UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 5

APRIL 4, 1963, TO APRIL 24, 1963
(PAGES 5659 TO 7058)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
V.109
pt. 5

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

Thursday, April 4, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Wayne R. Woods, pastor, Augustana Lutheran Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

The Lord be with you. Let us pray.

Lord and Father, have mercy upon us. We are sinful men. Our motives are mixed, and our words often drip with deceit. We are weak and inadequate for the heavy work we have been given to do.

Create in us clean hearts, O God, and put a new and right spirit within us.

It is good to remember Jesus Christ and his strengthening word, "I am with you always."

Bless our Nation and these who are its leaders. Grant them a heaven-sent wisdom by which they may perceive Thy will and Thy purpose amidst the revolutionary confusion of our time. Through their decisions, let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream—for all the people.

So may Thy Kingdom come on earth, beginning here and now. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 3, 1963, was dispensed with.

MORNING HOUR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the morning hour was dispensed with.

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF COMMON MARKET TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on April 1, 1963, at the Conference on Industrial Property Protection, at Villanova University, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] delivered an address on "The Economic and Political Implications of the Common Market to the United States." It is a sound appraisal of some of the problems which currently cloud our relationship with the European Economic Community.

The EEC is the world's largest market for farm imports. Its agricultural system is mostly antiquated, and is not equipped to compete efficiently with American producers. Yet the Community has embarked upon a highly protectionist policy in this area. Because of this, great injury already has been suffered by certain parts of American agriculture; and more trouble looms on the immediate horizon.

In his address, the Senator from Nebraska pointed out additional areas of concern, and raised some interesting questions. Do our antitrust laws provide sufficient safeguards for American firms competing abroad, especially in the growing markets of Africa and South America? Are our laws adequate to prevent foreign producers from selling goods in this country at prices lower than those for which they are sold in the home country or in some third country? What proof and procedures should be required to show that our producers are being injured by such discriminatory practices?

Free trade is a two-way street; and the Senator from Nebraska has ably pointed out several areas which are causing some restrictions in one of the lanes of traffic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's timely remarks on the Common Market be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE COMMON MARKET TO THE UNITED STATES

(Remarks of Senator Roman L. Hruska at the Conference on Industrial Property Protection, Villanova University, April 1, 1963)

It is a great pleasure to appear on this program. I consider myself deeply honored. The memory of this evening's fellowship will remain with me for a long time, for your conference has brought together a group of outstanding authorities whose contributions throughout these 3 days will provide an impressive study on the subject of "Industrial Property Protection."

What a splendid way to exchange ideas, views and information—in the company of men who have gained high respect and wide distinction in their respective areas of study. To see and hear them, to participate in panels where questions pinpoint specific areas of interest, and to have the opportunity to discuss the issues which develop with associates possessing like interests—all these activities fulfill the conference goals, which I take to be the gathering of information which can be put to use in your particular areas of work.

I speak as one who has participated in similar searches in the legislative field for some years. I know of no more effective method than the one you are employing to obtain a working knowledge of the foundations and complexities of that extraordinary enterprise, the Common Market, which is giving Europe a vigor and direction without parallel in its history. The Federal Bar Association, Villanova University, and Georgetown University are therefore to be commended for arranging this stimulating conference.

The panel of prominent speakers includes at least a half dozen who have journeyed across the Atlantic to be with us. This is gratifying. After all, they live close to the Common Market; some of them have an official connection with its present activities and had a decisive role in their initial development. It is well that they should participate in the program with others who engage daily in, and help shape the destiny of, the Common Market which is on this side of the Atlantic, and is now enjoying its 175th year of successful venture.

There is much we can learn from one another.

A NEW WORLD POWER IN THE MAKING

The creation and establishment of a new world power is no easy accomplishment. There are very few meaningful precedents to study as it does not happen often. In terms of human resources it takes enormous energy and incredible ingenuity to bring about such a result. In the past decade we have witnessed the gathering momentum for such a phenomenon. And today we face the accomplished fact.

The United States rejoices in the success of that effort.

It has been our policy from the inception to favor and encourage the fusion of European interests, just as it is American policy to similarly encourage and be of assistance to our Latin American neighbors.

In the immediate postwar years, a stable, prosperous Europe was deemed to be of paramount importance in preserving the common freedoms of the Atlantic nations.

Uppermost then was the thwarting of further Communist aggression and subversion. This involved political and military considerations. Their handling would have been difficult, if not impossible, without vigorous, orderly economic growth in the threatened areas. The strength of any military alliance is drawn from the well-being of all of its component parts.

More recently, another mutual responsibility has arisen through assistance to the poorer and underdeveloped nations. If this goal is to be attained, we must have increased, and certainly continued, economic prosperity on both sides of the Atlantic.

The Common Market is described by some as being a supranational organization following a Federal pattern. Others refer to it as containing merely the seeds of supranationalism. Perhaps the caution of the latter characterization is well warranted. The advocates of a "Europe-of-Fatherlands," a loose confederation of member states as opposed to a more closely unified organization, are very insistent.

In what direction the ultimate political development of the Community shall go is an issue which will not be settled for a long time. Moreover, I venture to say that the pattern will emerge quite gradually.

Obviously with a new economic power in being and a political one in the offing, it will behoove America to guide her actions and protect her own interests accordingly.

It is my purpose tonight to comment briefly on some of the areas in which the Congress will have an especial interest. With my observations goes a caveat, however, that the thinking of the Congress is still very fluid.

Basic assumptions which seemed so valid at one moment, such as Britain's entry into the Common Market when the trade expansion bill was enacted, have had to be discounted. Faced with so many unknowns, whose dimensions, let alone numbers, are yet to be fathomed, the Congress can well afford to remain conjectural about most of the apparent problems. Tonight I am taking a leaf from that notebook.

AGRICULTURE

The Treaty of Rome necessarily extends to agriculture and agricultural products and provides for the establishment among the member states of a common agricultural policy.

This constitutes one of the most difficult, complex, and far-reaching problems of any with which the six countries of the Common Market must grapple. By its nature, agriculture is on a different footing than are the other sectors of a national economy. Left to his own devices, the farmer cannot keep up with the rest of the economy. This is as true in Europe as it is in America, although for different reasons.

The European Economic Community is the world's largest market for farm imports. Its farm system is in the main antiquated and not sufficiently productive to be competitive with modern methods. It is far from being self-sufficient. In contrast, the United States is the greatest producer of many farm products the Community needs. Moreover, we are the most efficient producer in terms of manpower and machines. As a low-cost producer we can, in many instances, ship to the markets in Western Europe our farm products at a lower delivered cost than some, and perhaps most, of the countries can raise the products themselves.

For true free traders, this is a perfect situation because it would call for opening the doors to imports from a country which can more efficiently and economically produce the farm stuffs for the European consumer. The European farm laborer could then be released for more profitable occupations in other areas of the economy, whether they be industrial, commercial or otherwise.

But things just have not worked out that way.

First, because Europe wants to be self-sufficient in food production and, secondly, because the farm situation is more a matter of politics than economics—as I am sure you all are aware.

In the European Economic Community 1 out of every 4 persons belongs to the farming population, comprising a total of some 40 million. They till about one-tenth of the acreage farmed in the United States and require at least twice as many workers to do it. Their farms number 9 million as against our 5 million, with an average size of about 4.5 acres as against one 18 times that area in the United States. This tends to place their agricultural economy to a dismal level of inefficiency and high productive costs.

Just the same, the European Economic Community is embarking upon a highly protectionist policy as to farm products. Keeping its agriculture isolated and insulated, it hopes to hammer out a policy that will insure an adequate income for its farmers, increase agricultural productivity, balance production and consumption and supply food to the consumer at reasonable prices. Little wonder the member nations find themselves unable to devise a workable solution to their agricultural problem. When we scan the scope of such a policy, we can only exclaim: "What an order."

But the protectionist policy which the European Economic Community is forging and implementing vitally and directly affects American industry and trade beyond agriculture.

Variable import levies on certain farm stuffs went into operation on July 1 of last year. "Variable" is an appropriate term for the device by which the Community expects to obtain a protected, artificially priced market for the product. The designated import fee is of any size necessary to make certain that the product would not come into the Community at a price lower than the target price established throughout the six countries.

Its success is, as would be predicted, brilliant. For example, in the case of broiler poultry going into West Germany, which was our principal poultry market among the Six, exports dropped from 31.0 million pounds in the last quarter of 1961 to 10.8 million pounds in the same period of 1962. The reason? The duty plus variable levy was raised on last July 30th from 4.8 cents per pound to 12.5 cents per pound. The combined charges of each of the other countries were increased in about the same degree. As a result, poultry exports everywhere dropped precipitously. For this market our poultry trade has been seriously hurt.

Similar trouble looms in other product areas, especially wheat and feed grains, as soon as the six Common Market countries can compose the serious difficulties among themselves to agree on a target price.

The Common Market is by far our largest foreign market for farm products, particularly for sales in hard currency. In recent years our farm exports to the Common Market have averaged better than $1 billion a year. That is nearly a third of our total agricultural exports sold for dollars. Ten years ago the United States exported 100 million bushels of wheat. Last year the figure was 700 million. To have farm exports cut off or even heavily reduced would produce serious repercussions.

What interest will Congress take on this point? When the Congress enacted the Trade Expansion Act last year, which gave the President substantial authority to negotiate the reduction of foreign import restrictions by granting reductions of U.S. import restrictions, Congress attached an amendment which hopefully will set the tone for all future trade and tariff negotiations.

The statutory language, thrashed out in committee and conference, is designed to obtain a tough policy at the bargaining table. The President is directed not to grant additional concessions to countries that are imposing variable fees or other import restrictions which are contrary to existing trade agreements. He is also authorized to cancel previous concessions made to countries which persist in such practices.

You might like to know that some of us in the Congress pressed vigorously for mandatory action upon the President in such cases but the effort was beaten down.

The reason for urging the requirement of mandatory action in this area had good foundation. Far too often trade negotiations would be undertaken and completed on manufactured goods before any consideration would be given to agricultural products. Bargaining stock was usually dissipated by the time discussions reached that latter point on the agenda, with the disappointing result that the elimination of foreign restrictions on agricultural imports lagged far behind the elimination of restrictions on manufactured goods.

Recently, however, we have had some encouraging news in this regard. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, testifying before one of our Senate committees on this very point, announced:

"And our policy, the policy of our Government, is very clear, and I think very important, that agriculture will be an integral part of the negotiations, and that we are going to negotiate across the board, and we are not going to put agriculture in a corner and say, agriculture for agriculture, cow for cow, hog for hog, and automobile for automobile, which on an item by item basis was done before, leaving agriculture to the last, when the problem became almost insuperable.

"This is a very significant recognition by the administration, by Mr. Herter, by the State Department, and it will be very important to agriculture in the basic long-term negotiations. They of course include more than just the Common Market. These negotiations include all the nations in the free world."

It will be with keen interest that Members of Congress await developments in this area. Industrial exporters who wish to sell to the United States must recognize that expanded trade in industrial goods cannot be realized if U.S. agricultural exports are oppressively restricted. The agricultural policy now enunciated by the six member states will neither strengthen the Common Market nor promote trade alliances. While the American farmer has a primary stake in the outcome, the issue affects more than his foreign markets and the European consumer's pocketbook. Possibly the unity, and certainly the strength, of the free world is involved.

EXTRATERRITORIAL ANTITRUST

It is not my intention to dwell at length on the subject of our antitrust laws and how they affect American foreign commerce. This subject was thoroughly examined in your conference earlier today. But I would like to refer briefly to the hearings conducted by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee 2 weeks ago and leave with you some impressions which may indicate possible areas of future congressional interest.

Considerable testimony was devoted to the Webb-Pomerene Act which, as you know, was enacted to promote our export trade. Under this act, American companies may associate to engage in export trade. There are, however, substantial limitations on what these companies can do under the act.

For example, such an association must not be in restraint of trade within the United States or of the export business of any domestic competitor of the association. Moreover, the act does not permit export associations to enter into international cartel agreements.

The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Paul Rand Dixon, reported that the number of export associations registered under the Webb-Pomerene Act has dwindled steadily over the years and that in the first half of 1962, there were only 29. Little wonder, in view of the limited scope of the act.

Assistant Secretary Behrman of the Department of Commerce pointed out that the EEC's antitrust laws and regulations might permit a European cartel or restrictive combination to engage in foreign trade practices that a Webb-Pomerene association would be barred from doing. American firms could thus be placed at a disadvantage in foreign markets such as Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The suggestion followed that our antitrust laws might need to be amended to place American firms on an equal footing abroad.

On the other hand, Assistant Attorney General Loevinger, in charge of Antitrust Division, testified that these laws need no relaxation—that for the foreseeable future the "rule of reason" is an ample safeguard for American firms competing abroad. But is that enough assurance for American firms? Will such vagueness spur them to go confidently ahead to do battle in the trade markets of the world?

What about their competitors based in the Common Market? Does the Treaty of Rome prohibit them from restraining competition outside the Common Market? It would appear not to. Would it make any difference if such external restraints were to result in a distortion of competition within the Common Market? The treaty is silent on this question. It might make a difference, but we can only speculate on this point.

Let us assume that restraints outside the Common Market having effect within it may ultimately be held to violate the Treaty of Rome. Still, compare the differences between our antitrust laws and those of the European Economic Community. For example, restraints against competition may be exempted under the Treaty of Rome if, with certain limitations, they contribute to the promotion of economic progress within the Common Market. Mr. Dixon points out that American law would condemn some of these restraints as per se violations of section 1 of the Sherman Act. Hence we are confronted with the serious question whether the so-called "rule of reason" permits American businessmen to venture forth into the world with the same confidence and encouragement with which their European brethren embark.

Our balance-of-payments problem is sufficiently urgent to require an imaginative reappraisal of our antitrust laws as they apply to foreign commerce. In this connection it has been suggested to be in the interests of the United States—and, indeed, all of the nations of the free world—that there be sought an international treaty against restraints of trade.

To quote from the report of the Attorney General's 1955 Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws: "We cannot * * * depend on the gradual evolution of foreign law to protect the American economy against international cartels."

At the moment we can only speculate as to whether the European Economic Community Commission will be liberal or conservative in the application of its antitrust laws and regulations. But I believe Congress should be prepared to balance the scales if and when the rulings of the Commission make it clear that it does not intend to curtail the foreign trade practices of European businesses in a manner that American firms are restrained by the extraterritorial effect of our antitrust laws.

ANTIDUMPING STATUTES

As if the disadvantages imposed on American firms in the foreign arena were not enough, they must also contend domestically with dumping practices of some foreign businesses. "Dumping" occurs when a producer sells his products in a foreign country at a price below what he charges in his own country and so low as to be injurious to producers in the foreign country.

Foreign businesses have good reasons for selling their surplus goods here for lower prices than in their own countries. It is economically beneficial to them—and they are not subject to the Robinson-Patman Act.

Under our present statute it is very difficult for an American firm to show adequate injury as a result of such practices.

Here is an area that the Congress should carefully reevaluate. The Robinson-Patman Act prohibits discriminatory pricing within the United States by American firms. It may well be appropriate to consider amending the act so that it applies as well to foreign businesses which sell their goods in the United States at discriminatory prices, that is, at prices lower than those they charge in their home country.

THE DRAFT CONVENTION FOR A EUROPEAN PATENT SYSTEM

U.S. Patent Commissioner Ladd gave you his views in the morning session on the Draft Convention for a European Patent System. I join him in congratulating the authors of the draft. It is truly an outstanding achievement. But I share his disappointment in the possibility that the European patent may be effectively restricted to nationals of the contracting countries.

There is now a very substantial exchange of technological information and industrial property rights between the countries of the European Economic Community and the United States. It is difficult to comprehend why anyone would want to curtail this most useful relationship. It could have been expected that the Congress is perplexed that this remarkable document—the draft of the European Patent Convention—should set forth as an alternative that the European Patent System be in effect a closed shop.

Commissioner Ladd has given you some of the practical and legal reasons for such concern. I shall add but one further consideration.

We have provided, and still provide, to our European friends a common market of 50 States in which they may exploit their inventions under the protection of our patent laws. This may be done, not by filing 50 patent applications, not by filing six, but by filing just one. The patent that issues on this single application may be exploited in the vast common market that is the United States. America would not want it any other way.

For this reason, I find it difficult to believe that anyone would want to impair so forward-looking an institution as the proposed supranational European patent system by denying, or severely impeding, the availability of European industrial property protection to nationals of countries that are not parties to the convention. That would simply be retrogression, with consequences which cannot be foreseen.

CONCLUSION

If I have dwelled on some of the disappointing implications of the Common Market, it is because we in the Congress are concerned about them. But it is not my intention to leave you with the impression that I take a dim view of the organization in general.

On the contrary we can take a great deal of comfort in the progress made by the Community. The six countries appear headed for an order similar to our own. Certainly whether we have served as a precedent, the organization holds more promise than what previously existed on the Continent. While it remains to be seen if it can develop a better order of things than we have, there is no question that it will be an improved order for the Common Market countries.

It would be highly inaccurate to say that our interest in such development is paternalistic, but our pleasure at witnessing the rejuvenation of the Common Market countries is understandable. Beyond the challenge that stems from our businessmen trading there, we can sense the assurance that this new world power will be a significant and immediate force for European stability and world freedom.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. **SPARKMAN**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may now be a quorum call, and that the time required for it not be charged to the time available under the agreement.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public, and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I know that the pending amendment is the Morse amendment. A conference on that subject is going on right now. I ask unanimous consent that, without taking time from either side on the Morse amendment, I may be permitted to address the Senate for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT: A STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, the Senate and the House of Representatives are making encouraging progress in the consideration of the Youth Employment Act. S. 1 will soon be placed on the Senate calendar; floor action is scheduled within the next few days. The House

Education and Labor Committee has already reported the House bill favorably. Both Senate and House bills are remarkably similar in all fundamental respects. As principal sponsor of the Youth Employment Act, I am indeed hopeful that prompt and favorable decisions will be returned by both Houses.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. PERKINS, for their outstanding labors in both Houses in behalf of the proposed legislation. They could have been satisfied to rush this legislation through perfunctory hearings and executive sessions. Instead, the controversial aspects of both the Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps were inquired into and examined with great care. The opponents of the legislation were permitted every opportunity to state their objections, marshal their arguments, and question witnesses. The hearings published by both Senate and House committees contain a wealth of information and opinions regarding the Humphrey Youth Act.

This morning I rise to set forth the fundamental reasons for my 7-year advocacy of title I of the Humphrey youth bill, the Youth Conservation Corps. Often it is helpful to have the principal author of legislation discuss the bill's basic purposes and objectives. I hope to do this with all the candor, objectivity, and frankness at my command.

In discussing the basic purposes of the Youth Conservation Corps, I plan to analyze the major arguments that have been raised by the opponents of the proposal. It is possible to identify three basic issues that have been developed through the hearings and committee consideration. First, it is alleged that the training and work experiences available to enrollees in the Youth Conservation Corps are not adequate to the employment demands of our contemporary society. Second, it is charged that the cost of the program is excessive in relation to ultimate benefits. Finally, it is alleged that the program will have little impact on the overall problem of youth unemployment.

These are serious allegations. They warrant answers that are frank and forthright. If the proponents of this legislation cannot provide adequate answers, they have no business advocating the Youth Employment Act in Congress or before the American people.

Mr. President, I believe we have the answers. They are answers based on facts, not opinions; dollars and cents, not good intentions; and hard results, not mere promises. The problem of youth unemployment touches every section of the country, every city, town, and village. The tragedy of the enormous waste of human resources clearly places this problem above short-run political considerations. If this is possible, I have no doubt that the American people—particularly the hundreds of thousands of unemployed young people—will be the ultimate beneficiaries.

BASIC CAUSES OF YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

First, the objectives of the Youth Employment Act must be understood in relation to the basic causes of our youth unemployment problem. If we go to the roots of this problem, what do we find?

We find an economy that is lagging far behind its potential in terms of providing new jobs for both adults and young people. We find an elementary and secondary school system that often fails to provide the education each American child rightfully deserves. We find a society that considers vocational education to be second-rate education and has never provided adequately for such instruction. We find the American society—both urban and rural—undergoing profound transformations that radically alter the traditional modes of employment, family living, and social organization.

Do the proponents of the Youth Employment Act claim that the Youth Conservation Corps or the Hometown Youth Corps will provide the solutions to these root causes? Of course they do not. But anyone claiming to "solve" the problem of youth unemployment had better be ready to deal with each of these questions. For here lie the roots of the problem. Here are the causes.

What do the proponents of this legislation claim? They say simply this: the Youth Employment Act provides opportunities for assisting thousands upon thousands of young people who are victimized by the problems of sluggish economic growth, inadequate educational systems, automation, urbanization, and social disorientation.

While the Nation wrestles with solutions to these basic problems, can we afford to sit quietly by, with hands folded, and permit these young people to lose all chance for productive and meaningful lives? The President of the United States, the Senator from Minnesota, Members of Congress from all sections of the country, scores of private organizations, and thousands of private citizens say, "No."

It is interesting to note that many persons opposing the Youth Employment Act also oppose the President's program for tax reduction and reform, the legislation to foster educational improvement on the elementary, secondary, college, and postgraduate levels, urban renewal, and expanded vocational educational opportunities.

In the 87th Congress, for example, the same persons who now oppose the Youth Employment Act for the reason that it fails to provide sufficient vocational training voted to eliminate training allowances for young persons—16 to 21—in the Manpower Development and Training Act. The same persons attempted to cut the entire manpower retraining program in half by reducing the program's authorization from 4 to 2 years.

Alternatively, most Senators supporting the Youth Employment Act are also counted as vigorous supporters of President Kennedy's recommendations to attack the basic domestic problems that are the roots of youth unemployment.

In short, the proponents of the Youth Employment Act want to provide job opportunities for thousands of unemployed young Americans even though such job opportunities, in themselves, will not solve the basic causes of this unemployment. But such opportunities will do a great deal toward alleviating its devastating impact on individuals and on society at large.

WHY THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS WILL WORK

Are the programs contained in the Youth Employment Act capable of accomplishing even this limited task?

Opponents of the Youth Conservation Corps tell us that what filled the needs of the 1930's is not sufficient to meet the needs of the 1960's. This, I submit, depends entirely on the nature of the needs that existed in the 1930's as compared to the needs that still exist today.

As studies of the Civilian Conservation Corps have demonstrated, the primary need that existed among CCC enrollees was the opportunity to develop reliable, dependable, and mature work habits. After all, the most fundamental of all so-called job skills is the ability to appreciate the value of work—hard work—for its own sake. An individual possessing a highly developed technical competence and lacking this ability is just as poor an employment risk as the most unskilled school dropout.

I devoutly hope our civilization has not reached a plateau of technical sophistication where hard, honest labor is no longer necessary. My personal experience, as corroborated by expert testimony at the recent Senate hearings, suggests quite another answer. The personal qualities of reliability, maturity, dependability, and honesty far outrank in importance any specialized technical ability that may be taught to a young worker.

Frankly, Mr. President, I believe the opponents of the Youth Employment Act actually accept the proposition that sound work habits form the basis for any successful employment experience. Their own careers indicate the value of hard, dedicated work. In fact, I am still hopeful we can convince them of the great potential residing in the Youth Conservation Corps for bringing hope, enthusiasm, and self-fulfillment to America's forgotten youths.

If the crucial importance of nurturing these attributes among unemployed young people is acknowledged then I maintain that the Youth Conservation Corps is uniquely able to develop such personal qualities to a degree not possible in other vocational or occupational training programs.

The entire experience of the Civilian Conservation Corps stands as compelling evidence to this central fact. In my testimony before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee chaired by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I referred to a study of 272 boys from Cleveland who had enrolled in the CCC. This study was undertaken by the School of Applied Social Sciences at Western Reserve University and the conclusions are well worth repeating:

> The values which these 272 boys received from their camp experiences seem to fall into two general classifications: those having to do with the more or less concrete

> factors of improved physical health, increased weight, and financial gains, and those having to do with the intangible but significant factors of greater maturity, increased self-confidence, and general security. As we review the experiences and comments of these boys, we are impressed with the values from which many of them benefited, but we are impressed, too, by the responsibility placed on the individual boy for seeing and obtaining these values.

Let me also quote from the conclusions of another study, "The Administration of the Civilian Conservation Corps," undertaken at the Johns Hopkins University in 1937:

> Perhaps the most noteworthy achievement and the most beneficial result of the Civilian Conservation Corps program has been the development of good citizenship among the enrollees. The President (Franklin D. Roosevelt), in emphasizing the spiritual values of the project said, "Through you the Nation will graduate a fine group of strong young men, clean living, trained to self-discipline and above all, willing and proud to work for the joy of working." In their contacts with the administrative personnel, both camp and project, as well as with their fellow workers, the enrollees learned some of the valuable lessons of life. They learned to give and take, that honesty, sobriety, and truthfulness are the best policies, and above all how to live with others.

What young man ever outgrows the need for these qualities? To borrow the phrasing of certain opponents of S. 1—if the CCC provided such opportunities for young men in the 1930's, the Youth Conservation Corps will fill a similar need today.

Most of the enrollees in the Youth Conservation Corps will have dropped out of school prior to graduation. They will have failed in their attempt to acquire a basic education. They will have failed again in their attempts to locate permanent employment. They will be prisoners of their failures, prisoners of their local environment, and prisoners of their own discouragement.

The Youth Conservation Corps offers these young men an opportunity to break this chain of self-perpetuating defeats and failures and substitute in their place a unique experience of accomplishment and self-fulfillment.

They will leave their depressing local surroundings for a totally new start, among new companions and friends. They will travel to a well regulated community under the direction of experienced camp foremen. They will receive work assignments within their capacity to complete satisfactorily. They will participate in additional educational and training activities. They will engage in organized recreation, sports, and intracamp activities. Each of these factors will play an important part in transforming the outlook, attitudes, job skills, and employability of the YCC enrollees.

WORK EXPERIENCES IN THE YCC

What types of on-the-job work experiences will be available in the YCC camps? While this will vary according to specific camp locations, it is possible to identify the broad spectrum of tasks already planned for YCC enrollees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of projected work projects as supplied by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TYPES AND DESCRIPTION OF CONSERVATION WORK WHICH YCC ENROLLEES CAN ACCOMPLISH

The following types of work are available for accomplishment by a YCC on national forests and grasslands, experimental forests, national parks and monuments, wildlife refuges, fish hatcheries, Indian reservations, public domain lands, State parks and forests, and other public lands and related installations:

SOIL AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

Stabilizing eroded gullies and drainage channels, sheet erosion control, stabilizing dunes and earth slides, controlling erosion on roads and trails, water spreading, flood prevention, and stream pollution control. Stabilization of recent burned areas, brush control, permanent modification of vegetative cover for increasing production of the most valuable vegetation for consumption and watershed protection.

This work involves reseeding, reforestation, contour trenching, small dam construction, and fencing or ripraping of erodible areas by both hand and machine.

TIMBER STAND IMPROVEMENT

Gathering seeds for nursery production; propagation of trees in nurseries; hand and machine planting of seeds or seedling trees on understocked, lightly stocked, or burned forest areas and submarginal farmland; and thinning, pruning, weeding, release cutting, and plantation care to increase the productive condition of forested lands.

RANGE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Type conversion and revegetation of depleted ranges; machine, chemical, and hand labor control of noxious or poisonous range plants and farm weeds, reconstruction or rehabilitation and maintenance of existing range improvements; construction of new improvements such as range fences, stock water developments, cattleguards, and stock trails. Control of rodents harmful to range lands.

RECREATION FACILITIES

Develop new camps and picnic grounds, swimming areas, boating and winter sports areas, visitor information facilities and services such as museums, exhibits, nature trails, outdoor amphitheaters, scenic vistas, and roadside rest stops. Provide essential facilities such as roads, parking areas, adequate sanitation, cleanup, safe water, fire prevention, and safety conditions on public recreation areas. Install picnic tables, fireplaces, shelters, restrooms, and water supplies. Rehabilitate and maintain existing facilities.

Salvaging and preserving artifacts from known sites of archeological remains that may be threatened with loss or damage through construction activities. This includes work at protected sites that need further investigation and preservation.

This work involves carpentry, masonry, machine and equipment operation, and related skills.

WILDLIFE HABITAT IMPROVEMENT

Planting game food and cover in forest and grassland areas; developing wildlife openings, food patches, water supplies, and game ways in dense vegetation; improving fishing streams and lakes by stabilizing banks, planting streamside cover, constructing channel improvements, and cleaning up streams and lakes. Taking game census, population surveys, and surveys of habitat use and damage.

INSECT AND DISEASE PROTECTION

Controlling forest insects and disease by such means as removal and/or treatment of infested trees or removal or spraying of host plants.

This work involves both hand and machine methods of surveys, treatment, and eradication, including ground support of aerial operations.

FIRE PROTECTION

Fighting forest fires, using hand tools, hose, and pump operations, motorized fire equipment, and providing fire camp service support. Reducing fire hazards with such techniques as clearing hazardous debris concentrations, falling dead trees, roadside fuel removal, and clearing and maintaining fire equipment in a state of readiness such as hand tools, power saws, pumps, tankers, and other specialized fire equipment. Impound water for fire protection purposes.

ROAD AND TRAIL DEVELOPMENT

Maintenance, reconstruction, and construction of roads and trails.

This work includes such work as right-of-way clearing, assistance to survey and layout crews, culvert and bridge construction, trail construction, drainage installation, sign construction and installation, and assistance to equipment operators.

FIRE AND ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENTS

Maintenance, reconstruction, and construction of dwellings, offices, barracks, warehouses, lookout towers and cabins, footbridges, signs, and other service structures. Telephone line maintenance and construction. Maintenance and construction of landing fields, heliports, helispots, and ground facilities for air operations such as mixing plants and spraying facilities.

BOUNDARY SURVEYS AND MARKING

Assisting survey crews in land ownership boundary location surveys, clear and post boundary lines and establish corner monuments. Construct and maintain boundary fences.

MISCELLANEOUS

Providing camps support services such as clerks, cooks helpers, medical assistants, equipment maintenance assistants, warehousing and camp maintenance. Construction and maintenance of demonstration area improvements.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much conservation work of this type exists? Frankly, the backlog that has accumulated through years of neglect is tremendous. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that forecasts of the work suitable for the YCC program be printed in the RECORD at this point. These forecasts have been prepared by the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior.

There being no objection, the forecasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL BACKLOG OF NEEDED CONSERVATION WORK

This work in forestry, soil and water conservation, parks, fish and wildlife, range revegetation, water pollution and sediment, and other similar investments in protection and management of these basic resources would require an investment of nearly $20 billion. This calculation does not include the heavy construction programs in water development with a backlog of authorized projects nearly equal in size. These investment estimates are summarized as follows:

Forestry: Reforestation of 28 million acres; timber stand improvement, 140 million acres; expansion of fire protection, especially in Alaska, 200 million acres; purchase of 10 million acres of national forest in-holdings—total $2.6 billion.

Soil and watersheds: Establishment of soil and watershed conservation programs on 300 million acres of farm lands; purchase and retirement from crop production of 13 million acres of dust bowl lands; revegetation of strip mine areas—$5.1 billion.

Western rangelands: Brush clearing, water-spreading devices and revegetation over large parts of 200 million acres of Federal grazing districts and forest lands—total estimated cost $1 billion.

Parks and recreation lands.—Establishment and refurbishing of recreational facilities on National and State parks, national forests and other public lands; purchase of additional strategic recreational tracts and access to water areas—3 million acres—total cost $2.6 billion.

Fish and wildlife.—Establishment of wildlife habitat and structural improvements on wildlife refuges; expansion of wildlife cover development on private lands; and expansion of wildlife research programs; purchase of 7½ million acres of wetlands—total cost $1.2 billion.

Pollution control.—Construction of waste treatment facilities for all presently outdated industrial and municipal pollution—$5 billion.

Capital expenditures in renewable natural resources of the type just enumerated may be roughly classified into three major categories: (1) those which yield a direct "onsite" return in the form of additional yields of timber, crops, forage and other products; (2) those designed to prevent soil losses, siltation and damage from floods, etc., and (3) those which provide unmeasurable nonmonetary benefits such as recreation and wildlife.

Source: SCSA, 1961.

Conservation Work on Lands Administered by the Forest Service

GENERAL SITUATION

The Forest Service has the responsibility for the development, protection, and management under principles of multiple use and sustained yield of about 186 million acres in 154 national forests, 18 national grasslands, and other administrative units in 44 States and Puerto Rico. Much of the work in connection with the development, management, and protection of these lands is suitable for accomplishment through camps such as would be established under the proposed Youth Conservation Corps program. Modern and efficient methods and equipment would be used on all work. Manpower would be used where it is most the efficient method. Much of the needed work on these lands is of the type that would utilize large amounts of manpower.

READY CONSERVATION PROJECTS

For several years, the Forest Service has maintained up-to-date inventories of all Forest Service work needed on each of 805 ranger districts in the national forest system. These project work inventories are the basis of the project work in the development program for the national forests. They are also the source of work projects planned, budgeted, and accomplished in the ranger districts' annual plans of work. The amount and location of the project work in these inventories is known. All of it is needed and designed to meet the present and future demands upon the national forest system if these public lands are to provide their share of the Nation's future needs.

TYPES OF SUCH WORK

1. Timber stand improvement.
2. Reforestation.
3. Recreation area development and maintenance.
4. Fire hazard reduction.
5. Trail construction and maintenance.
6. Fishing stream and lake improvement.
7. Wildlife habitat improvement.
8. Range water developments.
9. Range, boundary, and other fence construction and maintenance.
10. National forest boundary line maintenance.

WORK ESTIMATES

A detailed table of these work estimates follows:

Type of nonrecurrent work (project work)

	Total man-years
Reforestation (seed or plant 4,400,000 acres of nonstocked and poorly stocked lands)	40,000
Timber stand improvement (pruning, weeding, thinning, and release cutting on 30,000,000 acres)	99,700
Recreation resource development (rehabilitate 2,000 campgrounds, picnic, and other recreation sites; develop 28,000 new campgrounds and picnic sites and construct 283,000 family units; develop 4,000 other recreation sites)	45,200
Wildlife habitat improvement (improve 1,500,000 acres of game range, 7,000 miles of stream, 56,000 acres of lakes. Develop 2,000 wildlife watering facilities, 400,000 acres of wildlife openings, food patches, and game ways; 11,000,000 acres of rodent control)	5,300
Range resource development (revegtation and control of noxious or poisonous range plants and farm weeds on 4,000,000 acres; construction of 16,000 miles of fence and 8,100 water developments)	7,100
Soil and water resource improvement (9,000 miles of gully and channel stabilization, 1,300,000 acres of sheet erosion control, 10,000 acres of dune and blowout stabilization, erosion control on 13,000 miles of substandard roads and trails, 5,600 acres of water spreading, 570 structures for flood prevention and stream pollution control)	9,000
Land surveys and boundary marking (clear and mark 200,000 miles of property lines)	3,000
Forest fire protection (reduce hazardous fuels on 4,000,000 acres, consisting of 250,000 acres of debris burning, 350,000 acres of snag removal, 3,500,000 acres of prescribed burning, and removal of roadside fuels on 39,000 acres; construct 11,000 miles of firebreaks)	6,600
Structural improvements for fire and general purpose (construct 2,500 housing and related improvements, 2,500 service buildings, 450 lookouts, 13 special structures; betterment of existing structures; replacement of 3,000 miles of telephone line; construction and reconstruction of 62 landing fields; construct 1,821 heliports and helispots)	11,200
Road and trail construction (construct 46,400 miles of multiple-use purpose roads and 8,000 miles of trails)	65,800
Total	293,300

Type of recurrent work

	Annual man-years
Forest fire protection [1]	3,500
Insect and disease control	1,400
Maintenance of resource and administrative facilities	6,300
Total	11,200

[1] Does not include fire suppression.

Inventory of YCC work potential, National Park Service, Department of the Interior [1]

Man-years annually	27,600
Camps needed	129
Capital improvements:	
Camp and picnic grounds (sites)	9,280
Minor structures (number of)	9,945
Historical, archeological work (man-years)	858
New roads and trails (miles)	1,153
Grounds improvements (man-years)	2,159
Boundary marking and fencing (miles)	5,146
Water suply and storage (projects)	659
Maintenance:	
Forest protection (man-years)	742
Vista clearing (miles)	1,480
Grounds maintenance (man-years)	2,041
Road and trail maintenance (miles)	3,312
Soil and moisture conservation (man-years)	945
Building maintenance (number of buildings)	2,893
Wildlife construction and protection (man-years)	233

[1] Prepared by Department of the Interior, Mar. 15, 1963.

Inventory of YCC work potential, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior [1]

Man-years annually	10,000
Camps needed	110
Capital improvements:	
Forest development (acres)	7,582,000
Trail construction (miles)	2,133
Road construction (miles)	21,571
Bridges (number)	1,066
Fencing (miles)	116,125
Range seeding (acres)	12,323,000
Brush control (acres)	32,283,000
Water management (projects)	64,575
Buildings (facilities)	21,755
Maintenance:	
Roads and trails (miles)	586,268
Fence maintenance (miles)	123,023
Building and facilities maintenance (number)	22,127

[1] Prepared by Department of the Interior, Mar. 15, 1963.

Inventory of YCC work potential, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior

Man-years annually	6,380
Camps needed	53
Capital improvements:	
Water impoundments:	
Structures	1,664
Dikes (miles)	883
Roads, trails, fences, etc.:	
Bridges (number)	93
Fencing (miles)	1,699
Roads (miles)	1,111
Recreation facilities:	
Campsites, number	253
Picnic tables, restrooms, etc.	1,867
Maintenance:	
Buildings and structures (number)	986
Roads, trails, fencing	11,882
Biological work on:	
Grasslands (acres)	6,417,000
Forests (acres)	950,000
Cropland (acres)	87,000

Inventory of YCC work potential, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior [1]

Man-years annually	7,444
Camps needed	320
Capital improvements:	
Brush control (acres)	2,635,421
Pest and weed control (acres)	24,793,000
Gully control (miles)	566,181

See footnote at end of table.

Inventory of YCC work potential, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior[1]—Continued

Capital improvements—Con.	
Tree planting (acres)	50,901
Seeding, sodding (acres)	3,258,795
Structures (number)	36,899
Forest improvement and protection (acres)	1,610,000
Trails and firebreaks (miles)	750
Truck trails construction (miles)	7,106
Water management construction (number)	11,309
Range improvements:	
Fencing (miles)	95,210
Projects (number)	3,150
Recreational development (projects)	16,689
Maintenance:	
Dam repairs, etc. (number)	168
Levees, dikes, laterals (miles)	5,333
Structures, erosion control (number)	83,416
Trails, firebreaks (miles)	740

[1] Prepared by Department of the Interior, Mar. 15, 1963.

Inventory of YCC work potential, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior[1]

Man-year annually	6,052
Camps needed	148
Capital improvements:	
Resource conservation on Reclamation lands (acres)	162,000
Plant control and eradication (acres)	160,000
New roads (miles)	830
Recreational areas (sites)	148
Maintenance:	
Resource conservation (acres)	34,000
Control of plants (acres)	31,300
Road maintenance (miles)	2,375
Trail maintenance (miles)	2,850
Site maintenance (sites)	475
Building maintenance (number)	4,750

[1] Prepared by Department of the Interior, Mar. 15, 1963.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as these figures clearly indicate, there is no possibility that the YCC could exhaust this existing backlog and expected recurring work for many years. The exhaustion of work projects is not a matter of serious concern to those persons familiar with the facts. There is much to be done. I submit that an analysis of the job opportunities contained in this extensive list of projects will arrive at three principal conclusions. First, these work projects cannot be described as makework. The respective Federal agencies concerned with conservation have programed these projects long before the YCC became a possible means of accomplishing them. The Forest Service has a fully documented forecast of required work entitled, "A Development Program for the National Forests." The various bureaus of the Department of the Interior have also submitted their estimates of work within their respective jurisdictions. Such statements referring to YCC projects as make-work blatantly ignore the documented evidence to the contrary.

Second, the nature of these work projects are exactly the type of planned work experience that will most effectively build sound work habits, create the opportunity for personal accomplishment, and provide the physical exhilaration of hard labor.

Third, these jobs will also provide valuable skills to enhance the future employability of the YCC enrollees. Rather than providing young men with the experience of raking leaves—the picture that many opponents of this bill insist on propagating—I see YCC enrollees acquiring the following skills, among others, from their on-the-job work experience: automotive repairing, baking, carpentry, clerical, construction equipment operation, cooking, conservation and engineering aid, electrical wiring, masonry, metalworking, photography, plumbing, sign painting, surveying and mapping, and truck driving.

I contend that a YCC enrollee will acquire on-the-job skills that compare most favorably with those learned in a vocational education program conducted for a similar period of time, but the enrollee will also benefit from the additional personal experiences found only in a resident work camp experience. Rather than describing the YCC as being seriously deficient in its training potential, I prefer to look at a YCC experience as job training-plus.

One should also understand that many industrial firms and businesses operate extensive job training courses for their employees. These companies do not expect their new workers to come fully trained, ready to begin their particular jobs. In fact, they frequently prefer to train new workers to the requirements of their specific assignments in a manner that corresponds directly with the established procedures of the company.

However, these companies are seeking employees with mature and responsible work habits. If these basic work attitudes exist, the employee can be trained to his specific responsibility, and often at company expense.

VOCATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL TRAINING IN YCC

As a vital supplement to the on-the-job experience, each YCC camp will also provide after-hours vocational and academic training. These courses will be provided through the U.S. Office of Education working in cooperation with State and local school officials. As Secretary Wirtz said in his testimony before the Clark subcommittee, it is currently deemed likely that each YCC camp would specialize in training for a particular skill. For example, certain camps would be equipped to teach basic fundamentals of automechanics; others would specialize in TV repairing, and so forth. Each enrollee should receive a minimum of 10 hours per week of supplementary vocational and academic training.

It has been suggested that the extensive home study curricula provided by the Armed Forces Institute could supplement other forms of instruction. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of subjects which could be taught at YCC camps through accredited home study schools, including the Armed Forces Institute, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Subjects which can be taught at YCC camps through accredited home study schools (including the Armed Forces Institute):

Accountancy, agriculture, air conditioning, aircraft and drafting mechanics, appliance servicing, auto body and fender, automotive work, baking, blacksmithing, boilermaking, bookkeeping, bricklaying, building construction estimates and maintenance.

Cabinetmaking, camera repair, carpentry, civil engineering, club and camp management, college preparatory, concrete engineering, construction, diesel engines, drafting, electroplating, engines.

Farm management (marketing, shopwork), foremanship, forging, foundry, gardening, high school subjects, horticulture, instrumentation, jewelry making.

Landscaping and gardening, livestock management, lumber yard management, machine shop, machine trades, mechanical engineering, merchandising, metal crafts, metallurgical engineering, metallurgy or metals, mining, mapping, and surveying.

Patternmaking, photography, plumbing, poultry raising, showcard and sign lettering, stenotypy (machine shorthand), surveying and mapping, telephony (electronic and nonelectronic), textiles, typewriter repair, waterworks and sewage plant operation, welding, wiring, woodworking.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the markup of the youth bill, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee accepted an excellent amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that called for special emphasis on vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of YCC enrollees. Where such services were shown to be deficient in a particular camp, the amendment also provided for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of local school officials and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I commend the distinguished Senator from New York for his highly constructive amendment that, in my opinion, has materially strengthened the entire bill.

I would also like to make one final suggestion regarding the educational programs in YCC camps. Recently I have been astounded by the progress that has been achieved in the area of machine and programed teaching. A former Member of this body, the Honorable William Benton, has recently undertaken to establish complete schools relying primarily on programed teaching and teaching machines. Britannica Schools, a division of Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., has opened its first teaching institute in Chicago. Others will soon open throughout the country.

The results are amazing. I intend to discuss the potential of machine teaching at greater length. For the present let me just note that the teaching methods used so successfully by Britannica Schools and other similar institutions provide an exceptional opportunity to guarantee vocational and academic teaching of the highest caliber to each YCC enrollee. It is my intention to explore this possibility with the U.S. Office of Education and the officials charged with administering the Youth Conservation Corps.

ACTUAL COST OF PROGRAM

Opponents of this legislation have charged that it will cost between $9,000 and $12,000 per year to support one YCC enrollee. As Secretary Wirtz repeatedly testified before the Clark subcommittee, these figures are exaggerated and misleading.

They are exaggerated and misleading in two fundamental respects: One, they are flatly contradicted by the cost data supplied by the Departments of Labor, Interior, and Agriculture; two, they fail to take into consideration any of the substantial financial returns that will accrue from the conservation projects undertaken by the YCC.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Estimated Annual Costs Per Enrollee" as prepared by the executive agencies be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED ANNUAL COSTS PER ENROLLEE

(These estimates represent the cooperative efforts of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, H.E.W., Labor, Army, and the Bureau of the Budget. They are based on a 50-man camp operation.)

Enrollee pay and benefits (annual base pay $720, ratings $18, OASI and BEC $57)	$795
Housing—amortized over 20 years ($250,000 per 50-man camp—less in camps with facilities available)	250
Camp maintenance (repairs, utilities, and services)	100
Clothing and personal equipment (includes blankets, towels, sheets, etc.)	200
Subsistence ($2.50 per day for 300 days, food and preparation)	825
Medical and dental care	300
Education and training	300
Transportation of enrollees to and to and from camps includes fare, food, and cost of group leader	100
Recruiting and administration (selection, induction, director's offices, bureaus, and departments)	150
Camp and work supervision (camp staff pay, benefits, and travel)	700
On-the-job transportation	190
Miscellaneous	70
Total	$3,985

Work equipment, materials, and supplies will vary greatly, depending on type of work, from $150 to $1,000; may average $500.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the greatest controversy has arisen over the estimated construction costs of the YCC camps. Construction of a 50-man camp has been estimated by the executive agencies at $250,000 amortized over 20 years, the life expectancy of the permanent buildings. Amortizing the permanent construction costs over 20 years—a legitimate and reasonable length of time—results in $250 being included for permanent construction in the total annual costs per enrollee of $3,985.

The opponents' figure of $9,000 annual cost per enrollee results from absorbing the entire permanent construction cost of a 50-man camp in the initial year of operation. In other words, the $9,000 per enrollee cost figure includes $5,000 that represents the entire payment per enrollee of constructing new permanent facilities.

The manner in which the opponents have used this $9,000 figure is seriously misleading. They have taken permanent construction costs, absorbed these costs in a single year of operation—as opposed to amortizing them over a longer time period—and then portrayed this extremely high cost figure as the average cost of supporting an enrollee in any year of operation. If they choose to absorb all construction costs in the first year, then they must make quite clear that all future annual costs per enrollee will contain no construction funds at all. Thus in the second year of operation, the annual cost would drop back to about $3,700 per enrollee.

In any event, I submit that amortizing the cost of permanent facilities over their normal 20-year life expectancy provides a more accurate perspective of the true costs involved in supporting a YCC enrollee for a single year and over a reasonable length of time.

There are, moreover, additional factors which further discredit the cost figures used by the opposition. For instance, the estimated construction cost of $250,000 for a 50-man camp represents a maximum figure. Many camps built of local building materials and prefabricated structures will cost much less. Some 100- to 200-man camps will also cost proportionately a great deal less than the $250,000 allotted for each 50-man unit.

Finally—and this is most important—there currently exist enough camp facilities to accommodate almost 12,000 YCC enrollees on a year-round basis. These camps need only marginal improvements to bring them to operating conditions. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a list of existing camp facilities that would be used in the Youth Conservation Corps. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point memorandums from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior describing existing camp facilities and providing cost figures for rehabilitation.

There being no objection, the list and memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Location and approximate capacity of year-round YCC camps

Name of camp (by State)	Agency	Approximate capacity
Alabama:		
Center Tower	Forest Service	100
Elliott Creek	do	100
Horseshoe Bend	National Park Service	25
Alaska:		
Anchorage	Bureau of Land Management	100
Fairbanks	do	100
Arizona:		
Big Springs	Forest Service	50
Tuthill	do	100
Indian Gardens	do	50
Blue Point	do	100
Buffalo Crossing	do	100
Last Chance	do	50
Fort Valley	do	25
Kingman	Bureau of Land Management	100
Forepaugh	do	100
Fort Apache	Bureau of Indian Affairs	60
San Carlos	do	38
Navajo	do	75
Coronado	National Park Service	25
Grand Canyon	do	100
Suguaro	do	25
Tuzigott	do	50
Arkansas:		
Clearfork	Forest Service	100
Ouachita	do	100
California:		
Hilt	do	50
Tennant	do	100
Magic Mountain	do	50
Valcrest	do	100
Center Camp	do	50
Strawberry	do	50
Patton Mill	do	50
Alder Springs	do	50
Shovel Creek	do	50
Bakersfield	Bureau of Land Management	100
Riverside	do	100
Yosemite	National Park Service	75
Colorado:		
Rocky Mountain	do	25
Montrose	Bureau of Land Management	100
Durango	do	25
Florida:		
Lake Bryant	Forest Service	100
Helen	do	50
Georgia: Wahsega (Chestatee)	do	100
Hawaii:		
City of Refuge	National Park Service	50
Halea Kala	do	25
Hawaii Volcanos	do	25
Idaho:		
Thorn Creek	Forest Service	50
Yellowjacket	do	50
Granite	do	50
Cobalt	do	100
Sawtooth Valley	do	100
Shake Creek	do	50
Warm Springs Creek	do	50
Oakley	do	100
Hudlow	do	50
Shoshone	do	50
Steamboat	do	50
Trail Creek W.C	do	50
Pelke	do	50
BRC Headquarters	do	50
Synder	do	50
O'Hara	do	50
Calder	do	50
Orena	Bureau of Land Management	100
Atomic City	do	100
Illinois: Carterville	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	100
Kentucky: Mammoth Cave	National Park Service	200
Louisiana:		
Kisatchie	Forest Service	50
Fort Polk	do	200
Nursery	do	100
Massachusetts: Cape Cod	National Park Service	100

Location and approximate capacity of year-round YCC camps—Continued

Name of camp (by State)	Agency	Approximate capacity
Michigan:		
Nesbit	Forest Service	100
Clear Lake	do	70
Isle Royale	National Park Service	25
Seney	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	25
Minnesota:		
Grand Marais	Forest Service	70
Sawbill	do	50
Long Lake	do	70
Cold Springs	do	50
Rochert	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	25
Holt	do	25
Montana:		
Birch Creek	Forest Service	100
Trapper Creek	do	50
Bailey Ranch	do	50
Savenac Nursery	do	50
Needmore	Forest Service	50
Rock Creek	do	50
Lions Club Camp	do	100
Coram	do	50
Gallatin Gateway	do	200
Moose Creek	do	50
Lincoln	do	50
Yaak Air Base	do	200
MSU Forestry Camp	do	50
Nine Mile	do	50
Camp Paxon	do	100
Lewiston	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	50
Fort Peck	Bureau of Land Management	50
Bridger	do	50
Nebraska: Blair	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	25
Nevada:		
Clear Creek	Forest Service	50
Wendover	Bureau of Land Management	100
New Mexico:		
Tularosa	Forest Service	100
Continental Divide	do	50
Roswell	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	25
Columbus	Bureau of Land Management	100
Blanco	do	100
Mescalero	do	180
New York:		
Seneca Falls	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	25
Basom	do	25
North Carolina:		
Hot Springs	Forest Service	100
Davidson River	do	200
Arrowwood (Wayah Depot)	do	50
Great Smoky Mountains	National Park Service	100
North Dakota: Eaton Dude Ranch	Forest Service	100
Ohio: Oak Harbor	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	25
Oklahoma:		
Big Tom	Forest Service	50
Platt	National Park Service	50
Millerton	Bureau of Indian Affairs	200
Oregon:		
Timber Lake	Forest Service	100
Burns	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	50
Baker	Bureau of Land Management	50
Salem	do	100
Pennsylvania: Blue Jay	Forest Service	200
South Carolina:		
Witherbee	do	50
Indian Creek	do	50
Fort Sumter	National Park Service	25
Kings Mountain	do	50
South Dakota:		
Bob Marshall	Forest Service	100
Box Elder	do	100
Badlands	National Park Service	50
Tennessee:		
Fort Donelson	do	25
Great Smokey Mountains	do	50
Texas:		
Angelina	Forest Service	10
Umbarger	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	20
Utah:		
Wolf Creek	Forest Service	75
Cold Springs	do	50
Cedar City	Bureau of Land Management	100
Green River	do	100
Dinosaur	National Park Service	25
Flaming Gorge	do	200
Zion	do	25
Uintah and Ouray	Bureau of Indian Affairs	113
Virginia:		
Colonial	National Park Service	100
Manassas	do	25
Washington:		
Sunset Camp	Forest Service	50
Cispus Camp	do	75
Curlew Air Base	do	150
Colville	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	25
Ilwaco	do	25
Spokane	Bureau of Land Management	100
Colville	Bureau of Indian Affairs	115
Wisconsin: Mayville	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	25
Wyoming:		
Kendall GS	Forest Service	50
Kelly GS	do	50
Grover Park	do	50
Jackson	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.	25
Green River	Bureau of Land Management	50
Puerto Rico: La Mina	Forest Service	50

Total number of camps in all agencies	156
Total capacity	11,240

Source: Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior.

FOREST SERVICE YCC CAMPS READY FOR IMMEDIATE OCCUPANCY

The Forest Service has 89 existing facilities which can be used for YCC camps. They vary in size from 50- to 200-man capacity. These include:

1. Former CCC camps which were retained for use by seasonal project crews. Due to recent changes in methods of doing some types of project work, such as control of blister rust by antibiotics instead of manual eradication, and other program changes, many of these old CCC camps could now be made available for YCC.

2. Government-owned camp facilities which are under occasional and temporary permit to organizations such as YMCA and Boy Scouts.

3. Former small military facilities on national forest lands which have been held for possible YCC use pending outcome of legislation.

4. Other Forest Service work camp facilities which are regularly operated for program projects but which can be made available for YCC purposes by making minor adjustments in programs, such as shifting present seasonal crew use.

The 89 existing camps could be rehabilitated and modernized to meet the safety, sanitation, and standards required for YCC at an estimated cost of $13.3 million.

Source: U.S. Forest Service, Division of Administrative Management, March 11, 1963.

FOREST SERVICE ORGANIZATION TO ESTABLISH AND MANAGE CAMPS

Establishment and management of camps of all sizes, up to 500 men, is a routine operation for the Forest Service. Civilian Conservation Corps, blister rust control, timber salvage, fire, and other innumerable emergency and regular camps have been organized by the Forest Service for 50 years. Several camps, 25–150 men, are presently operated on regular conservation programs.

Camps under a Youth Conservation Corps program could be established for natural resource conservation, development, and management work on the National Forests, National Grasslands, and other lands administered by the Forest Service. Normally, such camps would be located in or adjacent to National Forests or other lands on which work would be done. Eighty-nine existing camps could be operating within 30 days with facilities to accommodate about 7,200 enrollees. Within 4 months, up to 60 additional camps could be in operation to handle up to an additional 4,000 enrollees. Necessary added capacity could be constructed thereafter where needed.

Camps would be under the supervision of the forest supervisor. Technical direction of projects would be provided by the district ranger and forest supervisor's staff with direct crew supervision carried on by Forest Service foremen. These foremen would be available from experienced personnel now in the yearlong and seasonal work force of skilled workers and forestry and engineering aids of the Forest Service.

Interior Department YCC camps ready for immediate occupancy

Bureau	Number of camps	Number of enrollees	Rehabilitation cost
Bureau of Indian Affairs	7	780	$244,800
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	14	475	620,000
National Park Service	25	1,475	248,000
Bureau of Land Management	21	1,825	255,000
Total	67	4,555	1,367,800

Camp sizes vary from 25 to 200 men. Existing facilities consist of:

1. Portions of camps and bases in the project areas acquired or available from the Armed Forces.

2. Buildings acquired with project lands.

3. Quarters used during part of the year for seasonal operations.

4. Quarters and mess facilities available from concessionaires.

5. Buildings in nearby communities available for rental.

YCC camps to be occupied in 90 to 120 days

Bureau	Number of camps	Number of enrollees [1]	Rehabilitation cost
Bureau of Reclamation	8	400	$160,000
Bureau of Land Management	27	2,375	329,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	19	510	805,000
National Park System	40	2,925	1,265,000
Total	94	6,210	2,559,000
Total available in 120 days	161	10,765	3,926,800
SEASONAL CAMPS (BOTH SUMMER AND WINTER)			
National Park Service	6	650	244,000
Bureau of Reclamation	26	900	360,000
Total	32	1,550	604,000

[1] About 775 more enrollees can be accommodated in these camps, bringing the total capacity for Interior to 11,540.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the estimated cost of bringing these 156 year-round camps to operating level is $14,667,000 or an average of $94,000 per camp. Obviously this represents a considerable saving over the $250,000 allotted for constructing each new 50 man camp. These are savings in hard cash that the opponents of the Youth Conservation Corps never mention in their discussion of costs.

It has been impossible to determine the precise average cost of the on-the-job work equipment. Since the outlay per enrollee will vary from $150 to $1,000 according to the type of work scheduled for a particular area, a reasonable average cost for the work equipment appears to be $500. The addition of this $500 to the $3,985 already enumerated results in a total annual outlay of about $4,485 for each YCC enrollee.

In summary, the alleged annual cost of $9,000 per enrollee is exaggerated and misleading. Even the much lower figure on camp construction costs submitted to the Labor Committee is probably high since it fails to allow for first, the existing facilities that only need rehabilitation, and second, the opportunity to use prefabricated buildings and local building supplies at a resulting lower cost. I sincerely hope this discussion of actual costs will bring some enlightenment and commonsense to an area that has been characterized by something less than objectivity and fairmindedness.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE YCC

I appreciate the concern of certain Senators with the question of fiscal responsibility as it relates to the Youth Conservation Corps. But I cannot appreciate or accept their restricting this concept to the short-run impact of the YCC on the Federal Government's administrative budget. As I mentioned on the Senate floor recently, it is time we began defining "fiscal responsibility" in terms of jobs, investments, wages, products, and growth and not arbitrarily limit ourselves to the single criterion of the Government's annual budget.

Any businessman who approved an audit of his business affairs which only included expenses and made no attention to income would be judged an economic ignoramus. How does this fiscal responsibility really apply to the Youth Conservation Corps? In order to assess the true costs of the YCC it is absolutely essential to move beyond the shortrun cash outlay for annual operating costs and examine the financial returns that will eventually be created by this annual outlay.

The Forest Service estimates that each dollar invested on cultural treatment and planting will increase the value of timber stands by $5 within a period of 10 years. These benefits will be realized as cash payments to the Federal Treasury when these stands are harvested. In addition, payments from National Forest revenues for county roads and schools will increase correspondingly. Finally, the capital value of these timber stands will increase materially.

Thinning of young hardwood timber stands improves growth rate and increases the value of the timber produced. This work can be expected to produce a return in 50 years of twice the cost discounted at 3 percent. The financial benefits of reforesting idle land by planting idle land are widely recognized. Such planting yields sufficient return to retire the investment and provide additional benefits in improved wildlife habitat.

These returns can all be calculated in dollars and cents. And they certainly should not be totally ignored in determining the actual cost of the Youth Conservation Corps. I regret that the opposition rarely mentions this aspect of the Youth Conservation Corps.

This discussion of actual costs has not raised the numerous monetary outlays that will be avoided through the creation of the YCC. We pay an average of $25,000 for every juvenile delinquent who is arrested, sent to trial, convicted, and assigned to a corrective institution. Unemployment insurance represents a direct payment that will be terminated in many cases. These are examples of indirect financial benefits accruing through such a program as the YCC. They should not be totally overlooked in a discussion of fiscal responsibility.

EXAMPLES OF YCC CAMP COSTS IN RELATION TO RESULTING INCOME

In order to grasp the importance of considering short-run costs and long-run returns, I have prepared an analysis of several proposed camps that would actually be established under the YCC program. These studies compare total operating outlays in relation to expected income as generated by the work projects scheduled for the particular area where the camp is located. In other words, these examples of specific camps examine all relevant economic facts, income as well as operating costs.

Let us examine two proposed sites for YCC camps: one in the Southwestern United States, the other in the Middle Atlantic region. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that relevant estimates for the operating costs and the eventual monetary returns—both tangible and intangible—for these two proposed camp sites, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXAMPLE OF EXISTING FACILITIES AND SITUATION FOR A POSSIBLE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS CAMP (CAMP A, SOUTHWESTERN UNITED STATES)

This camp is on Government-owned land previously used as a rehabilitation center by the Army-Navy Hospital. All existing improvements are Government-owned. Access is by 11 miles of paved and 2 miles gravel road.

Existing facilities consist of a permanent modern main building containing recreation area, classrooms, kitchen, and dining hall; four permanent cabins; tennis courts; baseball diamond; boating dock, and swimming area. The offduty recreation opportunity for enrollees is excellent.

Rehabilitation of existing facilities to meet camp standards for a Youth Conservation Corps camp consists of such things as: (1) converting and equipping existing main building to recreation-classroom-canteen-supply office building; (2) converting and equipping one existing cabin to a 4-bed infirmary; (3) converting three existing cabins to quarters for supervisory personnel; (4) constructing and equipping dormitory for 100 men; (5) constructing a kitchen-dining hall for 100 men; and (6) constructing and equipping small miscellaneous service buildings.

This rehabilitation and modernization to required standard would cost an estimated $180,000 for a 100-man camp. The annual camp operating cost would amount to approximately $3,985 per enrollee for pay, clothing, food, medical care, educational services, transportation to camps and on-the-job, camp and work supervision, work equipment, and overhead. Dependent on the particular type of project work, the expense per enrollee for materials and equipment used by enrollees on the work project would run as low as $150 and as high as $1,000.

The inventory of high priority work available to this camp represents half the work in "The Development Program for the National Forests" for the local Ranger Districts. The work represents nearly 500 man-years of work and consists of:

Culturally treating 21,500 acres and planting 7,000 acres.

Constructing 84 campground and picnic sites and related facilities.

Improving and developing small and big game range on 5,100 acres.

Improving 8 miles of streams.

Revegetating 450 acres of rangeland.

Rehabilitating eroded lands and stabilizing gullies, roads and streams.

Surveying and marking 300 miles property lines. Topographic mapping of 610 square miles.

Reducing hazardous fuels on 5,500 acres.

Constructing two housing and related improvements, one service building, several lookouts and special structures; providing three radio installations; and replacing 3 miles telephone lines.

Constructing 55 miles of roads.

The total of all costs for this 100-man camp operating for a period of 5 years is estimated at $2,500,000. Benefits to be derived would far exceed the cost. For example, each dollar spent on cultural treatment and planting will increase the value of timber stands by $5 in 10 years. This amounts to a direct benefit of $3,500,000 for this work alone.

Other benefits would be employment of people in harvesting of national forest timber and other products and the value added to these products by manufacture, distribution, and marketing.

The 84 campground and picnic sites will add 300,000 man-days of use to present recreation facilities. These users will contribute to the local economy in the form of expenditures for sporting equipment, transportation, lodging, and other items.

The many intangible benefits cannot be assessed in dollars for the worth of the relaxation, pleasure, rest, spiritual satisfaction, and improvement in health derived from the use of the national forests. The accomplishment of work from this camp in timber management, recreation, wildlife, soil and water, fire control, improvements and roads will add much to these values.

EXAMPLE OF EXISTING FACILITIES AND SITUATION FOR A POSSIBLE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS CAMP (CAMP B, MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES)

This camp is located on the southern edge of the Allegheny National Forest and is situated on a level height of land in rolling plateau country with adequate space for softball, volleyball, and tennis. It is screened by planted red pine and cannot be seen from the main road.

The buildings are generally in good condition, having been maintained for use as a summer camp for students of forestry and civil engineering.

There are four barracks, administration building, mess hall, hospital, and a bath and laundry building. Commercial electric power is available. The water system consists of spring water pumped into a stand tank. Sewage is handled by septic tanks and disposal fields.

A careful condition survey of the entire camp estimates a rehabilitation cost for possible Youth Conservation Corps use at $42,200, or $130 per enrollee for a 5-year period. This is for a 50-man camp.

The annual camp operating cost would amount to approximately $3,985 per enrollee for pay, clothing, food, medical care, educational services, transportation to camps and on the job, camp and work supervision, work equipment, and overhead. Dependent on the particular type of project work, the expense per enrollee for materials and equipment used by enrollees on the work project would run as low as $150 and as high as $1,000.

A detailed inventory of available work shows a total of 800 man-years of work:

	Man-years
Thinning hardwood stands (14,000 acres)	180
Pruning 10,000 acres Red Pine	125
Planting 10,500 acres	126
Construction of two recreation areas	104
Miscellaneous wildlife habitat improvements	183
Soil and water; roads and trails; administrative improvements, and boundary surveys	82
Total	800

The work program available at this location can be justified on the basis of economic returns to the area. As an example the thinning of young hardwood timber stands improves growth rate and increases the value of the timber produced. This work can be expected to produce a return in 50 years of twice the cost discounted at 3 percent.

The benefits of reforesting idle land by planting are widely accepted. In this area, planting will yield sufficient return to retire the investment and give additional benefits in improved wildlife habitat and enhanced scenic and recreation values.

Construction of recreation facilities at an estimated cost of $65,000 during the first year will produce an immediate return to the local economy of $10,000 per year from increased recreation visits by picnickers and campers. The completion of a second area at a cost of $160,000 will provide additional facilities for attracting tourists to the area. This should give a cash increase of $15,000 to $18,000 annually to the local economy.

This area is heavily used for hunting and fishing. The planned wildlife habitat and stream improvement will maintain the game and fish populations to meet this heavy pressure and help to stabilize the local income from outside sportsmen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as the forecast for the Southwestern camp indicates, operating costs for a 5-year period are estimated to be $2.5 million. However, the funds expended just on cultural treatment and planting of trees during this 5-year period are expected to bring revenues of $3.5 million within a decade. A similar picture of sound investment exists for the camp in the Middle Atlantic region.

These analyses do not attempt to place a dollar figure on the more intangible returns such as the employment of people in harvesting national forest timber, or the manufacture, distribution, and marketing of these timber products. Similarly, the resulting recreational facilities constructed by the YCC enrollees will contribute to the local economy in both regions. These are not isolated examples. Every YCC camp location would show similar results.

However, I want to emphasize that I primarily support the Youth Conservation Corps on the basis of its potential impact on the lives of thousands of unemployed American youths. What price tag do we place on the opportunity to rescue a young man from a wasted and meaningless life? Here is our opportunity to invest in the human resources of this country.

Those persons who have raised the issue of fiscal responsibility—and I fully support their right and duty to do this—should also include monetary benefits created by the YCC in their calculations. As I have demonstrated, when these income factors are taken into account, the Youth Conservation Corps represents the very essence of fiscal responsibility, that is, a program of investment in income-producing activities that eventually returns the initial operating costs to the people of the United States.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, this morning I have attempted to outline the reasons why I advocate the Youth Employment Act as a fundamentally sensible attack on the mounting problem of youth unemployment.

This bill will come to the floor in the near future. We will have the opportunity to explore these facts more carefully at that time. I welcome this opportunity, for I devoutly believe that this is a good bill, a bill that will bring new hope and opportunity to many thousands of young Americans currently without hope and opportunity.

In his special message on youth, President Kennedy eloquently described the importance and urgency of this legislation:

> This Nation—facing increasingly complex economic, social, and international challenges—is increasingly dependent on the opportunities, capabilities, and vitality of those who are soon to bear its chief responsibilities. Such attributes as energy, a readiness to question, imagination, and creativity are all attributes of youth that are also essential to our total national character. To the extent that the Nation is called upon to promote and protect the interests of our younger citizens, it is an investment certain to bring a high return, not only in basic human values but in social and economic terms.

In the spirit of the President's remarks, I call for a bipartisan attack on the growing social and economic cancer of youth unemployment. Certainly the problems of young Americans demand of us far more than partisan division for its own sake.

This afternoon I have attempted to clarify the record on several points that have been misunderstood or misinterpreted by certain opponents of this legislation. On the basis of this record I look forward to prompt and favorable action on the Youth Employment Act in both Houses of Congress. We have an opportunity to assist thousands of young Americans find a more productive and secure life. Let us not permit this opportunity to escape us.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their consideration in granting my unanimous-consent requests.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], offered for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, amendment No. 30, the Morse-McNamara-Williams amendment, is the pending business. Is that correct? Has it been laid before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the pending amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both the majority and the minority be allowed to have such assistants as are needed from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and from other committees of the Senate present on the floor during the discussion of the bill today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. It is my understanding that, under the controlled time situation, a Senator cannot move to amend the pending amendment until all time for debate on the amendment has expired or has been yielded back. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to offer, out of order, my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. I think it will simplify matters, from the standpoint of debate and discussion, if I may be allowed to offer my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

What will be the effect of granting the request of the Senator from Texas? Will it displace my amendment for the time being, and thereby prevent explanation and discussion of my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will suspend the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. The amendment of the Senator from Texas would have to be acted on before action on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. It would not take any time out of the time allotted on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator mind stating briefly what is the purport of his amendment?

Mr. TOWER. My amendment strikes out the protective arrangements provision of the Morse amendment.

Mr. CLARK. In other words, it leaves in subsection (b)(1) and strikes subsection (b)(2)?

Mr. TOWER. It strikes subsection (c) on page 3 of the amendment, beginning on line 9.

Mr. CLARK. And substitutes nothing?

Mr. TOWER. And substitutes nothing. It will leave the labor provision currently in the bill as it is.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, and I ask the attention of the Senator from Oregon. Would not the Tower amendment more appropriately be considered entirely independently of the Morse amendment, since it is not a substitute for the Morse amendment? I would question whether the Tower amendment was a substitute for the Morse amendment.

Mr. TOWER. I am afraid I am not competent to answer the technical question as to whether it is a substitute or an amendment to the Morse amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Without regard to technicalities, I think it would be the better part of wisdom to have the Morse amendment explained and voted on, and then take up the Tower amendment later, if the Senator desires that.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Texas that a Senator may act independently on his own responsibility; but I am going to object to the request now. It may be that, after consultation with my colleagues, the Senator can do it later.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. I do not mind waiting until the Senator has used up or yielded back the time on the Morse amendment before mine is taken up, but I think mine will have to be acted on first, so far as action is concerned, before the Morse amendment is acted on, because if the Morse amendment is adopted and then we take up my amendment, it would strike the labor provision out of the bill, if it is adopted, and I know the Senator does not want to do that.

Mr. CLARK. I sympathize with the position of the Senator from Texas, having been in the same position many a day, but it seems to me, speaking only for myself, that I would prefer to have the Morse amendment acted on before we deal with the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Actually, I intend to propose my amendment before the Morse amendment is acted on, but I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CLARK. If it is not a substitute, I doubt that the Senator can do that.

Mr. TOWER. The Parliamentarian says I can.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Texas understands my position.

Mr. TOWER. I understand. I thought my suggestion would clarify the situation; instead it has only confused it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Chair give us an indication as to the parliamentary situation with reference to the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas can be offered after the time has expired or been yielded back on the discussion of the Morse amendment and before a vote is taken on the Morse amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I beg the Chair's pardon. Before what?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before a vote is taken on the Morse amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the amendment of the Senator from Texas would be either an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon or an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, which would it be?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is offered in the nature of a perfecting amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A perfecting amendment, and as such will be voted on prior to the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Am I to understand that the Chair has ruled that an amendment which strikes the entire text of the Morse amendment is nonetheless a perfecting amendment?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. It does not strike the entire text, only subsection (c), on page 3, beginning on line 9.

Mr. CLARK. Correct me if I am wrong. I may be wrong. I ask the Senator from Oregon to listen. It is my understanding that the Morse amendment proposes to strike out all of subsection (c) and substitute therefor a new amendment which contains two clauses, (b)(1) and (b)(2). Am I correct?

Mr. TOWER. Yes, I think that is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Now it is proposed, instead of dealing with the Morse amendment at all, that the amendment of the Senator from Texas, which has been ruled by the Chair to be a perfecting amendment, would strike subsection (c). The weird jungle of parliamentary laws is often too much for me, but this is really too rich for my blood.

Mr. TOWER. Actually my amendment would strike out the protective arrangements section of the Morse amendment. It would leave untouched, unsullied, and unhampered the protective arrangements section of the substitute for S. 6 we are now considering.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator were to prevail, am I correct that we would have untouched subsection (c) of the committee bill, we would have a new section of the first part of the Morse amendment, and the second part of the Morse amendment would be stricken?

Mr. TOWER. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for clearing my rather confused thinking this morning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall use 15 minutes or so for an explanatory statement of the amendment and my position relative thereto. I shall be glad to answer any questions my colleagues may wish to ask at the conclusion of my statement, but I shall not yield during that period of time.

It has been a policy of our American system to attempt to utilize private enterprise to furnish public utility services to the maximum extent possible. Section 3(b)(1) under the amendment would pursue that same policy.

Paragraph 3(b)(2) carries out the basic program under the act, not only of lending an emphasis to continuation of maximum use of private transportation companies, but also keys such use to a planned program for the coordination of the urban transportation system with the overall plan for the development of the urban area.

Paragraph 19(c) concerns the protective arrangements respecting interests of employees affected by the bill. As we know, any legislation which is intended to provide Federal aid for the purpose of strengthening and improving our urban area mass transportation systems must be concerned with another highly important factor, the stability of labor relations. It is a necessary corollary of any such consideration that there be provisions which would safeguard employee rights and promote and maintain the national labor policy with a view toward insuring labor relations stability and promoting employee morale.

The danger in the bill as reported is that it could seriously disrupt collective bargaining, which has had such a long and successful history in the mass transportation field. Accordingly, the amendment provides protections for the interests of employees who may be affected by the assistance or financing provided under this legislation. The amendment would protect existing employee rights, including pension rights; would continue collective bargaining where it now exists; would protect individual employees against their positions being worsened, with a reasonable floor of protection being that already established for the transportation industries subject to Federal regulation; would provide a continuation of the employment relationship where mass transportation systems are acquired by a new employer with assistance under this act.

Mr. President, it might be helpful to my colleagues in the Senate if I present a very brief outline, descriptive of the amendment.

First. No financial assistance under the bill shall be made available to any State or local public body for the purpose of purchasing any facility or property of a private mass transportation company unless (a) such company has, prior to such acquisition, been declared bankrupt or placed into receivership by a court of competent jurisdiction, or (b) the Administrator finds that such assistance is essential to a program, for the acquisition of mass transportation facilities or property, supplementary to the service provided by an existing publicly owned or operated mass transportation system, and (c) in either situation under (a) or (b), the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, acting jointly under section 19(c) of the bill, find that the project to be assisted complies with the section 19(c) requirements.

This limitation on the use of Federal funds under the bill extends to the improvement or reconstruction of facilities acquired after the effective date of the act as well.

Second. Financial assistance under the bill will be available to any State or local public body for the purpose of developing mass transportation facilities which will compete with or supplement existing mass transportation service only if the following conditions are met:

(a) The Administrator must find that such assistance is essential to the development of a unified urban transportation system which is a part of a comprehensively planned development of the urban areas;

(b) The Administrator finds that the program provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies to the maximum extent feasible; and

(c) The Administrator acting jointly with the Secretary of Labor is satisfied that the protective arrangements required by section 19(c) have been provided by the project.

Third. The amendment clarifies and improves the protective arrangements in section 19(c) of the bill in the following manner: (a) It makes it clear that the rights of beneficiaries will be preserved along with the rights of employees under existing collective bargaining agreements in effect in any mass transportation which is involved in any project assisted under the bill; (b) it makes it clear that collective bargaining in any situation where it now exists will be continued; (c) it assures employees that in the event of any layoff or downgrading of their employee classification in consequence of the development of any project under the bill, they will receive basic job protection benefits at least equivalent to those which have prevailed in the transportation industries subject to Federal regulation; and (d) it provides for the continuation of employment of any employees of any mass transportation system which has been transferred in consequence of any project which has been assisted under the bill.

Mr. President, let me say a few explanatory words about what may be called the philosophy of the Morse-McNamara-Williams amendment. I have worked on many complicated issues in the Senate. However, I do not know that I have ever worked on one with more tug and pull, more conflict of interests of various types, more complexities, than this issue. The amendment I am presenting is the composite result of many minds here in the Senate being brought to bear on a problem, with individual Senators pressing for consideration of individual problems relative to their States. What we have here is a composite amendment that I believe ought to go to conference. I would certainly be intellectually dishonest if I said to the Members of the Senate that the amendment may not need some modification in conference after there is brought to bear the give-and-take conference procedure.

The underlying purpose of the amendment, the underlying principle of the amendment, I thoroughly and heartily endorse. I wish to talk about those purposes for a moment. The issue of public policy runs through the amendment. That is a question of public policy on which reasonable men can disagree. We have already had disagreement on this policy, as we have already had disagreement on the bill with respect to that question.

The question of policy is this: Should the Federal Government make available to cities, States, and local governmental units Federal money to be used to strengthen their mass transit system in those communities when the use of that money would result in lessening the collective bargaining rights of existing unions?

As a matter of Federal public policy, can we justify the use of Federal dollars to weaken what I hope is true, namely, that collective bargaining between free labor and free employers is a basic and essential part of the American economic freedom? If we qualify that, and if we are not willing to agree to that premise, then I can see that individual Senators may have some decided differences with the senior Senator from Oregon with respect to the amendment.

However, let me state my position. In my judgment we cannot justify, as a matter of public policy, the use of Federal dollars by a local community or a governmental unit thereof to be spent for development of a transit system, the expenditure of which would result in worsening the present collective bargaining rights of free labor which operates that transit system.

As I have said in all the cloakroom and office conferences that we have had, I do not believe that the transit bill should be used in order to strengthen labor by imposing a union on a nonunion transit system.

Likewise, it is the position of the senior Senator from Oregon that the transit bill should not be finally passed in a shape in which it can be used to break the back of collective bargaining in any transit system now in operation. Let me very quickly say that neither do I think the bill should be used, in a new community where a transit system has to be built to require that a union be established in that transit system, because that ought to depend on the employees' free choice in the matter and on the processes of an orderly free collective bargaining system between free labor and free employers.

In summary, then, the philosophical position of the senior Senator from Oregon on this matter is one that he has held for years. We had in the War Labor Board a somewhat different fact situation but still the same policy question when in the early days we got into a controversy as to what our position would be on the maintenance of collective bargaining, or the maintenance of a union. As a public member of the Board, I proposed the formula that the Board unanimously adopted, employer members and labor members and public members, by a vote of 12 to nothing. The Board adopted the principle that the war could not be used by an employer to break a union that he already had in his plant; that the war could not be used by a union to force upon an employer a union in a plant then nonunion. If the plant was nonunion, the union could be established in that plant during the war only by free collective bargaining between employer and union, and any attempt to use economic force by way of strike in violation of the no-strike, nolockout agreement, which had come to be accepted by American industry and American labor, at the request of the President of the United States, would be a strike that the Board would not countenance.

Some attempts were made, and the history of that period is replete with instances, in which the Board made it perfectly clear to such unions that they would not have the support of the Board, and would stand in violation of the no-strike, no-lockout agreement. It is also true that under those wartime conditions there were some instances in which employers sought to use the exigencies of the war as a means of weakening or destroying a union. A couple of cases went as far as seizure, so as to make it clear to the employers that we meant it when we adopted the Morse formula and were not going to allow them to use the war as an excuse to destroy a union in their plants.

This proposal is not on all fours with the situation presented by the substitute bill, but there is a similarity of principle that I wish to stress, because it is my underlying thesis as I press for the adoption of the amendment: That is, we ought to maintain the status quo.

Let me talk about a few hypotheticals in my description of what we can do to maintain the status quo. Suppose we consider company X and union A. Company X is going into bankruptcy. It has been decided that city M will take over the company. In my judgment, the city should be allowed to take over the company, and my amendment would permit it, but it should be allowed to do so only if the city is willing also to take over the labor-management relations, if any, that have prevailed in the company. In other words, if there is a collective bargaining agreement, it should be understood that the city shall take them over. But I am told that such an arrangement cannot be accepted by many Senators because in some States there is a policy, by way of law, against recognizing unions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Let me finish my statement. I think it would be better if I stated my hypotheticals.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator allow me to ask him a question or two? I have some questions to propound which I believe will assist in making the legislative history. Would the Senator prefer to finish his presentation?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I should like to finish this statement; then I shall yield to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself another 10 minutes.

What we have in that situation under the substitute bill, as I see it, is a conflict between a sound Federal public policy and a policy of a State. The State can continue its State policy if it wishes to; but in the judgment of the senior Senator from Oregon, the State should not be allowed to receive Federal money with which to continue a policy that is in conflict with sound Federal policy.

In a nutshell, that is my position. I think what we really must decide today is whether the Senate will underwrite and approve free collective bargaining as national policy, or will pass a bill which, in my judgment, will weaken free collective bargaining. I warn the Senate that troublous days may be expected in the next few years anyway in the whole problem of labor relations. I do not think we should adopt a bill today without the protection offered by my amendment. To do so will intensify labor conflict in this country.

The whole problem of automation is growing, with probably tens and tens of thousands of jobs to be lost as a result of automation. Organized labor is greatly concerned about it. It has been said in some of our conferences that organized labor may very well be unduly apprehensive about the bill; but that does not change the reality of their concern. Organized labor wanted more than the Morse amendment offers. They wanted a guarantee that if a new transit company were to be established with Federal funds contributed to it, there would have to be collective bargaining. I said, "In my judgment, you are not entitled to that."

Organized labor wanted a guarantee, in case after case, that they would be strengthened. I said, "In my judgment, the only sound policy to which you are entitled is the maintenance of the status quo. If you have collective bargaining now, I think the bill ought to be so drawn that you will be assured of a continuance of collective bargaining, so far as the Federal Government is concerned."

Mr. President, that is my proposal in a nutshell. It is open to debate. I shall first yield to the Senator from Arizona for a question, and then to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. It may be that more workable language can be adopted or devised on the floor of the Senate. If so, and if it does not endanger the major premise of the senior Senator from Oregon, I shall not have any quarrel with such language changes.

But if any proposed language changes result in the Federal Government surrendering what I believe is a basic, sound national policy of economic freedom, and I look upon collective bargaining as such a policy, I shall vote against such a surrender if it is incorporated in the bill. I shall vote against the amendment and the bill.

I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall comment briefly on the proposal of the Senator from Oregon in the field of labor. Actually, it does not change the original subsection a great deal. However, I should like to raise a few questions about it, because I questioned it at great length on the floor when I sought to have the entire subsection stricken.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Arizona to inquire how much time I have remaining?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should be happy to ask the controller of time to grant time on the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Only a part of it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, if it is a question of time, I yield to the Senator from Arizona as much time as he wishes to take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOLDWATER. My basic concern in the field is caused by language that to me seems to present a possibility of conflict with existing State laws and city ordinances.

I am in partial agreement—I will not say complete agreement—with the objectives of the Senator from Oregon, in that where there are bargaining agreements, pension plans, and the like, already in existence, they should be protected. I believe there are 42 cities in the United States having a population of more than 300,000 which now have bargaining agreements with the workers in the transportation field.

The first question that comes to my mind relates to the language on page 3, line 16, of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon:

> Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary.

Does the Senator from Oregon share my fear that this language, without being limited, might be interpreted by the Administrator of the act to include the right to strike?

Mr. MORSE. Not in violation of Federal or State law in any case where the Federal law has not supervened.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is a question that comes to my mind, because at the bottom of the subsection this language occurs:

> The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of such protective arrangements.

It begins:

> It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act—

And so forth and so forth.

My fear is that if there were a State law which prohibited a strike against any segment of government, this language might preempt that State law.

Mr. MORSE. For the purpose of establishing the legislative history, let me assure the Senator from Arizona that such is not the intention of this language. Here we are talking, too, about the status quo; and whatever the status quo was in regard to that situation, it would continue to prevail. Furthermore, we are also talking about a municipally owned and operated transit company, not covered by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is a point which I wished to make following the one I have made on the question of striking.

Let us assume that in a hypothetical case, company A, in city X, is privately owned, and has a bargaining agreement with the union, and that the agreement recognizes the right to strike, because the agency is not an agency of government and is not covered by State law or by Federal law. If the company were taken over by the city and if the right to strike were one of the rights gained at the bargaining table, would that right continue to exist under the new arrangement, in the opinion of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. The amendment provides that Federal assistance will not be available under the bill for the purpose of enabling a city to acquire a privately owned transit system except in special instances such as bankruptcy. If there should be such an acquisition in these special cases and if there were a State law which prevented public employees from striking, they could not then strike. They would then have all their other rights, but not the right to strike.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I must disagree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and this is my major point of disagreement. I think we should reassure the States and cities that there would be no possibility of striking against the local government. I believe that is a very sound provision of law; and I believe it would be unwise to allow any employee of any government to strike against the people. I think collective bargaining for working conditions, and so forth, is perfectly legal, permissible, and desirable, so long as the right to strike is not included in it in such cases. So I suggest that we try to work out some language which will reiterate that, because if that is not done, I think the language proposed is such as to completely preempt any State law in this particular field.

Mr. MORSE. First, I wish to answer the hypothetical question of the Senator; and then I wish to point out that under the bill, his hypothetical is not altogether realistic.

But in the few special cases of acquisitions of bankrupt transit systems, for example, then, in my judgment, the collective bargaining if such relations were established, would continue. But continuation of the collective bargaining would not mean that the right to strike a private employer would also continue for the reason that the private employer has been replaced by a municipal employer. The public agency would still have the obligation to carry out all the collective-bargaining obligations of the contract; but if State law forbade a strike against a municipality of course the union would be bound by the State law.

But the Senator's hypothetical is unrealistic, because under the hypothetical and under the bill, the city could not purchase that particular transit line except in the special circumstance which I have mentioned.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time yielded to the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Arizona.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 10 minutes on the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then, Mr. President, let us extend the hypothetical to a situation in which it could be pertinent. Under the language of the Senator's amendment, which has been changed since he first showed us the other draft, the city could purchase a private company which either was in bankruptcy or was threatened with bankruptcy. Let us assume that company B was going broke, and that the city wished to purchase it, and that the company had a bargaining agreement which recognized the right to strike. Therefore, under this provision of the amendment, in paragraph (c), all rights, privileges, and benefits would be preserved. If one of those rights was recognized as the right to strike, how could the Senator's amendment do other than preserve that right?

Mr. MORSE. In that case, the State law would supervene. The rights we are talking about are those spelled out in the collective bargaining agreement—wages, hours, conditions of employment, pensions, welfare funds. This has nothing to do with the right to strike. In this sense, the right to strike is not part of the collective-bargaining agreement. The State law would be controlling, because a strike would be contrary to the public policy as established by the paramount State law since the National Labor Relations Act, by your hypothesis, does not apply. My amendment does not affect any application made by a public agency operating under such a State policy.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In my opinion, the right to strike is inherent in any bargaining agreement, and is, in my opinion, given to any bargaining agency—to the union, and does not have to be spelled out.

Mr. MORSE. Then the Taft-Hartley Act is not applicable.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But let us assume it were applicable.

Mr. MORSE. Then the situation would be entirely different.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let us consider a company in Memphis, Tenn., or in New York City, or in Hartford, Conn.—any company in a city where the State line is close by. Therefore, it would be in interstate commerce, and I think the Taft-Hartley Act would apply.

Mr. MORSE. If I understand your point; let me say that your question involves an interpretation of the Taft-Hartley Act, and does not involve this bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But I believe the Taft-Hartley Act would apply to this bill or its interpretation, regardless of what the Senator from Oregon or I may think about it. I do not think we can eliminate the application of the Taft-Hartley Act just because there is in the bill a subsection which deals with labor.

Mr. MORSE. If we were dealing with an employer who is subject to Taft-Hartley, the Federal law would preempt any municipal ordinance and State law in conflict with it. However, I am talking about a case in which Federal law does not touch the question of whether there is a right to strike.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let us consider a case in which an existing private transit system were taken over by a city and were operated at the government level. In the opinion of the Senator, could the bargaining agent strike against the city after it took over the transportation system?

Mr. MORSE. Again, the hypothetical is not realistic except in a few special situations such as a takeover of a bankrupt system, but the agreement in such cases could not supersede State law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then is it the opinion of the Senator from Oregon that this language in no way would supersede State law?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, as to the right to strike.

Mr. GOLDWATER. How could it not supersede State law as to the right to strike, but could supersede other law?

Mr. MORSE. That is perfectly clear. The amendment does not supersede any State policy. It makes perfectly clear that if there were a collective-bargaining agreement which covered wages, hours, conditions of employment, pensions, welfare, and all the other forms of collective-bargaining agreements, and if the city wished to obtain a loan or a grant under this bill for an acquisition in the few exceptional cases to which I have referred, and if it proposed to reject the collective-bargaining agreement, it would not be eligible to receive the money.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I understand that perfectly, but my concern does not go to that. My concern is that we would allow the employees of the company, while operating under the city, to have the power to strike against a division of government—which I do not think the Senator from Oregon would agree would be correct.

Mr. MORSE. No, the bill does not allow that and does not cover that.

I repeat that if in a State there is a public policy which forbids government employees to strike, that will prevail and it will in no way affect an application made under the terms of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to refer to another provision which contains what I believe to be ambiguous language. I refer to subparagraph (4). I shall read it:

> Assurances of employment to employees of acquired mass transportation systems by the acquiring or operating entities—

Then the ambiguity comes in—

> and priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off.

In the first part of that sentence there is a prohibition against laying off any employee. In the second part of the sentence the possibility of such a layoff is anticipated. I am not speaking against the Senator. I am suggesting that he might rephrase that provision to erase any idea of it going two ways.

Simply stated, to me the provision means that an employer could not fire an employee, but he might be able to fire an employee.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think we need to change the language. I believe we are covering the point in the legislative history that the Senator and I are now making. The point I wish to stress in the legislative history is that the successor company stands in exactly the same shoes as the predecessor company, and whatever was binding upon the predecessor company in regard to the matter of conditions of employment is binding upon the successor company. The collective bargaining agreement continues until the parties by collective bargaining change the agreement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am glad that point was cleared up. I think the Senator will agree that there is some doubt in that sentence. It is a rather fuzzy sentence. I believe it would probably have been just as well to have left the provision as it was or to have stricken the second part of it. It leaves some doubt in my mind as to whether or not the employer would be required to retain the employee.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the point is cleared up in our colloquy. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon referred to "the declared policy." I wish to state for the legislative record that in title I of the amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, which we call the Taft-Hartley amendment, the following provision appears:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their

> own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

I believe the Senator and I understand that language and agree with it. Many times I have stated publicly that when the law was enacted—indeed, when the original Wagner Act was enacted—it was long overdue.

However, in the definitions of section 2, paragraph (2), the following appears:

> (2) The term "employer" includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any wholly owned Government corporation, or any Federal Reserve bank, or any State or political subdivision thereof.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senator had not yielded 5 or 10 minutes——

Mr. TOWER. I yielded 10 minutes on the bill. I now yield 5 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my good friend from Texas.

It has already been stated as national policy that collective bargaining is to be encouraged. It is also a part of national policy that States or political subdivisions thereof are excluded.

My fear about the existing part of the act and the amendment proposed by my friend from Oregon is that either the language of the bill or that proposed by the Senator—and they are almost identical—will be interpreted by the Administrator of the NLRB or some court as preempting State laws that cover the field at the present time.

One final word of assurance from the Senator from Oregon that the intentions expressed in the definitions part of the Taft-Hartley Act will not be violated would be of great help on that point if we are ever attacked in relation to it.

Mr. MORSE. The very reason that the language in the bill reads as it does is in order to make it clear that the Taft-Hartley exemptions are not changed by the amendment.

I cannot emphasize the point more than I already have done in the legislative history in our debate. It deals with municipal and State problems, and not Federal problems.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then, as a final word, the language proposed by the Senator from Oregon or the language of the bill as it now stands in no way would preempt State law.

Mr. MORSE. The answer is yes; and particularly as I have mentioned. If the collective bargaining should be taken over by a public agency in the exceptional case described, the right to strike against the public agency would be taken away from labor. But that is not a contractual right; it is not among the contractual rights the State agency must recognize in order to have an application for aid considered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The right to strike against the public agency.

Mr. MORSE. Against the public agency where the State or local law forbids the right to strike.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If there is local law, the language of the Senator from Oregon would not prevail.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If there is not a local law, would it be the interpretation of the Senator from Oregon that employees could strike in spite of the language in the "definitions" clause of the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. MORSE. In the absence of any local law, it would be for the State court to decide whether they had that right.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for this discussion. I am very apprehensive about the proposed language, as he knows. I do not desire to destroy the bargaining rights of employees affected. Neither do I desire to destroy the rights of the public by some language that would overrule State laws which are designed to protect, and also overrule national policy which is designed to protect.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if it meets with the approval of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], I should like to yield 10 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOWER. It was my understanding that I had the floor. I had yielded to the Senator from Arizona.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The 5 minutes yielded to the Senator from Arizona have expired. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. In order to avoid a misunderstanding with the Senator from Texas, I thought I retained the floor. I only asked him, on my time on the floor, if he would be willing to yield time to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. TOWER. It is quite all right.

Mr. MORSE. I should like now to yield 10 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Connecticut, if the Senator from New Jersey approves.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I shall be happy to have the Senator yield time on the bill to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is important to clarify some doubts in the minds of many Senators. The Senator from Oregon has made some changes in his amendment since yesterday afternoon. As the Senator realizes, there was deep concern on the part of Senators from the New England States and New York concerning the language of the original amendment proposed by the Senator. That would have excluded from financial assistance States or regional authorities which might help or assist commuters by acquiring an interest in a private company already in bankruptcy such as the New Haven Railroad. As the Senator realizes, I offered an amendment to his amendment. Is it correct to say that my amendment No. 31 has now been incorporated in amendment 30 of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. I apologize to the Senator for not making that point clear when I explained my amendment. The Senator and I had a conference yesterday afternoon. We had technical assistance. I thought his amendment was meritorious. I told him it was acceptable to me and I would see if I could not have it included in the bill by obtaining the consensus of the others. They agreed with us, and we find it on line 4, page 2—

> Unless (A) such company has, prior to such acquisition, been declared bankrupt or placed into receivership by a court of competent jurisdiction,

The provision means that they could obtain aid under the bill.

That referred also to the objection of the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL] in regard to this particular point, but only in regard to that point.

Mr. RIBICOFF. We were all concerned about it. So there is no question at the present time that should the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, or New York find that they must develop a program with the bankrupt New Haven Railroad in order to save the commuter traffic and keep the line in existence, and this program were to include some acquisition of the commuter service of a bankrupt line by a public agency or some interest in such service, then under this act and under the amendment of the Senator from Oregon it would be possible to come to the Federal agency for financial assistance.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about it. They have the authority to do so.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania wish to ask me a question, or does he desire time of his own?

Mr. CLARK. I should like to have some time.

Mr. MORSE. I temporarily yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] was kind enough to say that he would yield me time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania from the time in opposition to the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with deep reluctance I rise to oppose the Morse amendment.

I am in complete agreement with my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, as to the objectives he seeks to achieve by his amendment. Surely we should not in this legislation attempt to write a labor law. We should leave labor's rights exactly where we found them, once this legislation is disposed of. I do not wish to see this legislation used to diminish the rights of labor. I believe it inappropriate in this kind of legislation to attempt to increase the rights of labor. I am as opposed to a labor-baiting amendment as I am to a labor-take-over amendment. In this I believe I am in complete accord with my good friend from Oregon.

I think it is as unfortunate to attempt to affect basic labor law by this amendment as it would be to try to write a civil rights rider into the bill. Members of this body know well that I have been a friend of labor. Labor has been kind to me. I have also been a protagonist of civil rights, and this has perhaps aided me in my own community and State, and I believe that the civil rights legislation proposed in this body should be passed. However, this is not the way to do it.

Therefore I must oppose the amendment. I oppose it, Mr. President, because in my judgment nobody knows what the amendment would do. I know that my good friend from Oregon, who is one of the best lawyers who has ever served in this body, did not write this amendment. I am sure that if he had had an opportunity to consider it at great length his trained legal mind would have made many changes in it.

This is not the same amendment which was presented to us yesterday by some of our good friends. This is an amendment rewritten overnight. I say again I do not believe the people who wrote it know what is in it. I suggest this is not the way to deal with so important a matter of legislation on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

The labor provisions in the committee bill—and I was a member of the subcommittee and of the full committee, and I approved them—were carefully thought through and carefully worked out by the Senator from New Jersey, who did a magnificent job, in my opinion, in reconciling the conflicting views of those who wanted to use this legislation to curtail the rights of labor on the one hand and of those who wanted to use this legislation to increase the rights of labor on the other. That language was thought out. It was thought through. It has gone through the crucible of minds battering out the truth on the anvil.

I suggest to my friends in the Senate that the language in the bill as it came from the committee is the language which should remain. That language ignores the radical right and ignores the radical left and goes down the middle with a sound provision.

I should like to summarize it at this point. It appears in subsection (c) on page 26. It states:

> It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Administrator after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing. Such protective arrangements shall include—

Not "may include" but "shall include"—

> without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) under existing collective bargaining agreements; (2) the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment; (4) priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of such protective arrangements.

Mr. President, I submit that that lays it on the line in accordance with what the Senator from Oregon is trying so hard to do—what I am trying to do also, and the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from New Jersey are trying to do, which is to go right down the middle to protect existing rights, not to increase them or to diminish them but to protect them.

What have the people who drew up the amendment done? They have drawn up an amendment which says, in the first place, that a public agency could not be utilized to buy a private company. Why, Mr. President, this would knock out two-thirds of the benefits of the bill. Why was that done? It was because they fear that if we allow a public company to buy a private company then the rights of organized labor somewhere in the country might be adversely affected.

Mr. President, I say that they are throwing out the baby with the bath water. So I am opposed to it.

Then they went around and said, "We will fix it up." And they fixed it up overnight. They took care of some of the problems in Massachusetts. They took care of some of the problems in Connecticut. And they took care of half the problems in Pennsylvania, but not the other half. Other Senators come around to say, "But you haven't taken care of me."

Mr. President, we cannot legislate in that way on the floor of the Senate. If there are defects in the bill that came from the committee, if there are things in subsection (c) on page 26 which need to be improved, to assure that the objective of the Senator from Oregon—which is my objective, too—is carried out in the final legislation, there will be ample time to take care of that in conference.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] will be on the conference committee. So will the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. So, God willing, will I.

I make my commitment now that I shall use my every effort in conference to see to it that the objectives of my friend from Oregon are carried out.

But, Mr. President, let us not throw the baby out with the bath water.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that nothing disappoints me more than to find us in disagreement. I am glad we are in agreement as to the objectives, though I am sorry we are in complete disagreement as to how to reach the objectives.

As to the preparation of this amendment, I should like to advise the Senator that some 800 man-hours have been used in the development of this amendment by experienced and skilled experts.

The Senator from Oregon did give instructions to the counsel assisting him as to what the amendment should contain so far as the objectives are concerned. Counsel prepared it, but the Senator from Oregon has gone over it and approves the language of the amendment as carrying out those objectives in complete accord with his instructions.

It is impossible to satisfy all Senators. The reason why it is impossible to satisfy them all is that we cannot satisfy each instance and protect the Federal policy, because some changes are going to have to be brought about in some of the States to conform to the Federal policy.

I do not think there would be any great wrong done if we simply said to a State, "You do not qualify for this Federal grant." It does not mean they are entitled, as a matter of right, to the Federal grants irrespective of the fact that they are not following a policy that is in conformity with a Federal policy which I think is sound public policy.

One of the differences between the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Oregon is that, in my judgment, the committee bill did not provide for the status quo of labor relations. If it had provided for the status quo of labor relations, I would not have been offering an amendment. There would not have been vigorous opposition to the bill as it came to the floor on the part of labor. When they think a great wrong is being done to them, they have the right, as free men, to oppose legislation, because even the language the Senator from Pennsylvania has referred to——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's minute has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself another minute.

Even that language uses the word "encourages" the maintenance of the status quo, but it does not require it. What does "encourage" mean? It cannot be subjected to a definition that gives any real protection to labor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. For myself, I would be glad to change the word "encourages" to the word "protects."

Mr. MORSE. Well, I have the bill before me, and the amendment is based on the bill as it is worded.

Under this indefinite language, collective bargaining agreements could be ignored or set aside by systems of public ownership.

Furthermore, there is not a word said about the Washington agreement, or section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce

Act. It is not even mentioned in the bill. Its present application to the railroads is vital. It is in my amendment. Without it, there will be unified opposition by the railroad brotherhoods to the committee bill. Under those circumstances, they would be right in their opposition. The precious rights obtained by them under the Washington agreement should be indifferently set aside by a federally assisted transportation system as a matter of sound public policy. Therefore, I could not vote for the bill as it came out of the committee, because I disagree with the Senator from Pennsylvania. It does not adequately protect the legitimate rights of labor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I should like to express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his clear and lucid argument against the adoption of this amendment, and state that, while my objectives may not be the same as his, I think his reasoning is absolutely right.

I certainly would not want to try to tack any punitive labor legislation onto this bill. I think that is definitely wrong. But we have been reassured time and time again that it is not our intent to supersede or contravene State law. But with the submission of this amendment by the proponents of the bill, a very ugly cat, indeed, has been let out of the bag.

I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that we cannot say what these provisions mean. The bill has not been enacted yet. It has not been tested in the courts. There are no precedents. How do we know what it means?

I think it means that, in a State where political subdivisions are prohibited from recognizing unions as bargaining agents, either municipalities in those States will not be able to qualify for aid under this bill or, if they do, they will have to repeal or amend their laws.

Much has been said about our not wanting discrimination in the bill. I tried to get a definition of urban area adopted. It would have excluded smaller communities. Much has been made of the fact that we do not want to discriminate against smaller communities; that they have as much right under the bill as any other communities. But we are discriminating against a number of States that have rigid provisions in their laws relative to bargaining arrangements, strikes, and picketing on the part of public employees.

I intend to offer an amendment to the Morse amendment in a moment which would strike out the labor provision. It appears that this may be a condition for the support of organized labor of the bill, but that certainly is no argument for the adoption of a provision of this sort.

Much was made in committee testimony about featherbedding. Mr. Wirtz said he was utterly opposed to featherbedding, that it was wasteful; but we are perpetuating featherbedding in this bill. That is precisely what we are doing.

There is a provision for buying bankrupt companies. What has made some of these companies bankrupt? They have been caught in the price-cost squeeze, because their costs got higher and higher, in many instances, perhaps, as a result of featherbedding. Yet we want to perpetuate the very thing that may be bankrupting these companies.

It is my fervent hope that the amendment will be roundly and soundly defeated.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not want my silence to leave the impression that I agree with the argument that the bill does not in any manner affect the Taft-Hartley law. In my judgment, the bill as it is written and as sought to be amended by the Senator from Oregon will affect the Taft-Hartley law. I shall endeavor to explain my reasons for that judgment.

The Taft-Hartley law provides that the right to concerted action by workers shall be valid. Concerted action includes the right to strike. However, the Taft-Hartley law also provides that it shall not be applicable to Federal or other governmental employees.

Whenever a transportation system crosses a State line or is engaged in a volume of business that affects interstate commerce, even though that system is solely within the boundaries of a State and does not cross the State line, the Taft-Hartley law is applicable.

There are now transportation systems which may be affected by the Taft-Hartley law. Others are not affected because they are governmentally operated. If the pending bill is passed and a private company is taken over by a government, although the Taft-Hartley law provides that it does not apply to governmental operations, the bill says that it shall apply to carry out the previous agreement.

To summarize, no operation in the transportation business now covered by government is affected by the Taft-Hartley Act. Private enterprises are covered, in many instances, by the Taft-Hartley Act. It is now proposed to have a free enterprise system, through the finances granted under the bill, taken over by a government. I submit to the Senate the language is clear that if that private enterprise had a collective bargaining agreement with a union, when it is taken over by a government the collective bargaining agreement applies, even though the present Taft-Hartley law states that governmental operations shall not be affected by the Taft-Hartley Act.

So I submit to my colleagues that, both by the bill as it is now pending and as it is proposed to be amended by the Senator from Oregon, the Taft-Hartley law will be amended if these proposals are adopted.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 2 minutes.

First, I wish to say to my friend from Texas that in my judgment no question of featherbedding is involved in this amendment at all. If there is a serious problem of featherbedding in the country, it will have to be handled as a separate matter. If we have that problem, it will have to be solved by procedures that will have to be developed for the handling of it, just as at the present time we are opening consideration of the charge of featherbedding in the railway industry; and just as analyses and studies are being made with reference to featherbedding in the maritime industry.

I suppose one way to get rid of featherbedding is to get rid of unions. According to the Senator from Texas, another way would be the operation of industry by public agencies, but I doubt he wants to advocate that. Neither method would be in keeping with the place that American unions have in our economy, or the part they have played in easing the transition into automation.

I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from Ohio, that I disagree with him on what would be the obligation under the bill. The obligation derives from the arrangements with the Administrator. It does not derive from the Taft-Hartley law at all. They are contractual arrangements. It is the contracts that are binding. I refer Senators to page 26 of the bill, where this language appears:

> (c) It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Administrator after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing. Such protective arrangements shall include—

Then it sets out such terms of the contract with continuation of collective bargaining in any situation where it now exists plus other obligations arising from the arrangement with the Administrator.

An unfair labor practice charge against the municipality under the Taft-Hartley law for any conduct under such arrangement under the amendment would be dismissed by the National Labor Relations Board because the arrangement that was entered into would create the obligation, not the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the language of the amendment reads:

> The protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to the provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Mr. MORSE. It means that the status quo must be preserved with respect to the employer-employee relationship. The relationships of the successor employer under a federally assisted project under the bill would be the same as his predecessor.

All I am saying is the public operation should extend to employees the same protection they had under private operation.

Mr. TOWER. I will yield in a moment to the Senator from Arizona to read the appropriate section of the Interstate Commerce Act. However, I read further from the Senator's amendment:

> Assurances of employment to employees of acquired mass transportation systems by the acquiring or operating entities.

I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MORSE. It means that the employees must be taken over with the plant; the position of the successor is no more or no less than his predecessor under this provision of the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Whether they are working or not? It means that redundant people must be kept on the payroll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Texas. This is one of the points I failed to cover in my colloquy with the senior Senator from Oregon. He referred to section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act. I am not going to read all of it, but I ask unanimous consent that the entire section be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the section of the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> (f) As a condition of its approval, under this paragraph (2), of any transaction involving a carrier or carriers by railroad subject to the provisions of this part, the Commission shall require a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the railroad employees affected. In its order of approval the Commission shall include terms and conditions providing that during the period of four years from the effective date of such order such transaction will not result in employees of the carrier or carriers by railroad affected by such order being in a worse position with respect to their employment, except that the protection afforded to any employee pursuant to this sentence shall not be required to continue for a longer period, following the effective date of such order, than the period during which such employee was in the employ of such carrier or carriers prior to the effective date of such order. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, an agreement pertaining to the protection of the interests of said employees may hereafter be entered into by any carrier or carriers by railroad and the duly authorized representative or representatives of its or their employees.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The point I refer to particularly reads:

> In its order of approval, the Commission shall include terms and conditions providing that during the period of four years from the effective date of such order such transaction will not result in employees of the carrier or carriers by railroad affected by such order being in a worse position with respect to their employment.

In other words, let us say that a bus company is taken over by a city. If the bus company practiced featherbedding, the city cannot discharge these employees for a period of 4 years, even though they are not needed.

I wish to make it clear to my colleagues in the Senate, so that they may understand this point. The amendment does perpetuate featherbedding. Let us say that the company has gone broke because of inefficiency, and the inefficiency is to be found in the operation of the vehicles or in the operation of the garage. The people there who are responsible for the inefficiency cannot be removed from their jobs for a period of 4 years. I suggest to my friend from Oregon and to my friend from Texas that this does violence to the concept of collective bargaining. It prohibits anything being done about these men for a period of 4 years. If we accept the Morse amendment today, we will accept a prohibition against the removal of any employees for any reason for a period of 4 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining on the amendment?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Four minutes.

Mr. TOWER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have deep respect for the senior Senator from Oregon, but on this legal proposition I cannot accept the answer which he gave me. I repeat that he said that the contemplation here is to preserve the status quo. If we preserve the status quo, and a private company was formerly under the Taft-Hartley law, the Taft-Hartley law would apply. But if the company is taken over by a city, the Taft-Hartley law provides then when the city operates, the Taft-Hartley law shall not apply. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon provides that it shall apply. The conclusion is inescapable that whether the right is derived from the judgment of the Administrator, with which statement I do not agree, the right under the bill is derived from the declaration in the law that collective bargaining agreements shall continue if aid is to be granted, and the Administrator is barred from granting aid unless all the terms and conditions of the collective bargaining agreement shall be carried into effect in accordance with the judgment of the Administrator.

If a company is now privately operated, it is plain that it is subject to the Taft-Hartley law. If that company is taken over by a municipality, it would not be covered by the Taft-Hartley law. However, under the Senator's amendment it would be covered.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill. First, I wish to say that municipalities are exempt under the Taft-Hartley law. Second, I wish to point out that preserving the status quo of the contractual arrangement means continuing the present collective bargaining relationship under the arrangement between the parties and the Administrator.

I wish to say to my friend from Arizona that the part of section 19(c) that he read in effect means, basically, that the job protections and standards refer to, first, dismissal allowances for employees who are deprived of employment; second, displacement allowances of employees who are displaced in minimum paying jobs; and, third, moving allowances for employees who are required to change their place of employment.

To my good friends, I say: You cannot have this both ways. You cannot say in one breath that you do not believe the bill should include any labor legislation, and in the next breath propose to follow a course of action which might adversely affect employment without giving the employee the comparable right which he would have had under section 5(2)(F) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

All I am saying is that whatever the arrangement is now—in comparable situations which might not have occurred without the bill, whether in terms of displacement allowances, or of moving allowances—such a severance arrangement is continued and collective bargaining rights are continued.

In effect, if the Senate follows the position of the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Texas, it will be passing major labor legislation within this bill, and using the bill improperly as a vehicle for major labor legislation.

Let us consider the problems existing in present collective bargaining agreements. How shall we correct abuses and injustices that have developed? They will be corrected just as we are seeking to correct them in the maritime industry, in the railroad industry, and in a good many other industries where there are charges of make-work programs.

I hope that we shall not, at least separately and distinctly, without a single hearing on these questions having been held, pass a transit bill which could and surely would, if the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Arizona have their way, result in denying thousands of employees their precious, hard-earned benefits which free collective bargaining has brought to them over the years.

To continue my argument would be only a matter of constant repetition. What the amendment would do, in spite of all the attacks on it, would be to assure that existing collective bargaining rights would not be taken away from the workers. I think that issue ought to go to conference. My confidence in the chairman of the Senate conferees, the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and his associates is such that I am satisfied that they can work out any of the "bugs," so to speak, that may be shown to have developed in the bill at the conference stage.

The distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], chairman of the subcommittee, will be a member of the committee of conference, as will the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

In my judgment, the Senate should, as a matter of public policy, adopt the Morse amendment, underwriting the basic principle that the Senate does not propose to take away from labor, in the mass transit bill, hard-earned collective bargaining rights achieved over the years.

I close by saying that I am making an argument for free enterprise in maintaining to the extent possible private ownership of transportation companies under free collective bargaining. I am standing here fighting for the economic freedom of employers and unions in this country to continue their collective bargaining arrangements without Congress creating a system of public ownership of transit systems which would override in a moment employee rights and interests established in decades of free negotiation.

In any event, cities cannot use Federal funds for that purpose unless a bill to acquire or take over privately owned transport systems is passed save for the exceptional cases of bankruptcy or receivership to which I have already referred.

We are debating a bill which will be of great assistance to one city after another.

But have we a bill, taking it in its totality, which will promote a solution, in many cities, of serious transport problems? I think we have. I am seeking to add to the bill an amendment which will protect the status quo of employer and employee relations. I am making a free enterprise argument. It is an argument which seeks to protect one of the most precious freedoms which American employers and American workers have, namely, the right of employees, through their representatives, to enter into free collective bargaining agreements with private employers and to have those rights preserved and protected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator from Oregon certainly can make a justification for the amendment far more eloquently than I can; but as a cosponsor of the amendment, I, too, wish to say a word.

First, I was surprised when the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] spoke as he did. I thought he would come here this morning to shout "Hallelujah." But he did not address himself to the first part of the amendment. The other day, in debate, the Senator from Ohio said:

> The pending bill has the machinery to drive private transit systems out of existence.

In speaking of his own bill, he defended it by saying:

> It would stop the Fabianists from pushing the private enterprise system of mass transportation into public, nationalized operation.

Under this amendment, that objective is certainly served, I respectfuly submit to the Senator from Ohio.

I wish to go back some 600 man-hours ago to the time when we were at the beginning of our deliberations on the questions here involved. It seems to me we have two important operative facts.

One fact is, and was, that if the bill shall be enacted, it will be a significant stimulant to reemployment, to increase the number of employees in a very sick industry, the transit industry of the United States. We are all aware of the decline of employment in all the departments of mass transportation. The bill would provide the stimulant necessary to bring workers back to the railroads, back to rapid transit, back to the bus companies. That was an important fact with which we had to deal.

The other fact is that very few, although some, systems might be changed in a way that a few employees might be adversely affected. There could be readjustments; there could be a loss of collective bargaining rights and opportunities.

There is one clear principle which we have sought to preserve. We have sought to do everything possible in the bill to protect the workingman in the rights he has won. That is why we had section 19(c) in the bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] spelled out the protection there, and we believe we have honored our obligation not to affect working people adversely by the action of the proposed legislation. However, in this sick industry, where there has been a decline in employment, an industry in which transit workers do not know from day to day what will happen to their jobs, they were fearful that this assurance was not guaranteed.

So we labored and labored and labored. Now we are here with a measure that certainly meets the objective of preserving the hard-earned rights and benefits of working people in the transit industry. We have preserved them in a way which certainly furthers private enterprise as the instrument to provide better transportation in this country.

All of us know that over the years one of the men most significant in finding the solution to the mystery in labor-management problems has been the senior Senator from Oregon. I express my personal gratitude for his advice and counsel both in our deliberations in the Senate and in offering this amendment today.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the time of the Senator from Oregon has expired. I yield back the remainder of my time for the purpose of offering an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon.

I offer my amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 3, it is proposed to strike out all beginning with line 9 and through line 8 on page 4.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I ask unanimous consent that the time required for the quorum call not be charged to the time available to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 3, 1963, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DELEGATION FROM THE ECUADORAN CONGRESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at this time we are honored by a visit from a large delegation of Members of Congress from our sister Republic to the south, Ecuador. In a short time they are to be the guests of the Vice President at luncheon. Prior to the luncheon, he has brought them here, for a brief visit to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I know that all of us join in extending to these distinguished guests a very warm invitation to be with us, and a very warm reception. We are delighted that they are visiting in our country. We appreciate very greatly the good relationships between Ecuador and the United States; and we know that these gentlemen will do much to cement further the strong bonds of friendship which our two countries enjoy.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished Senator from Alabama in welcoming our distinguished neighbors. We hope that they feel at home here, and we want them to be welcomed as further evidence of our very fine relationship with their great country. It is our distinct pleasure to welcome them here today. [Applause, Senators rising.]

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time required for the quorum call not be charged to the time available to either side under the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon Mr. [MORSE].

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, my amendment would merely strike from the Morse amendment the language on what has been referred to as the protective arrangements, and would preserve the language that is in the bill. I am not too happy with the language in the bill, as every Senator knows. But I think that the proposed language is infinitely worse. I am particularly concerned about subparagraph 2, relating to a continuation of collective bargaining in any situation in which it now exists, because I believe that the proposed language would fly in the teeth of several State laws. Probably it would make a number of States ineligible to qualify for aid under the provisions of the bill.

I am still concerned about subsections 3 and 4, because I do not believe, or I have not been satisfied, that those provisions do not perpetuate featherbedding. Let us examine this question. Subsection (3) states—

> (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to the provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act;—

which the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] read a while ago. Subsection (4) states—

> (4) assurances of employment to employees of acquired mass transportation systems by the acquiring or operating entities, and priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off;

It seems to me that this provision would seal into their jobs people who are no longer needed. For example, a motorman on a street railway who cannot drive a bus, when the street railway changes over to a bus operation rather than a streetcar operation, would fall in this group. The company would be compelled to keep him on his job. They would be compelled to keep him on the payroll even though his services were no longer needed.

I think this provision certainly should be eliminated and we should go back to the the original provision of the bill as worked out very carefully in the committee. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] pointed out a while ago, there was a good deal of deliberation on it and a good deal of give and take in the committee. It was probably the nearest thing to a compromise that one could find.

This proposal is not a compromise, Mr. President. This is a capitulation to the demands of trade union leadership, to demands made the condition for supporting this bill.

If we are going to make the bill satisfactory to everybody, I should like to consult a few interested groups of national importance to see what their condition for supporting the bill would be. Perhaps we could please everybody. I have never seen a piece of proposed legislation which did please everybody, but apparently this is what we are trying to do.

It is pretty obvious that not everybody among the proponents of the bill is entirely happy with the Morse amendment. I think this is the most odious section of it, and certainly it should be stricken.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I feel that I made the case against the amendment of my good friend from Texas [Mr. TOWER] when I made my argument in support of my own amendment. I wish to emphasize one point I made in support of my own amendment.

Not only would it continue the status quo, but also it would not in fact use the bill as a vehicle for passing major labor legislation. The amendment of the Senator from Texas would do exactly that.

Let us consider this matter of severance pay which is involved in the problem raised by the Senator from Texas.

What does the so-called Washington agreement involve? It states:

> If deprived of employment: 60 percent of text period average ranging from 6 months' compensation for service from 1 to 2 years to 60 months' compensation for service 15 years and over, less other railroad compensation. Less than 1 year service: 60 days' lump-sum payment.

That is a very precious right which has been won by railway labor, known as the Washington agreement on this point. These rights are in existence. I am saying that they ought to be continued. I say that whatever the present situation is, it should be continued.

I repeat that the problem of featherbedding, the problem of made work, is very serious, but it does not arise under the amendment. If we wish to solve it legislatively, it ought to be handled in proposed legislation after full hearings on the problem.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. We should not pass something here which would indirectly accomplish that purpose.

I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I wish to ask the Senator a question. Was not the Washington agreement a voluntary agreement between the carriers and the unions?

Mr. MORSE. It is a part of a collective bargaining agreement, and I want it continued. However, it has become a cornerstone governing layoffs and position downgrading in the federally regulated transportation industries for many years. It finds expression in modified form in section 5(2)(F) of the Interstate Commerce Act and has been the basis for recommendations by Presidential emergency boards under the Railway Labor Act.

As the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the chairman of the subcommittee, pointed out over and over again, there is a sick and dying industry in many parts of the country. The future of the transit companies in many cities is a pretty bleak future. We certainly do not have any right to destroy the rights of workers which have been worked out under collective bargaining agreements, through projects financed under this bill. We ought to preserve those rights.

Then, if there is a problem which calls for special legislation, we ought to consider it in hearings on the whole problem of made work, or featherbedding, or whatever the problem seems to be.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to have 5 minutes in opposition to the Tower amendment.

Mr. MORSE. If it is going to be in opposition, the Senator ought to take some of my time.

Mr. CLARK. I was going to ask the Senator from Oregon for time, if he has time to give me.

Mr. MORSE. I am willing to yield the Senator time from the time on the amendment; otherwise, I am sure he could use some of the time on the bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Oregon has ample time on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I do not intend to use any more time on the amendment myself, so I will yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Tower amendment for the same reason that I opposed the Morse amendment.

In my opinion this bill should not be used as a vehicle either for increasing or for decreasing the rights of organized labor. As I said earlier today, as I would oppose a civil rights rider to this bill I oppose either a prolabor or an antilabor rider.

The purpose of subsection (c) on page 26 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is to protect existing labor rights; not to increase them or to decrease them.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I realize that, in making this statement, my judgment is not in accord with the view of the Senator from Texas, to whom I now gladly yield.

Mr. TOWER. Actually, what my amendment would do is to strike out the labor provision of the Morse amendment, which would mean that the labor provision now in the bill would prevail. I would not touch that.

Mr. CLARK. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. TOWER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps I misunderstood our colloquy earlier this morning. I had thought that the net effect of the amendment of the Senator from Texas would be to strike from the bill subsection (c), line 6 on page 26, of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. TOWER. No.

Mr. CLARK. Is that an incorrect understanding?

Mr. TOWER. The effect of my amendment would be to strike from the Morse amendment the protective-arrangements provision.

Mr. CLARK. What would that leave?

Mr. TOWER. That would leave the present subsection (c) in the bill. It would not touch that at all. In other words, rather than the Morse language substituting for the language in the bill the language in the bill would continue and prevail.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, then I oppose the Tower amendment for another and different reason. [Laughter.]

That is, because the Tower amendment would still leave in the Morse amendment those provisions which would make this bill relatively meaningless for the people of my State and for the people of many of the other States of the Union, for, in a very ingenious and able way, I make no criticism of his motivation, but nevertheless most ingeniously and ably the Senator from Texas would succeed, if his amendment were to prevail, in making it impossible for any public utility owned by a municipality, an authority, or a State to use Federal funds under this program to acquire a privately owned public utility.

This, I think is wrong. This, I think, would defeat one of the major benefits of the bill. Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment. In fact, what would happen would be that, except for completely inadequate exceptions and inclusions of sections (b)(1) and (b)(2) of the Morse amendment, the prohibition would continue, preventing the acquisition of private companies by companies operated by municipalities.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. My amendment would remove only the labor provision. It would not remove the other provisions with which the Senator is concerned. I suggest that we dismember this provision a little at a time. I would be glad to join with the Senator from Pennsylvania in removing other sections and doing a job of general surgery.

Mr. CLARK. I appreciate the Senator's consideration, but I say again his delicate surgeon's knife succeeds, if it does succeed, in taking out a part of the Morse amendment to which I have no serious objection, and leaving in the bill that part of the Morse amendment which I think would largely defeat the purpose of the bill. Therefore, I would like to murder the whole child and defeat the Morse amendment, lock, stock, and barrel, and go to conference with what I believe are the wise provisions of the bill that came out of the committee, with no provision against permitting a municipality to acquire a private company, where that was desirable, and it will be soon in my State, while at the same time giving every possible encouragement, as the provisions are written in the bill, to the continuation and to the health of the existing private properties so long as they can serve their people the way the mass transportation needs of their people require.

So, to recapitulate, I am opposed to the Tower amendment because the net result would be to leave in the Morse amendment those provisions in the bill which are inimical to the interests of many cities in my State, in that it would not permit a public body to acquire a private transit company with funds provided under this bill.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I simply wish to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I would very much like to have his vote on my amendment. If he will support my amendment, I will support him and try to defeat the whole provision. Of course, I am going to vote that way anyway.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. It seems to me that is the kind of arrangement between Pennsylvania and Texas which should not be made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TOWER. I think the Senator is correct.

I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I tried unsuccessfully the other day to amend the whole section out, not because, as I said, I am opposed to arrangements between cities and other organizations, but because of my fear of this pattern of preempting State law. Having failed in my effort to have that subsection amended out of the bill, I must say I greatly prefer that subsection to the one offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse].

I think one feature of his amendment alone should cause all my colleagues apprehension, and I refer to the language beginning on line 24 of page 3 of his amendment: "which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to the provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act."

Section 5(2)(f) prohibits the firing of any person for 4 years after a transfer has been made. This means a man can be totally inefficient, can be drunk on duty, can be a dangerous driver, can pile up a bad record, and yet the city cannot get rid of him because of the provision of the act to which the Senator's amendment refers.

I think this feature alone should cause my colleagues to vote for the Tower amendment.

As I have said, objectionable as the labor section is, I would much prefer to have the one prepared by the committee than the one offered by the Senator from Oregon.

I know he feels sincerely and honestly that this provision will not do damage to State law, but I have not been convinced, from the legislative history, and I am not sure he has been, that it will not. Doing damage to State law has become a habit in this body. I think we do violence to our oath to protect the Constitution when we constantly pass measures that destroy local and State law.

For that reason, I think the Morse amendment is an extremely dangerous amendment, one that would place the entire concept of States' rights in jeopardy. Therefore, I am urging my colleagues to vote for the Tower amendment.

Should the Tower amendment prevail, then we can go to work on the other part of it, if other Senators so desire.

I think the Senator from Texas has done a real service on the floor of the Senate in pointing out the weaknesses of the bill—and there are many of them—but particularly in this field, where there is so much danger of preemption of State law, and where we are hamstringing the rights of people, particularly management, when we tell them they must keep employees for 4 years after arrangements for transfer to a public transit system.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, no Senator on this side seeks recognition, and I therefore yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Chair restate the proposition before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If this is a parliamentary inquiry, I should like to have the Chair advise me whether I correctly understand that the amendment of the Senator from Texas would strike out the second half of the so-called Morse amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would strike out that portion of the Morse amendment that is found on page 3, beginning in line 9, through line 8 on page 4. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Domi-

Nick]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Engle]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 68, as follows:

[No. 38 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Eastland
Ervin
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—68

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—9

Bennett
Carlson
Dominick
Engle
Gore
Magnuson
Moss
Smathers
Yarborough

So Mr. Tower's amendment to Mr. Morse's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the Morse amendment, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on the question of passage of the bill, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Morse amendment remain open to amendment, notwithstanding the ordering of the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

RATIFICATION BY NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE OF THE ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] be recognized, to make a statement, and that the time he uses not be charged to the time available to either side under the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I take great pride in announcing that this morning the Nebraska unicameral Legislature ratified the proposed 24th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the anti-poll-tax amendment, by a vote of 41 to 0, with two members absent, making it the 30th State to ratify the amendment.

Just a little more than 1 year ago, the Senate passed the joint resolution which permitted the States to ratify this amendment. At that time, my colleague, Senator Curtis, and I joined the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] and many other Senators in supporting the joint resolution. In brief, this proposal provides that the right to vote in elections of national officers shall not be denied on account of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

Thus, the unanimous approval by the Nebraska unicameral Legislature is most gratifying to me. It signifies the respect which Nebraskans have for the right to vote. Also, it is a tribute to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] for the effective leadership he provided this very important amendment; and I wish to pay him that tribute, as I believe the Legislature of Nebraska did earlier today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, under the same arrangement, may I be recognized for several minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first, I express my sincere thanks to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his very kind words about me. I wish to repeat that sentiment with reference to the unicameral Legislature of Nebraska. If the action it took today by unanimous vote is indicative of what can be expected of unicameral legislatures, perhaps there will be more of them in the days ahead.

Mr. President, I wish to pay my very appreciative thanks, in particular, to the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska and Mr. Curtis]. Both of them joined in sponsoring my resolution proposing this important amendment to the Constitution, and both of them voted for it. They have been exceedingly diligent in carrying this matter to the members of their State legislature and before the people of their State. It goes without saying that the favorable action taken today by the Nebraska Legislature depended greatly upon their effective leadership and action.

Therefore, Mr. President, I take this occasion not only to thank them, but also to say again that this action illustrates the completely bipartisan nature of the amendment and of the support it has received.

I thank my distinguished friends.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes on the bill to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I address my remarks particularly to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the author of the pending amendment, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered, and on which we shall vote directly.

I am a little curious about a portion of the amendment which provides that certain conditions must be met if the assistance is to be received; and one of them is that the required facilities either be bankrupt or be in receivership, as declared by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. President, now that we have reached that point, I wonder whether such a provision would act as a bailout of defunct property while operating in bankruptcy, in that one of the conditions for obtaining the assistance is that it go into bankruptcy. I gather that there are transportation systems which are operating on a thin edge. If I do not misunderstand this situation, such a provision would be an invitation in such circumstances simply to go into bankruptcy, and thus become eligible, upon compliance with the other conditions recited in the Morse formula.

The second condition is that the acquired property must be essential to a mass transit system. Why should we write into the bill a provision that a system can be bankrupt and in receivership as a condition for assistance under a policy bill dealing with mass transit? Such a provision intrigues me no end.

In the first part of the formula there is also a provision that the Secretary of Labor and the Administrator must act jointly on these questions. If I were writing the provision and were in support of the bill, I would be pretty careful about a joint operation and a joint determination, because I can see in such operation no end of trouble when we are dealing with a complicated subject such as mass transportation.

But the second part of the amendment, which would amend the language appearing on page 26, is even more interesting. I do not find a phrase or an expression that relates to the public interest.

For example, we find reference in the bill to protection of the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing. There is no indication of the public interest. It will have to come from those who ride the systems. The question is, Is the sky the limit in order to provide protection?

Nothing is said in the bill about the public interest. The bill should be amended in line 16, after the word "financing," to include the words "to the extent that it is consistent with the public interest."

We read a little further in the second part of the amendment and we discover that there must be a preservation of the rights, privileges, and benefits, including the continuation of pension rights and benefits, of all beneficiaries. Many of the systems have established pension systems. Everyone knows that officers, directors, and higher echelon employees are always placed in a much higher pension category. What I should like to know is whether the president, the vice president, and the managing and executive personnel who may have pension benefits targeted on amounts such as $50,000, $60,000, or $70,000, would receive the benefits of public funds under the provision which provides that all beneficiaries shall be protected.

Mr. President, I will not vote any authority or any public funds for such purpose. The heads of transit systems may be skating on thin ice. Their pension rights may have been determined long ago. After a certain number of years, the sums are rather fancy. Yet the proposed language would require that the rights and benefits of all beneficiaries shall be preserved.

I call attention to another item which appears in the bill. On page 3, line 21, the provision would apply "under existing collective bargaining agreements, or otherwise."

I have always had a rather precise notion about the English language. But I invite anyone to explain what the words "or otherwise" mean. They may cover a multitude of sins before we are through.

Thus far I have heard no explanation on the floor of the Senate as to what to two words "or otherwise" may include.

Another provision on page 3 provides that:

> The protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to the provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

If I remember correctly, that if an employee works 2 years, he is entitled to an additional 2 years. If he works 4 years, he is entitled to a second 4 years.

Is the proposal a bundle of feathers? We recently got through with featherbedding. Three years ago I introduced a bill. The Judiciary Committee conducted hearings on it. The bill was designed to relieve some of our carriers of the massive expenses resulting from featherbedding.

We could not obtain action on the bill in this body. The other body would not act on the bill. It remained for the Supreme Court to look at the inequity of the situation. Yesterday an order was issued which is expected to provide as much as or more than $600 million, not in benefits, but in easing of the burdens of the carriers because of rigid featherbedding.

If Senators desire to read some enriching testimony, I suggest that they read the findings of the Commerce Commission of the State of North Dakota. At one time way stations were established along railroad lines. Their distance apart was measured by how far a team and wagon with a load of grain could travel to and from a farm in a given day. Many of those way stations were set 6 miles apart. That is where the country elevator was built. The operator of the station may still be there. The testimony shows that in many cases, for as much as 15 minutes a day, an employee receives a full day's pay. There was no relenting in that equity until a case went from the district court in Chicago to the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and then to the Supreme Court of the United States.

We will never save the carriers and enable the railroads or any kind of transit system in our country to operate efficiently, if we put that kind of burden on them.

Railroads such as the B. & O., the Pennsylvania, the Illinois Central, the Milwaukee System, and the Chicago & Northwestern are all operating transit systems and carrying commuters. I suppose the New York, New Haven & Hartford is in difficulty today largely on account of their commuter system. When we think of the transportation problem, we must think of the whole problem. Yet what is the approach?

Pending now before the Committee on the Judiciary is a bill which would freeze mergers until the 31st of December 1963. The bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and I fought the bill to a standstill. There were hundreds of pages of hearings.

The bill was introduced again in the present Congress. A jurisdictional dispute developed, but the Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction and there will be hearings.

The New York Central Railroad and the Pennsylvania Railroad are begging, entreating, and supplicating the Interstate Commerce Commission to let them go through with their merger in order to impart health to those systems. If we will quit abusing them with a club, we shall not need the bill that is before us today, with its handouts.

In one breath we belabor the railroads with a club, and then we come along with a bag of sugar candy, as if that would do the job.

On page 4 of the Morse amendment another provision appears to which I should like to call attention:

> (4) assurances of employment to employees of acquired mass transportation systems by the acquiring or operating entities—

What is the general purpose of this bill, if it is not consolidation and efficiency? How will that be achieved, unless some jobs are abandoned in the process? How could people be assured? Suppose they are not needed. Suppose in the case of motormen 100 are lost. What will be done with them? Where will they be put?

This refers to assurances of employment by the operating entities and to priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off. That is pretty loose language. I would hate to be confronted with that kind of responsibility, Mr. President if I were going to direct one of these mass transit operations.

Then there are to be paid training or retraining programs. What is to be the limit in terms of money? What is to be the limit in terms of the kind of retraining involved? Shall we go all over the whole field? Would that solve the problem? I have grave doubts.

This is filled with a lot of uncertainty. I must say that the language of the Magnuson proposal is not much better except of course that there is no provision that a bankrupt outfit could get the benefits of the bill.

That is as clear as crystal for anybody to read, "such company has, prior to such acquisition, been declared bankrupt." If that is not an open invitation to go into receivership I give up.

We have some of those situations out home but that does not mean that I have to bail them out with the taxpayers' money or ultimately with the money of the people who are to ride on these systems. That is the public.

I defy Senators to find a line in the Morse amendment that even mentions the public interest. Why that term has been glorified. It has been embroidered. It has been couched in eloquent language on this floor—the public interest.

I ask Senators to find that in the Morse amendment.

I do not want to go down that road. I am not going down that road.

The sensible thing would be not only to send this back to the committee but also to embrace a proposal offered yesterday to let the whole problem go to the Commerce Department, where it belongs, instead of to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and to let that Department give some real study to it and come up with something quite worthwhile.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 3 more minutes to the Senator from Illinois from the time on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Finally, Mr. President, we ought to have a better estimate as to where lies, really, the end of the road. The Administrator himself before the committee estimated a cost of more than $9 billion for this program. His estimate falls far short of the mark. Year after year, under the impulses of inflation, wages and the costs of materials go higher and higher. I do not believe we could consummate that program finally for $20 billion, and I am not going to plow that long furrow until I feel reasonably sure where the end will be, or at least some kind of end, because this is going to be a gargantuan burden before we get through.

Mr. President, it seems to me that every dictate of prudence should persuade the Senate not only to defeat the Morse amendment but also to defeat the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. **MORSE.** I have made my case against the argument of the Senator from Illinois already today. As to the first point the Senator raises, we have a great dilemma in this debate. There is great concern on the part of many in the Senate about using the bill to enable State governmental agencies to force the purchase of a transit company upon its private owners. We have taken the position that we are not going to be a party to that action. If there is a situation in which a transit company is going bankrupt, has gone bankrupt, or is in receivership, then we think the Administrator should be in a position to make the decision as to whether it is in the public interest for a city which wants to buy that kind of transit company to buy it.

My amendment would make that possible. I tried to make clear earlier today that my amendment would not make it possible for a city to force a transit company to sell when it did not want to sell by getting Federal money it could use in the purchase of that company.

I think that is a pretty good position for us to take. It is a position that meets the objections which many earlier made in respect to the bill.

Now, as to all the arguments which the Senator from Illinois has made as to what the bill would continue, I only repeat that it would continue the status quo. Whatever the labor relations situation is now, it should be continued. What the Senator from Illinois has really proposed is that, without an hour's hearing, we should pass within this bill major labor legislation. He has had much to say about a make-work program.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

As I said earlier, we have problems about make-work programs. We shall have to handle them legislatively and administratively in the next months and a few years in this country, and that ought to be done as a result of legislation designed to handle the problem. We should not pass a transit bill which has a sleeper provision in it which would take away from labor, without any hearing whatsoever or any opportunity to consider proof, hard-won rights which have been won over the years through collective bargaining.

I repeat, as I close, the answer to the Senator from Illinois is that we would extend the status quo so far as transit companies are concerned. We still would have before us the problem of settling the labor problems by way of separate hearings and legislation.

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield 2 minutes to me, so that I may ask the Senator from Oregon a question?

Mr. **MORSE.** I should be glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator from Alabama yield further time?

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes from the time on the bill to the Senator from New York.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from New York may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. **JAVITS.** I thank the Senator from Alabama.

I should like the Senator from Oregon to tell us one thing.

It seems to me that, apart from the clauses in the amendment relating to the acquisition of private companies, the amendment would add one thing to the labor clauses already in section 19(c) of the bill and that is the so-called Washington agreement, which is incorporated in section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act. I understand that that section has been made a part of the RECORD, but, to be sure, I ask unanimous consent that it may be included with my remarks at this point.

Mr. **MORSE.** I have already put that in the RECORD, but I think it should be included now.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(f) As a condition of its approval, under this paragraph (2), of any transaction involving a carrier or carriers by railroad subject to the provisions of this part, the Commission shall require a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the railroad employees affected. In its order of approval the Commission shall include terms and conditions providing that during the period of 4 years from the effective date of such order such transaction will not result in employees of the carrier or carriers by railroad affected by such order being in a worse position with respect to their employment, except that the protection afforded to any employee pursuant to this sentence shall not be required to continue for a longer period, following the effective date of such order, than the period during which such employee was in the employ of such carrier or carriers prior to the effective date of such order. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, an agreement pertaining to the protection of the interests of said employees may hereafter be entered into by any carrier or carriers by railroad and the duly authorized representative or representatives of its or their employees.

Washington agreement, May 21, 1936: Employees affected solely by or in anticipation of a "coordination." Does not apply to employees affected solely by other causes. Employee not regarded as deprived of employment in case of death, resignation, retirement, dismissal for cause, furlough because of reduction of forces due to seasonal requirements of service, or if not affected within 3 years of coordination.

Mr. **JAVITS.** The Senator from Arizona, when he argued this matter, said that would compel us to continue the employment of a man who might be a drunkard, who might be a bad driver, who might have some reason for being fired under the normal work rules.

As I understand the language, so that the language may be clear, the so-called Washington agreement uses the following operative words: that the employees shall not be "in a worse position with respect to their employment."

Does the Senator construe that to mean—this is the way I construe it—that all the normal work rules and practices in effect at present under collective bargaining would remain fully in effect? It would not mean that a man could not be fired for proper cause as he can under present conditions. It would merely mean that he shall not enjoy a worse tenure than he enjoys now under a collective bargaining agreement or any other agreement or arrangement.

Mr. **MORSE.** The Senator from New York has put more clearly and potently than has the Senator from Oregon exactly the position of the Senator from Oregon. That is what the amendment means.

Mr. **JAVITS.** Does the Senator mean that the only thing added by the labor aspect of the provision is the Washington agreement?

Mr. **MORSE.** That is correct.

Mr. **JAVITS.** Other than that, we are dealing with acquisition of private companies, and so forth?

Mr. **MORSE.** Yes.

Mr. **JAVITS.** The Senator has gone a long way to meet the worries of persons like myself in the way the amendment is drafted. I certainly am glad to associate myself in support of the amendment.

Mr. **TOWER.** Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute from the time on the bill.

I point out that the inclusion of the reference to section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act is not the only change. I call the attention of Senators to protective arrangement No. 2. The bill as we now have before us contains the language: "the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights."

The Morse amendment reads: "the continuation of collective bargaining in any situation where it now exists."

That is an important and significant change.

Mr. **MILLER.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. **TOWER.** I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. **MILLER.** Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment, to the Morse amendment which I now call up and ask to have stated, and which I offer on behalf of myself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brewster in the chair). The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed to insert, after the comma on line 14, page 3, of the Morse amendment, the following: "and not inconsistent with the laws of the State in which the project or a portion of the project is located,".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this amendment by the Senator from Texas and myself is the same amendment we proposed 2 days ago to apply at page 26 of the main bill. We did it in an effort to make absolutely certain that the statements by the Senator in charge of the bill and some of the proponents of the bill, namely, that it was not intended that State law be usurped directly or indirectly by this legislation, would be effective.

I am happy to point out that the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], who is handling the bill, voted for the amendment. He carried out his commitment, that it was his intention that the bill not supersede State law, by supporting the amendment. I regret to say that there were only 36 votes in support of the amendment. I suggest that some Senators who voted against the amendment might have had difficulty in voting against it in view of the statement made that it was not intended, directly or indirectly, to supersede State law.

All this amendment does is to make absolutely certain that where there is a State law which is inconsistent with the standards established by the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, the State law will not be superseded or overridden.

It is all very well and good to say that a State does not have to take this aid; that it can go on with an inconsistent provision and not receive aid from the Federal Government. But I do not think that is fair, and it certainly is an indirect way of having Federal law supersede State law.

While some of us may not have great concern about State law being superseded in the areas itemized on page 3 of the Morse amendment, the language "without being limited to" opens it up to an unknown quantity.

All that the amendment which I have offered proposes to do is carry out what the Secretary of Labor expressed as an opinion as to what would be the case and, what the proponents of the main bill have stated is their intention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MILLER. I shall be happy to yield the floor for questions or comments on my amendment. I do not wish to yield back the remainder of my time as yet.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope the amendment to my amendment will be defeated, because the subject matter of the amendment was the subject of rather extensive debate earlier today, in which it was pointed out that the only time a transit company would be taken over would be in a case in which it is bankrupt, or is in receivership, or is fast growing defunct, and the Administrator feels it is in the public interest that it be taken over. Only in those situations could public money be made available by the Administrator for the takeover.

That provision protects the private enterprise system from having pressure put on it, vis-a-vis Federal funds, to force the private company to go out of business.

Earlier in the day we discussed the hypothetical case of a need to take over a company which has a collective bargaining agreement with its employees, but where there is a State law which prohibits the municipality, for example, from bargaining with the employees. We said that if such a situation should exist, in those limited cases—and they would be few and far between—Federal money could not be made available unless it was done by use of the Memphis formula. We discussed the Memphis formula. Also it might be done in line with the possible use of the Atlanta, Ga., case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself another 2 minutes.

We are still waiting to learn whether or not the Atlanta, Ga., case is an appropriate hypothetical case, because we have not been able to ascertain whether or not there is such a law in Georgia. But let us assume there is.

The Memphis formula involves a situation in which a transit line is publicly owned, but in which there is a law which prohibits collective bargaining with the union. However, use has been made of the device of establishing a private managerial commission to operate the line; and the private commission, under contract with the city, handles labor relations and can enter into collective bargaining with the employees.

I want to be very frank as I say this today: In rare cases in which local law prohibits collective bargaining, Federal money would not be available, because it would be in conflict with the policy of the bill.

I have just been informed that the Georgia law does not prohibit collective bargaining by the cities, and therefore the Georgia case has been removed from the debate.

The only situation we have is the hypothetical case that I have discussed, in which there might be a line that is defunct, or is going defunct, which the city wants to take over, and in which there is a State law which prohibits the municipality from having a collective bargaining agreement with the employees of the system, in the event the municipality takes over the private company, whereas the provision of the bill is that the agreement must be continued. But in that situation all a city needs is a good lawyer, such as the city of Memphis had. It established a private commission, under a contract by which the private commission operates the line and has an agreement with the employees.

I hope the pending amendment will be defeated, because it would cause great confusion.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. The Senator from Oregon has pointed out that a singular type of situation might arise, but I suggest that the phrase "without being limited to" opens this subject up to an unknown quantity, and that the singular situation to which the Senator from Oregon has referred could be very widespread. I can see no harm to the legislation resulting from the adoption of the amendment. I think the fact that the other day there were 36 votes in favor of the amendment to the main bill, which was supported by the Senator in charge of the bill, pretty well speaks for itself.

I hope my amendment will be adopted.

I will not press for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 41, as follows:

[No. 39 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Engle
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—41

Allott
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Morton

Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Russell
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—7

Bennett
Carlson
Dominick
Gore
Moss
Smathers
Yarborough

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 22 and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, between lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

> (d) No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act for any technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Attorney General, to be effective to insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will (with such exceptions and limitations as the Administrator may determine after consultation with the Secretary of Defense to be necessary in the interest of the national defense) be made freely and fully available to the general public. Nothing contained in this subsection shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity of any right which that owner may have under that patent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

On pages 9 and 10 of the bill provision is made for a considerable amount of research and development to be done by Government financing. My amendment follows the precedent which Congress has followed on other occasions with respect to the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the coal research bill, the helium gas research bill, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the practice in the Federal Aviation Agency, which provides that when Federal money is spent upon research, the benefits of that research will be made fully available to the people of the country.

My amendment is designed to prevent the sort of thing which occurs in some departments, when a contractor is permitted to have a private patent upon the fruits of the research and either charge a higher fee or deny the benefits of the patent completely to the people of the country in general.

So the purpose of the amendment is to make certain that in spending research money, the benefits of the research will be made available to all the people of the country and to all communities which are sought to be benefited by the bill.

To my knowledge, this proposal was not considered by the committee. I believe that if it had been considered by the committee, the committee would have included in the bill language to cover this situation, just as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and other committees have cared for this type of proposal in considering measures relating to research.

I believe the managers of the bill will agree to accept the amendment. I hope that it will be agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as I understand, a similar amendment has been added to several pieces of legislation in recent years. I am willing to accept the amendment; I think it is a good one.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe it has been added to every piece of legislation authorizing research that has been passed by Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand, that is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Several Senators have been considerably alarmed by the fact that language similar to this is in the Space Agency Act—the act creating NASA. Whereas contractors receive, on a cost-plus basis, 7 percent for doing research and development, the act intends that the fruits of the research, in the form of patents, should be the property of the United States. However, the Administrator of NASA has apparently been trying to promulgate rules which would enable him to give patents to the contractors, in addition to the 7 percent they receive on a cost-plus basis. The Senator from Louisiana has taken the lead in opposing that practice, and I have joined him. However, hearings were called for when Congress was not in session, and no one from the legislative branch was present to protest.

Is the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana worded so that there will not be a repetition of what is sought to be done by the Space Agency in connection with patents?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am familiar with the problem in NASA. In that instance, the Administrator of the Agency has the power to waive patent rights if he finds such action to be in the national interest. What the Administrator of NASA proposes to do is to find that a monopoly is in the national interest as a general rule; and to waive patent rights in general in all cases in which it can be established in advance that patent rights should be waived.

The language of my amendment is more closely drawn. The language in the NASA Act was a compromise. I believe it satisfies no one. The language of this amendment is drawn strictly on the principle that the public is entitled to the full benefit of information derived from Government research.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not true that NASA, having failed to have the legislation amended so that it could give away patent rights, is attempting to do so by regulations?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I regret to say that that seems to be the situation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana upon his amendment. It is drawn so that there will not be a repetition of that kind of action.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe that to be the case.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to compliment the Senator from Louisiana upon his diligence in this field and to thank him for offering the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as I understand, with all amendments disposed of, the bill now contains five amendments which were recommended by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I desire to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the subcommittee on Surface Transportation for its expeditious handling of the bill in the Committee on Commerce. I especially wish to thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], chairman of the subcommittee, who was opposed to the bill and will vote against it.

I pay my sincere compliments to the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] for his remarkably fine presentation of the bill in so short a time; and to Mr. Levin, our able assistant, who helped us all the way.

I urge the Senate to pass the bill, so that it may accomplish the purpose for which it was introduced.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. TOWER. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as I stated in my individual views in the Commerce Committee report on this legislation, I am opposed to enactment of the urban mass transit legislation. This proposal deals primarily with transportation, and yet the Commerce Committee was allowed slightly less than 2 weeks to consider it. The field of transportation falls entirely within the realm of responsibility of the Commerce Committee. During this short period, hearings were held by the Surface Transportation Subcommittee and every attempt was made to amend the bill so as to make it more consistent with a strong and vibrant national transportation policy.

The basic objective of our Nation's transportation system is, in the words of President Kennedy, "to assure the availability of the fast, safe, and economic transportation services needed in a growing and changing economy to move people and goods at the lowest cost consistent with health, convenience, national security, and other broad public objectives." This pronouncement by the President is certainly the objective which we all seek to achieve for our Nation's transportation system. As is usually the case, however, although there is no disagreement as to the basic objective in mind, there are many and varied opinions as to the method of achieving this objective. Last year, the Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Luther H. Hodges, in a hearing before the Senate Commerce Committee, stated the basic principle of the Department of Commerce in striving to achieve this goal. He said:

> We believe that this basic objective can and must be achieved primarily by continued reliance on unsubsidized, privately owned facilities, operating under the incentives of private profit.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly subscribe to the underlying principle contained in this statement, and it is my belief that this urban mass transit legislation fails to meet the test prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce.

There is no constitutional authority for the National Government to enter this field of activity, which is purely local in nature. There have been very few attempts to justify this activity under the Constitution for the obvious reason that any argument must fall of its own weight. Certainly it does not fall within the scope of the commerce clause of the Constitution, and the welfare clause was never intended to cover expenditures for such activities as this. Had the welfare clause been intended to cover such a broad area, there would have been no necessity for the specific enumeration of delegated powers to Congress, which are found in article I, section 8 of the Constitution. Also, had the welfare clause been intended to cover such a broad scope, the 10th amendment would have been meaningless, for the National Government would have had all powers under the welfare clause and there would have been no powers to reserve to the States and to the people.

The urban mass transit proposals would violate the organizational structure of our federated system of government. Municipalities are subdivisions of States, although the States are not subdivisions of the National Government. The Congress should not deal directly with a subdivision of a State. If the pending bill shall be enacted, it will mean that the State governments will be bypassed and the local communities will be required to place more reliance on the National Government. This would, in effect, accomplish the same purpose which the creation of the Cabinet position of the Department of Urban Affairs, which was defeated in the last session of Congress, would have accomplished. It would erode the principles upon which our Federal system is based and relegate the State governments to a position inferior to the National Government in questions affecting municipalities and urban areas.

The Federal aid made available under the terms of the bill would be advanced directly to the local municipalities for their use as they saw fit, as long as they complied with the regulations issued by the Administrator of the HHFA. This would, of necessity, result in Federal control to a large extent over the transit systems of municipalities and urban areas. The funds would be made available to these municipalities and urban areas only on the condition that they complied with strict Federal regulations, without deviation. Such National Government intervention would result in complete control over this aspect of local governmental affairs. It is easy to visualize how complete control over this one area could be expanded over many other areas which would otherwise be under the control of the local governmental unit. Compliance with almost any request would be virtually assured by the threat of withholding funds for transit systems.

Mr. President, I submit that the subsidy program would set a precedent and would merely be the forerunner of what could be expected later. Without a doubt, such programs would be extended to cover interstate carriers and would increase National Government control to such an extent that the only alternative would be the complete nationalization of transportation systems.

Urban mass transit is not a national question. It is a local one, and should be left for local solution and local control. Municipalities can sell bonds, exempt from taxation by the National Government, to finance their own transit systems. All that this requires is that the citizens of the local areas recognize their problem and display the willingness to solve it locally. It would be unjust to saddle the entire economy with the tax burden which would be required upon approval of this legislation. The present state of our Nation's economy dictates the need for less Federal expenditures rather than more. While it is impossible to foresee the exact amount of expenditures which would result from enactment of this measure, it is quite apparent that the total could reach the $10 billion mark, or possibly more.

Even if the National Government had jurisdiction to act in this field, and this authority is completely lacking, the funds which would be required are simply not available. After viewing the problem objectively, it is apparent that the United States cannot afford to spend this huge sum, considering the present state of our fiscal affairs.

Mr. President, very little research has been conducted in the area of urban mass transportation. The testimony before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee reveals a startling lack of knowledge in the field. Coupled with this is a sparsity of information as to the practical aspects of this plan. It would be foolish for Congress to authorize this vast expenditure of funds for programs which have never been investigated, and whose effectiveness has not been demonstrated and cannot be assured.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, speaking relative to Senate bill 6, I want to say there is no doubt that a serious transportation problem does exist. The rapid growth of our cities has spawned many new suburban complexes, unsightly freeways, and inadequate and outdated mass transit facilities. Our population continues to increase steadily, and Americans are stepping up their migration from rural to urban areas. These trends both point up and aggravate the problem of urban mass transportation.

I sympathize deeply with the millions of commuters who must daily spend several hours battling clogged highways and traffic jams.

Opponents of this measure are critical that the entire program is placed under the Federal Housing Administrator who is empowered to determine which plans the Government will underwrite and which it will not. It leaves too much to the arbitrary whim and discretion of the Administrator.

They also contend that enactment of this measure would be another attempt to solve municipal problems at the Federal level and would be another long step toward domination of essentially local responsibilities by the Central Government.

Many urban communities have already indicated a preference to resolve their transit problems without Federal grants. For example, voters in the San Francisco Bay area last year approved a $792-million bond issue to finance an entirely new transit system without outside help. In Los Angeles, plans are already underway to finance a costly monorail system almost entirely from fare-box revenues. And so it goes, in many other cities as well—Boulder, Colo.; Cleveland, Ohio; Chicago, Ill.; the Greater St. Louis area in Illinois and Missouri.

For me, I am not overly concerned about these criticisms to the measure. However, I am greatly concerned with our financial plight and our large numbers of unemployed people.

In such a situation, every Member of Congress is obliged to set up priorities to determine which of the many worthwhile measures proposed before the Congress he can, consistent with fiscal responsibility, and in good conscience support.

We must be very careful to husband our resources, so that those resources which are available to meet our domestic problems must be applied only to those problems which are most pressing.

The domestic problem which looms as most critical is our ailing economy—large numbers of Americans who are unemployed, our shaky fiscal situation. The President himself has called this America's No. 1 problem; he has recognized this in the proposed budget for fiscal 1964, which calls for a reduction in Federal expenditures in those areas not related to national defense.

In spite of the limited 3-year authorization of $375 million called for in the mass transit bill, there is little doubt that the program will cost billions of dollars over the next decade, with no end in sight. A report prepared for the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing Administrator has estimated that capital requirements alone in the next 10 years would total nearly $9 billion.

Once the program is started, very few city administrations with a real or imagined transit problem will be able to resist the appeal of a free handout from Washington, no matter how able they might be to solve the problem on their own.

It would be fiscally irresponsible to talk about committing the Government to spending $9 billion, at a time when our national budget faces a deficit of at least $8.8 billion in the current fiscal year, and at least $11.9 billion in fiscal 1964.

It would be financially disastrous to balloon the Federal debt beyond the present high level of $300 billion, and add to the high interest costs the Federal Government already is paying on this tremendous indebtedness.

It would be economically unsound to enact at this time legislation which would substantially increase domestic expenditures on a matter which, while serious, is considerably overshadowed by the problems of our lagging economy.

The plight of our economy requires that a substantial tax cut be enacted this year, a reduction sizable enough to invigorate our national economy. A reasonable scale of priorities does not justify enactment of this $375 million bill which eventually would cost $10 billion and would threaten passage of a tax cut measure indispensable to strengthen our economy.

I should also point out that if this bill is enacted into law, my own State, Hawaii, would be required to pay all out of proportion to the benefits it would derive from Federal grants. Figuring on the basis of population, Hawaii's nearly 700,000 citizens would have a $37 million bill over the next 10 years. The total assets of the Honolulu Rapid Transit Co., Ltd., according to the 1961 figures appearing in the Manual of Hawaii Securities, was valued at less than $5 million. Based on these figures, the $37 million that would be taken away from the people of Hawaii would be sufficient to replace the assets and facilities of the Honolulu Rapid Transit Co. seven times over.

I am quite sure that Hawaii's transit problems can be solved for far less than the $37 million that this legislation will take from us. This, however, is not the overriding reason I am voting against this measure.

The primary reasons I am voting against this proposal are because of our great deficit and our need to cut taxes. I feel strongly that we must have a large tax cut this year to reinvigorate our economy and to cut down our large unemployment. For these reasons, I do not feel that I can at this time support the measure now under consideration.

Under more favorable economic circumstances, when we have recovered our economic vitality, reduced our unemployment, and at a time when we can again enjoy a forward surge along all economic fronts, the mass transit bill might more reasonably be considered. But under our present national economic stress, a national fiscal policy for sound economic growth requires that there be greater selectivity of our new nondefense spending programs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, do the Senators who are in charge of the time yield back the remainder of the time available to them?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall yield back most of my time.

Let me say that I do not think the bill will be defeated — unfortunately — although I have labored in this vineyard for 4 days now, in an effort to obtain its defeat.

I believe everyone should understand what is at issue here. The question is not whether there is need for improvement of mass transportation facilities. We can assume that there is such need. The question is not whether there will be increased utilization as a result of such improvement. The issue here is that once more the Federal Government is invading the responsibilities of the people in their capacity as citizens of the local communities. We are constantly and steadily reducing the people of the country to a state of dependency on the Federal Government, to the extent that one day they will be completely subordinate to the Federal Government. We are weakening the moral fiber of our people by destroying their sense of local responsibility and initiative.

What else are we doing? At a time when we are piling deficit upon deficit and at a time when we are mortgaging the future of generations yet unborn, we are spending still more money—$750 million in this case.

Mr. President, I submit that it is both economically unsound and immoral for us to saddle our children and their children with such debts that we may have things for ourselves. That is the basic consideration which is involved in this case; and perhaps some day the people will judge the actions we take in this Chamber on that basis.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we have spent 4 arduous days on this measure. I desire to take this occasion to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], for the managerial skill he has, as usual, displayed in the handling of the bill.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is also entitled to high commendation, for his original sponsorship of the bill, and for his tireless efforts to amend it so as to assure its adoption.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] worked assiduously to bring to the floor of the Senate a bill which would benefit the urban areas of the country.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] has contributed mightily, because of his work in connection with the Commerce Committee amendments.

I extend praise also to the chairman of the Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

I believe a great deal of credit should go to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for the skillful and talented way in which he handled the very difficult amendment which has been considered and approved by the Senate. As usual, he has displayed great skill, and discrimination in connection with these matters.

I also wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who, although he was not in favor of the bill, made his fight, and then accepted the verdict the Senate rendered. I would say that in a sense he is responsible for bringing to the floor of the Senate a better bill, because of his initiative in having the bill considered by the Commerce Committee, after it had once been cleared by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. President, I would be remiss in the performance of my duty if I did not commend and compliment the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], who has led the opposition to the bill during the last 4 days, and who has comported himself with dignity and restraint. Certainly he has performed in a way which does credit to the Senate and to himself.

Lastly, let me extend my appreciation, on behalf of those who support this measure, to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. While he has never favored the bill, he interposed no objection to early hearings on it in his committee, and in fact displayed great courtesy by assisting in the expeditious handling of the matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to ask the majority leader about the program for the remainder of today and the remainder of the week.

However, first I should observe that the debate on the bill was kept on a high and a constructive note, and there was probably an absolute minimum of speeches on extraneous matters, not related to the measure before the Senate.

I, too, salute all the members of the two committees; and I give a particular salute to my genial and able friend, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], who has handled himself with extraordinary skill, and who very ably did his homework before coming to the floor to make his observations on this measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I agree with everything the distinguished minority leader has said.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, now I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader what he contemplates for the remainder of today and for the remainder of the week, and, in view of a rather interesting event which will take place on Monday in this city, whether he has any plans for the schedule for that day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in reply let me say there will be no further business before the Senate today, except speeches and the like, with the possible exception of consideration of some noncontroversial nominations and immigration bills, following completion of our action on the pending measure; and it is anticipated that then the Senate will adjourn until Monday morning.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M., MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn until 9 a.m. on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT ON MILITARY PROCUREMENT BILL

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senate is to adjourn from today to Monday, I hope we may obtain unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may report H.R. 2440, the procurement bill, so it can be available for consideration by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that is another bill which we would like to bring up next week.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is intended to have the Senate take up, later today, the wilderness bill, although no other action will be taken today on that measure. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the distinguished Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK] have all been informed, and have given their approval to having the Senate take up the bill this afternoon and to having the consideration of the bill begin sometime Monday. That is our hope.

However, as the minority leader has noted, Monday is a special day, because it marks the beginning of the American League baseball season; and I understand that the Washington Senators and some other team will have a game, that day, and that there will be the usual festivities attendant to that.

So we shall begin our session on Monday at 9 a.m., in the hope that there will be debate on the wilderness bill, or on the off chance that, if not, we shall perhaps be able to take up the nominations to the Communications Satellite Corp.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Montana will yield further, and if this is a fair question, I am wondering when he proposes to schedule the so-called youth opportunities bill. It was reported this week from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope we can take it up on Tuesday, or upon completion of the wilderness bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the best of grace and spirit, let me say that I always ask the majority leader, whenever opportunity affords, whether he can give us some comfort and solace regarding a possible recess in the Easter season, when the joys of spring are everywhere, the delights of the cherry blossoms somehow tantalize the eye and the taste, and the spirit of resurrection is upon the earth as the swelling buds burst into life, and the jonquils, the tulips, and the hyacinths spring forth in all their beauty.

However, thus far, I have received no real comfort from my friend, the distinguished Senator from Montana; but I hope this spirit is having an impact upon his affable genius, and that he can give us some comfort.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, Mr. President, there is a possibility that there will be some comfort and some solace, but it depends on how rapidly we get our work done. If the work is done, some comfort will be forthcoming.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is invoking the carrot and the stick.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the majority leader one further question. How many Easter eggs must go into the administration basket in order that we might earn our vacation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my comment is "No comment."

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE NEXT MONDAY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield, so that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I understand that the Senate will convene next Monday at 9 o'clock a.m.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. The Subcommittee on Public Lands has scheduled hearings on an important national park bill, in which the two Senators from Missouri are vitally interested. Arrangements have been made to hear two witnesses from Missouri on Monday at 10 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent that the Public Lands Subcommittee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday morning.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall interpose no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE COMMITTEE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be authorized to file certain reports during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay" and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 41, as follows:

[No. 40 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Engle
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield

McCarthy
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—41

Aiken
Allott
Bayh
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—7

Bennett
Carlson
Dominick
Gore
Moss
Smathers
Yarborough

So the bill (S. 6) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Urban Transportation Act of 1963".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

(2) that the welfare and vitality of urban areas, the satisfactory movement of people and goods within such areas, and the effectiveness of housing, urban renewal, highway, and other federally aided programs are being jeopardized by the deterioration or inadequate provision of urban transportation facilities and services, the intensification of traffic congestion, and the lack of coordinated transportation and other development planning on a comprehensive and continuing basis; and

(3) that Federal financial assistance for the development of efficient and coordinated mass transportation systems is essential to the solution of these urban problems.

(b) The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods, with the cooperation of mass transportation companies both public and private;

(2) to encourage the planning and establishment of areawide urban mass transportation systems needed for economical and desirable urban development, with the cooperation of mass transportation companies both public and private; and

(3) to provide assistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such systems, to be operated by public or private mass transportation companies as determined by local needs.

SEC. 3. (a) In accordance with the provisions of this Act, the Administrator is authorized to guarantee qualified revenue bonds or, where the Administrator has determined that such guaranteed revenue bonds would not provide the financial assistance required by the applicant, to make grants or loans (directly, through the purchase of securities or equipment trust certificates, or otherwise) to assist States and local public bodies and agencies thereof, and mass transportation companies both public and private, in financing the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for use, by operation or lease or otherwise, in mass transportation service in urban areas and in coordinating such service with highway and other transportation in such areas. Assistance may be provided for land and improvements acquired or constructed in advance of such use, if the Administrator obtains adequate assurance of repayment of the assistance where the land and improvements are not in fact put to the proposed use within a reasonable period of time. Eligible facilities and equipment may include land (but not public highways), buses and other rolling stock, and any other real or personal property needed for an efficient and coordinated mass transportation system. No guarantee of revenue bonds, grant or loan shall be provided under this section unless the Administrator determines that the applicant (which in no case shall be a private company) has or will have (1) the legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out the proposed project, and (2) satisfactory continuing control, through operation or lease or otherwise, over the use of the facilities and equipment. The applicant shall, with respect to private mass transportation companies, give full consideration to the exercise of such continuing control through the appropriate existing governmental regulatory agency authorized to issue to the operating company, in the form of certificates of public convenience and necessity, franchises, or other indicia of operating authority, the authority to operate as a private mass transportation company. No such funds shall be used for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses.

(b)(1) No financial assistance shall be made available under this Act to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose, directly or indirectly, of acquiring any interest in, or purchasing any facilities or other property of a private mass transportation company, or for the purpose of constructing, improving, or reconstructing any facilities or other property acquired, after the effective date of this Act, from any such company; unless (A) such company has, prior to such acquisition, been declared bankrupt or placed into receivership by a court of competent jurisdiction, or (B) the Administrator finds that such assistance is essential to a program, proposed or under active preparation, for the acquisition of mass transportation facilities or property which are supplementary to the service provided by an existing publicly owned or operated mass transportation system, and (C) in either situation under A or B, the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, acting jointly in accordance with the provisions of section 19(c) of this Act, find that the project to be assisted complies with the requirements set forth therein.

(b)(2) No financial assistance shall be made available under this Act to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose of providing by contract or otherwise for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment in competition with, or supplementary to, the service provided by an existing mass transportation company unless (A) the Administrator finds that such assistance is essential to a program, proposed or under active preparation, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, (B) the Administrator finds that such program, to the maximum extent feasible, provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies and (C) the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, acting jointly in accordance with the provisions of section 19(c) of this Act, find that such program complies with the requirements set forth therein.

(c) No Federal assistance under this Act shall be extended to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist any private mass transportation company unless the Administrator is assured that the State or States and the local public bodies or agencies thereof in the area covered by a proposed project have afforded the company every feasible relief, compatible with their own fiscal responsibilities, including, but not necessarily limited to, relinquishment of real property taxes, personal property taxes and franchise taxes; and no Federal assistance shall be extended under this Act to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist a public mass transportation company or any division or segment of its operations when one or more other divisions or segments are operating profitably unless the Administrator is assured that the transfer of funds from one division or segment to another would not be compatible with the maintenance of a coordinated mass transportation system in the area covered by the proposed project.

(d) No loan shall be made under this section for any project for which a grant is made under this section, except grants made for relocation payments in accordance with section 16(b). Loans under this section shall be subject to the restrictions and limitations set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The authority provided in section 203 of such amendments to obtain funds for loans under clause (2) of section 202(a) of such amendments shall (except for undisbursed loan commitments) hereafter be exercised by the Administrator (without regard to the proviso in section 202(d) of such amendments) solely to obtain funds for loans under this section.

(e) Section 203(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the third sentence a semicolon and the following: "except that notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain funds to provide financial assistance under section 202(a)(2) (as modified by section 3(d) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963) shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance by the Administrator of the notes or other obligations".

SEC. 4. Except as specified in section 14, no Federal financial assistance shall be provided pursuant to section 3 unless the Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, and are necessary for the sound, economic, and desirable development of such area. Such a program shall encourage, to the maximum extent feasible, the participation of private enterprise. Where facilities and equipment are to be acquired which are already being used in mass transportation service in the urban area, the program must provide that they shall be so improved (through modernization, extension, addition, or otherwise) that they will better serve the transportation needs of the area.

GUARANTEED BOND PROGRAM

SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator, upon application of a State, local public body or agency thereof, is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this Act—

(1) to guarantee the payment of so much of the interest and the repayment of so much of the principal on the revenue bonds of such State, local public body, or agency thereof as would, but for such guarantee, be unpaid when due; and

(2) upon such terms as he may prescribe, to make commitments to guarantee the payment of interest and principal of any such revenue bonds prior to the date of execution or sale thereof.

(b) Each contract of guarantee made under this Act shall run to, and shall be for the benefit of, the owners of such revenue bonds.

(c) The faith and credit of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of so much of the interest and to the repayment of so much of the principal on each revenue bond guaranteed or committed to be guaranteed under this Act as would, but for the guarantee provided for by this Act, be unpaid, when due.

(d) The Administrator shall not enter into any contract of guarantee (or of commitment to guarantee) under this Act if such contract, when taken together with other contracts of guarantee outstanding under this Act, would guarantee the payment of bonds exceeding $375,000,000.

(e) The Administrator shall charge in connection with every contract of guarantee under this Act a premium equal to one-quarter of 1 per centum of the face value of the bonds so guaranteed.

Sec. 6. To be eligible for a guarantee under this Act, any revenue bond shall—

(1) expressly state on its face that the State, local public body, or agency thereof issuing said bond has waived the normal status of said bond as exempt from the provisions of the Federal income tax laws, and the interest on any bond expressing such waiver shall not be exempt from taxation under the Federal income tax laws;

(2) be issued for the purpose of securing funds for a program (as described in sections 3(a) and 4) approved by the Administrator, and at least 25 per centum of the financing of such program shall be by bonds or securities not guaranteed under this Act, so that the federally guaranteed portion shall not constitute more than 75 per centum of the total cost of the program;

(3) bear interest at an average interest rate approved by the Administrator and have a maturity date not in excess of fifty years;

(4) be determined by the Administrator to be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure the punctual payment of principal and interest on the date or dates such payments are due and payable; and

(5) be issued under a trust indenture duly entered into between the State, local public body, or agency thereof and a corporate trustee approved by the Administrator containing all of the provisions required by section 7 of this Act and such other provisions as may be required by the Administrator and as may be agreed upon between such State, local public body or agency thereof and the trustee.

Sec. 7. (a) A trust indenture or supplemental trust indenture under which revenue bonds guaranteed under this Act are issued shall include provisions satisfactory to the Administrator—

(1) requiring the State, local public body, or agency thereof to insure that the mass rapid transit system or those portions thereof financed with the proceeds of the bonds is properly operated, kept at all times in good repair, working order, and condition, and that all lawful claims for labor, materials, and supplies or other charges are discharged and paid;

(2) requiring the State, local public body, or agency thereof to insure that the rates, fares, tolls, rentals, or other charges in connection with the services and facilities furnished from the mass rapid transit system, or any part thereof, financed from part or all of the proceeds of the bonds, are at least sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on the bonds as they become due and payable, together with all expenses of operation, maintenance, and repair of the system;

(3) requiring the State, local public body, or agency thereof to punctually pay or cause to be paid from its revenues the principal of all guaranteed revenue bonds and the interest thereon on the date or dates, at the place or places, and in the manner specified in the bonds; and

(4) providing for the systematic accumulation of revenues for the payment of the principal of all guaranteed revenue bonds and the interest thereon, which provisions shall be designed to assure that the State, local public body, or agency thereof, or the trustee of the trust indenture or supplemental trust indenture under which the guaranteed revenue bonds were issued, shall have accumulated revenues on or before the fifteenth day prior to the date or dates on which any installment of principal or interest becomes due and payable sufficient to pay in full such installment of principal or interest.

(b) Any such trust indenture or supplemental trust indenture shall also include provisions satisfactory to the Administrator requiring that in the event the State, local public body, or agency thereof has not, on the fifteenth day prior to the date or dates on which any installment of principal or interest becomes due and payable, accumulated, in the manner provided in paragraph (4) subsection (a) of this section, revenues sufficient to pay in full such installment of principal or interest, the State, local public body, or agency thereof, or the trustee of the trust indenture or supplemental trust indenture under which the guaranteed revenue bonds were issued, shall forthwith make and serve upon the Administrator a written demand for the amount of money needed to pay in full such installment of principal or interest, less the amount of revenues then accumulated for the payment of that installment of principal or interest. Such written demand shall be accompanied by a note made payable to the Federal transit revenue bond guarantee fund, created by section 10 of this Act, which shall constitute a binding obligation of the State, local public body, or agency thereof, as determined by the Administrator, and shall be in a principal amount equal to the amount of money demanded of the Administrator. Such note shall mature on or before a date six months following the date established for the retirement of the guaranteed revenue bond issue or, in case any prior note or notes are then held by the Secretary, on or before a date six months following the date of maturity of the prior note of latest maturity. Such note shall bear interest at a rate one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum higher than the average net interest cost of the entire guaranteed revenue bond issue, and shall be payable at maturity: *Provided*, That in no event should the interest rate of the notes so obtained be less than the interest rate accruing on Federal borrowings, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes. Nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from taking any remedial action otherwise available.

Sec. 8. Within ten days from the date of any demand made by a State, local public body, or agency thereof or trustee pursuant to the trust indenture provision required by section 7 of this Act, the Administrator shall pay to the trustee of the trust indenture or supplemental trust indenture under which the guaranteed revenue bonds were issued the amount of money specified in the demand, which money shall be applied by the trustee to the payment of the installment of principal or interest (or both) for which such money was demanded. Any money required to be paid by the Administrator to the trustee pursuant to this section shall be paid in funds good to the trustee on the payment date.

Sec. 9. The Administrator may, by rule or regulation, require States, local public bodies, or agencies thereof having outstanding revenue bonds guaranteed under this Act to submit to the Administrator from time to time such reports as in the opinion of the Administrator are necessary or desirable to enable the Administrator to anticipate in advance possible demands which may be made upon the Administrator for moneys required to be paid by the Administrator under section 8 of this Act.

Sec. 10. There is created a Federal transit revenue bond guarantee fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund") which shall be used by the Administrator as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this Act relating to the guarantee of revenue bonds and for the administrative expenses in connection therewith. All premiums and earnings on the assets of the fund shall be credited to the fund. Any moneys required to be paid by the Administrator under section 8 of this Act, and all administrative expenses in connection with the guarantee of revenue bonds under this Act, shall be paid from the fund; and there is authorized to be appropriated to the fund such sums as may be necessary to make such payments. The faith and credit of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all moneys required to be paid by the Administrator under section 8 of this Act. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations under this Act shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

Sec. 11. The Administrator is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That no provisions of this Act shall be construed to authorize the Administrator to regulate in any manner the mode of operation of any mass rapid transit system or the rates, fares, tolls, rentals, or other charges fixed or prescribed by any State, local public body, or agency thereof.

Sec. 12. The limitations and restrictions on the powers of national banking associations contained in paragraph "Seventh" of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), as to dealing in, underwriting, and purchasing for their account investment securities shall not apply to revenue bonds of a State, local public body, or agency thereof which are guaranteed by the Administrator under this Act.

GRANT PROGRAM

Sec. 13. (a) The Administrator shall estimate what portion of the cost of a project to be assisted under section 3 of this Act cannot be reasonably financed from revenues—which portion shall hereinafter be called "net project cost". The Federal grant for such a project shall not exceed two-thirds of the net project cost. The remainder of the net project cost shall be provided, in cash, from sources other than Federal funds, and no refund or reduction of that portion so provided shall be made at any time unless there is at the same time a refund of a proportional amount of the Federal grant. In determining net project cost for any project to be assisted under section 3, any estimate of revenues shall not be reduced by any amount to be allocated as a reserve for replacement of equipment or facilities. No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to section 3 unless the Administrator determines that (1) there exists a commitment from non-Federal sources to supply the remainder of the net project cost, and (2) the Federal Government's interest in the project is adequately protected in the event of a default or a failure to complete such project.

(b) To finance grants under this Act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated at any time after its enactment not to exceed $75,000,000 for fiscal years 1963 and 1964; $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1965; and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1966. Any amount so appropriated shall remain available until expended; and any amount authorized but not appropriated for any fiscal year may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year. The Administrator is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) as amended, to make advance or progress payments on account of any grant made pursuant to this Act.

(c) Any application under section 3 for a grant to assist any project for the provision of mass transportation service in an urban area shall include a schedule of fares, determined by the Administrator to be economically sound, and upon the basis of which the Administrator shall make his estimate of net project cost. If, at any time after the making of such grant while any revenue obligations issued to finance the project are outstanding, a change is effected in such schedule which the Administrator determines will substantially reduce revenues from the project and lessen the chances for an economically sound operation, he shall so notify the recipient of such grant. Thereafter, the Administrator shall not extend any assistance under any law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency (except pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to such notice) to finance in whole or in part any project to be undertaken in such area, until he determines that such schedule has been so revised, or that other action has been so taken, as to permit an economically sound operation.

EMERGENCY PROGRAM

SEC. 14. Prior to July 1, 1966, Federal financial assistance may be provided pursuant to section 3 where (1) the program for the development of a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system, referred to in section 4, is under active preparation although not yet completed, (2) the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought can reasonably be expected to be required for such a system, and (3) there is an urgent need for their preservation or provision. The Federal grant for such a project shall not exceed one-half of the net project cost: *Provided*, That where a Federal grant is made on such a one-half basis, and the planning requirements specified in section 4 are fully met within a three-year period after the execution of the grant agreement, an additional grant may then be made to the applicant equal to one-sixth of the net project cost. The remainder of the net project cost shall be provided, in cash, from sources other than Federal funds, and no refund or reduction of that portion so provided shall be made at any time unless there is at the same time a refund of a proportional amount of the Federal grant.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 15. (a) The Administrator is authorized to undertake research, development, and demonstration projects in all phases of urban mass transportation (including the development, testing, and demonstration of new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods) which he determines will assist in the reduction of urban transportation needs, the improvement of mass transportation service, or the contribution of such service toward meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost. He may undertake such projects independently or by contract (including working agreements with other Federal departments and agencies). In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Administrator is authorized to request and receive such information or data as he deems appropriate from public or private sources.

(b) The Administrator may make available to finance projects under this section not to exceed $10,000,000 of the mass transportation grant authorization provided in section 13 (b), which limit shall be increased to $20,000,000 on July 1, 1964, and to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1965. In addition, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of this Act or of section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949, the unobligated balance of the amount available for mass transportation demonstration grants pursuant to the proviso in such section 103(b) shall be available solely for financing projects under this section.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Administrator under section 602 of the Housing Act of 1956 or any other provision of law.

(d) No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act for any technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Attorney General, to be effective to insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will (with such exceptions and limitations as the Administrator may determine after consultation with the Secretary of Defense to be necessary in the interest of the national defense) be made freely and fully available to the general public. Nothing contained in this subsection shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity of any right which that owner may have under that patent.

RELOCATION REQUIREMENTS AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 16. (a) No financial assistance shall be extended to any project under section 3 unless the Administrator determines that an adequate relocation program is being carried on for families displaced by the project and that there are being or will be provided (in the same area or in other areas generally not less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the displaced families) an equal number of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings available to those displaced families and reasonably accessible to their places of employment.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, financial assistance extended to any project under section 3 may include grants for relocation payments, as herein defined. Such grants may be in addition to other financial assistance for the project under section 3, and no part of the amount of such relocation payments shall be required to be contributed as a local grant. The term "relocation payments" means payments by the applicant to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and any actual direct losses of property except goodwill or profit, for which reimbursement or compensation is not otherwise made, resulting from their displacement by the project. Such payments shall be made subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator, and shall not exceed $200 in the case of an individual or family, or $3,000 (or if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of a business concern or nonprofit organization. Such rules and regulations may include provisions authorizing payment to individuals and families of fixed amounts (not to exceed $200 in any case) in lieu of their respective reasonable and necessary moving expenses and actual direct losses of property.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR HIGHWAYS AND FOR MASS TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

SEC. 17. (a) In order to assure coordination of highway and railway and other mass transportation planning and development programs in urban areas, particularly with respect to the provision of mass transportation facilities in connection with federally assisted highways (including the acquisition of land and the acquisition or construction of improvements in advance of such use), the Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and shall exchange information and otherwise cooperate with respect to the planning, financing, and construction of proposed projects in urban areas.

(b) In order to be assured that proposed projects will not unnecessarily disrupt or otherwise have a deleterious effect (of a temporary or permanent nature) upon rail or motor carriers currently engaged in interstate commerce and subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Administrator shall consult with the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to proposed projects affecting interstate transportation, and the Administrator and the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission shall exchange information and otherwise cooperate with respect to such projects.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 18. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Administrator shall (in addition to any authority otherwise vested in him) have the functions, powers, and duties set forth in section 402, except subsections (c)(2) and (f), of the Housing Act of 1950. Subject to the provisions of section 10, funds obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Administrator in connection with the performance of such functions.

(b) To insure that small business concerns are given an equitable opportunity to share in all procurement aspects of any project for which a loan or grant is made under this Act, the Administrator shall cooperatively develop with the Small Business Administration within four months after the effective date of this paragraph a small business contracting program to be applicable to all such projects. The program shall contain such provisions as may be necessary to (1) enable small business concerns to have an equitable opportunity to compete, either directly or as subcontractors, for contracts and procurements for property and services awarded in the implementation and effectuation of the purposes of this Act, and (2) enable the Small Business Administration to obtain from the local public bodies and mass transportation companies such reasonably obtainable information concerning contracts and procurement, including subcontracts thereunder, awarded in the implementation and effectuation of the purposes of this Act.

(c) All contracts for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of facilities and equipment in furtherance of the purposes for which a loan grant, or guarantee is made under this Act, entered into by applicants under other than competitive bidding procedures as defined by the Administrator, shall provide that the Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall, for the purpose of audit and examination, have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the contracting parties that are pertinent to the operations or activities under such contracts.

(d) As used in this Act—

(1) the term "States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States;

(2) the term "local public bodies" includes municipalities and other political subdivisions of States; public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; and public corporations, boards, and commissions established under the laws of any State;

(3) the term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator;

(4) the term "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place which is appropriate, in the judgment of the Administrator, for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth; and

(5) the term "mass transportation" means transportation by bus or rail or other conveyance, either publicly or privately owned, serving the general public and moving over prescribed routes, but does not include charter or sightseeing service, or aircraft or steamship service (other than ferrying service).

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the funds necessary to carry out all functions under this Act except loans under section 3. All funds appropriated under this Act for other than administrative expenses shall remain available until expended.

(f) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, contracts for grants under section 3 (other than relocation payments in accordance with section 16(b)) for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate 12½ per centum of the amount of grant funds appropriated under the authority contained in section 13(b). The Administrator may make additional contracts for such grants (subject to the limitations prescribed in section 13(b)) aggregating not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated, but such additional contracts for grants for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate 1 per centum of the amount appropriated. In the case of any project undertaken in two or more States, in accordance with a duly approved compact or other agreement, the Administrator may apply the foregoing limitations by allocating any portion of the grants contracted for such project to any one or more of such States.

(g) The Administrator shall make an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress on the administration of this Act. Such report shall indicate to whom financial assistance has been extended pursuant to this Act, the purposes for which such assistance is to be utilized, and the amounts involved, and may include such other information, comments, and recommendations as the Administrator deems appropriate.

(h) The first sentence of section 814 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1434), is amended by—

(1) inserting after "grant,", the first place it appears, the following: "guaranteed revenue bond issue,";

(2) inserting after "grant,", the second place it appears, the following: "guaranteed revenue bond issue (including the revenues from which the bonded indebtedness is to be repaid),"; and

(3) inserting after "grant,", the third place it appears, the following: "guaranteed revenue bond issue,".

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 19. (a) The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed with the assistance of loans or grants under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended. The Administrator shall not approve any such loan or grant without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a), the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1959 (15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, 40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arangements are made, as determined jointly by the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including the continuation of pension rights and benefits of all beneficiaries) under existing collective bargaining agreements or otherwise; (2) the continuation of collective bargaining in any situation where it now exists; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to the provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act; (4) assurances of employment to employees of acquired mass transportation systems by the acquiring or operating entities, and priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of such protective arrangements.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

SEC. 20. In providing financial assistance to any project under section 3, the Administrator shall take into consideration whether the facilities and equipment to be acquired constructed, reconstructed, or improved will be designed and equipped to prevent and control air pollution in accordance with any critera established for this purpose by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as passed by the Senate, be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey subsequently said:

Mr. President, I had the high honor to be the principal sponsor of the mass transportation bill which has just passed the Senate. I did not take the time during the debate, but I should like to do so now, to say that the bill was a very complicated procedural and substantive measure which was considered over many weeks, if not months. It was complicated by the fact that both the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Commerce had jurisdiction. We encountered very complex problems. The staffs of other committees were included in our discussions.

The Senate employees presented one of the finest examples of the highest dedication of staff personnel in the Senate. Their willingness to work all day and literally all night was an example of the finest public service. I want the record to reflect that sentiment. So many persons worked on the preparation of the bill that I shall not mention any names; but they included the staffs of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Commerce, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and members of the staffs of many Senators.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE ON PLACEMENT AND FOSTER CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 155 of Public Law 87–543, I transmit herewith a report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding experience under subsection (a) of that section.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 4, 1963.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The Vice President laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STOCKPILING, STORAGE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF ESSENTIAL FOODSTUFFS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, relating to a proposed bill transmitted to the Senate on March 25, 1963, "to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes," advising that enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Plans for Works of Improvement in Various States

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement in the States of Florida, Iowa, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and South Dakota (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Reapportionment of Appropriations

A letter form the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that two appropriations to the executive branch for the fiscal year 1963 had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Disposition of Certain Nationals of the United States in Foreign Countries

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the disposition of certain nationals of the United States in foreign countries who are alleged and determined to be of unsound mind, and dangerous to persons or property, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, To Authorize Certain Amounts Received by Way of Reimbursement for Medical Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize certain amounts received by way of reimbursement for medical supplies and equipment to be used to purchase other medical supplies and equipment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on National Industrial Reserve

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Industrial Reserve, dated April 1, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Housing for the Elderly

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide additional housing for the elderly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

List of Real Property Exempt From Taxation in the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia, for calendar year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Reports on Real Property Exempt From Taxation in the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia, for the calendar year 1961 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of Section 7 of Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, To Provide for the Payment of Certain Travel Costs

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel cost for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Overpricing of Target Seeking Systems for the Bomarc Missile Under Contract With the Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of overpricing of target seeking systems for the Bomarc missile under Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 33(600)-38098 with the Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash., dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Proposed Contract Relating to Drainage Work on Crooked River Project, Oregon

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed contract relating to proposed drainage work on the Crooked River project, Oregon (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Reports Relating to Visa Petitions

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions approved by that Service, according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Extension of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 3 years the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Plans for Works of Improvement in Maryland and Kentucky

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Upper Rock Creek, Md., and Buck Creek, Ky. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 15

Resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation authorizing flood control appropriations to the Yuba County Water Agency

Whereas the Yuba County Water Agency was created by special act of the Legislature of the State of California, approved June 3, 1959, to develop and promote the beneficial uses and regulation of the water resources of Yuba County, including flood control; and

Whereas the people of Yuba and Sutter Counties have been subjected to devastating floods; and

Whereas the flood experienced during the Christmas season, 1955, was of particular severity, requiring three major evacuations from the Marysville-Yuba city area and causing loss of lives and millions of dollars of property; and

Whereas the Yuba County Water Agency has completed studies and has proceeded expeditiously and at great expense to the taxpayers of Yuba County to develop the water resources of the Yuba River for the conservation of water for agriculture, domestic, and recreational uses, for the generation of power, and for flood control; and

Whereas it is the policy of the Congress of the United States as manifested in many enactments adopted by the Congress over the years to allocate to flood control, on a nonreimbursable basis, such costs of construction of a project as may be found to be proper for the purposes of flood control under criteria established by the appropriate agencies of the United States; and

Whereas authorization for flood control appropriations is essential to the economic feasibility of the Yuba River development as proposed by the Yuba County Water Agency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the legislature memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing flood control appropriations to be made to the Yuba County Water Agency under appropriate criteria established in such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

REPORT ENTITLED "ORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 110)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, I am filing a report on behalf of the Committee on the Organization of Federal Executive Departments and Agencies, depicting the number of Federal employees assigned to the Executive Office of the President, the 13 departments and to the 50 independent agencies of the Federal Government, as of January 1, 1963.

The 2,462,262 employees reported by the executive branch of the Government compares to 2,418,864 reported on January 1, 1962; an increase of 43,469 during the calendar year 1962. For security reasons no employees of the Central Intelligence Agency are reported.

During the last 2 years, the Executive Office of the President reduced its personnel by 1,215, due primarily to the transfer of 1,106 civil defense employees from OCDM to the Department of Defense in 1961. The 13 executive departments reported total net increases of 57,643 in 1961 and 32,342 in 1962. The independent agencies showed net increases totaling 17,955 in 1961 and 11,127 in 1962. These increases reflected a total of 117,852 more employees in the executive branch of the Government than was reported on January 1, 1961.

The total of 2,462,262 employees reported by the executive branch represents an increase of 501,233 over the number employed as of January 1, 1950, the low since World War II, and prior to the Korean conflict. During the last 16 years, beginning on January 1, 1947, when this committee released its first report, there has been an overall net increase of 199,637 employees.

The increases of 43,469 in the departmental total during 1962 were reported by the Department of Defense, 7,330; Health, Education, and Welfare, 4,879—attributed largely to the amendments to the Social Security Act, totaling 12,903 in the last 2 years, bringing about an increase of more than 100 percent since the Department was created in 1953; Agriculture, 5,109; Interior, 4,496; Treasury, 3,457; Post Office, 2,591; State 1,210; Commerce, 1,167; Labor, 1,151; and Justice, 952.

The independent agencies reported a net increase of 11,127 in 1962, which with the increases of 17,955 reported in 1961, aggregate a total of 29,082 new employees during the past 2 calendar years. In 1962, the largest increases were reported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 6,724; the Federal Aviation Agency, 2,048; the General Services Administration, 1,403; the Housing and Home Finance Agency, 1,365; the Panama Canal Company, 520; and the U.S. Information Agency, 493. Thirteen of the executive agencies reported decreases in personnel during calendar year 1962: Veterans Administration, 3,047; Tennessee Valley Authority, 520; and the remaining 11 reported a combined total decrease of 209 employees.

As of January 1, 1962, 174,178 civilian employees of the executive branch were engaged in oversea activities, of which 61,523 were American citizens and 112,655 were nationals of other countries. This was a decrease of 704 American citizens and an increase of 3,182 foreign nationals over those reported on January 1, 1962.

The employment statistics contained in the report were developed by the committee staff, based on information furnished by officials of the executive branch, to accompany a chart outlining the organization of the major components of the Government, both of which are being released by the committee today.

I ask that the report be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brewster in the chair). The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1269. A bill for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 1270. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the retail sales of meat, meat food products, livestock products, and other food items; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1271. A bill to amend section 18 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to restore free transportation on any railroad carrier subject to that act for individuals receiving annuities or pensions under that act, and for their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1272. A bill for the relief of Viktor Jaanimets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Mundt):

S. 1273. A bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, and Mr. Randolph):

S. 1274. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act so as to provide preference in the awarding of certain Government contracts to contractors in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 1275. A bill to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1276. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Jackson):

S. 1277. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of professional engineering, physical science, and related positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 1278. A bill to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pell when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PREVENTION OF MONOPOLY IN THE MEAT INDUSTRY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have been concerned for several years about the growing concentration of power and monopolistic practices in livestock, meat and poultry marketing. This problem has been made more acute by the recent sharp decline in cattle and beef practices. Throughout the meat and poultry industry the vertical integration of retailing with wholesaling, transportation, manufacturing, processing, and production including livestock feeding has added to the concentration of economic power. In addition, the acquisition by large corporate food chains of competing retailers and manufacturing and processing plants is a further threat to independent business.

For these reasons I am today introducing a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 to strengthen competition by preventing packers from entering retail business or cattle feeding and likewise prohibiting large retailers from entering the packing business or feeding. Similar legislation has been introduced in the other body by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt]. This bill, I am convinced, would be a great help to livestock feeders and poultry growers in preventing the use of feedlots and packinghouses to depress prices.

In a letter to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives in 1961, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John P. Duncan, Jr. wrote:

> The Department agrees with the objective of the bill and strongly supports the principle of strengthening competition in all areas of livestock, meat and poultry marketing. It recognizes that the extent of the influence and control that may be exercised over the livestock and poultry industry by integrated packing and retailing operations can very definitely affect that competition. This is a very real problem area in this industry as reflected in the views and fears expressed to the Department by producer and industry groups alike.

I feel confident that some of my colleagues will wish to join me in sponsoring this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the Record and that it may lie on the table for 1 week, so that those who wish to do so may add their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 1270) to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1961, to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the retail sales of meat, meat food products, livestock products, and other food items, introduced by Mr. McGovern, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, is amended by inserting immediately after section 202 thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 202A. (a) It shall be unlawful for any packer whose gross sales were more than $30,000,000 during the preceding calendar year, or for any person engaged in the business, manufacturing or preparing livestock products for sale or shipment in commerce, or in wholesale marketing in commerce of meats, meat food products, livestock products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, or eggs, whose gross sales were more than $30,000,000 during the preceding calendar year, to engage in the business of selling at retail meats, meat food products, livestock products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, or eggs, and shall not engage in the business of feeding livestock, but nothing in this section shall preclude any person from engaging in such retail business if (1) his operations as a packer are limited solely to meat preparation operations customary in the conduct of such retail business, such as the slicing or grinding of meat, the breaking of carcasses, or the fabricating of meat cuts, or (2) he is primarily engaged in wholesaling dairy products or eggs and his retail operations are limited to the retail sale of such products through home delivery routes or company operated dairy stores. The gross sales referred to above shall include the sales of all corporations, partnerships, associations, and individuals owned or controlled in any manner whatsoever, in whole or in part, through stock ownership or otherwise, by such packer or person, or by the owners, officers, directors, agents, or employees of such packer or person.

"(b) A violation of this section which occurs on more than one day shall be considered a separate violation for each day on which such violation occurs.

"(c) Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than $50,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(d) For the purposes of the Act entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), and the Federal Trade Commission Act, this section shall be considered to be an antitrust law."

VIKTOR JAANIMETS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it will be recalled that when Chairman Khrushchev was here some years ago he came over on a vessel called the *Baltika*. In New York Harbor Viktor Jaanimets, a seaman on that vessel, sought asylum here in the United States. Since then I have been trying to get his admission here regularized. For that purpose I send to the desk a private bill for the relief of Viktor Jaanimets.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks a newspaper story from the Utica, N.Y., Observer Dispatch, explaining the situation in detail, and what animated Mr. Jaanimets to make his break for freedom, together with an article published in the New York Sunday News of September 17, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the articles will be printed in the Record as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1272) for the relief of Viktor Jaanimets, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The articles presented by Mr. Javits are as follows:

[From the Utica, N.Y., Observer Dispatch, Sept. 24, 1961]

Ex-Red Likes His Freedom

(By Jules Loh)

New York.—Each evening after work Viktor Jaanimets goes through approximately the same routine. Many would consider it inordinately dull.

He enters his $17-a-week second-story walkup with his own door key, makes a couple of cold meat sandwiches, gets a beer from the refrigerator, flicks on his small radio and sits down at the slightly wobbly kitchen table.

If the night is warm he might take in a picture show. It doesn't matter much what's playing; it's air conditioned, and Jaanimets hasn't yet got a good hold on the language anyway. Sometimes he stretches out on the bed, opens his bilingual dictionary, and tries to snatch from the radio announcer's rapid spiel some of the words he's struggling to master.

To Jaanimets, handsome, blond, 30-year-old bachelor, this seemingly lackluster routine is pure contentment—well worth risk of a man's life.

Not for a moment, he says, has he regretted his daring feat of a year ago October 10. That was the day he ditched his shipmates from Nikita Khrushchev's yacht, the *Baltika*, and made it to safety after a frantic search for someone who could understand his tongue.

Only Khrushchev's shoe-pounding demonstration at the United Nations during the same week matched the Jaanimets incident for headlines.

Speaking through Interpreter John Jaan Tiivel, Secretary General of the Estonian National Committee, Jaanimets said he was glad the hustle and bustle of his first months in the United States was over and at last he could lose himself in the anonymity of New York's millions.

To the countless requests for Jaanimets' presence at meetings of patriotic organizations, for speeches, for interviews, the former seaman asks Tiivel to "tell them, politely, no."

This Tiivel does gladly. He, for one, doesn't feel Jaanimets takes enough precaution against the possibility of being kidnaped by Soviet agents.

It sounds dramatic, but according to Tiivel and others who work closely with defectors the eventuality is not farfetched, especially as regards someone with the propaganda value of Jaanimets, a member of Khrushchev's handpicked crowd.

Jaanimets, smiling, says, "I can take care of myself." Looking at him you get the impression that he can, at least physically. He is a lithe and leathery 175 pounds, stands 5 feet 10.

On the advice of others, he rented his apartment under an assumed name and believes his landlord is not aware of his identity.

It is his own idea, however, to keep secret his address and his place of employment and to avoid striking up acquaintance with persons unknown to his relatively small circle of friends at the Estonian House, a social and cultural club for Estonian-Americans.

Jaanimets works as a machinist (the craft he learned in an Estonian trade school) at a small manufacturing plant headed by one of the more than 200 persons who offered him a job.

He started at $80 a week, has had two $10 raises since, and regards himself a wealthy man. Last month he bought a car and now is taking driving lessons.

"In the Soviet system it would take 5 to 7 years to get a car after you applied," he said. "I was amazed that all you have to do here is walk in and buy one. Also, there it would take many years' salary.

"As for having my own room," said Jaanimets, "I never had a room of my own since the Russian occupation in 1940.

"You need a permit to get a room, and when I applied in Tallinn (his hometown in Estonia) they told me to apply in Leningrad (the *Baltika's* home port); in Leningrad, they told me to apply in Tallinn."

More than his newfound wealth, Jaanimets said his greatest delight in America—one that he hasn't quite gotten used to—"is just doing what you like, saying what you like, going where you like." It was obvious he wasn't trying to impress, nor say something he thought he might be expected to say.

Jaanimets said he had anticipated there would be reprisals against his family in Tallinn, a widowed mother, a sister, and three brothers. Recently he learned "through Estonian sources" his brother had been jailed for a time and released. He knows no further details.

Naturally this saddens him. But he said "everyone has to live his own life and fight for his own freedom. I'm sorry for my family, but I can't help it."

Naturally, too, Jaanimets is somewhat lonely. But there are the soccer games at the Polo Grounds and the Friday night dances at the Estonian House and he vehemently dismisses as a foolish idea any notion he might ever have regretted the choice he made a year ago.

His main goal now is American citizenship. Senator Jacob Javits, of New York, has submitted a private bill now pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee, which would grant Jaanimets citizenship immediately rather than through the normal 5-year process.

Jaanimets went to sea in 1950 and was assigned to the *Baltika* in 1956, after careful screening. Because its crew was exposed at times to life outside the Iron Curtain, political indoctrination lectures were conducted twice weekly by an officer with a higher rank than the captain.

Jaanimets said he had planned to escape for 3 years before he finally pulled it off. Once in London and again in Stockholm he came close, but each time something happened to upset his plan.

The opportunity didn't come for him in New York until his third leave after the ship docked September 19.

"It's not easy," he explained. "You're always being spied on. There are spies on spies on spies." His own assignment was to spy on his shipmates to guard against smuggling.

Baltika seamen went ashore in groups of five, ostensibly "to protect each other from American thugs," and were not allowed to take cameras "because we were told we would be arrested as spies."

About an hour before his October 10 shore leave was to end, Jaanimets told his four companions he wanted to buy some hair tonic. He went into a large department store and quickly ducked out another door.

"I wasn't sure whether someone would overtake me," he said. "I just took a chance." Had he been caught, he said, the penalty would have been death.

He tried to hail a cab, but the cabbie couldn't make out what he wanted and drove off. Jaanimets began walking fast, not running. Several blocks away he slipped into a bar and ordered a beer. He tried to buy some cigarettes from a machine, and when it became obvious he couldn't figure out how to work it an American seaman, 50-year-old Brian Quinn, offered to help.

"He kept repeating, 'Estonian, not Russian,'" said Quinn, "and I finally figured out he was in some sort of trouble."

Quinn called the Estonian House and handed the phone to the frightened sailor.

"That moment was the start of my new life," Jaanimets said.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Sunday News, Sept. 17, 1961]

How It Feels To Be Free—"I Go Where I Want," Says Viktor Jaanimets a Year After Jumping Khrushchev's Ship—But He Still Looks Over His Shoulder

(By John Gregg)

At about 5:45 every summer morning a young, blond-haired man stepped out the front door of his brownstone apartment building somewhere in Manhattan and turned up the block in a fast trot. Dressed in light trousers, cotton T-shirt, and leather sandals he jogged around the corner, down the avenue and around the next corner. The only other life on the street was around a curbside newspaper stand and a beat cop swinging his nightstick.

The sprinter was Viktor Jaanimets. Remember him * * * the Estonian sailor who pushed the World Series off the front page last October when he jumped Khrushchev's ship, the *Baltika*, tied up in the East River? Today he is Refugee Jaanimets, an apprentice toolmaker in a metropolitan-area factory, and the early-morning lap around the block has been part of his daily regimen—until recently, that is.

"I stopped it when a policeman gave me a suspicious look one morning, like I might be a thief or a crazy man," Jaanimets told me when I met him last week at the Estonian House, 243 East 34th Street. "Now I do calisthenics in my room."

NO LONGER CENTER OF POLITICAL STORM

In the eye of an international hurricane less than a year ago, Viktor Jaanimets, 30 in July, now lives alone—and quietly—in a two-room apartment somewhere in the city. He rises every morning at 5:30 sharp and turns his radio on in the living room. (Viktor likes listening to American music and the newscasts and already has a favorite station.)

Then he does his exercises—pushups, kneebends and some other gymnastics. At 7 a.m. he leaves for work. There is no Jaanimets listed on a mailbox in the foyer. Only his closest friends know where he lives or where he works. He has taken a different name and none of the other tenants in the building, not even his landlord, knows him as Viktor Jaanimets, the former Estonian seaman.

The FBI has told him to be careful. Friends have cautioned "Keep your head out of the limelight, Viktor, or someone will chop it off." And Jaanimets himself is naturally guarded in all he says and does. Meetings with reporters—and there have been few since the first of the year—are arranged through John Tiivel, secretary of the Estonian National Committee, at the Estonian House.

Jaanimets will speak on the evils of Soviet communism as readily as he'll eat an Estonian pancake, but is reluctant to discuss anything having to do with his personal life. He insists that this attitude does not stem from fear. But when a man has been raised under the heel of oppression, maybe fear—and cunning—are too deeply imbedded to be shucked off within a year.

Viktor Jaanimets was only 9 years old when Soviet troops occupied his city, Tallinn, a port on the Gulf of Finland and capital of Estonia. Except for 3 years under the Nazis during World War II, Estonia has been under Russian control since 1940.

"You have no idea what it is like," Jaanimets began. Two lines across his forehead deepened into furrows from the strain of speaking English and the intensity of his feeling. Then he lapsed into Estonian, which Tiivel translated.

"The secret police are so efficient over there, if a lonely shoemaker in a cobblestone alley thinks only once, 'We will overthrow them.'—he cannot sleep that night; the next day he will be taken away. The younger Russians are ready to kill their mothers and fathers for the ideal—communism."

When Viktor was 15 his father died. His mother was left with two sons older than Viktor and a daughter younger. Two years later, Viktor joined the Russian merchant marine and worked for several years on coastal freighters plying the Baltic Sea.

In 1956 he joined the crew of the *Molotov*, a Soviet passenger liner which made regular runs between Leningrad and London, frequently mooring at Stockholm, Copenhagen, and Helsinki.

"One day in 1957, we woke up and found the ship had been renamed the *Baltika*," Jaanimets noted with grim humor, for Vyacheslav M. Molotov, the Stalinist leader, had fallen into disgrace.

Viktor considered jumping ship in London, but was afraid English authorities might turn him back to the Russians. Finally, on September 19, 1960, the *Baltika* tied up alongside pier 73, at the foot of 25th Street and the East River with passenger Khrushchev aboard.

While the Soviet Premier aired his socks in the U.N. General Assembly, Jaanimets was given three shore leaves. His third began at 10 a.m. on October 10, when he left the ship with two Russian girls—chambermaids aboard ship—a Russian sailor and an Estonian officer, who was in charge of the group. They were ordered to stay together.

LOVE WITH STRONG DOSE OF PROPAGANDA

"We were told not to see any movies, for fear we might lose some of our political indoctrination," Viktor said. "In Russia, there is more politics in a film romance than kissing."

Jaanimets was wearing a black wool suit he'd bought in Leningrad for 1,600 rubles ($400), a little over 2 months' salary for a first-class oiler. His shoes had cost him the equivalent of $93. The only way a Russian seaman could beat the cost of living was through the black market, and that's the business they had in mind when the two Estonians and three Russians began hiking downtown to shop in stalls and stores on Orchard Street.

Some of them bought a particular kind of tapestry evidently well known to Baltic sailors. Almost as thick as rugs, they are woven in such hues as green, gold, purple and scarlet, with designs showing grazing deer or fan-tailed peacocks. A tapestry bought for around $5 on the lower East Side sells for 1,100 rubles ($725) in the Leningrad black market, according to Jaanimets.

Carrying their treasure, the two girls and three men started back in the general direction of their ship on foot. Their tour took them through some of the worst slum areas in New York, sights which still impress Jaanimets. "People here should be penalized more for such littering," he says. "If a man wants to throw garbage into the street, let him pay for the privilege."

The party crossed the Bowery, skirted Greenwich Village and stopped on the southeast corner of 14th Street and 5th Avenue, in front of Lane's Department Store. It was about 3 p.m. They were due back aboard the *Baltika* in an hour. The girls asked if they could buy a few things before they returned. The Russian sailor wanted to take a look at some woolen scarves, and Jaanimets said he'd like to buy some hair oil. The Estonian officer consented, but he was too tired to ride herd on them inside the store.

"I'll wait here," he told them wearily. "Hurry up."

The four walked through the 14th Street entrance and the girls immediately took the escalator to the second floor. The Russian spotted a counter display of shawls and set off in that direction. Jaanimets strode diagonally across the store. He hesitated for a moment in front of the double glass doors opening onto Fifth Avenue, then he bolted through them.

He hurried westward—away from the Baltika. Then he zigzagged downtown, across one block, down the next. He knew his fellow crewmen at Lane's would hunt for him; they would be punished for coming back to the ship without him.

To this day, the Estonian refugee does not know which streets he hurried through. He hailed a cab and repeated to the driver "Estonian House," words he had heard over the Voice of America radio broadcast, but the driver didn't understand and Jaanimets walked away.

ESTONIAN ODYSSEY CONTINUES INTO BAR

A couple of hours later he entered a bar and grill on South Street, near the Battery, all the way down at the southern tip of Manhattan. There he met an old Irish seaman who understood some Russian and helped him phone the Estonian House. The Irishman was asked to bring Jaanimets to the house on 34th Street immediately by cab. The two left the bar.

The old sailor evidently thought it a reckless waste to hire a taxi, because he led the refugee to a South Ferry-First Avenue bus. To Jaanimets' utter horror, the bus took them uptown alongside the East River docks, heading right for Pier 73 and the Baltika. He was about to leap out the rear door, when the vehicle turned inland.

Only 3 hours later the Estonian sailor who jumped Khrushchev's ship was on the seventh floor of the News Building telling his story.

Jaanimets was granted political asylum, and for 3 months he lectured across the United States: Kansas City, Chicago, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, Los Angeles and San Francisco, which he calls "the white city," because it is so clean and many of the buildings are surfaced in white stone or stucco.

With John Tiivel as his interpreter, he told how the Soviets had crushed resistance within Russia and her satellites. "There will never be a spontaneous rebellion in Russia," he told them. "The people are flattened with fear and propaganda. The constant hammering of propaganda is unbelievable. No one stands up against it forever. Even a stone will crumble if it is struck enough times by drops of water."

In February of this year, Viktor got a job as an apprentice toolmaker and holds the same job today. Anyone who regards the slogan "America, the land of the free" as a tired cliche ought to see Jaanimets' grin when he talks of freedom.

"I can go where I want," he almost shouted, tossing his hand into the air. "I go to Broadway, see a movie any time I like. No one tells me what to believe, what to think, not to talk to people, where to go, where not to go."

Sometimes he comes home from work late, having put in a few hours of overtime. "I turn on the radio again, open a bottle of beer, light a cigarette and lean back in my chair with my feet up on the wall," he says. "That's the way I relax."

STILL STRUGGLING WITH HIS ENGLISH

Often in the evening he studies English from an Estonian-English dictionary and a Russian-English grammar. He has had no professional instruction so far, but plans to take a class this fall. Right now he speaks the language haltingly and there is much he doesn't yet understand, but what he does speak is grammatically perfect, with very little accent.

On Friday nights, after work, Viktor often drops by the Estonian House for dinner, a bottle or two of beer at the bar, and some continental-style dancing. The kitchen there is run by Mrs. Ada Parlin, who operated the only Estonian restaurant in New York, the Four Seasons on 34th Street, until her building collapsed into a neighboring excavation pit last December.

"Viktor likes my Estonian pancakes," she said, "but his favorite seems to be my mulgikapsad—a sauerkraut dish prepared with crushed barley and meat." Estonian pancakes are thick and fluffy, like a souffle, and Mrs. Parlin serves them with a topping of lingenberries and melting butter.

Viktor has bought a small standard-shift car, the first he has ever owned. He has a learner's permit and on weekends a friend on Long Island teaches him how to drive.

He is still classified by the Department of Immigration and Naturalization as a "refugee parolee," who is required to report to their office at least once a year and to notify them of any change in address.

On April 18, Senator JACOB JAVITS introduced a bill to have the Estonian's status changed to that of a refugee with permanent residence. With this classification, he could apply for citizenship within 5 years. But the Senate hasn't yet acted on JAVITS's bill.

"We are hoping they will take care of Jaanimets before Congress adjourns at the end of September," said Tiivel. "We have had experience with this kind of bill before. They are always the last ones considered before a session ends. So we still have hope. Viktor wants very much to become a U.S. citizen."

THE NEED TO INCREASE U.S. GOLD PRODUCTION IS CLEAR

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, more than a year ago I suggested that it was time to subsidize the Nation's gold mines in the public interest.

On February 12, 1962, I said:

> Nearly 30 years have gone by since our Government took a realistic look at the costs involved in gold mining. The expense in some instances is many times that of 1934, when the price of gold last was adjusted.

Commenting on the need to boost domestic gold production, I cited statistics appearing in the 1960 Minerals Yearbook which showed the United States producing 1,679,000 ounces in 1960, as opposed to U.S.S.R. figures of 11 million estimated ounces.

I suggested then that this should concern all of us.

Regrettably, there has been no marked change in the situation.

According to the 1961 Minerals Yearbook:

> U.S. mine production of recoverable gold in 1961 was 1.5 million ounces valued at $54.2 million, a decrease in production of 7 percent from 1960. This output was the lowest since 1885, except for 4 years (1943–46) during and immediately following World War II.

The "1961 Minerals Yearbook" further states:

> World gold production rose for the eighth successive year to a new high of 47.7 million ounces, valued at $1.7 billion.

Can the need for the United States to increase its gold production capability be made more clear? How clear must be the handwriting on the wall?

The writers of the gold report in the "1961 Minerals Yearbook" have no bias. They have given to us, and, I might add, to all of the world, the sorry story of U.S. gold production. It is not, I suggest, a pretty picture.

The report states bluntly:

> The decline in domestic production reflected curtailed operations in some areas and continuing unfavorable economic conditions owing to rising costs in relation to the fixed price of gold.

I found it revealing to read that the consumption of gold in domestic arts and industries, although decreasing slightly, nevertheless managed to be substantially higher than the amount produced. The domestic arts and industries consumed 2.8 million ounces or about 1.2 million ounces more than domestic mine production.

Just how clear does the handwriting have to be?

World production of gold continues to soar. In less than 10 years it has risen from 35.6 million troy ounces to 47.7 million troy ounces.

The minerals yearbook says domestic mine production decreased "principally because of first, a decline in placer mining in Alaska and California; and, second, a lower output of gold-bearing copper ores in Utah and Montana. And except for small increases in production in Arizona and Colorado, all the major gold-producing States recorded lower outputs." Alaska, sadly, dropped from third to fifth place among gold-producing States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this time a table showing mine production of recoverable gold in the United States, by States, over the past 10 years. It should be observed that in the majority of cases production declined. The 1952–56 total was 1,879,233 troy ounces. The 1961 total was 1,548,270 troy ounces.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 5.—*Mine production of recoverable gold in the United States, by States*

[Troy ounces]

State	1952–56 (average)	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
Alaska	240,288	215,467	186,435	178,918	168,197	114,216
Arizona	122,743	152,449	142,979	124,627	143,064	145,959
California	235,241	170,885	185,385	145,270	123,713	97,644
Colorado	105,241	87,928	79,539	61,097	61,269	67,515
Idaho	16,731	12,301	15,896	10,479	6,135	5,718
Montana	27,767	32,766	26,003	28,551	45,922	35,377
Nevada	87,804	76,752	105,087	113,443	58,187	54,165
New Mexico	2,859	3,212	3,378	3,155	5,423	6,201
North Carolina	257	1,373	876	965	1,826	2,094
Oregon	4,993	3,381	1,423	686	835	1,054
Pennsylvania	1,449	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
South Dakota	531,471	568,130	570,830	577,730	554,771	557,855
Tennessee	232	172	124	99	123	152
Texas	8					
Utah	435,915	378,438	307,824	239,517	368,255	342,988
Vermont	168	62				
Washington	65,821	[1] 89,708	[1] 113,353	[1] 118,394	[1] 129,012	[1] 117,331
Wyoming	245	573	117		40	1
Total	1,879,233	1,793,597	1,739,249	1,602,931	1,666,772	1,548,270

[1] Production in Pennsylvania and Washington combined.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I think it equally important that we consider world production of gold. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing world production of gold by countries over the past 10 years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 14.—*World production of gold by countries* [1] [2]

[Troy ounces]

Country [1]	1952–56 (average)	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
North America:						
Canada	4,363,943	4,433,894	4,571,347	4,483,416	4,628,911	4,442,153
Central America and West Indies:						
Costa Rica [3]	[4] 535	705	310			
Cuba [3]	1,154	915	804			
Dominican Republic	124	286	780	615	348	
Guatemala [5]	253	360	370	513	[3] 308	
Honduras	20,469	2,025	1,714			
Nicaragua	240,660	203,636	214,882	[3] 2,798	[3] 2,172	[3] 1,685
Salvador	11,985	2,508	2,372	218,302	210,200	226,250
Mexico	412,643	346,328	332,246	2,474	1,121	
United States [6]	1,899,606	1,800,000	1,759,000	313,663	300,256	268,684
				1,635,000	1,679,800	1,566,800
Total	6,951,000	6,790,000	6,884,000	6,657,000	6,823,000	6,506,000

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 14.—*World production of gold by countries* [1] [2]—Continued

[Troy ounces]

Country [1]	1952-56 (average)	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
South America:						
Argentina	7,671	7,732	3,054	[3] 1,782	[3] 201	[3] 1
Bolivia	25,873	27,685	[7] 19,115	[7] 35,246	[7] 45,457	[7] 80,184
Brazil	153,400	150,000	186,000	180,000	[5] 180,000	[5] 180,000
British Guiana	21,944	16,490	17,500	3,448	2,364	1,702
Chile	130,835	103,590	110,952	78,640	109,055	110,000
Colombia	411,233	325,114	371,715	397,929	433,947	399,877
Ecuador	20,568	16,840	19,685	18,450	15,159	15,210
French Guiana	5,375	8,954	20,000	16,100	18,940	7,944
Peru	149,876	161,831	159,127	150,299	141,001	133,570
Surinam	6,665	6,516	4,258	5,826	4,932	4,011
Venezuela	43,828	89,654	76,009	53,766	46,868	30,071
Total [5]	977,000	914,000	987,000	941,000	998,000	963,000
Europe:						
Finland	18,654	22,377	22,152	23,374	20,351	20,602
France	42,053	35,173	35,559	42,150	39,545	41,796
Germany, West	4,256	3,681	[5] 4,000	[5] 4,000	[5] 4,000	[5] 4,000
Greece	[6] 4,957	7,877	5,787	4,340	4,823	[5] 4,800
Italy	9,184	6,334	4,802	3,261	3,310	600
Portugal	20,461	23,277	17,747	20,769	21,927	20,959
Spain	9,769	11,901	14,211	15,239	13,986	[5] 14,000
Sweden	91,784	97,063	127,574	103,000	91,100	[5] 110,000
U.S.S.R. [5] [9]	9,300,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	11,000,000	12,000,000
Yugoslavia	41,423	51,988	55,364	59,640	63,980	[5] 64,300
Total [1] [5]	9,700,000	10,400,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	11,600,000	12,700,000
Asia:						
Burma	233	104	190	212	[7] 304	194
Cambodia	[4] 482	1,608	322	4,823	4,180	4,180
India	227,188	179,182	170,110	165,283	160,593	156,510
Japan	230,899	252,563	260,630	261,547	261,482	293,954
Korea:						
North [10]	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
Republic of	36,889	66,578	72,071	65,690	65,814	84,105
Malaya	20,427	11,157	22,484	26,739	20,745	12,486
Philippines	438,272	379,982	422,833	402,615	410,618	423,983
Sarawak	576	883	864	2,450	3,326	4,132
Saudi Arabia	37,052					
Taiwan	29,318	20,548	21,345	13,497	15,699	17,490
Total [1] [5] [9]	1,300,000	1,200,000	1,410,000	1,390,000	1,390,000	1,440,000
Africa:						
Angola	37		26	42	42	48
Bechuanaland	944	190	215	198	203	261
Cameroon, Republic of	1,066	10,899	2,009	971	415	538
Central Africa, Republic of	[8] 557	614	932	495	291	80
Congo, Republic of the (formerly Belgian)	365,749	371,020	352,276	347,967	316,195	232,611
Congo, Republic of	[8] 10,296	7,404	6,048	3,665	2,628	1,788
Eritrea	1,385	4,501	6,430	16,718	5,144	5,529
Ethiopia	27,128	[5] 25,000	36,369	41,439	40,915	[5] 41,500
Gabon, Republic of	[8] 143,336	22,727	15,921	16,172	17,696	15,286
Ghana	706,881	790,381	852,834	913,200	893,113	970,135
Kenya	9,958	7,388	7,753	9,145	8,646	[5] 12,122
Liberia	824	[11] 381	[5] 400	1,401	1,036	2,088
Malagasy Republic	1,353	842	804	193	273	347
Morocco	2,937				104	136
Mozambique	1,277	1,080	695	295	225	105
Nigeria	777	389	646	950	994	676
Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Federation of:						
Northern Rhodesia	2,776	3,270	3,729	4,685	5,527	4,279
Southern Rhodesia	518,947	536,849	554,838	566,883	562,703	570,095
Ruanda-Urundi	4,064	3,215	3,858	3,119	1,566	817
Sudan	1,980	1,158	1,571	1,419	2,605	1,500
Swaziland	51	7			806	1,325
Tanganyika [12]	72,095	63,280	68,250	95,794	107,009	101,067
Uganda (exports)	405	212	329	334	642	355
Union of South Africa	13,499,069	17,030,737	17,656,447	20,065,515	21,383,019	22,941,561
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	12,580	3,026	1,812	2,486	1,000	[5] 1,000
West Africa (formerly French)	959	331	3,247	[5] 8,000	[5] 8,000	[5] 8,000
Total	15,380,000	18,890,000	19,580,000	22,100,000	23,360,000	24,910,000
Oceania:						
Australia	1,050,444	1,083,941	1,103,980	1,085,104	1,086,014	1,070,467
Fiji	73,005	75,150	86,794	72,565	72,203	83,417
New Guinea	96,452	68,564	43,254	46,663	45,019	41,820
New Zealand	38,405	30,195	24,981	36,758	33,326	28,294
Papua	374	466	558	156	132	[5] 130
Total	1,258,680	1,258,316	1,259,567	1,241,246	1,236,694	1,224,128
World total (estimate) [1]	35,600,000	39,500,000	40,600,000	42,800,000	45,400,000	47,700,000

---

[1] In addition to countries listed, gold is also produced in Austria, Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Rumania, and Thailand, but production data are not available; estimates for these countries are included in the total. For some countries accurate figures are not possible to obtain, owing to clandestine trade in gold (as, for example, in former French West Africa).

[2] This table incorporates some revisions. Data do not add exactly to totals shown because of rounding where estimated figures are included in the detail.

[3] Imports into the United States.

[4] One year only, as 1956 was first year of commercial production.

[5] Estimate.

[6] Refinery production.

[7] Exports.

[8] Average for 1953–56.

[9] Output from U.S.S.R. in Asia included with U.S.S.R. in Europe.

[10] Estimate according to Minerais et Metaux (France), except 1961.

[11] Purchases. Production may be greater.

[12] Including gold in lead concentrates exported amounting to: 5,526 ounces, 1952–56 (average); 9.192 ounces in 1957; 11,951 ounces in 1958; 10,391 ounces in 1959; 8,963 ounces in 1960; and 521 ounces in 1961.

Compiled by Augusta W. Jann and Richard W. Peters, Division of Foreign Activities.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it will be seen in the table that the U.S.S.R. production estimate has been increased by 1 million troy ounces, or from 11 to 12 million ounces.

How clear does the handwriting have to be?

According to the minerals yearbook report, technology is important. It has, for example, reduced operating costs and extended the life of the older mines in the Union of South Africa. And, as the lay person might guess, production in the Union of South Africa increased in the 10-year period from 13,499,069 troy ounces to 22,941,561 troy ounces.

The handwriting again is clear.

I shall have more to say as to the urgent need for domestic aids with which to help our miners, hard-working Americans who would not have needed such aids had the Federal Government been realistic.

On March 16, 1962, I suggested that gold is a weapon and that because it is we should arm. Our national gold balance, as reported by U.S. Treasury, indicates that we have not armed.

U.S. gold reserves have dwindled by nearly $1 billion from February 12, 1962, to September 5, 1962, when the figure dribbled away from $16,788,000,000 to $15,878,000,000. They have been $24,771,000,000 in August 1949, an alltime high.

Yes; the handwriting is clear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing by the week the dwindling of U.S. gold reserves from September 5, 1962, to the present. These figures have been supplied by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and come from U.S. Treasury sources.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Week ending:	*Total amount of gold*
1962:	
Sept. 5	$16,098,000,000
Sept. 12	16,093,000,000
Sept. 19	16,067,000,000
Sept. 26	16,068,000,000
Oct. 3	16,068,000,000
Oct. 10	16,067,000,000
Oct. 17	16,067,000,000
Oct. 24	16,052,000,000
Oct. 31	16,006,000,000
Nov. 7	15,977,000,000
Nov. 14	15,978,000,000
Nov. 21	15,978,000,000
Nov. 28	15,978,000,000
Dec. 5	15,977,000,000
Dec. 12	15,978,000,000
Dec. 19	15,978,000,000
Dec. 26	15,978,000,000
1963:	
Jan. 2	15,978,000,000
Jan. 9	15,978,000,000
Jan. 16	15,963,000,000
Jan. 23	15,928,000,000
Jan. 30	15,928,000,000
Feb. 6	15,928,000,000
Feb. 13	15,928,000,000
Feb. 20	15,928,000,000
Feb. 26	15,927,000,000
Mar. 6	15,878,000,000
Mar. 13	15,878,000,000
Mar. 20	15,878,000,000
Mar. 27	15,878,000,000

Source: Federal Reserve Bulletins, Legislative Reference Service.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, during the 87th Congress a variety of bills were introduced by Senators concerned with the decline of the mining industry. I was a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 44 introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], who is most knowledgeable both on the mining and economic aspects of gold. The resolution offered as a tentative approach a $35 an ounce subsidy for each ounce of newly mined domestic gold. The proposal did not increase the price of gold, and was in no way, shape, or manner related to any change in the price of gold.

Interesting and informative hearings were held on Senate Joint Resolution 44. The ominous defects of existing controls which have placed the gold mining industry in a straitjacket were discussed and noted.

Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs Robert V. Roosa, speaking for Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, testified on June 8, 1962, at the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 44. He offered no solution to the crisis in which the gold mining industry found, and still finds, itself. He said that the Department of the Treasury had carefully studied earlier hearings on the proposed domestic subsidy, but had not changed its view that a subsidy would upset this Nation's monetary system. He said:

> An understandable, compassionate effort, in the spirit of which we can all share, to assist a relatively few people to keep or obtain employment in the gold mining industry—desirable as employment there would be, or their employment, in any event—that effort, instead of helping those in the gold mining industry, would, in our considered and deliberate judgment, disrupt the monetary system upon which not only their own livelihood, but also that of all the rest of us, depends.
>
> To us, it seems there is no compensating advantage in the promise that subsidies would produce a vast enlargement of the existing gold stock. The fact is that even if productive capacity would achieve the most optimistic estimate of the Department of Interior, American facilities could not in less than a century add—these are additions—to our gold production the amount of gold contemplated by the present terms of Senate Joint Resolution 44. But even if that total could by some alchemy be produced within a single year, it could not begin to offset the losses to the world economy that would be created by devaluation of the dollar. And in blunt, simple terms, if the U.S. Government should add an unprecedented subsidy to the official $35 price for gold, such action would be construed by the rest of the world as evidence that devaluation was underway.
>
> I would be glad to discuss further any aspects of this question relating to the function of gold in the world's monetary system, along whatever lines the chairman and members of this committee may wish to pursue. But I would stress, before we begin, that I can give you full assurance, based on intimate, continuous, extensive contact with financial officials of most of the leading countries of the world that a step of the kind contemplated by this resolution would be regarded as synonymous with a declaration of intent to devalue the dollar of the United States. That is why the Treasury Department is opposed to this resolution.

Mr. President, the members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee asked Secretary Roosa if he could suggest ways in which the mining crisis could be lessened and to date there have been no constructive comments coming from the Department of the Treasury.

It is obvious that little if any thought has been given to this enormously important problem. Perhaps more will be given in future days.

As chairman of the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have scheduled hearings April 9 and 11 to explore more fully the problems which face the mining industry. One of the areas to be explored will concern the gold mining crisis.

Of course, the then adamant, continuing refusal of the Department of the Treasury to realize that domestic gold production was a matter not to be coupled with balance of payments or the monetary aspects of gold, did not help the mining industry. And I detect as yet, I regret to say, no change in the attitude of the Department of the Treasury. Its attitude is not based on party principles. Its resistance was the same under the Eisenhower administration as to date it has been under the Kennedy administration.

But we are another Congress. We have new opportunity to take steps to correct the inequities which plague the mining industry, generally, and the gold mining industry in particular. Inequity is perhaps too weak a word. Injustice is probably more apt. Under our supposedly free enterprise system, gold is the only commodity compelled to sell at a price established 29 years ago, and compelled to limit its sales to one purchaser, the Government of the United States.

I am, therefore, in an effort to remedy this unfair, unjust and uneconomic situation, today introducing a bill which would establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency. The bill directs the Secretary to survey the domestic gold mining industry and determine the troy ounce price—up to $105 per troy ounce which should be paid to domestic producers. The Gold Procurement and Sales Agency would be instrumental in achieving maximum production of gold from U.S. mines.

The Gold Procurement and Sales Agency proposed would, first, be the only Agency authorized to buy gold from domestic producers and sell it for nonmonetary purposes within the United States, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; second, pay to domestic producers, for all gold mined after December 31, 1963, the price determined by the Secretary of the Interior; third, annually resurvey the domestic gold mining industry to determine whether the price paid to such producers for gold should be modified. The purchase price of domestically mined gold for the next succeeding calendar year shall be the price as so determined, or $105 per troy ounce, whichever is less; fourth, sell gold for defense, industrial, professional, artistic, and other nonmonetary uses at a price equivalent to that which was paid for the purchase of gold during the month prior to the sale; and, fifth, transfer to the Treasury Department any domestically mined gold not disposed of under the preceding clauses; and the Treasury Department shall reimburse the Gold Procurement and Sales Agency at the rate of $35 per ounce or such other amount as is, at the time of transfer, the monetary value of gold in accordance with applicable statutes and treaties.

The bill suggests an approach both realistic and reassuring. This proposed legislation was first introduced in the 87th Congress by Congressman Harold T. Johnson who has again reintroduced it this year. I am pleased to introduce it today on behalf of myself, my colleague from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1273) to establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Gruening (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall make a survey of the domestic gold mining industry and determine the price, not to exceed $105 per troy ounce, required to be paid to domestic producers in order to achieve maximum production of gold from mines in the United States. The result of the survey, together with the Secretary's determination of the price necessary to accomplish the aforementioned objective, shall be reported to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives not later than December 31, 1963.

Sec. 2. Effective January 1, 1964, there is established in the Department of the Interior the Gold Procurement and Sales Agency which shall be headed by a Director, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive an annual salary of $20,000.

Sec. 3. The Good Procurement and Sales Agency shall, on and after January 1, 1964—

(1) be the only agency authorized to buy gold from domestic producers and sell it for nonmonetary purposes within the United States, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(2) pay to domestic producers, for all gold mined after December 31, 1963, the price determined by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with section 1 of this Act;

(3) annually resurvey the domestic gold mining industry to determine whether the price paid to such producers for gold should be modified. The report of the agency shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior who shall, not later than December 31 of each year, advise Congress of the price he has determined to be necessary to meet the objective of section 1 of this Act. The purchase price of domestically mined gold for the next succeeding calendar year shall be the price as so determined, or $105 per troy ounce, whichever is less;

(4) sell gold for defense, industrial, professional, artistic, and other nonmonetary uses at a price equivalent to that which was paid for the purchase of gold during the month prior to the sale under the preceding clauses of this section; and

(5) transfer to the Treasury Department any domestically mined gold not disposed of under the preceding clauses; and the Treasury Department shall reimburse the Gold Procurement and Sales Agency at the rate of $35 per ounce or such other amount as is, at the time of transfer, the monetary value of gold in accordance with applicable statutes and treaties.

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this Act, including funds for the Gold Procurement and Sales Agency to absorb the difference between the purchase price of domestically mined gold and the sale of any quantities thereof to the Treasury Department at the rate fixed by this Act.

Sec. 5. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to repeal, supersede, or modify existing provisions of law relating to the monetary system of the United States or to interfere with the right of the Treasury Department to obtain gold from sources other than domestic producers.

Sec. 6. The term "domestic" as used in this Act refers to the United States, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is significant that the approach incorporated in this bill has been endorsed by the Legislature of the State of Alaska. The Alaskan resolution passed the house on March 20 and the senate on March 22.

The members of the Alaskan Legislature believe the proposal "will provide the incentive for a great new gold-mining development." Further, the bill has the endorsement of the Mining Advisory Committee of the Western Governor's Conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of house joint resolution 17 be printed in the Record at this time.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 17

Joint resolution relating to pending Federal legislation on gold-mining development, in the Legislature of the State of Alaska, third legislature, first session

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas gold production in our Nation, now at an alltime low, is essential to the stability of the monetary system of the United States; and

Whereas use of gold for industrial and commercial purposes has increased to more than 3 million ounces annually and is still increasing; and

Whereas mining production of gold has been only 1,500,000 ounces, the deficit being made up by sales from the Nation's monetary reserve; and

Whereas it is evident that the gold miners of this Nation need higher prices to produce gold; and

Whereas an increase in the dollar price of gold may interfere with international monetary policy, but incentive payments for newly mined gold from domestic gold mines would not; and

Whereas such an incentive would reopen closed gold mines and restore lost jobs, particularly in the State of Alaska which is in need of such an industrial incentive to bring back a great Alaskan industry; and

Whereas the passage of H.R. 1095 now pending before Congress will provide the incentive for a great new gold-mining development and still protect the monetary stability of the United States; and

Whereas H.R. 1095 has been endorsed by the mining advisory committee of the Western Governor's Conference;

Be it resolved, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to take favorable action on H.R. 1095; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Wayne Aspinall, chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the Honorable Henry M. Jackson, chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and members of the Alaskan delegation to Congress.

Passed by the house March 20, 1963.

Bruce Kendall,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

Patricia R. Slack,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed by the senate March 22, 1963.

Frank Peratrovich,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

Evelyn K. Stevenson,
Secretary of the Senate.

Certified true, full, and correct.

——— ———,
Governor of Alaska.
Patricia R. Slack,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have, during the past year, stressed the urgency for the Congress to move ahead—if the executive department fails to act. Crucial problems face us. To name but a few, they are: First, declining gold reserves; second, an industry crippled by a fixed gold price which does not pay for the production let alone provide for a profit; third, daily closing of mines; fourth, decrease of dredging operations; fifth, inadequate Federal assistance for the miner or miners; sixth, continuing waste of a great industry coupled with expeditious need to find new mining methods; seventh, reeducation of miners in an age of automation; and, eighth, inadequate supply of gold for national defense and space efforts. These are but a few of the problems which must be solved.

Mr. President, on June 25, 1962, I placed in the Congressional Record a table showing how the cost of living in our Nation had increased while the price of gold remained stationary. The comparison today is equally valid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chart be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cost of living increases while the price for gold remains stationary

Commodity	1934 price	1962 price [1]	Percent price increase
Bread, loaf, 1 pound	7 cents, A. & P	21.1 cents, CPI	201.42
Milk, quart	13 cents, Nationwide	24.9 cents, CPI	91.53
Flour, 5 pounds	27 cents, A. & P., Pillsbury	56.2 cents, CPI	108.14
Chicken, 1 pound	29 cents, fryers	40.4 cents, CPI	93.31
Pork chops, 1 pound	27 cents, A. & P., center cuts	87.4 cents, CPI	223.70
White potatoes:			
5 pounds	15 cents, Idaho baking		
10 pounds	15 cents, regular A. & P	55.8 cents, A. & P., CPI	272.00
Corn	2 No. 2 cans, 23 cents, Piggly-Wiggly	1 No. 303 can, 20.2 cents, CPI	75.65
Tomatoes	1 medium can, 8 cents A. & P	No. 303 can, 15.8 cents, CPI	97.50
Eggs, 1 dozen	29 cents, A. & P	2 for 85 cents, A. & P. (large size)	46.55
Apples	3 pounds, cooking, 17 cents, Delicious	1 pound, 13.7 cents, CPI	1.94
Cheese, 1 pound, American	21 cents, A. & P	49 cents, sliced, A. & P	133.33
Lard, 1 pound, Crisco	19 cents, A. & P	36 cents, A. & P	89.47
Coffee, 1 pound	19 cents, A. & P., 8 O'clock	Pound can, 71.2 cents	274.74
Butter, 1 pound	31 cents, A. & P	76.2 cents, CPI	145.81
Man's winter suit	$25, Hecht's	$55-$115, Hecht's	120.00
	$23.50 Raleigh's	$69.50-$135, Raleigh's	195 74
Woman's everyday dress	$2.95 Palais Royal	$3.99, Woodward & Lothrop budget store	35.25
Car, Chevrolet	$625, Master 6 sedan, Taylor Motor Co	$2,402.94, Biscayne 6 sedan, Hicks Chevrolet	284.46
Room and board	$35 a month	$90 a month	157.14
Canned spaghetti, 15½-ounce can	5 cents, Phillips	2 for 29 cents, Safeway, Franco-American	190.00
California oranges	2 dozen, 49 cents	74.5 cents a dozen CPI	204.07
Season ticket to National Symphony, 8 concerts	$3	$6 plus $5 dues, Prince Georges series	272.72
Ground beef, 1 pound	18 cents, Piggly-Wiggly	51.5 cents, CPI	186.11
Electric iron	$1.95, Kann's Universal	$7.77, Sears', Kenmore	298.46
Jewelry:			
Gold bead necklace	$70, Galt & Bros., Inc	$100	[2] 30.00
Gold cuff links	$50, Galt & Bros., Inc	$65	[2] 30.00
14-carat gold ring	$50, Galt & Bros., Inc	$60	[2] 30.00
Man's hat	$5, $4	$9.95, $11.95, Hecht's	139.00
Lamb, 1 pound	21 cents	49 cents, Safeway, shoulder cut	133.33
Men's shoes	$5, Hecht's	$17.95, Hecht's average price	259.00
Wilson Line (ride to Mount Vernon)	50 cents, round trip	$2.75, round trip	450.00
Rye or bourbon, case of 12 quarts	$11.95, Star Liquor Co	$38, Star Liquor Co	217.99
Calves liver, 1 pound	17 cents, Swifts	$1.39, Safeway	717.65
New home in Foxhall Village, Washington, D.C., 7 rooms	$8,950-$9,250	$32,500-$50,000	[2] 253.10

[1] Consumer Price Index (CPI), U.S. Department of Labor, January 1962. Prices for 1934 obtained from the Washington Post (September 1934). Remaining prices were obtained from personal phone contact, stores listed above have headquarters in Washington, D.C.

[2] Approximate.

NOTE.—Mining equipment cost has increased 190 percent since 1934 according to information supplied by the industry.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I believe the gold mining industry suffers unique and flagrant discrimination, unfortunately.

It is perfectly obvious that we must mine more gold to replenish depleted stocks. When shoes wear out, the consumer buys a new pair or has them repaired. According to information supplied by the Legislative Reference Service, two firms supply 57 percent of all gold mined today in the United States. Seventeen firms supply 35 percent and the remaining 8 percent is supplied by an estimated 500 firms or individuals. It is obvious that individual efforts have reached the point of near extermination. Production figures in Alaska for example indicate that in 1940 the then territory produced approximately $26.5 million in gold. That figure in 1961 was approximately $4 million.

Let us, therefore, pay attention to the many warning signs before us before time runs out.

AMENDMENT OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT TO PROVIDE PREFERENCE IN THE AWARD OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, for myself, and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. RANDOLPH] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act so as to provide preference in the awarding of certain Government contracts to contractors in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to lie on the desk until Monday, April 8, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1274) to amend the Area Redevelopment Act so as to provide preference in the awarding of certain Government contracts to contractors in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Area Redevelopment Act is amended by redesignating section 29 as section 30 and by adding a new section 29 as follows:

"GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

"SEC. 29. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'Government agency' means an executive or military department, and any commission, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partially owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, or other agency, in the executive branch of the Government.

"(2) the term 'Government procurement contract' means a contract to which a Government agency is a party for the procurement for the use of the Government of articles, materials, or supplies or of research or development services.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the areas designated as redevelopment areas in accordance with section 5(a) of this Act shall be classified by the Secretary at the beginning of each year into six categories in accordance with the relative rates of unemployment for such areas as determined by the Secretary of Labor for the preceding calendar year. The category of areas having the lowest rate of unemployment shall be designated as Class 1, and the remaining categories shall be designated as Classes 2 to 6 in the order of increasing rates of unemployment therein.

"(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of determining the successful bidder on any Government procurement contract to be awarded on the basis of competitive bidding there shall be deducted from the price bid or offered by any bidder whose place or places of business for the purpose of performing at least 75 per centum of the work under the contract is in a redevelopment area an amount determined in accordance with the following table:

"Classification of area:	*Rate of reduction (percent)*
1	2
2	4
3	6
4	8
5	10
6	12

"(2) Where a bidder has places of business for the purpose of performing a contract in two or more redevelopment areas, the rate of reduction provided in paragraph (1) shall be adjusted in accordance with regulations of the head of the contracting agency, giving due weight to the portions of the work to be performed in each such area.

"(d) In any case in which Government procurement contracts are awarded on a basis other than competitive bidding, the head of the contracting agency shall weigh the various factors upon the basis of which the contract is awarded in such a way as to give to prospective contractors whose place or places of business for the purpose of performing the contract is in one or more redevelopment areas, as nearly as may be possible, a degree of preference comparable to that which is accorded bidders from such areas under subsection (c) in the case of contracts awarded on a competitive bidding basis.

"(e) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any contract with respect to which the President finds and declares that such application is inconsistent with the national interest. Any such finding and declaration, together with the reasons therefor, shall be published in the Federal Register."

FEDERAL-STATE WATER RIGHTS: NOW IS THE TIME FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], a bill to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams.

One of the vexing and unsolved problems which directly confronts western America—indeed, the entire Nation—is the continuing, often embittered, jurisdictional dispute between Federal and State governments over the waters of many of our country's streams. How can our precious waters best be conserved and developed and controlled and put to maximum beneficial use by our people? One direct, and relatively simple, means of making the solution far more possible is to eliminate the jurisdictional battle, or, at any rate, some of it, which exists between Washington and our State capitals.

I shall not repeat here a detailed history of all the judicial, executive, and legislative actions by which we have arrived at the present situation. Suffice it to say that the present status of the law—in many respects the uncertainty of that status—is found objectionable by many responsible individuals and groups. I shall describe that status more fully in a moment.

The overall problem of Federal-State relationships in regard to water has many ramifications. Some espouse a doctrine of paramount Federal rights in almost every respect. It has been suggested, for example, that the United States should specify all aspects of water development, control and use which it might ever wish to assert and let the State operate on what, if anything, remains. I reject that theory as being in derogation of many proper State and local interests and better abilities to determine local needs. Such a theory is likely to lead to less, not more, beneficial utilization of our water resources.

Contrariwise, it has been suggested by some proponents of State supremacy in regard to water that all Federal water activities be subjected to State control. I also reject this theory. It would unduly impair and cripple the constitutional responsibilities of the Federal Government which, over the years, has constructed important and imposing water projects to serve the people.

I think it is because of such risks to the national interest that some of the past proposed legislation in this field has lacked sufficient support and has failed of enactment. But this does not mean that no legislation is needed, nor does it mean that sound legislation, based on principles of fairness to individuals and recognizing the proper roles of both the State and Federal Government, will not be supported in all significant quarters.

I said that it is not my purpose here to provide a history, but it is necessary to describe briefly the essential nature of those several aspects of the total situation which I feel must be remedied at this time. By this you will see that the bill we proposed is not a panacea for all questions in the complex field of Federal-State relationships in regard to water. Rather, it proposes immediate action on only the most pressing issues, upon which I believe men of good will may agree.

WATERS RISING ON FEDERAL LANDS

The spark which ignited the present apprehension among many of us is the *Pelton Dam* decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1955 (*Federal Power Commission* v. *Oregon,* 349 U.S. 435). That decision, as is asserted by agents of the United States, and as is feared by various individuals and States, has far-reaching implications for States, such as mine, which have significant water resources arising on reserved or withdrawn lands belonging to the United States.

By the Desert Land Act, March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), the Congress provided, inter alia, that after certain appropriations of water for desertland—

> All surplus water over and above such actual appropriation and use, together with the water of all, lakes, rivers, and other sources of water supply upon the public lands and not navigable, shall remain and be held free for the appropriation and use of the public.

Based on this and other provisions of Federal law, it has been generally assumed that the mere fact that nonnavigable water arises upon any U.S.-retained lands would not affect the rights to the control and use of that water acquired by persons or by State and local governmental entities, so long as such rights are otherwise in accord with State law. In other words, it was assumed Congress said that regardless of what power the Federal Government may have over water arising upon "the public lands and not navigable" such water was free for use by anyone under State law.

Many relied upon such an interpretation, and it was even expressed in *California Oregon Power Co.* v. *Beaver Portland Cement Co.,* 295 U.S. 142, 163–4 (1935) as follows:

> Following the act of 1877, if not before, all nonnavigable waters then a part of the public domain became publici juris, subject to the plenary control of the designated States, * * * with the right in each to determine for itself to what extent the rule of appropriation or the common-law rule in respect of riparian rights should obtain.

But, the Pelton Dam decision, to the contrary, defined the term "public lands" in the Desert Land Act to mean only those lands "unqualifiedly subject to sale and disposition" and said Congress did not mean to permit appropriation of water arising on lands withdrawn or reserved from entry for private acquisition. This would apply to vast acreages of watershed in many States as, for example, in my State of California where a great percentage of the total area of the State falls into this category of federally owned and withdrawn or reserved lands.

Without the Desert Land Act being applicable to withdrawn or reserved lands, it would necessarily follow that it is at least unclear as to whether any State-based right, accruing after the withdrawal or reservation, to the use of water arising on such lands could be valid as against a Federal undertaking to control or use such water. It has been said, in *Winters* v. *United States,* 207 U.S. 564, 577 (1908):

> The power of the Government to reserve the waters and exempt them from appropriation under the State laws is not denied, and could not be.

The resulting assertions and fears are that the United States has, in effect, a priority of appropriation of all the previously unappropriated water arising upon the reserved or withdrawn Federal lands, said priority arising no later than at the date of the relevant withdrawal or reservation. This theory has cast grave uncertainty on the reliability of individual and non-Federal public appropriations of water made after such withdrawals or reservations. In most of the relevant situations, the pertinent withdrawals or reservations were effected before the non-Federal appropriations upon which those of the West have proceeded to rely in developing water resources. Many of these reservations, as for forests, came around the turn of the century and there was also a general withdrawal of all Federal lands in 1934.

This is not a problem of interest to my State only, but let me give a concrete example of the need for congressional action on this subject. Not the least of the water development projects depending upon water affected by this situation is California's State water plan, now coming into fruition. If the just described fears as to the validity of the appropriation of water upon which this plan depends, water arising upon earlier withdrawn or reserved Federal lands, are not set at rest then the success of the plan is in danger. It is feared, also, that the interest charges to the people of California upon the bonds financing the plan could be significantly higher to offset the risk to the State's asserted rights possible by reason of Federal claims to control and use the water.

I agree with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] that there is no basis in the actual holdings of pertinent court decisions to compel a conclusion that such infirmities as have been raised do exist under a proper interpretation of present law. Therefore, the California project and other private and non-Federal public interests similarly affected should not be open to doubt.

The fact is, however, that assertions are made by agents of the United States, as in the United States answering brief, pages 64–65, August 14, 1961, *Arizona* v. *California*, U.S. Supreme Court original No. 8, which give rise to apprehension that the described infirmities might become law. There the Federal Government contended:

> The rights of the United States to use the waters on the public domain, being property rights, may be acquired by others only as authorized by Congress (citations). As observed above, the Desert Land Act is such an authorization with respect to nonnavigable waters on the public lands in certain States. But this act is not applicable with respect to waters upon reserved lands (citing Pelton Dam case). Nor is there any other Federal statute which has transferred these proprietary rights from the United States.

We have seen in the tidelands controversy that unsettling assertions made by counsel cannot be ignored for they may ultimately become case decisional law and require legislative rectification.

Let us act now to allay the existing fears caused by such assertions. Let us avoid now the possibility of an adverse judicial decision. This we can do by exercising the proper role of Congress in defining its will as custodian of the property of the United States under article IV, section 3, paragraph 2 of the Constitution. The judicial and executive branches, the States and the people, are entitled to statutory recognition of previously unquestioned vested rights, which will permit continued maximum development of our water resources for the benefit of our people.

CONSUMPTIVE USES PREFERENCE

I move now to a second issue of this total question of Federal power over interests in water, an issue as to which I also feel Congress should act at this time. The West is an arid region where water, the lifeblood of any society, is particularly dear because of its increasing scarcity. There the consumptive uses made of it take on a very special significance. Most Western States' laws say that among competing uses, consumptive uses are considered more important than nonconsumptive.

I propose that Congress recognize this situation by a general provision of law relating to all works hereafter constructed by or under the authority of the United States with respect to waters lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian. Such a salutary provision now exists as to federally constructed projects in the sphere of flood control and navigation generally in the West. This is by virtue of subsection 1(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 888–89), said subsection sometimes being known as the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment. Such provision says, in essence, that uses for nonconsumptive purposes as, for example, by diversion or other control for navigation, shall be subordinate to beneficial consumptive uses, present or future, such as for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes, as to waters arising in States lying in whole or in part west of the 98th meridian.

The Congress has been writing such a provision into irrigation and reclamation bills on a project-by-project basis. I propose we make it general law as to all Federal projects affecting waters of the West. By doing this, I do not propose to affect the authority of the United States or its licensees to construct works, nor do I mean to touch conflicts between navigation or power functions and other nonconsumptive functions such as preservation of fish and wildlife. I do feel we should enunciate a general congressional policy that consumptive uses are preferred to nonconsumptive uses in the West. This would assure our Western States that the Congress, too, acknowledges the wisdom of the preference which they have found most suitable to their situation. It would remove a potential area of Federal-State conflict.

FEDERAL RIGHTS UNDER STATE PROCEDURE

A third form of congressional action which I suggest, and which would also make general an existing beneficial provision of law now applicable in one area of Federal water activity, would be to extend one rule derived from the Reclamation Act of 1902 (32 Stat. 388) to any right, under State law, claimed by the United States to the beneficial diversion, storage, distribution, or consumptive use of water. Our bill would provide that whenever the Federal Government claims such a right under the laws of any State, it must play the game by the rules, and initiate and perfect such right in accord with the procedure established by the laws of that State. The United States, it seems clear to me, should follow the same steps required of others, if it wishes to compete for rights established under State appropriation procedures.

Such a provision would not deny the central government any power it now has to acquire water rights other than by State law.. It would apply only when the United States claims an appropriative right under State law. If that is the basis of its claim, rather than, for example, when proceeding by condemnation, should not the Federal Government conform to the administrative procedure of the State for its establishment of such a right? We would then avoid such a regrettable situation as arose in *United States* v. *Fallbrook Public Utility District* (165 F. Supp. 806, (S.D. Cal. 1958)), protracted litigation which I am now informed may be susceptible of satisfactory solution. In that case, the judge describes the U.S. contention on this point as follows (p. 829):

> That California's statutory application and permit procedures for the acquisition of an appropriative water right are police regulations which are inapplicable to the United States, with the result that, even if all other water users must comply with such procedures in order to acquire a valid appropriative right, the United States can obtain the right merely by taking and using the water.

I am told that the Justice Department may now be adopting, in that case, a position consistent with the principle I am here proposing. In any event, the approval of our legislation would bring to an end this kind of dispute.

COMPENSABILITY AND ORDERLY PROCEDURE

Finally, Mr. President, there is a fourth matter requiring the Congress' immediate attention. What I propose here is only that which the Bill of Rights indicates justice requires. The fifth amendment to the United States Constitution provides, among other things, that:

> No person shall * * * be deprived of * * * property, without due process of law.

This should mean that one shall be compensated by the Federal Government for the value of property of which he is deprived by his Government's water project activity, in precisely the same fashion as when the Government takes his property for a post office site. It also should mean that, in following due process, the Government should initiate judicial proceedings before implementing its plan to acquire or impair said property and in such proceedings there should be fixed the extent of compensation. Those constitutional provisions are clear and fair, but, unhappily, they have not always been followed in water rights matters.

First, there has developed, under case law, the theory of a navigational servitude which is to the effect that all navigable waterways, broadly defined to include most of our major streams and their tributaries, are subject to preeminent Federal control under the commerce clause of the Constitution (*United States* v. *Twin City Power Co.*, 350 U.S. 222 (1956)). I do not quarrel with that power of control, but I do differ with some extensions of the navigation servitude argument where they result in vested water rights being noncompensable when the servitude destroys their value. This argument was made by the United States but rejected in a reclamation project case because there the court found a congressional intent in the Reclamation Act to compensate deprived owners of water rights, regardless of what the power might be to do otherwise (*United States* v. *Gerlach Live Stock Co.*, 339 U.S. 725 (1950)).

It has also been held that section 27 of the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063) requires compensation by a Federal licensee acting under that act if said licensee interferes with water rights vested under State law (*Federal Power Commission* v. *Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.* (347 U.S. 239); *Henry Ford & Son, Inc.* v. *Little Falls Fibre Co.*, 280 U.S. 369 (1930)).

It has, however, been held that when the United States wreaks similar damage under navigation and flood control projects it need not pay compensation (*United States* v. *Willow River Power Co.*, 324 U.S. 499 (1945)). The result is that the Federal Government may proceed with impunity in impairing vested water rights in the course of nonreclamation or nonpower oriented projects on broadly defined navigable waters, even though such rights would be compensable by State-law standards (*United States* v. *Twin City Power Co.*, supra, pp. 227–228).

I propose we change this situation by providing that when either the United States, or any entity acting under its authority, takes, in any degree, in the course of any project in regard to navigable or nonnavigable waters, a state-protected water right, just compensation must be paid. It is only fair that the public, generally, through the Federal Treasury, rather than just the aggrieved water rights owner, bear the cost of the particular project, presumably constructed in the interest of all the people. So it is with post office sites, so it should be with water projects. There is no reason for a difference between the incidence of any Federal power over our waters and any other Federal power under the Constitution.

But that is only half of this particular problem. Unfortunately, even in instances where compensation by the United States is already required, as for example, in regard to the same reclamation project involved in the Gerlach case, the Justice Department has claimed the right to seize the affected water unilaterally, as by closure of a river, and put the deprived owners of affected vested water rights to the remedy of a suit in the court of claims. This is known as forcing resort to proceedings in inverse condemnation. As a lawyer, I judge this to be a deplorable tactic. The bill we introduce today should prevent such tactics in the future.

Compensation and orderly procedure should remove a great percentage of the friction in disputes between the Federal Government and those holding water rights recognized under State law. Yet the constitutional powers of the Federal Government would not be impaired. The relative cost of acquiring such rights would be small compared to the total cost of such projects, though just compensation is immensely important to the individuals and non-Federal public agencies involved.

I believe this bill goes a long way toward solving many of the existing or potential problems in the matter of Federal-State water rights. This bill is adapted from my S. 2636, 87th Congress, which, in turn, resulted from the very beneficial exploratory hearings on this subject held by the Senate Interior Committee in 1961. When I introduced that bill I said that I was introducing it for study as an initial step toward solving some of the many problems in this complex field. The verbiage of the pending bill is the result of extensive study and recommendations by many eminent water lawyers. It carries the endorsement of the Western Water Law Symposium conferees at the recent meeting of the National District Attorney's Association. I hope it will be uniformly supported by all those interested in this important field, even though it does not purport to solve all problems in this field.

Section 1 carries the thrust of the bill and, I believe, accomplishes all four of the proposals I have discussed here today. Paragraph 1 repeals, in effect, the definition of "public lands" which was enunciated in the Pelton Dam decision. It protects water rights assumed to be validly based on State appropriation and riparian doctrines in accord with the Desert Land Act and the interpretation in the Beaver Portland Cement Co. case.

Paragraph 2 enunciates the policy of preference for consumptive uses as against nonconsumptive uses, west of the 98th meridian.

Paragraph 3 provides that if the United States claims a water right under State law, it must perfect it under State law.

Paragraph 4 assures compensation for the taking of vested water rights. The word "vested" does not necessarily mean presently perfected rights—State law will, as it should, control in each case. This paragraph also requires affirmative judicial action by the United States. It should prevent acts of seizure by the Federal Government.

Section 2 of the bill includes several saving provisions for the protection of both the Federal interests and State and individual interests in particular circumstances. Paragraph 1 of section 2 provides that if the United States is under statutory limitation to acquiring water rights under State law, such limitation continues in effect. Paragraph 2 preserves the effect of treaties. Paragraph 3 preserves the effect of compacts, adjudicated matters, Indian rights, existing rights of others than the United States, accomplished Federal rights for governmental purposes, and later-acquired Federal rights authorized by an act of Congress or State law.

Different from S. 2636, the present bill does not include a provision by which the United States could be unwillingly joined in water litigation between two or more States. Under present law, it is necessary for the Attorney General to intervene on behalf of the United States if the Federal Government is to be bound by such suits. I believe that section 3 of my former bill was a good provision but some objections to it have been raised and, in order to present a bill suited for wide support, I have not included such a waiver of sovereign immunity.

Another difference in this new bill is that we make it clear that in protecting vested water rights we are protecting the beneficial diversion or storage of water, as well as truly consumptive uses.

Other changes from former S. 2636 are minor.

Mr. President, I think this bill we introduce today provides a vehicle for accomplishing many of the aims sought by the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources, on which I was privileged to serve as vice chairman. At page 65 of our report we asked for "clarification of the Federal position in connection with water rights." I think this bill would go a long way toward providing a sound basis for continued Federal, State, local, and individual water uses. It would also assure a more healthy climate of mutual confidence, respect, and cooperation in which our Federal Government and State and other interests can join in mutual water planning and development for the future.

This bill deserves the wholehearted support of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain at the desk through next Wednesday, and I hope that we may be able to obtain coauthorship from Senators on both sides of the aisle.

I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the table through next Wednesday, as requested.

The bill (S. 1275) to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. Moss), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (1) The withdrawal or reservation of surveyed or unsurveyed public lands, heretofore or hereafter made, shall not affect any right to the use of water acquired pursuant to State law either before or after the establishment of such withdrawal or reservation.

(2) The provisions of section 1(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (Act of December 22, 1944, 58 Stat. 888–89, as amended, 33 U.S.C. sec. 701–1 (1958)) shall apply to all works hereafter constructed by or under the authority of the United States with respect to waters arising within States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian.

(3) Any right claimed by the United States to the beneficial diversion, storage, distribution, or consumptive use of water under the laws of any State shall be initiated and perfected in accordance with the procedure established by the laws of that State.

(4) No vested right to the beneficial diversion, storage, or consumptive use of any waters, navigable or nonnavigable, which is recognized by the laws of the State or States in which such waters are diverted or used as compensable if taken by or under the authority of the State, shall be taken by or under authority of the United States without compensation; and where such rights are acquired otherwise than by agreement with the owner, they shall be taken by proceedings in eminent domain under the laws of the United States or of the State or States affected.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as—(1) Modifying or repealing any provision of any existing Act of Congress requiring that rights of the United States to the use of water be acquired pursuant to State law; (2) Permitting appropriations of water under State law which interfere with the provisions of international treaties of the United States; or (3) Affecting, impairing, diminishing, subordinating or enlarging (a) the rights of the United States or any State to waters under any interstate compact or exising judicial decree, (b) any obligations of the United States to Indians or Indian tribes, or any claim or right owned or held by or for Indians or Indian tribes, (c) any water right heretofore acquired by others than the United States under Federal or State law, (d) any right to any quantity of water used for governmental purposes or programs of the United States at any time prior to the effective date of this Act; or (e) any right of the United States to use water which is hereafter lawfully initiated in the exercise of the express or necessarily implied authority of any present or future Act of Congress or State law when such right is initiated prior to the acquisition by others of any right to use water pursuant to State law.

TO AMEND FURTHER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961, AS AMENDED, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the President and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1276) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1963".

PART I

Chapter 1—Policy

SEC. 101. Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is hereby redesignated "Policy" and section 101, which relates to short title, is hereby deleted.

Chapter 2—Development assistance

Title II—Development grants and technical cooperation

SEC. 102. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development grants and technical cooperation, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 212, which relates to authorization, strike out "1963" and "$300,000,000" and substitute "1964" and $257,000,000", respectively.

(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) strike out "use, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, funds made available for the purposes of section 211 for" and substitute the word "furnish".

(2) In subsection (b) strike out "to use" and "foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act, for purposes of subsection (a) of this section and for" and substitute "to furnish" before the word "assistance".

(3) Add the following new subsections (c) and (d):

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, such amounts as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the purposes of this section, which amounts shall remain available until expended."

"(d) The President is authorized to use, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act, for purposes of this section."

Title III—Investment guaranties

SEC. 103. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows.

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) In the first sentence after "wholly owned" insert "(determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the parent corporation)".

(2) In paragraph (1) strike out "$1,300,000,000" in the proviso and substitute "$2,500,000,000".

(3) In paragraph (2) strike out "$180,000,000" in the third proviso and substitute "$300,000,000".

(4) In paragraph (2) strike out "1964" in the fourth proviso and substitute "1965".

(b) Amend section 222(a), which relates to general provisions, by striking out "section 221(b)" and substituting "sections 221(b) and 224".

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by striking out "section 221(b)" in both places it appears and substituting "sections 221(b) and 224".

(d) Amend section 222(d), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

"(d) Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under sections 221(b) and 224 of this part, sections 202(b) and 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(b)(3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (exclusive of informational media guaranties), shall be paid first out of fees referred to in section 222(b) as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds, if any, realized from the sale of currencies or other assets acquired in connection with any payments made to discharge liabilities under such guaranties as long as such funds are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds heretofore appropriated for the purpose of discharging liabilities under the aforementioned guaranties, and thereafter out of funds realized from the sale of notes issued under section 413(b)(4)(F) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(c)(2) of the Economic Corporation Act of 1948, as amended, and finally out of funds hereafter made available pursuant to section 222(f)."

(e) Amend section 222(e), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

"(e) All guaranties issued prior to July 1, 1956, all guaranties issued under sections 202(b) and 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and all guaranties heretofore or hereafter issued pursuant to this title shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States of America. Funds heretofore obligated under the aforementioned guaranties (exclusive of informational media guaranties) together with the other funds made available for the purposes of this title shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims in accordance with section 222(d) of this part."

(f) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b) strike out "$60,000,000" and substitute "$150,000,000".

(2) Strike out subsection (c).

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

SEC. 104. Title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 251, which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) In subsection (e) strike out "economical" and substitute "economically".

(2) In subsection (f) strike out "Agency for International Development" and substitute "agency primarily responsible for administering part I".

(b) Amend section 252, which relates to authorization, as follows:

(1) Insert the following after the words "available until expended": ": *Provided,* That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year. The funds appropriated pursuant to this section".

(2) Strike out "and which" before ", except for".

(3) Insert following "1963" the second time it appears the words "and not to exceed $100,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in fiscal year 1964".

Chapter 3—International organizations and programs

SEC. 105. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended by striking out "1963" and "$148,900,000" and substituting "1964" and "$136,050,000", respectively.

Chapter 4—Supporting assistance

SEC. 106. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out "1963" and "$415,000,000" and substituting "1964" and "$435,000,000", respectively.

Chapter 5—Contingency fund

SEC. 107. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended by striking out "1963" and substituting "1964".

PART II

Chapter 1—Policy

SEC. 201. Chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is hereby redesignated "Policy" and section 501, which relates to short title, is hereby deleted.

SEC. 202. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 504(a), which relates to authorization, strike out "the fiscal years 1962 and 1963" and "$1,700,000,000 for each such fiscal year, which sums" and substitute "fiscal year 1964" and "$1,405,000,000, which", respectively.

(b) In section 510(a), which relates to special authority, strike out "1963" in the first and second sentences and substitute "1964".

PART III

Chapter 1—General provisions

SEC. 301. Section 611(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended by striking out "circular A-47 of the Bureau of the Budget" and substituting "the Memorandum of the President dated May 15, 1962".

Chapter 2—Administrative provisions

SEC. 302. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)(2) strike out "two" and substitute "one".

(2) In subsection (a)(3) strike out "nine" and substitute "ten".

(3) In subsection (b) strike out "paragraphs (2) and" and substitute "paragraph".

(b) Amend section 622(b), which relates to experts, consultants, and retired officers, as follows:

(1) Strike out the entire first sentence.

(2) In the second sentence strike out "Nor shall such service" and substitute "Service of an individual as an expert or consultant under subsection (a) of this section shall not".

(c) In section 631, which relates to missions and staffs abroad, add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) The President may appoint any United States citizen who is not an employee of the United States Government or may assign any United States citizen who is a United States Government employee to serve as Chairman of the Development Assistance Committee or any successor Committee thereto of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development upon election thereto by members of said Committee, and, in his discretion, may terminate such appointment or assignment, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Such person may receive such compensation and allowances as are authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, not to exceed those authorized for a chief of mission, class 2, within the meaning of said Act, as the President may determine. Such person may also, in the President's discretion, receive any other benefits and perquisites available under this Act to chiefs of special missions or staffs outside the United States established under this section."

(d) Amend section 635, which relates to general authorities, by adding the following new subsection (k):

"(k) Any cost-type contract or agreement (including grants) entered into with a university, college, or other educational institution for the purpose of carrying out programs authorized by part I may provide for the payment of the reimbursable indirect costs of said university, college, or other educational institution on the basis of predetermined fixed-percentage rates applied to the total, or an element thereof, of the reimbursable direct costs incurred."

(e) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out "1963" and "$53,000,000" and substituting "1964" and "$57,250,000", respectively.

Chapter 3—Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 303. Section 644(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to definition of defense services, is amended by inserting "including orientation" after "training" the first time it appears.

SEC. 304. Section 645 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to unexpended balances, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 645. UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Unexpended balances of funds made available pursuant to this Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or Public Law 86-735 are hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated, and may at any time be consolidated, and, in addition, may be consolidated with appropriations made available for the same general purposes under the authority of this Act."

PART IV—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 401. The Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes (Public Law 86-735, 22 U.S.C. 1942 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(a) In section 2 strike out "$500,000,000" and substitute "$700,000,000".

(b) Insert following the enacting clause "That this Act may be cited as 'the Latin American Development and Chilean Reconstruction Act' ".

SEC. 402. Section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-794, approved October 11, 1962) is amended as follows:

(a) Insert "(a)" before the words "The President shall".

(b) Add the following new subsection:

"(b) The President may extend the benefits of trade agreement concessions made by the United States to products, whether imported directly or indirectly, of a country or area within the purview of subsection (a), when he determines that such treatment would be important to the national interest and would promote the independence of such country or area from domination or control by international communism, and reports this determination and the reasons therefor to the Congress."

A METRIC SYSTEM OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, one of the most striking paradoxes in this modern aerospace age is our continued adherence to an antediluvian system of weights and measures. The United States, with other English-speaking countries stubbornly clings to a vestigial organ of inches and pounds which came into being with the birth of this Nation, and over the dedicated opposition of Thomas Jefferson who at least was able to give us a sensible currency system based on the tens of the metric system.

More incomprehensible is the fact that we cannot even meet with the British on common ground in this matter. Our gallon is not the British gallon; our ton is not the British ton, and there is little likelihood that these fraternal twins will ever be transformed into identical ones.

The most persuasive argument for the adoption of a metric system of weights and measures is that it would translate an antiquated system into one that is readily understandable, easy to work, and used by most of the nations and peoples of the world. It is a simple system based upon multiples of 10. Its adoption would facilitate both our domestic and our international commerce. It would provide us with a uniform system of standard measurements. And many segments of our society use the metric approach and have for many years, notably the medical and pharmaceutical professions, the military, and as I mentioned before, the financial world.

At the very least, we should be willing to conduct a comprehensive study to determine the feasibility of changing over to the metric system. The bill I am sponsoring, which is identical to that introduced in the House by the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER of California, would authorize the National Bureau of Standards to conduct a program of investigation, research and survey to determine whether the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures by the United States would be practical. As such, I consider it a worthwhile and eminently desirable endeavor.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this bill printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1278) to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National Bureau of Standards (hereinafter referred to as the "Bureau"), in the exercise of its functions under the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 271 and the following), and other provisions of law, shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the desirability and practicability of the adoption in the United States of the metric system of weights and measures.

SEC. 2. In the conduct of the program described in the first section of this Act, the Bureau may—

(1) conduct extensive comparative studies of the standards of weights and measures used in scientific, engineering, manufacturing, and commercial areas and in educational institutions, and the advantages of each in its respective field;

(2) cooperate with other governmental agencies and private organizations in determining the economic advantages of a general change to the metric system in the United States or of a change to such system in specific fields;

(3) cooperate with foreign governments in determining the advantages in international trade and commerce, and in military and other areas of international relations, to be derived from a universal standardized system of weights and measures; and

(4) investigate the attitudes of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government and of the several States with respect to possible practical difficulties which might be encountered in accomplishing a change in the system of weights and measures for use generally or in specific fields or areas in the United States.

SEC. 3. The Bureau shall submit to the Secretary of Commerce for transmission to the Congress annual reports, and within three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, a full and complete report of the findings made in the conduct of the program described in the first section of this Act, together with such recommendations as it considers to be appropriate and in the best interests of the economic development and national security of the United States.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO FILE REPORT ON SENATE BILL 1 DURING RECESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 1, the youth employment bill, may be filed tomorrow, despite the fact that the Senate will be in recess. I have cleared this matter with the ranking Republican member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE WILDERNESS BILL—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for filing minority views on Senate bill 4, the wilderness bill, be extended to midnight on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 138), to redesignate Big Hole Battlefield National Monument and revise boundaries, the name of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF HEAD-OF-HOUSEHOLD BENEFITS TO CERTAIN WIDOWS AND WIDOWERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] may be entered as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 35) to extend head-of-household benefits to certain widows and widowers which I introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOANS WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON REAL ESTATE BY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 28, 1963, the name of Mr. CASE was added as an additional cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 118) concerning loans without discriminatory provisions, on real estate by financial institutions, submitted by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and other Senators) on March 28, 1963.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON S. 63, AND S. 1057, PUBLIC DEFENDER BILLS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given that the public hearing scheduled for 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, April 9, 10, and 11, 1963, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on S. 63, a bill to provide for representation of indigent defendants, and S. 1057, a bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States, has been postponed until further notice.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON STATE OF DOMESTIC MINERALS INDUSTRY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am certain that all Members of Congress and indeed all Americans are aware of the fundamental importance of minerals to our Nation's security and economic development. The essentiality of adequate supplies of metals and mineral fuels, such as oil, gas, and coal to our civilization is so self-evident as to be axiomatic.

Yet for a number of years past our domestic mining industry has been deteriorating, according to consistent reports received by the Senate Interior Committee. More and more, for current needs we are depending upon foreign sources and ocean-borne transportation of materials without which we could not defend ourselves or grow as a nation.

In an effort to get the facts and find ways of remedying this situation, the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Interior Committee is scheduling hearings, beginning April 9, on the state of our domestic minerals industry. The subcommittee has invited Secretary Udall to appear before it as the first witness and present the situation with his recommendations for remedial action by the Government where any such action is indicated.

As chairman of the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee, I wish to invite Members of the Senate who have special interest in or special knowledge of our domestic mining industry to meet with us and take part in our seeking to get the facts and to find solutions for the problems.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

Address entitled "American Agriculture in a Changing World," delivered by Senator McGOVERN before the 29th Annual Convention of the Independent Bankers Association, at New Orleans, La., on March 26, 1963.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the opposition to the foreign aid program is placing strong emphasis on weakness, waste, and errors in its administration, and in this way serves an important function which I think will result eventually in a stronger, more effective program. But while we focus on this emphasis, we should not minimize or ignore the substantial impact that the foreign aid program has on our domestic economy in terms of the jobs, the industry, and the business development here in the United States and to be developed as these newly developing nations become more developed. Upstate New York has a very large stake in this program and generally in the development of American trade abroad, and the extent of the impact of this program on a particular upstate county has been the subject of a research project since last year. The project is being conducted by the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University, under a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, and will be completed in June. The project is directed by Gerard J. Mangone. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the interim report of the project, entitled "The Department of State and Onondaga County: American Foreign Policy at the Grassroots," issued in March 1963.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND ONONDAGA COUNTY: AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AT THE GRASS ROOTS

(An interim report to the Rockefeller Foundation, March 1963—a research project directed by Gerard J. Mangone)

FOREIGN RELATIONS AND THE CITIZEN

The hypothesis of this study of foreign policy at the Maxwell Graduate School of Syracuse University is that the philosophy, programs, and conduct of American foreign relations impinge more profoundly upon the daily lives of U.S. citizens than they realize. It is our feeling that the daily activities of the Department of State in policy formulation and its implementation, both at Washington and abroad, touch the immediate interests of the community in employment, prices, profits, health, housing, travel, recreation, and education.

The purpose of the Maxwell study is to examine one facet of foreign policy rarely treated in detail; namely, the impact of foreign policy on one county. The study is attempting to describe in concrete terms some of the effects of America's defensive stature and outreach abroad upon business and the social patterns of a community. It is to be illustrated by examples of how national responses to world events have brought about changes in Onondaga County and its urban centers of Syracuse.

The study is intended to make both the general American public and the attentive elite of policy leaders aware of the particular impact of American foreign policy at the local level, so that a popular criticism of U.S. foreign policy can be more intelligent, responsible, and dynamic. World plans and national programs ought to be regularly reviewed for their effect upon a man's daily life.

ONONDAGA COUNTY: A TYPICAL COMMUNITY?

A "typical" American community is a delightful abstraction, but impossible to denote. Recognizing this difficulty, however, we have selected Syracuse and Onondaga County as a good area for analyzing the impact of foreign policy. Its diverse, yet fairly well-balanced economy presents many opportunities for tracing the effect of foreign policy upon business, trade, commerce, finance, and agriculture. Its population, too, by size, variety of occupations, and ethnic origins roughly approximates national averages for the so-called American community.

In 1960 Onondaga County had a population of 432,028 in the area of 792 square miles, making it the 74th largest county in the United States by population. The county population grew by almost 25 percent in the decade from 1950 to 1960, with the chief increase taking place in the suburbs of the principal city, Syracuse.

The median age of the population is 30 years, half a year older than the U.S. median. The 106,065 families in the county have a median income of $6,691, somewhat higher than the United States as a whole. Foreign born make up 7.3 percent of the population, while 20.1 percent of the residents had one or both parents born abroad.

Syracuse is a hub of political, economic, and social activities for this part of New York State. Offices of the city, county, State, and Federal Government are located within its limits. Its location at the intersection of major interstate highways, access to main railway lines, possession of an excellent airport, and proximity to Lake Erie and the St. Lawrence Seaway make Syracuse a natural administration and distribution point for central New York, so that much wholesale and retail trade flows through Syracuse. Many national companies maintain regional offices in Syracuse to be in contact with local business firms. Several of the largest manufacturers in the Syracuse area are General Electric, Carrier Corp., Bristol Laboratories, New Process Gear Co., of Chrysler Corp., and Solvay Process Division of Allied Chemical Corp. Many other smaller and equally well-known manufacturers are located in the city and suburbs, including some with national or international outlets.

Syracuse is also the home of several institutions of higher education, including Syracuse University, LeMoyne College, the New York Upstate Medical Center, the State College of Forestry, and Onondaga Community College.

Onondaga County contains 252,000 acres devoted to agriculture. Dairy farms predominate, with a number of truck gardens and orchards. Mining is also represented in Onondaga County, with principal products including lime, salt, cement, crushed stone, sand and gravel, and clay.

Realistically no study can hope to show all of the effects of foreign policy upon a people. For example, the pride or anger that an American citizen feels about a foreign economic assistance program is very difficult to quantify, although it certainly exists. Personal insecurity over nuclear weapons testing or anxieties for people or property in Cuba or the Congo, in Berlin or Vietnam cannot truly be measured. Patriotism has its ups and downs, closely tied to foreign policy decisions, but it would be very tricky to compare one man's love of country with another's.

We have selected, however, aspects of community life that are clearly affected by decisions in Washington; namely, business activity, education, immigration, and international exchange.

BUSINESS AND FOREIGN POLICY: BROTHERS IN ECONOMIC GROWTH

To show how American foreign policy influences a local economy, we are taking into account the economic structure of Onondaga County and illustrating some changes in the last decade.

The value added by manufacture in Onondaga County in 1958 was about $586 million. Since World War II the structure of manufacturing in the county has shifted toward the electrical and nonelectrical machinery and chemical industries. While the number employed in manufacturing has remained roughly constant, fewer employees work in the production line and more have white-collar positions.

In 1958 Onondaga County had a labor force of 169,537, of which 4.2 percent were unemployed. Roughly one-third were employed in manufacturing, followed by those in wholesale and retail trade. Substantial numbers were also employed in transportation, communications, public utilities, educational services, construction, finance, insurance, real estate, public administration, and agriculture. The numbers employed in manufacturing and transportation, communications, and public utilities have remained about constant during the past decade, while the number in agriculture has declined.

The greatest increases in employment in Onondaga County have come in services, construction, education, and Government, which is similar to the national American pattern.

NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

The impact of America's defense posture on Onondaga County's economy has been very great. Over $220 million in military prime contracts were awarded to county firms in 1960. One of the most rapidly growing industries in the Syracuse area has been the manufacture of electrical machinery, in part due to its receipt of a substantial share of defense contracts awarded to the county. The value added by manufactures in electrical machinery increased from $51,686,000 in 1947 to $230,294,000 in 1958. National corporations, spurred on by military contracts, have added or developed subsidiary firms in Onondaga County, while some existing local firms have taken on new products to supply defense goods and services.

Some of the principal defense products manufactured in Onondaga County have included ammunition, lighting fixtures, blowers, exhaust and ventilating fans, air conditioning units, fabricated pipe and pipe fittings, radar and related detection apparatus, communication equipment, guided missile parts and auxiliary equipment, and laboratory, scientific and engineering instruments.

Many prime contracts for defense have been subcontracted, both because of regulations set forth by Congress designed to stimulate small business and because large companies often lack the specialized skills or equipment to complete a complicated defense mechanism alone. When a local firm received a contract for a component of the Minuteman missile, for example, it subcontracted a portion of the work to another local firm which could provide some highly technical equipment. Not all subcontracts have remained within the county, but, on the other hand, prime contracts awarded elsewhere have been subcontracted to firms in Onondaga County. One local manufacturer received several contracts from west coast firms.

Money coming into the county from defense contracts may pass through many hands before leaving the community. Local defense contractors buy many needed supplies and services from local businesses. General Electric, a large producer of highly technical defense equipment, has made purchases from over 800 local firms, and each of these in turn has bought from other local businesses.

Nearly all of the labor supply employed in defense work lives within Onondaga County. Roughly 90 percent of the employees of General Electric live within the county, while the rest reside close by and patronize businesses within the Syracuse area. A local resident assisting on some small part of the Gemini space capsule buys groceries, has his car repaired, attends a local movie, pays property taxes, and spends his paycheck for many other goods and services within the community.

Military prime contracts have also been awarded for research and development as well as for the purchases of hardware, construction, and miscellaneous services. Some of the contracts for research and development have been awarded to educational institutions. For example, during the fiscal year 1962 the Syracuse University Research Institute received $2,527,644 from the Department of Defense for research. It is estimated that over 90 percent of this money remains in the county on the first round, coming to local residents as wages and salaries or payment for goods and services rendered.

ARMED FORCES IN ONONDAGA COUNTY

Military units stationed within the county have been authorized to purchase much of their day-to-day need of supplies and services locally, bringing profits to county businessmen. Military and civilian personnel working for the Armed Forces within Onondaga County have been paid out of Federal funds and have spent their pay locally. In 1962 the 26th Air Division at Hancock Field had an annual payroll of about $9.5 million. Reserve and National Guard units also have brought money into the county through the procurement of supplies locally, construction of facilities, employment of maintenance personnel and watchmen, and payment to Regular and Reserve military personnel.

Certain secondary benefits have accrued from the presence of military installations in Onondaga County. For example, the extension of the runways at Hancock Field to accommodate jet airplanes, justified as a military necessity and paid for by Federal expenditures, has also benefited civilian use of the airport.

FOREIGN MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The foreign military assistance channeled through the Department of Defense has added to the economic impact of national security policy on the county. Orders for military supplies under this type of foreign assistance are generally placed with the individual branches of the American Armed Forces for procurement. A second type of foreign military assistance funds are appropriated directly to the President and are handled through the Agency for International Development. These also have resulted in contracts to local firms.

VETERANS

A legacy from the past defense policies is the presence of many military veterans in the county. There are roughly 60,000 veterans of the Spanish-American War, both World Wars, the Korean war, and peacetime campaigns in Onondaga County. Our national responsibility to those who have had to make direct sacrifices to maintain national security has brought an estimated $7.5 to $10 million in direct payments to veterans annually within the county, in addition to other indirect benefits. Over 700 people have been employed in veterans facilities locally, such as the Veterans' Administration hospital, which has an annual payroll of $4.4 million. Construction of veterans facilities has brought additional funds to the county.

TRADE AND ECONOMIC AID POLICY

Onondaga County firms have carried on a modest but healthy trade with many foreign countries. During 1960, Onondaga County's direct exports abroad mounted to more than $35.4 million and included air conditioning equipment, drycleaning and laundry equipment, vacuum cleaners, centrifugal blowers and exhausters, oil field machinery and equipment, chemicals, drugs, wiring devices, electronic equipment, radio and television transmitters and receivers, car and truck transmissions, and automotive lighting equipment.

Contracts totaling $1.4 million for economic aid, moreover, were awarded to Onondaga County firms through the Agency for International Development and it predecessor, the International Cooperation Administration, during the years 1954 to 1961. The principal products in these agreements included drugs, air conditioning equipment, rice and coffee hullers, and typewriters.

Foreign trade and economic aid have also had an indirect impact on local business through products which were components of finished goods that were eventually exported. Thus, a local firm making automotive lighting equipment has fulfilled an order for a truck manufacturer which in turn exported the trucks under a foreign aid agreement.

TARIFFS, IMPORTS, AND LOCAL BUSINESS

Several important products manufactured in Onondaga County have been protected by American tariffs. In some cases, nevertheless, the tariff rates have not been sufficient to prevent extensive penetration of domestic markets by foreign producers. For example, the chinaware industry in Onondaga County has been protected by a 51 percent ad valorem duty against imports of fine china, but finds this rate insufficient to protect its markets from displacement by inexpensive imports from Japan, Great Britain, and Germany.

Despite new investment, increased efficiency, and development of new product design, both employment and production in the industry have declined in the past decade.

The reduction of American tariff rates and the increased efficiency of postwar production have changed marketing conditions. Various countermeasures have been taken by local firms to compete for both domestic and international markets. For example, one Syracuse plant has invested in the newest machinery available, and it can now compete successfully with foreign firms having a lower per unit labor cost of production. Another firm has built up a foreign subsidiary to compete on international markets and, if necessary, on domestic markets as well. Since this particular product is not widely used in the United States, production abroad has had little influence on local employment. Another firm, driven off the international markets by inexpensive substitutes, has taken on a new line of production and has increased local employment and investment.

Since reciprocal tariff rates are only one consideration for an American firm seeking to develop new markets abroad, local firms have been rather reserved in their support of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which was heralded as a catalyst to better world trade. Local manufacturers mentioned quota systems, licensing restrictions, and dollar shortages in their marketing areas abroad as obstacles as great or greater than tariff barriers in developing their export trade.

Imports of raw materials are very important to local manufacturing. These imports have included manganese, chromite, nickel, cobalt, tungsten, graphite, rubber, industrial diamonds, iodine, mercury, quinidine, sisal, and jute. Some imports come to the county by an indirect route, first being transformed into alloys or other special products before purchase by local manufacturers.

Imports also have a very direct impact on business and consumers after they pass through wholesale and retail distributors. Many of these imports, such as bananas or coffee, are so commonplace that they are rarely thought of as foreign. A survey of local machine tool wholesalers, liquor distributors, retail department stores, and automobile dealers revealed that an average of 5 percent of their merchandise originated abroad. These foreign goods offer the consumer a wider choice of commodities than domestic suppliers provide. Substantial savings can be obtained by the consumer on some goods that cannot be produced domestically at comparable prices. However, tariff levels or prices seem less important to the flow of imports to Onondaga County than consumer demand. A decided preference for American goods because of their durability, their American styling, or the availability of service exists, and even the lower prices of foreign goods cannot offset these advantages.

IMMIGRATION: FOREIGN POLICY AND NEW NEIGHBORS

The determination of the number and types of immigrants to be accepted into a state is an important aspect of national foreign policy. This has been especially true of the United States which has received so many millions of people from other lands in the last two centuries. Not only is the overall level of immigration set by acts of Congress, but also the pattern of the immigrant population according to ethnic origin.

The flow of new residents from abroad to a community, determined in part by national policy, has a distinct impact on that community in residential housing and neighborhood character, skills and employment, social clubs and activities, perhaps even in crime rates or welfare benefits.

The largest group of foreign born and native born of foreign or mixed parentage in 1960 was the 29,554 Italians, followed in descending order by Canadians, Germans, Poles, English, Irish, Russians, Austrians, and Asians. Immigration to Onondaga County has come in waves, beginning with the English, Irish, and Germans, later followed by the Italians and more recently by East Europeans, predominantly Poles and Russians. The last available census of aliens registered in Onondaga County in 1958 reflected both the existing immigration laws and the special pressures from certain foreign groups to enter the United States.

The Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952, like previous statutes since 1924, set a rather restrictive policy on immigration into the United States. Many of the immigrants to Onondaga County were initially blocked by the quota system, but they have been able to come by other legislation, such as the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, or by Presidential order, such as the Hungarian "parolees." Others have avoided the quota system by marrying American citizens or obtained preferred status for immigration through critical skills.

Whereas the decision to admit immigrants or refugees is a matter of national policy, a large burden of integrating them into the American way of life falls on the community. For example, about 38,000 Hungarian refugees were admitted into the United States during 1956 and 1957. Approximately 165 of them came to Onondaga County. These newcomers arrived with little clothing or money, in need of housing and employment, and often with no knowledge of English. To the community fell the task of filling these immediate needs.

Policy decisions reflected in immigration legislation have many effects on a community. For instance, each immigrant is required to have a sponsor who guarantees that the new arrival will not become a public charge. In Syracuse, such organizations as the Syracuse Area Council of Churches, Catholic Charities, and the Jewish Family Service, who often take upon themselves the responsibility for the welfare and success of immigrants. One of these organizations has indicated that it cost about $1,000 to resettle each Hungarian refugee it handled in the community.

Other positive effects of immigration policy have been the economic skills which the immigrants contributed to Onondaga County, their community interest, and their hard work. A random survey of immigrants to Onondaga County during the past decade disclosed that their average income was about $5,700 and that 80 percent of them owned their homes, were above the national average in both categories.

On the negative side, some immigrants have also increased the economic and social problems of the community through their clustering in one residential area, or by adding to the competition for employment, or even contributing to the difficulties of law enforcement. For example, a check of police records revealed that a number of the Hungarians who came to Onondaga County in 1957 had been arrested for various offenses, a few of them felonies.

FOREIGN POLICY AND ITS EFFECT UPON EDUCATION

The enlarged international responsibilities of the United States in world affairs, particularly in maintaining American national security, have had a considerable impact on higher education in Onondaga County. An increasing demand for people who can speak foreign languages, who know the history, culture, and problems of particular areas of the world, or who have skills vital to defense or the conduct of America's affairs abroad has caused the Federal Government to take an unparalleled interest in education.

The National Defense Education Act, for example, has created graduate fellowships and loan funds for students learning critical skills. In 1962 national defense loans made by LeMoyne College, Syracuse University, and the New York State College of Forestry to students in these institutions amounted to more than $319,000. Enlarged military manpower requirements, moreover, due to America's defense strategy in the present world have given Reserve officer training programs at universities a new importance. The Army and Air Force officer training programs at Syracuse University cost the Federal Government over $300,000 in 1960, a large part of which went to students and was spent in the county.

Men and women who have served in the U.S. Armed Forces often qualify for veterans' educational benefits. These mature students add to the growth of the universities with its concomitant economic and social impact upon the community.

Beginning with the decisions of Washington to assist underdeveloped nations, local educational institutions have been called upon to undertake specific programs for the Federal Government in foreign policy areas. These have included training of Peace Corps personnel for overseas duty, the teaching of management skills for officials from emerging nations for the Agency for International Development, and seminars for foreign specialists in radio and television sponsored by the Department of State. For example, the two training programs in Syracuse for the Peace Corps brought over $200,000 in contracts for educational facilities, staff, medical expenses, administration, and housing accommodations, all within the community. No less important was the influx of the Peace Corps volunteers to the community and the increased awareness of the local citizenry about American objectives abroad.

In response to America's growing foreign policy needs, many philanthropic foundations have come to support new and necessary programs and projects in local colleges and universities, enabling these to broaden and improve curriculums and to undertake research in crucial areas. An excellent illustration of this cooperation in Onondaga County is the new Master of International Public Administration program at the Maxwell School of Syracuse University. The training at Syracuse is to be financed with the assistance of the Ford Foundation, while overseas internships in U.S. Government agencies are to be supported by funds granted by the Department of State and originating from the sale of surplus commodities abroad under Public Law 480.

Clearly, foreign policy has a considerable impact on the patterns of education in America. Other less direct, but equally real effects of America's national response to a changing world are observable in Onondaga County. These include, for example, the development of new research interests, higher faculty pay, new courses in world events and foreign policy in high schools, and an increased awareness of the important role of foreign policy among faculty members at all levels of education.

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

An international education or exchange program, formulated in Washington or encouraged by Federal agencies, touches the local community in many ways. In addition to sharing skills with foreign visitors, the American citizen—in his home, his job, his school, or elsewhere—comes into direct contact with the ideas and values of a citizen from another country.

One man in Syracuse meeting one man from Tanganyika can have a personal exchange of opinions far more valuable than many books, movies, and other informational materials sent across 7,000 miles of land and water. American foreign policy goals include economic and social assistance to development in many foreign nations. Tens of thousands of students, businessmen, and government officials come to the United States each year to learn American techniques and skills. More than a thousand exchange visitors from over 70 countries have come to Onondaga County alone during 1962. These visitors have been sponsored by local businesses, educational institutions, hospitals, and community organizations.

About 675 participants from 38 countries have come to Syracuse to attend the International Management Development program at Syracuse University since 1951. This program is sponsored by the Agency for International Development in Washington, but the impact of the cross-cultural exchange is on Onondaga County.

Carrier International has brought more than 90 sales personnel and technicians from its offices, agencies, and customers around the world to its Syracuse plant in the past year for training and the interchange of ideas. More than 35 young doctors from various nations are serving their residencies in hospitals in Onandaga County, learning specialties badly needed in their home countries.

Another type of exchange has been organized in Onondaga County by the American Field Service. Twenty-six young high school students from 22 nations have been "adopted" by American families and attend secondary schools in the Syracuse area. Each school sponsoring a foreign student, as well as learning from a new friend from Ethiopia or the Philippines, can nominate American students to go abroad for the summer, perhaps to live with a family in Denmark or Japan.

Foreign visitor exchange programs, originating from foreign policy considerations in Washington, call forth a response from the local community. There are seven community organizations in Onondaga County involved in hosting or assisting foreign visitors, and this does not include the many church groups and social clubs which also help out. One, the World Affairs Council, has organized a home hospitality program serving short-term foreign visitors whose itineraries are planned by Washington. These visitors, whose professional purpose in coming to Syracuse might be to view American methods in the administration of secondary education or in the manufacture of electronic equipment, stay with local families and learn in the best intimacy American ideas about manners and politics.

International exchange is an integral part of foreign policy which requires a wholehearted community participation in order to be successful. The impressions which the foreign participants take home about the United States will be formed not on a grand scale, but through their close contacts with citizens in communities such as Onondaga County.

SUMMARY: FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This interim report is an indication of the progress made by the Maxwell research project toward relating national foreign policy decisions to the daily economic and social life of a county in the United States. The report so far has been based on information developed from 14 individual research topics, each concerned with the examination of a particular aspect of American foreign policy and Onondaga County.

The present research design calls for the integration of these studies into a final monograph. The information already available is to be supplemented with further data and interpretation, the whole work to be completed by the summer of 1963.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, our colleague, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], today delivered a most provocative speech before the American Society for Public Administration, which is holding its 1963 national conference here in Washington. His subject was congressional reform, and he discussed issues which should be of paramount interest to every Member of this body. I urge my colleagues to read this significant speech, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL TEXT OF REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE AT THE 1963 NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 4, 1963

Congress has been getting a black eye with the general public.

In part, this is because of the misdeeds of a few Members. Congress has, perhaps reluctantly, begun to do things about this and some of us would like to see a lot more done about giving the public facts about congressional travel and expenses, about contacts with regulatory and contracting agencies, about financial interests and sources of income and gifts. Putting things on the record is the best way to set the record straight and keep it straight.

In part, the decline of Congress results from a growing feeling that it is not adequately responsive to the needs of our Nation and in the minds of some, is not responsive at all.

As many of you know, I am a strong proponent of congressional reform. There are other Members of our legislative body who share this concern, but I venture that the man in Washington who needs congressional reform most and should want it most is President Kennedy.

He would be something less than human if he did not feel growing frustration as his messages citing urgent needs to the Congress are often met initially with indifference, delay, and subsequent discard. As a man who urges that we get the country moving, he must feel pangs of despair as Congress twiddles and twaddles over his proposals for a tax cut, for an education bill, for medical care for the aged, for more medical schools, and a whole host of bills. A clear indication of the degree of his frustration is the fact that two of his major bills of the last Congress have not even been revived this year—the Department of Urban Affairs and the reform of unemployment compensation standards, a subject dear to him as a Senator from Massachusetts.

Virtually none of the President's current proposals have even reached a committee vote, much less a vote in the House of Representatives or the Senate. I do not suggest that these bills are the best or only answers to our problems, but I submit that the President of the United States, elected by all the people, be he Democrat or Republican, is entitled to a vote, up or down, on his major proposals.

Here we are in the 4th month of the congressional session, approaching the Easter recess, which only a few years ago was considered the halfway mark in congressional sessions. The new Congress has passed only one public law of any consequence—an extension of the draft. Not 1 of the 12 major appropriation bills has cleared both Houses.

Last year, Congress dragged its weary way into October before adjourning. At the present rate, we will have to rush in order to conclude any substantial amount of business before we switch to a new calendar. And the longer it takes us to buckle down to work the longer it will take us to develop solutions.

Americans who are now suffering for lack of jobs, medical care or adequate education will suffer all the longer because Congress fails to face the issues. Delay leaves public officials and administrators at all levels of government, as well as private agencies, uncertain about how to prepare programs. Several have written me, for example, inquiring about the chances for action on the library construction features of the administration's omnibus education bill. They have plans to make and budgets to prepare and so it is understandable that they should like to know.

What can be done about revitalizing Congress?

Greater urbanization of Congress is inevitable in the long run. Recent Supreme Court decisions have opened the way for fairer representation for our urban and suburban areas. Three-fourths of our Nation's citizens now live in metropolitan areas of the country. They are entitled to an adequate voice in the State legislatures and in the national legislature. Surely we should be spending as much determining what the dangers of air pollution are as we do in finding how to develop more uses for more peanuts.

The Supreme Court's view that the Constitution guarantees "one person, one vote" means that in time the tide will turn in favor of increased metropolitan influence in Congress. But it may be many years before the Court decisions have an important effect on the actual operations of our political system.

Meanwhile, as a complementary effort, and in its own right, we must proceed with dispatch to modernization of Congress.

There has been no comprehensive attempt to update congressional procedures since the enactment of the LaFollette-Monroney Congressional Reorganization Act in 1946. Since then, our Nation has gained two new States, has increased its population by 50 million, and has moved into an entirely new range of international and national problems.

In the last Congress we were very slipshod in the way we got our work done, and much of it didn't get done at all. There is a real danger that the public will lose confidence in the ability of the Congress to meet the problems of the 20th century.

I have introduced, with Senator CLARK, a bill creating a Commission on Congressional Reorganization, modeled on the Hoover Commission, to study the present organization of the Congress and the functioning of the legislative process.

The bill provides for the appointment of a 12-man Commission—3 Members of the Senate, 3 Members of the House of Representatives, and 6 "individuals in private life who are specially qualified by training and experience to contribute to the solution of problems of public administration or the functioning of legislative bodies."

I do not believe that the procedures of Congress should be considered the exclusive concern of the Members of Congress. The electorate has a substantial stake in the functioning of the legislative procedures, and we should try to obtain the best possible counsel we can in bringing them up to date.

The bill would require the Commission to study at least 12 major problem areas. I should like to take a few minutes to discuss some of the many interesting suggestions which have been made for dealing with each of the problem areas. In putting them forward, I do not mean to imply that they are all my ideas or that I necessarily would support them as remedies for the problems cited. But, I do think it would be helpful to give attention to some techniques not now used for expediting the business of the Congress.

The first problem area listed in my bill is the scheduling of measures for consideration and action. Legislation is now very slow in coming to a vote during the early months of a session of Congress, with an inevitable end-of-session pileup. It makes no sense that a subcommittee chairman or a single member of a committee, chairman because of longevity, can block even consideration of an important bill.

Here are some of the suggested remedies: Setting a deadline for committee action on bills recommended by the executive branch and on nominations and treaties submitted by the executive branch; scheduling congressional committee meetings on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and sessions of the full House and Senate on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and, as necessary, on Saturdays; extending appropriations bills to cover 2-year periods so that Congress may concentrate on legislation in one session of Congress and on appropriation in the second session, with due provision for consideration of emergency legislation.

The second problem area is the structure, staffing, and operation of congressional committees. The role of seniority in appointment to committees and especially in selection of chairmen should be reexamined. Clarification and modification of committees' jurisdictions is overdue. Rules of procedure, particularly for convening investigations and handling of witnesses should be enacted to cover all committees. The role of the House Rules Committee should be reconsidered.

Third, the workload of the Congress and its committees: Private immigration and claims bills constitute a heavy drain on the time which Congress should be devoting to national issues. More of this responsibility could be placed in the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the courts. Of course, home rule for the District of Columbia would remove many municipal burdens from our national legislative body, to the benefit of both.

Fourth, congressional rules and floor procedures: Revision of Senate rule 22, the so-called cloture rule, would end the power of a small minority to prevent action by a majority. Adopting a Senate rule of germaneness affecting the offering of amendments as well as the right to use of the floor for irrelevant discussion would expedite Senate sessions. Joint hearings of House and Senate committees on topics of mutual interest would save time for Congressmen and witnesses. Electronic voting in both chambers could save time. Installation of a public address system in the Senate would facilitate its work and the public's understanding of what goes on.

Fifth, conflicts of interest of Members of the Congress: The prestige of and confidence in the Congress could be improved by adoption of legislation dealing with conflicts of interest of its Members and their relationship with Federal agencies.

Sixth, the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives: Lengthening the term of Members of the House would add prestige to service in the House and reduce the time now spent in campaigning. Another proposal which could be examined is the setting of a uniform primary date close to the general election, facilitating legislative action and reducing the time taken from legislative activities for campaign purposes.

Seventh, communications, travel, and other allowances of Members of the Congress: Regulations assuring prompt and effective reporting on legislative expenses, including individual and committee travel, should be considered.

Eighth, the financing of congressional election campaigns.

Ninth, the duties of Members of Congress incident to the appointment of postmasters and the making of appointments to military service academies and other Government agencies: Congress could eliminate politics by placing post office appointments exclusively under civil service and handling nominations to the various academies by civil service examinations.

Tenth, the legislative oversight of the administration of laws: We need a more systematic and effective method of seeing to it that the intent of Federal law is carried out.

Eleventh, the strengthening of the congressional power of the purse: We need to improve congressional functions of raising and spending public funds.

Twelfth, the operation and effectiveness of existing laws with respect to lobbying.

While I have related several suggestions, some of them undoubtedly from members of your organization, more important at this moment than the details of these and other suggestions is the mobilization of public interest in the need for reform. If we once can get a reorganization commission appointed, I am confident that it will include some of the best brains in our Nation and that its members will give very careful attention to these and other problems in making their recommendations to the Congress.

I emphasize the need for public interest because realistically speaking, congressional reform is always an uphill fight for it is stalled by the very congressional inertia and self-interest about which many of us have been complaining. The interest and initiative of organizations such as yours is key to building public concern.

POLICY REGARDING MILITARY AWARDS AND BENEFITS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in the February 1963 issue of the Jewish Veteran, the national legislative director of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States devotes his column to the many distinctions drawn by our Government between hot and cold war duty.

Mr. Felix Putterman a World War II oversea combat veteran and former congressional staff member says that among these distinctions are "a number that are artificial and arbitrary at best." He lists these and proposes constructive steps which can and should be taken. Among the latter is enactment of the GI bill of rights.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Putterman's excellent Capitol Corridors column be entered in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The other day the Army awarded the Air Medal, a high honor indeed, to a noncom for giving aid to casualties while in helicopter flight over combat areas in South Vietnam. While this was still another incident in a long series of quiet American bravery in the sullen swampland and jungles of southeast Asia, it serves as a reminder that this is still a part of what is euphemistically called peacetime duty.

Hardly a week goes by without an announcement of casualties and deaths among U.S. servicemen on the hot front of the cold war. Yet as far as recognition and benefits are concerned, there is no distinction made between garrison duty here at home and service abroad on this razor-edge exposed nerve of the struggle between freedom and tyranny.

President Kennedy has taken an initial step in asking the Congress for legislative authority to award medals, the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Navy Cross, Air Force Cross, and Silver Star, now restricted to heroic service in active combat with an enemy of the United States during wartime. Such legislation is consistent with the President's action of last April when Mr. Kennedy issued an Executive order to establish eligibility for the award of the Purple Heart to cold war casualties.

Many distinctions are drawn by the Government based upon the supposed differences between hot and cold war duty. Among these are a number that are artificial and arbitrary at best.

Servicemen carrying out the national commitment in Berlin, on the armistice line in Korea, in Laos and the agony of Vietnam cannot purchase national service life insurance. If they lose a limb, they are not eligible for the special automobile available to World War II and Korean veterans. The benefits of a GI bill are as yet unattainable. Their eligibility for service-connected disability compensation is severely limited by much stricter presumptions of pre-service fitness than predecessors of Korea and World War II. After discharge, veterans of Vietnam, Berlin, etc., are not eligible for the same pension given war veterans totally and permanently disabled by reason of non-service connected cause.

Apparently, the Government's distinction between hot and cold war has not inhibited insurance companies. There have been a number of complaints from parents and widows that policies held on deceased sons and spouses are not being paid because the death occurred on a hazardous mission overseas. An insurance company refused to pay double indemnity for an accidental death to the widow of a warrant officer lost in a transport crash in Laos 2 years ago. A number of dependents have been trapped in this whiplash between the Government's artificial distinction of what comprises wartime duty and the private insurance companies' strict views on accidental death.

Obviously, the situation beggars a sensible, rational, and humane solution. The Congress can take a constructive step in the right direction by adopting the President's proposal on awards. The logical next step would be an adjustment of our entire schedule of benefits to bring in deserving veterans who have been exposed to hazardous duty.

The term "hazardous duty" should be interpreted in a limited sense so that the administration could not be accused of creating an all-encompassing Mother Hubbard for every peacetime serviceman. Finally, the GI bill for which Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has been leading a valiant and almost lonesome fight should be moved up high on the agenda of a Congress which may have time on its hands while waiting around a goodly portion of next summer for the tax bill to be reported out into daylight from the inner recesses of the Senate Finance Committee.

Admittedly the GI bill is expensive—not extravagant—but expensive. It is inconceivable that the talents of our most "fiscally responsible" Members of Congress cannot be used for something positive rather than merely being "agin" every spending proposal. One contribution would be a GI bill of rights, carefully drawn to limit, if necessary, its benefits to those cold war vets enduring the hazards of perilous duty while plugging the leaky dikes of the free world.

What is right is right. At the expense of some of our finest young men, the Government Treasury and private insurance companies have been eating their cake and having it as well.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the subjects of full employment, manpower training, and youth employment will receive a justifiable amount of attention in Congress this session. The first measure affecting these subjects, S. 1, Youth Employment Act, is slated to come to the Senate floor for debate in a few days. I should like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the comments of Congressman TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, who is the senior minority member of the Joint Economic Committee and a ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee. He is highly qualified to discuss this Nation's most serious economic problem, which is unemployment.

Several months ago, Congressman CURTIS presented a thought-provoking analysis of our unemployment problem in a book, "87 Million Jobs—A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment." Currently, a series of four newspaper columns based on the book is being distributed.

I serve with Mr. CURTIS on the Joint Economic Committee and feel that his ideas are sound and his recommendations offer a refreshingly new approach to a solution of our chronic unemployment problem. Instead of placing reliance upon the administration's panaceas of fiscal and monetary policy to increase aggregate demand, instead of spending vast sums to make work for obsolete skills, Congressman CURTIS offers a bold and imaginative program, including upgrading workers' skills, which hits at the specifics of unemployment. I am associated with many of these views of Congressman CURTIS which are incorporated in the Minority Report of the Joint Economic Committee. In my opinion, this four-part condensation of Mr. CURTIS' program entitled, "A Job for Every American," is a valuable analysis and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATISTICAL FOG HIDES FACT OF LABOR SHORTAGE IN UNITED STATES

(Unemployment, which according to the Labor Department accounted for 6.1 percent of the labor force for the 30-day period ending February 15, is a problem which continues to bedevil the Government economists. Following is the first article in a series by a man who takes a different view—that it is a shortage of men, not jobs, that troubles America. Congressman CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, is an expert on the Nation's economy, serving on both the Joint Economic Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee.)

WASHINGTON, MARCH 23.—America can have full employment. It can have full employment without resorting to Treasury-financed projects whose effect is temporary and in the long run bad for the wage earner.

Long months of listening to expert testimony before the Joint Economic Committee of the House and Senate has convinced me of this. Careful study of our economic history for the past decades has confirmed this testimony.

I am also convinced that we are headed for serious trouble unless we understand the real nature of our unemployment and employment dilemma today.

The basic dilemma, ignored by well-meaning men who think in terms of theory rather than of reality, is this: Today there are as many jobs going begging in the United States as there are persons unemployed and looking for work. Any economist will tell you that it is not jobs that this country needs but people to fill them. If this sounds impossible, look at the evidence.

TURN TO THE CLASSIFIEDS

It takes no Harvard degree to read the daily newspaper. But turn to the classified ads and measure what takes more space, the help wanted or situation wanted columns. In most cities and most cases, there are more jobs being offered than there are people asking for jobs. Talk to the employment agency people. They will tell you the same story. U.S. Employment Service offices, which handle but a small part of the Nation's job placement, listed 596,287 job openings in January. A year ago, there were roughly as many, or 586,755. And last June, at a time when the job market is flooded by students seeking summer employment, there were 726,753 positions going "a-begging."

These figures may seem pretty puny when compared with Bureau of Labor Statistics statements that there are close to 6 million people unemployed today. An unemployment beyond the normal drift of people from job-to-job is bad. But the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures don't reflect the true unemployment picture, and won't until new means are devised.

At the present time, anyone who says he is looking for a job is listed as unemployed. A housewife who would like to fatten up the family income but can find no work to suit her is listed as unemployed. The national figure, moreover, is based on a sampling of 33,000 families in a nation of 180 million.

But the flimsiness of Bureau of Labor Statistics figures is not the point. What is truly important to Americans is the paradoxical picture of job hunger in the midst of job plenty. And how does this come about? Very simply, the trade unions, which have a legitimate concern in the interests of their members, feel that whatever the beneficial impact of automation may be, the process must be halted if some members of a particular union are hurt.

WORKER SABOTAGE

It was the industrial revolution which made a liar of Karl Marx and introduced us to our present economic plenty. But at the time, the "Luddites" in England and their friends in France believed that the introduction of machinery was depriving them of jobs. So they attempted to destroy the machines. In France, the workers threw their shoes (sabots) into the works, from which we get the word "sabotage."

Today, to use but one example, certain unions refuse to permit the automation of our newspaper industry. As a result, a few men can hold onto their jobs temporarily. But one newspaper after another fails or must merge with a competitor because, under outdated methods, production costs exceed income. And when a newspaper fails, this means that printers, compositors, stereotypers, reporters, secretaries, and truckdrivers lose their jobs. You can apply this example to textiles, to steel, or to many other industries.

The solution is not to block progress. Improved production techniques not only create jobs but allow this country to compete in the world market—thereby bringing prosperity to this country.

The way to match up the unfilled jobs with the unemployed wage earners is dual. In some cases, the worker must be brought to the job. That is, if his particular skill is no longer needed in Massachusetts, then means must be created to help him get to Missouri or South Carolina or wherever his abilities are in short supply.

ROOM AT THE TOP

The second way to match the job to the man is in giving displaced workers the necessary skills to meet a changing technology. One of the facts that we have discovered in recent years is that the unskilled worker is needed less and less by American industry. Those unions which are made up of the so-called "blue collar" workers are steadily declining in membership, while the skilled and white collar workers today make up more than 50 percent of the labor force. This shift in employment patterns explains the rise in America's average wage. Under our system, there is more room at the top than at the bottom.

Therefore, if the United States is to have anything near full employment, there must be a systematic effort on the part of labor, management, and the Government to give the worker at the bottom of the ladder the skills which will make him necessary to industry. The unskilled worker is first fired and last hired.

But there must be flexibility. The man who says "I've been a cottonpicker—or you name it—all my life, and I'm not going to change now," is doomed to longer and longer periods of unemployment. The man who says, "There's no future here for me, so I'll learn the trade that is needed," will go far.

But any Government program which attempts to alleviate unemployment by creating make-work for the unskilled is merely pouring its money down a rathole. For once the make-work project has been completed, the unskilled worker is back where he started. If trained to new skills, he can find a place for himself in industry, thereby contributing to the Nation's economic good. At the same time, he ceases to be an unemployment statistic and becomes a man at work.

MORE JOBS A WORKERS' MIRAGE IF ACCOMPANIED BY INFLATION

WASHINGTON, MARCH 24.—At a time when our labor force was considerably smaller, President Truman was willing to accept as permanent an unemployed army of 4 million. This was and is a defeatist proposition.

It is important that this country achieve maximum employment, with jobs for all who are willing and able to work. Anything else wastes one of our major national resources.

But it is equally important that full employment not be accompanied by inflation. Rising prices rob those in the lower income brackets. If the paycheck buys less each year, the attainment of full employment becomes a hollow achievement. It is then simply a way of spreading poverty—or at least a lower standard of living—not a means of building prosperity.

Since the war, the Government has attempted to meet the unemployment problem by Government spending. But once committed to these programs of spending, the Government becomes an addict. As inflation increases, lowering the purchasing power of the dollar, the Government must spend more. As unemployment rises, the Government again is committed to greater expenditures. The two, combined, lead to a kind of vicious circle which puts the national economy in greater peril each year.

The labor unions, faced by the diminishing purchasing power of their members, call for higher wages which lead to higher prices which lead to a situation pricing American industry out of the world market which leads to greater unemployment which leads to more Government spending. This is a long sentence, but the point it makes is obvious.

FLOOR ON WAGES

Prof. Gottfried Haberler of Harvard has found three basic causes for inflation:

(1) Unions are able to maintain a floor on wages but have refused to impose a ceiling on pay increases. Caught in a wage-price squeeze, industry must inflate its prices or perish.

(2) Business lacks the muscle of organized labor and cannot meet it on equal terms in collective bargaining.

(3) Unions are not subject to antitrust regulations. Labor is a monopoly; business is not. Therefore, in any contest over wages, the unions are bound to win.

It is natural that unions wish to improve the positions of their members. This aim is established in the laws of the land. What is questionable, however, is action forcing large wage increases yearly or every other year—increases so large that they must result in inflationary price rises. The facts are that wages have been forced up at an average rate of 3 to 3½ percent a year while production has been rising about 2 percent. Prices have multiplied up to 1½ times due to this cause alone.

UPGRADING PRODUCTIVITY

A program of upgrading the productivity of the labor force, through increased skills and productivity, would have an anti-inflationary effect and benefit both management and labor. Real wages would rise as a result of superior performance, and this would keep costs down and maintain stable prices. The individual worker would be better off and the community would benefit from a price structure based on a reduction of unit-cost. The United States also would be in a more competitive position in world markets.

In Britain, wage settlements in excess of productivity, however attractive they may seem to those getting them, have been responsible for the general weakness of that nation's economy. Thus, the Economist—a highly respected center-to-left British publication—laments the "Collective bludgeoning" by unions, under which workers exact more money "before they have earned it," with the result that there is an inflationary weakening of Britain's economic position.

The Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) also agreed that Britain's current economic problems are due to this anti-productive wage-push. The OEEC found it significant that economic growth, which President Kennedy tells us is so important, was "less vigorous" in Britain and the United States in past years. It might have added that both countries have suffered from a serious loss of international confidence in the strength of their currencies.

Inflation is a fact of life in present-day America. Yet the unemployment which some economists tell us it will cure remains with the United States. In fact, it has become fashionable to speak of "hard core" unemployment. This hard core is in unskilled labor—or in labor whose skills are no longer needed. The coal miner is an example of this latter category. The answer is economic stability, an increase in productivity through new and advanced methods of work, and a systematic effort to train labor in new skills.

RETURN TO PICK AND SHOVEL?

The quality as well as the quantity of jobs must be reflected in our consideration in order to avoid some future day in which a man may be elected President by wildly proclaiming that he will abolish machinery and "create" all the new jobs needed by returning us to the pick and shovel economy in building roads and homes, to hand production in building automobiles. That is precisely the promise which, ultimately, our current clinging to the past in our employment considerations gives us.

Today, West Germany has one of the most modern industrial plants in the world. It employs the best and most modern techniques of automated production. Yet West Germany has so many jobs that it must import workers from neighboring countries. What has projected West Germany to the forefront of industrial nations has been the efficiency of its plant, the productivity of its labor force, and the resultant anti-inflationary forces it has released.

In contrast, the United States has attempted to turn back the economic clock to the point where even Dr. Walt Whitman Rostow, a leading spokesman of the New Frontier, concedes that much of our industrial plant is obsolete.

Private Sector, Not Government, Creates Economic Growth in the United States

Washington, March 25.—When most Americans talk privately about their jobs, the ones they have, want, or may have lost, they usually do it with native good sense. At the level of public debate, however, there are vested notions and emotions that make straight talk about America's jobs virtually impossible.

One of these notions is that public works, public spending are the only answer to unemployment. Forgotten is the fact that heavy public spending in the first 7 years of the Roosevelt administration hardly made a dent in the great depression or in unemployment. In 1933, there were some 12 million people out of work. Until the manpower needs of wartime production and the draft became felt, the unemployment figure fluctuated around 10 million. All the Public Works Administration (PWA) programs conceived by earnest New Dealers failed to solve the program.

Another notion, prevalent among the younger citizens of this country, is that only strong and highly centralized government can protect the people from something called a "market economy"—horrible sounding, but another way of describing the necessary and natural application of economic laws. Every year there are torrents of arguments that the greedy private sector—anything from General Motors to the man who owns the local candy store—is gobbling up our substance while the public sector—or government—goes begging. State and local governments, though presumably public, are somehow lumped in with the nasty private sector.

SOVIET PRODUCTIVITY STATIC

In these arguments we are offered "statistics" which show that whereas the Soviet Union is growing like a weed, the United States is withering on the vine. The facts, of course, show that productivity, one of the real measures of a nation's growth, has remained almost static in the Soviet Union since 1913; that where less than 10 percent of the American labor force produces a superabundance of food, it requires 50 percent of the labor force in the Soviet union to produce scarcity rations.

But it is simply not true that we have been starving the public sector in the United States. A glance at the facts shows just the contrary. For instance, social insurance grew almost 300 percent between 1950 and 1960, at a time when the gross national product (GNP) rose only 80 percent. Federal financing of research has grown from $1 billion to $7 billion in that period. Total education outlay jumped from $9 billion to $24 billion. We have, in fact, been building classrooms at a far greater rate than what President Kennedy has called for. Yet some still call for an ever-increasing centralism and the gradual starvation of the private sector.

But what does this mean? Vast centralism means, concretely, vast taxes to pay for Federal projects and undertakings, a slower rate of economic growth—since Government produces nothing—as resources are diverted into the bureaucracy, and delay in attending to many of our national problems.

OBSOLESCENT PLANT

Outstanding among the last named, of course, is that of coming to grips with effective ways of upgrading our work force, to the end that technological progress is not slowed because we have insufficient workers. Another outstanding result of vast centralism is the growing inability of an obsolescent American industrial plant to compete for world markets, thereby aggravating the unemployment problem. This competition, rather than modernization and automation, is what puts American wage earners out of work.

The United States cannot avoid a fairly large Federal Government operation. The military threat of communism and our complex relations to our allies necessitate a substantial Federal establishment. But the piling of questionable spending programs on top of these really vital ones can only cause a great and perhaps dangerous dilution of national energies.

Recognition of this has even produced the irony of lectures by European officials on the need for Washington to put its fiscal house in order. At a recent meeting of the International Monetary Fund, the French warned the easy-spending nations on the need for a "sound policy to ward off the recurrence of inflationary pressure." And the Germans emphasized the well-known principle that a workable international monetary order required "monetary discipline at home."

FOREIGN GOLD HOLDINGS

These nations had more than a mere academic interest in the economic health of the United States. They hold dollar balances in large quantities as part of their monetary reserves, and so have an enormous interest in measures to help protect the dollar. And they are aware that U.S. prodigality has brought about an imbalance of payments for us, drained away our gold reserve, and we have arrived at a point where our hoard at Fort Knox does not cover the claims of foreign nations.

There have been many attempts to sweep the balance-of-payments problem under the carpet. But it ties in directly to the question of heavy Federal spending, of high budgetary deficits, of the national economic health and of employment.

None of these questions can be solved by increasing the Federal budget. Government spending—the discredited pump priming of the depression years—does not equip a single man with the skills required to take one of the many new jobs created by our advancing technology, by automation. It can buy time, at an exorbitant price, but only individual training or retraining can buy any real guarantee of real work and real income.

Job Clearinghouse, Tax Prods Would Push Employment Upward

Washington, March 26.—Our dynamic economy has created a demand for so many skills of so many new and different sorts that today we have, in amazing fact, developed large labor shortages. In short, our economy is not sluggish but is suffering from growing pains and will continue to do so until a farsighted economic policy in and out of the Government prevails.

The skill requirements of our economy are snowballing. The Department of Labor recently estimated that about 5,000 new job titles will be added to its dictionary of occupational titles in the decade of the sixties. During the same period some 8 percent to 10 percent of current job titles will become obsolete. Since technological growth creates a demand for more jobs than it makes obsolete, our basic task as a Nation is to find ways and means to meet new demands.

The cost, surprisingly, is bound to be relatively low and in a sense self-liquidating. Work at higher skills pays more, which enlarges the tax base. Also success in this endeavor will reduce the incentive to featherbedding, which fear of technological unemployment frequently generates. The resulting greater productivity will also serve to expand the tax base. Billions now spent in all manner of Government programs to conceal unemployment in the fog of inflation could be saved and Federal taxes accordingly cut to the bone.

Government is not a copartner of the people. It is their servant, and Government jobs should be created only insofar as the private sector calls for them. The concept of the State as an entity with its own volition cannot exist in a free society.

PROGRAM OUTLINED

What must be done by Government to aid in the task of finding people for the unfilled jobs today?

(1) Urgently necessary are answers based on an analytical, nationwide study of the skills of the future, emerging skills of the present and obsolescent skills of the past. Such answers are needed so that we do not retrain men, as indeed today we are doing, in skills which are outmoded or unnecesary.

(2) To this end, there should be established a national clearinghouse for the classification of these skills and their needs on a geographical basis.

(3) Information gathered by the clearinghouse should be classified as to levels of remuneration by skill categories, length of retraining periods, and other relevant data.

(4) This information should be used by the Armed Forces, especially in connection with their vocation guidance.

(5) The clearinghouse information should be made available to educational bodies. This would instruct those in charge of our education with the new technological needs.

(6) We should pay relatively less attention to old-fashioned narrow training and place more emphasis in the schools on fundamental subjects. For it is the basic subjects which provide the future working population with a strong springboard to sound skill in youth, plus occupational flexibility after they have entered the labor force. Vocational schools, moreover, should not be allowed to continue as the dumping ground for students with discipline problems.

TAX REVISION

On the Federal level, these steps should be taken to accelerate the process of job escalation which will make employed workers of the unemployed:

(1) A change is needed in the tax laws. At present our tax laws actually impede the retraining process which is so necessary. Cost of improving one's present skill is deductible even if it's obsolete. Cost of learning a new skill is not deductible.

(2) The tax laws penalize a man who can get a lucrative but temporary job at some distance from his home. The law says that his "legal residence" is where he works, not where he lives. To take the good temporary job, he must relocate his family or take a tax loss. And it should be recalled that 70 percent of all Americans own their own homes.

(3) Unemployment insurance, as presently administered, impedes retraining. If a man loses his job, he can draw unemployment benefits so long as he does nothing to make himself eligible for another and better job. That is to say, if his job is "obsolesced out" and he tries to go to school to learn another skill, he is dropped from the unemployment insurance rolls. The system, moreover, penalizes companies which seek to retrain workers they have been forced to lay off.

(4) In our rapidly growing economy, machinery becomes obsolete before it wears out. Our tax laws, however, are geared to the old concept of wear, not of obsolescence. As a result, the lag in depreciation allowances is now estimated to be some $4 to $6 billion behind replacement needs. And slow replacement has an adverse effect on the creation of new jobs as well as the upgrading of old ones.

With faith in ourselves, and perseverance in job escalation without federalization, we can succeed in attaining a future of full employment. We can do so while strengthening our freedom, not through decisions which trickle down from an apex of authority in Washington, but from actions originating in the broad base of the pyramid of America's economic and political strength—a free people.

GEORGE E. BARCLAY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, on April 23, 1963, Mr. George E. Barclay, regional supervisor of the Branch of Wildlife Refuges, will retire after more than 30 years service. Mr. Barclay has been regional supervisor for the area, which includes Oklahoma since 1939. During this time, he played a major role in the development of all wildlife refuges in our region. In particular, his role in the development of Oklahoma's Washita National Wildlife Refuge, Tishomingo Refuge, and our Great Salt Plains Refuge will always be remembered and appreciated by Oklahomans.

George Barclay located and made original recommendations that the Washita Wildlife Refuge be established in western Oklahoma. Under his direction, a master plan of development and management was recently completed.

Mr. Barclay's interest and hard work eventually led to a cooperative agreement with the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation for the development and management of Oklahoma's Tishomingo Refuge near Lake Texoma. This area has become one of the Southwest's most popular recreational areas with hunting, fishing, boating, and many other attractive features—not the least of which is Lake Texoma lodge.

Finally, George Barclay guided development of our Great Salt Plains Refuge near Enid, Okla. This area is known as one of the finest places in Oklahoma for waterfowl hunting. Much of the area's reputation can be attributed to the hard work which Mr. Barclay did to improve and enlarge this refuge.

In addition to these other projects, Mr. Barclay has guided the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge near Lawton, Okla., to a position of national prominence.

On behalf of myself and other Oklahomans, I would like to publicly thank George Barclay for his many years of service and wish him a most enjoyable retirement—well deserved.

SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the 102 young men and women from high schools in our 50 States and the District of Columbia have now been back in their classes for some time after their participation in the first Senate youth program.

Theirs was a unique and rewarding experience, inasmuch as it brought these young people, two from each State and the District of Columbia, into a close association, with the U.S. Senate, specifically, and with the Federal Government generally for the period of a week.

I can say without qualifications, based on my own experience with the study group, shared with some of my colleagues of the advisory committee and with Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER as cochairman, that the project gave these future voters and participants in politics and Government a rewarding insight into the difficult, challenging, and always interesting operation of our Government as it involves us here in the Senate.

As one who has had many young people from Rhode Island as interns in his own office, a figure rapidly approaching 100, I feel we should do all we can for those of a younger age who will someday succeed us in the responsibilities and privilege of governing.

I am happy to have had a part in this most worthwhile endeavor. Many contributed their time, talent, and efforts. We are very grateful to them.

A tribute in this regard belongs to the William Randolph Hearst Foundation, which initiated this program; to Senators and their staffs, to the various branches of the executive department, to the American Political Science Association, and to the directors and superintendents of education in the various States.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a few weeks ago our distinguished senior colleague from Oregon, Senator MORSE, delivered the annual Frank Jacoby lecture at the University of Bridgeport in Bridgeport, Conn.

The purpose of this annual lecture is "to further the brotherhood of man and the equality of man regardless of race, color, or creed."

Senator MORSE's address was a notable contribution to the achievement of that purpose. His theme was the denial of adequate employment opportunities to the American Negro. In clear and concise terms, he gave an unforgettable outline of the size and shape of the discrimination picture. It was a real honor, and I may say a treat, for the people of Bridgeport to have the opportunity to hear Senator MORSE, and because his address was so memorable, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL

(Address of Senator WAYNE MORSE, annual Frank Jacoby lecture, University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Conn., Mar. 27, 1963)

It was with a great deal of pleasure that your kind invitation to be here today was accepted, for it is indeed an honor to be included in the illustrious group of speakers who have appeared here in the past as Frank Jacoby lecturers.

And the pleasure was enhanced when I noticed that my friend and next door neighbor in the Senate Office Building, Senator GOLDWATER, was last year's speaker. Our office space is a good deal closer than we generally are politically. But now it can be said that I, as a liberal, am 1 year behind the Senate's most noted conservative.

Though the two of us often differ politically, we do believe in the "brotherhood of man."

Yet to believe is not enough. And Frank Jacoby recognized that when he established this lecture. He stated that the purpose of the lecture was "to further the brotherhood of man and the equality of man regardless of race, color, or creed."

The belief in the brotherhood of man is not a once-a-year affirmation. To believe it we must practice it, each and every day.

Today, I would like to address myself to some of the efforts being made to further the brotherhood of man, and their relationship to the economic problems that beset our country.

Since 1954 our Nation has heard much of civil rights. It hardly seems possible that nearly 9 years have passed since the Supreme Court declared that separate but equal schools were inherently unconstitutional. Since that time our Nation has been torn over Little Rock, New Orleans, and Oxford, Miss.

When viewed over the past 10 years, great strides have been made in civil rights for colored Americans. But, when placed in the perspective of the opportunities and rights which are enjoyed by others and which we believe are the inheritance of everyone, it would seem that we have hardly moved at all.

In just the past few months a number of events have occurred that should give us all hope. While the U.S. Senate was filibustering over the use of the filibuster—a device used to kill civil rights legislation—the South demonstrated that in some places it was ahead of the Senate.

For in South Carolina, a Negro was admitted peaceably to Clemson College; in Mississippi, James Meridith returned to classes; in North Carolina, Governor Terry Sanford announced that the States had a responsibility to provide jobs—good jobs—for Negroes.

It is this last incident—Governor Sanford's announcement—that is of particular interest to me. It deserves to be of interest to all Americans not only because of the injustice that is done the colored citizen, but the high price the white community pays itself for this discrimination. The United States today faces a great challenge in trying to rejuvenate our economy. The domestic program of the administration now pending in the Congress is designed primarily to stimulate our economic growth from its present sluggish pace and its high rate of chronic unemployment.

In the last Congress, we adopted the Manpower Retraining Act, with programs of reeducating the unemployed in skills that are needed in today's labor market.

In this Congress, we are being asked to adopt a substantial tax cut, a measure I wholly endorse to attack the same problem on a much bigger scale. Our Senate Labor Committee is in the process of reporting out a Youth Conservation Corps bill, having for its purpose the provision of useful and needed conservation work for the jobless youths.

Testimony in support of the bill brought out that among teenage male jobseekers, about 10 percent of the whites are unable to find work, but 21 percent of the colored boys are unable to find work.

This whole vicious circle of school dropouts and lack of opportunity for them in the labor market is bad enough among our white population, but the added element of discrimination makes it twice as bad among our colored population.

From my own observation of this problem in the District of Columbia—and I am a member of the Senate District Committee—I know that thousands of Negro youth who are prevailed upon to finish high school and learn a trade are then thrown into a social situation that simply denies them the chance to work at that trade. Such a youth may find work only as a janitor, a busboy, or laborer, or he may not bother to work at all. And many others are discouraged from learning a trade at all, much less a profession.

Of the total labor force, only 1 in 10 is colored; yet 1 of 5 unemployed is colored. Of the chronically unemployed—that is over a long period of time—one in four is colored.

When the economic belt is tightened, as comedian Dick Gregory likes to say, the Negro is the first notch. The Negro in America—along with some other minority groups—is the lowest man on the economic totem pole of our Nation.

Because he does not have economic security, he is least able to survive an economic setback. Thus, an illness, however slight, can wipe out what small savings that do exist. A brief job layoff, for seasonal adjustments or plant conversion, can mean the relief lines again.

Being economically vulnerable has other disadvantages, too. And most of these disadvantages are far more serious.

For instance, many of you undoubtedly read of the action taken in LeFlore County, Miss. There, when it became apparent that a civil rights group might manage to register the remaining 99 percent of the county's Negroes who were not registered to vote, the county in retaliation cut off its distribution of surplus food which benefited mainly the Negroes. The reason given officially by the county was a lack of funds for distribution.

The effect of this action was important, for without the surplus food, the 37,000 Negroes could not survive, for their average income in LeFlore County was a little better than $300 per year.

By denying the surplus food provided for free by the Federal Government, the Negroes were faced with two choices: one was to vote and starve; the other was to maintain the status quo—no vote but at least the stomachs were partly filled.

To the observer of the American scene, it appears that the Negro has made great economic advances since the end of the Second World War. In absolute terms this is true, for the Negroes are now receiving higher wages under better working conditions at a greater variety of jobs than ever before.

The Second World War taught the Negro skills he would never have learned in his segregated school. For many, it was the only chance they would ever have to learn trades denied to their race in peacetime conditions.

After the war, the GI bill of rights increased the educational level of the Negro, it eased his entrance into the professions, and it trained his future leaders.

All of these advances are notable when compared to the previous decade, but relative to the economic progress of our Nation as a whole, the Negro's advance is not comparable to that the rest of us have enjoyed.

In Atlanta, Ga., while per capita income for white citizens was going up 44 percent, it was rising only 25 percent for colored people during the same period. In our Nation as a whole, the median income of the Negro is today nearly $2,000 less per year than that earned by the white. The sad fact is that the Negro worker earns only 65 percent of the income earned by the white worker.

Job discrimination in industry is the biggest impediment to the economic advancement of the Negro. Today the Negro can find work in government and in the professions. But American industry has not responded as well. The practices of both unions and management have been such that there are more Negroes in the United States today with doctorate degrees than there are Negro plumbers or electricians.

In Washington, D.C., last Friday the Secretary of Labor announced that he would seek an injunction if the contractors and unions constructing a gymnasium at Negro Howard University did not cease their discrimination and hire Negro workers.

It is not incredible that a Negro cannot even find employment in the construction of a building at a university that was and is dedicated to his education.

But all the blame does not lie with the unions. For if the labor movement has been reluctant to end discrimination, management has certainly not been eager.

There can be no doubt that many of our national corporations engage in token employment of colored workers in order to satisfy the rules against discrimination in defense industries, just as many school districts resort to token integration to satisfy the constitutional requirement of equal treatment.

As I have indicated, with little opportunity for advancement, the rate of dropout from high schools is twice as high for Negroes as for whites. We cannot afford to continue this waste of talent merely because of the color of skin involved.

Among Negroes over the age of 25, the average number of years of education is less than eight. Think of that. Less than an elementary education. Of course, in recent years this figure has improved remarkably so that the age group between 25 and 29 averages around 11 years of education.

One-fourth of the Negro dropouts remain unemployed until they reach the age of 25 or over, when the rate drops to slightly better than one-fifth.

The entire Nation pays for this situation in lost production, in welfare, and institutional costs. I have stressed that because race discrimination is one of the key factors in the education, the unemployment, and the slow growth rate problems—yes, even the tax cut—to which so much of our legislative program is addressed. It is far from the only factor; but it is certainly one of them.

As a nation we have failed to make this land the land of economic opportunity for all. As long as we continue to fail, we will remain a Nation fighting the cancer that results from discrimination, rather than enjoying the blessings of brotherhood.

Over one-tenth of our Nation is nonwhite. For this group the American dream is all too frequently just a dream, never to be a reality.

The right to vote on an empty stomach is not a right at all; the right to attend school and to learn to read with no economic future is not a right; the right to equal treatment at libraries, swimming pools and lunch counters is no right at all without the right to earn a decent living.

The right to economic opportunity overshadows in importance almost all other rights, yet in the past few years our attention as a nation has been directed to the more dramatic struggles in civil rights, such as voter registration, school integration, freedom rides, and apartment dwellings.

But when the United States operates in the world arena, it does not subordinate economic freedom to such an insignificant role. Time and time again we hear our leaders in foreign affairs emphasize the need for establishing economic freedom among the nations of the world.

Our foreign policy experts maintain that once an underdeveloped nation has a sound economic base upon which it can develop, there will be little or no need for concern as to that nation's political future. A sound economy, they claim, almost guarantees a sound political future.

And I think they are right. But the same argument should be applied to the economic rights of minorities within our country. But it is not done.

The hope that our country held out to the millions in the past was a hope that could, with work, dedication, and more work, be realized. Over the years our Nation has welcomed wave after wave of immigrants—and as the years progressed they or their descendants have found their hopes fulfilled.

But within our midst is a group which for 100 years has sought in vain for the opportunity to hope. And that hope has yet to arrive—and is even farther from being fulfilled. The only reason the arrival of that hope has been delayed is the accident of color which is the most conspicuous difference any minority group can have.

Yet all the Negro has asked for over the years is the right to have the same opportunity, the same chance, the right to receive the same treatment.

But for the past 100 years we have continued to ignore the Negro while welcoming to our midst new arrivals from other lands. The failures must cease. We must immediately undertake the task of making the Negro an equal partner by providing him with the skills he needs, with the opportunity he seeks.

The movement toward Freedom Rides, sit-ins, and all their various manifestations, was to be expected. We should expect it to continue, and to expand. This element of the American population is expressing an overdue determination to enjoy its natural rights. Certainly, equal opportunity will grow in all areas as specific discriminations are overcome.

And I think this will be healthy for the Nation, and for the economy. The dire predictions, for example, that an executive order against restrictions in certain federally financed housing would depress the construction industry are not being borne out. The home construction business appears headed for another prosperous year.

Frank Jacoby was an admirable man. Having had his American dream come true, he knew that others must have the opportunities he did, if our country was to fulfill its dream. He also knew that city and State and Nation are built by the exercise of opportunities.

Because we are our brother's keepers—an article of faith I do not question—we must see that all of us enjoy that dream of opportunity.

THE EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues and of the public generally to what I consider a remarkably interesting and significant document. I refer to the report to Congress by the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, of the Department of State, entitled "The Effectiveness of the Educational and Cultural Exchange Program."

This report, the first submitted by the newly reconstituted U.S. Advisory Commission, set up under Public Law 87-256 of September 1961, was called for under that same legislation, informally designated as the Fulbright-Hays Act. The Commission was directed to make "a special study of the effectiveness of past programs with emphasis on the activities of a reasonably representative cross section of past recipients of aid." The idea and the language, which were gladly accepted during Senate debate, were suggested by the senior Senator from Ohio, and might well be termed the "Lausche amendment." Here I want to pay tribute to my colleague on the Foreign Relations Committee for his foresightedness; he wrought better than we knew at the time. I say this because, although there have been many and varied reports on the exchange programs in the past, the present one appears unique in its scope, thoroughness, and significance.

The fact is that the report is a ringing endorsement of not only the concept of the exchange program, but also of its implementation and results. Indeed, as stated in the report:

> The Commission was frankly surprised, though gratified, at the wealth, variety, and convincing character of the evidence supporting the conclusion that the program is effective.

I might stress here the distinguished composition of the group which conducted the study. Members of the Commission are appointed by the President on a nonpartisan basis, as directed by Public Law 87-256, and it is clear that we can have the utmost confidence in their ability and fairmindedness.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent for insertion in the Record of a listing of the Commission members.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Walter Adams, professor of economics, Michigan State University.

James R. Fleming, publisher, Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette.

Luther H. Foster, president, Tuskegee Institute.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president, University of Notre Dame.

Walter Johnson, professor of history, University of Chicago.

Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor, University of California at Los Angeles.

Mabel M. Smythe, principal, New Lincoln High School, New York, N.Y.

Roy E. Larsen (vice chairman), chairman, executive committee, Time, Inc.

John W. Gardner (chairman), president, Carnegie Corp. of New York.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I prefer to have the report speak for itself, and shall ask to have a summary of it placed in the Record following my remarks. The report in its entirety is being printed as a House document and will be available to all those interested. However, there are a few matters to which I would like to give particular emphasis.

First, as I and others have often done in the past, the Commission stresses the fact that many of the effects of educational and cultural exchange programs are intangible; insofar as some of these can be measured, their full implications can only be seen over a long period of years. Surely one may expect quite a time to elapse before some struggling and perhaps wild-eyed student turns into a cabinet minister sympathetic to our view of the world. In order to allow for the limitations of existing instruments of research, the Commission deliberately sought to use the widest possible variety of techniques of inquiry.

Second, the report concentrates on the actual exchanges conducted by the State Department and the U.S. Information Agency. Within this frame of reference, the basic concern was to discover the overall impact on the foreign student of his experience in the United States. In other words, the Commission could not and did not undertake the virtually impossible task of assessing the multitude of Government and private programs which generally are lumped together under the heading of educational and cultural exchange. At the same time, I believe the report amply covers the most meaningful and interesting element in such programs.

In the third place, in describing the Government program, the Commission quite rightly stresses the great contribution to it made by private individuals and organizations in this country, not to mention the binational centers abroad. It is this extensive participation by the public which gives rise to the report's statement that the program is "in a sense conducted by the American people themselves." It has notably created a very broad base of public enthusiasm and support.

Fourthly, I would point out that the Commission—quite properly, in my view—did not content itself with an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the program, but also made numerous recommendations for future improvements. I hope my colleagues will give particular attention to those suggestions.

Finally, I believe the concluding paragraph of the résumé of the report is one which should be quoted in full and given the widest possible circulation. It reads as follows:

> In sum, the American people can feel pride and deep satisfaction that, although some improvements are yet to be made, the program has proved so effective to their purposes, and has established itself as a basic ingredient of the foreign relations of the United States. There is no other international activity of our Government that enjoys so much spontaneous public approval, elicits such extensive citizen participation, and yields such impressive evidences of success. In a time when most international activities seem almost unbearably complex, hazardous and obscure in outcome, the success of educational exchange is a beacon of hope.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the summary of the report by the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY

The U.S. educational and cultural exchange program has become a basic aspect of this country's relations with almost every part of the world. It is a program conceived and in a sense conducted by the American people themselves as a direct personal expression of their good will and good intent toward the people of other nations. As such, it embodies what all of us as Americans feel are the common human interests which we share with people all over the globe, including our passionate belief in education and in the freedom of intellectual inquiry, and our mutual hopes of peace.

The U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs was asked by Congress to appraise the effectiveness of this program with special reference to foreign students, leaders, teachers, and others who have come to the United States on State Department grants.

After conducting what we believe is the most broadly based survey yet made of the program both overseas and in the United States, we present the following conclusions:

1. Testimony is overwhelming from all sources that the program as a whole is effective. The Commission was frankly surprised, though gratified, at the wealth, variety, and convincing character of the evidence.

Out of 53,000 foreign grantees brought to the United States since 1949, there were perhaps unavoidably some cases of poor selection, of bad programing and placement. There were a few grantees who left with—possibly came with—negative, even hostile attitudes, or who for various reasons were unable to benefit from their experience here. But these instances, we find, are the fractional minority; the balance of evidence is overwhelmingly on the side of success. The evidence is also conclusive that the program has proved itself an essential and valuable part of America's total international effort. The basic concept of the program, its potential in accomplishing a wide variety of essential and desirable ends was overwhelmingly endorsed.

2. There is impressive testimony that the exchange program increases mutual understanding. The great majority of all types of persons queried, from American ambassadors to foreign and U.S. university heads, cite increased understanding of America and Americans as one of the most outstanding results of the program, and better understanding between the United States and other nations as one of its chief and clearly demonstrated values. Returned grantees name increased understanding of Americans as one of the most important results of their stay in the United States.

3. Evidence is abundant that the exchange program has succeeded in helping dispel among foreign visitors many misconceptions and ugly stereotypes about the American people. Experience in this country, even for visitors on a short study tour, is remarkably effective in communicating a favorable impression of the American character and customs broadly conceived. Particularly singled out for comment by grantees were the vitality of American thought, the American sense of drive and organization, and a group of warm, personal qualities differing notably from the stereotyped qualities which grantees apparently had expected to find.

4. The exchange program does not bring about a uniformly favorable point of view on all aspects of the American scene; the reaction of former grantees varies considerably with the country from which they have come, and with the particular aspect inquired about. In general, grantees from European countries were most critical; those from Latin America the most laudatory. For example, only 11 percent of grantees from Britain as compared with 86 percent from Argentina and Guatemala commended the economic system of the United States. Only 10 percent from Sweden, as compared to 72 percent from Colombia reported favorable opinions of the U.S. political system. Among all aspects of American life, America's scientific development received the highest commendation from former grantees as a whole; American race relations the lowest.

5. The program has been outstandingly successful in providing a valuable educational experience to foreign grantees. Although their average visit to the United States lasted less than a year, a high proportion of returned grantees report that they have benefited substantially from their experience in the United States—most notably in increased knowledge in their professional field and in the visit's favorable influence on their work and career. Only 2 percent found this influence other than favorable. Three-fourths of the grantees say their stay in the United States increased their confidence in their work; and half or more say it had a good effect on their professional title and standing.

6. The evidence is significant, though somewhat less conclusive, that the grantee's U.S. visit has also benefited his home country, by enabling him to transmit to it valuable news ideas, skills, knowledge, and attitudes. Nearly three-fourths of the returned grantees report that they have proposed or put into practice an idea which was based on what they learned in the United States and designated to benefit their profession, their own organization and their community at large.

7. The program has effectively established channels of communication between the people in other countries and the United States. Broader perspectives, a wider international outlook were repeatedly cited as important results of the program both by grantees and by prominent persons abroad and in the United States who are familiar with it. Furthermore, well over two-thirds of all returned grantees occupy positions in which they can readily communicate their broadened perspectives—whether as teachers, journalists or top level administrators. The great majority of all former grantees both in the United States and abroad keep up significant contacts with friends and professional colleagues discovered during exchange visits.

8. In increasing mutual understanding, in demonstrating American character and achievements, in furthering the grantee's own development and career and the strengthening of his country, the exchange program has effectively supported one of the Nation's most basic international objectives—of helping support strong, free societies able to work together, in mutual trust and understanding, on the grave issues of our time.

Thus the program as a whole has been found effective. The Commission feels, however, that it can be made even more effective if the following improvements are introduced:

THE FOREIGN AND AMERICAN GRANTEE

1. Too often foreign students, whether chosen by governmental or private exchange programs, are drawn from favored social and economic status groups, particularly in the underdeveloped countries where public education is not yet widespread. We recommend that the exchange program make a concerted effort to seek out and select more "have nots" with particular promise and talent, so that, in keeping with this country's traditions, an American exchange experience never becomes a privilege restricted to the elite. Where necessary to avoid accentuating a bias toward upper-income groups, we recommend that the English language proficiency requirement for U.S. study be relaxed, provided that intensive English language training is given prior to the student's taking up studies in the United States.

2. Similarly, in keeping with American traditions, the United States must clearly identify itself with the forces of constructive change and progress in the developing countries. We recommend that the exchange program make a particular effort to seek out and select those candidates abroad who are sufficiently vigorous and restless to help promote desirable social and economic change. This may mean in some countries choosing more rising young adults, including some who are locally considered radical, left-wing, or politically dissident. They must be given the opportunity to learn that there is a democratic road to reform.

3. To assure better quality foreign students for private exchange programs, we recommend that more field selection centers be set up on a regional basis overseas, under private sponsorship, to assist U.S. universities and private agencies in choosing properly qualified students; and to help the students select the university or college best suited to their needs.

4. To assure better placement and programing of foreign students and visitors in the United States, we make two major comments: (a) The private agencies which, under contract to the Department of State, handle programing and placement of foreign students and visitors, have made an immensely important contribution to educational exchange. However, we recommend that a special study be made of these private contract agencies to determine their present effectiveness and examine how they might more fully adapt themselves to the enormous growth in exchange in recent years; (b) Personal visits with American families are considered by foreign visitors one of the most significant and memorable parts of the U.S. experience. Returned grantees, especially from the developing countries, repeatedly express the need for more personal contacts and visits with Americans in a U.S. trip. We recommend that all programs for all foreign visitors provide more time and arrangements for meeting a wide cross section of American families.

5. There is pervasive testimony that, with many outstanding exceptions, the quality of American professors and lecturers selected for oversea grants is not as high as it should be. We recommend two remedies: (a) a substantial increase in the very low salaries now offered to professors and lecturers, even if this means sharply reducing the number

of grantees, as well as an allowance for travel for the grantees' dependents; (b) increased use of direct recruitment of qualified candidates. Oversea requests for American professors and lecturers should not be filled if first-rate persons are not available.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

6. Not enough attention has been paid to the role, quality, and status of the Cultural Affairs Officer who carries out the educational exchange program overseas. A special study should be made of this Cultural Affairs Officer, and the bearing that the administration of the educational and cultural program abroad by USIA may have on his work and career.

7. Fiscal starvation was frequently cited as a recurrent weakness of the program, which undermines its effectiveness. Testimony is almost universal that the program as a whole has been underfinanced. A special study should be made of the problems created for the program and the limitations placed upon it by the heavy reliance on foreign currencies. Further, two financial problems demand immediate remedy: (a) Funds should be provided at once for dependents' travel in order to secure better caliber American professors and lecturers for oversea grants, and (b) the present ludicrously low official hospitality allowances available to the State Department should be increased so that at least a minimum of official hospitality and courtesies may be extended to foreign visitors.

8. Better coordination among the various Government agencies involved in exchange of persons continues to be the highest priority objective for improvement of the program. The Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs has initiated important steps to coordinate the many diverse programs; but much remains to be done. The Assistant Secretary should continue actively to secure further coordination of these programs not only in Washington but at U.S. embassies abroad.

9. The character of the exchange program in any given country must be determined by the needs and character of that country, and not by a formula applied indiscriminately to a group of countries. One country may require special emphasis on teachers, another on leaders, etc. Thus, country-by-country planning is essential, both in Washington and the field. At U.S. embassies abroad, we urge our Ambassadors to give the strong leadership that is essential to a well planned and coordinated country program.

10. In the developing countries, the exchange program should, where possible and in keeping with the character of the program, directly concern itself with the strengthening of their educational and social institutions—helping to produce attitudes and leadership making for progress, and to build up local universities and educational agencies. Third-country training and exchange should be used much more fully by both Government and private agencies which are able to do so.

11. The new enthusiasm for work with developing nations should not lead to neglect or downgrading of the educational and cultural programs with Europe. The vitality of the new Europe, the crucial importance of our allies, and Europe's continuing close cultural ties with the developing nations all underscore the need for continued effort in that area.

12. Coordination of the approach and procedures of the various Government agencies vis-a-vis the universities is urgently needed on the problems of educational exchange and development. The Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs should continue to take all feasible steps to assure such coordination, and also to bring the universities more closely into the planning phase of oversea educational programs. Further, to relieve the financial pressure upon universities which receive foreign students and which are now called upon for considerable unreimbursed financial outlay, the Commission endorses the proposal that "cost of education" grants be paid to them for all Government-sponsored foreign students.

In sum, the American people can feel pride and deep satisfaction that, although some improvements are yet to be made, the program has proved so effective to their purposes, and has established itself as a basic ingredient of the foreign relations of the United States. There is no other international activity of our Government that enjoys so much spontaneous public approval, elicits such extensive citizen participation, and yields such impressive evidences of success. In a time when most international activities seem almost unbearably complex, hazardous and obscure in outcome, the success of educational exchange is a beacon of hope.

SUCCESSFUL PRIVATE FORESTRY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have two resolutions passed at the recent Oregon Logging Conference in Eugene, Oreg., printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution No. 6: Taxation

The Oregon Logging Conference for a quarter of a century has supported every public policy which aids in the development of a permanent timber supply. Among these was the enactment by Congress of the Bailey amendment of 1944 which recognized that to be successful, private forestry must have capital for investment over the long periods necessary to produce a mature timber crop. Since then more progress has occurred in forestry in Oregon and the Nation than in all our previous history. The present administration now proposes to sever this strong right arm of American forestry. The Oregon Logging Conference therefore calls on the Oregon congressional delegation to resist this ill-advised effort to destroy private forestry by opposing it vigorously.

Robert Cross,
Secretary-Manager.

Resolution No. 9: Wilderness Legislation

Whereas the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has last year, after long and comprehensive studies, developed a substitute wilderness bill which offers the best hope yet of providing congressional protection for a substantial acreage of carefully selected roadless wilderness; and which does not at the same time unduly restrict usage of natural resources vital to the developing public land States of the West; and which establishes for the first time uniform procedures for all public land withdrawals; and

Whereas the provisions of this legislative proposal have been maligned and misinterpreted in order to discredit the possibility that any new and different legislative approach to wilderness protection could be desirable and in the public interest: Therefore

The Oregon Logging Conference respectfully urges each and every Member of Congress to familiarize himself personally with the actual provisions of the House Interior Committee amendment to H.R. 776 (Committee Print No. 25) in 1962 and to evaluate the worth of the proposal on its intrinsic merits rather than on the emotional appeals of special-interest groups who do not want it to be considered at all; to recognize that that pure wilderness which will endure longest is that which is most carefully selected and does not project unnecessarily into the mainstream of advancing civilization with its growing demands for other benefits from the land.

The Oregon Logging Conference urges the Oregon congressional delegation to appear before the Senate Interior Committee on February 28 and oppose S. 4 as inimical to the economy of Oregon and support a wilderness bill containing the provisions similar to those recommended by House Interior Committee in 1962.

Very truly yours,

Robert Cross,
Secretary-Manager.

ELECTRICAL INTERTIE BETWEEN PACIFIC NORTHWEST AND PACIFIC SOUTHWEST—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record four resolutions I have received in support of legislation to take the first steps necessary for an electrical intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. One is from the Central Electric Cooperative of Redmond, Oreg.; one from the Umatilla Electric Cooperative Association of Hermiston, Oreg.; one from the Hood River County Pomona Grange No. 8; and another from the Bandon Common Council, City of Bandon, Oreg.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Certificate

I, Leonard Aldrich, secretary of Umatilla Electric Cooperative Association of Hermiston, Oreg., do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct excerpt from the minutes of a meeting of the board of directors of said corporation, duly called and held on February 13, 1963, at which a quorum was present and voting and that said resolution was duly made and has not been amended, altered, or repealed:

RESOLUTION

Whereas there is a bill known as H.R. 994 that has been introduced in the House of Representatives in Congress for the purpose of preserving preference rights to power generated from Federal hydroelectric projects in the Northwest; and

Whereas there is also under consideration the construction of a high-voltage tieline over which power may be transmitted from the Northwest to the Southwest and possibly other areas; and

Whereas it is necessary that the agencies now receiving power from Federal hydroelectric dams in the Northwest, who have no generation of their own, require a continuing source of power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Umatilla Electric Cooperative Association at a meeting of its board of directors held in a regular session on February 13, 1963, does urge and request that House bill No. 994 be enacted into law in order that its preference rights to federally generated power may be preserved; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Oregon representatives in Congress.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the Corporation on this 13th day of February 1963.

[seal] Leonard Aldrich,
Secretary.

Central Electric Cooperative, Redmond, Oreg.

Whereas recent technological advancements and economic considerations make it inevitable that an electrical intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest will be constructed; and

Whereas it is desirable that safeguards be established so that electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest will have first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and that electric consumers in other regions have reciprocal priority; and

Whereas such safeguards are not now present under Federal law or existing power purchase contracts but should be established prior to the construction of either a public or private intertie; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 1st session, H.R. 994 and in the Senate of the United States, Senate bill No. 1007, which establishes a guarantee that power generated in the Northwest Region shall be reserved for such region; and

Whereas this organization has reviewed the above mentioned bills and concurs in the legislation as set forth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of Central Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Redmond, Oreg., hereby request Congress to enact necessary legislation in accordance with H.R. 994 and Senate bill 1007, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Oregon representatives in Congress and the congressional committees that may consider such legislation.

State of Oregon,
County of Deschutes, ss:

I, Alva R. Teater, hereby certify that I am the duly appointed, qualified and acting president of Central Electric Cooperative, Inc., and that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the board of directors of said cooperative at a regular meeting of said board held February 21, 1963, at which meeting a quorum was present and acted throughout.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the cooperative this 14th day of March 1963.

[SEAL] A. R. Teater,
President.

Umatilla Electric Cooperative Association Resolution

February 16, 1963.

Whereas the Federal Government has pioneered in building Bonneville and many other multiple-purpose dams in the Northwest, and has invested millions of dollars in the economy of the area; and

Whereas there is an abundance of low-cost electricity generated at these dams, this being of great benefit to farmers, cities, and industry alike; and

Whereas there is a surplus of electricity throughout most of the year and as there is a ready market for this in California: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we go on record favoring the building of a California intertie by the Federal Government so that BPA can sell all surplus power not needed in this area, this will enable the Bonneville system to run full capacity, thus adding enough revenue so that the Government will be paid back all money advanced to build the system and we can continue to enjoy the present low rates we now have for electricity here in the Northwest; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this be sent to Oregon State Grange and to the Oregon delegation in Congress.

[SEAL] Walter Wells,
Master, Hood River County Pomona Grange No. 8.
Alyuna C. Routson,
Secretary, Hood River County Pomona Grange No. 8.

Passed by Hood River County Pomona Grange No. 8, February 16, 1963.

Resolution No. 63–4

Whereas two extra-high-voltage electrical interconnections between the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest have been recommended by the President in his fiscal 1964 budget; and

Whereas Bonneville Power Administration has received six non-Federal proposals for construction of all or parts of the necessary tielines or lines, thereby confirming the feasibility, desirability, and inevitability of such an interconnection; and

Whereas important benefits would accrue to both regions by virtue of such an interconnection, including an improvement in Bonneville Power Administration's financial condition, which would be reflected in BPA rates; and

Whereas ground rules have not yet been established to govern and facilitate the exchange of surplus power between the two regions, and to assure that such interconnection will not impair the power supply of any region; and

Whereas such ground rules legislation has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Henry M. Jackson and in the House by Congressman Jack Westland and Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen, and is supported by the President and the Secretary of the Interior: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That city of Bandon, Oreg., endorses the construction of an extra-high-voltage line or lines between the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest provided (1) that ground rules legislation substantially of the type introduced by Senator Jackson, Congressman Westland and Congresswoman Hansen be passed by Congress and signed by the President; (2) that one or both of the necessary tielines be constructed by the Federal Government; and (3) that capacity in any non-Federal tieline between the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest be made available to Bonneville Power Administration at a cost comparable to Federal costs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Interior, to the chairman of the Appropriations and Interior Committees of the House and Senate, and to the Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

——— ———,
Mayor.

Attest:

R. V. Backlund,
Deputy City Recorder.

THE NATION'S INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record the text of an address which I delivered on March 13 before the Foreign Relations Commission of the American Legion, in Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the address was ordred to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech of Senator Wayne Morse Before the Foreign Relations Commission of the American Legion, Washington, D.C., Headquarters Auditorium, March 13, 1963

It is an honor and a pleasure for me to be with you today to discuss some of the Nation's international problems, because this organization was born of international problems and of American involvement in them.

All of your members, and many millions more of American men, have served your Nation by leaving your homes, families, and personal careers, to protect our Nation's security. By historical and geographic chance, American participation in war in the last century has occurred elsewhere than in the continental United States. In a real sense, we were able to defend the United States and protect her vital interests in areas beyond our own territory, and thus we were spared the mass loss of life than the physical devastation that befell our enemies in those wars.

Yet the story of war today has just about closed the door on the possibility that we could ever again participate in a major war without the wives, children, and grandchildren of all of us being just as vulnerable and just as likely to become casualties as any man in uniform. That is perhaps the great new factor which has entered into our military and international thinking since the end of World War II. The introduction of missile systems to deliver nuclear warheads has wiped out the geographic protection which two oceans afforded this country for some 160 years.

Our own genius for industrial production has also made us a prime target for nuclear weapons. No nation with aggressive intentions or with a plan for preemptive war can select any other nation than the United States for its principal target. Our population and productive capacity are also heavily concentrated, as they are in any nation of industrial development.

Moreover, the present state of military technology has brought such a heavy development on offensive capacity that no nation is able to defend itself against nuclear attack. By defend I mean to protect a sufficiently large percentage of its people and industry to enable a continuation of national policy for an indefinite period.

Even with the heavy dominance of the United States in nuclear delivery capability, we are unable to prevent a very high level of destruction here at home. Estimates published last fall in London by the Institute of Strategic Studies attributed between 450 and 500 intercontinental missiles to the United States, and about 75 to the Soviet Union. It attributed 250 medium-range missiles to us, and 700 to the Soviet Union. This class of missile has a range of 700 to 2,000 miles.

While we have a heavy preponderance of bombers and surface ships, the Soviet Union has a heavy preponderance of conventional submarines, and is putting more and more nuclear-powered submarines into service. Last fall, Russia was believed to have 12 nuclear subs; this week, the British placed the estimate at 20. This is still fewer than we have, but it is a signal that the many advantages we appreciate in our nuclear submarines carrying Polaris missiles are also appreciated by the Communists. One advantage we believe we still maintain is our ability to fire Polaris missiles from underwater, while the Soviet subs are assumed to have to surface to fire their missiles. But the range and mobility and deception that goes with craft that can remain underwater for indefinite periods must also be attributed to the Soviets.

If it is assumed that by striking first, we could knock out even as high as 85 percent of Russia's nuclear capacity, the remaining missiles alone, exclusive of bombers, could deliver several dozen nuclear warheads on the United States because there is no effective defense against missiles. Moreover, Soviet ICBM's can carry a 10-megaton warhead, compared to the 3- and 4-megaton warheads carried by our own ICBM's. There is no operational antimissile missile. There will be someday, and then there will another severe shift in military arrangements and in international affairs, because military technology makes policy, almost as much as a policy calls military technology into being.

But today we live in a world where we are highly vulnerable, where we cannot attack without being attacked, and we cannot destroy on a large scale without being destroyed. The same applies to the Soviet Union.

This knowledge affects a great deal of the foreign policy of both countries. It affects both of us with reference to Cuba.

Today there is in this country a furor over Cuba that rivals 1898. It continues despite the fact that the primary and direct threat to the security of the United States has been removed. It was removed last October by a firm, wise, and judicious action by the President of the United States, and it was removed without war. This last point, so all important to the Nation, is largely ignored by the President's political critics, many of whom do not seem to be satisfied with any bloodless victory over communism.

This is not to say that the use of the quarantine was not a military action or even that it was not an act of war, because it certainly was the first and it was probably the second. But the installation of missiles in Cuba aimed at the United States was a direct and urgent threat to the basic security of the Nation. It was a clear and present danger, the removal of which justified the risk we took that the situation would erupt.

Since then, we have also obtained the removal of approximately 5,000 of the 22,000 Soviet troops believed to have been in Cuba in October. The Russians have stated that "several thousand more" will be removed by mid-March, and we know that there is ample Soviet shipping in Cuban waters to take out that many.

It is the position of the United States that this withdrawal must be pressed as fast as possible.

Yet it is evident to everyone that the element of crisis which made our action of last fall essential is no longer present in Cuba. Even the remaining 17,000 Russians there are not there to invade or otherwise threaten the United States itself. The rumors of missiles located in caves continue to be heard, but missiles require complex installations for launching which no longer exist. The construction of underground, hard missile sites such as we have for our Minuteman missiles cannot be conducted without vast construction operations that would be readily visible to our surveillance aircraft.

The demands now being made for a renewed blockade to force the removal of the remaining Russians, or the downfall of the Castro government, are being made on behalf of an objective that no longer involves a clear and present danger to the United States. These demands are also asking for an action that undoubtedly will receive a different response from last October. No one really knows what the response to a new blockade would be, one imposed by us, but not in defense of our own vital security.

This is why I support President Kennedy in his pursuit of the removal of those forces by all means short of an act of war. This does not mean that some further action in the nature of a blockade will never be necessary. But there is a great variety of other methods, diplomatic and economic, that must be utilized first. I have heard all the evidence from the intelligence sources that other Members of Congress have used to justify military action in Cuba, and it is my strong conviction that none of it tells of the kind of threat to the United States that must always be present before we use the military forces that could quickly lead to the nuclear destruction of our cities and our homes.

One reason I say that is because there are means we can employ to quarantine Cuba as a source of Communist infection in the hemisphere, and many of them are in operation. Basically, however, the application and enforcement of any hemispheric measures to forestall Communist underground activity requires the cooperation of the other nations of the hemisphere, whether the source of that activity is Cuba, the Soviet Union, or Communist China. We have underway in the Organization of American States measures to make that kind of quarantine effective. Today, it is much more difficult for Cuba to conduct its subversive activities in the Western Hemisphere than it was 15 months ago, before the Punta del Este Conference which set up these procedures.

Another reason why I believe that our policy toward Cuba should exclude direct military action for the present is because the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere is a homegrown one, and it exists no matter what becomes of Fidel Castro and his government. As a symbol, Castro has already lost most of his attraction for the people of Latin America. But the conditions of degradation and poverty and hopelessness which can form the backbone of Communist takeover exists in many other nations. Haiti is one; another is Peru, and the potential is present in several others, including even Brazil. One of the most conservative of Brazilian political leaders, Carlos Frederico Lacerdo, Governor of the State of Guanabara, has warned the United States that Brazil is in for troubles which will dismay the United States and that there is probably nothing we can do about it.

Latin America is a region of exploding population confronting an ancient, semifeudal social and economic structure. The real issue in Latin America is not whether that structure can be preserved, because it cannot; the question is whether it can be altered in a reasonably peaceful way.

The United States will, for an unkown period ahead, be confronted with turmoil in Latin America. It is a condition we cannot control, but we may be able to affect.

Plunging ourselves and much of the rest of the world into nuclear war is not the way to control communism anywhere. War of that dimension will mean the breaking up of governmental structures in every nation. World War I was a strain that brought the collapse of czarist aristocracy in Russia; it reduced France to a state of passivity which made resistance in World War II impossible.

World War II enabled Communist armies to overrun eastern Europe and mainland China. It was not our State Department, or our diplomacy which brought that about, it was the chaos of war. Communism excels at making the most of a period of unrest and change; it is hard to imagine a condition that would offer it more opportunities than a world wracked by nuclear war, even if the destruction of the Soviet Union was virtually complete.

In the last 2 years, we have developed within our Armed Forces an ability to respond to situations with something less than full-scale nuclear war. But we are never sure how much any conflict will escalate when it involves a head-on meeting of the two nuclear giants.

I believe that President Kennedy and his administration have shown a remarkable capacity to judge where our vital interests lie and how they can be protected with a minimum of danger to our people. It is here where true statesmanship lies. He deserves our confidence and support in his pursuit of that policy.

THE PRESIDENT'S COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, basic to our understanding of the compelling forces behind the President's comprehensive education program, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, is an appreciation of the difficult financial position of States and local governments. The Wall Street Journal in its March 7 edition contained an article headlined, "Governments of States, Localities Lift Outlays Far Faster Than United States." The subheading on this article was, "Surge in School-Age Children, Migration to Cities Cited: Non-Federal Payrolls Soar."

The article, which appears under the byline of Mr. Alfred L. Malabre, Jr., staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal, sets forth the cold problems of economics involved in the financing of State and local government. Mr. Malabre points out that the dramatic State and local rise in taxation stems from population trends of the post World War II era. There has been a sharp increase in persons of school age in our population and a massive migration of the families to the cities and towns of our Nation from the farms. He correctly points out that in the last 10 years enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools has soared by nearly 50 percent and is now above 40 million. This increase in the school-age population is much higher than the population as a whole, which in the same span of time increased but 20 percent.

Complicating the problem has been the cost-per-pupil increase which is now 70 percent above the 1952–53 school year figure. This cost-per-pupil rise is accounted for in part by the 75 percent increase in capital outlay for school construction and in operation and maintenance costs, including teachers' salaries.

The sheer magnitude of the rise in public school expenditure is shown by the following table in the article cited above:

School year	Total cost	Cost per pupil
1954–55	$9.8	$275
1958–59	14.3	350
1962–63	19.5	432

NOTE.—The total cost figures are in billions.

It is against this background and against the background in the growth of State and local debt reflected in the following table also appearing in the Wall Street Journal article, that we must assess the degree to which this Congress will meet its responsibilities in the field of education:

[Figures are in billions]

	State	Local	Federal
1946	$18	$102	$2,034
1954	61	185	1,713
1962	118	325	1,630

In my judgment, the statistics cited in the article constitute an exceedingly strong argument in favor of increased Federal participation in the financing without control of our American school system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 7, 1963]

SPENDING GIANTS: GOVERNMENTS OF STATES, LOCALITIES LIFT OUTLAYS FAR FASTER THAN UNITED STATES; SURGE IN SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN, MIGRATION TO CITIES CITED; NON-FEDERAL PAYROLLS SOAR; RISING TAXES AND RESISTANCE

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Spending by State and local governments has increased nearly 400 percent since World War II.

The increase is greater by far than the postwar rise of Federal expenditures. It has triggered a steep climb in State and local tax rates and, despite mounting taxpayer resistance, is continuing unabated.

"State and local spending constitutes about the only area where we economic forecasters can always predict correctly what's going to happen next," says William M. Burke, a senior economist at the National Industrial Conference Board (NICB).

The table traces the sweeping climb of non-Federal spending in the postwar era, and also shows the much tamer Federal increase (up 69 percent since 1946). Dollars are in billions and the years are fiscal periods ending June 30.

	State	Local	Federal
1946	$6.2	$7.0	$66.5
1954	15.8	17.8	77.7
1962	29.2	33.0	112.2

The extrasteep climb of State and local spending, compared with Federal spending, reflects partly the fact Federal expenditures were abnormally high in 1946, from lingering World War II expenses.

REFLECTS POPULATION SHIFTS

But the dramatic State and local rise stems also from basic postwar population trends: A sharp increase in persons of school age and a massive migration of families to cities and towns from the country.

"There's no question that State and local governments are bearing the brunt of the school-age population bulge, as well as of the increasing concentration of persons in urban centers," says Robert W. French, president of the Tax Foundation Inc., a research organization.

In the last decade, enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools has soared by nearly 50 percent to above 40 million. Total U.S. population has increased only 20 percent in the same span.

Costs per pupil are rising rapidly; they are up 70 percent since the 1952–53 school year. Teachers' salaries, on average, have climbed at about the same pace. And the expense of school construction keeps mounting; capital outlays, up 75 percent in a decade, will top $3 billion for the first time this year.

BURDEN OF SCHOOL COSTS

State and local governments pay for about 96 percent of public school costs, reports the National Education Association. The table below outlines the rise of public school expenses and of yearly costs per pupil. The total cost figures are in billions.

School year	Total cost	Cost per pupil
1954–55	$9.8	$275
1958–59	14.3	350
1962–63	19.5	432

School costs will continue to mount, talks with educators suggest. Government projections indicate 25.4 percent of the 1970 population will be of school age (5-17). That's up slightly from the 1960 school-age rate of 25.2 percent and well above 1950's 20.3 percent level.

"Education costs, I'm afraid, have nowhere to go but up and up some more," says an NEA official.

The increasing concentration of families in urban centers is driving up the expenses of non-Federal governments. Some 70 percent of the population is bunched in towns and cities today, compared with only 64 percent in 1950, Government figures show, and experts foresee no reversal of this trend.

The urban concentration is causing sharp increases in costs of such largely non-Federal services as police, sanitation, and firefighting facilities.

"On the farm, there was no need for a big, professional police force or fire department," notes NICB's Mr. Burke. "But in the city, you can't do without them."

HUGE COST OF SERVICES

The Federal Government, of course, maintains some key urban services, such as certain prisons and health facilities. These make up only a fraction of Federal spending, however; as the table below shows, such services are a major expense for State and local authorities. Figures are in billions.

Service	Federal support	State and local support
Police		$2.0
Fire		1.1
Prisons	$0.1	.8
Health and sanitation	1.0	6.1

Non-Federal Government payrolls are expanding much faster than the Federal one. Since 1954, the number of civilians employed by the Federal Government has increased by 5 percent, to about 2.5 million, while the State and local job force has leaped nearly 40 percent, to almost 7 million.

In government, the increase of non-Federal spending outpaces the rise of State and local tax receipts. In fiscal 1962, State and local tax revenues amounted to about $44 billion, far less than the non-Federal spending total of $62.2 billion. Federal grants-in-aid and funds from nontax sources helped close the gap.

State and local debt is piling up rapidly. The table below, computed from Government data by the Tax Foundation, shows the climb of per capita public debt at State and local levels, as well as the reduction of per capita Federal debt.

	State	Local	Federal
1946	$18	$102	$2,034
1954	61	185	1,713
1962	118	325	1,630

Above $80 billion for the first time last year, total State and local government debt is now a quarter the size of the Federal debt. In 1950, it was less than a tenth the Federal total.

Official concern is increasing over the pileup of non-Federal debt.

Gov. James Rhodes of debtridden Ohio, for instance, not long ago fired more than 3,000 recently hired State employees, ordered all State departments to cut spending back about 10 percent and requested all State employees to work on Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays.

Many States, at the same time, are considering sharp tax boosts this year.

Before Nebraska's legislature, for example, are proposals to eliminate some property tax exemption and institute a personal income tax. Other possibilities facing Nebraska taxpayers: A gas tax boost of up to 8 cents per gallon and a new 2 percent sales tax.

The 47 State legislatures meeting this year are expected to consider measures that would add $1.5 billion to the States' tax bills, the Tax Foundation estimates.

Tax collections in many States would receive an added boost, if the Kennedy administration's proposal to reduce Federal tax rates becomes law. In 19 States, Federal tax payments may be deducted from income subject to State taxation. And in many States curbs on personal deductions, proposed by the administration, would mean similar curbs on State tax deductions, without any offsetting cut in State tax rates.

The following table breaks down the major sources of State and local revenues. The percentages are based on Department of Commerce data.

Source of revenue:	*Total percent*
Property tax	33
Sales tax	21
Income tax	5
Vehicle tax	3
Corporation tax	2
Other	36

The most rapidly rising source of State tax revenues: Receipts from taxes levied on tobacco sales, now above the $1 billion mark and twice the 1956 total.

The relentless climb of State and local spending is encountering increased taxpayer opposition in some areas.

Example: Residents of Ridgewood, N.J., one of New City's wealthiest suburbs, recently rejected school board plans to boost sharply the community's school budget. The voters later approved a school budget scaled down by $151,422.

Despite such taxpayer efforts, however, overall non-Federal governmental spending—and taxes—will surely keep mounting, most experts agree. Expressing the view of many, NICB's Mr. Burke says: "So long as the need for education facilities and for municipal services continues to grow, State and local taxpayers will have to keep digging deeper into their pockets."

ELIMINATION OF POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES—TODAY'S HEALTH AND EDUCATION NEEDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two speeches delivered by Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in Portland, recently. The first one is entitled "The Elimination of Poverty in the United States," delivered before the Oregon State Conference on Social Welfare in Portland on March 25. The second one is entitled "Today's Health and Education Needs," and was given at a luncheon meeting of the City Club of Portland on March 22.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ELIMINATION OF POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Wilbur J. Cohen)

At a time when the United States has the greatest economic capacity, by far, in the history of the world, there could hardly be a national goal more urgent than the elimination of poverty by a democratic free enterprise society.

This conference, concerned with advancing the welfare of the people of Oregon, has a special capability in contributing to this goal.

America's annual gross national product is at its highest level of $552 billion because of our ability to produce more than three times as much per worker in a 40-hour week as could be produced in a 70-hour week in our grandfather's day. But our unemployment rate, now around 6 percent, is much too high. Almost one-fifth—including unemployed and underemployed—of our 186 million people are living on a bare subsistence level or less.

This is the paradox: Hard-core poverty endured by 15 to 20 percent of our neighbors while the Nation as a whole enjoys relative prosperity.

Most poverty in the past has been basically the result of the fact that there simply was not enough to go around. This is still true in most of Africa, Asia, and South America. In the underdeveloped countries in which two-thirds of the world's population lives, a large number of people will always be poor so long as there is no increase in the production of goods and services.

But in America, our capacity to produce is not what prevents us from eliminating poverty.

A 20th century English philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead, said that most of the terrible sufferings that accompanied the industrial revolution were not caused by the steam engine or the power loom. Instead they were the consequences of a giant step in technical innovation with no corresponding step at all in social, political, or economic innovation. Today, in the age of automation, the same deficiencies are the root of our trouble.

Our great problem is to organize our economy so the Nation can make full use of its huge technical capacity and its wealth of potential human resources. In that connection a most important immediate step in helping to reduce the present and future extent of unemployment is the passage of a tax-reduction bill.

The miraculous progress our country has made promises the possibility of improved material abundance, good health, and more leisure time for all. An unfortunate byproduct of change, however, is man's difficulty in making the necessary changes in his social, economic, and political institutions in the face of such whirlwind development.

Change does not go step by step, pausing to allow us time to adjust to each step. Rather, it is an ever-steepening curve upward and presents not only the task of adjusting to today's world but, at the same time, of preparing for tomorrow's.

Our urban centers grow larger and larger. Where there was farmland yesterday, a community has blossomed—tied to a cultural core perhaps 10, 15, or even 20 miles away.

And the core—the central city—is also undergoing change. Blight, delinquency, social ills, violence—these stand in dreary contrast to high-rise luxury apartments, efficient new office buildings, huge public housing projects, and the ever-widening freeways linking the center with its semiautonomous satellite communities.

Our people are mobile as no people before them—making the Nation their home. They are increasingly interdependent. And with automation, the market for muscle and sheer strength is waning—the demand for skill, technique, and knowledge booming.

The Oregon State Conference on Social Welfare, bringing together representatives of voluntary and public agencies and interested laymen, is typical of the American effort to improve the lives of its people. The elimination of poverty is a worthy cause to which the public-private partnership can devote its joint efforts.

In this spirit, I would like to review for you some of the recent actions taken by the Federal Government in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

During the past month the President has sent to the Congress five special messages outlining his recommendations for improving the health, education, and welfare of the people of our great Nation.

Three of these messages are especially significant because they represent areas of concern on which for the first time a President has sent a special message to the Congress. They deal with mental health and mental retardation, youth, and aging. In addition, the President sent special messages on education and health, as he did in each of the 2 previous years.

These messages represent a progressive and fiscally responsible program for the domestic improvement of the general welfare of all our people. The program is in keeping with the constitutional authority for the Congress "to provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States."

They set forth both general goals and specific priorities.

HEALTH PROPOSALS

All of you are well aware of this administration's profound commitment to the health of the Nation. In his special health messages to the Congress, this year and last, President Kennedy stressed that progress must be made in strengthening all the indispensable elements of a sound health program, "people, knowledge, services, facilities, and the means to pay for them."

Medical science exists to serve people. As long as the products of medical science are not available to the people who need them because they cannot afford to pay for them or because we lack professional personnel or because our patterns of delivery are outmoded or for whatever reason—then we are failing in our central purpose.

Bills on which we hope for prompt and favorable action in the current session of Congress include a carefully developed program of Federal assistance for the education of more physicians, dentists, nurses, and public health personnel, and Federal grants for the construction of community mental health centers and community mental retardation centers.

We also look forward to favorable action on a broad program to combat mental retardation which would include a doubling of the annual authorizations for grants for maternal and child health and crippled children's programs and the provision of project grants to stimulate public awareness of the problem and the development of comprehensive plans for dealing with it.

I believe that we have made significant advances in the health and medical fields. As I look back over the almost 30 years that I have been studying medical economics, I believe we are beginning to see some important changes in the financing, organization, and availability of medical services to assure that the powerful potential of American medical services is to be realized for all our people. I hope—and know—that you will be leaders in this effort.

We made a good start in health legislation in 1961 when the Community Health Services and Facilities Act was passed. The additional Federal funds authorized by this legislation are helping States and communities to develop new and improved community health services, to build more nursing homes, and to provide better care in the homes of patients, as well as in nursing homes.

But this is only a start. We are still sadly lacking a satisfactory means whereby older people can purchase the basic hospital services essential to their health. People over 65 have medical costs twice as high as those of young people, yet their annual income, on the average, is only half as large. During any year they can expect to spend three times as many days in the hospital as younger people. One-half of all the aged does not have any kind of hospitalization insurance, and a high proportion of those who have it receives only small benefits under limited conditions.

Older people need this protection, not as a gift or charity but as a statutory right, earned by their own efforts during their productive years. To make this possible, the President has asked the Congress to add a hospital insurance program for aged persons to the Social Security System. For those now over 65 who have not had an opportunity to participate in the social security program, the President has recommended that the cost of their coverage be paid from general tax revenues. The coverage of all the aged for hospital insurance should reduce the long-run cost to the States for medical assistance to the needy, under the Kerr-Mills Act.

The President has stressed that his insurance program is not a program of socialized medicine. Every person would choose his own doctor, his own hospital. The proposed insurance program would simply be a means of paying for health services, not a means of providing them.

Oregon can be proud of the leadership it has contributed to this fight for hospital insurance for our aged. Senators Morse and Neuberger and Representatives Ullman and Green have introduced the bill in the Congress. I know of no other State delegation where two-thirds of its members have sponsored this important bill.

Let us turn now to a second major factor in the health equation—the availability of adequate health services and facilities. You in the welfare field have been troubled by an array of problems in financing medical care. Today, when hospitals have more to offer people than ever before, when lifesaving miracles are commonplace, hospitals are beset by soaring operating costs, soaring construction costs, obsolescence, and personnel shortage.

A considerable part of this problem is directly traceable to the swift upward spiral of hospital expense for the consumer. In 1946, at the end of World War II, the average cost of hospital care per patient-day was $9.39. In just 5 years, it had climbed to $16.67. Since 1950 it has more than doubled that figure—rising to $32.23 per patient-day in 1960 and $34.98 in 1961. If this rate were to continue, the average daily hospital costs are likely to be $60 to $65 a day by 1970.

At the same time, some hospitals are filled and have waiting lists, while others have too many empty beds. For certain facilities, such as long-term care and community-based mental health centers, we continue to be plagued by critical shortages. Some patients get more expensive care than they need, while others in desperate need do without. In some small cities, hospital facilities are sufficient. In some large cities, they are out of date and require modernization and rehabilitation.

We must reexamine our total hospital needs, resources, and objectives for the coming decade. To encourage such appraisals, the President has recommended legislation to authorize planning grants to public and other nonprofit organizations to assist in developing comprehensive, areawide plans for the construction and operation of all types of health facilities.

One important task before all of us is to organize our facts to combat the attacks on the financial soundness of the social security system. These attacks, inspired by some persons in private insurance and organized medicine, seek to discredit this Nation's basic social insurance system as part of their campaign to defeat health insurance for the aged through social security.

These groups have a right to oppose the addition of hospital insurance for the aged through social security, but we should not permit them to tear down existing institutions, so necessary to our free society, in their attacks on the financial integrity of our social security system.

The old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program has always been fully supported by the social security contributions paid by covered employees and their employers. It has never received a subsidy from general revenues.

The most recent Advisory Council on Social Security Financing said in January 1959 in a report of its findings: "The Council finds that the present method of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is sound, practical, and appropriate for this program. It is our judgment, based on the best available cost estimates, that the contribution schedule enacted into law in the last session of Congress makes adequate provisions for financing the program on a sound actuarial basis."

YOUTH PROGRAMS

One of the areas in which the Kennedy administration is giving continued emphasis this year is the expansion of opportunities for youth—in the field of employment, training, education, and for participation in our national destiny.

It is difficult to see how a high school student can gain a sense of responsibility and participation in this Nation's economy when he is consistently denied jobs on account of his youth. The problem is the more acute for minority youth who encounter discrimination on account of race as well as because of their age. And the situation becomes all the more critical when teenagers, tempted to drop out of high school, feel an understandable futility about staying in school in the face of such widespread unemployment among their peers.

The administration has already begun an intensive effort to see that jobs are available to young people—particularly in urban environments—and also to see that youth know more about these opportunities. The U.S. Employment Service is making special counseling services available in urban areas of high youth unemployment. The manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 also has important implications for youth employment in that it provides training of workers whose skills have become obsolete because of economic or technological change.

A singularly important part of the President's youth program is the Youth Employment Act of 1963. One of the provisions of this bill would give employment opportunities to some 40,000 youths in their home communities, with Federal funds financing half their wages. Another provision, for a Youth Conservation Corps, would take about 15,000 jobless youths off the streets and give them employment in our national parks and other places where their services are needed.

Finally, the third portion of the President's youth program has enormous symbolic significance because it challenges youth to participate with dedication in this Nation's mission as leader of the free world.

The major aspect of this program is the Peace Corps. Although it has been operating just 2 years, it has won world renown. As youthful ambassadors to foreign lands, the younger members of our Peace Corps have built a tremendous reservoir of goodwill for us and have had their own lives enriched. The Peace Corps program is for citizens aged 18 or over—there is no upper age limit—who wish to take an active part in what President Kennedy called "a long twilight struggle * * * a struggle against the common enemies of man; tyranny, poverty, disease or war itself." One of the great benefits of a domestic version of the Peace Corps—the National Service Corps, now under serious consideration by the Congress—would be to increase citizen interest and participation in social welfare.

THE PRESIDENT'S EDUCATION PROGRAM

In a special message to the Congress (Jan. 29, 1963), President Kennedy vigorously outlined a bold and realistic program for American education.

It is the belief of this administration that the doors to the schoolhouse, to the library, and to the college lead to the richest treasures of our open society: The power of knowledge; the training and skills necessary for productive employment; the wisdom, the ideals, and the culture which enrich life; and the creative, self-disciplined understanding of society needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world.

The administration's program includes Federal aid for elementary, secondary, and higher education. It emphasizes improvements in both the quality and quantity of education. It is the most comprehensive and creative education program advanced by any President of the United States. It is fitting and proper that Oregon should again be in the lead here with both Senator Morse and Representative Green having introduced the National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

The proposals represent a careful reevaluation of national needs and national priorities.

Increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to both our national security and our domestic well-being. A free nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers, and school dropouts are failures of our educational system. They breed failures in our social and economic system—delinquency, unemployment, chronic dependence, a waste of human resources, a loss of productive power and purchasing power, and an increase in tax-supported benefits.

The loss of only 1 year's income because of unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school. Failure to improve educational performance is thus not only poor social policy; it is poor economics.

Only 10 percent of our adults had a high school or college education at the turn of the century. Today such an education has become a requirement for an increasing number of jobs.

Yet nearly 40 percent of our youths is dropping out before graduating from high school; only 43 percent of our adults has completed high school; only 8 percent of our adults has completed college; and only 16 percent of our young people is currently completing college.

Improved education is essential to give new meaning to our national purpose and power in the new age of science and space. In the last 20 years, mankind has acquired more scientific information than in all previous history. Ninety percent of all the scientists that ever lived is alive and working today.

The twisting course of the cold war requires a citizenry that understands our principles and problems. It requires skilled manpower and brainpower to match the power of totalitarian discipline. It requires a scientific effort which demonstrates the superiority of freedom. And it requires an electorate in every State with sufficiently broad horizons and sufficient maturity of judgment to guide this Nation safely through whatever lies ahead.

From every point of view, education is of paramount concern to the national interest as well as to each individual.

The growing demands of modern education make it necessary to expand Federal aid to education beyond the limited number of special educational programs which Congress has enacted over the years. We can no longer afford the luxury of endless debate over all the complicated and sensitive questions raised by each new proposal on Federal participation in education. To be sure, these are all difficult problems—but this Nation has not come to its present position of leadership by avoiding hard problems. We are at a point in history when we must face and resolve these problems.

A century's experience with Federal aid to land-grant colleges has demonstrated that Federal financial participation can assist educational progress and growth without Federal control. In the last decade, experience under the National Science Foundation, with the National Defense Education Act, and with programs for assisting federally affected school districts has demonstrated that Federal support can benefit education without leading to Federal control over curriculum.

Education is and always must be a local responsibility. It thrives best when nurtured at the grassroots of our democracy. But in our present era of economic expansion, population growth, and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient. These efforts must be reinforced by national support, if American education is to yield a maximum of individual development and national well-being.

The program for American education proposed by President Kennedy offers Federal assistance without Federal control. It provides for economic growth, manpower development, and progress toward our educational and humanitarian objectives. It encourages the increase of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and critical intelligence necessary for the preservation of our society. It will help keep America strong and safe and free. The President has strongly recommended it to the Congress for high-priority action. He asks your support for this vital measure.

These proposals dealing with youth and education which I have outlined are part of a bold attempt to strengthen the role of youth in society, to assure to each and every child (1) the opportunity to prepare for adulthood; (2) the opportunity for gainful and productive employment; (3) the opportunity to use his abilities to the maximum; and (4) the opportunity to participate in our national destiny.

A PROGRAM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

At the other end of the age scale we have almost 18 million senior citizens for whom the President has also proposed a dynamic program. On February 21 he delivered a message on aiding our elderly citizens.

In this message, in addition to hospital insurance for the aged, the President called for a new grant program to help public and voluntary organizations develop various services for older people which cannot be financed by any of the existing grant programs. Grants would also be authorized for research, demonstration, and training projects leading to new or improved programs to aid older people and for the construction, renovation, and equipment of public and nonprofit multipurpose recreational centers for the elderly.

Other measures proposed include tax reforms which would lower the Federal income tax liabilities of older people by about $790 million; changes in the old-age survivors, and disability insurance program which would raise the maximum earnings base from the present $4,800 to $5,200 and thus bring higher benefit payments to those who retire in the future; measures to increase employment opportunities for older people; more support for senior citizens' housing and for the construction of nursing homes; and improvements in the program of medical assistance for the indigent aged, as well as in old-age assistance.

The President's proposed homefront peace corps would give mature and retired people an opportunity to serve at home much as the Peace Corps serves abroad.

"Our national record in providing for our aged is a proud and hopeful one," the President said, "but it can and must improve. We can continue to move forward—by building needed Federal programs—by developing means for comprehensive action in our communities—and by doing all we can, as a Nation and as individuals, to enable our senior citizens to achieve both a better standard of life and a more active, useful, and meaningful role in a society that owes them much and can still learn much from them."

PUBLIC WELFARE CHANGES

Public welfare turned to a new course with the historic Public Welfare Amendments of 1962. When we consider how that course was shaped, we realize again how vital it is to any major welfare undertaking to have the cooperation of public and private welfare agencies and the support of the community.

You will recall that nearly 2 years ago, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sought advice from a distinguished group of persons on what the Federal Government could do to increase the effectiveness of public welfare, and particularly public assistance programs.

The recommendations of this ad hoc committee and other advisory groups were foundation stones on which the later administrative actions and legislative proposals were built. Other building blocks included a special report on steps which could be taken within existing legislation, the counsel of State administrators of public welfare, the positions taken by numerous organizations in or closely related to welfare, and the wealth of experience developed in the States and localities over the last few years.

Probably never before in the history of public welfare in this country had a more comprehensive reexamination taken place.

The administrative directives which took effect last year were aimed at developing constructive approaches to getting people off assistance where possible and to restoring personal independence to the great majority who are too old or ill or disabled to be self-supporting or who are still in childhood. They centered attention on the family unit and our need to help make it a more stable and stimulating environment for children. They were designed for tightening and streamlining agencies' procedures, so that assistance is available—as intended—only to those who are eligible for it.

Then came the 1962 public welfare amendments adopted by the Congress with support from all quarters. When the President signed that measure into law in July he called it "the most far-reaching revision of our public welfare program since it was enacted in 1935."

To go after the causes of dependency—and do something about them—is a difficult task. How nearly we realize our goal will depend upon whether full advantage is taken in States and localities of the Federal legislative and administrative changes and of the additional Federal funds now available.

Oregon has a number of distinct advantages in its public welfare endeavors. You have two schools of social work—one undergraduate, the other graduate—which have the faculty and the experience to provide vitally needed leadership and training opportunities in public welfare. Another rich resource is the large number of persons in the State in both public and private welfare—laymen and professionals—who understand this field and have the ability and willingness to make creative contributions to it.

If all these strengths are mustered, there is no reason why Oregon cannot have a public welfare program which points the way for other States in promoting family well-being, preventing the children now living in deprived circumstances from growing up without the capacity for self-support, and assuring the wise use of public money for the best interests of the whole community. Oregon's participation in the present nationwide review of eligibility in the aid to families with dependent children program is helping the Federal Government carry out its on-going responsibility to see that public assistance funds are being spent for the purposes intended by law.

The new public welfare legislation emphasizes the importance of expanding and strengthening services in a number of ways.

It provides for the doubling of Federal funds for child welfare services over the next 7 years from the present $25 million annually to $50 million.

It specifically earmarks some of the child welfare funds for day-care services for the children of working mothers—$5 million in 1963 and $10 million in 1964 and each year thereafter.

It provides that the State must extend its child welfare services with a view to making available by July 1, 1975, child welfare services in all political subdivisions of the State.

It provides for coordination between the services provided under the child welfare program and the dependent children program "with a view to provision of welfare and related services which will best promote the welfare of such children and their families."

It provides that in the assistance categories there be the development and application of a program of welfare and related services for each child who receives assistance as may be necessary in the light of the particular home conditions and other needs of such child.

It provides for increasing the Federal financial share from 50 to 75 percent for the social services and training.

Public welfare has a legal responsibility to provide the kinds of social services required to assure that each needy child has a family life which encourages him to grow up to responsible adulthood. We believe that the law should be administered on the basis that children should not be made to suffer for the sins of their parents.

This means that all available social services should be used to improve any home situation which appears to threaten a child's well-being. It means that, if these efforts fail, other provisions should be employed, including protective payments to an interested third party capable of handling the assistance grant in the best interests of the child or arrangements for foster or institutional care with Federal sharing in the cost if removal from home is necessary.

Most emphatically it means that aid cannot be denied an eligible needy child because of unsatisfactory home conditions so long as the child is left in that home. This principle, laid down in a ruling by former Secretary Flemming, continued by former Secretary Ribicoff, and ratified by the Congress last year and again this year is firmly fixed now in the basic Social Security Act. It is a principle of humanity and decency.

Families receiving public assistance are by definiton facing serious problems: Poverty; the breakup of the family unit because of desertion, divorce, separation, or death; unemployment; poor health; limited education; lack of skill for homemaking and child care; and social isolation.

Such families can benefit from intensive services which bring frequent visits and consultation from welfare workers and the application of the full range of community services and resources—social, vocational, educational, health—as individual or family need may direct.

Under the law as it existed prior to the 1962 enactment, States with approved plans for public assistance were entitled to 50-percent Federal participation in expenditures they made for administration of their programs, including costs of services to applicants and recipients. Under the new amendments, States may receive 75-percent Federal participation in certain expenditures for services and for staff training. Services may also be provided for persons who are likely to become applicants for assistance or for those who recently have been recipients of assistance.

Starting this July 1, to qualify for any 75-percent reimbursement for services or for staff training, each State will have to provide a minimum content of services prescribed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Some additional services beyond this minimum may be matched at the 75-percent rate if a State chooses to provide them. From last September until July 1, the identified services can be reimbursed at the 75-percent rate without providing the minimum content of services. The general standards required for 75-percent reimbursement of service costs call for a caseload not in excess of 60 cases per worker, for at least 1 supervisor for 5 caseworkers, and for visiting to families and adults with specific problems as often as may be necessary but in any event at intervals not exceeding 3 months.

We know that at the outset some States will be unable to meet the ultimate standards fully, and provision is made for progressive steps. For the tooling-up period prior to next July 1, a State may, upon proper justification, still be entitled to 75-percent Federal participation in properly identified services and training expenditures even though the standards are not fully met. During this period, a State that does the best it can with available resources and has a definite plan for going forward with an improved service program will get reimbursed at the 75-percent rate for those specified services which it actually does provide and, in addition, will get 75 percent for its training activities. After July 1, 1963, a State will have to provide certain prescribed services if it is to receive any 75-percent participation.

For a limited period, after July 1, 1963, a State may have temporary standards which are different and less exacting than those ultimately required. But standards will have to be strengthened progressively so that not later than July 1, 1967, every State will have to meet fully the following:

1. Provide that the full range of prescribed services under a given title shall be available to all families and adults with the defined special problems or needs.

2. Provide for caseload and case supervisory standards that insure time and case supervision necessary for the effective provision of services, namely, not to exceed 60 cases per worker and 5 workers for 1 case supervisor (or the equivalent where mixed service and nonservice cases are carried).

For an initial period up to July 1, 1964, cost-allocation methods are provided which are designed to minimize the work required of States in identifying those activities which are subject to the 75-percent rate. Only those costs for staff directly involved in providing services and the cost of purchase of services from other State agencies are subject to the 75-percent rate. The policy permits States to make functional direct charges of the entire cost of personnel services and travel of caseworkers and casework supervisors whose assigned caseloads include only cases with specified problems, without the necessity for a special showing of the amount and kind of work actually performed on these cases. This direct-charge method for services would also be applicable to States electing to include all families receiving aid to families with dependent children. States not utilizing the functional direct-charge method are given a choice of two simplified methods for claiming that portion of their expenditures which is subject to 75-percent reimbursement.

The new law clearly sets forth the important new policy that the training of public assistance personnel employed or preparing for employment in the State or local agency will be reimbursed at 75 percent instead of the previous 50 percent. Under the instructions implementing this new provision, we will pay 75 percent of the cost of any of the following:

1. State or local staff development services.
2. Agency training sessions in which the content deals with public assistance such as the cost of operating training centers, payment to outside experts to conduct special courses, and expenses of staff while attending such training.
3. Field instruction units including both salaries and rental of space.
4. Educational leave including salary and educational costs paid to the employee or to an educational institution.

The significance of the change from 50- to 75-percent reimbursement can easily be underestimated unless one stops a moment to figure out the real importance of the change. Under the 50-percent provision a State receives 1 Federal dollar for each dollar the State puts up. But under the 75-percent provision the State receives 3 Federal dollars for 1 State dollar. Thus, with the same amount of State funds, the total available for services and training can be doubled.

To promote family stability, the new legislation continues for 5 years last year's experimental program of aid to families with dependent children payments when the father is willing and able to work but unable to find a job—a breakaway from the traditional concept of help only upon the absence of the father from the home, a concept that encouraged many frantic and desperate unemployed fathers to desert their families so that they could obtain AFDC payments.

The new provisions for work training for jobless parents can offer them opportunities to learn new skills or conserve those habits and talents which they already have and, at the same time, be contributing members of society. For the minority of assistance recipients able to work, this is an important step forward.

The new legislation also provides for the funding of demonstration projects, introduces incentives to work by allowing certain income, and improves the adequacy of payments.

In formulating Federal legislative proposals and priorities for 1963, the administration has been guided by these general principles:

1. Public welfare must continue to become more service-oriented. It must put renewed emphasis on rehabilitation. It must emphasize prevention of dependency.

2. Public welfare must provide services to persons before, during, and after receipt of assistance.

3. Public welfare must coordinate its services more effectively. An important step in this direction was taken at the Federal level in January when the Welfare Administration was created as a major operating unit of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. All the Department's programs that have a major welfare component are now brought together as an operating entity so that there will be greater coordination of the services of the Bureau of Family Services, the Children's Bureau, the Office of Aging, the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, and the Cuban refugee program. As you know, Dr. Ellen Winston, former public welfare commissioner of North Carolina, is the new Commissioner of Welfare. One of her major objectives is to strengthen the services all these programs can offer to States.

4. Public welfare must be more community conscious—more public relations conscious. It must explain more effectively to the taxpayer what it is doing and why—and why it is not doing many things that are necessary. It must explain to welfare recipients what welfare is and what it is trying to do.

5. Public welfare must reexamine its operations, reassess its present methods, and simplify its bookkeeping to put the needs of welfare recipients and the prevention of dependency foremost in the minds of every person in the agency. This may mean discarding some fond notion somebody may have held for years and elevated into a principle. I do not think there is a principle—if it is sound—which cannot stand a new, cold, hard scrutiny; if it cannot stand such a scrutiny, probably it wasn't so sound to begin with.

6. Public welfare must be more experimental, more creative, more research minded.

CHANGES IN OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

The specific proposals which President Kennedy has recommended in old-age assistance are as follows:

1. The States would be permitted to make old-age assistance payments to third persons concerned with the welfare of the OAA recipients when the recipients, because of physical or mental condition, are unable to manage their money. State agencies would closely supervise these cases.

2. The Federal provisions relating to OAA would be amended to require that States establish an agency to set standards for rental housing occupied by recipients of old-age assistance. This provision would become effective July 1, 1966. It is similar to a provision adopted by Congress in 1950 relating to institutions.

3. To help the Federal-State public welfare programs meet more adequately the needs of people, it is proposed that the Social Security Act be amended to prohibit a residence requirement of more than 3 years (out of the last 9) as of January 1, 1968, and of more than 1 year as of January 1, 1970.

4. It is proposed that the 42-day limitation in titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act be deleted. This would enable the States to initiate or continue assistance to persons who are patients in general medical institutions because of a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis without limitation as to the time they may be in such an institution.

5. As a condition of plan approval for old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged, each State would be required to make available medical services for CAA recipients at least equal to those available under MAA. Nothing in the proposal would prevent a State from having more care under old-age assistance than medical assistance for the aged.

All this legislative, financial, and administrative encouragement to more and better services is a tremendous challenge to public welfare personnel, to legislators, to social workers in public and private agencies, and to schools of social work. Will Oregon accept this challenge? We in the Department hope it will. We offer our wholehearted cooperation to make this new effort a success.

It is going to require more staff, more money, and the cooperation of the State agency, the Governor, the legislature, the press—and you.

There is no magic in the use of social services to bring new strength to dependent persons. And we cannot expect quick results, however much we might hope for them. It will not be possible within a few months to realize the full potentials of rehabilitation services. Yet, I am sure that the enthusiastic support which has been inspired by these objectives will mean measurable progress in the near future.

Twenty years ago Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his famous "Four Freedoms" speech, said there is nothing mysterious about the foundations of a healthy, strong democracy. He said: "The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are: equality of opportunity for youth and for others; jobs for those who can work; security for those who need it; the ending of special privilege for the few; the preservation of civil liberties for all; the enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and constantly rising standard of living. These are the simple and basic things that must never be lost sight of in the turmoil and unbelievable complexity of our modern world. The inner and abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the degree to which they fulfill these expectations."

Many new gains, many advances have been made in the two decades since these words were spoken. But the gains we have made only point the way to others that must be won if poverty and dependency are to be abolished and the basic human expectations of the American people are to be fulfilled in a democratic, free enterprise society.

Today's Health and Education Needs

(By Wilbur J. Cohen)

I am glad to come here as an official of the Federal Government to speak to an organization whose predominant concern is the social and economic problems of its community.

There is nothing strange about this at all. To me it simply points up the fact that we have learned that our communities, acting alone, cannot solve all their own problems.

A community cannot, for instance, by itself cleanse the polluted water that flows into or through it. It cannot raise the educational level of the people moving into it. It cannot, by itself, effectively prevent the introduction of disease from sources beyond its control. It cannot effectively control the adulterated foods and unsafe drugs that are produced beyond its boundaries.

Thus, we have learned that many of our community problems call for planning, study, and even action, on the part of all the communities in a given area or in the Nation. It is quite logical, therefore, that communities are working with the States and the Federal Government to act in their joint and common interests.

This concept is especially reflected in the work of the Department I represent—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Much of what we do is done in partnership with State and local governments and involves problem areas of national concern or of such scope or complexity that Federal leadership and assistance is needed.

As an example, consider the health of the people of Portland. Good health is their most valued possession, for without good health nothing else matters very much.

The Department's work in the field of health is twofold. On the one hand, we seek ways to maintain good health by preventing those conditions which are detrimental to health. On the other hand, we seek ways to improve the health of those who are ill or injured.

There are many ways we go about this job.

Day in and day out our people in the Public Health Service work to keep disease from being brought into the United States—and thus into Portland. There is a constant tight screening of the people crossing our borders. Precautions are taken to keep disease from being introduced into this country through imported food stuff, manufactured items, and animals.

Our Food and Drug Administration guards the health of all Americans—including the people of Portland—by assuring us of the purity and safety of our food and drugs no matter where they are produced.

Our environment—the air we breathe, our water, the places we work and play—has a great deal to do with our health. Here, too, the Department—along with States and local communities—is working to provide better waste treatment to assure a pure and plentiful supply of water; to rid the air of the pollution that interferes with our health, safety, comfort, and enjoyment; to guard against overexposure to radioactive substances being released as we begin to make use of nuclear energy.

We work toward assuring communities that the facilities they need are available—adequate hospitals and nursing facilities in sufficient numbers, teaching facilities, up-to-date diagnostic and therapeutic equipment, and the supplies to back up the facilities.

The Department is responsible for providing leadership, guidance, and funds to the States so that they may assist handicapped citizens in finding a new way of life through vocational rehabilitation.

The Department, through its National Institutes of Health, is investing more than half a billion dollars a year in intensive research to help many realize the age-old dream of conquering disease. Under concentrated attack are such major problems as heart disease, arthritis, cancer, mental illness, blindness, and a host of other maladies that have plagued mankind throughout history.

Yet despite all that the Federal Government, the States, local communities, and private organizations and individuals are doing, we are still faced with formidable problems in our drive for better health.

President Kennedy, in his message of February 7 to the Congress on health, said: "Each improvement raises our horizons; each success enables us to concentrate more on the remaining dangers, and on new challenges and threats to health. Some of these new challenges result from our changing environment, some from new habits and activities. The Federal Government has stimulated much of the recent progress in medical research, without interference with scientific, academic, or individual liberty. Our task now is to be equally decisive in putting this knowledge into practice."

In effect, the President is suggesting to the Congress that the Federal Government give greater recognition to its responsibilities in the field of health; especially with respect to many of the health problems now upon us or which will be upon us unless something is done.

For example, even to retain our present ratio of physicians and dentists to population will require, over the next 10 years, a 50-percent increase in the number of people graduated from our medical schools and a 100-percent increase in the number of dental graduates.

Unless we face up to this situation now, there will be more than 2,000 people per family physician by 1970—as compared with 1,300 people per family physician in 1950.

To prepare for our future, President Kennedy recommends that the Federal Government assist in the financing of the construction and expansion of teaching facilities for the medical, dental, and other health professions and Federal financial assistance for students in these fields.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Just as essential as professional people to our health is adequate health facilities in which they may put their knowledge into practice.

For 16 years, the Federal Government has been assisting financially in the construction of health facilities through the Hill-Burton Act.

Here in Portland, for example, over $1 million in Hill-Burton funds were used in the construction of your $4 million Emanuel Hospital and School of Nursing. Hill-Burton will also pay $246,000 toward the addition to your Providence Hospital. Altogether, almost $5 million in Hill-Burton funds have been spent on 14 different medical-facility construction projects in Portland.

But, despite the addition of 275,000 hospital beds to this country's medical facilities with assistance from Hill-Burton funds, there is still a serious shortage, in part brought about by our rapidly expanding population.

President Kennedy has recommended, therefore, that the Hill-Burton Act, which is due to expire June 30, 1964, be extended for 5 years. And, in recognition of the problems of deterioration and obsolescence many of our older hospitals face, the Hill-Burton Act should be modified so that Federal financial assistance would be provided for modernizing or replacing old hospitals and other health facilities.

I spoke earlier of the work our Food and Drug Administration does in protecting our health. It could do an even better job for us if its authority was broadened, as President Kennedy recommended in his health message, to require proof of both safety and effectiveness of therapeutic devices before marketing and to require cosmetics to be tested and proved safe before they are marketed. This, and similar authority, would complement the additional powers given the FDA last year under the Kefauver-Harris drug control amendments which set higher standards of safety, honesty, and efficacy in the manufacture and sale of prescription drugs and new drugs of all kinds.

AIR POLLUTION

Another health problem of concern to the Department is the steady rise in the extent to which the rapid changes in technology and the accelerating movement of the population into metropolitan areas expose the population to health hazards. Every day, actions by individuals, by industry, and by government shape and change man's environment—and increase our responsibility for seeing that such actions are taken with due consideration of their health effects.

This is especially true of air pollution. Air pollution has been linked to a considerable number of human ailments—especially in older people. In addition, the garbage and wastes and byproducts we discharge into our air cause about $11 billion dollars worth of damage every year in the United States.

President Kennedy has requested legislation authorizing HEW to intensify its research into the causes, effects, and control of air pollution; to provide financial assistance through project grants to local air pollution control agencies so that they can initiate or improve their control programs; to study the interstate or nationwide significance of air pollution; and to take action to abate interstate air pollution along the general lines of the existing water pollution control enforcement measures.

Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER has introduced a bill (S. 1009) which would carry out the President's recommendations.

MENTAL ILLNESS AND MENTAL RETARDATION

Not all health problems, of course, are physical, as was pointed out by President Kennedy in his special message to the Congress on mental illness and mental retardation—the first such presidential message in the history of this Nation.

The heart of the program President Kennedy recommends to combat mental illness is the concept that many forms and degrees of mental illness can be prevented or ameliorated more effectively through community-oriented preventive, diagnostic, treatment, and rehabilitation services. This is a departure from the traditional view that such services could best be provided by a mental institution.

Specifically, the proposals relating to mental illness are designed to launch a national mental health program that takes into account not only current needs in existing facilities and programs but also the projected future mental health needs of the Nation. The Federal Government would participate in the programs by giving financial assistance for the construction and staffing of the community mental health centers and by greatly increasing its support of research to assure long-term advances in the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally ill.

Similar efforts are called for by the President in the field of mental retardation.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE

Another important feature of the President's health program is his proposal for hospital insurance protection for aged persons through the social security system. Considering the facts that aged people require, on the average, three times as much hospitalization as younger poeple and yet have only about half as much income, the addition of hospital insurance to social security is urgently needed to protect the economic freedom and security of older citizens. Every person eligible for hospital benefits would be given a card much like the cards now provided hospitalization insurance subscribers to identify him upon admission to a hospital or nursing home.

Hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, and community health-service organizations would be paid for the reasonable costs of the services they furnished. There would be little difference between the procedures under the proposed program and those already set up and accepted by hospitals in connection with Blue Cross programs.

Every hospital which is accredited by the Joint Commission of Accreditation of Hospitals (a nongovernment, professional organization) would automatically be able to participate, provided the hospital had an arrangement for reviewing the utilization of its services and facilities.

Appropriate State agencies would play an important role in determining which nonaccredited hospitals and which skilled nursing facilities would be eligible to participate. These State agencies would also provide consultative services to those institutions to help them qualify.

The President's proposed insurance program would not be socialized medicine. Nor would it lead to socialized medicine. It is simply a national program to help older people pay hospital and related health-care bills.

Older people who would be entitled to benefits under the program would continue to choose their own doctors, just as now. If an elderly person's doctor decided that his patient needed hospital care, the patient and his doctor—not the Government—would determine what hospital he entered, just as now.

The proposed program would simply be a means of paying for certain services, not a means of providing these services. The services themselves would be provided in the same way they are now. They would be provided by the same institutions and the same professional personnel.

As with Blue Cross, the only difference resulting from the program would be in how the bills got paid. In fact, persons over 65 who were already insured under a private health insurance plan providing the same benefits plus some other protection could continue under that plan and receive their basic social security hospital insurance in that way.

In short, what is proposed is a program of hospital insurance, with specified benefits, for people over 65. It is not a program under which hospitals and nursing homes would be taken over by the Government or run by the Government. It is not a program under which doctors would be working for the Government under Government supervision.

It is not a program of socialized medicine.

The program would have no effect on the relationship between the doctor and his patient. It would not cover the fees for the services of private physicians in home or office.

The only difference would be that a doctor could refer an elderly person to the hospital knowing that the bulk of the bill would be paid through the hospital insurance program—that the patient would not have to exhaust his savings or go into debt.

If the patient required nursing-home care following hospitalization, the doctor could recommend such care knowing that the bill would be paid through the hospital insurance program.

Or, if the doctor considered that the best course for the patient would be visiting-nurse services or other health services in the patient's own home, he could recommend this, knowing that the bills would be paid through the hospital insurance program.

In still another situation, if the doctor considered that the patient needed extensive diagnostic services as an outpatient of a hospital, he could arrange this, knowing that the bulk of the costs would be paid through the hospital insurance program.

Hospital insurance under social security—reinforced by private savings and private health insurance and supplemented where necessary by medical care through public assistance—would become the first line of defense against the high cost of illness in old age.

EDUCATION

Now let me turn to another concern of our Department and of the present administration—education.

Today, we are facing a twofold challenge in education that, unless met, can hamper our national growth. We have today more students than ever before, and their number is increasing. At the same time, the relentless progress of our technology is demanding higher levels of education and training for everyone concerned.

In his special message to the Congress (January 29, 1963) President Kennedy vigorously outlined a bold and realistic program for American education. The President pointed out: "Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education, coupled with widespread availability of college education."

The President believes that the doors to the schoolhouse, to the library, and to the college lead to the richest treasures of our open society: To the power of knowledge—to the training and skills necessary for productive employment—to the wisdom, the ideals, and the culture which enrich life—and to the creative, self-disciplined understanding of society needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world.

The President's program includes Federal aid for elementary, secondary, and higher education. It emphasizes improvements in both the quality and quantity of education. It is the most comprehensive and creative education program advanced by any President of the United States.

The proposals represent a careful reevaluation of national needs and national priorities.

Increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to both our national security and our domestic well-being. A free nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts—these and other failures of our educational system breed failures in our social and economic system: Delinquency, unemployment, chronic dependence, a waste of human resources, a loss of productive power and purchasing power, and an increase in tax-supported benefits. The loss of only 1 year's income because of unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school. Failure to improve educational performance is thus not only poor social policy; it is poor economics.

Only 10 percent of our adults had a high school or college education at the turn of the century. Today such an education has become a requirement for an increasing number of jobs. Yet nearly 40 percent of our youths is dropping out before graduating from high school; only 43 percent of our adults has completed high school; only 8 percent of our adults has completed college; and only 16 percent of our young people is currently completing college.

Recent research has shown that one of the most beneficial of all investments is education, accounting for some 40 percent of the Nation's growth and productivity in recent years. It is an investment which yields a substantial return in the higher wages and purchasing power of trained workers, in the new products and techniques which come from skilled minds, and in the constant expansion of this Nation's storehouse of useful knowledge.

Improved education is essential to give new meaning to our national purpose and power in the new age of science and space. In the last 20 years, mankind has acquired more scientific information than in all previous history. Ninety percent of all the scientists that ever lived are alive and working today. Vast stretches of the unknown are being explored every day for military, medical, commercial, and other reasons.

The twisting course of the cold war requires a citizenry that understands our principles and problems. It requires skilled manpower and brainpower to match the power of totalitarian discipline. It requires a scientific effort which demonstrates the superiority of freedom. And it requires an electorate in every State with sufficiently broad horizons and sufficient maturity of judgment to guide this Nation safely through whatever lies ahead.

From every point of view, education is of paramount concern to the national interest as well as to each individual. Our Nation requires a new standard of excellence in education, matched by the fullest possible access to educational opportunities, enabling each and every citizen to develop his talents to the maximum possible extent.

As a nation our concern for the future of our children—and the growing demands of modern education which Federal financing is better able to assist—makes it necessary to expand Federal aid to education beyond the existing limited number of special educational programs which Congress has enacted over the years. We can no longer afford the luxury of endless debate over all the complicated and sensitive questions raised by each new proposal on Federal participation in education. To be sure, these are all difficult problems—but this Nation has not come to its present position of leadership by avoiding hard problems. We are at a point in history when we must face and resolve these problems.

Local and State governments and private institutions, responding to individual and local circumstances, have done much. They have, in recent years, devoted sharply increased resources to education. Total national outlays for education nearly trebled during the 1940's and more than doubled during the 1950's, reaching a level of nearly $25 million in 1960. As a proportion of national income, this represented a rise from little more than 4 percent in 1940 to nearly 6 percent in 1960, an increase of over 40 percent in total effort.

And still more effort is needed. The Federal Government—despite increasing recognition of education as a nationwide challenge and despite the increased financial difficulties encountered by States, communities, and private institutions in carrying this burden—has clearly not met its responsibilities in education. It has not offered sufficient help to our present educational system to meet its inadequacies and overcome its obstacles.

It is our conviction that the Federal Government should not take over responsibility for education. That is neither desirable nor feasible. Instead its participation should be selective, stimulative, and, where possible, transitional.

Experience over a century with Federal aid to land-grant colleges has demonstrated that Federal financial participation can assist educational progress and growth without Federal control. In the last decade, experience with Federal aid under the National Science Foundation, with the National Defense Education Act, and with programs for assisting federally affected school districts has demonstrated that Federal support can benefit education without leading to Federal control.

The proper Federal role is to identify national education goals and to help local, State, and private authorities build the necessary roads to reach those goals. Federal aid will enable our schools, colleges, and universities to be more stable financially and therefore more independent.

What are these goals? In our opinion they include the following:

1. The quality of instruction provided in all our schools and colleges must be improved. We must stimulate interest in learning in order to reduce the alarming number of students who now drop out of school or who do not continue into higher levels of education. This requires more and better teachers—teachers who can be attracted to and retained in schools and colleges only if pay levels reflect more adequately the value of the services they render. It also requires that our teachers and instructors be equipped with the best possible teaching materials and curriculums. They must have at their command methods of instruction proven by thorough scientific research into the learning process and by careful experimentation.

2. The educational system of our Nation faces a major problem of quantity—of coping with the needs of our expanding population and of the rising educational expectations for our children which all of us share as parents. Nearly 50 million people were enrolled in our schools and colleges in 1962—an increase of more than 50 percent since 1950. By 1970, college enrollment will

nearly double, and secondary schools will increase enrollment by 50 percent—categories in which the cost of education, including facilities, is several times higher than in elementary schools.

3. Special attention must be given to increasing the opportunities and incentives for all Americans to develop their talents to the utmost—to complete their education and to continue their self-development throughout life. This means preventing school dropouts, improving and expanding special educational services, and providing better education in slum, distressed, and rural areas where the educational attainment of students is far below par. It means increased opportunities for those students both willing and intellectually able to advance their education at the college and graduate levels. It means increased attention to vocational and technical education, which have long been underdeveloped in both effectiveness and scope, to the detriment of our workers and our technological progress.

In support of these three basic goals, President Kennedy proposes a comprehensive, balanced program to enlarge the Federal Government's investment in the education of its citizens—a program aimed at increasing the educational opportunities of potentially every American citizen, regardless of age, race, religion, income, and educational achievement.

This program has been shaped to meet our goals on the basis of three fundamental guidelines:

1. The careful appraisal of the entire range of educational problems, viewing educational opportunity as a continuous lifelong process, starting with preschool training and extending through elementary and secondary school, college, graduate education, vocational education, job training and retraining adult education, and such general community educational resources as the public library.

2. A selective application of Federal aid—aimed at strengthening, not weakening, the independence of existing school systems and aimed at meeting our most urgent education problems and objectives, including quality improvement; teacher training; special problems of slum, depressed, and rural areas; needy students; manpower shortage areas such as science and engineering; and shortages of educational facilities.

3. More effective implementation of existing laws, as reflected in the President's recent budget recommendations.

To enable the full range of educational needs to be considered as a whole, the President has transmitted to the Congress a single, comprehensive education bill—the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, which has been introduced into the Congress by Senator MORSE and Representative EDITH GREEN. Education cannot easily or wisely be divided into separate parts. Each part is linked to the other. The colleges depend on the work of the schools; the schools depend on the colleges for teachers; vocational and technical education is not separate from general education.

The President's proposal is an attempt to launch a prudent and balanced program drawing upon the efforts of many past Congresses and the proposals of many Members of both Houses. It is solely an educational program, which does not attempt to solve all other difficult domestic problems. It is clearly realistic in terms of its cost—and it is clearly essential to the growth and security of this country.

The American people—in partnership with their governments—have continued to insist that "the means of education shall forever be encouraged," as the Continental Congress affirmed in the Northwest Ordinance. Fundamentally, education is and must always be a local responsibility, for it thrives best when nurtured at the grassroots of our democracy. But in our present era of economic expansion, population growth, and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient. These efforts must be reinforced by national support if American education is to yield a maximum of individual development and national well-being.

The urgency of the President's program does not rest on the course of the cold war. Improvement in education is essential to our Nation's development without respect to what others are doing. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile noting that the Soviet Union recognizes that educational effort in the 1960's will have a major effect on a nation's power, progress, and status in the 1970's and 1980's. According to a recent report prepared for the National Science Foundation, Soviet institutions of higher education are graduating three times as many engineers and four times as many physicians as the United States. While trailing behind this country in aggregate annual numbers of higher education graduates, the Soviets are maintaining an annual flow of scientific and technical professional manpower more than twice as large as our own. At the same time, they have virtually eliminated illiteracy, with a 23-fold increase since the turn of the century in the proportion of persons with an education beyond the 7th grade. This Nation's concern for education is surely sufficient to excel the achievements of any other nation or system.

The program for American education proposed by President Kennedy is reasonable and yet far-reaching. It offers Federal assistance without Federal control. It provides for economic growth, manpower development, and progress toward our educational and humanitarian objectives. It encourages the increase of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and critical intelligence necessary for the preservation of our society. It will help keep America strong and safe and free. The President has strongly recommended it to the Congress for high-priority action. He asks your help in fighting for this vital measure.

The health and education proposals that we have discussed today will be subjects of considerable debate in the weeks to come. They involve a matter of choice on the part of the Nation—a weighting of the importance of health and education and how the optimum in both can be obtained by each individual. I think that choice, dictated by the truth of the fact that we cannot stand still, will be a wise, affirmative one.

PREREQUISITES TO SUCCESSFUL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an address by A. J. Hayes, international president of the International Association of Machinists, entitled "Prerequisites to Successful Collective Bargaining," given at Texas Christian University on March 14.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREREQUISITES TO SUCCESSFUL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(Remarks by A. J. Hayes, international president International Association of Machinists, at Texas Christian University Conference on Collective Bargaining and Arbitration, Fort Worth, Tex., March 14, 1963)

I appreciate this opportunity to meet with you and to discuss some of the issues and trends which seem to point to a crisis in collective bargaining in America today.

Apparently a great many people have been convinced—by some of the organizations of big business, by some of the pundits of the political podiums, and by many of the keepers of the press—that collective bargaining has failed in America, and that some alternative method of settling labor disputes is inevitable and desirable.

Perhaps a hint of what has gone wrong with collective bargaining—if anything actually has gone wrong—was contained in an article by A. J. Liebling which appeared in the New Yorker recently. With tongue-in-cheek, Mr. Liebling noted that under the rules by which newspapers report strikes, employers always offer and unions always demand. He pointed out that since no newspaper has ever written about an employer who demanded that the workers accept his terms, the public has been conditioned to believe that employers make nothing but benevolent offers—and unions make nothing but greedy demands.

In the somewhat murky atmosphere of this kind of reporting it is not surprising that so many people are convinced that a crisis truly exists in labor relations. The dock strike, the combined lockout and strike in the newspaper industry, and threatened breakdowns in railroad and defense occupations have not only solidified this crisis complex, but generated a new drive toward laws designed to dilute and even destroy collective bargaining in America.

So I want to talk about collective bargaining, and the implications of the efforts to supplant it with other methods of settling labor disputes. Specifically, I want to analyze the "Prerequisites to Successful Collective Bargaining." And let me say at the outset that one of the most important prerequisites of all is a recognition—by employers, politicians, and the press—that in a free society with a free work force there is really no acceptable alternative to collective bargaining.

If collective bargaining is breaking down today part of the reason is that certain influential employer organizations, newspapers, and politicians are determined to replace free collective bargaining with State compulsion. In effect, they are creating a sickness in order that they may prescribe a cure.

Since the 88th Congress convened a flood of antiunion bills have poured into the hoppers. For example, one bill, by Senator DIRKSEN, would establish compulsory arbitration in the maritime trades.

Another, by Senator CURTIS and Senator MUNDT, would bring unions under the antitrust laws, which means breaking them into small isolated locals completely incapable of bargaining effectively with the kind of huge nationwide corporations that dominate so many industries in our economy.

Still another, by Senator MCCLELLAN, would prohibit strikes in defense industries and substitute compulsory arbitration by a board appointed by the Secretary of Defense. The Senator would also bring transportation unions under the antitrust laws and bar them from striking, picketing, or acting in concert with other unions.

Senator GOLDWATER has recognized that some of the other solutions being offered—particularly compulsory arbitration—would inevitably lead to Government control of prices, profits, and the prerogatives of management. Therefore, his solution is more direct and one sided. Without touching the privileges, prerogatives, and powers of management the Goldwater bill would destroy the ability of unions to bargain by hedging the right to strike in a thicket of bureaucratic and time-consuming restrictions.

In the face of bills such as these—proposing such drastic changes in the structure of collective bargaining and trade unionism in the United States—one might assume that collective bargaining has failed completely, and that the need to find some alternative method of regulating relations between labor and management warranted the most extreme and severe countermeasures.

And yet, despite the profusely publicized labor disputes that have hit the headlines recently, the facts clearly show that collective bargaining has not failed, and that no public or private emergency demands that collective bargaining be scrapped in America. True, some recent strikes may have caused inconveniences and, perhaps, even some shortages. But inconveniences and shortages are not, in themselves, a national emergency.

A shortage of bananas, for example, or even the several weeks' absence of your favorite newspaper does not justify a panic-stricken rush to destroy the rights and values that differentiate a free country from a Communist one.

Far from being a failure, collective bargaining has been spectacularly successful in America. Over the years—and at a time when swift technological changes have generated great apprehension and unrest in the workplace—collective bargaining has provided labor and management with a beautifully balanced mechanism for achieving industrial stability.

In fact, despite all the highly sensationalized accounts of recent strikes, the total impact of strikes on the total economy is so infinitesimal as to make the current hysteria about a crisis in labor relations look ludicrous.

Not only are the total man-days lost as a result of strikes in an average year, less than two-tenths of 1 percent of all the time that is worked, but the trend through the years has been steadily down. Last year, for example, fewer workers were involved in strikes than at any time since the end of World War II.

Invariably I've noticed that those who shout the loudest about the man-days and production lost because of strikes are the least concerned about the man-days and production that are lost because of unemployment or job injuries. And yet strikes cause only about one-fourth as much production loss as do job accidents, and only about one sixty-fourth as much wage loss as unemployment. In fact, more time was lost last year due to unemployment than was caused by all the strikes that have taken place in America in the past 35 years—since 1927.

Thus collective bargaining is working, and working better every year. The so-called crisis in labor relations is a phony crisis.

Millions of workers and tens of thousands of employers are producing peacefully under the terms of agreements amicably achieved through collective bargaining.

Thus, I repeat, the crisis is phony. However, the danger that we may recklessly destroy collective bargaining in America is very real indeed. Against a background of public hysteria shortsighted men have tried to set the stage for the destruction of the rights and freedoms of every member of every union in our country.

They are shortsighted because they have not considered the price they will pay to destroy the rights of the working people. That price is, of course, the eventual but inevitable loss of their own rights. It is axiomatic that what Congress can do to organized labor this year another Congress can—and will have precedent to—do to management in another year.

So let me suggest that as a people we must decide what it is we seek in our labor-management relations. If our total goal is simply industrial peace at any price, the way to achieve it has been blueprinted by every totalitarian dictatorship in history. Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy had industrial peace in the days of Hitler and Mussolini. The Soviet Union, Franco's Spain, and Castro's Cuba all have industrial peace right now. So industrial peace as such, is not hard to come by. It can be achieved by any society that is willing to sacrifice the freedom of the work force.

But certainly this is not a legitimate goal for America. For it is obviously not possible to sacrifice the freedoms of the work force without compromising those of business, managerial, and professional classes. And our goal is not to achieve an industrial peace based on submission and subjugation but to provide human beings with an effective voice in their own economic destiny.

And this goal has never been more important than it is today. Due to new developments in technology the scales of economic power are being dangerously tipped in favor of huge concentrations of impersonal corporate wealth. So the question is not whether collective bargaining is perfect, but whether, in a free society, any of the other methods being suggested would result in more industrial peace and greater industrial justice.

These are the tests—the true tests—against which we must measure the proposals that are being made in such profusion today.

Probably the most superficially appealing—at least to those who have never worked in a factory—is the proposal that unions be brought under the antitrust laws. On the surface it sounds so reasonable and fair to say that since corporations are covered by the antitrust laws unions should also be.

But the absurdity—or downright intellectual dishonesty—of those who profess to see no difference between the associations of workingmen and the predatory combinations of big business can be easily demonstrated by a few historic and economic facts.

First, what a worker has to sell is not property but a part of himself. Property can be withheld from the market, without loss of value, when the price is not satisfactory. But labor is highly "perishable." Any attempt to withhold it from the market when the price—that is, the wage—is too low results in an immediate and permanent loss to the worker.

Second, commodities can easily be transferred from an unfavorable to a favorable market. Labor, on the other hand, is relatively immobile, being rooted in a particular locality not only by such ties as family, friendship, church affiliation and familiarity of surroundings, but by lack of knowledge of employment opportunities elsewhere.

Third, buyers of commodities are vastly more varied and numerous than are employers of labor. In fact, in recent years a trend of corporate mergers and absorptions has concentrated greater and greater control of production and jobs into fewer and fewer hands. At the present time, for example, more than 38 percent of America's total productive capacity is accounted for by its 200 largest corporations.

Fourth, owners of commodities, corporate and otherwise, have far greater financial resources in cash, credit, property and inventory than do workers. Not only do they have greater resources, but while employers have piously preached individualism, they have customarily practiced combination. As Adam Smith pointed out in his bible of laissez-faire, "The Wealth Of Nations," about 200 years ago, "Masters are always and everywhere in a tacit but constant and uniform combination not to raise the wages of labor above their actual rate."

Fifth, on a commercial market it is the seller of a property that sets its price. But in the labor market it is not the seller—i.e., the worker—but the buyer—i.e., the employer—who establishes the amount to be paid for labor. This is because even in times of prosperity the need and competition for jobs is greater than the need and competition for workers.

For reasons such as these, workers—even with the strongest unions—have never been able to create a monopoly of labor which is anything like the monopoly of management over goods and markets. And today, with technological unemployment rising rapidly, the critical danger to our economy comes not from the efforts of unions to protect workers but from the cutthroat conditions which are generated when desperate men compete for jobs.

In view of these considerations it is clear that those who prescribe antitrust laws for labor, either have no conception of what they propose, or no conscience for the consequences. Despite the hopes of the kind of reactionaries in the business world who view right-to-work laws as a contribution to industrial relations, legislation of the antitrust stripe cannot be fairly considered a suitable or desirable alternative to collective bargaining.

The second great cure-all being offered to the country today is, of course, compulsory arbitration. It is said that we must adopt compulsory arbitration—at least in transportation and defense industries—because we cannot risk strikes or lockouts in occupations that connect so closely with the national health, safety, and welfare.

But before we get carried away with the idea that compulsory arbitration is a magic remedy, let us at least compare it with collective bargaining to see which is most likely to create conditions leading to true industry stability.

In free collective bargaining, where the ultimate right to strike exists, both parties have a reason to reach agreement. For neither normally wants a strike. A strike means lost—or at least delayed—profits for the employer. And it obviously means lost wages for the worker. This possibility of mutual loss serves as a powerful incentive for discussion, persuasion, facts, reasoning, and compromise. It means that no union will refuse to compromise—and risk a strike—over any but the most important issues which the membership will fully support.

The possibility of a work stoppage provides both parties with a compelling motive to reach an agreement that is not only mutually satisfactory, but which forms the foundation for a harmonious relationship throughout the life of the contract.

That is what collective bargaining will do. And, as I have indicated, that is what it does do in the overwhelming number of negotiations that take place in America each year. In our union we have studied the records and we have found that our objective of bargaining for settlements—not strikes—is achieved in almost 98 percent of our negotiations every year.

By way of contrast, this process of the parties actively seeking a mutually satisfactory agreement is completely negated by compulsory arbitration. When the right to strike disappears, and the parties have no reason to reach agreement, the chances are they will not. They won't because each side will start from an extreme position (to impress the eventual arbitrator) and will refuse to compromise (believing that the more they claim the more the arbitrator may give them).

Certainly compulsory arbitration will never lead to the kind of mutually satisfactory agreements that are normally achieved through collective bargaining. The chances are that neither party will be satisfied, that production will suffer, and that, as time goes on, the settlements will become increasingly political.

If nothing else the experience of other countries should warn those who think compulsory arbitration would be a labor relations cure-all. An arbitration is a quasi-judicial proceeding. As such it replaces negotiators with lawyers, issues with technicalities, and substance with form.

In Australia disputes between employers and employees have been dragged through one proceeding after another for as long as 5 years. By the time an award is handed down the issues often no longer matter. The result is not industrial stability, but a work force that takes its frustration out in slowdowns, sitdowns, wildcats, and other disruptive displays of industrial antagonism.

A study made a few years ago showed that Australia had as many strikes—despite compulsory arbitration—as other countries in the British Commonwealth where disputes were settled by collective bargaining.

In at least one country—the Philippine Republic—a compulsory arbitration law was repealed when experience proved that it provided neither better industrial relations, nor fewer strikes, than did free collective bargaining.

This is not to say that there is no place for arbitration in labor-management relations. As a union we agree to arbitration of disputes arising under the contract in about 95 percent of our negotiations. And every year we are involved in thousands of arbitration hearings at all levels of our organization.

But there is a vast difference between submitting an existing contract to a third party for a ruling on its meaning, and permitting a third party to write the contract itself.

The facts show very plainly that neither compulsory arbitration nor application of the antitrust laws to union will lead to greater industrial stability than collective bargaining carried on in an atmosphere of mutual respect and good will between labor and management.

And this, of course, is what we are missing in the relationships between unions and management in the United States today.

Though the workers of America approve and support the free enterprise system, the organizational spokesmen for management do not in turn accept the fact that unions play a needed and beneficial role in a free enterprise economy. Thus, instead of accepting the union as a partner in production, many employers tend to look at it as "the enemy."

In this atmosphere it is miraculous that collective bargaining has been as successful as the figures on strikes, settlements, and days lost have shown it to be.

Even though collective bargaining has been a long-term success in America, there is undeniably some public sentiment to prohibit strikes which actually jeopardize the national welfare. Of course, there is some question of definition here.

When is a strike really jeopardizing the national welfare? And when is it merely embarrassing whichever administration happens to be in power?

If it is necessary to enact a Federal law to deal with strikes in industries directly affecting the public health, welfare, and safety, I suggest that the principles on which our country is based demand that it be a fair law and not one which places all the penalties on one side regardless of which party is guilty of a breakdown in negotiations.

This, of course, is exactly what the present Taft-Hartley Act does. And the inequities of the injunction procedure under Taft-Hartley were never more dramatically illustrated than they were in the recent negotiations in the aerospace industry.

In the two negotiations that reached an impasse the union in both cases accepted the overall recommendations made by impartial Government panels, even though they fell short of goals previously selected by the membership.

It is interesting to note that this was one of the very few times in which a significant number of daily newspapers throughout the United States editorially condemned management's attitude and blamed the companies instead of the unions for bringing about the threat of a work stoppage.

And yet, when the chips were down, and the Government moved to act to avert a shutdown, the Taft-Hartley Act provided only one remedy, and that was to enjoin the union even though most objective observers believed that it was the company that precipitated the breakdown in defense production.

The lesson, I think, is clear. If we want to minimize the risk of work stoppages in defense industries we ought to set up a procedure under which penalties are levied not against labor alone but against the party which is shown by the evidence to be guilty of a refusal to bargain in good faith or accept the recommendations of impartial panels.

I suggest, for example, that if courts could seize a factory and impound the profits, as well as enjoin strikes, and force workers to accept conditions they would otherwise reject, very few disputes would ever reach a stage calling for public intervention.

But more than laws, and penalties, and continued Government participation in labor-management relations we need to bring the institutional relationships between business organizations and unions into harmony with the personal relationships that exist between businessmen and union representatives.

At the institutional level the organizations of business—the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Right-to-Work Committee and the like—are waging war, class warfare, against the American labor movement.

Make no mistake about it, the existence and purpose of such a center as the National Association of Manufacturers' so-called Center for the Study of Union Monopoly Power is well known to the union members of America. This and other weapons of the class war, spewing out their poison, can only obscure the basic compatibilities of labor and management within the framework of the free enterprise system.

It is ironic that these institutional and organizational hatreds—which, incidentally, are becoming stronger every day—do not reflect the feelings which most employers have for the particular union with which they deal—or the particular union representatives with whom they have contact.

Normally, the personal relationships between labor and management are characterized by mutual respect, trust, and appreciation.

Most business executives are wise enough to know that unions perform an essential and valuable service by handling day-today grievances, by providing workers with a constructive form of protest and expression, and by insuring that human values are not lost in the punchcard jungle of personnel administration.

But they must also recognize that there are no alternatives to collective bargaining consistent with the traditions that have grown out of our basic documents of government—the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. And the organizations that speak for them must stop chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of compulsory arbitration, or the destruction of unions through antitrust laws.

At a time when America seeks to provide the world with a suitable alternative to communism, it is dangerous for labor and management to engage in a class struggle which has no relevance or place in America.

So rather than continue to seek the destruction of unions and collective bargaining, I would seriously urge the leaders of American industry to bring this pointless, and potentially dangerous, class struggle to an end.

Let them recognize the obvious: that there is really no alternative to collective bargaining, and let us replace class warfare with a determination to make collective bargaining work. In the new climate which results—a climate which reflects institutional as well as personal respect, trust and mutual appreciation—America will achieve far more than a successful system of collective bargaining. It will solidify the foundations of the good and just social order which labor and management are both seeking in America.

INGRESS AND EGRESS RELATING TO NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 1, 1962, the Attorney General issued a landmark decision on ingress and egress relating to our national forest lands. I have discussed this excellent decision on several instances on the floor of the Senate.

The Secretary of Agriculture has now proposed a redraft of Forest Service regulations on ingress and egress. Within a short time he will issue final regulations. There may be further changes which should be made before these regulations are finalized. On April 23, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John Baker plans to hold a meeting which will give various groups an opportunity to express their views. I am certain that Secretary Freeman and Assistant Secretary Baker will, at that time, consider most carefully whether there ought to be revisions in these proposed regulations.

It is my opinion that unless there are some substantial defects which are brought to light and which need correction, the Secretary of Agriculture should place the new regulations into effect promptly after the April 23 meeting.

At this time I wish to place in the Record, so that there will be wide public notice, a letter dated March 18 addressed to me by Assistant Secretary Baker, enclosing a statement and notice concerning proposed national forest regulations, and the draft regulations themselves.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the Record, at the close of my remarks, a letter I received from Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Baker, also dated March 18, and a letter that the Chief of the Forest Service sent to Mr. Doyle of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association on the same date.

As I have said from the outset, I desire that there be the widest public knowledge of these proposed regulations, their cause and their effect, and it is for this reason that I place this further information at the disposal of my colleagues and the public.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In August 1962 a discussion draft of proposed regulations affecting administration of the forest development transportation system was circulated for review and comment. Many comments and suggestions were received by early November. These were carefully studied to determine which ones could be included in the regulations.

A redraft of the proposed regulations incorporating the acceptable comments and suggestions has been prepared. This together with a statement concerning them is enclosed.

There has been considerable interest in this subject. Expressed opposition to the adoption of these regulations has been largely limited to some portions of the lumber industry. It has been our position that the Department would arrange a meeting if differences were not reasonably resolved in redrafting the regulations. While considerable progress has been made, it is unlikely that the conflicts can be entirely resolved.

The redraft of the proposed regulations together with the statement is being distributed to those reviewers who have indicated an interest in the subject. Included with the new draft is an announcement of an advisory hearing. At this hearing there will be presented a brief summary review of the regulations and their purposes. The hearing will provide an opportunity for comments in addition to those already submitted by interested persons who appear. Comments may be filed with the Chief of the Forest Service in advance of or within 10 days after the meeting. I plan to attend the meeting.

Your further comments on the proposed regulations will be most welcome at any time as will be your participation or attendance at the meeting in April.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Baker.

Notice From Forest Service, Department of Agriculture

Enclosed for your information and further review are:

1. Redraft of the proposed national forest access regulations directed toward management of the forest development road system serving the national forests. This redraft is proposed for publication in the Code of Federal Regulations under title 36, chapter 11, part 212.7 to 212.11 inclusive, when approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

2. Statement concerning the proposed national forest access regulations.

These regulations were first circulated as a discussion draft for comments in August 1962. This review resulted in over 450 comments. These have been carefully considered in the development of the enclosed redraft and the accompanying statement.

The Secretary of Agriculture has requested me to circulate this draft to those interested reviewers who previously commented. He has also asked that a meeting be arranged to permit those interested to present new arguments or additional comments on this draft for consideration by him prior to his decision. Comments may also be presented to the Forest Service in writing prior to or within 10 days of the scheduled meeting.

An advisory public hearing is called for 10 a.m , April 23, 1963, in room 218, Administration Building, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

A transcript of the hearing will be made for use by the Secretary in his further consideration of the regulations.

Additional copies of this notice, the enclosed statement and proposed regulations are available in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, room 3008, South Building, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

M. M. Nelson,
Acting Chief, Forest Service.

Redraft of New Regulations Proposed by Agriculture—Code of Federal Regulations

TITLE 36—PARKS, FORESTS, AND MEMORIALS

Chapter II—Forest Service, Department of Agriculture

Part 212—Administration of the Forest Development Transportation System

Part 212 is amended by adding the following sections:

"Section 212.7 Road System Management:

"(a) Traffic Rules—

"1. General.—Traffic on roads under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service other than 'Special Service Roads' shall be subject to State traffic laws where applicable: *Provided,* That use of such roads shall be subject to rules prescribed by the Chief, notice of which has been given by publication in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality and posting at the entrances to the roads, covering uses of or operations on the road as to which the State laws and rules are not applicable or are not deemed adequate for the safety and protection of users of the roads and the National Forests.

"2. Special service roads.—The Chief shall issue traffic rules governing the use of 'Special Service Roads' or adopt in lieu thereof traffic rules promulgated for comparable roads of the State in which the road or segment of road is located, provided that where local traffic rules are adopted they shall be supplemented by him to the extent necessary to adequately govern special traffic uses and conditions, including but not limited to load weights and widths, size of vehicles, speed limits and provisions for the safety and protection of users and of the National Forests. Notice of such rules shall be given in the manner prescribed in section 212.7 (a) 1.

"(b) Special service roads.—The Chief may designate a forest development road or a segment thereof a 'Special Service Road' and control or regulate the use of the road as necessary in the public interest and safety: *Provided,* That the road is not a part of the highway system of a State, county, or other public road authority: *Provided further,* That the United States controls the right-of-way.

"(c) Cost recovery on special service roads.—Where the Chief determines that a share of the cost of acquisition, construction, reconstruction, improvement, or maintenance of a 'Special Service Road,' or a segment thereof, used or to be used for commercial hauling of non-Federal forest products and other non-Federal products, commodities and materials should be borne by the owners or haulers thereof and where such owners or haulers have not shared in the cost of acquisition, construction, reconstruction or improvement and have not made contributions to pay their proportionate cost shares, the Chief may condition the permission to use the particular 'Special Service Road' or segment thereof upon payment to the United States of the proportionate share of such cost and bearing proportionate maintenance as has been determined by him to be attributable to such owner's or hauler's use in accordance with section 212.11.

"Section 212.8 Ingress and Egress

"(a) Persons Residing Within the Boundaries of National Forests.—Persons residing within the boundaries of National Forests shall be permitted ingress and egress over the National Forests and use of existing roads and trails for access to their homes and property: *Provided,* Such ingress and egress or use shall conform to rules and regulations governing the protection and administration of the National Forests and the roads or trails to be used.

"(b) Others.—Entering upon the National Forests and use of existing roads and trails will be permitted for all proper and lawful purposes, subject to compliance with rules and regulations governing the National Forests and the roads or trails to be used.

"Section 212.9 Access Procurement by the United States

"(a) Policy.—The Chief shall obtain as promptly as is feasible needed road and trail access to National Forest land to assure effective protection, management and utilization of such land and its resources and for the use and development of the resources upon which communities within or adjacent to the National Forests are dependent. Such access shall include procurement of interests in existing non-Federal roads and road systems, as well as rights-of-way for roads and trails over non-Federal land. Consideration shall be given in each case to the needs of the owners to use the existing roads in the protection, management and utilization of their lands and industries.

"(b) Existing or Proposed Forest Development Roads Which Are or Will Be Parts of a System of a State, County, or Other Local Subdivision.—Forest development roads which are or will be parts of a system of a State, county, or other local subdivision road system and are on rights-of-way held in the name of the State, county, or other local subdivision may be constructed, reconstructed, improved or maintained by the Forest Service when there is an appropriate agreement with the State, county, or other local subdivision under authority of 23 U.S.C. 205: *Provided,* Such construction, reconstruction, improvement or maintenance is essential to provide safe and economic access to National Forest land.

"(c) Acquisition of Easements and Rights of Use.—Except as otherwise provided in these regulations, easements for road and trail construction across non-Federal lands and easements or rights of use over non-Federal roads and trails will be acquired in the name of the United States of America and its assigns. The easements or rights of use may be acquired by purchase, condemnation, donation, or as a reciprocal for permits or easements for rights-of-way for roads or trails to be constructed or for easements over or permits to use existing roads or trails.

"(d) Methods of Compensation for Easements and Rights of Use Acquired by the United States.—Compensation in negotiated acquisitions may be: (1) by payment from appropriated funds; (2) pursuant to reservation in the grant of easement to the United States whereby the grantor reserves the right to require haulers of Federal timber or other Federal products over the road conveyed or thereafter constructed by the grantor to make payments to the grantor in accordance with the terms of the reservation; (3) by granting reciprocal rights; or (4) by a combination of these methods. Compensation will be limited to the fair market value of the easement or right of use.

"(e) Cooperative Construction and Use Agreements.—Where areas, partly National Forest and partly private or other ownership, are undeveloped or inadequately developed by roads, the Chief will, to the extent feasible and advantageous to the United States, join in planning, constructing, reconstructing, improving, maintaining, and using an adequate road system on the basis of each party bearing the proportion of the cost attributable to the anticipated benefits.

"(f) Condemnation.—Where access across non-Federal land or over a non-Federal road or trail cannot be obtained on equitable terms through negotiations and with reasonable promptness, condemnation will be undertaken upon a finding that: (1) such action is necessary and advantageous to the

United States, considering the elements of time, need for access to National Forest land, probable cost (award for value and damage), alternative means of access, and other pertinent factors; and (2) that funds are available for payment of the anticipated award.

"(g) Access Over Non-Federal Land and Use of Non-Federal Roads or Trails on a Temporary Basis.—The Chief may negotiate a temporary agreement for access over non-Federal land and for use of an existing non-Federal road or trail where there is immediate need for temporary access for limited purposes that can be economically met by such procedure, or where the foreseeable need does not justify the expenditures necessary to provide a permanent road or trail.

"(h) Use and Control of Interests in Roads, Trails and Easements Acquired by the United States.—Interests in roads, trails and easements acquired by the United States shall be under the control of the United States, subject to approved reservations, limitations and other provisions set forth in the deed, permit and other indenture. This control by the United States may include restricting or conditioning the use of the interest owned by the United States in the road, trail or easement where necessary.

"Section 212.10 Permission To Cross National Forest Land and Assignable Rights-of-Way Owned by the United States

"(a) Permission to Construct and Use Roads Across National Forest Land and Assignable Rights-of-Way Owned by the United States.—If a reciprocal benefit is needed by the United States, permission to construct and use a road across National Forest land and across assignable rights-of-way owned by the United States and administered by the Forest Service will be conditioned, except as provided in this subsection, for any applicant who seeks a permit to construct and use a road across the same, upon the grant to the United States of a reciprocal benefit. Such benefit shall bear: (1) a reasonable relation to the management of the National Forests; and (2) a value substantially similar to the value of the permission to cross National Forest land or right-of-way applied for. In those instances where the values of the interests needed by the United States exceed those applied for by the applicant, the additional interests required by the United States will be acquired as provided in sections 212.9 (c) and (d). Where values needed by the applicant exceed those needed by the United States, the difference in values will be determined under principles set forth below and in sections 212.7(c) and 212.11. If a reciprocal benefit is not needed by the United States, or the applicant shows good cause why the reciprocal benefit needed by the United States cannot or should not be granted by him, or the applicant declines to grant the reciprocal benefit requested by the United States or if a bona fide emergency exists, permission to construct and use a road across lands owned by the United States may be conditioned for any applicant upon reasonable charges and all other terms and conditions required by the Chief to protect the interest of the United States. Permits for road construction and use will be non-exclusive and will retain in the United States all rights in the right-of-way and in the road except the privilege granted the permittee to use the road for the specific purposes stated in the permit. Permits will be conditioned upon compliance with their terms and conditions and to the rules and regulations governing the protection and administration of the National Forests and those applicable to such roads.

"(b) Permits for Commercial Hauling on Special Service Roads.—Except for minor or occasional use, permits will be required for commercial hauling on 'Special Service Roads' of non-Federal forest products, and other non-Federal products, commodities, and materials when the Chief determines that such owners or haulers should provide: (1) proportionate maintenance; (2) an equitable and reasonable needed reciprocal benefit to the United States; (3) a share of the cost of construction, reconstruction, or improvement of such road or segment thereof; or (4) any combination of these. When such owners or haulers have not provided to the United States the needed reciprocal benefit, or borne their share of the cost, permission to use a road will be conditioned for any applicant upon the terms and requirements and subject to the like conditions and charges as prescribed in Section 212.7(c), 212.10(a), and 212.11(d) for permission to construct or use such roads.

"(c) Easements and Stipulations for Roads Crossing National Forest Land Having the Status of Land Reserved From the Public Domain.—Applications for easements over National Forest land having the status of land reserved from the public domain, and over roads thereon, with appropriate stipulations will be approved by the Chief for those applicants who have conveyed or provided permanent multiple-use easements over roads and lands owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by them to the United States of America and its assigns and who have already constructed, or will, as scheduled by the agreements, construct their proportionate share of the road or road system concerned. Such applications for easements shall be approved by the Chief only when they are for non-exclusive easements which retain in the United States all rights in the road or road system except the rights of the applicant to use and maintain the road or road system in the administration, protection, and utilization of lands and the resources thereof owned or controlled by the applicant, and when the rights applied for are limited to the share of use commensurate with the applicant's contribution to, or performance of, a share of construction or other improvement as set forth in the cooperative agreement or cooperative understanding covering the road or road system. Applications for easements in appropriate form, together with required plats showing the National Forest land having the status of land reserved from the public domain to be crossed, shall be forwarded to the Forest Service. When the Chief has determined that the applicant has satisfactorily constructed his determined share of the related road or road system, or is committed by appropriate agreement to deposit funds or construct his share of the road or road system, and has granted or provided the easements or other interest required by the United States under such agreement, the Chief after approval of the application, will attach thereto the stipulations agreed to by the applicant and the Chief covering the use of the easement applied for, and forward the same to the designated officer of the Department of the Interior for the purpose of obtaining the required easement under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior. When the easement is approved and returned by the officer of the Department of the Interior to the Forest Service for entry in its records, it will be entered and thereafter delivered to the applicant pursuant to agreement.

"Section 212.11 Principles for Sharing Use of Roads

"The use of roads under arrangements for sharing costs or performance shall be in accordance with the following:

"(a) Road Improvement.—Use of a road for commercial hauling, except occasional or minor amounts, will be conditioned upon improvement or supplemental construction of the road to safely and economically serve the contemplated use, unless the Chief determines that the safety and economy of the established and foreseeable use by the United States, its users and cooperators will not be impaired by the use for which application is being made. With the consent of the Chief the applicant may deposit funds in the estimated amount required for the improvements or supplemental construction in lieu of performance. Such funds will be used by the Forest Service to do the planned work. The cost of the improvements or supplemental construction will be taken into account in determining any otherwise required contribution to cover the proportionate share of the cost of road acquisition, construction, reconstruction or improvement attributable to the use.

"(b) Corresponding Benefits.—Corresponding benefits which may be accepted by the Chief for sharing road use will be those which bear a reasonable relation to the management of the National Forests. They may be in the form of: (1) deposit of funds with the Forest Service for use in paying the cost of road construction, reconstruction or improvement to be borne by the user; (2) the grant of a reciprocal right of substantially similar value to the road use sought; (3) construction over applicant's property of a new road needed for access to and use of National Forest land and the conveyance to the United States of America and its assigns of the needed rights in such road; or (4) any combination of these.

"(c) Cost Determinations for Roads Cooperatively Constructed Under Agreements.—When roads are constructed under cooperative agreements to meet mutual needs of the United States and others for access, determinations of the shares of costs to be borne by the United States and the cooperating parties will include consideration of: (1) the standard of road required for the planned hauling; (2) the share of planned use; (3) the location and volume of tributary timber owned by each party and expected to be hauled over the road or roads; (4) the tributary areas owned or controlled by each party; (5) expected use by the public; and (6) other appropriate considerations.

"(d) Cost Recovery by the United States From Others on Special Service Roads.—When roads designated as 'Special Service Roads' are used under permit for commercial hauling instead of under cooperative agreement any cost to be recovered by the United States will be calculated in proportion to the planned use of the road. The road cost used in such calculation will be the amount or estimated amount expended in the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and improvement of that capacity of the road required to serve the use needs of all parties that are or reasonably can be expected to use the road. Such road share cost payments will be through deposits in advance of use unless the user provides a payment bond satisfactory to the Chief guaranteeing that payments will be made promptly upon billing by the Forest Service.

"(e) Cost Sharing With a Cooperator.—The costs to achieve the agreed upon road or road system may be met by: (1) use of appropriated funds; (2) construction, reconstruction or improvement of roads or segments of roads by timber purchasers or other users; (3) use of deposits made by cooperator with the Forest Service to cover cooperator's agreed share; (4) agreement with cooperator pursuant to which cooperator does more than his agreed share of constructing, reconstructing, or improving a road and recovers costs incurred in excess of his agreed share by charging National Forest timber purchasers and other commercial haulers using the road an equitable amount within the limits and to the total amount specified in the agreement; or (5) a combination of the aforementioned methods.

"(f) Road Maintenance and Resurfacing.—Cooperators, and permittees using 'Special Service Roads' will share the road maintenance and resurfacing costs under suitable agreements to perform, arrange for performance by others, or by making deposits with the Forest Service which will be used to pay the costs of work performed for efficient use and for the preservation and protection of such roads from all elements, and to prevent erosion to adjacent lands: *Provided,* That purchasers of National Forest timber shall perform an agreed upon amount of maintenance work representing their proportionate share of necessary maintenance, or at their election in lieu of actual performance thereof, make payments to a specified maintainer of the agreed amounts for maintenance.

"(g) INTERESTS TO BE ACQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES IN ROADS OR EASEMENTS THEREFOR.—Where the United States is to bear or share the cost of constructing, improving, or acquiring a road system, a road, or a segment thereof, or acquires an easement therefor, the interest acquired will: (1) be for perpetual use unless the road use falls within the limited classes where temporary roads or roads for limited periods are acceptable; (2) provide adequately for foreseeable National Forest management, protection, and utilization needs; and for the use and development of the resources upon which communities within or adjacent to the National Forests are dependent; and (3) not be subject to conditions, reservations, or covenants unrelated to the road use, or which seek or might tend to direct or limit National Forest management policies and procedures."

STATEMENT CONCERNING PROPOSED NATIONAL FOREST ACCESS REGULATIONS

GENERAL

Proposed regulations 212.7 to 212.11, inclusive, apply to the Forest Development Transportation System and to access over national forest lands. They do not apply to the Forest Highway System.

ACCESS PRINCIPLES

There are several principles which are of primary importance to and basically control the national forest access program. There are presented hereunder the highlights of the principles deemed most important in the current drafting of regulations. The following most strongly influence and direct the language of proposed regulations 212.7 to 212.11, inclusive.

1. Multiple-use access to national forest lands is needed in virtually every case. The United States needs and must obtain multiple-use access to national forests lands for the protection, administration, and utilization of the national forests, or where necessary, for the use and development of the resources upon which communities within or adjacent to the national forests are dependent.

2. Road construction by national forest timber purchasers is presently limited to the prudent operator concept. Consequently, some appropriated funds may be required sooner or later to do supplemental road improvement in every road system. This means that the right-of-way which is essential for multiple-use access is necessary before such improvement. It is usually good business to acquire initially the right-of-way to meet such foreseeable needs.

3. Sustained yield management of the various land resources requires generally permanent or long-lasting improvements, including roads. Permanent or perpetual easements are so uniformly needed that this requirement can be regarded as the normal and usual one.

4. Easements granted to the United States and its assigns to meet the foregoing requirement must be nonrestrictive so as to provide for all foreseeable use including use by recreationists, hunters, and fishermen as well as timber haulers. It follows that if the owner of a private road being acquired by the United States wants to reserve access rights for recreation, timber management, mining, and any other lawful use of his property, the Forest Service is quite willing to consider such reservation of rights. The Forest Service wants to be able to cooperate with those private landowners who also seek to promote the desirable policy of multiple use.

5. Since the purpose of national forest roads is to accommodate mixed traffic or all anticipated kinds of traffic at various times, it is essential that the Government be in a position to regulate the traffic it plans to accommodate. This does not mean the private road owner cannot control and be assured of the use of the rights he reserves. The owner will logically want to reserve the rights of use he foresees the need of and will wish to be assured of as a property right. Rules specified in the conveyance to the United States for the exercise of reserved rights would be part of the private right and not subject to change by the United States except after further acquisition through negotiation or in rare instances by the exercise of eminent domain.

6. Whenever possible and feasible, the Forest Service will avoid duplicating existing roads and road systems as a land and timber growing conservation policy by making a single road system serve all tributary ownerships insofar as practicable. If after reserving the interest desired by the owner for his purposes, it is determined by the Forest Service that the remaining road interests that can be acquired by the United States are less than will be needed, there must and will be a decision as to the best course to take. Usually the alternatives are to acquire subject to the owners' needs and widen and improve the road to meet the Government's needs, to acquire a separate right-of-way and construct a separate road system, or to condemn for access rights needed by the Government. It will be the policy to be quite prompt in reaching a decision to condemn for such needed access rights where negotiations cannot be concluded to the satisfaction of both parties.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES

Section 212.7—Road system management

Subsection (a) prescribes that the traffic on the road system will be controlled under provisions of the State traffic laws to the extent they are applicable. State and local governments are to be encouraged to develop means for applying State traffic laws to traffic on national forest roads.

When the public safety, protection of the national forests or the roads require it, the Forest Service will prescribe and enforce such rules as are needed to assure safe and efficient use.

Subsection (b) provides that special service roads will be designated as needed to assure use for the more important purposes. On these roads the Forest Service may: (1) regulate traffic for safety of the users or of property; (2) regulate the kind and volume of traffic to meet the requirements of land management; (3) obtain required maintenance; (4) regulate commercial hauling; (5) require needed road improvement to accommodate the permitted hauling; (6) recover road costs; (7) establish load size and weight limits and any other special traffic rules needed for safety or the utilization of the road.

Under subsection (c) cost recovery will be limited to commercial hauling of non-Federal products over such designated special service roads when the delegated official determines that such tributary products should bear a share of the cost of the road. Cooperative construction on the road, or contributions thereto, by land or timber owners will be recognized. Since most of the cooperative road agreements originated in 1952 or later, it is contemplated that cost recovery under section 212.7 will be generally limited to costs incurred in constructing or improving roads or segments of roads after June 30, 1952. In special situations involving earlier cooperation with one or more but not all non-Federal users cost recovery may be authorized over a road or road segments where the facts clearly indicate that it will be equitable to charge for non-Federal hauling by the party who has not previously borne an equitable share.

The replacement costs of that portion of the construction of a road which may have been accomplished by and to meet the needs of the user or hauler of National Forest products will be estimated and combined with any costs which may have been incurred from appropriated Federal funds. The total will be regarded as the Government's cost for the purpose of determining the share or shares to be borne by the commercial hauler of non-Federal products on a road designated for cost recovery.

Costs recovered will be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Relatively few of the existing roads will be designated for collection of cost recovery charges, because most road systems serving mixed ownership areas were developed with the cooperation of public agencies or the benefiting private owners. Most national forest roads will continue under these regulations to be used free of charge as they have been in the past.

Section 212.8—Ingress and egress

Under (a) it will be the objective to continue and improve our good relationships with persons residing within the national forests. After more than 50 years of development virtually all persons residing in the forests have a way by road or trail to their domiciles. It is intended that they be permitted to continue customary access on such roads or trails in compliance with rules and regulations of the Secretary.

The objective will be to assure that an actual settler shall not be denied the rights he has under the 1897 law. All entry and use by actual settlers and others will be conditioned upon compliance with rules and regulations governing the national forests and the forest development roads and trails to be used. These provisions are not new.

It is intended under (b) that, except on the few special service roads designated for cost recovery, use of national forest roads and trails will continue to be without charge as in the past.

Section 212.9—Access procurement by the United States

Subsection (a) indicates the principal objective of policy is to move more promptly to get multiple-use access to national forest lands. This will be accomplished by obtaining rights-of-way upon which the Government can build roads or trails or by acquiring private roads. Joint construction and sharing of costs is covered under 212.11.

Under (b) it will be the objective of the Forest Service to work cooperatively and closely with the States, counties or other local subdivisions of government in development and maintenance of roads needed for both national forest and local government use.

Under (c), (d), and (e), the objectives of the regulations controlling the acquisition of rights-of-way and establishing the methods of compensation are aimed at flexible means of obtaining access rights fairly and reasonably by negotiations. The rules for negotiating agreements on cooperative construction and use of roads are likewise aimed at serving the needs of the cooperators with each bearing a fair proportion of the costs.

Subsection (f) provides when negotiations fail prompt use of condemnation will be the objective, thus settling the issues judicially.

Under (g) the provisions for temporary access are intended to be used only where the circumstances clearly justify this action. If the temporary right-of-way is obtained to gain access more quickly, it will be the objective to promptly obtain the permanent right-of-way.

Under (h) the principle of the Government controlling that which it owns are well established. It is stated in this section to remove any doubt as to the intent that the Forest Service will follow this principle and that it has no authority to leave control of a road acquired by the United States in the prior owner.

Section 212.10—Permission to cross national forest land and assignable rights-of-way owned by the United States

Subsection (a) provides the guidelines for achieving reciprocity. It is intended they produce fair and reasonable results. Since reciprocity requires agreement of the private party and most Forest Service access needs must be met promptly the applicant who cannot or will not promptly grant the needed reciprocal rights or benefits may be given a permit to build and use a road at his expense. Such a permit, however, will be revocable and retain in the United States the right to improve and use the road. An applicant who delivers the reciprocal rights or benefits needed by the United States may obtain either a permit or a permanent right-of-way under 212.10(c) with an assurance, where appropriate, that other users will share in the costs of the road.

Subsection (b) prescribes the rules for hauling on special service roads by the haulers who have not shared in the construction. Haulers must do their maintenance and may be required to improve the road, provide a reciprocal benefit, or pay a share of the costs, or a combination of these.

Subsection (c) specifies the procedures for obtaining permanent rights-of-way under Department of the Interior authority. The objective is to use the authority to obtain permanent multiple-use access over the related private lands of the applicant. No permanent easement will be approved except for those who have furnished needed reciprocal benefits to the United States.

The Department of the Interior has the statutory authority to issue the permanent rights-of-way or long-term permits in the nature of an easement across national forest lands of public domain status. The appropriate officer of the Department of the Interior has been authorized to issue the rights-of-way for such permanent or long-term use as may be recommended for approval by the Department (Agriculture) and the provisions of 43 C.F.R. 244.16 and 244.9 have been suspended from operation in the cases involving such applications. Such easements are nonexclusive rights. The United States will in all cases retain the right to use or permit the use of the right-of-way for any purpose which does not unreasonably interfere with the grantee's use.

Stipulations for use of the rights-of-way will be prepared by the designated official to protect national forest interests and designed to meet the specific needs of the project or road system and to cover the management responsibilities of the United States.

It is the responsibility of the Forest Service to obtain clearance from other interested Federal agencies when they are involved (e.g., Federal Power Commission and Bureau of Reclamation for areas withdrawn for their use) and to have the application made in approved form for later approval by the Department of the Interior. The Forest Service has the primary management responsibilities over the lands in question. Accordingly, it is responsible for determinations that the interests of the Government are protected, that appropriate reciprocal rights have been obtained, and for terms of the stipulations entered into with applicants.

Section 212.11—Principles for sharing use of roads

Subsection (e) of section 212.9 directs the Forest Service, whenever it is advantageous to the United States, to join with the related owners of intermixed land in planning, constructing, reconstructing, improving, maintaining and using road systems serving the lands and resources of the cooperators. Where it is found mutually advantageous this general policy has been followed by the Forest Service and many neighboring land and timber owners for a number of years.

Section 212.11 is designed to establish methods of carrying out the cooperative policy established in 212.9(c).

Subsection (a) has as its objective the improvement of national forest roads to safely and economically meet the increasing needs of the particular roads and establishes the means of accomplishment.

Subsection (b) defines the authority to accept reciprocal benefits from an applicant desiring to use a forest development road. It should facilitate making mutually advantageous access agreements.

Subsection (c) provides that the determination of the shares of costs requires agreement of the Forest Service and the other cooperators as it has in the past. The objective of 212.11(c) is to establish guidelines which include the factors most often found essential in the past. The most important and usually the only definitive factor is the tributary timber expected to be hauled over the road system. Other factors may be important and require measurements or estimates for consideration. Agreements will include the extent to which overhead costs are to be recognized and included. A cost in an amount equivalent to interest on unamortized investments may be included in agreements under which cooperators recover costs from users. It will be the objective to eliminate any real need for this by having each cooperator construct or contribute his share at the appropriate time. The objective will be to obtain cooperation in the road system by the fairest possible means for determining the cost shares of the participants on the basis of the foreseeable and anticipated benefits.

Subsection (d) states the purpose of cost recovery is to obtain the fair share of the Government's cost for a road having a direct commercial benefit to a non-Federal user. The purpose is also to avoid having a user ride free over a road which is constructed and used by those who contribute their fair share of the cost. The objective will be to recover costs on roads or segments of them incurred since July 1, 1952. Under special circumstances where equity clearly warrants it, costs incurred earlier may be considered. Once costs are recovered only continued maintenance and road improvements, or a share of them if required to safely accommodate the use, would be required.

Subsection (e) establishes the guidelines on the various methods of sharing by agreement in the cost of constructing cooperative roads or road systems.

Subsection (f) establishes maintenance requirements for commercial use of designated special service roads. The principle is established that each will either do the maintenance representing his proportionate share or at his election make payments to a specified maintainer. A major purpose is to avoid having a road damaged or its worth deteriorate as a result of commercial use.

Subsection (g) has as its purpose to make it clear that when the United States is to share in a cooperative road or road system it is to obtain an interest in the right-of-way and road for the purpose of serving foreseeable needs of the national forest lands and resources and, when necessary, for other uses which serve dependent communities consistent with provisions of the forest development road and trail provisions of the Forest Highway Act. It also makes it clear this interest will not be subject to any type of control by grantors or prior owners which could tend to direct or limit national forest management.

(Note.—It is intended that upon final adoption of the new regulations they will replace or supersede any former regulations in conflict herewith.)

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1963.

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Morse: On October 12, Mr. Mortimer Doyle wrote to Mr. Cliff enclosing the National Lumber Manufacturers Association statement of principles directed to private land access within national forests. On November 2, you wrote to me and Interior Assistant Secretary Carver on the same subject enclosing Mr. Doyle's letter to Mr. Cliff.

Mr. Cliff has responded to Mr. Doyle and I am enclosing a copy of his reply. We have given considerable study to the principles and the related comments. We substantially agree on many of them and we believe these are fully reflected in existing and proposed policies and regulations. However, you will note there is not full agreement on a few of the principles which are in conflict with those which we believe must control a national forest access program operated in the public interest. These differences are discussed in some detail in the letter to Mr. Doyle.

We have analyzed the response to the NLMA principles by the Department of the Interior to you and by Agriculture in Mr. Cliff's letter to Mr. Doyle. They are in close accord. Considering the differences in the laws governing the O. & C. and the national forest lands, in the history of the lands, in their uses, and in their geographic patterns, we believe the differences in the policy are reduced to the practical minimum. These differences in the response of the two agencies to the NLMA principles which appear to us to have some significance are limited to the following:

Under principle 5, the Forest Service provides for designation of special service roads while the O. & C. regulations do not. The designation of certain Forest Service roads for special controls or restrictions will be applied where necessary to meet needs of maintenance, user safety, or particular forest uses at certain times and to achieve reciprocal benefits or to recover costs under the proposed regulations.

The Forest Service and O. & C. regulations are in harmony in response to principle No. 8, except that multiple use and sustained yield management of national forest lands as directed by 74 Stat. 215 require easements fully meeting these objectives. As you know, both agencies are on a perpetual basis in land management and road development.

Under principle 9, the BLM regulations do not provide for condemnation while the Forest Service proposes to do so. We understand the BLM uses other authorities for this purpose and has an active program underway in this. We propose to include condemnation in our regulations both because the industry has requested it and we think it is sound to describe when and how it may be applied here. The Forest Service does propose to promptly condemn where it needs access and cannot negotiate successfully for it.

Under principle 10, there first appeared to be a possibility of difference in practice by the two agencies. We have determined there is actually no substantial difference. Both agencies agree that arrangements may be made in advance to protect an investment. This must be done by agreement or arrangement before construction begins. A party who constructs a road under the permit cannot later be compensated for it unless the permit so provides or such an arrangement is made. A road permittee with no such agreement will construct no better road than is required for this purpose. Consequently, the situation should not present a significant problem under most circumstances.

Under 12(a), we would point out that it may be necessary to regulate traffic to a slightly greater extent to meet special multiple-use requirements than does the BLM. Considering the interest the Forest Service acquires in the road and the requirements of public and mixed traffic, this is logical. Consequently, the Forest Service does not agree to have its easements conditioned upon Federal road users carrying general liability insurance to cover operations and activities on other national forest lands.

We believe in other respects the Forest Service and O. & C. basic positions are very close together.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. BAKER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1963.

Mr. MORTIMER B. DOYLE,
National Lumber Manufacturers Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: This is in response to your letter of October 12 commenting on the discussion draft of the proposed road regulations which were circulated for review in early August.

We have given considerable study to your comments and the statement of principles for regulations governing access to private lands within the national forests. Our concern, of course, is how to obtain access across private lands to reach national forest lands. Since effective and constructive working relationships in areas of mixed ownerships are quite important, if the work of the industry and the Government is to be carried on economically and with minimum interruption, agreement on principles is quite desirable.

Our comments on the principles you presented follow hereafter in this letter. We substantially agree on many of them and we believe these are fully reflected in the existing and proposed policies and regulations. There are several, however, on which there is not full agreement. These are in conflict to a greater or lesser degree with principles which must control a national forest access program operated in the public interest. The national forest lands are dedicated by law to public use. This policy would not support regulation and restriction of use to serve only the needs of the forest products industry. We believe against this background that if these conditions are known to and accepted by the association, a major step forward will have been taken. We state them briefly.

1. Multiple-use access to national forest lands is needed in virtually every case. The United States needs and must obtain multiple-use access to national forest lands for the protection, administration, and utilization of the national forests, or where necessary, for the use and development of the resources upon which communities within or adjacent to the national forests are dependent.

2. Road construction by national forest timber purchasers is presently limited to the prudent operator concept. Consequently, some appropriated funds may be required sooner or later to do supplemental road improvement in every road system. This means that the right-of-way which is essential for multiple-use access is necessary before such improvement. It is usually good business to acquire initially the right-of-way to meet such foreseeable needs.

3. Sustained yield management of the various land resources requires generally permanent or long lasting improvements, including roads. Permanent or perpetual easements are so uniformly needed that this requirement can be regarded as the normal and usual one.

4. Easements granted to the United States and its assigns to meet the foregoing requirement must be nonrestrictive so as to provide for all foreseeable use including use by recreationists, hunters, and fishermen as well as timber haulers. It follows that if the owner of a private road being acquired by the United States wants to reserve access rights for recreation, timber management, mining, and any other lawful use of his property, the Forest Service is quite willing to consider such reservation of rights. The Forest Service wants to be able to cooperate with these private landowners who also seek to promote the desirable policy of multiple use.

5. Since the purpose of national forest roads is to accommodate mixed traffic or all anticipated kinds of traffic at various times, it is essential that the Government be in a position to regulate the traffic it plans to accommodate. This does not mean the private road owner cannot control and be assured of the use of the rights he reserves. The owner will logically want to reserve the rights of use he foresees the need of and will wish to be assured of as a property right. Rules specified in the conveyance to the United States for the exercise of reserved rights would be part of the private property right and not subject to change by the United States except after further acquisition through negotiation or in rare instances by the exercise of eminent domain.

6. Whenever possible and feasible, the Forest Service will avoid duplicating existing roads and road systems as a land and timber growing conservation policy by making a single road system serve all tributary ownerships insofar as practicable. If after reserving the interest desired by the owner for his purposes, it is determined by the Forest Service that the remaining road interests that can be acquired by the United States are less than will be needed, there must and will be a decision as to the best course to take. Usually the alternatives are to acquire subject to the owner's needs and widen and improve the road to meet the Government's needs, to acquire a separate right-of-way and construct a separate road system, or to condemn for access rights needed by the Government. It will be the policy to be quite prompt in reaching a decision to condemn for such needed access rights where negotiations cannot be concluded to the satisfaction of both parties.

With the foregoing in mind, we will turn to the "Statement of Principles" enclosed with your letter of October 12, 1962. Following each numbered principle are the Forest Service comments.

1. "Every landowner or possessor of interests in realty whose property is so located as to require access across national forest lands to reach and manage such property should be given access."

We believe this is provided for under 212.8 on Ingress and Egress, under 212.10 on Permission to Cross National Forest Land, and under 212.11 on Principles for Sharing Use of Roads.

2. "Existing access rights evidenced by such documents as Stipulations Government Exercise of Rights of Ingress and Egress and by Special Use Permits should be protected."

We agree in general to this principle. In cases where a road was constructed or improved in the past by the applicant and used for the purpose applied for, there is no intention to diminish any rights or privileges he has established. However, where a road was constructed by the Forest Service or by someone else for it, the party would be treated as not having a vested right of use in the road. See the provisions of proposed 212.10 concerning "Permission To Cross National Forest Lands and Assignable Rights-of-Way Owned by the United States," and 212.11 concerning principles for "Sharing Use of Roads."

3. "Grants of access across national forest lands should be given promptly for the purpose and duration requested, and should be appurtenant to the lands served."

We agree with the first part of this and intend to act as promptly as the conditions under the provisions of 212.10 and 212.11 can be met by the applicant and the Forest Service. The regulations will propose to continue using permits as in the past but add the substantial improvement of arranging to grant easements.

The procedure agreed upon with the Department of the Interior under the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1233, 16 U.S.C. 525) is designed to provide a permanent right-of-way to be used in the administration, protection, and utilization of forest lands and the resources thereof owned or controlled by the applicant. It is thus more comprehensive than a right-of-way appurtenant to certain described lands.

Also, it may be transferred with the consent of the Government, provided the assignee agrees to comply with and be bound by the terms and conditions of said right-of-way. Since its use is limited to situations where there is essential agreement on sharing maintenance and use, we have not believed it should be assignable in whole or in fractions without assurance that essential agreements of those joined in the road system will continue to be carried out.

4. "If the Forest Service has authority to issue rules and regulations governing access, such rules and regulations, including charges, if any, should be certain, definite, and uniformly applicable to all users. Maintenance and road use fees collected should be expended on or credited to the roads for which collected."

Our comments are as follows:

(a) The Secretary's authority to issue regulations pertaining to this program has not been delegated to the Forest Service.

(b) "Charges" under these regulations are only for the purpose of recovering that part of the costs incurred by the United States which equitably should be shared by the particular users.

(c) Cost recovery charges are designed to be applied only to a non-Federal hauler who benefits directly from the road use and who has not participated in constructing the roads or improving them to the extent necessary to bear his use.

(d) Cost recovery charges will not be expended on the roads for which collected. In accordance with law they will be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Timber and other products on Federal lands are sold on the basis that the particular Forest Service road is available for hauling them subject to sharing maintenance proportionate to the hauler's use, or upon condition that the hauler construct, improve and maintain the road to the extent required to permit his safe and economic hauling. In either case he has borne his share of the cost by means other than through cost recovery charges.

Cost recovery charges will under the above limitations be as certain, definite, and uniformly made as conditions will permit to those to whom they apply. Maintenance will be required as occasioned by hauler's use and will be as uniform as are the uses. There are situations in which maintenance work is "pooled" for a particular group of roads within a maintenance unit. Where cooperator deposits are made to cover maintenance work performed, separate accounting for individual needs in such units would be difficult to administer and would increase overhead expenses.

5. "In those instances where the Forest Service has authority to place certain access

roads in restricted use categories, it should announce a policy for so doing. National Forest roads, not restricted to special uses, should be available without charge to all users."

We are in agreement with this.

6. "Each road use should bear only its proportionate share of road costs."

We agree generally that road costs should be shared in proportion to the planned use of the road. Whether use by recreationists and others is significant and measurable and should be borne by the Government, a particular landowner, or all landowners proportionate to their other planned use of the road will depend upon the particular facts in each case.

7. "Disagreement over operating problems should be settled by an appeals procedure such as that requested in August 9, 1962, letter to the Secretary of Agriculture on the lumber industry four-point program."

The appeals procedure is under study. At this point, the recourse available is through the regulation A-10 procedure.

8. "Where the Forest Service seeks to condition access to private land on the grant of a reciprocal right from an applicant for access, such right shall be limited to the same road system for which the applicant seeks rights, to substantially similar values, to like property interests, and to a like term."

The objective of this principle is, we believe, to stress that the policy be fairly and reasonably designed and applied. In some cases there are opportunities for exchanging quite different rights over more than one road system needed by the private owner and by the Government. The intent is to be fair and reasonable so that the results will benefit both parties.

We provide under proposed 212.10(a) that if a reciprocal benefit needed by the United States exceeds those applied for by an applicant, the additional interests will be acquired by payment from appropriate funds or by other methods described under 212.9(d). If the values needed by the applicant exceed those needed by the United States, the differences in value will be determined under principles set forth in 212.7(c), and 212.10(a), and 212.11.

9. "In the event of disagreement as to whether value of the right being sought by the Forest Service is reciprocal, the Forest Service should within a reasonable time exercise its right of eminent domain to determine the true value."

Condemnation is not available for determining the values to be used as a basis for reciprocal grants. However, before a recommendation to exercise eminent domain is made to the Secretary where valuation differences are involved, we generally intend to prepare a staff appraisal of value and also in complex or unusual cases to obtain an independent appraisal of the value of the interest to be taken so that our judgment may be guided as to the amount that will likely be just compensation. Application of this principle will, of course, require that appropriated funds be available for payment of the award at that time. Strong efforts will be made to arrange allocation of funds for condemnation within a reasonable time after it is found that agreement cannot be reached.

10. "Where requested, temporary access should be granted during negotiations for a joint road system. Investments made under such temporary rights should be protected, and the road owner should be compensated for temporary use of the road."

We agree with the first sentence of the principle where conditions require early access. The objective of the last part of the second sentence can be agreed to, if the applicant will deliver the right-of-way for the access needed by the United States. It can then be arranged by including cost recovery provisions in a permit issued by the United States for the road to be built on national forest land. The agreement can provide that it may be carried over to an easement to be issued by the United States. To protect an investment made for construction under a temporary permit an agreement should be entered into prior to the construction. Otherwise the roadbuilder has no assurance that the anticipated final agreement will be consummated and that he will receive the needed easement. However, all past experience indicates that those who build roads under permits, including those containing cost recovery provisions, have generally been able to continue use of the road they have constructed and incorporate the terms thereof into subsequent agreements.

The Forest Service is quite willing to enter agreements in advance so that it can meet the requirements of those cases where conditions require early access and there is agreement in principle to cooperate but facts or conditions are not yet available or known with sufficient accuracy to agree in specific detail.

11. "The Forest Service should acquire only temporary or periodic use access rights where adequate to meet national forest management objectives."

We agree with this principle. Our proposed regulation 212.9(g) expresses the principle as we think it should be stated in the context of the responsibility imposed on the administration of the national forests.

12. The principle as stated is rather lengthy and really is a series of principles some of which are actually in the points already covered. Our comments on your views are as follows:

First sentence: "The Forest Service should recognize that there are instances when negotiated road agreements between itself and other parties will better satisfy all parties' access requirements."

Mutually satisfactory agreements providing for exchange of rights-of-way, joint construction and use of road systems in areas of mixed national forest and other ownerships are regarded by the Forest Service as providing the most desirable means of access in such areas. Many agreements have already been made and successfully carried out. Continuation of the cooperative road program will be strongly supported and implemented by the Department. The subject is treated primarily in proposed 212.9(e) and 212.11.

Except for temporary roads, the Forest Service cannot spend appropriated road construction funds on lands which it has permission to use only through revocable "agreements." It must have an easement. Proposed regulation 212.9(e) states the intended policy. A cooperative agreement is subject to mutually agreed modifications and to termination by either party. This background needs to be kept in mind in discussing the principles under consideration.

We agree to the second sentence which states: "The Forest Service should also recognize the need to provide a fair, sound, and mutually beneficial basis for any such agreement."

Our views on the following principles as they have been listed are as follows:

(a) "The Forest Service should recognize the right of the party having the principal investment in a road to control it. Control should include the right to prescribe reasonable operating rules and regulations, including the creation of adequate indemnity by bond or otherwise, and requiring general liability insurance in amount and scope consistent with industry practice."

The cooperating party can in his conveyance to the United States reserve the right to use the road subject to such specific terms, conditions and road use rules as may be mutually agreed upon and set forth in the conveyance. This would retain in the grantor whatever assurance and control were mutually agreed upon over his reserved interest. Control as it pertains to multiple use or any mixed traffic, public safety and control of use by others not provided for by the reservations in the easement will need to be vested in the United States. We agree that operating rules and regulations should be kept on a reasonable basis.

In areas where the practice is well established in the industry, we have agreed in some cases to a provision for requiring commercial haulers to be bonded for indemnity for damage to the roads or structures used and for requiring reasonable liability insurance for such haulers to insure their operations while using the road. We do not agree to requiring national forest users, other than commercial haulers, to be bonded for such indemnity. Nor do we agree that unless it were required by law any national forest user, including commercial haulers, should be required to carry general liability insurance for activities or operations conducted on national forest lands.

(b) "The parties' respective investments in existing roads should be recognized."

We agree if it means roads on lands or interests in lands belonging to the parties. On the other hand, if this means that the private party should be reimbursed for a road he constructed under a permit which did not provide for cost recovery on the roads over national forest land prior to entering into a share-cost agreement, we cannot do this. However, we do not propose to diminish any rights or privileges, without cause, of any given party who has constructed a road crossing national forest lands as long as he uses the road for the purpose covered by the permit and is not in violation of the permit or applicable laws and regulations.

(c) "All road users should be required to obtain a permit from the road owner prior to commencement of use. Such permit should contain terms and conditions of use which should be detailed at the time the joint agreement is negotiated."

This is partly covered in 12a above.

Control of use and how to permit it can best be worked out in the individual agreement at the time it is being negotiated.

(d) "Grants of right-of-way should be mutual with respect to their terms and conditions, including reservations, and with respect to their duration."

This principle is not incorporated in the regulations for the reasons hereafter stated. The Forest Service must normally require that easements be unrestricted as to time and kind of use except in the rare instance where the facts clearly show it is in the interest of the United States to accept something less. The Forest Service needs multiple-use access in virtually every case. Sustained yield management requires generally permanent or longlasting improvements, including roads. Easements which enable the United States to meet these requirements must be permanent and nonrestrictive so as to provide for such users as recreationists, hunters, fishermen, etc., as well as timber haulers. Since the purpose of national forest roads is to accommodate mixed traffic or all anticipated kinds of traffic at various times, it is essential that the Government be in a position to regulate such traffic.

(e) "This agreement should be certain, definite, and specific as to:

(i) "The road or road system of all parties which each will have the right to use."

We agree to this.

(ii) "The lands of all parties from which forest products or other materials may be taken out over the roads subject to the agreement."

This principle cannot be categorically followed in all cases. It is impossible to be definite and specific with respect to the lands that are owned by third parties within the agreement area. When it is impracticable to follow the principle, provisions may be made for adjustments and modifications.

(iii) "The extent to which overhead costs are to be recognized in both construction and maintenance."

We agree to this. Maintenance overhead expense may be quite nominal. Overhead items will be specific in agreements but not in the regulations.

(iv) "The procedure to be followed for reversion upon abandonment."

Generally reversion is not a problem; therefore, no regulation relating to it is proposed. Reversion or termination is not, however, a matter to be covered solely in an agreement. The terms should be stated clearly in the easement deed or other document granting right-of-way.

(f) "Where a change in private road status causes economic loss by limiting the uses of the road, the road owner should be compensated."

We intend to follow a policy of fair compensation recognizing whatever may be compensable under Federal law.

(g) "Existing reserved rights of use should be protected. Moreover, conditions agreed upon at the time a right-of-way agreement is entered into should not be subject to change by future regulations."

Existing rights of use, if retained by the owner in a conveyance, are property rights and are not subject to change by future regulations.

(h) "In appropriate instances, a road owner should be entitled to an amount equivalent to interest on any unamortized investment remaining in a road system."

This objective can be accomplished by agreement if conditions justify it. However, the objective is to eliminate any real need for it. This can frequently be done by having construction performed on behalf of each cooperator in time to avoid carrying any substantial unamortized investment.

(i) "Traffic rules shall be determined by mutual agreement subject to the party having the greater investment making the final decision."

See discussion of this point under "a" above.

(j) "Maintenance and road use fees collected from purchasers of national forest timber should be applied to the roads for which collected."

See discussion under 4 above.

(k) "Easements and other road use rights should be appurtenant to the lands served."

See our comments under 3 above.

(l) "Road replacement cost for each user should be determined at the time such user first removes logs."

We aren't certain of the purpose of this statement here. Perhaps you intend it to be applied to users who are not participants in the agreement.

Our proposed regulation 212.11(d) covers costs to be recovered by the United States from parties other than those who participate in road construction or improvement. Such costs would have to be determined at the time the user makes application for commercial hauling.

(m) "The amortization share allocated to timber volume should be based upon the total merchantable timber tributary to a particular road, including the volume merchantable at the time the road was constructed and the volume which will become merchantable during the payout period."

We agree quite fully to this in principle. However, there may be instances where this could produce inequity. When that is demonstrable, additional criteria may be required. Proposed 212.11(c) sets out the criteria we think should be given consideration. The "volume which will become merchantable during the pay-out period" may be indeterminate or the pay-out period be such that its inclusion could produce inequity or uncertainty. Therefore, we cannot agree to invariably include it.

(n) "A party should be required to share in the cost of a joint road only to the extent it is constructed to a standard adequate to serve his particular needs."

We would presume that the road must meet the sum of the needs of the parties and may require a standard more than adequate to meet the needs of any single one of the parties and yet result in having the share cost less than a road built by the party alone. Thus each party's share would be related to his situation. Our proposed 212.9(e) expresses what we believe is the sound guiding principle.

The foregoing together with the comments of all reviewers have been considered in redrafting the regulations. The redraft will shortly be referred to the Secretary. You have his letter of December 4, 1962, concerning them. You may be certain that your statement of principles has been given thorough consideration already both in this agency and in appropriate departmental offices.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD P. CLIFF,
Chief.

AMENDING THE TRADE ACT—ARTICLE BY SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the great students in the U.S. Senate on matters affecting American trade and trade policy is our able and distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

In the March 25 edition of Brandon's Shipper & Forwarder, the Senator from New York discussed with great clarity the amendment of the present Trade Act and his own feeling as to how trade among the free nations of the world should be strengthened and should grow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this excellent article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDING THE TRADE ACT

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

President de Gaulle is threatening to make France and Germany the core of a so-called third force in world politics. I believe that we must be clear on the deplorable consequences of such a course of action.

We must also make sure that there is an alternative to the free world bearing these consequences. The alternative would at least prevent a complete scattering of free world power, as is now threatened by Great Britain's exclusion from membership in the European Economic Community (EEC). The alternative is an economic association of the English-speaking peoples, joined by other free world nations which are threatened by exclusion from the EEC.

Such an association would be viable and soundly based on economic power and historic fact. It must be nondiscriminatory and look to the day when the EEC can be fully reintegrated into free world trade patterns.

The United States and the United Kingdom both have a total trade with each other and with the Commonwealth, the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), Japan and Latin America, nearly four times greater than with the EEC countries. The $23 billion of U.S. trade and the $14 billion of United Kingdom trade with these areas and with each other, added together, form a $37 billion trading relationship which overshadows the $24 billion of trade among the EEC countries. In terms of sheer economic weight, the total world trade of the United States and the United Kingdom alone almost equal the total world trade of the EEC countries. The combined annual production of an economic association of the areas I am discussing is four times greater than the annual production of the EEC countries; the combined population is six times greater. To a large extent such an association would have common traditions of law and language. The United States and the United Kingdom also have in common the fact that both are vitally engaged in economic development ventures—the Alliance for Progress and the Colombo plan—conforming closest to the aspirations for dignity and responsibility among the newly developing nations of the free world.

Let us be cognizant of our own strength. We continue to adhere to our policy that the economic integration of an outward looking Europe is a major asset in the struggle for freedom. We must not, however, leave any impression that the free world has no alternative to accepting the consequences of a small, isolationist Europe.

The setting up of unsurmountable barriers to British membership in the EEC, the short-tempered EEC retaliation against the United States increase of the tariffs on glass and carpets under the "escape clause," and the fact that the United States feels it necessary to deny to France information on nuclear weapons technology are bringing to a head a grave crisis of unity among the Atlantic nations. The bonds of purpose, mutual trust and interdependence which have enabled the free world to resist Communist aggression for 15 years are being strained severely.

We cannot let the situation get away from us, because the consequences are too grave for the United States and for the free world.

This danger was foreseen by many, like myself, who strongly favored and supported the movement for European economic and political integration which has resulted in the creation of the EEC—we were and are right, for the strength to the free world brought by the EEC was worth the risk, but this does not erase the need to fight the danger now. U.S. economic power, exercised through the instrument of trade, must be applied to counter the political forces which threaten to split the Atlantic Community.

But a decision must be made to so apply our strength, rather than to stand transfixed by the quixotic spectacle being enacted in Paris. Whatever may be General de Gaulle's motivations, his actions are made possible only by the economic power of the EEC. But economic power also can be used to bring these countries back into the mainstream of free world policies.

The principal element of the amendment (S. 602) which I have offered to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was conceived in the belief that the value of the EEC resides in its ability to strengthen the free world. If the EEC should tend to divide and weaken the free world, its value could turn into a temporary liability. Therefore, I have proposed authority for the President to negotiate for the mutual elimination of all tariffs with all fully developed free world nations. Thus, if Great Britain, the industrialized members of the British Commonwealth and the industrialized members of the European Free Trade Association are shut out of the Common Market, we can take them into an economic partnership with us.

With the authority now given to the President by the Trade Act, we could stand by, relatively helpless, while the EEC eliminated its internal tariffs and became a family club, and trade barriers continued to divide us from the rest of the free world. This is the effect of the provision that tariffs can be eliminated only on categories of items in which the EEC and the United States account for 80 percent or more of the world's export trade. There are only a very few such categories, unless Great Britain is a member of the EEC.

But the United States and Great Britain can and should form an effective economic and trading partnership with the developing nations and with Japan. Together, we take more than $4 billion of Latin American exports—twice as much as does the EEC. Together we import $9.1 billion from the British Commonwealth. Britain alone takes nearly as much in Japanese exports as the EEC, and, of course, the United States is Japan's best customer.

We are leading customers for British machinery and transport equipment, leather, wool textile manufactures, and, of course, Scotch whisky. Great Britain, in turn, is among the top European purchasers of our machinery, chemicals, grain products, fats and oils, nonferrous metals, textiles, pulp and paper, and fruits and vegetables.

Consideration of the U.S. export markets alone shows that we sell to Great Britain, the Commonwealth, the European Free Trade Association, Japan, and Latin America $11.3 billion of our products, more than three times as much as to the EEC countries. There is no logical reason why the action of General de Gaulle should deprive us of such a great trading partnership merely because of a quirk in our own law. I felt so last year when I originally introduced my amendment, and I continue to be convinced of this.

The markets and productive capacities of this free world complex are so vast that they could generate the kind of magnetic pull which would draw the EEC into solidarity with us. The debates now going on in Western Europe, as well as the clearly stated positions of high ranking statesmen on the continent of Europe give a basis for believing that the separatist tendencies will not prevail. But the fact that the alternative of an association of the English speaking peoples does exist could give substance to this hope.

INFORMATION ON THE CURRENT FINANCIAL STATUS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Republican policy committee of the Senate, at my request, has recently completed a comprehensive and I believe most informative study on the current financial status of the United Nations. This study was approached from a totally nonpolitical and impartial standpoint, and we believe it is an accurate objective presentation of the financial situation of the United Nations at the present time. I think it should be of great help to Senators and to the public generally in evaluating the program and from an information standpoint in connection with United Nations activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with my remarks, this study may be printed in the Record; including the preliminary statement; to be followed by a table giving the status of advances to the working capital fund and contributions due to the United Nations regular budget; a statistical statement of the status of contributions due to the United Nations Emergency Force special account; a statistical financial statement of the status of contributions due to the Congo ad hoc account; a compilation of the financial situation as to the totals of current and arrear contributions outstanding as at February 28, 1963; a table on contributions to the Food and Agricultural Organization for the Organization's calendar years 1958–61, as of the date October 31, 1962; a statement as to the contributions to the International Civil Aviation Organization, as those statistics were available October 31, 1962, for that Organization's calendar years 1957–61; a statement of the contributions to the International Labor Organization as compiled September 30, 1962, and showing the contributions to that Organization for the calendar years 1957–61; a statement of the contributions to the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, compiled as of October 31, 1962, for that Organization's calendar years 1959–62; a statement of the contributions to the World Meteorological Organization, as of December 31, 1962, for that Organization's calendar years 1958–61; a statement of the contributions to the International Telecommunication Union, compiled as of December 31, 1962, for that organization's ordinary budgets for the years 1957–61; a statement of the contributions to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, compiled as of October 31, 1962, for the Organization's calendar years 1958–61; and, finally, a statement of the contributions to the World Health Organization, compiled as of October 31, 1962, for the Organization's calendar years 1958–61.

There being no objection, the statement and tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Information on the Current Financial Status of the United Nations

(Note.—Prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, Bourke B. Hickenlooper, chairman; David S. Teeple, staff director.)

The United Nations regular budget was $82 million in 1962. Of this the United States is obligated to pay 32.02 percent; the Soviet Union, 14.97 percent; the United Kingdom, 7.58 percent; France, 5.94 percent; and the rest lesser percentages down to a minimum, fixed by the General Assembly, of 0.04 percent.

The regular budget of the United Nations is prepared by the U.N. Secretariat. When the General Assembly of the United Nations meets, it has before it both the budgetary estimates of the Secretary General and the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Decisions on the budget are made by a two-thirds vote of all General Assembly members present and voting.

No serious difficulties have been encountered on payments to the regular budget but difficulties have arisen on the special assessments levied for the U.N.'s Emergency Force in the Middle East (hereinafter designated as UNEF) and the U.N. operation in the Congo (hereinafter designated as UNOC).

The charter of the United Nations lays a specific obligation upon all countries to pay their assessments or, after 2 years in arrears, face the loss of their votes. But the charter provides, in article 19, "The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such a member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the member." As a result member countries great and small are refusing to fulfill their financial responsibilities to the United Nations.

No one has seriously suggested that any of them be deprived of their votes.

Prior to 1956, the expenses of peace and security operations had been carried within the regular budget. In 1956 UNEF was financed under a special budget, called a special account, and in 1960 in the case of UNOC, the budget was called an ad hoc account.

Another account, titled the "Working Capital Fund," is assessed on the same basis of percentage as the regular budget. It currently has a ceiling of $40 million. It is used partly as a revolving fund to carry the U.N. through the period when the regular budget assessments are due and when regular budget assessments are collected, and partly to finance emergency operations.

While willing to vote these peace and security operations into existence, most countries in the United Nations refused to share the cost of UNEF and UNOC in the usual manner; that is, on the basis of the regular scale of assessmenets. Because of default on these special levies, the organization will approach a debt of $200 million by the end of 1963. Reasons offered by defaulters for their refusal to share the cost of UNEF and UNOC in the usual manner were many and varied.

First, they contended the charter contemplated peace and security actions should be carried out primarily by the five permanent members of the Security Council who would furnish their troops without cost to other U.N. members. They said the five permanent members of the Security Council should therefore pay considerably more than their ordinary assessment percentage for UNEF and UNOC.

Second, they said the "aggressors" who made U.N. peace and security actions a necessity, plus "parties in interest" should pay all or most of the expenses.

Third, some member countries claimed they could not afford to contribute to the UNEF budget and UNOC budget.

Finally, some countries felt these operations to be unwarranted and in violation of the charter. As a result the United States has felt it necessary to make voluntary contributions, over and above our normal assessment contributions, in 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962.

The Soviet Union argued these emergency items did not fall within the assessments procedure provided by the charter and therefore any disapproving member is free to refuse to help pay for them.

The United States contended the charter's provision applied to all expenses of the U.N. The International Court of Justice at The Hague in July 1962 issued an advisory opinion supporting the U.S. position. The Soviet Union says it will ignore the Court's opinion and continue to refuse to pay its share of the special assessments. The Communist bloc countries have followed the Soviet lead and approximately 40 other nations have also refused to contribute to either or both of the peace-enforcing operations.

In the face of this financial crisis the Assembly in December 1961 voted to authorize the Secretary General to sell $200 million worth of bonds. At President Kennedy's request Congress last year passed a bill authorizing the United States to purchase up to $100 million worth of the U.N. bonds if the amounts are matched by other members.

Further financial criticism was directed at the United Nations when it was revealed, late in 1962, that the U.N. had undertaken to provide a grant of $1,157,600, over a 5-year period, to assist in the development of an agricultural research program in Cuba. To the extent the United States provides approximately 40 percent of the money contributed to the U.N. Special Fund for Economic Development, it was said that 40 percent of the cost of this assistance to Cuba was defrayed by the United States, contrary to our national interests.

Not all operations of the United Nations are financed through assessments. Several specialized agencies receive voluntary contributions from member countries. These specialized agencies include:

1. International Atomic Energy Agency.
2. International Labor Organization.
3. Food and Agriculture Organization.
4. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
5. World Health Organization.
6. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
7. International Development Association.
8. International Finance Corporation.
9. International Monetary Fund.
10. International Civil Aviation Organization.
11. Universal Postal Union.
12. International Telecommunications Union.
13. World Meteorological Organization.
14. Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

The following tables list, as of February 28, 1963, amounts due to the current Working Capital Fund, as well as amounts due to the regular budget, the U.N. emergency force, and the U.N. operation in the Congo, for each year in which funds are due.

An appendix to this report contains those available records of uncollected contributions to the voluntarily financed agencies as furnished by the U.S. Dpartment of State, Office of International Administration.

SOURCES

"Information on the Operations and Financing of the United Nations" (joint committee print), Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 2d session, February 6, 1962.

Supplement to joint committee print of February 6, 1962, "Information on the Operations and Financing of the United Nations" (prepared by the Department of State), June 25, 1962.

Disbursements made to United Nations agencies during the period July 1, 1961–June 30, 1962 (fiscal year 1962), memorandum from Sidney S. Cummins, Office of International Administration, Department of State, February 18, 1963.

Statement of advances to the Working Capital Fund and contributions to the United Nations budget payable by member States for the financial year 1963, United Nations Secretariat, December 27, 1962.

Statement of the collection of contributions as at February 28, 1963, United Nations Secretariat, March 8, 1963.

II. Status of advances to the working capital fund and contributions due to the United Nations regular budget [1]

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Advances to the working capital fund	United Nations regular budget					Total due
		1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	
Afghanistan	7,392.00	39,459.00					46,851.00
Albania	6,000.00	31,965.00	15,648.00				53,613.00
Argentina	150,421.00	782,949.00	611,362.00	642.815.00			2,187,547.00
Australia	247,597.00	1,294,537.00					1,542,134.00
Austria	7,717.00	359,655.00					367,372.00
Belgium	178,921.00	941,070.00	741,687.00	57,212.09			1,918,890.09
Bolivia	6,000.00	30,126.00	24,274.00	22,907.00	1,503		84,810.00
Brazil	154,609.00	823,116.00	2,391.00				980,116.00
Bulgaria	30,432.00	159,930.00	87,088.00				277,450.00
Burma	10,393.00	55,911.00					66,304.00
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	78,539.00	415,674.00					494,213.00
Cambodia	6,000.00	31,965.00	24,746.00				62,711.00
Cameroon	6,431.00	31,965.00					38,396.00
Canada	468,109.00	2,451,553.00					2,919,662.00
Central African Republic	6,431.00	31,965.00					38,396.00
Ceylon	13,392.00	71,893.00					85,285.00
Chad		28,540.80					28,540.80
Chile	38,892.00	200,759.00	160,340.00				399,991.00
China	680,752.00	3,624,229.00	2,850,814.00	3,072,961.00			10,228,756.00
Colombia	38,460.00	207,637.00					246,097.00
Congo (Brazzaville)	6,431.00	31,965.00	26,175.00	193.60			64,764.60
Congo (Léopoldville)	11,256.00	56,018.00	17,669.50				84,943.50
Costa Rica	6,000.00	31,965.00	9,231.12				47,196.12
Cuba	32,676.00	169,817.00	132,913.00	66,551.00			401,957.00
Cyprus	6,431.00	31,965.00					38,396.00
Czechoslovakia	178,738.00	910,187.00	549,255.40				1,638,180.40
Dahomey	6,431.00	31,965.00	15,854.89				54,250.89
Denmark		178,495.00					178,495.00
Dominican Republic	7,500.00	39,231.00					46,731.00
Ecuador	9,000.00	47,733.00	3,311.98				60,044.98
El Salvador	5,891.00	31,255.00					37,146.00
Ethiopia	7,392.00	39,930.00					47,322.00
Federation of Malaya	19,068.00	103,778.00					122,846.00
Finland							
France	886,036.00	4,667,518.00					5,553,554.00
Gabon	6,431.00	31,965.00					38,396.00
Ghana	13,715.00	71,973.00					85,688.00
Greece	34,500.00	177,048.00	29,273.00				240,821.00
Guatemala	7,500.00	39,518.00	32,203.00	28,871.00			108,092.00
Guinea	6,431.00	31,965.00	25,682.00				64,078.00
Haiti	6,000.00	30,801.00	24,949.00	23,582.00	19,436	1,667	106,435.00
Honduras	6,000.00	31,687.00	25,835.00	24,468.00	20,322	389	108,701.00
Hungary		447,877.00	365,819.00	259,841.00			1,073,537.00
Iceland							
India	299,860.00	1,559,041.00	139,999.50				1,998,900.50
Indonesia	67,284.00	359,549.00					426,833.00
Iran	29,892.00	156,035.00					185,927.00
Iraq	13,500.00	70,165.00					83,665.00
Ireland	20,784.00	111,823.00					132,607.00
Israel	22,608.00	119,893.00	55,548.00				198,049.00
Italy	335,892.00	1,789,993.00					2,125,885.00
Ivory Coast	6,431.00	31,912.00					38,343.00
Japan	341,363.00	1,814,206.00					2,155,569.00
Jordan	6,000.00	31,965.00					37,965.00
Laos	6,000.00	31,965.00	24,746.00				62,711.00
Lebanon	7,500.00	39,956.00					47,456.00
Liberia	6,000.00	31,965.00					37,965.00
Libya	6,000.00	31,965.00					37,965.00
Luxembourg	7,392.00	35,458.01					42,850.01
Madagascar	6,431.00	31,912.00					38,343.00
Mali	6,431.00	31,965.00					38,396.00
Mexico	111,324.00	587,301.00					608,625.00
Morocco	19,639.00	111,876.00					131,515.00
Nepal	6,000.00	31,965.00	2,290.81				40,255.81
Netherlands							
New Zealand	61,392.00	317,187.00					378,579.00
Nicaragua	6,000.00	31,810.00	25,958.00	2,831.18			66,599.18
Niger	6,431.00	31,965.00	26,175.00	13,925.00			78,496.00
Nigeria	33,767.00	167,814.00					201,581.00
Norway		24,885.64					24,885.64
Pakistan	63,216.00	335,682.00	140,000.00				538,898.00
Panama	5,969.04	30,586.00					36,555.04
Paraguay	6,000.00	31,965.00	26,113.00	24,746.00	4,199		93,023.00
Peru	14,892.00	77,673.00					92,565.00
Philippines	59,677.00	319,566.00					379,243.00

See footnotes at end of table.

II. Status of advances to the working capital fund and contributions due to the United Nations regular budget [1]—Continued

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Advances to the working capital fund	United Nations regular budget					Total due
		1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	
Poland	191,030.00	993,624.00	184,920.00				1,369,574.00
Portugal	23,569.00	127,752.00					151,321.00
Romania	47,785.00	255,664.00					303,449.00
Saudi Arabia	13,000.00	55,965.00	45,715.00				114,680.00
Senegal	20,000.00	39,930.00	32,717.00				92,647.00
Somalia	6,431.00	31,965.00					38,396.00
South Africa	79,176.00	403,749.00					482,925.00
Spain	128,245.00	687,054.00					815,299.00
Sudan	10,608.00	55,965.00	2,392.00				68,965.00
Sweden		194,029.00					194,029.00
Syria [2]	7,464.00	39,947.00	32,356.00				79,767.00
Thailand	24,000.00	119,664.00					143,664.00
Togo	6,431.00	31,965.00					38,396.00
Tunisia	7,500.00	39,956.00					47,456.00
Turkey	57,950.00	313,292.00					371,242.00
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	298,943.00	1,582,727.00					1,881,670.00
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	2,260,069.00	11,951,498.00					14,211,567.00
United Arab Republic	37,320.00	195,532.00	157,578.00	152,737.96			543,167.96
United Kingdom		5,806,367.22					5,806,367.22
United States of America	4,797,713.00	26,532,732.01					31,330,445.01
Upper Volta	6,431.00	31,965.00	25,744.00				64,140.00
Uruguay	16,391.00	82,963.00	65,655.00	60,000.00			225,009.00
Venezuela	78,216.00	412,156.00					490,372.00
Yemen	6,000.00	31,965.00	26,113.00	772.50			64,850.50
Yugoslavia	57,324.00	285,465.00					342,789.00
Total	13,165,186.04	77,533,489.68	6,790,542.20	4,454,414.33	45,460	2,056	101,991,148.25
Mauritania	16,000.00	32,071.00	26,182.00	2,686.00			76,939.00
Mongolia	16,000.00	32,071.00	26,182.00	2,686.00			76,939.00
Sierra Leone	16,000.00	32,071.00	26,182.00	2,686.00			76,939.00
Tanganyika	16,000.00	32,071.00	26,182.00	2,686.00			76,939.00
Total	13,229,186.04	77,661,773.68	6,895,270.20	4,465,158.33	45,460	2,056	102,298,904.25

---

[1] United Nations Secretariat, statement on the collection of contributions as at Feb. 28, 1963, ST/ADM/SER.B/170, Mar. 8, 1963.

[2] For the year 1961 assessment has been shown against the United Arab Republic.

III. Status of contributions due to the United Nations Emergency Force special account [1]

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	Total due
Afghanistan	907.00	5,583.50	5,926.00	9,092	15,000	2,814	39,322.50
Albania	735.00	7,484.00	3,951.00	6,062	10,000	5,876	34,108.00
Argentina	18,442.00	103,291.00	109,594.00	168,180	285,000	171,869	856,376.00
Australia							
Austria							
Belgium	115,533.00	43,245.00					158,778.00
Bolivia	735.00	7,484.00	3,939.00	6,056	12,500	7,345	38,059.00
Brazil							
Bulgaria	3,720.00	29,938.00	15,826.00	24,257	35,000	20,565	129,306.00
Burma							
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	50,170.00	87,943.00	46,419.00	71,219	117,500	70,510	443,761.00
Cambodia							
Cameroon							
Canada							
Central African Republic							
Ceylon							
Chad	777.00						777.00
Chile	4,765.00	25,125.00	26,643.00	35,269			91,802.00
China	217,133.00	466,207.50	989,797.00	759,151	1,252,500	505,048	4,189,836.50
Colombia							
Congo (Brazzaville)	777.00	7,524.00	444.00				8,745.00
Congo (Léopoldville)	1,362.00						1,362.00
Costa Rica	735.00	3,722.00	3,171.09				7,628.09
Cuba	4,008.00	46,778.00	24,679.00	37,874	65,000	12,662	191,001.00
Cyprus							
Czechoslovakia	113,093.00	162,787.00	85,983.00	131,856	205,000	123,393	822,112.00
Dahomey	777.00	381.93					1,158.93
Denmark							
Dominican Republic	919.00	9,356.00					10,275.00
Ecuador							
El Salvador	724.00	4,653.00					5,377.00
Ethiopia	907.00	5,583.50	5,868.00	9,067	27.500	16,159	65,084.50
Federation of Malaya							
Finland							
France							
Gabon							
Ghana							
Greece							
Guatemala	919.00	4,653.00	4,915.00	7,566			18,053.00
Guinea	735.00	7,484.00					8,219.00
Haiti	735.00	3,722.00	3,951.00	6,062			14,470.00
Honduras	735.00	3,722.00	3,951.00				8,408.00
Hungary	54,126.00	78,587.00	41,516.00	63,627	97,500	67,572	402,928.00
Iceland							
India							
Indonesia							
Iran							
Iraq	1,654.00	16,840.00	8,854.00	13,623	30,000	5,627	76,598.00
Ireland							
Israel							
Italy							
Ivory Coast							
Japan							
Jordan	735.00	7,484.00	3,951.00	6,062	10,000	5,876	34,108.00
Laos	735.00	2,987.00					3,722.00
Lebanon	919.00	4,653.00	4,938.00	7,576	1,759		19,845.00

See footnotes at end of table.

III. Status of contributions due to the United Nations Emergency Force special account [1]—Continued

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	Total due
Liberia							
Libya	735.00	7,484.00	3,951.00	6,062	10,000	5,876	34,108.00
Luxembourg							
Madagascar							
Mali	15.50						15.50
Mexico	13,629.00	132,849.00	70,158.00	107,564	170,000	32,828	527,028.00
Morocco	2,572.00	13,028.00	13,851.00				29,451.00
Nepal	735.00	200.00					935.20
Netherlands							
New Zealand							
Nicaragua	735.00	2,963.25					3,698.25
Niger	777.00	3,762.00	444.00				4,983.00
Nigeria							
Norway							
Pakistan							
Panama	735.00	3,722.00	3,939.00	6,056	12,500	1,289	28,241.00
Paraguay	735.00	3,722.00	3,951.00	6,062	10,000	5,876	30,346.00
Peru	1,826.00	20,582.00	10,817.00	16,649	37,500	7,034	94,408.00
Philippines	485.00						485.00
Poland	60,854.00	256,343.00	135,134.00	207,514	380,000	229,159	1,269,004.00
Portugal							
Rumania	30,816.00	63,618.00	33,406.00	51,442	122,500	73,448	375,230.00
Saudi Arabia	1,297.00	11,227.00	5,915.00	9,087	17,500	10,283	55,309.00
Senegal	971.00						971.00
Somalia							
South Africa							
Spain	15,720.00	174,013.00	91,643.00	140,826	277,500	167,462	867,164.00
Sudan	1,297.00	11,227.00	5,868.00	9,067	27,500	16,159	71,118.00
Sweden							
Syria [2]	915.00				20,000	11,752	32,667.00
Thailand	2,940.00						2,940.00
Togo	777.00	3,762.00	444.00				4,983.00
Tunisia							
Turkey							
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	191,019.00	336,801.00	177,778.00	272,747	450,000	271,759	1,700,104.00
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,444,204.00	2,548,457.00	2,706,146.00	2,063,805	3,405,000	2,050,676	14,218,288.00
United Arab Republic	4,574.00	59,876.00	31,477.00	48,432	87,500	52,883	284,742.00
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland							
United States of America							
Upper Volta	777.00	7,524.00	444.00				8,745.00
Uruguay	2,010.00	11,167.00	11,806.00				24,983.00
Venezuela							
Yemen	735.00	7,484.00	3,951.00	6,062	10,000	5,876	34,108.00
Yugoslavia							
Total	2,379,397.50	4,827,029.88	4,705,439.09	4,313,974	7,201,759	3,957,676	27,385,275.47
Mauritania	780.00	416.00					1,196.00
Mongolia	780.00	416.00					1,196.00
Sierra Leone	780.00	416.00					1,196.00
Tanganyika	780.00	416.00					1,196.00
Total	2,382,517.50	4,828,693.88	4,705,439.09	4,313,974	7,201,759	3,957,676	27,390,059.47

---

[1] United Nations Secretariat, statement on the collection of contributions as at Feb. 28, 1963, ST/ADM/SER. B/170, Mar. 8, 1963.

[2] For the years 1959, 1960, and 1961 assessments have been shown against the United Arab Republic.

IV. Status of contributions due to the Congo ad hoc account [1]

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Nov. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962	Jan. 1 to Oct. 31, 1961	July 14 to Dec. 31, 1960	Total due
Afghanistan	7,949.00	11,887.00	14,529.50	34,365.50
Albania	6,366.00	7,925.00	19,373.00	33,664.00
Argentina	160,664.00	219,911.00	268,797.00	649,372.00
Australia				
Austria	359,637.00	109,210.00		468,847.00
Belgium	958,903.00	1,287,766.00	629,615.00	2,876,284.00
Bolivia	6,366.00	7,925.00	19,373.00	33,664.00
Brazil	163,940.00	202,080.00	44,922.50	410,942.50
Bulgaria	31,865.00	31,699.00	77,491.00	141,055.00
Burma				
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	415,604.00	465,577.00	227,630.00	1,108,811.00
Cambodia	6,566.00	7,925.00	13,007.00	27,298.00
Cameroon				
Canada				
Central Africa Republic				
Ceylon				
Chad	6,936.00	6,639.98		13,035.98
Chile	41,372.00	53,492.00	65,383.00	160,247.00
China	1,823,774.00	2,481,426.00	1,446,543.50	5,751,743.50
Colombia				
Congo (Brazzaville)	6,396.00	7,925.00	2,131.00	16,452.00
Congo (Léopoldville)	11,196.00			11,196.00
Costa Rica	6,366.00	7,925.00	9,686.50	23,977.50
Cuba	34,989.00	49,529.00	121,080.00	205,598.00
Cyprus				
Czechoslovakia	935,266.00	861,813.00	421,358.00	2,218,437.00
Dahomey	6,246.06			6,246.06
Denmark				
Dominican Republic	7,958.00	9,905.00	24,216.00	42,079.00
Ecuador	8,655.85			8,655.85
El Salvador	6,358.00	9,905.00		16,263.00
Ethiopia	7,949.00	11,887.00	14,529.50	34,365.50
Federation of Malaya				
Finland				
France	4,746,601.00	6,339,772.00	3,099,642.00	14,186,015.00
Gabon				
Ghana				
Greece				
Guatemala	7,958.00	9,905.00	12,108.00	29,971.00
Guinea	6,366.00	7,925.00	19,373.00	33,664.00
Haiti	6,366.00	7,925.00	9,686.50	23,977.50
Honduras	6,366.00	7,925.00	9,686.50	23,977.50
Hungary	447,646.00	83,210.00	203,414.00	734,270.00
Iceland				
India				
Indonesia				
Iran	31,823.00	41,605.00	25,853.50	99,281.50
Iraq	14,324.00	17,831.00	43,589.00	75,744.00
Ireland				
Israel				
Italy				
Ivory Coast				
Japan				
Jordan	6,366.00	7,925.00	19,373.00	33,664.00
Laos	6,366.00	7,925.00	3,320.50	17,611.50
Lebanon	7,958.00	4,150.02		12,108.02
Liberia				
Libya				
Luxembourg	7,949.00			7,949.00
Madagascar	6,394.00	10,936.00		17,330.00
Mali	6,396.00	7,925.00		14,321.00
Mexico	117,801.00	140,664.00	343,866.00	602,331.00
Morocco	22,282.00	27,736.00	67,805.00	117,823.00
Nepal	6,366.00	137.16		6,503.16
Netherlands				
New Zealand				
Nicaragua	6,366.00	7,925.00	9,686.50	23,977.50
Niger	6,396.00	7,925.00	1,065.50	15,386.50
Nigeria				
Norway				
Pakistan				
Panama	6,366.00	7,925.00	9,686.50	23,977.50
Paraguay	6,366.00	7,925.00	9,686.50	23,977.50

See footnotes at end of table.

IV. Status of contributions due to the Congo ad hoc account [1]—Continued

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Nov. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962	Jan. 1 to Oct. 31, 1961	July 14 to Dec. 31, 1960	Total due
Peru	15,907.00	21,793.00	26,637.50	64,337.50
Philippines				
Poland	510,845.00	678,553.00	663,517.00	1,852,915.00
Portugal	25,431.00	39,624.00	96,864.00	161,919.00
Romania	255,713.00	336,800.00	164,668.00	757,181.00
Saudi Arabia	11,149.00	11,887.00	29,059.00	52,095,00
Senegal	7,994.00			7,994.00
Somalia	6,396.00	1,111.07		7,507.07
South Africa	423,528.00	554,730.00	271,219.00	1,249,477.00
Spain	136,816.00	184,250.00	450,417.00	771,483.00
Sudan				
Sweden				
Syria [2]	7,955.00			7,955.00
Thailand	25,465.00			25,465.00
Togo	6,396.00	7,925.00	1,065.50	15,386.50
Tunisia				
Turkey				
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	1,582,482.00	1,783,061.00	871,774.00	4,237,317.00
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	11,964,509.00	13,491,828.00	6,596,425.00	32,052,762.00
United Arab Republic	39,775.00	63,398.00	154,982.00	258,155.00
United Kingdom	377,242. 2			377,242.92
United States of America				
Upper Volta	6,396.00	7,925.00	2,131.00	16,452.00
Uruguay	17,499.00	23,774.00	29,059.00	70,332.00
Venezuela	82,778.00	99,059.00	121,079.50	302,916.50
Yemen	6,366.00	7,925.00	19,373.00	33,664.00
Yugoslavia	60,505.00	69,341.00	169,512.00	299,358.00
Total	26,072,551.83	29,990,532.23	16,975,290.00	73,038,374.06
Mauritania	6,400.00	877.00		7,277.00
Mongolia	6,400.00	877.00		7,277.00
Sierra Leone	6,400.00	877.00		7,277.00
Tanganyika	6,400.00	877.00		7,277.00
Total	26,098,151.83	29,994,040.23	16,975,290.00	73,067,482

[1] United Nations Secretariat, statement on the collection of contributions as at Feb. 28, 1963, ST/ADM/SER.B/170, Mar. 8, 1963.

[2] For the years 1960 and 1961 assessments have been shown against the United Arab Republic.

V. Totals of current and arrear contributions outstanding as at Feb. 28, 1963 [1]

[In U.S. dollars]

	Current [2]	Arrears	Total amount due
Working capital fund	13,214,834.04	14,352.00	13,229,186.04
United Nations regular budget	77,777,245.68	11,292,472.53	89,069,718.21
United Nations Emergency Force	4,784.00	27,385,275.47	27,390,059.47
Congo ad hoc	29,108.00	73,038,374.06	73,067,482.06
Total	91,025,971.72	111,730,474.06	202,756,445.78

[1] United Nations Secretariat, statement on the collection of contributions as at Feb. 28, 1963, ST/ADM/SER. B/170, Mar. 8, 1963.

[2] Including contributions of new member states for 1961 and 1962 as assessed in 1963.

VI. Summary of contributions due and received as at Feb. 28, 1963 [1]

[In U.S. dollars]

	Total amount assessed	Amount received (including credits)	Percent received	Balance due
Working capital fund	40,064,000	26,834,813.96	66.98	13,229,186.04
1959 contributions	61,500,000	61,497,944.00	99.997	2,056.00
1960 contributions	58,347,514	58,302,054.00	99.92	45,460.00
1960 contributions for new member states [2]	52,032	52,032.00		
1961 contributions	69,347,807	64,893,392.67	93.58	4,454,414.33
1962 contributions	74,124,117	67,333,574.80	90.84	6,790,542.20
1963 contributions	89,406,446	11,744,672.32	13.14	77,661,773.68
1961 and 1962 contributions for new member states [3]	115,472			115,472.00
UNEF 1957 assessments	15,028,988	11,071,312.00	73.67	3,957,676.00
UNEF 1958 assessments	25,000,000	17,798,241.00	71.19	7,201,759.00
UNEF 1959 assessments	15,205,000	10,891,026.00	71.63	4,313,974.00
UNEF 1960 assessments	20,000,000	[4] 15,296,336.91	76.48	4,703,663.09
UNEF 1960 assessments for new member states [2]	10,102	8,326.00		1,776.00
UNEF 1961 assessments	18,989,898	[5] 14,162,868.12	74.58	4,827,029.88
UNEF 1962 assessments	9,750,000	[6] 7,370,602.50	75.60	2,379,397.50
UNEF 1961 and 1962 assessments for new member states	4,784			4,784.00
Congo 1960 assessments	48,500,000	[7] 31,524,710.00	65.00	16,975,290.00
Congo 1961 assessments	100,000,000	[8] 70,009,467.77	70.01	29,990,532.23
Congo 1962 assessments	80,000,000	[9] 53,927,448.17	67.41	26,072,551.83
Congo 1961 and 1962 assessments for new member states	29,108			29,108.00

[1] United Nations Secretariat, statement on the collection of contributions as at Feb. 28, 1963, ST/ADM/SER. B/170, Mar. 8, 1963.

[2] Under financial regulation 5.2(e), this amount is applied as an adjustment to the amount of the appropriations for 1961.

[3] Under financial regulation 5.2(e), this amount is applied as an adjustment to the amount of the appropriations for 1963.

[4] Includes credits of $3,475,000 offset by voluntary contributions.

[5] Includes credits of $1,685,481.50 offset by voluntary contributions.

[6] Includes credits of $1,389,474 offset by voluntary contributions.

[7] Includes credits of $3,900,000 offset by voluntary contributions.

[8] Includes credits of $15,305,596 offset by voluntary contributions.

[9] Includes credits of $11,400,800 offset by voluntary contributions.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

Contributions statement as of Oct. 31, 1962, for the Organization's calendar years 1958–61 [1]

SUMMARY

Calendar year	Total due	Amount received	Percent received	Balance due
1958	$8,322,500	$8,313,352	99.89	$9,148
1959	8,322,500	8,261,932	99.27	60,568
1960	$9,225,500	$9,067,835	98.29	$157,665
1961	9,225,500	9,145,894	99.14	79,606

UNCOLLECTED CONTRIBUTIONS [2]

Country	Calendar year 1958	Calendar year 1959	Calendar year 1960	Calendar year 1961	Total
Argentina		$49,970	$134,692		$184,662
Bolivia	$5,826	5,826	3,690	$3,690	19,032
Costa Rica				544	544
Dominican Republic				6,458	6,458
Ecuador		1,443	7,381	1,880	10,704
Greece				3,446	3,446
Guinea			832	3,690	4,522
Haiti			3,690	3,690	7,380
Panama				$3,690	$3,690
Paraguay	$3,322	$3,329	$3,690	3,690	14,031
United Arab Republic				31,219	31,219
Uruguay				13,919	13,919
Yemen			3,690	3,690	7,380
Total	9,148	60,568	157,665	79,606	306,987

[1] Totals due for years prior to 1958 are: China, $1,077,198 (1948–52); Czechoslovakia, $141,292 (1949–50); Hungary, $88,235; Bolivia, $6,550 (1956–57).

[2] Czechoslovakia (on Dec. 27, 1949); Hungary (on Jan. 26, 1951); and China (on July 21, 1951) gave notice of withdrawal from the Food and Agriculture Organization. However, because of the revisions of the Food and Agriculture Organization Constitution (art. XVIII) that "notice shall take effect 1 year after the date of its communication to the Director General," and that "financial obligation to the organization of a member nation which has given notice of withdrawal shall include the entire financial year which the notice takes effect," these countries are under obligation to pay their assessments.

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

Contributions statement as of Oct. 31, 1962, for the organization's calendar years 1957–61 [1]

SUMMARY

Calendar year	Total due [2]	Amount received	Percent received	Balance due
1957	$3,074,437	$3,020,013	98.23	$54,424
1958	2,987,901	2,983,973	99.87	3,896
1959	3,672,000	3,667,104	99.87	4,896
1960	$3,865,000	$3,852,632	99.68	$12,368
1961	4,083,000	4,038,505	98.91	44,495

UNCOLLECTED CONTRIBUTIONS

Country	Calendar year 1957	Calendar year 1958	Calendar year 1959	Calendar year 1960	Calendar year 1961	Total
Bolivia				$3,745	$4,618	$8,363
Cuba					10,098	10,098
Dominican Republic					4,403	4,403
Haiti					4,258	4,258
Honduras					4,222	4,222
Laos					51	51
Nepal					1,880	1,880
Panama				$4,188	$5,274	$9,462
Paraguay	$3,163	$3,928	$4,896	4,435	4,737	21,159
Poland	51,261					51,261
Uruguay					4,954	4,954
Total	54,424	3,928	4,896	12,368	44,495	120,111

[1] Does not take into account supplemental assessment for 1957 and 1958 totaling $896.

[2] Totals due prior to calendar year 1957; China, $54,378 (1950–51); Cuba, $18,537 (1953–54); Czechoslovakia, $22,699 (1954–55); Poland, $86,645 (1955–56).

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Contributions statement as of Sept. 30, 1962, for the Organization's calendar years 1957–61 [1]

SUMMARY

Calendar year	Total due	Amount received	Percent received	Balance due
1957	$7,617,708	$7,598,999	99.75	$18,709
1958	7,972,901	7,963,333	99.88	9,568
1959	8,529,857	8,519,621	99.88	10,236
1960	$9,003,909	$8,859,097	98.39	$144,812
1961	10,054,660	9,685,512	96.33	369,148

UNCOLLECTED CONTRIBUTIONS

Country	Calendar year 1957	Calendar year 1958	Calendar year 1959	Calendar year 1960	Calendar year 1961	Total
Argentina				$120,956	$149,828	$270,784
Bolivia	$9,141			10,805	11,829	31,775
Chile					35,265	35,265
Congo (Brazza)				1,535	11,829	13,364
Costa Rica					1,732	1,732
Ecuador				711	10,506	11,217
Guatemala					11,755	11,755
Haiti					11,829	11,829
Honduras					11,755	11,755
Hungary					$41,143	$41,143
Mauritania					6,319	6,319
Panama					11,755	11,755
Paraguay	$9,568	$9,568	$10,236	$10,805	11,829	52,006
Philippines					36,245	36,245
Syria					2,029	2,029
Uruguay					3,500	3,500
Total	18,709	9,568	10,236	144,812	369,148	552,473

[1] Contributions due prior to 1957: Bolivia, $20,785 (1953–56); China, $243,463 (1952–53); Hungary, $33,034 (1953); Paraguay, $25,621 (1920–37, 1956); Spain, $38,750 (1937–41).

INTERGOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION

Contributions statement as of Oct. 31, 1962, for the organization's calendar years 1959–62

SUMMARY

Calendar year	Total due	Amount received	Percent received	Balance due
1959	$237,000	$232,554	98.12	$4,446
1960	255,000	248,728	97.54	6,272
1961	$232,500	$219,982	94.62	$12,518
1962	459,050	424,158	92.40	34,892

UNCOLLECTED CONTRIBUTIONS

Country	1959	1960	1961	1962	Total
Argentina				$1,210	$1,210
Dominican Republic				2,000	2,000
Ecuador	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000	2,000	8,000
Ghana				6	6
Haiti		2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000
Honduras	2,446	2,272	2,118	2,310	9,146
Indonesia				2,68	2,684
Madagascar			167	2,000	2,167
New Zealand				$2,565	$2,565
Nigeria			$1,000	1,000	2,000
Panama			5,233	12,459	17,692
United Arab Republic				2,492	2,492
Korea				1,333	1,333
Morocco				833	833
Total	$4,446	$6,272	12,518	34,892	58,128

WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION

Contributions statement as of Dec. 31, 1962, for the Organization's calenda. years 1958–61 [1]

SUMMARY

Calendar year	Total due	Amount received	Percent received	Balance due
1958	$434,929	$432,998	99.56	$1,931
1959	465,596	463,227	99.49	2,369
1960	$652,605	$648,790	$99.42	$3,815
1961	666,179	651,400	97.78	14,779

See footnote at end of table.

WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION—Continued

Contributions statement as of Dec. 31, 1962, for the Organization's calendar years 1958–61 [1]—Continued

UNCOLLECTED CONTRIBUTIONS

Country	Calendar year 1958	Calendar year 1959	Calendar year 1960	Calendar year 1961	Total	Country	Calendar year 1958	Calendar year 1959	Calendar year 1960	Calendar year 1961	Total
Argentina				$10,062	$10,062	Nicaragua		$302	$580	$590	$1,472
Bolivia	$1,931	$2,067	$2,318	2,358	8,674	Total	$1,931	2,360	3,815	14,779	22,894
Congo (Brazza)				590	590						
Haiti			917	1,179	2,096						

[1] Prior year's unpaid contributions are: Bolivia, $5,582 (1954–57).

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

Contributions statement as of Dec. 31, 1962, for the Organization's ordinary budgets for the years 1957–61 [1]

[Money amounts in Swiss francs]

SUMMARY

Calendar year	Total due	Amounts received	Percent received	Balance due	Calendar year	Total due	Amounts received	Percent received	Balance due
1957	5,410,533	5,361,256	99.09	49.277	1960	12,626,432	12,092,272	95.77	534,160
1958	5,429,233	5,376,433	99.03	52,800	1961	12,652,661	11,386,017	89.99	1,266,644
1959	5,440,600	5,379,000	98.87	61,600					

UNCOLLECTED CONTRIBUTIONS

Country	Calendar year 1957	Calendar year 1958	Calendar year 1959	Calendar year 1960	Calendar year 1961	Total	Country	Calendar year 1957	Calendar year 1958	Calendar year 1959	Calendar year 1960	Calendar year 1961	Total
Argentina				348,500	349,440	697,940	Ecuador			8,800	13,940	23,296	46,036
Bolivia	26,400	26,400	26,400	41,820	69,888	190,908	Haiti	5,277	8,800	8,800	13,940	23,296	60,113
Brazil					516,124	516,124	Honduras					33,813	33,813
Chile				15,420	69,888	85,308	Liberia				15,420	37,544	52,964
Congo (Léopoldville)					1,941	1,941	Sierra Leone					971	971
Costa Rica				15,420	47,138	62,558	Uruguay				41,820	23,296	65,116
Cuba	17,600	17,600	17,600	27,880		80,680	Total	49,277	52,800	61,600	534,160	1,266,644	1,964,481
Dominican Republic					121	121							
El Salvador					69,888	69,888							

[1] Prior to 1957 the unpaid sums in Swiss francs are as follows: Bolivia, 155,216 (1949–56); Cuba, 127,450 (1951–56).

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Contributions statement as of Oct. 31, 1962, for the Organization's calendar years 1958–61 [1]

SUMMARY

Calendar year	Total due	Amount received	Percent received	Balance due	Calendar year	Total due	Amount received	Percent received	Balance due
1958	$11,770,035	$11,763,163	99.94	$6,872	1960	$12,957,763	$12,935,382	99.83	$22,381
1959	12,614,034	12,598,763	99.88	15,271	1961	15,070,703	14,640,645	97.15	430,058

UNCOLLECTED CONTRIBUTIONS

Country	Calendar year 1958	Calendar year 1959	Calendar year 1960	Calendar year 1961	Total	Country	Calendar year 1958	Calendar year 1959	Calendar year 1960	Calendar year 1961	Total
Afghanistan				$1,062	$1,062	Greece				$22,700	$22,700
Argentina				161,256	161,256	Haiti			$4,499	6,028	10,527
Bolivia	$5,872	$5,126	$5,183	6,028	22,209	Hungary				61,790	61,790
Chile				37,489	37,489	Paraguay	$1,000	$5,126	5,182	6,028	17,337
Costa Rica				1,241	1,241	Ruanda Urundi			1,037	3,014	4,051
Congo (Léopoldville)				6,028	6,028	United Arab Republic				5,663	5,663
Czechoslovakia				80,033	80,033	Uruguay				18,085	18,085
Dominican Republic				6,078	6,078						
Guatemala		5,019	6,479	7,535	19,033	Total	6,872	15,271	22,381	430,058	474,582

[1] Unpaid contributions for prior years: Bolivia, $11,564 (1956–57); China, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland are paying their prior years' contributions in annual installments in accordance with the decisions of the 8th and 11th sessions of the General Conference.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Contributions statement as of Oct. 31, 1962, for the Organization's calendar years 1958–61 [1]

SUMMARY

Calendar year	Total due	Amount received	Percent received	Balance due	Calendar year	Total due	Amount received	Percent received	Balance due
1958	$13,393,480	$13,386,820	99.95	$6,660	1960	$15,704,700	$15,657,908	99.70	$46,792
1959	13,897,600	13,889,440	99.94	8,160	1961	17,723,430	17,360,787	97.95	362,643

See footnote at end of table.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION—Continued

Contributions statement as of Oct. 31, 1962, for the Organization's calendar years 1958–61[1]**—Continued**

UNCOLLECTED CONTRIBUTIONS

Country	Calendar year 1958	Calendar year 1959	Calendar year 1960	Calendar year 1961	Total
Argentina			$16,977	$192,990	$209,967
Bolivia	$6,660	$8,160	6,760	7,570	29,150
Chile				47,300	47,300
Costa Rica				1,116	1,116
Congo (Léopoldville)				7,570	7,570
Cuba			14,490	43,520	58,010
Ecuador				2,859	2,859
Guatemala				9,460	9,460
Haiti			4,805	7,570	12,375
Honduras				70	70
Nepal				$810	$810
Nicaragua				810	810
Panama				7,570	7,570
Paraguay			$3,760	7,570	11,330
Sierra Leone				440	440
Uruguay				20,810	20,810
Yemen				4,608	4,608
Total	$6,660	$8,160	46,792	362,643	424,255

[1] Totals due for prior years: Bolivia $14,980.

DANGER IN THE ARCTIC AS RADIOACTIVITY MOUNTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a grave and potentially dangerous situation exists in the Arctic regions of our Nation. American citizens of Eskimo and Indian stock who live in inland Alaska rely upon caribou meat as their principal food stock. There is reason to believe that the caribou are becoming increasingly contaminated with strontium 90 and cesium 137. This contamination cannot be of good effect and may well be of harm to these people and to their descendants.

The time is approaching, Mr. President, when the Senate and the Nation must give real attention to the perils caused by the radioactive refuse of atomic testing. Practical action is needed and the Federal Government dare not duck its responsibility.

Let me make it very clear, Mr. President, that I realize I am speaking of a highly technical scientific subject of which I have no expert knowledge. This is a subject on which there has been inadequate investigation and study. Scientists themselves cannot agree upon the implication and import of this contamination and certainly no layman can speak with any assurance.

Although I am not a scientist, as a Senator it is my responsibility to speak out when the health and safety of the people of my State are threatened. I am not an expert, but I will become one if it is necessary in order to get action and attention on this subject.

The contamination of foodstuffs by radioactive matter is subject to a good deal of misinformation and fear. It is not my intention to stir panic, to make wild charges, or to confuse further what is already a dreadfully confused situation.

It is my intention to obtain from those Federal officials responsible a clear statement of the facts as we now know them. I intend to press for active, continuing, and adequate on-the-spot investigations and a sensible and intelligent plan for securing and insuring the health and safety of Eskimo and Indian Americans.

TRICK FIGURES

The facts on radioactivity in the Arctic are not now adequate. I will present to the Senate such figures as are available to me. Before doing so let me make two points.

The figures that are available are scanty indeed. Averages and conclusions are often based upon findings taken from but two or three caribou or from three or four human beings. Figures are often "one shot" taken at one time in one place, even though there is reason to believe—especially with cesium 137 which has a biological half-life of approximately 120 days—that contamination levels may vary greatly with season, with atomic activity, with variations in plant life and general ecology.

The terms used in measuring the biological effects of radiation are many and confusing. Measurements may be given in nanocuries, picocuries, micromicrocuries, disintegrations per minute, rads, strontium units—SU, roentgen equivalent man—REM. Contamination levels may be given in the same report in DPM's per kilogram, wet weight per kilogram, ash per gram calcium and so forth and so forth and so forth. It has been suggested, Mr. President, and I pass this suggestion on without comment, that such a variety of units could be used to discourage and confuse the layman attempting to arrive at the facts of the situation. Certainly they have that effect.

The figures are sparse and insufficient. We should not place, therefore, too much reliance upon them. They should be taken as indications rather than fact.

In evaluating these statistics, we must remember that the radiation protection standards recommended by the Federal Radiation Council are not to be taken as standards but merely as guidelines. Let me quote from a Federal Radiation Council public announcement of September 10, 1962:

> Radiation protection guides are not a dividing line between safety and danger in actual radiation situations, nor are they alone intended to set a limit at which protective action should be taken or to indicate what kind of action should be taken. As applied to fallout, guides can be used as an indication of when there is a need for detailed evaluation of possible exposure risks and when there is a need to consider whether any protection action should be taken under all the relevant circumstances.

To a layman, it appears in practice that when these guidelines are approached, as they are being approached in Alaska, everything becomes very spongy. On some occasions when these limits are approached, the evaluation and protective action called for by the Federal Radiation Council are not undertaken. Instead, the limits themselves are reexamined.

Prior to 1960, the maximum permissible concentrations—MPC—as accepted by the U.S. Public Health Service for strontium 90 were 80 micromicrocuries per liter. In 1960 this limit was lowered to 33, thus conforming to the recommendation of the International Commission on Radiological Protection. In 1962 the maximum permissible concentrations were raised from 33 to 200 strontium units—strontium unit is defined as one micromicrocurie of strontium 90 per gram of calcium.

I ask unanimous consent that the table indicating the current radiation protection guide given for strontium 90 be printed in the RECORD at this point. This table is taken from the second summary report of the Atomic Energy Commission on Project Chariot.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Strontium 90[1] *in picocuries per day*
Range I	0–20
Range II	20–200
Range III	200–2000

[1] Assumes intake of 1 gram of calcium per day.

Mr. BARTLETT. I quote from the Public Health Service, 1962:

> The grades are as follows: Range I, intakes in this range would result in only a few individuals, if any, reaching a large fraction of the radiation protection guide; range II, intakes in this range would result in average exposures to population groups not exceeding the radiation protection guide; and range III, intakes within this range would result in exposures exceeding the radiation protection guide if continued for a sufficient period of time. The Federal Radiation Council has recommended that measures limiting intake of radioactive materials should be considered when indications are that levels averaged over a year will be within range III.

I am informed that the recommendations of the National Committee on Radiation Protection indicate that the maximum permissible burden of cesium 137 for nonoccupational populations is in the area of 1,000 nanocuries. For individuals the maximum range permissible lies at 3,000 nanocuries. The average rate is set lower than the individual rate to allow for individual mini-max variations of the contamination level within the group being averaged.

Strontium 90 taken into the body finds its way to the bones, where it lodges for many years. Concentrations of this nuclide can cause leukemia or bone cancer. Because children are growing and adding to their bone structure they tend, on the average, to absorb eight times the amounts of strontium 90 absorbed by adults under the same conditions. This is why strontium 90 is so very dangerous to the young.

Cesium 137 does not concentrate in any particular organ in the body but tends to spread throughout the system. The body eliminates roughly half of the cesium 137 within 100 days of ingestion. This short biological half-life of cesium 137 contrasts with the biological half-life of strontium 90 which is 11 years. Cesium 137 has as its main effect the mutation of gene structure leading to deformities in children yet unborn.

In the light of the above, my statement today must be read with the understanding that the figures are sketchy and the guidelines elastic.

CONTAMINATED FOOD CHAIN

The source of the contamination of Alaska native peoples is found in the unique arctic food chain. One of the major forms of indigenous plant life in the northern regions of Alaska is lichen. This type of plant, unlike most others, depends for its water and nutrients upon the atmosphere and not the soil. It sifts the air and thus absorbs directly and without dilution fallout material from atomic testing. Arctic lichen has been found to be very, very heavily contaminated with cesium 137 and strontium 90.

In the long, hard arctic winter the caribou depend upon this lichen as their principal food source. And thus they, too, become contaminated.

The Eskimos and Indians in these inland areas depend for their food upon caribou. There is ample reason to believe that these people in turn have absorbed into their system unusual amounts of radioactive materials.

The size of these amounts is a subject for debate. Adequate figures do not exist. The extent of the health hazard created is also a subject for dispute due to the lack of information.

This, however, seems clear and irrefutable: The Eskimos and Indians are receiving several times more strontium 90 and cesium 137 into their system than are American citizens of more temperate climates.

This contamination is not limited to Alaska alone. The lichen-caribou-man food chain exists throughout the arctic regions of the world. It is repeated in Canada; in Sweden, the Laplanders depend upon reindeer, which in turn depend upon lichen. Native peoples of the arctic regions, whether in Siberia, Canada, Europe, or Alaska, live by this food chain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three tables be printed at the conclusion of my remarks: Exhibit I indicating known measurements of radionuclides in lichen, exhibit II indicating amounts found in caribou and reindeer, and exhibit III indicating amounts found in arctic man. These tables were prepared by Dr. L. A. Viereck of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits I, II, and III.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, exhibit I indicates what few details we have on the contamination levels in arctic lichen. It appears that lichens have concentrations of strontium 90 and cesium 137 up to 100 times that of other plants in the Arctic as in temperate zones.

CARIBOU AND REINDEER

The figures on caribou contamination are difficult to evaluate. The levels of strontium 90 in caribou meat appear to be 25 to 30 times that of beef in the United States. The levels of cesium 137 appear to be from 3 to 300 times that found in beef.

It is perhaps significant that the level of strontium 90 found in reindeer bones in Scandinavia has doubled in the 4 years from 1956 to 1960. The level found in caribou antlers tripled in the years from 1955 to 1959. Since that time, with the stepup in atomic testing since 1960, these levels cannot have fallen.

The AEC has pointed out, in a letter to me dated February 12, 1963, that figures obtained during the 1962 Project Chariot investigations produced somewhat lower figures than those obtained elsewhere. This, however, is readily explained by the fact that there is little lichen available in the region in which the AEC tests were conducted—page 145, Project Chariot Report, 1962, "Floristic surveys and analyses of caribou rumen content both indicate a sparsity of forage lichens in the Cape Thompson region."

On the basis of the figures in exhibit II, it appears that radiation levels in caribou are approaching—or have surpassed since the figures were taken—the top of the second range as set forth by the Federal Radiation Council. The Council in publishing its guidelines said that such levels call for appropriate positive control measures. Yet, so far as I know, nothing whatever is known as to the effect such exposure is having on the caribou; so far as I know, nothing whatever is being done to find out.

HUMAN BEINGS

Exhibit II outlines what is known about contamination in arctic man It is apparently a fact that both in Finland and in Alaska human beings for whom caribou and reindeer are staple foods are receiving susbtantially more strontium 90 and cesium 137 than are those who depend upon other foods. This is not to say necessarily that these levels have reached dangerous proportions. But any strontium 90 is bad; more is worse; and it is foolish to deny it. It is both foolish and inhumane not to investigate with very great care situations involving continued substantial intake of the isotope.

Studies made so far on caribou-eating Eskimos have been insufficient in both time and extent. Individual adults sampled had values as high as 1.9 picocuries strontium 90 per gram calcium. Since young growing children retain in their bones eight times the strontium concentration of adults, this could mean that some individuals have a value as high as 15 picocuries per gram of strontium in their systems. It has been estimated this means that some are receiving about 50 picocuries per gram in their diet on a regular sustained basis. This is well above the maximum permissible concentration recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection and is midway within range II of the radiation protection guide.

Cesium 137 levels, because of the short biological half-life of this element, tend to vary excessively. Levels in Alaska have been found as high as 800 nanocuries; levels in Lapland have been found as high as 1,000 nanocuries. These figures are one-third the maximum permissible amounts. Whether these are exceptions on the high side or whether individual counts may rise, perhaps even double this level in other seasons under other circumstances we cannot know. I repeat: The figures we have are "one shot" figures.

WORLDWIDE CONCERN

Although we in the United States have taken little action in this area and have demonstrated little concern, the subject has been given attention by agencies and governments in other countries. The International Atomic Energy Agency, I am told, has sponsored radiology investigations in Scandinavia—RIS—and two international symposia have taken place. The United States was not represented at the first symposium but did, I believe, send a representative to the second; a third meeting was scheduled for March in Sweden. I shall request a full report on this meeting from the Atomic Energy Commission. I shall inform the Senate of its contents.

Many articles in scientific journals have touched upon the problem, and I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks exhibit IV, two articles on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit IV.)

Mr. BARTLETT. I requested the Atomic Energy Commission to comment upon the contents of one of these articles, "A New Caribou Problem," by Dr. William O. Pruitt, Jr. Dr. Pruitt is associate professor at the University of Alaska. In his article he pointed out the high strontium 90 level in caribou bone as an indication of the seriousness of the contamination threat to the Eskimo. The AEC dismissed this point by saying, "Eskimos do not eat caribou bone." Of course no one said they do. They eat caribou meat and marrow and if the bone is contaminated, will not this be contaminated too?

CONTAMINATION: A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Fallout and radionuclide contamination are a national problem. They are not a State problem. Failure to assume full Federal leadership and direction could lead to tragedy far larger than statewide proportions.

The time is long past due for the appropriate Federal agency to educate and inform the people as to the extent and nature of the subject. I am confident there is no widespread danger. The hazards that exist are of a spotty and variable nature and can be handled with adequate and fairly simple safeguards.

Certainly, in the case of the lichen-caribou-man life chain, remedy and precautions are not complex. Unlike problems caused by fallout, the contamination in the Arctic is concentrated in the single source: The life chain. Although Eskimos have always lived on caribou, they need not do so. Because it is certain that only a few areas would be heavily contaminated, it should be possible to find and demarcate these areas and to see that human beings living within them are given adequate protection.

The time is long past due to begin a program of informing and educating the people on the extent of fallout and contamination. That there is now a large measure of confusion and apprehension in this field is due in part to the lack of public information and understanding. It often appears that the responsible government agencies in this field look upon the public not as compatriots but as combatants.

Hazards from fallout or from contamination—if they exist and when they exist—are found only in small areas where wind or ecology will bring about an undue concentration. In these areas as they become identified positive steps should be taken to insure the health of the people.

IMMEDIATE NEEDS

It is imperative right now, to institute adequate, continuous, extensive, painstaking testing in Arctic Alaska. These tests should be on a month-in, month-out basis. There is little use and little point to one-shot tests. These have shown in the past only that the problem exists. What we need to know now is exactly where it exists and exactly how severe it is.

What is equally necessary is to work out a sensible program of steps to be taken should human radiation levels among the Eskimos reach grave heights.

In this regard, the radiation protection guide set the level 200 to 2,000 strontium units as that which would require "appropriate positive control measures." It is my understanding that the U.S. Public Health Service has not as yet determined just what measures will constitute "appropriate positive control." It is time that it does so.

There is no question that the vast majority of caribou-eating Eskimos are healthy. There is, however, the possibility that a few—a very few—individuals may be risking serious injury to themselves and their progeny through unusual intake of contaminated meat. Where such a possibiilty exists, it is our responsibility and our Government's responsibility to see that these individuals are found, that they are warned and helped.

Mr. President, as an example of lack of interest evinced by Government agencies in this question, I should like to have inserted at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit V, the comments of the Atomic Energy Commission upon Dr. Pruitt's article and my own letter in reply to the Commission's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit V.)

EXHIBIT I.—*Sr^{90} and Cs^{137} in lichens and a few other plants—Lichen and comparative plant data*

Source	Location	Date	Sr^{90}				Cs^{137} pc/g dry weight
			pc/gr. dry weight	Dpm/kg wet weight	Dpm/gr. ash	pc/gCa	
Lichens:							
Virkkunen (1962)	Finland	(?)	6.0			10,000.0	
Miettinen (1962)	Finnish Lapland	1960				350.0–2,800.0	
Davis et al. (1961)	Cape Thompson	1960	1.4				27
Davis (1962)	do	1960?					26
Wild hay: Miettinen (1962)	Finnish Lapland					50.0–300.0	
Wheat: Schulert (1962)	Fairbanks	1960		50.5	3.03	60.5	
	East United States	1960		100.0	5.89	114.0	
Sedges: Davis et al. (1960)	Cape Thompson	1959	.32				4.6
Willow Leaves: Davis et al. (1960)	do	1959	.09				1.4

EXHIBIT II.—*Amounts of Sr^{90} and Cs^{137} in caribou and reindeer*

[Data for Alaska is for caribou, that for Greenland and Scandinavia is for reindeer]

Source	Location	Date	Number of samples	Sr^{90}			Cs^{137}		
				Dpm/kg wet wt.	Dpm/kg ash	pc/gCa	pc/gK	pc/g dry wt.	pc/g wet wt.
Meat:									
Schulert (1962)	Anaktuvuk Pass	November 1959	1?	16.0		160			
	Shungnak	March 1961	1		3.3	162			
	do	February 1961	1		1.3	146			
Davis (1962)	Ogotoruk Creek	1961	(?)					4.4	
Davis et al. (1961)	do	1960	2					13	3.7
	Kisimilowk Creek	1960	15					2.7	.72
	Noatak River	1960	18					33	8.5
	Kobuk River	1960	1					1.0	.27
Lindell (1962)	Northern Scandinavia	September 1961							
	Lappland		7						12–14
	Norbotten		2						15–19
	Vasterbotten		1						3
	Jamtland		11						2–20
	Norrafinland		1						9
Virkkunen et al. (1962)	Finland	(?)	(?)						20
Aarkrog (1962)	Greenland	1961	10				1,940		11–12
Liden (1961)	North Sweden	1961	1						28
Other foods:									
Kulp and Schulert (1962)	Average meat in eastern U.S. diet.	1961				5.4			
Liden (1961)	Beef—Lund, Sweden	1961	(?)						.1
Kulp and Schulert (1962)	All foods U.S. diet	1956–1961					16–41		
Schulert (1962)	Milk U.S.	1957–1961				7.8–15.7	22–83		
Caribou and reindeer bones:									
Schulert (1962)	Shungnak	March 1961							
	Backbone		1		136	177			
	Legbone		1		179	180			
	Shungnak	February 1961							
	Backbone		1		121	140			
	Legbone		1		150	175			
Davies et al. (1961)	Northwest Alaska	1960							
	Ogotoruk Creek		1					.35	
	Kisimilowk Creek		5					.17	
	Cape Thompson		10					.70	
	Noatak River		6					1.00	
	Kobuk River		1					.53	
Virkkunen et al. (1962)	Finland	1961?	8			232			

Exhibit II.—*Amounts of Sr^{90} and Cs^{137} in caribou and reindeer*—Continued

[Data for Alaska is for caribou; that for Greenland and Scandinavia is for reindeer]

Source	Location	Date	Number of samples	Sr^{90}			Cs^{137}		
				Dpm/kg wet wt.	Dpm/kg ash	pc/gCa	pc/gK	pc/g dry wt.	pc/g wet wt.
Aarkrog (1962)	Southwest Greenland	1961	*1			278			
	do	1961	*1			318			
Hvinden	North Norway	1956							
	Sor Trondelag		1?			120			
	do		1?			120			
	Hallingdal		1?			120			
	do		1?			40			
Other bones:									
Hvinden (1958)	Sheep bones, North Norway	1956	14			17			
USAEC (1960)	Cattle bones, Nevada Test Site.	1957–59	(?)			Max. 44.8 Min. 5.6			
Schultz and Longhurst (1961)	Deer bones, California	1952–60	49			Max. 72.1 Min. 0.5			
Caribou and reindeer antlers:									
Schulert (1962)	Anaktuvuk River	1959	1?	9,450	238.0	281.0			
	do	1959	1	6,480	146.0	170.0			
	Tolugak Creek	1959	1	6,400	143.0	170.0			
	Alaska	1958	1?		98.4	106.1			
Davis (1961)	Northwest Alaska	1960							
	Ogotoruk Creek		1					0.29	
	Kisimilowk Creek		3					.39	
	Cape Thompson		9					.48	
	Noatak		3					.50	
Larson, K., personal letter	Anaktuvuk	October 1959	13			128.1			
	Glenn Highway	October 1959	1			128			
	Gulkana River	September 1955	1			36.7			
	Denali Highway	September 1956	1			51.7			
Other antlers:									
Schulert (1962)	California deer antlers	1958			6.81	8.05			
Larson, K., personal letter	Moose, Fairbanks, Alaska	1958	1			8.9			
Rumen:									
Schulert (1962)	Anaktuvuk River	November 1959	1?	7,880	245	1,264			
	Shungnak	March 1961	1?		300	3,444			
	do	February 1961	1?		231	2,968			
Davis (1961)	Northwest Alaska	1960							
	Ogotoruk Creek		2					.16	
	Kissimilowk Creek		8					.14	
	Cape Thompson		4					.22	
	Noatak River		9					.21	

*Chosen because of high Cs^{137} amounts in the meat.

Exhibit III.—*Sr^{90} and Cs^{137} in humans from northern areas*

Source	Location	Date	Age	Number of samples	Sr^{90}, pc/gCa	Cs^{137}		
						Pc/kg body weight	Whole ct. in nc	Pc/gK
Schulert (1962)	Alaskan Eskimos	November 1959 to December 1960.	4 months	1	2.4			
			7 years	1	3.4			
			16 years	1	2.4			
			20 to 61 years	(35)	.50			
Salo, K. (1962)	Finland	1960-61	0 to 5 years	3	3.13			
			5 to 20 years	6	1.21			
			Over 20 years	8	.54			
Kulp and Schulert (1962)	Average American adult	1961	Adult	(?)	.30			
Liden (1961)	North Sweden	1961	35 years	1			196.0	2,020
			46 years	1			361.0	3,360
			34 years	1			242.0	2,690
	Oslo, Norway		(?)	15			21.0	180
	Bergen, Norway		(?)	6			60.0	480
Dunning (1962)	United States	1960	(?)	(?)			[1] 90.0	
Palmer et al. (1962)	Diomede	1962	Adults	8			Max. 35.0 Min. 8.0 Ave. 22.0	
	Barrow	1962	do	259			Max. 166.0 Min. 8.0 Ave. 52.0	
	Point Hope	1962	do	107			Max. 119.0 Min. 3.0 Ave. 17.0	
	Kotzebue	1962	do	132			Max. 518.0 Min. 17.0 Ave. 138.0	
	Anaktuvuk	1962	do	52			Max. 790.0 Min. 83.0 Ave. 421.0	
Miettinen (1962)	Finland	October 1961						
	Men:							
	Reindeer breeders		40 years (average)	50			245.0	
	All Lapps		33 years (average)	84			178.0	
	Helsinki inhabitants		28 years (average)	84			8.4	
	Women:							
	Helsinki inhabitants		28 years (average)	5			8.4	
	Women:							
	Reindeer breeders		44 years (average)	33			122.0	
	All Lapps		35 years (average)	65			86.0	
	Helsinki inhabitants		32 years (average)	6			3.2	
Palmer et al. (1962)	Hanford Laboratory personnel	(?)	Adults	(?)			5.0–7.0	
Onstead et al. (1962)	Germany	1960	do	6,000		200	[2] 11.0	

[1] Highest quarterly value ever recorded.

[2] Based on an average weight of 125 pounds.

[From the Hudson's Bay Co. Beaver, winter 1962]

Exhibit IV—A New Caribou Problem

(By William O. Pruitt, Jr.)

The caribou problem in Canada has engaged the attention of biologists for several years. The massive decline in the caribou population has resulted in tragedy for segments of the northern ecosystem, including man. While the decline has been attributed to a variety of causes, the best explanation concerns the progressive loss, over many years, of mature spruce-lichen forest. This situation of loss of the winter range through forest fires has now been superseded by another caribou problem of even greater seriousness.

The new problem is that caribou (and reindeer) are "hot spots" in terms of contamination with radioactive material. This is true of not only Canadian caribou but also those in Alaska, northern Scandinavia, and northern U.S.S.R. Strontium 90 and cesium 137 appear to be the primary contaminants. The source of these radionuclides is undoubtedly atmospheric nuclear explosions.

In order to understand the magnitude of the contamination one must delve into the jargon of the radiation biologist. Here one meets a welter of terms for various levels of exposure and concentration of radionuclides—rems, millirems, microcuries, micromicrocuries, and a newly introduced one, nanocuries. In the United States the Federal Radiation Council has set a safe limit for humans for whole-body exposure of 0.17 rem per year. Such an exposure would occur with a concentration of about 17 strontium units of strontium 90 in the skeleton. The levels of contamination in caribou bones tested so far are now on the order of 100 to 200 strontium units, far above the level set as safe for another mammal, man. In Swedish reindeer contamination with cesium 137 has reached the order of 25 nanocuries per kilogram, while beef from the same region showed less than 0.1 nanocurie per kilogram.

Radioactive contamination of other northern mammals appears relatively low. Why are caribou and reindeer so high? Here is a neat demonstration of the interdependence of all living things. The answer can be deduced logically and, indeed, was ecologically obvious as far back as 1959. In that year E. Gorham reported in the Canadian Journal of Botany that lichens showed abnormally high radiation counts. Later work by a number of investigators has confirmed Gorham's findings. Moreover, the northern plants that rank next to lichens in intensity of radioactive contamination are sedges. What are the two most important caribou foods? Lichens and sedges.

Lichens are subject to radioactive contamination, particularly by fallout from noncontaminated nuclear explosions, because of their peculiar physiology. A lichen is actually a combination of two types of plants—a fungus and an alga. The two live together and together they form a completely different kind of plant—a lichen. This form of life receives its nutrients directly from the air, from dust and other windblown material. Thus a lichen feeds on a kind of natural fallout. In all the eons of time before 1945 it was a harmless kind of fallout. Now, however, lichens absorb manmade radioactive fallout along with the natural nutrients. Lichens have evolved such efficient mechanisms for retaining natural fallout that they also retain virtually 100 percent of the radioactive particles which fall onto them. Moreover, lichens grow exceedingly slowly. While a blade of grass may contain fallout particles deposited on it during a 2- or 3-month growing season, a fragment of lichen of similar size may contain fallout particles deposited during many years. Because of their slow growth, lichens now contaminated will probably remain hot for many years.

The mechanisms whereby sedges are contaminated are not so well understood. It is known, however, that plants from tundra-wet meadows generally contain more radioactive material than do plants from other tundra habitats.

Since the caribou is the base of the food chain in the North, turning vegetation into a form that other animals, including man, can utilize, one would expect the entire food chain to be contaminated. Here we run into a paucity of data. What data have been gathered, however, indicate that the entire food chain (lichen/sedge—caribou—carnivore/man) is indeed contaminated. For example, what few data have been gathered on man indicate that all people who eat much caribou or reindeer meat have higher whole-body radiation counts than people who do not eat caribou or reindeer. Tests for strontium 90 in a few Alaskans showed that new bone was being formed which had about four times the average U.S. concentration. Measurements of a few Swedish Lapps showed that they had cesium 137 concentrations 30 to 40 times as high as the average of the control group from southern Sweden. What the levels of contamination are in relation to details of diet and food habits and how these levels affect the genetic and somatic attributes of the plants, animals and men concerned, is not known. The few published reports from North America have shown a strikingly nonecological approach to the problem.

Behind all the reassuring announcements and news releases about nuclear explosions since the beginning of the atomic age there has lurked the spectre of the time when the so-called safe limits would be exceeded. It is clear that for a great area of the earth's surface that time has now come. The tundra and taiga which now contain such ecologically important hot spots comprise about one-fifth of the land area of the northern hemisphere. The human population of the region is relatively sparse and, unfortunately, casts few votes in the world's halls of government. If a hot spot of similar magnitude were to develop in relation to peaches, or beef, or milk, or tobacco it seems probable that no reason would be thought serious enough to allow the contamination to continue.

[From Science magazine, April 1962]

Strontium 90 in Alaska—Alaskan Eskimos for Whom the Caribou Is a Dietary Staple Have a High Strontium 90 Concentration

(By Arthur R. Schulert, assistant professor of biochemistry at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., and attached to the U.S. Navy Medical Research Unit No. 3, Cairo, Egypt)

(Abstract: Strontium 90 concentrations have been determined in a variety of foods used by the native population. Caribou from the tundra carry 10 to 20 times the level of domestic cattle. Eskimos for whom caribou is a staple in the diet are found to have four times the strontium 90 content of the average for the world population of the North Temperate Zone.)

The strontium 90 distribution in the ecology of the Arctic tundra has been given relatively little attention. The closeness to the U.S.S.R. test site, the permafrost surface, and the initial high concentrations in caribou bone from Alaska suggested that a survey of critical samples from this area should be performed.[1] It was decided to examine caribou which live on the mosses and low vegetation overlying the permafrost zone, foodstuffs grown on farms along the coastal belt, native fish, and human bone and particularly urine from isolated Eskimo groups.[2] The localities of interest are shown in figure 1.

Most of the samples were obtained in cooperation with the Arctic Health Research Center of the Public Health Service. The farm crops were obtained through the University of Alaska. Some caribou samples were obtained by personnel at the Ladd Air Force Base in Fairbanks. About 75 percent of the human bone samples were analyzed by commercial laboratories. The remainder of the human bones, and all other samples, were analyzed at the Lamont Laboratory by use of previously reported methods.[3]

Table 1 gives the results of pooled samples of deer antlers obtained in California in 1945, 1952, 1955, and 1958, and shows the gradual increase in concentration. In contrast, the pooled sample of caribou antlers from Alaska showed over 10 times the concentrations of the California deer. Since the fallout appears roughly proportional to precipitation, which is very low in the tundra region, this great difference would appear to point toward an ecological mechanism. For example, in late 1959 the strontium 90 cumulative deposition in Columbus, Ohio, and New York, N.Y., was about 67 megacycles per square mile in the 40-inches-per-year rainfall belt, while at Point Barrow, Alaska, deposition was 11 megacycles per square mile for 10 to 20 inches of rainfall.[4] The tundra region averages less than 10 inches per year of rainfall.

The strontium 90 content of a variety of Alaskan foods is given in table 2. The farm crops are compared with the average values from three eastern U.S. locations previously reported, namely, Atlanta, Ga.; Baltimore, Md.; and Cincinnati, Ohio.[5] The cabbage and potatoes show much lower concentrations of strontium 90 in Fairbanks than in the eastern United States, but the wheat carries similar concentration. The milk produced in the vicinity of Anchorage, Alaska, has a similar strontium 90 concentration to that in the Midwest.[4] Thus it might be expected that the level of strontium 90 in human bone for the non-Eskimo population in the cities and towns along the southern coast of Alaska would be similar to that in the continental United States.

Among the native foodstuffs sampled. marine fish as well as polar bears, who feed largely upon them, show generally low concentrations with the exception of one sample of Beluga meat. The fresh-water fish and one sample of plant roots are in the range of vegetables and grain grown in the United States. One walrus sample showed a high concentration of strontium 90 in the meat. Overall it would be expected that Alaskan natives who live predominantly on fresh-water fish would have body burdens of strontium 90 similar to the rest of the United States, whereas those who live predominantly on marine life would have values somewhat lower, particularly those that eat the bony parts of small fish.

---

[1] Most of the sample procurement was accomplished by Dr. Christine Heller of the Arctic Health Research Institute of the Public Health Service at Anchorage, Alaska. This followed arrangements made in cooperation with Dr. A. B. Colyar and Dr. E. M. Scott in October 1959. Some caribou samples were obtained by Col. J. D. Fulton of the Ladd Air Force Base in Fairbanks. The wheat, cabbage, and potatoes were obtained by Dr. Arvo Kallio of the Department of Horticulture, University of Alaska. The California antlers were submitted by Dr. Harry Foreman of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos, N. Mex. Prof. J. L. Kulp critically read the manuscript and offered helpful suggestions. The Lamont analyses were conducted by Rieta Slakter Hirshman and Karin Bartelsen. This research was supported by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission on contract AT (30–1)– 1656. This report is Lamont Geological Observatory contribution No. 537.

[2] "An Appraisal of the Health and Nutritional Status of the Eskimo," report of the Interdepartmental Commission on Nutrition for National Defense, Department of Defense (Washington, D.C., August 1959).

[3] H. L. Volchok, J. L. Kulp, W. R. Eckelmann, J. E. Gaetjen, Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. 71, 1, 293 (1957).

[4] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Radiological Health Data," vol. 2, No. 3 (Office of Technical Services, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., March 1961).

[5] A. R. Schulert, R. S. Hirshman, K. E. Bartelsen, "Health Physics," in press.

In contrast to the above, samples associated with caribou of the Arctic tundra show much higher concentrations (table 3). The stomach contents of the caribou show extremely high concentrations, indicating that the strontium 90 from fallout must be concentrated on the surface and soaked up by the lichens, mosses and other plant life which exists on top of the permafrost and constitutes the caribou diet. Since there was no significant reduction in the concentration between 1959 and 1961, the concentration of strontium 90 in the atmosphere and rainfall must not be an important factor for this ecological situation.

The lower strontium 90 concentration in bone and meat compared to stomach contents is in the direction of the discrimination against strontium relative to calcium which exists in almost all biological processes. The discrimination from diet to bone in the caribou, however, as indicated by these data, is 10 to 20, as compared to 4 for man. The strontium 90 concentrations in soft tissue and newly depositing bone are similar but are 10 to 20 times higher than animals' bones in Germany or Nevada at about the same time.[6] The antlers which are replaced yearly show values similar to those of the bone.

---

[6] Health and Safety Lab., U.S. Atomic Energy Commission publication No. HASL-88 (1960); Publication No. HASL-69 (October 1959).

TABLE 1.—*Strontium 90 concentration in deer and caribou antlers*

Antlers	Dpm/g ash	μμc Sr ^{90}/g Ca
1945 California deer antlers	<0.10	<0.12
1952 California deer antlers	.71	.85
1955 California deer antlers	4.19	5.04
1958 California deer antlers	6.81	8.05
1958 Alaska caribou antlers	98.4	106.1

TABLE 2.—*Strontium 90 concentrations in foodstuffs and animal products*

Sample	Location	Collection date	Strontium 90 content		
			Dpm/kg wet	Dpm/g ash	μμc/g Ca
Farm crops:					
Wheat	Fairbanks	1957	22.0	1.42	22.6
	do	1958	98.0	6.38	104.0
	do	1959	106	6.20	125.0
	do	1960	50.5	3.03	60.5
	Eastern United States	1959	143	6.09	147.0
	do	1960	100	5.89	114.0
Cabbage	Fairbanks	1959	5.9	1.11	7.8
	do	1960	4.1	.52	4.4
	Eastern United States	1959	76.2	7.78	45.4
	do	1960	44.8	5.92	36.5
Potatoes	Fairbanks	1959	1.6	.17	7.8
	do	1960	1.5	.26	7.6
	Eastern United States	1959	15.0	1.85	54.1
	do	1960	13.1	1.25	52.2
Milk	Average U.S. Midwest (3)	1960			8.0
	Anchorage, Alaska, milkshed (3)	1960			7.0
Native foods:					
Marine fish:					
Tom cods	Point Hope	December 1959	3.45	.05	.1
Needlefish	Hooper Bay	October 1959	605	7.24	7.6
Beluga meat	Kotzebue	do	.39	.12	8.8
Do	do	Fall 1959	26.3	.81	142.3
Beluga Muktuk	do	October 1959		.67	11.5
Dried flounder and herring	Newfok	do	110	1.46	2.7
Cod	Kotzebue	do	632	6.63	7.9
Fresh-water fish:					
Whitefish	Kobuk River	do	[1] 156	2.25	15.7
Do	do	Spring 1960	[1] (2390)	42.4	62.4
Do	do	do	[1] (115)	2.03	.3.5
Do	do	do	[1] (1410)	25.0	32.8
Marine mammals:					
Whale meat	Point Hope	October 1959	<.04	<.07	<2.4
Whale rib (bowhead)	Saint Lawrence	May 1959	<64	<.12	<.1
Seal backbone	Point Hope	Fall 1959	8.40	.07	.1
Walrus backbone	Saint Lawrence	Spring 1959	324	.65	.8
Walrus meat	do	do	180	9.38	360.0
Do	Gambell	December 1960		.66	25.2
Land animals: Polar bear meat	Point Hope	Fall 1959	<.6	<.06	<2.8
Plants: Plant roots	Shungnak	October 1959	106	4.30	16.7

[1] These values are approximate, since accurate wet weights were not obtained on these samples.

TABLE 3.—*Strontium 90 in samples of Alaskan caribou*

Sample	Location	Collection date	Strontium 90 content		
			Dpm/kg wet	Dpm/g ash	μμc/g Ca
Antlers	Arctic Tundra	1958		98.0	106
Do	Anaktuvuk River	October 1959	9,450	238.0	[1] 281
Do	do	do	6,480	146.0	170
Do	Tolugak Creek	do	6,400	143.0	170
Meat	Anaktuvuk Pass	November 1959	16		160
Stomach contents	Anaktuvuk River	do	7,880	245.0	1,264
Caribou-A	Shungnak	March 1961			
Backbone				136.0	177
Leg bone				179.0	[2] 180
Meat				3.3	162
Stomach contents				300.0	3,444
Caribou-B	Shungnak	February 1961			
Backbone				121.0	140
Leg bone				150.0	[3] 158
Meat				1.3	146
Stomach contents				231.0	2,968

[1] Average 207. [2] Average 179. [3] Average 158.

In view of the high strontium 90 concentration in caribou, an attempt was made to obtain bone samples from outlying districts, since it is understood that a few of the inland Eskimos live largely on caribou. This, of course, is very difficult in the sparsely settled areas where autopsies are almost nonexistent, but some samples were obtained from natives in these areas, who were treated at the Public Health hospitals. Most samples were obtained during thoracic resection; some were obtained at autopsy.

Bone samples, shown in table 4, were obtained from native people, but most of them lived near towns or villages or along the seacoast. A few probably lived inland. No precise dietary information was obtained on these subjects.

The average of these adult samples (0.5 μμc Sr^{90}/g Ca) lies somewhat above that for the rest of North America (0.3 μμc Sr^{90}/g Ca for adults).[7] The individual adult samples which gave 1.9, 1.4, and 1.0 μμc Sr^{90}/g Ca are unusually high. Since young children have eight times the concentration of adults, children on the diet which gave an adult level of 1.9 μμc Sr^{90}/g Ca would reach 15 μμc Sr^{90}/g Ca, and newly formed bone would have a concentration slightly greater than this, corresponding to an average diet of about 50 μμc Sr^{90}/g Ca, which is about four times the U.S. average for the same period. Thus, while the average in this series in which high values were sought is about 25 percent greater than the U.S. average, a few samples are quite high, which may reflect an appreciable quantity of caribou in the diet.

TABLE 4.—*Strontium 90 content of bones from native Alaskan children and adults*

Age:	*μμc Sr^{90}/g Ca*
Single bones, November 1959–December 1960: 4 months	2.4±0.3
1960: 4 months	2.4±0.3
Years:	
7	3.4±0.3
6	2.4±0.1
20	1.0±0.2
20	0.8±0.2
20	0.6±0.1
24	0.4±0.1
24	0.7±0.2
25	0.2±0.1
26	0.4±0.2
26	<0.3
26	<0.1±0.0
26	1.9±0.2
29	0.4±0.1
30	0.5±0.1
30	<0.2
32	0.2±0.1
33	0.7±0.1
35	1.4±0.1
36	<0.2
38	0.3±0.1
38	0.3±0.1
39	0.8±0.1
40	<0.4
42	<0.4
44	0.4±0.1
46	<0.4
46	<0.2
48	0.5±0.1
53	0.4±0.1
54	0.7±0.2
54	0.3±0.2
58	0.2±0.1
60	0.8±0.2
60	0.4±0.1
60	0.4±0.1
61	0.4±0.1
62	0.5±0.1
Composite samples, January–February 1961:	
Years:	
38	0.58±0.06
38	0.38±0.04

A few tribes that consume caribou almost exclusively are known in Alaska, but bone samples did not become available from this small group. Therefore, in order to get an adequate index of their exposure to strontium 90 and thus what the level would be in newly deposited bone, urine samples were obtained on six such individuals in February 1961 with the results shown in table 5. Their tribe is located near Shungnak in northwest Alaska about 50 miles north of the Arctic Circle and 150 miles from the coast along the Kobuk River. Thus, in addition to caribou, they had access to fresh-water fish, but probably not marine life. It is noted that the strontium 90 concentration averaged 25 μμc (range 20 to 32) in the individuals of this predominately caribou-eating tribe.

In earlier work comparing the diet and urine concentrations of strontium 90 in three diverse population groups, it was shown that the diet level is about twice that found in the urine.[8] Therefore, these individuals had diet levels of about 50 μμc Sr^{90}/g Ca. The diet/bone discrimination against strontium 90 is four, and thus these individuals are forming bone at concentrations of 12 μμc Sr^{90}/g Ca. This is more than four times the U.S. average in 1961 and corresponds with the highest value obtained in bone among the 36 samples received and individually analyzed from native residents of Alaska.

The following conclusions are reached:

1. The foodstuffs consumed by the bulk of the population in Alaska probably have strontium 90 concentrations similar to those in the North Temperate Zone.
2. The concentration of strontium 90 in Alaskan caribou exceeds that of other foods by a factor of 10 or more.
3. Urine concentration of strontium 90 in a caribou-eating tribe indicates that new bone is being laid down with about 12 μμc Sr^{90}/g Ca, which is more than four times the average U.S. concentration.
4. Three human bones of 35 that were analyzed also indicated new bone deposition of about this concentration.

TABLE 5.—*Strontium 90 content in human urine specimens from Alaska, February 1961*

Sample	Dpm/liter	μμc Sr^{90}/g Ca
1	10.4	23.4
2	22.6	32.1
3	11.4	19.9
4	8.9	21.1
5	12.3	31.6
6	7.5	22.1
Average	12.2	25.0

EXHIBIT V

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1963.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: This is in reply to your letter of January 18, 1963, which forwarded for our comment an article concerning caribou in Canada and Alaska.

The article by Dr. William O. Pruitt, Jr., on "A New Caribou Problem" in the Hudson's Bay Co. publication entitled "The Beaver" is somewhat misleading.

The guides provided in "Handbook 69," National Bureau of Standards, and in the Reports of the Federal Radiation Council, which are in agreement, are intended for use under assumptions of a 50-year exposure period and a constant exposure level. Thus, exposure to such things as fallout or nuclear accidents presents a much different problem from the constant level 50-year exposure. Even if the guides could be used, Dr. Pruitt's reports of 100 to 200 strontium units are not applicable because they represent ratios of calcium to strontium; moreover Eskimos do not eat caribou bone, at least during their usual patterns of living.

The cesium levels that were obtained for Eskimos during the 1962 Chariot investigations provide a basis for a somewhat different view than that of Dr. Pruitt. The FRC guide is 0.5 rem per year for an individual, and one-third of that (0.17 rem per year) for the average of a population.

These exposure levels are considered by the FRC to fall well within levels of exposure acceptable for a lifetime. The 1-year cumulative totals are simply fractions of this total, arbitrarily recommended to provide a regular interval within which to check exposure levels as radiation exposure occurs. For cesium 137 these levels are 3,000 nanocuries (per individual) averaged over 1 year, and 1,000 nanocuries (per population) averaged over 1 year.

Inland Eskimo communities had higher levels in 1962 than coastal villages because, Dr. Pruitt explains, the people are more dependent on caribou meat for food. Caribou eat lichens and these have higher levels of almost all isotopes than any other plants and, frequently, are the chief food plant during the winter months. At Anaktuvuk, the cesium 137 level in one individual was 790 nanocuries, less than a third of the radiation guide level specified by FRC. The average for the village was 421 nanocuries, less than half of the guide level specified by FRC.

At the coastal village of Point Hope, near the Chariot site, levels were much lower, the average being 17 nanocuries, and the maximum for an individual was 119 nanocuries. These are one fifty-ninth and one twenty-fifth of the radiation protection guide, respectively.

But, as was pointed out at the beginning, these guides were designed to apply only to a reasonably constant source of radiation, a dubious assumption in the tundra, but used in attaining the above values.

Pruitt's language is also misleading in that he cites levels in terms of multiples of some lower level without citing the actual value of the lower level.

Cesium 137 has a biological half-life of about 100 days, a factor not mentioned by Dr. Pruitt. It is difficult to conclude that "safe limits" are being exceeded and that the tundra and the evergreen forests to the south contain "ecologically important 'hot spots,'" either on the basis of data obtained during the Chariot investigations or on the basis of those data cited by Dr. Pruitt.

Your attention is called to the graph on page 148 of the recent Chariot report which you have received showing relative levels of cesium 137 in caribou. Seasonality is emphasized in one location, but much less prominent in another. This is traceable to presence or absence of lichens in the caribou diet during winter months.

Additional findings are contained in the section of the Chariot report entitled "Radiation and Biotic Populations," beginning on page 113.

If we can be of further assistance in this matter, please let us know. We are returning the article forwarded to you by Mr. Lucien.

Sincerely yours,

S. G. ENGLISH,
Assistant General Manager.

MARCH 21, 1963.

Dr. SPOFFORD G. ENGLISH,
Assistant General Manager for Research and Development, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. ENGLISH: I write to you relative to the question of the radiocontamination of caribou in the Arctic and in response to your letter of February 12.

---

[7] J. L. Kulp and A. R. Schulert, Science, in press.

[8] A. R. Schulert, "Nature," 189, 933 (1961).

In paragraph 3 of your letter it appears that you have misinterpreted Dr. Pruitt's reference to strontium units found in caribou. In his article, Dr. Pruitt reports that the FRC guide for humans for whole-body exposure is set at 0.17 rem per year. He says, "Such an exposure would occur with the concentration of about 17 'strontium units' of strontium 90 in the skeleton. The levels of contamination in caribou bones tested so far are now on the order of 100 to 200 strontium units." Dr. Pruitt is not saying here that Eskimos eat caribou bone as you imply. He is saying that the caribou has been found, in certain areas, to be heavily contaminated. It is an uncontested fact that in the inland areas of the Arctic, caribou meat is a major and staple food for Eskimos. If caribou bones are highly contaminated, is it not logical to assume that caribou meat will also be contaminated; and is it not likely that the Eskimo eating this meat will also receive a high level of radioactivity? This is what Dr. Pruitt is saying.

As you point out, cesium 137 has a biological half-life of about 100 days. I am informed that at the time Project Chariot scientists were measuring whole-body contamination levels at Point Hope, Alaska, it had been more than 100 days since caribou had been taken by the people. As a result whole-body levels were low. I am told that while the AEC investigator was on the scene, 11 boatloads of caribou arrived in the village from hunters on the Kukpuk River. If the investigator had tested the people a week or so after they had eaten the fresh meat, would not the results have been significantly different?

It would appear to me noncontrovertible that caribou meat is a consequential and perhaps dangerous source of contamination for human beings. People who eat caribou and reindeer have been found to be in the 400–700 small nanocurie gamma range while those who do not eat caribou and reindeer have been found to be in the 5–10 nanocurie range.

While apparently such contamination is not a source of great concern to the AEC, it is of concern to the International Atomic Energy Agency. This Agency has sponsored the radiation investigations in Scandinavia (RIS) and two international symposia on the subject.

Is it true, as I am told, that no American or Canadian representative was present at the first symposium and that the second was attended by an AEC official who had not himself investigated the caribou-Eskimo problem?

You say, "It is difficult to conclude that * * * the tundra and the evergreen forest to the south contain ecologically important 'hot spots' either on the basis of data obtained during the Chariot investigations or on the basis of those data cited by Dr. Pruitt." While the AEC does not feel that "hot spot" is the appropriate term, apparently RIS does. This term, I am told, is taken directly from RIS literature.

May I please have, at your convenience, comments on the above and a direct answer in layman's language to the following:

1. Is caribou contamination a peril to the health and future of the Eskimo?

2. If it is AEC's position that this could be a peril to health, what is being done to protect American citizens living in the Arctic?

3. If it is AEC's position that this is not a peril to health, how do you reconcile your stand with that of the International Atomic Energy Agency?

Sincerely yours,

E. L. Bartlett.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 71, Senate bill 74, and continuing through Calendar No. 86, Senate bill 752, and that they be considered in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Under the agreement, the following bills were considered and passed, as follows:

DR. OLGA MARIE FERRER

The bill (S. 74) for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Olga Marie Ferrer (A12539965) shall be held and considered to have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence on May 17, 1947, and to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act.

FLORA ROMANO TORRE

The bill (S. 93) for the relief of Flora Romano Torre was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Flora Torre shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CARNETTA GERMAINE THOMAS HUNTE

The bill (S. 196) for the relief of Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CARMELO SCHILLACI

The bill (S. 213) for the relief of Carmelo Schillaci was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mr. Carmelo Schillaci shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent resident to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

YOO CHUL SOO

The bill (S. 292) for the relief of Yoo Chul Soo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yoo Chul Soo may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by the Reverend and Mrs. Gordon J. Milldrum, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Yoo Chul Soo pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

KAINO HELY AUZIS

The bill (S. 310) for the relief of Kaino Hely Auzis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kaino Hely Auzis shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Aileen Ellen Auzis and Anthony Adolph Auzis, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

DOMENICO MARTINO

The bill (S. 504) for the relief of Domenico Martino was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Domenico Martino may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* This this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

MILLIE GAIL MESA

The bill (S. 686) for the relief of Millie Gail Mesa was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of paragraph (7) of section 301(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Janis Lavern Mesa, a citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to have resided in and to have been physically present in the United States, prior to the birth of her natural child, Millie Gail Mesa, for a period of five years after the said Mrs. Janis Lavern Mesa had attained the age of fourteen years.

LASZLO JANOS BUCHWALD

The bill (S. 715) for the relief of Laszlo Janos Buchwald was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 212(a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Laszlo Janos Buchwald may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That the exemptions provided for in this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

ELVIRA CICCOTELLI

The bill (S. 322) for the relief of Elvira Ciccotelli was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elvira Ciccotelli may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

ENRICO PETRUCCI

The bill (S. 866) for the relief of Enrico Petrucci was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Enrico Petrucci may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Matthew J. Hannon, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Enrico Petrucci pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

JOZSEF POZSONYI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 72) for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "visa", to strike out "fee" and insert "fees", and in the same line, after the amendment just stated, to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available." and insert "Upon the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall reduce by three numbers the number of refugees who may be paroled into the United States pursuant to sections 1 and 2(a) of the Act of July 14, 1960, as amended (74 Stat. 504; 75 Stat. 460)."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall reduce by three numbers the number of refugees who may be paroled into the United States pursuant to sections 1 and 2(a) of the Act of July 14, 1960, as amended (74 Stat. 504; 75 Stat. 460).

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CHANG AH LUNG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 206) for the relief of Chang Ah Lung, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 8, after the word "to", to strike out "this alien" and insert "such alien as provided for in this act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chang Ah Lung shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MANNOR LEE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 215) for the relief of Mannor Lee, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Miss"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mannor Lee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper qouta-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MIRHAN GAZARIAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 671) for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Act of October 24, 1962 (Public Law 87–885), Mirhan Gazarian shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 1 of that Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JANOS KARDOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 752) for the relief of Janos Kardos, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to insert "be issued a visa and", and in line 10, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*And provided further,* That this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Janos Kardos may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 88, Senate bill 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no action taken on this measure today, but it is being laid down as the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably 65 appointments and promotions of general and flag officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and the nomination of one admiral for retirement. I ask that these nominations be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations are as follows:

Vice Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, for appointment to commands and other duties determined by the President, in the grade of admiral while so serving;

Rear Adm. William E. Gentner, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to commands and other duties determined by the President, in the grade of vice admiral while so serving;

Adm. Robert L. Dennison, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list;

Rear Adm. William A. Brockett, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy;

Maj. Gen. Charles H. Hayes, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to commands and other duties determined by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general while so serving;

Maj. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, U.S. Army, for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general while so serving; and

Brig. Gen. John Edward Kelly, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 1,472 promotions and appointments in the Army in the grade of colonel and below, and 5,404 appointments and promotions in the Navy in the grade of commander and below. Since these names have already been printed in the Congressional Record, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Hawaii.

The nominations are as follows:

Edkwood H. Solomon, Jr., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Ned E. Ackner, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Adolphus R. Allison, Jr., and sundry other officers of the U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion;

Raymond G. Andrews, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Jackie E. Bradford, and sundry other distinguished military students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with new reports, will be stated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations under New Reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the first nomination under New Reports.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Averell Harriman to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I know the distinguished Senator from New York would not want the confirmation of the able Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to take place without there appearing in the Record at least a brief statement on the exemplary and unselfish service to the Nation performed by Mr. Harriman during many years, ranging through prewar years, the war years, and the postwar years. Mr. Harriman has not only served as ambassador, Secretary of Commerce, and as Director of Mutual Security, but also as Assistant Secretary of State and as special representative of the President of the United States; all this as well as having been governor of the great Empire State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief biographical sketch, showing particularly the services to this country performed by Mr. Harriman, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

W. Averell Harriman

Present position: Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

Considered for: Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

Born: November 15, 1891. Education: B.A., Yale, 1913. Marital status: Married.

Experience: Nongovernment: 1915–17, vice president, supplies and purchases, Union Pacific R.R.; 1932–46, chairman of the board, Union Pacific; 1917–25, chairman of the board, Merchant Shipbuilding Corp.; 1920–31, W. A. Harriman & Co., Inc.; 1931–46, partner, Brown Brothers Harriman & Co. (merger); 1946–63, limited partner, Brown Brothers Harriman & Co.; 1931–42, chairman, executive committee, Illinois Central R.R. Co.; 1915–46, director, Illinois Central R.R. Co.; 1955–58, Governor of the State of New York.

Government: 1933, member, Business Advisory Council for Department of Commerce; 1937–39, Chairman, Business Advisory Council for Department of Commerce; 1934, Administrator, Division II, National Recovery Administration, special assistant, Administrator, NRA; 1934–35, administrative officer, NRA; January 3, 1941, Chief, Materials Branch, Production Division, Office of Production Management; 1941, special representative of the President in Great Britain, rank of Minister; 1941, special representative of the President to U.S.S.R. (chairman mission) rank of Ambassador; 1942, representative in London of Combined Shipping Adjustment Board; 1942, member, London Combined Production and Resources Board; 1943–46, U.S. Ambassador to Russia; April 10, 1946, U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain; 1946–48, Secretary of Commerce; 1948–50, U.S. Representative in Europe under Economic Cooperative Act of 1948, rank of Ambassador; 1950–51, Special Assistant to the President; 1951, American representative on North Atlantic Treaty Organization Commission To Study Western Defense Plans; 1951–53, Director, Mutual Security Agency; 1961, Ambassador at Large, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

Office: Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Home: 3128 P Street NW., Washington. D.C.

Legal residence: New York.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. Harriman has given most of his life to the service of his Nation. I am very proud to be able to share in his friendship, and I am proud to be living at a time when the Nation has been served by such outstanding statesmanship and leadership.

I wish to compliment the distinguished Under Secretary of State on his service to the Nation. He brings to that service a wealth of experience and a breadth of knowledge that very few men possess.

His vitality and vigor are a source of amazement to his contemporaries. He is a unique man in American history. He is one of the truly great men of our time and a great American citizen.

I congratulate the Senate upon its confirmation of the nomination of this great American, and I congratulate the President on sending to us this nomination.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator is perhaps unaware that I appeared and, quite unnecessarily, introduced this distinguished figure to the Committee on Foreign Relations at the time his nomination was considered. I said then that he was beginning to make a perennial appearance and commented on the great service which he has rendered to our country. I express the hope that he will continue to advance in appointive office and will not be diverted in any way to the seeking of elective office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from New York makes such wise observations. I knew that the Senator came before the committee to present Mr. Harriman. This was only another expression of the qualities of courtesy and hospitality—and, I might add, good commonsense—on the part of the Senator from New York. For this, I commend him.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

BOARD OF PAROLE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James A. Carr, Jr., to be a member of the Board of Parole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Homer Lester Benson to be a member of the Board of Parole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

A COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations will be conducting a major study on "Inter-Agency Coordination in Environmental Hazards."

A multitude of evidence confirms that such a study could prove tremendously useful to the Nation.

A formal examination of this nature was first proposed to me by my distinguished associate, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

I have asked Senator RIBICOFF to take the lead in conducting this review.

OUTSTANDING QUALIFICATIONS OF SENATOR RIBICOFF

Senator RIBICOFF brings to this heavy assignment outstanding qualifications as a former Member of the House, former Governor, former Cabinet officer, and now a Member of this body. As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Senator RIBICOFF had firsthand knowledge of the need for coordinated activity in the field of environmental hazards. In joint action with the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Defense, he established on June 22, 1961, the Federal Pest Control Review Board. Significantly, the earliest recognition of the need for establishing an administrative procedure like this was expressed by Dr. Neely Turner, entomologist for the State of Connecticut, during the controversy resulting from gypsy moth control operations in the Northeastern United States a number of years ago. Actually, the Review Board was established after President Kennedy's special message on natural resources in 1961 spelled out the need to resolve the conflict that had arisen between several agencies of Government over the use of chemical pesticides that might harm public health and our fish and wildlife resources.

Senator RIBICOFF also served as Chairman of the Federal Radiation Council, composed of the major Federal agencies having an interest in nuclear energy and its safe use. Congress had authorized the establishment of this Council in recognition of the challenge facing the Nation in the field of radiological health, requiring coordinated activity on the part of the various Federal agencies involved in nuclear matters.

The Nation can count on him and on the subcommittee as a whole for a thorough-going and rational review.

THE SUPREME INTEREST—HEALTH

Earlier, I mentioned various economic and other interests involved. The fact is that there is one supreme interest—the health of us all. We are all, in the final analysis, consumers.

As consumers, we both benefit from chemicals and face possible hazards.

Last night's CBS program indicated the great good that has come to mankind as a result of the development of pesticides, insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] pointed out on the floor 2 days ago:

> Today through the use of chemical insecticides, typhus, yellow fever, and malaria, man's ancient and dismal scourges, are rapidly disappearing throughout the world. Were it not for modern pesticides * * * our agricultural resources would be fearfully inadequate to the task of sustaining an expanding world population at acceptable standards of living and health.

And I agree with her that this good must be weighed against possible adverse affects from uncontrolled and mismanaged use of these products. A reasonable balance must be struck. This is the underlying concept of all control measures in the field of environmental hazards.

No one in a position of responsibility, including, of course, Miss Carson, has suggested that "all" chemical poisons be taken off the market. No one suggests we close down our industry, because water is being polluted. No one proposes to take automobiles off the road because they contribute to air pollution. But what must be done is to establish reasonable and intelligent controls over possible hazards so that they do not become unmanageable threats to our health, our economy and our very way of life.

MEMORANDUM FROM SENATOR RIBICOFF AND WALL STREET JOURNAL ARTICLE

I believe that, as a matter of completeness of the record, the Senate may be interested in reading the excellent memorandum from Senator RIBICOFF, which prompted the review.

I ask unanimous consent that his comments be printed at this point in the RECORD, to be followed by a helpful article in the April 3, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Pesticides and Health."

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To: Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations.
From: Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.
Subject: Agency coordination in environmental hazard research and regulation.

Rachel Carson's book "Silent Spring" has stirred wide public interest in the problem of environmental hazards. As she pointed out: "The most alarming of all man's assaults upon the environment is the contamination of air, earth, rivers, and sea with dangerous and even lethal materials."

During my tenure as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare I became acutely aware of the problems of interagency coordination in the field of environmental hazards.

As Secretary I served as Chairman of the Federal Radiation Council which was established some years ago to work out the interagency problems of radiation control. Without the Council there would have been chaos in this vitally important field. At least now the interagency conflicts in the field of radiation control can be resolved in an orderly manner. But serious problems remain in the development of Government policy with respect to many environmental hazards.

For example, the pesticide situation discussed in Miss Carson's book had deteriorated to such an extent, with each agency going its own way without regard to the programs or policies of other agencies, that it became necessary, through the joint action of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare to issue an order establishing the Federal Pest Control Review Board (June 22, 1961). This action grew out of a recommendation by the President in his 1961 natural resources message. One of the examples cited by the President in that message was the need to resolve the conflict that had arisen between several agencies of Government over the use of chemical pesticides that might harm public health and our fish and wildlife resources.

Air pollution activities are carried on in the Public Health Service, the Bureau of Mines, and other agencies.

Water pollution control problems are considered in various agencies and in different units of the same agency.

The contamination of milk and food is under study and control of various agencies.

In short, there is real need to examine the agency coordination aspects of environmental hazard regulations with a view to determining the efficiency and economy of programs designed to protect the health and safety of 180 million American men, women, and children.

We have the various agencies studying themselves and the White House Office of Science and Technology studying the various agencies. While these studies are helpful there is a need for a full public airing of the problem which only can be accomplished by a congressional subcommittee having a wide-scope jurisdiction and directive to look into interagency relations. Only your subcommittee has such authority.

I have studied your hearings on drug research and regulation and feel that a study of environmental hazards could follow that same pattern. The issues and problems are quite similar and the good work already done could serve as a guide to the staff. Perhaps an initial subject to be looked at in this field is pesticides. The White House Office of Science and Technology has circulated among interested Federal agencies the first draft of its report reviewing the use of pesticides in the United States and what is being done by the Government to control their effects. The report could serve as background for an agency coordination study by your subcommittee on the subject of pesticides as one example in the field of environmental hazards.

With regard to staff, I would endeavor to have assigned to me an intern under the American Political Science Association program who could be assigned full-time to working with other members of my staff and Mr. Cahn in developing these hearings.

[From The Wall Street Journal, Apr. 3, 1963]

PESTICIDES AND HEALTH: CHARGE THAT CHEMICALS HARM HUMANS, NATURE FAILS TO HAMPER SALES—FARMERS, GARDENERS STEP UP SPRING BUYING AMID FUROR STIRRED BY AUTHOR'S ATTACK—TIGHTER U.S. CURBS FORESEEN

(By Roger B. May)

Makers of chemicals that attack insect pests, rodents and weeds say sales are soaring this spring even though they are under heavy attack themselves. But they are concerned about the future.

Although no stranger to controversy, the industry has been under increased fire since last June when Rachel Carson, a respected author and biologist, charged that careless users of pesticides were not only poisoning pests but also beneficial wildlife and man himself. Contending that the present massive chemical attack on nature could have dire results, she urged use of other controls. For instance, she argued that crabgrass killers widely used on lawns wouldn't be necessary if proper methods of lawn care were followed.

Miss Carson's views first appeared in a series of articles in the New Yorker magazine. In September, a longer version, documented with 54 pages of references, was published as a book titled "Silent Spring."

The book, a best seller for a time, aroused conservationists and other groups. Since the beginning of the year, 40 bills have been introduced in State legislatures calling for stricter controls on the use of pesticides. In Connecticut a hearing last month on new pesticide legislation drew such a large crowd it had to be moved to larger quarters.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE TO REPORT

One of the chemical companies' biggest worries is over a study of pesticides being conducted by President Kennedy's Advisory Committee on Science and Technology. Insiders say the committee's report, to be issued soon, will stress the value of pesticides but will take a critical line and recommend Federal steps to assure better control. Two bills already have been introduced in Congress to tighten Federal controls on pesticide use.

No one can predict what further restrictions, if any at all, these efforts will bring on the use of pesticides.

But so far there is no evidence that sales have been affected at all. Industry sales of pesticides rose to $345 million last year, 16 percent over the 1961 level. This accelerated a climb that has lifted volume 72 percent since 1955. As the planting season gets underway in many parts of the Nation, producers say farmers and gardeners are buying more of these chemicals than a year ago at this time.

An outpouring of new products has been partly responsible for the industry's rapid growth. Nearly 5,300 new pesticide compounds were registered with the Department of Agriculture last year, the most since 1948, the first year registration was required. For the first 2 months of this year, registrations were slightly ahead of the 1962 pace. There are over 57,000 pesticides on the market for use against some 25,000 species of insects and untold varieties of weeds and rodents. Most of the compounds are based on chemicals known as chlorinated hydrocarbons.

RESEARCH SPENDING HIGH

Spending for pesticide research this year is expected to be close to $40 million, more than 10 percent of industry sales. Research expenditures for industrial chemicals generally average only about 4.4 percent of sales. Stauffer Chemical Co. of New York raised its pesticide research budget by 17 percent in 1962 over the year before and boosted it a further 20 percent this year. Of the 757 patent applications filed by Dow Chemical Co. of Midland, Mich., in 1962, about 10 percent were for pesticides although only about 7 percent of Dow's sales are in this field.

American Cyanamid Co. has pumped $11 million into new greenhouses and related facilities near Princeton, N.J. for testing farm chemicals. California Chemical Co., a Standard Oil Co. of California subsidiary, is increasing the research staff of its Ortho Division by 12 percent this year as it mans new research facilities in California and Florida. Union Carbide Corp. has more than doubled the size of its research farm near Raleigh, N.C., since it opened in 1956.

Among the new fruits of this research is a Rohm & Haas Co. product which the company claims will kill barnyard grass in rice fields but not the rice itself. It may save farmers the bother of flooding fields to hold down grass and weeds. FMC Corp.'s Niagara Division is marketing a new herbicide which it claims kills weeds in tomato fields without affecting the tomatoes, a difficult problem in the past. Monsanto Chemical Co. has a new chemical it says will destroy hard-to-kill weeds such as thistle and lambsquarter. Du Pont Co. is beginning large-scale promotion of a chemical designed to kill cornfield grasses, which are hard to control, as well as weeds.

ENTHUSIASTIC FARMER

Farmers often greet chemical developments with enthusiasm. Joseph A. Wagner in Prince George County, Va., claims his yield from a 50-acre peanut field last season was 2,200 pounds to the acre after he used a new soil insecticide. The previous season, using no insecticide, his yield was only 1,400 pounds an acre, largely because of an attack by army worms. Such dramatic increases in yields through use of pesticides are not unusual.

"Farmers have been convinced of the value of these chemicals—the objections are coming from nonagricultural people," one company official says. Public health officials also frequently support the chemical companies. Massive chemical attacks on mosquitoes and flies have been credited with widespread control of malaria and other diseases.

But critics also cite evidence of damage. Dr. James D. DeWitt of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service told the annual convention of the National Audubon Society last fall that findings of chemicals in dead birds indicate pesticides may be contributing to the extinction of certain species, including the bald eagle. The society is urging States to set up control boards to regulate pesticide use. Massachusetts has set up such a board and Ohio and Connecticut have bills pending.

Douglas Campbell, a San Francisco psychiatrist and a professor at the University of California, contends that many of what are believed to be virus infections and nervous disorders in humans may actually be toxic conditions resulting from repeated small doses of insecticides. Such doses, he claims, only cause vague aches and pains, low-grade fevers and chronic stomach aches, but also the symptoms of some mental disorders, such as double vision.

In Miami, a Dade County medical examiner recently ruled that a fumigation of a household with insecticides "instigated a chain of events that led to the death" of a housewife. Six homeowners in Norfolk, Va., recently filed an unsuccessful suit to stop the State from using a chemical called dieldrin to wipe out the white-fringed beetle, which damages plants. Miss Carson's "Silent Spring" cited deaths of birds and cats near Sheldon, Ill., when dieldrin was used to kill beetles.

POSITIVE SIDE STRESSED

To try to counter such adverse publicity, the Manufacturing Chemists Association (MCA) and National Agricultural Chemicals Association (NACA), both in Washington, last November began sending monthly feature stories to news media stressing the positive side of pesticide use. Similar material is being mailed directly to 100,000 individuals. The NACA doubled its public relations budget for the fiscal year that begins October 1 and is promoting a safety program, underway so far in five States, aimed at convincing applicators of chemicals they should follow manufacturers' directions. Chemical makers complain most accidents stem from improper usage of pesticides.

"But I don't see how it (the industry) can be regulated any more than it is," says Pincus Rothberg, president of Montrose Chemical Corp. of California, a Stauffer affiliate and a major producer of DDT, one of the earliest of modern insect killers. Chemical companies contend they spend several years testing new pesticides and then must register them with the Department of Agriculture, which can require further tests.

In addition, the Food and Drug Administration sets maximum levels of residues of pesticides that may remain on food crops after harvesting. The FDA cannot check all foodstuffs that go to the consumer, of course, and its police powers are limited. But an FDA charge of unsafe practices can have spectacular results. Cranberry sales plummeted in November 1959 after the Agency warned that the crop had been sprayed with a weedkiller that had caused cancer in rats.

Miss Carson argues that the results of chemical attacks often are only temporary, since pests have a habit of adapting quickly to new poisons. She urges greater use of other types of controls, such as encouraging the natural predators of pests.

Some chemical companies admit insects do develop immunities; some varieties of house flies have become immune to DDT, for example. Much current research and some new products are necessitated by this, they say. Some companies are working on products that are not direct poisons. For instance, Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. is working on a compound that it hopes will eradicate boll weevils and potato bugs by sterilizing the male of the species. Federal tests of this method on the boll weevil have shown promise. Sterilization has been used successfully by the USDA in the Southeast to destroy the screw worm fly, which attacks animals.

The chemical companies say, however, that Miss Carson's attack was one-sided and overdrawn, failing to weigh the large benefits of pesticide use against its risks. Miss Carson's warning about the dangers involved when man attempts to manipulate his environment are challenged by George C. Decker, an entomologist at the Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station. He argues that man has been successfully manipulating his environment for centuries.

"With populations increasing and the area of farmland decreasing, it will be only a matter of a few years until (the world) will have to make ever-increasing use of agricultural technology, including more efficient pest control, to meet the world's food and fiber requirements," Mr. Decker says.

THE GREAT DEBATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a great debate has been raging in our country over various aspects of environmental health, notably over issues posed by pesticides.

It is, however, indisputable that there are environmental hazards, and that they are increasing, not diminishing. There definitely is a rising contamination of the air, earth, rivers, and seas with dangerous, and sometimes even lethal, materials. Man is gaining increasing benefits from the chemical-industrial revolution, but he is also paying a price.

Last night, the Nation saw an outstanding television program, prepared by CBS Reports, "The Silent Spring of Rachel Carson." It dramatically pointed up one of the great challenges of our time—man's assault upon his environment.

It depicted the strong, sincere views of leading public and private protagonists on this subject.

The unassailable fact, as I see it, is that, as man changes his environment, his environment may change him. Man is a part of his environment. He is a part of Nature: He must be prudent as he makes changes in the balance of nature. But changes will come.

We cannot turn the "hands of the clock" back. As I told the Animal Health Institute yesterday, whether anyone likes it or not, we are living in a chemical age of incredible scientific achievement.

We must set our goal consciously to maximize the benefits of science and minimize avoidable hazards.

A FEW GENERAL GUIDELINES

I should like to set forth what I regard as a few additional guidelines of the study.

First. Its aim will be to get the significant facts and present them to the Senate and the Nation.

We will want to know where our country is heading and why, and how, and where we should be heading.

Our traditional procedure on the subcommitte has been, to learn and set forth which agency is doing what, why, how, where, at what cost, and with what relationship to what other agencies are doing.

Our procedure, moreover, has been to draw to the fullest extent upon the facts and judgment of prior and contemporaneous studies.

Very considerable review of this subject has already been conducted within the executive branch, by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, and other sources. Our aim would be to capitalize upon the other work, avoiding any duplication, and picking up from where others have left off.

COOPERATION WITH PRESIDENT'S OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Second. We would work very closely, I am sure, with the President's able science adviser, Dr. Jerome Wiesner. I am informed that the pesticide problem has been receiving Dr. Wiesner's closest attention. I am further informed that within about 4 weeks, a report by the Life Sciences Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee on this issue will be ready for release. I have not seen the report, but it is my understanding that it is a frank, historic statement of the policy and technical issues confronting the U.S. Government agencies, industry, agriculture and the public on this much-debated issue.

I do not have the slightest doubt that it will be a landmark report.

INTERAGENCY MECHANISMS

Third. We will be interested, as indicated earlier, in how well interagency mechanisms are actually working. I refer, of course, to the Pesticide Control Review Board, the Interdepartmental Committee on Pesticides, the Armed Forces Pesticide Control Review Board, and so forth.

It is clear that interagency coordination is the key to success in these efforts. Numerous Federal agencies have important and enlarging responsibilities in this field. These agencies include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, Department of Defense, and others. Considerable sums of taxpayers' money are involved, both for regulatory and research purposes.

Our subcommittee's continuing study of drug issues has repeatedly shown that, even with the best of intentions, Federal agencies face serious difficulties in coordination and collaboration, because of often different orientations, approaches, and backgrounds.

PERSPECTIVE ON AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT

Fourth. We will want to learn the areas of interagency agreement, and the areas of interagency disagreement, as well as the comparable points of agreement and dispute in the vast private sector of our society.

Having outlined these areas, we will be in a position to find a sound, judicious road ahead.

A sense of overall perspective is essential.

MINNESOTA'S BROAD INTERESTS

The people of Minnesota know that I approach this problem with a full awareness of its many implications to all segments of life in my State and in all the other 49 States of the Union. Our conservationists are aware of my deep concern over the misfortune of man's permitting the despoiling of the great outdoors.

Industry knows, however, that it is my desire to advance the state of the art in science and technology as rapidly as possible. And agriculture is aware that in order to continue to have high-quality foods and fibers at reasonable cost, it is essential that man deal effectively with insect pests, weeds, and disease.

These respective interests are hardly irreconcilable; but they do involve sharply different emphases and can and do lead to misunderstanding.

The problem of environmental hazards has, of course, long been of interest to me. In 1956 and 1961, I joined with Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota, in sponsoring legislation to strengthen the Nation's water pollution control programs. This year I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S. 432, the clean air bill introduced by Senator RIBICOFF and S. 649, a bill to further strengthen the Federal Water Pollution Control Act introduced by Senator MUSKIE.

CONTINUED STUDY OF DRUGS

Our subcommittee's present study of interagency coordination in drug research and regulation will, of course, continue. It has given us valuable experience for this larger study.

Chemical agents used to treat man's diseases are but one part of man's changing environment. There are both similarities, as well as differences between the study of drugs and other environmental factors.

Preliminary evidence suggests these similarities, among others, between our drug study and the wider study which are now launching.

First. In the field of environmental health, there is as critical a problem of breakdown in scientific communication, as exists in almost any other aspect of modern life. All of the mounting problems which this subcommittee has mentioned over a period of years—relating to the collection, abstracting, indexing, storage, retrieval, evaluation, and dissemination of scientific information—are multiplied manyfold in the area of environmental health.

We are dealing with incredible numbers of chemical ingredients and of published and unpublished information about them.

There are today well over 200 basic chemicals used in somewhat over 54,000 formulations—registered with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

How even one chemical on a given crop at a given time under given circumstances interacts with another chemical—much less still others—is a scientific problem in itself, and a problem to try to search in the literature to the extent that the literature exists.

Second. We do not begin to know enough about how drugs actually work on a cellular or system or organism basis, particularly over a long term; and we do not know the genetic effects of many drugs and chemicals. In the same manner, science does not possess a fraction of the counterpart knowledge which it feels it must have as regards agricultural and other chemicals.

The question often is: How far and how fast dare we go or dare we not go—while the basic knowledge is being discovered?

If, at one extreme, we wait "until all the answers are in," we will not use a single new drug or other chemical agent. If, at the other extreme, we hardly wait at all, we run a needlessly high degree of risk.

Third. Everyone should be aware that the Food and Drug Administration has important statutory obligations with respect to both drugs and environmental health. I may add that this latter area seems to illustrate as strikingly as almost any other—the critical shortage of manpower, materiel, and equipment which has for so long confronted this vital agency. Its scientists, inspectors, and other personnel have had to spread themselves so thinly with respect to the pesticide problem alone, that it seems almost a miracle that we have achieved as much protection as we have.

The proposed 1964 fiscal year budget for the agency will allow it, for example, to increase its tiny present sampling of one-third of 1 percent of interstate shipments of food crops to but 1 percent of the total.

The proposed budget, moreover, will only make a small dent in overcoming the shortage of scientific personnel for the setting of safety levels—tolerances—for residues of agriculture chemicals permitted on crops.

PAST SUBCOMMITTEE WORK

Both from an FDA and other standpoint, environmental health is far from new to this subcommittee. The very title of our subcommittee, "Reorganization and International Organizations," indicates our area of jurisdiction over fiscal and other phases of U.S. activities in the U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization and the World Health Organization.

Our extensive past series of health publications has made numerous references to the type of problems we will now meet head-on. For example, of our 11 committee prints on international health, print No. 5—"Cancer—A Worldwide Menace"—noted carcinogenic effects of chemical agents; print No. 10—Radiation Research in the Life Sciences—referred to health problems posed by nuclear progress and our report, Senate Report 142, 87th Congress—"Coordination of Research in Bio-Medicine and Other Scientific Areas"—noted overall outlay for all health purposes, including environmental health.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I am honored he has given me this assignment. Under the chairmanship of Senator HUMPHREY, the subcommittee on reorganizations has performed invaluable service to the American people.

His hearings on drug safety have alerted us to the continued need for careful administration of our drug laws and more frequent interchange of information and ideas between Federal agencies.

The adoption of a strong drug law last year was an important step forward. Its proper administration is now the essential element of consumer protection against dangerous and useless drug products.

The drug hearings have served and will continue to serve a most useful purpose. I am very hopeful that our study of environmental hazards, which the chairman has just now authorized, will be just as useful.

As last night's CBS telecast clearly showed, there is an appalling lack of information in the entire field of environmental hazards. We face serious questions, but we are woefully short of answers.

We will take a full and careful look at this entire field. We will seek neither to condemn any useful product nor to condone any needless hazard. It is clear these chemicals have a great potential for good. They also have a potential for harm. We want to know how the appropriate balance is being struck, and how our Federal agencies are going about this vitally important job.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for his remarks.

ADDRESS BY RIGHT HON. HAROLD WILSON, O.B.E., M.P.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, recently the leader of one of the major political parties in Great Britain addressed the National Press Club in Washington. In the course of his address, he spoke on a number of subjects, including the United States, England, and the whole Western Alliance. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Right Honorable Harold Wilson be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE HAROLD WILSON, O.B.E., M.P., AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB AT WASHINGTON, D.C., ON MONDAY, APRIL 1, 1963.

I should like to begin by saying what I am here for. First, what I am not here for. I am not here to negotiate. An opposition cannot negotiate with governments. I am here as leader of one of the great parties in our democracy to learn more about current thinking in the United States on the great issues confronting the Atlantic partnership. I was last here in January 1962, at that time as the Labor Party's spokesman on foreign affairs. I would have come in January of this year, but had to return from New York to London on the day that Hugh Gaitskell died, without coming on to Washington.

So having said what I am here for I do not need, I hope, to repudiate the story which was featured in some papers last week under the title "Wilson's Fourteen Points." I haven't got 14. I haven't got any. A statement in one of Friday's papers that I "announced" before leaving London that I was bringing a 14-point program is quite wrong. The London story came as the responsibility of the pressman who wrote it and who at that time had not been to see me or had any discussion with me. It was a nice and amusing piece of imaginative writing but I cannot take any responsibility for it. I'm sorry.

I have not come to press any lines of policy on the U.S. administration. To do so would be highly improper and unconstitutional. My purpose in coming is to learn and to listen—and to explain, when I am asked, the general trend of Labor Party thinking and policy on the main issues of world affairs.

But I have read a great deal of what has been written, and I should like to thank you for all the kind things you have said about me—I have in the process learned a lot of things about myself I didn't know before—and I have been asked by many pressmen a lot of questions about our approach. I should, therefore, like to try today in my talk to answer some of these questions.

I should like to begin with the economic problems the free world is facing.

All of us want to see a great expansion of trade, and a removal of trade barriers, between member countries of the Atlantic community. Equally we urgently need to see a steady and dynamic expansion of production within our respective countries. My fear is that anything we are able to do in freeing trade and expanding national production will run in a measurable period of time into a crisis of world liquidity. World trade has increased fourfold in monetary terms since prewar; the monetary resources available to lubricate this trade have barely doubled. We have the position that the two greatest trading nations in the world both urgently need to expand production, in their own inerests and that of the free world, and that both are inhibited by fear of balance-of-payments difficulties. We are moving more and more into the position that if sterling is strong, the dollar is weak, if the dollar is strong, sterling is weak; there are times when we face the danger that both are weak. And if Western nations show the degree of statesmanship which we hope for in reducing trade barriers, there is a real danger that trade expansion will grind to a standstill through a famine of liquidity. And we shall be reduced again to beggar-my-neighbor measures designed to export unemployment and deflation from one country to another. We are within a reasonable distance of a major sizeup in free world trade, beginning with a crisis in dollar and sterling trade, which at best will inhibit our hopes of economic expansion at a time when other nations are pressing remorselessly ahead, and which at worst could create another 1931. I am also deeply concerned at the growth of indebtedness in underdeveloped countries such as those of Latin America. Already the burden of servicing loans is preempting a high proportion of their oversea earnings; in 4 or 5 years many of them will reach the breaking point.

In passing may I say with all the emphasis I can command that the answer does not lie in devaluation whether of the dollar, or sterling, or both. That would be a lunatic and self-destroying operation, neither justified by the problem nor relevant to its solution. The same applies to loose talk about floating rates. As an ex-trade minister I have a built-in prejudice in favor of enabling exporters to quote fixed prices with reasonable assurance of monetary stability. Equally the answer cannot be found in a revaluation of gold, which would simply provide an uncovenanted benefit to two countries, South Africa and the Soviet Union, whose benefit should be low in our scale of priorities.

What is needed is a medium for the creation of international credit through the established machinery of the International Monetary Fund. The unparalleled American and British expansion in the 19th century was made possible by a new discovery, the power of commercial banks to create credit, free from the thralldom of gold. In the 20th century we have so far shown ourselves unworthy of the ingenuity and inventiveness of our grandfathers. We should now move toward a system in which the IMF could create international credit peri passu with the development of world trade. If this could be combined with the Australian proposal for discriminatory credit facilities to be issued to underdeveloped countries to spend in debtor countries such as, in present circumstances, United States and Britain, we could evoke increased production in our two countries, related to the needs of world development. This could be the answer to unused capacity in our countries.

The dangers, and the opportunities, we now face would justify the summoning of a World Monetary Conference, an economic summit for the free world.

Now I turn to the situation which arises from the breakdown of the Brussels negotiations. I do not want to go back over the past. What matters now is our response to a challenging and even exciting situation. It is above all a new, though not an unforeseeable situation. For 18 months Western policies were directed to a consummation in Brussels. Now we have to start again.

The Labor Party was prepared to accept a solution which would have been genuinely outward looking and be a stepping stone to a wider free trade area embracing the Atlantic community, and the Commonwealth.

There was nothing in the Treaty of Rome, as such, that would have precluded such an advance. What we were not prepared to join was an inward looking, autarchic Europe which would sever Britain from our traditional channels of trade with the Commonwealth and the wide-trading world. The adoption by the EEC of an agricultural policy based on restrictionism, of high prices policed by a penal import levy on imports from the outside world was a sign that perhaps Schacht, rather than Adam Smith, provided the inspiration for the agricultural planners of the new Europe. This policy involved a degree of interference with established market channels, a degree of rigging of prices and production, of internal self-sufficiency, far transcending the wildest dreams of any British or American Secretary of Agriculture, of any party, who ever existed, and in saying this I am speaking the language of superlatives.

At every stage of the debates in Parliament, Hugh Gaitskell and I and others of us stressed the need for the preparation of an alternative policy in case the talks broke down and Britain was presented with entry terms which proved intolerable. This was designed not only to strengthen our bargaining position, for negotiations based on the thesis that there was no alternative to entry were bound to produce stiff, possibly unacceptable, terms; it was designed to avoid a vacuum, a paralysis of policy in the event of breakdown.

At all stages we spelled out a policy based on the concept of an Atlantic—and wider than Atlantic—community based on the United States, Britain and EFTA, EEC, the Commonwealth and probably Japan and possibly Latin America. As long ago as November 1961, when the Clayton-Herter report was presented to the joint committee of Congress, I said that this, rather than a narrow European conception, provided the key to the future.

President de Gaulle's brusque intervention faced us with the need for a constructive alternative. Paying every tribute to the breadth and vision of Mr. Macmillan's reappraisal after Brussels, I could not feel that a policy whose constructive measures were limited to the cancellation of a royal visit to Paris could be said to be measuring up fully to the challenge with which we were faced. We, therefore, put forward the following:

1. Urgent action to make the Kennedy round effective, on the basis I have mentioned including the United States, United Kingdom, the Commonwealth, EFTA, and those trading areas such as Japan and Latin America which are essential to U.S. trade.

2. Urgent action to conclude international commodity agreements to provide stability in the prices and production of those commodities which enter into international trade, including products of temperate zones such as cereals and dairy produce, and those of primary producing countries such as cocoa, tin, rubber, sisal and tea. We are too apt to forget that all that has been done in the past 10 years in the development of economic aid from advanced countries to the underdeveloped areas, amounting now to $3½ billion, has been more than offset by the collapse in the export income of underdeveloped countries through the fall in primary commodity prices.

3. Associated with this, action to channel food surpluses from advanced countries to meet the needs of hungry nations, for example on the lines proposed by Lord Boyd-Orr in 1946 for a world food board, an imaginative concept 15 years ahead of its time, which was rejected because most of us hadn't the dollars in a dollar-hungry world. We must face the fact in our modern democracies, that built-in subsidies and support to our farmers will mean a permanent surplus of food, and this will be enormously augmented if the Common Market agricultural policy is not vetoed by GATT.

4. Planned international action to provide not merely monetary help for developing countries, but governmental and intergovernmental orders for steel, machine tools, and transportation equipment, linking their needs with our industries at present working below capacity.

5. Measures to expand international liquidity.

6. Urgent action on the lines so imaginatively proposed by Mr. George Ball to provide planned quota outlets in all advanced countries for textiles and other manufactured goods from Asia and Africa.

7. On a Commonwealth basis closer integration of Commonwealth development plans enabling Britain to recapture markets we have lost through neglected opportunities in the past decade.

These are measures required on a marked scale. For our part we are prepared in Europe to work to find a solution to the problem of an economic division between EEC and EFTA. Perhaps OECD will provide the right forum, perhaps, as we have suggested, regular meetings of European heads of government to seek close political unity and a solution of Europe's economic problems. We are prepared at the right time, and given the right conditions to enter into fresh negotiations with the Six, provided this does not mean another 18 months with Britain setting the anti-chamber while the Six meet and wrangle about our fate, provided that no one regards the concessions made by Mr. Heath as an acceptable starting point. We have stated the five broad conditions which should govern Britain's entry and we are prepared to negotiate on the basis of these conditions. But no one sees any immediate prospect of a new breakthrough, and that is why I stress the urgency of the other measures which are open to us.

Now I turn to some of the wider issues of world affairs; three in particular, Berlin, disarmament, and the defense of the West.

On Berlin, I recognize that reports of a speech I made in Cardiff 5 weeks ago have caused some anxieties. This is because the full text was never available. I do not blame the press. I overloaded them. It was the night I made my first major speech as leader of the opposition. I had a full handout on our policy for housing and rents, and the position of slum landlords. In addition, I had a few animadversions on Mr. Macmillan and his colleagues which news editors thought of some interest. So there was little space to report a speech I made earlier in the day at the university in which Berlin was mentioned. Our view, which I repeatedly stated in Berlin when last year I led 42 Labor Members of Parliament on a mission to Berlin, designed to show our solidarity and support for Willy Brandt and the citizens of West Berlin is clear. Any settlement of the Berlin issue must provide two nonnegotiable, inalienable conditions: (1) the right of the people of West Berlin to live in a system of society and under a system of government of their own free choosing; (2) guarantees of access to West Berlin from the West going beyond mere paper promises, together with all other measures necessary to insure the viability of West Berlin; (3) we regard it as essential that for the foreseeable future Western forces remain in Berlin, as of right, and as custodians of the new agreement; (4) to secure such an agreement we should be prepared to show some degree of flexibility in relation to recognizing the existence of the authorities in East Germany and working out practical measures with them; and (5) we should show a willingness to recognize on a factual basis Germany's Eastern frontiers. Unfortunately some reports from Cardiff only repeated the fourth and fifth points of this package.

On disarmament I will say little because of the delicate stage of the negotiations, because we could be on the verge of a great breakthrough. My party accepts and insists on the need for effective international verification and supervision. On the test ban there is not only the problem of the number of inspections, but also the means and effectiveness of the system of inspection. On this Russia still has to come through.

On the wider question of a comprehensive disarmament agreement, nuclear and conventional, we feel that time has come when the Secretary General of the United Nations might be asked to take the two drafts and examine the possibility of bridging the formidable gap which still exists between them.

We believe that a further step forward could be made, here I know that what I am saying will find little acceptance here today, by the creation in areas of high tension of nuclear free zones and areas of effectively controlled conventional disarmament. Such areas as the continent of Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and central Europe, might be taken, perhaps in that order.

This would mean effective inspection. The Soviet acceptance of the Rapacki plan involves acceptance of inspection. But inspection must be effective. And, as the Swedish Government insisted in their December 1961 resolution at U.N., we must have realism and no disturbance of the present balance of forces in Europe.

Now, on defense. Our position is clear. We stand firmly by NATO and the Western Alliance. We are not a neutralist party and neutralism has no part or place in our policies. We want to see Britain and other European countries make a more effective contribution to NATO.

I know there is nothing more boring in nature than a politician who continually refers to his past speeches, but I find that if I repeat, ipsissimis verbis, the speeches I made 2 or 3 years ago on this issue, there is a rush to say, "How he's changed since he became leader of his party." In every speech I made as foreign affairs spokesman I stressed the central role of NATO in our defense policy and in that wide section of our foreign policy which relates to defense; and, secondly, the paramount need to increase our contribution to the conventional strength of NATO forces. We do not believe this is possible if we pour out our substance on the vain effort to maintain the so-called independent, so-called British, so-called deterrent. Because it isn't independent, it isn't going to be British and its deterrent value in our view adds nothing to the effectiveness of Western deterrent power.

But it does mean such a deployment of our financial and real resources as to limit our ability to make an effective contribution to NATO's ground forces. It does mean a block to our hope of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and it does mean increasing the danger that a conventional outbreak in Europe can quickly escalate into nuclear war.

I believe that our view on this represents the consensus of military opinion in Britain, including many Conservative M.P.'s, and that in this respect Mr. Macmillan is inhibited from pursuing the right military policy by the clamant pressure of a small but vociferous band of atavistic back-benders whose intervention was decisive at the time of Nassau.

It is argued that to be realistic and recognize the plain fact that the United States is the custodian of the strategic deterrent on behalf of the Western Alliance, that this places us in a position of humiliating dependence on another nation. I do not agree. It is dependence on the United States for the so-called British deterrent which creates the wrong relationship and which means that meetings of Western leaders, instead of being directed to the urgent problems of strengthening the alliance, are dominated by unrewarding, and I would feel humiliating wrangles about the supply of particular weapons.

Every American pressman I met asks whether a labor government would repudiate the Nassau agreement. I don't like the word "repudiate" which implies breaking faith with a partner, and I have my doubts about the enthusiasm with which the U.S. administration approached the Nassau agreement. My answer is that a Labor government's first task would be to survey the defense position we inherit, to survey the shambles, some say, then to enter into discussions with our American partners about Nassau and about our broader approach to NATO. In view of our policy on deterrents, we should then renegotiate, I have heard the word "denegotiate," the agreement.

Before I leave defense I should like to say one word about Britain's overseas bases East of Suez. The future of some of them is obscure: one thing we should have learned at heavy cost is that you cannot hold a military base in hostile territory. But in general, though some rundown is possible and desirable to release troops for Germany and for the strategic reserve, I believe it to be a mistake to evacuate key bases where we have the chance to remain. It is a hundred times easier for Britain to remain there, even with a token force, than for us, still less the United States, to seek to enter if trouble breaks out. I believe, therefore, that our maintenance of these bases should be regarded as a specific and invaluable contribution to the alliance.

I have talked today mainly about the relationship of Britain and the United States within the Alliance. Frequently I am asked, "What about the special relationship?" I am never quite sure what this means. I am more interested in a close relationship based on a common purpose, common objectives and as far as can be achieved community of policy, a relationship based not on condescension or on a backward-looking nostalgia for the past, but on the ability of both parties to put forward their strength and their own unique contribution to our common purpose. Charles Lamb said in one of his essays, "There is nothing so irrelevant in nature as a poor relation," and if ever our relationship with you were based on that status the sooner it were ended the better: that is why the first priority in British internal policy is to build up our economic strength so that as partners, in the Alliance, in Europe, and the Commonwealth, we are relevant and necessary. It is on that, not on any conception of past greatness that our standing in the world will depend. Our ability to restore the lost dynamic to Britain's economic society, to restore a sense of economic and social and moral purpose, will have far more bearing on our value as an ally and a partner than any vain nuclear posturings. It may not be long before the same truth dawns on President de Gaulle.

Because we reject the notion that Britain is fated by history or some vicious twist of fate or by internal debility to be treated as the sick man of Europe, we are not. We have a reservoir of unused and underused talent, of skill and craftsmanship, of inventiveness and ingenuity, of administrative ability and scientific creativeness which if mobilized will, within a measurable period of time enable us to become, not the workshop of the world; that is no longer our role, but the pilot plant, the toolroom of the world. Our scientists are among the finest in the world. The tragedy is we don't produce enough of them, and those we do produce we do not use intelligently. Some we fail even to hold, and the reason for this is not as one noble lord has said the deficiencies in your educational system, it is deficiencies in our industrial and governmental system that we do not provide the status and opportunities, above all the key role in our society that the needs of the 1960's demand.

That is why the central thread of labor policy, the key to our plan to redynamize Britain's economy, is our plan to mobilize the talents of our scientists and technicians, redeployed from missile and warheads, on research and development contracts, civil research and development to produce the new instruments and tools of economic advance both for Britain and for the war on poverty in underdeveloped areas of the Commonwealth and elsewhere. If we are able to do this, and I have no doubt that we can, we shall be able in a very few years to transform our society and, in the alliance, in our economic relations with the Atlantic community, and in the wider context of the north-south challenge, to put forward our full and so far unrealized strength, dependent on no one, but ready to play our full role in the interdependent community of free nations.

FIRST INSTALLMENT OF REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION ON RULES OF NATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGES AND NATIONAL SECURITIES ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday the Securities and Exchange Commission submitted to Congress the first installment of its report on the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities associations.

On March 28 I urged the industry, the press, investors, and the general public to consider the report in a mature and sober manner, with careful reflection and thorough analysis. From what I have read, it appears that such an approach has been adopted by those in authority.

Conflicting reports on the Commission's findings may arise, however, and it is, therefore, proper that the general public have an opportunity to review the highlights of this report as set forth in Chairman William L. Cary's letter of transmittal to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Cary sets the tone of the SEC's report in the following paragraph:

> At the outset we emphasize that, although many specific recommendations for improvements in rules and practices are made in the report of the special study, the report demonstrates that neither the fundamental structure of the securities markets nor of the regulatory pattern of the securities acts requires dramatic reconstruction. The report should not impair public confidence in the securities markets, but should strengthen it as suggestions for raising standards are put into practice. Serious shortcomings are apparent and the report, of course, has concentrated on their examination and analysis. Yet it is not a picture of pervasive fraudulent activity and in this respect contrasts markedly with the hearings and findings of the early thirties preceding the enactment of the Federal securities laws. The study confirms the strength of those laws and the heightened sense of obligation of the financial community.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cary's letter of transmittal be printed at this point in the Record:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Securities and Exchange Commission,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1963.
The President of the Senate.

Sir: I have the honor to transmit the first segment of the Report of the Special Study of Securities Markets. The report is submitted pursuant to section 19(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (P.L. 87-196), which directs the Commission to make a broad study of the adequacy of investor protection in the securities markets.

I

At the outset we emphasize that, although many specific recommendations for improvements in rules and practices are made in the Report of the Special Study, the report demonstrates that neither the fundamental structure of the securities markets nor of the regulatory pattern of the securities acts requires dramatic reconstruction. The report should not impair public confidence in the securities markets, but should strengthen it as suggestions for raising standards are put into practice. Serious shortcomings are apparent and the report, of course, has concentrated on their examination and analysis. Yet it is not a picture of pervasive fraudulent activity and in this respect contrasts markedly with the hearings and findings of the early thirties preceding the enactment of the Federal securities laws. The study confirms the strength of those laws and the heightened sense of obligation of the financial community.

At the same time the report makes very clear that important problems do exist, grave abuses do occur, and additional controls and improvements are much needed. The tremendous growth in the securities markets over the past 25 years, and most particularly the increased public participation, imposed strains on the regulatory system and revealed structural weaknesses. Neither the securities acts, the Commission, nor the industry itself anticipated the problems arising from the entry of unqualified persons, the spectacular development of the over-the-counter market, the vast number of companies going public for the first time, or a variety of other striking changes. Some of these problems resulted from inadequacies in established enforcement machinery, both Government and industry. Others reflect patterns of conduct now tolerated, but which, upon exposure and analysis, appear incompatible with the public interest. Testimony to this effect has been given by many responsible members of the financial community, in their comments and most vividly in their adoption of higher standards of conduct without compulsion of law. It is these voluntary standards which regulation should reflect and make generally applicable.

The functions of this report and of any changes proposed are to strengthen the mechanisms facilitating the free flow of capital into the markets and to raise the standards of investor protection, thus preserving and enhancing the level of investor confidence. Raising capital from the general public is a marked feature of the American economic system. In this country there are now approximately 17 million shareholders. As the study attests, this phenomenon has been advanced and protected by the securities acts, a proven legislative achievement. Yet no regulation can be static in a dynamic society; unanticipated changes in the markets and the broader public participation should be accompanied by corresponding investor protection. The importance of the capital markets to our national economic progress does not permit anything less than the most fair and efficient operations. Government and industry regulation and the efforts of the financial community must continue to be directed against practices which undermine the integrity of the securities markets and which can only be harmful to the economic growth of this country and to the investors who furnish the funds for that growth.

While the report focuses upon shortcomings in the industry and in the self-regulatory authorities, in certain respects it is an express or implied criticism of the Commission as an institution. The Commission has not fully exercised its powers, nor coped effectively with all of the problems confronting it. There are undoubtedly several reasons for this. Important among these is the expansion of the securities markets, which renders exceedingly difficult the task of identifying and responding to a myriad of new problems while preoccupied with a heavy flow of administrative tasks. Furthermore, at times the Commission has been hampered by a lack of personnel or has concentrated its efforts on particular areas. Finally, in certain instances, statutory power has been lacking. But our job, like industry's, is not to rationalize inactivity but to initiate improvements. The report of the special study will be a catalyst in this process.

As a final prefatory comment, we should like to emphasize that this report is not a commentary on the level of securities prices, nor upon the investment merits of any particular company mentioned. These types of economic analyses have traditionally been outside the scope of the Commission's responsibilities.

II

The complete report of the "Special Study of Securities Markets" will be the most comprehensive of its kind in over 25 years. The examination of the securities markets and the writing of the report have been done by a separate group established in the Commission and designated the "Special Study of Securities Markets," under the supervision of Milton H. Cohen, Director. The special study was given freedom to analyze and point out problems as they appeared to it; in this respect, the judgments, analyses, and recommendations in the report are those of the special study and not the Commission. However, the Commission has worked very closely with the study throughout and has gone over every section of the report. We believe that the report is a thoroughly responsible document. We do not embrace every recommendation as our own, but we do accept them as a sound point of departure for proposals to the Congress, for rulemaking by the Commission and by the self-regulatory agencies, and for discussions with the industry. Like the study, we at the same time recognize the complexities and subtleties of the problems presented.

III

Transmitted here are chapters I through IV, and chapter IX. The remainder of the report, while nearing completion, is not available at this time essentially because of the scope of the undertaking. The Congress repeatedly made clear that the report should be broad and thorough. The study, with the support of the Commission and its operating divisions, has made every effort to carry out this mandate. However, the breadth of the obligation was not evident at the outset and a proper fulfillment necessitates some delay.

The chapters submitted deal with important and basic areas and practices in the securities markets. In many respects they disclose problems calling for vigorous and prompt responses by the Commission and the industry. The Commission will very shortly recommend to the Congress certain legislative proposals (to be discussed below) where the present statutory scheme appears inadequate. An important part of these reflects our continuing belief in self-regulation as an ingredient in protection of the investor. Certain deficiencies can be treated through rulemaking by either the Commission or the self-regulatory agencies. Still others can be resolved only by a more uniform and voluntary adoption of improved procedures by the members of the industry.

A

The report begins where regulation must begin—the point of entry into the business. It is self-evident that the standards of conduct of the securities industry are vitally dependent on the integrity and competency of its personnel. Obviously no system can be devised which eliminates all potential wrongdoers. But the report of the special study concludes that the minimal controls furnished by existing regulation are inadequate. Notable ease of entry is apparent under both Federal law and the rules of the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., the self-regulatory agency for the over-the-counter market. With the exception of the major exchanges, significant standards of character, competence, and minimum capital have not been generally imposed. Nor has attention been sufficiently directed to the unique problems of supervisors, such as branch managers, and research analysts. Furthermore, certain sectors of the industry, including most importantly certain distributors of mutual fund and real estate securities and also investment advisers, are not subject to the discipline of self-regulation. In addition, the present legislative scheme, in revolving around the firm as the regulated unit, provides an artificial and unsatisfactory means of focusing on the individual in the many instances where he is the appropriate object of disciplinary action. Finally, useful and needed intermediate sanctions, short of revoking the registration of a broker-dealer, are not available to the Commission.

We shall, therefore, recommend to the Congress legislative proposals in the following direction:

1. Authorizing standards of character, competence and financial responsibility as conditions for entry into the business, to be established and administered by the national securities associations, notably the NASD which will complement similar regulation by the exchanges of their members;

2. Requiring all firms and individuals to be subject to the authority of one of the self-regulatory agencies;

3. Granting the Commission direct disciplinary controls over individuals and perfecting NASD controls in this area; and

4. Providing the Commission with intermediate sanctions over firms and individuals.

B

A basic factor underlying the enactment of the Federal securities acts was recognition of the intricate nature and high liquidity of securities and of the corresponding duties necessarily assumed by those who deal in them. The heightened public participation in the securities markets severely tested the adequacy of controls, external and self-imposed, particularly in the area of selling practices and investment advice. The examples of sales techniques cited by the study show a striking spectrum: from the illegal operations of boilerrooms to the disciplined patterns of the responsible, reflecting elaborate supervisory procedures and voluntary codes of conduct. Even in the latter, which represent high standards of achievement, serious lapses have occurred. Yet it is their best formula which, if universally followed, would result in increased investor protection. Certain excesses also appear to have developed in the investment advisory materials of both broker-dealers and investment advisers, as evidenced by fanciful recommendations based on little more than mere rumor. Here again uniform application of the best industry practices would seem to be in order. In this area, legislation is not presently recommended. Powers exist in the self-regulatory institutions and the Commission to advance selling and investment advisory practices.

C

The mechanism, practices and rules for distributions in the securities markets are examined in the report with particular emphasis on the so-called "hot issue" phenomenon that accompanied the active and rising markets of the late 1950's and the early 1960's and involved primarily companies going to the public for the first time. A record flow of these new issues was another critical trial for both the regulatory pattern and industry practices; the findings of the report do not invalidate the general thrust of this pattern or whose practices. At the same time particular weaknesses have developed; their elimination should strengthen the distribution mechanism without impairing access to the capital markets. Most of these can be remedied by rules of the Commission and the NASD, with one important exception.

At present a prospectus containing business and financial information about a company must be delivered to the purchasers of the company's stock during a period of 40 days after a registered public offering of that stock. The findings of the report of the special study demonstrate that, particularly in the case of new issues, dramatic price movements may result from uninformed investor action and that maximum exposure of financial and public information is crucial to securing knowledgeable evaluation of these securities. The Commission will, therefore, recommend to the Congress that, in the case of new issues, the 40-day period be extended to 90 days or such shorter period as the Commission may prescribe by rule or order.

D

Much of the material submitted evidences the fundamental importance of adequate disclosure by issuers as a most vital means of investor protection. The report points out the broad range of problems and abuses in the securities markets, including improper selling practices, misleading public relations, irresponsible investment advice, and erratic "after markets" for new issues, which can be greatly mitigated by the more complete availability and dissemination of financial information. The report further demonstrates, as have prior studies, that the longstanding contrast in the disclosure-oriented protections afforded investors owning securities listed on national exchanges and investors owning securities traded in the over-the-counter market is not warranted. Issuers of over-the-counter securities, unlike their listed counterparts, are under no obligation to comply with the Commission's proxy rules or, except in certain cases, to furnish annual and periodic financial reports.

Another void in investor protection in the over-the-counter market relates to insider trading. An insider of a listed company must report his transactions in the company's stock; his short-swing trading profits in the stock are recoverable by the company; and he is prohibited from selling the stock short. The policies expressed in these sections should also be applicable in the over-the-counter market. The so-called sponsorship problem, where an underwriter makes an after-market in a stock he has underwritten and at the same time is represented on the board of directors of the issuing company, has been carefully analyzed by the study. Its findings indicate that the application of the insider trading provisions will not disrupt trading markets in over-the-counter securities, except perhaps in very limited instances which could be handled through exemptions on a case-by-case basis.

Accordingly, the Commission will recommend extension of those sections of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 which provide for the filing of annual and periodic reports, compliance with the proxy rules, and protections against insider trading to certain companies whose securities are traded in the over-the-counter market. A phased program of coverage would gradually include all those companies with 300 or more stockholders. In the case of bank stocks, which appear to account for about 20 percent of the issues of the over-the-counter market, if Congress so desires, disclosure requirements could be administered by the appropriate Federal bank regulatory authorities in order to integrate these controls with the existing patterns of bank regulation.

E

An analysis of the over-the-counter market will be submitted in our complete report. At this time, however, we wish to inform the Congress that we shall propose a legislative recommendation essentially directed to the wholesale quotations systems of that market.

At present the National Quotations Bureau dominates the business of over-the-counter wholesale quotations. The bureau, a private corporation, is not regulated by any agency, Federal, State or self-regulatory. Despite the efforts of the bureau, which has operated with a conscientious regard for the responsibility which its function and dominant position entail, this crucial segment of the over-the-counter market has had inadequate controls; numerous abuses involving quotations have been perpetrated by broker-dealers. Moreover, developments in electronic data processing have foreshadowed the emergence of new and perhaps revolutionary quotation systems. In view of the vital significance which these systems can have to the functioning of the over-the-counter market, they should not be allowed to emerge without due regard to the welfare of the market and to the public interest.

Accordingly, the Commission will recommend to the Congress that operators of quotations systems, like the National Quotations Bureau, be required to register with the Commission and adopt and enforce rules of fair practice in the use of their systems, just as is presently the case with the self-regulatory agencies.

F

We have described a substantial part of the legislative measures which we shall recommend to the Congress this year. A few others will subsequently be proposed; a very important one of these might concern certain aspects of security credit regulation—which would be submitted only after full coordination with the Federal Reserve Board. Not all of the study's legislative recommendations in the chapters transmitted have been adopted by the Commission; these are the subject of our continuing study and may be proposed to the Congress at a subsequent date.

To secure the benefit of industry views on our legislative proposals, we shall immediately request leaders of the financial community to form liaison committees.

IV

The report of the special study is a major contribution to the understanding of the operations and problems of the securities markets. In its collection and analyses of data, it provides a thorough and responsible foundation for action. Furthermore, the enactment of Public Law 87-196 and the very existence of a special study have assisted in the creation of a more salutary environment and have resulted in numerous important developments. The American Stock Exchange has undergone an intensive reorganization. The New York Stock Exchange has commenced a program for improved controls over selling practices and initiated new qualification standards. The NASD has undertaken a comprehensive revision of its bylaws and rules of fair practice. Broker-dealers have reviewed and altered their systems of supervision. It would go too far to assert that all of these, and other numerous changes, are the direct products of the special study and of the initiating legislation. Yet it would be difficult to deny that their existence has at least produced a reevaluation of existing practices and procedures by the industry, as well as the Commission, which can only be beneficial. In other words, the financial community has taken the opportunity to make its own special study, with valuable consequences.

As has been pointed out throughout this letter, the report of the special study is only a prelude; it discloses many problems whose resolution will require the efforts of the Commission, the exchanges, the NASD, and the industry itself. To these we will now turn our attention. Our legislative recommendations to the Congress will be an important first element, indeed a prerequisite for needed improvements. However, much of the action may be taken through the self-regulatory agencies, through exercise by the Commission of existing powers and through the influence of leaders in the securities industry to raise standards.

In concluding, the Commission wishes to express its appreciation to the members of the financial community, the self-regulatory institutions and the numerous companies that fully cooperated with the special study. Many gave generously of their time and manpower in assisting the study to gather information and viewpoints.

The superlative efforts of the staff of the special study and its supervisors must be especially singled out. All worked tirelessly and with a fine understanding of the heavy responsibility they were obligated to discharge. The Commission was uniquely and most strongly served in having Milton H. Cohen as Director, Ralph S. Saul as Associate Director, Richard H. Paul as Chief Counsel, Sidney M. Robbins as Chief Economist, and Herbert C. Schick as Assistant Director. Not to be overlooked are the contributions to the study in counsel and data collection of many persons in the operating divisions and offices of the Commission.

By direction of the Commission.

WILLIAM L. CARY,
Chairman.

CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for many months the attention of this Nation has been fixed on the Caribbean area and in particular on the island of Cuba, where the Soviet Union has established a powerful military base. Last fall the Soviets installed medium and intermediate range missile bases, imported medium range missiles into Cuba and stationed bombers there, precipitating the most serious cold war threat since the days of the Berlin blockade. Under a quarantine procedure, supported by the Organization of American States, the United States was successful in forcing the withdrawal, so far as we know, of these weapons systems.

But, Mr. President, the overall Soviet threat to this hemisphere has not been withdrawn. A substantial Communist military base continues to exist only 90 miles from U.S. shores. Soviet troops and weapons are still there and so far as we know, are still being kept fully supplied. In my judgment, the people of the United States have no choice but to face this situation realistically and work out a course of action to meet it effectively.

I am convinced the American people and most of our Government officials share the same basic premises which I do in considering the Cuban situation:

First, the maintenance of a Soviet military base in Cuba is a persistent threat to world peace. Its removal by any means short of war would enhance prospects for world peace.

Secondly, Communist activities in Cuba and emanating from Cuba pose a special danger to the stability of the Western Hemisphere. Not only the security of the U.S. facilities, such as the Guantanamo Base and the Panama Canal, and the reliability of launching and communication facilities at Cape Canaveral, but also the internal stability of Latin American States are jeopardized by the continuing Soviet military presence in Cuba.

Thirdly, the Soviets, we can be sure, will not remove their forces and weapons from Cuba merely because we have asked that they do so. Only if the burden of their maintenance on this island, thousands of miles from the Soviet mainland, is made intolerable to them, will they consider the possibility of withdrawal.

Fourthly, the United States and the Organization of American States have the right and obligation to require the removal of a foreign controlled military base from the Western Hemisphere and to use all necessary measures to bring about such a removal.

These premises, I believe, form the basis for a common consensus on the part of the American people regarding Cuba. But, individuals may and do differ and offer contradictory views on the very difficult question on how to act to bring about the desired results. Many people in public life have spoken out on the subject. A number of Members of Congress have made specific recommendations. These range for instance, from the blockade or quarantine proposed by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], to the recognition of a Cuban government in exile, suggested by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

There have, in fact, been many other proposals. I certainly do not claim for my own recommendations any particular infallibility; nor, of course, can I guarantee that my recommendations, if put into effect, would cause the Soviets to fade like mists from the Western Hemisphere. What I do offer, however, is my own analysis of the dangers that face us in Cuba, and, stemming out of that analysis, my own, personal views as to what course we can take in cooperation with other free world allies to bring maximum pressure to bear on the Soviets in Cuba.

Mr. President, these recommendations, which I shall be discussing today, are derived from a position paper on Cuba which I submitted on February 8 to Mr. John McCone, the Director of the Central

Intelligence Agency. This series of recommendations for U.S. action on Cuba was submitted to the President on the same day. It was agreed at that time that these proposals would not be made public until the President, the State Department, and others had an opportunity to review them.

A week and a half later—on February 19—I inquired whether it was at that time considered advisable to discuss publicly these recommendations. The next day I was advised by Mr. McCone that the President, of course, would not attempt to inhibit any Senator from discussing any matter, but that he felt that disclosure of these suggestions at that time might be harmful and might adversely affect the promised Soviet troop withdrawal, anticipated before mid-March. It was emphasized that the decision as to public disclosure of my proposals was entirely up to my own judgment.

Under the circumstances, however, I felt I should not go counter to the views of the Commander in Chief, regardless of whether I agreed with the rationale of his decision. Now that the middle of March has passed—indeed, the entire month of March—and a limited number of Soviet personnel have apparently been withdrawn, I see no further reason to maintain silence.

It has always been my view that constructive discussion of the Cuban situation is in the national interest and can contribute to the achievement of national unity and support for any effective program our Government ultimately adopts to eliminate Russian weapons and soldiers from this hemisphere.

Mr. President, this is not a time for lamenting and wringing of hands over Cuba. It is a time for a realistic review of the problems and a serious analysis of what can be done both in the short run and in the long run to meet the threat posed by a Soviet base in this hemisphere.

For that reason, I have decided to outline and discuss my policy recommendations at this time. I recognize that there are no pat solutions to the problem of Soviet Cuba; and offer my proposals only in the hope that they have sufficient merit to be worthy of study. Certainly, they will not be easy to implement and their effect may not be evident for many months. Nevertheless, I believe that they do offer an important alternative which should be seriously weighted and attempted before any more drastic and potentially more dangerous measures are considered.

First and foremost, let no one deceive himself into thinking that the danger is Cuba. Even Castro's Cuba, a country of 6 million people is not a military threat to the United States. And Castro as the head of such a state is no more able seriously to menace the United States than any other Latin American dictators, past or present, who have put their own personal ambitions and megalomania ahead of the welfare of their impoverished citizens.

No, Mr. President, the threat is not Cuba or Castro. The threat is the Soviet Union and Khrushchev. Those who try to conceal this unpleasant fact are not doing any service to the United States or the free world. They are only hiding their own heads in the sands of hope while the rough winds of reality continue to wreak havoc.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield; or does he prefer to finish his speech, first?

Mr. KEATING. I prefer to finish my speech; and then I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. President, surely this unpleasant truth should be clear by now. In fact, in his latest public utterance Castro appears to have emphasized the point himself. He revealed that the Soviets had taken the initiative and had requested the Cuban Government to permit the construction of MRBM and IRBM sites last fall. If this is true, the Soviets were not yielding to Cuban pressures in bringing their strategic missiles, as some Kremlinologists and Cubanologists have suggested. They were bringing the pressure to bear themselves, in order to menace to Western Hemisphere more directly. Of course, we cannot be positive that Castro is speaking the truth about anything; but those revealing words have not yet been disproved. They should be a warning to all who still choose to pretend that 180 million Americans do not need to pay any heed at all to 6 million Cubans. At this time the 6 million Cubans have, and deserve, the deep sympathy of virtually the entire hemisphere, but it is the 215 million Soviets and the power of Soviet Russia behind them that should be of concern to all of us.

Our ultimate objective, then, in dealing with Cuba, must be, as outlined in my position paper delivered on February 8:

First. The prevention of the spread of Communist influence and Soviet control from Cuba to other parts of the hemisphere.

Second. The removal from Cuba of Soviet-bloc forces, weapons, and other military equipment.

Third. The establishment of self-determination for the people of Cuba, through a freely elected constitutional government.

To block the spread of Soviet influence from Cuba, we must work closely with the Organization of American States. Meetings such as the recent Costa Rican gathering can be useful in devising methods to track Soviet agents throughout the hemisphere and in devising procedures for preventing the export from Cuba of propaganda, weapons, funds, and other equipment to promote subversive activities. This objective must not be subordinated to the enunciation of eloquent, long-range economic ideas, important indeed as that is. The United States must not measure the success of an international gathering by the amount of U.S. aid that is promised.

There are still too many ways for Communist influence and techniques to enter this hemisphere right now for us to be able to ignore the immediate threat. Tighter security is required in many areas.

Mexico, which still permits weekly Cubana Airline flights between Havana and Mexico City—parenthetically it should be said there used to be two a week; so it is an improvement to have them now only weekly—and is the principal gateway between Cuba and Latin America, was not even a party to the recent Costa Rican Conference. Other nations have under consideration the continuation of routes—which were discontinued at the time of the October crisis—between Cuba and the continent. Somehow, even U.S. citizens have found ways of reaching Cuba, so that they can return and can deliver glowing accounts of the supposed successes of communism.

Five nations—Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, and Bolivia—still have Cuban diplomatic missions that are hives of Communist activity. Cuban diplomats transport anything from guns to propaganda broadsides and hard cash. These routes, by which communism is exported throughout the Western Hemisphere, can be, and must be, better controlled than is the case today.

The recent upheaval in Guatemala and the disturbances in Argentina illustrate the continuing instability in Latin America which increases the danger of the export of subversion and violence from Cuba. This is a particularly acute problem among the smaller nations of Central America. Admittedly, economic, social, and even political conditions in some of these countries are not what they might be, and add fuel to leftist propaganda. Admittedly, United States aid through the Alliance for Progress and economic coordination through a Central American Common Market will be useful in the long run in defeating Communist propaganda. But the immediate threat is subversion, violence, and revolution. When a hoodlum grabs you by the throat, you do not react by shouting, "Federal aid for urban renewal."

In my view, the isolation of Cuba should be the most important of the O.A.S. objectives at this time. I believe it can be accomplished by—

First. Setting up O.A.S. inspection teams to monitor and inspect all ships and planes on arrival in Latin American countries from Cuba.

Second. A progressive, gradual policy of curtailing flights and passenger steamship routings between Cuba and other Latin American countries.

Third. Establishment of a complete trade boycott between Cuba and other Latin American countries.

Fourth. Denying Latin American cargoes or refueling facilities to any ships or planes trading with Cuba.

Fifth. Withholding of U.S. assistance to Latin American countries which persist in supplying or strengthening the links between Soviet Cuba and the rest of the hemisphere.

These recommendations were, as I have said, first presented to the President on February 8—nearly 2 months ago. Since that time, some of the steps I suggested in whole or in part, as well as some others, have been taken by the U.S. Government. Both at the request of Latin American nations and under U.S. guidance, we have tightened up on procedures for keeping track of subversive agents throughout the hemisphere. Surveillance over Castorist supporters has been greatly stepped up. In my judgment, all these moves are in the right direction.

Others of these proposals, such as a trade boycott, are in actual fact being very gradually realized by the increasing inability of the Cubans to offer goods for export or payments for imports. Some, such as the withholding of U.S. AID funds, seem to be more honored in the breach. But it is my convinced judgment that measures of this sort, seriously proposed and emphasized by the U.S. Government, can be forged into an effective OAS program against Cuba. I applaud the steps taken to date; and I hope they will be followed by some of the other measures proposed, as well.

Certainly there will be some opposition from Communist groups in Latin American countries. Some Latin American countries will be reluctant, as Mexico and Brazil have already been, but the point is that the United States must offer genuine and effective leadership. As President Garcio Fascio of Costa Rica, President of the OAS Council, pointed out recently on "Meet the Press":

> The OAS cannot have a definite policy without knowing what the policy of the United States is * * * We cannot take any step that the U.S. Government is not prepared to take because it is the one who has the responsibility of the cold war and the only one who can confront the military consequences of a clash with the Russians.

When the United States took the lead, as we did in October, the Latin American countries offered 100-percent cooperation. When we, on the other hand, deliberately downgrade the Soviet menace and talk only about economic development for the next decade, important as that is in the long run, then we do not get cooperation. That is one of the big lessons of the Cuban crisis. It must be taken to heart as part of an integrated and determined policy to rid this hemisphere of the Soviet military base that Cuba today represents.

OAS action, however, is only a part of the program which I propose and in many ways it is the lesser part. The real menace is not Castro or Cuba, but the Soviet Union. We must bear in mind at all times the fact that our principal objective is not merely to contain Castro but to effect the removal of Soviet troops and weapons. To dislodge Khrushchev from Cuba will require the cooperation of NATO and the entire free world. This, too, is possible, once our Government impresses upon the world what the real dangers are; once we make clear to the world that we are not afraid of a Cuban invasion of the United States any more than we feared a North Korean invasion of the United States in 1950 or a North Vietnamese invasion of the United States in 1962.

What we do fear and what we and the whole free world most oppose is a progressive takeover, as we saw in Eastern Europe, as we have seen in Laos, and as we may see elsewhere, under the supposed guise of legality, by a Communist power and dictatorship that will stifle the voice of freedom entirely.

Cuba today is isolated in geography from the rest of the Communist empire. But it is not isolated in the history of Communist expansion. It must be seen and handled in the whole, regrettable, unfortunate, but necessarily present context of the cold war.

The strongest weapon that NATO and the free word nations possess in this struggle is economic. The basic strength of the free enterprise system and the basic weakness of the totalitarian system are pitted against one another. Our strongest weapons in peacetime as in war are the muscle and sinew of our economy. Yet in the so-called peaceful competition between East and West, the Soviets are using every economic trick they know, while we, in effect, have too often ignored what we can accomplish by our genuine economic impact.

Particularly, where Cuba is concerned, the economic resources of the United States, of NATO, and of the free world could be mobilized with devastating effect. We could make the economic burden on the Kremlin for the support of their Cuban base well-nigh intolerable. Specifically, I propose a step by step program of economic pressure, on the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc, which I am convinced would do more to halt Communist expansion than any other nonmilitary method. Until the Cuban people are restored to freedom, we should, first, forbid U.S. cargoes of any sort, Government or private, to be carried on ships or shipping lines that have been used since January 1963 to supply Cuba.

Second, we should insure that no U.S. shipping facilities or cargoes anywhere in the world are available for any ships or shipping lines that have supplied Cuba.

Third, we should initiate NATO regulations to provide that no NATO ships carry cargoes to Cuba.

Fourth, we should initiate NATO action to insure that no NATO cargoes will be available to ships supplying Cuba.

Fifth, we should deny U.S. nonmilitary aid to any nation providing shipping, trading, or refueling facilities or goods for Cuba.

Sixth, we should cut off NATO sales to the entire Soviet bloc of any goods or equipment of a type which the Soviet bloc is supplying Cuba, except possibly food and medicine.

Seventh, we should initiate further restrictions on NATO trade and, where possible, institute a complete free world boycott on trade, with the Soviet bloc, so long as any Soviet soldiers or weapons remain in Cuba.

Mr. President, let me again say that I know it will not be easy to secure agreement for such measures. It will require powerful influence and serious persuasion on the part of the U.S. Government. I also recognize that even so these measures may not be sufficient to force an immediate Soviet withdrawal. Even the most severe economic pressure and trade restrictions can be withstood by the Soviet Union for some time. Nevertheless, I believe they must be the first step in a concentrated policy to make the continued Soviet occupation of Cuba intolerable.

Only after measures of this kind have been attempted strongly and severely over a reasonably long interval, barring some unforeseen exacerbation of the situation, should the United States seek to move further. Only then, in my judgment, should the United States consider reconstitution of an international quarantine around the island to prevent additional Soviet economic or military entrenchment in Cuba. Only then, should the United States seek OAS and NATO cooperation to; first, institute a quarantine on shipments by the Soviet bloc or other countries of any additional military equipment to Cuba; and, second, if even this fails to accomplish our objective, institute a quarantine on shipments by the Soviet bloc or other countries of any petroleum products to Cuba.

To some extent we are moving in this direction right now. The United States has put into effect limited shipping restrictions. We have persuaded some of our allies to do the same.

Yet in the months of January, February, and up to about the middle of March, 39 ships from non-Communist nations landed in Cuba. These included 14 British—counting 2 visits by 1 ship—14 Greek—counting 2 visits by 1 ship—4 Norwegian, 3 Italian, 1 Japanese, 1 Lebanese, 1 Spanish, and 1 Danish. On March 16, the Greek Government forbade Greek ships, excluding those on long-term charter, to trade with Cuba, an act which I heartily commend.

Although I have been asked not to reveal the exact dates, more of these ships arrived in February than in January, and indications are that March figures also will not reflect any decline from the 2 previous months; in fact, more probably another slight increase. None of these ships carried any U.S. cargo in the month of January because of the east coast dock strike. Only three that I am aware of carried U.S. cargo in February or March either—but this was less the result of official Government action than of the patriotic determination of the International Longshoremen's Association.

There has also been a sharp drop in overall free world purchases from Cuba, from $789 million in 1958 to $81 million for the first 6 months of 1962; and in Cuban purchases from the free world, from $771 to $41 million for the same periods. This is primarily due to the limited ability of the Cubans to export or to finance imports in view of their deals with the Soviet Union and their decline in agricultural production.

As far as trade between the Soviet bloc and NATO and other free world countries is involved, this is an area of increasing importance, which in my judgment the United States has consistently underrated. It is a subject I have spoken on at some length in the past, several times, on the Senate floor.

It is a well-known fact that the Soviets gain a great deal more than the Western nations from the current trends of East-West trade. Immediately after Stalin's death in 1953, Soviet economic experts determined that there were many areas in which they might profit significantly from increased trade with the West. Particularly in order to meet the Soviet requirements for rapid industrial growth, the Communists turned to Western Europe.

Communist-bloc imports between 1953 and 1960 from the industrialized countries of the West increased from $1.4 to $4.4 billion. Sixty to ninety percent of Soviet imports from European countries consisted of metals, metal shapes, transportation equipment, machinery, complete plants, and other goods representative of an advanced Western technology. Inevitably such items as electronic equipment for communications and control, precision machine tools, industrial handling equipment, railroad and sea transportation equipment, mills for sheet and strip steel, electric power equipment, and large diameter pipeline contributed greatly to Soviet industrial development. They enabled the Soviets in many cases to skip lengthy and expensive research and development programs. And these items help the Soviets in their efforts to "leap-frog" Western technological progress.

What does the West get in return? First of all, it must be admitted that European countries see the Soviet Union primarily as a market for their manufactured goods and, therefore, ultimately a source of jobs. What the European nations actually buy in return is to a large extent Soviet oil and petroleum products. These products could, of course, easily be purchased from Middle Eastern countries or from Latin America but at a somewhat higher price.

So, in effect, what is happening right now is that present East-West trade patterns provide the Soviets with what they want most in the way of Western industrial equipment and know-how. At the same time, it provides them with an important level where jobs are concerned in key west European countries. The French experience has indeed been instructive, for when the French coal miners went on strike, the Soviet Union canceled coal deliveries to France, already scheduled and contracted for, to demonstrate what they called "socialist solidarity" with the striking miners. Thus the Soviets used their trade position deliberately to influence the domestic economy and politics of France. In short, it should be completely clear that it is the Soviets and not the Western nations which gain by existing trade arrangements. Instead of using our powerful trade economic weapons to our own advantage, we are using them to help the Soviets. To cope with the present Cuba crisis we must use every means in our power to reverse this trend, to bring pressure to bear through trade and economic measures. The Soviets know how dependent they are on the industrial nations of the West. We are foolish to ignore this important source of economic power.

Specifically, I am concerned about the lack of coordination within NATO on trade controls with the Communist bloc.

I am concerned about the increasing sales of Soviet oil at cutrate prices, to create a market on which the industrial countries of Western Europe may come to depend.

I am concerned over the continued export to the Soviet Union of oil pipeline and other equipment that helps the Soviets to undermine Western oil companies, free world oil producing nations, and industrial security and aids them in their program of economic and political penetration.

I am concerned over the continued sale and transfer to the Soviet bloc of Western technology which the Soviets do not now possess.

In all these areas where the free world is strong we are literally selling our strength at a discount for Russian rubles.

Last year after considerable debate, an amendment to the Export Control Act was adopted of which I was the author. It provided:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to use its economic resources and advantages in trade with Communist-dominated nations to further national security and foreign policy objectives of the United States.
>
> Such rules and regulations shall provide for denial of any request or application for authority to export articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, from the United States, its territories and possessions, to any nation or combination of nations threatening the national security of the United States, if the President shall determine that such export makes a significant contribution to the military or economic potential of such nation or nations which would prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States.

This is now the law of the land and United States officials are obligated to abide by this language and this intent in carrying out the provisions of the Export Control Act.

In our dealings with other free world countries through the foreign aid program, we are equally lax in consideration of the cold war economic competition which we are facing. We provide aid to countries that sell strategic goods to the Communist bloc and in some instances our aid has even helped other countries build up powerful military forces with Soviet training and equipment.

Last year the Congress adopted an amendment to the foreign aid bill which I offered, providing as follows:

> It is further the sense of Congress that in the administration of these funds great attention and consideration should be given to those countries which share the view of the United States on the world crisis and which concentrate their own resources on economic development rather than on Communist-supported military or propaganda efforts directed against the United States or against other countries receiving assistance under this act.

This, also, is now the law of the land and should be the basis for consideration and decisions made to implement the foreign aid program.

In short, it is my deepest conviction, over years of study and attention to this issue of trade with the Soviet bloc that the greatest power of the free world is economic and that we are both neglecting and abusing that power. While the Communists thrust their aid like a weapon into the heart of the free world, some of our allies tend too often to barter freedom for a few pounds and shillings of profit.

In the particular case of Cuba, I believe that only a firm and determined policy will lead to Soviet withdrawal. The steps I have recommended are severe—admittedly so—but they are infinitely preferable to military force. We must use our economic might. We cannot hope to oust the Soviets with our right hand, as it were, tied behind our back. My recommendations at no point call for military action against Cuba.

The longer we delay effective action, the more difficult it will be to blunt the Communist drive in this hemisphere. Certainly risks are involved in an effort to engineer a Soviet retreat. Certainly the Kremlin would prefer to move forward than backward. But there are even greater risks if we do nothing.

The most difficult aspect of the programs I have outlined, I am well aware, will be to obtain the necessary understanding and cooperation of other free world countries. It will be possible only when we ourselves determine to face the dangers squarely and to discuss them in their full extent. Continued efforts to minimize the threat, even consciously to distract attention from it with plans, however meritorious, for the next decade, instead of now, will make it impossible to generate the united action and determination necessary for success.

We have in our power the methods and the means to conduct an effective policy toward Cuba.

If we use our economic strength, today, against the Communists, to promote a Soviet withdrawal from Cuba, we will be in a far stronger position tomorrow to make our economic strength work for Latin America through the Alliance for Progress and similar measures. If we do not use our strength efficiently against the Soviets today, we may find, as we are even now finding in South Vietnam, for instance, that it will be infinitely more costly and more difficult to achieve our objectives in the long run.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. MONDAY, APRIL 8, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, pursuant to the order heretofore entered, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock next Monday morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 8, 1963, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 4, 1963:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

John M. Cannella, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Irving R. Kaufman, elevated.

Charles B. Fulton, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida. (A new position.)

UNITED NATIONS

Edwin M. Martin, of Ohio, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, to be the Representative of the United

States of America to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Latin America of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the 18th plenary session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Bryan R. Frisbie, of California, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, in accordance with the provisions of section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Guy Chandler Mallett, Jr., of Florida, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

William F. Miller, of Massachusetts, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

Andrew F. Antippas, of Massachusetts.
David E. Biltchik, of New York.
Kenneth E. Block, of Maryland.
Paul H. Boeker, of Ohio.
Stephen W. Bosworth, of Michigan.
Kenneth L. Brown, of California.
Richard Irving Burnham, of New York.
Francis R. Campbell, of Minnesota.
James R. Cobbledick, of Connecticut.
Gerald de Santillana, of California.
Jerrold Mark Dion, of Washington.
Richard A. Dugstad, of Virginia.
William F. Eaton, of Maryland.
Frederick D. Elfers, of New York.
David A. Engel, of New Jersey.
David J. Fischer, of Minnesota.
Donald Keith Guthrie, of New Mexico.
Benjamin Hill Hardy III, of Virginia.
Jean J. Hediger, of New Jersey.
Miss Audelia V. High, of Illinois.
Robert W. Holliday, of Texas.
Kenneth C. Keller, of Idaho.
Edmund H. Kelly, of Ohio.
Richard F. King, of Louisiana.
C. William Lafe, of Pennsylvania.
William L. Lee, of California.
Hugh C. Lobit, of Texas.
Mark McCormack, of Pennsylvania.
Harry M. Montgomery, Jr., of New Jersey.
Bert C. Moore, of Ohio.
Glenn A. Munro, of Maryland.
Benjamin R. Parks, of Pennsylvania.
Charlton M. Pettus, of Missouri.
Allen Van Potts, of Utah.
Jerrold C. Rodesch, of Wisconsin.
Walter F. Schepp, Jr., of New York.
Merle W. Shoemaker, of Pennsylvania.
N. Shaw Smith, of Virginia.
Charles T. Sylvester, of Rhode Island.
Daniel Taher, of New Jersey.
Raymond J. Wach, of Ohio.
Haven N. Webb, of Tennessee.
John D. Whiting, of Wisconsin.
Thomas Edward Williams, of Kansas.
Richard L. Wilson, of Iowa.
Miss Hanna W. H. Woods, of Arkansas.
Ronald E. Woods, of Michigan.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Norman L. Achilles, of Pennsylvania.
Evan R. Berlack, of New York.
Stephen M. Block, of Connecticut.
Miss Ann P. Campbell, of Connecticut.
Richard C. Devine, of New York.
Robert Duncan Emmons, of California.
Robert P. Goold, of the District of Columbia.
John P. Jurecky, of Illinois.
Richard L. McCormack, of Florida.
Cameron H. Sanders, Jr., of New York.
Miss Mary J. Sommer, of Connecticut.
Miss Lenore E. Westfahl, of Wisconsin.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard C. Brown, of New Mexico.
James R. Bullington, of Tennessee.
Francis S. Hall, of New York.
James M. Hawley, III, of West Virginia.
Robert E. Lamb, of Georgia.
David F. Lambertson, of Kansas.
Melvyn Levitsky, of Iowa.
Edward W. Lollis, II, of Indiana.
Stephen Harwood Miller, of Pennsylvania.
Donald E. Mudd, of the District of Columbia.
Nicholas M. Murphy, of New York.
Louis V. Riggio, of New York.
Philip McPherson Rudisill, of Georgia.
Thomas A. Schlenker, of California.
John F. Simmons, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Rufus Grant Smith, of New Jersey.
Dennis L. Thompson, of Idaho.
Thomas J. Wajda, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Warren H. Brown, of New York.
Archie Davies, of Florida.
William B. Davis, of Michigan.
Francis T. Donovan, of Pennsylvania.
George Gurow, of Illinois.
H. Henry Heintzelman, of Maryland.
John F. Hogan, Jr., of Maine.
Rene Andrew Lutz, of Maryland.
James A. McGinley, III, of Florida.
John A. Mason, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
E. Bruce Miller, of Pennsylvania.
George W. Porter, of Louisiana.
Albert F. Reynolds, of Virginia.
Robert B. Sandin, of Virginia.
James A. Scott, of Maryland.
John W. Shirley, of Maryland.
Calvin M. Smyth, of Virginia.
Ernst A. Van Es, of South Carolina.
Francis E. Ward, of Rhode Island.
David E. West, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ned P. Holman, of Oklahoma.
Robert L. Smith, of Virginia.
Alexander J. Zeffer, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Dino J. Caterini, of Ohio.
Ernest J. Chiocca, of Virginia.
Jeff Corydon, III, of Maryland.
James R. Fees, of Washington.
Robert E. Knopes, of Maryland.
Theodore Kobrin, of Connecticut.
Bruce R. Koch, of Pennsylvania.
Jacques A. Prindiville, of Massachusetts.
Ismael Rivera, of the District of Columbia.
Wendell J. Roye, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Francis L. Albert, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
John C. Bonnet, of Virginia.
Charles G. Cogan, of Massachusetts.
James V. Joyce, of Virginia.
William B. King, of the District of Columbia.
Robert H. Lupton, of New York.
Charles A. Mann, of North Carolina.
Clare E. Petty, of Maryland.
Peter Ringland, of Maryland.
Harold Shapiro, of California.
Charles D. Stewart, of Michigan.
Serge Taube, of Virginia.
Joseph Stanley Toner, of Virginia.
Thomas A. Twetten, of Iowa.
Raymond Villemarette, of Louisiana.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 4, 1963:

Department of State

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

Board of Parole

James A. Carr, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1968.

Homer Lester Benson, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1968.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Albert.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

April 4, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable Carl Albert to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Dr. Arthur M. Romig, D.D., Presbytery executive, Presbytery of Washington City, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God of grace, God of glory, whom we know as Father, Thy name we adore; Thy purposes we would fulfill. Look down in mercy upon this company assembled. With knowledge of our weakness we seek Thy strength; in knowledge of our limitations we beseech Thine infinite power.

Lead us from mere prudence into venturesome faith; stretch our vision from the narrow horizons of human prejudice to the larger view of divine righteousness; and grant us the ability and courage to translate our sensitivity to human need into laws and acts that would make real in the lives of the people of this great Nation the divine purpose of Thy great goodness.

Hear our prayer and grant us Thy peace, dear Father. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 28, 1963:

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

On April 2, 1963:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

DUAL RATE CONTRACTS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker on Wednesday, April 3, 1963, the Speaker did on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the Senate:

S. 1035. An act to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. **BOLLING**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. **BOGGS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate on today, April 4, Friday, April 5, Monday, April 8, and Tuesday, April 9.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE McNAMARA

Mr. **STAGGERS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **STAGGERS**. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the many men and women who are rising in approval and commendation of our Secretary of Defense. Secretary McNamara has brought honor and distinction to a department that is easily the most important section of the executive branch of our Government today. It is vital to the adequate defense of our Nation and, indeed, to our survival in a hostile world, that this Department be headed by a man capable of directing and controlling the most powerful military machine in all history. Mr. McNamara has demonstrated a variety of qualities too seldom found in an executive carrying so much responsibility: a detailed understanding of the many elements which make up his job; unquestioned integrity; a willingness and ability to make quick decisions based on exhaustive study; a clarity in explaining the reasons for his decisions; a resolute courage in defending his decisions. The Nation is fortunate that it can enlist the services of such a stanch and able American in this hour of need. His conduct of his office leaves no opening for any proper political or industrial criticism. Informed sources both at home and abroad agree as to the brilliance of his performance, as well in the matter of conserving national resources of money and energy as in the more important matter of perfecting our military capabilities. I call upon all good Americans to offer fitting tribute to an official who is wise and farsighted, alert and active, faithful to his trust, and a patriot in every sense of the word. Such a tribute can be best expressed in strong approval of the course Mr. McNamara has been following in these difficult days.

FEDERAL TAX ON GAMBLERS IS A FAILURE—LET US HAVE A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. **FINO**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FINO**. Mr. Speaker, after 10 long years, we should be convinced that the 1951 Federal tax on gamblers is a real and complete flop. The recent report from the Treasury Department proves that this tax has failed not only as a revenue raiser but as a gambling stopper as well.

When Congress imposed this 10 percent tax, which the Supreme Court has interpreted as governmental recognition of gambling in the United States, it was then believed that it would pump into the Treasury $400 million a year based on estimates that the gamblers' annual take was $4 billion.

However, Mr. Speaker, in 10 full years, gamblers have paid into the coffers of our Treasury a little over $8 million for their stamps and about $73 million out of their earnings. This total collection of $81 million is a far cry from what should have been collected by Uncle Sam.

Although gambling in this country has grown into a $50-billion-a-year industry, only about 16,000 persons have confessed being gamblers by paying their Federal wagering tax.

It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, for our American taxpayers to understand the double role played by our Government in assuming a sanctimonious attitude about gambling while taxing gamblers, gambling winnings and admissions to race tracks.

Is it not time that we stopped all of this hypocricy and really faced sound reality?

It is difficult to understand our stubborn refusal to recognize and capitalize on the normal gambling spirit of the American people when we know that gambling moneys are being siphoned off by organized crime syndicates.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to strike a real blow at the underworld and that is through a national lottery which will not only solve the problem of gambling and crime but would add over $10 billion a year to our own tax revenues.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that a national lottery will never be a flop as a revenue raiser.

INVESTIGATION OF U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. **ADAIR**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ADAIR**. Mr. Speaker, I recently presented to the House of Representatives a number of petitions bearing upward of 20,000 signatures urging the Congress of the United States to conduct a complete and impartial investigation of the U.S. State Department. These petitions and almost all of the signatures thereon came from Fort Wayne, Ind., and indicate a deep and growing concern with respect to the Department of State.

At the same time microfilm copies of these petitions were sent to the President of the United States and the matter was brought to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

There are many things which contributed to the large number of signatures upon these petitions and the fact that a considerable portion of those who signed have emphasized their views in letters or personal conversations with me. These people are loyal, patriotic Americans, who desire above all that our Nation maintain itself free from the influences of communism. As they look about the world and see conditions in country after country they become understandably concerned. Particularly, are they distressed over the fact that there is in Cuba a Communist base which threatens not only our own Nation militarily and from the standpoint of propaganda, but is a menace also to virtually every republic in the American hemisphere. We have seen how Cuba has become a base for propaganda activities, and there is now a well-grounded fear that it may become an arsenal from which pro-Communist elements throughout Latin America are to be supplied.

This is only one of many illustrations which could be used, and I am sure that the intent of the signers of these petitions is to strengthen and preserve our

American Republic. I commend them to the attention of the Members of this House and urge that appropriate action be taken.

U.S. ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE NUCLEAR POWER FIELD

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, outstanding progress has been achieved by the Nation's nuclear power program in the brief decade following the passage of the Atomic Energy Act in 1954. No nation in the world has matched U.S. leadership in the development of this new source of energy. It is to the fullest credit of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and American industry, that technical progress and practical achievement have brought nuclear power to the threshold of economic reality.

Following upon the very substantial research and development efforts of the AEC toward the realization of economic nuclear power, 125 investor-owned electric utility companies are today participating in 1 or more of 25 nuclear power projects in the United States. These projects include—

Eight stations in operation with capacities ranging from 4,000 to 275,000 kilowatts, and totaling some 750,000 kilowatts.

Six stations under design or construction with capacities ranging from 17,000 to 325,000 kilowatts, and totaling some 550,000 kilowatts.

Four stations under preliminary planning or contract negotiation with capacities ranging from 395,000 to 1,000,000 kilowatts, and totaling some 2,300,000 kilowatts.

Seven utility group projects involve studies and research and development.

These projects are summarized in table I and participating utilities listed are discussed in table II. Details respecting the projects are as follows:

First. Santa Susana plant consists of the AEC's sodium reactor experiment, and the Southern California Edison Co.'s experimental station. The reactor plant was designed, constructed, and is being operated for the AEC by Atomics International, a division of North American Aviation. The conventional portion is being operated by the Southern California Edison Co., at its own expense.

Reactor plant design started July 1, 1954, and the entire station went on the line July 12, 1957. The facilities were installed to serve experimental needs and were an important preliminary to the construction of the Hallam nuclear power facility. Experimental data continue to be developed, and Atomics International has a program which may last several years.

During the past year the bulk of the effort was directed toward experimental work. In connection with this, the installation generated steam for a total of 2,617 hours and produced 2,264,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity over a period of 1,439 hours.

Second. The Vallecitos atomic powerplant celebrated its fifth anniversary of start of power operations last October. During these 5 years of developmental work this joint project of Pacific Gas & Electric and General Electric produced some 292 million thermal killowatt-hours of power and supplied over 40 million kilowatt-hours of electricity. In addition the plant has been used to train many reactor operators and has attracted over 31,000 visitors.

The plant's boiling water reactor was used in 1962 and will continue to be used in 1963 for AEC and General Electric sponsored development programs on high power density nuclear fuels, longer nuclear fuel life, and maritime reactor fuel studies. System stability studies were completed in 1962. In addition, a superheat loop in the reactor was expanded in 1962 to boost superheat fuel irradiation capability from one element to nine elements. The superheat loop is a part of the AEC's nuclear superheat development program.

The reactor was shut down in September due to a steam leak caused by a small crack in the recirculation piping. High thermal and mechanical stresses were identified as the forces responsible for the cracking. New piping was installed and corrective action taken to prevent reoccurrence.

Third. Shippingport atomic power station, the country's first large-scale nuclear power station, was constructed as part of the AEC's reactor development program. Duquesne Light Co. owns the conventional portion of the plant, contributed to the nuclear portion of the plant and operates the entire plant for the AEC. Shippingport was designed to function both as a test facility and as a power producer. Construction was initiated in September 1954—and completed the latter part of 1957. Criticality was achieved on December 2, 1957. Since then numerous tests have been made while the unit has also been operated as part of the Duquesne system.

In April 1962 a supplemental agreement was concluded between Duquesne and the AEC, which provides for continued operation of Shippingport by Duquesne Light beyond the expiration date of the present contract. The revised agreement will provide for operation during the burnup of core I, seed 4, the removal of core I and installation of core II, and for a period of 5 years beyond completion of the installation of the second core. Installation of this second core is scheduled for early 1964 and will increase the net capability of the plant from 60,000 to 90,000 kilowatts net. In addition, this new agreement provides for an adjustment in costs so that Duquesne Light's future expenses associated with Shippingport will be equal to those which Duquesne would incur in generating the equivalent electrical output of Shippingport by conventional means.

Initial construction of the heat dissipation system was completed in October. Operational testing was performed but terminated due to major control problems. The heat dissipation system, a part of the core II modification program, will operate in parallel with the turbine generator plant. This system was installed to dissipate the excess energy because core II is designed to produce 150,000 kilowatts and the generator has only a 100,000-kilowatt capacity.

Fourth. Dresden nuclear power station was designed and built by the General Electric Co. for a firm price of $45 million. Of the contract price, $15 million was paid as a research and development expenditure by Commonwealth Edison Co. and the other members of the Nuclear Power Group, Inc. The remaining $30 million plus the cost of the site and company overheads was capitalized by Commonwealth Edison Co. First criticality was achieved on October 15, 1959; first electricity was produced on April 15, 1960. The plant went into commercial operation on August 1, 1960.

From January 1, 1962, until it was shut down for the first refueling on November 7, 1962, Dresden operated 93.3 percent of the time with an overall capacity factor of 86 percent. The unit was shut down to remove and replace 192 fuel elements out of the 464 in the reactor and to make certain alterations and inspections.

Inspection showed the cause of sticking of one rod was galling between a chromium-plated sleeve and the index tube. Inspections of five other control drives showed only minor wear. Inspection of the lower case boron carbide control blades showed them to be in perfect condition. The grid support plate showed no new or enlarged cracks in areas previously inspected and only one in the area not previously inspected. Inspection of fuel assemblies showed a few failures among experimental elements. These will not be returned to the core.

Permission was received from the AEC to increase reactor power from 630,000 kilowatts—thermal—to 700,000 kilowatts—thermal—in September. A net station capability of 202,000 kilowatts was demonstrated at a reactor output of 675,000 kilowatts—thermal—prior to shutdown.

Negotiating a fuel reprocessing contract with Nuclear Fuel Services and the related agreements with the AEC have been pushed vigorously throughout the past year. It appears now that these matters would be settled in the near future. Without the incentive of the $30 plutonium price, Dresden probably will be operated as incremental operating costs dictate, the same as the conventional plants. This should result in an annual capacity factor of about 65 percent for the next few years.

Fifth. Yankee Atomic Electric Co.'s nuclear powerplant at Rowe, Mass., uses a pressurized water reactor. Construction was completed in July 1960; initial criticality was attained in August; and power operation began in November of that year. The plant was placed in commercial operation July 1, 1961, at an authorized power level of 150,000 kilowatts gross electrical output. The reactor was shut down for refueling on May 18, 1962, core I having produced 1.33 billion kilowatt-hours by that date. Operation was resumed with core II on September 21, 1962. On October 11, 1962, Yankee's facility license was amended to permit operation at 540,000 kilowatts—thermal—which corresponds to approximately 170,000 kilowatts gross electrical output. The new power level was reached on October 17 and operation at or near this level continued for the remainder of the year. Gross generation during this period amounted to 370,951,000 kilowatt-hours.

The project was undertaken as part of the power reactor demonstration program and was estimated to cost $50 million. Arrangements had been made to finance up to $57 million including cost of the initial core, working capital, and preliminary operation. As of July 1, 1961, when the plant was placed in commercial operation, the total cost of the project was $43.7 million, of which $39 million represented the cost of the plant and the balance, working capital, core fabrication costs, and organization expense. In addition, the AEC contributed $5 million in the form of research and development work pertaining to the nuclear design of the plant.

Sixth. The Saxton nuclear powerplant attained initial criticality on April 13, 1962. This 5,000-kilowatt plant is owned and operated by Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corp., a company formed by the domestic operating subsidiaries of the General Public Utilities Corp. The unit will be operated in a 7½-year research and development program. The program will include 5 years of operation with primary emphasis on exploring the possibilities of increasing nuclear fuel-use efficiencies and economies and lowering future capital costs.

Following attainment of criticality, zero power experiments were conducted in order to provide a reference for accurate interpretation and evaluation of future research and development experiments.

Power was generated for the first time on November 16 for a period of approximately 3 hours. The reactor was then shut down for a period of approximately 3 weeks to make a number of previously scheduled minor modifications and repairs. Electric power was generated again on December 16 and the reactor was operated for several days at 75 percent of full power starting December 26.

The AEC issued an amendment to the Saxton operating license providing for phase 1 of the Saxton research and development program. This will cover a period of approximately 1 year and include operating the reactor with chemical shim control up to 23,500 kilowatts—thermal—and operation with special test subassemblies in the core at power densities up to 16 kilowatt-feet of fuel rod.

Seventh. The Indian Point nuclear powerplant was built and financed by the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. This 275,000-kilowatt pressurized waterplant attained criticality in August 1962 and began commercial operation in the following month. Since the early part of this year the plant has operated at rated capacity. The nuclear reactor provides 163,000 kilowatts of the capacity and an oil-fired superheater 112,000 kilowatts.

Eighth. The Big Rock Point nuclear plant achieved criticality on September 27, 1962, 28 months after Consumers Power Co. was issued a construction permit for this facility. The first generation of electric power was achieved on December 8, 1962. Since December 8 the plant has been engaged in a stepwise approach to full power. Full rated power of 50,000 kilowatts electrical gross output for the first core and a sustained full power run are scheduled for the month of March. This program is necessary to verify plant capability and to establish normal operating conditions as a reference base for research and development activities. With the completion of these performance tests the plant built and owned solely by Consumers Power Co., will be dedicated to the conduct of a 4½-year research and development program under the auspices of the AEC. The program will include irradiation of developmental fuels; stability, transient and physics testing; and operation of a process computer system. The program also includes increasing plant capability to 75,000 kilowatts and providing data useful to the design and operation of large, economic boiling water reactors.

Construction cost of the completed plant was well within the original estimate for the project. The success of the operation training program is evidenced by the fact that the plant staff took full responsibility for and provided the manpower necessary for all plant operations to date with consulting assistance available from General Electric Co. The success of plant operations and favorable response to Consumers Power Co.'s public information program resulted in the Big Rock Point nuclear plant being recognized by the press as among the top 10 news items in Michigan during 1962. The public information center at the plant has handled over 150,000 visitors.

Ninth. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. commenced construction of Unit No. 3 at Humboldt Bay powerplant on November 11, 1960. This project is being financed entirely with investor funds, including research and development. Bechtel Corp. designed and constructed the unit on a rgular commercial basis. General Electric Co. supplied the nuclear and electrical equipment. The total cost of the unit is estimated to be $21.4 million. The design incorporates pressure suppression containment, which is believed to be a significant advance in the art. With it, in the event of an operating accident, escaping steam from the primary system would be quenched in a water pool, thereby reducing pressure rise after the accident.

The construction permit incorporating this feature was granted by the AEC on November 9, 1960. The public hearing for the provisional operating license was held July 19, 1962, and the license was issued on August 28. As of January 1, 1963, construction was essentially complete. The first load of fuel was delivered on September 25 and fuel delivery was completed December 29. Initial fuel loading began February 15, 1963.

Tenth. The Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, formed in 1956, have built a heavy-water moderated and cooled, pressurize-tube reactor nuclear steam generator under the third round of the AEC power demonstration program.

During 1962 the Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates completed installation of all major equipment in its plant at Parr, S.C. An AEC provisional operating license was issued on November 27, 1962. During hot fitup tests conducted in late November, minor mechanical difficulties were experienced which have delayed criticality. It is now anticipated that initial criticality will occur in midspring 1963.

Under the contract the Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates has with the Commission, the AEC supports the cost of the research and development program. The Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates bears the cost of administering the program and furnishes the reactor.

Eleventh. The Enrico Fermi atomic powerplant is sponsored by the Power Reactor Development Co., a nonprofit organization, and the Detroit Edison Co. Atomic Power Development Associates, Inc., is performing research and development and furnished the reactor design. In addition, Atomic Power Development Associates, Inc., is assisting in the nuclear testing of the reactor.

Construction essentially is completed, but nonnuclear testing in 1961 revealed two areas where extensive repairs and modification were necessary. The work required was nearly completed before the yearend, and in early 1963 various components were being reassembled and checked out for actual operation. It was estimated that from 2 to 4 months would be required before the reactor would be ready for fueling.

In December 12, 1962, during preoperational testing, a leak developed in the tubing of No. 1 steam generator and a sodium-water reaction occurred. All safety devices worked as intended and the resultant gases were discharged through a rupture disc to vent pipes above the steam generator building roof.

Inspection with the tube bundle in place revealed what seems to be comparatively small leaks in six tubes. An appropriate program to determine the cause of the failure and proper corrective measures is underway. This failure is not expected to cause a delay in the fueling program.

Twelfth. Construction essentially is completed on the Pathfinder atomic powerplant, rated 66,000 kilowatts with a boiling water reactor and an internal nuclear superheater. The plant, located about 5 miles from Sioux Falls, S. Dak., was designed and built for Northern States Power Co. by the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. with architect-engineering services by Pioneer Service & Engineering Co. The Central Utilities Atomic Power Associates, a group of 10 midwestern utilities, has furnished $3.65 million toward research and development costs and AEC assistance for research and development totals $10.3

million including a $1.8 million waiver of fuel-use charges. Northern States Power, as owner and operator, will be investing about $19 million in the plant.

Due to delays in fabrication of the fuel, plant startup is now scheduled for third quarter 1963. The startup program involves about 1 year in a step-by-step approach to full power so that commercial operation cannot be realized before late 1964. Preoperational testing of the plant is well underway and training for operating personnel is continuing. Northern States Power, as license applicant, and Allis-Chalmers, as plant designer, are actively engaged with the AEC in plant licensing matters.

Thirteenth. The Peach Bottom nuclear powerplant is being built by Philadelphia Electric Co. in cooperation with the nonprofit High Temperature Reactor Development Associates, Inc. (a 53-company association). These companies are building a prototype high-temperature, helium-cooled, graphite-moderated nuclear powerplant in response to an AEC invitation.

The plant is being constructed on a fixed-price contract for $24.5 million. In addition, AEC will contribute toward research and development performed by General Dynamics an amount not to exceed $14.5 million, including $2 million in postconstruction research and development. AEC also will waive up to $2.5 million in fuel-use charges during research and the first 5 years of operation.

A construction license for Peach Bottom was issued by the AEC in February 1962 and site clearance was begun immediately. All major plant components have been ordered and physical construction of the plant was approximately 28 percent complete by the end of 1962. The plant is scheduled for completion in the middle of 1964. Preconstruction research and development essentially is complete. The program for postconstruction research and development is in preparation.

Fourteenth. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. on November 28, 1962, received from the California Public Utilities Commission a certificate of public convenience and necessity for unit No. 1 at Bodega Bay Atomic Park. The petition for a rehearing before the Commission was denied on January 2, 1963. On December 28, 1962, the company filed an application with the AEC for a license to construct and operate a nuclear reactor as a part of unit No. 1.

The unit will consist of a nuclear-fueled boiling water reactor and a tandem compound turbine generator, with a nominal rating of 325,000 kilowatts. It will be located on Bodega Head on the Pacific coast, approximately 50 miles northwest of San Francisco, on a 225-acre site. The reactor will be of the single-cycle, forced-circulation type with internal steam separation. Fuel will be slightly enriched uranium dioxide in stainless steel tubing. Pressure suppression containment, first developed for the company's Humboldt Bay nuclear unit, will also be employed at Bodega Bay.

Fifteenth. Southern California Edison Co. and San Diego Gas & Electric Co. project: Southern California Edison Co. has executed a contract with Westinghouse Electric Corp. and Bechtel Corp. for the engineering and construction of its proposed 395,000-kilowatt—gross—nuclear powerplant, to be located in the northwest corner of Camp Pendleton, Calif. San Diego Gas & Electric Co. will acquire a 20-percent interest in the plant.

Site grading and excavation is scheduled to commence on October 1, 1963, and construction of the plant proper is scheduled to commence on April 1, 1964. This schedule is dependent upon acquisition of the plant site and the issuance of all necessary regulatory approvals in advance of these dates. An application for a construction permit and for an operating license for the plant has been filed with the AEC.

Good progress has been made with respect to the significant features of a contract between Edison, San Diego, and the AEC, under which the two companies will undertake to procure and operate the plant in accordance with, and as a part of, the AEC's power demonstration program.

The Secretary of the Navy has stated that the Department of the Navy has no objection to the location of the plant in the northwest corner of Camp Pendleton. Legislation has been introduced in Congress which would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements to Edison and San Diego for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the plant, and for offsite transmission and communication lines, access road, spur track, and other appurtenances to the plant.

Sixteenth. The Connecticut Yankee Atomic Co., formed by the 12 major New England investor-owned electric utility companies, plans to construct a 500,000-kilowatt atomic powerplant at Haddam Neck, Conn. The plant will use a pressurized water reactor. Its cost is estimated to be between $70 and $80 million. Completion date is tentatively set for 1967. Research and development assistance will be sought from the AEC.

The decision to go forward with plans for a large nuclear plant of this type is based on the results of a study which showed that atomic power cost is competitive now with fossil fuel costs in New England and gives every promise of producing lower costs in the future.

Seventeenth. A large-scale nuclear powerplant is expected to be built by the New England Electric System. While the original plan was for a plant of the order of 300,000 to 350,000 kilowatts, present thinking is directed toward a plant of 500,000 kilowatts or larger. The recent organization of Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Co., in which New England Electric System is a substantial participant, and its plans for construction of a nuclear plant of approximately 500,000 kilowatts for completion in 1967 has influenced the time schedule for the proposed New England Electric System plant so that a completion date in 1968 or in 1969 is now envisioned.

This plant must, of course, take its place in the orderly development of the future power-supply program for the system. It is conceived as a production plant, not an experiment or prototype. In view of the proposed completion date, the system has as yet no necessity to freeze on the reactor's precise type or design, and can continue to analyze and take into account continuing developments in reactor operations and design.

Eighteenth. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., has applied to the AEC for a construction permit to build a 1,000,000-kilowatt nuclear powerplant at Ravenswood, Queens, N.Y. The proposed plant will have a pressurized reactor and oil-fired superheater. The combination design is expected to produce electricity at a cost competitive with a plant using conventional fuel entirely. Preliminary estimates indicate construction costs of $175 million. The plant will be built entirely with funds raised by Con Edison. No Government moneys would be involved. Plans call for completion of the plant by 1970.

These projects aggregate some 3,600,000 kilowatts of capacity and will involve estimated utility company expenditures of almost $1 billion. Expenditures through 1964 are tabulated in table III. Furthermore, it is to be expected that additional stations and further substantial expenditures by utility companies will follow in time involving units not only in the 500,000-kilowatt category and larger but also in the smaller ranges of say, 150,000 to 200,000 kilowatts, as well. In line with this is the recent announcement of Pacific Gas & Electric Co. that it will depend on the atom more and more as time passes. If its Humboldt Bay atomic plant and its proposed Bodega Bay atomic park plan are as economically successful as Pacific Gas & Electric Co. confidently expects, many of its new big generating units will be nuclear. This could involve about 10 million kilowatts in the period 1970 through 1980.

While the majority of the reactor projects in which electric utility companies are participating make use of the presently most competitive types, there are a significant number which are designed to push existing technology to the utmost limits. Thus, there are found advanced projects involving not only converter and breeder reactors but also sodium technology, high temperature and gas-cooled systems, uranium-thorium complexes, and pressure-tube designs. In addition, the utility group study projects include advanced development concepts.

It was recognized from the outset that most of the stations being built would not produce economic power. However, these systems had favorable promise for the future, and justified the construction and operation of plants to identify the problems involved and so to accelerate the development of applicable technology. It is reasonable to expect that they will contribute markedly to our national reactor development program.

Another significant contribution by the electric utility industry has been the evaluation and clarification of nuclear power economics. The operation of power stations by power companies on power networks had made it possible to study directly and practically the cost of nuclear power. As a result, it is becoming increasingly possible to judge nuclear reactor designs in terms of true economic values. In this connection, the investment and participation of the equipment manufacturers has played a notable role and has contributed to the competitive environment which exists today for proven reactor systems.

It is significant to note that the growing competition of nuclear power is having an impact on the conventional power industry as well. As Congressman Holifield, Dr. Pittman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Federal Power Commission Chairman Swidler have pointed out, the competition of nuclear power has been a factor in the downward cost trends of fossil fuels in certain areas of the country. In short, nuclear power has already become a competitive element in the electric power producing market and, in this sense, electric power consumers already are enjoying fruits of nuclear power developments.

A further substantial contribution by electric utility companies to our Nation's effort is being made through the training of personnel. Electric utility companies have recognized the need for technical competence in this new field and have pressed the training of their engineers, scientists and operators in nuclear technology and related disciplines. In this manner, they have added substantially to the pool of human resources needed to support the Nation's growing program in the use of nuclear energy.

The electric utility companies' accomplishments, contributions and active participation in the nuclear power field have done much to complement and justify the efforts of the AEC. A strong feeling of confidence is emerging in the industry concerning the reliability and economic viability of nuclear power systems. This feeling of confidence undoubtedly will continue to grow as new stations are added to the power systems. There is little question but that the past decade's effort has brought nuclear power to a level of economic competitiveness in the high fuel cost areas of the country. It is safe to say that, by 1970, few electric utility companies anywhere in the United States will add substantial new capacity to their systems without considering the possibilities of nuclear power.

TABLE I.—*Electric utility company participation in nuclear power development*

PLANTS IN OPERATION

Name of participating utility and plant [1]	Location of plant	Reactor type	Capacity of plant (kilowatts electric)	Construction cost [2]	Research and development cost [3]	Critical	Commercial operation	Generation in 1962 (kilowatt-hours)	Total generation (kilowatt-hours)
(1) Southern California Edison Co.[4] (Santa Susana).	Santa Susana, Calif.	Sodium graphite.	[5] 7,500	[4] $1,340,000	----------	April 1957	July 1957	2,310,000	18,438,000
(2) Pacific Gas & Electric Co.[6] (Vallecitos).	Pleasanton, Calif.	Boiling water	[5] 5,000	[6] 572,000	----------	August 1957	October 1957	8,264,000	40,117,000
(3) Duquesne Light Co.[7] (Shippingport).	Shippingport, Pa.	Pressurized water.	[8] [9] 60,000	22,500,000	([10])	December 1957	December 1957	[9] 315,963,900	[9] 1,152,590,200
(4) Commonwealth Edison Co. (Dresden).	Morris, Ill	Boiling water	[9] 200,000	34,200,000	$15,000,000	April 1960	October 1960	1,192,735,900	[9] 1,974,916,360
(5) Yankee Atomic Electric Co. (Yankee).	Rowe, Mass	Pressurized water.	[9] 170,000	39,000,000	1,000,000	August 1960	July 1961	[5] 740,124,700	[5] 1,701,472,000
(6) Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corp. (Saxton).	Saxton, Pa	Closed cycle water (PWR).	[5] 4,000	[11] 6,932,428	[12] 286,392	April 1962	([13])	228,000	228,000
(7) Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Indian Point).	Buchanan, N.Y.	Pressurized water.	[14] [5] 275,000	126,000,000	11,000,000	August 1962	September 1962	60,672,385	60,672,385
(8) Consumers Power Co. (Big Rock Point).	Charlevoix, Mich.	Boiling water	[15] [5] 50,000	26,310,000	([16])	September 1962	([17])	[9] 28,900	[9] 28,900

PLANTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR DESIGN

Name of participating utility and plant [1]	Location of plant	Reactor type	Capacity of plant (kilowatts electric)	Estimated construction cost [2]	Estimated research and development cost [3]	Scheduled for commercial operation
(9) Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Humboldt Bay)	Eureka, Calif	Boiling water	[5] 60,000	$21,400,000	----------	Early 1963.
(10) Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc. (Parr).	Parr, S.C	Pressure tube, heavy water	[9] 17,000	[18] 18,540,000	([19])	([20]).
(11) PRDC-Detroit Edison Co. (Fermi)	Lagoona Beach, Mich	Fast breeder	[21] [5] 60,000	68,829,000	31,305,000	([22]).
(12) Northern States Power Co.-Central Utilities Atomic Power Association (Pathfinder).	Sioux Falls, S. Dak	Boiling water [23]	[5] 66,000	19,000,000	4,000,000	Late 1964.
(13) Philadelphia Electric Co.-HTRDA (Peach Bottom).	York County, Pa	High temperature, gas cooled.	[9] 40,000	[24] 8,000,000	16,500,000	1964.
(14) Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Bodega Bay)	Bodega Bay, Calif	Boiling water	[5] 325,000	58,826,000	----------	1966.

PLANTS UNDER CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS OR IN PLANNING

Name of participating utility and plant [1]	Location of plant	Reactor type	Capacity of plant (kilowatts electric)	Estimated construction cost [2]	Estimated research and development cost [3]	Scheduled for commercial operation
(15) Southern California Edison Co.-San Diego Gas & Electric Co.	Camp Pendleton, Calif	Pressurized water	[5] 395,000	$80,000,000	----------	December 1966.
(16) Connecticut Yankee Atomic Co	Haddam, Conn	do	[5] 500,000	80,000,000	----------	September 1967.
(17) New England Electric System	Massachusetts	Not selected	[25] 500,000	70,000,000 to 80,000,000	----------	1968–69.
(18) Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Ravenswood).	New York, N.Y	Pressurized water	1,000,000	175,000,000	----------	About 1970.

---

[1] Utility member companies of groups are shown in appendix II.

[2] Plant costs exclusive of switchyard and step-up transformers, but including interest during construction. Any exceptions for specific plants are noted.

[3] Made by sponsoring utility or other participating utilities; does not include contributions made by the AEC.

[4] Nuclear portion of plant designed, constructed, and operated for the AEC by Atomics International. Southern California Edison Co. built and operates conventional portion of plant.

[5] Gross.

[6] Pacific Gas & Electric Co. built and operates conventional portion of plant. General Electric Co. built and operates nuclear portion.

[7] AEC owns nuclear portion of plant. Duquesne Light Co. contributed to nuclear portion, owns conventional portion of plant and operates entire plant.

[8] Turbine rated 100,000 kilowatts. Plant to be modified to have increased capacity with new core.

[9] Net.

[10] In addition to expenditures for conventional portion of plant and the site, Duquesne Light Co. contributed $5,000,000 toward cost of reactor.

[11] Fixed price for reactor and auxiliary equipment, fuel and associated costs for 5-year research and development program, plus expenditures for training, licensing, insurance and other miscellaneous costs during construction.

[12] Administrative, operation maintenance cost of research and development program till end of 1962. Does not include manufacturer's research and development costs.

[13] Research and development project.

[14] Nuclear 163,000 kilowatts: oil-fired superheater 112,000 kilowatts.

[15] Ultimate capacity of plant 75,000 kilowatts (gross).

[16] The construction of the Big Rock Point nuclear plant required capital expenditures of approximately $12,000,000 more than would have been required for the same amount of conventional plant capacity. This amount is considered to be a research and development expenditure and as such is to be amortized off over a 10-year period. The cost of ownership of the remaining plant investment made available for research and development activities is also a logical research and development expense. For the coming 4½-year period this will amount to an additional $8,000,000.

[17] Plant now engaged in initial phase of a 4½-year AEC sponsored research and development program aimed at increased power densities, longer fuel life, and lower fuel fabrication costs.

[18] Does not include $1,650,000 administrative, employee training, and startup costs.

[19] Not available.

[20] Fuel loading scheduled early spring 1963, criticality midspring 1963.

[21] 100,000 kilowatts after fuel development program.

[22] Low power testing, April 1963. Commercial operation indefinite, probably early 1964.

[23] Internal nuclear superheater.

[24] In addition to this expenditure and its portion of the HTRDA research and development program, the Philadelphia Electric Co. will expend an estimated $4,240,000 for land, interest during construction, etc.

[25] Or more.

TABLE II

NAMES OF ELECTRIC UTILITY COMPANIES PARTICIPATING IN NUCLEAR POWER STUDY, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, OPERATING AND CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Projects in operation

1. Southern California Edison Co. (Santa Susana).

2. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Vallecitos).

3. Duquesne Light Co. (Shippingport).

4. Commonwealth Edison Co. (Dresden). Nuclear power group; American Electric Power Service Corp., Central Illinois Light Co., Commonwealth Edison Co., Illinois Power Co., Kansas City Power & Light Co., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Union Electric Co.

5. Yankee Atomic Electric Co. (Yankee): Boston Edison Co., Central Maine Power Co., Central Vermont Public Service Corp., Connecticut Light & Power Co., Eastern Utilities Associates, Hartford Electric Light Co., New England Electric System, New England Gas & Electric Associates, Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, Western Massachusetts Electric Co.

6. Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corp. (Saxton): Pennsylvania Electric Co., Metropolitan Edison Co., Jersey Central Power & Light Co., New Jersey Power & Light Co.

7. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Indian Point).

8. Consumers Power Co. (Big Rock Point).

Projects under construction or design

9. Pacific Gas & Electric (Humboldt Bay).

10. Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc. (Parr): Carolina Power & Light Co., Duke Power Co., South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., Virginia Electric & Power Co.

11. The Detroit Edison Co. (Enrico Ferm). Power Reactor Development Co.: Alabama Power Co., Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Consumers Power Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co., Long Island Lighting Co., Mississippi Power Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., Toledo Edison Co., Wisconsin Electric Power Co.

12. Northern States Power Co. (Pathfinder). Central Utilities Atomic Power Associates: Interstate Power Co., Iowa Power & Light Co., Iowa Southern Utilities Co., Madison Gas & Electric Co., Northern States Power Co., Northwestern Public Service Co., Otter Tail Power Co., St. Joseph Light & Power Co., Western Power & Gas Co., Wisconsin Public Service Corp.

13. Philadelphia Electric Co. (Peach Bottom). High Temperature Reactor Development Associates, Inc.: Alabama Power Co., Arizona Public Service Co., Arkansas Power & Light Co., Atlantic City Electric Co., Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., California Electric Power Co., Central Illinois Electric & Gas Co., Central Illinois Light Co., Central Illinois Public Service Co., Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc., Central Power & Light Co., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., Gulf Power Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., Idaho Power Co., Illinois Power Co., Iowa Public Service Co., Kansas City Power & Light Co., Kansas Power & Light Co., Kentucky Utilities Co., Louisiana Power & Light Co., Mississippi Power Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., Missouri Public Service Co., Montana Power Co., New Orleans Public Service, Inc., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Portland General Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Public Service Co. of Colorado, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., St. Joseph Light & Power Co., San Diego Gas & Electric Co., Sierra Pacific Power Co., Southern California Edison Co., Southwestern Electric Power Co., United Illuminating Co., Utah Power & Light Co., Washington Water Power Co., West Texas Utilities Co.

14. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Bodega Bay).

Projects in planning or contract negotiations

15. Southern California Edison Co.-San Diego Gas & Electric Co.

16. Connecticut Yankee Atomic Co.: Boston Edison Co., Cambridge Electric Light Co., Central Maine Power Co., Central Vermont Public Service, the Connecticut Light & Power Co., the Hartford Electric Light Co., Montaup Electric Co., New Bedford Gas & Edison Light Co., New England Electric System, Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, the United Illuminating Co., Western Massachusetts Electric Co.

17. New England Electric System.

18. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Ravenswood).

Study, research, and development groups

19. Empire State Atomic Development Associates, Inc.: Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., Long Island Lighting Co., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.

20. Texas Atomic Energy Research Foundation: Central Power & Light Co., Community Public Service Co., Dallas Power & Light Co., El Paso Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Houston Lighting & Power Co., Southwestern Electric Power Co., Southwestern Public Service Co., Texas Electric Service Co., Texas Power & Light Co., West Texas Utilities Co.

21. Southwest Atomic Energy Associates: Arkansas Power & Light Co., Arkansas-Missouri Power Co., Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc., Empire District Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Kansas Gas & Electric Co., Kansas Power & Light Co., Louisiana Power & Light Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., Missouri Public Service Co., New Orleans Public Service, Inc., Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Southwestern Electric Power Co., Western Light & Telephone Co., Inc.

22. Atomic Power Development Associates: Alabama Power Co., Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Connecticut Light & Power Co., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., Consumers Power Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., General Public Utilities Corp., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Hartford Electric Light Co., Indianapolis Power & Light Co., Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Long Island Lighting Co., Metropolitan Edison Co., Mississippi Power Co., New Jersey Power & Light Co., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Pennsylvania Electric Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., Southern Services, Inc., Toledo Edison Co., Wisconsin Electric Power Co., Wisconsin Power & Light Co.

23. East Central Nuclear Group; Appalachian Power Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Dayton Power & Light Co., Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., Indianapolis Power & Light Co., Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Monongahela Power Co., Ohio Edison Co., Ohio Power Co., Pennsylvania Power Co., Potomac Edison Co., Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co., West Penn Power Co.

24. Florida West Coast Nuclear Group: Florida Power Corp., Florida Power & Light Co., Tampa Electric Co.

25. Rocky Mountain-Pacific Nuclear Research Group: Arizona Public Service Co., California Electric Power Co., Iowa Public Service Co., Nevada Power Co., Portland General Electric Co., Public Service Co. of Colorado, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Rochester Gas & Electric Co., Southern California Edison Co., Utah Power & Light Co., Washington Water Power Co.

TABLE III.—*Estimate of expenditures by electric utility companies for nuclear power projects* [1]

	1958 and earlier	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Expenditures for plants [2]	$123,324,000	$98,451,000	$103,058,000	$84,054,000	$45,452,000	$39,211,000	$31,999,000
Other expenditures [3]	11,485,000	3,307,000	3,048,000	6,004,000	6,133,000	6,806,000	6,738,300
Total by years	134,809,000	101,758,000	106,106,000	90,058,000	51,585,000	46,017,000	38,737,000
Cumulative	134,809,000	236,567,000	342,673,000	432,731,000	484,316,000	530,333,000	569,070,000

[1] Based on information obtained from the major nuclear power groups and previous surveys made by Edison Electric Institute.

[2] Estimate of expenditures by electric utility organizations for the following plants in operation, under construction or in contract negotiations including accompanying research and development work, but exclusive of operating cost: Dresden, Yankee, Shippingport, Santa Susana, Vallecitos, Saxton, Indian Point, Big Rock Point, Humboldt Bay, Parr, Enrico Fermi, Pathfinder, Peach Bottom, Bodega Bay, Southern California Edison-San Diego Gas & Electric Co. project, and, Connecticut Yankee.

[3] Includes expenditures by individual companies and groups of companies for nuclear power study, research, and development. These figures do not include expenditures associated with any of the projects listed in footnote 2 above. Included in this category are the following groups: Empire State Atomic Development Associates, Texas Atomic Energy Research Associates, Southwest Atomic Energy Associates, Nuclear Power Group, Rocky Mountain-Pacific Nuclear Research Group, Atomic Power Engineering Group (up to 1959), Pacific Northwest Power Co. Group, Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. project (up to time of cancellation), Pioneer Service & Engineering Group (up to 1957). ECNG–FWCNG project (up to time of cancellation), East Central Nuclear Group, and Florida West Coast Nuclear Group.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5366, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 15]

Avery
Bass
Battin
Buckley
Burton
Cameron
Cederberg
Celler
Corman
Cramer
Dawson
Diggs
Dulski
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kluczynski
Lloyd
McDade
McIntire
Macdonald
O'Brien, Ill.
Pike
Pilcher
St Germain
Shelley
Staebler
Teague, Tex.
Tollefson
Walter
Widnall

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 5366, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 395 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering today one of the most important bills that this House will be called upon to consider during the entire session. It is the second largest appropriation bill that will be presented. This bill carries in total $16,100 million. Of that amount, I hasten to say, that $10,100 million is for permanent appropriations over which our committee has no control. The greater part of that amount is for the interest on the public debt.

We are faced today, in my judgment, with a very serious fiscal situation. To begin with, we have a public debt as of March 27, 1963, of $304,638,386,616.44 and in the slang of today, "That ain't hay." It is a tremendous debt that we, today, are passing on to future generations because we are doing nothing whatever to reduce it. The Federal budget has been balanced only six times during the last 32 years.

The estimated deficit for this present fiscal year which ends on June 30, 1963, is $8,800 million. The estimated deficit for the next fiscal year, 1964, is $11,900 million. That anticipates a deficit of $2,700 million by reason of the proposed tax cut. So we are going into debt every day.

The estimated interest for the fiscal year 1964 is $10 billion. That is an increase of $320 million over last year. The interest on our Federal debt alone is greater than the entire Federal budget in 1940.

Let me call your attention to this fact. Every time the second hand of your watch makes a complete circle, it costs the taxpayers of this Nation $19,000 in interest alone.

That is for every minute throughout the entire 24 hours for the 365 days in the year. That in my judgment is something to cause us to stop and consider.

I have heard a lot of criticism of the work of our committee on this bill. Let me say to you that I think we have one of the best committees in the entire Congress. I want to pay my respects to my colleagues on this committee: The gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. OTTO PASSMAN; the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. TOM STEED; the gentleman from New York, Mr. JOHN PILLION, the ranking minority member; and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. SILVIO CONTE. I want to tell you they have worked on this bill. I am rapidly acquiring the title around here of slave driver, and I am afraid that it is not without some cause, because I do urge the members to work hard and, at times, for long hours. My only defense is that I work along with them, however hard or long the task.

This committee held hearings for 1 solid month, during which we heard various representatives of the departments. If you really want to know something about our Government I suggest that you scan, at least, the printed hearings of our committee.

It has been the policy for the last several years for the full committee to call before them the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget for the purpose of inquiring into the entire budget and the fiscal affairs of the Government. The full committee did not do that this year; therefore, our subcommittee requested the Secretary of the Treasury and the Budget Director to appear together before us to discuss these matters, and you will find them carefully reported in the hearings of our committee. You can get some very valuable information there concerning the fiscal condition of the Government.

In addition to that we have a very able assistant, the clerk of our committee, who has done a magnificent job on this bill.

The bill, therefore, is not one man's labor, it is the labor of the committee; and I am happy to say that our committee comes before you today with a unanimous report.

To begin with we have followed the lead of our very able and beloved colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. MIKE KIRWAN. When he presented his bill to you last Tuesday, he called attention to the fact that his committee had started what I hope is going to be the policy throughout this session of requiring each agency to absorb as a minimum the second step of the pay increase which was authorized by Public Law 87-793 to become effective January 1, 1964. You will recall when we adopted the pay increase bill last year we provided that additional amounts should become effective in various steps.

The gentleman from Ohio started the practice in his committee and our committee has followed it in this bill.

The total amount of regular appropriations in this bill after taking out the permanent appropriations is approximately $6 billion, to be exact, $5,997,026,000. That is an increase of $331 million over 1963.

It is a cut in the budget request of $149,816,000. In percentages that cut is only 2.45 percent of the amount requested. But I do think I should say, in an effort to justify a cut of that magnitude, and I do not make any apologies for the cut, you have in this bill two of the oldest and most sensitive departments of the Government. There are no new activities in these departments. They are all essential activities that the Government has been carrying on for years. You cannot cut them 10 to 15 percent as you can with some of the agencies by stopping new programs. There are virtually no new programs in the bill.

So far as personnel is concerned, the total personnel requested was 14,088. Our committee recommended 11,273, which is a cut of 2,815.

Taking the estimates according to departments, we will start first with the Treasury Department.

The request of the Treasury Department was for $1,153,230,000. Our committee recommends $1,095,910,000, which is an increase of $102,946,000 over 1963, and a cut of $57,320,000. This is a cut of 4.1 percent.

I have not heard one single murmur out of the Treasury Department. If they have insisted that any of that be restored, I have not heard it. To the contrary, we have cut the Post Office Department only 1.8 percent on their request—as I will point out when I get to the Post Office Department—as opposed to the 4.1 percent for the Treasury Department. I simply mention it now in passing. Most of the increases in personnel requested were by the Post Office Department and by the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is necessary to go into every single item in this bill. For example, there is the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury. We cut that $80,000. They asked for 10 additional employees and we allowed 5. We think some additional employees are needed because of the tax studies that are going on at the present time. But I want to emphasize that this is an economy budget. I am perfectly willing to admit that. The Departments, in order to live within it, are going to have to economize. I think this is a fair budget and one under which they can live. In view of the fiscal situation today, I think we have got to move to the establishment of economy budgets.

Something very unusual happened in the Division of Disbursement. That is one of the divisions of the Treasury Department that has been making excellent use of the automatic data processing machinery. They asked this year for a personnel decrease of 71. Instead of asking for a larger force they asked for a decrease of 71 employees.

We come now to the Bureau of Customs, which is one of the larger bureaus, and I think we should discuss it briefly. They asked for $76,100,000. We allowed them $72 million, an increase of $4,490,000 over 1963, and a cut of $4,100,000.

They do have new programs. One of them the Congress put upon them last year. The Congress during the last session passed a law requiring the Bureau of Customs to enforce the law against the admission of Communist material into this country. What have they done? The Bureau of Customs and the Post Office Department have combined their activities. They are working in close harmony, not only in stopping Communist propaganda coming into the country, but also in stopping pornographic material.

Frankly, I must say to you that I had not paid much attention to this pornographic situation until this year, but our committee visited New York and saw some of the material that the Customs Bureau has confiscated there, and I want to tell you it is a most shocking situation. Not only is that material subversive, but a great part of it is perversive, and they are sending this pornographic material out to the youth of our land, striking at the fundamental morals of our entire Nation. The Bureau asked for 37 additional employees to work on that program. We have allowed all of them. In addition to that, they have been providing the Census Bureau with statistics for years. They were taking these statistics off of the unaudited invoices that came in. They began to make some checks, and they found out that a great many of those invoices were incorrect, as the result of which their statistics at times were from 10 to 25 percent in error. In view of this new trade bill it is very essential that we have correct statistics touching our trade. These statistics are used by the Commerce Department and the other departments of the Government. So, now they have a verification program on those statistics. They audit the invoices before they compile the statistics. They have asked for 89 additional personnel for that purpose. Representatives of the Commerce Department and other departments said the statistics were badly needed, and while it is bad enough not to have statistics, it is certainly worse to give incorrect ones. If they are furnished they should be accurate. In addition to this, they requested 251 personnel over and above those two activities. We felt that was too much. But, they do have a backlog in their appraisals and in their evaluation of the imports, and whenever that backlog piles up sufficiently, they cannot assess the duties in sufficient time to enable the importers to work their costs into their goods. Unless they know what the tariff is going to be, they cannot properly fix the price of their goods. So, we have allowed them 74 additional personnel, and we have suggested that they be used where they can best serve to cut down these backlogs which exist in the Department.

We put the Bureau of Printing and Engraving under a business budget some years ago, and it is operating very successfully. We do not appropriate any money for them, but they determine what their unit cost is, and they charge each department for the work that they do for it. However, they need an air-conditioning system in their building, and it is probably needed worse in that building than any other building in the city, because the engraving work that they do, requires not only uniform temperature, but it also requires uniform humidity. Last year we allowed them $300,000 for drawings and specifications for an air-conditioning system. This year they asked for $5,380,000 for construction. We did not allow that amount because we do not think, from the information we have, that the drawings and specifications will be ready in time for them to spend that money this year. So, we have postponed that until next year. Very frankly, it is not a saving, but we have taken it out of this budget. It will have to be appropriated next year because it is a very essential project.

The Bureau of the Mint tells us that we have a very substantial shortage of coins in this country. There has been a run on the mint in the last few years, and they do not know why. But at the present time the inventory of coins at the mint is at a very low ebb. As a matter of fact, if we do not pass the pending supplemental bill which will provide the additional money they need for the current fiscal year, they will be very severely handicapped. They are rapidly running out of coins. Therefore we have allowed most of the appropriation they asked for. We have recommended $7.3 million, reducing their request by some $420,000, which represents mostly the absorption of a part of the pay increase.

We have added—and I will say for the benefit of my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. ROGERS, who is standing now, and I assume is going to question me, because one of the mints is located in his district—we have allowed $125,000 for the installation of an annealing furnace at the Denver Mint, and also suggested a study at that mint.

Mr. Chairman, the sum of $125,000 will provide for 400 million additional coins. We are operating the mints today at a maximum. We are running three shifts a day and are operating at a maximum and still we cannot turn out enough coins.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress has before it a request to authorize a new mint for Philadelphia. We have made some improvements in Philadelphia. As a matter of fact the last improvements we made at the mint in Philadelphia we had to run some of the machinery outside the building through one window and bring it back into the building through another because of a lack of space within the building. We felt that through the installation of this furnace we can increase the capacity of the Denver Mint.

Mr. Chairman, we also recommended a study to see if something could not be done to increase the output of the Denver Mint further, which we think can be done.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I appreciate the gentleman giving me the opportunity to discuss the question of the $125,000 for the purpose of installing an additional annealing furnace and related equipment and facilities at the mint in Denver.

As I understand it, this is only what one would call a temporary stopgap in supplying the necessary coinage that is now thought to be temporary?

Mr. GARY. This will be an additional annealing furnace. The $125,000 will put in a permanent installation which will increase the coinage output by 400 million coins. We have asked for a study to determine whether or not we can go further.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It would not be a temporary thing, but it would not in any manner interfere with the so-called report as to the possibility of expansion of the Denver Mint?

Mr. GARY. No, it would not. We have asked for a study in order to determine how it can best be expanded.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And they have asked for this because the operation of the Denver Mint shows that the cost of production is less per unit?

Mr. GARY. That is right, and because it is a more modern plant and has more modern machinery. We modernized the machinery at the Philadelphia Mint several years ago, as much as it could be modernized at the present time. Before we can make any further changes at the Philadelphia Mint to reduce the cost or to increase the output, it will be necessary to build a new addition or plant.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman's request for further study involves an expansion perhaps of the Denver Mint, if it proves to be profitable?

Mr. GARY. We have asked for a report on that. This $125,000 is temporary in that we may add to it later on, but it will be a new and a modern annealing furnace which will enable them to increase the output, not as much as we want to increase it, but 400 million coins, which will help meet the shortage.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is my understanding that it is not the intention of this subcommittee to predetermine the so-called request for an additional mint as provided in S. 872?

Mr. GARY. Absolutely not; and, to the contrary, I will say that our committee intends to visit the Denver Mint next month and personally inspect the situation to see what can be done to enlarge it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I may say that I should like to welcome the gentleman's committee next week, because I am going to be home and would like to show them a good mint and an efficient operation. I wanted to establish a clear legislative intent here.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman; but some of our committee would also like to be home next week, so we are going to make our trip in May.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the next item is the Bureau of Narcotics. In my judgment, that is one of the most efficient bureaus in the entire Government of the United States. I earnestly suggest to every one of the Members that they read the portion of our hearings relating to narcotics. It will open your eyes to the things that are going on in this country. There are charts that will tell you the number of addicts, where they are, and you can see where the seat of the trouble is in this country in the matter of the narcotics problem. It will also show some of the very interesting cases that they have solved during the past year, in which they seized millions of dollars worth of narcotics coming into this country.

The Bureau of Narcotics is doing a magnificent job. We have allowed them a few extra men for work overseas because the agents we have had working overseas have been very effective.

The next item is the Bureau of the Public Debt. They surprised the committee with a request for a reduction of 104 employees. They are doing a magnificent job with their data processing machinery and have greatly reduced their workload in the last few years.

Mr. Chairman, the next is the Coast Guard, which asked for $251 million for operating expenses. We recommended $248 million. That is an increase of $27,600,000 over what they have for the current year, but it is a cut of $3,100,000 in their estimate for 1964.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that, of the increase that the Coast Guard is requesting, $28,500,000 represents items over which it has no control. For example, one of them is not really an increase in expenditure but a transfer of the ocean station program from the Navy to the Coast Guard.

Up to the present time, the Coast Guard has been operating this ocean station program. They have been manning the ships, operating the program; but the Navy has been paying them for it. Whatever the cost was, they sent the Navy the bill and the Navy paid it. We saw no reason for that situation. We thought that if the Coast Guard is going to operate the program, we should appropriate the money to the Coast Guard and let them operate it completely, so $17 million of that amount is merely a transfer item that heretofore was paid to the Coast Guard by the Navy. Now we are appropriating the money directly and I hope that when the Defense Department appropriations bill comes out that committee will see that that $17 million is cut out of the Navy program. We have apprized them of the situation and I am sure that they will do that.

The next item is the Coast Guard "Acquisition, construction and improvements activity." They requested $60 million which would be an increase of $26,670,000 over the 1963 appropriation of $33,330,000. We recommend $51 million which is an increase of $17,670,000 over 1963 and a cut of $9 million from their estimate for the next fiscal year. This is substantially higher than last year's appropriation simply because we have insisted on well-worked-out programs. We recognize that they must have safe and adequate airplanes, ships, and shore installations in order properly to perform their functions, but we have insisted for the last few years that they work out a program of replacement in each of those areas. They worked out the program for airplanes about 5 years ago and we have been going along with them on that.

What we wanted was a program of replacement that would give them a more uniform amount for replacements each year, rather than coming in and asking for large replacements one year and small replacements the next year.

Last year they said they had worked out their ship program, but they were not ready to present it, so we did not allow them anything for ships. Something was put in on the other side but we held it down. They have now worked out a program for their ship replacement. We felt we ought to go along with that program. At the same time, the program is on a 10-year basis. In view of the fiscal situation we thought it might be stretched out a little bit, so we have cut them $9 million.

The next is the retired pay. Congress fixes the amount of that and we can make no changes in the amount.

The next is the Reserve program. There has been a very careful study of the Reserve program of the Coast Guard, along with all of the other services, and we are allowing the amount they request, which is in keeping with the recommendations of that study committee. The budget contemplates the provision of additional Reserve facilities and equipment that is necessary to carry out the program that all of the services have agreed on.

Next is the Internal Revenue Service, and here is one of the most difficult problems we have had through the years. There is not a Member of this House, Mr. Chairman, that does not want to see every man pay his just taxes, because if he does not, then his burden is passed on to the man who is paying just taxes and it increases his burden beyond the point that it should be increased.

The Service has a most ambitious scheme. They have a scheme whereby they are going to have a central data processing center in Martinsburg, W. Va. Then they planned to have nine regional centers in various parts of the United States. Every taxpayer in the United States will be given a number. He places that number on his return. These returns are sent to the regional offices. There they are put on punchcards, and from the punchcards they are transferred to magnetic tapes. The magnetic tapes will then be sent to Martinsburg, W. Va., and there, at Martinsburg, W. Va., will be a complete file of the tax status of every taxpayer in the entire United States. It is going to take until 1969 to complete the program.

Our committee before they started on it said, "Listen, do you need all of these nine centers?" They said they thought they did. We said, "Go back and make a further study and see if you cannot cut the number." They came in this year and said they had made a further study and they could cut them to seven, and that alone would save $5 million a year.

Only one of those regional offices is in complete operation at the present time and that is the one in Atlanta, Ga. There they are processing both the individual and corporate returns. One has been opened in Philadelphia. They this year are processing the corporate returns but will not begin to process the individual returns until next year. Then gradually they will open up these centers all over the United States.

Our committee in January visited the one regional center that is in full operation, in Atlanta, Ga. We also visited the national center at Martinsburg, W. Va. There we saw the first refund checks processed on the new machines. They told us, "Now you can watch us compute 800 refunds." I stood there before the automatic machinery and I expected to see the wheels begin to turn, and there was just half a turn in the machinery and they said, "It is all over."

With a half turn, in a split second, they were able to compute on that machine 800 refunds. That tape was sent to the Bureau of Disbursement and from that tape the Bureau of Disbursement will print the refund checks. It is a system that should save the Government tremendous sums of money.

In addition to that, they have asked for substantial increases in personnel this year. We felt they did not need all of the increase they had asked for so we have cut them down rather considerably in their personnel requests. I know they think it is too much, but nevertheless we have allowed them some additional personnel because this is a growing country and you have additional returns coming in each year that have to be processed. So we have allowed them 500 additional permanent employees. They also asked for 777 temporary employees and we allowed them that entire number of temporary employees because we thought it is much cheaper to employ temporary employees during the rush season than to employ permanent employees. So we gave them the allowance on the temporary employees but held down on the permanent employees.

The next item is the Office of the Treasurer of the United States. As you know our former colleague, the delightful Mrs. Kathryn O'Hay Granahan is now Treasurer of the United States. As you all know, she is a very gracious lady and she came before our committee and captivated the hearts of the members of the committee as she does with everyone with whom she comes in contact. We allowed most of the money that she requested although we did cut her request by $100,000. I think she can absorb that cut without any difficulty.

The next item is the Secret Service. The Secret Service requested $7,260,000. We recommend $6,760,000 which is an increase of $1,065,000 over 1963 and a decrease of $500,000 in the estimate. Included in this request of the Secret Service is a request for 76 additional employees, 35 of whom were for the protection of the Vice President of the United States. There has been some discussion of this situation on the floor of the House, and I want to explain just exactly what the situation is. Just after the Blair House attack on President Truman in 1950, the Congress passed a bill authorizing the protection of the Vice President at his request. Of course, any Vice President hesitates to ask for protection. Thereafter, after the Caracas incident in Latin America when Vice President Nixon, as you know, was in grave danger there, the Eisenhower administration asked for the passage of a law that would authorize the protection of the Vice President without his request and placing that responsibility upon the Secret Service. That legislation was introduced by Senator Dirksen in the other body. It passed the other body and came to the House of Representatives late and was not passed during that session. At the beginning of the next session, it was introduced again and it passed the House on July 19, 1961, under a suspension of the rules without a rollcall vote. It was held up in the other body by Vice President Lyndon Johnson, because he did not want the protection. The Vice President left the city briefly in October 1962 and it was at that time that the other body took the bill up and passed it and it became law. That bill places upon the Secret Service the obligation to protect the Vice President as well as the President of the United States.

The situation is that the Vice President has never asked for protection; he does not want protection now; he would like to see the law repealed. I have that from his own lips. It is not secondhand information. But the Secret Service says "Congress has placed the duty upon us and we have got to protect him." Frankly, I think there should be the same protection for the Vice President of the United States as there is for the President; for, after all, he is the next person in line. However, at the time the matter came before the House the then Chief of the Secret Service, who has since retired, said it could be done for $100,000 and the House passed the bill with that information before it. The present Chief said he thought he would need 35 men and some $330,000 to discharge this duty. Our committee did not agree. Consequently we have placed the following language in our report:

> In connection with the request for additional personnel to provide protection for the Vice President, the committee feels that adequate protection should be provided for the Vice President and that his wishes in connection with such protection should be respected. When Public Law 87–829 was enacted, the former Chief of the Secret Service estimated that the annual cost of this protection would be approximately $100,000. The amount recommended by the committee would allow such protection as may be necessary, and in the event additional agents are needed to provide adequate protection for the Vice President during his travels, either within the United States or overseas, certainly the Secret Service should draw on its entire resources in order to provide whatever protection is considered to be advisable under the circumstances. The use of Secret Service agents stationed in localities which are visited by the Vice President, of course, should be used in protecting the Vice President when he visits such locations.

In other words if he goes to San Francisco they should use the agents they have in San Francisco rather than send a large group of agents from here.

Two were assigned to be with him at all times. That means that to have 2 regular agents on the job at all times it requires 10 personnel, because we have 5 for each agent on account of the changes in shifts, holidays and the time that these agents are off.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I shall be pleased to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Virginia has stated chronologically the historical facts. The Vice President opposed the passage of the bill making it compulsory that he be given protection by the Secret Service. If the Vice President had his own way now he would not want them. There has been a great deal of unfortunate publicity attached to the situation. Every emphasis should be made to show the position of Vice President JOHNSON which has been clear and distinct all the time. I can remember some years ago when I was talking with a President of the United States, chatting with him on some matter, something about the Secret Service came up. That particular President said to me: "John, the only one in connection with my safety who can tell me what I shall do and what I shall not do, will not do, is the Secret Service. They can tell me what I should do and what I should not do. It is the law and I have got to obey it." The Vice President is in the same situation. The law is on the statute books; it is identically the same as the law in relation to the President of the United States.

If anything happens in the future—and may God forbid—the record is clear if any error has been made as to whether adequate protection has been provided, and the report of the committee takes issue with the Chief of the Secret Service, then the responsibility will rest upon the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

There is a popular song, I believe, that "The Secret Service Makes Me Nervous." I can understand that this would be true of both the President and the Vice President. I think it would make me nervous to have them around me all the time.

The next item is the White House Police. There we have a substantial increase, but that is due to the fact that we have transferred to the White House Police jurisdiction over the entire Executive Office Building where important strategic agencies have their offices and highly classified documents are kept. It has been guarded by the General Services Administration, but we thought the White House Police were better qualified to guard that building than the General Services Administration.

The next is the Guard Force. There is very little change in that—practically none. Most of the addition is for increase in salary.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Has the gentleman finished his discussion of title I?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. May I say it has been a very clear, forthright statement, and I congratulate the gentleman for presenting it so well to the House.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I wonder if the facts are available or if the gentleman can pinpoint the amount of money in title I for traveling?

Mr. GARY. I shall be glad to give the gentleman that information. I do have it available right here.

Mr. JONAS. Would the gentleman rather wait and put a table in at the end of his discussion?

Mr. GARY. I think it would be better, because the figures I have here cover the entire bill.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman do that before he concludes his remarks?

Mr. GARY. I shall be glad to do so.

We come now to the Post Office Department. They requested $4,976,964,000. That is a lot of money. Our committee is recommending $4,885 million.

Let me say, like the rest of you I have received telegrams stating that we have wrecked the Post Office Department. That cut in the Post Office Department, as I pointed out a few moments ago, is only 1.8 percent, as compared with 2.45 percent for the entire bill, and 4.1 percent for the Treasury Department.

They tell you it will result in cutting off a lot of employees, that they are going to have to reduce employees; and, in addition to that, none of them will be able to get their pay increase. I say to you unqualifiedly that is not true.

I am perfectly willing to admit, as I said in the beginning, that this is an economy budget. We have cut it as much as we thought it could stand. We have cut it $91,964,000, but they do not tell you that we increased it $227,539,000 over last year.

In addition to that, they asked for 9,650 additional employees. Now, they are going to have to cut off some of those employees to meet this budget; they are new employees. It is not going to affect the old employees. We could not stop the increase in pay if we wanted to, and we certainly do not want to. That has been voted by the Congress of the United States. It has got to be paid. So, this budget today would not affect that in any manner, shape, or form.

Now, I will say this. Year before last the Post Office Department came in with an estimated volume increase. During World War II, we thought the postal volume was at a peak, and we expected after the war to see it go down. Instead of going down, it has gone up every single year since World War II. They estimate this increase and, of course, the more volume they have, the more employees they have to have and the more it costs to handle the mail. They came before our committee 2 years ago with an estimated increase in volume of 4.9 percent. Our committee said "We think that is too high," so we recommended 2.9 percent. It went over to the other body, and they made it 3.9 percent, and that was the amount finally agreed upon. Last year they came in again with an estimate of 4.9 percent. We cut it to 2.9 percent. The Senate raised it to 3.9 percent. Then, while we were having all of that discussion last year as to where the committees were going to meet and who was going to preside, the Postmaster General came in and said, "We overestimated our volume for last year. We think now the estimated volume instead of 4.9 is going to be between 2.9 and 3.3 percent; in fact, it looks like it is going to be 2.9 percent." And, that is what it was, and they turned back $30 million to the Treasury. Then he said, "We do not need the money for this year also, because we think the volume is overestimated," so we settled on the 2.9 percent. This year, although they are not turning anything back into the Treasury, they have absorbed $58 million of the pay increase for 1963. Now, that is a remarkable showing and I congratulate them for it. Frankly, they have finally come to our figures, and their figure this year is based on a 3.5-percent increase in volume, which is our 2.9 percent plus 0.6 percent that they estimated for the 2 additional days in 1964.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. In effect, the gentleman is saying that if we had not increased the salaries, they could have turned back $58 million out of last year's appropriation?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is a matter of record.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. PASSMAN. And we were subjected to just about as much criticism last year for making adjustments as we are this year; is that not a statement of fact?

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. The telegrams I have been receiving talk about a cut of $100 million. Of course, that is greater than the total cut for the department. The total is only about $91 million, I understand.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that the cut in operations is considerably less than that? The cut in the Bureau of Operations is only $69 million?

Mr. GARY. The cut in the Bureau of Operations is $69,814,000.

Mr. JONAS. And, if the gentleman will yield further, this cut would actually amount to less than 1 percent if it is related to the entire bill?

Mr. GARY. Yes; or related to their estimate which was $3.9 billion—$3,959,814,000.

Mr. JONAS. In other words, it would be five-eighths of 1 percent, someone tells me at the table here.

Mr. GARY. I am not that good a mathematician.

Mr. JONAS. I am not either.

Mr. GARY. I am not a mathematician, and never have been.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the record ought to show that in the field of operations the cut was only $69 million.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman the one thing I have tried to conceal all my life is my marks in school in mathematics.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Because some of us have been very discontented and really gravely concerned with this cut, those of us on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service are proposing to present at the proper time an amendment to restore these cuts. The amendment will be presented at the appropriate time by the ranking majority member, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Morrison].

I thought it would be well to give notice of that at this time.

Mr. GARY. Well, sir, I hope the House will not adopt it. But of course, we have to abide by the decision of the House in this matter.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I know this is reiterating just what the gentleman has said, but the actual decrease in the Post Office Department is $91 million from the total amount of the request?

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Mr. HALEY. If the gentleman will yield further, there is, however, an increase of $227 million above last year's appropriations?

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HALEY. And the appropriation for last year covered some unusual things which happened or they would have had money to turn back; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HALEY. This decrease will not affect any present permanent employee of the Post Office Department?

Mr. GARY. Absolutely it will not.

Mr. HALEY. And, further, in 1962 the Post Office Department had an increase of something over 6,000 employees? Now they are already in here, and this will not affect them in any way whatsoever?

Mr. GARY. Absolutely it will not.

Mr. HALEY. So the people who are screaming about this thing and putting out misinformation to the effect that this is going to cause a decrease in employment in the Post Office Department are absolutely wrong. There is not one present employee of the Post Office Department who will lose his or her job if this present proposal is enacted?

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not think that the postal clerks knew anything about this reduction until about 65 hours ago. It is somewhat surprising to me that they have acquired so much knowledge as to what the effect would be in such a short period of time. I am not being sarcastic. However, the telegrams which I have received certainly indicate that they believe they have far more knowledge about this matter than the committee.

I want to know if the gentleman from Virginia has received any of those telegrams?

Mr. GARY. I certainly have.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I wonder what prompted the telegrams to come in during this short period of 65 hours after the committee worked its will.

Mr. GARY. I have been receiving them and I have answered them by telling them just exactly what I have told the members of the committee on the floor of the House here today.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. With reference to the Bureau of Operations, I come from a very rapidly expanding area. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that the reduction which the committee has made in the request will not affect the Department to such an extent that it would be impossible for the Department to extend service where it is called for?

Mr. GARY. It certainly will not, in my judgment, keep them from extending services. Of course, to what extent it might interfere with it, I have stated in the very beginning that this is an economy budget and it may curtail their extensions to some extent.

I could not say to the gentleman, and I want to be perfectly honest about it, that it would not curtail extensions to some extent. We refrained from telling them where they would have to cut in any place. In addition to that they have the authority to transfer from one appropriation to the other. Therefore, if they run short in one appropriation they can transfer from another appropriation. They have greater latitude in the use of their funds than any agency in the entire Government, with the possible exception of the armed services. I think they can live adequately with this budget.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If the gentleman will yield further, where there is a real need for extensions it is the gentleman's feeling that the service can be extended?

Mr. GARY. Yes, it is my opinion that where there is a real need for it it can be extended.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. And, of course, we have a record in this committee of being extremely fair. When this bill goes to the other body, in all probability, if those who are presently complaining could make a case that we have cut it a few million too much it can, and always has been, reinstated. That is the record, is it not?

Mr. GARY. Absolutely.

Mr. PASSMAN. And this committee has a record of being extremely fair. In a few instances, in the 17 years that the gentleman has been on this committee, the committee has made cuts, perhaps a little bit too deep, but then we readily made available a supplemental appropriation so that the service would not be disrupted.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am not bragging at all——

Mr. PASSMAN. Am I not making a statement of fact?

Mr. GARY. I do not believe there is a Member of this House that has the interest of the Post Office at heart more than I do.

Mr. PASSMAN. I certainly agree with the gentleman and that is why I asked that question. There are two other stages—the other side and then the conference. And then if it is found that we have cut a little bit too deeply, which I do not believe, adjustments can be made at a later time. Always there is a supplemental appropriation that can be approved if it is found that we have made a mistake. But may I say that the record is abundantly clear that the estimates of the gentleman from Virginia have always been more accurate than those of the Post Office Department.

Mr. GARY. The estimates of the subcommittee, not of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PASSMAN. I shall accept that—the subcommittee. But is not that a statement of fact?

Mr. GARY. It is a statement of fact.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman can assure the House that if this cut stands it will in no way affect adversely within-grade step pay increases that are required by law.

Mr. GARY. We cannot affect those. Those are fixed by law. There is no way we can change that.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Precisely.

Mr. GARY. We could not change them if we wanted to, and we do not want to change them. Congress has acted on that. We have no disposition to change that and we could not do so if we wanted to.

Mr. JOHANSEN. At the risk of repetition, this does not involve any layoff or discharge of present employees?

Mr. GARY. Absolutely not.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask one other question and that is whether since this report became public, the gentleman has had any communication from the Post Office Department protesting this?

Mr. GARY. No, sir.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Then is it not passing strange, I will ask the gentleman, that we have this barrage of propaganda from representatives of the employee organizations? The gentleman does not need to answer this question if he does not want to, or if he does not know the answer, but I wonder whether the employee unions are now acting as spokesmen for the Department?

Mr. GARY. I have no information concerning the telegrams that were sent except those that were received in my office and I have answered those. Members have told me that they have had telegrams and I have tried to give them the information so that they could answer them.

Mr. JOHANSEN. It seems to me that if there is a valid protest from the Department, that is a management function.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. DULSKI. When the subcommittee was considering this appropriation, did they consider the $163 million deficiency appropriation which is pending at the present time?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir; we did.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has made an excellent presentation, but I think he is also sensitive to the fact that the public has been recently taxed 1 cent on first-class mail and are expecting better service from the Post Office Department. The question is whether they are paying more for the service than they are getting. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us whether there will be any curtailment in present plans for same-day delivery that were inaugurated in this city and in other cities by virtue of the cut that is now being proposed? That is question No. 1. No. 2, I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not there would be any curtailment in the proposed building plans of the Post Office Department with regard to new post offices or the machinery within the post offices?

Mr. GARY. I do not believe there will be any curtailment in the service. It was not the intention of our committee to cut to a point that would result in curtailment of service. Insofar as the building program is concerned, I cannot answer that. We asked for various increases in rent, and what the effect of those programs would be and of their commitments on present programs.

The statement has been made that this bill does not cover present commitments. If that is true, it is the fault of the Post Office Department because we did not have that information before us.

Mr. BARRY. There is a $7 million reduction in plans.

Mr. GARY. Yes. We reduced all along the line. We felt that time has come to economize.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true, notwithstanding the fact that we had a substantial increase in postal rates effective as of this January, it is now estimated that in fiscal 1964 we will have a gross operating deficit of $554 million?

Mr. GARY. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. That gives an idea of the cost of expanded service.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. BARRY. My understanding is that $450 million of that $500 million of which the gentleman is speaking would be allowed for public service, but it would be only a real operating deficit of something over $100 million for the Post Office Department.

Mr. GARY. I think it is allowed for public service that is not public service.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is, of course, a deficit. You are following the new formula to offset a deficit. You can offset a trillion-dollar deficit if you follow this formula.

Mr. GARY. That is right. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. In the discussion today, frequently the comment has been made that the committee has cut so much. I think it ought to be made clear that the committee has not cut back anything; you have merely slightly reduced the requests for increased funds over last year. For example, in connection with the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON], the report shows that while there was a reduction of $69 million for operations, there is an increase of $188 million for operations over the amount provided last year. So there is not a cut at all—no reduction for operations but an increase of $188 million over the current year. It is merely a reduction in the increase requested over last year.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

I have been on the Appropriations Committee for 17 years, and I have never yet made a cut in an appropriation bill that I can remember that I was not accused of wrecking the operations.

I have wrecked more programs, probably, than any Member of Congress, but they are all still running. They are the healthiest wrecked programs that I ever saw. I think if we wrecked a few more of them in that way we would be better off.

Let me say in addition to this we have made some appropriations here for the Executive Office of the President, but we made very little cut in those because we have three separate and equal branches of the Government and it has been our policy to let the President run his own office as he sees fit. We think that as the head of an independent and equal branch of the Government he is privileged to do that.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to compliment the chairman and the members of the committee for the outstanding job they have performed on this budget and the many budgets in the past. I must say in all fairness that about 4 years ago when the committee made a cut in the Post Office budget I was convinced that the committee had gone too far, Mr. Chairman, and I took the floor against some of the cuts. I did not prevail however. The Post Office operated very well with those cuts.

I would like to get some legislative intent here on the Secret Service so that the record will be clear. Is it the intent of the committee now to provide the Vice President with 2 Secret Service men around the clock, in all, 10 Secret Service men?

Mr. GARY. The budget request for the Secret Service was for 76 additional personnel including 35 agents and 1 clerk for the protection of the Vice President.

We allowed 30 additional employees, 10 for the Vice President and specifically stated that the other 20 were allowed for the tremendous increase we are having in counterfeit cases. They enforce the counterfeiting laws and they needed some additional personnel to enforce the laws against counterfeiting and forging of Government checks and we specifically stated in our report that 20 additional employees are allowed for that purpose.

Mr. CONTE. In other words, these 10 will be assigned to the Vice President, and if I understand it correctly, if he takes a trip someplace in the United States and he needs more to protect him, they will be taken from the field; and if he takes a trip overseas, they will be taken from the field to protect him in those places.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Of course, the two who are assigned to him will travel with him anywhere he goes. They will be with him all the time, but for additional protection in out of the district areas, they will rely on other personnel in that district. Overseas we felt we should give him unlimited power because we do not want to assume the responsibility for the Vice President when he is traveling overseas.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I would like to leave some time for other members of my committee. I would be delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. JONAS. I just wanted to remind the gentleman that he was planning to put in the RECORD, at the conclusion of his remarks, the figures on travel.

Mr. GARY. I have these figures. I am glad the gentleman suggested it.

For the Treasury Department, the figure for travel for the Secretary's Office is $61,000 for 1962, $60,000 in 1963 and $62,000 in 1964.

The total for the Treasury Department is $24,655,000 for 1962, $29,323,000 for 1963 and $33,023,000 for 1964.

The complete figures are as follows:

TREASURY—POST OFFICE AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE BILL

Travel

	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Treasury Department:			
Secretary's Office	$61,000	$60,000	$62,000
Bureau of Accounts	6,000	8,000	8,000
Disbursement	69,000	55,000	51,000
Customs	791,000	780,000	987,000
Mint	41,000	40,000	40,000
Narcotics	262,000	312,000	347,000
Public Debt	490,000	488,000	537,000
Coast Guard operations	6,393,000	7,141,000	7,455,000
Acquisition, construction and improvements	86,000	152,000	175,000
Reserve training	847,000	924,000	1,018,000
Internal Revenue Service	15,074,000	18,894,000	21,677,000
Treasurer of United States	10,000	13,000	13,000
Secret Service:			
Salaries and expenses	523,000	454,000	644,000
White House Police	2,000	2,000	9,000
Guard force			
Total, Treasury Department	24,655,000	29,323,000	33,023,000
1963 over 1962		+4,668,000	
1964 over 1963			+3,700,000
Post Office Department:			
Administration	3,966,000	4,593,000	4,727,000
Research and development	129,000	209,000	284,000
Operations	17,263,000	17,880,000	18,629,000
Transportation			
Facilities	28,000	35,000	45,000
Plant and equipment			
Total, Post Office	21,386,000	22,717,000	23,685,000
1963 over 1962		+1,331,000	
1964 over 1963			+968,000
Executive Office of the President:			
White House Office	21,000	25,000	25,000
Special projects	206,000	347,000	347,000
Bureau of the Budget	106,000	125,000	135,000
Council of Economic Advisers	10,000	10,000	10,000
Security Council	8,000	8,000	12,000
Total, Executive Office of the President	351,000	515,000	529,000
1963 over 1962		+164,000	
1964 over 1963			+14,000
Independent agencies:			
Tax Court	57,000	52,000	52,000
Intergovernmental Relations Commission	20,000	29,000	23,000
Labor-Management Committee	12,000	38,000	40,000
Total, independent agencies	89,000	119,000	115,000
1963 over 1962		+30,000	
1964 over 1963			−4,000
Grand total	46,481,000	52,674,000	57,352,000
1963 over 1962		+6,193,000	
1964 over 1963			+4,678,000

Mr. GARY. I might call the gentleman's attention to this, that the 1963 amount was $4,660,000 over 1962. We have been looking into this item and urging them to keep it down and try to hold it down. As a result, in 1964 there was only a $3,700,000 increase. There is an increase, but the increase was less than the year before.

Mr. JONAS. It does show that traveling is increasing from year to year in the executive department.

Mr. GARY. Yes, travel is increasing from year to year, but the same situation exists in substance in the Post Office Department.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment my colleague from Virginia on the bill he has brought to the floor today. I happen to know that he has devoted a great deal of time, energy, and work on the details of this bill; and I am sure he has not brought in here any cuts that the Department cannot well stand and absorb. I do hope that, with the work he and his committee have done on this bill, the House will sustain the reasonable cuts that have been made in this appropriation.

Everybody talks about cutting appropriations. This is going to be one opportunity where you will have the chance to resist some pressure that is being brought on you, as we all know, by different minority groups. I do hope that my friend from Virginia, if any amendment increasing the bill is adopted, will demand a rollcall vote and put the Members on record.

Mr. GARY. I certainly will ask for a rollcall vote on any amendments increasing the amount.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I know the gentleman is tired, for he has been on his feet more than an hour explaining this bill. I commend the gentleman and his subcommittee for the splendid job they have done. I especially want to say they have done a fine job in providing the machinery to curb the distribution of salacious material, and I am wondering whether or not the gentleman would care to make a little statement in that regard.

Mr. GARY. We allowed the budget request. We went into that very fully. It is a terrible situation. We allowed the full request both for the Post Office Department and the Customs Bureau. They are working together on it and together we hope they will succeed in eliminating or at least curtailing it. It is a very difficult situation now because the offenders are using first-class mail to send out their advertising matter. They get lists of the youth attending camps in this country or schools. They will send a letter by first-class mail and enclose some salacious material, and say: "We have much worse than this. Just send us $5 and we will send it to you." Of course no one can open first-class mail except upon authorization of the addressee, and the use of first-class mail complicates the problem. But all concerned are doing everything possible to curtail it. We are working assiduously at it.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that it will be the pleasure of the House to pass our bill without amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has consumed 1 hour and 17 minutes.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman from Virginia in his accurate analysis of this bill.

I am in full agreement with the present reductions proposed in this bill.

This bill is a reasonably good bill. The reduction of $150 million is a substantial cut. It is not irresponsible. It is fully supported by the testimony presented to the subcommittee.

In the markup of this bill, the subcommittee had to keep in mind the fact that these two departments, the Post Office and the Treasury are the major revenue-producing agencies of our Government. Reducing their operating costs requires delicate and skillful surgery.

I would like to express my respects to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia. He presided over the hearings with impartiality, patience, dignity and great wisdom.

I consider it my duty to publicly acknowledge the substantial contributions made by my associates, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], in improving this bill. Their searching questions and valuable suggestions not only helped to reduce the budget recommendations, but will also result in better, more efficient management by these departments.

Mr. Gunnels, of the staff, deserves special mention. His cooperation has been most helpful to the committee.

U.S. SILVER AND MINT CAPACITY SHORTAGES

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to restate the reductions recommended in the Treasury Department appropriations.

But there is one item in the Treasury appropriation that warrants our most serious attention and deliberation. I refer to the appropriation for the operation of our mints in Denver and Philadelphia. Those items involve basic fiscal and monetary policies.

Our Government is faced with an imminent, highly explosive monetary crisis. This crisis arises from a double squeeze upon our coinage operations.

First. We are faced with a critical lack of manufacturing capacity to produce sufficient coins to meet the public demand.

Second. Our Government lacks sufficient silver stock to meet the legal silver requirements for the redemption of our dollar certificates, and at the same time meet the requirements for silver coinage.

COINAGE SUPPLY CAUSES

There is a noticeable shortage of coins throughout the Nation. The Federal Reserve banks have been rationing coins to different sections of the country. The mints' inventories of coins are exhausted. Some firms in various cities have had to resort to paper script to relieve the shortages.

This is a most unhealthy and dangerous psychological condition.

The causes for this abnormal demand for coins are as follows:

First. An increased industrial demand for silver.

Second. The increasing number of vending machines.

Third. An expanding economy.

Fourth. There is a definite process of speculative hoarding of silver coins, and hedging against the devaluation of the dollar.

Fifth. A fear of inflation and growing lack of public confidence in the fiscal and monetary policies of this Nation.

COIN PRODUCTION AND MINT CAPACITY

The alarming increased demand for coins is illustrated by these mint production figures:

Our coin production for the years 1955–59 averaged 1.56 billion pieces.

In fiscal 1962, our production jumped to—more than doubled—3.46 billion pieces.

For fiscal 1964, our budget called for a prospective production of 3.3 billion pieces.

The Little report, of February 11, 1963, on mint capacity and expected coin requirements, projected a 1964 requirement of 3.3 billion pieces.

The demand for coins has increased so fast that, within the last month and one-half, since February 11, 1963, the coin requirement has been increased to 4.1 billion pieces for 1964. The Little report is already obsolete. That is how fast our coinage system has deteriorated.

THE 1964 DENVER AND PHILADELPHIA MINT CAPACITY

If the Denver mint operates three shifts a day, 6 days a week, and the Philadelphia mint operates three shifts a day, 5 days a week, it will be nip-and-tuck as to whether or not they can produce the 4.1 billion coins that will be needed for fiscal 1964.

These are maximum capacities. The ideal operation for efficiency is two shifts a day, 5 days a week. We lack a reserve capacity if there is a further acceleration in the demand for coins.

LEGISLATION FOR NEW MINT

There is now pending in this Congress a Treasury-sponsored bill to authorize the construction of a new mint. This mint will probably replace the antiquated high-cost minting facilities at Philadelphia. This new mint is needed and should be built. But, a critical time element is involved.

From the testimony before our committee, there will be protracted negotiations for a site. There are development and engineering design problems involved. The target date for construction completion and manufacturing readiness for a new mint is 4 to 6 years away.

This new mint will not solve the crisis that exists today.

The subcommittee took two steps to alleviate the lack of coin manufacturing capacity.

First. This bill provides an astonishing small appropriation of $125,000, and directs the mint officials to put into operation an annealing furnace at the Denver mint. This furnace is on hand, a leftover from the San Francisco mint.

This simple operation will increase our coin production capacity by 400 million coins a year at practically no cost at all. A 10-percent increase of capacity will be produced over the present combined capacities of both the Denver and Philadelphia mints. The new maximum capacity will be increased to 4.5 billion a year.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As I understand, the $125,000 is to step up production at the Denver mint at the present time.

Mr. PILLION. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And it has nothing whatsoever to do with the plan that the Treasury Department may have as to any buildings that may be constructed under S. 872 that the gentleman referred to.

Mr. PILLION. This is to meet an immediate critical situation to increase the production of coins in the next 6 months or year. The Philadelphia mint or proposed new mint, whether it is going to be at Philadelphia or not, or any other place, is a long-range increase of capacity.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That was evidenced by the statement made on page 528 of the hearings when we were cross-examining the director of the mint, Miss Adams, when she said:

> That is very practical if you can guarantee to us they will not decide upon a single mint and close the existing Denver mint after we put that extra money into it.

Now, that is the unanimous position of the committee.

Mr. PILLION. That is correct. I do not think there is any prospect or intent to close the Denver mint at all.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate that.

Mr. PILLION. Second, the committee report further directs the mint officials to study the feasibility and the time element involved in the installation of a third roller line at the Denver mint. This would add another 1 billion annual coin plant capacity.

These steps are intended to increase production capacity within the near future—6 months to 1 year—sufficient to meet and forestall any prospective panicky shortage of coins. We want to assure the public that there will be an adequate supply of coins for our needs.

These actions were not initiated or recommended by the mint or the Treasury officials. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], deserves full credit for this solution to a most urgent problem.

Mr. Chairman, the acute shortage of our silver supply is closely related to our fiscal and monetary policies. Our free supply of silver available for coinage is about 50 million ounces, or roughly $80 million. At the present rate of demand this supply is less than a year's supply. Our silver dollars are fast disappearing. In 1935 we had a supply of 500 million silver dollars. We thought that inventory would last forever. In the last 14 months the Treasury Department lost 60 million silver dollars. Today we have left only about 84 million silver dollars. At the present rate of demand these will be exhausted in less than 1 year. We do have 1.6 billion ounces of silver in the Treasury. That is worth about $2.11 billion. But this is not free silver. Against this silver we have outstanding about $2.14 billion of U.S. currency redeemable in silver. Therefore, this silver is not available for coinage under our present law.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a spectacular rise in the price of silver. In 1961 the price was 71 cents an ounce. In 1962 it rose to $1.05 an ounce, and today the price is roughly $1.26 to $1.27 per ounce. We carry this silver on our books at $1.29 per ounce.

The silver dollar has a content of seventy-seven one-hundredths ounce of silver at an evaluation of $1.29 per ounce. If the price of silver goes above $1.29 then it becomes profitable to hoard or melt the silver dollars.

In our subsidiary coins, the 10-cent piece, the 25-cent piece, and the 50-cent piece, they have seventy-two one-hundredths of an ounce of silver per $1 of face value. The ratio there is $1.38 per ounce. If silver goes above $1.38 then it becomes profitable to hoard these, or to melt down the silver subsidiary coin.

We must remember that silver is our secondary monetary reserve for our dollars. If the price of silver depreciates the value of our dollar correspondingly depreciates. We are being forced by our fiscal policies into a process of devaluing our dollar.

On December 28 last year President Kennedy under authority of law took the following steps to relieve our silver prices. First, he terminated the sale of silver by the Treasury at 91 cents per ounce. This action was taken rather late, and a large portion of our silver stocks were depleted. Next, the President called for the retirement of all U.S. silver certificates in denominations of $5 or more to be replaced by Federal Reserve notes that are not redeemable in silver. This retirement of silver certificates did not free enough silver to satisfy our needs for coinage.

Now, I note that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House has favorably reported a bill to demonetize silver. Under this bill—and I expect the bill will be before the House very shortly—the Federal Reserve banks will be authorized to issue $1 and $2 currency notes not redeemable in silver in substitution for the U.S. silver certificates, the $1 and $2 bills that are now in being. This action will replace about $2 billion worth of certificates and place them in the same category as the $30 billion of outstanding Federal Reserve notes.

This action will place about $2 billion of certificates in the same category as the $30 billion of outstanding Reserve notes.

The present 25-percent gold reserve requirement will be increased by $500 million. Our free gold to meet our foreign short-term liabilities will then be reduced to less than $3 billion. The total short-term liabilities held by foreigners payable in gold on demand or the equivalent of demand today totals $25.5 billion. Thus we have $3 billion of free gold promptly available to meet $25.5 billion of current liabilities in gold held by foreign institutions and foreign nationals.

We are at the mercy of foreign governments who hold our dollars and other short-term obligations. We are dependent upon the forbearance of foreign governments for our solvency.

The next step this country must take is to repeal the law requiring a 25-percent gold reserve for our currency and the Federal Reserve Bank deposit requirements. After we have done that we are headed down the road and the fiscally fatal step we will have to take is to internationally devalue the dollar in terms of gold and this of course means international fiscal bankruptcy; and we are pretty close to it. The political, economic and military consequences of such a step would be catastrophic.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second appropriation bill to come before this House. The day before yesterday the House acted upon the Interior Appropriation bill. I was personally proud of the action of this House on that bill. This House is charged with the prime responsibility for fiscal policy and currency regulations. This House I thought acted prudently to discharge its responsibilities faithfully and I have the highest esteem for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] who managed that bill on the floor of this House. It was a job well done. I know that this House will give the bill that is now before us the same careful and prudent consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I now address myself to the Post Office Department appropriations in this bill. This appropriation cannot be isolated from the total fiscal picture of this Nation. The administrative budget projects an $11.9 billion deficit for fiscal 1964. The President's budget made a number of assumptions that have not materialized. Unless substantial reductions are made in the budget recommendations the 1964 budget will not have $11.9 billion in deficit but it will exceed $15 billion and probably run somewhere between $15 and $20 billion. That size deficit would seriously jeopardize possible tax cuts. It would further destroy public confidence, discourage job-producing capital investments and weaken our economy generally.

This bill would reduce the Post Office appropriations by $91,964,000. This amounts to a percentage reduction of only 1.85 percent.

The Interior Department reduction was 10 percent. The Treasury Department reductions amount to 5 percent of the budget recommendations.

Based on a percentage comparison, the Post Office reduction is a modest one.

I would like to assure this House that every reduction made by your committee is justified by the testimony before the committee. Earlier, I said that this was a reasonably good bill. A reasonably good bill is not good enough. This House can legislate a better bill.

My criticism of this bill is that the reductions are not big enough. The budget figures and the testimony indicate areas where at least $75 million additional, could be cut without impairing services.

I would like to respond to the flood of telegrams with which the Postal Union officials are attempting to pressure and stampede the Members of this House.

I have talked to a number of national officers of these unions. These officials had no specific criticism or objection to the reductions. They expressed a vague fear that, in some unspecified way, these reductions might possibly affect postal employees.

Every member of the subcommittee has, year after year, been most solicitous for the welfare of postal employees.

It was this subcommittee that insisted that the day-by-day guides work measurement system be reduced to a minimum.

It was this subcommittee that slowed down the costly automation of the post offices.

It is this subcommittee that has pressured the Post Office Department to take into consideration our unemployment figures, so that automation does not take away jobs in periods of unemployment.

There are no present jobs in jeopardy as a result of these reductions.

There are no automatic within-grade salary increases jeopardized.

No present mail services are to be eliminated or curtailed.

There are no present postal routes to be eliminated or reduced.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that this blitzkrieg upon the Members of Congress emanates from the Post Office Department. They have misrepresented the facts to the union officials. These officials are fearful of reprisals from the Post Office officials if they do not put pressure upon the Members of Congress to restore these cuts.

The union officials are acting upon misrepresentations made by Post Office officials as to the effect of these reductions upon their union members. The Post Office Department is not acting in good faith. They are responsible for this campaign of political intimidation against the membership of this House.

The question here is this, Shall this Congress allow itself to be stampeded and coerced into providing funds for the Post Office over and above their established and justified needs?

Mr. Chairman, I anticipate that an attempt will be made to restore the $69,814,000 by which the operations appropriation has been reduced in this budget.

This is less than a 2-percent reduction. The committee has asked the Post Office to absorb $43 million of the 2½-percent pay increase that will become effective on January 1, 1964.

So the absorption of $43 million is less than the absorption in 1963. I want to point out, it is very important to note that the $58 million absorption in 1963 is not carried over into 1964. So the absorption in 1964 is a great deal less than the absorption they were able to make in the year 1963.

Let me say a word or two about the automatic-step increases. It is claimed this budget would affect that. It does not affect the automatic-step increases one iota. There is not any employee who can or will be denied a step increase under this bill. The committee has carefully examined into this item. The budget item stated in the budget for this program was given to us as costing $46.6 million. In 1963 it only amounted to $13.3 million. Mr. Nicholson, Assistant Postmaster General, testified that only $18 million is required for automatic-step increases. So this item alone is overstated by $28.6 million and can be and should be reduced by that amount.

Let us consider the item of temporary personnel cuts. The budget requested an increase of $51 million for temporary personnel. The pay increases and the two extra days for temporary personnel totals only $56 million. This is an item that can and should be cut by an additional $15 million.

Next, we have the item of lapses. The lapses are the differences in the annual rate of pay and the sums left over from the annual salaries that are budgeted due to the termination of jobs in any year. In 1963, the savings to the Department from lapses for 3,216 terminations of jobs amounted to $32,147,000. In 1964, there will be more lapses, more terminations of jobs than in 1963, a total of 3,358. Yet, they budgeted a saving in this area of only $18.3 million. The budget has understated its savings from this account by $14 million. This bill should be reduced by an additional $14 million over and above the amount in this bill.

Next, let us take the item of facilities. The Post Office Department has embarked upon a grandiose 5-year program for the leasing of newly constructed post office buildings. They plan to have constructed and lease back 7,000 new buildings over the next 5 years. The total construction costs will be $800 million or more. Let us just see what that does to the annual budget. This is the way these annual lease costs have risen. Just let me give you a few figures. They are startling. The lease cost rental for leases in 1960 were $44 million. In 1964, that is this year, the annual lease costs have jumped by 100 percent. Today, they stand at $87 million a year.

In 1967 the lease cost will amount to $153 million. That is another jump of $67 million. This item for facilities, in my estimation should be reduced to the 1963 level of $160 million. This bill allows an increase of $18 million. You could well do without that increase.

So far I have itemized a number of areas where reductions can and should be made in this bill in addition to what the committee has recommended, and now these additional reductions would not cut back one job or in any way impair a necessary service, and they are conservative reductions.

Additional reducible items in my estimation are as follows: First, the automatic step increase, $28,600,000; temporary personnel cuts by $15 million; lapses which are understated by $14 million; and facilities, a reduction of $18 million. The total of these reductions that could be made without hurting the service in any way amounts to $75.6 million.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is not a tough bill. If anything it is overly generous. The Post Office budget figures in many areas are adequate, and I would recommend that we fully sustain the cuts contained in this bill if we cannot reduce the amounts that I have mentioned here that ought to be reduced, that should be reduced.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. FOREMAN. Is the gentleman going to propose an amendment to effectuate these additional cuts?

Mr. PILLION. No; I proposed it in the committee, but I do not intend to propose amendments on the floor.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman for his generous remarks.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. REIFEL. Recently the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service announced that there would be some consolidations of regional offices. It just happens that the district office in my State is involved to the extent of the possibility of the transfer of some 17 families the heads of which have been employed there for a number of years, and own their homes. Naturally, they are concerned. We had a meeting with the regional director at which time he explained that the proposal was held up, and under review by Secretary Dillon. However, if the plans are carried out it would take place probably by next January. I read in the committee report on page 9 just below the center of the page the following paragraph:

> As stated in its report last year, the committee approves in principle the long-range plan of the Internal Revenue Service. However, after visiting some of the installations in the field early this year, the committee continues to be of the opinion that the Service is attempting to progress too rapidly in the implementation of its long-range plan and that valuable experience to be gained from the automatic data processing installations in Atlanta, Ga., and Martinsburg, W. Va., will not be fully realized unless the plan is extended and the other planned service centers are phased in on a more reasonable schedule.

Was the fact that this consolidation was being held up for review taken into consideration by the committee as evidence of moving a little more rapidly than might be desirable?

Mr. PILLION. Yes, the committee felt that these automatic data processing stations in the country were moving too fast to profit from the experience of the automatic data processing systems in Atlanta and Martinsburg.

We felt to put in this mechanism and get the greatest benefit from it we should not attempt to build it on a crash-type program.

Mr. REIFEL. Does the gentleman have information other than that given to him by the Commission in the hearings as reported that this review is going to slow this up beyond January 1?

Mr. PILLION. I have no definite information, but under the original order for the consolidation the effective date was January 1 of next year, as the gentleman knows. So I assume that the reconsideration or review would probably put off and delay this consolidation.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. Along this line, the gentleman talked about the automatic data processing installations and additional automation in the handling of IRS returns.

If we are expanding our agency installations, this automatic handling of returns, why is it that we continue each year to add additional personnel to the IRS in 1964, numbering 1,277 personnel?

Mr. PILLION. Of course these are always sold on the idea that the electronic processing equipment will do the work that was formerly done manually; but in the Income Tax Division, the Internal Revenue Service, we find that the automatic data processing system is able to make all these recordings and send them to Virginia or elsewhere. We find some have missed out. These returns must be audited and investigated. If we find a thousand people have failed to account for their bank interest, for instance, you have to have someone to audit them and investigate them and make the collections. That is where these additional employees come in.

Mr. FOREMAN. The more automation you get the more time and personnel is required, and the more we try to save the more we have to check up on them.

Mr. PILLION. That is exactly it.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. I am also interested, as our friend was, in these proposed mergers throughout the country, the Internal Revenue Service and its representation that it is going to be able to save some $5 million. As far as my personal investigation is concerned, I find no logical basis for that statement that there will be any appreciable savings in these proposed mergers. I am wondering whether or not the gentleman's subcommittee at any time was given concrete figures by the IRS which would reflect that this is in fact a savings that will be effective.

Mr. PILLION. No, we do not have any concrete figures that I recollect. They thought they could make savings not only in the consolidation of the regional offices but also in the consolidation of district offices. How much they can save or what areas they will consolidate or what offices they will consolidate we thought was an administrative matter rather than one within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. CAHILL. What I am seeking to find out is if there is any way a Member can find out the basis for this projected figure of $5 million.

Mr. PILLION. Oh, yes, surely. All you have to do is to request it, and I am sure they will give you the details.

Mr. CAHILL. I have not been able to determine it.

Mr. PILLION. Has the gentleman asked?

Mr. CAHILL. Yes.

Mr. PILLION. We will be pleased to ask them and get the information for the gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. In the appropriation for the Bureau of the Budget you have allowed them an additional $416,000 here in this proposed budget for 12 new employees. Will the addition of these 12 new employees work to lower the budget or up the budget?

What is this going to do to the budget?

Mr. PILLION. Well, I do not know. Supposedly they are working to reduce the budget, and they do quite a job. The departments come in with estimates a great deal larger than the final recommendations in the budget, so there is probably some justification for it.

Mr. FOREMAN. Did they specifically state in appearing before the committee what the jobs of these additional employees would be; what they would be used for?

Mr. PILLION. No. We cannot go quite that far into detail, because then we get into management, we get into administrative areas. We do not go into what each man will be doing.

Mr. FOREMAN. One other point. I notice the Council of Economic Advisers, which I believe Mr. Heller is the chairman of.

Mr. PILLION. That is the think factory. They do economic thinking and speculation.

Mr. FOREMAN. Getting $13,000 more worth of thinking or perhaps antithinking. I mean, is this for additional employees for the Council of Economic Advisers, or is this for salary increases for those that are there?

Mr. PILLION. I do not know; I cannot say. But, I assume it is for pay raises under the pay scale. I do not know; I do not recollect the testimony.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins, would he yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. As the gentleman knows, like many of us, I am exceedingly interested in trying to be as economical with our expenditures as we can. At the same time I am interested that where we cut the budget, we are fair and do it judiciously. Therefore, I wonder if the gentleman would answer three specific questions very briefly for me.

First, will the reduction which the committee has suggested in this bill cause the elimination of any personnel presently on the rolls of the department?

Mr. CONTE. Definitely not.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Secondly, will it affect anyone within the department insofar as the scheduled pay raises are concerned under the pay raise bill that we passed last year?

Mr. CONTE. Certainly not. As the chairman pointed out, this is by statute that the Congress passed, and if the committee wanted to cut the pay increase, it could not do it. And, I want to make it specifically clear that the committee had no intent of cutting any pay increase. They are all in favor of the pay increase. However, regardless of that, this is by statute. It is completely out of our jurisdiction, and nothing can be done about it.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I appreciate that fact. Now, just one more, which has to do with the extension of service. It is my understanding that the Department requested some 9,000 additional personnel for next year in addition to the 16,000 which have been added to the rolls in the past 2 years; that they also requested additional funds for the extension of service, in addition to the extra personnel. Is it your claim that the reductions which have been suggested by the committee will drastically curtail the Department's plans for extension of service?

Mr. CONTE. To the best of my knowledge, I do not think that there will be any curtailment of extension of service. You must understand this, that there is an increase in operation over 1963 in the amount of $188,137,000; in other words, the committee has recommended in this bill $3,890 million for operations. Now with the $69,814,000 cut from operations, there is still an increase over last year of $188,137,000. Now, it will be up to the Department to decide how this money is going to be spent; how much will be used to cut down on the requested 9,555 additional employees, or what they are going to do for extension of service. To the best of my knowledge, I do not think there will be any curtailment of service, and that they will have enough money in here to continue on with their program.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I appreciate that.

Mr. CONTE. I think I should point out also, prefacing my remarks, that I am most sympathetic with the Post Office Department and the postal employees.

I never recall when I have ever voted against them and I do not intend to start voting against them now. I think, perhaps, they are misinformed in respect to this budget. I am sure that if these cuts are sustained, that no one—not one at all—will be hurt as a result of this particular budget.

I must say also in all fairness that I have the greatest respect and admiration for our present Postmaster General. I believe he knows this. I think that J. Edward Day has done a magnificent job as Postmaster General.

In answer to the gentleman's question I want to point out that on March 20, downtown, he spoke to a group and there he stated, and I quote:

> In contrast to the last fiscal year we asked for no supplemental appropriation but instead turned back to the Treasury nearly $40 million in unused funds.

Of course, one must realize that this particular department, the Bureau of Operations, last year received only $3,701,863,000 as compared to $3,890 million which is provided for in this bill. Yet the Postmaster General returned $40 million of unused funds to the Treasury. I want to commend them for that, and I think that they can live with plenty of elbowroom within this budget.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a statement of fact?

Mr. CONTE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CORBETT. With reference to the $40 million that was returned from the budget 2 years ago, in the current situation they have had to ask for a supplemental of about $168 million.

Mr. CONTE. I do not have the exact figure. I am reading from his statement here where he returned $40 million.

Mr. CORBETT. That statement is a year out of date. There is a supplementary appropriation bill lying in the wings right now which proposes to appropriate to the Post Office Department for the current fiscal year I think something in the neighborhood of $165 million.

Mr. CONTE. Well, that could be so, which will take care of the pay raise.

Mr. CORBETT. I think there are two things involved.

Mr. CONTE. You must remember this, that the amount provided by the committee of $3,890 million takes in the pay raise.

Mr. CORBETT. Granted that, here is where these figures become so misleading in the report. The Department asked for 9,650 additional employees. Your committee report estimates that this would cost $64 million. In other words, the assumption was made by someone who wrote this report that all of these people were going to be hired the first day of the fiscal year.

Mr. CONTE. No; that is not so.

Mr. CORBETT. If the gentleman will yield further, the actual figure, according to the Department, for the increase of this number of employees is $25 million. Consequently, they indicate—I cannot quote them directly—that they will have to get rid of 6,000 of their present employees in order to live under this budget.

Mr. CONTE. That is not so. I do not know where the gentleman picked up this evidence. To the best of my knowledge there will not be a loss of one employee, one present employee.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The increase in the postal salaries for 1964 over 1963 is $127 million, and we have allowed a total increase of $227 million.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Did the gentleman from Virginia read the report of his own committee? On page 16 there is stated that the 9,555 additional personnel is at an estimated cost of $64,593,000. The Department figure, because they expected to stagger these people onto the payroll, is an estimated cost of $25 million. So when you are charging $69 million to these increased employees when you are actually only going to have to pay them $25 million this money has to come out of somebody's hide.

Mr. GARY. We can only use the figures that the Department gives us when they come before us. That is all we can use.

Mr. CORBETT. These are not the Department's figures.

Mr. GARY. These are the figures the Department gave our committee. I do not know where they got them and I do not know whose figures they are, but they are the figures the Department gave to us.

Mr. CONTE. And furthermore, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this report that says that we advocate the reduction of the total amount of these improvements.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. All this does is to point out areas in which we recommend that the Post Office might look to find $69 million that we are recommending be taken out of the operations budget. As I said a little bit earlier, they absorbed $58 million last year and here we are asking them to absorb only $43 million. The $58 million is not carried over into the 1964 appropriation.

It is no great hardship.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CONTE. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. I want to say to the gentleman that when I went to high school we learned in geometry that things equal to the same thing are equal to each other. We say that we do not tell the Post Office Department, "Do not have any Saturday service;" we do not tell the Post Office Department to cut the payroll; we do not tell the Post Office Department not to build offices. We simply take the money away from them. Who is telling whom?

Mr. CONTE. Let us not leave that on the record that way. The record should show that we are providing for this branch of the Post Office $188 million more than they received last year. We are not cutting down. We are giving them a lot more than they received last year.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am trying to reconcile my understanding of the statement that the Chairman made a few moments ago when he said there would be no adverse effect, no reduction of automatic within-grade salary increases as a result of this—is that correct?

Mr. CONTE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I cannot reconcile that, although I do not question the gentleman's statement, with the statement in the report on page 16 which lists as one of the areas in which reductions can be accomplished in this period of deficit financing the automatic within-grade salary increases for personnel.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. GARY. The situation is simply this. We felt that there was a possibility that the Department had overestimated the need to carry out the law passed by Congress increasing within-grade promotions. We said a part of the money may come from an overestimate of the funds needed. We do not change any of the within-grade promotions; we cannot change them.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, that responds directly to my question and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Something has been said during the debate about the construction of facilities and the improvement of post offices. Can the gentleman tell the committee how much money the Post Office Department is receiving from area redevelopment funds under the accelerated public works program for repairs and renovation of postal facilities?

Mr. CONTE. I believe the figure is around $2,950,000.

Mr. JONAS. It is a fact, then, it is true, that the Department is receiving additional funds from that source?

Mr. CONTE. Under the accelerated public works program, yes. Also I would like to point out something that has been completely overlooked by anyone who has spoken on this matter. No one has taken into consideration the tremendous modernization program that has been going on in the Post Office Department in the past 6 or 8 years.

There has not been a year I have sat on the committee we have not allowed millions and millions of dollars for automation, research, and development, in places like the Providence Turnkey Post Office. We have a big automation program going on on the west coast. We have visited post offices all over the United States. We have them all over the United States now, where we have automation in parcel post, and we are putting automation in the regular post offices. Of course this will absorb jobs, yet we have added thousands and thousands of employees every year the budget has come up.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Post Office is practicing what industry is doing. Industry today is displacing workers. They are not hiring anyone. I think if the Post Office will look over the hiring, it is not so much the people who are being put out of work, as the gentleman says, by automation, they are not taking into consideration how many people they are displacing and putting back on a labor market which is now overmanned.

Mr. CONTE. That is right. This should be taken into consideration when we are discussing this problem; however, in this case there is an addition of personnel rather than a decrease.

Mr. PILLION. There are a number of times when we slow down automation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then you ought to put a little more money in this bill to hire some people and take them off relief.

Mr. CONTE. I think we ought to point out to the House that here we have two departments of the Government. We recommended for the Treasury Department $1,095,910,000. This agency was cut by over $57 million. But here we have the Post Office with $4,885 million, and it was cut $91,964,000. So draw a ratio between the two. Everybody is excited here on the floor about the Post Office Department. It has not even been scratched compared with what has happened to the Treasury Department. I think both these cuts are very modest cuts. Certainly these Departments can well live within their appropriations.

I should like at this time to ask the gentleman from New York a question so that I may have some further legislative history with regard to the Secret Service men. Is it the gentleman's understanding that when the Secret Service came before our committee they requested 35 Secret Service men and 1 clerk for the Vice President?

Mr. PILLION. That is correct.

Mr. CONTE. When the committee reported out the bill they gave 2 Secret

Service men for the Vice President around the clock, which would be 10, at a cost of about $112,000.

Mr. PILLION. The figure of the subcommittee was a partial reduction, with approximately $112,000 for that service, not to exceed that amount, because representation was made on the floor of the House it would cost not more than $100,000. With the additional pay increases that would amount to about $112,000.

Mr. CONTE. When the Vice President travels to some other part of the United States away from Washington, D.C., where he has to make a speech, then the Secret Service could draw from the agents in the field?

Mr. PILLION. From the agents in those cities.

Mr. CONTE. If he were abroad to some foreign country, they could also draw from the field?

Mr. PILLION. We excluded that. We thought that going to the unknown conditions that may exist on a trip abroad the Secret Service could then assign Secret Service agents as they may find necessary.

Mr. CONTE. But these would be drawn from the field?

Mr. PILLION. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The most difficult thing for me as well as a lot of other people is to reconcile the fact that here we are mechanizing almost every agency of the Government with this automation machinery that costs millions upon millions of dollars, and they tell us in our hearings that it will relieve a lot of labor, that they will not need as many employees. Then we learn that after we have bought all this machinery they constantly ask for more employees. That is the case in this instance. When can we expect this machinery to start showing up the savings which they have told us it is going to bring about? Has the gentleman any idea of just what goes on here and how much longer we are going to spend these millions upon millions of dollars for this machinery, and then keep on piling on more employees?

Mr. CONTE. I think this is an excellent question that the minority leader of the Appropriations Committee has brought forth. I think that is exactly what the committee took into consideration in arriving at this budget.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I have about 2 minutes remaining and I have not started on the prepared text of the talk I wanted to make.

Mr. MORRISON. Perhaps the gentleman can get additional time, but I do have a question on automation that I would like to ask.

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The Magazine Publishers Association recommended that the Post Office Department ought to have a $2 billion crash automation program. That is $2 billion. The Post Office Department is only asking for $13 million and not $2 billion. The Post Office Department is just asking for $13 million and this committee is cutting $2,200,000 out of that.

Mr. CONTE. I am glad that the gentleman from Louisiana asked that question. I read that. It is in the same wire release attributed to the Postmaster General, saying that $40 million went back to the Treasury. That is a lot of hogwash.

Mr. MORRISON. What the Magazine Publishers Association are saying?

Mr. CONTE. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not think that is hogwash. I think they give a great deal of valuable news and information throughout this country.

Mr. CONTE. They certainly do.

Mr. MORRISON. And they certainly pay a tremendous postal bill.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to yield further.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, I would point out that they do not pay the cost of handling their magazines; is that not true? And they are being heavily subsidized by the Government of the United States to a very striking extent.

Mr. CONTE. And in further answer, Mr. Chairman, to the question of the gentleman from Louisiana, let me say this, that the Post Office Department knows what they are doing when they are only asking for $13 million for this item. Why they would have the worst case of indigestion if you ever tried to thrust $2 billion worth of automation down their throat.

Mr. MORRISON. The Post Office Department is only asking for $13 million. That is all they are asking for the whole Department.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, we have seen and this committee has seen, under the able chairmanship of our chairman, some automation down at Providence Turnkey, which we call the Providence Turnkey post office. It is one of the worst messes of automation that I have ever seen. As a result of that big mistake, we told the Post Office Department, and they agreed with us, that you had better go slow in regards to modernization and automation of your post offices.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. Is it not true that the Post Office in the past 2 weeks issued an order stopping the mechanization in many of the new constructions because they are all balled up on mechanizations?

Mr. CONTE. That is true.

Mr. Chairman, I would like this House to know I certainly consider it a deep privilege and honor to sit on this distinguished subcommittee which has done such an excellent job. Certainly, there are some soft spots that remain. I think that with more time and with more help, we might have been able to cut off even more than we did in some of the other departments and agencies. There are areas here, Mr. Chairman, which I believe certainly demand the attention of the Congress. One of the agencies that came up before us was an advisory group to the President known as the Advisory Committee on Labor and Management Policy. That committee since its inception, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, has spent $580,000. Now I would like to read from the record in regard to the questioning of this particular agency. The witness at the time was Mr. Donovan. That record reads as follows:

> ### FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE
>
> Mr. CONTE. Since its inception, this committee has appropriated $580,000. Is that right? That is what you received from Congress.
>
> Mr. HUDSON. No, sir. $305,000.
>
> Mr. DONOVAN. In the 2 years.
>
> Mr. HUDSON. $580,000.
>
> Mr. CONTE. You have issued four reports.
>
> Mr. DONOVAN. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. CONTE. Divided by four, that would total $145,000 for each report. This is quite an expensive project. I picked up one of the reports on collective bargaining, and I see that you recommend that we have free collective bargaining. You did not need to spend $145,000 to tell me that. I am a former union man myself. It is a high cost to receive that opinion.
>
> Why do you need $37,000 extra for personnel compensation this year?

Then he went on to say why they needed more employees.

I quote further:

> Mr. CONTE. Getting back to the $580,000, I should have added that the report on collective bargaining is 9 pages long—not quite that, 8¼ pages long. That comes to about $16,000 a page.
>
> Mr. DONOVAN. In addition to the four reports that you have before you, in the last fiscal year there were also two national conferences, one on national economic issues and one on fiscal and economic policy, which were attended and participated in by leading people from the American industrial world, from the various economic groups, and from the trade union movement. I do not know how one could put a monetary value on that.
>
> Mr. CONTE. I put monetary value on results.

This report starts defining collective bargaining and winds up by saying we should have free collective bargaining and the cost of this report to the taxpayers is $16,500 per page.

Mr. Chairman, it does not take $145,000 to tell me that; I learned the definition of collective bargaining my first year of law school.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to speak at this time as I did 2 weeks ago and that is in regard to the budget appropriation asked to give protection to the Vice President, 35 Secret Service agents and 1 clerk. Before I review the facts I would like to stress again as I did in my original speech.

That my remarks are in no way directed to the Vice President himself, nor are they to be construed as in anyway reflecting upon him. I fully understand that the Vice President never made such a request and I am not saying that he did.

However, I could not understand that whereas previously 2 agents have been traditionally assigned to the Vice President, the Secret Service is now asking for 35. In reviewing the RECORD of July 17, 1961, Mr. CELLER, my distinguished colleague from New York, asked the following question to Mr. FORRESTER:

> Is it not a fact also that at best the cost would not be over $100,000 for protection of the Vice President-elect and our past Presidents who are now alive?

Mr. FORRESTER, in reply, said:

> I do not think it would be any more than that. I say they are entitled to protection.

And—

> I do not think the RECORD will indicate that I am extravagant, but the people elected the Vice President of the United States, and he is entitled to that protection.

I remember this discussion very clearly, and this is why I was shocked at the huge request of the Secret Service. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I must give every thought to needless expenditures and at a time when 6.1 percent of the people in this country are unemployed.

There was not any sensible justification for the Vice President to have 35 Secret Service agents assigned to him. I am fully in agreement that the mission of the Vice President is an exceptionally important one, and that Mr. JOHNSON is an important man. However, as has been made clear, Mr. JOHNSON does not feel that he needs such a large contingent of agents. Nor could I imagine anyone in this Congress justifying 35 Secret Service men especially when it has been made clear that no other Vice President has ever had more than 2. The vagueness of the law which stated that the Secret Service will provide protection should not be construed as meaning that the Vice President should be swamped with agents.

If, as I stated, the request of $100,000 was made 2 years ago and the cost of the increased protection during the fiscal year starting next July would be $322,000 not including travel expenses, what will be the cost 2 years from now? Will it continue to rise at such an astounding rate? I found the entire issue, as I said in my original speech, preposterous and presumptuous. I am greatly pleased that this Congress will not add funds for this expanded force, at a time when expenses are so high. I repeat that there was nothing personal involved here against the Vice President. I did not think that this request could be justified to this Congress or to the American people, and now we have saved over $200,000. For this reason, I am gratified that my committee has agreed. It must always be the individual function of the Congressman to be a "watchdog" in regard to Federal funds, and to save whenever we can. This is a great responsibility and one we must never overlook.

In answer to the remark made by the majority leader and by the Speaker of the House, I certainly hope and pray that no harm will ever come to our President or Vice President. But I do not feel that it is the responsibility of the House and that the blame should be placed on the House should any injury or harm ever be inflicted upon our President or Vice President. If you had a platoon of Marines, if you had a whole army surrounding each one of these men, and if you had a crackpot with a tripod and a highpowered rifle, he could cause harm to either one of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Chief of the Secret Service has stated that he considers it mandatory to give protection to the same degree as provided in the law relating to the President. Whether 35 is the correct number or not, I do not know, but in his opinion that is what is necessary. If the Congress should vote less than what in his judgment is necessary, and in the future if a situation should arise which, as the gentleman has said and I have said, God forbid, we hope will never arise, who would be responsible? The Chief has stated his position. Now I want to ask the gentleman whose responsibility will it be then?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, as a legislator I am bound by any intent of the Congress. When the bill went through there was colloquy between the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and it was stated at that time that the amount for these Secret Service men, not only for the Vice President but for past Presidents, would be $100,000. Taking into consideration the pay raise, that comes to 10 Secret Service agents. That is two Secret Service agents around the clock. That was the intent of the Congress, and the Chief of the Secret Service is bound by that intent and that is what we have provided for here in this budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman says as to what was stated is correct, but circumstances might change. I think my friend will emphasize the fact that any construction made anywhere on remarks that the gentleman previously made with reference to the Vice President certainly was never intended by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I do not know whether 35 is sufficient or 20. All I know is that the one charged with the responsibility, the head of the Secret Service, has stated his opinion. My main purpose was to express my concern at the impression that went throughout the country about the Vice President. If Mr. Nixon was Vice President, under the same circumstances I would feel just as concerned. A man individually may not want them around, but the Vice President is not only LYNDON JOHNSON individually but LYNDON JOHNSON as Vice President. My concern is to have emphasized as strongly as possible that no matter what is done the Vice President never wanted, himself, any mandatory law passed.

Mr. CONTE. I started out my remarks belaboring the fact that the Vice President had not requested these additional Secret Service men. Again I go back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21, when I originally spoke on this. At that time, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] asked me if the Vice President had requested these additional men.

> Mr. CONTE. Now, I think I made it clear here that I am not directing my remarks to the Vice President.
>
> The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, when he presented his budget to the Congress or to the President, and the administration in turn presented it to the Congress, requested 35 men on behalf of the Chief of the Secret Service.

I made it explicity clear here today that the Vice President did not request these men.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will agree if anything should happen that the Chief of the Secret Service is not responsible?

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Is there any idea where these additional people will be used?

Mr. CONTE. This is intriguing. Of the 35 it was explained to us that 1 would be sent down to his ranch in Texas and he would remain there 365 days a year, so that no one could plant electronic equipment in the home or plant a bomb or anything else there while the Vice President was gone.

I believe 16 would be planted at his home here in Washington around the clock, and then he would have 2 with him all around the clock, which would be the 10 that we are giving him now.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. There would be two around the clock?

Mr. CONTE. With him.

Mr. GARY. There would be two at his home here, one inside and one outside, and one on the farm down in Texas. But, to maintain those 3 would require 15 men, because you have to have 5 for every 1 agent to take care of the shifts, holidays, and otherwise. But, there would be 15 just for the guarding of the two residences.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CONTE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My remarks were not for the purpose of controversy, but I would like to place responsibility. Might I say, I know the Vice President's views. He fought anything other than a voluntary bill, and we all know that. Now, he has a motorboat on some lake down near his ranch in Texas—and I guess it is a fast one—and the Secret Servicemen have to follow him, and they have not got a boat as fast. So, he found out at one time that there was a boathouse built there and he inquired who built the boathouse for the Secret Service to house their boat. It was a little under $2,000. And, LYNDON JOHNSON insisted that he pay that money himself, and he did. So, from the angle of the Vice President, personally he does not want it. He is a man of courage. He has gone through crowds of hundreds of thousands abroad, and the Secret Service say that if there is any one man who has guts, it is LYNDON JOHNSON. But, it is to clarify the picture in the minds of the people of America. And, again, the Chief of the Secret Service has made his recommendations. So, certainly, he has assumed his responsibility. And, my remarks, as I say, were not for the purpose of controversy, because I do not know whether 35 or 20 or anything else is sufficient. But, I do know how LYNDON JOHNSON feels.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How big is this ranch down in Texas?

Mr. CONTE. I do not know. I have never been down there.

Mr. GROSS. Could it be 1,500 or 2,000 acres? How is one man going to handle that situation?

Mr. CONTE. I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Is he going to live in the boathouse, or where is he going to live? How did the boathouse get into it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly, these questions do not clarify the situation. I understand he has a home and he has a ranch. Now we are talking about two different propositions. The fact remains that the impression that the Vice President sought protection is as far removed from the truth as possible. The Chief of the Secret Service has performed what he considered to be his duty. Whether it should be 25 or 30 I do not know, but I do know if it is cut down, the responsibility does not rest upon the Chief of the Secret Service.

Mr. CONTE. I want to make one thing specifically clear, and it is unfortunate that we are getting into personalities. I was originally opposed to the issue of giving 35 agents and 1 deskman at a cost of approximately $328,000 per year. I could not see where this could be justified, plus the fact that I am a legislator and I think I must abide by the intent of the Congress.

When I went back and I searched the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 17, 1961, it said that they predicted the top dollar—not the medium dollar or approximately the top dollar but the top dollar—for the protection of this person and any past Presidents would be $100,000 a year. So, I gained the impression that it was the intent of Congress to give this person 2 agents around-the-clock which would amount to the equivalent of 10 agents, which the committee gave him and which would come to about $112,000 a year, and I want to commend the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have never brought up in any of my remarks or insinuated that the Vice President asked for these. I think the Chief of the Secret Service was bound by the intent of Congress and he had no right in coming in here and asking for 35 men and 1 clerk.

Mr. Chairman, going back to my original statement I also feel that, perhaps, the Speaker of the House of Representatives deserves protection. After all, the Speaker is the third man in line of command; if anything happens to the President or the Vice President, my dear friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], would be the President of the United States, and certainly we should be giving some consideration here today to give him protection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps our distinguished Speaker does not live as dangerously as the Vice President.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, another matter that I would like to discuss is the establishment of the Customs Training Center. There is a request in the budget for four positions which will be filled by instructors with high travel expense costs. This contingent will purport to make matters more pleasant for travelers who arrive in the United States and it is expected that it will cost $152,000 a year on a recurring basis. I was told in committee that this money will be used just to train four instructors. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are about 2,500 or 2,600 inspectors all told, and it seems to be quite a large number.

The reasoning of the customs officials on this whole issue is amazing. For one thing, they want to bring their people from California to New York and plane fare will cost roughly $300 round trip for a single class flight. It would be much easier to bring the instructors to California. It appears that customs will be sending 433 people from the west coast to New York instead of sending the small number of instructors to California. To multiply 433 people by roughly $300, customs is spending a considerable amount of money unwisely. One of the reasons that they give is space problem when all that is needed is a blackboard, some pencils, and paper in any given room. This is just one incident of waste and one which I cannot accept.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, this is the centennial year of city delivery of mail in the United States. In 1863 when this country was in much worse shape than it is today, when indeed we were experiencing the War Between the States, the administration had the courage to establish city delivery of mail. Facing deficit spending in 1863 they had that kind of foresight to be the first Nation in the world to establish city delivery of mail. Now in 1963 we see a move to cripple the Post Office Department. I know that this charge is scoffed at and has been for several hours now. But it is a fact that the committee has not allowed for any new positions by their own admission, not any new positions for the delivery of mail, either rural or city delivery.

Mr. Chairman, what is the record of the Post Office Department? It is a record of increased efficiency over the years and particularly since 1946 the Post Office Department has increased efficiency 62 percent. At the same time the mail volume has increased 83 percent.

Some challenge is being offered that automation should eliminate some expense. It does in the Post Office Department just as it has done in the telephone business. If it were not for innovations in the telephone business there would not be enough women in America to man the switchboards. Likewise in the Post Office Department, the post office buildings would not be large enough to hold the mail, the volume of mail they have today, if it were not for mechanization to move it out. But they know that even with the mechanization they have to have more people. And where do they have to have them more than any other place? They absolutely have to have them as letter carriers, both rural and city, because there is no automation there. There has to be a man to deliver the mail to the door. That is one place you cannot have a machine perform the duty. And so the Post Office Department has advised us that at the end of this fiscal year, under the proposal of the committee, there will be 7,500 fewer positions in the Post Office Department. They advise us that on the contrary the Post Office Department should have been increased approximately 10,000 positions, or a total of 17,000 positions should have been in this budget.

However, another significant point is that this would not begin to satisfy the $92 million reduction required in this bill, of which $69.8 million is in the operational end—the delivery of mail through nearly 35,000 post offices. The cut of the new positions would only save $25½ million.

It is obvious cuts must be made in other major areas.

One of the areas that is most vulnerable, because it is not a "moneymaker," is in our rural deliveries.

I have made some queries on this point. I understand rural deliveries may have to be reduced to three a week if these cuts stand. This is not a threat. It is a fact.

This would affect about 30,000 rural routes, serving more than 9 million rural families, or well over 30 million individuals.

Such service has been extended to about 150,000 rural families a year in recent years. It seems clear that additional extensions would have to be curtailed under this measure in addition to reductions in existing services.

I do not believe we can afford such serious curtailments of public service so vital to so many of our people at this time.

Mr. Chairman, it should be made crystal clear here that this bill, in effect, cuts the heart out of the operations of our postal service for 1964, even below the 1963 fiscal level, for all practical purposes, at a time when our delicate national economy sorely needs the support of improved mail service.

True, in the postal operational area, where a 3.5 percent increase in mail volume must be handled for a growing population and a mushrooming suburban development, it would grant an increase—on paper—of $188,137,000 over 1963.

However, all but $35 million of that is for the pending Pay Act Supplemental, and automatic within-grade salary increases alone will require nearly $46 million, more than offsetting the $35 million paper increase—leaving an actual cut in available money to run the post offices and deliver the mail. In operations this is a cut in 1964 of about $11 million.

Incidentally, I fail to see how the within-grade increases can be curtailed, as the committee's report implies. These increases are mandatory under law—beyond the control of the postal service.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of the amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that despite the Department's real progress in the past year in reducing costs and increasing productivity, there is no doubt that if this $92 million cut is approved the Department will be forced to halt its current program for modernizing post offices, for extending new post offices to new households and new businesses by providing needed facilities and equipment for speeding up mail delivery and providing any Saturday delivery at all to the citizens of America.

In other words, we are not necessarily here debating money only. We are also debating services. If you take $92 million out of the Post Office budget you are going to take out $92 million worth of services and a lot of people are going to have their jobs taken away from them. They are not going to hire any new personnel to take care of the increase in the mail which is over a billion pieces per year; is that right?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That is exactly correct; all of those statements are correct.

Mr. MORRISON. And that is the position of the Post Office Department?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That is the position of the Post Office Department and the position of the postal employees. And it is the position of the majority of us on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The rural mail delivery service would have to be frozen at its present point. There could be no extension of the lines. Indeed, because there will be new patrons on the rural routes, there will have to be fewer deliveries to reach the patrons if the same number of employees is to serve.

There are going to be on July 1 of this year 110 new communities or communities that will be entitled to city delivery service under our regulations. But on July 1 of this year with this budget those 110 communities are not going to get city delivery service; and that means 110 congressional districts will suffer denial of city mail delivery.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Oliver P. Bolton].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I asked for the time in order to address a question to the last previous speaker, the gentleman from Montana. I should like to ask him this question. I do not understand his figures. It is my understanding that there is an increase recommended by the committee, for the Department's operations, $188 million. Furthermore, on page 16 of the report, the committee has pointed out that cuts can be made in one of three specific fields.

It does not state that there can be no additional personnel hired. It does not state that the routes will not be extended. It does not state that it will be impossible to extend city delivery. The testimony by the chairman of the committee in answer to my question, and by a gentleman of the committee on our side in answer to my question specifically stated that this was not the intent nor did the committee feel that this would be the result. This is the reason I have asked these questions. I should like the gentleman to explain his reasons, if he will.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. As I understand, the explanation was that the committee said there had to be a cut some place and that the Post Office Department would have to compute that. There is a dispute here, of course, between the committee and the Post Office Department as to how rapidly and to what extent the volume of mail will increase, but it is granted that an increase in mail will come, and there will be extended routes for the increase in the number of patrons of the mail. The Post Office Department says that by their calculation of this increase in the volume of mail and the increase in patronage they must have more money for employees or they will have to spread employees over longer routes. If they do that, then they are going to have to have alternate days of delivery, for instance, in rural delivery.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. May I ask the gentleman from Montana, cannot the Post Office Department save $1 million a year by knocking out the guideline system?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. How much?

Mr. CONTE. One million dollars. That is what the postal union said when they came before us.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I do not know, but I of course have my own objections to the guideline system. But let us get back to the question of serving the patrons as well as the increasing volume of mail with a budget cut.

Let us look at alternatives given us by the committee.

The committee suggests three alternatives—reduce proposed programs, curtail automatic within-grade pay increases or cut postal delivery service.

Let us take a long, hard look at the three alternatives.

As to No. 1, the Department requested no money for new programs. But the committee is asking the Department to handle an increased workload of 2.4 billion pieces of mail—not with the same personnel it now has, but with fewer positions.

As to the second alternative, if automatic salary increases are indeed automatic, how can they be reduced?

So that leaves the third alternative—cutting mail deliveries.

Under this bill, the Department cannot extend mail service to 1 million new suburban homes, 75,000 new businesses, and well over 150,000 rural families next year.

That is bad enough, Mr. Chairman. But cuts in the Department's budget will surely force further cuts in mail service, including Saturday mail and three-a-week rural deliveries, denying 30 million farm families of good mail service.

I do not think the people will stand for these service cuts. I think they will retaliate. And when they do, it is going to be against those of you who have forced these service cuts in the false name of economy.

It is one thing to ballyhoo back home that you are saving the taxpayers money. But I would like to hear how you are going to explain that in order to save their money you had to cut off their mail service.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I would rather not yield further, for I have only about 15 seconds left. If I can get more time I will gladly yield to the gentleman. However, I would like to say that in the reading not only of the hearings, but the report of the committee, I can only come to the conclusion that under the allocation, which is $118 million higher for this year than it was for last year, the Post Office Department will be able not only to put on additional personnel needed to extend service but to extend service where that service is justified to be extended. Coming from a district that has rapidly expanded, I know how much service needs to be extended, and under this bill, it is my understanding the Department has the funds to do so, not all it wants, but there is not enough money to do all we want in any field.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed], a member of the committee.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, it seems this subcommittee has prepared and brought to the House today a bill that has inspired two fields of thought. There are those who feel that the bill has been cut too much and there are some who feel that it has not been cut enough.

It has been a pleasure and privilege to me to work on this subcommittee. We have gone through many weeks of detailed work, many hours a day. We have one of the most careful and efficient chairmen in the Congress. He has provided us with the skilled leadership this year that makes it possible for me here in all good conscience to say that I think this is one of the finest bills that has been or will be brought before the House.

I think the Members would like to know the attitude of this subcommittee as it approaches its work with these two very big and important Departments of our Government. The Post Office Department and the Treasury Department probably touch the lives of more people in more ways and in more times during the year than any other agencies of our Government. We think they perform some of the most vital and important services that our people get from the Government. The members of this subcommittee feel when we work with these two Departments that we are working with them as partners and as their friends. We certainly are not enemies. Some of the finest and ablest people in all the Government work for these two Departments. They are people who take tremendous pride in doing a great and fine job. They do do a great and fine job, and this subcommittee knows it. I think I can say without any fear of contradiction whatever, there is not anyone on this subcommittee who would have the slightest intention of making any recommendation that they thought would work an undue hardship or impose an undue burden upon any of these agencies that are performing what we believe to be such a wonderful and such a well carried out service for the American people.

We have been in close contact with the people who run these Departments. We think they have made an honest and forthright presentation. I think they have tried their best to give us all the information they have that might help us. If that is true, then there have been some things said here on the floor of the House today about the attitude of the Post Office Department that has not come to the attention of this committee.

I just do not believe that men like Postmaster General Day and Mr. Frederick C. Belen and others in the Department are going around telling some Members of this Congress one story and telling this subcommittee another story. I think these gentlemen are doing a wonderful job. I think they have always leveled eye to eye with the members of this subcommittee. We believe what they say. On page 264 of the hearings, I would like to call your attention to where Mr. Belen was making his presentation to this committee. You will find detailed there some of the finest evidence of the type of skilled management that this Department of Government has been getting. I wish every Member would read it. Then, I think, you, too, would take pride in the kind of management that we are getting. We know that these men have done a good job, can do a good job, and are doing a good job. They will continue to do a good job. We believe they will continue to give the same kind of fine service to the American people that they have been giving in the past. If any of us thought that they could not do that job with the money that we recommend here, we would not have brought in these figures for your consideration. We are not trying to make a record here for economy just for the sake of economy. We know that these people bring in tight budgets. Of all the appropriation bills presented to the Congress, there are no two bills where it is harder to find places to reduce the amounts than these two bills. We know that. That is why we have been so careful as to where we made cuts. We have tried to remember that this is an austere budget and that this is an austere year.

We think the temper of the American people and of this House of Representatives is such that they want the budget to be operated on that basis. There are many things that would be most desirable which, if we were in a prosperous time, we could afford. There are a lot of customhouses that we would like to build. There are a lot of postal facilities that we would like to build. They are very desirable but they are not necessary at this time and some of them can be put off at the present time. When we thought the figure was high and that something could be put off, and should be put off, that was what we tried to do. I give the House my assurance that if I ever believed in anything that I have said in my life, I believe that if this budget becomes law, there will be no people now employed by the Post Office Department who will lose their jobs.

As a matter of fact, there will be several thousand more working a year from now than there are today. That can be done under this budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I want the House to know that we have tried to keep this budget as low as it is possible to keep it, and at the same time give these agencies the funds that they have to have. We hope and believe there is no place in these bills where we have been pennywise and pound foolish. This is our best judgment after working hard weeks with the people who are charged with this responsibility. But, there is one thing I think the House ought to know. The total amount of money in these bills is a great deal more than last year. The reason for that can be charged to the Congress itself. The mandatory acts of the Congress is what keeps the cost of government going up. You cannot have these things that you are always doing and asking for and which cost more money and to give the people more service without expecting to pay for it.

I am not saying that these things are wrong, but I do think we should recognize the fact that day after day when we pass bills here authorizing new services someone is going to have to pay for it. There are several hundred million dollars in this bill caused by acts of the last Congress. That is not anybody's fault. I am not saying that is wrong, but that is some of the reason why it costs so much more money to carry on these agencies next year than it does this year. The Members of the Congress in their wisdom having made these increases and authorized these services, there is nothing this committee can do but accept it. There is not much to the budget when you get down to it that can be cut, for 75 percent of the Federal budget is more or less in the mandatory category. Your committee has been very careful in the places where it has made cuts. I think no bill will ever be brought before you with any greater skill used in its preparation than the one brought to you by this committee this year. The very fact that men of the caliber of the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman GARY, the chairman; and the gentleman from New York, JOHN PILLION, the ranking minority member, agree on what is in this bill I think attests this bill to the Members of the House more strongly than anything I can say. They are two of the most outstanding, forthright Members of this House. The bill is brought to you as nearly right as human ingenuity can make it.

It has been a pleasure to be associated with men who have worked with such sincere devotion. They have done a fine job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes in order that he may yield the gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. PASSMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Having served on the committee 15 years, I have a very deep interest in this legislation. Does the gentleman feel that there are sufficient funds in the Post Office bill to expand the service on rural routes and delivery by city carriers to keep pace with the population growth we have had?

Mr. STEED. The gentleman knows that, one: There is enough money in this bill to equal every facility they have had this year, including the pay raises, so certainly they can do next year the thing they are doing now. They have more than $100 million additional in operating funds alone and, of course, they can expand services to that extent.

Mr. PASSMAN. I asked the question because it had been stated earlier that they could not expand the rural service and business delivery and residential delivery in new communities. I, of course, feel as does the gentleman that there are adequate funds in the bill to take care of the growth and meet the demands for the expanded service.

Mr. STEED. We sincerely believe that all existing and anticipated needs have been adequately provided for.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, about a month ago the Internal Revenue Service announced a major reorganization of its field operations to be effective in January 1964. As a result of widespread congressional protests, the Secretary of the Treasury subsequently ordered a delay, advised that a study would be made of the proposal, and that no implementing action would be taken on it pending the completion of such a review.

This has done little to ease the burden for those employees who are under the gun and who know that, should the plan be reinstituted, the only choices left to them will be either to move their homes and start life anew in another State or to separate from the Service. There seems to be unanimous thought among IRS personnel that the holding action is a temporary thing and that the

Revenue Service is committed to its consolidation.

None of us in this Chamber, Mr. Chairman, would oppose any plan to increase the efficiency of operation of an agency of Government which was, at the same time, performing and maintaining the level of service to which its patrons were entitled. The problem in the proposed reorganization is that many of us know that efficiency of operation will not increase, the service to our constituents will be seriously reduced, and morale among the agency personnel will continue to be badly affected.

This is definitely true in the Providence, R.I., office. The transfer of supervisory personnel from Providence to Hartford, Conn., will undoubtedly be followed by the transfer of subordinate positions, files, and so forth, until eventually the Rhode Island taxpayer will have to journey into our neighboring State in order to process his tax return.

Mr. Chairman, I have no direct knowledge as to how the reorganization would affect other congressional districts but I am convinced that its impact on my State of Rhode Island would be harmful. It would be a distinct disservice to both the taxpayers and the employees of the Internal Revenue Service and a move which I would be forced to vigorously oppose. I strongly urge the abandonment of the proposal as it applies to Rhode Island so that Revenue Service personnel there can continue the excellent service they have always given the Rhode Island taxpayer.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], particularly in the recommendations of the committee as they affect the operating expenses of the Coast Guard. Included in these recommendations are provisions for the construction of one high-endurance cutter vessel costing approximately $14 million, three medium patrol craft costing approximately $11,250,000, one coastal tender for $2,500,000 and five small tenders for $3,100,000. These vessels are sorely needed in order that our Coast Guard can carry on its important responsibilities.

The Coast Guard Fleet should be kept modern and effective. A vessel replacement program should be in existence and it is very evident that the Appropriations Committee has this matter in mind. According to the report an increase of $17,670,000 in acquisition, construction, and improvements is contained in this legislation.

I wish to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for his diligent efforts in maintaining a strong and effective Coast Guard.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for presenting a relatively good budget in this bill, comparatively speaking, particularly in view of the fact that they have reduced the 1964 request by approximately $150 million. I am concerned however that this bill, H.R. 5366, is an increase of better than $330 million over the 1963 budget for these same departments.

At a time when we are faced with a record high budget and increased deficit financing, I very seriously question the advisability of a kind of government planning that provides for the continually increasing size and cost of our Federal Government. If we want a balanced budget, and if we want reduced taxes, and I firmly believe that the vast majority of the American people want both of these, then we must cut spending. We are not, cannot, and will not, cut spending by upping the budget for every department each year, year after year, as is proposed by this bill.

I have the very highest regard and respect for my post office friends and, of course, as has been specifically pointed out here today, this bill will not cut the pay of any of our present fine postal employees, nor will any of them be relieved from their present jobs or duties as a result of the decrease in the 1964 estimate presented by the Post Office Department. This part of the bill I can approve as I do several other good parts and provisions of this bill.

I cannot, however, in good conscience, support such items in this bill as an increase of over 8 percent or some $42 million for the Internal Revenue Service to have 1,277 new employees. I cannot, at this time of deficit financing, see any responsible reasoning in the provisions of this bill that increase appropriations for the Office of the Treasurer by $250,000, the White House Office by $185,000, the Bureau of the Budget by $416,000, Mr. Heller's Council of Economic Advisors by $13,000, the National Security Council by $25,000, and many others.

If you do really believe in sound, responsible government, I urge you to carefully reconsider the many provisions of this bill that could easily be postponed until a later date at which time we might be better able to afford them. Let us give the folks of this country some consideration, let us give them a realistically sound budget so that we can give them a true tax cut, instead of the administration's proposed tax shift.

Instead of increasing the size, cost, and control of our bureaucracy, let us grant a little tax relief and increased freedom to the working people of America.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I trust that our approval of the Internal Revenue Service's provisions in this bill will not in any way be interpreted as an endorsement of the Commissioner's plan for the elimination of the New York regional office through the merger with the Boston office of the Internal Revenue Service. I, and I am certain several of our colleagues, feel the proposal is fully unjustified. Any plans that the Treasury Department may have for this action, I hope, will be thoroughly reevaluated and that a full airing of the matter will be forthcoming.

I am strongly convinced it is unwarranted, inequitable, and countrary to the best interests of the taxpayers and of good administration.

It is difficult to see how the transfer of the important functions of the regional office of the IRS to Boston could result in anything but dissatisfaction, confusion, inconvenience, and administrative problems that far offset any of the arguments for coordination of activities that have been advanced.

The Treasury Department maintains that the elimination of the New York region will result in material savings to taxpayers. Frankly, this is hard to believe. The New York regional office employs about 670 persons compared with 375 in Boston. This is not a merger, this is a mass move to uncertainty and administrative headaches, one which, I predict, will end up costing the U.S. taxpayers a lot more than any anticipated savings.

The Department stresses the argument that the regional office should be in Boston because the service center is nearby. However, this is not a consistent argument. In Austin, Tex., the distance between the regional office and the service center is over 200 miles. The San Francisco regional office is separated from the service center in Utah by over 300 miles. The distance between the Chicago regional office and the Kansas City service center is 500 miles.

I say it is sheer nonsense for the IRS to claim that this proposed merger will develop a lean, efficient organization. The New York City region has the most efficient of the nine regional offices in the United States. By contrast, Boston is beset with management problems.

With the largest district in the United States—Manhattan—and the fourth largest district—Brooklyn—it just does not make sense to me to move this important regional office function outside of New York.

I do not dispute the responsibility of the Commissioner of the IRS to streamline his office. The Commissioner is an outstanding public official and is performing a superb job, unequalled in recent history, in one of the most difficult roles in Government service. My only question now is, how his admirable intentions compare with the facts and the realities of the New York situation.

The arguments against this move far outweigh the points, well taken as they may be, that have been advanced in its favor. It will take a tremendous amount of convincing in my opinion, and that of countless others, to even begin to justify this proposal.

I hope this entire matter will be reevaluated and reconsidered.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this opportunity to oppose the adoption of this bill (H.R. 5366) after hearing testimony delivered before this House. In view of my 7 years experience in budget matters at a lower level of government, I have concluded that further economies can be achieved in this budget, without the so-called loss of service to our constituencies. With reference to my previous experience, I submit that there are very few budgets in public agencies that could not stand appreciable cuts without any extreme loss in services.

I would like to concur in the laudatory commendations of our able Postmaster General Day. Being a fellow Californian and somewhat familiar with his reputation in his business career prior to the acceptance of his high position, I am convinced that should further cuts be recommended by this Congress along with the request that the cuts be offset by initiating administrative economies, I have every confidence that our Postmaster General could and would meet the challenge in a manner consistent with his previously displayed executive abilities.

I have always endorsed the theory that adequate salaries for dedicated career employees is a must to insure the high quality of service to our people. Once again, I refer to my previous experience whereby tightening our belts and creating economies in the administration we were able to increase salaries to personnel as well as fringe benefits—yet hold the line and in certain cases decrease the operating costs of our governmental units. A statement that I made previously might be appropriately applied here in the House of Representatives and I quote, "Economy can be gained through wise spending." Being a freshman Member of this honorable body, I have much to learn. However, if I were to summarize my analysis of budget procedure at this level of government, I would like to suggest that the leadership and/or a majority of our Members issue a directive to the Executive Department and all administrative heads be instructed to present budgets that reflect a 10- to 15-percent cut in expenditures. This would place the responsibility squarely where it belongs and tend to expedite the orderly business of this body.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, in the Congress management of the financial business of our Federal Government the responsibility is reposed in the Members to attempt to balance Federal expenditures with Federal revenues.

At this stage of the present session of Congress it appears that sufficient funds will not be available to provide for the total appropriations set forth in H.R. 5366 as well as in the other appropriation measures which will come before the Congress at a later date. Until the total of all appropriations as well as total tax revenues can be gaged with greater accuracy, final action by this House on H.R. 5366 should be deferred. For these reasons, among others, I am impelled to cast my vote in the negative at this time.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the expansion plans of the Internal Revenue Service and it seems to me the Appropriations Committee's assessment of the direction of this agency is going, needs to be underscored in this debate. The committee obviously feels that the Internal Revenue Service is attempting to move too rapidly. It asks, as do many Members of this House, when and how the new automatic data processing equipment being installed will show results in reductions in personnel.

The committee wisely points out:

> Other agencies in the Treasury Department have been able to realize substantial reductions in work force while at the same time handling a greatly increased workload. Those agencies have been able to reduce personnel substantially while in contrast the Internal Revenue Service continues to request several thousand additional personnel each year, as well as increasing the number of its temporary employees used in the data-processing system.

Certainly, Americans are a law-abiding people who pay their taxes and assume their just burden of the cost of Government. However, this year the Internal Revenue Service has conducted what seems to be a campaign of finger wagging at the people of this country—in effect, warning about the dire consequences of tax evasion and delinquency. Obviously, the administration needs to squeeze as many tax dollars from the American people as possible. The tax laws are also sufficiently complicated that many Americans wonder, as they face their tax returns, whether they are breaking laws they do not understand.

The accusatory tone the Internal Revenue Service has taken has been resented by many honest Americans and I should suppose some of the extra people in the Internal Revenue Service have been recruited for this purpose. This morning, I received a letter from one of my constituents in the Ninth District of North Carolina who expresses that feeling which so many other Americans join in resenting. Because it is appropriate to this debate, the letters is as follows:

> Representative JAMES T. BROYHILL,
> *New House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. BROYHILL: For some time I have been considering writing to you about the growing problems of the U.S. system of taxation and, in view of the present news censorship situation in our Capital, I felt that I had better write while one of our few remaining freedoms, the freedom of speech, is still available to us.
>
> Our great Nation is facing a grave and even destructive future when the Internal Revenue Service begins to consider everyone guilty until proven otherwise. I realize that this business of tax collection is quite a problem but when the people of our land are constantly threatened via TV commercials and newspaper stories about the consequences of making false tax returns, it's time for a change.
>
> During the past several months, local television and radio stations (along with the newspapers) have been carrying public service announcements about filing tax returns. Before the public service is completed, the American citizen is told that, in essence, he is a crook and we (the IRS) are watching you.
>
> Personally, sir, I resent the fact that I am mistrusted and I'm sure many other Americans have the same feeling. May I suggest that the U.S. Congress begin immediately to overhaul our tax structure and to return to the American people the dignity and respect due them. After all, they're paying the way of Congress as well as the overstaffed Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5366 adds 11,044 new employees to the Federal payroll and $331 million to the astronomically high budget of last year, fiscal 1963. Last year's budget added many new employees and was a big spending boost over the previous year. Therefore, there is even less reason to swell the Federal bureaucracy now.

Who is for the downtrodden taxpayer who pays for this profligate spending? I am. Therefore, I shall vote to maintain this year's expenditures to last year's level. I shall oppose this bill. Preferably, I would reduce this year's spending to a straight 5- or 10-percent cut of last year's budget.

How do we balance the budget? We raise taxes or cut spending. I am for balancing the budget and against higher taxes, therefore, I shall try to cut spending. Meanwhile, the President and the liberals increase spending and talk about tax cuts at the same time, which is the course to fiscal suicide or fiscal socialism, as it has been so well called.

Worse yet, taxes have and are going up. Social security taxes are up, State and local taxes are up, unemployment compensation increase is threatened. What is the matter with us? Is it ignorance of the economic facts of life? Is it some kind of schizophrenia? Or are we just playing politics talking one way and doing another at the behest of the latest pressure group to threaten us.

We Congressmen should provide leadership in fiscal matters. That is our job. Why should Members be afraid to oppose the spending requests of specific pressure groups who fail to compute or to see the overall impact of all the requests of all the pressure groups combined.

We must remind the petitioning groups of the fiscal dangers confronting the United States, of deficit financing, inflation, gold outflow, and damaged confidence at home and abroad when we fail to balance income and outgo.

Look at the facts. We owe $1 trillion and $51 billion; that is $1,051 billion or $1,051 per minute since Christ was born in fixed obligations even before we add to the debt. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] makes this debt abundantly clear.

Other appropriation bills will follow this one. We must set standards or guidelines and hew to them. The Treasury Department wants $103 million more than last year's $993 million; the Post Office wants $227.5 million more than last year's $4,657 million; the President wants $552,000 more than last year's $13.1 million. Of course these expenditures can be cut. Of course, impassioned pleas can be advanced for increasing any Government operation. Why get nervous or be taken in?

For myself, I am tired of the old double play we give the constituents. To baffle them, and talk on either side. Here's how it goes: We cut the budget so we economized. We increased the spending over last year so we have a heart and are for the program, whatever it is. This device is good for getting off the hook but it is hardly a firm position based on sound logic, particularly when we are deficit financing.

So there is no mistaking my position though it deprives me of the political device of being able to talk on either side of the issue. I am opposed to this year's budget. I was opposed to last year's budget. I am for a balanced budget. I am for helping the burdened taxpayer. I am for relieving the pressure of inflation and gold outflow. All of this presents no dilemma to me—nor impossible choice. I shall oppose increased spending, and shall vote for all possible cuts in spending. There is a clear choice—to be for a balanced budget, surplus, and tax cut on the one hand or for deficit financing, unbalanced budget, inflation, gold outflow, currency devaluation and fiscal suicide, that is socialism on the other.

I shall not take part in the repudiation of our national debt through the inflation resulting from Federal deficit spending which has watered our dollar to 44 cents since 1940. Nor shall I pass on to future generations the debts of our time. My conscience is clear.

It is my hope, my prayer, that my colleagues will reconsider and move to restore fiscal sanity and oppose the fiscal socialism of deficit financing typified by this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CURRENT AUTHORIZATIONS OUT OF POSTAL FUND

ADMINISTRATION AND REGIONAL OPERATION

For expenses necessary for administration of the postal service, operation of the inspection service and regional offices, uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); management studies; not to exceed $25,000 for miscellaneous and emergency expenses (including not to exceed $6,000 for official reception and representation expenses upon approval by the Postmaster General); rewards for information and services concerning violations of postal laws and regulations, current and prior fiscal years, in accordance with regulations of the Postmaster General in effect at the time the services are rendered or information furnished; expenses of delegates designated by the Postmaster General to attend meetings and congresses for the purpose of making postal arrangements with foreign governments pursuant to law, and not to exceed $20,000 of such expenses to be accounted for solely on the certificate of the Postmaster General; not to exceed $75,000 for expenses (including expenses of official reception) incidental to meetings in the United States of the Management Council of the Universal Postal Union's Consultative Committee on Postal Studies; and not to exceed $25,000 for rewards for information and services as provided for herein, shall be paid in the discretion of the Postmaster General and accounted for solely on his certificate; and settlement of claims, pursuant to law, current and prior fiscal years, for damages, and for losses resulting from unavoidable casualty; $83,500,000.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the committee may consider a series of amendments going to the same issue, notwithstanding the fact that these amendments go to various paragraphs that have not been read. In other words, this is to save time so the amendments will not be offered one at a time. They all refer to the $92 million which the amendment would replace in the bill that the committee took out.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MORRISON:

Page 11, line 9, strike out "$83,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$85,700,000".

Page 11, line 19, strike out "$11,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$13,700,000".

Page 12, line 5, strike out "$3,890,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,955,814,000".

Page 13, line 2, strike out "$611,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$611,750,000".

Page 13, line 11, strike out "$185,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$195,000,000".

Page 13, lines 18 and 19, strike out "$104,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$111,000,000".

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer these amendments to the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill to restore the $92 million that the subcommittee took out of the appropriation, as requested by the Department and as approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, we all are interested in effecting reasonable economies in the operation of our Government. I think the Appropriations Committee generally has done a noble job of eliminating areas of waste and short-circuiting possible attempts at extravagance. The committee has worked hard and well and it should be commended and congratulated.

However, in dealing with the Post Office appropriations, I feel the committee has been carried away by its own zeal and the suggested reduction of $92 million is both unrealistic and potentially harmful.

In the first place, the Postmaster General himself and his staff eliminated all possible fat from the budget before they submitted it. They voluntarily cut out $58 million before they sent the request to the committee. The committee's proposed additional cut of $92 million would bring the total to $150 million.

By far the most part of this reduction would come out of operations. In the Post Office Department, "operations" means people and services. The Post Office Department is different from any other agency of Government. It does not plan its programs; it does not plan its own growth and expansion. These things are done for them by the American people who use the mail.

In our dynamic economy the mail volume grows every year. In fiscal 1964 the volume will be at least 70 billion pieces, more mail than in all the nations in the free world. The annual increase in volume will be at least 2.3 billion. That increase alone is greater than the entire volume of many European nations.

Also, the American people are on the move. They are moving from the overcrowded cities to suburban areas. They are building new homes in new places. Each time this happens it means an extension of service, an increase in manpower, an extension of facilities.

The Post Office Department did not cause these problems, but the Post Office Department has to solve them, and it takes this additional $92 million to give this additional service.

They cannot be solved by holding a whip over the postal employee and making him work harder than any human being should be expected to work. The postal employees of this country have increased their productivity per employee by more than 4 percent each year. This has been going on for decades. It is a glorious record of achievement and it stands alone among all comparable industries in the Nation. In the past 17 years the productivity and the efficiency of our postal employees have risen by 62 percent. No one can expect better performance than that, and no one can get better performance than that, I do not believe. And, there is a limit to what a postal employee can do, no matter how dedicated and devoted he might be.

Because of the population increase and the movement to new areas where houses never existed before, there must be an increase of at least 1 million letter carrier stops each year. These added stops are not just added onto existing routes. By far the most part of them are on new routes, servicing areas where people are living in new houses, areas that never had mail delivery before. The major part—indeed almost the entire amount—of the cut in the operations budget affected these new routes.

There are 110 cities that after July 1 will be entitled to get additional mail-delivery service. If this budget cut stays in, they will not get that increase in new services. The rural carriers will not be able to extend their routes to give new service to new patrons. Saturday delivery by both the city carrier and the rural carrier could be eliminated, and you cannot take $92 million out, which practically all goes for service, or the great part of it, and expect to get the same service as if you left it in.

Now, a lot was said about the fact that the Post Office Department in 1962 turned back $46 million. Well, that certainly is a great accomplishment, and if there is any money left from this appropriation that they did not need, you could certainly expect the Postmaster General to turn it back. But, on the other hand, what you are doing is taking away this money that is going to be used for this personnel service, and 6,000 employees will be discharged, and the contemplated 15,000 that are necessary for handling the increase of annual mail.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I heard one of my good friends, a predecessor on the floor, say that this would result in no loss of jobs or no loss of employment. I was wondering if the gentleman would want to comment on that point.

Mr. MORRISON. The Post Office Department estimates that there will be in excess of 6,000 jobs lost in fiscal 1964 if this cut stays in.

Mr. DINGELL. This is 6,000 employees who would be laid off; is that right?

Mr. MORRISON. That is right. I have a letter from the Postmaster General that says it will even be in excess of that.

Last year the Congress passed and the President approved a postal rate increase. That rate increase will bring into the Treasury during fiscal 1964 an estimated $580 million in additional revenues, over one-half billion dollars. The pay increase we voted, incidentally, will cost the Department $344 million, a lot less in the same period. The American people accepted this rate increase with good grace. There was very little grumbling about paying 5 cents for a first-class letter or for a 4-cent post card, or 8 cents for an airmail stamp.

But the American people will find out that they will be paying $580 million more for postage in fiscal 1964 to get less service than they ever received in their lives. The objections will be tremendous and overwhelming, as each of us knows. Almost every Member of this body represents some area in his district in which new homes are being built. Our constituents have invested their lives in these homes, serene in the belief that they will have their mail delivered to their door. When these new homeowners find out that despite these postal rate increases they have to travel to the nearest post office or collect and deliver their own mail, we shall hear from them, and promptly. The things we shall hear will be bitter and horrible. But worse than that it will be true, and it is a ridiculous spectacle, Mr. Chairman, for us to follow up this postal rate legislation where we have increased the rates and then give less service by taking away Saturday deliveries and by not giving these extensions in these services which will affect practically every major city and rural community in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, if the Bell Telephone Co. were to raise rates and then put all of its subscribers on party lines, the wrath of the people and the community would be terrible to behold. This is just what we would be doing with the mail service if we were to permit this drastic and unnecessary cut in appropriations to stand.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would avert all this trouble by restoring this badly needed $92 million. And, I want to say this: There has been a lot said about what the Postmaster General figured and what he told the committee. I do not know what he told the committee because I am not on the Appropriations Committee. But I am a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and here is what he told me. This is from the Postmaster General:

> In your letter of April 2 you asked what in my opinion would be the effect of the $92 million reduction in the appropriation for the Post Office Department recommended by the Appropriations Committee. According to our evaluation at the present time this reduction, if sustained, means that we cannot improve service.

That is what the Postmaster General, who has charge of the Department, and not the Appropriations Committee members, says.

I quote from the Postmaster General:

> We have to consider what services to the public can be eliminated.
>
> The central problem involves the "operations" appropriation. This appropriation covers the cost of personnel—practically all personnel in the Department—who collect, sort, and deliver mail and operate the 45,000 postal installations throughout the country.
>
> Our 1964 appropriation request was based on an estimated increase of mail volume and workload of 3.5 percent. The committee in its report indicated acceptance of this estimate of increased workload. However, the committee recommends a reduction of $69.8 million in the "Operations" appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 3 additional minutes. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington reserves the right to object.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment which I would like to discuss when the gentleman from Louisiana finishes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has asked whether there is objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to finish reading this letter, because there has been a lot said about the position of the Postmaster General, and you should know his position.

The Postmaster General further stated, as follows:

> The committee in its report indicated acceptance of this estimate of increased workload. However, the committee recommends a reduction of $69.8 million in the "Operations" appropriation.
>
> We are presently evaluating the kinds of service curtailments that would be necessary if the reduction is sustained. Complete elimination of deliveries on Saturday by city carriers and on rural routes has to be considered. We are reluctant to eliminate this service because we realize many individuals benefit from the Saturday delivery and many businesses depend on it. Still, the size of the reduction requires consideration of a major curtailment of this kind.
>
> Along with mail volume growth we are expecting substantial growth in the number of households during 1964. Household formation is almost certain to accelerate as the postwar generation reaches marriageable age. The formation of new suburbs will continue with the continuing shift of population to urban areas and will increase the demand for city delivery service.
>
> During 1964 the area eligible for city delivery service is expected to increase by at least 5.6 percent over 1963. The increase in number of carrier stops to service this growing area is estimated at 3.4 percent. We had requested an increase in city carrier employment of 2.6 percent in order to provide needed service.
>
> However the result of the reduction by the committee would be no increase in carrier employment with the consequency that we would have to consider putting a freeze on the present service in cities and on rural routes. This would mean that approximately a million households normally eligible for this service would not receive it in 1964.
>
> Since the new postal rates have gone into effect, users of the mail might well expect that mail service would improve. We must face the fact, unless our appropriation request can be restored, that the mail users will get less service for their added postage, not more.
>
> In order to adjust our "Operations" appropriation to the amount recommended by the committee, we estimate that we will have to eliminate approximately 17,000 positions from the number originally requested for 1964. We would have a reduction of about 7,500 positions from the number estimated for the end of the current fiscal year.
>
> The increase in productivity in recent years has been most encouraging. In 1962 we attached a 1.5-percent improvement in the clerk account. We budgeted a goal of an additional 1.5-percent improvement in 1963 and expect to attain it. Our 1964 submission was based on still another 1.5-percent improvement on top of the progress made in the 2 preceding years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, the gentleman's request that his amendments be considered en bloc was agreed to. He has already had 13 minutes. I think, Mr. Chairman, we ought to move on to the accomplishment of final action today. I withdraw my reservation, but I express the hope that we may keep the debate within the limitation of the 5-minute rule and dispose of this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. To further continue with the Postmaster General's letter:

> The imposition of the reduction in our "Operations" appropriation so curtails available employment that the relationship between employment and workload requires a 3.4-percent increase in clerk productivity. This rate—more than double the highest rate of the best in recent years—is completely unrealistic. A restricted work force already performing with laudable efficiency cannot be expected to take on such a substantial increase in its work. The total amount of work would have to be reduced in the ways that I have indicated for consideration above.
>
> Other reductions recommended by the Appropriations Committee also face us with serious problems. For example, the $2.2 million reduction in "Administration and regional operation" means a reduction in the man-years of employment available to provide the management leadership at headquarters and in the field. This reduction of management capability of course compounds the difficulty of solving the operating problems imposed by the reductions in the "Operations appropriation."
>
> Sincerely,
>
> J. EDWARD DAY,
> *Postmaster General.*

I urge this House not to curtail our postal service and to vote for this amendmend so as to put back this $92 million, which is a sound, realistic, and reasonable approach. Practically all of it will be spent in service.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Stinson to the amendment offered by Mr. Morrison: On page 12, line 5, strike out "$3,890,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,885,000,000"; and on line 22, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof ": *Provided further,* That no part of the amounts appropriated by this Act may be used for the implementation or continuation of work measurement programs (formerly known as 'Guide Line') or similar production measurement programs in the Post Office Department."

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to the bill H.R. 5366 for the consideration of my colleagues who are interested not only in cutting down the budget in nonessential areas but also in the welfare of our post office employees.

This amendment will save the taxpayers a minimum of $5 million per year and will gradually improve the working conditions of the postal employees.

I trust, first of all, that you are familiar with the program now called the work measurement program, but which was once referred to as "Guidelines."

This program requires postal employees to keep track of each activity on a card for a week in each month. If an employee gets a tray of mail it must be entered on the card. If he goes for a drink of water it must be entered on the card. Or if he leaves his position for any purpose at all it must be entered on his particular card. On the surface some of you might think it a good idea to have this check on our postal employees. However, consider these results, or better yet, lack of results, of guidelines:

First. The system does not result in either promotions or demotions of employees.

Second. The several minutes each day that each employee must take to fill out the card adds up to thousands of man hours lost each year.

Third. Many of the postal employees that I have talked to maintain that the tension that occurs from this program actually brings about decreased production on the part of the employees.

Fourth. The postal supervisors have the responsibility of production of the employees and are perfectly capable of obtaining the maximum production from each one of those employees in their charge.

If measurements of mail production are required they are readily available. First, the number of bags of mail can be and are easily counted when they come into the post office. Second, postage canceling machines can give an accurate relative count of the amount of mail handled on a given shift.

In these times of deficit spending and mounting national debt, I sincerely hope you will support my amendment to eliminate $5 million from this appropriation. Five million dollars is the very minimum that would be saved if this program is eliminated. The actual saving, when we take into consideration the vast number of man-hours that will again be used for production, can easily run as high as two or three times that amount.

I ask your support for my amendment to eliminate this wasteful and useless program.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is some merit to this amendment, however, I would like to read from the record of this year's testimony on page 77 and I quote from Postmaster Day who says:

> We estimate that it would cost the Department a minimum of $100 million a year, if we had no work measurement system at all.

Then I quote further from the testimony. This is the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pillion] addressing Mr. Day:

> Is it your judgment as a manager of this whole system a policy decision that 1 week a month or 1 week in 4 weeks is the least amount of work measurement system for you to be able to act upon the results you get from that measurement system?

Mr. Day replies:

> Yes, it is, Mr. Pillion.

Then I posed the further question:

> After considering all the advantages and all the disadvantages, pros and cons, that this is the minimum amount of work measurement that it is necessary for you to get information upon which you can act to maintain a reasonably high level or high standard of work performance?

Mr. Day's reply is:

> Yes, that is our considered judgment in the Department after looking into this thing in great detail.

The subcommittee was very critical of the work measurement system. It has been reduced and it has been improved. I think there is possibly room for some improvement, but I do think it would be a great mistake if it were completely cut out and done away with. That I think would be a great disservice to the Post Office Department.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about this work-measurement system. This program, installed in 1,183 large offices, is designed to furnish essential information on relationship between mail distribution workload and man-hours. Postal management at all levels now has a tool to measure and control distribution productivity of, first, the individual distributor—1 week out of 4—second, groups or tours of duty, and third, installations as a whole.

The work-management system aids in identifying those areas where supervisory direction must be reemphasized.

On the basis of experience to date, and as a further aid to attaining our productivity goal, refinements in this system are contemplated during this year.

That is the statement of the Post Office Department with reference to this work measurement system.

Mr. Chairman, this is nothing new. Every business in the United States employs some kind of work measurement system. Certainly it is not a hardship in the Post Office Department.

Mr. Chairman, let me read to you what was said about it in our hearings. Mr. Pillion was examining Mr. Belen, who is the Assistant Postmaster General in charge of operations. It is in operations that we are told we are going to do the greatest harm by this report that we have made here today and by this bill.

> Mr. Pillon. You quoted Mr. Day as saying that if you did not have the work measurement system you would lose $100 million a year in production.
>
> Mr. Belen. We would have to have $100 million more; yes, sir.

Here we are going to add to the amendment that has already been offered, another amendment that will require $100 million additional for the Post Office Department. That is according to their own statement, and I submit to you that the work measurement system is a management tool. We should leave it to management, and this Congress should not be dictating to management as to how they ought to run their department to that extent.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. This is nothing more than a practice used in every business and manufacturing plant.

Mr. GARY. Absolutely.

Mr. PASSMAN. Without such a management tool, you would not expect to get much production in any business establishment.

Mr. GARY. That is true. That is exactly what the Postmaster General says. The Post Office Department has worked with the employees in trying to make the system absolutely fair and as little offensive to the employees as possible.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CORBETT. Would not the effect of this amendment to the amendment by changing the total amount to be appropriated at this point in the bill have the effect of wiping out all of the Morrison amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not construe that to be a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee I urge that we vote down the amendment to the amendment and I urge that we support and adopt the Morrison amendment. The real issue—and I hope we can vote on it in a few minutes—is, are we or are we not going to restore $92 million?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. As a member of the committee, would the gentleman care to answer or comment upon the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? Because some of us are interested in the question.

Mr. UDALL. I do not have the knowledge to comment on that, but I will say that the guideline problem is an involved and controversial thing. The subcommittee has arranged for hearings on guidelines and work measurement systems. We are going to have the various departments, agencies, and organizations in to testify. I really think we ought to wait until that committee has finished its hearings before we legislate on the floor without knowing too much about it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. In my reading of this amendment, if you are going to change the total amount in this amendment to the amendment it would have the effect of changing the total amount which the Morrison amendment carried and therefore set aside the so-called Morrison amendment.

Mr. UDALL. I am not an authority on the rules of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON. I think my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania is right. If you want to vote for the $92 million restoration, vote down this amendment to the amendment and then vote the way you want to on my amendment to restore the $92 million. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct.

Mr. UDALL. I agree with the gentleman. I hope the Morrison amendment will be approved. Let me remark that last year the favorite indoor pastimes here in Washington were the J.F.K. Coloring Book, or Monopoly. This year the pastime is budget cutting. This is a game at which some of the regular inhabitants of this chamber seem to be pretty good this year.

The Appropriations Committee has done a good job. I do not quarrel with them. But we have to get the rules straight on this budget-cutting game. Any number of contestants can play. Some of them make up their own rules.

Some contestants put the list of budget cuts in an envelope and then talk about a $15 billion reduction. This adds secrecy and suspense to the game.

Other contestants have a handicap system. It works about like this: On the first big appropriation bill you vote more for bombers and submarines. Then you have a handicap. You have to cut down more and more to get the $15 billion cut.

Other contestants use the cliff-hanging method. You first vote for big authorizations and then you pull it out of the bag at the last minute by cutting down the appropriation.

There is another rule that is very vital in this budget-cutting contest. If you have a twenty-million-dollar harbor in your district, or a flood-control project, or a new post office, you never include those in your list of budget cuts.

Violation of this last rule may mean you cannot come back next year and play in the contest.

I say that the Post Office Department is essential. They have done a good job. We have the best administration in the Post Office Department we have had in a long time. This is the wrong cut, at the wrong place, and the wrong time.

Every year this country has added to its population three million more people. That is enough people to populate another Philadelphia, with all its schools, homes, businesses, and so forth. These people are entitled to the postal service. The Department cannot do anything about it.

People talk about economy. I want to get on the budget-cutting team here, too, before the session is over. Perhaps I can vote against cranberries and lobsters, or something like that. Already this week we have taken a good whack at the Interior appropriation bill. The game is being played rather well.

You can vote for the Morrison amendment and then go back to your office and announce that you have cut fifty million dollars more off the Kennedy budget. It is important to understand that even with the Morrison amendment added the overall bill will be $50 million under the administration budget request. So you can be a budget cutter today and still be in favor of an efficient postal service.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. This was intended to eliminate the guideline system. I am not an expert on the rules either, only being a freshman Member. But it was my understanding the only way I could eliminate the guideline system at this time was to cut the budget. This would cut the budget because it is in an appropriation bill.

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman is against the guideline system, come over to our committee and testify.

Let me say further, our citizens, in the best American tradition, are seeking a better life. They are moving to outlying areas of their communities where they and their families can enjoy more room for living. The movement is a natural result of our improvements in transportation patterns, our modern highways, and our modern automobiles.

It is obvious that this new phenomenon in our national life is not the fault of the Post Office Department, but the Post Office Department must meet the problems that it creates. The problems are many, and they are expensive.

These new developments—if they are to receive modern mail service—mean that the Post Office Department must transport the mail out to them, and they mean that the Post Office Department must create new carrier routes to service them. This means the Post Office Department must have enough money to provide this service.

However, if the Congress permits this $92 million cut to stand, there is no possible chance that these new suburban areas will get modern mail service or, indeed, any mail service whatsoever. Are we to expect these new homeowners to pick up their mail at the post office every day—even though the nearest post office may be 10 miles away?

In fact, if the $92 million cut remains as is, it is entirely possible that existing services to suburban areas will have to be curtailed. Those now receiving mail at their front doors will have to revert to going to the post office every day. This reversion will cause intense unhappiness in every district in the United States.

There are many reasons why this money should be restored. This is just one of them. I simply cannot understand how we can justify to the American people the fact that we are charging them an extra penny on every piece of mail they send out and, at the same time, are refusing them basic services which they were accustomed to getting before the postage rates were raised.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment. The $92 million should be restored in its entirety.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there are some things that I want to make absolutely clear relative to the appropriation that we have before us. I am in absolute support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Morrison] and I hope that the amendment will carry by a big margin.

In fiscal 1962, the Post Office Department received $4,331 million. That year the Postmaster General returned $37 million. In the current year, fiscal 1963, the Department received $4,446 million; they had a request prepared for money to meet the pay increase in the amount of $211 million. The Budget Bureau, however, reduced this $211 million by $18 million in money for facilities and $40 million for operations. Operations represents primarily manpower. There is still pending before the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee a request for $163 million additional that will be needed to complete the year.

For 1964 the Post Office Department requested $4,633 million, plus $344 million for the pay raise, or $4,977 million.

I think it is well to point out that the rate increase provided for in Public Law 87–793 will bring in $261 million in 1963 and $580 million in 1964. As a result of the rate increases and as a result of the public policy program enacted by the Congress last year, the postal deficit, which amounted to $749 million in 1962, and $392 million in 1963, will amount to only $104 million in 1964, based on the Department's request in the budget. This will be the lowest postal deficit since the war years when the military took over a great many of the postal functions and made it possible for the Post Office Department to show a profit in its operations. In the face of this marvelous record, and in view of the increase in volume of business, which is estimated to be 2.9 percent for 1964, plus the fact that there are 2 more working days because of leap year and because of the fact that there are 53 Mondays and Tuesdays in 1964, the increase asked for by the Post Office Department is entirely justified.

To cut the appropriation by $92 million means that 9,555 additional jobs that are needed to take care of the rapidly growing population—an increase of 4½ million a year—will be knocked out of the bill, and it will be necessary for the Post Office Department to eliminate approximately 6,000 existing jobs. In the face of the current unemployment, running about 6 percent—in the face of the fact that we voted a postage rate increase last year and promised the American people better postal service—I do not see how any Member of the House of Representatives could support this drastic reduction in appropriations.

In addition to the reduction in personnel that will be necessitated by this proposed cut in appropriations, funds for acquiring sites for new post offices and for architect and engineering work for leased construction projects will be reduced by $10 million. The Post Office Department has poor plant facilities at the present time. With the growing population, we need 110 new post offices to take care of 110 city delivery authorizations that have already been issued for July 1, 1963, plus others that would be necessary in 1964. The post office buildings require a great deal of modernization and, in many instances, the motor vehicles used by the Post Office Department are in a dangerous, rundown condition and are a menace to life and limb.

We have to take the responsibility for providing the postal people with proper tools. We have to take the responsibility of living up to the promises we made to the American public last year when we increased first-class mail rates by 25 percent. We will be responsible for destroying jobs in our American economy if we support the appropriation cut recommended by the committee.

By all means we should support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] and restore the necessary funds to the Post Office Department to properly operate that Department.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, it has always been an American tradition that if we pay more for something, we have a right to expect more in return. If we permit the cut in the Post Office appropriations to remain as is, we shall be reversing that tradition. We shall be establishing a tradition of pay more—get less.

This year the American people will be paying $580 million extra into the Treasury because of higher postage rates. Are we then going to permit this vicious cut in postal appropriations which will result in a curtailment in service? This is the only course the Postmaster General can take if we impose upon him this curtailment in his funds.

We are also in danger of reversing another traditional slogan: "Honesty is the best policy."

The Postmaster General has been criticized because he forthrightly returned to the Treasury $43 million in unexpended funds last year. This has actually been put forward as an argument why his appropriations should be cut this year. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the shoe is on the other foot. This is proof that we have in Mr. Day an honest administrator who uses only the money that he needs and returns what he does not need. He should be commended and encouraged—not penalized—for his honesty.

We also find the spectacle of a Postmaster General being penalized because he submitted an honest budget to the Congress. He voluntarily cut $58 million out of that budget in the interest of economy—although there is doubt that the economies that would be imposed by that voluntary cut are entirely wise. He then presents us with a budget request that has no fat in it. Would that every other administrator followed his lead.

But, instead of encouraging this type of honesty—and if it were universal throughout the Government we would have a really economic operation—we are in danger of crippling the operation of the Department because of it.

The moral has been reversed: "Honesty—evidently—is the worst policy." If you make an honest budget presentation you get clobbered.

If we persist in following this philosophy we shall never have hopes of seeing an honest budget presentation again. Every administrator in government will get our message. Honesty does not pay. Lard your budget with fat. A penny earned is a dollar lost. Take any of our traditional slogans and turn them inside out—and you will come up with the false moral we shall be preaching if we fail to restore this $92 million.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support of the amendment to restore the money to the Post Office appropriations.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, ordinarily I save my firepower for the foreign aid bill. However, I am the ranking majority member of this subcommittee and it has been my privilege to serve on this subcommittee for a period of 15 years.

Mr. Chairman, since the effective date of the Constitution in 1789, we have collected in revenues from the American people $1.31 trillion. But for every dollar we have collected, we have incurred an obligation of $1.76. We are now overdrawn 1 trillion 51 billion for services previously rendered. Every person in the United States is in debt to the Federal Government in the amount of $5,500 for services previously rendered, not something that you are going to do in the future.

Mr. Chairman, $305 billion represents borrowed money. We have 108 statutes on the books that call for the payout of $746 billion in subsequent years for services previously rendered.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to give a brief explanation of this: The interest on the public debt covering much of our extravagance in the past is now $10.1 billion annually. We have approximately 5 million retired military personnel. We must pay those pensions. It is just as much an obligation to send that retired military man his check as it is to redeem our Government bonds. Then we pick up the judicial system. Then we pick up, first, the civil service cases, and then you go into the veterans benefit cases involving some $6 billion or $7 billion annually.

Mr. Chairman, we have borrowed from the future $1,051 billion. It is impossible to extract out of this economy sufficient money to meet the demands of all the people. Somewhere along the way history is going to record us in a way in which we do not like to be recorded, if we do not face up to our responsibilities and bring this thing under control.

Mr. Chairman, you and I know that we are spending unborn generations into destruction. It is a little disappointing to some of us, even though I approve of the system of the Congress working its will, to think that we sit for weeks and months and sometimes as long as five months trying to effect some small savings. Then when we bring the bill out, for some reason or other not necessarily inspired by the Members themselves, some pressure organization, is wiring and telling us "This is the way I expect you to act tomorrow when the bill comes up." I hope that we will face up to our responsibility and recognize that even a 1940 dollar will only buy about 44 cents worth of the 1962 redemption.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the House know the way in which we are traveling. We should work together so we will not have to repudiate this public debt either directly or indirectly, and we are repudiating it indirectly by continuing to lower the purchasing power of the dollar.

Mr. Chairman, this is only a small cut. I have kept silent so far because I thought it could be cut deeper. But let us face up to our responsibilities and recognize that for 17 years this committee has handled this bill, and there has never been any harm done by following the recommendations of this subcommittee.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Morrison amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock, reserving the last 5 minutes to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I heard the preceding speaker talk about the terrible debt we are passing on to our children. I would like to say in just 1 minute that I would rather pass on to my children a debt than to pass upon them the prospect of living under a dictatorship. It is a plain fact that our debt in America is largely due to our participation in World War II, when it rose from $41 billion to $265 billion. It is going up because we are facing up to the challenge of communism around the world. I say that I would rather face a child and say to him that I am passing on to you a debt than to say to that child that I am passing on to you a miserable, bleak life under Communist or Fascist dictatorship.

Now, to get back to the issue at hand, we still hear talk about the so-called deficit in the postal department. To me, this talk is meaningless. Also it results in a disservice to the postal department, its employees, and the public.

The postal department renders a public service. Why should it alone of all Government departments and agencies be expected to break even financially at the end of each fiscal year? We do not demand this of any other Government service.

We say to the postal department that we cannot afford some of its services because of the postal "deficit." Can you imagine our telling the Army that we cannot afford bullets because the Army is not showing a profit this year? Should we stop the National Labor Relations Board from speeding up its caseload because it brings in no revenue?

If you want the postal department to operate without a deficit, why not go a step further and let Western Union operate it at a profit? It is simply ridiculous and unreasonable to demand that a public service operated by the Government end up without cost at the end of the year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Corbett].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, the issue on the Morrison amendments is simply an issue whether or not you are going to give the American people what they are paying for in the way of postal services. Everyone here recognizes that the mail has to go through. Everyone recognizes that if we cut this budget too much we cripple the service until such time as a supplemental appropriation bill comes before us. We are simply saying to the Post Office Department that really needs this money, we are not going to give it to you now, we are going to give it to you in a supplemental sometime later. And we are saying to the American people that we increased your postal rates and now we are going to decrease your service.

To me this is one of the most amazing cuts in an appropriation bill that I have ever seen here. I do not believe under the increased volume that the Post Office has to handle that it can possibly be justified. If we are going to economize we have to do it in those services over which we have jurisdiction. We do not have jurisdiction over how many pieces of mail are dropped in the boxes.

So I believe very sincerely that we should pass these amendments and that we should continue to make the postal service better and give the people what they are paying for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, the committee on page 16 of the report gives three alternatives to take care of the cuts in the appropriation. One, for instance, the Department did not ask for any increased money for new programs; they just asked for money to take care of the increase in the mails, the increased workload. The committee says that is one place you should cut. That is service to the public. That is the service to the public that the committee says is an alternative that can be cut.

Or, second, automatic salary increases can be cut. How can we cut automatic salary increases? I submit it cannot be done. They are established by law.

The third alternative is to cut mail deliveries; cutting mail deliveries, indeed when under the circumstances explained by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Corbett] we have already increased the cost to the mail user everywhere in America for the use of the mail.

It seems to me we must restore every bit of the reduction of the Post Office budget in order to take care of the increased load of mail and the increased number of patrons.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in my determination to see the Congress economize whenever and wherever possible. Yet, as I rise to support both the amendment by the gentleman from Washington and the amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana, I do so believing that such amendments are in the best interest of efficiency and the postal service for the people of America.

My support of the amendment to restore the operational cut to the Post Office Department is based, first, upon the fact that, notwithstanding the statements on the floor of this House by the proponents of the cut, the written report of the Subcommittee on Appropriations states specifically on page 16 thereof that such reductions would come from "automatic within grade salary increases for personnel on the rolls" and "the extension of postal delivery service," both of which proposals I believe to be detrimental to the postal service and the American people.

Mr. Chairman, my support of this amendment is further based upon the fact that the Post Office Department, unlike so many other Government agencies which render service only to certain segments of our population, renders an indispensable service to all of our citizens, rich and poor, urban and rural alike. In considering any reduction in postal operational expenses we should consider the fact that last year we required the American people to pay 25 percent more for first-class postal deliveries and for us to support any measure now which would not expand the service in keeping with the increased volume of mail and our expanding communities would be a disservice to the people of this Nation. They are entitled to what they pay for in the way of postal service.

Then, too, my support of these amendments is based upon the fact that the record proves that the Post Office Department returned to the Federal Treasury $37 million of its authorized budget last fiscal year and has absorbed some $58 million in salary adjustments this fiscal year. These savings could well be emulated by other Federal agencies, and this further convinces me that, should this amendment carry and the proposed increase not be used, that the Post Office Department would return the unused portion to the U.S. Treasury. Accordingly, there would be no unnecessary expenditures of this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, as to my support of the amendment by the gentleman from Washington concerning the so-called work measurement system of the Post Office Department, I do so because I believe the elimination of this watchdog program would result in a saving of at least $5 million annually and, most importantly, this program presently presents a serious morale problem in many large postal facilities which is resulting in a loss of personnel efficiency. Obviously this loss of efficiency adversely affects the postal service itself and does not accomplish its intended purpose.

I believe that the best interest of economy and efficiency can be served by paying competent employees well, eliminating the incompetent, and guarding carefully the number and competency of new employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, under the law the Postmaster General is directed to fix rates for fourth-class postal service based on the costs of that service. Today the Post Office Department is running a deficit of $100 million a year in fourth-class service because the Postmaster General has not brought about an increase in the rate according to law. If the Postmaster General had acted to fix fourth-class rates as so directed there would be another $100 million of revenue in the Post Office Department.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the amendment for restoration of the necessary funds to operate the Post Office Department during fiscal 1964 on a basis equal to all of the patrons of the U.S. postal service. I note with interest on page 268 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, that the Post Office Department is anticipating a strong increase in the number of households during the next fiscal year. They point out an uncontestable statement that new household formation is almost certain to accelerate as the postwar generation reaches marriageable age. The Post Office Department anticipates population growth in no less than 110 new communities all of which will meet requirements for city delivery service.

I ask my colleagues in those 110 areas how they will be able to answer their constituents when demands are made to equalize delivery service in these areas with the same type of efficient service which is being rendered elsewhere.

Since the reduction in appropriations concerns especially the continuing establishment of city delivery service, it must be understood that without the necessary funds further extension of delivery service to postal patrons will cease, and the same people who have accepted the recent first-class postage rate increase will be diverted to a second-class type of postal service.

According to the same report of the Postmaster General, housing starts during the first 9 months of 1962 were up 10 percent, while multiple unit construction was up 32 percent.

With the continuing shift of populations from farm to urban life, and along with the household growth, it appears that the expected increase in areas which meet requirements for city delivery service will be even greater than anticipations during fiscal 1964.

Certainly when the Post Office Department displays such initiative, such splendid efficiency, such steady increase in productivity annually, it is the responsibility of the Congress to encourage such administration, and I urge that the reduction recommended be restored so that even greater efficiencies and even greater innovations can take place.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I urge you to support the Morrison amendment to restore the cut of approximately $92 million to the Post Office budget. I feel that the Appropriations Committee has done a wonderful job in almost every respect. Its chairman and its members have worked hard and conscientiously—but, in this case, they have cut too deeply and the cut would be—not a constructive but a destructive blow to postal services.

The Postmaster General and his staff prepared an honest and conservative budget presentation. They had voluntarily cut $58 million out of that presentation before it reached the Appropriations Committee. The budget, as presented, represented the bare bones of a budget for handling a mail volume of more than 70 billion pieces. It was a budget which would permit the supply of basic services to our expanding population—and nothing more. The massive slice which the Appropriations Committee would make in that budget would cripple the Department and would prevent it from supplying even the basic services which the American people have every right to expect. As for improvements in the service—they would be entirely out of the question. With this drastically reduced budget the Post Office Department would be hard put to stand still, let alone move ahead.

Our population grows by 4.5 million people every year. Our mail volume grows by almost 3 billion pieces every year. This is the standard rate of growth in America. It is a sign of our progress and our natural development. This growth is not planned, and there is nothing the Post Office Department can do about it except to meet the problems it presents.

If we were to permit this $92 million cut to stand—on top of the $58 million cut the Department already has imposed upon itself—we would be expecting the Post Office to meet the problems that growth imposes with a cut of $150 million in its appropriations. Since the budget originally prepared was an honest one—the prospect for the Department would be hopeless. They could not maintain the standards they are maintaining today. The only result would be retrogression and decline.

The normal requirement to meet the growth in our mail service is an addition of 1 million letter carrier stops a year. For the most part these stops are not added onto existing routes. They represent new routes, giving mail service to new housing areas, new developments, new suburbs. If this appropriations cut were to remain, these million stops could never be added. One million families—approximately 4 million Americans—would be denied the basic right of regular and convenient mail service.

Mr. Chairman, this would be false economy, particularly since it would come on top of a postage-rate increase which will add $580 million in postal revenues next year.

It is the American tradition to move forward—not backward. To permit this cut to remain, we would be moving backwards in an area in which forward movement is a national necessity. I support the amendment to restore the money and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly support the Morrison amendment, to provide an adequate and economical U.S. Post Office Department budget for fiscal 1964.

Mr. Chairman, this last year Congress voted a substantial increase in the U.S. postal rates. With the increase of the postal rates, the U.S. taxpayers naturally expect to get more and better postal service. The postal rate increase legislation produced approximately $300 million more revenue in fiscal 1963, and we expect to have $580 million more revenue in fiscal 1964.

We therefore have the additional money to provide for an adequate U.S. Post Office budget, to pay adequate and decent wages and salaries for all postal employees, and to provide fast, efficient, and regular postal services to all our U.S. citizens and taxpayers. I am tired of hearing of the sad plight of our underpaid and overworked postal employees. They do a magnificent job, and Congress should take off the blinders and recognize this good and loyal service.

I believe this reduction is not just economy but this is a cut in essential postal services and jobs. With 4,500,000 new U.S. population being added every year and 1 million new suburban stops for postal service that must be instituted each year, we really will need extra employees to carry out that service and give the good postal service our U.S. citizens are paying for and deserve.

Under this present proposed budget cut, if accepted, 6,000 employees now working in postal service jobs will have to be furloughed and laid off, or discharged completely. In addition, we will lose 9,555 jobs for carriers and clerks that are necessary to give good postal service to our rapidly expanding suburban areas. I represent south Pittsburgh industrial areas, and we need jobs in those areas, good jobs providing needed services, and not just leaf raking or boondoggling. This proposed budget cut would be a loss of 15,555 necessary jobs in these times of high unemployment. I therefore strongly urge that the cut be replaced and favor the passage of the Morrison amendment to restore $92 million approximately to the U.S. postal budget. This budget will still be $58 million below original budget estimates, so Congress will be voting an economical budget.

I like the fact that the Postmaster General has returned to the Treasury previously $37 million of his budget that was appropriated. To me, this is fiscal responsibility, and General Day is to be complimented on this businesslike action. Now when the Postmaster General needs this operations and facilities money to give good efficient postal service, I believe he deserves this confidence.

Our U.S. postal employees have received more pay by our action, but they certainly do not deserve to lose those jobs, or be laid off. We in Congress must be careful, we must be prudent, we must be economical, but we also must remember the postal service must be well run and efficient, and that the postal workers and their families are human beings. Our postal workers through their loyal service to the U.S. taxpayers and the public are entitled to look every Congressman straight in the eye and ask justice and fair treatment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, I rise in support of the Morrison amendment. In saying that, I would like to observe that in my opinion Postmaster General Day is probably the most efficient, effective, and hard-working Postmaster General we have ever had. He is now trying to put into effect improvements for delivering mail across the Nation. Certainly instead of curtailing service we want to improve the service. We cannot do it by cutting $62 million out of the budget. Postmaster General Day says he needs this money to carry on effectively. If the cuts are made he will have to cut services.

I think it is the responsibility of the Congress to improve the postal service of America and give the Postmaster General the tools to do just that.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Morrison amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I was the author of the amendment to the pay bill last year calling on our Federal agencies to absorb so far as possible the additional costs involved in the pay increases. I believe the action of the Committee on Appropriations is in line with that objective and I shall support the cut. I believe, if it is found to be at fault or to provide inadequate funds for the Post Office Department, that there are methods by which additional funds can be provided. I believe we are laying an appropriate foundation upon which the other body is going to build a super structure, anyway.

I recall last fall just before the election when there were a lot of people forgetting about economy and voting for the rate bill and the pay increases. Today, judgment day, is here. We are going to have to face up to the facts. I wish last fall I could have heard some of the people now talking economy join the 20 of us who voted against the pay and rate increase bill. I wish they had then said what the committee report now says:

> During times of Government deficit financing and sizeable postal deficits, the committee believes that all programs should be limited only to the absolutely essential items.

Instead they voted out a whopping increase in costs last year and now the chickens are coming home to roost.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department has only one thing to sell, and that is service. If it cannot give service, it fails in its objective. If it cannot give service, the American people are the ones who pay for that lack.

Mr. Chairman, last year after long months of deliberation Congress enacted legislation increasing postal rates on all categories of mail.

The rate on first-class mail was raised from 4 to 5 cents.

Airmail was increased from 7 to 8 cents.

Similarly, the rate on other classes of mail was increased.

Coupled with these increases was the promise of maintaining our postal service at a high level. Implied was the hope that the service would be improved even beyond what it was at that time. Certainly a curtailment of service was not contemplated. Worded another way, Congress did not intend that the American public be asked to pay more for less service. However, that is the situation confronting us here today if the cut in the appropriation for the operation of our postal service is allowed to stand.

Mr. Chairman, the American public accepted the increase in postal rates without complaint. Large users of the mail as well as the private citizen has paid the increased postage without flinching. I think it would be little less than larceny to continue to demand the higher rate and at the same time curtail service.

I am opposed to this kind of action and, therefore, shall vote for restoration of the funds needed to operate the Post Office Department in an efficient manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER].

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I rise in support of the Morrison amendment.

Certainly, economy is a very worthwhile objective. We all know this. But reducing funds does not necessarily mean economy in my judgment. Economy is directly connected with productivity and maintenance of service, and if reduction of $92 million is made below the request of the Post Office Department, I submit that productivity and service will lag in giving the public that to which they are entitled. The American public, of course, governs the postal service by depositing the amount of mail it requires to be sent. I do not, for the life of me, see how the Department can give service with $92 million less than the Post Office told us they needed. Especially, when a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee has told us that the Department has made an honest and forthright statement.

I believe that this justifies us in following their recommendation. I say that the Post Office Department has submitted a tight budget. Further, I maintain that the citizens paying increased postal rates are entitled to and demand better postal service. With this cut they will not get it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, my district in Kansas has one of the fastest growing populations of any congressional district in the United States. Johnson County, Kans., includes the suburbs for Metropolitan Kansas City, and of course Kansas City, Kans., and Lawrence, the home of the University of Kansas, are all growing fast. Over the entire United States, the Post Office has to add 1 million new delivery units every year, and of course most of these added delivery units are in the rapidly growing suburban areas such as Johnson County and fast-growing areas in my district in Kansas.

Last year we here in Congress passed a postage rate increase bill. We told the American people that, with the increased rates—a full 25 percent increase for the ordinary user—they could expect better postal service. This rate increase will bring in $580 million in 1964; and it will provide more than $600 million in 1956.

The cut in appropriations proposed by the distinguished Committee on Appropriations will mean sharp cutbacks in mail service. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that in my suburban district I am going to be pretty red faced trying to explain what happened to the postal service if this recommended cut is not restored. I am going to be even more red faced explaining to the people in my district where the good postal service we promised them last year has gone.

I think it is ironic that we are voting on this cut in 1963. In 1863, in the midst of a terrible war, the Government of the United States of America established city delivery service. This year we are celebrating the centennial of that city delivery service. Are we going to celebrate by cutting this fine service to the point where it is no longer a service—or are we going to vote the necessary amount of money to properly operate the Post Office Department and especially the city delivery service?

I urge support of the Morrison amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Morrison amendment to restore to the Post Office Department funds it requested in its appropriation for fiscal 1964.

In my opinion the cuts, if carried through and fully accomplished, will have dire effect on the operation of the Postal Service and also on the entire economy of the United States including hundreds of postal workers in the State of Illinois.

Every business letter that is delayed because of the failure of the Congress of the United States to provide the necessary funds to operate the postal service efficiently, is potentially a hazard to the prosperity of our Nation.

Every moment of anxiety in the heart of a postal employee because he fears that his pay adjustments may be in jeopardy will cause a hidden deterioration in the Postal Service and will result in securing less value from each postal dollar.

The cut in postal appropriations will have a very real impact on the economy of the entire Nation. The major problem however is the damage to the postal service because of any cuts. This is particularly true in that the largest cut is proposed for the Bureau of Operations.

Every action of the Bureau of Operations has an impact on the employees and on the mail-using public. It is doubly serious then that of the proposed total cut of $91,964,000, almost exactly $70 million is to be taken from the Bureau of Operations. I am sure that if Assistant Postmaster General Belen goes back and reads now the statement he made when he appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee on February 21, he will wonder about his enthusiasm for "the support and encouragement of this committee."

On the occasion of his appearing before the subcommittee Mr. Belen said:

> I am happy to report that we are entering the homestretch of an eventful and productive year. We are pleased with the results of the efforts we have made to improve service and reduce costs. We recognize that these gains certainly would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the way in which the Congress of the United States may best show its confidence in the work being done by the highly qualified leaders of the Post Office Department, would be to restore the funds requested by Postmaster General Day.

Let us examine the reasons why it was necessary for the Post Office Department to request additional money for operation during fiscal 1964. Mr. Belen outlined six points:

> 1. [Request of] $38.6 million is for the additional man-years required to handle 3.5-percent increase in mail volume.

2. [Request of] $33.6 million is to cover cost for programed expansion of delivery service to 2.3 million additional patrons, operation and maintenance of a larger vehicle fleet, and the protection and maintenance of the additional space to be occupied during 1964.

3. [Request of] $46.6 million is for automatic step increases for all employees required by law.

4. [Request of] $11.8 million is to cover the cost for the 2 extra workdays of all employees, except clerks which are related to the additional volume generated on these 2 extra days.

5. [Request of] $124.5 million is to cover the cost for the annualization of increased pay under phase I of Public Law 87–793, effective October 13, 1962 ($78.8 million) plus the part-year cost of phase II of this law effective January 4, 1964 ($45.7 million).

6. [Request of] $3.1 million is to cover the cost for the increased amount of reimbursement to the Federal employees compensation fund.

Mr. Belen pointed out that the total cost of the installment on the pay increase which is due on January 1, 1964, will be $206.9 million, but that the Department is asking only $153.4 million. Forty million dollars is being absorbed and $13.5 million is being transferred from the allocation for "Plant and equipment."

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department is a big business and naturally, we expect that the managers of a big business should show themselves to be capable of efficient management. In my opinion, the fact that the direct outlay for the pay increase approved by this Congress is being reduced through such sound management by an amount of 25 percent is an administrative miracle and one which we should commend rather than condemn by withholding necessary funds.

Mr. Chairman, when the postal pay increase law was approved by the Congress of the United States, this body was virtually unanimous in its endorsement of that legislation. Let us act now to remove any apprehensiveness that might be in the minds of postal employees about the degree to which their pay increase is protected. The fact that the increase is not truly in jeopardy is of no significance. The postal employees are afraid that we in the Congress of the United States are breaking faith on the commitments we made. I ask my colleagues to support the Morrison amendment and that the full amount be provided in order that we may have a sound and efficient postal service in the year ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Edwards].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and I am directing my remarks to the money in the bill allocated to postal operations where it seems very clear to me that insofar as postal operations are concerned, the bill provides for an actual cut for 1964, and this at a time when our national economy sorely needs the support of improved mail service.

True, in the postal operational area, where a 3.5 percent increase in mail volume must be handled for a growing population; it would grant an increase on paper of $188,137,000 over 1963.

However, all but $35 million of that is for the pending Pay Act Supplement, and automatic within-grade salary increases alone will require nearly $46 million, more than offsetting the $35 million paper increase—leaving an actual cut of about $11 million in 1964 to run the post offices and deliver the mail.

Incidentally, I fail to see how the within-grade increases can be curtailed, as the committe's report implies. These increases are mandatory under law—beyond the control of the postal service.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we should expect the Post Office Department to take an operation cut in 1964 when the workload will increase by 3.5 percent.

I urge approval of the Morrison amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary] for 5 minutes to close debate on the amendments.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that a great many people seem to be disturbed by the language appearing on page 16 which says that the recommended reduction can be absorbed by reducing the proposed programs such as the request for 9,555 additional personnel at an estimated cost of $64,593,000; the automatic within-grade salary increases for personnel on the rolls, estimated at $46,600,000; and the extension of postal delivery service, estimated at $33,600,000.

We say the $46,600,000 may be more than is necessary for that item and, therefore, that is one item they can look to for some reduction.

The Department has overestimated its volume every year since I can remember and we think that maybe they have overestimated some of these other costs and that they should look into it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to point out to the committee what we are called to vote upon by this amendment. This amendment will restore to this bill every single penny that the Appropriations Committee has recommended be cut from the bill, and it will give the Post Office Department every single penny they asked for.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this House for 18 years, and I have never seen that done during the entire 18 years I have served here. If this amendment is adopted, we will today break a precedent here that I have never seen broken.

Let me point out the fact that we have reduced this amount only $91 million on a $5 billion appropriation—1.8 percent.

I have the very highest regard for the Postmaster General and for his assistants who are administering the postal laws. I also have the highest regard for the postal employees. They are doing a grand job. We cut the Department budget 2 years ago. They said, "You have wrecked the Post Office."

But what happened? At the end of the year they were able to turn back $30 million to the Treasury, which was a real accomplishment.

By their ability to economize they were able to save and return to the Treasury, as I stated, $30 million.

Last year we cut them again. They said we were wrecking the Department. But they were able, out of the amount appropriated, to apply $58 million to the automatic salary increase in the present fiscal year 1963.

I am glad to say I have more faith in the Postmaster General and his assistants than do the authors of this amendment. I have too much faith in the Postmaster General to believe that he is going to close up the Post Office just because we cut $91 million out of a total request of $5 billion. I think he can absorb that. It is going to require some ingenuity, it is going to require some ability, but I want to see him use his ingenuity and his ability in this office. He can do it; he is doing it now and I want to see him continue.

If we give him the money that is requested in this bill, I believe he will be able to take care of the postal service without any curtailment whatever.

I trust the House will defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Morrison].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Morrison) there were—ayes 107, noes 195.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gary and Mr. Morrison.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 124, noes 212.

So the amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the item on page 18, "Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," for which an annual appropriation of $385,000 is provided.

In looking at the hearings at page 764 I find that this Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations concerns itself, among other things, with telling the States how to invest their idle money. I do not know whether there is so much idle money in Virginia that they need Federal help to the tune of $385,000 to tell them how to invest it. I cannot believe they have to have that kind of help from the Federal Government. We do not have that problem out in Iowa.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, was the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. GROSS. I would be glad to have the gentleman tell me just why we are spending $385,000 a year on this kind of a setup.

Mr. GARY. This Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was organized several years ago at the suggestion of President Dwight Eisenhower when he made his speech in Williamsburg. State and local governments and the Federal Government have membership on this Commission. The purpose of the Commission is to try to work out some of these problems that are confronting their States and to save some of our States rights on which he spoke at Williamsburg.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that what Mr. Eisenhower may have suggested several years ago does not make very much of an impression upon me, because I was not his most enthusiastic supporter in many governmental matters, as the voting record clearly shows.

Mr. GARY. I know that the gentleman believes in States rights. This Commission was set up in an effort to preserve our States rights and to see how we can work with the Federal Government instead of having them work us.

Mr. GROSS. You do not have to have an expensive setup here in Washington to tell you in the State of Virginia how to reapportion your legislature, do you? I am sure we do not in the State of Iowa. It seems to me that this is getting into States rights.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It is true, as the gentleman from Virginia said, that this matter of intergovernmental relations is one of the things that was brought up in the 1952 campaign. For the gentleman's information, in the 83d Congress the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, introduced in the Senate and I introduced here in the House of Representatives a resolution to create the Intergovernmental Relations Committee. Our idea was then and I think it is still a good idea that we need to do everything we can to preserve for the States and the local governments those functions of government that ought to be theirs. I think some progress has been made, not nearly as much progress as I had hoped could be made, but some has been made. I want to say to the gentleman that speaking for myself, in my opinion a furtherance of that sort of idea of preservation to the States and the local communities and subdivisions of their right of government is one thing we really need in this country.

Mr. GROSS. I would further point out that this has gone from an original $50,000-a-year appropriation in 1960 to $385,000 now. This is a plush setup, and it is fat from the standpoint of salaries.

Mr. GARY. It was $50,000 when it was first started, because they were building up their personnel. They told us at the time that they estimated it would take about $375,000 to run the Commission, and when they got that they would level off. They have operated at $375,000 for the last 3 years, but this year they had a $10,000 increase merely because of the increase in salaries. There is not a single employee added to this Commission in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. It was $375,000, and you added $10,000 to take care of the increases in salaries?

Mr. GARY. Because of the increase in salaries paid, that this Congress voted last session.

Mr. GROSS. In addition to issuing reports dealing with reapportionment of State legislatures and telling State and local governments how to invest their idle cash, the experts for the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations are also reporting on the role of the States in improving the property tax. Is there nothing to be left to the States and municipalities to work out for themselves? And how can this organization make reports on these and a score of other issues without invading States rights?

I hope that the Appropriation Committee next year will take a long, hard look at this expenditure. I am convinced that the States are capable of managing most of their own affairs without this bureaucratic setup in Washington at an annual cost of $385,000. Let us amputate the interfering arm of the Federal Government rather than extend it.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, apparently several Members of this body feel there is something unusual about an advisory commission's offering advice. It is perfectly clear, however, both from the legislative history and the statutory language itself that the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was created for the express purpose of studying intergovernmental activities and problems and charged with the responsibility of making recommendations for improving relations between the separate levels of government in our Federal system.

I should like to remind my colleagues that the Congress established the Advisory Commission by Public Law 380 in 1959 only after extensive committee study of the need for a mechanism to give continuing attention to intergovernmental matters. The broad support in the Congress for this legislation is reflected in the rollcall vote of 335 to 31 by which it was passed in the House and the fact that it was passed without opposition in the Senate.

The basic objective of the Commission is to strengthen the ability of our Federal system to meet the problems of an increasingly complex society by promoting greater cooperation, understanding and coordination of activities among the Federal, State, and local levels of government.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some misunderstanding as to the nature and purpose of the Advisory Commission. The Commission, although financed by Federal funds for practical reasons, is a bipartisan body with its members drawn from all governmental levels and from both the legislative and executive branches. Actually, a majority of the Commission's members are officials of our State and local governments.

In reporting H.R. 6904 the bill which was enacted to establish the Commission, the Committee on Government Operations stated in this connection:

> The committee views the Advisory Commission as a political innovation—a new type of organization designed especially to cope with the changing problems encountered in our Federal form of government. It will be a genuine interlevel body, not an agency dominated or controlled by any one level of government.
>
> It is the committee's expectation that members will come to the Commission with open minds and with the intention of working toward the ultimate goal of responsible and effective government at all levels of our Federal system. In this connection, the committee also believes that the members will not regard themselves as primarily representatives of any particular group, level of government, or geographic area for the advancement of a special point of view. It is intended that the Commission will not urge a Federal solution simply because Federal action appears the easiest course. It is rather intended that it will encourage the assumption of responsibility by the appropriate level or levels of government with respect to any given problem.

During its relatively short existence the Commission has studied a variety of difficult subjects and has issued 16 formal reports plus several informational documents. The Commission's recommendations and suggestions have been directed, in many instances, to our State and local governments and in other instances to the Congress or the President. As the result of the Commission's work, I and other members of the Commission have introduced bills for the consideration of the Congress, and the Governors, State legislators, mayors, and county officials who serve on the Commission have taken similar appropriate action in their respective jurisdictions and through their organizations.

Those of us who have served on the Advisory Commission can attest to the high quality and objectivity of its work. The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh], and I are presently the three Members of this body serving on the Commission. Other House Members who formerly served on the Commission are the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills] and former Representative Ikard, of Texas. While each of us may not agree with every one of the Commission's recommendations, I am sure we would agree that the Commission's work has been thorough and objective and that it functions as a democratic body with full opportunity for the expression of all shades of opinion. Dissenting or additional views are contained in some of the Commission's reports, although others have received unanimous support.

It should be noted also that the Commission's recommendations have been widely endorsed by such important State and local organizations as the Governors' conference, the National Legislative Conference, the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of

County Officials. A detailed table showing the endorsement by these organizations of the Commission's legislative proposals for State action appears on page 21600 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 16.

The Commission's work has also been favorably viewed by many national publications. As an example, I would call your attention to an excellent article written by John Gerrity in the Daily Bond Buyer of April 2, 1962, which I placed in the April 4, 1962, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues. As the article clearly observed:

> [The Advisory Commission] has no power to command, as others do, nor even to criticize. It is a creature of Congress. But it owes its allegiance—in terms of performance—not only to the Federal Government, but to the 50 States and to their 90,000 political subdivisions, 35,000 of which are cities and towns of all sizes and kinds.
>
> Thus, it cannot even take, or receive, credit when any of its suggestions are translated into action. For credit, when it is merited, must go to those who do what they have been advised to do.
>
> It can act only as a catalyst to bring forth the best that is latent in the thousands of differing ambitions and aspirations that all who govern in scores of different ways must have for the governed.
>
> Yet despite its seeming lack of power the Advisory Commission has recorded a remarkable record of achievement in its short life—and this it has done, using mainly two effective weapons: The power of commonsense and the power of good example.

I think it only proper and fitting in concluding these remarks intended to clarify the role of the Commission that I refer to a letter of commendation of this Commission sent by the President to Mr. Frank Bane, the Chairman of the Advisory Commission, on February 26, 1962, at the completion of the Commission's first 2 years. The President said in part:

> The relationships existing among the various levels of government in this country are more complex and more important than at any other time in our Nation's history. It is obvious that the Federal, State, and local governments will be able to discharge their responsibilities more effectively if there is fuller understanding of the proper roles that each can and should perform.
>
> Problems resulting from the rapid growth of our metropolitan areas—including both the central city and the surrounding suburban area—require special attention. Studies already undertaken by the Commission on the subject contain valuable proposals identifying the proper responsibility of each level of government and recommending the most effective use of the combined resources of our cities, States, and National Government. You have properly called attention to the fact that State and local leadership, as well as national leadership, is essential to meet the needs of our growing urban population.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to include the President's complete letter at this point:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, D.C., February 26, 1962.*
>
> Hon. FRANK BANE,
> *Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On the occasion of the reconstitution of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I wish to express my appreciation to those members who have served so well during the first 2-year term of the Commission's existence. I should like also to convey to those members, both old and new, who will carry forward the Commission's work my deep personal interest in the problems which will have the attention and collective experience and judgment of the Commission membership.
>
> The relationships existing among the various levels of government in this country are more complex and more important than at any other time in our Nation's history. It is obvious that the Federal, State, and local governments will be able to discharge their responsibilities more effectively if there is fuller understanding of the proper roles that each can and should perform.
>
> Problems resulting from the rapid growth of our metropolitan areas—including both the central city and the surrounding suburban area—require special attention. Studies already undertaken by the Commission on the subject contain valuable proposals identifying the proper responsibilities of each level of government and recommending the most effective use of the combined resources of our cities, States, and National government. You have properly called attention to the fact that State and local leadership, as well as national leadership, is essential to meet the needs of our growing urban population.
>
> The rising cost of government at all levels, coupled with the growing interdependence of national life, has called new attention to the strains placed on traditional governmental taxing practices. We must improve Federal, State, and local coordination of tax and fiscal practices and policies to achieve equitable taxation, increase administrative efficiency, and make it possible for our taxpayers to pay their taxes with a minimum of confusion and administrative burden. Equitable and reasonable intergovernmental tax policies will facilitate the free flow of trade among our States and will contribute to our economic growth.
>
> I am confident the Commission will address itself to these and other important problems of intergovernmental relationships. You have my sincere wishes that your efforts will help strengthen and improve our system of cooperative federalism.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> JOHN F. KENNEDY.

I think it is evident from these references that the Advisory Commission has been performing important work and that its studies and recommendations have been valuable to our State and local governments as well as to the Federal Government.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes, but I would like to say to my colleague from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that I am sympathetic with what he said about the Intergovernmental Commission. I wish he had offered an amendment to strike out some of the money because I will tell you what that commission is—that is a place where all the Governors can go to beat their breasts for States rights and on their way home stop in Washington and get some more Federal funds to help out on their programs.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PILLION. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. PILLION moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5366 to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 386, nays 17, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—386

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.

Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—17

Alger
Beermann
Bruce
Clausen
Curtis
Foreman
Goodell
Gross
Hall
Johansen
Kilburn
Libonati
McClory
O'Konski
Pillion
Pool
Senner

NOT VOTING—31

Avery
Ayres
Bass
Brademas
Buckley
Burkhalter
Burton
Cederberg
Celler
Cramer
Dawson
Diggs
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Jennings
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Keogh
Kluczynski
McIntire
Macdonald
O'Brien, Ill.
Pilcher
Pirnie
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.
Walter

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Bass.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Jennings with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Celler with McIntire.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Dawson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 5366.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Friday to file a report on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

SECTION 155 OF PUBLIC LAW 87-543—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 155 of Public Law 87–543, I transmit herewith a report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding experience under subsection (a) of that section.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 4, 1963.*

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TRAINING ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 18(c) of the Government Employees Training Act (Public Law 85–507, approved July 7, 1958), I am transmitting forms supplying information on those employees who, during fiscal year 1962, participated in training in non-Government facilities in courses that were over 120 days in duration and those employees who received training in non-Government facilities as the result of receiving an award or contribution.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 4, 1963.*

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, WEEK OF APRIL 8

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader if he will advise us of the program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have completed the legislative business for the week and it is my intention after announcing the program to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tonight it go over until Monday.

Monday is District Day. There is no business.

On Tuesday, the 1963 supplemental appropriation bill will be called up.

Tuesday is a Jewish holy day, the Jewish Passover, and I ask unanimous consent that all votes on Tuesday except on rules or procedural matters may go over until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. For Wednesday and Thursday the program is as follows:

H.R. 5389, purchase of silver.

H.R. 3845, Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act amendments.

H.R. 3120, simplification administration of Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act.

H.R. 1989, Virgin Islands, general obligation bonds authority.

H.R. 1762, outdoor recreation coordination program.

These bills may not be called necessarily in the order listed.

There will be no session on Friday.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further business may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 8

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EASTER RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to advise the House that at the close of business on Thursday, April 11, 1963, it is planned to recess until the morning of Monday, April 22, 1963.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will that be under a 3-day recess agreement?

Mr. ALBERT. I advise the House that we plan to do this by resolution, so that Members may govern themselves accordingly.

FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 5367) to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the dam known as the Bear Creek Dam authorized to be constructed on the Lehigh River in the Delaware River Basin in the State of Pennsylvania by the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 644) shall be known and designated hereafter as the "Francis E. Walter Dam". Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such dam is referred to shall be held to refer to such dam as the "Francis E. Walter Dam".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES L. McDEVITT

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I and other members of the Democratic delegation from Philadelphia may be permitted to extend our remarks at this point in the RECORD in eulogy of the late James L. McDevitt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a distinguished citizen and an old personal friend whose sudden passing on March 19 was a grievous blow to the Nation.

James L. McDevitt was known to many in this Chamber as the national director of the committee on political education, the political arm of the AFL–CIO. But his service in that capacity, distinguished though it was, did not even suggest the full measure of his contributions to his community, his State, and his Nation.

Jim McDevitt was born in my home city of Philadelphia, on November 3, 1898. After attending parochial school, he became an apprentice member of Local No. 8 of the Plasterers Union. But before he had completed his training, the United States became involved in the First World War.

Characteristically, Jim McDevitt enlisted in the service of his country. He fought in France with the Army Air Corps.

When he returned, after the armistice, he resumed his apprenticeship. Once he became a fullfledged journeyman in 1920, he rose quickly through the ranks of local No. 8 from recording secretary to president and then to business representative.

In 1928, he was elected president of the Philadelphia Building Trades Council—just in time to meet the problems of the great depression.

Within the labor movement, Jim McDevitt fought to preserve wage standards against the pressure of unemployment. He fought off the attempts of the Communists to infiltrate the unions and to capitalize on the plight of the jobless. His name and his deeds became known throughout the State, and in 1938, he was chosen as president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, one of the largest in the Nation.

For more than a decade, Jim McDevitt guided the State federation through the turbulent years of depression, recovery, and war. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the political pitfalls were numerous in Pennsylvania; but Jim McDevitt avoided them. He avoided them so skillfully that in 1951, he was summoned by the national AFL to direct its new political action organization, Labor's League for Political Education.

When the AFL–CIO merger took place 4 years later, Jim McDevitt became codirector of COPE; and when his former CIO counterpart retired in 1957, he assumed the directorship alone.

But this is merely a bare outline of his career. What is still more significant, Mr. Speaker, is the role this busy man was playing apart from his trade union concerns.

I am not referring only to service on public bodies. True, Jim McDevitt served on the building code commission and the housing authority in Philadelphia. He was Labor Relations Director for the WPA in the city, and a member of the regional labor board.

Later, he was a member of the State unemployment compensation commission board of review, the State planning commission, and many other bodies having to do with labor relations, vocational education, and occupational safety. To a degree, these were related to his position as a union leader.

But beyond that, Jim McDevitt actively led fund-raising drives for community chests and the Red Cross. He was deeply interested in the displaced persons commission, on which he served.

He was an executive committee member of the Pennsylvania Council for a Fair Employment Practices Commission. He was a member of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the National Trade Council for Palestine.

In short, Mr. Speaker, James L. McDevitt, a trade union leader, was above all a citizen; a citizen who was not only concerned about the well-being of the community, and about the plight of the unfortunate, but who tirelessly devoted his time and his talents to building a better America. We need more such citizens in every walk of life; and I think it is most appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for this House to note with sorrow the loss of so outstanding an example.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the eulogies that have been paid to my old friend, James L. McDevitt, are heart warming, even though I am still stunned by his sudden passing.

It is difficult to express the nature of a man in words. The facts of his career must largely speak for themselves, even though they are inadequate.

Mention has been made of Jim McDevitt's concern for the disadvantaged—the Negroes, the Jews, the displaced persons and all the rest. This stemmed, it seems to me, from an inherent faith in the goodness of man; and it was related to his ability to take a partisan side without enmity.

This was equally evident in his own trade union field. At the time Jim McDevitt became president of the Pennsylvania AFL, the rivalry between the AFL and the new CIO was at its height. The disputes were so bitter that the rival organizations often found it impossible to work together, even when their objectives—as in the case of legislation—were identical.

But this was not the case with Jim McDevitt. When feelings ran highest, he still maintained a working relationship with the rival CIO forces—a relationship based upon mutual respect, and a recognition that the ultimate good was more important than immediate advantage.

This was a key element in his character; and it is the reason, I believe, why his loss is so deeply felt by all of us who knew him, on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the tribute paid by my distinguished colleague to the late James L. McDevitt. I knew him personally for many years; I was counseled by him in labor matters when I served in the General Assembly of Pennsylvania; my late father was a plastering contractor and hired men from local No. 8, of which Jim was the business agent.

I was glad to note that the national chairmen of both political parties expressed their sorrow at his death, and praised the contributions he had made to our national life.

It seems to me that this truly represents the man himself. As many Members of the Congress are well aware, Jim McDevitt was a partisan; but his basic partisanship was on behalf of a more perfect democracy.

As COPE director, he took part in campaigns in opposition to some of us and in support of others. Yet his greatest objective was the full participation by every citizen in the electoral process, so that the outcome, whatever it might be, would truly represent the will of the people.

Surely that is an objective that should be shared by every American.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any case in which Jim McDevitt's partisanship was tinged with personal rancor. He stood on the principles in which be believed; and he fully recognized the right of others to do the same.

Therefore, it can be said, I think, that in this political world, of which we are all a part, Jim McDevitt had many friends; he had many opponents; but he had no enemies. For this quality alone, he will be sorely missed.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the eloquent words of my distinguished colleagues in memorializing James McDevitt.

He was a man of warmth, of humor, of deep sincerity. He was a man of his word—a man you could trust.

In a field that is contentious by nature, he was a powerful advocate without spite or venom. His goal was not the accumulation of power, but the advancement of principle.

As a labor leader, as a politician and as a citizen, Jim McDevitt represented the best qualities of democratic life.

I will miss him as a friend; the labor movement will miss him as a leader; and the Nation will miss him as an example of the democratic faith in action.

I deeply appreciate this opportunity to join in a tribute to his memory.

Jim McDevitt was kind to everyone and it is my earnest prayer that the good Lord will be kind to him.

RUSSIA CANNOT EQUAL UNITED STATES

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the best newspaper headlines to stir pride and confidence in the people of this great Nation is emblazoned in this afternoon's Washington Daily News. Emphatically and boldly it proclaims "Russia Cannot Equal U.S. Power in Our Lifetime: McNamara."

It is good to be reassured of the posture of our national defense and strength. The people—all of us—across the length and breadth of this land will sense a feeling of satisfaction, and may I add, relief as we harken to the words of Secretary McNamara. It is good that he speaks out at this time. For, Mr. Speaker, too often, the arena is left to carping critics who constantly downgrade the Nation's security and its strength.

The country's position vis-a-vis Russia with respect to our capability is due, of course, to many factors. First and foremost has been the willingness of the people of this Nation to sacrifice so much of their material gains to insure the best and the finest of military hardware. They have been ready and eager to shoulder the very heavy burden of taxes that make possible the achievements that guarantee our survival. Behind our people stand the long line of completely dedicated officers and men of our Military Establishment; our magnificent industrial capacity of research, machines, and workers; the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government who have risen to the challenge. And finally, Mr. Speaker, this country can point with pride to men like Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara who, under oft times difficult and trying circumstances, has brilliantly marshaled all of these forces into the most powerful and effective military force the world has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the Record excerpts of Secretary McNamara's testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee:

McNamara Says United States Leads Reds

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has told Congress that Russia's economic and military power complex will not equal that of the United States "in our lifetime."

Mr. McNamara's confident appraisal of the U.S. defenses was contained in testimony given to the Senate Armed Services Committee in February. It was made public today by the committee.

The Defense Secretary said that all-out nuclear war was "improbable," but his testimony made it clear he thought the United States was ready to fight if necessary—and win.

Mr. McNamara said that all Premier Khrushchev's actions "indicate the conclusion that he knows we can destroy his society today should he attack us from the ground, the sea, the atmosphere, or space."

Responding to criticism from committee members for some Pentagon decisions, Mr. McNamara defended his policy of phasing out manned bombers, canceling the the Skybolt missile, and other steps he has taken.

He also said the United States would be stronger—not weaker—if a treaty banning nuclear testing could be negotiated with the Soviet.

Mr. McNamara said he was confident this country would continue to have the ability to penetrate Soviet defenses with strategic payloads, even without further U.S. nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere to perfect warheads.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, at last the Republican budget cutters have been exposed in all their irresponsibility.

For the past month—since March 5—they have called for a $15 billion cut in the fiscal 1964 budget.

But not once during this month did they submit a bill of particulars.

Not once did they publicly say where they were going to cut—and how much.

Not once did they inform the taxpayers where their tax dollars supposedly would be saved.

And yet, if we are to accept their statements at face value, their cuts would have been made solely for the benefit of the taxpayers.

But we can never accept the Republicans at face value unless we first tear away the mask of fiscal responsibility that covers up a ruthless and irresponsible partisanship.

And it is for this reason that the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Albert] speaking for the Democratic leadership yesterday rose in the House of Representatives to tell the Nation what the Republican budget cuts would do.

He presented in detail—down to effect in cities and towns—the results of a $15 billion budget cut.

He presented the Republican formula for "America Last."

He presented it because the Republicans had not stood up and supported their wild charges.

Why?

Because they know the American people would never submit to the Republican budget ax turning the American dream into a nightmare.

In my own State of California, for example, a 15-percent cut in the NASA budget would put 9,200 people out of work in space industries, and kill the jobs of other thousands in related activities. And that would only be a start.

A Republican cut in the manpower training and development program would mean that 2,262 Californians would be denied a chance to learn new skills that would give them a chance to earn a good living in our technological society.

How many of these 2,262 persons have families? What would a denial of training do to them, to their children? They would be forced to go on relief rolls.

So to save $2.5 million in California, the Republicans would send people begging; they would increase the relief rolls so they could pose as savers of the Nation's dollars.

They would rather have people hungry than give them a chance to learn new skills so they can feed themselves.

Then there is the accelerated public works program.

By cutting this program 15 percent, dozens of California projects would be eliminated.

What do the Republicans plan to do instead?

How would they compensate for the flood control projects at Los Angeles and Santa Ynez that would be stopped? Or the seven watershed projects?

What about airports?

At least 25 California airports would have to forget about improved safety devices.

Bakersfield, San Diego, and Stockton could not have new equipment that would improve their existing instrument landing systems.

For another example, take the Veterans' Administration program.

Cuts here would mean that Long Beach, Los Angeles, Palo Alto, and San Francisco would have a poorer quality of care in VA hospitals.

California would lose weather stations, too.

And a reduction in the maritime fleet would mean the loss of shipbuilding contracts at Bethlehem Steel Co. of San Francisco, National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. of San Diego, and Todd Shipyards of San Pedro.

Wherever you turn, California, like every other State in the Nation, would be hit hard by the irresponsible Republican budget cuts.

Because these are cuts that eliminate jobs, that put people on relief, that eliminate public works projects designed to stimulate the economy, and that even will risk air safety for the sake of saving a few dollars.

As I said earlier, at last the full scope of Republican irresponsibility has been made public.

They had their chance to explain for 1 full month when we asked them day after day for a bill of particulars.

Their answer to the American people was only silence.

We will not permit them to make America last.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Democratic leadership for the intensive study it has made of the effect of the $15 billion budget reduction proposed by the Republicans.

I think it is most significant that even after the majority leader made his excellent presentation on Tuesday, the Republican leadership still refuses to pinpoint its $15 billion emasculation of the budget.

The truth is that $15 billion cannot be cut out of the budget without seriously damaging this Nation and its people—their defense, their livelihood, their educational system—the whole gamut of projects, functions, and programs in which the Federal Government plays a vital role.

The Republican leadership knows this, I am sure.

It is across a barrel.

It refuses to admit it is wrong and either will not or dare not admit the effect of what it proposes.

In the meantime it sits on its so-called statistics and makes noises like an outraged elephant.

This great Nation must be first in defense, first in education, first in economic growth, first in all those things vital to the strength of a free people.

We dare not weaken our Nation at this crucial time.

We must not permit a crippling of essential Federal programs.

In my State of New York, for example, the following vital Federal operations would be cut back or abolished if the Republicans had their way:

First. Ten employment security offices would be closed, sending 575 employees to other offices to collect their own unemployment insurance benefits.

Second. A cutback in NASA's space budget for Project Apollo would put 1,840 New Yorkers out of work—240 at the Kollsman plant at Elmhurst and 1,600 at the Grumman factory at Bethpage.

Third. The continued operation and high quality of care given the patients at Veterans' Administration hospitals at Castle Point and Northport, Long Island, to say nothing of the proposed new Veterans' Administration hospital we so desperately need on Long Island.

Fourth. Planned or pending improvements to the following airports:

New York—Idlewild: Instrument landing system, third facility: New standards approach light system, runway, and identification lights, and visual approach slope indicators.

New York—Jamaica: Airport traffic control center operation, aircraft movement information service.

Elmira, Binghamton, Utica: Airport traffic control tower instrument landing system.

Niagara Falls: Approach light system.

Islip: Airport traffic control tower instrument landing system.

White Plains: Airport surveillance radars.

De Lancey, Dunkirk, New York—LaGuardia, Utica, Watertown: Distance measuring equipment.

Ogdensburg, Saranac Lake: Terminal very high frequency radio directional ranges.

Binghamton, Buffalo, Islip, New York—Idlewild, Niagara Falls, Peconic, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, White Plains: Equipment to improve the reliability of instrument landing systems.

Buffalo: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Albany, Buffalo, Elmira, Watertown: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Plattsburg: Tactical air navigation equipment.

This action would seriously impair safety to both air travelers and persons living adjacent to some of the world's busiest airports.

Fifth. Weather Bureau operations at LaGuardia Airport, New York City, Rochester, Binghamton, and Albany.

Sixth. Corps of Engineers pending and incomplete projects at Flushing Bay and Creek, Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, Buffalo Harbor, Rochester Harbor, Herkimer, and Buttermilk Channel.

Seventh. National Park Service projects: Rehabilitation of the Statue of Liberty National Monument, Federal Hall and Hamilton Grange National Memorials, Saratoga National Historical Park, construction at Sagamore Hill—home of Theodore Roosevelt.

Eighth. Work pending or in progress on flood control and watershed projects.

Flood control: Buffalo Creek.

Watershed: Conewango Creek, Cowaselon Creek, Genegantslet Creek, Ishua Creek, Nanticoke Creek, and Upper Five-Mile Creek.

Ninth. Accelerated pending public works projects:

Waddington's application for $45,000 for a new sewer system creating 45 man-months of onsite labor.

Tonawanda's application for $225,000 for a new water system generating 225 man-months of onsite labor.

Lake Placid-Saranac Lake Hospital in Ray Brook's application for $900,000 for a new hospital to replace two existing hospitals creating 900 man-months of onsite labor.

Sharon Springs' request for $70,500 for additions to the sewage treatment plant generating 70.5 man-hours of onsite labor.

The Republican effort to reduce essential activities in my State would be duplicated in every State of the Union. Certainly, the people of New York State won't buy this penny-wise, pound-foolish policy of so-called savings. Nor will the people of the rest of the country.

While all these projects and activities are essential, none more pointedly demonstrates the grotesque effect of a meat-ax slash prepared by the Republicans than does the possibility of a shabby and unkempt Statue of Liberty. Surely, Mr. Speaker, they cannot be serious.

LET US NOT SWEEP THE PLIGHT OF OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS UNDER THE RUG

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread defeatism regarding Federal aid for our public elementary and secondary schools, and justly so, since the needs of our public schools grow more serious with each year of inaction. Criticism of this inaction is growing.

Such criticism was so aptly summarized last Friday by the noted journalist, Marquis Childs, in his syndicated column. He stated:

> What is most striking is the fact that the alarm of only 5 or 6 years ago over the public schools has seemed to fade away. It is as if the problem of overcrowding, underpaid and overworked teachers, antiquated and even dangerous school buildings had by some unseen force been solved.
>
> But what has happened, in the view of knowledgeable observers, is that out of frustration with repeated failure to make any progress the whole question of the deteriorating American educational system has been swept under the rug. Plagued by the religious controversy, legislators have shunted the challenge of aid to elementary and secondary schools into the background. Apparently in the conviction that out of sight, out of mind, all except a few conscientious Members of Congress are content to let it stay there.

I wish to disassociate myself completely from those—in or out of the U.S. Congress—who are willing to sweep the plight of our public schools under the rug.

I also wish to disassociate myself from the position being taken by some of our colleagues that we can ignore the plight of our public schools and consider that we have met the Federal responsibility toward education by providing aid to colleges. Throughout the hearings on H.R. 3000—the so-called omnibus education bill—I have insisted again and again that to aid only higher education is like putting a roof over a house without solid foundations. We must have both higher education and public elementary and secondary school assistance. The basic strength of American education must be reinforced from the ground up.

I do want to associate myself with President Kennedy's statement that "excellence in education must begin at the elementary level" and with those Members of Congress who agree with me that the Congress has for too long abdicated its proper responsibilities to public education. Of course we need more doctors, more scientists, more teachers, and more technicians, but we must recognize that the place to begin to prevent the loss and waste of potential talent is in our public schools. For it is in our public schools that the chain reaction is first set off. Ignore this basic fact and you are ignoring the basic problem itself. What good is it to try, at much greater cost, to wipe out adult illiteracy and school dropouts without assuring that weaknesses at the foundations of education will not constantly feed replacements into the national pool of the uneducated?

Each year that action is postponed—action to help the States get American education moving forward at a more rapid pace, action to end overcrowding of classrooms and to provide needed quantity and quality of teachers—means millions of children permanently deprived of a sound education. These are the children who eventually swell the lists of school dropouts and illiterates. Unless we begin to concern ourselves with the fundamental problems of our public schools, we shall scarcely be able to survive as a free people in a free world.

Our counterparts in the legislatures of our 50 States face the same problems we face in providing funds for public education. For the past many years, our school enrollment has increased at the rate of 1 million pupils each year—requiring more classrooms and teachers. While the States and localities have taken action to meet this challenging problem, what contribution have we made?

The extensive congressional debates on the subject of Federal aid to education have not been a complete waste of time but have served a very useful function. They have eloquently expressed the yearning of the American people for the best possible public educational system for their children. They have emphasized that under our system of government, primary responsibility for education is a State and local function, that we are in fact a Nation of 50 separate State school systems—each in turn made up of local school districts representing a variety of educational patterns—and finally, that a way must be found to provide needed Federal aid without overruling State and local education authorities on what and how elementary and secondary school pupils are taught.

There is general agreement that American education is in need of many changes and much improvement. Millions of dedicated citizens, through participation in parent-teacher associations, local school boards, and our State and local legislative bodies, are taking part in the day-to-day process of improving our schools. Many gains have been made in recent years. But much more needs to be done. A high proportion of the local and State tax dollar is now being voted for our public educational systems, but the competition for the limited State and local tax dollar is becoming more and more severe. Increasingly, the average citizen is becoming aware that almost two-thirds of his tax dollars go to the Federal Treasury. Increasingly, he is asking that some of it be returned to the State where it can be added to State and local funds and used to accelerate the solution of the most pressing educational problems.

The needs of our public schools are clear and I believe that our duty in the U.S. Congress is clear. I intend to press for action because it is urgently needed in the national interest.

Several days ago, I introduced a bill, H.R. 5344, the Public Education Improvement Act of 1963, which provides for a new approach to Federal aid for public elementary and secondary schools. This proposal follows the basic principles of the Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Public Elementary and Secondary Education and the policies of the Council of Chief State School Officers.

The members of the Bipartisan Citizens Committee have differed in the past as to the proper role of the Federal Government in the financing of education. As individuals, they undoubtedly remain less than unanimous on particular details. Despite such differences, however, they have joined together to support a bipartisan approach to legislation and have formulated a series of principles for constructive legislative action. My bill follows these principles closely, and I do believe that they provide a basis for ending the impasse and achieving the enactment of a sound general education bill. Following is the membership of the citizens committee and its "Statement of Principles":

BIPARTISAN CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

(Members serve as individuals—titles are for identification)

Chairman: George J. Hecht, publisher, Parents' Magazine and chairman, American Parents Committee Inc.

Executive vice chairman: Bernard Locker, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

William Benton, chairman of the board, Encyclopedia Britannica, former U.S. Senator from Connecticut.

Barry Bingham, editor and publisher, Courier-Journal and Louisville Times.

James B. Conant, president emeritus, Harvard University.

Gardner Cowles, editor and president, Look magazine.

Lawrence G. Derthick, former superintendent of schools of Chattanooga, Tenn., and former U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Walt Disney, chairman of the board, Walt Disney Productions.

Arthus S. Flemming, president, University of Oregon, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Marion B. Folsom, director, Eastman Kodak Co., former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers.

Nelson C. Jackson, associate executive director, National Urban League.

Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, former president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Austin J. McCaffrey, executive director, American Textbook Publishers Institute, former State commissioner of education of New Hampshire.

Earl J. McGrath, executive officer, Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, former U.S. Commissioner of Education.

William C. Menninger, M.D., president, the Menninger Foundation.

M. D. Mobley, executive secretary, American Vocational Association.

James S. Peters, board chairman, Bank of Manchester, Ga., and chairman, Georgia State Board of Education.

Walter P. Reuther, president, International Union, United Automobile Workers.

Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, public and industrial relations counsel, former Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Harry Scherman, chairman, Book-of-the-Month Club and trustee, Committee on Economic Development.

Howard K. Smith, news analyst, American Broadcasting Co.

Jesse G. Stratton, farmer, member Clinton, Okla., school board, former president, National School Boards Association.

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

In our efforts to promote sound legislation to provide Federal aid to accelerate necessary improvements in public elementary and secondary education, the following principles serve as our guidelines:

Bipartisan approach: The legislation should be formulated, sponsored, and supported on a bipartisan basis. Only a truly bipartisan bill can serve as a rallying point for Democrats and Republicans—both in and out of Congress—who favor the principle of Federal participation in the financing of public elementary and secondary education, without controlling or supplanting State or local efforts.

As a committee, we neither support nor oppose any particular bill at this time. What we do urge is a determined and concerted effort by both the administration and the Congress to stop dealing with this vital matter on a partisan basis, and to give the highest priority to the consideration of a sound and meaningful education bill developed on a truly bipartisan basis.

Make Federal control illegal and impossible: The legislation should be based on clear and unequivocal recognition that education is constitutionally a primary function of the States and that Federal funds for education should not be used in any way to control education programs and activities at either the State or local level. In line with this all-important principle, the Citizens Committee urges that any legislation include the following provisions to allay honest fears of Federal control.

1. Federal funds should be invested in ongoing State aid education systems, as authorized by the legislature of each State, and for which the States are annually appropriating more than $6 billion of State funds.

2. Federal funds should, by Federal law, be deemed to be State funds upon receipt by the State, with subsequent responsibility for reporting to the Federal Government confined by law to the official State agency for education.

3. The commingled Federal and State funds would be distributed to local school authorities for public education purposes, as defined by State law, using the same processes through which State funds are now distributed, thus making Federal control impossible since the Federal dollar would be indistinguishable from the State dollar.

4. The State and local educational authorities should continue, as at present, to determine which are their most critical educational needs and priorities and how they can best be met.

Under this new approach, the issue of Federal aid for private and parochial schools is not a question for the Federal Government to decide. This is because each State would be left full responsibility to define the public education purposes for which Federal funds may be used.

Aid in proportion to need: Federal funds should be apportioned among the States on an equalization basis so that the poorer States would receive proportionately more than the wealthier States, and each State should be left free to extend its own program of allocation to local districts so that the purposes of equalization of financing within each State will be fully served with the combined State and Federal funds directed to the points of greatest need.

Encourage greater State and local effort: The legislation should include necessary safeguards to prevent Federal funds from being substituted for State and local funds, and should also stimulate increased State and local financing. This could be accomplished in several ways:

1. By requiring the States to match Federal grants with "new" State funds, with the poorer States matching proportionately less than the wealthier ones.

2. By penalizing a State through a reduction of Federal aid when total State and local funds for public education are reduced.

3. By providing an incentive for increased State and local appropriations for public education.

State planning for action: Finally, the legislation should encourage each State to conduct a complete and comprehensive study of its system of public elementary and secondary education, determine its own priorities of educational needs, and set forth its own program to use Federal as well as State and local funds in accelerating needed improvements.

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on March 4 I referred to the President's changing moods with reference to conditions in the country and in the world. I have an article here on the policy of inaction against Cuba. Just a couple of years ago, President Kennedy, while in Canada, lauded the Cuban rebels for trying to free their country, and, of course, we all laud them for that. Today, the President has changed his mood. Now he states that we must prosecute and we must expel the Cuban rebels for trying to free their country. This is a double standard because in Vietnam we are supporting the fight against North Vietnam which is being helped by the Russians. We have lost 60 American military lives there. The Russians have troops in Cuba and they are furnishing and moving all the military supplies in there that they need. Now President Kennedy is not going to permit the Cuban rebels to fight for the freedom of their own country. What kind of changing mood is this that the President is in today and when are we going to get some kind of policy off the ground that will solidify our position with respect to Cuba and take the necessary action to support these people who want to give their lives to free their country.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper article to which I referred, by David Lawrence, in the Washington Evening Star, is as follows:

Policy of Inaction Against Cuba—U.S. Efforts Against Anti-Castro Attacks Described as Result of Confusion

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the "clearer idea" has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in South Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Migs, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called "neutrality" laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of "neutrality." The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly neutral.

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the South may fall one-by-one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke "neutrality" laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

A THREAT TO THE PEACE

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply disturbed by reports of German scientists working in Egypt to develop Egyptian rocketry. Such activity not only threatens Israel but also the peace of the entire area. I have asked the Secretary of State for a full report on this explosive situation and have called upon the Secretary of State to urge the West German Government to discourage such activities.

On April 2, 1963, the New York Post published an editorial which points out that the West German Government is seriously considering measures to discourage their scientists from aiding the Egyptian Government. The West German Government should be encouraged by us to pursue vigorously such a policy. The New York Post editorial also suggests that steps be taken to initiate area disarmament in the Middle East. Disarmament in that area would reduce tensions in one of the most explosive spots in the world and would be a major step toward world peace. I recommend the following editorial to my colleagues:

GERMANS IN EGYPT

An Associated Press dispatch from Cairo recently quoted authoritative sources as saying that most of the German scientists in Egypt are working on a supersonic fighter plane, not on rockets and missiles, as the Israelis have alleged.

Unhappily for the Egyptians, this denial collided with official admissions in Bonn that German scientists were working on rocket projects in Egypt. The West German Government, after an initial tendency to shrug off the Israel charges, is now taking them with great seriousness.

The charges were discussed at a Cabinet meeting which authorized a condemnation of German citizens who worked on the production of weapons of annihilation in areas of international tension. It also ordered a study of measures by which such citizens could be persuaded to return home.

This is a far sounder attitude than the earlier inclination to take shelter behind the alleged legal difficulty of preventing German citizens from working in Egypt.

In view of modern history, the Israel complaint merited more than a legalistic reply. For the specter of German science enlisted in the service of those who would destroy Israel is an intolerable sequel to the Nazi nightmare.

But this is not only a German responsibility. This is an area that urgently calls for regional disarmament, starting if necessary with an arms freeze.

All that is required is for the Great Powers who are the suppliers of the more sinister weapons littering the region to agree on a cutoff. Why not? It should be clear by now that arms purchase no lasting friendship in the Middle East for either East or West.

IS HITLER'S TOP AVIATION DESIGNER, WILLY MESSERSCHMITT, HELPING THE EGYPTIANS BUILD A MACH 2 FIGHTER AIRPLANE TO THREATEN THE SECURITY AND PEACE OF ISRAEL?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly disturbed by a report which has just come to my attention from the March 31 issue of the London Sunday Telegraph to the effect that Hitler's top aviation designer, Willy Messerschmitt, is now in Egypt heading up a team of 300 German aviation technicians helping the Egyptians in building a mach 2 fighter aircraft.

This report is disturbing indeed because, if true, it would represent a grave threat to the peace of the Middle East and to the security of the State of Israel. It would also represent a violation of the West German Constitution which prohibits, "actions designed to disturb the peaceful coexistence of nations or to prepare a war of aggression."

Mr. Speaker, it is incredible that countries which receive our aid, and with one of which we are closely allied should be permitted to participate in military development activities which clearly threaten the security and independence of Israel.

This report states, Mr. Speaker, that included among these aviation technicians are a former Nazi stormtrooper colonel and a physician who fled from Germany because he is wanted there for medical atrocities at Buchenwald for which he was responsible.

The published report also indicates that a number of vital parts of this fighter being developed in Egypt have been manufactured in the same Messerschmitt factory in Germany which is currently producing parts for the F-104 under provisions of a NATO contract.

Mr. Speaker, I have today wired both the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and asked them to investigate the facts alleged in the article and to report to me their findings. I have further requested that if these reports prove to be true, these officials advise me what steps the U.S. Government could take to help put an immediate end to these activities. I wait eagerly for their replies.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article referred to:

GERMAN TELLS OF WORK FOR NASSER—MESSERSCHMITT MEN BUILD FIGHTERS

(By Sefton Delmer)

Munich.—A German engineer who until January of this year was a member of a team of 300 German aircraft technicians working in Egypt under Hitler's ace designer, Prof. Willy Messerschmitt, has talked to me here in Munich for 2 hours with complete candor.

He gave me the first account of this extraordinary operation, by which West Germans, including former leading Nazi functionaries, are helping President Nasser with his plan to liquidate the survivors of Hitler's terror, and the State they built in Palestine.

The information the engineer gave me made it irrefutably clear that Professor Messerschmitt and his men are violating Germany's basic law. This forbids "actions designed to disturb the peaceful co-existence of nations, or to prepare a war of aggression."

For he revealed to me that the powerful jet fighter the German experts are building for President Nasser in two vast factory complexes at Helouan on the Nile is designed as a powerful weapon of attack. It is to be capable of a speed of mach 2.

AIRCRAFT PARTS SUPPLIED

More than that, Professor Messerschmitt is also violating the article of the basic law which lays it down that "instruments of war may be transported or put into circulation only with the permission of the Federal Government."

The Messerschmitt works in Germany, the engineer revealed, not content with producing essential parts of the American F-104 multipurpose fighter-bomber under a NATO contract, have also been manufacturing and forwarding to Helouan a number of parts vital to the German-designed Egyptian fighter.

Among the parts he mentioned specifically were undercarriages and canopies. A number of other German firms, and Swiss ones too, are manufacturing machine tools for the Messerschmitt operation in Egypt.

I find it unthinkable that Dr. Adenauer's government, which has always shown itself fully aware of the need for the Federal Republic to atone for the crimes committed under Hitler against the Jewish people, could have authorized the Messerschmitt exports.

WORK GIVEN UP

The engineer asked me to keep his name secret. I readily agreed.

"I gave up my work in Egypt," he said, "partly because I fell sick, but mainly because of my growing misgivings concerning it. I could not stand the everlasting anti-Jewish fulminations of the ex-Nazi element among my colleagues.

"Above all, I felt that it was morally and politically indefensible for Germans to be associated with this enterprise, which one day was bound to end in conflict with Israel, in view of our very special situation with regard to the Jews.

"And I did so even though I appreciate fully the arguments that if we West Germans back out of this project our places will most likely be taken by Communists. The Germans of the Soviet zone, and the Czechs are both eager to take it on."

The engineer categorically denied that the Messerschmitt men or the factory installations built under Professor Messerschmitt's directions had been used for the production of missiles.

"The work on missiles," he said, "is the job of an entirely separate team, also consisting mostly of Germans and Austrians. Their plant is near Heliopolis, some way down the road to Suez.

"Our two plants are at Helouan. We had nothing whatever to do with the missile team.

"In fact I did not even know of their existence until one day we heard the sound of exploding rockets and saw three missiles soaring through the clear blue sky in the direction of the western desert."

The Messerschmitt team itself is divided into two production units. Each has its separate plant and equipment. The first headed by the Austrian Hans Schöubaumsfeld, and installed in military factory No. 36, is concerned with the elaboration of the frame of the new Egyptian super-fighter which the Germans call "T Cell."

The second, under the direction of another Austrian, Ferdinand Brandner, is exclusively concerned with the design and construction of a new jet propulsion unit. It is housed in military factory No. 35.

Herr Brandner's unit, my engineer informant declared, was the more rabidly Nazi of the two, for Brandner, an old-time Nazi, held the rank of Stormtroop Colonel.

BUCHENWALD DOCTOR

One of Brandner's first decisions was to appoint, as medical officer to his unit, the notorious Dr. Eisels, who escaped to Egypt from Germany to avoid being sentenced for the medical atrocities he committed as camp doctor at Buchenwald.

According to the plans made when Professor Messerschmitt agreed to take over the project in 1960, the Egypt superfighter—a development of the HA-300 which he built in Spain after the war with Bristol jet engines—was to be ready for mass production by 1965.

Although President Nasser has poured close to £100 million of Suez Canal revenues into the Helouan project—Professor Messerschmitt insists on cash down for every screw delivered—the prototype is nowhere near ready for testing. The main reason being that Brandner is badly behind with the production of the new power unit.

Among Nasser's circle of advisers there are many critics of Brandner, even though Brandner himself enjoys the personal friendship of Col. Nasser. What apparently particularly attracts the Egyptian dictator is Brandner's unconventionality in solving problems.

When, for instance, production of the Messerschmitt jet trainer, the HA-200, threatened to be held up because the French would not deliver to Egypt the Marbre jet engine which went with it, or grant Helouan a license to build it, Brandner simply went ahead, my informant said, and built it without a license.

"You can get away with that sort of thing if you are working for the Soviet Union," the engineer said, "but I doubt whether the French will let him get away with it in Egypt."

COLONEL NASSER IMPRESSED

Brandner's enthusiasm and optimism, however, constantly fires President Nasser's imagination and pride. Brandner is promising that his engine is to power an Indian jet fighter being built for Mr. Nehru by Dr. Tank, another of Hitler's jet designers.

Indian experts have been visiting Helouan, and, according to a dispatch from Anthony Mann, a further conference between Professor Messerschmitt and Helouan's men took place recently in Delhi.

All this is sheer joy for the ambitious Colonel Nasser, who dreams of making Egypt at one jump the premier military and industrial power of the Afro-Asian bloc. Other Egyptians however, are pressing that priorities should be given to the production of missiles and that the fighter project should be scrapped.

My engineer informant fears that there is a real possibility that this may be done, if under German Government pressure, or as the result of Egyptian dissatisfaction with the superfighter's progress, the Messerschmitt team is sent home.

THE TRUTH OF THE SITUATION AT GREENWOOD, MISS.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, characteristic of racial disturbances in the South, there has been considerable misinformation and slanted reports in the press and other media of communication about the true situation at Greenwood, Miss. Efforts to dramatize and, I fear, to bring about racial discord, certain newspaper reporters and television reports have attempted to give the country a distorted picture of what is happening in this Mississippi community.

The general tenor of these reports is to the effect that the law enforcement officers of this little city of 20,000 people are resorting to brutal methods of preventing Negroes from registering to vote. The truth is that those city officials, responsible for maintaining peace and order, are merely carrying out their obligations as peace officers and officers of the community to prevent disorderly conduct and prevent bloodshed.

The real trouble at Greenwood today is similar to the trouble that has occurred in many other southern cities. The mayor and city commissioners of Greenwood have prepared a statement, giving their side of the controversy which, apparently, in most instances, has been ignored by the press. They point out that no Negro is being denied the opportunity to go to the registrar's office and register to vote. They are merely insisting that this be done in an orderly manner. They object to large and disorderly groups marching through the streets of the city and upon the registrar's office. They particularly resent, and rightly so, these outside agitators coming into the community and stirring the emotions of the citizens of both races. They demand, and rightly so, that those who seek to register to vote do so singly or in groups of two or three. They fear that the gathering of these large groups and the efforts of the outsiders will get out of hand and bring about a tragedy similar to that which has happened in other cities. I am sure that all fair-minded people will recognize, when they learn the true story, that the efforts of these city officials are not only legal but reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, each of the Members of the House of Representatives from Mississippi has been furnished with a copy of the statement of the mayor and commissioners. As dean of the Mississippi delegation, I have been requested by my colleagues, Messers. WHITTEN, ABERNETHY, WINSTEAD, and WILLIAMS, to present this statement to the House in order that it might appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it will receive wide circulation. The statement made by Mayor Charles E. Sampson and Commissioners W. G. Mize, Jr., and B. A. Hammond is as follows:

STATEMENT OF MAYOR AND COMMISSIONERS OF CITY OF GREENWOOD, APRIL 2, 1963

During recent weeks, Negro groups from elsewhere, working hand in hand with the Justice Department of the United States, have made an all-out effort to create incidents and to manage and control news emanating from Greenwood with reference to these incidents so as to formulate public opinion against our city and its people. It is now obvious that the purpose of this activity has been to lay the predicate for unwarranted and unprecedented interference by the Federal Government into the affairs of this, until now, peaceful and orderly Mississippi community.

We are glad that there are now in our city some responsible members of the press; and it is our hope and belief that they will fulfill their obligations to the people of this area and of the Nation as a whole by advising the American public of the entire truth about the things that have been happening in and to the city of Greenwood. We strongly feel that the people of the United States are entitled to know the following listed facts, and we urge the press representatives here to investigate them and to make a full and impartial report to the American people of the results of their investigation.

1. Negroes for many years have been applying for voter registration in Greenwood, Miss. No instance has been cited where any applicant, colored or white, has ever been intimidated, molested, or in any way interfered with. During recent years, and particularly during recent weeks, many representatives of the Justice Department have observed firsthand that registration procedures here have been orderly and uneventful. They have observed that the registrar of voters treats colored and white applicants alike and that Negroes are given full opportunity to qualify for the privilege of voting. We do not feel that these facts have been sufficiently emphasized by the national press. On the contrary, the news has in some reports been so managed as to create the impression that it has been and is the local policy to prohibit Negroes from applying to vote. The Justice Department has copies of all applications and other voting records of Leflore County up until March 16, 1963.

2. The so-called activist groups here have attempted to persuade the Nation that local people are making violent resistance to Negro voter applicants in Leflore County. Little or no effort has been made to inform the public that the first act of violence occurred in Leflore County, Miss., on the night of February 27, 1963, when a car occupied by five Negroes allegedly tried to run down some white youths who were walking alongside the highway. Arrests were made and charges of felonious assault were lodged against the five Negroes involved. They are now out on bond awaiting the action of the grand jury. This episode has either not been mentioned or has been watered down in news reports. The FBI investigated this matter, and we invite the press to obtain the full details about this incident from local law enforcement officials and from the FBI and to report them to the people.

3. The next night, that is, on the night of February 28, 1963, in the immediate area involved in paragraph 2 above, and no doubt as an unfortunate result of the events involved in said paragraph 2, three white men shot into a car occupied by Negroes. The local sheriff's department made an intensive investigation in connection with this shooting, located the car driven by the white men, and shortly arrested three white men who were promptly charged with felonious assault. They are now under bond awaiting grand jury action. The FBI also made an investigation of this matter, and its files will reflect the diligence of the local law enforcement authorities in connection therewith if the press desires to seek them.

4. On the night of March 6, 1963, Samuel Block, a Negro activist who has been here for many months, complained that a car occupied by him and three other Negroes was shot into by white men. Block's car was, in fact, shot into by a shotgun, and the shots went through both the left and the right front door glasses. Block stated that he and another person were sitting on the front seat at the time of the shot. However, either by good luck or prearrangement, none of the occupants of the car was injured by the gunfire. So far local officials have found absolutely no evidence that white persons were in any way involved. The FBI has investigated this shooting, but has not indicated to us that there is any evidence that a white person was the guilty party. However, without any proof whatsoever, effort has been made by virtue of managed news to create the national impression that the shooting was done by a white person resentful of Negro voting activity. This was done despite the fact that Block was known by the Justice Department and others informed of his activities to be entirely irresponsible and to have made several false reports of injuries and attempted injuries to Negroes by whites. Three of Block's representations which were then known to the Justice Department to be untrue are set out below. A fourth false report, made by Block subsequently, will be set out in paragraph 5 to follow.

(a) In August 1962, Block reported to the Justice Department of the United States and to the press that on the previous day he had been severely beaten for 5 minutes by 3 unidentified white men. His statement was carried by some agencies as a major news item. Immediately thereafter Block was engaged in his usual activities, and was observed by many persons, including the publisher and editor of the local newspaper, to have no sign of injuries. Full investigation proved his charges to be wholly untrue, but the false picture created by the giving of nationwide publicity to Block's statement has never been corrected. The FBI investigated the matter, and it is our belief that the Department of Justice has full knowledge that Block's accusations were not true. However, the FBI report of this investigation has not been shown to us and has not been made public. It has, no doubt, been given full burial rites by the Justice Department, and we urge the press to disinter it and give it full publicity.

(b) Two nights later, Block and Robert Moses, one of the Negroes presently in Greenwood, reported to the Justice Department and to the press that a number of white men came to Block's office to injure him and some of his workers and that they escaped by sliding down a television antenna. This accusation on the part of Block was given widespread publicity. Investigation revealed that Block was again guilty of a complete fabrication, but this fact has not been passed on to the Nation as a whole. The FBI also investigated this episode, and we further urge that the report of this investigation be obtained by the press and publicized.

(c) On February 20, 1963, three adjoining buildings occupied by colored businesses caught fire. These buildings were plainly marked as a cafe, a pressing shop, and a garage, and were obviously not office buildings. Block's office was over a block away from the fire on the opposite side of the street, and bears no resemblance whatsoever to the buildings which were burned. However, Block issued a statement, which was also widely publicized, that white people had mistaken the burned buildings for his office and had set fire to same in reprisal for the food distribution activities being carried on by Block's organization. Investigation revealed that the garage and pressing shop where the fire started both contained much combustible material and that arson was not involved. Nevertheless, no effort was made to inform the American people that another of Block's statements which had been passed on to them had been shown to be false.

5. On March 24, 1963, Block reported that the building occupied by him and his helpers had been set afire, and that two white men had been seen running from the area. Despite Block's previous record of fabrication, this statement was not verified, but was released to and carried by the national press as a big news item. Some pertinent facts developed by the investigating authorities in connection with this fire are as follows:

(a) Block and his group had been instructed by the colored owner of the building to vacate it immediately, and they were preparing to move out.

(b) According to Block's own statement, he locked the building with a padlock at approximately 10:30 p.m., and he had the only key or keys to the padlock used.

(c) The fire occurred between 11:30 p.m. and 12 o'clock midnight.

(d) When the fire was investigated, there was no evidence of forcible entry, and the door which Block stated he had padlocked, with a padlock to which he had the only key, was open. It had not been forced open, and the padlock was found on the scene, unbroken and undamaged. Therefore, the door was obviously opened by the person having the key. That person, namely, Block, has not produced the key to investigating officials, advising the authorities that he has lost it.

Further investigation of the fire has proved that no white person was seen in the area and that white persons were in no way involved therein. Nevertheless, little effort has been made to correct this further false impression that has been created in the minds of the Nation at large. The FBI has investigated this matter, too, and we again urge the press to obtain and advise the public of the contents of the FBI file.

6. On the night of March 26, someone shot into the house of a local Negro. Again, through good fortune or advanced planning, no one was hurt. It was then known to everyone here, including representatives of the Justice Department, that the Negro organizations presently in Greenwood were deliberately framing criminal charges against white people for crimes against Negroes. Yet, despite the known unreliability of these colored groups, the American public has been led to conclude that the shots were fired by white persons in retaliation for voting activity among the Negroes.

The investigation in connection with this last shooting is continuing by local authorities and, presumably, by the FBI. As yet, it is not known who did the shooting, but so far there is no proof that a white person was in any way responsible. Nonetheless, by virtue of "managed" press releases, the white people of Greenwood stand condemned in the national mind, again on the basis of unconfirmed reports made by individuals proven to have made untrue reports in the immediate past.

7. If white persons did shoot into the Block car and the Greene house, they were not doing so as representatives of the city of Greenwood. They were, in fact, acting contrary to the wishes and beliefs of nearly all the citizens of this city. If a crime occurs in a community, it does not follow that the community is peopled by criminals. We make no claims to perfection, but we join with most civilized people in being unalterably opposed to violence.

8. We have received much unfavorable publicity because we have dispersed, with the use of one police dog, large groups of Negroes marching along the public streets in Greenwood. This action is not designed to prevent or impede voter registration procedures. In fact, the groups dispersed are advised by the police that they can proceed to the courthouse in orderly fashion if they desire to do so. Little effort has been made to explain to the American public that there is no plausible reason for the marches, and that the officials of Greenwood have dispersed the marching groups solely because they consider it necessary to peace and order that no large groups, colored or white, be allowed to make public demonstrations at this particular time of public excitement. The acts of violence and alleged violence set out above have created an inflammatory situation in this community, and have consequently made it necessary that extraordinary precautions be taken to insure the public safety. We have never had race riots in Greenwood, and we want none now.

It is difficult for us to comprehend why the Justice Department of the United States should dictate to us what should or should not be done to preserve safety on the streets of Greenwood, Miss., when it is common knowledge that they either cannot provide or do not provide protection for the people using the public streets of Washington, D.C., the Nation's Capital, and the headquarters of the Justice Department, itself.

The Greenwood situation has been highly publicized, and we have no way of controlling the inflow into Greenwood of potential troublemakers, Negro and white, from other areas. If we allow Negroes to march, we would also have to allow whites to march, if they desire to do so. If we allow 50 to march, this 50 will soon very probably increase to 100, and then to several hundred, eventually putting the matter beyond the control of our comparatively small police department. Flareups of violence would be the inevitable result. If we did not use our police powers to prevent the development of situations calculated to produce serious disorder, we would be derelict in our duty in the community we serve.

As yet no one has been seriously hurt in Greenwood. We want to maintain this record and are exercising every effort to do so.

CONTINUATION OF HIGH SCHOOL TRIPS TO THE CAPITAL

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the 21 years it has been my privilege to represent the people of my district in Washington, one of the greatest constant pleasures and thrills I receive is to see the stream of visiting high school students to this Nation's Capital.

Certainly in no other city can these youngsters get a sounder and more realistic feeling of the greatness and the stability of this country than by seeing history being made day by day. They actually live through the experience of the processes of legislation, executive action, and the administering of justice under the law—the three facets of the great democratic process under which we live.

Recently I have been disturbed by statements in the press and in other media about the danger to students visiting this city. Because of my fondness for this city and wishing to see every high school student in the country take advantage of a visit to this Federal City, I have done some investigating of the prospects of anything unfortunate happening to a visiting student. The facts I have discovered are most revealing. Police figures in Washington show that of the approximately 600,000 students who visited Washington in 1962, only 1—and I repeat—only 1 from outside the area of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia was the victim of an assault; and this was a case of simple assault. Certainly this does not indicate that any school group need have any hesitancy about coming to this great city.

Further evidence on this matter of crime in the District shows that of the 16 cities in its population bracket, the District ranks seventh in the rate of serious crime reported. Obviously, there are many other cities in the country in which the crime rate is greater than it is here.

But we must face the fact that what happens in this world capital makes news everywhere. There are perhaps more accredited highly qualified news correspondents in this city than in any city in the country and they do report on all happenings here. Consequently, an event here gets publicity everywhere. Therefore, while I am not trying to minimize our crime rate, I am convinced that while it is not the highest, it is certainly the most widely publicized.

I emphasize that our high school students from throughout the country should continue to take advantage of the opportunity to visit this great Capital of the United States.

TIMBER TAXATION

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am seriously concerned with and vigorously opposed to the proposal of the Secretary of the Treasury to change drastically the provision for timber taxation. This proposal would, in my opinion, if enacted seriously damage the forest industry and curtail the incentive that has brought our timber resources to a high level of productivity. One-third of the U.S. land area is classed as commercial forest land, 488 million acres. Four and a half million Americans own this timberland. Over a million citizens are employed in the forest products industries and thousands of communities are almost entirely dependent upon timber production for their livelihood. Forestry and forest products are one of the principal stays of the Nation's economy. Thus, any changes which damage the timber industry will have a profound effect upon our entire Nation.

Over half of the farm forest land, commercial forest land, lumber and pulp industry is located in the South. Therefore, as a Floridian and a southerner, but especially as an American concerned with our economic welfare, I am strongly opposed to the plan now being considered by the Ways and Means Committee to radically curtail capital gains taxation of the timber industry. These proposals would eliminate capital gains treatment for corporations on the cutting or sale of timber, and would limit capital gains treatment for individuals to gains less than $5,000 per year. It seems remarkable to me that these proposals are being entertained at all, for it is apparent that timber production is a form of capital investment.

Timber is not a regular crop, and can only be produced by a long-term investment in a stock of growing trees, profit on which is realized years or even decades later by cutting. Throughout the life of the tree, the producer must run risks of fire, insects, and windstorm damage. He must wait years for a return on his investment. In general he is dependent upon a harvest of one crop in 20 years. Timber production is a risky business and because of its nature, forest production is clearly "new capital formation," a classic definition of investment, and should be treated as such for tax purposes. If we are to remove capital treatment on timber production, we should also remove it on other investments in order not to discriminate against one sector of the economy. It must be remembered that local assessments are constantly increasing and that rising local and State taxes are also a serious problem to the timber growers.

The present tax provisions have helped materially to bring timber growth well ahead of timber removal for the first time in recent history. Section 631 of the Tax Code has a direct cause-and-effect relationship with reforestation. If the forest industry is to maintain an adequate supply of wood products in the face of increasing demand, we must be sure to encourage the initiative to plant and care for new growth. Should section 631 be abolished, I fear this initiative would be stifled. Unfavorable tax treatment could well force the forest industry to return to the destructive policy of "cut and run" prevalent before the enactment of section 631 in 1944. Those who recall that destructive timber harvesting policy and who saw the ruined forests which resulted realized how far we have progressed in a positive direction. It would be unthinkable to return to the old practices, but this could be the result of a change in timber tax laws.

Possibly, the Secretary's recommendations for increased taxes on timber are predicated on the belief that the forest industries are presently receiving too much profit. However, it is significant that the net aftertax rate of return of the lumber and paper industry from 1944 to 1960 was approximately equal to the average for all manufacturing industries, being higher in 5 years and lower in 12 years. This can scarcely be considered excess profit.

The Secretary of the Treasury acknowledges that proposed tax changes would impose a heavy burden upon large timber producers, but insists that their number is small. This is a misleading picture. Repeal of section 631 would seriously affect some 23,000 forest industry operators who own 13 percent of the forest land, some 62 million acres with average holdings of 2,660 acres each. In addition, more than a million corporate shareholders who own forest land derivatively would be injured.

The Secretary's report to the Ways and Means Committee acknowledges that the timber industry is confronted with a variety of serious economic problems, including foreign competition, intercoastal shipping regulations, public timber sales policies. But in practically the next breath it calls for measures to further burden forestry. It states that "the industry generally suffers from overcapacity," and then proposes that higher taxes be levied in order to "help restore a healthy competitive balance in the industry." How governmental action which could force the larger, more efficient producers out of the market can be considered healthy competition is not explained.

The fallacies inherent in these proposed tax changes should be apparent to all. The basic fact is that capital gains tax treatment of forest production has contributed substantially to sound timberland management, a fair and equitable return to investors, and an ample and inexpensive supply of wood and wood products for all. To repeal the capital gains tax would be to jeopardize the future of timber production, and penalize unjustly those who have attempted to carry on sound forestry practices through confidence in our Nation and in its future.

ACADEMY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a U.S. Academy of Foreign Affairs. Its enactment will have far-reaching effects on our future diplomacy and relations with the rest of the world.

May I call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of the President at his press conference yesterday concerning the need for such an Academy of Foreign Affairs. The President noted the urgency of the situation by pointing out that our Ambassadors face a multitude of specialized problems in the trouble spots of the world, and therefore need special training in close cooperation with the Department of State.

Quite frankly, I have been greatly concerned over the past few years at the numerous remarks dealing with the quality of our Foreign Service—remarks such as "Today we have probably the largest, best paid third-rate service in the world." This comment was made in an article by William P. Cochran, Jr., which appeared in the Foreign Service Journal of March 1963. What is more alarming is that it comes from a man who had devoted 30 years of his life to the Foreign Service of his country, and no doubt knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, we pride ourselves that our Nation leads the world in every field. Can we afford to be represented by officers who are not sufficiently seasoned and are intellectually unprepared for the challenges of our nuclear space age? The answer is obvious.

In my judgment, the time to act is now. The need for the Academy is urgent, for the only kind of diplomacy that we can afford today is the best, and this does not mean in quantity, but in quality.

DEPENDENT WIVES AND CHILDREN OF CERTAIN NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced two bills which have as their purpose the protection of dependent wives and children of certain noncommisioned officers, who, under existing statutes have no legal remedy against a runaway pappy.

Several instances have already occurred in my own constituency wherein certain noncommissioned officers have dishonored their obligation and disregarded their responsibility to support their wives and children. Since the effective date of Public Law 87-531, dependents have sought relief in civil courts only to find that the courts of most States interpret the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act as giving the serviceman immunity from actions for support and maintenance. They have sought redress from the military only to find that appropriate machinery does not exist to compel these servicemen to provide support.

I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the pertinent portion of a letter dated March 27, 1963, which was written to me by Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant of the Marine Corps, and which acknowledges, quite properly, the inability of the military to compel its personnel to furnish support for dependents:

> I might point out the following difficulty which will be encountered in resolving nonsupport problems under the new legislation (Public Law 87-531). In accordance with the Marine Corps policy, a member who fails to provide support for his dependents may become subject to disciplinary action. Such action will not, however, serve to force the member to provide support for dependents against his wishes. This can only be accomplished by a civil court of competent jurisdiction.

One of my bills provides without equivocation that servicemen shall not be immune to actions for support. While this, to be sure, will not enable the plaintiffs in such actions to effectuate any withholding of the serviceman's pay, the following results would obtain:

First. Real and personal property of the serviceman would be subject to attachment.

Second. A civil court of competent jurisdiction would be empowered to assume jurisdiction of the issue, to hear both sides of the controversy and to render a judgment in keeping with the evidence in each case.

Third. Civil courts would have power to adjudicate such a serviceman to be in contempt upon a showing that he possessed the means of complying with its judgment and that he had willfully failed and refused so to do.

Fourth. A valid and binding judgment against the serviceman would accumulate against him should he not make such periodic payments as the judgment might require. His dependents would be free to enforce the full amount upon his return to civilian life.

The second bill which I have introduced amends Public Law 87-531 so as to restore the requirement that specified senior enlisted personnel grant an allotment to their dependents in order to be eligible to receive quarters allowances.

Public Law 87-531 increased the amount of the quarters allowances to which members of the Armed Forces are entitled for their dependents where they are not occupying government quarters and eliminated the requirement that certain senior enlisted personnel grant an allotment to their dependents in order to be eligible to receive such quarters allowances. This, in effect, has permitted these senior members to receive personally the Government quarters allowances with their basic pay and other allowances to which they may have been entitled.

While this change did not in any way relieve these noncommissioned officers of their obligation to support their dependents, as I have earlier noted, I have been shocked to find that a significant percentage of these servicemen are willfully and flagrantly abusing the privileges bestowed upon them by this act in that they are refusing to support their wives and children.

While the overall purpose and intent of this provision of Public Law 87-531 was undoubtedly well-intended, the resultant hardship which has been imposed upon innocent women and children is not worth whatever benefits might have flowed from this change.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE ARTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the idea that the Federal Government should assume an active role in support of the arts is not new; but in recent years, it has been a source of heated controversy and profound misunderstanding. Too often existing confusion has been compounded by the artistic community itself. I wish to address myself today to the role of the Federal Government in the advancement of the arts in our national life. The growth and development of the fine arts in the United States are certainly in the national interest. We are presently engaged in a great effort to strengthen our security. Surely it is also in the national well-being to enhance the cultural life of our civilization.

It is my great privilege to represent in Congress the area in New York City which is undoubtedly the leading hub of cultural activity in the United States. Within the bounds of the district are the Metropolitan Opera, Carnegie Hall, Broadway's Great White Way, the New York City Ballet, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the New York Public Library, the Seagram Building, the Guggenheim Museum, Greenwich Village, Yorkville, Gramercy Park, Rockefeller Center, the New York Coliseum, Central Park, Cooper Union, New York University, the United Nations, Union Square—the centers of book and music publishing, the Nation's leading daily press, advertising, all major national radio and TV networks, scores of galleries, bookshops, and coffeehouses. The list could be extended indefinitely.

There is mounting evidence of increased interest in the arts in America. I am impressed and heartened by such signposts as the growth of the quality paperback, by the increase in symphony orchestras, and by the increased patronage of our Nation's art galleries. It must be pointed out, however, that while these hopeful signs are indicative of increased cultural consumption, they do not indicate that the creative climate is as healthy as it should be.

I think it is fair to state that our national leaders expressed a more profound concern with the growth and development of the fine arts in the early years of the country than they do today.

For example, George Washington in his first annual address to the Congress, January 8, 1790, declared "that there is nothing which can better deserve our patronage than the promotion of science and literature." John Quincy Adams in his first message to Congress called for the founding of a national university and for the passage of laws for the encouragement of the arts, sciences, and literature.

In 1846, the Smithsonian Institution was created to take advantage of a bequest of James Smithson to the United States. The Institution has expanded over the years and now includes no less than 10 bureaus, 4 of which are directly concerned with the arts: the U.S. National Museum, the National Collection of Fine Arts, the Freer Gallery—which operates only partly on Federal funds—and the world-renowned National Gallery of Art.

In 1910, Congress created the Commission of Fine Arts as guardian for the L'Enfant plan for the development of the District of Columbia. The Library of Congress operates a music division which not only collects material relating to music, but also conducts a performance program. The General Services Administration is charged, among other things, with the responsibility of design and construction of all public and administrative buildings of the Federal Government. Its annual payments to architects, muralists, sculptors, and painters are considerable. For many years, the Department of Agriculture has had a program of making and using motion pictures in its educational program. The National Park Service has a program for the conservation of our national historic and architectural monuments. The Office of Education has several specialists serving in areas related to the arts.

The Department of State has engaged in cultural enterprises for a number of years. Particularly since World War II under the foreign building program, the Department has brought in leading architects to design many of our new embassy buildings. Under our educational and cultural exchange program, representatives of our artistic community have traveled throughout the world, testifying to the vitality of our national life.

The Federal arts projects of the 1930's marked an extensive effort to participate in the artistic development of our country. Although primarily geared to the problem of employment, these projects had a significant effect on our national life.

So it is clear that Federal participation in the arts is hardly a new development. It has gone on with a large degree of success for many years. The hostility that has been expressed to a Federal entry is justified only when one examines the problem of Government control.

Institutions of American culture are confronted with a number of difficulties, the greatest of which is financial instability. No one embarks on a career in the arts to secure a "comfortable" existence as long as there exists a scarcity of opportunities and a surplus of hopefuls seeking them.

As the House hearings on this subject, held in 1961, pointed out, production costs have far outpaced reasonably available revenues, and great patrons of the arts who once gave of their personal fortunes to support cultural activities are disappearing.

How then can we as a Nation help to restore these institutions to financial vitality and to give the individual artist an opportunity to do what long and arduous years of training have prepared him to do.

It seems clear that Federal subsidies to the arts are not necessarily the answer to artistic development in this country. Rather the role of an enlightened citizenry is of paramount importance. It is the responsibility of individuals in all parts of the country—the general public as well as the wealthy patrons and benefactors—to provide the principal basis of support for the artistic community. Private enterprise and the American labor movement too must continue to bear a heavy share of this responsibility. There has been heartening progress in this area in recent years. Let us hope that it continues.

Further, financial support is only part of the problem. The function of the Federal Government should be to create healthy environmental conditions so that the arts can grow and flourish. Too often, Government, through such restraints as inequitable tax treatment, actually hinders artistic expression and surrounds the practice of the arts with unnecessary restrictions.

A number of State and local governments are providing increased assistance to the arts, and it is to them that we can turn to observe some of the more hopeful developments in the relationship between Government and the arts. A number of cities and States already have established executive offices whose purposes it is to give due recognition and status to the arts. New York State, under Governor Rockefeller, has developed one of the best within the last 2 years. Many more are developing programs for the systematic improvement of the arts. It is on the local level that these programs should begin, for it is there that all the vast community resources for private participation can be best utilized.

The New York State Council on the Arts has been a great success in fostering and encouraging the arts, and in the words of Governor Rockefeller is "providing a pattern for emulation both for the Federal Government and for many of our States."

On the Federal level, there is little likelihood that legislative action can be taken until the various groups and individuals interested in the arts can achieve a better coordination of their efforts, place their combined best interests ahead of their internal dissensions and take a more active interest in the legislative process. Spokesmen are urgently needed in the States and in Washington, and coherent programs of action based on priorities must be established.

As I pointed out earlier, the Federal Government has taken an active role in support of the arts for a number of years. There is nothing new about this. However, widespread confusion exists because many people mistakenly assume that all Federal assistance to the arts must necessarily involve direct subsidies. In my opinion, subsidies are not the first order of business.

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—A FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

The step that the Federal Government should take at this time in promoting the development of the fine arts in the United States is to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. Both the previous and the present administrations have called for the creation of such a council, but the measure has been consistently stymied in the House where it has failed to clear the Committee on Rules. This has always been a bipartisan proposal and has received widespread support throughout the country. I am today reintroducing this bill with my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

As we have pointed out many times, the proposed Council would have no authority or funds to dole out subsidies. The cost for its first year of operation would be extremely modest. But my colleague and I are realists. We are not optimistic about the chances of getting Rules Committee clearance for this measure. It is regrettable that Congress has failed to act on this measure and that the administration has failed to exercise the strong leadership necessary to insure its passage.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the legislative deadlock, I urge the President to establish an Advisory Council on the Arts by Executive order and to place the Council in the Office of the White House.

The precise structure and membership of the Council should be up to the President no matter how the Council is created. Certainly, it should be composed of individuals with broad judgment and the finest credentials. The Council should have the power to study the state of cultural resources in the United States, to propose methods of increasing private initiative in the arts, to support increased cooperation among local, State, and Federal departments and agencies so as to foster greater activity in the forms and practice of the arts.

FEDERAL TAX RELIEF

The Federal Government should remove unnecessary restrictions upon the creation, practice, and appreciation of the arts in America. Federal tax relief is therefore essential. New York City has repealed its 5-percent admissions tax on Broadway legitimate theaters. I have long urged that the Federal Government repeal its 10-percent admissions tax on live dramatic performances. The resultant saving could in part be passed on to the public in the form of lower ticket prices and in part to the theater itself to stimulate the creation and production of more and better plays which could employ the idle talents of many of our citizens.

Unfortunately, the Treasury Department persists in lumping the dramatic arts together with other failing industries. To the Treasury, the dramatic arts, shooting galleries, dog races, and flea circuses are all the same. The Treasury Department retains the hidebound view that what is right for an industrial organization is right for the theater industry. Naturally, this position is conveniently overlooked when the Government, in response to Soviet competition, uses the arts as instruments of foreign policy in our cultural exchange program. But the Treasury Department fails to recognize that without a healthy environment for the creation of new plays, new works of music and the like, there would be little or nothing to export. If this is the view of Government, then it is placing a strong barrier in the way of a free and healthy creative climate.

Another change in the tax law which I have sought to bring about through legislation is more equitable tax treatment to authors of literary, musical, or artistic compositions in the event that they sell the rights to their works. Under present law, tax treatment for authors of literary, musical, or artistic compositions is discriminatory. Benefit of capital gains tax treatment is given to the author of a patent in order to stimulate inventive activity. We should have a comparable means of stimulating literary, musical, and artistic creation. The bill (H.R. 2519) would repeal the exclusions which presently prohibit copyrights and literary, musical, and artistic compositions from considerations as capital assets. The bill further provides that transfer of copyrights or composition rights in the hands of the creator shall be considered a sale or exchange of a capital asset. Under present law such sales are taxed as ordinary income. Persons who acquire an interest in such property from the creator prior to the substantial completion of the copyrighted work would also receive this treatment. In order to avoid difficulties which could arise in the operation of this legislation, two limitations have been written into the bill. A transfer would apply only with respect to work that has been substantially completed. Second, only one copyright or composition of a taxpayer year would be eligible for this treatment. This bill came very close to being reported out by the Ways and Means Committee in the last Congress. It was stopped by the administration, which lobbied long, diligently, and senselessly against it.

A third area which merits remedial action is the problem of authors, composers, and artists including performing artists who receive income in fluctuating amounts from year to year and whose earnings may be concentrated in a comparatively short period while the completion of the work itself may have taken several years. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 2520) which would permit writers, musicians, and artists to spread the compensation that they receive from a work of art over the period in which they have worked on the project in computing the tax on this income.

This bill will remove the discriminatory treatment of writers, musicians, and artists under the present law. The nature of their work leads toward fluctuating incomes; and under a progressive tax schedule, a year of relatively high income results in taxation at unreasonably high rates. This bill will permit the writer, musician and artist to spread his income and will avoid the bunching problem that arises under present law.

I am extremely pleased that the President's tax message this year gives some recognition to the problem that has concerned me for some time.

I regret, however, that in some respects, the treatment under the formula in the Treasury program would not give the relief afforded under my bill. The Treasury bill does not deal with unused deductions and exemptions, and with small income variations. The Treasury bill does, however, cover more trades and professions. I am hopeful that the Committee on Ways and Means will consider all the proposals in this area and will report favorably on some provision that will extend relief to artists, writers, and musicians.

The present law has such a provision for inventions and artistic works but the provision in present law applies only under quite restrictive circumstances. At least 80 percent of the income from the work must be bunched in 1 year and the work on the project must have covered at least 24 months.

Under H.R. 2520, these restrictive provisions of present law are removed for all amounts received in respect of an artistic work created by the taxpayer. If the writer, for example, receives payments for a book in 1 year, he may compute the tax on these amounts as though they had been received over the period during which he worked on the book whether or not this is as long as 24 months or whether or not 80 percent of the income is received in 1 year.

I am pleased to say that Senator Javits, one of the national leaders in this area, has joined me in sponsoring my bill in the Senate.

Another proposal which I believe has genuine merit has long been sponsored by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] both veteran members of the Committee on Ways and Means. Their bill would provide a charitable contribution deduction of up to 30 percent for contributions by an individual to nonprofit museums, libraries, and other facilities in support of the arts. Under present Federal income tax law, a deduction for charitable contributions by an individual is limited to 20 percent of his adjusted income in all cases except gifts to churches, schools, and colleges, and certain types of hospitals and medical research organizations where the limitation is 30 percent. The proposed legislation would permit an added 10 percent to libraries and museums of art, history, or science. Senator Javits has sought to add societies and organizations conducted for the sole purpose of maintaining symphony orchestras and operas. John D. Rockefeller III has suggested that ballet, repertory drama, and community art centers also be included. As former Secretary of Labor Goldberg said in his statement on "The State of the Performing Arts" which was included in his findings in the Metropolitan Opera dispute "this is obviously a matter worthy of the attention of an advisory council on the arts." In fact, all suggestions which have been proposed to aid the arts either through tax and tariff relief—the Tariff Act could well be liberalized with respect to the importation of works of art—the construction of physical plants (buildings, concert halls and the like) or by direct Federal subsidy should receive the closest and most detailed study from an advisory council on the arts. We could all benefit from the increased understanding that would result.

THE PROBLEMS OF SUBSIDIES

There is always the danger that Government aid, if unchecked, could result in Government censorship and control. Then, too, there is no convincing evidence that direct subsidies can enhance creativity and artistic development. A thorough study of the WPA Federal artists projects of the 1930's could shed some needed illumination on this question. I think it is well established that these projects provided needed employment to writers, actors, artists, and musicians, renewed their faith in America and helped bring the arts closer to the daily life of our Nation's citizens. An example, the American guide series of the Federal writers project remains, even with all its faults, a thoughtful contribution to the literature of the period. Many of the guidebooks have been updated for present-day use. Some have remained unmatched in quality since their publication a quarter century ago.

But these projects did have their pitfalls. Bureaucratic snarls, waste, extravagance, and inefficiency were rife, and marred the constructive and lasting achievements of the projects. As I have stated, these projects should be studied in greater detail in order to aid our thinking about what must be avoided in future Federal participation in cultural matters. Certainly, a Federal advisory council on the arts could profit greatly from such a study in formulating and presenting its recommendations to the American people.

I have devoted a great deal of time in trying to think through a plan to enable worthy institutions of the arts to receive Federal assistance without suffering the hardships of Federal interference. Such a plan may be impossible to achieve, for it would have to be written in such a way to assure the public and the artistic community that a Federal grant-in-aid program operated by a Government-appointed panel would not dictate cultural tastes in America.

Although I do not at present advocate or favor a direct subsidy approach, I would like to suggest an arrangement for public discussion which might be successful in avoiding some of the dangers of Federal control and could prevent councils, departments, and bureaucracies generally from exercising artistic judgments to determine which organizations are most worthy of receiving Government funds. It would go something like this:

Let us hypothesize that in a given year Congress were to appropriate $5 million to aid in the production of plays, operas, concerts, and so on. Various groups seeking Federal aid would present evidence to the United States Treasury of private, individual or foundation contributions made to them. The Treasury would allot a portion of the available funds proportionate to the private aid given. This system would allow the public to choose what organizations receive Government aid. To be eligible, an organization would have to prove private support over a certain minimum figure. This would compel the organization to prove itself with the public before receiving Government aid.

Ideally, the system would also provide for matching funds from the States. Thus, if a group in New York were to receive money, New York State would have to provide a certain amount.

If handled by the Treasury Department, the problem of councils, departments, and outspoken individuals doling out money to suit their particular artistic fancies would be avoided.

This system has other advantages. If Congress seriously did not like the results of the program, it could reduce the appropriations, but it could not single out one particular organization to discipline. This would be the responsibility of the public, exercised by withholding private aid.

Also in its favor is the ease of its operation. The program requires no additional office space, no additional staff to initiate, to implement or revise a policy.

As a safeguard, a ceiling—say 3 percent of the total appropriation—should be set on the amount any single organization could receive. This would prevent a single group from capturing the whole Federal kitty.

This system is only a suggestion, designed to avoid most of the pitfalls usually bound up in a Federal subsidy scheme. It is far from perfect. It seems to equate value with the amount of private contribution, and this is clearly no criterion for accurate judgment of the worth of an organization. But it is probably better, however inaccurate it may be, than for the Federal Government to appoint a panel to decide which group should receive how much.

But it is important to accept the fact that subsidies do not have to be the first order of priority in this program. Local offices, arts councils, and tax relief come first. The approach must be step by step. It must be made with regard for the potential effectiveness of local government. And it must be undertaken with awareness of the pitfalls and expense possibly involved.

Before Congress can embark on a unified, purposeful program of art patronage for the Nation, it must be confronted with a compelling need, a feasible plan, precise cost calculations, and a clear and unmistakable call from the conscience of the people. That means a response from everyone who cares.

CONCLUSION

In the course of these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I have pointed to much that is hopeful in the artistic taste and expression of this Nation. But for all that is full of promise, there is much that is shoddy and distressing. Bad city planning has crowded out reason and justice. New construction too often destroys the good with the bad. Roads encroach upon precious solitude. Entertainment aims at the lowest common denominator. These may afford satisfaction for the moment but how much will endure? Artistic endeavor in America must not be judged by false or ersatz criteria. When we mistake the package for the product, the shadow for the substance, quantity for quality and consumption for creation, we do ourselves a disservice as a nation.

The great ages in the life of a civilization have been those in which the arts have flourished. The Age of Pericles in democratic Athens was as noted for its philosophers, sculptors, and playwrights as for its generals and statesmen. We should not forget this. It was hardly an accident. The quality of a society is measured as much by its culture as its political and economic attainments.

A wise gentleman who has never lost sight of this and whose insight and counsel are richly valued by those who know him personally or through his writings and his appearances throughout the country is my friend, August Heckscher. In his role as Special Consultant on the Arts to the President, Mr. Heckscher has labored diligently to help this country dedicate itself to the promotion of the arts as an integral part of a national quest to provide for the public happiness.

I would like to close my remarks by bringing to the attention of the House Mr. Heckscher's illuminating analysis of the problems as well as the opportunities that could be afforded through a proper partnership between Government and the arts. Mr. Heckscher's analysis is contained in an article in the March 1963 Music Journal entitled "Government and the Arts." As stated by Mr. Heckscher in this article:

> To establish between the artist and society the right relationship to avoid his subservience yet to assure his involvement in the national purpose—this is one of the great and challenging tasks before our democracy today.

The article follows:

GOVERNMENT AND THE ARTS

(By August Heckscher)

The arts have been recognized in almost all ages as being closely related to the quality and the well-being of a people's life. Great epochs have been those in which the arts flourished. Conversely, when political life seemed to decline, when the people succumbed to a general listlessness and boredom, the arts, too, sank to a low ebb. It is, of course, possible for a lonely genius to be produced in any period, even amid the least favorable circumstances. His skill and vision will assert themselves regardless of the surrounding mood. But that contagion from a wide circle of talent, infusing the whole artistic life with brilliance and vigor, exists only when all parts of a society are self-confident and genuinely alive.

The greatest ages have been marked by what may be called a common style. Not only have the various forms of art shown an affinity, but there has been a recognizable connection between the achievements of the artists and the great figures in other fields of life. Thus we can recognize quite clearly a Greek or a Roman style. Keats, in one of his letters, speaks of "the undefinable gusto of the Elizabethan voice." The accents of that voice may be heard as clearly in the great explorers and men of action as in the playwrights and poets of the age.

The full expression of artistic genius has been recognized by rulers in all periods as a chief mark of their glory—second, perhaps, only to military conquest. And in comparison to military conquest, artistic achievements have proved incomparably the more durable. The empire of the Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella is of little moment to us now. The extraordinary flowering of the arts which marked their reign has never been forgotten. What one writer has called the beneficent residue is all that speaks to us of a past age; and the works of painters, writers, musicians, architects and playwrights form that residue—not the political quarrels or the military victories and defeats which seemed so important at the time.

In the formative period of our own history, a high value was placed on these marks of a high civilization. Laws and institutions seemed vitally important. So did outward forms that would reflect the hopes and ambitions of the young Republic. Cities spaciously laid out, public buildings displaying both grandeur and taste, painters capable of preserving for posterity great scenes and moments—these were ardently desired, and within the limits of that still rough and struggling society were effectively promoted.

Modern America lost something of this first concern for the arts. The tasks of opening a continent and multiplying its material wealth consumed enormous energies. Education was highly valued throughout the 19th century; but it was an education leading toward practical skills, not to the full expression of those inner values and visions which are the soil of artistic achievement. The cultivation of art was left largely to a few very rich patrons, in that period of their life when all other possibilities for acquisition and power had been exhausted.

It was natural that the pendulum should swing, and from all the evidence it has recently swung very far in the opposite direction. Today we recognize that the arts are an overwhelmingly important element in the total picture of America which the world forms and upon which it acts. Indeed the rivalry of the cold war, like most great rivalries of history, may ultimately turn upon this point. It is significant that in the worst days of the Berlin crisis of 1961 General Clay sent back word urgently requesting that a first-rate exhibition of art be sent over to the beleaguered city. And it may be worth remembering that during the tensest hours of the recent Cuban crisis, Mr. Khrushchev was reported as spending 4 hours at the opera.

At home, and in the everyday conduct of our democracy, the arts seem no less related to the attainment of our national purposes. It is difficult to see how we shall make the change from being a people rural in heart and soul to a great urban civilization unless the arts in all their forms make city life seem both entertaining and ennobling. A city without a brilliant cultural life must always be a dreary spectacle—a soul-deadening crowd cut off from the sources of its being. In the same way it is difficult to see how we shall keep ourselves alive amid an ever-expanding leisure except as the arts become a dominant interest among the people.

We aspire to greatness as a world power, to happiness as a people, to vitality as the first mass democracy that has ever been able to combine a deepening spiritual life with unparalleled physical and material well-being. For all these reasons the arts have a close relationship to the Nation. They are part of the common life, not of individual existence alone.

Promotion of the arts is therefore a legitimate public concern. The question of how they can be promoted is difficult and open to many interpretations. We would probably all agree that if by spending a certain number of billions of dollars we could attain results as definite and predictable as in scientific research the money would be well spent. But actually we do not know how to produce genius. The expenditure of public funds, however useful and necessary within strict limits, might well be done in such a way as to defeat the very ends we are seeking. The Government could build theaters, but it would have no assurance that the stages would evoke another Shakespeare. It could subsidize schools of art, but would have no proof that a Leonardo would emerge.

In this field, as in all new fields of political activities, a tentative, experimental and perhaps piecemeal approach should be pursued. The following considerations are among those which should guide policy formation.

1. Government must be careful to supplement and encourage, but not to undermine, the complex structure of private support for the arts which has been characteristic of this country. The United States is rich beyond any other country in the habit of voluntary giving, with the accompanying sense of participation and involvement. To disregard this would be to leave our cultural life the poorer, no matter how generously government funds might be spent.

2. The role of the States and localities must be encouraged. New York has pioneered with a state Arts Council with funds sufficient to allow the diffusion of the best in its arts, the cultivation of new talent in smaller communities, and perhaps the ultimate support of major cultural institutions. Other States are now watching New York closely. To the extent that they follow its lead, the Federal Government would find it a natural and easy step to support these efforts with matching grants.

3. Government at various levels must be careful to act in such a way as not to limit the freedom and variety of the arts. It is quite possible, in this as in other fields, to establish boards and committees independent of political control. It is reasonable to believe that the judgment of such bodies will be increasingly respected by political authorities. Besides, there is much that government can do in the form of simple housekeeping—maintenance and building of plant, or the hiring of the services of artistic institutions—which create very little opportunity for interference in the artistic management.

4. Government itself, in all it does in the ordinary pursuit of its business, can take care to set an example and to maintain the highest standards. In what it builds, at the points where it determines the shape of the landscape as in the planning of roads and urban regions, it must move with an awareness of aesthetic considerations. In the objects upon which it sets its mark, from the post box at the corner to the White House at the center of the Nation's life, it must concern itself with excellence.

"Literature can take care of itself," said Pitt, when appealed to for help on behalf of one of England's great authors. "Yes," answered Robert Southey, "it will take care of itself, and of you too, if you do not look to it."

Carlyle, who records this interchange, adds characteristically that of all priesthoods and governing classes now extant in the world, "there is no class comparable for importance to the priesthood of the Writers of Books." To make the generalization convincing, we have to include the composers and artists in all fields.

To establish between the artist and society the right relationship—to avoid his subservience yet to assure his involvement in the national purpose—this is one of the great and challenging tasks before our democracy today.

EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have taken the floor of this House to speak on a subject which for several years has been of increasingly serious concern to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in both Chambers of Congress. But then this is the first time I have had personal experience with this issue. I refer to the claim by the Congress of its right to obtain information from the executive branch of Government in the face of a claim by the Executive of a right to deny the information because of its executive privilege.

From Febraury 6 through February 14 of this year, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was before the subcommittee on Department of Defense appropriations of which I am the ranking minority member. During the course of our committee's lengthy interrogation of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and General Taylor, the subject of the Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961 was raised. The committee members were concerned about the events of that effort, for although it took place 2 years ago it is still a matter of considerable controversy and discussion. Further, it was felt that a full understanding of what happened there would enable the committee to better exercise its judgment of the financial needs of the military establishment. It is our subcommittee which has original congressional jurisdiction each year of the budget for the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Because of the group's control over funds for the military and related agencies, it has specific concern with and responsibility for Army, Navy, and Air Force, policies, programs, and procurements.

Mr. McNamara was questioned first, but he avoided implication in the problem by stating that U.S. forces as such were not involved in the invasion. Then General Taylor was questioned on that subject, first on February 7 and again on the following day. His knowledge of that incident should be just about the most complete in the land. At the President's request he directed a study Board consisting of Attorney General Robert Kennedy, Chief of Naval Operations Arleigh Burke, and former CIA Director Allen Dulles. The Board looked into all phases of the invasion attempt and filed a report with the President. Our questions were directed to the information which General Taylor was thus in a position to tell us about the invasion attempt. The testimony has been published in censored form by the subcommittee, but I shall only summarize its contents here.

First, public statements and testimony before us revealed that President Kennedy instructed the four members of the Board not to reveal their findings except to him. Second, Admiral Burke apparently followed these instructions and did refuse to discuss it with reporters from U.S. News & World Report. Third, Attorney General Robert Kennedy did reveal part of the findings in a long interview published in the same magazine January 28, 1963, and also to David Kraslow of the Knight Newspapers in an interview published January 21, 1963. Fourth, General Taylor refused to discuss this report or any findings of the study Board before our committee and claimed that his refusal was prompted by President Kennedy's order and the concept of executive privilege.

Now it is true that America has heard, seen and read a great deal about the Bay of Pigs in the last 2 years. This is understandable, for it certainly is one of the most unfortunate, embarrassing and shameful incidents with which our country's name has ever been connected. I would venture to say that it will loom larger on the landscape of history as the years pass. It seems that not a month goes by without some new disclosure of our Government's fumbling role in that disastrous operation. Some "wise old owls" have complained that we Republicans are "beating a dead horse" by our references to that occasion. To that I simply reply that in our subcommittee we are trying to do our part of the job Congress is supposed to do—get the facts, study them and then pass the laws and appropriate the funds for the operation of the Government.

Why has General Taylor refused to reveal his knowledge of this incident? Certainly not for security reasons. I asked him:

> How would it endanger the security of the United States (to discuss the Bays of Pigs)?

He answered:

> I think it would result in another highly controversial, divisive public discussion among branches of our Government which would be damaging to all parties concerned.

Now I ask you gentlemen, is Congress to be denied this information because to reveal it would stimulate controversy? What General Taylor has said, in effect, is that he won't tell us the facts because the President told him not to, because the public should forget it ever happened, and because the administration might be embarrassed if the truth were known.

So General Taylor does not claim that the national security is at stake. But even if it were, even if intelligence matters were involved, this would not justify refusal to tell the members of the subcommittee the full facts as collected and digested by this high-level committee of four appointed by the President. All of us on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee are fully cleared for access to this sort of information. We handle state secrets regularly. We see to it that these secrets are kept on a classified basis. Only those Members of Congress with a demonstrated "need to know" have access to this information.

I am astounded that General Taylor should offer as grounds for his refusal to testify on that matter the possibility that controversy might result. Surely he and President Kennedy are not so short on memory that they forget their own separate and consistent challenges of Eisenhower policies, attitudes, and decisions in military and foreign affairs, and the controversy their remarks generated.

To date, then, this subcommittee has access to only part of the story of the Bay of Pigs invasion—the part which Attorney General Robert Kennedy managed to give a newspaper reporter and a news magazine. The information in that article is the subject of legitimate criticism and controversy. In our efforts to resolve some of that controversy, the subcommittee is blocked by a decision of the immediate superior and older brother of the very source of the controversial material.

The facts at issue are past happenings; events of history; things over and done with. Supposedly, they have been carefully reviewed and analyzed. What better time is there for Congress to investigate this subject and obtain this information?

I would remind the House of a commendable statement made by President Kennedy in this Chamber on January 29, 1961:

> For my part I shall withhold from neither the Congress, nor the people, any fact or report, past, present, or future, which is necessary for an informed judgment of our conduct and hazards.

My personal experience with General Taylor on the subject of the Bay of Pigs leads me to the conclusion that these carefully selected and beautifully spoken words are wholly meaningless.

This brings me to some basic questions which have troubled me a good deal lately. Can Congress permit this kind of refusal to go unchallenged? What can we do? What should we do?

Please believe this next statement. We must keep this whole discussion on a nonpartisan level. Certainly there are partisan possibilities in my questions of General Taylor. His answers, if given, might have publicized the inability of the Kennedy administration to conduct a well integrated military effort or some such finding which the Republicans would enjoy exposing. But the basic issue of congressional access to executive information is far more important than fanning partisan flames.

I need only remind you of the important work in this field done by the very able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy], and his fellow Democrats, the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan], as well as my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader], to underscore the nonpartisan nature of this issue.

We all know that this problem has come up in various guises many times over the years. It has cut back and forth across party lines. There even are examples of both Democrats and Republicans who argued on one side of the issue when they served in Congress and on the other side when they served in the executive branch.

I shall not attempt here to review the legal problems and precedents involved in this concept of executive privilege. I decline to refer to it as a doctrine. One man's doctrine is another man's myth. Suffice it to say that the traditional arguments seek to answer this question: who has the authority—the Congress or the Executive—to decide what information must be given to Congress for the conduct of its investigations?

Unfortunately, the Constitution is silent on this problem. Proponents of the privilege say the constitutional concept of separation of powers extends to allow the Executive to do as he likes with his information. But at the same time, the Constitution's system of checks and balances provides for certain overlapping of powers. Examples of such exceptions to the separation-of-powers idea are the Senate's authority to pass on treaty agreements and the President's veto power. Nothing is said in the Constitution about any Executive right to keep Congress in the dark, and I seriously doubt that this was the intention of the framers.

If it were their intention, the Constitution would have given the executive branch the power to write its own record of the facts on any given issue. That power, the power to collect facts from many witnesses, challenge the accuracy of those facts and analyze their importance—that power belongs to Congress.

In the courtroom, there are several recognized types of "privilege." These are the privileged relationship between the lawyer and his client, that between a priest and parishioner and that between a husband and wife. But I submit that the Chief Executive of the United States enjoys no such privileged relationship with the people of our country or their representatives in Congress. The Executive exists to serve the people by administering laws and the Congress exists to legislate in the best interests of the people. To maintain that the executive has the right to keep to itself information specifically sought by the representatives of the very people the Executive is supposed to serve is to espouse some power akin to the divine right of kings.

Further, no court has ever been faced with the issue, and until it is the debate will likely continue.

This is not to say that we could not force such a case. The House has, in fact, two paths open to it if it should choose to force General Taylor to provide the requested information on the Bay of Pigs investigation. First, the committee could sponsor a House resolution citing the general in contempt of Congress and presenting the case to the Attorney General for admission to a grand jury and subsequent prosecution. Obviously in the present circumstances it would be ridiculous for us to put the case in the hands of the Attorney General. Even under ideal circumstances, any Attorney General would tend to reflect the attitude of his own boss in handling any executive privilege case. Second, we could call the general to the floor of the House, and, if he still fails to answer the questions, find him in contempt. He then would be placed in the custody of the Sergeant at Arms and jailed, presumably to the end of the congressional session.

I do not suggest either course of action for two reasons. First, such direct and highly charged confrontations probably would produce more heat than light. The mutual confidence and rapport which exists between the two branches could be damaged beyond immediate repair. We must have this rapport among all three branches to properly govern our land. Second, I do not suggest either type of confrontation because I have doubts that this particular incident presents a classic enough case to justify formal action in either of the two legal arenas previously mentioned. General Taylor's refusal has not stopped the defense subcommittee in its tracks, but I am convinced that the hidden information would be of significant value in performing our subcommittee's responsibility. I do not see how any committee could recommend a specific sum for the military or intelligence operations of our Government without knowing how well the previous appropriation has been spent. It might waste the taxpayers' money by appropriating too much, or jeopardize our security by being too stingy. Surely as we face the challenge of a new era in Latin America, the Congress has the high responsibility of insuring military and intelligence capabilities which are able to cope with such problems as have already arisen and may confront us again.

However, there is a fine distinction between preventing the committee from functioning and preventing it from functioning as well as possible. And it is such distinctions which have a way of becoming all important in the courtroom.

What I do suggest is that this incident be remembered as another in a long series of executive department claims of special privilege. In a frightening proportion of these cases, the claim was made to cover up dishonesty, stupidity, and failure of all kinds. We have only to recall that the Teapot Dome of Harding's administration, the tax scandals in Mr. Truman's, and the Laos foreign aid mess in the last administration all were initially covered up by the "executive privilege" blanket. There have been many more instances. You all have seen that pattern develop. First the suggestion of wrongdoing is made. Congress demands the records. The people downtown in the ivory tower of the executive branch stall and say the investigation is silly. Then they simply refuse to give the information. Something eventually leaks out and the scandal spills over for all the world to see. Then someone resigns and his resignation is accepted with regret. Congress cannot help but conclude that executive privilege is most often used in opposition to the public interest.

My fear is that there may be far more trouble if we permit this concept to take deep root. The key idea is that while the powers of Congress and the Executive certainly must be separated, so must the traditional system of checks and balances have real meaning. The investigatory power of Congress is well founded in law and so basic to its legislative function that without freedom to investigate thoroughly Congress can have no effective check on the executive branch. It should be superfluous to say that without adequate information no investigation can succeed.

I would further suggest that the Committee on Government Operations, through its Subcommittee on Foreign Operation and Government Information, give priority consideration to this problem of executive privilege and offer proposals to resolve this dilemma. It may be possible, for example, for Congress to find another way to bring the matter to court without going through the Attorney General. This would serve to prompt meaningful debate on an issue now hopelessly fogged in by Executive jealousy and congressional pride.

I would also alert the entire membership of this House to the existence of this critical problem and warn you that none of your committees would be immune to the stifling influence of executive privilege if the President found it expedient to invoke it tomorrow. This affects us all as Members of the House, and through us it affects all America. We cannot abide its existence one whit longer than necessary.

Whenever the concept of executive privilege is discussed, special emphasis is given the fact that it has been so traditional a problem that even President Washington faced it. First, may I insist that the passage of time has no bearing whatsoever on the legality of this concept. Indeed, the mere fact that an idea has been thought acceptable by some for 170 years is probably a very good argument for challenging its validity today. More important, however, is the striking parallel between the incident which spawned the problem in Washington's time and the one which prompts my comments today.

In 1791, President Washington sent Maj. Gen. Arthur St. Clair into the midwestern wilderness to stop a series of Indian raids along the Ohio-Indiana border. On November 3 of that year, General St. Clair's troops were surprised by the Indians and nearly half of the 1,400 soldiers were wiped out. It was one of the worst military fiascoes in our country's history. The next spring Congress appointed a special committee to investigate the facts and in the process demanded all relevant papers and reports from the executive branch.

President Washington and his Cabinet mulled the problem over for several days, completely aware of the important precedent they were setting. As it turned out, President Washington agreed that there was not one report or paper which could not be produced for the examination of Congress and, in fact, they were produced. The results? The Congress learned that mismanagement and a lack of supplies were the largest factors in the defeat.

The St. Clair defeat bears relation to the Bay of Pigs defeat in that our Government suffered a badly damaging blow in both cases. Both cases involved serious mismanagement. Both cost American lives. Both were events in history that were over and done with and investigated by the Executive by the time the Congress began its inquiry. The difference, apparently, is that while Washington was willing to bare the records so that errors could be corrected before they were repeated, President Kennedy is not willing to follow that example.

To conclude, let me stress that while we must always protect the general public's right to full information, the basic issue here is full disclosure to Congress—to that same group of Congressmen who regularly review issues of the most sensitive national interest and make decisions in behalf of the public.

Let me urge you all to think of this not in terms of the Bay of Pigs invasion or in terms of a minority Congressman who objects to actions of a President of the opposite party. This is a critical problem of vast scope. It would exist even if we had only one Congressman making all the law for a one-man executive branch. It is one of the great legislative challenges of our time and we must either face it or accept the certainty of continued assaults upon Congress' right to know.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, first permit me to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] for having called attention to this very important and basic problem facing Congress in its relations with the executive branch of the Government. I think the gentleman's statement is an excellent one.

I want also to refer to the suggestion whch has been made by the gentleman that the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations undertake an inquiry with respect to the exercise of executive privilege.

I am privileged to serve as the ranking minority member on that subcommittee and also on that subcommitte on the minority side is the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN]. While the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] is the chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] form the remainder of the majority side of that committee.

Naturally, the committee will conduct inquiries into government information practices and this is one of the most important ones.

Mr. Speaker, I notice also that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] referred to the inherent contempt power of the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, in my opinion we have in the past 30 years or so relied more upon section 102 of the Revised Statutes and have had the U.S. Attorney General in effect enforce our powers by using that criminal statute rather than using our contempt powers ourselves.

In fact, the last case—and I think it might be interesting in light of the gentleman's discussion to have this reference in the RECORD—the last case was the case of *Jurney* v. *MacCracken*, 294 U.S. 125. That was decided February 4, 1935, and that is the last time, to my knowledge, that either the Senate or the House of Representatives sought to enforce obedience to its orders, subpenas, by using its own contempt power.

As the gentleman said, if we would exercise the contempt powers, it would be a confrontation with the executive branch of the Government and would be the exercise of our power to its full limit and might strain the equilibrium between the three branches of our Government which must of necessity, in view of their autonomy, get along with each other, rather than each pushing its power to the limit.

But it seems to me that while there is no case of the exercise of the investigative authority of the Congress against an official in the executive branch of the Government, there is ample authority for the congressional subpena to reach the records of private citizens. It certainly seems to me that that should be a precedent for the command of the House of Representatives addressed to an official in the executive branch of the Government to produce records regarding the expenditure of public funds or the discharge of public authority, because he acts as a steward or a trustee. And certainly if we can reach the private lives of our citizens we ought to be able to reach the official lives of our public officials.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has contributed, and I hope will contribute in the future, to the proper exercise of a very important power of the legislative body. It cannot act intelligently unless it has the facts and all the facts. That is what is basic. I certainly hope that a way can be found to get the executive branch of the Government to cooperate without pushing Congress to the ultimate limit of its power.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his enlightening and helpful comments. Since this was my first personal experience with this problem I must confess that I did not really appreciate the full implications and ramifications of the refusal of a member of the executive branch of the Government to testify before a committee.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, first I should like to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for his enlightening, forthright, and nonpartisan statement here today. It strikes me as important to the future of the United States in the relations between the coordinate branches of the Government, between the Executive and the Congress.

Beyond complimenting the gentleman from Michigan, I would like to add that it is my purpose here today not to question proper prerogatives of the Executive versus the Congress in matters of Executive privilege, but I do believe nonetheless that the Executive privilege like all privileges can go too far. And here I think the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has pointed out clearly the situation in his reference to General Taylor's testimony. The general responded that he could not supply the necessary information to the appropriate subcommittee because it would be controversial and would contribute to divisive public discussion.

This does not seem to me to be a legitimate reason.

Second, I think the President has made clear in the statement the gentleman from Michigan reported that he has believed in the past and I am sure does for the future, and I quote:

> For my part, I shall withhold from neither the Congress, nor the people, any fact or report, past, present, or future, which is necessary for an informed judgment of our conduct and our hazards.

Finally, let me say that I am delighted the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has suggested that the Government Operations Committee, and specifically the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittees, should look into this. I think it is a matter that clearly concerns the future role of the Congress. It is a coordinate responsibility. I believe deeply that the right of the Congress, that is to say, the right of the people, to know essential facts must be maintained, must be clear, and that the Executive must never under any circumstances preclude the opportunity for the Congress to know the facts. Executive privilege should not be a cloak for any area of mismanagement or inefficiency. The Congress' right to know must be maintained.

May I again compliment the gentleman from Michigan.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. MEADER, Mr. FORD was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend my colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORD] on the excellent and outstanding statement he has made here today on executive privilege. I think it should be called to the attention not only of all Members of the House but of all Americans. I, too, am a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of which the ranking member is my good friend and colleague [Mr. FORD].

When General Taylor testified before our committee I was shocked and amazed to see his attitude when he refused to answer a simple and forthright question about the Bay of Pigs fiasco. I asked him if he thought any violation of security would be involved at this late date by disclosing what happened at the Bay of Pigs. He merely answered it would be unfortunate to open up the case at this time.

I should like to point out to the House that in the early part of the session I introduced a joint resolution calling for a full investigation of what happened at the Bay of Pigs. I also call to the attention of the House that the leadership has not seen fit to give this resolution any attention to date.

ALLENTOWN, PA.: AN ALL AMERICA CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Allentown, which I have the honor to represent in our Eighth Pennsylvania Congressional District, has just been named an All America City by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. Ten other outstanding cities throughout our Nation have received the same distinctive honor.

It is fitting that Allentown should be accorded this coveted award just a few short months after conclusion of a memorable series of significant events that marked the 200th anniversary of the founding of the city in 1762 by Judge William Allen. It comes as a most satisfying climax to a wonderful bicentennial observance.

Today, on the main street of Allentown, a visitor to the city will see flying proudly in the breeze the red, white, and blue banner that is emblematic of the All America City Award. Hundreds of these flags grace our distinctive flowering light standards on Hamilton Street, the main thoroughfare of Allentown's central business section. And near the foot of Hamilton Street, close to the site of Lehigh County's now-abuilding new courthouse overlooking an area about to be transformed by urban renewal into an attractive complex of modern dwelling units, is a larger flag. This flag was raised in a public ceremony in front of the courthouse at noon Monday, April 1.

Allentown's entry, which was sponsored by the Allentown Chamber of Commerce, was based specifically on four phases of community betterment—its historic renaissance, economic advancement, civic development, and cultural achievement.

All four of these attributes were noted in the work of eight specific agencies whose contributions to civic betterment had been cited in the chamber's entry.

These participating agencies are: YMCA, YWCA, Allentown Art Museum, Trout Hall, the Library Bell Shrine, the Industrial Development Corp. of Lehigh County, the Allentown Redevelopment Authority, the County of Lehigh, and the city of Allentown.

While these were listed as the most significant for their contributions during the past year—the basis for the judging of the awards—the presentation made by the chamber directed the award jury's attention to other noteworthy organizations and activities of the city over past years.

Included among these was the work of the chamber itself, the activities of the Lehigh County Bar Association, Park & Shop, the Allentown Symphony Orchestra, the Civic Little Theater, Operation Help, the Jewish Community Center, and the creation of the Allentown Catholic Diocese under Bishop Joseph McShea.

All of these, it was pointed out, reflected the spirit of the community, its striving for cultural eminence, its fight to continue as a city with sound economic assets, a community with a heart, and a soul firmly rooted in a rich heritage.

The official presentation advancing the city's eligibility for the award noted:

> Our community has been beset by all the typical problems facing an American city of today. But with marked citizen participation we have effected a year of progress without parallel in Allentown's history.

WILL MEET CHALLENGES

It was also noted in this:

> We believe the activities recorded here are indicative of the initiative and industry that have marked the citizenry of Allentown since early colonial beginnings. We are confident that our ability to work in a great team effort will enable the residents of Allentown to meet the challenges of the future.

The individuals listed as the most active leaders responsible for the success of the winning efforts were listed in the presentation according to category.

The four leaders listed for historic activities are Dr. Morgan D. Person, Louis E. Dieruff, Melville J. Boyer, and Mrs. John H. Leh.

In the cultural field the leaders were Attorney William B. Butz, Donald P. Miller, Austin Gavin, and Mrs. John S. Cartwright.

Leaders in the economic category were listed as I. C. Gutman, Clarence A. Reichard, and Ralph C. Swartz.

Civic leaders were listed as Edmund F. Corkery, Mayor John T. Gross, and Earl S. Kester.

Allentown's bid for the All America City citation was made by Mr. Reichard, then president of the chamber of commerce, and W. Reese Super, executive vice president of the chamber. They appeared before the 12-member panel of judges in Washington, D.C., on November 16.

Among the outstanding civic achievements that were weighed by the jury in making this award to Allentown were the building of the new Liberty Bell Shrine, which houses a replica of the Liberty Bell in the basement of Zion United Church of Christ in the original spot where the bell was hidden during the Revolutionary War; the huge center-city rejuvenation centered on the Fourth Street urban renewal project, which will soon bring into being an imposing civic center that includes a new city hall and county courthouse; the reopening of Trout Hall, a colonial structure built originally by the city's founder, William Allen; the national recognition of the Allentown Art Museum; the completion of a $1.5 million new home for the Allentown YMCA and YWCA; the yeoman work of the Industrial Development Corp. of Lehigh County, which last year alone provided sites for 16 new companies involved in new locations or expansions, with 1,000 job potentials.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members of this House join with me in saluting Allentown—a city that has not only a rich heritage of history as the refuge for the Liberty Bell in the dark, troubled days of our Nation, but a city that nearly two centuries later is a vibrant, alert community that looks to the future with confidence.

FORUM ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND DISARMAMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my belief that a Representative has a responsibility to encourage the discussion of substantive issues by his constituents. Democracy depends upon citizen participation. In our mass society we must find the means for the individual citizen to participate in and to more closely control his community and his government.

Since my election to Congress, together with the Reform Democratic Clubs of Manhattan's West Side, I have sponsored an annual all-day community conference. The nonpartisan conferences permit a sharing of knowledge and ideas on the problems facing a troubled world.

Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1963, we sponsored our third annual all-day conference. This year the forum was concerned with the issues of national security and disarmament. More than 1,000 interested citizens attended the forum at Riverside Church. The enthusiastic response and great interest indicate a deep desire of our citizens to be informed on the vital questions of our times. This kind of public discussion, open to everyone, can do a great deal to invigorate the whole political life of our country. The public cares; it wants to know. Our annual community conferences are one attempt to bring closer together the citizen, the experts from our government, our universities, our research, and labor organizations and the issues. We hope this will engender greater citizen participation and control of political parties, public officials, and government.

Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., special assistant to the President; Herman Kahn, director of the Hudson Institute; and Arthur Waskow, senior staff member of the Peace Research Institute, who participated in the plenary session, and the experts on the six panels for their enlightening contributions to this democratic dialog.

The participating clubs were: Independent Democrats of Inwood, Heights Reform Democrats, Fort Washington-Manhattanville Reform Democrats, New Colonial Reform Democratic Club, the Riverside Democrats, FDR-Woodrow Wilson Democrats, West Side Democratic Club, Reform Independent Democrats, J.F.K.-Midtown Democrats, and the New Chelsea Club.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mrs. Hermine Brucker, the forum chairman, whose magnificent efforts, along with the efforts of all those who worked so hard with her, made the conference such a success. Daniel J. Nelson, the forum cochairman; and the panel chairmen, Carol Chauls, Robert Clampitt, Elinor Finkelstein, Emil Schattner, and Joseph Sugarman, made a great contribution to the program. I also want to thank Sara Silon, reception chairman; Barbara Jeffers, club coordinator; Robert V. Engle, program design chairman; and Eileen Lottman and Carmen Pertierra, publicity cochairmen.

Mr. Speaker, many of the ideas adopted for the 1963 conference were innovated by the late Gertrude Miller, chairman of the 1962 Forum on Foreign Policy, who symbolized the volunteer in politics.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD an article by Jack Newfield, editor of the West Side News, which appeared in that paper on March 14, 1963, and described the conference:

The ideal of the amateur Democrat was honored last Saturday, as a capacity audience jammed the Riverside Church for the plenary session of an all-day conference on national security and disarmament, sponsored by Congressman WILLIAM F. RYAN and the reform Democratic Clubs of the West Side.

With amateur Democrats, students, housewives, and clean-shaven peace activists filling every cranny of the marble assembly hall, Representative RYAN opened the plenary session with a tribute to the spirit of the amateur in politics.

"Mass society, mass media, giant corporations, even our two-party system," he said, "at times seem to negate the individual * * * if this kind of conference were held everywhere, the political life of this country would be greatly invigorated."

Then came Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Pulitzer Prize winner at 28, historian, and special assistant to President Kennedy.

"The historical trend of the 20th century," he began, "has been the disassociation between liberalism and the use of force. The great early heroes of democracy—Garibaldi, Bolivar, Jackson—saw no contradiction between democracy and force."

Zeroing in on his target, Schlesinger recalled, "After the Second World War there emerged a new totalitarianism and a new weaponry that created a cruel paradox for Democratic progressives."

COGENCY AND CLARITY

And then, with his legendary cogency and clarity, Schlesinger eviscerated the strawman of unilateral disarmament. "Unilateral disarmament," he asserted, "would very likely prevent verifiable disarmament, the only way to force the Soviets to accept a program of international arms control, is to convince them we are dedicated to staying in the arms race as long as they are.

"The better-Red-than-dead position, argued so gracefully by Stuart Hughes, is sheer folly," he added.

Schlesinger rounded out his carte blanche defense of the administration's deterrence policy by asserting, "The argument that the American economy requires a cold war is demonstrably unconvincing. The American economy would survive disarmament, just as it did in 1946."

The second half of the plenary session was a debate between Herman Kahn, the author of "On Thermonuclear War," and Arthur Waskow of the Peace Research Institute.

Waskow, scholarly and detached, began stating his objective: a warless world. Addressing himself to Schlesinger's defense of deterrence, he said, "America has not learned that the more bombs there are in the world, the more fear there is about using those bombs."

HELP DEMOCRACIES

Waskow climaxed his opening remarks with a plea to President Kennedy to "start dismantling our military superiority and start building political victories. Turn our military superiority to helping libertarian democracies all over the world."

Kahn proved to be not the bogeyman he has been caricatured by the peace movement. He did concede "New York might be blown up by accident. He did seem to savor rolling the numbers, "20, 30, 50, million dead" off his tongue, and he did mention he was reading the life of Ghenis Kahn.

But essentially Kahn's position was no different than Schlesinger's, and in fact, he said, "If forced to choose, I would say everyone Red rather than everyone dead. But I would say "A lot of people dead rather than a lot of people Red". Ask any Russian today and he will say he preferred 25 million dead to Hitler.

His support of deterrence, however, was less theoretical than the President's assistant "At least 20 incidents since the Second World War," he said, "would have resulted in the third world war in a less balance of terror environment. Only nuclear deterrence can assure the warless world Mr. Waskow dreams of."

"I am no apologist for the current system," concluded Kahn, "but it is the least undesirable of a bad lot."

LIBERTY AND BOMBS

In his rebuttal, Waskow again raised the ideal of democracy. "You simply cannot protect political liberty in a world that continues to produce H-bombs. Nuclear weapons did not allow us to advance political liberty in Hungary or Cuba."

Kahn's rejoinder proved it is not his ideas, but his choice of images that enrages the peace movement. "An 8-ton nuclear warhead, to me, means peace, justice, democracy, and security," he said.

Schlesinger's thesis continued to provoke refutations at an afternoon panel discussion, billed as prospects for enforcing arms control.

* * * * *

Afterward, as the crowd filed out, the conference was certified an unqualified success by all parties: sponsors, participants, and audience. It was, indeed, an inspiring example of what the ideal of the amateur in politics could accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I also include at this point in the RECORD a summary of the plenary session and the six panel discussions, which was prepared by Mrs. Eileen Lottman, chairman of the forum publicity committee, and Neil Cowan:

OVERFLOW AUDIENCE ATTENDS FORUM ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND DISARMAMENT

(By Eileen Lottman and Neil Cowan)

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., special assistant to President Kennedy, spoke to an audience of over 1,000 people at the open forum on national security and disarmament, Saturday, March 9, 1963, the third annual community conference to be sponsored by Congressman WILLIAM F. RYAN and the reform Democratic clubs of Manhattan's West Side. The conference included three morning panel discussions, three afternoon panels, and a plenary session, all open, free to the public, which responded by filling every seat and crowding the standing room at the huge Riverside Church (121st Street and Claremont Avenue).

The conference was keynoted by Congressman RYAN at the plenary session when he stated, "This conference was held to discuss the greatest danger man has ever faced." The speakers then discussed the issues of how man must face the threat of nuclear annihilation, how to thwart it, and, in the meantime, how to live with it.

After pointing out the great public concern with this problem, indicated by the overcapacity audience, Congressman RYAN introduced Mr. Schlesinger.

Mr. Schlesinger traced the progressive-liberal view of international politics from the Founding Fathers through Theodore Roosevelt, from Woodrow Wilson through two World Wars. Concluding his historical review, he pointed to the paradox facing liberals since the end of World War II—a desire for peace and a desire to halt Communist aggression. After discarding popular approaches, such as denying the existence of either the need for peace or the Communist threat; admitting the paradox but trusting to human ingenuity to solve it; cynically asserting that the paradox is necessary for the economy; or simply adhering to one side of the paradox rather than the other on the grounds that it is more important; Mr. Schlesinger posed his own solution for the achievement of disarmament in face of the Soviet nuclear threat.

Accepting the truism that total war means total destruction, Mr. Schlesinger stated that the United States must maintain its military security and and accept the reality of nuclear weapons. When the Soviet Union is convinced that the United States will always remain strong, the futility of maintaining such a balance of terror will be clear. The only reasonable alternative then will be disarmament. The stockpiling of these weapons and the maintenance of such a large defensive complex is a tragic choice, but a choice that we must live with if we expect to hold onto our position as a free nation.

Mr. Arthur Waskow, senior staff member of the Peace Research Institute and author of "The Limits of Defense" and coauthor with Stanley Newman of "America in Hiding," spoke next. He views peace in the nuclear age as something which must be achieved through the United Nations or a similar world body.

"Historically," said Mr. Waskow, "the United States has always depended upon military superiority for its national security. The advent of nuclear weapons has resulted in a change in this position—the more bombs we have, the more we fear to use them. In the search for military superiority we have developed weapons that are so destructive there is little likelihood that they will ever be used. We have become frozen in a policy and a political climate which affords no alternative; the rationalization for our position is that no real choice exists.

We must now learn how to carry out the national interest without reliance on military strength and potent weapons systems. We must establish a means to protect our boundaries and to maintain our liberty and power. We desire an institution that will prevent rearmament, but one that will not impose its values on us. Thus, we are seeking those avenues whereby the free world is expanded and, at the same time, political victories can be won. This can be achieved by directing those resources, now part of the military establishment, into other areas. The manpower used in the waging of war could be employed in a great Peace Corps project. The result of these projects would be the maintenance of fredom and power by the United States. The Soviet Union would find herself in a position of either matching the performance of the United States or losing whatever sphere of influence she now has. By taking such a lead, Mr. Waskow said, the United States would become, as Jefferson phrased it, man's last best hope on earth.

Herman Kahn, the third speaker at the plenary session, author of "On Thermonuclear War," spoke in opposition to Mr.

Waskow's views. He sees the problem as one which must be solved by what we have on hand, with a marked contrast existing between what is most feasible and what is most desirable.

Mr. Kahn foresees a world with three possible shapes by the beginning of the 21st century. In the first, the major blocs would be politely hostile, but because of a careful definition of terms and fear of ultimate consequences the hostility will go no farther than minor incidents.

The second possible shape, most desirable but least feasible, in Mr. Kahn's view, is that of a world government formed as a result of either a third world war or some other crisis that dissolves national sovereignty and national self-interest to a higher cause. This supragovernment, a result of external pressures, would be forced upon nations by the political climate of the times. This is not feasible, for men would rather have self-government than good government.

The third shape, the one Mr. Kahn foresees as most feasible, if least desirable, is a continuation of present policy of nation-states seeking world empires, maintaining the careful balance of polite hostility. There would be minor incidents, Mr. Kahn stated, but the nuclear weapons system itself would prevent them from turning into major wars.

Mr. Kahn does not believe that the present system of deterrence and defense will last forever. The tendency to violence will create crises, but the final result will probably not be the destruction of the major powers, national self-interest being the deterrent to national suicide. The answer to the choice of Red or dead is answered by Mr. Kahn. The choice applied to everyone is obviously, "better Red than dead"; however, if the choice is applied to only a relative few, nations would prefer to lose millions rather than give up their own power and nationality.

Three morning panels were held on the topics: "History of Disarmament Negotiations," "Economic Consequences of Disarmament," and "Social Values in the Nuclear Age." The three afternoon panels were focused on: "The Spread of Nuclear Power," "Prospects for Enforcing Arms Control," and "Ideological Barriers to Disarmament."

The participants in the panel discussions were experts from government, universities, research and labor organizations, and communications media. A brief summary of each discussion follows.

HISTORY OF DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Robert Matteson, senior adviser, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Robert H. Cory, Jr., Quaker program of the United Nations.

Professor Richard Swift, New York University, Department of Government and International Relations.

Moderator: Professor Abramo Organski, Brooklyn College, Department of Political Science.

Professor Swift traced the history of disarmament negotiations to the first U.N. discussions in 1946, divided at first into control of atomic weapons and conventional arms. The large U.N. Commission has since been split into several subcommittees whose work has been truly fruitful and positive. Professor Swift discussed the Baruch plan for an international authority to own and control atomic energy, which was outdated with the development of the Soviet bomb in 1949. When monopoly no longer existed, a check system needed to be developed on the number of weapons each nation possesed. This is where we stand today. He pointed out that in the history of negotiations since 1949 it has been suspicion on both sides which has precluded agreement.

Mr. Cory spoke of the small nations of the world as the "voice of reason" in our age. In the first 10 years of negotiations the big powers had primary responsibility and power to act; somewhere in the middle of the last decade the smaller nations began to demand a voice in the future of the world. Banding together as neutrals in the Disarmament Commission of the U.N., the smaller countries have been able to put pressure on the great powers to study the situations thoroughly as they arise and to keep propaganda to a minimum.

Mr. Matteson agreed with Professor Swift that secrecy and suspicion has always been the stumbling block to negotiations and stressed that proposals must be studied from both points of view. It is clear that with increasing security of built-up arms and second-strike capability the Soviet powers might be more likely to agree to a test-ban treaty. The history of negotiations since 1957 does show that limited objectives can be obtained with bilateral negotiations.

Professor Organski concluded the discussion with the observation that the arms race, when viewed in historical perspective, shows us that the weapons themselves are part of a double underlying problem—world power and world politics. Many of our objectives are the same; it is these shared areas of interest which can lead us to agreement.

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF DISARMAMENT

Prof. Emile Benoit, Columbia University, author of "Europe at Sixes and Sevens."

Prof. Seymour Melman, Columbia University, author of "The Peace Race."

Henry D. Wyner, Economics Officer, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Moderator: Jack Sessions, Education Department of the AFL–CIO.

Our Government is seriously interested in disarmament, stated Mr. Wyner, and this is evidenced by the active interest on the part of the administration in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as well as the studies in this field authorized by Congress. Mr. Wyner stated that there are three general areas in which economic problems might be in conflict with disarmament in this country: (1) the major role of the defense program in our economy; (2) the adjustments which must be made to keep the country economically strong; and (3) the long-range goals—defining the values and desires of American society. Disarmament would mean reduction in the size, the force, the inventories of our producing defense industry, and controls over production and force. The U.S.S.R. is faced with no such problems. Possible methods of dealing with these problems must be researched and developed.

It is the responsibility of the Government to gather analytical data, and this we are doing.

Professor Benoit pointed out that disarmament comes about for reasons of physical safety rather than reasons of economic advisability. He proposed a long-range plan involving both the U.S.S.R. and the United States, plus a higher power such as the United Nations in assuming the burden of finding workable substitutes for a military and defense-based economy.

Professor Melman discussed the conversion of military activities into other channels. We are living in a period of military superabundance. This "overkill" could be safely turned right now into peaceful industrial progress. The individual States in this country which are affected by cutoff of military funds should be addressing themselves to problems of conversion to industry, and management and trade unions should face these problems and come up with answers.

Professor Melman urged the turning of our strength and energies and wealth to opening opportunities to grow and options of freedom for the rest of the world. The transfer of resources on our part would place the Soviet Union in a position which would force that power to concentrate on the challenge we would be setting with underdeveloped and uncommitted nations.

SOCIAL VALUES IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

Prof. Robert Engler, Sarah Lawrence College.

Dr. Jerome Frank, psychiatrist, Johns Hopkins Medical School.

Col. Amos Jordan, U.S. Military Academy, West Point.

Moderator: Richard Heffner, vice president and general manager, Educational Broadcasting Corp.

Professor Engler called the nuclear bomb an example of the continuing industrial revolution with the huge industrial organization and giant military apparatus in this country increasingly narrowing the range of public debate, restricting the privacy of the individual, and producing a "what can I do" outlook in the general public. "The extent to which the American press is used as an arm of the state is something that needs a full investigation," he declared. Our military-industrial complex has led us into a potentially totalitarian system, and it is vitally important to examine the roots of the conflict now. Russia and the United States are actually the aristocracy of the world, and the conflict may one day develop into a fight between the developed and the underdeveloped countries of the world.

Dr. Frank examined several social values which need to be modified in the nuclear age. He considers patriotism a dangerous trait in its inference that a nation has the right to pursue its own interests at the expense of any and all other nations. Dr. Frank stated that now no nation can flourish unless all do. The accepted social assumption that war is a proper and feasible way to solve differences, accepted for milleniums and equating armed strength with courage, must be altered. A "just war" based on emotions is no longer possible. The nonviolent techniques recently effective in India and in the United States have proved to thousands of people that courage does not necessarily mean killing. However, geographic distances between the two major powers makes nonviolence a nonrealistic solution.

Colonel Jordan, emphasizing that he was not a spokesman for the Army or the Government, expressed the opinion that conflict will be the rule rather than the exception in the next decade. The military of the United States differs from that of other countries in important and key ways, in that it is impossible here for the military ever to come into power through political coupe. "U.S. officers are trained to think of the welfare of the Nation and to serve the country," he stated, and added that the citizenry must take the responsibility of keeping alert to the dangers of too much control over communications by a few major companies and/or the Government. The strategy of deterrent nuclear build-up, he stated, is the best course to follow until a better strategy is developed.

THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR POWER

Arthur Barber, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Peter Dobell, First Secretary, Delegation of Canada to the United Nations.

Prof. Warner Schilling, Institute for Peace and War Studies, Columbia University.

Prof. John Stoessinger, Hunter College, author of "The Might of Nations."

Moderator: Lawrence Finkelstein, Vice President, Carnegie Endownment for International Peace.

Mr. Dobell traced the influences which affect the development of nuclear power to three main sources: geography, economic development, and political systems. He stated that the Government of Canada was able to make atomic bombs at the close of World War II, with plentiful supplies of uranium and highly trained and experienced technicians on hand. The decision of the Government not to make bombs is still standing.

He traced several reasons for this decision, including the fact that Canada has no aspirations for greater power and that it counts on the United States for defensive help if necessary. He outlined the current conflict in the Government of Canada regarding nuclear power; the new Democratic Party wishes to resist in every possible way the spread of nuclear weapons; the Conservatives feel that Canada should not accept nuclear warheads under any terms; the Liberal Party wishes to accept the weapons and then be in a position to negotiate for their withdrawal and control. Mr. Dobell stated that decisions are forced upon governments not by threats, but by political considerations.

Professor Schilling pointed out the inequities between nations with power and nations without power—one example is that we ask other nations to join with us in foreign aid, but protest their joining us in sharing nuclear weapons. The countries which do not have the nuclear force find themselves in the position of deciding whether to pour all their resources into establishing such a force, leaving themselves with little else to contribute in other areas.

Professor Stoessinger introduced into the discussion the alternative of an international agency which would administer and control nuclear power for peaceful purposes. He traced briefly the history of the International Atomic Energy Administration, which has not been effective since nuclear powers do not stay within it in their negotiations. Professor Stoessinger foresees no other alternative to keeping the spread of nuclear power within a rational framework.

Nuclear weapons have become a symbol of national prestige, Mr. Barber explained. As a result nations are sacrificing industrial development for military buildup. We should try to persuade people that it is not necessarily in their national interests to build nuclear weapons. The prestige value of nuclear power should be discouraged so that national resources can be used for economic development and a proper climate established for disarmament.

Mr. Finkelstein noted that China will inevitably explode a nuclear devise, and all attention will be turned to negotiating with that power. The response of the United States will reflect international policy, and it is probably that we will defend whoever is attacked by China. If a test-ban agreement is to be reached, it must be done before this occurs.

PROSPECTS FOR ENFORCING ARMS CONTROL

Nelson Bengston, chairman of the Committee for World Development and World Disarmament.

Prof. Amitai Etzioni, Columbia University, auothor of "The Hard Way to Peace: A New Strategy."

Dr. Leonard Rodberg, senior physicist, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Moderator: Prof. Walter Goldstein, Brooklyn College, Department of Government.

Mr. Bangston spoke of the peace resolution of the United Nations which has been effective in Korea, Suez, Hungary, and the Congo. This resolution depended largely upon the prestige and leadership of the United States, but in the present situation with Cuba, this country has been depreciating its prestige by acting outside of the UN.

Mr. Rodberg brought out that inspection is not control, and that inspection, per se, is neither a barrier to arms control nor a problem of disarmament. A nation can only be induced to control its armaments if it is in that nation's own national interest. Agreements between powers will depend, therefore, on two approaches: (1) to verify the letter of the agreement—this requires extensive access which is incompatible with distrust; and (2) security protection against significant violations. The real use of inspection is to provide other parties with reassurance that significant violations are not taking place, so that others can maintain their compliance with the international agreement.

Professor Etzioni stated that the United States talks disarmament, but does not take it seriously, as evidenced by the veto of arms control by the Pentagon. Arms control carries no surcease from dangers of accidental wars or insane wars brought about by unstable military powers. It also freezes the balance and puts a premium on scientific breakthrough. What is needed, he stated, is arms reduction, down to an eventual zero, with control.

Professor Etzioni suggested that the U.S. Senate would never ratify a treaty carrying any implications of give-and-take in an inspection agreement with the U.S.S.R. Dr. Rodberg stated that our Government would support general and complete disarmament if it could get adequate inspection, but it might be better to settle for partial disarmament if we could get significant inspection and verification.

Professor Goldstein brought up the problem of nuclear disengagement for Africa and Latin America. The panel agreed that in this area control depends upon balance being maintained; that critical weakenings of one side or another would bring about a unilateral disarmament.

IDEOLOGICAL BARRIERS TO DISARMAMENT

Arnold Beichman, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Prof. Saul K. Padover, New School for Social Research, author of "To Secure These Blessings."

Prof. Alexander Dallin, director of the Russian Institute, Columbia University.

Gerald Steibek, foreign affairs director, Research Institute of America.

Moderator: Daniel Nelson, assistant research director, International Ladies Garment Workers.

Mr. Beichman opened the discussion with his view that the Soviet Union was antagonistic to disarmament on the grounds that it would weaken her position vis-a-vis China.

Mr. Steibel felt that a failure of understanding on the part of the West has resulted in failure to achieve any disarmament treaty. The West believes that the Soviet Union is becoming more rational.

This is probably a bad assumption. The West seeks to maintain the status quo, which in this case is a stalemate; the Soviets seek change. It is important to remember that disarmament will come when it is profitable to both sides. Thus, national self-interest is the prominent factor.

Dr. Padover stated that the Russians often act out of fear of the West, that suspicion and mistrust act as psychological blocks and thus the barriers to agreement are emotional, not rational. It is important to our self-interest that the Soviets become convinced that we are not seeking to conquer them. At the same time we should maintain our power so that our friendliness will not be turned against us.

Professor Dallin looks upon Khrushchev's demand for disarmament at the U.N. as pure progaganda. The changing world will encourage the Soviets to disarm because of their great faith in the flow of history bringing countries into their camp. The maintenance of the status quo forces them to rely on arms. Their basic distrust is reflected in the question: Who watches the watchers?

Mr. Beichman disagreed on the point that the United States is a status quo nation. He pointed to the statistics of people leaving their home countries to come here, which is not true of the U.S.S.R. If we have not convinced the Russians of our nonaggressive attitude, he added, we never will.

Mr. Steibel felt that on the issue of test inspections the Russians cannot be trusted. If we agree to their terms, they will have won a major victory and will be more difficult to deal with in the future.

The panelists agreed that the issues center on two factors: basic distrust between the two great powers and the issue of status quo versus change.

PAUL W. CRONIN

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable young man has just been elected to the post of selectman in Andover, Mass. Mr. Paul W. Cronin at 25 has been chosen by the voters of that community to serve on the board, making him one of the youngest ever to serve and possibly one of the youngest selectmen in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts today. Mr. Cronin combines intelligence and experience extraordinary for one of his years. I wish him all the best in his new office.

I, under unanimous consent, include an article by Frank J. Dyer, which appeared in the Lawrence, Mass., Eagle Tribune on March 26, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD describing the achievements and convictions of a distinguished young American:

A SELECTMAN AT 25

(By Frank J. Dyer)

GOT EARLY START

"He combines idealism and practicality, energy and judgment, youth and maturity in a most unusual way."

This description of Andover's new selectman, Paul W. Cronin, was made by his former teacher, George Blackwood, associate professor of political economy at Boston University and coauthor of "The Alienated Voter" and "The Complete Politician."

Cronin, 25, is one of the youngest selectmen elected to office in Andover and is possibly one of the youngest selectmen in the State today.

His political ambitions were nurtured young in life.

"I handed out political cards at the polls when I was 9," he said. He also attended selectmen's meetings while in high school.

The new selectman earned his degree at Boston University, where he carried a double major in economics and government. He has resided in Andover for nearly 20 years.

Cronin, who campaigned under the slogan, "A secure future for Andover," acknowledges the "broad base of support" he received from his campaigners, a support that helped him win over his nearest opponent by a 1,000-plus plurality.

Selectman Cronin believes that townspeople should be willing to devote their time and efforts for the benefit of the community.

"If you're going to maintain democracy as we know it and if we are to strengthen our system, this power has to come from the people," he says. As far as committee appointments are concerned, Cronin feels that "qualified townspeople should be willing to step forward and give of themselves for the benefit of the town."

He says that, "all too often" interest in town government isn't generated until "late in life." He believes this interest should be instilled in the citizen while young.

While campaigning, Selectman Cronin publicly stated that he was opposed to the controversial urban renewal proposal. However, he says he does believe that certain areas in Andover should be revitalized.

"I believe that the native ingenuity of the townspeople will prove to the Nation that Andover was the town that could solve its own problems * * * that Andover could do it on its own."

He adds that if changes are to be made to the face of Andover, they should not be "total or abrupt."

Repeating a statement he made while campaigning, Selectman Cronin says he intends to be "liberal in my time in dealings with townspeople, conservative in areas of fiscal responsibility, yet firm on policy matters."

Cronin is a corporate staff member of the industrial relations firm of Edgerton, Germshausen & Grier, Boston. He is married to the former Kathleen Sears and the couple have two preschool children, Kevin and Kimberly. They live at 96 Maple Avenue.

MINORITY STAFFING STATEMENT BY GOV. ALF LANDON

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one Kansan who has been watching closely and with great interest the fight for increased minority staffing under the leadership of the House Republican conference subcommittee on increased minority staffing is former Gov. Alf Landon, of Kansas. Governor Landon, the 1936 Republican presidential standard bearer, has during recent years become again increasingly active in speaking out courageously on issues confronting our Nation. His leadership last year in connection with the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was one of the highlights of Governor Landon's legislative year. In Washington last year we were also fortunate to have several talks by the Governor to Members of Congress and to the press. Governor Landon is interested in an increasingly strong, vigorous, and constructive Congress. He also feels that the Republican Party, in order to be a vital forward moving force in this fast moving world, should be able to contribute to the utmost in the Halls of Congress. Individual Members of Congress have asked me from time to time about Governor Landon's views, and I have been happy to share these with them. Governor Landon recently wrote a letter to the chairman of the Republican conference subcommittee on increased minority staffing, the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, the full text of which follows below:

TOPEKA, KANS., *March 26, 1963.*

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: Glad to notice you're pounding away on more representation for minority staff members. I think this is a highly important factor. Keep up the good work.

I watched the returns from Iowa last fall with a lot of interest and was happy to see that you won a well-deserved reelection.

Hope the goose continues to hang high and the smoke goes up the chimney for you and yours.

ALF M. LANDON.

Mr. Speaker, it would be appropriate at this time to pay tribute to the persistent and unselfish leadership of the Congressman from the First Congressional District of Iowa, Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL. Many of the constructive things which have been done in the minority staffing fight have been the result of long hours of overtime on the part of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and his associates. Many of the facilities, letters and conferences have been initiated and executed by FRED SCHWENGEL, and he has done all of this in addition to his conscientious service to the people of the First Congressional District of Iowa as well as to the Public Works Committee and the District of Columbia Committee.

I join this distinguished Kansan in paying tribute to Congressman SCHWENGEL and to public-spirited citizens both here in the Nation's Capital and throughout the country who are becoming increasingly active in the fight for effective minority staffing on congressional committees. I hope in the future Governor Landon will consent to come to Washington again and share with Members of this body and the other body his impressions of what is going on in the world today. There is a great deal of wisdom and knowledge in this distinguished American's mind, and we need to have the benefit of it. Kansas is still proud of the many contributions to the betterment of American life made by Governor Landon.

HOW SOUND IS THE DOLLAR?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's RECORD the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] made an excellent statement concerning expenditure reforms. He reminded us that international communism plans to defeat us economically rather than on the battlefield.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri put it in this way, and I quote:

> I remind all of you of what Lenin and other Communist leaders have said that they are not going to defeat America on the battlefield. We will get America to spend itself to death.
>
> And, indeed, if they succeed we will then go down the same trail of oblivion as so many other nations in history have gone. We will not go out in a blaze of glory but in a whimper.

FORCES AFFECTING THE DOLLAR

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri has well stated the end result of foolish fiscal policies. There are many forces adversely affecting the value of the U.S. dollar. Among these are inflationary policies at home and a growing balance-of-payment problem with respect to other countries. In combination, they have produced doubts concerning the soundness of our dollar.

President Kennedy's proposed budget deficit of $12 billion, if enacted, may well further erode the value of the U.S. dollar. Even suggesting such a huge budgetary deficit is creating a bad psychological climate for our currency.

RUMORS ABROAD

In European financial capitals, there has been increased speculation suggesting a dollar crisis in 1964. Such rumors add fuel to the fire and tend to destroy faith in the U.S. dollar. These rumors subsist on faulty economic statements made by this administration.

GOLD FLOW PROBLEM

Another factor damaging to the dollar is America's poor gold position. Gold still influences the credit standing of our Government although we have been off the gold standard for some 30 years.

Possession of gold reserves has remained a standard for judging the fiscal soundness of governments, even though their currencies are not directly convertible into this precious element.

On April 1, 1963, the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee issued the following statement on America's gold reserve position:

FACTS ON FOREIGN AID—OUR GOLD RESERVE

The Clay Committee report to the President, released March 20, 1963, rightly reveals "increasing concern * * * over the contribution of foreign aid to the persistent deficits in our international balance of payments. These deficits have produced a sustained decline in our gold stock and a marked increase in foreign-owned dollar balances." Facts supporting this increasing concern are supplied by the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee:

CLAIMS ON U.S. GOLD RESERVE

Federal Reserve notes, deposit liabilities, and U.S. notes outstanding, require by law a backing in gold of $12,066 million.

By swap arrangement the Federal Reserve has obtained calls on foreign currencies, repayable in kind totaling $1,100 million.

For the first time in history the U.S. Treasury has been compelled to issue obligations, payable not in dollars but in foreign currencies. These borrowings amount to $529 million.

Monetary silver reserves are disappearing. The Treasury has asked the Congress for authority to substitute Federal Reserve notes for the silver certificates outstanding. This transaction will require, in gold as reserve backing, $540 million.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) sold $800 million of gold to the U.S. Treasury for Treasury notes, to be repaid in gold $800 million. U.S. gold obligations total $15,035 million.

Accordingly, we have obligated $15,035 million of our gold reserve which, since aid began, has dropped from $24,500 million to $15,878 million. But this is not all. Principally due to foreign aid, foreign central banks now hold $24,980 million in short-term dollar credits, redeemable in gold. Increasingly apprehensive over a possible devaluation of the dollar, foreigners hold its fate in their hands.

THE ONLY REMEDY

Our unfavorable balance of payments runs some $2 billion annually. To preclude another unfavorable balance of payments and thereby prevent risking a ruinous run on our dwindling gold reserve, the Congress should cut in half the foreign aid request for fiscal 1964.

Mr. Speaker, in the foregoing statement, the principal reason for our unfavorable gold flow is attributed to foreign aid. Although foreign aid is unquestionably of major importance in this matter, the funds we spend in maintaining U.S. Armed Forces abroad is a large factor.

We cannot overlook increased imports into the United States and decreased exports to other countries as being important to our balance of payments. We are pricing ourselves out of some markets and losing others through unfair discriminatory practice.

Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers and the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee are to be commended for the clear picture they have presented about our gold obligations to other countries.

TAX POLICY AND THE PURITAN ETHIC

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. CURTIS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed Republican colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] who serves with such ability and distinction in the House and as a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Joint Economic Committee has established a national reputation as a foremost authority on tax policy. To his responsibilities as one of the leaders on tax policy in the Congress, TOM CURTIS brings an outstanding professional competence as a lawyer as well as great capability as a learned student of economics.

Congressman CURTIS has made and is making a major contribution to public awareness and understanding of the tax policy issues now before our Nation. He has addressed citizen groups throughout the Nation, he has participated in the congressional hearings on tax policy, and he has written extensively on the subject.

Recently TOM CURTIS spoke at a public affairs forum conducted by the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce on tax policy. The subject of his address was "Tax Policy and the Puritan Ethic." He spoke of the need for expenditure reform as a prerequisite to tax rate reduction. He described the sense of our people to believe that we should pay our way for adequate but frugal government as a strong moral conviction—a Puritan ethic.

Mr. Speaker, I will include my colleague's remarks before the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce at this point in the RECORD. I commend the reading of these remarks to everyone interested in sound tax policy. I commend the Honorable TOM CURTIS for his able commentary on this important issue.

REMARKS OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS BEFORE THE ST. LOUIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE MEETING, MARCH 29, 1963

TAX POLICY AND THE PURITAN ETHIC

My fellow Americans, my friends and neighbors, I am pleased to return again to my home community to talk for the second time in as many weekends on matters involving tax considerations.

Indeed, I was at first somewhat concerned about talking again on the same subject because of the prospect that I would be repeating myself and thus possibly subject the unwary to the agony of hearing me again. My staff in Washington has in some measure quieted my fears with the reassurance that surely no one who heard me last week would make the mistake of coming back so soon. Be that as it may, I have succeeded this evening in at least having a new topical theme, namely, "Tax Policy and the Puritan Ethic." I apologize if some of my substantive comments may have been heard last week by any of you present tonight.

Before I begin my principal remarks I would like to commend the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce for sponsoring this public affairs series. I know that great good will come of it and it is to be hoped that the example you set will be followed by other citizen organizations in our home community and throughout our State and Nation. Such public forums have a great potential for good.

Citizen laxity about public affairs has helped to produce a deterioration in the moral quality of service to country by our people. Too often we satisfy our sporadic citizenship urge by dealing with issues involving our liberty, opportunity, and security armed only with platitudes and devoid of knowledge of the facts because acquiring the latter would take time.

President George Washington in his first annual address in January 1790 has this to say about the importance of citizen knowledge:

"Knowledge is * * * the surest basis of public happiness. In one in which the measures of government receive their impression so immediately from the sense of the community as in ours it is proportionably essential. To the security of a free constitution it contributes * * * by convincing those * * * entrusted with public administration, that every valuable end of government is best answered by the enlightened confidence of the people * * * by teaching the people themselves to know and to value their own rights (and to) provide against invasions of them * * *."

The wisdom of George Washington on the need for citizen knowledge is certainly pertinent today. With these forums you gentlemen will be helping to develop that citizen knowledge that he said is the surest basis of public happiness.

During the next several minutes it will be my purpose to comment on the subject "Tax Policy and the Puritan Ethic." I will attempt to appraise the present factors influencing tax policy. I will offer my views as to the tax policy that is in the best interest of our Nation.

I propose to express myself forthrightly in terms of fiscal principle and economic conviction, letting the political chips fall where they may. I hasten to add that I will not offend your hospitality by making a deliberately partisan speech. However, I will accept the invitation of the President of the United States made in his now famous Yale speech to engage in a national debate on the subject of tax policy.

Indeed, some of you know me pretty well and it will come as no surprise to you that I accepted this challenge almost, if not actually, before it was uttered. I have expressed my views on the tax policy issue in such places as New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Washington, and now St. Louis. I must admit that the "other fellow" may have received more publicity but I have reason to believe that I have received a better response from the thoughtful citizens of our Nation.

Based on my exposure to the public sentiment in regard to the conduct of America's fiscal affairs:

I sincerely believe that the puritan ethic of paying our way for adequate but frugal government is still a strong moral conviction of our people.

I sincerely believe there is a growing awareness that we cannot preserve our liberty while seeking to solve every human problem by recourse to compulsive spending out of a depleted Federal Treasury.

I sincerely believe that the bankrupt policy of seeking national affluence through deficits—of trying to spend ourselves rich, smart, and secure by Government credit card—is declining in public acceptance.

With those prefatory comments, I turn to my topic for the evening: "Tax Policy and the Puritan Ethic."

The English satirist Samuel Butler, in a book published in the early 1870's entitled "Erehwon"—nowhere spelled backward—described a Utopia—also nowhere spelled frontward in Greek—in a way that ridiculed the absurdities and contradictions of then modern society. In this book he told about a man "who makes a colossal fortune in the hosiery trade, and by his energy has succeeded in reducing the price of woolen goods by the thousandth part of a penny in the pound—this man is worth 10 professional philanthropists. So strongly are the Erehwonians impressed with this, that if a man has made a fortune of over 20,000 pounds a year they exempt him from all taxation, considering him as a work of art, and too precious to be meddled with; for they say, 'How very much he must have done for society before society could have been prevailed upon to give him so much money.'"

Implicit in that excerpt are principles that are essential elements in any tax policy that purports to be conducive to sustainable economic growth. One principle we find is the incentive for ingenuity and enterprise. We also find economic opportunity multiplying into greater economic opportunity. We find technological progress advancing the national weal. We find the essence of our American free enterprise system—the opportunity for reasonable profit for productive effort. I do not advocate that we go the Erehwonian route to the extent of total tax exemption but we might well better heed the lesson these fictional people offer us in terms of greater reward for greater effort.

In the period of the past three decades our tax structure has developed according to the pressures of political expediency rather than economic concept and principle. In a relative sense we have tended to encourage consumption and in an absolute sense we have discouraged investment. As a consequence, capital investment in the United States as a percent of gross national product compares unfavorably—falls disturbingly short—of the experience in the other industrialized nations of the world. This shortsighted tax policy has levied on capital, impaired investment, and created obsolete productive capacity. The result is that job opportunities in private enterprise are not as abundantly available as they would otherwise be.

Therefore, it behooves us to seek a tax policy that will encourage entrepreneurial investors to rid our economy of obsolete production facilities through expanded modernization so that we can compete more effectively in domestic and world markets, thereby enhancing the job opportunities available to our citizens. It also behooves us to train the aptitudes and skills of our people so that they can fill the jobs that are now going unfilled and the jobs that technology will create in the future. Parenthetically, it is to be observed that much of our all too high unemployment today comes not so much from an absence of jobs as from an alarming absence of usable skills among the jobless.

Tax policy of the past three decades has sought the political objective of redistributing the existing wealth among our citizens rather than the sounder economic objective of creating greater wealth for all our citizens. Our confiscatory tax policy has led us to the result that in 1962 the total tax payment to governments equaled one-third of the value of the Nation's total output. One revealing light in which this startling statistic might be viewed is as a measure of the extent to which we have gone in socializing the productive endeavors of our citizens—one-third of the product of your labor is taken by governments. The Federal tax burden alone takes about one-fifth of the net national product or substantially upward from $100 billion.

Has this staggering tax burden paid for the Government goods and services that have been provided? Tragically, the answer to that question is known to all—at home and abroad—and is a shameful "No." Eighty percent of the time in the last three decades the Federal budget has been in the red. We have had deficits in war and in peace, in recession and prosperity—largely because we as voters thought the politicians were spending someone else's money—and it is only in recent months that there seems an awareness that the only someone else involved other than ourselves is our children. The compulsive spending by Government has vastly exceeded the productivity our citizens have been willing to pay in current taxation. Hence, the future generations will find their productive efforts encumbered by the more than $1 trillion of debt and unfunded obligations we have amassed and will leave unpaid when the certainty of death relieves our generation from concern over the certainty of taxes.

But we need not go back 30 years to find cause for concern. The budget experience of the past few years has brought an alarming worsening in our fiscal affairs. Spending for the fiscal year 1964 is projected at $22.3 billion higher than was spent in the year 1960—the last year in which we had a budgetary surplus. This is an increase of 29 percent. The cumulative total of just the increases over the 1960 level that have been spent or are scheduled to be spent in the years 1961 through 1964 is more than $56 billion; an amount that exceeds our annual total Federal spending as recently as 1951. Our deficits and debts are keeping pace with our spending growth. We have not had a surplus since 1960 and we are told that we will not have a balanced budget again until 1967 at the earliest and more likely it will be into the 1970's before the budget is next balanced. In the 4 years 1961 through 1964 the prospect is we will add a minimum of $31 billion to our Federal debt and $75 billion is predicted as the debt addition before our next expected surplus.

Has this record of unprecedented spending and record debt given pause to the compulsive spenders? Not at all. With new programs and bigger programs, with soaring new obligational authority requests, the architects of profligate government blandly forecast higher spending and admonish that Government frugality will generate economic decline.

I know one perhaps impolite but not profane word that properly describes the spurious economics of these neo-Fabians and that word is "balderdash." Where are the prosperity, the growth, the jobs, the vigor—or is it rigor?—we have been promised year after year? What has happened to the economic upturn we were promised if we just let the spenders add a few billion more to the spending level and the public debt? We have an economy that lacks advance and forward thrust not because we are spending too little but, if anything, because we are spending too much and because apprehension has replaced confidence.

After these many billions spent on revived New Deal programs, we are now told that what we really need is something the New Deal never did try and that is tax reduction. Eureka. Now we are going to spend more, tax less, and pay off some of the national debt. I wonder how it happened the Erehwonians left that one to the New Frontier to think of? Some of us in public life—Republican and Democrat alike—hailed the idea of a tax cut as long overdue but when we proposed an expenditure cut to make the tax cut consistent with principles of fiscal integrity we were accused of having that loathsome malady know as a "puritan ethic."

My friends, my ailment has been properly diagnosed. I do have a puritan ethic and it is as compulsive in me as the proclivity to spend the taxpayer's dollar seems to be in some other people. I earnestly submit to you that it is the fiscal principles of the puritan ethic that alone will make meaningful tax reduction a responsible reality.

In the time that remains I will briefly apply my puritan ethic to considerations of tax policy. I will outline a prescribed course of action for the Congress and the citizens of our Nation in achieving urgently needed reform of our tax rate structure. Your attention is specifically called to my use of the word "reform" in connection with changes in our tax rate structure. To me, the tax change that has the highest priority is the reform and restructuring of our rate schedules. Substantive reforms can come later over a period of years after careful study and need not detain either the Congress or us at the present time or this year.

The first step and prerequisite to subsequent steps in the tax reduction program must be a minimum $5 billion cut in the proposed budget spending and an even larger slash in the proposed new obligational authorities. And in making these cuts there must be cooperation between the legislative and executive branches to make the cuts stick so the deleted amounts will not be restored in supplemental appropriation bills. When we get on the subject of Government economy a frequent cry of the spenders is to "Name where you will cut." To them I have this answer—any budget that has grown by $22 billion or 29 percent in 4 years inevitably contains extravagances that can, should, and must be cut. I also call to their attention the observation of our fellow Missourian, the Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, who said of the 1964 Budget:

"I have listened to messages from Presidents here in the House for 40 years, but in all that time I have never seen or heard a budget message like this one, and neither have you, nor has anyone else. This admittedly tenuous budget is too high. It can be cut. It ought to be drastically revised."

The Congress in acting on spending to make tax reduction a responsible reality should hold the spending line at a level not in excess of the 1963 level and as much below that as possible. This frugality should continue not just for 1 year but for several years so that growing revenues can be devoted to debt reduction.

With success in budget cutting established as a prerequisite to tax cutting we can now turn our attention to what kind of tax cuts. On this point let me say at the outset that everyone's tax burden is too high because our spending is too high and our debt is too high. Unfortunately, as long as we have the critical fiscal problems and balance of payments problems that we have, a general tax cut merely for the sake of making the tax burdens of Government less onerous is not feasible.

We have to seek in the initial stages of our tax rate reform program the maximum economic good from the minimum revenue loss. To this end, I propose that the maximum tax rate applicable to individual and corporate incomes be made 49 percent effective July 1, 1963. This would have a full year revenue impact of approximately $2 billion. To the demagog's charge that I am giving the initial tax relief to upper income taxpayers and corporations, I would point out that under present law the corporate rate is scheduled to become 47 percent this July so that actually I am providing for a tax increase in this area. The important thing is, however, that my proposal would provide a release of funds for investment out of earnings and would be a step toward the restoration of confidence to induce such investment.

Next a proportional tax rate adjustment in the middle and lower brackets should be made for individuals in the magnitude of $5 to $8 billion in revenue loss effective in July or October depending on our success in cutting spending. The corporate rate should be allowed to become 47 percent by July 1, 1964, and at this time we should begin an 8 year transition toward putting corporate tax payments on a fully current basis. The current payment proposal would also provide a revenue gain to offset partially at least the revenue loss from the corporate rate adjustment to 47 percent. It should be our goal to manage our affairs in such a way that further tax rate reform can be implemented within 3 to 6 years from now so that our rate schedules could eventually approximate a range of from 15 percent to a top percent of not more than 40 percent.

These are tax objectives that are not only meritorious but are essential if our free enterprise economy is going to work the way we want it to. Our present tax structure perverts initiative, impairs opportunity, and discourages job-creating risk taking. The political tax reduction program urged by the administration will restore neither the confidence nor provide the incentive that we need in America to grow and go. We must use economic sense and not political cunning in our fiscal decisions that affect our tax policy.

My friends, I close on this note. America is facing problems that demand the earnest attention of us all as we seek the truth and knowledge essential to the development of wise and enduring solutions. Not the least of these problems involves our fiscal and monetary affairs. Our military strength will be meaningless and our economic aspirations empty if we continue to pursue the path of expediency in our fiscal and monetary concerns. The protection of human freedom, the encouragement of individual opportunity, and the safeguarding of our Nation's security must be sought within the framework of sound fiscal policy. The puritan ethic that believes in government frugality, individual responsibility, and the industry of society cannot be abolished by executive decree nor repealed by legislative enactment. The puritan ethic is the hope of our future, not its despair.

Thank you.

WASHINGTON MONUMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the 50 U.S. flags surrounding the Washington Monument. The specific wording of my resolution reads as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall arrange for appropriate ceremonies to be conducted in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument in the District of Columbia.

It is my belief that greater significance should be accorded this stirring ceremony at the Washington Monument site for it would be a memorable and inspiring experience for our many visitors who come from every corner of our Nation and from all over the world. The monument area with its flags rippling in unison is one of the most beautiful sights in Washington. The very sight of it is enough to make every American proud of this country and his flag.

Presently, instead of exploiting this procedure for Washington's many visitors, the Interior Department has assigned the chore of daily raising and lowering the flags to a maintenance crew. I feel this duty should be accomplished proudly and with due flourish. Previously the Interior Department advised that they favor such a procedure as I suggest, and they stated they have been trying to get something like this instituted for a long time.

Generally, it takes about an hour for the maintenance crew to raise and lower the flags. At one point in the past, the Interior Department had to reprimand the maintenance crew because they were reportedly shoving the flags into a basket like Mrs. O'Leary's wash.

The 50 American flags fly so splendidly at the base of the Washington Monument it is a wonder that a sensible and simple ceremony has not been enforced before this.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, at his press conference April 3, President Kennedy was asked by Mrs. May Craig what his reply was going to be to the request of the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee that a Presidential Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditures be appointed to begin the difficult task of fashioning an objective and nonpartisan reform of Federal expenditure policy. The minority request to the President was contained in both the minority views to the 1963 annual report of the Joint Economic Committee and in a letter to the President dated March 19.

Essentially, the President's reply was that the Budget Bureau and the Appropriations Committees of the Congress were responsible for expenditure policy and that he was satisfied with the present arrangement.

Frankly, I am surprised that the President would express satisfaction over an expenditure system which has not produced a budget surplus since 1960, but which instead will produce a series of steadily mounting deficits totaling $30 billion from fiscal 1961 through 1964, and with no end in sight.

Quite clearly, the present system is not adequate to cope with the insistent multitude of pressures to increase Federal spending. If one believes that spending on certain programs can be reduced without damaging the national interest—and I believe any reasonable man must reach this conclusion—then we must seek means to produce this result. A Commission, such as I and my Republican colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee suggest, is one way to do the job.

We have in the Clay Commission a recent example of what a committee of thoughtful, respected, and responsible Americans can achieve when they examine objectively and dispassionately an important area of Federal spending. The recommendations of the Clay Commission, including its statement that foreign aid could be cut by $500 million, did not evoke cries of alarm and charges of recklessness. Instead, there was general approval of the Commission's report, even by the strongest champions of foreign aid. The administration, itself, has recognized the soundness of the Commission's recommendations and has reduced its foreign aid request for 1964 by $400 million as a result.

This example of what respected and intelligent men, standing apart from the pressures and commitments of the political arena, can do and of the great weight that their recommendations carry lends powerful support to the concept which the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee have put forth.

While recommending a Presidential commission, however, we also recognize that an improvement in procedures under the existing system would be helpful in promoting expenditure reform. In our minority views, we urged the creation within Congress of a Joint Committee on the Budget, and we also suggested that one of the functions of a Presidential Advisory Commission should be to recommend improvements in the budgetary process within the executive branch.

Those who believe that certain approaches to reducing spending are reckless, irresponsible, and heedless of the national welfare should welcome this particular approach. Personally, I support continuing efforts in other directions to reduce Federal spending and believe they represent responsibility of the highest order. But, at the same time, I support this approach as well and feel that in no wey could it be branded reckless or irresponsible. Indeed, selective and prudent reductions in Federal spending, such as a Presidential commission would be likely to recommend, would promote the strength of the Nation.

While we have not yet received a written reply from the President, I sincerely hope he will give our proposal his most careful consideration. The President should regard this proposal as exactly what it is—an honest attempt to devise a method to bring about expenditure reform. In this way, we can bring the budget into balance within the very near future and thus avoid the serious consequences of continued deficit financing and at the same time pave the way for badly needed incentive tax reduction and reform.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Craig's question and the President's reply be included in the RECORD.

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S NEWS CONFERENCE, APRIL 3, 1963

QUESTION. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago six Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee, House and Senate, wrote you a long letter of suggestions about Federal expenditures, including a request that you establish a Presidential Commission on Federal Expenditures, somewhat similar to the Clay Commission on Foreign Aid—headed by retired Army Gen. Lucius Clay. What would be your position on that suggestion?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think we have the Bureau of the Budget which oversees and gathers together all of the recommendations which we wish to make for programs. We then submit it to the Congress, the House and the Senate, and they finally appropriate the money. We do not. So that the House and Senate has its opportunities with its staff, the Appropriations Committees. We have probably the most effective staff in Washington, for the amount of work they do and the men employed, in the Bureau of the Budget. I am very satisfied with this procedure.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the apparent improvement in the U.S. balance of payments over the past 2 years was largely accomplished by the use of special techniques—some of which have received very little public attention—which amount to borrowing from the future. In other words, improvements in the balance of payments in 1961 and 1962 were at the expense of future years. It is my belief that without these special techniques the balance-of-payments deficit in 1962 would have been as large as $3.6 billion instead of the $2.2 billion actually reported.

Thus, in both 1961 and 1962, the balance of payments showed an improvement of nearly $700 million because of advance repayments of foreign debts. Debt payments made in advance, while they help the balance of payments currently, eliminate a source of balance-of-payments credits in the future when the debts normally would have been paid.

It is my understanding that in 1962 the administration developed some additional techniques which resulted in a temporary improvement in the balance of payments which could have amounted to as much as $800 million. These new techniques included the sale to other governments of $250 million in U.S. Government obligations denominated in foreign currencies. In addition, $460 million was set aside for the credit of the U.S. Government by Germany for military purchases in advance of firm orders for the supplies and equipment. Payment normally is made and reflected in the balance of payments at the time of order or of delivery. Finally, when our subscriptions to certain international organizations came due in 1962, the United States paid the subscriptions—totaling about $100 million—in noninterest bearing, nonmarketable Government securities. These will be turned back to the United States for dollars as they are required and will cause balance-of-payments debits at that time.

On April 2, I addressed a letter to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon setting forth in more detail these observations and asking for his comment upon them. If my understanding of these transactions is correct, then our balance-of-payments problem in 1962, far from being improved, actually grew worse. This would have important consequences for economic policy and, in order that the subject be better understood, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to Secretary Dillon be included in the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Part of the reason for the apparent improvement in the U.S. balance of payments over the past 2 years has been advance debt repayments by foreign governments of about $700 million in both 1961 and 1962. To the extent that advance repayments improve our current payments position, they eliminate a source of balance-of-payments credits in future years when the debts normally would have been paid. In this sense, foreign debt prepayments represent borrowing from the future.

It is my understanding that in 1962 the administration began using a number of additional techniques based upon the same principle of borrowing from the future in order to improve the current balance-of-payments position. Without the use of these new techniques, excluding debt prepayments, it is my impression that the balance-of-payments deficit in 1962 would have been as much as $3 billion, instead of the $2.2 billion reported. If debt prepayments also are considered, the deficit would have been over $3.6 billion or about as much as the average in the 1958–60 period.

Since these techniques have received little or no public attention, there is a widespread impression that our balance-of-payments position is steadily improving. In order that the Congress and the public have a clear idea of what progress actually is being made, I wish to set forth my understanding of these techniques and to ask for your comment.

One of new techniques being employed is the sale to foreign governments of nonmarketable U.S. Government obligations denominated in foreign currencies. This technique accounted for an improvement in the balance of payments last year of $250 million. In 1963, an additional $279 million of these obligations have been sold. When these obligations are finally paid off, there will be an equivalent debit item in our balance of payments.

Another new technique which temporarily improved the balance of payments in 1962 by as much as $460 million, was the firm commitment of foreign funds for military purchases in the United States. This was achieved when the German Government, on January 1, 1962, deposited this amount to the credit of the U.S. Government. These funds, which were set aside for the eventual purchase of military supplies and equipment, thus showed up as a credit in the U.S. balance of payments in advance of firm orders for the equipment and supplies. Normally the German payments would have appeared as a credit only after the equipment and supplies had been actually ordered or delivered. To the extent that this is the case, any improvement in the balance of payments in 1962 from this source was at the expense of the balance of payments in a later year.

Finally, the balance of payments appears improved by about $100 million because the United States has paid its subscriptions to certain international organizations as they came due, not in dollars, but in non-interest-bearing, nonmarketable securities. Sometime in the future, the international organizations will exchange these for dollars. In other words, the debit in our international payments represented by these subscriptions has been postponed from 1962 until a subsequent year.

I will appreciate having your comments on these observations.

Respectfully yours,
THOMAS B. CURTIS.

REMOVING IMPEDIMENTS TO ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks an article by David Lawrence entitled "Factors for Economic Growth."

Mr. Lawrence makes the valid point, which was stressed in the minority views to the 1963 Annual Report of the Joint Economic Committee that a tax cut is only one of a large number of steps needed to remove impediments to economic growth. Action is also needed in the area of improving corporate profits, international trade, labor legislation, enlarging America's sales opportunities abroad and in foreign investment. Mr. Lawrence's point is so important and so well made that I hope it will receive the careful attention of all those interested in this Nation's economic progress.

FACTORS FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are being told repeatedly that a tax cut will bring prosperity. Yet it's just one of five or more major factors that are essential to the economic growth of the United States. If the other incentives are ignored—as is the case today—a depression of the severest kind can conceivably confront this country in the next few years.

One trouble is that figures are being given out currently to generate optimism, but they are not being explained to the public in true perspective.

Thus, an announcement this week from the U.S. Department of Commerce forecasts business expenditures for new plant and equipment this year at a "record $39.1 billion."

But of what good are generalities about "record spending" when it turns out that the increase in projects for plant and equipment in 1963 will be the second smallest in 17 years? There have been increases in 13 out of the last 17 years. It is the rate of increase, rather than the total figure, that counts.

Take also the item of profits of corporations. Economists estimate that profits will total $27.5 billion in the fourth quarter of 1963. This could be emphasized by the over-optimistic as equaling the highest record in history. But what kind of record is it for corporate profits to reach $27.5 billion this year, when they were the same exactly 13 years ago in the last quarter of 1950? This hardly indicates progress.

Furthermore, in 1950 these profits were 9 percent of the gross national product, but in 1962 they were only 4.7 percent. If the rate of profit in terms of the gross national product keeps going down and the total profits make no increase over what they were 12 years ago, the word to use is not "progress" but "stagnation."

President Kennedy is putting all his eggs in one basket. He is depending on a tax cut alone. The emphasis seems to be on stimulating spending by means of a tax cut of $10 billion spread over the next 3 years. Pumppriming of this kind, however, has failed again and again to bring sound business conditions and has resulted instead in a series of setbacks every few years. The main reason is that other factors have been neglected. Lasting improvements rather than temporary palliatives are needed.

What seems most unfortunate is the complete indifference exhibited here in Washington to the factors that could produce a well-balanced and sound economy in the decade ahead. Among them are the following:

(1) Removal of Government barriers to marketing operations that could increase the total volume of sales.

(2) An increase in the rate of profit per dollar of sales. This would involve encouragement of automation and a general reduction of costs, but it also would mean more volume of business. The big telephone companies, for instance, employ more people since they introduced automatic phones than before. Employment is reallocated due to automation, but the sum total of jobs is increased.

(3) Legislative action to permit a system of fair competition in which interferences with marketing are eliminated, and no monopolies by any company or labor organization are tolerated.

(4) A prohibition against industrywide "bargaining" for labor agreements, because they tend to produce monopolies by forcing marginal companies out of business through high labor costs and by bringing about mergers that reduce or eliminate competition within an industry.

(5) An encouragement of trade with the rest of the world by a comprehensive plan which would include not merely a system of reciprocal tariffs and trade arrangements with large areas or regions embracing several countries, but also a wider investment of American capital abroad.

(6) A reexamination of the whole range of foreign investment so that individual

American companies will be protected against confiscation or harassment at the whim of changing regimes, especially in Latin America. A formula by which the U.S. Government guarantees a certain portion of the investment would probably achieve this purpose, especially since in times of default or domestic turbulence the protests of one or more private businesses are futile, whereas the power and influence of the American Government is bound to insure a large measure of protection for the investors.

While the growth in American exports in the last decade has been considerable, and imports have increased, too, the surface has hardly been scratched on what can be done to enlarge American sales opportunities abroad. Not enough time has been given by Congress to the study of how America's domestic economy can be enlarged by production of materials and finished goods needed in other countries to raise standards of living for the people.

These projects could be financed by foreign governments in cooperation with American companies that do business abroad. To blend the private and public sectors in foreign trade projects has been an objective often expressed, and some progress has been made along this line through various international financial institutions. But the amounts forthcoming are still negligible, and the impact on world trade is infinitesimal compared to what it could be.

Permanent measures that will take the brakes off the national economy and rid it of impediments to progress are the crying need of the times.

COAST GUARD SHOULD BE KEPT MODERN AND EFFECTIVE

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, while I am in general sympathy with the aim of greater economy in Government, I believe we must be extremely careful when cutting items important to our national defense. I wish to place on record my serious misgivings to the cut of over $12 million in the estimate for the U.S. Coast Guard, $9 million of this in their construction program.

Here is one more example, if we need another, of how this "orphan" of our armed services is constantly penalized by being under the Department of the Treasury instead of Defense during peacetime.

The Congress has shown great reluctance to reduce requests of the Department of Defense; indeed, we often give them funds they do not want. Yet, here is a service with important military missions effecting our security, as well as vital air-sea rescue missions and enforcement of many maritime regulations, with few spokesmen willing to raise a voice of protest in this body.

The committee feels it has been most generous in allowing the increase of $17,670,000 over appropriations to date for 1963. I do not agree. We must consider that the Treasury Department, in an effort to set a good example for all departments, always keeps a restraining hand on the Coast Guard and its budgetary requests. In fact, such tight rein has been exercised in the past, that the U.S. Coast Guard has suffered. Ranking Coast Guard officials have also been at fault over the years, for most have not wished to displease the Secretary of the Treasury.

It does not take an expert to realize that the U.S. Coast Guard needs many new ships and helicopters. In my own State of Maine, with a broken coastline that would extend many hundreds of miles in a straight line, we know of the great value of this seagoing service. Our thousands of commercial fishermen and the many yachtsmen that sail our coast, can attest to the great contributions this service is making with its rescue work.

Recently, the U.S. Coast Guard has been asked to take on additional duties off Florida to prevent violations of U.S. laws that might inadvertently set off a major war.

I think there is perhaps a natural feeling that the Coast Guard is not really a military service. If Members could have been with me several weeks ago in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and could have boarded the Coast Guard vessel, *Barataria*, then patrolling off Guantanamo, they would have seen no difference between this service and identical Navy vessels performing the same important task. Let there be no mistake about it. The U.S. Coast Guard is a military service, performing in addition other most important missions.

For the first time in years the Secretary of the Treasury, fully realizing the absolute necessity that the Coast Guard immediately embark upon a stepped-up construction program, consented to budget requests that would make it possible.

The requests, while amounting to a substantial increase in terms of percentages, are still modest.

The committee says that they feel that the—U.S. Coast Guard—fleet "should indeed be kept modern and effective," yet that the U.S. Coast Guard plans for moderization are "slightly too ambitious." This is ridiculous. It is not ambitious enough in terms of duties imposed upon the service or in terms of U.S. security.

If the U.S. Coast Guard cannot be brought rapidly up to required strength under the Treasury Department, it should be transferred to the Department of Defense. I would hazard a guess that if and when this is done, the Coast Guard would fare infinitely better as far as appropriations are concerned.

As a member of the U.S. Coast Guard Subcommittee, I have listened to Admiral Roland, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury James Reed discuss current needs of the service. I would be remiss if I did not say the country is indeed fortunate to have men of this caliber in these responsible positions. Each time I have had occasion to meet with these gentlemen concerning problems of the Coast Guard, I have been genuinely impressed. Both are highly intelligent, with a broad viewpoint not always found among those heading a branch of an armed service.

During the period from 1959 through 1963 rescue missions by Coast Guard vessels increased 21 percent. During this period recreational boating has doubled. In the words of Admiral Roland, the condition of Coast Guard vessels is "approaching a stage of block obsolescence."

By 1964 five of the Coast Guard's major cutters will be 30 years old, six others 25 years old. All have been subjected to heavy usage over the years. They have been converted, reconditioned and modernized in an effort to keep them useful. Some of them are completely ill fitted for their present tasks.

Communication equipment, machinery, and other equipment are poor and crews have substandard living space.

The experience of the Coast Guard with this equipment during the recent Cuba quarantine demonstrated how inadequate the floating equipment is.

There is a need to expand and modernize the U.S. Coast Guard helicopter fleet. They should have at least another 14 amphibious helicopters. Along the entire Stae of Maine coastline, there is presently not a single Coast Guard helicopter for air rescue work, with 6,000 fishermen engaged in their livelihood off the coast as well as several more thousand island residents, all looking to the Coast Guard for help in case of emergency.

I think cutting the Coast Guard budget request by $12 million is an example of being "penny wise, pound foolish," particularly at this time.

I have requested the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, chairman of of the Subcommittee on U.S. Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation, to have the subcommittee undertake a thorough study of the adequacy of the U.S. Coast Guard's present equipment, to review and evaluate their planning for the future, and to report to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and subsequently to the Congress.

I think it is long past the time when Congress must acknowledge paternity of this offspring and support it in a much better fashion.

Our overall defense effort demands that we give the Coast Guard more attention.

U.S. SHIPYARD INDUSTRY

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, along with a number of my colleagues, I have been concerned by two recent developments affecting the U.S. shipyard industry. The logical end result of these developments could mean more unemployment for skilled workers in California as well as in all other States in which both private and public shipyards are located.

These alarming situations stem from the frequent evidences that in the executive agencies "the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing." But, in the doing, a very grave problem of potential unemployment is being created which might well confound the best efforts of both the right hand and the left hand. It seems to us that a time for a clear, unequivocal national policy in these respects is overdue.

As the first illustration of my point, let me read the following press release No. 316–63 issued by the Department of Defense Press Office on March 8:

> NAVY AWARDS CONTRACT FOR CONVERSION OF TWO OILERS
>
> The Bureau of Ships is awarding a $14,949,563 fixed price contract to Puget Sound Bridge & Dry Dock Co., Seattle, Wash., for the conversion of two fleet oilers authorized in the fiscal year 1963 shipbuilding and conversion program.
>
> The U.S.S. *Navasota* (AO–106) and the U.S.S. *Waccamaw* (AO–109) are the first of the AO's scheduled for jumboization. This conversion of each vessel will increase the petroleum cargo capacity by 50,000 barrels.
>
> Twenty-three firms were invited to compete for this contract, which was formally advertised, and seven submitted bids. Pudget Sound Bridge & Dry Dock Co., the lowest responsible and responsive bidder, submitted a bid which was approximately $1.6 million lower than that submitted by the second lowest bidder.
>
> The Navy has determined that the lowest bidder's offer conforms in all respects with the Buy American Act as currently implemented and as carried out by policies of the Defense Department and with other requirements of law.
>
> The conversion of each vessel will consist of increasing the petroleum cargo capacity from 100,000 to 150,000 barrels, replacing and renovating pumps and deck gear to increase the rate of transfer of the cargo, and installation of an auxiliary machinery plant which will give the ship a capability of higher speed during replenishment operations.
>
> Both vessels are approximately the same size, having an overall length of 551 feet, a maximum beam of 75 feet, and a full load displacement of 25,500 tons. After conversion the ships will be 644 feet long, and have a full load displacement of 34,600 tons.

Unsaid and unwritten in this press release is the fact that a considerable portion of this contract will be procured from a shipyard in Japan. Involved are the equivalent of more than $5 million in shipyard work and nearly 6,000 tons of steel. Little imagination is needed to equate this foreign procurement in terms of lost employment for U.S. workers. Little imagination is needed to understand the contribution that this transaction has on the precarious balance of international payments with which the White House and the Treasury Department are at this moment feverishly struggling.

The inconsistency of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy in this instance is even more startling when one realizes that the Pentagon in August of last year saw fit to reverse a procurement of 2,000 tons of steel from West German and Japanese manufacturers by the Navy in the national interest.

Has the national interest improved so much in a short period of months to the extent that we must now rely on foreign sources for essential naval vessels? I say no. Has the national interest improved so much that the Defense Department or the Navy Department should not change existing procedures and policies to prevent a repetition of this type of procurement? I have no evidence that the Pentagon has any intention whatsoever of changing this harmful practice—harmful to the national interest. To the contrary, I am forced to conclude, on the basis of the facts, that the Pentagon is wholly insensitive to the feelings and livelihood of U.S. shipyard workers.

The second situation is also an example of this insensitivity. Permit me to quote from an article by the very able journalist, Allen M. Smythe, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 22:

> The Navy, the taxpayers, and the local communities would be better off if 6 of our 11 obsolete Navy yards were given to the cities in which they are located. Several others should be drastically reduced in size.
>
> However, it took 40 years to abandon our cavalry posts and you can obtain swords and saddles now in our supply depots.

This statement by an unidentified Navy officer typifies the undercurrent of rumors which have been floating around for some time. By comparison, the distinguished Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Anderson, said in San Francisco a few weeks ago, that as far as the Navy is concerned there is no plan for elimination of, or reduction in the size of, any naval shipyards. For the Navy's part, that might be true, but what of the Defense Department? Are they planning to cut back on the functions of the naval shipyards?

I wish I knew. The American people are entitled to know. The workers whose jobs are at stake are entitled to know. The answer can come only from the Pentagon, and it should come forward immediately.

On the first point of foreign procurement, since the Pentagon is unwilling to take the initiative, we, in the Congress, can do something about a solution on behalf of the shipyard workers of the United States. To that end, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 5401, to insure that shipyard work on naval vessels will be done exclusively in the United States. In its consideration of this measure, the Armed Services Committee can perform a great service by making sure that the right hand knows what the left hand is doing.

WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have always been interested in any legislation that will save taxpayers money. I was unhappy with previous farm price support programs that permitted the stockpiling of feed grain and wheat to such an extent that it was costing us a million dollars a day in storage, interest, and handling charges.

The new feed and wheat programs have done much to cut into these surplus stocks and I am told we are already saving over $700,000 a day by reason of reduced surpluses.

This is one of the reasons I supported the 1964 wheat program because it would guarantee permanent reduction of wheat stocks to a reasonable level.

I hope farmers approve the program in this referendum. If they do not, I am going to be sorely disappointed. If farmers think we will pass new wheat legislation in the event they turn this program down, they will be disappointed too.

I say, let them live with dollar wheat for a year if that is their choice. By 1964 I predict they will vote the program back in the next referendum. They can because the wheat program will still be on the books, waiting to be put into operation. But farmers are the ones that will have to do it. Congress cannot do anything more for them.

FREE THE EXILES TO FREE CUBA

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, freeing Cuba is a job for Cubans, and a national goal as stated by the President and the Department of State.

The President has wisely drawn the distinction between U.S. responsibility for Cuban exiles launching hit-and-run raids on Castro's seacoast. In an effort to avoid U.S. involvement in a Caribbean war, he has made it clear to the Communists that the United States will not be responsible for such raids when they originate outside U.S. jurisdiction.

It is argued that hit-and-run raids which have occurred served little purpose against Cuban communism. It is true that Castro has survived them to date. However, reports are that discontent grows inside Cuba.

If allowed to be launched outside U.S. territory, these raids can offer great encouragement to anti-Castro elements inside Cuba. Such raids can also serve notice to the world that there are still a great many Cubans who concern themselves with freedom.

Castro himself used hit-and-run tactics to give momentum to his own revolution. It is plainly evident that Cuban-trained Communist agents are using these same hit-and-run tactics to subvert this entire hemisphere.

It is our national goal to see Cuba free. This goal would be greatly aided by the United States unleashing Cuban exiles eager to base their anti-Castro efforts outside U.S. territory.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the following comment is in tribute to our Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable John W. McCormack, which was broadcast by Joseph F. McCaffrey, Tuesday evening, April 3, 1963, WMAL–TV, Washington, D.C.:

Speaker of the House John W. McCormack

Good evening. Capitol Hill is crawling with tourists these days. Members find it difficult getting from their offices to the floor because of the guided tours clogging the corridors. This, most Members admit, some loudly, is a bit irritating.

But there is one Member of Congress who thinks more Americans should visit Congress.

"This," says this man, looking at you intently, "is their House; this is their building; I would like to see 10,000, 20,000 Americans stream in here every day of the year.

"And everyone here has orders to treat these men and women with respect and courtesy, because these people are the employers of everyone who works here. These are the people who have a vested interest in the building and everything that goes on inside it."

What this man said counts because he is more than a civics teacher, he is one of the Nation's outstanding political scientists. He also holds the country's No. 3 job as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

John McCormack may be a Democrat, he may be a Bostonian, but first and foremost he is a practicing American. This week I stood in the back of his high ceilinged office and listened to him chatting with a group of young girls from Pennsylvania State University.

To questions critical of Congress, the Speaker neither apologized for the House and its procedures nor did he defend them. He did something better, he explained them. And this professor's view of the political system is the view which is missed by classroom professors; his theme is the role of human nature in politics.

Speaker McCormack views his colleagues in the House not as Democrats or Republicans, but as individuals. And by the same token, to the Speaker, any one of those girls from Penn State was just as important, just as essential as his most powerful committee chairman.

After his little seminar was over, the Speaker walked down to the House Restaurant, saying, "I wish I could see everyone who visits this building."

"If I had the time, I'd like to talk with every guided party that comes through here. The more people realize that they are a real, important part of this Congress, the more interest there will be in government and the better government each one of us will get."

To Speaker John McCormack the key to American Government is the individual.

WIDENING OF SHIPPING LOCKS AT BONNEVILLE DAM

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Ullman] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the full use of the mighty Columbia River is of first importance in the progress of the Pacific Northwest. The Columbia River potential for navigation and trade depends upon the great dams on the river, and on the locks provided for shipping. House Joint Memorial 18 recently passed by the Oregon State Legislature petitions Congress to provide for the enlargement of the locks at the Bonneville Dam:

House Joint Memorial 18

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Columbia River is the main navigation artery for Astoria, Portland, The Dalles, and other communities in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas an uninterrupted flow of commerce on the Columbia River is of vital importance to the economic development of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the shipping locks at Bonneville Dam are less in width than those at the upstream dams on the Columbia River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds to widen the shipping locks at Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River so as to conform with the width of the shipping locks at The Dalles Dam and McNary Dam and thereby provide for an uninterrupted flow of commerce on the Columbia River.

2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, and to each Member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Healey (at the request of Mr. Multer), for Thursday, April 4, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Davis of Georgia, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Curtin, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Reuss (at the request of Mr. Olsen of Montana), on April 10, for 60 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Broomfield (at the request of Mr. Harrison), for 45 minutes, on April 8, 1963.

Mr. Minshall (at the request of Mr. Harrison), for 30 minutes, on April 11, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Hosmer and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. White.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Harrison) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Harsha in two instances.

Mr. Alger.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Olsen of Montana) and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. Addabbo.

Mr. St. Onge.

Mr. Nix.

Mr. Marsh.

Mr. Evins.

Mr. Edmondson.

Mr. Ullman in two instances.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; and

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 8, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

641. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Istokpoga Marsh and Jumper Creek, Fla.; Held, Iowa; Callahan Creek, Mo.; Apache-Brazito-Mesquite, N. Mex.; Conetoe Creek, N.C.; Harmon Creek, Pa., and W. Va.; and Upper Little Minnesota River, S. Dak., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

642. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Upper Rock Creek, Md.; and Buck Creek, Ky., pursuant to the section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956: to the Committee on Public Works.

643. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United

States Code, to provide for the disposition of certain nationals of the United States in foreign countries who are alleged and determined to be of unsound mind, and dangerous to persons or property, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

644. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide additional housing for the elderly"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

645. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the use being made of such specifically exempted property, and of any changes in such use, with recommendations, pursuant to Public Law 846, 77th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

646. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of reports showing and explaining property in the District of Columbia exempt from taxation during calendar year 1961, pursuant to Public Law 846, 77th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

647. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel cost for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

648. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first-preference classification, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

649. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide penalties for certain offenses committed in connection with highway construction"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

650. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

651. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report showing adjustments in contracts authorized by the Administration during the calendar year 1962, pursuant to 72 Stat. 972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

652. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to repeal the provisions of law relating to the fixing by the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of rates of postage on fourth-class mail"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 305. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 12, a bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 184). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 306. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1762, a bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 185). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 307. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1989, a bill to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 186). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 308. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3120, a bill to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); without amendment (Rept. No. 187). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 309. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3845, a bill to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); without amendment (Rept. No. 188). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 1159. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases; with amendment (Rept. No. 189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 1819. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 3517. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 3545. A bill to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968; without amendment (Rept. No. 192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DANIELS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 3612. A bill to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 5207. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 55 pertaining to Castro Communist subversives in the Western Hemisphere, (Rept. No. 195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FARBSTEIN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 55 on Arab refugees in Palestine; (Rept. No. 196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5067. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 5454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer in certain cases to deduct as a medical expense the additional cost of modifying or specially equipping an automobile to permit its use and operation by an individual (himself, his spouse, or a dependent) who is physically handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5455. A bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5456. A bill to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 5457. A bill to amend section 302(h) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to the payment of quarters allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5458. A bill to amend the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to permit civil actions against members of the Armed Forces for support of their spouses and children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 5459. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5460. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide free insurance protection for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5461. A bill to promote the security and welfare of the people of the United States by providing for a program to assist the several States in further developing their programs of general university extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5462. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 5463. A bill requiring all clerks hired by Members of the House of Representatives to perform compensated services at certain specified places; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 5464. A bill relating to the Indian heirship land problem; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 5465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for each dependent who is a full-time undergraduate student at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 5466. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 5467. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5468. A bill to provide credit or refund of self-employment tax in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5469. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the liquidation of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 5470. A bill to incorporate the Young Engineers and Scientists of America, for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85-875; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5471. A bill to establish the U.S. Academy of Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 5472. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5473. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5474. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to the payment of quarters allowances to enlisted members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 5475. A bill to provide for the construction and improvement of certain roads on the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 5476. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, with respect to technicians of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5477. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to convey certain surplus property to the Aiken County Historical Commission for use as a historic monument; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 5478. A bill authorizing a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 5479. A bill to provide Federal assistance to schools in the initiation of educational programs for the preservation of our national heritage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 5480. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 5481. A bill to provide for more uniform application of section 4369 of title 39, United States Code, which pertains to filing of information relating to second-class mail publications; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5482. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a grant program for the prevention and control of dental diseases and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5483. A bill to amend section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit individuals who are permanently disabled for work in their regular occupation to receive annuities after the completion of 10 years of service, and to permit the payment of a spouse's annuity to the wife of individuals who are retired for disability, without regard to the age of the individual or the wife; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5484. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide an increase of 10 percent in pensions and annuities paid to retired employees and an increase of 20 percent in annuities paid to widows of deceased employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 5485. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a conclusive presumption of service connection in the case of the death of certain veterans who have suffered from service-connected total disabilities for 15 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5486. A bill to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5487. A bill to provide for more uniform application of section 4369 of title 39, United States Code, which pertains to filing of information relating to second-class mail publications; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 5488. A bill to amend section 411(a) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 5489. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 5490. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 5491. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments to assist in providing for the education of the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 5492. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 5493. A bill to provide for the tariff classification of certain particleboard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5494. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 5495. A bill for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5496. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5497. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 5498. A bill to promote the sale and beneficial use of public lands by amending section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H.R. 5499. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act so as to provide preference in the awarding of certain Government contracts to contractors in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 373. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 374. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union, which shall reveiw the exercise of power or jurisdiction by the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 375. Joint resolution providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing the desire of the Congress that the President of the United States study the feasibility of the reciprocal exchange of nonvoting delegates between the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to initiate action leading to the adoption of a United Nations resolution calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution providing for the annual observance of the Liberty Bell anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. DADDARIO: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to honor Revolutionary War hero Lt. Col. William Ledyard by giving his name to a new submarine being built at Groton, Conn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LIBONATI: Senate Joint Resolution No. 18 of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 5500. A bill for the relief of Lt. John P. Mann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 5501. A bill for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5502. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe LaVersa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 5503. A bill for the relief of Jose J. Quintero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5504. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Danovaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5505. A bill for the relief of Stavroula G. Regakos (Regakou); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5506. A bill to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 5507. A bill for the relief of Michal Goleniewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5508.A bill for the relief of Francesco Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5509. A bill for the relief of Domenico and Giuseppa Di Roma and their minor child, Catalina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 5510. A bill for the relief of Carmela Macaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5511. A bill for the relief of Konstantin P. Veliskakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 5512. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria de Jesus Umali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 5513. A bill for the relief of Fang-Tsun Kuo and his wife Agatha Mei-Tso Kuo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 5514. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 5515. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Nicolia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 5516. A bill for the relief of Leslie Freeworth (also known as Laszlo Freiwirth); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Foster's Test Ban Treaty Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 2 Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster directed a letter to Members of the Congress relating to the administration's test ban treaty proposals. I have sent the following letters to colleagues discussing the Foster letter. The American Security Council Washington report referred to in the first letter has been reprinted at pages 4914-4915 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1963.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: If a nuclear test ban treaty will serve to reduce the world's risks, it is only an effective treaty which will do so—one which in fact stops nuclear weapons progress equally on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Negotiation of an ineffective treaty would surrender the benefits an effective one might achieve.

Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster wrote you on April 2 declaring "significant Soviet advances" by cheat testing "would require a series of tests." He added that under present U.S. treaty proposals "the probability is high that any meaningful series would be discovered by seismic and intelligence means."

I respectfully differ with Mr. Foster based on scientific facts brought to light during recent hearings on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The AEC's Director of Military Applications testified that all nuclear weapons of military interest except very large super H-bombs, which the Soviets have anyway, can be developed by underground tests which create seismic signals of very small size.

The Defense Department's seismologist testified about the inherent limitations on seismic instruments to detect and identify as cheat tests signals of this very small size (10 millimicrons and less).

The net effect of this testimony was that intelligent Soviet cheating would create signals which might be detected outside the U.S.S.R., but would be too small to identify as cheat tests. This is because such signals cannot be distinguished from the seismic signal of hundreds of small earthquakes occurring annually in Soviet territory.

Therefore, there exists a big hole for cheating and clandestine development of Soviet nuclear weapons superiority under U.S. nuclear test ban treaty proposals.

This big hole can be closed, and an effective treaty achieved, only by U.S. insistence on manned seismic stations inside the U.S.S.R. Unmanned black boxes won't do the job because they are not tamperproof.

Although Mr. Foster mentions "intelligence" as another means to spot cheating, when one recalls the difficulties even of finding out what is going on in nearby Cuba, wisdom dictates little reliance be placed on this alternative.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1963.

Re nuclear test ban treaty.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Yesterday you received a letter from the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, mentioning the risk of "surprise abrogation" inherent in test ban treaty.

This would be the situation if Soviet's prepared clandestinely in their laboratories for a vital testing series. This could be done over a period of years behind the secrecy of the Iron Curtain. The Soviet Union then would suddenly announce withdrawal from the treaty and capitalize on this surprise factor by conducting intensive tests.

The Director states the risk of Soviet achievement of nuclear superiority in this manner could be reduced by a U.S. policy of maintaining readiness to test in such eventuality.

However, the impossibility of keeping U.S. progress up under these circumstances was adequately stated by President Kennedy on March 2, 1962, in announcing U.S. test resumption following the breach of the then existing informal testing moratorium.

The President's words were as follows: "In actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution."

The Director's letter briefly mentions arguments for a test ban treaty. A more complete and fair discussion can be found at pages 3234-3236 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 1963.

The subject also is covered in the American Security Council's March 18, 1963, Washington Report which accompanies this letter.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

What Economy Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to point out that the continual expansion of Federal governmental activities and increased civilian employment by the administration are the major reasons why Federal budgets and deficits continue to grow.

Since taking office, the present administration has added 132,901 civilian employees to the Federal payroll. In addition, the President requested 36,500 new jobs in his 1964 budget.

The average annual wage of these employees is $5,800 and this places an added burden of approximately $1 billion per year on the budget, excluding the necessary expenditures for equipment, office space, etc.

These facts belie the administration's claim of a vigorous Federal job economy program.

Bartlesville Wins All-America Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a signal honor was recently bestowed upon a community in Oklahoma's Second Congressional District when the National Municipal League and Look magazine designated the city of Bartlesville as a recipient of the annual All-America City awards.

This is a distinguished honor for which all Oklahoma is proud. Bartlesville is 1 of 11 American cities to be singled out for this outstanding recognition out of the nearly 70 applicants that were considered.

The basic criterion for selecting the award-winning cities is effective citizen action in addition to good local government.

Bartlesville well qualifies in this regard. The community leaders and citizens of Bartlesville have a fierce community pride and they work together on various projects which are greatly beneficial to the city and to the State of Oklahoma.

The junior chamber of commerce is an excellent example of the spirit and enthusiasm with which the citizens of Bartlesville tackle community projects.

The Jaycees spearheaded many projects, among them being a statewide drive that secured 220,000 signatures to a petition for reapportionment of the State legislature, thus forcing a referendum vote.

The April 23 issue of Look magazine, which highlights the All-America City winners, points up other Jaycee-community activities such as the successful 5-month campaign to raise $612,760 for a new 52-acre city park and an adjoining 160-acre 18-hole golf course.

Bartlesville residents enthusiastically supported this drive and all funds needed for the project were collected from local contributors. This same generous response was given to the local community fund and United Health-Service Fund campaigns.

The Bartlesville Jaycees are planning a celebration on April 19 and 20 in honor of the city's recent recognition, and an outstanding program is being formulated.

I had hoped to be on hand personally for the celebration and to congratulate the residents of Bartlesville personally, but will be unable to do so because I will be on active duty as a Naval Reserve officer and will be visiting Guantanamo and fleet and Marine units in the Cuban area at that time.

However, I know I speak for all Oklahomans in extending our sincere congratulations to the city of Bartlesville and to its citizens and leaders whose work and efforts have brought this great honor to our State.

Statement of Draper Daniels, National Export Expansion Coordinator, Before House Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, at the hearings held last week by the House Small Business Committee, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, it was refreshing to find that the President and his administration appear to be moving forward in assisting businessmen, and particularly small businessmen to enter into an expanded program of foreign trade. Although there is much that needs to be done, it appears that definite and positive progress have been made by the administration in this direction.

Mr. Draper Daniels, the newly appointed National Export Expansion Coordinator, appeared before the House Small Business Committee and, in explaining his functions, quoted the President's memorandum to various agencies involved concerning the functions of this new post. The memorandum quoted by Mr. Daniels and which explains the scope of his office follows:

> On July 12, I appointed Draper Daniels, of Illinois, National Export Expansion Coordinator.
>
> Stationed in the Department of Commerce and reporting to Secretary Hodges, the National Coordinator functions across departmental lines.
>
> Anything designed to facilitate the expansion of this country's export sales is his concern, and increased exports help our balance of payments which is the concern of all of us.
>
> Specifically, he is charged with coordinating all parts of the export expansion program, regardless of origin, with keeping the program focused on major and meaningful targets, and with moving it toward specific and possible goals on a workable timetable.
>
> All programs in being designed to aid export expansion should be reviewed with him and any new programs to be initiated should be reviewed with him.

Although Mr. Daniels has been in his post only since July of 1962, the presentation he made to our committee indicates that his office is already beginning to function effectively in coordinating activities of various agencies in relation to foreign trade. In summarizing his statement, Mr. Daniels briefly set out some of the accomplishments in this field, which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues and others. The conclusion of his remarks follows:

> This has been a long statement, Mr. Chairman, and I expect that you and the committee may be wondering, "What if anything has happened as a result of all this?"
>
> If I may summarize quickly as a result of the combination of things I have been talking about:
>
> One thousand one hundred and ninety-seven new exporters were introduced to international trade through Department of Commerce field offices and completed at least one successful international transaction in 1962.
>
> Businessmen attending export seminars in 1962, 36,000.
>
> The Department of Commerce Field Office Director estimates that 85 to 90 percent of these were small businessmen.
>
> Of all applications for export credit insurance through FCIA 17½ percent came from firms that had never before exported.
>
> U.S. exports increased to $20.901 billion, an increase of 4 percent.
>
> If this sounds good, let me assure you that it isn't nearly good enough. If we are to solve our balance-of-payments problem by increasing our exports, we need to do more than twice as well.
>
> I do not believe that this is at all impossible.

Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Ralph Harding, of Idaho, is already well known for his defense of the public interest in matters involving the protection of our great natural resources. In particular, his advocacy of sound soil conservation practices marks him an expert in this field which is of such vital importance to the continued prosperity of our Nation.

On March 29 Representative Harding appeared before the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in support of additional funds for conservation activity for the coming fiscal year. In his statement he spoke not just on behalf of the farmer who works the soil, but for everyone—producer, processor, and consumer. His remarks reflect my interest in the need for adequate funds for important conservation programs. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include his statement to the subcommittee.

We cannot hope to adequately meet the demands of the future unless we take the steps needed to conserve what we already have. Representative Harding asked that funds be provided to allow merely a realistic minimum program of conservation. I commend his statement to the attention of my colleagues.

Representative Ralph Harding Testimony Before House Appropriations Committee, Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations, March 29, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate your courtesy in granting me sufficient time to come personally before your Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations to discuss with you again this year some of my concerns as I look over the funds which have been requested for conservation purposes in the fiscal 1964 budget.

First I would like to say that while I represent an agricultural State and serve on the House Agriculture Committee it is not strictly my interest in the farmers alone that brings me before your subcommittee today.

For conservation of our natural resources concerns all groups in our country, the businessman in the metropolitan area just as much as the farmer. There is no one who does not directly or indirectly benefit from the wise use of our soil and water resources.

That is why so many of us from widely divergent areas are following your actions on these appropriations so closely and hoping that adequate funds to meet the increasing needs for resource improvement and development can be provided.

My first concern this year, as last year, is over the fact that sufficient funds have not been set aside to increase the level of technical people to staff our soil conservation districts.

It is true that the fiscal 1964 budget sets aside an additional $1,072,500 for existing soil conservation districts. But let us take a close look, if we may, at what this amount means when it is distributed on a State basis.

In my State of Idaho, where soil conservation districts number 54 and some 18,598 persons are participating in resource improvement activities, I am informed that of this amount only $12,000 additional will be forthcoming if the total appropriation requested is approved.

And how many additional technicians can be added to these Idaho soil conservation districts where the man-years of technical assistance for each office are continually decreasing as the workload grows, not more than 1½ persons for the entire State.

Conservation district supervisors, both in my State and nationwide, report that each of these districts if adequately staffed would need 1½ additional persons or a total of 81 statewide.

Recognizing the great demands on the budget for other purposes, it was hoped by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, as well as the Idaho association, that this staff increase of 1½ persons for each district might be accomplished over a 4-year period.

If this were the case, Idaho should have funds to employ 20 more technicians this year instead of the 1½ persons the present budget would allow.

Right here let me point out that in many ways our conservation program is an unusual one. Locally people organize themselves into conservation districts, choose unpaid leaders and then come to the Federal Government for the technical assistance they need through the Soil Conservation Service. These districts also seek financial help from local and State governments.

If adequate technicians are not available, it can only serve to stifle local initiative and progress. And I am afraid this will be the case in Idaho if we cannot soon provide our people with the aid they request and require.

States the Yellowstone Soil Conservation District in Fremont County in their annual report mailed to my office the middle of this month:

"Requests for assistance from the district are increasing quite rapidly from all phases of agriculture; irrigated, dryland, woodland, and range. The most consistent requests come from the irrigated section, because this area is within short distance of the district office. These requests alone are enough to keep the present work unit staff busy."

The Yellowstone district reports to me that they need at least two more technicians to handle their workload. And this report is typical of the workload situation in the other conservation offices in Idaho and throughout the Nation, I know.

Adequate technical people must be supplemented by sufficient soil and water research staff and facilities. They are part of the same package. One cannot operate efficiently and progressively without the other.

Yet a look at the fiscal 1964 budget reveals that not only are funds for the construction of new research facilities being curtailed, but inadequate funds have been set aside to utilize already existing facilities.

For example, the middle of this month at the Snake River Conservation Field Station at Kimberly, Idaho, we had a dedication and cornerstone laying ceremony with great enthusiasm evident among the participants over what this facility was going to add to the State and to the agricultural industry in particular from the soil and water research planned there.

The construction of the project is well ahead of schedule, I am told, and should be ready for occupancy in July, but the funds set aside in the budget for this plant would leave it standing nearly idle for at least a year. The budget request for an increase of about $50,000, along with other funds in the State which can be allocated for this field station, provide for only a little over $100,000 for this research facility which will benefit not only Idaho, but also our surrounding neighbors—Wyoming, Nevada, Oregon, Montana, Utah, and California.

I urge that the increase for the coming year be $643,300 required to complete the projected implementation instead of the $50,000 included in the budget.

Proving that conservation does concern more than the farmer, the Twin Falls, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce joins the conservation districts in this plea for more funds for the Snake River Field Station.

"We feel there must be some error in providing funds. At the present time the level of proposed appropriation would leave the plant standing substantially idle for at least a year. This would be most difficult to explain and understand."

Then there are the research facilities at Pullman, Wash., whose assignment is to investigate water erosion control on the frozen wheatland soils of the Palouse region. Although not located in my State, Idahoans, too, have much to gain from the results of these studies.

Therefore, I again join Idaho soil conservation experts in urging that the present budget request of $78,000 be increased by at least $200,000 which they tell me would "provide for a sizable effort to tie in with wheatland work proposed at the Snake River station at Kimberly and the proposed soil and water research activities at Pendleton, Oreg."

Last year when I appeared before the subcommittee I expressed my concern over the fact that the authorization for agricultural conservation program assistance for aiding farmers and ranchers in bearing the cost of accomplishing soil and water conservation measures had been reduced by $100 million from the $250 million of the previous year to $150 million.

The current budget again carries this proposed reduction. As you know, the committee last year restored this to $250 million. I commend you for this action and urge that this be done again.

Greater emphasis is also needed on weed control research which causes greater agricultural losses than any other pest or crop impediment.

In view of the fact that the University of Idaho is so ideally geared to research of this type, I hope that when such a facility is established it can be at this land-grant college.

Now I ask your subcommittee to look closely at the need for greater emphasis on watershed planning. As perhaps many of you read in the national press, Idaho was hit by raging floodwaters in the early spring of 1962 and again early this year.

The areas most severely damaged are small farming areas in need of the kind of structural and land treatment assistance which can be provided under the Public Law 566 program.

I am told by Lee T. Morgan, Idaho's State conservationist, that in our State alone we need to be engaged in watershed planning at at least double the current rate and the Idaho State Association of Soil Conservation Districts assures me this is true on a nationwide basis.

The water problems in Idaho are extremely complex and frequently it is necessary for the local people to call on the services of both the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Army Engineers. As we all know, the corps' work is devoted to the main water stems, but their efforts need to be supplemented by work upstream on the small watersheds.

The need for greater watershed planning is no more dramatically demonstrated than looking at what happened in the little community of Bancroft, Idaho, hit twice by the floodwaters since 1962.

It is the view of the supervisors of the local soil conservation district that an adequate watershed treatment program, carried out under Public Law 566, could have reduced the amount of runoff during these two floods almost in half and saved many damaged homes and businesses in their community.

I would prefer to provide funds now for adequate watershed development than to extend our tax money on flood recovery after the precious water has been lost and taken a terrific toll of public and private property.

The current budget request of $5½ million, which is the same amount as appropriated for fiscal year 1963, for watershed planning enables Idaho to handle only two water planning applications a year. The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts has asked that this be increased to $7½ million.

I urge the approval of these additional funds as does the Idaho Soil Conservation Association.

But watershed planning is just the beginning. Funds spent for planning are not of value unless these plans can be carried out.

The current requests for construction under the watershed program provides for only 36 new starts for 1964 nationwide. This is less than one per State I urge, as do conservation experts, that this be increased by $20 million.

It is noted that the budget request for conservation contains a new item—$6,275,000 for resource conservation and development projects. These were authorized last year under Public Law 87-703. It is the hope of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service that 10 projects can be initiated in 1964.

Several soil conservation districts in my State are interested in this and busy at work with county commissioners and other local people developing applications for consideration.

While one of these initial projects may not be located in my congressional district, nevertheless I want to support this item since indirectly any work of this type does benefit my State and the Nation generally.

I also note in going over the agricultural appropriation requests that there is only $500,000 in the budget for scabies control and eradication. While this departs somewhat from my emphasis on conservation needs, I did not want to overlook this opportunity to call your committee's attention to the need for adequate funds to eradicate this disease which attacks sheep.

My own State of Idaho has fortunately not had a scabies outbreak for many years, but as long as it exists in other areas it does constitute a threat to our sheep industry in the Western States.

Since the States contributed over $1 million last year to fighting scabies I would hope the Federal Government could more adequately supplement their efforts by at least matching the amount of money they are expending for eradicating this disease and eliminate the need for the amounts we spend annually for control purposes.

While I am sure your Subcommittee hears mostly requests for funds and gets few commendations on the vital decisions you must make on appropriations, I do want to take this opportunity to commend you for the action taken last year in strengthening the snow survey and water forecast phase of our program. This has proved of inestimable value in my State in that we have been able to increase the number of soil moisture stations, have added snow survey courses and currently provide our water users with the best forecasts that have ever been available.

With current reports indicating that the snow in Idaho this year is at the lowest level ever recorded, this information will enable our farmers to start immediately to use their short supply of water to the best possible advantage.

I hope you will allow me one last comment on the work on the Soil Conservation Service generally. In my travels throughout my congressional district I am continually impressed with the excellent reports I am given on the work which is being provided by these technicians and the local conservation districts. I have yet to hear one complaint which as your subcommittee members know is unusual for any program, be it Federal, State or local.

These soil conservation people are doing a tremendous job, and I hope the Congress can give them the monetary assistance they so desperately need to carry out their vital work programs.

The 41st Anniversary of Carl Follen Unit No. 103, Steuben Society of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today, April 4, 1963, marks the 41st anniversary of the establishment of Carl Follen Unit No. 103, Steuben Society of America. This unit has its headquarters in my congressional district and most of its members reside in the Seventh Congressional District of New York.

The aims and purposes of the Steuben Society of America, in part, call upon the members to loyally support the Constitution of the United States of America by advocating the proper application of its provisions and inculcating the principles underlying true democratic government. Truly, it can be said that the Carl Follen Unit No. 103 has in every way exemplified this aim of the society. Its members are active in local, State, and National matters of importance to our citizenry. Many of them have risen to important positions in their community, State, and Nation. My predecessor in the House of Representatives, Albert H. Bosch, has been a member of this unit since he reached the age of 21.

It gives me pleasure today to congratulate Carl Follen Unit No. 103 on its 41st anniversary and wish for the membership many long years of continued good fellowship and service.

American Agriculture in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, recently the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] was guest speaker at the Independent Bankers Association 29th annual convention at the Roosevelt Hotel in New Orleans. While in my State addressing this meeting, he delivered an interesting message with reference to the situation of agriculture in a changing world. I thought each Member of the Senate would be very much interested in what the Senator from South Dakota had to say on this occasion and I, accordingly, ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE IN A CHANGING WORLD

(Address by Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, at the 29th Annual Convention of the Independent Bankers Association, March 26, 1963)

In the early years of our national history, Thomas Jefferson observed that "the small landholder is the most precious part of the state."

Jefferson asserted his conviction that "those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if ever He had a chosen people * * *."

Throughout our history, most Americans have shared to varying degrees Jefferson's lofty view of the importance of agriculture in American life.

It is true that for many decades the glitter of the city has held a strong attraction for American farm youth. No one has fully answered the question: "How ya gonna keep 'em down on the farm after they've seen Paree."

But at least until recent years, agriculture has occupied a high place, not only in public opinion, but also in the Congress of the United States.

Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, told me that when he first came to Washington 26 years ago, Senators considered agriculture and appropriations the two most desirable committee assignments open to any Senator.

Yet, this year I was the only Member of the Senate to request assignment to the Committee on Agriculture, and five Senators presently on the committee asked to get off. Only three of them were permitted to do so.

What has happened in recent years to explain this turn of events?

I suspect there are several factors.

First of all, agriculture has become an extremely complex industry afflicted with problems that are frustrating and difficult to solve.

Secondly, the farm population which embraced 9 out of 10 Americans in Jefferson's day now comprises only 8 percent of the American people. This inevitably spells a relative decline in the political power and public appeal of agriculture.

Thirdly, there is no organization to speak for agriculture with a single voice. This not only frustrates the friends of the farmer in Congress; it means that the farmer's story is told poorly to the Nation.

I am constantly appalled by the distorted views on agriculture of my urban friends. For example, they labor under the false impression that the farm price support program results in excessively high food prices to the American housewife. Actually, consumer food costs are $4 to $6 billion a year less than if farm prices had increased as much as prices in other parts of the economy in the last 8 years.

Again, urban taxpayers look askance at the $6 billion budget of the Department of Agriculture and assume that this is a gigantic subsidy to farmers. Of course, the major portion of this budget is not a farm subsidy at all. Much of it goes to finance such programs as the school lunch and special school milk program, our oversea food-for-peace program, the consumers meat-inspection program, repayable loans for rural electrification, management of our national forests, and storage fees to commercial storage companies.

Many city dwellers call for oversimplified "solutions" to the farm problem, such as eliminating the "marginal" farmer. This recommendation overlooks the fact that thousands of farmers who are now at the margin of financial failure would not be in that plight if they were receiving a fair price for their produce.

I know that the independent bankers of America are keenly aware of both the problems and the importance of agriculture. Because you are in daily association with the hopes, the anxieties, and the difficulties of our farm families, you know better than most of us the integral relationship between a healthy agriculture and a prosperous main street.

One of the most eloquent statements on the current challenge to American agriculture was delivered by one of your distinguished spokesmen, Mr. Pat DuBois, before a congressional committee a year ago. That statement refuted in unmistakable language the false notion that we can eliminate the farm problems simply by eliminating farmers.

As Mr. DuBois put it: "Move the people from the farms and you also remove the banks and other service institutions. The farmers came to the prairies before the towns and when the farmers are gone there will be no further need for the towns."

If we could assure the farmer a fair return on his products, it would be a powerful stimulus to business and industry. Prosperous farmers are the Nation's best customers for basic commodities such as steel, rubber, machinery, appliances, and a host of other items that keep the factory wheels turning. The most effective way I know to reduce unemployment, get the economy moving, and retard the exodus of young people from the rural areas to the cities is to strengthen our farm economy. In my view, if we could correct the imbalance between agriculture and the rest of the economy, it would do more to stimulate the economic life of the Nation than the President's proposed tax cut.

A strong and prosperous agriculture is essential not only for the welfare of our farm families and our domestic economy but in a broader sense because the food and fiber of America is one of our most valuable assets in today's world.

As the former director of the Nation's food-for-peace program, I came to a new appreciation of the enormous advantage this Nation has in our marvelous capacity to produce food.

Indeed, I believe that the productivity of American agriculture is coveted more by our competitors in Russia and China than any other U.S. asset.

Having traveled in most of the underdeveloped nations of the globe, I am equally convinced that the most serious barrier to the development of those nations is their backward agricultural system—inefficient production, lack of rural credit, and a decadent system of land ownership and taxation.

One of the major weaknesses of our foreign assistance program has been its overemphasis on industrial development at the expense of more urgently needed rural development. The capital investments we made in Western Europe under the Marshall plan were effective because Europe had the technical and administrative experience to use such aid efficiently. But those factors are missing in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Basic rural and community development must come first. We take our own food production for granted, but this is the crying need in most of the rest of the world.

We have been awed by the achievements of our astronauts in outer space. But the world which these remarkable men left behind for a few hours is a world where two-thirds of the inhabitants till the soil with crude implements and primitive techniques—little changed in the past 3,000 years.

It is still the fate of most of the inhabitants of the earth to see their children suffer the listlessness of body, the dullness of mind, and the weariness of spirit that are the companions of malnutrition.

This paradox of plenty in the midst of hunger prompted Congress to enact in 1954 one of the most imaginative laws ever placed on the U.S. statute books.

Public Law 480, passed with broad bipartisan support, made American surplus food available to friendly countries who were unable to meet their needs through traditional commercial arrangements.

Since its passage in the summer of 1954, U.S. food and fiber valued at over $11 billion have moved to more than 100 countries and territories under concessional sales arrangements or as outright grants.

In the opening hours of his administration, President Kennedy gave new force to Public Law 480 by an Executive order creating a food-for-peace office in the White House which I was privileged to head. The President called for an expanded effort to use our "agricultural abundance as a national asset to meet foreign policy objectives."

This far-reaching Executive order has given a dynamic new dimenison to American food reserves. It has done much to replace the negative concept of surplus disposal with a positive view of U.S. agricultural abundance as a precious national asset. It has given the American farmer a vital stake in foreign policy. It has focused worldwide attention on the achievements of American agriculture in a world of food shortages. It has strengthened the political and moral position of the United States in international affairs.

There is, of course, a double thrust behind food for peace. It is first of all clearly in the self-interest of the American people to reduce costly storages, to protect our farm economy from price-depressing surpluses, to stimulate our shipping industry by massive food shipments, and to develop long-range commercial markets. Food for peace does all of these things.

But the other thrust behind food for peace stems from the philosophy of the scriptural admonition to "feed the hungry." No one can doubt the genuine, humanitarian desire of the American people to see our food reserves shared with the world's hungry.

There have been two especially important breakthroughs in food for peace recently which hold exciting future prospects. The first of these is the use of food to pay the wages of workers engaged in building schools, roads, clinics, and rural improvements.

Today in a dozen countries, American cereals and other foods are financing part of the wages of workers employed on valuable public works projects. Wheat and corn and rice and milk from across the Nation are being converted into classrooms, roadways, and better communities abroad.

A second challenging breakthrough is a greatly expanded oversea school lunch program. The most precious asset of any nation is its children. Their health and education are the twin foundations of social growth.

School lunches not only give new physical energy and health to the children, they result in sharply improved school attendance and academic performance. A pilot school lunch agreement with Peru resulted in a 40-percent increase in school attendance in its first year of operation. Eight and one-half million children in Latin America are now enjoying this American assisted school lunch program. Thirty-five million school children around the world are now participating in our food-for-peace program.

In Japan where the program has been operating since the end of World War II, the Japanese have now taken over the entire responsibility. Japanese children who learned at school to enjoy American milk and wheat flour and other U.S. commodities help explain why Japan has become our best dollar customer for American farm products.

America's agricultural know-how has not only resulted in invaluable contributions of food to a hungry world; it has also enabled us to offer vitally needed technical assistance to the developing countries. Through our overseas point 4 program and our Peace Corps units, we have offered the skills of hundreds of our trained agricultural technicians. We are also cooperating in the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization and the Freedom From Hunger campaign.

When one considers that three-fourths of the people of the world are rural residents, it is clear that the amazing efficiency of the American farmer is our most appealing material asset. This is one area of competition in which we have no serious challenge from the Communist world. It is, perhaps, our greatest opportunity to lead the rural societies of Latin America, Africa, and Asia into the solid social and economic growth which makes peace and freedom possible.

I would like to think that more of our enormous reservoir of agricultural technicians, extension workers, and retired farmers might become involved for a time in pointing the rural people of the world toward higher standards of life.

There is one final challenge that I think is worthy of the careful thought of everyone concerned with the future of American agriculture—the European Common Market.

This new trading bloc composed of France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg—absorbed a third of our entire oversea dollar sales of agricultural produce in 1962. Other West European countries including the United Kingdom are seeking entrance to the community and will doubtless be admitted eventually.

The burning question for U.S. agriculture turns on whether or not this huge historical outlet for our farm produce will throw up a trade wall to hold out future agricultural shipments from the United States.

Recent actions by West Germany against American poultry and some of the pronouncements of the French are genuine cause for concern on the part of the United States. There is other solid evidence of European efforts to block imports of American farm products.

Our Government, and especially Secretary Freeman, has very properly sounded a strong note of protest against these efforts. If the United States were to lose a major part of our agricultural markets in Western Europe, it would have a disastrous impact on our farm economy and also on our balance of payments.

It is hoped that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 will strengthen the President's bargaining power with the Common Market countries. It is imperative, however, that the President keep agriculture and industry in a package when he negotiates our arrangements with the Common Market. He must not grant trade concessions to European industrial producers who desire to sell in the United States until we are assured of favorable treatment for our normal agricultural exports to Europe.

In addition to vast economic aid to Western Europe after World War II, the American people have, for many years, financed a significant portion of the cost of Europe's defense. Our troops and weapons commitments to Berlin and the NATO forces have been most generous. These commitments have seriously affected our balance-of-payments position.

I think, therefore, that if necessary, the President should make it clear to the Common Market countries, that if they exclude our farm exports, we may find it necessary to withdraw part or all of our military forces from Europe. The defense of Europe is now primarily a European responsibility in any event, and we can permit no further deterioration of either our balance-of-payments position or our agricultural economy.

The trade negotiations ahead will not be easy, especially in view of Mr. de Gaulle's apparent desire to use French agriculture as his chief instrument in establishing a Western Europe that is much more independent of the United States.

But in the long run, if our negotiators are tough and intelligent, we can face the future in the firm knowledge that the unparallelled efficiency of American agriculture will assure us of an expanding trade.

Nearly a quarter of a century ago, the Department of Agriculture published a great yearbook entitled, "Farmers In a Changing World." In a postscript to the foreword of that 1940 publication, the editor identified the underlying theme of the book as the necessity in the modern world for constant and adequate adjustment to change.

And he added: "The fundamental problems of our agriculture are not likely to be lessened by the changing international situation. They are more likely to be intensified, and there will be more need than ever to meet them with courage and intelligence in order that we may strengthen our country to the utmost."

I can think of no more fitting words on which to conclude this consideration of the prospects facing our farmers in a changing world.

Why Shackle Cuban Freedom Fighters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, patriotic anti-Castro Cubans—in the United States, in Latin America, in their unhappy homeland—must harbor feelings of bewilderment, frustration, and anger after reading the stern statements of our State Department spokesman in regard to Alpha 66 raids on Cuba, and noting the extraordinary measures being taken by our Government to curb these forays.

Cubans who live for the day of their country's liberation may be able to appreciate the undesirability of open encouragement of these harassing tactics, but they must be mystified by this strong condemnation from the Government which once led them to bitter disappointment at the Bay of Pigs.

As long as Alpha 66 is going it alone, why could not our State Department spokesmen content themselves with the simple statement, "We don't know anything about it"?

Proposed Shift of the Internal Revenue Service From New York to Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to the proposed shift of the Internal Revenue Service office from New York to Boston, and, while I believe in more efficient Government operations, find it difficult to understand how moving operations to the area of lesser demand will save money. It appears to me that just the opposite will be the result.

The Senate Finance Committee will meet in executive session tomorrow, April 5, to study the matter, and I have made my views known to that august body, recommending that the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to reconsider this decision.

The text of my letter to Chairman Byrd is submitted for the future consideration of my colleagues:

> I want to place my views and recommendations before the Senate Finance Committee for consideration at the executive session tomorrow, April 5, being held to investigate the reasons behind the removal and transfer of the New York City regional internal revenue office to Boston.
>
> The announced reason is that a consolidation of the two district offices will save money. If this is true, I think it would also be true that more money will be saved by consolidating the much smaller district into the much larger district.
>
> The logic of this, it is argued, is upset by the proximity of the Boston site to the Record Center. I submit that unless the proximity is such that material is under the same roof no substantial saving will be realized for this reason.
>
> The plain fact is that the New York district is the main district, and geographically is much better located than the proposed Boston area.
>
> I have just been informed that although it has been publicly stated that the Secretary of the Treasury is reviewing this matter, the entire transfer is proceeding without delay. New York's top officials were sent to Boston on March 15 to arrange the transfer, and on April 3 officials from Boston will come to New York so that plans might be completed by May 1. It would appear that the Secretary's announcement may just be an instance of managed news.
>
> I request the Senate Finance Committee to ask the Secretary of the Treasury to reconsider this decision.

Dollar Benefits of Youth Conservation Corps Work in National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture to see if estimates could be made of the dollar benefits that would result from the work of a Youth Conservation Corps in our national forests. I found his answer to be rather startling.

A very conservative estimate by the Forest Service indicates that the direct and indirect dollar benefits of a Youth Conservation Corps would be about $7,000 per enrollee as compared to the annual cost per enrollee of $3,895.

I think my colleagues would be interested in reading the Forest Service's full report. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Congressional Record a copy of the report along with copies of my correspondence with the Agriculture Department:

April 2, 1963.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: As you know I have joined with other of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation to authorize a Youth Conservation Corps. While it is my own feeling that the most significant argument for this legislation is the personal benefits for the individual enrollee, I am also quite aware of the great benefits that would result in the work of conserving our natural resources.

I would very much appreciate it if the Forest Service could make estimates of the actual dollar benefits that would result from the work of YCC members in the national forests. If possible, would you also include the delayed and indirect benefits such as eventual timber sales and recreational revenues.

With continued best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Al Ullman,
Member of Congress.

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Forest Service,
Washington D.C., April 3, 1963.

Hon. Al Ullman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Ullman: This acknowledges your letter of April 2 to Secretary Freeman, who has referred it to us for reply.

Attached is a statement which has been prepared showing the potential benefits from a Youth Conservation Corps program. We believe that it will serve the purpose you had in mind in your inquiry to the Secretary.

Sincerely yours,

W. S. Swingler,
Acting Chief.

Possible Estimate of Dollar Benefits From Youth Conservation Corps Work

There is over 300,000 man-years of development work on the national forests that is available for accomplishment by a Youth Conservation Corps.

The direct financial revenues to the Treasury from the national forests, if all of this work was accomplished, would rise to over $200 million annually by 1972. Payments from national forest revenues for county schools and roads would increase correspondingly. The capital value of the timber, forage, and lands of the national forests would increase by about $2 billion.

The timber stand improvement and reforestation work would contribute materially to a long-term investment resulting in timber production of 21 billion board feet of sawtimber annually by the year 2000, worth $350 million annually in timber sales.

In addition to direct financial income to the United States as a result of national forest development, there will be both substantial secondary benefits and very real intangible benefits. Secondary benefits include such things as numbers of people employed directly on the program work and the harvesting of national forest timber and other products and the value added to those products by manufacture, distribution, and marketing.

In timber alone, it is estimated that for every dollar of national forest stumpage sold, the end products will be worth about $20 by the time they reach the ultimate consumer. The estimated employment directly associated with the utilization of timber harvested from the national forests will amount to about 800,000 man-years annually by 1972. This will be more than twice the current level.

Development of the recreation facilities on national forests would serve the recreationists who will be putting into trade channels by 1972, $1.5 billion for sporting equipment, transportation, licenses, lodging, and other items.

Development and improvement of the small and big game habitat and fishing waters by a Youth Conservation Corps would increase the use of many national forest areas by hunters and fishermen. It is estimated that fishermen and hunters spend about $10 for each man-day visit to national forests. Increase of this use through improvement of the wildlife habitat would put a large share of this man-day expenditure into the local economy.

Of the reservoir of national forest work available to a Youth Conservation Corps program and the resultant total benefits, the following examples indicate possible benefits attributable to the program.

On a national average, recreationists spend about $5.50 per person-trip day. It is estimated that national forest recreation visitors spend about half of this average, or $2.50 per man-day. Every family recreation unit constructed by a Youth Corps on the national forests, at an approximate cost of $1,000 per unit, would return approximately $1,060 annual expenditures by recreationists into the local economy in a year or two. It is estimated that a Youth Corps of 15,000 enrollees could conduct at least 12,000 family recreation units annually, which would return approximately $12 million into the local economy in a year or two.

Millions of acres of young growth timber stands on the national forests or of timber stands partially or completely denuded by fire, insects, diseases, or other causes will, when culturally treated, return $5,000 or more in 10 years on a $3,000 investment. There are nearly 30 million acres of national forests lands in need of such treatment. A 15,000 Youth Corps could accomplish about 2,000 man-years or $7 million worth of such work annually. This would

return about $11.7 million annually in 10 years.

Similar benefits can be indicated in wildlife habitat improvement to increase use of many national forest areas by sportsmen; watershed restoration to stabilize soil, improve streamflows, and enhance water quality; insect and disease control to prevent annual losses in timber of about $94 million annually; and forest road and trail maintenance and construction to increase public use and access to resources.

A very conservative dollar estimate of the direct and indirect benefits of a Youth Corps is a return of about $7,000 per enrollee or $7,000 for a $3,985 annual cost per enrollee.

A Voluntary Medical Care Plan for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio, FRANK BOW, has had the foresight to present to this Congress a constructive program dealing with the problem of providing adequate medical care for our elderly citizens. The Bow bill is a progressive approach to the problem, meeting it head on and provides the care required by the free enterprise approach without the stigma of socialized medicine. On April 1, 1963, my distinguished colleague presented his program to the American Academy of General Practice at Chicago, Ill. In this speech he explains the merits of his bill and I am happy to include his speech in my remarks:

A VOLUNTARY MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY

(Address of Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, before the American Academy of General Practice, at Chicago, Ill., April 1, 1963)

In his invitation to me, Dr. Rhoades suggested that I might be considered the middle-of-the-road member of this panel. Perhaps that is a fair description, because in almost every aspect of political philosophy I am certain I stand far to the right of Secretary Nestingen, and with respect to medical care for the elderly, I am certainly to the left of those who want to stand pat on the present laws or programs in this field.

Insofar as the provisions of my own legislation are concerned, I am neither left nor right of them but far out in front for I propose to do more and do it better than either of them.

As I said to some of you in Detroit a few weeks ago, you are entitled to an explanation of why FRANK BOW, a conservative member of the House Appropriations Committee, is here at all, for it is most unusual to find such a man sponsoring something drastically new in the field of social legislation.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF HEALTH CARE

Let me say, first, that I have been concerned by efforts to federalize—or nationalize or socialize, you can choose your own term—the health care of this Nation for many years. My interest was stimulated 16 years ago when I became the counsel of the Harness Committee, a congressional committee investigating the lobbying activities of Federal agencies. One of the worst offenders of that era was the Federal Security Agency, predecessor of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Oscar Ewing, Chief of the Agency, was engaged in a widespread lobbying campaign to place the Federal Government in control of all health services of the United States and guarantee cradle-to-the-grave security for every American, the object of his affections was the old Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. His principal agent, who has now returned to Government as a close associate of my fellow panelist, was Assistant Secretary Wilbur Cohen.

The Forand bill of several years ago, the King-Anderson bill of the 87th Congress, and the present Kennedy bill are the direct descendants of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell measure.

When it was discovered that Americans were not ready to accept Government control of all medicine, and compulsory health insurance for everyone, the approach was modified in the Forand bill to include everyone who receives social security benefits. And when the American people refused to buy that package, it was further modified to include only people over 65 who are covered by social security.

Each step of the way Mr. Forand and the other sponsors of the legislation assured their supporters that the retreat was temporary. They say that if we can get hospitalization for the aged under social security, we can get the next Congress to add doctor bills and house calls, and the next Congress to add widows and orphans, and so on, year by year, until we will cover everyone for every health need by a compulsory tax. That would be a sad day for the American people, for as I have often said, government medicine is not good medicine.

ELDERLY NEED PROTECTION

However, I find merit in the proposal to provide a special program to help retired men and women meet the cost of medical care. I am convinced that this is a serious problem and one that deserves the attention of the Federal Government. It is a problem because people who retire must live on reduced income, sometimes greatly reduced. They often lose the group health insurance benefits that protected them during their years of active work or, if they can afford it, they can continue the protection at higher individual rates. However, sadly enough, very many of our retirees cannot afford to pay the premiums necessary to obtain adequate protection.

Most of these people can get along insofar as the customary expenses of a modest or even frugal living are concerned. Their difficulty arises when they are confronted with an unusually large extra expense, such as that of a severe illness, and they simply cannot meet such additional expenses on retirement income.

As members of the medical profession, you know far better than I some of the hardships that older people encounter.

The administration proposal as presently advanced does not solve the problem. The Kerr-Mills law does not solve it, for these people are not medical indigents. They become so only after severe illness wipes out their resources.

It seemed to me that someone must develop a better plan than King-Anderson or Kerr-Mills, and that it should be a plan embodying these fundamentals:

1. It should be voluntary.
2. It should provide generous coverage to take care of major medical expenses, to the maximum possible extent.
3. It should avoid establishing a new Federal bureaucracy.
4. It should avoid Federal control or interference in health care.
5. It should cover everyone who cannot afford to take care of himself.
6. It should be supported by all of the people of the United States who pay taxes, just as almost every other national need is satisfied out of national income.
7. It should encourage family responsibility toward older people.

THE BOW BILL

The basis of the Bow bill is incentive. The incentive is found in tax credits. We state that the United States believes in medical care insurance for everyone. We believe that the special problems of retired people merit a special incentive to encourage insurance protection for them.

I would allow a tax credit up to $150 for each individual over 65 who is covered by a comprehensive medical care policy. The credit would be equal to the actual cost of premiums up to $150. In the income group covered by the bill, those with incomes less than $8,000 per year per couple, there are probably at least 2 million who could take advantage of this tax credit themselves.

Among the other 12 million, many, and I think the great majority, could obtain the same protection if someone else would buy the insurance for them. My bill offers them an incentive to do so. A son for his parents, or perhaps an older man for his widowed sister-in-law, could get a tax credit up to $150 if he provided the protection.

And finally, this, I think, is most important for the future, the tax credit would be made available to any employer who provides the protection for retired employees.

These are incentives that would work.

There will always be some who cannot take advantage of these incentives. For them the bill provides that a medical care insurance certificate with a value of $150 will be issued which may be used by the individual to enroll in an insurance plan. The certificate will be redeemed for cash by the Treasury from the insurance carrier who provides the protection.

PROTECTION AFFORDED

The entire plan would be administered insofar as the Government is concerned by the Internal Revenue Service. That service already handles the special exemptions for the aged. It handles millions of collections and refunds each year. It would be no great administrative burden to add this program.

My bill establishes the minimum benefits which must be included in a medical care insurance policy if the insured wishes to take advantage of the Government incentive or assistance.

These minimum benefits were developed with the help of experts in the insurance business. They inform me that either of the two plans spelled out in the bill could be offered for $150, although this is close to the pure premium cost. And they assure me that if Government assistance opens up a market of 14 or 15 million people, the competition for that market will make certain even richer benefits than the bill prescribes. Approximately half of these people already have some kind of health insurance, and they will be encouraged to provide better protection for themselves. The remainder will certainly take advantage of at least the minimum $150 package.

There are two plans, one a "first dollar" coverage which includes up to 90 days hospitalization, ancillary charges up to $120, physicians services, convalescent home care and surgical charges on the basis of a $300 fee schedule.

The second plan is a co-insurance plan with a deductible feature, which makes it possible to offer more comprehensive benefits.

Either plan offers the elderly person far more protection and assistance than is proposed by the administration bill.

The burden of the plan, on the Federal Government, would appear as a reduction in income rather than an added cost. And it would not be as expensive as my critics claim. If one multiplies $150 by some 14.5 million people the cost appears to exceed $2 billion. We must remember, however, that the protection provided would relieve Federal, State, and local governments of a great part of their current spending for medical care of the aged, and to a large extent it would eliminate the deductions for medical care that are now taken by elderly taxpayers. These considerations bring the actual loss of revenue down to approximately $1.25 billion. This is far more favorable than the unrealistic and far underpriced estimates of the cost of the President's program.

POLITICAL FACTS OF 1963

I regret that there are many people in this country, including many of my friends, who are willing to go along with me on tax incentives, but who draw the line when I propose taking care of those less fortunate who cannot take advantage of the tax incentives for themselves, because they have no income to be taxed, and who have no relatives or former employers able or willing to provide the insurance and take the credit. For some this appears to be too radical, and they tell me that these people can be cared for under the Kerr-Mills Act, or the excellent welfare programs of some States, or by the charity of individual physicians.

I can tell you this today just as surely as I can tell you that I enjoy sharing this fine meeting with you. We are going to do something to take care of the health problems of persons of small income over 65 on a private, voluntary, free enterprise system such as I have proposed, or we are going to have forced upon us a Federal compulsory health system with Federal control and direction of hospitals, doctors, nurses, and everything else connected with hospital care. The provisions of King-Anderson made this self-evident.

My friends who wish to stand pat on Kerr-Mills, those who each day must check nervously the attitudes of members of the House Ways and Means Committee or Senate Finance, those who rely on one or two men in one or the other of these committees to hold off socialized medicine, they are going to lose this battle unless they adopt some constructive alternative, something better.

And it must be done soon.

The Bow bill is not a perfect vehicle, but it is a vehicle around which can be built a satisfactory bill, a program that will serve its purpose, and one that will take the entire issue out of the political arena once and for all.

INADEQUACY OF PRESIDENT'S PLAN

How different would be the case if Congress were to enact the President's proposal.

As you know, he has modified it somewhat. He proposes to give an option on the kind and extent of hospital coverage an oldster can get. This is in answer to our criticism of the $90 deductible feature. The bill last year presumed that an indigent person who needed hospitalization could pay the first $90, and that is not true. Also, he is covering out of general revenue those old people who are not members of the social security or railroad retirement system, a concession to another point of criticism of his 1961 proposal.

The bill is admittedly inadequate. If it were enacted steps would be taken in the next Congress, as Mr. Forand has promised, to broaden the benefits and then to broaden the age group covered and these enlargements of the plan would be accepted and we would be on the way to complete Federal control of health care from the cradle to the grave. That is the alternative to something like the Bow bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING

I would like to speak for a moment about financing the administration's proposal.

As you may know, it is supposed to be financed by an increase of one-half percent in the social security tax and an increase in the base to $5,200. This is expected to yield $1.3 billion per year. Social security estimates that the King-Anderson bill will cost only $1.06 billion per year, but these figures are open to serious challenge. Experts in the health insurance industry who have experience in this field estimate the first-year cost at $2.2 billion.

At best, social security financing is in precarious balance. If the health insurance experts are even half right, the proposed tax increase will fall far short of paying the bill. I am inclined to place my faith in the experts in this matter.

And what does that mean to the present system of social security benefits? Admittedly, the present payments are woefully inadequate and they become less adequate as this administration continues its inflationary course. The average retired woman worker receives $62.40 in benefits, the average aged widow $65.40, and the average retired couple $127.10. Social security was supposed to supplement other retirement funds, but in fact it has encouraged many to put off the thought of acquiring such funds.

Also, we must remember that the people of whom we are talking reached maturity about the time of the First World War, came home from war to encounter a bad recession, weathered a 10-year depression at about the time when they should have been in their years of highest earning power. It has been very difficult for the people of that generation to lay aside a great deal for retirement.

PRESENT PROGRAMS INADEQUATE

If we are going to increase social security taxes, we should do something about the present rockbottom benefits. We should do something about the widow who at age 55, having never worked a day, finds herself left on her own without benefits until she reaches 62. We should do something about the high school student whose orphan benefits run out at his 18th birthday, while he has perhaps a year of high school remaining, and who may be forced to drop out and go to work. We should continue those benefits until he graduates from high school. What about the man who is 10 years older than his wife, who retires at 65 when she is 55, and they must struggle along on his meager benefit until the wife's benefit becomes available. There is plenty of room for improvement in the present social security system if social security taxes can be raised, and I think it is dangerous indeed to ignore these needs and jeopardize the entire program by adding this hospitalization experiment to the load.

For there is a limit to what people will pay. Social security taxation is a levy against gross income. There are no deductions. It falls most heavily on the person whose income is least, on young people raising families, working people everywhere. Present law will increase it to 9¼ percent of the first $4,800 of gross income by 1966. Senator RIBICOFF, when he was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, predicted that people would not be willing to pay more than 10 percent. Increase the base to $5,200 and the tax to support medicine, and we may have reached the limit on our social security program.

Perhaps I have been dwelling too much on why I believe it is important to reject the social security approach.

FREE ENTERPRISE SOLUTION

Let me close on a positive note. The cost of medical care is a problem of our old people. It can be solved without unnecessary Federal interference by using tax incentives and assistance and the facilities of the free enterprise health insurance carriers of the Nation. I believe this is the proposal that must win support of all people who believe, as I do, that big government is always the enemy of freedom and must be closely controlled by a people who wish to preserve their liberties.

If you agree with that philosophy, you will join me in rejecting absolutely every suggestion for a Government program that is not clearly required in the public interest. And this carries with it the obligation to propose comprehensive and constructive solutions, in accord with our ideas about liberty, whenever new problems clearly require Government intervention. It is easy to say "No" to everything but it is not always right.

I hope that I have contributed something, from the practical political viewpoint, to your thoughts about the medicare issue. I will welcome your comments and suggestions concerning my proposal, for I know that you who are so close to the problem will have a great deal to offer those of us who are dealing with the issue in the Congress.

Congress Should Restore Allotments for Servicemen's Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to the payment of quarters allowances to enlisted members in the Armed Forces.

My bill seeks to correct a grave injustice that has been done to dependents and the immediate families of servicemen. The injustice, to be sure, was not committed intentionally, but it exists nevertheless and many of these dependents are now suffering the consequences.

On July 10, 1962, Public Law 87-531 was enacted by Congress to amend certain sections of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950. These changes went into effect on January 1, 1963. The major change is that under the new law noncommissioned officers in all branches of our Armed Forces, having 4 years of service or more, are no longer required to have a class Q allotment in effect for their dependents. In other words, the law gives the serviceman full authority for the disposition of his pay. If he so desires, he may arrange for continued direct payment to his dependents; if he chooses not to do so, he need not make such arrangements.

Since December 31, 1962, all class Q allotments have been terminated, except for certain enlisted members in the lower grades. The result is that many of the men in service failed to make the necessary arrangements for their dependents to receive the allotments they have been getting in the past. In recent weeks, I have received several complaints from the wives of servicemen who have young children and are dependent on these allotments for their subsistence.

What can such families do? In an information sheet prepared by one of the military services, we are told that the dependent may contact the serviceman's unit commander. If the serviceman, having been counseled, refuses to furnish direct support or initiate a class E allotment, "he renders himself subject to disciplinary action, including reduction to a grade in which a class Q allotment is mandatory and may be initiated without his consent."

This creates a difficult administrative problem for the military services and much unnecessary work. But the worst part of it is that the services can only try to impress the servicemen with the need for providing assistance to their families, they can take certain disciplinary action against men who refuse to do so, but they cannot force them to provide support. This is something that only a civil court can do.

In some communities, I understand, such families are turning for help to local welfare organizations and the Red Cross. Women with small children are becoming desperate in their efforts to make ends meet, after having been deprived of support. Some of these people have told me of their plight in person, others have written to me. I should like to quote from a letter of a woman in my district, who writes:

> Previous to January 1, I was receiving $137.10 regularly on the 5th day of each month. I had been receiving a regular allotment check for the past 9 years. Since the new ruling on allotments for dependents of servicemen, which was recently passed, my checks have been discontinued.
>
> I received an American Express check on February 5 in the amount of $100, and at that time I wrote to my husband's commanding officer requesting him to make arrangements for a definite and regular payment. I have not received anything since February 5. I understand it is entirely up to my husband to determine how much I am to receive and that it is his responsibility to see that it is sent to me.
>
> This seems unfair to me because, after all, I do have a small son (age 10) to support, a home to operate, and bills to pay. I must have a definite amount to plan on in order to meet my obligations. I know of several other servicemen's wives who are faced with the same problem. If our husbands do not choose to send us money, we have to worry about how we are to pay our bills.

If this situation becomes widespread, and I fear that it may, it can create great havoc in many families and lead to tragedies where the greatest victims will be the young children. This was not the intention of Congress when the law was enacted last year. Congress was simply trying to raise the quarters allowance for certain members of the Armed Forces and noncommissioned officers were given the freedom to provide voluntarily for their dependents without arbitrary action on the part of the Government. Congress meant well, but human nature being what it is, it did not work out so well for the families of these men. For reasons of their own, many of the men have terminated their assistance with the result that their families, their wives and children, are now suffering great hardship.

In view of the fact that Congress, directly or indirectly, was instrumental in bringing this situation about, I believe that immediate steps should be taken by Congress to rectify the situation. With every day's delay the problem will grow bigger and more difficult. The old system of mandatory allotments should be restored at once before disruption sets in with many families and tragedies ensue.

It is the purpose of my bill to restore the system of mandatory allotments for dependents of military personnel as it existed prior to January 1, 1963. Congress has made a mistake and should recognize it as such and correct it. I appeal to all my colleagues to request this correction before they are deluged with letters from families telling of their hardships. I appeal to the House Armed Services Committee, to whom my bill has been referred, to consider this bill in the nature of emergency legislation and to act on it at once.

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising of 1943—Their Struggle for Freedom Shall Inspire Mankind for Centuries To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the civilized world has never ceased to marvel at the undaunted courage of poorly equipped patriots who have risen in the face of impossible odds to confront callous oppressors. The Hungarian freedom fighters of 1956 and the Tibetan insurgents of 1959 are cases in point. But with these recent episodes of heroism freshly imprinted on our minds, let us not forget one of the most heart-rending tragedies in this century; namely, the uprising of the 40,000 Jews in the Warsaw ghetto who exactly 20 years ago this month defiantly chose to confront almost singlehandedly the mighty German war machine. They announced to a startled world that they would not die meekly as hundreds of thousands of their brethren had, sacrificial victims on the altar of Nazi superracism. Instead, they elected to die as martyrs, fighting the hated enemy, gun in hand, knowing full well there was little hope their uprising would succeed or that they themselves would live through the conflagration.

It is doubtful whether even a year previous to the uprising these stalwart defenders of human dignity realized the fate that would be forced upon them. They were fully acquainted with Nazi anti-Semitism, but they, like most of the world, could not believe that any human being could stoop to the barbarity and butchery which soon became synonymous with Nazi actions.

But the Nazi noose had been slowly suffocating the hapless remainder of the more than 3 million Jews of prewar Poland, whose ranks had been swelled by the addition of their coreligionists uprooted from their homes in Western Europe. Immediately after the defeat of Poland in the fall of 1939, the Germans had promulgated special laws for the Jews, who were all subject to forced labor and whose assets above a certain amount expropriated. Gradually other restrictions followed which curtailed their religious, economic, and personal freedom—freedoms which should be the inherent right of every human being. Jews were separated from their Aryan neighbors, being forbidden to buy or sell bread with them or doctor them. Every Jew above the age of 12 was compelled to identify himself with a Star of David on his clothing. Violators of these regulations were killed.

This policy of separation entered a new phase as the Nazi masters sought to effect their plan for mass annihilation of the despised Jews. On November 15, 1940, nearly half a million Jews in Warsaw were squeezed into a ghetto whose area of only 100 square city blocks was then sealed with brick walls 10 feet high and barbed wire fences. The Nazi masterminds sought to slowly starve their defenseless victims. Death and demoralization within the compound soon proved the effectiveness of their plan. With only a minority of the inmates employed, ration cards and thus food became exceedingly scarce, although those receiving provisions gave to their less fortunate neighbors. Besides starvation, overcrowding and the lack of sanitation facilities encouraged the spread of epidemics. Bodies were dumped into the streets to be carted away to a common grave. But the spirit of the oppressed Jews was not completely broken. A government sponsored by the Germans existed among them and social services such as schools, libraries, and even a symphony orchestra were kept alive.

This method of separation and starvation proved too slow for the Nazi killers. In the summer of 1942 they turned to more extreme ways of exterminating the inferior race. On July 22, the Germans ordered the Jewish Council to provide 5,000 Jews daily for deportation to labor camps in the east. Actually these Jews were to be sent to the extermination ovens of Treblinka and Auschwitz. Most Jews were skeptical, but some 40,000 were so demoralized that they lined up to receive the promised 7 pounds of bread and 2 pounds of marmalade with which the Germans had baited them. Of the dubious majority, those who did not succeed in escaping the trap were mercilessly beaten and dragged to the waiting railway cars if they resisted. The daily quota of Jews was raised first to 7,000 and then 10,000 per day. In October the Germans announced that henceforth only 40,000 ration books and jobs would be available instead of 120,000. The unlucky two-thirds were to join their brethren on the nightmarish journey to the dread concentration camps. By the end of that month, only about one-tenth of the original number or 50,000 Jews remained in the ghetto. The other 450,000 had either died of starvation or disease or been shipped to the east. Before the end of the year the area of the ghetto was greatly reduced, being split into two separate ghettos.

One might ask why it was that the Jews in the face of these Nazi provocations did not revolt until 1943 when numerically they were much weaker. Let us remember that before these requisitions, the horrors and the grisly intent of the concentration camps were not fully known.

No effective machinery for resistance or arms existed. It was only when hope died, when the remaining Jews no longer feared Nazi retaliation for their acts against all, especially the weak and the old, that they armed to resist. Then they knew that no matter what course was followed, all were doomed. Retaliation meant nothing. By that time generally the younger and physically more able were left to organize and arm a resistance movement.

The necessary machinery came into being with the formation of the Jewish Fighter Organization—ZOB—which ultimately encompassed all Jewish organizations from the Zionists to the Socialists. They were soon strong enough to assassinate some hated German officials which raised morale in the ghetto. But they were not yet strong enough to openly defy the Nazi master.

This stand could only be possible if arms could be obtained. The Polish resistance movements contributed some guns and ammunition and other weapons were bought, but in the face of German military might, they were still greatly underarmed. But their spirit of choosing death embattled against their German oppressors rather than a quiet end in a gas chamber compensated for much of their material weakness.

Their opportunity to strike back came on January 18, 1943, when the Nazis, after waiting 4 months, resumed their campaign of deportation against the remaining 40,000 Jews. To their surprise, they were met with pistols, hand grenades, and homemade gasoline bombs. In 3 days they quelled, but did not subdue the disturbance. The flame of resistance still burned brightly.

Each side knew that the final encounter was yet to come. The Jews used this period of quiet to further arm and organize themselves. Underground shelters, or bunkers, arms factories, and intercommunication lines were perfected. Defensive operations were subdivided and authority meted out by the central ZOB command. Another clash in March convinced the Germans that a new plan was needed. In the middle of April a new German commander, Gen. Juergen Stroop, arrived with orders to liquidate the ghetto. The Jews were ready to face him.

The clash came on April 19. The Germans, angry that only 200 Jews responded to their order for workers for the Trawniki concentration camp, determined to strike on, ironically, the day before the Passover. The reading of the Sedar gave the defiant defenders courage to repulse this new oppressor, just as they had stood up to Pharoah thousands of years before. The blue and white flag of David was rung up alongside of the flag of Poland as the Jews prepared to defend every tenement and every alley with their last drop of blood. Every Jew had an assignment. The ablebodied were at their battle stations, while the children were ready to run messages and the weak were guarding and distributing food.

The battle raged 12 hours. Deadly fire met and repulsed the German, Ukrainian, Polish, and Lithuanian police who had come to escort the Jews to their place of labor. The Germans retired, although some outlying buildings had fallen into their hands. Each side made preparations for the next round of fighting. Daring Jewish commandoes, dressed in captured German army uniforms, fell on Nazi arsenals to carry away badly needed ammunition. Later, again dressed in the stolen uniforms, they liberated the Polish, Jewish, and German prisoners from the Paiwak jail who then joined their benefactors to face the Nazi fire. Polish Socialists—non-Jews—crept into the ghetto to fight side by side with their Jewish compatriots.

Larger German forces now attacked the ghetto as Nazi planes swooped down to seek out the bunkers of the well entrenched defenders. Tanks rumbled forward, many to be blown up by Jewish suicide squads, clothed in the captured German uniforms, who crawled under them with hand grenades blowing themselves up along with the hated war machines. The Germans began to realize that the determined defenders could only be snuffed out with more systematic, coldblooded methods. A new battle would have to be fought for every block and bunker.

Since they cared little for saving the beleaguered survivors or the rows of houses, the Germans embarked on a policy of leveling the ghetto. Artillery was mounted outside the ghetto and heavy machineguns were installed on roofs of buildings near the Jewish quarter. Their bombardment was complemented by flamethrowers and incendiary bombs and hand grenades. The ghetto was a sea of flames. Victims fleeing the burning buildings were cut down. Blocks of houses were mined and blown up so that they could not become refuges for Jewish snipers. All persons found within shelters were massacred, sometimes with poison gas. During the day, the Germans invaded the ghetto, but at night, when the Jews often executed sorties against them, they left.

With ammunition running low, the Jews were forced to retreat turning from organized military maneuvers to guerrilla tactics. From the rubble of their buildings, they shot at the approaching Germans and emerged to lead forays against the enemy. On May 8, after a 2-hour battle, the Germans blew up the main operational bunker of the ZOB. All 200 defenders, including the main leaders, either died in the blast or were killed or committed suicide. A week later on May 16, the Germans dynamited the great Jewish synagogue. The Nazi General Stroop could report to his superiors in Berlin that there was no longer a Jewish quarter in Warsaw. However, this statement was not entirely correct. Although by the end of May only a flicker of resistance remained among the few remaining Jews who eked out a shadowy existence amongst the rubble, the last guerrillas were not wiped out until the end of September.

As to the survivors of this worst of all Nazi atrocities, the Germans gave no quarter. The sick in Jewish hospitals were shot in their beds. Except for the few that managed to escape and join the partisan forces, the remainder were shipped to the dreaded death camps. The city itself suffered greater destruction than in 1939 when the Germans conquered Poland. In the ghetto itself, only eight buildings remained standing—and these were not intact. But the price was not small. For the thousands of Jewish martyrs dead, the Germans had lost hundreds dead and a thousand wounded besides countless war material.

But more important, the true nature of Nazi savagery was starkly revealed to the world by this handful of doomed Jews who knew that they would lose. Under Nazi oppression, the Jews had turned the other cheek more than 70 times 7 times. But when their only choice was that between which kind of death, the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto did not hesitate. They scorned the passive death of the gas chambers or ovens of the Nazi concentration camps which were the reward for those Jews who managed to survive the inhuman train ride there, packed in railway cars for days. This method of destruction was the one chosen for them by a victor who, in typical Nazi fashion, showed a sadistic contempt for human values. Instead, these heroic Jews of Warsaw elected the death of martyrs, upholding not only their own pride and dignity, but that of the whole human race.

Mr. Speaker, the heroic struggle of these Jewish martyrs during the Warsaw gettto uprising shall serve as a monument to the courage of the Jewish people for centuries to come. As we pay tribute this month to their tremendous sacrifice in the cause of human dignity, let us resolve that the free world shall never again permit such genocide against any people because of their race, religion, or ethnic background. If this can be done, then their tragic death was not in vain but instead shall serve forever as a beacon, reminding mankind of its responsibility toward its fellow man.

A Plan Needed for Liberation of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the deterioration of our relations with the Cuban exiles and the apparent inability to cope with the Cuban situation stems from the apparent lack of any concrete plan by President Kennedy. In his usual manner of dealing with problems he confounds everyone by a series of conflicting statements emanating from the White House and through his brother, the Attorney General.

Since the Bay of Pigs disaster we have been told by the President, by his spokesmen, and by the Attorney General that we did promise air cover for the invasion, that we did not promise air cover, that we would support the freedom fighters in their struggle to liberate their homeland, that we would arrest any of them that tried it.

In a brave and heroic speech to the world a few days before the election last fall, the President demanded the removal from Cuba of Russian missiles and troops. The quarantine he called for turned out to be no quarantine nor blockade indeed. We never halted any ships and even allowed the first Russian vessel to proceed even though its cargo was oil, the most vital commodity necessary to the Castro economy. No on-site inspections were ever made to assure that the missiles had actually been removed. Months later we are still trying to get the Russian troops out of Cuba by appealing to Khrushchev to honor his pledges and accepting his word that they are being removed in spite of the fact that he has never been known to honor his word or any agreement.

At this point I would like to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal pointing out the risks of the Kennedy inaction, and that the President must formulate and execute a plan of action to reimpose the Monroe Doctrine:

THE RISKS OF INACTION

President Kennedy is perfectly correct when he observes that it's pointless for people to just say we've got to "do something" about Cuba. And he is equally right in noting that a good deal has been done since October in terms of restricting trade and maintaining surveillance of the Communist island.

But these are not the issues which bother so many people. The causes of concern are an uneasy feeling that the administration is not telling all it safely could about Cuba, the unhappy spectacle of the U.S. Government bitterly fighting with the Cuban foes of Castro and, above all, the continued presence of Soviet troops with no apparent American plan for getting rid of them once and for all.

As former Vice President Nixon put it the other day, whether there are 12,000 or 17,000 Soviet troops in Cuba, Khrushchev's position "is firmer today than a year ago." Senator KEATING also says the precise number is somewhat beside the point; one Red soldier is too many. What matters is not Castro, who by himself would be just another pipsqueak dictator. Rather, the threat to all the Americas is Khrushchev in Cuba.

The New York Senator does, however, insist there has been practically no net reduction in the number since November, because the troops that have left have been replaced. Government officials retort in effect that it's easy to make such charges without documentation, and especially easy for political critics of the administration.

Unfortunately for that answer, the charges are coming from nonpolitical sources as well. For a notable example, from the New York Times' Ruby Hart Phillips, who spent 25 years in Cuba before being expelled by Castro in 1961 and who still remains in close touch as head of the Times' Miami bureau.

According to Mrs. Phillips' information, the Russian troops are being rotated, not taken out. Moreover, she declared flatly in a speech the other day that the missiles still remain in Cuba. "And I have not a doubt that they have a good submarine base and extensive submarine pens."

Such assertions, whether right or wrong, deserve more than an official brush-off. They could hardly be more serious; in Mrs. Phillips' view, unless Cuba is taken out of the Communist camp, all of Latin America is going to fall, country by country. Or, in Mr. Nixon's words, Khrushchev didn't spend a billion dollars merely for the purpose of acquiring Cuba; he has far bigger game in mind.

Nor do all those who are disturbed by administration policy take refuge in the "do something" generality. Mrs. Phillips is forthright enough; she says only force of arms will get communism out of Cuba. Many disagree, but it is a possibility that cannot be ruled out for all time.

Meantime Mr. KEATING, among others, advocates a number of further economic, diplomatic and military moves short of invasion. Certainly it does seem that, after facing up to Khrushchev last fall, it ought to be possible to demand the withdrawal of troops and weapons. It is hard to believe that it was necessary to lose October's initiative and move to the extreme of protecting Khrushchev's men from attacks by Cuban exiles.

Mr. Nixon may, perhaps, be charged with vagueness when he says the United States must make "a command decision to do whatever is necessary to force the removal of the Soviet beachhead." But his real point is that without such a decision, the problem can only get worse for us.

Will the risks of action, he asks, "be less in 6 months, 1 year, 2 years? If we allow Cuba to remain an example for Communist takeovers in other Latin American countries, the risks are certain to grow."

The issue is not, it seems to us, whether we should dispatch the Marines this minute. The deeply disquieting thing is the seeming absence of any real plan. Or if there has been any decision, for all the American people can tell, it is to accept an intolerable coexistence with Soviet conquest in our hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to emphasize the points made in this editorial: First, the administration is not telling all it safely could about Cuba. Second, it is not Castro, it is Khrushchev. Khrushchev's position is firmer today in Cuba than it was a year ago. Third, there has been no significant decrease in Russian troops in Cuba. The Russian troops are being rotated, not taken out. Fourth, there is substantial evidence that missiles remain in Cuba and a good submarine base and submarine pens are in existence. Fifth, there is increasing evidence that other Latin American countries are in danger of being subverted by Khrushchev-Castro directed Communists. Sixth, and, in my opinion, most important, the seeming absence of any real plan by the Kennedy administration for freeing Cuba and getting the Russian aggressors out of this hemisphere.

The President, in his news conference today, complained that his critics have not come up with any concrete plan. A look at the RECORD any day of the week will disclose that many of us have been advocating a number of measures, short of military action, which can and must be taken. I would suggest as a starter that the United States recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile. Contrary to the President's disavowal of the importance of exile governments in today's press conference, we have only to point to the important role such governments played in rallying underground forces in occupied countries in World War II to remind him that once again he is wrong or does not understand history.

Another phase of a positive program which we could enact now is to support a massive propaganda effort to encourage the Cubans, within and without that country, to throw off their dictators. Support internal uprisings of the Cuban people and let them know that we will not fail them if they do accept our promise to support their efforts to win freedom. We should institute an effective blockade. From all available information it is apparent that if we were to cut off only the oil supplied to Cuba from Russia, the Castro government would be in immediate danger of collapse.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Cuba can be freed and the Russian menace to the United States and this hemisphere can be eliminated if the President will quit the doubletalk and replace his high-sounding words with deeds and action. We can again take the initiative in winning the war in which Communist Russia is engaging us if the President will face the issue with courage and will trust the American people with the facts. He can electrify all those who believe in freedom and can reinspire the Cuban people to renew their fight for liberty if he will immediately impose the Monroe Doctrine and in no uncertain terms notify Khrushchev that all Russian troops and all Russian equipment and all Russian subversion must be removed from this area without further delay.

The people are ready to back you up, Mr. President. Are you ready to lead the Nation?

Of course the distasteful truth is that no action that President Kennedy initiates will be successful, if the President does not understand the need and reasons for it. The President disregards the dangers of Khrushchev controlling Cuba, the military buildup, the base for subversion of other nations, the submarines bases, and the continuing violation of the Monroe Doctrine and the sound reasons underlying this doctrine.

To be successful what is needed is a sound, consistent, firmly stated worldwide foreign policy of toughness and self-interest, then a consistent hemispheric policy and then consistent actions directed to freeing Cuba. Isolated single shot actions like the quarantine are worse than any action without a continuing, consistent, tough understandable policy.

The Kennedy policy of indecision, vacillation, inconsistency, appeasement, and accommodation is no basis on which to launch any new Cuban action.

The President's inability to see a clear course of action does not mean that such actions are not possible or are not seen by others.

Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of the Washington Post regarding the proposed repeal of the Silver Purchase Act and a letter I sent regarding the editorial:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1963]

THE SILVER DOLLAR

We have come a long way since William Jennings Bryan used to orate about the "cross of gold" and demand the acceptance of silver as basic to our monetary system on a ratio of 16-to-1 with gold. Now Secretary of the Treasury Dillon has made a recommendation that, if approved by Congress, will diminish the importance of silver by switching from silver certificates to Federal reserve notes thus freeing 1.3 billion ounces of silver required by law to maintain $1 silver certificates in circulation. The recommendation is eminently sensible. Mr. Dillon points out that the Government's supply of silver for coinage will run out in 1965 unless it can free for use by the Government's mints some of the 1.3 billion ounces now lying useless in vaults. When the Government's supply runs out, it may have to buy silver in foreign markets, for the domestic production of silver is not sufficient to meet all demands.

Some of the silver producing States have long maintained a sentimental interest in silver dollars, along with a powerful bloc in Congress that prevented any modernization of our silver laws. The silver dollar is about as obsolete as the arguments of the silver bloc, and sentiment is strong for a revision of our laws concerned with silver in its relation to the monetary system. If something is not done, Mr. Dillon suggested even graver threats to silver coinage ahead. If the Government has to diminish its gold reserve still further by purchasing silver abroad, we may be faced with a common European expedient of using other cheaper metals. The silver bloc would hate the thin jingle of aluminum dimes and quarters. To forestall that hazard, let the silver laws be revised.

MARCH 21, 1963.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
1515 L Street NW.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It was a great pleasure for me to return to Washington and have the benefit of the generally fine editorial policy of the Post. However, the traditional aspirations for spring's first day turned to ashes this morning upon reading the editorial entitled, "The Silver Dollar."

I am sure that if more research had been spent on the proposed demonetization of silver, more than half the truth would have appeared in the editorial. Even a few minutes of reflection would have cleared up the confusion of silver dollars with silver certificates. Perhaps some study of the silver situation would have given the author of this unfortunate editorial some arguments, other than the ad hominen references to William Jennings Bryan and the bogeyman silver bloc, for the Treasury bill to replace silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes.

At the risk of being labeled the sole surviving representative of the powerful silver bloc in Congress, I would like to briefly point out some of the rational arguments against the Treasury Department's proposal in H.R. 4413. Silver has traditionally been, in this country, and in almost every other civilized nation, a monetary metal. The present drive to substitute currency that has 100 percent silver backing with notes which will have but 25 percent gold backing is aimed at complete demonetization of gold as well as silver. The recent spectacular rise in the price of silver has given a lever to the proponents of a completely managed currency system. However, I am disappointed that our Treasury's reaction is only one of panic, rather than reason.

Silver production now has but a 12 to 1 ratio with gold. The monetary price of silver at $1.29 per ounce represents an approximate ratio to gold of 27 to 1. Rather than irretrievably retire silver certificates, a more sensible approach would be to place the monetary value of silver in a more realistic relation to gold. I have suggested to the Banking and Currency Committee that a monetary value of $1.38 for silver would be a sound move at this time. This would involve no mechanical problems at all, since the monetary price of the silver in our coins is $1.38.

To replace $2 billion in silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes would cost the American taxpayer more than $50 million per year, since 75 percent of the backing for Federal Reserve notes is in the form of collateral, upon which the United States pays interest. It costs the taxpayer nothing to keep silver certificates in circulation; rather the Treasury has realized an economic profit on them every year since the enactment of the Silver Purchase Act.

The history of silver legislation is clouded with too much emotion. I believe it is time that the Congress approach the problem rationally and that is why I would like to see the Post apply its policy of thoroughness and objectivity to this legislation.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Action Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the time is now for immediate and drastic executive action, for accelerated legal procedures by the Attorney General, for positive congressional action to strengthen and extend the law by giving to the Attorney General the legal authority to protect the rights of the Negroes of Mississippi, as well as the rights of minorities everywhere in the United States, to the limit.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to solicit the aid of every Member of the Congress of the United States to join me now in protesting and denouncing the illegal actions on the part of the authorities of Mississippi and elsewhere insofar as the actions of those authorities in anyway hamper the constitutional rights of Negro citizens.

I call the attention of my colleagues to a long series of outrages suffered by Negroes of Mississippi and I emphatically state that these crimes cry out for positive and courageous action, not tomorrow, but now.

CHRONOLOGY OF VIOLENCE AND INTIMIDATION IN MISSISSIPPI SINCE 1961

1961

January 1, Greenville, Washington County: Two young white men rode a motorbike through a residential area and, according to the local police chief, fired a volley of shots into a group of Negroes. George Mayfield, 18, was seriously wounded in both legs; Percy Lee Simmons, 19, was shot in the right leg.

March 30, Jackson, Hinds County: Club-swinging police and 2 police dogs chased more than 100 Negroes from a courthouse where 9 Negro students were convicted for staging a sit-in demonstration. Several were struck by the clubs and at least one person was bitten by the dogs.

May 7, Jackson, Hinds County: Several white youths, riding in an open convertible, lassoed 9-year-old Negro Gloria Laverne Floyd with a wire and dragged her along the street. The girl suffered a deep gash in her head that required three stitches, cheek bruises, a laceration of her right shoulder, and burn marks on her neck. Police made arrests.

August 15, Amite County: Robert Moses, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—registration worker, and three Negroes who had tried unsuccessfully to register in Liberty, were driving toward McComb when a county officer stopped them. He asked if Moses was the man "who's been trying to register our niggers." All were taken to court and Moses was arrested for "impeding an officer in the discharge of his duties," fined $50 and spent 2 days in jail.

August 22, Amite County: Robert Moses went to Liberty with three Negroes, who made an unsuccessful attempt to register. A block from the courthouse, Moses was attacked and beaten by Billy Jack Caston, the sheriff's first cousin. Eight stitches were required to close a wound in Moses' head. Caston was acquitted of assault charges by an all-white jury before a justice of the peace.

August 26, McComb, Pike County: Hollis Watkins, 20, and Elmer Hayes, 20, SNCC workers, were arrested while staging a sit-in at the F. W. Woolworth store and charged with breach of the peace. They spent 36 days in jail.

August 27 and 29, McComb, Pike County: Five Negro students from a local high school were convicted of breach of the peace following a sit-in at a variety store and bus terminal. They were sentenced to a $400 fine each and 8 months in jail. One of these students, a girl of 15, was turned over to juvenile authorities, released, subsequently rearrested, and sentenced to 12 months in a State school for delinquents.

August 29, McComb, Pike County: Two Negro leaders were arrested in McComb as an aftermath of the sit-in protest march on city hall, charged with contributing to the delinquency of minors. They were Curtis C. Bryant, of McComb, an official of the NAACP, and Cordelle Reagan, of SNCC. Each arrest was made on an affidavit signed by Police Chief George Guy, who said he had information that the two "were behind some of this racial trouble."

August 30, McComb, Pike County: SNCC Workers Brenda Travis, 16, Robert Talbert, 19, and Isaac Lewis, 20, staged a sit-in in the McComb terminal of the Greyhound buslines. They were arrested on charges of breach of the peace and failure to obey a policeman's order to move on. They spent 30 days in jail.

September 5, Liberty, Amite County: Travis Britt, SNCC registration worker, was attacked and beaten by whites on the courthouse lawn. Britt was accompanied at the time by Robert Moses. Britt said one man hit him more than 20 times. The attackers drove away in a truck.

September 7, Tylertown, Walthall County: John Hardy, SNCC registration worker, took two Negroes to the county courthouse to register. The registrar told them he "wasn't registering voters" that day. When the three turned to leave, Registrar John Q. Wood took a pistol from his desk and struck Hardy over the head from behind. Hardy was arrested and charged with disturbing the peace.

September 13, Jackson, Hinds County: 15 Episcopal ministers—among them three Negroes—were arrested for asking to be served at the lunch counter of the Greyhound bus terminal. They were charged with inviting a breach of the peace. They were found not guilty of the charge on May 21, 1962, by County Judge Russell Moore.

September 25, Liberty, Amite County: Herbert Lee, a Negro who had been active in voter registration, was shot and killed by white State representative E. H. Hurst in downtown Liberty. No prosecution was undertaken, the authorities explaining that the representative had shot in self-defense.

October 4, McComb, Pike County: The five students who were arrested as a result of the August 29 sit-in in McComb returned to school, but were refused admittance. At that, 116 students walked out and paraded downtown to the city hall in protest. Police arrested the entire crowd, but later released all but 19, all of whom were 18 years old or older. They were charged with breach of the peace and contributing to the delinquency of minors and allowed to go free on bail totaling $3,700. At the trial on October 31, Judge Brumfield, finding the students guilty, and sentencing each to a $500 fine and 6 months in jaid, said:

> Some of you are local residents, some of you are outsiders. Those of you who are local residents are like sheep being led to the slaughter. If you continue to follow the advice of outside agitators, you will be like sheep and be slaughtered.

October 5, McComb, Pike County: Charles Sherrod was arrested on the street, thrown into a police car, and charged with resisting arrest. Cordelle Reagan was also arrested and charged with contributing to the delinquency of a minor. Both were fieldworkers for SNCC.

October 11, McComb, Pike County: Paul Potter of Philadelphia, a vice president of the National Student Association, and Tom Hayden of Atlanta, both white, were dragged from their car and beaten as they drove alongside a group of Negroes making an antisegregation march. When the two slowed their car for a traffic light, a heavy-set white man opened the door and dragged the driver out and hit him several times. He then walked around to the other side of the car, opened the door and knocked the second man to the street. The incident occurred in the business section of the city.

October 13, McComb, Pike County: Police Officer B. F. Elmore shot and killed a Negro motorist. Police Chief George Guy said that Elmore said he had stopped Eli Brumfield at 4 a.m. for speeding. Brumfield allegedly jumped from his car with a pocket knife in his hand and attacked Elmore. A coroner's jury ruled Elmore fired in self-defense.

October 22, Jackson, Hinds County: Dion Diamond, a SNCC worker, was arrested for "running a stop sign" after being followed all day. In court the next day, the arresting officer told the judge:

> "He is a Freedom Rider. Throw the book at him."

Diamond was refused legal counsel and fined $168.

November 9, McComb, Pike County: Jerome Smith, 22, Congress of Racial Equality—CORE—field man, and four companions, Dorothy Smith, 18; Alice Thompson, 22; Thomas Valentine, 23; and George Raymond, 18, were attacked by a mob of 30 to 40 whites when they sought service at the lunch counter of the Greyhound bus terminal in McComb. Smith, who suffered head injuries when he was slugged with brass knuckles during the attack, said FBI agents were present at the time of the attack, but did "nothing but take notes" while the mob kicked and beat his companions. The victims were rescued from the mob by a Negro truck driver and Negro cab drivers.

November 10, Jackson, Hinds County: Jessie Divens, 12-year-old, was arrested for refusing to move to the rear of a city bus. Judge Carl Guernsey released the girl to the custody of Rev. G. R. Horton, chaplain of Campbell College where she attended classes. Judge Guernsey continued the case until November 17:

> With the understanding that the Reverend Mr. Horton and the child come back with a workable plan which would cause the child's mind to be concerned with education rather than social reformation.

November 18, McComb, Pike County: Persons unknown fired a shotgun blast into the bedroom of Dion Diamond and John Hardy at 702 Wall Street. Investigating officer Frank Williams found shotgun pellets embedded in the window frame.

December 1, McComb, Pike County: Four white men attacked three newsmen on the street, sending one crashing into a plate glass window of a store. The newsmen were Tom Uhrborck and Don Underwood, Life magazine, and Simmons Fentress, Time magazine.

December 2, McComb, Pike County: Police broke up an attempt by white attackers to drag three Freedom Riders from an automobile at the Greyhound bus terminal. Four men kicked at the locked car and beat upon the windows in an attempt to reach the young Negroes and their driver, Thomas Gaither, field secretary of CORE. The police, who were standing by when the riders arrived aboard a bus from Jackson, pulled the men away from the car, but made no arrests.

December 26, Jackson, Hinds County: Rafford Johnson, Negro, was severely beaten by two law officers after being involved in a minor collision with a car driven by a white woman. Johnson underwent surgery for skull injuries.

1962

February 6, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Miss Bessie Turner, 19, a Negro, was walking with a young man down a Clarksdale street when Clarksdale police officers stopped them and accused Miss Turner of having been involved in a theft. Miss Turner said the officers took her to the jail, forced her to unclothe and to lie on her back. She said one of the policemen then beat her between the legs with his belt. A few minutes later, Miss Turner said, the other officer beat her across her naked breasts. Miss Turner filed Federal charges against the officers.

March 15, 1962, Shelby, Bolivar County: Aaron Henry, State president of the NAACP, was convicted in Justice of Peace court on charges of making perverse advances on a white teenage hitchhiker. Henry stated that the charges were a complete fabrication, and presented an alibi supported by sworn witnesses. The conviction has been appealed. When he later stated in a press conference that the prosecutor and the police chief, who figured in the trial, had conspired to frame him, Henry was sued by the two for defamation. A Mississippi white jury awarded the prosecutor $25,000 and the police chief $15,000.

April 12, 1962, Taylorsville, Smith County: Cpl. Roman Ducksworth, Jr., U.S. Army, a Negro, was shot and killed by Policeman Bill Kelly, when, according to an NAACP news release, Duckworth "insisted on his right to sit where he chose on an interstate bus." Policeman Kelly claimed that Ducksworth was drunk and started fighting. No charges were brought against Kelly. Ducksworth was en route from Camp Ritchie, Md., to see his wife who was ill in a Laurel, Miss., hospital.

April 1962, Lucedale, George County: Mrs. Ernestine Denham Talbert, who lives in George County but teaches in Green County, was notified by the Green County School Board that her teaching contract would not be renewed. Mrs. Talbert had tried in January to register to vote but had been refused.

May 17, 1962, Rankin County: The Negro editor, of the Mississippi Free Press, said he and a companion were beaten by Rankin County officers and a highway patrolman. Lawrence Hudson, Jr., of Jackson, said the beating occurred after he was stopped en route from Jackson to Forest to check on a rumor that a Negro man had been killed by a white man. He was jailed, refused permission to phone a lawyer, tried the next day on several charges and fined $151.

June 21, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: A white lawyer from Jackson and four college students were jailed in Clarksdale for 20 hours without outside communication. One of the students was a Negro. William Higgs, the lawyer, and the students were jailed on a Sunday night by county officers and were released the following day, without charges being filed against them.

July 5, 1962, Jackson, Hinds County: Jesse Harris, 20, and Luvaghn Brown, 17, SNCC workers, charged that they were beaten and threatened with death while serving a 30-day sentence in the county jail for contempt of court. The young Negroes had refused to move from a court bench customarily occupied by whites while they were attending the trial of Mrs. Diane Nash Bevel. The young men said that, in the courthouse elevator, a deputy sheriff called Harris "a damned nigger" and beat him about the head with his fist. At the county farm, they were singled out as freedom riders and wore striped uniforms. Both were beaten by guards. Harris was beaten by a guard named Keith while other prisoners held him. Keith beat him across the back with a length of hose threatening:

> Nigger, I'll kill you.

August 16, 1962, Greenwood, Leflore County: Samuel Block, 23, SNCC field secretary, said three white men accosted him in a parking lot and "started beating me with their fists." He said they threatened him and then beat him for about 5 minutes.

> There is no use reporting it to local authorities—

He said.

August 17, 1962, Greenwood, Leflore County: SNCC workers Samuel Block, Luvaghn Brown, and Lawrence Guyot were forced to flee from the second story window of their voter registration office. They said armed white men invaded the premises intent upon doing them harm.

August 17, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Mayor Charles Durrough asked Mr. Leonard Davis, a Negro employed by the city, what he knew about the registration school being conducted at a Negro church. Mr. Davis replied that he did not know anything at all about the school, and did not attend any of the classes. The mayor then told him that he, the mayor, knew what kind of school they were having. The mayor said he knew it—presumably, civil rights for the Negro—was coming, and he was not going to allow it to be forced on them. The mayor said that anyone attending the school would be given a one-way ticket out of town, and if that would not do it, they would use whatever they had available. See entry below for September 3, 1962.

August 1962, Greenwood, Leflore County: Welton McSwine, Jr., 14-year-old Negro, was arrested by police after a white woman's house had been broken into. When police got the youth to the station an officer said:

> All right, nigger, you know why you are here, and we want to know who broke into that white woman's house.

McSwine told them he knew nothing of the incident, saying that he spent all his time in the cottonfield, and suggesting that his mother could corroborate this. McSwine said officers then took him to a cell and beat him, first hitting him in the head with a blackjack; then one of the policemen beat him in the face with his fist while another hit him in the stomach with his club; then the officers made him lie naked on the floor on his side while they beat him with a whip. McSwine was released after intercession of his father's white employer.

August 21, 1962, Liberty, Amite County: Sam Wells and Tommy Weathersby went to the courthouse to register. While they were waiting to get into the registrar's office, they stood on the front porch of the courthouse. Deputy Sheriff Daniel Jones told them:

> Get your ——— off the front porch, and don't come back on.

Weathersby and Wells got off the porch. A few moments later, rain began, and the two wanted to take shelter in the courthouse, but Deputy Sheriff Jones would not permit it.

August 21, Liberty, Amite County: Dewey Greene, Jr., Mississippi Free Press reporter, was taking pictures of Negroes waiting to register at the courthouse. An unidentified young man working in the office down the hall from the registrar's office snatched Greene's camera away, and refused to return it. Greene was told to leave town by three white men, one of whom was flourishing a length of lead pipe. He left.

August 29, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Seven Negroes were arrested after attending a voter registration meeting. David Dennis, CORE field secretary, was charged with failure to yield right-of-way after a police officer had forced him to submit to a long harangue of threats and abuse. Samuel Block, John Hodges, J. L. Harris, Richard T. Gray, and Albert Garrer, SNCC field workers, and Dewey Greene, Jr., reporter for the Mississippi Free Press, were forced by Clarksdale police to alight from their car, and were charged with loitering in violation of the city curfew.

August 30, 1962, Indianola, Sunflower County: SNCC workers C. R. McLauren, Albert Garner, J. O. Hodges, Samuel Block, and Robert Moses were arrested by Indianola police on a charge of distributing literature without a permit. The registration workers had been taking leaflets announcing a registration mass meeting door-to-door in the Negro community. Lafayette Surney, 17, another SNCC worker, was arrested and then released to Rev. James Bevel, of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—SCLC.

August 31, Indianola, Sunflower County: During the trial of Samuel Block on charges of distributing literature without a permit, the Municipal Judge informed Block that he could cross-examine the arresting officer. Block asked the officer:

> Did you actually see me hand out a leaflet?

The judge turned to the officer and said:

> He can ask you anything he wants to, but you don't have to answer.

The judge told Lafayette Surney if he was caught in Indianola agitating again, he would be sent to the penal farm.

September 3, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Because of registration activity, two Negro-owned dry cleaning establishments were closed—allegedly for violating city ordinances.

September 3, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Lenard Davis, 49, sanitation department worker, was told by Mayor Charles M. Durrough:

> We're going to let you go. Your wife's been attending that school.

He referred to a registration school conducted by SNCC workers in Ruleville.

September 3, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Fred Hicks, 40, who drove fieldworkers to the plantations, was told he could no longer use a bus without a commercial license. Hicks said the bus owner told him that, because Hicks' mother had registered to vote:

> We gonna see how tight we can make it—gonna make it just as tight as we can. Gonna be rougher and rougher than you think it is.

September 3, 1962, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Moses and Amzie Moore, a local Negro leader, were walking down the street. A white man in a pickup truck drew up alongside and asked if they were the "folks getting the people to register." Moses and Moore answered yes, they were. The man asked if they could come out to his plantation to register people. The two answered, yes, they could come. The man said then:

> I've got a shotgun waiting for you, double barrel.

September 3, Ruleville, Sunflower County: A letter from Mayor Durrough notified the Williams Chapel Missionary Baptist Church that tax exemption and free water were being cut off because the property was being used for "purposes other than worship services." The church was a meeting place for voter registration workers.

September 10, Ruleville, Sunflower County: Marylene Burkes, 20, and Vivian Hillet, 19, were severely wounded when an unidentified assailant fired through the window of Miss Hillet's grandparents' home. The grandparents had been active in voter registration work.

October 3, Biloxi, Harrison County: A Negro frame residence and a gasoline station were targets for two "Molotov cocktails" which caused more than $4,000 damage. One of the bombs struck the home of Dr. Gilbert Mason, a Negro physician, who is active in integration efforts. The other crashed through the window of a service station operated by Emmett Clark, a Negro.

October 5, Harmony, Leake County: Night riders fired shotguns into eight Negro homes and a Negro store. An elderly Negro said he was struck in the knee by squirrel shot while he and his 9-year-old grandson were sleeping. He said he was not seriously hurt. Harmony Negroes had recently petitioned authorities for school desegregation.

October 10, Columbus, Lowndes County: A "Molotov cocktail" was tossed from a speeding car into the home of Dr. James L. Allen of Columbus, vice chairman of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

October 29, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Charles McLaurin, SNCC registration worker, was stopped by police as he was walking a group home from the courthouse. The group had tried to register to vote. The officer asked to see

McLaurin's driver's license. McLaurin showed it. The officer asked McLaurin what he was doing there. McLaurin told him he worked in voter registration. Then, accompanied by obscene remarks, the officer said:

> Nigger, do you know the way out of town?

McLaurin replied:

> Yes.

The officer said, with more obscenity:

> Nigger. Can't you say "Yes, sir?"

The officer's partner asked the officer what charge should be put on the tickets.

The officer said:

> Charge the ——— $26 on both charges. Nigger, you got $52?

McLaurin replied:

> No.

The officer said:

> Then you're going to jail.

At the jail, McLaurin learned that the officer was Clarksdale Police Chief Ben Collins. McLaurin was in jail a few minutes when his companions posted bond for him in the amount of $103. They decided to forfeit bond rather than run the risk of a higher fine or incur the legal expense of an appeal.

October 31, Jackson, Hinds County: Thomas E. Johnson, a white minister, and a member of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commisison on Civil Rights, saw a group of neighbors dumping garbage on his lawn. Johnson had just returned from taking his car to a safe place because of threats by neighbors to damage it. Johnson sought a peace bond against the man whom he had observed leading the garbage-dumping operations of his neighbors. The man presented 11 witnesses who swore that he had been in their presence at all times on the evening in question. The justice of the peace accepted their testimony and refused the bond. Then the Hinds County Grand Jury indicted Johnson and his wife on perjury charges, because of their testimony at the peace bond hearing.

November 6, 1962, Greenville, Washington County: Two WAF's and two airmen—all white—from the Greenville Air Force Base were fined $55 and given 30-day suspended sentences on charges of creating a disturbance by entering a restaurant and seeking service with two Negro voter registration workers.

December 26, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Ivanhoe Donaldson and Benjamin Taylor, students from Detroit, brought a truckload of food, clothing and medicines for distribution to the Delta's needy families who had been cut off from Federal surplus commodities. The medicines had been donated by a physician in Louisville, and were consigned to Aaron Henry, a licensed pharmacist. They were arrested by Clarksdale police and held for investigation. After police searched the truck on December 27, and found what they described as a drug used to ease the pain of middle-aged women, Donaldson and Taylor were charged with possession of narcotics and bond was set at $15,000. Bond was later reduced to $1,500.

1963

January 17, Canton, Madison County: The castrated and mutilated body of Sylvester Maxwell, 24-year-old Negro, was found by his brother-in-law less than 500 yards from the home of a white family. Mississippi NAACP Field Secretary Medger Evers termed the slaying a "probable lynching."

February 2, Greenwood, Leflore County: Willie Peacock, SNCC registration worker, complained to the Justice Department that officials had refused to register him on two occasions, and had rejected his poll tax payment for this year.

February 20, Greenwood, Leflore County: Four Negro businesses on the same street as the SNCC voter registration office were burned to the ground. Mrs. Nancy Brand, a worker in the SNCC office, reported an anonymous telephone call in which a man's voice asked her if she ever came to the office. When she said "yes", the voice said:

> You won't be going down there anymore, that's been taken care of.

The burned businesses were Jackson's Garage, George's Cafe, Porter's Pressing Shop, and the Esquire Club. The pressing shop is next door to the SNCC office, and SNCC workers believed the businesses were burned by mistake. Sam Block, SNCC field secretary, was arrested 2 days later for suggesting there was some connection between the burnings and the registration efforts of SNCC. He was charged with circulating statements calculated to create a breach of the peace.

February 28, Greenwood, Leflore County: Three registration workers were attacked with gunfire on U.S. Highway 82 just outside Greenwood. The shots were fired from a 1962 white Buick. The car in which the workers were riding was punctured by 11 bullets. One worker, James Travis of SNCC, was wounded in the neck and shoulder.

March 4, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: The show windows in the Fourth Street drugstore were smashed, as they have been several times in the past. The proprietor of the store, Aaron Henry, found the damage when he returned from speaking at a mass meeting in Leflore County in connection with the voter registration drive there.

March 6, Greenwood, Leflore County: Samuel Block and three others were fired on from a station wagon which pulled up beside their car as they were parked in front of the SNCC voter registration office. Both front windows were shattered. Police later found the wadding from a shotgun shell buried in the headliner of Block's car, and several pellets in the wall of the building in front of which the car had been parked.

March 12, Greenwood, Leflore County: A 12-year-old Negro girl was attacked by an egg-throwing truckload of white teenaged boys. The girl suffered facial bruises.

March 20, 1963, Jackson, Hinds County: Three shots were fired through the windshield of a car belonging to Mrs. Mattie Dennis while it was parked in front of the home of Mrs. Dennis' cousin, whom she was visiting. Mrs. Dennis is the wife of David Dennis, CORE field secretary for Mississippi. Both have been active in voter registration.

March 24, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: Fire destroyed partially the interior of the voter registration office at 115 East McLaurin Street, making the office unusable and necessitating a search for new headquarters. Witnesses said they saw two white men fleeing the scene shortly before the fire was discovered.

March 26, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: A shotgun blast ripped into the home of Dewey Greene, Sr., father of the latest Negro applicant to the University of Mississippi. Another of Mr. Greene's sons and a daughter have been active in the Leflore County registration project. Greenwood police said they were investigating.

March 27, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: James Forman, executive secretary of SNCC, Bob Moses, and about 10 other registration workers were arrested and taken from a group en route to the courthouse to register after the police dispersed a group of more than 100 Negroes with the use of police dogs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 8, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 72: 19: *Blessed be His glorious name forever; and let the whole earth be filled with His glory.*

Almighty God, we have entered upon Holy Week, commemorating events and experiences in the life of our blessed Lord whose sacred meaning our finite minds can only faintly comprehend.

Grant that during these days we may be filled with penitence and humility, with praise and thanksgiving as we turn our minds and hearts to the cross to meditate upon the sufferings and death of the great High Priest, who on Good Friday laid upon the altar the acceptable sacrifice of His own life for the sins of the world.

May we accept and submit ourselves to His claims and commands and have the faith and the courage to believe that someday all mankind shall be lifted to higher levels of character and conduct through the transforming and conquering power of His sacrificial love.

Hear us in our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 4, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 6. An act authorizing the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes;

S. 72. An act for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi;

S. 74. An act for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer;

S. 93. An act for the relief of Flora Romano Torre;

S. 196. An act for the relief of Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte;

S. 206. An act for the relief of Chang Ah Lung;

S. 213. An act for the relief of Carmelo Schillaci;

S. 215. An act for the relief of Mannor Lee;

S. 292. An act for the relief of Yoo Chul Soo;

S. 310. An act for the relief of Kaino Hely Auzis;

S. 504. An act for the relief of Domenico Martino;

S. 671. An act for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian;

S. 686. An act for the relief of Millie Gail Mesa;

S. 715. An act for the relief of Laszlo Janos Buchwald;

S. 752. An act for the relief of Janos Kardos;

S. 822. An act for the relief of Elvira Ciccotelli; and

S. 866. An act for the relief of Enrico Petrucci.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file sundry reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on Tuesday, April 9, 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, many people will be making pitches this afternoon.

My pitch, Mr. Speaker, is on behalf of the accelerated public works program. This Nation needs the $500 million for which the President asked in his request for a supplemental appropriation.

I was interested in this morning's paper to read a strange observation by the chairman of the Republican National Committee, who stated:

> It is high time some White House initiative was exerted to lift us out of the Democratic rut.

I congratulate the Republican Party, which usually charges strong Presidents with being dictators, for at long last coming out in favor of firm Presidential leadership in the Lincoln-Teddy Roosevelt tradition. One of the best examples of Presidential leadership was the statement which President Kennedy made last Saturday urging the Congress to restore the $500 million needed for the accelerated public works program.

As a part of my remarks I include President Kennedy's statement, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

Yesterday's decision by the House Appropriations Committee to eliminate funds for the accelerated public works programs was, I believe, most unfortunate and one that I am confident will be reversed by the entire House when the facts are presented to it.

It seems inconceivable to me that people can make speeches against unemployment and then vote to destroy a program the objective of which is to attack the unemployment problem by providing jobs, especially in those areas with chronic and persistent unemployment.

When the Congress enacted the program I recommended, authorizing the $900 million program last year, and appropriated $40 million to initiate the program, it was widely understood that the additional amount authorized would be considered early in 1963 and that the early experiences under the program would guide the Congress in determining how much money should be made available of the remaining $500 million authorization.

The response to the program has been truly remarkable. Since its enactment thousands of projects have already been approved and there are now in hand applications for over 6,200 projects for more than 3,000 communities throughout the United States, which are eligible under the standards of the program.

It will be recalled that the basic objective of the program is to speed up those projects which would otherwise be undertaken at a later date in order to provide immediate employment—hospitals, streets, sewers and other essential facilities.

On the basis of experience thus far under the program it is clear that with the full $900 million authorized by the Congress last year 500,000 of our Nation's unemployed will be on the job, on project sites and in supporting activities. That the projects undertaken by the funds are worthwhile is evidenced by the fact that local communities across the country have raised matching funds to participate in the programs even to the extent of passing local bond issues. The combination of local and Federal money flowing into the economy has proved to be a healthy and substantial stimulant.

This program must not be permitted to lapse and I am confident that the Congress will not permit it to do so. I hope that partisan activity will not be allowed to destroy or weaken a program aimed at our unemployment problem.

Mr. Speaker, some 3,000 projects have been approved, and I believe that this additional funding will enable the financing of over 6,000 projects which are now pending. We should not only have the $500 million supplemental appropriation but also move immediately to extend the accelerated works authorization for another year as contained in the bill H.R. 3311, which I have introduced.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that the $450 million supplement authorized by the whole Congress last year to complete the accelerated public works program has been deleted from the bill reported last Friday by the House Committee on Appropriations and intended for consideration in this body tomorrow.

There is no need to repeat the history of this bill. It is well known. We all recall that the bill authorized $900 million in matching funds to assist municipalities in undertaking needed public works essential to the health and welfare of the community in many distressed areas, including northeastern Minnesota, where the unemployment problem is acute.

The House had already sent its appropriation bill to the Senate when the Accelerated Public Works Act became Public Law 87-658 on September 14, 1962. The Senate, in October, appropriated $400 million for the program of accelerated public works. The statement on the accelerated public works appropriation published in the Senate committee report on the appropriations bill was specifically and enthusiastically endorsed at the joint conference by the House managers.

Mr. Speaker, the whole Congress thus pledged itself to a definite program of assistance to the Nation's distressed municipalities. The following remarks from the report published by the Senate and endorsed by the House conferees clearly identifies this pledge:

> The committee felt, therefore, that it would be desirable to provide a partial appropriation which would permit this program to get underway at the maximum possible rate for the next 4 months, with the understanding that the administration can submit a supplemental estimate in January, at which time they should be in a position to support a definite program, with specific recommendations for projects to be undertaken and justification therefor.

To be frank, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply shocked at the action of the House Committee on Appropriations, and I say this advisedly, with full respect for the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. The Congress made a serious commitment, on the basis of which distressed municipalities and governmental subdivisions throughout America went ahead and planned to raise additional local funds for over 6,000 essential public works projects. In many instances they even utilized the difficult procedure of floating bond issues while waiting for this additional $450 million or $500 million to be appropriated. They counted on the money being made available this year to take up the slack of unemployment by creating work in their localities. Now, for some reason or other, after having given a solemn pledge, a firm declaration of intention, the Congress has reneged.

When the appropriations bill comes up, I urge the full membership of this body to give serious reconsideration to restoring the $450 million accelerated public works supplemental appropriation which was both authorized and literally promised to the distressed communities by the 87th Congress.

THE PURCHASE OF A MOBILE AIRPORT CONTROL TOWER KNOWN AS THE AN/MRN-12

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, as my colleagues will recall, I presented an hour-long documentation of a procurement case I had studied for over 4 months. It was a purchase of a mobile airport control tower known as the AN/MRN-12 in which, my analysis showed, the Air Force wasted over $560,000 and paid Craig Systems, Inc., of Lawrence, Mass., considerable excess profits. I asked for a complete audit of the matter by the General Accounting Office as well as a study by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Defense.

In reply to my presentation made on the floor of the House, Erich Kauders, president of Craig Systems, made a statement to the Boston Globe. It was printed on page 28 of the Globe on Monday, April 1. In his statement, Mr. Kauders said my allegations made on the floor of the House were, and I quote:

> Repetitious of a speech he (WILSON) made last October and it is our understanding that the findings of various Government agencies who have reviewed this procurement since then are contrary to Congressman WILSON's findings.

To my knowledge, no such reports have been made. Certainly I want to see them if they exist. I contacted the General Accounting Office and asked if any such report had been made by the Comptroller General. I was assured it had not. I contacted the Air Force and was told the same thing—no study has been made of the procurement, so consequently no findings had been returned.

In a spirit of cooperation, Mr. Kauders was then telephoned for his assistance. Certainly, since he mentioned the reports, he knew where they could be found. I wished to see them in order to be perfectly fair with everyone concerned. Mr. Kauders at first denied having made the statement, but after I read it to him verbatim from the Boston Globe, he confirmed its content as his own remarks. However, he said, he had nothing to add and declined to identify the various Government agencies mentioned in his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that there are no such reports and that none have been made. I can only assume that the contractor and perhaps some in the military are trying to pour oil on the troubled waters at Lawrence and Boston, Mass., and Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y.

This, to me, is simply more evidence that this entire procurement should be audited thoroughly by the General Accounting Office, the Justice Department and the Department of Defense. A letter of transmittal referring my file to GAO, together with a series of questions I wish answered, went into the mail today, and I hope for an early reply.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS ON H.R. 5389 TO REPEAL THE SILVER ACT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider H.R. 5389, to repeal the Silver Purchasing Act of 1934. H.R. 5389 was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee because of its impact upon monetary policy. The Banking and Currency Committee referred title II of the bill to the Ways and Means because it involved the repeal of a tax.

Because of the haste with which this matter was considered my request to file supplemental views with the majority views of the Ways and Means was neglected. I am setting forth these views in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so they will be available during debate on the measure.

Essentially I am pointing out that no committee considered the fiscal aspects of the proposed legislation which are of grave importance because of our balance of payments, gold flow, and debt-management problems.

The Kennedy administration is cashing in capital assets wherever it can find them to lessen its current deficits—see my remarks of April 4, 1963, entitled "Balance of Payments," page 5827, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This simply staves off the day of accounting and makes it worse when it comes because we have failed to do what is necessary, reform our ways of spending more than we take in in current revenues. H.R. 5389 permits the administration to cash in $2 billion of capital assets, $2 billion of silver bullion. It is an essential step to the devaluation of our dollar. The problem we face of the cash in of silver certificates and melting down silver coins for the silver value in them can be met without permitting the administration to cash in the silver itself to meet current expenditures. This matter needs the study and evaluation of a committee of the Congress before floor action is in order. Hence I recommend recommitting this bill to the Ways and Means Committee for such and study.

Herein follow my supplemental views:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS ON H.R. 5389, TO REPEAL THE SILVER PURCHASING ACT OF 1934, INCLUDING THE TAX ON TRANSFERS OF SILVER BULLION

H.R. 5389 is divided into two parts. The first part, sections 1 through 3, is concerned with the repeal of the silver legislation and authorization for $1 Federal Reserve notes. This matter was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee which held hearings on these aspects on March 11-14, expressly reserving to the Committee on Ways and Means jurisdiction with respect to the second part of the measure, the repeal of tax on transfers of silver bullion. The Ways and Means Committee held no public hearings and devoted one morning session of informal executive session to the matter. No testimony was taken, and very short notice was given to the members of the committee that the matter was to be taken up.

Neither the hearings nor report of the Banking and Currency Committee were available during the Ways and Means Committee's consideration. Nor were the hearings and report of the Ways and Means Committee which had jurisdiction of the entire legislation in 1934 made available to the committee. The memorandum prepared by the Ways and Means Committee staff made no reference to the original 1934 hearings and committee report. Upon interrogation of the Secretary of the Treasury and other persons present at the informal executive session it was apparent that they were unfamiliar with these hearings and report.

I received copies from the Library of Congress just as the committee went into executive session.

From the 1934 hearings and report, it is apparent that the Silver Act of 1934 was presented "in developing an improved monetary system."

The committee in its report makes the following points:

The measure is a logical and necessary complement of the Gold Reserve Act passed by this House on January 20 and approved by the President on January 30, 1934. Silver is a valuable component of any monetary system designed to stabilize the money's worth of goods. * * * We may look toward a coordinated use of that silver to check changes in the purchasing power of the dollar.

Section 2 declares the policy of the United States to be to increase the proportion of silver to gold in its monetary stocks with the ultimate objective of having and maintaining in silver one-fourth of the monetary value of the stocks of gold and silver, and three-fourths of the monetary value of such stocks in gold.

The second sentence of the section (5) requires that there be maintained in the Treasury as security for all silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued an amount of silver in bullion and standard silver dollars aggregating in monetary value the face value of such certificates outstanding at the time.

Section 10 states: "'Monetary value' is defined to mean a value calculated on the basis of $1 for an amount of silver or gold equal to the amount at the time contained in the standard silver dollar and the standard gold dollar respectively."

In respect to the tax being imposed, the committee report has this to say: "Holders of silver are thus allowed to make a profit which should at least equal any profits arising from investments in silver or the purchase and sale of silver for industrial use during times when the price is not being increased by governmental action. The tax being in the nature of a profits tax covers transactions taking place prior to enactment. Were this provision not included in the bill, the policy of equitably reimbursing the Government for the increase which its action may bring to the price of silver could easily be obstructed."

The first question asked Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., when he testified before the committee was in respect to the revenue aspects of the tax. I quote from page 9 of the hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 9745, the Silver Purchasing Act of 1934, in the 2d session of the 73d Congress, May 25 and 26, 1934:

"The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Doughton). Mr. Secretary, has there been any estimate made as to the probable amount of revenue that may be derived from this 50 percent tax?

"Secretary MORGENTHAU. It would have to be a very rough estimate, but I would say that it is perfectly possible the Government might get as much as $25 million.

"The CHAIRMAN. Per annum?

"Secretary MORGENTHAU. Well, I would not want to say that; but over the period of the purchase of silver.

Mr. VINSON. The Treasury is deriving no revenue from that source at this time?

"Secretary MORGENTHAU. No.

"Mr. VINSON. Then that will be additional revenue?

"Secretary MORGENTHAU. That is correct."

I make this reference to point up two things. The expressed basis for the passage of the act was to establish a monetary policy based upon two precious metals, silver and gold. The purpose of the tax was to collect revenue from the profits that speculators in silver stood to gain from the Government's actions.

The proposal of the Kennedy administration to repeal the act and the tax makes no reference to this historical basis.

The Congress is asked to abandon the monetary policy based upon two precious metals established in 1934 with no reference to its merits or demerits and with little reference to the monetary policy which will supplant it.

The administration presents its arguments in 1962 as if the reasons advanced by the administration in 1934 were specious and sham, that the real purpose of the Silver Act was not to establish a monetary policy, but to provide subsidization to the silver mining industry and that the real purpose of the tax was not to raise revenue, but rather to police the subsidization act.

The question for the Congress is not to determine why the Kennedy administration should treat the Roosevelt administration proposals as sham, but rather whether the 1962 presentation itself is a sham.

Perhaps the Silver Act of 1934 was not to establish a monetary system, but rather to provide a subsidy for the silver industry. Perhaps the tax was imposed not for revenue, but for policing the subsidy measure.

But the proposal of President Kennedy to repeal the act is certainly not designed to improve our monetary system. Rather it is designed to solve a serious economic condition resulting from the fiscal policy of deficit finance and economic circumstances wherein silver bullion is worth considerably more than the silver certificate for which it may be exchanged.

Repeal of the act adds one other method to the many which have been utilized by the Kennedy administration to cash in capital assets of the Nation to temporarily ease the problems created by the continued high deficits we have experienced and that the administration is planning to continue for several years to come.

In other words, there are more fiscal issues than monetary issues involved in the proposal to repeal the Silver Act.

The bald effect of the President's proposal to repeal the Silver Act is to permit him to sell off and to use as current revenue $2 billion of precious metals (silver bullion and vault silver dollars) which is maintained as security for $2 billion of our paper currency. He may then issue $2 billion of new Federal Reserve notes in place of the $2 billion of silver certificates. This will leave us with an additional $2 billion of paper money backed by our present diminishing gold reserves.

Not only will this leave us minus $2 billion of precious metal to back up our $32 billion of paper currency but it withdraws precious metal which was required to be dollar for dollar of the paper money issued against it. Furthermore due to the rise in value of silver in relation to the paper dollar, the silver bullion behind our silver certificates is 30 percent greater than the face value of the paper money it supports. Contrast this to our gold reserves which must be only 25 percent of the outstanding paper money and we begin to see how much the outright repeal of the Silver Act cuts back on our precious metal reserves.

If the Kennedy administration was simply trying to repeal or amend the bimetallic monetary policy we have adopted instead of, as I suggested, cash in capital assets to pay for some of our current expenditures then it would propose one of two things: Readjust the silver reserve required to back up the silver certificates or replace the silver backing the paper currency with gold. Either proposal would correct the problem of silver cash-ins which is the professed concern of the administration.

Certainly it is true that as the policy of deficit financing continues the problems of marketing and managing the Federal debt (a part of fiscal policy within the purview of the Ways and Means Committee) becomes more acute. The precious metal standing behind our currency is not just a matter of monetary policy, in these critical times of balance of payment and limited supply of precious metals in our vaults. It deeply involves our basic fiscal policies.

Neither the Banking and Currency Committee nor the Ways and Means Committee have studied or evaluated the implications of the repeal of the Silver Act upon the overall fiscal policy of the United States. This is a responsibility the Ways and Means Committee must meet.

I suggested to Secretary Dillon in executive session that by proposing an outright repeal of the Silver Act the administration lends credence to the belief currently expressed that the administration contemplated devaluing the dollar. Secretary Dillon stated that this was in no sense the policy of the administration. I then asked him if it was true that repeal of the Silver Act was a necessity in order to devalue the dollar. With this he agreed, reaffirming, however, no intention on the part of the administration to do so.

Under these circumstances I strongly urge that this bill be recommitted to the Ways and Means Committee for immediate and full hearings into the fiscal implications of this bill.

MONETARY POLICY

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Missouri in concern over the situation that is involved in our monetary backing of our money in gold and silver. Also, I join the gentleman from Missouri in his supplemental views on the silver bill. The gold outflow is implicit in the trade bill and in the tax bill on which we have concluded hearings and are now in executive session.

We have $15.8 billion of gold on hand. Gold is outflowing at the rate of $100 million a month and foreign holdings of liquid liabilities are increasing. The world holds $24 billion that can be claimed on us in gold. We have only $4.1 billion on hand above the $11.7 billion sold for monetary backing. Devaluation of our money is imminent at the current outflow. Huge deficits are building up. The Silver Act, of course, points in that direction as we reduce precious metal backing of a dollar from 100 to 25 cents.

The outflow of gold is so serious that I will not be a party to this conspiracy of silence, one may call it, where we have not faced up to the gold outflow problem, the reasons for it, what to do about it and confide in the American people.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I simply wanted to point out that I just had a study made of foreign and international ownership of Federal securities which shows that in 1950 the ownership was $4.3 billion; in 1962 the holdings are $15.3 billion, an increase from 1.7 percent as the total of Federal securities outstanding to 5 percent, which further bears on this important issue of balance of payments which is in addition to the demands that can be directed against our gold supply and other capital assets.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include my views at this point in the RECORD in supplement to what the gentleman from Missouri has said.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The supplemental views are as follows:

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, our tax policies at home and abroad are intimately interrelated with our overall economy and our international balance of payments. Several witnesses have mentioned gold outflow and the imbalance of payments. Earlier, of course, the consideration of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 by the Ways and Means Committee resulted in our considering the imbalance of payments many times during both the hearings and the executive sessions.

Over the years the Ways and Means Committee has never lost sight of the inherent danger of our position as the world's banker and our responsibility as a committee in the field of refinancing Federal indebtedness. Former Secretary of the Treasury, Bob Anderson, warned us in no uncertain terms of the danger of our gold outflow at a time when the U.S. gold level was approximately $22 billion.

Inasmuch as the imbalance of payments and gold outflow are a part of the hearings on tax recommendations and because of colloquies between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] and myself, I would like to supplement earlier statements with information bringing the gold situation up to date. At my request, Colin Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, submitted the following information which I include at this point:

MARCH 25, 1963.

Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALGER: In response to your request for data on the relationship between the U.S. balance of international payments and declines in the U.S. gold stock, we are enclosing a table which shows the U.S. balance of international payments and the offsets thereto, including changes in U.S. gold stock, during the period 1954–62.

In this connection, you may be interested in the following succinct summary of the U.S. experience in the last 5 years by Hon. William McChesney Martin, Jr., chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, in his February 1, 1963, statement before the Joint Economic Committee. Mr. Martin stated: "Finally, let me comment briefly on our balance-of-payments problem. * * * As a result of five large successive deficits, we have transferred to foreigners some $7 billion from our monetary gold stock and added another $9 billion to our liquid liabilities."

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

U.S. balance of international payments and resultant reductions in U.S. gold stock, 1954–62

[In millions of dollars]

Year	U.S. balance of payments	Year	Increase (−) in liquid liabilities to foreigners [1]	Increase (+) or decrease (−) in convertible currencies	Increase (+) or decrease (−) in U.S. gold stock
1954	−1,550	1954	−1,252		−298
1955	−1,145	1955	−1,104		−41
1956	−935	1956	−1,241		+306
1957	+520	1957	−278		+798
1958	−3,529	1958	−1,254		−2,275
1959	−3,743	1959	−3,012		[2] −731
1960	−3,925	1960	−2,223		−1,702
1961	[3] −2,360	1961	−1,618	+116	−858
1962	[3] −2,181	1962	−1,274	−17	−890

[1] To International Monetary Fund, foreign central banks and governments, foreign commercial banks, and other international and regional institutions.

[2] Excludes payment of $344,000,000 as increase in U.S. gold subscription to the International Monetary Fund.

[3] The U.S. payments deficit in 1962 would have been $900,000,000 higher in the absence of certain special receipts: $660,000,000 of advance repayments by France, Italy and Sweden of postwar debt to the U.S. Government, and $250,000,000 of receipts from sale by U.S. Treasury of 15- and 16-month nonmarketable securities denominated in foreign currency to Italy and Switzerland. Debt prepayments of over $660,000,000 had also been received in 1961. By the end of 1962 most countries experiencing reserve gains had repaid all or a substantial part of their 1946–49 borrowing in the United States.

This information was then more fully explained again in my request by Mr. Stam in the following letter:

MARCH 25, 1963.

Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALGER: This is in response to your request for data showing for the 5-year period 1958-62 the relationship between the U.S. balance of payments on the one hand and the resultant increase in liquid liabilities to foreigners and decrease in our gold stock on the other.

The requested data are as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

U.S. balance of payments	−15,738
Increase in liquid liabilities to foreigners	−9,381
Increase in convertible currencies	+99
Decrease in U.S. gold stock	−6,456
Total	−15,738

If the $344 million increase in U.S. gold subscription to the International Monetary Fund is included as a decrease in gold stock rather than as an increase in liquid liabilities, the figures would appear as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

U.S. balance of payments	−15,738
Increase in liquid liabilities to foreigners	−9,037
Increase in convertible currencies	+99
Decrease in U.S. gold stock	−6,800
Total	−15,738

Thus, as our letter of this morning indicated, the 5-year situation may be summarized as follows:

As a result of five large successive deficits in our balance of payments, we have transferred to foreigners some $7 billion from our monetary gold stock and added another $9 billion to our liquid liabilities.

The above figures were derived from those in the table submitted to you this morning.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

This information clearly shows the extreme danger of our current position where foreign nations hold approximately $24 billion for which they may demand gold, and we have on hand as of March 1963 $15.8 billion. The outflow has been approximately $100 million a month for the last several years. Mr. Stam's figures show that the outflow of gold is only a part of the clear and present danger wherein the liquid liabilities to foreigners have increased $4,640 million in fiscal 1961 and 1962. In his more recent letter, Mr. Stam outlines the 5-year period 1958 through 1962 increase of liquid liabilities to foreigners $9,381 million, and the decrease of gold out stock of $6,456 million for a total of $15,738 million of increase in both gold outflow and liquid liability.

At any time our gold supply, therefore, could be wiped out and our currency valuation and entire economy jeopardized. The greatest danger, of course, would be loss of confidence at home and abroad in the future value of our currency and the interrelated aspect of lack of fiscal self-discipline by the Federal Government, assuming the best, however, rather than a run on the bank, it would appear that we have less than 4 years left at the current rate of outflow assuming further no speedup of imbalance of payments before it will be necessary to devalue our currency by reducing the percentage of gold backing upon our currency.

The danger becomes all the more apparent to some of us who recognize in the President's deficit financing the large oversea expenditures through foreign aid and the lowering of tariffs, a further increase of gold outflow or increase of liquid liabilities, which would build up the pressure to a possible breaking point.

So far as I am concerned there is absolutely no room at this point for complacency or wishing away the problem. We are derelict in our duty if by silence we default in solving the problem. As I see it, we must go to meet this problem. At this juncture, it is nothing short of ridiculous to justify our present fiscal imbalance by pointing out that our imbalance monthly or yearly is now less than during comparable periods in the preceding administration. Every day that passes the cumulative pressure is building toward that inevitable moment when creditors of the United States abroad doubt our fiscal responsibility and demand gold.

Not to be forgotten in our concern over gold outflow is the accompanying jeopardizing of confidence of American businessmen in our Government's fiscal policies. Our entire economy, which is largely private and still oriented around the principles of capitalism, is motivated almost entirely by confidence—confidence of businessmen in the value of currency, confidence in the stability of the market, confidence in future supply and demand wages and prices and any loss of confidence because of the intrusion of Government through deficit financing, inflationary practices, planned economy and fiscal irresponsibility would jeopardize our entire economic system. Lack of confidence will tie up risk capital, stifle incentive, result in layoff of workers, less expansion of future business in a decelerating spiral which in total could wreck the American economic system. If we do not or cannot pay off in gold when requested, foreign and domestic confidence in the U.S. Government would nosedive.

On a related subject we see a gold squeeze developing as we remove 100 percent backing in precious metal of $1 bills, to be replaced by 25 percent backing in gold which is not redeemable. This change will require $35 million per year approximately to be added to our gold reserve and suggests two related problems: First, we are devaluing $1 currency by 75 percent and, secondly, we will be needing even more gold to undergird our money and the gold supply is rapidly dwindling.

It is obvious that our gold supply and the imbalance of payments is interrelated by the President's tax recommendations and these figures and remarks should be a part of this RECORD.

It is appropriate at this point that I include the memorandum of April 5 of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] concerning gold holdings, U.S. dollars owned by foreign countries, U.S. balance-of-payments position, and gross public debts:

Gold holdings (free world countries):	
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1952	$23,252,000,000
U.S. gold outflow to foreign countries, 1952 through 1962	−7,195,000,000
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, reduced to	16,057,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries,[1] Dec. 31, 1952	13,028,000,000
Gold holdings, increase, other countries, 1952 through 1962	+11,630,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries, Dec. 31, 1962 increased to	24,648,000,000
U.S. dollars owned by foreign countries (free world):	
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1952	10,546,100,000
Increase in foreign dollar holdings, 1952 through 1962	+14,437,900,000
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, increased to	24,984,000,000
U.S. balance-of-payments position:	
1950 net deficit	−1,912,000,000
1951 net deficit	−578,000,000
1952 net deficit	−1,100,000,000
1953 net deficit	−2,100,000,000
1954 net deficit	−1,500,000,000
1955 net deficit	−1,100,000,000
1956 net deficit	−1,000,000,000
1957 (only credit in 13 years)	+500,000,000
1958 net deficit	−3,400,000,000
1959 net deficit	−3,700,000,000
1960 net deficit	−3,800,000,000
1961 net deficit	−2,400,000,000
1962 net deficit	−2,200,000,000
U.S. deficit, 1950 through 1962, inclusive	−24,290,000,000
Gross public debts:	
U.S. public debt on Dec. 31, 1962	303,470,080,489
Other free world countries (latest available figures)	201,500,000,000
U.S. debt exceeds debts of other free world countries by	101,970,080,489
U.S. debt exceeds all other countries of world by	24,000,500,000

[1] Does not include Sino-Soviet bloc.

The above indicates clearly what the foreign aid program is doing to our gold reserves and our balance-of-payments position (trade).

It is long overdue but let us hope not too late that the Congress immediately direct its attention to solving the imbalance of payments and the gold outflow. For my part, it is quite clear that restoring fiscal order will require reduced Federal spending, immediate balanced budget, a reduction of our debt and then with that background tax reform which primarily means a drastic cutback in the tax progression and a reduction of rates.

Finally, a further comparative chart from 1950 to 1962 on foreign holdings of Federal securities, balance-of-payments deficits, and gold outflow to which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] referred:

	Foreign and international ownership of Federal securities[1]	As a percent of total Federal securities outstanding[2]	As a percent of total short-term liabilities to foreigners[3]	Balance-of-payments deficit[4]	Change in total gold stock[5]
End of December—	*Billions*			*Billions*	*Millions*
1950	$4.3	1.7	50.0	−$3.6	
1951	4.3	1.7	46.2	.3	
1952	5.3	2.0	50.5	−1.0	$492
1953	5.9	2.1	50.9	−2.2	−1,168
1954	6.3	2.3	48.5	−1.6	−298
1955	7.5	2.7	55.1	−1.1	−40
1956	7.8	2.8	52.3	−.9	305
1957	7.6	2.8	50.0	.5	799
1958	7.7	2.7	47.5	−3.5	−2,275
1959	12.0	4.1	61.9	−3.7	−1,075
1960	13.0	4.5	61.0	−3.9	−1,703
1961	13.4	4.5	59.8	−2.5	−857
1962	15.3	5.0	61.2	−2.2	−890

[1] Source: Treasury Bulletin, February 1963. Consists of the investments of foreign balances and international accounts in the United States.

[2] Securities issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Government, excluding guaranteed securities held by the Treasury.

[3] Derived from data in Treasury Bulletin, February 1963.

[4] Source: 1962 supplement to Economic Indicators.

[5] Source: Treasury Bulletin, August 1959; February 1963.

SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HONORABLE HAROLD WILSON, O.B.E., M.P.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged on April 1 to attend the National Press Club luncheon for the Right Honorable Harold Wilson, O.B.E., M.P. Mr. Wilson's brilliant analysis of the economic and foreign policy problems confronting the free world deserves our attention. As leader of Britain's Labor Party, Mr. Wilson brings to us a new approach. I commend Mr. Wilson's speech to my colleagues.

SPEECH BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE HAROLD WILSON, O.B.E., M.P., AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB AT WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 1, 1963

I should like to begin by saying what I am here for. First, what I am not here for. I am not here to negotiate. An opposition cannot negotiate with Governments. I am here as leader of one of the great parties in our democracy to learn more about current thinking in the United States on the great issues confronting the Atlantic partnership. I was last here in January 1962, at that time as the Labor Party's spokesman on foreign affairs. I would have come in January of this year, but had to return from New York to London on the day that Hugh Gaitskell died, without coming on to Washington.

So having said what I am here for I do not need, I hope, to repudiate the story which was featured in some papers last week under the title "Wilson's Fourteen Points." I haven't got 14. I haven't got any. A statement in one of Friday's papers that I "announced" before leaving London that I was bringing a 14-point program is quite wrong. The London story came as the responsibility of the pressman who wrote it and who at that time had not been to see me or had any discussion with me. It was a nice and amusing piece of imaginative writing but I cannot take any responsibility for it. I'm sorry.

I have not come to press any lines of policy on the U.S. administration. To do so would be highly improper and unconstitutional. My purpose in coming is to learn and to listen—and to explain, when I am asked, the general trend of Labor Party thinking and policy on the main issues of world affairs.

But I have read a great deal of what has been written, and I should like to thank you for all the kind things you have said about me—I have in the process learned a lot of things about myself I didn't know before, and I have been asked by many pressmen a lot of questions about our approach. I should, therefore, like to try today in my talk to answer some of these questions.

I should like to begin with the economic problems the free world is facing.

All of us want to see a great expansion of trade, and a removal of trade barriers, between member-countries of the Atlantic Community. Equally we urgently need to see a steady and dynamic expansion of production within our respective countries. My fear is that anything we are able to do in freeing trade and expanding national production will run in a measurable period of time into a crisis of world liquidity. World trade his increased fourfold in monetary terms since prewar: the monetary resources available to lubricate this trade have barely doubled. We have the position that the two greatest trading nations in the world both urgently need to expand production, in their own interests and that of the free world, and that both are inhibited by fear of balance-of-payments difficulties. We are moving more and more into the position that if sterling is strong, the dollar is weak, if the dollar is strong, sterling is weak, there are times when we face the danger that both are weak. And if Western nations show the degree of statesmanship which we hope for in reducing trade barriers, there is a real danger that trade expansion will grind to a standstill through a famine of liquidity. And we shall be reduced again to beggar-my-neighbor measures designed to export unemployment and deflation from one country to another. We are within a reasonable distance of a major seizeup in free world trade, beginning with a crisis in dollar and sterling trade, which at best will inhibit our hopes of economic expansion at a time when other nations are pressing remorselessly ahead, and which at worst could create another 1931. I am also deeply concerned at the growth of indebtedness in underdeveloped countries such as those of Latin America. Already the burden of servicing loans is preempting a high proportion of their overseas earnings; in 4 or 5 years many of them will reach breaking point.

In passing may I say with all the emphasis I can command that the answer does not lie in devaluation whether of the dollar, or sterling, or both. That would be a lunatic and self-destroying operation, neither justified by the problem nor relevant to its solution. The same applies to loose talks about floating rates. As an ex-trade minister I have a built-in prejudice in favor of enabling exporters to quote fixed prices with reasonable assurance of monetary stability. Equally the answer cannot be found in a revaluation of gold, which would simply provide an uncovenanted benefit to two countries, South Africa and the Soviet Union, whose benefit should be low in our scale of priorities.

What is needed is a medium for the creation of international credit through the established machinery of the International Monetary Fund. The unparalleled American and British expansion in the 19th century was made possible by a new discovery, the power of commercial banks to create credit, free from the thralldom of gold. In the 20th century we have so far shown ourselves unworthy of the ingenuity and inventiveness of our grandfathers. We should now move toward a system in which the IMF could create international credit peri passu with the development of world trade. If this could be combined with the Australian proposal for discriminatory credit facilities to be issued to underdeveloped countries to spend in debtor countries—such as, in present circumstances, United States and Britain, we could evoke increased production in our two countries, related to the needs of world development. This could be the answer to unused capacity in our countries.

The dangers—and the opportunities—we now face would justify the summoning of a World Monetary Conference, an economic summit for the free world.

Now I turn to the situation which arises from the breakdown of the Brussels negotiations. I do not want to go back over the past. What matters now is our response to a challenging and even exciting situation. It is above all a new, though not an unforeseeable situation. For 18 months Western policies were directed to a consummation in Brussels. Now we have to start again.

The Labor Party was prepared to accept a solution which would have been genuinely outward-looking and be a steppingstone to a wider free trade area embracing the Atlantic Community and the Commonwealth. There was nothing in the Treaty of Rome, as such, that would have precluded such an advance. What we were not prepared to join was an inward-looking, autarchic Europe which would sever Britain from our traditional channels of trade with the Commonwealth and the wide trading world. The adoption by the EEC of an agricultural policy based on restrictionism, of high prices policed by a penal import levy on imports from the outside world was a sign that perhaps Schacht, rather than Adam Smith, provided the inspiration for the agricultural planners of the new Europe. This policy involved a degree of interference with established market channels, a degree of rigging of prices and production, of internal self-sufficiency, far transcending the wildest dreams of any British or American Secretary of Agriculture, of any party, who ever existed, and in saying this I am speaking the language of superlatives.

At every stage of the debates in Parliament, Hugh Gaitskell and I and others of us stressed the need for the preparation of an alternative policy in case the talks broke down and Britain was presented with entry terms which proved intolerable. This was designed not only to strengthen our bargaining position, for negotiations based on the thesis that there was no alternative to entry were bound to produce stiff, possibly unacceptable, terms: it was designed to avoid a vacuum, a paralysis of policy in the event of breakdown. At all stages we spelled out a policy based on the concept of an Atlantic—and wider than Atlantic—community based on the United States, Britain and EFTA, EEC, the Commonwealth and probably Japan and possibly Latin America. As long ago as November 1961, when the Clayton-Herter report was presented to the joint committee of Congress, I said that this, rather than a narrow European conception, provided the key to the future.

President De Gaulle's brusque intervention faced us with the need for a constructive alternative. Paying every tribute to the breadth and vision of Mr. Macmillan's reappraisal after Brussels, I could not feel that a policy whose constructive measures were limited to the cancellation of a royal visit to Paris could be said to be measuring up fully to the challenge with which we were faced. We, therefore, put forward the following:

First, urgent action to make the Kennedy round effective, on the basis I have mentioned including the United States, United Kingdom, the Commonwealth, EFTA, and those trading areas such as Japan and Latin America which are essential to U.S. trade.

Second, urgent action to conclude international commodity agreements to provide stability in the prices and production of those commodities which enter into international trade, including products of temperate zones such as cereals and dairy produce, and those of primary producing countries such as cocoa, tin, rubber, sisal and tea. We are too apt to forget that all that has been done in the past 10 years in the development of economic aid from advanced countries to the underdeveloped areas, amounting now to $3½ billion, has been more than offset by the collapse in the export income of underdeveloped countries through the fall in primary commodity prices.

Three, associated with this, action to channel food surpluses from advanced countries to meet the needs of hungry nations, for example on the lines proposed by Lord Boyd-Orr in 1946 for a World Food Board, an imaginative concept 15 years ahead of its time, which was rejected because most of us hadn't the dollars in a dollar-hungry world. We must face the fact in our modern democracies, that built-in subsidies and support to our farmers will mean a permanent surplus of food, and this will be enormously augmented if the Common Market agricultural policy is not vetoed by GATT.

Four, planned international action to provide not merely monetary help for developing countries, but governmental and intergovernmental orders for steel, machine tools and transportation equipment—linking their needs with our industries at present working below capacity.

Five, measures to expand international liquidity.

Six, urgent action on the lines so imaginatively proposed by Mr. George Ball to provide planned quota outlets in all advanced countries for textiles and other manufactured goods from Asia and Africa.

Seven, on a Commonwealth basis closer integration of Commonwealth development plans enabling Britain to recapture markets we have lost through neglected opportunities in the past decade.

These are measures required on a marked scale. For our part we are prepared in Europe to work to find a solution to the problem of an economic division between EEC, and EFTA. Perhaps OECD will provide the right forum; perhaps, as we have suggested, regular meetings of European heads of government to seek close political unity and a solution of Europe's economic problems. We are prepared at the right time, and given the right conditions to enter into fresh negotiations with the Six, provided this does not mean another 18 months with Britain sitting in the antechamber while the Six meet and wrangle about our fate, provided that no one regards the concessions made by Mr. Heath as an acceptable starting point. We have stated the five broad conditions which should govern Britain's entry and we are prepared to negotiate on the basis of these conditions. But no one sees any immediate prospect of a new breakthrough, and that is why I stress the urgency of the other measures which are open to us.

Now I turn to some of the wider issues of world affairs, three in particular: Berlin, disarmament, and the defense of the West.

On Berlin, I recognize that reports of a speech I made in Cardiff 5 weeks ago have caused some anxieties. This is because the full text was never available. I do not blame the press. I overloaded them. It was the night I made my first major speech as leader of the opposition. I had a full handout on our policy for housing and rents, and the position of slum landlords: In addition I had a few animadversions on Mr. Macmillan and his colleagues which news editors thought of some interest. So there was little space to report a speech I made earlier in the day at the university in which Berlin was mentioned. Our view, which I repeatedly stated in Berlin when last year I led 42 Labor M.P.'s on a mission to Berlin, designed to show our solidarity and support for Willy Brandt and the citizens of West Berlin, is clear. Any settlement of the Berlin issue must provide two nonnegotiable, inalienable conditions—first, the right of the people of West Berlin to live in a system of society and under a system of government of their own free choosing: second, guarantees of access to West Berlin from the West going beyond mere paper promises together with all other measures necessary to insure the viability of West Berlin. Third, we regard it as essential that for the foreseeable future Western forces remain in Berlin, as of right, and as custodians of the new agreement. Fourth, to secure such an agreement, we should be prepared to show some degree of flexibility in relation to recognizing the existence of the authorities in East Germany and working out practical measures with them. Fifth, we should show a willingness to recognize on a factual basis Germany's eastern frontiers. Unfortunately some reports from Cardiff only repeated the fourth and fifth points of this package.

On disarmament I will say little because of the delicate stage of the negotiations, because we could be on the verge of a great breakthrough. My party accepts and insists on the need for effective international verification and supervision. On the test ban there is not only the problem of the number of inspections, but also the means and effectiveness of the system of inspection. On this Russia still has to come through.

On the wider question of a comprehensive disaramament agreement, nuclear and conventional, we feel that the time has come when the Secretary-General of the United Nations might be asked to take the two drafts and examine the possibility of bridging the formidable gap which still exists between them.

We believe that a further step forward could be made—here I know that what I am saying will find little acceptance here today—by the creation in areas of high tension, of nuclear-free zones and areas of effectively controlled conventional disarmament. Such areas as the continent of Africa, the Middle

East, Latin America, and central Europe, might be taken, perhaps in that order.

This would mean effective inspection. The Soviet acceptance of the Rapacki plan involves acceptance of inspection. But inspection must be effective. And, as the Swedish Government insisted in their December 1961 resolution at U.N., we must have realism and no disturbance of the present balance of forces in Europe.

Now, on defense. Our position is clear. We stand firmly by NATO and the Western Alliance. We are not a neutralist party and neutralism has no part or place in our policies. We want to see Britain and other European countries make a more effective contribution to NATO.

I know there is nothing more boring in nature than a politician who continually refers to his past speeches, but I find that if I repeat, ipsissimis verbis, the speeches I made 2 or 3 years ago on this issue, there is a rush to say "How he's changed since he became leader of his party." In every speech I made as foreign affairs spokesman I stressed the central role of NATO in our defense policy and in that wide section of our foreign policy which relates to defense; and secondly, the paramount need to increase our contribution to the conventional strength of NATO forces. We do not believe this is possible if we pour out our substance on the vain effort to maintain the so-called independent, so-called British, so-called deterrent. Because it isn't independent, it isn't going to be British and its deterrent value in our view adds nothing to the effectiveness of Western deterrent power.

But it does mean such a deployment of our financial and real resources as to limit our ability to make an effective contribution to NATO's ground forces. It does mean a block to our hope of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and it does mean increasing the danger that a conventional outbreak in Europe can quickly escalate into nuclear war.

I believe that our view on this represents the consensus of military opinion in Britain, including many Conservative M.P.'s, and that in this respect Mr. Macmillan is inhibited from pursuing the right military policy by the clamant pressure of a small but vociferous band of atavistic back-benchers whose intervention was decisive at the time of Nassau.

It is argued that to be realistic and recognize the plain fact that the United States is the custodian of the strategic deterrent on behalf of the Western alliance, that this places us in a position of humiliating dependence on another nation. I do not agree. It is dependence on the United States for the so-called British deterrent which creates the wrong relationship and which means that meetings of Western leaders, instead of being directed to the urgent problems of strenthening the alliance, are dominated by unrewarding, and I would feel humiliating wrangles about the supply of particular weapons.

Every American pressman I meet asks whether a labor government would repudiate the Nassau Agreement. I don't like the word "repudiate" which implies breaking faith with a partner, and I have my doubts about the enthusiasm with which the U.S. administration approached the Nassau Agreement. My answer is that a labor government's first task would be to survey the defense position we inherit, to survey the shambles, some say, then to enter into discussions with our American partners about Nassau and about our broader approach to NATO. In view of our policy on deterrents, we should then renegotiate, I have heard the word "denegotiate," the agreement.

Before I leave defense I should like to say one word about Britain's oversea bases east of Suez. The future of some of them is obscure: one thing we should have learned at heavy cost is that you cannot hold a military base in hostile territory. But in general, though some rundown is possible and desirable to release troops for Germany and for the strategic reserve, I believe it to be a mistake to evacuate key bases where we have the chance to remain. It is a hundred times easier for Britain to remain there, even with a token force, than for us, still less the United States, to seek to enter if trouble breaks out. I believe, therefore, that our maintenance of these bases should be regarded as a specific and invaluable contribution to the alliance.

I have talked today mainly about the relationship of Britain and the United States within the alliance. Frequently I am asked, "What about the special relationship?" I am never quite sure what this means. I am more interested in a close relationship based on a common purpose, common objectives, and as far as can be achieved community of policy, a relationship based not on condescension or on a backward-looking nostalgia for the past, but on the ability of both parties to put forward their strength and their own unique contribution to our common purpose. Charles Lamb said in one of his essays, "There is nothing so irrelevant in nature as a poor relation," and if ever our relationship with you were based on that status the sooner it were ended the better: that is why the first priority in British internal policy is to build up our economic strength so that as partners—in the alliance, in Europe, and the Commonwealth—we are relevant and necessary. It is on that, not on any conception of past greatness that our standing in the world will depend. Our ability to restore the lost dynamic to Britain's economic society, to restore a sense of economic and social and moral purpose, will have far more bearing on our value as an ally and a partner than any vain nuclear posturings. It may not be long before the same truth dawns on President de Gaulle.

Because we reject the notion that Britain is fated by history or some vicious twist of fate or by internal debility to be treated as the Sick Man of Europe, we are not. We have a reservoir of unused and underused talent, of skill and craftsmanship, of inventiveness, and ingenuity, of administrative ability and scientific creativeness which if mobilized will, within a measurable period of time enable us to become—not the workshop of the world; that is no longer our role—but the pilot plant, the toolroom of the world. Our scientists are among the finest in the world. The tragedy is we don't produce enough of them, and those we do produce we do not use intelligently. Some we fail even to hold—and the reason for this is not, as one noble lord has said, the deficiencies in your educational system—it is deficiencies in our industrial and governmental system, that we do not provide the status and opportunities, above all the key role in our society that the needs of the 1960's demand.

That is why the central thread of Labor policy, the key to our plan to redynamize Britain's economy, is our plan to mobilize the talents of our scientists and technicians, redeployed from missile and warheads, on research and development contracts, civil reresearch and development to produce the new instruments and tools of economic advance both for Britain and for the war on poverty in underdeveloped areas of the Commonwealth and elsewhere. If we are able to do this, and I have no doubt that we can—we shall be able in a very few years to transform our society and, in the alliance, in our economic relations with the Atlantic Community, and in the wider context of the North-South challenge, to put forward our full and so far unrealized strength, dependent on no one, but ready to play our full role in the interdependent community of free nations.

URBAN RENEWAL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my colleagues that I do not intend to take this full time. However, I shall be back. I will be back on Wednesday next with a special order and there will be sufficient time for my colleagues to participate in an exchange, I hope, on urban renewal.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to be blunt enough today in the RECORD, for those who are interested in the subject, so there will be plenty of reason to cross-examine me or to share with me this concern next Wednesday at the time of my special order.

Mr. Speaker, what is urban renewal?

Urban renewal is the replanning and rebuilding of our Nation's cities by the Federal Government at the expense of the taxpayer. It is the condemnation of one man's property for resale to another—in violation of our traditional concepts of property rights. It is the demolition of whole areas of our cities. It is the rebuilding of cities in conformity to the schemes of Federal planners, through Federal finance and Federal control. It threatens to end local self-government.

Urban renewal is a political weapon. It is an attempt by liberals using the taxpayers' money, to reduce their opposition to ineffectiveness by buying off large sections of the business community. If an individual accepts his slice of the New Frontier, how can he legitimately deny others their portion? Urban renewal is a planned alliance between local political leaders and the Kennedy administration, aimed at keeping both in power.

Urban renewal is a pretext for introducing public housing into a community. Frequently, public housing—unpopular on its own merits—is tied to urban renewal as a condition for receiving Federal funds, and in this way socialized housing gets a foothold in the local community.

Now a new trend in urban renewal and public housing is developing. If the social planners in Washington get their way, the Government will be able to nationalize your home or choose your neighbors for you.

Mr. Speaker, I would call to my colleagues' attention the fact that tomorrow, I believe, is the issue date for a special supplement of Human Events that will spell out in some detail this proposition on urban renewal which I will develop further on Wednesday next.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will have the time to look at this RECORD tomorrow and to participate with me on Wednesday in this matter of urban renewal.

In any bill of particulars these matters deserve special attention:

First. Because of urban renewal, the Supreme Court has reinterpreted the Constitution, and violated the letter and spirit of the law.

Second. Private property can be taken away for esthetic and spiritual reasons for private—not public—use.

Third. The Federal contribution results in Federal control of local government.

Fourth. Local need for Federal help has been fraudulently determined by both local and Federal Government.

Fifth. The financially less able cities and States are supporting the wealthier cities and States in the Federal aid distribution.

Sixth. Federal guidelines, procedures, criteria, and formulas are inequitable, and cannot be made equitable.

Seventh. Misuse of Federal aid is scandalous.

Eighth. Windfall profit at taxpayer expense is commonplace.

Ninth. Public housing is forced on communities that want urban renewal.

Tenth. Crime abounds in public housing and is getting worse; morals and moral values are being destroyed.

Eleventh. Urban renewal and public housing are being used to affect sociological changes in U.S. society at the planners' whim.

Twelfth. When people know the facts and there is a referendum, public housing is rejected.

The constructive answer to urban renewal and housing is local; it is a local problem, not Federal. The solution must be local, not Federal. Examples are Indianapolis, Dallas, Erie, Pa., and many others.

U.S. MILITARY AID TO INDIA—THE NEED FOR A KASHMIR SETTLEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Secretary of State Rusk, in a hearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, outlined the foreign aid programs proposed for the next fiscal year.

While we appreciated the detail and depth in which the Secretary of State delved in these discussions, many of us were disturbed over what is happening in Asia between two neighboring countries.

At a time when India faces the immediate threat of further invasions of its territory by the Red Chinese, we find that India is diverting a large portion of its military forces, not to protect against invasion from China, but to guard the border between India and Pakistan.

If Red China should launch another offensive against India, most military experts agree that India would have little chance of stopping it.

At the same time, Pakistan would find itself under possible attack by the Communists.

Instead of facing up to this dangerous situation, what has happened?

A majority of the forces of both India and Pakistan, some say as high as 80 percent, now face each other on the Kashmir border.

Defense expenditures

[Millions of dollars]

PAKISTAN	
Figures for 1962–63:	
Total expenditure inluding revenue expenditure and capital outlay	1, 022
Total defense expenditure (the Pakistan expenditure on defense is approximately 20 percent of total expenditure)	216
INDIA	
Figures for 1963–64:	
Total expenditure including revenue expenditure and capital outlay	5, 626
Total defense expenditure	2, 043

NOTE.—The Indian expenditure on defense is approximately 36 percent of their total expenditure. If revenue expenditure alone were to be taken, India's defense expenditure in 1963 will amount to nearly 47 percent of their total revenue expenditure.

The crux of the dispute between India and Pakistan is Kashmir, not a very prosperous territory of high mountains and beautiful lakes. At present, Kashmir is under the control of India.

Pakistan argues that Kashmir should be Pakistani because the majority of its people are Moslems. India argues that it should continue to retain control, because the present rulers are Hindu.

Four attempts have been made to settle this longstanding dispute, but so far without success. A fifth series of conferences on this question is now about to begin, and hopes for a successful solution are very slim.

Instead, a majority of the armed forces of both Pakistan and India confront each other on the border, forgetting for the time being their need to unite against a common enemy.

The current U.S. military assistance program to India, in which the British are participating, is to cost around $120 million. And this is only the beginning. A joint United States-British-Canadian mission recently returned from India after studying India's needs for offensive and defensive air power. Another mission has visited India to study ways of developing her defense production capacity. The Indian Army is to be expanded from the existing 11 divisions to 17 divisions in the near future. The United States will, no doubt, be asked to pick up the tab when the time comes to implement these proposals—a tab that may eventually run into billions of dollars.

What is the declared purpose of this heavy and obviously long-term military aid to India? To enable her to resist Communist aggression. But it seems to me that the method we have chosen to buttress Indian defenses against the Chinese Communists will, if persisted in, not only defeat our purposes in that region but may also lose for us the friendship of Pakistan, our stanchest ally in that part of the world.

The scale of the current U.S. military assistance to India, and the prospects of it continuing for the next 10 years—for that is Mr. Nehru's estimate of the time it will take to settle the Sino-Indian conflict—has caused alarm among the people of Pakistan. It is creating bitter resentment among the Pakistani people against U.S. policies in that region. Even so, there is no certainty, that if the hot war were to start again in the Himalayas, the Indians would be able to resist the Chinese attack any more successfully than they did last year.

Commenting on this subject, the Chicago Tribune had this to say in an editorial on February 27. I quote:

> Once again we find ourselves ignoring the interests of a country (Pakistan) with which we have firm military alliances in favor of those of India, which has studiously avoided committing itself to the West. If a country is our friend, Washington seems to reason there is nothing to gain by being nice to it. The folks we must humor are the uncommitted ones. Sooner or later our friends may decide that they are being made suckers.

The Tribune's warning is not to be taken lightly. Editorials in Pakistani newspapers have, in recent months, been outspokenly bitter in their criticism of U.S. military aid to India, a neutral country, which has made no secret of its hostility to Pakistan, a U.S. ally. Pakistanis feel they are being let down by their allies.

Now, why should the Pakistanis, who have been, and still are, our stanch allies, begin to think in those terms?

The Pakistanis argue—and no one has disputed their argument—that the key to the security of south Asia lies in a just and satisfactory settlement of the Kashmir dispute between Pakistan and India.

In the absence of such a settlement, we have seen the pathetic spectacle of India trying with a handful of troops to defend its borders against Chinese Communist attacks while maintaining an estimated 80 percent of its best-equipped forces massed against Pakistan.

This state of affairs is borne out by Mr. Saville R. Davis, of the Christian Science Monitor, who paid a visit to India to study the situation there during the Chinese attack. Writing in the Monitor's issue of March 1, 1963, he categorically states that the Nehru policy was to endorse, and here I quote Mr. Davis' own words:

> The stationing of most of India's Army with its best weapons on the frontier of Pakistan—while leaving the Chinese Communist frontier virtually undefended except by the interposition of patrols and armed posts and some half-hearted deploying of pathetically underequipped forces.

Listing the reasons for the Indian defeat by the Chinese, Mr. Davis says, and I quote again:

> That Mr. Nehru did not want to make concessions to Pakistan in Kashmir to free the Indian troops so they could face the Chinese.

Mr. Davis' conclusion was that the Indian nation under Mr. Nehru's leadership "was, and is, unsure where it is going." Let us see the course Mr. Nehru has charted for his government.

He is anxious to take from the United States all the military assistance this country can give him. Yet he insists on remaining allegedly unalined. I say "allegedly" because he has sided with the Soviet Union against us whenever it suits him, and will no doubt continue to do so, despite our aid. He insists that China's attack on India was not Communist aggression; instead, he calls it merely imperialist aggression. Rather than settle the Kashmir dispute with Pakistan, which would immediately release two-thirds of his army, now immobilized on Pakistan's borders, he wants to maintain the bulk of his forces against Pakistan and create a second army to face the Chinese. Hence his Government's decision to double the size of the Indian Army, which he hopes to arm with military assistance from the United States.

Unsure as the Indians are of the direction in which they are going so far as resisting Communist aggression is concerned, the United States is, nevertheless, prepared to give them heavy long-term military assistance despite the danger it might constitute to Pakistan and despite opposition from our Pakistani allies.

It is not surprising, then, that the Pakistanis should exhibit alarm at such U.S. policies.

Already the Indian Army, they say, is four times as strong as their own and more than three-fourths of it has always remained massed on Pakistan's borders. The recent Indian military takeover of Goa was a fresh reminder to the Pakistanis that no faith can be placed in Mr. Nehru's professions of peaceful intentions, or in his promises not to use American arms for purposes of aggression. They recall that, while explaining the reasons for the Indian military debacle in the recent fighting against the Chinese, Mr. Nehru publicly admitted that the Indian Army had been organized to fight Pakistan only. This is precisely what the Pakistanis had maintained ever since Mr. Nehru sent in his troops to occupy Kashmir. Indian leaders have repeatedly alleged that by her presence in Kashmir, Pakistan is guilty of continuing aggression against India and have suggested that Mr. Nehru take steps to put an end to this aggression, if necessary, by force of arms. They have publicly termed Pakistan as India's enemy No. 1.

All these factors have served to make the Pakistanis extremely suspicious of Indian military intentions. An India greatly strengthened with American arms, they argue, may or may not fight the Chinese Communists. It will certainly use its vastly increased military strength to intimidate or attack Pakistan. This danger is very real and cannot be ignored.

The aim of U.S. policy is to strengthen the security of the India-Pakistan subcontinent as a whole. What is needed to implement this sound policy is that the Indian and Pakistani forces in Kashmir and along the Indo-Pakistan borders be disengaged. This would immediately release six to seven divisions of the best equipped Indian forces for deployment against the Chinese, without the United States having to spend a single additional dollar of aid. Such a disengagement can be brought about only, however, if there is a just and satisfactory settlement of the Kashmir issue. Without it, Indian and Paskistani relations cannot improve and the armies of the two countries will continue to remain poised against each other, immobilized through mutual fear.

I cannot see how, under present circumstances, the supply of massive U.S. military equipment to India can serve to strengthen India's defenses against the Chinese Communists. On the contrary, continued U.S. military aid to India could only serve to make Mr. Nehru more determined in his resolve not to make concessions in the Kashmir dispute, which in turn will make the dispute itself more difficult to settle. Yet the key to the security of the entire south Asian region clearly lies in the settlement of the Kashmir issue and the establishment of a rapprochement between India and Pakistan which only a Kashmir solution can bring about.

To give military assistance to India without making it contingent upon a Kashmir settlement can only cause harm to the real interests of India, Pakistan, and the United States. If there is no Kashmir settlement, the security of India would not be increased despite the arms. In fact, both India and Pakistan could be further weakened by this heightening of tension between two neighbors with a common enemy. The U.S. taxpayer would have provided very large sums of money to no purpose. The only result of this policy would be to destroy the existing good relations between the United States, Pakistan, and India.

Some claim that a settlement between India and Pakistan is impossible. I do not think so.

India and Pakistan came to a mutual understanding on a problem at least as complex and important when agreement was reached on the Indus River Basin compact.

In 1949, the United Nations passed a resolution urging a plebiscite in Kashmir to determine the wishes of the majority of people in that area. India to date has refused to honor this resolution.

Supplying the arms and equipment for two nations to destroy each other while the wolf is waiting at the door to pick up what is left seems, to me, to be folly.

Unless there is some assurance that the arms we are supplying will not be used by two friends to fight each other, I think we should seriously reconsider military assistance to both Pakistan and India.

The need is apparent for India and Pakistan to face a common foe together, united in strength rather than weakened by division and conflict.

NATO and the coordinating of defense forces in free Europe certainly should demonstrate to India and Pakistan the absolute necessity of a common front against a common aggressor, whether that foe be communism, imperialism, or a combination of both.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 27, 1963]

WHY BE NICE TO OUR FRIENDS?

The announcement of our latest and largest development loan to India—$240 million for the purchase of foodstuffs—isn't going to contribute to our stature as an unbiased helper in the negotiations between India and Pakistan over Kashmir.

Our friendship and military alliance with Pakistan already have been jeopardized by the military aid we've given India since the Chinese invasion. Pakistan's suspicions have been aggravated by reports that when the Kashmir talks resume on March 9, the United States will propose a partition favorable to India.

The American plan, according to information from New Delhi, is supported by the British. Although it would give Pakistan at least half of all Kashmir, it would give India the capital, Srinagar, and most of the valley surrounding it—which is pretty much the only part of Kashmir worth having. Most of the state consists of snowy Himalayan peaks.

It would ignore the legitimate Pakistani contention that most of those who live in and around Srinagar are Moslems and would vote to join Pakistan.

Although Pakistan should be entitled to most of Kashmir on ethnic grounds and on the basis of self-determination, our Government seems to favor the claim of India, which is based on a legalistic act of accession by the late Maharajah of Jammu and Kashmir and on India's present possession of the Vale.

Once again we find ourselves ignoring the interests of a country with which we have firm military alliances in favor of those of India, which has studiously avoided committing itself to the West. If a country is our friend, Washington seems to reason, there's nothing to gain by being nice to it. The folks we must humor are the uncommitted ones. Sooner or later, our friends may decide that they're being made suckers.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 8, 1963]

INDIA NOW: IF THERE'S A NEW ATTACK BY CHINESE REDS—

(NOTE.—Mostly, it's business as usual in India, little sign of urgent alert against another invasion by Red China. Sol W. Sanders, of the international staff of U.S. News & World Report, studied Indian defenses and plans for this report from New Delhi.)

NEW DELHI.—It is just about half a year since Chinese Communists poured over the border and clobbered the Indian Army. It was a jolt that Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru says could be repeated any time.

Yet, the country is not on anything like a war footing, although a new defense budget is before Parliament.

The Army probably could do better than last time if the Reds attacked again. But it couldn't halt an offensive.

And Mr. Nehru, despite the shock the Communists gave him, still is committed to a policy of nonalignment.

The new budget includes the equivalent of $1.8 billion for defense, almost three times that of last year. But just before the budget was submitted, T. T. Krishnamachari, the Minister of Economic and Defense Coordination in the Nehru Cabinet, said that the economic measures to meet the emergency of renewed war with Communist China were both unrealistic and insufficient.

Additional troops are being raised. Plans are under way to recruit and train six new divisions for mountain warfare. With the aid of a dozen American transport planes and crews, the Indian Army has pushed supplies into several forward areas in the Himalayan regions bordering Chinese Communist Tibet. But no one believes this buildup has yet reached anything like the proportions needed to hold the Chinese in check.

Other elements are at work to endanger effective military cooperation among India, Britain, and the United States. Indian requests for Western aid are regarded as being quite impractical, in many cases. But refusal to meet these requests is being used by leftwing and anti-Western forces—centering around former Defense Minister V. K. Krishna Menon—to prove that Western help cannot be relied on.

This, in turn, is leading the Indians to count heavily on Russian help to brake the Chinese Communists. The result is almost certain to make effective cooperation between India and the United States that much more difficult.

POLITICS TO BLAME?

Looking back on the defeats of last autumn, observers here tend more and more to put the blame on the intrusion of politicians into strictly military questions—although shortage of materiel, Chinese superiority in men and weapons, surprise and terrain all played a role.

Military men say the essential mistake was the insistence by Prime Minister Nehru and Defense Minister Krishna Menon on the so-called forward positioning of Indian troops. This meant that Indian outposts were flung out on mountain pinnacles where they could not be defended. The policy was a calculated risk based on a belief that the Chinese Communists would never attack in force. But they did.

As a result of the defeats, both Gen. P. N. Thapar, chief of the army staff, and Gen. B. M. Kaul, who commanded the corps that suffered the greatest defeats have been removed. The new commander is Gen. J. N. Chaudri, who has been characterized by one of the foreign military attachés here as "a perfect British officer and gentleman."

A high Indian officer says now that if the Chinese should attack again, India would retreat to positions that could be defended and held.

TAKING THEIR TIME

What worries many foreign observers here is the slowness with which Indians are repairing deficiencies exposed by last year's attack. An American military mission has been set up under Brig. Gen. J. E. Kelly, an Infantry officer with experience in Asia. But so far the Indians have not taken many of General Kelly's hints of offers to extend training facilities. The same thing is true with the British.

A planning target established during the heat of the Chinese attack called for $120 million worth of American and British aid—$60 million from each side. But by March only about $30 million worth of the U.S. aid had arrived or was in the pipeline.

An Indian source says the aid is moving slowly because the Indians are screening their requests, carefully "since, theoretically, at least, we don't know whether there will be anything forthcoming after this $120 million is used up." But American sources put the blame on unrealistic requests they get from the Indians—that, plus the slowness with which requests are processed in the Indian Defense Ministry.

LOGISTICS OF LADAKH

Everybody admits that the job of building up Indian defense against the Chinese Communists is a terrific one. Take the example of the defense line in Ladakh, the northwestern corner of the 1,800-mile Indian frontier with Red China.

For 4 months, the Indians have been building stockpiles in the area against a possible Chinese attack this spring. This has been done with the help of U.S. air transports, since India does not have the aircraft required.

It has been a tremendous job. Yet, American military observers here believe that the huge tonnage necessary to maintain Indian forces in Ladakh cannot be permanently airlifted—even if India had the planes to do it.

The observers say that India needs two all-weather roads leading from the valley of Kashmir to Leh, the jump-off place in Ladakh for Indian defenses. U.S. sources estimate it would take at least 2,000 trucks, much heavy roadbuilding machinery, snow-handling equipment, and other equipment plus spare parts to turn the one truck route that is passable only part of the year into an adequate supply line. It could mount up to a $50 million project.

Such logistical problems abound along the whole northern frontier.

THE STUCK UMBRELLA

Also, there still is thorough confusion about Indian strategy and tactics. For example, consider the issue of an "air umbrella," as it has been called by Indian newspapers.

The Chinese Reds have at least 12, possibly 15, airfields capable of launching jets within easy range of India's 3 principal cities—Delhi, Calcutta, and Bombay. If hostilities broke out again now, the Communists would have virtual immunity from Indian air attack. It is believed they have jet interceptors that could keep India from bombing Tibet's difficult supply lines.

The Chinese also could make terror raids on Indian cities. It was fear of this that kept the Indians from using their tactical air support in the fighting in the northeast frontier agency last year.

AIR COVER—BUT HOW?

During the crisis last autumn, Mr. Nehru asked the United States for air cover for Indian cities. A joint United States-British-Australian-Canadian mission is preparing a report at India's request on the air-defense question.

But it is clear that any extensive buildup of the Indian Air Force—even if the United States and the rest of the West were willing to foot the bill—would take anywhere from 3 to 5 years.

It is also clear that any attempt to have Western air power here "on a standby basis" as some Indian newspapers have suggested would mean the presence of Western ground forces. Yet, Mr. Nehru insists that he will not tolerate Western bases in India—and that includes Western personnel permanently assigned here.

An American mission has toured India to see whether the country's two dozen ordnance plants can be overhauled. Some of these date back to before World War I.

The plants performed excellently under the British, and even supplied a good part of the munitions used during the Battle of Britain in World War II. But during the past 15 years the plants have been permitted to deteriorate.

One Indian official estimates that $125 million worth of capital equipment is needed just to begin their rehabilitation. And he says "eight times that figure" is needed in foreign-exchange support for the defense budget—largely to finance the importation of raw materials. These figures do not include future capital equipment for the ordnance plants, many of which appear to American observers to be suitable only for scrapping.

A BURDEN—BUT WHOSE?

What part of this burden can the Indians bear themselves? Very little, the Indians believe. The argument is that, should a large part of their resources be diverted from their 5-year development plans, the country would be further weakened and exposed to Red subversion.

The Indians maintain—and most foreign observers here agree—that very little of this planned economic development could be turned to defense purposes. Much of the money is committed to specific projects. Their abandonment would weaken the overall defense effort, since they are devoted to building up India's basic structure—steel, railroads and power.

So far, about the only important measure the Government has taken to meet the crisis that grew out of the Communist attack is to try to gather up India's huge hoard of privately held gold. Some economists estimate it to be as much as $10 billion.

The Government has asked private holders of gold to declare their holdings and has offered a 6½-percent gold-bond loan. It has forbidden jewelers to make gold into jewelry of more than 14-carat purity.

Critics of the Government policy—including most businessmen—say these steps not only are unreasonable, but are damaging to the economy.

In a country where some of the highest interest rates in the world prevail, the 6½-percent bond issue is regarded as a joke. Also, by searching for bullion, the Government has driven it into hiding and closed off one of the most important sources of credit financing in India.

Businessmen and bankers predict a wide-scale flouting of the gold law. They say it will bring an increase in black-marketing and will create general antagonism toward the Government at a time when national unity is essential.

UNLEARNED LESSONS

About half a year after a shocking military defeat, there is little evidence that the Indians learned many lessons from their experience on the Chinese border.

Mr. Nehru said after the Chinese Communist attack that India had been living in a world of unreality of its own creation. It seems incredible that India should ever move back into that world. Yet, most observers here believe that, to a large extent, that is exactly what has happened.

PUT TEETH IN EXPORT CONTROL ACT

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the merry-go-round policies of the State and Commerce Departments, and point out some very interesting revelations that require this Congress to put some teeth in the Export Control Act.

Since the beginning of 1963, the Department of Commerce has persisted in issuing export licenses authorizing the shipment of such strategic materials as steel mill machine parts, synthetic rubber, woodpulp, recording and controlling instruments and electrical devices, to Russia, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and other Communist nations.

This trade is voluminous, running into many millions of dollars. One such authorization was for $4 million worth of rolling mill machine parts to Yugoslavia. This type of mill is used to reduce steel ingots into intermediary sizes and shapes before further processing into such things as steel plates, rails, wheels, sheets and skelp—which is used in the manufacture of oil pipe, the very type of pipe which the United States and NATO have asked Germany not to ship to Russia.

The products of this mill are also to be used in the machine building and ship construction industries, and Yugoslavia has been engaging in shipping and trade with Cuba.

The synthetic rubber we ship to Czechoslovakia is for the manufacture of tires, and the woodpulp to Russia is for the manufacture of rayon tire cord. It is not inconceivable that this same material finds its way into the tires used on the military equipment these countries have delivered to Cuba.

The recording and controlling instruments and other electrical equipment are of the same type that is found on the Russian fishing trawlers that spied on our nuclear testing in the Pacific and that have recently been seen prowling all corners of the globe collecting data and intelligence.

Apparently, the only way to bring a halt to this practice is to tie the hands of the Departments of Commerce and State by putting teeth in the Export Control Act.

Incredibly, many of these same purchases are financed through the Export-Import Bank, an organization which acts as agent for the U.S. Treasury. The Export-Import Bank negotiates the loan with the Communist nation, then borrows the money from the U.S. Treasury and lends it to the Communist nation to make the purchase. This, in effect, is using the taxpayers' money to enhance the Communist economy.

Last year, Congress authorized the Export-Import Bank to borrow up to $750 million for development loans.

What good are economic sanctions by this country against Cuba if she can obtain these materials indirectly from the United States through her Communist allies?

How can we expect to win the cold war by making it possible for these Communist countries to obtain these strategic materials through the use of U.S. tax dollars? Where is this merry-go-round going to lead us?

APPALACHIAN HIGHLANDS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing provides for immediate action and for longer time comprehensive planning for developing the resources of the Appalachian Highlands area.

The time is long past due to take more positive action to prevent disastrous floods such as were experienced in 1957 when there were $40 million worth of damages in eastern Kentucky alone. Again in 1963 a similar disastrous loss occurred with like amounts in eastern Kentucky and in Virginia, West Virginia, Tennessee, and other States.

These disastrous losses can be prevented, and at the same time productive and profitable use can be made of the abundant rainfall with which this whole region is blessed. Plans are underway to build more reservoirs under authorities already in existence, but I am proposing a greatly expanded program for water resource developments in the Appalachian Highlands area.

In this bill, I am proposing both a long-range approach and an immediate acceleration of action under existing authorities.

To accomplish this, I have made a four-pronged approach under four titles.

Title I provides for an Appalachian Highlands Commission composed of Federal agencies and representatives appointed by the Governor of each of the 11 States in the region. This proposal is patterned after the legislation that established the U.S. study commissions for the Texas river basins and the river basins of Southeastern States. This Commission could be formed immediately, and could begin at once to prepare comprehensive plans for development of the entire Appalachian Highlands region. Such a Commission would not preclude the formation of an Appalachian States Interstate Compact at such time as it is needed. In fact, I would favor the formation of such an interstate compact. But to form such a compact might require several years. The Commission I am proposing could get underway immediately with studies, surveys, and long-range plans to deal with the many complex problems of accelerated development of recreation, timber supply, water commerce industry, and full employment.

As a part of this bill I have incorporated the provisions of a bill which I previously introduced as H.R. 2610, 88th Congress, 1st session. This provides for a new approach to meeting the peculiar needs of this area for conserving and developing soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation on farms and woodlands of the Appalachian Highlands. I have proposed a $100 million appropriation authorization for this work.

I have made provision to get underway with immediate action by authorizing an appropriation of $500 million to accelerate Federal public works programs under existing authorities, but with cost-sharing provisions more in keeping with the needs of this area than are provided for in existing programs. I am proposing an amendment to the Small Watershed Act, which I had previously introduced as H.R. 4189, to adapt the authorities of that program to the special conditions in depressed rural areas.

A more detailed summary of the bill follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR A RESOURCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR THE APPALACHIAN HIGHLANDS AREA

The President would be authorized under the bill to establish the boundaries of the Appalachian Highlands area within the States of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, and to designate the counties in which the provisions of titles I, II, and III would be applicable.

The bill would provide for the formulation and submission to Congress of a comprehensive plan of resource and economic development in the Appalachian Highlands area by a Commission composed of representatives of Federal departments and agencies and of the concerned States. Pending the authorization of the plan by Congress, the bill would authorize a program for the conservation and development of soil and water resources through Federal assistance agreements with landowners, operators, and occupiers in the Appalachian Highlands area, and would also authorize acceleration in such area by Federal departments and agencies of public works projects and programs carried out by such departments and agencies.

TITLE I

Title I would provide for the formulation of a comprehensive plan for flood prevention and control, domestic and municipal water supply, improvement and safeguarding navigation, reclamation and irrigation of land, including drainage, possibility of hydroelectric power and industrial development, soil conservation, forest conservation, preservation, protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources, salinity and sediment control, pollution abatement and protection of public health, industrial, housing, transportation and other economic development, and other beneficial and useful purposes.

The plan would be formulated within guidelines set out in the bill by an Appalachian Highlands Commission composed of a chairman, to be appointed by the President; Federal members representing the Departments of Agriculture, Army, Commerce, Health, Education and Welfare, Interior, and Labor, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, to be appointed by the heads of such departments and agencies; and State members representing the States in the Appalachian Highlands Area, to be appointed by the Governor of each State.

The duties, functions, and authorities of the Appalachian Highlands Commission are prescribed, and the compensation of the chairman and State members are set forth. Federal members would receive no additional compensation.

In the formulation of the comprehensive plan respecting the control, conservation and utilization of water, conservation and development of land resources, flood prevention and control, navigation, reclamation, agriculture purposes, power, recreation, fish and wildlife, economic development, and other needs set out in title I, the Commission would be directed, among other things, to take into consideration certain prescribed benefits, utilize the services, studies, surveys and reports of existing Government agencies, and to include in the plan specified costs, benefits, and payout schedules, and the Commission's recommendations concerning construction and operation of the projects therein.

Prior to the submission of the comprehensive plan to the Congress through the President, the plan would be submitted to each Federal department or agency and to the Governors of each State represented on the Commission, for their written views, comments or recommendations.

TITLE II

Title II would provide for a program in the Appalachian Highlands Area for the conservation and development of soil and water resources, including land use adjustments and the beneficial use of lands. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to enter into agreements of not more than 15 years with landowners, operators, and occupiers in counties having serious need of protection of lands from water erosion, and flooding or sedimentation, stabilization and improvement of the quality of streamflow, development of beneficial uses of land, including improved woodland, and private recreational and fish and wildlife developments, or improvement of local living conditions and of opportunities for raising the level of family income through conservation and development of soil and water resources.

In return for the agreement by such landowners, operators, or occupiers to make needed changes in land use, and to establish practices and measures needed to conserve and develop soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation resources, the Secretary would be authorized to furnish them with appropriate technical, financial, and other assistance.

Acreage allotments and marketing quota histories would be preserved for any landowners, operators, or occupiers during the period of the agreement, and for an equivalent period thereafter for specified purposes.

An appropriation of $100 million would be authorized to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE III

Title III would authorize the direct Federal departments and agencies to accelerate within the Appalachian Highlands Area, to the maximum extent feasible under authorized increased appropriations, existing public works programs and other programs providing technical or financial assistance, grants or loans to States and local agencies. It would provide that all land rights needed for such projects and programs, except those needed in connection with Federal projects, would be acquired by and in the name of State and local agencies in accordance with the provisions of State laws. It would increase the existing statutory percentage of Federal financial participation in such projects and programs by one-half the difference between the existing statutory percentage and 100-per centum Federal participation. An appropriation of $500 million would be authorized to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV

Title IV would amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that in areas in which Federal grants and loans may be made under the Public Works Acceleration Act the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to bear the costs of relocations, removals, and replacements needed to make land, easements, and rights-of-way acquired by local organizations suitable for the installation of works of improvement, and that such costs would not need to be considered in determining benefit-cost ratios. It would also authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to bear an equitable part of the cost of installing works of improvements for the added purpose of water quality control.

THE WILDERNESS BILL

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1963, I introduced H.R. 5246, to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people of our Nation. This measure is substantially the same as the bill introduced in the U.S. Senate by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would block development and exploitation of the few remaining virgin areas left in the United States. It creates a national wilderness preservation system of about 6.8 million acres.

I like the language of this legislation. Senator ANDERSON's definition of what wilderness is, is both eloquent testimony of our wilderness areas and strong argument for enactment of this legislation. It states:

> Wilderness—in contrast with those areas where man and his works dominate the landscape—wilderness is an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man—where man himself is a visitor who does not remain.

In a very short time—because of commercial development or the growing recreational program—there will not be many areas left in California nor throughout the Nation where "the earth and its community are untrammeled by man—where man himself is a visitor who does not remain."

Mr. Speaker, as a native Californian, I have seen vast sections of our outdoors give way to front doors, sliding doors, and picture windows—with no picture left to view. Nor are Californians the only Americans who have seen this. All Americans see this endless drama unfold every day. This is growth. This is boom. This is progress. This drama is, in fact, one measure of our Nation's greatness. Pioneers who tested their cunning and skill against the elements to tame the wilderness are national heroes. And well they should be. They tamed the West and laid the groundwork for this prosperous life we now enjoy.

In many ways, this pioneering spirit is seen today as the businessmen who risk their capital and their energy and time to develop new lands—to build homes and streets and shopping centers on the land. This is good. This is progress.

My fear is that in our dedication to progress—in our sturdy individualism—that one day we may wake up to find our State and our Nation with no land left "untrammeled by man."

There is another equally important factor to consider, too. It is this: The decrease in primitive, virgin land in this country is not due to commercial interests alone. It is due also to the unprecedented pressure of our States and Federal Government to open more and more park lands to mass public recreational uses.

What does this mean? It means recreational facilities—roads and boat landings—cabins and barbecue pits—cars and trailers—service stations and restaurants.

In a word, it means civilization. And that starts with C and that rhymes with T and that stands for trouble.

Trouble for those of us who believe some wilderness areas should be set aside and left exactly as they are.

Trouble for the generations of Americans who will follow us. We have seen the wilderness. We must ask ourselves: Will they? There will be outdoor recreation, to be sure. But will there be any wilderness left? Will any areas remain where "man and his works have not begun to dominate the landscape"?

Let me read a little more from the bill itself:

> Wilderness is further defined to mean an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence—with the imprint of man's works substantially unnoticeable.

Recreational areas show the imprint of man's works. The imprint is there—from lodges to superscenic highways to advertisements. The imprint is as bold as life and as up to date as the cheerful billboards reminding us that "every litter bit hurts." Indeed, every litter bit does hurt. I feel a pain every time I am reminded of that fact in that manner. Yes—a thousand times, yes—I am against litter bugs—be they driving down Market Street or toasting marshmallows at Lake Tahoe.

But it seems to me that there ought to be some lands preserved in our Nation where there are no antilitter signs, littering up the landscape—where there are no picnic tables and salt licks—and man and beast are alone on the land from which they sprang. The land is our land—yours and mine. And we ought to preserve some of it—just a little of it anyway—just the way it was created.

We are not asking too much, really. The wilderness bill would include in its national wilderness preservation system only about 2 percent of the more than 2 billion acres of national land area. Two percent of 2 billion. That is not very much.

The wilderness bill will create a wilderness area system to be composed of areas that are already reserved and restricted—forest, park and wildlife areas. These areas will continue to be administered by the agency now in charge of it. There would be no change of their present purpose—as game ranges or refuges or parks or monuments or forests. We would simply add to their administration the new condition that they remain wilderness areas. And cannot be reclassified without an act of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation will insure a sensible and logical program of our overall land, water, and resource conservation program. It would be most meaningful in holding large timber stands and preserving our water runoff sheds.

Let me point out that all of these areas subject to inclusion in the wilderness system are presently restricted areas. They have already been set aside by Congress, by the President or the Department of Interior or Agriculture for special purposes—including preservation of their natural state.

What the bill does is this: It says that those areas presently under a high degree of wilderness protection may be placed in the wilderness system upon the recommendation of the President. But any new areas—areas not already restricted—can only be included in the wilderness system by Act of Congress.

Inclusion of the wild and wilderness and primitive, park and wildlife areas in the wilderness system will cause little or no disturbance to individuals or communities or economic patterns. These areas have been restricted for years. There have been no timber sales from forest lands involved so there are no lumber mills dependent on them which would be forced to close down.

In short, there is virtually no change in the status quo. The bill simply makes wilderness preservation a statutory directive. The existing administering agency continues to hold responsibility for the land. The bill does not set up any new agencies or new categories of land classification.

In introducing this bill in 1961, Senator Anderson said that he did not remember a witness before his Senate Interior Committee who was opposed to preserving some of our great, natural scenic areas in their primitive, natural state. The debate he said, had been over how the preservation would be accomplished—over what safeguards would be placed around the wilderness system once it had been established.

I think the arguments in support of the bill are sound. I agree with Interior Secretary Udall when he says that "wilderness can be preserved only by positive public action designating and protecting areas of wilderness."

I agree with a spokesman for the AFL-CIO who pointed out that the wilderness bill offers "every reasonable concession to those who fear that economic development may be hindered by setting aside certain wilderness areas."

Mr. Speaker, as a Californian I believe I am in a unique and enviable position of seeing—at closer range, perhaps, than many other people—why this legislation is important—why it is so necessary that we pass it as soon as possible—why this is in a very real sense last-chance legislation.

I think a short summary of reasons for supporting this bill go something like this:

America is growing. To be sure, we have very serious problems—unemployment, for example, is much too high—production in many industries is well below capacity—but the undeniable fact is that we are growing. California—the No. 1 State in the Union—is vigorous testimony to that growth.

Every year California must provide 200,000 to 300,000 new jobs. Because 1,600 new citizens arrive in our State every day. And we must build and build and build—new homes and schools and highways and playgrounds and supermarkets and harbors and department stores.

A hundred years from now students will ask their history professors, Well, did it ever stop—all this building and growing?

I know the answer will be, "No, it never stopped." They were bold, ambitious, enterprising people—these energetic citizens of the sixties. They went right on building their schools and their homes and highways and playgrounds.

But they were not so consumed with their own destiny—their own needs and ambitions—that they forgot about ours.

They left us their spirit—they left us their natural resources—they even left us some of their wilderness as a reminder of our past and our heritage. This they inherited from those who went before them. This they preserved for us. This we must preserve, too.

UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION OR UPHOLD THE JUDGES?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Casey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sam Holliday, of San Antonio, Tex., has written a very provocative analysis of our Supreme Court's recent operations. In my opinion Mr. Holliday, whom I have the pleasure of knowing for many, many years, is a very able student of constitutional law. It gives me pleasure to insert his analysis and observations in the Record at this point:

Does the Supreme Court of the United States Have the Right To Reverse Prior Constitutional Interpretations by That Court?

In considering this question, we are immediately met with the evident and undisputable fact that the Constitution does not state that the Supreme Court may interpret the Constitution. It does not say anything whatever about the matter. Many eminent men, including Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence and one of the inspirers of the American Bill of Rights, incorporated into the Constitution, were of the opinion that the Supreme Court had no more power to interpret the Constitution than did the other branches of the Government in their respective spheres. The Court's asserted right is based, upon a claimed logical necessity. It is claimed that the Court, in applying the Constitution to the facts in cases coming before it, must ascertain, or interpret, the true meaning of the Constitution in order to know what it was applying. In other words, it is claimed that the Court is called upon, or has the duty, to search for and ascertain the Constitution's true meaning and then apply that meaning to the facts before the Court.

Much criticism has been heaped upon those, especially lawyers, who do not agree with recent reversals of prior constructions of the Constitution by the Supreme Court. Generally, such reversals occurred when the Court was composed of a different group of judges than those who rendered the prior decision. The basis of such criticism is that the Supreme Court has the duty to interpret the Constitution, when it needs interpreting to arrive at its true meaning; that as the Court is only interpreting the Constitution to ascertain its true meaning in order to apply such meaning, that, when the Court does interpret, or construes, a provision, that is, when it has ascertained or found its true meaning, such interpretation should be accepted as the same as the provision. It is claimed that it is the duty of all citizens to uphold such interpretation just as if that had been the way the provision in question had been expressed when it became part of the Constitution, because that was its true meaning when it was adopted, only expressed differently. It is claimed that such interpretation must be upheld whether the lawyer critic, or other critic, likes it or not, just as it is his duty to uphold the express terms of the Constitution, whether he likes it or not. This writer has no fault to find with such reasoning.

But the duty to uphold the Constitution and such an interpretation is not only that of the lawyer, the official, the soldier, and other citizens, but it is also the obligation of the members of the Supreme Court themselves. They, like the lawyers and other citizens, are obliged to uphold all of the Constitution. And if an interpretation becomes a part of it, then the judges themselves, like the lawyers and other citizens, have sworn to and are obligated to uphold it, just as they are obligated to uphold the Constitution as written, whether they like it or not. It would appear axiomatic that, if they are not so obligated, neither is anybody else, because the obligation of each to uphold it is the same. Is the Constitution which the lawyer swears to uphold the same or a different Constitution from that which the judges of the Supreme Court swear to uphold?

There is only one Constitution of the United States of America, and all citizens, regardless of their position, not excluding judges of the Supreme Court, are all alike dutybound to uphold it.

Does a lawyer, official, soldier, or citizen have the right to say, "I will not uphold this provision, or this interpretation, because it is out of date and should be changed?" It is evident that he does not.

Does a judge of the Supreme Court have the right to say, "I will not uphold this provision, or this interpretation, because it is out of date and should be changed?" It is still evident that he does not.

Suppose that the night before a reversal is made by the Supreme Court, a lawyer is upholding the Constitution as originally interpreted by such Court, which had correctly interpreted it as having the meaning it had when it was adopted. But the following morning, without his knowledge, the Supreme Court reverses such prior interpretation and gives it a meaning opposite to the original interpretation. Thereupon, still without knowledge of the change, the lawyer continues upholding the constitutional interpretation as he was the day before. Who would be upholding the Constitution, the lawyer or the judges who attempt to change the prior interpretation? Is it the lawyer's duty to uphold the Constitution or to uphold the judges?

It is inconceivable to this writer's mind that the judges can emit judgments, orders, or whatnot, which everybody, except themselves, is dutybound to uphold. Our laws are applicable to all citizens, generally. We do not have a two-class citizenship, one composed of nine judges who are above the law and yet who, at the same time, can make what amounts to law binding on everybody else, the second-class citizens. I do not believe that we have a nation of 180 million second-class citizens, including writer, and nine first-class citizens. In a society of our background and traditions, it cannot be that the judges of the Court can set the limits of their own power, for in such a case there would be no limits to such power. Would the government then be by the people? How could it be, if the people have no effective will, no power, as a matter of RIGHT to decide on their government? How could this be if any expression of their will must depend on the will of nine men, and any expression of their will can be disregarded, nullified and destroyed by those nine men? And the quaint idea in the Declaration of Independence that every just power is derived "from the consent of the governed," where would it fit in?

I beg you earnestly to consider the following reasoning.

There are at least three reasons why the Supreme Court cannot change, that is, amend by interpretation, by construction, the meaning of a provision of the Constitution, or its equivalent, a prior interpretation, which, as such an interpretation, has become of constitutional status, or as it is sometimes stated, "a part of the Constitution."

The first reason is that the Constitution contains no provision giving the Court such right. This was no oversight because the Constitution does provide how it is to be amended, and the Court is not mentioned in this connection. Is this not proof that the authors, great and learned men, who labored so earnestly and ably to make the Constitution clear, simple, and comprehensive, as well as the people who adopted it, had no intention of giving the Court such power, under the well recognized rule of legal construction, "Inclusio unius est eclusio alterius."

But the fundamental question as raised by the Court itself, is this: "Can the Supreme Court change the meaning of the Constitution, including prior interpretations, in order to make the Constitution better, to make it suit what the Court considers to be our current conditions and the better current sociological thought?"

Whether a particular decision was good or bad, or whether any particular change in the Constitution should have been made is not herein considered. We here are only interested in whose right it is to make changes in meaning in the Constitution.

Writer has never heard of anyone who claims that the authors who wrote the original Constitution, and the people who adopted it, thought they were providing that the Supreme Court could amend the Constitution. If they did, why didn't they say so? Furthermore, in such case, why did they expend so much effort, care, and thought in writing out a full Constitution at all? It would have been much simpler, and equally as effective, to have provided something like this: "There shall be one Supreme Court and its word shall be the Constitution and the supreme law of the land; and such Court may, as and when it sees fit, change or amend such Constitution, in the manner it sees fit, by its word alone."

Can anyone believe that Madison's hand could, in seriousness, have written anything meaning that? Can anyone believe that Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Franklin, John Adams, and other patriots would have agreed to it? And that grizzled, lean, austere, uncompromising, old Samuel Adams, whose life was so enmeshed with the struggle for freedom that one can hardly think of the one without thinking of the other, would he have agreed to it, or would he have died first?

Who can believe that the people, after revolting and undergoing nearly 8 years of suffering, hardship, and war to get freedom would have adopted such a provision denying them that freedom?

It is certain that that did not happen, and I will waste no more time on whether the Constitution, at the time of its adoption, meant that it could be amended by the Supreme Court. If the Court ever acquired such right, it happened in some other way and later. We will in this discussion, I believe, arrive at a correct conclusion as to whether this happened.

If the Court has the right to change, or amend, a prior interpretation, or construction, that is, an explanation of the meaning of the Constitution, which has become a part of the Constitution, it can also change a part of equal dignity, an express provision of the Constitution. If it can change it to what one person believes is good, it can change it to what another person believes is good, although it may seem bad to the first person. We are all aware that the 13th amendment provides that slavery may not exist in the United States. Does the Court have the right to say (not, will it do so) that such provision is now changed and it means, "Slavery may exist anywhere within the territorial limits of the United States, notwithstanding any objection by any particular State"?

If the judges of the Court can decide what is forward, they can decide that backward is forward, because, if their will is the test, that which is backward and that which is forward depend upon the ideas and whims of the judges of the Court. It may just as well be the reverse of what those who support discretionary power for the Court believe, just as some of its reversals are the reverse of what some other people believe.

But the Constitution is inviolate. It is this inviolability of the Constitution, or what the cases call inviolatus, and not stare decisis, which makes the Constitution invulnerable against changes without constitutional amendment. The Doctrine of inviolatus means that the Court cannot make changes in the meaning of the Constitution because it is sacred as it is. Stare decisis has no application to constitutional construction.

The second reason that the Supreme Court has no such right is that any right of the Court to make such a change would be diametrically opposed to, inconsistent with, the duty of the Court to interpret, to ascertain and to apply the true meaning of the Constitution so as to preserve it inviolate, and to protect it, the only function which the Supreme Court has with respect to the Constitution. Consider this a moment. The Court, as a court, has no choice whatever with respect to the Constitution other than to decide the form, not the meaning, of its interpretations. The meaning has already been set by the Constitution which the Court is interpreting or ascertaining. There are rights under the Constitution in the judges, as citizens, and those rights are no different from those in other individual citizens. But, as a court, its relation to the Constitution is principally that of a duty owed. The duty is to perform a function. That function, as above stated, is to apply the Constitution and to interpret it so as to preserve it, preserving its meaning. The function is commensurate with the duty and extends only as far as the duty extends. Where there is no duty, there is no function to perform. The duty arises in necessity to ascertain and make clear and apply the true meaning of the Constitution, and the function goes no further than the duty and the necessity. The right which is correlative to the Court's duty is in the people and it is to have the Court faithfully interpret the Constitution.

Expressed in another way, the function of the Court to interpret the Constitution is necessary in order for it to perform its duty to apply the true meaning of the Constitution to the facts coming before the Court. Such facts vary. Rarely, if ever, are the facts before the Court in the exact words, or the exact opposite of the words of, the Constitution. Hence the necessity that the Court ascertain, or interpret, the meaning of the Constitution with reference to such facts. This necessity is the only excuse or reason for the Court's construing, that is to say interpreting, the Constitution. The function of the Court arises in and exists only from and to the extent of such duty, and the duty arises in and is dependent upon such necessity. Therefore, the function to interpret the Constitution goes only to the extent of such necessity. Such necessity sets the limits of the function of the Court to interpret.

If there is no such necessity, there is no call for an interpretation, and, therefore, no duty or function to interpret. It is not necessary to misinterpret to interpret. From this it is evident that the Court's duty and function does not extend to misinterpreting, that is changing the meaning of, a provision of the Constitution, for this would be contrary to and would destroy the meaning which the Court is dutybound to ascertain, or interpret, and to apply. The function to interpret the Constitution is the exact opposite to and is inconsistent with any function to misinterpret or to give another meaning to, to change, the Constitution. The Court cannot discharge its duty to apply, to interpret and to protect, preserve and uphold the Constitution by attacking it and destroying it. Therefore the Court has no such function, much less a right, to change, or amend, the Constitution.

The third reason that the Court cannot amend the Constitution, or an interpretation with constitutional status, is because the Constitution positively, and clearly, though not in so many words, prohibits the Supreme Court from doing so. What provision is that?

It is the one directly and affirmatively stating how the Constitution is to be amended. It provides that it can be amended by the people through their representatives. One may say, "Yes, but this is not a statement that the Court can't." Yes, it is, in effect, for consider this:

I am not relying only on the well known rule of construction, "Inclusio unius est exclusio alterius." Such rule is, of course, applicable. But there is a much more compelling and fundamental reason why such right in the people excludes the same right in the Court. This reason is that, if the Court can have such power as a right, then the people cannot, despite the clear and express provisions in the Constitution that they can. If the Court can, by interpreting, change the meaning of a provision or an amendment adopted by the people, the Court can reject such provision or amendment and the people's act would be futile. Hence either the one or the other of such claimed rights must yield. Of course, if such claimed rights conflict and are inconsistent, then the claimed right in the Court would have to cede in view of the clear, direct statement in the Constitution that the people can amend it.

How do they conflict? If the Court, at will, amends, or changes the Constitution, or an interpretation which has become a part thereof, it must be because the Court decides to make a change in its meaning. If the Court can change it because it is bad or wrong or for any other notion of its own, then it is the idea of the judges which limits the right to make the change. If the judges' idea as to what change they want to make is the test, then they could make a change whenever they take a notion to do so; they could do it immediately upon the adoption of an amendment or later when the notion struck them. This would amount to the right of veto over any amendment by the people. Then the right of the people would be ineffective and such right would exist only so long as the judges decided not to veto it. It is clear then that the right of the people to amend would not then exist as a right at all, but only as a matter of sufferance or grace on the part of the judges of the Court. A so-called right that does not exist, except by sufferance or grace of another man or men, is no right. Then the two rights would be antagonistic and the Court's right would be destructive of the people's so-called right. But the Constitution expressly provides that the people have such right and says nothing about the Court's having any such right. Therefore the claimed right of the Court is necessarily denied by the recognition of the inconsistent right in the people. The provision that the people have such right cannot be twisted to mean they cannot.

The Court does have the same right that all its predecessors had—the right to construe, to interpret, that is, to ascertain, the meaning of the Constitution, to reinterpret the meaning of it, or of a prior interpretation, and to respect their own constitutional acts, as many times as may be necessary to apply the meaning of the Constitution to the varying facts which may come before that Court, but not to change, that is to amend, such meaning.

There are two exceptions, as writer sees it, when a later Court can set aside a prior interpretation: If the interpretation were made through fraud, and if the prior interpretation was wrong in that it did not give a provision the meaning it had when it was adopted. If there were such a cause of fraud, there would have been no interpretation at all and, consequently, such purported interpretation could be ignored by a subsequent Supreme Court. In the second case the Court would not have performed its function to give a provision its true meaning, and the Court cannot intentionally or through mistake change the meaning of a provision of the Constitution. But these exceptions do not authorize the Court to make changes in the meaning of an interpretation for other reasons, certainly not because the Court thinks a provision is "bad" and should not have been adopted by the people, and certainly not because the Court believes that "the better modern sociological thought" has changed and now considers a provision "bad" that was before thought to be "good." Any misinterpretation by a later Court is likewise vulnerable and can be corrected, if the Court does not give a provision the correct meaning it had when it was adopted.

The supporters of discretionary power for the Court do not seem to understand that, when they advocate the Court's having the right, at will, to interpret out of existence prior interpretations, which have reached constitutional status, they are in reality advocating the destruction of the entire process of constitutional interpretation by the Supreme Court and hence the destruction of constitutional government. How does this follow:

If the limitations are removed as to the present Court, they likewise are removed from the next and ensuing Courts. If the prior interpretations mean nothing to this Court, then this Court's interpretations would mean nothing to the next and future Courts. Each Court would be able to interpret the Constitution and prior interpretations as it sees fit, thereby being able to disregard the prior acts of the Court and to interpret them out of existence. The will of the judges would then become the only law. The Constitution, and prior interpretations, including those of all past, present and future Courts, would become surplusage. A Constitution that is surplusage and which cannot furnish a binding rule is no Constitution and might just as well never have been written. As a result of too much power in the Court, the entire constitutional system would have disappeared. A true Constitution is a limitation on the Court. If there is no limitation, there is no Constitution. An interpretation, to be effective as an interpretation, must have binding effect. If it does not have binding effect, then that which has equal dignity, a written provision of the Constitution, would have no binding effect and we would have government by fiat, or order, by the word of a few men, changeable at their discretion. What the discretionary power of a judge means has been considered before. On other occasions I have called to your attention that one such case is that of *State* v. *Cummings*, 36 Mo. 263, in which it is said:

"The discretion of a judge is the law of tyrants; it is always unknown; it is different in different men; it is casual and depends on constitution, temper and passion. At best it is often caprice; in its worst it is every vice, folly and passion to which human nature can be liable."

THE CENTURY OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have taken the privilege of calling the attention of the House to some of the public expressions of our Vice President.

I am satisfied that these expressions of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson are not going unnoticed by the Members of this House, but I feel it important that they be recorded in the Record of the Congress since they constitute important parts of the history we are every day living.

Vice President Johnson has time and again demonstrated his keen skill in taking the pulse of our history. He is particularly well situated to perform this service, for no other man in government is so privy to the expressions, the moods, the beliefs, and the actions of both the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

Our Vice President is sensitive to the nuances of current events and is in a position to comment on them as they recede from time to time to form the history of our time. His comments on this century as "The Century of Human Rights" are a worthy addition to the records of this day.

The Century of Human Rights

(Address by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson upon receiving the B'nai B'rith Human Rights Award, New York City, April 4, 1963)

You do me a very great honor by this award tonight. For deeply personal reasons, it is a most gratifying honor—most gratefully received—and I thank you for it.

In responding to what has been so generously said, I realize that I cannot divorce my personal words from my public station nor can I disregard the public nature of this occasion. But insofar as it is possible, I would like to speak with you as I might do privately.

This century in which we live has been given many names. One predecessor in the office I hold described it eloquently as the "century of the common man." Others have applied different descriptions of both hope and despair. For myself, I feel it may be most accurately and aptly described as the "century of human rights."

It may seem paradoxical to refer to a century which has seen the rise of two of the greatest tyrannies in history—fascism and communism—as the century of human rights. But in the light of historic human behavior, it becomes apparent that there is no paradox whatsoever—in fact, that the rise of these forces is evidence of the growing strength of the cause of equality.

The intense fury with which the totalitarians of both the right and the left deny the concept of human rights is the measure of their realization that their cause is doomed. People who are truly confident, people who truly believe they represent the wave of the future, do not resort to mass denial of age-old religious practices, mass denial of political rights, or mass extermination. These are the weapons of frustration—the last resort of men who know, however loudly they may deny the fact, that they have reached the end of one of the blind alleys of history.

It is difficult for our generation—which has known of Dachau and Warsaw, of the imprisonment of cardinals and the fate of Passover in the Soviet Union—to realize the tremendous advance of the concept of equal rights in the mid-20th century.

A few short decades ago, the thought that all men and women—regardless of race, creed, color or origin—were entitled to equality of treatment was a novel idea.

There was a concept of tolerance, but to far too many people it was a tolerance for "lesser breeds without the law" who were to be treated with kindness and humanity but not with equal regard as fellow human beings.

There are very few thinking men today who regard this kind of tolerance as a virtue, however much it may have contributed at one time to "peaceful" relations. The whole moral drive of the Western World is focused on the concept that we are all children of God—however we may worship our God—and entitled to judgment on our individual merits without regard to irrelevant considerations of ancestry.

This is the true "wave of the future"—the fulfillment of the dreams and hopes of moral men throughout the ages. However much we may fall short of our ideals, we are striving to attain them with an intensity heretofore unknown to history. They have become an accepted part of the fabric of our society. And however vehement may be the forces of bigotry, the fact remains that those forces are on the defensive. They are fighting a losing battle.

That is why I am confident our century—the century of human rights—will be remembered for the legacy it leaves to the future more than for its inheritance from the past.

SEASON OF CHANGE

I would like to speak for these few moments about certain of our special American responsibilities to the greater fulfillment of this century of human rights.

It is abundantly clear that in the course of our Nation's affairs, we have arrived at a season of change in our policies and our relationships with the world—especially the non-Communist world. A period of searching reassessment has begun. However, we lose—and others lose—a necessary and indispensable perspective, when we neglect the fact that this is also a time for reassessment by all nations of the free world community.

All of us together are emerging from a period which has seen history's greatest explosion of political rights. We are also emerging from the early phase of what has been called the explosion of economic aspirations. In a very brief period, new world standards of political equality and equality of economic expectations have been established and we cannot neglect the implications.

We of America welcome what has happened. We are proudly conscious that both the revolution of political independence and the revolution of economic expectations had their beginnings on these shores. We are conscious of special responsibilities to these forces which have reshaped the destinies of so many men. Our national policies since World War II have sought to honor those special responsibilities.

As the authentic revolutionaries of the world, however, we of America must make it clear to those who have chosen freedom that the revolution of freedom is fundamentally and above all else a revolution of human rights.

And we must make it clear not only by words but by example and precept. Our own house must be in order.

HARD DECISIONS

When our system was created, many hard decisions were required. None was harder—none was more revolutionary—than the decision embodied in our Bill of Rights that the Central Government should be prohibited from serving as the instrument for perpetuation of the prejudices and bias and discrimination of any sect or segment of American society. This decision was—and has continued to be—fundamental to our American unity, fundamental to our American capacity for economic growth, fundamental to the eternal harmony of our society, and fundamental to our capacity for exercising leadership on behalf of freedom beyond our own shores.

We must not acquiesce passively to any concept that the world can enjoy a new freedom while remaining the accomplice and prisoner of old prejudices.

To say this is to point no finger of scorn—nor to cast first stones of criticism. We make for ourselves no claim of national perfection.

But if a better world is to be built—and I am an unreserved optimist about the potentials—there must be a universal recognition that mankind must marshal the full potential of human resources and make full use of those potentials without regard to hereditary bias, prejudice, and discrimination.

If we of America are to rise to our full height as men in this century, we must face courageously the world's problem of human discrimination. We must speak clearly. We must speak in concrete terms. We must help the world to understand that the curing of the problems of discrimination is the beginning—not the end—of genuine freedom.

STEREOTYPES

As long as there have been societies more complex than tribal simplicity, majorities and minorities have relied on stereotypes to mold their opinions of one another. Such stereotypes have been convenient—but they have also been cruel.

We can take some measure of satisfaction from the fact that there is progress and that these stereotypes disappear as human understanding spreads.

For example, the two highest elective offices in the strongest free nation on earth are held today by men who have overcome the dead hand of the stereotype—for reasons of religion or region of birth. And I believe that each passing day will diminish the force of the stereotype for all of us.

As recently as last week when I attended the swearing in of an Ambassador of the United States it was noted in some accounts that I am "from a Southern State." The Ambassador himself was from a Southern State, also. But the accident of my birth became newsworthy, as did his, because I was born in the South of white parents—and he was born of Negro parents.

If to stand by his side and to shake his hand and wish him "Godspeed" make news, then that is news I am proud to make.

HIGHER SIGHTS

I say this to emphasize that the effort made by your national leadership today against discrimination, against bias, against division, and against the tyranny of stereotypes is, above all, an effort directed by men who know personally the enemy—and know his toll.

But, I say this also to suggest that perhaps we of America should consider raising our sights toward larger horizons. Certainly in this field there is much still to accomplish—but what remains undone does not detract from the magnitude of what has been done.

Much of our effort is directed today to the subtle forms of discrimination. This is a necessary and worthwhile effort—and we cannot be content until we have succeeded completely. But when we look to the world as a whole, the problem of discrimination is a massive problem—requiring massive effort on our part.

We cannot be content until we commit ourselves to massive support of the cause of human rights everywhere.

Our American vocabulary is filled with frequent expressions identifying illiteracy, illness, ignorance, and poverty as the oppressors of humankind. I believe we need to complete our vocabulary by acknowledging frankly that the greatest oppressor of all continues to be that of bias and prejudice.

We shall have failed our country and our cause if, from the position we are now privileged to enjoy in the world, we do not undertake the initiative in fulfilling the promise of this 20th century as the "century of human rights."

If we are to be remembered as constructive builders of a better world of peace and justice and freedom we shall be remembered not for the dollars we sent abroad but for the force of the influence and leadership we exercise to improve the lot of all mankind. It is this work that challenges us—it is this undertaking that summons us—it is toward this higher goal that we must lift up our sights and set our course.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Willis, for 20 minutes, tomorrow, April 9, 1963.

Mr. Hall (at the request of Mr. Broomfield), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, April 11, 1963.

Mr. Schadeberg (at the request of Mr. Broomfield), for 1 hour, on Thursday, April 11, 1963.

Mr. Alger (at the request of Mr. Broomfield), for 1 hour, on Thursday, April 11, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Randall.

Mr. Curtis and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Broomfield) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Tupper.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gibbons) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Purcell.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 72. An act for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 74. An act for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 93. An act for the relief of Flora Romano Torre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 196. An act for the relief of Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 206. An act for the relief of Chang Ah Lung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 213. An act for the relief of Carmelo Schillaci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 215. An act for the relief of Mannor Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 292. An act for the relief of Yoo Chul Soo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 310. An act for the relief of Kaino Hely Auzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 504. An act for the relief of Domenico Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 671. An act for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 686. An act for the relief of Millie Gail Mesa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 715. An act for the relief of Laszlo Janos Buchwald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 752. An act for the relief of Janos Kardos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 822. An act for the relief of Elvira Ciccotelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 866. An act for the relief of Enrico Petrucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 9, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1962, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submitted the following report for printing in the Congressional Record pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85–804:

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1963.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: This is a report to the Congress pursuant to section 4 of the act of August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 972), submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to rule XL of that House.

During the calendar year 1962, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration utilized the authority of the above-cited statute three times:

1. Under date of January 3, 1962, it authorized an adjustment in the amount of $2,976.50 in a contract for documentation services with the National Aeronautic Association, Washington, D.C.

2. Under date of April 2, 1962, it authorized an adjustment of $24,640 in a contract for launching and related services with the Department of Supply, Government of Australia.

3. Under date of June 19, 1962, it authorized an adjustment in the amount of $1,585 in the contract for minor items of electronic equipment with the Vector Manufacturing Co., Southampton, Pa.

Very truly yours,

Hugh L. Dryden,
Deputy Administrator.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

653. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia transmitting a draft of a proposed

bill entitled "A bill to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

654. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

655. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1932, relating to the control or possession in the District of Columbia of dangerous weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

656. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

657. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, relative to requesting that the pending legislation for authorization of fiscal year 1964 appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission be amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

658. A letter from the president, National Safety Council, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the National Safety Council for the year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 259, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

659. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

660. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the automatic-separation provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

661. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to increase the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, from 10 to 20 miles"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

662. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449) as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

663. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 4, 1963, the following bill was reported on April 5, 1963:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5517. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted April 8, 1963*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 5131. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; without amendment (Rept. No. 199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 310. Resolution to authorize additional traveling authority for Committee on Banking and Currency; without amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 311. A resolution waiving points of order on H.R. 5517, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 201). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 312. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5207, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 202). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 313. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5389, a bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 4, 1963, the following bill was introduced on April 5, 1963:

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 5517. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred April 8, 1963*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 5518. A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5519. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services Administration to dispose of Ellis Island for educational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 5520. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act so as to provide preference in the awarding of certain Government contracts to contractors in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 5521. A bill to determine the need for a channel from Lanark Village to St. George Sound, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 5522. A bill to protect postal patrons from obscene mail matter and Communist propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 5523. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5524. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to the determination of unrelated business taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5525. A bill to provide for a resource and economic development program for the Appalachian Highlands area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 5526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 65 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 5527. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 5528. A bill to abolish the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and repeal the Arms Control and Disarmament Act; to the Commmittee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5529. A bill to provide for Federal assistance for the construction and expansion of public community junior colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5530. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 376. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take favorable action upon a request by the Director of the Bureau of Mines for funds to carry on a mineral resource study; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the territorial waters of Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the construction of modern sternramptrawlers for experimental commercial fishing and research; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to congressional action on H.R. 4901 which provides for a flat annual installment rate by employers, repaying Federal loans made to the State for its unemployment compensation program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the defeat of any legislation amending the enabling act so as to permit the State of Arizona to sell school and institutional lands granted to the State by the Federal Government without appraisal and public auction; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relating to Federal taxation and recommending that the Federal excise tax on women's handbags be abolished; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting favorable action on a bill for an act making the pay of the Federal workers at Pearl Harbor Naval Base comparable to that of Federal workers doing the same work in San Francisco Bay area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to requesting the amendment of Federal laws which grant subsidies to any industry so as to require compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to providing for ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, regarding the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation introduced by Senator Claiborne Pell (S. 751) to amend the immigration and nationality laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5531. A bill for the relief of Maria Santina Filomena Tambellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5532. A bill for the relief of Evdokia Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 5533. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lydia Schmidt Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5534. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gerardo L. Yubero, his wife, Luz Fortuny de Lopez, and their two minor children, Gerard Lopez Fortuny, and Fernando Lopez Fortuny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 5535. A bill for the relief of Paul Ching-Szu Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 5536. A bill for the relief of Maria Anotonieta Ribeiro Da Costa Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5537. A bill for the relief of Melbourne B. Siebbles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5538. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Licastri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

82. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Dracut Board of Selectmen, Dracut, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution relative to requesting efforts toward the location of the NASA Space Research Laboratory in the Central Merrimack Valley, which was referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 8, 1963

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, maker of all things, judge of all men: With solemnized hearts and reverent awe we bow at the beginning of this holy week, over whose grim days is the shadow of a cruel instrument of torture. With multitudes under all skies, we have followed the hallowed footsteps of man's Best Man, of love's Best Love, the crystal Christ, as in lowly pomp He rode into His nation's crowded capital. As we gaze on Him, in whose face Thy full glory is revealed, teach us anew the pretense of pride, the hollowness of self-centered ambition, the vanity of might, the deceit of riches, the ashes of fame.

In the set and steadfast countenance of that Servant of all, who rides on to die and to life no grave can hold, may we see anew the royalty of love and the majesty of meekness riding on, as His dreams which enthrall the heart are brought to earth—

"In mart and court and Parliament
The common good increase
'Til men at least shall ring the bells
Of Brotherhood and Peace."

In His spirit and vision we bring our prayer. Amen.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the orders of the Senate of April 4, 1963,

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported favorably, with an amendment, on April 5, 1963, the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs, and submitted a report (No. 111) thereon.

Mr. SIMPSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported favorably, without amendment, on April 5, 1963, the bill (S. 982) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and submitted a report (No. 112) thereon.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 3, 1963,

Mr. ALLOTT, on April 5, 1963, for himself, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, and Mr. Dominick, submitted minority views, and the individual views of Mr. Simpson, on the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, which were printed.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 4, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5366. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5367. An act to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5366. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 5367. An act to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar was waived.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, by request, I must object to that unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objections? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of National Aeronautics and Space Administration on Adjustment of Certain Contracts

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that under date of January 3, 1962, the Administration authorized an adjustment in a contract for documentation services with the National Aeronautic Association, Washington, D.C.; under date of April 2, 1962, the Administration authorized an adjustment in a contract for launching and related services with the Department of Supply, Government of Australia, and under date of June 19, 1962, the Administration authorized an adjustment in the contract for minor items of electronic equipment with the Vector Manufacturing Co., Southampton, Pa.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Improvements of Fiscal and Administrative Practices in the National Bureau of Standards

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449) as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities (with acompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Penalties for Certain Offenses Committed in Connection With Highway Construction

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide penalties for certain offenses committed in connection with highway construction (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 15

"Whereas both Houses of the 87th Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which is in words and figures as follows, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'"ARTICLE—

"'"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"'"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation"': Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is, hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Washington; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the presiding officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Passed the house February 23, 1963.

"WILLIAM S. DAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate March 14, 1963.

"JOHN A. CHERBERG,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"*To the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:*

"*Resolved,* That we, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, respectfully petition that the Congress of the United States call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following articles as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE—

"'SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in which the people have the right of initiative in the appointment of representation in its legislature.

"'SEC. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature in a State in which the people have the right of initiative.

"'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this memorial prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Passed the house March 28, 1963.

"WILLIAM S. DAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate March 30, 1963.

"JOHN A. CHERBERG,
"President of the Senate."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 478

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation to amend the immigration and nationality laws. Legislation introduced by Senator CLAIBORNE PELL (S. 751)

"Whereas the birth, growth, strength, and defense of the United States has stemmed from the combination of skills and cultures of people from many nations; and

"Whereas many people from nations all over the world seek entrance to this great Nation in the hope that they may apply their skills and add their cultures to this free society; and

"Whereas the present immigration laws are archaic and arbitrary and are not in keeping with the American philosophy of the equality of man; and

"Whereas S. 751, a bill to amend the immigration and nationality laws, introduced by Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, grants more equality to all deserving potential immigrants and proportionately and categorically presents a fair system of immigration; and

"Whereas the provisions providing for pioneer immigrants will strengthen the immigration system and enrich the American economic system; and

"Whereas this bill which is in keeping with the principles advocated by Jefferson and Lincoln, strengthens the democratic cause around the world and leaves the United States in a better light since it will grant a fair share and equal rights immigration law that is in line with the true principles of a free society: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the general assembly place itself on record as respectfully requesting the Congress of the United States to enact into law S. 751, an act in amendment of the immigration and nationality laws (the Pell Act); and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state prepare certified copies of this resolution and send them to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate in the U.S. Congress, the majority and minority leaders of both Houses, the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and the members of the Rhode Island delegation in the Congress."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 4

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein)*, That the General Assembly of the State of Missouri respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a Convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article—

" 'Section 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

" 'Sec. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

" 'Sec. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it has been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That if Congress has proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a Convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein)*, That the General Assembly of the State of Missouri respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article—

" 'Section 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

" ' "Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it has been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission" '; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That if Congress has proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO PROPOSED INCREASES IN RATES CHARGED BY SOUTHERN CARRIERS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the appropriate place in the Record a joint resolution by the Vermont Legislature with respect to proposed increases in truck rates charged by southern carriers. This relates to the proposal to institute highly discriminatory truck rates between certain Southern States and the States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. This proposal is also opposed before the Interstate Commerce Commission by the North Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, Inc., the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, Inc., and the traffic department with headquarters at Atlanta, Ga., representing several hundred textile mills.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point excerpts from a brief filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). Under the rules, the resolution will be received and printed in the Record and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpts referred to will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Joint Resolution Relating to Proposed Increases in Rates Charged by Southern Carriers

Whereas the Southern Motor Carriers Conference proposes to increase less-than-truck rates by 15 percent into Vermont, and truckload and volume rates by 6 percent on finished and unfinished textile products, effective April 15, 1963; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has set a deadline of April 3, 1963, for the receipt of protests to the proposed increase; and

Whereas this proposed increase is discriminatory against Vermont interest; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont hereby registers its protest to such proposed increase and requests that the Interstate Commerce Commission Board of Suspension suspend the proposed increase for the entire period provided by law pending investigation by the Commission into the facts relating thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and hereby is instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Hon. George D. Aiken, Hon. Winston L. Prouty, and Hon. Robert T. Stafford; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and hereby is instructed to send a telegram to the Secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, advising of the adoption of this resolution of protest.

Approved April 2, 1963.

The excerpts presented by Mr. Aiken are as follows:

In addition to the violation of section 216(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act by providing rates prima facie higher than maximum reasonable on certain descriptions of traffic, obvious violations of section 216(d) also would result in that:

(a) The protested rates higher than the classification basis on textile products, as illustrated by appendix B, would create unjust discrimination and undue prejudice against this description of traffic.

(b) The discriminations and prejudice against localities are obvious from the fact that the increases apply only on shipments to or from points in the three States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. These States are a portion of New England territory and a smaller portion of eastern territory and no justification appears for imposing upon shippers or receivers of freight in those three States a special discrimination and disadvantage in the amount of charges required to be paid for transportation of shipments to and from the Southern States.

The application of the protested increases is not dependent upon ratemaking distances. This is also illustrated by appendix B. For example, between Danville, Va., and Bennington, Vt., for a ratemaking distance of only 626 miles, the increases would apply whereas from Atlanta, Ga., to Massena, N.Y., for a distance of 1154 miles, almost twice as great, the increases would not apply.

The selection of certain States for application of the increases produces higher rates for similar distances dependent solely upon whether the origins or destinations are in a particular State. For example, from Greenville, S.C., to Bennington, Vt., distance 825 miles, the present rate on finished cotton piece goods, less truckload, is $2.79 per 100 pounds, which is 1 cent lower than the $2.80 per-100-pound-rate from Greenville, S.C., to Massena, N.Y., for 1013 miles or 138 miles greater distance. The increased rate of $3.21 to Bennington is 41 cents higher than to the 138 miles more distant point of Massena, and it is 61 cents higher than the rate of $2.60 to Newburyport, Mass., for 104 miles greater distance.

This controvenes the basic principle and purposes of the act to protect the public interest and prohibit restrictions against the freedom of movement of commerce between all States in the Nation at just and reasonable rates without unjust discriminations, undue preference, or prejudice.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. **BIBLE**, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 18. A bill to change the name of Harpers Ferry National Monument to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park (Rept. No. 114); and

S. 932. A bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police (Rept. No. 113).

By Mr. **BIBLE**, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 386. A bill to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park and to provide for certain adjustments necessitated by the installation of a park tour road, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115).

By Mr. **METCALF**, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 138. A bill to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116).

By Mr. **ANDERSON**, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2. A bill to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research (Rept. No. 117).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **GRUENING** (for himself, Mr. Moss, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Church):

S. 1279. A bill to amend title 30, United States Code, relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **HILL**:

S. 1280. A bill to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. **HART**:

S. 1281. A bill to establish an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government authorized to conduct the elections of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXXIII, TO PROVIDE FOR REPORT AND QUESTION PERIODS

Mr. **KEFAUVER** (for himself, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. McGee, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Metcalf) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 120) to amend rule XXXIII to provide for report and question periods, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Kefauver, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT AND HEARINGS ON "STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY"

Mr. **EASTLAND** submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 121) authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of a report and hearings on "State Department Security" issued by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the 87th Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

> *Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary eight thousand additional copies of the report (committee print) of its Internal Security Subcommittee of the Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, entitled "State Department Security"; five thousand copies each of part 1 ("The William Wieland Case"), part 2 ("The Office of Security"), part 3 ("The New Passport Regulations"), part 4 ("Testimony of Elmer Hipsley, Otto Otepka, John Leahy, Roger Jones, Scott McLeod, Andreas Lowenfeld"), and part 5 ("Testimony of William Wieland") of the subcommittee's hearings of the Eighty-seventh Congress on "State Department Security"; and five thousand additional copies of part 13 of the subcommittee's hearings of the Eighty-seventh Congress on "Communist Threat to the United States Through the Caribbean."

U.S. MINERS DESERVE AND NEED HELP

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, a good businessman keeps an inventory. When a certain item is sold out or is in need of replenishment, the good businessman reorders the stock. The procedure is routine.

I suggest that the Federal Government would be wise to follow a similar inventory procedure in meeting its metals and minerals needs. This Nation confronts an increasingly perilous situation because of its growing dependence upon foreign sources for its metals and minerals, even as its own mineral resources have yet to be explored fully.

How can we correct this cart-before-the-horse approach?

One remedy, of course, is to learn the extent of our minerals reserves. Mining today is not the relatively simple business of 1890. The day of the prospector accompanied by his mule discovering a multimillion-dollar gold vein in the mountains of Colorado is passé. Mining in the 1960's is complicated and expensive.

The Congress of the United States has taken some remedial action to meet the new needs of this new era. Public Law 701 of the 85th Congress established the Office of Minerals Exploration in the Department of the Interior. The funding, although modest, has been helpful, and the work of the staff of the Office of Minerals Exploration is increasing.

I have discussed the program with its director, and, in response to my questions, Mr. George Fumich told me that he and his staff anticipate receiving more valid exploration fund requests than they can fill in fiscal year 1964 under the Office's proposed budget request.

His testimony before congressional committees this year on behalf of the OME fiscal year 1964 budget request includes reference to the growing number of requests for funding. The OME staff has worked to prevent a waste of funds on projects. A portion of the budget is used for professional assistance and technical guidance for applicants because OME deals with small firms and individuals who need and request such aid.

To facilitate better understanding of the program let me quote Mr. Fumich directly:

> Briefly stated, the OME offers financial assistance to firms and individuals who wish to explore their properties for one or more of 35 mineral commodities. This help is offered to applicants who ordinarily would not undertake the exploration under present conditions or circumstances at their sole expense and who are unable to obtain funds from commercial sources on reasonable terms.
>
> We contract with an eligible applicant to pay one-half of the cost of approved exploration work. The applicant pays the rest. The Government participation in a single contract cannot exceed $250,000. Interest, at rates which have ranged from 5¾ to 6½ percent, is charged from the time funds are made available.
>
> Funds contributed by the Government are repaid by a 5-percent royalty on production from the property. If nothing is produced, there is no obligation to repay. Royalty is paid on any production during the period in which work is being done under the contract; and if the Government certifies that production may be possible from the property, the royalty obligation continues until the Government's contribution is repaid with interest, or for the 10-year period usually specified in the contract.

Mr. President, under such a program, the Federal investment need not be a contribution, and I am confident that the miner would prefer to make repayment.

The Office of Minerals Exploration program is providing our ailing mining industry with some tools which to a limited degree have and will bolster the industry.

It is educational to see how the program has developed. Overfunded by the Congress initially, before OME could learn what its real role was to be, the Office barely touched the fiscal year 1959 appropriation of $4 million, obligating slightly more than $90,000. The obligated sum has increased and in March of this year OME had contracted for $612,000 of its $750,000 appropriation and had under investigation requests which would use the funding remaining—and more.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this time a copy of Public Law 85–701 and a table showing the development by year of the OME program.

There being no objection, the public law and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Public Law 85-701, 85th Congress, S. 3817, August 21, 1958, 72 Stat. 700

An Act to provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its Territories, and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes

MINERALS EXPLORATION

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is declared to be the policy of the Congress to stimulate exploration for minerals within the United States, its Territories and possessions.

Section. 1. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed, in order to provide for discovery of additional domestic mineral reserves, to establish and maintain a program for exploration by private industry within the United States, its Territories and possessions for such minerals, excluding organic fuels, as he shall from time to time designate, and to provide Federal financial assistance on a participating basis for that purpose.

EXPLORATION CONTRACTS—INTEREST RATES

Sec. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, and subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to enter into exploration contracts with individuals, partnerships, corporations, or other legal entities which shall provide for such Federal financial participation as he deems in the national interest. Such contracts shall contain terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate, including terms and conditions for the repayment of the Federal funds made available under any contract together with interest thereon, as a royalty on the value of the production from the area described in the contract. Interest shall be calculated from the date of the loan. Such interest shall be at rates which (1) are not less than the rates of interest which the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the Department of the Interior would have to pay if it borrowed such funds from the Treasury of the United States, taking into consideration current average yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with maturities comparable to the terms of the particular contracts involved and (2) plus 2 per centum per annum in lieu of recovering the cost of administering the particular contracts.

ROYALTY PAYMENTS—CERTIFICATION—AGREEMENTS

(b) Royalty payments received under paragraph (a) of this section shall be covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

(c) When in the opinion of the Secretary an analysis and evaluation of the results of the exploration project disclose that mineral production from the area covered by the contract may be possible he shall so certify within the time specified in the contract. Upon certification, payment of royalties shall be a charge against production for the full period specified in the contract or until the obligation has been discharged, but in no event shall such royalty payments continue for a period of more than twenty-five years from the date of contract. When the Secretary determines not to certify he shall promptly notify the contractor. When the Secretary deems it necessary and in the public interest, he may enter into royalty agreements to provide for royalty payments in the same manner as though the project had been certified.

(d) No provision of this Act, nor any rule or regulation which may be issued by the Secretary shall be construed to require any production from the area described in the contract.

ADJUSTMENT OF CONTRACT

(e) The Secretary shall establish and promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the puposes of this Act: *Provided, however,* That he may modify and adjust the terms and conditions of any contract to reduce the amount and term of any royalty payment when he shall determine that such action is necessary and in the public interest: *Provided further,* That no such single contract shall authorize Government participation in excess of $250,000.

(f) No funds shall be made available under this Act unless the applicant shall furnish evidence that funds from commercial sources are unavailable on reasonable terms.

EXPLORATION

Sec. 3. As used in this Act, the term "exploration" means the search for new or unexplored deposits of minerals, including related development work, within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether conducted from the surface or underground, using recognized and sound procedures including standard geophysical and geochemical methods for obtaining mineralogical and geological information.

ADVISORY SERVICES

Sec. 4. Departments and agencies of the Government are hereby authorized to advise and assist the Secretary of the Interior, upon his request, in carrying out the provisions of this Act and may expend their funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, in accordance with such agreements as may be necessary.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to present to the Congress, through the President, on March 1 and September 1 of each year, a report containing a review and evaluation of the operations of the programs authorized in this Act, together with his recommendations regarding the need for the continuation of the programs and such amendments to this Act as he deems to be desirable.

APPROPRIATION

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Approved August 21, 1958.

Office of Minerals Exploration program development

Fiscal year	OME budget request	Bureau of budget allowances	Appropriated by Congress	OME contractual obligations	Fund carry-over
	Millions	*Millions*			
1959	$5.0	----------	$4,000,000	$90,295	----------
1960	6.0	$1.5	1,100,000	275,000	----------
1961	1.5	1.1	550,000	220,000	$304,000
1962	1.5	1.0	750,000	726,325	197,632
1963	1.5	1.0	750,000	[1] 612,000	----------
1964	1.0	.9	----------	----------	----------

[1] To date.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the men who have worked with the program these past 5 years speak of its worth. When I asked them if the interest rate had been found too high—it is 6 percent or more—they admitted that the small operator time and again had found it so. When I asked as to the limitation of $250,000 for a single contract limitation, in view of the expense of mining, they told me the limitation was too low considering that exploration for gold, for example, may require work far below the surface of the earth. I asked why no language in the public law made specific reference to air exploration—since so much of our initial minerals exploration work comes with air overflights.

Air exploration gives the 20th century prospector 20th century methods. Through the use of the magnetometer he may measure the intensity and direction of magnetic forces, thereby locating anomalies having deposits of iron and other minerals. Large magnetometers are carried in airplanes, but smaller magnetometers may be carried for ground exploration. Air exploration with a refined Geiger counter, the syntometer, helped prospectors locate uranium deposits in Wyoming. And air exploration includes the taking of aerial photographs for geological mapping. These are but a few of the refinements which are modernizing mining today.

But this type of exploration must be specified in the public law.

Likewise there appeared to be need for amending legislation which would make possible Federal financial assistance for the development of domestic ores as well as language which would authorize technical assistance for exploration and development of mineral deposits and in their utilization.

I am, therefore, introducing today on behalf of myself, my colleague from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] five amendments to Public Law 85-701.

Enactment of this proposed legislation would aid our ailing mining industry. It would help the operator who is confronted with a fixed price for his product and a continually increasing cost of production.

The miner today has to find higher grade ore. He must also find a means to reduce his cost. The Federal Government can help lick its growing dependence upon foreign sources for its metals and minerals by sharing the risk and cost, thereby stimulating exploration and, hopefully, increasing production.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments proposed and an explanation of each be printed in the Record at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1279) to amend title 30, United States Code, relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 30, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 642(a) is amended as follows: In the last line after the word "contracts" delete the period, insert a colon, and insert the following: "*Provided,* That in no event shall the interest rate exceed 4½ per centum."

(2) Section 642(e) is amended as follows: In the last line after the word "of" delete the figure "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$500,000."

(3) Section 643 is amended as follows: In line 2 after the word "or" delete the word "unexplored" and insert in lieu thereof the word "additional," and in line 5 after the word "the" insert the word "air" and a comma.

(4) Sections 644 through 646, inclusive, are renumbered as section 646 through 648, respectively.

(5) Add a new section 644 as follows:

"SEC. 644(a). The Secretary is hereby authorized and empowered to provide Federal financial assistance to individuals, partnerships, corporations, and other legal entities for the development of domestic ores.

"(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this section, and subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with individuals, partnerships, corporations, or other legal entities that shall provide for such Federal financial assistance as he deems in the national interest. These agreements shall contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate, including terms and conditions for repayment, together with interest, of the Federal funds made available under any agreement. Interest shall be calculated at a rate determined by the Secretary from the date that Federal funds are made available."

(6) Add a new section 645 as follows:

"SEC. 645. The Secretary is hereby authorized to provide technical information and assistance which would be useful in stimulating the exploration and development of mineral deposits and in their utilization."

(7) The redesignated section 647 is amended as follows: In line 2 after the first comma, delete the words "through the President,"; after the word "on" delete the words "March 1 and"; and in line 3 after the comma delete the letter "a" and insert in lieu thereof the words "an annual".

The explanation presented by Mr. GRUENING is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 85-701 INTENDED TO BE PROPOSED BY SENATOR GRUENING

Enactment of this legislation would be especially beneficial to the operator who is faced with a fixed price for his product and a continually increasing cost of production. He must find higher grade ore and also find means to reduce his cost. By sharing in the risk and cost of finding and developing mineral deposits the Government stimulates exploration and increased production thereby aiding depressed mining areas.

The proposed legislation would aid the miner by:

1. Placing a ceiling of 4½ percent on the interest rate he would pay on Government funds granted him for exploration. The present high rate of 6 percent or more is a psychological roadblock to the small operator and a burden on long-range projects.

2. Raising the single contract limitation from $250,000 to $500,000. The present limitation is not responsive to modern-day methods. Most of the surface gold deposits, for example, have been worked out. The great majority of new gold deposits of significant size will be deep below the surface and require expensive, high-cost exploration projects.

3. Redefining exploration to give clear authority for exploration by air. This would enable the Government to participate more fully in modern methods of exploration.

4. Authorizing Federal financial assistance for the development of domestic ores. This would be especially helpful to the small operator who needs some assistance to get into production or maintain his production but is unable to obtain the required funds from banks or other Government agencies.

5. Authorizing technical assistance for exploration and development of mineral deposits and in their utilization. This would enable technical assistance to be extended to the small operator who needs such assistance in finding higher grade deposits, developing his ore deposits, lowering his operating costs, beneficiating his ore, and producing a marketable product.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, perhaps some of the Members of this body read as I did in Sunday's edition of the Washington Post and Times-Herald that the domestic chrome market was becoming increasingly depressed as other producers dumped their chrome on the world market in what would appear to be a direct attempt to break the market.

This attack is injurious to democracy. It cannot be longer ignored. Our mining industry can meet any challenge if we give it a chance.

The bill I am introducing today is designed to help give that chance.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we of the Western States deeply appreciate the efforts which the distinguished Senator from Alaska has made, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on behalf of the advancement of the interests of the mining industry. All of us know of the serious problems confronting the mining industry and of the need for effective legislation in this field. I am pleased to say that the Senator from Alaska brings to this whole problem new and vigorous leadership and a determination to get something done. For this, we are thankful.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho. He has always been an advocate of an enlightened and progressive policy, not only with respect to our mining resources, but for all the resources of the West—indeed, of the whole Nation.

I think it is time we looked into this problem searchingly and seriously and came up with some constructive proposals that will take this great industry, mining, which once was so promising and productive, from its present doldrums.

I thank the Senator from Idaho for his unfaltering, helpful encouragement.

AGENCY IN LEGISLATIVE BRANCH TO CONDUCT ELECTIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would create an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government designed to insure that the right of all citizens to vote for Members of Congress shall be adequately protected.

Congress recently has given the executive branch additional enforcement tools to protect the rights of American citizens to participate in all Federal elections. These are contained in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. The President, in his message to the Congress on February 28, outlined further amendments which the administration believes will be helpful in meeting continuing pockets of resistance to the full exercise of the right of franchise.

While all of this is progress, Congress has an additional responsibility that goes quite directly to the election of its own Members—to the problem of assuring full citizen rights in the election of the Members of Congress. The proposed act would give Congress the machinery to meet this problem, one which is and should be of special concern to the legislative branch of our National Government.

The Constitution, under article I, section 4, and under the 15th amendment, authorizes the Congress to make regulations as to the time, place, and "manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives or to alter regulations prescribed by the State legislatures for such purposes, except as to the place of choosing Senators."

The Federal judiciary cannot be expected to bear the full burden of litigating the dilatory actions of innumerable local registration officials intent on frustrating the desires of eligible voters.

This problem is the active election-by-election responsibility of the Congress, placed on the Congress by the Constitution, to insure the right to vote in each Federal election.

Nor is this a matter of States rights. The States have only that authority in this field of congressional elections expressly given them by the Congress. The Congress itself has the duty to see to it that those who sit as its Members are elected by all the people. The buck on this issue stops here.

There is a long history of widespread and flagrant denials of the right to vote. The record of the hearings held by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee over the years tells the story. Further, the hearings held by the Commission on Civil Rights, expressly established by the Congress to look into voting practices, emphasizes the need for congressional action.

The proposal I make to establish a Congressional Elections Commission as an arm of the Congress, is, as far as I know, a unique one. I first introduced it in 1959. The virtue of the bill I now introduce lies in the fact that it establishes a continuing agency of the Congress itself, designed to insure that registration and election procedures shall be reasonable, fair, and equally available to all our citizens. It can perform the same service for the Congress in the vital area of its elections which the Government Accounting Office, another agency of the legislative branch, does in matters involving the public purse.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with a summary of its provisions, be printed with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1281) to establish an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government authorized to conduct the elections of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. Hart, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Congressional Elections Act".

TITLE I—STATEMENT OF PURPOSE: DEFINITIONS

Sec. 101. Taking cognizance of the fact that, although ninety-three years have passed since the fifteenth amendment was adopted, American citizens otherwise qualified to vote continue to be denied that right because of their race or color, and that qualified voters are thus arbitrarily and discriminatorily being denied the right to cast a vote for the selection and election of their representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives; and recognizing the authority and the obligation of the Congress under the fifteenth amendment, and more particularly under article I, section 4, to assure that Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives are nominated and elected in a manner and pursuant to procedures which best assure that every qualified elector is afforded full opportunity to cast his vote, the Congress hereby determines that it is necessary, in order to assure to all qualified electors the opportunity to participate in the selection and election of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, that Congress establish an agency to conduct registration and voting in the primary, special, and general elections at which nominees to the Senate and the House of Representatives are elected.

Sec. 102. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Commission" means the Congressional Elections Commission established by this Act.

(b) The term "special or general election" means any special or general election in any State or congressional district for the purpose of electing Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

(c) The term "primary election" means any election, whether by convention, meeting, popular primary, or otherwise, in any State or congressional district for the purpose of choosing party nominees as candidates for the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States.

TITLE II—ESTABISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Sec. 201. (a) There is hereby established, as an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, a Congressional Elections Commission, as an authority to conduct primary, special, and general elections for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two of the members shall belong to the same political party. The President is requested in appointing members to provide, insofar as possible, representation for the various geographical areas of the United States.

(c) Each member of the Commission shall be appointed for a term of nine years, except that—

(1) the three members first appointed shall be appointed for terms expiring respectively on December 31, 1965; December 31, 1968; and December 31, 1971; and

(2) a person appointed to fill a vacancy in the Commission occurring by reason of the death, disability, resignation, or removal of a member before the expiration of his term shall be appointed to serve for the remainder of such term.

(d) The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence or disability of the Chairman or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Chairman.

(e) Subject to the provisions of subsection (f), a vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall not affect its powers.

(f) Two members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum thereof.

Sec. 202. Each member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall receive compensation at a rate of $20,000 per year. The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at a rate of $20,500 per year.

TITLE III—REGISTRATION OF VOTERS BY THE COMMISSION

Sec. 301. The Commission is authorized to make and maintain temporary and permanent registers of voters qualified to participate in primary, special, and general elections in the various congressional districts. The Commission's making and maintenance of such registers of voters shall be in its discretion and it shall not be necessary, for the making and maintenance of such registers in any congressional district, for the Commission to have first determined to hold an election therein pursuant to title IV of this Act.

Sec. 302. No person shall be registered as a voter under section 301 who does not have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated. The Commission shall establish adequate procedures to assure that all persons placed upon its registers as qualified voters continue to have the residence and other qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated.

Sec. 303. No State or local laws or ordinance governing the time, place, or manner of the registration of voters shall be applicable to or limit the power of the Commission to conduct registrations of voters pursuant to this title, but the Commission shall endeavor as far as in its judgment is conducive to uniform and orderly election procedures, to conform its conduct of the registration of voters to the procedures governing time, place, and manner of registration, prescribed in the State or local laws or ordinances in effect in the congressional district.

TITLE IV—CONDUCT OF ELECTIONS BY THE COMMISSION

Sec. 401. The Commission is authorized in any congressional district to conduct the primary, special, or general elections for the purpose of selecting and electing Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives whenever—

(1) the Commission is officially requested so to do by the duly empowered official of the State in which the congressional district is situated; or

(2) the Commission determines that unless such election is conducted by the Commission, persons having the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is located are likely to be denied their right in such primary, special, or general election to cast their votes and to have them fairly counted.

Sec. 402. Whenever the Commission conducts a primary, special, or general election, such election shall be the sole primary, special, or general election for the congressional district for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the results thereof shall, in any primary election, determine the authorized nominees, and in any special or general election, determine the duly elected Member of the House of Representatives, and the official vote of such congressional district for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives at large.

Sec. 403. No person shall cast a vote in an election conducted pursuant to section 401 unless (a) he has been found by the Commission, pursuant to title III foregoing, to have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated, or (b) he is registered on a State registration list, which the Commission determines to be appropriate for utilization in the election conducted by it, as a person having the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated.

Sec. 404. The Commission shall, immediately upon determining to conduct an election pursuant to the authority contained in section 401 (a) or (b), give notice of such determination to the Governor of the State concerned.

Sec. 405. No State or local laws or ordinances governing the time, place, and manner of conducting elections shall be applicable to, or limit the power of, the Commission to conduct elections pursuant to this title, but the Commission shall endeavor, as far as in its judgment is conducive to uniform and orderly election procedures, to conform its conduct of elections to the standards of time, place, and manner prescribed in State or local laws or ordinances in effect in the congressional district.

TITLE V—CERTIFICATION OF RESULTS

Sec. 501. The Commission shall, upon the determination of the results of any primary, special, or general election conducted pursuant to title IV, certify the results of such election to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Senate, to the Governor of the State in which the election was conducted, and to other appropriate persons. Such a certification shall constitute the binding and conclusive determination of the results of the election.

TITLE VI—DELEGATION OF POWERS

Sec. 601. The Commission is authorized to delegate to any appropriate officer or officers of a State or local government, or to any agent, employee, or designee of the Commission, any or all of the powers granted by this Act, with the exception of the authority granted pursuant to section 301 to determine whether or not to make and maintain registers of voters in any congressional district, and the authority granted pursuant to section 401 to determine whether or not to conduct an election thereunder, which determinations shall be made only by a quorum of the Commission itself.

TITLE VII—JUDICIAL REVIEW

Sec. 701. Any citizen of a State, having the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature, who has made appropriate application for inclusion upon a register of qualified electors maintained by the Commission for the congressional district in which he is a resident, who is denied such registration or who, having once been so registered, is removed from such register or denied the opportunity to vote in a primary, special, or general election conducted by the Commission in such congressional district, shall have an action for declaratory and injunctive relief in the United States district court for such district.

TITLE VIII—PERFORMANCE OF COMMISSION FUNCTIONS

SEC. 801. The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions and duties.

SEC. 802. In carrying out its functions the Commission is authorized to utilize on a temporary basis employees of the departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government. Each department and agency of the executive branch of the Government shall fully cooperate with the Commission to the end that it may effectively carry out its functions and duties and shall, at the request of the President, assign on a temporary basis employees of such department or agency to the Commission.

SEC. 803. In carrying out its functions the Commission is authorized to utilize the services of State and local governmental officers and employees and the facilities of State and local governments. The Commission is authorized to reimburse any State or local officer or employee whose services are utilized under the authority of this section for travel expenses incurred, and to pay to any such officer or employee per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same amounts as authorized by law for persons in the Government service serving without compensation. The Commission is authorized to reimburse any State or local government for the services of any officer or employee of such government, and for the facilities of such government, utilized under the authority of this section.

SEC. 804. (a) In carrying out its functions and duties, the Commission may sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, administer such oaths, require the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, or other written matter, procure such printing and binding, and make such expenditures as the Commission deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission. Subpenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses or for the production of written matter may be issued over the signature of the Chairman, or any member designated by him, and may be issued by any person designated by the Chairman or by such member.

(b) A witness attending any session of the Commission shall receive $4 for each day's attendance and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the same, and 8 cents per mile for going from and returning to his place of residence. Witnesses who attend at points so far removed from their respective residences as to prohibit return thereto from day to day shall be entitled to an additional allowance of $12 per day for expenses of subsistence, including the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance. Mileage payments shall be tendered to the witness upon service of a subpena issued on behalf of the Commission.

(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued on behalf of the Commission, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

SEC. 805. The Commission may promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, as it deems necessary or desirable for the performance of its functions and duties under this Act.

SEC. 806. The Commission shall, on or before January 31 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of its activities under this Act, together with any recommendations for suggested legislation which it finds desirable.

SEC. 807. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 808. No provision of law contained in section 5 of the Act entitled, "An Act for the Apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Census", approved August 8, 1911; section 26 of the Revised Statutes; and section 27 of the Revised Statutes, which is inconsistent with this Act, shall be applicable to elections conducted under this Act.

The analysis presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS COMMISSION BILL INTRODUCED BY SENATOR PHILIP A. HART

It is the purpose of the Congressional Elections Act to establish an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government with authority to conduct the elections of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

TITLE I

Title I states that because of the continuing denial to American citizens, on grounds of their race or color, of their right to vote, particularly to vote in the election of Representatives and Senators, recognizing the authority of Congress under the 15th amendment and under article I, section 4 of the Constitution to assure fullest participation of qualified electors in congressional elections, the Congress determines it necessary to establish an agency to conduct registration and voting in the primary, special and general elections at which Representatives and Senators are elected.

TITLE II

Title II establishes the Congressional Elections Commission as an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government authorized to conduct primary, special and general elections for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Commission is composed of three members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, Commissioners to be appointed for a term of 9 years.

TITLE III

Title III authorizes the Commission to make and maintain registers of voters in various congressional districts who are qualified to participate in primary, special and general elections of Members of the Senate and House of Representatives. The Commission may maintain registration lists in various congressional districts whether or not it has determined to run an election in the district. It is also provided that no person can become or stay registered on the Commission's lists who does not have the qualifications for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. It is also provided that State and local laws and ordinances covering the time, place or manner of registration are not applicable to registrations conducted by the Commission, but the Commission is instructed to conform its conduct of registration as far as possible to the procedures in effect under State or local laws.

TITLE IV

Title IV authorizes the Commission to conduct primary, special or general elections in any congressional district for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives either when (1) the Commission is officially requested so to do by the State in which the district is located, or (2) the Commission determines that unless it conducts such an election, qualified voters are likely to be denied their right in such a primary, special or general election to cast their votes and have them fairly counted. Whenever the Commission conducts a primary, special or general election that shall be the sole primary, special or general election in the congressional district for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the results thereof shall determine the party nominees, the elected Members of the House of Representatives and the official vote of the congressional district for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives at large. No person may vote in an election conducted by the Commission unless he has either been registered under title III by the Commission or he is registered on a State registration list determined by the Commission to be appropriate for use in its own elections. The Commission, if it decides to conduct an election, shall immediately notify the Governor of the State.

TITLE V

Title V provides for the certification of results of election by the Commission to the Speaker of the House, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Governor of the State, and that such certification constitutes the binding and conclusive determination of the results of the primary, special or general election.

TITLE VI

Title VI authorizes the Commission to delegate to its own agents and employees or to appropriate officials of the State and local governments any of the powers provided by the act with the exception of the authority of the Commission to determine whether or not to maintain registers of voters or to conduct an election in any particular congressional district which powers shall be exercised only by the Commission itself.

TITLE VII

Title VII authorizes suits for declaratory and injunctive relief in the U.S. district court by any citizen qualified to vote who has applied for registration by the Commission and is denied it or after being granted registration is removed from the registry or is denied opportunity to vote in an election conducted by the Commission.

TITLE VIII

Title VIII contains miscellaneous provisions concerning the compensation of agents and employees of the Commission as well as officials of the State to whom Commission functions may be delegated; provisions for the taking of testimony by the Commission; attendance of witnesses; refusals to testify; promulgation of the Commission rules and regulations; reports to the Congress; and amendment of prior laws.

Mr. HART. Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the table until the end of business on Wednesday, April 10, so that Senators who might wish to join in sponsoring it will have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT AND QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to amend the rules so as to make it possible to invite heads of departments and independent agencies to report and answer questions on the floor of the Senate. I ask that the resolution be held at the desk for 5 days, to enable other Senators to join in sponsoring it.

When I was a Member of the other body, I suggested that a similar procedure be adopted there; and that suggestion was very favorably received. At that time, more than 350 daily newspapers commented editorially on this suggestion, and all referred approvingly to it. A survey of the Gallup poll showed that 72 percent of those interviewed were favorable to the proposal, and only 7 percent were opposed. In addition, a poll throughout the country of leading citizens, political scientists, and men with governmental experience resulted in a virtually unanimous approval of this idea.

I think the report and question period would be even better suited to the Senate than it would be to the other body, because of the smaller membership and more intimate atmosphere of the Senate.

The resolution would allow the Rules Committee to provide for a report and question period on the floor of the Senate at least once every 4 weeks, but not more often than once a week. The sessions would not last more than 2 hours.

During the first half of the report and question period, members of the Cabinet or the heads of agencies would be invited to appear on the floor of the Senate and to answer written questions, which would have been prepared and submitted to them in advance. The last half of the question period would be taken up by questions by Members from the floor of the Senate, with the time to be allocated by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee.

I believe that much good would result if administrators were brought face to face with representatives of the people under an ordinary procedure, in order that the country might have the benefit of free and open consultation between them.

As a result, we in the Senate would have the benefit of a regular accounting from the heads of the departments as to how they are administering and interpreting the laws we pass. This would bring about better teamwork between the Congress and the executive departments, and would foster better public understanding of both.

It would also give the Senate a fresh source of initiative in governmental matters, and would give Members of the Senate direct and fuller information with regard to the operation of all departments—not just those supervised by their committees. It would also give the Cabinet members a chance to give their proposals directly to all Members of the Senate.

I am pleased that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] have joined with me as cosponsors of this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the resolution printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the Record.

The resolution (S. Res. 120) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXXIII of the Rules of the Senate be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"There shall be held in the Senate immediately following the reading of the Journal on at least 1 day in each period of 4 calendar weeks, but not oftener than 1 day in any 1 calendar week, a 'report-and-question period,' which shall not consume more than 2 hours, during which heads of departments, agencies, and independent establishments in the executive branch of the Government are requested to answer orally written and oral questions propounded by Members of the Senate. Each written question shall be submitted in triplicate to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such question, and, if approved by such committee, one copy shall be transmitted to the head of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, with an invitation to appear before the Senate, and one copy to the Committee on Rules and Administration with a request for allotment of time in a report-and-question period to answer such question. Subject to the limitations prescribed in this paragraph, the Committee on Rules and Administration shall determine the date for, and the length of time of, each report-and-question period, and shall allot the time in each period to the head of a department, agency, or independent establishment who has indicated his readiness to deliver oral answers to the questions transmitted to him. All written questions to be propounded in any one period shall be approved by one committee. With the consent of the committee which has approved the written questions to be propounded in any period, the head of a department, agency, or independent establishment may designate to represent him in such period the head of a principal division of such department, agency, or independent establishment, and, in the case of a department, the head thereof may designate the Under Secretary or an assistant secretary of such department. The latter half of each period shall be reserved for oral questions by Members of the Senate, one-half of such time to be controlled by the chairman of the committee which has approved the written questions propounded in such period and one-half by the ranking minority member of such committee. Each oral question shall be germane to the subject matter of at least one of the written questions propounded in such period. The time of each report-and-question period and the written questions to be answered in such period shall be printed in two daily editions of the Record appearing before the day on which such period is to be held, and the proceedings during such period shall be printed in the Record for such day."

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide a healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WILDERNESS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fong, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Thurmond), submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ALLOTT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 4, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS—MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that minority and individual views on Senate bill 1, the youth education bill, may be filed while the Senate is in adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

Authority of April 1, 1963:

S. 1238. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated: Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Engle, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

Authority of April 2, 1963:

S. 1250. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls: Mr. Douglas, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. McIntyre.

S. 1251. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides: Mr. Douglas, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. McIntyre.

S. 1255. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States: Mr. Cooper.

Authority of April 3, 1963:

S. 1262. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least 20 quarters of coverage, and for other purposes: Mr. Long of Missouri and Mr. Scott.

S. 1268. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes: Mr. Long of Missouri and Mr. Scott.

Authority of March 21 and April 1, 1963:

S. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the President appoint a committee to evaluate our foreign aid program in each country and report its finding to the President and the Congress: Mr. Case, Mr. Fong, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Pearson, and Mr. Randolph.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 777, TO AMEND THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold public hearings on Wednesday, April 10, on S. 777. This is an administration bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees. S. 777 was introduced by Senator Humphrey for himself and Senators Clark and Randolph on February 11, 1963.

The hearing will be held at 10:30 a.m. in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building.

CHANGE IN HEARINGS DATE ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce a change in the date for beginning hearings on S. 1163, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

The hearings will begin at 10 a.m., Tuesday, April 30, 1963, rather than Monday, April 22, as previously announced. The hearings will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, and will continue on the following days of that week.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this bill are requested to notify Mr. Jonathan Lindley, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone CApitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Comments praising the six recipients of the 1963 Federal Woman's Award.

NOMINATIONS FOR BRIGADIER GENERALS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Senate nomination reference 41, containing the names of 49 Army colonels for promotion to temporary brigadier general in the Army. The Committee on Armed Services has unanimously recommended that this list be approved.

Mr. President, the Armed Services Subcommittee on Officer Grade Limitations held a hearing on this nomination list. I emphasize that the subcommittee did not challenge the fitness of any officer nominated for promotion. The hearing did involve a matter of policy, however, which I feel should be called to the attention of the Senate.

With respect to this list, the average age of those recommended for promotion to brigadier general is about 46½ years. This represents an average drop of about 2 years in age as compared with the lists of the last several years. Furthermore, speaking in terms of prior service before promotion, in 1961 and 1962 more than 75 percent of the officers had completed at least 24 years of service at the time of their selection. With regard to the pending list, however, only about 37 percent will complete 24 years or more of service. On the whole, therefore, the officers selected for general on this list were younger and had less years of service than those selected in prior years.

The point was raised as to whether the selection of a greater proportion of younger officers was wise as a matter of policy and was fair to the more senior colonels who would have been selected in greater numbers had the promotion policies of the last few years been followed.

Mr. Vance, Secretary of the Army, appeared before the subcommittee and stated in effect that it was necessary to select some of the younger officers in order to give those who were commissioned in 1941 a fair chance for consideration for promotion to general officer. There were fairly large numbers of officers commissioned in 1941 and the contention is that in order to give this group a reasonable opportunity over the next few years their promotion to brigadier general should begin at the present time.

In technical promotion terms, Mr. President, what happened is as follows: In 1960, the primary promotion zone ended at year group 1936, that is, those commissioned in that year; in 1961 it ended at year group 1937; and in 1962, year group 1938. But for those promoted in 1963, it ended at 1941. Three additional year groups were therefore put in the promotion zone for the recent selections. The result is that year groups 1939 and 1940 were competing along with 1941 for selection for promotion.

It was the contention of the Army that over the next few years the percentage of those selected from each year group will balance out and will be about the same. That is, year groups 1939 and 1940 will probably receive as great a percentage of selections to brigadier general as 1941.

Mr. President, I would like to make two points in connection with this promotion matter.

First. The first point is that approval of this list should not be construed as a commitment or blanket endorsement of any overall policy of early promotion. In other words, the committee's action on this list does not mean that future lists involving this question will not be carefully reviewed, depending on the circumstances involved.

Second. The second point, Mr. President, is that this promotion policy may well have two definite side effects which are not desirable. First, there is the fact that if the bulk of the colonels are to be considered at around 21 or 22 years of service, many of those not selected will feel that there is little hope for advancement for the remainder of their normal 30 years of service. Many of the colonels who feel this way will undoubtedly lean toward early retirement at a time when they are at the height of their experience and knowledge. Furthermore, where officers enjoy early selection to the grade of brigadier general, we may see a policy which will result in the early retirement of these same officers. The case is often made that early retirements are desirable in order to avoid promotion humps and permit advancement for the younger officers. Mr. President, the record should be clear that the subcommittee will closely observe the whole matter of early retirement which could result from the Army policy.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] on the floor. I note that on the Executive Calendar are a number of nominations reported by him from the Armed Services Committee. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider those nominations, beginning with the new reports on page 2.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports on page 2, will be stated.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE ARMY AND THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army and in the Navy, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT OF CHESTER BOWLES TO BE AMBASSADOR TO INDIA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the designation of Chester Bowles by President Kennedy to be our Ambassador to India is a very worthy appointment. Just as Governor Bowles, in his earlier capacity as Under Secretary of State, has helped select such uniquely qualified men as Edwin O. Reischauer, our Ambassador to Japan, and William Attwood, our Ambassador to Guinea, so the President has now shown similar imagination and excellent judgment in asking Governor Bowles to return, once again, to India, to be our Ambassador. He previously served in that vitally important post from 1951 to 1953. During that time, a decade ago, he was instrumental in establishing vital bonds of understanding between India and the United States.

Let me say that it seems to me that Chester Bowles became the model of what an Ambassador should be. He mingled very closely with the people of India. He took his family with him, and they learned the language and magnified the warm and friendly Bowles association with Indians. As Ambassador, Governor Bowles spoke to large numbers of groups in all walks of life—students, labor, business and many others. He did a splendid job in winning friends for us in India and in demonstrating in act as well as word to the people of India what American democracy means.

As we know, India has been challenged by a serious threat from the Communist regime on the mainland of China. India finds herself in the midst of an arduous and probably long-run effort to preserve her independence and her way of life against the Communist threat. In this time of peril for India, a time when the people of the subcontinent of India are united as never before by new ties of national spirit, it is especially fitting that the United States return Governor Bowles to the Embassy where he served with such great flair and distinction 10 years ago.

Governor Bowles has had a long and remarkable career of public service, ranging over nearly all parts of our Government. After a career in high Government posts in Washington and abroad, he served as Governor of Connecticut and as a Congressman from Connecticut. As our Ambassador to India, he will take with him the good wishes of his many colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, yesterday there was published in the New York Times a most interesting article on Mr. Bowles. The article was written by the distinguished head of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times, James Reston. In the article he pointed out that Mr. Bowles is one of those rare souls who is a deep and profound thinker who says what he thinks. As Mr. Reston points out in the article, of course those who have new ideas and express them vigorously and honestly are always subjected to criticism; and Mr. Bowles has a large number of critics. However, I think the fact that he does have critics is an index to the sort of stimulating and thoughtful person he is. I believe we should also recognize that Mr. Reston is the one who put to rest the vicious story that Chester Bowles had talked publicly about opposing the President's decision about the Bay of Pigs invasion. Mr. Reston is the one who had first developed the story that Mr. Bowles had opposed this tragic mistake; and Mr. Reston went to Mr. Bowles to ask him directly about it. Mr. Bowles in fact refused to comment on the situation or to discuss it.

Yet, on that score, Mr. Bowles has been criticized very severely and obviously very unjustly—because Mr. Reston is certainly the authority in this case.

Mr. President, I am happy to support this nomination with enthusiasm.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, this past weekend President Kennedy announced his intention to appoint Chester Bowles as Ambassador to India.

With this important assignment, Chet Bowles continues what is one of the most varied and remarkable careers of public service of any American. He has served with great distinction as head of the Office of Price Administration, Director of Economic Stabilization, Governor of Connecticut, Ambassador to India, U.S. Representative from Connecticut's Second Congressional District, Under Secretary of State, and Special Assistant to the President for Asian, African, and Latin American Affairs.

In returning to the crucially important post of Ambassador to India, Chet Bowles takes with him one of the most creative and imaginative minds in our country. He has thought and written and spoken about foreign affairs with insight, courage, and dedication. He has the vision that produces ideas and the energy and determination that turn ideas into action.

Chet and I have been close political and personal friends for many years. I have always valued his advice and wise counsel.

The President is to be congratulated for selecting for this assignment such an eminently qualified person, and Chet Bowles deserves the appreciation of his country for his willingness to take on yet another challenging task in a brilliant record of distinguished public service.

Mr. President, I hope and expect the Senate will speedily confirm this nomination. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSAGE TO INDIA

The appointment of Chester Bowles as Ambassador to India will give this country an able, gifted and articulate spokesman in New Delhi. His previous service as Ambassador to India in the fifties, his profound knowledge of the economic, political and social problems of the subcontinent and his friendly relations with the Indian people all eminently qualify him for this assignment.

India has made much progress in the decade since Mr. Bowles last served as Ambassador there, but the basic problems remain. It still is struggling to achieve industrial growth, rural development and social progress. The problem of Kashmir remains a constant complication. The Chinese invasion has added to the old problems the new one of military organization.

This country needs an informed, able and perceptive observer in New Delhi. And India needs the kind of an American Ambassador who can understandingly and sympathetically interpret its situation to Washington. It would be difficult to find a public man better suited for the challenges of the post to which he has been assigned.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT—TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has led an almost single-handed fight to persuade the Senate and the country to recognize the wisdom of a treaty to suspend nuclear testing. He has done a great job with very, very little recognition nationally. Max Freedman, a columnist for the Washington Post, in an article printed in this morning's issue of the Washington Post, discussed the fight in which the Senator has engaged. Mr. Freedman has stressed the effort of the Senator from Minnesota to serve the national interest as well as the cause of peace throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the fine column by Max Freedman entitled "Humphrey And Disarmament" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HUMPHREY AND DISARMAMENT

(By Max Freedman)

Without Senator Humphrey the debate on disarmament would proceed against hopeless odds. He has been President Kennedy's chief supporter in Congress for a prudent and responsible treaty. When Mr. Eisenhower was President he gave the same kind of courageous support to a Republican administration. It is not the least of his merits that he believes that disarmament, like defense policy, should be above mere partisan skirmishing. In view of this record he is entitled to a thoughtful hearing when he makes a major statement on the disarmament negotiations at Geneva.

Yet this careful examination of his proposals is precisely what has been lacking. It almost seems as if the cynical principle is being followed of ignoring Senator Humphrey's points because one cannot answer them. Some time ago he delivered an elaborately documented analysis of the disarmament deadlock but his address met with little response in the Senate and with only scattered attention in the country. This surely is shabby treatment for a Senator who is carrying the lonely burden of protecting the public interest in a safeguarded disarmament treaty.

It may therefore be some contribution to the public debate if one summarizes the main points which Senator Humphrey is now making.

He points out that in 1958 it was the belief of both Russian and American scientists that there would have to be an international inspection system with about 180 control posts, of which 19 would be in the Soviet Union. It would have taken between 4 to 6 years to install this system; scores of international technicians would have been included in the project; the system would have cost $2 billion to build and several hundred million dollars a year to maintain. Today no such system needs to be established at all.

The United States, like Russia, can now identify nuclear tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space. If Russia would agree to a treaty outlawing such tests, the risks of successful evasion or cheating would form no problem. The real concern is with tests conducted underground where they may be harder to detect or may be confused with earthquakes.

Senator Humphrey reports that in the past 5 years the United States has greatly improved its ability to identify earthquakes in Russia. It is a generous figure to suggest that these unidentified occurrences in any one year will be only a few dozen at most. Under the British-American treaty each of these mysterious events would be subject to inspection. From a scientific or technical standpoint, the problem of security is wholly manageable. Russia would soon learn this fact if it were willing to give the proposed treaty a fair trial.

Senator Humphrey asked the Kennedy administration to make available the results of studies of underground events in Russia from 1958 through 1962. He has quoted "a competent administration official in whom I repose the highest confidence" as saying that the United States has the present ability to monitor a test ban agreement with full safeguards for American security.

Under these new arrangements it would be necessary to supplement these monitoring devices by inspections inside Russia carried out by inspectors who could be accompanied by Soviet observers. The inspected area would be small and would be located by using the records of at least four detection stations. There would be no more than seven inspections each year. The treaty would lapse and the United States would be free to resume its tests if Russia refused to agree to any suggested inspection or was caught in a secret test.

Since the 1960 campaign Mr. Kennedy has shown much more eagerness than the general public to reach a disarmament agreement with Russia, above all on a test ban treaty. The public has tended to view the Geneva talks with resigned apathy as a meaningless charade. Yet all the time hard working and often misunderstood officials have been closing the gap between the Russian and American positions, while always striving for a treaty that would be endorsed by two-thirds of the Senate. It is high time that we realize that American public indifference is very helpful to Russia in resisting a treaty. For Russia can twist and equivocate at Geneva without being called to account by a bored American press.

WASTE IN THE SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, over the weekend there were a number of developments, calling into question the wisdom of proceeding with as generous and, I think, as wasteful an appropriation for space as the Congress has been in the habit of doing. On Friday the New York Times, in a very unusual story, reported that the Air Force had documented $77 million of duplication in the space budget. The article stated chapter and verse specific duplication, citing the place, the facility, and the degree of duplication in dollars and cents.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarkable story entitled "Air Force Scores Building by NASA" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AIR FORCE SCORES BUILDING BY NASA—SAYS SPACE AGENCY'S PLAN WILL DUPLICATE FACILITIES

Washington.—The Air Force, in a formal memorandum, has charged that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is asking for construction of $77,671,000 worth of facilities that duplicate Air Force facilities.

The memorandum appears to support charges that the civilian space program, initiated during the Eisenhower administration and endorsed by the Kennedy administration, needlessly incorporates many projects already being studied by the military.

In reply to a reporter's questions about the memorandum, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of NASA, said that his organization had frequent coordination meetings with the Department of Defense and that "no such statement has been made to us."

He described the Air Force memorandum as representing "a point of view of junior people who can't get their superiors to support their desires."

On a point made in the memorandum about offering bioastronautics facilities to the Space Agency, Dr. Dryden said:

"We have offered to carry half the cost of bioastronautics laboratories but this was not accepted by the Department of Defense."

One reason for the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in 1958 was the desire to emphasize this country's belief in peaceful rather than military exploration of space. The early U.S. space programs were all conducted by the military services.

Little by little NASA has taken over such space facilities as the former Army installation at Huntsville, Ala. The military services, however, have retained many major projects and still support NASA with missiles and base facilities.

Over the years, however, as the United States has pressed its space efforts, a controversy has developed as to whether the major space responsibilities should not have been retained by the military services.

It has been pointed out that the Soviet Union's space programs are believed to be directed chiefly toward military ends.

In recent congressional hearings, members of the House Science and Astronautics Committee have questioned NASA officials regarding possible duplication of facilities already controlled by the Air Force.

Robert Seamans, Associate Administrator of the space agency, has testified that all of the construction requests have been carefully coordinated with the Defense Department. The agency's construction requests total $800 million.

The Air Force memorandum, apparently prepared in connection with the President's budget proposals for the fiscal year 1964, beginning next July 1, starts with this question:

"What is the Air Force's opinion of NASA's need for the facilities listed in the NASA fiscal year 1964 construction program, which is attached?"

GIVES OWN ANSWER

It gives this answer:

"Specific characteristics and capabilities of the individual facilities on the attached NASA construction program are not available to the Air Force in the majority of the items. However, from limited information available, location of proposed facility, title assigned and knowledge of the NASA center's responsibilities, it is highly likely that similar or duplicating facilities to present Air Force facilities are being requested by NASA."

The memorandum cites the following examples:

(a) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, Calif.

(1) Life sciences research facility—$4,880,000. The Air Force has a large facility and technical capability in the bioastronautics area, which has been offered several times to support NASA programs. The space agency has not accepted these offers.

(2) Space Materials Laboratory—$3,600,000. The Air Force Materials Laboratory complex at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, could support the space agency in this area.

OTHER FACILITIES CITED

(b) Langley Research Center, Langley Field, Va.

(1) Vehicle antenna test facility addition—$1,758,000. The Air Force has capabilities in this area at the Wright-Patterson base, and at the Rome, N.Y., Air Development Center.

(c) Launch Operations Center, Cape Canaveral, Fla.

(1) Central instrumentation facility—$31,508,000. This facility appears to provide NASA with an excess of capability, in view of the Department of Defense's capability at the Atlantic missile range. The range's telemetry system was jointly planned with NASA, thus the requirement for additional telemetry by the space agency is unknown. In addition, this facility contains $5 million for electronic tracking items. Tracking is a range responsibility and the range has adequate electronic tracking capability.

(2) Calibration and standards laboratory—$2,867,000. It would appear that the best interest of the Government would be served

by expanding the existing Department of Defense capability to satisfy the requirements of all missile-range users, rather than establishing a separate capability.

DUPLICATION FOUND

(3) Optical and Electronic Component Servicing Facility—$855,000. Department of Defense has a similar capability at the Atlantic missile range.

(d) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland.

(1) Propulsion component and subsystem environmental facilities—$2,320,000. The Rocket Laboratory at Edwards Air Force Base in California has capabilities in this area.

(e) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex.

(1) Mission Control Center—$8,409,000. It is probable that the missile range capability could fulfill this need.

(2) Launch environment and antenna test facilities—$7,482,000. Air Force facilities at Wright-Patterson base and Rome Air Development Center are available for similar efforts.

(3) Mission simulation and procedures training facilities—$2,216,000. The Air Force Aerospace Research Pilots School at Edwards base has similar facilities. Many NASA pilots have utilized this Air Force facility.

(4) Atmospheric reentry materials and structures evaluation facilities—$2,915,000. The Air Force has excellent facilities at Arnold Engineering Development Center and at Wright-Patterson base.

(5) Ultrahigh vacuum space chamber facilities—$2,685,000. Similar facilities are available at Arnold Engineering Development Center.

(f) Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.

(1) Acceleration test and calibration facility—$1,700,000. Comparable facilities are available at Wright-Patterson, Edwards, and Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask also that an article published in the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Stress on Space Called Dangerous to Science," in which Dr. Barry Commoner, professor of plant physiology at Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., a very competent and able scientist, discusses the adverse consequences to science of excessive emphasis on space.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRESS ON SPACE CALLED DANGEROUS TO SCIENCE

PHILADELPHIA, PA.—American science, in the opinion of a prominent biologist, is in danger because of the emphasis and money being allocated to the exploration of space.

Dr. Barry Commoner, professor of plant physiology at Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., warned of the danger in a speech to the National Science Teachers' Association convention.

His speech reflects widespread concern within the scientific community over implications of the rapid growth of Government support of science in recent years. The growth has been stimulated by the advent of space technology. Government funds for research and development have quadrupled in the last decade.

NOT JUST GROWTH PAINS

Commoner contends that U.S. science is "not merely suffering the natural pains of rapid growth."

"Certain weaknesses at the very heart of the scientific enterprise may threaten the future of science and its usefulness to the Nation and to the world," he says.

His basic objection is that American science and the Government's support of research is becoming oriented too sharply toward a specific mission, particularly the exploration of space and the landing of a man on the moon, rather than being aimed at the broader objective of the pursuit of knowledge.

"We are engaged in a spectacular balancing act," he says. "Education is supported by science, science by space and space by the man on the moon.

PINCHPENNY EFFORT

"We should recognize this policy for what it is—a shortsighted, pinchpenny effort to buy a few selected fruits of the tree of knowledge without accepting the honest responsibility of nourishing the whole living, growing organism."

As evidence of how "project oriented research" is tending to dominate and to distort the overall course of American science he points to the emergence of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as one of the principal patrons of basic research and graduate education.

In 1962, he says, more than one-third of the total Federal obligations of $900 million for basic research come from NASA while the National Science Foundation, the agency created to support basic research, received less than $90 million.

SOURCE OF FELLOWSHIPS

The space agency also has become the major source of graduate fellowships in science, he adds.

The space agency program, he argues, no longer follows the principle, laboriously established legislative debate on the National Science Foundation bill, "that a national program of support for science should be science oriented rather than mission oriented."

Commoner also complains that education and science are becoming "constricted" by the present policies of support.

"Science is a subsidiary part of education and one would suppose that any effort to strengthen science should be predicated on adequate support for the entire educational base," he says. "But we seem to have turned this relationship upside down.

"While exhibiting a considerable reluctance to provide the total support needed to sustain our schools and universities, the Nation is eager to expand that part of the educational system which deals with science."

Most universities have become so dependent on Government research funds that "if such funds were withdrawn their total competence as educational institutions would sharply decline," he contends.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

As further evidence to support his view, he cites:

A "glut" in scientific literature which results from the tendency to ignore the interrelationships of scientific knowledge.

"Serious failures" in the proper application of science, such as in the failures to anticipate the harmful effects of detergents, insecticides and atomic fallout.

A tendency toward authoritarianism and neglect of theory—again resulting from the "excessive isolation of scientific fields" and the "fragmentation of knowledge."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, James Reston has very well stated the position that more and more thoughtful people are beginning to take regarding the space program.

There are many Americans who favor space exploration, and favor being first to the moon. But it seems to me the real issue about the space budget is summed up in Mr. Reston's conclusion:

This is the real issue about the space budget: not whether it should explore space, but whether the degree of exploration should be so great as to spend tens of billions on propaganda as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Reston published in the New York Times, issue of April 5, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN ON THE MOON AND THE MEN ON THE DOLE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The debate on the Nation's space program is getting out of hand. Some Republicans are attacking the program as if it were a vast boondoggle, and President Kennedy is defending it as if it were the Bill of Rights.

Most of the extreme arguments, however, are sheer political moonshine. The main issue is not one of politics but one of priorities. The question is not whether the exploration of space is important, but whether it is more important to put a man on the moon than to get several million men off the dole.

When the President was asked in his news conference this week about General Eisenhower's attack on the budget in general and the space budget in particular, he seemed annoyed and immediately went into a political orbit.

His reaction was to compare his budget record with the worst of President Eisenhower's, and to imply that anybody who wanted to cut the space budget was willing to hand over the space race to the Russians.

The space debate, however, deserves a more serious response. For a large and influential sector of the scientific community of the Nation, while enthusiastic about the exploration of space, believes that the scientific objectives of the program can be achieved at a fraction of the cost by putting instruments, rather than man, on the moon.

SCIENCE OR PROPAGANDA

Thus, the issue, as they see it, is whether the man on the moon is essential for scientific purposes, and whether the immense additional cost of the man-landing should take a higher priority than using a part of the savings on other essential tasks that would invigorate the economy and create jobs.

Dr. Warren Weaver, former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, recently said: "I believe that most scientists consider the proposed expenditures quite unjustified on the grounds of scientific considerations; and also consider the frantic pace of the program to be wasteful."

Dr. James R. Killian, former president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has asked: "Will several billion dollars a year additional for enhancing the quality of education not do more for the future of the United States and its position in the world than several billions a year additional for man in space?"

In 1960, the administration spent on space, $523 million; the next year the ante went up to $964 million; in the present fiscal year, the bill will be $3,700 million; and for the coming fiscal year, the administration has requested $5,712 million.

ESTIMATING THE COSTS

Estimates of total space costs for the sixties vary. The Deputy Administrator of the space agency, Robert C. Seamans, Jr., has put it between $50 billion and $60 billion. Fortune magazine puts it at $75–$100 billion for a decade in which the Nation shall also have spent $50 billion on missiles.

It is not only some Republicans, but prominent Democrats, such as Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT of the Foreign Relations Committee, who are asking whether the non-scientific part of this immense total should be spent on a lunar man landing rather than on projects that will ease the unemployment, education, slums, housing, and transportation problems here below.

The scientific objectives are not primarily in question, but the propaganda objectives are. FULBRIGHT, for one, is opposed to paying such a price for what he regards as a kind of lunar Olympic race to land a man on the moon, especially since he believes the Nation's prestige will never be greater than its ability to house, transport, educate, and employ its own people.

VALUES AND PRIORITIES

What has happened here is fairly clear. The violent popular reaction to the first Soviet sputnik has deranged the administration's sense of priorities and values, and the preference of the Congress for spectacular victories over the Russians has aggravated the imbalance.

Clearing slums and wiping out unemployment raise more controversies on Capitol Hill than shooting John Glenn to the moon. Accordingly, the administration has said, in effect: "Ask not what is best for the country, but what is easiest to get through Congress."

It is an understandable position, the political struggle being what it is, but it does not satisfy even the President's own closest scientific advisers. For they see the defense, atomic energy and space programs taking most of the creative scientific brains of the country; they do not believe the space experiments will help the civilian economy as much as the space addicts believe; and, like FULBRIGHT, they are not convinced that the cost of space propaganda will bring as much prestige as a booming economy.

"The differences today," said the President at Yale, "are usually matters of degree." This is the real issue about the space budget: not whether it should explore space, but whether the degree of exploration should be so great as to spend tens of billions on propaganda as well.

SALEM (W. VA.) COLLEGE PARTICIPATES IN NEW LEASING PLAN FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF DORMITORIES—CIT ANNOUNCES PROGRAM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we are all painfully aware of the challenge which faces the field of education as a result of rapid and widespread increases in population. Without imaginative and far-reaching action by the Congress and segments of the private economy the situation in 10 years will be grave—in 20 years it could be disastrous.

We must, therefore, be governed in our actions of today by the needs of tomorrow, and must address ourselves steadfastly to the task of producing meaningful legislation which will add impetus to the progress and expansion of education facilities in the United States.

Mr. President, in light of the current needs for expanded educational capability it is heartening to note that certain elements of the business community are making significant contributions toward acceptable solutions. The CIT Financial Corp. is one such firm, having recently announced the establishment of a pay-as-you-go plan for the construction, rental, and future ownership of units, which is being offered to colleges and preparatory schools. It is designated "the CIT campus homes program."

I am gratified to report that Salem College, a small and progressive institution of higher learning in Salem, W. Va., is among the first to take advantage of this remarkable opportunity. Dr. K. Duane Hurley, its vigorous and devoted president, has said:

> The plan will be a tremendous help in moving forward toward our goal of doubling our facilities to meet the expansion of our enrollment expected in the years ahead.

He further pointed out that the student enrollment of 850 is expected to rise to approximately 1,200 in the next 5 years, and to double within the next decade.

I ask unanimous consent that explanatory fact sheets of April 3, 1963, released by CIT Financial Corp., and explaining the new leasing plan for dormitories, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the fact sheets were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIT ANNOUNCES NEW LEASING PLAN FOR DORMITORIES

A pay-as-you-go program under which colleges and preparatory schools can acquire the early use and eventual ownership of additional student dormitory facilities without capital investment was announced in New York today by L. Walter Lundell, president of CIT Financial Corp.

The program, as outlined by Mr. Lundell at a press conference attended by college officials and other educational leaders, will make it possible for these institutions to meet their increasingly pressing needs for additional housing solely from normal room rental fees paid by the students who will occupy the buildings.

A newly formed company subsidiary, CIT Educational Buildings, Inc., will arrange for construction of CIT-owned dormitories, lease them to the colleges for a specified number of years, up to a maximum of 12, and then give title to the buildings to the colleges without further cost or charges, Mr. Lundell said. The overall project has been named "The CIT Campus Homes Program."

"This unique, self-liquidating plan, we believe, will make a significant contribution to solving the serious and growing student residence problems facing many colleges and schools," he said. "It is the essence of the plan that standard room rentals approximating those charged students occupying other rooms on the same campus should be sufficient to cover all rental payments under the lease, as well as provide income to the college for building service and maintenance costs."

TWO PROJECTS LAUNCHED

While negotiations currently are underway with a number of colleges, Mr. Lundell announced that contracts and leases have been signed for two substantial building projects that will get underway at once for completion by the opening of the college year next fall. The two projects will be built for Ricker College, located at Houlton, Maine, and Salem College at Salem, W. Va.

Construction of both dormitory complexes will be handled by Southern Mill & Manufacturing Co., of Tulsa, Okla., leading industrial and home construction firm, of which A. R. Tandy is chairman and president.

The buildings on the Ricker campus, to be erected as an open quadrangle, will house a minimum of 120 students in double rooms. Proctor's rooms also will be provided. Construction will feature an exterior of brick and cedar shingles to blend with existing campus buildings.

OUTSIDE BALCONIES

The three Salem dormitories, also to be erected in a U-shaped plan, will have exteriors of brick and rustic wood. They will house a total of 140 students. The architectural plan for these buildings will feature outside balconies for access to all interior rooms and the students will live in four-room, eight-occupant suites, built around a common lounge and separate bathroom facilities for each living unit.

CIT officials pointed out that variations in building costs, college requirements and other factors will necessarily result in varying per-student room charges from one project to another. However, it was said that all investigation to date suggested that most buildings could be leased for annual per-student charges in the $225-$250 range with payments on the Ricker and Salem projects falling within these limits. This range will fix the total per-student, or per-bed cost to a college somewhere between $2,500 and $3,000 over the 12-year period of the lease. At the end of this period, it was noted, the title to the building will be turned over to the college without further payments, so that all the income in future years will accrue to the college itself.

EXPERIENCED BUILDERS

Southern Mill, prime contractor in the educational building program has had extensive experience in mass production of homes, schoolroom facilities, and municipal, industrial and military housing, Mr. Tandy said. He pointed out that the company was a pioneer in the pre-engineered construction industry.

As one of the country's leading constructor-contractor-builders, Mr. Tandy said, Southern Mill, among other major projects, completed a $12 million mobilization housing project, comprising 3,862 family units in Kansas; built an entire community of 66 homes and 4 service buildings at Mexican Hat, Utah, and has constructed more than 400 school classrooms in Tulsa. More recently, he said, the company has expanded its activities to construction of college housing, including 20 dormitories at Denton, Tex., apartments, motels and other major units. Its buildings now serve more than 1,000 communities in 37 States, he added.

"The broad experience of the Southern Mill Co., the skilled organization it represents and their imaginative approach to architectural and construction considerations have made an important contribution to the development of CIT's campus housing program," Mr. Lundell said. He added that CIT representatives and Mr. Tandy and his associates had visited scores of colleges across the country to study campus housing problems, building designs and other dormitory requirements, and had consulted with many college building authorities in the course of the development of the program.

Mr. Tandy noted that while flexibility in dormitory design is essential to provide buildings compatible with each college's overall architectural atmosphere, standardization of the basic structures will result in substantial savings and is contemplated for most projects, in the interests of savings for the colleges and students.

COLLEGE DESCRIPTIONS

Ricker, founded in 1848, is a 4-year, liberal arts college with an enrollment of 380 students but expects to increase that total to 500 by 1967. Dr. C. Worth Howard, former president of American College, Cairo, Egypt, is president. Business manager is Charles W. Heath, who handled negotiations with the builder.

"After having tried unsuccessfully to adapt large homes within the town to our student housing needs, we welcome CIT's campus homes program as a providential answer to our problem," Dr. Howard said. "At last we are able to build student housing facilities to fit our specific needs and ultimately to own our own dormitories. This is obviously the solution to our housing requirements and undoubtedly to those of other small colleges in the Nation."

Dr. K. Duane Hurley, president of the 75-year-old Salem College, said that student housing is "one of our most pressing problems." He added:

"We at Salem College are extremely enthusiastic about this 'pay-as-you-go' plan to help us provide badly needed additional dormitory space. It will be a tremendous help in moving forward toward our goal of doubling our facilities to meet the expansion of our enrollment expected in the years ahead." He said the present student enrollment of 850 is expected to rise to approximately 1,200 in the next 5 years and to double within the next decade.

CIT officials pointed out that other builders also are expected to participate in the program as it develops. One of those interested, the company said, is National Homes Corp. of Lafayette, Ind., a leading organization in the manufactured homes industry, operating nationally.

CIT has long had a close corporate relationship with the educational world. Through two other subsidiaries, Tuition Plan Inc. and the recently formed Tuition Plan of New Hampshire, Inc., CIT makes installment financing of college educations available to all families with college-age children. The CIT Foundation, the company's philanthropic affiliate, participates in the national merit scholarship program and, in addition, makes challenge grants of $5,000 each to all newly accredited, 4-year, liberal-arts colleges. Under the latter plan, the school is asked to raise at least an equal amount from local business sources in order to receive the CIT award.

Salem College, Salem, W. Va.

Salem College was founded in 1888 and this year is celebrating its 75th anniversary.

It is a 4-year liberal arts college that was founded by the Seventh Day Baptists. It is coeducational.

Its present enrollment is approximately 850 students. The college is in a period of considerable growth and it is expected that its enrollment will reach approximately 1,200 students in the next 5 years and will at least double in the next decade.

President of Salem is Dr. K. Duane Hurley, who has been active in the founding and growth of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

In December of 1962 Salem was selected by the Association of American Colleges to receive the seventh annual quality improvement award amounting to $25,000 in unrestricted funds. The award, made possible by a grant by the U.S. Steel Foundation, "is designed to encourage and reward a college striving for excellence and to help it obtain full recognition from its regional accrediting association." Salem College was fully accredited in March of this year by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Salem College joins Ricker College of Houlton, Maine, as the first schools to participate in the new CIT Educational Buildings, Inc., program of providing "pay as you go" campus housing to colleges and schools.

The CIT Financial Corp. subsidiary will arrange construction of three dormitories for Salem, lease them to the college for up to a maximum of 12 years and then give title to them to the college.

The buildings will consist of a center structure in brick colonial style, with two other separate dorms angling out from either side. The 3 will house 140 students.

Contractor is Southern Mill & Manufacturing Co., Tulsa, Okla., a leading industrial and home builder. Architect for the college is W. H. Grant, Jr., Clarksburg, W. Va.

Construction is to start this spring with completion scheduled for September 1963.

The new dormitories will be constructed on the 100-acre Salem campus, located in the Salem and Clarksburg, W. Va. area.

CIT Educational Buildings, Inc.

Newly formed subsidiary of CIT Financial Corp., the Nation's largest industrial and commercial financing firm.

Officers of Educational Buildings: L. Walter Lundell, president. Mr. Lundell also is president of CIT Financial Corp.

Offers unique plan to U.S. colleges and schools to provide the use and eventual ownership of dormitories and other campus housing facilities.

Educational Buildings will construct campus housing, lease to the college for a stated number of years—to a maximum of 12—and then give title to the building(s) to the college.

Buildings will be constructed on college property, built to specifications worked out between college and construction company.

Rental payments will be made to educational buildings on a semiannual or quarterly basis. The payments will be made from funds derived from normal student room rent charges, expected to range from $225 to $250 a year. Thus the buildings can be self-liquidating for the colleges.

Under the plan, colleges eliminate any outlay of their own funds and their general credit is not committed or impaired in any way.

Initial projects are construction of three-unit dormitory buildings for Ricker College, Houlton, Maine, and Salem College, Salem, W. Va. Completion is scheduled for September, 1963. Contractor for both projects: Southern Mill & Manufacturing Co., Tulsa, Okla.

The campus housing program was developed by CIT after 2 years of study in cooperation with college and other educational officials, builders and architects.

A number of colleges and schools already have expressed interest in the plan, and it is expected other construction projects will be undertaken during the year. It is also expected that other builders will participate with CIT in the program as it progresses.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this year the Rockefeller Foundation is celebrating its 50th anniversary. The work of this foundation is a striking example of the type of service that American foundations can perform for the advantage of all mankind. As a former overseer of Harvard University, I have some small idea of what contribution the Rockefeller Foundation has made to education.

The Rockefeller Foundation was founded in 1913 by John D. Rockefeller, with an initial endowment of $35 million. Its various funds have spent more than $763 million to date. The money has been used to advance the cause of public health and hygiene, medical research to stimulate advanced scientific studies through fellowships and scholarships, and to support science in general. Twenty-eight recipients of the Rockefeller-financed fellowships and scholarships have received a Nobel prize. The foundation has also lent assistance in the fields of the arts and to programs in humanities and social sciences. Their funds have helped make possible our Arena Stage here in Washington, D.C., and the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in New York City, to name but a few. It has also been extremely active in the international field and much progress which we see in certain of the newly developing nations can be credited to the Rockefeller Foundation support.

We hear today about certain abuses of privileges granted nonprofit organizations. We can be certain that the Rockefeller Foundation does not fall in any such category. We turn with pride and confidence to this foundation as one which is working in the best interest of all of our citizens here in this country and throughout the world.

I commend the Rockefeller Foundation for its extremely fine work in the past and wish them another 50 years of equal progress.

VERY DISTINGUISHED COLUMNIST POINTS UP SENATOR HUMPHREY'S SIGNIFICANT DISARMAMENT ROLE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, today's Washington Post carries an article by the noted columnist, Mr. Max Freedman, entitled "Humphrey and Disarmament."

Mr. Freedman very properly gives the senior Senator from Minnesota, who also serves as chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, major credit for keeping the current disarmament discussions in perspective. As Mr. Freedman points out, Senator Humphrey has been "carrying the lonely burden of protecting the public interest in a safeguarded disarmament treaty."

Many informed observers believe that the Senate speech delivered by the Minnesota Senator on March 7 is the most important statement made on the Senate floor in this session of the Congress. Certainly, it is a speech that fully documents the position taken by our administration in the Geneva negotiations. It is a statement that ought to be studied carefully by all those who believe in a realistic and safeguarded disarmament agreement.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Freedman's column be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 8, 1963]

Humphrey and Disarmament

(By Max Freedman)

Without Senator Humphrey the debate on disarmament would proceed against hopeless odds. He has been President Kennedy's chief supporter in Congress for a prudent and responsible treaty. When Mr. Eisenhower was President he gave the same kind of courageous support to a Republican administration. It is not the least of his merits that he believes that disarmament, like defense policy, should be above mere partisan skirmishing. In view of this record he is entitled to a thoughtful hearing when he makes a major statement on the disarmament negotiations at Geneva.

Yet this careful examination of his proposals is precisely what has been lacking. It almost seems as if the cynical principle is being followed of ignoring Senator Humphrey's points because one cannot answer them. Some time ago he delivered an elaborately documented analysis of the disarmament deadlock but his address met with little response in the Senate and with only scattered attention in the country. This surely is shabby treatment for a Senator who is carrying the lonely burden of protecting the public interest in a safeguarded disarmament treaty.

It may therefore be some contribution to the public debate if one summarizes the main points which Senator Humphrey is now making.

He points out that in 1958 it was the belief of both Russian and American scientists that there would have to be an international inspection system with about 180 control posts, of which 19 would be in the Soviet Union. It would have taken between 4 to 6 years to install this system; scores of international technicians would have been included in the project; the system would have cost $2 billion to build and several hundred million dollars a year to maintain. Today no such system needs to be established at all.

The United States, like Russia, can now identify nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space. If Russia would agree to a treaty outlawing such tests, the risks of successful evasion or cheating would form no problem. The real concern is with tests conducted underground where they may be harder to detect or may be confused with earthquakes.

Senator Humphrey reports that in the past 5 years the United States has greatly improved its ability to identify earthquakes in Russia. It is a generous figure to suggest that these unidentified occurrences in any 1 year will be "only a few dozen at most." Under the British-American treaty each of these mysterious events would be subject to inspection. From a scientific or technical standpoint, the problem of security is wholly manageable. Russia would soon learn this fact if it were willing to give the proposed treaty a fair trial.

Senator Humphrey asked the Kennedy administration to make available the results of studies of underground events in Russia from 1958 through 1962. He has quoted "a competent administration official in whom I repose the highest confidence" as saying that the United States has the present ability to monitor a test ban agreement with full safeguards for American security.

Under these new arrangements it would be necessary to supplement these monitoring devices by inspections inside Russia carried out by inspectors who could be accompanied by Soviet observers. The inspected area would be small and would be located by using the records of at least four detection stations. There would be no more than seven inspections each year. The treaty would lapse and the United States would be free to resume its tests if Russia refused to agree to any suggested inspection or was caught in a secret test.

Since the 1960 campaign, Mr. Kennedy has shown much more eagerness than the general public to reach a disarmament agreement with Russia, above all on a test ban treaty. The public has tended to view the Geneva talks with resigned apathy as a meaningless charade. Yet all the time hardworking and often misunderstood officials have been closing the gap between the Russian and American positions, while always striving for a treaty that would be endorsed by two-thirds of the Senate. It is high time that we realize that American public indifference is very helpful to Russia in resisting a treaty. For Russia can twist and equivocate at Geneva without being called to account by a bored American press.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a thorough overhaul is overdue in America's foreign aid program. This is my conclusion after I carefully studied the Clay report—a report of the Committee appointed by the President to look into our foreign assistance programs.

I am convinced that the money Congress has been appropriating for foreign aid is not being as effectively used as it should or could be used.

While I have served in the U.S. Senate, I have consistently supported our foreign aid program. I believe in it.

In a world where relentless Communist imperialism manipulates the poverty and instability of nations to subvert their freedom, I see foreign aid as an important arm of American foreign policy.

It should keep open avenues of trade to market our products and reliable sources of raw materials needed for our industry. It should assure America of free, independent, and strong allies, and thus strengthen our defense posture around the globe.

In a world in which poverty, sickness, and turmoil are rife, I see foreign aid as the spiritual and humanitarian thing for America to do. As the Clay report pointed out, it is an "American tradition to be concerned with the plight of those less fortunate than ourselves."

Our extensive foreign aid programs, lasting for well over a decade, may be accredited with impressive accomplishments—the Marshal plan, the point 4 technical assistance plan, the capital loan assistance plan, to name a few.

Yet, even with these and other successes, "much remains to be accomplished." We do not really know how effectively much of our funds are being used; we know that some recipient nations have not adopted the necessary fiscal, administrative, political, and social reforms for a successful program.

Nor have they planned well in some cases, or planned sensibly—so that some nations are not using their own resources to help themselves, while other countries have programs ill suited to their needs and conditions.

To meet these inadequacies and problems, I am cosponsoring a bipartisan resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, with a group of other Senators to appoint a series of small committees, one for each country receiving American foreign aid. Each of these committees would take a long, close look at the receiving country, reviewing and evaluating the development program in that country.

The committees would study three questions:

First. Does the country receiving U.S. aid have a practical and sensible development program that will help raise the country's living standards?

Second. Is the recipient country doing all it can to help itself?

Third. Has it adopted all the reforms needed for the program to succeed?

If we are to get as much mileage out of our foreign aid dollar as we can, I believe it is imperative that we stop and take a good, hard look at the effectiveness of our foreign assistance program in each country.

THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS BILL NEEDED NOW: THIS BILL IS ALL GOOD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Senate is fortunate to be able to take up this week, among the first major bills before it, S. 1, the Youth Employment Act. The Senate will be able to show its wisdom and concern for the country by the speedy passage of this bill. By thus acting, we can take another step toward improving the economy of our country.

For too many years, this Nation's economy has been in a stagnant condition. We have been faced with an unemployment rate that seems to creep upward regardless of the general business conditions. Of course, this Democratic administration and Congress have viewed this situation as intolerable, and have commenced in the last 2 years a series of specific programs carefully tailored to have a lasting impact on the unemployment problem. The Area Redevelopment Act, the Accelerated Public Works Act, the Housing Act, the Manpower Training and Development Act, these and other intelligent steps have been taken to lay the groundwork for full employment. In this Congress, we have the opportunity to act in the area of greatest need for stimulation in employment; our youth.

The young people of this country compose the most serious unemployment problem we face in the immediate future. Their rate of unemployment is twice the national average; more than 13 percent of the 16-to-21-year-olds in the labor market are without jobs. There are 700,000 unemployed youths between 16 and 21 years of age. And this year 3,800,000 young people come of age, 1 million more than last year.

So we are proposing to take a modest number of these youths and put them at jobs that beneficially serve the public interest. In the Youth Conservation Corps, we shall put some 15,000 to work outdoors improving our resources for conservation and recreation, but the second year, this number would rise to 50,000. Initially, in addition, we shall help 45,000 young people do community service near their own homes, in the Home Town Service Corps. Of course, we hope that this will have some small effect on the unemployment rate, but even more worth while are the public benefits to accrue both to the young people joining these programs, and to the localities where their service is performed.

What more useful calling could be devised for a young man than to be employed in healthy outdoor conservation work? And what better contribution can be made to our national investment in conservation and recreation facilities than the products of these youths' labor? One can look about in the National and State parks of my State and see that a very large proportion of the permanent facilities there are legacies of the work of the CCC more than 20 years ago. I dare say the situation is the same in many other States.

We knew the CCC well in Texas, where 156,000 young people worked in the camps between 1933 and 1942. They built over 6,000 miles of Texas roads and track trails. Texans knew their work and appreciated it—perhaps it should never have been stopped, putting us to the effort of starting it again.

The other title of this bill would institute a new and worthwhile program, the home town service corps. State and local public agencies would be provided funds on a 50–50 matching basis to provide worthwhile job opportunities and training for youths between 16 and 21. These 45,000 young people would be employed in their own communities in needed capacities at hospitals, libraries, children's homes and other community service institutions, public and private. Community service institutions are usually pressed for funds and personnel; local programs of this design have proved to be quite successful. They channel youth into beneficial public work, while improving the employability of the young person. Regular workers will not be displaced, and pay and working conditions are to be reasonably comparable with the community standard.

There have been needless fears expressed that this program will provide a haven for juvenile delinquents. Perhaps that has arisen because the proponents of this bill have expressed their hope that it will provide a constructive outlet for the energies of school dropouts. In spite of the bad social conditions created thereby, I do not equate school dropouts with any predisposition to juvenile delinquency. If one looks at our educational statistics he can see that this country has been built mostly by the labor of so-called school dropouts. They have performed useful services for America in the past; they shall do so in the future under the terms of this bill. I sincerely hope that we shall avoid the sort of social stigma on these youths that some have already started to hint. The provisions of the bill are sufficient safeguard against undesirables; those serving in the two phases of the program will be performing very desirable services for this country.

As an example, I am pleased to note that Secretary of the Interior Udall, in his testimony for the bill, suggested that the Youth Conservation Corps might well be employed in establishing recreation facilities in the newly created national seashores at Cape Cod, Point Reyes, and Padre Island, Tex. Texas this week completed the necessary legislative action by it to establish the Padre Island National Seashore, an event which pleased me very much as the original sponsor of that legislation. Texas would be benefited indeed if the recreation facilities needed to implement fully the National Park Service plans for Padre Island were to be built by the Youth Conservation Corps volunteers as contemplated by this bill.

The Youth Conservation Corps created by the Youth Employment Act will build conservation facilities in the great national parks, dams and bridges, roads and trails, and even cabins and other recreational facilities. But more than that, it will build in the boys and young men who live close to nature in the camps, a love for the outdoors, and appreciation of nature, a will to work, a drive for higher ideals in life. The Corps will build character along with muscle; it will build into its graduates employability in our society, and good citizenship for our Nation.

S. 1 is a proposal that will truly offer to young people the means for attaining human dignity, individual self-reliance, and citizenship training. It is a necessary step toward beginning to solve some of the problems our urban industrialized economy has created for today's youth. This bill is all good. I urge its adoption.

PASSOVER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, sundown today marks the start of the Festival of Passover to commemorate the liberation of the ancient Israelites from slavery in Egypt. In this traditional ceremony of the Jewish religion, families will observe rites that have been upheld for centuries and passed on in days of slavery and persecution as well as in freedom.

Even as these high holy days are observed with the age-old scriptural responses and the traditional foods, we are all reminded that elsewhere in the world this freedom does not exist. For the second year in a row the Soviet State bakeries in Moscow have prohibited the baking of matzohs, the unleavened bread that is eaten in remembrance of the haste with which the people of Israel fled from Egypt.

Passover, perhaps, more than any other religious holiday, symbolizes liberation, the redemption of a people from alien oppression and slavery. Yet freedom poses its responsibilities—responsibilities for self-restraint, tolerance, community service, and integrity. It is most fitting that on this start of the Passover season, we all, regardless of religion, assess again our continuing obligations as individuals and as citizens of a free nation to the ideals of religious and political freedom which are such a deep and meaningful part of the historic celebration of Passover.

TO BE OR NOT TO BE: THE INDIANA DUNES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a deeper understanding of the issues concerning the effort to preserve the Indiana dunes from the destruction spearheaded by the economically unjustified Burns Ditch Harbor is taking shape throughout Indiana. This increased understanding is in large part the result of the dedicated and skilled efforts of Mr. Thomas E. Dustin, of Fort Wayne, Ind., who is the voluntary public relations director of the Save the Dunes Council.

The fight to save the dunes was started by Indiana citizens and has largely been carried forward by Indiana citizens, although strong nationwide interest and active support has developed. The Save the Dunes Council and others working to rescue the dunes, including myself, do not oppose a new harbor for Indiana. We do oppose the unnecessary and economically unjustified construction of a harbor in the heart of the irreplaceable and beautiful dunes. As has been pointed out many times, there are several alternate locations for a harbor which will preserve the dunes and give Indiana a large new harbor and industrial site.

In its current issue, Fort Wayne, a magazine devoted to the good life in northeastern Indiana, carries an excellent article by Mr. Dustin which discusses the issues in relation to recent proposals made by Governor Welsh, of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent that this article from the April issue of Fort Wayne be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO BE OR NOT TO BE—THE INDIANA DUNES

In mid-February, the Governor of Indiana addressed the people of the State in support of what was termed an economic development fund.

The basic purpose of this program was to obtain tax support from the citizens and the business of Indiana, to finance construction of a port project, east of Burns Ditch, in the Indiana Dunes adjacent to Lake Michigan.

This program was rejected in the regular 1963 session of the Indiana General Assembly, but taxpayers may well expect new State administration angles to finance the same project, in the special session of the legislature, called by the Governor, partly for this very purpose.

A port in Indiana at the particular location proposed has met opposition from conservationist groups, because construction at that chosen place would destroy much of the irreplaceable Indiana dunelands, as well as skiing, boating opportunities and other water recreation activities on our Indiana Lake Michigan shores. This view has been expressed by the Izaak Walton League, by the American Camping Association, the Save the Dunes Council, and by almost every other similar group in this State and throughout the Nation, as well as by more than 70,000 Indiana citizens.

But if the port was first opposed by those who only wanted to save our dunes, it is now opposed by uncounted thousands who want to save our money.

It is now well understood that there are already four harbors on our Indiana Lake Michigan shoreline, two of which have been fully public for many years, and both of which are federally funded, not State tax subsidized, for deepening to ocean vessel depth, or for studies of other improvements.

It is also well known that the Tri-City area of Lake County is now under intensive study by the Army Corps of Engineers, who are determining the feasibility of a deep water port at that site. That port project would have an initial size 10 times the greatest size which could be attained at Burns Ditch.

But the tempo to get millions of dollars of State tax money for construction of yet another port continues at fantastic levels.

In light of the fact that our State already has two public harbors now, both of which are federally funded for improvement, Indiana taxpayers ask why the State should spend $25,500,000 to finance a Federal project.

This project—which was the fundamental purpose of such proposals as the Economic Development Fund, has not even been given an unqualified approval by the Army Engineers. There are many conditions which have not been met—only one of which is an integrated steel mill.

We are having chaotic troubles in Indiana, raising $1,400 million for absolutely essential uses. Why should we be expected to pay for a two-company port which remains unapproved by the Federal Government, now considering budgets approaching half a trillion dollars?

Are we to spend this money just so we can enjoy the dubious privilege of thumbing our noses at imagined "out of State" enemies? * * * and at a time when millions are being slashed from university appropriations.

Several specific phases of the Burns Port program are worth discussing, both on its own merits, and on the effects it would have on a great natural resource. As citizens of a proud State, we have a right and a duty to show concern, not only for the size and quantity of our growth, but also for the shape and quality of that growth.

The Burns Port is feasible only under a very strict set of conditions. One of these many conditions is an integrated steel mill.

What are the prospects for meeting that requirement before today's 10-year-olds have graduated from our universities?

According to State house estimates, which predicted the Economic Development Fund, a port would not be in operation for a dozen years or more, under the very best conditions.

An authoritative trade journal said less than a year ago, that Midwest Steel Corp. integrated mill plan is a "way out" expansion, and added the company would use the port if it built a basic steelmaking facility—an integrated mill.

On January 10, little more than 2 months ago, the chairman of the board of Bethlehem was quoted in the Wall Street Journal, as saying that their integrated mill was only a dream well off in the future.

And this was confirmed in a letter of February 18, to the Governor from Bethlehem Steel, which we obtained, and which said this: "It is obvious that we cannot now predict, with any degree of accuracy when we will reach step 6, which will be the fully integrated steel mill."

This same letter also indicated that production worker employment for the committed mills might be on the order of 2,100 to 2,300, but that possible labor agreements "will have a bearing on whether the local labor supply, where qualified, will be given preference for these jobs."

There are simply no guarantees either as to when or if any integrated mills will be built.

But even if the firms did make hard commitments to build integrated mills, it would be adverse to our interests to use State funds for building their harbor, whether through an Economic Development Fund, or through some other grand-sounding legislation.

No one has made a target of either of these two great firms. Conservationists as well as all other citizens wish both a long and prosperous history in our State. But establishing a spirit of good will and a favorable economic climate are far different than providing a vast subsidy, which a Burns Port represents.

We don't think our administration should ask us to pay a 3-cent cigarette toll—or a special corporate tax to finance such a doubtful objective. Conservationists have in mind a new fighting slogan, paraphrasing a famed historical exclamation: "Millions for education—but not 3 cents for tribute."

Let's turn now to the Army Engineers reports and the figures attributed to the Burns Ditch port project.

In both its 1960 and its 1962 reports, the corps set an integrated steel mill as a basic requirement for port feasibility. There was nothing strange in this. Fully 94 percent of all the proven tonnage for the port is set forth for limestone, ore and coal, required only for an integrated mill. Yet, the administration expressed shock when the engineers called this detail to their attention a couple of months ago.

This was quite an oversight at best.

An agreement between the State and Midwest, lying in the files of the Indiana Port Commission, even mentions the possibility of nice, clean, open hearth blast furnaces if an integrated mill is built. These are the only devices which would consume ore, limestone and fuel at the site.

The Army Engineers state the project would save Midwest Steel $6,700,000 a year if they used the port. And they say the project would save all other shippers just $610,000 a year, less than one-tenth of the total.

But even of this small nonsteel benefit, two-thirds is listed for transshipped coal alone. This leaves about 2 or 3 percent of the benefits for all the rest of the agriculture and manufacturing industry of the entire State of Indiana.

If the mills do not integrate, and if the coal shippers used more of the capacity of the present Michigan City harbor, we'd have little more than a ghost harbor up there. But even with complete fulfillment of every qualification, we lose money if we build the port with State funds.

Here is why this is so:

The Army Engineers computed the benefit-to-cost ratio at 1.5:1; that is, the port would save $1.50 to shippers for every dollar of cost. But while this computation is based on the Federal portion of the cost only, it includes all the benefits. The Federal part is $25,500,000; but the rest of the cost is conservatively estimated at $38 million. The total cost of the project then, is at least $63 million.

Weighing all the costs as well as all the benefits, the benefit-to-cost ratio falls below 1 to 1. That is, in complete terms, the port will cost far more than it will return.

Let's review this again. The total annual income from the port is estimated at $1,500,000, while cost against only the Federal portion of the investment is $1 million a year. But what about the rest of the costs, $38 million in revenue bonds and what about maintenance costs? The annual interest costs, principal costs, and maintenance costs come to $3,700,000; but we are still working with only a total income of $1,500,000.

Now, if we approve State taxing for the Federal portion of the project, total costs of operation for which we are responsible—in one way or another—amount to $4,700,000, the sum of the Federal and the bonding charges—a net overall loss in excess of $3 million a year.

This reality becomes quite clear when you think of the State (Indiana taxpayers) going it alone.

Neither of the steel companies will pay any terminal fees. This is established, and it means that only terminal fees from the small fraction of nonsteel users would be available for bond retirement, channel maintenance and other costs.

Now, here is the $63 million question: Who has first claim on the scanty $1,500,000 income which is supposed to cover $4,700,000 in annual costs, we the taxpayers—or they, the bondholders?

Let's return to Uncle Sam. If he builds the breakwaters, nobody pays anything to enter the port area; this is established by both statute and custom. If the State builds the breakwaters, and attempts to levy fees for entry, we have a whole new problem to contend with.

Even the small group of nonsteel alleged users, base their interest on a federally financed outer breakwater program, which would require no entry fee. What will they say if they now find they would have to pay a terminal fee and an entry fee? The margin of alleged advantage at Burns Ditch is so small to begin with, any such additional charges will clearly make the port uneconomical for any but the two steel firms.

With a $3,200,000 spread in the red, where do we make up the losses? From more corporate taxes? From university appropriations? More tribute from smokers? Or do we just issue more bonds in a never-ending series?

But there's more on the costs. Much more. In its 1960 report, the Army Engineers estimated that it would cost at least $6,400,000 for the first dredging costs of the port. This figure remains unchanged by the 1962 report; but the engineers commit the Federal Government to only $3,700,000 of these costs, and they say that if the job can't be done by hydraulic pumping means, the cost could double, to $12,800,000. Even with Federal financing, we have to pay at least $2,700,000 for first dredging, and we could be hit with up to $9,400,000 for this; without Federal financing, we get the bill for the whole thing, no matter what it is.

They don't talk much about this in the State capitol.

Besides first dredging costs, the Army Engineers said 27,000 cubic yards of shoreline erosion would be caused by the riparian filling and construction; and they exclude the Federal Government from any responsibility for this. Who is going to pay to correct the erosion?

Then, of course, there's the question of continued harbor dredging. No one has figured what this amounts to; but it is a fact that every other port in the lower Lake Michigan area requires extensive and continued dredging to maintain suitable depths. How much is that going to cost the taxpayers?

After all, the State house emotionalism and diversionary charges of "outside pressure" are set in perspective, here is the basic sediment of the Burns Ditch port:

(1) The annual revenues predicted for the port are less than one-third the known annual costs;

(2) There is no solid commitment, with dates, for construction of an integrated steel mill; but even if there were, this would not increase revenue because neither steel company would pay terminal fees.

(3) Neither the costs of first dredging, nor of continued dredging, nor of erosion control and corrections are known or even guess-estimated.

(4) The nonsteel users are unproved, particularly for coal, and especially if the State builds the port—with our money—and tries to collect entry fees.

Any one of these uncertainties is more than reason to wait before we lay out at least $25,500,000 of our State tax money for the project.

Let's go into this alleged coal tonnage for Burns Ditch in a little more detail.

We have obtained a copy of the 1961 annual report of the Monon Railroad. The Monon is called The Hoosier Line, because it serves Indiana, almost exclusively, with 90 percent of all its tracks in Indiana.

The Monon is the only railroad with existing direct rails between our southern Indiana coal areas and a public harbor on our shore of Lake Michigan—the harbor at Michigan City, which has been serving the Indiana coal industry for years.

The Monon's annual report says, under a paragraph entitled "Michigan City":

"The general plans and specifications for a deep water dock facility at Michigan City have been prepared. This facility, as designed, would initially handle the transfer of coal from railroad cars onto lake steamers."

Elsewhere in the report, the company explains that its expansion, accomplished with its own investment—not State subsidized—would enable it to transfer 2 million tons of coal a year at Michigan City.

The Monon is an Indiana company, willing to invest millions of its own money in terminal and other facilities so that it can expand its existing coal carrying operations.

Furthermore, this public harbor is now federally funded for improvements. Neither of these operations are being paid for out of Indiana State taxes; and new jobs will result from the program, at no drain on us.

What's significant about the Monon's plan at Michigan City? Only this: Ditch port backers allege that Burns Ditch is the only port project capable of coal transshipment; and coal is the only major nonsteel commodity listed for shipment from the Burns project.

But, there is the Michigan City harbor program. Why should we put up State funds for a carbon copy coal handling capability, thus discouraging private enterprise from solving the problem in the tried and true way?

Here's one more shocker: A full year ago, the president of the only real shipper who had expressed intent in the part, Rail to Water, Inc., of Chicago, wrote Clinton Green, of the Indiana Port Commission, that port feasibility from their point of view relied upon Federal participation. The firm also said our commission would have to buy out Rail to Water's Calumet facilities first, and morever that it did not consider itself a "public utility" bound to handle just anybody's coal. Just where does all that leave Indiana and our sick coal industry?

It would be interesting, now, to turn back to the 1957 Indiana General Assembly, which appropriated $2 million for the purchase of Burns Ditch port lands.

"This appropriation," the legislation reads, "shall not be expended or available for expenditure by the Board (now the Indiana Port Commission), in whole or in part, unless and until the Corps of Army Engineers has approved the economic feasibility and justification for a public harbor or terminal on said real estate."

The requirements for feasibility, as set forth by the Army Engineers have not been met, and they have not requested construction funds for the project.

Yet, the port commission has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for the purchase of these lands. They have jumped the gun, and now we are asked to produce an additional $25,500,000 for a project that has not even fulfilled the requirements of the first $2 million.

It has been 6 years and four legislatures ago since that $2 million was appropriated, we still don't have assurances that the Army Engineers requirements will be met.

No amount of scapegoating and charges of "outside interference" can cover these hard, cold facts.

It would be hard to see how Indiana needs another port under the best of conditions. In combinations, both our public ports and the two private ports now handle millions of tons a year, of coal, gypsum, limestone, iron ore, general cargo, petroleum products, steel, gravel, and other materials.

If we do need yet another port, we can have it in the East Chicago-Whiting-Hammond area of our State. This project is now under study.

How many gateways to world trade do we need?

Won't the State House be satisfied until we have nothing but one long string of ports from one end to the other on our 42-mile Lake Michigan shoreline?

What are the prospects for employment by the known industry for the port? We can only go to the record for this. The 1962 employment at Midwest Steel, the only plant now operating there, was listed authoritatively at less than 500, and many of these folks are known to be from out of State.

In combination with the unbuilt, but committed plants of the other firm, this indicates a total of about 3,500 production workers. But that's only one-tenth of the employment forecast by the administration, and just 3 percent of the prediction by the Lieutenant Governor.

C. W. Efroymson, an economist at Butler University, offers a professional opinion on employment from the proposed development in the dunes. He says:

"In view of the probable advance in automation, particularly in steel, and the probable future of the steel industry as a whole, it seems likely that the number of jobs available in that industry will gradually decline."

"While it is probable that steel employment will decline over the years," he comments, "the opposite applies to employment in recreational facilities such as the dunes are fitted to offer."

Mr. Efroymson asks: "Shall we destroy a continuing certain source of jobs and income for employment in an industry which can be closed down when some executive committee in Pittsburgh or New York decides it would be cheaper to build a new mill in Utah or Texas?"

Let's turn from the opinion of this professional economist, and examine what other trained experts say about our Indiana dunes and shoreline, and what the Burns Ditch port would mean.

Commenting on the effects of the proposed port, an associate director of the National Park Service said this:

"Development of a public harbor in the location proposed by the Governor of Indiana would level several hundred acres of the remaining tree-covered dunes, and would destroy nearly a mile of the finest sand beach on the Great Lakes."

He also said, and this is especially important, "There is a grave probability that the water and air pollution created by harbor activities and adjacent factories will make the Indiana Dunes State Park less desirable, and might well make beach activity unsafe."

In his official, written statement to Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Chief of Engineers, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall said this on July 20, 1962:

"The inevitable pollution which would necesarily follow the construction of the harbor at this location would have a detrimental effect on the public recreation potential in this area."

The Secretary said, "There are alternate sites within the same general area for artificial harbors which have not been studied in detail; there is no substitute for the scenic and recreational opportunities which the Indiana dunes can be made to provide."

"It is our recommendation," the Secretary continued, "that approval of the proposed reports be withheld until thorough study can be given by the Corps of Engineers to alternative sites for the harbor, and until the impact of the Burns Waterway project on the proposed lakeshore is fully evaluated."

The Bureau of the Census now forecasts that within a very few years, there will be virtually a continuous strip of cities from Milwaukee, Wis., to Buffalo, N.Y. On our own Lake Michigan shore, Gary on the west and Michigan City on the east, will form links of this urban system.

With most of our existing shoreline already given over to ports, cities, and industry now, it is easy to see that the rarest and most priceless asset in a few years is not going to be one more port or one more factory.

The unusual, and therefore the most valuable tract will be the last green legacy we can provide for our people and the people of the country.

Make no mistake about the dunes as an economic asset. This place is right now in the main flow of transcontinental traffic, and this is going to increase. Even now, highway expansion feeding the dunes area is being considered, though the Governor vetoed certain highway improvement in that area.

It is the simplest of logic which indicates we should acquire those lands which are known to be in demand now, and which can be proved of demand in the future.

For instance, if we give credibility to statements made by the Handley administration only 3 years ago, and the Welsh administration today, the Indiana Dunes State Park increased in development and use from 10 to 33 percent in that short period of time.

The Dunes State Park was acquired in the mid-1920's, and has not been added to since that time. It contains about 3 percent of the total park area in our State, but it gets 25 percent of the human traffic. This means that the average acre of the Dunes State Park gets 10 times more human traffic than the average of all our other State parks.

This means money to us—lots of it—incoming money, from other States to our own State.

The average tourist spends $12 a day when he visits, and on this basis our duneland attraction should now result in about $62,500,000 of business for our State each year * * * one-fourth of all the skimpy tourist business we get in Indiana.

What are we to do? * * * seal this off little at a time, or capitalize on it while there is still time? Should we write off our whole shoreline for industry and more ports as the position of Congressman HALLECK seems to suggest?

Beyond the money, we have an obligation on our shoreline. Indiana is not an isolated republic. It is a member of the community of States. We have an asset in the dunelands of which all America is proud, and which we should want to use and share.

Thousands of Indiana educators, scientists, conservationists and other citizens have publicly expressed their hope that this asset be protected for our enjoyment and for the use of future generations.

Not a month ago, 13 biologists from the University of Notre Dame, which represents virtually the entire biology staff at the university, went on record favoring shifting of the port to another site because of its effects on the dunes and lakeshore.

A month or two ago, almost 200 educators and scientists from more than a dozen other major public and private universities echoed this wish in a joint letter to President Kennedy.

Dr. James Dewey Watson, one of Indiana's few Nobel Prize winners, who earned his doctorate at Indiana University, sent the following message in November. He said:

"I would view the loss of the Indiana dune region to industrial exploitation as both a personal and a national tragedy." Dr. Watson said the natural variety of the area stimulated him to become a scientist, and he added that "There is no honest reason why subsequent generations should forever lose this same opportunity."

What have other areas of the United States done about similar problems?

New York, under Mr. Rockefeller's leadership, has established a multimillion-dollar fund for acquiring much of the Adirondack Mountain region as a vast State park system for the benefit of all.

The State of Oregon has set aside 162 State parks, almost 10 times our meager effort, and many Federal areas as well.

California has saved many of the redwoods for our enjoyment.

The people of Wyoming have set aside the incomparable Tetons for us, and Yellowstone; Massachusetts has preserved our Cape Cod heritage; Florida, our Everglades; Minnesota, our Quatico Superior National Forest; North Carolina, our Great Smokies and Cape Hatteras * * * all against many of the same kinds of self-interested influences and real estate wheelers now faced by the people of Indiana.

Who are we, and what manner of people are we, to turn backs on our special share of this great national responsibility—the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore?

> Can we afford the continued destruction of this priceless natural resource? Or are we to act at last with Hoosier conscience, and say "No" to further ruin of this place * * * financed by the very taxes we pay?

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

THE WILDERNESS ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business, Senate bill 4, Calendar No. 88, be laid down and be made the pending business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4) to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I would advise the attachés on both sides to have Senators come to the Chamber, because this may well be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the role.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when hearings were set on S. 4, the wilderness bill, request was made to witnesses to confine themselves to new material. The hearings, accordingly, do not involve as much material as heretofore.

The measure has been before the Senate 6 years. We have held 10 hearings on it and accumulated 2,825 pages of printed record. It passed the Senate by a 78 to 8 vote on September 6, 1961. Nearly everything which can be said about the measure has been said several times in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and repeated a time or two here on the floor. The report on the bill makes available to the Senators a section-by-section analysis and explanation.

In presenting the bill today I am seeking to impose on myself the same rule we proposed to witnesses at the hearings, and will try to confine myself largely to a statement on what is new.

The effect of the bill is to provide for setting aside, for preservation in their primitive condition, areas in the national forests, national parks and monuments, wildlife refuges and game ranges which are already being administered to preserve their wilderness character, as a national wilderness preservation system.

The bill sets criteria for their management to preserve their natural character and has two practical effects: It provides that areas finally and fully accredited for wilderness preservation shall have been reviewed both by the executive agencies in charge, and by Congress. It provides that once designated, the areas shall be protected against disturbance or exploitation except when one of the two highest authorities in the land, the President or the Congress, determines that other use is in the greater public good.

Because these areas are public lands already restricted as to commercial exploitation, the bill will cost nothing and cause no economic disturbance to communities, counties, States or private enterprises. Private rights, a half dozen mines, some grazing and a few inholdings, are not disturbed.

The net effect is essentially increasing the degree of protection given to existing wilderness. It becomes a statutory requirement with congressional approval, not just a bureau policy that can be set aside with a stroke of someone's pen.

Two years ago one of the principal points of attack made on this bill was that it was hasty—that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was making a $2.5 million study of recreation facilities, including wilderness needs, and that we ought to delay action on a wilderness preservation bill until that report was filed.

But the minority report on the bill—then S. 174—said:

> We feel that the "sense of urgency" that lies behind the drive for enactment of this legislation is artificial and fictitious.

The minority continued:

> We do not attempt to challenge the motives of our colleagues who sincerely support this legislation, but we firmly believe that the "problems which will make the enactment of (such) legislation even more difficult" in the event of further delays are among the following:

The minority, speaking in 1961 before the ORRRC report was issued, then listed as the No. 1 problem which would make enactment of this bill more difficult this year as:

> 1. An analysis of the 1962 report of the ORRRC may well disclose that the 7 million acres presently classified as wild, wilderness, or canoe will be more than adequate to meet the recreation needs of those rugged few who seek the solitude of these areas.

The report of the Commission created under a bill which I introduced and on which I had the honor to serve with many fine Members of the Senate, is now available. It was filed in January 1962. The minority's question is answered, and one of the bits of new material which I can submit on this subject today is just what the Commission said in regard to wilderness.

On page 131 of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission's report is the Commission's recommendation 8 to 6, which reads:

> Congress should enact legislation providing for the establishment and management of certain wilderness areas as primitive areas.
>
> Primitive areas satisfy a deep-seated human need occasionally to get far away from the works of man.
>
> Prompt and effective action to preserve their unique inspirational, scientific, and cultural values on an adequate scale is essential, since once destroyed they can never never be restored.
>
> Portions of national forests, parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, game ranges, and the unreserved public domain meet the basic criteria of primitive areas. The natural environment has been undisturbed by commercial utilization, and they are without roads. Some of these areas are managed for the purpose of wilderness preservation under broad statutory authority. Certain areas of more than 100,000 acres in the national forest have already been set aside by the Secretary of Agriculture as "wilderness areas." Others between 5,000 and 10,000 acres have been set aside by the Chief of the Forest Service as "wild areas."

And now, Mr. President, comes the answer to the minority speculation about the Commission finding 7 million acres of wild and wilderness area to be more than adequate.

The Commission reported:

> There is a widespread feeling, which the Commission shares, that the Congress should take action to assure the permanent reservation of these and similar suitable areas in national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, and other lands in Federal ownership.

Mr. President, the ORRRC went beyond S. 4, the wilderness bill which is now the pending business of the Senate. Ater enumerating the types of lands covered by this bill, it reported that:

> Congress should take action to assure the permanent reservation of these and similar suitable areas.

It also went beyond S. 4 by suggesting that, in addition to the forest, park, wildlife and game lands covered by S. 4, there should be some areas of the unreserved public domain set aside.

There are no unreserved public domain lands put into the wilderness system by S. 4 for a very good reason.

The lands which are designated as wilderness in the pending bill are all areas already reserved, already restricted, as to commercial exploitation.

There are no such reserved areas in the unreserved public domain.

We cannot be certain, as we are about areas actually covered by S. 4, that if a wilderness area is designated in the unreserved public domain it will not disturb some economic activity or arrangement.

Where designation of unreserved, unrestricted areas are involved, the sponsors of this bill have felt that the same procedure as is followed in establishing a national park—an act of Congress—is the proper procedure. This bill so provides. No unreserved lands, no areas not already restricted as to economic activity, are involved in S. 4. If there is effort to add the additional lands to our wilderness holdings as recommended by the Outdoor Recreation Commission, it will hereafter have to be by an act of this Congress apart from S. 4.

The point of these remarks is that the speculation of the minority in 1961, and I imply no criticism of my colleagues for being careful in their approach—has not only not been sustained by the ORRRC report, it has proved to be rather wide of the mark.

ORRRC found that the wild, wilderness, primitive, canoe, park, and wildlife areas covered in this bill should be reserved and protected as wilderness through prompt and effective action.

Since the findings of the Commission have been released, we have had witnesses before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee who have contended that ORRRC found that "we do not need wilderness very much." The argument goes that the Commission found that the major part of our recreation problem is within 50 miles of our great urban centers.

The Commission did find that the largest number of recreational activity occasions will be an afternoon or evening walk, a drive, tennis, golf, a swim, or some simple pleasure close to home.

But besides these 1-day activity occasions, there are weekends, and there are vacations of 1, 2, 3, and 4 weeks and even longer on which only 9 percent of the participants stay within that 50-mile radius. Two-thirds travel more than 250 miles. One-third travel more than 750 miles; 27 percent travel more than 1,000 miles, and 10 percent make a trip of 2,000 miles or more.

The erroneous argument that we do not need recreation facilities except close to big cities was used against the Sleeping Bear Dunes proposal, by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], at hearings a week ago. The Public Lands Subcommittee was told that a lakeshore recreation area was not needed in northern Michigan because it was more than 50 miles—240 miles, in fact—from Detroit. The implication was that no one would go there.

I hope that no one in the Senate will make such an argument. We need city playgrounds inside city limits. We need golf links, tennis courts, pools, and general outdoor recreation areas in or close to the suburbs. We need reasonable accessible vacation areas a day or two away from population centers, and we need far away places like our great national parks and wilderness for vacations.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission proposed a system of classification of recreational areas illustrating the variety of our needs. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point the Commission's recommendation of a system of classifying recreation lands in six categories to facilitate planning, administration, and understanding in the recreation field. It will clearly indicate the Commission's finding of the range of our needs.

There being no objection, the recommendation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The following system of classifying outdoor recreation resources is proposed:
>
> Class I—High-density recreation areas: Areas intensively developed and managed for mass use.
>
> Class II—General outdoor recreation areas: Areas subject to substantial development for a wide variety of specific recreation uses.
>
> Class III—Natural environment areas: Various types of areas that are suitable for recreation in a natural environment and usually in combination with other uses.
>
> Class IV—Unique natural areas: Areas of outstanding scenic splendor, natural wonder, or scientific importance.
>
> Class V—Primitive areas: Undisturbed roadless areas characterized by natural, wild conditions, including "wilderness areas."
>
> Class VI—Historic and cultural sites: Sites of major historic or cultural significance, either local, regional, or national.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I served on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and it was a real privilege, for which I am grateful to the Senate, for it was a truly outstanding Commission which did a very wonderful job.

The Commission was composed of four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House, equally divided between political parties, and seven members appointed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Mr. Laurance Rockefeller served as Chairman, and he rendered the Nation a great service in that capacity, as he is continuing to do as Chairman of a citizens' group which is pressing for implementation of the ORRRC report.

The members of the Commission, and also of a larger advisory council which assisted the Commission, included conservationists, public officials, and businessmen interested in the use and utilization of the natural resources of our forests and mineral lands.

The report itself says:

> After 3 years of research and an aggregate of 50 days of discussion among the Commissioners, the Commission has developed specific recommendations for a recreation program. The 15 members brought different political, social, and resource-use opinions to the meeting table, and proposed recommendations were put through the test of this range of opinions. During the course of the study and discussion, views of individual members developed and the collective opinion crystallized. The final recommendations are a consensus of the Commission.

That consensus, Mr. President, agreed with the policies and programs which would be established by S. 4 in detail.

The Commission recommended, as S. 4 provides, that wilderness areas remain under the administration of the agencies which now administer them. It commented immediately following the recommendation that "this concept is incorporated in pending legislation which provides that wilderness areas shall be administered by different Federal bureaus."

The Commission declared that wilderness areas should "be managed for the sole and unequivocal purpose of maintaining their primitive attributes. There should be no development of public roads, permanent habitations or recreation facilities. Mechanized equipment of any kind should be allowed in the area only as needed to assure protection from fire, insects, and disease."

All of these statements support features of S. 4.

The Commission had an independent study made of the wilderness problem. It discussed that report and the many subordinate problems involved in preserving an adequate area of untouched, natural lands. This discussion covered competing uses and needs for the lands. Those competing uses and needs are not entirely commercial, exploitive users like mining, timbering, and grazing. One of the greatest pressures on the wilderness areas in the national parks, and on the backlands in the wildlife ranges and refuges, is from the burgeoning number of recreationists themselves, and the pressure for mass recreation facilities.

It was because of this pressure, as well as other use pressures, that ORRRC found that the type of protection given the wild and wilderness areas in the national parks and wildlife lands by S. 4 to be highly desirable.

Mr. President, deep down inside of most Americans is a love of the out-of-doors.

This is the really essential fact one needs to know to pass judgment on this bill, and give it his support.

It is an effort to protect and preserve, unspoiled, just a little bit of the vast wilderness which stretched from ocean to ocean on this continent less than 300 years ago, so that this love of the great, unspoiled, out-of-doors which is a part of us can be gratified.

In September 1961, when this measure first passed the Senate, I was forced to be away and the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] handled the measure on the floor.

I have a great obligation to him for the splendid presentation of the measure which he made, and the skillful manner in which the bill was handled. He had able assistance from the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]; from the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]; the present chairman of the Interior Committee [Mr. JACKSON]; and others.

As I read the RECORD, I felt, as I still feel, a deep sense of appreciation to all of them.

One passage in the debate impressed itself in my mind. That was a passage during which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] very fervently and very eloquently stated the fundamental case for the preservation of wilderness.

It is the one bid of old, not new, material which I shall use in these remarks for it is well worth repeating; it was one of those relatively infrequent but memorable passages in our usually workaday record. It was devoid of statistics, and devoid of legalistic arguments but it got down to fundamentals. The Senator said, and I read from the RECORD:

> Have those who seek the sanctuary of the wilderness no right in a country as vast and rich as the United States?
>
> We will deny those people their right if we fail to act in a timely fashion upon a wilderness bill.
>
> Most of the people in the Eastern United States are denied the right now because the wilderness has largely disappeared. It is vanishing in the West. Unless we take some action to establish legislative safeguards around it, within a few years it will disappear entirely. Once it has been dissipated, once roads have been built, once organized life starts, it is gone forever. It is not a renewable resource.
>
> So, if we are to preserve for future generations the uplifting experience which has come to those of us who have known the wild lands, we must act now, else our children and grandchildren will be forever deprived.
>
> So I say that, in a country which has come to be characterized by the congested life of cityism by the domesticated life of nicely clipped countrysides, let us reserve some places here and there and elsewhere around the country where the land remains as God

gave it to us, and make sure that it stays that way; so that those who want to escape from the banality of beer cans and cigarette commercials will have a chance to do so.

Mr. President, without wilderness this country will become a cage.

This passage from the distinguished Senator's remarks has been reprinted and quoted many times for the reason that it stated what a great many Americans feel and believe but cannot state so forcefully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 11, after line 18, strike out:

"(i) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall each, in submitting any recommendations to the President with respect to any area's retention in or incorporation into the wilderness system include with such recommendations the independent views of the Governor of the State in which such area is located with respect to the Secretary's recommendations generally, unless no reply is received from such Governor within ninety days after such recommendations are submitted to him and his views thereon requested."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"(i) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall, prior to submitting any recommendations to the President with respect to any area's retention in or incorporation into the wilderness system—

"(A) give such public notice of the proposed action as they deem appropriate, including publication in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having general circulation in the area or areas in the vicinity of the affected land;

"(B) hold a public hearing or hearings at a location or locations convenient to the area affected. The hearings shall be announced through such means as the respective Secretaries involved deem appropriate, including notices in the Federal Register and in newspapers of general circulation in the area: *Provided,* That if the lands involved are located in more than one State, at least one hearing shall be held in each State in which a portion of the land lies;

"(C) at least thirty days before the date of a hearing advise the Governor of each State and the county, or in Alaska the borough, governing board of each county, or in Alaska the borough, in which the lands are located, the United States Forest Service, the United States Soil Conservation Service, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Mines, the United States Geological Survey, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Federal Power Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration and the Federal Communications Commission, inviting each to set forth its views at the hearing. It shall be the responsibility of each named Federal agency to submit its independent views concerning the designation of an area as 'wilderness', giving an analysis of the comparative values that may be involved as between wilderness and that type of development or uses for which the Federal agency has administrative responsibility."

On page 13, line 21, after "(j)" strike out:

"In any case where State owned land is completely surrounded by lands incorporated into the wilderness system such State shall be given either (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) vacant, unappropriated and unreserved land in the same State, not exceeding the value of the surrounded land, in exchange for the surrounded land."

And insert:

"In any case where State-owned land is completely surrounded by land incorporated into the wilderness system, such State shall be given either (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) vacant, unappropriated, and unoccupied Federal land in the same State, equal in value of the surrounded land: *Provided,* That if the State does not reserve mineral rights in the surrounded land conveyed to the United States, the United States need not reserve mineral rights in the land conveyed to the State in exchange."

On page 14, line 21, after the word "the", strike out "Congress." and insert "Congress: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to confer a right of condemnation with respect to privately owned land within the boundaries of a wilderness area, or to impair any customary right or privilege heretofore enjoyed by the owners of such land, respecting access to it or to its ordinary use and maintenance."; and on page 17, line 14, after the word "where", strike out "well"; so as to make the bill read:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Wilderness Act'.

"WILDERNESS SYSTEM ESTABLISHED

"STATEMENT OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. (a) The Congress recognizes that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition. It is accordingly declared to be the policy of the Congress of the United States to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System to be composed of federally owned areas in the United States and its possessions to be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness.

"DEFINITION OF WILDERNESS

"(b) A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's works substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.

"NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

"EXTENT OF SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) The National Wilderness Preservation System (hereafter referred to in this Act as the wilderness system) shall comprise (subject to existing private rights) such federally owned areas as are established as part of such system under the provisions of this Act.

"NATIONAL FOREST AREAS

"(b) (1) The wilderness system shall include all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe: *Provided,* That the areas classified as primitive shall be subject to review as hereinafter provided. Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years, review, in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20, of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959, the suitability of each primitive area in the national forests for preservation as wilderness and shall report his findings to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the continued inclusion within the wilderness system, or exclusion therefrom, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided,* That the President may, as a part of his recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area to be continued in the wilderness system, recommending the exclusion and return to national forest land status of any portions not predominantly of wilderness value, or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value: *Provided further,* That following such exclusions and additions any primitive area recommended to be continued in the wilderness system shall not exceed the area classified as primitive on the date of this Act. The recommendation of the President with respect to the continued inclusion in the wilderness system, or the exclusion therefrom of a primitive area, or portions thereof, shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided,* That if Congress rejects a recommendation of the President and no revised recommendation is made to Congress with respect to that primitive area within two years, the land shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system and shall be administered as other national forest lands: *And provided further,* That, primitive areas with respect to which recommendations are submitted to Congress on the eighth, ninth, and tenth years of the review period herein provided shall retain their status as a part of the wilderness system until the expiration, in respect to each area, of a full session of Congress, two years for resubmission of revised recommendations to Congress by the President, and, if so resubmitted, until the expiration of a full session of Congress thereafter. Recommendations on all primitive areas not previously submitted to the Congress shall be made during the tenth year of the review period. Any primitive area, or portion thereof, on which a recommendation for continued inclusion in the wilderness system has not become effective within fourteen years following the enactment of this Act shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system and shall be administered as other national forest land.

"(2) The purposes of this Act are hereby declared to be within and supplemental to but not in interference with the purposes for which national forests are established as set forth in the Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11), and the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86-517 (74 Stat. 215).

"NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AREAS

"(c) (1) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, each portion of each park, monument, or other unit in the national park system which on the effective date of this Act embraces a continuous area of five thousand acres or more without roads. Within ten years after the effective date of this Act the Secretary of the Interior shall review the units of the national park system and shall report his recommendations for the incorporation of each such portion into the wilderness system to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each such portion for which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each such portion shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

"(2) The Secretary of the Interior shall include, as part of his recommendations to the President under the provisions of this subsection, a description of the parts of each park, monument, or other unit submitted which should be reserved for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations. Such parts shall be determined in accordance with the procedures for rulemaking under section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003), except that the public notice required under such section shall be at least ninety days prior to the determination proceedings. No designation of an area for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, or administrative installations shall modify or affect the application to that area of the provisions of the Act approved August 25, 1916, entitled 'An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes' (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 and following). The accommodations and installations in such designated areas shall be incident to the conservation and use and enjoyment of the scenery and the natural and historical objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition. Further, the inclusion of any area of any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system within the wilderness system pursuant to this Act shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of such area in accordance with such Act of August 25, 1916, the statutory authority under which the area was created, or any other Act of Congress which might pertain to or affect such area, including, but not limited to, the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 432 and following); section 3(2) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C., sec. 796(2)); and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C., sec. 461 and following).

"NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES AND GAME RANGES

"(d) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, such portions of the wildlife refuges and game ranges established prior to the effective date of this Act under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior as he may recommend for such incorporation to the President within ten years following the effective date of this Act. Before the convening of Congress each year the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each area recommended for such incorporation by the Secretary of the Interior during the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each area shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

"MODIFICATION OF BOUNDARIES

"(e) Any proposed minor modification or adjustment of boundaries of any portion of the wilderness system established in accordance with this Act shall be made by the appropriate Secretary after public notice of such proposal by publication in a newspaper having general circulation in the vicinity of such boundaries and public hearing to be held in such vicinity not less than ninety days after such notice if there is sufficient demand during such ninety days for such hearing. The proposed modification or adjustment shall then be recommended with map and description thereof to the President. The President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to such modification or adjustment and such recommendations shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

"EFFECTIVE DATE OF PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS

"(f) Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall have approved a resolution declaring itself opposed to such recommendation: *Provided,* That in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution of opposition may be limited to one or more of the areas covered, in which event the balance of the recommendation shall take effect as before provided: *Provided further,* That where a resolution of opposition to any such recommendation has been introduced, a hearing thereon shall be held within thirty days by the committee to which such resolution has been referred. Any such resolution shall be subject to the procedures provided under the provisions of sections 203 through 206 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C., secs. 133z-12—133z-15) for a resolution of either House of Congress.

"EFFECT OF PUBLIC NOTICE OF PROPOSED ADDITION TO WILDERNESS SYSTEM

"(g) Public notice when given by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture that any area is to be proposed under the provisions of this Act for incorporation as part of the wilderness system shall segregate such area from any or all appropriation under the public land laws to the extent deemed necessary by such Secretary. Such segregation shall terminate (1) upon rejection of such proposal by the President, (2) upon approval by the Senate or the House of Representatives of a resolution opposing the incorporation of such area in the wilderness system, or (3) five years after the date of such notice if the proposal to incorporate such area as part of the wilderness system has not been submitted to both Houses of Congress prior to the expiration of such five years.

"ADDITION OR ELIMINATION NOT PROVIDED FOR IN THIS ACT

"(h) The addition of any area to, or the elimination of any area from, the wilderness system which is not specifically provided for under the provisions of this Act shall be made only after specific affirmative authorization by law for such addition or elimination.

"ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO RECOMMENDATIONS

"(i) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall, prior to submitting any recommendations to the President with respect to any area's retention in or incorporation into the wilderness system—

"(A) give such public notice of the proposed action as they deem appropriate, including publication in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having general circulation in the area or areas in the vicinity of the affected land;

"(B) hold a public hearing or hearings at a location or locations convenient to the area affected. The hearings shall be announced through such means as the respective Secretaries involved deem appropriate, including notices in the Federal Register and in newspapers of general circulation in the area: *Provided,* That if the lands involved are located in more than one State, at least one hearing shall be held in each State in which a portion of the land lies;

"(C) at least thirty days before the date of a hearing advise the Governor of each State and the county, or in Alaska the borough, governing board of each county, or in Alaska the borough, in which the lands are located, the United States Forest Service, the United States Soil Conservation Service, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Mines, the United States Geological Survey, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Federal Power Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Federal Communications Commission, inviting each to set forth its views at the hearing. It shall be the responsibility of each named Federal agency to submit its independent views concerning the designation of an area as 'wilderness', giving an analysis of the comparative values that may be involved as between wilderness and that type of development or uses for which the Federal agency has administrative responsibility.

"(2) Views submitted to the President under the provisions of (1) of this subsection with respect to any area shall be included with any recommendations to Congress with respect to such area.

"STATE LANDS SURROUNDED BY WILDERNESS SYSTEM

"(j) In any case where State-owned land is completely surrounded by land incorporated into the wilderness system, such State shall be given either (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) vacant, unappropriated, and unoccupied Federal land in the same State, equal in value to the surrounded land: *Provided,* That if the State does not reserve mineral rights in the surrounded land conveyed to the United States, the United States need not reserve mineral rights in the land conveyed to the State in exchange.

"ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PRIVATELY OWNED LANDS WITHIN THE WILDERNESS SYSTEM

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to acquire as part of the wilderness system any privately owned land within any portion of such system under his jurisdiction, subject to the approval of any necessary appropriations by the Congress: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to confer a right of condemnation with respect to privately owned land within the boundaries of a wilderness area, or to impair any customary right or privilege heretofore enjoyed by the owners of such land, respecting access to it or to its ordinary use and maintenance.

"GIFTS OR BEQUESTS OF LAND

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior may each accept gifts or bequests of land for preservation as wilderness, and such land shall on acceptance become part of the wilderness system. Regulations with regard to any such land may be in accordance with such agreements, consistent with the policy of this Act, as are made at the time of such gift, or such conditions, consistent with such policy, as may be included in, and accepted with, such bequest.

"USE OF THE WILDERNESS

"OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW

"SEC. 6. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes stated in the establishment of, or pertaining to, any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system, or any national forest, wildlife refuge, game range, or other area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the wilderness system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes as also to preserve its wilderness character. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the wilderness system shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. Subject to the provisions of this Act, all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.

"PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN USES

"(b) Except as specifically provided for in this Act and subject to any existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise within the wilderness system, no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such areas.

"SPECIAL PROVISIONS

"(c) The following special provisions are hereby made:

"(1) Within the wilderness system the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become established may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the appropriate Secretary deems desirable. In addition, such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such conditions as the appropriate Secretary deems desirable.

"(2) Within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including but not limited to exploration for oil and gas), mining (including but not limited to the production of oil and gas), and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (B) the grazing of livestock, where established prior to the effective date of this Act with respect to areas established as part of the wilderness system by this Act, or prior to the date of public notice thereof with respect to any area to be recommended for incorporation in the wilderness system, shall be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions and regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary having jurisdiction over such area.

"(3) Other provisions of this Act to the contrary notwithstanding, the management of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, formerly designated as the Superior, Little Indian Sioux, and Caribou roadless areas in the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, shall be in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the general purpose of maintaining, without unnecessary restrictions on other uses, including that of timber, the primitive character of the area, particularly in the vicinity of lakes, streams, and portages: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall preclude the continuance within the area of any already established use of motorboats. Nothing in this Act shall modify the restrictions and provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan Act, Public Law 539, Seventy-first Congress, July 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 1020), the Thye-Blatnik Act, Public Law 733, Eightieth Congress, June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Andresen Act, Public Law 607, Eighty-fourth Congress, June 22, 1956 (70 Stat. 326), as applying to the Superior National Forest or the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Modifications of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area within the Superior National Forest shall be accomplished in the manner provided in section 3(e).

"(4) Commercial services may be performed within the wilderness system to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other purposes of the system as established in this Act.

"(5) Any existing use or form of appropriation authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing any national wildlife refuge or game range existing on the effective date of this Act may be continued under such authorization or provision.

"(6) Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

"(7) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests.

"(8) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent, within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, any activity, including prospecting, for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or water resources or to prevent the completely subsurface use of such areas, if such activity or subsurface use is carried on, in a manner which is not incompatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment.

"RECORDS AND REPORTS

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each maintain available to the public, records of portions of the wilderness system under his jurisdiction, including maps and legal descriptions, copies of regulations governing them, copies of public notices of, and reports submitted to Congress regarding, pending additions, eliminations, or modifications. Within a year following the establishment of any area within the national forests as a part of the wilderness system, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and legal description of such area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however*, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be made with the approval of such committees. Within a year following the establishment of any area in the national park system or in a wildlife refuge or range as a part of the wilderness system, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and legal description of such area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be corrected with the approval of such committees. Copies of maps and legal descriptions of all areas of the wilderness system within their respective jurisdictions shall be kept available for public inspection in the offices of regional foresters, national forest supervisors, forest rangers, offices of the units of the national park system, wildlife refuge, or range.

"CONTRIBUTIONS AND GIFTS

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of this Act. Any such contributions or gifts shall, for purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, be considered a contribution or gift to or for the use of the United States for an exclusively public purpose, and may be deducted as such under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subject to all applicable limitations and restrictions contained therein.

"LAND USE COMMISSIONS

"SEC. 9. With respect to any State having more than 90 per centum of its total land area owned by the Federal Government on January 1, 1961, there shall be established for each such State a Presidential Land Use Commission (hereinafter called the Commission). The Commission shall be composed of five persons appointed by the President, not more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party, and at least three of whom shall be residents of the State concerned. The Commission shall advise and consult with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture on the current utilization of federally owned land in such State and shall make recommendations to the appropriate Secretary as to how the federally owned land can best be utilized, developed, protected and preserved. Any recommendations made to the President by the Secretary of Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture and any recommendations made to the Congress by the President pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be accompanied by the recommendations and reports made with respect thereto by the Commission.

"SEC. 10. At the opening of each session of Congress, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall jointly report to the President for transmission to Congress on the status of the wilderness system, including a list and descriptions of the areas in the system, regulations in effect, and other pertinent information, together with any recommendations they may care to make.

"SEC. 11. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding, modifying, repealing, or otherwise affecting the provisions of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792–825r)."

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. CHURCH addressed the Chair.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator from Vermont permit me to yield to the Senator from Idaho first?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. CHURCH. I merely wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I appreciate his opening remarks. All of us on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee know of the fine leadership we have had in him that has resulted in bringing this bill to the floor today. The Senator from New Mexico is one of the most distinguished conservationists in the Senate today, and no chapter he has written over the course of a long and brilliant career will win for him greater esteem in the hearts of the people, than the leadership he has given to this measure. I just wanted to express my feeling, which I know is shared by many other Members of the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Idaho. I yield now to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico for his ability and persistence in this effort. This bill, if enacted into law, will enable future generations of Americans to see at least a few wilderness spots in America.

As I understand, very little area east of the Mississippi and north of Kentucky would be eligible for inclusion in wilderness areas. Am I correct in my understanding that the Mount Desert Island area in Maine and the White Mountain area in New Hampshire will be eligible for such inclusion?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is correct. A few States have some space that is wilderness area, like New York State, for example, which will be eligible for preservation under their own State system, but not under the national system.

Mr. AIKEN. But it would require additional legislation to put in the wilderness area any tracts which are not now included?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, it would. One of the things we made sure of is that it requires positive legislation to add new areas.

Again I thank the Senator from Vermont for his fine leadership. I have been associated with him many times in agricultural legislation, and it has been a great pleasure to be associated with him in conservation legislation. I pay tribute to him.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall support the legislation even though no area of my State would be eligible to be included in the wilderness area. We have other ways, however, of preserving forest reserves and wild areas in Vermont.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New Mexico for the diligent work he has given to the bill pending before the Senate. In the Southeast, and especially in South Carolina, we would be benefited very little, if at all, by the bill; but I am mindful of the fact that if something had been done years ago in this particular field, it would have brought much benefit to South Carolina and the Southeastern States. We let it slip through our fingers, so to speak. Today we can do very little about it, but, at the same time, the West is at the present time trying to preserve forests. I am glad to see them do it. I commend especially the senior Senator from New Mexico for his diligent efforts in this field.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his kind remarks, which are typical of him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Have the committee amendments been adopted en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc. The bill, as amended, is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment. The bill is now open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, if I may, at this time, I should like to make some statements about the pending bill and my own position on it, and also with respect to possible amendment which might be added to it.

First of all, I wish to say that I had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives in the last 2 years on both the Public Lands Subcommittee and the Interior Committee, which considered the bill when it came to the House from the Senate last year.

There is little or no doubt in my mind that although I personally would like to see a wilderness system set up under legislative authority, the pending bill, as it is now written, would, if passed by the Senate, encounter considerable difficulty in being approved by the appropriate committee in the other body.

I say that for a variety of what I consider to be very good reasons. First, I served with a great many of the Members in the House; secondly, there is basic disagreement on the question of which branch of Government should have primary authority in creating a legislative system under law.

We have at the moment in the pending bill a proposal which I believe it would be wise to modify in at least one important respect, and which could have vast significance in insuring for future generations a wilderness system in which people could enjoy the forests and mountains and lakes as a part of our Nation's heritage.

However, the difficulty is that we are grouping together and putting into one system, without any particular legislative scrutiny, a vast area of land known as the primitive lands, which have not been classified by the executive department or reviewed by Congress, to see whether this is the most useful purpose for that particular group of public lands.

What we have proposed in committee, and what the other body was doing its best to try to put into effect in previous hearings and previous discussion of the bill, is the proposal that the legislative body, Congress, should have the right to determine, after recommendation by the executive department, which of these primitive lands or which group of these primitive lands should be brought into the wilderness system, and that they should not all be blanketed in at the same time.

As an example of that, I would like to point to—and I believe the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] would agree—what I consider to be a good system, namely, the method by which we decide on the establishment of reclamation projects. There is a possibility, I suppose, that under reclamation law the Executive could simply decide what is to be done by way of reclamation projects and then send the proposal to Congress, and, unless Congress vetoed it, the projects would go through. However, as a matter of fact, that is not the way we have established the reclamation system. What we have done is to say that the Executive shall determine whether a particular project is feasible. At the end of that study it sends the project to Congress. Then Congress both authorizes the project involved and appropriates the money for it. During the course of that time, however, Congress very carefully inspects and studies the details of each project that is presented to it.

It is my feeling, and I believe the feeling of a great number of us in Congress, whether it be in the Senate or in the House, that that is the same type of system that we ought to use in connection with the wilderness system. However, it is not. What we are being asked to do here is to say that we will blanket everything in, and then the Executive will review it and say either that additional public lands will be brought in or that some of them should be taken out; and that the only way Congress will have the right to act in a negative way on the matter will be by way of a veto.

I believe that a comparison of such a proposal with the Reorganization Act shows it to be basically wrong. The reason it is basically wrong is that under the Reorganization Act the executive department is, in fact, dealing with the executive departments of Government. In that kind of situation perhaps the Reorganization Act, which gives Congress only the right to veto, has some possibility of being fruitful and the expedient way of handling executive departments.

However, in this particular situation what we are dealing with is wholly different. We are saying that we will take a vast amount of public land, belonging to the people of the United States all over the country, and blanket it into a system, as the result of which the majority of the people can no longer use those lands for any purpose whatsoever.

The evidence has shown, in the House and in the Senate, if I may use a colloquial term, that only about 2 percent of the visitors to public lands never go into the wilderness lands at all.

This taking of action by Executive decree is beyond the principle and scope of the effort which we in this great body should undertake. We should determine whether particular lands are to be isolated and carried out of use by people of the United States, and isolated into a situation where only 2 percent of the people can have any benefit out of them.

There are other problems involved in connection with this situation. I was able, during the course of the hearings, to ask the distinguished head of the Forest Service as to whether passage of the bill would later prevent the construction of electric transmission lines across wilderness systems which might be incorporated in the pending bill. I asked whether we would be able to continue the necessary water development of the West if we passed the bill. I asked that particularly because of the need that we have for water development in the western area of the United States, in particular.

The answer that I received was that the bill, if passed, would supersede other laws now on the books, and that this would mean that no construction could go on in these wilderness areas, of any kind, unless the President of the United States himself determines that this construction of transmission lines or water development facilities, or whatever it might be, was in the public interest to the extent that there should be permitted an invasion of the wilderness concept of any particular land. This could easily in the State of Colorado, and in any other Western State, seriously hamper the necessary construction of facilities for the accumulation of water for the benefit of the entire economy of the Western area of the United States.

It is a really serious question as to whether it will be possible to continue water development if any of the wilderness systems which are contemplated under the terms of the bill will in fact hamper the construction of transmission lines or the development of water facilities. We already know that within some of the wilderness systems which would be brought within the terms of the bill as it is now presented to the Senate, there are in existence water development projects which it will be necessary, in some manner, to maintain so as to insure their continuance. There is no such guarantee in the bill at the present time. Therefore, it would be necessary to promulgate special regulations or to get special exceptions in order to be able to take care of existing water developments in certain portions of wilderness areas at the present moment. This is one reason why I have serious doubt whether the bill, if it remains in its present form, even with the amendments adopted by the committee, will be able to pass the other body of Congress.

I say again, publicly, that I favor a legislative system to preserve wilderness areas; but I have strong doubts as to whether the pending bill will accomplish that result. I say that because I have strong doubt as to whether the bill in its present form will ever pass the other body of Congress.

We have a very simple amendment, which was offered in committee by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], which would reserve the process which is proposed in the bill. It would bring into the wilderness system all lands which are now classified as wilderness or canoe, but would leave out all lands now classified as primitive. It includes specific instructions that primitive lands shall remain primitive under their present usage, but that they would be reviewed by the executive department, and that each year, as Congress meets, Congress would be presented with recommendations as to those lands, not only by the executive department but also by the Governors of the States and by representatives of the local areas which are involved, after hearings. The recommendations would be presented to Congress for authorization to be included within the wilderness system.

If this type of amendment were adopted by the Senate, it seems to me that without any doubt not only would there be almost unanimous approval for the passage of the bill in this body, but that the chances of the passage of the bill in final form through the other body would be greatly enhanced. At the moment, I do not conceive of any particular difficulty in getting a bill of that type through the other body. However, I anticipate substantial difficulty in having a bill of the present nature, even with the committee amendments which have been adopted, passed by the other body.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Do I correctly understand that the committee amendments as shown in the committee report—Report No. 109—have already been adopted by voice vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been adopted. The bill as amended is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The plan was to have the committee amendments adopted en bloc. The bill then would be regarded as a new bill, to which amendments to any section thereof would be in order. Amendments which were then offered would not be barred as third degree amendments, or anything of that nature.

Mr. DOMINICK. Have the amendments which were included in Report No. 109 been explained to the Senate?

Mr. ANDERSON. They have not been explained. A motion was made that they be adopted. The explanation should properly take place during the discussion of the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. Has that motion yet been voted upon?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, it has. The committee amendments have been adopted en bloc, and the bill is all new text, as carried in the report, for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. That relieves my mind.

Mr. President, most of us, particularly those of us who represent the Western States, are probably more conscious of the beauty and magnificence of the proposed wilderness areas than perhaps any other group in the United States. Most of us from that area use the public lands for hunting, fishing, and exploring. Some of the public lands are used for grazing purposes. Those who conduct grazing operations on the lands have participated in the process of soil conservation within those areas and have performed a very fine service in many cases. Therefore, I believe that the general attitude which has been created by some conservationists, namely, that those who are opposed to this type of bill are a group of Neanderthals, and who do not have any idea of what the greatest heritage of our country is, are simply wholly wrong in their approach to the problem. They do not understand what we are trying, basically, to do.

I do not suppose there is any group of people who are more conscious of the need of preserving the public lands and of the need for having as a national heritage public lands, public parks, and systems of this kind, which can be preserved and used for their beauty and for the solitude that is contemplated in the bill, for hunting, for fishing, and all the other desirable uses that these lands would make possible. But this does not derogate from the conflict with the basic principle, namely, whether Congress will retain affirmative control over the public lands, or whether Congress proposes simply to delegate the whole operation to the executive department, and retain nothing except the right of veto. It seems to me that that is the basic principle with which we in this body are concerned, and which will be of great concern in the other body.

I add one more observation. I have explored, I have fished, I have hunted, I have hiked, I have camped all through these systems. I have been doing it for most of my life. I think most of us in the Senate have done so, in one form or another. We who feel that the bill should be amended are not trying to prevent its passage. We are simply trying to insure the adoption of a system which will not prevent the great majority of the people of the country from enjoying these areas, from enjoying the lands which will actually be included in the system, and insure that the lands will be those which should more properly be within that system.

We are also very carefully trying to outline for the Members of this body the basic conflict in the matter of principle. Will Congress retain control and authority over the public lands in an affirmative sense, or will we turn control over to the executive department, as is now proposed in S. 4, even as amended?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have asked the Senator to yield for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request. The proposal has been cleared with the two Senators from Colorado, with the minority leader, and the acting minority leader; with the majority leader; with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has done so much in behalf of the bill; and with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business of the Senate has been completed today, the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, 1 hour be allocated to each amendment, 30 minutes to a side, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]; and that there also be 1 hour on the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, does the majority leader contemplate any morning hour tomorrow at 10 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is proposed that the Senate adjourn today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; and the time for debate will begin at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. KUCHEL. So, Mr. President, assuming that yea-and-nay votes are ordered, the Senate should be on notice, as I understand, that on or about 11 a.m. the Senate will begin to vote on the proposed amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The acting minority leader is correct in his assumption.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well.

I have no objection.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The chair hears none, and without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That, on Tuesday, April 9, 1963, at the hour of 10 a.m., the Senate resume the consideration of the bill S. 4, the so-called Wilderness Act, and that thereafter debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. Church: *Provided,* That in the event Mr. Church is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Colorado has made three arguments which I think require some comments for purposes of clarification, if for no other purpose.

First of all, he has called for amendments to the bill, on the ground that unless we amend the bill in certain important respects, it will not be acceptable to the other body.

Mr. President, it is always open to the other body to modify in anyway it may see fit measures passed by the Senate; and if we in the Senate are to do our constitutional job, it certainly is not incumbent upon us to pass measures in such form as we think might be acceptable to the other body. Instead, we should pass measures which in our judgment will constitute the best and most desirable legislation for the country. In doing so, we do not impinge upon the prerogatives of the other body; instead, we discharge our own responsibilities in the best and highest sense of that term.

Second, the junior Senator from Colorado has argued that we should handle primitive areas in the way we handle reclamation projects; namely, by having special authorization by Congress prior to the time any given project is constructed.

I would agree if we were considering the establishment, for the first time, of primitive areas; if we were faced with a situation in which there were no primitive areas; and if Congress were being asked now to establish them. If this were the situation, it might be entirely appropriate to take the position that these areas should be established only upon the affirmative act of Congress.

But today we have in our national forests over 6 million acres which have been designated by the executive agencies of the Government as primitive areas. These areas have been established for periods of between 20 and 30 years. In my State alone, Mr. President, there are in excess of 3 million acres in primitive areas. The authority to establish these areas, to enlarge them, to create new ones, and to modify their boundaries was delegated years and years ago to the executive branch by the Congress.

What we are attempting to achieve by this bill is a measure of congressional control which does not now exist. In Idaho, we have waited for nearly 30 years to have these primitive areas reviewed by the Forest Service. Only this year has the Forest Service managed to complete its review of one of them, namely, the Selway-Bitterroot Area, involving portions of Idaho and Montana—an area which originally comprised 1,875,000 acres. The Forest Service has for the past 2 years studied the area, held special hearings in Montana and Idaho, and finally made recommendations—which were approved only 2 months ago by the Secretary of Agriculture—committing 1,240,000 acres of the area to wilderness, excluding and restoring to ordinary forest lands 447,000 acres which were found to be more suitable for multipurpose use, and leaving 190,000 acres in primitive area status.

Mr. President, this example should suffice to demonstrate that the executive agencies not only have the power to establish primitive areas, but also can redesignate the primitive areas as wilderness areas, without having the matter even come to Congress for any sort of consent, surveillance, or review.

The Secretary of Agriculture has announced his intention to convert another primitive area in Idaho—the Sawtooth Primitive Area, comprising 200,942 acres of land—into a wilderness area. Again he proposes to do so—using authority he now has under existing law—by the stroke of his pen; and the matter will never come to Congress for any vote or any review.

So I suggest that it is totally unrealistic to argue that this bill somehow diminishes congressional power over the public lands. The very contrary is the case. The bill seeks to restore to Congress surveillance over the portions of the primitive areas which are to be permanently included in the wilderness system; and the bill does so by providing that before the President, acting through the Secretary of Agriculture, may convert a primitive area into a wilderness area and may make it permanently part of the wilderness system, he must submit his recommendation to Congress, where it will be subject to review by both Houses, and where either House can, by majority vote, veto the proposal.

So, Mr. President, by means of this bill we are attempting to accomplish a restoration of authority to Congress, thus reclaiming to Congress a power which heretofore has been delegated to the executive branch.

Finally, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Colorado has argued that the bill constitutes some sort of impairment with respect to the development of water resources within the areas affected by the bill. He has pointed out, quite correctly, the importance of water impoundments—dams, power generators, and reclamation projects—to the West. But, Mr. President, I suggest that there are two portions of the bill which adequately assure the West continued water development, and I submit that even within the wilderness system the bill does not constitute any impediment whatever.

First of all is the provision which preserves intact the authority of the Federal Power Commission to license water projects.

In the course of the hearings it was made clear that the Federal Power Commission, which Congress has charged with the authority to license water development projects on the rivers of the West, would retain its full jurisdiction. There is no provision in the bill to the contrary which would affect that jurisdiction. So with respect to the major water developments that must be licensed by the Federal Power Commission, the bill would in no way interfere.

Second, there is provision that the President of the United States may open a wilderness area to minor water resource conservation measures, small watershed developments, so that once we would place areas into wilderness, they would not forever be removed from such activity.

Finally, need it be said that with respect to major public water projects, the Congress always retains authority—and, indeed, it is the practice of the Congress—to authorize such projects by legislation. Nothing in the bill could affect the power of Congress to authorize public water projects in wilderness areas by specific enactment. That is our practice anyway. So I suggest there is no basis for the arguments that the Senator has advanced. I hope that the Senate will not amend the bill in the ways that he has suggested.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I was particularly interested in two phases of the very interesting discussion of the Senator. First was the question of fact as to whether we would regain authority under the bill from the executive department or whether we would not. I would say that

I think we probably would. I think that is probably a correct analysis of it.

But the point I am making is that we would not regain the type of authority that we should take. With respect to the analysis of the Senator from Idaho as to what the executive department can do now and what the Congress would be permitted to do under the bill as it stands in its present form, I ask the following question: Is it not true that at the present moment there must be positive action by the Congress of the United States in order to create a national park, even though it may be out of lands classified as public lands in one form or another?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. There must be an affirmative enactment on the part of Congress to establish a new national park. But there need be no action at all on the part of Congress, in fact, no congressional action is now taken when areas within the national forest are placed in wilderness status. That authority has long since been delegated away to the Secretary of Agriculture, and this bill would restore the prerogative of Congress.

Mr. DOMINICK. But my question really is as follows: If we must take positive action to create a national park, why should we not also take positive action in order to create a wilderness area?

Mr. CHURCH. The answer to that question is that the primitive areas are already there. In this bill we are attempting to have them reviewed within a 10-year period, and a determination made by those reviews as to what portions of the areas shall be permanently included in the wilderness system. Given those facts, if we were to require affirmative action on the part of Congress before primitive areas that are already there may be included within the wilderness system, we could not assure ourselves that each of the recommendations would ever come to the floor of either House for action.

The Senator from Colorado, having been a Member of the other body, is fully aware that many legislative proposals and many executive recommendations never get to the floors of Congress for a vote. If we were to require positive action, which would call for an affirmative vote in both the Senate and the House of Representatives before a recommendation could take effect, there would be no way by which we could assure ourselves that those recommendations would ever be acted upon in the Congress. After the 10-year review period has expired, without some action by the Congress, the bill provides that primitive area lands not acted upon would automatically be returned to regular National forest status. So the only way that we could guarantee that primitive areas would be reviewed and the Congress would act upon them is by the device that is provided in the bill giving a veto to either House, but not requiring affirmative action on the part of both Houses.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would merely say in passing that if we should determine that that was the necessary procedure to get something before Congress in this case, it seems to me that perhaps any measure which the Senator from Idaho favored ought to be treated legislatively along those lines. Such action would seriously reduce the power of Congress.

But the other point that I wished to make was with reference to the question of whether or not the proposal might inhibit water development, reclamation projects, and the construction of transmission lines on projects that have already been authorized and constructed.

I call to the attention of the Senator from Idaho the questions that were asked of the Secretary of the Interior as they appear on page 29 of the hearings. I pointed out that water development includes more than merely plain damsites. It includes the construction of conduits—transmission lines—a great number of pieces of which must go across lands which would be included within the wilderness system under the bill as it is now written. I asked him whether the provision would not give a right of veto to the President of any particular reclamation project that might be passed by Congress. The President could say, "All right. We do not mind the reclamation project, but we are not going to permit you to build facilities for the reclamation project across the wilderness system." The answer was that obviously that could be true.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I respectfully disagree with the Secretary of the Interior in that regard. Had he had an opportunity better to consider the question and his answer, I believe he would have concluded otherwise.

First, if we are to have any new public water project in a wilderness area, it would require positive action of the Congress, and that requires Presidential consent; he must sign the bill. It is hard for me to feature why a President would sign a bill authorizing a public project and then turn around and refuse to permit the building of the project by virtue of the fact that it is located in a wilderness area. That would be an act of complete contradiction.

Second, if the project is a private project, it must be licensed by the public power commission. The bill preserves the full prerogative of the Federal Power Commission without any inhibition or limitation whatsoever.

I suggest to the Senator that his fears are not well grounded with respect to this proposed legislation.

Mr. DOMINICK. I sincerely trust that the Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I intend to speak at some length on this subject. I wish to begin by remarking that no bill that has been before the Congress in the past 2 years has had as many words said about it which shed as little light or little understanding of what the bill is about as the particular measure before us.

I first encountered this matter in the spring of 1957. Since then various groups in support of a wilderness system have grown up, like mushrooms, all over the country.

What is a wilderness system? The bill describes it in some of the most wonderfully idealistic language anyone ever could conjure up:

> A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man.

There are those of us who have opposed this concept of a wilderness system for years. I shall always oppose it, because I think it is wrong. It is wrong because it is a travesty upon the great majority of the American people. I shall go into this later.

Secondly, it is wrong because the bill, as now drawn, violates the fundamental precepts of our American constitutional system.

It is also wrong because it would give to a very few people in the United States the unbridled use of land to the detriment of every other public use, whether it be mining, grazing, forestry, or plain recreation.

All those factors add up to sufficient reason, in my mind, for opposing the bill in its present form.

I say again—because it seems necessary to say it at least a hundred times to get it through the minds of some people who will not and do not wish to purvey and repurvey the truth—I am in support of a limited wilderness system. I have always been in support of a wilderness system. I am in support of a wilderness system of from 7 to 8 million acres. There is one now existing of 8 million acres.

I think we should set aside forever for the people of this country an area which will be essentially untouched by man and unbothered by man, which will be used solely for a measure of enjoyment by man of nature in its primitive state.

The facts are that there are some 65 million acres, using round figures, in primitive areas, wild areas, canoe areas, wilderness areas, wildlife refuges and game areas, and national parks which are susceptible of inclusion in the wilderness system.

The pending bill seeks to include and would include immediately in the wilderness system all of the primitive areas, all of the wilderness areas, all of the wild areas, and all of the canoe areas.

The question is, What should we do? There is one big question, aside from the problem of improving the language of the bill and making it more workable. The big question is, How should we include these areas within the wilderness system? How should we add to the 8 million acres?

I wish to point out a few things about the 8 million acres which are now in the wilderness system. Some 1¼ million acres were added in the past year by administrative action taken in the Department. This is one reason why I want a bill passed. I say to those who are sponsors of the bill, they are no more anxious to have a wilderness bill passed than I am, except that I should like for Congress to take a hard, affirmative look at every acre of land which is to come under the system afterwards.

The testimony has been undisputed before the committee for several years that not more than 1 percent of all the people who use the Federal public land areas—the forests, the parks and everything else—use the wilderness system.

Before the administrative action was taken last year, those people already had available for their use 8 percent of all of the land of the public domain, set aside in wilderness areas. So the 1 percent of the people who use our public lands, before the administrative action was taken last year, had the use of 8 percent of the land. They had 8 times as much of the use of the land, in proportion, as did the people who used the national parks, the national monuments, and things such as that, in the ordinary sense in which we use them.

What happened last year was that there were approximately 1¼ million acres added—whatever the figure was; at least a million acres—in the Selway-Bitterroot Area of Idaho. That raised the proportion. Now the 1 percent of the people who use our public lands have 12 percent of the public lands set aside for their use—12 percent is set aside for their exclusive use.

I am somewhat of a realist. I can appreciate the great cultural values some of these people feel these lands might have. When they have 12 times as much land set aside for their use as the ordinary individual does, I think they are getting somewhere near their equal share of the public land use.

There is a more impelling reason why we should not go beyond this at the present time. If Senators will read the bill, they will find that no one could go into these areas except man on his two legs or on horses. There are to be no roads. No motorboats will be allowed, except where they have been customarily used, and they will be regulated out as fast as they can be. There will be no machinery of any kind in these areas. There will be nothing allowed in the areas except man on his two legs and on horses.

What will this mean in practical terms and effects? I do not care what the supporters of the bill have said to the contrary, the facts are it is not within the financial realm of the average man who takes his family on a vacation to rent an outfit with a guide and horses, as well as pack horses and the necessary equipment, to go into a wilderness area. I do not care what anybody says to the contrary, we shall be establishing here, mainly, a wilderness system for people of more affluent means, denying the area and its enjoyment for the most part to people of ordinary means.

But there is another reason for opposition. No roads are to be provided. I do not have the figures with me, but we all know that there is a growing number of people who are retired, who have reached the ages of 60 and 65. They have retired, and now, perhaps for the first time in their lives, they have sufficient time to utilize these facilities, to have some of the pleasures of life, after having worked for so long.

There is not one person in a thousand of that age who has the physical stamina to put a pack on his back or to ride a horse into a wilderness area 25 miles in order to enjoy the use of that area, even if he had the money to hire a horse and guides. Frankly, most of them have no business in those areas without guides, having lived a more sedentary existence all their lives. They have no justification physically for walking or riding into those areas.

So what have we done here? We have already locked up 12 percent of our public lands, and the most beautiful areas in the United States. They are not locking up any old swamp or merely mediocre views, or anything like that, for the 1 percent of the population; they are locking up 12 percent of the most beautiful, wild, primitive country we have between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Now, I think there is a case to be made for pure justice and pure equity. Consider that our people from 60 to 65 years of age cannot have access to a road where they can view those parts of the country, because no roads are permitted in them. On the other hand, how well are we going to treat the 1 percent of our population, this handful of people who are reaching out for more and more of this land? They are not satisfied with the 8 million acres that they have now. Under this bill 65 million acres of land are subject to reclassification as wilderness area, and this is what they are reaching out to grab.

As a matter of compromise, I am perfectly willing, personally, to go along with the 8.2 million acres they now have. But it seems to me we are going as far as we should go.

This brings me to the amendment which I have offered, and which I intend to offer again tomorrow morning, to provide that, just like the park system, no more lands shall be included in the wilderness system unless Congress has acted affirmatively.

I think my colleague from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] very beautifully and brilliantly illustrated this point just a few minutes ago. Fortunately, we have not given authority to the Secretary of the Interior to throw any lands he wants to into this system. Congress has retained jurisdiction for that purpose.

On February 20 of this year, the following Senators all joined me in offering an amendment to Senate bill 4: Messrs. BARTLETT, BENNETT, CANNON, DOMINICK, FONG, GOLDWATER, HAYDEN, JORDAN of Idaho, LAUSCHE, MECHEM, MUNDT, RANDOLPH, SIMPSON, and THURMOND.

This amendment is not now in print, having been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and that it may also be printed for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

(f) Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment Congress approves a concurrent resolution declaring itself in favor of such recommendation: *Provided*, That, in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution may be limited to one or more of the areas covered or parts thereof.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall discuss this amendment more fully tomorrow.

In order to understand this problem and all its ramifications, there are certain things that need to be known. First of all, let us face it squarely—this is not a conservation bill. I repeat, this is not a conservation bill. The word "conservation" is mentioned in the bill only once.

As a man who has lived all his life in the West, I think I understand conservation about as well as anyone. I have been a fan of conservation measures, and I may say even a rabid supporter.

In my opinion, the bill as it is now constituted is not going to conserve anything. It is going to lock up areas for the use of a few. But the conservation aspects of the bill are completely lacking.

I should like to underscore again the fact that this is not a conservation measure. If a bill locking up areas which may not receive the benefits of conservation is called a conservation measure, then we have reversed the meaning of conservation in this country. The word "conservation" is mentioned in the bill only once. I do not see mentioned anywhere in the bill the fact that conservation is one of the purposes hoped to be accomplished.

In order that the record may be completely clear, there are in the national forest, wild, wilderness, and canoe areas, 8,220,403 acres.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Can the Senator tell me how many acres there are in my State of Arizona?

Mr. ALLOTT. The figures I have before me show 422,990.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the National Park System there are 22,560,000 acres.

In the lands not now permanently withdrawn from resource use, there are in the national forest primitive areas 6,098,532 acres.

There are 28,554,014 acres in the National Wildlife Refuges and game areas.

That makes a total of 65,432,949 acres that are susceptible of inclusion within the wilderness areas.

I ask unanimous consent that I may include in the RECORD at this point a table showing Federal ownership or management of land in 11 Western States. The table shows, I may say for the benefit of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who is on the floor, that 71.3 percent of the State of Arizona is owned by the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Federal ownership or management of land in 11 Western States*

	Total land area (thousand acres)	Federally owned land [1] (thousand acres)	Percent of total land area	Managed by Federal Government Indian tribal lands (thousand acres)	Percent of total land area	Federally owned or managed lands (thousand acres)	Percent of total land area
Arizona	72, 688	32, 396	44. 6	19, 383	26. 7	51, 779	71. 3
California	100, 314	45, 071	44. 9	496	. 5	45, 567	45. 4
Colorado	66, 510	24, 156	36. 3	746	1. 1	24, 902	37. 4
Idaho	52, 972	34, 050	64. 3	409	. 8	34, 459	65. 1
Montana	93, 362	27, 815	29. 8	1, 557	1. 7	29, 372	31. 5
Nevada	70, 265	60, 726	86. 4	1, 062	1. 5	61, 788	87. 9
New Mexico	77, 767	27, 300	35. 1	5, 815	7. 5	33, 115	42. 6
Oregon	61, 642	31, 580	51. 2	1, 208	2. 0	32, 788	53. 2
Utah	52, 701	36, 466	69. 2	2, 253	4. 3	38, 719	73. 5
Washington	42, 743	12, 666	29. 6	1, 813	4. 2	14, 479	33. 8
Wyoming	62, 404	30, 219	48. 4	1, 753	2. 8	31, 972	51. 2
Total	753, 368	362, 445	48. 1	36, 495	4. 8	398, 940	52. 9

[1] Excludes trust properties, Indian tribal lands.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1960.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might point out that in my State of Arizona, when we add the State-owned land to the Federal-owned land, the total is 88 percent. In other words, the fastest growing State in the Nation must get along, taxwise, by taxing 12 percent of the available land.

I suggest that in the days when my State had fewer than a million people, and the density was two or three persons to the square mile, we could live under those conditions. However, what the Federal Government is doing by forcing more and more land in the West under Federal control is to hasten the day when the Western States will not be able to tax themselves adequately to run their own governments. Of course, when this happens, the only place that we will be able to turn to will be the Federal Government. That is something that we westerners do not like to do.

It is unfortunate that when the Original Thirteen States formed our Union they, too, were not subjected to some kind of giving away of their land in order to become members of the Union.

Frankly, I believe that if we westerners had known before what we know now, many of our communities would not be States of the Union, but would still be territories. I say that because, frankly, we were better off as far as the ability to live our own lives was concerned.

In my State we have 16 national monuments, 2 national parks, and 2 national recreation areas. I forget how many wildlife areas we have. Still the effort is to put more and more land under the control of the Federal Government, instead of continuing with the rather time-honored and time-proven concept of multiple use of the lands in the West.

I suggest that our eastern friends, who are so eager to have the West become a giant national park, might try to imagine their own State problems if they were to have in their own States their own lands subjected to ownership by the Federal Government.

I might say, in passing, because I see on the floor my good friend from Idaho, sitting in the majority leader's chair, that, as he well knows, one of my favorite fishing spots in the whole Nation is in the Middle Fork of the Salmon River in Idaho. I remember when that was truly a wilderness area, when it was hard to get in, and when it meant perhaps a 2½-day pack trip to get to the Middle Fork of the Salmon River. It was opened up. I do not know if it is a wilderness area, as such. However, it is some kind of wildlife area.

To me that was one of the most beautiful streams in the world. Although it has retained its beauty, the area has been opened up to people who have no appreciation for this kind of scenery. The last time I was there I saw empty beer cans and empty whisky bottles, and fish still lying around the campsites, and the campsites uncleaned. Instead of preserving these areas as wilderness areas, the tendency is to have them more and more opened up. The public will demand that they be opened up. As a result they will lose their scenic value. I am in hearty accord with the preservation of areas for people who really like to get into the wilderness, or get out into the open, as we say, and use it. However, I am not in favor of opening it up to the abuse of people who want to say they have been there and in the process leave their trade mark.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield, so that I may respond to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CHURCH. The area to which the Senator from Arizona refers is, of course, an Idaho primitive area. I know the Senator loves the area very much. He has taken some wonderful photographs of the area on the occasion of his trips into it in the past. I say to him that one of the purposes of the proposed legislation is to prevent a further opening up of the area, which is what has occurred in past years, so that the scenic and wilderness values, which are the predominant values, can be preserved, and so that the wildlife and the watershed can be preserved as well. In this sense, the bill is not only a wise conservation measure, but also a measure to prevent the continuation of the very process the Senator has lamented.

I might just say in passing, in all good humor, that I have listened with interest to the remarks of the Senator with respect to the burdens of statehood. I would say that it is open to him to sponsor legislation to restore Arizona to territorial status. If a persuasive case can be made, I believe Congress would listen with fascination to the advocacy of such a proposal by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might say that I doubt Congress would seriously consider, or that even the New Frontier would seriously consider, such a proposal, because we pay about $300 million a year into the National Treasury. I do not believe they are about to let go of a fat plum like that.

My reference was to the days when we became territories and then later States, when we did not have big populations, and when Federal ownership of lands, even in Idaho and in Montana, was of no great consequence. We never gave it any thought at all. Today, in a State like my own, which is the sixth largest State from a geographical standpoint in the United States, we find ourselves with these national parks and national monuments and national recreation areas located in our State, and approximately 19 Indian reservations, taking up about 88 percent of the State. We do not like to lose any more of the 12 percent of the land, because we are up against the wall now.

There is another point that I should like to raise and with respect to it ask a question of my good friend from Idaho, if the Senator from Colorado will yield for that purpose.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. First I should like to respond to the Senator from Arizona by saying that the pending bill does not involve the acquisition of so much as a single acre of additional Federal land; all of the land involved is already owned by the Federal Government; so it will not impose any heavier burden upon the Western States, where, I agree, Federal ownership is very large. The bill does not enlarge that holding whatever.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to be reassured on that point by the Senator. This is the point that bothers me. I know what the intention of the writers of the bill is. I can say that I am in accord with it, but I am troubled by this point. The Senator says that the Idaho Wilderness Area, if it becomes a part of the public land, will be preserved in its present form and condition.

I have asked this question of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, with respect to a large section of land near Henry Mountain, in southern Utah, in the Wild Horse Area, about which Zane Grey wrote, and with respect to Navaho Mountain, where I run a trading post, an area consisting of about 15 million acres, which he wants to make into a so-called wilderness area. What is going to happen when the eastern tourist or the western tourist cannot get in there? What if he cannot get in there because he does not like to ride a horse and he does not like to walk, perhaps because he has not heard of the 50-mile program, but, instead, likes to drive his car on a paved road and find good accommodations when he gets there? My question is, Can the Interior Department and can the organization set up to administer the bill and can Congress withstand pressures to provide the funds to open these places? That is what bothers me.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like to respond to the question of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Idaho to permit him to respond; then I should like to resume my discourse.

Mr. CHURCH. The very pressures which the Senator from Arizona fears are pressures which are genuinely feared by the supporters of the proposed legislation. We feel that an enactment of this kind will provide better guarantees that wilderness areas can be preserved in their primitive state than will the absence of such legislation. Without such legislation, it is much more likely that the pressures will not be withstood and that the small portions of the wilderness which still remain to us will vanish. This is one of the chief reasons why I support the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to respond, since the Senator from Arizona has raised this question. I am looking at a map which is included in the hearings on S. 174, the wilderness bill, held in 1961. I am looking at page 284, which has facing it a map of Colorado and a map of Arizona, showing areas which are susceptible of inclusion in the wilderness system.

Everyone who desires to have some kind of beauty retained in our mountains must ask himself a question. For example, if one looks at the wilderness areas in Colorado, he observes that it is very hard to establish a camp on the side of one of our mountains which rise to 14,000 feet. Ultimately, in the wilderness areas of the West, one is reduced to a relatively few locations where camps can be established.

The next question one must ask himself is this: After 30, 40, or 50 parties have camped in those few areas which are suitable for camping, and considering the tin cans and other refuse, including the residue left by horses, how much suitable area will be left untrammeled by man and his four-footed friends? The answer is: Not too much So the proposal to include more and more land in the bill is unrealistic.

The Senator from Arizona mentioned the multiple-use concept of land. I wish to discuss that point. Since the passage by Congress of the multiple-use law, this would be really the first time that that law would be completely abrogated. Congress included in the multiple-use law the use of areas for a wilderness system. I think this is one of the proper uses. But we simply cannot afford, as I pointed out to the Senate 2 years ago, to put all our land—some of it our best land—into wilderness and lock it up so that it can never be touched again.

Mr. John Wolfe, a prominent Colorado geologist, made an impressive statement before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this year. He pointed out that the great portion of the mineral wealth of Colorado lies beneath the wilderness areas which would be set aside by the bill. The same is true of other States. When we begin to talk about conservation and the use of land, I think we are entitled to talk about multiple use. When 12 percent of all the public lands of this country are already locked up for a single use—as wilderness areas—merely to enable people to breathe fresh air, I think we have reached a place beyond which we should not go until Congress has had an opportunity to consider the proposal and gage it affirmatively. The multiple-use theory with respect to land has been accepted by Congress and has been adopted by Congress. I think it should be retained by Congress.

When we hear what is proposed to be done with the land, I think it should be pointed out that in the 11 States of the West—Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming—the value of the farm, mine, and forest products is $6,369 million. The value of the mineral production is $3.8 billion; the value of forest products is $3.3 billion.

As in the State of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], Federal land ownership is substantial in Colorado, roughly, 35 percent. That means that we who live there must bear a greater proportion of the expense of our State than we would if we had the opportunity to convert Federal lands to private ownership; but we do not have that opportunity.

At the time a similar bill was considered by the Senate 2 years ago, the proponents did not pay any attention whatever to impending report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. The reason was that the report had not been completed at that time. But the proponents were perfectly willing, anyway, to establish wilderness areas, even though some $2 million had been spent on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and the study which it had made. Congress nevertheless proceeded to consider wilderness legislation.

Now the report of that Commission is before us. What did that "blue chip" Commission, of which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] was a member, say about wilderness areas. Speaking of primitive areas, the report said:

> Areas in this class are inspirational, esthetic, scientific, and cultural assets of the highest value. They, and they alone, satisfy the longing to leave behind for a time all contact with civilization. Fortunately, they are a resource of which the country still has an abundant supply and which it can afford to preserve from other uses for the benefit of future generations. At the same time, it must be recognized that there are some areas which meet the physical requirements of this class but which for economic and social reasons are more valuable for other purposes.
>
> The recommendation is that primitive areas should be carefully selected and should be managed for the sole and unequivocal purpose of maintaining their primitive characteristics.

What the Commission said was that some of the lands may be valuable for other purposes than as wilderness areas. With that statement I agree.

Mr. President, turning now to the bill, it contains several items which I think should be considered very carefully.

On page 17 we find the following provision in regard to grazing:

> The grazing of livestock * * * shall be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions and regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary having jurisdiction over such area.

Mr. President, in the committee I tried unsuccessfully to have the word "restrictions" stricken, because I believe that word has a connotation in the bill which is not justified. So, Mr. President, tomorrow I shall try again to have that word stricken.

The word "restrictions" is also used in connection with motorboats, on page 16. I think there is no question that it is the intention of both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to restrict the use of motorboats. However, with respect to this matter I notice the provision that—

> The President may * * * authorize prospecting (including but not limited to exploration for oil and gas), mining (including but not limited to the production of oil and gas)—

And so forth, and so on.

The point is that "restrictions" and "regulations" either mean the same thing or else "restrictions" further qualifies "regulations." I believe it rather significant that the portion which refers to the President's action provides for "regulations," but the bill provides that there will be "restrictions" in regard to the use of motorboats. If anything is to be done with respect to grazing in the wilderness system, I believe such a provision should be included under "regulations," not "restrictions." In my opinion and, I believe, in the opinion of most persons, the word "restrictions" carries with it the right arbitrarily to establish a guideline which must be followed, whereas the word "regulations" implies a limitation under a definite set of guidelines which will remain constant and will not be subject to the whim or fancy of the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment relating to these words. I ask that the amendment be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in the next few minutes I propose to discuss briefly several amendments which I shall send to the desk and ask to have printed.

I turn now to another amendment relating to page 17 of the bill. This part of the bill has caused us a great deal of concern and trouble. I refer to the provision of the bill that:

> (2) Within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable,—

And so forth.

My amendment would substitute the words "appropriate Secretary" for "the President." I believe it perfectly obvious to anyone—and tomorrow I shall discuss this matter at greater length—that no one would have access to the President, for the purpose of securing authority to explore for minerals or "the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance," and so forth. Of course I believe those who drafted the bill desire to place that power in the hands of the President, because no one would have access to him. However, if we wish this provision to be meaningful, and if we really mean what we provide in the bill when we include the provision that this can be done whenever the public interest demands it, let us put the authority in the Secretary, and permit him to take action.

So, Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be printed and lie on the desk until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I also call attention to the review provided by the bill. On page 10 of the bill we find the following provision:

> *Provided, further,* That where a resolution of opposition to any such recommendation has been introduced, a hearing thereon shall be held within thirty days by the committee to which such resolution has been referred.

The difficulty arises from the fact that 30 days is too long a period of time. The Reorganization Act of 1949—and the procedures under the bill are subject to that act—contains a provision that immediately after 10 days following the filing of any resolution and its referral to a committee, any Member of the House or any Member of the Senate may move to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution. But if such a motion were made on the 11th day, for example, the committee would not be required to hold a hearing for 20 days after that, but still be in compliance with this provision of the bill.

So this amendment is a simple one which provides that the word "thirty" be changed to the word "five", so that the committee will have to hold a hearing within the limitation time provided under the Administrative Procedures Act, and so that the Member of the House or the Member of the Senate who makes the motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution will have in his hand, when he comes to the Senate or to the House, as the case may be, a hearing upon the resolution, and will have an opportunity to question and to cross-question witnesses and to provide a record and to have the record available for debate.

Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be printed and lie on the table until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Would the amendment be an amendment to a provision of the Reorganization Act or the provision on page 10, line 14, which reads "shall be held within thirty days"—so that it would read "five days"?

Mr. ALLOTT. It is an amendment to line 14. "Thirty" would read "five".

Mr. METCALF. There would be no change in the other provisions of the Reorganization Act?

Mr. ALLOTT. No, the amendment would not affect the Reorganization Act, as such, or the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. METCALF. I merely wished to be clear as to the effect of the proposed amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. The amendment would only change the time of hearing from 30 days to 5 days, so that anyone who would desire to avail himself of the so-called advantages of the bill would really have some advantage he could take.

Mr. President, tomorrow I shall offer another amendment which would deal with page 3, line 23. I shall not discuss the amendment in detail today. The gist of it is that primitive areas would not be placed within the wilderness system following enactment of the bill, but, they would be assured their preservation in their present category and their protection until such time as they could be classified by the appropriate Secretary and recommendations made as to their exclusion from or inclusion in the wilderness system.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and lie on the desk. I am sure that members of the committee fully understand the purpose of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

> On page 3, line 23, strike out all through line 3 on page 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "(b) (1) The wilderness system shall include all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, or canoe: *Provided,* That the areas within the national forests classified as primitive may be included in the wilderness system as hereinafter provided. Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years, review in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20, of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959, the suitability of each primitive area in the national forests for preservation as wilderness and shall report his findings to the President. While being reviewed and until action is taken as provided by this subsection, primitive areas shall be administered so as to preserve their present status and condition. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the inclusion within the wilderness system, or exclusion therefrom, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided,* That the President may, as a part of his recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area to be included in the wilderness system, recommending the exclusion and return to national forest land status of any portions not predominantly of wilderness value, or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value; *Provided further,* That following such exclusions and additions any primitive area recommended to be included in the wilderness system shall not exceed the area classified as primitive on the date of this Act. The recommendation of the President with respect to the inclusion in the wilderness system, or the exclusion therefrom of a primitive area, or portions thereof, shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided,* That if Congress rejects a recommendation of the President and no revised recommendation is made to Congress with respect to that primitive area within two years, the land shall cease to be a primitive area and shall be administered as other national forest lands: *And provided further,* That primitive areas with respect to which recommendations are submitted to Congress on the eighth, ninth, and tenth years of the review period herein provided shall retain their status as primitive areas until the expiration, in respect to each area, of a full session of Congress, two years for resubmission of revised recommendations to Congress by the President, and, if so resubmitted, until the expiration of a full session of Congress thereafter. Recommendations on all primitive areas not previously submitted to the Congress shall be made during the tenth year of the review period. Any primitive area, or portion thereof, on which a recommendation for inclusion in the wilderness system has not become effective within fourteen years following the enactment of this Act shall cease to be a primitive area and shall be administered as other national forest land."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on page 17 of the bill is a section which, as I have stated, has caused us much trouble. There is a provision that purports to refer to mining, which I wish to discuss. I have already pointed out that it is next to impossible—if not impossible—for anyone to get the President's ear for the purpose of determining whether or not a certain area should be explored and mined for oil, gas, or other minerals. The amendment which I propose would affect the mining provision which is now in the bill, which is utterly meaningless, and which would never have any effect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed, that it lie on the table until tomorrow, and that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 17, line 1, strike out all through "(B)" on line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Within national forests and public domain areas included in the wilderness system: (A) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, until midnight, December 31, 1977, laws of the United States pertaining to mineral leasing and mining shall, to the same extent as applicable prior to the effective date of this Act, extend to all lands affected by this Act; subject, however, to such reasonable regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary having jurisdiction over the area consistent with the use of the land for mineral development and exploration drilling. Subject to valid rights then existing, effective January 1, 1978, the minerals in lands designated by this Act as wilderness areas are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and from leasing under the mining laws and from leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act and all amendments thereto. *Provided,* That after December 31, 1977, the appropriate Secretary may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including but not limited to the exploration and production of oil and gas).

"(B) The appropriate Secretary may within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable authorize the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (C)".

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have one final amendment which I shall offer tomorrow. I am making my remarks so that Senators may be aware of the nature and the purposes of my amendments. The amendment, relating to page 21, line 9 of the bill, would strike out the section of the bill concerning a land use commission, a provision which was inserted in the bill to affect one State. I believe there is no justification for treating any one State any differently from another. In this instance the Secretary of Agriculture himself recommended that we exclude that provision from the bill.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it lie on the table. I ask unanimous consent that it may also be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 21, line 9, strike out all through line 4, page 22.

Mr. ALLOTT. In conclusion, we should have a wilderness system. We should have a wilderness bill. I desire to be protected from the precipitous actions of our Secretaries of Agriculture and our Secretaries of the Interior. We have found that they are capable of precipitous action. We found that they were capable of such action when they included the Selway-Bitterroot area last year.

It is my hope that we could have a wilderness bill which would protect all Americans—not merely those who desire wilderness, but also those who are interested in true conservation, those who are interested in the development of the West, and those who wish to see restored to Congress control of that portion of our congressional duties which we have relinquished. As the distinguished Senator from Idaho has said, it is true that, under the bill, we would have more control than we have had. But we would not have the control that we should have. What is needed is the right and the power to exert control over lands that are going into wilderness areas in the same way that we do lands that go into the national park system. Otherwise we will actually have abrogated much of our responsibility and our power, and we will be afflicted with more woes than Job ever was.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. METCALF. So that the discussion will be in today's RECORD and available for Senators to read, I desire to take some time to discuss the power which the Senator from Colorado suggests we should recapture. As was very brilliantly outlined by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who is handling the bill, we are only dealing with Federal land that has a certain specific use. We are recapturing some of the power that we delegated 30 to 50 years ago.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is that not the statement I just made?

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

I wish now to talk about the other Federal land, about which the Senator from Arizona was concerned, land with which all of us in the Western States are concerned. That is all the other Federal land that is not incorporated in a primitive area, in a national park, in a wilderness area, in a fish and wildlife or in a canoe area. As to those vast Federal lands, the bill would give authority to Congress that the Senator is seeking.

The bill provides that no new wilderness area shall be created out of areas that are not now under wilderness use or under use similar to wilderness use without an affirmative and specific act of Congress.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator's statement is in the form of a question, I shall be happy to answer. The Senator is completely correct. But the fact is that it is a statement without meaning. None of the areas of which he has spoken will ever be included in the wilderness areas because they would not be useful for that purpose. It is not that kind of area and not that kind of land.

As far as I know, at the present time the Department of Agriculture has already classified as primitive areas and as wilderness areas almost every strip of land in this country which could possibly be classified as such.

The Senator from Colorado was a faithful attendant at the hearings. The Senator will recall that several witnesses suggested that, contrary to our prediction a few years ago, the amount of land in wilderness and primitive areas in the national parks, and so forth, has grown in the last few years. Right now some of the people who were proponents of the measure are suggesting that other wilderness areas and other primitive areas in other parks shall be created. Under present law, as the Senator from Idaho has said, such areas could be created by a stroke of the pen. If the land is national forest land, the area could be created out of the national forests by a decision of the Secretary of Agriculture. But if the bill should pass, we would have to have an affirmative act to create a wilderness area just as we create a national park or authorize a Bureau of Reclamation project.

I merely wish to say to the Senator that if, under section (h), page 11, of the bill, he is perfectly happy to have other areas reviewed affirmatively, I can see no real basis for differentiation as to why we should have a different system for the areas that have been qualified as wilderness areas.

Mr. METCALF. Merely because——

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to remind the Senator that I have the floor. I yielded to him. I at least want to keep enough control so that I can answer in full before I yield to him again.

The fact is that the Senator was talking about areas which are outside of the primitive, wild, park, game refuge, and so forth, areas, and the Senator says, "This is all right." There is no justification for making a distinction as between the two. I made this statement before the Senator took his feet: I agree that by the bill, if it should become law—and the Lord forbid that it ever should become law—we would be recapturing a portion of the powers which we delegated away a long time ago. The point is that we would not be recapturing enough. We would not recapture enough so that the Congress would consider every acre which was to go into a wilderness system on exactly the same basis it considers every acre which is to go into the park system.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator. I did not mean for the discussion to be a series of questions. I merely wished to discuss with the Senator a phase which the senior Senator from Colorado and the junior Senator from Colorado had omitted.

I refer to the effect of the bill on other areas of the public domain which are not included in these various categories.

I should like to cite, for information, the ORRRC report, which the Senator from Colorado cited. On page 132 of the report there is the quotation:

> Portions of national forests, parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, game ranges, and the unreserved public domain meet the basic criteria of primitive areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report, from which I have quoted, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Portions of national forests, parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, game ranges, and the unreserved public domain meet the basic criteria of primitive areas. The natural environment has been undisturbed by commercial utilization, and they are without roads. Some of these areas are managed for the purposes of wilderness preservation under broad statutory authority. Certain class V areas of more than 100,000 acres in national forests have already been set aside by the Secretary of Agriculture as wilderness areas. Others between 5,000 and 100,000 acres have been set aside by the Chief of the Forest Service as wild areas.
>
> There is widespread feeling, which the Commission shares, that the Congress should take action to assure the permanent reservation of these and similar suitable areas in national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, and other lands in Federal ownership. The objective in the management of all class V areas, irrespective of size or ownership, is the same—to preserve primitive conditions. The purpose of legislation to designate outstanding areas in this class in Federal ownership as wilderness areas is to give the increased assurance of attaining this objective that action by the Congress will provide.

Mr. METCALF. I now skip some of the excerpt, to the point:

> There is widespread feeling, which the Commission shares, that the Congress should take action to assure the permanent reservation of these and similar suitable areas in national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, and other lands in Federal ownership.

I am suggesting that by the passage of the bill, with respect to other lands in Federal ownership and the unreserved public domain, we would be recapturing for the Congress an affirmative declaration of congressional action to create a wilderness out of those lands, which is sought by the two Senators from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then the Senator is recommending, as I understand, that other lands should go into the system, other than those contemplated by the pending bill?

Mr. METCALF. I am not recommending. The ORRRC report so recommends.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thought the Senator was citing it with approval.

Mr. METCALF. I was citing it in response to the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado that there were no lands other than the primitive areas, and so forth, which were capable of wilderness use. I was suggesting that there are people, including the authors of the ORRRC report, who say that there are other lands in the public domain and national forests which meet the criteria for wilderness, and who wish to incorporate them into a wilderness system.

Mr. ALLOTT. I know that the Senator argues his point with great sincerity and with great belief in what he says. I should like to invite attention to the same section of the report to which the Senator has referred. On page 131 of the ORRRC report, it is stated:

> Recommendation 8-6: Congress should enact legislation providing for the establishment and management of certain primitive areas (class V) as "wilderness areas."

There was nothing in the report about classifying all primitive areas as wilderness areas. That is what we would be doing, under the form of the bill as it is now being considered. We would include all primitive areas to start with in the wilderness system.

Mr. METCALF. The very next paragraph, which I have had printed in the RECORD along with my remarks, lists the national forests, national parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, game ranges, and the unreserved public domain, as meeting the basic criteria of primitive areas, as being lands which should go into the wilderness system.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have one question for the Senator. It is more a rhetorical question than an actual one.

If the affirmative action of the Congress is the proper way to bring in the other areas, why is it not a proper way to apply to the present bill?

Mr. METCALF. As the Senator from Idaho so eloquently pointed out, these areas are now and have been for more than 30 years primitive, for wilderness use. We would only continue the basic use which has existed for more than 30 years. We would not be using any of these acres of land for anything else; whether national parks, primitive areas, or designated as wilderness.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should have to disagree with the Senator, because if the primitive areas come into the wilderness system under the terms of the bill, even though there may be mining and some forestry in some of the primitive areas now, there would not be any in the future.

Mr. METCALF. For 30 years these lands have been administered substantially as wilderness areas.

Mr. ALLOTT. There has been mining and some forestry. So if we should bring the lands into the wilderness system under the terms of the bill, all that would stop immediately.

Mr. METCALF. The very purpose of the review is to protect the interests which have been created. The people involved have had an opportunity during all of these past years to go in and prospect the lands. They have not lumbered in these areas. They have not built roads into these areas. By and large, substantially they have been administered in the same manner as wilderness areas or national parks for 30 years.

What we are seeking, under techniques which have been established for many years in the Congress, under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, is to quickly take care of those lands that have a basic wilderness use, and then to provide that in respect to any future creation of a wilderness area Congress will, as the Senator from Colorado desires, affirmatively authorize such creation and establish the boundaries in the same way as a law is passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I merely say to the distinguished Senator that I know the way he feels. I can hardly sympathize with his point of view, because in my opinion there is no justification for arguing that the Congress should affirmatively review areas outside of the specified ones which might possibly be included in the future. I do not think any of these lands would come in, because mostly they are not of a quality which would classify them as wilderness areas. But there is no basis in fact for a distinction as to justifying one method for these lands and another method for the lands which are included under the terms of the bill at this time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for yielding to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. I was happy to do so.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. DOMINICK. I was intensely interested in what my colleague said, for I consider it to be an extremely fine analysis of the bill and the problems inherent in its consideration.

There is one question which I think might pinpoint the discussion the Senator was having.

It is my understanding that we in the Congress must take affirmative action to include within the wilderness system all lands now not classified in specific uses. Second, we must take affirmative action to take from forest lands particular portions and put them in national parks. Third, we must take specific action to authorize reclamation projects, part of which may be within the public lands—a great deal of which in fact are within the public lands system.

Can my colleague see any justification for making the sole exception to the generally conceded procedure the lands which are classified in this bill as primitive lands?

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall have to answer my distinguished colleague in the negative. I am at a loss as to any legal reason or other method of logic which would say that we should change the method for bringing in the primitive areas, to make it different from all the instances my colleague has cited. The logic of such a conclusion escapes me.

Mr. DOMINICK. Does the distinguished Senator have any specific example he might give in which the type of procedure contemplated under the pending bill is applied to any other substantive legislation?

Mr. ALLOTT. Of course, the Senator is aware that it is applied to recommendations of the President for reorganization of Government and it has been used in that respect, but I do not know, offhand, of another one that occurs.

Mr. DOMINICK. Are not those recommendations solely concerned with the executive department?

Mr. ALLOTT. They are solely concerned with the executive department.

Mr. DOMINICK. Would the Senator think that was substantially different from what the responsibility of Congress is with respect to our national resources and our public lands?

Mr. ALLOTT. It occurs to me the responsibility is entirely different. The act to which I previously referred, under which the President makes recommendations to reorganize the executive departments, grew out of the Hoover report. They said, "We want to go ahead with the reorganization of our Government. We want to give the President the chance to do it, but we want Congress to have a chance to review it." So the President was given the right to reorganize the executive branches of Government, with the Congress having the right of review.

That is not the same as the case before us. Here we are dealing with the fundamental responsibility of the assets of the United States. They do not belong to my colleague or to me; they belong to all the people. We are dealing with those assets now. We are disposing of them.

I discussed this matter at great length on the floor of the Senate 2 years ago. In the original action in giving this power to the Secretary of Agriculture, or even admitting that he had it, Congress was negligent in its duties. It is my hope that we will take back that power, or retain it, because these are assets which I think we should consider only affirmatively.

The argument is made that we cannot get action on these proposals. The other party is in control of the Congress. It has an almost two-to-one majority in the House, and a better than two-to-one advantage in the Senate. I cannot believe that it cannot bring before Congress any bill it wants to. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considers any bill they wish to bring up. I have not known of any bill that has not been brought before the committee that the majority party wanted to bring to the floor. That is no argument, in my mind. The other party has an effective majority. It can bring any of these bills to the floor if it wants to.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think we have brought out the point at issue, very frankly.

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Am I correctly informed that the Senator from Colorado has submitted an amendment to strike out the final provision in the bill which takes care of the special situation in Alaska?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator realize that the conditions in Alaska are quite different from those in any other State? It happens that Alaska has gone further in setting aside areas that would be eligible for wilderness than has any other State in the Union. In Alaska is set aside in national parks two-fifths of the total national parks areas of the entire Nation. In wildlife ranges and refuges we have in Alaska virtually twice the total land set aside in the other 49 States. In national forests we now have larger areas than any other State of the Union. So Alaska has not only done its part in providing areas potentially available for designation as wilderness, but far more. I am fearful that this trend may go ahead still further unless there are some safeguards. Section 9, dealing with land use commissions, seeks to provide them. It seems to me that that section, which merely provides that a study be made before action is taken, is a reasonable and a modest one. It would merely provide information to guide the appropriate Secretary before he makes his recommendations to the President before action is taken. It provides only a minimum safeguard for the vast area of Alaska, in which so much more land is already in Federal ownership than in any other State.

I should dislike seeing that provision withdrawn. I hope the Senator will not press his amendment at this time.

I wonder why he feels the provision for Alaska should be deleted?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will answer the Senator in two ways. As he knows, since the territory of Alaska became a State I have, in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, been most of the time with the Senator from Alaska—in the main, if not almost entirely. The Senator from Colorado has been sympathetic to legislation which pertained to Alaska, and which perhaps gave Alaska an advantage that was not available to the other States.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator for whatever he has done, and I hope he will maintain the same attitude in the future.

Mr. ALLOTT. While this section was in the bill of 2 years ago, and I recall when the Senator offered it, I feel it gives the Commission too much power. I feel it should not be applied to one State any more than to other States.

I read now from page 30 of the committee report, which is a letter from the Department of Agriculture:

> As worded, the provisions of section 9 for a Presidential Land Use Commission would apply only to the State of Alaska. We recognize that Federal ownership of about 99 percent of the land area of the State of Alaska presents a situation peculiar to that State, and have no particular objection to such a Commission in relation to Alaska. However, the scope of the duties of the Commission would go to all federally owned land in the State and not just to lands in wilderness-type areas.
>
> We therefore question whether provision for such a Commission should be included in legislation which otherwise deals only with wilderness-type areas. We therefore suggest that all of section 9 on pages 19 and 20 be deleted and the succeeding sections be renumbered accordingly.

I answer the distinguished Senator in two ways: First of all, the Land Use Commission section takes in too much territory. I do not think it should be applied solely to Alaska. Second, I am simply following the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GRUENING. I appreciate the point of view of the Senator. I point out that one of the reasons why this is a special provision for Alaska—and I can understand the feeling on the part of my colleague that all States should be treated alike—is that, it should be recalled, Alaska entered the Union so much later than the other States, and was subject, during its long stepchildhood, to a rampant and militant bureaucracy which often imposed its will arbitrarily and over the protests of Alaskans. At the same time Alaska was discriminated against and excluded from much beneficial legislation enacted for the other States. Alaska should be given a chance to undo some of the damage done to it when it was not a State. Section 9 simply provides for an advisory Commission. It does not compel anything. It alters nothing. The power of Congress is not diminished.

If the Senator from Colorado will not withdraw his amendment to delete this section, I hope it will not prevail. I understand his feeling that States should be treated alike, but, after all, there is a vast difference, not merely in the historical background, but in the great size of Alaska and the tremendous withdrawals that have taken place for various purposes potentially related to wilderness. No State had so little land of its own at the time it came into statehood; 99 percent or more was in the Federal domain, and even after the provisions of the Statehood Act go into effect, will be entitled to only 27 percent of its area, and by no means the best land.

If the provisions of section 9 are not allowed to remain in the bill without revision, and the provision on advice is not maintained, I am fearful of what may happen.

A few years ago a bill was introduced by the previous Secretary of the Interior to withdraw 9 million acres of arctic wilderness in the northeast corner of the State. Extensive hearings were held, and this proposal was rejected by the Congress. Nevertheless, the Secretary of the Interior withdrew that amount.

Immediately, of course, efforts were made by the Interior Department to get appropriations to manage this remote wilderness, which my colleague and I opposed, because if it was to be left wilderness it should be left alone. This is why Alaskans may well be fearful unless we have this moderate safeguarding amendment, for study before recommendations for more wilderness withdrawals are made.

As I say, the Commission which would be appointed by the President would be merely advisory, and would merely consult with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, and would have no other authority. I am hopeful that the amendment will remain in the bill. I am sure that it will not do the damage that my friend from Colorado anticipates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in support of the pending bill. I am proud to be counted as a supporter of the wilderness bill. It is a measure which received tremendous support in newspaper after newspaper across the length and breadth of our land. The editorial policy of the overwhelming number of newspapers in the Nation supports the wilderness bill.

During the 85th and 86th Congresses, I was privileged to be the principal sponsor of the proposed legislation. In the 87th and 88th Congresses, this task has been assumed by the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], together with the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], myself, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church]. All the cosponsors are listed on the bill.

In 1961 the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] guided the wilderness bill, then known as S. 174, to an overwhelming victory by a vote of 78 to 8. This substantial margin testified to two primary facts; one, it demonstrated the legislative adroitness and skill of the Senator from Idaho; two, it indicated the fundamental soundness of the legislation.

It should be remembered that this type of legislation has been processed over the years in the appropriate committees of Congress. The refinements which are contained in the pending bill are the result of the most careful scrutiny that any proposed legislative program has ever received.

I believe we have before us an extremely worthwhile bill. As I indicated in my statement before the Committee on Interior and Insular affairs, this solid vote of confidence, the vote of 78 to 8, did not occur by accident or error. It reflected the reasonable, temperate, and moderate procedures contained in the proposed legislation, to preserve certain areas of the Nation within a national wilderness preservation system.

It should be quite obvious to every American citizen that if future generations are ever to have the privilege of seeing the native beauty of wilderness areas, or areas that have been untouched by commercialism, this legislation which is before us must be adopted.

During the 8 years in which the proposed legislation has been before Congress, many important modifications have been effected in the specific procedures for identifying and protecting certain areas of wilderness. For example, the proposal to establish a permanent national wilderness preservation council has been eliminated. The original definition of a wilderness area has been modified considerably. The regulations for the protection of wilderness areas have been revised and liberalized. Each of these changes was made because the proponents of the legislation were determined to seek a bill that recognized the need for wilderness preservation but which did not unduly hamper present land-use programs or legitimate economic, commercial, or commodity uses.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to speak at length about the undeniable benefits that wilderness resources will impart to future generations of Americans. As our civilization becomes progressively more mechanized, automated, and dehumanized, the value of preserving the primeval character of certain designated areas will increase manifold.

This will represent a legacy of incomparable value to generations hundreds of years hence, because it will be a gift beyond human creation.

As a matter of fact, I am not at all sure that the preservation of these wilderness areas may not make a great contribution to our individual and national mental health. I believe that as we preserve these areas, we may very well economize in the building of institutions for taking care of people who are the victims of the terrific tensions of the modern day world.

In the State of Minnesota, we are proud to have such a national forest, which is a wilderness area. It is one of the most beautiful areas in the world. It is untouched by commercialism. It is a constant source of enjoyment and recreation for thousands of families. It has become a source of great recreational opportunity for the families of our Nation. Thousands of families have an opportunity to enjoy the blessings that only God Himself can give to people in this beauty of the native area.

These lands that we speak of are not beyond human protection and preservation. The national wilderness preservation system containing national forest areas, national park system areas, and national wildlife and game range areas, will insure that these federally owned lands will be administered in such a way as to leave them unimpaired. I am confident that an overwhelming majority of Senators will recognize the historic nature of our opportunity to establish this legacy.

I really cannot believe that anyone would oppose it, that anyone would momentarily put private property ahead of the long-range interest of the people.

I wish to congratulate the principal sponsors of the proposed legislation, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel]. They have provided us with determined, courageous, and bipartisan leadership. Similarly, the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] has done a magnificent job in managing the proposed legislation in the Interior Committee and on the Senate floor.

I am confident that the efforts of these devoted public servants will be richly rewarded as countless generations of future Americans reap the benefits of their wisdom, their foresight, and their determination.

In fact, Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the proposed legislation and as one who initiated it some years ago, and took a great deal of criticism, much of which was very vicious and at times most disturbing and distracting, I wish to say that I am more proud of my name being listed as a cosponsor of this bill than of almost any other bill that I supported in Congress. I can think of no greater service that a man can perform at this stage for future generations in terms of our domestic legislation program, than the bill that is before us. Nothing is more important than for us to stake out, so to speak, and to protect these areas of America that are known as wilderness areas, to make sure that generations yet to come will be able to enjoy the blessings of our time and the heritage of this great Nation.

Again I commend the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator very much; but I believe he has been overly modest with respect to his own role in connection with the proposed legislation. He is the father, the initiator, the pioneer, who first submitted wilderness legislation, some 6 years ago, in March of 1957, and it has been a hard, long, legislative road since.

Ten hearings have been held on the proposed legislation, four in Washington and six in the field. Two thousand, eight hundred and twenty-five pages of testimony have been taken. Such has been the interest in the proposed legislation and in the struggle to adopt it. In connection with the long, hard fight, the man who got it all started is the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. We are all greatly indebted to him for his efforts in behalf of the millions of Americans who will receive a lasting profit and benefit from his efforts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. It is something to get something started, but another to bring it to a successful conclusion.

I am not trying to be overly generous when I say that the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Montana, and the few other Senators who have carried on this fight, particularly in committee, are deserving of our thanks and gratitude. I can assure the Senator that this legislation is looked upon by people throughout the Nation as one of the finest bits of the legislative program that we have before us. I salute them for what they are doing.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for the pending measure, the National Wilderness Preservation Act. We who live along the Atlantic seaboard might at the first blush seem to have only an indirect interest in the proposed legislation. Yet the preservation of our wilderness territory, mostly in the Mountain States of the Far West and Alaska, while it may seem a long way from Pennsylvania, is nevertheless definitely in the national interest.

I have supported such proposed legislation every time it came before the Senate since I was first elected to this body. I support it again. Actually, I wish it were stronger. In my view, we could have gone further than the pending measure does to preserve our wilderness lands. Nevertheless, I realize the necessity for compromise. I know we are engaging in the art of the possible. At least, the bill makes a substantial

start toward setting aside for posterity and for those who love the wilderness to camp and fish, and to some extent hunt in it, the opportunity to do so.

I particularly commend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for his leadership in this regard. It is a leadership which is not without risk, for I know that there are within his State strong interests who oppose the proposed legislation, interests which, in my opinion, do not represent the better view on this controversial subject. The Senator from Idaho, who I am happy to say was returned to this body last fall by a very substantial majority, was brave indeed in fighting those strong vested interests in his own State.

It is nice to know that, every now and then, in elections to this body, right, in the long run, on the whole, does to some extent tend to prevail. I compliment the Senator from Idaho for his taking the national interest on many problems which, ostensibly, might seem to be of very little interest to his State. Need I add that I include the mass transit bill in this regard? There are those who sometimes think Senators engage in log rolling; that "If you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours," and thereby proposed legislation is passed which otherwise could not be passed.

I have no hesitation in saying that it is my clear opinion that the wilderness bill is in the national interest, without regard to any other proposal coming before Congress, just as the mass transit bill was in the national interest, without regard to any other proposed legislation which might come before Congress. I have no guilty conscience—in fact, I sleep well at night—in supporting the wilderness bill—which, as I say, is of little immediate interest to the people of Pennsylvania—just as I supported the mass transportation bill, which is of imperative importance to the people of our State; and I am indeed happy to know of the prospects for the prompt passage of the bill by the Senate. I hope and pray that the other body will be equally alert and equally intelligent in following the national interest.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this is not the first time that I have been a coauthor of the wilderness bill, nor will it be the first time that the Senate will pass it—as the Senate will do this week.

In the first part of the bill we find the following:

> SEC. 2. (a) The Congress recognizes that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition. It is accordingly declared to be the policy of the Congress of the United States to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System to be composed of federally owned areas in the United States and its possessions to be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness.

Mr. President, the first question for me and for the other Members of the Congress to ask themselves is whether the bill is in the public interest. There will be no quarrel with any Senator concerning his answer to that question. I think the question should be answered unanimously in the affirmative.

The next question is whether the bill accurately and reasonably carries out the provisions of this legislative intent. On that subject there is in this Chamber a divergence of views. For my part, I answer that question also in the affirmative. I believe that the interests of all people of our country are advanced by the provisions of the bill. Other Senators have spoken earlier today in regard to those provisions; and I shall not take the time of the Senate or encumber the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by submitting extended remarks on the bill.

I make this point, Mr. President: As has been stated heretofore, under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture has complete, untrammeled authority to classify as wilderness any of the public domain now under his jurisdiction, if he so desires. With respect to his authority as well as the authority now existing in the Department of the Interior, the bill provides for a procedure by which lands in the public domain not now classified as wilderness shall parcel by parcel and piece by piece be examined and explored; and provision is made for a hearing at which interested American citizens—including local Government officials—will be able to support or oppose any proposed classification as wilderness of any parts of the public domain.

If, for example, the Department were to overrule the objectors, and were to determine that, in its judgment, any given parcel should be classified as wilderness, provision is made for an appeal to the President. There, again, this measure provides for the filing of objections. Let us assume that the White House concurred in the determination made by the Department. The bill provides that either of the two Houses of Congress can reject, repudiate, and overrule the decisions made in the executive branch. What is wrong with that, Mr. President? Who honestly and logically can argue against that approach and the due process followed at various stages under that approach?

Today, Congress has no control or check on the exercise of discretion in the executive branch. This bill provides that Congress shall have such control or check. However, far more important is the fact that if the bill is enacted into law, the American people of your generation, Mr. President, and mine and the American people of succeeding generations will have an opportunity in their lifetime to see the pristine beauty with which the Creator endowed the North American land mass, for this measure will preserve for the Americans of today and for those who come tomorrow the beauty of our country in its primitive state.

Mr. President, I wish to make another point for the benefit of the people of California. My State is a semiarid State; and a U.S. Senator from California is not worth his salt if he ever forgets the necessity to supply more water to the people who now live in California and to those who are coming there each year at the rate of over a half a million or more. We had before us the question of whether the Federal Power Commission should continue its jurisdiction with respect to matters of water and power, or whether we should prevent it from operating in areas designated as wilderness. There was a dispute about that. The Interior Department recommended that Congress eliminate all the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission as provided by this measure. To the credit of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, it rejected that recommendation; and it has written clearly into the bill a provision that with respect to problems of water under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, the present law with respect to that jurisdiction shall remain in effect.

Mr. President, those are the brief comments which I wished to make here today. In past Congresses and in the discussions which have occurred in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have spoken at great length on this subject. I want the RECORD to show my statement that the bill is in the public interest.

This measure is not one of partisan or political concern, Mr. President. U.S. Senators from both parties stand on this floor and speak in favor of the bill. Other U.S. Senators from both parties stand on this floor and speak in opposition to the bill.

A year ago the bill was passed overwhelmingly by the Senate. I trust that this year, once again, the bill will be passed by the Senate; and I hope that in this Congress—different from the last session—the Members of the House of Representatives likewise will have an opportunity to vote their judgment as to whether the bill should become law.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I might express my appreciation to the able Senator from California?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator for the very fine support which he has given the bill over the years. He has been one of the stalwart champions of wilderness legislation. In giving the bill that kind of support, he has demonstrated his farsightedness in that field as he has demonstrated statesmanship on other questions that pertain to the wise conservation of the Nation's resources.

The people of California can be very proud of him in the role he has played in connection with the proposed legislation and, as a Democrat who stands on this side of the aisle, I wish to extend my personal appreciation to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to give my friend and colleague my unbound thanks for his generous comment. I am grateful to him. I sincerely believe that he, I, and others who feel as we do can supply a leadership that will result in the enactment of the bill into law.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will indulge me one more minute, I should like to place into the RECORD some statistics that I think are called for in view of the discussion that has heretofore taken place today on the pending measure.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am sorry that the senior Senator from Colorado is not present. I believe he would not take offense if I placed the figures in the RECORD, for he will have an opportunity to review them when the RECORD is published today and to comment on them tomorrow, should he see fit to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the figures to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Acres
Total land area of the United States	2, 313, 733, 120
Total Federal lands	767, 766, 435
Total land in national forests	181, 600, 000
Total national forest land subject to S. 4	14, 138, 000

Mr. CHURCH. In the course of his remarks, the senior Senator from Colorado mentioned that the bill would authorize the establishment of a wilderness system which would comprise some 12 percent of the public domain. He observed that only 1 percent of our people actually use the wilderness. On that basis he concluded that we would be giving a disproportionate amount of public lands over to a very small number of people to utilize and to enjoy.

Mr. President, I question those figures in two respects. First, members of the committee staff advise me that the correct figure is not 12 percent of the forest lands but somewhere between 7 and 8 percent of the forest lands.

Furthermore, the land about which we are talking is a part of one great country. If we are going to compare the numbers of people who enjoy the wilderness with the amount of land that we would set aside, then the comparison must be based upon the land set aside as it relates to all of the area of our country.

Today we have 2,313,733,000 acres of land in the United States of America. After the review provisions which are established in the bill have been completed and the wilderness system that would be authorized by the proposed legislation has been established, it is estimated that it would run to between 35 and 40 million acres, which is approximately 1½ percent of the total area of the United States. So that if the figures have any meaning at all, I suggest that a very definite balance has been struck between the area set aside and the numbers of our people who, over the years, will enjoy it. I placed my figures in the RECORD because I think they put the subject in proper perspective, particularly in view of remarks made earlier by the senior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I am now prepared to yield the floor. I wish to say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that I appreciate the fact he has been so generous in allowing me and other Senators to speak. It is typical of him to stand aside and let others take the floor. I commend him for it. I hope he has no further difficulty in getting his own remarks into the RECORD before he adjourns the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his kind and generous remarks. My good friend from California, who is terse, desires that I yield to him briefly. I am only happy to do so.

CHOOSING CONTRACTORS TO DO FEDERAL WORK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania. I shall not add to his difficulties.

Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] introduced a measure providing that Americans should be given more facts with respect to how contractors are chosen by the Federal Government in matters of defense and of space agency procurement contracts. When he introduced that proposed legislation, the able Senator said:

> A full disclosure of all relevant facts would benefit everybody. An informed public opinion would exert irresistible weight in support of decisions which are soundly based and against those which are not. It would reduce to a minimum improper pressure on Government officials. It would restore public confidence in the integrity of Government.

Mr. President, I completely agree with what the able Senator from New Jersey had in mind in introducing his proposed legislation and with the comments he has made concerning it.

So do distinguished newspapers and able columnists. I ask unanimous consent that the excellent editorial published in the Washington Post on Friday, March 1, and comments made by two distinguished American columnists, Mr. Marquis Childs and Mr. Roscoe Drummond, dealing with the subject all be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 1963]

CONGRESS AND CONTRACTS

The practice of letting favored Congressmen announce the award of Government contracts in their districts may have some partisan advantages, but the cost is high in terms of the longrun public confidence. Of course Senators and Members of the House are delighted to make known that so many millions of dollars will be spent in their States or districts because their constituents will assume that the announcer has wielded a potent influence in the matter. The difficulty with the practice is that such an inference is often false and that if it were true it would suggest a scandal.

The official policy of the Defense Department is the antithesis of favoritism. It provides: "Our first and paramount objective is to acquire weapons and materiel which fully meet our qualitative, quantitative and delivery requirements—at the lowest overall cost. Whenever our specifications are sufficiently precise, we must obtain competition through formal advertised bidding procedures as required by law." But when the Department announces the awarding of contracts through Democratic Congressmen and denies a comparable privilege to Republican Congressmen, it seems to fly into the face of its own policy.

The effect on Congressmen is likely to be especially unfortunate. Certainly it tends to intensify the pressures on the Department from legislators who want a larger share of the huge defense budget spent in their districts. The net effect is to encourage legislators to think of defense expenditures, not in terms of the maximum national security, but in terms of swinging lucrative contracts to their hometowns.

Instead of cultivating the impression of a cozy liaison between the Defense Department and Members of Congress in the letting of contracts, Congress ought to be strengthening the safeguards against special influence and favoritism. Senator CASE, of New Jersey, has proposed a bill requiring that all ex parte communications in regard to defense or space contracts by persons other than the bidder be recorded for public inspection. He would also require, in the case of negotiated contracts, the disclosure of the basis on which the contract was made, except for classified information, and set up a House-Senate watchdog committee to review such contracts.

This is the direction in which Congress ought to be moving. With billions of dollars flowing from the Treasury to defense and space contractors, it is of the utmost importance to avoid favoritism and even the appearance of using defense projects as political bait.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1963]

ARMS RACE SEEN INFECTING POLITICS

(By Marquis Childs)

The noisy quarrel, which is essentially between two giant contractors and their congressional backers. Over the TFX plane contract points up the ever-growing entanglement of huge defense spending with the politics of who gets what.

The Senate subcommittee investigating the $6.5 billion contract has taken after Secretary of Defense McNamara on the ground that he gave the contract to General Dynamics even though Boeing entered a lower bid. McNamara's answer is that economies to be achieved through developing a single plane for both the Air Force and the Navy determined the award. A resolute man, he shows no signs of reversing his decision.

The Defense Department has responded by saying, in effect, that you can hardly expect an unbiased finding when Senators with a direct stake in the outcome sit on the investigating committee. The accusing finger is pointed at Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, for whom the Boeing plant in Seattle and its payroll must be a major consideration.

But it is possible that JACKSON, with his wide and continuing interest in national security, would welcome a way out of the pressures that inevitably bear down on a Senator with important defense industry in his State. If he can deliver for a particular industry back home he may at the same time be doing a disservice to the Nation.

That is why the Senate, instead of indulging in the quarrel currently going on, would do well to give serious consideration to the proposals of Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey. CASE put in bills the other day calling for complete public disclosure of all communications whether written or oral and from Members of Congress and anyone in the executive branch seeking to influence the awarding of a contract. He would also require full and prompt disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract is granted.

Of the $60 billion a year in defense and space contracts an estimated 65 percent are negotiated without competitive bidding. This is a wide-open invitation to pull and push. While by most accounts McNamara has done a remarkable job of standing up to these pressures, it is too great a burden to put on one man.

CASE, in introducing his proposals, cited examples of the "I can do more for you" theme that is more and more resorted to. He quoted speeches by President Kennedy in last year's election in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, claiming a marked increase in Government contracts for those States under his administration, with the President urging election of Democratic Governors to continue this collaboration.

The Defense Department has fallen into the habit of allowing Senators and Representatives to announce important defense contracts in their States and districts. That tends to create the impression they are responsible for obtaining this prize. In most instances the impression is false but there is rivalry for the local headlines that come out of such an announcement.

Senator CASE has a third proposal. That is to establish a joint Senate-House committee to review defense and space contracts, with special attention to negotiated contracts. It would be made up of a Democrat and a Republican each named from the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, Senate and House Government Operations, and Senate and House Space Committees.

It would bear a family resemblance to the Committee on the Conduct of the War which Harry S. Truman so ably directed in World War II.

That any of the CASE proposals will be adopted seems unlikely even though five other Senators have joined in sponsoring the bills. The joint committee on contracts cuts across too many privileges and perquisites which present committee chairmen cling to.

With each succeeding election, so long as defense budgets run at $55 or $60 billion, the game of contract promise and grab will become more deeply entrenched in the political system. As this system prevails any meaningful disarmament is bound to become more difficult. Each Member of Congress will have a stake in keeping the home plant going. This has already been demonstrated in areas where aircraft contracts have been cut back as missiles have begun to dominate.

In his farewell address President Eisenhower spoke solemn words of warning about the growing influence of what he called the military-industrial complex. Today it might better be called the military-industrial-political complex.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 26, 1963]

DEFENSE CONTRACTS—CONGRESS SHOULD CHECK

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Despite the respect and confidence which the top civilian leadership of the Pentagon has well earned, especially Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and Deputy Secretary Roswell Gilpatric, I submit that instead of there being too much congressional checking of defense there isn't enough.

Take the TFX plane contract which the Senate Committee on Government Operations is now investigating. This was awarded to General Dynamics although three different military panels had recommended that it go to Boeing.

There is no evidence that Secretary McNamara yielded to partisan pressures. It is clear that he had a rational basis for the decision he made. But here, at one stroke, is $6,500 million going to one corporation to build a supersonic Navy-Air Force fighter plane which the military would prefer to have built somewhat differently. The issue is primarily one of economy—the McNamara-approved single two-service plane, which could be used both from the ground and from carriers, versus two somewhat different and thus more expensive planes sought by the Navy and Air Force.

Even if you have read everything that has been said on this matter, I do not see how you or I can adequately judge the conflicting contentions. Mr. McNamara made an honest and defensible decision, but no outsider who isn't devoting almost continuous scrutiny to the evidence can have any basis for being sure it was the best or wisest decision.

This is why responsible, expertly staffed congressional investigation is desirable and can be a boon to the Defense Department itself.

There is not enough of this kind of investigation. It is sporadic. It needs to be continuous. With approximately $60 billion going into defense and space contracts, we need more doublechecking, not less. About 65 percent of these are negotiated contracts let—for quite sound reasons—without competitive bidding.

The amount of money going into defense and space continues to mount. The defense budget has been increased 25 percent in the last 2½ years. The rate of growth in defense spending may taper off in a year or two, but the space budget will increase substantially.

With this kind of money involved, even the best Pentagon decisionmaking needs steady scrutiny by people outside the Defense Department. It will be a protection to the Defense Department. Even if the McClellan committee decides that the McNamara-Gilpatric team was in all ways prudent and courageous and sound in the TFX contract, let's not stop there. Congress ought not to limit its investigations to ex parte complaints.

This is why the recent proposals of Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, are all headed in the right direction. Their effect would be to give some additional bone and muscle to congressional scrutiny. To this end CASE proposes:

1. A permanent joint Senate-House committee to give continuous attention to defense and space contracts. It would be fully bipartisan, with one Democrat and one Republican named from the present committees which have specialized knowledge—House and Senate Appropriations, Government Operations, and Space.
2. Complete public disclosure of all communications seeking to influence the letting of defense contracts—oral or written by anybody, Congressmen, ex-Congressmen-turned-lobbyists, presidential aids.
3. And, in the end, a full public exposition by the Defense Department setting out the basis for the award of a contract.

These are needed and sound steps. They would strengthen congressional scrutiny. They would make it continuous rather than sporadic. They would reduce the massive outside pressures, which can be countered when they are open but are hard to resist when they are under the table. My information is that most, if not all, the civilian heads of the Pentagon would welcome all of these measures. They should.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I intend to speak on the need for congressional reorganization. In a few minutes the Senate will adjourn for the purpose of going to the opening of the professional baseball season. I shall go, too. I am looking forward to a good game.

However, it is rather amusing that we abandon our usual custom of coming in at noon, and come in at what to most Senators is really the ungodly hour of 9 o'clock this morning so that we could get at least a little business done, and then all go to the ball game.

That is all right with me. Last week we had an informal recess from a little after 10 o'clock in the morning until after 2 o'clock so that certain Senators could greet the cherry blossom queens from their States. That is fine. I am for cherry blossoms; I am for queens. They were beautiful girls. They deserved all their honors. It was a shame that the cherry blossoms blew off before most of the queens had an opportunity to be crowned.

Mr. President, I do think that in between our cherry blossom recesses and our baseball fun we ought to give a little bit of thought as to whether the Senate of the United States is really doing the job it ought to be doing.

It will be no news to my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to learn that in my opinion it is not.

In the Washington Post of April 5 appeared a very good column written by my friend Roscoe Drummond entitled "Congress—Why It Falters."

Mr. Drummond, a very acute observer of the congressional scene, asks the question as to what is the crucial issue before the 88th Congress. He concludes that the issue of highest priority on the agenda is the reorganization of Congress itself. I agree.

Mr. Drummond believes that the most urgent need is to improve the future of Congress and, indeed, to make sure that it has a future. I agree. While in my opinion the executive arm of our Government has been doing an outstanding job and did an excellent job even during the years of the Eisenhower administration, and while the judicial branch of our Government in my opinion has been farsighted, forward-looking, intelligent and sound, the legislative branch has been under increasing criticism. In my opinion that criticism is largely justified.

Mr. Drummond comments that Congress has already lost its capacity to transact the public business carefully, responsibly, and efficiently.

He points out that it has lost this capacity by attempting to deal with space-age problems with iron age tools. The cliche which I prefer is "with horse and buggy tools," but perhaps "iron age tools" is a more accurate term, historically.

Mr. Drummond comments on the vast amount of time and public attention, both in the committee and on the Senate floor, which has been taken by the TFX controversy. He suggests that everybody would agree that $6.5 billion should not be spent casually. He points out that it was not, that it is not going to be, that the investigations in the Defense Department have been painstaking and meticulous, that there has been a good deal of controversy, and that the controversy has been resolved by the individual who under the law is supposed to resolve it, the Secretary of Defense.

Nevertheless, one of our able congressional committees has thought it worthwhile to go into an extensive review of that decision. I do not say the committee had no right to do so. Clearly it did.

Mr. Drummond says the committee did, too, but he points out that last October, after Congress had been in session for 173 days, in the last 4 harried days before adjournment we rushed through five appropriation bills totaling $15,850 million, or one-sixth of a $93 billion budget. He suggests that $15 billion should not be appropriated casually. He comments, "It was." I agree with him.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I should prefer to finish my remarks, but I will yield to the Senator for a question. I do not want to get into a colloquy with the Senator at this time. I should be glad to do that when I finish.

Mr. PROUTY. I will wait for the Senator to finish.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is suggested by Mr. Drummond that the time may come when Congress will look into the mirror and do something about its own failure to transact the public business carefully, responsibly, and efficiently. He quotes with approval comments made early in this session by the National Committee for an Effective Congress, to the effect that last year Congress found it almost impossible to finish its business.

The Senate did not even organize this year until the end of February.

This committee—an able committee with which all Senators are familiar—suggests that "Congress is not handling its workload because it has not organized its time, its talents, and its resources to meet the space-age tasks which today's world imposes upon it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column written by Mr. Drummond may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS—WHY IT FALTERS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

What is the crucial issue before the 88th Congress? Is it the tax bill or medicare or aid to education?

All of these are important, but I am convinced that the issue of highest priority on the agenda of this Congress is the reorganization of Congress itself.

Many things need to be done to improve the future of the country, but the most urgent need is to improve the future of Congress—to make sure it has a future.

The fact is that Congress has already lost its capacity to transact the public business carefully, responsibly, and efficiently. It has lost it by attempting to deal with space age problems with iron age tools.

Look at one example:

The Senate's Government Operations Committee is worried and is therefore vigorously investigating whether the Department of Defense may have made a mistake in selecting the TFX fighter plane and awarding the $6.5-billion contract to General Dynamics.

The military put in months investigating how this plane should be built. After the facts were laid out, the civilian heads reviewed them exhaustively for many weeks. Six and a half billion dollars shouldn't be spent casually. It wasn't.

Last October, after Congress had been in session 173 days, in the last four frantic harried days before the session expired, it rushed through five appropriations bills totaling $15,850,000,000—one sixth of a $93-billion budget. Fifteen billion dollars shouldn't be appropriated casually. It was.

I am not saying that Congress should not investigate the TFX contract for fear it was casually decided. I am simply asking when Congress is going to look into the mirror and do something about its own failure to transact the public business carefully, responsibly, and efficiently.

Year after year, as cited above, it appropriates huge sums with the back of its wrist as it rushes home to tell the voters what a good job it is doing.

Congress appropriates everything piecemeal. It never examines the budget in toto. Different committees look at different parts. Congress never looks at the whole.

After authorizing the expenditure of billions of dollars each year, Congress fails to give itself adequate staff to review the misuses of Federal funds reported to it by its own agency, the General Accounting Office.

This is not the only evidence of congressional disorganization. The National Committee for an Effective Congress makes this early-session report:

"Last year Congress found it almost impossible to finish its business. This year Congress found it almost impossible to get started. The Senate did not even organize its committees until the end of February.

"This year the session was accompanied by a rising public chorus questioning the structure and function of Congress, but the suggestion echoes within Congress itself that reforms are in order.

"Congress is not handling its workload."

Congress is not handling its workload because it has not organized its time, its talents, and its resources to meet the spage age tasks which today's world imposes upon it.

Fortunately there are some influential Senators and Congressmen who are acutely aware that Congress must modernize its machinery for transacting the public business. There is formidable resistance from those Members who would rather have a weak and ineffectual Congress than give up special privilege and personal power.

Time is running out because this session of Congress is further behind than the last.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. I will not engage in any colloquy, I assure my friend from Pennsylvania.

I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that Mr. Drummond also pointed out that one of the great difficulties encountered, particularly by the minority, in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, is that we do not have adequate committee staff members.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator from Vermont. I do not think the minority does have a sufficient number. I should like to help the Senator get them.

Mr. PROUTY. As the Senator well knows, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. CLARK. Hardly the chairman, but at least the ranking minority member.

Mr. PROUTY. The ranking minority member. I thank the Senator for correcting me. I hope someday to be chairman.

Mr. CLARK. I hope the Senator will not be, but I love him very much.

Mr. PROUTY. In any event, I do not have a single staff member on whom I can rely assigned to me on either of those subcommittees. The Senator can undertand very well, considering the problems with which we are confronted, that it is impossible for any of us on the minority side to do adequate justice to legislation presented before us.

I hope very much that the Senator will exercise his influence with the minority leader, so that the Republicans may have adequate staff members.

Mr. CLARK. With the majority leader.

Mr. PROUTY. With the majority leader.

Mr. CLARK. I have great sympathy for the Senator's position. I was about to invite attention to one of the subjects which is on the table, S. Res. 81, submitted by the Senator from Vermont, to provide for a more equitable distribution of staff members of committees. I am a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, though, to be sure, one of the most junior members. I shall be glad to use my influence to see that a prompt hearing is given to the Senator on that resolution. I urge him to get in touch with other members of the committee for that purpose.

Mr. PROUTY. I appreciate the Senator's help very much.

THE SENATE CALENDAR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, among the other matters listed on our calendar under "Subjects on the Table" are Senate Resolutions 9, 10, and 80, offered early in the session, to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

It has seemed to me for some time that the Senate, which has been, as I shall show later, in very brief sessions during the past 3 months—many times it has met only twice a week, frequently has come in late and adjourned early—might well devote its attention to that part of the reorganization of the Congress which is set forth in the cloture resolutions, but the leadership thought otherwise. I am in no position, as merely one Senator, to bring the resolutions again before the Senate for consideration. I express the hope that before the 88th Congress adjourns those resolutions will be brought before the Senate and brought to a final vote on their merits. This I believe could be done, if the leadership on both sides of the aisle were really in favor of majority rule.

Fifty-six Senators in this body, including the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the only other Senator on the floor as I speak, the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], favor that action.

I think it is high time that majority rule did take over in the Senate, and the Senate should be able to act when its majority not only is ready for action, but also has indicated how it would act.

(At this point Mr. BURDICK assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn to a discussion of today's calendar; the calendar for Monday, April 8, 1963. I note that in addition to the "Subjects on the Table," which I have briefly discussed, there are only four pieces of proposed legislation on the calendar for action, under the heading of "General Orders Under Rule VIII."

Two of them—a bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, and a bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps and to authorize local area youth employment programs—will be acted on before our Easter recess, which officially will begin toward the end of this week, and which I hope because I intend to take full advantage of it—will unofficially continue until Monday, April 22, statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is extraordinary, Mr. President, that on this 8th day of April, after 3¼ months of laboring, we have been able to produce so small a litter of mice as this legislation to which I have referred, but "That's all there is, there isn't any more."

Why is that? Why has there been such a small output? The Senate has passed only two major bills—the mass transit bill, which after extensive debate was passed, on April 4; and the 4-year extension of the draft, which might well also have resulted in substantial and meaningful debate for a good many days, because, goodness knows, the Draft Act is in great need of being gone over, revised, and put through a fine-tooth comb. But that bill passed in 10 minutes.

The Banking and Currency Committee, from which the mass transit bill was reported, did not even meet until February 26, although there was no reason in the world, under rule XXV, why the Banking and Currency Committee could not have met as early as Wednesday, January 9, or some 7 weeks—at least 6 weeks—before it did meet.

In all the Senate has acted on 34 routine money resolutions, which took about 2 days. We have passed only 12 public bills, mostly of a minor or noncontroversial nature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of those 12 bills together with an analysis of time consumed by the Senate since the start of the session, may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Analysis of record—Jan. 9 through Feb. 25

Date	Senate	Time in session
Wednesday, Jan. 9	12:00-12:57	0:57
Thursday, Jan. 10	12:00- 1:04	1:04
Friday, Jan. 11	(1)	
Monday, Jan. 14	12:00- 3:21	3:21
Tuesday, Jan. 15	12:00- 5:48	5:48
Wednesday, Jan. 16	12:00- 5-55	5:55
Thursday, Jan. 17	12:00- 5:25	5:25
Friday, Jan. 18	12-00- 3:51	3:51
Monday, Jan. 21	12:00- 5:51	5:51
Tuesday, Jan. 22	12:00- 5:55	5:55
Wednesday, Jan. 23	12:00- 4:56	4:56
Thursday, Jan. 24	12:00- 5:40	5:40
Friday, Jan. 25	12:00- 5:14	5:14
Monday, Jan. 28	10:00- 6:07	8:07
Tuesday, Jan. 29	10:00- 6:04	8:04
Wednesday, Jan. 30	11:00- 1:34	2:34
Thursday, Jan. 31	12:00- 5:40	5:40
16 sessions		[2] 78:22
Friday, Feb. 1	(1)	
Monday, Feb. 4	10:00- 5:10	7:10
Tuesday, Feb. 5	10:00- 5:11	7:11
Wednesday, Feb. 6	10:00- 5:02	7:02
Thursday, Feb. 7 [3]	10:00-11:27	1:27
Friday, Feb. 8	(1)	
Monday, Feb. 11	12:00- 3:30	3:30
Tuesday, Feb. 12	(1)	
Wednesday, Feb. 13	(1)	
Thursday, Feb. 14	12-00- 3:18	3:18
Friday, Feb. 15	(1)	
Monday, Feb. 18	12:00- 1:56	1:56
Tuesday, Feb. 19	12:00- 5:45	5:45
Wednesday, Feb. 20	12:00- 5:54	5:54
Thursday, Feb. 21	12:00- 5:26	5:26
Friday, Feb. 22	12:00- 1:10	1:00
Monday, Feb. 25	12:00- 4:29	4:29
12 sessions		[2] 55:58

[1] Not in session.
[2] Average length of session less than 5 hours.
[3] Date of cloture vote.

Analysis of record Feb. 26 through Apr. 5

Date	Senate	Time in session	Legislative action
Tuesday, Feb. 26			Not in session.
Wednesday, Feb. 27			Do.
Thursday, Feb. 28	12:00-3:36	3:36	
Friday, Mar. 1	12:00-5:17	5:17	
Monday, Mar. 4	12:00-4:16	4:16	Passed S. 13 (Arkansas land transfer), S. 345 (Hawaii housing)
Tuesday, Mar. 5			Not in session.
Wednesday, Mar. 6			Do.
Thursday, Mar. 7	12:00-7:08	7:08	
Friday, Mar. 8	12:00-3:00	3:00	Passed S. 816 (establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.
Monday, Mar. 11	12:00-2:27	2:27	Passed S. 20 (outdoor recreation, plus 34 money resolutions).
Tuesday, Mar. 12			Not in session.
Wednesday, Mar. 13			Do.
Thursday, Mar. 14	12:00-7:54	7:54	
Friday, Mar. 15	11:00-3:46	4:46	Passed H.R. 2438 (draft extension).
8 sessions		39:14	
Monday, Mar. 18			Not in session.
Tuesday, Mar. 19	12:00-3:50	3:50	Passed S. 1089 (cadmium), H.R. 212 (veterans), H.R. 2085 (taxation), H.R. 1597 (tax).
Wednesday, Mar. 20			Not in session.
Thursday, Mar. 21	12:00-5:05	5:55	
Friday, Mar. 22			Do.
Monday, Mar. 25	12:50-3:02	3:02	
Tuesday, Mar. 26			Do.
Wednesday, Mar. 27			Do.
Thursday, Mar. 28	12:00-5:30	5:30	190 hours, 21 minutes.
Friday, Mar. 29			Not in session.
Monday, Apr. 1	12:00-6:02	6:02	Passed S. 1035 (dual rate contracts).
Tuesday, Apr. 2	11:00-6:08	7:08	Passed H.R. 4374 (Winston Churchill).
Wednesday, Apr. 3	10:00-6:15	8:15	
Thursday, Apr. 4	11:00-4:34	5:34	Passed S. 6 (mass transit).
Friday. Apr. 5			Not in session.
44 sessions		222:50	12 bills and 35 resolutions.

Mr. CLARK. It has been said that the only reason why we do not act any more quickly than we do is because the committees are busily at work on the President's program and on important legislation which Members desire to bring before this body on the floor which is not in the President's program.

I point out, however, that 47 committees or subcommittees of the Senate have held 233 meetings. There have been 63 possible weekday meeting days. On nine of them no meeting of any sort was called. This is an average of less than 4 meetings a day for those 47 committees or subcommittees.

I note in passing that the Finance Committee has met only six times, and not at all on that bill to which, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many other Senators, they should be devoting their attention, which is the President's tax revision and tax reform bill.

Let it be noted that there is nothing in the Constitution that would keep the Finance Committee from doing exactly what the Appropriations Committee has been doing, namely, holding preliminary sessions. Just as the Appropriations Committee does, the Finance Committee could hold preliminary sessions on tax revision and tax reform, in order that when legislation comes over from the House the Senate will be able to act promptly on the legislation. I commend the Appropriations Committees for this action. I deplore the failure of the Finance Committee to follow the same course of action.

Let no one think that the Constitution prevents a committee that deals with revenue raising from holding preliminary sessions in order to hear administration witnesses and other experts before the House sends the bill over to the Senate. There is no constitutional prohibition against hearings. Indeed a year ago hearings took place in the Finance Committee on the so-called Du Pont bill long before the House had acted on the proposed legislation.

In my judgment, this is probably one of the best ways in which the time of the 100 Members of this body could be saved. If the Finance Committee would only move forward with their hearings, it could report the bill out of the committee, and the Senate could act on it within 30 days of the time it gets the tax bill from the House.

In my opinion, if we are still in session by Labor Day, if we stay here long after Labor Day, the primary reason will be that the Finance Committee did not choose to meet and to conduct preliminary hearings on the administration's tax bill.

The Senate has held 44 different sessions, totaling 222 hours, in this session of the Congress, an average of 5 hours per session.

The Senate was not in session on 19, or 30 percent, of the 63 weekdays on which it could have met.

To be sure, as was pointed out, there has been very little business for floor action, but there has been ample need for committee action. I suggest committee action has been inadequate.

Let us take a look at the action which has been taken on the President's program. Thirty-four administration legislative requests have come to the Senate and have been referred to Senate committees for action. As of the 21st of March, which is the last date for which the Democratic policy committee has a memorandum available for Democratic Senators, no action whatever had been taken on 23 of those legislative recommendations of the President. That is over two-thirds of all his requests. This includes no action in committee as well as no action on the floor.

I conclude that Congress is off to an unjustifiably slow start. The committees should have been organized during the first few days of the session, instead of on February 25. There was no legitimate excuse for not doing this. Let no one say that it was the fight over the rules change which made it impossible, because those who were in favor of the rule change were willing for the committees to meet. It was those who were against the rules changes who refused to permit committees to meet, and thus unjustifiably delayed the work of the Senate.

From January 9 to February 7, when the rules debate terminated, there were only 7 days when the Senate met before noon. There was nothing to prevent morning committee meetings on these days.

My next point is that fewer, longer daily sessions with more days set aside fully for committee work in the first months of the opening session of the Congress could save at least 1 month of time and move up adjournment by that much.

There is not one Senator who does not want to get out of the session by the middle of summer. There is no reason why the Senate could not get out of the session by the middle of the summer, having done all the work we wanted to do, except for the fact that we are so tied up in our redtape, so tied up in horse-and-buggy practices, so tied up by procedures which prevent the Senate from using modern methods of business, that, like Ferdinand the Bull, we sit under the tree and smell the flowers while the rest of the world goes by.

There is another aspect of the problem which I want to discuss, and that is the inordinate amount of time the committees take out of the busy lives of executives of our Government. I wrote to each of the Cabinet officers in the President's Cabinet some weeks ago, asking him to compile for me the amount of time which the chief Cabinet officers had been forced to expend in testifying before congressional committees during sessions of the 87th Congress in 1961 and 1962.

I do not say that it is not frequently necessary for members of the executive branch to come before the committees of Congress and testify. It is. But I do say if we had joint sessions of relevant Senatorial and House committees, the enlightenment which the witness would furnish to committee members would be the same as it would be otherwise, and the amount of time they would have to spend testifying would be cut in half—perhaps not quite in half, because there would be more committee members to ask questions but decreased substantially. And I suggest there is not much excuse for the time spent, as it now frequently is, in coming before two or three or more committees exercising jurisdiction over the same subject matter, when their testimony and time in contribution to the national interest could be very much curtailed.

Cabinet officers from the Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Justice, Commerce, Interior, Labor, State, Post Office, and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments during the 87th Congress appeared 592 times before congressional committees. This consumed a total of 1,394½ hours of their time.

I ask unanimous consent that the schedule which I have caused to be prepared, showing the amount of time spent by these Cabinet officers in appearing before congressional committees, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

1961 and 1962

Department	Appropriation bills				Other bills				Briefings				Special			Total	
	House		Senate		House		Senate		House		Senate		Times	Hours	Committee	Times	Hours
	Times	Hours	Times	Hours	Times	Hours	Times	Hours	Times	Hours	Times	Hours					
Treasury: Secretary	6	8½	4	6½	37	91	15	45	3	7	4	9½	4	10	Joint Economic Committee.	74	179½
													1	2	Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.		
Defense: Secretary	13	50¼	7	22	16	51	15	78½								51	201¾
Agriculture: Secretary	(?)9	18	(?)2	4	(?)32	65	(?)19	38	(?)8	15						70	140
Justice: Secretary	2	2	1	½	9	12¾										12	24
Commerce: Secretary	2	4	3	7	37	73	10	17					1	2		53	103
Interior: Secretary	3	6	3	6	17	25½	23	36	[1] 2			[1] 4½				49	78
Labor: Secretary	4	14	5	14	25	50	17	34					51	110	Ways and Means	102	222
State: Secretary	7	15	4	8	10	20	9	18	10	20	84	101	1	2	Joint Atomic Energy	125	184
Post Office: Postmaster General.	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)		31	113
Health, Education, and Welfare: Secretary.					13	39	8	21								21	60
Total																588	1,305¼

[1] House and Senate.

[2] No specific figures.

Mr. CLARK. So, Mr. President, I hope in due course the Senate will pay heed to the suggestions of Roscoe Drummond and James Reston, to which I have referred many times before, and to the many other commentators and practically every political scientist in the United States of America who has considered this subject, and many of our own Members, and get on with the work of congressional reorganization, for that indeed is the crucial task of this Congress; and I hope it will be done before it is too late.

DISARMAMENT

Mr. CLARK. Now I turn briefly to another subject, which has to do with the subject of disarmament.

I note that on April 3 of this year the able junior Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] placed in the Congressional Record a lecture which had been delivered by Mr. David E. Lilienthal entitled "The Mythology of Nuclear Disarmament." The text of the lecture appears in the Congressional Record at pages 5583–5584.

I have the highest admiration for Mr. Lilienthal. In fact, I believe that he is one of the great living Americans. The work he has done in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority has earned for him a deserved permanent place in American history. The magnificent impromptu comments he made on what the United States meant to him, before a congressional committee, which was badgering him, some few years ago, has justly gone down in the annals of permanent eloquent prose as an outstanding appreciation of our country.

Yet, in my judgment, Mr. Lilienthal is just plain wrong in the position he takes toward disarmament and world peace.

His main theme is that it is both futile and dangerous to concentrate on disarmament while the real causes of war tensions remain.

Mr. President, as long as man is as imperfect as he is today, as long as he reacts like a human being, just so long are there going to be world tensions. As long as we have national States, there will always be tensions, and there will always be problems. If we want to get rid of the delicate balance of terror in which we live, until all international tensions have relaxed we are going to wait until the end of the world. That end could come sooner than we think, if we do not do something about armaments.

So I say in that regard, with deep regret, Mr. Lilienthal is just plain wrong in this basic assumption.

He also states that nuclear war is not inevitable; that the way to peace lies through the "slow sure growth of community among men."

Of course that is true. Nuclear war is not inevitable, but it is pretty close to it today, unless we start taking some positive steps to eliminate the delicate balance of terror and to reduce the heavy burden of armaments which lies heavy on the shoulders not only of the American people but also on the shoulders of the Russian people, and in addition, on the shoulders of many other taxpayers in countries across the face of the world.

Mr. Lilienthal makes four criticisms of the pending disarmament negotiations.

First, he says that these negotiations tend to increase ill will and mutual suspicion and produce a dangerous cycle of high hopes and disenchantment. Geneva, he says, is a minus for peace.

Mr. President, this I categorically deny. I was present as a congressional observer for 2 weeks at the Geneva Disarmament Conference last fall. I observed the Russian delegates and the American delegates, and the delegates of nations alined with the West and those who are alined with the Communist world.

I can state categorically that nowhere did I see any ill will created by these interchanges on the part of the delegates. The delegates all behaved as civilized mature human beings with mutual respect for each other.

To be sure, there was disagreement between what the Russians felt should be done and what the Americans felt should be done; but I do not believe that these interchanges create ill will. I believe they have contributed to the eventual hammering out agreements, in connection with which both parties negotiate from respected strength.

Then Mr. Lilienthal says that the absence of China and France from the bargaining vitiates efforts along this line.

This is not true. If we can come to agreement with the Soviet Union, I am confident it will be possible to bring both France and China into line. While I believe it is difficult to negotiate without France and China, this is a rather insignificant difficulty in the face of what can be done if the two greatest powers in the world can get together.

The third point Mr. Lilienthal makes is that disarmament negotiations distract and dilute our enemies from the multiple, diverse ways in which we can build a community of interest which is the only real hope for world peace.

This, again, I categorically deny. There are all kinds of ways to build a community of interest. Disarmament negotiations are probably the most effective. There is no reason why these negotiations should not continue to a successful conclusion, at the same time that every other effort goes forward in the building of a community of interest, which I join Mr. Lilienthal in believing is the most important single way of bringing about real peace.

Mr. Lilienthal's fourth and last point is that disarmament negotiations are either unrealistic, because military force is growing as they go on, or cynical, because they are being used for propaganda and a cause of disillusionment.

Again I categorically deny this. The differences between the Soviet Union and ourselves both with respect to the test ban and with respect to general and complete disarmament, which is the fixed national policy of President Kennedy, as well as of the Soviet Union, have been shrinking constantly over the last few years. The differences between us is now relatively slight. I am optimistic and I am hopeful that the negotiations will continue to a satisfactory result within the foreseeable future.

In summary, Mr. Lilienthal believes that war cannot be abolished by trying to abolish the weapons of war, so long as the basic causes of war remain; and that by concentrating on the attempts to abolish the weapons, we divert our efforts from the task of eliminating the basic causes.

This, I suggest, is superficial and only half the coin. We have to do both.

I deeply regret that so able, and, indeed, so great an American should thus place himself in support of those in this country who have a cynical point of view with respect to the issue which confronts the world and how to eliminate the delicate balance of terror.

A far sounder approach to this problem has been made by one who is perhaps as equally great an American, the Honorable James J. Wadsworth, the former chief of our disarmament delegation at Geneva, and the former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, and presently president of the Peace Research Institute in Washington, D.C. He is a man who is respected by practically every American. In a brilliant article entitled "Let's Be Adult," published in the December 29, 1962, issue of the Saturday Review, Mr. Wadsworth says that he was brought up, as were many of us, and as indeed we all were, as a great supporter of military preparedness. But he states, further:

> To me, peace is just the only thing that makes sense. I believe in peace precisely because I am a devoted American who would volunteer to fight for his country if she were at war.

However, he states that he hopes that honorable alternatives can be found to keep war from our shores and from the whole world.

Mr. President, I share these hopes.

Mr. Wadsworth continues:

> The tensions of the cold war have created a strongly belligerent posture among many Americans.

Surely no one who has listened to speeches made on this floor by some of our colleagues can come to any other conclusion. Some of this is understandable, Mr. Wadsworth says, but some of it is largely a matter of public confusion over the news.

In this I concur.

Mr. Wadsworth continues by saying that it is a sad commentary on our capacity for adult thought that in the last analysis so many of us still appear to prefer the rumble of the mindless physical conflict for the settlement of argument. We must decide whether we are strong enough to ignore the occasional accusation of "chicken," as one small boy defies another.

> If we have confidence that our way of doing things is better than that of our competitors, then we don't have to prove it by force. What we desperately need to do, then, is to develop the force of example which proclaims our inward force of character.

Mr. Wadsworth goes on to point out:

> Our military-minded friends will retort that force of character cannot protect the country against a "mad dog" neighbor country, if the latter decides to attack. Probably true. But the point is that some people are more anxious to go out and shoot what they think is a mad dog than to make sure that it is really mad.

Again, I agree. Then Mr. Wadsworth says:

> It might therefore prove helpful to everyone if we reminded ourselves—

And I again agree—

> if we reminded ourselves, regularly and out loud, that the primary cause is the quest of peace and that the secondary part is the surmounting of the difficulties blocking that quest. Singlemindedness is a trait which can range from admirable devotion to stupid stubbornness, but unless we are singleminded about peace we might just as well forget it.

Mr. Wadsworth concludes—and I shall not detain the Senate with a longer summary of what he has to say:

> Let me be quite clear: no one disapproves more than I do—

And I agree—

> of being pushed around. I have the same wholly human reactions to indignity and injustice as most men. I do not advocate "turning the other cheek" as the preferred path to peace.

I interpolate: I am wholly opposed to unilateral disarmament.

> Rather, I insist that we can block or parry the first blow, thus making the "turning" unnecessary. But, though I understand human reaction, I cannot condone either the belligerence of the Communist line or the counterbelligerance which that line creates in the United States of America. Both reactions are simply not adult, in the light of the holocaust to which they can lead.
>
> So we must give more thought and attention—

And I concur—

> to what I call the "Three A's": the Attitude which can help create the Atmosphere in which we can take the Action which will lead us and our adversaries away from the brink of disaster together. Neither of us really wants to jump off: this would mean destruction for us both. Why not, then, put as much thought and energy into creating and developing such a course of action as we do in creating and developing ever newer and more devastating weapons? Which course is more likely to be our salvation in the long run? Which makes more sense? Let's try being adult for a change.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wadsworth's article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S BE ADULT

(By James J. Wadsworth)

In common with most boys of my generation, I was brought up a devoted military-preparedness advocate. I majored in military science (ROTC) at college, then enlisted in the National Guard, took my commission in the cavalry, and served with the guard for 11 years. When war threatened in 1941 I tried to get my commission out of mothballs, but, failing my physical, took a job in an aircraft company where I fought the war, meanwhile acting as inspector general of a New York State guard regiment headquartered in Buffalo.

All in all, I was and still am about as poor a candidate for what is called pacifism as can be imagined. By that I mean that peace, to me, is not something one espouses for religious, moral, or ethical reasons, or even political reasons. To me, peace is just the only thing that makes sense. I believe in peace precisely because I am a devoted American who would volunteer to fight for his country if she were at war; but I am also one who fervently hopes that honorable alternatives can be found to keep war from our shores and from the whole world.

It strikes me that as a first step toward finding such alternatives we Americans should take a more objective view of our "peace versus war" posture. Let's explore that idea for the moment, in terms of a common denominator. We are all familiar with the way children fight with each other: Somehow the whole outlook of the child seems to revolve around the question of who started the fight and who, therefore, is solely to blame. Such wrangling is part of what I call the playground procedure. Don't you think that the adults in high office should by now have improved a bit on the routine?

Of course, we know they haven't. Take the ever-current argument about nuclear tests. It offers plenty of material for discussion, but since September 1961, the free world has confined itself, in the main, to reiterating the accusation that the Russians "broke the moratorium" that had "been in effect nearly 3 years." People seem to forget, however, that there had never been an agreed moratorium, and that on December 29, 1959, President Eisenhower proclaimed that as far as the United States was concerned, there was no moratorium and that we felt ourselves free to test at any time. People also forget that, since then, the United States has turned down no less than three suggestions on the part of the Soviets and the nonalined states that a moratorium be entered into. Now, I have no quarrel with that policy at this time—an unpoliced moratorium can be a dangerous thing. I merely feel that when we insist on saying the Soviets broke a moratorium we refused to recognize as existing, we are behaving in an unadult way.

Perhaps, too, we should have listened with more care to the statements of Soviet representatives during the late summer and fall of 1958, and ever since. Many times, both at Geneva and elsewhere, we were told plainly that the Soviet Union considered it her right to conduct as many tests as had the United States and the United Kingdom put together. The main reason for Soviet resumption a year ago was indeed for the purpose of catching up, both in technology and in number of shots. I don't condone it: I think it was a bad business, but at least we were warned, even if the warning itself was not very adult.

It is interesting to note that the Soviet series conducted in 1962 seems to have occasioned only mild disturbance within the administration, and interesting too that the decision to resume U.S. tests in March of 1962 was made in the full expectation that another Russian series would follow. There was considerable speculation that after both series have been completed the Soviets would be more amenable to a test ban treaty. But mark this well: there are few persons in official Washington today who are ready to say that the latest Soviet series will not trigger of still another U.S. series. And, if the United States does fire another series, what then? If the Soviets follow the Playground Procedure, we know the answer.

The tensions of the cold war have created a strongly belligerent posture among many Americans. Some of this is understandable, some of it unjustified by the facts, and some largely a matter of public confusion over the news. I find it all over the country, however, coming from all sorts of people. They say they are tired of being pushed around and lied about and lied to; that it is time we stood up on our hind legs and did some pushing ourselves. If you ask them whether they want an all-out nuclear war, they say "No," but they don't fear it as much as they used to because they have become accustomed to the talk about it—perhaps "numbed" would be a better word. But they call for a military invasion of Cuba in almost the same breath as they reject war.

Perhaps the most dangerous factor in this attitude is that people who have it don't see any inconsistency in it. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why one of the great Communist inconsistencies of all time seems to have made little impression on the U.S. public, or the press, or even the Government. This inconsistency lies in the fact that the Soviet Union incessantly calls for general and complete disarmament, and just as incessantly proclaims its support both now and in the future for "wars of liberation." How one can advocate war and disarmament in the same breath I have never been able to discover, but our most belligerent Americans fall into the same trap.

Look at the situation in Berlin from the standpoint of the Playground Procedure. The facts are grim: they include not only the infamous wall, but the existence of massive Soviet and East German military strength right across the street. Even so, would Khrushchev readily go to war over Berlin—I mean, all-out war, which could not be avoided in such a tinder box? Yet until Cuba, Khrushchev kept pacing that chip on his shoulder with bombastic and provocatory statements, and Secretary McNamara kept threatening to knock it off by proclaiming that we have loaded nuclear weapons in our airplanes, ready at the end of the runways to take off if the President gives the word.

Haven't we seen this before? Haven't we heard it over and over again in the backyards, playgrounds, and parks of our communities? The buildup for the original charge, usually to such a point where the accused has to embrace a position of aggression never contemplated; the resentment and counterbelligerence of the accused at being unfairly pushed around; the inexorable increase of pressure, tension, and bellicosity to avoid the stigma of being "chicken," with sensation seekers yapping "let's you and him fight"—this is the cold war in our world today. It is a sad commentary on our capacity for adult thought that in the last analysis so many of us still appear to prefer the rumble—the mindless physical conflict—for the settlement of arguments.

Consider for a moment the concept underlying the "rumble" mentality—that if you are big and strong enough, no one will attack you. As it happens the writer of this article, who is 6 feet 4 inches tall and weighs 240 pounds, can controvert this notion. For, the fact is that there will always be those who are out to prove something (heaven knows what) by attacking the big guy. The fact that he is big is no more a deterrent against attack than the penalty of the law, even of capital punishment, is enough of a deterrent against crime. Yet it is worth remembering that the big fellow himself can often control the situation by the exercise of adult thinking.

To scorn a trial by battle is very difficult. Our ingrown ideals of courage forbid us to refuse such a trial. Yet if to be strong automatically makes us a target for some (as indeed it does), then we must decide whether we are strong enough to ignore the occasional accusation of "chicken." If we have confidence that our way of doing things is better than that of our competitors, then we don't have to prove it by force. What we desperately need to do, then, is to develop a force of example which proclaims our inward force of character.

Our military-minded friends will retort that force of character cannot protect a country against a "mad dog" neighbor country, if the latter decides to attack. Probably true. But the point is that some people are more anxious to go out and shoot what they think is a mad dog than to make sure that it is really mad. They don't want to inquire whether some other action might not be more effective. There are even those who instead of killing the dog prefer to throw stones at it, or even to tie tin cans to its tail, which is what international diplomacy calls provocative acts. Either way, such people are not even trying to live up to their self-proclaimed label of "peace-loving."

Both the great power blocs say: "We want to survive in peace." Significantly, in the United States, that simple phrase is almost inevitably followed by the word "but": "But we cannot allow communism to take over the world"; "but the Communists understand only the language of strength"; "but the Berlin wall represents a challenge we can't afford to sweep under the rug." Whether these statements are right, wrong, or half-true, the important word in them is the "but," for it means that the simple phrase that precedes it (e.g., "We want peace") is secondary in our minds. It means that we really do not want peace under existing conditions, and that preliminary fighting may still be necessary. We have used the same "but" for the last 15 years to becloud our position in the disarmament debates and other negotiations involving the world's nations; and though it is only a tiny word, it has seemed to our antagonists and even some of our friends to qualify our acceptance of disarmament as a principle.

It might therefore prove helpful to everyone if we reminded ourselves, regularly and out loud, that the primary cause is the quest of peace and that the secondary part is the surmounting of the difficulties blocking that quest. Singlemindedness is a trait which can range from admirable devotion to stupid stubbornness, but unless we are singleminded about peace we might just as well forget it.

Today our leadership is still indulging in the same qualifying method of enunciating policy. The other day I heard a TV news commentator describe the U.S. posture in these terms: "The administration is determined to add to our military strength to seek disarmament." What kind of double talk is that, and what does it really mean? Our President and our top military men tell us there is no security in piling new armaments on top of old ones, but we seem determined to do it, come what may. Why do some Americans in high office display such an appalling disregard of the world? It is customary, of course, to explain away the arms escalation by saying it is merely a reflex response to what others are doing. If we were the definite underdog in this weapons business, if we needed desperately to catch up with a much more powerful adversary, I could perhaps understand this argument. But this is not the case. We do not occupy a position of weakness at all.

We have enough weapons to destroy all our potential enemies many times over.

Why then the emphasis on increasing our military potential? Is it to frighten the Soviet Union into disarmament? That simply does not make sense. If there is one truth that has been proved out in the past, it is that a strong and proud Nation will go to almost any lengths to keep from being surpassed militarily—to catch up if they are behind, and to keep ahead if they are ahead. Frighten the Soviet Union into disarmament? You might just as well try to frighten the United States into Communism.

My quarrel with my government, as well as with the governments of friend and foe alike, is, therefore, that they have not convinced even themselves that a world without war is worth a supreme effort. No Nation has ever tried an all-out, concerted, organized offensive against war as the method of settling international disputes. Many have joined together in treaties, agreements, leagues, and associations such as the United Nations, but each of them has always felt it necessary to reserve the right, out loud, to take unilateral military action should they deem it necessary.

Up until the era of the nuclear weapon this preoccupation with force-as-policy was neither surprising nor particularly vulnerable to criticism. Most wars arose from the desire for power or aggrandizement or the annexation of valuable territory. It seemed worth the time and expense of most nations either to plan for or to guard against aggression for such purposes. But it is no longer as simple as that, nor are the consequences of a shooting war in the same league today with those of times past. Therefore, if we are interested in survival, and most human beings are, we are forced in our own self-interest to find honorable alternatives to shooting.

It is all very well to swagger and strut and warn of our power and defy the antagonist to knock off the chip. Play-acting of this sort may still carry considerable weight in the playground, but not in 20th-century diplomacy, because the nuclear weapon has in fact become the great equalizer between the warring camps. A new way of impressing the adversary must therefore be found which will have the effect of removing the wholly uncalled-for pressures that characterize the cold war impasse.

No one has all the answers, but they exist somewhere, and they will be found. On the level of brute, man-to-man contention, we humans have often come to the realization that fighting is not as important as learning to get along; we have come to understand that the energy, substance, and blood wasted in fighting can be put to far better use in peaceful, cooperative pursuits. In such situations, neither man need be afraid of the other's strength. Each man may well figure he has a good chance of winning any set-to, regardless of his antagonist's brawn. Yet both men can find in judging each other's potential that there is room for respect, even without total agreement, and can find that this respect leads gradually to cooperation and perhaps even to friendship. Is such an evolving friendship impossible between nations? It has, after all, not proved impossible between neighbors, between communities, between cities and States.

But such respect and cooperation do need a new atmosphere, a new environment in which to thrive. And the more we yip and yap about how we should not only flex but use our muscles, the further we remove ourselves and our friends from that environment. Let me be quite clear: no one disapproves more than I do of being pushed around. I have the same wholly human reactions to indignity and injustice as most men. I do not advocate "turning the other cheek" as the preferred path to peace; rather, I insist that we can block or parry the first blow, thus making the turning unnecessary. But, though I understand human reaction, I cannot condone either the belligerence of the Communist line or the counterbelligerence which that line creates. Both reactions, are simply not adult, in the light of the holocaust to which they can lead.

So we must give more thought and attention to what I call the "Three A's": the attitude which can help create the atmosphere in which we can take the action which will lead us and our adversaries away from the brink together. Neither of us really wants to jump off: this would mean destruction for us both. Why not, then, put as much thought and energy into creating and developing such a course of action as we do in creating and developing ever newer and more devastating weapons? Which course is more likely to be our salvation in the long run? Which makes more sense? Let's try being adult.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the New York Times this morning published a splendid letter, also written by Mr. James J. Wadsworth, on the subject of the test ban, in which he denies that the Hosmer committee of the House, a partisan Republican committee, speaks for all House Republicans. He points out that the Republican leadership in the other body "has left the impression that the GOP as a whole opposes the administration's current test ban policy."

Mr. Wadsworth states categorically that this is not true. I am glad to note this comment by a very able, effective member of the Republican Party. He discusses rather critically the report of the Hosmer committee, pointing out that they made their first report when they had heard only one side of the story, and that after the second side, the administration side, was in, they gave it very little publicity. Mr. Wadsworth concludes his letter by saying:

> If this administration is guilty of anything—

And he does not say that it is—

> It is the failure to educate the public to the comparative risks of continued testing versus a treaty.

I commend Mr. Wadsworth for his very able statement of support for the test ban position of the President of the United States and his advisers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wadsworth's letter may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Test-Ban Report Attacked—Wadsworth Denies Panel Speaks for All House Republicans

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Critics of the protracted efforts to achieve a nuclear test-ban treaty with the Russians have been most outspoken since the chances of agreement seemed to improve in the wake of the Cuban crisis. These critics are to be found in both parties, as are the consistent advocates of a workable treaty. Unfortunately, however, the Republican leadership in the House has left the impression that the GOP as a whole opposes the administration's current test-ban policy.

This impression has been left by Representative CRAIG HOSMER's Republican House panel on nuclear testing, whose reports are signed by the entire GOP leadership. The panel's first report, presumably based on the views of experts whose antitest-ban views were already well known, was released to the press before scientists with a different approach could be heard.

Not surprisingly, the first report concluded that "the present basis for negotiations on detection machinery fails to offer realistic probability of detecting violations." Yet it was not until almost a month later that Government witnesses spelled out the areas of recent progress in underground test detection before the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Anyone seriously interested in the facts could hardly be in a position to judge the detection machinery without hearing from the men most closely associated with making it work.

UNDERGROUND EXPLOSIONS

Now the hearings are over and Mr. HOSMER's panel has issued another report. This time the panel has seized upon one bit of testimony, carefully ignored other statements, and has come to the conclusion that the American-British detection system cannot detect small underground nuclear tests over an area of 2.5 million square miles in the U.S.S.R.

The Hosmer panel's calculations are based on the assumption that secret Soviet tests would be conducted in dry alluvium, a soft earth. But the panel ignored the testimony of Dr. Franklin Long of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who indicated that there are only two small areas of alluvium in the U.S.S.R. One is on the Iranian and Afghan borders, the other about 400 miles from Iran. Both are within detection range of stations outside of the U.S.S.R.

As a Republican and as the former chief negotiator for the Eisenhower administration, which initiated the nuclear test-ban talks, I find the operation of the Hosmer panel one of the most unfortunate domestic developments since I served in Geneva. It is biased in its presentation of the argument and misleading in its pretense of speaking for all House Republicans. I feel sure that the panel does not reflect the views of all Republicans in the House and certainly in the Senate, which must ultimately ratify any treaty which is signed.

BASIS FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Some congressional and press attacks on continued efforts to reach agreement imply that the top officials of the administration and their negotiators are "giving away" our national security, piece by piece. Levelheaded Americans know that successful negotiations must be based on a structure of mutual advantages for both sides. A workable nuclear test ban—and further steps toward mutual disarmament—would improve the security of both major powers as well as all other nations.

If this administration is guilty of anything, it is the failure to educate the public to the comparative risks of continued testing versus a treaty. President Kennedy made a cogent point during his press conference of March 21 when he spoke of the probability that many more nations would have the nuclear weapon by the mid-seventies. I hope he will continue to voice this warning until it is well understood. When the public is made aware of the choice we face, it can intelligently weigh the risks of new paths of international security.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I conclude as follows: Let us stop playing games with disarmament, as though we were little boys. Let us put away our tin soldiers. Let us disavow the "war whoopers," as Walter Lippmann calls them. Let us forget all this nonsense about "eyeball to eyeball" and "Who is going to blink first?" In short, let us grow up. This is serious business. We are not on a juvenile Western television circuit, where the goodies are our boys shooting up the baddies, and the baddies, named Vladimir, are all trying to shoot us up.

We are living in a stark, harsh world of the mid-sixties. We cannot retreat into euphoria. Nor can we recapture the mood of the First Crusade. Let us not get into a holy war on 700 years of controversy between Mohammedan and Christian led to no intelligent conclusion. Let us not get into a long, bitter shooting war with those with whom we disagree, with the same unfortunate result as a thousand years ago.

Let me suggest that we are not playing a high school football game with the Russians. Let us support the hardboiled realists of our administration, and indeed of President Eisenhower's before them, who say there is no alternative to peace, who say that war is unthinkable. Let us get on with the long, hard, tough negotiation from strength, which, in the long run, is the only road to a lasting peace, which, in my opinion, will inevitably lead to the President's objective; namely, general and complete disarmament under enforcible world law.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate and commend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania upon the speech he has just made. I am conscious of the fact that David Lilienthal was a great public service commissioner in Wisconsin before he became the head of TVA.

I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that Mr. Lilienthal is a man of wisdom, restraint, and responsibility. Nevertheless, I think the answer which the Senator from Pennsylvania has given to the Lilienthal thesis, which is, that we should not engage in disarmament discussions and should not sign a disarmament treaty because such a treaty is superficial and does not go to the basic causes of war, is completely correct. I support the Senator from Pennsylvania wholeheartedly. We must work on both ends of the problem. We must work on the basic causes of war—poverty, illiteracy, mistrust—as well as work night and day to do what we can to limit the forces of destruction, which of themselves certainly can cause war.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his support of my position in this regard, and I welcome it. I assure him that he and I do not stand entirely alone.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, earlier today I placed in the RECORD a column by Max Freedman, in which he protested that the excellent speeches made by the majority whip in favor of a treaty for the control of nuclear weapons testing have not been given the kind of national attention and publicity which they should have received. The Senator from Pennsylvania also has been making speeches in the Senate on this subject, and his speeches have not received the attention which they deserve.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from Wisconsin recall that a number of us came to the Chamber when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was making his speech on the floor several weeks ago? I think six or seven of us engaged in a colloquy with him at that time. I receive plenty of publicity; I am not looking for more; but I think it is a great shame that the Senator from Minnesota should have received, so far as I know, only one little stick of type in the Washington Post; I saw no other comment on his speech in any other newspapers. To my way of thinking, his speech was one of the great speeches delivered at this session of Congress.

Mr. HART. I, too, should like to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for again pricking the conscience of the Senate concerning the overshadowing question which confronts America today and will confront it in the years ahead.

It is remarkable that we can discuss at great length a great variety of things, ranging from A to Z, and yet we seem consciously to ignore the fact that all that litany from A to Z will evaporate if we do not face up to this problem.

Again I salute the Senator from Pennsylvania for insisting that we obtain a sense of priority.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his comments. May the three of us—the only Senators on the floor—and also the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], express the hope that this point of view will be adequately reported in the press and on the television and the radio.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION RECORD ON LANDIS' RECOMMENDATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in December 1960, shortly after President Kennedy was elected, and before he took office, Dean Landis, of the Harvard Law School, was appointed to make a study of the quasi-judicial agencies of the Federal Government. He made a very intelligent, thoughtful, and critical appraisal of them. He also made a series of recommendations as to how they might improve their operations.

I may point out that, in the judgment of many persons, these quasi-judicial agencies have a more profound influence on the American people and on their way of life than does almost any other area of Government operation. These quasi-judicial agencies include the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and many others. They affect the content of much of what we see on the television and much of what we hear on the radio; and they also have a definite effect on the rates we pay for gas and fuel oil, on the cost of transport, and on the health of all these industries.

On January 11, I wrote to each of the agencies, and asked what progress they had made on the Landis recommendations. Previously, I have placed in the RECORD the replies which came from other agencies. Today, I should like to call attention, very briefly, to a reply I received from Mr. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. He acknowledged the criticisms made by Mr. Landis and conceded their validity when he said:

> The present members of the Federal Power Commission have been fully aware of the serious questions raised by Mr. Landis' December 1960 Report on Regulatory Agencies, particularly those associated with the Commission's past inaction and past failure to protect the consumer interest.
>
> We have taken numerous steps to achieve the goals set forth in Mr. Landis' report even though our experience has indicated that all of his detailed suggestions were not in the public interest.

Mr. Landis called the Federal Power Commission a classic example of the breakdown of the administrative process. He pointed out that laws passed by Congress and decisions made by the Supreme Court have been flouted and ignored by the FPC.

The letter from Mr. Swidler is a significant justification of the record of his agency in meeting the Landis criticisms. I do not fully share Mr. Swidler's opinion; and at a later time I intend to evaluate and appraise further the progress made by the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter of March 1, from Mr. Swidler, Chairman of the Commission; and also a release by the Federal Power Commission, dated January 30, reporting on recent activities of the Commission; and a further release, dated February 13, by the FPC; and several statistical tables which set forth the progress made by the Commission.

There being no objection, the letter, releases, and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I regret the delay in responding to your letter of January 11, but as was explained to your staff the press of official business made it impossible to prepare in a shorter period of time the detailed response which your inquiry deserves.

The present members of the Federal Power Commission have been fully aware of the serious questions raised by Mr. Landis' December 1960 Report on Regulatory Agencies, particularly those associated with the Commission's past inaction and past failure to protect the consumer interest.

We have taken numerous steps to achieve the goals set forth in Mr. Landis' report even though our experience has indicated that all of his detailed suggestions were not in the public interest. As you know, when the present members of the Commission took office we were faced with backlogs in the natural gas field and a withering away of responsibilities in the electric power field which had accumulated over a period of years. We have made major advances in the past year in clearing away the backlog of natural gas cases and bringing stability to gas prices, and in revitalizing our activities in carrying out our statutory responsibilities under the Federal Power Act. These advances have been accomplished through organization changes, new procedures, clear policies, and a greater sense of urgency by the Commission as well as its staff.

I am enclosing a recent press release describing our progress in the four major natural gas regulatory areas. This report contains complete statistics on our natural gas caseload.

As you know, many of the recommendations contained in Mr. Landis' report called for the President to submit to the Congress reorganization plans for the various regulatory agencies, including the Federal Power Commission. Since the initiation of these proposals rests with the President, I shall not comment on them.

Mr. Landis devoted a considerable portion of his report to the suggestion that the FPC should utilize section 7(f) of the Natural Gas Act to eliminate the processing of thousands of independent producer and pipeline certificate applications. Section 7(f) permits a natural gas company to enlarge or extend its facilities to supply increased market demands within its service area without further FPC authorization.

In considering the application of this provision to pipeline companies, the Commission last year dismissed a series of long-pending applications seeking such determinations, holding that the service area provision is not an exception that can be applied without reservations. We concluded that the determination can be applied to a company such as the Washington Gas Light Co., which is in probably a unique position, engaged solely in local distribution of gas even though its system crosses State lines in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. On the other hand, we denied a request by Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co., which is typical of the interstate pipeline systems, finding that it was seeking a service area determination which would allow it unlimited rights to construct facilities within a contiguous geographical area that includes a large portion of one State and small areas of two others. Such an exemption would be an abdication by the Commission of the full jurisdiction that Congress intended that the Federal Power Commission exercise over interstate transporters of gas. Copies of the Washington Gas Light and Arkansas Louisiana orders are enclosed.

We have achieved the purposes of the section 7(f) by proscribing regulations which permit pipelines through budget-type authorizations to construct additional facilities to existing customers is specified relatively small amounts without further approval of the Commission.

Mr. Landis specifically suggested that small natural gas producers should be exempted from regulation.

The suggestion that the Commission should exempt all producers below a certain size has been thoroughly explored and we have had to reject this course for reasons both practical and legal. First, the Natural Gas Act does not permit us to exercise such a discretion. The statute requires the Commission to regulate natural gas companies, and no leeway is provided which would permit us to treat certain classes of companies, such as small independent producers, any differently than other types of companies. Secondly, even if the statute did permit such exemptions, there are other problems, including the likelihood of triggering escalation clauses in major contracts, if the small producers are freed to operate outside of our price ceilings.

The Commission has taken many steps to reduce the burden of regulation for small producers and make independent producer regulation effective. The most important actions are the area rate proceedings which obviate the necessity for case-by-case determinations for the thousands of independent producers and enable us to fix just and reasonable rates for an entire producing area in one proceeding. We have also developed simplified forms for small producers to use in making filings with the FPC, which reduce the burden on the producer as well as simplifying the processing within the Commission.

Other recommendations made by Mr. Landis, including those relating to planning, budget management, and the development of new policies and procedures designed to improve administration and expedite the substantive work of the Commission have been considered and acted upon during the past 18 months with good results.

Applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity require notice of application and hearing and are acted upon at the earliest date possible consistent with statutory requirements and other matters pending. An abridged procedure is employed when no opposition is filed to a certificate application and the Commission staff recommends that the certificate be granted by the Commission as in the public interest. This procedure permits a large number of cases to be decided in a single order and facilitates prompt disposition of pipeline certificate applications. The Commission has intensified its efforts to use the abridged hearing procedure whenever feasible. Thus, 1980 pipeline and independent producer certificates representing 83.6 percent of all certificates granted during fiscal year 1962 were processed in this manner.

Present Commission experience concerning cases initiated since July 1, 1961, shows that the time required for disposing of all types of cases has been greatly reduced as compared with the record in the past. For example, 13 were decided in an average of 179 days after filing or suspension, compared to an average of 815 days for 67 cases decided by the prior Commission in fiscal years 1960 and 1961. Although the 13 cases are only a small sample, their processing time is indicative of the progress being made to shorten the proceedings.

On July 1, 1961 there were 116 pipeline rate cases pending. These involved accumulated revenues collected by the companies, subject to possible refund to the consumer, totaling over a billion dollars. By January 1, 1963, the backlog had been reduced to 48 cases with possible refunds amounting to $471 million. During this 18-month period, 85 cases were disposed of and refunds totaling $350 million were ordered by the Commission. Thirty-nine of the 85 cases were disposed of in the last 6 months and refunds ordered in this period totaled more than $252 million. Rate reductions ordered in these same cases totaled $62 million annually. Eighty-four of the 85 cases were inherited from the former Commission and the great majority were decided through the settlement process.

The disposition of our backlog of independent producer rate cases cannot be expected until we can conclude the first two area rate cases now underway. The hearing in the lead case is now well along. These proceedings have been devised to dispose of hundreds of cases in a single decision. Over 900 of the 2,940 cases pending December 31, 1962, have been consolidated into the two area proceedings. The Commission staff is presently developing plans for area rate proceedings to fix just and reasonable rates for the remaining major gas producing areas in the country.

We have identified the workload and established controls to insure that all types of cases move in an orderly and timely manner from one processing stage to the next. We have established time standards throughout the formal hearing process and are making every effort to meet or excel the standards.

To enable us to process our cases more expeditiously, we have also:

(a) Required natural gas companies to submit their case-in-chief and all supporting data verified by an independent certified public accountant at the time a rate increase is filed, thus eliminating the need for extended field investigations as a part of rate cases.

(b) Made more extensive use of prehearing conferences to clarify issues and, where possible, eliminate immaterial or peripheral issues.

(c) Established guidelines limiting the type of evidence necessary to determine initial prices of natural gas in independent producer certificate cases.

(d) Initiated action to require electric utilities, when filing schedules of rates subject to our jurisdiction, to support these filings with cost information.

In line with another recommendation in the Landis report, the position of Assistant to the Chairman has been established to assist in carrying out the important duties of the Chairman's office. The assistant acts as the adviser and personal representative of the Chairman, who under Reorganization Plan No. 9 is responsible for the executive and administrative functions of the Commission. Other members of the Commission now also have personal assistants to help them handle the heavy workload of the Commission.

Mr. Landis recommended that individual commissioners should be responsible for enunciating the grounds on which conclusions are reached in decisions. On May 1, 1961, the Commission announced that its opinions generally would be issued in the name of the individual commissioner preparing the opinion. This policy has resulted in expediting the disposition of cases and improved the quality of our opinions by providing close Commission supervision.

In response to your final question, the Commission's total appropriation for the current fiscal year (1963) is $10,700,000, which compares with $6,932,500 in fiscal 1959.

I have concentrated largely on our progress in natural gas regulation, since the main weight of the Landis report and the heavy backlogs were in this area. The Commission during the last year and a half has taken strong action to revitalize its activities in electric power regulaton to correct the results of past inaction and past disregard of consumer interests. I am enclosing a list of recent accomplishments of the Commission, describing progress in all of our major areas of responsibility.

If you need any further information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

RECENT ACTIVITIES OF THE FPC

NATURAL GAS

1. In the past 18 months the Commission has disposed of two-thirds of the billion-dollar backlog of pipeline rate cases it inherited and has ordered interstate pipelines to refund $350 million and reduce their rates for the future by over $62 million annually.

2. The rapid increase in the wellhead price of gas sold in interstate commerce has been halted. The average price has been virtually stabilized in the past year.

3. The Commission has wholeheartedly carried out its responsibility for regulating

sales of gas in interstate commerce by independent producers. We have ordered producers to refund over $30 million.

4. The Commission has underway a comprehensive study in cooperation with the State commissions to determine the extent to which natural gas rate refunds reductions are being passed on to the ultimate consumer.

5. The Commission has pushed forward with area rate proceedings to fix just and reasonable rates for producers and the hearing in the lead case involving hundreds of producers in the Permian Basin of Texas and New Mexico is well along toward completion.

6. The interim area ceilings for sales of new gas in the important producing areas of southern Louisiana and Texas Railroad District 4 were reduced by 2 cents per thousand cubic feet.

7. The Bureau of Natural Gas was reorganized to pinpoint responsibility and assure that cases were speeded to a prompt conclusion.

8. The Commission adopted a rule requiring pipelines to file complete backup information with rate increase requests, thus eliminating field investigations and enabling the Commission to set cases for hearing at once and dispose of them promptly.

9. The Commission adopted a rule which outlaws new contracts for the sale of gas by producers that contain indefinite escalation clauses, such as the so-called favored-nations clauses, which have caused much of the inflation in the price of gas in the past.

10. The Commission adopted a rule prohibiting ex parte communications dealing with the merits of contested cases.

11. The Commission has taken many steps to ease the burden of regulation on the small independent producer.

a. We have devised a one-page form in which they can file for increases which are not in excess of our ceilings.

b. Our area rate policy, in which the rates for all the producers in an area are determined in a single proceeding, relieves the small independent producer of the burdens of individual rate proceedings.

12. A field office has been established in Houston, Tex., to insure closer supervision of personnel working in the field and serve as a clearinghouse for the problems of the producers in the area.

13. We have established an Office of Economics to assist the Commission in planning the future course of regulation of the natural gas industry because economic problems go to the core of regulatory policy.

14. The Commission has established guidelines which limit the evidence in producer certificate cases and will enable the Commission to hold the line on the price for new gas and at the same time dispose of certificate applications expeditiously.

15. In opinion No. 369 issued November 30, 1962, the Commission rejected a price increase by H. L. Hunt and others that would have created a new, higher price plateau for natural gas in southern Louisiana and Mississippi. The decision was the present Commission's first decision in a litigated gas producer rate case and demonstrated our determination to hold the line against unjustified increases in natural gas prices.

16. In opinion No. 348 issued October 23, 1961, the Commission held that it had jurisdiction over the sale of all of the gas moving in interstate commerce, even though some of the gas was consumed in the producing State. The Commission thus prevented possible increased costs to interstate customers by the use of contractual arrangements purporting to segregate certain volumes of gas from the interstate stream and thus to avoid FPC jurisdiction over the price paid to the producers.

17. In opinion No. 351 issued January 22, 1962, the Commission decided the famous CATCO case on remand from the Supreme Court. The decision reduced the initial price for this large sale of gas in southern Louisiana from 21.4 cents per Mcf down to 18.5 cents and ordered refunds of the higher amounts previously collected.

18. In opinion No. 366 issued October 19, 1962, the Commission decided the rate of return issue in four rate cases involving El Paso Natural Gas Co. pending before the Commission since 1955. The case was set for hearing in July 1961 and the interim order procedure, which the Supreme Court recently approved and described as "not only entirely appropriate but in the best traditions of effective administrative practice," was used by the Commission to expedite the decision. The Commission ordered refunds which will total over $68 million, exclusive of interest, on the rate of return issue alone and ordered rate reductions of 15.8 million annually which were made effective before the end of 1962 over the protest of El Paso. The reduced rates were therefore in effect in time to lower the 1963 price of intrastate gas in California which is controlled by the January 1 price fixed by the FPC for interstate sales.

ELECTRIC POWER

1. The Commission is conducting a national power survey to encourage the voluntary interconnection and coordination of the Nation's power systems on a regional and interregional basis. The Commission's objectives are to promote the maximum use of the latest technology in the electric power field to provide lower rates to consumers. The survey has already stimulated many new interconnections between companies. The advisory committees we have formed have provided a forum for all segments of the industry—public, private, and cooperative—to meet and discuss their expansion plans in light of the national interest in providing low cost electricity in all parts of the country.

2. When the present members of the Commission took office the Commission's electric rate regulation functions were practically nonexistent. There were only four professional people engaged in electric rate work. The Commission took immediate action to exercise its responsibility to regulate the wholesale rates of electric utilities in interstate commerce which is one of the primary consumer protection functions of the Federal Power Act.

3. The Commission transferred the electric rate staff from the Bureau of Natural Gas where it was buried and made it a prominent part of a new division in the Bureau of Power. We have built up the electric rate staff within the limits of existing manpower and we are seeking funds to enlarge the staff to the minimum required to carry out effective rate regulation.

4. Many utilities did not even have their wholesale rates in interstate commerce on file with the Federal Power Commission. We are requiring that these rate filings be made and where necessary have issued a show-cause order to require the filings. Over 1,000 electric rate filings were made with the Federal Power Commission in the last 6 months of 1962.

5. The FPC has issued a proposed rule that will require electric companies to support their rate filings with cost information to facilitate meaningful Commission review.

6. The Commission is preparing a list of all the public utilities subject to the Commission's jurisdiction which we will publish shortly.

7. The Commission has announced a proposed rule requiring strict and detailed accounting for political expenditures by power companies. (The rule applies also to natural gas companies.)

8. The Commission has taken action to carry out its responsibility for collecting the money owed the U.S. Treasury from downstream hydroelectric projects that benefit from upstream Federal developments.

(a) A provision is being inserted in all new licenses which will require annual payments for headwater benefits based upon a formula.

(b) We have announced a rule which will accomplish the same purpose for existing projects.

In this fiscal year we are collecting $1,750,000 in headwater benefits for the Federal Treasury which is three times as much money as has been collected in the entire history of the FPC. We estimate that in the next year we will collect $4 million.

9. The Commission in Opinion No. 356 on April 19, 1962, ruled that a pumped storage hydroelectric project was subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. The Commission emphasized that the Federal Power Act conferred broad authority on the Commission to insure the most comprehensive use of the Nation's water resources.

10. The Commission in opinion No. 357 on April 25, 1962, spelled out a new policy in issuing licenses for non-Federal hydro projects built prior to 1935 and still operating without a license. The FPC concluded that these projects should not be given the benefit of the maximum 50-year licenses allowed under the Federal Power Act but should be licensed for a shorter term. We are making a concerted effort to bring these projects under license.

11. We have accelerated the pace of our hydroelectric licensing work. In the last 6 months of 1962 licenses were issued for projects whose construction will add $260 million to stimulate the Nation's economy.

12. We have proposed a rule requiring all licensees to submit a comprehensive plan for public recreation with their license applications to assure that the general public obtains the full benefits of the recreation potential of hydroelectric projects built under FPC license.

[From Federal Power Commission Release No. 12,497; G-6907]

FPC Chairman Swidler Reports Progress in All Natural Gas Regulatory Areas During 1962

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 13, 1963.—The Federal Power Commission cut its pipeline rate case backlog by well over half during 1962, reducing the number of cases on hand from 90 to 41 and the annual dollar amount of proposed increases from $388.2 million to about $151 million, Chairman Joseph C. Swidler reported today.

The FPC during 1962 also made substantial progress in its other three natural gas regulatory areas, Chairman Swidler said. He reported—

A reduction of $16,098,417 in the backlog of proposed annual rate increases by independent producers of natural gas.

A decrease from about $1.1 billion to $914 million in the amount of proposed construction in pending pipeline certificate applications.

A reduction from 3,209 to 2,814 in the number of producer certificate applications pending.

The $1,099,090,000 accumulation of excess rates collected subject to refund 6 months ago by natural gas pipelines was reduced to approximately $470,779,443 at the end of 1962.

During the quarter ended December 31, Chairman Swidler said, the FPC disposed of

23 pipeline rate increase cases involving $96,070,000 annually. At the same time it ordered refunds estimated at $184,946,172, plus interest.

More than two-thirds of the $151,009,400 in pipeline rate increases pending at year's end was involved in five cases. One of these is before the Commission, two are awaiting initial decision by FPC examiners, and two are undergoing staff investigation.

The annual dollar amount involved in proposed rate increases by independent natural gas producers dropped for both the year and for the last quarter of 1962. The Commission had on hand proposed increases totaling $167,525,597 at the beginning of the year, and this was reduced to $158,159,192 by September 30, and to $151,427,180 at year's end. However, the number of cases on hand rose approximately 5 percent from 2,756 at the beginning of the year to 2,881 on September 30 and 2,905 on December 31.

Chairman Swidler also reported an across-the-board reduction in the amount of proposed construction in pending pipeline certificate applications for both the quarter and the year.

Pending applications, measured by the estimated construction costs, were reduced from $1.1 billion to about $914 million for the year; the miles of pipeline in pending applications was reduced from 8,782 to 8,582; and measured by compressor horsepower the reduction was from 772,783 to 612,960. The number of cases on hand, however, rose from 206 to 224 during the year. Corresponding reductions for the quarter were $1,036,230,973 to $913,783,652 (construction costs); 9,414 to 8,582 (miles of pipe); and 767,942 to 612,960 (compressor horsepower).

Hearings have been completed on nearly half of the $913,783,652 backlog of proposed new construction on hand December 31, and approximately $120 million was being held up awaiting further information or action by the applicants or the disposition of other cases.

More than $351 million of the pending pipeline construction applications, or more than one-third, is proposed in the five largest cases. Four of these applications are through the hearing stage, and the fifth is ready for hearing. Temporary authorization has been granted for construction of $138,227,922 of the new construction proposed in pending applications.

The number of pending applications by independent producers seeking authorization to sell gas in interstate commerce was reduced from 3,209 at the beginning of the year to 2,814 on December 31, 1962. The FPC during the year disposed of 2,039 such applications. Temporary authorizations had been issued in 1,892 of the 2,814 cases still pending at year's end. Of the remaining 922 applications, 300 involve service for which temporary certificates have not been requested or which are new filings still being processed. For the last quarter, however, there was an increase in the number pending from 2,557 to 2,814.

The attached tables show statistics as of the end of the last quarter, with comparisons with the preceding quarter and the quarter ended a year earlier. The statistics are divided into four tables—pipeline certificate cases, pipeline rate cases, producer certificate cases, and producer rate cases. The tables include summary remarks concerning the more significant aspects of the statistics.

The publication of these statistics completes the first full year of coverage through the quarterly reports, initiated by Chairman Swidler at the beginning of 1962.

TABLE I.—*Pipeline company certificate filings and actions (construction and operation only)*

	Number of applications, quarter ending—			Miles of pipeline, quarter ending—			Compressor horsepower, quarter ending—			Estimated cost		
	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961
Pending start of quarter	194	200	195	9,414	10,202	7,432	767,942	785,197	590,298	$1,036,230,973	$1,101,470,293	$934,623,381
Applications filed during quarter	71	49	53	916	616	1,830	73,590	55,410	192,050	121,123,452	86,333,844	242,418,571
Certificates issued during quarter	38	51	39	1,562	1,403	476	228,572	72,665	9,565	230,865,173	151,522,153	71,866,821
Otherwise disposed of during quarter	3	4	3	186	1	4	----------	----------	----------	12,705,600	51,011	30,544
Pending end of quarter	[1][2] 224	194	206	[3] 8,582	9,414	8,782	[3] 612,960	767,942	772,783	[3] 913,783,652	[4] 1,036,230,973	1,104,144,587

[1] Increase during quarter.

[2] Includes 82 applications on which temporary certificates involving $138,227,922 in estimated construction cost have been issued.

[3] Reduction during quarter.

[4] Adjusted to include amendments and supplements to applications and modifications of certificates.

Analysis of cases pending

	Dec. 31, 1962	Dec. 31, 1961
Additional information requested	$11,548,000	$61,955,000
Undergoing staff analysis	69,714,047	171,622,030
Ready for hearing	125,225,404	188,266,145
Hearing in progress	178,208,630	387,598,061
Before examiner for decision	197,110,200	84,253,994
Before Commission	212,365,567	27,458,000
Pending action by applicant or in other cases	107,302,320	164,702,662
Total major projects pending ($700,000 or more construction cost)	901,474,168	1,085,855,892
Minor projects pending	12,309,484	19,288,695
Total, all projects pending	913,783,652	1,105,144,587

5 largest certificate applications pending Dec. 31, 1962

Name of company	Docket No.	Estimated construction cost	Status
Colorado Interstate Gas Co.	G-16904	$99,745,673	Before Commission.
Columbia-Gulf Transmission Co.	CP-62-89	72,225,300	Before examiner for decision.
Oklahoma-Illinois Gas Pipeline Co.	CP-62-260	64,130,000	Ready for hearing.
El Paso Natural Gas Co.	G-16235	58,685,000	Before Commission.
Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.	CP-60-94	56,624,000	Before examiner for decision.

TABLE II.—*Pipeline company rate filings and actions*

	Number of dockets, quarter ending—			Annual amount, quarter ending—		
	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961
Filings under suspension, start of quarter	64	76	101	$247,042,400	$277,189,100	$394,764,500
Increases suspended during quarter	----------	2	----------	37,000	8,582,900	----------
Increases allowed without suspension during quarter	----------	3	----------	----------	826,500	600
Disposition of suspension proceedings during quarter [1]	23	14	11	96,070,000	38,729,600	6,573,600
Increases allowed after hearing and decision	5	----------	----------	9,849,000	----------	----------
Increases disallowed or withdrawn after hearing and decision	----------	----------	----------	8,054,000	----------	----------
Increases allowed by settlement proceedings	18	14	11	56,726,900	13,026,500	3,275,000
Increases disallowed or withdrawn by settlement proceedings	----------	----------	----------	21,440,100	25,703,100	3,298,600
Filings under suspension, end of quarter	[2][3] 41	64	90	[3][4] 151,009,400	247,042,400	388,190,900

[1] Cases disposed of during the last quarter provided for refunds estimated to total $184,946,172, plus interest.

[2] Includes 8 cases still pending which have been disposed of except for subsidiary issues.

[3] Reduction during quarter.

[4] The accumulated amount of revenues collected subject to possible refund was $470,779,443 on Dec. 31, 1962, compared with $1,099,090,000 on July 1, 1962.

5 largest pipeline rate suspensions as of Dec. 31, 1962

Name of company	Docket No.	Annual amount suspended	Status
El Paso Natural Gas Co.	G-12948 et al.	$62,526,000	Awaiting examiner's decision.
United Fuel Gas Co.	G-20270	14,614,500	Do.
Southern Natural Gas Co.	G-18512	10,135,400	Undergoing staff investigation.
Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co.	RP60-9	8,507,900	Before Commission.
Northern Natural Gas Co.	G-15335	8,137,000	Undergoing staff investigation.

TABLE III.—*Independent producer gas certificate filings and actions (service and abandonment)*

	Number through quarter ending—		
	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961
Pending start of quarter	2,557	2,520	2,973
Applications filed during quarter	402	404	453
Certificates issued during quarter	[1] 80	311	142
Otherwise disposed of during quarter	65	56	75
Pending end of quarter	[2] [3] 2,814	2,557	3,209

[1] None of these certificates were conditioned to require reductions in the initial sales price of the gas.

[2] Temporary authorizations have been issued in 1,892 of these cases. Of the remaining 922 pending applications, 300 involve service for which temporary authorization cannot be issued. The remaining 622 cases include those for which temporary authorizations have not been requested or which are new filings still being processed.

[3] Increase during quarter.

TABLE IV.—*Independent producer rate filings and actions*

	Number of dockets,[1] quarter ending—			Annual amount, quarter ending—		
	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961
Filings under suspension, start of quarter	2,881	2,902	2,563	$158,159,192	$164,870,541	$165,787,033
Increases suspended during quarter	191	96	203	3,682,301	5,115,468	2,406,941
Disposition of supension proceedings during quarter	167	117	10	10,414,313	11,826,817	668,377
Increases allowed after hearing and decision	6					
Increases disallowed or withdrawn after hearing and decision				85,465		
Increases allowed by settlement proceedings	161	117	10	5,502,432	3,181,997	491,654
Increases disallowed or withdrawn by settlement proceedings				4,826,416	8,644,820	176,723
Filings under suspension, end of quarter	[2] [3] 2,905	2,881	2,756	[4] 151,427,180	158,159,192	167,525,597

[1] A docket may include 1 or more filings.

[2] Includes 901 dockets in area rate proceedings now in progress.

[3] Increase during quarter.

[4] Reduction during quarter.

NOTE.—A substantial portion of the suspended independent producer rate filings are held pending determination of the proper area price in a formal proceeding. The Commission is currently devoting the efforts of a considerable portion of its staff, in expediting area hearings, docket No. AR 61-1 and AR 61-2, and significant decrease in number of suspensions on hand is not anticipated pending conclusion of such hearing.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that, in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at 10 o'clock a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 9, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8, 1963:

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John Edward Kelly, O20156, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Louis Alfred Walsh Jr., O19567, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Elmer John Gibson, O19822, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Edwin Hess Burba, O31518, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alexander Day Surles Jr., O20622, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Henry Pochyla, O30103, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Roberts Calhoun, O19256, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Walter August Jensen, O19006, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. George Thomas Powers 3d, O19137, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Jackson Graham, O20553, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Howard Wilson Penney, O22917, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Peter Clarke Hyzer, O20589, U.S. Army.

Col. Walter Evans Brinker, O21776, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Thomas Cassidy, O23213, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Emil Paul Eschenburg, O23469, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Norton, O23858, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Leland George Cagwin, O23200, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Albin Felix Irzyk, O24158, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Walter Philip Leber, O25130, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Charles Gribble, Jr., O23695, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Harry Jarvis Engel, O39840, Judge Advocate General Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Richard Pressly Scott, O23787, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Clinton Taber, O25270, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Pershing Brown, O23544, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Keith Lincoln Ware, O33181, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Lafayette Mabry, Jr., O34047, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, O23004, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Ralph Longwell Foster, O22669, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Parker Warner, O32462, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Raymond Leroy Shoemaker, Jr., O22978, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Clarence William Clapsaddle, Jr., O22972, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Willard Pearson, O44466, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Eugene DePuy, O34710, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Paul Smith, O22063, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joseph Alexander McChristian, O21966, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Fred Wilbur Collins, O33425, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Herron Nichols Maples, O45920, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Bruce Smith, O46241, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Howard Bayer, O23551, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George I. Forsythe, O24510, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Joe Seitz, O33979, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., O25269, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel U.S. Army).

Col. Ellis Warner Williamson, O34484, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Edmonston Coffin, O25234, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army.

Col. Dayton Willis Eddy, O24565, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Gray O'Connor, O21088, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas Mull Crawford, O21983, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Elias Carter Townsend, O31680, U.S. Army.

Col. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., O22993, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., O43773, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Austin James Montgomery, O51942, U.S. Army.

Col. Raymond Chandler Conroy O33276, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Bryan Coleman Thomas Fenton, O20088, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Conn Lewis Mulburn, Jr., O20405, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Joe Morris Blumberg, O29332, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, O18709, U.S. Army.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

Having been designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, the following-named officer, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Charles H. Hayes, U.S. Marine Corps.

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. William A. Brockett, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Adm. Robert L. Dennison, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade indicated, on the retired list, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having been designated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, the following-named officers for appointment to the grades indicated while so serving:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy.

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. William E. Gentner, Jr., U.S. Navy.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Raymond G. Andrews to be first lieutenant, and ending Gabriel J. Zinni to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 15, 1963;

The nominations beginning Ned E. Ackner to be colonel, and ending Hugh M. Zumbro to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 28, 1963; and

Eckwood H. Solomon, Jr., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288, which nomination was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 15, 1963.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning Adolphus R. Allison, Jr., to be lieutenant commander, and ending Clarence Van Eaton to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 28, 1963.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Maine Chicken Barbecue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when all of our States seek greater employment opportunities for their citizens, it has become most important to increase consumer demand in this country and abroad for the countless goods and products produced in the United States.

It seems timely for me to acquaint my colleagues with a most successful sales promotion event in Washington, D.C., which should prove beneficial to several State of Maine food products. I refer specifically to a Maine chicken barbecue sponsored by the Maine State Society on April 3 at the Kenwood Golf and Country Club. Featured on the menu was Maine chicken barbecued on the grounds by experts, Maine potatoes and peas, and topped off by Maine blueberry pie.

This barbecue would have been judged a success by any standards. Three hundred and fifty loyal State of Maine people, temporarily displaced from the Pine Tree State and living in Washington, D.C., turned out to dine on Maine delicacies, listen to the Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, and meet Maine's lovely cherry blossom princess and "Miss Maine Vacationland," Miss Sarah Allen.

The more intangible benefit from this affair came from acquainting a host of people, including food brokers and food retailers in the Washington area with a few food items produced in Maine, of which we are justly proud.

Executives from all the major chainstores attended as well as representatives from several embassies of countries that import Maine agricultural produce.

This most successful affair was the brainchild of the imaginative president of the Maine State Society, Hon. James V. Day, better known in Washington as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission. Cooperating to the fullest extent were the Maine State Department of Agriculture and the Maine Poultry Growers Association.

The resulting good will and extensive publicity could very well open new markets for Maine produce; I commend Commissioner Day and other officers of the Maine State Society.

I have been assured that the famous Maine State Society annual lobster dinner will be put on again this summer, with extra trimmings.

The day of the Yankee peddler may be gone, but there are still ways to get people everywhere to recognize superior products. The formula is still the same, a little initiative and a lot of hard work.

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the whopping $98.8-billion budget—the biggest ever submitted by any administration in war or peace—many of the needs of the American people are being pushed aside.

While the need for more and better schools for our children is vital, we find that education must wait because we are short on funds.

While the need for medical care for the aged is urgent, we find that we cannot provide a health care program unless we raise taxes, social security taxes.

While there exists an ever-increasing need for more housing for the elderly, we find that there are insufficient moneys to properly house our senior citizens.

While there is a need for more adequate benefits for our disabled veterans, we find that our budget cannot stand this additional expenditure.

While there is a desperate need for tax relief for the overburdened wage earners, we find that a tax cut can only be given at the expense of creating a bigger deficit and a larger national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on but the answers are always the same, we cannot afford these needed services. Now, if there were no other avenue open to us, I would agree. But, we can find the money to accomplish many of these objectives if only we used a bit of horsesense.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is a national lottery. By promoting a national lottery, we could raise easily, painlessly and voluntarily over $10 billion a year in new revenue.

Instead of letting all the money that is spent on betting—$50 billion a year—disappear into the hands of the underworld, we can tap this tremendous source of revenue for our own welfare and the public's good.

In a national lottery, Mr. Speaker, we can find not only the answer but the money to take care of many of these needs of our American citizens.

Mrs. Blanche W. Noyes Is Among Six Named To Receive 1963 Federal Woman's Award — Outstanding Achievements Credited to Honorees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, an article by Reporter Sue Cronk in the April 7 issue of the Washington Post discusses the naming of six outstanding women employed by the Government as recipients of the 1963 Federal Woman's Award.

Established in 1960, this award recognizes women in the Federal employ who have contributed to the quality and efficiency of the career service, influenced major programs, and demonstrated personal qualities of leadership, judgment, integrity, and dedication. Heading the panel who selected the six 1963 recipients was News Commentator David Brinkley. Other judges were TV Personality Betty Furness; Katharine E. McBride, president of Bryn Mawr College; and H. Ladd Plumley, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

It is a pleasure to note that one of the ladies accorded this high honor is Mrs. Blanche W. Noyes, former Bendix Trophy winner and an air-marking specialist for the Centers and Towers Project Branch, Installation and Materiel Service, Federal Aviation Agency. A cherished friend, Mrs. Noyes is an experienced and capable aviatrix who has logged some 13,000 certified air hours. I have been privileged to fly with her as a passenger on many occasions, and have often joined her as a participant in ceremonies and programs sponsored by segments of the aviation industry in West Virginia.

Mrs. Noyes has been a leader of thought in the field of aviation. The Post article states that—

> She has been directly and personally responsible for the Government's air-marking program. She has written and revised the technical handbook used by those who design and build air markers, and she has designed the U.S. standard heliport marker and the ground signals used by pilots awaiting rescue, in addition to helping many foreign countries set up their marking programs.

We are grateful to Blanche Noyes for these significant contributions which reflect her unswerving devotion to the public interest.

The 1963 Federal Woman's Award was also presented to the following:

Dr. Eleanor L. Makel, assistant to the director of the medicine and surgery branch, St. Elizabeths Hospital; Miss Bessie Margolin, assistant solicitor in the Department of Labor; Mrs. Katherine Mather, chief of the petrography section, Special Investigations Branch, Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Department of the Army; Miss Verna C. Mohagen, director of personnel management, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Miss Eleanor C. Pressly, head of the vehicles section, Spacecraft Integration and Sounding Rocket Division, Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. President, I am confident that each Member of Congress will wish to join me in conveying these dedicated and distinguished ladies our heartfelt congratulations and gratitude for tasks well done.

ASCS Committeemen Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a special group of farmers in our Nation. They are the farmer ASCS committeemen who administer most of the action programs of the Department of Agriculture. The time is appropriate because 1963 is the 25th anniversary of the legislation establishing the present farmer committee system. The 75th Congress passed legislation which the President signed into law—Public Law 430—on February 16, 1938. It was, in part, an amendment to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act which directed the Secretary of Agriculture to establish local and State committees. While similar committees functioned from the time the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed in 1933, these others were operating under directives issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than by provision of law.

Under this law the Secretary was directed to establish local administrative areas which cannot cross county lines, with the provision that the participating farmers within such local areas were to elect three farmers to administer the program and represent them. This, then, amounts to an honor for these three elected farmers, but it also becomes a duty. It is an honor because it shows the esteem in which these men are held in their communities. It is a duty because many demands are made on their time, often when they can ill afford to take the time from operating their individual business, to attend meetings or perform other duties including explaining new programs to farmers and enrolling them in these programs.

We all know that over the years these committees have become increasingly interested and effective in the presentation of the programs to the farmers, as is so well evidenced by the following data on farmer participation in the agricultural conservation program during the past 5 years.

Year	Farms participating	Acres on participating farms	Cropland on participating farms
1958	1,114,459	400,763,000	157,230,000
1959	1,005,738	387,534,000	148,644,000
1960	1,055,872	391,421,000	152,199,000
1961	1,216,962	433,573,000	182,224,000
1962 [1]	1,270,000	440,000,000	185,000,000

[1] Estimated.

Actually, the total number of farmers who have participated in the ACP during this 5-year period is much nearer the 2 million figure, because there is a constant turnover of participants which, in 1962, was approximately 200,000, or 4 times the total increase over the preceding year. Because of the importance of the functions these committeemen perform in the limited time they are given the opportunity to work, it appears that more extensive use should be made of their talents whenever possible, as these men are the backbone of the program. This in no way detracts from the efficient and hard-working staffs maintained in their offices. They work as a team for the benefit of all farmers. One point which is frequently overlooked in the consideration of this program is the fact that it embraces all farmland. From time to time, special programs to treat production and conservation problems on certain types of land are considered and then enacted, but not all land is eligible. Some of these special programs include (a) the conservation reserve of the soil bank program, (b) the Great Plains program, (c) feed grains program, and so forth. Since under the ACP any farmland is eligible—it is this total of all land which we must depend upon for the Nation's food supply in the future—we must do everything possible to see that it is preserved rather than wasted away. Hence, it becomes increasingly important that these men—the community, county, and State ASCS committees—be given the necessary tools, including the opportunity to familiarize all farmers in their locale with the need for the preservation of the soil for future generations, and the necessary finances to enroll all farmers in the program.

For my part, I believe they have done a giantlike job to date with the tools provided for them to work with. They have earned all the acclamation accorded them by their fellow farmers. They deserve to be lauded for their years of dedication to duty. ASCS committeemen, we salute you.

A Shortage of Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 domestic problem in the United States today is the high rate of unemployment. One of the main causes of this serious problem is the fact that many of our unemployed lack the basic skills needed to fill existing job vacancies. We are suffering not so much from a shortage of jobs as from a shortage of manpower trained to fill those jobs.

During a recent interview for U.S. News & World Report, Labor Secretary Wirtz said that there are numerous opportunities, especially for young people, "in skilled jobs and in professional jobs such as teaching, medicine, nursing and engineering," as well as in many service occupations.

In order to reduce the steadily rising level of unemployment, we must equip our labor force through training and retraining to fill the skill demands of the jobs that are going begging. Because of the importance of Secretary Wirtz' remarks on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from his interview in the April 1 issue of U.S. News & World Report be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

EXCERPT FROM "WHY YOUNG PEOPLE FACE A SHORTAGE OF JOBS"—AN INTERVIEW WITH LABOR SECRETARY WIRTZ

Question. Are there jobs now for all those with skills?

Answer. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act we are training people at the rate of 50,000 to 60,000 a year, and so far we have been able to find work for most of those who finish the training program. If the economy can move up at the rate of 4 percent a year—the present goal—there would soon be full demand for our manpower supply. We are actually coming close to a shortage of skilled manpower in a number of occupations already.

Question. A shortage of workers? In what kinds of jobs?

Answer. This is already true in a good many types of engineering jobs, in teaching jobs, in many professional jobs and in skilled jobs in some trades.

Question. Aren't these jobs for college-trained people?

Answer. Not necessarily. Take the construction industry: Unless we train at a much faster rate than now through the apprenticeship program, there will be a real shortage of skilled workers in the construction industry.

Question. Who controls the apprenticeship program?

Answer. In general, the industry and the unions. There are problems in connection with apprenticeship training which have to be faced squarely.

Question. Has there been an arbitrary limitation of the number who can get apprenticeship training?

Answer. Yes, there has been some of that.

Question. Restraint on Negro training in particular?

Answer. In some unions there has been and still is racial discrimination in apprenticeship programs which cannot be justified or tolerated.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in what fields are jobs for younger people now available?

Answer. In general, the answer is in skilled jobs and in professional jobs such as teaching, medicine, nursing, and engineering. There is a shortage, too, of people just below the professional level, such as assistants to engineers and scientists, and so on.

Question. What about secretarial jobs?

Answer. In a good many cities job opportunities are available in service occupations, ranging all the way from secretarial work to domestic help, both male and female. In most cities it's hard for housewives to get the domestic help they need.

Question. But domestic work is not highly skilled. Why is it so hard to get domestic help at a time when there are so many people unemployed?

Answer. There are two problems here. One: It's a harder administrative job to bring thousands of workers together with thousands of housewives than it is to staff a single factory that employs several thousand workers. Often a housewife just wants somebody for part-time work.

There is also this problem: In this country there is a tradition of looking down on domestic service. To many workers even the most menial job on an assembly line is more attractive, has more status appeal, than a job taking care of somebody's house or yard, or working in a restaurant.

GOP Solons Fettered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, studies have been made to determine the status of the minority as far as staff work in House committees is concerned. This study has shown a decided lack in the quantity of staffing which is available to the minority. On April 7, 1963, my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER wrote a column entitled "GOP Solons Fettered" which sets forth the complete case for adequate minority staffing in a succinct, well-ordered manner.

The article follows:

[From the New York Journal-American, Apr. 7, 1963]

WHAT I BELIEVE: GOP SOLONS FETTERED

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

Why doesn't the Republican minority in Congress exercise more weight in Government policymaking?

There are many reasons, such as the size of the majority, the role played by powerful Democratic committee chairman and the influence exerted by a Democratic President.

But another reason, one which doesn't get nearly enough attention, is the fact of inadequate minority staffs in the House and Senate.

Just as generals must, so Senators and Representatives depend heavily upon staffs to do the real digging and much of the work, pulling together the background on which a policy decision can be made. What witnesses will a committee hear? What is the status of similar legislation? What are the needs for proposed legislation, and so on? All this is the work of committee staffs.

Today, of course, the majority party, which is the Democratic Party, expects a substantial share of the staff to be appointed by them and to be working for them.

On committee after committee, however, the minority party has not been able to appoint any staff members at all. On most, there is at least a disparity of staff appointments far beyond the disparity in party representation.

Insufficient minority staffing makes legislation more dependent than ever upon the statistics, the witnesses, the proposals of the Democratic administration as transmitted through the majority. I would make this point just as emphatically if the situation were reversed and proper committee staffing was denied to the Democrats.

The need is for proper policies, properly researched, properly arrived at and understood above and beyond the desires of the particular administration running the executive branch.

This cannot be done without spadework on behalf of the minority position on the myriad questions coming before the House and Senate. Legislating is amazingly complex, reaching into every possible phase of American life. Some subjects could occupy the entire time of intelligent legislators to the exclusion of everything else.

What it boils down to, is help for busy Senators and Congressmen. Unless provided on a larger scale for minority Members of Congress, the case for the opposition in American political life will continue to suffer.

Unfortunately, too much importance is given to advancing the administration's program today. Just because a President sends a message to Congress and follows it up with specific legislation doesn't automatically assure that this is the best thing that could be enacted for the people.

Very often, just the opposite is the case. Sometimes it is the people's definite advantage to have Presidential requests opposed and defeated by their representatives in Congress. And because of this, the minority effort is extremely important. It definitely should be supported by the best staff work available.

A Timely Fable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, a modern fable with a strong point to make appeared on March 31. The newsletter of our able colleague from Texas, Hon. JIM WRIGHT, offers a subtle, but most effective, explanation of one of the most controversial transactions of modern times.

I heartily commend this document to my colleagues as enjoyable, enlightening, and eloquent literature.

The article follows:

A TIMELY FABLE

Once upon a time, in a fair and bountiful land where many animals lived, there stood a curious five-sided house. It nestled alongside a broad river in a big and majestic city.

In this house lived a mule, a goat, and a falcon. To them the other animals of the land had entrusted the job of protecting their country from an angry red bear which snorted the kind of fire from which the sun is made and, on occasion, thumped his shoe upon the table.

The mule, the goat, and the falcon all were anxious to protect the land, but among themselves they were very quarrelsome. Each had his own idea on how to defeat the red bear in case he should attack.

"I shall meet him on the land, and with my great mobility and firepower, I shall kick him to death," brayed the mule, flecking a bit of lint from his forest green suit.

"Tut, tut, there will be no need of that" sneered the goat, who was resplendent in his dark blue suit with gold stripes. "My specialty is the sea, and if the bear ever threatens our shores, I shall butt him right out of the water."

"Nonsense," jeered the falcon, proudly displaying the silver wings on his light blue suit. "If the bear should attack, I shall fly to his homeland, peck out his eyes and destroy his ability to fight."

So it went for many years, with the three animals incessantly bickering among themselves.

Nowhere did these arguments cause more concern than on a gentle hill which lay just across the river. Here lived a great herd of donkeys and elephants. Even though they themselves were not immune from petty jealousies, they realized there was a desperate need to eliminate the tumult within the great five-sided house. After the donkeys had done much braying and the elephants had done much trumpeting, they decided that another animal should be chosen to take complete charge of the occupants of the five-sided house.

Now it happened that in a large white house not far from the hill there lived an eagle. It was decided to let the eagle choose the animal to be in charge of the five-sided house, provided, of course, that the donkeys and the elephants approved of the eagle's choice.

Many years passed, and several different eagles moved in and out of the large white house. Each eagle chose an animal to live in the five-sided house. Alas, however, the mule, the goat, and the falcon never really stopped their bickering. They seemed to resent every animal that was put in charge of them, and each continued to go pretty much his own way.

Finally one day a new eagle moved into the large white house. This eagle had some very definite ideas about the animal that should be put in charge of the five-sided house. He wanted a wise, but young, owl.

It so happened that just such an owl lived in a busy city to the west. This owl made a living by providing engines to be used in crossing narrow inlets on the shore of a large lake, the Fjord Motor Co., some animals called it.

The owl consented to take charge of the five-sided house, and the animals on the hill generally approved.

"He's very wise," nodded the donkeys.

"And he can bring to the house the valuable cost-cutting lessons he learned in private enterprise," trumpeted the elephants.

Soon after moving into the five-sided house the owl discovered that the goat and the falcon were planning to buy new swords. Separate kinds, of course.

"Why can't you both buy the same type of sword and save money?" the owl asked.

"That's quite impossible," said the goat with a patronizing smile. "Yes, quite," agreed the falcon. When the owl asked why, the goat tried to explain.

"You see, my sword is to be used at sea," he said. "I have always bought a sword shaped sort of like a 'T'."

"And my sword," put in the falcon, "is to be used for the air and must have something of an 'F' shape."

The wise young owl pulled a slide rule out from under his wing and appeared quite thoughtful. "Perhaps an 'X' shaped sword might serve you both," he observed. "We could call it the TFX, and it would save a billion dollars."

Panic gripped the goat and the falcon.

"It won't work," cried one.

"It's never been done before," shrieked the other.

The owl consulted his slide rule again. "Nevertheless I think we should try it. Even though the TFX might not exactly suit your individual preferences, I will promise you that it will provide a far better sword than either of you now has."

Crestfallen and bitter, the goat and the falcon left the owl.

"Whatever shall we do?" cried the goat.

"We shall march straight to the Hill and complain to our powerful friends," said the falcon. "One of the donkeys is a particularly close friend of mine."

The goat appeared puzzled. "But aren't the elephants and the donkeys on the Hill also very close friends of the owl?" he asked.

"They have been," the falcon gloated. "But they may change their minds if we tell them that the owl is robbing us of an effective means of protecting the country, and that it would be cheaper and better to build two different swords."

"But is that true?" demanded the goat.

"Sure it is," smirked the falcon, winking and nudging the goat in the ribs. "Sure it is."

Moral: As long as we're going to have an owl, we ought to believe in him because he seems to be the only one who gives a hoot.

Accelerated Public Works Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Members of the House of Representatives will consider the 1963 supplemental appropriation bill.

In my opinion, based upon personal experience, it is essential that Congress appropriate the full $500 million requested by the President of the United States in order to continue the vital accelerated public works program, as authorized during the 87th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, immediately following the 1962 general election my office arranged and participated in a public meeting in each of the seven counties of the Fifth Congressional District to explain the Accelerated Public Works Act. Because of the extremely high percentage of existing unemployment, I knew the accelerated public works program would provide the only method available for our citizens to help themselves. This act made possible urgently needed temporary employment and at the same time made it possible for our local officials to improve local living conditions.

Our citizens have done all within their resources to create new and permanent private employment. Our unemployed, who are denied gainful employment through no fault of their own, are anxious to have an opportunity to work and support their families.

Because of continued increased unemployment, our community, city, and county officials have been forced to reduce essential services due to the fact they have no way to obtain local funds because of their decreased income. However, they have carefully considered the accelerated public works program and following detailed studies they have submitted applications for quite a few fully justified public projects. In each case our local officials have been able to arrange the required local financing because of the benefits provided by this program.

Not only in the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia but also throughout the United States our local citizens have demonstrated their initiative and desire to improve their local areas. These public-spirited citizens have applications pending for Federal funds exceeding twice the amount requested. Unless the Congress appropriates the full $500 million as requested, our local citizens, who have worked so hard to do their part, will be discouraged, and failure to appropriate these funds will justify the fact that the efforts extended to improve local conditions will have been in vain.

Each of these communities, I might add, has expended funds in properly preparing their applications and because of the provisions of the act as previously authorized by the Congress, they fully expected that carefully chosen improvements would be approved. Without additional Federal funds these communities cannot move forward, simply because they do not have the financial resources. In this connection, I have worked closely with the officials of the Area Redevelopment Administration and other participating Federal agencies in following every application through each step. I have respect for these Federal officials for the completely fair and dedicated manner in which they have been doing a most difficult job. To my personal knowledge these officials have worked long hours, including Saturdays and Sundays, in an effort to process those applications which afford the greatest benefit for each dollar expended by the Federal Government.

Just last month southern West Virginia suffered the most disastrous floods in our history. These Federal officials came to see firsthand the unsurpassed damages. Some of our pending applications are in more urgent need now because of this disaster. I have seen firsthand the effectiveness of the accomplishment so far of the officials of the Area Redevelopment Administration and other agencies.

When it is considered that we have nearly one-third of our counties in the United States adversely affected by persistent and substantial unemployment, no one can successfully challenge the fact that we do have a major internal problem. I am firmly convinced that the accelerated public works program, Federal participation with local governments, is a very important investment in the future of our Nation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully plead with the Members of the House to vote the full $500 million for the continuation of the accelerated public works program. It is my firm conviction that we have an obligation to our citizens in these areas and to our future generations to appropriate these funds in order that our citizens may be able to help themselves and continue to look forward.

Senator Tower Explains the ABC's of Conservatism to a Liberal Texas Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the April 6, 1963, issue of Human Events includes an excellent article entitled "Senator Tower Explains the ABC's of Conservatism to a Liberal Texas Editor."

The Senator's letter to the editor of the Texas Observer does a great deal to place the issue of liberalism versus conservatism in proper perspective:

SENATOR TOWER EXPLAINS THE ABC'S OF CONSERVATISM TO A LIBERAL TEXAS EDITOR

Mr. RONNIE DUGGER,
The Texas Observer,
Austin, Tex.

DEAR RONNIE: I am flattered that the Texas Observer has asked me to do something on my fundamental beliefs. In your note to me, asking me to do this piece, you observed that "* * * our readers have so little, substantially, in common with you." However, I am always glad to speak or write under critical, as well as favorable circumstances.

Too, I remember a line from Rudyard Kipling: "They cannot know England who only England know." Perhaps some exposure to an honestly expressed conservative viewpoint may cause some of my liberal friends to take better stock of their own positions.

At the outset, I should note that, too often, the doctrinaire liberal or the doctrinaire conservative tends to state his case in a manner that would convey the impression that he is God, dictating the Ten Commandments to Moses. I'm as guilty of this as anyone.

So, perhaps I should start with a little disarming humility and say that that I am aware that I have no monopoly on truth and, although political philosophies are things to which insincere men may, from time to time, repair for the sake of political expediency, I will concede the intellectual honesty of those who might be properly regarded as the real opinion leaders of the liberal movement.

LIBERALS POSSESSED OF A MASSIVE CONCEIT

However, it occurs to me that they are possessed of a massive conceit. As the attitude toward people low on the socioeconomic scale on the part of the old Tory Democrats of the last century may have been condescendingly philanthropic, so, too, the attitude of the American 20th century so-called liberal is one that sometimes appears to border on contempt for the ability of people in a society to regulate themselves.

Liberal intellectuals cling to the ancient notion that there must be a ruling elite which uses the coercive authority of the state as a means of ordering the lives and destinies of men, through complete planning of the political, economic and social processes.

As I see it, the function of Government is to preserve order in society—not to order society.

It is no more accurate to caricature the conservative as a bloated, greedy, avaricious moneybags, bent on the preservation of privilege and the exploitation of the poor, than it is to caricature the liberal as a bewhiskered, red-eyed, bomb-throwing anarchist.

Assuming that the liberal and the conservative have mutually compatible goals: to wit, the elevation of the whole condition of mankind, the enhancement of the individual dignity of man, consistent with our Judeo-Christian system of ethics, morality and humanity, the difference lies in the approach, the conservative being libertarian, the liberal, essentially egalitarian.

GOVERNMENT PLANNING GUESSWORK AT BEST

In the eyes of the conservative, the liberal approach, too often, becomes an end unto itself and is, therefore, destructive of the goal. The achievement of complete "equality," and its maintenance, it seems to me, would necessarily require substantial sacrifice of individual liberty and freedom of choice.

It appears to me the liberals are bent on the establishment of a system which would marshal the wealth and resources of the land and redistribute them in the form of welfare benefits and public works. While some liberals may not consciously seek the establishment of a Socialist state in America, I believe that many of the programs they advocate establish a trend in that direction.

In seeking the establishment of a planned economy, the liberal apparently fails to take into consideration the fact that capitalism, or the market-regulated economy, has proved to be the most productive system and has afforded the highest standard of living.

Government planning, as one wise man has observed, is not a mature way to organize an economy. It is unproven; it is educated guesswork at best. Carried to its ultimate, it is necessarily tyrannical in character in that it essentially determines what will be produced and consumed, at what jobs people will work and what compensations they will receive.

A market-regulated economy preserves the democracy of the marketplace in which people, by the manner in which they spend their dollars, in effect determine what goods and services will be produced.

A system in which taxes become confiscatory, in which there is extensive government competition with business, or at its worst, one in which the means of production, distribution, and exchange are nationalized, not only denies a certain amount of freedom of choice, it destroys incentive.

I am aware that conservatives are very often accused of placing property rights before human rights. I deny the allegation and defy the alleger. I consider that the right to own and exploit property for private subsistence, or gain, is an essential human right. It prevents the citizenry from being reduced to a status of complete dependency on the government.

I submit, further, that the honest and consistent conservative has equally high regard for other rights which those of us living in an Anglo-Saxon society have grown to expect, such as freedom of speech, press, assembly and worship. We believe in elaborate safeguards for the accused and equality in the eyes of the law.

On that last point, was it Anatole France who cynically said, "The law in its majestic equality prohibits the rich man from begging alms and sleeping under bridges, as well as the poor man"? I don't believe this comment could characterize our legal and political system, as the conservative thinks it should be. We do not seek to foster or preserve privilege.

INTENSE TAXATION PENALIZES SUCCESS

Consistent with our notion that government should preserve order in society and should foster a climate of freedom and growth, we approve such measures as antitrust laws and other legislation designed to protect the general citizenry against the unscrupulous and the greedy—laws that create a climate of opportunity for all the people, regardless of station or origin. In short, we seek a society in which all men can aspire to be successful and have some reasonable chance of realizing that aspiration.

We, therefore, resent a system of taxation and expenditure that penalizes success and encourages indolence, a regulatory system that will prevent one segment of the society from abusing its economic power—but, at the same time, allow, indeed, even encourage another segment to abuse its power with impunity.

Conservatives cling to the idea that ours is, historically has been, and ought to be, a classless society—one in which people move freely and without prejudice up and down the socioeconomic ladder. We are righteously, rightfully indignant at those who foment class war for political purposes.

It should be obvious to any but the most ignorant that the best interests of the working man are closely identified with the best interests of the proprietors and managers. Certainly, there are legitimate differences between labor and management on hours, wages, and working conditions. But generally, where a favorable climate for business exists, where business prospers, the working man prospers also.

MUST THERE ALWAYS BE ALTERNATIVES?

Too often, the cry is raised that we are "aginners"; we are nonprogressive because we oppose programs and proposals which are propounded by the administration. "What are you for?" we are asked.

We are for individual liberty and freedom of choice. We are for a market-regulated economy. We are for the responsibilities of government devolving on those organisms of government that are closest to the people. We therefore oppose that which is destructive of what we are for.

Being in the minority, it is our duty to oppose that which we consider to be conducive to the establishment of dangerous trends. When, and if, we succeed to a majority position, then we will propound our own programs—then it will be the liberals who have to hazard the accusations of obstructivism and negativism.

It is often suggested that we have no alternatives to the proposals of this administration. Why should we oppose bad proposals with programs and proposals that are less bad? Must there always be alternatives?

Well, Ronnie, that about wraps it up. I've probably left out a great deal that I should have said; but I hope this will give your readers some insight into the conservative mentality. We are not without humane feelings; we love our children; we support humanitarian causes; we give as generously of our time and energies to the betterment of our communities as the liberals do—perhaps more so.

We do not deny that responsibilities for the care of the indigent, the education of our children, and the elevation of the whole state of our society, exist. We simply believe that they should devolve on the individual, the family, the community, the local or State government to the maximum degree possible.

Many thanks to you and the Texas Observer for giving me this forum. It is a tribute to your desire to be fairminded.

Very truly yours,

JOHN G. TOWER.

Sites in Washington, D.C., With Facilities for the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, annually Washington, D.C., plays host to over 10 million visitors. Of this number, many are handicapped and disabled. A request from a handicapped constituent regarding the facilities available to him at the various sites in Washington, D.C., made it apparent to me that a list of such facilities would be of value. Therefore, I would like to make known to the general public the following list of sites in Washington, D.C., with information concerning the facilities they provide for handicapped sightseers.

Aquarium: Basement of Commerce Building, 14th Street between E and Constitution NW., Sterling 3-9200. Open 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily and Sunday. Wheelchairs for the handicapped are not provided. The entrance of the Commerce Building has a few stairs. A ramp, however, at the rear of the building on Constitution Avenue provides access to the elevator. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Arlington National Cemetery: Jackson 2-3000. The grounds are open daily and Sunday, October through March, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.; April through September, 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. Located here are the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the Amphitheater and the Custis-Lee Mansion. There is a change of guard at the Tomb every hour on the hour. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, members of the staff, if contacted in advance, will usher handicapped persons around.

Botanic Gardens: First and Maryland Avenue SW., Capitol 4-3121, extension 6520. Open Sunday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Open Saturday 9 a.m. until 12 noon. One wheelchair is provided for the use of handicapped persons. The building entrance consists of five stairs. There is no ramp. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Bureau of Printing and Engraving: 14th and C Streets SW., Executive 3-6400, extension 7514. Open Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 11 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. to 2 p.m., with the exception of holidays. Conducted tours are available. The Bureau provides wheelchairs for visitors because ordinary wheelchairs are too wide for the ramps. A system of ramps makes it possible for handicapped persons to avoid stairs. If desired, wheelchair service from one's automobile to the building can be arranged by calling in advance.

Capitol: Capitol Hill, Capitol 4-3121. Open daily and Sunday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Open to those who hold passes to the gallery if Congress is in session until one-half hour after adjournment. Tours are available from 9 a.m. to 3:55 p.m. with groups forming every 15 minutes. The guide service is 25 cents for persons 10 years and older. The Capitol provides many wheelchairs for the handicapped. Several elevators and ramps make the Capitol accessible to the handicapped. Special arrangements for tours may be made by calling in advance.

Corcoran Gallery of Art: 17th Street and New York Avenue NW., Metropolitan 8-3211. Closed Monday, open Tuesday through Friday, 10 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; Saturday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; Sundays and holidays, 2 to 5 p.m. The gallery provides one wheelchair. A ramp entrance is available at the service entrance on E Street and should be arranged for by calling in advance.

Custis-Lee Mansion: Jackson 2-3000, extension 2146. Open daily 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., October through March; 9:30 a.m. to 6 p.m., April through September. Admission is 25 cents per person; persons under 18 years of age may be admitted free. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. The mansion has several steep steps which might cause difficulties for the handicapped. However, the staff is willing to provide personal assistance and tours for the handicapped if contacted in advance.

Dumbarton Oaks: 1703 32d Street NW., Adams 2-3101. The gardens are open Monday through Saturday, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.; Sundays and holidays, 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. One wheelchair is provided for the handicapped, although several steps in the garden make sightseeing difficult for the severely handicapped. In the fall 1963, two museums are scheduled to be opened. The entrance of one will have no steps, while the entrance of the other will have approximately three steps.

Federal Bureau of Investigation: 9th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Executive 3-7100. Open Monday through Friday, 9:15 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Tours start every 15 minutes and last approximately 1 hour. Advance reservations are necessary for large groups. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, there are no stairs at the entrance of the building, and most of the stairs inside of the building can be avoided by using elevators. We are informed by the Bureau that handicapped persons should try to avoid the peak tourist seasons. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Folger-Shakespeare Library: 201 East Capitol Street, Lincoln 6-4800. Open Monday through Saturday, 10 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, there is a ramp at the entrance. It is not necessary to make advance arrangements.

Ford's Theatre—Lincoln Museum: 10th Street between E and F NW., Republic 7-1820, extension 2565. Open Monday through Saturday, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m.; Sundays and holidays, 12:30 p.m. to 9 p.m. The building in which Lincoln died is directly across the street and is open Monday through Saturday, 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.; Sundays and holidays 12:30 to 5:30 p.m. Admission to each building is 10 cents. Persons 18 years of age and under are admitted free. No arrangements are made for the handicapped. There are five or six short steps at the entrance to the Museum. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Franciscan Monastery: 14th and Quincy Streets NW., Lawrence 6-6800. Tours are conducted from 9 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. daily. No wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped; however, a long ramp extends along the side of the main church. It is not possible for a person in a wheelchair to enter the catacombs. Special plans for a large group should be made by calling in advance.

Jefferson Memorial: South Bank of the Tidal Basin, Republic 7-1820, extension 2145. Open daily and Sunday, 8 a.m. to 12 midnight. Special tours are available and may be arranged by calling in advance. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, the guards will assist handicapped persons if requested to do so.

Library of Congress: First Street and Independence Avenue SE., Sterling 3-0400. The exhibit halls are open Monday through Saturday, 9 a.m. to 10 p.m.; Sunday, 11:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. Wheelchairs are available for handicapped persons. The guards will assist in lifting the chair if necessary. A special parking place in front of the building and special tours may be arranged in advance by calling the Stack and Readers' Division.

Lincoln Memorial: West Potomac Park at the foot of 23d Street NW., Republic 7-1820, extension 2573. Open daily and Sunday, 8 a.m. to 12 midnight throughout the year. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. Personal help from the guards is available if requested. Blind persons may take their dogs into the memorial and may touch the pedestal.

Medical Museum, Armed Forces Institute of Pathology: 9th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Republic 7-6700, extension 64768. Open daily and Sunday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. One wheelchair is available. The entrance consists of several stairs, and no ramp is available. Two exhibit halls are located on the second floor and are accessible only by a staircase.

Mount Vernon: Mount Vernon, Va., South 5-2000. Open daily and Sunday, March through September, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.; October through February, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Adult admission is 75 cents. The admission for school groups and children, grades 7-12, is 40 cents. Children under 12 years of age and school groups, grades 1-6, are admitted free. A number of wheelchairs are available for the handicapped. It is possible to arrange by calling in advance for a station wagon to meet and pick up handicapped persons at the gate as well as at the boat. The staff at Mount Vernon is able to provide better service for the handicapped persons during the nonpeak tourist seasons.

National Archives: Seventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Worth 3-1110. Open 9 a.m. to 10 p.m. weekdays; 1 p.m. to 10 p.m. Sundays and holidays. Wheelchairs are not provided for the handicapped. However, a ramp is available at the Seventh Street entrance, and may be used if arrangements are made in advance. Special tours may also be arranged by calling in advance.

National Gallery of Art—Mellon Gallery: Sixth Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Republic 7-4215. Open daily 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.; Sundays, 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. There is a concert every Sunday evening at 8 p.m. in the east garden court starting in September and ending in June. Wheelchairs are provided for handicapped persons. There are no stairs at the entrance on Constitution Avenue. Special tours may be arranged in advance only when a group consists of more than 15 persons.

National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception: Fourth Street and Michigan Avenue NE., Lawrence 6-8300. Open daily 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. Sunday masses are held at 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 noon. Free guided tours are available every half hour. One wheelchair is provided for handicapped persons. The entrance to the building has no stairs. Elevators may be used in the building. Special tours may be arranged by calling in advance.

National Wax Museum: 500 26th Street NW., at E Street, National 8-2996. Open daily and Sunday, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. The museum features monuments and personalities in American history. Admission: adults, 75 cents; children 6 through 12, 50 cents; children under 6, free. Wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. There are no stairs at the entrance of the building. During the nonpeak tourist season special tours may be arranged by calling in advance.

Naval Observatory: 34th Street and Massachusetts Avenue NW., Decatur 2-9013. Open Monday through Friday for conducted tours at 2 p.m. only. For groups of 10 or more special advance arrangements should be made. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. There are stairs at the entrance of the main building. Much walking, including several inclines, is required between the three buildings visited on the guided tour.

Smithsonian Institution Group: National 8-1810. Arts and Industries Building, Ninth Street and Jefferson Drive SW. Museum of Natural History, 10th Street and Constitution Avenue NW. Smithsonian Building, 10th Street and Jefferson Drive SW. Freer Gallery of Art, 12th Street and Independence Avenue SW. All of the above buildings are open daily and Sunday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Wheelchairs are provided at the entrance of each building for handicapped persons. The entrances of many of the buildings have no stairs; however, not all of the buildings have elevators. In the past, special tours for the blind have been arranged and special exhibits prepared. Special arrangements may be made by calling extension 542 or 543.

Supreme Court: First, and Maryland Avenue NE., Executive 3-1640. Open Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; Saturday, 9 a.m. to 12 noon. Conducted tours are available every 15 minutes except when the Court is in session. No special facilities are provided for handicapped persons. However, if advance reservations are made with the Marshal's Office—extension 281 or 282—the South Drive on Second Street can be used for easy access to the elevator. Special tours may also be arranged by calling the Marshal's Office in advance.

Washington Cathedral: Wisconsin Avenue and Woodley Road NW., Woodley 6-3500. Services are held Sunday, 7:30 a.m., 9 a.m., 11 a.m., and 4 p.m. Conducted tours are available daily, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., and on Sunday, after 11 a.m. The cathedral and the Bishop's Garden are open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily and Sunday. The Memorial and Tomb of Woodrow Wilson, the only President buried in Washington, D.C., are located in the cathedral. Wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. Handicapped persons should enter the cathedral at the west entrance because it has no stairs. Special tours may be arranged by calling in advance.

Washington Monument: On the Mall at 15th Street, Republic 7-1820, extension 2840. Open daily, March 20 through Labor Day, 8 a.m. to 11 p.m. Open daily, Labor Day to March 20, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. The elevator fee is 10 cents for visitors 19 years and older. No wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. However, special priviliges are given the handicapped in use of the elevator. It is possible for persons in wheelchairs to ride the elevator to the observation point at the top of the Monument.

White House: 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., National 8-1414. Open Tuesday through Friday, 10 a.m. to 12 noon; Saturday, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. One wheelchair is provided for the handicapped. The elevator may be used. Special arrangements should be made in advance through one's Senator or Congressman.

Zoological Park: 3000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Columbia 5-0743. The buildings are open during November through April, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; May through October, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. The grounds are open throughout the year from daylight to dark. A limited number of wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. Many ramps have been constructed in order that handicapped persons may avoid stairs. It is possible to secure directions from the Park Police for seeing maximum part of the park with the minimum effort. Special arrangements for the tour should be made by calling in advance. The park has restaurant facilities, and special arrangements for handicapped persons or groups of handicapped may be made by contacting Mr. Leech at Columbia 5-9434 or Columbia 5-3231.

Sightseeing at the Zoological Park is easier for handicapped persons during the summer months as the animals are kept out of doors and it is not necessary to enter the buildings.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 1963

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Robert Blakely McNeill, minister, Bream Memorial Presbyterian Church, Charleston, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of all nations, whose lordship of the conscience is the basis of our freedom, whose grace confers dignity upon each person, and whose love is the ground of all human affection, look with favor upon those who dare grip the somber issues of our time.

In the intensity of daily conflict, if there is difference of opinion, let there be unity of spirit; if there is diversity of approach, let there be concurrence in purpose, strength in conviction, tolerance of opposition, malice toward none, and charity toward all.

We pray not for world dominion, but for world peace; not for power to destroy, but for a genius to reconcile; not for the right to judge others, but for the right to be judged aright by Thee.

Make of this Nation a sanctuary of good will, a priest of charity, and a prophet of a hopeful future.

We have not forgotten, O God, that this Government is but an assemblage of men, subject to every whim and weakness of human aspiration. Hear the prayers of each of them as they plead for wisdom, stamina, and integrity sufficient for the requirements of this day. Let Thy wisdom become their statecraft, and Thy sovereignty their urgency. We pray this in Thy holy name and spirit. Amen.

THE WILDERNESS ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate S. 4, the so-called Wilderness Act, with respect to which there is a limitation on debate of 1 hour on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Under the limitation, who is to be in charge of the time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proponent of any amendment will be in control of the time available to those who favor the amendment. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] will be in control of the time available to those in opposition to an amendment. The two leaders are to be in control of the time available on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. It is my understanding that the time available on the bill will be under the control of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. Yesterday, I was informed by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] of a death in his family. Therefore, I ask that the time under his charge be allotted by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and that the RECORD so show.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the junior Senator from Colorado is seeking recognition.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to make it plain that the understanding is that the time required for the quorum call is not to be charged to the time available to either side, and also that at the end of the quorum call the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] will have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 38, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 1, it is proposed to strike out all through "(B)" on line 14, and in lieu thereof to insert the following language:

> (2) Within national forests and public domain areas included in the wilderness system: (A) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, until midnight, December 31, 1977, laws of the United States pertaining to mineral leasing and mining shall, to the same extent as applicable prior to the effective date of this Act, extend to all lands affected by this Act; subject, however, to such reasonable regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary having jurisdiction over the area consistent with the use of the land for mineral development and exploration, drilling. Subject to valid rights then existing, effective January 1, 1978, the minerals in lands designated by this Act as wilderness areas are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and from leasing under the mining laws and from leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act and all amendments thereto: *Provided*, That after December 31, 1977, the appropriate Secretary may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including but not limited to the exploration and production of oil and gas); (B) the appropriate Secretary may within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable authorize the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (C).

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have called up amendment No. 38 to the so-called wilderness bill as the first amendment, because I think it will have a major bearing on the course of the proposed legislation through this body and through the other body, in the event the bill should pass.

This particular amendment of my colleague [Mr. ALLOTT] would provide that the ordinary Mineral Leasing Acts and mineral laws remain in effect in the areas within the wilderness system until December 31, 1977.

Under the wilderness bill as it has been reported by the committee, there is a provision only that under special circumstances the President can authorize prospecting for minerals only, including oil and gas; but this prospecting will not do any particular good so far as the actual discovery of mineral bodies which may well be vital to the security of this country is concerned. I say that it is not going to do any good advisedly.

In the first place, in the wilderness areas one is not permitted to bring in mechanized equipment, nor is there permission for any access roads. Consequently, a prospector within the wilderness system would be restricted by the sheer physical difficulties involved in going out and tramping through the wilderness area, carrying a pack on his back, or leading a burro, with a small miner's pick.

I think all Senators present are as well aware as am I that the modern methods and technology as to the discovering of ore bodies no longer rely on the classical system of the burro, the canary in the cage, and the little miner's pick that miners used to bring with them.

I am not talking about uranium. One might be able to find some more uranium, but under the present circumstances I gather, from what the Government says, that we have uranium "running out of our ears," so we do not have to worry too much about that.

I think it is worthwhile to conceive of the uranium problem we had some 13 years ago in order to put the amendment into context. At that particular time the Nation suddenly felt an urgent and vital need for the production of uranium ores for the national defense of this country. We were relying on supplies from the Belgian Congo and from Canada, and no one really knew whether there were any reserves of uranium in this country.

Most of the uranium reserves which were found in the process of the exploration which came subsequent to the incentives which were provided by Congress came within the States and the areas which will have a great portion of their territory blocked off from this kind of activity under the wilderness system, if it is approved.

Specifically getting down to the details of what I am talking about, in the hearings Mr. John Wolfe, who is president of the Colorado Mining Association, appeared before our committee and gave what I thought was one of the most illuminating speeches I have heard in a long time on the question of where mineral reserves and mineral resources might well be found. He pointed out that in Colorado alone about 95 percent of the mineral reserves which may be needed in the future can probably be discovered within approximately 1 percent of the actual territory of the State of Colorado.

I quote some portions of his testimony. On page 148 of the hearings he said:

> By the techniques which have been developed in the past 5 years, we can break the mountainous regions of the West into areas where the probability of success in mineral exploration is relatively homogeneous. When an explorations manager on a budget sees a probability index of 1 on the eastern half of Colorado and 1,000 on the western half, it is obvious where he will concentrate his effort. Within the western area you find a subarea with a probability index of 10,000.

I quote again:

> In the past, 95 percent of the production of the State of Colorado has come within that belt—

Which he showed on a map to the committee—

> and by these calculations it is indicated that 95 percent of the future production of these commodities will come from that area also.

The point I am making is that if we allow a reasonable period of time within which the ordinary mineral activities under our general mining laws and our mineral leasing laws can continue within the wilderness system, it will be possible during that period of time to discover these minerals in the area, and to stake out and to do the development and mining work. We can actually find these minerals within the period of time to be provided in this particular amendment.

After December 31, 1977, under this proposed amendment, the appropriations under the Mineral Leasing Act and under the mining laws will be knocked out. We will no longer have to worry about what the conservationists say about the despoiling of the wilderness areas by virtue of mining activities in those areas, unless the President decides that, under exceptional circumstances, we need such activities in the national security even more than we need the wilderness area.

The process of such exploration during that period of time will give the executive department and the Congress the opportunity of ascertaining which portions of this area may well be subject to removal from the wilderness system without harming the rest of the wilderness system, so that we will have a wilderness area and still have ascertained the necessity of having minerals subject to production within our own country.

Mr. President, what kind of materials are we talking about? Frankly, I do not know. In 1940 nobody was particularly looking for uranium. In 1945 nobody was particularly looking for the rare earths found in some quantities in the Western United States. In 1925 people were still looking for gold. Frankly, they are not still looking for gold anymore, because it cannot be produced at a profit.

We have a situation where almost any kind of mineral can become vital to the successful development of our national defense, our economy, and our industrial affairs and commercial enterprises.

It seems to me it is imperative that we keep open those areas which in many cases are the most highly mineralized areas in the United States for further exploration and development of the resources which might be found within the scope of the wilderness system as it is set up by the pending bill.

As I said before, we are not trying to ruin the bill, as has been asserted by some of the advocates of the wilderness system. We are not trying to do anything more than preserve the right, under existing laws, to be able to continue the exploration of those areas to determine whether or not the mineralized areas may safely be removed from the wilderness system because they are more valuable to the country by using them for mineral purposes.

Some other points were contained in Mr. Wolfe's testimony. At page 151 of the hearings, in answer to a question from my colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] as to whether the existing provisions in the bill permit fruitful prospecting for minerals, Mr. Wolfe's answer was:

> In my opinion it would be almost impossible to persuade management—

By this term he is talking about management of a mining company—

> to budget money for studies in these areas, that we would feel that it was so—that the chances of being able to proceed and develop would be so remote that we would be extremely hesitant to spend the company's money in any area of that nature.

The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] went on to bring this point out. He asked the following question:

> Under the general provisions of the bill and under our present knowledge of your particular field—

Referring to Mr. Wolfe's field—

> would it be possible to do any prospecting without such a permit from the President?

Mr. Wolfe answered:

> There would be some phases of work that could be done. There are some regional bits of information that can be obtained. But it would be certainly much more difficult to go in with a mule and pick and shovel than if we could take in the modern tools which we have available to us.

The point I am making to the defenders of this bill is that we do not have to worry about mining, because there are provisions in the bill which provide the President will permit it to be done only if he feels it is important. But those provisions do not mean a thing, because the areas are locked up, there is no access to the areas, and the only way one could get into it would be with a mule and a pick and shovel.

Therefore, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has proposed this amendment, which is not all out, which is not designed to wreck the bill, which does not go as far as the Interior Committee in the other body went during the last session of Congress. It simply provides we will have until midnight, December 31, 1977, to operate in those areas under the mineral leasing and mining laws, subject to such reasonable regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary having jurisdiction over the area, consistent with the use of the land for mineral development and exploration and drilling.

The amendment then goes on to provide, as I pointed out a little earlier, that after that particular time, the right of all forms of appropriations under the mining laws will expire subject only to existing rights that are then in effect.

It occurs to me—and I think this is a point which perhaps has not been brought to the attention of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] before this time—that this very exploration may provide the basis for the various departments in the executive department to determine whether or not a wilderness area at a particular point should be increased or decreased in size. Without this information available to them, which could be discovered under this amendment, they would in many cases be operating in the dark, in this particular field at least.

I do not know how many States would be involved particularly in the mining amendment we have before us. I know Colorado would be. I am reasonably sure the State of the Senator from Idaho would be. I am almost positive Nevada would be. I see present the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. I am reasonably sure—in fact, I am sure—the great State of Alaska would be involved.

It seems to me, where we are dealing with the mineralized portion of the United States and are simply cutting off any right for the further determination of where these resources are, that we are going beyond the reasonable scope of Congress to determine what is in the national interest. We are simply saying it is more important to have wilderness areas than to have the opportunity of determining where the mineral resources are.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield me about 5 minutes, if he has completed his opening statement? I do not know what the time situation is.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. It seems to me this is a worthwhile amendment.

In my judgment, it does not do a disservice to the wilderness concept. As the Senator from Colorado knows, during the deliberations on the bill in committee, I offered an amendment which was a more severe amendment than the one presented by the junior Senator from Colorado on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado.

The amendment I offered had no cutoff date of some 15 years after the passage of the bill, in whatever form it may be enacted.

I firmly believed then, and I firmly believe now, there is nothing irreconcilable in having mining within a wilderness area.

I pointed out during the committee deliberations then, and I repeat now, that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the past has done exactly that—permitted mining in national park areas, areas which are set aside for conservation and recreation uses.

For example, in the creation of Mount McKinley National Park, a park which contains 1,939,493 acres, mining is permitted.

In Death Valley National Monument, which is a great area in southern California of some 1,907,760 acres, mining is permitted.

The Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument is an area of lesser size, but still of considerable acreage. It consists of 330,874 acres. Mining is permitted in that area. In the Glacier Bay National Monument, consisting of 2,274,595 acres, Congress provided for mining rights in one section. Congress wrote such a clause into those acts. These are areas in which mining and other uses occur without any apparent difficulty.

In the last session of Congress, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs knows, we made considerable progress in the field of lakeshore and seashore legislation. We are presently considering those before the Public Lands Subcommittee of that committee. We did permit other use in the Cape Cod National Seashore. We certainly permitted other use in the Padre Island National Seashore, because we permitted oil exploration to exist side by side with the recreational benefits.

Then, too, on the west coast, in the Point Reyes National Seashore, we permit adverse use; not mining use, but continuation of grazing and dairying in that area.

In the last session of Congress, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported favorably two bills, one, the Great Basin National Park, in my own State of Nevada, consisting of an area of 123,000 acres. Mining there is specifically permitted. The other is the Canyonlands National Park bill, a bill that carves out 257,000 acres for a great national park. There, too, we permitted mining in one section.

My position, I would say to my distinguished friend from Colorado, is that in this amendment we are not creating an irreconcilable use. The two can exist side by side. We have spoken on this a number of times, and we should speak on it again. I shall certainly support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator very much. There are one or two points I should like to make while I am on my feet speaking on this amendment. I shall again quote from page 150 from the testimony of John A. Wolfe.

He was asked whether, because S. 174 had failed to become law in the last session, there had been increased exploration of these areas which might eventually be within the wilderness system, or whether it had cut back on such exploration. I quote Mr. Wolfe:

> Several large mineral-producing companies in the West have continued exploration in the proposed wilderness areas which are still open to entry. I have asked representatives of the exploration organizations of these companies if they have located within these areas what they consider to be significant desposits warranting detailed exploration. None of these companies would spend exploration funds on a deposit which it felt did not have a chance of producing gross values in excess of a hundred million dollars. I set the cutoff date on this study at September 1961 to evaluate the potential difference between the mineral wealth of the Nation today and what it would have been had S. 174 of the 87th Congress become a law on the date it was passed by the Senate. I found that at least one significant deposit has been discovered every 3 months. I asked each of these men with whom I discussed this matter if the fact that the last bill did not become a law had given impetus to their exploration activities within the proposed wilderness areas. Each answered that, on the contrary, the fact that similar legislation was hanging over these areas inhibited exploration expenditures in these regions. This is very much the case with the activities of my group. We are reluctant to budget money which stands in serious danger of being lost.

He testified a few weeks ago. It seems to me that this testimony pinpoints the very question I have been discussing. In the short period of time, exploration of these areas, which would be locked up from any development and exploration, had shown significant deposits, at least one every 3 months.

Apparently, in referring back to this fact, he is talking in terms of significant deposits, with a deposit producing at least a hundred million dollars.

Therefore, it seems to me that we are dealing with an enormous facet of the economic wealth of this country, and we should not ignore this and throw it to one side. That is why our amendment deals with this area, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator from Colorado will not leave in the record the statement that these three deposits which they found every 3 months had the possibility of producing a hundred million dollars. His statement was that the companies would not spend exploration funds on a deposit which did not have that capacity. No significant deposit of that kind has been found in Colorado so far as I have heard.

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not know of any such deposit from my own personal knowledge. However, he said that they would not spend these funds unless it had that capacity or they thought that it had a chance of producing a hundred million dollar deposit. Then he goes on to say:

> I found that at least one significant deposit has been discovered every 3 months.

This presumably refers back to at least a very valuable deposit. I have been in the mining game myself, and I know that fervor and optimism are a part of every miner's makeup. If a miner did not have those characteristics, we would not have any mining going on. I would not say that this was the actual amount they had discovered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did Mr. Wolfe indicate that these were deposits within a wilderness area?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes. He said these are explorations that were made within wilderness areas.

Mr. ANDERSON. We raised the same question on that point. I did not have a chance to question Mr. Wolfe. However, we raised the question as to whether or not the maps which had been prepared and that were brought in to indicate areas affected by S. 4 were accurate. Dr. Boyd introduced them in evidence. It was conceded many areas outside the forests, long withdrawn, were indicated. Their status as to mining would not be changed. The discoveries could not be on these areas for they have long been closed. The Department of Agriculture has very strict regulations on prospecting in wilderness areas in the forests. They are not aware of any extensive prospecting or location of minerals in these areas.

Mr. DOMINICK. I call the Senator's attention to the first two sentences on page 150 of the hearings.

Mr. ANDERSON. He does say, "proposed wilderness areas." The Senator remembers that when we asked Dr. Boyd about the proposed wilderness areas, it developed that they were areas long closed to mining.

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes. I remember that statement. However, I still believe that the adoption of the pending amendment will take care of the point I have raised. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will support it, because I believe its adoption might be extremely important not only for our State and other States, but to his own State.

It seems to me that what we are doing here is merely getting permission to proceed with development within a limited period of time, so we can lay the basis to determine which mineral areas should be retained in the wilderness systems and which should be excluded from the wilderness system at a later date.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, may I be yielded 2 minutes on the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. On the pending amendment?

Mr. COTTON. No, not on the amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire on the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing that this colloquy appear following the debate on the pending amendment, if that is desired.

I desire to ask the Senators in charge of the bill two questions for my own information. First, I note on pages 2 and 3 of the bill a definition of "wilderness." I shall not take the time out of the 2 minutes to read the entire definition; but it indicates that it is to be wilderness untrammeled. I take it that that means that there are to be no roads or highways through the area or no roads into it.

If the bill passes, and there are forest areas in the wilderness without entrance roads, does the bill preclude the building of roads for the purpose of harvesting timber in a reasonable way, consistent with sound conservation practices? Does the bill isolate the forests and prevent the building of roads under the authority of those in control, or does it not?

Mr. CHURCH. The wilderness system as defined in the bill is confined to certain specific areas which have already been specified as wilderness or primitive areas. Those areas are located in the national parks and in the national forests, where they have been designated as primitive areas and where no roads have been permitted for many years. So, apart from the areas which have already been set aside and so designated, and in which no roads have been permitted in the past, the bill has no application. However, in ordinary national park and forest lands, roads could be constructed where roads are not presently located.

Mr. COTTON. But not in lands affected by the pending bill?

Mr. CHURCH. Areas affected by the pending bill—in the national forests, for example—are the primitive areas which have been set aside as wilderness and in which roads are not now permitted under the existing regulations of the Forest Service.

Mr. COTTON. It is my recollection from past years, particularly when I served in the other body, that there has been, at certain periods, a long standing difference of opinion between the Park Service and the Forest Service as to whether the proper use is to let the forests remain virgin land, to let the forests rot and fertilize the ground, or whether the forests should be periodically harvested. Would the bill compel the former course in areas where forests exist?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; I should say, however, that whatever differences of opinion may have existed in the past, the Forest Service now, as it has done for some years, strongly endorses the proposed legislation.

Mr. COTTON. I have one other question, which relates to the title of section 4, on page 14: "Acquisition of certain privately owned lands within the wilderness system." Section 4 begins:

> The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to acquire as part of the wilderness system any privately owned land within any portion of such system under his jurisdiction—

Does the word "within" mean that the land which may be acquired under the act must be completely surrounded, or does it mean that it may be surrounded on three sides or be contiguous to?

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for bringing it up, so that the record may be made perfectly clear. The understanding of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on this point is that this language refers exclusively to any holding entirely surrounded by wilderness or primitive areas.

Mr. COTTON. That statement may be considered as a part of the legislative history of the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, it may. I am happy that the Senator from New Hampshire has raised the question, so that there will be no ambiguity or confusion about the understanding of the language.

Mr. COTTON. As the bill is now written, there is no right of condemnation?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COTTON. Nor can any customary right or privilege, if there has been such, be taken away?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield a half minute to the Senator from New Hampshire, and a minute and a half to myself to respond to him.

Mr. COTTON. If there are existing rights-of-way or roads, or even ways that by prescription would be considered rights- of-way, are they preserved, too?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. This is an amendment that I myself propose to the bill, because there are in my State inholdings—ranches—which were homesteaded many years ago and which lie entirely within primitive areas. We wanted to be perfectly sure that the owners of those ranches were guaranteed the customary usage of their property for ingress and egress according to the customary ways. So the bill provides, quoting now from section 4, page 14:

> *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to confer a right of condemnation with respect to privately owned land within the boundaries of a wilderness area, or to impair any customary right or privilege heretofore enjoyed by the owners of such land, respecting access to it or to its ordinary use and maintenance.

Mr. COTTON. I take it that the language means a road or trail customarily used even if no legal right-of-way has been acquired because the land was owned by a corporation or for other reasons? Under the language in this bill such customary use would be presumed to have created a right-of-way?

Mr. CHURCH. The language speaks for itself. Whatever has been the customary method of ingress and egress would continue to be preserved.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the questions asked by the Senator from New Hampshire relate specifically not only to the points to which he was referring, but to the very amendment I have offered. Section 6(b), on page 16, clearly shows that there cannot be any access rights within any of the lands which are brought within the wilderness system, so far as road construction or the development of new roads is concerned. The only persons who would be entitled to retain any roads or access would be those who have inholdings. Consequently, any pertinent mining activity would be almost wholly barred by the present provisions of the bill, as would, of course, the harvesting of any timber that might be in any of the wilderness area. So that problem exists.

It seems to me that the amendment which I have offered, so far as mining is concerned, would specifically cure that problem and would allow 15 years in which to determine which of the areas should be taken out of the wilderness system and which should be permitted to remain within it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as may be required, within the limitation.

At the outset, I must say it is very difficult for me to speak against the amendment. I am mindful of the importance of the mining industry. It is one of the chief industries of my State. I have always tried to uphold what I regard to be the legitimate interests of the mining industry. I have been the sponsor of many bills designed to be helpful to mining.

However, I am opposed to the pending amendment because I feel that to adopt it would be an act of contradiction. If wilderness areas are to be established and preserved, if we regard such preservation as being in the interest of our own and future generations, then the bill must be strong enough to protect the integrity of the wilderness it embraces. I submit that if this amendment were to be enacted into law, there would be no way, for the next 15 years, to guarantee the inviolability of the areas established—whereas the guarantee of their integrity is the very purpose of the bill.

Inasmuch as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is largely composed of Members coming from the Western States, who understand the importance of mining, and strongly support mining activities, we have tried to be extremely reasonable in making every possible allowance for mining, which would not basically contradict the purpose of the bill or render it impossible to preserve these wilderness areas, once established by this legislation.

Let me refer to the provisions of the bill which make allowances for mining. First of all, there is the provision in section 6(b), which is to be found on page 16 of the bill. It makes clear that existing mines and valid, existing mining claims within the areas affected by the bill are to be preserved inviolate. The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] says another 15 years are needed for unrestricted exploration of these areas. Mr. President, I submit that there has been unrestricted exploration of these areas for more than a century; yet today only 6 mines are operating within the whole area which would be affected by this legislation. These mines will be unaffected and will continue their operations. All valid existing mining claims within the wilderness system are also protected by this legislation.

Furthermore, the bill provides that for the next 10 years, surveys are to be conducted by the Forest Service, within the primitive areas in the national forests, for the purpose of redefining the boundaries. The purpose of the surveys is to exclude from these areas portions which seem to have greater commercial value, or portions which seem to be more suitable for multiple use than for preservation as wilderness.

So I submit that, for the next 10 years, there will be ample opportunity for those tracts within the primitive areas of the national forests to be excluded whenever the surveys show there is commercially valuable mineral bearing rock which makes these tracts more valuable for commercial development than for preservation as wilderness.

Therefore, the difference, in this respect, may be only the difference between 10 and 15 years.

Mr. President, for one of these primitive areas in Idaho—the Selway-Bitterroot area—such a survey has been completed; and, in the process, over 450,000 acres were excluded, after they were found to have higher commercial value than wilderness value. So here, again, is a demonstration of how the bill can operate, during the next 10 years, to exclude from the primitive areas to be included in the wilderness system the mineral-bearing lands which have higher value for mining purposes.

But this is not all; the bill contains other protective provisions of even greater importance. Section 6(c)(8), on page 19 of the bill, provides that once the wilderness system has been established, limited prospecting can continue within the system as a matter of right, without need for permission from anyone. The only limitation on the prospecting is that it shall take such form as will not be incompatible with the surrounding wilderness environment. So all types of prospecting will not be denied within the wilderness system, once it has been established by the bill.

Finally, if I may call attention to section 6(c), on page 17 of the bill, in subsection (2) provision is made to allow for unrestricted prospecting and unrestricted mining within the wilderness system wherever the President finds that it is in the higher national interest to permit such prospecting or mining to occur.

I read from subsection (2) of section 6(c) of the bill:

> (2) Within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including but not limited to exploration for oil and gas), mining (including but not limited to the production of oil and gas)—

Then I read from line 11:

> upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial—

So, Mr. President, we have made very liberal allowances for all the reasonable requirements of the mining industry. We even have provided that unlimited prospecting and unlimited mining may take place within given wilderness areas if the President finds that the national interest so requires.

But if we do not leave with the President the authority to make such a determination, and if, instead, we adopt this amendment, then, for the next 15 years, we shall have denied ourselves the tools with which to protect the integrity of the very wilderness areas which the bill is designed to establish. That would be a total contradiction of purpose.

For this reason, I feel that the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. President, let me make a final observation: The primitive areas which are really the subject of concern, insofar as this amendment goes, constitute between 7 and 8 percent of the national forest lands. When the reviews are completed, the primitive areas will comprise an even lesser part of the national forests. So the restrictions which do exist in the bill apply to only a very small part of the national forests, and apply not at all to the rest of the land, which remains open for unlimited prospecting and unlimited mining activity.

So I suggest that we keep our eyes upon the doughnut, not upon the hole. If we do, I believe we shall conclude that the provisions of the bill are as reasonable and as adequate as they can be made to protect the legitimate interests of the mining industry and still have a wilderness bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to reject this amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for several questions?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator from Idaho stated, as I understand, that all of this is taken care of, because, after all, within the primitive areas the Secretary of Agriculture can make the reviews within the next 10 years, and therefore everyone will be happy. But it is a fact that the bill as it now stands does not permit the President to do that; only the Secretary of Agriculture would do it.

Mr. CHURCH. The resources of the Government—including the mining and geological agencies of the Government—will be available for the surveys. These lands are not new or unexplored. They are familiar lands. So I think the surveys will be useful to determine the portions of these areas which are mineral bearing and have mining potential. In my State, not a single mine is located in any of the primitive areas involved in the bill, and none has been located in them for many, many years, although for a century these areas have been open to unrestricted prospecting. Therefore, I do not feel that any hurtful restriction is being imposed by the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is my understanding that the only prospecting which is permitted is the prospecting permitted under subsection 8, page 19, of the bill. It must be done in a manner compatible with the preservation of a wilderness area. The only other way in which prospecting could be done would be with the specific permission of the President. Can the Senator from Idaho indicate to me why the President would authorize prospecting in any of the proposed areas on the ground that it would better serve the interests of the United States, when there is no opportunity to try to show the President, except by geological maps which may already be in existence, as to whether or not any minerals are present in the area?

Mr. CHURCH. I can think of instances that might cause the Chief Executive of our country to open up given areas for further exploration for mining purposes. It might be that a need for special minerals essential to the national defense would require it. That is the first and most obvious consideration that comes to mind. Depressed economic conditions in a given area might be another reason for authorizing unrestricted prospecting, where the general evidence indicates that valuable minerals may be present. The national defense requirement is the most obvious. But I am sure that other considerations could also form the basis for granting permission to prospect and to mine.

Mr. DOMINICK. We certainly could not say that the opportunity was free and open, could we?

Mr. CHURCH. I merely say that we cannot maintain a wilderness and leave it free and open for exploration, for prospecting, for mining, and for commercial activities. We shall either have a wilderness or we shall not. I believe it is in the national interest to establish and to maintain a wilderness system for reasons I have already explained. There are good and bad mining promotions. I am aware of some mining ventures in my State—and I am sure the same have occurred in the State of Colorado as well—that have had more to do with the mining of stockholders than the mining of minerals. I refer to speculations that are hardly worthy of the price of opening up a wilderness. Unless in the bill the President is given authority to prevent this from happening, we cannot effectively protect the wilderness that the proposed legislation is meant to preserve. The two things are inconsistent. They are contradictory. The amendment concedes as much by imposing a 15-year cutoff upon itself. If the inherent contradiction were not present, why have a time limit? The very fact that a time limit is included is an admission that the two concepts are inherently contradictory. On that basis I oppose the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Is it not also a fact that the authors of the bill recognize the need for prospecting; otherwise they would not be supporting the measure at all?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as I have said, I think we have made every reasonable allowance for the mining industry that can be made, consistent with the principle of the proposed legislation and the objective it seeks to accomplish.

I should like to yield now to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this is a subject that we have all considered a great deal. We have mining in my home State. I am glad to see the mines do well. But the amendment is not the route to take to see that they do so.

I admit that Mr. Wolfe was an interesting witness. The Senator from Colorado quoted a good deal of what he said. Immediately above the portion that he quoted, on page 150 of the hearings, is the following interesting observation:

> My own group has discovered one such deposit. If all of our preliminary work is substantiated, and if this deposit can be mined to depletion, at today's prices it will contribute $800 million. This would be the basis for $6 to $8 billion of construction.

That quotation leads me to believe that Mr. Wolfe was talking about an operation involving taking out materials for cinder block. I should hate to believe that the only place one could obtain materials for cinder block is in a wilderness area. There must be other places in which material for cinder block is available.

While Mr. Wolfe said much about how many significant discoveries have been made in the last few months, I point out that when one calls the Forest Service, a representative of that agency advises that they do not believe there have been any significant developments, except one development on the south end of Three Sisters, in respect to an area where gravel is being removed in order to make cinder block.

We have gravel all over the country. We do not have to go into a wilderness area to obtain it.

I call the attention of Senators to the fact that not too long ago we had a scandal because of what happened in the Al Sarena case. Some people had gone out and filed a mining claim on a virgin timber area in the State of Oregon. They never mined anything except the timber. They took out millions of dollars of timber on the basis of mining claims. I would hate to see wilderness areas destroyed that way.

The subject to me is not a new one. In the 81st Congress I introduced the bill S. 353 to protect the scenic values tributary to Aspen Basin Road and contiguous scenic areas inside the Santa Fe National Forest. We had to do that because the people were going into the forest, filing a mining claim on some gravel, removing one truckload of gravel, and then putting up a hotdog stand. Where we had the finest scenic values, we then had hotdog stands.

I introduced in the Congress a bill which became Public Law 81–94.

We have had this problem constantly everywhere we have attempted to protect land. It is easy to go into such areas, take out a small amount of material, and say, "This is the essential purpose of the activity."

Dr. Boyd, while testifying on behalf of the American Mining Congress, introduced into the record a brief he presented to the House 2 years before.

In that brief he had a table entitled "Discoveries S. 174 Would Have Prevented." When we pinned Dr. Boyd down, not a single one of those discoveries would have been prevented by the bill S. 174. Not a single one. He merely said, "Yes, they would have been prevented if the principles of S. 174 had been applied all across the United States."

Surely, if we proposed to stop mining everywhere, you could make a showing of mines that cannot be developed.

I asked the Department of Agriculture, which has charge of wilderness areas, if they knew of any of the significant discoveries in the State of Colorado that Mr. Wolfe had talked about. They said they had no knowledge of mineral discoveries in the national forests of any such magnitude as he was talking about in the last two years.

The Kennecott Copper Corp. was interested in a little place called Glacier Peak. It was about a 4- or 5-year-old claim. It had nothing to do with S. 174. It will be very interesting to follow along these developments and find out what great discoveries Mr. Wolfe was talking about as being made in the wilderness areas. I think he was talking about the national forests, not the wilderness areas.

When we pinned Dr. Boyd down, we found that he referred to 66 million acres being sterilized from mining by S. 4. There were not that many acres involved. He could not tell which acres being included were closed to mining long ago and which acres were not. We know which acres being put in the wilderness system have long been restricted. That includes acres in the wild, wilderness and canoe areas. The primitive areas will be reviewed.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be rejected. I regard it as an extremely destructive amendment to the bill. I hope it will not be a part of the proposed legislation.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. I am ready to vote.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 38 of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ANDERSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is detained on official business.

The respective pairs of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and that of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] have been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

If present and voting the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 56, as follows:

[No. 41 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Carlson
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Ellender
Fong
Goldwater
Gruening
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Scott
Thurmond
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—56

Aiken
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Church
Clark
Douglas
Eastland
Engle
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, Del.
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Allott
Anderson
Bennett
Cannon
Case
Cooper
Curtis
Edmondson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
Metcalf
Pell
Simpson
Sparkman
Tower

So amendment No. 38 was rejected.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up the amendment identified as No. 34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as read, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 3, line 23, strike out all through line 3 on page 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b)(1) The wilderness system shall include all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, or canoe: *Provided*, That the areas within the national forests classified as primitive may be included in the wilderness system as hereinafter provided. Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years, review in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20, of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959, the suitability of each primitive area in the national forests for preservation as wilderness and shall report his findings to the President. While being reviewed and until action is taken as provided by this subsection, primitive areas shall be administered so as to preserve their present status and condition. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the inclusion within the wilderness system, or exclusion therefrom, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided*, That the President may, as a part of his recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area to be included in the wilderness system, recommending the exclusion and return to national forest land status of any portions not predominantly of wilderness value, or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value: *Provided further*, That following such exclusions and additions any primitive area recommended to be included in the wilderness system shall not exceed the area classified as primitive on the date of this Act. The recommendation of the President with respect to the inclusion in the wilderness system, or the exclusion therefrom of a primitive area, or portions thereof, shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided*, That if Congress rejects a recommendation of the President and no revised recommendation is made to Congress with respect to that primitive area within two years, the land shall cease to be a primitive area and shall be administered as other national forest lands: *And provided further*, That primitive areas with respect to which recommendations are submitted to Congress on the eighth, ninth, and tenth years of the review period herein provided shall retain their status as primitive areas until the expiration, in respect to each area, of a full session of Congress, two years for resubmission of revised recommendations to Congress by the President, and, if so resubmitted, until the expiration of a full session of Congress thereafter. Recommendations on all primitive areas not previously submitted to the Congress shall be made during the tenth year of the review period. Any primitive area, or portion thereof, on which a recommendation for inclusion in the wilderness system has not become effective within fourteen years following the enactment of this Act shall cease to be a primitive area and shall be administered as other national forest land."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up this amendment because I believe it is of extreme importance to the pending bill. There are enough Senators on the floor so that I can explain it rather rapidly.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, may we have order so we can hear what the Senator is saying?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the amendment, prepared by my colleague [Mr. ALLOTT] does only one thing. What it does is to change the method by which primitive areas would be included within the wilderness system. As the bill is now written, all areas which are classified as wilderness, wild, canoe, and primitive, are automatically included within the wilderness system. Then the Executive is given 10 years for evaluation and recommendation to determine whether these areas should come out of the wilderness system.

The amendment of my colleague from Colorado shifts this around. What it does is to provide that the primitive areas will remain within their present classification and will be evaluated over a period of 10 years, and that then a recommendation will be made for inclusion of the proper areas within the wilderness system.

This is a holding in status quo of the primitive areas at the present time until evaluation can be made as to the most useful purpose for these particular areas. Once that recommendation has been made, the Secretary would come to Congress and say, "This is the way we think these primitive areas ought to be included or not included within the wilderness system."

His recommendation would be final unless vetoed by Congress.

This is not my colleague's affirmative action amendment. This deals specifically with the primitive areas alone, and it says, in effect, "We will evaluate them before we put them into the wilderness system."

Is there any purpose in this? What is the need of doing it this way?

I assure the Senate that I sat for weeks in the committee hearings during 1961 and 1962, in the other body, while the bill was being discussed in depth. The principal objection of most of the witnesses who came before the committee was with respect to the question of whether or not the primitive areas should be blanketed in immediately or whether they should be evaluated and brought in later. Almost every witness, except members of the Sierra Club, and a few other strong conservation groups, felt that the evaluation should come first and then the primitive areas should be brought in.

This was effected by an amendment in committee in the House in the 87th Congress. It came under sharp attack by some of the conservation groups. It was an amendment which was proposed by more witnesses as being valuable to the passage of the bill than any other amendment that was offered by any group.

This has an impact, I can assure Senators, on the question whether or not a wilderness system will be created by legislation and will be adopted by the other body. If we can get this amendment adopted and a subsequent one which I will offer at a later time, we will have a chance of getting through Congress legislation creating a wilderness system.

I should like to make some points which I believe are very important. The first is with respect to the question of whether the Department of the Interior, as such, would have any objection to this kind of action. During the process of the hearings before the Senate subcommittee I asked the Secretary of the Interior whether he recalled saying he had no objection to this type of amendment. This is fairly important, and I would like to have order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Secretary of the Interior indicated that he had never made such a statement. I refer Senators to the hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior Affairs in the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress, at page 1170. This is the statement.

The first question is by me to the Secretary of the Interior:

I gather, Mr. Secretary, you would rather put everything—this means all the areas—and then eliminate, rather than start with what we think ought to be in and adding to it as the classification goes on.

Secretary UDALL. No. I thought I made it clear in my colloquy with Congressman RIVERS that I favored the other approach, except for the Forest Service wilderness area. I think this is a very clear-cut case. But I think we ought to start with a guideline and instruction from Congress that we have 10 years to make this review and to recommend what should go in, rather than saying put it in and then let us review to see whether it should come out. I think that is the wrong way to go about it.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Is that the Secretary of the Interior testifying?

Mr. DOMINICK. This is the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, testifying.

Mr. METCALF. He was testifying about forest areas?

Mr. DOMINICK. He was testifying about the primitive areas.

Mr. METCALF. He has no jurisdiction over primitive areas; it is the Secretary of Agriculture who has that jurisdiction.

Mr. DOMINICK. I understand. However, the Secretary of the Interior, who has a close connection with the whole wilderness system, and who works very well in most instances with the Secretary of Agriculture, in this particular phase of their operations, specifically said in the hearings, held May 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, 1962—I do not know which particular day this was touched on—that he favored the approach which was recommended in this particular amendment.

The other day, when he was before the committee, he said, in answer to my question about this testimony, that he did not so testify. Apparently his recollection was in error.

I bring this up because I believe it shows that after analysis of all the testimony which had been given before the other body and in its subcommittee during last year, on consideration of the bill, the Department of the Interior at that time thought the approach which is recommended by this amendment was a better approach than the one that is now in the bill.

I next refer to the recommendations in the report on "Outdoor Recreation for America."

On page 113 of this report, there appears:

> Recommendation 1 to 10: Primitive areas (class V) should be carefully selected and should be managed for the sole and unequivocal purpose for maintaining their primitive characteristics.

Just prior to that, the report states:

> Areas in this class—

Talking about primitive areas—

> are inspirational, esthetic, scientific, and cultural assets of the highest values. They, and they alone, satisfy the longing to leave behind for a time all contact with civilization.

I add, so do wilderness areas.

> Fortunately, they are a resource of which the country still has an abundant supply and which it can afford to preserve from other uses for the benefit of future generations. At the same time, it must be recognized that there are some areas which meet the physical requirements of this class but which for economic and social reasons are more valuable for some other purpose.

Mr. President, I have recited that language and placed it in the RECORD because it seems to me that rather than blanketing in a great area of primitive land, which amounts, according to committee print No. 26, as of August 31, 1962, to 7,852,958 acres—I observe what seems to be a difference in the amount of acreage between that shown in the RECORD and that in the committee print.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may explain the discrepancy?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The difference results from the fact that three primitive areas have been designated as wilderness by the Secretary of Agriculture between the time the Senate last considered the bill and the present time. This has caused a reduction in the amount of acreage presently in the primitive areas within the national forests. I think the correct current figure is a little in excess of 6 million acres.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Idaho for clearing up that point. This means that more acreage has gone into the wilderness area, does it not?

Mr. CHURCH. More acreage has gone into the wilderness area, and a large amount of land has also been restored to ordinary forest status for multiple use. The total extent of the wilderness system has been reduced somewhat by virtue of the surveys which have taken place in the past 2 years.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the point I seek to make again is that if the Senate adopts the amendment, it will nevertheless be putting into the wilderness system immediately, and without any review or reevaluation, 8,220,403 acres of land which are now classified as wilderness, wild, or canoe. We will also be saying that primitive areas comprising 6,098,532 acres will stay in that classification while they are being reevaluated during a period of 10 years to determine whether they will be brought within the wilderness system or will be held in regions where the primitive areas are located.

The recommendations of Governors will be obtained, as will the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. Those recommendations will be submitted to Congress. The recommendations provided in the bill as it is now written will go into effect unless either House of Congress vetoes the recommendations. It seems to me that that would be a logical and proper way to proceed. It is a way which I know would receive almost unanimous approval if the amendment were adopted. If we were to adopt this amendment and one more amendment, I believe there would not be a dissenting vote in this body against the bill.

With respect to the basic theory of whether we should blanket this huge area in immediately, and then try to take it out over a period of 10 years, Senators will recognize the pressure which we would be under to retain such land, because we have been in situations of this kind before. The pressures would be strong to keep the land in. Unless the other method is chosen, we shall simply be saying that we will take in all areas, having a total of more than 14 million acres, and locking them up so that only those people who have the physical capacity and the money either to explore it by foot or by organized pack trip can go in and have the use, availability, and enjoyment of this enormous area.

As I have said before, I believe this would be the logical procedure. The land is not classified at the moment as to its most valuable use. Under the amendment, it would be kept in the same condition in which it now is, and 10 years would be provided for a careful evaluation of each of the areas. Hearings would be held to determine their use in the areas involved, so that Congress could then determine what eventually would be done with the property.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Colorado has said that if the present amendment and the next amendment he proposes to offer were adopted, the Senate would approve this legislation by a unanimous vote. I do not agree. If this amendment and the next amendment are adopted, I shall vote against the bill, because I think the two amendments, taken together, would gut the bill utterly.

With respect to the pending amendment, I suggest that if it is adopted, we shall simply undo what we have just done. We have just rejected an amendment which would have left the wilderness system open to unlimited prospecting and unlimited mining for the next 15 years. Why did we reject that amendment? Because we recognized that it is not possible to establish a wilderness system and then not preserve it from violation; the two concepts are in contradiction. We cannot have a wilderness and then open it up, for 15 years, to uncontrolled commercial activity.

The pending amendment is a backdoor approach to accomplish the identical purpose, not during 15 years, but during 10 years. The amendment provides that the primitive areas in the national forests, which the bill incorporates into the wilderness system, shall be subject to a review which will occur over the next 10 years, to redefine the boundaries, to include permanently within the wilderness such parts of those primitive areas as are predominantly wilderness in character, and to exclude from the system those parts which are predominantly of a multiple-use value—whether for mining, lumber, or other commercial use.

The bill provides that the review shall take place during a period of 10 years. Resulting Presidential recommendations will be made, subject to a veto on the part of either the Senate or the House.

Now, the current amendment would leave the primitive areas outside the system until the reviews have taken place. That means that during the period of 10 years, while the reviews were actually being conducted in the field, the gates would be open to uncontrolled prospecting and mining. So the wilderness character of these areas could not be preserved during this 10-year period.

Mr. President, if the bill is a good bill, as I believe it to be; if its enactment would serve the public interest, as I believe it would; if it makes every reasonable allowance for mining activity within the wilderness that is consistent with the principle and purpose of the bill, as I am sure it does; then it is obviously wrong to accept the amendment, and is utterly inconsistent with the action the Senate has just taken.

I therefore urge the Senate to reject the amendment.

Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to be heard, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, having reserved the remainder of my time, I wish to make a brief rebuttal.

It does not seem to me that the Senator from Idaho has properly analyzed the amendment. It specifically holds in their present status and condition all primitive areas, while the review is being made. Consequently, there would not be any more wide-open infiltration of the areas—although such infiltration has been intimated by the Senator from Idaho—than there would be now within the primitive areas. As he has said from time to time in the committee, at this time not much is permitted to go on in the primitive areas. So we would not be changing that status at all; but we would be providing adequate time in which to determine whether these areas should or should not be locked up. The evaluation would be made after a hearing held in the area; and the local people, and also the Governor himself, could make statements at the hearing. Then the evaluation would be based on their recommendations; and it would be submitted to the President, and then it would be submitted by the President to Congress. Under the bill as it now stands, in order to overturn that recommendation, whatever it might be, Congress would have to veto the President's recommendation.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that we have included every possible safeguard to prevent the spoiling of these areas. We simply ask for time in which to ascertain what is in these areas, before they are locked up and before the general public is prevented from having access to them and is prevented from making use of them.

The bill is for the purpose of outdoor recreation; and special funds would be provided for this purpose, because the need for outdoor recreation is so great. Yet we know that historically not more than 2 percent of the people ever go into wilderness areas; and some of these areas may be needed for special purposes. The need will be determined as a result of the surveys, and the determination will be subject to being dealt with by Congress. But it is important that this opportunity be preserved, so that these areas may be dealt with in this way.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

On the question of the adoption of the amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If the Senator from Texas were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MONRONEY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have voted "nay." I have a pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is detained on official business.

The respective pairs of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] have been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 42 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Bartlett
Bible
Carlson
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Gruening
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Saltonstall
Thurmond
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—61

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Beall
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Miller
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Allott
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Cooper
Curtis
Edmondson
Goldwater
Javits
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
Metcalf
Monroney
Robertson
Simpson
Sparkman
Tower

So amendment No. 34 was rejected.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up amendment 37 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 20, it is proposed to strike the words "restrictions and".

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during the course of the committee action, when this amendment was offered, I resisted it because I did not know what effect the use of the words "restrictions and" would have on the Taylor Grazing Act, title 43, section 315, and the following. The headnotes in the Taylor Grazing Act provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to impose restrictions, and down through the various sections of that act there are also provisions for restrictions.

Since that time I have had an opportunity to make some research into this question, and I find that the term "regulation" and the term "restriction" are frequently used as synonymous. For instance, "regulation," according to Webster's Dictionary, means:

> A regulating principle or law; specifically a rule or restriction prescribed and enforced by constituted authority for the sake of order, uniformity, discipline, etc.; as the regulations of a school or society.

"Restriction" means:

> That which restricts; a limitation; a qualification; a regulation which restricts or restrains; as, to make restrictions; new restrictions for hunters.

The use of the term "regulation" in a statute is very comprehensive. *City of*

Madison v. *So. Wisconsin Ry. Co.*, 146 NW., 492,500; 156 Wisconsin 352.

In the case of *Stone* v. *Cray*, 89 N.H. 483, 200 A. 517, the court said: "Restrictions can be embraced in regulations." It was that court that talked about the legislative "language of redundancy and synonyms." And many cases hold that where we indulge in this legislative tautology and say "rules and regulations," "regulate and control," or "regulations and restrictions," the words are synonymous.

The point is made that use of the word "restriction" would permit arbitrary and discriminatory action on the part of the Secretary and of course that is to be avoided. Under the general and accepted meaning of the word "regulation" it gives the Secretary adequate authority to make the regulations that are necessary to carry out the intent of the act; namely, the preservation of the area.

In the course of a short research on this question I found a case in which authorization to regulate sale of liquor carried with it authority to restrict sales in certain areas. Authorization to regulate traffic permitted a restriction of truck and commercial traffic to certain streets, et cetera.

I have come to the conclusion that when one uses the words "restrictions" and "regulations" together they are synonymous, and the cases so hold; and that it is only a matter of redundancy to use an additional word. Therefore, there would be plenty of authority in the hands of the Secretary to impose, if necessary, grazing regulations if the amendment were agreed to.

Lastly, of course, under the provisions of the Constitution, the Congress has authority to take care of the property of the United States under such regulations as it may care to make.

The word "regulations" is good enough for me. I would suggest that the Senator in charge of the bill accept the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I concur in the remarks and the interpretation made by the Senator from Montana. I am willing to accept the amendment. I suggest a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back their remaining time?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 37.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 36 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 2, it is proposed to strike out the word "President" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "appropriate Secretary."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this is a simple amendment both in language and in meaning. If I may have the attention of Senators for a few moments, I think we can dispose of it also by a voice vote.

I strongly urge that the Senator in charge of the bill think carefully about the amendment.

The language as it now prevails in the bill would give to only the President the power to authorize prospecting or mining or the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water conservation lines, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, and only when he determined that this would better serve the interests of the United States.

This is particularly important in the water development field. That is the point I am trying to make.

What the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has offered, in conjunction with myself, is a provision which would simply substitute the words "appropriate Secretary" for the word "President."

I think we are all aware of the great burdens which fall on the President of the United States. On the other hand, the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, is specifically designated by Congress to deal with the problems we shall be facing in respect to this particular provision.

It seems to me only proper tc permit those who are best qualified on this particular subject to make the decision.

I am relatively positive that no President, regardless of who he may be, would make such a decision without a recommendation of the appropriate Secretary. Therefore, why not take some of the burden off the President and put it on the Secretaries who know more about the subject?

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] such time as he may require.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this question was discussed in committee. The reason we left the language in as it is in the bill is that there are certain functions which do not relate to a Secretary, appropriate or otherwise. It is all very well to say, "Leave it to the Secretary, and not the President," but what are we to do when the Federal Power Commission is involved? The Federal Power Commission is involved in transmission lines.

While I agree with the Senator from Colorado that the President would take the advice of the appropriate Secretary when the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior were involved, for example, other departments may be involved. I think it is wise to leave in the word "President" rather than say "appropriate Secretary."

I hope the amendment will be defeated, because while we know the Federal Power Commission is one agency that may be involved, it is also true that other agencies may be involved. I would dislike to reach the point where there was no "appropriate Secretary," and no action could be taken.

The Senator from Colorado has correctly pointed out that the President would take the advice of the appropriate Secretary, but I believe the language should remain "the President." I hope the amendment will be defeated.

I suggest that the remainder of the time be yielded back and that there be a voice vote on the amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 36.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not think there is any provision as to whether or not the time for the quorum call be taken out of the existing time allotted, but I ask unanimous consent that the time for taking the quorum call be not charged to either side.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum temporarily, and yield to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out lines 19 through 25 on page 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (1) Within the wilderness system the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become established shall be permitted to continue subject to such regulations as the appropriate Secretary finds necessary. In addition, such measures may be taken as are necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such regulations as the appropriate Secretary finds necessary.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I believe this amendment merely ties down the language a little more neatly. It conforms with a previously adopted amendment changing the word "restrictions" to "regulations" and also the word "conditions" to "regulations," so the Secretary will actually be issuing regulations.

It also provides the mandatory word "shall" rather than the word "may," under the conditions set forth in the paragraph of the bill.

I have discussed the amendment with the Senator in charge of the bill. I understand there is no objection to it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa give us a moment to take another look at it?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there is no intention to inhibit the effectiveness of the bill, but I believe, on the basis of my experience in working on this particular bill in the previous session, when I had the honor of being a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that it will meet the requirements and desires a little better than the present language.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we have reviewed the language of the amendment. We see no particular objection to it. The purpose of the original language was to preserve intact the practice, wherever airplanes or motorboats have been used to go into primitive areas, that is, wherever the practice has been established. The Senator from Iowa believes his language makes more definite the intent of the committee. We have no objection to accepting it. We find the language unobjectionable.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. I suggest that a voice vote be taken on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOMINICK. What is the present status of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. Let me say, in conjunction with this request, that I understand the majority leader said that the time taken for a quorum call would not come out of the time of either side.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I did not hear the announcement, but I would agree to such an arrangement.

I ask unanimous consent that that be done, if there is any question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up amendment 32 and ask for the yeas and nays on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> (f) Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment Congress approves a concurrent resolution declaring itself in favor of such recommendation: *Provided,* That, in the case of a recommendation covering two or more of the areas covered or parts thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I approach the discussion of the pending amendment with some hesitation, only because I am afraid I cannot do as much justice to it as Senator ALLOTT could do if he were here. It is extremely unfortunate, in my opinion, that he is unable to be with us today. Obviously he is unable to because of a death in his family.

This is probably the most important amendment we will consider in connection with the pending bill. In fact, I am sure it is. This does not involve merely the bill; it involves also the concept of whether Congress will retain affirmative control over the public lands of the United States, or whether it will simply retain the veto power over the exercise of judgment by the Secretaries of the various departments that are involved.

It is worthwhile noting that with respect to almost all phases of activity connected with the Department of Agriculture or with the Department of the Interior, which are involved in this particular bill, before public lands can be classified for a particular purpose, or used in a different way, affirmative action must be taken by Congress.

I brought this up yesterday in the process of the discussion, and I pointed out that with respect to any reclamation project in the western area of the country, we must first authorize the project, after it has been investigated by the Department, and then we appropriate funds for it.

I pointed out that in the case of setting aside of public lands for national parks, Congress determines the degree of land and the amount of land that will be included within national parks, and does it upon the recommendation of the Secretary, and following hearings all the way through.

I pointed out, and I believe it should be repeated today, that in subsection (h) of the pending bill, on page 11, there is this provision:

> ADDITION OR ELIMINATION NOT PROVIDED FOR IN THIS ACT
>
> (h) The addition of any area to, or the elimination of any area from, the wilderness system which is not specifically provided for under the provisions of this Act shall be made only after specific affirmative authorization by law for such addition or elimination.

In the Park System, as in the wilderness bill itself, we have the provision that additions to it and eliminations from it shall be by affirmative authorization.

In connection with reclamation projects, affirmative action is required.

I might say that I do not know of an instance in which Congress does not retain affirmative control, except in two cases; the first is in the Reorganization Act, which is merely a reorganization of the executive branch. It does not involve our basic land policy. The other is in the pending bill as it is now proposed.

The defense for the present situation, that the recommendation of the executive branch becomes final unless Congress vetoes it, is that this is the only way in which we can be sure of getting a vote on every recommendation that is made.

I would say that although this statement has been made, it is begging the basic issue. Obviously, we can get a vote on any subject if we fight for it long enough. We have done that in connection with civil rights legislation, which has been a subject of some concern to this body on many occasions. However, civil rights legislation has come up and has been passed.

We have done it in the House. There are a good many methods by which bills can be brought before the other body for some kind of action. It could be true here. To say that we could not get a vote on these matters, because so and so or such and such a thing would not do something or take certain action, is not dealing with the basic issue. It is finding an expedient and using it in the face of a principle which is the very subject of this amendment. That principle, I repeat, is the question of whether or not Congress will retain its affirmative control over the public lands and the public land policy. What would this involve? What would it mean? It does not mean as much as appears on the surface except with respect to the principle that is involved.

We shall be blanketing in automatically all wilderness, wild, and canoe area—8,220,403 acres. That acreage will be blanketed into the wilderness system regardless of what happens.

Under the bill, we shall be including initially 6,098,532 acres of area classified as primitive. This area will be subjected to review by the Secretary over a period of 10 years. He will submit his recommendations to Congress. Under the bill as it is now written, those recommendations will become final unless either House of Congress vetoes them. Under the provision as proposed in the amendment, if adopted, those recommendations would be made to the committees, and the committees would determine whether action should be taken upon them or whether it should not.

In addition, there is the National Park System, which must be reevaluated under the provisions of the bill. The National Park System comprises 22,560,000 acres, all of which would be subjected to review in connection with the wilderness system to determine which portions ought to go into wilderness and which would remain in national park status. Each of these areas would be automatically taken within the wilderness system or eliminated from it upon the recommendation of the Secretary, unless Congress vetoed the proposal.

It seems to me that Congress ought to retain its control over the National Park

System. We should say that we, as representatives of the people of the country, will determine for ourselves whether a certain portion of this system should be placed within the wilderness system.

The national wildlife refuges comprise 28,554,014 acres. These are public lands that belong to all the people. They should be reviewed by the representatives of the people to determine whether they should be included in the wilderness system, or whether they should be locked up and not used, or whether they should remain in the national wildlife refuges or national parks, where they will be open to the people who use those areas.

I repeat what I have said before: I should like nothing better than to be in a position to vote for a legislative wilderness system. However, I am not willing to do so on the basis of a compromise with the principle involved in the amendment. The principle involved in the amendment is whether Congress will retain control over the National Park System, the national wildlife refuges, the primitive areas, and the wilderness system itself, or whether it will simply dispose of such control and keep only a right of veto. Certainly a right of veto is useful. It is more than we now have; I am willing to admit that. But when we have a proposal under which Congress can regain the necessary power over the public lands of the country which was given to it originally, it seems to me we ought to take what we can put into the law for a fruitful purpose, so that we will have the opportunity to decide, after hearings, which portions of the public lands will be included within which portions of the particular systems concerned.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado. I doubt if there is a Senator who is more in favor of preserving a segment of our country in its natural state, for the enjoyment of present and future generations, than I. I can think of few things more wasteful and thoughtless than to destroy all the primeval areas in our Nation, so that future generations could never see for themselves what this continent was like centuries ago. But there are honest differences of opinion as to the best way to accomplish this purpose.

I wish to speak in support of the pending amendment to the wilderness bill, an amendment which I am privileged to cosponsor with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and other Senators. I think the amendment is a good one; in fact, I think it is vital to the success of any wilderness bill.

The theory and practice of American constitutional government has been that Congress shall pass measures and the Executive shall have the veto power, with Congress retaining the power to override such a veto by a two-thirds vote. Under the pending bill, as reported by the committee, this process would be reversed, because the Executive would make the recommendations, leaving to Congress the power to veto.

The process established by the committee bill is not in accordance with the usual congressional procedures, but follows the outline set up by the Reorganization Act of 1947, which relates to changes in the executive branch of the Government, not to methods of handling public lands owned by the Federal Government.

Those who claim that the amendment would harm the overall wilderness bill are in a sense indicting our traditional legislative process. In the past, Congress has acted, without any undue hardship, on many pieces of legislation similar to those which would be involved in the approval of future wilderness areas.

The present congressional procedures relative to natural resources development are the time-honored processes. At present, all such actions are taken by affirmative action. Congress must affirmatively act to include within the wilderness system all lands not now designated for specific uses; Congress must take affirmative action to create national parks from forest lands; and Congress must take specific action to authorize reclamation projects which are in the public lands system. I cannot understand why there is any justification for making a congressional procedure for wilderness areas the sole exception to the regular process of dealing with public lands.

The procedure established by the committee bill is based on the outline of the Reorganization Act of 1947. This act grew out of the Hoover report and was passed to give the President more of an opportunity to reorganize the Government according to what he felt was necessary. That is not the same as dealing with public lands. Here we are dealing with the fundamental responsibility over the assets of the United States. These assets belong to all the people.

When Congress delegated this present power to the Secretary of Agriculture, I believe it was negligent of its duties. I hope that today we will take back that power.

If the attention of the whole Congress were focused on each individual area proposed for wilderness by holding congressional hearings, there would be much more assurance that this land would be properly classified for its highest use. I understand that the bill calls for congressional hearings, but only if resolutions have been submitted to disapprove the President's recommendations. If no such resolutions are submitted, no hearings will be held, and the President's recommendations will become law.

The dedication of any area to a single use, whatever the purpose, is premature until it is justified by thorough study. Congressional hearings would certainly afford an opportunity for more of such study. Who knows, at this time, what hidden mineral wealth, for instance, might be found under these lands? Fifty years ago, not only was the need for uranium and its use unknown, but the actual metal itself existed in obscurity. Who is to say what unknown metal will be vital to the survival of this country in future years? How can such ores be found in wilderness areas if such areas cannot be prospected by modern methods?

S. 4 would permanently set aside for exclusive and extremely limited wilderness use some 3 million acres of public lands in Idaho. Much of this acreage has never been objectively evaluated for multiple-use potential. Its mineral potential is virtually unknown. Some of it has not even been surveyed.

I urge the the Senate to approve the amendment, because I believe it is vital to the bill. I believe we should have a wilderness system to preserve some primeval areas of our country. I believe that to do this we must pass a wilderness bill. But I am not willing to vote for a wilderness bill which does not protect the people of the country from the precipitate actions of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior. I want a wilderness bill which will restore to us the traditional congressional review and controls which were set aside by earlier congressional action.

I urge Senators to support the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], by myself, and by other Senators.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Idaho for what I believe is a pertinent and statesmanlike presentation concerning this problem. Does the Senator agree that in this amendment we are dealing with an extraordinarily important concept?

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Indeed, I do.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Allott amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Colorado and cosponsored by 14 other Senators which would require the Congress to act affirmatively upon any recommendations made by the President relating to the inclusion of additional wilderness areas. This amendment merely provides that the Congress shall rightfully perform the duties with which it is charged under the Constitution.

Each of us must take his responsibilities most seriously in performance of his legislative duties. We have been sent here by the people of our individual States to carry on the public business.

I, for one, consider the provision of article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the Constitution overwhelming importance in the consideration of the legal question involved in the situation at hand. That provision grants to the Congress the right and the power to dispose of and make regulations with regard to the public lands belonging to the United States. It does not confer any powers upon the executive branch of the Government or officials representing departments and agencies of the executive.

It is our function to make the laws of this country. The Congress of the

United States should have affirmative control over the manner in which the public lands are administered and developed. The Congress should not delegate such authority to agencies of the Government which are not directly responsible to the will of the people as expressed by their elected representatives.

Under the provisions of the bill, as recommended by the committee, Congress would retain only a small measure of control. If the Congress did not approve of the President's recommendations, it could take action indicating its displeasure. This, of course, is a negative approach to the problem, and does not in any way keep the control of the public lands of the United States where it properly belongs—in the hands of the Congress.

In connection with the bill before us, no sound reason for the abdication of our legislative responsibilities in this area is presented. All too often, we have permitted the departments and the other executive agencies to make legislative regulations or to take other actions which constitute legal action having the full force and effect of legislative enactments by the Congress. We are constantly diminishing the effective control and force of the Congress in those areas. Once such powers have been given, it is rare that they are ever again recaptured by the Congress.

In a search for precedent, we can look to the case of Newhall against Sanger, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1875. The Court held that "the Government holds public lands in trust for the people, to be disposed of so as to promote the settlement and ultimate prosperity of the States in which they are situated."

Thus, we see that Congress is the trustee, and that it is the obligation and the duty of Congress to determine the use of our public lands in such ways that the greatest benefits from those lands accrue to the maximum number of our citizens.

There is no sound, acceptable reason why we should enact legislation which will delegate our obligation to the executive agencies, under a provision which severely limits the amount of control which Congress can exercise. The committee bill would shift the responsibility to such an extent that we could not then properly retain our responsibilities and would function as trustees for the citizens in developing the public lands. I, for one, cannot agree to abdicate this congressional responsibility, which rests upon us under the Constitution.

The voice of the public can always be heard in Congress. I am not satisfied that the voice of the public will be adequately or satisfactorily heard by executive officials. I do not believe that we can say today what will be the most effective use of the public lands for any appreciable time in the future.

I do not believe that executive officials can better predict such future uses. They are in a less favorable position to protect the interests of our citizens in the use of the public lands. Elected officials are closer to the people, and are responsible, and responsive to them.

This Nation became great during the period of westward expansion. The West is still being opened. We may yet find much in the way of new products and new uses for our natural resources, including our timber, our mines, our water, and our power. Many great industries have been built upon the idea of the multiple-use concept of public land. These industries have contributed to a greater gross national product and to a higher standard of living for our country.

I favor the wilderness use of the public lands, but I think that it is only one type of use to which these lands may be put. This use should be balanced with other uses. We can foresee the day when we shall need to make use of untapped natural resources for our expanding population and for its civilian and industrial needs.

It is my opinion that Members of Congress must ever be alert to exercise properly their legislative responsibilities. Unless we are willing to face up to those responsibilities, Congress will come into a period of decline in its proper functions and into disrepute with the public.

In that connection, Mr. President, I may say that in books, in magazine articles, and by commentators generally, there is currently being expressed considerable criticism of the Congress for functioning under outmoded rules and procedures. Certainly those critics who are Members of the Congress should support this amendment, because it will enable the Congress to retain the powers delegated to it under the Constitution. Even if there are outmoded procedures in the Congress, the solution should not be the derogation or the limitation of those powers. In that event, the powers rightfully belonging to Congress would be exercised by others.

So, Mr. President, let us retain and exercise our powers, as envisioned in and granted under the Constitution. Let us not surrender them.

It is my sincere hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be adopted. The control which it seeks to achieve by affirmative action by Congress is necessary and essential to the proper carrying out of congressional responsibilities. The amendment seeks to prevent a clear and repugnant abdication of congressional responsibility.

I am grateful to the Senator from Colorado for allowing this much time to me.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the junior Senator from Colorado for his lucid and straightforward presentations during debate on this bill. The sad event of the death of Senator ALLOTT's mother made it impossible for him to be here for today's discussion of a measure in which he has an abiding interest and concern.

Senator DOMINICK has been a splendid advocate for his colleague. His sharp, analytical approach has been of great help to all of us here in the chamber. I heartily commend him for an outstanding presentation and suggest that the Senate is indeed fortunate to have men of his ability among its membership.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I sincerely thank the Senator from Nebraska for the very, very fine statement he has made. If I may say so, it bears out the recognition dinner which was given him a few days ago in Nebraska, which I had the honor to attend.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am grateful for the attendance there of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Nebraska that in the hearings before our committee there was specific testimony by Mr. Cline, who is a lawyer and is chairman of the Federal Legislative Committee of the Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Association. On pages 48 and 49 of the hearing record we find that, after quoting clause 2 of section 3, of the Constitution—the part of the Constitution which grants to Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, he said:

> What attitude should Congress have in exercising this power? The Supreme Court as early as 1875 in the case of *Newhall* v. *Sanger* held:
>
> "The Government holds public land, in trust for the people, to be disposed of so as to promote the settlement and ultimate prosperity of the States in which they are situated."
>
> In my filed statement there are further cases cited. Thus, under the Constitution, Congress acts as trustee in determining the use of public lands for the greatest benefit of maximum number. This means that the best management of public lands should be determined affirmatively by Congress giving due regard to whatever use or combination of uses offers the greatest good to the greatest number.
>
> Accordingly, we believe that Congress should retain its full authority in order to fulfill its responsibilities as trustee of the public domain. In doing so, it should require the various governmental agencies supporting particular uses to prove which use or uses which will result in the greatest benefit to the maximum number. Such use should not be determined in a proceeding before an executive agency in which the stated presumption is that exclusive wilderness use is the highest use. The justification for any proposed use should be shown to Congress for its decision.

Mr. President, it seems to me this is the basic principle with which we are faced in connection with the amendment. It is the basic principle which is before us in connection with so many other legislative propositions. In all the cases of which I have awareness—including, as I have said, our action on national parks; our additions to the wilderness system, as proposed in this bill; our action on reclamation projects; and our action in regard to almost any phase of the disposition of the public lands—that action has been through affirmative acts of Congress.

Therefore, I cannot see either the justification or the need for shifting these around, so that the Executive will initiate and the Congress will veto. Certainly that would be a far cry from the system under which our Government was created.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the arguments that have been presented on behalf of this amendment. I must say that I fail to comprehend them; for either the committee thoroughly misunderstands the present status of the law, or, I respectfully suggest, those who support the amendment misunderstand it. The arguments have been varied, but they have all related to one theme. The junior Senator from Colorado has said that the principle behind his amendment is whether Congress should retain control over the public lands. Other arguments have been advanced to the effect that the bill would not protect the people against precipitate actions by the Secretary of Agriculture. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska has even ventured that the bill represents some kind of abdication of congressional responsibility.

Such arguments are utterly incomprehensible to me.

I remind Senators that the amendment deals with primitive areas in the national forests. That is the question at issue. The present law delegates to the Secretary of Agriculture all the authority to create these primitive areas, to determine their boundaries, to add new areas, and to expand existing areas. If there ever was any abdication of congressional responsibility, it occurred years ago when all that power was removed from the Congress and placed in the executive agencies downtown.

The people of Idaho need not be reminded of the facts, for in this year alone the Secretary of Agriculture has established a wilderness area in our State—the Selway-Bitterroot area—which contains more than 1 million acres of public land.

He proposes to establish another wilderness area in the Sawtooth Mountains that will comprise approximately 200,000 acres of land. Does it require any congressional surveillance for him to do that? Is there any requirement in the law that his recommendation must first come to Congress for any kind of review, let alone approval? It does not. He now has the authority to set aside these enormous areas, and to designate them as wilderness, merely by the stroke of his pen.

So, Mr. President, what sense does it make to indict the bill as some kind of abdication of congressional responsibility when years ago all the authority was transferred to the executive agencies?

If we are really interested in restoring congressional responsibility, if we are really interested in talking sense about this bill, I suggest that one of the most powerful arguments that can be made for the measure is that it undertakes to restore to the Congress authority which we long ago delegated away.

What would the bill do? In the first place, it would provide, with respect to the areas that are presently being administered as wilderness—wilderness areas, canoe areas, wild areas, and primitive areas—that they shall comprise the wilderness system.

As for the primitive areas, there will be a review over the next 10 years to determine what portions of the primitive areas will remain in the system. But, as regards any new addition, in years to come, to the wilderness system, the bill specifically provides that not a single new acre may be added to the system without an affirmative act of Congress. This provision completely restores the congressional prerogative with respect to any future additions to the wilderness system.

As to the primitive areas that for 20 years have been administered as wilderness, are now being administered as wilderness, and are made a part of the system subject to review, a veto is provided, so that any Presidential recommendation for permanently including any one of such primitive areas, or any portion of it, in the wilderness system, is subject to the veto of either House of Congress.

The committee has included this kind of provision for a reason. We know that the provisions of the Reorganization Act guarantee that any Member of this body, or the other body, who may object to a given Presidential recommendation, will have an opportunity, if the procedures in the bill are adopted, to bring his objection to a vote in the Senate or the House, as the case may be. The provisions of the Reorganization Act assure each Member of an opportunity to bring his objection to the floor and to have it acted upon.

Is there any Senator at all acquainted with the procedures of Congress who for one minute believes that if this amendment were agreed to, we would not then have the risk of having resolutions for approving Presidential recommendations bottled up in committee so that they would never reach the floor for a vote?

Those who desire to reestablish really effective congressional control are for the provisions of the bill. Adoption of the amendment would water down the restoration of congressional control, for, in many cases, resolutions would be bottled up and never get to the floor.

We strongly urge that the amendment be rejected upon the ground, first, that the most effective way to restore congressional control with respect to those areas that are to be reviewed is through the adoption of the veto procedure.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have a report printed at this point in the Record. The report lists the provisions of Federal law relating to programs or activities which become effective if not disapproved or rejected by Congress within a prescribed time. I make the request in order to make it absolutely clear that the procedures of the bill are not novel, that they are well known to the Congress, and that they are in accordance with well-established practices in the Congress.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho whether he knows that any of these deal with any public lands proposals.

Mr. CHURCH. The reports that I now ask to have printed appear in the hearings beginning on page 172. I believe the Senator will find, in the transcript of the hearings, exactly what it is I should like to include in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Provisions of Federal Law Relating to Programs or Activities Which Became Effective if Not Disapproved or Rejected by Congress Within a Prescribed Time

(Note.—The following list does not purport to give every such provision, but is, in general, representative of those appearing in the Federal statutes.)

Year 1943. Act of July 7, as amended (44 U.S.C. §§ 369–372): The Administrator of General Services is required to submit to Congress lists and schedules of Government records said to be lacking in preservation value, for examination by a joint congressional committee. If the committee fails to report on any list within 10 days prior to adjournment of the session, the Administrator may empower the agency having custody of such records to dispose of them in accordance with prescribed regulations.

Year 1945. Reorganization Act of December 20 (59 Stat. 616 § 6; not in code): Reorganization plans submitted by the President to Congress were to take effect at the expiration of 60 days of continuous session after submission, unless a concurrent resolution was passed stating that Congress did not favor the plan. (This act has been superseded by the Reorganization Act of 1949.)

Year 1946. Act of August 7 (60 Stat. 898, sec. 6; not in Code): The Secretary of the Navy is required to transmit to Congress proposals to dispose of obsolete naval vessels, and if Congress, after 60 days of continuous session, does not express its disapproval, the transfer of the vessels shall take effect.

The Secretary is also authorized to dispose of captured or condemned ordnance, etc., if Congress after being informed of the proposed disposal fails to disapprove within 30 days.

Year 1947. Act of December 30 (50 App. U.S.C., sec. 1917): Programs for production of foods in non-European foreign countries which are to be carried out by the Commodity Credit Corporation must be submitted to Congress and if not disapproved by concurrent resolution within 60 days, may become effective.

Year 1948. Act of June 25, as amended (28 U.S.C., secs. 2072, 2073, 2074): Rules of civil procedure for district courts, admiralty rules for district courts, and rules for review of decisions of the Tax Court prescribed by the Supreme Court of the United States shall not take effect until the expiration of 90 days after they have been reported to Congress.

Year 1949. Reorganization Act of June 20, as amended (5 U.S.C., sec. 133a–4): Reorganization plans submitted by the President to Congress shall take effect upon the expiration of 60 days of continuous session, after date submitted, unless either House passes a resolution stating its disfavor of the plan.

Year 1956. Small Reclamation Projects Act of August 6, as amended (43 U.S.C., sec. 422 (d)): No appropriation shall be made for financial assistance in the development of reclamation projects, prior to 60 days from the date the Secretary of the Interior submitted the proposed project to Congress, and then only if within the 60 days neither the House nor the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee disapproves the proposed project.

Year 1958. Department of Defense Reorganization Act of August 6, (5 U.S.C., sec. 171a(c)): In order to provide for a more efficient administration of the Department, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to take appropriate steps to provide for the transfer, abolition, or consolidation of functions. However, no function shall be substantially affected until 30 days after the proposed action has been reported to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. If during such 30-day period either committee reports a resolution stating that the proposed action should be rejected, it shall not become effective until 40 days from the date of the resolution, and then only if such resolution has not been passed by the House to which it has been reported.

Year 1959. Act of June 25, as amended (10 U.S.C. § 2662): The Secretary of a military department may not enter into transactions relating to the acquisition, use, or disposal of real property until after the expiration of 30 days from the date upon which a report of the proposed transaction is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Year 1960. Act of June 3 (75 Stat. 157 § 2; not in Code): Act authorizing construction of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project in California provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report to Congress upon agreements entered into, and he shall not commence construction thereon for 90 days from the date of his report.

Year 1960. River and Harbor Act of July 14 (74 Stat. 480–503): Under this Act a 60-day period is required to lapse after submission of reports to Congress, before work can be started (if within the period Congress does not disapprove) on such projects as—

(a) Modification of Pascagoula Harbor, Miss. (p. 481);

(b) Construction of sea-wall to protect against tidal waves, etc., Hilo Harbor, How. (p. 483);

(c) Improvement of Missouri River between Sioux City and the Mouth (p. 485);

(d) Construction of flood protection project in Gering and Mitchell Valleys, Nebraska (p. 495); and

(e) Project for flood protection at Sioux Falls, S. D. (p. 495).

Year 1961. Arms Control and Disarmament Act of September 26 (Public Law 87–297 § 47 (b)): Proposals to transfer certain activities or facilities of a Government agency to the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency must be submitted by the President to Congress; and if, within the first period of 60 calendar days of regular session following receipt by Congress, neither House has adopted a resolution opposing it, the transfer will be made.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of the disposition of reorganization plans under the Reorganization Act of 1949. I do so to show how the veto procedure has been utilized in the past by the Congress.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Disposition of reorganization plans under Reorganization Act of 1949

	Approved	Rejected
1949	6	2
1950	20	7
1951	1	0
1952	2	3
1953	10	
1954	2	
1955	0	0
1956	0	2
1957	1	0
1958	1	0
1959	0	1
Total	43	15

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1961.

To Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

From: American Law Division.

Subject: Sundry questions concerning the Reorganization Act of 1949.

(Attention of Mr. Stong.)

I. Which plans have become effective?

A. Reorganization Plans of 1949:

1. No. 2, Labor Department, 14 F.R. 5225, 63. Stat. 1065.

2. No. 3, Post Office Department, 14 F.R. 5225, 63 Stat. 1066.

3. No. 4, Executive Office of the President, 14 F.R. 5227, 63 Stat. 1067.

4. No. 5, Civil Service Commission, 14 F.R. 5227, 63 Stat. 1067.

5. No. 6, Maritime Commission, United States, 14 F.R. 5228, 63 Stat. 1069.

6. No. 7, Public Roads Administration, 14 F.R. 5228, 63 Stat. 1070.

B. Reorganization Plans of 1950:

1. No. 2, Justice Department, 15 F.R. 3173, 64 Stat. 1261.

2. No. 3, Interior Department, 15 F.R. 3174, 64 Stat. 1262.

3. No. 5, Commerce Department, 15 F.R. 3174, 64 Stat. 1263.

4. No. 6, Labor Department, 15 F.R. 3174, 64 Stat. 1263.

5. No. 8, Federal Trade Commission, 15 F.R. 3175, 64 Stat. 1264.

6. No. 9, Federal Power Commission, 15 F.R. 3175, 64 Stat. 1265.

7. No. 10, Securities and Exchange Commission, 15 F.R. 3175, 64 Stat. 1265.

8. No. 13, Civil Aeronautics Board, 15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1266.

9. No. 14, Labor Standards Enforcement, 15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267.

10. No. 15, Alaska and Virgin Islands Public Works, 15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267.

11. No. 16, Certain education and health functions, 15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1268.

12. No. 17, Public works advance planning and other functions, 15 F.R. 3177, 64 Stat. 1269.

13. No. 18, Building and space management functions, 15 F.R. 3177, 64 Stat. 1270.

14. No. 19, Employees' Compensation functions, 15 F.R. 3178, 64 Stat. 1271.

15. No. 20, Statutes at Large and other matters, 15 F.R. 3178, 64 Stat. 1272.

16. No. 21, Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Board, 15 F.R. 3178, 64 Stat. 1273.

17. No. 22, Federal National Mortgage Association, 15 F.R. 4365, 64 Stat. 1277.

18. No. 23, Loans for factory built houses, 15 F.R. 4365, 64 Stat. 1279.

19. No. 25, National Security Resources Board, 15 F.R. 4565, 64 Stat. 1280.

20. No. 26, Treasury Department, 15 F.R. 4935, 64 Stat. 1280.

C. Reorganization Plans of 1951:

1. No. 1, Reconstruction Finance Organization, 16 F.R. 3690, 65 Stat. 773.

D. Reorganization Plans of 1952:

1. No. 1, Internal Revenue Bureau, 17 F.R. 2243, 66 Stat. 823.

2. No. 5, Government of District of Columbia, 63 Stat. 203.

E. Reorganization Plans of 1953:

1. No. 1, Health, Education, and Welfare Department, 18 F.R. 2053, 67 Stat. 631.

2. No. 2, Agriculture Department, 18 F.R. 3219, 67 Stat. 633.[1]

3. No. 3, Office of Defense Mobilization, 18 F.R. 3375, 67 Stat. 634.

4. No. 4, Justice Department, 18 F.R. 3577, 67 Stat. 636.

5. No. 5, Export-Import Bank of Washington, 18 F.R. 3741, 67 Stat. 637.

6. No. 6, Defense Department, 18 F.R. 3743, 67 Stat. 638.

7. No. 7, Foreign Operations Administration, 18 F.R. 4541, 67 Stat. 639.

8. No. 8, United States Information Agency, 18 F.R. 4542, 67 Stat. 642.

9. No. 9, Council of Economic Advisers, 18 F.R. 4543, 67 Stat. 644.

10. No. 10, Air Carriers, payments to, 18 F.R. 4543, 67 Stat. 644 (Repealed by Public Law 85–726, title XIV, sec. 1401(c), August 23, 1958, 72 Stat. 806).

F. Reorganization Plans of 1954:

1. No. 1, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, 19 F.R. 3985, 68 Stat. 1279.

2. No. 2, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, liquidation of certain affairs of, 19 F.R. 3986, 68 Stat. 1280.

G. Reorganization Plans of 1955: none.

H. Reorganization Plans of 1956: none.

I. Reorganization Plans of 1957:

1. No. 1, Abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, 22 F. R. 4633, 71 Stat. 647.

J. Reorganization Plans of 1958:

1. No., Civilian Mobilization, 23 F. R. 4991, 72 Stat. 1797.

K. Reorganization Plans of 1959: none.

(5 U.S.C. § 133z–3. (b) No provision contained in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is transmitted to the Congress before June 1, 1961. (June 20, 1949, ch. 226, title I, § 5, 63 Stat. 205; Feb. 11, 1953, ch. 3, 67 Stat. 4; Mar. 25, 1955, ch. 16, 69 Stat. 14; Sept. 4, 1957, Pub. L. 85–286, § 1, 71 Stat. 611).

(See Public Law 87–18, April 17, 1961).

II. Which plans were rejected by the Congress?

(5 U.S.C. § 133z–4. (a) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such sixty-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan).

A. Reorganization Plans of 1949:

1. No. 1, Department of Welfare (S. Res. 147—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949.)

Introduced by Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Taft, and Mr. Hunt; referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 8, page 10399).

Reported back (S. Rept. 851) (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 8, page 10936).

Minority views (S. Rept. 851, pt. 2) (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 8, page 11023).

Remarks on (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 8, page 11098).

Individual views (S. Rept. 851, pt. 3) (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 8, page 11237).

Debated (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 9, page 11520).

Passed Senate (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 9, page 11561).

2. No. 8, Department of Defense (H.R. 5632 passed in lieu of (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 8, page 11288 et seq.).

B. Reorganization Plans of 1950:

1. No. 1, Comptroller of the Currency.

(S. Res. 246—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950.

Introduced by Mr. Robertson; referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 4, page 4446).

Reported back (S. Rept. 1518) (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 5, page 5675).

Debated and passed Senate (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 5, page 6891).

2. No. 4, Department of Agriculture.

(S. Res. 263—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950.

---

[1] Fountain motion to discharge No. 2 was rejected June 3, 1953, by the House 128 to 261, with 41 not voting.

Introduced by Mr. Holland, Mr. Schoeppel, Mr. Johnston of South Carolina, and Mr. Thye; referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 4, page 5560).

Reported back (H. Rept. 1566) with minority views (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 5, page 7065).

Debated and passed Senate (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 6, page 7225).

3. No. 7, Interstate Commerce Commission (S. Res. 253—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1950).

Introduced by Mr. Johnson of Colorado; referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 4, page 5058).

Reported back (H. Rept. 1567) with minority views (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 5, page 7065).

Debated and passed Senate (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 6, page 7154).

4. No. 11, Federal Communications Commission (S. Res. 256—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 11 of 1950).

Introduced by Mr. Johnson of Colorado; referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 4, page 5058).

Reported adversely (H. Rept. 1564) (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 5, page 7065).

Passed Senate (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 6, page 7173).

5. No. 12, National Labor Relations Board (S. Res. 248—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950).

Introduced by Mr. Taft; referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 4, page 4575).

Reported back (S. Rept. 1516) (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 4, page 5560).

Debated (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 4, page 5560; part 5, pages 6792, 6862, 6864).

Passed Senate (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 5, page 6886).

6. No. 24, Reconstruction Finance Corporation (S. Res. 290—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 24 of 1950).

Introduced by Mr. Fulbright, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 6, page 7884).

Reported without recommendation (S. Rept. 1868) (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 7, page 9147).

Debated (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 7, pages 9673, 9680, 9682, 9683, 9688).

Passed Senate (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 7, page 9694).

7. No. 27, Department of Health, Education, and Security.

(H. Res. 647—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 27 of 1950.)

Introduced by Mr. Hoffman, of Michigan; referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 6, page 8568).

Reported back (H. Rept. 2320) (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 7, page 9223).

Passed House (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 7, page 9843).

C. 1951—None.

D. Reorganization Plans of 1952:

1. No. 2, Post Office Department. (S. Res. 317—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1952.)

Introduced by Mr. Johnston of South Carolina, Mr. McKellar, Mr. Neely, Mr. Langer, and Mr. Carlson; referred to the Committee on Government Operations (Congressional Record, volume 98, part 4, page 5140).

Reported back (S. Rept. 1747) (Congressional Record, volume 98, part 6, page 7128).

Minority views debated (S. Rept. 1747, pt. 2) (Congressional Record, volume 98, part 6, pages 7452, 7468).

Passed Senate (Congressional Record, volume 98, part 6, page 7495).

2. No. 3, Bureau of Customs. (S. Res. 331—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 3, of 1952.)

Introduced by Mr. George; referred to the Committee on Government Operations (Congressional Record, volume 98, part 5, page 6582).

Reported back (S. Rept. 1748) (Congressional Record, volume 98, part 6, page 7128).

Passed Senate (Congressional Record, volume 98, part 6, page 7508).

3. No. 4, Department of Justice. (S. Res. 330—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 10, 1952.)

Introduced by Mr. McCarran; referred to the Committee on Government Operations (Congressional Record, volume 98, part 5, page 6497).

Reported back (S. Rept. 1749) (Congressional Record, volume 98, part 6, page 7452).

Minority views (S. Rept. 1749, pt. 2) (Congressional Record, volume 98, part 6, page 7452).

Passed Senate (Congressional Record, volume 98, part 6, page 7495).

G. Reorganization Plans of 1955: none.

H. Reorganization Plans of 1956:

1. No. 1, Research and development programs, Department of Defense (H. Res. 534—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 16, 1956).

Introduced by Mr. Vinson; referred to the Committee on Government Operations (Congressional Record, volume 102, part 7, page 10076).

Reported (H. Rept. 2585) (Congressional Record, volume 102, part 9, page 11787).

Passed House (Congressional Record, volume 102, part 9, page 11886).

2. No. 2, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (H. Res. 541—Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 17, 1956).

Introduced by Mr. Fascell; referred to the Committee on Government Operations (Congressional Record, volume 102, part 8, page 10427).

Reported (H. Rept. 2599) (Congressional Record, volume 102, part 9, page 11788).

Passed House (Congressional Record, volume 102, part 9, page 11886).

I. Reorganization Plans of 1957: none.

J. Reorganization Plans of 1958: none.

K. Reorganization Plans of 1959:

1. No. 1, Transfer of certain functions to the Secretary of Agriculture (H. Res. 295—To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959)

Introduced by Mr. Smith of Iowa; referred to the Committee on Government Operations (Congressional Record, volume 105, part 8, page 10583).

Reported (H. Rept. 586) (Congressional Record, volume 105, part 9, page 11990).

Debated (Congressional Record, volume 105, part 10, page 12740).

Passed House (Congressional Record, volume 105, part 10, page 12856).

III. Was the discharge procedure set out in 5 United States Code 133z–13 ever invoked?

Congressman Fountain moved to discharge plan No. 2 of 1953 and was defeated 128 to 261 on June 3, 1953.

IV. Examples of legislative veto.

(5 U.S.C. 133z-4). Effective date of reorganization specified in plan.

(a) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating in substance that the House does not favor the reorganization plan.

Veto: (42 U.S.C. 2153).—Cooperation with other nations. No cooperation with any nation or regional defense organization pursuant to sections 2074 (foreign distribution of special nuclear material; compensation; distribution to agency), 2077 (unauthorized dealings in special nuclear material), 2094 (foreign distribution of source material), 2112 (foreign distribution of byproduct material), 2121 (authority of Commission), 2133 (commercial licenses), 2134 (medical therapy, research, and development licenses; limitation), or 2164 (international cooperation) of this title shall be undertaken until—

(d) Submission to the Congress, the proposed agreement for cooperation, together with the approval and determination of the President, if arranged pursuant to sections 2121(c), 2164(b), or 2164(c) of this title, has been submitted to the Congress and referred to the Joint Committee and a period of 60 days has elapsed while Congress is in session, but any such proposed agreement for cooperation shall not become effective if during such 60-day period the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the proposed agreement for cooperation.

(23 U.S.C. 104–(b)(5)). For the Interstate System for the fiscal years 1960 through 1969:

"In the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State, as determined and approved in the manner provided in this paragraph, bears to the sum of the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States. Each apportionment herein authorized for the fiscal years 1960 through 1969, inclusive, shall be made on a date as far in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized as practicable but in no case more than 18 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized. As soon as the standards provided for in subsection (b) of section 109 of this title have been adopted, the Secretary, in cooperation with the State highway departments, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System as then designated, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, based upon such standards and in accordance with rules and regulations adopted by him and applied uniformly to all of the States. The Secretary shall transmit such estimates to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958. Upon approval of such estimate by the Congress by concurrent resolution, the Secretary shall use such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1962. The Secretary shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1962. Upon approval of such estimate by the Congress by concurrent resolution, the Secretary shall use such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963, June 30, 1964, June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966. The Secretary shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 10 days subsequent to Jan-

> uary 2, 1966, and annually thereafter through and including January 2, 1968. Upon approval of any such estimate by the Congress by concurrent resolution, the Secretary shall use such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year which begins next following the fiscal year in which such report is transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives. Whenever the Secretary, pursuant to this subsection, requests and receives estimates of cost from the State highway departments, he shall furnish copies of such estimates at the same time to the Senate and the House of Representatives. In making the estimates of cost for completing the Interstate System as provided in this paragraph, the cost of completing any mileage designated from the one thousand additional miles authorized by section 108(1) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 shall be excluded."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words, and then I shall yield to other Senators who, I know, are anxious to speak.

It has been argued on behalf of the amendment that if Congress wishes to authorize a new reclamation project, it must be done by affirmative vote; and that is so.

It has been argued that if Congress wishes to set up a new national park, that it must be done by affirmative vote; and that is so.

It has been argued that this is the normal way in which Congress exercises its power; and that is so.

I merely remind my colleagues that the same is the case in respect to the pending bill. If Congress should wish to establish any new wilderness area or add anything new to the system, it would have to be done by affirmative vote, for the bill so provides.

There really is no substance, I submit, to the arguments made on behalf of this amendment. The present provisions of the bill represent the most effective method for restoring to Congress surveillance over the primitive areas which are to be permanently included in the system, and also would provide us with a full restoration of congressional prerogatives with respect to any new additions to the system.

For these reasons I think the arguments submitted on behalf of the amendment are self-defeating, and I urge that the Senate reject it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I think a few comments should be made in reply to the presentation of the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

As I said at the beginning of my presentation, I recognize that the executive department would have less control over the public lands under the terms of the bill as now written than it has at the present minute. But we are being asked to take a major step. We are asked to create a new system. We are asked to take the public lands, as the right and prerogative of Congress, and to create something new. If we are to do that within this system, we should retain control of what elements will go into it. That is the crux of it.

I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that this deals not only with primitive lands, but also with the national parks and with the wildlife game refuges. For example, on page 6 of the bill it is stated:

> There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, each portion of each park, monument, or other unit in the national park system which on the effective date of this Act embraces a continuous area of five thousand acres or more without roads.

So we are asked to legislatively set aside portions of this automatically, to include them provided the Secretary so recommends within the 10-year period for review, and provided certain veto powers are not exercised when the recommendation comes to the Congress.

The wildlife refuges are included in that same type of context. They would be included, and therefore they would be modified, and the national park system would be subject to review and recommendation by the Secretary, and we would not have a thing to say about whether the Secretary was correct or not except to veto whatever action he might take.

The difficulty involved in the bill, it seems to me, is that we are asked to reverse what we should be doing in connection with determining what portions of the park system, wildlife refuges, primitive lands, and other areas should remain as they are and what portions should go under the wilderness system. It does not seem to me that we could retain adequate control over this unless we agreed to the amendment, to give Congress the affirmative rights to determine which portion is to go into which system. This is the principle for which we are really fighting.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have only one further remark.

The Senator from Colorado persists in the use of the word "retain." I think the record is clear that what we are attempting to do is restore powers in the Congress which have been hitherto delegated away. The question is not one of retaining congressional power, but adoption of a method by which we shall recapture congressional power.

I wish to make one further observation with respect to the pending amendment. The real mischief of the amendment is that if it were adopted—requiring concurrent affirmative consent of both Houses of the Congress to approve a Presidential recommendation to permanently include a given primitive area in the wilderness system—there would be no guarantee that we could ever get such a resolution to a vote, and we would then face the danger of having no congressional action taken with respect to large primitive areas.

Now the bill provides that if no congressional action is taken within a 10-year period, subject to some extension—with a maximum of 14 years—the whole area then will go out of the wilderness system and will be returned to ordinary forest lands. So the danger of this amendment is that if it should be adopted, not only would it fail to achieve the most effective form of congressional surveillance, but it would present us with the hazard of losing large areas of the wilderness system which ought not to be lost, merely because of the failure to obtain affirmative action by the Congress.

This is why the committee insisted upon the veto procedure, in order to make certain that this kind of loss by default did not occur, in order to assure that an effective kind of congressional review and surveillance of the President's recommendations would take place.

If the Senator from Colorado is willing to do so, Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Colorado have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, if I may, I shall use that 1 minute. I do not wish to have the record show or imply that I am trying to do something which would jeopardize the wilderness system or which would say that pertinent portions of other properties should not be put into a wilderness system, out of the parks or wildlife refuges. But I should like to have the right to look at them and to make up my own mind and to decide after hearings whether the recommendation is right or wrong. I think every other Member of the Senate would wish to do the same. This is why I think the amendment is so important.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 32. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. ANDERSON (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] are necessarily absent.

The respective pairs of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] and that of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] have been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 43 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Beall
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hayden
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
Mechem
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—49

Aiken
Bayh
Brewster
Burdick
Case
Church
Clark
Douglas
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Miller
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Smathers
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bennett
Cannon
Cooper
Curtis
Edmondson
Javits
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
Metcalf
Morse
Simpson
Sparkman

So amendment No. 32 was rejected.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. I call up amendment No. 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 10, line 14, it is proposed to strike out the word "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "five."

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe the amendment will be acceptable provided that——

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from Colorado will read the language which the Senator from Idaho is offering as a substitute for his amendment, I believe he will find it to be satisfactory.

Mr. CHURCH. If the Senator from Colorado will permit me to do so, I propose that we substitute, in place of the language contained in the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, the following:

> On page 10, line 19, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a semicolon, and to add the following:
>
> "*Provided*, That a motion to discharge shall not be in order until the time for the committee to hold a hearing has elapsed."

That language is to be substituted in lieu of the language the Senator from Colorado proposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the language I have read be substituted in place of the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to direct a question to the distinguished Senator from Colorado. In view of the fact that there is a ceremony this afternoon which many Senators are eager to attend, I wonder whether the Senator would be willing to yield back the remainder of his time on the bill, provided we did the thing on this side, so that we could have a final vote on the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes; except for 2 minutes that I should like to use.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado may be allotted 5 minutes to speak on the bill, and that all the remaining time on both sides on the bill be yielded back.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 5 minutes be allowed on each side for summation arguments prior to a final vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho, as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I was informed, just before we reached the agreement as to the limitation of time, that the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] wishes some time to be yielded to him. After I have made my own comments, I should like to yield to him, even if it is necessary to obtain more time.

The Senate is considering a bill as important, in my opinion, as any that has ever come before it. It is a bill with whose principle I am wholly in sympathy. As I said during the debate yesterday, I have hunted, fished, and explored all my life. I have done so in areas which will be included within the wilderness system. I, myself, have been on many of those lands.

However, I cannot understand how Senators can establish a wilderness system in which Congress will be regaining only some legislative control over the public lands, while leaving all the rest of the control to the executive department. I do not see how Senators can take action which will blanket into a wilderness system lands which have not been classified, which have not been evaluated, and which will thereby become locked up, so that no more than 2 percent of the people can get onto them and use them and enjoy them. By historical record, only that small number of people will use these lands, once they are within the wilderness classification.

Third, it does not seem to me to be correct or right to bulldoze a bill of this kind through the Senate, insisting on wording which will blanket—in this additional property, will change the boundaries of the national parks and the boundaries of wildlife refuges, and will provide that the only thing Congress can do to change the arrangement is to veto a recommendation by an executive officer. In my opinion, that is the wrong way to legislate.

One more point. The bill establishes a principle which, as I have said, is good in its concept of having a wilderness system authorized by legislation. But in its present form, I do not believe the bill will ever pass the other body. I sat in the other body. I saw what the reaction in committee was to a bill of this kind. The reasons given in opposition were the very reasons which I stated in the debate on the principal amendments which were offered. The reaction of the other body was: If there is to be a trustee, Congress is the trustee of the public lands; so, for heaven's sake, let us be the trustee of the public lands and not say that we are simply vetoers of what someone else does.

It is with reluctance that I oppose the bill in its present form. I believe that Congress should retain and regain its control over the public lands. I believe that the bill should have been revised and revamped in order to place that power in the hands of the Senate or the House, and thereby provide for the proper delegation of powers as between the executive department and Congress. I cannot see how the bill can be passed in its present form without being subjected to attack by the people of the country on the ground that we have deliberately given away the responsibility which has been placed upon us by the Constitution.

Therefore, with reluctance, I shall be forced to vote against the passage of the bill.

Mr. President, if I have any time remaining, I yield it to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I believe we had an understanding that the Senator from Connecticut would be recognized. I ask unanimous consent that he may be recognized for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, since I have been a Member of Congress, and long before, I have been greatly interested in the issue of the conservation of our natural resources. I have spoken on the floor of the Senate on this question and have consistently supported conservationist measures.

Though I support the objective of this bill, I oppose its passage because it permanently delegates to the executive branch a constitutional power of the Congress, that of disposing of Federal territory, which is set forth in article IV, section 3, of the Constitution:

> The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to the Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

This calls for affirmative action by Congress, and has been so interpreted by the courts.

Supporters of this delegation of constitutional power by Congress to the executive branch, defend it on the grounds that the original delegation was made many years ago and that the present bill would at least recapture for the Congress a veto power.

I disagree. I believe we should right the wrong that was done and not make it permanent. I believe we should restore the Constitution in this matter and not seek to permanently legitimize an unconstitutional delegation of power.

This is the time, when we are establishing a permanent, ambitious wilderness program, to set right the proper power of Congress as bestowed upon it by the Constitution.

The proponents of the wilderness bill successfully obscured this basic constitutional issue by providing that Congress could veto future executive proposals for permanently allocating public lands as wilderness areas. This procedure, if extended to other fields, would reverse the role of Congress from that of writing the laws of this Nation, subject to veto by the President, to that of merely having the veto power over laws written by the President. There is a world of difference between these two approaches, and that difference spells the disintegration of congressional power and of our traditional system of checks and balances.

All who have studied the decline and fall of representative governments, all who have observed the process by which parliaments are transformed from bodies which initiate action and make laws to bodies which subserviently ratify the actions of an all-powerful Executive, will share my apprehension over the fact that the Congress of the United States has traveled some distance down this road.

During the period in which I have served in Congress, I have seen proposals to delegate congressional power to the executive branch recur with increasing frequency. I regret to say that I have sometimes voted for such proposals. Each time this issue is before us, a plausible argument can be made for turning over this or that particular congressional power to the Executive, on the ground that such action will make the program in question more effective, better administered, and more coherently planned. And if one regards each of these proposed delegations of power as an isolated issue, he is tempted to support these delegations.

Yet, we must ask ourselves what will happen to the status of Congress if it does not soon turn its face rigidly against any further delegations of legislative power to the executive branch, however small or apparently meaningless? Each of us must answer that question himself, and many will have differing estimates as to what constitutes the danger point.

I believe the danger point has been reached, and I have made a personal decision to resist all future proposals which call for the delegation of one scrap of congressional power or responsibility or prerogative. This issue determined my position on the wilderness bill.

I supported the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], which would have restored the affirmative power of Congress to dispose of the lands in question. If that amendment had been adopted, I would have supported the wilderness bill. Since it was defeated, I am voting against the bill.

Much as I wish to support conservation measures, I must oppose this one because the greatest conservation issue before us is the question of conserving the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in my opinion, the bill upon which we are now about to pass judgment is a good bill. In September 1961 the Senate passed a good wilderness bill by a vote of 78 to 8. I hope that this year we shall again pass the bill by a large vote, because I think that in many respects the bill has been tightened and made better.

I wish to commend especially the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the floor manager of the bill, and the acting majority leader during the course of the debate on it; and also his strong backstops in the persons of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and my own distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. Together, they have occupied the seats of leadership and have displayed the traits of leadership.

I also wish to commend the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who, because of the death of his mother on yesterday, is not with us today. He has been a stout proponent of the opposition side; and certainly he has an able colleague in the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], who has shown that he has done his homework carefully and thoroughly. He represents a point of view entirely different from that of many of us; nevertheless, he has proceeded with consistency, vigor, understanding, and tolerance to make a good case.

Now it is for the Senate to make the decision.

I wish to state—and I am sure the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] will join me in this statement—that the debate has been conducted on a high level, and that Senators on both sides are to be complimented for sticking to the facts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to say that the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] has done a superb job in the management of the bill for the minority. I concur in the statement of the majority leader that it is clearly evident that the junior Senator from Colorado has done his homework carefully and well, not only on all the amendments, but also on the background of the bill. So I compliment him on the work he has done, even though we who are in the minority may ultimately fall by the wayside, and the majority may be the winner.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

MINING IN THE WILDERNESS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the months since the Senate last acted upon legislation to establish a Wilderness Area Preservation System, we have heard many statements to the effect that these primitive domains are amply protected under existing regulations. I disagree with that viewpoint.

My opinion as to the necessity for passage of the wilderness bill has been strengthened by what has occurred in two such areas in my home State of Oregon—in the Three Sisters Wilderness Area and in the Kalmiopsis Wild Area. When the Senate last debated wilderness legislation, these two areas of unique scenic beauty were intact. Today the situation is quite different.

In the Three Sisters Wilderness Area, a California mining company has established a mining claim on 1,460 acres. We have been told that mining in the wilderness is necessary for national defense and security, in that the wilderness hides vast stores of strategic defense materials. But we are told that in Oregon the Three Sisters Wilderness Area must be breached in order to open a supply of pumice. Until this valid mining claim was filed, I had no idea that pumice of the type found in wilderness areas was either of strategic importance or in short supply. The lava mesas of eastern Oregon, I had thought, would give our Nation a perpetual supply of pumice.

Mr. Larry Worstell, recreation and land staff officer for the Willamette National Forest, told a meeting of the Izaak Walton Club, in Eugene, Oreg., on February 26, 1963, that there is nothing in the Federal law to prevent a mining company from working pumice claims in the Three Sisters Wilderness Area. Mr. Worstell told the group that the laws concerning wilderness areas specifically provide that they shall be subject to the same entry for mining purposes as other public lands.

This Forest Service official explained that once the claims are patented, the land in the Three Sisters Wilderness will belong to the mining company, and there would be no controls.

A similar situation has developed in the Kalmiopsis Wild Area of Oregon. The Senate should know that the Kalmiopsis Wild Area was set aside especially to preserve the complex of rare botanical species found there, and not found anywhere else in the world. These species include the Kalmiopsis plant and the Brewer Spruce. Seventeen species of conifers are found there. Also of great interest to recreationists is the Chetco River, the principal drainage system within the wild area. The river is noted for the limpid, almost luminous quality of its water. It is one of the principal fish producers of the coast.

But now that has changed. A placer mining operation has staked a claim on the entire stretch of the Chetco River which passes through this area. Westerners well know what happens to the terrain of a stream when placer operations move through. In the Kalmiopsis Wild Area, the banks and bed of the Chetco have been washed away and pumped through sluices in order to recover gold. The claim extends for 12 miles through this unique and scenic area. Mud and debris threaten the purity of this once clear stream.

These developments give us cause for concern if we are to provide a wilderness legacy for future generations of Americans. We must face the reality that if a miner wished to lop the top off Mount Hood, in Oregon, in order to get to minerals, he could do it. That is what the law says. It is legal. But is it necessary?

As an editorial writer for the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard remarked:

> Is America so short of pumice that we have to chew up the spectacular Mesa Rock area in order to get it?

Areas such as Mesa Rock are scarce, indeed, and are becoming scarcer. But pumice is hardly scarce. I urge the enactment of Senate bill 4, so that we can have some safeguards for wilderness, such as Oregon's Three Sisters and Kalmiopsis.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Senate is about to vote on the question of the passage of a bill which, if enacted into law, will be regarded as one of the great landmarks in the history of conservation.

If we do not act now to conserve our vanishing wilderness, it will soon be lost forever. The wilderness not only is important to those who love the outdoor life and the sportsmen who hunt and fish there; it is equally needed for nature studies and general scientific inquiry, and for wise watershed and wildlife conservation. Therefore, it has general importance to the entire Nation.

When the previous bill on this subject was dealt with by the Senate, it was passed by a vote of 78 to 8. Scarcely any legislative proposal has been considered for a longer period of time. For 6 years, hearings on this proposed legislation have been held, and thousands of pages of testimony have been taken. Two years ago, the Senate debated the bill at length; and now, once again, the Senate has considered this bill carefully. The committee has given countless hours to a careful appraisal of the bill, which not only provides a sound method for the establishment of a wilderness system, but, far from relinquishing congressional control, also restores a strong measure of congressional prerogative which long ago was delegated to the executive branch.

Therefore, Mr. President, both from the standpoint of upholding the Constitution, and for the sake of advancing the cause of conservation for all our people, those now alive, and those yet unborn, I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me to make a brief statement on the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield 2 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the pending bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System is landmark legislation. If the measure is passed, it will represent a historic action on the part of the 88th Congress. As a cosponsor of the bill, I attach a high priority to its enactment, and I am gratified that the Senate leadership has seen fit to schedule it for action so early in the session.

This measure would preserve in our national parks, national forests, and wildlife refuges certain portions of land to be designated as wilderness areas. Such areas would be preserved as nearly as possible in their original primitive condition, uncluttered by manmade installations.

There are several reasons why such a wilderness system is in the public interest.

First of all, as the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has said:

> Primitive areas satisfy a deep-seated human need occasionally to get far away from the works of man. Prompt and effective action to preserve their unique inspirational, scientific, and cultural values on an adequate scale is essential since once destroyed they can never be restored.

I think each one of us has been enriched at one time or another through our experiences with natural undisturbed areas of the country. Those of use who live in an area such as my home State, South Dakota, with its Black Hills, its comparatively uncluttered open spaces, its lakes and woods, have a special appreciation for the purpose of the wilderness preservation system. As the population of our country grows and as our city areas become more congested, it is all the more imperative that we look to the preservation of great primitive outdoor areas where people can go for recreational and inspirational experience.

It is also important that a portion of our wilderness area be preserved for scientific, conservation, and scenic purposes.

The wilderness bill does not rule out the possibility that mining, grazing, and lumbering interests may necessitate the opening up of some of our wilderness area for commercial exploitation at some future time. It places the responsibility for this decision, however, on the President and the Congress who are in the best position to evaluate the total public interest as over against a special interest consideration.

At a time when all of us are concerned about economy in Government, it is important to recognize that no expenditures of public funds are involved in this legislation. The land is presently owned by the Federal Government and will continue to be administered by the agencies now in charge of these areas. The proposed legislation simply establishes the criteria under which our wilderness areas will be managed so that we can assure their preservation for the cultural, inspirational, recreational, and scientific values that these areas can offer to ourselves and future generations.

Also, as the report of the Senate Interior Committee on this legislation states:

> The Wilderness Preservation System can be established without affecting the economic arrangements of communities, counties, States or business enterprises since the areas are already withdrawn, or because existing private rights and established uses are permitted to continue. There will be no withdrawal of lands from the tax base of counties or communities; no withdrawal of timberlands on which lumbering operations depend, nor any withdrawal of present grazing or mining rights.

It should be further emphasized that this legislation has broad bipartisan support. The Outdoor Recreation Review Commission which recommends its passage was created by President Eisenhower. The bill has the strong backing of the present administration and was passed by the Senate in the last Congress by an overwhelming vote.

I earnestly hope that this important measure will be speedily enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All available time has been used.

The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PEARSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 12, as follows:

[No. 44 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Douglas
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—12

Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Goldwater
Hayden
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower

NOT VOTING—15

Allott
Bennett
Cannon
Cooper
Curtis
Edmondson
Javits
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Morse
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.

So the bill (S. 4) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Wilderness Act".

WILDERNESS SYSTEM ESTABLISHED

Statement of policy

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress recognizes that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition. It is accordingly declared to be the policy of the Congress of the United States to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System to be composed of federally owned areas in the United States and its possessions to be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness.

Definition of wilderness

(b) A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Extent of system

SEC. 3. (a) The National Wilderness Preservation System (hereafter referred to in this Act as the wilderness system) shall comprise (subject to existing private rights) such federally owned areas as are established as part of such system under the provisions of this Act.

National forest areas

(b)(1) The wilderness system shall include all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe: *Provided*, That the areas classified as primitive shall be subject to review as hereinafter provided. Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years, review, in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20, of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959, the suitability of each primitive area in the national forests for preservation as wilderness and shall report his findings to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the continued inclusion within the wilderness system, or exclusion therefrom, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided*, That the President may, as a part of his recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area to be continued in the wilderness system, recommending the exclusion and return to national forest land status of any portions not predominantly of wilderness value, or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value: *Provided further*, That following such exclusions and additions any primitive area recommended to be continued in the wilderness system shall not exceed the area classified as primitive on the date of this Act. The recommendation of the President with respect to the continued inclusion in the wilderness system, or the exclusion therefrom of a primitive area, or portions thereof, shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided*, That if Congress rejects a recommendation of the President and no revised recommendation is made to Congress with respect to that primitive area within two years, the land shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system and shall be administered as other national forest lands: *And provided further*, That, primitive areas with respect to which recommendations are submitted to Congress on the eighth, ninth, and tenth years of the review period herein provided shall retain their status as a part of the wilderness system until the expiration, in respect to each area, of a full session of Congress, two years for resubmission of revised recommendations to Congress by the President, and, if so resubmitted, until the expiration of a full session of Congress thereafter. Recommendations on all primitive areas not previously submitted to the Congress shall be made during the tenth year of the review period. Any primitive area, or portion thereof, on which a recommendation for continued inclusion in the wilderness system has not become effective within fourteen years following the enactment of this Act shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system and shall be administered as other national forest land.

(2) The purposes of this Act are hereby declared to be within and supplemental to but not in interference with the purposes for which national forests are established as set forth in the Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11), and the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86-517 (74 Stat. 215).

National park system areas

(c)(1) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, each portion of each park, monument, or other unit in the national park system which on the effective date of this Act embraces a continuous area of five thousand acres or more without roads. Within ten years after the effective date of this Act the Secretary of the Interior shall review the units of the national park system and shall report his recommendations for the incorporation of each such portion into the wilderness system to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each such portion for which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each such portion shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior shall include, as part of his recommendations to the President under the provisions of this subsection, a description of the parts of each park, monument, or other unit submitted which should be reserved for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations. Such parts shall be determined in accordance with the procedures for rulemaking under section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003), except that the public notice required under such section shall be at least ninety days prior to the determination proceedings. No designation of an area for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, or administrative installations shall modify or affect the application to that area of the provisions of the Act approved August 25, 1916, entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes" (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 and following). The accommodations and installations in such designated areas shall be incident to the conservation and use and enjoyment of the scenery and the natural and historical objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition. Further, the inclusion of any area of any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system within the wilderness system pursuant to this Act shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of such area in accordance with such Act of August 25, 1916, the statutory authority under which the area was created, or any other Act of Congress which might pertain to or affect such area, including, but not limited to, the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 432 and following); section 3(2) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C., sec. 796(2)); and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C., sec. 461 and following).

National wildlife refuges and game ranges

(d) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, such portions of the wildlife refuges and game ranges established prior to the effective date of this Act under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior as he may recommend for such incorporation to the President within ten years following the effective date of this Act. Before the convening of Congress each year the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each area recommended for such incorporation by the Secretary of the Interior during the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each area shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

Modification of boundaries

(e) Any proposed minor modification or adjustment of boundaries of any portion of the wilderness system established in accordance with this Act shall be made by the appropriate Secretary after public notice of such proposal by publication in a newspaper having general circulation in the vicinity of such boundaries and public hearing to be held in such vicinity not less than ninety days after such notice if there is sufficient demand during such ninety days for such hearing. The proposed modification or adjustment shall then be recommended with map and description thereof to the President. The President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to such modification or adjustment and such recommendations shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

Effective date of President's recommendations

(f) Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall have approved a resolution declaring itself opposed to such recommendation: *Provided*, That in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution of opposition may be limited to one or more of the areas covered, in which event the balance of the recommendation shall take effect as before provided: *Provided further*, That where a resolution of opposition to any such recommendation has been introduced, a hearing thereon shall be held within thirty days by the committee to which such resolution has been referred. Any such resolution shall be subject to the procedures provided under the provisions of sections 203 through 206 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C., secs. 133z-12—133z-15) for a resolution of either House of Congress: *And provided further*, That a motion to discharge the Committee shall not be in order until the time for the Committee to hold a hearing has elapsed.

Effect of public notice of proposed addition to wilderness system

(g) Public notice when given by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture that any area is to be proposed under the provisions of this Act for incorporation as part of the wilderness system shall segregate such area from any or all appropriation under the public land laws to the extent deemed necessary by such Secretary. Such segregation shall terminate (1) upon rejection of such proposal by the President, (2) upon approval by the Senate or the House of Representatives of a resolution opposing the incorporation of such area in the wilderness system, or (3) five years after the date of such notice if the proposal to incorporate such area as part of the wilderness system has not been submitted to both Houses of Congress prior to the expiration of such five years.

Addition or elimination not provided for in this act

(h) The addition of any area to, or the elimination of any area from, the wilderness system which is not specifically provided for under the provisions of this Act shall be made only after specific affirmative authorization by law for such addition or elimination.

Additional requirements with respect to recommendations

(i)(1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall, prior to submitting any recommendations to the President with respect to any area's retention in or incorporation into the wilderness system—

(A) give such public notice of the proposed action as they deem appropriate, including publication in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having general circulation in the area or areas in the vicinity of the affected land;

(B) hold a public hearing or hearings at a location or locations convenient to the area affected. The hearings shall be announced through such means as the respective Secretaries involved deem appropriate, including notices in the Federal Register and in newspapers of general circulation in the area: *Provided*, That if the lands involved are located in more than one State, at least one hearing shall be held in each State in which a portion of the land lies;

(C) at least thirty days before the date of a hearing advise the Governor of each State and the county, or in Alaska the borough, governing board of each county, or in Alaska the borough, in which the lands are located, the United States Forest Service, the United States Soil Conservation Service, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Mines, the United States Geological Survey, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Federal Power Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Federal

Communications Commission, inviting each to set forth its views at the hearing. It shall be the responsibility of each named Federal agency to submit its independent views concerning the designation of an area as "wilderness", giving an analysis of the comparative values that may be involved as between wilderness and that type of development or uses for which the Federal agency has administrative responsibility.

(2) Views submitted to the President under the provisions of (1) of this subsection with respect to any area shall be included with any recommendations to Congress with respect to such area.

State lands surrounded by wilderness system

(j) In any case where State-owned land is completely surrounded by land incorporated into the wilderness system, such State shall be given either (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) vacant, unappropriated, and unoccupied Federal land in the same State, equal in value to the surrounded land: *Provided*, That if the State does not reserve mineral rights in the surrounded land conveyed to the United States, the United States need not reserve mineral rights in the land conveyed to the State in exchange.

Acquisition of certain privately owned lands within the wilderness system

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to acquire as part of the wilderness system any privately owned land within any portion of such system under his jurisdiction, subject to the approval of any necessary appropriations by the Congress: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to confer a right of condemnation with respect to privately owned land within the boundaries of a wilderness area, or to impair any customary right or privilege heretofore enjoyed by the owners of such land, respecting access to it or to its ordinary use and maintenance.

GIFTS OR BEQUESTS OF LAND

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the interior may each accept gifts or bequests of land for preservation as wilderness, and such land shall on acceptance become part of the wilderness system. Regulations with regard to any such land may be in accordance with such agreements, consistent with the policy of this Act, as are made at the time of such gift, or such conditions, consistent with such policy, as may be included in, and accepted with, such bequest.

USE OF THE WILDERNESS

Other provisions of law

SEC. 6. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes stated in the establishment of, or pertaining to, any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system, or any national forest, wildlife refuge, game range, or other area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the wilderness system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes as also to preserve its wilderness character. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the wilderness system shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. Subject to the provisions of this Act, all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.

Prohibition of certain uses

(b) Except as specifically provided for in this Act and subject to any existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise within the wilderness system, no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such areas.

Special provisions

(c) The following special provisions are hereby made:

(1) Within the wilderness system the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become established shall be permitted to continue subject to such regulations as the appropriate Secretary finds necessary. In addition, such measures may be taken as are necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such regulations as the appropriate Secretary finds necessary.

(2) Within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including but not limited to exploration for oil and gas), mining (including but not limited to the production of oil and gas), and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (B) the grazing of livestock, where established prior to the effective date of this Act with respect to areas established as part of the wilderness system by this Act, or prior to the date of public notice thereof with respect to any area to be recommended for incorporation in the wilderness system, shall be permitted to continue subject to such regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary having jurisdiction over such area.

(3) Other provisions of this Act to the contrary notwithstanding, the management of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, formerly designated as the Superior, Little Indian Sioux, and Caribou roadless areas in the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, shall be in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the general purpose of maintaining, without unnecessary restrictions on other uses, including that of timber, the primitive character of the area, particularly in the vicinity of lakes, streams, and portages: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall preclude the continuance within the area of any already established use of motorboats. Nothing in this Act shall modify the restrictions and provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan Act, Public Law 539, Seventy-first Congress, July 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 1020), the Thye-Blatnik Act, Public Law 733, Eightieth Congress, June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Andresen Act, Public Law 607, Eighty-fourth Congress, June 22, 1956 (70 Stat. 326), as applying to the Superior National Forest or the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Modifications of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area within the Superior National Forest shall be accomplished in the manner provided in section 3(e).

(4) Commercial services may be performed within the wilderness system to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other purposes of the system as established in this Act.

(5) Any existing use or form of appropriation authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing any national wildlife refuge or game range existing on the effective date of this Act may be continued under such authorization or provision.

(6) Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

(7) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests.

(8) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent, within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, any activity, including prospecting, for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or water resources or to prevent the completely subsurface use of such areas, if such activity or subsurface use is carried on, in a manner which is not incompatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment.

RECORDS AND REPORTS

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each maintain available to the public, records of portions of the wilderness system under his jurisdiction, including maps and legal descriptions, copies of regulations governing them, copies of public notices of, and reports submitted to Congress regarding, pending additions, eliminations, or modifications. Within a year following the establishment of any area within the national forests as a part of the wilderness system, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and legal description of such area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however*, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be made with the approval of such committees. Within a year following the establishment of any area in the national park system or in a wildlife refuge or range as a part of the wilderness system, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and legal description of such area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be corrected with the approval of such committees. Copies of maps and legal descriptions of all areas of the wilderness system within their respective jurisdictions shall be kept available for public inspection in the offices of regional foresters, national forest supervisors, forest rangers, offices of the units of the national park system, wildlife refuge, or range.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND GIFTS

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of this Act. Any such contributions or gifts shall, for purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, be considered a contribution or gift to or for the use of the United States for an exclusively public purpose, and may be deducted as such under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subject to all applicable limitations and restrictions contained therein.

Land use Commissions

SEC. 9. With respect to any State having more than 90 per centum of its total land area owned by the Federal Government on

January 1, 1961, there shall be established for each such State a Presidential Land Use Commission (hereinafter called the Commission). The Commission shall be composed of five persons appointed by the President, not more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party, and at least three of whom shall be residents of the State concerned. The Commission shall advise and consult with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture on the current utilization of federally owned land in such State and shall make recommendations to the appropriate Secretary as to how the federally owned land can best be utilized, developed, protected, and preserved. Any recommendations made to the President by the Secretary of Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture and any recomendations made to the Congress by the President pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be accompanied by the recommendations and reports made with respect thereto by the Commission.

SEC. 10. At the opening of each session of Congress, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall jointly report to the President for transmission to Congress on the status of the wilderness system, including a list and descriptions of the areas in the system, regulations in effect, and other pertinent information, together with any recommendations they may care to make.

SEC. 11. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding, modifying, repealing, or otherwise affecting the provisions of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792–825r).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 8, 1963, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT ON GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TRAINING ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 18(c) of the Government Employees Training Act (Public Law 85-507, approved July 7, 1958), I am transmitting forms supplying information on those employees who, during fiscal year 1962, participated in training in non-Government facilities in courses that were over 120 days in duration and those employees who received training in non-Government facilities as the result of receiving an award or contribution.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 4, 1963.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development procurement action, for the period January 1, 1962, through December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REGULATIONS FOR PREVENTING COLLISIONS AT SEA

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, SEPARATION, AND RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 14 OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 8, 1932, relating to the control and possession in the District of Columbia of dangerous weapons, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT OF NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

A letter from the president, National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that council, for the year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO DELEGATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY TO THE CHIEF MEDICAL DIRECTOR IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE, TO INCREASE THE AREA WITHIN WHICH THE POSTMASTER GENERAL MAY ESTABLISH STATIONS, SUBSTATIONS, OR BRANCHES OF POST OFFICES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 39 of the United States Code to increase the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, from 10 to 20 miles (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF AUTOMATIC-SEPARATION PROVISIONS OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the automatic-separation provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the appropriations for that Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **PRESIDENT** pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution providing for ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relative to the qualification of electors

"Whereas both Houses of the 87th Congress of the United States of America, at the 2d session of such Congress, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds of the Members of each House thereof, made a proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States in the following words, to wit:

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE —

" ' "SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reasons of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" ': Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio,* That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and the same is hereby ratified; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Ohio be, and he hereby is directed, to deliver to the Governor of this State a certified copy of this resolution, and such certified copy shall be forwarded at once by the Governor to the Administrator of General Services, U.S. Government, Washington, D.C., to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Secretary of State of the United States.

"ROGER CLOUD,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"JOHN W. BROWN,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Adopted February 27, 1963.

"TED W. BROWN,
"*Secretary of State.*"

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah to ratify a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States of America, at its 2d session in both Houses by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, adopted the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America:

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE—

" ' "SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" ': Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Utah,* That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, be and the same is hereby ratified; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the Governor of Utah to the Administrator of General Services, U.S. Government, Washington, D.C., to the President of the Senate of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Utah memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to preserve to the respective States their power to apportion among their citizens their representation in the various State legislatures

"Whereas the representation enjoyed by the citizens of the State of Utah, as well as by the citizens of the various States of the Union in their respective State legislatures, is best determined by consideration of local importance; and

"Whereas the courts of the United States are construing the Constitution of the United States so broadly as to empower them to intervene in the rights of the respective States to determine the membership of their respective legislatures; and

"Whereas it is the considered opinion of this legislature that the power of determination of problems relating to apportionment of legislative representation is best exercised by the direct representatives of the people of the States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah,* That it is fitting and proper for the citizens of this State and of their representatives in the Legislature of the State of Utah to determine the membership of their senate and of their house of representatives, and to apportion representation therein among the various portions of the State; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we believe that this power of legislative determination and apportionment therein is best exercised by the people and the legislatures of the respective States of the Union; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to take all necessary legislative steps including the possibility of initiating a constitutional amendment to protect and preserve the powers of the various States of the Union to determine the membership of their respective legislatures and the apportionment of representation therein; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Utah is hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this memorial to the Senate and to the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in the National Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

"Resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Utah memorializing the Congress of the United States to maintain the name 'Flaming Gorge Dam and Reservoir' for the dam and reservoir that now bears that name

"Whereas the dam and reservoir which has been constructed on the Green River in northeastern Utah is presently known as the Flaming Gorge Dam and Reservoir; and

"Whereas the proposal has been made before the Congress of the United States to change the name of this dam and reservoir to "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area"; and

"Whereas in view of the location of this dam and reservoir in relationship to the States of Utah and Wyoming, it would seem desirable to retain its present name: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein)*, That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to maintain the presently existing name of the Flaming Gorge Dam and Reservoir as to said dam and reservoir; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of Utah be, and he hereby is, directed to send copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 35th Legislature of the State of Utah petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, unless Congress shall sooner have submitted such an amendment, to provide for the election of the President and Vice President in a manner fair and just to the people of the United States

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States presidential and vice presidential electors in the several States are now elected on a statewide basis, each State being entitled to as many electors as it has Senators and Representatives in Congress; and

"Whereas the presidential and vice presidential electors who receive the plurality of the popular vote in a particular State become entitled to cast the total number of electoral votes allocated to the State irrespective of how many votes may have been cast for other elector candidates; and

"Whereas this method of electing the President and Vice President is unfair and unjust in that it does not reflect the minority votes cast; and

"Whereas the need for a change has been recognized by Members of Congress on numerous occasions through the introductions of various proposals for amending the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That application is hereby made to Congress under article V of the Constitution of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an article of amendment to the Constitution providing for a fair and just division of the electoral votes within the States in the election of the President and Vice President; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if and when Congress shall have proposed such an article of amendment this application for a convention shall be deemed withdrawn and shall be no longer of any force and effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the proper officer of this State be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Joint memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to defeat any legislation amending the Enabling Act so as to permit the State of Arizona to sell school and institutional lands granted to the State by the Federal Government without appraisal and public auction

"Whereas the State of Arizona holds in trust title to considerable land granted to the State by the terms of the Enabling Act; and

"Whereas the Federal Government in granting the land to the State of Arizona placed restrictions and conditions effecting the sale, lease, conveyance, or contracts of, or concerning the lands or the use thereof, or the natural products thereof, requiring, among other things, appraisal at true value of the lands prior to sale and sale only at public auction; and

"Whereas the beneficiaries of the trust, the schools and institutions of the State of Arizona, should realize the reasonable value of any lands sold or otherwise disposed of; and

"Whereas the 25th Legislature of Arizona memorialized Congress to pass legislation making certain amendments in said Enabling Act; and

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the 26th Arizona Legislature that if the Enabling Act should be amended as proposed in Senate Joint Memorial 3 of the 25th Arizona Legislature, or in S. 3283, H.R. 11710, or H.R. 11712 of the 87th Congress of the United States, the beneficiaries of the trust, the schools and institutions of the State of Arizona, would not realize the benefits as safeguarded by the Enabling Act as enacted by Congress in 1910: Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States take no action which would amend the Enabling Act of the State of Arizona to permit the State of Arizona to sell school and institutional lands granted, in trust, to the State by the Federal Government without appraisal and without public auction.

"2. The secretary of state of the State of Arizona is directed to transmit a copy of this memorial to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 4

"Memorial requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona

"The State of Arizona does not have a national cemetery within its borders even though, proportionately, there are more veterans in Arizona than in most States of the United States. The influx of veterans into the State of Arizona is due to the fact that for many years there have been many military installations located in the State. Moreover, thousands of veterans have moved to Arizona to take advantage of the dry, healthful climate.

"A deceased veteran who has expressed a desire to be buried in a national cemetery has to be transported to a distant point in another State for burial.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State or Arizona."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution relating to the territorial waters of Alaska

"Whereas the fisheries abutting the Alaska coast are of enormous economic value and represent the sole source of livelihood for scores of American nationals; and

"Whereas American nationals have fished for years under carefully planned and stringent conservation regulations imposed to insure maximum sustained yield from the resource; and

"Whereas recent years have seen an increased amount of foreign fishing effort in the waters abutting the Alaska coast; and

"Whereas alien fishermen fish entirely free of conservation restrictions imposed on American citizens; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government, charged with the obligation of protecting American fisheries from foreign encroachment, has taken insufficient action to protect the resource either through assertion of a greater territorial belt of water than 3 miles or application of the so-called base line method already sanctioned for use by the International Court of Justice; and

"Whereas Gov. William A. Egan, of the State of Alaska, has attempted unceasingly to impress upon the U.S. Government the gravity of intrusions by foreign nationals into waters historically considered American and the necessity of establishing a broad claim to waters adjoining the Alaska coast; and

"Whereas the Governor, faced with the complete lack of action on the part of the U.S. Government, has acted courageously in protecting the fisheries of Alaska through State action which circumstances required: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Legislature of the State of Alaska offers its commendation to Gov. William A. Egan for his past action, and vigorously urges the U.S. Government to act quickly in establishing broad water areas adjoining the Alaska coast as subject solely to U.S. sovereignty; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House; the Honorable William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate March 1, 1963.
"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Attest:
"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Passed by the house March 28, 1963.
"Bruce Kendall,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Attest:
"Patricia R. Slack,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*
"William A. Egan,
"*Governor of Alaska.*"

"Senate Joint Resolution 21

"Joint resolution relating to the construction of modern stern-ramp trawlers for experimental commercial fishing and research

"Whereas the high-seas fish resources of the United States are being ravaged by fleets of modern trawlers operated by foreign nations; and

"Whereas the fishing fleets of the United States have never received the attention and encouragement necessary to permit our fishermen to compete successfully with the vast, efficient and modern foreign fleets; and

"Whereas construction by the Federal Government of two stern-ramp trawlers would make available American vessels which could be used for exploratory and scientific investigations of the fisheries resources of the high seas: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Congress is urgently requested to act favorably on S. 744, the proposed Fishing Vessel Development Act of 1963, as introduced by Senator Warren G. Magnuson, for himself and Senators E. L. Bartlett, Theodore Kennedy, and Leverett Saltonstall; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable Herbert Bonner, chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the Senate February 26, 1963.
"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Attest:
"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Passed by the House March 29, 1963.
"Bruce Kendall,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Attest:
"Patricia R. Slack,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*
"William A. Egan,
"*Governor of Alaska.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 53

"Resolution relating to congressional action on H.R. 4901 which provides for a flat annual installment rate by employers repaying Federal loans made to the State for its unemployment compensation program

"Whereas Alaska, under territorial administration and then as a State, accepted loans under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and under the Reed Act for carrying out its unemployment compensation program; and

"Whereas these Federal loans were not repaid when due, causing certain provisions of the aforementioned acts to become operable which started repayment by employers of the loans in annual installment payments which increase each year; and

"Whereas the State is attempting to maintain a favorable climate toward business to encourage greater investment to aid its economic growth and to reduce the amount of unemployment; and

"Whereas the sum paid per employee under the installment payment provisions now in effect grows larger each year thus causing a financial handicap to present employers and discouraging future investors and potential employers from establishing businesses in the State; and

"Whereas a bill (H.R. 4901) has been introduced in Congress to alleviate the hardship now placed on employers by establishing a continuing flat rate of installment payment of the unemployment compensation loans, thus relieving in part the burdensome features of the existing law: Be it

"*Resolved,* That Congress is urged to give speedy passage to H.R. 4901; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Harry F. Byrd, chairman, Senate Finance Committee; the Honorable Wilbur Mills, chairman, House Ways and Means Committee; and the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the Senate March 29, 1963.
"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Attest:
"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 56

"Resolution relating to encouraging Congress to take favorable action upon a request by the director of the Bureau of Mines for funds to carry on a mineral resource study

"Whereas there is an urgent need for resource development in the Nation, and especially in Alaska; and

"Whereas studies of the kind necessary to determine the amount and the nature of

Alaska's resources have never been made; and

"Whereas a step-up in the studies of Alaska's resources is necessary because of the planned construction of the Rampart Canyon Dam on the Yukon River, which has created a demand for knowledge of resources in the area of the hydroelectric plant; and

"Whereas Marling Ankeny, Director of the Federal Bureau of Mines, has asked that funds be made available for these mineral resource studies which will begin July 1, 1963: be it

"*Resolved*, That Congress is respectfully urged to take favorable action on the Bureau's request so that the full resource potential of Alaska may be developed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Clarence Cannon, chairman, House Committee on Appropriations; the Honorable Carl Hayden, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations; the Honorable Marling Ankeny, Director, Bureau of Mines; and to the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the Senate March 30, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest.

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution relating to the elimination of monopolistic and restrictive practices in the drug industry

"Whereas the American public spends approximately $2½ billion each year for prescription drugs and medicines; and

"Whereas the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, of which Senator Estes Kefauver is chairman, found during hearings on the drug industry's role in price administration that patent practices and pricing and marketing methods of large drug manufacturers have resulted in excessively high prices of some drugs and medicines to consumers; and

"Whereas in the words of Senator Kefauver: 'The time has arrived for action by the Congress to reduce the excessive and unwarranted charges upon those who are least able to afford them—the Nations' sick and afflicted'; and

"Whereas it appears that prescription drug and medicine prices might be significantly lowered by amending Federal patent and antitrust laws to assure greater competition among the members of the drug industry: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963 (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to study the necessity of amending the Patent Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act to eliminate any monopolistic and economically restrictive practice which might be found to exist in the drug industry to the end of stimulating competitive pricing policies resulting in reasonable charges to consumers for prescription drugs and medicines, without, however, unduly curbing the research activities of the drug industry; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of the concurrent resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to Senator Estes Kefauver, of the State of Tennessee, and to the Senators and Representatives to Congress from the State of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Concurrent Resolution 9

"Whereas labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers still exist in the United States and its possessions; and

"Whereas inferior labor conditions, including low wages, constitute an unfair method of competition and interfere with the orderly and fair marketing of goods; and

"Whereas the sugar industry in the State of Hawaii pays the highest wages in domestic sugar production in the United States and its possessions and provides sugar workers a standard of living comparable to workers covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; and

"Whereas the sugar industry in the State of Hawaii must compete with producers and processors of sugar in other areas whose employees labor for wages as low as 60 cents per hour and whose conditions of employment otherwise are, under American standards, substandard; and

"Whereas fairness and justice demand that all workers in the United States and its possessions, whether industrial or agricultural, be entitled to enjoy a standard of living compatible with the American way of life; and

"Whereas fairness and justice to the people and sugar industry of Hawaii require that minimum wage levels be set for sugar workers in the United States and its possessions so that competition among the different sugar producing areas shall be on fair and equitable terms: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Second Legislature, State of Hawaii, regular session of 1963 (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to amend all Federal laws granting subsidies to any industry or agricultural pursuit, in which individuals are gainfully employed, to require compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and as may be further amended from time to time, as a condition of the payment of any such subsidy: *Provided, however*, That the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division shall be authorized to determine temporary exclusions from the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, to provide:

"1. That payment to all persons employed on a sugar farm of wages not less than the minimum wage as set by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and as may further be amended from time to time, shall be a condition of payment to the producer: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to hold hearings to determine temporary exclusions and amounts of payments to be authorized for producers so excluded temporarily.

"2. That there shall be no reduction in the base rate of payments of 80 cents per 100 pounds of sugar for any sugar farm which pays to all persons employed thereon wages at rates not less than the minimum wage established by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and as may be further amended from time to time, irrespective of production; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Labor, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Hawaii delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"Elmer F. Cravalho,
"'*Speaker, House of Representatives.*
"Shigeto Kanemoto,
"*Clerk, House of Representatives.*
"Nelson K. Doi,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Seichi Hirai,
"*Clerk of the Senate.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 18

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress to act favorably on a bill for an act making the pay of the Federal workers at Pearl Harbor Naval Base comparable to that of Federal workers doing the same work in San Francisco Bay area

"Whereas the naval base at Pearl Harbor has historically and is presently playing a key and vital role in our national defense; and

"Whereas it is most important that the morale and well-being of the several thousand Federal employees at Pearl Harbor Naval Base maintain their working efficiency at a top level during the present critical world situation; and

"Whereas for many years blue collar workers in certain ratings at the Pearl Harbor Naval Base have been paid lower wages than their counterparts in the San Francisco Bay area; and

"Whereas a bill has been jointly introduced by the two Senators of the State of Hawaii, the Honorable Hiram L. Fong and the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, whereby these discrepancies in wages would be eliminated and the pay for similar jobs would be made comparable to each other; and

"Whereas the immediate correction of the inequities in wages on a regional basis within these United States is urgently warranted on moral and legal grounds; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963 (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to act favorably, with reasonable expedition, on the bill introduced by the said Senator Hiram L. Fong and Senator Daniel K. Inouye, making the wages of the Federal workers at Pearl Harbor Naval Base comparable to that of Federal workers doing the same kind and level of work in the San Francisco Bay area; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Hiram L. Fong and the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Senators from the State of Hawaii; and to the Honorable Thomas P. Gill and the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga, U.S. Representatives from the State of Hawaii."

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Memorial 1

"Memorial urging the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription 'In God We Trust'

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas Public Law 140, enacted by the 84th Congress, and approved by the President of the United States on July 11, 1955, provided that all U.S. currency shall bear the inscription 'In God We Trust.' The intent of the U.S. Congress is clear and this law is hereby quoted below: '*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That at such time as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted in connection with the current program of the Treasury Department to increase the capacity of presses utilized by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the dies shall bear, at such place or places thereon as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be appropriate, the inscription "In God We Trust," and thereafter this inscription shall appear on all U.S. currency and coins.

"'Approved July 11, 1955.'

"Whereas 8 years have elapsed since the enactment of this law by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas as recently as the fiscal year 1962, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing delivered 193,960,000 silver certificates, series 1935 G, without the inscription; and

"Whereas it appears that the use of currency without the inscription, 'In God We Trust,' gives aid and comfort to those nations which pursue the atheistic Communist ideology;

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress of the United States authorize the appropriate officials and agencies of the Federal Government to order the cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription 'In God We Trust.'

"Adopted by the house on February 8, 1963, by the following vote: 73 ayes, 2 nays, 5 not voting.

"Approved by the Governor, February 8, 1963.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state, February 8, 1963."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 3

"Memorial relating to Federal taxation and recommending that the Federal excise tax on women's handbags be abolished

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents: The Federal Government is currently levying a 10-percent excise tax on the purchase of women's handbags. This tax purports to apply only to luxuries and not to necessities. It is a well-known fact that a handbag is no longer a luxury but is, instead, a necessity.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress give favorable consideration to the subject of abolishing the tax on women's handbags.

"Adopted by the house March 26, 1963, by the following vote: 64 ayes, 4 nays, 12 not voting.

"Approved by the Governor, March 26, 1963.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state, March 28, 1963."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. PELL:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 1745

"Resolution memorializing Congress, asking that favorable consideration to legislation providing benefits to the aged, ill, and disabled veterans of World War I in the form of pensions or any other means which provide relief so vitally needed

"Whereas many hundreds of thousands of our Nation's finest citizens served the cause of democracy during the period of World War I; and

"Whereas a large number of these veterans have now reached the age and circumstances in which they are no longer self-supporting, as well as suffering illnesses and infirmities aggravated by this honorable service to their country; and

"Whereas through no fault of their own, they have largely become a class of forgotten men, many of whom are close to the grave: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the members of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island recognize the predicament of these veterans of World War I and petition the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to H.R. 2332 (World War I Pension Act) providing benefits to the aged, ill, and disabled veterans of World War I in the form of pensions or any other means which will provide relief so vitally needed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the recording clerk of this house of representatives is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Director of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, to the Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, to the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a certified copy of resolution S. 478 passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations memorializing Congress to enact legislation to amend the immigration and nationality laws.

This legislation was introduced in the U.S. Senate by my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell]. I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the birth, growth, strength, and defense of the United States has stemmed from the combination of skills and cultures of people from many nations; and

Whereas many people from nations all over the world seek entrance to this great Nation in the hope that they may apply their skills and add their cultures to this free society; and

Whereas the present immigration laws are archaic and arbitrary and are not in keeping with the American philosophy of the equality of man; and

Whereas S. 751, a bill to amend the immigration and nationality laws, introduced by Senator Claiborne Pell, grants more equality to all deserving potential immigrants and proportionately and categorically presents a fair system of immigration; and

Whereas the provisions providing for pioneer immigrants will strengthen the immigration system and enrich the American economic system; and

Whereas this bill which is in keeping with the principles advocated by Jefferson and Lincoln, strengthens the democratic cause around the world and leaves the United States in a better light since it will grant a fair share and equal rights immigration law that is in line with the true principles of a free society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the general assembly place itself on record as respectfully requesting the Congress of the United States to enact into law S. 751, an act in amendment of the immigration and nationality laws (the Pell Act); and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state prepare certified copies of this resolution and send them to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate in the U.S. Congress, the majority and minority leaders of both Houses, the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and the members of the Rhode Island delegation in the Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 22. A bill to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve (Rept. No. 118).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 277. An act to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Rept. No. 120); and

H.R. 1544. An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz. (Rept. No. 121).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 873. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada (Rept. No. 119).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1007. A bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 122).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 247. A bill to authorize survey and establishment of a townsite for the Juneau Indian village in Alaska (Rept. No. 124);

S. 394. A bill to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves (Rept. No. 125);

H.R. 2291. An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass (Rept. No. 126); and

H.R. 2294. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz (Rept. No. 127).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H.R. 2440. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 123).

REPORT ENTITLED "TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE — SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 128)

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "Trading With the Enemy Act," pursuant to Senate Resolution 268, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, together with the supplemental views of the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating].

I ask unanimous consent that this report, together with the supplemental views, be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Metcalf):

S. 1282. A bill to permit a State to increase the mileage of its Federal-aid primary system when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 percent thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mansfield when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Engle, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 1283. A bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1284. A bill to authorize Dr. Alonzo F. Brand, Medical Director, U.S. Public Health Service, retired, to accept and wear the decoration tendered him by the Government of Thailand; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the highway use tax in the case of certain trucks and other vehicles which are used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from their places of production to market or mill; and

S. 1286. A bill to provide for the abatement of certain penalties and interest otherwise payable with respect to the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from their place of production to market or mill; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1287. A bill for the relief of John Joseph (also known as Hanna Georges Youssef); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. Humphrey):

S. 1288. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to specify the treatment processes considered as mining in the case of granite used or sold for use as dimension stone; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. Pell):

S. 1289. A bill to eliminate the population limitation as it affects the eligibility of communities in redevelopment areas for certain benefits under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, and title II of the housing amendments of 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1290. A bill to establish a uniform national policy concerning proprietary rights in inventions made through the expenditure of public funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1291. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity; and

S. 1292. A bill to repeal section 1(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, commonly known as the commodities clause; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 1293. A bill for the relief of Theofilos Bougias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1294. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the restriction on the period during which an application for a determination of disability is granted full retroactivity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 1295. A bill to amend section 64(a)(2) of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Johnston when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1296. A bill for the relief of Leonard F. Rizzuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1297. A bill to provide for compulsory licensing of prescription drug patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kefauver when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1298. A bill to provide for certain highway and bridge construction as part of the Flaming Gorge Dam and Reservoir project in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. Simpson):

S. 1299. A bill to defer certain operation and maintenance charges of the Eden Valley Irrigation and Drainage District; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1300. A bill to convey Ellis Island to Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams, of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Hart):

S. 1301. A bill to provide for a separate session of Congress each year for the consideration of appropriation bills, to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself and Mr. Hart):

S.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the first full week in May of each year as "National Employ the Older Worker Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT AND HEARINGS ON "STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 37); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary eight thousand additional copies of the report (committee print) of its Internal Security Subcommittee of the Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, entitled "State Department Security"; five thousand copies each of part 1 (the William Wieland case), part 2 (the Office of Security), part 3 (the new passport regulations), part 4 (testimony of Elmer Hipsley, Otto Otepka, John Leahy, Roger Jones, Scott McLeod, Andreas Lowenfeld), and part 5 (testimony of William Wieland) of the subcommittee's hearings of the Eighty-seventh Congress on "State Department Security"; and five thousand additional copies of part 13 of the subcommittee's hearings of the Eighty-seventh Congress on "Communist Threat to the United States Through the Caribbean."

FEDERAL-AID PRIMARY HIGHWAYS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my able colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], and I have sent to the desk a bill which would amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act. If enacted this proposal would permit a State to increase the mileage of its Federal-aid primary system when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 percent thereof.

Under existing highway regulations a State must complete construction and maintenance on 90 percent of its existing primary mileage before any additional primary mileage can be allocated to the State. This limitation is extremely difficult in most States, particularly in States such as Montana, where distances and limited financing create a number of problems in the primary program. There are, however, a number of instances in the State where bringing certain roads and highways under the primary program would be of tremendous benefit in developing improved travel. This is especially true in eastern Montana. At the present time it has been impossible to obtain any additional primary mileage for these meritorious projects.

The amendment Senator Metcalf and I have introduced would relax the situation somewhat. This proposal was endorsed by the Montana State Legislature in its recent session. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the Congressional Record the text of Senate Joint Memorial 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint memorial will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1282) to permit a State to increase the mileage of its Federal-aid primary system when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 percent thereof, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The joint memorial presented by Mr. MANSFIELD is as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, to the Montana congressional delegation, to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce and to the Federal Bureau of Public Roads Administrator, urging that necessary steps be taken to introduce legislation to amend a Federal law relating to highways, to permit a State to build additional primary system mileage when 75 percent of a State's primary system is completed and maintained, instead of 90 percent as presently required

Whereas section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code Annotated requires that the primary highway system shall not exceed 7 percent of the total highway mileage of a State; and

Whereas when 90 percent of the primary system of a State is completed and maintained, said State may increase its primary mileage to 8 percent of the total State mileage; and

Whereas the State of Montana has not reached the required 90 percent but needs an increase in primary road mileage because of the large area to be served by highways in Montana; and

Whereas an increase in primary mileage would correct existing inequities in various counties; and

Whereas many Montana counties would have greatly increased travel if the proper primary highway mileage were available; and

Whereas when primary highways were designated in past years, many Montana areas which had a minor volume of traffic now have enough traffic to warrant primary highway designation; and

Whereas an increase in primary highway mileage would greatly benefit the State of Montana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That necessary steps be taken by the Montana congressional delegation, in cooperation with Federal officials to introduce legislation to amend section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code Annotated, relating to highways, to permit a State to have additional primary highway system mileage when 75 percent of said State's primary highway system is completed and maintained instead of 90 percent which is presently required; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this memorial to the Honorable Michael J. Mansfield and Lee Metcalf, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen and James F. Battin, Congressmen from the State of Montana; to Luther H. Hodges, U.S. Secretary of Commerce; and to Rex M. Whitton, Federal Bureau of Public Roads Administrator.

PROTECTION OF THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill carrying out the recommendations of the President to strengthen the protection of the right to vote. These recommendations were outlined by the President in his historic February 28 message to the Congress on civil rights.

This administration, with great diligence, has sought to protect the constitutional rights of citizens seeking to register and vote. In no comparable period of our history has so vigorous an effort been made to see that this very keystone of our democracy is secure. Yet insidious and complex devices to frustrate citizens of this Nation in exercising their right of franchise hampers the functioning of this basic element of our governmental system.

Under this administration, the Department of Justice has brought 22 suits against voting discrimination and 4 suits involving incidents of intimidation of potential voters. Under the previous administration, over a period of 8 years, the Department of Justice brought a total of 10 suits, 6 involving discrimination in voting and 4 involving intimidation of voters.

But the President, in his message, made quite clear the need for additional legislation if we are to insure to all Americans their right to vote. He stated:

> Experience has shown, however, that these highly useful acts of the 85th and 86th Congresses suffer from two major defects. One is the usual long and difficult delay which occurs between the filing of a lawsuit and its ultimate conclusion. In one recent case, for example, 19 months elapsed between the filing of the suit and the judgment of the court. In another, an action brought in July 1961 has not yet come to trial. The legal maxim, "Justice delayed is justice denied," is dramatically applicable in these cases.

Many of these cases illustrate the difficulties faced by an administration anxious to protect voting rights. Among the examples of the delays in these cases are the following:

United States against Raines, Terrell County, Ga., filed September 4, 1958; decree entered September 13, 1960.

United States against Alabama, Macon County, Ala., filed February 5, 1959; injunction issued March 17, 1961.

United States against Majors, Dallas County, Ala., filed April 1961; tried May 1962.

United States against Lucky, Ouachita Parish, La., filed January 1, 1961; not yet tried.

United States against Ramsey, Clarke County, Miss., filed July 1961; tried December 1962.

United States against Daniel, Jefferson Davis County, Miss., filed August 3, 1961; tried October 1962.

United States against Wood, Walthall County, Miss., filed August 1961; presently being tried.

United States against Ward, Madison Parish, La., filed October 1961; tried December 1962; no relief to date.

United States against Dogan, Tallahatchie County, Miss., filed November 17, 1961; segment of suit involving discrimination in registration not yet tried.

United States against Duke, Panola County, Miss., filed October 1961; tried March 1963; no relief to date.

The voting bill we introduce today includes four main provisions:

First. The appointment of temporary voting referees.

Second. Expedition of handling suits brought under Federal civil rights statutes.

Third. Requirement for application of uniform standards and procedures to applicants seeking to register.

Fourth. Establishment of a presumption that those seeking to vote who have a sixth grade education possess sufficient literacy to vote in Federal elections.

There is little doubt that this legislation would go far toward ending ugly racial incidents such as the recent one at Greenwood, Miss., where 19 Negroes were arrested during a registration campaign.

The President, at his press conference, pointed out that if the provision of this bill providing for temporary voting referees had been law, those seeking today to register in Greenwood, Miss., would have already gone before a court-appointed referee and many would be duly registered.

It is a shame that special legislation of this kind is necessary to win people their essential constitutional right. But clearly legislation is necessary, and I believe that Congress has no moral alternative but to pass it as swiftly as possible.

The most urgent part of this proposal is the provision for the appointment of temporary referees to carry out registration in these problem counties. All qualified citizens of these counties have the right to vote today, today, and also had this right yesterday. There is no excuse for putting off the full exercise of the right to vote—even for the lengthy period of litigation. Clearly the assurance that temporary relief can be obtained early in a voting case would be a most important step forward.

As always, the enactment of civil rights legislation is a lengthy task. Therefore, we are hopeful that there will be expeditious scheduling of committee consideration of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the bill, together with the letter of transmittal from the Attorney General, be printed at this point in my remarks. I also ask that that portion of the President's civil rights message containing the recommendations on voting rights be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask further that the bill lie on the table until the end of business on Thursday, April 11, for any additional Senators who might wish to join in sponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and portion of the President's message referred to will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 1283) to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Voting Rights Act of 1963."

SEC. 2. Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971), as amended by section 131 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 637) and as further amended by section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 90) is further amended as follows:

(a) Insert "1" after "(a)" in subsection (a) and add at the end of subsection (a) the following new paragraphs:

"(2) No person acting under color of law shall

"(A) in determining whether any individual is qualified under State law to vote in any Federal election apply any standard, practice or procedure different from the standards, practices or procedures applied to individuals similarly situated who have been found by State officials to be qualified to vote.

"(B) deny the right of any individual to vote in any Federal election because of an error or omission of such individual on any record or paper relating to any application, registration, payment of poll tax, or other act requisite to voting, if such error or omission is not material in determining whether such individual is qualified under State law to vote in such election; or

"(C) employ any literacy test as a qualification for voting in any Federal election unless (i) such test is administered to each individual wholly in writing and (ii) a certified copy of the test and of the answers given by the individual is furnished to him within twenty-five days of the submission of his written request made within the period of time during which records and papers are required to be retained and preserved pursuant to title III of the Act of May 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 88).

"(3) For purposes of this subsection

"(A) the term 'vote' shall have the same meaning as in subsection (e) of this section;

"(B) the words 'Federal election' shall have the same meaning as in subsection (f) of this section; and

"(C) the phrase 'literacy test' includes any test of the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter."

(b) Insert immediately following the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (c) the following new sentence: "If in any such proceeding literacy is a relevant fact it shall be presumed that any person who has not been adjudged an incompetent and who has completed the sixth grade in a school accredited by any State or Territory or the District of Columbia where instruction is carried on predominantly in the English language, possesses sufficient literacy, comprehension, and intelligence to vote in any Federal election as defined in subsection (f) of this section."

(c) Add the following subsection "(f)" and designate the present subsection "(f)" as subsection "(g)":

"(f) Whenever in any proceeding instituted pursuant to subsection (c) the complaint requests a finding of a pattern or practice pursuant to subsection (e), and such complaint, or a motion filed within twenty days after the effective date of this Act in the case of any proceeding which is pending before a district court on such effective date, (1) is signed by the Attorney General (or in his absence the Acting Attorney General), and (2) alleges that in the affected area fewer than fifteen percent of the total number of voting age persons of the same race as the persons alleged in the complaint to have been discriminated against are registered (or otherwise recorded as qualified to vote), any person resident within the affected area who is of the same race as the persons alleged to have been discriminated against shall be entitled, upon his application therefor, to an order declaring him qualified to vote, upon proof that at any election or elections (1) he is qualified under State law to vote, and (2) he has since the filing of the proceeding under subsection (c) been (A) deprived of or denied under color of law the opportunity to register to vote or otherwise to qualify to vote, or (B) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law. Such order shall be effective as to any Federal or State election held within the longest period for which such applicant could have been registered or otherwise qualified under State law at which the applicant's qualifications would under State law entitle him to vote; provided that in the event it is determined upon final disposition of the proceeding, including any review, that no pattern or practice of deprivation of any right secured by subsection (a) exists, the order shall thereafter no longer qualify the applicant to vote in any subsequent election.

"Notwithstanding any inconsistent provision of State law or the action of any State officer or court, an applicant so declared qualified to vote shall be permitted to vote as provided herein. The Attorney General shall cause to be transmitted certified copies of any order declaring a person qualified to vote to the appropriate election officers. The refusal by any such officer with notice of such order to permit any person so qualified to vote to vote at an appropriate election shall constitute contempt of court.

"An application for an order pursuant to this subsection shall be heard within ten days, and the execution of any order disposing of such application shall not be stayed if the effect of such stay would be to delay the effectiveness of the order beyond the date of any election at which the applicant would otherwise be enabled to vote.

"The court may appoint one or more persons, to be known as temporary voting referees, to receive applications pursuant to this subsection and to take evidence and report to the court findings as to whether at any election or elections (1) any applicant entitled under this subsection to apply for an order declaring him qualified to vote is qualified under State law to vote, and (2) he has since the filing of the proceeding under subsection (c) been (A) deprived of or denied under color of law the opportunity to register to vote or otherwise to qualify to vote, or (B) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law. The procedure for processing applications under this subsection and for the entry of orders shall be the same as that provided for in the fourth and fifth paragraphs of subsection (e).

"In appointing a temporary voting referee the court shall make its selection from a panel provided by the Judicial Conference of the circuit. Any temporary voting referee shall be a resident and a qualified voter of the State in which he is to serve. He shall subscribe to the oath of office required by Revised Statutes, section 1757 (5 U.S.C. 16) and shall to the extent not inconsistent herewith have all the powers conferred upon a master by Rule 53(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The compensation to be allowed any persons appointed by the district court pursuant to this subsection shall be fixed by the court and shall be payable by the United States. In the event that the district court shall appoint a retired officer or employee of the United States to serve as a temporary voting referee, such officer or employee shall continue to receive, in addition to any compensation for services rendered pursuant to this subsection, all retirement benefits to which he may otherwise be entitled.

"The court or temporary voting referee shall entertain applications and the court shall issue orders pursuant to this subsection until final disposition of the proceeding under subsection (c), including any review, or until the finding of a pattern or practice pursuant to subsection (e), whichever shall first occur. Applications pursuant to this subsection shall be determined expeditiously, and this subsection shall in no way be construed as a limitation upon the existing powers of the court.

"When used in this subsection, the words 'Federal election' shall mean any general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives; the words 'State election' shall mean any other general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate for public office; the words 'affected area' shall mean that county, parish or similar subdivision of the State in which the laws of the State relating to voting are or have been administered by a person who is a defendant in the proceeding instituted under subsection (c) on the date the original complaint is filed; and the words 'voting age persons' shall mean those persons who meet the age requirements of State law for voting."

(d) Add the following subsection "(h)":

"(h) In any civil action brought in any district court of the United States under Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and Title III of the Act of May 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 88), wherein the United States is plaintiff, it shall be the duty of the chief judge of the district (or in his absence, the acting chief judge) in which the case is pending immediately to designate a judge in such district to hear and determine the case. In the event that no judge in the district is available to hear and determine the case, the chief judge of the district, or the acting chief judge, as the case may be, shall certify this fact to the chief judge of the circuit (or in his absence, the acting chief judge) who shall then designate a district or circuit judge of the circuit to hear and determine the case.

"It shall be the duty of the judge designated pursuant to this section to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date and to cause the case to be in every way expedited."

SEC. 3. If any provision of this Act is held invalid, the remainder of this Act shall not be affected thereby.

The letter and portion of the President's message presented by Mr. HART are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: It is my privilege to transmit for your consideration and appropriate reference the text of a draft bill including four of the civil rights proposals recommended by the President and discussed in some detail in his message of February 28, 1963.

The bill includes:

1. A provision for temporary and interim relief, including the appointment of temporary voting referees, in certain circumstances while voting suits are proceeding through the Federal courts.

2. A provision to expedite voting suits brought under the Federal civil rights statutes.

3. A provision to require the application of uniform standards, practices and procedures to all applicants seeking to register and to vote in Federal elections; to prohibit the disqualification of any applicant because of immaterial errors or omissions; and to require any literacy test given to an applicant for voting in a Federal election to be administered in writing.

4. A provision to establish a presumption in voting suits brought pursuant to subsection (c) of 42 U.S.C. 1971 that any person who has completed the sixth grade in an accredited school where instruction is predominantly in the English language possesses sufficient literacy to vote in any Federal election.

This bill is designed to remedy two major defects which experience has shown exist in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. While these acts have proven a useful tool in the protection of voting rights, a considerable period of time, measurable in terms of years, frequently elapses between the filing of a lawsuit and its ultimate conclusion. The result is that with respect to specific elections occurring during that period, the right to vote is lost forever. This bill, therefore, would accelerate the enjoyment of voting rights previously recognized by the Constitution and laws of this country, but too long denied to a substantial segment of our population.

Second, this bill would explicitly prohibit the application of arbitrary and discriminatory standards in determining the qualifications of persons seeking to register and to vote in Federal elections. As the President stated in his message, no one can rightfully contend that any voting registrar should be permitted to deny the vote to any qualified citizen through discriminatory administration of qualifying tests, or upon the basis of minor errors in filling out a complicated form which seeks only information. Yet the experience of this Department has been that such arbitrary and discriminatory practices play a major role in the deprivation of the right of otherwise qualified citizens to vote.

The need for legislation to correct this administrative abuse and to alleviate the delay now experienced by many of our fellow citizens in the enjoyment of their right to vote cannot be overemphasized. The Department therefore urges that Congress give prompt and favorable consideration to this bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

ROBERT KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

I. THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The right to vote in a free American election is the most powerful and precious right in the world—and it must not be denied on the grounds of race or color. It is a potent key to achieving other rights of citizenship. For American history—both recent and past—clearly reveals that the power of the ballot has enabled those who achieve it to win other achievements as well, to gain a full voice in the affairs of their State and Nation, and to see their interests represented in the governmental bodies which affect their future. In a free society, those with the power to govern are necessarily responsive to those with the right to vote.

In enacting the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, Congress provided the Department of Justice with basic tools for protecting the right to vote—and this administration has not hesitated to use those tools. Legal action is brought only after voluntary efforts fail; and, in scores of instances, local officials, at the request of the Department of Justice, have voluntarily made voting records available or abandoned discriminatory registration, discriminatory voting practices, or segregated balloting. Where voluntary local compliance has not been forthcoming, the Department of Justice has approximately quadrupled the previous level of its legal effort—investigating coercion, inspecting records, initiating lawsuits, enjoining intimidation, and taking whatever followup action is necessary to forbid further interference or discrimination. As a result, thousands of Negro citizens are registering and voting for the first time—many of them in counties where no Negro had ever voted before. The Department of Justice will continue to take whatever action is required to secure the right to vote for all Americans.

Experience has shown, however, that these highly useful acts of the 85th and 86th Congresses suffer from two major defects. One is the usual long and difficult delay which occurs between the filing of a lawsuit and its ultimate conclusion. In one recent case, for example, 19 months elapsed between the filing of the suit and the judgment of the court. In another, an action brought in July 1961 has not yet come to trial. The legal maxim, "Justice delayed is justice denied," is dramatically applicable in these cases.

Too often those who attempt to assert their constitutional rights are intimidated. Prospective registrants are fired. Registration workers are arrested. In some instances, churches in which registration meetings are held have been burned. In one case where Negro tenant farmers chose to exercise their right to vote, it was necessary for the Justice Department to seek injunctions to halt their eviction and for the Department of Agriculture to help feed them from surplus stocks. Under these circumstances, continued delay in the granting of the franchise—particularly in counties where there is mass racial disfranchisement—permits the intent of the Congress to be openly flouted.

Federal executive action in such cases—no matter how speedy and how drastic—can never fully correct such abuses of power. It is necessary instead to free the forces of our democratic system within these areas by promptly insuring the franchise to all citizens, making it possible for their elected officials to be truly responsive to all their constituents.

The second and somewhat overlapping gap in these statutes is their failure to deal specifically with the most common forms of abuse of discretion on the part of local election officials who do not treat all applicants uniformly.

Objections were raised last year to the proposed literacy test bill, which attempted to speed up the enforcement of the right to vote by removing one important area of discretion from registration officials who used that discretion to exclude Negroes. Preventing that bill from coming to a vote did not make any less real the prevalence in many counties of the use of literacy and other voter qualification tests to discriminate against prospective Negro voters, contrary to the requirements of the 14th and 15th amendments, and adding to the delays and difficulties encountered in securing the franchise for those denied it.

An indication of the magnitude of the overall problem, as well as the need for speedy action, is a recent five-State survey disclosing over 200 counties in which fewer than 15 percent of the Negroes of voting age are registered to vote. This cannot continue. I am, therefore, recommending legislation to deal with this problem of judicial delay and administrative abuse in four ways:

First, to provide for interim relief while voting suits are proceeding through the courts in areas of demonstrated need, temporary Federal voting referees should be appointed to determine the qualifications of applicants for registration and voting during the pendency of a law-suit in any county in which fewer than 15 percent of the eligible number of persons of any race claimed to be discriminated against are registered to vote. Existing Federal law provides for the appointment of voting referees to receive and act upon applications for voting registration upon a court finding that a pattern or practice of discrimination exists. But to prevent a successful case from becoming an empty victory, insofar as the particular election is concerned, the proposed legislation would provide that, within these prescribed limits, temporary voting referees would be appointed to serve from the inception to the conclusion of the Federal voting suit, applying, however, only State law and State regulations. As officers of the court, their decisions would be subject to court scrutiny and review.

Second, voting suits brought under the Federal civil rights statutes should be accorded expedited treatment in the Federal courts, just as in many State courts election suits are given preference on the dockets on the sensible premise that, unless the right to vote can be exercised at a specific election, it is, to the extent of that election, lost forever.

Third, the law should specifically prohibit the application of different tests, standards, practices, or procedures for different applicants seeking to register and vote in Federal election. Under present law, the courts can ultimately deal with the various forms of racial discrimination practiced by local registrars. But the task of litigation, and the time consumed in preparation and proof, should be lightened in every possible fashion. No one can rightfully contend that any voting registrar should be permitted to deny the vote to any qualified citizen, anywhere in this country, through discriminatory administration of qualifying tests, or upon the basis of minor errors in filling out a complicated form which seeks only information. Yet the Civil Rights Commission, and the cases brought by the Department of Justice, have compiled one discouraging example after another of obstacles placed in the path of Negroes seeking to register to vote at the same time that other applicants experience no difficulty whatsoever. Qualified Negroes, including those with college degrees, have been denied registration for their inability to give a reasonable interpretation of the Constitution. They have been required to complete their applications with unreasonable precision, or to secure registered voters to vouch for their identity, or to defer to white persons who want to register ahead of them, or they are otherwise subjected to exasperating delays. Yet uniformity of treatment is required by the dictates of both the Constitution and fair play; and this proposed statute, therefore, seeks to spell out that principle to ease the difficulties and delays of litigation. Limiting the proposal to voting qualifications in elections for Federal offices alone will clearly eliminate any constitutional conflict.

Fourth, completion of the sixth grade should, with respect to Federal elections, constitute a presumption that the applicant is literate. Literacy tests pose especially difficult problems in determining voter qualification. The essentially subjective judgment involved in each individual case, the difficulty of challenging that judgment, have made literacy tests one of the cruelest and most abused of all voter qualification tests. The incidence of such abuse can be eliminated, or at least drastically curtailed, by the proposed legislation providing that proof of completion of the sixth grade constitutes a presumption that the applicant is literate.

Finally, the 87th Congress—after 20 years of effort—passed and referred to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment to prohibit the levying of poll taxes as a condition to voting. Already 13 States have ratified the proposed amendment and in 3 more one body of the legislature has acted. I urge every State legislature to take prompt action on this matter and to outlaw the poll tax—which has too long been an outmoded and arbitrary bar to voting participation by minority groups and others—as the 24th amendment to the Constitution. This measure received bipartisan sponsorship and endorsement in the Congress, and I shall continue to work with Governors and legislative leaders of both parties in securing adoption of the anti-poll-tax amendment.

PATENT POLICY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a uniform national policy concerning proprietary rights in inventions made through the expenditure of public funds.

The Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary has been engaged for some time in a study of the patent policies and practices of the various Government departments and agencies. The subcommittee has given particular attention to determining what disposition shall be made of patent rights in inventions arising from Government-financed research and development contracts. The need for a determination by the Congress as to this Government's patent policy is made clear by the fact that during the present fiscal year it is estimated that the Federal Government will obligate $14.7 billion for research and development. Government agencies conducting research in related areas have different patent policies. The general policy relating to disposition of such patent rights should be made by the Congress and not left to the discretion of each Government department.

A number of bills have been introduced on this subject. These have ranged from almost total ownership of patent rights by the Government to bills which would almost totally exclude the Government from such ownership. The Patents Subcommittee, during the 87th Congress, held extensive hearings for the purpose of receiving testimony from all individuals and groups who could make a useful contribution. The record of these hearings has been carefully studied and additional proposals have been explored by the subcommittee.

While this subject will require further study and possibly additional hearings, I have concluded that the most appropriate legislation would be a bill which would provide general guidelines to be observed by Government departments in disposing of patent rights. I am also of the view that no informed judgment can be made as to the disposition of patent rights at the time when the contract is negotiated and that such determination should be deferred until the inventions are actually disclosed.

The bill which I have introduced today, in my opinion, constitutes a reasonable solution to a complex question—a question which should be resolved. While the bill reflects what I believe is a sound approach to this matter, I do not pretend that it is perfect. I therefore invite those who are interested in this subject to communicate to the subcommittee their views as to this bill and any suggestions which they have for amendments. After reviewing the entire situation, the subcommittee will decide whether additional hearings are required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1290) to establish a uniform national policy concerning proprietary rights in inventions made through the expenditure of public funds, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McClellan, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO EMPLOY ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, together with a statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1291) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are attached four copies of a proposed bill "To authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity."

There are also attached four copies of a statement of purpose and need for the proposed bill.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

Luther H. Hodges,
Secretary of Commerce.

Statement of Purpose and Need

The proposed legislation will provide authority for the Department of Commerce to employ noncitizens in scientific or technical work. Authority, similar to that here sought, was granted by the Congress recently to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Congress has exempted the Department of Defense from the prohibitions against employment of noncitizens. The Departments of State and Agriculture, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Public Health Service have also been given authority by Congress to employ noncitizens for certain necessary purposes.

On various occasions, agencies of this Department engaged in scientific and technical work of critical national importance have found that the only persons qualified and available to undertake these projects could not be hired because, as noncitizens, they were ineligible for employment by the Government.

The proposed legislation would enable the Department to make the best possible use of available scientific manpower. Any employment under the proposed legislation would, of course, continue to be subject to a prior determination that no qualified U.S. citizen is available for the particular position. The legislation provides adequate authority for investigation to determine the suitability and security status of aliens who may be employed thereunder. The Department of course has even more stringent security standards for aliens than it has for citizen applicants for comparable positions.

While the problems created by the prohibition on the hiring of aliens are present in several of the bureaus of the Department of Commerce, those problems are particularly severe at the National Bureau of Standards.

In certain areas of research now important in the technical program of the National Bureau of Standards, the availability of U.S. citizens with adequate specific training is extremely limited. Two factors have contributed to this situation. In the first place, the well-recognized general shortage of scientists and engineers in the United States has definitely restricted the Bureau's ability to fill important research positions. Secondly, some important Bureau research programs are in areas of the physical sciences that have not in recent years been fashionable or attractive to American students and scientists. In such fields, the training of new research scientists in American universities has been limited and the suppy of new research personnel has therefore continued to decline.

The following examples will illustrate the problems:

1. A number of our most important national programs are increasingly in need of precise data on atomic properties that can be obtained only through an intensive program in atomic spectroscopy. Such information is essential for example, in interpreting the astrophysical data obtained by space vehicles and other astronomical observatories, in measuring the energy and understanding the flow of energy in plasmas such as those involved in thermonuclear fusion research, and in understanding the physical processes involved in rocket propulsion. Programs such as these require information on the precise value of the spectral wavelengths of the radiated energy of the atoms of each of the elements and precise measurements of the rates with which atoms radiate or absorb energy.

The analysis of atomic spectra occupied the majority of the effort of academic physicists during the late 1920's and early 1930's, but most of the physicists trained in atomic spectroscopy during the early 1930's shifted their research interests to nuclear physics later in the decade. Through this change in interest and the retirement of previously active spectroscopists, great laboratories which once made major contributions to the field have drastically reduced their work in atomic spectroscopy. Thus, the recently increased demand for an enormous quantity of precise data falls primarily upon the National Bureau of Standards just at a time when American universities have been producing very few trained personnel in this field.

Although disappearing from American universities, spectroscopy is still an active field of study and research interest abroad. Major institutions are producing qualified atomic spectroscopists in Sweden, Israel, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Spain, and Belgium. While the nationals of some of these countries may be employed by the National Bureau of Standards under the present statutory authorization, it is desirable to extend the authorization to all such countries so that the Bureau may recruit the best-qualified research personnel for its particular programs.

2. A similar situation exists with respect to applied mathematics. In a number of relatively "unfashionable" branches of mathematics, the general shortage of trained mathematicians is aggravated by the lack of interest on the part of American students. Numerical analysis, for example, which involves the use of numerical techniques for the solution of problems of physics, chemistry, and engineering is a relatively new mathematical field in the United States. It has, however, become an important field in recent years because of the availability of powerful computers and the applicability of numerical analysis to extremely difficult problems in science and technology. One of the most valuable sources of trained personnel in this field of mathematics is Switzerland but the National Bureau of Standards is, under the present statute, precluded from the employment of Swiss nationals.

3. The neutron measurement field is another area in which the Bureau could obtain important assistance from Swiss scientists. Many segments of Government and industry look to the National Bureau of Standards for basic information on neutron cross sections and neutron polarization. Such data are of great importance in radiation shielding problems vital to defense and in reactor development. The Bureau has experienced great difficulty in recruiting competent scientists in this increasingly important field. The Bureau is aware of at least two Swiss nationals who are highly qualified for this work and probably would be interested in coming to the National Bureau of Standards if suitable authority was available for their employment.

REPEAL OF SECTION 1(8) OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which would repeal section 1(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, known as the commodities clause.

This bill is introduced at the request of the Transportation Association of America, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter from that association as well as a statement of justification prepared by that association be included in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement of justification will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1292) to repeal section 1(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, commonly known as the commodities clause, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of justification presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follow:

TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: You will recall that during the last Congress, you introduced a bill, S. 734, to repeal section 1(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, commonly known as the commodities clause. This clause presently restricts a railroad from transporting in interstate commerce commodities—other than lumber and the manufactured products thereof—which it owns, produces, or in which it has any interest, except commodities used in its business as a common carrier. A photocopy of your statement on the floor of the Senate when introducing this bill is enclosed, as taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, 1961.

Since the conditions justifying such legislation are just as valid today as at the time of introduction of this bill, we are hopeful that you will again consent to introduce such a bill. If agreeable, you could use approximately the same statement as given on January 31, 1961, or you might consider remarks along the lines of the enclosed statement. Also enclosed is a copy of the actual language of the bill, which you can note is quite simple.

As you undoubtedly are well aware, the President, in his transportation message of 1962, recommended that this clause be repealed. He stated further:

"The need for this provision, which goes back to the days of oppressive railroad monopoly, has largely passed; and its current effect is to handicap the railroads in competing with other modes of transportation. The antitrust laws can insure protection against the possible abuse by a railroad of its dual status as shipper and carrier."

Since this recommendation is thus part of the President's transport program, we hope that you will include any bill calling for repeal of the commodities clause with the administration's omnibus bill when you schedule the latter for hearings in the coming months. TAA would, of course, like to present testimony in support of repeal of the commodities clause.

Sincerely,

HAROLD F. HAMMOND,
President.

STATEMENT OF JUSTIFICATION

It is recommended that section 1(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, commonly known as the commodities clause be repealed.

The clause, as it now stands, reads as follows:

"(8) From and after May 1, 1908, it shall be unlawful for any railroad company to transport from any State, territory, or the District of Columbia, to any other State, territory, or the District of Columbia, or to any foreign country, any article or commodity, other than timber and the manufactured products thereof, manufactured, mined or produced by it, or under its authority or which it may own in whole or in part, or in which it may have any interest, direct or indirect, except such articles or commodities as may be necessary and intended for its use in the conduct of its business as a common carrier."

Thus, the commodities clause presently restricts a railroad company from transporting in interstate commerce commodities which it owns (other than timber and the manufactured products thereof), produces, or in which it has any interest, except commodities which may be used in its business as a common carrier.

Since the passage of the clause—over 50 years ago—other acts have been enacted to provide for the regulation of other modes of transportation. None of these acts contain a provision similar to the commodities clause.

Competition between the various types of transport has developed since that time to a point of great intensity. This highly competitive condition in today's transportation field has made this clause an unnecessary and outmoded form of regulation that unfairly burdens the railroads.

The history of the commodities clause indicates that abuses at which it was originally directed would be reached by the antitrust laws or by the Interstate Commerce Commission's control over discrimination and railroad service. Since the clause first became effective, the jurisdiction of the ICC has greatly increased and the Commission now has the power to correct and prevent discrimination and preferential treatment.

The railroads presently occupy no monopoly position in the transport industry; in fact, their relative share of both total freight and passenger traffic has steadily declined since World War II. They are faced with intense competition from thousands of other carriers—both regulated and unregulated—and none of them is prevented from engaging in other nontransport fields by a commodities clause. Nonrail carriers are continuing to expand into many types of nontransport business operations.

Many of the largest and most prosperous corporations in the United States carry their own commodities in their own barges, ships, and trucks. It is estimated that at least one half of the total truck ton-mileage is moved by shippers' privately owned or leased equipment. If the commodities clause were applied in reverse, other industries would be prohibited from performing their own transportation services.

The President, in his transportation message of 1962, specifically called for repeal of the commodities clause. He stated: "The need for this provision, which goes back to the days of oppressive railroad monopoly, has largely passed; and its current effect is to handicap the railroads in competing with other modes of transportation. The antitrust laws can insure protection against the possible abuse by a railroad of its dual status as shipper and carrier."

Therefore, in order to relieve the railroads of an outdated regulation and to help "provide fair and impartial regulation," as called for in the declaration of national transportation policy in the Interstate Commerce Act, section 1(8) of the act should be repealed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 64(a)(2) OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 64(a)(2) of the Bankruptcy Act and ask that it lie over for 3 days for the benefit of those who want to cosponsor this important legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying explanation of the bill also be printed immedately following the draft of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

The bill (S. 1295) to amend section 64(a)(2) of the Bankruptcy Act, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 64 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting therein, immediately after the semicolon at the end thereof, the following: "and, further, for the purpose of establishing priority under this clause and for computation of the maximum claim to which priority can be given, payments due to any fund or plan established for the purpose of providing employee benefits, which are based upon hours worked or wages paid, shall, if such payments would qualify as deductible from the employer's gross income under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, be deemed to be wages assigned to the fund or plan by the individual employees upon whose service or wages such payments are based;".

The explanation presented by Mr. JOHNSTON is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF DRAFT BILL TO AMEND SECTION 64(a)(2) OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The draft bill would amend section 64(a)(2) of the Bankruptcy Act to place employer payments owing to an employee benefit plan or fund, which are based on hours worked or wages paid, in the same priority class as cash wages. This is done by providing that such payments shall be deemed to be "wages" assigned to the plan by the employee.

More than a century ago Congress established the firm principle of public policy that the wages of workers who face financial need because of their employer's bankruptcy should have some measure of protection. To provide such protection, the Federal bankruptcy law was amended in 1841 to give a certain amount of cash wages owed employees a degree of priority with respect to the assets available. Since that time these provisions have been extended and improved at various times. Under existing law, however, an employee benefit plan is treated as a general creditor, and as such must compete with other general creditors for any remaining assets, without regard to the amounts such creditors may have been paid prior to the time the employer finally became bankrupt.

The draft bill recognizes the desirability—in fact, the basic equity—of providing a similar priority for payments which an employer has promised his employees he would make on their behalf to maintain a fund which furnishes health and welfare benefits in which they may share. Such payments are to an ever-increasing extent being considered as a form of additional compensation to the employees.

The concept of wages has broadened considerably in the last several decades, particularly with respect to employee benefit plans providing pensions, health insurance, disability insurance, life insurance, and similar benefits. When wages were first accorded a degree of priority in Federal bankruptcy law, these employee benefit plans were nonexistent. Even as late as 1938, when the present order of priority for wages was established in the Bankruptcy Act, they were relatively unknown.

However, the rapid increase in the coverage of two types of employee benefits—hospital insurance and pensions—indicates their increasing importance to wage and salary workers. Since 1940, the first year for which reasonably complete data are available, the number of persons provided hospital expense protection by employee benefit plans has increased from about 10 million to over 100 million persons. The magnitude of this development is further underscored when considered in terms of the tremendous sums of money involved. Almost $60 billion is now invested in all types of welfare and pension plans, and this amount is increasing annually by some $5 billion. Employee benefit plans are clearly an integral part of our Nation's wage structure.

The humanitarian considerations involved also present compelling reasons for amending the act as proposed in the draft bill. The existence of a wage priority in bankruptcy proceedings is intended to provide a protective cushion for workers who depend upon wages for their support, and who face immediate financial needs because of a loss of wages resulting from their employer's bankruptcy. This need frequently results not only from the loss of regular wage payments, but also from the possible loss of protection of benefit plans into which a portion of the employees' wages may have been placed in reserve over a period of many years. It is when an employer's business fails that his employees or their families may well most urgently need the protection these plans normally provide.

Further, at a time when an employer's business is facing bankruptcy, he is perhaps most likely to apply his available funds to the more pressing demands of his ordinary creditors and to fail in his obligation to contribute to a plan such as this bill is designed to protect.

The proposed legislation will also operate to help employees in the very situation where bankruptcies are most likely to occur, i.e., the small, marginal type of employer. The large, stable, and established employers do not usually become bankrupt. The garment and construction industries are leading examples of this type of small employer. Individuals in these industries are constantly buying a few capital items and starting their own business, with a few employees. Many of them fail, even in times of reasonably good business conditions. The proposed legislation would help the employees of this type of enterprise, which by its very nature is unstable.

In sum, the draft bill would establish, for the first time, a priority in bankruptcy proceedings for payments due pension or welfare funds based on hours worked or wages paid. Such a priority will enable the Bankruptcy Act to give effect under present economic conditions to the sound principle of public policy that the wages of workers who face financial need because of their employer's bankruptcy should be protected.

COMPULSORY LICENSING OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG PATENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the important accomplishments of the last Congress was the passage of Public Law 87-781 relating to drugs, which has come to be referred to as the Kefauver-Harris drug law. Reflecting the thalidomide tragedy, references to this omnibus statute have often stressed its safety features, which, though important, represent only one of its three major objectives. In addition to improving the safety of drugs, the law is designed to improve the quality and lessen the quantity of advertising and promotional material directed to physicians. And, in its original form, it was intended to bring about lower prices of all types of drugs, an objective which has been accomplished only in part. Prices of patented drugs, which represent about 60 percent of all prescriptions, were to be reduced through compulsory licensing under carefully specified conditions. Prices of nonpatented drugs were to be lowered as a result of a stimulus to prescribing by generic name which, it was anticipated, would result from a number of the bill's provisions.

The savings which are possible under generic-name prescribing can be illustrated with a few examples which can be provided by a contrast of the prices charged by McKesson & Robbins for generic-name products with the prices of the major drug companies for their trademark versions of the same products. McKesson's price for the nervous system stimulant, dextro-amphetamine sulfate, is only one-fifteenth that of the most widely selling trade-name make of a large drug company, to wit, Smith Kline & French's Dexedrine. Both digitoxin, used in heart cases, and isoniazid, used in the treatment of tuberculosis, are sold by McKesson at about half the prices charged by large manufacturers for their trade-name products.

As finally enacted, the compulsory licensing provision was not incorporated, although on a rollcall vote it received the support of 28 Senators. All of the provisions designed to promote generic-name prescribing, however, were retained. Indeed, short of requiring by statute that all prescriptions be written in terms of a drug's generic name, there is little that the Congress could have done to promote generic-name prescribing that it did not do.

LOWER PRICES FOR NONPATENTED DRUGS

Specifically, the new law sought to overcome each of the three principal barriers to generic-name prescribing which have existed in the past. The first obstacle has been the apprehension by physicians that if they prescribe by generic names, their patients will not receive a drug of adequate and acceptable quality. Their position, reiterated time and again, is that they have confidence in the trade-name products of the large companies. Despite the disclosure by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee that most prescription drugs are produced in bulk form by only one or in most cases no more than three companies and that all other companies, large and small, necessarily obtain their supplies from these few sources, there has thus far been no discernible trend toward generic-name prescribing. It is hoped that such a trend will develop as physicians become aware of the provisions in the new law designed to assure that any drug sold in the United States will be of fully adequate and acceptable quality, regardless of whether it is prescribed by generic or trade name and regardless of whether it is supplied by a large or a small company. Insofar as prescription drugs are concerned, these provisions greatly extend the powers of the Food and Drug Administration to inspect drug plants; they require that all drug plants establish recognized quality manufacturing controls; and they provide that all drug establishments be registered with the Food and Drug Administration and be inspected at least every 2 years.

A second obstacle was the hiding, masking, and camouflaging of the generic name, a practice based on the elemental reasoning that a physician could not prescribe by generic name if he did not know what it was. During one of our hearings, the head of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, Dr. Smith, was handed an advertisement that had been sent to physicians and was asked to locate the generic name. That he was unable to do so is understandable in view of the fact that it was printed in microscopic type alongside the stem of one of the letters of the trade name printed in very large type. In order to be sure that physicians are constantly made aware of a drug's generic name, the new law provides that in all advertisements, labels, and labeling, wherever the trade name is shown, it shall be followed by the generic name in type at least half as large as that used for the trade name.

I wish to emphasize the word "wherever." Wherever the trade name is shown, whether on the label, in advertisements, in labeling, such as brochures, the generic name must be printed in type at least one-half as large as that used for the trade name.

The final obstacle has been the practice by the drug companies in making their generic names so long and complex that they cannot be remembered, spelled, pronounced, or written. The new law gives to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the authority to designate generic names which are to be simple and useful. He can use this authority under two conditions; first, when he is requested to do so by the compiler of an official compendium, such as the "United States Pharmacopeia," and second, upon review of generic names which under the law he is required to make.

Thus, since physicians should be able to have confidence in the quality of all prescription drugs, since the generic names will constantly be brought to their attention, and since the generic names themselves will tend to become simpler and more useful, there should take place a pronounced and continuing increase in generic-name prescribing.

May I point out that since the time our hearings started, almost 4 years ago, there has been a marked increase in the buying of drugs by generic name, principally by institutional buyers. The Military Medical Supply Agency of the U.S. Government—MMSA—constantly buys drugs by generic name, saving the taxpayers millions of dollars. Incidentally, those are the drugs Senators get when they go to Walter Reed Hospital or Bethesda Naval Hospital, or when they call Dr. Calver's office. The same is true of the Veterans' Administration.

In addition, many States have saved large sums of money through buying drugs by generic name.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], when he was Governor of Connecticut, inaugurated a program of this kind, which has saved the State of Connecticut substantial sums in the purchase of drugs. Also, hospitals, by the use of formularies, have been buying drugs by generic name.

All of this goes to show that the widespread apprehension that drugs prescribed by generic names might not be as safe or as efficacious as trade name drugs does not have a solid foundation. It has certainly not been borne out by actions of the Federal Government and State governments. But whatever basis existed for that apprehension should now be eliminated by the new safeguards which should assure all physicians that drugs manufactured by any company, large or small, are going to meet acceptable standards.

THE HIGH PRICES OF PATENTED DRUGS

But these reforms, important as they are, will have little effect on the prices of patented drugs, which, I again want to stress, constitute the majority of all prescriptions. For these products the customer will pay the same price regardless of whether the prescription is written in terms of its trade name or its generic name. It is in this area that new legislation is called for.

Let me emphasize that the prescription drug industry is a big industry, exceeding in size $3 billion a year at the manufacturers' level. It is larger than that, of course, when we include the retail markup. Plus the amount paid for therapeutic devices, the amount spent on drugs amounts each year to more than the American people pay to physicians for treatment.

As we all know, a private monopoly anywhere, in any industrial field, usually means arbitrarily high prices unrelated either to costs of production or to reasonable profits. Monopoly in the field of prescription drugs is, quite conspicuously, no exception. Last August, in proposing legislation to correct this unfortunate situation, I presented some specific case examples. I want to present some of them again today, because, in the stress of discussing the important legislation that was passed, the significance of monopoly pricing in drugs may not have been fully understood.

Let me emphasize again that these cases are not exceptions; they represent the ordinary, everyday, garden variety of pricing practices in the ethical drug field. Take, for example, prednisone, which is a cortical steroid widely used in the treatment of arthritis.

The cost for this drug is illustrated by a chart in the back of the Chamber, the chart to the right.

Many elderly people, living on pensions, take this drug regularly every day of their lives. Usually they have to take three tablets daily; if the doctor prescribes Meticorten, the brand name of Schering Corp., which is the leading seller of the drug, it costs them 30 cents a tablet, or a daily maintenance cost of $1. Many retirement pensions are around $60 a month; so Senators can see that $30 per month for prednisone takes a big chunk out of their monthly allotments.

During the hearings of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, evidence was presented showing that Schering's costs of producing 1,000 tablets of Meticorten, tableted and bottled, were roughly $13. Against a price to the druggist of $170, this represents a markup of 1,208 percent. As the term customarily implies, the "production costs" which I am referring to in this discussion exclude distribution costs, profit, and that portion of profit taken by taxes. Schering was offering this material to the Military Medical Supply Agency, the purchasing agency for the U.S. Armed Forces, for about $18. In England, Schering's price for Meticorten is less than one-half of the price in this country; the retail druggist there pays $75 as against $170 here.

In England the druggist pays about $75 a thousand, or 7½ cents each, as against $170, or 17 cents a tablet, here. And the cost to the patient in that country and throughout Europe is substantially less than it is here.

These figures are depicted in the chart in the rear of the Chamber. This is an important drug, taken by many elderly persons suffering from arthritis.

McKesson & Robbin's factory cost is $8.99 a thousand. The bid price to the Military Medical Supply Agency, which would include, of course, a substantial profit, is $17.97 a thousand. Schering's price to the foreign druggist, in England, is $75.30 a thousand. The price to the druggist in the United States is $170 a thousand. The druggist's price to the patient is about $270 a thousand.

Breaking this down in terms of costs per tablet, the production cost is a little less than 0.9 cent. The bid to the MMSA is 1.8 cents a tablet. The price to the druggist in England is 7.5 cents per tablet. The price to the druggist in the United States is 17 cents a tablet.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was going to ask a question about the price to the ultimate consumer. The Senator has covered the point.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The price to the ultimate consumer is around 27 cents a tablet. Sometimes it is a little higher, and sometimes a little less, depending on where it is purchased.

Though primarily a wholesale concern, indeed the largest in the country, McKesson & Robbins have long been engaged in drug manufacturing. No one, to my knowledge, doubts the quality of their products. They are manufacturers comparable to the very best. Their cost of $9 per 1,000 includes the cost of purchasing the finished material, plus the expenses of tableting and bottling. Using this cost as a base for calculation, Schering's markup is 1,789 percent.

There are, however, two items included in our cost estimates that are excluded from McKesson's actual costs, which would explain part of the difference between the two figures: First, a profit on the tableting and bottling operations; and second, an allowance for research costs. Speaking of research costs, the subcommittee found that expenditures by the major drug companies on research averaged only 6.3 percent of their total sales dollar for drugs, as compared to 24.8 percent for selling, distribution, and advertising expenses, and 25.8 percent for profit—of which, of course, about half went to taxes.

If Senators think this is phenomenal, let us take a look at reserpine, another important drug used as a hypotensive. Reserpine is not a new drug; the crude material, rauwolfia, has been used for centuries in India and other countries for the treatment of physical and mental disorders.

It is a plant, the root of which has been used as a tranquilizer in India for hundreds of years. Reserpine is a more refined version of this older drug, and the patent on it is held by C.I.B.A., a Swiss company, which markets the product under the name Serpasil. Our estimate of C.I.B.A.'s production cost per 1,000 tablets was $2.48. The drug is sold abroad to druggists for $10.50; in this country the druggist has to pay $39.50. On the U.S. price this represents a markup of almost 1,500 percent.

The subcommittee was greatly surprised to learn that C.I.B.A. was offering reserpine to the MMSA for 52 cents per 1,000 tablets.

In the normal course of business they would not be offering it for this price unless they expected to make a profit. In a word, it was offering 1,000 tablets to this buyer for the same price it was offering 13 tablets to the druggists. This did not look so surprising, however, when McKesson & Robbins informed the subcommittee that its cost, in purchasing this material in the open market, was about 63 cents per 1,000 tablets. Using this cost as a base, the markup of C.I.B.A.'s product is truly phenomenal—about 6,170 percent.

I could continue indefinitely with this type of cost-price comparison on drugs, but I will present only two more. One of the most revolutionary developments in drug research is the oral antidiabetic, tolbutamide, which was invented by the German firm, Hoechst. Upjohn is the exclusive licensee of Hoechst in this country, and under our system of patent protection no other company is allowed to sell the drug in this country. Here the situation is very different from the two drugs previously discussed. In the case of prednisone, there has been a patent interference in progress in the Patent Office for several years. A patent interference occurs when two or more parties claim priority of invention and the Patent Office must reach a decision on which claimant is entitled to the patent. Since no patent has yet been issued, any company is free to market prednisone. I might add that the two contesting parties are Schering and the Syntex Corp., formerly an independent Mexican company but now owned by Allen & Co., an investment house.

The kind of competition which has occurred in the marketing of prednisone will not happen on any new products developed by Syntex, for this company is now party to a contract with Eli Lilly & Co., under which all of its new drug inventions will be offered to Lilly on an exclusive basis, with Syntex retaining the right to sell in final packaged form only. Thus bulk sales to small drug companies—where real price competition exists—can no longer take place because all new products will be exclusively handled by Lilly and Syntex. The situation regarding reserpine is also unusual. Despite the patent issued to C.I.B.A., this company has chosen to make available the finished bulk material to other companies rather than exploit the full monopoly potential granted by the patent. It is generally believed that this decision was made because C.I.B.A. did not feel that it had a strong patent and it could not control the marketing of the unpatentable root material, rauwolfia.

In the case of tolbutamide, the monopoly held by Upjohn in this country is complete. It is the sole seller of this product to retail druggists in the United States. The subcommittee's estimate of Upjohn's costs for this drug, based on Upjohn's purchases of the finished bulk material from a Hoechst manufacturing subsidiary in Rhode Island, was $13 for 1,000 tablets, bottled and packaged. The price to the druggist is $83.40, and the same general level of prices has prevailed in sales to the MMSA. Yet in Germany, where the Hoechst Co. has had to recoup the costs of its research work, the price is $37. It should be noted that, in this case, Upjohn is the beneficiary of the pioneer work done abroad. It incurred no costs for research in the discovery of the drug; its research costs were the necessary operating expenses of underwriting the clinical testing of the new material in this country before the Food and Drug Administration permitted tolbutamide to be marketed. The main argument in defense of these high markups that I have been presenting is that the money is needed for research. Here the costs for research were incurred by a foreign company which sells the product at less than half the U.S. price in its own country.

Another example is Thorazine, a potent tranquilizer. The price of the drug in France, where the research and development was conducted by Rhone-Poulenc, is 51 cents. The French firm owns the patent but has licensed Smith Kline & French, in Philadelphia, to market it in this country, where it is sold for $3.03, or roughly 6 times the price in the country where the research was conducted and the drug was developed.

One final example I wish to present: tetracycline, the widest-selling broad-spectrum antibiotic now sold throughout the world. This product is subject to strict patent control, with the Pfizer Co. holding the product patent. Suits have been instituted by the antitrust agencies charging conspiracy and fraud in securing the patent. The subcommittee's estimate of the factory cost for this product was $2.88 per 100. Again we were too high; documents subpenaed from Bristol, 1 of the 3 manufacturers in the United States, showed actual costs were $1.67 per hundred. Yet tetracycline is currently sold to retail druggists for around $26, a markup of over 1,450 percent.

On sales to the Military Medical Supply Agency the companies offered tetracycline first for $11, then $17, then $19, and then $17. It was not until the MMSA determined to go abroad to purchase tetracycline on a competitive basis that the dam broke. Pfizer then precipitately came down to a price of $6, but was underbid by a small American firm as well as by foreign companies which have won awards with bids, including transportation and customs, ranging from $2.08 to $3.

In terms of cost per tablet the actual manufacturing cost to Bristol for making a tablet of tetracycline, including the share of the company's total research expenses is 1.6 cents a tablet. The drug has been sold to MMSA for 3 cents a tablet. Yet, the price to the druggist is 26 cents a tablet. When the druggist sells the tablet to the patient or the sick person, the price is usually over 40 cents a tablet.

By any test, I think the prices on this and other drugs I have been talking about, and many others which could be discussed, are unreasonable, unconscionable and intolerable. Such prices are an unfair imposition upon the sick people of the United States.

THE TREATMENT OF DRUG PATENTS

The traditional American method of reducing excessive profits is by the injection of competition, which in the drug industry can readily be done through compulsory licensing. The patenting of drugs is handled in four different ways by the countries of the world. At one extreme are the United States, Belgium, and Panama, which grant unrestricted patent protection to both products and processes. Because of their unique properties of preserving and protecting the public health, virtually all other countries restrict in one way or another the patent protection accorded to drugs. At the opposite extreme from the United States is Italy, which grants neither product nor process patents. A third group of countries, such as Great Britain, grant product as well as process patents, but provide for compulsory licensing, which is often supplemented by direct price control.

In the fourth group, which includes the major European countries, the method historically followed is that exemplified by West Germany, which does not grant patents on drug products per se, but does grant them on drug processes, with the protection extending to the product as long as it is manufactured by that process; that is, the patent protection on the product disappears upon the discovery of an alternative process of manufacture. Mr. P. H. Federico, Examiner in Chief of the Patent Office, acknowledged that the manufacture of drugs is "particularly susceptible" to the development of alternative processes. The conceptual bases of the European system are: First, the long-held moral belief that no one should have the right to withhold from the public products which relieve suffering and may spell the difference between life and death; and second, the assumption that the granting of process patents would stimulate the discovery of alternative and cheaper methods of protection, which, because of the absence of product patents per se, would result in lower prices to consumers.

It is ironic that in the case of tolbutamide in Germany and reserpine in Switzerland, the companies which pioneered these inventions possess in their home countries only patents on processes of manufacture. Their licensees in this country, however, who contributed nothing to the basic discovery, are free to obtain under our laws not only process patents but product protection, as well. In the United States, at present, even if a company develops a superior process or a more economic method of manufacture, it is barred from making use of this invention because of the product protection that is accorded. In the case of tolbutamide, for example, any German company may use its own process to manufacture this important drug in competition with Hoechst; and the lower prices in that country indicate that this is a real incentive which has resulted in stimulating invention and has brought other manufacturers into the market in competition with Hoechst.

It seems to me that we in this country must face up to the fact that the health of the American people takes precedence over the unbridled exercise of monopoly power under product patents in drugs. For the last several years the stocks of the major drug companies have been a pet of Wall Street investors, and for good reason. In the ethical drug industry the rate of return on investment, after taxes, is higher than that of any other industry. Since 1957 it has averaged around 20 percent as compared with 10 percent for all manufacturing. The net profit on sales has also averaged about double that for all manufacturing. I am deeply gratified personally that the Congress enacted the drug legislation that was passed last October. But in all honesty I must say that there is still unfinished business which remains to be done. The immediate and urgent need is for drug prices to be brought down to reasonable levels. I believe that much could be accomplished in this direction if the modest proposal I am introducing today is passed.

A 500-PERCENT MARKUP SHOULD BE ENOUGH

Specifically, my bill, which I am introducing, and which is identical to the amendment voted on by the Senate—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 13, page 17415—requires compulsory licensing only for those drugs whose prices are clearly excessive, and as a rough measure of what constitutes a clearly excessive price I have taken the figure of 500 percent. Surely, a price which is more than five times the cost of production, including an appropriate allowance for research, is excessive. A markup of this magnitude should certainly be sufficient to cover all necessary distribution costs and still provide a more than reasonable profit.

Moreover, compulsory licensing will not be required until after 3 years following the issuance of the patent. Since it usually takes at least 2 years for the Patent Office to process a patent application, this will give the applicant in most cases an effective monopoly of 5 years or more, which in the case of most drugs is more than sufficient to recoup any research expenses incurred in developing the drug.

After compulsory licensing is required, the patent owner will continue to receive a fair royalty from sales by the licensees, which will be limited, incidentally, to sales in finished or packaged form. On such sales the licensee will pay a royalty of up to 8 percent. This is a generous royalty provision. In virtually all of the licensing contracts submitted by the drug companies and published in the record of the subcommittee hearings, the royalties charged were well under 8 percent. For example, on tetracycline, one of the most profitable patent monopolies in the history of the drug industry, Pfizer, who obtained the product patent, has charged 3½ percent royalty to its two licensees, American Cyanamid and Bristol. American Cyanamid, which holds important process patents on this antibiotic, has been charging its licensees, Pfizer and Bristol, a 5 percent royalty. On benzathine penicillin, another important patent monopoly in the antibiotics field, the royalty charged is 2½ percent on the drug for human and veterinary use, and 1 percent used in animal feeds. On prednisone and reserpine the royalties on sales in this country are 6 percent.

In the Senate debate on this provision last year, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] put his finger on the crux of the matter, when, in referring to high prices in this country, as compared to prices in the countries where certain drugs were developed, he stated "It is immoral."—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 13, pages 17413–17414.

What is at issue here is, indeed, a matter of fundamental morality. Since our first disclosures of these fantastic markups, more than 3 years ago, there have been a number of price reductions in prescription drugs; but they have been few in number and limited in extent. What the heads of the drug companies cannot seem to understand is that it is simply immoral to continue to gouge the American people for a product which spells the difference between sickness and health and, indeed, life and death. Since they refuse to recognize this fundamental fact, it is the duty and obligation of the Congress to act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1297) to provide for compulsory licensing of prescription drug patents, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of April 7. The article makes the point that thus far the provisions of the Kefauver-Harris Drug Act have certainly not hurt the drug companies since their profits have continued to rise. And it goes on to note that in their annual reports the drug companies are modulating their criticism of the new law. Let me read the final paragraph of the article:

> Comments on the Drug Amendments of 1962 are much milder—now that the amendments have become law and the pharmaceutical companies must live with them—than they were when the companies were trying to tone them down or head them off during the last Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRUG COMPANIES ADD TO EARNINGS—THEY STILL VOICE DOUBTS ON VALUE OF CHANGES IN ACT

Annual reports of major drug companies are appearing with remarkable uniformity in two respects: They disclose higher earnings for 1962, and they express misgivings over the redtape in the Kefauver-Harris amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

The American Home Products Corp.'s sales increased to $543,875,476, from $503,057,847 in 1961. The $40 million sales gain increased net earnings by 6 percent to $53,448,000 from $50,763,000.

The American Cyanamid Co. was even more successful in increasing gross and bringing it down to net. Sales rose 7 percent, to $649,211,240 from $603,958,772 in 1961. Net gained 20 percent, to $59,320,702 from $49,353,505.

Sales of Merck & Co., Inc., also set a record, rising to $240,521,000 from $228,578,000. Net of $29,244,000 was 8 percent higher than 1961's $27,191,000, but a little short of 1959's peak.

Charles Pfizer & Co., Inc., showed its 13th increase in sales, going to $383,573,179 from $332,470,550. Net rose to $36,493,572 from $32,663,562. In both cases 1961 results were restated because of acquisitions during 1962.

The Upjohn Co. reported a slight sales increase, to $173,181,000 from $169,229,000 for 1961, and earnings of $23,255,000, compared with $22,756,000 for 1961. Products containing the antibiotic tetracycline, it was explained, declined during the year and narrowed margins on this important product.

PARKE, DAVIS SALES DECLINE

One exception to the parade of gainers was Parke, Davis & Co., whose sales fell to $181,707,805 from $184,304,365. Earnings were more seriously affected, dropping to $19,074,140 from $22,326,327. This was blamed in major part on sales of the antibiotic Chloromycetin in markets outside the United States under its generic name of chloramphenicol. Sales of such pharmaceuticals under generic names was one of the principal aims of the Kefauver-Harris amendments in their original form.

Sterling Drug Co. and Smith, Kline & French Laboratories are among the larger drug companies which have not formally reported 1962 results. Smith, Kline & French has disclosed that sales were $180,165,000, compared with $161,161,726, and earnings $30,527,600 compared with $27,072,865. J. M. Hiebert, president and chairman of Sterling Drug, has estimated that earnings rose to $3.10 a share on the 7,961,712 shares outstanding, from $2.95 a share in 1961.

Comments on the drug amendments of 1962 are much milder—now that the amendments have become law and the pharmaceutical companies must live with them—than they were when the companies were trying to tone them down or head them off during the last Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent article entitled "New Drug Law Can Save Dollars." The article, written by Sidney Margolius, was published in the Machinist for March 14, 1963, and in other papers. In the article, he stresses the savings that are available in nonpatented drugs if people can get their physicians to prescribe drugs by their generic names.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DRUG LAW CAN SAVE DOLLARS

(By Sidney Margolius)

The recently enacted Kefauver-Harris drug regulations have been hailed as providing additional safety against hazardous effects. But experts who have studied the new law tell this department that the public does not yet realize the potential savings in buying medicines also made available by this law, if consumers and doctors understand all its provisions.

This is a moneysaving law, as well as a safety law, even though all the provisions Senator KEFAUVER had sought to reduce high prices of medicines were not granted by Congress.

The big financial benefit in the new law is that doctors and pharmacists no longer have to worry about the safety of nonbrand-name drugs. As you know, the same medicine sold under its generic or common name, often costs half or less the price charged under a brand name.

As just one of the many examples found by the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, McKesson & Robbins, a large drug wholesaler, charged pharmacists only 2.1 cents a pill for prednisone, an arthritis medicine, under its generic name. But major manufacturers charged pharmacists 17 cents for prednisone sold under their patented brand names. Thus, the public paid about 3 cents a pill under the common name but 28 cents under the brand name.

But the problem up to now has been to get the doctors to prescribe by generic name rather than by advertised brand names. Many doctors and pharmacists have felt safer with the branded products of the large drug manufacturers. They felt quite sincerely in most cases, that there is closer quality control of brand-name drugs. They were afraid that the Food and Drug Administration had neither the power nor sufficient staff to check all the smaller makers and distributors of non-brand-name drugs.

But under the new law, doctors and pharmacists have greater assurance than ever before that the quality of non-brand-name medicines will be reliable. For one thing, the Food and Drug Administration now has more power than it had sought even, to inspect drug factories and control the manufacture of drugs to assure their safety, identity and purity.

The new law also requires that each drug factory and repackager must be registered with the FDA and must be inspected by FDA at least once every 2 years.

Not only does FDA now have more power to assure satisfactory quality of medicines, whether sold under generic or brand name, but it now also has more money to employ the necessary technical staff.

Thus, the fear of inferior quality is no longer a valid reason for buying a brand-name drug instead of its much lower priced generic equivalent. In fact, it never was a wholly valid reason. As Harry Abramson, of Celo Laboratories, a wholesale drug cooperative, has pointed out, many manufacturers sell drug compounds under advertised names, then turn around and sell the same products under their generic names to other distributors at a fraction of the name-brand price.

You yourself may have to call your doctor's attention to the valuable quality-control provisions of the new law. You can't depend on the American Medical Association or the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association to educate the doctors in prescribing lower cost medicines.

Another encouragement to your doctor in prescribing by generic name, is that the new law provides that all advertising and labeling tell the generic name of the medicine as well as the brand name, and in type at least half as large as that used for the brand name. Moreover, the FDA is authorized to provide a generic name for a drug if the manufacturer doesn't and—very importantly—can require that a generic name be simple and easy enough for doctors to use. Sometimes manufacturers have given drugs long, complicated generic names, and doctors have found it simpler to write out the shorter easy-to-use brand names.

Among other provisions which will help reduce drug costs as well as improve safety, are those relating to advertising. There has been evidence that advertising to doctors sometimes exaggerated the effectiveness of specific medicines, or omitted important vital information about side effects. Now advertising to doctors must carry a statement of the possible side effects and the proven efficacy of a drug.

Experts we consulted estimate that the new controls potentially can do about half the necessary job of reducing drug prices to more reasonable levels. One important Kefauver proposal that could further cut prices was omitted by Congress, for one reason because the administration did not back it. This was the proposal that manufacturers be required to license others to produce their patented drugs. This requirement would encourage price competition, while assuring the company originating a new drug that it still will collect handsome royalties from the other manufacturers.

That provision is what Senator KEFAUVER will seek in the current session of Congress if he can get sufficient public support to get the bill past those Senators who had opposed any drug controls at all until the thalidomide scandal erupted.

CONVEYANCE OF ELLIS ISLAND TO ELLIS ISLAND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, INC.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, since 1955 when the property was declared to be surplus to the needs of the Federal Government, Ellis Island has been the subject of renewed public attention. For those of us in Congress who share a deep concern for the fate of the island, this strong continuing expression of public interest has been gratifying, indeed.

After the property was declared surplus, the future of Ellis Island soon became a matter in which the Federal Government was involved as departments and agencies fulfilled their statutory responsibilities as provided for by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. When it was apparent that the direction of public policy in regard to Ellis Island was still unclear, Congress entered the picture to provide an independent review of the situation. Under the able leadership of the junior Senator from Maine, the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Senate Government Operations Committee has engaged in an investigation of the appropriateness of special guidelines to insure that the future use of Ellis Island will be consistent with the prescriptions of public interest.

It was within this context, that last year I introduced S. 2596, a bill to convey Ellis Island to Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc. It was my feeling that the proposal sponsored by this group could best retain the symbolic meaning of the island for it would preserve the existing property and facilities and convert them into a most positive public use by making an important contribution to higher education. After a close investigation of the competing plans as explored by the subcommittee's hearings I have retained my conviction that a conveyance to Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc., makes eminently good sense.

In practical terms, the establishment of a 4-year liberal arts college on Ellis Island has strong appeal. The island, its location, and historical buildings, are all adaptable to the uses of the program. In addition to the facilities that will house this academic institution, provisions have been made to establish a permanent museum to commemorate the island's symbolic past.

This program shares the support of a distinguished group of academicians as the following list of academic advisers will testify: James Case, Jr., Mark Van Doren, Eric F. Goldman, Oscar Handlin, Seymour Harris, Hans Kohn, Max Lerner, Isidor Lubin, Leopold Damrosch Mannes, Margaret Mead, Clinton Rossiter, Meyer Schapino, Ordway Tead, and Lionel Trilling.

I am also happy to report that New Jersey and New York Congressmen have joined me in support of this proposal by introducing companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

The text of the following letter I have received from Dean Harry J. Carman, who is a member of the board of directors of Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc., is perhaps the most informative description of the operation and goals of this fine program:

ELLIS ISLAND FOR HIGHER
EDUCATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., September 21, 1962.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Here is a brief description of our proposal and the support it has received.

Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc., was organized more than 2 years ago to try to accomplish a double purpose: to put a valuable historic facility to constructive public use and to make a significant contribution in the present educational crisis. The past 2 years has seen the development of a detailed plan that would convert the island to a liberal arts college of a thousand students along with a museum devoted to its history.

The museum would supplement the immigration museum planned for nearby Liberty Island. The college would help to provide for the urgent need for more facilities that all estimates agree will be doubled in 10 years and will be felt especially heavily in the metropolitan area. Even more importantly, it would provide a fresh approach to the problems of higher education which, with Ellis Island's unique location and circumstances, might have significant effect more generally.

What is the college to be like? Its goal is the traditional one, to provide a first-rate liberal education for its students. Its means are more unconventional and are adapted to the specific problems that challenge our colleges in the 1960's. Intensive work in small groups, close student-faculty contact, and independent study are among the many academic aims of the curriculum. A well-paid and not overburdened faculty is another goal. More remarkable is the fact that we have found the means of achieving all this, while cutting the annual operating costs to such an extent that the new college will be self-sufficient from the outset. In other words we hope to balance annual expenses solely with income derived from students fees and thus free the college from dependence upon annual fund raising and endowments. Tuition would be the same as that of comparable institutions and all revenue beyond these fees would be devoted to a substantial scholarship program.

It is important to emphasize that this proposal is more than a pious hope. The plan has been worked out in the most thorough detail by a large committee that includes some of America's most distinguished scholars and educators. It embodies proposals long advocated by knowledgeable administrators. And it has won the enthusiastic support of the academy community. McGeorge Bundy (then dean of Harvard) writing in the Sunday Times, called it an ideal college; Newsweek, a college of the future; and so on. The offices of education in New York and New Jersey, as well as Washington have endorsed the plan in principle and encouraged its preparation. The new college aims high but the plan is as concrete, practical, and detailed as it has been possible to make it.

Among the primary considerations in planning, was the need to fit the new college to the existing facilities. A team of architects and engineers, Charles Tilton, Inc., of New York City, armed with the specifications of the new institution, spent weeks on Ellis Island examining everything in detail and drafting elaborate floor plans that would provide a blueprint for the new college. They found that all the buildings were usable and that, more importantly, their conversion was practical and economical. The estimated costs, in a systematic breakdown, show that the buildings can become a college for only $6 million, a remarkably low figure indeed. Cafeteria, dormitories, classrooms, gymnasium, campus, playing fields, in short, all the needs of the college can be met with the already existing facilities, only minimally modified. With furnishings and equipment, a 250,000-volume library and all the additional requirements of the college satisfied, the total cost will still come to less than $10 million. Here is an opportunity that is rare indeed, particularly in our crowded metropolitan area, to begin a new college for a fraction of what it would otherwise cost.

With a plan thoroughly accomplished and the support of the academic world, it is not surprising that support has been forthcoming from all corners. Since the first announcement of the plan, the press has responded not only with remarkably thorough news coverage but with strong and forthright editorial comment. The New York Times, and Journal-American, various New Jersey newspapers, the Washington Post, even the Bristol Herald-Courier in Tennessee-Virginia, have all endorsed the plan as the best and most appropriate solution for Ellis Island's disposal. Correspondence has arrived from all over the country, including inquiries from many professors interested in working in the new institution. Businessmen have begun to give support. Mr. Edward Booher, president of McGraw-Hill Book Co., and Mr. David Finn, president of Ruder & Finn, have joined the board of directors. Mrs. Albert List recently contributed to the operating expenses of the committee. Other individuals like Louis Schweitzer, Frederick Richmond, Jennie Grossinger, Donald Rugoff, etc., have promised to help. Several foundations, most recently, the William C. Whitney Foundation, have shown strong interest. And in Congress, the response has been equally gratifying. In addition to having bills introduced, we have received pledges of support from Senators CLARK and DOUGLAS and Congressmen LINDSAY, RYAN, FARBSTEIN, STRATTON, HALPERN, BRADEMAS, and many others.

We are confident that of the many public-spirited proposals that have been suggested so far, we can demonstrate that ours is the most appropriate, the most practical, and the most welcome to the community. All we need now is the opportunity to put it into effect.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY J. CARMAN.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1300) to convey Ellis Island to Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc., introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE OLDER WORKER WEEK

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, one of the serious problems that has been under investigation by our Senate Special Committee on Aging is that of discrimination in employment because of age.

Our committee's hearings and studies have shown us how widespread this discrimination is—and even more distressing is the fact that it can begin to haunt an individual as early as age 45 or even before.

As automation or mergers displace workers in the 45 and 65 age group from their regular jobs, these persons find it increasingly difficult to obtain new employment.

In the recent recession, for example, persons in this age group had the greatest duration of unemployment of those under 65.

A report of our committee describes the situation in considerable detail.

Mr. President, this situation is not only injurious to the dignity and self-respect of older workers, as well as the very livelihood of themselves and their families, but it also deprives the country of one of its most valuable resources, the skill and experience of the mature person.

Fortunately, we also found in our hearings that a great deal of new attention was being given this problem.

State and local levels of government are initiating efforts to end this discrimination, with six States having enacted laws to prevent it.

Taking a leading role in these efforts is the American Legion, which has designated this week as Employ the Older Worker Week.

I am happy to salute the Legion for its work in calling attention to the problem, and I believe its campaign deserves the recognition and support of the Federal Government.

For that reason, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would designate the first week in May of each year as National Employ the Older Worker Week.

I am joined in sponsorship of the joint resolution by my colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

Passage of the joint resolution would give this worthy program the status, stability, and recognition that it deserves.

I send the joint resolution to the desk and ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) to provide for the designation of the first full week in May of each year as National Employ the Older Worker Week, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Nation is witnessing the emergence of patterns of discrimination in employment against properly qualified persons because of their age; and

Whereas such age discrimination is contrary to American traditions of equal opportunity for men and women who are willing and able to work; and

Whereas bias against jobseekers as young as forty-five and sometimes younger, because they are deemed too old, deprives the national economy of important sources of experienced workers, increases the burden upon public welfare resources, and imposes on older persons a sense of humiliation and loss of faith in the free enterprise system; and

Whereas local, State, and National organizations, and employers and labor organizations should be encouraged voluntarily to take all possible and proper measures to eliminate discrimination in employment against properly qualified persons because of their age: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the first full week in May of each year, beginning with the year 1963, as "National Employ the Older Worker Week," and calling upon employer and employee organizations, other organizations officially concerned with employment, and upon the people of the United States, in general, to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs designed to bring about the elimination of discrimination in employment because of age.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PROUTY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROUTY also submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. INOUYE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT, RELATING TO THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF INSURANCE PROVIDED THEREUNDER—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 106) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder, the name of Senator Dominick be added as a cosponsor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO GAIN FROM SALE OF HIS RESIDENCE BY A TAXPAYER WHO HAS ATTAINED THE AGE OF 60—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 316) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years, my name may be added as a cosponsor. This bill was introduced by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] on January 18, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] be added as an additional cosponsor of S. 1273, a bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency, and for other purposes, and S. 1279, a bill to amend title 30, United States Code, relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals, and for other purposes, at the next printing of the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator Randolph be added to the names of sponsors of S. 1231 at the next printing. Also, that the name of Senator Miller be added to the names of sponsors of S. 720, at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT UNITED STATES-MEXICAN COMMISSION ON FLOW OF CERTAIN DRUGS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as a cosponsor to the resolution (S.J. Res. 65) I introduced on March 28, 1963, to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPENING OF HEARINGS ON S. 5, THE COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this morning the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs begins public hearings on the GI bill, Senate bill No. 5, which extends to veterans of post-Korean service readjustment benefits similar to those afforded Korean veterans under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, popularly known as the Korean GI bill of rights.

I am happy to note that two members of this subcommittee, Senator Burdick and I, are cosponsors of the cold war bill which is the subject of these hearings. The 37 other Senators who have joined us in introducing S. 5, which has as its primary purpose the establishment of a balanced program of readjustment assistance for post-Korean veterans, are: Senators Humphrey, Sparkman, Morse, Neuberger, Hill, Kefauver, Smith, Byrd of West Virginia, Gruening, Hartke, Eastland, Long of Missouri, Bible, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Douglas, Pell, Bartlett, Inouye, McGee, McGovern, McCarthy, Fulbright, Cannon, Moss, Pastore, Nelson, Fong, Johnston, Hart, Clark, Dodd, Young of Ohio, Metcalf, Magnuson, Bayh, and Edmondson. Senator Bayh will be the first witness for the bill.

The provisions of S. 5 are virtually identical with those of a similar bill introduced in the 87th Congress, 1st session, with the exception of the vocational rehabilitation for service-connected disabled veterans provisions of that bill, which became public law last session.

A cold war GI bill I introduced in 1959 passed the Senate in the 86th Congress by a vote of 57 to 31. The cold war bill of the 87th Congress was sponsored by me with 36 other Senators and was favorably reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. This year the need to enact this legislation is greater than ever before. The proposed legislation has always enjoyed broad public support. The requests for its passage are vast in number.

Each year a large number of American youth embark upon 2, 3, or more years of service in our Military Establishment. They do so, and the country needs them to do so, because foreign powers continue to threaten the security of this Nation and the free world.

The basic eligibility period of the bill extends from January 31, 1955, the officially declared termination date for establishing eligibility under the Korean GI bill, to July 1, 1963.

Applicable throughout the bill is a requirement that a veteran, to qualify for assistance, must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Two major types of readjustment assistance, patterned closely after the forms of assistance provided under the GI bills for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, would be available to post-Korean veterans under the provisions of S. 5. These are: first, education and vocational training assistance; and second, guaranteed and direct loan assistance for the purchase of homes, including homes on farms, and farmlands, livestock, machinery, and so forth, to be used in farming operations conducted by the veterans.

When this legislation was considered in the 86th Congress, there were about 687,000 cold war veterans. Two years ago there were 1,380,000 cold war veterans and today, there must be well over 2 million. By 1973, there will be more than 4 million cold war veterans. These figures alone show, I believe, the great magnitude of the loss we will sustain if we do not take action to keep the minds, hands, and skills of these young Americans within our arsenal of human resources.

We dare not, as custodians of the public trust, as the guardians of the future of this Republic, ignore the positive good or the positive harm that will flow from our decision as to whether these young men should be afforded educational opportunity similar to that which a grateful, free nation gave to their fathers and elder brothers who served before them.

This Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs has looked deeply into this question over the past 4 years. So far as I am concerned, justice, equity, humanitarianism, the need of military defense, cold dollars and cents, public judgment—every conceivable consideration—demands an affirmative answer on the question at issue. America will be made stronger, immeasurably stronger, by the passage of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, at this point in the Record, a letter from the Library of Congress dated April 4, 1963, addressed to me, written by Mr. Charles H. Donnelly, senior specialist in national defense, and his former letters to me of March 10, 1961, and March 13, 1959, all containing data on the numbers and percentages of men serving in the Military Establishment before they pass the age of 26.

It will be noted that the percentage of men aged 26 who will have entered active military service will be 45 percent on June 30, 1963, down to 42 percent on June 30, 1964, and 40 percent on June 30, 1965—thus a constantly declining percentage of our young men serve, but with increasing disadvantage to themselves.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1963.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The subject is the probability of men having to render substantial military service before they pass the age of 26 when, practically speaking, they are no longer likely to be drafted.

Reference is made to (1) my letter on the same subject addressed to you on March 10, 1961, which appears on pages 207–209 of the hearings of your subcommittee during the first session of the 87th Congress on readjustment insurance to post-Korean conflict veterans; and (2) your letter of March 25, 1963, requesting that the projections in reference (1) be brought up to date.

"Substantial military service," for the purposes of this letter, is defined as active duty of 2 years or longer in the active armed services of the United States. This excludes active duty training periods of 6 months or less for members of Reserve or National Guard components, as well as weekly drills and summer camps.

Since there is no intention of reflecting in any way on the merits of the Reserve Forces Act or on the motive of those who avail themselves of its provisions, the term "substantial military service" is used to differentiate between those whose military service causes an important interruption in their civilian careers contrasted to others who through rejection, exemption or deferment, or who serve under the provisions of the Reserve Forces Act, do not experience major interruptions in their education or careers.

It is assumed that, through fiscal year 1965:

1. Inductions will continue to be made in the sequence established in Executive Order No. 10659, February 15, 1956, as amended in Executive Order No. 11098, March 14, 1963, as follows:

(a) Delinquents who have attained the age of 19 years, in order of their dates of birth with the oldest first.

(b) Volunteers for induction who have not reached 26, in the sequence in which they volunteer.

(c) Nonvolunteers who have attained the age of 19 years and have not attained the age of 26 years in the order of their dates of birth with the oldest being selected first.

(d) Nonvolunteers who have reached the age of 26, in the order of their dates of birth with the youngest first.

(e) Nonvolunteers who have atained 18 years and 6 months but not 19, in the order of their dates of birth with the oldest first.

2. In the classification of registrants and granting of deferments, the degree of liberality of selective service boards will remain about as at present.

3. The average aggregate active military strength of the armed services will be approximately 2,700,000.

4. Reenlistment rates and extensions by Reserve officers on active duty will continue at approximately the current level.

The present induction sequence differs from that previously in effect in that fathers, 19 through 25, are now classified as 3A (dependency deferment).

As of June 30, 1962, table 1 shows that, of a total estimated male population of 1,110,000 of age 26 at their nearest birthday, approximately 530,000 (48 percent) had seen active military service. By "active military service" is meant that they were enlisted, drafted, or called to extended active duty. In the last case, some were ROTC graduates called to extended active duty after leaving college; others were Reserve and National Guard personnel called into active service during the Berlin crisis.

Table 2 gives projections of the percentage of men in the age 26 class who will have entered military service up to June 30, 1965, if currently programed active service strengths are maintained:

TABLE 2.—*Projections: men, age 26, who will have entered military service*

[In percent]

June 30—	Total	Entered active service	Entered Reserve service only [1]
1963	57	45	12
1964	54	42	12
1965	53	40	13

[1] Includes active duty for training.

Source: Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower).

In table 2, the projections of those who will have entered active service (third column) relate to those who normally serve 2 or more years. If another situation like the Berlin crisis arose, reservists called to active service would be included in this column. However, the above percentages do not anticipate such a contingency.

The figure in table 2 of 45 percent of those reaching age 26 by June 30, 1963, who will have experienced active military service (mostly for 2 or more years) compares favorably with the figure of 46 percent predicted in my letter of March 10, 1961, especially in light of the Berlin situation, the effects of which had not been anticipated in the earlier studies.

It is believed that the percentages in table 2 will be substantially accurate provided that the assumptions made above hold true and the status of our economy remains fairly stable. Of course, any significant change in the international situation or a major change in the U.S. economy could have a marked effect upon the predictions above.

Sincerely,
CHARLES H. DONNELLY,
Senior Specialist in National Defense.

TABLE 1.—*Military service status of male population, ages 18½ to 27½, as of June 1962*

NUMBER (THOUSANDS)

	18½ to 19½	19½ to 20½	20½ to 21½	21½ to 22½	22½ to 23½	23½ to 24½	24½ to 25½	25½ to 26½	26½ to 27½
Total male population	1,460	1,410	1,300	1,220	1,170	1,160	1,130	1,110	1,100
Entered military service	300	390	390	420	510	610	640	640	640
Active service	250	340	340	350	400	480	510	530	560
Reserve service only [1]	40	50	50	70	110	130	130	110	80
No military service, estimated status:									
Unfit for peacetime service	480	470	430	400	380	350	320	300	290
Fathers and dependency deferments	20	50	90	110	120	130	120	130	120
Students and other deferrables	410	260	180	130	90	60	50	40	40
Net availables (nonfather manpower pool)	250	250	210	150	70	10	(2)	(2)	------
	Percent distribution								
Total male population	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Entered military service	21	28	30	35	44	53	57	58	58
Active service	17	24	26	29	34	41	45	48	51
Reserve service only [1]	3	4	4	6	9	11	12	10	7
No military service, estimated status:									
Unfit for peacetime service	33	33	33	33	33	30	28	27	27
Fathers and dependency deferments	1	4	7	9	10	11	11	11	11
Students and other deferrables	28	18	14	11	8	5	4	4	4
Net availables (nonfather manpower pool)	17	18	16	12	6	1	(2)	(2)	------

[1] No tour of extended active duty. May have had active duty for Reserve training.
[2] Less than 5,000 or 0.5 percent.

NOTE.—Detail does not necessarily add to totals due to rounding.

Source: Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower).

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1961.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.
(Attention Mr. Frederick R. Blackwell, Counsel).

DEAR SIR: The subject of this letter is the probability of men having to render substantial military service before they pass the age of 26 when, practically speaking, they are no longer likely to be drafted.

Reference is made (1) to my letter of May 13, 1959, on the same subject which appears on pages 373–376 of the hearings of your subcommittee during the first session of the 86th Congress on educational and other readjustment assistance for post-Korean veterans; and (2) to your request of February 3, 1961, to bring the findings in the May 13, 1959, letter up to date.

In the 1959 letter, "substantial military service" was defined as active duty of 2 years or longer in the active armed services of the United States, thus excluding terms of 6 months or less of active duty in Reserve or National Guard components, as well as weekly drills and summer camps.

Since there is no intention to reflect in any way upon the merits of the Reserve Forces Act or the motives of those who avail themselves of its provisions, the explanation of "substantial military service" in the letter of May 13, 1959, is repeated:

"What is sought is a clear differentiation between those who are experiencing a real interruption in their civilian careers contrasted to others who through rejection, exemption, or deferment, or by serving under the provisions of the Reserve Forces Act manage to keep from major interruptions in their education or careers."

The assumptions made 2 years ago have been checked with officials of the Department of Defense and the Selective Service System and are considered to be still valid.

It is assumed that, through fiscal year 1963—

1. Inductions will continue to be made in the order provided for in Executive Order No. 10659, February 15, 1956, which establishes this sequence:

(a) Delinquents who have attained the age of 19 years, in order of their dates of birth with the oldest first.

(b) Volunteers for induction who have not reached 26, in sequence in which they volunteer.

(c) Nonvolunteers who have attained 19 but not 26 and do not have a child or children with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes, in the order of their dates of birth with the oldest first.

(d) Nonvolunteers who have attained 19 but not 26 and have a child or children with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes, in the order of their dates of birth with the oldest first.

(e) Nonvolunteers who have reached 26, in the order of their dates of birth with the youngest first.

(f) Nonvolunteers who have attained 18 years and 6 months but not 19, in the order of their dates of birth with the oldest first.

2. In classifying registrants and granting deferments, the selective service boards will continue their present degree of liberality.

3. The average aggregate active strength of the armed services will be continued at slightly over 2.5 million.

4. Enlistment and reenlistment rates will continue at approximately the average of the last 2 years.

The predictions made in the letter of May 13, 1959, were based upon projections of manpower requirements for the active armed services for fiscal years 1959 through 1963 and the estimated military service status of men aged 19 to 26 years, as June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1963. These projections had been made in a study of military manpower requirements and supply made by officials from the Department of Defense, Department of Labor and Selective Service System.

Officials of the Department of Defense and the Selective Service System state that no further projections have been made since 1959 and that they have no plans to make further studies of this nature at this time. At the same time these officials have stated that the 1959 projections have been borne out as to accuracy. The following letter from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) substantiates this:

"March 7, 1961.

"Dear Mr. Donnelly: This is in reply to your letter of March 3 in which you requested to be advised as to the continued accuracy of the projections appearing in the publication 'The Military Service Outlook,' which was made available to you in May 1959 in connection with a study for the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs.

"Despite the lapse of about 2 years since the development of the projections, the estimates in this booklet continue to be substantially unchanged. The study assumed a continuation of military active duty strengths of slightly over 2.5 million personnel. This compares with an actual strength of 2,503,000 on January 31, 1961. Inductions were projected at an average rate of 90,000 per year during the period fiscal year 1960 to fiscal year 1963. Actual inductions in fiscal year 1960 totaled 90,300. From the standpoint of manpower supply, there have similarly been no significant changes in either population estimates or selective service deferment policies, relevant to our study.

"It is our judgment, therefore, that the projections of the military service outlook for men aged 19 to 26 years through fiscal year 1963, as published, continue to be substantially accurate at the present time.

"Sincerely yours,

"Harold Wool,

"Chief, Plans and Analysis Division."

CONCLUSIONS

Since no further projections of military manpower requirements or of estimated military service status of men aged 19 to 26 years are available, and in light of the accuracy with which the 1959 projections have been realized to date, the conclusions in my letter of May 13, 1959, are considered to be still valid.

It should be realized that a number of things could happen which might affect the validity of the assumptions, the accuracy of the projections, and the soundness of the conclusions. Business booms and depressions affect reenlistment rates; when jobs are scarce, men are more likely to reenlist and this reduces the number of replacements necessary from civil life. The converse is true when times are good. The international situation affects the maintained manpower strength of the armed services and also the reenlistment rate. And any shifts in the prestige and popularity of military service as a career will have a bearing on reenlistments.

With the foregoing caveat, it appears likely that as of June 30, 1963, only 530,000 of an estimated 1,150,000 males reaching age 26 will have entered military service for 2 years or longer, which is 46 percent or less than 5 out of every 10. If we deduct an estimated 340,000 unfit from the 1,150,000 total, the percentage rises to a little over 65 percent. Furthermore, it appears that the trend toward fewer substantial interruptions in civilian careers due to military service will continue until something occurs to change one or more of the assumptions, particularly the aggregate active strength of the armed services or the reenlistment rates.

Very truly yours,

Charles H. Donnelly,

Senior Specialist in National Defense.

The Library of Congress,
Legislative Reference Service,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1959.

Hon. Ralph Yarborough,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The subject of this letter is the probability of men having to render substantial military service before they pass the age of 26 when, practically speaking, they are no longer likely to be drafted. In this connection, the term "substantial" is defined as active duty of 2 years or longer in the active armed services of the United States; service in the Reserve or National Guard components involving active duty training of 6 months or less and weekly drills and summer camps for a number of years is excluded from this definition.

In making this definition, the use of the term "substantial" is in no way intended to reflect upon the merits of the Reserve Forces Act or the motives of those who avail themselves of its provisions. What is sought is a clear differentiation between those who are experiencing a real interruption in their civilian careers contrasted to others who through rejection, exemption, or deferment, or by serving under provisions of the Reserve Forces Act manage to keep from major interruptions in their education or careers.

For a number of years the Department of Defense, Department of Labor, and Selective Service System have collaborated in studying military manpower requirements and supply. This study has been projected to include fiscal year 1963 and, using their experience data and estimates, it is possible to arrive at some reasonable judgment as to the chances a young man faces of having to engage in a period of active military service of 2 or more years.

At the outset, it should be recognized that any predictions will be only as good as the assumptions and data upon which they are based; also, that these predictions are very vulnerable to the effects of such variables as business booms and depressions, changing public attitudes and political situations, legislation effecting the attractiveness of military careers, and the international situation.

It is assumed that, through fiscal year 1963:

1. Inductions will continue to be made in this order:

(a) Volunteers for induction.

(b) Registrants who have been delinquent under the law.

(c) Nonfathers, ages 19–25 (oldest going first).

(d) Fathers, 19–25 years.

(e) Registrants, ages 26–35, whose liability has been extended.

(f) Registrants, between ages 18½–19 (who can only be inducted, under the law, if no older men are available for induction).

2. The degree of liberality of Selective Service Boards in classifying registrants and granting deferments will remain about as at present.

3. The average aggregate active strength of the armed services will be continued at slightly over 2½ million.

4. Enlistment rates will continue about as at present.

In arriving at our predictions, it is helpful to compare the actual and projected manpower requirements over a period of years (table 1) with estimates of the military service status of eligible males during that period (tables 2 and 3). From these figures one may arrive at reasonably accurate estimates, provided that the assumptions remain valid and the population estimates (which are based on unpublished estimates and projections of the Bureau of the Census) are borne out.

Table 1.—*Projected military manpower requirements from civil life, by source, fiscal years 1959–63 (fiscal year 1958, actual)*

[Thousands]

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Total, Active and Reserve Forces	630	620	610	610	610	590
From manpower pool [1]	530	520	500	500	500	500
From other sources [2]	100	100	100	110	110	90
Active Forces, total	540	530	520	520	510	500
From manpower pool [1]	440	430	410	410	400	400
From other sources	100	100	100	110	110	90
Reserve Forces, total nonprior service [3]	[4] 90	90	90	100	100	100

[1] Includes volunteers aged 17 to 18½ years.
[2] Other sources: prior service men, ROTC, and medical officers, women.
[3] Net. Excludes losses to civil life and to Active Forces.
[4] Estimated.

Note.—Detail does not necessarily add to group totals due to rounding.

Table 2.—*Estimated military service status of men aged 19 to 26 years, June 30, 1958*

[Thousands]

	Age, nearest birthday							
	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Male population	1,200	1,190	1,150	1,130	1,120	1,090	1,080	1,100
Entered military service	270	400	460	500	590	700	760	770
Active Forces	200	310	380	420	520	650	740	750
Reserve Forces	70	90	80	80	80	50	20	20
Manpower pool, total	210	180	170	180	160	70	(1)	(1)
Nonfathers	190	150	120	110	80	20	(1)	(1)
Fathers	20	30	50	70	80	50	(1)	(1)
Deferable, other than unfit, total	330	240	180	140	110	80	80	90
Dependency	10	10	10	20	20	30	40	50
Students and others [2]	320	230	170	120	90	50	40	30
Unfit	390	370	340	310	260	240	240	240

[1] Less than 5,000.

[2] Also includes small number in exempt groups (ministers, divinity students, aliens, sole surviving sons).

Note.—Detail does not necessarily add to group totals due to rounding.

Table 3.—*Estimated military service status of men aged 19 to 26 years, June 30, 1963*

[Thousands]

	Age, nearest birthday							
	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Male population	1,430	1,480	1,430	1,290	1,220	1,200	1,190	1,150
Entered military service	240	310	350	400	450	550	610	630
Active Forces	180	250	280	310	350	440	500	530
Reserve Forces	60	70	70	90	100	110	110	100
Nonfather manpower pool	270	320	300	210	160	60	30	(1)
Fathers other than unfit [1, 2]	20	50	90	120	130	150	140	140
Students and other deferrable groups other than unfit [3]	430	310	220	130	80	50	40	40
Unfit	470	490	470	430	400	390	370	340

[1] Less than 5,000.

[2] Includes fathers in class I-A or in III-A, dependency, and small number of nonfathers eligible for dependency deferments.

[3] Also includes small number in exempt groups (ministers, divinity students, aliens, sole surviving sons).

Note.—Detail does not necessarily add to group totals due to rounding.

When examining table 2 it will be noted that the ratio of unfit to total male population is substantially higher among the 19- to 22-year-olds than with 23- to 26-year-olds. This is due to the recent upgrading of physicial and mental standards for inductees (permitted under Public Law 85-564) rather than to any substantive difference in actual physical and mental fitness between the different age groups. Because of the desire of many young men to get their military requirements out of the way before they go to college or start a career, a substantial number between ages 17 and 19 either enlist or volunteer for early induction. For example, at the end of fiscal year 1958 an estimated 510,000 19- and 20-year-olds had entered the Active Forces. Of these, 48,000 either had enlisted or volunteered for early induction. In the case of the older age groups (note the last two columns of table 2) many were inducted during the latter years of the Korean war when they were around age 20.

Since the percentage of unfit will depend largely on the standards existing at the time of induction and the largest percentage of those entering service is in the younger age groups, the impact of the introduction of higher standards for induction has been understandably heavier against the younger age groups.

CONCLUSIONS

In table 2 it is noted that the Department of Defense estimates that, as of June 30, 1958, there were 1,100,000 males aged 26 of whom 750,000 had seen substantial military service. In other words, about 68 percent or less than 7 out of 10 had served (or were in process of serving) for 2 years or longer. Of those physically, mentally, and morally qualified—860,000—87 percent entered service for 2 years or longer).

From the Defense estimate in table 3, it is apparent that only 530,000 of the 1,150,000 males reaching age 26 will have entered military service for 2 years or longer. This is 46 percent—less than 5 out of every 10. (Deducting the 340,000 unqualified for physical, mental, or moral reasons, between 65 and 66 percent of the 810,000 qualified can expect to serve for 2 years or longer.) Another way of stating the estimate of service for all males aged 26 in 1963 is that one-third more of those who reach age 26 by June 30, 1963, can expect to escape substantial military service as compared to those who reached age 26 by June 30, 1958.

As a matter of interest, at the end of fiscal year 1963 the projected total of the male population for ages 19 to 26 is about 10,300,000. Of this total, according to the estimates of the Department of Defense, 2,840,000 will have entered military service for a period of 2 years or longer, a little over 27 percent. While the figure for the 26-year-olds alone is 46 percent, it should be pointed out that many of the younger age groups will be brought into service after fiscal year 1963, provided that the draft is still in effect.

As long as the international situation permits us to keep our Armed Forces near the 2½ million level, the population continues to increase, and the recent improvement in enlistment and reenlistment rates holds, it appears likely that the percentage of those who will experience no substantial interruption in the civilian careers because of military service will increase, year by year.

Very truly yours,

Charles H. Donnelly,
Senior Specialist in National Defense.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Excerpts from address delivered by him at a conference sponsored by the Northwestern University Bio-Medical Engineering Research Center, Chicago, Ill., on March 29, 1963.

By Mr. CASE:

Article entitled "To Move Congress Out of Its Ruts," written by Senator Humphrey and published in the New York Times magazine of April 7, 1963, relating to proposed reforms in congressional procedures; also an article on the same subject from the New York Times of April 7, 1963.

Editorial entitled "Confusion in Space," published in the New York Times of April 7, 1963; also a recent statement issued by his office concerning his inquiry to Air Force Secretary Zuckert, with regard to alleged duplication of facilities by NASA.

WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the midst of legislative debate last Tuesday, the Senate paused for a moment to vote U.S. citizenship for an Englishman. The occasion was duly noted by several of our colleagues and all wished the recipient well. However, the demands of duty pressed upon us, and shortly we were compelled to return to the consideration of our business.

Too often these moments go by here without warning and without time for savored meditation. But these past few days of spring have been warm and sunny, conducive to meditation, and their pleasantness disturbed my resting memories of a time some 20 years ago, a time C. P. Snow has called, "the beautiful, shining, desperate summer of 1940."

It was after Dunkirk, and the final fall of France with its accompanying bitter disappointments was only 3 weeks away.

The stubborn resistance of civilization seemed narrowing down to that small island in the North Atlantic; but the voice of that resistance growled out across the airwaves that England would never surrender. We remember those words clearly:

> We shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be. We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender, and even if, which I do not for a moment believe, this island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving, then our empire beyond the seas * * * would carry

> on the struggle, until, in God's good time, the New World, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the Old.

With pride, Winston Churchill addressed his own people, and with patience the people of a sister nation across the Atlantic. It was clear to him that the medieval darkness which was then gathering on the Continent threatened not just the west of Europe, but all of Western civilization. It had been clear to him all along.

Two years before, on October 16, 1938, while the visionaries and the defeatists still believed that Germany had satisfied its last territorial claims and that war could be avoided by giving to the Fuhrer what he otherwise would take by force, Mr. Churchill addressed the people of America:

> I avail myself with relief of the opportunity of speaking to the people of the United States. I do not know how long such liberties will be allowed. The stations of uncensored expression are closing down; the lights are going out; but there is still time for those to whom freedom and parliamentary government mean something, to consult together. Let me, then, speak in truth and earnestness while time remains.

Mr. Churchill restated the development of the philosophy common to our two nations:

> As we look back over the long story of the nations, we must see * * * their glory has been founded upon the spirit of resistance to tyranny and injustice. Since the dawn of the Christian Era a certain way of life has slowly been shaping itself among the Western peoples, and certain standards of conduct and government have come to be esteemed. After many miseries and prolonged confusion, there arose into the broad light of day the conception of the right of the individual; his right to be consulted in the government of his country; his right to invoke the law even against the state itself.

Mr. Churchill would not be forced by the fate that threatened his island to compromise reality with expediency. He pointed out then in precise terms the similarity of principle that rules all totalitarian states though his words might have offended a possible ally:

> Like the Communists, the Nazis tolerate no opinion but their own. Like the Communists, they feed on hatred. Like the Communists, they must seek from time to time, and always at shorter intervals, a new target, a new prize, a new victim. The dictator, in all his pride, is held in the grip of his party machine. He can go forward: he cannot go back. He must blood his hounds and show them sport, or else, like Actaeon of old, be devoured by them. All-strong without, he is all-weak within.

Mr. Churchill had spoken to us long before that summer of 1940 and patiently warned us of the events which were later to forcefully eject us from the deceptive security of our retirement.

But that was still before us in the summer of 1940. Then England stood alone and the stillness of the fragrant Dover evenings was broken by wave after wave of German planes heavy with bombs for the British heartland. We and the world held our breath awaiting the inevitable, for the island to be engulfed by the irresistible Nazi blitzkreig.

The English survived that summer, "God's good time" soon came, and the United States entered the war. After an undisturbed and generous youth, history decreed that the time had come for our Nation to take up the burden which the rest of the free world was no longer strong enough to carry. We still bear the heavy part of those burdens and there is not, and will not soon be, opportunity to set them down.

Such are the affairs of men that the years find our old enemies now our stanchest allies, and some among those allies have become our present adversaries. Governments change, friendships change, and the temptation sometimes is to ask why the battles have been fought, where lies the sense to all the bloody sacrifice?

I know of no more compelling proof that our real enemy is not other nations, or other peoples, but tyranny, which rises like a weed in lands that are not tended, to choke off the dignity of man. The struggle since the beginning of history has been, in larger terms, not so much the struggle of nations as a struggle between that dignity and those who deny man's dignity. That war has grown in scope and in intensity until today the world is divided into two great parts, representing those two opposing beliefs.

Some say democracy is outmoded, a thought of the past, and that other "modern" philosophies will rule in times to come. The statement contains its own lie, for tyranny has been the overriding fate of man since his forgotten beginnings. Indeed it is the concept of dignity and freedom that is new, that has been slowly nurtured in the breasts of men, and that has grown stronger in spite of repeated assaults by man's dark lawless past. Our conflict today is but the latest, perhaps the final great battle between tyranny and dignity, and I ask which of those two concepts is new to the history of men.

I hear it said that loss of empire has deprived England of its place among great nations of the world. I believe this is not true and will never be so. For it was England that served as mankind's school of freedom. It was there that our concepts of responsibility and right were painstakingly developed and it is to England that America will forever owe its greatest debt.

That which we have desired to bestow on one of her great statesmen is intended not only as the gift of our highest honor to him, but also as recognition of the debt we owe to the proud nation that he led.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as one of the original cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 5, conferring U.S. honorary citizenship upon the Honorable Winston Churchill, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], on the occasion of the signing of this resolution by the President today.

I wish it were within the power of this body to go beyond that and confer upon Mr. Churchill the title, "Honorary Citizen of the World," because, Mr. President, that is truly the title he deserves. He deserves it because the fight he has carried on for the good and decent life for his people is of the kind that all human beings, in their heart, believe in and admire.

Who can ever forget his sonorous voice as he rallied the people of his beloved, sceptered isles against the hated Hitler hordes? Who can ever forget the pledge which he made on behalf of his beleaguered people: to fight the invader on the beaches, in the streets or wherever he might appear?

Who can forget the redoubtable figure of this marvelous man, smiling through the blood, sweat, and tears of his nation's agony, puffing on his familiar cigar and holding aloft two fingers in a promise of victory that, God willing, did come true?

And who can forget the omniscience of this man as he stood in the quiet of a hall at the University of Zurich after the tumult of war had died away, and described his vision of a United States of Europe, a vision that now lies so near the grasp of those of us who believe in a united community of Atlantic nations, dedicated to the peace and freedom and dignity of all men of good will?

Mr. President, the world will long remember this man, Winston Churchill, whom we honor with our simple tribute today. He is one of those of whom it can truly be said, "He is a great man."

SENATOR ANDERSON TO BE HONORED BY CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that our able colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will be honored at a testimonial dinner for his many outstanding contributions in the field of conservation and natural resource development.

I am very pleased to know that Senator ANDERSON will be so honored. Those of us here in the Senate are well aware of his interest and many accomplishments in the areas of conservation. The major conservation groups are to be complimented in selecting our colleague for this award which will be presented on Monday, May 20.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a news release pertaining to the testimonial dinner.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION AWARD TO SENATOR ANDERSON

> National recognition for outstanding contributions to the conservation of America's natural resources will be accorded the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, U.S. Senator from New Mexico, at a testimonial dinner given in his honor by 12 of the Nation's foremost conservation organizations on Monday, May 20, at Washington's Statler Hilton Hotel.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, Members of Congress, and other ranking Government officials will attend the dinner, which will be open to all who wish to pay tribute to Senator Anderson's long and vigorous career as an advocate of a balanced conservation program for national forests, parks, wildlife refuges, water, and other resources. The sponsoring groups will present Senator Anderson with a national award of recognition.

In announcing the dinner, Committee Chairman C. R. Gutermuth, secretary of the North American Wildlife Foundation, stated: "In staging this National Conservation Testimonial Dinner in honor of Senator Anderson, 12 of the leading national conservation organizations in America have combined their efforts to recognize a man who has fearlessly and selflessly acted in the best interests of the Nation in matters concerning natural resources. I believe that the scope of the interests represented in the list of sponsoring organizations is testimony in itself to Senator Anderson's place of esteem among the conservationists of America."

The dinner is being sponsored jointly by the American Conservation Association; American Forestry Association; Conservation Foundation; Izaak Walton League of America; National Audubon Society; National Parks Association; National Wildlife Federation; North American Wildlife Foundation; Sierra Club; Sport Fishing Institute; Wilderness Society; and the Wildlife Management Institute.

Tickets and further information on the dinner can be obtained from the steering committee at 709 Wire Building, Washington 5, D.C., phone DI. 7-1774.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for half a century the Rockefeller Foundation has been a major factor in the improvement of the human lot and the enrichment of the human experience. Its great constructive work in public health, medicine, education, international relations, and in the arts has profoundly influenced the fabric of life as it is lived today in this Nation and throughout the world. Over the years, it has channeled the potentials of enlightenment into the service of humanity.

The sum of $763 million which the foundation has disbursed during the past five decades may appear staggering. Yet it is but a small fraction of the total which has flowed for similar purposes from governments, international agencies and other sources and it does not really explain the great effectiveness of the foundation. Rather, the key lies in the basic approach which has been taken from its inception. There has been consistent recognition that even as human needs are not static, even as they vary in time and in place, the response to them can be neither static nor stylized. For 50 years the foundation has applied, within this approach, a systematic and perceptive priming of action of many kinds to meet ever-changing needs.

Mr. President, the board of trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation has issued a statement on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of its establishment. I ask unanimous consent that this brief statement of an extraordinary private achievement which forms a unique part of the history of the first half of the 20th century, be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by the Board of Trustees on the 50th Anniversary of the Rockefeller Foundation 1913–63

The Rockefeller Foundation has now completed 50 years of activity in promoting the well-being of mankind throughout the world.

As we look back at the record of those who preceded us, we note with pride the achievements that have flowed from the foundation's 50-year history. During this period the foundation has spent over $763 million—far more than its total income. This sum by itself could have accomplished relatively little. The real accomplishments have been brought about by the inspired and dedicated efforts of thousands of talented and learned men and women who needed financial support at critical moments in their determined endeavor to improve the lot of their fellow men. To these servants of human welfare we pay respectful tribute.

We note with further respect and admiration the contributions of the dedicated corps of officers who have implemented so ably the purposes of the foundation, and of our predecessor trustees—among them such noted public figures as John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Charles Evans Hughes, Owen D. Young, John Foster Dulles, John W. Davis, Simon Flexner, Raymond B. Fosdick, Dean Rusk, Robert A. Lovett, Henry Allen Moe, and John J. McCloy; and such distinguished educators as Eliot, of Harvard; Angell, of Yale; Dodds, of Princeton; Compton, of M.I.T.; Sproul, of California; Wilbur, of Stanford; and Hopkins, of Dartmouth.

In 1913 the foundation's first trustees decided to focus all efforts and resources on what John D. Rockefeller once called "a search for cause, an attempt to cure evils at their source." It was a time when life expectancy in this country was restricted to 52 years, compared with 70 years today; when 1 out of every 10 children died in the first year of life, compared with 1 in 40 today. Here was a place to start, for surely mankind could not move on toward creating a better life without physical well-being.

During those early years dedicated scientists on the foundation's staff sought out major infectious diseases—malaria, hookworm, and yellow fever—all over the world. Out of this persistent work, patterns for the improvement of public health began to emerge and, for the first time in history, protection against major diseases could be given to millions of human beings.

One aspect of this systematic approach to the whole problem of public health was the establishment by the foundation of public health schools—the first at the Johns Hopkins University, followed by similar undertakings here and in 21 countries all over the world. Governments and private organizations have now entered this field with greatly expanded resources. The foundation itself moved on to advance the general improvement of medical education, and with this concentrated effort went the encouragement of research in the belief that persistent probing for new knowledge must move hand in hand with education.

Combining its interest in public health and the medical and biological sciences, the foundation has also turned its attention to human nutrition, especially to the problem of increasing the world's food production. The foundation has just completed 20 years of work in Mexico in close cooperation with Mexican leaders, scientists, and agricultural producers. The deficit position of Mexico with respect to its basic crops has been corrected. Lessons learned and techniques evolved are now being applied to other areas of the world with comparable problems.

Meanwhile, the search for causes of disease, poverty, malnutrition, ignorance, and despair revealed pressing needs for new knowledge about man himself as a part of his whole environment. For the needs of mankind merely begin, and do not end, with physical well-being and an adequate diet—vital as these may be. Among the great ends and the great achievements of man are those that grow from inspirations of his intellect and his spirit. In the middle of its second decade, therefore, the foundation began its long and intensive support of work in the social sciences—economics, sociology, political science—and its increasingly broad interest in the humanities and the arts. In the natural sciences the foundation moved into the support of pioneering research in physics, chemistry, and biology, and then into biophysics, biochemistry, and disciplines such as genetics, physiology, and microbiology.

The Rockefeller Foundation's 50-year record has helped demonstrate the role of a private foundation in meeting contemporary human need. A private foundation can take initiative; it can pioneer; and, by mustering available knowledge and human competence, it can identify causes and experiment with solutions. It can move without the political complications created when governments are involved with other governments. It can encourage cooperative effort across national and political boundaries. It can bring a high order of individuality and diversity of viewpoint into the field of human betterment. It can provide a decentralization of social initiative and responsibility. And it can enlist the interest and support of vigorous, enterprising, and public-spirited benefactors.

The Rockefeller Foundation has been a catalyst, undertaking operations of its own only when there was no existing organization ready to act. It has considered itself primarily a cooperating enterprise in situations both in the United States and abroad where people were ready to help themselves and needed aid, not only in funds, but also in developing their potentials for research and scholarship.

The foundation has always looked to the eventual assumption of total responsibility by local institutions and individuals, thus making continuing effort eventually self-sustaining. One way of achieving this has been through the financing of some 16,000 fellowships, which have enabled promising men and women to improve their professional knowledge and aptitudes. Twenty-eight fellows eventually won Nobel Prizes for their contributions to human welfare; an additional 68 Nobel laureates have received other forms of foundation assistance.

Where institutions exist for research, education, and training in fields of foundation interest, they have been aided by direct grants. In rare instances where such institutions have not existed, grants have been made toward their establishment. Because the foundation believes that it is difficult for one generation to foresee the needs of the next, grants have never been tied to rigid purposes. Once grants have been made, after careful exploration, to responsible groups or institutions, the foundation has never sought to direct or control the work supported. It has not assumed a permanent share of the expenses of any institution, because it does not want to influence the policy of recipients or detract from their responsibilities or their independence.

Whether acting as an operating institution or a grantmaking institution, however, the foundation's characteristic procedure has been to identify the cause of the particular problem, to find realistic ways of dealing with it, to aid others as they carry out this effort, and then to move on to other opportunities in response to changing human needs.

Large new resources are becoming available on many academic and scientific fronts in the United States and elsewhere as worldwide attention is being given to the well-being of mankind. Public funds are being used in areas where 50 years ago almost nothing was being done, except the pioneering efforts of a small number of private foundations. In 1913 expenditures for social welfare by Federal, State, and local governments were less than $1 billion, compared with more than $55 billion today. And yet, despite these increased resources, the immensity of problems inhibiting "the well-being of mankind throughout the world" still dwarfs the forces involved—public and private.

We face the future in a world startlingly different from that in which the Rockefeller Foundation was founded 50 years ago. It is a complex and intimately interdependent world, exploding in revolutionary change as man struggles to improve his conditions of life in many physical and social environments. Meanwhile, the great new force of a rapidly expanding population increasingly magnifies such problems as food supply, conservation of natural resources, urbanization, public health, education, the use of leisure, and world peace and security.

The opportunities for effective work toward the well-being of mankind through the systematic dispensing of private resources are today enormous. For in attacking the momentous problems he faces, civilized man has at hand means that were unavailable 50 years ago—a great improvement and broadening of education; a vast storehouse of new scientific knowledge and techniques for applying this knowledge; and a general awakening among the peoples of the earth to the fact that man can improve himself and his environment if he has the will and patient determination to do so.

As it begins its second half-century, the Rockefeller Foundation adds to these new means for human advancement an experienced faith in the validity and the vitality of the philanthropic idea. Those whose devotion to the betterment of mankind gave the foundation its first half-century of success have established, it seems to us, that private wealth can be responsibly and effectively expended by private institutions devoted solely to the public good.

To perform this urgent task with increasing effectiveness will be the continued aim of this foundation.

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Barry Bingham, editor and publisher, the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times.

Lloyd D. Brace, chairman of the board, First National Bank of Boston.

Detlev W. Bronk, president, the Rockefeller Institute.

Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs, United Nations.

Lowell T. Coggeshall, vice president, University of Chicago.

John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College.

Orvil E. Dryfoos, president and publisher, the New York Times.

Lee A. Dubridge, president, California Institute of Technology.

Lord Franks of Headington, provost, Worcester College, Oxford University.

Clifford M. Hardin, chancellor, University of Nebraska.

J. George Harrar, president, the Rockefeller Foundation.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, president, University of Notre Dame.

Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., president, Steuben Glass.

Clark Kerr, president, University of California.

John R. Kimberly, chairman of the board, Kimberly-Clark Corp.

John D. Rockefeller 3d, chairman of the board, the Rockefeller Foundation.

Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System.

Henry P. Van Dusen, president, Union Theological Seminary.

W. Barry Wood, Jr., director, Department of Microbiology, the Johns Hopkins University.

George D. Woods, president, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION IN MEXICO

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, in the New York Times, April 8, there appears an article by Ben A. Franklin on the state of the Alliance for Progress, and another by Paul P. Kennedy on the current economic situation in Mexico. I commend these articles to the attention of the Senate. The one emphasizes the realism of the U.S. approach to the Alliance under the able leadership of Teodoro Moscoso who refuses to substitute words for deeds but works stubbornly and with optimism to bring about the kind of situation in which the concept of the Alliance can contribute to the well-being of the Americas. The second article notes the revival of the Mexican economy, particularly in the wake of President Kennedy's visit last June. This friendly and highly successful undertaking apparently had the effect of contributing to business confidence which, in turn, has reflected itself in investment, in trade, and in a new economic buoyancy.

This development is of immense importance, not only to the Mexican people but to this Nation and the hemisphere as a whole. The pattern of the evolving Alliance for Progress depends heavily on what transpires in Mexico. Its economic achievements not only can keynote developments elsewhere in Latin America but will enable Mexico to make a major contribution to progress in other American Republics. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 8, 1963]

ALLIANCE HOPES TO END ITS SIESTA—MOSCOSO OPTIMISTIC DESPITE PROGRAM'S HESITANT START—DIRECTOR SAYS UNITED STATES IS READY TO MOVE IF LATINS ARE

(By Ben A. Franklin)

WASHINGTON.—Nobody in the Kennedy administration has a firmer reputation for candor than Teodoro Moscoso.

The energetic, self-critical optimist, increasingly criticized, directs the Alliance for Progress from a large, sunny office on the sixth floor of the State Department Building.

Mr. Moscoso predicted recently that the Alliance would end its 20-month siesta in 1963. But he quickly qualified his forecast.

"We are ready to move," Mr. Moscoso said, emphasizing the "we." "But there is no sense in fooling ourselves, no sense in saying that we are ready to finance the plan of a certain country that requires 80 percent local resources, when there are no local resources.

"This isn't the same as going out and doing the usual kind of Government job, where you control all the elements and you just get it done."

Mr. Moscoso does not control all the elements of the Alliance. After a year and a half, he remains one of the few administration officials whose early hopes and aspirations for more than superfical progress in Latin America have not been dashed.

In the nearly 2 years that the Alliance has operated, about $1,500 million has been committed to Latin countries. Much of this money remains undisbursed for lack of ordinary progress in planning, in clearing the technical and political underbrush for specific projects, and in satisfying the prudent requirements of the Alliance Charter for reforms.

Accordingly, there has been a depressing lag between the Alliance's high aspirations and its results, even its prospects for results.

The United States is still willing to help—more willing, if anything—but its willingness exceeds the hemispheric ability to move ahead.

The distressing fact is that most observers here see little hope that real remedies for the political detachment of the Alliance—its removal from the political realities of Latin America and its consequent "professorial approach"—can be found soon.

The great political and social goals are far from realization. As a disillusioned Latin authority put it recently:

"There is hardly anything in the Alliance record to date that could not have been done, and probably would not have been done, if the Alliance had never existed."

Mr. Moscoso cannot—and would not—admit publicly that his job is hopeless, but his critical faculties do not seem to have been dulled by rationalization.

"The United States," he is fond of saying, "is only a junior partner in the Alliance," implying that much criticism of the program's lag belongs south of the border.

Not everyone understands or agrees with this explanation, however. There is mounting pressure for action, for good news, but little is in sight.

Mr. Moscoso's forecast is full of hope, but circumscribed by ifs. The high points of his projection barely rise above the foothills of adversity and struggle. In making it, he did not look into the astrologer's glass, but at the philosopher's stone.

"In 1963," he said, "we will be turning around. We will have two or three of our big national programs moving. We will begin getting benefits from the demonstration effect. There will be more appreciation of what we are doing."

The national programs are the heart and backbone of the Alliance. Without them, the program is vulnerable to the skeptics' charge that everything the Alliance stands for can be done as well under the less flamboyant foreign aid.

MOST PROJECTS LOCAL

But the usual foreign aid project, which deals with a dam or railroad, and program, which covers large areas such as public health and education, are often local. They are desirable, but confined in scope.

The national programs of the Alliance are designed to bring countries into the 20th century by raising per capita income, wiping out illiteracy, stretching life expectancy and providing homes, farms and jobs for millions.

By "demonstration effect," Mr. Moscoso said, he means that when the first of the dramatic national programs takes hold and begins to yield returns in terms of national progress, more Latin governments and citizens will begin to see the virtue of the Alliance program and its insistence on sweeping financial, fiscal and social reforms.

Of the six countries that have submitted long-range national development plans to the Alliance's panel of nine wise men, only two—Chile and Columbia—have even tentative prospects of making preparatory headway this year.

The plans of both countries have been delayed, at the brink of final approval, by lack of boldness and imagination, by technicians conducting business as usual, and an almost total lack of grassroots support for the difficult domestic reforms needed to make the plans work.

Mr. Moscoso said that Chile had made good progress, Colombia was doing well, and Mexico, Venezuela, and Brazil were hastening reforms and merging them into prospective long-range Alliance plans.

But none of the national plans is actually underway. In addition to Chile and Colombia, the other countries that have submitted development plans are Venezuela, Mexico, Bolivia, and Honduras.

To accelerate planning a necessary phase of Alliance activity that notably lacks a demonstration effect, Mr. Moscoso said, the Alliance staff has begun to stress the usefulness of shorter-range plans.

Of the development plans submitted to date, Chile's, Colombia's, Bolovia's, and Venezuela's are for the full 10-year span of Alliance operations. Mexico's 2-year plan took less time to prepare and, accordingly, will take less time to get into operation.

Mr. Moscoso believes that is a hopeful trend. He indicated that future Alliance proposals might be for a series of successive, shorter periods, embracing the 10-year development period in stages. The succeeding steps of Mexico's plan, for example, are to be formulated while the first stage is being applied.

MARKED—NOT CELEBRATED

Eight months ago, Mr. Moscoso decided that the Alliance's first birthday would be marked, not celebrated. This was done in deference to the unspectacular record up to then.

"In the Indianapolis 500-mile auto race they don't celebrate for anyone at the end of the first lap," he explained.

The omitted opportunity to emblazon the Alliance's anniversary did much to reinforce his standing as a bureaucrat who talks plainly and acts as he speaks. But it was probably a shrewd public relations decision as well. A celebration would have been met with derision in Latin America, even had it been swallowed here.

Regarding the worth and eventual outcome of the Alliance, the Director has no doubts. He has faith. He believes that the Alliance can and must succeed. This attitude has cost him the admiration of some less faithful officials.

He seems chastened only by the enormity of the job he believes the Alliance must do. It is a bigger job, he believes than the transformation of postwar Europe wrought by the Marshall plan, which had its share of criticism.

The comparison is worth noting because Mr. Moscoso makes it often. The Marshall plan, in the 3 years from 1948 to 1951, injected $12,500 million into European economies wrecked by war.

The Alliance calls for foreign investment of $20 billion in 10 years in Latin America. The difference, Mr. Moscoso says, is not only a 40 percent increase in dollars—the Latin American countries are to add $80 billion if they can.

"In Europe we dealt with recovering countries, we were rebuilding countries," he declared the other day. "Now we are dealing with developing countries, not recovering countries. Many of them are starting from the bottom, with nothing to rebuild."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 8, 1963]

MEXICO DISPLAYS SIGNS OF REVIVAL—KENNEDY'S VISIT IS CREDITED WITH A ROLE IN UPTURN

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

MEXICO CITY.—This country, in the spring of 1963, is qualifiedly optimistic after two less than satisfactory economic years.

The sluggish economy of the early months of 1962, highlighted by scant confidence of both domestic and foreign private investment, began showing signs of revival in late summer. The economy continued on a raggedly rising pattern through the remainder of the year.

It is estimated that when final returns are in, the year will have ended with a grand national product growth of between 4 and 4.5 percent. This, while not as much as was hoped and planned for when the year began, was still proudly hailed after a disappointing 3.5-percent increase in 1961.

Several factors are considered to have contributed to the warmly welcomed turn in late summer. One most frequently mentioned was the visit to Mexico on June 29 of President and Mrs. Kennedy. The visit was considered an outstanding success from the standpoint of public reception. But so far as the economy was concerned, the chief beneficial result was psychological. It appeared to provide the beginning of a certain reestablishment of confidence in the country and its administration after many inferior months.

The waning confidence was attributed to confusion over Mexico's position with respect to Cuba during 1960, 1961, and the early part of 1962. There was also much uncertainty over the administration's position on labor, business management, and investment security.

Some of these doubts and uncertainties have not been entirely dispelled even now. Enough were met head on, however, in the latter part of 1962 to revive the economy and to speed foreign investment, which had been virtually dormant. Confidence, observers say, was inspired by the meeting of President Adolfo López Mateos of Mexico and President Kennedy.

The flow of confidence grew additionally in October, when Mexico concluded a definition of its position on Cuba. It made its stand plain against the latter's possession of offensive missile weaponry. From the earliest months of 1960, this country's attitude toward the regime of Premier Fidel Castro had been left in doubt, so far as the business community was concerned.

An additional influence in the growth of the national product was a growing favorable balance of trade. This was reflected particularly in a comparison of two 12-month periods: October 1960 to September 1961, and October 1961 to September 1962. Exports in the first 12-month period amounted to, roughly, $1,570 million, as against $1,730 million in the succeeding 12-month period, or a gain of $160 million.

Imports during the 1960-61 period totaled $1,690 million, as against $1,717 million in the 1961-62 period, or a decline of $27 million. Tourism in the first 12-month period brought dollar revenue of $692 million, as against income in the 1961-62 period of $755 million. This amounted to a net gain from the three items of $196 million for the 1961-62 period.

Exports in September 1962 fell to $80 million from $86 million in August, but they exceeded the total for September 1961, by $28 million for a net gain of $22,600,000. Imports for September 1962 were $91,300,000 against $97,400,000 in August, but they were still $1,700,000 ahead of September 1962, thus yielding a net gain for these two items of $20,900,000 for the month. It appears certain that when final returns for the final quarter of 1962 are adjusted, probably in February, the proportion of gain in the balance of trade for goods and services will remain the same, although quite possibly the magnitude will have depreciated.

The third significant factor in the grand national product increment has been spending in the public sector. This spending in 1962 was 18 percent higher in actual disbursement than in 1861. It has been widely agreed that the gross benefits of this factor are open to question. A high level of Government spending could be of short-lived benefit unless it were accompanied by the full cooperation of private enterprise and became self-sustaining.

In conjunction with its economic planning, the Government has called for a 5-percent national product growth from 1961 to 1965. The failure of 1961 to come nearer than 1½ points of goal, called for 5.4 in the remaining years. A failure of 1962 to reach the latter goal will advance the ante to a rather difficult point, considering that each year the growth becomes more complicated.

PUBLIC SPENDING RISING

It appears certain that public spending will be greater in 1963 than in the past year. In the autumn of last year manifold negotiations were underway for contracts scheduled to begin this year. Loans for some of these projects were completed in the later months of 1962 but still have not been drawn on.

On the drawing board for this year are a number of highway and irrigation projects for which funds have been assured. The highways are largely feeder roads from areas scheduled to become agricultural production centers with the help of new irrigation projects.

There are qualified estimates by observers here that foreign exchange reserves will have reached more than $400 million for the year when computations have been completed. The more optimistic estimates place this figure between $410 and $420 million. In any case there is universal assurance that the 1962 primary reserves will considerably outdo the $390 million of 1961.

In secondary or standby reserves, the country finished 1962 with $345 million, or $45 million better than it had during a large part of the year. It started the year with the following standby loans: Export-Import Bank $90 million; International Monetary Fund, $180 million, and U.S. Treasury, $75 million. Before the year was half over, it drew down $45 million from the Monetary Fund. It paid this back long before the year was over, however.

There was some pressure on the peso during 1962. This took place at the classic period here for pressure on monetary stability—during the Easter holidays. It was considered, however, that the pressure last year on the peso was the lightest and easiest disposed of in any recent year.

During 1962 President López Mateos asserted repeatedly that the peso's value would be preserved. He made this emphatic in his "Informe" of September 1, the annual presentation of Mexico's equivalent of the state of the Union address of the United States. The Mexican President on that occasion declared, "We have had a solid currency since the beginning of this administration, and we will maintain the stability of the peso. We will maintain the practice of not resorting to inflationary financing or resources."

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just received from the Social Security Administration a tabulation showing the number and monthly amount of benefits paid as of the end of December of 1962 to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance recipients. By that date, 18.1 million persons in the Nation were receiving monthly benefits. This represents an annual increase of some 1,450,000 for the last 3 years, and reflects the changes contained in the 1960 and 1961 amendments to the Social Security Act. The changes were made necessary by greater need on the part of all recipients, especially those retired persons over 65 and dependent children under 18.

Mr. President, these figures indicate that dependent children, the elderly, and the disabled in my own State of Montana totaled 68,404 persons in 1962. They received benefits amounting to slightly more than $4.5 million a month. The bulk of the funds went to some 38,026 elderly persons in retirement benefits. Also, 10,428 dependent children benefited from the program. I want to point out that these moneys are not grants from the Federal Government. Rather they are benefits earned by workers who have paid into the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program over the years. They are earned returns on insurance premiums, if you will. Mr. President, I ask that the table containing the information on payments to Montana be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number and amount (dollars) of monthly benefits in current-payment status as of Dec. 31, 1962, by type of benefit and beneficiary's State and county of residence, old-age, survivors, and disability insurance

[Residence based on post office or place name in benefit check address. Benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance (OASI) parts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program are payable from the OASI trust fund to old-age-insurance (retired-worker) beneficiaries and their dependents and to survivors of deceased workers. Benefits under the disability insurance (DI) part of the program are payable from the DI trust fund to disability-insurance (disabled-worker) beneficiaries and their dependents]

State and county	Total			Old age	Disability	Wife's or husband's			Child's			Widow's or widower's	Mother's	Parent's
	Total	OASI	DI			Total	OASI	DI	Total	OASI	DI			
MONTANA														
Total:														
Number	68,404	64,585	3,819	38,026	2,189	10,452	10,009	443	10,428	9,241	1,187	5,647	1,545	117
Monthly amount	4,529,355	4,273,587	255,768	2,922,824	202,368	421,970	406,214	15,756	505,712	468,068	37,644	374,624	93,637	8,220
Beaverhead:														
Number	805	771	34	527	25	83	81	2	93	86	7	57	16	4
Monthly amount	52,713	50,235	2,478	37,482	2,116	3,259	3,155	104	4,994	4,736	258	3,596	964	302
Big Horn:														
Number	835	780	55	378	23	120	113	7	236	211	25	49	28	1
Monthly amount	45,031	42,356	2,675	27,195	1,787	4,387	4,213	174	7,434	6,720	714	3,123	1,015	90
Blaine:														
Number	807	792	15	457	10	127	126	1	136	132	4	60	17	0
Monthly amount	50,546	49,512	1,034	34,479	888	4,899	4,875	24	5,476	5,354	122	3,882	922	0
Broadwater:														
Number	379	346	33	196	15	63	59	4	71	57	14	27	7	0
Monthly amount	22,845	20,907	1,938	14,149	1,358	2,363	2,249	114	2,859	2,393	466	1,710	406	0
Carbon:														
Number	1,335	1,268	67	794	35	238	228	10	124	102	22	119	23	2
Monthly amount	81,048	76,843	4,205	55,551	3,040	8,606	8.234	372	5,604	4,811	793	6,791	1,281	175
Carter:														
Number	251	240	11	137	6	56	55	1	28	24	4	19	4	1
Monthly amount	15,982	15,185	797	10,357	618	2,199	2,167	32	1,275	1,128	147	1,168	289	76
Cascade:														
Number	5,799	5,499	300	3,246	179	803	772	31	877	787	90	553	134	7
Monthly amount	404,997	384,549	20,448	260,811	16,420	34,246	33,195	1,051	46,140	43,163	2,977	38,738	8,192	450
Chouteau:														
Number	784	768	16	456	7	152	150	2	113	106	7	40	16	0
Monthly amount	57,073	55,952	1,121	40,178	751	6,834	6,748	86	5,411	5,127	284	2,981	918	0
Custer:														
Number	1,412	1,350	62	859	43	213	204	9	172	162	10	95	28	2
Monthly amount	92,198	87,510	4,688	63,628	3,855	8,462	8,078	384	8,252	7,803	449	6,206	1,665	130
Daniels:														
Number	528	526	2	303	2	112	112	0	63	63	0	37	11	0
Monthly amount	36,497	36,329	168	25,192	168	5,015	5,015	0	2,764	2,764	0	2,729	629	0
Dawson:														
Number	875	816	59	459	29	150	141	9	149	128	21	60	25	3
Monthly amount	57,560	53,969	3,591	35,023	2,709	5,922	5,639	283	7,958	7,359	599	4,048	1,643	257
Deer Lodge:														
Number	1,688	1,520	168	742	112	216	199	17	313	274	39	259	42	4
Monthly amount	127,164	114,306	12,858	67,240	10,632	10,287	9,552	735	16,975	15,484	1,491	18,930	2,829	271
Fallon:														
Number	331	311	20	193	11	59	57	2	35	28	7	28	5	0
Monthly amount	21,008	19,862	1,146	14,129	938	2,091	2,033	58	1,769	1,619	150	1,764	317	0
Fergus:														
Number	1,782	1,744	38	1,048	24	309	303	6	244	236	8	123	32	2
Monthly amount	115,442	112,741	2,701	79,351	2,212	12,438	12,218	220	11,629	11,360	269	8,219	1,453	140
Flathead:														
Number	4,079	3,810	269	2,312	138	678	644	34	566	469	97	302	74	9
Monthly amount	261,819	244,411	17,408	171,307	12,962	25,861	24,548	1,313	27,726	24,593	3,133	18,794	4,597	572
Gallatin:														
Number	2,477	2,376	101	1,433	61	402	389	13	338	311	27	184	56	3
Monthly amount	162,399	155,467	6,932	108,847	5,607	15,825	15,353	472	16,405	15,552	853	12,211	3,344	160
Garfield:														
Number	191	188	3	116	3	26	26	0	24	24	0	16	6	0
Monthly amount	12,883	12,649	234	8,862	234	1,103	1,103	0	1,290	1,290	0	1,012	382	0
Glacier:														
Number	758	717	41	405	19	83	80	3	182	163	19	44	25	0
Monthly amount	47,351	45,143	2,208	29,903	1,714	3,448	3,331	117	8,013	7,636	377	2,927	1,346	0
Golden Valley:														
Number	167	165	2	97	2	36	36	0	19	19	0	10	3	0
Monthly amount	10,899	10,779	120	7,497	120	1,450	1,450	0	1,042	1,042	0	600	190	0
Granite:														
Number	320	306	14	178	10	43	41	2	49	47	2	29	6	5
Monthly amount	21,502	20,291	1,211	13,304	979	1,826	1,710	116	2,978	2,862	116	1,685	420	310
Hill:														
Number	1,331	1,272	59	729	28	188	179	9	245	223	22	104	35	2
Monthly amount	90,772	87,149	3,623	58,850	2,518	8,148	7,816	332	11,976	11,203	773	7,072	2,072	136
Jefferson:														
Number	585	527	58	266	25	73	65	8	171	146	25	41	8	1
Monthly amount	34,073	30,967	3,106	18,982	2,110	2,551	2,342	209	7,489	6,702	787	2,352	528	61
Judith Basin:														
Number	315	293	22	177	10	51	48	3	46	37	9	26	5	0
Monthly amount	20,957	19,529	1,428	13,787	1,045	2,088	1,999	89	2,076	1,782	294	1,709	252	0
Lake:														
Number	1,851	1,736	115	1,008	47	318	302	16	310	258	52	134	30	4
Monthly amount	107,183	100,644	6,539	69,816	4,532	11,065	10,487	578	12,196	10,767	1,429	7,715	1,637	222
Lewis and Clark:														
Number	2,973	2,804	169	1,776	104	363	348	15	412	362	50	250	58	10
Monthly amount	205,715	193,930	11,785	138,901	9,382	15,764	15,170	594	20,630	18,821	1,809	17,145	3,229	664

Number and amount (dollars) of monthly benefits in current-payment status as of Dec. 31, 1962, by type of benefit and beneficiary's State and county of residence, old-age, survivors, and disability insurance—Continued

[Residence based on post office or place name in benefit check address. Benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance (OASI) parts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program are payable from the OASI trust fund to old-age-insurance (retired-worker) beneficiaries and their dependents and to survivors of deceased workers. Benefits under the disability insurance (DI) part of the program are payable from the DI trust fund to disability-insurance (disabled-worker) beneficiaries and their dependents]

State and county	Total			Old age	Disability	Wife's or husband's			Child's			Widow's or widower's	Mother's	Parent's
	Total	OASI	DI			Total	OASI	DI	Total	OASI	DI			
MONTANA—continued														
Liberty:														
Number	205	196	9	105	6	30	29	1	41	39	2	15	8	0
Monthly amount	15,159	14,492	667	9,102	522	1,391	1,344	47	2,487	2,389	98	1,147	510	0
Lincoln:														
Number	1,052	979	73	528	37	151	137	14	226	204	22	80	30	0
Monthly amount	66,890	61,789	5,101	39,478	3,665	5,851	5,247	604	11,384	10,552	832	4,755	1,757	0
McCone:														
Number	272	269	3	160	3	61	61	0	28	28	0	12	6	2
Monthly amount	19,469	19,240	229	13,825	229	2,767	2,767	0	1,310	1,310	0	920	265	153
Madison:														
Number	720	693	27	472	20	92	90	2	84	79	5	44	8	0
Monthly amount	42,302	40,301	2,001	31,443	1,796	3,174	3,104	70	2,972	2,837	135	2,457	460	0
Meagher:														
Number	282	268	14	182	14	29	29	0	40	40	0	10	7	0
Monthly amount	17,402	16,180	1,222	12,503	1,222	1,115	1,115	0	1,783	1,783	0	459	320	0
Mineral:														
Number	243	228	15	136	7	29	27	2	53	47	6	15	3	0
Monthly amount	15,245	14,263	982	9,726	698	1,023	935	88	2,811	2,615	196	801	186	0
Missoula:														
Number	4,251	4,025	226	2,399	135	627	600	27	636	572	64	369	80	5
Monthly amount	286,850	271,092	15,758	185,416	12,445	25,769	24,834	935	33,549	31,171	2,378	24,295	5,025	351
Musselshell:														
Number	708	649	59	377	27	125	116	9	84	61	23	80	15	0
Monthly amount	45,967	42,753	3,214	28,466	2,441	4,769	4,509	260	4,013	3,500	513	5,220	1,058	0
Park:														
Number	1,314	1,273	41	777	30	199	195	4	174	167	7	107	25	2
Monthly amount	80,807	77,699	3,108	54,420	2,633	7,493	7,325	168	8,430	8,123	307	6,412	1,305	114
Petroleum:														
Number	114	106	8	59	3	20	18	2	24	21	3	4	4	0
Monthly amount	7,090	6,756	334	4,332	215	795	758	37	1,225	1,143	82	287	236	0
Phillips:														
Number	819	798	21	476	13	159	157	2	101	95	6	52	18	0
Monthly amount	51,364	50,194	1,170	36,014	1,002	6,304	6,267	37	3,869	3,738	131	3,312	863	0
Pondera:														
Number	688	657	31	383	19	119	117	2	108	98	10	39	18	2
Monthly amount	46,481	44,676	1,805	30,859	1,559	5,341	5,284	57	4,847	4,658	189	2,602	1,131	142
Powder River:														
Number	237	236	1	138	1	49	49	0	29	29	0	14	6	0
Monthly amount	15,504	15,418	86	10,490	86	2,104	2,104	0	1,627	1,627	0	928	269	0
Powell:														
Number	682	615	67	388	43	98	93	5	99	80	19	39	12	3
Monthly amount	45,708	41,049	4,659	29,041	3,956	3,833	3,646	187	5,349	4,833	516	2,499	786	244
Prairie:														
Number	243	239	4	120	4	47	47	0	43	43	0	23	6	0
Monthly amount	14,402	14,090	312	8,671	312	1,735	1,735	0	1,949	1,949	0	1,367	368	0
Ravalli:														
Number	2,070	1,973	97	1,175	45	398	387	11	262	221	41	160	27	3
Monthly amount	119.677	114,685	4,992	80,427	3,864	13,809	13,539	270	10,963	10,105	858	8,993	1,443	178
Richland:														
Number	1,185	1,121	64	632	29	227	218	9	159	133	26	102	35	1
Monthly amount	76,894	73,320	3,574	48,997	2,710	8,865	8,616	249	7,450	6,835	615	6,676	2,150	46
Roosevelt:														
Number	1,155	1,121	34	615	21	190	188	2	215	204	11	81	32	1
Monthly amount	73,713	71,750	1,963	48,264	1,667	7,766	7,712	54	8,233	7,991	242	5,888	1,842	53
Rosebud:														
Number	614	599	15	335	6	86	85	1	137	129	8	31	19	0
Monthly amount	35,577	34,902	675	24,237	540	3,088	3,073	15	4,837	4,717	120	2,006	869	0
Sanders:														
Number	928	894	34	549	18	148	143	5	132	121	11	61	18	2
Monthly amount	55,780	53,599	2,181	38,822	1,700	5,130	4,986	144	5,494	5,157	337	3,620	897	117
Sheridan:														
Number	809	783	26	472	10	159	154	5	95	84	11	55	18	0
Monthly amount	57,028	55,526	1,502	39,597	957	7,125	6,930	195	4,381	4,031	350	4,016	952	0
Silver Bow:														
Number	6,222	5,540	682	3,111	423	758	684	74	958	773	185	782	163	27
Monthly amount	463,130	412,277	50,853	266,657	42,071	34,972	32,085	2,887	50,490	44,595	5,895	55,752	11,104	2,084
Stillwater:														
Number	694	668	26	409	16	138	134	4	68	62	6	47	16	0
Monthly amount	41,750	40,133	1,617	28,746	1,294	5,006	4,896	110	2,939	2,726	213	2,839	926	0
Sweet Grass:														
Number	435	426	9	280	6	77	76	1	32	30	2	35	5	0
Monthly amount	26,383	25,775	608	19,264	464	2,766	2,713	53	1,558	1,467	91	1,999	332	0
Teton:														
Number	770	763	7	425	6	160	160	0	101	100	1	63	13	2
Monthly amount	51,350	50,737	613	34,121	557	6,775	6,775	0	4,665	4,609	56	4,301	809	122
Toole:														
Number	648	610	38	392	16	101	96	5	85	68	17	43	11	0
Monthly amount	46,742	44,467	2,275	32,511	1,545	4,374	4,190	184	4,520	3,974	546	3,063	729	0
Treasure:														
Number	127	125	2	72	2	22	22	0	18	18	0	11	2	0
Monthly amount	7,791	7,665	126	5,319	126	768	768	0	625	625	0	828	125	0
Valley:														
Number	1,104	1,064	40	645	21	185	181	4	171	156	15	61	21	0
Monthly amount	74,714	72,292	2,422	50,858	1,836	7,972	7,865	107	8,658	8,179	479	3,948	1,442	0
Wheatland:														
Number	337	318	19	207	9	51	49	2	40	32	8	23	7	0
Monthly amount	21,148	20,190	958	14,514	658	1,999	1,956	43	2,057	1,800	257	1,457	463	0
Wibaux:														
Number	213	208	5	122	5	45	45	0	23	23	0	14	4	0
Monthly amount	13,718	13,337	381	9,300	381	1.840	1.840	0	1,123	1,123	0	835	230	0
Yellowstone:														
Number	6,605	6.216	389	3,593	226	910	864	46	1,146	1,029	117	509	214	7
Monthly amount	437,663	411,725	25,938	272,583	20.522	36,114	34,616	1,498	59.753	55,835	3,918	33,835	14,256	600

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate at this time to discuss the scope of the old-age, survivors and disability insurance program throughout the Nation. The Social Security Administration statistics show that seven-tenths of all beneficiaries—or 12.7 million—were retired workers and their dependents. Nearly a fourth of the total—or 4.1 million—were survivors of deceased workers. Disabled worker beneficiaries and their dependents numbered 1.3 million and made up 7 percent of the total. Because of recent changes in the Social Security Act, about 89 percent of the persons reaching age 65 this year will be eligible for benefits. In families with children under 18, if the father should die, the mother and children in about 9 out of 10 families would be eligible for monthly survivor benefits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two additional tables, showing the breakdown of OASI benefits to all of the 50 States, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amount of benefit payments in calendar year 1962, by State, old-age, survivors, and disability insurance

[In thousands]

Beneficiary's State of residence [1]	Total	OASI [2]						DI [2]		
		Total	Monthly benefits [3]				Lump-sum death payments [4]	Monthly benefits [3]		
			Total	Old-age	Supplementary	Survivor		Total	Disability	Supplementary
Total	$14,461,461	$13,356,411	$13,172,993	$8,812,611	$1,349,281	$3,011,101	$183,418	$1,105,050	$887,630	$217,420
Alabama	199,438	173,734	171,239	101,524	18,878	50,837	2,495	25,704	19,752	5,952
Alaska	5,695	5,327	5,053	3,147	242	1,664	274	368	302	66
American Samoa	23	23	23	2	(5)	21	0	0	0	0
Arizona	91,572	81,233	80,127	52,283	7,897	19,947	1,106	10,339	8,145	2,194
Arkansas	130,625	117,890	116,388	76,376	14,412	25,600	1,502	12,735	9.774	2,961
California	1,193,049	1,106,606	1,091,504	757,100	96,991	237,413	15,102	86.443	71,834	14,609
Colorado	119,183	110,983	109,556	73,363	11,674	24,519	1,427	8,200	6,554	1,646
Connecticut	238,626	225,029	222.128	154,250	20,440	47,438	2,901	13,597	11,468	2,129
Delaware	33.509	30,952	30,433	20,405	2,797	7,231	519	2,557	2.121	436
District of Columbia	46,567	42.524	41,779	28,962	2,836	9,981	745	4,043	3.533	510
Florida	512,325	472,520	467,289	332,205	51,019	84,065	5,231	39,805	32,209	7,596
Georgia	216,417	187,191	184,053	112,112	17,040	54,901	3,138	29,226	23,117	6,109
Guam	77	76	73	16	4	53	3	1	1	0
Hawaii	28,345	25,879	25,577	16,978	2,427	6,172	302	2,466	1,983	483
Idaho	50,151	47,090	46,450	31,433	5,428	9,589	640	3,061	2,333	728
Illinois	865,968	808,462	796,261	541,424	77,865	176,972	12,201	57,506	48,383	9,123
Indiana	407,220	379,308	374,144	250,336	40,628	83,180	5,164	27,912	22,019	5,893
Iowa	247,212	235,491	232,579	161,262	28,916	42,401	2,912	11,721	9,331	2,390
Kansas	176,058	165,784	163,577	111,759	19,755	32,063	2,207	10,274	8,116	2,158
Kentucky	233,410	205,556	202,835	128,633	24,527	49,675	2,721	27,854	19,994	7,860
Louisiana	170,235	149,470	146,970	85,630	15,014	46,326	2,500	20,765	15,895	4,870
Maine	90,229	84,416	83,238	57,573	7,998	17,667	1,178	5,813	4,603	1,210
Maryland	192,557	178,124	175,260	112,376	15,638	47,246	2,864	14,433	12,001	2,432
Massachusetts	497,527	467,573	461,296	319,401	40,825	101,070	6,277	29,954	24,922	5,032
Michigan	668,861	620,878	612,830	403,862	66,207	142,761	8,048	47,983	38,378	9,605
Minnesota	277,566	264,734	261,556	180,725	30,196	50,635	3,178	12,832	10,305	2,527
Mississippi	121,580	107,809	106,210	66,963	12,063	27,184	1,599	13,771	10,677	3,094
Missouri	377,448	350,630	345,846	237,846	37,606	70,394	4,784	26,818	21,741	5,077
Montana	55,751	52,301	51,599	35,050	5,655	10,894	702	3,450	2,720	730
Nebraska	118,556	113,292	111,905	78,327	13,827	19,751	1,387	5,264	4,298	966
Nevada	17,360	16,068	15,792	10,759	1,088	3,945	276	1,292	1,074	218
New Hampshire	59,721	56,527	55,745	39,713	4,878	11,154	782	3,194	2,656	538
New Jersey	556,027	521,529	513,955	346,349	47,979	119,627	7,574	34,498	29,008	5,490
New Mexico	41,883	37,847	37,349	22,214	4,025	11,110	498	4,036	2,939	1,097
New York	1,569,002	1,465,823	1,446,036	1,004,729	131,429	309,878	19,787	103,179	87,240	15,939
North Carolina	268,057	236,936	233,078	145,308	24,020	63,750	3,858	31,121	24,897	6,224
North Dakota	45,580	43,720	43,199	29,758	5,841	7,600	521	1,860	1,416	444
Ohio	809,528	750,840	740,761	483,938	79,480	177,343	10,079	58,688	46,781	11,907
Oklahoma	169,559	154,601	152,614	100,078	17,791	34,745	1,987	14,958	11,603	3,355
Oregon	170,562	159,319	157,286	111,903	15,117	30,266	2,033	11,243	8,911	2,332
Pennsylvania	1,053,059	971,580	957,716	622,357	100,180	235,179	13,864	81,479	66,305	15,174
Puerto Rico	64,155	59,947	59,282	38,567	9,272	11,443	665	4,208	3,011	1,197
Rhode Island	84,792	78,903	78,071	54,858	6,777	16,436	832	5,889	4,980	909
South Carolina	126,560	108,962	107,267	63,511	9,822	33,934	1,695	17,598	13,930	3,668
South Dakota	53,154	50,808	50,196	34,518	6,610	9,068	612	2,346	1,837	509
Tennessee	227,468	201,707	198,740	126,073	22,001	50,666	2,967	25,761	19,667	6,094
Texas	551,187	502,684	495,195	310,763	54,795	129,637	7,489	48,503	37,990	10,513
Utah	53,761	50,756	50,015	31,520	5,677	12,818	741	3,005	2,313	692
Vermont	35,756	33,125	32,737	22,342	3,348	7,047	388	2,631	2,064	567
Virgin Islands	889	853	843	549	79	215	10	36	30	6
Virginia	238,537	211,337	208,035	129,344	20,677	58,014	3,302	27,200	21,105	6,095
Washington	244,875	229,559	226,501	158,173	22,076	46,252	3,058	15,316	12,373	2,943
West Virginia	172,843	145,636	143,891	85,415	18,173	40,303	1,745	27,207	18,830	8,377
Wisconsin	361,103	340,881	336,578	230,016	37,761	68,801	4,303	20,222	16,265	3,957
Wyoming	22,225	20,846	20,524	13,955	2,101	4,468	322	1,379	1,113	266
Abroad	98,038	94,732	93,809	64,578	9,479	19,752	923	3,306	2,783	523

---

[1] Based on benefit check address.

[2] Benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance (OASI) parts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program are payable from the OASI trust fund to old-age (retired-worker) beneficiaries and their dependents and to survivors of deceased workers. Benefits under the disability insurance (DI) part of the program are payable from the DI trust fund to disability (disabled-worker) beneficiaries and their dependents.

[3] Distribution by type of benefit and by State estimated. Supplementary benefits are paid to wives or dependent husbands aged 62 or over, wives under age 62 with child beneficiaries in their care, children under age 18, and disabled sons and daughters aged 18 or over (whose disability began before age 18) of old-age or disability insurance beneficiaries. Survivor benefits are paid to widows or dependent widowers aged 62 or over, children under age 18, disabled sons and daughters aged 18 or over whose disability began before age 18, widows or divorced wives with child beneficiaries in their care, and dependent parents aged 62 or over of deceased insured workers.

[4] Distribution by State based on 10-percent sample.

[5] Less than $500.

Number and amount (dollars) of monthly benefits [1] in current-payment status at end of December 1962, by type of benefit and by State, old-age, survivors, and disability insurance

Beneficiary's State of residence [2]	Total			Old-age	Disability [4]	Wife's or husband's			Child's [5]			Widow's or widower's	Mother's	Parent's
	Total	OASI [3]	DI [3]			Total	OASI [3]	DI [3]	Total	OASI [3]	DI [3]			
Total:														
Number	18,053,395	16,778,290	1,275,105	9,738,500	740,867	2,678,531	2,531,465	147,066	2,547,057	2,159,885	387,172	1,859,191	451,984	37,265
Monthly amount	1,181,724,895	1,099,227,307	82,497,588	741,960,646	66,672,954	105,071,711	100,304,771	4,766,940	116,166,050	105,108,356	11,057,694	122,475,143	26,837,590	2,540,801
Alabama:														
Number	307,183	272,799	34,384	132,760	17,641	47,674	43,040	4,634	69,250	57,141	12,109	26,830	11,851	1,177
Monthly amount	16,275,206	14,352,330	1,922,876	8,624,604	1,486,858	1,464,727	1,329,414	135,313	2,492,880	2,192,175	300,705	1,537,150	597,589	71,398
Alaska:														
Number	7,172	6,795	377	3,443	222	389	355	34	2,513	2,392	121	271	322	12
Monthly amount	434,683	409,095	25,588	255,746	21,614	13,099	12,080	1,019	111,053	108,098	2,955	16,872	15,377	922
American Samoa:														
Number	102	90	12	3	1	3	2	1	82	72	10	0	13	0
Monthly amount	2,195	2,063	132	151	76	33	28	5	1,612	1,561	51	0	323	0
Arizona:														
Number	117,815	106,019	11,796	58,798	6,649	16,141	14,729	1,412	23,721	19,986	3,735	8,663	3,613	230
Monthly amount	7,740,062	6,937,742	802,320	4,584,186	635,496	648,751	599,010	49,741	1,073,534	956,451	117,083	576,843	206,321	14,931
Arkansas:														
Number	207,806	189,887	17,919	103,714	9,220	37,540	34,960	2,580	35,606	29,487	6,119	15,725	5,424	577
Monthly amount	10,723,881	9,742,105	981,776	6,443,893	758,484	1,103,126	1,029,952	73,174	1,232,814	1,082,696	150,118	874,939	275,340	35,285
California:														
Number	1,424,475	1,337,088	87,387	829,690	56,834	184,013	175,655	8,358	180,997	158,802	22,195	141,365	29,651	1,925
Monthly amount	98,520,963	92,023.010	6,497.953	64,385,233	5,426,694	7.676,751	7,374.537	302,214	9,609,346	8,840,301	769,045	9,443,584	1,843,294	136,061
Colorado:														
Number	152,552	142,999	9,553	82,974	5.492	23,200	22,162	1,038	23,191	20,168	3,023	13,967	3,587	141
Monthly amount	9,820,591	9,192,659	627,932	6,196,934	502,275	901,688	866,759	34,929	1,096.461	1,005,733	90,728	900,629	213,674	8,930
Connecticut:														
Number	257,154	243,905	13,249	150,978	8,939	34,142	32,943	1,199	25,629	22,518	3,111	31,806	5,221	439
Monthly amount	19,323,018	18,330,365	992,653	12,836,702	840,226	1,567,920	1,524,380	43,540	1,452,538	1,343,651	108,887	2,242,636	350,005	32,991
Delaware:														
Number	40,015	37,223	2,792	22,241	1,773	5,170	4,887	283	5,377	4,641	736	4,388	990	76
Monthly amount	2,735,611	2,543,758	191,853	1,722,432	159,621	218,804	209,231	9,573	269,729	247,070	22,659	297,105	62,438	5,482
District of Columbia:														
Number	60,390	55,802	4,588	34,329	3,190	5,551	5,244	307	9,160	8,069	1,091	6,246	1,787	127
Monthly amount	3,797,856	3,494,350	303,506	2,439,550	266,657	218,491	209,804	8,687	378,854	350,692	28,162	397,723	88,055	8,526
Florida:														
Number	643,433	597,344	46,089	369,480	27,289	102,082	96,507	5,575	78,900	65,675	13,225	51,685	13,153	844
Monthly amount	43,144,012	40,116,437	3,027,575	28,768,624	2,465,114	4,161,515	3,975,149	186,366	3,511,767	3,135,672	376,095	3,413,868	766,604	56,520
Georgia:														
Number	331,837	290,837	41,000	149,292	21,969	43,664	38,731	4,933	75,557	61,459	14,098	27,784	12,471	1,100
Monthly amount	17,650,362	15,426,488	2,223,874	9,525,662	1,767,288	1,351,867	1,222,979	128,888	2,732,202	2,404,504	327,698	1,600,119	605,836	67,388
Guam:														
Number	230	227	3	27	1	6	6	0	160	158	2	4	32	0
Monthly amount	7,418	7,333	85	1,442	44	141	141	0	4,436	4,395	41	227	1,128	0
Hawaii:														
Number	37,804	35,025	2,779	19,953	1,658	4,563	4,282	281	7,457	6,617	840	2,866	1,202	105
Monthly amount	2,325,153	2,141,935	183,218	1,442,135	148,314	164,517	155,069	9,448	326,458	301,002	25,456	169,592	66,666	7,471
Idaho:														
Number	64,271	60,690	3,581	35,617	1,932	10,672	10,226	446	9,588	8,385	1,203	5,066	1,309	87
Monthly amount	4,101,582	3,870,546	231,036	2,633,550	177,661	412,411	397,038	15,373	470,629	432,627	38,002	320,216	81,073	6,042
Illinois:														
Number	988,198	929,882	58,316	557,805	38,641	140,568	135,370	5,198	114,294	99,817	14,477	113,514	21,432	1,944
Monthly amount	70,197,551	65.953,075	4,244,476	45,204,636	3,591,932	6,046,194	5,864,199	181,995	6,023,475	5.552,926	470,549	7,819,201	1,369,975	142,138
Indiana:														
Number	487,106	456,781	30,325	268,166	17,260	75,488	72,109	3,379	63,012	53,326	9,686	51,792	10,499	889
Monthly amount	32,971,513	30,919,123	2,052,390	20,846,000	1,629,576	3,110,267	2,992,893	117,374	3,188,929	2,883,489	305,440	3,455,966	676,268	64,507
Iowa:														
Number	313,109	299,618	13,491	181,333	7,874	57,230	55,608	1,622	31,169	27,174	3,995	29,640	5,536	327
Monthly amount	20,273.935	19,399,102	874,833	13,525,621	700,163	2,261,459	2,207,685	53,774	1,503,813	1,382,917	120,896	1,921,813	338,190	22,876
Kansas:														
Number	228,172	216,248	11,924	129,384	6,854	40,773	39,395	1,378	25,315	21,623	3,692	21,421	4,167	258
Monthly amount	14,431,859	13,660,251	771,608	9,403,781	615,643	1,551,928	1,506,166	45,762	1,229,265	1,119,062	110,203	1,356,369	257,585	17,288
Kentucky:														
Number	346,514	305,268	41,246	161,064	17,602	59,685	53,565	6,120	69,138	51,614	17,524	28,158	9,896	971
Monthly amount	18,991,043	16,874,507	2,116,536	10,800,722	1,534,542	1,908,906	1,732,695	176,211	2,466,362	2,060,579	405,783	1,684,426	533,912	62,173
Louisiana:														
Number	251,825	223,011	28,314	108,210	14,325	36,391	32,562	3,829	57,330	47,170	10,160	24,139	10,260	670
monthly amount	13,942,720	12,378,236	1,564,484	7,315,278	1,208,936	1,195,399	1,084,548	110,851	2,199,028	1,954,331	244,697	1,437,718	546,243	40,118
Maine:														
Number	115,778	108,997	6,781	67,050	3,852	15,847	15,022	825	14,382	12,278	2,104	11,934	2,526	187
Monthly amount	7,277,950	6,863,415	414,535	4,781,347	330,886	609,479	583,925	25,554	647,644	589,549	58,095	748,186	148,187	12,221
Maryland:														
Number	238,426	223,059	15,367	127,098	9,900	29,849	28,361	1,488	35,431	31,452	3,979	28,467	7,133	550
Monthly amount	15,761,985	14,709,809	1,052,176	9,539,985	879,970	1,225,354	1,174,520	50,834	1,752,800	1,631,428	121,372	1,890,306	435,069	38,501

See footnotes at end of table.

Massachusetts:														
Number	565,836	535,534	30,302	333,497	19,985	71,470	68,589	2,881	57,294	49,858	7,436	70,148	12,533	909
Monthly amount	40,185,023	38,044,818	2,140,205	26,563,036	1,792,006	3,161,150	3,058,886	102,264	3,029,061	2,783,126	245,935	4,773,262	801,756	64,752
Michigan:														
Number	750,723	700,930	49,793	399,745	29,305	116,420	110,903	5,517	100,651	85,680	14,971	85,509	17,917	1,176
Monthly amount	54,302,754	50,737,093	3,565,661	33,726,404	2,877,756	5,094,384	4,893,152	201,232	5,322,686	4,836,013	486,673	6,003,059	1,189,521	88,944
Minnesota:														
Number	352,488	338,107	14,381	203,882	8,654	59,411	57,786	1,625	40,405	36,303	4,102	32,505	7,248	383
Monthly amount	22,862,186	21,900,151	962,035	15,224,307	779,145	2,314,834	2,259,980	54,854	1,930,375	1,802,339	128,036	2,144,539	443,181	25,805
Mississippi:														
Number	212,655	191,663	20,992	97,981	10,470	34,735	31,896	2,839	46,793	39,110	7,683	14,670	7,124	882
Monthly amount	9,925,631	8,871,353	1,054,278	5,642,970	821,719	913,505	841,869	71,636	1,384,492	1,223,569	160,923	789,407	319,901	53,637
Missouri:														
Number	485,313	453,988	31,325	272,479	18,375	78,038	74,542	3,496	57,855	48,401	9,454	48,354	9,429	783
Monthly amount	30,839,436	28,849,968	1,989,468	19,982,079	1,619,836	2,940,638	2,832,006	108,632	2,555,696	2,294,696	261,000	3,132,966	554,553	53,668
Montana:														
Number	68,404	64,585	3,819	38,026	2,189	10,452	10,009	443	10,428	9,241	1,187	5,647	1,545	117
Monthly amount	4,529,355	4,273,587	255,768	2,922,824	202,368	421,970	406,214	15,756	505,712	468,068	37,644	374,624	93,637	8,220
Nebraska:														
Number	155,316	149,116	6,200	90,909	3,774	28,599	27,926	673	15,506	13,753	1,753	13,686	2,659	183
Monthly amount	9,756,097	9,360,150	5,947	6,580,418	324,763	1,085,013	1,063,655	21,358	728,040	678,214	49,826	870,144	155,243	12,476
Nevada:														
Number	20,734	19,461	1,273	11,950	849	1,976	1,853	123	3,872	3,571	301	1,551	505	31
Monthly amount	1,432,112	1,335,012	97,100	916,483	80,723	80,429	75,543	4,886	217,705	206,214	11,491	103,954	30,742	2,076
New Hampshire:														
Number	72,021	68,696	3,325	44,069	2,166	9,031	8,725	306	7,706	6,853	853	7,528	1,429	92
Monthly amount	4,863,472	4,632,917	230,555	3,322,147	192,820	373,865	363,315	10,550	390,002	362,817	27,185	489,571	88,829	6,238
New Jersey:														
Number	613,333	579,397	33,936	347,992	22,747	82,976	79,733	3,243	64,626	56,680	7,946	79,009	14,634	1,349
Monthly amount	45,214,266	42,686,049	2,528,217	29,055,163	1,235,494	3,766,474	3,647,770	118,704	3,612,253	3,338,234	274,019	5,560,441	981,381	103,060
New Mexico:														
Number	63,433	57,311	6,122	27,617	2,625	9,081	8,283	798	17,230	14,531	2,699	4,107	2,568	205
Monthly amount	3,476,056	3,159,099	316,957	1,910,058	231,914	297,337	275,252	22,085	643,653	580,695	62,958	249,872	130,573	12,649
New York:														
Number	1,767,729	1,662,849	104,880	1,031,139	70,951	232,678	222,894	9,784	181,465	157,320	24,145	207,813	39,801	3,882
Monthly amount	127,703,397	120,073,852	7,629,545	84,102,323	6,480,471	10,277,690	9,928,693	348,997	9,645,202	8,845,125	800,077	14,331,440	2,575,555	290,716
North Carolina:														
Number	412,014	368,930	43,084	191,601	23,782	60,190	54,807	5,383	86,701	72,782	13,919	32,813	15,716	1,211
Monthly amount	21,897,635	19,542,041	2,355,594	12,329,363	1,897,023	1,837,199	1,699,048	138,151	3,116,155	2,795,735	320,420	1,873,847	769,350	74,698
North Dakota:														
Number	62,205	59,544	2,661	34,707	1,328	11,570	11,210	360	8,753	7,780	973	4,376	1,396	75
Monthly amount	3,784,561	3,640,520	144,041	2,519,822	110,265	432,220	422,010	10,210	358,189	334,623	23,566	280,824	78,448	4,793
Ohio:														
Number	942,356	878,361	63,995	501,089	37,137	144,887	137,655	7,232	122,920	103,294	19,626	112,154	22,542	1,627
Monthly amount	65,782,194	61,394,622	4,387,572	40,452,154	3,518,114	6,209,624	5,951,555	258,069	6,297,999	5,686,610	611,389	7,719,942	1,465,470	118,891
Oklahoma:														
Number	234,332	216,066	18,266	121,742	10,027	40,176	37,824	2,352	35,204	29,317	5,887	21,124	5,621	438
Monthly amount	13,970,336	12,837,574	1,132,762	8,505,952	887,055	1,405,765	1,328,810	76,955	1,527,366	1,358,614	168,752	1,293,728	322,512	27,958
Oregon:														
Number	204,168	192,185	11,983	121,904	7,080	28,891	27,515	1,376	24,267	20,740	3,527	18,339	3,449	238
Monthly amount	13,972,702	13,126,249	846,453	9,405,792	673,460	1,174,771	1,124,550	50,221	1,272,549	1,149,777	122,772	1,205,704	223,024	17,402
Pennsylvania:														
Number	1,214,745	1,130,541	84,204	643,266	52,914	183,217	173,523	9,694	142,478	120,882	21,596	158,178	31,699	2,993
Monthly amount	85,441,061	79,429,746	6,011,315	52,161,638	4,929,710	7,886,129	7,522,587	363,542	7,427,964	6,709,901	718,063	10,727,620	2,095,492	212,508
Puerto Rico:														
Number	163,236	151,123	12,113	67,392	4,109	28,104	26,372	1,732	54,059	47,787	6,272	4,179	4,824	569
Monthly amount	5,425,623	5,065,386	360,237	3,312,605	260,913	529,848	504,223	25,625	918,640	844,941	73,699	207,020	166,428	30,169
Rhode Island:														
Number	98,154	92,165	5,989	58,394	4,138	12,278	11,734	544	9,305	7,998	1,307	11,869	2,017	153
Monthly amount	6,870,789	6,445,323	425,466	4,563,267	363,036	526,930	508,153	18,777	482,477	438,824	43,653	794,612	129,309	11,158
South Carolina:														
Number	198,411	173,780	24,631	84,574	13,211	24,990	21,997	2,993	49,866	41,439	8,427	15,795	9,257	718
Monthly amount	10,278,519	8,951,600	1,326,919	5,383,541	1,059,254	752,751	677,728	75,023	1,724,539	1,531,897	192,642	892,916	422,187	43,331
South Dakota:														
Number	71,783	68,841	2,942	40,529	1,626	13,508	13,127	381	8,764	7,829	935	5,782	1,495	79
Monthly amount	4,373,564	4,200,950	172,614	2,901,461	136,659	503,038	492,028	11,010	377,952	353,007	24,945	366,580	82,728	5,146
Tennessee:														
Number	349,918	314,622	35,296	168,961	17,856	56,765	51,875	4,890	65,138	52,588	12,550	29,192	10,890	1,116
Monthly amount	18,569,885	16,625,897	1,943,988	10,658,938	1,496,381	1,715,788	1,575,694	140,094	2,380,747	2,073,234	307,513	1,679,795	568,370	69,866
Texas:														
Number	785,995	724,673	61,322	388,215	33,324	126,273	118,594	7,679	141,604	121,285	20,319	70,950	23,823	1,806
Monthly amount	45,504,045	41,839,742	3,664,303	26,588,487	2,891,837	4,312,972	4,077,873	235,099	5,964,805	5,427,438	537,367	4,321,147	1,311,400	113,397
Utah:														
Number	66,408	62,976	3,432	34,224	1,900	10,443	10,065	378	11,593	10,439	1,154	6,253	1,904	91
Monthly amount	4,400,117	4,172,681	227,436	2,656,509	176,538	427,967	414,386	13,581	598,181	560,864	37,317	414,814	119,712	6,396
Vermont:														
Number	46,005	42,924	3,081	25,879	1,717	6,822	6,461	361	5,627	4,624	1,003	4,861	1,005	94
Monthly amount	2,907,921	2,720,134	187,787	1,870,403	149,359	260,281	249,124	11,157	255,142	227,871	27,271	306,148	60,166	6,422
Virgin Islands:														
Number	1,649	1,588	61	803	31	186	180	6	490	466	24	76	58	5
Monthly amount	74,755	71,910	2,845	47,377	2,394	4,857	4,739	118	13,464	13,131	333	4,162	2,228	273

See footnotes at end of table.

Number and amount (dollars) of monthly benefits [1] in current-payment status at end of December 1962, by type of benefit and by State, old-age, survivors, and disability insurance—Con.

Beneficiary's State of residence [2]	Total			Old-age	Disability [4]	Wife's or husband's			Child's [5]			Widow's or widower's	Mother's	Parent's
	Total	OASI [3]	DI [3]			Total	OASI [3]	DI [3]	Total	OASI [3]	DI [3]			
Virginia:														
Number	340, 263	304, 405	35, 858	162, 062	18, 764	48, 403	43, 750	4, 653	66, 070	53, 629	12, 441	32, 434	11, 339	1, 191
Monthly amount	19, 431, 220	17, 390, 310	2, 040, 910	10, 940, 687	1, 593, 449	1, 619, 506	1, 481, 039	138, 467	2, 622, 072	2, 313, 078	308, 994	1, 964, 919	614, 683	75, 904
Washington:														
Number	288, 954	273, 226	15, 728	169, 201	9, 728	40, 993	39, 326	1, 667	34, 740	30, 407	4, 333	28, 811	5, 195	286
Monthly amount	20, 001, 042	18, 867, 963	1, 133, 079	13, 271, 421	921, 396	1, 700, 192	1, 639, 599	60, 593	1, 853, 678	1, 702, 588	151, 090	1, 904, 025	330, 358	19, 972
West Virginia:														
Number	233, 419	197, 362	36, 057	96, 837	14, 820	39, 828	34, 110	5, 718	51, 241	35, 722	15, 519	22, 120	7, 762	811
Monthly amount	13, 911, 161	11, 893, 705	2, 017, 456	7, 148, 261	1, 413, 287	1, 429, 128	1, 235, 731	193, 397	2, 021, 802	1, 611, 030	410, 772	1, 377, 291	469, 637	51, 755
Wisconsin:														
Number	435, 752	413, 910	21, 842	247, 839	13, 051	71, 895	69, 478	2, 417	48, 920	42, 546	6, 374	44, 878	8, 600	569
Monthly amount	29, 531, 023	28, 035, 527	1, 495, 496	19, 303, 799	1, 212, 164	2, 923, 194	2, 839, 675	83, 519	2, 452, 975	2, 253, 162	199, 813	3, 044, 119	555, 543	39, 229
Wyoming:														
Number	27, 860	26, 331	1, 529	15, 705	928	4, 036	3, 887	149	4, 347	3, 895	452	2, 225	580	39
Monthly amount	1, 818, 561	1, 716, 828	101, 733	1, 176, 295	83, 520	156, 256	151, 524	4, 732	219, 719	206, 238	13, 481	144, 696	35, 460	2, 615
Abroad:														
Number	126, 916	123, 506	3, 410	70, 883	2, 188	19, 568	19, 115	453	13, 880	13, 111	769	16, 524	3, 345	528
Monthly amount	8, 237, 247	7, 986, 816	250, 431	5, 536, 448	210, 055	723, 179	706, 158	17, 021	539, 129	515, 774	23, 355	1, 022, 467	171, 061	34, 908

---

[1] A person receiving both an old-age (retired-worker) benefit and a secondary survivor benefit, or an OASI secondary life benefit that was awarded, reinstated, or adjusted after Sept. 13, 1956, is represented only once—under old-age benefits—and the old-age benefit amount includes the reduced secondary benefit. A person receiving both a disability (disabled-worker) benefit and a DI secondary benefit is represented only once—under disability benefits—and the disability benefit amount includes the reduced secondary benefit.

[2] Based on monthly benefit check address.

[3] Benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance (OASI) parts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program are payable from the OASI trust fund to old-age (retired-worker) beneficiaries and their dependents and to survivors of deceased workers. Benefits under the disability insurance (DI) part of the program are payable from the DI trust fund to disability (disabled-worker) beneficiaries and their dependents.

[4] Payable to disabled workers under age 65.

[5] Includes benefits payable to disabled persons aged 18 or over—dependent sons and daughters of deceased, disabled, or retired insured workers—whose disability began before age 18.

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Division of the Actuary, Baltimore, March 1963. A:A-2.04.

EXPROPRIATION OF FOREIGN ENTERPRISES AND THE CLAY REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my attention has been directed to an extremely interesting article which appeared in the April 1 edition of Barrons. The lead article discusses the proposed expropriation of American investments abroad, the effect it is having here at home and recommendations made in the Clay report.

While the article specifically mentioned the copper industry which is of great importance to Montana it is a situation which can be associated with a number of instances where American firms have expanded their operations to foreign lands. I highly recommend this brief analysis and ask that the text of this article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Shift in Copper—Anaconda and Kennecott Add a Footnote to the Clay Report

To the Broadway stage last month came a musical remake of "Tovarich," a comedy about White Russians living in exile in Paris, which was written by Jacques Deval and Robert E. Sherwood a quarter century ago. Handsomely mounted and performed with rare style, the production is a personal triumph for Miss Vivien Leigh, whose artistry and charm, all the critics agreed, have diminished not a whit since "Gone With the Wind." The passing years, however, have been less kind to the playwrights, whose talents evidently failed to include a working knowledge of either capitalism or communism. Big business is portrayed as a gang of monopolists with evil designs on the mineral wealth of the Soviet people—in the musical version, a tuneful tribute to the virtues of a small cartel, sung with gusto by the greedy rich, rings down the curtain on the first act. Moreover, the plot—which deals with the Kremlin's efforts to retrieve a hoard of gold held in trust for the Czar by the refugees—is resolved in fairly simple-minded fashion. In order to keep their nation's oilfields out of the clutches of foreign plutocrats, the exiled nobility, anti-Bolshevik but Russian patriots above all, hand over the bullion to the commissars.

In the make-believe world of the theater, especially in the radical thirties, this might have looked like a happy ending. Unfortunately for the authors, however, real life has refused to follow the script. Wherever the state, in the development of national resources, has ousted private capital, the results for all concerned have generally proved anything but happy. The tragedy of socialism has been played to the bitter end by diverse casts of characters in many varied settings: Cuban sugar, Mexican and Iranian oil, Bolivian tin. Moreover, while few observers show much awareness of the fact, a rerun of the same dreary plot is also shaping up in Chilean copper. Trouble already has befallen shareholders of Kennecott Copper Corp., which recently cut its quarterly dividend. Sooner or later, if events follow their customary sequence, users of the red metal, as well as the impoverished Chileans, are apt to pay a heavy price. Statism may give its misguided followers a fleeting illusion of progress; it never delivers the goods.

Barron's, of course, has been saying so for a long time. Last week, the Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World, under the chairmanship of Gen. Lucius D. Clay, repeated the message. "We must be clear as to the kind of economic systems we attempt to foster and assist," said the Clay report. "We believe the United States should not aid a foreign government in projects establishing government-owned industrial and commercial enterprise which compete with private endeavors. The observation of countless instances of politically operated, heavily subsidized and carefully protected inefficient state enterprises in less developed countries makes us gravely doubt the value of such undertakings in the economic lives of these nations." With a hard eye on the Alliance for Progress, the Clay Committee stressed the importance of monetary stability, as well as incentives to savings and investment.

General Clay and his colleagues might or might not have had Chile specifically in mind. However, that unhappy Andean land could certainly profit from their wisdom. For in recent years the country's economic affairs have gone from bad to worse. Some of its difficulties have come from outside forces—in 1960 earthquakes and tidal waves inflicted on Chile one of the worst natural disasters in its history. In the main, however, its woes have been manmade. Despite occasional gestures toward stable money, the government has pursued policies which raised the cost of living by 26 percent in 1962 alone. Inflation has weighed heaviest on foreign (i.e., American) mining interests, notably Anaconda and Kennecott, which have suffered endless labor unrest, discriminatory rates of exchange and confiscatory taxation. Last year, for example, Kennecott had to turn over to the Chilean Government more than 80 percent of the pretax profits of its rich Braden mine.

In consequence, Kennecott's earnings on its Chilean operations have plummeted. In 1960 Braden supplied $23.6 million, or roughly 30 percent, of the parent company's aftertax net. In 1962, in striking contrast, its contribution plunged to an estimated $7 million, or roughly 10 percent of the total. The drastic decline in the return on their Chilean properties has led both Kennecott and Anaconda to revise their investment programs. Thus in 1961 Anaconda slashed its capital outlays in Chile by nearly half; despite an increase last year, Chile's share dropped from 28 percent of the total to less than 20 percent. Kennecott, in turn, has made what appears to be a fundamental shift in its blueprint for the future. The company recently disclosed that it has abandoned plans to sink $200 million into Braden. Instead, it will make a heavy investment designed to step up the capacity of its mines in Utah.

Kennecott's announcement pointed up a curious byproduct of the mounting turmoil abroad—a growing concentration upon resources in the United States. Several major producers, notably Inspiration, which recently opened its big new Christmas mine, and Magma, have always stuck close to home. Lately, however, they have been joined by others. Peripatetic American Smelting & Refining began operating its Mission mine, near Tucson, in mid-1961. Six weeks ago Anaconda signed an agreement with the Banner Mining Co. to explore the latter's properties in Pima County, Ariz., a move which aims at the eventual production of 40,000 tons of copper annually. Kennecott's ambitious expansion of its Utah division, scheduled for completion in 1967, will cost $100 million and boost output by 100,000 tons per year.

Far from declining, as such authoritative sources as the Paley Commission once forecast, domestic production of copper is on the rise. Favorable for some, the news is nothing for the United States as a whole to cheer about. For it means that capital has been diverted into less productive channels: whereas a ton of Chilean soil yields Kennecott nearly 40 pounds of copper, its Utah deposits are less than half as rich. If producers are forced to rely on poorer grades of ore, the shift inevitably will show up in prices, thereby burdening all consumers of the raw material. For Chile, which derives the bulk of its foreign exchange and over two-thirds of total government revenues from the export of copper, a decline in output would be far worse. Recent official policies have been damaging enough—the country has slipped to third rank among the world's producers. If pursued further—and the man who many think will be the next President is calling for outright expropriation of the mines—they could easily lead to disaster.

While less diverting than Tovarich (and clearly unpalatable to the spiritual heirs of the late Mr. Sherwood), the Clay report, we submit, makes far more sense. Let it accordingly have the last word. "Agitation for the expropriation of foreign enterprises and for nationalization of private productive ventures is hardly conducive to the mobilization of private local and foreign capital investment and is destructive of rapid economic progress. Latin America must be encouraged to see its essential choice between totalitarian, inefficient, state-controlled economies and societies on the one hand, and an economically and politically freer system on the other, realizing that a society must begin to accumulate wealth before it can provide an improved standard of living for its members."

TRADING POTATOES ON NEW YORK MERCANTILE EXCHANGE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting letter from Mrs. Floyd J. Kierstead, of Presque Isle, the wife of a potato farmer in Maine, in opposition to trading of potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange.

I ask unanimous consent that her letter be placed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Presque Isle, Maine,
March 27, 1963.

Senator Margaret Chase Smith,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Smith: Many farmers in Aroostook have been very disturbed by the letters made public recently by you; received from those who oppose the Muskie-McIntire bills to eliminate trading on the Mercantile Exchange on Maine potatoes. I am not surprised that Dr. Philip Turner, general manager of the Aroostook Federation of Farmers, and Jack Roth, president of Beaver Brook Farms, Inc.—both of Caribou, Maine—both oppose this bill and neither would you be surprised if you knew all the details. Mr. Roth stated it was "good for the small farmer and he has 160 growers he deals with" etc., etc.—and also Dr. Turner stated that "many farmers would have been unable to farm last year, without the help of the Exchange" etc. etc. Both these men—and probably 90 percent of those who have contacted you—are only speaking from their end of the deal. To be sure, many farmers were financed by these outfits, to produce a crop of potatoes, to make money for their creditors, as thousands of barrels were contracted for $1.75 to $2 per barrel and some lower, even. Now this means the farmer worked the whole year just for the chance to stay on his farm etc., because he'd absolutely have to have $2.50 per barrel to produce his barrel of spuds he contracted for $1.75 and by the time he racked them and took the cut, etc., he averaged less than $1.50 per barrel but the contractor made sure he paid only for the No. 1 hauled to him, besides he made money—and a good profit—from the fertilizer he sold the farmer and the spray materiel, etc., etc. But where does the farmer stand? A big loss, year after year until right now 95 percent of the farms are in debt, to the limit. We know. Only a few years ago we were free of debt and had small savings but now its all gone, everything. Everything, through no fault of ours—only because we raise potatoes for every Tom, Dick, and Harry to make a good profit from. Two years ago, we had to finance under FHA and this spring the Federal Land Bank plans to slap a foreclosure on, because of 2 years delinquent taxes. This week the price of potatoes dropped from $2.15 to $1.50 a barrel when we had hoped, by now, to be getting at least $3 for these beautiful seed potatoes and we could have avoided that foreclosure. Last spring there were 30 foreclosures in Fort Fairfield alone (by Federal land bank). (No hearsay—the Fort Fairfield FHA manager told me himself.)

Last spring our next door neighbor walked off the farm that had been in that family for 70 years. They were young folk, college graduates who wanted to farm where his father had made a good living for his family and had sent four children through college (losing one (lieutenant) in the Korean war). This can be duplicated hundreds of times in our farm families. We are in a desperate condition. The consumer has no pity for us, and I don't blame them, when they pay $5.50–$6 per barrel for the same potatoes we get $1.50 for, right here in our county, where we grow them. There is too big a spread between the producer and consumer; and each one makes a profit, all but the producer, who's at the mercy of everyone. No one labors so hard and such long hours as we do, and so many are sick at heart, after 6 years of unheard of low prices. It is much worse than the depression years, as one could squeeze a dollar in those days, but production costs are so high. How embarrassing to present a check for produce sold, to the FHA and ask for enough from it, to pay the light bill, gas bill, groceries, and so forth, after being so independent all these years.

We are 60 years old and had supposed these years would be our best ones, after all the hard work, the saving, the long hours of waiting when we could take things easier, and so forth. Most farmers' wives work at some job, but because of a brain injury, at birth, to our only child, 38 year ago, she is retarded and only because we love her so much, have all these years been bearable—but I am unable to follow my profession of teaching because of this.

I'm sorry to have written such a long letter, but I feel we must, outlaw the trading on the Mercantile on Maine potatoes. They have us bound and there is no hope for us, if they continue this damaging practice. In three different referendums the farmers have voted it out by 93 percent, but it still is here.

Please do all you can to help us get rid of it. Maine is the only State that allows it and potatoes are the only agricultural product not getting a subsidy, and the potato industry is the hardest hit financially, of all the agricultural products. The diversion program was not enough to make a dent in the situation, and helped very little. High-paid officials aren't helping us any, nor the processing plants.

Congratulations to you on your courage to speak out with convictions on many issues and let them know there are still people in Government who stand for the right and not afraid to say so.

My apologies for such a lengthy letter.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Floyd J. Kierstead.

P.S. As you must know—Maine is the only State allowing trading of potatoes on Mercantile Exchange. This week the price dropped from $2 per barrel to $1.75 because on Monday the Mercantile plunged 13 cents. Then on Thursday the price dropped from $1.75 to $1.50 because the Mercantile took another plunge of 13 cents. I noticed the price in the stores remained the same—49 cents per bushel.

ON LIVING TOGETHER

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Evening Star published in Washington, D.C., in its issue for Monday, April 8, 1963, carried an editorial entitled "On Living Together."

Mr. President, this editorial has to do with recent events at Greenwood, Miss., and on the broader subject of racial relations among the people who live in the Deep South.

The author of the editorial has a clear understanding, great tolerance, and a very practical approach and viewpoint upon this matter. This is one of the best editorials I have ever read written outside of the immediate area in question. I commend the editorial writer and the Evening Star highly. It is only through better understanding and a consideration of the practical points involved that we avoid trouble and make progress.

I wish to give this publication to my colleagues as well as to the people of the United States; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On Living Together

The legal "truce" which has been arranged in the clash over registering Negro voters in two Mississippi counties strikes us as being a rational settlement of what looks very much like a phony issue.

Several days ago the Justice Department asked a Federal judge in Greenwood, Miss., to issue a temporary restraining order barring any interference with registration of Negro voters. The judge declined to issue such an emergency order, and set Thursday of last week as the day for a hearing in which the Mississippi officials could be heard. Somewhere along the line a closer look apparently was taken, the so-called truce was arranged, and the court hearing was put off until October.

We doubt that it will ever be held. For the indications, or at least those available in press reports, do not suggest that there has been any concerted plan or effort to prevent Negroes from registering as voters in Greenwood or Leflore Counties.

Not having been born yesterday, we do not think that the white people in those counties, heavily outnumbered by Negroes, would like to encourage Negro voting. The fact is, however, that the Associated Press has reported day after day that the local authorities in the two counties were permitting Negro registration by individuals and in small groups. What the police were breaking up were marches on the registration places by large groups of Negroes—some of whom possibly were eligible voters and many of whom certainly were not. After all, the risk of incitement to race riot in Mississippi is something that cannot be ignored.

Why the Department of Justice at first jumped eagerly into this situation, and then backed off, we do not know. If the real purpose was to help insure the right of qualified Negroes to register as voters, that was both necessary and proper. If, on the other hand, the purpose was to grab some of the headlines from such as Negro comedian Dick Gregory, the action of the Justice Department was wrong and unworthy.

At one meeting in Greenwood, a Negro preacher from Texas said that mass demonstrations were unwise. "We've got to live together," he stated, "and all the fault is not in the white man." An audience of some 350 Negroes called him an "Uncle Tom" and shouted him down.

In modern vocabulary, "Uncle Tom" has become a term of opprobrium. It suggests that any Negro who is not actively fighting the white man is betraying his own race. We suspect, however, that in time it will be shown that the preacher in this instance, the Reverend W. R. Fairley, was right. For when the last demonstration is over, when the Justice Department has made its last gesture, when all Negroes who went to register and who are qualified have been registered, the truth of the Reverend Mr. Fairley's statement will remain, "We've got to live together."

APPOINTMENT OF STUDENTS TO SUMMER FEDERAL JOBS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I want to commend the Chairman and the members of the Civil Service Commission for their very prompt and definite action in regard to the appointment of students to summer Federal jobs.

There were many positive evidences that the appointments of students to summer jobs were to be made on the basis of political patronage.

The order issued to the heads of executive departments and agencies of our Government not only contains quotations from the civil service rules in regard to this, but also contains statements on the part of the Commission which completely prohibit the clearing of jobs for students through the Democratic National Committee or the White House.

I ask unanimous consent that the order issued by the U.S. Civil Service Commission of April 5 and also a column written by Jerry Kluttz, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the order and column were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1963.

To the heads of executive departments and agencies:

Recent press reports alleging that political clearance is necessary for summer employment in civil service positions in the Washington metropolitan area indicate serious misunderstanding about this program. The image of the Federal service can be gravely damaged and future quality staffing can be jeopardized unless all doubt as to the integrity of merit system operations is dispelled. We must make sure that no steps are taken to defeat the President's expressed intention "to protect fully the civil service merit system."

Political clearance in filling competitive civil service positions is clearly illegal, as shown by the following quotations from the civil service rules:

"Sec. 04.2. Prohibition against racial, political, or religious discrimination: No person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government who has authority to take or recommend any personnel action with respect to any person who is an employee in the competitive service or any eligible or applicant for a position in the competitive service shall make any inquiry concerning the race, political affiliation, or religious beliefs of any such employee, eligible, or applicant. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any employee in the competitive service, or any eligible or applicant for a position in the competitive service because of his race, political affiliation or religious beliefs, except as may be authorized or required by law.

"SEC. 05.4. Enforcement authority of the Commission: (a) Whenever the Commission finds that any person has been appointed to or is holding a position in violation of the Civil Service Act, rules or regulations, or that any officer or employee in the executive branch has violated this order or any of the laws, rules, or regulations administered by the Commission, it is authorized, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee and the agency concerned, to certify the facts to the proper appointing officer with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.

"(e) If the appointing officer fails to carry out the instructions of the Commission issued under * * * this rule, the Commission shall certify the facts to the head of the agency concerned. If the head of the agency fails to carry out the instructions of the Commission within 10 days after receipt thereof, the Commission shall certify the facts to the Comptroller General of the United States, and shall furnish a copy of such certification to the head of the agency concerned; and thereafter no payment shall be made of the salary or wages accruing to the employee concerned."

To assure compliance with the above provisions, the Commission has found it necessary to take the following steps:

1. Suspend the use of the following appointment authorities for any intermittent or limited temporary employment in the Washington metropolitan area between the dates of May 1, 1963, and October 1, 1963:

(a) Section 6.101(s) of schedule A, covering temporary or intermittent employment of students and teachers to assist in scientific, professional, or technical work.

(b) The delegated authority to make temporary limited appointments outside of regular competitive procedures when total employment will not exceed 700 hours.

(c) Any other special authority (such as that contained on a CSC Form 303 or equivalent), which may be construed as authorizing summer employment.

2. Direct the making of special inspections during the next few months to insure that any summer appointments are made (a) without political clearances, and (b) in compliance with these instructions. This includes the investigation of complaints charging political clearance for summer employment.

3. Direct that corrective action be taken as required by appropriate laws, rules, and regulations if violations are established.

The suspended appointment authorities may be restored on an agency-by-agency basis when the Commission receives a satisfactory certification and assurance from the agency head that their use will be in accord with these instructions. Such restoration is effective only on notification by the Commission that the agency head's statement is acceptable, and such notification must be cited on appointment documents. Unless these authorities are restored, the agency must use the appropriate competitive register.

Such an agency statement shall include:

1. A certification by the head of the agency that summer appointments will be made in accordance with these instructions.

2. A copy of the agency's appointment plan and the agency head's instructions and explanation of any other steps taken to insure that all responsible appointing, reviewing, or recommending officials are informed of the agency's appointment plan, the fact that political clearance is illegal and will not be tolerated, and any other applicable laws and rules.

For your information, the Commission is currently developing plans for nationwide competitive examining for summer positions, to be effective in 1964.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

CIVIL SERVICE MOVES TO BAR POLITICS FROM SUMMER JOBS FOR STUDENTS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Civil Service Commission yesterday acted to prevent the White House and Federal agencies from appointing students to summer Federal jobs here on the basis of political pull.

It withdrew from all agencies authority to make the temporary appointments and the power won't be restored unless the Commission is convinced that the appointments are made without political clearances and in full compliance with the law and its rules.

The tough antipolitical interference order was a departure for the agency, which generally contents itself with issuing warnings to prevent undermining of the merit system and its laws and rules by either agencies or individuals.

"We must make sure," the Civil Service Commission announced, "that no steps are taken to defeat the President's expressed intention to 'protect fully the Civil Service merit system.'" It further explained:

"Recent press reports alleging that political clearance is necessary for summer employment in civil service positions in the Washington Metropolitan Area indicate serious misunderstandings about this program. The image of the Federal service can be gravely damaged and future quality staffing can be jeopardized unless all doubt as to the integrity of merit system operations is dispelled."

The Civil Service Commission then informed agency heads in a special bulletin that political clearance in filling competitive jobs "is clearly illegal" and it quoted the appropriate rule and the sweeping authority it has to enforce it. To assure compliance with the rules, the Civil Service Commission concluded, it was necessary for it to suspend all agency authorizations to make temporary appointments in the Washington area between next May 1 and October 1.

The Commission also directed its staff to make special inspections during the summer months to make sure that summer appointments comply with its rules and the law.

The Civil Service Commission will restore the hiring authority on an agency-by-agency basis but only after the agency head certifies that he and his staff fully understand the civil service laws and rules and will carry them out.

Chairman John W. Macy also announced that the Civil Service Commission is developing plans for a nationwide competitive exam that would be used to fill summer jobs in 1964. This would be the first time for such a test and it would discourage both nepotism and partisan political considerations.

The Civil Service Commission official commented: "We were sorry to have to do it but we were placed in an impossible situation where our honor and virtue and the integrity of the system was at stake."

The White House repeatedly assured the Civil Service Commission that it had no plans to require a political test for summer Federal jobholders. But Dorothy Davies of the White House sent agencies data sheets that asked for the names, addresses and other information on applicants. The significant question on the form in the Civil Service Commission's eyes was "By Whom Recommended?"

College Democrats were advised to have Members of Congress send their completed form 57's, job application forms, to Mr. Davies along with recommendations from the Members. James Hunt was assigned by the Democratic National Committee to advise student applicants on how to get jobs.

Agency officials also advised the Civil Service Commission that they were being told that the jobs were to be filled on a political basis despite the Civil Service Commission and the laws.

The hard-hitting Civil Service Commission directive will have the effect of canceling commitments made to hundreds of students who were promised jobs here this summer. The Civil Service Commission stressed that agencies must use appropriate competitive registers to fill their summer jobs unless their hiring authority is restored.

Incidentally, the order will have the effect of improving job prospects of students who have passed the student aid, trainee, Federal service entrance, typing and other competitive tests. Most of the summer hiring will be from these registers.

Federal agencies last year hired nearly 10,000 students for temporary summer jobs and a recent Civil Service Commission survey indicates they plan to hire about 6,000 this summer.

But the controversy over summer jobs and cuts by Congress in agency budgets have combined to lower estimates to around 3,000.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, all of us have been concerned about the high rate of unemployment in this land of plenty. Latest figures just released by the Department of Labor show that 4½ million Americans were unemployed in March. This group represents 5.6 percent of our work force.

Startling as these figures are, they are comforting next to the statistics on unemployed young people. Teenagers between 16 and 19 have an unemployment rate of 14.5 percent. This is almost three times the national average. Most of the young people in this group are seeking work for the first time, and many of them have left high school without a diploma.

One of the primary reasons for their frustration is that they have not been trained in marketable skills. In our academically oriented school systems, we have concentrated heavily on the 20 percent of American children who will graduate from college, and have neglected the vast majority who must find jobs while they are still in their teens. Vocational education has become the stepchild of the school system. Only 4.5 percent of total secondary school budgets is allocated to vocational training in spite of the fact that the great majority of our children need it. Marketable skills—secretarial and business training, mechanics, appliance repair training—are neglected to the detriment of the whole national economy.

Providing the best possible education for our nuclear scientists, teachers and professional people is indeed commendable. Retraining the unemployed is necessary and useful medicine for a sick economy. But pretraining—that is, education in vocational skills before our children enter the labor market—would be a vaccine against economic ills.

Planning is needed to insure training for the jobs which do exist. Students who do not plan to go on to college should not be marking time in school, or dropping out because they have lost interest in academic subjects. They should, instead, be equipped to perform the jobs our Nation needs, and to become contributing members of our society.

In this connection, Edward T. Chase has written an excellent article which appears in this month's Harper's magazine. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Record. I know it will prove valuable reading for every Member of the Senate who is concerned not only specifically with the legislation which is soon to come before this body but also with the long-term future of our Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Learning To Be Unemployable

(Edward T. Chase)

The biggest failure of American education is not its inability to produce more scientists than Russia. It is the way in which it is turning millions of young people into unemployables. This fact is as little understood as it is shocking. Because of it, job-hunting youths face a grimmer prospect in the 1960s than their elders did in 1933 at the depth of the Great Depression, when the unemployment figure stood at a record 24.9 percent.

Already today, in many cities, unemployment among youths equals, and is often double or triple this depression rate. And the outlook is worsening. In the closing days of 1962, while general unemployment remained at a fixed level, the number of young people out of work leaped upward by 100,000. And another 100,000 increase was recorded in the first figures on unemployment for 1963.

This menacing situation is a direct consequence of the gross imbalance in our educational system. Its attention has been overwhelmingly concentrated on the 20 percent of students who go through college. The vocational future of the other 80 percent has been either ignored or sabotaged by an archaic system of job training. It is a system that produces unneeded farmers, cabinetmakers, and weavers, while the demand is rising for business-machine repairmen, chefs, auto mechanics, and electrical servicemen—to mention only a few of the skills in short supply.

A self-serving lobby of vocational educationists perpetuates this training in moribund trades; at the same time it has intensified the youth unemployment crisis by tightening the standards of admission to vocational schools. In the academic high schools, on the other hand, there is, in the main, not even the semblance of preparation for work. Ninety percent of all U.S. schools offer no training for jobs in industry; 95 percent offer none in selling or merchandising although there are now more job opportunities in these fields than in production; only about 18 percent of high school students in urban areas are getting any sort of preparation for work. Indeed, the Federal Government spends 10 times as much on the national school lunch program as on vocational education—which commands only 4 percent of all current expenditures on public education.

For years this national scandal has been swept under the rug. There is, however, now some hope that the shortcomings of our job-training efforts will be aired—and even that steps will be taken to remedy them. For our archaic vocational education system has suddenly become the vital tool in a massive national effort to train unemployed people for new jobs under the Manpower Development and Training Act passed by Congress at the last session. It is in our long-ignored vocational schools—in afternoon and evening classes—that men and women who may have been out of work for months will, it is hoped, be taught trades that will make them self-supporting. Large sums of Federal money will be poured into this program. And in the process local school boards, employers, and many other Americans who have never worried about what went on inside vocational schools will be brought face to face with their inadequacy.

Fortunately this is happening at a time when we are beginning to understand the nature of the so-called structural unemployment of which the youth unemployment crisis is a part. This understanding has dawned very slowly. Only a year ago the prevailing view among Washington policymakers, including the Council of Economic Advisers, was that there was no unemployment problem which could not be cured by a rise in our economic growth rate.

We now know that this is not the case. Economic growth, to be sure, is important, but it is no panacea for the kind of unemployment that at present confronts so many Americans.[1] For this is a two-sided problem. There is, on the one hand, the demand side—the availability of job openings. And then there is the supply side—the availability of people capable of filling those openings. To date the two sides have not matched, because the unemployed people did not have the right skills or were not located in the right places. The number of job openings fluctuates with the business cycle; they were relatively plentiful, for instance, at peak periods such as 1948, 1953, 1957, and May 1960. But in these same periods 2 or 3 million Americans were out of work. Among them is the group of hard-core unemployed (out of work 15 weeks or more) who will not find work even in a boom year. This is a standing army of 1,153,000 today. They will not be helped by manipulations of monetary or fiscal policy. For these people lack skills—often even the elementary ability to read and write—which most jobs require. Dire as is the plight of these adult "unemployables," the more terrifying fact is that we are adding to their numbers each year many thousands of boys and girls who drop out of high school—or graduate—without a marketable vocation or trade.

The need to halt this wasteful neglect becomes increasingly urgent as the demand for unskilled workers continues to shrink.[2] Unskilled jobs today account for only 5 percent of all U.S. employment. In the 1960's on the average some 2.5 million jobs will be eliminated annually by automation. Most dismaying is the yearly loss of a quarter of a million "entry" jobs, the kind whereby youth matriculate into the work world. Simultaneously there will be a spectacular explosion of young men and women from 14 to 25 years old into the labor force—50 percent more of them than in the 1950's. But few of them will find work unless we take emergency steps to prepare them for the kind of jobs that will need doing. Difficult though this may seem, it is by no means impossible, for a good deal of precise information is available as to the technological and occupational changes that lie ahead.

Projections provided by the Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor show, for instance, that we will need 50,000 new carpenters annually in the 1960's, 5,000 new toolmakers and diemakers and appliance servicemen, and 10,000 new plumbers. We will also need many times the current supply of technicians—aids to engineers, guards, drycleaners, policemen, and waiters. We will need more stenographers and secretaries but fewer typists (more copying will be done by duplicating machines). Similarly there will be a decline—due to technological and social changes—in the demand for refrigerator mechanics, lithographers, machinists, cashiers, paperhangers, and telephone linemen.

Projections like these should, one would think, be a matter of vital concern to the people who run our vocational-education system. But if you visit almost any vocational school, you will find its program incredibly irrelevant to the facts of work in the 1960's. To understand why this is so, one must pause for a brief look at the little-known history of vocational education—or "vo-ed" as it is known in the shorthand of the educationists.

BLUE-COLLAR PEDAGOGS

Keystone of our vocational-education system—unaltered to this day though other laws have supplemented it—is the Smith-Hughes Act, which Woodrow Wilson signed in 1917. At that time, about a third of all American workers were farmers and the accent was heavily on training for agriculture. It still is—even though only one-eighteenth of our labor force now works on the farm (and often not in full-time jobs). Today, as in 1917, nearly half of the annual $7 million of Federal money provided under this basic legislation (it is given to the States in perpetuity on a dollar-for-dollar basis) goes to farm training. This law and its supplements are very precise about just what this means. States cannot be reimbursed for training in such things as food processing, marketing, maintenance of farm machinery, or irrigation—all fields that now employ more rural people than actual farming does.

Across the country a third of all vocational-education funds—Federal, State, and local combined—are still spent on training farmers, although at present only 1 young applicant in 10 can hope to find a job on a farm when he leaves school. Even New York City is the beneficiary—if that's the word—of farm-teaching funds. The city maintains and is expanding a farm school in Flushing, a semisuburban area half an hour by subway from Times Square.

The official headquarters of the "vo-ed" world are in Washington, D.C. on the fourth floor of 1010 Vermont Avenue, NW. This is the modest base of the American Vocational Association and, more importantly, the lair of M. D. Mobley. He runs the AVA as its executive secretary and is (correctly) reputed to be Washington's most successful lobbyist. "M.D." (short for Mayor Dennis), as he is known to Senators and other influential types, belongs to the educational breed called "vo-ags." They are teachers of agriculture, champions of the Smith-Hughes Act and of the continuing dominance of farming in vocational education. The "vo-ags" are the biggest single force within the American Vocational Association, a body which a prominent member of President Kennedy's Committee on Youth Employment described to me recently as "the greatest obstacle in American education."

---

[1] We need at least a 5-percent growth rate just to stand still. Since 1946 it has taken between 3 and 5 percent fewer persons annually to produce the gross national product. So to keep the same number of people employed, we have to expand our overall product by this same 3 to 4 percent each year. But the population of the labor force also expands, between 1.2 and 1.5 percent yearly. Hence the need for the roughly 5-percent expansion.

[2] The unskilled still dominate Western Europe's labor force, largely because of the relatively sluggish rate of technological change. A third of Italians are still farmers, a fourth of the French. The "economic miracle" of Western Europe and Japan has obscured the fact that a U.S. factory worker produces three times as much in an hour as a European, seven times as much as a Japanese. One American miner produces as much as seven European miners; one American steelworker doubles the output of a Japanese. The United States is the only Nation with more white-collar than blue-collar jobs and more people in service-producing than in goods-producing industries.

M.D. is a Georgian (as were both sponsors of the Smith-Hughes Act). When you meet him he is instantly identifiable as your true friend, and a born conciliator blessed with an uncritical mind that blandly ignores the anachronisms in our vocational-education system. Back in 1919, M.D. was the only boy in his rural Georgia county to graduate from high school. He then went on to take a degree in agriculture at the University of Georgia and later taught poultry farming. He was named "Man of the Year" in 1940 by the magazine Progressive Farmer.

This barnyard background is belied by M.D.'s current sartorial splendor. He sports an expensive watch with an ornate silver and gold wristband, bejeweled ring, tiepin, and cuff links and has an overall polish, accented by an F.D.R.-type cigarette holder, which presumably would render the average bumpkin speechless. Nonetheless, he is the darling of the vo-ags and their undeviating protector. "There's not a thing wrong with vo-ed legislation," he told me earnestly.

Clearly his constituents agree with this dictum. At their national convention last December in Milwaukee the AVA enthusiastically resolved to "vigorously oppose any effort to repeal or modify those provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act which earmark funds for agricultural education. * * *." The convention went on to applaud the establishment at Ohio State University of "a center for advanced study and research" in vocational education. The specialty of this pioneering center? Farm teaching.

M.D., in the course of our talk, made it plain that nothing in recent years has so irked him as the 1962 farm report of the Committee for Economic Development which called for a deemphasis of farm training in vocational education. Prodded by M.D. the House Committee on Agriculture subjected the CED to hearings that can fairly be described as inquisitorial. One must go back to McCarthy days to find a rival to this hearing for sheer yahooism. It was the uproar over the CED report that moved the AVA convention to its anxious support of an unmodified Smith-Hughes Act.

This anxiety, M.D. said, in a pungent evocation of his farming past, is due to the fact that vo-ed "always gets the last tit on the sow." By this he means that vocational training gets a small slice of the overall educational budget. This is true. But it is also a fact that M.D. is consulted on the writing of all Federal educational legislation. And quite apart from the gifted Mr. Mobley, the vo-ags are a potent group. Unlike city vo-ed teachers, they enjoy high status in their home territories. Many of them have degrees from A and M colleges and often are the best science and math teachers in rural schools, which have few college-trained teachers. Since their own salaries depend on Federal appropriations, many of them make it their business to maintain close contact with their Congressmen and any other groups likely to influence vocational education. In 1961, for example, a Presidential panel was set up to review and reevaluate vocational-education laws "with a view toward their modernization." Although technological change was obviously the most important item on the agenda, the panel report urges that "the vocational agriculture program under Federal reimbursement should be broadened."

"A pure sop to the vo-ags," one Washington expert called this recommendation. Nor, alas, are the vo-ags the only doughty diehards within vo-ed. Their equally militant allies are the home economics teachers. Under the Smith-Hughes Act, while nearly one-half of the annual Federal grant goes into teaching Adam to delve (or its equivalent), 20 percent is allocated to teaching Eve to spin. To be sure, home economics has progressed a bit beyond spinning and weaving. But most of the courses consist of disorganized, mediocre instruction in skills that have little relevance to the age of supermarkets.

Dr. Chester E. Swanson, Director of the Presidential Panel, when I talked to him in Washington not long ago, called the present stress on home economics absurd. Most enlightened educators agree with him. Yet for years home economics has enrolled the largest number of students in the federally reimbursed vocational-education program. Indeed, some home economists are now urging that boys too should devote part of the school day to "the homemaking arts." Admiral Rickover should really have a talk with these ladies.

HARDY THOUGH MORIBUND

Vo-ed, as it is practiced today, is not only fantastically biased in favor of farming and home economics. It also teaches skills and uses equipment which are often hopelessly obsolete—even in such categories as "trade and industrial education." Dr. Swanson recalled, for instance, that in the 1940's when he became a school official in Allentown, Pa., cabinetmaking was the rage. On investigating he discovered there had been no jobs for cabinetmakers in Allentown for years. However, teachers of this trade had tenure and expensive equipment. He was up against a stone wall when he tried to reduce the staff and beef up more pertinent parts of the vo-ed curriculum.

In addition, Federal money goes to training in certain specified occupations. The broadest category is "trade and industrial education," which includes the needle trades, carpentry, drafting, firemen, and similar traditional fields. Other categories are "distributive occupations," meaning selling and retailing, practical nursing, and fishing. Since 1958 the training of a few technicans has been supported under the National Defense Education Act, but it is due to lapse this year.

The limitation of Federal aid to rigid occupational categories is a great mistake. One result is that no Federal funds are available for instruction in typing, filing, stenography, and other officework, a field employing 10 million people. Similarly the many service jobs which are ideal fields for less gifted students are too avant-garde to receive Federal vo-ed support.

But even if freed from these straitjackets, vo-ed as now constituted cannot prepare students for real jobs. So archaic is most of the training given in vocational schools that unions in the printing, plumbing, food, and other trades refuse to give credit for it. Graduates of vocational schools must start from scratch on apprenticeships often running from 3 to 5 years.

Small wonder that a penetrating survey by the Taconic Foundation (published last year) concluded that "it is extremely questionable and certainly has never been demonstrated whether the training absorbed by vocational high school graduates is useful to them in getting employment and advancing on the job."

In part this dismal record reflects the extreme difficulty of recruiting competent vo-ed teachers (apart from the vo-ags and homemade pie bakers). City vocational high schools have come to be increasingly thought of as dumping grounds for morons and delinquents—between a third and two-thirds of whom vanish before graduating. Most vo-ed teachers are at the bottom of the pedagogic hierarchy. Often they are not even allowed to join the regular teachers' associations. Lacking prestige in a society that esteems the white-collar professions, the blue-collar teachers became identified over the years with the dropouts and washouts—the school failures.

Some years ago, the vo-ed lobby began to worry about this stigma, which, they foresaw, might jeopardize their future slice of the school tax pie. The solution they chose was not the difficult but socially vital one—of reshaping their programs to meet the needs of the majority of students. Instead they began to upgrade their clientele by tightening admissions standards. The less promising were shunted off into the general curriculum of academic high schools to pass the time and learn virtually nothing.

Curiously, there has been almost no public outcry against this antisocial policy. Instead, for example, the latest report of the State education department on the New York City schools smugly and typically observes that admissions to programs of skilled trade education should be limited to those students who, on the basis of interest, aptitude, and ability give promise of succeeding.

What then is to happen to the less promising—to the 1 million jobless out-of-school youth whose ranks will swell to 1,325,000 by next year? Even if some kind of Youth Conservation Corps succeeds in Congress, it will at first serve only 15,000 boys. And what is to become of the millions of adults who, because of the pace of technology and automation, must expect to work at a half-dozen different kinds of jobs in a lifetime? These questions are unanswerable in vo-ed's anachronistic terms. But some new answers will have to be found if the new manpower retraining program is to come close to its objective which is, in essence, the rehabilitation of our hard-core unemployed. As never before in its sheltered history, vo-ed is in the limelight.

A NEW CATALYST

The Manpower Development and Training Act program is a special separate project designed specifically for the out-of-school jobless. It provides that $435 million be spent in the first 3 years to cover both the cost of instruction and an allowance to the trainees equivalent to unemployment insurance. Some 400,000 men and women, it is expected, will be enrolled. Training is not confined to the traditional occupational categories but a given course of instruction will be undertaken only if jobs requiring that particular skill are known to exist. This is a wise provision, as has been demonstrated in past retraining efforts under the Area Redevelopment Act and in programs sponsored by some of the States and by industry.

Although the Manpower Development and Training Act program is separately financed and is carried on after school hours, it is, as a practical matter, dependent on the vo-ed teachers and the facilities of existing vocational schools. This is why one worried Federal official recently said to me: "The vo-ed boys will make us or break us, and its even Steven it may be the latter."

What may also make or break the program is geography. The present appropriation does not include funds for relocating retrained workers in areas where they can find jobs utilizing their new skills. This is a piece of incalculable foolishness, for labor mobility is crucial today when new industries are burgeoning and old ones vanishing all over the country with unprecedented suddenness. But even if funds for relocation were provided, workers themselves know little or nothing about what jobs are plentiful in other sections of the country or even about future prospects in their own communities.

The logical source of this vital information is the U.S. Employment Service. Unfortunately, its absorption with handing out unemployment-insurance checks has overshadowed what should be its main business—finding jobs or advising workers on how to go about getting them, and its information is largely confined to local or intrastate use, with little attempt at national coordination. There is, for instance, practically no way for an unemployed miner in Pennsylvania to find out what job he might qualify for in Oregon (assuming he could pay his way out there). With notable exceptions, for example in Arizona, Wisconsin, and New York, USES's 1,900 local offices are spectacularly unequipped to deal with technological change and, as a key Presidential adviser on employment described them to me, are "cesspools of mediocrity."

Clearly the U.S. Employment Service must be invigorated if the Manpower Development and Training Act program is to come even close to its goal. A step in the right direction would be the mandatory listing of job vacancies. Industry, also, should help the Government to make a realistic job-outlook study. This calls for candor about impending automation and resulting unemployment. Testimony before the House Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation showed that many companies refuse to make such information public for fear of tipping their hand to competitors. In the months ahead it will become increasingly clear that the present Manpower Development and Training Act program cannot possibly vanquish the problem of hard-core unemployment, including the problem of unemployable youth. It is, nonetheless, a valuable program and not merely because thousands of workers will in fact be retrained for new jobs. The experience gained will, I hope, bestir Americans to get to the bottom of our manpower problem.

So far this has not happened.

For example, not long ago in a small northeastern city I visited a vocational high school whose facilities are being used to retrain the unemployed under Manpower Development and Training Act. This class was for would-be auto mechanics. The pupils looked older and shabbier and half were Negroes. But otherwise they appeared to be not too different from the daytime students. The teacher started out by describing the school's superior parking facilities, apparently on the assumption that in our affluent age even the jobless have cars. He then went on to explain that if any student failed to progress satisfactorily he would be dropped. Subsequently I discovered that some of the students had dropped out of this same school when they were teen-agers. I also learned that a number of applicants for the class had been turned down because they could not meet the entrance requirements.

Now I am not suggesting that anyone can become an auto mechanic. What is evident, however, is that we cannot turn our backs on those who do not immediately qualify for training in this or any other skilled or semiskilled occupation. The one fresh note sounded by the Presidential panel under Dr. Swanson was a call for a federally aided program for "high school youth with academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program." This recommendation deserves top priority. For we know, from actual experience, that such handicaps can often be overcome—though not by the classic techniques of vo-ed as it exists today.

A WORKABLE FORMULA

The chief "handicap" of unemployable young people and adults today is not necessarily lack of intelligence. Often it is lack of functional literacy (ability to read at the fifth-grade level). In Chicago a substantial number of relief clients have been able to find work after receiving basic instruction in reading and writing at evening and summer classes sponsored by the city welfare department. Elsewhere it has been found that young people brought up in city slums who drop out of schools geared to middle-class children are not necessarily stupid. And often they are extremely responsive to realistic job training, linked with actual work experience.

This can be accomplished in several ways. About 5 percent of our colleges now offer what are known as cooperative or work-study education programs. Similar programs exist in academic high schools, chiefly in the business-education departments for girls. Often one job is shared by two trainees, one of whom works for part of the year while the other is at school; on graduating, almost all the trainees get jobs with the companies involved. But except for sales training and in new locally devised schemes, such programs are the exception in vo-ed. Instead, the Federal reimbursement formula requires that students' time be divided concurrently and equally between "practical" (shop) and "related" (academic) classwork—a ritual often unworkable for the many students who can't be taught in classrooms. Frustrated, they drop out. Labor Secretary Wirtz aptly calls them "pushouts."

What is most urgent is that business and labor unions alter their stance in the new age of technological unemployment. The business system is, after all, on trial more than any other institution. It must bear part of the novel social costs arising from technological change with a new resourcefulness and awareness of changing social needs. As a basic starting point, management and the unions must expand apprenticeship programs. Instead of expanding, they have grown steadily smaller (231,000 apprentices in 1950, 166,000 in 1960). Labor must also end its racial discrimination in apprenticeships and abandon its old myopic view that by obstructing entry into the trade—entry being the very thing most necessary for our floating unemployed youth—it will be possible to guarantee jobs for insiders. One of the important breakthroughs of the past year was by New York Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. It enrolled 200 Negroes and Puerto Ricans in its 1,000-man training program. Far more unions should be moving in this direction.

Furthermore, business must develop programs for retraining both its own employees and youth in or just out of school. This was the chief lesson which emerged from a National Committee on Employment of Youth conference which I attended recently. Several businessmen observed smugly that a high school diploma is becoming meaningless because their companies' employment standards are so high. "These young graduates can't even qualify for our company training," said a banker. A school superintendent, Mary E. Meade, leaped to her feet. A large, wonderfully plain, almost Victorian figure of the no-nonsense breed, she is in charge of New York City's minute but highly successful work-study project. This program, financed by the Ford Foundation, enables some high-school students to get work experience in municipal government jobs. Miss Meade suggested that maybe business should alter its attitude toward the young and join with the schools in preparing them for useful work. This is still a novel idea although, to be sure, in a few places—all too few—business is beginning to assume some responsibility for training and retraining at least its own workers. The most exciting venture is the new plan developed by the Kaiser Steel Corp. and the United Steelworkers of America. Each worker displaced by automation is placed in a pool, where his wages continue, and he is then either given a new job or is retrained for one within the company. He is not abandoned; he is the company's responsibility until he retires—unless the company suffers grave loss of business or actually folds.

Those who are fainthearted about the possibilities of solving our worsening manpower problems through vocational education and retraining should acquaint themselves with what has been accomplished in rehabilitating the physically disabled—the maimed and paralyzed. In 1961 more than 100,000 disabled people entered gainful employment as a result of the State-Federal program which cost $17 million. Before retraining they had been earning $47 million a year; now they are earning $205 million, and the Federal Government will collect $10 in income taxes for each dollar invested in rehabilitation.

This is wonderful. But the best therapy is always preventive. So far as manpower is concerned, the place to start is with the transformation of our system of vocational education.

ALLENTOWN TO DENVER

The immediate change required is to end the absurd overemphasis on farming and home economics. We need to launch a program of practical training for real jobs in a vast national effort. By way of a start, we might well make sure that every urban high school has an automechanics shop, in the hope of turning out the 40,000 new mechanics we must produce every year to maintain the present meager ratio of one mechanic to every 87 vehicles. Another basic requirement is a continuing, up-to-date inventory of jobs and skills in demand in every section of the country. To make this inventory a useful practical tool the U.S. Employment Service will have to take on new functions.

To do this will cost money. M. D. Mobley is dead right about our national parsimony toward vocational education, however, cockeyed he may be on farm training. We will have to spend at least the $400 million a year recommended by the Presidential Panel on vocational education. In addition, we need many more vocational schools, especially the so-called area schools, large enough to be well equipped, and they should be open the year around, free to anyone who needs to acquire a skill. The schools must be supplied, not only with skilled teachers and modern equipment, but also with sufficient guidance counselers to help students make a wise choice of vocation. Less than 1 percent of Federal funds is spent on guidance; the ratio of counselors to students is an impossible 1 to 500; 15-year-old youngsters are forced to make career choices unassisted. I heard a boy who had left school address a prospective employer "Hey, Mac" and respond under questioning that his ambition is to be a nuclear physicist.

In a few isolated spots, there is convincing evidence that vocational training really can work. In Allentown, for instance, local industries cooperate closely with the schools in an outstanding vocational program. Milwaukee, which puts more money into "vo-ed" than any other city its size, has a model central vocational school. Cincinnati has dealt with the dropout problem by establishing 14 vocational training centers throughout the city. Denver's Griffith Opportunity School is a celebrated skill center offering free instruction to students of any age.

In these cities, vocational education has, for various reasons, become a matter of major local concern and is vigorously supported by the community. Such sporadic local achievements are widely and justly publicized. But this acclaim is unfortunate if it diverts attention from the central fact, namely this: Unless interest in vocational education is awakened on a massive national scale, the United States will lose a crucial lap in "the race between education and catastrophe"—in H. G. Wells' annually more apt definition of history.

Unemployment is both a prime cause and a symptom of the country's alarming economic torpor. Recent economic studies, stemming from the work of Arthur Burns of the National Bureau of Economic Research and from the University of Chicago's Milton Friedman, demonstrate that investment in education rivals investment in physical capital (factories, machinery) in stimulating economic growth. Walter Heller, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has said that such investment in "human capital" has accounted for half of our economic growth in the 20th century.

Now this hardly seems too difficult a concept for the American people or even Congress to grasp and to act upon. But maybe homelier considerations can be more compelling: the fact, for example, that the loss in production in the United States caused by unemployment in 1962 was greater than the loss caused by the strikes in the last 35 years; or that, to the average man, the loss of only 1 year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school. However one may dramatize the issue, the essential point is that education, employment, and economic growth are inextricably linked. Today rational education must include training pertinent for the 80 percent of all young Americans who enter the labor market without college degrees. To ignore their vocational training is a reverse twist on the Eskimos' fabled custom of pushing their unproductive senior citizens onto the icepack. That practice at least has a certain economic logic. Our system is managing to be at once inhumane and economically suicidal.

HOW THE KREMLIN CAPTURED CUBA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of all those who may not have yet heard about it a remarkable and highly readable book on Cuba called "The Great Deception," by James Monahan, a Reader's Digest senior editor, and Kenneth O. Gilmore, an associate editor. I urge all those who want a gripping, up-to-date and authoritative account of exactly how the Kremlin took over Cuba to read this book which has recently been published by Farrar, Straus & Co. The significant fact about "The Great Deception" is that it covers, as does no other book, the Communist deception in Cuba from the day Castro took power on January 1, 1959, up through last fall's missile crisis and its aftermath. Innumerable items in this publication will be both fascinating and eye opening to anyone who reads it. For example, there is a frightening look at how the Communists seized control of the labor unions in Cuba.

Another portion provides a chilling account of the Bay of Pigs invasion disaster through the eyes of those inside Cuba. This reveals that the underground tragically knew less about the invasion plan than Castro and his Communist agents. There is also a vast amount of unpublished and dramatic material on the Castro Communist effort to infect and take over Latin America through propaganda, infiltration, and subversion, all of which will convince many that our efforts today to cut off this activity from the Cuban base will be next to impossible until that base is eliminated. Moreover, the book lays out the full picture of the Soviet miltiary intrusion in Cuba which actually began in late 1960 and built up to Moscow's implantation of troops and missiles.

A key reason for the superb quality of this book lies in the fact that for nearly a year Monahan and Gilmore headed a Reader's Digest task force which made an in-depth study of the Sovietization of Castro's Cuba. Hundreds of Cubans, many still living in the police state, were interviewed at length; their personal stories were tape recorded, and later analyzed and checked out to establish absolute authenticity.

It is for this reason, perhaps, that reaction to the book by leading free Cubans has been so laudatory. And, of course, those Cubans who lost their country to Soviet imperialism are best qualified to judge the accuracy and quality of a book describing their tragedy.

Allow me, therefore, to present some comments by outstanding Cubans in exile that have been received by the publishers of the book.

Manuel Artime, civilian leader of the valient Cuban invasion brigade who just last December was released from Castro's prison, has said:

> As one who lived through some of the key phases of the Kremlin's takeover of Cuba, I can attest that "The Great Deception" is one of the best accounts yet written on Communist Cuba.

Dr. Jose Miro Cardona, who heads the Revolutionary Council of Cuba:

> "The Great Deception" is an example of the tragedy of Cuba, which is the tragedy of America. This book aids effectively in understanding this through the expository force of the facts which it relates, and the clear and precise form in which they are presented. I thank the authors, as a Cuban, for the intensity with which they have felt the drama of my country; and I hope, as a Spanish-American, that the book will be read carefully by the Government and people of the United States in order that they will understand the true nature and extent of the danger which this holds for the liberty of our hemisphere.

Dr. Oscar de la Vega Torres, Secretary-General, Teachers Revolutionary Directorate—in exile:

> I would like everyone—from the President to the most humble functionary—in this country to read carefully "The Great Deception," especially the chapter "Darkness Descends" where there is expressed clearly and precisely, as never before, the great harm that communism is inflicting on the minds of Cuban children and youth. Let no one forget that it is these young people—sick with hatred against our democratic principles—who, if we do not act in time, will prevent reintegration of the people into the American community and contaminate it with the poison they have received.

Jose Antonio Gonzalez-Lanuza, Students Revolutionary Directorate of Cuba:

> After carefully reading this book on the process of communization that Cuba is suffering today, I wish to express my sincere congratulations for the objectivity and quality of this work.
>
> "The Great Deception" is, to our way of thinking, the best compilation published to date in the United States on the facts about the conversion of Cuba into a satellite of Moscow.
>
> What stands out are the variety of the sources of authoritative information collected by the authors, as well as the clear, impartial exposition of events. told in such a way as to give the North American reader a magnificent panoramic vision of what has occurred in our country during the last 4 years.
>
> In the name of the Students Revolutionary Directorate and myself, I offer sincere congratulations for the work accomplished.

Vicente Rubiera Reito, secretary general, Federation of Cuban Telephone Workers in Exile:

> As a Cuban labor leader, Democrat and worker, I would like to take this opportunity to make clear my gratitude for the service rendered the cause of liberty by "The Great Deception"—a true and exclusive account of the process by which the Communist Party and the U.S.S.R. are penetrating the American Continent.
>
> It is the most exact, most realistic expose of how they operate, set in motion and carry Communists to power. It is the best work in behalf of democracy, the liberation of Cuba and the defense of the continent.

Dra. Ana Tomeu de Miller, secretary general of Cuban Feminine Crusade:

> "The Great Deception" is a magnificent exposition of how international communism used tactics of deceit and lies to seize Cuba and convert it into an isle of hell, Russian colony and springboard for the expansion of Soviet imperialism in the American Continent.

ANTI-COMMUNIST FREEDOM FIGHTERS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Fighting the Wrong Side," published in the Oakland, Calif., Tribune of April 3, 1963, dealing with the effort of the administration to restrain anti-Communist freedom fighters who are attempting to harass Fidel Castro and establish a strong Cuban underground.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Apr. 3, 1963]

Fighting the Wrong Side

The administration has cracked down hard on anti-Communist freedom fighters who are attempting to harass Fidel Castro and establish a strong Cuban underground.

Not content with merely insuring that no raiding parties leave from U.S. territory, the administration has solicited help from Great Britain as well, so that a good portion of the Caribbean Sea is being combed for anti-Communist war parties.

The reason given by the State Department for this "blockade of the blockaders" is that the U.S. Government accrues the blame for the raids in the eyes of the world, and is therefore assumed to be committing warlike acts.

Thus, once again, the siren song of manufactured world opinion has been heeded by this Nation's pussyfooting diplomats, to the detriment of the free world. For years, the Soviets have built up a global network of sympathizers and "neutralists" who will quack and bleat with alarm every time the United States shows some signs of resisting the advance of global communism.

In recent months, when the anti-Castro resistance has begun to score some real damage against the Cuban regime, world opinion naturally began to chant that the raids were instigated by the U.S. Government.

And now, to its shame, the administration has capitulated to that opinion when it should simply be laughing it off with a declaration that the raids are not sanctioned by the U.S. Government.

The trouble with heeding this kind of world opinion is that it will continue to denounce U.S. "aggression" even if the Coast Guard and the Federal Bureau of Investigation manage to halt all anti-Castro activity altogether. No matter what the Government does, it can't win against a propaganda machine created by the Soviets. If the United States is going to be berated no matter what it does, then the logical thing is to ignore the clamor and do exactly what will be in the best interest and security of this Nation.

It is a matter of great importance to establish a virile underground in Cuba. The activities of anti-Castro freedom fighters serve not only to drain Castro's strength but to fan the flame of resistance of the captive Cuban people.

The vengeance taken against the anti-Castro Cubans is so severe that one is compelled to wonder whether world opinion is really the reason for it. It looks like the administration is actually as interested in preserving the Castro regime as it is in encouraging its overthrow.

AUTOMATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the problems, challenges, and opportunities of automation in industry continue to expand. At the same time, however, "automation" is still a new word in our national vocabulary, and often a misunderstood word. There can be no misunderstanding, though, about the great changes automation is making in our country and the need to understand and cope with them.

Because of the tremendous impact of automation, and the swiftness with which the changes are taking place, I have called for a White House conference on automation in a bill introduced earlier in this session. Such a conference is necessary, I am convinced, to focus attention on advances in technology and the effects of these advances upon all of us.

Automation also has a bearing on the need for an enlarged and more active program of vocational education, which would come about if another bill I have introduced, S. 1222, is enacted.

An article which helps explain automation appeared in the April 17, 1963, issue of the New York Times magazine. It is by Victor R. Fuchs of the staff of the National Bureau of Economic Research. He is also a consultant to the Ford Foundation. Because of the timeliness of this article I commend its reading to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FALLACIES AND FACTS ABOUT AUTOMATION

(By Victor R. Fuchs)

Once or twice in a generation a single word captures the attention, imagination and concern of the American people. In the past, the mere mention of such words as "abolition," "prohibition" or "unionization" was enough to strike the sparks of controversy and to epitomize the problems and the promise of complex forces at work in our society.

Today the word is "automation." Originally coined to describe the automatic handling of parts between successive stages of production, automation was later defined as the use of machinery to control machinery. In popular discussion, however, the word has come to mean any kind of technological change, particularly where nonhuman effort is substituted for human labor.

The heat and intensity of the arguments surrounding automation suggest its importance, but amidst the uproar it is often difficult to determine just what the facts and the issues are. For some, automation poses the threat of permanent unemployment, the necessity of undergoing retraining or the possibility of having to uproot home and family to seek employment in a strange community. Others stress the benefits of automation—low costs, new products and the maintenance of world economic leadership for the United States.

The current debate over automation tends to be dominated by the "alarmists"—those who can only see the warehouses filling up with goods and the streets filling up with unemployed—and the "do-nothing" school who find automation an unmixed blessing. This debate is marked by exaggeration, illogical reasoning, and other fallacies. A close look at some of these fallacies may help to provide a basis for constructive attack on the problem, and permit us to enjoy more fully the benefits of technological change.

These are the principal fallacies indulged in by the "alarmist" school:

(1) The rate at which labor is being displaced by technological change is more rapid now than in the past.

This particular fallacy lies at the heart of the "alarmist" position. It is the fundamental premise; the rest is elaboration. Everyone has read or heard about the "increasing rate of technological change." The words come so readily that it seems almost pedantic to question their accuracy. But the fact is that there is no economic evidence to support this premise.

Isolated examples of rapid change abound, but they always have. Recall, for example, the printing press, the cotton gin and the substitution of the typewriter for feathered quills. The question is not whether examples of large-scale displacements of labor can be found in particular firms or industries, but whether the overall impact on the economy is greater now than in the past.

If technological innovations were replacing labor at an increasing rate, one would expect to find evidence of this in the output obtained per man-hour of labor. The figures show no such trend.

For the period 1947–60 output per manhour in the private sector of the economy grew at an annual rate of 3 percent. This is a slightly higher rate than the average for the entire 20th century but it is not an unprecedented rate for the United States, and it is far below the pace achieved in Japan, Russia and several West European countries.

Moreover, there is no evidence that the rate is increasing. On the contrary, the figures show an average annual gain of 3.5 percent for the period 1947–54, slowing down to 2.6 percent in the 1954–60 period. Finally, there is little prospect that we are on the threshold of a sharply increased rate in the future; we may have difficulty maintaining the pace of the last 15 years.

One obvious problem is that fewer and fewer of our people are employed in sectors where labor-saving change has been easiest, such as agriculture. Each year more Americans are employed in the service industries, where productivity growth has been slowest. Because of these shifts in employment, we will actually have to achieve an increased rate of productivity growth sector by sector simply in order to maintain the same overall rate of increase. A recent pathbreaking study by Edward F. Denison, "The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States," shows that it will be difficult to achieve this increase.

(2) Automation makes it possible to produce more goods and services than we can possibly use.

This fallacy gets its widest circulation in the well-appointed living room after an excellent dinner that includes an appropriate wine. The hi-fi is usually playing softly in the background, and the conversation is mixed with references to vacations abroad, sports cars, and college admissions. If one were to approach a family of average means with arguments about a surfeit of goods, they would doubt your sanity or your motives. And they would be right.

Most of the talk about our having the ability to produce more goods and services than we need or want, now or in the foreseeable future, is nonsense. It is based either on medieval notions about discriminatory consumption standards for various classes of the population or on a wild overestimation of the productive capacity of the economy.

We need more rapid growth, not less. Consider the demands for helping to raise the living standards of the underdeveloped two-thirds of the world. Consider the problem of removing the deep pockets of poverty that still exist in our rural areas and urban slums. Finally, consider the simple fact that to bring the average American family up to the level of living currently enjoyed in the more prosperous suburbs surrounding New York City would require 25 to 30 years of very rapid growth at full employment.

To argue, as some do, that the problem is primarily one of distribution, is completely in error. If income were divided absolutely equally in the United States, each family would have about $7,000 per year—an income that falls far short of producing satiety.

Another gross exaggeration is the claim that 30 percent or more of potential output is lost through unemployment. This is based on the observation that certain industries have 30 percent idle capacity, but this is a false guide to production possibilities for the economy as a whole. One might just as well argue that there is no unemployment problem because some industries are working overtime.

Marxian dogma aside, it makes little sense to say that the man who produces an automobile is doing productive work but the man who keeps it in good running order is not, or that the modern farmer is very productive but the research scientists and the farm extension agents who advise him are not.

Not all of the exaggeration and illogic can be found on the alarmist side. A smaller but equally vociferous group sings the praises of automation in arguments that do not stand up well under inspection. This group voices three major "do-nothing" fallacies:

(1) Automation automatically creates at least as many new jobs as it eliminates.

The key word here is "automatically." Of course, it is possible for automation to create new jobs. It does this principally in two ways. First, there are the jobs created to build, install, and service the new machinery. At fixed levels of output, however, this can never require as much labor as that displaced or it would not pay to introudce the new machinery. Whether output will increase or not will depend upon prices, income, and other factors.

Second, technological change may also create employment by making possible new industries and products, and by contributing to the expansion of the economy. Automation typically results not only in a cheaper and better way of doing what was done before, but also in the possibility of doing and producing new things.

Thus, the job-creating potential of automation is present, but there is nothing automatic about it. It depends upon many things—price policies, wage policies, investment policies, and the maintenance of a high level of effective demand in the economy.

(2) Automation always results in more interesting jobs, requiring greater skill and training.

If this is meant to apply to the specific factory or office situation it is incorrect. Prof. James Bright of Harvard and others who have looked at particular examples of the introduction of superior machinery report that the effects of automation vary greatly.

Sometimes the jobs that are eliminated required considerable training and experience, and they are replaced with jobs that are relatively simple and easy to learn. The displaced worker who must seek employment in some other industry or occupation will frequently find himself forced to accept work demanding far less skill and experience than his old job required. Automation usually has a cost, and the displaced worker pays it.

If one takes a national and longrun view of automation, it is clear that skill and educational requirements will be upgraded. Similarly, technological unemployment tends to disappear in the long run. The fallacy lies in the failure to realize that what is true in the long run need not be true in the short, and what is true in general is not true in some specific cases.

(3) Any problem created by automation can be solved by the individual firm concerned or by local government.

Efforts by individual firms, unions and local governments to deal with the problems created by automation are to be commended. We should not, however, blindly put our trust in them simply out of fear or dislike of the Federal Government. Some Federal activities are warranted on economic grounds, and might obviate the necessity for the Government to assume a much larger role.

For example, a program to make the State employment services more responsive to national needs and leadership would help our labor markets function more effectively, but there is strong opposition to such a program.

(4) "Conventional" jobs that represent truly "productive" work are disappearing.

If one defines "conventional" jobs as those that exist at present, and if one limits "productive" work to the production of commodities on farms and in factories then this statement is true—but rather meaningless. Of course, technological change will result in changes in the type of work required. It always has. One hundred years ago most Americans worked on farms. Today fewer than 10 percent do.

Each generation has its own ideas about what is a "conventional" job. Today jet pilots and TV repairmen fall into that category, but 20 years ago they were not only unconventional but unknown. Moreover, not all of the fields of expanding employment opportunity are new ones. Teaching and nursing, for example, are old and "conventional" and job opportunities are growing rapidly.

The notion that some kinds of work are productive and others are not can be traced to a Marxian fallacy (inherited from Adam Smith) that attempts to distinguish between the production of commodities and of services. To this day, the U.S.S.R. refuses to include the services of doctors, teachers, and similar workers in its gross national product, although in other contexts the value of these services is extolled.

Similarly, Federal aid to education is blocked, although underinvestment in education in low income States is economically wasteful and a prime cause of unemployment. Even such obvious programs as retraining are opposed or hampered by requirements that limit training to local job opportunities.

Given the fact that automation does pose some problems, that our national economy is highly complex and the parts are intimately related, and given the inability of State and local governments to deal adequately with many of the social and economic difficulties now before them, it is reasonable to conclude that the Federal Government must play an important and positive role.

What should this role consist of? First and foremost, the economy must be kept operating at a high level so that output can expand and workers displaced by technological change can seek jobs in a buoyant economy. Second, the costs of change should be distributed fairly throughout the economy. Third, strenuous efforts should be made to facilitate reemployment of displaced workers.

In the short run, this means support of retraining and relocation programs, a vastly expanded employment service and the removal of artificial barriers to employment such as racial prejudice. In the long run, it calls for a large-scale shoring up of our educational system, a revolutionary improvement in our approach to vocational education and technical training, and the development of attitudes and institutions appropriate to the concept of education as a lifelong process—not one that terminates with a "dropout" or a diploma.

To sum up: Automation does pose problems. These problems are not unprecedented, either in kind or in degree. But, solutions will not come automatically.

We should not fear automation or try to retard it. On the contrary, we should welcome it, and try to accelerate it. Automation is the key to a higher standard of living at home and to increasing our ability to help less fortunate peoples abroad. There is no need to panic, or to give up our competitive free-market system for some vague and unspecified controls.

There is need to face the problems with coolness, sympathy, intelligence, and determination. A do-nothing attitude is unwise and unjust. The greatest danger is not that technological change will come too quickly, but that our institutions will adapt too slowly to the problems and the promise of automation.

The ultimate scarce resource is manpower. At the present time about 6 percent of our labor force is unemployed. Some 2 or 3 percent more would probably seek work if it were available, while short workweeks for those currently employed represent perhaps an additional 2 or 3 percent of involuntary unemployment. One must subtract, however, about 3 percent for frictional unemployment—that which is built into a dynamic economy—this being about the minimum level consistent with efficiency and the right of workers to change jobs whenever they wish. On balance, the removal of all involuntary unemployment would raise labor input by 7 or 8 percent.

Some increase in output requires no additional labor—it needs only increased demand—but even allowing for this, it is difficult to see how a total increase of more than 10 to 15 percent could be achieved solely by eliminating involuntary unemployment. Such an increase would be welcome, but would leave most of us far short of affluence.

(3) Automation will result in mass unemployment because there will not be enough purchasing power to buy the increased output.

This is a more sophisticated version of the "overproduction" fallacy. It is not factually false, but it is illogical. It is based on a circular argument that runs as follows: no purchasing power equals unsold goods equals unemployment equals no purchasing power.

This could happen. Indeed, it did happen in the 1930's. But it is incorrect to argue that it must happen. Whether it does or not will depend primarily on whether we are able to manage our monetary and financial affairs in a sensible manner. Our tools of monetary and fiscal policy are admittedly imperfect, but most economists are prepared to bet that they are not so imperfect that we need suffer mass unemployment because of a shortage of purchasing power.

THE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as my colleagues are aware, I have had a public exchange of statements on the subject of the nuclear test-ban negotiations with Mr. Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

On March 4 Mr. Fisher issued a communication to the press in reply to a letter which I had written to the editor of the Washington Post and which was printed in their edition of March 1.

On March 7 the Post consented to print a communication from me replying to Mr. Fisher's presentation.

These two items were entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 7.

On March 21 Mr. Fisher sent me a personal letter, pursuing the discussion further, and attempting to persuade me of the validity of our present position in the test-ban negotiations. At the conclusion of his letter, Mr. Fisher asked that I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I told him over the phone, after receiving his letter, that I would be happy to do so.

I felt that Mr. Fisher made an exceedingly careful and thoughtful presentation in his communication of March 21, and that it deserved a careful and detailed reply. The drafting of this reply, which runs 20 typewritten pages, required a good deal of time; and it is because of this, that my reply to Mr. Fisher was not delivered until this afternoon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, both Mr. Fisher's letter of March 21, and my reply to Mr. Fisher of today's date. Despite the length of this exchange of correspondence, I hope my colleagues will take the trouble to read it. There are some subjects that one can deal with adequately in a few pages. But the problem of the nuclear test-ban negotiations is so complex and many sided that one can only deal with it properly by going into it in detail.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that Mr. Fisher and I are friends of many years' standing. I strongly supported the establishment of the Agency of which he is now Deputy Director, and I do not believe the Agency could have found a more competent man for this very important position. On the issue of the test ban negotiations we disagree; but, as I stated in my letter to him, I hope that the mutual respect that has characterized our exchange of views at least serves to demonstrate that honest men, sharing the same values and goals, can nevertheless differ sharply over the means to be used in striving after their common objectives.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL
AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
Washington, March 14, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS J. DODD,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: I certainly appreciated the kind personal references to me in your communication of March 7 to the Washington Post and assure you that they are reciprocated. I agree with you that it is important that the merits of the nuclear test ban issue be the subject of intensive public discussion. I have studied your communication carefully and find that there are some things in it with which I disagree and, as a result, I would like to carry the dialog one step further in putting before you the considerations which have led the national security advisers to the President to the view that a nuclear test-ban treaty, of the type now under consideration, is in the interest of the national security of the United States.

As I read your letter there are basically three reasons why you believe the United States should not sign a test-ban treaty: (1) because you believe we have lost our lead in nuclear weapons; (2) because you believe such a treaty, in your judgment, would prevent us from dramatically strengthening the security and peace of the free world by decisive new discoveries resulting from continued testing; and (3) because, in your judgment, the proposed U.S. treaty does not provide a system of inspection which gives reasonable assurance that the Soviets are not cheating.

The first two of these three arguments are not directed against the position which the United States now has on the table at Geneva but are rather directed against any comprehensive treaty banning nuclear weapons tests which might be negotiated. All of them overlook the risks implicit in continued testing by both sides of the nuclear arms race.

First, the United States has not lost its lead either in nuclear weapons or in our strategic military posture which includes nuclear weapons as one of its elements. The current nuclear arsenal of the United States is larger and more diversified and more sophisticated than that of the Soviet Union. We have produced nuclear weapons in large quantities and have developed the necessary nuclear warheads for all of the U.S. long-range missiles and tactical weapons. It is true, however, as the President has stated many times, that the continuation of the arms race is giving the United States less, rather than more, security. This is not because our lead in nuclear superiority has been lost to the Soviet Union, but because the longer the race goes on, of which unlimited testing is a part, the more the nuclear forces of the United States and U.S.S.R. will tend to equal each other. An illustration of this fact is that it is generally recognized that the United States would have been better off, in its nuclear position, had the efforts made during the Eisenhower administration to obtain a nuclear test ban been successful. Moreover, the technology developed by unlimited testing may not remain a possession of either the United States or the Soviet Union unless an agreement is reached to curtail testing. Unless an agreement is reached to curtail testing sooner or later this technology will become available to many other countries.

Second, the security and peace of the United States and the free world would be strengthened more by an effective test-ban treaty than by continued testing to develop and produce new advances in nuclear weapons.

There is no question that further nuclear testing can and would bring advancements to the total U.S. stockpile of nuclear weapons. Continued testing, however, would also bring advancements to the Soviet stockpile. Any agreement to turn down the arms race, whether in the field of nuclear testing or otherwise, will be open to the argument that it precludes some field of weapons development which might otherwise be open to us. This is a factor which certainly must be taken into account. Any such agreement should be entered into only if, in the light of our current weapons posture and the restraints which will be placed on the Soviet Union, such an agreement will be, on balance, in the interests of our national security. The present U.S. position was recommended to the President not only by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency but also by the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission as meeting these criteria. In the deliberations which led up to this position, consideration was given to both the effects of this position on the development of the AICBM and the pure fusion weapon.

With respect to the AICBM, the most important problems relate to the development of a system which can handle the problem of separating actual warheads from penetration aids. This is the key problem needing solution. We now have warheads available for an AICBM without further testing. So far as the constraints on the Soviet Union are concerned, development by them of important new data on nuclear effects as they influence AICBM systems could not be accomplished without an extremely high probability of detection.

With respect to the pure fusion bomb, it should be pointed out that the development of such weapon is by no means certain. Moreover, as you know, we have already made significant advances in the direction of tactical weapons with a smaller fission as compared with fusion component. There is, therefore, a real question as to the utility of a pure fusion bomb over weapons already available. We must gage the difference between a pure fusion weapon and weapons now available not only from the risk of fallout, or of damaged property, but from the risk of escalation. Frankly, I don't think a possible reaction to the tactical use of nuclear weapons by us would be very much different whether it were a matter of our developing and using pure fusion weapons or an enhanced radiation weapon of a type now available. I believe that, if such pure fusion weapons were developed, their primary significance would be in providing a cheaper substitute for the explosive component of our very large stockpile of fission weapons. However, considering the very large numbers of nuclear weapons that would be available to both the United States and the Soviet Union in the time period when such a device might become available, its existence would not appear to constitute a great advantage to either side. Such a weapon would be of greater significance to other countries that do not as yet have a nuclear capability. For this reason, an inhibition to the development of fusion weapons would be to our net advantage.

Third, the treaty which the United States is prepared to negotiate does provide adequate assurance that the Soviet Union could not conduct a significant test series without our knowledge. Perhaps earlier descriptions of the U.S. position which you have read have not been sufficiently clear or detailed. Your statement that, "for 16 years the Soviets have rejected this principle (i.e., adequate onsite inspection and control) and we now yield to them by saying that our reliance is on a system of outside monitoring and that the token inspection inside the Soviet Union is only supplemental and unimportant," does not describe our present position. We are, in fact, emphasizing the necessity of an adequate number of properly conducted inspections and at no time has anyone said that these inspections were supplemental or unimportant. We have proposed an outside monitoring system since the technical facts based on the actual operation of our existing intelligence detection system indicates that such a system would have almost the same detection capability as a system located inside the Soviet Union according to the original Geneva specifications and might in practice actually be more effective since it would be fully under our own control and could be put into operation immediately upon treaty signature instead of requiring 2 to 4 years to build.

Further, in challenging the effectiveness of our proposed detection system you rest your argument primarily on the assertion that "it is now possible for the Soviets to test secretly in outer space and to test large weapons underground without any possibility of detection." With regard to testing in outer space, there are several detection techniques that can detect from the surface of the earth nuclear explosions out to the distance of the moon and other satellite-based systems are within the state-of-the-art that could detect explosions at distances of hundreds of millions of miles (beyond the distance of the sun). With regard to the possibility of testing large weapons underground, I assume that you are referring to the possibility of testing in very large underground cavities. Continued examination over the past few years of this technique indicates that such underground cavities would be extremely difficult and costly to build. In attempting to undertake a project of this extent, a potential violator would run a serious risk of being detected by nonseismic means long before he even reached the point of testing. I believe that you have not given sufficient consideration to the vast technical problems and large expenditures that a violator would face in attempting to conduct a significant series of tests in outer space or in underground cavities in a manner calculated to avoid detection. In view of the many uncertainties involved in these complex methods of evasion, a violator could never be sure that his attempts at clandestine testing, no matter how elaborately conceived, would not be discovered by a national detection system whose total capabilities the violator would not know in detail.

Your letter contains an extract from Mr. Foster's testimony before the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee which you believe points to a contrary view. In the extract which you quote Mr. Foster was recapitulating his reply to a question directed to the contribution of stations on Soviet soil to the problem of identifying an event as an earthquake, a contribution which, although noticeable, could not be called a breakthrough. His testimony, as a whole, as well as the recent testimony of both Government and private witnesses before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, supports the conclusion that there have been improvements in our verification capability, both caused by an improved capability for long-distance detection and identification of underground events which could be caused by nuclear explosions or earthquakes, and a better assessment of the number of underground events in the Soviet Union.

You refer to the requirement of Soviet approval of a budget and to the appointment of an executive officer as an illustration of a Communist veto which could prevent onsite inspections. These are provisions which have been in the U.S. position for almost 3 years, but under the proposal now under consideration, the primary emphasis is being placed on onsite inspections of the U.S.S.R. by United States and United Kingdom personnel, and vice versa. Under these circumstances, Soviet refusals to agree on an executive officer or on an adequate budget could not frustrate the conduct of onsite inspections.

The advantages and risks involved in a test ban have been weighed by the President and his key advisers in the national security area on a number of occasions since the negotiations began in 1958. Each time the conclusion has been that the advantages outweighed the risks.

I would hope that the arguments I have presented to you as to why a test-ban treaty is in the U.S. interest and that the position proposed by the United States provides reasonable assurance against cheating would persuade you to give further consideration to this question and that you would withhold judgment on a treaty pending the outcome of the negotiations.

Despite the rather lengthy list of disagreements discussed above, I appreciate the tone in which your letter was written. I would also appreciate if you could put this letter in the record.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

Adrian S. Fisher.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Aeronautical
and Space Sciences,
March 29, 1963.

Mr. Adrian S. Fisher,
Deputy Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fisher: I am grateful to you for the considerate attention you have given my several communications on the subject of the nuclear test ban. I believe that our exchange of letters has served to give the public a better understanding of the issues involved; and because of this I welcome your proposal that your detailed letter of March 14 be inserted into the Congressional Record. In doing so, however, I am taking the liberty of replying to several of your more important contentions.

In your second paragraph you construe my position as meaning that "the United States should not sign a test-ban treaty." I do not see how you could have read this interpretation into my several statements, because I have repeatedly made it clear that I do favor a properly safeguarded test-ban treaty and that, despite all the difficulties, I strongly support the quest for limitations on the arms race.

Indeed, it is precisely because I believe that we must strive for realistic disarmament, that I am opposed to the test-ban treaty now under discussion.

It is my belief that the draft treaties we have recently proposed do not provide us with adequate safeguards against the possibility of Soviet cheating. I know that you differ with this estimate; but the irrefutable fact remains that the many concessions we have made at Geneva have resulted in widespread misgivings, both in Congress and among the American people; and these misgivings have unfortunately had the effect of undermining confidence in the prospect of legitimate disarmament.

This is an issue on which the broadest public unity ought, ideally, to prevail. Instead, there is grave and widespread disunity. I deplore this disunity; but I believe it can be overcome, or reduced, if we are prepared to insist on increased safeguards for a test ban treaty.

Surely there is room for honest differences as to what constitutes adequate safeguards; and, surely, we should be able to conduct this discussion without one side charging that the other side is opposed to any kind of test-ban treaty or, conversely, without charges of a sellout by the second side against the first side.

In my speech of this February 21, while I urged a frank reassessment of our status, I also warned against the abandonment of the test-ban negotiations. I said that the original Geneva formula, although it was unsatisfactory in many ways, at least called for a significant measure of opening up on the part of the Soviets and that it might have led, and may yet lead, to an acceptable treaty.

In my speech of May 10, 1960, in which I first addressed myself to the test-ban negotiations, I called for a unilateral cessation of all tests that contaminate the atmosphere, even in the absence of a treaty. I still believe that the national interest and the interest of world peace would be served if, recognizing the difficulty of achieving a treaty, we committed ourselves to the suspension of all such tests—with the understanding, of course, that we would be free to resume such tests if the Soviets failed to observe a corresponding moratorium, and that every effort would be made to keep our facilities in a state of readiness, so that there would not again be a time lag of almost 1 year while the facilities and personnel essential for the conduct of atmospheric tests were reassembled and readied.

I take this stand because I consider it essential that we take every possible initiative to reduce the dangers that may result to the human race from continuing atmospheric fallout. I do so despite very serious misgivings about the ability of a democratic state to keep testing facilities in readiness while it is adhering to a moratorium on testing. President Kennedy dealt with this matter frankly in the following statement made on March 2, 1962:

"But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution."

The differing conclusions we arrive at stem, I believe, from three principal sources: (1) Conflicting evaluations of what constitutes the major threat to our national security; (2) conflicting estimates of Soviet intentions; (3) radically different estimates of the potentialities of nuclear technology.

On the first point, if I understand your position correctly, you apparently consider the proliferation of nuclear weapons—the menace of the so-called "*n*th nation"—to be the prime source of danger. I am concerned with this matter, and I believe that we must strive to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. But this in my opinion is a minor danger compared with the mortal danger to our national security if the Soviets should ever achieve nuclear superiority over us. It is, moreover, a danger that belongs to a period 10 or 20 years in the future, while the peril posed by Soviet communism belongs to today. Instead of permitting ourselves to become obsessed with the hypothetical danger posed by a hypothetical "*n*th" nation in decades to come, we would do well to concentrate on the real, immediate, and desperately urgent problems posed by the existence of Soviet imperialism.

In your letter you argue that "the longer the nuclear race goes on, the more the nuclear forces of the United States and U.S.S.R. will tend to equal each other." You state further that "it is generally recognized that the United States would have been better off in its nuclear position had the efforts made during the Eisenhower administration to obtain a nuclear test ban been successful."

I believe that this statement may accurately be described as the premise for your entire argument. I differ with this premise on several counts.

I do not believe that nuclear technology has reached the ultimate point of its development, or that it has leveled off. I believe that this technology, which is still in its infancy, will witness many more revolutionary advances.

I do not believe that Soviet technology was bound to catch up with ours, or is bound to catch up with ours in these areas where we still lead, simply because of the fact that both sides engage in testing. On the contrary, I believe that we had the scientific brains and the resources to maintain our lead in all phases of nuclear technology if we had made a serious effort to do so.

If the Soviets have now pulled even with us in strategic weapons technology, it is not because we continued to test or because there was no test-ban treaty. On the contrary, it was because we suspended our test program for more than 3 years, under the terms of a moratorium which gave the Soviets all the advantages of a test-ban treaty, so far as our side was concerned, without any of the disadvantages or inhibitions of a monitoring apparatus or onsite inspections.

Obviously, if the Soviets continue to run as fast as they can, while we stop running for years on end and then dawdle along at a fraction of capacity when we resume running, the Soviets are not only bound to catch up with us but will ultimately surpass us.

In the light of the known record, I simply cannot understand how the relative progress scored by the Soviets in nuclear technology can be blamed on the failure to achieve a test-ban treaty, or how it can be used to justify the hypothesis that the continuation of the race in nuclear technology was bound, in any case, to result in an evening out between ourselves and the Soviets.

I also believe that the moratorium was a mistake from the standpoint of achieving an acceptable treaty on nuclear testing. I believe that the Soviets would have had far more reason to come to terms if we had demonstrated our determination to maintain and even extend our lead in nuclear technology, so long as there was no formal treaty Conversely, I believe that by largely inactivating our own technology we deprived ourselves of our most effective weapon in the test-ban negotiations and removed any incentive the Kremlin may have had to come to terms.

My previous statement concerning Soviet superiority was not intended to apply to the entire weapons spectrum, but referred specifically to large-yield strategic warheads. I note that while you do not challenge my contention that the Soviets have at least pulled even with us in strategic weapons technology, you contend that we retain a significant across-the-board lead. That we enjoyed a clear-cut lead in 1958, before the moratorium went into effect, is no doubt true; but I frankly doubt that any broad spectrum lead exists today.

Perhaps the most sobering appraisal of the relative positions of the United States and the Soviet Union has been expressed by Dr. Edward Teller, who, I assume, has full access to the facts. Teller states:

"Who is ahead? I truly don't know. But I can go a little further. Nobody else knows—at least not in our country. True we can observe their explosions to a limited degree. But to judge their progress in the way we are able to judge them is like judging a restaurant by smelling the smoke from the kitchen. This is not a complete or reliable or scientific evaluation, and we cannot and should not let the fate of our Nation and of the free world depend upon guesses, based on such scant information. They (the Soviets) have conducted more nuclear tests recently than we. They have had many more big thermonuclear explosions than we. They are not fools. Through these repeated tests they are finding out more information. On the basis of any valid, commonsense arguments, they should be ahead of us today. It is my guess, and it is only a guess, that today the Russians are ahead of us in nuclear weapons."

That the Soviets have at least pulled even with us in strategic technology has, I believe, been demonstrated by our analyses of their massive series of atmospheric tests.

In the very large yield areas, that is, tens of megatons, we are very clearly behind by virtue of the fact that we have neglected to do any testing in this region. In the yield area which ranges from about one megaton up to several megatons—that is, the range which encompasses most of our strategic missiles, such as Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman—we have a statement from Dr. Hans Bethe, chairman of the panel which evaluates Soviet tests, that the Kremlin in its several recent test series, placed very great emphasis on warheads of this magnitude. As Teller suggests, the Soviets may very well be ahead of us in these yields; the sad truth is that we really do not have the technical ability to judge.

We have much less ability to evaulate Soviet progress in the low yield range, which embraces air defense weapons as well as tactical weapons. Conducted underground, most of these tests would defy detection, let alone analysis. As for the neutron bomb, since it produces no significant radioactive debris, it could probably be tested, if required, in the atmosphere and still deny any hope of assessment by us.

While you contend that we still retain an impressive lead over the Soviets, it is interesting to note that the responsible Soviet atuhorities have spoken in considerable detail of the lead they now enjoy over the United States in nuclear weapons. Let me quote, as an example a statement from the recent Soviet book, "Military Strategy," put out by Marshall Sokolovskii, former chief of the general staff, and 14 other senior Soviet officers:

"In the 1960's nuclear weapons were supplied already to all branches of the Soviet armed forces—strategic missile forces, ground forces, air forces, the navy and air defense forces. Along with this, our armed forces received nuclear warheads with yields from several tons to tens of millions of tons. Considering that thermonuclear weapons were created in the Soviet Union earlier than in the United States—and most important of all—that the United States of America does not possess super-powerful thermonuclear warheads of several tens of millions of tons which the U.S.S.R. has, we consider that our superiority over the Western bloc in nuclear weapons is indisputable."

Perhaps this statement is exaggerated at certain points, but it is always a safe maxim to overestimate one's enemy rather than underestimate him. I believe the Disarmament Agency is putting itself in a posture that invites criticism when, with no tangible proof to back up its assertion, it assures the American people that our lead is secure and all is well.

You say that I "overlooked the risks implicit in continued testing by both sides." I do not overlook this risk. As I have pointed out, it is precisely because I recognize it that I believe we must strive for a realistic test-ban treaty. But whereas you seem to think that there is only a risk that the Soviets would endeavor to cheat, I take it as a certainty that the Soviet Government, which is publicly committed to our destruction, which has violated more than a thousand treaties and agreements in its brief lifespan of 45 years, and which has time and time again displayed a monumental contempt for world public opinion, will cheat if there is something to be gained from cheating, and if the chances of verification are nonexistent or marginal.

This is why I believe that a test-ban treaty must incorporate far more rigorous safeguards against cheating than our present position at Geneva calls for.

I believe that a test ban treaty can safely be extended to cover all those areas where we can, with today's technology, maintain an effective monitoring system. On the other hand, I also believe, as I have stated several times, that we would be endangering the national security if we extended the treaty to cover areas where monitoring is clearly impossible or where there is no serious chance of detection and verification.

The recent testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy offered little encouragement about our current ability to detect small underground tests, or larger underground tests conducted in a cavity, or tests in outer space.

As you no doubt know, Dr. Carl F. Romney, Assistant Technical Director of the Air Force Technical Applications Center (who is generally recognized as one of our top seismologists), estimated that, even without decoupling, a series of underground tests conducted in alluvial soil below the level of 3 kilotons would probably escape detection.

This testimony took on added significance in the light of a statement by Dr. Jack Ruina, Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, that half our underground tests have been below 3½-kiloton level, and of a statement by Gen. A. W. Betts, Director of the Division of Military Applications, Atomic Energy Commission, that at this level tests could be conducted which had application to large-yield strategic weapons as well as to small tactical weapons.

You told me in your letter that space detection presents no serious problem and that "satellite-based systems are within the state-of-the-art that could detect explosions at distances of hundreds of millions of miles."

On the day that we have demonstrated our ability to verify tests in outer space up to a distance of several hundred million miles, I shall be willing to support a ban or moratorium on all such tests. But I note that, in his testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee last September, Mr. Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, admitted frankly that we have no present capability to detect tests in outer space.

I note further that Dr. A. W. Schardt, Deputy Director of the Nuclear Test Detection Office, Advanced Research Projects Agency, in his recent testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, made it clear that the capabilities of which he was talking were all in the future. In reply to a question about our present capability to detect tests in outer space, he replied, "We do not have a satellite up, and I would say our present capability is zero."

Finally, I note that Dr. Schardt was careful not to claim any foolproof ability for the projected space system. He pointed out that tests might be very much more difficult to detect: (1) if they were shielded by large metalized space balloons; (2) if they were conducted on the other side of the moon, and; (3) if they were made to coincide with solar flares.

While tests in outer space are completely feasible with today's technology, the art of verification in outer space is still on the drawing boards and it may take many years to emerge as an operating system. For this reason I am opposed to the inclusion of outer space in a test-ban treaty at this juncture.

In your letter, you repeat the statement that "an inhibition to the development of fusion weapons"; that is, the neutron bomb—"would be to our net advantage." Your generalized statements about our detection capabilities for small underground tests are considerably more optimistic than those of Dr. Romney. But even if underground tests of 1 kiloton could be detected and verified—and I know of no one who has gone beyond this claim—I still fail to understand your reasoning when you say that a comprehensive test-ban treaty, incorporating no threshold of detection, would inhibit the Russians from developing the neutron bomb.

The neutron bomb, as I understand it, is conceived as a weapon ranging from a yield of 1 ton, or even lower, to 1 kiloton. In my speech of February 21, I quoted from a statement by a Soviet Red Army colonel, describing the tactical implications of a neutron bomb equivalent to 40 tons of TNT.

I should therefore like to ask, first, whether you seriously believe that we have any ability at all to detect tests at a 40- or 50-ton level, or whether you believe that such a capability lies just beyond the horizon. My own understanding from the recent testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is that, while there are only some hundreds of large earthquakes each year, there are many thousands of small earthquakes which resemble subkiloton yields; and, when you go low enough on the earthquake scale, there are so many minor events that an ultrasensitive seismograph would record them as almost a continuous rumble.

In short, unless there should be some revolutionary breakthrough in the science of detection, the chances that we will be able to detect a neutron bomb test, or series of tests, of 50 or 100 tons magnitude, or even more, are precisely nil. When Dr. Romney, in his recent appearance, was asked about the possibility of detecting a 100-ton underground test, he was frank in stating that this was "out of the question."

The second question I should like to ask is, whether you believe that the men of the Kremlin, knowing that our chances of detecting such tests were zero, would refrain from conducting such tests out of considerations of honor.

On the one hand, you argue that a test ban agreement on the terms now under discussion would be to our advantage because it would inhibit Soviet development of such a weapon; from this, one would conclude that the neutron bomb would be a weapon of serious significance. On the other hand, you argue that our tactical nuclear weapons arsenal is already so highly developed that it would not seriously affect our position if the Soviets did succeed in achieving the neutron bomb. This is a rare instance of two arguments which contradict each other and each of which, separately, is demonstrably false.

I have already explained why a comprehensive test-ban treaty could not, by any stretch of the imagination, inhibit the Russians from developing the neutron bomb. Let me now deal with the other part of your statement.

I am aware that there are a number of people who share your estimate that the neutron bomb would have no revolutionary advantage over some of the tactical nuclear weapons now in our arsenal. I am also aware that, before we got the H-bomb, there were some scientists, including several who have held key positions as advisers on the test ban, who argued that the H-bomb would not have the revolutionary implications claimed by its proponents, that there was nothing an H-bomb could do that couldn't be done just as well by a beefed-up A-bomb.

You say that it is not at all certain that the neutron bomb can be made. But the entire past experience of nuclear technology has been that those things that are theoretically feasible, ultimately turn out to be feasible in practice. I know of no exceptions to this rule.

I consider it of some significance that the scientists, who today dispute or question the scientific feasibility of the neutron bomb, include those: (1) Who expressed negative opinions concerning the feasibility and the advisability of making the H-bomb; (2) who have advised us into our present disastrous posture in the test-ban negotiations; and (3) who have had no serious experience with the developmental work that has already been done in this area.

I also consider it of some significance that the scientists who have been concerned with the development of the neutron bomb and who have firsthand knowledge of the project, have been reluctant, because of the excessive secrecy which surrounds the project, to discuss its feasibility publicly. I have reason for believing, however, that your reservations concerning the feasibility of the neutron bomb does not accurately reflect the opinion of these scientists. Perhaps it would be helpful to the American people in assessing this matter if the cloak of secrecy were lifted so that the scientists who are associated with the project and believe in it, could be heard.

I think you will agree that there are some highly competent scientists and military men who have gone on record with an evaluation diametrically opposed to your own. They believe that the neutron bomb would have revolutionary implications because of its numerous advantages over the tactical fission weapons on which we now rely. The pure fusion weapon would be far cheaper to produce in quantity; it would be much more effective than fission weapons; it would do little damage to our allies' urban centers; and, of great importance, it would virtually eliminate widespread fallout. On the one hand, this would enable our troops to follow up on a tactical nuclear barrage without delay and without danger to themselves. On the other hand, the absence of significant fallout would reduce the political opposition of our allies to the use of tactical nuclear weapons and, to this extent, would make the resort to such weapons far more plausible.

You contend that the neutron bomb would not have any critical advantages over the fission-fusion weapons which we already have in our development program. This development has been known to me for some time, but I have hesitated to refer to it, because of its classification. I am delighted that you have chosen to bring the existence of our fission-fusion weapons into public discussion, since it enables us to discuss the entire problem more frankly.

I find it difficult to understand the processes by which you arrived at the conclusion that the major difference between the pure fusion weapon, or neutron bomb, and the fission-fusion weapons we possess today, is essentially one of cost. Actually, the pure fusion weapon would have numerous advantages. It could be tailored in far lower, more discriminating yields. It would be considerably lighter and, therefore, more versatile and effective.

In terms of nuclear costs, it would be cheaper by a factor of 10- to 100-fold, or even more, than fission weapons or fission-fusion weapons.

You imply that we have an adequate supply of plutonium and of tactical nuclear weapons. I feel that this estimate can only be explained in terms of the official rejection of the possibility of limited nuclear warfare, which I criticized at length in my Senate statement of February 21. As you may recall, I argued at that time that the advent of the neutron bomb would make tactical nuclear warfare far more plausible, and that we had to face up to this prospect realistically.

Having said this much about the superiority of the neutron bomb, I nevertheless wish to express the hope that top priority will be accorded to the fission-fusion weapon you describe, as an interim system, until the neutron bomb becomes available. I should be grateful if you could inform me whether production requirements for this weapon have actually been established by the Department of Defense.

If it ever comes to limited nuclear war, tactical weapons may be needed in the many thousands. As you are aware, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have several times urged the expansion of our plutonium production, so that our tactical weapons might be produced in larger quantity. The production of a pure fusion weapon would liberate our Armed Forces from this limitation, and make tactical weapons available in quantities adequate for any contingency—at only a small fraction of the cost of our current tactical weapons.

You challenge my assertion that the development of an effective antimissile missile is also tied in with the problem of underground testing, specifically as it relates to the neutron bomb development. I am, of course, aware that the missile and radar components of an antimissile system can be tested even under the conditions of a test ban treaty.

I am also aware that perhaps the single most important problem relating to the antimissile missile has to do with the development of a system capable of separating actual warheads from penetration aids. If the enemy should carry this offensive technique one stage further, and employ penetration aids in the form of multiple warheads, our currently envisioned antimissile capabilities would be completely inadequate. The technological possibility of multiple warhead attacks, in fact, constitutes one of the most formidable obstacles to the effective defense of our industrial and urban areas.

It is precisely from the standpoint of overcoming this obstacle, that the pure fusion, neutron bomb-type of warhead would be of key importance. In the first place, it is generally accepted that this warhead would have a far more effective kill capability than a conventional nuclear warhead. In the second place, and most important of all, the extremely low cost of the pure fusion warhead would make it possible to develop an antimissile defense system quantitatively capable of dealing with saturation raids even by multiple warhead missiles.

You question my statement that even quite large tests could be conducted underground without fear of detection. I do not know why it is that the proponents of the present test ban treaty persist in belittling the "big hole" theory with the tortured argument that it would be extremely expensive and extremely time consuming to create a 500-foot spherical cavity such as Dr. Latter postulated in presenting the big-hole theory. Dr. Latter's 500-foot cavity, according to his calculations, would reduce the seismic impact of an underground shot by a factor of 300, so that a 300-kiloton shot would register as 1 kiloton. In downgrading the possibility that the Soviets may use the big hole technique for purposes of cheating, your letter ignores the fact that a much smaller hole would still result in a substantial reduction of the seismic impact of an underground test.

I have been informed by people who are competent in the field that at the 20-kiloton level, and even lower, tests can be conducted that have application to our largest multimegaton weapons. If the Soviets were to excavate a hole big enough to reduce the seismic impact of such a shot by a factor of only 30, 20 kilotons would produce a seismic signal of less than 1 kiloton. This low signal would probably not even be detectable, let alone verifiable. Yet, this level of decoupling would involve a cavity of relatively modest size, which would be cheaply and easily constructed.

I would also point out for the record that the recent testimony established that a substantial reduction could be achieved in cavities that are elliptical or flattened rather than spherical. Such cavities are much more easily engineered, and for that matter, are frequently found in nature.

Your letter makes obscure reference to the possibility of detection by nonseismic means, by which I assume you mean conventional intelligence operations. There is always a mathematical possibility that some conscience-stricken Soviet scientist may decide to cooperate with American intelligence in reporting a Soviet test ban violation. But on the basis of our intelligence record to date, I do not think that we can attach any serious weight to this possibility. I would remind you that our intelligence community had no advance knowledge of the Soviet A-bomb, no advance knowledge of her H-bomb, no advance knowledge of sputnik, and no knowledge of the emplacement of Soviet missiles in Cuba until they were photographed in position on their concrete emplacements. It is worthwhile recalling, in this connection, that the Soviets denied point blank that nuclear missiles had been installed in Cuba until we produced the irrefutable photographic evidence.

In recapitulating this record, I do not mean to criticize our intelligence community. I simply wish to make the point that intelligence operations in a closed totalitarian society are incredibly difficult and that the Soviets have been consistently successful in concealing from us even the most massive technological and logistic operations.

It has repeatedly been stated that so long as there is a chance of detection and verification, this would serve as a deterrent to any Soviet treaty violation. I believe the American people are entitled to a precise statement, or at least to an approximate estimate, of what is meant by "a chance." If it means one chance in two, or one chance in five, most people would agree that such a probability factor would act as a deterrent. But if "a chance" means 1 chance in 1,000 or 1 chance in 100,000, it clearly would not constitute a deterrent to a determined and aggressive cheater; nor would it command the confidence of the American people.

I propose to examine some of the problems connected with detection and verification because, as I see it, there are so many improbabilities at so many different points in the entire process, that 1 chance in 1,000 would, if anything, be an optimistic estimate.

Your letter completely ignores the tremendous difficulties that monitors would inevitably encounter, first, in endeavoring to locate the site of a suspected explosion with some precision, and, second, in obtaining concrete proof, or verification.

Mr. Ruina testified that, whereas before the Gnome underground test, it was felt that we could locate the precise origin of seismic events within a radius of some 10 kilometers, the Gnome event surprised the community of scientists working in this field by producing a 30-kilometer error in the calculation of point of origin. Such an error would mean that an inspection team would have to cover more than 3,000 square kilometers or 1,000 square miles to verify one event. In the light of the Gnome experience I find it difficult to understand why we have now offered to confine any given on-site inspection to an area of 500 square miles. But 500 square miles, so it seems to me, would still be a tremendously large area to inspect.

It was also estimated in the recent hearings that it would require a minimum of 2 weeks after the detection of a suspected seismic event before an inspection team could be assembled, the matter could be processed, and a team flown into the area in question.

It was also estimated that, apart from their normal logistical supplies, the team would require 100 to 200 tons of drilling equipment, which, in remote areas, would have to be moved from point to point by air, as one drilling after another failed to produce the evidence for which we were looking. I think it pertinent, in this connection, to recall some of the testimony presented to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in its hearings of April 1960.

Dr. C. E. Violet, of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, estimated the probability of locating radioactive debris from a 1.7 kiloton underground test at 1 in 100,000.

Dr. Richard Foose, of Stanford Research Institute, offered little grounds for encouragement. Dr. Foose estimated that, provided the area of suspicion could be cut down to 500 feet in radius, it would require only 63 drill holes in triangular grid patterns to insure a 100-percent complete search. The drilling of 63 holes, it was pointed out, would involve a total footage of 75,600 feet, or the equivalent of 3 Mount Everests, and would require 1,008 man-days of drilling. Dr. Violet did, however, point out that if one were willing to settle for a 1 in 20, or 1 in 10, chance of verification, fewer holes would be necessary.

In the light of all this, I cannot help wondering whether we have faced up realistically to the stupendous problems involved in achieving verification.

Much has been said about the techniques that have been evolved for surface observation; but, in small type, it is admitted that most of these techniques would be thrown into a cocked hat if the Soviets chose to make surface observation difficult by conducting their tests in their northern areas under cover of the long Arctic night, or if they conducted them under shallow waters, or deep underground.

In reply to a question I have put to Advanced Research Projects Agency, I have been informed that it would require weeks to disassemble a drilling rig after a first failure, transport it to another point, reassemble it, and drill to a depth of 10,000 feet.

Under these circumstances, how many holes can we realistically expect to drill in each on-site inspection and what probability of verification would this number of drillings actually give us?

There is a simple mathematical fact which has not been given the consideration I feel it deserves.

Before it can be certified that a test has taken place, there are four separate hurdles that have to be crossed: (1) Detection, (2) identification, (3) location, and (4) verification. There is a probability factor attached to each one of these hurdles; and all of these probability factors have to be compounded in order to calculate the chances of final verification.

No one has seriously attempted to calculate these probabilities. But from everything I have read, I would be surprised if the final probability figures were any better than 1 in 1,000.

Finally, there are political factors that enter into the equation of detection and verification which, I believe, have not been given sufficient consideration.

If a comprehensive test-ban treaty calling for five, six, or seven on-site inspections annually, is ever signed, I can conceive of the Russians permitting us to squander half of our inspections during the first half of the year on genuine seismic events; and, after it had been established that these seismic events had been caused by genuine earthquakes, I am sure that there would be no dearth of innocent people who will construe this as proof that we were wrong to distrust the Russians.

I can even conceive of the Russians permitting us to conduct an on-site inspection in an area where an underground test had actually taken place, confident that the odds were more than 1,000 to 1 in their favor.

But if the inspection team ever decided to erect a drill rig in the vicinity of a clandestine underground test, I simply cannot conceive of the Russians permitting the team to complete its operation and come up with a radio-active core for presentation to the bar of world opinion.

If past behavior is any indication of future behavior, the Kremlin at this juncture would probably order the inspectors out of the country on the grounds that they had been engaging in espionage, charge that it had incontrovertible evidence that the United States had engaged in clandestine testing, and, if we objected strenuously enough, abrogate the treaty on its own initiative rather than waiting for us to do so.

We have been told that if we catch the Soviets cheating, or if they refuse to cooperate in an onsite inspection, or if they themselves abrogate the treaty, we would consider ourselves free to resume testing. All of this has been said in a manner which strongly implies that there is nothing to be lost. But I find small consolation in the prospect that we will be free to resume testing if the Soviets violate the rules. By inactivating our nuclear technology during the recent ill-fated moratorium, the Soviets were able to wipe out an estimated 3- to 4-year lead in strategic weapons technology. If they could similarly inactivate our technology for another 3 to 4 years under the terms of a test ban agreement, we might one day discover that the Soviets had been cheating all along; and we might simultaneously discover that they had forged ahead of us in nuclear technology in several critical respects. It will be an ominous day for the free world if such a situation should ever arise. Our own resumption of testing might come too late to do any good.

Specifically, I should like to urge again:

1. That we return to the original Geneva formula for a monitoring network, which called for 20 stations in the Soviet Union, manned by non-Soviet nationals.

2. That tests in outer space and underground tests below the threshold of detection be exempted from the treaty, with the provision that these exemptions be narrowed as improved methods of detection are devised.

3. That we withdraw our offer to accord the Soviets a veto over the budget of the control organization.

4. That we return to the position we held for almost 2 years on the question of onsite inspection—that is, that we have the right to inspect any seismic events above the level of 5 kilotons that cannot clearly be identified as earthquakes, and 20 percent of the seismic events below this level which have been recorded but cannot be clearly identified.

5. That if the Soviets reject these terms, we let them know in advance that we will instruct our laboratories to push full steam ahead at every point of nuclear weapons technology.

6. That if the Soviets refuse to accept a realistic test ban agreement which would give both sides assurances against the possibility of cheating, we challenge them to join us in a moratorium on all tests that contaminate the atmosphere.

7. That, if the Soviets refuse to consent to such a moratorium, we commit ourselves before the world to conduct no such tests so long as the Soviets abstain from them.

In your closing paragraphs you expressed the hope that I would withhold judgment on the treaty, pending the outcome of negotiations. I assure you that I shall at all times give the most careful consideration to the information developed by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in support of its position in the test ban negotiations. I also want to assure you that I have not spoken out lightly against the draft treaty we are currently discussing at Geneva. On the contrary, I have given the matter much study and thought and I have spoken only because I felt conscience impelled to do so before a commitment was made at Geneva. It would be disastrous if the administration committed itself to a treaty which the Senate then felt obliged to reject. It is for this reason that I believe the debate should not be deferred until a treaty is signed.

Perhaps I may yet vote for the treaty, if you can satisfy me that our national security would not be endangered if the Soviets, after agreeing to a treaty, continued to test in space and underground below the threshold of detection; that the development of the neutron bomb and the neutron antimissile warhead would not give the Soviets a critical military advantage over us; and that the art of detection and verification has truly advanced to the point where the treaty we are now discussing would constitute an adequate deterrent against Soviet cheating. In the light of all the information I have seen to date, however, I must say that I have the gravest misgivings on these scores.

I believe that our exchange of correspondence, if it has not succeeded in bringing us together, has at least served to give both of us a better understanding of our respective positions. It has also, I hope, served to give Congress and the American people a clearer insight into the basic issues.

Finally, I hope that the mutual respect which has characterized our exchange will help to discourage extremist statements on both sides by establishing that honest men, sharing the same values and goals, can still differ sharply on the means to be pursued in achieving their common objectives.

With my thanks again for your consideration, and with every best wish.

Sincerely,

TOM DODD.

THE PARTY OF THE THIRD PART—THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Federal Trade Commissioner Sigurd Anderson, formerly Governor of South Dakota, spent March 28 as a daylong guest of the Middletown, Ohio, Chamber of Commerce and Junior Chamber of Commerce. Speaking at a luncheon meeting, he made some highly informative observations entitled "And the Party of the Third Part, the Government," dealing with the part the Government plays in seeing that the rules of the game are respected in commercial life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks by Commissioner Anderson be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND THE PARTY OF THE THIRD PART, THE GOVERNMENT

(By Sigurd Anderson)

Mr. President, distinguished guests, officers, members, and guests of the Middletown Chamber of Commerce; it is a pleasure to be with you on this occasion. I feel the impact, not only of your industrial prowess but also the historical significance of the fact that Ohio has been properly named the "Mother of Presidents." During the several years that I have driven across your State while traveling to and from South Dakota and Washington, I have not been privileged to come through Middletown. I can now see that I have erred in my travel scheduling. The benefits that come from quick travel by turnpikes may not be overbalanced by getting to know various sections of the country by actually seeing them. This is just another evidence of the fact that saving time is not the most important factor in life.

Before coming here I explored your splendid brochure, "Middletown, Ohio, A Profile * * *." Since coming here and during the forenoon, I have explored the Middletown area more fully. It is my understanding that this afternoon further exploration will be had. From what I have seen, I am most favorably impressed. Your industrial life is indeed enriching this community as well as all of the United States of America. We poked around in quite a number of places this forenoon but never for one moment was I in doubt of what we were doing, which is a little bit different from the story told about President Calvin Coolidge. The story about President Calvin Coolidge which is accepted in South Dakota is as follows: The President was on his way to spend his summer vacation in the Black Hills of South Dakota—which, by the way, I urge you, too, to visit—and stopped off en route at Pierre, the State capital. The citizens of Pierre, being very proud of a new city park that had been recently created, prevailed upon the President to take a ride through the city and eventually the entourage wound up in the new city park. After driving around the park for a while, the President looked at his companion and said, "What in the world are we doing down here, anyway"

I appreciate your invitation to come to Middletown. In a way, it was made possible by my good friend and your fellow landsman, Congressman ROBERT T. SECREST, who for many years served as a most effective member of the Federal Trade Commission, and who is now serving effectively as a Member of Congress from the 15th Ohio District. The pleasant correspondence that I have had with your president, Calvin F. Floyd, and your staff associate, Bruce Evans, has brought about a meeting of the minds to this extent, that during the formal portion of this noon meeting that I should explore with you—in a few thousand well-chosen words—some of the areas that you, as members of the business community, would be interested in insofar as trade regulation is concerned. With that thought in mind I have labeled my remarks "And the party of the third part, the Government."

ENFORCING THE RULES OF THE GAME

As business people, you have all entered into contracts. You are all familiar with the terminology of contracts that goes something like this: "Whereas the party of the first part and the party of the second part * * *." I would like to amend that statement by adding the following: "And the party of the third part, the Government."

The development of the United States from a hunting and fishing civilization to a farming civilization and then to an industrial civilization where the complications of modern life press in on us has brought about changes that our forefathers never imagined could ever take place. As the complexities of our civilization increased, the number of laws governing the conduct of our citizens increased correspondingly. In fact, one of the penalties of civilization is the multiplication of laws governing the conduct of the members of society. The early pioneers in this Ohio community had no traffic laws; they had no health and sanitation laws; they probably had no weights and measures laws. In fact, the laws governing their conduct were very few. As the community developed, the laws governing conduct came into being. This is something that we have to accept. Like you, I wish it were possible to have our development without having laws impinging upon our conduct. But it just can't be and so if we say that we long for the "good old days," we must remember that the good old days are always now.

The greatness of the United States of America is due to a combination of factors. Those factors are greater resources, favorable geographic location, a merging of peoples who were desirous of getting away from the shackles of oppression in their home countries, and a vigorous competitive spirit. Let us not forget God Almighty in this enumeration. God's help was, is, and always will be of the greatest importance. The United States has always been noted for its competitive spirit. Competition is the American way of life. When that competition simmers down or stops, then the United States of America is on the way out. Therefore, competition must be preserved. Competition does not come about automatically, nor is it automatically maintained.

You and I are not distressed if we run in a footrace and lose to a competitor who can run faster than we can. But we are distressed when a competitor trips us and, by that unsporting gesture, wins the race. We have rules of conduct for football, basketball, baseball, and golf. We have rules for playing bridge. In fact, we have rules for every game that has been invented. For these games we have umpires, referees, linesmen, and what not. And the same is true in the field of business. In order to preserve competition, it has become necessary to have rules of conduct for those who engage in business. We talk a lot about free enterprise. By "free enterprise" we don't mean the utter freedom to operate. There have to be some restraints on their freedom. This reminds me of the story of the Irishman who migrated to the United States from his home country. The first thing he did when he stepped onto the dock in New York was to hit a man on the nose. When taken before the judge, he was asked why he hit the man on the nose. The Irishman said: "Your Honor, all my life in Ireland I have heard that the United States is a free country and I was just exercising my rights of freedom." To which the judge replied: "Mr. Murphy, it is true that this is a free country, but in this country your freedom ends where the other man's nose begins."

So it is with free enterprise. It does have limitations and those limitations do not permit the free exercise of operation in any way the operator sees fit to carry out his operations. He must operate in accordance with rules and regulations that have been laid down.

BRINGING IN THE UMPIRE

The regulation of business is not something new. It goes back to the river kingdoms in Mesopotamia thousands of years ago. Regulating weights, measures, and business conduct generally has come down through the ages. It came to England; from England it came to the United States. It may be of interest to you that the first great act regulating business conduct carries the name of a citizen of your State. The famous Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 was introduced by U.S. Senator John Sherman of Ohio. By the way, Senator Sherman as you know, was the brother of that well-known Civil War general, "Cump" Sherman, who developed the famous scorched earth policy against the Confederate States, and the man who made a statement about war that never will be forgotten. That statement is, "War is hell."

The Sherman Act of 1890 made it criminal act for businessmen to conspire to restrain trade and to monopolize or attempt to monopolize. As could be expected, there was considerable objection to the Sherman Act. But it was sustained in the courts though considerably watered down by the famous "rule of reason" doctrine. It was believed by many lawyers, economists and indeed businessmen that the "rule of reason" weakened the Sherman Act. Finally, these voices reached Congress, and in 1914 the Sherman Act was given company, so to speak. The Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act were enacted. These acts were to further supplement the work of the Sherman Act in helping preserve competition. These acts took the sting out of "rule of reason" reasoning.

In 1936 it appeared to Congress that there were some deficiencies in the Clayton Act, and the Robinson-Patman Act came into existence. These acts, the Sherman Act, Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act, as amended, are the principal Federal laws governing the business conduct of businessmen. Every businessman who is in interstate commerce, and that is coming to include more and more people these days, should have a general knowledge of these acts. True, a businessman's lawyer will have to have a real specialist's knowledge of them, but the lawyer's client should have a general idea that there are laws governing business conduct. Because of these laws, the two parties to the typical business transaction such as we know them in the past, namely, the party of the first part and the party of the second part, actually now have been joined by the party of the third part, the Government.

It is my simple advice to you that when you as businessmen are about to undertake business enterprises, you should ask yourselves, "Does the Government have any interest in this?" Unfortunately, the Government seems now to have an interest in almost all things. Therefore, do not ignore the road markers of Government interest.

What is the Federal Trade Commission? Well may you ask that question. In brief, the Federal Trade Commission is an agency of the Federal Government that has been created to enforce the laws against certain unlawful business acts and practices. The Commission is made up of five Commissioners who are appointed by the President for 7-year terms and confirmed by the Senate of the United States. At present, the Commission has a staff of 1,200 people who are located in the main office in Washington and in 11 branch offices located at Atlanta, Ga., Boston, Mass.; Chicago, Ill.; Cleveland, Ohio; Kansas City, Mo.; New Orleans, La.; New York, N.Y.; Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif.; Seattle, Wash., and Arlington, Va.

What are some of the acts that constitute violations of the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act or the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act? Manifestly, I cannot give you a detailed exposition in the matter because both time and opportunity prevent, but here are some things that businessmen should know to be suspect:

CONSPIRATORIAL ACTIONS ET CETERA

It is against the law for business people engaged in interstate commerce, or where there is an effect upon interstate commerce, to conspire to fix prices, or to conspire to allocate territory, or to conspire to carry out acts detrimental to competition and competitors. By conspire, which has an ugly sound, we mean "to agree." Let me take an example. Suppose a number of the businessmen in this room agree that they are going to set the price of widgets or to divide the territory where widgets will be sold, or agree to decide where they will be sold—such is unlawful. There are those who feel that if businessmen want to get together to set the prices on the goods so as to prevent a market from completely deteriorating, they have a right to do so. But the courts have rather soundly put their fingers on this theory by saying, "But the existence of sound business reasons for selling at uniform prices is not a defense to a proven conspiracy to fix prices."[1] Certainly it must be obvious that there is no competition where prices, territories, and other arrangements are agreed upon by those in the business. Competition is the opposite of agreement.

Many of you are members of trade associations. Trade associations have to be very careful not to become the vehicle for illegal action. The furnishing of rate books, common price lists, reporting of individual member activities, and the like, must be checked very carefully so as not to bring the association and its members into the legal doghouse. It is easy for business groups to get into trouble.

---

[1] *Advertising Specialty National Association et al.*, v. *Federal Trade Commission*, 238 Fed. 2d 108.

PRICE DISCRIMINATION

The famous section 2(a) of the Clayton Act, as amended, frequently called the price discrimination statute of the Robinson-Patman Act, is one that I must call to your attention. Under the law, it is unlawful for a supplier in interstate commerce to discriminate in sales between his competing customers where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce or to injure, destroy or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination or with customers of either of them. There are exceptions to this, such as meeting the lawful price of a competitor. It is also provided in the law that differences which make due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered, must be taken into account. It is also provided in the law that nothing shall prevent price changes due to changing conditions affecting the market or the marketability of the goods concerned, including such things as deterioration of perishable goods, obsolescence of seasonal goods, distress sales, or sales in good faith and discontinuance of the business. Sales to governmental bodies, educational institutions and others are also exempted. Possibly I could best illustrate this law in this manner. Let us assume that "X" is a manufacturer and he has customers "A" and "B" who compete with each other. Under the law, the supplier may not discriminate between these customers if the conditions obtain that I have previously set forth. Discrimination between customers can make or break those who are the beneficiary or the victim of the discrimination. Where an aggressive customer demands and receives a discriminatory price from his supplier, the supplier may be hard put to refuse to give him this favored price. But the supplier must remember that if he is in interstate commerce and none of the defenses to a discriminatory price is available, that for him to treat one competing customer in a favorable way over and against another competing customer may bring a 2(a) charge against him.

Many businessmen look upon getting a favored price as good business, and if the concession for a favored price has been wrung from an unwilling supplier, it may be that it is not as good business as originally contemplated if the Federal Trade Commission moves in on the supplier for having violated 2(a).

At this point I must say that the Commission, in acting against those who violate its laws, does not have the power of criminal sanctions. The Commission seeks injunctive relief. By that I mean if the Commission prevails against a law violator, the Commission will secure a cease and desist order against the violator. In other words, the order will recite that the violator must stop the practices it is pursuing and with which it has been charged by the Commission. Any violation of this order may result in a civil penalty suit where the penalty is $5,000 per day per violation. This is a severe penalty.

BROKERAGE

2(c) of the Clayton Act, as amended, is the famous brokerage section which inveighs against illegal brokerage. In brief, this law works this way: If "A" is a seller and "B" is the buyer, "B" cannot get passed on to him the savings in brokerage. This famous statute came about in this manner: One of the world's largest grocery stores set up a dummy brokerage firm. This brokerage firm received brokerage from the sellers based on sales to the grocery chain. The dummy brokerage firm thereupon turned the money over to the grocery chain. This practice was one of the reasons Congress enacted the famous Robinson-Patman Act.

ALLOWANCES AND PROMOTION BENEFITS

I also want to call your attention to sections 2(d) and 2(e). These sections have reference to the making of payments for advertising allowances as in section (d) or the furnishing of services for advertising promotional allowances under section (e). In other words, if a supplier wishes to give an advertising allowance to his customers for advertising or promoting his goods, he must grant those allowances on proportionally equal terms. The same is true of section 2(e) where, if a manufacturer or supplier furnishes the services, that then he must make those services available to all competing customers on proportionally equal terms. It is evident that what these two sections seeks to do is to provide equality between competing customers.

INDUCING OR RECEIVING DISCRIMINATORY PRICES

Section (f) of the Clayton Act, as amended, deals with the soliciting of discriminatory prices. A good example of this would be if I am a customer of a supplier and I demand and receive a favorable price that the supplier does not grant to my competitors. This is a type of business law violation that is rather interesting because it seems to penalize business enterprise. If I am trying to get a better price from my supplier, it seems as though I should be so entitled to do, but the law just doesn't permit it if it is a discriminatory price. If I know, or should have known, that the price that I am requesting is a discriminatory price, I would be considered to be a logical candidate for a 2(f) charge. If I had solicited either promotional services or promotional allowances, then I could be charged with a violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

EXCLUSIVE DEALINGS

Another very interesting type of business practice that has been frowned on is in connection with exclusive dealings. This type of violation is covered by section 3 of the Clayton Act:

"That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, to lease or make a sale or contract for sale of goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies or other commodities, whether patented or unpatented, for use, consumption or resale within the United States or any Territory thereof or the District of Columbia or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States, or fix a price charged therefor, or discount from, or rebate upon, such price, on the condition, agreement or understanding that the lessee or purchaser thereof shall not use or deal in the goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or other commodities of a competitor or competitors of the lessor or seller, where the effect of such lease, sale, or contract for sale or such condition, agreement or understanding may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce."

As you see from the statement of the above law, this act is very properly called an exclusive dealing act. Accompanying this type of business activity are what we call full line forcing and requirements acts. If, for instance, the seller requires his customers to deal exclusively in his goods to the detriment of competition as set out in the law, it is an exclusive arrangement. If, in addition to the exclusive purchase of the seller's goods, the customer is also required to either buy the parts or equipment used by the machinery, or is required to buy the seller's full line, it can well be seen that it is a type of practice that could sharply curtail the activities of the seller's competitors. A good example would be if I, as a seller, required your president, Mr. Floyd, who is my customer, to refuse to handle any of the goods of my competitor or competitors, and that, in addition thereto, I required him to buy from me and use only the rivets or materials used by the particular machine in question and, in addition thereto, he would have to buy my full line of manufactured equipment in order to get the machine that I am making that he desires to handle. Exclusive dealing matters are handled under section 3 of the Clayton Act, as amended. Full line forcing and requirements contracts come under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act jurisdiction of the Commission.

MERGERS

I cannot refrain from calling to your attention that one of the most interesting types of antitrust activities on the part of the Federal Trade Commission and our colleagues of the Department of Justice, the Antitrust Division, is in connection with illegal mergers. A merger, as you know, is nothing more than the acquisition of one company by another. This may appear to you to be a perfectly legal act for one corporation or company to buy another company or corporation. This is true, except that section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, does not always so view it. Insofar as the Federal Trade Commission is concerned, if a corporation engaged in commerce shall acquire the stock or share capital and the assets of another corporation, provided they are both in interstate commerce, then such may be in violation of the law. However, no violation can occur unless the effect of such acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country and in any line of commerce. I realize that it must come as a shock to many people to know that it is against the law under certain circumstances for one company to acquire another. I must say that most acquisitions, in fact, the vast majority of acquisitions, are not illegal and such acquisitions are never questioned. But if the acquisition is such as to have a tendency to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, then by law the Commission or the Department of Justice, or other governmental agencies that have jurisdiction, are required to step in to prevent the merger, or, if it has occurred, then to bring about divestiture or some other appropriate remedy. It may be of interest to know that in the manufacturing and nonmanufacturing areas in 1962, the Commission compiled a total of 1,260 mergers. This information was gained from Moody's Standard & Poor's Corp., the Wall Street Journal, and the New York Times.

These 1,260 mergers may not include all of the mergers that took place because some are of such small size as to probably slip through the mesh of the reporting agencies. Last year the Commission examined in depth approximately 50 mergers. Within the past few years the Commission has proceeded against many of these mergers. Investigations are being made as to others. It goes without saying that a merger usually results in the permanent disappearance of a customer or competitor. Exclusive dealing results only in tying up a customer or customers; mergers may cause the utter disappearance of customers and competitors. If you are in interstate commerce and you are contemplating a sale of your company to another concern which is in interstate commerce, it would be well for you to consider whether section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, has any bearing on your proposed merger.

DECEPTIVE ACTS AND PRACTICES

The Commission has a number of other interesting statutes that it enforces. In view of the fact that I am going to discuss the antideceptive acts and practices activities of the Commission at the Bosses Night meeting this evening, I shall not touch upon that vast area of Commission activity at this time. This is a field all by itself. This is a fantastic area of activity and includes some almost unbelievable actions on a small, but too large, part of American industry. I am sure that Ripley, who created the famous "Believe It or Not" cartoon column, could have made his living just by sitting at the Federal Trade Commission and writing about the rare and unbelieved things that come to us for attention. So, with your consideration, I will leave the area of deceptive acts and practices for discussion tonight.

WOOL PRODUCTS

I feel that it is my duty to mention to you that the Commission also has jurisdiction under other statutes which are important to you as businessmen here in the State of Ohio. The first of these is Commission activity pursuant to the Wool Products Labeling Act enacted in 1939. Under this act the jurisdiction over proper labeling, advertising, and selling of wool products is a Commission obligation. This act was passed so that persons buying woolen products would not be deceived as to texture, quality, admixture, etc., of the product that they were furnished. The old expression, "All wool and a yard wide," has some application in this connection.

FUR PRODUCTS

In 1951 Congress passed the famous Fur Products Labeling Act. This act required the correct, proper, and honest labeling and advertising and sales invoicing of fur products. With your permission, I am going to touch on this law at our evening meeting.

FLAMMABLE FABRICS

Another important consumer law obligation that the Commission has for consideration is the Flammable Fabrics Act. The purpose of this act is to afford the public protection from wearing apparel made of fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous. The Commission has issued rules and regulations, including required tests, concerning these fabrics. The act was passed in 1953 because certain fabrics had caused death or injury to wearers who were not aware of the dangerous quality of the garment's material. This act carries criminal penalties, including fine and imprisonment.

TEXTILES

In 1958 the last of the consumers' protective statutes administered by the Commission was enacted. This was the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act. This act requires disclosure on a label of the percentage as well as the generic name of the major fiber constituents of textile fiber products. Such products must be enforced as to fiber content in each marketing transaction in order to establish a complete chain of truthful content disclosure from raw fibers to the finished consumer product.

The Commission also administers portions of the McCarran-Ferguson Act, the Lanham Trade-Mark Act, and the Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Act.

A NEW FUNCTION—ADVISORY OPINIONS

It is my understanding that portions of this meeting will be devoted to questions and answers. This is, I believe, the proper way to find out something about the applicable law, and in that connection I must say that the Commission has within the last year embarked upon a program that I think will be of great benefit to the economic community. In June 1962, the Commission authorized a new procedure; namely, the device of issuing advisory opinions. It is now possible for a businessman to determine in advance whether a proposed course of action, if pursued, may violate any of the laws administered by the Commission and, where practicable, to give such businessman the benefit of the Commission's views. This new procedure operates in this way: If a businessman who is contemplating a certain course of action is not sure in his own mind as to whether it is free from violation of any act administered by the Commission, he may write to the Commission, setting forth the facts in connection with his proposal and requesting of the Commission an opinion in advance as to the legality of his contemplated action. If you, as members of the business community, want to find out if it would be wrong for you to perform an act, you may write the Commission and find out whether it's right or wrong. It's much better to find out in advance than to be sued after your contemplated course of action has turned out to be in violation of the law. This may be done by writing the Federal Trade Commission, Washington 25, D.C. I want to say that the device of granting advisory opinions is not a "permit" system. If inquirants do not wish to follow the advice given, they may ignore it.

The Federal Trade Commission wishes to cooperate fully with the members of the business community. If you have any questions or criticisms, please direct them to the Commission. If you wish to secure publications, pamphlets, booklets, and other material that the Commission has available for distribution, just send the Commission a letter stating your request. I am sure that many of you would be surprised to know how many laws apply to the conduct of American business. The Commission maintains branch offices in 11 American cities. In the State of Ohio, the nearest branch office is at Cleveland, at Room 1128, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. Should you wish to come to Washington to discuss your matters with either the staff or the Commission, you may do so at the Commission headquarters at Sixth and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

This discussion is beginning to lengthen out and I must seek terminal facilities.

I am sure that you will agree with me that there just isn't such a thing as getting too much information about one's business. I am sure you will also agree with me that the vast majority of American businessmen want to do the right thing and conduct themselves in a legal, law-abiding, and honorable manner. Many of those who do violate the business laws do so because of ignorance of the law. Therefore, it behooves business people to know what is right and what is wrong about their conduct. The only way to find out what is wrong is for either you or your attorneys to contact the Government and, in turn, in order that we of the Government may have your ideas, we must come to you to hear your points of view and to gain your ideas.

I am sure that there are very few, if any, American businessmen who want to commit economic suicide. By "economic suicide," I mean the practice of pursuing business practices that are in violation of the moral ethics and laws to the point where the Congress of the United States enacts more laws to cover such conduct. A good example of economic suicide is the infamous electrical parts conspiracy that led to the conviction of several prominent business leaders and their companies in the Federal District Court in Philadelphia. Actions like this are reprehensible. I think it can be safely said that every law on the books today that the Federal Trade Commission or any other governmental agency enforces is there because the conduct or the misconduct of somebody caused Congress to enact the law to protect the public generally. Therefore, the only thing to do in order to avoid the increase of regulatory legislation is for business to observe the highest conduct possible so that there will be no reason for the passage of legislation to cover improper conduct. To do otherwise is to bring about economic suicide. Therefore, keep in mind "the party of the third part—the Government." Business and Government must share the burdens of clean competition.

Ladies and gentlemen, it has been a pleasure to have been your guest on this occasion. I wish for you great success via the route of clean, honest, and decent competition.

THE REAL BOSS: THE PUBLIC

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have a copy of the speech given by Federal Trade Commissioner Sigurd Anderson, formerly Governor of South Dakota, to the Annual Bosses' Night meeting of the Middletown, Ohio, Junior Chamber of Commerce.

"The Real Boss: The Public" was the second address of his March 28 visit to Middletown. He undertook to square the efforts of the business community and the Federal Trade Commission with the needs of the public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks by Federal Trade Commissioner Sigurd Anderson be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL BOSS: THE PUBLIC

(By Sigurd Anderson)

Mr. President, distinguished guests, all bosses, future bosses and guests at this Bosses Night banquet sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Middletown, Ohio, it is a pleasure to be with you on this occasion where the young businesspeople and the businesspeople who are not so young, who are their bosses, sit down together with a feeling of common pride in business relationship. I wish it were possible for me to come here tonight as a member of the younger group, but the calendar tells me that no matter how much I wish it, I cannot claim to be a member of the junior chamber of commerce. In fact, it is so long ago since I was eligible for membership in the junior chamber of commerce that I can't remember.

Before we get into the program, I want to say to you members of the junior chamber of commerce that you have the greatest possession that any person can have, namely, youthful years. I am reminded of that statement of the philosopher who gave this injunction to those who would listen: "Remember, you come this way but once." Therefore, make the most of it, in the best way for the greatest good. Remember the advice of Benjamin Franklin—"If thou lovest life, then do not squander time, for that is the stuff life is made of."

It is not my purpose to begin this meeting by making those of you who are more than 35 years of age feel sad; therefore, let us say no more about this age business. I am delighted to have been invited to come here tonight. This splendid industrial area of the great State of Ohio has made and is now making great contributions to the industrial greatness of the United States. I know the pride with which you hold your Buckeye citizenship. I assume that each one of you has in his or her wallet or pocketbook a buckeye as tangible proof of the fact that you are a citizen of the Buckeye State. Sometime ago while attending a banquet in Washington, I met with a Government official who said he was from Ohio. I said, "You are a Buckeye?" He said, "Absolutely." And I asked him in a rather jocular manner, "And you have your buckeye to prove it?" And he said, "Yes, sir." And he fished one out of his pocket and he said, "I carry this with me at all times, and when I change pants I put the buckeye in the pants I am going to wear." That manifestation of pride in one's State is healthy. It's in the same class as the Texans, who are never known for lacking the opportunity to tell the rest of the world where they are from.

When Calvin Lloyd, the president of the Middletown area Chamber of Commerce, and Bruce Evans, the staff associate of the chamber, were making arrangements for my appearance here, we decided that I should discuss a phase of the work of the Federal Trade Commission that would be of general interest to the community. With that in mind, I am going to label my remarks, "The Real Boss—The Public."

ADVICE ON WORKING WITH PEOPLE

Before I dip into my formal remarks, I would like to generally pay my respects to those young men and women who will take over the steering wheel of tomorrow in not too many years hence. I challenge you on the great opportunities before you, and I trust that in the tradition of your predecessors that you will so guide the United States of America and its business enterprises that it will continue to be the greatest Nation in the world. It may be trite to say that the future is in your hands, but, by Jove, I don't know of any statement more truthful.

I cannot help commenting on the fact that all of us are salesmen. Whereas you are salesmen for your businesses and your industry, I am a salesman for the U.S. Government. All of us are salesmen for the greatest product in the world—Americanism. As sales people, not only do our words but also our actions count. Do you remember the words of the famous philosopher who said, "Your actions speak so loud I cannot hear a word of what you say."

The other day I was reading an article in a little publication called the Sample Case, which is the official publication of the United Commercial Travelers. The article, which was entitled, "Making Your Sales Talk Better Understood," was by Ernest W. Fair. I thought the article so penetrating that I am going to set it out in digested form. I feel that you young salesmen, as well as you not-so-young salesmen and I could well take to heart the words of the writer. Here they are:

1. Be sure you understand it yourself.

(a) Too often we deal in generalities.

(b) We cannot expect others to grasp important sales points by generalities.

(c) Accuracy cannot be deduced from general statements.

(d) Be sure that we have a firm and positive understanding of what we are talking about and thinking about.

2. Take no single detail for granted.

(a) There are many routine sales details in daily life which we take for granted because we live with them. Such details may not be understood or may be unknown by the customer.

(b) Check carefully to see that every detail is understandable.

3. Never mind the flowery phrases and language.

(a) Such verbiage does not contribute to clear understanding.

(b) Sometimes flowery phrases are used to avoid saying anything specific and definite.

(c) Clear, sharp and to-the-point words cannot be misunderstood.

(d) Selling has little use for flowery language.

4. Provide needed supplemental material or data.

(a) Many cases of selling failure exist because important information needed to put over the idea was not provided.

(b) Top salesmen always make sure that supplemental data or material is available to help for a better understanding.

5. Slow down.

(a) Speed never pays off in selling.

(b) Too many salesmen seek to impress customers with rapid-fire conversation.

(c) Many talk at high speed because of tensions and eagerness to get the sale over with.

(d) Not every customer has the same hearing capability.

(e) The machine gun approach will leave the listener at odds and wondering what he heard.

(f) The listener must have time to consider what the speaker said.

6. Watch your language.

(a) There are many words which have multiple meanings. Be sure that we have words that convey the same meaning to everybody.

(b) Words must have the same meaning to the customer as to the salesman. If not, no sale.

(c) Choose words that you know the meaning of.

7. The way you say it counts.

(a) Sincerity can be in the tone of the voice.

(b) Speaking with confidence and assurance has no equal in a sales message.

8. Be sure of every single fact.

(a) One bad fact has the same liability as one bad apple in a barrel.

(b) Bad facts can destroy an understanding and ruin a sale.

9. Be sure of complete attention.

(a) Gain the undivided attention of the customer before proceeding—the human brain isn't capable of considering several things at one time.

10. Concentrate on one thing at a time.

(a) Doing so always helps to avoid confusion.

11. Don't beg.

(a) The salesman who begs or tries to use influence seldom succeeds.

(b) Such approach always creates suspicion on the part of the customer.

12. Say it once emphatically.

(a) When one keeps repeating, the other person shuts his mind to the whole business.

The credo set out by Mr. Fair is packed with advice that any person could well accept. I know that advice is hard for a young man or woman to take. And speaking of advice:

I am reminded of the advice of the seven wise men of Greece. I am going to set that out, too. I am very partial to the Greeks, who had one great desire, and that was the desire to be perfect. Well can we of this age emulate the Greeks of the ancient world who created a civilization that has never been equaled. Here are the sayings of these wise men:

1. Pittacus of Mitylene: "Take time by the forelock."

2. Periander of Corinth: "Industry conquers everything."

3. Solon of Athens: "Know thyself."

4. Cleobulus of Rhodes: "Choose the wise middle course."

5. Chilo of Sparta: "Consider the end."

6. Thales of Miletus: "Surety for another is ruin to yourself."

7. Bias of Ionia: "Most men are bad."

At the north entrance of the National Archives Building, one of the most beautiful and substantial buildings in Washington, D.C., there are some statues. On one of them is carved this inscription: "Study the past." The statements of the seven wise men of Greece, men who lived 2,000 years ago, bear out the injunction to study the past because the sayings of these seven wise men of Greece are as important and as potent today as they were the day they were uttered. Wise is he or she who looks upon the past as a guide for the future. As the business leaders of tomorrow, you young men and women who are meeting with your bosses tonight can well consider what the wise men, whether they are the Greeks of 2,000 years ago or the wise people who are your bosses, have given you for your guidance. Never let it be said that you turn down good advice.

DIPPING INTO TRADE REGULATION

In order to carry out my injunction to discuss some of the work of the Federal Trade Commission, I am going to stop philosophizing and dip into trade regulation. This noon, I was the guest of the chamber of commerce at a luncheon. At that time, I gave a not-too-short speech where I discussed some of the acts and practices which were in violation of the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Clayton Act, as amended. This evening, I would like to discuss with you some unfair methods of competition in commerce and some unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce which have by law been declared unlawful.

The Federal Trade Commission is an agency of the Federal Government that was created in 1914 to protect competition in interstate commerce. Since then its powers have been greatly enlarged and expanded. The Commission enforces a large number of statutes, including its basic statute, the Federal Trade Commission Act. The governing body of the Commission is composed of five Commissioners who are appointed for a 7-year term by the President of the United States and are confirmed by the Senate of the United States. The Chairman of the Commission is appointed by the President. Currently the Commission has 1,200 employees. The headquarters of the Commission are in Washington, D.C. The Commission also has 11 branch offices located in the following places: Atlanta, Ga.; Boston, Mass.; Chicago, Ill.; Cleveland, Ohio; Kansas City, Mo.; New Orleans, La.; New York, N.Y.; San Francisco, Calif.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.; and Washington, D.C. As you will note, one of our branch offices is in Cleveland. Should you wish to make any contact with the Commission at any time, you may do so by writing, calling or coming to the Commission headquarters in Washington or at its branch offices. The Commission is interested in serving the people of the United States to the greatest possible extent. In order to know your wishes, you must make them known to us.

The most important part of the Federal Trade Commission Act is set out in section 5(a)(1) of said act and contains only 19 words. Those words are: "Unfair methods of competition in commerce, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce, are hereby declared unlawful." As you have noted, these words do not enumerate what are unfair methods of competition or unfair or deceptive acts or practices. Those are determined by the Commission and, if necessary, by the courts. Congress purposely intended that the powers of the Commission should be "shotgun" in nature. For Congress to have written into a regulatory act of the size and the scope of the Federal Trade Commission Act the precise violations to be proscribed would have required thousands of examples. It would have meant that every session of the Congress would have to consider amendments to the act. Congress in its wisdom made the act very general and gave the Federal Trade Commission the power to act within the periphery of its expertise. And may I say that that periphery may reach to the horizons. I would like to have you remember, then, that the purpose of the Federal Trade Commission is to protect competition.

PROTECTING COMPETITION

The vast majority of American business people are decent, honest, and ethical. But there are some who are not so. There is a number whose halos are very loose. In fact, their halos slip over their ears and get to be as big as hula hoops. It is that group that the Federal Trade Commission and other regulatory agencies of government—Federal, State, and local—try to reach and try to correct. I would like to point out that many of the business laws are violated because of ignorance on the part of the members of the business community. Where, however, the violation is intentional, that is another matter. The Commission does not have the power to proceed criminally in exercising its jurisdiction. The Commission's power is injunctive in nature. It has the power to order a violator to cease and desist from the practices found to have been violated. If the person so charged, whom the Commission calls a respondent, does not obey after the order has been made final, then, of course, civil penalties may be exacted from the offender, and those penalties are severe. Each violation may cost the offender $5,000 per day on occasions. Criminal contempt proceedings may also be brought against violators. But the main purpose of the Commission is to stop the practice of the violators. The Commission has great power to stop practices in their incipiency before they become full blown. This is of great benefit to the public. The Commission has often been called the consumer's protector. We have also been called guardians of the free enterprise system, because we are all familiar with the fact that free enterprise calls for free competition. We have also been called policemen in gray flannel suits. And on occasions we have been called other things. Tonight I would like to touch on the deceptive acts and practices against which the Commission proceeds, practices which the Commission stops by means of the aforementioned orders to cease and desist. Our jurisdiction covers acts in interstate commerce. Therefore, we do not invade the prerogatives of the States. But in this day and age, interstate commerce becomes more and more possible, and, therefore, the areas that the Commission did not invade years ago are today common areas of operation. Let me give you some examples of deceptive acts and practices against which we take action:

HEALTH

Is there anything more important than health? It need not be argued that a person in ill health will spend his fortune to effect a cure. Even when a cure is doubtful, the person ill and distressed will seek good health. The old expression "grasping at a straw" must have had reference to a sick person seeking a cure. In the area of ill health, we find a fertile field for those who sell cures. It is in this area that cruel deception is found at its worst. It is here that we find the examples of those in ill health who spent themselves into the poorhouse, hoping for a cure that never came and that the seller knew could never come. Carl Sandburg, the great writer, put it so well when he said some sellers had this slogan: "This is good for what ails you; if nothing ails you, it's good for that, too." What are some of these cures?

Arthritis cures: Here we have the cruelest of all deceptions. Most arthritis victims cannot be cured because there are few cures for arthritis. This aching, nagging affliction has been a great moneymaker for operators who glowingly advertise and sell pills that are made of aspirin with additives of doubtful worth, copper, zinc, and other metallic bracelets and anklets or metal heel plates, all claimed to bring great relief to those who suffer from arthritis. Another cure for this ailment is to place the victim in a uranium mine so that rays of the uranium ores can penetrate the victim's body and attack the arthritis areas. I have also seen uranium pillows sold for treatment of arthritis of the neck and shoulder areas. The number of these cures that the Federal Trade Commission has stopped is great.

Rheumatism cures: These are a lot like arthritis cures. I don't believe this area has the money attraction for operators as does arthritis.

Obesity cures: This is a profitable area of operation. Here it can be said that those who offer and sell these cures literally "live off the fat of the land." It is quite a temptation for an overweight person to buy preparations that permit him to eat his favorite food and at the same time enable him to lose weight. This is a good example of "eating one's cake and having it, too." Medical authorities are firm on the proposition that caloric intake generally determines weight. In other words, "Don't eat so much." It is tough to be a Spartan. But it's that or else, if obesity is a problem. There is no magic in weight reduction—just plain willpower.

Hair restorer, preparations, and treatments: One of the banes of the male is baldness. Millions of men have traced the loss of their hair from a receding of the hairline or thinning to a complete "fringe on top." The campaign to either stop the loss of hair or to restore the hair has been, is now, and will be expensive, trying and burdensome to the anxious male with hair troubles. Countless cures, both by preparation or treatment claiming effectiveness, have been stopped by the Federal Trade Commission. Most baldness, 90 to 95 percent thereof, is male pattern baldness, for which there is no cure. Baldness is generally hereditary by nature. To avoid baldness, a man should choose his ancestors more carefully.

BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES

This is an area where the Commission has been very active in stopping many schemes. These alleged opportunities are offered to the aged, the crippled, the retired, or the part-time workers of our country. When a retired person or an old or crippled person discovers that he or she does not have sufficient means for living, it is only natural that they will look around for supplemental income. These so-called business opportunities that are advertised and offered read and sound most alluring and before the "customer" is aware of the true nature of the business opportunity, he or she has already been victimized. It is indeed a cruel perpetration of fraud to practice upon persons who are so badly in need, but that is of no moment to the sharp operator who is interested in deception and a quick sale. Some of the types of business opportunities that the Commission has stopped are certain vending machine operations, home repair operations, and the like. Some time ago a large number of retired farmers in a Midwestern State who had invested heavily in vending machines attempted to sell the machines back to the operator who had painted such a glowing picture of financial independence from the use of the machines. When he was asked to buy the machines back, he made the classic comment, "I am in the business of selling vending machines, not buying vending machines." I cannot stress too strongly that those who are looking for business opportunity should be careful that the plan that they enter into is a bona fide operation and is not a scheme to defraud them of their money. I am sure that many of you know of friends or relatives who have been victimized. You can do no better than to urge friends and relatives to be careful, wise, and judicious in consideration of any business opportunities where the persons dealt with are not hometown people known to the community.

ADVANCE FEE DEALS

This is a type of business operation that flourished several years ago but has now tapered off due to the activities of the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Justice, and the Post Office Department. Briefly, the operation is as follows: Where a person has real estate to sell, he or she is approached by representatives of a reputed national real estate firm that promises to make quick and ready sales of real estate. As the contract is entered into, it is explained by these representatives that it will be necessary to have a portion of the commission or the selling fee paid in advance. The smooth representatives make the story so realistic and so persuasive that the prospective seller will advance a part of the fee and after that, hear no more about the sale or the fee. This type of operation, according to authorities, cost the American people around $60 million in 1957. At the Federal Trade Commission, we still receive continuing reports about advance-fee deals. Many of you own property or you have friends or relatives who own property. If you or they wish to sell, certainly a sale can be effected through a reputable real estate firm. Dealing with strangers who are persuasive and plausible can be a dangerous business.

EDUCATIONAL FRAUDS

This is a field that should be of interest to all of us. Even the wisest become victims of plausible schemes, and that includes Ph. D.'s. In fact, lawyers and doctors may be included in this category. Many persons seeking to advance themselves take correspondence courses. There are many fine correspondence schools in the United States. But there are also many correspondence schools whose courses are of little, if any, value. It is tragic that young people or those with limited means should invest their money and their time in a correspondence course that is valueless and sometimes indeed a downright fraud. In this connection, the Commission has taken action against correspondence schools offering practical nurses training, heavy machine equipment training, preparation for Government positions, preparation for positions in foreign countries, airline hostess work and airline mechanics work, and many others that have been found to be deceptive and fraudulent in nature. A prospective student should be sure that the training received from the schools is of value and should check with one in a position to know before investing his or her time and money.

The Commission has many distressing letters in its files from people who discovered too late that the correspondence course that they had completed was valueless. It may be of interest to know that diploma mills are still grinding away, although their activities have been greatly reduced. Not long ago, the Commission successfully completed a case against a diploma mill that was offering special degrees to clergymen, of all people! With the great number of fine educational institutions available, it seems almost ridiculous to seek out some unknown institution in order to get a degree. An enterprising young man in the New England States recently came into contact with the Commission on a scheme called a diploma equivalency plan. For a certain stated consideration, this young man and his school—of about two teachers—would test individuals in any desired educational field, and, if they met the test, they would receive an equivalency diploma. Quite recently the Commission brought actions against a number of the large encyclopedia manufacturers for unlawful methods in selling their products to the public. Many of the high-pressure schemes used to sell these products to the public are somewhat like this: A smooth young man represents to the husband or wife, or both, that they have been specially selected to receive a free set or receive a reduced price if they will buy certain supplemental volumes of the publication or if they will permit their names to be used in the community as prominent people who have the seller's product. The undermining influence of the alleged low price or no price at all, with the statement that they are considered to be prominent people in the community, usually results in a sale. Upon investigation, the buyer usually discovers he paid the regular price for the product.

The gimmicks that are employed to break down sales resistance are both ingenious in nature and countless in number.

FUR PRODUCTS

In view of the fact that a fur coat or other fur garment has tremendous appeal to the women of America, I should warn you that there has been considerable deception in the sale of furs. Thanks to the efforts of the law enforcement agencies and the fur people, as well as the Better Business Bureaus of the country, the deception in this area has been almost eliminated, but there still remains some deception. The Fur Products Labeling Act requires that a fur garment shall have attached thereto a label indicating the name of the animal from which the fur came. One of the furs that lent itself to deception was rabbitskin. Rabbitskin could be processed to look like a very expensive fur. Processed rabbitskin with an exotic foreign name was sold widely. The buyers were not aware that it was a rabbitskin. Who among you would knowingly buy a rabbitskin coat? According to fur products authorities, there are 95 names for rabbitskin, including such names as Baltic lion, electric seal, electric beaver, and Hudson Bay seal. It may also interest you to know that Hudson seal is dyed and processed muskrat. There are many persons who were unaware that the fur for their Hudson seal coat bought years ago was the lowly muskrat. In connection with fur products deception, I am reminded of a story of the burglar who told his girl friend, "Honey, I have a mink stole for you. I don't know if it is mink, but I know it is stole."

DECEPTIVE PRICING

This is the type of sales technique that is a fraud upon the public. It can be explained as follows: The prospective customer sees a product advertised in the store. The product, let us say, is a watch marked $75. Someone has stricken the $75 with a marking pencil and down below are these words: "Now $20". To the public this means one thing: that the watch has previously sold for $75 and is now selling for $20. This is a tremendous inducement to buy. The fact of the matter is that the watch had probably never been sold for $75, was never intended to sell for $75, and offering the watch at this considerably "lower" price is just a gimmick. This type of deceptive pricing, usually called "preticketing," is a sales technique that is, of course, generally dishonest and generally unlawful.

A BIG DIFFICULTY: GETTING PEOPLE TO ADMIT THEY'VE BEEN VICTIMIZED

The above examples constitute but a few of the types of business frauds that the Federal Trade Commission and other law enforcement agencies have to deal with. It would be possible for me to give you scores of other examples, but time and space do not permit. I think that these examples do demonstrate a small portion of the whole area of deception and fraud upon the public.

Every one of us has a blind spot. Will Rogers once said, "Everybody is ignorant—only on different subjects." And how true that is. Sinclair Lewis, the famous author of "Main Street" who grew up at Sauk Centre, Minn., once said, "People will buy anything that's one to a customer." It was Oliver Goldsmith who said, "Every absurdity has a champion to defend it." Each of us may be strong, but in some respect or other we have an Achilles heel or a weakness. Even some of the shrewdest business people have bought worthless stock. We should recognize our weaknesses and guide ourselves accordingly. One of the difficulties that faces the Federal Trade Commission in successfully concluding injunctive actions against those who engage in unfair and unethical business practices is the fact that most Americans will not admit their failures. Years ago, a prominent advertiser used this slogan: "Even your best friends won't tell you." That is so true in connection with persons who have been victimized. They don't want to admit that they have been the victims of a fraud. For that reason, there must be countless fraudulent schemes that never come to light because of the reluctance of the victims to speak up. It is for that reason that all possible publicity should be given to schemes that are deceptive in character, so that the public may be warned.

Business frauds follow us from the womb to the tomb. It can be said that frauds run from our heads to our heels. The grandchildren of the men who sold the Brooklyn Bridge are now offering bargains that are better than their grandfathers ever thought of. It is unfortunate that the public has to be subjected to these deceptions but it is a fact of life that we must accept.

NEED FOR A WARY PUBLIC

The best policeman in protecting the public against frauds is an alert, educated and knowledgeable public. The Federal Trade Commission believes that the primary responsibility for clean, fair, and honest competition is that of the businessman and most businessmen accept this challenge. For those businessmen who do not accept this challenge and do not subscribe to that view, the Federal Trade Commission and other regulatory bodies, national, State, and local, have to step in and "blow the whistle." May I say that the obligation of the press, radio, and television is also most apparent in protecting the public. The advent of television has opened an avenue of attack by those who practice deception that is rather alarming to contemplate. I repeat, the press, radio, and television, as well as the advertising agencies, carry heavy obligations in protecting the public. I do not believe that they can escape these obligations under the guise that freedom of the press must be widely observed. With freedom to speak and to print, there also goes the obligation of not lending one's services to the machinations and schemes of those who deceive.

It must be apparent that all of us—you as young business people, your bosses as the older business people, and I as a representative of the Government—have one boss, and that is the public. The old expression, "The customer is always right," is an expression that neither you nor I can ignore with impunity, because in the last analysis the real boss is the public, those that we serve, those that buy our goods, those who pay for our services. Therefore, it behooves all of us to bear in mind that it is the public in the final analysis that is going to sit in judgment upon our actions. And I think that I could best close my discourse this evening by quoting the words of one of the shrewdest judges of human nature that has ever lived—the rail splitter of Illinois, the sage of the Sangamon, Abraham Lincoln, who said, "If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all of the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all the people all the time." Therefore, let us remember that our real boss, your real boss, and my real boss is the American public and that our dedication to that boss will pretty well determine how great the United States of America will be and for how long. May God grant us the power to serve the public honestly, cleanly, and faithfully. Thank you and good night.

BETTER CITIZENSHIP PROGRAM FROM KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as a former governor of the Minnesota-Dakotas District of Kiwanis International, and as a member of my hometown Kiwanis club in Madison, S. Dak. for more than 30 years, I have always felt it a privilege to have the opportunity to be associated with the important work of this organization.

Today I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate another of the outstanding citizenship projects undertaken by Kiwanis International.

Kiwanis clubs throughout the United States and Canada, in cooperation with local, school, and youth officials, and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, are spearheading a timely new program directed toward helping youngsters make better citizens of themselves. The program, called "You and the Law," is a series of educational devices designed to teach youngsters, from the 7th through the 12th grades, the basic fundamentals and protections of the law.

The program's aim is stated as "to help adolescents recognize the sometimes fine line between high spirits and a serious breach of the law. No one frowns on high spirits," it says, "but fun simply cannot encroach upon your neighbor's person or property without serious consequences."

In a booklet which the Kiwanis club is making available, through proper authorities, to youngsters of the community, the questions are posed:

> This is a free country, isn't it? So why can't we do anything we feel like doing?

The booklet answers itself by saying:

> Here are the answers: We could if each of us lived entirely alone, but this is not possible. America is a land of freedom; freedom to do as we wish and go where we will—but only if we do not trespass on the rights of others. At this point freedom ends.

The booklet will be supplemented by school assemblies, Boy Scout, Girl Scout, Key Club, and other youth group meetings devoted to the subject; field trips to courts; the viewing of films; and discussions on the law, on delinquency, and on rights and responsibilities, moderated by teachers and other youth leaders.

The booklet and supplementary materials were written by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in consultation with nationally prominent educators and police officials.

The idea of the program, "You and the Law," was originally conceived and developed by the Westchester, N.Y., Citizens Committee—an affiliate of the National Council, several years ago. As a result of the program, and other practical steps in prevention, youthful delinquency was substantially reduced there, and the project was widely acclaimed.

When it was decided to make a national project of "You and the Law" the National Council on Crime and Delinquency asked Kiwanis International—long a leader in service to youth—to act as cosponsors.

Mr. President, I know that my 100 colleagues in the House and Senate who are members of Kiwanis International, join with me in the hope that this new program will achieve the rewarding results of helping young Americans everywhere to not only better understand the importance of good citizenship but encourage a more active participation in those plans and projects which help to preserve our free society.

REDUCTION OF FOREIGN AID

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion in the press about reducing foreign aid, particularly since the publication of the report of the Clay Committee, appointed by the President. Almost everyone agrees now that a reduction in the overall program should be made. The President himself has recommended reductions in his original foreign aid request. The debate now hinges on the degree of the reduction and the timetable.

I have supported foreign aid in the past as money well spent for mutual security. However, it appears that some of the money has been wasted through maladministration. It also appears that money spent for the sole purpose of buying friends for the United States has been ill spent. Without doubt, reductions must be made. But, caution must be used in the reductions; they should not be made too fast.

An excellent editorial on this subject appeared in the April 7, 1963, issue of the Baltimore Sunday Sun. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE WAY TO LOSE

The all-out opponents of foreign aid are crying foul after Secretary Rusk's harsh words of Friday; and some proponents of aid feel that a more courteous approach would have served better to forward Mr. Rusk's case. He did not, as charged, call the down-with-aiders "Communist sympathizers," but he did say that it was beyond his understanding why "any American would want to cooperate" with the Communist global strategy of getting Americans and American influence withdrawn not only from Western Europe but also from the Mediterranean, South Asia, the Far East, Latin America, Africa, and elsewhere. Aid cuts too severe, he said, would amount to such cooperation.

That is indeed rough language. What impelled the Secretary of State, ordinarily quiet-spoken at home as abroad, to resort to it? His reasons are not difficult to guess.

The Clay Committee report, issued 2 weeks ago, was seized upon by the down-with-aiders as a weapon against the whole program. They have picked up and brandished those sections of the report critical of past procedures, and those sections recommending reductions, phasings-out and in some instances terminations. With much of this the administration agrees, but it emphatically does not agree with the opponents' view that the sense of the report is antiaid. The administration emphasizes rather the committee's statement that "it is our purpose in this report to point out how this essential program can be strengthened * * * and our criticisms and proposals here should be viewed in this light."

Opposition to aid boils down to the question: In what way is it essential? Every national administration since World War II has given answers to that, in various forms. The answers can be boiled down, too:

We could lose the world struggle on the periphery. We could lose it in the Middle East. We could lose it, as the Clay Committee declared bluntly, in South Asia—the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent. We could lose it in Southeast Asia, including the islands, and in the Far East, and in Latin America and Africa. We could lose it to a degree even in Afghanistan. If in these places, bit by bit and one by one, our support were removed and our influence eroded, the enemy in many regions would have simply to walk in.

To prevent that, now and into the future, is the first purpose of foreign aid. Mr. Rusk's knowledge of how vital a purpose it is may have led him into tactlessness, but the point needed making and cannot be backed down from.

FERTILIZER FROM COAL

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, now that spring is here many a householder's fancy has lightly turned to thoughts of seeds, flowers, and fertilizer. And throughout the Nation, and indeed in many other countries of the world, a new and remarkably efficient fertilizer, produced in Glenrock, Wyo., is being marketed. The essential ingredient for the fertilizer, Mr. President, is coal.

I mention this new fertilizer and the $1 million plant built at Glenrock to produce it, as another example of the ingenuity that is utilizing Wyoming's great potential for growth and development. Coal is not ordinarily thought of as the basis for fertilizer, yet someone had the ingenuity to look into Wyoming's leonhardite ore and found it rich in humic acid, a potent fertilizing agent. On that discovery this industry was founded.

In like manner, Mr. President, we await many new discoveries, and I would point out that I have introduced Senate Joint Resolution 7 which would provide for the investigation of new methods of utilizing mineral deposits in the West and throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, an article describing the new fertilizer plant at Glenrock appeared in the March 31 issue of the Casper Star-Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLENROCK PLANT PRODUCES NEW KIND OF FERTILIZER

(By Irving Garbutt)

A swirl of black soot envelopes a cluster of tanks and a steel building along the highway east of Glenrock, where begrimed workers resembling blackface comedians are wheeling out 50-pound paper bags and loading a 50-ton North Western railroad car.

This is American Humates new $1 million fertilizer plant, a new industry in central Wyoming, in fact the only plant of its kind in the world—grinding and pelleting leonhardite ore into a new type fertilizer rich in humic acid.

The process is secret and you can't lug a camera into the sooty interior to photograph the equipment, but anyone from the Wisconsin dairy belt would recognize the big spray tank of the same type used to convert skim milk into the familiar powdered form found on grocery shelves.

The finely ground leonhardite ore, similarly, is heated by powerful gas jets and sprayed against the interior walls of the tank, then collected below, mixed with chemical fertilizers, pelleted and bagged for shipment.

The dust from the operation looks like coal dust, but Charles F. Canfield, vice president of the company and the engineer who helped to assemble this pilot plant explains that leonhardite is something special. Soft, lignite coal, ground up, would have no value as fertilizer. But leonhardite, halfway between peat from an Irish bog and lignite coal in the geological scale, is rich in humic acid.

It is said to have 60 times as much humus as sheep manure.

NO GOOD FOR HEAT

The ore, as it comes to the plant from deposits north of Glenrock, looks like the poorest, airslacked type of soft coal imaginable, with sulfur streaks in it, and John Ford, plant manager, explains that it is too low in Btu content to burn in your old coal heating stove, if you had one.

Even the early settlers would pass up this stuff for heating fuel, preferring buffalo chips, but it is reported to be a great soil conditioner and plant stimulator, and there is enough of it around Glenrock to run the plant for the next 200 years.

A crew of 13 hands working in three shifts at the new plant is busy meeting demands for the new fertilizer, which has been tested by orchardists, nurserymen, university specialists and farmers in many States, with surprisingly good results. This is the height of the fertilizer shipping season, and the plant can't keep up with the orders rolling in, says Ford.

At first, it was anticipated most of the product would be shipped to distant markets, but a demand developed in the Wyoming area also.

Mr. and Mrs. Homer Lathrop, well-known local feed and machinery dealers, formed a corporation known as the Western Humus & Supply Co. last month to distribute the product, known as Aqua Humus, to dealers in Wyoming, Montana, and western Nebraska. It is available in 50-pound bags and later will be sold in retail stores in convenient, 10-pound plastic bags for home gardeners and the housewife with potted plants.

GRASS IS GREENER

Lathrop treated some strips of fairways at the newly seeded Paradise Valley golf course late last fall. The treated strips show up a brighter, lusher green in an aerial photo, outstripping growth in the surrounding grass which was treated with the usual commercial chemical fertilizer applications.

A Glenrock dairyman, Allan Brubaker, also found the product stimulated his cornfield last year.

It is reported to make potatoes firmer, with 3 weeks' earlier maturity; stimulates the growth and improves the quality of many other field and garden crops.

"This is because the humus triggers other soil nutrients, makes them available in soluble form," said Lathrop.

Shipments of the new fertilizer product from Wyoming have been made all over the world, to points as distant as Tel Aviv, Israel; and Peru, as well as all over the United States. Already this year, a carload has been dispatched to Washington State, and another to Maryland. It has proved beneficial to cabbage and lettuce crops, tobacco, potatoes, and commercial rose fields.

Lathrop believes this surprising fertilizer product will find wide acceptance in Wyoming, since it loosens up heavy gumbo soil and makes it friable, counteracts alkaline soils, and improves the moisture retention of sandy and gravelly soils.

The plant has a capacity of turning out 10,000 tons of fertilizer a year.

MEDICARE, INSURANCE, OLD AGE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, recently Mr. Loraine Rollins, editor of the Uinta County Herald, of Evanston, Wyo., celebrated his 80th birthday. Ordinarily such an event would be cause for real celebration and I am sure that many of Loraine's friends did indeed pay him homage on that day.

However, Mr. President, he also received a short note from his insurance company informing him that because of his age his sickness policy was terminated.

I need not draw any conclusions about this action or its relevance to the debate on medical care payments to the aged through social security. Loraine is an extremely competent journalist and I would ask unanimous consent that his editorial on this action, which appeared in the March 28 edition of his newspaper be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICARE, INSURANCE, OLD AGE

(By Loraine Rollins)

Much has been said, written and pictured during the past 2 or 3 years over what has been termed "medicare." Concerning that question there has been a division of sentiment. Certain groups have been strong for the passage of the proposed measure by Congress. Other groups have strenuously opposed and have fought it on every turn. At present it remains a burning but an unsolved question.

The group that has been in favor of the proposed measure, more so than any other group, are the aged people of the Nation. They, of course, would be benefited more than any other group. There are two groups in particular that have fought the passage of the measure at every turn of the road. Thus far they have blocked its passage. These two groups are the AMA (American Medical Association) and the powerful insurance companies. I speak now of companies that solicit, sell and issue health and accident policies.

There seems to be a reason why the insurance companies are opposed to it. The passage of the measure would reduce their income. At the same time it may call a halt to some of their practices.

Many of our people, perhaps the vast majority of them are not familiar with practices of these companies.

Well let me inform you of how they do business with their policy holders. I am in a position to know.

Several years ago, in the year 1946 to be exact, I took out a policy with a big and powerful insurance company with headquarters in Chicago. It was a sickness policy. At that time I was already the holder of a health and accident policy with the same company. This I had held for several years.

Did I read the sickness policy carefully? I don't remember. If so, I paid no attention to one of its provisions. Or perhaps I had forgotten it.

Well during the past week I received a reminder. In a letter dated March 14, I received a notice which read in part:

"As you undoubtedly know your sickness policy has a provision in it which automatically terminates the contract when you reach your 80th birthday."

Then I was reminded that I have passed my 80th birthday.

It stated further that my policy was paid to August 21, 1963. Then came the businesslike statement: "Effective August 21, 1963, your policy will be canceled." That was followed by a very friendly statement—spreading a little salve on the sore spot. It said: "It has been a pleasure to be of service to you under your sickness policy."

Upon receipt of the letter I found the policy and sure enough there in plain but small type I found the statement that "the policy shall not cover any person over the age of 80 years."

After a little research I found that the company actually had been of service to me. It had accepted my premium payments for 17 years. That's where the service both started and ended, except for the protection it offered. It was not an expensive policy, but during its lifetime I had paid the company $544. I had received nothing in return. I had enjoyed fairly good health. I had not been hospitalized.

Doesn't it appear that I may need the protection now more so than ever before? But such protection is not forthcoming—at least not from that company.

What has happened to me may and no doubt does happen to hundreds of other persons. These and many other instances that happen to the aged people of our country are among the reasons why medicare—assistance to the aged—was proposed that they may have proper care during their declining years.

The action taken by the company to which reference is made is perfectly legal. But the company is certainly not assuming its moral responsibility.

Big companies in general strenuously object to any Government interference or control. But given a free hand many of them take undue advantage of their customers. Certainly the older people need to be protected against the system under which they operate.

Here is an afterthought. In addition to the sickness policy above referred to, I have two other policies with the same company, one of which I have carried for approximately 25 years. During the life of these policies I have paid a total of approximately $1,300 in premiums, and what do I get as a reward? The cheering news that effective August 21 my policy will be canceled.

Let me add that this company has had some very efficient, persuasive salesmen who have dealt with gullible customers, such as I.

A DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, PERTINENT QUESTIONS, A COURSE OF ACTION

Since writing the above statement, I have determined to speak out boldy.

I propose a new declaration of independence, or rather, an addition to the Declaration of Independence. Here it is:

We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they have been endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness—and the right to grow old.

I submit a few questions:

Shall our country, which has long and rightly proclaimed equal rights to all and special privileges to none continue to allow certain or any concerns to divide our citizens into special groups and classes?

Should these concerns, many of which have grown rich and powerful, be allowed to solicit business from our residents, accept their money, offer protection to a certain point and then even within their legal rights, withhold protection and all business connection?

Should our country that has battled and is still battling over the question of civil rights—equality to all, regardless of race, color, religion (or age) be allowed to draw the age line?

Should our country that has sent, and is sending billions of dollars to foreign countries to assist the depressed and downtrodden, including the aged, allow powerful concerns to divide our people into separate classes and discriminate against those who have reached a certain age?

Is there anything criminal connected with growing old? Should one be highly respected in his business, sought until he reaches a particular milepost in his career, and then all of a sudden be pushed aside and forced to join the ranks of "the forgotten man"?

This is the second time within a period of 2 years that I have been notified that my insurance policy has been canceled by companies with which I have done business for many years, not because of anything that I have done, or failed to do, but in each case "because of my age."

For a period of more than 45 years I have been writing and publishing editorials singing the praises of my country, the country that I love—the "land of the free and the home of the brave." And now I find myself denied the privilege that I have enjoyed over a long period of years—privileges all others enjoy with the exception of one class—the class of the aged.

It is high time that we in this class—that are in it through no fault of our own—stand up on our "hind legs" and demand equal right with all others of our countrymen.

It is my purpose to mail a copy of this editorial to the insurance company. Other copies will be sent to the Wyoming insurance commissioner; the U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare Department; to each of the Wyoming congressional delegation; to the White House press secretary with the suggestion that if he considers it of sufficient importance, he call it to the attention of President Kennedy.

NEW JERSEY STANDS OUT AT CHERRY BLOSSOM FESTIVAL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we from New Jersey always enjoy sharing the Cherry Blossom Festival with the residents of the District of Columbia. Our State is so close to the District in terms of the time it takes to travel here on highways that we feel as if we are neighbors, especially at this very pleasant time of year.

This year we had added reason to enjoy the annual parade and to feel a sense of pride at those who represented us in the festival. One New Jersey group, the Queens Guard Air Force ROTC Unit from Rutgers, the State university, won first place in the drill team contest. The third place in the same competition was won by the Pershing Rifles of St. Peter's College in Jersey City.

And the State float—bearing our beautiful princess, Miss Ingrid Helmke, of Kinellon—won third place in that competition.

These accomplishments would not have been possible unless the individuals and groups involved had not worked hard and practiced hard. I think that their performance shows the high regard they have, not only for the State they represent, but for the annual festival here. We from the Garden State are proud of their performance here.

PEACE CORPS' LAWYER PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I was pleased to learn that the ranks of Peace Corps volunteers are soon to be swelled by an eager group of young lawyers, some of them just finishing law school.

I could not help recalling the famous advice of Mr. Justice Holmes to a questioning young law student, "Have faith and pursue the unknown end." Historians may one day write of the Peace Corps in terms of this great lawyer's advice. I know of few greater living examples of unbounded faith than that embodied in the Peace Corps.

The law profession enjoys an unprecedented level of esteem in America. Its contribution to the governmental structure of this country has been of great significance, not only because we, under a government of laws, rely heavily on the service of lawyers as public figures, but because the legal profession has given us some of our greatest leaders—Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln come readily to mind.

Lawyers were among the earliest to respond to the idea of the Peace Corps, and many are already overseas in adminstrative and technical capacities. The idea of a specialized lawyers' project, however, is a very recent one. The first group is scheduled to begin training in August 1963. The volunteers will teach in law schools, work with courts and legislatures, and assist in public administration projects. These are weighty tasks, fraught with far-reaching implications for the countries which have requested their services. I am confident that these young men will be a credit to themselves and their profession.

Finally, the American Bar Association has given the project a strong endorsement and is working closely with the Peace Corps in order to make it a success. Their guidance and counsel should be of great value.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article announcing the lawyers' project, taken from the March 1963 American Bar Association Journal, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Peace Corps Lawyer Volunteers: Architects of the Free Societies

The American Bar Association and the Peace Corps have combined their talents to enlist lawyer volunteers for legal service in Africa.

On February 4 the house of delegates of the association, meeting in New Orleans, La., gave overwhelming approval to a resolution supporting a Peace Corps lawyers' project which would provide qualified lawyers for a variety of legal assignments in Nigeria, Sierra Leone, West Cameroon, and Liberia. Earlier, the board of governors had approved the three-part resolution. Its provisions are:

1. That the association support and encourage a Peace Corps pilot program which would meet the requests from developing nations for Americans trained in the legal profession, in accordance with its basic concept to promote world peace and friendship.

2. That the association bring to the attention of the legal profession nationally the unique opportunities offered by this program to perform a worthy public service.

3. That the association encourage law firms and others employing lawyers to consider granting leaves of absence to lawyers who wish to volunteer for the pilot program.

Commenting on this action, President Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., said: "American lawyers are equipped by training and by tradition to respond to needs for professional and public services in many forms. All the volunteers will gain a broadened professional experience and the rewards of having helped serve as architects of the free societies developing in these lands which have newly won their independence."

The Peace Corps regional lawyers' project has been developed to assist African nations to strengthen their legal and judicial systems and to establish facilities for legal education. In Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and West Cameroon volunteer lawyers will be working in five basic capacities. These are:

1. Legal and administrative assistance in local courts. Here the volunteers will aid in the administration of justice in the local magistrates' courts where many judges have no legal training.

2. Codification of customary law. This work could involve considerable travel. It would deal with problems arising from the integration of customary law with national statutory law and the common and statutory law received from the former colonial government.

3. Teaching law in newly organized law schools.

4. Organizing and editing professional law journals and law reports.

5. Legal assistance in tax administration and enforcement. This will include research, drafting of opinions and the preparation of courses for litigation. The work would be of special interest to American lawyers since it would involve interplay of federal and regional law and institutions.

The Liberia project differs in scope. In this program lawyers will be assigned to a public administration project under the supervision of Liberia's Special Commission on Government Operation, which is similar to the U.S. Hoover Commission.

To be eligible for either of these projects, applicants must have an LL.B. degree, but not necessarily admission to the bar. In addition, a year's clerkship in a law office or with a judge would be helpful. A summer internship on Capitol Hill, in one of the judical arms of the Federal or a State Government or in a legal office of a Federal agency would also be valuable.

Preferably, volunteer lawyers should be single. Married couples will be considered for Liberia, however, but they should meet the following requirements: both husband and wife must volunteer together and the wife should be a lawyer or possess a skill usable in another project training for Liberia at the same time. They may have no dependents under 18.

All Peace Corps volunteers must be American citizens. There is no maximum age limit. Training for Liberia and the other three countries is expected to begin in late summer. It will be held at a leading American law school.

For all the projects—Liberia and regional Africa—volunteer lawyers will take an intensive program covering the history, culture and tradition of their host nations. They will also study established judicial procedures and language dialects, if necessary. Refresher courses in legal studies will be part of the program, along with a review of the American system of government. Much of their study and experience will not be obtained in the classroom, according to Peace Corps officials who say: "Through imagination, ingenuity and on-the-spot activity, the volunteer will learn his legal craft."

Volunteer lawyers, as all Peace Corps volunteers, do not receive salaries. Instead, they receive $75 a month readjustment allowance which is paid at the end of the 2-year tour of duty—a total of $1,800. Volunteers are provided with medical care and transportation along with allowances to cover food, clothing, housing and incidentals. They are expected to live on the same level as the people with whom they are working.

Volunteer questionnaires and additional information on this program may be obtained by writing to Jules Pagano, Director, Professional and Technical Division, Peace Corps, Washington, D.C.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON UPON RECEIVING THE B'NAI B'RITH HUMAN RIGHTS AWARD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a wonderful tribute was paid a fine American on April 4 when Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was awarded the B'nai B'rith Human Rights Award in New York City.

Certainly no individual is more deserving of this honor than my good friend, the Vice President, who has given unselfishly and tirelessly to the cause of human rights.

In accepting the award, the Vice President described this as the century of human rights. He pointed out that it was not too long ago that the thought that all men and women—regardless of race, creed, color, or origin—were entitled to equality of treatment, was a novel idea.

> Our American vocabulary is filled with frequent expressions identifying illiteracy, illness, ignorance, and poverty as the oppressors of humankind—

The Vice President declared.

> I believe we need to complete our vocabulary by acknowledging frankly that the greatest oppressor of all continues to be that of bias and prejudice.

Mr. President, these are strong words, easily understood and meaningful for peoples not only of this Nation but throughout the world. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Vice President's address be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Century of Human Rights

(Address by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson upon receiving the B'nai B'rith Human Rights Award in New York City, April 4, 1963)

You do me a very great honor by this award tonight. For deeply personal reasons, it is a most gratifying honor—most gratefully received— and I thank you for it.

In responding to what has been so generously said, I realize that I cannot divorce my personal words from my public station nor can I disregard the public nature of this occasion. But insofar as it is possible, I would like to speak with you as I might do privately.

This century in which we live has been given many names. One predecessor in the office I hold described it eloquently as the century of the common man. Others have applied different descriptions of both hope and despair. For myself, I feel it may be most accurately and aptly described as the century of human rights.

It may seem paradoxical to refer to a century which has seen the rise of two of the greatest tyrannies in history—fascism and communism—as the century of human rights. But in the light of historic human behavior, it becomes apparent that there is no paradox whatsoever—in fact, that the rise of these forces is evidence of the growing strength of the cause of equality.

The intense fury with which the totalitarians of both the right and the left deny the concept of human rights is the measure of their realization that their cause is doomed. People who are truly confident, people who truly believe they represent the wave of the future, do not resort to mass denial of age-old religious practices, mass denial of political rights, or mass extermination. These are the weapons of frustration—the last resort of men who know, however loudly they may deny the fact, that they have reached the end of one of the blind alleys of history.

It is difficult for our generation—which has known of Dachau and Warsaw, of the imprisonment of Cardinals and the fate of Passover in the Soviet Union—to realize the tremendous advance of the concept of equal rights in the mid-20th century.

A few short decades ago, the thought that all men and women—regardless of race, creed, color, or origin—were entitled to equality of treatment was a novel idea. There was a concept of tolerance, but to far too many people it was a tolerance for "lesser breeds without the law" who were to be treated with kindness and humanity but not with equal regard as fellow human beings.

There are very few thinking men today who regard this kind of tolerance as a virtue, however much it may have contributed at one time to peaceful relations. The whole moral drive of the Western World is focused on the concept that we are all children of God—however we may worship our God—and entitled to judgment on our individual merits without regard to irrelevant considerations of ancestry.

This is the true "wave of the future"—the fulfillment of the dreams and hopes of moral men throughout the ages. However much we may fall short of our ideals, we are striving to attain them with an intensity heretofore unknown to history. They have become an accepted part of the fabric of our society. And however vehement may be the forces of bigotry, the fact remains that those forces are on the defensive. They are fighting a losing battle.

That is why I am confident our century—the century of human rights—will be remembered for the legacy it leaves to the future more than for its inheritance from the past.

SEASON OF CHANGE

I would like to speak for these few moments about certain of our special American responsibilities to the greater fulfillment of this century of human rights.

It is abundantly clear that in the course of our Nation's affairs, we have arrived at a season of change in our policies and our relationships with the world—especially the non-Communist world. A period of searching reassessment has begun. However, we lose—and others lose—a necessary and indispensable perspective, when we neglect the fact that this is also a time for reassessment by all nations of the free world community.

All of us together are emerging from a period which has seen history's greatest explosion of political rights. We are also emerging from the early phase of what has been called the explosion of economic aspirations. In a very brief period, new world standards of political equality and equality of economic expectations have been established and we cannot neglect the implications.

We of America welcome what has happened. We are proudly conscious that both the revolution of political independence and the revolution of economic expectations had their beginnings on these shores. We are conscious of special responsibilities to these forces which have reshaped the destinies of so many men. Our national policies since World War II have sought to honor those special responsibilities.

As the authentic revolutionaries of the world, however, we of America must make it clear to those who have chosen freedom that the revolution of freedom is fundamentally and above all else a revolution of human rights. And we must make it clear not only by words but by example and precept. Our own house must be in order.

HARD DECISIONS

When our system was created, many hard decisions were required. None was harder—none was more revolutionary—than the decision embodied in our Bill of Rights that the Central Government should be prohibited from serving as the instrument for perpetuation of the prejudices and bias and discrimination of any sect or segment of American society. This decision was—and has continued to be—fundamental to our American unity, fundamental to our American capacity for economic growth, fundamental to the eternal harmony of our society, and fundamental to our capacity for exercising leadership on behalf of freedom beyond our own shores.

We must not acquiesce passively to any concept that the world can enjoy a new freedom while remaining the accomplice and prisoner of old prejudices.

To say this is to point no finger of scorn nor to cast first stones of criticism. We make for ourselves no claim of national perfection.

But if a better world is to be built—and I am an unreserved optimist about the potentials—there must be a universal recognition that mankind must marshal the full potential of human resources and make full use of those potentials without regard to hereditary bias, prejudice, and discrimination.

If we of America are to rise to our full height as men in this century, we must face courageously the world's problem of human discrimination. We must speak clearly. We must speak in concrete terms. We must help the world to understand that the curing of the problems of discrimination is the beginning—not the end—of genuine freedom.

STEREOTYPES

As long as there have been societies more complex than tribal simplicity, majorities and minorities have relied on stereotypes to mold their opinions of one another. Such stereotypes have been convenient, but they have also been cruel.

We can take some measure of satisfaction from the fact that there is progress and that these stereotypes disappear as human understanding spreads.

For example, the two highest elective offices in the strongest free nation on earth are held today by men who have overcome the dead hand of the stereotype—for reasons of religion or region of birth. And I believe that each passing day will diminish the force of the stereotype for all of us.

As recently as last week when I attended the swearing in of an Ambassador of the United States it was noted in some accounts that I am "from a Southern State." The Ambassador himself was from a Southern State, also. But the accident of my birth became newsworthy, as did his, because I was born in the South of white parents and he was born of Negro parents.

If to stand by his side and to shake his hand and to wish him "Godspeed" makes news, then that is news I am proud to make.

HIGHER SIGHTS

I say this to emphasize that the effort made by your national leadership today against discrimination, against bias, against division, and against the tyranny of stereotypes is, above all, an effort directed by men who know personally the enemy and know his toll.

But, I say this also to suggest that perhaps we of America should consider raising our sights toward larger horizons. Certainly in this field there is much still to accomplish, but what remains undone does not detract from the magnitude of what has been done.

Much of our effort is directed today to the subtle forms of discrimination. This is a necessary and worthwhile effort, and we cannot be content until we have succeeded completely. But when we look to the world as a whole the problem of discrimination is a massive problem, requiring massive effort on our part.

We cannot be content until we commit ourselves to massive support of the cause of human rights everywhere.

Our American vocabulary is filled with frequent expressions identifying illiteracy, illness, ignorance, and poverty as the oppressors of humankind. I believe we need to complete our vocabulary by acknowledging frankly that the greatest oppressor of all continues to be that of bias and prejudice.

We shall have failed our country and our cause if, from the position we are now privileged to enjoy in the world, we do not undertake the initiative in fulfilling the promise of this 20th century as the century of human rights.

If we are to be remembered as constructive builders of a better world of peace and justice and freedom we shall be remembered not for the dollars we sent abroad but for the force of the influence and leadership we exercise to improve the lot of all mankind. It is this work that challenges us, it is this undertaking that summons us, it is toward this higher goal that we must lift up our sights and set our course.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND FEDERAL AID TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I shall speak about free enterprise, small business, and Federal aid to small business.

To speak of any one of these separately could occupy us for days. To speak of all three together could be presumptuous, and not do justice to any one of them. However, what I am proposing to do is take a look at certain aspects of their interrelationships which I think peculiarly important at this juncture in our Nation's economic development.

If we look at the recipe for free enterprise we find that one of the most important ingredients is individualism. In a free enterprise system the individual has no prohibitions against his freedom of entry to businesses. If he wants to go into business there is nothing to stop him, in some cases even though he lacks the capital to do so.

It has been one of the identifying characteristics of capitalism that individual enterprise manifested through private initiative has been the motivating force. Nowhere has this been more in evidence than in the history of economic development in America.

American economic growth has been reflected in the large expansion of the number of firms doing business. In the decade of the 1950's alone, over 700,000 enterprises were added to our business population. Today there are some 4,810,000 firms doing business in the American economy.

Of the total number of firms, over 95 percent are small. In other words, the great bulk of American business is made up of undeniably small enterprises—businesses without any paid employees other than the owners. Only one out of four businesses has more than three paid employees. From these figures alone it is easy enough to see that between 3.5 and

4 million firms in operation today are tiny, regardless of what measuring stick we use.

In addition to these very small businesses there are several hundred thousand which are relatively small compared with the leading corporations in the markets in which they compete. For example, in manufacturing, the largest 200 companies accounted for 38 percent of the value added by manufacture in 1958.

But the size figures alone do not tell the whole story. The statistics of new firm formations and of discontinuances show how much in flux our economy really is. Every year thousands of firms come into existence and thousands discontinue business. In 1961, 437,000 new firms came into existence and 398,000 discontinued business—leaving a net gain of 39,000. The year before, and the year before that, and each year before, exhibits these turnovers. Thus, even though the size of the economy has been increasing year by year, it has not presented a simple picture of growth. Growth has not been just a case of adding on new businesses. Instead, the historical picture has been one of change in the whole texture, the product mix of the economy. This steadily changing mixture attests to the ability of the American economy to adapt to changing demands for goods and services, and to the changing global economy of which we are a part.

This ability to adapt has been greatly facilitated by one distinguishing feature of our capitalistic economy—the ease of entry into business. Whereas ease of entry diminishes there is invariably indicated a decline in the capitalistic nature of an economy. In the Soviet Union, for example, it is impossible for a new business to be organized. The same has been true of the societies ruled by dictators. In these situations governmental decisions have not only set the contours of the economy but have also determined its content and mix. The history of capitalism, of free enterprise, has been quite different. Here the opportunity to enter business has been unrestricted. The vigor of the American economy amply demonstrates this freedom.

Our economy is one of dramatic and rapid transition. Population is growing and will surpass 200 million people before the year 2000. The age structure of the population is changing. These two factors alone create new systems of demands for goods and services to be satisfied by the ingenuity of the American economy.

In addition, the great force at work not only in America but in other countries is that of technological change. We are undergoing a rapid technological evolution which is imposing itself upon the economic structure. Old businesses are declining and new forms of enterprise are coming into existence. Declining operations are being replaced by insurgent industries marked by strong growth trends.

The complications of technological change and changes in the demands for goods and services are producing other changes in the structure of the American economy as well as in its dynamics. The forms of retailing are undergoing great changes. Drugstores no longer sell just drugs; food stores no longer sell only food; department stores in many instances have shifted their merchandising techniques.

All of these changes have combined to affect the ways of doing business by individual firms in America. The occurrence of such changes marks the flexibility in the American economy which has made it for so long a growing, viable, healthy part of the world economy.

The preservation of this flexibility is of the utmost importance in the preservation of the freedom of enterprise in our economy. Wherever Government intervenes to inhibit the flexibility and mobility of that economy it inhibits the possibilities of future growth in the economy. Where Government takes those measures which by regulating activities within the economy promote flexibility, ease of entry, and persistence of opportunity, then Government acts to stimulate the free enterprise system.

I speak of "regulating activities" because, distasteful as is that concept in its abstract form, it is nevertheless clear that the freedom of entry to business and preservation of opportunities for small business have not occurred in the absence of governmental regulation and assistance.

I do not think it is necessary to argue the case for governmental intervention in the preservation of competition beyond a consideration of this question: If we were to assume the complete absence of any Federal regulation or assistance since 1890, what kind of economy would we be presented with today? Given historical evidence of other countries, as well as trends which have manifested themselves here, we could say with certainty that there would be many fewer firms in existence today.

In the field of manufacturing, merger movements and sharp competition would have reduced most areas of manufacturing to competition among a relatively small number of giant firms. In fact, today the only section of the economy showing a decline trend in the number of firms doing business is manufacturing.

The field of retailing would be dominated by large organizations and the same would be true in the field of banking, savings and loans, insurance, and other financial areas. Only in the service trades would we find ease of entry for the small operators.

It should be obvious that entry is precluded to small firms in many areas simply because the costs of entry—getting into business—are so high. What freedom of competition involves is, quite simply, the preservation of the opportunity for small firms to come into existence in all sections of the economy in which a small firm can operate economically.

The central questions are thus these: How best to preserve freedom of entry? How best to preserve flexibility of private enterprise? How best to assure equality of economic opportunity?

It is from the point of view of these questions that I examine the role of governmental assistance with respect to small business.

Many studies have shown—for example, the Federal Reserve Board has published such a study—that financing is the most pressing problem confronting small business. The small firm, unlike the large firm, faces very serious difficulties in getting long-term or equity financing. Small firms for the most part are limited to short-term borrowing and at generally higher costs than are paid by large firms.

The small firm is unlikely to have the management skills and know-how which is available to larger firms; neither will it have access to information concerning research and development of new products which are available to large firms. In addition, the small firm is frequently at a great disadvantage in bidding on Federal procurement opportunities.

Here are areas where small business can use assistance. In none of these areas has the private economy working alone been able to provide assistance, on the scale and to the degree, which the small business population requires.

And if Government could provide this assistance without establishing giveaway programs of any kind, and without affecting the conditions of competition—that is to say, without slanting the conditions of competition simply for the benefit of the small firm—then certainly Government would be fulfilling its obligations to the American people in a wholly legitimate, thoroughly desirable fashion. It would be fulfilling the role of assisting the economy and economic growth without in any way inhibiting freedom of enterprise by its actions.

It seems to me that the development of the Small Business Administration constitutes a wise and heartening step in the right direction.

Congress has long recognized that assistance to small business constitutes a contribution toward the success of the private enterprise system rather than an encroachment upon that system. In the preamble to the Small Business Act itself, Congress made it clear that it considered a strong and prosperous small business community to be a basic element in a free and competitive economy:

> The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition. Only through full and free competition can free markets, free entry into business, and opportunities for the expression and growth of personal initiative and individual judgment be assured. The preservation and expansion of such competition is basic not only to the economic well-being but to the security of this Nation. Such security and well-being cannot be realized unless the actual and potential capacity of small business is encouraged and developed. It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise * * * and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation.

It is the job of the Small Business Administration to aid, counsel, assist, and protect the small business community. At no time in our history has that job been as important as it is today, when the Nation is making every effort to sustain economic recovery. It is clear that a strong and prosperous small business community can contribute materially to that recovery. For small businesses constitute not only a significant proportion of the total production of goods and services, but also a vast and diversified source of employment opportunities. At a time when the Nation is striving toward full capacity and full employment these facts take on a significance.

How does the Small Business Administration go about assuring that the actual and potential capacity of small business is encouraged and developed?

The SBA, working in cooperation with banks, makes funds available to small firms in the form of loans on a sound business basis. Small firms are not given money but establish eligibility for loans on the same basis as is required at a bank. The program has enabled thousands of businesses to acquire funds for operating or growth purposes which they otherwise would not have obtained. The soundness of the program is testified to by the very small percentage of loss on these loans.

The SBA has made a determined effort to cut through the tangle of redtape and delays which had long made the process of loan applications a bewildering maze to small businessmen. One of the most significant steps in this regard has been the institution of the simplified bank loan-participation plan, under which the SBA in effect accepts the experienced judgment of the bank itself. The response to this program has been gratifying. Today, some two-thirds of all SBA loans are made in participation with banks and other private lending institutions. Perhaps most significant, the agency has thus taken a major step toward encouraging the development of permanent relationships between the banks and the small businessmen of this Nation. This is, of course, helpful to small business; but it is also helpful to the banking industry.

A striking development in this area has been the program announced jointly by the Small Business Administration and the American Bankers Association. The essence of the program is that the banks will make and service the loans for the Small Business Administration and will provide a large share of the loan funds. The banks' share will be repaid before the Small Business Administration begins collecting its share of the loan principal. Under the new program it should be easier for small businessmen to obtain secured long-term loans from the bankers with the Government underwriting a large part of the transaction. The plan thus meets the dual objective of providing small business financing while at the same time utilizing the resources of the private banking system.

In addition, the SBA has been given the authority to license small business investment companies for the specific purpose of making equity and long-term capital available to small businesses. Here, as in the case of the financial assistance program, the SBA is simply filling in part a gap whose existence has been pointed to by most all students of the subject. That gap has by no means yet been filled.

In the past 2 years the agency has licensed almost 510 small business investment companies. Approximately $425 million in venture capital has been brought into the financial markets for investment in small business enterprises. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the program from the point of view of the businessman and of the taxpayer is that the Federal funds which have been committed so far constitute only one-seventh of the available capital. Thus the Government has assumed a role, not of a competitor with private enterprise, but rather that of a partner; providing, not a substitute for private enterprise, but rather an incentive for increased activity in the private sector of the economy.

Management problems make up one of the greatest difficulties facing the Nation's small businesses; and, perhaps not surprisingly, a high percentage of business failures stem from poor management. In recognition of these economic facts of life, the SBA has undertaken a broad program of strengthening small business management.

The agency publishes a variety of management, technical, marketing, and research aids. These materials have met with enthusiastic response from small businessmen in this country and have been widely translated abroad. Further, through management research projects undertaken by outside organizations and financed by SBA, new and valuable information is becoming available to more and more small business owners and operators. In addition, SBA provides individual management counseling—in the form of letters, telephone calls, and personal visits—to established or prospective small businessmen.

Finally, SBA seeks to make available to the small businessman all of the know-how and developments in managerial skills and techniques which have been developed by large businesses and by universities and colleges. It does this through the establishment of training programs and seminars conducted by colleges, universities, and other institutions in cooperation with the SBA. All of these business education programs are self-financing.

In still another area the SBA acts to open doors which otherwise the small firms would have difficulty in even finding. The Federal Government procures goods and services totaling billions of dollars annually. Large firms with their teams of engineers and contact men have had little difficulty in bidding on Federal requests for procurement. In cooperation with the Department of Defense the SBA, in carrying out the will of Congress, seeks to set aside a certain proportion of all Federal procurement for bidding by small firms only.

It should be clear that the procurement which is set aside for small firms is set aside for competitive bidding, and that the procuring officer must be satisfied that there is a sufficient number of competent bidders to assure a fair price. The ultimate savings to the Government which result, while difficult to measure, are apparent. The SBA also makes an effort to develop information on firm capabilities and to call this to the attention of procuring officials in order that procurement contracts can be made available to the small firms on a competitive basis.

In still other instances, the SBA seeks to assist the small firm which is having production difficulties. Here the SBA makes available to the small firm production know-how which would not otherwise be available to the small operator.

In summary, in each of these instances the efforts of the SBA have been directed toward increasing the competitive capabilities of the small firm and its operators. There is represented here no effort to give a kind of special protection or privilege to the small operator. There are no giveaways involved. The entire program is based upon the idea that the American economy is a competitive economy, and that its future success depends upon the maintenance of a high degree of competition. Therefore, if through financial and other assistance the SBA can make the small firm a better, more alert, more efficient competitor—then it will have contributed substantially not only to the growth of the American economy but to the preservation of the essential capitalistic features of that economy.

This, in my opinion, the Small Business Administration is doing.

It is clear that much has already been accomplished. In the last fiscal year small businessmen received more financial help from the Agency than in any comparable period in its history—an increase of 24 percent in number and 44 percent in dollar amount of loans approved over the previous year, 69 and 114 percent over fiscal year 1960. At the same time, small firms received record assistance in obtaining Government contracts under the SBA's cooperative procurement programs. In a number of contracts awarded under the joint set-aside program during calendar year 1962, the Agency recorded an 18 and 116 percent increase over the 2 previous years; in dollar amount, the increase was 24 and 91 percent, respectively.

But it is equally clear that much remains to be done. Some 6,200 small business loans represent a gratifying achievement; but, when viewed in the context of the great need that exists, it is quite obviously a drop in the bucket. The sharp increase in SBIC's licensed is an encouraging sign; but the equity financing gap which has long plagued small firms remains largely unfilled. More than 54,000—calendar year 1962—prime contracts awarded to small businesses bespeaks an increased recognition on the part of Government of its obligation not to allow its procurement practices to work inequitably; but the dismal fact is that the last few years have seen small firms receiving a steadily decreasing share of the Government procurement dollar. This trend was halted during fiscal year 1962 by herculean effort on the part of SBA and the procuring agencies but strong efforts will be required if a further drop in the share going to small firms is to be prevented.

Yes, much remains to be done; and at one of the most critical moments in our history for the small business community. One need only look to the daily newspapers to see the economic developments which imperil the future of the small firm; business failure at about 8 percent below the post-war high; corporate mergers at record levels; the growth of discounting endangering the very existence of traditional forms of merchandising; the increase in costs of production resulting in a profit squeeze which only the hardiest can weather; the rapid evolution of automation; the mounting competition from the newly rebuilt industrial complexes of Europe and Japan.

I do not believe that the Small Business Administration—or, indeed, any agency of Government, State or Federal—can or should be thought of as the answer to these problems. In the final analysis, it is the ingenuity, adaptability and perseverance of the small firm which will determine whether it can survive. But it is clear to me that there is a great deal which an agency like the SBA can do to ease the path and guide the way on that road to survival.

What the SBA needs—and what it has never received, either in sufficiently large doses or with sufficient regularity—is adequate resources. Lipservice tribute to the value of small business to the American economy is simply not enough. What is absolutely essential is a recognition that, while the cost of augmenting the SBA's resources does constitute a temporary drain on the budget, the cost is neither great nor long-lived. Loaned funds are repaid with interest; Government contracts awarded to small businesses lead inevitably to lower prices and better quality for the Government dollar; the success story of a small firm can be told in terms of increased employment, increased profits—and increased tax revenues.

Providing adequate resources for the Small Business Administration thus constitutes neither a dole nor an uneconomic commitment. It constitutes, rather, an investment, and one which is at once the soundest and most gratifying we can make: an investment in the future of America.

APPOINTMENT OF CHESTER BOWLES AS AMBASSADOR TO INDIA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the announcement of Chester Bowles' appointment as our next Ambassador to India deserves the most enthusiastic reception both in the United States and in India. Indeed, Mr. Bowles has a worldwide stature that is unsurpassed.

During the years since World War II the United States has sent a succession of brilliant Ambassadors to India that represents one of the most satisfying chapters in our diplomatic history. The Senator from Kentucky, John Sherman Cooper, was one of that distinguished succession as is the resigning Ambassador, Prof. Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard University.

Chet Bowles who previously held the high post to which he has been again assigned brings to that responsibility the highest possible qualifications.

As President Kennedy said in announcing Mr. Bowles' appointment, no other American has such a deep understanding of India and indeed of all Asia.

Chet Bowles has demonstrated throughout his public career a capacity to see clearly the basic forces which are shaping today's world. Many of us are indebted to him for insights that have made the 20th century more intelligible to us. For years he has been one of America's most articulate and inspiring spokesmen.

I congratulate President Kennedy for the wisdom of his choice, and I salute the people of India for their good fortune in once again having in their midst one of our truly great citizens, Chester Bowles.

A VITAL NATIONAL INTEREST—EXPORTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with the development in Western Europe and the Common Market, with the ever-increasing concern by our Government with the outflow of gold, with the increased pressure of foreign competition on world markets, the policies and programs of American industry and government in the field of foreign trade become evermore important.

Industry in the Midwest is showing awareness of the importance of foreign trade and U.S. trade policies. This typifies a new economic spirit and a desire and willingness to compete in the international markets that will serve well our national interests.

I was privileged to address the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce on Friday, March 22, on the subject "Why We Must Increase Exports." The Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce is sponsoring a tour of Midwest businessmen to the Western European Common Market area this coming summer. Midwest industrialists are seeking markets. They are preparing themselves for foreign competition. This group will be in Washington in late June meeting with representatives of the Departments of Commerce and State in order to be more fully informed on U.S. trade and economic policy. I wish to commend the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce for its initiative and I am pleased that Midwest industry has recognized the importance of foreign trade and is seeking to obtain its fair share of the world markets.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why We Must Increase Exports

Increasing our exports is the greatest challenge facing American business today. It is the best solution to our balance-of-payments problem, and it represents a real opportunity to create new jobs for Americans and new profits for business.

New markets are opening for U.S. goods all over the world. Personal incomes are rising rapidly in Europe and Japan. We hope to improve the economic picture in Latin America dramatically in the next 10 years. And in Asia and Africa new countries are hungry for imports of both capital equipment and consumer goods.

We face many problems in developing profitable business opportunities in these countries. But now is the time for American business to move and move aggressively into these foreign markets. If we don't, other countries are going to get this business. And once they are firmly entrenched, it is going to be harder for us to come in to change their established business and trade patterns.

For many business enterprises, there are good profits to be made in global marketing. For our country as a whole, the need to increase our exports is vital. There is simply no other way to put an end to deficits in our balance of payments, without undermining our national security and our political leadership in the world.

We have been able to persuade some of our allies to buy more military equipment in the United States to offset some of the dollar outflow caused by our overseas military commitments. But as long as we face the threat of Communist aggression, these military expenditures will continue to be a drain on our payments position.

We have also been successful in tying more of our foreign aid to purchases in the United States, and in persuading other countries to step up their contributions to the economic development of the new nations. But it will be a long time before these new countries can stand on their own two feet—able to take care of their own economic development and to resist Communist influence and subversion.

Last year we were able to bring our payments deficit down to $2.2 billion—a little more than half the deficit we ran up in 1960. But the 1962 deficit would have been much higher if we had not increased our exports by nearly $1 billion, and if our private investment in other countries had not dropped by nearly $1 billion.

We do not look remarkably good on exports, frankly. Exports account for only 4 percent of our gross national product, while the six countries of the Common Market export 12 percent of their total gross national product—3 times the rate.

Growth in Europe and Japan since the end of World War II has been phenomenal. An entirely new way of life is developing—based on higher incomes, higher living standards, and substantially increased demands for goods and services.

In the United States we have many advantages in competing in these markets. We do not have to build industries, as many foreign nations still must do. We have the equipment, the manufacturing and merchandising skills, and we have established lines of merchandise. We also have in our factories a force of trained workmen that we are not using to the fullest, and we have idle capacity in many of our industries that is ready and waiting to be put into use.

We have an historic reputation for having the best salesmen in the world. It's high time we put our salesmanship to the test of foreign markets, and directed more of our talents and energies to exporting.

There are obstacles, I know. But I suggest the highest obstacle is ourselves. We have not been export minded in the past, and the whole process is strange to us. We have failed to develop markets abroad. In some cases we have actually refused markets that could have proved profitable.

Much is made of foreign wage differentials—it is said that American industry cannot compete with the low pay in, say, Europe. But while average hourly earnings are lower in Europe than the United States, they have been rising much more sharply than in the United States.

Furthermore, added to European wages are fringe benefits that generally exceed the U.S. average of 14 percent. For example, fringe benefits run about 44 percent of wages in Germany, 51 percent in France, and 74 percent in Italy. In one industrial area in Italy, they are more than 90 percent.

The real test of our ability to compete is not wages so much as it is productivity. Our highly automated industry is tremendously productive, and our unit-labor costs are slightly declining. Available data for the principal trading nations of Europe and Japan indicate that there is no comparable decline in any of these countries.

Finally, there is a scarcity of skilled labor abroad. The shortage is acute in the Netherlands and Germany and serious in parts of France and Belgium. U.S. firms who manufacture abroad have found that even with advanced American machinery more men were required in production that would have been necessary in the United States.

The barriers to international trade we hear most about are tariffs, quotas, and the like. These present real barriers to our experts, in many instances, but fortunately we now have ways to deal with them.

The Common Market, which is such a rich and promising customer for our goods, presents a particular problem.

As you know, by 1967 the member nations of the EEC hope to have eliminated all tariffs among themselves, and to have established a common external tariff for nonmembers that will about equal the average tariffs of individual members in force on January 1, 1957. Many industrial items, however, have, through negotiations, been further reduced by 20 percent.

On July 1 of this year the EEC will make the second move toward final common external duties. Fortunately the President has today, in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, broad authority to enter into the reciprocal tariff agreements required by such changing and rapidly developing patterns of world trade.

This new authority, in my judgment, represents the third major development in American trade policy in our history. The first development came in the form of Alexander Hamilton's report on manufactures, which set a pattern of protectionism for industry and labor that lasted until 1934. Then, out of the dismay of the depression, came the adoption of the first Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act during the first administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt—the second development. Under that legislation, the President was empowered to lower tariffs reciprocally on goods coming from nations who granted us like concessions.

Since passage of the 1962 Trade Act, we have had to face a significant change. The present failure of Britain's application for membership in the Common Market has, of course, reduced the practical significance of the "special" or "dominant supplier" negotiating authority included in the trade act. However, the most important negotiating authority in the trade act remains unaffected. We still have the broad, general authority under the act to negotiate reductions of up to 50 percent on all duties as of July 1, 1962, except for certain sensitive items covered by escape clause or national security provisions. With this broad authority we should be able to negotiate significant reciprocal reductions in free world trade barriers.

In addition, the trade act authorized reduction of U.S. duties to zero in several special situations—for example, where the duty is less than 5 percent ad valorem, or where such reduction on agricultural commodities would help expand our exports of these commodities. Reductions to zero also would be possible on tropical agricultural and forestry products which are not produced in substantial quantities in the United States—provided the Common Market countries admit these tropical products on a comparable, nondiscriminatory basis.

Thus, our negotiators can go into the forthcoming tariff sessions with sufficient negotiating authority to secure substantial reductions in the duties that restrict U.S. export opportunities.

In these negotiations, we will not be interested in tariffs alone. We are also very much concerned with non-tariff barriers, which can be equally damaging. This administration is going to see to it that they are bargained down, so that we can get into these new expanding markets.

Now who will handle these negotiations on behalf of the United States? Ultimately, authority and responsibility rests, of course, with the President. But, unlike previous tariff negotiations, which were handled through the Department of State, this round will be handled by a special representative of the President—Christian Herter.

This distinguished gentleman is bringing together an outstanding staff of trade, industry, and agricultural specialists—including some experts he has recruited from the Commerce Department and other agencies. His deputy is William Gossett, former vice president of the Ford Motor Co.

The negotiations will be carried out under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade —the GATT—which has 44 member nations. The timing—hopefully early next year—and the scope of the negotiations and other procedural matters remain to be worked out through mutual agreement.

To assure that implementation of the Trade Expansion Act will be meaningful, American business must begin to sell aggressively in world markets now.

TAX PROGRAM

American business must move ahead now to improve our cost position through greater investment in more modern plant and equipment.

We have, thanks to the 87th Congress, a new tax credit for investment in new machinery and equipment. New Treasury depreciation schedules, together with the tax credit, will make it possible for many companies to recover more than 30 percent of their new machinery and equipment costs in the first year. And we have corporate borrowing costs that are essentially as favorable as those at the bottom of the 1960–61 recession.

Conditions are right. We now have an urgent reason to get on with the job of modernizing the industrial plant of this country to increase our productivity and efficiency and lower our per-unit costs.

American business must expand its research and development to create new and improved products for sale at home and abroad and to improve our productive processes through a steadily advancing civilian technology. Too much of the U.S. research dollar is defense-oriented. Not so in Europe, for example.

While we are ahead of other countries in productivity, and currently enjoy a lower per-unit labor cost, they are making gains.

The President's tax program recognizes the need to stimulate industry initiative and investment in research and development, as well as in plant modernization. In addition to his proposal for reductions in the corporate income tax rate, the tax revision program includes a new provision for treating capital investment in research facilities as a currently deductible business operating expense.

EXPORT-CREDIT GUARANTEES

Through the Export-Import Bank of Washington and the Foreign Credit Insurance Association, as you know, steps have been taken to improve credit availability and export insurance for commercial and political risks, so that American businessmen can operate on a par with foreign exporters. Innovations recently made include FCIA policies to insure political risks alone, and a new rate schedule for both FCIA insurance and Eximbank guarantees to private banks, which calls for lower fees and premiums than those previously charged.

I understand that 17½ percent of FCIA policies in the last few months have been for companies that never exported before. This is another indication that more companies are being brought into the export field.

FCIA now has 74 leading insurance companies participating in its program from its office in New York or from insurance agents and brokers throughout the country.

Eximbank is working with 75 U.S. commercial banks, and application forms and information can be obtained through any commercial bank in the United States.

NATIONAL EXPORT EXPANSION COUNCIL—REGIONAL EXPORT EXPANSION COUNCILS

The National Export Expansion Council is an arm of the U.S. Government operating in the Department of Commerce, and directing the 35 regional export expansion councils located across the Nation.

These REEC's conduct a series of export expansion workshops for businessmen; they work with banks to encourage them to strengthen their export departments and, especially in the smaller banks, to establish the supportive financial services that exporters need; they work with colleges and universities on special courses and seminars that will help businessmen learn about the special problems in exporting and help them overcome any fear they may have of an unfamiliar type of business; they contact top executives directly to apprise them of the potential for marketing their specific products abroad; the St. Louis REEC has even organized its own trade mission.

The NEEC has asked each of its 900 REEC members to obtain one new exporter. This is a good beginning. The total impact of 900 new exporters will be considerable, and it will build each year as these exporters gain experience and their foreign sales grow.

TRADE MISSIONS, CENTERS AND FAIRS

The Department of Commerce has developed an extensive program of trade missions, trade centers, trade fair exhibitions and specialized export services designed to bring American sellers and foreign purchasers together. Last year each official trade mission carried about 500 U.S. business proposals abroad, and returned with leads on foreign investment opportunities and contacts.

The Department's new trade centers in London, Bangkok, and Frankfurt offer considerable promise to exporters. More than 200 companies which had never exported before have obtained agents to represent them overseas as a result of exhibits in one trade center or another.

An Atlanta toy company increased its total sales volume by 10 to 15 percent, following the toy show at the London center last year.

A Texarkana company sold its entire exhibit after the show for medical, dental and surgical supplies and equipment at the Bangkok center. Since then it has received substantial orders from the Thai company that bought the exhibit, and has had inquiries from companies in other southeast Asian countries whose representatives saw the exhibit in Bangkok.

The newest trade center in Frankfurt is off to an encouraging start, and the Department expects similar good results when they open their permanent showcase for U.S. goods in Tokyo on April 2 and in Milan later in the year.

In addition to the trade fairs staged for the USIA, the main purpose of which is to project the image of America, the Commerce Department is launching a new program of purely commercial exhibits in prime markets for U.S. goods. These exhibits are organized after market surveys have been made to identify specific export opportunities for our producers. The first of these all-commercial exhibitions was just held at the Royal Netherlands Industry Fair in Utrecht. Exhibitions will follow at the Lyon International Fair in France in April and the International Samples Fair in Barcelona in June.

I encourage companies in Minnesota to participate in these international trade centers, fairs and missions as a regular practice. Foreign trade means a great deal to Minnesota. The jobs of more than one-third of Minnesota's workers engaged in manufacturing are tied in one way or another to exports. And agricultural exports account for the production of almost 1 in every 10 farmworkers here in Minnesota.

The export job has to be done by private business. It has to be done by existing exporters putting more drive behind their export efforts—expanding their marketing to more countries, working their existing foreign markets more intensively, and giving greater attention to their export activities at the top levels of management. It also has to be done by bringing more companies with export capabilities into the export markets.

It is in your interest, as well as the national interest, to do everything you can to make certain that no company here in Minnesota with export capability fails to take advantage of its foreign sales opportunities.

In short, gentlemen, we pride ourselves on our energy and initiative; let's show a lot more than we have. The Government is cranking up to help—but the responsibility is squarely on the shoulders of the business community.

We are going to export or we are going to be in real economic trouble. That, it sems to me, is the key to prosperity in the 1960's.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to call up some bills on the calendar to which there is no objection. I hope that Senators who may desire to make extraneous remarks will withhold them until the youth employment bill is laid before the Senate.

The distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I intend to call up four bills which I understand are noncontroversial.

WATER FOR LANDS IN THIRD DIVISION, RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 90, Senate bill 982.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 982) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, we have heard some comments about the slowness of pace of this body, but this afternoon we are witnessing some very rapid movement in meeting an emergency which has arisen in my State of Wyoming.

The settlers on the third division of the Riverton reclamation project are again faced with the prospect of having no water to irrigate their crops. The problem arises because of the inability of the settlers and the Bureau of Reclamation to reach an agreement on a repayment contract. As a result, the Bureau is without authority to deliver water until this legislation is enacted.

Even as we are working on legislative proposals to correct some of the deficiencies of the project, it is evident the farmers must have irrigation water to grow their crops in order to protect their investments and to meet their current obligations.

The Congress is meeting this need today. The House of Representatives has already passed a companion bill to this measure—S. 982—which I introduced along with my colleague [Mr. SIMPSON]. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is to be commended for its action in reporting this measure to the Senate so that we can send it to the President for his signature.

As I have previously stated, there will be additional legislation introduced in the near future to meet other needs of these settlers. I am confident the Congress will provide the additional assistance to make this project one that is an economic reality and one which will provide the families living on the project with a comfortable living.

There are many individuals who have played an important part in seeking the solutions to the problems on the third division, and to them I can offer my gratitude and the thanks of the settlers on the project.

Mr. President, I hope this body will give speedy approval to S. 982 so that the farmers on the third division can make their plans for the coming year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 112), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 982, which was introduced as the result of an executive communication, is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming, during calendar year 1963 without regard to the time limitation specified in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. It provides that only those water users who desire water will be required to receive water and pay for it. This legislation authorizes a temporary arrangement for this year only pending receipt from the Department of the Interior of recommendations for a permanent solution and the enactment of permanent legislation.

COST

The legislation provides that the operation and maintenance costs in excess of the water payments received will be nonreimbursable. However, payments by those water users who have already indicated that they will take water if it is available will be sufficient to almost pay the operation and maintenance expenses, and, therefore, the nonreimbursable cost, if any, will amount to no more than a few thousand dollars.

NEED

There is an urgent need for the enactment of this legislation at an early date since the Secretary is without authority to deliver water to lands of the third division during the forthcoming irrigation season. Many of the farmers have already started preparing their lands to receive water in anticipation that it will be available. Failure to enact this legislation would result in financial losses to many of the farmers and add to the problems of the third division.

EXPLANATION

The lands of the third division, Riverton project, were opened to entry in 1949 and 1950. Settlement of these lands came about primarily because of this Nation's efforts to assist veterans following World War II. Inadequate study was given to the project lands prior to entry and serious drainage problems were encountered soon after the settlers came on the lands. In addition, the third division farmers have been plagued by numerous other problems related to the general economic conditions that have prevailed in agriculture in recent years. In the 83d Congress an attempt was made to resolve these problems by the enactment of Public Law 258 which permitted settlers in the third division to select units on other reclamation projects. Under that authority over one-half the settlers moved off the third division lands to other projects. In an attempt to form economic units the settlers remaining were given additional land, and it was hoped that this action would put the third division on a sound operating basis. However, this has not proved to be the case.

The development period expired in 1959 on a portion of the third division lands and in 1960 on the remainder of the lands. In 1960, Congress passed legislation authorizing the Secretary to continue to deliver water during the calendar years 1960 and 1961. Last year, Congress again enacted legislation authorizing delivery of water during calendar year 1962. While it now appears that a permanent solution may be reached this year, this legislation is necessary in order that those desiring water may receive it during this irrigation season.

At the time the legislation was enacted last year, the committee emphasized the need for pursuing this problem unceasingly until it was resolved and advised the Secretary that it expected firm recommendations early this year with respect to such a solution. The House committee also suggested a review commission be appointed to study the Riverton project and all other reclamation projects in the State of Wyoming, existing or proposed. As a result of this suggestion, the Wyoming Reclamation Projects Survey Team was appointed last August. The survey team gave immediate consideration to the Riverton project problems and submitted its recommendations thereon in January. The survey team's report has been made available to the committee and the Department's recommendations with respect to permanent legislation are expected to be transmitted to Congress within the next few weeks.

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends the enactment of S. 982.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4423, the companion bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4423) to permit the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 982 is indefinitely postponed.

AGE LIMIT WITH RESPECT TO U.S. PARK POLICE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 91, Senate bill 932.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 932) relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 113), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BILL

Members of the Park Police force are recruited under the laws applicable to civil service. This includes a provision which prohibits the establishment of a maximum age limit for entrance on civil service work contained in "Title III: General Provisions" of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1957.

Police work is arduous work, carried on an around-the-clock basis in all kinds of weather. Older policemen use more sick leave than younger men. Those recruited at older ages retire after relatively short terms of service although there is a considerable investment in their training. Further, the liberal allowances for police sick benefits, hospital and clinical care, and early retirement make the recruitment of Park Police applicants without regard to their beginning age a heavy drain on the police budget.

It is intended, under the discretion granted the Secretary of the Interior in S. 932, to fix a maximum age for entry into Park Police duty in the 29- to 31-year age range.

This is now the situation in regard to Metropolitan Police, under authority given the District Commissioners in the act of January 24, 1920 (41 Stat. 398), to "fix the minimum and maximum limits of age within which original appointments to the Metropolitan Police and Fire Departments may be made."

The committee is convinced that it will be in the interest of economy and the good of the Park Police force to give the Secretary the authority proposed in S. 932.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to determine and fix the minimum and maximum limits of age within which original appointments to the United States Park Police may be made.

HARPERS FERRY NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 92, Senate bill 18, introduced by our distinguished colleague from West Virginia, Senator RANDOLPH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 18) to change the name of Harpers Ferry National Monument to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 114), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND

This measure was approved by the Senate as S. 3566 in the 87th Congress.

Harpers Ferry has been the site of historical significance in various periods of American history. While it is probably best known for John Brown's raid in 1859 and for Civil War battles and events, it was also a site of importance in other periods.

President George Washington selected Harpers Ferry as a site for a Federal arsenal and armory because of its proximity to waterpower, iron and charcoal, and water transportation to the District of Columbia.

In the 1830's it was the goal of builders of competing transportation agencies racing to establish service to the valley of the Ohio River and the West—a race ultimately won by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad when the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal was terminated at Cumberland, Md.

John Brown's raid in 1859 was a forerunner of the Civil War, which followed in a year and a half. Harpers Ferry was seized early in the war by Stonewall Jackson, who captured a treasure in railroad equipment and supplies for the South. It was captured again in 1862 by Jackson as a part of Confederate strategy in Lee's ill-fated attempt to invade the North. It served as a Union Army base in later years of the war.

The committee is in agreement with the Department of the Interior that the 500-acre area, soon to be expanded to 1,500 acres, would be more appropriately designated as a national historical park then as a national monument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Harpers Ferry National Monument established pursuant to the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument", approved June 30, 1944 (58 Stat. 645), shall hereafter be known as Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such monument is designed or referred to under the name of Harpers Ferry National Monument shall be held to refer to such monument under and by the name of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am gratified in the passage of the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park bill.

As a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, it was my privilege to introduce the original measure to create a national monument at Harpers Ferry. This was enacted by the Congress in 1944. In the years since the area's actual usage there has been a steady increase in the number of annual visitors to this section which is so heavily saturated with American history. In 1956, for example, 115,000 persons journeyed to Harpers Ferry, a figure which had increased more than fivefold by 1962, when the total visitations reached 657,991.

In view of the continued significance of Harpers Ferry as a pivotal point in American history from the time of President Washington, it is most appropriate that the Congress acknowledge this significance by altering the status of Harpers Ferry National Monument to that of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. It is my hope that this action will soon be followed by the conveyance to the park of the remainder of the 1,500 acres which have been authorized.

My colleague, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, and members of the West Virginia delegation in the House of Representatives, have been associated with me in this effort to achieve for Harpers Ferry the status of a national historical park. I am confident that this year the measure will also be passed in the other body, its final enactment being an appropriate act of commemoration for West Virginia's centennial year.

BIG HOLE BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 94, Senate bill 138.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 138) to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 3, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. There is hereby retroceded to the State of Montana such jurisdiction as has been ceded by such State to the United States over any lands within the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield reserving in the United States, however, concurred legislative jurisdiction over such lands.

And, at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "4" to "5"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, established by Executive Order Numbered 1216 of June 23, 1910, and enlarged by Proclamation Numbered 2339 of June 29, 1939, is hereby redesignated as the Big Hole National Battlefield.

SEC. 2. In order to preserve historic features and sites associated with the Battle of the Big Hole and to facilitate their administration and interpretation, the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield are hereby revised to include the following described lands:

MONTANA PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 2 south, range 17 west: section 13, southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 23, east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; section 24, west half east half, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 25, those portions of the northeast quarter northwest quarter and the northwest quarter northeast quarter lying north of the north right-of-way line of relocated Montana State Route 43; consisting of approximately 466 acres.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase, exchange, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the area described in section 2 of this Act.

(b) Any lands described in section 2 of this Act that are a part of the Beaverhead National Forest when this Act takes effect are hereby excluded from the forest and added to the Big Hole National Battlefield.

(c) Lands included in the Big Hole National Battlefield pursuant to this Act shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1–3), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 4. There is hereby retroceded to the State of Montana such jurisdiction as has been ceded by such State to the United States over any lands within the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield reserving in the United States, however, concurred legislative jurisdiction over such lands.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated no more than $20,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 116), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND

During the retreat of the Nez Perce Indians in the summer of 1877 from Idaho to the Canadian border, the Indian camp at Big Hole River was attacked by Federal forces. The Indians forced the Army to retreat to the 200-acre location which is now Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, which was reserved for "military purposes" in 1910. It was given national monument status in 1939.

S. 138 proposes the addition of 466 acres to the tract, including 160 acres from the Beaverhead National Forest and 306 acres of land to be acquired from private owners. The additions will include the site of the Nez Perce Indian encampment, where the first and most important phase of the battle took place; the twin trees from which an Indian sharpshooter punished the retreating troops; and the Army's howitzer pit, which was outflanked and captured by the Nez Perce warriors.

The area would be renamed "Big Hole National Battlefield" in keeping with the policy of the National Park Service's offer to give uniform titles, which best reflect the nature of the individual areas, to units under its jurisdiction.

This bill was approved by the Senate, September 12, 1962, too late for the House of Representatives to complete action on it in the 87th Congress.

AMENDMENT

On page 3, line 4, renumber section 4 to section 5, and insert before the renumbered section 5 the following new section 4:

SEC. 4. There is hereby retroceded to the State of Montana such jurisdiction as has been ceded by such State to the United States over any lands within the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield reserving in the United States, however, concurrent legislative jurisdiction over such lands.

This retrocession of concurrent jurisdiction over the area is intended to avoid a broad range of technical legal difficulties which sometime arise as a result of exclusive Federal jurisdiction. The citizenship of persons born in such an area, probate of wills, voting rights, and other civil matters are complicated. Concurrent jurisdiction also permits trial in State courts of criminal offenses committed in such areas.

COSTS

A limit of $20,000 is imposed on land acquisition costs. The National Park Service estimates that development costs, including road extensions, will be approximately $25,000 as a result of the acquisition of the additional area. Maintenance and management costs are not expected to be materially affected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 89, S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Youth Employment Act".

TITLE I—YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Short title

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Youth Conservation Corps Act".

Statement of purpose

SEC. 102. The purpose of this title is (1) to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed youths so that their employability may be increased through participation in such programs of conservation planned and designed by, and under the immediate supervision of, the various Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of planning and carrying out such programs; and (2) to enable the Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving and developing natural resources and recreational areas to accelerate programs planned by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility.

Establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps

SEC. 103. In order to carry out the purposes of this title, there is hereby established within the Department of Labor a Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). There shall be a Director of the Corps who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and whose annual salary shall be $20,000. The Director shall perform such functions in connection with the Corps as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary").

Authority of Secretary

SEC. 104. The Secretary shall have authority to—

(1) establish adequate standards of safety, health, and conduct for enrollees of the Corps, and enter into agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the provision, by the latter, of medical, dental, hospital, and other health services to enrollees, either directly or through other public or nonpublic facilities and personnel;

(2) enter into agreements with Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the natural resources of the Nation, and of developing, managing, and protecting recreational areas, whereby the enrollees of the Corps may be utilized by such agencies in carrying out, under the immediate supervision of such agencies, programs planned and designed by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility;

(3) utilize, with their consent, the services and facilities of Federal agencies, and with the consent of any State, accept and utilize the services and facilities of the agencies of such government or of any county or municipal subdivision thereof; and to utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed;

(4) insure the provision of a system of training and educational services to enrollees of the Corps, in addition to the regular program of work and on-the-job training: *Provided,* That to the maximum extent practicable such programs shall be provided by State and local educational authorities under agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(5) expend such amounts as he deems necessary within available appropriations for supplies, materials, and equipment for enrollees to be used in connection with their work, instruction, recreation, health, or welfare;

(6) prescribe such rules and regulations, establish such procedures, enter into such contracts and agreements, and generally perform such functions as he may deem to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title; and

(7) authorize the performance by the Director of any functions of the Secretary under this title.

Interdepartmental Committee on the Youth Conservation Corps

Sec. 105. (a) There is established a committee to be known as the Interdepartmental Committee on the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee"). The Committee shall be composed of four members as follows: The Secretary of Labor (or his designee) who shall be Chairman, and a representative of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a representative of the Department of Agriculture, and a representative of the Department of the Interior, each of whom shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Department of which he is a representative.

(b) The Committee shall consult with and advise the Secretary with respect to all phases of the operation of the Corps.

(c) Each member of the Committee shall act in a liaison capacity between the agencies of the Federal Department represented by him and the Corps in carrying out any agreement between such agency and the Corps.

National Advisory Council on the Youth Conservation Corps

Sec. 106. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Labor a National Advisory Council on the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be Chairman, and not more than fourteen additional members appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. The appointed members of the Council shall be persons (including persons from public and voluntary organizations) representing the fields of conservation, agriculture, education, training, youth employment, labor, management, and the public in general. Upon request of the Secretary, the Council shall review the operations of the Corps in general, the kind of work performed and the training provided and shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the execution of his responsibilities under this title. The Council shall meet at least twice each year and at such other times as the Secretary may request.

(b) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings of the Council or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept the services of appointed members under this section without the payment of compensation therefor (and with or without payment of travel expenses or per diem in lieu of subsistence).

Composition of the Corps

Sec. 107. (a) The Corps shall be composed of male individuals who are permanent residents of the United States, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age twenty-two at the time of enrollment, and whose participation in the Corps will be consistent with the purposes of this title. Enrollment or participation in the Corps shall not be grounds or a legitimate reason for deferment or rejection under the Selective Service Act. The number of enrollees shall not exceed at any one time fifteen thousand during the first fiscal year of its operation and during the next four fiscal years such numbers as may be maintained within the appropriations made therefor by the Congress.

(b) In order to enroll as a member of the Corps, an individual must agree to comply with rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary for the government of the Corps.

(c) Enrollment in the Corps shall be for a period of not less than six months; if permitted by the Secretary, an individual may reenroll, but his total enrollment shall not exceed two years.

(d) For purposes of accepting enrollment in the Corps in any year, (A) 50 per centum of the total number of the authorized enrollment of the Corps for such year shall be allocated to the various States on the basis of the ratio that the total male population of each State within the age group referred to in subsection (a) bears to the total male population of the United States within such age group, (B) 50 per centum of the total number of the authorized enrollment of the Corps for such year shall be allocated by the Secretary to the various States, determined each year in accordance with (1) the ratio that the total unemployment of each State bears to the total unemployment in the United States, using in both cases the previous year's annual average following its publication; and (2) the extent of additional allocation which should be made to any State in order to compensate for benefits accruing to other States from the placement within such States of camps established or maintained under this title; and (C) allocations not utilized in (A) shall be reallocated under (B). The population categories and the other relevant factors referred to above shall be determined in accordance with the most recent statistics available from the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Labor.

Compensation of enrollees

Sec. 108. (a) (1) The base compensation of enrollees shall be $60 per month for the first enrollment and an additional $5 per month for each subsequent enrollment. Up to an additional $10 per month may be paid on the basis of assigned leadership responsibilities, or special skills.

(2) The Secretary shall establish procedures whereby each enrollee may make an allotment to his parent, dependent, legal guardian, or any fund established for his benefit, of part of the periodic compensation to which he is entitled under this title, and such allotment shall be paid directly to the person or fund in favor of which it is made.

(b) Enrollees as well as applicants for enrollment may be furnished with such quarters, subsistence, transportation (including travel from and to the place of enrollment), equipment, clothing, training, educational and recreational services, medical, dental, hospital and other health services, and such other expenses (including funeral and burial expenses) as the Secretary may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

(c) In the case of any individual who is an enrollee within the meaning of this title, the value of items furnished shall be exempt from income tax under subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, except to the extent that the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, determines any portion thereof to be additional base compensation.

Application of provisions of Federal law

Sec. 104. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this title, an enrollee is deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of Federal laws relating to Federal employment including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits such as retirement, life insurance, and health benefits.

(b) (1) Section 210 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 410) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"Service as Enrollee in Youth Conservation Corps

"(p) The term 'employment' shall, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), include service performed by an individual as an enrollee in the Youth Conservation Corps established by title I of the Youth Employment Act and all such service shall be deemed to have been performed by such individual as an employee of the United States."

(2) Section 209 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 409) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"For purposes of this title, in the case of an individual performing service to which the provisions of section 210(p) apply, his 'wages' for such services, shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, be deemed to be $150 for each calendar month during all of which he is an enrollee within the meaning of title I of the Youth Employment Act, or $5 per day for any calendar month during part (but not all) of which he is such an enrollee."

(3) The first sentence of section 205(p)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 405(p)(1) is amended by striking out "and including service," and inserting in lieu thereof "service," and by inserting "and service, performed as an enrollee within the meaning of title I of the Youth Employment Act, to which the provisions of section 210(p) are applicable," after "to which the provisions of section 210(o) are applicable,".

(c) (1) Section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(q) Service as Enrollee in Youth Conservation Corps.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'employment' shall, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, include service performed by an individual as an enrollee in the Youth Conservation Corps established by title I of the Youth Employment Act, and all such service shall be deemed to have been performed by such individual as an employee of the United States."

(2) Subsection (i) of such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Service in the youth conservation corps.—For purposes of this chapter, in the case of an individual performing service to which the provisions of subsection (q) apply, his 'wages' shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (a)(1) of this section, be deemed to be $150 for each calendar month during all of which he is an enrollee within the meaning of title I of the Youth Employment Act, or $5 per day for any calendar month during part (but not all) of which he is such an enrollee."

(3) The first sentence of section 3122 of such Code (relating to Federal service) is amended by striking out "and including service," and inserting in lieu thereof "service," and by inserting "and service, performed as an enrollee within the meaning of title I of the Youth Employment Act, to which the provisions of section 3121(q) are applicable," after "section 3121(p) are applicable,".

(4) Section 6051(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of compensation for service as an enrollee in the Youth Conservation Corps, the statement shall show, in lieu of the amount required to be shown by paragraph (5), the total amount of wages as defined in section 3121(a), computed in accordance with such section and section 3121(i)(4)."

(5) Section 3401(a) of such Code (relating to the definition of wages for purposes

of the collection of income tax at source on wages) is amended by striking out ", or" at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (12) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (13) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(14) pursuant to section 108(b) of title I of the Youth Employment Act, other than any portion determined thereunder to be additional base compensation, for service performed as an enrollee within the meaning of such title."

(6) Section 121(a) of such Code is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (18) and inserting in lieu thereof ";", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(19) Amounts received by enrollees under section 108 of title I of the Youth Employment Act, see such section 108(c)."

(d) The amendments made by subsection (b) of this section and by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (c) of this section shall apply with respect to service performed after the date of the enactment of this Act. The amendment made by paragraph (5) of subsection (c) of this section shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e)(1) Enrollees under this title shall, for the purpose of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742, as amended), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 40 of such Act and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

(2) For purposes of this section—

(A) The term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of an enrollee—

(i) while he is on authorized leave or pass; or

(ii) while he is absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Corps.

(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed to be $150 a month, except that with respect to compensation for disability accruing after the individual concerned reaches the age of 21, such monthly pay shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-2 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(C) The term "injury" as defined in section 40 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall include disease, illness, or injury if it arises out of service in the Corps.

(D) Compensation for disability, including medical care, shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the injured enrollee is discharged from the Corps.

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 110. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, the sum of $60,000,000, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years thereafter such amounts as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this title may be transferred between departments and agencies of the Government for use for the purpose for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated and may also be transferred to State governments for the purposes provided in this title.

Reports

SEC. 111. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report on the activities of the Corps during such year, and not later than January 1, 1966, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report evaluating the activities of the Corps from its inception, together with such recommendations as he may deem desirable.

TITLE II—STATE AND COMMUNITY YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Short title

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "State and Community Youth Employment Act".

Statement of purpose

SEC. 202. The purpose of this title is to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed youths so that their employability may be increased through participation in State and community youth employment programs thereby enabling the agencies of the State, county, or municipality or political subdivision thereof to carry out programs in the field of conservation and development of natural resources and recreational areas, or various other programs which will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest which will otherwise not be provided.

Development of State and community employment programs

SEC. 203. In order to carry out the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall assist and cooperate with the agencies of State (which for the purposes of this title shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa), county, and local governments and private nonprofit agencies in developing programs for the employment of young people in State and community service activities, hereinafter authorized, including the conservation, development, and management of the natural resources of the State and the community and the development, management, and protection of recreational areas within the State and the community, which, whenever appropriate, shall be coordinated with a program of training and education provided by local educational authorities. In those States where the public land holdings of the Federal Government are less than 5 per centum of the land area within the State, the Secretary when requested, may offer such additional assistance as may be required in the development of programs of conservation and recreation. The Secretary shall advise such State and local governments as to the number and availability of unemployed young people, their skills and qualifications for various types of work, and shall provide in cooperation with local school authorities for the orderly selection and referral of youths for enrollment in such programs.

Approval of programs

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to approve for assistance under this title any State, county, municipal, or local programs submitted hereunder if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

(1) enrollees in the program will be employed either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects, sponsored by private nonprofit agencies approved by the appropriate State agency;

(2) the program will increase the employability of the enrollees, or will enable student enrollees to resume or to maintain school attendance;

(3) the program will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest which will not otherwise be provided, or will contribute to the conservation, development, and management of the natural resources of the State or community or to the development, management, or protection of State or community recreation areas;

(4) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers;

(5) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment are appropriate and reasonably consistent with the rates and conditions applicable with respect to comparable work in the locality;

(6) to the maximum extent feasible, the program will be coordinated with vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of enrollees in such program and sponsored by State, county, or local school authorities: *Provided*, That where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the program may make provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of, or where appropriate pursuant to agreement with, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(7) the program includes standards and procedures for the selection of applicants including provisions assuring full coordination and cooperation with local and other authorities to encourage students to maintain or resume school attendance.

(b) In approving projects under this title, the Secretary shall give priority to projects with high training potential.

Enrollees in programs

SEC. 205. (a) Enrollment in programs under this title shall be limited to young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age twenty-two, and whose participation in such programs will be consistent with the purposes of this title.

(b) Enrollees shall not be subject to the provisions of any other Federal law relating to Federal employment including hours of work, rates of compensation, or employee benefits.

(c) The number of enrollees in programs under this title shall not exceed at any one time the equivalent of 60,000 full-time enrollees during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and during the next four fiscal years such numbers as may be maintained within the appropriations made therefor by the Congress.

(d) The Secretary shall provide for testing, counseling, job development, and job referral services through either governmental or private nonprofit agencies to youths in order to carry out the purposes of this title.

Federal share of program costs

SEC. 206. (a) Whenever a State, county, municipal or local youth employment program is determined under section 204 to be appropriate, the Secretary may enter into an agreement with the State, county, or municipal government, or agency or political subdivision thereof, or a private nonprofit agency, under which such government or political subdivision thereof or agency shall pay not more than 50 per centum and not less than 25 per centum of all costs of the program, including those of administration, in such proportion as may be determined by the Secretary, considering among other relevant factors (1) the severity of the rates of unemployment and underemployment in the area and the duration of such unemployment and underemployment, and (2) the income levels of families in such area. The contributions by such government, or political subdivision thereof, or agency, pursuant to such agreements may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. Such agreements shall further provide that the Secretary will pay grants to such governments or political subdivisions thereof or agencies covering the balance of all costs of such programs, including those of administration.

(b) Funds available for grants under agreements authorized by subsection (a) shall be allocated among the States in the following manner: (A) 50 per centum of such funds in any fiscal year shall be allocated among the States on the basis of the ratio that the total population of each State within the age group referred to in subsection 205(a) bears to the total population of the United States within such age group, and (B) 50 per centum of such funds in any fiscal year shall be allocated by the Secretary in accordance with the ratio that the total unemployment of each State bears to the total unemployment in the United States, using in both cases the previous year's annual average following its publication, and (C) allocations not utilized in (A) shall be reallocated under (B). The population categories and the other relevant factors referred to above shall be determined in accordance with the most recent statistics available from the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Labor.

Authority of secretary

SEC. 207. (a) In carrying out this title, the Secretary is authorized to—

(1) delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government any of his functions, powers, or duties under this title as he deems appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation thereof by the heads of such departments and agencies.

(2) utilize with their consent the services and facilities of Federal agencies and, with the consent of any State accept and utilize the services and facilities of the agencies of such government or of any county or municipal subdivision thereof; to establish State and local advisory committees; and to utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed.

(3) make such contracts or agreements, establish such procedures, and make such payments, either in advance or by way of reimbursement as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(4) encourage the enrollees to participate in a systematic program of training and education provided by State and local educational authorities.

(5) prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) Any agreement under this title shall contain such provisions as may be necessary to promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss, and insure the application of funds in a manner consistent with the provisions and purposes of this title and the terms of such agreement.

National Advisory Council on State and Community Youth Employment Programs

SEC. 208. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Labor a National Advisory Council on State and Community Youth Employment Programs (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be Chairman, and nine members appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. The appointed members of the Council shall be persons (including persons from public and voluntary organizations) who are recognized authorities in professional or technical fields related to the employment of youth or who represent the fields of conservation, agriculture, education, training, labor, management, and urban development, or persons representative of the general public who are leaders in programs concerned with employment of youth. The Council shall advise the Secretary on the administration of this title. The Council shall also include, whenever appropriate, the various agency heads designated in section 209 of this title.

(b) Upon request of the Secretary, the Council shall review the operation of this title in general and shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the execution of his responsibilities under this title. The Council may also make recommendations to the Secretary on projects referred to it by the Secretary. The Council shall meet at least twice each year and at such other times as the Secretary may request. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters relating to this title for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

(c) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings of the Council or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept the services of appointed members under this section without the payment of compensation therefor (and with or without payment of travel expenses or per diem in lieu of subsistence).

Interagency consultation

SEC. 209. In the administration of this title, the Secretary shall seek the advice and assistance of the Secretaries of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Agriculture, and Interior, of the Attorney General, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and of such other agency heads as the Secretary deems appropriate.

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 210. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, the sum of $60 million and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years thereafter such amounts as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this title may be transferred between departments and agencies of the Government for use for the purpose for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated and may also be granted to State and local governments for the purpose provided in this title.

Report by the Secretary

SEC. 211. Not later than 120 days after the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report on the activities and programs authorized by this title during such year; and not later than January 1, 1966, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report evaluating the activities and programs authorized by this title from its inception together with such recommendations as he may deem desirable.

THE ENEMY'S NAME IS KHRUSHCHEV, NOT KENNEDY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the pamphlet, "Has Cuba Been Abandoned to Communism?" written by W. Cleon Skousen, represents a serious attempt to undermine the confidence of the American people in their Government. Honest, forthright dissent is an essential element in the democratic process of government, but this does not mean that we must silently accept deliberately distorted allegations against our U.S. Government. Any opinion or idea offered in the political marketplace must stand the test of challenge and inquiry; it is in this fashion that general interest and public understanding of political issues is fostered. In a democracy, the people are the ones who are responsible for their Government—and the people must be honestly and continually informed. Only in such a way can each citizen perform his role in making our form of government work. An alert, informed citizenry is the one essential element upon which a democracy such as ours depends. That is why such a pamphlet as this one disturbs me so much—because it is a deliberate attempt to misinform the people. Moreover, it is a cleverly calculated, shrewdly executed, and piously self-righteous attempt to misinform the people.

We must not confuse such calculated, deceptive literature with honest and legitimate differences of opinions about our problems with Cuba. There is great need for such open, public debate about the Cuban situation today, because the American people need to reach a consensus on what the U.S. policy toward Cuba should be. First, there should be a factual understanding about what the situation with regard to Cuba is; next, we should examine the possible avenues of action open to us, considering the consequences of each; and finally, decide on what we want done, and give the Government our full and undivided support in carrying out our wishes. This is how a democracy works.

Such a booklet as Skousen's clouds and muddies the entire picture of Cuba, and thereby does a great disservice to the American people. This booklet is riddled with vagueness, half-truths, isolated events taken out of context and strung together artificially, and in some instances with outright deception. What the motivation behind such a deliberately calculated attempt to misinform the American people was, I cannot presume to say. But I emphatically resent the objective of this pamphlet, and therefore feel compelled to point out a few things about it in a frank, open, and I honestly hope successful, effort to completely discredit it. I am not going to honor this booklet with an attempt to refute it word for word, sentence for sentence, page for page. It does not merit such attention. If it were an honest opinion of dissent, I would be the first to acknowledge that it did deserve such a reply, but it is not.

This booklet, as I stated in an address on the floor of the Senate of the United

States, is based almost entirely on the completely false charges that our President has betrayed the United States by making the following commitments to Khrushchev:

> 1. A personal guarantee by the President that the United States would not attempt to liberate Cuba.
>
> 2. A personal guarantee by the President that the United States would not allow any other Western Hemisphere country to liberate Cuba.

What is the source given by Skousen to substantiate these charges? A letter from the Premier of Soviet Russia, Mr. Khrushchev, which Skousen states was printed in the New York Times on October 29, 1962. The booklet states that the Khrushchev letter was in answer to the "secret letter" from our President to Mr. Khrushchev several days earlier, in which the President made these commitments. But as I pointed out previously to my colleagues in the Senate, the letter from our President was not secret, because it was published right alongside the letter quoted by Skousen, on the same day and on the same page, in the New York Times. And if Mr. Skousen had not been attempting to deceive the American people, and had quoted from our President's letter, instead of from the Premier of Soviet Russia's letter, the people could plainly read that the President set the conditions of onsite inspection inside of Cuba as our condition of promising—not to refrain from attempting to liberate Cuba, as charged by Skousen—but to refrain from invading Cuba.

Furthermore, as the President's letter states, he did not guarantee the United States would not allow any other nation in the Western Hemisphere to liberate Cuba, as falsely charged by Skousen; he said that if Russia allowed on-site inspection and we pledged noninvasion of Cuba—"I am confident that the other nations of the hemisphere would be prepared to do likewise." Perhaps they would have, and perhaps not, but that is beside the point. The point here is that a false charge was made against the President of the United States by a man who quoted the No. 1 Communist in the world to back up this false charge. And this in spite of the fact that the letter he quoted as proof from the New York Times was printed right along side of the President's letter, which Khrushchev distorted and which Skousen falsely called secret. I ask Senators sincerely, Is this honest? Does this represent legitimate dissent in the interest of informing the American public about the truth? Obviously it does not.

In any case, I am sure that any newspaper reader knows that the Russians did not permit inspection of their dismantled missile sites inside of Cuba, and therefore did not meet the necessary preconditions for our tentative promise to refrain from invading Cuba. The Secretary of State and the President of the United States have both stated unequivocally that we are therefore not bound in any fashion by any agreement with the Soviet Union, because they did not fulfill their half of the contemplated agreement. I am disturbed about the motivations of Skousen and his backers in deliberately and deceptively trying to paint the President as a traitor to his country.

On page 3 of this misleading tract of his, Mr. Skousen, using a typical propaganda device, lifts a quote out of context and surrounds it with his own commentary in order to pervert its original meaning. The quote is from an article written in 1947 by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and the lifted quote is an attempt by Skousen to portray one of the President's advisers as a sinister pro-Communist, in an inferential attempt, I suppose, to further undermine the confidence of the American people in their elected President. The fact is that the Schlesinger article was advocating the containment of Soviet Russia expansionism—remember, this was in 1947, when only a few people recognized the dangers of a renewed appetite for territory on the part of our wartime ally against Hitler. That does not sound like a pro-Communist position to me. But, of course, I am not picking a sentence out of context.

In much the same familiar, deceptive manner, this pamphlet goes on and on, speaking of our policy of softness toward communism, when we are spending $50 billion a year to build and maintain a Defense Department capable of making a cloud of dust out of what is now the Soviet Union if harm is threatened to the United States. Skousen makes a little list of 15 items which he says illustrate the American policy of softness toward communism. Some of them are so vague and ridiculous that they cannot even be sensibly answered, but I am going to take a few of these points, and show that in each case the charges made by this booklet are misleading, deceptive, or based on a complete misrepresentation of the real facts of the matter.

One such charge is that the Kennedy administration "ordered the lifting of the ban on the distribution of Communist propaganda through the U.S. mails, allowing it to be distributed to American citizens postage free." How deceptive a little statement like this can be. Let me take 1 minute to give the facts in this matter, and then Senators may judge for themselves how misleading this statement of Skousen's is. First of all, no material, propaganda or not, is delivered postage free. If it does not bear postage, mail is not delivered. But let us examine the more serious charge.

Prior to 1958, an interception program relating to Communist propaganda material was in effect. Under this program, printed matter arriving from Communist countries, and thought to be Communist propaganda, was delivered to addressees if they had specifically indicated they desired it, or if it was addressed to a registered foreign agent, a foreign embassy, a U.S. Government agency, a newspaper, a library, or an educational institution. In 1958 this policy was amended so that individual addressees who did not come within one of these exceptions were asked whether they wanted the propaganda publications addressed to them. If they replied that they did, the material was delivered.

In 1960 approximately 5½ percent of printed material from Communist bloc countries was excluded as being propaganda not desired by the addressees.

During 1960 a committee of the National Security Council had recommended the discontinuance of the interception system. The recommendation was accepted by the Planning Board of the National Security Council, but was not carried forward until March 1961, when it was concluded that the interception program had no intelligence value. Six legal actions had been filed against the Government questioning the constitutional and legislative authority to detain this mail. The Department of Justice was convinced that legislative authority was lacking to detain such postage-paid mail.

The discontinuance of the interception program in no way affected the method of handling publications addressed to libraries, universities, and the like, which have been receiving them all along; and it did not permit the mails to be used to carry literature which could not use the mails before.

So, it was the U.S. National Security Council, under President Eisenhower, that made the decision not to further detain mails for evaluation and acceptance by the addressee. But it is true that it was under President Kennedy, who had been President for about 50 days, that the change in regulations came into effect on March 17, 1961.

But all this quibbling about who was President when the decision was made or came into effect is nonsense, and Skousen knows it. The reason? Before his pamphlet was published, there was a new law on the statute books, chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, as amended, which states in section 4008:

> Communist political propaganda, shall be detained by the Postmaster General upon its arrival for delivery in the United States, or upon its subsequent deposit in the United States domestic mails, and the addressee shall be notified that such matter has been received and will be delivered only upon the addressee's request.

That is the present law of the land, approved, signed, and enforced by the President of the United States. But would we know this from reading the Skousen charge? Of course not, because it was designed to deceive us. But Senators can see the trouble and care one must go to in order to clarify and disprove such statements.

I am only going to take time to dispose of a few more of these charges, such as this one that the Kennedy administration began laying the foundation for the seating of Red China in the United Nations and then backed away under an avalanche of public protest. The truth is that it was the Soviet Union who laid the foundation of the admission of Red China to the U.N., and it was done in early 1950, when young John F. Kennedy was merely a third-term Representative from the State of Massachusetts. And incidentally, our representative to the

United Nations under President Kennedy, as under President Eisenhower, and under President Truman, has consistently opposed the admission of Red China to the U.N.

The final charge which I am going to take the trouble of exposing as false and misleading is that the current administration pushed through the abolishing of the loyalty oath for students seeking Federal loans. Again, the facts of the matter are contrary to the charge. It was a large group of colleges and universities which pushed through the amendment to the National Defense Education Act, eliminating the so-called disclaimer affidavit. Institutions of higher education which refused to participate in, or withdrew from, the NDEA program because of the disclaimer affidavit requirement included Princeton, Radcliffe, St. John's, Vassar, Wesleyan, Yale, Harvard, and many others, all of them among our leading universities.

There was, of course, a reason for these institutions to oppose the disclaimer affidavit. It was that there were two affidavits, one a positive oath or affirmation of faith and allegiance to our Government, which the schools mentioned did not oppose, and the other a negative disclaimer to the effect that the student was not a member of and would not support any organization dedicated to the overthrow of our Government. It was this challenge to young people's loyalty specifically that these schools opposed, and it was this negative disclaimer which was eliminated on the demands of these schools and a total of some 200 more major universities, including Indiana University, the Universities of Colorado, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, and many more. How does that square with the vague and misleading charge that the Kennedy administration pushed through the abolishing of the loyalty oath? Once more, obviously it does not stand up.

I have taken this trouble to clarify the charges brought up by Mr. Skousen not to honor them as worthy of answering, but to discredit them. Such charges, whether they be made against President Eisenhower or President Kennedy, are designed to undermine the faith of the American people in their duly elected public officials. What the motivations for this are I do not know, but the results I deplore. I would like to close with a quote from the Director of the FBI, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who wrote in his book, "Masters of Deceit," which described the dangers of the Communist menace to the United States, that—

> As we have seen, identifying Communists is not easy. They are trained in deceit and trickery and use every form of camouflage and dishonesty to advance their cause.
>
> For this reason we must be absolutely certain that our fight is waged with full regard for the historic liberties of this great Nation. This is the fundamental premise of any attack against communism.
>
> Too often I have seen cases where loyal and patriotic but misguided Americans have thought they were "fighting communism" by slapping the label of "Red" or "Communist" on anybody who happened to be different from them or to have ideas with which they did not agree.
>
> Smears, character assassination, and the scattering of irresponsible charges have no place in this Nation. They create division, suspicion, and distrust among loyal Americans—just what the Communists want—and hinder rather than aid the fight against communism.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago when I first mentioned the pamphlet written by Mr. Skousen and made my remarks on the floor, I received a letter from a citizen of Salt Lake City who asked that I place the pamphlet in the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the pamphlet entitled "Has Cuba Been Abandoned to Communism?" written by W. Cleon Skousen, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAS CUBA BEEN ABANDONED TO COMMUNISM?

(By W. Cleon Skousen)

In all the excitement over the October 1962 crisis in Cuba, many Americans apparently missed the fact that the President of the United States paid an appalling price for the Russian promise to dismantle the Cuban missile bases.

Nearly all the newspapers carried headlines such as "Khrushchev Backs Down," or "J.F.K. Gets Russian Accord." Down in the small print—which too few people read—was the shocking disclosure that President Kennedy had made two commitments to Khrushchev which Cuban freedom fighters could scarcely believe:

1. A personal guarantee by the President that the United States would not attempt to liberate Cuba.
2. A personal guarantee by the President that the United States would not allow any other Western Hemisphere country to liberate Cuba.

KHRUSHCHEV'S VICTORY

The New York Times for October 29, 1962, carried the full text of Khrushchev's reply to the Kennedy commitments. He shrewdly spelled out the embarrassing details of the amazing and completely unnecesary capitulation which President Kennedy had made in his secret letter to Khrushchev 2 days earlier. Said Khrushchev:

"I regard with respect and trust the statement you made in your message on October 27, 1962, that there would be no attack, no invasion of Cuba, and not only on the part of the United States, but also on the part of other nations of the Western Hemisphere, as you have said in the same message of yours" (the New York Times, western edition, Oct. 29, 1962, p. 4).

Those who caught the full impact of this tremendous legal and diplomatic victory for Khrushchev wondered how the President and his advisers could have been so completely outmaneuvered. Only a few days before, President Kennedy had made himself a world hero by standing up to Khrushchev and commanding the military might of the U.S. armed services to throw a blockade around Cuba. Khrushchev had immediately tried to conciliate the President by promising that the Soviet Union would not indulge in any rash act. It was obvious that Khrushchev was afraid of the brink. (For a brief background on Castro's original conquest of Cuba see "The Naked Communist," ch. 11.)

Military authorities had already advised the White House that the Soviet leaders would not dare make a war issue out of Cuba because of America's vast superiority in fire power. Latin American countries has assured the United States of their complete support in this new posture of U.S. firmness. Thousands of Cuban freedom fighters had been encouraged to join Spanish-speaking units of the U.S. Army with the confidence that the liberation of Communist-conquered Cuba was only days away. Members of Congress openly assured the President that this was the hour to invoke the Monroe Doctrine and the Rio Pact to show the Soviet Union that foreign conquests of independent nations in North and South America would not be tolerated.

With such manifest forces of unity and strength behind the United States, why did the administration allow Khrushchev to extort from it a promise that there would be no attempt to liberate Cuba if the Soviets would just dismantle their illegal missile bases? And by what authority did the President commit the military might and prestige of the United States to a policy of preventing any other country in the Western Hemisphere from liberating Cuba?

There was also the very serious possibility that the President had entered into a secret pact which amounted to a treaty agreement without providing any opportunity to have the Senate approve it as required by the Constitution. The treaty-approving power of the Senate was intended by the Founding Fathers to bring the facts out in the open where the people could have a chance to examine the issues before any sweeping commitments were made. In this spirit Woodrow Wilson had strongly advocated open covenants, openly arrived at. The merits of such a policy were demonstrated in the Kennedy-Khrushchev negotiations. If Khrushchev had not published these commitments, the American people might never have heard of them. Undoubtedly Khrushchev knew he was embarrassing the American President by publishing what was to have remained a secret agreement between two heads of state.

Citizens wondered what was in the President's mind when he deliberately tied the hand of the American forces and committed the United States to a permanent policy of neutrality toward Soviet-conquered Cuba.

IS PRESIDENT KENNEDY FOLLOWING THE SCHLESINGER-ACHESON LINE?

Among the closest advisors to President Kennedy is Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., who has openly opposed any anti-Soviet policy. He also says the United States can come to socialism "through a series of New Deals." He has referred to the freedom fighters behind the Iron Curtain as "reactionaries" and called their lost liberties "obsolete prerogatives." As far back as 1947 Dr. Schlesinger boasted that the State Department was following the policies which he advocated:

"Though the secret has been kept pretty much from the readers of the liberal press, the State Department has been proceeding for some time somewhat along these lines. Both Byrnes and Marshall have perceived the essential need—to be firm without being rancorous, to check Soviet expansion without making unlimited commitments to an anti-Soviet crusade, to invoke power to counter power without engaging in senseless intimidation, to encourage the growth of the democratic left. The performance has often fallen below the conception; but the direction has been correct. Men like Ben Cohen, Dean Acheson, Charles Bohlen, have tried to work out details and whip up support for this admittedly risky program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, page 21482).

It was risky indeed. By the end of 1948 all of Eastern Europe had been pulled behind the Iron Curtain with a loss of over 100 million allies. By the end of 1949, we had lost China with its teeming population of between 450 and 600 million. Congressional testimony revealed that the same tragic policy continued throughout the Korean war. Even when there was a change of administration in 1952, the men who were masterminding the foreign policy behind the scenes continued to follow the stubborn, almost blind, conviction that the Communists would change.

As Dr. Schlesinger pointed out in his book, "The Vital Center" (1949), the object is to have communism mellow and the free democracies come together with it under peaceful socialism. That is what he means by stating that we should contain the Soviets but push the rest of the world toward the "democratic left." He believes the Communist leaders should not be looked upon as enemies but as over-zealous allies whose brutalities must be tempered so that they behave more like true socialists. And because the Communists are allies in this sense, Dr. Schlesinger is not in favor of liberating any of the Communist-conquered countries. He makes this very clear in his statement:

"At the same time, the United States must not succumb to demands for an anti-Soviet crusade nor permit reactionaries in the buffer States to precipitate conflicts in defense of their own obsolete prerogatives."

Notice that the freedom fighters behind the iron curtain are referred to as reactionaries and their longing for liberty as obsolete prerogatives.

These views are prevalent among a certain body of powerful policymakers who serve in the State Department and the White House. Their influence seeps to the surface on numerous occasions where it may be easily observed.

THE POLICY OF SOFTNESS TOWARD COMMUNISM

In the Cuban crisis of October 1962 the President was apparently guided by these policymakers who followed the Schlesinger line as outlined above. It was characterized by a determination to remove the threat of Russian military conquest but smother the rising tide of popular demand for the liberation of Cuba from communism. It was the same kind of thinking during the previous administration which guided the State Department in supporting Castro in spite of reliable warnings that he was a Soviet agent. Men of this persuasion do not seem to fear the cunning of Communists the way most ordinary people do. They somehow feel that the Communists can be controlled, they can be manipulated, they can be forced to mellow. They therefore approach them in a spirit of accommodation and appeasement which often violates the most elementary aspects of protecting American interests. This is evident in the following incidents which have occurred during the past 18 months. These incidents shocked many Americans at the time they occurred, but only on rare occasions were enough citizens paying attention to do anything about it. Every one of these incidents created circumstances favorable to the Communist position and detrimental to that of the United States.

1. Official State Department proposal to disarm the United States and transfer its military, naval and air force equipment (including nuclear weapons) to the United Nations.

2. Refusal by the President to proclaim the 3d week in July as the traditional Captive Nations Week because it was an unnecessary irritant in relations with the Soviets. Public pressure finally prevailed but the proclamation was extremely weak, making no reference to communism and the slave states under it.

3. Ordered the dismissal of charges against indicted Russian spy, Igor Y. Melekh, to improve Soviet-American relations.

4. Ordered the release from prison of Communist Party organizational secretary, Harry Winston, one of 11 Communist leaders convicted of conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government by force and violence. Winston immediately went to Russia with State Department permission where he appeared on radio and television castigating the United States.

5. Forced the anti-Communist government of Laos to accept Communists in positions of leadership. Threatened to withdraw all American aid if the Laotian Government failed to comply.

6. Ordered the lifting of the ban on the distribution of Communist propaganda through the U.S. mails, allowing it to be distributed to American citizens postage free.

7. Forced Dutch New Guinea to become a part of pro-Communist Indonesia in spite of a previous promise to help these people become an independent country.

8. Openly promoted a Communist coalition government in the Congo. Gave financial support to the conquest of Katanga which had broken away from the Congo in protest against the Communist domination of the government.

9. Sent more than 70 jet planes to the Communist government of Yugoslavia.

10. Used political pressure to force the Senate to give up its resistance to foreign aid to Yugoslavia and Poland.

11. Ordered military officials to submit speeches to the State Department for censorship. References to the threat of the Soviet Union and the need for victory in the cold war were deleted.

12. Began laying the foundation for the seating of Red China in the United Nations and then backed away under an avalanche of public protest.

13. Pushed through the abolishing of the loyalty oath for students seeking Federal loans.

14. Sided with Russia in condemning our long-time ally, Portugal, for suppressing the Communist-inspired uprising in Angola. Allies in Europe condemned United States for being on the wrong side.

15. Initiated negotiations with Russia to discuss concession of rights in Berlin when these rights had been previously fixed in at least five iron-clad agreements.

SOFT POLICY SHOWS UP AT BAY OF PIGS INVASION

In an article entitled, "Kennedy's Fateful Decision," the U.S. News and World Report for September 17, 1962, summarized the facts surrounding the tragic Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba. The Readers Digest reprinted the same article in its November 1962 issue.

The facts are not pleasant. President Kennedy had approved the invasion which took place April 17, 1961, and he had promised the invaders air cover. Two U.S. carriers, their decks loaded with fighting planes, were standing by within easy striking distance. In addition, the invaders had their own planes which they expected to use for their protection. Here is the way the article describes what happened:

"Secure in this assurance of air support, the invaders went ashore in the early morning darkness of Monday, April 17. Their landing was successful; 1,400 armed men reached the beaches of a place called the Bay of Pigs.

"In the battle that followed, Castro's troops suffered heavy casualties. Castro's tanks, coming up to the battle, were sitting ducks for an attack by air. Confidently, the little invading force waited for its air support to arrive. Its leaders had assurance of that support. It was provided in the preinvasion planning.

"Hours before, on Sunday evening, a small but potent force of B-26's was sitting in readiness on an airfield 500 miles away, waiting to take off for the Bay of Pigs. Those were planes of the invasion force, with Cuban pilots.

"But those planes didn't take off.

"The reason: President Kennedy forbade their use.

"That was the fateful decision President Kennedy made on that Sunday evening. He decided that the anti-Castro Cubans could not have the support of their own air force during the invasion. Without that support, the invasion failed."

President Kennedy made his decision the night before the invasion and while the invasion force was still on the high seas. Nevertheless, the Cubans were allowed to continue their course and make their landing without ever being told that their air cover had been canceled. The military aspects of the decision was one factor, the moral question of promising these fighting men protection and then removing it without letting them know, was quite another. It did something to the image of American leadership in Latin American minds which may never be forgiven.

Then there is the military aspect of the decision.

Even after the landing when officials in charge of the invasion pleaded with the President to change his mind, he refused. Even when they told him the mission was collapsing he remained adamant. In this hour President Kennedy was the Commander in Chief. No one could overrule him. Whatever his motives, they must have been powerful indeed to resist both the advice of CIA officials and the obvious embarrassment which the collapse of the invasion was bound to bring.

The U.S. News & World Report emphasizes how easy it would have been to liberate Cuba had the President's promised help been provided:

"The invaders inflicted close to 2,000 casualties on Castro's forces, suffered only a hundred or so casualties of their own. But without air support, the invaders could not hold out. Most of them wound up as Castro captives.

"American military officials who followed this operation say that it came within a hair's breadth of success. They say: Given early air support, the invaders could have destroyed Castro's air force and tanks. Defections from his militia, which had started, would have spread. Underground forces, waiting for word of success before rising against Castro, would have sprung into action. When that word did not come, they remained underground."

SOFT POLICY SHOWS UP IN EVENT CULMINATING IN THE OCTOBER CRISIS

By midsummer 1962 it was impossible to completely suppress the reports from Cuba that the Soviets had landed substantial military forces and were building Cuban bases for the launching of nuclear missiles. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, carried these reports to the floor of the Senate in August 1962. He repeated them during the month of September. On October 10 he declared: "Construction has begun on at least a half dozen launching sites for intermediate-range tactical missiles. My own sources on the Cuban situation * * * have substantiated this report completely."

The administration seemed casual if not indifferent to these warnings. It is now known that by October 16 aerial photos had verified the existence of both offensive missiles and Soviet jet bombers in Cuba but the official line continued to discount charges that a crisis was brewing in Cuba. As late as October 20, newsmen peppered the Defense Department with questions about the reports of Soviet missiles and jet bombers in Cuba and were met with flat denials.

The U.S. News & World Report later published an article entitled: "How U.S. Newsmen Were Misled About Cuba." The article stated:

"American news reporters and editors are complaining that they were deceived by the Kennedy administration about the situation in Cuba" (issue of Nov. 5, 1962, p. 8).

The President, meanwhile, was on a campaign tour, and had run headlong into a political chill at the grassroots level wherever the subject of Cuba came up. On the eve of an election the crisis in Cuba had become an issue with the people. Suddenly, the President terminated his tour, claiming he had contracted a cold, and hurried back to Washington.

Two days later President Kennedy went on the air and proclaimed a blockade of Cuba. A shout of triumph went up all over the free world. It looked as though the sleeping giant were waking up at last. But certain aspects of the President's blockade speech were puzzling: the Monroe Doctrine was never mentioned, there was no promise of any help to liberate the Cuban people, the overthrow of Castro's Communist regime was definitely not on the agenda.

It was on October 27 that President Kennedy sent his secret communication to Khrushchev promising that no attempt would be made to invade Cuba and that no other country in the Western Hemisphere would be allowed to liberate Cuba if the Soviet Union would remove its missiles. It was on October 29 that the New York Times published the full text of Khrushchev's reply and told the world what President Kennedy had agreed to do.

It appeared that legally and diplomatically, Cuba had been abandoned to communism.

The administration team had conducted itself completely within the framework of the Schlesinger-Acheson doctrine of keeping the Soviet within bounds but not attempting to liberate any Communist-conquered territory.

Only one question then remained for Cuba: Would the American people stand for it? Americans everywhere seemed to feel that the sooner Cuba was liberated the less blood it would cost. The longer it was postponed the stronger the forces would become which inevitably must be rooted out. They knew it was not just for Cuba that a new policy of firmness was required—the whole future of the world depended on it.

THE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the nuclear test-ban treaty proposed by the President of the United States is in the national interest.

This afternoon, I wish to discuss this question on the basis of scientific fact and rational argument, rather than on the basis of partisan politics. I regret very much that a good deal of the discussion of the nuclear test-ban treaty proposed by the United States has been, to date, on a partisan basis. I deplore this very much.

I wish to make the following points:

First, a nuclear test-ban treaty is in the best interests of the United States and is in the best interests of world peace. It would reduce international tension. It would decelerate the spread of the arms race. It would inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons to countries which do not now have them. It would prevent additional fallout, which, all over the world, is causing great damage to the health of future generations; and if testing is resumed, this damage will accelerate almost in geometrical progression.

Second, American security is impaired, not enhanced, by the unlimited development of nuclear weapons capability. At the present time, both the United States and Soviet Russia have a substantial overkill capacity. If an attack were to be made by one on the other, regardless of which one began it, it would be impossible for either side to escape incredibly destructive retaliation.

Third, presently we are far ahead of the Soviets in the development of nuclear weapons. Reputable scientific opinion believes that we have from three to eight times as many intercontinental ballistic missiles as the Soviet Union. Therefore, continued development through testing would not be in our interest; but it would be in the interest of Soviet Russia. It would be against our interest, because since we have this overkill capacity, inevitably the result of continued testing would be to narrow that gap. I make the categorical statement that the policies of President Eisenhower and of President Kennedy have not cost us our nuclear superiority. We still have it by a substantial margin. But in the event of nuclear war, the Soviet Union has enough to be able to wreak frightful damage on our country.

Fourth, the argument that our representatives are pursuing a "soft" political line in the negotiations at Geneva and elsewhere is completely fallacious. It is true that we have decreased the number of onsite inspections which we would require as part of any treaty which we would sign, but this is because of the development of the art of seismic detection. We do not need nearly as many inspections as we did before in order to ascertain whether a suspicious seismic event is an earthquake or is a nuclear explosion. The fallacious argument that we do need as many as we formerly did was exposed in great detail, and most convincingly, by the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in a brilliant speech which he made on the floor of the Senate about 3 weeks to a month ago. I deeply regret that his speech was not adequately reported in any of the communications media. It is not true that massive underground tests can be conducted in the Soviet Union without detection. There is not enough soft alluvial soil in the Soviet Union to provide the sites for such massive tests; and if such tests were conducted underground anywhere except in alluvial soil, they would be rapidly detected by the detection stations now in existence, and they would be confirmed by the seismic stations which, under our treaty draft, we would be entitled to erect on Russian soil.

Fifth, those opposed to a treaty grossly exaggerate the risks of cheating, and minimize the risks of continuing the arms race. For example, Dr. Edward Teller has made the completely fallacious, unsound, and untrue statement that the test-ban treaty we have proposed would call for another Munich. That is not true. He also said it would be virtually unpoliced. That is not so. He also said it would not interfere with the Russian program. That is not so. Each of those statements by Dr. Teller is a flagrant violation of fact. Even worse is his calling upon "all patriotic Congressmen" to oppose the test-ban treaty itself. I consider myself as patriotic an American as Dr. Teller; and I have no hesitation in stating that the preponderance of scientific opinion is strongly against him. For my part, I hope all clear-thinking Members of both Houses of Congress will rally in support of the test ban proposed by the President of the United States, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Chief of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. One can be sure that the Secretary of Defense did not act without adequate consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Sixth, I should like to state the direct advantages to the United States of the test-ban treaty proposed at Geneva by the President.

First, it would give us dependable assurance that no atmospheric underwater, or outer space testing would occur. All such testing can be reliably detected by stations outside the boundaries of the Soviet Union.

Second, it would give us dependable assurance that no high yield series of underground tests would occur, because tests underground of nuclear weapons above the 3 kiloton measurement would readily be detected by existing seismic detection stations if conducted underground.

Third, it would give reasonable assurance that no series of tests of small nuclear weapons below 3 kiloton measurement would occur underground without detection

My seventh point is that the Soviets did not, as has been frequently averred, break a test ban agreement in 1961. In point of fact, there was no such agreement at that time. There was a moratorium which had been participated in by both the United States and Soviet Russia, but we terminated that moratorium when President Eisenhower, in December of 1959, more than a year before the Soviets resumed testing, stated that, so far as we were concerned, we were no longer bound by the moratorium.

Eighth, and finally, the views which I have here expressed are set forth far more ably and with closer logic than I have been able to bring to bear in this speech by a number of very able American scientists and physicists in a letter which appears on page 10 of this morning's Washington Post under the heading, "Statement on the Test-Ban Treaty."

The signers of the communication are Dr. Bernard Feld, Department of Physics, at Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. David Inglis, Argonne National Laboratories, Argonne, Ill.; Dr. James Watson, Department of Biology, Harvard University; Dr. Bruno Rossi, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Donald Glaser, Department of Physics, University of California; Dr. Hans Bethe, Department of Physics, Cornell University; Dr. Freeman Dyson, Institute of Advanced Studies, Princeton University; Dr. Francis Low, Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Dr. K. T. Bainbridge, Department of Physics, Harvard University.

Mr. President, surely those eminent, reputable, and well-known American scientists, each with competence in his field, are worthy of belief. I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE TEST-BAN TREATY

In view of recent controversy concerning the desirability of concluding a nuclear test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union, we wish to make the following statement in support of the efforts of the U.S. Government to conclude such a treaty as soon as it can be negotiated.

Our primary reason for support lies in the fact that a test-ban treaty is in the best interests of the United States and of world peace. A treaty would reduce the speed of the present arms race, inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear powers, reduce the likelihood of nuclear war, and prevent the extension of the hazards of fallout. We therefore commend the President of the United States for his sincere attempt to reach a workable agreement with the Soviet Union on a test ban, and urge that Members of the United States Congress and of the general public consider the question of the test-ban treaty in the light of scientific fact and rational argument rather than in terms of partisan politics.

Unfortunately, public debate on the issue has been confused in recent weeks by some Members of Congress and by public figures who have attacked the test-ban treaty by spreading a completely false view of the test-ban situation. They also would appear to be operating on the fallacious assumption that American security can best be maintained by unlimited development of our nuclear weapons capability no matter what the other nations may be free to do in this regard. The attackers have failed to recognize the clear fact that once the overkill capabilities of the Soviet Union and the United States have reached their present level—and hardened missile bases are in place, making a successful disarming attack impossible for either side—an increase in nuclear capacity by one side or the other does not upset the balance of deterrence.

DETERRENCE REMAINS

Even though we probably possess between three to eight times as much intercontinental nuclear weapons capability as the Soviet Union, we would still have little chance of escaping an incredibly destructive retaliation were we to strike first with our strategic force. Since the smaller Soviet force is enough to deter us from a nuclear attack on the Soviets, a considerable change in force levels would still leave us with more than sufficient force to deter the Soviets from making a nuclear attack on us.

The opponents of the test-ban treaty also base their argument on the fallacious assumption that any attempt on our part to negotiate with the Soviet Union means that we are taking a soft political line and making dangerous concessions. The treaty opponents therefore consider any lowering of the number of onsite inspections by the United States simply as a sign of weakness and of yielding to the advantage of the Soviet Union, rather than as realistic negotiation to improve national security. In fact, during the period since the test-ban discussions began in 1958, detection techniques have been rapidly improving and may be expected to improve still further. It is now possible to detect many of the explosions within a given country by stations outside that country, and the number of onsite inspections required for checking the identification of earthquakes versus explosions has been greatly reduced. Research has also shown that there are many fewer earthquakes in the Soviet Union than was formerly thought, thus making a reduction in the possibility of their being confused with nuclear tests.

The strategy of the opponents of a treaty is to exaggerate the risks of clandestine testing and to minimize the risks of a continuing nuclear arms race. Among the most flagrant violations of fact which they have publicized in these matters are the recent statements by Dr. Edward Teller that a test-ban agreement "would be virtually unpoliced" and "would not interfere with Russian progress," and Senator DODD's claim that the test-ban policy of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations "has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets."

MISSTATEMENT CHARGED

In making this claim, Senator DODD is completely misstating the facts as set forth by responsible Department of Defense officials. If the Soviets learned more than we did in the 1961–62 testing and narrowed the gap between us, it was because they had more to learn. There is every reason to believe that they would have narrowed the gap even more rapidly had there not been a moratorium and had there been continuous testing on both sides after 1958. Conversely, if we had been able to conclude a test-ban treaty in 1959, the Russian tests of 1961–62 would not have taken place and we would still have our great superiority of nuclear weapons technology. By no stretch of the imagination could these tests have been carried out secretly underground.

The direct advantages to the United States of a test-ban treaty are these:

1. Dependable assurance that no atmospheric testing, which is the really important kind, is taking place.

2. Reasonable assurance that underground testing of small nuclear weapons is not taking place.

What assurance do we have that in the event of a test-ban treaty the Soviet Union would not conduct secret underground tests?

Even though a single small test might be concealed by being confused with an earthquake if the test were conducted in a region of frequent earthquake occurrences, any significant series of tests would be almost impossible to conceal.

RISK IS EMPHASIZED

It is extremely unlikely that the Soviet Union would be willing to risk the breakdown of the treaty for the marginal gain they might achieve by testing explosions small enough to escape detection. It is important to recall that American nuclear weapons experts insisted that underground testing was of little value for military purposes when, in 1961, our testing was temporarily limited to underground explosions. We have additional assurance in the fact that the Soviet Union has agreed to three onsite inspections should suspicious indications of underground testing be discovered by the detection system of the United States and the United Kingdom, and is willing to permit a number of automatic seismic stations on Soviet territory.

The Soviets surprised us by starting big atmospheric tests in 1961 when we thought at that time they would continue negotiations for a test ban treaty. The opponents of a present treaty now claim that this means the Soviets broke a test ban agreement in 1961. On this basis they warn against entering another agreement. It is too often forgotten that there was no test ban agreement (much less a treaty) in 1961; and that President Eisenhower on December 29, 1959, terminated the 1-year informal moratorium by announcing, "The voluntary moratorium on testing will expire on December 31." Even though the Soviets and most other nations have broken treaties, a test ban treaty would be very different from a mere cessation of tests, particularly if adhered to by an increasing number of nations, because it would be in the interest of the United States and the Soviet Union to abide by it. To be on the safe side, our developments and preparations would continue as far as possible without testing, and there should be no doubt that American testing would be resumed if the Soviets should break the treaty by again resuming tests in the atmosphere.

Even if the treaty should be abrogated after a time or should fail to develop into a world test ban because of the recalcitrance of France or China, it would not have interfered with our nuclear development appreciably more than the Soviets. The treaty would emphasize above all the common interest of the United States and the Soviet Union in trying to avoid nuclear war.

In summary, the test ban treaty, as proposed, will stop atmospheric testing as long as the treaty is in effect. It will leave some uncertainty about very small tests (one ten-thousandth the size of the H-bomb) but could reasonably be expected to deter the Soviets from even small-scale cheating (a) because it would teach them relatively little, (b) because of the serious risk of being caught, and, (c) because there are good reasons for the Soviets to want the treaty to function.

Careful studies by the foremost experts in the United States and by the President's advisers on national security, including those in the Defense Department, have furnished the conclusion that the risk of continuing the arms race without a test ban treaty is considerably more than the risk that such a treaty might be violated by secret testing. We support the President in this conclusion and believe that once the Members of Congress and the people of the United States are aware of the realities of our present situation and of the facts of the test ban case, that they too will support the President in his effort to find answers to the greatest question before the world today—the question of survival.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join with the able Senator from Pennsylvania in his comments relating to the article which appeared in this morning's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, as well as his general observations on the subject of the nuclear test ban proposed treaty. I had intended to invite the attention of Senators to the very article which the Senator from Pennsylvania has placed in the RECORD. It represents a well-thought-out, constructive, and sensible statement by a group of eminent scientists in support of a nuclear test ban treaty. Signed by nine leading physicists and experts in other branches of science, the statement takes on added significance, because these are men of no partisan persuasion in particular, but are rather men of competence, excellence, and scholarship in the field of science, particularly as physicists. In little more than two columns of newsprint they provide us with a superb analysis of the advantages of a test-ban agreement between the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union. The authors have approached the question from the only point of view that has any lasting relevance to the Senate. They have argued almost exclusively from the point of view of U.S. national security and national interest. It is a very convincing argument indeed.

I was particularly struck, Mr. President, by the passage refuting the allegation that a test ban would give "nuclear superiority" to the Soviet Union. The scientists, including Dr. Hans Bethe, of Cornell University, concede that the surprise Soviet test series of 1961–62 narrowed the gap between Soviet nuclear technology and ours. But the writers do not conclude from this that a test ban is ipso facto unenforcible or that it would inevitably put us behind the Soviet Union. On the contrary, they say:

> There is every reason to believe that (the Soviet Union) would have narrowed the gap even more rapidly had there not been a moratorium and had there been continuous testing on both sides after 1958. Conversely, if we had been able to conclude a test ban treaty in 1959, the Russian tests of 1961–62 would not have taken place and we would still have our great superiority of nuclear weapons technology. By no stretch of the imagination could these tests have been carried out secretly underground.

Mr. President, it is always pleasant to find oneself in agreement with men who know their business and who do not decide momentous issues on the basis of prejudice. In my speech of March 7 in this Chamber, I referred to this very question of the comparative advantages of a test-ban treaty. Let me recall my remarks at that time:

> As of this date, the balance of power is in our favor. The balance of power 5 years ago was even more in our favor. Ten years ago it was unmistakably in our favor. Had we been able to obtain a test-ban treaty 6 years ago, the Soviet Union today would be, for all practical purposes, a second-rate power.
>
> But some of the criticisms leveled today against a test-ban treaty were leveled against the same basic proposal 6 or 8 years ago. I held hearings of the Disarmament Subcommittee on this subject. Time after time, year after year, I have heard exactly the same thing. Yet it is now an accepted fact that had the United States of America been able to get the Soviet Union to agree to stop nuclear testing 6 years ago, the Soviet Union would never have been able to equal the power of the United States, or even come close to it.

These same points were developed further in colloquy between myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who had the perseverance to stand at my side throughout quite a long speech. My distinguished colleague and I were in full agreement that endlessly repeated rounds of nuclear testing are distinctly harmful to the overall security posture of the United States. Their one result would be to allow the Russians to narrow the gap.

I wish to make clear that there is not a scientist of any competence who does not say that continuous testing tends to narrow the gap between what we now have as a superiority over the Soviet Union.

My colleague and I concluded that a test-ban treaty is most advantageous to the country which at any given time happens to be in the lead. That is our position now. I hope that the opponents of a test ban will take this into consideration in their vigorous campaign against an agreement which has not even reached the President's desk, let alone the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has had printed in the RECORD the "Statement on the Test-Ban Treaty" signed by Drs. Bernard Feld, David Inglis, James Watson, Bruno Rossi, Donald Glaser, Hans Bethe, Freeman Dyson, Francis Low, and K. T. Bainbridge.

I caution Senators on one point in the article that has been placed in the RECORD.

I do not completely share the conclusion that the present "overkill capabilities" of the Soviet Union and the United States make a "successful disarming attack impossible for either side," although this may be an unpleasant fact of life in the very near future. Yet I commend the authors of the statement for a courageous, outspoken defense of a test-ban agreement at the earliest possible time.

Mr. President, I consider this statement in this morning's press to be very timely, significant and meaningful in terms of our national security and the national interest. I hope that it will be studied meticulously and thoughtfully by every person in the United States, and indeed throughout the world, who is interested in world peace.

Mr. President, this weekend we are going to have a papal encyclical on the subject of peace on earth. It will be one of the most important documents issued by any spiritual leader, or any lay leader or political leader. His Holiness Pope John is doing great things for this world in his courageous spiritual leadership, calling to man's attention the evil of our times and the evil of our ways and, above all, calling to our attention the importance of peace on earth and the ways and means to find it.

As we approach Good Friday it might be well for Members of Congress to contemplate the great mission and the message of the Prince of Peace, who brought to our attention and to the attention of the world the importance of peacemakers and the fact that they are blessed indeed.

I am anxiously awaiting—and I hope thoughtfully—the great message which will come to us this weekend from the Holy See. I say this because if the world needs anything today it needs this kind of courageous, fearless spiritual leadership, to bring to the attention of political leaders of the world the fact that there is something else in the world today other than the sheer exercise of physical power. There is something else which possibly can lead us into the paths of peace. I am sure the message we will receive, according to what we have heard thus far, will be not only meaningful in terms of its spiritual content but also will have what some people often refer to as the practical methodology for achievement of a spiritual objective.

PROGRESS AT GENEVA: COMMUNICATIONS LINK AND TEST BAN

Mr. President, I add there is other good news we could well contemplate. There has been progress in the past few days at Geneva, Switzerland, as well as progress at home and in other parts of the world in the cause of peace.

The news from the Geneva Disarmament Conference within the past few days has been encouraging. The Soviet Union, at long last, has accepted a proposal advanced by the United States to establish a reliable arrangement for a communications link between Moscow and Washington to be used in time of crisis. This link is expected to be in the form of a teletype and would help to reduce the likelihood that war might break out due to miscalculation or failure of communication at the height of a crisis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include, at the close of these remarks, that portion of a U.S. working paper on reduction of the risk of war through accident, miscalculation, or failure of communications that deals with the subject of communications on military emergencies. This document was submitted to the Conference on December 12, 1962, and it gives the outline of the U.S. proposal which, as I have said, the Russians have accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is interesting to note that one of the recommendations made by the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament in the year 1958 related to providing a better means of communication between the Soviet Union and the United States, to prevent accidental war. We called upon the executive branch of the Government then, as we have repeatedly since, to find a way through modern media of communications to avoid any accidental war through miscalculation or through some breakdown in communications. I am pleased that at long last there seems to be an agreement upon this detail.

Details of this measure will now be worked out in Geneva. We should regard this as an important step forward, but it is only one step and a small one. The next step should be agreement for a test-ban treaty.

The Soviet Union has not moved on its position on inspections since Chairman Khrushchev's letter of last December proposing three onsite inspections and three automatic recording seismic stations in the territory of the Soviet Union. It is time the Soviets moved. The last move was made by the United States. Clearly the next move is up to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union keeps contending that the question of an agreement on a test ban is political and has no scientific basis. Of course, the Soviets are half correct when they say it is political, because the question of a test-ban treaty and the proper verification safeguards in it is a question of political judgment based on scientific and other considerations. The United States, from a deterrent point of view, cannot accept the three inspections offered by the Soviet Union. The number is simply not enough. The eight new nations in the Geneva Conference—the so-called neutral or unalined nations—according to news reports, are proposing a compromise. Certainly it is hoped that any compromise proposed by the eight nations will be one that takes into consideration both the point of view and situation of the United States, as well as that of the Soviet Union. The responsibility on any third party in such an important situation is very great. It is time for the Soviets to begin to negotiate seriously on this matter now that they have come forward and made a significant move toward establishing a communications link. A test-ban treaty should be next.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the New York Times, published Monday, April 8, written by the Honorable James J. Wadsworth, former U.S. Ambassador to Geneva, on the subject of disarmament and a test ban.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

COMMUNICATIONS ON MILITARY EMERGENCIES

PURPOSE

Although extensive technical means of communication are available today, there is a question as to whether existing arrangements for communications between States would prove sufficiently rapid and reliable in time of a military emergency or crisis. If there is to be assurance that means of communication will be available when needed, steps must be taken in advance, and it would appear to be a reasonable precaution to place in effect between particular States special arrangements which could ensure the availability of prompt, dependable, and direct communications. Awareness of the availability of such communications links could itself prove reassuring, and should the need to use them arise, they could be employed with a minimum of the uncertainty that is characteristic of periods of tension.

PRINCIPAL ELEMENTS

In considering the establishment of special communications links, it would be necessary for the States concerned to reach agreement on a number of matters.

1. In view of the essentially experimental and untested character of such arrangements, it would not appear necessary or desirable to attempt to specify in advance all types of situations in which a special communications link might be utilized. However, there should be a common understanding of the general purpose of the link and of the broad circumstances under which it might be most useful. In the view of the United States, such a link should, as a general matter, be reserved for emergency use; that is to say, for example, that it might be reserved for communications concerning a sudden change in the military situation or the emergence of a military crisis which might appear directly to threaten the security of either of the States involved and where such developments were taking place at a rate which appeared to preclude the use of normal consultative procedures. Effectiveness of the link should not be degraded through use for other matters.

2. Specific technical means should be determined in the light of the geographic locations and types of equipment available to the States concerned. The primary criteria would be that technical arrangements be effective on a continuing basis and that they be as rapid as practical. Ordinary voice telephone represents one possibility, and radio might also be considered although until communications satellites become available on an operational basis, radio might not prove sufficiently reliable. In both these cases, however, there would seem to be some possibility of inadvertent error either through lack of precision in reception or through incorrect translation. Considering all aspects of the problem, the use of teletype systems might, on balance, prove preferable. It should be noted that a line reserved for transmission of messages by teletype could have a dual capability and be used for voice communication as well should that prove desirable.

3. Each state would be responsible for arrangements within its own territory, would determine the terminal (or originating) point of the link, insofar as its end of the circuit was concerned, and would make such arrangements as might be needed to effect internal distribution of messages to appropriate Government officials. In the case of the United States, it might be practical for the link to originate (or terminate) in the national command center, which maintains continuing contact with principal Government officials, including the President. Such a location would also permit relevant data and experience in military matters to be brought rapidly to bear. The route for connecting the two end points of a particular link would, of course, have to be agreed.

4. Adequate arrangements would be made by each state for continuous manning of the link and for acting on messages which might be received. Periodic joint tests or checks of the link could be undertaken.

5. No exchange of personnel would be involved. However, if military missions were exchanged concurrently with the establishment of a direct communications link, such missions would be available for consultation should that prove desirable in connection with matters requiring use of the link.

Although the foregoing arrangements would be undertaken directly between the states concerned, such states might, at their discretion, wish to notify the Secretary General of the United Nations of the circumstances involved in a military situation of a character warranting emergency use of the link.

EXHIBIT 2

TEST-BAN REPORT ATTACKED—WADSWORTH DENIES PANEL SPEAKS FOR ALL HOUSE REPUBLICANS

(The writer of the following was disarmament adviser to the Eisenhower administration and serves as U.S. representative to the United Nations.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Critics of the protracted efforts to achieve a nuclear test-ban treaty with the Russians have been most outspoken since the chances of agreement seemed to improve in the wake of the Cuban crisis. These critics are to be found in both parties, as are the consistent advocates of a workable treaty. Unfortunately, however, the Republican leadership in the House has left the impression that the GOP as a whole opposes the administration's current test-ban policy.

This impression has been left by Representative CRAIG HOSMER'S Republican House Panel on Nuclear Testing, whose reports are signed by the entire GOP leadership. The panel's first report, presumably based on the views of "experts" whose antitest ban views were already well know, was released to the press before scientists with a different approach could be heard.

Not surprising, the first report concluded that the present basis for negotiations on detection machinery fails to offer realistic probability of detecting violations. Yet it was not until almost a month later that Government witnesses spelled out the areas of recent progress in underground test detection before the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Anyone seriously interested in the facts could hardly be in a position to judge the detection machinery without hearing from the men most closely associated with making it work.

UNDERGROUND EXPLOSIONS

Now the hearings are over and Mr. HOSMER'S panel has issued another report. This time the panel has seized upon one bit of testimony, carefully ignored other statements, and has come to the conclusion that the American-British detection system cannot detect small underground nuclear tests over an area of 2.5 million square miles in the U.S.S.R.

The Hosmer panel's calculations are based on the assumption that secret Soviet tests would be conducted in dry alluvium, a soft earth. But the panel ignored the testimony of Dr. Franklin Long, of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who indicated that there are only two small areas of alluvium in the U.S.S.R. One is on the Iranian and Afghan borders, the other about 400 miles from Iran. Both are within detection range of stations outside of the U.S.S.R.

As a Republican and as the former chief negotiator for the Eisenhower administration, which initiated the nuclear test-ban talks, I find the operation of the Hosmer panel one of the most unfortunate domestic developments since I served in Geneva. It is biased in its presentation of the argument and misleading in its pretense of speaking for all House Republicans. I feel sure that the panel does not reflect the views of all Republicans in the House and certainly in the Senate, which must ultimately ratify any treaty which is signed.

BASIS FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Some congressional and press attacks on continued efforts to reach agreement imply that the top officials of the administration and their negotiators are "giving away" our national security, piece by piece. Levelheaded Americans know that successful negotiations must be based on a structure of mutual advantages for both sides. A workable nuclear test ban—and further steps toward mutual disarmament—would improve the security of both major powers as well as all other nations.

If this administration is guilty of anything, it is the failure to educate the public to the comparative risks of continued testing versus a treaty. President Kennedy made a cogent point during his press conference of March 21 when he spoke of the probability that many more nations would have the nuclear weapon by the mid-seventies. I hope he will continue to voice this warning until it is well understood. When the public is made aware of the choice we face, it can intelligently weigh the risks of new paths of international security.

JAMES J. WADSWORTH.

WASHINGTON, *March 26, 1963.*

DISARMAMENT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Colorado with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to clear up a couple of points which have really bothered me.

In the process of the Senator's discussion on disarmament I received the implication, at least, that the United States under the leadership of President Eisenhower was the Nation destroying the moratorium or test-ban agreement with Russia. I do not see how under any conceivable set of facts this conclusion could be reached.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will look at the letter from the eight scientists which I placed in the RECORD in my remarks, he will find that in December of 1959 President Eisenhower made a public statement that, from that time on, the United States would no longer be bound by the 1-year moratorium, to which we had earlier agreed. Therefore, after December of 1959 and before the

Russians resumed testing in the fall of 1961 there was absolutely no agreement between the two countries with respect to a moratorium.

Mr. DOMINICK. Was it not true that following that statement which was made—which was obviously an effort to try to induce the Russians into reaching a written agreement as such—it was also said that the United States would not resume any testing, and that this situation went on for a period of months and months and months? Is that not also the fact?

Mr. CLARK. That is not my understanding, but I shall ask my friend from Minnesota to verify the fact. The Senator from Minnesota would like to have the Senator repeat his question.

Mr. DOMINICK. After the December 1959 statement was made, the President publicly said that we were not going to do any testing, so that so far as we were concerned the moratorium was still in effect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from Colorado is correct in that. I know President Eisenhower did serve notice that we were not necessarily bound any longer by the 1-year moratorium, but he gave notice that we would not test.

I would be less than candid if I did not say that during that period of time I felt this was a justified Executive action, because the President of the United States was seeking to bring some pressure to bear on the Soviet Union to arrive at an agreement. I do not stand in criticism of the efforts of President Eisenhower. I will be frank with the Senate. I think he was very sincere and made a determined effort, and the program he entered into was a sound one.

I want to pay tribute to a man who did a monumental job, Ambassador Wadsworth, who served us so well at Geneva and later as a delegate to the United Nations. Ambassador Wadsworth has only recently responded, in a letter to the editor, to certain criticisms leveled against a proposed nuclear test-ban treaty.

I think he is a great statesman and has dedicated a life of experience to the cause of a just and enforcible peace.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. I share the views of the Senator from Minnesota with regard to President Eisenhower relating to a test ban. I think he was right. I had occasion to state yesterday on the floor of the Senate how much more right Ambassador Wadsworth was on the subject of disarmament than my friend, David Lilienthal, who has gone overboard in this area.

To answer specifically the question of the Senator from Colorado, I should like to read and quote from the statement of the scientists which I placed in the RECORD:

> The Soviets surprised us by starting big atmospheric tests in 1961 when we thought at that time they would continue negotiations for a test-ban treaty. The opponents of a present treaty now claim that this means the Soviets broke a test-ban agreement in 1961. On this basis they warn against entering another agreement.

This is the key sentence:

> It is too often forgotten that there was no test-ban agreement (much less a treaty) in 1961; and that President Eisenhower on December 29, 1959, terminated the 1-year informal moratorium by announcing, "The voluntary moratorium on testing will expire on December 31."

It is true, as the Senator from Colorado has said, he also announced we did not for the time being intend to test further, but there was no binding commitment on the Soviet Union, and none on us. But they started it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Did we not also say, when we announced that we are not going to do any testing, that we were getting ready to do so?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, we did.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

RULES, CUSTOMS, AND MANNERS OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn to another subject, that of the rules, customs, and manners of the Senate. I point out that the last four or five speeches on the floor of the Senate, starting with the interesting talk of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] about the drug industry, and concluding with my present talk, have been nonpertinent and nongermane to the pending business before the Senate, which is the Youth Employment Act.

I again deplore, for the record, the fact that we have no rule of germaneness and therefore for the last hour we have been discussing matters which in essence have slowed down the pending and important business of the Senate.

I myself have participated in this. I make no apology for it. I do point out that we do need, right now, not next year or the year after, the limited rule of germaneness of the nature proposed by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] so we can go ahead with the business of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN STAFF MEMBERS TO BE PRESENT ON THE FLOOR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower [Mr. PROUTY] may be entitled to have on the floor during the consideration of S. 1 such members of his staff as he may select to accompany him to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent that the full staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may be on the floor during the debate on S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the majority leader whether or not he anticipates completing action on this bill tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish it were possible.

Mr. CLARK. Could we say it is our pious hope?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Scotchman says, "I hae my doots," but we do intend to come into session early and stay late. I hope it is possible this week to finish action on the youth employment bill and the military procurement bill.

I had hoped we could bring up the water resources bill, but because one of our colleagues is away because of a death, that bill will not be taken up.

I had understood that the northwest power preference measure was ready to be reported, but it has not been reported.

To repeat, I hope we will be able to take up and finish the consideration of the youth employment bill and the military procurement bill. If we do not finish it this week, then I think after adjournment on Thursday we can anticipate starting in on it Monday morning next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But if, on the other hand, action on those two measures is completed, the other measures and the confirmations of nominations for the satellite corporation could well go over until after the Easter recess?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that happens, they will go over.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator does not mean the youth employment bill will go over?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; if the youth employment bill and the military procurement bill are disposed of one way or the other.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I would like to assure the majority leader that if the Senate feels inclined to accept an amendment which I shall offer later on, we can dispose of the bill very rapidly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In the same spirit the Senator from Vermont is speaking, would he be willing to consider a limitation of time at this time?

Mr. PROUTY. Definitely not, because I think a great deal of educational work is necessary, because much information in respect to this bill is misleading, and the Senate needs to be informed, as well as the public at large.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I made the proposal in the same spirit of cooperation in which the Senator from Vermont made his proposal. I thought we could approach the objective from different directions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the majority leader will be willing to conduct night school, if we need education?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Up to a certain time.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest vocational education.

Mr. PROUTY. If I may suggest, I hope I will not be compelled to speak to 90 empty seats. I think that would be unfortunate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. When the Senator from Vermont gets the floor, I shall be glad to have a quorum call, because I think he is entitled to a respectable audience.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it the intention of the majority leader to set this bill aside for the military procurement bill which will be on the calendar tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As of the moment, it is not the intention of the majority leader to do so, but if something comes up which indicates that not too much time will be taken with the military procurement bill, that suggestion will be given consideration after consultation with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota about it.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending measure is S. 1, the youth employment measure, whose title is "A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs."

This bill, S. 1, was introduced by the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for himself and a great number of other Senators. Extensive hearings were held on the bill before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which subcommittee I have the honor to be chairman.

In all, 61 witnesses were heard; 59 of the witnesses supported the bill and 1, representing the National Association of Manufacturers, opposed it. The bill is an administration measure. If Senators will refer to appendix B of the hearings, which appears at page 719, they will note the message of the President of the United States on "Our Nation's Youth," which was sent to the Senate on February 14 of this year, and in which he endorsed the principles of S. 1. They will also note excerpts from the budget message of the President, in which he made favorable references to the bill. They will note also a letter from Philip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference of the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, in which he states that S. 1 is in accord with the program of the President. They will also note letters from Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Anthony J. Celebrezze, regarding the bill. Also, there was a rather unusual hearing, at which five Cabinet officers appeared as a panel to support the legislation. They were the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior.

In my opinion, they made a strong case for this measure, which I hope the Senate will shortly pass.

The purpose of the bill is to provide useful work experiences for unemployed youths so that their employability may be increased. In providing these opportunities, the bill requires that youths enrolled in the program work on projects important to their Nation, State, or community.

The bill contains two titles.

Title I creates a Federal Youth Conservation Corps.

Title II establishes a State and community youth employment program.

The programs authorized under the bill will be administered by the Secretary of Labor in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, State, and local representatives, and authorities in the fields of youth education and training and conservation.

Legislation similar in intent has been before Congress for more than 4 years. S. 812, introduced in the 86th Congress by Senator HUMPHREY and 20 other Senators, passed the Senate in 1959. Similar to title I of S. 1, this program was not acted upon by the House of Representatives.

A similar, though larger and broader bill, also introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], with a number of cosponsors, was reported favorably by the committee and the subcommittee in the 87th Congress, but was not acted upon by the Senate.

I shall now briefly state the provisions of the two titles of the bill.

Title I provides for a Youth Conservation Corps, whose members are to be enrolled across the country, to work on Federal lands, largely national forests and national park lands, under the jurisdiction of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

The members of the Corps would engage in conservation projects to improve natural resources in outdoor recreational facilities. Its work would be similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps, one of the most successful Federal programs of the 1930's.

The camps and the work to be performed by the boys who would live away from home would be under the supervision of the appropriate conservation agency.

The work program in the camps would be complemented by educational and vocational training. During the first year of its operation, the enrollment in the corps would be limited to 15,000 young men between the ages of 16 and 21. The program is a 5-year program, and after the first year the number of enrollees would be governed by the amount of the appropriations which Congress allowed. The sum of $60 million is authorized by the bill for the first year of the Corps. Thereafter, Congress would have to decide from year to year what appropriations would be needed.

I turn now to title II of the bill, known as the State and community youth employment program. This program would include the establishment by the States, if they so desire, of conservation camps similar to those under title I, but on State lands and local and community lands, to improve the natural resources or recreational facilities.

In addition, work opportunities in improving educational, recreational, or other community assets; the elimination of blight, or assisting in hospitals, libraries, playgrounds, and welfare activities may be provided under the direction of the States or local communities.

Enrollees under this title may live either in State conservation camps away from home or may live at home. As under title I, educational and vocational training will have an integral role in the training experience. Evaluation, testing, counseling, and guidance will also be provided.

This title would also, generally, be administered by the Secretary of Labor, but immediate supervision and control would be in the hands of the relevant State and community agencies.

During the first year of operation, title II programs will be limited to 60,000 full-time enrollees. During the remaining 4 years of the program enrollment will be in accord with funds appropriated by Congress.

The bill authorizes $60 million for the first year and for the 4 remaining years leaves it to Congress to determine the level of appropriations.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; although I would prefer to finish my statement on the bill before we get into an extended colloquy.

Mr. PROUTY. Does not that, in effect, mean that we are acting on a 1-year program? We have no idea or knowledge of what Congress will do next year or in succeeding years.

Mr. CLARK. I would answer the Senator's question in this way. It is the hope of those of us who support the measure that the program will be so successful in its first year that Congress will see fit to substantially expand it in a few years. We may, however, be disappointed in that expectation, and Congress, accordingly, will have the opportunity, through the appropriations process, to curtail or even to eliminate the program if it sees fit to do so. The point of the matter is that we want to go through now with an authorization for a 5-year program.

Having established the principle that Congress supports the President in the program, we can then leave it to the appropriating process of future Congresses as to whether they wish to extend, curtail, or eliminate the program. However, the authorization will be in effect for 5 years, and it will not be necessary, if the bill is passed by the Senate and the House, to come back at the end of the first year and start with a new bill all over again.

I think that is responsive to the Senator's question.

Under title II, the participating States or communities are required to share a part of the costs in accordance with a formula similar to that adopted by Congress for the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962. That Act provides that costs shall be shared half by the Federal Government and half by the State or community, except in cases of severe financial hardship, in which, in the judgment of the Secretary of Labor, a lower cost-sharing ratio may be required to enable the State or community to participate. In no case, however, may the State or local share be less than 25 percent. State or local contributions may be made in kind as well as in cash.

I emphasize at this point that we who support the proposed legislation are most hopeful that many local communities and counties—indeed, metropolitan areas—will collaborate in asking for and receiving projects under title II, for which they, not their States, would put up the required amount of matching funds.

In my own city of Philadelphia, in Fairmount Park, we have had for a number of years work projects clearing trails and bridle paths, and the like; and the elimination of storm damage. This has given useful employment to a number of our school dropouts. There are many other projects of a similar nature across the country. I mention this one only because I am familiar with it.

In committee, the bill was significantly rewritten to bring it into its present form. Senators will note that the original text has been stricken and that the new text, in italic, commences on page 24 of the bill. This rewriting was the result of consideration by the subcommittee and, to a lesser extent, by the full committee, of the testimony of the 60 witnesses, and also by very stimulating discussion in executive session.

I shall now refer to the need for the bill. In his Manpower Report, transmitted to Congress in March 1963, the President declared persistent unemployment to be the major domestic challenge confronting the Nation today. Youths aged 16 to 21 account for a disproportionately large number of those without work—15.6 percent; whereas Senators will recall, the percentage of unemployment in the labor force across the country as a whole has dropped again, I am happy to say, below 6 percent. This high ratio of unemployment among youth is traditional when there is a sluggish market for labor; but these difficulties are further aggravated by the failure of many young people to finish high school.

As the President points out, there is less and less demand for unskilled and uneducated labor. Workers must have a fundamental education and some kind of work discipline if they are to hold jobs.

It is often said that there will be few places in the future of our country for those with strong backs and weak minds. Of course, this is generally true with respect to members of the labor force, who in the traditional American way, will desire to move up the ladder of business or profession, or of any other kind of occupation, to success. Yet it would be foolish not to recognize that there will always be in the world in general, and in the United States in particular, much useful work which individuals who do not have a high school degree will be able to do, and will be called upon to perform. It is hoped by the sponsors of the bill that that kind of work experience, that kind of training, for the less technical jobs, or jobs which do not need some higher level of education, will be provided for a number of our younger people by this measure.

At present, every year between 750,000 and 800,000 young people are dropping out of high school without finishing. The figure for vocational schools is still higher. Whereas in the conventional high schools the dropout rate is from 3 to 4 out of every 10 students, in the vocational schools the number of dropouts is 2 out of every 3.

I do not wish to be an alarmist about this situation, because there is pretty good evidence to the effect that the school dropout rate is no higher now than it has been over the course of the years—certainly over the course of the past 40 or 45 years. But it was alarming then, and it is alarming now. It becomes all the more important now as our population increases and we face the rather frightening fact that more than 1 million more young people will be joining the labor force next year than joined it last year. Where in the world will those young people—far too many of them school dropouts—find useful employment?

Note, for example, that approximately 350,000 young people over the age of 16 dropped out of high school between January and October of 1961. Of the school dropouts in that year, 27 percent were unemployed that fall, whereas the percentage of unemployment of high school graduates was 18 percent—far too high, to be sure, but substantially less than the number who had dropped out.

One of the things which concerns the administration, and concerns the committee, about this problem may be described by an old cliche, which is certainly true, to the effect that idle hands and idle minds turn to mischief, delinquency, and crime, and become a burden to the productive members of society.

Mr. President, one of the purposes of the bill is to provide a new setting in which these school dropouts may be taught work discipline and may be given a new motivation to strive to better themselves. At a time when machines are replacing more and more human labor and when opportunities for employment in agriculture and in manufacturing are in steady decline, the Nation faces an enormously great educational challenge in order to prepare young workers for gainful employment.

However, I hasten to add that the pending bill is certainly not the whole answer to the problem I have been discussing. Vocational education and its improvement are of great importance. Manpower retraining is highly important. The provisions, under the Area Redevelopment Act, for bringing new industries into areas of chronic and persistent unemployment will inevitably have a salutary effect on the employment of our younger people. Of course the most important factor of all would be stimulation and revival of the entire economy, which those of us on this side of the aisle hope will be provided by the President's tax bill. It is clear that private industry—not the Government—will have to pick up a large part of the load in helping American citizens—young, middle aged, and old, alike—who are in desperate need of gainful employment.

Yet, Mr. President, if this bill is enacted into law, it will have a substantial impact. I repeat that no one has suggested that this program provides in any sense the ultimate solution of all the problems involved in providing jobs for the new entrants into the labor force whom we can expect each year in the coming decade. This bill is only a start.

I should point out that among the witnesses who, in testifying before the committee, supported the proposed legislation were representatives of governmental agencies, representing at least 22 States, counties, and cities; also representatives of the National Association of Counties, the American Municipal Association, the Association of State Foresters, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AFL-CIO, educational institutions of all varieties, and a number of religious institutions. All the conservation groups and most of the youth and welfare organizations also urged the passage of the bill.

The representative of the National Association of Manufacturers was the only witness in opposition, although statements in opposition were filed by the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. President, I think I can say without fear of contradiction that the overwhelming preponderance of the testimony was in support of this measure, and that those who opposed it were not representatives of organizations which have any real competence to speak in the field of youth training, employment, and youth education.

I turn now to the conservation tasks undone, on Federal land which can be benefited by title I of the bill; and on State and local land by title II. This is work which will not be done under the regular conservation programs of the States and the Nation. This bill matches idle young hands with these important tasks.

Senators who will turn to page 6 of the report will note the startling figures on the millions of acres of the national forests, the extraordinarily widespread number of national parks and national monuments, and the large areas of the State and local conservation lands on which work under the bill could be authorized and could be done.

Speaking only about the Nation's potential on Federal lands, let me say there is a sufficient backlog of conservation work to provide 900,000 man-years of work. This work will not be done by regular appropriations. Congress will never provide the funds necessary to be provided in order to do all this work; and the President's budget will not support it. So—as was the case in the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps—this bill comes in to help our conservation programs—local, State, and National—all across the board.

Mr. President, let me say a few words about what can be done under title II. State recreation facilities and forest lands are deteriorating for lack of hands on the State and local payrolls to do the work. Help is needed in the cities' playgrounds, libraries, and hospitals, and to clean up blight. There is ample precedent at both the State level and the local level for such a youth employment program—as Senators will see if they turn to page 7 of the committee report.

Now let me say a few words about the kind of training which it is hoped the program will provide the enrollees. I shall state some of the occupations in which an enrollee under either the title I program or the title II program can expect to obtain some competence. I do not say we can expect them to come out highly trained and highly skilled; but they will be subjected to training in these kinds of occupations and skills; and one can hope they will be employable at least at the apprentice level when they finish the training under the program. Although the official program contemplates enrollment for 6 months, there are provisions for reenrollment for not to exceed 2 years.

The following are some of the skills in which training can be given: auto mechanic trainee, electrician's helper, traffic device maintenance trainee, traffic checker, mimeograph machine operator, multilith offset operator, photocopy machine operator, calculating and adding machines operator, telephone operator, secretarial, filing and general clerical worker, stockroom and office supplies checker, removal and planting of forest, town, roadside and park trees, construction of retaining walls, rehabilitation of picnic areas, block paving, typewriter repairman, addressograph machine operator, accounts and audits assistant, mechanic's assistant, and work in the food trades.

Then the committee report states in some detail the physical and educational benefits which the bill will provide; and in the report reference is made to the splendid work done for the youth of the country in the old Civilian Conservation Corps during the 1930's. I call attention to page 8 of the report, where Senators will find a very concise statement of the benefits the country received, both in terms of youth training and in terms of useful conservation work, by means of the old Civilian Conservation Corps program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether it is true that many economic studies have shown that one of the principal reasons for unemployment is the lack of skills on the part of our young people.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not also true that the heaviest concentrations of unemployment are among these three categories: first, young people; second, unskilled workers; and, third, minority groups?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. In the young people category I would lay special stress on the school dropouts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. So the bill strikes directly at the heart of what liberals as well as conservatives have recognized is the principal reason why people have not been able to find work?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not also true that one of the best ways in which contributions can be made at all levels to the economic strength and the economic growth of the country is to provide training, so that those who are trained can make definite and important economic contributions?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

That is the opinion of a majority of the committee, which I share.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. That particular section of the bill is extremely important. Frankly, I have heard those who oppose the bill contend that the bill does not provide adequate training of the kind that would be necessary after the participants leave the Civilian Conservation Corps and return to the cities. Having had a few years of work in conservation, they would not be trained for the kind of work which they would have to do if they wanted to continue to live in an urban environment. What is the Senator's answer to that charge?

Mr. CLARK. The testimony, buttressed by the experience under the CCC back in the 1930's, pretty clearly established that we would receive at least three major benefits from work under both title I and title II. In the first place, particularly in the work under title I, and in that part of the work under title II in which boys would live in a camp in the woods, we would observe extraordinarily enhanced physical buildup. The evidence is clear that young people who are too fat would come back lean. Those who are too lean would come back having put on needed weight. They would have an opportunity to have dental work done and to have a physical examination. The physical buildup of such young people, as revealed both in the experience under the CCC program and the testimony of witnesses in support of the bill, has been amply demonstrated.

The second benefit which we hope the program will bring will be an understanding of work discipline, of the need to maintain regular hours, of the need not only for health, but for adequate sanitation, the need to obey superiors and to work as part of a team which is trying to do useful work. We believe that to be very important indeed.

The third benefit would be educational—both vocational and technical. The educational process we believe will be a substantial part of the benefits under the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it true that there would be an opportunity in each State and locality to try to do what I understand has been done in Milwaukee with great success, namely to tailor the kind of training the men would receive to the kind of jobs in which skilled operators are needed, and in which the training could be useful, so that the men would have a much better opportunity—a direct, practical, well developed, and explored opportunity—to find work after they have finished a period of training in the Conservation Corps?

Mr. CLARK. That is the intention of a majority of the committee. It is the expressed intention of the Secretary of Labor. We have been unwilling to write into the bill what we call a straitjacket amendment, which would require that a skill could not be taught unless it could be established that there was at that time a need for that kind of skill, either in the specific area from which the enrollee comes or where the work is being done. But education is certainly a part of the program, and it is fully intended that it should be followed out.

Mr. PROXMIRE. One further question. Is it not true that while the conservation aspects of the bill are very important and constructive, the essence of the bill is to provide the kind of human conservation and human training which are essential if young people are to have an economic opportunity in life, and if they are to make the kind of contribution that American citizens would like to make to their locality, their State, and their Nation.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Having yielded to my friend the Senator from Wisconsin, I am happy to yield to my friend from Vermont. I shall not require more than 5 or 10 minutes to complete my statement.

Mr. PROUTY. I merely wish to comment on a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. Milwaukee is to be congratulated on its vocational educational training program. It is my understanding that it has one of the lowest high school dropout rates in the country. I believe it is 5 percent or less. Milwaukee has spent a great deal of money to modernize the entire approach to vocational education. To my mind, that is the answer to the problem with which we are now confronted, rather than sending a boy out in the woods for 6 months, where, based upon the testimony of witnesses, he will acquire no skill and will return to find himself at the same place he was when he started. I congratulate Milwaukee. I hope other cities in the country will follow the example of that city.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like briefly to refer to some of the other points in the bill which should be before the Senate when it acts. The standards of selection provided by the bill are purposely flexible so as to permit the Director to distinguish between good and bad risks. That is a problem with which the subcommittee and the committee wrestled at some length. It is a difficult task indeed to provide an adequate definition as to what kind of boys should go into a conservation corps and what kind of girls and boys should be offered employment under title II of the program.

Since I may not have mentioned it before, title I is intended entirely for the benefit of young men and boys. Title II is intended for both girls and boys, except in the State camps, where only boys will be accepted. But in the community projects under title II, young women will also be accepted. The age limits are from 16 to 21 inclusive.

Returning to the standards of selection, the present occupant of the chair, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], is responsible for the provisions in the bill under which the Director would be given substantial flexibility to distinguish between good and bad risks. However, the committee is very clear that a delinquency record would not automatically exclude a boy who had demonstrated that he had the willingness and the capacity to become a productive member of the program.

However, it would exclude one whose behavior, in the light of his record, suggests that he might be a disruptive element in the corps, or that he might not benefit from the kind of program proposed. It is anticipated that prospective enrollees will be screened in centers by the administrative force authorized under the bill in order to separate those who would make good risks for the program and whose performance would be in accordance with the purposes of the bill from those who would be disruptive influences, and therefore would not only fail to benefit by the bill, but also might be a detriment to the other members and to the whole program.

Senators should know that the enrollment opportunities are allocated among the States on the basis of population and need. A short time ago I referred briefly to that point. But it is intended that the proposed flexible formula will give the Secretary of Labor sufficient latitude to relate enrollment opportunities to youth unemployment as it exists within each State, in accordance with comparative need. Thus, the formula anticipates that allocations will be made fairly among both urban and rural areas, that adequate numbers of members of Indian tribes, where serious unemployment is at present the rule of the day, will be enrolled, and that States with small populations, which will be assigned smaller quotas, will be able in most cases to derive substantial benefit from the conservation work which will be carried on within their borders.

The compensation of enrollees will be $60 a month, but will include food, shelter, transportation, equipment, clothing, medical, dental, hospital and other health services, and recreational services.

As noted before, a substantial number of hours will be devoted to educational and vocational training.

The kinds of work which the members of the Corps could perform under title I and under the State and local camps called for by title II would include the prepartion and cleaning up of camps, picnic grounds, trails, boundary marking, forests, croplands, timber management, small bridge building and maintenance, fencing, range seeding, brush control, water management, plant control, weed eradication, building and levee maintenance, dam repairs, gully control, tree planting, seeding and sodding, historical and archeological projects and biological work on grasslands.

These are some of the areas in which useful employment can be provided, according to the witnesses who appeared before the committee.

The work classifications to which these young men would be subjected—they would have an opportunity at least to gain a primary skill, though not more than the skill of an apprentice, however—would involve instruction in and operation of construction equipment, both hand and power, electrical wiring, masonry, plumbing, carpentry, truck-driving, automotive repairing, metalworking, photography, conservation and engineering, surveying, mapping, cooking, and clerical tasks.

It is important to note that the Director will not assign enrollees of the Corps to direct construction work where historically such work is normally performed by skilled mechanics and laborers employed by construction contractors under contract with the conservation agencies.

The bill is not intended to replace regularly employed workers with cheap labor furnished by enrollees of the camps.

I shall say a word about the treatment of the school dropouts, who will, in all likelihood, comprise a very substantial percentage of the number of enrollees. These dropouts will be encouraged to go back to school at the end of their 6 months' tour of duty. High school graduates will be encouraged to continue their education. It is not intended that this program should siphon off young people who are presently in high school. Every effort will be made to discourage anyone from dropping out of school in order to enroll in a camp.

It should be pointed out also that this is to be a voluntary program. No one is to be drafted into it. I say again that the Director must take every step possible to encourage applicants to stay in school and complete their education; or, if they have dropped out, to return to school if that is at all possible.

I should now like to say a word about costs, which is one of the major differences between my friend from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] and the majority of the committee.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified during the hearings that the cost of the title I program would approximate $4,000 per enrollee; that is to say, $3,985. This figure is based upon amortizing fixed investments over their useful lives, and writing off annual costs each year.

Interested Senators will find the details of Secretary Wirtz' cost figures on page 12 of the report. I shall not detain the Senate at this time by a detailed discussion of those costs, but I merely say that in my judgement the Secretary of Labor made an excellent case for his figures.

In connection with the cost figures I should like to comment again, as I have in other connections during the past few weeks, on the comparatively low cost of this program. We are asking at this time for appropriations to be authorized of $60 million under title I and $60 million under title II, a total of $120 million.

Let it be noted that the cost of the defense program between the time I now speak at 25 minutes after 4 o'clock in the afternoon and 8 o'clock tomorrow morning will be more than the total cost of both titles of this program for the first whole year under the terms of the bill. We are presently spending $1 billion a week for defense. Can we not spend one-tenth of what we spend each week for defense to give to these school dropouts and to other youths an opportunity for 1 year to rehabilitate themselves, to build up their bodies and minds, to give them useful work experience, and to return them to their communities with some hope that they can find gainful employment?

The Federal share of the program cost is to be, of course, 100 percent under title I, but under title II the formula, as I said earlier, is modeled after that contained in section 2(c) of the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962, as interpreted by the Area Redevelopment Administration. I think I said enough about that formula earlier this afternoon so as to make it unnecessary to deal with this matter in greater detail now.

I should point out that the bill calls for a National Advisory Council of Citizens on Youth Employment Programs consisting of 10 members, including the Secretary of Labor or his designee, who shall be Chairman. Members of the Council are to be representatives from the fields of youth employment, youth welfare, labor, local or county government, management, education, training, and conservation. The Council shall also include, whenever appropriate, representatives of the Secretaries of the various Federal departments who have an interest in the program, the names of whom I indicated earlier.

The Advisory Council is modeled on those which have been used with great success on other subjects in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the section-by-section analysis of the bill, which begins near the top of page 16 of the report and runs to the middle of page 20, may be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

TITLE I. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Section 101: Title I may be cited as the "Youth Conservation Corps."

Section 102: This provision describes the objectives of the title I program: To provide on-the-job training for young unemployed men aged 16 to 21 together with supplemental training and education programs adapted to their special needs in order to increase their chances for permanent employment. The section would put these young men to work conserving our natural resources.

Section 103: A Youth Conservation Corps will be established in the Department of Labor to be administered by a Director of the Corps, appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate. The Director shall perform such functions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

Section 104: This section describes the general authority of the Secretary of Labor to carry out his responsibilities under this title. His authority includes (1) the establishment of adequate standards of safety, health, and conduct for YCC enrollees and to provide, through agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for medical, dental, hospital, and other health services; (2) the execution of agreements with the participating agencies of the Federal Government responsible for the conservation, development, and management of the natural resources of the Nation and of the Nation's recreation areas under whose supervision the enrollees will work; (3) the utilization of the services and facilities of Federal agencies and with the consent of any State, of the services and facilities of the agencies of the State, or a county, or municipal subdivision; and of (4) the development of a system of training and educational services for enrollees in the Corps coordinated with their regular on-the-job training program, under such agreements as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may execute with State and local educational authorities; (5) the expenditures of such amounts as may be necessary for the purchase of supplies, materials, and equipment to be used in the work of the Corps; (6) the promulgation of such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the title; (7) the delegation of any of the Secretary's functions to the Director of the YCC.

Section 105: An Interdepartmental Committee on the YCC is established by this section. It is composed of the Secretary of Labor, or his designee, and representatives from the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; Agriculture; and Interior. The Committee is directed to consult and advise with the Secretary with respect to all phases of the operation of the Corps.

Section 106: A provision is made for the creation of a National Advisory Council on the YCC consisting of 15 members representing the fields of conservation, agriculture, education, training, youth employment, labor, management, and the public in general.

Section 107: Subsection (a) provides that the Corps will be composed of male individuals who are permanent residents of the United States, who are not younger than 16 or not older than 21 at the time of enrollment and whose participation in the Corps will be consistent with the purposes of the title. Participation in the Corps will not be grounds for deferment under the Selective Service Act. It specifies that the number of enrollees within the Corps shall not exceed 15,000 during the first fiscal year of its operation and during the next 4 fiscal years shall be maintained in such numbers as permitted by the appropriations made therefor by the Congress.

Subsection (b) requires the enrollee to abide by the rules and regulations of the Corps.

Subsection (c) provides a period of enrollment of not less than 6 months with reenrollment for such additional periods not in excess of 2 years.

Subsection (d) provides the basis of apportioning enrollment quotas among the several States. Fifty percent of the allocation will be made on the basis of the comparative populations within the male 16 to 21 age group covered by the bill. The remaining 50 percent will be distributed among the States by the Secretary based upon the State's share of national unemployment there is provision for a compensating allocation to those States which will not have Federal conservation camps.

Section 108: Under subsection (a)(1) the compensation of enrollees is specified at $60 per month with $5 additional for such subsequent enrollment. An additional $10 per month is provided for assigned leadership responsibility or special skills.

Subsection (a)(2) will enable the enrollee to make allotments to parents or dependents.

Subsection (b) provides for food, shelter, transportation, and other assistance, including education, medical, and hospital services for enrollees as well as applicants for enrollment. Applicants for enrollment will receive a subsistence allowance during preenrollment and screening stages.

Subsection (c) provides an income tax exemption for the subsistence items described above.

Section 109: Subsection (a) provides that the Federal laws relating to Federal employees governing working hours or work rates or compensation, leave, unemployment, and other employee benefits will not apply to the enrollees under this title except as specifically authorized.

Subsections (b), (c), and (d) sets a figure of $150 per month for computing wages within the meaning of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code and contains appropriate amendments to those laws.

Subsection (e) extends the benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act to enrollees in the Corps, specifying $150 per month as the basis for compensation benefits for disability and death with the high rate described in the entrance salaries for a GS–2 grade under the 1949 classification act in the case of permanent disability.

Section 110: Subsection (a) authorizes an appropriation of $60 million for the first fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and authorizes such amounts as the Congress may deem to be necessary to carry out the provisions of the title during each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years and after.

Subsection (b) provides for the transfer of appropriate funds between Federal agencies for the purposes covered by the title.

Section 111: The Secretary of Labor is directed to submit two annual reports on the activities of the Corps to the President for transmittal to Congress, together with such recommendations as he may deem to be desirable.

TITLE II. STATE AND COMMUNITY YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Section 201: This title may be cited as the "State and Community Youth Employment Act."

Section 202: The purpose of title II, like title I, is to relate useful and meaningful jobs which can and should be undertaken in the public interest with the need for unemployed youths within the 16 to 21 age group to obtain useful work experience. The objective of the program, as in the case of the first title, is to enable these young men and women to develop sufficient work discipline and experience to enable them to obtain regular employment.

Section 203: The Secretary of Labor is directed to assist and coordinate with agencies of the States, county, and local governments, including Indian tribes, as well as the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, in the development of employment programs for young men and women within the 16 to 21 age group. The programs will combine on-the-job training with vocational training and education provided by local educational authorities. Included among the programs contemplated by this title are those in conservation and the development and management of natural resources and recreational areas.

Section 204: Employment programs developed by the State and communities under this title are submitted to the Secretary of Labor for approval as federally assisted projects. The Secretary will approve these programs if he finds that (1) the enrollees will be employed on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, including Indian lands or in local projects, sponsored by private nonprofit agencies approved by the appropriate State agency; (2) the program will increase the employability of the enrollees or will enable student enrollees to resume or maintain school attendance; (3) the program will contribute to a project or service in the public interest which will not otherwise be available or will contribute to State or community programs in the field of conservation and recreation; (4) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers; (5) the rates of pay or other conditions of employment are consistent with the rates and conditions in the area; (6) the program will be coordinated with vocational training and educational services adopted to the special needs of the enrollees with further provision for development and improvement of such services in any case where they are insufficient; and (7) the program includes standards and procedures for the selection of applicants and will be fully coordinated with local activities to encourage students to maintain or resume school attendance.

Section (b) directs the Secretary to give priority to projects with high training potential. These would include those programs which are fully coordinated with vocational training and educational services sponsored by State and local educational authorities and adapted to the special needs of enrollees within the training program.

Section 205: Young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, who are within the 16 to 21 age group, and whose participation in the employment program will be consistent with the aims and objectives of the title are eligible for enrollment under subsection (a).

Subsection (b) provides that enrollees shall not be subject to the provisions of Federal law relating to Federal employment.

Subsection (c) provides that the number of enrollees during the first fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall not exceed the equivalent of 60,000 full-time enrollees and shall not exceed such numbers during the 4 fiscal years thereafter as may be maintained within congressional appropriations.

Subsection (d) directs the Secretary of Labor to provide for testing, counseling, job development, and job referral services through either governmental or private nonprofit agencies to young men and women enrolled within the program.

Section 206: Subsection (a) provides that whenever the Secretary determines that an employment program conforms to all of the standards of the title and is appropriate for Federal assistance, he may enter into agreements with the sponsoring agencies in which the Federal Government will bear a share of all costs of the program, including administration on the basis of a flexible formula. The Federal share will range from 50 to 75 percent in such proportion as may be determined by the Secretary upon the basis of all relevant factors including rates and duration of unemployment and underemployment in the area covered by the program and the income levels of families within such areas. The share to be borne by the State or the political subdivision or the agency sponsoring the plan may be paid in cash or in kind fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant equipment and services.

Subsection (b) directs the Secretary to apportion the funds under this title among the

States upon the basis of population and need. Fifty percent of such funds will be apportioned among the States on the basis of population ratios within the 16 to 21 age group covered by this title. The remaining 50 percent will be allocated by the Secretary to the States and to areas within based on the share of each State of the national unemployment.

Section 207: Subsection (a) provides the Secretary with authority to carry out his responsibilities under the title. He may delegate whatever powers may be appropriate to the heads of other Federal agencies to carry out the purposes of the title. He may use the services and facilities of Federal agencies or, with the consent of the State, of the agencies of a State or subdivision thereof. He is authorized to establish State and local advisory committees, to make such contracts and agreements as may be necessary, to execute his responsibilities, to take such steps as may be necessary to encourage the enrollees to participate in a systematic program of training and education, coordinate with State and local education authorities regarding on-the-job training programs and to prescribe rules and regulations.

Subsection (b) contains the usual provisions with respect to protection of the United States against loss.

Section 208: Subsection (a) establishes a National Advisory Council on State and Community Youth Employment Programs. Membership in the Council will consist of the Secretary of Labor or his designee and nine members including representatives from the fields of youth employment, conservation, agriculture, education, training, labor, management, and urban development. The Council shall also include, wherever appropriate, the Secretary of HEW, Agriculture, and Interior, as well as the Attorney General, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and other agency heads who may have an interest in the administration of the program.

Subsection (b) provides that the Council, upon request of the Secretary, shall review the operations under this title and shall make recommendations with respect to the administration of the act. It may also make recommendations to the Secretary on projects referred to it by him.

Subsection (c) fixes the compensation of council members.

Section 209: Directs the Secretary to seek the advice and assistance of the Secretaries of the Departments of HEW, Agriculture, and Interior, of the Attorney General, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and of such other agency heads as he may deem appropriate.

Section 210: Subsection (a) authorizes appropriations of $60 million for the first fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and authorizes such sums for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years thereafter as Congress may deem necessary for the administration of the title.

Subsection (b) authorizes the transfer of funds between Federal departments and also authorizes grants to States and local governments for the purposes provided by this title.

Section 211: The Secretary shall file annual reports with the President for transmittal to Congress, including a full and complete evaluation of the activities and programs authorized by the title together with such recommendations as he may deem desirable.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I now turn briefly to the minority views. I shall say only a word in this regard, because one of my colleagues on the committee, the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], will deal in some detail with the minority views. I wish to say in all candor that the minority views are pretty bitter, pretty extravagant. They go far beyond any testimony by witnesses who came in to oppose the bill.

Generally speaking, the minority views are largely negative, and have no constructive suggestions to make other than a complete overhauling of our vocational education system, which is obviously a matter for the education bill and not this bill; and, in the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee, we should have done something a long time ago to meet the youth problem.

I deny that the case for the bill was poorly prepared by the administration witnesses.

I am glad to admit that title I of the bill relies heavily on the very successful experience with the Youth Conservation Corps in the 1930's. That program is as pertinent today as it was then; and, in my opinion, it should not have been abandoned. It was abandoned only because of World War II.

I deny that the YCC will not provide any skilled training. I think it will, at the apprentice level. I deny that the cost will be exorbitant.

I deny that there will be a potentially serious disciplinary problem in the camps. In that regard, I have drawn for support of my viewpoint on the magnificent testimony of George Catlett Marshall, probably the greatest soldier the United States has known in my lifetime, who was intimately connected with the administration of the CCC program, and who rallied to its defense in testimony before the Congress a good many years ago.

I am amazed that the minority would make this statement:

> A young man who had committed murder might actually meet these enrollment requirements and join the YCC.

This extravagant statement has, of course, no truth whatever.

Nor do I think the bill would be helped by the amendments proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] to bring the Defense Department actively into the program. We conferred with the Defense Department. We know that it wants no part of the program. This is supposed to be a civilian program, and not a military program. The committee relies upon that decision.

Nor do I think there is any basis for the opinion that the Corps would weaken family ties; nor that the "Hometown Youth Corps," as the minority calls the youth program, would be another boondoggle.

So I turn briefly to the amendments to S. 1 printed in the appendix to the minority views and proposed before the full committee by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater].

Each of these amendments was carefully considered in committee. Each of them was rejected. I shall not attempt to anticipate which will be proposed again, but I assure Senators—and I am sure the Senator from West Virginia will amplify this statement when he speaks—that there is a sound, strong reason for opposing on the floor of the Senate every one of the amendments proposed by the Senator from Arizona, which were defeated in the committee.

In conclusion, in the view of the majority of the committee, this is a good bill. It is needed. The administration is correct when it asks the Congress to pass it. It would provide useful employment opportunities, both at home and in conservation camps, for substantial numbers of unemployed youth, a very large percentage of whom are school dropouts. Its cost would be moderate. It would make at least a moderate beginning toward giving the young people of our country the kind of training and opportunity which would enable them to obtain employment, to live out useful lives dedicated to the benefit of our country, and give them normal expectations of raising families of fine Americans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate refer the pending bill, S. 1, to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with instructions to report the bill again to the Senate, together with its views, not later than April 30, 1963.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PROUTY. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator; but let me say first that I do not intend to take a great deal of time in discussing the motion. I hope Senators will remain in the Chamber so that there may be a vote in short order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before the majority leader suggests the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if the Senator from Vermont would be willing to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement, applicable to this amendment only, limiting debate to 15 minutes, or perhaps 30 minutes, to a side.

Mr. PROUTY. As of now, I am unable to agree to any such unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Vermont desires a live quorum. I suggest that attaches on both sides of the Senate notify Senators.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the thought in mind that it will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 45 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern

McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with instructions to report back not later than April 30 next.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on this motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I intend to be brief in justifying my motion that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The vote on the motion could come very soon. I know also that many Senators are desirous of leaving Washington; but I think so much misinformation has been given with respect to S. 1 that considerable time will be necessary to explain exactly what the bill does and does not do. But the utilization of a great deal of time will be necessary only if the pending motion is defeated.

Never during my service as a Member of the Senate have I seen such evasive answers given to legitimate questions asked by members of the subcommittee as was the case with respect to the consideration of S. 1. I think the reason was that most of the witnesses did not have the necessary information. They could not give definite and specific answers to many—perhaps most—of the questions which were asked by members of the subcommittee.

At the outset, I wish to make it clear that it is not my purpose to sabotage the bill. I feel very strongly that the Senate has an exceedingly difficult problem to solve—the problem of our unemployed young people. During the course of the debate, I hope to offer amendments which, in my judgment, would be far superior to the approach suggested by the bill.

Originally the impression was created that S. 1 is an educational measure; that it was proposed to take unemployed boys off the city streets and send them into camps, so that they would return fully qualified for gainful employment; and that they would acquire skills of one kind or another which would make them self-supporting citizens of our society. However, practically no testimony has been given before the subcommittee, which suggests that this would be the case. I shall quote briefly now from one of the statements made on this point. Focus your attention on the significant words of Secretary of Labor Wirtz:

> I call attention to this: First, there is no suggestion that this training program will qualify one of the enrollees for a skilled occupation. That we should dismiss completely.

I could quote other witnesses, and shall as the debate progresses, if my present motion is not approved.

Now a word about costs.

We were told originally that 50-man camps would be built at a cost of $250,000, a ridiculously low figure, one which I think cannot be justified. If sufficient camps were constructed, the program would more than utilize the $60 million provided in the proposed authorization, to say nothing about operating costs. I shall not go into that subject in detail at the present time. However, I do wish to emphasize that we are talking about a conservation measure. It is a measure that should have been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, committees which are definitely concerned with subjects of this nature.

We have heard something about camps. In the Congressional Record of April 4, page 5666, is a list of camps which the administration and the proponents of the proposed legislation now tell us can be occupied within a very short period of time to take care of 12,000 boys. Yet I found that the administration does not know where the camps would be located, despite the list. Secretary of Labor Wirtz admitted as much during the Senate hearings. I asked the Secretary where the Government would house 15,000 enrollees in the Youth Corps if existing facilities were used. He replied as follows:

> Where are we going to put them? That question I cannot answer.

I asked the Secretary of Labor if he could tell me the pertinent facts about the existing facilities that might be utilized. I inquired of him regarding the age of the buildings involved; the type of construction; and whether the buildings are currently occupied by the staff of any Federal agency. The Secretary could not provide any of this information. Indeed, he had several days, following his oral testimony, in which to supply the requested data before the record of the hearings was closed. Yet he did not provide it.

Mr. President, this whole subject would be comical if the welfare of the country and the solvency of the Federal purse were not involved.

It is true that the administration has submitted a list of camps which it says are available for Youth Corps enrollees. The list provides the name of the agency which supposedly has jurisdiction over the camps, and it also cites what is allegedly the approximate capacity of the camps.

I ask Senators not to make the mistake of being impressed by the list. In the past 24 hours, I have discovered that one of the camps that is supposed to be used in a Western State does not even exist.

It seems to me that every bit of information we have received in connection with the bill has been in the "preplanning stages." Figures and estimates have been juggled all over the place in an effort to make this woodland folly palatable.

Perhaps the most tragically comical incident occurred during the hearings on S. 1, when I asked the Secretary of Labor about potential Youth Corps camps in Vermont. Permit me to read the colloquy:

> Senator Prouty. Are any of these camps in Vermont?
>
> Secretary Wirtz. Are any of the camps in Vermont? I will have to check that.
>
> Now, when you say, "Are any of the camps in Vermont?" I am talking only about the list I have before me at the moment, the list which has been presented and prepared by the Department of Interior; and as far as the Department of the Interior is concerned, there is a camp at Swanton in Vermont.
>
> Senator Prouty. Can you give me any information about that camp, how long it has been built, what type of camp it is?
>
> Secretary Wirtz. It is a camp the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife established. It would be a small one. The capacity of that camp is indicated, according to the figures I have, which I must give you at this point, on the basis of what I have before me, at 10 people, with a cost of $25,000, which would be available within 90 days of the approval of the project.

The fascinating thing about this Vermont camp is that it does not exist. The Department of the Interior rather squeamishly admitted that the camp is nonexistent, but stated in half apologetic tones that the Department is considering building a camp there.

Just imagine that, Mr. President. The administration cited as a camp available for use one at Swanton, Vt., which is not even in the blueprint stage.

I also referred to another camp in a Western State, which is of the mythical variety.

These are only two glaring examples of the administration's lack of knowledge of existing facilities. In short, the administration does not know which ones will be used, or which ones are presently occupied, or how they are constructed. In fact, the administration does not even know whether they exist.

Mr. President, the hearings on Senate bill 1 amounted to an extensive monolog by administration spokesmen on the glories to our civilization which will result from the two titles of Senate bill 1.

More particularly, the major portion of those hearings extolled the magnificent elation which unemployed youth will experience from 6 months—or 2 years—in the woods and forests, as contemplated, in the Youth Conservation Corps, under title I of the bill.

One significant fact emerges from a reading of the hearings on title I: The apparent failure in the bill to deal with the matter of the preparation of unemployed youth to enter the skilled labor force which our economy now needs.

Almost without exception, the witnesses before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, which conducted the hearings, concentrated on the conservation of natural resources which is sought to be fostered by Senate bill 1.

Indeed, one of the committee amendments to title II of the bill was to insure that the hometown programs proposed under that title should give priority to conservation and park cleanup projects.

So Senate bill 1 is, in essence, a conservation bill, rather than a bill to deal with the unemployment problem among our youth.

I greatly favor conservation of our natural resources. I recognize the importance of our park system to the people of the United States. But there is an appropriate means by which the Senate should consider such legislation.

The time and service which members of the various Senate committees devote to the problems before them give to those members special insight into those problems. However, some of us who serve on other committees are perhaps less familiar with those areas of legislation, and look to our better informed colleagues for assistance.

The Committee on Labor and the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower should, and do, know something about our unemployment problems. But we, as members of the Committee on Labor, do not possess the specific knowledge with respect to conservation and park land matters which members of the Interior Committee are able to develop.

Certainly that committee should have an opportunity to consider Senate bill 1. This would seem to conform to the view of the proponents of the pending bill.

Consideration by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would appear to me to be a valuable asset to the bill. The Senate, and indeed the entire Nation, to say nothing of the administration, would seem to be wisely served by a report from that committee on both titles of Senate bill 1.

The Interior Committee is entitled to express itself on this matter. The Senate is entitled to have the benefit of those views. Indeed, for the sake of an orderly conservation program, consideration by that committee would seem to be absolutely necessary.

Mr. President, I have heard that some of the agencies which have supervision over the camps which were listed in the RECORD of April 4 are very much concerned that the names of these camps or their location have been divulged—for the reason that many of them feel that if new undertakings of this nature are to be instigated, the camps should be in different locations, in order to take care of the problems in existence in those areas. Moreover, I defy anyone to show that many of these camps are in such a condition that they can readily be utilized by the proposed Youth Conservation Corps.

Representatives of the administration have said that the expenditure of $15 million would be required in order to put these camps into shape. That would reduce the available money the first year to $45 million. Based on a statement during the hearings, prepared by a majority staff member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the minimal cost would be $4,500 per boy. That means that the potential enrollment would be reduced to 10,000. Of course, as I suggested earlier, if they had undertaken to build camps sufficient to provide housing for 15,000 boys, the cost would have been $75 million, instead of the $60 million which would be authorized under the provisions of the bill.

I believe it is in the best interests of sound legislation to permit the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is familiar with facilities on public lands to have an opportunty to study the bill and to hear witnesses who are far more qualified to discuss this matter than were most of the witnesses who were heard by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

So, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to refer the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with instructions that it report the bill to the Senate not later than April 30.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I trust that the Senate will have ample opportunity to examine the arguments submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont in reference to the condition of the camps and their location, and also the other arguments he has made in opposition to the bill.

The question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The remarks I shall submit at this time will be brief.

The old Civilian Conservation Corps camp program, which was so phenomenal a success that it was almost without opposition or criticism, remains a landmark of public policy. That legislation was initiated by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and was reported to the Senate by that committee; and it was under the jurisdiction of that committee that the program was established.

Second, exhaustive hearings on Senate bill 1 or on legislation identical in nature have been held during the last three Congresses, as follows: On Senate bill 812, in the 86th Congress; on Senate bill 404, in the 87th Congress; and on Senate bill 1, in the 88th Congress.

I may state that Senate bill 812 was passed by the Senate after having been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Insofar as this proposed legislation is concerned, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is uncontested by the Reorganization Act of 1946.

Third, the bill does not provide any new authorizations involving forests, parks, or public lands. Of course, it is true that when this measure becomes law and becomes public policy, many of the youths who will be employed under the provisions of the bill will work upon public lands or in national or State parks or in Federal forests or State forests. But so far as new authorizations are concerned, such parks, forests, and public lands are not included within the purview of this proposed legislation.

The proposed legislation is essentially an employment bill and an education bill. It would be just as germane and reasonable to suggest that when the Hill-Burton Hospital Act comes before the Senate it be referred to the Committee on Public Works; or that when the program of accelerated public works is reported by the Public Works Committee, each section of that bill that related to a hospital or to a health center go to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; or that if any funds were to be expended upon any kind of streets or sewerage system, the bill be referred to the committee that handles housing and home finance activities.

The responsibility for the measure is clearly in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. To determine otherwise would be unjust to that committee and to the work of a committee which reported the bill after a vote of 11 to 3, and a committee that during three Congresses has held hearings day after day and week after week. I believe it would really be an insult to the committee to reject its jurisdiction and refer the bill to another committee which has its own field of jurisdiction and does well within that field of jurisdiction, as was indicated only recently by the wilderness bill, which passed this body by an overwhelming majority.

I call upon Senators to sustain the committee and the leadership on this question, to vote against the motion of the Senator from Vermont, and to support the committee representative who is handling the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont to commit the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized briefly. I suppose the question might be asked, Why would I speak upon this question? Perhaps my easiest excuse is that I have served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs longer than any Member of the present Congress. I have served for 14 years. I have seen a good many bills go through that committee.

There is another reason why I am interested in the bill. I served for some time in the Department of Agriculture, as many people will recall. If we are to consider the forests of the United States, the man who has charge of that field is the Secretary of Agriculture, and the committee that might have jurisdiction after the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has concluded its hearings would be the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I have still another reason which is somewhat compelling to me. In the year 1935, as a representative of Mr. Harry Hopkins, I tried to be administrator of the CCC program, not only in my own State, but eventually in all 11 Western States. I know that the interest of those camps was not in trails but in youth. Therefore I am anxious to make sure that the measure comes from the committee whose main interest is youth.

The words with which the bill starts are as follows:

> SEC. 102. The purpose of this title is (1) to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed youths.

That is the whole point. If the main concern of the bill was work in the interior areas of our country and upon forests, I might insist upon jurisdiction for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I see present in the Chamber my fine and always honored friend the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. We have considered some bills relating to taxation on minerals. We have considered bills designed to help the lead and zinc industry. They have contained tax features. There has never been any difficulty about them. Those were finance bills. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has taken a look at each of them. Each time the committee has done so, we have asked to have that look. When there is a necessity for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to have a look at a bill, we do not hesitate to make the request.

I did not consider the pending bill to be a bill of that nature.

First, I point out that no new authority to do things on forests, parks, or public lands created from public domain is involved in the bill. Hence, I do not believe the bill belongs in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Second, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, the old CCC Act, was under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor. When jurisdiction has been granted, it has persisted for a long time.

In the House of Representatives, the sugar bill is handled by the Committee on Agriculture. In the Senate, it is handled by the Finance Committee. There is no logic in the arrangement, but there is tradition, and we live up to it. Any Senator who might try to take the sugar bill away from the committee of which the able Senator from Virginia is chairman would find himself in a peck of trouble. Senators would insist that it return to the committee which had been handling that measure.

Third, I point out that exhaustive hearings have been held in the 86th, 87th, and 88th Congresses by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I am not authorized to speak for the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who is the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I desire that point to be clearly understood. But I am able to say that the schedule of that committee has been pretty well taken up. We have a great deal of hard work to do. We have already done hard work.

Some of the bills considered by that committee have already passed the Senate. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for that committee to give the measure careful consideration and report back by April 30.

Title I of the bill deals with Federal lands only. At the most the enrollees could number 15,000. But title II deals with urban areas and State lands. States may decide that the work be performed elsewhere. The program would involve some 60,000 enrollees. Therefore the very purpose of the bill seems to be to benefit urban areas, and not so much forest areas.

The standing rules of the Senate mark out the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The duties of the committee are clearly defined. They involve "public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon."

Bringing boys to camp to develop trails in an endeavor to help them does not relate to grazing on such lands.

Therefore, when we deal with the measure, I hope we deal with it realistically and allow the bill to remain with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and not be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As much as I like to preserve the jurisdiction of that committee, and as much as I like to have its jurisdiction expanded, I do not believe that the bill now before the Senate is a proper bill to be referred to that committee.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the argument that the bill is properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and therefore should not be referred to another committee, is a rather narrow argument indeed, especially when we consider that only last week in this body there was considered a measure—the Mass Transportation Act—which had been studied carefully by the Committee on Commerce, which did not have jurisdiction of the bill. Senators in charge of that bill said that although they had originally opposed the idea of the Committee on Commerce considering the measure because they felt that "too many cooks spoil the broth," they themselves admitted—and it was the consensus—that the consideration or study of the measure by the Committee on Commerce had resulted in a much improved bill. The Committee on Commerce had made some good contributions to it. In the light of that precedent established only last week, it is only reasonable to conclude that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, my distinguished friend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] read the first two lines of section 102 under the stated purpose. I should like to read the entire section:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

> SEC. 102. The purpose of this title is (1) to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed youths so that their employability may be increased through participation in such programs of conservation planned and designed by, and under the immediate supervision of, the various Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of planning and carrying out such programs; and (2) to enable the Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving and developing natural resources and recreational areas to accelerate programs planned by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility.

I submit that programs of a conservation nature do not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but very definitely are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I submit also that at the present time no one, including those in the executive departments, has any idea whatsoever what camps included in the list on page 5666 of the RECORD of April 4 are available and what the cost of rehabilitation would be. I am certain of that because I have been told by some in a position to know that they have not the slightest idea. They were asked to submit certain figures, and they did so. But the figures are not very realistic. I am sure we will find that to be the case if and when the program gets underway.

I have no desire to prolong this discussion. When the debate gets underway, if my motion is defeated, we shall examine the camp situation, together with other aspects of the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I ask the Senator from Vermont whether it is his thought at this time that the Youth Conservation Corps should be under the Department of Labor, or whether it is his thought that it should be somewhere else?

Mr. PROUTY. I think it should not be under the Department of Labor. It should be either under the Department of the Interior or under the Department of Agriculture, because this facet of the program is concerned primarily with activities over which those departments have definite jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask the Senator about the CMTC camps which were established? The point was made that the bill setting up those camps was cleared by the Committee on Education and Labor in the thirties. There was an inference that since that bill had been handled by the Committee on Education and Labor, the pending measure should be handled by a similar committee. Does the Senator recall whether the CMTC camps fell under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor?

Mr. PROUTY. I am sure they did not.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to refer the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with instructions to report the bill to the Senate, together with its views, not later than April 30 next.

On this vote the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

If present and voting the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 46 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Aiken
Beall
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Russell
Saltonstall
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—58

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Smith
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Allott
Bennett
Cooper
Curtis
Edmondson
Javits
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Robertson
Scott
Simpson
Sparkman
Talmadge

So Mr. PROUTY's motion was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PROXMIRE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to be absent from my duties beginning now. I have been invited to appear tomorrow before the Florida Legislature on the poll tax amendment. I have frequently given assurance to this body that that would be my course. I therefore ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on my duties in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations may hold hearings tomorrow while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employement for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs.

Mr. HOLLAND. Next, Mr. President, I want to say that I voted against this motion not because I favor the bill, but because I think the committee which reported the bill had ample authority to do so. It not only has jurisdiction in labor matters, but also in educational matters. The substance of this bill falls in one place or another.

Second, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs apparently does not want to take jurisdiction. So I think there was ample reason for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to have considered the bill.

I want the record to show that I oppose the bill. I think it is as wrong as can be for the Department of Labor to be engaging in an effort of this kind, with substations to be located in every village and farm in the Nation. I hope the bill will fail, and I am sorry I will not be able to be present to vote against it when the vote on passage is taken.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. PROXMIRE, for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON, is as follows:

> On page 38, line 11, strike out "$60,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000,000".
>
> On page 48, line 23, strike out "$60,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am willing to agree to a limitation of debate on the amendment, if the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes me to do so.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if there could be an agreement to a limitation of 5 minutes on each side on this amendment and if the yeas and nays may be ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield so that the unanimous-consent request may be acted on?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin be limited to 5 minutes on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is a simple amendment. It would cut back the cost of the bill from $120 million to $100 million.

The President, in his budget, on page 619, requested $100 million for this program. That was the limit of what he requested. As I understand, the numerous and formidable administration witnesses who appeared before the committee did not request that the amount of $100 million be increased. The administration position is clear. The administration is very sympathetic to this program. It studied it carefully, evaluated it carefully, and felt that $100 million would accomplish the purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is this $100 million for the first year, or do the amounts escalate after the first year?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is $100 million for the first year. I understand that after the first year there will be such appropriation as Congress wishes to make.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, the sky and the demands of the various communities will be the limit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It depends on what Congress decides to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. I realize that. However, when a camp is established in one community, it will be very difficult for a neighboring community to understand why it cannot also have a camp.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator's Armed Services Committee has recommended a reduction of some $420 million in the defense budget.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is about $771 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, gross, but the committee increased the appropriation in another section by over $300 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the net decrease was about $400 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me if we can cut the defense budget by that amount, we can certainly cut the program that is recommended here to the level of what the administration requested. As Members of the Senate know, there is a deficit this year in our Federal budget of about $9 billion. There is a budget of $100 billion. The President has asked us to increase spending to the extent of $4.5 billion to $6 billion.

It seems to me it makes sense to keep spending at least down to the level that the administration itself has requested. I earnestly hope the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will accept the amendment, because I know how deeply he feels about the bill. I believe it is a good bill, a necessary bill; but I think we should go along with the administration's original request.

I wish to make one further statement. On page 4 of the committee report on the bill, the committee itself states:

> The committee agrees that this program must begin small. It would be unwise to appropriate sums for a full-scale attack upon the segment of the youth employment problem covered by this bill until the machinery and procedures for such a program are operable.

I submit that a $120 million program is not small. It is 20 percent above what the administration requested. Under those circumstances I believe it makes sense for us at least to cut back the amount to the administration's request for spending.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for presenting his amendment. I point out that one reason why I think the amendment is a wise amendment is that there was submitted for the Record the other day a list of campsites that would be available. I forget whether 10 or 12 were listed in my State. Only one of these camps could be occupied to any extent at all. One was located 40 miles west of Wickenburg. I know that Senators do not know where Wickenburg is located. However, it has temperatures reaching 125 degrees in the shade. I never heard of that camp. Another one is proposed to be located at the bottom of Grand Canyon. I do not believe that the Park Service would agree to have a camp down there.

I think highly of the Senator's amendment. I wonder if he would agree to give me the honor to let me cosponsor his amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Seantor from Arizona be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that the administration did not expect to spend more than $60 million on this program during the first year. Therefore, my amendment would give the administration ample flexibility.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. A few weeks ago I thought surely I would not have voted for the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin. However, many things have happened since then. We have heard from the Secretary of the Treasury and from the Director of the Internal Revenue Service, Mr. Caplin. Mr. Caplin has stated that the fate of the Nation virtually depends on our saving $5 million through emasculating the Internal Revenue Service in a considerable number of States. I had not realized until this day that our country is in such dire financial straits. However, inasmuch as Mr. Caplin seems to feel that the Nation is likely to fall apart unless we save $5 million somewhere, I think it is much better to save it by voting for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin than it is through emasculating the Internal Revenue offices in 12 States and depleting them in many others.

Therefore, I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. I hope that before the end of this session of the Congress, we will be able not only to try to save Mr. Caplin his $5 million, but also, in connection with other measures that will come up, as much as $5 billion.

I am glad to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is true, as the Senator from Wisconsin says, that the administration, interested as always in economy, recommended an authorization of only $100 million for the bill. After carefully hearing the testimony of approximately 60 witnesses, the committee decided by a vote of 11 to 3 that an additional authorization would be desirable, fully appreciating that when the bill reaches the Appropriations Committee, if it ever does, there will be a natural tendency to appropriate somewhat less than the authorization. However, the Goldwater-Proxmire axis——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Symington.

Mr. CLARK. I beg the Senator's pardon. It is the Goldwater-Proxmire-Symington axis. It is a brave Senator who would oppose an amendment jointly sponsored by such fine Senators. Therefore, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

I point out one final consideration. I hope the matter will be kept in proper perspective. We are spending something like $1 billion a week on the defense program, or $52 billion a year. The suggestion was made the other day, in connection with the pending bill by the Secretary of Labor—and it is true—that we will spend on the defense program between this minute, 5:45 p.m., and 8 o'clock tomorrow morning, more money than the committee asks in this bill for a whole year.

I suggest that we keep these things in proper perspective. If we have any desire to help the young people of our country become employable, I hope we will keep the authorization for the program substantially as it is and the bill as it came from the committee.

I am prepared to vote in favor of the Symington-Proxmire-Goldwater axis reduction in the authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], on behalf of himself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 21, as follows:

[No. 47 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Aiken
Anderson
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Inouye
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson

Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—21

Bartlett
Bayh
Byrd, W. Va.
Douglas
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Humphrey
Jackson
Kefauver
Kennedy
McCarthy
McNamara
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Pell
Randolph
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—14

Allott
Bennett
Cooper
Curtis
Edmondson
Hayden
Holland
Javits
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Scott
Simpson
Sparkman
Talmadge

So the amendment offered by Mr. PROXMIRE, for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. SYMINGTON, was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there will be no further voting tonight; therefore, there will be no further business to come before the Senate except for Senators who wish to make speeches, unless I hear otherwise from Senators in charge of the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR DURING SENATE SESSION ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet tomorrow to hear the testimony of Secretary of Labor Wirtz and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Celebrezze.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to be assured that the members of the subcommittee on this side of the aisle have approved this request.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from California that, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I have discussed the request with the Senator from New Jersey and have agreed to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE CAROLINA CHARTER OF 1663

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, more than 375 years ago at Fort Raleigh on Roanoke Island, on the outer banks of North Carolina, Sir Walter Raleigh established the first English colony in the New World. It was there in 1585, more than 20 years before the founding of Jamestown and more than 30 years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, that Virginia Dare, the first child of English-speaking parents, was born. Thus it was that this area of the New World, which in time was to be known as North Carolina, achieved the double recognition of the first State to be colonized by the English and the first to record a birth of a child of English descent.

However, there is another, later event which is at least as significant as this early colonization to the history of my State and our country. Although it was not known by the name until later, and although some settlers were already there by that date, 1663 was in a real sense the birthdate of North Carolina, for it was then that a charter was given by King Charles II of England to eight of his noblemen. The land granted by the charter stretched from Virginia to Florida. It was bounded on the east by the Atlantic and on the west by the Pacific; and it was called Carolina. That land covered part or all of 17 of the present States; and the charter is, therefore, peculiarly important to the history of each.

The Carolina Charter, which the King issued to his eight lords proprietors 300 years ago formed part of the foundation upon which our Nation's laws and government are built; it is a keystone of our U.S. Constitution. This significant contribution of the charter has been succinctly pointed out by the Tercentenary Commission:

> It is nevertheless an indispensable link in the chain of record beginning with Magna Carta that establishes and preserves our political liberties down to the present.

Three provisions deserve special attention in this connection. Under the first of these the lords proprietors were directed to "make and enact laws with the advice, consent, and approbation of the freemen of the said province, or the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies."

Another provision granted to the people of Carolina "all liberties, franchises, and privileges of this our kingdom of England." A third grants a large measure of religious freedom to the settlers. These portions of the charter contained what seems to me the heart of our American Constitution which was adopted more than a century and a quarter after the charter was granted.

The charter itself was the basis of succeeding colonial and State constitutions of North Carolina. The first constitution adopted after the charter was the Concessions and Agreement of 1665, which provided for a popularly elected assembly with powers broader than those contemplated by the proprietors. From the beginning the people of Carolina demonstrated that they were of independent stock, unwilling to be the transatlantic serfs of eight lords in England. The proprietors themselves were only too aware of what they considered to be the capricious nature of the ungrateful settlers whom they admonished "were a people that neither understood your own nor regarded our interests." During this time the first American uprising against distant and arbitrary rule occurred. This was Culpeper's rebellion in the Carolina county of Albemarle in December 1677. The object of this protest was a tax measure which the proprietors imposed without the consent of the colonists; this became the first rebellion against "taxation without representation." The colonists succeeded in electing an assembly and controlling Carolina for 3 years after the uprising. At that time the settlers were referred to as rebels; a century later their descendants would be known as patriots.

During its first half century the control of Carolina alternated between its inhabitants and its nominal rulers in England. Finally in 1729, the charter was returned to the crown, and North Carolina remained an English colony until its independence. The King had no better luck than did the proprietors with impressing upon his subjects what he considered their proper station. Rebellion and formal protests were the rule during this period. In May 1775, the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence was adopted. In April 1776, the North Carolina Provincial Congress, in the Halifax resolves, formally urged the dissolution of ties with England and a Union of the Colonies. This was a major impetus toward drafting the Declaration of Independence on July 4. North Carolina was, however, the next to the last original colony to ratify the Constitution, joining the Union only after it had received firm commitments that a Bill of Rights, similar to the rights already guaranteed by the State, would be added to the document.

Mr. President, the tercentenary celebration is focusing attention on the first hundred years following the issuance of the Carolina Charter. There were many events and many great men during that period who were important to the cultural, financial, agricultural, and religious history of the Nation. However, the events I have just cited are to me of the greatest moment. Everything else is nothing without the freedom and liberty upon which this country was based.

Today, 300 years after the charter was granted, North Carolina is a world leader in industry, agriculture, education, and progressive government. For these great blessings we owe our eternal thanks to the heritage that was North Carolina's from its inception.

In 1962, President Kennedy signed into law a joint resolution of the 87th Congress, establishing the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission "to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes." The President has appointed my good friend, Frank Graham, the distinguished United Nations mediator, as Chairman of that Commission, on which I am proud to serve. In addition, in North Carolina there is a State Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission which is supervising a yearlong celebration. Just this past Saturday a stamp commemorating this great event was issued in Edenton, N.C., one of the oldest towns in the country.

1963 is a year of festivity in North Carolina with special cultural observances marking our anniversary throughout the State. This, therefore, will be a particularly exciting year for tourists to visit the "variety vacationland" of North Carolina and attend the great outdoor dramas which depict life during the State's early colonial history and visit our many sights of historical interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following items concerning the Carolina Tercentenary Celebration printed at this point in the RECORD: "Charter Issued—State Is Born," Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N.C., March 24, 1963; "The Carolina Charter Commission," pages 2 to 5; "Calendar of Forthcoming Events for Carolina Charter Tercentenary 1963; and Tercentenary Projects"; Public Law 87-437; "Tar Heel Stamp Placed on Sale," Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N.C., April 7, 1963.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Mar. 24, 1963]

THREE HUNDRED YEARS AGO: CHARTER ISSUED—STATE IS BORN

(By Robert Page)

Today, 300 years ago, North Carolina was born. It was not christened as North Carolina until almost 50 years later, but was bred by the Charter of Carolina.

In his court at Westminster, England, 300 years ago today, King Charles II, surrounded by his eight loyal and powerful supporters, gave to the eight lords proprietors the Charter of Carolina.

Considered outrageously liberal in its provisions to the proprietors and to the settlers in the territory, the charter established certain freedoms for the colonists. It became a link in a chain of invaluable documents, preceded by the Magna Carta and the English Bill of Rights, and followed by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

During 1963, the Carolina Charter is being honored by a yearlong celebration. The occasion is also being used to tell of the many significant events which occurred as a result of the charter until 1763 in North Carolina.

Two years after the charter called for an assembly of the settlers in Carolina, the Grand Assembly of the Albemarle convened in 1665 at Hall's Creek. The only settlers of Carolina were in the Albemarle Sound area.

North Carolina's 1963 General Assembly will visit the site of that first assembly on April 17. The current legislature is a lineal descendant of the Grand Assembly of 1665.

The U.S. Post Office has recognized the importance of the charter in producing a commemorative stamp which will go on sale April 6 at Edenton. Significance is added to the Carolina Charter stamp in that the number of commemorative stamps issued by the Post Office is now 9, reduced from 45 of the recent years.

ART EXHIBITION TO BE HELD

A Tercentenary Art Exhibition will open on March 23 and run through April 28 at the North Carolina Art Museum in Raleigh.

Scores of annual tourist attractions, conventions and meetings have adopted the theme of North Carolina's 300th anniversary.

On April 22, the North Carolina Symphony at Durham will premiere a symphonic composition written by North Carolina composer Hunter Johnson who has worked to capture and transmit through music the spirit of the colonists in good and hard times.

A 3-day wagon train in western North Carolina will tell of "Daniel Boone's Crossing of the Blue Ridge," June 27-29.

Less spectacular, but vital, work is being done in schools, churches and study groups to reevaluate the role North Carolina played in the early development of the Nation as a result of the Carolina Charter.

A statewide essay contest, a documentary motion picture, special publications and campus and school programs are being sponsored within the State's schools to rejuvenate recognition of North Carolina's importance and proud past.

As Gov. Terry Sanford stated: "Too often in the past, neighboring States have stolen the thunder on commemorations and celebrations of this type. It is time we began paying proper attention to our past. North Carolina is richer and more interesting in its heritage and history. It is richer still in its potential. Building on the foundation stones of that rich past, North Carolinians intend to achieve that great potential."

Whatever the great potential becomes in reality, it should be remembered that it all began 300 years ago—to the day.

THE CAROLINA CHARTER TERCENTENARY COMMISSION

The year 1963 marks the 300th anniversary of the Carolina Charter of 1663. On March 24 of that year, King Charles II at his court in Westminster issued this document to eight of the supporters who, a few years earlier, had provided him crucial backing in his successful struggle to regain the English throne. Under the terms of the grant the eight lords proprietors became the owners of an immense area extending southward from Virginia to Florida (then a Spanish possession) and from the Atlantic to the South Seas or Pacific Ocean. Although the Carolina Charter was granted by Charles II to his eight friends in settlement of political and, perhaps, other indebtedness, it is nevertheless an indispensable link in the chain of records beginning with Magna Carta that establishes and preserves our political liberties down to the present.

In the Carolina Charter are found, for example, guarantees of the representative form of government which characterizes our way of life. The lords proprietors were required to "make (and) enact under their seals * * * any laws whatsoever, either pertaining to the public state of the said province or to the private utility of particular persons, according to their best discretion, of and with the advice, assent and approbation of the freemen of the said province, or the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies, whom for enacting the said laws when and as often as need shall require we will that (the lords proprietors) shall from time to time assemble in such manner and form as to them shall seem best."

The original document from which these words are taken was acquired for the State of North Carolina by a group of public spirited citizens who purchased it from a British antiquarian bookseller in 1949. The venerable 4-page parchment is on display in the Hall of History in Raleigh, encased in a modern, fireproof safe so constructed that each page can be examined without damaging it. Each year many thousands of visitors, including entire classes of schoolboys and girls, view the document. It is worth noting that only six other States possess their colonial charters today.

In 1959, the North Carolina General Assembly, the lineal descendant of that early body which convened in Albemarle County pursuant to the provisions of the charter, established the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission. This group was charged with the development and execution of plans for a program for the celebration of the tercentenary of the charter in 1963. The charter commission, as it is commonly referred to, comprises 25 members of whom 3 are ex officio, namely: the superintendent of public instruction and the directors of the department of conservation and development, and of archives and history. The remaining 22 members are appointed by the Governor for 2-year terms. The Honorable Francis E. Winslow, of Rocky Mount, is chairman of the commission. Brig. Gen. John D. F. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired, who was appointed executive secretary of the charter commission in May 1960, maintains an office in Raleigh at 121 Halifax Street.

Among the important early decisions taken by the charter commission was one to include in the scope of the celebration the first century of the colony's existence, that is, the period 1663-1763. Several cogent reasons influenced the members of the commission in this determination. Since the actual granting of the Carolina Charter occurred in England, there is not available in North Carolina a locale specifically associated with the year 1663 as is Jamestown for 1607 or Plymouth Rock for 1620. Moreover, the tempo of activity in the colony immediately following the issuance of the charter was slow; it was not until October 1664, that the first colonial official, William Drummond, was appointed Governor and commander in chief of Albemarle County, one of the three regions into which the colony was divided by the lords proprietors.

During these early years settlements were confined chiefly to the coastal region. It is estimated that by 1700 the total population of the colony did not exceed 5,000 with perhaps half this number in a small area adjoining Albemarle Sound. By 1763, however, the colony's population had grown to approximately 200,000 and settlement had extended westward to the Blue Ridge mountains. The fortification from which the present-day town of Old Fort, near Asheville, is descended was built in 1755.

It is obvious, therefore, that the time frame 1663-1763 provides a broad geographical base for 1963's celebrations and offers a reasonably wide selection of events suitable for commemoration. Increased opportunities are afforded for local as well as State-wide observances, a situation which the charter commission considers conducive to a genuinely popular celebration.

Still another important consideration motivated the charter commission in its decision to adopt the period 1663-1763 as a chronological basis for its plans. Historians regard the year 1763 as the end of the colonial epoch of American history. In that year the Seven Years' War, or the French and Indian War, as the conflict was known in the colonies, ended. With the elimination of the local threat, provincial spirit tended to become increasingly self-sufficient and nationalistic, a development that was not slowed by Britain's efforts to induce the colonies to accept economic measures designed to liquidate part of the cost of the war. Events led rapidly to the outbreak of the hostilities which resulted in American independence.

While much is known about North Carolina's role in the struggle for independence—the Regulators, the Battle of Alamance, the Provincial Congresses, and the Halifax resolves are familiar to Tar Heels—the events of the first century following the Carolina Charter are less well understood. The Culpeper revolt in 1677, for example, in which the colonists successfully maintained their right to representative government as established in the Carolina Charter of 1663, is equally as significant as the Halifax resolves as a "first" in American colonial and national history. Renewed attention to the period 1663-1763 during the Carolina Charter Tercentenary in 1963, therefore, will permit a better understanding of the part played by pioneer North Carolinians in shaping the institutions of our country. The more familiar events of the period following 1763 will, no doubt, be commemorated during the bicentennial of the American Revolution in the 1970's.

Several committees have been organized to formulate plans in various fields of activity: Arts; commemorative events; programs in schools, colleges, and universities; religious activities; and scholarly activities. Each of these groups includes, in addition to members of the charter commission, a number of prominent citizens whose interests and experience lie in the field of the committee concerned. These persons are designated associate members of the charter commission.

The committee on the arts is responsible for planning a program in the field of fine arts, music, and literature. Projects in this category include literary competitions, musical compositions and performances, playwriting and dramatic productions, ballet, production and exhibition of works of art, and other related activities. Mrs. J. O. Tally, Jr., of Fayetteville, is chairman of the committee.

Two other prominent ladies are cochairmen of the committee on commemorative events: Mrs. Inglis Fletcher of Edenton and Mrs. Harry McMullan of Washington. This group, which has a steering subcommittee headed by the Honorable J. Vivian Whitfield, of Wallace, is concerned with commemorative activities observing significant events which occurred during the period of establishment and consolidation of colonial North Carolina. These observances will be festive or serious in character as the event to be commemorated requires. Emphasis will be given to local as well as statewide commemorations. In order to enlist the support of local patriotic and civic organizations in the promoting of these programs, the committee on commemorative events requires membership from most, if not all, of the counties of the State.

In like manner the committee on programs in schools, colleges and universities has a large membership. Its job is planning for the observance during the tercentenary of significant events of the colonial period by students in all of the State's education institutions. Representation on the committee from each county and from each institution of higher learning is rapidly being attained. The committee is headed by Dr. H. H. Cunningham, dean of Elon College, assisted by Miss Lois Edinger, former president of the North Carolina Education Association.

Recognition of the historic role of the church in the establishment of the colony is accorded by the charter commission through its committee on religious activities. Although its organization is still incomplete, this group will encourage the development of plans for observing the tercentenary by churches throughout the State, particularly those which trace their establishment to the colonial period.

The committee on scholarly activities, under the leadership of Mr. Lambert Davis, director of the University of North Carolina Press, is concerned with the identification and selection of scholarly materials for exhibition, publication and microfilming. The major project planned by the committee on scholarly activities is the publication of a completely revised edition of the "Colonial Records of North Carolina" with its first volume to be issued in 1963. The group is also making arrangements for certain national and regional learned societies to conduct conferences and conventions in North Carolina in 1963. Mr. William S. Powell, librarian of the North Carolina collection of the University of North Carolina Library, is cochairman of the committee on scholarly activities.

A major objective of the charter commission is support of construction by the State of an appropriate building to serve as a repository for North Carolina's priceless archives and other historical items, and as a modern, efficient, historical museum. The lack of suitable facilities for these purposes, which every neighboring State possesses, is considered by the charter commission as entirely out of keeping with the forward-looking attitude of a great State. The charter commission, therefore, seeks public support for such a building which will afford an appropriate setting for the historic Carolina Charter of 1663, permit the proper preservation of the State archives, and provide an up-to-date hall of history, worthy of the State's proud record. To facilitate the achievement of this objective, the charter commission has formed a committee on finance and building which is headed by Mr. James G. W. MacLamroc, of Greensboro.

It has been proposed that the projected structure be called the Carolina Charter-Confederate Memorial Building, a name which in time might be appropriately shortened to "Charter-Memorial Building." Such a building, apart from its critical need to serve a functional purpose, would indeed constitute a fitting monument to the great heritage of North Carolina. The charter commission is much encouraged by the action of the 1961 general assembly on the recommendation of the commission on reorganization of State government to "provide for the establishment of a center, to be called Heritage Square, wherein may be eventually erected suitable buildings for the State library, the department of archives and history, the museum of art and the museum of natural history."

The completion of the proposed Charter-Memorial Building as one of the structures in the complex contemplated in the foregoing recommendation would be a proper climax to the activities of the Carolina Charter Tercentenary. Such a building would symbolize for the citizens of North Carolina the history and traditions which have made it the great commonwealth it is. It would keep present and future generations of our citizens aware of the roots from which they spring, and in so doing would nurture those civic virtues of courage, determination and sense of purpose so much in evidence among the early settlers of the colony.

Calendar of Forthcoming Events for Carolina Charter Tercentenary 1963 and Tercentenary Projects

April 15 to 22: Tercentenary week in Chowan County with pilgrimages to Colonial Edenton on 19 to 21.

April 20: Dare County Pirates' Jamborama, tercentenary weekend.

April 21: "Adam Sherrill's Crossing of Catawba River" commemoration at Rehobeth Church, Maiden, Catawba County.

April 22: Assembly program, North Carolina College at Durham.

April 22: Premier performance of tercentenary symphonic composition by Hunter Johnson; North Carolina Symphony at Durham.

April 24: Literary Club meeting, Winston-Salem Teachers' College.

May 8 to 11: State Federation of Music Clubs convention, Statesville, to feature tercentenary.

May 20: State winners in essay contest announced; invited to Raleigh for special ceremony.

June 22: Rhododendron Festival, Bakersville, to feature tercentenary.

June 27 to 29: "Daniel Boone Crosses the Blue Ridge," 3-day wagon train; all day celebration on 29th along Blue Ridge Parkway. Opening of "Horn in the West," in evening of 29th with special tercentenary program.

July 31: Tercentenary program, 8 p.m., at Mineral and Gem Festival, Spruce Pine.

Date indefinite: "Prince of Parthia" production, Parkway Playhouse, Burnsville. (First play written in America, by Thomas Godfrey, completed in North Carolina.)

Public Law 87–437

Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the three hundredth anniversary of the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes

Whereas the year 1963 will mark the tercentenary of the charter by which King Charles II of England conveyed to Edward, Earl of Clarendon; George, Duke of Albemarle; William, Lord Craven; John, Lord Berkeley; Anthony, Lord Ashley; Sir George Carteret, knight and baronet; Sir William Berkeley, knight; and Sir John Colleton, knight and baronet "all that territory or tract of ground situate, lying and being within our dominions in America extending from the north end of * * * Luck Island which lies * * * within 6 and 30 degrees of the northern latitude, and to the west as far as the South Seas, and so southerly as far as the River Saint Mathias, which borders upon the coast of Florida and within 1 and 30 degrees of northern latitude, and west in a direct line as far as the South Seas aforesaid * * * to have, use, exercise and enjoy * * * as * * * true and absolute lords and proprietories (with authority to make and) enact under their seals any laws whatsoever, either pertaining to the public state of the said province or to the private utility of particular persons, according to their best discretion, of and with the advice, assent and approbation of the freemen of the said province, or the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies;" and

Whereas the foregoing event constitutes a major landmark in the early history of North Carolina and of the United States as an English Colony; and

Whereas it is fitting and desirable that we commemorate the beginnings of the State of North Carolina, together with its subsequent history and future role in the family of the United States, for the benefit of all the people of our Nation; and

Whereas such a commemoration, with careful planning, can be of enduring, rather than transitory, worth to our people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission (hereafter referred to in this joint resolution as the "Commission") which shall be composed of fifteen members as follows:

(1) Four members who shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Four members who shall be Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(3) Seven members to be appointed by the President.

(b) The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman. The members of the Commission shall receive no salary.

Sec. 2 (a) The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute suitable plans for the celebration of a series of anniversaries occurring during 1963, commemorating the three hundredth anniversary of the Carolina charter of 1663, together with significant events in the history of North Carolina from 1663 to 1763, both years inclusive.

(b) In carrying out its functions the Commission is authorized to cooperate with and to assist the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission and any other agency created or designated by the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina for the purpose of planning and promoting the Carolina charter tercentenary celebration. If the participation of other nations in the celebration is deemed advisable, the Commission may communicate to that end with the governments of such nations through the Department of State.

Sec. 3. The Commission may employ, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions. Service of an individual as a member of the Commission, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U.S.C. 99).

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with patriotic and historical societies and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution. The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property and make contracts, and may exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this joint resolution.

(b) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the executive officer of the Commission, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account also for all funds received by the Commission. A report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress within three months following the celebration as prescribed by this joint resolution.

(c) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon termination of the celebration may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the national park system or may be disposed of as surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall expire upon the completion of its duties, but in no event later than April 1, 1964.

Approved April 27, 1962.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Apr. 7, 1963]

TAR HEEL STAMP PLACED ON SALE

EDENTON, April 6.—U.S. Postmaster General J. Edward Day dedicated a new postage stamp issue today in this historic coastal city commemorating the 300th Anniversary of the Carolina Charter.

Day told the 500 people gathered in the auditorium of the Edenton Elementary School that the stamp "will renew in the millions of Americans who see it and use it an interest in the Carolina Charter."

"I hope and believe that in so doing," he said, "the stamp will also reawaken an awareness of the value of our hard-earned political freedoms."

ISSUED IN 1663

The Carolina Charter was issued in 1663 by King Charles II of England, conveying to eight lords proprietors the "Carolina Territory." From this, 14 States eventually were formed.

The red and brown stamp shows a reproduction of the first page of the charter.

Day said "the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission, through its activities celebrating the anniversary of the charter, is making Americans aware of the historic roots of this State. Our commemorative stamp program serves a similar purpose, to honor outstanding individuals and events of national importance."

He said the special stamp is the first to be issued this year, in line with a policy to turn out fewer of the special issues.

Day's speech was preceded by a speech by Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER who termed the occasion "a great day for the Albemarle, the State and the Nation."

BETTER JOB

U.S. Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, who followed BONNER, told the gathering "the New England States have been doing a better job of dramatizing their colonial history." He commended the work of the Tercentenary Commission for stirring more interest in North Carolina's past.

Francis E. Winslow of Rocky Mount, chairman of the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission, spoke at a luncheon following the ceremony. Edenton Mayor John A. Mitchener, Jr. served as master of ceremonies at both events.

Edenton's post office did a booming business selling and canceling first-day issues of the commemorative stamp. J. L. Chestnut, local postmaster, had 35 extra workers on hand to handle first-day cancellation requests from stamp collectors across the country.

The Edenton Post Office was supplied with 1½ million of the special stamps for the occasion.

NORTH CAROLINA'S WORK-RELEASE PROGRAM: A SIGNIFICANT ADVANCE IN PRISONER REHABILITATION

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in these days of rising crime rates, habitual offenders, and overcrowded prisons, the problems of criminal rehabilitation and prison reform are of acute national concern. In this connection, I have read an excellent article which I believe will be of great interest to the Senate. The article deals with North Carolina's progressive prison program. In only 2 years the prison population in the State has been reduced by 1,000, or almost 10 percent, at a time when the national average was steadily increasing.

The experience of North Carolina in meeting the crime challenge I feel certain will be of great help in other jurisdictions throughout the country. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, Robert E. Baker's article entitled "North Carolina Prisoners Support Families, Learn Skills in Work-Release Plan," published in the Washington Post of April 8, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIQUE AND REWARDING: NORTH CAROLINA PRISONERS SUPPORT FAMILIES, LEARN SKILLS IN WORK-RELEASE PLAN

(By Robert E. Baker)

RALEIGH, N.C.—A young woodcarver works in a mountain craft shop near Asheville and earns $130 a week.

A bricklayer works on a construction job in Raleigh at $3 an hour and supports his 61-year-old mother. Another bricklayer here supports his wife and two children at his $2.75-an-hour job.

These three men and more than 1,400 other North Carolina jobholders have one thing in common:

They are all inmates of the North Carolina prison system who work in the free community under the State's unique and rewarding work-release program.

It is part of an overall prison reform in North Carolina that is paying off. The Tarheel State's prison population is diminishing while the population in the prisons of the Federal Government, District of Columbia and almost every growing State is rapidly increasing.

REACHED PEAK IN 1961

North Carolina's prison population reached an all-time high of more than 12,000 2 years ago. Today it is under 11,000—3,000 below the prediction made by experts in 1956.

One reason for the drop is that North Carolina's economy is improving; its people are better off.

But more important is the multiple attack against increasing prison populations launched by former Gov. Luther H. Hodges, accelerated by present Gov. Terry Sanford, and administered by George W. Randall, Director of Prisons.

"Crime in the Nation is growing four times faster than the population," Randall said. "That shows the old ways don't work. We just had to do something else."

The overall program is designed to improve the preparation of prisoners for release through effective rehabilitation programs and increased use of parole.

AN $800,000 SAVINGS IN YEAR

Taxpayers should like it. Because fewer former prisoners fail to live within the law, the taxpayers save money. The reduction of the State's prison population means North Carolina taxpayers will save more than $800,000 this year. The prison department's budget request for the next 2 years is $1.25 million less than had been expected.

"But more important than saving tax dollars," Randall said, "is the incalculable saving of human suffering. There is no way to measure the waste, heartaches, and human misery caused by crime."

One example of North Carolina's progressive prison program is the school attendance required for all inmates who have less than fourth-grade achievement level.

"The link between crime and lack of education is irrefutable," said Randall. "Of 541 youthful felons that we have, 512 were school dropouts."

MANY FINISH HIGH SCHOOL

Prisoners are encouraged to go beyond the fourth grade. Many have received the equivalent of high school certificates.

The alcoholic rehabilitation program is another example. Alcoholics Anonymous groups in the communities take their program into the various prisons.

"About 75 percent of our inmates are here because of an alcohol problem," Randall said. "This program has had fine results."

About 345 inmates who participated in the voluntary alcoholic rehabilitation program failed and came back to prison. But 2,000 others, followed closely by prison officials to see if it worked, remain in the free society and continue to participate in Alcoholics Anonymous outside.

Other programs include extension vocational training, mental health clinics in the prisons to help mentally disturbed inmates, expansive work and recreation systems.

WORK-RELEASE PROGRAM

But the eye-catcher is the work-release program, unique in the United States.

This permits selected prisoners who are serving 5 years or less to work in the free community during working hours. Nonworking hours are spent back in the prison.

From the money they make, they pay the Prison Department for their cells and meals and the transportation to and from work. They support their families. Any money left over is deposited in a trust account for them when they are released from prison.

Many prisoners have $1,800 to $2,000 when they are released. Some have used the money for downpayments on new homes. A welder, serving 5 years for breaking and entering, was accepted in the work-release program and used the money he saved to establish his own business when released.

A printer with a wife and two children worked 3½ months in the work-release program and made $1,075, minus taxes and social security.

He paid $229 to the prison for housing and board, $53 for transportation to and from his job, $750 to support his family, and was released with $43 in cash from the trust fund.

Inmates in the work-release program are actually paying their way through prison.

About 20 percent of the 8,000 prisoners now serving 5 years or less have been approved for the program. About 5 percent of those who are accepted are withdrawn for violations. Most violations fall into two categories: taking a drink or slipping off to see the wife.

Many of the inmates work for former employers. But many other learn a trade in prison and then are accepted for the work-release program for outside work. They are shifted to prisons near their employment.

Because participants in the program are able to support their families while in prison, when otherwise the dependents might be forced on the welfare rolls, families are saved. So are tax dollars. The prisoner has a job when he is released; the crime rate is reduced. Prisoners have an incentive to make a good record.

Public opinion was initially hesitant about the work-release program, but it is changing.

"Many people think the prisoner is a different breed of man," Randall said. "But that's not so. The prisoner is more like the average man on the street than most of us are willing to admit.

"People forget that 97 percent of our prisoners are going to be released. We simply ask: Is it better for them to come out with a job and self-respect and contribute to society, or to come out with nothing?"

YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, we all know it is difficult sometimes to predict with assurance the effect enactment of a particular bill will have on the country. Especially is this true if it is groundbreaking legislation—something new and untried. We can always forecast what we believe will happen—what we hope will happen—but we cannot always be certain.

In the case of S. 1, however, we do not have to hesitate or equivocate. Title I is based on the highly successful Civilian Conservation Corps of the depression years. The establishment of the CCC is still paying us dividends through the many good citizens it built up, and the natural resources it preserved.

A good example is a news story with dramatic pictures which appeared in the Deseret News, one of Utah's outstanding newspapers, on January 2 of this year. The story relates how through the cooperative efforts of the CCC, and State and Federal forestry departments, flood control work done in Davis County in the 1930's has completely controlled the serious floods which formerly devastated that county.

Davis County is located immediately north of Salt Lake County, in which Salt Lake City is located. For years prior to the 1930's the small communities which stretch along the base of the Wasatch Mountains in this county, and the rich farmlands between the towns, were regularly devastated by destructive flash floods. Overgrazing had denuded the mountains of the necessary foliage to hold back the water in a cloudburst, and almost each summer the county suffered a disastrous flood in some portion of it. A number of people were killed, and vast farmlands covered with mud and boulders.

Then came the CCC boys who went to work to build terraces, dikes, and channels, to control the runoffs. This was combined with a reforestry and foliage-cover program inaugurated by the State and Federal forestry services.

As a result there has not been a single serious flood in Davis County since 1930—a fact the Deseret News cheered in the story carried last January. I ask that the entire article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cooperative Efforts Pay Off—Davis Cheers Flood Controls

(By Gary R. Blodgett)

Farmington.—Cooperative efforts of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and State and Federal forestry departments to control floods throughout Davis County have been successful—if measured by time.

Not since 1930 has there been a serious flood in this northern Utah county between Salt Lake City and Ogden.

Beginning in the early 1930's the Civilian Conservation Corps went to work to build terraces, dikes, channels, and storm drainage creeks to control flood runoffs.

At the same time, United States and State forestry department officials began an extensive grazing control program to allow foliage to grow on the hillsides along the Wasatch Mountains.

"With this cooperative effort we have come a long way with storm drainage control," said Alden Blain, now a research forester at the Intermountain Forest and Range Experimental Station, Farmington.

But prior to 1930, floods from the Wasatch Mountain canyons were common—and destructive.

Between 1923 and 1930 at least four flash floods roared down the mountains onto the farmlands of Davis County causing several hundred thousand dollars in damage and killing six persons.

The most tragic of all Davis County floods was August 23, 1923, when a flash flood struck without warning in Farmington Canyon, killing six campers.

"This flood struck shortly after dark," recalls Amasa L. Clark, 95-year-old Farmington resident. "The only warning was the thunderous roar of the rocks and debris tumbling down the mountainside."

COUPLE, SCOUTS

Killed when they were trapped in the canyon were a young married couple and four Boy Scouts.

"They never had a chance to escape the wall of water which roared down the steep, narrow canyon," said Mr. Clark.

In Centervile, floods the same day brought mud and rock down the mountains and deposited them in the orchards and on the farmlands in the valley.

Homes in the path of the Ford Creek flood were destroyed. Water also overflowed from Barnard Creek causing minor damage.

BOX ELDER FLOOD

In Willard, Box Elder County, a flash flood roared down the foothills behind majestic Ben Lomond Peak, destroying everything in its path.

Residents were caught by surprise. Three persons were killed and thousands of dollars damage was reported from loss of homes, barns, and farmland.

Another major flood hit Davis County in 1930 when heavy rains caused water, mud, rock, and debris to spill down into the center of Centerville.

BOULDERS ROLL

So devastating was this flood that huge boulders—some weighing as much as 200 tons—were dislodged and rolled down the mountainside.

Caught in the middle of the floodwaters was the Centerville Elementary School. Part of this building was damaged and at least one home, the Streeper home, was washed away by the flood, according to U.S. Forestry Department reports.

Since the floods, residents of central Davis County have taken advantage of the flood remains by using the rocks washed down from the mountains to build homes, walls, garages, and foundations for sheds and barns.

HOME OF ROCKS

Hugh J. Ford, 1304 North Main, Centerville, only 2 years ago built a new home of rock—every stone gathered from his own backyard.

Rock walls, homes, and other buildings such as the Farmington First-Second Ward, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and the old Farmington Hotel (now an apartment house) are made of mud and stone.

So popular is the use of rock for building construction that even the new Davis County library and jail have exterior stone walls—even if they are precast rock.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is a source of considerable satisfaction to me that the YCC bill was one of the first bills I cosponsored when I came to the Senate 4 years ago, and that I have been a consistent supporter ever since. Because of the fine work done in Utah in the past by the CCC, the measure has wide support in the State. An effort has been made recently to establish a Salt Lake County youth camp, based on the old CCC pattern to help fight juvenile delinquency. There is no Federal source of assistance for this camp and the recent session of the State legislature failed to provide State funds, but I understand its supporters are still seeking ways to make the camp a reality. However, the wide interest in it, and in the YCC concept in the past 4 years, convince me that the idea of putting young men to work on the backlog of conservation work on our soil and in our forests—not just as a remedy for juvenile delinquency—but as a way of building character and muscle and improving our resource heritage, has considerable support in Utah. I am confident, also, that the YCC would be a constructive force in the life of all young American men who might be privileged to serve in its ranks.

I studied with great interest the charts describing existing camp facilities placed in the Congressional Record last week by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] during his masterful address on the Youth Opportunities Act. These charts, you will remember, were compiled by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, and described camp facilities now available in each State and the estimated cost of rehabilitating them. Eight camps were listed in Utah as follows:

Wolf Creek, capacity 75, Forest Service.

Cold Springs, capacity 50, Forest Service.

Cedar City, capacity 100, Bureau-Land Management.

Green River, capacity 100, Bureau-Land Management.

Dinosaur, capacity 25, National Park Service.

Flaming Gorge, capacity 200, National Park Service.

Zion, capacity 25, National Park Service.

Uintah and Ouray, capacity 113, Bureau-Indian Affairs.

I have visited most of these areas personally, and I can attest to the fact that not only would they be excellent locations for YCC camps, with bracing air and good sunshine for the recruits, but that there is an unlimited amount of work to be done to enhance and preserve the natural resources in the area. I would hope other YCC sites would also be developed in Utah.

Title II of the bill is, of course, a newer approach to the problem of teenagers and young people out of work, but one which I most certainly feel is worth trying. I understand that there are 800,000 young men between the ages of 18 and 22 who are at present neither in school or in gainful employment, and there is every reason to believe the number will grow.

Because of the great emphasis on education the dropout rates in Utah are not as high as in the Nation as a whole. However, they are altogether too high. The National Committee for the Support of Public Schools reports that only 77 percent of Utah boys and girls who enroll in the eighth grade complete high school. Utah is 15th in the Nation in this respect, far behind such States as Wisconsin, Nebraska, and California who have truly remarkable success in holding their teenagers in school.

Unemployment is high among this dropout group in Utah, just as it is elsewhere. I understand that for the Nation as a whole for the period of January 1, 1962, through January 1, 1963, young people under 25 totaled about 14 percent of all unemployed. In Utah, in the same period, young people under 25 totaled between 20 to 23 percent of all unemployed. This indicates that young people in Utah who have been able to get jobs and then have lost them are having an even more difficult time than those in some other States in finding new employment.

This bill presents somewhat of a dilemma to the Members of this body. We are all concerned, I am sure, about the size of our Federal expenditures in relation to our income, and everybody is searching for ways to reduce Government spending without endangering the health or welfare of our people. I have listened with interest to Senators who feel we cannot afford this legislation; that we cannot afford any legislation which will result in any new Federal spending.

There are most certainly many proposals for Federal programs which I agree we cannot afford at this time, but this Youth Opportunities Act is not one of them. It will conserve two of our most precious resources—our youth and our natural resources. Neglect of them now will only cost more in the long run—more in juvenile delinquency and penal programs—more in water and land and forest protection in the years to come. It is cheaper and wiser and better to do it now. I hope the bill will pass.

IN MEMORY OF BATAAN

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, 21 years ago today, the United States lost a battle.

On April 9, 1942, the epic defense of Bataan Peninsula in the Philippines by American and Filipino troops ended. In a matter of days, the fall of the island bastion of Corregidor followed.

It is not my intention to review the significance and meaning of the Battle of Bataan today. Nor do I wish to analyze its tactical and strategic impact on the course of the Second World War in the Pacific. This has already been done by historians.

I make this simply an occasion for a salute to all Americans and Filipinos who, in one way or another, participated in that struggle.

I salute those who gave their lives during the battle, those who fell on the wayside during the death march, those who did not survive to see the day of victory. I salute those who survived the ordeal of war, and those whom the dead left behind—widows and orphans and loved ones—with only the knowledge and memory and a pride of gallantry and heroism to comfort them.

I take this opportunity to express America's admiration for the people of the Philippines—for all Filipinos everywhere.

We admire their courage and bravery on Bataan.

We admire their steadfast adherence to freedom and democracy.

We admire their determined recovery from the ravages of war, their effective struggle against the Red menace in their country, their dedicated efforts to strengthen their economy, to preserve their independence, to play their important and valiant role in international affairs with sobriety and maturity.

The wounds of the Second World War have healed. Foes then are friends now, and enemies, allies. The savagery of that conflict has been forgotten. This is as it should be.

But to forget the bravery, the courage, the gallantry and heroism of the defenders of Bataan would be almost sacrilege.

This we will not forget.

It is for this reason that I wish to read into the RECORD that sad but proud message broadcast by the Voice of Freedom, a makeshift radio station operating on Corregidor Island, on April 9, 1942:

> Bataan has fallen. The Philippine-American troops on this war-ravaged and blood-stained peninsula have laid down their arms. With heads bloody but unbowed, they have yielded to the superior force and numbers of the enemy. The world will long remember the epic struggle that Filipino and American soldiers put up in these jungle fastnesses and along the rugged coast of Bataan. They have stood uncomplaining under the constant and gruelling fire of the enemy for more than 3 months. Besieged on land and blockaded by sea, cutoff from all sources of help in the Philippines and in America, these intrepid fighters have done all that human endurance could bear. For what sustained them through all these months of incessant battle was a force that was more than merely physical. It was a force of an unconquerable faith—something in the heart and soul that physical hardship and adversity could not destroy. It was the thought of the native land and all that it holds most dear, the thought of freedom and dignity, the pride in these most priceless of all human prerogatives. The adversary, in the pride of his power and triumph, will credit our troops with nothing less than the courage and fortitude that his own troops have shown. All the world will testify to the almost superhuman endurance with which they stood up until the last in the face of overwhelming odds.
>
> But the decision has to come. Men fighting under the banner of an unshakable faith are made of something more than flesh, but they are not made of impervious steel. The flesh must yield at last, endurance melts away, and the end of battle must come.
>
> Bataan has fallen, but the spirit that made it stand—a beacon to all the liberty-loving people of the world—cannot fail.

Mr. President, our willingness to give meaning and significance to these words in the days ahead will determine the outcome of the struggle of freemen everywhere against another form of tyranny.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Washington.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Apropos what the Senator from California has said, I point out that 21 years ago this week, when Corregidor and Bataan were being besieged and when things in the Pacific were looking very dark for our country, a small task force left Pearl Harbor, and finally made a rendezvous in the Pacific; and on April 18, despite the fact that we were then losing the war on all the perimeter of the Pacific, that task force made a very spectacular attack on the mainland of Japan. The physical damage it did was not extremely great, but the psychological effect of that attack was enormous. I think that first air attack on Tokyo restored the spirits of all the people of the free world.

This week there will be held at Seattle, Wash., a celebration in connection with the 25th anniversary of the Tokyo Raiders. I had the privilege of being on one of the aircraft carriers which launched the planes that day. I remember very well that while we were proceeding on that mission, we were very anxious to obtain any news we could about the situation at Corregidor and Bataan. We were saddened by what happened there; but by participating in that task force, we contributed what we could to the improvement of the psychological situation in the free world.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I thank the Senator from Washington for his reference to those events which illumine our country's history. From time to time I have talked with his friend and mine, Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, who, on the occasion of the anniversary celebration, will participate with others who took part in that memorable raid. I am glad that during the session of the Senate today, we can pause for a moment to recall some of the historic moments through which our country passed 21 years ago.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suppose military historians have suggested, and others will suggest, that the months of March and April of that year probably were the darkest months in U.S. history, from the military point of view.

Mr. KUCHEL. Unquestionably so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But we passed through that period; and it is well that we honor those who served during those dark days.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator very much.

OPPOSITION TO AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS UNDER THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture from the Agriculture Committee of the Iowa State Senate. In the letter, the committee protests the action taken by the Department of Agriculture in amending the regulations under the Packers and Stockyards Act. The committee points out that those amendments are having an undesirable influence on the livestock market and also on the efficient method of advertising and promotion of meat, which the matter deleted from the regulations by the recent action of the Secretary of Agriculture was designed to promote.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Senate, State of Iowa,
Des Moines, Iowa, April 4, 1963.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman,
U.S. Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Freeman: We ask your reconsideration of the action taken in the amendment to the regulations of the Packers and Stockyards Act, an amendment nullifying authorization of packers, market agencies, and dealers to deduct funds from receipts of livestock sales for research and meat promotion by the National Livestock Meat Board.

This is a real blow to livestock feeders who are now showing a net loss of $25 to $50 a head on fat cattle being marketed. It will also stop the efficient method of advertising and promotion of meat as well as result in the loss of excellent research into the nutritional value of meat conducted for the benefit of the consuming public.

The outstanding work conducted by the National Livestock Meat Board within the prior consent of deduction of funds from livestock sales of producers and feeders over a 40-year common law period should establish without question its right to continue.

We urge your immediate reconsideration of this drastic ruling to avoid further loss along with the high cost of operation of the livestock industry.

Respectfully yours,
Senate Agriculture Committee.
By John A. Walker, *Chairman.*

RADIO COMMENTARY BY W. EARL HALL

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, for 20 years, W. Earl Hall, editor and publisher of the Mason City Globe-Gazette, has aired his views in his "One Man's Opinion" over Iowa radio stations KGLO, Mason City; WOI, Ames; and WSUI, Iowa City. His commentaries have covered many subjects, including education, communism, his trips and findings abroad, his faith in God and in our country—in short, in essence his philosophy as a working newsman and an American and, I may add, as one of our most prominent Iowa citizens.

The reports have been published each week by the Mason City Globe-Gazette, and have quite well set forth the credo of this distinguished gentleman.

The last report he has made was published in the April 2 issue of the Mason City Globe-Gazette. It begins with the following words, "I come now to the end."

Mr. President, we regret very much that he has come to the end of his splendid commentaries. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Hall, as published in the Mason City Globe-Gazette of April 2, 1963, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One Man's Opinion

(A radio commentary by W. Earl Hall, editor and publisher)

THESE ARE THE THINGS I BELIEVE

I come now to the end of 20 years of once-a -week commentaries. The words I've spoken in these quarter-hour talks would fill at least 20 books of conventional novel length. Subjects have ranged from the love life of the honey bee to man's place in the scheme of things. I've really covered the waterfront.

It would be possible—let me hasten, however, to say I'm not suggesting it—to browse through my 3-foot-tall pile of typewritten manuscripts and either identify my credo or discover that I don't have one. I have told not only all I know but all I even suspect.

Most of the time since March 19, 1943, when I launched my series of broadcasts, my little network has included two State university stations. Conscious of the obligations thus implied, if not actually imposed, I probably have tempered my preaching more than I otherwise would have done.

My abiding belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man has been stated more than once. Corollary to this is my belief that there is a God-directed evolution * * * always upward. The gift of an intellect and a conscience made man a partner of the Supreme Architect in this evolutionary process of which I speak.

With Grove Patterson, of the Toledo, Ohio, Blade, whom I was proud to call my friend for many years, I can't bring myself to believe that this Supreme Architect would build for man a stairway leading nowhere.

Throughout the period of these commentaries I have rejected the oftrepeated assertion that man is a fighting animal. To the exact contrary, I have maintained—and do maintain—that deepest instinct in humankind is the instinct for peace, not war.

This premise was at the center of my opening commentary two decades ago (March of 1943). Although the outcome of World War II was by no means decided, I predicted victory for the free world and a peace organization which would permit America to make amends for its role in scuttling the League of Nations.

It was my contention then, as it has been many times since, that people in most of our world are entitled to better government than they have had. In a true democracy such as ours, of course—and there are few others—people get almost precisely what they deserve. But for nine-tenths of the world's population this rule is not applicable.

Not in modern times certainly and probably never have those who must do the fighting and the dying been responsible for our wars. The decision is made by those far removed from the fighting and the dying. In this I find the most compelling argument possible for a quest for lasting world peace through a system of enforcible law.

It may be a far-off goal but there can be no security against future wars unless and until we have a world peace organization equipped to reach down into the individual nations and eliminate the Hitlers, Mussolinis, and, yes, the Stalins and Khrushchevs before they plunge us into another bloodbath.

Some say—and I readily agree—that the course of action I've suggested here involves substantial risk. I ask only that this risk be set down alongside the ever-present risk attaching to following the same road that has led to two World Wars within my own span of maturity.

Almost before the ink was dry on the United Nations Charter, I sensed that we had sent a boy to do a man's work. The lofty goals set up in that document were not matched by the means of reaching them. In fairness, as I have pointed out innumerable times in these commentaries, it must be admitted that we were no less responsible than the Kremlin for the inadequate setup we got in U.N. 18 years ago.

How to make amends for lost opportunity is by no means clear at this time. We're locked in a life-and-death struggle with world communism. Even if it ended in complete victory at an early date—and this is by no means an impossibility—I'm not sure that we'd profit fully from the lesson we should have learned from two attempts at world organization for peace.

Now for a moment or two, let's turn our attention to that most nefarious ideology ever visited upon our world—communism. No subject has had more frequent or extensive attention in my commentaries down through the years. I've spoken about it with more than a little feeling.

Communism presented itself as a reality to me, as distinguished from a theory, a dozen years ago. First it was Tito's Marxism, then Stalin's. In Yugoslavia I saw empty store windows and ill-clad people in the center of a land suggestive of Iowa in its fertility. Then it was East Berlin, still in ruins whereas West Berlin was a flourishing city.

Later I saw Marxism at its fountainhead—Kiev, Leningrad, Moscow. I viewed its collective farming at close range. I studied its education from nursery schools to graduate level in 35-story University of Moscow looking down on the historic Moskva River from a commanding site on Lenin Hills.

I didn't see Russia's assembly line industry because my intourist guide was under orders not to let me. I could only judge it by its products, which included automobiles and trucks and tractors 20 years behind the times alongside their American counterparts.

What has become a well-defined impression in Yugoslavia and East Germany a half dozen years previously became a settled conviction on the basis of my time in Russia. Here are some of the things I believe about the ideology spawned by Marx and Engels, applied by Lenin and adapted by Stalin and Khrushchev:

Communism is as phony as a three dollar bill. It never went anywhere on honest invitation. It could stay nowhere—not even Russia—if there was a free choice and a plausible known alternative. Its one genius, if that word can be used, has been its ability to hold a pistol at the temple of its enslaved people longer than any other tyranny of our time.

I verily believe that communism bears the seed of its own destruction. I am willing to stake my reputation as a reporter on a prediction that Americans now living—including my seven grandchildren—will be on hand to witness the burial rites for this most loathsome ideology ever conceived in the mind of man. If, and it's a big if.

If we of the free world remain strong economically, militarily, and most important of all—spiritually.

This is a point of view I have expressed more than once—many times, in fact—in this extended series of commentaries now coming to an end.

Another oft-recurring theme in my weekly visits has been education in its varied manifestations. My conviction that education is the one most important business in the world has presented itself in numerous garbs. My reasoning has been rather elemental.

With education and an application of the technology embraced by education, there can be food for the 4 billion people who will inhabit our earth by 1970. With education—and only with education—can religion be elevated from superstition to something supremely meaningful.

Education is an indispensable precedent to true self-government in the democratic pattern. This was a studied judgment reached 2 decades ago on an extended fact-finding mission through South America. I had to report—and I'd still have to report—that there wasn't in all of Latin America any true democracy—republics, yes, but no real democracy.

Where illiteracy prevails, as it does in at least two-thirds of our world, a despotism is inevitable. The only question is whether it shall be a benevolent or a malevolent tyranny. I know of no exception to this rule.

Where there's democracy—our kind or any other form which glorifies human dignity—aggressive warfare becomes an impossibility. No war, as I've already suggested, could be launched by popular vote in an enlightened people. It's as simple as that.

It may be said of me that I have been a sucker for causes * * * safety, Red Cross, Community Chest agencies, crippled children, cancer, Radio Free Europe, all of them. If I am so accused, I shall not be disposed to enter a denial. Support for causes designed to promote happiness and human welfare has been deeply rooted in my credo.

As I have given of my time, my effort and my means, I have always had the deep-seated conviction that I was receiving even more than I gave. That is my heartfelt testimonial. I'm truly sorry for those who have not experienced the comfort and satisfaction which come from believing—really believing—in a cause and doing something about it.

Some of the causes I've espoused have prospered. Others—and a larger number, I suspect—have not—at least not yet.

Safety doesn't lend itself to permanent solution. My approach to the problem is that we get the degree of safety we deserve and demand. There's a price to be paid and we haven't been willing as yet to pay it.

In recent years, even recent months, there has been a most encouraging cutting through the ignorance and superstition that has blocked scientific water fluoridation. Vaccination's story is being repeated.

Iowa's adoption of a constitutional amendment which can put us at the forefront of judicial and court reform—if it's properly implemented by our legislature—has been a source of tremendous gratification to me by reason of having been head of the State citizen organization behind the move.

My story with respect to calendar reform isn't as pleasant to relate. There is a plan that would provide uniformity in months, quarters, and years. The logic for its adoption would seem to be unanswerable. Other nations favor it but American inertia blocks the path. We seem to need a modern Julius Caesar or Pope Gregory for another giant stride forward in time reckoning.

I had some slight part in bringing the city manager plan to my community. Its abandonment through apathy by our self-admitted good people was disappointing. But I haven't given up. Someday it will return because it constitutes the one best path to efficient and economical municipal government.

On the less serious side I haven't been able to make it known that it was Charles Dudley Warner, not Mark Twain, who said "everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it." Nor have I been wholly successful in getting across the information—even among some of my own associates—that the word is adDRESS—not ADdress.

"One Man's Opinion" has been a generally pleasant and rewarding chore—and interesting at times. I'm remembering some shortwave transmission by BBC during my tour of duty in war correspondence and an airmail transmission of a tape cut in Melbourne, Australia, during the 1956 Olympics at a cost suggestive of platinum if not radium.

But my happiest memory is going to be about the thousands of stimulating letters from listeners. These have undergirded my well-defined conviction that humankind is mostly good and that our God-directed evolution is ever upward.

IMPACT ON THE BANKING INDUSTRY OF SEC INVESTIGATIONS AND CONTROLS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the American Banker for March 27, in the column entitled "Today," written by Raoul D. Edwards, appears an article in which he points out that the American Bankers Association is joining forces with the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. Saxon, in seeking to ward off the impact on the banking industry of SEC investigations and controls. In the article he points out the extent to which the Federal regulatory agencies are involved in the banking business. I must say that a very impressive case is made for not adding further to the burdens on the American bankers.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY: ABA JOINS SAXON IN COMMON CAUSE

(By Raoul D. Edwards)

WASHINGTON.—The bank president looked up at his cashier with a harassed, tired look in his eyes. "Now what?"

The cashier looked equally tired. "Some examiners have shown up from the Housing and Home Finance Agency. They want to go over our loans on the slum clearance project. And that new school loan we made."

"Well, go ahead; that's their legal right. Go ahead. The more the merrier. But tell me—when do you think we can get a little work done around here?"

The president turned to his desk, fuming. In the last 2 weeks his bank had been inundated by the usual spring rush. The Fed had been in for its examination; the Comptroller's Office had sent a trust examiner down and the SEC had been in to probe his trust operations; FHA and VA officials had gone over his mortgage operations with a fine-toothed comb, and the FDIC had been in, examining all loans in its jurisdiction, as had several other agencies. Half his staff was shepherding some examiner or another around the premises; papers were scattered everywhere, and customers weren't getting the attention they deserved.

Incredible? Impossible? Of course, but—

"If banking were regulated by everyone whose jurisdiction it touches, the effectiveness of the banking system in meeting the public's needs would be threatened. One industry simply could not be responsive to the regulation which this multisupervisory system would entail. Ultimately, the public would be denied the benefits of our uniquely designed business because banking would no longer be able to offer the services that have been so important to our people."

The picture of a bank being intruded upon by a dozen supervisory agencies is unlikely, but the above warning, sounded by Dr. Charles Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, is not unwarranted.

Dr. Walker was throwing the whole weight of the ABA behind the Comptroller of the Currency in his effort to keep the Securities and Exchange Commission out of regulation of bank trust powers, as far as they cover common trust operation of funds under the Keogh Act.

But Dr. Walker made a second point, and one which in the long run may be far more important: that banking cannot endure much more of a regulatory burden than it now bears. Perhaps no other business in the country is as heavily regulated as is banking.

Thoughtful bankers know this. They know that SEC attempts to regulate their use of this particular trust fund is not needed, for the simple reason that banks already are more closely regulated in this field, than are mutual funds.

In Dr. Walker's words: "Bank regulatory agencies already effectively supervise our business."

Indeed, bank supervisory bodies regulate far more closely than the SEC does, or probably would want to. Banks operating in the trust field are not permitted the management fees, or the "pack" or price, that mutual funds are. They do not want them; even if they did, the bank supervisory bodies would not permit them to take these higher fees.

And, as Dr. Walker added, "if the need for greater regulation does develop, it should be imposed by existing bank supervisory agencies."

As it now stands, a bank can be held answerable depending on the system to which it belongs—to the Comptroller of the Currency on trust functions; the Federal Reserve as a member bank, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as an insured bank, its State supervisor as a State-chartered bank, the Justice Department on antitrust matters, and, in a more limited sense, other State and Federal agencies on controls over certain types of loans handled, and the like. FHA rules must be observed in making FHA loans, for example. And don't forget the Internal Revenue Service, that senior partner of every corporation in the country.

Without considering the legalities of SEC control over some bank trust functions—a matter in grave doubt—it still seems that there is no need, and no public good, to be gained by adding this agency to banking's many other regulators. The ABA's decision to support Mr. SAXON's position is well advised.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS ON APRIL 10 AND 11

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee was authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate on April 10 and 11.

WINSTON CHURCHILL BECOMES AN HONORARY CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today the President of the United States signed the resolution giving to Sir Winston Churchill the first honorary citizenship of the United States, and thus making him an honorary citizen of our great Republic.

Mr. President, Winston Churchill is known by every American. The Associated Press, in a remarkable article about this great world citizen, has reminded us of Sir Winston's visit to the Congress. I shall read part of the article, because it tells a little of the story of this great man's capacity and ability, almost with the incisiveness of the great man's rhetoric, to present his views:

> For Congress he rolled out a display of this renowned oratory. He looked around the Senate Chamber and remarked impishly:
>
> "I cannot help reflecting that if my father had been an American and my mother British, instead of the other way 'round, I might have got here on my own."

And, you know, I do believe he would have.

During this visit to the Capital Sir Winston addressed a joint meeting of the House and the Senate. All of us remember it. It was a most exciting chapter in the history of the United States.

Mr. President, today is another great chapter in the history of the United States and in the history of Great Britain, our faithful, loyal, and strong ally. When President Kennedy signed the resolution giving honorary United States citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill, I am sure the President was speaking for every American, because our Nation loves, admires, and respects Mr. Churchill. We respect him as a great warrior, as a great wartime leader, as a great statesman, as a great Englishman, and, above all, as a great citizen of the free world.

I think his willingness to accept the title of honorary citizen of the United States is an honor to the American people. We can embrace him as one of our own; he becomes a citizen of this Republic, as well as a citizen of the United Kingdom.

As my colleagues know, Sir Winston's mother was an American. The bond of friendship between this country and the great English leader is all the more enduring because of this parental bond. His steadfast courage and loyalty throughout the war will remain as a constant reminder with all Americans who can recall those grave and fateful days.

What better way than by this act of Congress and this act by the President of the United States to perpetuate for the ages the wonderful relationships existing between the United States and Great Britain.

The United Kingdom and the United States now have a common bond that goes far beyond diplomatic niceties or far beyond the alliances that arise through treaties. We now have the common bond of citizenship in common with Sir Winston.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by the Associated Press be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONORARY AMERICAN: CHURCHILL BECOMES CITIZEN

Sir Winston Churchill, the magnificent Briton, becomes officially today what he has been for 2 decades in the hearts of Americans—the first honorary citizen of the United States.

The bestowing of this honor, unique in all history, requires only a touch of President Kennedy's pen on a bill enacted by Congress and a second signature on a presidential proclamation.

Weary now with the weight of 88 years, Sir Winston was unable to be present to receive a nation's accolade. Neither were Herbert Hoover, Harry S. Truman, and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the three former Presidents, able to accept Mr. Kennedy's invitation to attend today's ceremony.

But the ceremony was carefully timed so that the British Broadcasting Corp. could bounce it off the orbiting Relay satellite and Sir Winston could watch it on television in his London home.

And Sir Winston sent a special message of acceptance and appreciation to be read by his son, Randolph.

The setting was the rose garden outside the White House where Sir Winston helped chart the strategy of global war and peered at the problems of an uneasy peace in the climactic years of a stirringly erratic career.

It was in this house that the man Britain chose as its Prime Minister in the moment of its greatest peril showed up suddenly and secretly a few days after Japan smashed at Pearl Harbor and the United States went limping off to war.

Side by side in the oval Presidential office, Sir Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt thundered at the common enemy at a joint news conference. They assured the world that allied might ultimately would win out over Germany first and then Japan. Spryer then, Sir Winston climbed onto a chair, chomped a cigar, and poked his split fingers aloft in his renowned V-for-victory salute.

For Congress he rolled out a display of his even more renowned oratory. He looked around the Senate Chamber and remarked impishly:

"I cannot help reflecting that if my father had been an American and my mother British, instead of the other way 'round, I might have got here on my own."

Today he got back to the National Capital in thought and spirit.

And memories surged back through Washington of how Sir Winston seared the Nazis with acid tongue and tone, of how he preferred a spot of brandy to that "bleak beverage," water; of his head to toe, zippered air raid suit; of the big cigar and jaunty air.

Today homage comes to Sir Winston not only from the Ambassadors of Britain and seven Commonwealth nations. Invitations to the citizenship ceremony also brought an outpouring of acceptances from American friends and admirers of Sir Winston in and out of Government.

Half the Cabinet accepted. So did leading men in Congress. So did Chief Justice Earl Warren.

On the list were such persons as the sons of the late President, John Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.; former Ambassadors to the United Kingdom, John Hay Whitney and Winthrop Aldrich; Financier Bernard Baruch; Mrs. Alice Roosevelt Longworth; General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, and retired Gens. Carl. A. Spaatz and J. Lawton Collins, Jr.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the assistant majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who has so eloquently described his happiness at the designation of citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill.

Many of us remember the day when he spoke at the joint session of the Congress during the bleak days of World War II, when his great leadership of England, matched with that of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, stood guard against the conquering of most of the world by the forces of Hitler. I remember that he remarked to the assembled Senate and the House that his mother was an American and his father was a Britisher. Had it been the other way around, he might have been here in his own right.

I am certain we all agree that, had his father been an American, with his great statesmanship, he would eventually have been a leader in the Senate or in the House of Representatives. His great strength of character, his grasp of strategy, and his great talent of leadership for the British people through hopeless conditions following the fall of France, will stand out as a burning torch for men who desire to maintain their freedom everywhere.

EFFECT OF CHANGES IN TAX LAWS RELATING TO OIL AND GAS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, proposed changes in Federal tax laws would have grave consequences not only for the millions of Americans directly associated with the oil and gas industry, but for all Americans who must rely on a healthy and responsible fuels production capability as part of our national defense. In hearings recently before the House Ways and Means Committee many witnesses testified that the proposed changes in the tax laws would reduce exploration and drilling by U.S. petroleum companies at a time when Soviet Russia is developing its oil as a principal weapon in the cold war.

Recent authoritative studies have resulted in the prediction that the demand for energy fuels in the United States will triple by the year 2000. The question that faces Congress this year is whether the U.S. petroleum industry can fill its share of the demand if it carries the brunt of a so-called tax reform program.

I am convinced the people of the United States are far too complacent about their future fuel requirements. This complacency results, to a large extent, from lack of information.

In the April 1 issue of the Oil and Gas Journal, an authoritative publication, the bleak outlook for U.S. crude oil reserves has been carefully pictured. The magazine reports that U.S. oil reserves declined last year to the lowest point since 1958. A gain in the discovery of natural gas reserves failed to offset the decline in total liquid hydrocarbon reserves available to this Nation in the event our foreign supplies were again denied us by war or other catastrophe. The summary which the Oil and Gas Journal published will be of interest to the Members, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAS RESERVES UP, OIL DOWN IN 1962

Crude-oil explorers last year turned in their worst record in the United States since World War II, and reserves fell to the lowest point in 4 years.

Even a good gain by natural-gas liquids failed to forestall the second decline in total liquid-hydrocarbon reserves in the postwar period. Natural-gas drillers, by contrast, had one of their better years.

The Canadian industry registered sizable increases in all categories, but exploration danger signals were being raised there as well.

These results were reported by the American Petroleum Institute, the American Gas Association, and the Canadian Petroleum Association. Their annual studies presented the following picture of North America's reserves as of January 1:

Crude oil: 31,389,223,000 barrels down 369,282,000 barrels or almost 1.2 percent for the largest postwar decline, while production rose 1.5 percent to 2.550 billion barrels, third highest on record. Peak gain was in 1957, followed by the gain in 1956.

Natural-gas liquids: 7,311,517,000 barrels, up 262,421,000 or 3.7 percent, while production hit a fourth consecutive new high of 470 million barrels, up 1.8 percent.

Texas, the other State with a higher level of activity, still dropped 201 million barrels. Substantial setbacks were also suffered by the other important oil States—Wyoming, Oklahoma, Illinois, Arkansas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah.

Natural-gas liquids: Following the trend in natural-gas success, reserves in this category increased more than in the previous year.

But the size of the addition was the second lowest in 5 years because of steadily rising production.

Among the 20 States broken out separately there were as many losses as gains. But success in the two big States offset the decreases with some to spare. Louisiana added 204 million barrels and Texas 74 million. The only other substantial gains were made by New Mexico and Oklahoma.

California's loss of 34.5 million barrels was the only minus sign worthy of note.

Natural gas: In the face of record production, the increase in natural-gas reserves was more than 50 percent larger than the increase for the previous year.

The life index changed very little and remained at about 20 years.

Louisiana's position as the Nation's hottest gas-hunting province was never more pronounced. Its net gain of 5.9 trillion cubic feet accounted for virtually the entire national increase. Almost half of the 19.5 trillion cubic feet of gas found in the United States last year was discovered in this single State.

Texas, still by far the leader in reserves and production, slipped by 335 billion cubic feet.

The only other major gas State recording a sizable improvement was Oklahoma, which added 1 trillion cubic feet net with gross additions of 2 trillion cubic feet. If the trend continues another year, Oklahoma will surpass Kansas in reserves as it has done in production, becoming third ranked behind Texas and Louisiana.

These four States, together with New Mexico, ended the year with more than 88 percent of the Nation's entire gas supply.

Alaska, with no production to speak of yet, actually made the third largest addition to reserves of any State and is now assigned a conservative total of 1.6 trillion cubic feet. California's modest resurgence permitted this huge market, supplied some two-thirds from out of State, to increase its own supply slightly.

Canada. Exploration for new oil and natural gas up 5.7 percent to 35.4 trillion cubic feet. Canadian explorers gathered almost all of their increase from revisions in estimates and extensions to known fields.

Crude oil: With U.S. drilling hitting the lowest point in a decade, reserves responded accordingly by dropping for the third time in the past 6 years.

Reserves dipped to the lowest level since 1958.

The new oil added through discoveries of 380 million barrels was the best performance since 1957, auguring well perhaps for 1963, but still below the postwar average.

But revisions and extensions, which traditionally account for the great bulk of reserves additions, contributed less than for any year in the postwar period. This marked only the second time since World War II that the figure dipped below 2 billion barrels.

Of the 23 States listed separately, only 5 increased their reserves. And of these 5, only 2 made notable additions—Louisiana, with 155 million barrels, and California, reversing its trend of recent years with an increase of 33.7 million barrels. These States were two of the three to show drilling increases of consequence last year.

Total liquid hydrocarbons: 38,700,740,000 barrels, down 106,861,000 barrels or just under three-tenths of 1 percent, while production increased almost 1.6 percent to 3.02 billion barrels, exceeding 3 billion for the first time.

Natural gas: 273.8 trillion cubic feet, up almost 2.3 percent or 6 trillion cubic feet, in spite of another production record of 13.7 trillion cubic feet, 1.9 percent above the 1961 level.

Canada: reserves hit new highs in all categories. Crude reserves are up 7.4 percent to 4.48 billion barrels, natural-gas liquids up 20.8 percent to 695.4 million barrels, total liquid hydrocarbons up 9 percent to 5.176 billion barrels, and natural-gas liquids was singularly unsuccessful in Canada last year, although substantial additions to reserves were made.

Only 21 million barrels of the 552-million-barrel gross addition to crude oil came from new discoveries. British Columbia, which had a big development year, adding 65 million barrels in revisions and extensions, wasn't assigned a single barrel of oil from new strikes.

Alberta contributed 450 million barrels from extensions and revisions, but only 11 million from new discoveries, putting geologists on the spot to open new plays or face a reversal in the supply trend. This threat was raised down the road, although the current picture is bright as Canadians found more than twice as much oil as they produced last year.

British Columbia and Alberta were the only two Provinces to show an increase.

In natural-gas liquids, only 3.7 million of 143 million barrels in gross additions came from new finds.

Natural gas showed up somewhat better, having gross additions of 2.8 trillion cubic feet, including 453 billion from discoveries.

Big production gains were made across the board—crude oil, up 23.9 million to 244.9 million barrels; natural-gas liquids, up 9.8 million to 23.5 million barrels; total liquid hydrocarbons, up 33.7 million to 268 million barrels; and natural gas, up 161.7 billion to a total of 949 billion cubic feet.

NO APPLESAUCE AT HOME

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, long after the beautiful petals of the cherry blossoms have been blown away by the winds, and the lovely dresses and coiffures of the princesses are forgotten, Oklahomans will remember Miss Peggy Harlow, our princess for this year.

Peggy is the attractive daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Bryce Harlow, of Oklahoma and Washington. For many years Mr. Harlow was a congressional aid. He later served, during 8 years in the White House, as a legislative aid to President Eisenhower. As her father distinguished himself as a writer, so has Peggy won distinction by winning first place in the essay contest among the princesses.

Her essay brilliantly deals with the true meaning of culture in America. She has carefully separated the frills from the basic outlines of our customs and our arts. Her eloquent summary of Oklahoma's contribution to our Nation's culture portrays our outstanding progress during the State's relatively brief history.

It so clearly defines Oklahoma's unique and proud contributions that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in full in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO APPLESAUCE AT HOME

(Winning essay by Miss Peggy Harlow, cherry blossom essay contest winner)

To the self-styled sophisticate, it may seem strange that the word "culture" springs to mind as I think of my wonderful Oklahoma. But let me explain.

So much of "culture" these days seems to consist of taking pictures of prominent people making glittering entrances into theaters, opera houses, or art museums. Often, it seems staged, and composed of activities suited to the intellectual elite and the well to do.

It was such cultural posturing that made our beloved Will Rogers protest, "Say, when you come right down to it, that intelligence and culture thing is a lot of applesauce."

I am sure that Will Rogers, had he been challenged, would have explained that real culture is not "applesauce"; he meant, rather, that it is more than museums, theaters, and opera houses, more than kleig lights playing on mink coats and evening gowns in front of marquees. Oklahoma's great cowboy-philosopher knew that culture is the totality of a society's contributions to mankind, encompassing every field of endeavor. The rich and poor, the gifted and mediocre, the leaders and followers are all part of it, and to it each of us makes his large or small contribution.

So it is that I think of culture as I regard my Oklahoma, for it is in this broad context that my State has excelled since territorial days.

Our educational progress gives a measure of what I mean. In scarcely more than a half century, Oklahoma has worked wonders. In 1959 she was first in America in teacher education and preparedness. More than 99 percent of her public school teachers held at least one college degree, compared with the national average of 75.3 percent. Here Oklahoma's standards—Oklahoma's culture—are revealed.

I know that when non-Sooners talk of Oklahoma schools many suggest that our real interest is football—often said with some envy. And imply that our educational standards leave much to be desired. But the science and mathematics taught at Oklahoma City University in conjunction with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and at Oklahoma University and Oklahoma State University; our preeminence in petroleum engineering; the atomic reactor being used for advanced experimental work—these exemplify the central preoccupations of our people. Undergraduate degrees are offered in more than 70 areas, master's degrees in more than 50 areas, doctorates in more than 20 areas. The University of Oklahoma Press is unexcelled in the quality and rich variety of its work. All this, remember, in one of the youngest States in the Union.

And then, we of Oklahoma have excelled in such artistic endeavors as painting, music, and dance. The whole Nation values our contributions to the national culture through the hauntingly beautiful and stirring art of the Indian. Such names as Acee Blue Eagle, Noah Deere, and Kodaseet make all Americans proud of exceptional accomplishment. Art museums from coast to coast prominently display Oklahoma Indian works. For years such paintings adorned the White House corridor adjacent to the President's office.

Our wonderful Indian and cowboy heritage still gives zest to many aspects of Oklahoma life. Square dancing, cowboy laments and ballads, and the primitive mysticism of Indian religious songs add a tingling delight to our total art. Other gifted Oklahoma Indians—Maria Tallchief, Rosella Hightower, Yvonne Choteau, Moscelyne Larkin—bypassing their unique culture, have triumphed in ballet. They are rightly the pride of the United States.

Nor have I mentioned our extraordinary scientific achievements. The Frontiers for Science Foundation, nurtured and matured in Oklahoma, catapulted my youthful State from arrows to atoms virtually overnight. It has had the warm praise of the President of the United States, given in person in Oklahoma City, as well as tremendous acclaim from the top scientists of our country. Considering also our Medical Research Foundation, the FAA Aeronautical Center at Oklahoma City, the restless probings by our colleges and universities, ours is clearly a State that is vital, aggressive, and intellectually afire—a State new, but born to lead.

Such spectacular achievements do not just happen. They evolve from the verve, vitality, and venturesome spirit of the people of Oklahoma. A refreshing spontaneity, freedom of the inhibitions of old world sophistication, a disregard of the deadening obsession for physical security, and eagerness to push ever outward the boundaries of human knowledge and opportunity—such qualities have made my State, in only two generations, a shining star in the Union.

But in the golden philosophy of Will Rogers is found the most admirable Sooner qualities. He projected, for all the world to see, the instinctive honesty, the friendliness, the optimism, the belief in fellow men, which came from the pioneers of the 1889 run. His philosophy is still the hallmark of my home State. In his, "I never met a man I didn't like," appears the commitment to enduring human values, the best in real culture, that represents Oklahoma to the United States and to the world.

RESULTS OF THE TAX CREDIT FOR INCENTIVE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last year a provision was inserted in the tax bill which called for a 7 percent tax credit to serve as an incentive to business, if business would make an investment in new equipment. At the time the proposal was before the Senate, well intentioned Senators and others said that it was not a wise move to make. The contention was made that it would not in fact stimulate capital investment. Many opposed the bill on that ground.

It is interesting to observe that since the bill passed with that tax investment credit in it, it has accomplished exactly the purpose at which it was aimed. It has achieved the ambition set out for it by the administration when it was first recommended.

I have in my hand an article from a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal. I do not know the exact date of it, but I am sure that the date can be recaptured easily. The article states, "Capital goods gain." The article describes how many of our large companies in the United States have made expenditures far above that which they had originally planned to make in order to take advantage of the incentive credit. I should like to read a couple of paragraphs from the article:

> CHICAGO.—Many large corporations are taking a second look at their 1963 capital spending plans and are revising them upward.
>
> That's the picture that emerges from talks with executives of more than two-score companies and with officials of capital goods producers who closely watch the buying moods of corporate managers. It is backed up by many economists.
>
> One economist predicts the revisions will lead to a sharp rise in capital spending this year from last year's record $37.4 billion. "I'll be surprised if spending doesn't increase 8 to 10 percent this year," declares George W. Cloos, senior economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.

I will skip down to the place in the article which describes some of the conditions and what companies have actually done:

> Some steel company executives say their experience with the Federal tax incentives has caused them to remodel spending plans upward. A number of railroads have been similarly affected.
>
> "The extra cash we're generating from these tax savings has encouraged us to do some things we wouldn't have otherwise," says H. C. Murphy, president of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad. "The intent of the tax savings is to enable railroads and industry to plow them back into income-producing property and we expect to follow this intent."
>
> The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway has earmarked $90 million for capital improvements this year, up 80 percent from $50 million last year. Great Northern Railway has a spending budget of $24 million for this year, double its 1962 outlay. Railway Age, a trade publication, estimates the industry's capital spending this year will increase 20 percent. Last fall some industry experts were looking for a slight drop in 1963 spending.
>
> ### OTHER SHARP INCREASES
>
> Sharp spending increases are slated by other types of companies, although not all reflect recent changes in plans. General Motors Corp.'s outlay for U.S. facilities will jump to $520 million from $425 million in 1962. Ford Motor Co.'s U.S. spending will go up to $130 million from $95 million. Container Corp. of America has budgeted $40 million for 1963, up from $24 million last year. Montgomery Ward & Co. has set aside $50 million compared to only $20 million spent last year. Domestic spending by International Harvester Co. this year is scheduled to rise to $60 million from $47 million in 1962.

The article designates several other companies which will make considerably more expenditures for capital investment than they had originally planned, and all of it encouraged and caused by the investment credit which we passed last year.

I desire to call that to the attention of the Senate to let Senators understand that the administration in its recommendation last year, which was severely criticized for a while, was totally correct in what it intended to do. The administration hit a high mark. It probably exceeded that which they thought would be hit. But it does show the wisdom of the economists who are helping the administration to make up its mind about what are the proper fiscal and financial programs which the present administration should follow.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL GOODS GAIN: MANY COMPANIES RAISE PLANT AND EQUIPMENT SPENDING GOALS FOR 1963

(By Harlan Byrne)

CHICAGO.—Many large corporations are taking a second look at their 1963 capital spending plans and are revising them upward.

That's the picture that emerges from talks with executives of more than two-score companies and with officials of capital goods producers who closely watch the buying moods of corporate managers. It is backed up by many economists.

One economist predicts the revisions will lead to a sharp rise in capital spending this year from last year's record $37.4 billion. "I'll be surprised if spending doesn't increase 8 to 10 percent this year," declares George W. Cloos, senior economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. Upward revisions are most notable in the steel and railroad industries, he says.

An economist for the National Industrial Conference Board, an economic research organization based in New York, also believes earlier capital spending forecasts should be scaled upward. He looks for a 6 to 8 percent gain this year from 1962.

GOVERNMENT ESTIMATE DUE SOON

A fuller view of the 1963 spending outlook will emerge late this week or early next week when the Commerce Department and Securities and Exchange Commission issue results of their quarterly survey of industry's capital outlay plans. Last fall, the report estimated first quarter spending would drop to an annual rate of $37.7 billion, down 1.7 percent from the fourth quarter rate and only slightly above the total 1962 volume. The coming report will take a second look at the first quarter rate and forecast spending for all of 1963.

There are plenty of signs that corporate executives are in a freer spending mood than they were last fall. Their mood reflects a number of factors: Corporate earnings may have set a record in 1962's fourth-quarter and many companies are reporting first-quarter profits above the year-ago period. Auto sales are high. The stock market has held a reasonable steady upward trend since last fall. And more and more companies are finding they make worthwhile savings on their equipment purchases with a 7-percent tax credit on such buying and liberalized tax rules for depreciating the equipment both of which were put into effect by the Government last year.

"From talks with our customers it is obvious many of them are going to spend more this year than they had originally planned," says Julien P. Steelman, chairman and president of Koehring Co. of Milwaukee, which makes heavy construction and industrial equipment. Koehring has had a "sharp" increase in orders in the last 3 months, Mr. Steelman says.

DU PONT STEPS UP SPENDING

Du Pont Co. has quickened the pace of its spending. "Last fall, we figured we would spend as much as $325 million in 1963; now we expect to spend $350 million and it may go still higher," says an official. This year's projected spending is 45 percent above the record $245 million Du Pont spent in 1962.

Upward revisions in steel industry spending are evident when plans of major companies are matched against a survey taken last November by the American Iron & Steel Institute. The survey showed steel firms expected to spend $1 billion in 1963, only $75 million more than in 1962. A sampling now indicates the estimate of a $75 million gain is undoubtedly too low. Inland Steel Co.'s 1963 capital spending budget is $110 million, compared to $42 million last year. Bethlehem Steel Corp. will lay out $250 million in contrast to last year's $193 million. Among other companies planning increases are United States Steel Corp., Republic Steel Corp., and Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

Some steel company executives say their experience with the Federal tax incentives has caused them to remodel spending plans upward. A number of railroads have been similarly affected.

"The extra cash we're generating from these tax savings has encouraged us to do some things we wouldn't have otherwise. says H. C. Murphy, president of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad. "The intent of the tax savings is to enable railroads and industry to plow them back into income-producing property and we expect to follow this intent."

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway has earmarked $90 million for capital improvements this year, up 80 percent from $50 million last year. Great Northern Railway has a spending budget of $24 million for this year, double its 1962 outlay. Railway Age, a trade publication, estimates the industry's capital spending this year will increase 20 percent. Last fall some industry experts were looking for a slight drop in 1963 spending.

OTHER SHARP INCREASES

Sharp spending increases are slated by other types of companies, although not all reflect recent changes in plans. General Motors Corporation's outlay for U.S. facilities will jump to $520 million from $425 million in 1962. Ford Motor Company's U.S. spending will go up to $130 million from $95 million. Container Corp. of America has budgeted $40 million for 1963, up from $24 million last year. Montgomery Ward & Co. has set aside $50 million compared to only $20 million spent last year. Domestic spending by International Harvester Co. this year is scheduled to rise to $60 million from $47 million in 1962.

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which last year accounted for about 8 percent of all U.S. capital spending, plans to increase its outlay some 3 to 5 percent this year to about $3.1 billion.

Another important rise in capital spending this year would be a significant sign of vitality in the U.S. economy. Last year's outlay of $37.4 billion was up 8.5 percent from the $34.4 billion of 1961.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator for bringing this important item to our attention. The Senator alluded, in a private conversation, to the article which was published in the Wall Street Journal earlier today. It substantiates the hopes expressed and the claims made at the time the Senate voted on the investment tax credit.

I am pleased that it was my privilege to vote for that tax relief measure. Not only did I vote for it, but also I worked for it, because I felt it would release much needed capital for the improvement of heavy goods industries and for a capital improvement in the industrial structure of the country.

As I indicated to the Senator from Florida earlier today, I have received several letters from businessmen who have told me in their letters that they have made new investments because of the recommendation of the administration and the action by the Congress in regard to the investment tax credit. I received a letter from a large utility in the State of New York outlining the plans which had been made and the moneys which already have been committed for expansion in the utility industry.

The tax credit was a very important piece of legislation, which has had a good effect on the economy.

Today's newspapers tell us that the profits of American business—profits now available for dividends and for new industrial improvement—are running the highest ever in the history of the Nation. I think this administration can take a bow for being a friend to business. How could one be more friendly to business than to make possible an economic climate in which American business can prosper, in which American business can modernize, in which American business can receive just and equitable tax treatment.

Now the President has come forward with another proposal which is designed, as was the investment tax credit, to release capital into the private economy, for the consumers and investors. The consumers will be able to make a choice as to spending. The investors will be able to make a choice as to long-range investment.

This is why I basically support the broad outlines of most of the provisions of the administration tax bill, because I believe it is the way to help the economy help itself. That is the kind of legislation which will permit the industrial economy, the financial community, and the consuming public to make their own decisions as to the use of capital.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

I am sure that on this particular point the Senator would agree with me—and I think the statistics support the contention—that by virtue of the investment tax credit given last year, and the stimulus to capital investment which resulted, there has been brought about a situation in which more jobs are being created, so that the whole economy will be strengthened. Some of these companies had not been paying very much in taxes, because of a lack of income. As the Senator so well pointed out, and as was stated in this morning's newspaper, they are now in better financial condition. The Senator cited the morning paper, which showed how much profit these companies are now beginning to enjoy. This means that in the long run the U.S. Treasury will realize a greater income.

Therefore, when the taxes are lowered in some instances, as was done last year, the net effect of the reduction is to actually increase revenues at the same time, while strengthening the economy.

That is the philosophy behind the tax cut provided last year, and that is the philosophy behind the recommended personal income tax reduction for this year.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, according to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 10, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hebrews 11: 6: *Without faith it is impossible to please God.*

Most merciful and gracious God, during these troublous days when we are encountering and must withstand many mighty and mysterious forces of evil, inspire us to maintain and safeguard the continuity of faith in Thee and in a nobler civilization built upon the foundation of truth and righteousness.

Grant that in this glorious spring season there may blossom forth among all the nations of the earth the fragrant spirit of brotherhood, the spirit of mutual obligations and cooperation, supplanting the spirit of selfishness which manifests itself in a sordid scramble for prestige and power.

Show us how we may have a share in raising the spirit of mankind to a higher quality and seek to clothe it with a dawning splendor which brightens more and more unto the perfect day.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who called himself the Bright and Morning Star. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **EDMONDSON.** Mr. Speaker, this morning's edition of the Washington Post predicts that there will be a donnybrook on this floor today on the proposed elimination of funds for the accelerated public works program and quotes one of our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], as saying that if Congress is serious about cutting spending, this is the one place to start, and further quoting, that it is not necessary for the minority to win this fight, but it must make its position clear.

Apparently the position of the opposition is to be in favor of percentage cuts on some items but against every red cent for the accelerated public works program. It is interesting to see that they have brought out a bill which provides a cut of approximately 2 percent in the money for forest land management, of approximately 25 percent in educational television, of less than 18 percent for General Services Administration supplies, but of 100 percent for a program to give jobs to American people, for a program which is in effect in 45 of the 50 States, and for a program which is making possible useful sanitation improvements, water supply, hospital construction, and other desirable and long needed improvements in depressed areas. I say if this is the one place to start in the mind of the opposition party, then let us draw the line good and clear for the American people, because the program of accelerated public works is the one program in this bill that is guaranteed to improve employment in the depressed areas of this country. I earnestly hope we can have a thorough debate of both party positions in the course of today's consideration.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. **MORRIS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

PAN AMERICAN DAY, 1963

Mr. **CONTE.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CONTE.** Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 11 we again commemorate Pan American Day throughout the Western Hemisphere. This year marks the 73d anniversary of the system of inter-American cooperation which is embodied today in the Organization of American States. From very humble beginnings in this city of Washington in 1890, the inter-American system has made tremendous strides in the accomplishment of the dreams of its original champion, Simon Bolivar.

We have seen the growth of the pan-American idea to encompass hemispheric security, economic growth and betterment, and social and cultural progress. We have seen the development of the multinational acceptance of the Monroe Doctrine, the Good Neighbor Policy, and the Alliance for Progress. Each of these was a historic step in the development of true pan-Americanism.

But 1963 does not mark a resting place in the continued development of inter-American cooperation. We can be thankful for the support shown by our neighbors during the October missile crisis without being disillusioned that our troubles are over in Latin America. We must face the future, all Americans, north and south of the Rio Grande, with a renewed determination to preserve and protect liberty and justice in this hemisphere. And our sincerity will be measured not by our words, but by our deeds. Thus it is that we commemorate this 73d Pan American Day with dedication of our efforts to a free and progressive hemisphere.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN PROPOSALS

Mr. **HOSMER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HOSMER.** Mr. Speaker, I think it should be brought to the attention of the Members of the Congress that there has been a spate of letters to the editor, and so forth, in the New York Times and in the Washington Post this morning and probably in other newspapers from so-called scientists and people like James J. Wadsworth, all containing exactly the same sort of argument put forth by the disarmament agency in connection with the upcoming treaty proposals to be made by the administration at Geneva later this month to the Soviet Union. These proposals have been disclosed in part to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. A public record has been made showing the proposals contain a big hole through which the Soviets could drive their way to nuclear superiority. The gentlemen who wrote these letters were not in attendance at the hearings; and do not have the information upon which to give the assurances they are relating apparently on information furnished by the disarmament agency. It seems to me to be an obvious and organized effort to brainwash the American people to accept treaty safeguards which are illusory and do not actually provide for the national security and survival of the United States of America. I hope the people of the United States will read these communications with the knowledge that the men who have affixed their names to them do not have the information to sustain the contentions they make in public over their names and reputations, in many cases in various fields not connected with nuclear weaponry, in which cases they are not authorities on the subject on which they seek to assure the American public with authority.

TRANSFER OF FLOODED ACREAGE

Mr. **STUBBLEFIELD.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 5067) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. **BELCHER.** Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. **STUBBLEFIELD.** Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. It provides for the transfer of flooded-out cotton acreage allotments from the bottomlands of the Mississippi to high ground for a period of 1 year. This is the same bill that was passed in 1958, 1961, and 1962, on the Consent Calendar. It is estimated by USDA that 11,400 acres are flooded affecting about 656 farms in Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, and Louisiana.

The bill applies to the 1963 cotton crop only, and provides that the acreage allotments will not be affected.

Mr. **BELCHER.** I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 344(n) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the figures "1962" where they first appear therein and inserting the figures "1963."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4 insert after "(1)" the following:

By striking out the word "substantial" where it appears, (2) page 1, line 6, strike out the period and insert

, and (3) by striking the period at the end of the second sentence thereof and substituting a colon therefor and the following proviso: "*Provided,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 344(m)(2) of this Act, the transfer of any farm allotment under this subsection for 1963 shall operate to make the farm from which the allotment was transferred eligible for an allotment as having cotton planted thereon during the three year base period."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 17]

Andrews
Barrett
Brademas
Bray
Burton
Celler
Cooley
Corbett
Daddario
Farbstein
Fino
Foreman
Fuqua
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Halpern
Healey
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Multer
Osmers
Patten
Powell
St. George
St Germain
Shelley
Smith, Iowa
Thompson, La.
Toll
Van Pelt
Wallhauser
Walter
Whitener
Willis

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 389 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. **DELANEY**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 311 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

> *Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, all points of order against the provisions contained in lines 5 through 10, page 22, are hereby waived.

Mr. **DELANEY**. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for waiving all points of order on one item in the supplemental appropriation bill. The item is contained on page 22 in lines 5 to 10. It deals with the authorization of the purchase of furniture and fixtures for the Rayburn Office Building, the appropriation for which is to be handled in the legislative branch appropriation bill. This is the only item on which we ask a waiver, this single item, so they can go ahead and order the furniture for the new Rayburn Building.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **DELANEY**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **GROSS**. Why should points of order be waived on this purchase? Does the gentleman not think that it ought to be authorized?

Mr. **DELANEY**. This is the authorization that we are asking for now in the interest of saving time. This building is completed and apparently there was no authorization for the furniture. Therefore, we are asking for the authorization in this bill.

Mr. **GROSS**. When is the building to be completed?

Mr. **DELANEY**. I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] can answer that question much better than I can.

Mr. **THOMAS**. Mr. Speaker, may I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, the best information we have now is that the building will be completed in toto in August of next year. Some parts of the building will be ready for occupancy beginning in April of next year. The language contained in this bill waiving the point of order is merely an authorization to get the furniture. There is not 5 cents provided for here to buy the furniture. That will be handled by another subcommittee within the next 60 or 90 days. The purpose of this is to give to our distinguished committee of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], our beloved Speaker, and our beloved gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] anywhere from 60 days to 6 months leadtime to procure the furniture. That is the sum and substance of the matter.

Mr. **GROSS**. If I understand this thing correctly, there is not going to be any occupancy of this building for nearly a year and a half. It seems to me, therefore, that we could do this in the normal and regular legislative way and that is to authorize this rather than to come in with an appropriation bill where obviously, you have to waive points of order because this is unauthorized.

Mr. **THOMAS**. That is what we are seeking to do, to authorize this. There is not 1 penny of money provided for here to buy any furniture.

Mr. **GROSS**. That does not make any difference. You are shortcircuiting the regular legislative process; are you not?

Mr. **THOMAS**. This is not the regular legislative committee that is handling this, but we are doing this at the request of our committee composed of the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS]. The purpose in following this procedure is to save time and to afford some leadtime for procurement, otherwise you will not have any furniture to go into the building when it is ready. That is the point.

Mr. **GROSS**. If the gentleman will yield further, do you mean to tell me the legislative committee cannot come in with legislation in the regular way for this purpose and then buy the furniture for this building that is to be occupied next August? I cannot understand that.

Mr. **THOMAS**. The purpose of this is to save about 3 to 6 months' leadtime. That is all that is involved here. The furniture cannot be bought in a day.

Mr. **ROONEY**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **DELANEY**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **ROONEY**. I should like to point out with regard to legislative authorizations for the Rayburn Office Building that the entire transaction and every part of it has been handled in this same way in appropriation bills right from the time of the initial planning for the building.

Mr. **STEED**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **DELANEY**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **STEED**. The leadtime that the approval of this legislation today will give us will enable the companies that manufacture office furniture to make bids that competitively will be more favorable to the Government. The manufacturers have told us that on an item this large and involving this amount of furniture, they will require a lot of time, first of all, to manufacture the furniture, and this will give them that extra time and we can expect to get better bids and thus hope to save a considerable amount of money by having this leadtime that will be provided in this bill.

Mr. **DELANEY**. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. **BROWN** of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. **BROWN** of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] has explained, the only reason we have a rule on this particular measure, which comes from the Appropriations Committee, is because there is a legislative provision in the bill, and it is therefore necessary to waive points of order so that by the passage of the bill the House at least, and I presume the other body, if it approves the legislation, will authorize later appropriations for purchasing furniture for the new House Office Building now under construction, the so-called Rayburn building. I presume it will be necessary to buy some sort of furniture for the new building. I am a bit concerned over the cost of the building itself. I did not like the way it was authorized in the first place. I am not sure the Congress as a whole, or the general tax-paying public will be too much impressed by the amount of money the furniture for the Rayburn building may cost in these days of inflation when we are moving forward so rapidly with "vigah"; nevertheless, I do feel it is necessary to take some action; therefore, I will support this legislation.

However, in all the discussion that has taken place thus far in connection with this particular bill, for some reason or other there has been no mention of the real issue contained in this measure; that is the question as to whether or not there will be an item of some $500 million reinstated in the bill, $500 million that had been stricken out by order of the Appropriations Committee, from page 7 of the bill, to finance the accelerated public works program as had been budgeted originally, and requested by the President.

Mr. **ROONEY**. The gentleman surely does not mean the Rules Committee, does he?

Mr. **BROWN** of Ohio. No, the Appropriations Committee. The $500 million item was stricken out by the Appropriations Committee after it had been in the President's budget to finance continuation of the accelerated public works program which had originally been approved by a rather divided and controversial vote here by the last Congress for a total of $900 million, $400 million of which was appropriated in 1962.

That vote will come, as I understand, on a motion to restore the cut; that is, on an amendment offered to reinstate the $500 million item for the purpose of financing the accelerated public works program, as requested by the President. That vote will come in the Committee of the Whole, either by voice vote, standing vote, or teller vote. If the motion to restore the item prevails, then a rollcall will be demanded in the House on that amendment, under the rules of the House. However, if the attempt to amend and to restore the $500 million item for the accelerated public works program is defeated in the Committee of the Whole, then there will be no rollcall on this particular issue.

I have stated the parliamentary situation to the best of my ability because there have been so many questions asked about it. A great many people have indicated their belief the Rules Committee made in order the offering of this amendment. That is not true. The amendment could have been offered regardless of the action of the Rules Committee. However, the rule waiving points of order on the furniture item was necessary on the basis that one individual Member could have otherwise objected to the consideration of the item to authorize the purchase of it. However, if this rule is adopted, as written, then the section dealing with the purchase of furniture will be subject to the usual debate under the 5-minute rule, and vote in the House, so the majority decision will control the final action on that particular item. So no rights have been taken from the House to pass upon the question as to whether or not it wants to authorize the purchase of this furniture. It does not fix any amount in this bill for the purchase of furniture. Another Appropriations Committee later on will bring in a bill for that purpose. Whether or not you authorize it will be subject to the will of the House and not to that of one individual Member who could otherwise object and strike out the item.

After all, I think the big controversy and the real issue at hand in this bill is whether or not we will have a $500 million increase in the amount carried in the bill, as the Appropriations Committee has reported the measure, to be spent on this accelerated public works program which bore the label some time ago of being a slush fund. That issue is one that the House will have to confront when we get down to considering the bill under the 5-minute rule. There may be other amendments offered and considered, but this will be the principal amendment, as I understand the situation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me whether under the item of "furniture" it will include the equipment for the swimming pool?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. But if the gentleman wishes a set of water wings, I shall try to have them furnished him. Personally, I do not object to the bill.

Mr. GROSS. This does not include equipment for the swimming pool, then?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know what it contains. I presume when the particular appropriation item is considered there will be hearings made available to the House, and the item will be fully explained. It will be in the legislative appropriation bill, when and if the measure reaches the floor of the House. I hope the legislative appropriation bill may be passed soon so this Congress may adjourn and go home, which will be a blessing to the American people and result in the saving of a lot of money.

Mr. GROSS. It is still my hope that instead of spending $10 million on a fish tank to be located on Hains Point, that swimming pool will be converted into a pool for fish.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The only comment I wish to make on that, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa for whom I have great affection, is that it was worth a great deal to most of us here in the House to listen to the dialog and matching of wits between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Ohio concerning this so-called fish pond, or whatever you wish to designate it. I am sure we did obtain a great deal of inspiration and enjoyment from that debate.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this rule will be adopted.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5517, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be concluded not later than 5 p.m. today, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], and one-half by myself, and that at the conclusion of general debate today the Committee will rise.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. When the gentleman requests that debate conclude at 5 o'clock, that is a rather unusual length of time on this bill.

I assume that the gentleman feels that by having a full and complete debate under general debate, we could promptly get to the reading of the bill and vote on the bill tomorrow, and that we could finish sometime tomorrow.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is exactly right. Of course, if we get through before 5 o'clock under the unanimous-consent agreement, we could get out sooner. Further, maybe we might prevail on the Speaker and the minority leader and the majority leader to come in early tomorrow morning and wrap it up tomorrow.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. BOW. May I say to the gentleman that I hope if we have this general debate this afternoon going on until 5 o'clock, or however long it may be, that those who are going to speak on the subject will take the time today, so that we can proceed on tomorrow with debate under the 5-minute rule. And, with general debate extending to 5 o'clock this afternoon, I should like to serve notice now that I shall insist upon the 5-minute rule, with no extension of time after the 5 minutes tomorrow. I will object to any extension of time, because there will be plenty of opportunity here today for general debate. I hope that we can move on and dispose of the bill tomorrow as promptly as possible.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What really confronts us is 4 hours of general debate. That is in effect what the gentleman is asking for, is 4 hours of general debate. Now, I am one of those that likes to see adequate time taken on all bills, but this is something new for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to ask for 4 hours of general debate on bills from his subcommittees. He usually tries to get his bills through in an hour and a half or 2 hours or even less, at times, and I am surprised. Can the gentleman tell me what changed his mind?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my distinguished friend that we are going to try to finish this bill tomorrow when we start reading it under the 5-minute rule. Following the lead of my able and distinguished friend from Ohio, we are going to try to put speed on it tomorrow, so let everybody debate today and get their statements in the RECORD. There are many items in this bill; about 110, I will say to my friend from Iowa, plus another 200 strictly for Pay Act costs.

Mr. GROSS. I am perfectly willing to go ahead this afternoon, and evening if necessary, and get rid of the bill today. What is wrong with today?

Mr. THOMAS. I think it would be impossible. There are 110 items in here. Let us give everybody a chance to be heard.

Mr. GROSS. Now, let me ask the gentleman this question. This bill involves slightly less than $1 billion.

When the gentleman from Texas comes in with the independent offices appropriation bill which will run, I assume, on the basis of past bills of this nature, to $12 billion or $15 billion, will we have general debate time in proportion to what is being consumed here today? Will we take about three times as long on the independent offices appropriation bill?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, when we get into that, we will get my able and your able friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], and we will agree on a reasonable amount of time, and it will be our hope to give everybody a chance.

We want our friend from Iowa to be heard. The day would not be complete without our able friend being here. We want him here, and I know he will be here, and we will go through our paces with him.

Mr. GROSS. I am just delighted that the gentleman from Texas is opening up to more time on legislation on the House floor, and I am sure everybody will expect the same treatment when the independent offices appropriation bill comes to the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman wants a little time from this side of the aisle, I will see that he gets it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5517, with Mr. Bolling in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, general debate will conclude not later than 5 o'clock p.m. today.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] will be recognized to control one-half of the time, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized to control one-half of the time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we bring to the Members of the House today the supplemental appropriation bill for 1963.

Mr. Chairman, in the number of bills that it has been my pleasure to work with in my 20-odd years of service I will be frank to say that this has been just about as perplexing as any such bill by virtue of the fact that we have so many small items in the bill which have been requested by so many different agencies of the Government. There are about 100 or 110 items contained in title I alone. In title II there are about 200 items which include the Pay Act increases for practically every agency of the Government.

The bill as originally submitted to the Committee on Appropriations carried a budget estimate for both titles I and II of the bill of a little better than $1.6 billion. However, regardless of the difficulties contained in handling this bill, your subcommittee has done its best.

May I say at this time we lost one of our able and genial and distinguished members who has served for a long time on this subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen]. The gentleman took himself off the subcommittee and assigned himself to other important duties, and I might say more important duties, because he is now the ranking minority member of the full committee. But, certainly, we have no finer man in the Congress than the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], who is now the ranking member on the subcommittee.

We also have two new members. One of them is an oldtimer, our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wilson]. He has certainly performed yeoman service. We also have our able and genial friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] who has done likewise. We are proud of both of them.

Of course, on the Democratic side we have the oldtimers here, our friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan], and certainly our able and genial friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland].

We have a lot of items for your consideration which are contained in this bill, and practically everything is agreed to on both sides of the aisle except one or two items. I think it is a fair statement to say that the subcommittee has been just about as unanimous as you are going to get any several men to be who handle a couple of hundred items such as are contained in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, when the subcommittee considered this bill we had a total request of about $1.6 billion. It was our judgment, after consulting with other members of the full committee, to reduce that estimate by around 12 or 12.5 percent. That is about right, is it not, Mr. Bow?

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield, yes.

Mr. THOMAS. So, we worked on the bill rather diligently. The item which gave us all the most trouble is what we commonly refer to as the accelerated public works program. We had a budget estimate for $500 million. The subcommittee reduced that estimate to $450 million. The full committee cut it out.

I think it would be perfectly in order for me to say at this time an amendment will be offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] to restore not the $500 million but the subcommittee figure as originally recommended, namely, $450 million. Again, I think it would be in order for me to say that in my individual capacity as a Member of the House I will help to defend and support that item.

Mr. Chairman, your committee on both sides of the aisle know just as much about this bill as I do, and I am not going to consume all the time. Let me make one point, and then I will yield the floor to my colleagues. We were committed to take care of the pay increase voted by the Congress last year. The total cost for the pay act in 1963 is slightly less than $700 million. The agencies absorbed almost 40 percent of it. Your subcommittee reduced the remaining request around $22 million. Everybody took a 5-percent cut straight across the board, and the House of Representatives took part of the cut, too.

So by and large we submit to you this is a good bill. If there are any questions I can answer I will be delighted to. If I cannot answer them, both sides of the aisle are here and we will all join together to do our best to help you out.

Now I yield to my able friend from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. You did not apply this 5-percent cut to all the agencies that are in the appropriation bill.

Mr. THOMAS. There may be one to which it did not apply, and that was the White House guards. I am not positive about that, but the amount of money involved is trivial. It applied to the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and everybody else .

Mr. GROSS. I believe you can go further than the White House guards. I am not too sure about that, and I will look it over.

Mr. THOMAS. Look it over. If I am in error, I will correct it.

Mr. GROSS. You did intend to apply it across the board to all as the result of the Legislative Pay Increase Act last year?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa, the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. Jensen].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have never been happy with the authority vested in the Deficiency Committee. I have the highest regard for the members of the committee. I have the highest regard for the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas]. He is an able, honorable gentleman of the highest order, as are all the members of the committee. This committee is a most difficult committee to chair.

Let me go back many years to explain how this committee was instituted and the reason for its institution. The Congress many years ago passed an antideficiency law. That law had sharp teeth in it. It provided for heavy fines and jail sentences for any Federal agency head who spent more money in any one quarter than the funds appropriated to that agency for that fiscal year. You can imagine the consternation that arose in many agencies, departments, boards, and commissions of Government. So some bureaucratic dreamer dreamed up the word "supplemental" in lieu of the word "deficiency." As a result, we find since that time that billions of dollars have been appropriated by the Congress on the basis that they were supplementals—not deficiencies. In this bill there are some 100 Presidential budgeted items for agencies of Government in the amount, as the bill comes to the floor, of $988,756,506. A major portion of that amount is not actual deficiencies, but purely supplementals, that have no place in this bill. The bill came to the full Committee of Appropriations in the amount of $450 million more than the bill now before us. A majority of the full Committee on Appropriations struck out $450 million for the accelerated public works program. Remember that this $450 million that was put in the bill by the Deficiency Subcommittee of Appropriations is to be obligated, expended, or committed in the fiscal year 1963, which is the present fiscal year ending next June 30. An amendment was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] before the full Committee on Appropriations to reduce the bill by $450 million which was the amount in the bill for this accelerated public works program. That amendment was adopted by a vote of 22 to 19.

As everyone knows who has read the newspapers, 5 of the majority members joined 17 minority members to strike this $450 million from the bill.

Mr. Chairman, just what is the need for this great rush to establish projects of every nature in thousands of towns and political subdivisions in these United States? We understand that an amendment will be offered tomorrow to reinsert this $450 million. Other Members who oppose that amendment will, I am sure, give proven reasons why there is no justification for the spending of all our taxpayers' dollars in such a program. There is unemployment in some places, of course; but we are informed that many of these projects have been approved in areas where there is no unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, we will have a bill on the floor of this House before long which will provide that our $1 and $2 bills, greenback currency—if the law is passed—will have no silver backing. Those bills will be scrip, just paper scrip, such as was used in the early thirties to take the place of U.S. currency, because good currency was in short supply at that time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my highly respected colleague.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman made a very important statement when he said that if this silver bill passes there would be no monetary backing for the dollar bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. I have good reason to believe it is a correct statement.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in presenting that matter to the Rules Committee stated that there would be no silver backing, but there would be a 25 percent gold backing.

Mr. JENSEN. Maybe so, but the facts are that we are losing our gold at a very dangerous rate, hence such backing might soon be gone too.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not arguing about it, I am simply stating what was said by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. I cannot buy that kind of argument, because one of these fine days unless we stop this unconscionable spending of the taxpayers' money we will have very little gold backing for any of our currencies.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield further I want to say that what the gentleman has just said about this extravagant expenditure for everything on the face of the earth we ought not to be spending money for, meets my approval. I could not be in more hearty accord with the gentleman than I am.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman, and I have the very highest regard for the gentleman from Virginia, who is one of the best informed Members of this Congress, as to just what will happen to this great beloved Nation of ours and the people therein unless we can put the brakes on this reckless, wasteful spending like that requested for fiscal year 1964 to the tune of $108,800 million. Our spending liberals constantly shed crocodile tears for the ones whom they call our little people. Let us look into the facts and figures. The ultimate consumer of goods pays all the bills in the final analysis. We know that.

They pay, in the final analysis, every dime that is spent by local, State, and Federal Governments.

What do these so-called little people pay? Those so-called little people, who have an annual income of $6,000 or less on an average, consume over 70 percent of all the goods year in and year out. So the so-called little people which the liberals in this Congress and out of the Congress are always crying for, pay for this extravagant program that we of the Congress spend for them to pay. The businessmen, the industrialists, must add their taxes to the price of their goods and services or soon close their doors. Hence the so-called little people pay at least 70 percent that the local and State and Federal Governments spend. Think about that please before you vote, please think about that before you vote to reinstate $450 million in this bill today.

The American people are becoming greatly worried and concerned. The thinking well-informed people of America know that every nation in this world, as far back as history records, that has traveled to the end of the reckless spending, wasting road on which we have been traveling at breakneck speed for the last 30 years, spending the people's tax dollars like drunken billionaires, every one of those nations has suffered untold misery, strife, hunger, cold wars, and everything that is bad for a people.

You say it cannot happen here? Well, it will happen here, and it is happening here this very minute.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt said during his reign that this Nation could safely afford a $75 billion Federal debt. I am sure that Franklin D. Roosevelt knew that this Nation could never afford a $304 billion debt which we have at this minute, for those to pay who are living, or their children, or their grandchildren, or their great-grandchildren.

Now, of course, we could keep on spending as we have been doing for the past three decades to the end that finally a $5 bill would not buy a loaf of bread, which has been the history of every nation on the face of this earth that traveled the reckless spending road to the end, which we have been traveling on at breakneck speed for nigh onto three decades, and the end of that road is nearer than some people realize.

Mr. Chairman, I will not be a party to that kind of life for you, your children, your grandchildren, to suffer. My friends, if you want that on your conscience, then continue to vote to spend, spend, in order that you help to destroy everything we hold dear in this blessed land of ours. For myself I want no part of it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take much time on this particular bill. The report of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, I think, pretty well indicates the job that has been done by that particular committee.

As the distinguished chairman from Texas has indicated, this is a bill which comes to this committee with some 110 items in it. It embraces practically all of the departments and agencies of Government; some 9 departments and some 12 agencies and the District of Columbia. It is a bill which is necessary primarily because of legislation which was passed in the last session of the Congress which has added additional responsibilities and financial burdens to many of the agencies of Government, particularly the pay increase in the last session. As the chairman has indicated, some $400 million in this bill represents pay increases which were passed by the Congress. This subcommittee has tried to do a reasonable job in asking most of the agencies that came before it to absorb some of the increases. All of the agencies indicated that they could do it, and they have absorbed some additional 5 percent in addition to some of the absorptions which they have already taken care of in their regular budget.

There are some items here which are in controversy. I think it would be very simple for this committee to pass this bill without any difficulty at all if we can get some agreement on some of the smaller items that will be referred to by a great number of Members interested, particularly in the accelerated public works program.

I might add that in this bill there is $30 million which the committee put in at the request of the Civil Service Commission for the purpose of taking care of the increase in annuities for the retired employees. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that these retired employees have been particularly patient with the Congress. Last year we passed a bill increasing the annuities for retired employees by 5 percent. It was to become effective as of January 1 of this year. We provided no money for them, with the result that none of the retired employees has received any of that increase. This bill puts $30 million into the civil service retirement fund for the purpose of paying the increase for the retired civil service employees, who will receive a 5-percent increase not provided for last year, but provided for in this bill.

There are a number of other areas in which we passed legislation last year for which this bill carries appropriations to implement that legislation. One of these programs is educational television. I think in this bill here we have some $1.5 million for educational television. As the membership is no doubt aware, the complete authorization runs to around $30 million in a 5-year program.

Mr. Chairman, we provide money in this bill for the Office of Education for producing and distributing additional captioned films for the deaf. This comes as a result of legislation passed in the last year which increased the annual authorization for appropriations from

$250,000 to $1.5 million. Under this bill, we provide $345,000 for this activity.

All told, Mr. Chairman, the percentage of decrease which has been recommended by the full Appropriations Committee amounts to, I think it is, 39.8 percent.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that this pending bill also provides $3 million to the Children's Bureau for allotment to the States for the development of day care services, and one-half million dollars for grants for training of child welfare personnel?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes; and all of this is occasioned by amendments to the Social Security Act. Permit me to also say to the gentleman from New York that some of the gentleman's distinguished constituents were down from New York and I think they made a very fine presentation. The gentleman was there and should be proud of them.

Mr. Chairman, all told, as I indicated, the total reduction amounts to 39.8 percent. This is a lot lower than some of us on this side of the aisle hoped for or wished for, and we hope to amend it tomorrow so we can bring it down to about 12 percent instead of 39.8 percent. We think this is a fair reduction and we think would be in line with most of the speeches which have been made on the other side of the aisle for a minimum net budget decrease of 10 percent in both the 1964 budget and this budget here. Ten percent seems to be a rather reasonable cut, but we are willing to go along with a 12-percent cut, and I hope we can obtain some support from some of the Members on the other side of the aisle when the motion is offered to restore $450 million to the accelerated public works program.

As was indicated by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget amounted to $1,641 million. We provide $988 million in this bill. We hope to add $450 million to it tomorrow, for a total of $1,438 million.

Now, with respect to deficiencies and supplementals, these are necessary, of course, because we have had changes in the law. When you have changes in the law you have to provide funds to implement the changes. Therefore, some committee has to do this work and so this catch-all bill rests with the Subcommittee on Deficiencies. There is some objection, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], says to having a supplemental bill considered by this Deficiencies Subcommittee. But based upon what I know about the Committee on Appropriations, and those who have served on it much longer than I can attest to it. For many, many years the Deficiencies Subcommittee considered both strict deficiencies, requests for emergency appropriations and also some of the supplementals. This was the routine of the Committee on Appropriations for many, many years, until the present chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], decided to permit each of the subcommittees to consider supplementals dealing with that particular subcommittee. Well, the chairman did not believe this worked too well, and a few years ago he sent all the supplementals to the Deficiencies Subcommittee. This has not set well with everyone of the chairmen of the various subcommittees, but in my judgment I think it has worked well. I think this is a matter of policy which ought to be established by the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes; I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman from Massachusetts serves on the Independent Offices Subcommittee as well as the Deficiencies Subcommittee.

I note on page 11 of the bill, under the Civil Aeronautics Board, there is an item of $3.3 million for payment to air carriers which is a matter that is ordinarily considered under the independent offices appropriation bill.

Is that the subsidy money which makes up the difference as between the amount appropriated and the Civil Aeronautics Board requirements for that purpose?

Mr. BOLAND. That is the subsidy, and that makes up the difference of what the Civil Aeronautics Board has determined to be the proper subsidy to airline carriers throughout the United States.

Let me say that this subsidy goes only to the Hawaiian carriers, two lines in Hawaii, and just to the domestic local carriers such as Allegheny, Pacific, Freemont, and Bonanza. As the gentleman from New York knows, none of the subsidy goes to the large trunk carriers.

Mr. Chairman, as was indicated, there will be a motion made tomorrow to restore the $450 million for the accelerated public works program.

This was a request from the Bureau of the Budget for $500 million. Your subcommittee reduced that by $50 million, brought it to the full committee, and the full committee deleted the item by a few votes.

We intend to offer this motion tomorrow, and I hope that the majority of the Members of this House will support it. I think the record is clear that it has been a good program. I think the record as delineated by the subcommittee shows the value of it. Many Members of the House are familiar with it. All of them do not like it. There are some deficiencies in it. It is a program which I agree brings headaches to Members of Congress. But this is not the only area in which Members of Congress get headaches. This program has helped to lift the stress of underemployment in many areas. As has been indicated by many Members who have already spoken, this is specifically reserved for areas with high unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, I know there are a great number of Members on both sides of the aisle who want to speak on this particular program, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of this subcommittee I rise rather hesitantly with reference to the legislation that is before us; by the same token, I do say with some degree of distinction, of satisfaction, and honor that it has been a real personal privilege and certainly a wonderful experience to have had the opportunity of serving on this subcommittee.

I want to express my personal gratitude to each and every one of the members for the degree to which they have been both patient, understanding, and most helpful to a new member in considering some rather complex items that are before us.

By the same token, having gone through this experience, it occurs to me that this bill comes before us at a very appropriate time. You have had a pretty thorough explanation of what is in it, the degree to which the committee has given consideration to each of these items and responded with appropriations in one fashion or another. But at the same time I think there are some items here that we could well use as a guideline for other determinations that are going to be made by this House during the course of the coming session.

Actually of the amount of money that we have in here a great percentage of it relates to three specific items, items that have been created and generated by this Congress: No. 1, salaries; No. 2, an increase in postal rates; and No. 3, new programs that were enacted during the last session. So we see an instance of where actually Congress as well as Government to some degree is caught here in its own web in that the respective departments find themselves short of money with which to meet their obligations by virtue of these items that were passed during the course of the last session.

These requests tell us quite a little story. I happen to recall the figures for one of them. The Treasury Department, as an example, made a request for $1,700,000-and-some-odd because of the postal rate increase. This is a pretty big figure. Again as a new member of the committee, I was thinking in terms of an increase of 1 cent per letter, and discovered it is their intention to send out 175 million letters between January 15 and July 1 of this year.

And so the high expenditure. But may I recall for you too that this has a reflection as to the entire Nation, and that every business enterprise throughout the Nation that mails out any volume mail is also confronted with exactly the same problem—that of finding the additional money with which to meet the increased rates. In many instances, they involve more than letters such as packages, and other mail, this too runs into large figures. So we find ourselves now faced with the proposition, and we hear talk about it every day, that the economy is lagging and that we have to get some more money back to the people, and businesses, by a tax cut or in some other way. We just got through taking a substantial part away from them.

Most of these business enterprises do not have a deficiency appropriations committee that they can appeal to and say, "Well, now listen, this is our problem." No, they are going to have to do it in some other way and the chances are they are going to have to take it out of the pockets of the general public.

In line with this also, we find there are moneys here in many instances that are essential where the committee had no choice because they are actual obligations of Government that have to be met such as claims against the Government, money for soil bank contracts and other obligations. These are proper considerations provided by this committee.

Then we come to the matter of new programs of which there are several such as trade adjustment assistance, trade adjustment loans and guarantees, civilian industrial technology programs, educational television and public works and there are a few more in addition to those. But, let me refer to just one of these as an example of the problem that confronted the subcommittee. How many Members of this House know about the civilian industrial technology program and what it is going to do? Oh, yes, we have heard of some problems in this field in the textile industry. We do not know how many more there are. We do not know how far this program is going to go or where it is going. We do know there was a request for $1,250,000 to start this program. It was reduced by the committee pretty much on the basis of—well, this is enough to get the program started—with no real background as to how it was going to be spent, where it was going to be spent or the manner in which it might or might not be spent or be beneficial to the business and industries throughout the Nation. I make reference to that because it occurs to me that to make the appropriations for new programs of this kind through the means of a deficiency committee is not the best way to legislate. This certainly is not a criticism of the committee. I should rather compliment the chairman and all the members of the committee for the degree to which they directed attention; but in programs of this kind, it occurs to me that more time is necessary and a greater exploration is necessary and we ought to know on a more substantial basis the degree to which and the manner in which these programs are to be carried out. Frankly, in this particular item, I think we were aware of only one specific field of activity and very much unaware of how that, in turn, is going to be carried out.

Let me say a little now about one of the other items that we know is in great controversy here, namely, the item of the accelerated works program. I suppose if there is any Member in the House of Representatives who ought to be interested in that program, I am one of them because there are any number of projects pending in my district at the moment and any number of counties that are eligible by the same token. I should say in all honesty and sincerity, I should have to question the wisdom of including this kind of money in a deficiency appropriation for a program of that kind. I say so on the basis of experience up to this point.

You know, it is kind of unique, but I had a county in my district approved to become eligible for accelerated public works this morning. They do not have any money for this purpose, but they did see fit to approve another county in spite of that fact. For this I am most grateful. What puzzles me is that if we are to make an appropriation of another $450 million we ought also to know the degree to which these programs are to be carried out, how many new areas are to be added, how many new and different considerations are going to be made, and how many projects in turn, are going to be rejected. Remember, the requests for additional aid at the moment total more than $1,200 million; so we were acting very much in a great shadow when we were talking in terms of the degree to which this program can be applicable in the respective areas.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman mentioned the designation of the new county this morning. The fact of the matter is that the Area Redevelopment Administration designates the counties and that there is money aside from accelerated public works under the Area Development Administration for use in the counties. The accelerated public works program is a program falling within the jurisdiction of the Area Redevelopment Administration insofar as the designation of counties is concerned.

Mr. LANGEN. I may say to the gentleman that I was talking about the accelerated public works program, and I am well aware of the provisions that apply to these programs.

Mr. EDMONDSON. There is no designation or qualification other than Area Redevelopment Administration designation.

Mr. LANGEN. Now if I can get back to these new programs, it is my opinion we ought to be better informed as to the exact use of these moneys. I think this House has a real opportunity in this bill to effect better administration of these funds in all the new programs. We could do that were they to be reassigned to the respective subcommittees for consideration that have these subjects assigned to them in the first instance. In my humble opinion, the House has a very important assignment that it can perform tomorrow.

We should look at these new programs in the light of proper administration and expenditure of the moneys, with every consideration for the general economy of the country and not rush too hastily into these new programs.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to direct my remarks to the item of civil defense. The administration asked for and the Budget Bureau approved, $61,900,000 for the completion of the survey of civil defense shelter spaces and the austere stocking of those shelter spaces. They have located heretofore shelter space for about 104 million people. These shelters are in varying degrees of efficiency.

The reason for my concern with this matter is—and may I say I speak from more than a general background and knowledge of the subject because for 7 years subcommittees that I have chaired of the Government Operations Committee and the Joint Commitee on Atomic Energy have studied the problem of nuclear weapons' effect in war, the effect of radiation, and the capability of our Defense Department to offset a nuclear attack. I am not stating anything but the facts when I say that today we stand absolutely naked to a nuclear attack by the Soviet Union. There is no such thing as an effective antimissile missile. If war comes—and we hope, of course, that it does not—intercontinental ballistic missiles from the Soviet Union and intermediate range ballistic missiles, from submarines, or ships, could strike any target in the United States. If we do not have a military defense against this new and terrible military capability of attack and if attack comes, some several million people will perish. Therefore any procedure we can take to save the lives of the people of the United States we should take.

There is only one thing that can save the people in a nuclear attack from complete destruction, and that is shelter. In other words, the interposition between the individual and the radiation of the nuclear weapon of some kind of shielding. The $61 million which is requested is a very small amount. This would merely complete for use the existing types of shelter. It would not be for the purpose of building shelters. It would complete the survey of existing shelters which would serve the purpose of shielding the people from radiation and would permit a small amount of austere stocking of food, medicines, and so forth in the shelters.

In October of 1962, we all well remember that Khrushchev was confronted with an ultimatum by the President of the United States. This ultimatum involved the Cuban situation, the occupation of Cuba with missiles which could reach any part of our heartland. But the removal of those missiles from Cuba did not remove the capability of the Soviet Union for striking the United States. That capability still remains. This Cuban event was played up and it alarmed us because it was within 90 miles of our mainland. But a ship or submarine could cruise within 90 miles on the ocean today with missiles of like effect. You either believe that civil defense is a practical thing or you do not. I know that the Subcommittee on Appropriations is not convinced that civil defense is a valuable adjunct to our total defense picture. I am sorry they do not take a position of going along with the President and with the Defense Department that has advocated this very small sum in relation to the sums we are spending. For instance, we are spending $50 billion a year for a military force that cannot stop an intercontinental ballistic missile or an intermediate range missile from being delivered on any land or military target in the

United States. That is $50 billion. Yet we have an item of $60 million which would give the people the right of survival in case of an attack. You may think, I do not believe an attack will come. I do not know whether an attack will ever come. I hope not. But if it does come we would be in a position in the Congress of not doing our duty in giving those people who are spending $50 billion for defense the right and chance for survival, not insuring their survival but a right to the chance of survival.

Let me call your attention to something else. We are engaged in a great race to put a man on the moon. We are going to pass in this Congress this year probably $5.7 billion. Next year it may be $7.6, the following year it may be $10 billion. I prophesy it will cost $30 billion to place a man on the moon. Yet we are denying the people who are going to have to pay the $50 billion for defense the right to survival for a few paltry millions of dollars. I say that the perspective with which we look at this thing should be changed. I am not against space exploration. I think we should do it. But I think the priority we give to a program that will take from $20 to $30 billion worth of the taxpayers' money out of the budget, which will amount to one-half of the deficit we have this year and next year, I say we should look at this program and look at it carefully, because this space program of $5, $7, or $10 billion a year is going to destroy many programs which are worthwhile and which would give more safety and more service to the people of the United States.

Now, it may be necessary to put a man on the moon, and I might be willing to pay the price if I could pick the man that they would send to the moon, but I say in the face of the needs of this Nation—I am not just talking about civil defense, but I am talking about the many domestic needs of this Nation, in your district and in my district, needs which will not be filled—I say we should look at this tremendous portion of the budget which is going into space. And, I would wish that the Members of this House would study the effect of nuclear weapons and would face the realities of an age in which these weapons might be used. God knows, I hope they will never be used, but when you have in the capacity of one Polaris submarine, more than three times the power of all the bombs that were dropped in World War II, when you have the capacity of a B-52 to carry hydrogen weapons that would be five or seven times the power of the bombs dropped in World War II, and when two great nations are sitting with their nuclear daggers pointing at each other's throat, I say that we should not take the chance of risking nuclear war without giving some protection to the people of the United States.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my deep concern with the cut made by the Appropriations Committee of $61.9 million requested for additional provisions and equipment for fallout shelters.

The fallout shelter program, which has been initiated and conducted by the Office of Civil Defense in the Department of Defense, is a vital element in our overall defense effort. It is coming to be recognized as essential in the Department of Defense. The Military Operations Subcommittee, of which I was a member in the previous Congress, held extensive hearings on this vital matter, and reported to the House on the importance of the program.

The funds which the committee has denied cover only a part of the necessary civil defense program but it is a part which has to go ahead on schedule. These funds are intended to cover the last quarter of the cost of the survey, marking, and stocking of fallout shelter spaces in existing structures across the Nation; $175 million has been spent in fiscal year 1962 and fiscal year 1963 to identify this shelter space and to procure a large part of the necessary provisions and equipment. It is false economy to cut funds for an austere program which has been developed to use existing resources instead of major construction programs. I am informed that the denial of these funds is likely to throw off the schedule for stocking and activating shelter spaces by 9 months or more. It will upset or damage the cooperation with local governments which has been generated in this program. This fallout shelter program, as initiated and carried forward by the Department of Defense is a minimal step in providing protection for the American people. At least such a minimum must be provided for the population in a world where the possibility of nuclear war can arise so suddenly and threaten us all. I believe a cut in this program is false economy; I believe the program should go forward. If the Congress has doubts, they should be resolved in favor of the American people.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked for this time is the fact that, of course, this public works acceleration program, for which there was a $900 million authorization last year, after about 3 years of discussion and dispute in the Public Works Committee and the Congress, came out of the Public Works Committee, on which I serve, and at the time it was before the House for authorization the minority did prepare for consideration of the House minority views in connection with the authorization bill, at which time there was pointed out a number of shortcomings of this approach; the fact that this was not a sound approach; the fact that this would become a political boondoggle; the fact that this was pork barrel, grab bag legislation the likes of which the Congress had never considered before outside of WPA. Many of those shortcomings were brought out in the minority report. The fact is that most of these programs and projects can be and have been, before this accelerated program, considered on the basis of justification and need by the proper committees that have particular jurisdiction over them, but this WPA program is just not being handled and was not expected to be handled on that basis, and the result has been that you have had a pork barrel, grab bag approach, the likes of which this country has never seen since WPA. The legislative committees, the authorization committees that traditionally consider projects public works in nature have been overlooked, and instead lump-sum requests to appropriations have been made. Now, a $400 million lump-sum amount had been requested as a deficiency appropriation, with very few specifics in 1962, and I have the hearings right here. They could not even prepare a program for House consideration, although the other body tried to justify it. They could not even tell you what the justification was. And, I said this before, that this money was going to be spent on leaf-raking projects, projects that if the American taxpayers knew that their tax money was going into the extent of 70-percent grant money for such projects as swimming pools, ski lifts, golf courses, they would naturally say to this Congress that they thought their money was being misspent by the Congress. And that is exactly what happened in 1962. As a matter of fact, as justification brought out in the last session, in the last minute of the Congress in October, this is what the money was to be spent on, and I believe we should give serious consideration to any effort to put this money, $500 million additional, into this deficiency appropriation bill under those conditions. Listen to this. Reading from the Senate hearings in 1962, here is a swimming pool, Grants Pass, in the State of Oregon, $190,000. Here is a fairground expansion, $1,260,000, in Pennsylvania.

Here is another swimming pool in Pennsylvania in the amount of $158,000. Here is an item of park development in the amount of $388,000. Here is an auditorium in the amount of $3.65 million. Here are zoological gardens in the amount of $4,352,332. And you can go right down the list showing truly pork barrel projects submitted as justification for the 1962 $400 million amount.

Mr. Chairman, the administration has gone out and solicited these projects. They have written the cities, they have solicited these projects. They have written letters to the communities asking for lists of projects. As a matter of fact, this program had not even been authorized by the Congress when such solicitations were underway. When we were considering it before the Committee on Public Works, the administration was writing to cities and asking what projects would they like to have built under such a program if it were put into effect.

Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder that $1.2 billion in projects now are awaiting additional appropriations? That leads me to my next point. There is the sum of $1.2 billion for some 6,000 projects languishing now on the shelf waiting not only for this $500 million appropriation request, but there has already been introduced a bill for an additional $900 million authorization in the House and $1.7 billion in the Senate and those bills will come before the Public Works Committee on which I serve. That is why I am concerned about this thing; it is a temporary program being made permanent. We talk about fiscal sanity and fiscal responsibility.

This is the most irresponsible program you can consider especially when it is on a lump-sum basis and when it encompasses such make-work projects.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one bill in the Senate which has been introduced which would provide for $1.7 billion more authorization for this program, twice more than its present size. Do you not see what is going to happen if this Congress at this time, in this manner—and this is no manner for it to be considered in a deficiency appropriation bill without proper justification—there is going to be an immediate demand, it has already been announced, for additional authorization. Then the matter will be before the Public Works Committee. There will be another $900 million or $1 billion or $1.5 billion authorization bill before the authorizing Public Works Committee. Then the Appropriations Committee is going to be asked for at least $500 million more this coming fiscal year, 1964. This is an interesting wrinkle. This present request for $500 million does not show up in this next year's $12 billion deficit that has already been planned. It shows up in and increases this year's deficit that we now know is at least $8 billion.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Not at this time.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman does not yield to me now, the gentleman will not have any time left in which to yield.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman from Texas would be kind enough to yield me some additional time, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. I will yield it to you now, if the gentleman would like.

Mr. CRAMER. I will certainly yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman from Florida is making an honest and sincere statement according to his own judgment.

But the gentleman has given a lot of conclusions, and they are purely the gentleman's conclusions. The gentleman talks about the waste of money. May I point out to the distinguished gentleman—and he is, he is a very able member of the great Public Works Committee—that the gentlemen's mayor is authorized to act after he has been elected by your people and your city council was voted by your people. These projects cannot be supported unless they spend the money of your local people. It is more or less accidental. If it is wrong, your people will take care of your mayor and your city council who agree to these projects.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that that is not true in my hometown. They voted against urban renewal and they would vote against most of these Federal-spending projects in this WPA approach. I am sure. The gentleman just does not know my hometown.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not think the gentleman's hometown and the gentleman's lovely city is turning down any Federal money.

Mr. CRAMER. They have turned down urban renewal. They voted against it. They are not asking for this program, either.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman does not want me to read a few facts from his area, does he?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I would be delighted, because there is not an unemployment area in my district. Go ahead and read some. There is not an unemployment area in Pinellas County, that presently constitutes my district, and therefore cannot qualify under this legislation because it does not have adequate unemployment to qualify.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Would the gentleman yield to have some from Florida?

Mr. CRAMER. I did not say "Florida," I said "my area."

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is talking about the area, which is Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. My area is Pinellas County, although my district used to be four counties. The day after this became law, the only county in the ARA designated area, namely Pasco County, came off the list as an interesting sidelight. I know there are projects in Florida, but I will say to the gentleman I believe the majority of the Congressmen from Florida and of the people of Florida oppose this program.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Do I understand the supporters of this bill are insinuating we are voting for or against this because there is going to be public money spent in our districts, in contrast with the question of the principle as to whether or not this program is right?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman focuses on the real issue; he speaks as a statesman. I have been attempting to say the same thing in a little different verbiage. I have been attempting to put this thing into some focus with regard to the type of projects that exist. Also, last year we on the minority in our report on the bill listed the programs that this supplements, in effect. Authorizations for adequate public works on a planned basis exists outside this WPA approach, and with prospectuses and approvals by the respective committees involved. The outstanding authorizations at that time totaled $2.5 billion available in those authorizations. Many of them still remain. That is the proper way to handle these public works programs—through existing properly planned and congressionally reviewed basic programs on a program by program authorization basis.

As a matter of fact, the administration was so anxious to get projects that could qualify under this boondoggling WPA program that they not only solicited projects but then they decided, "We are going to have to change our basic foundation and requirements for this program." Many projects thus are not really public works or capital improvements at all.

They have no lasting effect from a construction standpoint and there is grave doubt as to the essentiality of many of the so-called public works which have been approved—I have a list of some of those that may be classified as public works but should the Federal Government pay 70 percent of such local projects?

Many of us were concerned last year over the provision of the Public Works Acceleration Act that permits the President to establish many new Federal grant-in-aid programs, limited only by the ingenuity and imagination of State and local officials and Federal bureaucrats, without benefit of the searching scrutiny which the Congress has traditionally given to the commencement of new grant-in-aid programs when considered on their individual merits. I regret to say that our anticipated fears have now become realities. In the approval of projects for little more than one-half of the $400 million appropriated last year, the administration has, in effect, created new grant-in-aid programs for city halls, fire stations, libraries, county office buildings, courthouses, coroners' offices, children's receiving homes, welfare centers, warehouses, administration buildings, municipal stadiums, police stations, garages, beach boardwalks, storage buildings, ship wharves, maintenance shops, civic centers, swimming pools, and natural gas facilities.

Heaven only knows what other grant-in-aid programs will be commenced if additional moneys are appropriated for this program.

I just happened to think, in answer to the gentleman who raised the question with regard to the local public works—he brought out exactly the point of my argument, that is, that they should be decided, constructed, and financed on the local level. The Congress has consistently turned down broad community public works proposals because Congress did not believe the United States should inject itself into every single type of local public works to the extent of 70 percent participation.

That takes from the local people their right to make these decisions. It crams down the throats of the local communities some of these projects that otherwise they might decide are not as necessary as they might believe or decide, if they saw Federal money dangling as a teaser over their heads. And it is having this further effect. How many of these communities are being detained or deterred in their construction programs by this hope that these additional Federal authorizations will be made with the hopes of these additional appropriations? How many have stood back and waited and said, Let us not do these things even if they are needed. Let us not build these fire stations—let us not build this city hall and let us not do these things that may be needed—these sewer projects and so on because there may be some Federal money available some time in the future, if the Congress authorizes or appropriates more money. That is the danger of making this a permanent program—the danger of dangling this money over their heads. The result is to deter projects and thus decrease employment.

Let us get back to these projects that have nothing to do with capitol improvements, public works, or construction. Listen to this—this is a list of some of the projects on which this money is being spent in a boondoggle fashion:

Cemetery maintenance.

Razing old buildings and structures.

Archeological research.

Pasture improvement.

Shoreline cleanup.

Planting and clearing of trees.

Rodent control.

Exotic plant control.

For snag clearing and storm damage cleanup.

For hazardous tree removal.

For removal of dead trees.

Seeding.

Mr. Chairman, this is under the guise and in the name of public works acceleration program. And you know, they avoided using the name or initials WPA—the Works Project Administration. They avoided using that designation although that is the initials of this program. They changed that around and they are using this designation and call it the accelerated public works program. It should be called the PWAA program—the Public Works Acceleration Act program. But, obviously, that designation carries a connotation of WPA—and that perfectly describes how much of the money is being spent on this leaf raking program.

It is difficult to see how the administration could justify the appropriation of any additional funds in the light of many highly questionable and unnecessary and ineffectual and wasteful projects that already have been identified. Not a dollar ought to be spent merely for the sake of spending it, not when we have a deficit this fiscal 1963 year as is expected between $8 billion and $11 billion and a projected and planned deficit for this fiscal year of 1964 of some $12 billion.

Furthermore, the Committee on Ways and Means is now considering the President's tax reduction and tax reform proposal. If there is to be a reduction in taxes, obviously, there has to be a reduction in needless programs and if there ever was a needless program in many respects, this is it. This spending that is proposed here is needless public spending, and this is the best place I can think of to start eliminating such spending.

This is not a partisan matter either. It is a question of what is in the interest of the people of this country. I do not think it is in the interest of any American for the Nation to continue down the road to bankruptcy. Every Member of this House should be fully aware that if he votes in favor of the appropriation of additional funds for this program, that he is at the same time giving his vote of confidence to this boondoggle program and to its continuation and to its enlargement and to the spending of funds on the type of projects I have just described with 70 percent of Federal grant money. Several bills are now pending to make it a permanent program as I just discussed and I, for one, do not want to be a party to providing one additional red cent for this program. I hope many of you share that view. The right way to handle public works projects, in my opinion, is if there is needed an additional authorization, it should come out of the committee that has jurisdiction over the specifically authorized respective program. It should be considered on a justification basis project by project, and they should be given consideration by the committees most familiar with them, and if more public works are needed, then let the proper authorizing committees come out with specific additional authorizations for these specific programs.

This program has been lauded as one that is solving the unemployment problem. We have had 4 months of it during which time we have spent $400 million at the rate of $100 million per month, but we still have the same number of unemployed. Is not that proof of the fact that this is not the answer? Let me give you one little example of how much it costs per person, per capita to employ him.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. I wish to ask the gentleman, a former member of the Public Works Committee, if it is not a fact that there are literally thousands of projects that have been gone over by the House Public Works Committee and are on the shelf waiting to be included in omnibus bills that could be embarked upon immediately?

Mr. CRAMER. Surely, and that is the way to do it.

Mr. BECKER. As I remember there is something like $12 billion worth of projects that have been gone over by the Public Works Committee that are now on the shelf waiting to be dusted off by the committee, projects that have been justified.

Mr. CRAMER. Certainly. The only thing is that in that way Congress would have something to say about it, whereas in this way Congress does not, for this is just a lump-sum appropriation without adequate project by project justification.

Listen to this. Do you know how many more people will be employed? Our hearings showed that the whole program of $900 million would result in only 125,000 additional employees. That is awful expensive kind of employment on public works projects. That is not going to really help unemployment. The way to help unemployment is to do something to encourage private industry so that private industry can employ more people. That is the only long-range way to do it.

Let me give you one other example. This is one of the projects the Public Works Acceleration Act lists as a "recreational project." It is listed as recreational only as an approved APW project—that is the reverse of WPA. It costs $881,000. This $881,000 for a recreational project is reported to generate some 9 man-years of additional employment or $90,000 per man-year, a totally unjustifiable amount—$90,000 for one person in a year, $881,000 for nine people.

I think it should be borne in mind that this $900 million would result in an increase of 125,000 employees over a 2-year period if all new people are hired. What is happening is that when these projects are let out to contract the contractor already has his employees and is not going to spend time to hire and train a large number of additional personnel. What he is going to do is to work his present employees overtime or maybe put on a few additional employees, unskilled people.

There is not any requirement in the program that they hire new people on a new contract basis. So the result is that people presently employed will get more overtime and the employment of new people will be at a minimum. This pump priming is no way to take care of unemployment.

Certainly it was not the intent of Congress that this amount of accelerated public works funds be used on recreational projects, when there is ample need for more useful projects which would generate much more employment.

The use of the Public Works Acceleration Act to make any substantial improvement in the unemployment picture was doomed to failure from the beginning. Even if the entire $900 million accelerated public works program could have gotten underway and been completed in 12 months, it would have had very little effect on reducing unemployment. The total estimated onsite employment would amount to about 2 percent of the current unemployment rate. An additional like amount of off-site employment is hopefully estimated. There is no assurance that such employment will result or that any major part of the jobs generated will or can be filled from the ranks of the unemployed.

There are many other points involved, but I would suggest that those who have not one get a copy of the Public Works Coordination Act, House Report No. 1756 of the 87th Congress, minority views. This report was signed by everyone on the minority side and is very meaningful and I think enlightening, and, in view of the facts that have transpired since, a correct analysis that this is not the answer to unemployment. It is disturbing to me that last year when this bill was passed some went home and told the folks that they had solved the unemployment problem, that they had it licked. The administration gave that impression. We see now how fallacious those statements were and how the problem has not been met. The sad part of it is there is not going to be any substantial increase of employment, but it is a problem that still lies ahead of us, one which I think this Congress has the responsibility to solve on a sound, long-range basis.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. If the gentleman feels this program is such a boondoggle, that it is being jammed down the throats of the people, how does he explain the fact that hundreds of communities and counties have been willing to put up 50–50 matching funds at a time when they are caught in a tax squeeze locally?

Mr. CRAMER. That is better than 100 percent local and many projects have been solicited, not volunteered. Naturally, they are going to prefer a project in which they put up only 50 percent if the Federal Government advertises it will put up the other 50 percent. But, on the other side of the issue, how many hundreds of millions of dollars of local public works projects are still on the shelf and going to stay there in the hopes of getting Federal matching funds which otherwise they might have gone into on their own—thus increasing employment.

Mr. JOELSON. That has nothing to do with the necessity for these programs.

Mr. CRAMER. So far as necessity is concerned, the Federal Government went out and solicited many of these projects. I have listed many that are not necessary. Others could be built under existing authorizations. The local and State governments were able to finance them, as well as or even better than the Federal Government, and they are not in debt as much as we are.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think one of the facts to be remembered is that we have no money in the Federal Government.

Mr. CRAMER. That is just what I said.

Mr. CEDERBERG. We are completely broke. We are going to be required to increase the debt limit probably next month.

When this program was originally adopted, there was a surplus in the Treasury of a half billion dollars. This surplus has melted away now to a deficit of $8 or $9 billion this year. Next year we will have a deficit anticipated to be $12 to $15 billion. We do not have any money to give to the local communities. That is one of the things that makes it difficult for me to understand.

Mr. CRAMER. They suggest we borrow the money at 4 percent, or the present going rate, when the local communities can issue bonds and get it at 3 or 3½ percent.

Mr. JOELSON. Many towns involved are at their limit. They could not possibly have done that with many of these projects.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I would certainly agree that there are many towns that are in that situation, but most of the towns have certain limitations by either state constitutions or local city charters and they have the mechanics to change. The Federal Government is over $300 billion in debt. We are going to have a deficit of $8 billion this year and $10 billion next year. We are borrowing the money on the market at probably a rate of 3 or 4 percent to give to the same people that can get it for less. We give it back to them. I cannot understand that.

I come from a district that has several projects in here, and it certainly is not good politics for me to vote against it. I have a depressed area also. But I will say I have a responsibility to my people to be honest with them and tell them what the Federal situation is.

Mr. CRAMER. It is just indicative of what the philosophy of some people in the Congress here is. After all, some think we do not have a real debt ceiling. It is flexible, it is said. It can be ever increased. The municipalities do have a limitation they say. But ours is flexible. We do not have a debt ceiling. I do not agree with that kind of philosophy. We should recognize that we have one, and for good reason and we should make our spending conform to it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. One of the other things that disturbs me about this program is this: When it was originally adopted, it was to be a 12-month quick program, an accelerated public works program, for the purpose of taking care of our unemployment problem in a hurry. This $450 million is good until June 30, 1964. There are pending requests for additional authorizations. It looks to me as if this so-called accelerated public works program is a permanent program that will probably be with us for many, many years to come, the extent of which we cannot possibly realize. Obviously, all communities have certain needs. For instance, I served as mayor of a city of between 55,000 and 60,000 people.

Now, obviously, the Federal Government can get the money and they are going to say "We will do this." And, I might say that this very city I am talking about has requests now pending before this agency to get $500,000 for a waterline. And, this is a depressed area. There is no legitimate reason why they cannot more economically issue revenue bonds and build this line. And, remember, we do not have any money.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to answer the gentleman from Michigan by saying, in regard to these bond issues, that most of the sewage disposal projects and transmission lines that he is talking about are financed out of water revenue. The local communities are more able to pay out of water revenues these types of public works programs at 2½ to 3½ percent than the Federal Government is at a 4-percent interest rate. It discourages the local communities from doing their own financing.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. As one who has had some experience with State budgets and the problem of trying to balance revenues and expenditures at that level, I might say that in our own State I ascertained that there were more than 50 matching funds projects which were taxing the State resources. And, as the gentleman has so ably brought out, this is undertaking to provide a Federal program with funds we do not have which will, in turn, encourage or coerce local communities and State governments to undertake expenditures that otherwise they would not undertake and that they cannot afford and do not want, and we are inducing them and forcing them to do this with your big Federal handout.

Mr. CRAMER. Another thing, it involves Federal control. I tried to get a more definitive list of recreational projects under this $500 million request, and I was told that they did not have a definitive list yet, because the Government had not decided exactly how they were going to put their new antidiscrimination policy into effect and therefore they could not give me a definitive list in regard to recreational projects. And, there is $25 million worth of recreational projects in that new February 15, $240 million request or list alone. And, that is an indication of the extent to which the Federal Government, if it is going to put money into it, will tell you how to spend the money. They could not give me a breakdown of what was meant by recreation or recreational activities, whether it was swimming pools, ski lifts, or golf courses. They said they could not tell me because they had not finalized the antidiscrimination regulations as yet.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Awhile ago I was not too surprised when I learned that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, my friend, Mr. GROSS, did not care too much for swimming pools and swimming, but when I now hear that a gentleman from Florida apparently is antiswimming pool and antiswimming, I am a little flabbergasted.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman from New York we have more free beaches and more free swimming pools in Florida than any State in the United States, but we in Florida also believe that these are local responsibilities, and I will guarantee that 90 percent of the people in the State of Florida would not come to the Federal Government asking for 70 percent matching money.

Mr. ROONEY. How about the many applications from the State of Florida under this program?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I was sorry, after my last colloquy, that I did not have an opportunity to understand what the gentleman from New Jersey was asking.

I am sorry that we were cut off.

Mr. JOELSON. I did not ask a question. I merely made the point that due to the fact that certain municipalities are depressed areas, they are not in a position to raise the same money on a broad scale as the Federal Government is because we have, fortunately, only pockets of depressed areas. It is the depressed areas themselves that just do not have the sources of revenue to provide for the projects that they need which will not only improve their living conditions, but which as the gentleman knows produce employment. That is why we must have this on a depressed-area approach.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. In response to that, I think it is certain that there are some areas that are depressed which would probably have some trouble in financing certain of the projects they have in mind under this particular program. But the majority of them—and my home area happens to be one which has a very fine top rating as far as bonds are concerned—I do not see any particular purpose in that regard here. But if they can get this Federal money from a depressed Federal Government—we are more depressed than they are—what we have got to do now is to depress the taxpayer because the taxpayers from this depressed area have to pay their Federal tax, whether the program can be delayed or abandoned for a period of time or not.

Mr. JOELSON. I do not agree with the gentleman that the United States is depressed. I think we have pockets of depressed areas about which we must care. But I cannot share the gentleman's views that the United States is one huge depressed area.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I did not say that the entire United States is depressed. But one of the things involved is this: If we are not so depressed, why do we have to continue these budget deficits year after year? Why do we not have the intestinal fortitude to say we are going to pay our way, if we are not in this situation because it is easier to run a deficit?

Mr. JOELSON. I will answer the gentleman from Michigan if the gentleman from Florida will yield further.

Mr. CRAMER. I refuse to yield further. I will say to the gentleman that it does appear to me that the U.S. Treasury is financially depressed, with a $305 billion debt and we are going to be more so with these kinds of programs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, since my name came up here? I regret I was not paying too close attention to the debate. I just wondered which one of the swimming pools the gentleman from New York, [Mr. ROONEY], had me in a while ago?

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield, the point was I thought you were afraid to get into one.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The one with the lemonade.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman further that with regard to swimming pools it is my opinion that no community would have asked for money for swimming pools or ski slides or golf courses if the Federal Government had not sent them a letter telling them "If you want these things, we will put up 70 percent of the money."

Mr. Chairman, I do not think any community would have ever had any such demand for Federal money for that purpose. I do not think the various communities in the State of Florida would have wanted that kind of money if the ARA had not solicited these projects.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. The gentleman from Florida was talking about this depressed area situation. I am very proud to be from an area, the west Texas area, where we are not in a depressed situation. However, if we keep fooling around helping depressed areas, we are going to make a depressed area not only out of west Texas, but out of the entire country.

I think the thing we need to do is to come out of this depression and start relying upon ourselves and our local communities and our State governments to do this rather than creating new depressed areas.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his views.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is the gentleman from Florida prepared now to back up on the numerous projects which have been authorized in his district for harbor improvement and for navigation improvements and other projects having to do with water resources development in the gentleman's district which involve projects looking toward a Federal expenditure?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I am proud of the fact that since I have been a Member of this House there has been a $16 million harbor built in my district. That is the Tampa Harbor, and it is one of the largest harbors in the State of Florida. But I will tell you this: It was justified. We went to the proper authorization committee and to the proper appropriations committee. We got it done on the basis that it was done on the merits, not as a political proposition or public works boondoggle. We did not ask them to build swimming pools or ski slides and things like that, but things that are and have been properly Federal matters.

Mr. JOELSON. Would the gentleman give us his definition of what is proper for the Federal Government to do in his district and not in other districts?

Mr. CRAMER. I would answer that all districts should be judged on the merits of properly considered projects that are necessary and within properly authorized programs and within our spending means. I was one who stood here and opposed a public works appropriation and public works authorization bill some 3 years ago and 4 years ago and 5 years ago, even though it had money in it for that very harbor project the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] was talking about in order to try to live within our fiscal means. So my record of fiscal responsibility is on record.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, may I say first that the gentleman from Iowa has again today ridiculed the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium. May I remind the gentleman from Iowa that two-thirds of the U.S. Senate last year voted for this project and two-thirds of this body voted for it. This House voted again just last week to initiate planning for the Aquarium. In ignoring these facts the gentleman from Iowa reminds me of Napoleon. He is about the same height, has the same color hair, and he comes from a town they call Waterloo.

Mr. GROSS. I have not been exiled to Elba yet.

Mr. KIRWAN. You are going up against the same stone wall Napoleon went against. You are already there but you do not know it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. No. I did not ask you to yield when you were having a good time about the aquarium. I wanted you to have a good time.

Now in reference to the accelerated public works program I am very concerned that this bill does not carry funds to continue projects to help the unemployed in distressed areas. Sitting back there I was reminiscing about the WPA and the PWA. I want you to look at the record. This is not politics, this is the record.

Since 1930, in the last 33 years, you Members on the other side of the aisle who are opposed to these public works projects to help the unemployed have elected only two Houses of Congress. So the record must be pretty good over here. I think the record is clear that the people want us to do everything possible to help the unemployed and make our country prosper.

Do you remember when Roosevelt came into office? He knew what the people wanted and he never lost a Congress. He knew they expected action to help the unemployed and with action programs he put this country back on its feet.

And we have made progress in the past year in improving business conditions. Production in the steel industry, for example, is up to 80 percent of capacity. Last year along about this time, they were down to about 50 percent. They had been down to about 45 percent. The same is true of other segments of our economy. We are doing better all along the line.

Now I am not saying that the $400 million that has been spent to date on accelerated public works has been solely responsible. But it has played an important part in these distressed areas, along with many other special programs, to get the economy going again by providing employment and purchasing power. Now that we are doing something about the problem, let us not stop the program and let these communities down. Do not upset the apple cart just as they see hope of getting back on their feet.

Last year, Congress authorized this program. We promised we would provide $900 million worth of public works projects to help the unemployed in these distressed areas. Certainly we are not now going back on that promise. To fail to appropriate additional funds for this program would mean drifting back again. We would be saying we have changed our minds, we do not want to take action to help solve the unemployment situation.

As in the past, I think the record is clear that the people expect positive action by Congress. This is the only Nation on earth where we, the people, are the boss. It is not the Congress or the President of the United States. It is we, the people, who are the boss. If we, the people, have elected Representatives to the Congress to do certain things, then the people must be right. I am not speaking politics. I am speaking of the record.

You people on the other side elected only two Congresses in 33 years. So there must be something wrong somewhere with your thinking. And there must be something right with those of us who are in the majority. I believe the recent elections were evidence that the people back home endorse the program and other efforts to help these distressed areas get back on their feet. They are part of America and anything we spend to help them will come back many, many times.

Tomorrow you will be asked to vote for an amendment restoring $450 million to this bill to keep this program going. So I hope when you go home tonight you will give this question careful thought and realize the importance of continuing this assistance to the unemployed in these distressed areas. Certainly the alternative of taking no action is no answer. Certainly the unemployed do not want to go back to the experiences of 1929 to 1931; they will not go through that again. What more need I tell you? That is why I am asking you to do some serious thinking, whether you are a Republican or a Democrat.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman said there were 12 million unemployed in 1931. I expect that is correct. I would also remind him that there were 12 million unemployed in 1939.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am talking about our responsibility in Congress to take action to help the unemployed and, I hope, that when you go home tonight and lay your head on your pillow that you do some serious thinking, and that tomorrow you will come here and cast your vote to restore the $450 million to this bill to continue this program.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest as my distinguished and able colleague from Florida on the Public Works Committee spoke for 40 minutes in a plea for economy with regard to this program. To me it was somewhat significant that he had words for economy in one direction, that was in the direction of this accelerated public works program to give work to unemployed people in the depressed areas. He had nothing to say to you over a further cut in the item for telecommunications, a $9 million item on which the committee made a cut of only 10 percent.

He had nothing to say to you about any further cut of the GSA supply fund which is a $25 million item out of a $30 million request; nothing to say to you about any cut on the $3,300,000 payment to air carriers out of a $3,478,000 request; nothing to say about a cut in the conservation reserve program which was funded at $4 million out of a $4 million request.

He is for Uncle Sam making good on his commitment to air carriers; he is for Uncle Sam making good on his commitment to the people who put land in the conservation reserve; he is for Uncle Sam making good on his commitment to people who sell supplies to the Government; he is for standing by the telecommunications commitment. If they are demands of this type he is for them; but when it comes to a commitment made to the unemployed in the depressed areas of the United States, when it comes to making good on our commitment to fund this program with $900 million then he forgets all about full faith and credit.

I say to you that the analysis which he gave of these accelerated public works projects in which he classified them as a bunch of boondoggles is about as unfair a treatment of the facts as I have ever heard from the well of this House. If you want to get the facts about these projects and about what percentage of them can accurately be described as so-called boondoggles, turn to pages A2110 of the daily Congressional Record for Monday, April 8.

Our good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] put in a lengthy list of pending and approved accelerated public works projects. There are more than 10,000 of them. I challenge you to look down that list for your State and to say with all honesty that there is any sizable percentage in any State which can be said to be boondoggles.

The gentleman from Florida referred briefly to a project or two from Oregon. I think he called off a grand total of maybe 15 or 16 projects that were in his view boondoggles. Out of 10,000 projects he finds 15 or 16, some of them from the State of Florida and some from Oregon. Go down the list of the Oregon projects on page A2125 of the daily Congressional Record. He mentioned one about a ski slide somewhere.

But look at the list on page A2125 of the daily Congressional Record for Oregon, and you will see the following:

OREGON

Halsey, Linn County; sanitation, new.

Gearhart City, Clatsop County; water system, new.

Warrenton, Clatsop County; water system, new.

Seaside, Clatsop County; sanitation, new.

Seaside, Clatsop County; municipal buildings, new.

Seaside, Clatsop County; water system, new.

Seaside, Clatsop County; municipal buildings, new.

Cave Junction, Josephine County, sanitation, new.

Grants Pass Irrigation District, Josephine County; sanitation, new.

Newport, Lincoln County; sanitation, new.

Newport, Lincoln County; water system, new.

Nelscott Sanitation District, Lincoln County; sanitation, new.

These projects, almost without exception in practically every State in the Union, are water development projects. They are projects to give needed sanitation facilities; they are projects to stop pollution of our streams and our lakes. Keep in mind that over 50 percent of the projects are in towns under 10,000. They are projects to make it possible for these towns to have an environment in which they can have some private development, in which they can have some economic development. They are projects that are good projects in which the local people of our country have confidence.

The best test of the good sense of these projects will be the list you will find on these pages of the Record from your own State, from your own community; and in the main, in the very great majority of cases, they are sound, desirable projects, because the people back home who originated them did so from commonsense. The people back home are originating these projects, and they have a commonsense foundation in the needs of the community.

The first requirement for these projects is that they must meet essential public need in the community in order to be instituted.

A second requirement is there must be an unemployment or depressed income situation that will be benefited by the institution of these projects.

The gentleman from Florida says that nothing has been done about unemployment. If the gentleman's plain statement of facts is correct, that unemployment today is not the same as it was last year, then we have some progress in this direction, because we have added about 3 million new people to the eligible list for employment this last year. If we have started holding the line on unemployment, we have made some progress over the previous administration which had seen a steady worsening of the situation during the closing years of the previous administration.

We have a serious problem in unemployment; we have a serious problem in many parts of our country in terms of depressed income and the absence of opportunity.

I want you to hear for just a minute a statement made by one of the most sensible men I know of in Government, a man who has played a great part and a responsible role in connection with this program, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, who testified on March 19, 1963:

> The need for this program of accelerating public works is not supported just by unemployment figures. This need is also evident on the backlog of project applications of more than $1.2 billion which are being held by participating Federal agencies. In this connection, I would emphasize that the many projects which would be financed by the appropriation request now under consideration are desirable and justifiable in and of themselves. The completion will fill definite and critical needs in countless communities. These communities will be made better places in which to work and live, and in many instances the public works projects which can be completed under this program will in turn produce a needed boost for private industrial development which can lead to new jobs on a permanent basis. For example, if a community's present sewerage system is inadequate, that community is obviously under a distinct handicap in attracting private investment for industrial development. Or the community whose water mains and pumping capacity are not adequate for industrial fire protection will be left by the wayside when it comes to choosing a site for the prospective factory which must have adequate fire protection and an adequate water supply for industrial operations.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud of a project in my own district, in a small town, one of the first area redevelopment projects. The community had a very inadequate water supply. The water supply was inhibiting and constricting all growth in the community. A local cannery came around and said, "If you can give us an adequate water supply, we will double the capacity of this cannery. We will add hundreds of new jobs in this community if you give us an adequate water supply." That assistance was given. Today that cannery is engaged in expansion; they are providing hundreds of additional jobs in a community that had limited opportunity because its water supply was limited.

I say when you embark on this kind of a program in your own community by originating projects, with the local people paying half of the cost, and the Government aiding and assisting communities to put the project across and providing essential services to the people, that we are building on the most solid foundation in the world. And, all of you who have voted in the past for aid programs for foreign countries, remember this: This is a program for all America; it is a program for the depressed and the unemployed and the poor and those without opportunity in our own land, and if there is any man in the hearing of my voice who has supported aid programs for foreign countries and for underdeveloped countries who cannot in good conscience cast a vote for these development dollars to spend in the United States, then I am ashamed for his heart and his generosity. This is a program to build a better United States of America and to go into regions where they need help, and I believe we are going to give it to them in the bill we consider today.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat disturbed by what appears to be a somewhat partisan slant in the action deleting funds from this legislation for the accelerated public works program, and I rise in support of the efforts which will be made under the 5-minute rule to reintroduce this money in line with the recommendations of the President of the United States. I speak as one who has the honor, although being a Democrat, to represent an overwhelmingly Republican constituency. In fact, Mr. Chairman, as Members are aware, six of the eight counties which I have the honor to represent in this body in the 88th Congress were represented in the previous Congresses and for 40 years prior thereto by our distinguished former colleague from New York State, the former ranking Republican member of the great Committee on Appropriations for many years, Hon. John Taber. Six of the eight counties in this new district that sent John Taber to Congress for 40 years are suffering so great a degree of unemployment that they are eligible for consideration under this bill. And the fact that people and public officials in these six Republican, conservative upstate counties are eagerly pressing for the assistance which the program provides will perhaps help to put this debate into a little better perspective, especially when it comes to talking about boondoggles or make-work or "needless" projects. Mr. Chairman, these counties in New York State are counties where hardly a day seems to go by without one more business closing down and more people—50, 75, or 100—being thrown out of work. And the only program that now exists to help these hard-hit communities has been the accelerated public works program adopted by the last Congress.

We read a lot of statistics in the papers. We even read speeches by the distinguished Governor of our State, who even before the State legislature had completed its work before for the year 1963, was out in the Middle West campaigning for President.

We read Mr. Rockefeller's speeches about how successful business is in New York State, and how he has licked the problem of unemployment. But the fact of the matter is that 26 out of 62 counties in New York State are eligible for assistance under this bill. And, the fact of the matter is that this unemployment is affecting increasingly greater areas that traditionally have been Republican.

Let me take, for example, the lovely Finger Lakes region of our State. We have the so-called Geneva-Canandaigua labor market area up there. In the city of Geneva itself unemployment has reached something like 15 percent or 16 percent. When the accelerated public works program went through we had mayors, boards of supervisors, chambers of commerce—all local intitiative, if you will—knocking on the doorstep of the new agency saying "Can we not become eligible for this program?"

Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose that there are three counties in the entire United States which have filed more applications under this program, applications from good, solid, hard-line upstate independent conservative Republican areas than have the three counties that make up the Geneva-Canandaigua labor market surplus areas.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. CRAMER], or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] could go up into those areas and tell these people that the effort to help relieve their unemployment is a boondoggle, could tell these people that they do not have any unemployment, or because there is no unemployment in some areas, in the United States we in Congress need not worry about the unemployment in those areas where it does exist. Unemployment knows no party lines.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter of trying to cram projects down the throats of the people. I sometimes find it hard to set through all the debates of this House because of the number of projects that the people in these communities in my district are interested in and are pressing to get approved. Why are they pushing these projects? Why are they anxious to get them through? Because it is the only program they have. There is nothing from the State, nothing at all from the State. The only program that gives these counties an opportunity to meet the unemployment problem they face is this accelerated public works program which some Members of the House would now kill by taking away its funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Texas yield to me an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 5 additional minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. There has been some talk here on the floor today to the effect that the Federal Government is stepping in and crushing local community initiative. Mr. Chairman, what is actually happening is the precise opposite. Because funds are available in this program, other local funds that would otherwise never have been committed are coming out. The local communities themselves could not underwrite these programs completely on their own. But they are willing to go half way. Therefore, as a result of this program—and I have seen it in county after county in my district—we have more local initiative, more local funds, more local interest in improving our communities than existed before the program went into effect.

Mr. Chairman, what job do we have to do that is more important in this country, if it is not to put people to work and to solve our continuing and nagging unemployment problem? Today we have men and women who cannot find work. We have a program that can help them find work and which has the support of local leaders, the leaders who best know whether the community needs the work help provided by this program. These are the people who are asking for help under this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, today we have a great backlog of applications, at least as far as New York is concerned, because the funds to finance these projects have run out. Are these communities now to be told that because they did not become eligible for help quite as soon as some other community did nothing is now going to be done for them; that because Congress authorized $900 million last year we are going to pull the rug out from under them? I do not think this is the day to do it at all.

We committed the Congress to a program of $900 million. That program was so popular, so much in demand, and had so much grassroots support for it, without regard to party affiliation, that the funds were used up well before the year was through.

Now we have a choice of waiting until the the next fiscal year comes around and putting the money in, or putting the money in under this supplemental appropriations bill, as the subcommittee had tried to do. What we have to do if we really want to put people to work is to keep the momentum of this program going. You cannot let them sit around until the first of July to satisfy some of the technical requirements of budget-making. Here is an opportunity for us to continue this program, to move into communities that are anxious to get help, and give that help. I think the program should be continued. I support the effort to reintroduce the $450 million in funds requested by the administration.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I personally feel that we have within our grasp an opportunity to be of service to our country, especially in time of need. If we were discussing the impacted area school bill on the floor today, I doubt that we would have all this argument. I say this as one of the supporters of that legislation all through the years, where we have been giving assistance to areas that obtain most of the defense contracts, where we have in some instances a median family income of $6,000, and $8,000, contrasted here today with counties such as those in the district I represent, and certainly that prevail in districts of many other Congressmen, where the median family incomes run $1,400, $1,500, $1,700, and $1,800 a year.

As I see it, we cannot afford to fail to restore this $450 million, especially since we have in the past supported programs in underdeveloped parts of the world. I represent a section of Kentucky that is depressed, especially the southern part of the district. This legislation was passed primarily for depressed areas. Within the past 6 years we have had in eastern Kentucky two of the worst flood disasters in the history of Kentucky. Those people have been trying to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps in every way possible. Their savings in most instances have been wiped out and the economy in many of these coal-mining communities has for all intents and purposes collapsed. With the program this Congress has already committed itself to, how will they feel if we turn our backs on them after that commitment and fail to restore these funds, especially since progress is being held up in certain areas of this country dependent upon sewage and water and other permanent improvements in many of these communities? That is true in my district. We have in the city of Beattyville, Ky., some 30 low rent housing projects, and some of those units are for the elderly, held up on account of the lack of sewage.

Within the past 60 days, 13 of the counties I represent have been declared disaster areas by the President of the United States.

In another community in Martin, Ky., we have another low rent public housing project of 40 units that is being held up because of the lack of a sewage disposal system. Now these are the facts. In Martin, Ky., the water was 6 feet high in the streets. Every home in the main part of the city was flooded and every business establishment in that community was flooded.

Approximately a year ago the Area Redevelopment Administration made available a $650,000 grant to the University of Kentucky Extension Service at Quicksand, Breathitt County, Ky., for the purpose of establishing a wood utilization center. This center will create many jobs, but this particular community does not have a water system. Representatives from the community and from the University of Kentucky have been in Washington seeking Federal assistance. The median family income in Breathitt County is $1,432 and 76 percent of the people in this county have incomes less than $3,000. The purpose of the Accelerated Public Works Act was to assist communities of this type. If we fail to make available the money, there will be no water system at Quicksand, Ky., in the foreseeable future. The local people just do not have the means to support a project of this type. These are a few of the projects that are dependent upon this appropriation. There are some 40 applications pending in the district that I represent, including 8 administration buildings such as courthouses.

If we cannot give assistance to people in such circumstances, then I certainly think this Congress is being derelict in carrying out its responsibility. We know that this program is being administered well notwithstanding what may be said about it.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I compliment the gentleman on his statement. If there is anyone who knows about depressed areas and the unemployment problem, it is the gentleman who is now addressing us in the well of the House. At page 111 of the hearings, I had inserted by the ARA a list of the States and the areas in which this money is being expended. As the gentleman just indicated, the people who are running this program have done a fantastically fair, reasonable and equitable job in a very, very difficult program.

Mr. PERKINS. And they have done a nonpolitical job.

Mr. BOLAND. Yes, they have done a nonpolitical job. There is no question about that and the record bears that out. The record with respect to the distribution of funds among the States clearly shows that those States that have had the largest percentage of unemployment have benefited the most by this program and they include States like Kentucky, the State from which the gentleman now addressing us from the well of the House comes, and the States of Tennessee, West Virginia, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. These are the States that have received the most under these programs and these are the States that have had the worst problems with respect to unemployment. I congratulate the gentleman on his statement.

Mr. PERKINS. In southeastern and eastern Kentucky, southwestern Virginia, in the Williamson, West Virginia, area, and particularly in the district of my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER], I can think of millions of people who have been affected by recent floods and where their communities have bonded indebtedness to the hilt. They deserve and expect this assistance and I am certainly hopeful that we will not put the dollar ahead of our people.

This nation cannot afford to expend our substance in idleness, for that would be as wasteful as burning our forests, and sealing our mines. We need to make these communities more attractive for industry. They need sewer systems to dispose of their waste, water lines to permit them to sustain life more easily, other utilities, such as roads and streets. To get these they are willing to put up some of their own money for the results are tangible. The unemployed and underemployed in these communities are given an opportunity to work. The project takes shape before their eyes. A program of this type is our only hope to make these communities, such as we have in the coal-producing sections, attractive for industry.

We need to extend this program further. We need to provide an additional program that will put people to work cleaning up the streams and building country roads, especially in these depressed areas where we have one-third of our people unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, I think this appropriation should be restored. It is good economy to restore these funds.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, senior member of the committee [Mr. WHITTEN] such time as he may consume.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, first may I say with regard to the public works item which has been discussed here today, I have always been a strong advocate of domestic public works. In fact, in 1959 when President Eisenhower vetoed the public works bill of that year because it provided for 67 new starts, I was the author of the successful motion which overrode the President's veto and saved the 67 new starts in public works.

Insofar as the particular program, however, is concerned, it has always been my belief that it would be much better if you had a set of rules in connection with the selection of these projects. As it stands now, as I understand it, the criteria is whether it is a depressed area which in turn is set by unemployment. I respectfully submit that that is only one element to be considered. There are other features such as local tax rate, the tax structure, the assessed valuation of the area, the indebtedness of the county and of the city. The thing that creates most of the problems in a given district is the use of only one yardstick in the determination. Frequently this leads to the area of greatest need being overlooked. Not only that, but the question is raised why one area was included and the other one left out, and that in turn leads to some real explaining, if I may use that phrase. Also, it is apparent that if funds here were restored, four out of five projects which either are or would be approved, could not be financed—and the prohibition by the committee against buying land would eliminate still others.

I repeat I am for public works. I truly believe my successful motion to override President Eisenhower's veto—which was the first time in history that any President had to take that which he had vetoed where the House had first sustained him in his veto—was probably the act of which I am most proud. I repeat what I said then, "the greater the national debt the more imperative it is to look after our own country, develop our harbors, harness our rivers, and improve our country. Here, however, we need some guide rules for fair treatment based on value and need.

THE MISSISSIPPI SITUATION

Mr. Chairman, in Mississippi we are up against a difficult situation. I represent the district in which is located the University of Mississippi. I have been sorely distressed, not only at what has been done to my fine university by the Federal Government but to government itself. I believe in my 21 years here I have been temperate in my remarks. I do not recall ever having any controversy with any of my colleagues which reached personalities, but included in this bill are funds for the restoration of money that was expended for the use of U.S. marshals and Assistant Attorneys General at the University of Mississippi. May I say that we in the Mississippi delegation feel very strongly about it, and we feel we are right that such use was not within the law.

For the record I want to point out several things. One of the first is that the Supreme Court had not rendered a final decision when this action by the Attorney General and the President was taken. The next is that under the law of the State of Mississippi the only police force that any Governor has is the State militia. The State militia was taken from the Governor by the President prior to this movement of Federal marshals into the area. The highway patrol in Mississippi is limited in its jurisdiction to the highways and places adjacent thereto, thus the Governor was without any force to maintain order. Later I shall point out other facts which have not been brought to your attention.

In this bill is an appropriation of $559,000, as requested by the President's proposed supplemental budget, Presidential Document No. 61.

I quote:

> For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals," $1,140,000.
>
> This proposed supplemental appropriation includes $559,000 for the cost of enforcing court orders in the University of Mississippi school registration case and $581,000 to cover the cost of pay increases under Public Law 87-793.

In the report of the committee, page 11, is this statement:

> Department of Justice. The Department has included in the bill $1,110,000 for salaries and expenses of U.S. attorneys and marshals. The allowance will require that 5 percent of the cost of pay increases be absorbed.

Then I refer you to pages 561 and 562 of the hearings where facts were developed as to the personnel, equipment, and weapons which were used on that occasion.

May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee or a member of the Committee on the Judiciary whether this is to restore funds that heretofore have been expended or to pay obligations now existing?

Mr. ROONEY. The total amount requested with regard to U.S. attorneys and marshals is comprised of two items; first, the amount of the pay increases, which was cut to the extent of 5 percent, and the amount in connection with the Mississippi incident.

With regard to the Mississippi incident, this is to replenish funds for the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service to the extent of $185,880; the Bureau of Prisons, $31,389; the U.S. marshals' appropriation itself, $294,362; the U.S. attorneys' appropriation, $491; the Civil Rights Division, $27,950; the Civil Division, $12,337; and $6,591 for the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice.

This supplemental appropriation would replenish these various accounts in the Department of Justice for the costs of the people they had at Oxford, Miss., during this unfortunate period of time, including equipment, including gasoline for the automobiles, and mileage for the deputy marshals and employees at the usual 10 cents a mile.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I ask a further question. The gentleman mentioned the Immigration and Naturalization Service. May I say that Service advised our House delegation from Mississippi that they supplied a plane, but their plane happened to be available for this use.

Mr. ROONEY. It appears at page 565 of the printed hearings that there were 316 specially deputized enforcement officers from the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. WHITTEN. This does not apply to the use of the plane that belonged to that Service but applies to the personnel?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the gentleman have the authority under which funds that had been appropriated for different purposes last year could be diverted to this use, as was done in this case?

Mr. ROONEY. I think that this was a part of the activities of each one of the branches of the Department of Justice.

Mr. WHITTEN. The Immigration and Naturalization Service, may I say, has a different authority.

Mr. ROONEY. I submit to the gentleman they are all law enforcement officers, and that is what they were there for in Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, the Comptroller General supplied a listing of statutes under which the Federal Government acted. As the gentleman may appreciate we do not agree.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Defense. When the Secretary of Defense was before our committee, I questioned him relative to the Mississippi episode. It was developed that the Federal Government used 22,000 soldiers in Oxford and adjacent areas at a time when we had only 6,000 soldiers in Berlin.

I would like to quote from a distinguished military man who rose to the rank of general as to whether these orders were in accord with general law.

I quote:

> I have served in a command status with the National Guard, the Reserves, and 9 years on active duty in three wars. This was practically always in a command status, from a battery on up to a division or posts commanding 35,000 officers and men. Therefore, I believe that I have been fully exposed to the regulations governing command, authority, and the responsibilities of a commander. After reading the Look article (much of the information contained therein, I presume, was given to Messrs. Alsop and so forth by the Attorney General's office), I assume that this is the Department of Justice's position in the matter. It would appear unquestionably that Mr. Kennedy, in making these charges, takes the position that there should have been a divided command at the University of Mississippi. How he expected Governor Barnett to maintain law and order after the President had taken away from his command 11,000 officers and men of the Mississippi Air and Army National Guard, is inconceivable. Had he armed the 50 State patrolmen, he would have set up a separate force on the field along with the 100-odd marshals who were present under arms.
>
> In all of my experience in the military, I have never heard of a divided command authority. The regulations do not even countenance such a situation, but are very explicit in requiring that the senior officer take full command, full authority, and full responsibility. Especially during a riot, anyone should realize that two commanders under such circumstances would be impossible in the employment of armed forces.
>
> I am taking the liberty of forwarding to you photostatic copies of Army Regulations No. 600–20, dated August 11, 1960, subject "Personnel—General, Command," along with changes 4 and 5 which represent the current regulations dealing with command. I believe that these regulations will bear out my point that under any conditions where Federal troops are employed, the overall command, authority, and responsibility rest with the senior officer present. In the case at Ole Miss, this was Mr. McShane who had command over the U.S. marshals and later the National Guard units when they appeared on the field. Later General Billingslea assumed the overall command, including the Army troops who were brought in. In my opinion, in the face of these regulations and the regulations quoted in my previous letter, had Colonel Birdsong with his 50 patrolmen—attempted to exercise any authority or control over the situation in maintaining law and order, he could have been subject to arrest and prosecution for interference with the implementation of Army Regulations No. 600–20.

When the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, was before our Appropriations Committee I requested him to list the orders issued in connection with the University of Mississippi. I quote them here:

From: DA Wash DC
To: The Honorable Ross R. Barnett, Governor of Mississippi.
Info: CG, Army National Guard, State of Mississippi; CG, Air National Guard, State of Mississippi; CG, USCONARC, Ft Monroe, Va; CG, US Army Three Ft McPherson Ga; COFS USAF; UNCLAS
From: The Secretary of the Army, Cyrus R. Vance.
Subject: Calling Army and Air National Guard units into Active Federal Military Service.

In order to enforce the laws of the United States and to enforce any orders of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Court for the removal of obstruction of justice in the State of Mississippi with respect to matters relating to enrollment and attendance at the University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi, the President has exercised the authority vested in him by the Constitution and laws to authorize the Secretary of Defense to call the Army National

Guard and Air National Guard of the State of Mississippi into active Federal service as necessary for that purpose.

I am, in consequence, instructed by the Secretary of Defense to transmit through you his call into the service of the United States for an indefinite period and until relieved by appropriate orders as of and from 0002 EDT, September thirtieth, nineteen hundred and sixty-two, all of the Army and Air National Guard organizations of the State of Mississippi, and all personnel assigned thereto, which the President desires shall be assembled at their respective Army National Guard armories and Air National Guard air bases in the State of Mississippi.

National Guard units so called will be under the operational command of U.S. Army Field Commander, Brig Gen Charles Billingslea, who will issue timely instructions through the commanding officers of the Army and Air National Guard of Mississippi.

Commanding General, U.S. Continental Army Command will furnish necessary administrative and logical support to Army National Guard. Personnel procedures, Section II, Army Regulations 130-10, and paragraph 32, Army Regulations 135-300 will apply.

For Air National Guard units, logistical and administrative support will be furnished by the gaining command. The Mississippi Air National Guard units of appropriate gaining commands are:

153d Tac Recon (Meridian)—Tactical Air Command

183d Aeromod Transp Sq (Jackson)—MATS

238th Mobile Communications Flt—AF Communications Service Personnel procedures are set forth in AFM 45-2.

For your information, the text of the order from the Secretary of Defense is quoted as follows:

"By virtue of the authority conferred upon me by the President under the provisions of Executive Order 11053 dated 30 September 1962, I hereby call into the active military service of the United States, effective 0002, 30 September 1962, all of the units and members of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard of the State of Mississippi, to serve in the active military service of the United States for an indefinite period and until relieved by appropriate orders.

"I further direct the Secretary of the Army to take such action as he deems necessary, utilizing active Army forces or the National Guard units and members named in the first paragraph above, or both, to implement the mentioned Executive Order and this Order, and I hereby delegate to the Secretary of the Army any and all of the authority vested in me by the mentioned Executive Order with respect to the use of such active Army forces and the use of such National Guard units and members.

"Copies hereof shall be furnished forthwith to the Governor of Mississippi and to the commanding officers of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard of the State of Mississippi."

Origin: OSA

Distr: OCS, AAA, ACSI, (MA'S), AF, AFIE, AMC, AMS, ASBCA, ASESB, CH, CI, CLL, CMC, COMPT, CONARC LN, CORC, CSCPD, CSMD, CUSR, DACC, DASA, DCA, DCSLOG, DCSOP (MAAGs & MSNs), DCSPER, DIA, DPSC, DSA, ENG, FAAO, FIN, FT MCNAIR, FT MYER, HIS, ICAF, IG, JAG, JBD, JCS, MDW, MED, MPS, NAVY, NBPRP, NGB, NGRP, NSA, NWC, OSD, OSS, PDC, PMG, R&D, RES, SCAF, SDMIC, SHAPE LN, SIG, TAG, TC, USASA LN, USRSG, WSEG, AMMC, ENG COM DC, JBUSDC, MLC, PJBD, SEL SVC, STATE, USDEL IADB

From: DA WASH DC
To: Brig Gen Charles Billingslea, Memphis Naval Air Station; Tenn
Info: CGUSCONARC
CGUSARMYTHREE Ft McPherson Ga
COFS USAF: (DLVL)
CNO: (DLVD)

Secret DA 919745. From DCSOPS for Gen Billingslea.

1. (S) You are designated field commander of all U.S. Army Forces, except those assigned to Tent City, but including National Guard units of the State of Mississippi, which may be called to action by the President, employed to enforce Federal authority. You will carry out the provision of EXECUTIVE ORDER No. 11053, dated 30 Sep 62, subject, PROVIDING ASSISTANCE FOR THE REMOVAL OF UNLAWFUL OBSTRUCTIONS OF JUSTICE IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI:

WHEREAS on September 30, 1962, I issued Proclamation No. 3497 reading in part as follows:

"Whereas the Governor of the State of Mississippi and certain law enforcement officers and other officials of that State, and other persons, individually and in unlawful assemblies, combinations and conspiracies, have been and are willfully opposing and obstructing the enforcement of orders entered by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit; and

"Whereas such unlawful assemblies, combinations and conspiracies oppose and obstruct the execution of the laws of the United States, impede the course of justice under those laws and make it impracticable to enforce those laws in the State of Mississippi by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings; and

"Whereas I have expressly called the attention of the Governor of Mississippi to the perilous situation that exists and to his duties in the premises, and have requested but have not received from him adequate assurances that the orders of the courts of the United States will be obeyed and that law and order will be maintained:

"Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including Chapter 15 of Title 10 of the United States Code, particularly Sections 332, 333, and 334 thereof, do command all persons engaged in such obstructions of justice to cease and desist therefrom and to disperse and retire peaceably forthwith;" and

Whereas the commands contained in that proclamation have not been obeyed and obstruction of enforcement of those court orders still exists and threatens to continue:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including Chapter 15 of Title 10, particularly Sections 332, 333, and 334 thereof, and Section 301 of Title 3 of the United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take all appropriate steps to enforce all orders of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and to remove all obstructions of justice in the State of Mississippi.

Section 2. In furtherance of the enforcement of the aforementioned orders of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to use such of the armed forces of the United States as he may deem necessary.

Section 3. I hereby authorize the Secretary of Defense to call into the active military service of the United States, as he may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this order, any or all of the units of the Army National Guard and of the Air National Guard of the State of Mississippi to serve in the active military service of the United States for an indefinite period and until relieved by appropriate orders. In carrying out the provisions of Section 1, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to use the units, and members thereof, ordered into the active military service of the United States pursuant to this section.

Section 4. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to delegate to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, or both, any of the authority conferred upon him by this order.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 1962.*

2. (S) In carrying out your duties, you will be directly responsible to the Chief of Staff, United States Army. You will establish your headquarters initially at Memphis NAS, Tennessee. Direct liaison is authorized with USAF and US Navy agencies and with the local representative of the United States Attorney, the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Oberdorfer in all matters connected with your duties as field commander.

3. (S) You will assume command of such Regular Army forces allocated for this operation upon their arrival at Columbus and Memphis or at such other arrival point as may be designated. You will assume command of all National Guard forces which are ordered to active duty in connection with the execution of the President's Executive Order. In this respect, you will, on approval of the Dept of the Army in each instance, order into the area(s) of operations only those units of the National Guard of the United States called into the service of the United States which you require for the performance of your mission. You will direct the remaining National Guard units to remain at their home areas, subject to your orders.

4. (S) In carrying out your assigned mission, you will use the minimum force necessary.

5. (S) Direct communication with the Department of the Army (DCSOPS) is authorized and directed. To facilitate this measure, the Chief Signal Officer will establish direct line telephone facilities between your Field headquarters and the Office of the Director of Operations, ODCSOPS.

6. (S) Major General Creighton W. Abrams, Jr. is designated as the personal representative of the Chief of Staff for this operation. While not in the chain of command, he is authorized to issue orders in the name of the Chief of Staff.

7. (S) Necessary staff, logistics and administration support will be provided to you by CG, Third Army.

8. (S) You will insure that this headquarters is kept fully informed of the operation through the submission of reports as follows:

a. Telephonic spot reports every two hours on the odd-numbered hours.

b. Interim telephonic reports on major changes which warrant the immediate attention of this headquarters.

c. Written periodic reports covering each six-hour period, ending 1700 hours local time and transmitted so as to reach this headquarters by 0400 hours the following day.

d. You will be informed of any changes in these reporting requirements.

SCP 4.

From: DA WASH DC
To: CG XVIII AIRBORNE CORPS OXFORD MISS; CGUSCONARC FT MONROE VA
Info: CGUSARMYTHREE FT MCPHERSON GA; CGUSARMYTHREE (REAR) MEMPHIS TENN; COFS USAF; UNCL From DCSOPS.

1. You are directed to redeploy to home station, effective 101400Z Oct, the following units:

Hq XVIII Airborne Corps.
Hq 101st Airborne Division.
1st Battle Group, 327th Infantry.

1st Battle Group, 501st Infantry.
503d MP Battalion.
Hq 82d Airborne Division.
1st Battle Group, 187 Infantry.
82d Signal Battalion.
Appropriate support elements.

2. CG XVIII Airborne Corps will pass command of all operations under his command to the CG, 2d Infantry Division, Brig Gen Charles Billingslea, at a time agreed upon by the two commanders. This time will be reported to the DA. The CG, 2d Infantry Division, Brig Gen Charles Billingslea, will be directly under command of the Chief of Staff, United States Army, General Earle C. Wheeler. Continuous reliable telephone and teletype communications will be sustained between the DA and the command post of the CG, 2d Infantry Division. The CG, 2d Infantry Division will assure continuous, reliable, adequate communications between his command post and all operational elements immediately subordinate to his headquarters. This will include appropriate and adequate communications between the commander and his command post and/or his subordinate elements whenever he is absent from the command post. Adequate aviation support will be provided the CG, 2d Infantry Division.

From: DA WASH DC
To: CG XVIII AIRBORNE CORPS FT BRAGG NC
Info: CGUSCONARC FT MONROE GA; CGUSARMYTHREE FT MCPHERSON GA; COFS USAF; CNO, BRIG GEN CHARLES BILLINGSLEA, MEMPHIS NAS, TENN
Secret DA919750 From DCSOPS exclusive for Gen Howze. Sgd. Gen Parker.

1. (S) Upon your arrival in the objective area in Mississippi you will contact Brig Gen Charles Billingslea. At that time you are designated field commander of all U.S. Army Forces, except those assigned to Tent City, but including National Guard units of the State of Mississippi which have been called to action by the President, employed to enforce Federal authority. You will carry out the provision of EXECUTIVE ORDER No. 11053, dated 30 Sep 62, subject, PROVIDING ASSISTANCE FOR THE REMOVAL OF UNLAWFUL OBSTRUCTIONS OF JUSTICE IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

Whereas on September 30, 1962, I issued Proclamation No. 3497 reading in part as follows:

"Whereas the Governor of the State of Mississippi and certain law enforcement officers and other officials of that State, and other persons, individually and in unlawful assemblies, combinations and conspiracies, have been and are willfully opposing and obstructing the enforcement of orders entered by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit; and

"Whereas such unlawful assemblies, combinations and conspiracies oppose and obstruct the execution of the laws of the United States, impede the course of justice under those laws and make it impracticable to enforce those laws in the State of Mississippi by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings; and

"Whereas I have expressly called the attention of the Governor of Mississippi to the perilous situation that exists and to his duties in the premises, and have requested but have not received from him adequate assurances that the orders of the courts of the United States will be obeyed and that law and order will be maintained:

"Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including Chapter 15 of Title 10 of the United States Code, particularly sections 332, 333 and 334 thereof, do command all persons engaged in such obstructions of justice to cease and desist therefrom and to disperse and retire peaceably forthwith;" and

Whereas the commands contained in that proclamation have not been obeyed and obstruction of enforcement of those court orders still exist and threatens to continue;

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including Chapter 15 of Title 10, particularly Sections 332, 333 and 334 thereof, and Section 301 of Title 3 of the United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take all appropriate steps to enforce all orders of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and to remove all obstructions of justice in the State of Mississippi.

Section 2. In furtherance of the enforcement of the aforementioned orders of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to use such of the armed forces of the United States as he may deem necessary.

Section 3. I hereby authorize the Secretary of Defense to call into the active military service of the United States, as he may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this order, any or all of the units of the Army National Guard and of the Air National Guard of the State of Mississippi to serve in the active military service of the United States for an indefinite period and until relieved by appropriate orders. In carrying out the provisions of Section 1, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to use the units, and members thereof, ordered into the active military service of the United States pursuant to this section.

Section 4. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to delegate to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, or both, any of the authority conferred upon him by this order.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 1962.*

2. (S) In carrying out your duties, you will be directly responsible to the Chief of Staff, United States Army. You will establish your headquarters initially in the vicinity of Oxford, Mississippi. Direct liaison is authorized with USAF and US Navy agencies and with the local representatives of the United States Attorney in all matters connected with your duties as field commander.

3. (S) You will assume command of such Regular Army forces allocated for this operation upon their arrival in Mississippi. You will assume command of all National Guard forces which are ordered to active duty in connection with the execution of the President's Executive Order. In this respect, you will, on approval of the Dept. of the Army in each instance, order into the area(s) of operations only those units of the National Guard of the United States called into the service of the United States which you require for the performance of your mission. You will direct the remaining National Guard units to remain at their home areas, subject to your orders.

4. (S) In carrying out your assigned mission, you will use the minimum force necessary.

5. (S) Direct communication with the Department of the Army (DCSOPS) is authorized and directed. To facilitate this measure, the Chief Signal Officer will establish direct line telephone facilities between your field headquarters and the Office of the Director of Operations, ODCSOPS.

6. (S) Major General Creighton W. Abrams, Jr. is designated as the personal representative of the Chief of Staff for this operation. While not in the chain of command, he is authorized to issue orders in the name of the Chief of Staff.

7. (S) Necessary staff, logistics and administration support will be provided to you by CG, Third Army.

8. (S) You will insure that this headquarters is kept fully informed of the operation through the submission of reports as follows:

a. Telephonic spot reports every two hours on the odd-numbered hours.

b. Interim telephonic reports on major changes which warrant the immediate attention of this headquarters.

c. Written periodic reports covering each six-hour period, ending 1700 hours local time and transmitted so as to reach this headquarters by 0400 hours the following day.

d. You will be informed of any changes in these reporting requirements.

SCP 4.

From: DA WASH DC
To: CO USARMY FORCES OXFORD MISS
Info: CGUSCONARC FT MONROE VA; CG USARTHREE FT McPHERSON GA; COFS USAF WASH DC; CNO WASH DC; CONFIDENTIAL DA 920510 From DSCOPS. Ref: A.
DA 920432, 19 Oct 62; B. 2d Inf Div, Oxford Miss AJHGT-R-20-2-2; C. CO USARMY FORCES Oxford Miss RRGT-R-20-3-3; D. DA Msg 919745, 30 Sep 62; E. DA 919746, 30 Sep 62.

1. Refs A, B and C above pertain to the change of field commander of US Army forces in Oxford, Mississippi, special operation. Effective with the change of command 202030Z Oct 62, all the responsibilities and authority directed to General Billingslea by refs D and E are hereby transferred to Col Lucien F. Keller.

2. Comments and recommendations regarding guidance and policy contained in refs D and E will be addressed to DA. SCP 4.

From: DA WASH DC
To: CO US ARMY FORCES OXFORD MISS
Info: CGUSCONARC FT MONROE VA; CGUSARTHREE FT McPHERSON GA; UNCLAS DA320296 from DCSOPS. Reference: a. US ARMY FORCES OXFORD MISS RRGT S2-1-1 DTG 212210Z OCT 62; b. DA 919746 ATG 301322Z SEP 62.

Recommendation in Reference a is approved. This message constitutes authority to revise paragraph 4d(2) Reference b as requested in Reference a.

(This changes the priority of use of minimum force. Change attached.)

From: DA WASH DC
To: BRIG GEN CHARLES BILLINGSLEA, MEMPHIS NAVAL AIR STATION, TENN
Info: CCUSCONARC, FT MONROE VA; CCUSARMYTHREE FT MCPHERSON GA, COFS USAF CNO

Secret DA919746 from DCSOPS for Gen Billingslea. Ref DA 919745, the following additional instructions are provided:

1. (FOUO) The following fragmentary order is based on assumed Army missions resulting from expected Executive Orders. Although the mission and tasks may alter slightly, the general concept of the operation should remain firm.

2. (S) SITUATION:

a. (FOUO)) Mississippi State official(s) and police prevent the enrollment and attendance of Mr. Meredith at the University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi.

b. (S) SECRET.

3. (S) MISSION:

a. (S) SECRET.

b. (FOUO) DA takes all appropriate steps to enforce any orders of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi for removal of the obstruction of justice in the State of Mississippi with respect to matters relating to the enrollment and attendance of Mr. Meredith at the University of Mississippi located at Oxford, Mississippi.

4. (S) TASKS:

a. (FOUO) Concept of Operation: This operation will be a two-phase operation:

Phase I: (S) Secret.

(FOUO) Removal of all obstruction that interferes with the enrollment and attendance of Mr. Meredith at the University of Mississippi.

(FOUO) Phase II: Maintenance of law and order upon completion of Phase I. In this operation the Army will use minimum strength and force to accomplish its mission. This does not preclude the use of the entire Task Force Oxford, if necessary.

(FOUO) b. Task Force Oxford—General Billingslea, Commanding.

(FOUO) (1) Remove all obstruction interfering with enrollment and attendance of Mr. Meredith at the University of Mississippi.

(2) (S) SECRET.

(FOUO) (3) Be prepared for assignment of any National Guard units that may be called into the service of the United States. In this respect:

(FOUO) (a) If situation permits, have units perform duties at home station.

(FOUO) (b) Plan for the phasing-in of National Guard units and the eventual release of all Regular Army units from the Oxford, Mississippi area. Timing on this will be determined by the situation.

(FOUO) c. DA Agencies (omitted).

(FOUO) d. Coordinating Instructions:

(FOUO) (1) For the purpose of this operation, it is desired that minimum strength necessary be employed. If a squad can do the job, do not employ a platoon. Accordingly, to assure successful completion of the mission, reserve forces must be responsive to any degree of escalation requiring more troops.

(FOUO) (2) For the purpose of this operation, it is desired that minimum force necessary be applied. Normally, force will follow this priority; unarmed rifles (no bayonets); unarmed rifles (fixed bayonets with sheaths on); tear gas (ON); unarmed rifles (fixed bayonets, unsheathed); loaded rifles. Similar: priorities for carbines and pistols. A desire for minimum force must not jeopardize successful completion of mission.

(FOUO) (3) Whenever possible, Federal marshals should take action when civilian personnel (ring leaders, etc.) should be taken into custody. When it becomes necessary for Army personnel to take this action they will immediately seek a Federal marshal to take over such custody.

(FOUO) (4) The Army mission calls for removing the obstruction to justice. It does not require the physical or actual escort of Mr. Meredith; (S) Secret.

(FOUO) The Army provides only the assurance that no one will interfere with the Federal marshals carrying out the court orders. Federal marshals will do the actual apprehension and escorting; the Army clears the path. This policy will apply to any subsequent missions resulting from Executive Order(s), unless directed otherwise by DA.

(FOUO) (5) Riot Control Gas (CS) or (CH) may be used when its use is clearly required to accomplish the mission and lesser efforts would not suffice. Authority to use CS or CH is delegated to Brigadier General Billingslea, who is not authorized to further delegate this authority.

(FOUO) 5. (U) Administration and logistics:

(FOUO) DA furnishes PAG and CINFO support as previously announced.

(FOUO) 6. Command and signal:

(FOUO) a. Command: When Gen. Billingslea assumes command of Task Force in objective area, command lines are from Task Force to DA.

(FOUO) b. Signal: DA supports as previously announced.

SCP 4.

JOB015
Priority
DE RUEPJO 046
PR 212210Z
FM CO US Army Forces Oxford Miss
To Dept of the ARMY War Room Wash DC
Info CG USCONARC Ft Monroe Va
CG 101ST ABN CORPS FT Bragg NC
CG 101ST ABN Div and Ft Campbell KY
CG 2D INF DIV Ft Benning GA
DA GRNC
BT
In reply refer to RRGT S2-1-1
Application of force in Oxford area

1. (U) REFENENCES:

A. DA 919746 FROM DCSOPS FOR GEN BILLINGSLEA DTG 301322Z SEP 62 (NOTAL).

B. TELECON COL JUNG DA WAR ROOM/LT COL CONNELL, OXFORD,

2. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE INSTRUCTIONS IN PARAGRAPH 4D(2) OF REFERENCE A. BE REVISED AS FOLLOWS:

"FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS OPERATION, IT IS DESIRED THAT

Page two REEPJO 046

Minimum force necessary be applied. NORMALLY APPLICATION OF FORCE WILL FOLLOW THIS PRIORITY:

First: Unloaded rifles with bayonet fixed with scabbard on bayonet.

Second: Unloaded rifles with bare bayonets fixed.

Third: Tear gas (CN).

Fourth: Loaded rifles with bare bayonets fixed."

3. Experience in the Oxford area during the period 30 Sep 1 Oct clearly demonstrated that the unloaded rifle without bayonet did not provide an adequate means to insure the first application of force necessary for crowd or riot control.

SCP 4
BT
21/2235Z

From: DA WASH DC
To: CG FT BENNING GA
Info: COUSCONARC FT MONROE VA; CGUSARTHREE FT MCPHERSON GA; CGUSAOX OXFORD MISS
From: OCSOPS for COLONEL WARREN HODGES. Reference DA 920510 and DA 320206.

1. You are designated to replace Colonel Lucien Keller as field commander of all U.S. Army Forces in Oxford, Mississippi (USAOX).

2. References above pertain to responsibilities and authority assigned to Colonel Keller as COUSROX. Colonel Keller will pass command of all operations under his command to Colonel Hodges at a time agreed upon by Colonel Keller and the Chief of Staff, General Wheeler. When this passing of command takes place, the responsibilities and authority stated in referenced messages will be transferred to Colonel Hodges. Portions of these references that appear to be past history remain as guidance for any subsequent event similar in nature. SCP 4.

Mr. Chairman, we have had further troubles in our fine State, and it is certainly believed, and there is much evidence to support the fact, that this agitation and disturbance has been for the purpose of reaping certain benefits in other sections of the United States. In my judgment, as I have said many times, once any government takes into its hands the absolute control, uses all services and all money and, as Secretary McNamara says, spends $5 million, certainly they never stop short of going the whole hog, and I hope we can, when this item is reached in the reading of the bill, delete these funds from this measure.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. General Walker was arrested by the Federal Government when he put in an appearance in Oxford, Miss. I am not in a position to say whether he should or should not have been there, but he was arrested. Does it not seem to the gentleman that it is strange no arrests have been made since by the Federal Government of anyone coming into the State of Mississippi for the purpose of creating a disturbance? Is it not strange that no one else has been arrested on the same basis as General Walker was arrested?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that professional agitators, people who admittedly went there to create trouble, who have said they meant to stay in Greenwood, Miss., until the Federal Government sent troops, have not only gone without Federal arrest but have had the help of U.S. attorneys. They were and are on the opposite side from that which General Walker was charged with taking. These people, trying to incite local people to riot have gone free of arrest by the Federal Government. It appears there are two rules—not only in Mississippi but here in Washington. While I know others disagree, I am convinced that sending troops to Oxford, prior to final court decision by the Supreme Court, was beyond the authority of any Attorney General or President.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot help but wonder whether there are two standards of justice and law enforcement on the part of the Department of Justice.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, ours is a small State. To lose its vote by reason of supporting present agitators who are doing their best to force the Federal Government to send more troops there, would not hurt any national campaign too much, if thereby appeals could be made to the large minority votes of other States.

Truly we must be proud of the officials of Greenwood, Miss., and of Leflore County who have withstood these efforts to create riots and every other thing which would give excuse for a second movement of troops into Mississippi.

These officials sincerely feel that the Federal Government has made real efforts to support those who would incite to riot the people in the area.

The mayor has pointed out that the initial cause of the trouble at Greenwood has never been listed, beginning with the night of February 27 when a car occupied by five Negroes reportedly tried to run down some white youths who were walking alongside a highway.

Arrests were made and charges of felonious assault were lodged against the Negroes involved. They are now free on bond awaiting the action of the Grand Jury. This episode has either not been mentioned, or has been watered down in news reports.

The city cites events beginning with activist Negro Samuel Block's report that on different occasions he had been shot at, beaten, and had his Greenwood office set afire by white persons. The statement said each of the incidents had been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and that in each case no evidence was found that indicated Block's reports to the Justice Department were true.

In the case of Block's reported beating, immediately thereafter Block was engaged in his usual activities, and was observed by many persons to have no sign of injuries.

Full investigation proved his charges to be wholly untrue, but the false picture created by the giving of nationwide publicity to Block's statement has never been corrected. The FBI investigated the matter, and it is our belief that the Department of Justice has full knowledge that Block's accusations were not true.

On the night of March 26, when an unidentified person shot into the house of a Negro here, the mayor said:

> It was known to everyone here, including representatives of the Justice Department, that the Negro organizations presently in Greenwood were deliberately framing criminal charges against white people for crimes against Negroes.

Through good fortune or advanced planning, no one was hurt in the shooting.

On the subject of the city's dispersal of groups of Negroes marching on the Leflore County Courthouse with the use of one police dog, city officials said:

> This action is not designed to prevent or impede voter registration. Little effort has been made to explain to the American public that there is no plausible reason for the marches.
>
> In fact, the groups dispersed are advised by the police that they can proceed to the courthouse in an orderly fashion if they desire to do so.
>
> It is difficult for us to comprehend why the Justice Department should dictate to us what should or should not be done to preserve safety on the streets of Greenwood when it is common knowledge that they either cannot provide or do not provide protection for the people using the public streets of Washington, the headquarters of the Justice Department itself.
>
> As yet no one has been seriously hurt in Greenwood. We have never had race riots in Greenwood and we want none now.
>
> If a crime occurs in a community, it does not follow that the community is peopled by criminals. We make no claim to perfection, but we join with most civilized people in being unalterably opposed to violence.

Mr. Chairman, who would have believed this could have happened in the United States? The use of Federal might may suit some people in this instance, for they may believe the end justifies the means. But they are wrong. Power once used will continue to be used—and I would point out here, for the executive department through the Department of Justice, to intervene in private suits in the courts, obtain the decree sought from the Court, and then use the military to enforce the decree, can only mean the executive and the judiciary are working hand in hand, and the balance of power—legislative, judiciary, and executive has gone by the boards.

Remember, no other democracy ever survived under such use of power. Thus are dictatorships made.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, a short while ago the gentleman from Ohio, after quoting indisputable authority, suggested that we should get our think factory working in regard to this bill. Now, this Member will confess that as he enters his third term in this body he almost gets to believing that he thinks better than he did when he came, probably because he finds himself agreeing with certain esteemed colleagues. Then all of a sudden he realizes that he really is not thinking better at all, but that he just has a little higher regard for a poor opinion. Some of the Members perhaps remember the old Earthworm Tractor stories that used to run in the Saturday Evening Post. I suggest that there is some comedy of errors going on in the public debt acceleration program which makes the hero of the Earthworm Tractor stories, Mr. Elmer Botts, look considerably like Ralph Waldo Emerson.

I know about one program, and I want to relate a few facts concerning it.

The gentleman from Oklahoma stated a moment ago that there are two primary criteria for this public works acceleration program. First, that it must meet a need in the community and, second, it must make jobs.

Mr. Chairman, no doubt these are fine criteria. But I would ask, Mr. Chairman, to prove Robert Burns' old observation that "the best-laid schemes o' mice an' men Gang aft agley."

In the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa there are two counties which are labeled depressed areas. They did not ask for this designation. One of these counties we shall refer to hereafter as county A. It asked for $379,000 to perfect a waterworks extension. It is labeled "APW-41." The reason this extension was needed was the fact that there was an industry moving into the community which would employ 1,100 people. That is making jobs, you see. Everything was "go" on this project. All of the engineering was completed. It was ready, and it could have an accelerated public works designation. The industry, incidentally, was not attracted by ARA or APW. So, these people made application and, as I say, it was the first one presented in the region. The regional office said of this project, "These papers are finest we have seen. This is a wonderful project. This is it. This is a good one. We will see that it goes through immediately."

So, it came to Washington, and after a time I called some of the people downtown in the Department. I said, "How are we moving on APW-41 for county A in Iowa?" They said, "We have to turn this project down because under our fair distribution formula"—a formula, incidentally, which the regional office did not know existed at that time—"under our fair distribution formula we cannot approve a program for more than $200,000."

Mr. Chairman, being someone who wanted to get some of the goodies for his own district, I said, "Why can we not reduce the amount of the request to $200,000 and let the home folks supply the rest?" They said they would check this, which I assume they did, in a period of about a week. The answer came back, "No; we cannot do this."

Incidentally, in spite of the fact they cannot approve project 1 because it was over $200,000, this same county submitted a request for another program to the regional office and was advised to take it home and make it bigger because it was not big enough. It answered the local purpose, but this one was not big enough.

On March 15 our office received a list of approved public works projects, as your offices did, and included here was the project for county A listed as Grade and Base Coarse, and note the amount—$385,000.

Mr. Chairman, we did not get our waterworks to the factory which was going to employ 1,100 people, but somewhere there was this program which had been approved to grade and put on a base coarse costing not $200,000, but $385,000.

Well, I immediately called the Department.

Mr. Chairman, to my amazement, or I guess I really was not amazed, nobody in the Department knew where this project was or what it was or whether it had been approved. But after about 10 days they found it, not in ARA, not in Accelerated Public Works, not through any request anyone had made from the district, but in the Bureau of Public Roads. Somebody said this has to satisfy a local need, people have to ask for it. These people at home in the county office, in the city office, the OEPD people, nobody knew anything about it. But here it was on the books.

Mr. Chairman, to make this long story short, we finally found that this project is to grade and improve 4.9 miles of road leading to an Iowa State Park. But the road is not even located in county A, or any other depressed county. It is in a county that has never received such a designation.

Mr. Chairman, the industrial plant is being built without the benefit of this money. I suppose this means that the county will no longer have a depressed status, and I might suggest that there are some who will not be greatly disappointed.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to a lot of the debate on the floor this afternoon, I would say that it is quite obvious that there are many Members here who are concerned directly with unemployment, but it is very obvious that the unemployment which concerns them most is their own.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am taking the time of the Committee this afternoon because there are two items in this bill that disturb me.

The first is the subject of civil defense. This afternoon the Committee heard the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, the chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Government Operations

Committee, a subcommittee on which I have the privilege to serve, a gentleman who knows whereof he speaks, urge that we give greater attention to civil defense. This program is also supported by the very distinguished Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara.

What I am saying is that this program is one that is supported by people who know whereof they speak.

I remember at the height of the Cuban crisis last October people coming to me, not in panic but asking for advice, saying, "What do I do—where do I go—in the event of an attack?" I think at that time we learned in a time of crisis when we had to take action we could not take any drastic action for fear of developing a panic in our people. Now the crisis is over and we do not act.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. There are many in this body who share the concern the gentleman has expressed about this civil defense item and who are very hopeful that the Committee on Appropriations will take a long further look at it when additional evidence has been presented on the impact of this cut on the program now underway.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think the gentleman would be interested to know that the military operations subcommittee in a report issued last summer said:

> If a crisis should occur that threatens imminent attack, the people of this country will inquire in a single and loud voice what the Government has done to protect them. A wise administration—and a wise Congress—will not be caught unprepared.

I hope we have that wisdom.

The second point that disturbs me here is, of course, the cut—no, not the cut, the abolition of the accelerated public works program. I come from a depressed area. Unemployment in the city of Pittsburgh is over 11 percent. We have been working hard to rebuild our city to make it a lovely place, to give ourselves a new economic base for the future. We have been working, but we cannot do it all by ourselves because we are in a depressed area. Under this program we have been able to achieve new water facilities and sewage facilities, and street improvements, all of which are essential if we are to build a new economic base for future growth and future contribution to our country.

We were able to acquire a new library addition, a new public safety facility. All of these are essential for a healthy economy in a community. Not only did this program provide a base for our economic development in the future, but it also provided the economic support in immediate man-months of work to tide some of our unemployed over the period when our economy will be working out.

In Pittsburgh alone the programs approved amount to over 2,300 man-months of work. The total in Allegheny County is over 4,800 man-months of work. In addition to these programs which will result in employment, we managed to build a new hospital and make additions to existing hospitals to provide for the needs of our people.

With the exception of the tax bill, I believe there is no program which will face the Congress this year, that is more important to cure unemployment. I urge my colleagues to vote to replace the money cut from the accelerated public works program.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to support the action of the full House Committee on Appropriations in reducing the funds for the accelerated public works program by $500 million from the request made by the President.

Last year, when the accelerated public works program passed the House of Representatives, it is true that there was an authorization for $900 million in this particular area. But, only 2 weeks ago we heard here on the floor of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from the other side of the aisle say "Well, now there is no need to worry about this authorization for military procurement in the amount of $15,890 million because, after all, this is just an authorization bill and the Committee on Appropriations will have an opportunity to work its will later on on this program when the appropriations request is before the Committee on Appropriations and also later when it comes to the floor of the Congress." The story then was—not to worry about this increased authorization because an authorization, after all, is just an authorization and the Committee on Appropriations must work its will on this program.

When this particular request came before the Committee on Appropriations last year, the committee did not appropriate for fiscal year 1963 $900 million authorized for this program or the $500 million requested by the President. The Committee on Appropriations appropriated only $400 million. No commitment has been made to any community in the United States that an additional $500 million will be funded in this total authorization for 1963. Let me further state that in the bill and in the amendment proposed by the administration, the $500 million was not made available for fiscal year 1963. This appropriation was requested for obligation through fiscal year 1964. Mr. Chairman, the language which was inserted in that bill by the Bureau of the Budget, I am sure was subject to a point of order here on the floor of the House of Representatives because you cannot insert in a deficiency appropriation bill a provision authorizing the obligation of these funds through fiscal year 1964. This has to be considered under the regular appropriation procedure and in the regular funding bill for fiscal 1964.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an easy vote for the Members of the Congress to make. Many Members of the Congress feel that the manner in which they are judged here in the Congress is by how much Federal money they bring back to their particular congressional districts. I have areas in my congressional district which qualify under the accelerated public works program. It may not be an easy vote for any Member of the Congress to make, but if we are going to be serious about reducing the funds in the new obligational authority budget of the President, and the new obligational authority budget of the President is for $108 billion—if we are going to be serious in making reductions in this budget, we must be willing to face up to tough votes.

We must be willing to face up to question of what are the responsibilities of the Federal Government, what are the responsibilities of the State government, and what are the responsibilities of the local government in this year 1963 and as we face fiscal year 1964.

The President of the United States has told us, and leading economists throughout the country have said, that if we are going to get this economy moving again the No. 1 priority which we as a Congress face is a tax reduction in this year 1963. The position of some of us on both sides of the aisle, of the minority party as well as of the majority party, has been: "Yes, a tax cut; but before we can have this tax cut it is necessary for us to make substantial reductions in Federal expenditures and substantial reductions in the President's new 1964 obligational authority budget of $108 billion."

It seems to me that this is the time, this is the test, this is the most important test we have had in this session of Congress. Are we willing to stand up here and agree with the President of the United States that the No. 1 priority as far as our economy is concerned is to try to stimulate the private sector of our economy through tax reduction at the corporate and individual level? And if you believe in tax cuts at the corporate and individual level it is necessary for us to do something about the $12.8 billion deficit which is anticipated under this particular budget for fiscal year 1964. It is necessary for us to do something about this budget of our President.

We cannot stimulate our economy, we cannot get our country moving again by going in two directions at the same time. Increasing spending and making tax cuts at the same time just does not make sense.

Let us see if we can get our country moving again by the use of this particular Federal spending program.

As of February 15 the total Federal obligations under this program were $244 million. The number of projects approved under the accelerated public works program were 2,060. The man-years of employment that were provided by these 2,060 projects that had been approved was a total of 29,921 individuals put to work. Thus in spending almost one-fourth billion dollars on this program we were only able to employ seven-tenths of 1 percent of the unemployed. These are very unsatisfactory figures. The total Federal cost per man-year of employment under this program was $8,150.

On the basis of program experience through February 15 reflected in the foregoing figures, it would require a Federal expenditure of $32,620 million under this program to put 4 million people to work.

The total cost of this program including local contributions for each job that has been provided has been estimated at $10,225 for every job created under this particular program.

All we need do is look at the testimony before the Joint Economic Committee where the leading economists of this country told us that we could secure more job opportunities, we could go in the direction of getting this economy of ours moving again if we are willing to reduce Federal spending and taxation. If we are going forward with spending programs at an ever-increasing rate, getting into the area of local and State responsibility, we cannot pursue a course of Federal tax reduction in the next fiscal year. It may be good politics to "ride both these horses" at the same time but it is very poor economics.

All of you who believe that it is time to get our economy going, that we can do it through the private sector instead of Government handouts from Washington, D.C., must face up and vote for economy in our first big test tomorrow. We should vote for this reduction of $500 million in the President's new obligational budget. We can make reductions, we can have tax cuts, but only if the Congress exercises its responsibility under our Constitution of controlling the pursestrings and the runaway spending represented in $108 billion new obligational authority of the executive branch. We must not pass on to our children and grandchildren these ever-increasing Federal deficits. This is a real opportunity that we have tomorrow, and I hope that the House of Representatives will sustain the action of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to go back to an item in this bill which was previously referred to by my good friend and colleague from California [Mr. Holifield]. It has to do with the stocking of the shelters under the civil defense program.

Some of you will remember that at the time of the Cuban crisis there was a wave, particularly in those areas where there are important military installations, either direct or indirect, of fear that manifested itself in many ways among the general population. In my area, for instance, through an unfortunate remark, a great many people swept the shelves of the food markets in the belief there would be a shortage of food and an inability, therefore, to survive if an attack came about. But above all else, people kept pushing on the phone asking where should they go. When they were told where they should go if they lived in an area marked for public shelter, they were then informed that many of these shelters were not stocked with food or medical supplies or water containers or the sanitation kit. These would make them livable for a number of days. If so, perhaps they might be able to survive and to save their lives.

I want to make it very clear this program is in no way an answer to an atomic attack. It means if the attack happens to be a sufficient distance away that your chance of survival is increased. At the present time, at least, we have shelters identified for 104 million American people. We believe we can have 70 million more places by September 1963. But of these 104 million people, there are only 42 million of them that we are able now or have on order enough supplies to assure them that their shelters will be stocked. The request that was made in this budget was to at least give us an amount of $61.9 million to keep the program going, and to supply the necessary needs of another 23 million Americans.

That was taken out of the bill, in the good judgment of the committee, because the committee felt perhaps a little more time would reveal additional information. But nothing is going to reveal more information on this program until, and God forbid, there should be an actual attack. On the other hand, if this money is not forthcoming, it means there will be 5, 6, or 7 months' delay in not only providing for these 23 million, but loss in the faith that our communities have that the Federal Government really means to go through with this shelter program.

Mr. Chairman, while I understand the pleas for economy that are being heard on many sides, when it comes to a case of national defense and, above all, giving a man, woman, or child a chance to survive a horrible war that might face us in the future. This is indeed the kind of economy I do not think any Member of this Congress, if he really understands the facts, wants to undertake.

When you think of the billions of dollars that we spend in national defense, perhaps we underrate the fact our opposition would like to be sure that our population would panic before an attack. Without panic maybe they would not be so ready to attack. This kind of defense we provide in part by the $61 million requested to finish marking and stocking public defense shelters.

I certainly hope, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, that a way can be found to put this item back into the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I note from the committee report on the shelter supplemental request that it states that we should not approve more funds until more experience is obtained with this program.

I would like to ask: How much more experience do we need?

The national shelter program started in 1961. Hundreds of professional architects and engineers were trained in the special techniques of analyzing buildings for radiation protection. They surveyed the Nation and located 104 million shelter spaces in existing structures. Department of Defense field estimates are that 70 million of these spaces can be made available in a year if there are sufficient supplies for them.

We have already invested $111 million for supplies for nearly 47 million shelter spaces, about two-thirds of the 70 million spaces the Defense Department estimates can be made available for public use. The supplemental request is to keep the pipeline flowing so that we can complete the final third of the project and provision shelter spaces for 70 million persons.

The Defense Department has set up an intricate logistical system of procurement and transportation schedules affecting more than 3,600 business establishments to produce and deliver the emergency shelter supplies to local communities. Some 5,000 county and municipal governments are, or soon will be, engaged in a job of installing and managing the supplies. Special training courses have been underway for months to prepare local officials for making the best use of public shelters in a nuclear emergency.

I ask again, How much more experience do we need? You do not gain experience in any venture by standing still. It seems to me that we have more than enough experience with this national shelter program to justify continued movement ahead. This is no time to stop.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to respond to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] with respect to his fishpond. I do not see him on the floor at the present time, so I will defer that until tomorrow, and hope I can find time then to reply to him on that issue.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Langen, for the comments he made concerning this bill wherein he said there are entirely too many new programs being financed in a deficiency appropriation bill. I am surprised the committee would bring in a bill providing money for so many new programs. This should be left to the regular appropriations procedure.

I should like to question the chairman of the subcommittee concerning the item to be found on page 8 of the report in connection with the Small Business Administration. Why did you defer that appropriation? Preliminarily to the gentleman answering the question, I would point out to him that Congress passed—I did not vote for it, but passed the free trade bill known as the Trade Expansion Act, which is bound to do injury to business in this country, yet this bill provides no money to take care of the damages. Why?

Mr. THOMAS. That is a good question, and we will give you the best answer we can. We are not against the Trade Act. The reason we deferred it to the regular committee was, there was not one single request for funds from small business.

Mr. GROSS. Well, does not the gentleman agree that there is going to be damage; there is going to be injury, to business in this country from the Trade Expansion Act?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct. We anticipate that. Of course, this bill is only good to June 30, and in view of the fact there was not one requst made for money, we decided to pass it over to the regular bill. We are not against it at all. We are for it.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to question the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] concerning the appropriations for international organizations and conferences and contributions to international organizations. Can the gentleman tell me how much was appropriated to the State Department in the regular appropriation bill last year for these purposes?

Mr. ROONEY. Which item is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about contributions to international organizations, missions to international organizations, and international conferences and contingencies.

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, I imagine the contributions to international organizations are in the vicinity of $60 to $65 million.

Mr. GROSS. And that was not enough to cover the expenses of those who junket all over the world; is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman would kindly rephrase his question.

Mr. GROSS. And $60 to $65 million was not enough to take care of the expenses of those who traveled all over the world in 1 year?

I would call your attention to this language on page 634 of the hearings:

> U.S. participation in international conferences during fiscal year 1962 increased markedly to 474 conferences as compared with 381 during fiscal year 1961. With emphasis on a more positive and aggressive foreign policy, as exemplified by a number of major programs recently initiated or supported by the United States; namely, (1) the Alliance for Progress; (2) the United Nations decade of development; (3) the peaceful uses of outer space; (4) the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and (5) the trade expansion program.

And so forth. Is this where the money is going, and how much more? How many more conferences are going to be held? There were 474 last year as compared with 381 international conferences the year before.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, I am sure the gentleman understands that this is a supplemental bill. It covers only the period until this coming June 30.

There were a considerable number of requests. I believe there is language in the report which indicates that the committee has approved funds with regard to only two of these requests. We say that "the committee recommends an appropriation of $315,000 for International Conferences and Contingencies, a reduction of $440,000 in the budget estimate."

That is a pretty good reduction. This would provide $250,000 for expenses incident to organizing and holding a World Food Congress in the United States, and $65,000 for the International Secretariat on Middle Level Manpower, to wit, the Secretariat of the International Peace Corps.

Mr. GROSS. While I still do not have an answer as to why they cannot live within their regular budget in the matter of international conferences, it leads me to another question——

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to point out that these are two items that justifiably, as they say, were not foreseen at the time of the regular bill a year ago.

Mr. GROSS. Well, of course, the Peace Corps did not publicize what they were up to when they staged a conference in the plush Rockefeller Hotel in Puerto Rico last October. They did not let anyone in on that secret.

Mr. ROONEY. They tell me that that is a pretty nice hotel.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; so I have heard. It is at the rate of $56 a day per person during the winter season.

Mr. ROONEY. I understand they had special reduced rates.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, about $26 a day, which is still pretty fancy living for members of an organization that is supposed to be down to earth and operating at the common man's level.

Mr. ROONEY. This was a meeting of a group of representatives of many nations who were there for the purpose of creating an International Peace Corps so as to take some of the load off the backs of the American taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman knows that that seldom is the case. I have heard that for 14 years; how foreign governments are going to get off our backs. It just never happens that way.

Mr. ROONEY. I believe it is the case here, and if my memory serves me right, we had some testimony in this respect which indicated the number of nations interested in having their own Peace Corps to go into underdeveloped nations. The amount of money that this has saved to date, I do not know. I believe it is in the printed hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Can my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] help me with the title of this organization?

Mr. ROONEY. I am trying to help the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. What is the meaning of "middle level manpower"? Can the gentleman help me out with this?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman knows that I am always very frank. I must say I do not know myself. I do know that it is a nice name for a meeting that concerned the subjects referred to—I am probably showing my ignorance here, and I should know better, and I hope no one will hold this against me—but the fact is that I just do not know. However, it does have to do with forming an International Peace Corps.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder how high or how low "middle level" is?

Mr. ROONEY. I think it would be in the middle.

Mr. GROSS. Is R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, one of the middle level or is he above or below? Where does he fit?

Mr. ROONEY. He is at a fine level, let me say.

Mr. GROSS. That still does not tell me the meaning of "middle level manpower." But what this would do, as I understand it, is establish an International Secretariat for the Peace Corps. That is about correct, is it not?

Mr. ROONEY. That is so.

Mr. GROSS. This $65,000, in other words, would put them in business officially. They are already in business unofficially by dipping into a contingency fund of some kind. They already have their hands in the till for $150,000, as I understand it, but this would put the stamp of approval on it as far as Congress is concerned from the money standpoint.

Mr. ROONEY. This is a nonrecurring item. The gentleman knows we cut this item from $80,000 to $65,000.

Mr. GROSS. There is no legislative authority for the Secretariat of the International Peace Corps, is there?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, I believe there is.

Mr. GROSS. Where would that be found?

Mr. ROONEY. It is right here in the hearings. I was previously under the same impression as the gentleman. I asked this same question during the hearings, and now I understand my impression was not the proper one.

Mr. GROSS. I do not question their authority to get $150,000 out of some fund because Congress has delegated unconscionable authority to the President to spend millions in any way he chooses, but I question the legislative authority to create the organization.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman will find in the printed hearings beginning at the top of page 646 the authority for making this appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], who is chairman of one of the Committee on Public Works subcommittees and very knowledgeable in these affairs.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, may I make reference to some statements made earlier—I thought very unfairly—blanketing the whole program as a boondoggle, and making very casual and careless reference to swimming pools, golf courses, and ski slides, and intimating, without saying, that these items characterize the entire program.

There may be a few such projects. But the record of performance and accomplishments of the first $400 million of this accelerated public works program is a good and sound one. Let us look at the summary figures of the total of $400 million authorized last October.

There is the largest amount of $76 million, which is 25 percent of the total, that went for water and sewer works in 451 projects. The next three items are first, water pollution plants, $44 million, distributed over 300 projects, making 15 percent of the total; second, $41 million for hospitals and health facilities, accounting for another 15 percent; and third, badly needed streets and roads, for 15 percent more. The categories I have just cited account for 72 percent of the accelerated public works funds.

Twenty-eight percent of the money went for direct Federal projects, and very properly so, because they were geared so that in 1 month practically all the money assigned to them could be committed and thus provide justifiable employment quickly. We have to remember that most municipal projects took time for planning, engineering, and making out the applications, time that ran to 2 or 3 months before they could get underway with construction.

In the meantime the coldest winter in the last third of a century blanketed almost half the northern United States. I believe you know that, whether you are from the North, the Northeast, the Northwest, the central part of the country, or even down in the South.

When someone calls this a boondoggle, I think of my hometown right in the heart of the iron range, the Mesabi iron ore country, that produced the iron to win World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. Twenty-six percent of the able-bodied workers, the miners, mostly family men, in my hometown were unemployed last winter.

I visited their homes. Most of these men are veterans. Most of them have had combat experience. They were 20, 22, and 24 years old when they were in combat. Now they are 40, 42, and 44 and 45 years of age. I went into their homes. I recall a child that I had seen 3 years ago who was in the fourth grade. Now he is in the seventh grade. He is wearing the same old mackinaw with the sleeves up at his elbows, torn and ragged.

I think it is an insult to these fine Americans who are in distress to imply they want to boondoggle. They are trapped in these hard core unemployment areas all over the country, whether the economic distress is due to technology or to depletion of resources such as iron ore in my case, or timber, or agricultural submarginal lands. They are trapped.

They cannot sell their homes, they cannot rent them, they cannot give them away. There is nowhere for them to go. And, yet, there are those who today would call this kind of program to help such people a boondoggling program.

In considering the problems of the country, we need to give the highest priority to the labor market and to this national problem of unemployment. We are not going to save any money. We will, however, pay a heavy price in human values if we do not do something soon. Unemployment is not going to disappear by itself. Either we give men productive and vital work, in which they contribute to their country by building sorely needed public facilities, or we pay them for not working, by doling out unemployment compensation, putting them on relief, or signing them up for the food stamp plan.

It is the relief measures that are the most expensive items. For unemployment compensation benefits alone from 1960 to 1962—the last 3 years—this country paid out $10.5 billion. Under the accelerated public works program we are proposing to use less than one-tenth of that sum to give work to our jobless men.

Our relief measures are beginning to show the wear and tear of long-term unemployment. I would like to quote an excellent article written in the Washington Post of Sunday, April 7, 1963:

> The Nation's unemployment compensation program is in trouble.
>
> Reserve funds for jobless benefits have fallen to dangerous levels in nearly half the States.
>
> All this comes at a time when employers are paying substantially less in unemployment taxes in relation to total wages than they were at the program's inception in 1939. And it comes at a time when high unemployment is making added demands on the system.
>
> Pennsylvania, which not only has one of the highest unemployment rates in the Nation but also has the second highest average payroll tax, is the worst off. Its solvency rating is only .34.
>
> And whereas it paid out $253 million in jobless benefits last year, it had only $149 million in reserve on December 31. And a large part of this represented a loan from the Federal-State emergency loan fund.
>
> (By contrast, the 7.67 solvency rating of the District of Columbia tops that of all 50 States.)
>
> Ohio is only a bit better off than Pennsylvania. It disbursed $175 million last year but had only $124 million in reserve at year's end.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from New York, Mr. CHARLES BUCKLEY, has commented earlier today on the need for the accelerated public works program, citing the editorial from the New York Times for Tuesday, April 9, 1963. I, too, would like to quote from this perceptive editorial:

> Rejection of a $450 million public works bill has been hailed as a victory for the "economizers" of the House Appropriations Committee.
>
> It is the worst sort of economizing, however, to eliminate prospective jobs for perhaps half a million unemployed in depressed areas across the country. Furthermore, failure to restore the funds will encourage hasty ax-wielding on other programs to create jobs and better utilize the Nation's resources.
>
> There may be many areas where reducing the amount of Government spending would be constructive—in the race to put a man on the moon, for example. But the accelerated public works program is not one of them. To provide jobs for the unemployed is not the equivalent of giving them a handout. To create better hospitals, streets, and other public facilities is not throwing money away.

In short, Mr. Chairman, we have here a most prudent use of limited funds.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the unemployment problem is an ever-worsening crisis. We have the evidence and the legacy of the three great Eisenhower recessions—a definite pattern in which it has taken us longer to recover from the successive recessions, each of which have left us with a higher total of unemployment than before. I predict that if we continue to neglect and defer this problem, we will encounter ever-increasing difficulties. We will subject ourselves to unnecessary frustrations and heartaches. Through a shortsighted failure to utilize effectively our manpower, we will inevitably slow down economic growth. We will see the day when it will be a good deal more difficult to put able-bodied men on jobs than it will be to put men on the moon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 1 hour and 32 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio has consumed 1 hour and 34 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is my understanding correct that at 5 o'clock the Committee will rise?

The CHAIRMAN. General debate concludes at that time under the previous order of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to be emotional. In fact, I am going to try not to be. But, I would like to recall to the Members of this House that we are dealing today not with numbers and not with figures. We are dealing with the destiny of human beings.

This is the first test that we in the 88th Congress have had as to whether or not we are willing to face up to our responsibility and do something for these people. We have more to do in the spring of 1963 than fight the crabgrass. We have to fight the indifference that consigns people to the economic scrap heap.

While we hear talk of States' rights and local rights, meanwhile unemployed human beings are left to fend for themselves and lose their dignity and self-respect as a result of their inability to provide for themselves and their families.

We have heard talk about boondoggles and leaf-raking programs. Of course, the fact is indisputable that in every one of these projects, local communities, Republican communities and Democratic communities alike, have to put up matching funds. In most of these cases, the people in these hard-pressed communities, in distressed areas, if you please, are willing to say we will match the U.S. contribution dollar for dollar despite the fact that locally we are in deep economic trouble. This is not a boondoggle. This is decency and industry and caring about the towns we live in and the people who live in these towns.

In concluding I would like to quote something that my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] said, I think it was last year, on this same subject here on the floor. He said that many here in Congress when they talk with the unemployed are like an Elvis Presley record. Before election they say, "I wants you, I loves you, I needs you;" but after election they turn the record over and it says: "See you later, Alligator."

Those people want us to see them now; they want us to match our talk with action, and the time to do it is here and now. For that reason I urge support of the amendment that will be offered subsequently to put back into this appropriation bill money for humanity, money for the American people to go forward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the committee has cut 39.8 percent from the 1,641,507 requested.

However, I have reserved on certain items.

When we refer to supplemental appropriations, it seems to me that we should be providing funds for programs now in existence, rather than begin to fund new programs.

In my opinion, all new programs should be reviewed in depth by the regular subcommittees of the appropriations committee.

If you read the record of the supplemental hearings, you will find that there is little justification for the new starts on many new projects. Bear in mind that there will be only about 2 months between the time this bill becomes law and the end of the fiscal year for which we are not appropriating. You must conclude either that these funds for new projects cannot be used in fiscal 1963, or we are inviting reckless spending with inadequate justification to obligate by the end of the fiscal year.

New starts should be considered on a priority basis and should be considered in competition with the other demands in the regular appropriation bills, always having in mind the overriding considerations of our financial situation.

May I outline some of the new starts in the bill before you.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of Trade Adjustment: On page 2 of the report, the committee allows $25,000 for administrative expenses. New items for this program were deleted elsewhere in the bill.

Civilian industrial technology: The committee allows $500,000 for this new program, a reduction of $750,000 from the budget estimate. Where is the urgency in starting this program under a supplemental appropriation? Is this the time or the place to lay the foundation for a highly controversial program which may grow into another gigantic Government research effort?

The very industries that are supposed to be helped by this new proposal are strongly opposed to it, with one or two exceptions.

First. None of the 110 national trade and professional associations in the construction industry were consulted by the Department of Commerce before formulation of its proposed program. The program proposal therefore presents a dangerously one-dimensional view of the building industry and its present needs and capabilities.

Second. The proposed program as presented in the budget request is indefinite, unclear and contradicts statements on the aims and purposes of the building research and development program as enunciated by Department of Commerce spokesmen.

Third. The proposed program threatens to tamper with the delicate free enterprise mechanism of America's largest domestic fabrication industry.

Fourth. The program, if set in motion, would compete with private industry research efforts.

Fifth. The proposed new program should be evaluated by appropriate committees of the Congress such as the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the House and by the Commerce Committee in the Senate and should not be initiated by the highly unusual procedure of a deficiency appropriations request. This is an attempt to prevent debate on the merits of the proposal during the regular appropriations process.

Sixth. The construction industry and its 110 national associations are presently evaluating the proposed Department of Commerce program to determine whether there is a proper role for the Federal Government in building research and development. Until the associations in the $80 billion construction industry have had an opportunity to meet and discuss the proposed subsidy program for building research, the program proposed should be rejected.

Aside from the textile industry and one or two letters we have received from manufacturers of chinaware, I do not know of any private industry that seeks to have the Government intrude into this field. They are opposed to it. Yet we propose here to launch the program on the basis of the very limited testimony that it was possible to receive in the course of hearings on this huge supplemental appropriation bill.

Transportation research is the next item: $625,000 is allowed for this new start. The Department asked **$1,250,000.** How can they possibly use these funds in the 2 months or less that will be left in the fiscal year?

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education: $345,000 is recommended of the $600,000 requested for the new program of films for the deaf.

Public Health Service: $5,430,000 is in the bill for mass inoculation, a reduction from $12,600,000 requested. Also, the bill includes $500,000 of the $1,500,000 requested for the new programs in behalf of migratory workers.

Children's Bureau: $3,500,000 is authorized for the start of the new program for day care centers, a reduction of only $150,000 from the budget estimate.

Educational TV, another new start: $1,500,000 is recommended to initiate grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities. I should like to say just a word about that item. These are grants to build educational television. Many Members of the House are in favor of educational television. But I have some concern about that from this standpoint. I asked them in the hearings: After you make these grants, after you build this television network, who is going to operate it, who is going to pay for it?

The answer to me was, the local communities, the local school boards. They tell us this educational TV will cover 90 percent of the people of the country.

I am fearful, Mr. Chairman, when we establish it, when we get it ready for operation, there will not be any local money to operate the educational TV. Where will they come? They will come to the Congress of the United States for funds to operate a television network covering 90 percent of the people, operated by the Federal Government. That is my concern, regardless of what administration may be in power. The opportunity of thought control, the opportunity for broadcasting programs to the people by the Government, it seems to me is a very dangerous thing.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service: $5 million to initiate land acquisition at the Point Reyes National Park. The regular Interior Department appropriation bill already passed the House carries an appropriation for $2 million for this purpose.

Office of Territories: $7,290,000 for schools, hospitals, utilities, and transportation.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Trade Expansion Act, $100,000. One item has been approved, some have been disapproved. They are concerned now about two industries—china and earthenware and whisky. Each has lost about 1,000 employees since passage of the act, although there have been no changes in tariffs.

Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Acceleration Act—Public Law 87-658—was approved on September 14, 1962. This act authorized the appropriation of $900 million for the accelerated public works program. On October 13, 1962, Congress passed the public works appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1963 which included $400 million for initiating the accelerated public works program program. This was less than half the full $900 million the administration had requested. This $900 million request was not considered by the House but went directly to the Senate.

The Senate Appropriations Committee in its hearings was highly critical of the lack of budget justification for any specific project. The Senate committee in its Report No. 2178 called attention to this failure to present proper justification for each project to be funded by the accelerated public works program in these words:

> In recommending an appropriation of $500 million the committee notes that this is a new program for which firm estimates are not available. The witnesses testifying before the committee presented lists of public works projects which they considered eligible for allocations under this program. They pointed out, however, that many States and communities are not yet even aware of this legislation, much less have they been able to prepare project requests that might qualify under this act. Accordingly, the witnesses cautioned that it should be clearly understood that these lists do not represent an approved program nor could they give the committee any assurance that any individual project would be approved. The committee felt, therefore, that it would be desirable to provide a partial appropriation which would permit this program to get underway at the maximum possible rate for the next 4 months, with the understanding that the administration can submit a supplemental estimate in January at which time they should be in a position to support a definite program, with specific recommendations for projects to be undertaken and justifications therefor.

The Senate committee also specified the type of projects that should be included in the program in these words:

> Since the purpose of the Public Works Acceleration Act is to provide additional employment in depressed areas, the committee believes that the projects to be approved by the various administrators under the favored terms of the new authorization should be those projects for which the local communities or other political subdivisions are unable to meet the cost-sharing requirements under the agencies' regular programs. An example of the type of program the committee has in mind would be the public facilities loan program.

It is amply clear from the Senate report language and the conference report language which was accepted by both Houses, that the appropriation of additional funds over and above the $400 million initially provided was dependent upon the presentation of specific recommendations and justification for each of the projects in the remainder of the program. This has not been done.

In fact, the administration has made no attempt to comply with this specific requirement of the law as it now stands. Actually, the committee should have refused to schedule any hearings on the supplemental request for the additional $500 million until the administration presented a firm program with specific descriptions and justifications for each project included therein.

The actual presentation to the Deficiency Subcommittee has been nothing more than a list of several thousand project names with the most meager indication of what each project was. It was nothing more than a continuation of the same emaciated and inadequate initial presentation to the Senate at the time of the original request for funds for the accelerated public works program.

Here are a few examples of the kind of descriptions of the projects given in the accelerated public works program presentation: Repair building, recreational facilities; construct building, recreation facilities; recreational facilities; Hawaii Volcanoes recreational facilities; land treatment; Chesapeake & Ohio Canal; interceptor; flood control; courthouse; concrete raceways; city hall; activation of vessel; zoological gardens; swimming pool; cultural center; fairgrounds extension; nursing home.

There is no need for Congress, if it is to be a rubberstamp for these billion dollar public works acceleration programs on which no specific justification is presented for the projects to be covered. Why not just hand the key to the Treasury over to the administration with a request to please let us know at some future time how they spent the taxpayers' money? Of course, we might have to raise the debt limit several times a year, but at least it would keep the bureaucrats happy up until the time this Nation went the way of all profligate nations of the past.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. I appreciate it and I thank the gentleman. May I say at the outset there is no Member of the House for whom I have greater respect than the gentleman from Ohio. He is not only a gentleman but a man of integrity who always gives his own deep thought to the opinions of others and expresses his with equal force and conviction. And, I appreciate this time.

The point the gentleman made about making capital investments in plants is sound. The point the gentleman made about the burden of fiscal deficits on the economy, we agree with that. But, to clear the record on that point, you see we are in a box. The decision here is not whether we save half a billion or spend it, because if we do not use it for public works, then we have to pay for unemployment compensation and relief. In 1960 we have spent $3 billion for unemployment compensation; in 1961, $4.1 billion; last year $3.1 billion, for a total of $10.5 billion in 3 short years for unemployment compensation. And, to that you must add welfare costs, aid to dependent children, food stamp plan, county and municipal, relief and welfare costs. One county in my district last year spent $12 million for relief alone.

Mr. BOW. How much has that been reduced since this program has been in effect, with this $400 million we have already spent?

Mr. BLATNIK. The program is just starting. We have only had 4 months of it.

Mr. BOW. I cannot yield further. My time is running out, and I should like to make one further point, one further reason I am opposed to this program. Here are the proposed projects. This is what the Committee on Appropriations had before it in the consideration of this budget request.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman would show that to the gentleman from Florida who said we did not have any information about this program.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman from Florida, there is no information. There are names of towns and there are titles of what they are going to do, but there is not one bit of information in here. I know the gentleman from New York so well. I have served with him now for a number of years. He has been my chairman, and I know what he demands of witnesses who come before that committee for justification of projects. There is not a single word of justification in these projects. Do you know what these projects really are, except by some title? There is nothing in there, and may I point out to the gentleman from Minnesota who spoke here the other day in which he expressed some amazement with our committee when he stated as follows:

> To be frank, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply shocked at the action of the House Committee on Appropriations, and I say this advisedly, with full respect for the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. The Congress made a serious commitment, on the basis of which distressed municipalities and governmental subdivisions throughout America went ahead and planned to raise additional local funds for over 6,000 essential public works projects.

Then the gentleman rightly said that the conference committee said to come back with a supplemental in January. But what did they say? They said, with the understanding that the administration can submit a supplemental estimate in January, at which time they should be in a position to support a definite program, with specific recommendations for projects to be undertaken and justifications therefor. Now, here was an admonition to the administration as to what they should come before the Appropriations Committee on supplementals. Not a document with the list of the cities, simply saying "We are going to build a bridge here, we are going to clear brush there, we are going to build a boat dock there"; not that sort of thing. That is not a justification before the Appropriations Committee. They said "Support a definite program with specific recommendations for projects to be undertaken and justified."

I ask you this: Look at this record. Search the record as you may. Find a justification. There are none there. There are no justifications. If this were any other kind of program and your Committee on Appropriations authorized up to $450 million, you would read us out of this House as incompetent and not doing our job.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat what has been said here before, the Constitution of the United States places upon this Congress a responsibility for appropriations. Under that we certainly have a responsibility to know what we are appropriating and what it is for.

Now, someone could very well ask me the question, "Well, all right, had they come up with justifications spelling out in detail these projects, had they justified these as being good projects, would you be for it, or against it?"

Mr. Chairman, if they were properly justified under an authorization which this House had passed, I would support it. But I want to see them properly justified under justifications such as we have in other areas. To me this idea that all of these projects have now been put in the Congressional Record has but one purpose, and that is not to advise you. We could have found that. But to try to put upon every Member of Congress the opportunity to see whether they are in his district or not, are we beginning to appropriate on the basis of money for our districts, or are we going to appropriate on the basis of what is best for the United States?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we have six speakers remaining on our side. In looking at the clock I note that we have 18 minutes left. If I may, I yield to our speakers 3 minutes each.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to our able and distinguished friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers], who is one of the able and senior members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to a great deal of the debate on this issue. It seems to me it has deteriorated from the question of whether it is worthwhile or not into a partisan issue almost entirely. I do not believe that is a good atmosphere in which to try to pass legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Ohio who preceded me in saying that unemployment is the No. 1 issue that faces America today. It has wrecked governments down through the years, many of them today around the world. The situation is serious in many localities in this land.

If this $500 million is not restored in this legislation we are not keeping faith with the communities across America who have spent their own money for planning, and who could ill afford it, to complete sewers and bring in wholesome water and complete highways and navigational aids that industry might be introduced into these depressed areas.

You say, "That is not our fault, it is theirs." It is the fault of the Congress of the United States, and it affects every Member in America. To me it depends a great deal on your outlook on life, your financial attitude and your financial outlook on things, as to whether we take a material or a human outlook as we legislate in the Congress. I prefer we take the human element.

I say if we do not restore this we are not keeping faith with the small communities across America who have spent their money planning and getting ready for the $500 million which they had every reason to expect. I believe I expected it to come almost automatically, and I am sure the communities across America expected that.

I have heard Members here say, "There is nothing coming into my district." That should not be the criterion. It should be, Will it help people in this land? If it helps one or two or three districts, that should be the criterion, not whether it comes into my district in West Virginia. If we legislate that way we are not legislating for the land but only as individuals.

Mr. Chairman, it cannot be repeated too often and too loudly that unemployment is the most menacing threat to the Nation today. Many of our other problems, especially the rising crime rate, stem directly from continued unemployment. How can we expect a citizenry which is normally honest and peace-loving to refrain from violence when opportunities for a job elude every attempt they make? Inability to find work that will sustain a family is the condition which has wrecked governments in the past, and is wrecking governments all over the world today. Unemployment is particularly frustrating when it is scattered widely through sparse populations. A large group of unemployed located in a single small area attracts public attention. The necessity for curative measures is only too evident, and something is done about it. But when comparatively small numbers of the jobless are scattered over a whole State, their hopelessness is more or less concealed by what seems to be a general prosperity. Their plight is easily overlooked as relatively unimportant. Such is the condition in my State of West Virginia.

West Virginia has accepted with enthusiasm and commendable energy every project and program offered by the Federal Government to improve industry and employment. Through the redevelopment program a number of new industries have been brought into the State and are beginning operations. Some of these use State natural resources hitherto undeveloped. All of them are small of necessity and employ limited numbers of workers. It has been testified before congressional committees that West Virginians are taking advantage of retraining programs and fitting themselves for totally new kinds of jobs. In short, wherever there was an opening toward a more prosperous life, West Virginians have hurried toward it.

One program was of peculiar promise to West Virginia, that providing for accelerated public works. It is known and admitted that the public works program has been delayed in West Virginia because of inadequate funds. The development of the State awaits the completion of highways, navigation systems, sewers, waterworks, and other public facilities. These will open up the State to industry, and in the process of construction will furnish employment to small groups of workers dispersed here and there through the countryside, thus helping to eliminate a problem which is hard to visualize because its dimensions are inconspicuous.

The $900 million authorized last year for this purpose filled a real need. Less than half of the amount was appropriated last year, with the tacit understanding that the remainder would be added this year. In that hope, West Virginia prepared and submitted a number of projects. The rejection of the expected $500 million appropriation would doom all those projects to further delay. We must restore that appropriation to the pending bill. We argue with heat and passion over a $6 billion appropriation which would go to some single large industry and to the thousands of workers who are employed in that one industry. We need equal heat and passion over an appropriation that will total only a small fraction of that expenditure, but that will take up the slack in employment which is bedeviling obscure and remote corners of every State in the Union.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I join in support of the announced proposal that will be made to restore $450 million to the appropriation bill. I am very much surprised today to hear again the old Hooverisms of 30 years ago, that unemployment is only a local problem, that it is a local problem only, that relief for the hungry, the unemployed, the poor, and the sick, is a local program, that it is not a national problem.

I submit that the proposition was established a long time ago that this is one country, that unemployment, that financial distress, that relief of sickness, that relief for those in poor health, that relief for the hungry is local, State, and national in scope, and that we must treat it together as one country.

I have found that some distressed areas are in such a great state of shock that they find it difficult if not impossible to plan for the future without encouragement, and I mean financial encouragement. They find they just cannot levy any more property taxes to support bond issues to renew public facilities so as to provide employment. They absolutely have to have some financial encouragement from some other place.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Montana would give his opinion with regard to this: If some program such as this accelerated public works program had been requested during the Eisenhower administration, is it possible there would not have been the two serious recessions we had during the second part of the Eisenhower administration?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. In answer to that question, I think the serious recessions during the Eisenhower administration could have been averted and that the unemployment problem could have been controlled. I submit that now we can, as we have I think, slow down unemployment or the acceleration of unemployment, if we have not stopped it, and with this program we can reverse the trend and make some progress against unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my unrestrained joy and gratitude to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas], and to the members of the committee for their fine work in bringing in the supplemental appropriation for that magnificent project which I had the honor to coauthor, the Point Reyes National Seashore.

As many of you know, a good deal of land speculation has been going on at Point Reyes—speculation which has not only been inflating land values but which has also been destroying a precious natural resource—and these funds will enable us to get underway with this important project.

On the other hand, I feel sure that the chairman will forgive me if I chide him a bit over another item in the bill which concerns me greatly and which is a relatively small amount, it would seem to me, compared to some of the sums of money involved in this bill. I am referring to page 5 in the committee report where the committee states it has approved $500,000 of the $1,500,000 requested to assist local and State groups improve the sadly neglected health of our domestic migratory agricultural workers.

Mr. Chairman, since the time is short I would ask my colleagues most sincerely to read the hearings, pages 362–369 because the chairman and the committee have done a splendid job, and it would seem to me after reading the hearings that there is ample justification for including the full amount requested. Accordingly, I would like to ask the subcommittee chairman if he would be good enough to explain why we do not fully fund the request of $1,500,000 for this program.

Mr. THOMAS. This is a new program and you have 60 days left. On the basis of 60 days, we thought $500,000 would be ample to get the job done.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman. I want to point out again that I have been keenly interested in this program and I urge that it be fully funded as soon as is reasonably possible.

I have introduced virtually a bushel of bills on aid for American migrant workers. I have also, as you know, for several years been opposing the extension of Public Law 78 for reasons I will amply develop later this session.

But it seems to me it would be a shame to permit the continued extension of the bracero program if we cannot at least provide the funds necessary to adequately implement the sole bill passed in the last Congress to help domestic migratory workers.

As the record pointed out last year when we considered S. 1130—the medical services for migrant farm families bill—migrant families have little access to health care, yet they have even greater needs than other low income groups. These needs not only cause personal misery and suffering, they also create fiscal problems for local hospitals and health facilities, both public and private. In addition, migrant families are frequently either barred from local medical services by local residence requirements, or these facilities are unavailable at times and places which would enable the people to avail themselves of the services.

The Division of Community Health Services has stated that within 30 days after funds become available under this legislation, migrant family health clinics will be in operation in a number of areas. Needy migrant workers, mothers, and children will be able to receive health services not previously possible. Furthermore, a major focus of this program is to help migrants understand and assume greater responsibility for meeting their health needs, and this certainly is a goal in the common interest of us all.

Considering these factors, and also the additional point that the State of California alone has submitted a request for $490,000 under this act—an amount which falls just short of the total amount reported by the committee—I would like to urge again that the full amount requested be approved as promptly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, the committee's hearings make the very important point that the imperative need for a health program for domestic migrant agricultural workers is made even more clear by the fact that health services are being made available for the thousands of foreign agricultural workers who come to the United States each year. The agreement under which these workers enter our country provides medical care for on-the-job accidents under workmen's compensation and off-the-job health insurance at a reasonable cost to the worker—benefits which are not accorded in the great majority of instances for our own migrant farmworkers.

Mr. Chairman, this point and others discussed in the committee's hearings have great relevance for the proposed extension of Public Law 78 which, as I understand it, we will be considering shortly. I hope that my colleagues will review them carefully and bear them in mind when we discuss that proposal, for Public Law 78 is a measure which I believe to be morally unacceptable to the basic tenets of our society, which is contrary to our free enterprise system, and which is certainly inconsistent with our attempts to combat the very serious problem of unemployment and underemployment with which we are confronted today.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, after hearing the lengthy discussion on the bill—H.R. 5517—to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, I am delighted to observe the bipartisan acceptance of the $5 million item for the land acquisition program of Point Reyes National Seashore located in Marin County.

I should like to commend this honorable body for its attitude toward the early acquisition of the land within the confines of the park area. It is for this reason that I take this opportunity to include in the RECORD my views as to why this action at this time is most appropriate.

First of all, this project has been accepted into the sphere of Federal responsibility by the action of the 87th Congress. In joining this honorable body, I want to simply point out reasons why early acquisition is essential. Since authorization of this project, there has been an expanded speculation program initiated by investors. In view of this, it appears to be in the best interests of the Federal Government to appropriate funds for early acquisition. Due to this speculation, the land values are certain to increase with subsequent higher costs to the Federal Government as time lapses. Furthermore, the present land owners who are affected by the project are concerned about their own personal future plans which obviously are dependent upon the payment for their properties before any positive future plans can be made. It is only fair that their considerations be recognized.

Also, in endorsing this project, I concur with the Members of the 87th Congress who recognized the great value in establishing a national park immediately contiguous to a major population area and promoted conservation in an area where a maximum number of our population can enjoy it.

Early acquisition should then encourage developments in areas adjacent to the parks, thereby expediting recovery of the lost tax base by the local units of government.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the restoration of $450 million for the accelerated public works program.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is late and I shall not take much time, but I wish to register my hearty approval of the efforts to restore 450 million for the accelerated public works program.

I was very interested in the earlier remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] concerning swimming pools, ski slides and other recreational projects. At the time the original authorization bill was being debated in the last Congress, the gentleman from Florida made a similar speech casting ridicule on applications of this nature. He was assured by the sponsors of the bill that the central purpose of the bill was to enable communities to provide badly needed public facilities which would also provide jobs.

It seems to me that the remarks of the gentleman from Florida both last year and this year serve a very useful purpose. Let me furnish a very practical example. As soon as the appropriation was voted for the bill last year and Congress had adjourned, I addressed letters to the mayors of every community in the 13 counties of my congressional district, as well as to the county officials and civic leaders, apprising them of the nature of the legislation—emphasizing that recreational projects were given a low priority. Then I set up a series of meetings in the county seat of every county of my congressional district, enabling officials from the Community Facilities Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other agencies to explain the accelerated public works program and to answer questions by local officials.

At many of these meetings, the local people asked: "What about a swimming pool? What about a playground? What about a hunting or fishing lodge?" These all represent activities we West Virginians love to engage in, being an outdoor people. But invariably I told the people at these meetings about the wonderful speech of the gentleman from Florida, and how he had made us promise not to use the bill for any of this type of project. And as a result, we had maybe two or three applications out the hundreds we received for recreational projects, but invariably the Community Facilities Administration would simply write "Recreational" across the face of them and not even move such applications out of the Regional Office. As a result, all of our approved projects have been for libraries, street paving, storm sewers, sewer lateral lines, sewage disposal systems, hospitals, and health centers.

Therefore, I think the fears of the gentleman from Florida are groundless. All over the Nation, critically needed local projects are moving forward, jobs are being provided, and I hope that the $450 million will be voted to continue this worthwhile program.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to serve Nashville and Davidson County, Tenn., the historic Hermitage district, home of Andrew Jackson. Andrew Jackson, one of the great names in American history, who, if he were sitting in this body today would, I am sure, have no reservations about the funds under discussion and their necessity.

Andrew Jackson would know that the Hermitage district today does not qualify for these moneys, that our economy is strong and diversified; that our unemployment is well below the national average.

If "Old Hickory" sat here today and were a man of narrow vision who could see no farther than the boundaries of his own district, he might well say "My people do not need these funds, so why should I put myself on the political limb by urging this appropriation?"

But General Jackson was a much bigger man. Andy Jackson could and would see far beyond his own district; he would see that in Tennessee alone 62 of our 95 counties are listed as depressed areas and need these funds, in many instances, for their very survival.

Andrew Jackson not only could but did see far beyond the fertile valleys of middle Tennessee and what he saw he understood. It was because of this vision, this compassion and understanding for all the people that Andrew Jackson was elected to the highest office in the United States.

Today I would ask you, in the great tradition not only of Andrew Jackson but of our frontier forefathers who always had a helping hand for their neighbors, to restore this appropriation.

In the great midlands of our Nation with their lush fields of grain there are few depressed areas such as we have in many parts of the South.

In the upper Middle West, the home of the world's finest dairy producers, there are few depressed areas such as the blighted coal regions of Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia.

But we all have our problems. With the farmers, it is overproduction and they need Government aid in the form of price support. The dairy farmer has his problem. In our oil-rich Southwest the producer is aided with tax relief through the depletion allowance.

We all have situations which may be particular to our own areas but we cannot solve them by ourselves.

Only by aiding one another in the tradition of our forefathers have these problems been met and eased.

We spend billions of dollars on foreign aid to help other nations each year, and I do not question the worth and need of these foreign peoples.

But this issue before us today is to help our own people who, I say unequivocally, are as deserving as any nation on God's earth. If we can spend $4 billion to help others why can we not spend $450 million to help our own.

Gentlemen, we have an obligation and a trust here. This program was launched in the last session of Congress. I was not a Member at that time but had I been, I would have voted for it.

I hope the Members of this great and dignified body will not waver in their trust and will not fail to carry out their duty to the people of the United States of America.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my friend from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON]. My views on this subject are well known. Rather than take the time of the House myself I have left it for others. I commend the gentleman on his statement and thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Chairman, the House Appropriations Committee struck $500 million for the accelerated public works program from the supplemental appropriations bill which we are today considering. I believe these funds must be restored.

In February, there were 4,918,000 unemployed, approximately one-half of whom reside in areas eligible for assistance under the accelerated public works program. By restoring this $500 million, we would be able to give on-site employment to about 60,000 of these individuals for 1 year. In addition, related service industries would absorb a portion of these unemployed; thus, nearly 10 percent of those out of work in economically depressed areas would be gainfully employed.

It is my undertsanding that a backlog of over 6,200 essential and urgent public works projects has accumulated in the Area Redevelopment Administration. Additional applications for grants-in-aid from States and local communities are continuing to be received—New Mexico alone has over 50 applications pending.

The Public Works Acceleration Act authorized an appropriation of $900 million; $400 million of this sum was appropriated and within 5 months had been allocated. The additional $500 million appropriation which we are now considering is of paramount importance and is extremely vital if we are to continue this worthwhile program.

A great portion of the State of New Mexico has been designated a labor surplus area by the Department of Labor. Fourteen counties and nine Indian pueblos have been declared economically depressed areas and eligible for assistance under the Area Redevelopment Administration. In addition, many of our communities are in dire need of Federal assistance to implement public works projects necessary for the continued health of our citizens. Because of limited bonding capacity, capital resources and tax revenues, these communities must have Federal assistance in order to initiate and complete these vitally needed public works projects.

I would like to point out that over 80 percent of the accelerated public works funds expended in the State of New Mexico was not used for community improvements, but was administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Forest Service and other Federal agencies. The $500 million appropriation which was deleted from this supplemental is needed for community improvements such as sewer projects, storm drains, municipal gas systems, municipal water systems, and other such projects.

As I stated before, communities in New Mexico have over 50 applications for Federal assistance pending. Due to lack of funds, no action has been taken on these applications. I do not want to take up too much time by enumerating each in detail. However, I would like to cite a few examples of the conditions which exist in some of our New Mexico communities which have applied for assistance under the accelerated public works program and which have already made arrangements to sell revenue bonds for the necessary matching funds. The following examples are merely representative:

The city of Raton is facing a critical water shortage because of the inability of the present 12-inch transmission line to deliver water to the city. The present water line to the filter plant from Lake Maloya is not adequate to supply the city's needs. At one time, the level of water in the city's reservoir was so low that the city was in great danger. If a fire had broken out, the citizens would have been unable to fight it. Raton's application for assistance has been held up due to lack of funds.

Last November Bernalillo applied for assistance to construct a central drain along the main street of the town because each year serious damage to property results from floods during heavy rains. This application has also been held up because the appropriated funds have already been expended.

In Santa Rosa, N. Mex., the municipal water system has been condemned by the New Mexico State Health Department. The community is allowed to continue the use of this system on a day-to-day basis pending the construction of a new municipal water system. Their application has been pending since last October. Santa Rosa has a very limited bonding capacity, and if a new municipal water system is to be constructed, Federal assistance is absolutely necessary.

The villages of Moriarty and Williard and the town of Estancia applied for Federal assistance for construction of a natural gas system for their communities. These applications were forwarded last November to the community facilities administration for action; however, here again, no action was taken because the funds appropriated had already been allocated.

The city of Espanola applied for assistance several months ago for badly needed water works and sanitary sewer improvements including a water well and storage tank and a new sewer treatment plant. The completion of this project is essential to the continued health of the entire community, but unfortunately, the city's application has not yet been approved.

I think you will agree that our need for Federal assistance under the accelerated public works program is great in New Mexico. This situation is not unique to my State alone—other States throughout the country have communities which have a limited bonding capacity and low tax revenue where Federal assistance is vital if needed community improvements are to be undertaken.

I strongly urge the Members of the House to restore this $500 million appropriation to the supplemental under consideration in order that these vitally needed community improvements can be initiated under the accelerated public works program.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Acceleration Act has two main purposes. Let me quote from the act itself:

> Action by the Federal Government is necessary, both to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed in these communities through improvement of their facilities, to become more conducive to industrial development and to provide better places in which to live and work.

Other speakers have mentioned the "immediate useful work" which will be provided by this appropriation if it is restored to the bill. These jobs are important but they are only one side of the coin. The other side is the creation of public facilities which will help these communities attract industry and be better places to live.

I strongly urge the restoration of the $450 million for accelerated public works because I believe that only through industrial development can we permanently solve the problems of these hard-hit areas.

No industry wants to move into a slum, whether rural or urban. If a community has a dilapidated city hall or courthouse, or an inadequate hospital, or streets in poor condition or a water system unable to supply adequate fire protection or a polluted stream, then it may well lose, or have already lost, a prime industrial prospect.

The accelerated public works program is not a leafraking program. It is a public works construction program which has already created $400 million worth of public facilities from its 3,756 individual projects. And it is not a giveaway program. Communities generally have to put up 50 percent of the cost of a project. In the most extreme cases of severe unemployment the community still has to put up 25 percent of the cost of the project.

So these are not frivolous projects. These are the projects necessary to a decent standard of community living—water and sewer and gas systems—waste treatment plants—incinerators—city halls—hospitals—in short, all of the things American industry looks for when evaluating a community prior to making a decision about a new plant.

And you can readily agree that a community saddled with high and persistent unemployment—these communities cannot afford the full cost of these local public works. In other words, Mr. Chairman, if we do not restore these funds the projects will never be built.

For a permanent solution to the problem of the distressed areas I urge the House to restore the appropriation for accelerated public works.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, despite bright prospects brought on by the latest unemployment figures, unemployment remains a most serious stymie to our economic growth. There remain throughout our Nation pockets of sustained and severe unemployment and underemployment. It is at these pockets of economic depression that the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 and the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962 are aimed. The Accelerated Public Works Act has been providing the vital, short-term, immediate relief necessary to carry forth the long-range objectives of the Area Redevelopment Act.

The Accelerated Public Works Act authorized $900 million to combat the persistent high level of unemployment in depressed areas while at the same time providing for the construction of essential public works. With the full authorization appropriated we can provide jobs for 10 percent of the unemployed in the 1,228 eligible depressed areas.

The $400 million appropriated already has been allocated to 3,756 projects covering every State and almost all congressional districts. Work on these projects has made a significant dent not only on our local unemployment rate but on the tremendous backlog of public works projects we have.

I strongly support the restoration of the accelerated public works funds necessary to continue action on this program which has already contributed greatly to the reduction of unemployment and to the stimulation of our national economy. Without the additional funds, Hawaii, along with the rest of the Nation, will suffer an irreparable setback.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, less than 6 months ago millions of Americans learned with a shock that the possibility of nuclear warfare is virtually on our own doorstep.

The civil defense office in my hometown was flooded with questions from worried citizens who wanted to know what they should do if those Cuban-based missiles started coming our way. There was also a certain amount of anger that the civil defense program was not more advanced than it was.

Actually, even at that time the program was quite far along. The Defense Department had surveyed hundreds of thousands of buildings throughout the United States and had located fallout shelter space for millions of citizens. Thousands of building owners had signed agreements to make space in their buildings available for public shelter in an emergency. A huge operation, largely volunteer in character, was starting in many communities to post shelter signs on the surveyed buildings and to stock the buildings with emergency provisions purchased by the Federal Government.

We have heard a good deal about Cuba since those days last October when Cuba was about the only thing we were worrying about. We have heard less about civil defense—probably because the crisis has faded, the Communist finger does not appear to be quite so close to the trigger. In fact, the latest news on civil defense came last week when our Appropriations Committee refused an administration supplemental request of $58.9 million to purchase additional supplies for public shelters and $3 million to update the shelter survey completed earlier this year.

I do not question the desire on the part of the committee to economize in Federal expenditures. I am in full sympathy with this. But I wonder how we can so easily forget the great danger we faced only 6 months ago when we wished we were much better prepared on the civilian front than we were. And I would simply point out that wishing for protection during a time of crisis does not bring it into existence. That must be done now—today—and in the months ahead, long before any crisis.

The subcommittee that recommended against the civil defense supplemental request stated in its report that we have enough shelter supplies on hand or on order "adequate for the time being"—those are the exact words in the report: "adequate for the time being."

Most things we do are adequate for the time being—if we are not too concerned with the future. But adequate civil defense requires action now and in the months ahead if we are to be prepared for another Cuba.

In my view, we cannot develop a nationwide shelter program, with all its complex ingredients of purchasing, production, transportation of supplies and the like, if we are going to judge when to move on any of these matters only on the basis of adequacy for the time being.

I urge the Appropriations Committee to review the need for funds to avoid interruption of the shelter supply line and to take such action as is necessary when it is necessary.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the restoration of the full amount of $450 million recommended by the subcommittee for the accelerated public works program.

There are more than 1,200 areas in the country which are eligible for projects under this program. Some of these are rural counties with many small towns. Some are metropolitan areas of substantial unemployment.

In the rural areas the problem is generally underemployment and low family income. The median family income for the Nation is $5,660 as determined by the Bureau of the Census in 1960. Yet more than 170 of the areas eligible for accelerated public works have median family incomes of less than $1,800 per year. You can imagine the standard of living that these people must have.

In the urban areas the problem is generally that of unemployment. The national average of unemployment today is about 5.6 percent of the work force. Many of the areas eligible for accelerated public works have unemployment rates in excess of 20 percent. The national unemployment rate during the depths of the depression in 1933 was 24.9 percent. Gentlemen, there are areas in these United States that have unemployment rates in excess of those during the worst part of the great depression.

Why are these areas suffering so? Are their people lazy or irresponsible? Are they content to live on Federal surplus foods?

Mr. Chairman, for most of the areas eligible for accelerated public works, the problem has existed for decades. These are the areas whose economies have been unable to keep pace with the rest of the country. These areas are victims of changing times, changing consumer tastes, new technologies, depleted natural resources, wornout soil or overreliance on a single declining industry.

Mr. Chairman, if you feel as I do that unemployment rates of 26.1 percent in Benewah and Shoshone Counties in Idaho; of 24.4 percent in Livingston County, La.; of 27 percent in Mora County, N. Mex.; of 26.4 percent in Graham County, N.C.; and 27.9 percent in Crawford County, Mich., are too high for America I ask you to vote to restore these funds for accelerated public works to create jobs for these people.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the action of the House Appropriations Committee eliminating funds for the continuation of the accelerated public works program is a blow to those areas of the country which have unemployed.

This action is especially harsh on those areas such as the Detroit metropolitan region which have fallen victim to the vast changes in our technology and a changing market structure. For over 6 years, Detroit has been classified as a depressed area. This is a matter of deep concern to all of us. Our mayor has moved to utilize the tools for hastening our recovery through the Area Redevelopment Administration, the Accelerated Public Works Act, and the Manpower Development and Training Act.

As a result of continued unemployment, much needed public works have lagged since our ability to finance them was limited. Under Accelerated Public Works Act, Detroit has been able to move up much needed sewer and water projects. Other important pending projects are in the fields of health, fire protection, and the like. Obviously, with the current $400 million appropriation exhausted, all other communities throughout the Nation who are in the same situation, are depending on the supplemental appropriation of $500 million recommended by President Kennedy to complete the program which Congress authorized last year.

The funds provided to Detroit and surrounding communities under the initial public works appropriation means more than 860,000 man-hours of work for residents of the metropolitan area. Pending projects under accelerated public works will generate more than 2 million man-hours of labor. I urge you to include $500 million to carry on this important program when the matter comes before the House of Representatives for a vote.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, reinstatement of $450 million for accelerated public works in the supplemental appropriation bill is imperative to provide employment, as well as permanent improvements, in communities where depressed economic conditions exist.

In 11 of the 19 counties of the First District of Idaho, which I represent, community facilities projects were planned in good faith with careful analysis by responsible officials who relied on accelerated public works consideration and grants. Some of the project estimates were prepared with engineering aid and in some cases bond issues were passed to provide what was intended for matching funds. Many of these projects are pending because funds for grants were exhausted before the applications were processed. Pending projects include waterworks, sewerage, replacing wooden water mains, post office buildings, street improvements, community buildings, recreation site preparation, and highway and trail construction, all of which are projects of permanent benefit.

The unemployed in these areas of Idaho are not out of work of their own volition. Depressed conditions in the lumber and mining industries are responsible for the layoffs in most instances. If these people are not to be assisted with employment that contributes to their welfare and to the improvement of the economy in the communities where they reside, they have no alternative but to apply for unemployment compensation.

Since the inception of the program, a total of 3,275 man-months of work have been allotted in projects for the State of Idaho through the accelerated public works. This employment has been of inestimable benefit to the morale of the people concerned and has resulted in accomplishments of genuine worth; however, additional Federal aid is sorely needed to implement additional projects. The accelerated public works is an exemplary system of aid without waste and it is a plan especially well adapted to small communities. Considering the benefits that have accrued from the program, it is deplorable that there is partisan opposition to continuance of the plan in an attempt to discredit the administration which initiated accelerated public works.

In the sincere belief that many blessings will result from continuance of the accelerated public works program, I urge my colleagues, who are interested in a measure that is both utilitarian and humanitarian, to support the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, in my March newsletter to my constituents I set forth a list of Philadelphia projects under the accelerated public works program. I received a report from the office of the Administrator for public works acceleration on an up-to-date list of all projects cleared by the Area Redevelopment Administration and announced by the participating agencies as of March 1, 1963. They total $5,153,000 in accelerated public works funds and will provide an estimated 7,569 man-months or 630 man-years of onsite employment. If Congress approves President Kennedy's request for a supplemental appropriation of $500 million, it may be anticipated that additional projects will be approved for Philadelphia.

The funds approved for Philadelphia include a direct Federal project now in progress at Independence National Park; a new maternity building for the Albert Einstein Medical Center, a project under the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; a number of projects under the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency such as the Center Building for the Trade and Convention Center; a project involving the Fox Chase Pumping Station and the Torresdale Pumping Station; stream drainage at the North Philadelphia Airport; an intercepting sewer at Byberry Creek, and other projects which benefit other sections of Philadelphia.

The Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962—Public Law 87-658—authorized $900 million for construction of needed community facilities such as hospitals, streets, water and sewage systems, public buildings, and so forth. Prior to adjournment last October, $400 million was appropriated under the act to begin work on these projects and to provide jobs in areas of substantial unemployment, including Philadelphia. Thus far the program has been highly successful.

I feel that the Members should support President Kennedy's request for the remainder of the funds authorized by the 87th Congress for such a worthwhile program.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, it was cheering news for most of us last week, to learn that the Nation's unemployment ratio had dropped by half a point—that it was once again below 6 percent.

But many areas of serious unemployment persist. One of them is my home county of San Diego. The most recent report showed our jobless ratio still perilously near 8 percent.

San Diego's skilled labor pool has contributed much to America's fame, and to America's security. My community built the little monoplane that carried Charles Lindbergh to Paris. A third of a century later it built the giant Atlas that has sent American astronauts into orbit.

Today, San Diego is in trouble. But the trouble is not of our making. It is the result of a war effort that left our community in the same category as a war casualty. For the trouble stems from the phaseout of conventional aircraft production, and from completion of contracts for the Atlas missile, gigantic efforts undertaken in times of crisis to help insure the safety of a Nation.

Our efforts were successful, as the victory in war and our new superiority in the missile race can attest.

But this success had its price, a price paid by the cities. For with the crises past, the need for defense production all but ended and with it, the need for the workers' services.

They had come in time of the Nation's need, and the city had received them. They came at their country's call to work. Now, their call is to their country to help them keep working.

This is what the accelerated public works program is all about.

Our people's skills—in San Diego and elsewhere—will continue to help build America—I promise you. Meanwhile, I ask that the House help us absorb the bumps of change—help us by your votes tomorrow, to extend this very practical program for speeding public works.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired, all time for debate has expired. The hour is 5 o'clock. Under the previous order of the House the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Friday, April 12, next, to file a report on the bill H.R. 4655.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have conferred with the minority leader and there was an understanding—I think the gentleman from Ohio is aware of it—that it would be agreeable to come in at 11 o'clock. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why?

Mr. ALBERT. We would like expeditiously to dispose of this matter. We have only finished general debate. I understand there are over 100 items in the bill. We would like to expedite consideration of the bill as much as possible by meeting at 11 o'clock. We can get into consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule by noon tomorrow. We have other bills, and we want to dispose of them before Friday, if possible, and as soon as possible.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to say that the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], did speak to me about an agreement with the distinguished majority leader to come in at 11 o'clock. I agreed with him to come in at that time.

Mr. GROSS. Further reserving the right to object, it seems to me that having finished general debate this bill ought to be handled easily tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. ALBERT. We have four other bills on the program for this week, and we would like to expedite consideration of this and all the other bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives approved on March 5, 1963, a prospectus for the construction of 87 small public building projects under the Public Buildings Act of 1959 which qualify for construction under the Public Works Acceleration Act, which were transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration. (See attached list.)

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House, The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on April 4, 1963, approved prospectuses for the following public building projects, which were transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration:

BUILDINGS PROPOSED FOR CONSTRUCTION

Location and type

Alabama:
Cullman, post office and Federal office building.
Tuscaloosa, courthouse and Federal office building.
Alaska: Tok Junction, border station.
Arkansas: Hope, post office and Federal office building.
California:
Blythe, post office and Federal office building.
Harbor City, post office and Federal office building.
Jackson, post office and Federal office building.
San Bruno, records center.
Van Nuys, Federal office building.
Colorado:
Glenwood Springs, post office and Federal office building.
Leadville, post office and Federal office building.
Connecticut:
Bridgeport, courthouse and Federal office building.
Windsor Locks, post office and Federal office building.
Florida:
Cross City, post office and Federal office building.
Ocoee, post office and Federal office building.
Umatilla, post office and Federal office building.
Georgia:
Acworth, post office and Federal office building.
Americus, post office and courthouse.
Chatsworth, post office and Federal office building.
Toccoa, post office and Federal office building.
Indiana: Evansville, courthouse and Federal Office Building, post office and Federal Office Building.
Kansas:
Scott City, post office and Federal office building.
Wellington, post office and Federal office building.
Kentucky:
Covington, Internal Revenue Service Center.
Olive Hill, post office and Federal office building.
Paris, post office and Federal office building.
Louisiana:
Crowley, post office and Federal office building.
Opalousas, post office and courthouse.
Thibodaux, post office and Federal office building.
Maryland:
Centreville, post office and Federal office building.
Prince Frederick, post office and Federal office building.
Suitland, central heating plant.
Massachusetts:
Boston, records center.
Boston-Lawrence, Internal Revenue Service Center.
Marlboro, post office and Federal office building.
Milford, post office and Federal office building.
Springfield, post office and Federal office building.
Michigan:
Detroit, Federal office building.
Grand Haven, post office and Federal office building.
Minnesota: Fort Snelling, Federal office building.
Missouri:
Crystal City, post office and Federal office building.
Montgomery City, post office and Federal office building.
New Hampshire: Berlin, post office and Federal office building.
New Jersey:
Avenal, post office and Federal office building.
Burlington, post office and Federal office building.
New Mexico: Raton, post office and Federal office building.
North Carolina:
Cary, post office and Federal office building.
Jacksonville, post office and Federal office building.

Raleigh, post office, courthouse and Federal office building.
Waynesville, post office and Federal office building.
North Dakota:
Fargo, post office and Federal office building.
Pembina, border station (revision).
Ohio:
Canton, post office and Federal office building.
Mantua, post office and Federal office building.
Oklahoma:
Elk City, post office and Federal office building.
Hugo, post office and Federal office building.
Oregon:
Baker, post office and Federal office building.
Enterprise, post office and Federal office building.
Portland, Federal office building.
Prineville, post office and Federal office building.
Pennsylvania:
Dallas, post office and Federal office building.
Irwin, post office and Federal office building.
Tennessee: Oak Ridge, Federal office building.
Texas:
San Antonio, post office and Federal office building.
Sulphur Springs, post office and Federal office building.
Vermont, St. Johnsbury, post office and Federal office building.
Virginia, Chester, post office and Federal office building.
Washington:
Colville, Federal office building.
Vancouver, Federal office building.
District of Columbia:
Federal office building, Department of Labor building.
Courthouse, (Tax Court).
Total: 71 buildings.

ALTERATION PROJECTS (EXTENSION AND/OR CONVERSION)

California, Calexico, border station.
Massachusetts:
Cambridge, post office and Federal office building.
Springfield, courthouse and Federal office building (revision).
Michigan, Detroit, Roosevelt Park Annex.
North Dakota, Fargo, post office and courthouse.
Ohio, Canton, post office and Federal office building (revision).
Vermont, St. Albans, post office, customhouse and Federal office building.
District of Columbia, Federal office building, National Science Foundation building.
Total: eight projects.

ALTERATION PROJECTS (REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT)

Alaska, Anchorage, post office and courthouse.
California, San Francisco; 49 Fourth Street building.
Colorado, Pueblo, post office and courthouse.
Florida, Fort Myers, post office.
Georgia:
Atlanta, Federal annex.
Gainesville, post office and courthouse.
Illinois, Chicago, customhouse.
Maryland:
Baltimore, customhouse.
Suitland, Federal office building No. 3.
Suitland, Federal office building No. 4.
Massachusetts, Boston, appraisers stores.
Minnesota, St. Paul, post office and customhouse.
Missouri:
St. Joseph, post office and courthouse.
St. Louis, Federal office building, 208 North Broadway.
St. Louis, post office.
New Jersey:
Newark, Federal office building, 20 Washington Place.
Newark, post office and courthouse.
New York:
Albany, post office, courthouse and customhouse.
Brooklyn, Federal office building, 210 Livingston Street.
Brooklyn, post office and courthouse.
New York, appraisers' stores, 201 Varick Street.
New York, Federal office building, 252 Seventh Avenue.
New York, post office, Grand Central Annex.
New York, post office, Morgan Annex.
North Carolina: Asheville, Federal building.
Oregon:
Klamath Falls, post office.
Medford, post office and courthouse.
Portland, courthouse.
Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, 128 North Broad Street.
South Dakota: Sioux Falls, post office and courthouse.
Tennessee: Memphis, post office, courthouse and customhouse.
Utah: Clearfield, Naval Supply Depot.
Virginia:
Arlington, temporary building No. 7.
Arlington, heating, refrigeration, and sewage disposal plants.
Washington: Seattle, courthouse.
Wisconsin: Milwaukee, 342 North Water Street.
Washington, D.C.:
Central heating and refrigeration plant.
Treasury Annex.
101 Indiana Avenue NW.
1626 K Street NW.
24th and M Street, building.
Total: 41 projects.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

ITALY

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, my admiration for the people of Italy compels me to speak today about some of the great decisions facing their nation. These decisions affect not only the future of Italy but also the future of the entire free world. They are, therefore, of deep concern to all of us—to all who are united by the common endeavor of enlarging the horizons of freedom, of striving for lasting peace and security in the world.

My admiration for all that Italy represents does not spring solely from my work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Its origin goes back to my college days when, as a history major, I devoted considerable time and effort to the study of our Western civilization. In the process, I became very conscious of, and deeply impressed by, Italy's contribution to the heritage of the Western World.

I hesitate to dwell on this subject—yet I believe that it is worthwhile for all of us to recall that during a good portion of the past 2,000 years, Italy was the temporal, the spiritual, the intellectual, and the artistic center of our Western civilization.

Even a partial list of Italy's contributions to our heritage will astound any student of history.

In literature, Italy gave us Dante, Petrarch, Tommaso, Da Todi, Tasso, Manzoni, and many other poets and writers;

In philosophy, Thomas Aquinas, Ambrose of Milan, Anselm of Canterbury, Anthony of Padua, Boethius, Bonaventure of Albano, Cajetan, Bellarmine, Gregory the Great, and Augustine of Canterbury;

In science, Galileo, Michaelangelo, Da Vinci, Achillini, Cassini, Cavalieri, Colombo, De Rossi, Marconi, Grimaldi, Secchi, Torricelli, Volta, Marconi, and Fermi;

In architecture, Bernini, Michaelangelo, Campello, Palladio, Bramante, Brunelleschi, Pisano, and Vignola;

In sculpture, Verrocchio, Della Robbia, Donatello, Ghiberti, Bernini, Canova, Michaelangelo, Brunelleschi, Pisano, and Cellini;

In painting, Fra Angelico, Fra Bartolommeo, Bordone, Botticelli, Correggio, Giotto, Perugino, Del Sarto, Titian, Vasari, Veronese, Verrocchio, Da Vinci, and Tintoretto;

In music, Palestrina, Cherubini, D'Arezzo, Donizetti, Verdi, Puccini, Leoncavallo, Rossini, Scarlatti, and Martini;

There are, of course, many others—some equally as great as those I have named—but it would take too long to mention them all.

While Italian artists, writers, composers, scientists, and explorers occupy a place second to none in the history of our culture, there is one other field which deserves special mention. I refer, of course, to the field of law. The Jus Gentium, and the Justinian Code, form a vital part of our heritage and continue to influence our legal concepts and forms to this very day.

The Jus Gentium was a uniform code of laws which applied to the subject peoples of the then-known world, brought together under the Pax Romana. Unique in concept, and propagated for several hundred years by the Latins of Italy, Jus Gentium became integrated with our Western social, political, and legal development, persisting with the centuries even to today. And the Justinian Code, embodying the authority of Roman law and the opinions of the ancient Roman jurisconsuls, provides the broad legal bases of our Judaeo-Christian civilization in the West. Every lawyer, every legislator, is undoubtedly aware of these facts.

Having contributed so much to the enrichment of the Western civilization, Italy has a large stake in the preservation of that heritage—a heritage which is today being buffeted on all sides by the tides of nationalistic, totalitarian communism.

In the years which have elapsed since the end of World War II, Italy, through its participation in NATO and in other undertakings of the Atlantic Community, has worked actively to preserve, and to add to that heritage. More recently, however, Italy appears to be approaching a crossroads at which she will decide whether to continue in its present direction, or to turn off from the main road of the collective defense of the free world.

The reason for saying this is self-evident. Only last year, and for the first time since Italy became a member of NATO, the government of that country made a decision, and initiated a course of action, which may ultimately alter Italy's participation in the common defense system of the Atlantic community. Through the so-called "opening to the left," the majority coalition in Italy undertook to bring the Italian Socialist Party into a meaningful participation in the government of that country.

I have been very apprehensive about the outcome of this experiment, not because I want to interfere in the domestic political affairs of Italy, but because I am concerned about their effect on the security of the free world. My apprehension springs from the neutralist leanings of the Italian Socialist Party, and the kinship which exists between some elements of that party and the Italian Communists. If these elements should acquire a position of greater authority in the Italian Government, there is no doubt in my mind that they would bend their efforts to the task of vitiating Italy's participation in NATO, and Italy's commitments to other vital free world undertakings.

What would happen, for instance, if the communications systems in Italy were to fall under the authority of a Government minister whose sympathies are with the leftwing Socialists—or even with the international Communist movement?

What would happen if internal transportation, or labor affairs, or the direction of the nationalized sector of the Italian economy—or Italy's external economic relations were to fall under the authority of a government official with such leanings?

Even more to the point, what could happen if the control over Italy's armed forces, and over Italy's participation in the collective defense arrangements of the free world, were to fall into such hands?

I am certain that I need not point out that such developments could seriously undermine the collective security of Western Europe and of the entire free world.

It is for this reason that I would rather see the Christian Democratic Party of Italy—a party that has an outstanding record of working for Italy's progress and for the security of the free world—I would feel much better if this party were to have a large working majority in the Italian Parliament.

Will this happen, or will the Socialists gain more authority in Italy's governmental affairs? The answer to this question will become apparent shortly.

In a few short weeks—to be exact, on April 28—the people of Italy will make their decision. In a free, democratic election, the first such election since "the opening to the left," the people of Italy will determine the complexion of the next government of their country, and thereby decide upon the course which Italy will pursue in the future.

This is why I say that Italy today stands at the crossroads of history. In the interest of preserving the western civilization to which she has contributed so magnificently, and in the interest of the cause of freedom in the world, I hope and pray that the great Italian nation will make the right decision, and take the right road. I know that freedom-loving people everywhere share these sentiments.

SGT. NOBLE FRANK SMITH

Mr. **ARENDS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ARENDS**. Mr. Speaker, this is a believe it or not. They say that the truth is stranger than fiction. What I am about to tell you is the truth. It is not fiction. It is not just indescribably strange. It is unbelievably preposterous.

Our State Department has been endeavoring to collect from Marine Sgt. Noble Frank Smith the sum of $1,421.92 as repayment for subsistence and medical assistance given his wife and newborn child, through the Swiss Government, when the Japanese took Shanghai, China.

When war broke out Sergeant Smith was ordered to the Philippines, having to leave his family behind in Shanghai. He is one of the heroes of Bataan. While he was risking his life, and enduring untold hardship in the Bataan Death March and as a prisoner of war of the Japanese, his wife and child were also enduring great hardship in Shanghai as internees of the Japanese.

Now—18 years later—this great big, generous Government of ours, through our State Department, bills the Smiths—now a family of five, farming in Onarga, Ill.—for financial help given the mother and first-born child in China. It is preposterous. And it should be added that the amount sought to be collected is at the exorbitant wartime rate of exchange.

What makes this even more preposterous is how in contrast this great, big generous Government of ours, at the insistence of our benevolent State Department, awarded $400 million to the people of the Philippines to pay property damage claims arising from the War. Many of you will recall how our State Department officials wept, and wept some more, for the Philippines in prevailing upon the Congress last year to appropriate $73 million to settle questionable property damage claims.

It was not enough that we helped the Philippine people get their country back from the Japanese. We paid them for the damage our Armed Forces did to their property in the process. This was for rehabilitation purposes. And we even paid them $73 million more long after rehabilitation.

It was a debt of honor, argued the State Department, to a loyal and trusted friend. Our sense of justice and fair play demanded that it be paid.

But there has been forthcoming no such frantic appeals for Marine Sergeant Smith.

And so, we have this paradox. Our State Department demands that we pay the Philippine people for war property damage. Our State Department demands Marine Sergeant Smith pay for the meager assistance given his family while he was fighting in the Philippines.

On March 22 I wrote the Secretary of State about this $1,421 claim against Marine Sergeant Smith. He responded under date of April 5 to the effect that for the present the Department is taking no further action on this case, pending possible action by the Congress. The State Department makes no recommendation.

I have introduced a bill to relieve the Smiths of the claimed indebtedness. I am urging that this measure be promptly enacted. This is the least we can do. A claim of this character should never have been asserted, in the first place, if there had been a proper screening and a disposition on the part of the State Department that such liabilities be set aside.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE SURRENDER OF BATAAN PENINSULA

Mr. **RHODES** of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RHODES** of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a young native from the Philippine Islands, Mr. Sotero Cabahug, Jr., has worked as an intern in the office of the Republican policy committee since the beginning of this session of Congress. Mr. Cabahug is a very capable student of political science. He is also the deputy secretary general of the Nationalista Party of the Philippine Islands. We have all appreciated his keen intellect and the fine work he has done.

Today is the 21st anniversary of the fall of Bataan. He remembers that day. Mr. Cabahug has prepared his own remarks relating to this day, and I include them at this point in my remarks:

> On April 9, 1942, the United States lost a battle.
>
> On this day, the heroic American and Philippine defenders of Bataan Peninsula in the Philippines laid down their arms to an enemy superior in numbers and in arms.
>
> They had held the enemy at bay for more than 3 months. They had stemmed the tide which had engulfed all the rest of southeast Asia. While everywhere else in the Far East it seemed that nothing could stand in the way of the enemy's might, these soldiers stood their ground as all the world watched in awe and admiration.

World War II belongs to the pages of history now. The wounds it inflicted have already healed. Even its savagery has been forgotten. This is as it should be, if humanity is to survive its own follies.

Yet, in this complicated day and age of cold war diplomacy, nuclear stalemate and disarmament talks, foreign aid and neutralism, it might be well for us to remember not the bitterness generated by that conflict, but the gallantry and courage of the men who fought in it, of the Americans and Filipinos on Bataan, men of different races and creeds who fought and died side by side in defense of a common ideal—human dignity.

There are many words and phrases which today may sound trite and platitudinous to many people. But it may well be on our willingness to give these words and phrases meaning and significance that democracy's survival depends.

Today let us relive the epic stand on Bataan by recalling the last message emanating from the "Voice of Freedom," a makeshift radio station operating on the island bastion of Corregidor, just before it went off the air and was forever silenced by defeat.

It is an inspiring message, and with its reading I pay tribute to the gallant defenders of Bataan and Corregidor:

"Bataan has fallen. The Philippine-American troops on this war-ravaged and bloodstained peninsula have laid down their arms. With heads bloody but unbowed, they have yielded to the superior force and numbers of the enemy. The world will long remember the epic struggle that Philippine and American soldiers put up in these jungle fastnesses and along the rugged coast of Bataan. They have stood uncomplaining under the constant and gruelling fire of the enemy for more than 3 months. Besieged on land and blockaded by sea, cut off from all sources of help in the Philippines and in America, these intrepid fighters have done all that human endurance could bear. For what sustained them through all these months of incessant battle was a force that was more than merely physical. It was a force of an unconquerable faith—something in the heart and soul that physical hardship and adversity could not destroy. It was the thought of the native land and all that it holds most dear, the thought of freedom and dignity, the pride in these most priceless of all human prerogatives. The adversary, in the pride of his power and triumph, will credit our troops with nothing less than the courage and fortitude that his own troops have shown. All the world will testify to the almost superhuman endurance with which they stood up until the last in the face of overwhelming odds.

"But the decision had to come. Men fighting under the banner of an unshakable faith are made of something more than flesh, but they are not made of impervious steel. The flesh must yield at last, and endurance melts away. And the end of the battle must come.

"Bataan has fallen, but the spirit that made it stand—a beacon to all the liberty-loving people of the world—cannot fail."

MASSIVE U.N. AID TO COMMUNISTS CONTINUES—AMERICAN TAXPAYERS PAY LION'S SHARE OF BILL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have been investigating the foreign aid operations of the United Nations for 2 months, including the U.N. Special Fund grants to Red nations for large projects. What I found was disheartening, as I have told this House.

Now I have turned my attention to the other technical assistance programs operated by the U.N. and subsidized 40 percent by American dollars. These programs, the expanded technical assistance program and the regular technical assistance program, deal with training projects of smaller individual scope than Special Fund projects.

I regret to inform the House that the U.N. policy of providing American dollars to aid Communist nations operates every bit as effectively in the assistance programs as it does in the Special Fund. It is my unpleasant duty to document that shameful record here today.

My colleagues, under its programs of technical assistance, the United Nations has scheduled 87 projects in 6 Communist bloc nations in the next 2 years. The projects will cost the U.N. $3,110,423.

American taxpayers are to pay 40 percent of the cost of these Red aid projects to the tune of $1,244,169.

From past experience we would have expected the U.N. to extend this aid to Cuba, Poland, and Yugoslavia, but the shocking thing about the training projects is that they also will involve Red—Bury the West—Albania, Red Bulgaria, and the U.S.S.R. itself.

The aid programed for the Red bloc is $838,776 more than the bloc contributed to the expanded technical assistance program in 1962. Cuba gave nothing last year, Albania $2,000, Bulgaria $17,647, Poland $100,000, Yugoslavia $152,000, and the U.S.S.R. $2,000,000. In 1962, the United States gave $18,498,207.

Among the more ambitious of the projects are ones that would provide training in Albania for technical education, in Poland for general atomic development and for telecommunications, in Yugoslavia for nuclear reactor design and construction and for industrial development, in Cuba for educational services, in Bulgaria for small-scale industry, and in the U.S.S.R. for such things as aerial surveys and oceanography.

The projects, listed in U.N. documents marked for limited distribution, include none involving the United States.

Once again, the U.N. has acted without asking the long-suffering American taxpayers. It has placed Americans in the impossible position of paying to help make communism work. Worse yet, the U.S. State Department blandly informs me that the United States has not even bothered to object to these projects—even the ones in Cuba.

In view of the fuss the administration raised about the first revealed Special Fund farm aid to Cuba and the hogwash logic about "no U.S. dollars being used," it is amazing to me that there has been no further objection to, or rationalization of, these other U.N. projects.

Can it be that the Department of State does not know about them? Or perhaps they hoped the American taxpayers never would find out about them. Maybe the Congress will find soon a solution better even than objection.

PROJECT BREAKDOWN

Mr. Speaker, here is a breakdown of the 87 projects:

Yugoslavia: 27 projects under the expanded technical assistance program and 2 projects under the regular technical assistance program with a total cost of $1,001,143.

Albania: 2 expanded technical assistance program projects costing $70,000.

Cuba: 15 projects from expanded technical assistance program and other U.N. associated agencies at a total cost of $1,179,080. Eleven of these projects I revealed here on March 6. Four are revealed for the first time today.

Poland: 28 projects under the expanded and regular programs at a cost of $277,200.

Interregional: 12 projects each including a number of countries and costing a total of $583,000—8 involving the U.S.S.R.—$448,000; 2 involving Yugoslavia; and 1 each involving Poland—$60,000; and Bulgaria—$30,000.

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

Mr. Speaker, I will provide in the Record details of these projects. Typical of the subjects for training are these:

Yugoslavia: Nuclear reactor construction, metallurgy, shipbuilding, chemicals, tourism, farm production, livestock production, aircraft fatigue, aerodynamics, ultrasonics measuring, restoration of monuments, airport management, sterilization by radiation, X-ray diffractometer, electronic switchboards, prophylactic problems.

Albania: Technical education, cancer control, meteorology.

Cuba: Scientific and technological education service, pisciculture, soil survey, dietetics training. These 4 projects are in addition to 11 Cuban projects revealed on March 6.

Poland: General atomic energy development, diesel engines, aluminum industries, roller bearing production, pistons, high-speed gears, hydraulic pumps, microwave techniques, language training, coaxial cables, space telecommunication ground stations.

Bulgaria: Small scale industry.

U.S.S.R.: Oceanography, aerial surveys, pest control, grain storage, nutrition, reforestation.

STATISTICS

Mr. Speaker, the technical assistance programs normally involve grants to fellows who study in the fields designated.

It is my judgment that the study fields designated by the all-knowing United Nations are not the sort of things Americans should be paying to teach enemies of the free world. Nor should Communist countries be paid to serve as hosts for such study.

It appears that the President should recall his Clay Committee on Foreign Aid and have it conduct an extensive investigation of the aid programs of the United Nations which Americans subsidize so heavily.

The total 1963-64 program of the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance is $83,419,000. The 40-percent U.S. share of that comes to $33,367,600.

Since the U.N. first got the idea of giving away aid, in 1951, the United States has contributed $205 million to expanded technical assistance programs alone at rates varying from 40 to 60.65 percent of the total expanded technical assistance program budget.

Total expanded technical assistance program grants from 1951 through those planned for 1964 come to $431,488,000—an impressive amount of giving for an organization kept from bankruptcy only by handouts from American taxpayers, whose own Nation is deeply in debt.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this U.N. problem at length in my office with Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton and with Mr. Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. Mr. Dutton and Mr. Gardner have provided details about some selected U.N. technical assistance projects in Communist-bloc nations. I will insert this listing with my remarks in the RECORD.

And, Mr. Speaker, I wish to have printed at this point in the RECORD a number of tables concerning U.N. aid. Some of the tables were prepared by my staff, others are from United Nations budget documents.

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS FROM U.N. DOCUMENTS—PROVIDED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

YUGOSLAVIA

UNTA 294-57 industrial development and productivity:

Under the headings of "Ferrous and Nonferrous Metallurgy," "Metal Industry," "Motor Industry," "Machine Building," "Ship Building," "Electrical Industry," "Chemical Industry," "Wood and Pulp Industry," "Rubber Industry," "Food Industry and Productivity," a total of 99 fellowships have been requested.

Four short-term experts are requested in 1963: Motor vehicle headlamps (2 months); toolshop work organization (2 months); organic benzene intermediates (3 months); and production of paints (3 months). In 1964 an expert in machine production is requested for 5 months.

Demonstration equipment for the Institute for Light Metals Research, the Metal Industry, the Motor Vehicle Industry, and the Wood Institute Industry has been requested for 1963. In 1964 equipment for the Metal Industry and for the Institute of Chemistry at the University of Zagreb has been requested.

ILO 124-53 manpower organization including vocational training:

Short missions are provided for an expert in training methods and expert-instructors for the Zagreb Training Center. In addition, short missions are foreseen for experts to advise the Government in the training of skilled personnel in specific industrial processes such as production methods for cut strips cores for transformers in electrical industry, repair of cooling installations, serial servicing of motor vehicles; one 4-month fellowship will be awarded to study abroad methods for assessing training need for skilled workers; demonstration equipment will be provided to help in the preparation of teaching aids for vocational training and in-plant training.

Some 127 worker-traineeships for a total of more than 500 man-months will be awarded to enable foremen and skilled workers to improve their training abroad in various specialties of activities such as metallurgy, generation of electric energy, metal industries, electrical industry, chemical industry, paper and pulp industry.

UNESCO 679-63/64 Universities—Technical Sciences:

For some years EPTA assistance has been provided for the reform of the entire national educational system. At this stage the concentration is on the reform and modernization in university research and teaching and 23 fellowships in technical fields such as organic chemistry, biology, physics, and mathematics are required.

ICAO 16-61 air transport: The program provides 4 fellowships for advanced training in the organization and management of airports, flight simulators, and servo systems and their applications.

ITU 359-57 telecommunications: Six fellowships will be awarded for advanced training in various telecommunication problems.

WMO 402-57 meteorology: Four fellowships are requested for training in specialized fields of meteorology.

IAEA 634-70 reactors: The Government has requested 8 fellowships in reactor physics and 8 fellowships in reactor design and construction.

POLAND

UNTA 152-61 natural resources development and power: The post for an adviser on research in geophysics was postponed from 1962, since the preferred [sic] candidate was not available earlier. Under this project the Government has also requested 11 fellowships in various fields concerned with the use of national resources or power production.

UNTA 189-60 industrial development and productivity: In order to meet the requirements of the Polish Industry for trained specialists and engineers, the Government has requested 64 relatively short fellowships in various industrial fields.

UNESCO 48-63/64 (418-61/62) language training center: The language teaching center of the University of Warsaw wishes to complete the project initiated by the expert attached during 1961-62. Two language laboratories recommended by the UNESCO expert are to be supplied with equipment and two will study laboratories abroad.

ITU 43-62 telecommunication: Three fellowships in 1963 and two in 1964 will be awarded for the advanced training in telephony, cables, and radiocommunications.

WMO meteorology: In order to enable the Meteorological Service to make hydrometeorological forecasts the Government has requested the services of an expert in the field of weather radar to advise on the installation of a Decca type weather radar. Demonstration equipment will also be provided. Additionally, provision is made for fellowships both in 1963 and 1964 in the fields of radar maintenance and the application of radar to meteorology.

IAEA 634-120 general atomic energy development: The Government has requested four fellowships in various fields related to atomic energy.

ALBANIA

UNESCO 156-61/62 technical education: The technical faculty of the National University in Tirana has been establishing courses and laboratories in the technical aspects of radio broadcasting and radio communications. Some equipment was provided under expanded program technical assistance in 1961-62 and the government has requested some additional laboratory equipment in 1963-64, together with two fellowships for studies of electronic computers.

WHO 76-61 cancer control: Continuing a project which formed part of the 1961-62 program, the government has requested equipment for treatment of cancer with radioactive materials in a center being established in Tirana, together with a short mission by a consultant to help in putting the equipment into operation.

WMO meteorology: Albania does not as yet have a meteorological station at a high mountain location and the Hydrometeorological Service has requested equipment for one such station, together with fellowships for training in the installation and operation of this equipment.

TABLE 1.—*U.N. projects in Cuba (long term), expanded technical assistance program—1963-64 program*

Organization and project title	Project No.	Total cost of project	Experts				Fellows				Equipment and supplies
			Field of activity	Number	Man-months	Cost	Field of study	Number	Man-months	Cost	
FAO											
Fisheries	59-58	$74,000	Pisciculture Master fisherman (sardines)	1 1	18 15	$27,000 23,000	Marine biology	1	12	$4,000	$20,000
Land and water development.		27,000	Soil survey	1	18	27,000					
Subtotal		101,000		3	51	77,000		1	12	4,000	20,000
UNESCO											
Educational service	256-59	22,000	Scientific and technological	1	12	18,000		1	12	4,000	
WHO											
Public health services	106-60	23,000	Dietetics training	1	12	18,000					5,000
Total (Cuba)		146,000		5	75	113,000		2	24	8,000	25,000

TABLE 2.—*U.N. projects in Poland (long term) expanded technical assistance program, 1963–64 program*

Organization and project title	Project number	Total cost of project	Fellows			
			Field of study	Number	Man-months	Cost
UNTA						
Industrial Development and Production	Add. 1 K189-60	$17,600	Sheet metal packages	1	2	$800
			Casting industry	2	4	1,600
			Steel cables	1	2	800
			Automation of production processing	1	2	800
			Electro devices on welding apparatus	1	2	800
			Metallographic methods	1	2	800
			Production of transistors	1	2	800
			Automation in industry	1	2	800
			Shaft sinking	1	2	800
			Design diesel locomotives	1	2	800
			Production of laminates	1	2	800
			Electroplating	1	2	800
			Equipment, diesel, electric railway traction	1	2	800
			Welding atmosphere	1	2	800
			Constructing agricultural machines	1	2	800
			Refrigerator compressors production	1	2	800
			Electronic measurement mechanics quantity	1	2	800
			Harvesting machinery	1	2	800
			Production of refractory materials	1	2	800
			Organization of technical information services	1	2	800
			Measurements of cargoship, fishing craft	1	2	800
Total		17,600		22	44	17,600
FAO						
Land, Water Development of Rural Industries.	127-61	800	Farm production planning	1	2	800
	128-61	6,000	Oleaginous plant growing	1	2	800
			Starch production techniques	1	3	1,200
			Bacterial diseases of fruit trees and shrubs	1	2	800
			Economics of pest and disease control	1	3	1,200
			Cereals production	1	3	1,200
			Automatic sugar factories	1	2	800
Fisheries Development	61-60	2,000	Fish processing techniques	1	2	800
			Tuna fish catching methods	1	3	1,200
Forestry Development	129-61	2,000	Forest roads destruction and construction	1	2	800
			Forest land reclamation	1	3	1,200
Nutrition	62-60	3,600	Automatic production of yeast	1	2	800
			Additives in fodder production	1	3	1,200
			Extension methods in nutrition	1	2	800
			Methods of nutritional analysis	1	2	800
Economics: Economic analysis	13-61	800	Quality of foodstuffs (Austrian Chamber of Commerce).	1	2	800
Total		15,200		16	38	15,200
WHO						
Nursing	21-63	6,300	Nursing	3	18	6,300
Total		6,300		3	18	6,300
ITU						
Telecommunications	43-62	3,600	Radio control	1	2	800
			"Crossbar" telephone networks	1	2	800
			Telecommunication measurements	1	3	1,200
			Space telecommunication ground station	1	2	800
Total		3,600		4	9	3,600
Grand total (Poland)		42,700		45	109	42,700

TABLE 3.—*U.N. projects in Albania (short term) expanded technical assistance program—1963–64 program*

Organization and project title	Project No.	Total		Experts			Fellows			Equipment and supplies, 1963
					1963			1963		
		1963–64	1963	Field of activity	Man-months	Cost	Field of study	Man-months	Cost	
UNESCO										
Technical education	156-61 156-62	$15,000	$15,000	Technical education	1/1	$1,500				$13,500
WHO										
Cancer control	76-61	37,000	37,000	Consultant	1/1	1,000				36,000
WMO										
Meteorology		18,000	18,000				Meteorology	3/15	$8,000	10,000
Total short term		70,000	70,000		2/2	2,500		3/15	8,000	59,500
Total (Albania)		70,000	70,000		2/2	2,500		3/15	8,000	59,500

TABLE 4.—*U.N. projects in Cuba (short term)—Expanded technical assistance program—1963–64 program*

Organization and project title	Project No.	Total					Experts					Fellows				
		1963–64	1963	1964	1965	1966	Field of activity	1963		1964		Field of study	1963		1964	
								Man-months	Cost	Man-months	Cost		Man-months	Cost	Man-months	Cost
ILO																
Social security	11-63	$9,000	$9,000	-------	-------	-------	Administration	1/2	$3,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
							Actuary	1/2	3,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
							Accidents	1/2	3,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Total (short term)	-------	9,000	9.000	-------	-------	-------	-------	3/6	9,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
FAO																
Fisheries development	59-58	−160,000	88,000	$72,000	$85,500	$85,500	Master fisherman	1/9	12,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
							Biologist (research)	1/12	18,000	1/12	$18,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
							Biologist (oyster culture)	1/12	18,000	1/12	18,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
							Master fisherman	1/12	18,000	1/12	18,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
							Biologist (genetics)	1/12	18,000	1/12	18,000	Marine biology	1/12	$4,000	-------	-------
Total (long term)	-------	−160,000	88,000	72,000	85,500	85,500	-------	5/57	84,000	4/48	72,000	-------	1/12	4,000	-------	-------
UNESCO																
Marine biology	501-63/64	54,000	36,000	18,000	22,500	22,500	Planktonology	1/12	18,000	1/12	18,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
							Oceanography	1/12	18,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Total (long term)	-------	54,000	36,000	18,000	22,500	22,500	-------	2/24	36,000	1/12	18,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Educational service	256-59 (200)	13,500	13,500	-------	-------	-------	Technical education	1/9	13,500	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Total (short term)	-------	13,500	13,500	-------	-------	-------	-------	1/9	13,500	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Total	-------	67,500	49,500	18,000	22,500	22,500	-------	3/33	49,500	1/12	18,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
ICAO																
Civil aviation	27-61	17,280	8,640	8,640	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	Civil aviation meteorology	6/72	8,640	6/72	$8,640
Total (short term)	-------	17,280	8,640	8,640	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	6/72	8,640	6/72	8,640
WHO																
Public health services	106-60	152,000	94,000	58,000	58,000	58,000	Medical officer	1/12	18,000	1/12	18,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
							Sanitary officer	1/12	15,000	1/12	15,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
							Public health nurse	2/24	26,500	1/12	12,500	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
							Nurse educator	1/12	12,500	1/12	12,500	Hospital administration	1/12	4,000	-------	-------
							Nutrition	1/12	18,000	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Total (long term)	-------	152,000	94,000	58,000	58,000	58,000	-------	6/72	90,000	4/48	58,000	-------	1/12	4,000	-------	-------
Grand total, Cuba	-------	405,780	249,140	156,640	166.000	166,000	-------	17/168	232,500	9/108	148,000	-------	8/96	16,640	6/72	8,640

TABLE 5.—*U.N. projects in Poland (short term)—Expanded technical assistance program—1963–64 program*

Organization project title	Project No.	Total			Experts					Fellows					Equipment and supplies	
		1963–64	1963	1964	Field of activity	1963		1964		Field of study	1963		1964		1963	1964
						Man-months	Cost	Man-months	Cost		Man-months	Cost	Man-months	Cost		
UNTA																
Natural resources development and power	152-61	$11,800	$9,400	$2,400	Research in geophysics	1/3	$3,000	--------	--------	Powerplants	1/2	$800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Iron ore processing	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Iron ore mines	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Treatment fine coal	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Electric powerplants	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										High voltage	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Gas mines	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Coal mines transportation	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Steam powerplants	--------	--------	1/2	$800	--------	--------
										Hydraulic drives	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Colleries reconstruction	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
Industrial development and production	189-60	62,550	26,150	36,400	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	Chemical engineering	2/4	1,600	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Organic chemistry	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Chemical reactors	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Hydrocarbons industry	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Application of latex	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Micro-organisms	1/3	2,100	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Pharmaceuticals	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Petrochemical wastes	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Analysis of detergents	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Diesel engines	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Plastic coatings	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Electrodes	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Metal cutting	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Automation equipment	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Aluminum industry	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Welding of turbines	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Machine casting technology	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Roll-bearing production	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Theory of automation	1/2	1,650	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Mechanical presses	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Ferrous materials	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Production of oxygen apparatus	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Drying installations	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Metallic coatings	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Production of fiber boards	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Circuits breakers	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Chemical metallurgy	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										High-voltage insulation	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Cable industry	1/2	800	--------	--------	--------	--------
										Electronic industry	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Metal industry	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Fats industry	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Dextran	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Polymaide fibers	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Organic analysis	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Resins industry	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Pesticide	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Machine tools control	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Hydraulic machine tools	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Tractor engineering	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Technology hull buildings	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Welding of plates	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Transport in workshop	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Aluminum pistons	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										High speed gears	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Gas industry	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Building machines	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Electrical engines	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Hydraulic pumps	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Glass reinforced	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Spectrochemical analysis	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Aircraft aerodynamics	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Automation foundries	--------	--------	2/4	1,600	--------	--------
										Research in mat. ind.	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Operation mining machinery	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Water for cooling and boiler	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------
										Silicon control diodes	--------	--------	1/2	800	--------	--------

										Microwave technique			1/2	800		
										Microwave measurements			1/2	800		
										Emission from metals			1/2	800		
										Production of telecommunication elements			1/2	800		
										Electronic components			1/2	800		
										Installation of sugar factories			1/12	3,200		
										Magnetic amplifiers			1/8	2,300		
										Electric velocity modulating tubes			1/9	2,400		
										Oxygen in steel plants			1/4	1,300		
Total short term		74,350	35,550	38,800		1/3	3,000				38/77	32,550	41/107	38,800		
Total		74,350	35,550	38,800		1/3	3,000				38/77	32,500	41/107	38,800		
FAO																
Plant production and protection	128-61	4,000	1,600	2,400						Green fodder meal production	1/2	800				
										Fodder plants	1/2	800				
										Virus diseases			1/2	800		
										Seed variety qualifications			1/2	800		
										Potatoes in field and storage			1/2	800		
Animal production and protection	19-62	1,600	1,600							African swine disease	1/2	800				
										Control of animal foodstuffs	1/2	800				
Forestry development	129-61	1,600	800	800						Testing of cardboard materials	1/2	800				
										Timber appraisals and particle boards			1/2	800		
Nutrition	62-60	800		800						Liofilization methods			1/2	800		
Economy: Economic analysis	130-61	2,400	2,400							Wheat and packing techniques	1/2	800				
										Fruit and vegetable storage	1/2	800				
										Urban meat supplies	1/2	800				
Total short term		10,400	6,400	4,000							8/16	6,400	5/10	4,000		
Total		10,400	6,400	4,000							8/16	6,400	5/10	4,000		
UNESCO																
Language training	418-61 418-62 (48)	15,000	15,000							Language training	1/12	3,000			$12,000	
Total short term		15,000	15,000								1/12	3,000			12,000	
Total		15,000	15,000								1/12	3,000			12,000	
WHO																
Tuberculosis control	109-60	5,200	3,500	1,700	Consultant	1/1	1,600	1/1	1,600	Tuberculosis control	2/6	1,800			100	$100
Vital and health statistics	20-63	4,900	2,450	2,450	do	1/1	1,600	1/1	1,600	Vital and health statistics	1/3	750	1/3	750	100	100
Social and occupational health	112-60	2,750	500	2,250						Social and occupational health			1/3	750	500	1,500
Total short term		12,850	6,450	6,400		2/2	3,200	2/2	3,200		3/9	2,550	2/6	1,500	700	1,700
Total		12,850	6,450	6,400		2/2	3,200	2/2	3,200		3/9	2,550	2/6	1,500	700	1,700
ITU																
Telecommunications	43-62	5,600	3,200	2,400						Automatic teletype networks	1/3	1,200	1/3	1,200		
										Coaxial cables	1/3	1,200	1/3	1,200		
										Radio links	1/2	800				
Total short term		5,600	3,200	2,400							3/8	3,200	2/6	2,400		
Total		5,600	3,200	2,400							3/8	3,200	2/6	2,400		
WMO																
Meteorology		42,600	39,300	3,300	Meteorological radar	1/3	4,000			Meteorological radar	1/6	2,100	1/6	2,100	32,000	
										Servicing of meteorological radar equipment.	1/3	1,200	1/3	1,200		
Total short term		42,600	39,300	3,300		1/3	4,000				2/9	3,300	2/9	3,300	32,000	
WMO total		42,600	39,300	3,300		1/3	4,000				2/9	3,300	2/9	3,300	32,000	
IAEA																
General atomic development	634-120	16,000	8,000	8,000						Atomic energy	2/24	8,000	2/24	8,000		
Total short term		16,000	8,000	8,000							2/24	8,000	2/24	8,000		
Total		16,000	8,000	8,000							2/24	8,000	2/24	8,000		
Total (Poland)		176,800	113,900	62,900		4/8	10,200	2/2	3,200		57/155	59,000	54/162	58,000	44,700	1,700

TABLE 6.—*U.N. projects in Yugoslavia (short term) expanded technical assistance program, 1963–64 program*

Organization and project title	Project No.	Total			Experts					Fellows					Equipment and supplies	
		1963–64	1963	1964	Field of activity	1963		1964		Field of study	1963		1964		1963	1964
						Man-months	Cost	Man-months	Cost		Man-months	Cost	Man-months	Cost		
UNTA																
Economic surveys	24–58	$4, 200	$2, 100	$2, 100						Industrial investments	1/6	$2, 100	1/6	$2, 100		
Industrial development and production	294–57	218, 875	119, 675	99, 200	Headlamps	1/1	$2, 700			Metallurgy	9/37	14, 950	9/42	16, 525	$1, 300	
					Toolshop organization	1/2	3, 900			Metal industry	6/23	11, 350	3/11	5, 950	5, 000	$5, 000
					Machine production			1/5	$7, 500	Motor industry	2/7	2, 625	3/12	4, 350	3, 600	
					Organic benzene inter	1/3	5, 100			Machine building	12/42	15, 600	3/14	5, 100		
					Paints	1/3	5, 100			Shipbuilding	2/6	2, 250	2/6	2, 250		19, 000
										Electrical industry	10/43	15, 825	7/33	11, 925		
										Chemicals industry	8/29	10, 725	5/18	6, 750		
										Wood and pulp	4/20	7, 200	4/18	6, 600	4, 200	
										Rubber	1/3	1, 125				
										Food industry	2/8	3, 900	3/11	5, 025		
										Productivity	2/9	3, 225	2/9	3, 225		
Natural Resources Development, Power.	295–57	33, 800	15, 275	18, 525	Abrasives			1/3	5, 100	Electric power	4/26	9, 575	2/16	5, 850		
										Mining	3/6	2, 250	2/4	1, 500		
										Nonmetals	2/8	3, 450	3/14	4, 950		
										Geological surveys			1/3	1, 125		
Transportation and Communication	296–57	5, 100	3, 000	2, 100						Local transport	2/8	3, 000				
										Transport investment			1/6	2, 100		
Statistics	297–57	5, 400	2, 700	2, 700						Industrial statistics	1/8	2, 700				
										Agricultural statistics			1/8	2, 700		
Housing, Planning and Building	299–57	26, 025	12, 225	13, 800						Housing	7/28	11, 150	7/28	13, 800	1, 075	
Trade, production, and marketing	25–58	6, 825	2, 925	3, 900						Tourism	2/8	2, 925	1/5	1, 800		
										GATT			1/6	2, 100		
Social services	23–58	6, 800	5, 300	1, 500						Rehabilitation	1/5	1, 800				
										Orthopedic aids	1/4	1, 500	1/4	1, 500	2, 000	
Total, short term		307, 025	163, 200	143, 825		4/9	16, 800	2/8	12, 600		82/334	129, 225	62/274	107, 225	17, 175	24, 000
Total		307, 025	163, 200	143, 825		4/9	16, 800	2/8	12, 600		82/334	129, 225	62/274	107, 225	17, 175	24, 000
ILO																
Manpower organization and vocational training.	124–53	126, 800	73, 800	53, 000	Training methods experts (Zagreb).	1/2	2, 00			Training need	1/4	2, 300				3, 500
					Experts-instructors					Worker-trainees	67/287	59, 000	60/228	45, 600		
					Rolling mills	1/1	1, 000									
					Oil industry	1/1	1, 000									
					Leather	1/1	1, 000									
					Carbon, noncorrosive steel.	1/1	1, 000									
					Transformer cores	1/2	2, 600									
					Cooling installations	1/1	1, 300	1/1	1, 300							
					Motor vehicles service	1/2	2, 600	1/2	2, 600							
Total, short term		126, 800	73, 800	53, 000		8/11	12, 500	2/3	3, 900		68/291	61, 300	60/228	45, 600		3, 500
Total		126, 800	73, 800	53, 000		8/11	12, 500	2/3	3, 900		68/291	61, 300	60/228	45, 600		3, 500
FAO																
Plant production and protection	173–53	86, 600	39, 300	47, 300						Wheat production	1/6	3, 100	1/6	3, 100		
										Wheat Resources Institute equipment					10, 000	10, 000
										Sunflower technology			1/6	3, 100		
										Cotton technology			1/4	2, 200		
										Sugarbeet selection	1/4	2, 200				
										Potato selection	1/4	2, 200	3/12	6, 600		
										Vegetable production	4/12	7, 200	1/3	1, 800		
										Peach production	2/8	4, 400	4/12	7, 200		
										Stone-fruit production	1/6	3, 100	1/3	1, 800		
										Agrumes production	1/4	2, 200	1/4	2, 200		
										Potato disease	1/6	3, 100	1/6	3, 100		
										Tobacco plant diseases	1/3	1, 800				
										Tobacco plantations			1/3	1, 800		
										Orchards mechanization			2/8	4, 400		

Animal Production and Health	174-53	61,800	29,700	32,100						Pigs breeding	3/9	5,400	3/9	5,400		
										Sheep selection	1/6	3,100	2/6	3,600		
										Beef and milk production	4/16	8,800	3/9	5,400		
										Poultry and egg selection			1/4	2,200		
										Poultry technology	2/8	4,400	3/12	6,600		
										Production of concentrates, mixed food			1/6	3,100		
										Cattle protection	1/3	1,800	1/3	1,800		
										Calf pathology	1/4	2,200	1/4	2,200		
										Poultry protection	2/7	4,000	1/3	1,800		
Land, Water Development, Rural Industries.	171-53	1,800		1,800						Mineral fertilizers			1/3	1,800		
Fisheries Development		9,300		9,300						Deep sea fishing			3/18	9,300		
Forestry Development		15,100	7,100	8,000						Coniferous trees	2/9	4,900	2/8	4,400		
										Forest mechanization	1/4	2,200	1/3	1,800		
										Production of foliate trees			1/3	1,800		
Total, short term		174,600	76,100	98,500							30/119	66,100	41/158	88,500	10,000	10,000
Total		174,600	76,100	98,500							30/119	66,100	41/158	88,500	100,00	10,000
UNESCO																
Universities—Technical sciences	679-63 679-64	69,000	33,000	36,000						Electrical techniques	1/9	3,000				
										Electrical machines	1/9	3,000				
										High tension	1/9	3,000				
										Automatic regulation			1/9	3,000		
										TV measuring	1/6	3,000				
										Digital measuring	1/9	3,000				
										Impulse testing			1/9	3,000		
										Crystals in metals			1/9	3,000		
										Coal gas products	1/6	3,000				
										Semiconditions in digital techniques	1/9	3,000				
										Stability of airplanes	1/9	3,000				
										Aircraft fatigue	1/9	3,000				
										Dynamic loading	1/9	3,000				
										Precision valves	1/9	3,000				
										Nonlinear vibrations			1/9	3,000		
										Experimental aerodynamics			1/9	3,000		
										Aircrafts propulsion units			1/9	3,000		
										Vibration in ships			1/9	3,000		
										Homogenous aerosols			1/9	3,000		
										Skin penetration toxic materials			1/9	3,000		
										Feedback control systems			1/6	3,000		
										Photogrammetric triangulation			1/6	3,000		
										Ferromagnetism			1/9	3,000		
Universities—Natural sciences	680-63-64	129,800	53,400	76,400	Biological study	1/6	9,000	1/6	9,000	Field theory			1/12	3,900		
										Tissue conservation	1/12	3,900				
										Biological studies			3/27	9,000	11,500	11,500
										Nucleonic acids			1/9	3,000	5,000	5,500
										Psychological genetics			1/9	4,000		
										Solid state physics	1/9	3,000				
										X-ray difractometer						21,500
										Mathematical statistics	1/9	3,000				
										Inorganic-organic compounds	1/9	3,000				
										Physical and chemical methods			1/9	3,000		
										Chemical structure analysis	1/9	3,000				
										Magnetophysics	1/9	3,000				
										Geodetic astronomic observations			1/9	3,000		
										Study of magnetic fields	1/9	3,000				
										Ultrasonic measurements	1/9	3,000				
										Identification of organic compounds	1/9	3,000				
										Genetics			1/9	3,000		
Universities—Social sciences	681-63 681-64	6,000	3,000	3,000						Economic integration	1/9	3,000				
										International financing for development.			1/2	3,000		
Universities—Education	682-63 682-64	28,500	9,000	19,500	Vocational training lectures.			1/2	3,000	Restoration cultural monuments			1/6	3,000		6,000
										Basic electrotechniques	1/9	3,000	1/9	3,000		
					Teaching methods			1/3	4,500	Steam machineries	1/9	3,000				
										TV documentary broadcast	1/6	8,000				
Total, short term		233,300	98,400	134,900		1/6	9,000	3/11	16,500		24/210	72,900	24/203	73,900	16,500	44,500
Total		233,300	98,400	134,900		1/6	9,000	3/11	16,500		24/210	72,900	24/203	73,900	16,500	44,500
ICAO																
Civil Aviation		7,200	3,600	3,600						Simulators in airplane problems	1/3	1,800				
										Servo systems			1/3	1,800		
										Management of airports	1/3	1,800	1/3	1,800		
Total, short term		7,200	3,600	3,600							2/6	3,600	2/6	3,600		
Total		7,200	3,600	3,600							2/6	3,600	2/6	3,600		

TABLE 6.—*U.S. projects in Yugoslavia (short term) expanded technical assistance program, 1963–64 program*—Continued

Organization and project title	Project No.	Total			Experts					Fellows					Equipment and supplies	
					Field of activity	1963		1964		Field of study	1963		1964			
		1963–64	1963	1964		Man-months	Cost	Man-months	Cost		Man-months	Cost	Man-months	Cost	1963	1964
WHO																
Tuberculosis Control	57–57	5,600	3,600	2,000	Consultant (BCG vaccine).	1/1	$1,600								$2,000	$2,000
Public Health Administration	55–57	20,000	7,600	12,400						PHA	1/10	$4,000	1/10	$4,000		
										Geriatrics	1/3	1,200	1/3	1,200		
										Dental care			1/6	2,400		
										Micology			1/6	2,400		
										Prevention of chronic diseases	1/6	2,400	1/6	2,400		
Nursing Education	13–59	9,600	4,800	4,800						Psychiatric nursing	2/12	4,800	2/12	4,800		
Maternal and Child Health Services	111–53	9,600	4,800	4,800						Rehabilitation	2/12	4,800	2/12	4, 00		
Public Health Administration (various fields).	55–57	34,800	18,800	16,000						Virology, epidemiology	2/12	4,800	2/12	4,800		
										Plastic surgery, traumatology	1/6	2,400	2/12	4,800		
										Tropical diseases	1/5	2,000	1/4	1,600		
										Haematology	1/6	2,400				
										Radioisotopes in ophthalmology	1/3	1,200				
										Orthopedy-strabimus	1/6	2,400				
										Treatment and rehabilitation of contractures.	1/3	1,200				
										Tooth pulp treatment	1/3	1,200				
										Sterilization by ionizing radiation	1/3	1,200				
										Micro and ultramicro methods in clinical biochemistry.			1/3	1,200		
										Conservation of tissues			1/3	1,200		
										Microsurgery in otorhinolaryngology			1/3	1,200		
										Profilactic problems			1/3	1,200		
Total, short term		79,600	39,600	40,000		1/1	1,600				17/90	36,000	18/95	38,000	2,000	2,000
Total		79,600	39,600	40,000		1/1	1,600				17/90	36,000	18/95	38,000	2,000	2,000
ITU																
Telecommunications	359–57	8,700	4,350	4,350						Protection of telecommunication equipment.	1/2	750				
										Ships antennas			1/2	750		
										Electrical measuring instruments	1/3	1,800				
										Electronic switchboards			1/3	1,800		
										Modern safety signal devices	1/3	1,800				
										Interlocal telephony			1/3	1,800		
Total, short term		8,700	4,350	4,350							3/8	4,350	3/8	4,350		
Total		8,700	4,350	4,350							3/8	4,350	3/8	4,350		
WMO																
Meteorology	402–57	8,618	4,300	4,318						Aerology	1/3	2,150				
										Agrometeorology	1/3	2,150	1/3	2,150		
										Application of meteorology to industry and medicine.			1/3	2,168		
Total, short term		8,618	4,300	4,318							2/6	4,300	2/6	4,318		
Total		8,618	4,300	4,318							2/6	4,300	2/6	4,318		
IAEA																
Reactors	634–70	48,000	24,000	24,000						Reactor physics	4/48	12,000	4/48	12,000		
										Reactor design, construction	4/48	12,000	4/48	12,000		
Total, short term		48,000	24,000	24,000							8/96	24,000	8/96	24,000		
Total		48,000	24,000	24,000							8/96	24,000	8/96	24,000		
Total (Yugoslavia)		993,843	487,350	506,493		14/27	39,900	7/22	$33,000		236/1,160	401,775	220/1,074	389,493	45,675	84,000

TABLE 7.—*U.N. projects in Poland and Yugoslavia regular technical assistance program, 1963 program*

U.N. program	Project title	Cost	Field of activity
POLAND			
Regular program in economic development	Industrial development and productivity.	$9,000	Textile, building, synthetic, and chemical industries.
Do	Statistics	1,800	Statistical sampling and surveying.
The regular program in advisory social welfare services	Social services	4,050	Rehabilitation of individuals; family and child welfare.
Do	Population	5,850	Demography.
Do	Social services	28,000	Rehabilitation; social welfare administration.
The regular program in public administration	Public administration	9,000	Organization of postal services; mechanization of postal service; public administration.
Total, Poland		33,700	
YUGOSLAVIA			
The regular program in advisory social welfare services	Social services	4,900	Rehabilitation.
Do	Housing planning and building.	2,400	Housing.
Total, Yugoslavia		7,300	

INTERNATIONAL REGIONAL

ILO 165–53 cooperation and small-scale industry: Two seminars, one in 1963 and one in 1964, will permit further training on cooperative education and related subjects to be given to principal and senior teaching staff of cooperative colleges and training institutions and to top-ranking officials of cooperative departments responsible for educational planning and organization. These seminars will be organized jointly by the Danish Government, FAO, and ILO.

FAO 14–64 training in basic veterinary bacteriology: The purpose of this training center is to train participants in all matters concerning bacteriology as it relates to animal disease diagnosis and control.

FAO 15–64 Karakul sheep production (U.S.S.R.): The course consists of lectures, practical studies of Karakul sheep, raising under desertic conditions, management, feeding, genetics, and slaughter methods.

Participating countries are expected to include: India, Pakistan, Iran, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Israel, Sudan, Iraq, Turkey, and possibly one or two others.

An extended series of exercises in the selection of fur for the various qualities and colors used in the Soviet market and in the export trade are given to the students, and educational and practical trips are made to the warehouses, slaughter centers, and tanneries of Uzbekistan in order to demonstrate Soviet techniques. A thorough study of pasture improvement methods and fodder conservation practices recommended by Soviet fur-raising specialists is also given to the participants.

The information gained by the participants is useful to governments interested in raising Persian lamb fur in the desertic areas of their countries. Many of the techniques are also useful in countries which raise fat-tail sheep under dry conditions for meat, milk, and wool.

FAO 62–63 training course and study tour on fisheries biology and oceanography (U.S.S.R.): The general purpose of this training center and study tour is to acquaint senior fisheries scientists from various countries, mainly of southeast Asia and Africa, with the organization and conduct of marine and freshwater research and of the application of its results for development and management of fisheries. Visits will probably be made to: Leningrad, Sebastopol, Astrakhan and possibly Murmansk, all of which are centers of marine or inland fisheries laboratories of various kinds. The language of training will be English.

FAO 66–63 seminar on aerial forest surveys (U.S.S.R.): A training center on aerial forest inventory was organized by FAO in 1960 in Malaya and oversubscribed. It was therefore suggested that another regional center be organized to which, in particular, the chiefs of the forest inventory services of the countries mentioned below should be invited to exchange views on recent experience and discuss new technical developments so that they would be enabled to organize short training courses in their countries.

Participating countries are expected to include: Indonesia, Korea, Japan, Malaya, Thailand, Burma, Pakistan, Ceylon, India, Iraq, Iran, Syrian Arab Republic, and Turkey.

In most of the above-mentioned countries, forests cover about two-thirds to three-quarters of the total land area and forest products take a predominant place in exports; however, large areas of the forests have remained unsurveyed so far, because costs of surveys by traditional methods prevented their inventory, and this has resulted in insufficient or irrational forest utilization. Modern inventory techniques have overcome these difficulties and brought forest surveys within economic reach for all these countries. Yet, knowledge of modern use of aerial photography, mathematical-statistical sampling methods and data processing is not yet adequate and rapid progress has been made in all these fields in the most recent years.

FAO sunn pest control study tour (U.S.S.R.): Various problems and techniques for bringing the sunn pest under control are to be studied through lectures and field visits.

FAO grain storage study tour (U.S.S.R.): Losses of grain in storage are of considerable economic significance in the developing countries. Participants would be given an opportunity to study various techniques for grain storage used under different conditions.

FAO mechanization of sylviculture and reafforestation study tour (U.S.S.R.): In many parts of the world, especially in semiarid areas, programs for reafforestation are in various stages of study and implementation. Through lectures and field visits, participants will have a chance to study and evaluate a number of factors and techniques in relation to possibilities for mechanization of this work.

FAO irrigation and drainage study tour (U.S.S.R.): Participants from countries in various regions where irrigated agriculture is of considerable scope will study the solutions of a variety of irrigation and drainage problems in the U.S.S.R.

FAO study tour on food consumption and nutrition data (U.S.S.R.): Through lectures and field visits, specialists from a number of countries will study some problems and techniques in the analysis of nutrition levels and deficiencies.

TABLE 8.—*U.N. assistance to communist bloc nations under expanded and regular technical assistance programs, 1963–64*

Nation	Projects	Cost
YUGOSLAVIA		
Expanded technical assistance program	27	$993,843
Regular technical assistance program	2	7,300
Total	29	1,001,143
ALBANIA		
Expanded technical assistance program	3	70,000
CUBA		
Expanded technical assistance program and other U.N. agency budgets	15	1,179,080
POLAND		
Expanded technical assistance program	22	219,500
Regular technical assistance program	6	57,700
Total	28	277,200
INTERREGIONAL PROJECTS INVOLVING COMMUNIST BLOC NATIONS		
Bulgaria	1	30,000
Poland	1	60,000
Yugoslavia	2	45,000
U.S.S.R.	8	448,000
Total	12	583,000
Grand total	87	[1] 3,110,423

[1] 40 percent contribution of United States equals $1,244,169.20.

ATTENTION TAX TRIMMERS AND BUDGET CUTTERS

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962 authorized $900 million for construction of community facilities, and before Congress adjourned last fall we appropriated $400 million to begin the projects. Today and tomorrow we will be debating the supplemental appropriation bill from which has been eliminated the President's request for the remaining $500 million authorized under the act. I urge my colleagues to consider the economic consequences of this cut when an amendment is offered to include the unappropriated funds. The purpose of the act is to combat unemployment is economically distressed areas and to stimulate the sluggish economy.

In considering the condition of our economy and the impetus which programs of this type will provide, I call the attention of my colleagues to a brilliant analysis of the implications of our fiscal and economic policies by Prof. Robert Lekachman, chairman of the Barnard College Department of Economics, in the April 1963 issue of Commentary, entitled "The Tax Trimmers."

Mr. Speaker, the state of our economy and the continued high level of unemployment call for immediate and imaginative action to help lift our economy out of its doldrums. As Professor Lekachman points out:

> Poverty has become a permanent condition for a very large slice of the urban population.

To attack this problem, he stresses, requires substantial increases to finance schools, hospitals, homes, and social programs. By providing the full appropriation for the Accelerated Public Works Act, we will be helping to reduce unemployment and stimulate the economy.

Professor Lekachman's article follows:

THE TAX TRIMMERS

(By Robert Lekachman)

Like last year's Trade Expansion Act, President Kennedy's only consequential legislative proposal for 1962, the new tax bill, is a long, intricately detailed affair which—as is usually the case with tax measures—promises to be a lawyer's delight and a layman's labyrinth. The President has followed the precedent of the Trade Expansion Act in another respect, too. Just as last summer he mobilized well in advance of the congressional season an extraordinary range of sentiment in support of a more liberal trade policy, so this year he has won the backing of a similarly broad coalition for the notion that tax reductions will serve the cause of economic growth, high employment, and unmarred prosperity. Here, however, the parallel ends, for while last year's allies remained united through the passage of the Trade Expansion Act, this year's coalition—which comprises the chamber of commerce, the Committee for Economic Development, the AFL–CIO, and a large body of independent economic and editorial opinion (including that of Walter Lippmann)—is now quarreling not only about the distribution of the tax benefits, but also about the advisability to tying tax reforms to tax reductions.

The President's total program of tax cuts and tax reforms involves, at least at first glance, some impressive numbers. At the completion of all the stages of the 3-year sequence of reductions and reforms, gross reductions would total $13.6 billion and the reforms would recover some $3.2 to $3.3 billion for the Treasury, making the net reduction in the tax burden more than $10 billion, much the largest single diminution of tax liabilities in recent history. In 1965 corporations would surrender 47 percent of their profits instead of the 52 percent which they now pay, and levies on the first $25,000 of profit would drop from 30 to 22 percent—a benefit to small companies. Individual income, now taxed at rates which rise from 20 to 91 percent, would enjoy a more humane progression from 14 to 65 percent.

If all the reforms should be enacted, the bulk of the program's benefits would go to earners of small income. However, the dramatic slash of top incremental rates would in all probability also do something to still the clamor over the adverse effects on incentives of present "confiscatory" rates. Moreover, since in real life very few people actually pay taxes at such rates, the Treasury would lose comparatively little revenue from the substitution of 65 percent for 91 percent as the highest marginal rate. Thus, though the President's program marks no step forward toward greater equality of income distribution, it at least does offer something for all income groups.

If the President had stopped here, with the tax cuts alone, he might have had a proposal of almost universal appeal. But, possibly to his present sorrow, pressure within his own administration and in Congress led him to put forward the complicated and controversial reforms as well. For if the tax cuts are to be taken as the major triumph of the Heller wing of the administration, the reform aspect of the program can equally be taken as the major achievement of the Surrey-Dillon-Caplin school of thought at the Treasury, backed by WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Whatever the merits of the proposed reforms and whatever the political considerations which argued for their submission to Congress at this time, there is no doubt at all that they have stirred up not one but a cluster of hornets' nests—and the insects sting just as hard when they are in the wrong as when they are in the right. The reform which now seems most likely to fail is the proposal that taxpayers only be permitted to deduct for interest payments, medical expenses, and charitable contributions that exceed 5 percent of their income. This provision afflicts mose severely middle- and upper-income groups, for it diminishes the tax savings of homeowners burdened by heavy property taxes and mortgage payments.

It seems odd politics to affront homebuilders and home buyers and to be gentle at the same time with oil-wealthy Texans and Oklahomans who benefit so greatly from the mineral depletion allowances. But if the President has feared to make an all-out assault upon the oil interests, he has not hesitated to fight other battles. Thus the Treasury proposes to apply ordinary income-tax rates (instead of the 25-percent capital gains tax) to the profits realized from the exercise of stock option rights by executives. Moreover, the dividend credit and exclusion—an Eisenhower benefit to the stockholder, under which the first $50 of dividend income may be excluded from the taxable total—is to be terminated. Other changes are designed to curb some of the grosser tax benefits of oil well ownership, limit the favorable depreciation treatment of real estate, tighten the rules which govern personal holding companies, and revise the treatment of capital gains. In general these alterations would increase Treasury receipts, and the 5-percent deduction floor would provide the bulk of the added revenues. Certain other reforms, however, would cost the Treasury money. These include broadened income-averaging arrangements, more generous child-care allowances for working mothers, and slightly more favorable terms for the elderly.

For the most part these reforms are desirable. In many instances they are the culmination of years of agitation by tax attorneys and teachers of tax law. There is little doubt that their enactment would increase the equity of the tax system and move us closer to the democratic goal of equal treatment for individuals in identical situations. And it should be plain that the equity and efficiency gains of the reforms are considerably more important than the $3.2 or $3.3 billion of additional revenue which they would raise.

Apart from this, it is the minor glory of the President's approach that after hinting in his famous Yale speech and in press conference comment that a deficit should be planned as an instrument of national economic policy rather than deplored as a moral lapse on the part of thriftless politicians, he has at last expressed the idea in boldly concrete terms. Mr. Kennedy's hopes for the impact of his policy are not small. He expects an increase in total output and economic growth * * * by an amount several times as great as the tax cut itself, reduced unemployment, stable prices, improvement in the balance of payments, higher standards of living, and expanded investment. And if Congress fails to rise to the occasion, then, says the President, an even larger deficit will follow in the wake of sluggish economic activity, a renewed recession, and curtailed tax revenues.

It is to Mr. Kennedy's credit as an educator that he should finally be trying to persuade Americans that the conduct of a Nation is not comparable to the financial management of a household. But the educator has not dismissed the politician in the President's calculations. His political arithmeticians have computed a deficit for the fiscal year 1964 of $11.9 billion—slightly below the record Eisenhower deficit of 1959—and they have with similar deference to political numerology, if not to economic sense, kept the administrative or conventional budget just under $100 billion.

But this is not all Mr. Kennedy has done to lull the fears of the timid. He has offered a pledge, reaffirmed in congressional testimony by his new director of the budget, Kermit Gordon, that public expenditures for nondefense programs will be held at or below present levels. And finally, he has uttered some soothing private enterprise noises. The loudest of these affirms that a massive increase in Federal spending could also create jobs and growth—but in today's setting, private consumers, employers, and investors should be given a full opportunity first.

In short, the President intends to give a cautious whirl to Walter Heller's pet argument that the American structure of progressive and corporate taxes impedes economic recovery. Heller's case runs likes this: During recoveries, personal income naturally rises, but because individual tax rates are progressive, larger and larger percentages of these increases are taken by the Internal Revenue Service. Of the parallel expansions in corporate profits, less than half remains at the disposal of the corporations that earn them. The consequences are a restriction of consumer and business spending, a tendency for tax receipts to increase more rapidly than economic recovery, and a probability that the Federal budget will approach first balance and then actual surplus well in advance of full recovery. As Heller sees recent history, the economy has behaved in much this way during recent recessions. If, as critics might take note, no surpluses have actually developed, this is because the tax brake choked off recovery too early for the full tendencies to work themselves out during the course of a whole fiscal year—the usual unit of record. "If," says the President, "the tax brake on our economy is not released the slack will remain, Federal revenues will lag, and budget deficits will persist."

So much for the program and its justifications. Is it an adequate program according to the administration's own lights? Is it the program which best answers the country's economic needs? Will it really renew vigorous economic growth and reduce unemployment to the interim target of 4 percent? So far as the remainder of 1963 is concerned, the prospects seem exceedingly poor that the tax program, even if it were to be passed according to the administration's schedule, would seriously influence economic activity. In fact, increases in social security levies and in State and local taxes are likely to collect more additional tax dollars than the Federal reductions would release. Really noticeable benefits would not reach taxpayers until 1964, and the full effects of the program could not be realized until 1965. Whether circumstances will justify tax cuts then is anyone's guess.

In sober truth more economists are willing to subscribe to the idea that a quick tax reduction would have an immediately stimulating effect than are eager to embrace the Heller-Kennedy doctrine that taxes are the root of all economic evil. Paul Samuelson, an administration adviser with a supporter of the President's tax program, nevertheless has confessed doubts. In a U.S. News & World Report interview (February 18, 1963), he observed that the "stifling effects of our tax system have been overplayed," and added, "I do not think that tax reforms are going to do a great deal to improve the rate of progress." As Samuelson and many others have noted, all the great expansions since the end of the Second World War occurred in the face of an even more burdensome tax system than the current one, while the recessions of 1958 and 1960 and the incomplete recoveries which followed each of them came after, not before, the Eisenhower tax reductions and reforms of 1954.

It should also be noticed that the Kennedy tax cuts promise in their present form to be effective agents of high economic growth only on the assumption that some extraordinarily chancy conditions are satisfied. The most important of these is that the economy will go on expanding at its present moderate rate—and the Economic Report of the President does in fact predict continued improvement during the whole of 1963. But as the Council of Economic Advisers observes, the present recovery will be 34 months old if it endures through December 1963 (just 1 month short of the longest postwar expansion), and there is very little in the pace of the present advance or in the plans of Government which bolsters the hope that expansion will break past records. The upshot is that if the upturn were actually to end in 1963, the administration's tax program would do literally nothing to stimulate economic activity at exactly the time when the need would have become most pressing. Last summer the evidence of impending recession was almost sufficient to persuade the President to request an immediate tax cut, unencumbered by tax reforms. It can scarcely be said that the economic picture is much brighter today than it was last July.

Yet even if the cautious optimism of the Council of Economic Advisers turns out in the end to be justified, the state of the labor market and the changes taking place in the size of the labor force seriously diminish the efficacy of tax reductions as unemployment therapy. This year's labor force is likely to be 1,200,000 larger than last year's—an increase of perhaps 500,000 in excess of the year-to-year changes in the size of the labor force during the 1950's. The Council of Economic Advisers' own arithmetic implies that we shall be fortunate indeed if unemployment does not increase between now and next December. It is worth looking at the figures the Council gives:

1. To reduce unemployment from its present 5.6–5.8 range, the economy must create 1.1 million new jobs.

2. If business improves, and the prospect of finding jobs once again becomes real, another 800,000 men and women will return to the labor market.

3. An additional 1,200,000 jobs will be needed for the newcomers to the labor force.

4. Although the Council oddly omits a numerical estimate, a substantial number of jobs will also be needed to accommodate factory and office workers being displaced by technological change.

Even without the inclusion of the fourth category, 3.1 million new jobs are needed to bring the economy within sight of the 4 percent unemployment target—and the target itself is unsatisfactory. What is called for, then, is a 4.7 percent expansion of employment. Yet job expansion actually reached this figure only in the boom year of 1955.

From all this it seems plain that the President has tacitly written 1963 off. The staging of the tax cuts, the willingness to combine reform and reduction, and the caution of the administration's economic forecasts for this year, point to 1964 and 1965 as the testing years. Though Kennedy supporters may well squirm at the sight of a liberal President's willingness to live during the third consecutive year of his term of office with high rates of unemployment, an economic boom in 1964 and 1965 would do much to ease their pain.

What about 1964 and 1965? Applying the simplest and most primitive of Keynesian doctrines—which discerns in deficient aggregate demand the source of business debility—the administration program in effect (if not in statement) rests its 1964 and 1965 hopes on its capacity to stimulate spending. Military and space programs will add some $4.5 billion to Federal spending, while the tax reductions are designed to encourage both personal consumption and business investment, the second and third components of the aggregate demand for goods and services.

If consumers cooperate by spending the bulk of their tax savings, and if investors feel more buoyant because their corporations can retain more of the proceeds of investment and they themselves can keep larger portions of dividend income, the increase in national income will amount to some multiple of the tax reduction. In time increased consumer spending will strain existing plant facilities and further investment will be necessary for capacity expansion: This is the economist's acceleration process. Guesses about the values of the multiplier and the accelerator have more to do with the phychological condition of the guesser than with anyone's ability to estimate future consumer and investor behavior. The favorite current guess, however, is that a $10 billion net reduction in taxes should, through the combined effects of the multiplier and the accelerator, increase gross national product by about $30 billion, or a factor of 3.

Is this enough stimulation to get the economy moving and to bring unemployment down to 4 percent? The Economic Report of the President estimates that we have at the moment sufficient unused capacity to produce between $30 and $40 billion of additional goods and services. Other students of the problem advance much larger numbers—as high as $70 billion. Now, if the $10 billion tax cuts were made available immediately, if the lower of the estimates as to unused capacity were accepted, and if the combined value of the multiplier and the accelerator really turned out to be 3, then this tax cut could probably eliminate most of our currently unused capacity, although it would still not fully meet the administration's employment goal. But: the $10 billion tax cut will not be realized until 1965, and by then, even at current rates of investment, industrial capacity will be much larger and the labor force will comprise at least an additional 2.5 million workers. In default of a sudden leap in economic growth, therefore, the President's program is simply too small to accomplish its aims. It would seem that there is considerable accuracy in Leon Keyserling's charge that the administration has sent a pygmy to do a giant's job.

In 1964 and 1965, when the tax program builds to its climax, it will appear either irrelevant or inadequate. In the unlikely event of a genuine boom, tax reductions will not be needed to enlarge demand. Indeed they might have the undesired effect of increasing inflationary pressure and endangering the balance of payments. If, as is much more likely, 1964 and 1965 are recession years, then the amounts to be released are simply much too small seriously to mitigate a recession.

There is something to be said for a rapid reduction of taxes once and for all in 1963 and the simultaneous jettisoning of the tax reforms. Such seems to be the present mood of the Committee for Economic Development and the AFL–CIO.[1]

There is, however, almost nothing to be said for a tax reduction largely postponed until 1964 and 1965. Hence the President's program seems little more promising as a longrun measure than it does as a 1963 attack upon economic sluggishness. This is a pity; much would be gained from a successful peacetime experiment with Keynesian tools. At the least, public sophistication in modern economics would be enormously enhanced. As it is, a good Keynesian might well prefer no experiment to an experiment doomed to failure because of excessive timidity on the part of the experimenter.

What has been said so far is designed to demonstrate the inadequacy of the Kennedy tax program as an exercise in fiscal policy. But even a better fiscal policy would not suffice to meet the economy's basic difficulties, for these difficulties belong only in part under the rubric of deficient aggregate demand. The ailments of our economy in increasing measure are structural, not fiscal. They have to do with the matching of people and skills; technological displacement of workers; inadequate education; inequitable distribution of income; urban poverty; and the allocation of national resources between the public and private sectors. The symptoms are not unknown. Take, for example, technological displacement. The argument is probably fruitless whether or not automation really amounts to a qualitative departure from the incremental changes in technology which have become more or less routine since the industrial revolution began. Whoever is right on this point, the facts are sufficiently grim. Solomon Fabricant of the National Bureau of Economic Research has estimated that between 1889 and 1953 physical output per man-hour increased in the United States at an average annual rate of 2.3 percent. In other words, in 1961 it was possible to produce 1960's gross national product with 1.5 million fewer workers. Thus if productivity increases simply at its historic rate in the coming years, at least 1.5 million workers will be displaced annually. Here is one possible figure to fill in the blank left in the Council of Economic Advisers fourth category of job needs cited above.

No doubt a buoyant economy can soften the impact of such displacements, but ours has not been a buoyant economy. Rather it has been an economy which during the last 5 years has had average unemployment rates of 6 percent. Not only that, but between 1948 and 1958 the average duration of unemployment rose from 10.3 to 14.3 weeks. In consequence, between 1958 and 1962 the country probably lost at least $170 billion of goods and services which might have been produced by available manpower and factories.

---

[1] Indeed the President's own comments at the now famous February symposium of the American Banking Association gave powerful support to the tax cut now, tax reform later, school of thought.

Much of this problem of unused human labor and talent is a problem of the cities. School dropout rates are disconcerting, and vocational education has not adjusted to changing technical needs, all too frequently becoming a dumping ground for the backward and the delinquent. After a generation of gestures to public housing and urban redevelopment, slums still disfigure every sizable American city.

Almost unnoticed in our split-level economy, poverty has become a permanent condition for a very large slice of the urban population. As Herman Miller demonstrated in a striking article in the New York Times magazine (Nov. 11, 1962), literally nothing of consequence has happened to the distribution of income in the United States since 1944 except a moderate improvement in the position of the second richest fifth of income recipients. In 1944 the worst paid fifth of the population received 5 percent of the national income, and they are still stuck at this share. The top fifth, which enjoyed over 45 percent of the national income in 1944, has maintained its position. Even in the 1960's, to be in the bottom fifth of the income distribution is to be poor in the old-fashioned sense of the word. Individuals in that category in 1960 earned on the average less than $2,800 annually, about $55 a week, a trifle over the national minimum wage level. Moreover, in the last decade the gap between the earnings of whites and Negroes, once thought to be narrowing, has changed not at all. At the beginning of the 1950's non-whites earned about three-fifths as much as whites; they are no better off today. Thus, the revolution in income distribution of which economists used to write has long since ground to a halt.

The situation of the poor is the consequence of a double failure. For one thing, market forces have not been strong enough to draw the unskilled and the ill-educated into the labor force—whereas in times of really high prosperity industry itself assumes a good deal of the burden of training workers who initially lack the skills or fall short of the standards which employers consider desirable. The second failure is public. It is a failure really to enforce antidiscrimination policies in employment, residential desegregation in housing, and racial desegregation in urban schools. It is a failure to grapple with the uncomfortable fact that the unskilled and the ill-educated stand diminishing prospects of employment. It is a failure, finally, to take the city into account. If we are not to maintain a large proportion of our urban population in angry idleness, we must do something substantial with vocational training of the young, retraining of mature workers, education in general, urban redevelopment, minority housing, and social welfare. The Domestic Peace Corps is a gesture of good will, but it by no means constitutes a determined assault on our complex social and economic problems.

The real inadequacy of the President's tax emphasis is revealed in these needs. It may well be that our cumbersome Congress is capable of handling only one major legislative program a year, and indeed, the administration's strategy appears to accept this limitation as a fact of life. In 1963, then, the Kennedy administration has traded for a timid tax program its chance to make a concerted attack upon the problems of the cities in which most Americans live.

A serious program of this nature, however, requires substantial increases in public expenditures rather than tax reductions. It implies liberal financing of schools, hospitals, houses, recreation, and social agencies. The diagnosis of the poverty of the public sector of the economy offered by Galbraith in 1958 in "The Affluent Society" is no less pertinent to 1963. Resources must still be shifted from the private to the public sector. To deliberately encourage consumer purchases of automobiles, electrical appliances, and leisure articles at a time of serious public need involves a species of social insanity, and yet this is precisely what a tax cut does. Even if such a cut succeeded in stimulating aggregate demand, it would do very little to increase the production of the goods and the services which are most needed, those which add to the social investment of the public sector.

It is sometimes forgotten that there were always two Keyneses; and as a society we may be somewhat belatedly listening to the wrong one. There was the Keynes who saw nothing more grievously wrong with contemporary capitalism than inadequate aggregate demand and who contemplated no remedies more disrupting than alterations in interest rates, the supply of money, and the size of government deficits. But there was also the Keynes of "The Economic Consequences of the Peace" and chapter 24 of "The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money." This Keynes toyed with the euthanasia of rentiers, speculated about the possibility of a long-run decline in the rates of profits to be expected in rich countries, questioned extreme disparities of income and wealth, and wondered whether a "somewhat comprehensive socialization of investment will prove the only means of securing an approximation to full employment." The administration's Keynes is the mild chap of the first version. But if we are to cope successfully with the problems of the 1960's, we shall have to begin paying much closer attention to what the second Keynes had to say.

CONGRESS MUST SAVE THE PANAMA CANAL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years I have addressed this body at great length to present to the Congress and the Nation a clear picture of the situation in the Caribbean with special reference to the key target of the world revolutionary movement in that area—the Panama Canal. All significant aspects have been explored, a plan of action to meet the crisis offered, and a series of predictions made of what would happen in the event of the failure of our Government, the Congress and the Executive, to take the necessary steps in the way of forthright declarations of our national policy.

So far, our country has not taken the measures required. Instead, it has floundered from crisis to crisis making concession after concession and, by this inaction or implied acquiescence, has invited larger and larger demands. The most serious fears that inspired my repeated warnings have come to pass virtually as predicted with no end yet in sight, and I hardly know what to say.

The situation which a few years ago was simple and easy to remedy has now become so grave that I feel impelled to speak out again on this crucial matter so that the people of the United States and their Congress will know what is happening in their backyard with respect to the sovereign powers, rights, and authority of the United States over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. To this task, I now address myself.

WARNINGS THAT WERE IGNORED

What were some of the incidents that were forecast and timely warnings given? The list of them, in the light of what has subsequently transpired, is an impressive array. They were:

In 1958, the attempt of Panamanian students to hoist the Panama flag at the Canal Zone Administration Building, which most people then laughed off as a playful students' prank; and

On November 3, 1959, during the annual commemoration of the independence of Panama from Colombia, the attempted invasion of the Canal Zone by a Panamanian mob, which overpowered the civil police of the Canal Zone and required the use of the U.S. Army to protect the zone.

On September 17, 1960, soon after the adjournment of the Congress, the ill-advised action of the President of the United States, contrary to will of the Congress as expressed in legislative enactments concerning the canal, in directing the formal display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory as evidence of Panama's so-called "titular sovereignty."

The ensuing misinterpretation by Panamanian and international propagandists of this action as recognition of Panamanian fundamental sovereignty over the zone.

And on October 29, 1962, on orders of the executive department of our Government, the formal raising of the Panamanian flag at the Canal Zone Administration Building, on a separate flagmast alongside the U.S. flag as part of a program for similar displays at other points in the zone as increased recognition of Panama's claim of titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa; yes. I am very glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], because I recall that when I was a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee which at that time considered the request for the Department of Commerce, during the period of years I was discussing this, there was an amendment introduced by the gentleman from Iowa to the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce and passed unanimously by the House, to prevent the use of any funds in that bill for the erection of any flagpole or any other contrivance for the flying of a flag in an attempt to defeat that program. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And, it was by an Executive order of then President Eisenhower that the will of Congress was subornated—I believe that is the proper word—at least the flag of Panama was raised along with the U.S. flag in the Canal Zone?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct; and it was done by subterfuge because the gentleman's amendment to the appropriation bill and as it applied to the Department of Commerce became law. It was clear and it expressed again the second intent of this Congress that that not take place, and that any money in the bill could not be used to build a flagpole or to fly the flag because under the provisions of that appropriation for the Department of Commerce and related agencies the Panama Canal and the Panama Canal Government was in that bill.

Hence that money could not be used. So, the subterfuge was perpetrated upon the American people and upon this Congress, and I do not think he should have directed the Army from those funds to do so because of the gentleman's amendment to that bill.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right, and I want to commend the gentleman for the unceasing fight he has made to preserve our right to be in the Canal Zone and to administer the Territory there as it ought to be administered in the interest of the United States.

Mr. FLOOD. With the help of such Members as the gentleman from Iowa, we will continue to do this.

The last action, Mr. Speaker, was taken by our Government despite the fact that on October 12, only 17 days previously, the ceremonies for the dedication of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge at Balboa, attended by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball and other notables, was marred by Panamanian demonstrators, who used communistic revolutionary tactics and claimed Panamanian sovereignty over the bridge.

To many Members of the Congress and our people, this series of predictions by me seemed extraordinary. They are, I can assure, not the result of any so-called inside information or of the powers of a clairvoyant, but only the considered conclusions from the study of trend-forming developments and their projection into the future. Nor is the fact that all of them materialized, essentially as foretold, any source of gratification to me. Rather, it is a cause for deep concern for the failure of the responsible agencies of our Government, the Congress, and the Executive, to take timely preventive measures instead of waiting until little hills become volcanoes and erupt in our faces.

Later in this address, I shall indulge in other predictions, affecting both the United States and Panama. In so doing, however, I wish to stress again that what I shall say is not as an enemy of Panama or its people, but as a friend of both, with their best interests ever before me. I shall speak realistically, for the problems involved are too grave to gloss over or ignore.

PANAMANIAN ASPIRATIONS AIDED BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE

What are the aspirations of Panama with respect to the Canal Zone and Panama Canal? Panamanian leaders and agitators have never disdained to publish their objectives. But no better summary of them has ever been made than that by Gilberto Arias, recently Secretary of Finance in the Cabinet of President Chiari, as quoted on March 19, 1963, in the isthmian newspaper, Critica. His words were:

> In the future, with God's help, we will achieve our objective: that the Panama Canal be the property of Panamanians, under full and absolute jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama, maintained by Panamanians, operated by Panamanians, sanitated by Panamanians, and protected by Panamanians.

This concise statement, Mr. Speaker, must be accepted at its face value. Moreover, it is the end toward which every move in the relations between Panama and the United States has been made ever since the Suez Canal crisis of 1956 in a program of piecemeal liquidation, aided and abetted by certain elements in our Department of State.

How responsible officials of our Government can knowingly collaborate with Panamanian radicals to surrender more of our authority to a country, which since 1955, when sanitation in the terminal cities of Colon and Panama was returned to it, has not even succeeded in collecting its garbage, is incomprehensible.

Let us not be so naive as to think that those primarily responsible for this erosive process do not know what they are doing. They know precisely and seem to be bent on following the same path at Panama as they did in Cuba, which was featured by covert collaboration—Earl E. T. Smith, "The Fourth Floor," New York, Random House, 1962. The only difference is that in Cuba it was the friendly anti-Communist Cuban Government being undermined whereas in Panama it is the sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone territory being assaulted.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that the Republic of Panama grew out of the movement for the Panama Canal and not the reverse. The only advantage that Panama can claim as regards the canal is its geographical location, which advantage it never ceases to exploit in advancing its demands for increased benefits and sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

To make sure that there is no uncertainty as to what purpose the Panamanian Government is using all its energies to acquire, I shall quote its openly declared objectives, as stated in a report on September 20, 1960, to President Chiari by his Committee on International Politics. These demands included:

First. Raising the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.

Second. Equal salary treatment and job opportunities for Panamanians and North Americans.

Third. Raising the annuity to 20 percent of the gross income, with a guaranteed minimum of $5 million.

Fourth. Setting the length of time for the annuity and cessation of the perpetuity clause.

Fifth. Mixed courts in the Canal Zone.

Sixth. Complete supplying by Panama of the Zone market, including ships, and stopping of production activities in the Zone.

Seventh. Recognition in the Canal Zone of exequaturs granted by Panama to foreign consuls.

Eighth. Use of Panamanian postage in the Zone.

Ninth. Liquidation of the Panama Railroad.

Tenth. Establishment of Spanish as the official language of the Canal Zone along with English.

Eleventh. Panamanian jurisdiction in the Zone over passengers and cargo coming into Panama and over ships flying the Panama flag.

Twelfth. Granting to Panama of dock and port facilities, and at U.S. expense.

Thirteenth. Organization of Panama's civil defense at U.S. expense.

Fourteenth. Corridors, under Panamanian jurisdiction across the Canal Zone.

Fifteenth. Opportunities for Panamanian products in U.S. markets.

Sixteenth. Acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court over controversies between Panama and the United States.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will give you one guess and only one as to what would happen in the decision of the World Court on the controversy between the great Republic of Panama and the United States of America.

Such demands, Mr. Speaker, are matters that would inevitably affect all interoceanic commerce that uses the Panama Canal and has to pay tolls. They more than justify the concise statement of former Finance Secretary Arias, previously quoted, and present grave questions to which the merchant marine of all nations simply cannot afford to be indifferent. Moreover, it is significant that the flag of Panama's new Independent Revolutionary Party carries 10 stars, the 10th star representing the Canal Zone.

No wonder that patriotic Americans in the Canal Zone and the United States have become alarmed for the security of this vital transportation artery and view with amazement what is now taking place.

BYPASSING OF CONGRESS BY INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISTS

As to the flag question previously mentioned, it will be recalled that the distinguished House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in early 1960 in anticipation of difficulties with respect to the flag question, conducted hearings on United States-Panama relations, when high executive officials and myself testified—hearings, January 12, 15, 19, 22, and February 2, 1960; also House Report No. 2218, 86th Congress.

The unanimous recommendation of the full committee was for a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 between the United States and Panama with reference to matters of territorial sovereignty shall be made only pursuant to treaty—House Concurrent Resolution 459, 86th Congress.

After an animated debate on February 2, 1960, the House adopted this resolution by the overwhelming vote of 381 to 12, which should have prevailed over the predilections of executive officials.

Transmitted to the Senate, this resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where, because of opposition from the Department of State, it was not reported to the Senate and died in the committee.

Notwithstanding the failure of the Senate to act, the magnitude of the

House vote is significant, clearly reflecting the concern of our people for the security of the Canal Zone territory. It also demonstrates to the international infiltrators in the Department of State and their collaborators that these influences can never succeed in perpetrating their schemes with respect to the Panama Canal through normal procedures. They realize that they must bypass the Congress by means of a new canal treaty. This, they no doubt feel, can be pushed through, as was the 1955 treaty, without adequate debate, to continue the process or erosions that started with the 1936–39 treaty.

What a contrast has been the action of the Department of State in respect to West Berlin. For that city, Khrushchev has spoken publicly about replacing the flags of the United States, Britain, and France, with that of the United Nations but the Department of State correctly opposes striking the American flag there. Why did it urge striking it in the Canal Zone?

U.S. VITAL INTERESTS DISREGARDED

Though the writings on the diplomatic history of U.S. Caribbean and Isthmian canal policies are voluminous, the truly vital interests of our country at Panama are seldom stated. Those who view the subject realistically emphasize the following major points:

First. Control of the maritime approaches to the Panama Canal, both Atlantic and Pacific.

Second. Maintenance of untrammeled sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

Third. Meeting our treaty obligations to maintain free and open transit for vessels of commerce and war of all nations on term of equality with tolls that are just and equitable.

Fourth. Civil protection of the Canal Zone from disorders and pestilence, originating in the terminal cities of Colon and Panama.

Fifth. Safeguarding the summit-level water supply as required for lockages and maintaining channel depths.

Sixth. Military and naval defense of the Panama Canal from aggression.

The foregoing points, Mr. Speaker, are not wanderings of someone's imagination, but conclusions developed from the study of history. Most of the present difficulties at Panama have stemmed from either ignorance of these fundamentals or a heedless disregard of them, coupled with connivance on the part of international socialist elements in our Government and those cooperating with them for the complete liquidation of U.S. control of the Panama Canal—a major object of Soviet policy.

The question arises who are these elements and why are they not eradicated? Supplying the answers are tasks that the Congress should undertake.

In this general connection, Mr. Speaker, it was Alger Hiss, when holding an important position in the Department of State in 1946, who, under article 73 of the U.N. Charter, filed an administrative report with the United Nations listing the Canal Zone as an "occupied area." By thus minimizing U.S. sovereignty and supporting the Communist revolutionary conspiracy, this was a monstrous aggression upon our valid and unblemished title to that part of our territorial domain—FLOOD, "Monroe Doctrine or Khrushchev Doctrine," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 12, 1962. These facts in our history suggest the question as to whether there are yet Alger Hisses in the Department of State. If there are, let us clean them out.

In any event, the Congress and the Nation should know that since 1923 our Government has made no forthright public statement of policy with respect to the Panama Canal. The urgency for such a statement is more acute today than ever in our history.

LIQUIDATION OF PANAMA RAILROAD NARROWLY AVERTED

Among the most audacious attempts at liquidation in the Canal Zone was the example of the Panama Railroad as was evidently contemplated under the 1955 treaty. This effort, officially made on June 17, 1955, before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries by the then Governor of the Canal Zone, an active military officer, inspired that committee and other Members of the Congress to take the necessary measures to prevent it.

Notwithstanding the committee's objective, the first step in the railroad's liquidation was actually taken by awarding to Panama, without any compensating concession, over $25 million worth of valuable property of the Panama Railroad, including its terminal freight yards and passenger stations in the cities of Colon and Panama. It was evidently in the minds of the schemers that, after surrendering the terminal facilities, the removal of the main line tracks would follow in due course and thus permit the construction of a truck highway on the roadbed, the effort for which was being sponsored by certain Panamanian interests and advanced by the then Governor of the Canal Zone. This was discussed and prevented by me as the result of hearings before my subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for the Department of Commerce and related agencies, which included the Panama Canal Government, and by the merest accident of a question I asked the then former Governor of the Canal Zone on the matter of trucks and the highway.

While the treaty power of our Government, consisting of the Executive and the Senate, was engaged in giving away the railroad terminals, the House, by conducting an independent investigation headed by an able railroad executive in the United States, a retired vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, prevented taking up the main line tracks and the complete liquidation of the railroad itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation difficult for even the most credulous to comprehend—a railroad without its needed terminal facilities and without any substitution therefor. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, our diplomacy was fast becoming a laughing stock in the Western Hemisphere. No wonder our citizens kept demanding the elimination from the Department of State of the elements responsible for such diplomatic stupidity or downright disloyalty to the paramount interest of our country.

Mr. Speaker, it was the indicated congressional inquiry that saved the Panama Railroad. It was also this inquiry that caused some Members of the Congress present, including myself, to question the correctness of the "traditional" practice of appointing as governors of this great civil agency, known as the Panama Canal enterprise, only active officers trained for a military career. Moreover, the evidence indicates that had there been a capable business administrator heading this civil agency, the move to liquidate the railroad would never have been attempted. See Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, hearings on proposed abandonment of Panama Railroad, June 17, December 7 and 8, 1955, pages 33–36.

PENALTIES FOR SURRENDERING AUTHORITY

The undertaking by the United States following the 1901 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain to construct and operate a trans-Isthmian canal was the culmination of an evolutionary process, involving most major historical occurrences in the Americas during the 18th and 19th centuries. Such an edifice cannot be demolished and swept into the ashcan of history with impunity.

Provisions in the 1903 treaty gave the United States the necessary authority to enforce sanitary ordinances and to maintain public order in the cities of Colon and Panama. Unfortunately, the right to intervene in the terminal cities, in event of domestic violence, was abrogated at the specific insistence of Panama in the 1936 treaty and the authority of the United States to enforce sanitation was surrendered to Panama in 1955.

What have been the results? The most violent border incidents in Isthmian history, which as previously shown, were accompanied by attempted mob invasions of the Canal Zone; and a deplorable breakdown in sanitation procedures, as evidenced by the failure of Panama to collect garbage, which is frequently piled high in the streets, causing Panamanian citizens to make vigorous protests to their government.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would stress that these are facts and not mere carping criticisms. These facts are rooted in conditions that are inherent and serve to emphasize that where there is responsibility there must be adequate authority, such as provided by the 1903 treaty, or there will be chaos. Nor should it ever be overlooked that our country, notwithstanding its concessions to Panama, is still responsible. This responsibility must be faced; it cannot be evaded, for our obligations are to the entire world. We now have a total investment in the canal enterprise of more than $1,500 million, the funds for which have been supplied by the American taxpayer. Panama, in its radical demands does not offer a penny for reimbursement for these vast expenditures, but claims the right to take over the canal—lock, stock, and barrel—free from any obligation whatsoever. How can any Panamanian with a sense of justice favor such a demand and how can the free world approve it? Of course, the Communist powers would approve, because without delay they would fill the vacuum thus created and take over the canal itself.

Nor should our Government be deluded with the idea that its actions at Panama are not being observed by interested nations. In Great Britain, one of the signatories to the 1901 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, it is well understood, as shown by a recent story in the Times of London, which emphasized that aid to Panama is "no substitute for a firm policy and this apparently the United States lacks in its dealings with Panama." Quoted from Miami, Fla., Herald, March 14, 1963.

CANAL ZONE CITIZENS APPEAL TO THE COURTS

By the fall of 1962, the process of erosion of our rights, power, and authority, symbolized by the formal display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone wherever the U.S. flag is flown by civilian authorities as increased evidence of Panamanian sovereignty, had gone so far that our citizens there decided to act, for they understand the significance of such display far better than temporary custodians of the governorship.

In a desperate effort to protect our Nation's interests, they organized at their own expense to bring court action to test the legality of the formal display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone Territory of the United States. One of them, Gerald A. Doyle, Jr., Chief Architect of the Panama Canal, brought suit in the U.S. District Court of the Canal Zone against Gov. Robert J. Flemming, Jr., of the zone and Secretary of the Army, Cyrus R. Vance, in an effort to end this symbol of surrender by the United States to the mob-ruled Panama Government.

PANAMANIAN REACTION TO FLAG SUIT

Mr. Speaker, I would invite the attention of the Congress to another angle of the sovereignty question that is most significant and illuminating.

Reacting to the suit in the Canal Zone court, a Panamanian citizen, on January 9, 1963, filed a suit in the Supreme Court of Panama that aims to establish that the ratification of the 1903 treaty by executive decree of the Panamanian revolutionary junta, was illegal and hence null and void. If sustained by the Panama Supreme Court, it would logically follow by the same token that the 1903 revolution, by which Panama gained its independence from Colombia, was likewise null and void, that Panama is still a department of the Republic of Colombia, and that Colombia and not Panama, is the sovereign of the isthmus.

Such eventuations, Mr. Speaker, would not be improbable, because the original guaranty by the United States of Panamanian independence that was provided in article I of the 1903 treaty, at the specific request of Panama, was abrogated in the 1936 treaty for the reason that Panama felt that it no longer needed such guarantee. This leaves the way open for Colombia to regain its territory lost throughout the political events of 1903 out of which came the Republic of Panama and the Panama Canal. Realistically, and I speak without intended offense, how long could Panama continue as a free and independent nation after liquidation of U.S. control and operation of the Panama Canal?

CANAL USERS HAVE MOST AT STAKE

The Panama Canal enterprise, under treaty and law, operates on a self-sustaining basis, with tolls prescribed at rates calculated to cover costs.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would invite attention to the fact that the users of the canal, which have to bear increases in costs of operation through increased tolls have the most to lose by what could happen at Panama. Unless the users of the canal are to suffer unpredictable consequences, the crisis on the isthmus must be met, and met forthrightly and adequately, and without further temporization or delay; else the entire course of history will be changed, and changed disastrously.

The situation in the Canal Zone is just that grave and nothing less; and our policies of diplomatic placation and lack of judgment and vision have largely contributed to the crisis which has thus arisen.

All claims by Panama of any type of sovereignty on the Canal Zone, except that of reversionary character, must be repudiated. In so doing, our Government must make clear that the sovereign rights, power, and authority of the United States are not negotiable and that there will be no treaty with Panama liquidating or changing the basic sovereignty provisions.

In this general connection, I would invite attention that on March 20, 1963, at San Jose, Costa Rica, the President of Panama and the United States spent 41 minutes in conference. As far as is known, no report of this meeting was published in the United States, but the press of Panama in describing its results quoted President Chiari as having expressed his satisfaction. This, and other information, indicates that President Chiari, now being opposed by six of Panama's political parties, is pressing desperately to secure more benefits from the United States so that his parties will not be defeated in the coming Panamanian election and that he will be able to dictate his own successor.

GOVERNOR OF CANAL ZONE ATTACKS JUDICIAL FOUNDATION OF PANAMA CANAL

In December of 1962, Mr. Speaker, I visited the Canal Zone. Making it a point to seek enlightenment from all possible sources—official and unofficial, civlian and military, high and low—I found general alarm on the part of our citizens at the conduct of the Governor of the Canal Zone. This alarm, Mr. Speaker, was not surprising but the natural result of what has been transpiring. I share the deep concern of our residents in the Canal Zone for the same historic reasons.

There was more than a scintilla of Clive of India. I could see the East India Co. all over the place, with thousands of Americans being considered and rapidly considering themselves as colonials from the home office. This apprehension is not good for the canal, not good for Panama, and not good for the United States.

At a press conference held at the Tivoli Hotel, I learned about an address given on December 10, 1962, shortly before my arrival, by the Governor before the Panama section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, which includes Panamanian engineers among its membership.

Imagine my surprise on reading this address, which began with an apology for what has made our country great and an expression of his low regard for engineers. Not only was this address the most disconcerting ever publicly uttered by a Governor, but he seems to have reveled in its flavor.

Though it has many points that could be challenged, it is important to note that his address first, reflected the philosophy of international Socialist elements in and on the fringes of our public affairs; second, advocated what amounts to a permanent state of social revolution, which advocacy is not a valid function of a Governor of the Canal Zone; third, belittled the constitutional foundations of our country and urged unconditional exercise by Federal agencies of power without regard to constitutional limitations; fourth, condemned the past in our history without discriminating between that which is great and that which is ephemeral; fifth, failed to present the Constitution in its true light as the great contractual document under which the Thirteen Original States created three separate and independent agencies of government with limited powers; and sixth, concluded with an illiberal assault upon those who differ with his views as having small minds bent on preserving the status quo, and thus, in effect, as being domestic enemies as dangerous to the United States as foreign enemies.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that this address by the Governor of the Canal Zone, who was at that time, and still is, a member of task forces engaged in important diplomatic discussions with Panamanian officials, was interpreted by many who heard it as first, a deliberate administrative attack against the present diplomatic and juridical foundation of the Panama Canal enterprise; and second, as an attempted public intimidation of those standing up for the sovereign rights, power, and authority of the United States over it. Thus, this shocking address served to invite further aggressions against the sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone territory.

GOVERNOR MUST BE REPLACED

It will be recalled that President Chiari of Panama visited Washington June 12–13, 1962, to present points of dissatisfaction over the basic 1903 Panama Canal Treaty, and then agreed to appoint representatives to discuss them. The Governor of the Canal Zone and the U.S. Ambassador to Panama were designated to form the previously mentioned task force to represent the United States in the ensuing consultations.

In the months following, there were many rumors of extreme demands by Panama, often denied at the time and later proved true by events. On January 10, 1963, the Department of State, in a joint communique, announced agreement by the United States-Panama representatives on the following:

First. That the flag of Panama would be flown with the U.S. flag on land wherever it is displayed by civil authorities.

Second. That foreign consuls may function in the Canal Zone on the bases of exequaturs issued by the Government of Panama.

Third. That Panamanians will have equal opportunities with the U.S. citizens at all levels, with social security benefits from the United States.

Fourth. That the U.S. representatives proposed the use of Panamanian postage stamps in the Canal Zone.

Fifth. That the representatives of the two countries discussed the need of pier facilities for Panama.

The latest news from the zone is that Panama has demanded jurisdiction of a corridor across the zone from Arraijan to Panama City, including the Thatcher Highway and the Thatcher Ferry Bridge, both entirely within the zone. Though this report may be denied, I can assert on the floor of the House that there have been discussions of this demand and that a survey has even been made. What is the meaning of this secrecy?

This vulnerable structure across the Pacific entrance to the canal would be an obvious point for attack in event of hostilities as a means of blocking the channel. Even to consider the idea of its transfer to Panama is shocking.

In addition, I can state without fear of successful contradiction that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is now engaged in an effort to prevent the leasing of certain piers, repair yards, and the small drydock at Balboa to the Republic of Panama—H.R. 3999, 88th Congress. What further evidence is required to show the sustained program of cannibalization of the Panama Canal that has been, and still is going on in the Canal Zone? Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that these facts, which are well known on the isthmus, are denied to the people of the United States?

The surrenders, already made and contemplated, all without the authority of the Congress are not meaningless gestures of diplomatic pacification, but acts of aggression by public officials of our Government against the treaty-based sovereign rights, power, and authority of the United States. As such, they are fully in line with the long-range Soviet program for conquest of the Caribbean.

The latest effusion from the Governor of the Canal Zone was his statement on March 16, 1963, to U.S. newsmen visiting the Canal Zone in which he denounced Americans "in Panama and the United States" defending our country's treaty rights and expressing himself as favoring the "slaughtering of some sacred cows." His remarks, Mr. Speaker, by implication, apply to Members of the Congress, both House and Senate, who, after studying the Canal problem, have justifiably condemned unilateral surrenders to Panama without compensatory accommodations as "appeasements."

As to those he had in mind, the Governor stated that Chief Architect Doyle is one and that in the military "you could bust a man like that" but he apparently regretted being unable to do so. Aside from the Governor's ignorance of Panama Canal history as revealed by his published statements, his obvious threat to bust Doyle and implied attack on Members of Congress who, under the Constitution cannot be questioned in any other place for any speech or debate in either House, reveals a contempt of the Congress, and our system of limited government under the Constitution, which he is bound under oath to support and defend.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with those in the Congress who wish the President to relieve this Governor and, in line with the philosophy of the 1950 recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, appoint an experienced and capable business administrator to head the Panama Canal—House Document 460, 81st Congress. Such business type organization was originally desired by President Woodrow Wilson, who was prevented from bringing it about by the opening of World War I. In any event, Mr. Speaker, the original reasons for designating only active officers of the Army as governors of this civilian agency no longer apply and the need in completing the reorganization for the Panama Canal enterprise started in 1950, with transfer of its supervision from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of Commerce.

Before concluding this matter of the Governor's actions, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my admiration for the way our patriotic citizens on the isthmus have risen to the defense of our legal position in the zone.

Thank God for Theodore Roosevelt who made the Panama Canal possible. Thank God for Gerald A. Doyle, Jr., and his fearless leadership. Thank God for the Canal Zone civil employees who are supporting him. And thank God for the Constitution of the United States, under which the founders of our Nation made it possible for American citizens to defend, by lawful means, our country's just interests wherever they may be.

CONGRESS MUST SAVE THE PANAMA CANAL

The court fight now being waged by frustrated and beleaguered American citizens in the Canal Zone has heroic aspects, suggestive of the plight of those barricaded in the legation compound of Peiping, China, during the Boxer Insurrection in 1900, while awaiting rescue by expeditionary forces. The rescue in the Canal Zone must be affected by the Congress as the ultimate authority under the Constitution of the sovereign people of our country, while there is still time.

As a start in this direction, my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], on March 4, 1963, introduced House Concurrent Resolution 105, which aims to clarify and make definite the fundamental policy of the exclusive sovereign control by the United States over the Panama Canal enterprise and to lead to the repudiation of all actions by the executive counter to that policy, including the ill-advised measure of hoisting the Panama flag over the Canal Zone as an evidence of Panamanian sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, the situation that I have developed at such length today is not the result of illusory impulses, but of considered conclusions derived from years of study and observation, which I am ready to uphold on every appropriate occasion. Furthermore, the issues are basic and must be met on their merits and not to obscure weak, mistaken actions on the part of elements in our Government.

Over a period of years, I have received many letters from our citizens from various parts of our Nation. Though the views held by them are seldom seen in the mass news media, I know that they understand what is taking place at Panama and realize the significance of the control of the Panama Canal for the future of the United States and the entire world.

Although I could quote hundreds of letters from individuals and organizations in these regards, I shall not do so. But I do wish to state that among the strongest supporters for maintaining the untrammeled sovereignty of the United States in the Canal Zone are members of our great labor and patriotic organizations, such as the AFL-CIO and the American Legion. They view the Panama Canal as the highest achievement of American statesmanship, genius, and labor. They realize the mounting danger and are determined that control of the canal will not be wrested from our country.

Mr. Speaker, some of these organizations have taken their positions as regards continued U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone by means of letters and resolutions, which are quoted in the documentation for my remarks. Because of the importance of their stands in the evolving lineup in the United States on the Panama Canal sovereignty issue, I can think of no better way to support their stands than to make known to the Congress and the Nation the views of such eminent legal authority as former Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes when faced with a similar crisis at Panama.

On December 15, 1923, Secretary Hughes, in response to demands by Panama for increased sovereignty and increased sovereignty attributes over the Canal Zone, spoke with a refreshing degree of candor. His words, which should ring throughout the world, were:

> Our country would never recede from the position which it had taken * * * in 1904. This Government could not, and would not, enter into any discussion affecting its full right to deal with the Canal Zone and to the entire exclusion of any sovereign rights of authority on the part of Panama (Foreign Relations, 1923, vol. III, p. 684). It was an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, any President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the treaty of 1903.

Mr. Speaker, I would state that from time to time, since the birth of freedom, parliamentary bodies have preserved the just rights of a nation against the misguided exercise of executive power. In the present juncture, it seems that the legislative branch of our Government must similarly act to uphold and maintain the unalienable rights of our Nation in regards to the great Isthmian waterway.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 105 and other documentation follow:

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, to include a resolution and certain other material in connection with these remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

House Concurrent Resolution 105

Whereas the United States, under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange or ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 26, 1904; and

Whereas since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprise; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world; and for which rights the United States has paid the Republic of Panama the full indemnity and annuities agreed upon by the two nations; and

Whereas, on February 2, 1960, the House of Representatives in the Eighty-sixth Congress, by an overwhelming vote, approved House Concurrent Resolution 459, favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives* (*the Senate concurring*), That it is the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 between the United States and the Republic of Panama, with special reference to matters concerning territorial sovereignty shall be made only pursuant to treaty."

Whereas, because of continuing claims of sovereignty over the Canal Zone by Panama which, if granted, would liquidate United States control of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, a further declaration by the Eighty-eighth Congress is deemed necessary and timely: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (*the Senate concurring*), That (1) the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired and holds, in perpetuity exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and will lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

(4) That the provisions of H. Con. Res. 459, Eighty-sixth Congress, are reiterated and reemphasized.

[From the Republic of Panama Sunday American, Mar. 17, 1963]

Fleming Would Slay "Sacred Cows"—Has Strong Feelings About Doyle

Canal Zone Gov. Robert J. Fleming Jr. was quoted yesterday by the Scripps Howard wire service as saying "I'm in favor of slaughtering some sacred cows."

The statement was quoted in dispatch from Jim Lucas, one of a group of 21 U.S. newsmen visiting the Isthmus on a tour of U.S. Army installations, who also heard Fleming denounce those Americans in Panama and in the United States who believe "any accommodation to give Panamanians a better share (of Panama Canal benefits) is a sellout of vital American interests."

Fleming was also quoted in the dispatch as saying that he has "very strong feelings" about the suit filed against him by Panama Canal Chief Architect Gerald A. Doyle, and as declaring that in the military "you could bust a man like that."

Lucas' dispatch reads as follows:

"The governor of the Panama Canal Zone today denounced those, in Panama and the United States, he said believe "any accommodation to give the Panamanians a better share is a sellout of vital American interests."

"I'm in favor of slaughtering some sacred cows," Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., president of the Canal Company as well as Governor, said in an angry statement to 21 visiting American newsmen.

"Among them:

"1. The 'shibboleth' that any agreement between the United States and the Republic of Panama to settle differences is a form of appeasement.

"2. A discriminatory wage scale which has given 16 percent of the Canal employees, 98 percent of them Americans, the bulk of the payroll.

"3. 'Blind adherence to a treaty signed 60 years ago' and 'strictly legalistic interpretation' of its provisions.

"Fleming said he had 'always believed these things and it is high time somebody said them.'

"Here is where we, the United States, became a world power," he said. "The Panama Canal is a technical achievement of which every American can be proud. But socially, there is sand in our gears. We have lagged behind the rest of the United States, and we've got to catch up."

Fleming said any progress in betterment of relations between Americans and Panamanians "has been and will be resisted by small groups having a vested interest in the status quo." He said these people gain an audience they do not deserve. He said they undo the good done by thousands of others, and thus serve our enemies. He said there are some Members of Congress who "obviously" share their sentiments and work with them.

"He refused to name any particular congressman, but Representative Clarence Cannon, Democrat, of Missouri, is author of a resolution which would require Fleming to haul down the Panamanian flag now flying over portions of the zone.

"Fleming said he has 'very strong feelings' about a suit filed against him in Federal court here by his Chief Architect, Gerald Doyle of Cleveland, Ohio. Doyle seeks a writ of mandamus to force the Governor to haul down the Panamanian flag, forbid the use of Panamanian stamps in the Canal Zone (something Fleming said he 'hopes' to do soon) and block an agreement now being negotiated whereby Panama's Foreign Ministry would accredit foreign consulates in the zone subject to our veto.

"Fleming conceded Doyle was the kind of American he had in mind. In the military, he said, 'you could bust a man like that' but he is powerless to do anything about zone employees who have special status.

"In a separate interview, Doyle said a 'Gerald Doyle Defense Committee' in the zone has raised $8,000 to finance his litigation to the Supreme Court, if necessary. He said, however, he merely seeks to prevent Fleming's doing those things without congressional approval which he said is required 'if our constitution means anything.'

"Fleming and Doyle wants to 'block (U.S. Ambassador) Joe Farland and I from carrying out any agreements by the executive branch to improve relations with Panama.' He said it is important that public opinion in the United States be marshalled in favor of 'treating Panamanians like people.' "

Small groups of old time Canal employees, he said, are "insulated from the facts of life which are familiar to other Americans through daily exposure."

"We are not going to solve our problems by listening to these people," he said.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., October 26, 1962.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: A news dispatch from Balboa, C.Z., in the New York Times of October 7, 1962, states that starting with the dedication of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge across the Panama Canal on October 12, the flags of both Panama and the United States will fly side by side over the bridge and at several other spots in the Canal Zone.

Information is respectfully requested of the authority for this action.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel J. Flood,
Member of Congress.

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., November 8, 1962.

Dear Congressman Flood: Thank you for your letter of October 26, 1962, addressed to Secretary of State Rusk concerning the display of the flags of Panama and the United States on the Thatcher Ferry Bridge in the Canal Zone.

As you know, on September 14, 1960, President Eisenhower directed that the flag of the Republic of Panama be displayed, along with the flag of the United States, at a particular location in the Canal Zone. This decision was made voluntarily and unilaterally by the United States as a gesture of good will toward Panama. The concept of "titular sovereignty," expressed by Secretary of War Taft in 1906, was affirmed in 1960 by President Eisenhower. Since the 1960 action the Panamanian authorities have expressed a desire to have their flag fly in a similar manner at other sites in the Canal Zone.

In June of this year the subject of flags was discussed by President Kennedy and

President Chiari during their talks in Washington, D.C. As stated in the joint communique of June 13, the two Presidents agreed that their representatives would arrange for the flying of Panamanian flags in an appropriate way in the Canal Zone. It is on the basis of President Kennedy's publicly announced decision that arrangements were made to fly additional Panamanian flags alongside the U.S. flag at certain sites on land in the Canal Zone.

I hope the above information will be useful to you. If I may be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1963.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Department of State, in its letter of November 8, 1962, advised me that the concept of Panamanian "titular sovereignty" over the Canal Zone, as expressed in 1906 by Secretary of War Taft and as affirmed in 1960 by President Eisenhower, is the basis for President Kennedy's June 13, 1962, agreement to fly additional Panamanian flags in the Canal Zone alongside those of the United States. This statement, unless amplified by historical facts, is not only incomplete but also misleading as to the real intent of Secretary Taft concerning sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

To supply the essential additional facts, attention is respectfully invited to the following:

October 24, 1904: In a comprehensive reply to a note of the Panamanian Government, Secretary of State Hay mentioned the "titular sovereignty of the Canal Zone" but asserted that such sovereignty is "mediatised by its own acts, solemnly declared and publicly proclaimed by treaty stipulations, induced by a desire to make possible the completion of a great work which will confer inestimable benefit on the people of the isthmus and the nations of the world." (Foreign Relations, 1904, pp. 613–630.)

January 12, 1905: When discussing the question of jurisdiction over the Canal Zone in a report to President Theodore Roosevelt, Secretary of War Taft explained that "while we have all the attributes of sovereignty necessary in the construction, maintenance, and protection of the canal, the very form in which these attributes are conferred in the treaty seems to preserve the titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone in the Republic of Panama, and * * * we have [had] conceded to us complete judicial and police power over the zone and the two ports at the ends of the canal. (Hearings before Senate Committee on Interoceanic Canals, 1907, vol. III, p. 2399.)

April 18, 1906: When testifying before the Senate Committee on Interoceanic Canals, Secretary Taft commented that article III of the 1903 Canal Treaty is "peculiar in not conferring sovereignty directly upon the United States the powers which it would have if it were sovereign. This gives rise to the obvious implication that a mere titular sovereignty is reserved in the Panamanian Government." (Ibid., page 2527.)

February 9, 1909: In an address at New Orleans, President-elect Taft stated that, under the 1903 treaty, "we are entitled to exercise all the sovereignty and all the rights of sovereignty that we would exercise if we were sovereign, and Panama is excluded from exercising any rights to the contrary of those conceded to us. Now that may be a ticklish argument, but I do not care whether it is or not. We are there. We have the right to govern that strip, and we are going to govern it. And without the right to govern that strip, without the power to police it, and without the power to make the laws in that strip bend, all of them, to the construction of the Canal, we would not have been within 2 or 3 years, hardly, of where we are in the construction."

November 16, 1910: When attending a banquet given by the President of Panama in the capital of that country, President Taft made this significant statement: "We are here to construct, maintain, operate, and defend a world canal, which runs through the heart of your country, and you have given us the necessary sovereignty and jurisdiction over the part of your country occupied by that canal to enable us to do this effectively." (Canal Record, vol. IV, [Nov. 23, 1910], p. 100.)

December 5, 1912: President Taft in an Executive order, pursuant to the Panama Canal Act of 1912 and in conformity with the 1903 treaty, decreed that: "All land and land underwater within the limits of the Canal Zone are necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, protection, and sanitation of the Panama Canal."

October 15, 1923: When the Minister of Panama brought up the subject of sovereignty over the Canal Zone with Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes, the latter stated: "The grant to the United States of all the rights, power, and authority which it would possess if it were sovereign of the territory described, and to the entire exclusion of the exercise by Panama of any such sovereignty, is conclusive upon the question you raise. The position of the Government upon this point was clearly and definitely set forth in the note of Mr. Hay * * * of October 24, 1904." (Foreign Relations, 1923, vol. II.)

December 15, 1923: In a conversation with the Minister of Panama, Secretary Hughes reiterated this stand, declaring with refreshing candor that the U.S. Government "would never recede from the position which it had taken in the note of Secretary Hay of 1904. This Government could not and would not enter into any discussion affecting its full right to deal with the Canal Zone under article III of the Treaty of 1903 as if it were sovereign of the Canal Zone and to the entire exclusion of any sovereign rights or authority on the part of Panama." (Ibid., p. 684.) Moreover, Secretary Hughes added: "It was an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, no matter what it was, any President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the Treaty of 1903."

In addition to the foregoing, the fact that U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone was meant to be absolute was also stressed in 1913 by Bunau-Varilla, who, as Minister of Panama in 1903–4, had been the principal draftsman of the 1903 treaty. He stated: "After mature thought, I recognized that if I enumerated the various attributes of sovereignty granted, I ran the risk of seeing in the (U.S.) Senate, some other attributes asked for. To cut short any possible debate, I decided to grant a concession of sovereignty en bloc." (Bunau-Varilla, as quoted by Earl Harding, "The Untold Story of Panama," New York: The Bookmaker, 1959, p. 39.)

Accordingly, the formula adopted by the duly accredited representatives of the United States and Panama was that of exclusive sovereignty as conferred in article III. The validity of this formula has been confirmed in a series of U.S. court decisions. It would thus appear that, if the term "titular sovereignty," has any meaning at all, it is in the nature of a reversionary interest in the sole event the United States should fail to meet its treaty obligations to maintain and operate the Panama Canal. It can mean nothing more than this for the United States cannot operate and defend the canal enterprise with less than exclusive sovereignty. There must be authority where there is responsibility.

In these connections, I would also invite attention to the following:

Hearings before the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs on U.S. Relations with Panama, January 12, 15, 19, 22, and February 2, 1960.

Debate on Panama-U.S. Relations, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 2, pages 1798–1808.

House Concurrent Resolution 459, 86th Congress. (See H. Rept. 2218, 86th Congress, Aug. 31, 1960.)

This resolution (H. Con. Res. 459, 86th Cong.), which aimed at preventing the formal display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone except as may be authorized by treaty, was adopted on February 2, 1960, by the House, with an overwhelming vote of 381 to 12. The measure was transmitted to the Senate where it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations but, for reasons never publicly stated, was not acted upon by the Senate.

In adition to adopting the flag resolution, the House of Representatives, on February 9, approved the Gross amendment to the 1961 Department of Commerce Appropriation bill, which provision prohibited use of funds thus appropriated for display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone. This measure became law.

These actions in the legislative branch in 1960, House Concurrent Resolution 459 and the Gross amendment, made clear the position of the Congress that acceding to demands for display of the Panama flag in the zone would constitute a "major departure from established policy and 'should not be accomplished through Executive fiat.'" President Eisenhower's voluntary and unilateral action on September 17, 1960, directing the display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory, went beyond the authority conferred on the Executive branch by the Congress. This striking of the U.S. flag in the zone led me to issue a special press release on September 21, 1960. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 1, pp. 114–115.)

All of the sources and citations mentioned in the foregoing must be well known in the Department of State. If the actual records of the issue were not presented to successive Chief Executives by the responsible officials of the Department, they were gravely derelict in the performance of their duties to protect the interests of our country. It is upon the Congress that the Constitution conferred the power to declare war, the supreme act in defense of the national interest; and if the Congress has this power, it has the last word of authority in defining what the national interest is, was, or will be. No one of the creatures set up by the Congress, and by it with the means to operate, namely, the executive departments or agencies, may go beyond, above, below, or behind the precise definition of the national interest whenever the Congress chooses to define it with precision. And rarely, Mr. Secretary, has the Congress defined the national interest with more force and with greater precision than in regard to the untrammeled exercise by the United States of its sovereign rights in the Canal Zone. No refinement by Executive rhetoric can change the explicit definition of the national interest exercised by the Congress in this regard.

Moreover, the Canal Zone is not an "occupied area" subject to Executive disposal, but a portion of the territorial domain of the United States acquired in 1904 pursuant to law and treaty. (See "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States," World Affairs, Fall 1958.) As such, it is virtually a part of the "coastline of the United States."

I assert that the Department of State's interpretation of the statement of Secretary

Taft in 1906 so as to justify the action of the Executive in 1962 to authorize the flying of additional Panamanian flags in the Canal Zone is wholly mistaken. In any event, the ordering of such display was an arbitrary assumption of authority, subject to judicial review as to its validity.

The flag of a nation, when permanently flown, has only one meaning and that is sovereignty; and this is the way in which the display of the Panamanian flag over the Canal Zone is interpreted at Panama and elsewhere by Marxist-Socialistic elements hostile to the United States. Nor should it ever be overlooked that Soviet strategy for conquest of the sea aims at gaining control of key water routes; namely, the Skagerrack, Straits of Gibraltar, Dardanelles, Suez Canal, Straits of Malacca, and the Panama Canal. Thus, the Cuban crisis has been only an incidental element in the program to take over the entire Caribbean, in which movement the Panama Canal has long been, and still is, the key target.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Thank you for your letter of January 7, 1963 concerning the historical background of sovereignty over the Canal Zone and your views on the flying of the Panamanian flag alongside the U.S. flag at certain sites in the Canal Zone.

The references cited by you have in the past served as bases and guides for decisions and they will be kept available for continued use. The Department of State in carrying out its responsibilities will continue to be governed by duly constituted authority and the expressed policy designed to safeguard U.S. national interests; these conditions were set forth in two of my previous letters both dated November 8, 1962, in response to your inquiries of October 9 and 26, 1962.

Your continued interest in United States-Panamanian relations and operation of the Panama Canal is greatly appreciated. If I may be of additional assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary,
(For the Secretary of State).

JOINT COMMUNIQUE AND AIDE MEMOIRE RESULTING FROM DISCUSSIONS IN PANAMA BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND PANAMANIAN REPRESENTATIVES

President John F. Kennedy and President Roberto F. Chiari of the Republic of Panama agreed, during President Chiari's visit to Washington on June 12–13, to appoint high level representatives to discuss points of dissatisfaction with provisions of the United States-Panama Treaty governing the Panama Canal. The results of the discussions in Panama, which are continuing, are summarized in the following joint communique and aide memoire:

"JOINT COMMUNIQUE

"The representatives of the Governments of the Republic of Panama and of the United States of America, appointed to discuss points of dissatisfaction in United States-Panamanian relations with regard to the Canal Zone have periodically met during the last 5 months. Various aspects of pending questions have been discussed up to the present, with the following results:

"First. It has been agreed that the flag of the Republic of Panama will be flown together with the flag of the United States of America on land in the Canal Zone where the flag of the United States of America is flown by civilian authorities. Private organizations and persons in the zone are free to display flags at will over their places of residence or business. Other aspects of the flag question will be discussed later.

"Second. Foreign consuls, on the basis of exequaturs issued by the Government of Panama and, in accordance with procedures and understandings which have been agreed upon by the Government of Panama and the Government of the United States, may function in the Canal Zone. Subject to these procedures and understandings the U.S. Government will cease issuing documents of exequatur.

"Third. The representatives of both Governments have discussed labor problems relating to Panamanian citizens who work in the Canal Zone. Special attention has been devoted to the subject of wage scales, equal opportunities for Panamanian and U.S. citizens at all levels, and social security benefits. All these problems continue to be under discussion.

"Fourth. The representatives of Panama submitted for discussion the question of using Panamanian postage stamps in the Canal Zone postal system. The U.S. Government has proposed the use of Panamanian stamps in the zone in accordance with technical arrangements now under consideration and in conformance with international postal standards.

"Fifth. In accordance with instructions, the representatives have discussed Panama's need for pier facilities and have visited the present pier facilities in Cristobal. This subject continues to be under discussion.

"The representatives of the Governments of the United States of America and of the Republic of Panama will continue their present discussions aimed at finding solutions to other problems which remain unresolved.

"The discussions are continuing in the spirit of the joint communique issued by the President of Panama and the President of the United States of America at the end of the visit which the President of Panama made to Washington in June of last year.

"From time to time additional joint communiques outlining the progress of the discussions will be issued.

"AIDE MEMOIRE

"JANUARY 8, 1963.

"With reference to the conversations between His Excellency the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the American Ambassador concerning the meeting on September 11, 1962, of the United States and Panamanian representatives to discuss improvement of United States-Panamanian relations with regard to the Canal Zone, His Excellency will recall that the following decision was reached.

"It was agreed that the practice heretofore followed on the part of the United States with respect to the issuance of exequaturs for use in the Canal Zone would be changed as follows:

"The U.S. Government would not be agreeable to the exercise of consular functions by a consular officer from a government not recognized by the United States. Also, the Government of the United States will notify the Government of Panama and will prohibit a consular officer from acting in the Canal Zone if, for example, in the opinion of the U.S. Government, a situation arises in the future in which a consular officer accredited by Panama is a security risk, or his functioning would interfere with the operation, maintenance, or defense of the canal.

"Hereafter, when the Government of Panama has on request issued an exequatur to a consular officer to function in Panama, and has notified the Department of State to that effect, the Department of State, providing it has no objection in accordance with the preceding paragraph, will inform the Government of Panama by note that said consular officer may function in the Canal Zone, and the Government of Panama will so inform said consular officer; in the event the Department of State objects in accordance with the preceding paragraph, information to that effect will be supplied the Government of Panama and the consular officer may not undertake to perform consular functions in the Canal Zone."

RESOLUTION 230 OF THE 44TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, LAS VEGAS, NEV., OCTOBER 9–11, 1962

Resolution opposing surrender of U.S. jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal

Whereas more than 50 years' experience in the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in a region of political instability, has completely established the wisdom of the 1903 treaty provisions for its exclusive control by the United States in perpetuity as indispensable for safeguarding the vital interests of our country and all free nations; and

Whereas a series of surrenders to successive demands by the Republic of Panama, through treaties and executive agreements, and finally, by Executive order on September 17, 1960, to authorize display of the Panamanian flag over the zone (issued contrary to the overwhelming vote of the House of Representatives) has seriously weakened our legal position on the isthmus; and

Whereas, notwithstanding solemn treaty obligations to maintain and operate the Panama Canal, the President has acceded to recent Panamanian demands for general treaty revisions that aim not only further to weaken the rights, power, and authority of the United States on the isthmus, but also to set a time for turning over control of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone to Panama: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the 44th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, assembled in Las Vegas, Nev., October 9–11, 1962, That the American Legion reaffirms the position expressed in resolution 251, adopted by the American Legion at its 43d national convention, in Denver, Colo., September 11–14, 1961, which is:

1. That the United States should not, in any way, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

2. That it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but as well of all nations and peoples—that all powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

3. That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any immediate control of whatever character over the Panama Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges the duties and obligations with respect to the canal.

4. That formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States, is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion is deeply concerned over the published aspirations of the Republic of Panama to negotiate with the United States of America for certain concessions, which, if granted, would be contrary to the established policy of the American Legion; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion urges the loyal news mediums of the Nation to publicize the grave perils involved so as to alert and inform our people, with demands for prompt and forthright declarations and actions by the legislative and executive departments of the Government.

RESOLUTION 22 OF THE AMERICAN COALITION OF PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES, 34TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

CARIBBEAN CRISIS FOCUSES ON PANAMA CANAL

Whereas the outbreak of the Cuban crisis in early October 1962, followed by the raising on October 29 of the Panamanian flag at the Canal Zone administration building under the authority of the President, emphasized the Marxist-Socialist plan for conquest of the strategic Caribbean area in which the Panama Canal is the key objective; and

Whereas over a period of years the conduct of our Panama policies by the Department of State, made with the approval of Presidents, has been featured by a series of harmful and timid surrenders to Panamanian radical demands which have seriously undermined our juridical position on the isthmus; and

Whereas more than half a century's experience in connection with the acquisition of the Canal Zone, the construction of the Panama Canal, and its subsequent maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection in a region of endemic revolution has completely established the wisdom of the 1903 treaty provisions for its exclusive sovereign control by the United States in perpetuity, as indispensable for the vital interests of our country and other free nations; and

Whereas, regardless of the pathetic twists and turns of the controlling International-Socialist element in the Department of State with respect to our Caribbean and isthmian policies, the United States cannot forswear its inherent right of self-defense;

Resolved, That the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies:

1. Urges the following plan of action for our Government:

(a) Clarify and openly restate the Monroe Doctrine as applying to intervention through infiltration and subversion in any part of the Americas.

(b) Clarify and openly restate our historic, indispensable, and time-tested policies for U.S. control in perpetuity over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal.

(c) Announce to the world the determination of the United States to liberate the people of Cuba from alien masters and the restoration of constitutional government.

(d) Reactivate a special service naval squadron in the Caribbean to serve as a symbol of liberty and as an assurance for security.

2. Condemns the tragic failures on the part of Congress, the Department of State, and the President to safeguard U.S. vital interests in the Caribbean;

3. Considers that the responsibility for such derelictions rests primarily with the jurisdictional committees of the Congress, the Department of State, and the President; and

4. Urges the loyal news media of our country to inform our people about the dangers in the Caribbean, with demands for prompt and forthright actions and declarations by the legislative and executive branches of our Government.

CONTROL OF PANAMA CANAL

Resolution adopted by the 69th Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, April 18-22, 1960

Whereas the United States in 1903 acquired full sovereignity by grant in perpetuity of the Canal Zone from Panama; and

Whereas the Thomson-Urritia Treaty between the United States and Colombia aimed, through a generous compensation to Colombia, to restore the friendship between that country and the United States which had been threatened by the loss of territory and revenue occasioned by the secession of Panama from Colombia, and defined the rights of the United States and Colombia respecting the Panama Canal; and

Whereas forcing the abandonment of the Panamal Canal, and accomplishing its internationalization is a Communist tactical objective; and

Whereas retention of sovereignty and control of the Panama Canal Zone is a vital necessity to the defense of the United States;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge that the United States refuse to permit the flag of Panama to be flown in the Panama Canal Zone; and

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the President and the Senate of the United States to refuse to enter into any treaty or make any Executive agreement with Panama whereby this country would lose its sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone, and the Panama Canal.

CANAL ZONE CENTRAL LABOR
UNION, AND METAL TRADES
COUNCIL, AFL–CIO,
Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, March 31, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We know that upon your shoulders will fall the major burden of marshaling the arguments for the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 105 and the companion Resolution 113 which was introduced by yourself.

We believe that these resolutions are a reaffirmation of the basic principles upon which any civilized form of government may exist or continue to exist. No government, even ours, can hope to maintain its prestige for any length of time when it does not operate within the framework of constitutional law.

In other parts of the world, as well as here locally, commitments have been made by various individuals dictated by expediency, which have resulted in long-term detriment to the inherent rights of all of our citizens. Unfortunately, when Congress perceived the need for remedial action, these commitments have become irrevocable actions tying the hands of Congress.

We pray that you will have the inspiration that may show all your colleagues that it is not only the few citizens of the zone that are effected, but that every one of their constituents in one way or another, is, and will be, adversely affected.

It is very possible that these resolutions may be the one single piece of legislation that does the most to establish in the Americas a respect for government under constitutional law. The forces that are working in this hemisphere against democracy want government by fiat.

Sincerely,

J. H. ELLIOTT,
President.

METAL TRADES DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1963.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CANNON: We have read with interest House Concurrent Resolution 105, which you introduced on March 4, 1963, dealing with the Panama Canal. I am writing you to let you know that the Metal Trades Department, AFL–CIO, is very much interested in the continued welfare and well being of the many U.S. citizens employed in the Canal Zone, the vast majority of which are members of our affiliated international unions of this department.

The deep interest of the Metal Trades Department in matters concerning the welfare of the citizens of the United States employed as civilians in the Canal Zone, was evidenced by the unanimous action taken at our last convention in December 1961. The convention adopted three resolutions dealing with the Canal Zone merit system, the promotion of a sound apprenticeship program in the zone, and the unanimous expression that any person appointed to position as Governor of the zone, stockholder, or, Member of the Board of the Panama Canal Company should be required by oath to express their intent in the continuing of the Panama Canal as a U.S. enterprise.

We indeed desire to commend you for the introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 105, which obviously reflects the considered view of thoughtful and well-informed Members of the Congress with regard to the Panama Canal.

The recent Cuban situation and the Suez Canal crisis in 1956 have both served to focus world attention on the Panama Canal. We are indeed greatly concerned with the continued erosion of U.S. authority over the Canal Zone. We recognize that the Republic of Panama is subject to economic ills due largely to its overdependence on the Panama Canal and its failure to develop its own agricultural potential.

We trust that with the administration-proposed increase in technical and economic aid will come a decreasing need for Panama to rely on the Panama Canal as a solution to its economic ills.

The position of the metal trades department is to endorse and support a policy of the fullest measure of justice and generosity for the Republic of Panama consistent with public interest and our national security.

The principal purposes of the Panama Canal since its first transit almost 50 years ago has not changed. The dual purpose of its construction was to serve without profit world commerce, and as a measure of national defense. It was with wise understanding and responsible statesmanship that the House Committee on Panama Canal reported: "the canal should not be permitted to become a pawn in our normal diplomatic relations with Panama."

The Panama Canal still has great strategic importance to the security of both the United States and the free world. The phenomenal (record breaking) demand for Panama Canal services established in 1962, reveals to all its economic importance. Until, and unless another canal is built, the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal must in the interest of the entire free world continue to remain under exclusive U.S. authority and control.

We strongly support the provisions and urge, the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 105.

We are taking the liberty of sending a copy of this communication to Congressmen DANIEL J. FLOOD and FRANK T. BOW, who introduced similar resolutions, House Concurrent Resolutions 113 and 120, on March 12 and 28, 1963. A copy of this letter is also being sent to THOMAS E. MORGAN, chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and to all members of that committee.

Sincerely yours,

B. A. GRITTA,
President.

[From the Panama (Republic of Panama) American, Mar. 23, 1963]

THE TREATIES—WERE THEY ALL "TAKE"?

SIR: This is the fifth article we have written to your column dealing with the subject of present and past treaties between the United States and Panama as regards the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal. Our past papers have dealt with the subject of sovereignty and international law as both apply to the "big ditch," the Panama Canal.

It has been loudly, eagerly, and zealously argued that the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 were completely one sided in favor of the United States with the Republic of Panama getting the very short end of the stick. It has been forthrightly urged that it was all take and no give on the part of the U.S. Government as regards the Panama Canal.

We found the book, "The Untold Story of Panama," by Earl Harding, extremely interesting on this subject and at the same time quite revealing and quite shocking. This 171-page book was published by Athene Press, Inc., of New York City in 1959. Harding is a famed journalist and was formerly the assistant to the president and public relations counsel of Remington Rand, Inc.

As early as 1913 Harding advocated that to properly protect the Panama Canal the Canal Zone should take in much more territory than the treaty of 1903 gave to the United States. On page 103 of his book, Harding states: "I suggested that acquisition of territory for future defense could not be regarded as aggression—unless delayed until a new generation of Panamanians came to believe their sovereignty an inalienable right."

They believe it now. For Panama history books have not told Panamanian youth that only a handful of conspirators knew that a revolution was planned. Radical ideologies infiltrated all around the Canal Zone and exaggerated ideas of supernationalism took hold of a generation of Panamanians schooled to believe in the fiction that their "founding fathers" actually won their independence. So uninformed and misinformed Panamanians and North Americans took for granted the righteousness of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's abrogation of practically everything in the 1903 treaty to which the Panamanian politicians objected and the new treaty of 1936 was signed in Washington on March 2.

What did the treaty of 1936–39 give to the Republic of Panama? Harding states quite bluntly the following:

1. The priceless treaty rights of the United States to build defense bases outside the 10-mile-wide Canal Zone. "That giveaway cost American taxpayers much more than the million dollars in rental paid to the Panama Government during World War II for permission to plant guns, build roads, landing fields, bomber bases and nearly 400 buildings on Panama's pasture lands and in her swamps and jungles adjacent to the Canal Zone." "It took endless negotiation to obtain permission—where the United States formerly had the right under the 1903 treaty—to use Panamanian territory for defense purposes."

2. All U.S. authority outside the Canal Zone was abrogated "thus abandoning its (United States) rights to defense bases outside the Canal Zone." The U.S. Government's right of eminent domain in acquiring property within the cities of Panama and Colon which might be needed for canal operation was renounced."

3. Also eliminated (by the 1936 treaty) was "the right of the United States to maintain public order in Panama if the Panamanian Government could not do so. The annuity of $250,000 paid by the United States for use of the canal strip was increased to $430,000—"on account of the Roosevelt devaluation of the dollar."

4. The treaty of 1936 restricted residence in the Canal Zone to American civilian and military personnel, established corridors within the zone for Panamanian convenience and prohibited new private enterprises in the Canal Zone.

The treaty of 1936 was the legal basis that brought about the "United States, in January 1948, abandoning the 13 defense sites within the Republic of Panama" and "retreated within its Canal Zone." "It was then understood that future defense would be entirely from within the zone limits."

The little-mentioned treaty of 1955 gave to Panama the following:

1. Increased the U.S. annuity to Panama from $430,000 to $1,930,000.

2. Gave Panama, without required compensation ($), waterfront and other properties, including Panama Railroad's yards and terminals in the cities of Colón and Panamá, of an "estimated fair market value," as stated by our Government of $24,300,000. These gifts included the Hotel Washington in Colón ($1,450,000) and many other parcels.

3. Agreed to ask Congress to appropriate and authorize building a bridge across the Panama Canal to replace the Thatcher Ferry, estimated to cost (at that time) up to $27 million. This bridge is now constructed.

4. Concessions to Panama designed to restrict American (United States) and extend Panamanian rights in respect to commissary privileges, trade advantages, wage classifications, taxation, etc.

"Panama's principal token return for all the treaty concessions was 'the right to use, for a period of 15 years without cost" as a military training and maneuver base the old Rio Hato base west of the Canal Zone. Extension after 15 years is subject to "agreement between the two governments."

The treaty of 1955 was ratified by the U.S. Senate on July 29, 1955, by a vote of 72 "for" and 14 "against." Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, repeatedly questioned the wisdom of ratification and stated in his argument against ratification: "I reiterate that the Department of Defense never thinks of challenging the Department of State or interfering in any way in any international negotiations. That has been true of all negotiations we have had in the past 2 years. If I had the privilege of appointing someone in the Department of Defense I would have cautioned him, when he came to consider a treaty having to do with the Panama Canal, to get some agreement that would not bleed us white, if we had to get some land outside the zone, in the event of another war * * * while we were committing ourselves to these increased payments, we should have some room to stand and fight, in the event of another war, rather than having to pay a large rental for additional ground."

Have the series of treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama since the treaty of 1903 been "all take" on the part of the United States and "no give"? In all intellectual honesty and sincerity, we think not.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
CANAL ZONE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MRS. JEANNE B. CLARK

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include related matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is natural for all of us to be interested in the success of people from our hometown and particularly reassuring when they occupy positions in the Government service that deal with matters concerning the security of our country.

I am happy in this instance to salute Mrs. Jeanne B. Clark, the former Jeanne Bertrand of my hometown of St. Martinsville, La., on the 45th anniversary of her coming to Washington during all of which time she has been in Government service or connected with Government work in one way or another. Mrs. Clark is the widow of Reed Paige Clark, whose career as a Foreign Service officer was distinguished by many years of outstanding service to our Nation in various parts of the world.

As Assistant Chief of the Arms Traffic Division of the Department of State, in which position she is second ranking officer of the Division and Acting Chief during the latter's absence, Mrs. Clark's work has drawn much commendation. She is highly regarded for her competency, integrity, and cooperativeness in the performance of her highly important duties.

These duties are carried out under the munitions control provisions of the Mutual Security Act. This act grants authority to the President to control, in furtherance of world peace and the security and foreign policy of the United States, the export and import of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, including technical data. Under the law no one, other than a Government agency of this country, can export or import arms, ammunition and implements of war, including firearms, explosives, chemicals, tanks, bombs, missiles, rockets and war vessels, etc., without a license.

The functions of her position require Mrs. Clark to analyze specific applications to export or import such material and to issue or reject the licenses or make recommendations consistent with the applicable laws, regulations and policy-security factors currently in effect. These activities must be coordinated with appropriate bureaus of the State Department and with other government agencies such as the Department of the Treasury, Department of Commerce, Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission. In making decisions and in matters of public relations, Mrs. Clark's previous experience abroad as the wife of a Foreign Service officer, and her interest in both foreign and domestic political, economic and cultural fields, has contributed immeasurably to the valuable service she is rendering to the national interest and security.

Prior to assuming her present post, Mrs. Clark already had wide experience in Government service, first as an adjudicator with the Veterans' Administration, beginning in 1918, then as auditor with the Bureau of Internal Revenue, with the Foreign Service in Mexico City, and as divisional assistant in the Passport Office of the State Department.

It was during her tour of duty with the Foreign Service in Mexico that she became acquainted with and married Mr. Clark, in 1928. Even at that time Reed Paige Clark already had a splendid record of service behind him.

He had been secretary to Senator Burnham of his home State of New Hampshire and clerk of a number of Senate committees. He had been general receiver of customs in Liberia for 10 years and developed the first system of customs service in that country. He had been agent of a New York commercial house in the Gold Coast of Africa.

Mr. Clark joined the consular service in 1919, and prior to his marriage he had served as consul in Angola, in the Union of South Africa, and in Mexico. But many more years of valuable and distinguished service were yet to come.

After their marriage her husband's assignments took Mrs. Clark from Mexico City to Guadalajara, Mexico; to Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic; to Belgrade, Yugoslavia; to Vienna, Austria, and to Victoria, British Columbia.

Those were busy, crowded, and useful years.

With a French maiden name, background, and education, speaking that language comes both naturally and fluently to Mrs. Clark. And since most of the people of the European countries where they lived are bilingual and preferred to converse in French, Mrs. Clark's knowledge of the diplomatic language of the time as well as her gracious manners made living abroad and participating in official and social life that much more lively and happy for her and her devoted husband.

Dining with Mrs. Clark and her sister, Gertrude Bertrand, in their apartment at 411 Chastleton Hotel in Washington has been a Saturday evening ritual for Mrs. Willis and myself during the past 15 years and Mrs. Clark's witticisms and reminiscences always add zest to these occasions.

She tells about her experiences with a new breed of human beings who appeared on the social scene in Europe in the mid-1930's, when she was a delegate to the convention in Vienna of the American Women's Club in Europe. As a break from the serious discussions and debates a lavish entertainment had been arranged for the delegates in Vienna's swankiest nightclub. Mrs. Clark was impressed with the well-mannered and immaculately dressed young men in attendance and she and some of the younger set in the group danced away all night. Well, after the ball was over the young gentlemen demanded their pay. They were gigolos.

> Of course, we could not afford, shall I say, to hurt their feelings, and we had to pay up. Besides, they were so nice and handsome and it really was fun—

Mrs. Clark concludes.

And then there was the time when the Duke of Kent used the Clark's swimming pool in Victoria, British Columbia, and asked for 12 towels for him and his party and a pair of slippers for his personal use. But she explains that they were fresh out of towels because somehow all of their supply had been sent to the laundry and they had overlooked keeping a few for spare use, as they usually did. But not in the least dismayed, Mrs. Clark appealed to a young bride living next door who considered it a great privilege to furnish their sole and only dozen towels and her husband's only pair of slippers for the personal use of the Duke.

> After the swimming party—

Mrs. Clark relates—

> the dear little bride decided to keep as souvenirs for herself, her heirs, and assigns forever the things that the Duke of Kent had so graciously condescended to borrow. And so both families had to do without towels until our regular supply came back from the laundry a week later, and the bridegroom without his sandals—permanently.

But Foreign Service also had its ordeals for the Clarks.

There was the assassination of King Alexander of Yugoslavia.

If my memory of the incident serves me well, the King was traveling to France by sea. Upon reaching Marseilles, as I recall, he was warned that inadequate security measures had been taken for his own protection but he paid no particular attention to those admonitions. Instead, choosing what was considered to be proper conduct and ceremony in a friendly country, over personal safety, the King dressed in an admiral's uniform and was an easy target for the assassin's bullet.

In any event, Mrs. Clark vividly remembers that the assassination of King Alexander caused considerable political reverberations in Europe and great stress and strain on consular officers in Belgrade, where the Clarks were stationed at the time.

But their most harrowing experience occurred during one of the worst storms of the century which hit the Caribbean while they were stationed in Santo Domingo in 1930. There was no official record of the velocity of the wind because the anamometer broke when it reached 200 miles per hour. The hurricane raged for 9 hours, leaving in its wake thousands of people dead and tens of thousands homeless; with no electricity, no means of communication, no water and no food and with stark disease and pestilence staring the survivors in the face. In the great task of rehabilitating the area Mrs. Clark did much to assist her husband who took a leading part in this grim program.

Mrs. Clark recalls:

> We lost everything we had, furniture, fixtures, books, papers, personal belongings; literally everything we owned except the clothes on our backs, even the shoes off my feet.
>
> And to add to our worries, our newborn baby, Reed Paige, became desperately ill. But the Lord was good to us. Look at him today, happily married, with a lovely wife and two healthy children.

Yes, and a fine young gentleman, this Reed Paige. Following the family tradition of Government career service, he has been employed for quite some time by the Passport Division in the Department of State.

Mr. Clark retired on April 3, 1943, and died on September 5, 1958, but Mrs. Clark still maintains membership in the University Club of Washington, of which her husband was a charter member under William Howard Taft who served as first president of the club and later became the 27th President of the United States.

She is an active member of Dacor House: Diplomatic and Consular Officers' Club, where Mrs. Willis and I frequently play bridge with her and a host of her friends.

And Mrs. Clark always finds time to participate as an interested and interesting member of the Democratic Club.

Just last week Mrs. Willis inquired, "Jeanne, whatever made you come to Washington back in 1918, 45 years ago?"

> Well—

She replied—

> this was during World War I and I was teaching school. Your husband, Ed, should know because I taught him.
>
> I had deep admiration for President Woodrow Wilson; he had such great talent and capacity for leadership. He had been expounding his 14-point program and to tell you the truth I really believe he was the one who attracted me to the Capital City. As a matter of fact, I think if the great powers on earth at the time and especially the people of this country had listened to him and followed his advice concerning the formation of a meaningful League of Nations we would be living in a better world today. But that is history now and I can only say that these 45 years have gone by very swiftly and I have never had any cause to regret one moment of my work.

Regret indeed. On the contrary, Mrs. Clark has every reason to rejoice over every minute of her fruitful work and activities during the past 45 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is comforting to me personally to know that this remarkable lady from my hometown of St. Martinville, La., is playing at least some part in the total effort connected with our national defense and security. I wish we had more Jeanne Bertrand Clarks in Government and I pray that her contribution to that great endeavor may continue to be blessed with successful accomplishment.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my good friend and colleague from Louisiana for bringing to the attention of the House the distinguished service which Mrs. Clark has been rendering to our Government for many years.

It has been my good fortune to know Mrs. Clark quite some time. Mrs. Boggs and I have had the pleasure of meeting her on many occasions, including functions at the Democratic Club, and always enjoy her interesting conversation and ready wit.

Mrs. Clark is a competent and faithful Government employee and I join her own Congressman from the Third Congressional District in paying a deserved tribute to one of the outstanding citizens of his hometown of St. Martinville.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I first became acquainted with Mrs. Clark when my close and personal friends, ED WILLIS and his good wife, Estelle, came to Washington some 15 years ago. The three of them together have been guests at my home in Virginia a number of times and we always look forward to their visits.

Mrs. Clark is a lady of culture and refinement and ED WILLIS has every reason to be proud of her devotion to duty and her attainments over her long years of Government employment.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with everything that the gentleman from Louisiana, ED WILLIS, has said about Jeanne Bertrand Clark. In fact, I am proud to regard myself as one of Jeanne's personal friends.

Mrs. Thompson and I have had the good fortune to dine at Mrs. Clark's on a number of occasions and both the delicious French dishes and conversation are something to remember.

Mrs. Clark is highly intelligent and full of good, practical sense. I, too, would feel better if we had more like her in Government.

MUTUAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, each year the printed matter attendant on the mutual security bill is voluminous, so much so that it is impossible for most Members of Congress to read, let alone digest a good portion of this considerable reading matter. Even those officials who—it has been reliably reported or at least we hope it "managed" to be reliable—have sought remedy and solace in speed reading courses would find the task impossible. As a result much of this matter falls unread into the convenient Washington depository—the wastebasket.

Therefore in the dutiful exercise of their responsibilities it has become necessary for Members who cannot conceivably find time to read all this to search elsewhere for information. Some avail themselves of writings in newspapers, newsmagazines and other reflective, but succinct commentaries which assist in informing them of divergent viewpoints surrounding the foreign-aid program. Over the years as experience added to our knowledge, the assessment of these programs has shifted and changed. This year is no exception especially with the publication of the Clay report and with the administration's subsequent recommendations now before the Congress. Therefore, I recommend as helpful to my colleagues three short, yet informative columns by distinguished and knowledgeable Americans.

The views of our foreign-aid program explored in these articles crystallize the spectrum of opinion prevailing in Congress as well as the Nation. In my judgment these articles define the conflicting views which the House will be asked to resolve in the mutual security debate which will ensue in the weeks ahead. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent then that the articles appear in the RECORD at this point. Following are the columns which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on March 31, 1963, by the Honorable Barry Goldwater, U.S. Senator from Arizona; Walter Lippmann, Washington Post columnist; and Nick B. Williams, editor, of the Los Angeles Times.

[From the Los Angeles Times]

THE U.S. MESSAGE MUST INCLUDE HOPE, RESPECT

(By Nick B. Williams)

Any American who is concerned about the trend of the cold war with the Communist nations—and I think most Americans are concerned since Cuba—ought also to be concerned about the appeal of our individualistic system to the peoples of Asia, Africa, South and Central America, and much of Europe.

The Communists are selling one ideology and we are selling another that is philosophically opposed to it. In such a competition, meaning so much to us, we ought to concentrate our basic thinking on what is right and what is wrong with the cause we espouse—why others are converted to it, or reject it.

In concentrating on this, we ought to try hardest to examine our message not as it sounds to us, but as it must sound to those we seek to convert.

We have got to understand why, for example, communism appeals so strongly to some of the South American people despite our own much more tangible attempts to reinforce their economies.

A major argument currently being made within the United States against the continuance of much of our foreign aid program contends that men do not become Communists because they are poor—and hence the cure for communism is not to be found in raising the level of an infected nation's economy. I am beginning to believe there is a good deal of validity in this argument. Certainly the minor increases that we usually have been able to achieve have not cured it.

The answer, I suspect, is much more complex than boosting the economy of a have-not nation, although that probably will prove to be an integral factor in the answer. The important elements in our message, in the sale of individualism, must be a combination of hope for better living conditions—not too long delayed—and mutual respect. And of these two elements, the mutual respect may be the more important.

Most people in these emerging nations are not ideologues. They are not personally committed to grand philosophical concepts—neither our concept of individualism nor the Communist concepts. The vast majorities want only to live as well as those around them, with the respect of those they know. And in those nations where they have turned away from individualism, or are not turning toward it, we ought to find out why our message seems to them to miss that formula.

It is foolish for us to sit here comfortably in the United States and denounce those who turn against us. It is foolish also for us to take refuge in such promises as, "The Communists are better organized for subversion." That surely is true—but it doesn't help us in the cold war simply to say it.

In the upper intellectual levels, the concept of individualism has a far greater attraction than the Communist concepts—we do lose intellectuals to communism but we convert a far greater number of intellectuals away from communism. The struggle for men's minds, so often made to seem a struggle for the intellectual sophisticate, is not that at all. It really is a struggle for the minds of the least sophisticated, the least educated, the minds of the masses.

Until we understand that, and develop the kind of message that reaches them, we are going to be wasting our lives and substances in propping up facades.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Mar. 31, 1963]

THE FOREIGN AID DEBATE: ARE WE THROWING GOOD MONEY AFTER BAD?

(By BARRY GOLDWATER, U.S. Senator from Arizona)

How silly can we get in our efforts to distribute foreign aid money throughout the world?

Perhaps the case of Brazil can highlight that question for the benefit of American taxpayers. They have a right to know since they have footed the bill to the tune of over $100 billion since the end of World War II.

Brazil's finance minister, Francisco San Tiago Dantas, has concluded his discussions in Washington for a loan which is reputed to be in the neighborhood of $400 million.

But it was a very close thing. There was a time during the negotiations when Brazil threatened not to accept American aid. Think of that.

There is no telling what might happen to the New Frontier's plans for the Alliance for Progress if we hadn't been able to convince the Brazilians that they should avail themselves of the seemingly endless American largesse.

The trouble arose from a report issued by the House foreign affairs subcommittee on inter-American affairs. The report bore the name of Lincoln Gordon, American ambassador to Brazil, and said that the Communists have infiltrated Brazil's Government under President Joao Goulart.

When news of this report reached Brasilia, Goulart ordered his Foreign Minister in Washington to suspend all negotiations for U.S. aid. He called off the discussions pending a clarification of the report by the State Department.

The State Department, of course, obliged with a statement to the effect that Communist infiltration of the Brazilian Government is not sufficient "to have a substantial influence on Brazilian Government policy."

It is understandable that the administration would want to avoid any aid difficulty with Brazil while President Kennedy was in Costa Rica proposing a massive spending program designed to fight Castro communism with political, social, and economic reform.

But it isn't clear why a State Department official's name should appear on a report warning of the dangers of communism in Brazil if the State Department doesn't believe that infiltration is very substantial.

The fact of the matter is that 3 of the 15-member Brazilian Cabinet are said to be notorious proponents of the Marxist-Leninist political philosophy, while Goulart's press secretary is reputed to be a self-declared member of the Communist Party.

Not only that, but the negotiations for providing Brazil with millions of American dollars got off to a very doubtful start right at the beginning. The trouble stemmed from an announcement in Rio that the Brazilian finance minister was coming here to get American money so that his country could build up a trade program with the Soviet Union.

After his arrival, the finance minister revised his story and said that trade with Russia would be only part of the program which Brazil hoped to build with many other countries.

Any way you slice it, there is very good reason to doubt whether Brazil is completely in tune with American anti-Communist objectives in the western hemisphere. And we find this situation prevailing despite the fact that, since 1946, the United States has poured almost $2 billion into Brazil in loans, grants, military aid and food.

So the question arises of whether we should send good money after bad. I don't believe there is any justification for advancing funds to a government to help it develop a trade program with the enemy, particularly when that government is in danger of being taken over lock, stock and barrel by the Communists.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

The Foreign Aid Debate: Gamble on Brazil May Prevent Violence

(By Walter Lippmann)

The foreign aid program, which began with the Marshall Plan in 1948, has always been a gamble, has never been a sure thing.

In Europe it has been a brilliant success. But 15 years ago nobobdy could know that it would be. In fact, such were the poverty and paralysis of France, Italy and Germany that there was a serious possibility of a general collapse into communism.

The Marshall plan was expensive. But because it worked, all would agree today that it was cheap at the price.

Now we are concerned with foreign aid in this hemisphere. The problem is not what it was in postwar Europe. There the purpose of aid was to enable advanced and highly developed countries to recover from war.

Our purpose in this hemisphere is more complicated and difficult. Broadly speaking, it is to help our neighbors achieve peaceably, and with liberty if not with democracy, a revolution out of their semi-feudal past. Our hope is that they will in fact achieve by progressive government what, failing that, their people will attempt to achieve by communism.

Our Latin American policy would be easier to explain if we forgot about peaceable revolution and concentrated on the simple task of giving unlimited military support to any government, indeed to any dictator, who was unqualifiedly anti-Communist. Such a policy would earn much applause in certain quarters. The trouble is that it would not last very long. For this is an age when the mass of men will no longer put up with their ancient poverty and servitude.

Knowing this, we are looking to the progressive governments, as in Mexico, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Colombia, and Brazil, to carry out the progressive revolutions which are the alternative to the Castroite kind of revolution. It is, of course, a gamble and nothing is easier than to think up the many reasons why it may be lost.

The biggest gamble in all our foreign aid in this hemisphere is in Brazil. This is not only because Brazil is the biggest country in Latin America and the geographical heart of the South American Continent but also because in Brazil there are the biggest stakes to be won or lost.

If the progressive revolution fails in Brazil and the country descends into revolutionary violence, the whole continent is certain to become involved. It is possible more or less effectively to contain the revolutionary influence of a small island like Cuba. It would be a wholly different thing with a continental mass like Brazil, which has a common frontier with every country in South America except two.

On the other hand, the prospects of success in Brazil are bright. For while Brazil has its desperately poor masses, it is not a primitive and undeveloped country. It has a certain resemblance to Italy, before its brilliant recovery, when there was desperate poverty and backwardness in the south and high technical progress in the north.

If we study the agreement just worked out in Washington between Brazilian Finance Minister Francisco San Tiago Dantas and David Bell, who now manages foreign aid, we are bound to marvel at the political courage of the Goulart government. To end the inflation and to reestablish its international credit-worthiness, the Brazilian Government has adopted a program which only a very strong government, strong in its hold on popular support, would dare to undertake.

The Goulart government is going to raise tax collections by 25 percent. It has eliminated the subsidy of wheat, which has doubled the price of bread. It has eliminated the subsidy of petroleum products, which raised the price of gasoline 80 percent. It has increased commuter railroad fares five times. It is cutting down the expansion of bank credit to a third of what it has been. It is freezing government employment and is trying to freeze government pay.

It is an astonishing program. Yet it is said that the Goulart government, which is left of center, is strong enough to carry out the program. We must hope that it will be, and surely the administration has been right in deciding to help it.

For it would be hard to name any item in our whole global foreign aid program which, if it succeeds, will do so much good.

CROSSROADS FOR THE GOP

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House a very interesting article which recently appeared in National Review. We obviously are entering the season for Republican presidential hopefuls to start flexing their muscles and turn their ear to the ground. Lest the Republican Party be led once more down the primrose path to defeat, it is necessary that we nominate a candidate in 1964 who will not run on a "me-too" platform. With each succeeding reversal of the Kennedy administration, it is becoming more and more obvious that the people want a candidate who will turn us away from economic socialism with its dishonest fiscal chicanery and reassert American patriotic pride in firm foreign relations.

I know of no one who seriously believes that Governor Rockefeller would turn us away from economic socialism. His pronouncements in the field of foreign policy—witness the Godkin lectures at Harvard—indicate that he would sacrifice our national sovereignty to further his grand Atlantic design. Yet, many Republicans still take the view that he could win and this at least would be better than what we have now.

Mr. William A. Rusher, publisher of the National Review, presents a forthright rebuttal to the argument that a conservative cannot win in his article "Crossroads for the GOP." It clearly indicates that if the conservative majority of the Republican Party will come into the next convention with strength and nominate a truly representative candidate such as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER that he will have an excellent chance to carry the country in 1964 and reverse the socialistic tide which is engulfing us.

I heartily commend this article to the Members of this body.

Crossroads for the GOP

(By William A. Rusher)

America's most accomplished tea-leaf readers have now concluded their study of the November election results, and they are turning up with an interpretation so unexpected and so unsettling that many of them profoundly wish they had never investigated the matter at all.

Just about all of them have long agreed that the only relevant question, in choosing a Republican presidential nominee, is "Who has the best chance of winning?" And it seemed perfectly safe to let this problem merge imperceptibly into the technically subordinate question, "Who can carry New York and California?"—on the hitherto sound principle that these two large States are indispensable if a Republican nominee is to win nationally. The 1964 answer to this not terribly complicated conundrum is, of course, supposed to be Nelson Rockefeller.

Imagine, therefore, the shock to the neural ganglia of these practiced pragmatists when a hard look at the 1962 election returns revealed: (1) that neither Nelson Rockefeller nor any other Republican, real or nominal, has much more prospect of wresting New York and California from John F. Kennedy in 1964 than Mao Tse-tung; (2) that the GOP has, nevertheless, an astonishingly good chance of upending Kennedy nationally, by taking most of the 165 electoral votes of the Southern and border States away from him; and (3) fasten your seat-belts, please—that the man with the best chance of carrying these States, and therefore of winning, is not Nelson Rockefeller, nor even George Romney or William Scranton, but Arizona's soft-spoken and conservative junior Senator, BARRY GOLDWATER.

Before accepting such a bizarre conclusion, the analysts leaned back, polished their pince-nez and took a relaxing stroll around the block. Like the TV commentator whose early Univac, on election night 1948, predicted on the basis of the Connecticut city returns that Truman would defeat Dewey, they secretly felt that what the damned machine really needed was a healthy kick.

THE ROCKEFELLER SHOWING

But, in 1962 as in 1948, the statistics refused to lie. Rockefeller defeated incumbent Democratic Gov. Averell Harriman 4 years ago by 573,034 votes. Kennedy, however, managed to carry the State against Nixon in 1960 by 383,666. In 1962 the Democrats nominated for Governor a cigar-store Indian named Robert Morgenthau, and frugally held their campaign expenditures to just $420,000—the smallest such figure in the modern political history of the Empire State. Rockefeller and the GOP, determined to "win big" in order to make the indispensable demonstration of puissance in supposedly crucial New York, publicly admit to having spent $2,184,000, or more than five times as much as the Democrats. And that, of course, doesn't include the salaries of the windrows of ghostwriters, analysts and advisers palmed away in various Rockefeller family foundations and businesses. Rockefeller himself campaigned tirelessly for almost a full year before November—kissing babies, patting cows, and munching blintzes as if there were no tomorrow. His opponent, on the other hand, in his all but motionless 2-month campaign, richly earned the mocking sobriquet, "the Democratic Calvin Coolidge." Small wonder that Rockefeller's official campaign manager openly predicted, the day before the election, that his tiger would win by 800,000—perhaps even by a million—votes.

And yet on election day 1962 Rockefeller's margin over Morgenthau was actually 43,865 votes less than his 1958 margin over Governor Harriman. And when we take into account the 141,877 votes rolled up by the gubernatorial candidate of New York's brash new Conservative Party—which is now a legal party in the State, and which has sternly warned that it will run a full slate of independent presidential electors against any liberal nominated by the GOP in 1964—Rockefeller's overall margin sinks to a phthisic 387,292. Seldom has so much been so mauled by so little.

Nor can the Governor's apologists take refuge in the proposition that 1962 was a slow year for the New York GOP generally. On the contrary, it was an uncommonly good year. The party actually increased its already husky majority in the legislature. Rockefeller, however, far from leading the ticket, trailed his chief running mate, Senator JACOB JAVITS, by 190,830 votes. He even trailed his own attorney general, a relatively unknown—to put it mildly—named Lefkowitz, by 29,485. And these figures do not even take into account the fact that the total vote for the lesser offices was naturally lower. JAVITS' actual margin over his own rivals, for example, was 855,726, and Lefkowitz' was 602,935—as against Rockefeller's aforementioned 387,292 in the contest that piled up much the largest total vote.

Add to all this the fact (reported by independent pollster Samuel Lubell within weeks after the election) that 80 percent of the 1960 Kennedy voters who deserted the Democrats to support Rockefeller for Governor in 1962 have already decided to back Kennedy over Rockefeller 2 years hence, if it comes to that. What, then, are the odds that Nelson Rockefeller can take the Empire State away from John F. Kennedy in 1964? Ask your bookie.

Nor is Rockefeller's synthetic reputation as a dragon-slayer enhanced by considering his other supposititious long suit: California. Richard Nixon, a native son, had to wait until the absentee ballots were counted to be sure he had wrested it from Massachusetts' John F. Kennedy in 1960, and actually lost the governorship to Kennedy's man Brown (a sort of west coast Morgenthau) by over 300,000 votes in 1962. Does anybody, in the teeth of such statistics, seriously suppose that Nelson Rockefeller of New York can carry it against President Kennedy in 1964?

Well, say there is no kingdom then for Nelson. Can the Republican Party do better? Surprisingly enough, the signs are multiplying that it can; that, in fact, 1964 can prove as dramatic a turning point in the fortunes of the GOP as 1932 did for the Democrats. It will take courage; it will take imagination; it will compel the GOP to break the familiar mould that has furnished it with every Presidential nominee for a quarter of a century—but it can be done. One can almost prophesy that it will be done—if not in 1964, then inevitably in 1968. The Republican Party, like it or not, has a rendezvous with a brand new idea.

PROSPECTS IN THE SOUTH

And that brings us to the second great lesson of the 1962 elections. Ever since Reconstruction, the Southern States have been as relentlessly Democratic as Rose Kennedy herself. This mulish but understandable prejudice has forced them into unnatural association with northern entities and ideas that every true southerner instinctively loaths (Mencken once described the Democratic Party as "two gangs of natural enemies in a precarious state of symbiosis"), but it worked: it provided almost every Democratic presidential candidate for 80 years with a guarantee of well over 100 electoral votes before he opened his mouth.

But, as the Bible reassuringly predicts, "This too shall pass away." Erosion has steadily undermined the one-party South—most notably during and since World War II, which ruthlessly homogenized American youth and—perhaps even more important—laid the foundations of a modern mixed economy in this once, almost wholly agricultural region. Swifter means of communication and transportation—national newsmagazines, television networks and jet aircraft—have further diluted the ancestral tendencies. In scores of Southern cities today, white-collar and professional workers drive home to split-level suburban ranch houses every evening, looking and acting for all the world like their northern and western counterparts.

And they are voting Republican. In the 11 States of the old Confederacy, according to Time, Republican candidates for the House of Representatives received 31 percent of all votes cast in 1962—as against only 16.3 percent in 1958. And this, mark you, despite the fact that a substantial number of seats were not even contested by the GOP. In Alabama, hitherto presumed to be as safe for Democracy as Tammany Hall, a smooth-talking 43-year-old Republican named James Martin, who had never sought public office before, ran against veteran Democratic Senator LISTER HILL, lost by just seven-tenths of 1 percent, and carried every major city in Alabama.[1] And other strikingly strong showings were made by Republican gubernatorial or senatorial candidates in such unfamiliar territory as Arkansas (30.8 percent), South Carolina (42.6 percent) and Texas (45.9 percent).

It takes no seer, therefore, to recognize that the Republican Party is at last within measurable distance of becoming what it has never been since Reconstruction: a truly national party, with a powerful State-by-State organization and successful local candidates in the South as well as elsewhere.

And what are the Republicans of this new South saying? What will they be arguing, as they foregather with their fellow Republicans of the North and West in the convention of 1964? "Nominate Rockefeller?" Far from it. With an unanimity that cannot fail to impress, they are calling for a conservative GOP and a conservative presidential candidate.

"I am against Rockefeller," says 34-year-old Tad Smith, recently retired Republican State chairman of Texas, "because his nomination would, quite simply, destroy the Republican Party of Texas. At one resignation rally after another, lifelong Democrats now turning Republican have warned me that they will vote for a conservative Republican in 1964—but not for Rockefeller or any other liberal." And the same story is told by leading Republicans in State after State across the South.

But the showing of Southern Republicans in 1962, encouraging as it may be, is still almost uniformly short of the 51 percent in each State that would be needed to carry the South's electoral votes in 1964. Is there any evidence that a Republican presidential nominee could improve on this showing by the GOP's local candidates? Once again, the answer is an emphatic Yes—provided he is a conservative.

In the first place, it should be remembered that voting Republican for the Presidency is far commoner in the South than voting Republican for congressional candidates (a practice which threatens the prized seniority of conservative Southern Democrats in the Congress). The following Southern and Border States have all gone Republican, primarily as a means of conservative protest, in at least two of the three presidential elections during the past 11 years: Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. (Louisiana and West Virginia went Republican once apiece.) There is no reason to suppose that any of these States is beyond the grasp of a Republican candidate chosen precisely because of his proven appeal to the South.

In addition, consider the cold estimate of the vigorous young men who are the Republican State chairmen in two of the Democratic Party's strongest remaining southern redoubts: John Grenier, of Alabama, and Wirt Yerger, Jr., of Mississippi. Both insist that their own States will vote for a conservative Republican, if one is nominated in 1964. Says Grenier: "It'd be the easiest campaign I ever ran."

Moreover, their prediction is echoed by some surprising sources. Within the past 2 months, a senior Democratic Senator from the Deep South confided to a friend that, in his opinion, GOLDWATER could carry all 165 Southern and Border State electoral votes against Kennedy in 1964, and underlined his view by quoting Attorney General Robert Kennedy as having told him privately that the First Family fears GOLDWATER far more than Rockefeller.

As a matter of fact, as already noted, the logical path we have traced has already been trodden by just about every serious student of the 1962 election results, regardless of party or personal bias. Certainly conservative Republicans have no patent on the obvious conclusion. JACOB JAVITS, for example, took one horrified glance, added 2 and 2, got 4, and bellowed a warning against the Republican Party ever courting the South. Joseph Alsop, with the vichyssoise of his most recent White House dinner still fringing his petulant lower lip, perceived the danger at once and recoiled in horror at the racist venality of any Republican attempt to take southern votes away from Kennedy.

NATURE OF THE COUNTERATTACK

Which brings us to the nature and validity of the inevitable counterattack. Alsop may, perhaps, be dismissed as too intemperate to argue with. (The author personally witnessed, during the Republican convention of 1952 in Chicago, a distasteful scene in which Alsop shrieked to all within earshot that the late Robert Taft was running "a straight fascist campaign—straight fascist.") But Joe Alsop is scarcely the whole problem. Even disregarding the slightly mildewed laurels and still smoldering ambitions of Nelson Rockefeller, the New York GOP has naturally enjoyed, and will not readily give up, its familiar role as "Most Popular Girl at the Ball." More broadly, the liberal Republicans, who have won every convention since (and including) 1940 by urging the necessity of wooing liberal votes in the big cities of the North, are certainly not going to accept demotion without a fight. So the cry is up: any Republican concession to southern sentiment is a venture in sheer racism, and will lose the GOP crucial votes in the North and West.

---

[1] Nor can Martin's amazing showing be dismissed as merely a nonrepeating one-shot reaction to the Meredith dispute at nearby Ole Miss. The Republican Party polled 43 percent of the Alabama vote in the 1960 presidential election.

It is tempting to dismiss this argument by observing that the GOP will have to drink deep indeed at the racist trough before it equals the record of John Kennedy's own southern allies on this score. The Democratic Party for 80 years has run with the hares down South on the race issue, while riding with the hounds up North—nominating loudly integrationist presidential candidates, while calmly raking in, on locally segregationist platforms, 95 percent of all Senate and House seats (not to mention governorships and legislatures) south of the Mason-Dixon Line. If Joe Alsop really means to demand consistency on this subject, in short, he should be forced to include his famous dinner host in the general anathema and seek his vichyssoise elsewhere hereafter.

But there is another and better answer. As Roscoe Drummond recently pointed out, the Republican Party in the South is, in general, far less committed to all-out segregation than the Democrats. And there is a sound reason for this, already hinted at: the Republican Party is strongest in the southern cities and suburbs, where the tides of social change are tending to run fastest. It was the primitive "wool hats" of the Alabama backwoods who saved LISTER HILL for John Kennedy, and it is they, in State after State of the South, who are the really hard-shell segregationists.

On this issue of integration, truth is difficult to separate from emotion. The southern Republicans understand and accept the fact that they cannot dictate a national Republican platform, or candidate, committed to segregation. They make, on the other hand, no apology for opposing the Warren Court's breezy ventures in social pioneering—and it may well be that here they have something to teach conservatives of the North. If it is objected that, nonetheless, a gap remains between northern and southern Republican sentiment on this issue, the only honest answer is that the American society is deeply riven on the subject, and no party that pretends to national scope can, by definition, do other than reflect—as the Democratic Party has for 80 years reflected—this division in itself.

Certainly there is not a shred of evidence that any large bloc of votes now sustaining Republican dominance in any northern or western State will bolt to the party of Kennedy (and EASTLAND, and ELLENDER) because the GOP chooses to bid vigorously for the support of the new middle class of a changing South. Republican National Chairman William Miller was much nearer the mark when he exhorted the December meeting of the Republican National Committee: "Don't let them give you a sense of guilt (about seeking votes in the South)." The American people, North and South, are entitled to be heard on the question of which party is treating the complex issue of race relations most honestly and with the most real statesmanship. As a matter of fact, one of the tantalizing byproducts of a 1964 decision by the GOP to nominate a conservative would be precisely this: that it would compel the Democrats, for the first time in almost a century, to pay a reasonable amount of attention to their own hitherto captive Southern conservatives.

But what the Republican delegates in 1964 will want to do is win, and it is here that the case for a conservative (meaning, in practice, BARRY GOLDWATER) must be rested and can be won. No Republican—not Rockefeller, not GOLDWATER, and neither Romney nor Scranton—has a serious prospect of carrying either New York or California against Kennedy in 1964. Probably any one of them can hold the GOP's Midwestern heartland, and such peripheral fiefs as northern New England and certain of the Mountain States, amounting in all to perhaps 140 electoral votes with 270 needed to win. But GOLDWATER, and GOLDWATER alone (for in this respect Scranton and Romney are in no better position than Rockefeller), can carry enough Southern and border States to offset the inevitable Kennedy conquests in the big industrial States of the North and still stand a serious chance of winning the election.

Whether Senator GOLDWATER is willing to shoulder the burden of a campaign of this sort—first against Nelson Rockefeller's millions, and then against John Kennedy and the massed batteries of the American left—is not presently known. Certainly a man could be forgiven for praying that he might be spared that cup.

But the arithmetical imperatives speak with a logical force of their own, and it is not in the final analysis BARRY GOLDWATER's personal wishes that are paramount: it is the overarching necessities of the Republican Party, and, in a larger sense, of the Nation itself.

And this remains true, whatever we believe will be the final outcome of the 1964 election. For what if, despite everything, 1964 is fated to be a Democratic year? How can the Republican convention, then, best build for a successful future? By turning its back on the new, conservative and increasingly Republican South and gumming blintzes with Nelson Rockefeller? Or by nominating a candidate who—win or lose—will galvanize the party in a vast new area, carry fresh scores and perhaps hundreds of southern Republicans to unprecedented local victories, and lay the foundations for a truly national Republican Party, ready to fight and win in 1968 and all the years beyond?

TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time it is alleged that some foundations represent overly large concentrations of economic power and that others abuse their tax-free privileges. Congress has inquired into foundations in the past and presently an inquiry is being conducted by the House Small Business Committee. Responsible foundations have always cooperated to the fullest extent with such inquiries. Foundations enjoy tax benefits and therefore have a public status. Foundations recognize this and regard their affairs as open to the public. They have denied no inspection to the Congress.

Foundations are a halfway mark between public and private interests. By being essentially public, but nongovernment, they further the free system. They have helped "humanize" the free enterprise system. They have done good works, and will do more.

In the midst of a good deal of discussion of the role of foundations in the modern society, a constructive piece by Ben Hibbs, former editor of the Saturday Evening Post, appeared in the March 16th issue of the Post. The article discusses the Ford Foundation and is, in my judgment, the best piece that has yet been written on the foundation world.

Mr. Hibbs points out in his article how a grant of $980,000 to Swarthmore College triggered a self-sustaining drive by Swarthmore which resulted in four times as much money being raised from other private sources. Last fall the Ford Foundation announced a series of grants for new college-development programs, which totaled $114.7 million spread among 35 universities and colleges. The funds will be matched by $277 million more to be raised by the recipients.

One of the great values of foundations is that they are relatively free to experiment in areas where the Government would not dare to experiment. An example in the education world is the plan called "continuous learning," a system under which pupils progress at their own speed in various subjects without being promoted specifically from grade to grade. Mr. Hibbs' article tells us about this experiment.

With the consent of the House of Representatives, I am placing Mr. Hibbs' article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the hope that my colleagues in the Congress will take time to read it.

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Mar. 16, 1963]

MR. FORD'S BUSY BILLIONS

(By Ben Hibbs)

Thousands of institutions in America enjoy an unusual privilege: They pay no taxes, even though their incomes may run well into the millions of dollars annually. They are the Nation's tax-exempt foundations, and under the circumstances it is not surprising that they have frequently come under attack by a variety of critics and under close scrutiny by Congress.

In the past, most of the foundations have emerged from these attacks smelling sweet enough to satisfy their inquisitors. Now once again, however, they are the target of congressional investigation, and this time they are up against a formidable adversary, WRIGHT PATMAN, veteran Congressman from Texas.

PATMAN, who heads the House Small Business Committee, has had a staff of researchers digging into the affairs of the foundations for months. Last July he launched his attack from the floor of the House, and in January he issued an interim report, 135 pages long, specifying the sorts of skulduggery he had discerned.

Big business and wealthy persons, he said, often established foundations primarily as a cover to escape taxes, not from motives of sweet charity. Some foundations exerted powerful influence over the business firms which had given them birth. Others were competing unfairly with small business by investing their tax-exempt funds in a variety of commercial ventures.

Many foundations, the Congressman said, were skirting the law, some actually violating it flagrantly. And even if none of these abuses existed, PATMAN insisted, foundations as a whole still represented a dangerous concentration of economic power. Through their huge investments they had become a potent influence in the financial marketplace, not always for good. He strongly implied that the tax-exempt privilege was in itself a sinful invention which penalizes all the taxpayers.

PATMAN obviously has done his homework with great diligence, and he seems able to document many of his charges with clear-cut examples. Yet almost nothing in the Patman investigation thus far has given Congress and the public any glimpse of the powerful and usually constructive role which the foundations—particularly the large ones such as Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Kellogg, and Sloan—have come to play in our society. When questioned from the floor of the House about this other side of the coin, Congressman PATMAN replied that his purpose was to investigate the finances of the foundations—their assets, investments, and income—and not their philanthropies. Yet it is impossible to bring the foundations into focus without taking note of the profound way in which they are reaching into the lives of nearly all of us.

Never before in the history of this country have so many large blocks of private capital been set aside for human welfare. There are today in America about 15,000 tax-exempt institutions which qualify as foundations. Many are small and relatively local in scope—often devoted to a single project dear to the heart of the founder. Others are huge and incredibly diverse in their activities. The Ford Foundation, which is by far the largest, listed its net assets at about $2.3 billion as of September 30. During the past fiscal year it made grants of more than $200 million. Its benefactions, which have now reached a total of approximately $1.8 billion, have gone to 4,950 institutions in all 50 States and 67 foreign countries. Ninety percent of this money has been handed out in the United States.

Figures compiled by the Foundation Library Center in New York indicate that the foundations now have total assets of about $13 billion and their grants currently add up to approximately $700 million annually. Much of this is used as seed money—to initiate or back innovations and experiments, to demonstrate, to lead the way.

Fear has been expressed by thoughtful people that the power of foundation money—reposing, as it does, largely in a small group of professional philanthropists—could run amok someday and damage our institutions and our way of life. And occasionally large groups of citizens have been outraged by certain foundation activities in such areas as civil rights, race relations and far-out experiments in education.

In view of the power they unquestionably exert and the controversies they sometimes provoke, it seems reasonable to ask just what the big foundations are up to. What, for instance, does the Ford Foundation do with all that money?

WHY TEACHERS GIVE UP

The answer, of course, is: many things. To see one specific example from the beneficiary's viewpoint, consider the case of Swarthmore College, a coeducational institution of distinguished academic standards located on the outskirts of Philadelphia. Its student body numbers about 950, its faculty about 120.

When Courtney Smith, then 36 years old, became president of Swarthmore in 1953, one of his early decisions was that faculty salaries must be raised. He was still grappling with this thorny problem in 1955 when the Ford Foundation electrified the academic world by announcing that it had just appropriated $260 million to help raise the salaries of teachers in all the 630 private, regionally accredited, 4-year colleges and universities in this country. It was and remains the largest single giveaway program in the history of American philanthropy.

Ford, which over the years has leaned toward the educational field in its benefactions, had been studying the disgracefully low estate of college-faculty salaries. It found that in 1955 the median annual salary of full professors was $7,100—as contrasted, for example, with the median earnings of $15,000 for doctors. The median for all faculty grades was $5,200.

In effect college teachers were subsidizing the education of other people's children. As a result many faculty members, particularly the younger ones, were giving up the unfair financial struggle and turning to other occupations. Many others on the threshold of their careers, who yearned to teach, took a long look and fled in other directions.

Even with its massive resources, Ford could not hand out enough money to correct these inequities. But foundation officials thought they might be able to ignite a brush fire—or, hopefully, 630 brush fires—that would grow into a solid blaze of accomplishment across the country. This is the way the foundation works. "We like to start things," Henry T. Heald, president, said to me. "Then if the idea is valid other people take over where we leave off."

Most of the money granted in the faculty-wage program was given with the stipulation that it should be invested in endowment funds for at least 10 years and the income used exclusively for salaries. Swarthmore College got $908,000. This in itself did not solve Courtney Smith's problem. Put out at a safe 4 percent interest it would yield $36,320 and permit an average pay hike of about $300. But the Ford money did serve as a potent shot in the arm.

Through alumni fund drives, Swarthmore had been raising about $100,000 annually. Now, inspired by the Ford grant, the alumni board decided to double this amount and earmark the second $100,000 for salaries. Within 3 years the new goal had been reached, and the contributions have continued at or above that level ever since. President Smith now had almost four times as much new spending money as was produced by the Ford grant alone and was able to give his teachers substantial increases. Swarthmore salaries had long been far above the general academic average. Today they are in the top 10-percent bracket, enabling the college to compete with the Ivy League schools for teaching talent.

This experience was repeated, in varying degrees and in many ways, in hundreds of colleges throughout the country. Perhaps the greatest good, however, came from the enormous publicity given the huge Ford grant. The announcement, together with statistics on salaries, hit the front pages; radio and television joined the chorus; editorial writers wrote about the financially neglected profession of teaching. Attention was focused, and the public conscience was aroused.

Today faculty wages are still far too low in comparison with earnings in other learned professions, but progress has been made. The median for all ranks has risen from $5,200 in 1955 to $7,486, and faculty people, generally speaking, are less hopeless about the future than they were 10 years ago. Although the foundation itself is careful not to claim too much credit, many college officials will tell you that the massive Ford grant of the middle 1950's had quite a lot to do with this salutary change of climate. As foundation officials had hoped, their salary program did ignite a lot of brush fires.

With that triumph under its belt, Ford embarked in 1960 on another massive college project that in total grants may eventually surpass the $260 million salary program. The man handling this new project is James W. Armsey, director of the foundation's special program in education. Armsey, 45, had had a distinguished career in education administration before he joined the foundation staff in 1956.

"The administrators of even the best colleges and universities," Armsey said to me, "are so bedeviled by money problems that they are hard put to find time to run their schools. We are trying over a period of years to give some of them a lift."

As of last autumn the foundation had announced at yearly intervals three packages of grants in this new college-development program. They totaled $114.7 million and went to 35 private universities and colleges. The Ford funds, which this time must be matched by $277 million raised by the recipients, are more or less unrestricted—that is, they may be spent for a wide range of physical and academic projects. However, each institution being considered was required to submit a detailed analysis of itself, its needs, and its plan of expenditures.

Swarthmore College again received a grant, $2 million this time, to be matched on a 3-to-1 basis. "But," said Joseph B. Shane, vice president of the college, "even if Swarthmore had been turned down in the end, the study which we put together for Ford was a highly worthwhile project in itself. It was a revealing exercise in self-examination."

In the academic world these days a pious old saying is being twisted around a bit, with no sacrilegious intent, to read, "Ford helps those who help themselves." College presidents in faraway States, it is said, have been known to face reverently toward the foundation offices in New York City and repeat these words as a hopeful incantation.

THEY CARE ABOUT THE JOB

The Ford Foundation occupies nine floors of a blocky office building at 477 Madison Avenue. The permanent professional staff numbers about 100, but you will rarely find more than two-thirds of these men and women at their desks on a given day. The others will be out in the field, investigating, assessing, administering. Talks with many members of the staff showed they are for the most part mature but relatively young men who discuss their many projects eloquently and with fervor. Many come from the educational field, but there are also lawyers, journalists, former Government executives, men from the business and financial world—and one ex-labor-union official. They obviously have one thing in common: high enthusiasm for their jobs. Despite the hard work and the occasional headache when a program flops, it seems to be fun to give away the late Mr. Ford's millions for mankind.

Started in 1936, the Ford Foundation remained a relatively small family trust, devoted chiefly to local charities in Michigan, until the late 1940's. Then under the wills of the elder Henry Ford and his son Edsel it received some 90 percent of the stock of the Ford Motor Co. Unquestionably one of the motives behind these huge bequests was the determination of the Ford family to prevent the company from falling into the hands of outsiders through confiscatory inheritance taxes. But the wills specified that the vast sums were to be used for the purpose of advancing human welfare.

The enlarged foundation opened for business in the autumn of 1950 with assets of close to a half billion dollars. In the intervening years it has sold about two-fifths of its Ford stock and diversified into a wide variety of other securities. Its worth has multiplied fivefold in 12 years through the increase in value of Ford stock and the growth of other investments. About two-thirds of its capital remains in nonvoting Ford stock. Ford stock sold to the public is converted at the time of sale into voting stock. Thus the foundation cannot have control over the company.

It is equally true that the Ford Motor Co. does not run the foundation. The fund is administered by a board of 15 distinguished trustees headed by John J. McCloy, the financier, who also has served in several important governmental posts. All policy matters and all appropriations must be approved by the board. Edsel Ford's sons, Henry II, who is now chairman of the board of the Ford Motor Co., and Benson, vice president of the company, are foundation trustees. So is Donald K. David, a Ford Co. director. These three men are the only link with the company.

Foundation President Henry Heald, 58, is a tall, handsome man of scholarly attainments and forthright manner. After a long career in engineering and education he became chancellor of New York University in 1952 and moved to the presidency of the foundation in 1956. He likes to speak of the foundation as a "wholesaler" of philanthropy—meaning that it usually makes its grants to sound institutions which have the know-how in their own fields to parcel out the money effectively. Thus some of its institutional grants filter down, as scholarships and fellowships, to hundreds of persons. Dr. Heald also emphasizes the experimental nature of many of the foundation's projects.

"When we see a good new idea in education or some other field," he said, "we often put our money behind it and give it a chance to prove or disprove itself. If it is indeed good it may well become an effective demonstration whose effects will spread and grow. If it fails—as happens now and then—well, we've simply lost a bit of money. Because we are a private philanthropy we are not frightened by occasional defeat. And again because we are private and are not bound by civil service pay scales, as Government agencies are, we can get highly competent people to block out and administer our programs."

Occasionally the foundation creates a brand new agency to carry out some program. One of these, the Fund for the Republic, turned out to be a hot potato. It was one case in which a foundation managed to enrage a considerable segment of the American public.

The purpose of the fund, which opened its doors in 1953 with a $15 million grant, was to do battle for our constitutional liberties. CLIFFORD P. CASE, now a U.S. Senator from New Jersey, was its first president, but was succeeded in 1954 by Robert M. Hutchins, who had been associate director of the foundation itself. Hutchins, a voluble liberal, waded into the civil rights fray with such vigor that for a time he and the fund were in the headlines almost constantly. It was the McCarthy era, and targets for Hutchins were not lacking.

Hutchins, however, made so much noise that many people got the idea that the fund was the Ford Foundation, or at least its major project. In this case, the tail was wagging the dog. And the sharp criticisms which Hutchins' tactics provoked inevitably bounced back to the foundation itself.

Today foundation officials speak of the fund with marked reticence. "It did some good," they say, "but——." No further grants were ever made, and officials point out, a bit defensively, that there was never any expressed intent to give the fund any more money. It was, they imply, a one-shot experiment.

A DISOWNED SUBSIDIARY

The Fund for the Republic still operates, rather quietly, in Santa Barbara, Calif., and Hutchins still heads it. Its chief function now seems to be to make studies and publish reports on social and governmental problems. No longer connected with the foundation in any way, it is reported hard up for spending money. Hutchins, always a phrasemaker, sometimes refers sadly to his enterprise as a "wholly disowned subsidiary."

Another special agency, which by any yardstick has been a whopping success, is the Fund for the Advancement of Education which the foundation created in 1951 and has continued to support all out. Housed in the same offices as the foundation itself, it is charged with initiating and carrying out scores of experimental programs to improve our schools all the way from kindergarten through college. It is headed by Clarence H. Faust, president, and Alvin C. Eurich, vice president—a couple of ex-educators who posses tough enough hides to push ahead on their projects despite occasional bombardments of brickbats from members of their former profession.

This is the arm of the foundation which is backing much revolutionary experimentation in public school education. Many of its projects have already proved their worth. Others, still in the demonstration stage, are eyed with doubt by some educators and by those parents who want only hard-core, old-fashioned schooling for their children—with no fancy new ideas, please. Thus the foundation has become a big hunk of yeast in the general ferment which seethes through the whole educational field.

From its earliest beginnings, Ford's education fund has put massive infusions of money and work into the growing battle to train teachers more effectively. For one thing, it has insisted that teachers should be given more liberal-arts education and fewer courses in the teaching techniques. The fund's conviction is that there are teachers whose own education, to put the matter charitably, has been superficial.

As a part of this campaign, Ford has given heavy backing to internships for teachers—an idea borrowed from the medical schools. A liberal-arts A.B., for example, may do graduate work for an M.A. in pedagogy and within the same school year get paid part-time wages by a local school board for intern teaching under the eyes of experienced teachers. This system is now widely employed in school systems located near universities. Public school administrators generally proclaim it a huge success.

Ford also backed television as a teaching tool when TV was still new enough to be controversial. And it was largely Ford money which in 1961 got that "flying-antenna" airplane off the ground in Indiana—the plane that broadcasts lessons, recorded by experts, to classes of public schools in a six-State area. This experiment, incorporated as the Midwest Program in Airborne Television is so successful that the corporation hopes eventually to become largely self-supporting through fees paid by the schools. That's the way Ford likes to have its experimental programs work out: Point the way with money and counsel, and then, after the idea catches hold, move on to something else.

Another innovation massively supported by Ford is team teaching—a system whereby several teachers of the same grade work in groups, cooperatively, shifting classroom work from one to another. In English, for example, one may be a whiz at teaching grammar while another's specialty is poetry. At intervals the large classes are broken into smaller groups for discussions. The plan is being adopted more widely every year.

Still newer, more complicated and more controversial is the plan called continuous learning—a system under which each pupil progresses at his own speed in each subject without being promoted specifically from grade to grade. It is close to special tutoring on a mass production basis.

One school system which has received substantial Ford money to try out continuous learning and other experiments, and to extend its team-teaching plan, is that of Newton, Mass., a suburban city of 92,000 on the outskirts of Boston. Newton has long been a front-runner in educational innovation, and its present school superintendent, Charles E. Brown, who is just 37, has a national reputation. When I visited Newton last summer, task forces of teachers were planning their complex new regimen.

Said Bettina King, principal of a junior high where one continuous-learning program is being launched, "We have talked and talked about these things, and now finally, with Ford money and Dr. Brown's blessing, we have a chance to find out whether they are as good as we think they are." Initial results of the new methods are promising, but it will take at least 3 years to determine their validity.

Educators in Oregon are now embarked on a statewide school-improvement program with Ford support. It involves 9 private and public colleges and universities, which train 88 percent of all the State's teachers, and 26 school systems, which enroll 52 percent of the public school students. In this case the Ford money will be spent on a host of innovations—team teaching, widening the range of subjects, flexible scheduling of the students' time, the use of nonprofessionals—housewives and others—as teacher aids, variable grouping of students for classroom instruction, programs for gifted students, more attention to the dullards, more effective guidance programs.

Through its grantee institutions Ford has awarded fellowships for graduate study to thousands of young men and women: some for work pointing directly to college teaching; some for science and other occupations; some for foreign studies. A favorite remark around the foundation is that "the America of the future must know more about this world that it is trying to lead."

Ford is trying to improve university-level business schools, which in quality have been down at the bottom of the educational totem pole along with teachers' colleges. Several years ago it also gave $90 million to privately supported medical schools to strengthen their faculties. And the foundation expects to launch shortly a course of instruction at Columbia University for successful men in middle life who have decided that business is for the birds and want new careers in something which they believe will be more satisfying, such as teaching or public service.

It is also handing out eating money—this time directly, with no intervening agency—to scores of serious writers, composers, painters, performers and others in the arts, to enable them to work uninterruptedly for a time without having to grub for a living. Results are piling up in this field: books published, new music performed, paintings sold.

Commenting on Ford's list of benefactions, Francis Keppel, recently appointed U.S. Commissioner of Education who for 14 years was dean of Harvard's Graduate School of Education, said to me, "You can't even keep track of all the things they are into, but, the good Lord willing, may they continue. What an encouraging thing it is, in this critical time for education, to have a rich foundation which steps in with its money and starts doing the things that some of us can only shout about."

Yet the foundation's projects in education are only part of its sprawling program. It is also operating in the gray areas of the big cities, trying to do something about juvenile gangs and helping municipalities coordinate and make some sense out of the confused jungle of welfare agencies. It has devoted money to mental health, to the problems of the aged, the chronically unemployed, the submerged thousands who earn their living as migrant farm laborers. Several years ago it handed out $200 million to improve the services of nonprofit hospitals across the Nation. It is also devoting some attention and money to one of the world's most critical situations, the population explosion, and as a part of this program it is backing new research on birth control. Here, of course, it is beginning to stick a toe into deeply troubled waters.

The foundation also has a vast and growing foreign program—or, rather, numerous programs, with the emphasis frequently on education. In a recent case—a typical one—the University of Chicago was awarded over a million dollars to support educational programs in Pakistan. Oklahoma State University, with another million, also will work to improve the Pakistan schools. The University of Brazil is using Ford money to train scientists who will be needed as the nation's industry grows. And in January the foundation announced a multipronged $2 million program to strengthen the artistic, educational and cultural resources of West Berlin.

Several months ago the trustees took a long look at the Ford Foundation's past, then peered ahead and announced that they would go on doing pretty much the same types of things in the 1960's.

It has been suggested that the foundations of this country are now at their peak; that their functions gradually will be usurped by the Government with its proliferation of welfare programs and its vast resources; that the foundations eventually will spend all their money and cinder out. Maybe, but thus far there is little evidence to support this prediction.

The Ford Foundation, for example, not only gives away its income but occasionally dips into capital for grants. Over the years it has disposed of about $600 million of its assets in this way, and yet its book net worth continues to grow. "Under our charter," said President Heald, "we could give away everything and go out of business." But it is doubtful that Dr. Heald or anyone else at Ford believes this will happen. Certainly the Ford Foundation still finds more to do, in scores of fields, than it can finance. It consistently turns down worthy ideas simply because there isn't enough money.

A reporter's guess is that the foundations will continue to flourish. They will make occasional mistakes, sponsor failures now and then, and irritate some citizens.

There will be abuses of the tax-exempt privilege such as Congressman PATMAN has found. Yet on balance it must be expected that they will continue to accomplish much that is good. The better foundations are, in a sense, the flowering of the genius and conscience of the private-enterprise system.

COST-PRICE SQUEEZE WORST SINCE 1934

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the cost-price squeeze for Illinois farmers is the worst since the depression year of 1934.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture shows parity ratio for March dropped to 71 for Illinois farmers—the lowest level since 1934 when it was 67. Parity ratio shows the relationship between prices of things farmers need to buy, and prices farmers get for their own produce.

Kennedy farm policies have been a tragic failure, and have contributed to today's cost-price squeeze. Heavy dumping of Government corn on markets under the feed-grains program is one of the major factors which caused a sharp decline in cattle and hog prices the past few months.

The Department of Agriculture has kept monthly figures on parity ratio for Illinois farmers since 1938. Prior to that year the ratio was averaged only once a year. March's parity ratio of 71 is the lowest on record since 1934.

A NEW PEARL HARBOR

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I visited America's newest Pearl Harbor last Saturday. Its real name, of course, is Miami, Fla.

I was there 1 week to the day after the surprise attack—the Washington order banning Cuban exile raids against their island's Communist captors. Incidentally, I made the trip at my own, not the taxpayers', expense.

The implications of this disastrous ban are global, but its impact is centered in Miami.

The bulk of the Cuban exiles live there. Headquartered there are the diverse U.S. agencies and working-level U.S. officials charged with the distasteful task of enforcing—and explaining—the ban, and I talked with several of these officials.

It is to Miami that American-captured anti-Castro raiders are brought after their seizure on the high seas or on tiny Caribbean islands—and I saw the first such group of prisoners.

And it is Miami—technically Dade County—which has become the boundary of the house arrest imposed upon would-be Cuban raiders under the Washington decree.

Despite all the official explanatory and fumbling alibis, the ban on exile raids against Cuba is a self-inflicted military, psychological, and policy Pearl Harbor.

It is one more proof of the cumulative effect of blunders; one more reminder that incompetence and mismanagement have a special kind of deadly momentum.

A military Pearl Harbor? Yes, because puny as these exiles' raids may now be they can keep Castro off balance, possibly even long enough for the administration to muster an effective course of action of its own. A bee buzzing around a motorist's head can cause a disastrous wreck. And it should not be forgotten that Castro himself started with a handful of men and a series of minor forays.

Bear in mind, also, that this is not only a raid ban but an aid ban. The administration restrictions cut off outside support for anti-Castro rebels within Cuba and thus become a death knell for these freedom fighters.

A psychological Pearl Harbor? Decidedly so. The ban creates—if not confirms—an impression of doubletalk and doubledealing. What becomes of the President's September 13, 1962 pledge:

> We shall continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders who are dedicated as we are to that nation's return to freedom?

The promise to the ransomed Bay of Pigs prisoners that their brigade's battle flag would be returned to them in Havana is now hollow mockery. And what about the wall of dedicated men around Cuba the President talked about at San José?

Bitterness and uncertainty—that was the description of the Cuban exiles' state of mind I heard in Miami last Saturday. Is there any wonder? And do millions of Americans not share these feelings?

A policy Pearl Harbor? Unequivocally, yes. A State Department official in Miami with whom I talked was later quoted in the press as saying the raids "tend to take the control away from the United States."

That, of course, is the official line, coming directly from the White House. But, one may ask, what control? The administration lost control of its Cuban policy and course of action when it refused to take the risks of firmness and when it blabbed its fears to the world and to our enemies.

The Government of the United States will never regain that control—or wipe out its newest, self-inflicted Pearl Harbor defeat—until it recovers its nerve, its will, and the high purpose vowed by the President in his inaugural address:

> This hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation are announcing the observation of the 50th anniversary of the operation of this pioneering philanthropic agency. John D. Rockefeller was not only an astute businessman, he was also even when a young man of modest means, a charitable one as well. He and those of his family who have succeeded him have epitimized the spirit of our Republic which is an enlightened free enterprise system.

The initial effort of this great foundation was in the field of health—an effort to combat and eliminate malaria, yellow fever, and the hookworm. In this successful program a total of $14 million was spent. The value of this contribution to society can never be evaluated in dollars; it can be said that it has brought relief and protection to millions of people. This was, moreover, the real beginning of a mass attack on those debilitating diseases and might even be said to be the forerunner to our present National Institutes of Health.

Starting with an initial endowment of $35 million it has spent more than $763 million or several times its income. More than 16,000 scientists have been awarded foundation-financed fellowships and scholarships for advanced studies through grants totaling over $61 million. Twenty-eight of these have won a Nobel Prize.

The foundation has known no national boundary lines, no prejudices or fetishes in their efforts to improve the lot of humanity. It has had an ideal and labored ceaselessly to achieve it. The entire Nation owes this organization a great debt; we should endeavor to encourage such enlightened progress by our national policies originating in the Congress.

URBAN RENEWAL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in the annual report of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1961, the following significant statement appears:

> Despite a greater rate of progress in urban renewal during 1961 than in previous years, it has been recognized that improvement must be made in the organization of the city's total urban renewal effort.

On March 12, 1963, the Washington Post said editorially:

> At whatever cost to bureaucratic sensibilities and traditions, the city must find a way to resolve routine difficulties and make routine changes without jeopardizing the entire work at every stage. The city is now confronted with unanswerable evidence that the responsibility for redevelopment must be concentrated in one public agency.

On March 30, 1963, the Washington Post declared editorially that:

> In 1955 the city accepted with enthusiasm an urban renewal program entitled "No Slums in 10 Years." Eight years have now passed, and as Mr. Dowdy, the chairman of the House District Subcommittee, observed at the beginning of the recent hearings, the slums are still very much with us.

The Washington Post editorial went on to say:

> Since urban renewal is a vastly complex and cumbersome procedure that occasionally generates cases of real hardship, and since many millions of public dollars have been spent on it in Washington, these hearings are altogether desirable. They will demonstrate that Congress does indeed have the power to remedy its two most obvious weaknesses. Operating responsibility must be centralized in one agency rather than spread among three competitors. And the city must be given the authority to redevelop commercial neighborhoods, an authority that Congress has already offered to every other American city.

The Washington Post of March 30 published a letter from Joseph J. Honick, executive director, Adams-Morgan Light Commercial Institute, protesting the proposed removal of a number of light commercial firms from the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area. Mr. Honick stated in his letter that:

> To date, according to RLA figures, of the more than 800 small businesses that have been dislocated by urban renewal, more than 40 percent have gone out of business. The contention that many of these firms were marginal operations may or may not be valid.

Perhaps the 320 small business firms that have gone out of business following dislocation by the urban renewal program in the District of Columbia were on the editorial mind of the Washington Post when it declared that:

> Since urban renewal is a vastly complex and cumbersome procedure that occasionally generates cases of real hardship, and since many millions of public dollars have been spent on it in Washington, these hearings are altogether desirable.

A resolution adopted on April 8, 1963, by the independent citizens of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area, a group of homeowners and small business owners, protested the eradication of all licensed rooming houses no matter how well run from the Adams-Morgan Urban Renewal Project Area.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have expressed some sympathy with the small businessmen of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area, and with the owners of licensed rooming houses in that area.

The new president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Edwin P. Neilan, has called on local chambers of commerce to lead their communities away from the Federal Treasury, saying that:

> A revival of grassroots initiative and sense of responsibility is badly needed.

The Evening Star of March 28, 1963, reported Mr. Neilan as saying that businessmen must counteract the work of Federal officials who are on the road selling their subsidy programs, including urban renewal, as painless panaceas for almost every type of community program.

I include as part of my remarks, items from the Washington Daily News and Evening Star, and the text of a resolution adopted April 8, 1963, by the independent citizens of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 22, 1963]

SIXTEEN CITIZENS OPPOSE RENEWAL PLAN: ADAMS-MORGAN REVOLT FORMS

A citizen revolt against the Adams-Morgan urban redevelopment plan has been organized by an "Emergency Committee To Save Our Homes and Businesses in the Adams-Morgan Area."

The committee was formed by 16 citizens who invited Col. Thomas K. Fullerton, Assistant Engineer Commissioner, to hear complaints against various features of the plan. The plan has been approved by the National Capital Planning Commission and is awaiting a public hearing.

Colonel Fullerton listened for 3 hours and invited the group to arrive at a consensus on specific points and bring it to the city heads.

After he left, the 16 citizens agreed to oppose these points:

Scattered site public housing; elimination of commercial rooming houses and light industry; inclusion of residential structures marked for rehabilitation in the officially designated Adams-Morgan urban renewal area, and displacing families before construction of public housing in which to relocate them.

The group wants licensed rooming houses retained, with strict code enforcement. It also wants an industrial park development to accommodate light industry now in the area.

It is opposed to public rehabilitation of residential buildings.

"Why not let private industry rehabilitate them?" the group said.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 23, 1963]

THE FRANKENSTEIN OF URBAN RENEWAL

Robert J. Lewis, in his able presentation of the effect of the sleeper clause in the Redevelopment Land Agency's plan for the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project, exposes the Frankenstein of urban renewal which stalks our neighborhoods.

He makes it clear that we visionaries, in our anxiety to conserve and restore the beauty and usefulness of our cities, have created, instead of the constructive machinery we sought for this purpose, a monster capable of destruction. Under the manipulation of our local RLA, this urban renewal monster now menaces the cherished property rights of every private owner of land in this city.

"Mistakes were inevitable in our early attempts," we told each other as we ruefully observed the new ugliness rising in the place of the old ugliness of the Southwest redevelopment area, and as we found the slums of the Southwest transferred to other areas by the evacuation of problem families ahead of the bulldozers.

"We will do better as we start urban renewal operations in other sectors," we said. "Meanwhile, we must find some way of controlling the taking power of this other independent agency, the Public Housing Authority, which is invading our neighborhoods. It has now expanded its bureaucracy and its taking powers to the point where 1 out of each 100 District of Columbia residents is living in publicly subsidized housing, with no cessation in sight. Its mass conversion of land from private to public ownership is swallowing the residential districts at an appalling rate and our protests are met with the excuse that they must provide homes for families displaced by urban renewal."

All this we have told ourselves as we tried to sustain faith in the miracles we hoped to achieve through the broad powers of urban renewal. But now we find that the mistakes of the past are to be compounded in the Adams-Morgan project. The RLA and the National Capital Housing Authority, acting under the comfortable cloak of immunity from citizen control enjoyed by independent agencies, are teaming up into a power combine to seize at random the dwellings of private property owners and convert them to permanent public ownership for public housing at prices less than they were bought for and at prices lower than that at which they would be available to anyone else.

Furthermore, Mr. Lewis tells us, that the RLA makes no secret of its plan to follow this same policy as it extends its operations into other parts of the city.

Let us no longer delude ourselves about the future of urban renewal. Let us admit that our anxiety for progress and our naivete have led us to sell our American birthright for a mess of pottage. And in proclaiming our error let us call upon Congress to help us subdue the monster we helped to create before its evils are allowed to further undermine American property rights in Washington and other cities across the length and breadth of our country.

MARGUERITE SNYDER.

There is a sleeper clause in the urban renewal plan which has just been OK'd by the Redevelopment Land Agency and the National Capital Planning Commission which will, if approved by the District Commissioners, allow homes all over Washington to be seized by the RLA and sold to the National Capital Housing Authority to be used as permanent public housing units. That means that your home and my home can be seized for that purpose or any other purpose.

The appalling magnitude of the RLA's power is beginning to dawn on the people of Washington.

According to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, the RLA can seize any real property in an urban renewal area of the city without giving you any reason. If you doubt that, look at the Southwest area or Columbia Plaza area where hundreds of houses and business properties have been seized by the RLA.

There is a law pending before Congress and sponsored by the Federal City Council that will, if enacted, turn the whole city of Washington over to the RLA for 40 years. And when that law becomes effective, the RLA and the National Capital Planning Commission can seize your home, office building, store, garage, or what have you without giving you any reason.

Other cities such as Chicago have voted urban renewal out. The citizens of Washington cannot do that because they have no vote.

It does not do the value of your real estate any good for it to be generally known that it is subject to seizure at any time at the whim of a few power-hungry men in the RLA and the NCPC.

William Webster.

A Resolution Adopted by the Independent Citizens of the Adams-Morgan Urban Renewal Project Area at a Meeting Held at 8 P.M., April 8, 1963

Whereas the following significant statement appears in the annual report of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1961: "Despite a greater rate of progress in urban renewal during 1961 than in previous years, it has been recognized that improvement must be made in the organization of the city's total urban renewal effort;" and

Whereas the Washington Post, the major uncritical backer of urban renewal in the District of Columbia to date, surprisingly has this to say about urban renewal in an editorial on March 12, 1963: "At whatever cost to bureaucratic sensibilities and traditions, the city must find a way to resolve routine difficulties and make routine changes without jeopardizing the entire work at every stage. The city is now confronted with unanswerable evidence that the responsibility for redevelopment must be concentrated in one public agency;" and

Whereas the Washington Post, in an editorial entitled "Rehearing for Renewal" published on March 30, 1963, said: "In 1955 the city accepted with enthusiasm an urban renewal program entitled 'No Slums in 10 Years'. Eight years have now passed and, as Mr. Dowdy, the chairman of the House District Subcommittee, observed at the beginning of the recent hearings, the slums are still very much with us. His subcommittee's inquiry will endeavor, he said, to find out precisely what Congress can do to increase its efficiency.

"Since urban renewal is a vastly complex and cumbersome procedure that occasionally generates cases of real hardship, and since many millions of public dollars have been spent on it in Washington, these hearings are altogether desirable. They will demonstrate that Congress does indeed have the power to remedy its two most obvious weaknesses. Operating responsibility must be centralized in one agency rather than spread among three competitors. And the city must be given the authority to redevelop commercial neighborhoods, an authority that Congress has already offered to every other American city;" and

Whereas the Adams-Morgan urban renewal program, if given the green light by the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, in its present form without major surgery will generate many new "cases of real hardship" (the telling phrase of the Washington Post editorial of March 30) including the following: (1) the eradication from the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area of scores of small businesses at the very time when the Congress is doing everything it can to help small businesses (Joseph J. Hornick, executive director, Adams-Morgan Light Commercial Institute, in a letter to the Washington Post (March 30, 1963) has this to say: "To date, according to RLA figures, of the more than 800 small businesses that have been dislocated by urban renewal, more than 40 percent have gone out of business. The contention that many of these firms were marginal operations may or may not be valid"); (2) the eradication of all licensed rooming houses no matter how well run (they will of course remain in other parts of the city); and (3) the inclusion in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project and its eminent domain procedures of some of the finest streets and residential areas in the Nation's Capital for the purpose of obtaining clearance by District and Federal Government agencies for a program which is primarily concerned with the redevelopment of a few commercial concerns at 18th Street and Columbia Road which could not obtain urban renewal aid under the present laws without the inclusion of large residential areas; and

Whereas it is a betrayal of the urban renewal process, and a subversion of the plain intent of the Congress, to classify as "slum" and "blighted" the Kalorama Triangle and its many fine streets including Waterside Drive, Allen Place, Ashmead Place and Biltmore Street (the Kalorama Triangle was the subject of a major feature story with pictures in the Sunday Star magazine, March 17, 1963, pictures which never have been presented by the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency because they prove that the Kalorama Triangle area is not "slum" or "blighted". This Sunday Star article said, in part, that: "Former President Eisenhower was a Triangle resident earlier in his career. The Triangle's Gold Coast, along Connecticut Avenue, housed former Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes and Vice President Barkley. Today it shelters Justice Tom Clark, former Ambassador William Bullitt and Mrs. Kennedy's social secretary, Letitia Baldridge, among others"); and

Whereas it is also a betrayal of the urban renewal process and a subversion of the congressional intent to classify as "slum" and "blighted" the residential areas of Columbia Road, Lanier Place, the 1700 block of U Street (North Side), Crescent Place (known as millionaire's row), and the Embassy area of 16th Street including the famous Hotel 2400 and Marshall Field's former million-dollar townhouse; and

Where as a number of Members of Congress have introduced bills in the Congress to fight slums by making it more profitable to improve property than to let it run down and decay with the benefit and encouragement, as at present, of decreased taxes; and these bills would provide tax abatement for the preservation and improvement of property in the District of Columbia as is done in other cities in this country and in other cities in other nations—a step once seriously considered by the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia; and, further, such bills would save millions of dollars in taxes by not placing all of the property improvement "eggs in the basket" of urban renewal which, after 8 expensive years of operation and the expenditure of more than $100 million has, according to Congressman John Dowdy, and the Washington Post of March 30, 1963, left the slums "still very much with us" despite its glowing promises to end slums in 10 years; and some of these tax abatement bills, introduced by Representatives Abraham J. Multer, John Kyl, and Harris B. McDowell, Jr., are before the House Committee on the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the finest and most interesting urban renewal programs in the Nation's Capital are in such areas as the Kalorama Triangle, Georgetown, Foggy Bottom, and Capitol Hill, according to the Washington Evening Star, which has published many articles on this subject, and these citizen-led improvement programs have not cost a cent of public funds; while the Southwest urban renewal program has become mired in controversy, has cost nearly $100 million in public funds, has worked untold hardship on the residents thereof and is lifeless and dead in appearance with vast areas still unoccupied; and

Whereas the independent citizens who are homeowners and small businessmen in the 230-acre Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area firmly believe in the basic American principles that every man's home is his castle, and that the Government should not interfere with and control our lives, and that Government should be our servant and not our master: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the independent citizens of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area wholeheartedly endorse bills introduced by Representatives Abraham J. Multer, John Kyl, and Harris B. McDowell, Jr., to provide tax abatement for the improvement of property in the District of Columbia and urge the House District Subcommittee headed by Congressman Dowdy to hold hearings on these bills as well as on Congressman McDowell's bill to establish in the government of the District of Columbia a Department of Housing and Planning in order to provide, as strongly urged by the Washington Post, in its editorials of March 12 and March 30, 1963, that "Operating responsibility * * * be centralized in one agency rather than spread among three competitors; and be it further

Resolved, That all citizen and civic groups and preservation societies of the District of Columbia rally to support the U.S. Chamber of Commerce the new president of which, Mr. Edwin P. Neilan, has called on local chambers of commerce to lead their communities away from the Federal Treasury, saying that "a revival of grassroots initiative and sense of responsibility is badly needed," and his objections to urban renewal.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, on this day I have introduced a bill to grant complete and genuine home rule for the residents of the District of Columbia. Simply stated, the bill would reserve as a new District of Columbia only the central portion of the District which is the site of the White House, Capitol, and major office buildings in the major complex. It would retrocede all residential and commercial portions of the District to the State of Maryland.

While home rule is a major consideration, it is not the only compulsion for this type of legislation. Passage of this act would relieve the Congress of the time-consuming chore of legislating for the District.

When our Republic was very young, there were many worries about influences on the new Federal system. This Government was a new experiment. There were many divergent views on almost all questions of government in this new Nation. As a matter of fact, many of the uncertainties were not to be settled until the middle of the 19th century when a bloody war was fought to prove whether "this Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated—could—long endure."

The genuine purposes for creation of a city apart as the seat of government have long since disappeared. I cannot think that those who created the District out of property donated by a group of 18 citizens, could have projected the denial of rights to self-government for all time.

This bill retains a District of Columbia which is actually the specific site of the Federal Government. Thus, we satisfy a constitutional question. I presume that some might argue our right to retrocede a portion of the District, but commonsense dictates that this question has been decided in the early retrocession of almost one-third of the District to the State of Virginia. To argue that changes in the District are impossible is to preclude any future argument, however justifiable, that the central government could be moved temporarily or permanently to a safer area of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, each year the Congress is presented with several proposals for home rule. These proposals, as a collection, are a mockery because they always provide self-government only to a point. Some of the proposals seem to say, "We will approach self-government gradually. We will go a step at a time, educating the residents to govern themselves."

Another type of provision calls for some kind of unique status with nonvoting representation in the Congress.

Most home rule bills seem to provide a kind of self-government akin to a secondary school student council which finds the students going through the actions of self-government which they do not have.

Residents of the District of Columbia are citizens of the United States who should have the right to local self-government in the city and county, in their State and in the Nation. To settle for anything less is to say that all Americans are equal but some are more equal than others. To settle for anything less is politically fraudulent.

One Member of the House has said we must not reduce the size of the District or create a Washington, Maryland, because we have to retain a Federal city, a Capital City for the Nation. I assume this means we must retain a separate spot of 60 square miles which suggests a garden spot, a center of culture, a center of learning, a center of government, a mecca for the constituents who visit this area.

So Farmer Brown comes to visit the Federal city. Perhaps he stays in a motel in Virginia or Maryland. He visits the Lincoln, Jefferson, and Washington Memorials, the Archives, the Smithsonian, the National Gallery, the Capitol, the House and Senate, and the office buildings of those two bodies. All of these buildings are located in the District created by my bill. Then he wants to visit the Arlington Cemetery, which is not in the District, and goes from there to Mount Vernon. To him, these two locations are part of the Nation's Capitol, though we know they are not.

We probably would just as soon he did not see certain large areas of the District of Columbia which are part of the Federal City—much to our shame. To the average citizen, these spots are not as much a part of the Capital as are the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the Iwo Jima statue, the Masonic Shrine, or Mount Vernon.

On the other hand, some have suggested, that maybe the residents of the District do not want to be a part of Maryland, nor perhaps of any other State. I think they are in the minority. Not all District of Columbia residents have urged home rule. Some, perhaps, profit personally from a "less than complete citizenship" status. There are some who perhaps feel a bit sheltered by the sometimes benevolent Federal City. There may be comfort in not having to make civic decision. It is possible here, to do a lot of griping without having to do anything about the situations which earn criticism.

As a matter of fact, one home rule missionary, on being confronted with my proposal said, "But heavens, then we would have to put up with county government and State government and all that."

Likewise, some worry about loss of Federal payments to the city. As a matter of fact, certain Federal payments are now denied to the District but are available to the States. Legislation can be provided at the proper time to accomplish necessary economic adjustments. If Congress cannot be trusted to do this little job it certainly cannot be trusted with the entire problem of governing the District.

When we talk about the District and suffrage, we frequently overlook a very apparent evil. If the situation is not an evil, it is certainly ridiculous. If John Smith moved to Washington from the Midwest in 1933 to take one of those temporary jobs in a temporary office in a temporary office building to work in a program supported by a temporary tax, and has lived here ever since, the chances are he voted in his native State by absentee ballot. He voted for candidates he never met or heard of and helped make decisions on matters he did not understand. He effectively canceled the vote of another citizen who lived in that native State and who had an opportunity to know the issues on which he voted. In a very real sense, he disenfranchised the person who resides in the State who did not vote as he did.

Mr. Speaker, as part of the Record, I include part of a learned treatise on retrocession written by Prof. R. P. Franchino in the Georgetown Law Journal, volume 46, 1957–58:

Retrocession—Historical Development

The District clause of the Constitution circumscribes a relatively precise area for the Capital City. This area has been diminished by Congress retroceding to Virginia the part originally contributed by that State. Inasmuch as the citizens of the retroceded area enjoy both home rule and national representation, the question of the propriety of retrocession is particularly significant in determining whether such franchise may be afforded to the present citizens of the District.

If one construes literally the area designation and the word "exclusive" in the District clause of the Constitution, it would seem that a congressional act of retrocession would be invalid as an attempted constitutional amendment by mere legislation. Yet congressional retrocession to Virginia is an accomplished fact.

At the very inception of congressional residence in the District, there had been proposals for retrocession of the ceded areas with a view to restoring franchise to the people concerned even though it was stated during a committee deliberation that such retrocession was unjustified since Congress would afford franchise eventually. A proposal, which was ultimately to achieve success, was submitted by a committee of the town of Alexandria to the House of Representatives in 1846. In essence the proposal contended as follows:

1. The lack of self-government in the area in question was bad government and time would aggravate rather than improve the situation.

2. The lack of franchise deprived the people of political rights and privileges dear to the American citizen, and in spite of a wise and moderate exercise of exclusive jurisdiction such circumstances should certainly excite the sympathy of every Member of Congress.

3. Notwithstanding these disadvantages, the people would be willing to continue if there were the compensating benefits of direct associations with the fame and glory of the Federal Government. However, this was lacking in the Virginia area since the Federal buildings were located on the northern side of the Potomac River.

4. Since Congress had failed to act on requests to revise the antiquated local Code in keeping with the progress in other States, the Virginia area had been prejudiced. The only way to remedy this situation would be by retrocession.

5. The denial of franchise rights in this 10 mile square was inconsistent with the increase of it elsewhere.

6. The exclusive clause and the area designation were designed to protect Congress' deliberations from disturbances and popular outbreaks and to limit the maximum area to be encompassed. It was not intended to prohibit Congress from relinquishing jurisdiction over part of the whole if this were consistent with the purpose of the act of cession. The right to abandon would seem to follow the right to acquire.

7. The only condition (and it would be implied) which attached to the grant to Congress would be that a later retrocession or abandonment of jurisdiction should not defeat the original purpose of the grant. A retrocession to Virginia would still continue congressional jurisdiction over the Maryland area where the Federal Government was operating.

8. Congress, regardless of the mode of acquisition of public lands, has complete title. This is true as to the territories, forts, arsenals, and the District of Columbia. Whenever the lands no longer are necessary or useful to the original purpose, Congress may, and should be empowered to, convey the land away.

9. Congress has in the past acquired public lands, constituted such areas as territories but retained jurisdiction. Upon acquisition of statehood, congressional relinquishment of jurisdiction has been held proper.

10. A sound construction of the Constitution and the repeated and well-established usage of the Government, should leave no doubt that Congress has the power to retrocede and legislation should be effectuated to this end.

It is to be noted that the proposal contended that the use of the word "exclusive" and the specific designation of the area did not preclude Congress from retroceding part of the District if such disposition were consistent with the purpose of the Capital City. The Congress had relinquished jurisdiction over territories, forts, and arsenals to which the United States held complete title when they were no longer necessary for their original purpose and this practice had been upheld.

The proposal, or memorial as it was then designated, was reported favorably by the House District Committee. Its conclusions were as follows:

1. The area of Virginia constituted one-third of the whole and had not yet been used as public grounds or for buildings necessary for the seat of the Government. Thus exercising control of the Virginia area was an unnecessary and unjustified distraction of Congress from its more important duties.

2. The Federal disbursements were being made in the Maryland area and would continue to be so made. Thus the advantages were being enjoyed by the Maryland area while the burdens were being assumed by both areas.

3. The inability of Congress to fashion a single code of laws for the entire Capital required the Virginia area to continue to tolerate its antiquated laws.

On the constitutional question, the committee concluded:

4. The assumption that Congress' power to change the size and location of the District was exhausted upon acceptance of the area was incorrect. If Congress had accepted less than 10 miles square in the first grant, it could have accepted further cessions to make up the difference. Also, Congress as a matter of necessity could change the location if a foreign invasion was feared, or if an unhealthy situation arose in the Capital so as to endanger the lives of Federal officials, or if its location became inaccessible or otherwise impractical. In addition, such a limitation would apply to the like power over forts and arsenals which view would be contrary to the usages of Congress.

5. There were three constitutional bases for retrocession by Congress: (a) exclusive legislation over the District, (b) to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, and (c) when Congress ceases to exercise exclusive legislation, the area would revert back to the ceding State. Although, under this third basis a congressional act is not necessary, it would seem advisable as declaratory of the other two bases.

6. The assumption that this was a multilateral contract and any deviation from its terms needed the approval of all the contracting parties was incorrect. Neither Virginia nor Maryland, by their acts of cession, made the permanence of the seat of government a condition of the grant. Nor is there anything in the acts of cession or surrounding circumstances to sustain the view that there existed a tripartite contract between the United States, Virginia, and Maryland which would require the assent of both States to a retrocession to either. On the contrary, the cession acts show that each State contracted only with the general Government and did not contemplate the necessity of action by any other State. This conclusion is further supported by the fact that each State offered to cede the whole of the 10 miles square clearly intending that it and the United States be the only parties to the contract.

Congress followed up the favorable report by passing an act of retrocession conditioned upon a majority vote of acceptance by the people of the town and county of Alexandria. The election was favorable with 763 for retrocession and 222 against it. On September 7, 1846, President Polk issued a proclamation, declaring Alexandria County retroceded to Virginia.

In order to reach an objective conclusion as to the constitutionality of the act of retrocession, one should look to the original acts of cession. The Virginia act does mention Maryland but only to the extent that it may participate in the location of the 10 miles square. It also states in paragraph 2 that the area in question "shall be, and the same is hereby forever ceded and relinquished to the Congress and Government of the United States, in full and absolute right, and exclusive jurisdiction * * * pursuant to the tenor and effect of the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution of Government of the United States."

In the light of the above, it cannot be said that the Virginia act in any way considered the State of Maryland as an official party to the contract. In fact the tenor of the words used seems to indicate that Congress had complete and unlimited power to use the land as it saw fit circumscribed only by the District clause. Thus the words of this grant provide a weak argument for proving a multiparty contract.

There were 18 private property owners who contributed the original grant. They initiated their participation by entering into an agreement on March 29, 1791. The consideration accruing to them was "the great benefits we expect to derive from having the Federal city laid off upon our lands." The conditions in this compact made no reference to a grant by other parties. The consideration proviso does not reflect any matter other than the proprietors concern for the benefits to accrue to them because their land was involved.

In summary, the above discussion would support a congressional act of retrocession of part of the original District area providing such transfer does not interfere with the primary purpose of the area, i.e., a location for the proper functioning of the Federal Government free from State control.

On the other hand, partial retrocession preserves the essence of the District clause, a home for the Federal Government under its exclusive control, but merely modifies its territorial limits.

The above conclusion permitting partial retrocession but prohibiting total retrocession might appear to be inconsistent. It permits Congress the power to retrocede but limits the full exercise of such power. This results from the fact that the propriety of the lesser power (partial retrocession) is not dependent upon a finding that the greater power (total retrocession) is valid.

HOSPITAL CARE FOR THE AGED—OUR MOST PRESSING DOMESTIC PROBLEM

Mr. **WILLIS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SHELLEY**. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1963, I joined with the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] and a number of other Congressmen, in introducing the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963. My bill, along with others introduced, will meet one of the most pressing domestic issues facing the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, hospital care for the aged is, if we consider the tremendous prosperity and advancements of our country, a provision for our older citizens that is long overdue. It is indeed fitting that we, the leading world power, reflect a high degree of care for those who have labored in our fore in order that we might attain this position. All our achievements are not mere fortune, they represent the cumulative effort, to a large degree, of our senior citizens who are not to be forgotten assets of our society. In view of the wealth and resourcefulness of this country, we owe our older citizens a moral, if not an actual, obligation to provide them with a sound plan for medical care for the aged.

The number of senior citizens currently stands at 17½ million but this figure is subject to constant enlargement as the medical profession increases our longevity. These citizens represent a wealth of skill and knowledge that we can ill afford to squander by not providing substantial medical assistance for them. In the 1961 hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, Secretary Ribicoff, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and now U.S. Senator, stated that—

> People over 65 are in hospitals, on the average, over 2½ times as much as younger people; * * * for those over age 65, 2,332 days of care per 1,000 persons (are required while) * * * for people up to age 64 there are only 883 days of care required for every 1,000 persons."

This testimony highlights the apparent need for increased medical attention while subsequent testimony showed the financial impact of such medical aid for our aged. The vast majority of our citizens over 65 are living on fixed incomes that do not ascend with other prices. For instance, in the past 15 years hospital costs have tripled, from $9.39 a day in 1946 to $32.28 in 1960. It would have taken great insight for anyone to foretell or provide for contingencies such as this in 1946.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known, that a potentially sufficient retirement reserve for older citizens can easily be destroyed by a serious illness, especially when we consider the average income. The Bureau of Census statistics show that in 1959, 55 percent of those over 65, had incomes of less than $1,000, 23 percent made between $1,000 and $2,000, 9 percent between $2,000 and $3,000, while only 13 percent made over $3,000 per year. One can easily see that a short hospital visit would be catastrophic in the face of such average meager resources.

Hospitalization's increased bite on the budget does not mean that the rise is not warranted by better hospital services. The rise is justified but its impact upon our elderly is not. It is not equitable in a society as rich or affluent as ours, that the senior citizens should bear the brunt of tripled hospital costs solely with their limited resources.

For these pressing reasons I introduced my bill which is comparable to that of the administration's and will provide the following features: First, all costs of in-patient hospital services for up to 90 days, with the patient paying $10 a day for the first 9 days and at least $20, or for those individuals who so elect all such costs for up to 180 days with the patient paying the first 2½ days of average costs, or all such costs for up to 45 days; second, all costs of care in skilled nursing homes facilities affiliated with hospitals for up to at least 180 days after transfer of the patient from a hospital; third, all costs above the first $20 for hospital out-patient diagnostic services; and, fourth, all costs of up to 240 home health care visits in any one calendar year by community visiting nurses and physical therapists. All of this can be provided by the time-tested method of distributing the benefits through the social security system. The costs will be borne, since it is financed nationally, by a nominal rate of one-quarter of 1 percent of what has been contributed by the employer and the employee. In addition the maximum taxable wage base will be raised from $4,800 to $5,200. My bill has the additional merit of being part of an actuarially sound system of social security that is administered in the hands of a competent agency.

Mr. Speaker, my bill will meet one of the criticisms launched against prior bills designed to provide hospital care for the aged. For health benefits only it will cover all those who reach 65 before 1967 thereby preventing any discrimination against those who have not been able to contribute to social security during their working life. It is only just that we allow those who have not qualified under social security to benefit from this remedial legislation. In fact, many were excluded by social security laws from participating in the system until coverage was recently expanded in the 1950's. Some of these were close to retirement or already retired when their kind of work was covered by the plan. Now that the social security includes practically everyone, my bill takes this into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, a period of adjustment, beginning after 1966 and up to 1971, sets a limited requirement for coverage but by 1972 requirements for coverage for health and cash benefits will be the same. This method was devised to meet a temporary situation which would currently exclude 2½ million people and then to return to the time-tried method of requiring at least a minimum contribution in order to qualify for benefits at a time when most people will be able to qualify.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, it is important that we have a uniform system that is nationally enforced in order to get the full benefit of many participants. With a vast program of hospital care for the aged we can provide maximum benefits at a minimum cost to each citizen. This system will not be limited by the underwriting restrictions imposed upon private insurance companies. Therefore our senior citizens will get coverage that is both more comprehensive and more extensive in terms of the number covered than they could get by purchasing voluntary health insurance. The fact that private insurance is often inadequate is pointed out by Mr. Walter Reuther of the United Automobile Workers and AFL-CIO, when he stated:

> Many of the people now counted as insured do not have insurance worthy of the name.

Mr. Speaker, the onerous burden of hospitalization does not press only upon the improvident who have not made allowances for the future. The unforeseeable costs of hospital care affects also those who anticipated retiring on a medium sized income. To subject all people over 65 to a needs test would force many who retire on modest means to struggle on until they are destitute before qualifying for and meeting the needs test. A hospital-care-for-the-aged plan based upon right rather than need would avoid the humiliation of forcing our senior citizens to meet a needs test. A needs test is violative of the ingenuity we as a people can exhibit when providing for our elderly.

Another meritorious factor, Mr. Speaker, of my bill is that by making the benefits a right it will encourage early treatment. If our senior citizens are not precluded from sufficient hospital treatment at an early stage, because of financial reasons, their life expectancy and productivity can be raised.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not the beginning of what some opponents of a sound hospital care for the aged program label as socialized medicine. This is purely a scare label that, upon examination, is meaningless. The hue and cry raised by opponents is based upon fallacious reasoning because the bill provides that there will be a choice of doctors and hospitals. Freedom of the doctor-patient relationship is an important one which this legislation clearly recognizes, clearly continues, and clearly enhances. There is absolutely no encroachment here. An initial alarm of socialized medicine is customarily registered when Federal remedial legislation is proposed. The alarm was sounded when the social security disability insurance provisions were introduced. Is there any Member of Congress who would rise now and maintain that this alarm was anything other than false? Mr. Speaker, the same alarm will be proven false when this bill has become the law of our land.

It is my fervent hope that a suitable hospital program for the aged will become the law of our land—and, become the law very soon.

DADE COUNTY, FLA., RECEIVES ALL AMERICA CITY AWARD FROM LOOK MAGAZINE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been paid in recent weeks, both in Congress and in the press, to Florida's Fourth District, represented by me. Some of this attention has been stimulated, I regret to state, by evidence of tensions, and confusions rising out of the Cuban refugee assistance and relocation problems in Greater Miami. Recent hearings conducted by my colleague, the gentlemen from Florida, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, and myself, in Miami, Fla., as well as hearings today before the House Banking and Currency Committee, all have dwelt on the problem areas of the Greater Miami situation.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a more encouraging side—yes, even a bright side—to existence in Dade County, and it is this to which I call the attention of my colleagues today.

Complicated as the situation has been the past 3 years due to the sudden influx of approximately 200,000 persons escaping the tyranny and oppression of Castro's Cuba into the Greater Miami area, the local governments, churches, institutions, and private citizens have opened their purses and hearts and made tremendous effort to solve the problem. National recognition has been accorded their fine efforts.

Doubtless, this has weighed heavily in the consideration of Dade County, Fla., for receipt of the 1962 All America City Award bestowed annually by Look magazine and the National Municipal League. I am proud to state that Dade County has now won the All America City Award for the second time—in 1957 Dade received an award jointly with the city of Miami for establishing a metropolitan form of government in the county.

You are doubtless aware, Mr. Speaker, that the all America city program is now in its 15th year. The All America City Awards are given each year to 11 U.S. communities selected by a jury of distinguished citizens and experts on government impaneled by the National Municipal League, which is cosponsor with Look magazine of the annual awards competition. The all America cities jury, which selected the winners for 1962, was composed of Dr. George H. Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion, former president, National Municipal League; Mrs. Hazel Blanchard, president, National Education Association; Albert C. Boyd, president, American Chamber of Commerce Executives; William T. Gossett, former vice president, the Ford Motor Co.; Mrs. Herbert E. Hawkes, president, American Association of University Women; Leo Kramer, assistant to the president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO; Roy B. Martin, Jr., mayor of Norfolk, Va.; Willard V. Merrihue, board chairman, Effective Citizens Organization; Vernon C. Myers, publisher, Look; James M. Osborn, research associate, Yale University; Mrs. Robert J. Phillips, president, League of Women Voters of the United States; Dr. Donald H. Webster, director of Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Washington.

In announcing the award, Dade County was cited "for the vigorous action of its citizens in bringing about major improvements in their city, and thus setting an example of good citizenship to the Nation."

Vernon C. Myers, publisher, Look magazine, personally presented the award plaque at a dinner meeting of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce in Miami, Fla., on April 4, attended by dignitaries, officials and members of the metropolitan county government, city of Miami officials, representatives of surrounding local governments, members of the chamber of commerce, and interested citizens.

It is my pride and pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to place in the Record the news story covering the award which is in the April 23 issue of Look on the newsstands today:

ALL AMERICA CITY: DADE COUNTY, FLA.

> Dade County (Greater Miami) received an All America City Award in 1957 for the work its citizens did in forming a then-unique metropolitan government. Metro was an attack on the complex problems that resulted from the lack of a government agency with unified authority over public services, traffic, public safety, and taxes in a cluster of 27 cities. Since 1957, Dade County citizens who favor Metro have had to defend it four times. Through the work of the League of Women Voters, the chamber of commerce, and the chamber's government research council, Metro has been upheld at the polls. In 1959, business leaders organized ICBM (Independent Citizens for Better Metro) to draft qualified people to run for the county commission. Three of four ICBM candidates were elected.
>
> Dade residents, teaming with various national religious organizations, have solved many of the problems caused by the huge (130,000) influx of refugees from Cuba. In 1961, when proposals were made in the State legislature to close public schools that might be desegregated, a Dade County Citizens Committee for Better Schools was formed. The group rallied enough statewide support to defeat the legislation. To date, 30 Dade schools have been desegregated without incident.

INTER-AMERICAN SOLIDARITY—A TRIBUTE TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, Abraham Lincoln gave utterance to a statement prophetic of our times:

> The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew.

One of the most hopeful signs that America has risen to the challenge inherent in these words is President Kennedy's 10-year program of inter-American cooperation known as the Alliance for Progress.

As with many improved world conditions, we sometimes unwittingly turn our backs on the evidences of progress while bemoaning our inability to achieve our goals. When one views the present status of the modern world's oldest international organization and the upward steps taken by the 21 sovereign nations that are today members of the Organization of American States, one is filled with pride and gratitude at the tangible expressions of Simon Bolivar's dream of long ago.

For it was in 1815 that the great liberator, Simon Bolivar, whom we honor as the "Father of Pan Americanism" wrote, in exile, his famous "Jamaica Letter" and committed to paper his desire for an "America fashioned into the greatest nation in the world, greatest not so much by virtue of her area and wealth as by her freedom and glory."

In 1890 the First International Conference of American States was held in Washington and established the International Union of the American Republics, naming the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics as its central office.

Nineteen hundred and ten saw the renaming of the Commercial Bureau to "Pan American Union," today the General Secretariat of the OAS, and its headquarters "House of the Americas," was dedicated.

During succeeding years there have been many strides toward achievement of greater communication and understanding between the Americas. Each day comes greater recognition on the part of all that our involvement with each other's lives and futures is total, that the welfare of one is the welfare of all in this hemisphere. We share—despite differences of locale, climate, tradition, and language—a common inheritance, a common hope for the future, and common objectives—the preservation of freedom and expansion of the democratic ideal that "what blesses one shall bless all mankind."

As our President said during his recent visit to the University of Costa Rica at San Jose:

> We are embarked upon a great adventure together and that is the task of demonstrating to a watching world that freemen can conquer the ancient enemies of man, poverty, ignorance, and hunger; of protecting freedom against those who would destroy it; of bringing hope to those who search for hope; of extending liberty to those who lack it.

Mr. Speaker, in following the leadership of President Kennedy, who on last February 11 proclaimed April 14 as Pan American Day and the week of April 14 through April 20 as "Pan American Week," I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding achievements of the Organization of American States and to urge their continued support of our national intent to implement our mutual aspirations by the creation of an era dedicated to peace, plenty, and progress.

U.S. IMMIGRATION SERVICE MERITS HIGH COMMENDATION

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the Easter season, which heralds the renascence not only of religious ideals and fervor, but also of renewed physical vigor and joy in daily living surrounded, as we are, by all the glorious sights and fragrances of springtime, perhaps we may well give thought to the wellsprings of our national greatness—the essential qualities which symbolize America.

Strip away the outward trappings of a militarily strong world power, one which has pioneered great technological and scientific advances, a nation of vigorous and materially blessed citizens, and what do we find?

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and my colleagues will agree with me that the greatness of our Nation lies not in these more tangible accomplishments—important as they are in the contemporary world—but in the spiritual qualities of tender compassion, generosity of spirit, and warmth of heart which over the years has come to symbolize America in the yearning minds of the oppressed, the hungry, and the needy in all parts of the world.

I am led to think on these things because of the recent remarks by Mario T. Noto, Associate Commissioner, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, at a Kiwanis Club luncheon in Miami, Fla., on March 29, 1963.

Mr. Noto addressed himself to the subject of "Public Opinion and Enforcement of Immigration Laws." In delineating the scope of the responsibilities and activities of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, the efficient and comprehensive outline of the mundane workings of the Service seemed to be constantly blurred by the insistent image of the true America which obviously motivates the dedicated workers in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which persistently came through.

As Mr. Noto observed, public opinion needs to be fully and accurately informed before it can truly evaluate and come to a conclusion. Incomplete knowledge frequently leads to a distorted viewpoint. On too many occasions, alas, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has been depicted, cartooned, and lampooned as a service which administers laws with a heavy hand with no thought or regard of human welfare. As in many other areas of public life, the distortion is frequently more dramatic and more easily remembered than the plain unvarnished truth.

It is unfortunate that little is known by the general public of the qualities of humaneness and compassion shown by the Service to many deserving ones. In the current Holiday magazine, in an article on the Department of Justice, you find this paragraph:

> In talking with immigration officials, little unknown acts of compassion come to light. Not long ago a bright Hungarian student came to the University of Washington, but his temporary visa expired before he could finish his studies. Quietly and on its own, the Service made private arrangements for the boy to fly to Brazil and return a few days later with a new permit.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote some of Mr. Noto's remarks:

> At the very outset, the Service has made great strides in creating the most favorable impression of America upon the arriving traveler. We have set our best foot forward to show to the world the true American image. This was exemplified by our own President when at the dedication of Dulles

International Airport at Washington, D.C., on November 17, 1962, he said:

"Most of all, I want to commend those who will be working here, those who fly our planes, those who man those planes, those members of the Immigration Service who will be the first American that visitors will see here in the United States, and I hope it will be possible, building on what has been done here at Dulles Airport, that we will make sure that all of our airports and all of our piers at the seas, and all of the people who work on them, show a face of America to the world which is our best face."

These are the Immigration inspectors and especially the corps of Immigration receptionists. It is of interest to you that we have placed a number of them at the Miami International Airport because this city is the gateway from Central and South America.

When we think in terms of the millions of persons who are examined each year by the Service, and compare it to the few stories which appear in the press which indicates a lack of understanding or compassion for the individual, the true measure of the application of governmental commonsense is revealed.

Untold are the hundreds of stories which invoke and manifest humane understanding and compatability for our fellow man. But, on the contrary, occasionally a story is reported in the press which although not calculated, nonetheless results in portrayal of a ridiculous or harsh Service. Thus, from these, public opinion becomes aroused and because it is as powerful as it can be, it becomes a substitute for facts. But, even when the truth is later established, it is too late because the image conjectured is beyond repair.

Let me bring the issue into sharper focus; we in Government believe that our people must be more adequately informed so that their attitudes and reactions will be based upon reality. When we speak of compassion of Government and men toward our fellow man we need go no farther than this city. For here in this State and city, government, and private persons have demonstrated their acceptance of the plight of the unfortunate Cuban refugee who has been granted asylum from tyranny and communism. As to them, both government and people have enforced the law with understanding and sympathetic compassion.

The eyes of the world are focused upon us today. They test our tolerance and attitudes toward those who seek asylum from communism. And here in this very city, the United States of America has telescoped its answer. It has manifested and proved to the world that we are tolerant and helpful. The true spirit of America and its patriotism which was so aptly exemplified by the Founding Fathers of this Nation has been shown again in Miami. The fire and the passion for liberty and freedom which the refugee has is known only too well by Americans, for we too have shed blood for such causes.

When the Castro regime in Cuba began to show to the world first its adherence then its adoption of Marxism and Leninism, this country of ours gave refuge to those who fled from that land of tyranny. As of December 31, 1962, there were 153,520 Cubans in the United States in temporary status. Included in that group were 91,621 who had been paroled into the United States as refugees from Cuba. The others had been in the United States but could not return because of their rejection of Castro and his regime.

You will recall that on December 29, in this city, speaking to the released Cuban prisoners of Brigade 2056, our President said:

"I assure you that it is the strongest wish of the people of this country that Cuba shall one day be free again."

When that day arrives, you of this city will long live in the hearts and minds of all peoples because at a time of need you unselfishly gave shelter and comfort to these unfortunates. You will serve for all time to remind us that tolerance and compassion can be side by side with the enforcement of law. For when the final story is told with objectivity and fairness, public opinion will acclaim your city and State as a monument to sanctuary and hope, which freedom loving peoples in the world will long cherish.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to gloss over without recognition the more practical aspects of the activities of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service—its administering of the immigration laws which are applicable to aliens who are a minority of the peoples among us and which laws transcend a multitude of areas in the field of social welfare, domestic relations, national security, criminal laws, and various others. In the implementation of the immigration laws one finds the undesirable alien who is of the criminal, immoral, narcotic classes, and many others who hold disregard and contempt for our laws and are a blight upon our society—669 such aliens were deported in the last fiscal year. Subversives in our midst, working to foist the alien and cancerous Communist doctrine upon our society, after due process of law, have been deported.

However, it is the quality of mercy which is the natural corollary of true justice, as expressed in the day-to-day activities of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service which I wish to extol today.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Mr. Noto for his public recognition of the qualities of unselfishness, tolerance, and compassion which he has correctly attributed to the citizens of Greater Miami who I am proud and privileged to represent as Congressman for the Fourth District of Florida.

CARL ESTES DAY

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Carl Estes, publisher of prominent newspapers in northeast Texas at Longview, is an outstanding, public spirited, civic minded, and patriotic American.

Just recently the city of Longview, where he has resided over a long period of time, honored him by setting apart a day, April 3, 1963, in his honor.

I shall always be grateful to Carl Estes for his substantial and effective efforts in behalf of the Lone Star Steel Co., which greatly contributed to the location, establishment, and success of that steel company, which is located in the district which I have the honor to represent.

The Dallas Morning News, Friday, April 5, 1963, carried the following news item:

Carl Estes Day Proclaimed in Longview

LONGVIEW, TEX.—Carl L. Estes, publisher of the Longview News and Journal and widely known in the industrial development field, was honored Wednesday by the city commission, which set apart the day in his name in connection with Texas Industrial Week.

Carl Estes Day in Longview was proclaimed by Mayor J. Clyde Tomlinson as one of his last official acts before he retires from office next week.

A copy of the proclamation, inscribed on a plaque, was presented to the publisher by the mayor at a ceremony attended by all members of the commission.

"My colleagues and I are delighted to have this opportunity of honoring you," said Tomlinson. "You have done more for east Texas than any man."

The action was taken by the city, the resolution said, "as a token of our esteem and respect and in public recognition of the unparalleled leadership and invaluable contributions he has made and continues to make toward establishment of a strong economic base through industrial growth and expansion in Longview and our neighboring region."

Publisher Estes, the proclamation continued, "has long been the leading exponent of industrial development in Longview and chief salesman of this area's advantages to industry, has led personally and with signal success campaigns which resulted in bringing in many basic industries to the Longview area, and continues to support personally and through his publications every effort for new and expanded industry in our area."

The Shreveport Times, April 5, 1963, carried the following news item:

Carl Estes Day Held in Longview

LONGVIEW, TEX.—Carl L. Estes, Longview newspaper publisher and widely known in the industrial development field, was honored Wednesday by the Longview City Commission, which set apart the day in his name in connection with Texas Industrial Week.

Carl Estes Day in Longview was proclaimed by Mayor J. Clyde Tomlinson as one of his last official acts before he retires from office next week.

A copy of the proclamation, inscribed on a plaque, was presented to the publisher by the mayor at a ceremony attended by all members of the commission. "My colleagues and I are delighted to have this opportunity of honoring you," said Tomlinson, "you have done more for east Texas than any man."

The Dallas Morning News, April 6, 1963, carried the following editorial:

Longview's Estes

Most east Texans don't need to be told why Longview celebrated Carl Estes Day. For decades this colorful publisher and industrial leader has been a crusader for the advancement of east Texas. It is gratifying to any man when those who know him best express their appreciation. To Mr. Estes and to his Longview News & Journal, the Dallas News joins in felicitations.

The Governor of Texas, the Honorable John Connally, sent the following message:

Governor's Telegram

LONGVIEW NEWS & JOURNAL,
Longview, Tex.

Congratulations to Carl Estes and the citizens of Longview on Carl Estes Day. In his role as publisher of an outstanding newspaper and as a citizen he has contributed greatly to the journalism profession and the growth, progress, and vitality of Longview and east Texas. He is esteemed throughout the State and Nation for his dedicated service to humanity. Best wishes for continued health and happiness.

JOHN CONNALLY,
Governor of Texas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. HANSEN, for April 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26, on account of business in her district.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WHITTEN and to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made today on H.R. 5517.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARSHA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAHILL.

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WILLIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEED.

Mr. BOLAND.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 10, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

664. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the fourth annual compilation of General Accounting Office findings and recommendations for improving Government operations (relating for the most part to the fiscal year 1962) (H. Doc. No. 96); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

665. A letter from the Chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report covering refunds and credits of internal revenue taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to section 6405 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. Doc. No. 97); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

666. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting copies of the Air Force report entitled "Semi-Annual Research and Development Procurement Action Report," which covers the periods for January 1 through June 30, 1962, and July 1 through December 31, 1962, pursuant to section 2357 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

667. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the accounts and financial statements of the general supply fund, General Services Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962; to the Committee on Government Operations.

668. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

669. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 3881. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5539. A bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5540. A bill to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BONNER (by request):

H.R. 5541. A bill to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937, and to extend cash relief benefits to widows of recipients; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5542. A bill to assist the States in providing necessary instruction for adults not proficient in basic educational skills through grants to States for pilot projects, improvement of State services, and programs of instruction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5543. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 759, ch. 672; 32 D.C. Code 417), to authorize the commitment of persons of unsound mind found on Federal reservations in Loudoun County, Va., to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 5544. A bill to amend section 220(h) of the National Housing Act to permit the insurance under that section or section 203(k) of a loan made to a homeowner for the purpose of paying the cost of public improvements for which (by assessment or otherwise) he is legally liable; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 5545. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5546. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, under certain circumstances, disclose the current addresses of husbands and parents who have deserted their families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5547. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 5548. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5549. A bill to repeal section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5550. A bill to amend section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, in order to grant to the Federal Communications Commission authority to grant special temporary authorizations for up to 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 5551. A bill to amend the act of May 25, 1920, relating to conveyances of certain parts of rights-of-way by railroad companies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 5552. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes;" to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5553. A bill to provide that persons who served in the Army or Navy during World War I may, if they possess certain qualifications, wear the Distinguished and Presidential Unit Citations and Combat Infantryman's and Medical Badges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5554. A bill to provide for the award of the Good Conduct Medal to certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 5555. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 5556. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the cost of all medicine and drugs for the taxpayer and his spouse, rather than only the excess of 1 percent of adjusted gross income as otherwise provided, may be included in computing the medical expense deduction where such taxpayer or spouse is 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5558. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5559. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 5560. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5561. A bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5562. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 5563. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 5564. A bill to retrocede a portion of the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 5565. A bill to provide for the payment of debt service construction charges, and increased operation and maintenance charges when irrigable lands are taken for nonagricultural uses under Federal programs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 5566. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 5567. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for certain individuals who have attained age 72; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 5568. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 5569. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the Government of amounts due the Government in the settlement of claims under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 5570. A bill to provide for the disposal easements in Intracoastal Waterway, Lake Charles deep water channel; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 377. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the elimination of monopolistic and restrictive practices in the drug industry, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 5571. A bill for the relief of Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5572. A bill for the relief of Maurice Diran Sobajian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 5573. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Momtaloa De Piro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 5574. A bill for the relief of Frank Zgagliardich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 5575. A bill for the relief of Mr. Demos Botsaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 5576. A bill to provide that Lt. Col. Frank W. Bailey shall be retained on active duty until August 31, 1963; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5577. A bill for the relief of Evangelista Gravina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5578. A bill for the relief of Charles Sakellaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 5579. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Curatolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 5580. A bill for the relief of Odette A. Eid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5581. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alfred Stahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5582. A bill for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 5583. A bill for the relief of Brig. Gen. Fred C. Gray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 5584. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ransom C. Aplin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

83. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Leo R. Volker of Newport, Oreg., and 34 others petitioning the Congress to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

84. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lawrence W. O'Rourke, city administrator, city of commerce, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to posthumously commending Congressman Clyde Doyle upon a long and distinguished career of public service; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Provocative Questions Concerning Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the New York Times of April 7 contained an editorial that raises a number of provocative questions concerning our space program.

Those of us who serve on the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee have a particular responsibility to make sure that, as the Times put it, we are putting first things first and that we are getting our money's worth. Of particular interest to me is the question of duplication of facilities. The complex of NASA installations and laboratories has been growing at a staggering rate.

Is each new facility really necessary? This is the question we must ask and to which we must find the "hard" answer. Is, for example, a separate new electronics research center, such as NASA has proposed for the Boston area, truly essential? This is a question which I raised publicly some time ago and which I believe our committee will want to explore thoroughly when the authorization bill comes before us.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of the Times editorial and of a recent statement concerning my inquiry to Air Force Secretary Zuckert with regard to alleged duplication of facilities by NASA.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

CONFUSION IN SPACE

The latest Soviet space achievement, another lunar exploration, emphasizes the need for a searching look at the U.S. space program, its organization, its management, its goals.

From the beginning, our program has been hampered by a dichotomy of organization and effort. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration was supposed to concentrate on developing the peaceful uses of space; the military were to work hand in hand with it. In practice NASA has preempted the man-in-space program, and in many areas in which the military should be concerned has exhibited a propensity for empire building and politics; laboratories and installations which duplicate some already existing in the Armed Forces have been bestowed, with prodigal hand, upon various deserving sections of the country.

Specific instances of this kind of duplication have been cited in recent weeks. Some congressional eyebrows were raised recently when an expensive electronics research center was proposed for the Boston area, home bailiwick of the youthful new Senator from Massachusetts. Now the Air Force in a memorandum has suggested that some $77,671,000 of projected NASA construction costs represent unnecessary duplication of existing facilities. NASA, for instance, proposes to build at Moffett Field, Calif., a life sciences research facility at a cost of $4,880,000. This despite the fact the Air Force has long maintained superb bioastronautics laboratories, which NASA has declined to use.

There are two key questions which should be answered: The first is: Are we putting first things first? And the second is: Are we getting our money's worth?

We agree with Dr. Edward Welsh, executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, that Russia will not hesitate to use space for military purposes, and that, as Dr. Welsh put it, the "ability to defend ourselves in space against threats from space (an antisatellite capability, for instance) is as essential as preparedness in any of the other defense dimensions." Yet the military development of space applications clearly has been subordinated to NASA programs and goals.

This subordination of security goals and the organizational split in our space program, with the unnecessary duplication it has entailed, create doubt that all the money appropriated for space is being utilized wisely. The President himself, in defending his space program at his news conference, cast doubt on whether all the funds were well spent. Congress should make a detailed study of the entire program, and particularly of its organization, its management, and its goals.

INQUIRY OF SECRETARY ZUCKERT BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, disclosed that he has telegraphed Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert requesting an expeditious report on a news story concerning an Air Force memorandum complaining that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration seeks "millions of dollars for facilities which would duplicate Air Force facilities."

The news story quoted NASA Deputy Administrator Hugh Dryden as saying he had been told an Air Force memorandum had been prepared charging that NASA is asking for construction of $77,671,000 in facilities, which the Air Force asserts would duplicate Air Force facilities.

Early in February, Senator CASE in a speech before the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce said:

"A new proposal of the administration, which deserves very close scrutiny in this connection, is the proposal in the new budget to establish a basic electronics research center in the Greater Boston area, with a starting cost of $6½ million and with a projected payroll of about 2,000 persons. The eventual cost of the facility is estimated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration at about $50 million.

"As a member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, I shall insist on the fullest possible airing of the need for construction of this Government facility in the face of the tremendous electronics know-how and competence in private firms concentrated in several States. And, second, if the need for a Government basic electronics research center is demonstrated, why should not the facilities of the already existing Air Force Flight System Development Center located in the same area be used?"

Last month the New Jersey Council for Research and Development, a statewide organization of business, industry, labor, education, and government promoting the growth of research and development in New Jersey, wrote Senator CASE that New Jersey was an ideal location for the proposed electronics research center and pointed out that in recent months several hundred engineers have been laid off in the Camden and Moorestown area. Senator CASE responded that if the need for such a facility is proven, all areas of the country should be considered, including New Jersey. He added that he agreed with the council that the scientific and educational qualifications of New Jersey are outstanding.

Improvement in Train Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, I addressed the House and complained about the type of service being rendered by the Pennsylvania Railroad to passengers between New York and Washington. I called to the attention of the House the overcrowding of passenger trains, the antique equipment being used and the dangerous conditions being permitted by the railroad. While I know that my comments did not bring about the results that I am about to mention, I nevertheless felt constrained to bring to the attention of the House the effort on the part of the Pennsylvania Railroad to improve the service for passengers particularly between New York and Washington, announced in a release from the Pennsylvania Railroad under date of April 3 and in an article in the Washington Post under date of Saturday, April 6, 1963. John B. Dorrance, general manager of passenger sales of the Pennsylvania Railroad, announced that 50 modern stainless steel coaches with completely new interiors will be added to the fleet of Pennsylvania Railroad day-and-night trains between New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington starting in September. It is also my understanding that additional dining cars, mail cars, and express cars are scheduled for rehabilitation during the coming year. Mr. Dorrance has announced that the additional coaches will more than double the number of modern cars in the New York-Washington service. This is indeed good news for the traveling public and is an indication that the railroad is sincerely interested in improving the passenger service for the citizens of this country. I have stated on several occasions that I was convinced that the railroad was trying to drive passengers away and was attempting to discontinue passenger service. This type of action on the part of the railroad is a clear indication that the railroad does intend to continue passenger service and is seriously interested in improving it. Even the railroad will admit it has had inadequate and unsatisfactory accommodations for passengers between New York and Washington. Its desire and positive efforts to correct these conditions certainly deserve notice and commendation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I compliment the Pennsylvania Railroad, Mr. Dorrance, and the other officials responsible for this change in policy. I am satisfied that a continuation of this progressive policy will go a long way in restoring the confidence of the traveling public in the railroad and thus reduce appreciably the losses now being sustained by the railroad in their passenger service.

I would also like to report to the Congress that as a result of my comments I was privileged to meet representatives of the railroad, headed by Mr. Bart Viviano, assistant vice president. I have been assured by Mr. Viviano and by other representatives of the railroad that every effort will be made to eliminate overcrowding and that a sincere effort on the part of the railroad is being made to improve service. The recent action of the railroad would seem to confirm Mr. Viviano's assurances.

I believe, Mr. Spreaker, fair play dictates that having openly criticized the Pennsylvania Railroad, I now bring to the attention of this Congress the efforts on the part of the railroad to remedy the situation which prompted my criticism.

Special Captive Nations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our colleagues Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD and Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI and the many other Members who are dedicated to the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

I support House Resolution 14 which would establish the special committee. This action is clearly in the interests of the United States and will help to fulfill our real responsibility to those persons living under the domination of foreign powers.

There is one additional point that needs to be made and to which I want to give special attention today. It is now evident that Cuba is a captive nation in every sense of the word. We should now add Cuba to the group of nations whose people no longer have the opportunity to determine their own form of government or to participate in the day-to-day procedures of their governing authorities.

As free citizens, we in this country must come to recognize that the captive nations as a group constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom.

The international Communist organization has consistently shown that it fears a growing world knowledge of and interest in the captive nations. Advancement of this kind of factual understanding serves to explode the myths of Soviet unity and exposes the true meaning of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout those areas controlled by communism.

We need to do everything we can to bring the facts to all the world. I am proud to give my support to House Resolution 14 and I urge my colleagues to do the same and I respectfully urge on the President of the United States to affirm his support.

Laxities, Illegalities, Flagrant Abuses in U.S. Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General of the United States, in his reports to the Congress, has disclosed innumerable instances where business firms in concert with, or independent of, Government procurement officials, have extorted countless millions of dollars out of U.S. taxpayers.

Our Government procurement programs are riddled with flagrant violations of law. There exists a combination of utter incompetency, negligence, and civil and criminal conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, the following are three briefs extracted from the reports of the Comptroller General issued on March 29, 1963.

HAZELTINE CORP. UNJUSTLY ENRICHED BY $428,800

Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. designed and developed the Navy's WF–2 attack early warning airplane. In November 1958, and January 1959, Grumman subcontracted with Hazeltine Corp. for the production of spare parts and modification kits for the WF–2's airborne radar system. The contract was issued under the provisions of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract which had been awarded to Grumman for the production of the WF–2 aircraft by the Bureau of Aeronautics, Department of the Navy.

In his report to the Congress, the Comptroller General disclosed that the purchase orders issued to Hazeltine by Grumman under this contract, totaled more than $3,050,000.

The GAO found that the prices negotiated for these purchase orders were $428,800 greater than needed to cover the costs Hazeltine could reasonably expect to incur. Even though the purchase order awards were under the surveillance of the Navy, the Comptroller General found no evidence whatever to indicate that the Navy questioned the prices agreed upon by Grumman and Hazeltine. As a consequence, the padded prices agreed upon by Grumman and Hazeltine were passed on to the Government under Grumman's cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract with the Navy.

The GAO pointed out that had the Navy or Grumman obtained and studied Hazeltine's most recently experienced costs or vendors quotations before the formal purchase orders were awarded, the overstated charges to the Government of $428,800 could have been avoided.

The Comptroller General cited a number of specific instances wherein a study of Hazeltine's cost data would have permitted the Government to avoid these excessive costs:

(1) Hazeltine's proposal included estimated material costs of $1,511.10 for each of 29 radar receivers. At the time Hazeltine prepared its proposal, it had cost information which indicated that it had incurred material costs of only $1,071.66 a unit for producing the exact same radar receiver under a previous purchase order.

(2) Prior to preparing its price proposal, Hazeltine obtained a price quotation of $1,926 for each of 18 computer assemblies. However, in pricing out the 18 computer assemblies in its proposal, Hazeltine included an estimated cost of $2,145 for each unit.

GAO's review disclosed that Hazeltine's proposal to Grumman included cost allowance of over $14,100 for items which had not even been ordered and for costs which would not be incurred.

It was also discovered that Hazeltine's price proposal included an estimated cost of $7,800 for certain components of the frequency modification kits, none of which were either ordered by, or delivered to, Grumman.

The Comptroller General, during the course of his review, found that "Hazeltine's comments to the GAO were directly contradictory to Hazeltine's representations to Grumman."

Mr. Speaker, under Grumman's cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract with the Navy, it undertook the responsibility of awarding subcontracts at reasonable prices. It is evident that Grumman, by failing to adequately review Hazeltine's price proposal, did not properly discharge these responsibilities.

Neither is it reasonable for Hazeltine to retain the $428,800 it acquired through failure to disclose and by cost padding.

The Department of the Navy, having failed to adequately review its procurement procedures on this contract, must take such action as is necessary to obtain full recovery of Hazeltine's unjust enrichment.

AIR FORCE NEGLIGENCE IN BOEING-WESTINGHOUSE CONTRACT

On April 10, 1959, the Air Force Air Materiel Command awarded a contract to the Boeing Company for the production of Bomarc interceptor missiles, weapon support equipment, and related spare parts.

The incentive type of contract used in this procurement provides for the contractor and the Air Force to agree, prior to production, on an estimate of costs to be incurred. This is the initial target cost, and an initial target profit is determined by applying an agreed percentage to such costs. Any overstatement of target costs proportionately increases the contractors target profit.

The Comptroller General, in his review of this contract, disclosed that the Government will incur unnecessary costs of about $404,500 in the form of unwarranted profits because:

(1) Westinghouse, to which Boeing had subcontracted a portion of the contract work, quoted prices to Boeing that were based on cost estimates that were higher than those justified by its most recent experience;

(2) Boeing, without adequately reviewing this price, included it in its proposed initial prime contract target price; and

(3) The Air Force not only accepted Boeing's proposed price for the subcontracted items without adequate review, but also allowed target and incentive profits to be based on this price although the subcontract price was only tentative and was subject to redetermination.

The GAO clearly pointed out that, at the time of negotiations on the prime contract, later and more reliable cost data were available to the prime contractor—Boeing—which showed that actual costs experienced under prior purchase orders were substantially lower than the amounts proposed by the subcontractor. Boeing should most certainly have considered this in negotiations with the Air Force.

The following examples by the Comptroller General indicate the extent to which Westinghouse padded their materiel costs:

(a) GAO's computation, based on previous purchase orders for identical equipment, showed that unit materiel costs for antenna subassemblies should have been $5,976 rather than the $10,948 proposed by Westinghouse.

(b) GAO's computations showed that the unit materiel costs for receiver/transmitter subassemblies should have been $3,232 rather than the $9,196 proposed by Westinghouse.

(c) GAO's computations showed that the unit materiel costs for control unit subassemblies should have been $2,085 rather than the $5,042 proposed by Westinghouse.

Mr. Speaker, Boeing failed to evaluate the reasonableness of the bases on which the materiel estimates were established or to relate the proposed materiel prices to known materiel cost data available at Westinghouse.

The Air Force negligently accepted these prices without change.

Mr. Speaker, the profiteering of the civilian contractors in this case could not have been possible had the Air Force carried out its responsibility to review the detailed support of Boeing's cost proposal, and to review Boeing's procedures for satisfying itself that the subcontract costs in its proposal were based on the latest available cost data.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY WASTES $1.2 MILLION IN FIRE EXTINGUISHER PROCUREMENT

Mr. Speaker, in his report to the Congress on March 29, the Comptroller General disclosed that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers incurred unnecessary costs of more than $1.2 million in the procurement of new, higher priced, portable fire extinguishers.

The Comptroller General charged that the Army authorized wide usage of these new high-cost fire extinguishers without properly evaluating the benefits to be obtained in relation to the increased costs involved. As a result, large numbers of the new type extinguisher were procured and issued for use even though a subsequent study indicated that substantially less expensive extinguishers would have been adequate.

This new type of extinguisher was adopted by the Army in May 1959, for use in fighting liquid-fuel and electrical fires. A Corps of Engineers report on the new extinguisher stated that its estimated cost was the same as the cost of the item replaced.

Mr. Speaker, it is a proven fact that the average procurement cost of the new extinguisher was $20.19 compared with a cost of $13 for extinguishers identical to those already in use.

By October 1959, the Corps of Engineers had decided to replace 16 other fire extinguisher models with the new type of extinguisher without evaluating the benefits to be obtained in relation to the relatively high cost of the new extinguisher.

Mr. Speaker, had the Corps of Engineers continued to use the completely adequate current models, their procurement costs for the 102,678 extinguishers in question would have been $849,147. The Army chose, however, to purchase the new extinguishers at a cost of $2,073,295, which represented wholly unnecessary excess costs to the Government of $1,224,148.

The Comptroller General pointed out that a fundamental management failure occurred in this procurement, in that a program was adopted and allowed to proceed without followup evaluations to assure that the costs involved were warranted in relation to the actual benefits obtained. A timely comparison of planned costs with the actual costs being incurred would have shown at a much earlier date the need for a critical review of the program. Had this review been made, a substantial part of the excess cost could have been avoided.

Mr. Speaker, the collusion and connivance between U.S. procurement officials and business firms has reached alarming proportions.

The Comptroller General's reports themselves cannot cure this evil. There must be a fixing of responsibility and accountability; appropriate disciplinary action by all departments; and a strict enforcement of the applicable civil and criminal laws.

All the criminal laws written will not deter crime or protect the public interest without effective enforcement agencies, procedures, and actions. These abuses can only be deterred by making examples of the offenders.

The repeated shocking losses and wastages in our military procurement clearly indicate that the present corrective measures being taken by our responsible officials are inadequate and ineffective.

Opportunities in Biomedical Engineering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was recently privileged to address a conference sponsored by Northwestern University Biomedical Engineering Research Center in Chicago, Ill. Northwestern University has participated in a program of the National Institutes of Health relating to the cooperation between medicine, biology, and engineering. The biomedical engineering research center is the first project of its kind in the Nation. It brings together in harmony and teamwork the disciplines of medicine, biology, and engineering as a new development in the healing arts.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPORTUNITIES IN BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING FOR CHICAGO AREA INDUSTRY

AN OPENING ABSTRACT

As this audience is aware, for a number of years, I have been recommending improved abstracting of scientific information.

Let's start right off, therefore, with an "abstract" of the principal points which will be submitted to you this evening. They are:

No. 1. We are at just the dawn of a dramatic era of biomedical engineering.

Aerospace medicine, alone, has hardly begun to yield its fantastic potential for us earthbound civilians.

No. 2. In this era, to move ahead, as rapidly as possible, will require:

Advancement of the state-of-the-art in many individual disciplines.

The teamwork of all interested disciplines. Here, I refer to the individual and combined efforts of medical science, the physical and engineering sciences, agencies of the U.S. Government, the universities of our land, particularly their colleges of engineering, schools of medicine, and teaching hospitals, private American industry, and professional and trade organizations.

Each has an expanded role to play. Each must function at its highest level of efficiency.

I shall concentrate as I know you would wish, on what the Federal Government should be doing with you and on what you can do in conjunction with it.

No. 3. The path ahead—rewarding as it is and will ultimately be—will not be easy, scientifically, technically, or, indeed, financially. Optimism is necessary, but so is realism as to the practical obstacles ahead.

Now, let's turn to each of these phases in turn.

THE VAST OPPORTUNITIES

I have had 5 years of contacts and correspondence with biomedical engineers in the United States and throughout the world. What they have said and written confirms in my judgment this fact: Biomedical engineering offers some of the most profound opportunities for human service to be found anywhere in health science.

Biomedical engineering offers, too, some of the most inspiring opportunities for the American economic system to demonstrate further:

Its sense of public service.

Its creativity and efficiency.

Its awareness that there is profit to be made in leading the world in meeting tomorrow's needs with tomorrow's answers.

American industry is moving rapidly ahead into the automation era. Industry knows that systems engineering is the key to that era. And, systems engineering will be the crux of tomorrow's health services, tomorrow's hospitals, tomorrow's laboratory research into organ systems.

Biomedical engineering, moreover, offers particular opportunities for us of the Midwest and the upper Midwest, provided we aggressively grasp these opportunities.

For a layman who still marvels at the miracle of flight, what is being done in electronics today seems incredible: Miniaturized instrumentation—radio "pills" devised many years ago to relay information from inside the human body—successful cardiac pacemakers—heart-lung bypass machines—the almost unbelievable range of existent uses of ultrasound and infrared among other elements of the electromagnetic spectrum.

And more marvels, further applications are on the way:

The development of physiological monitoring systems, particularly for intensive postoperative patient care in the Nation's hospitals.

The development of electronic instrumentation which may one day enable the blind to "see," the deaf to "hear," as already the mute are being enabled to "speak."

The development and refinement of additional artificial internal and external organs, to replace diseased or amputated organs.

The simulation of biological phenomena by analog computers, leading to increased understanding of the nature of living processes.

Specifically, the development of bold new systems concepts for understanding of that most fantastic of all instruments—the human brain—how it learns, how it remembers, how it thinks, how it sleeps.

The use of digital computers for the mass input, "massaging," evaluation, output of biomedical data of unheard of complexity—about a single individual or a million or 10 million individuals.

And other applications, too numerous to even highlight.

TEAMWORK NECESSARY

Yesterday's achievements of this type have taken sweat and some tears; and so will tomorrow's.

Never before have individual scientific disciplines been called upon to develop faster and to collaborate more closely with other disciplines.

The Ph. D. and the M.D., the biophysicist and the biochemist, the electrical engineer and the neurosurgeon—these and a vast number of other types of teams will be communicating with one another, working with one another as never before.

Traditional compartments between disciplines have now been shattered by interdisciplinary breakthroughs.

Telemetering developments, alone, from orbiting space satellites and man-to-the-moon rockets have altered and will revolutionize old sciences and engineering.

THE TASKS OF MANY ORGANIZATIONS

It behooves every discipline, every organization, every industry, to appraise its past, present, and future role.

Medical science, in particular, will have to revise both its undergraduate and postgraduate medical education.

The physical sciences and engineering will have to improve their curriculums. And they, like the life sciences, will have to increase the numbers of their future specialists, as well as their generalists.

Business, trade, professional, and other not-for-profit organizations must reexamine their present services in terms of tomorrow's needs.

Fortunately, there is abundant indication that this is being done, particularly by professional groups.

I need only cite the forward-looking plans of, to cite but three groups: the Engineering Joint Council Research Committee; the Institute of Radio Engineers and its long-established Professional Group on Medical Electronics; and the work by the International Federation of Medical Electronics, among others in this category, and the work of the Foundation for Medical Technology in other not-for-profit areas.

In all of this concurrent effort, the Federal Government has special obligations.

FOUR TASKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

No one need be reminded in detail that your Government is spending in the order of $14.7 billion a year for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

The overwhelming proportion of that total ($7.4 billion) is, of course, for military objectives, with civilian space, nuclear energy, and medical activities the three largest components thereafter.

Let me submit four tasks of the Federal agencies, as I see them, in this area:

1. To act in concert with one another so as to expedite the progress of biomedical engineering.

We need more interagency planning on biomedical engineering, and more interagency funding of projects of common interests, more interagency consistency in fellowship and other education programs.

NASA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Federal Aviation Agency are only beginning to realize common programing.

NO EASY AUTOMATIC "SPIN OFF" FROM SPACE SCIENCE

2. The Federal agencies must act further to help convert military and space science and technology into civilian technology. There was a day when some folks assumed a "spin off" of civilian byproducts would occur automatically.

Fortunately, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is now more realistic. It is aware that miracles of adaptation of space devices to users—here on earth—are not going to occur by themselves. An aggressive, grassroots effort to assist universities and private industry in civilian-type application is essential.

President Kennedy has, as you know, soundly proposed a Federal Engineering Extension Service. Such a Service would enable the great colleges of engineering of our land to serve as local packagers of information so as to meet the special needs of local industry. Engineering colleges should then, in effect, parallel the magnificent job which has been done down through the years, by colleges of agricultures. By means of the vast county agent system, the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges have revolutionized American farming and made its productivity the envy of the world. Similarly, any company in the Chicago area, or in any other area, should be able to get the benefit of the counsel of its engineering schools. They, in turn, should be able to draw upon the sum total of federally sponsored information, and, to the extent feasible (without impairing proprietary rights) of privately sponsored information.

3. Information and communication are, in my judgment, the key.

There is no single greater task, as I see it, than for each Federal agency to put its information and communication house in order and for all Federal agencies to put their mutual Federal information house in order.

In this way, you in Evanston and your counterparts anywhere in the 50 States should be able to learn promptly, easily, about anything and everything (not classified for military reasons) for which you have paid as taxpayers.

Right now, there may be as many as 150,000 federally supported research and development tasks underway. Perhaps one-sixth of them are in electronics alone. You're paying the bill for these projects. You personally should be able to tap into the vast bank of information about nonclassified projects, present and past.

In my view, a scientist or an engineer (whether at Northwestern University or any private company) should be able, by telephone, by letter, by telegram, by visit, to draw upon an automated network of federally sponsored information resources in every region of our country.

In the same manner, when you and I make a telephone call from Chicago or Evanston (or anywhere else in the United States), we tap into a system of local, regional, national, and international switchboards. Most of the switching of our signals, from our house, office, or laboratory, to a person 1 mile or 3,000 miles away, is done automatically and in a matter of seconds or minutes.

The day should not be long distant when, in a similar manner, any individual can receive swiftly signals from the scientific repositories of the earth. He may want to receive these signals by ear, or by sight; e.g. through a print-out from the world's "pool" of library and other information centers, or to have the information magnified from microfilm or microform, displayed visually on a TV-like console at his desk.

If that sounds "Buck Rogerish," I can assure you that the makings of this system are actually already in existence—in bits and pieces.

DON'T BE BASHFUL ABOUT YOUR INFORMATION NEEDS

You of the world of university and industary have a right to expect that your Government will serve you.

Do not hesitate to acquaint Federal agencies with your specific information needs. Tell them what you want and the way you want it. Don't be bashful.

I have found that, for too long, even our leading private citizens and companies have tended to resign themselves to poor Federal information service. The information that they wanted came in too slowly, or they were flooded with irrelevant information which was totally useless in terms of their particular request.

Sometimes the poor service was relatively unavoidable because Federal service was underfinanced and undermanned. But now there is no excuse for any agency's failing to provide taxpayers with information which you need and want and which is useful to our free enterprise system and to the service of human health.

Last September the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, held a 5-hour hearing, at which representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and of every single major science agency in the U.S. Government testified.

Perhaps the most remarkable and enlightening testimony was that given by the able Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell Gilpatric.

Mr. Gilpatric readily conceded that the Defense Department has not begun to perform the information service which our subcommittee has long urged upon it.

He promised to improve the management of Defense information. He has been true to his word. In the last 5 months, there has been a whirlwind series of actions within the Defense Department and within what has heretofore been known as the Armed Services Technical Information Agency in particular. My hope is that out of these actions and out of the new Defense Documentation Center will come the first systematic management and dissemination of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Advance Research Agency information.

Following our hearing, there has been vigorous followthrough from the President's Office of Science and Technology. Two landmark reports have just emerged from the President's Science Advisory Committee—one from its Panel on Information, one from its Panel of Life Sciences. Both reports provide valuable impetus to biomedical information advances.

OUR REGIONAL OPPORTUNITY

We have considered national efforts and studies. Now, what of the needs of the Midwest?

Here is a fourth phase of Federal obligation, but it is also a phase involving our own responsibility.

You are probably familiar with the fact that for some time now, I have been taking steps to help correct what I regard as a very disturbing imbalance in the geographic distribution of Federal contracts for research and development.

The Midwest and the upper Midwest have been getting the "short end of the stick" not deliberately, but because of a combination of nondeliberate, nonplanned developments. Government decision after government decision—apparently unrelated—have created a condition in which nearly half of all the defense procurement is on the west coast, and another fifth on the east coast.

These areas have earned much of this support, in part through their superb graduate centers in research and technology. They were in early, and they are reaping the fruits of early labors.

But they have no monopoly or near-monopoly in industrial or university skill—far from it.

It is not just a matter of regional pride when I point to the magnificent untapped talents and know-how in our own region. It is in the natural interest to orchestrate the human resources of the Midwest with those of the west and east coasts.

We of the Midwest have some of the greatest medical resources in the world. We have some of the finest engineering and industrial resources.

The harmonious marriage of midwest engineering, industry, and medical resources is essential.

The talent and know-how of all three must be refined, polished, sharpened and matched to tomorrow's Federal and private requirements.

UPGRADING SKILL THROUGH EDUCATION

Everyone in this audience must be on the alert to learn what our citizens and what Uncle Sam will need and want, and to upgrade our ability to fulfill those needs and wants.

Excellence in education—undergraduate and postgraduate—is the indispensable foundation for upgrading our regional skills.

And that is, of course, precisely what Northwestern University's magnificent biomedical engineering research center will offer.

The world will "beat a path" to Northwestern's "door," because Northwestern is determined to "beat a path" to frontiers of man's knowledge.

Meanwhile, I welcome the recent establishment in Bloomington, Ind., of the Aerospace Research Application Center, partially supported by NASA, but having strong private support, as well, I note, too, that Midwest Research Institute at Kansas City in a recent pilot project found around 50 commercial applications for space technology. But this is only the beginning of what we of the Midwest must do to identify opportunities and equip ourselves to fulfill them.

ECONOMIC DIFFICULTIES AHEAD

And, now, a word of caution. I have mentioned the potential profits from this vast new field.

Make no mistake. There are potential losses, as well, in endeavoring to serve both the Federal and the private market.

The files of our subcommittee contain letters from many electronic and other companies, telling of their difficulties in selling more than a few prototype models of their most advanced instrumentation.

The American M.D. and the American hospital are not the easiest customers to sell; nor should they be. Where human life is involved, every effort has to be made to minimize avoidable risk when new techniques or instruments are proposed. Inevitably, modern science will prove cautious about installing new devices until there has been careful basic and applied research and adequate clinical trial. This takes time, money, skill, and standards.

We must always carefully balance our zeal for the new with respect for the old. We must always respect the right of the M.D. to demand the most solid scientific proof of the safety and efficiency of new instrumentation.

There are over 6,500 hospitals in our Nation. Potentially, they offer a great economic market, but in actuality, the hospitals of our country have some of the severest financial problems of any community institutions. Selling new instrumentation to them in large quantities has proven an enormously difficult task for even the largest, best established electronic and other companies.

And so, although I am happy to speak of the promise ahead, I do also want to sound this note of realism.

Industry will need its most careful marketing surveys, maximum engineering efficiency, and great patience and perseverance, if it is to serve this unusual and difficult market.

But always remember, it is a market worth serving.

The Federal Government can and should help you, insofar as possible.

But each of you must also shoulder your own burdens.

CONCLUSION

An old Chinese proverb reads that "If every man would sweep in front of his own doorstep, the world would soon be clean." Yes, we are all enlisted in the struggle to cleanse the world of disease and disability. The world indeed, stands on the threshhold of a new day in diagnostic, preventive, curative, and restorative medicine.

I know that this great intellectual community of the Chicago area has a tremendous part to play in the fashioning of that new day.

The Springfield Armory, Selected by President George Washington as National Armory, Designated as National Historical Landmark by National Park Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week, on April 2, the Springfield Armory in my home city of Springfield, Mass., was officially designated as a registered national historical landmark by the National Park Service, U.S. Department of Interior, under provisions of the Historic Sites Act passed by Congress in 1935. An armory in Springfield produced weapons for Gen. George Washington's Continental Army during the Revolutionary War. Shortly after President Washington's inauguration in 1789, the first Chief Executive and father of our country visited Springfield and subsequently recommended the establishment of a national armory there. Since that time the Springfield Armory has contributed to America's national defense and arsenal of small weapons.

Unfortunately, I could not go to Springfield for this dedication, because the appropriations subcommittee on which I sit was holding hearings, but I did send the following telegram for the occasion:

APRIL 1, 1963.

COL. C. L. P. MEDINNIS,
Commanding Officer, Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass.:

Regret cannot join with you personally on this momentous occasion as the Springfield Armory is officially designated as registered national historical landmark, but congressional duties necessitate my remaining in Washington. Ever since President Washington selected and Third Congress approved Springfield as site of national armory, the community and arsenal have grown together in importance, have made innumerable contributions to national security in wartime and to national culture in peacetime. We in Greater Springfield can justly be proud of the Springfield Armory, its history, its tradition, its weapons development in the past and its most recent contribution, the M–14 Springfield rifle. The fact that the M–14 Springfield remains as the Army's standard rifle is testimony to the skills and hard work of the craftsmen and researchers at this arsenal. The armory has had a glorious history and it will also have a useful future as the Army's small weapons research and development center of the Nation. Let it be said on this historic occasion that I am a firm believer in the Nation's arsenal system which has sparked the arming of this Nation in every crisis of its history and has contributed such outstanding weapons as the M–1 Garand and the M–14 Springfield rifle to the national arsenal. However, we must not rest on our laurels. Now is the time for a renewed effort in research and development at Springfield to produce new generations of small weapons so vital to the Nation's defense even in the space age.

EDWARD P. BOLAND
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD newspaper stories telling of the dedication, taken from the Springfield Daily News of April 1, another on April 2, another in the Springfield Union on April 3, an editorial in the Springfield Daily News on April 3, and the address by Col. C. L. P. Medinnis, commanding officer of the Springfield Armory.

The articles follow:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Apr. 1, 1963]

REPRESENTATIVE BOLAND IN DEFENSE OF THE M14—URGES RENEWED EFFORT IN SMALL ARMS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—U.S. Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, of Springfield, today, on the eve of the official designation of the venerable Springfield Armory as a national historic landmark, spoke out in defense of the arsenal system and particularly its latest product, the M–14 Springfield rifle.

The local representative sees the recently much criticized M–14 Springfield as a fit contributor to a long tradition of military small arms development here.

At the same time, the Congressman, who wrote to Col C. L. P. Medinnis, commanding officer of the gun plant, to say he would be unable to attend the ceremonies, urged that there be a renewed effort in research and development to produce a "new generation of small weapons vital to the Nation's defense, even in the space age."

After expressing his regrets at being unable to attend the landmark plaque ceremony at the armory, Representative BOLAND wrote:

INNUMERABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

"Ever since President Washington selected and the third Congress approved Springfield as the site of the national armory, the community and the arsenal have grown together in importance and have made innumerable contributions to the national security in wartime and to the national culture in peacetime.

"We in Greater Springfield can justly be proud of the Springfield armory, its history, its tradition, its past weapons development and its most recent contribution—the M14 Springfield rifle.

"The fact that the M14 Springfield remains as the Army's standard rifle is testimony to the skills and hard work of the craftsmen and researchers at this arsenal.

"The Springfield armory has had a glorious history and it will also have a useful future as the Army's small weapons research and development center of the Nation.

"Let it be said on this historic occasion that I am a firm believer in the Nation's arsenal system which has sparked the arming of this Nation in every crisis of its history, and has contributed such reliable weapons as the M1 Garand and the M14 Springfield rifle to the Nation's arsenals.

MUST NOT REST

"However, we must not rest on our laurels. Now is the time for a renewed effort in research and development at Springfield to produce new generations of small weapons so vital to the Nation's defense even in the space age."

The 10 a.m. dedication event will take place in front of the main administration building, Armory Square, where a permanent bronze marker will be unveiled.

Dr. Murray N. Nelligan of the Department of the Interior will present the plaque and certificate.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Apr. 2, 1963]

ARMORY IS ESTABLISHED AS NATIONAL LANDMARK—GUN PLANT ON HILL JOINS MOUNT VERNON AND TICONDEROGA AS HISTORICAL U.S. SITE

Pleasant weather today was a fitting background as the 169-year-old Springfield Armory took its place as a national historic landmark along with Valley Forge and Mount Vernon and other revered places in the Nation.

While some 2,000 gathered in a large semicircle around the flag-bedecked armory administration building, Col. C. L. P. Medinnis, commanding officer of the armory, accepted a Department of the Interior certificate, and a few minutes later John C. Garand, inventor of the M–1, one of the "guns of glory" of the arsenal, unveiled a plaque.

The Interior Department official, Dr. Murray Nelligan, remarked that the ancient gun plant, established by Gen. George Washington, had a right to stick out its much respected military chest since it is to be one of only 350 locations in the Nation deemed important enough in American history to be selected as a landmark.

"The armory takes its place now with Mount Vernon, with Fort Ticonderoga, with Old North Church, and the USS *Constitution*," commented Dr. Nelligan, "certainly a coveted honor which the people and city of Springfield can share."

Introduction of the brief dedication program was made by Colonel Medinnis, who also conducted a tour of the historic spots within the arsenal, ending with a visit to the Benton Small Arms Museum and a luncheon at the officers club for special guests.

After the reading of congratulatory telegrams and letters from Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Representative Edward P. Boland, and Maj. Gen. Nelson M. Lynde, Jr., commanding officer of Army Weapons Command at Rock Island, Ill., Colonel Medinnis spoke on the history of the gun plant, its contribution to the Nation's military growth, and its close relation with the city of Springfield over more than a century and a half.

STARTED IN 1777

The armory began with the establishment of a laboratory and depot in rented buildings in 1777, Colonel Medinnis said, Springfield was chosen as the site of a national armory primarily because of the presence of a considerable number of skilled gunsmiths, blacksmiths, and craftsmen.

General Washington, he said, visited the city shortly after his inauguration in 1789 and, convinced of its potentialities, recommended the establishment of an armory, which was agreed by the 3rd Congress.

"Today this installation," said the commanding officer "is the only manufacturing arsenal which can call itself an armory. The Springfield Armory was so designated from the very beginning and, because of long historical association, the term has remained unchanged."

He then traced the development of small arms, and made note of the presence on the platform with him of Mr. Garand, who was the first designer of a semiautomatic rifle, first issued in 1937.

WAR PRODUCTION

In 1795, he noted, there were 40 people employed and 245 muskets produced at the Armory; in 1864, 276,000 rifles were produced and during World War II, more than 4 million Garands were produced by a peak work force of 14,000.

Springfield Armory is today a member arsenal of the Army Weapons Command with headquarters at Rock Island, and furnishes modern weapons to all elements of the Armed Forces. Commenting on the famous names of those who commanded or worked in the armory, the commanding officer said that the Benton Museum, one of the stops on the tour of the grounds, contains historical mementos of not only the armory but also the saga of American military greatness.

The tour included the main administration building, erected in 1817; the high point of Shays' Rebellion in 1786; the original guardhouse, erected in 1880, now referred to as "honeymoon house" for newly assigned lieutenants, and the officers club, the oldest building or post erected in 1808.

The main arsenal, officers' row, and watershops area were also visited before the museum and the luncheon program which ended the official phase of the observance.

Visitors included Col. John W. Carroll, commander of Westover Air Force Base; Mayor Charles V. Ryan, Joint Civic Agencies President Bernard H. McMahon, and other community and military leaders.

The plaque placed on the facade of the administration building reads:

"Springfield Armory has been designated a registered National Historic Landmark. Under the provisions of the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1955, this site possesses exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States, U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service."

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Apr. 3, 1963]

U.S. Landmark Title Achieved—Armory Named Historic Site at Ceremony

The Springfield Armory was formally designated as a national historic landmark at a ceremony at the armory grounds attended by about 2,000 persons Tuesday.

Col. C. L. P. Medinnis, armory commanding officer, accepted a Department of Interior certificate and John C. Garand, inventor of the M1 rifle, unveiled a plaque.

FACILITIES TOURED

Colonel Medinnis recited a history of the armory and conducted special guests on a tour of armory facilities.

The plaque designating the armory as a national historic landmark notes, "This site possesses exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States."

The armory joins Valley Forge and Mount Vernon and some 350 other sites as national landmarks.

Congratulatory telegrams included one from Senator SALTONSTALL, received during the afternoon. It said:

"Sorry I could not be with you this morning. Since Revolutionary days, the armory has been a vital part of the Springfield economy and has played an important role in our Defense Establishment. This is an important day for the armory and a reminder of the role which is played in the history of our country and its continuing significance to Springfield."

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Apr. 3, 1963.]

National Historic Landmark

Connecticut Valley residents hardly need to be reminded that the U.S. Armory at Springfield is a national historic landmark, but that designation given to the armory yesterday by the Department of the Interior may be a helpful guide to citizens in other parts of the country.

There were some positive reasons for locating the armory at Springfield. Even in colonial times, there were gunsmiths, blacksmiths and other skilled craftsmen in Springfield. There were also some negative reasons. Any site below the Enfield Rapids could be attacked by enemy gunboats, but a location above the navigability limits of the Connecticut River would be safe. West Springfield was then larger than Springfield, and the former used its political influence to keep the armory out of West Springfield, and thus to keep the west side girls out of the ogling range of the armory soldiers.

The armory, with its wartime expansions and its postwar layoffs which flooded the labor market with skilled craftsmen, was largely responsible for Springfield's industrial development. However, the armory's role is not only historic, it is present. The armory is not only the Nation's oldest manufacturing arsenal; it is also today the U.S. Army's principal research and development center and pilot manufactory for small arms.

The Springfield Armory is a national historic landmark, but it is also a vital part of the National Defense Establishment, and of the region's industrial complex. The armory is 169 years old, but it must help the country prepare for the common defense until that day when the poetic prayer of one of the armory's most famous visitors is answered, and the "huge organ" of "burnished arms" gently whispers "peace."

Springfield Armory Being Named National Historic Landmark

(Speech by Col. C. L. P. Medinnis, April 2, 1963)

Congressman BOLAND, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, as commanding officer of the Springfield Armory it affords me the greatest pleasure to welcome you this morning to this uniquely historic post for the presentation of the plaque and certificate officially designating the Springfield Armory as a registered national historical landmark.

Under the provisions of the Historic Sites Act passed by the Congress of the United States in 1935, the Secretary of the Interior was directed to make a survey of the historic sites of the United States "for the purpose of determining which possess exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States."

A program for the registry of such landmarks was initiated by the National Park Service some years ago and on December 4, 1961, my office was notified that the Springfield Armory had been designated as such a site.

We are here today for the presentation of the plaque and certificate officially marking this designation.

As you are all aware, the Springfield Armory traces its history back to the year 1777 when a laboratory and depot were established in rented buildings in what is now the downtown district of the city of Springfield.

Following the Revolutionary War, all manufacture and repair work was stopped but Springfield was retained as a storage depot for the New England area. President George Washington visited this city shortly after his inauguration in 1789 and, convinced of its potentialities, recommended the establishment of a national armory here. His approval of the local area was adopted as a law by the Third Congress.

Springfield was chosen as the site of a national armory primarily because of the presence of a considerable number of skilled gunsmiths, blacksmiths and craftsmen. The availability of such a great number of artisans prompted Gen. Henry Knox, the then Gen. George Washington's most experienced artillery officer, to recommend Springfield for its march toward history.

Since then, the Springfield Armory and the community of Springfield have been mutually interdependent. The armory attracted additional arms industries to the area, and the supply of competent gunsmiths, in turn, has continued to be an important factor in enabling this post to continue its activity.

The designation of this installation as a registered national historical landmark is a source of considerable pride to all of us in this area. We at the Springfield armory are particularly proud of this recognition for it constitutes a tribute to the leadership and the personnel of past and present years who have had such a great part in shaping the great traditions of this installation.

The names of Superintendents David Ames and Benjamin Prescott, the first leaders of the armory, immediately come to mind since they were the first to formulate the plans which led to the basic foundations of the arsenal system. Then, too, the name of Lt. Col. Roswell Lee, the first of the military commanders here whose name has been perpetuated in the local chapter of the Masons; Maj. J. W. Ripley; Capt. George Dwight; Capt. Alexander B. Dyer; Maj. J. G. Benton for whom the city's Benton Park and this installation's small arms museum have been named—all these are names which have contributed to the history not only of the Springfield Armory but also to the city of Springfield. All these men were particularly outstanding in their work effort and also active in the affairs of the city during or after their service at this installation. Their names have been indelibly recorded, as attested by various parks, streets, and other landmarks bearing their names.

There are still other names of men from the Springfield Armory who have contributed to the march of history.

They are men like Thomas Blanchard who designed a machine for turning gunstocks. This very machine, which is to be seen in the Armory Benton Small Arms Museum, was the forerunner of all modern lathe machines.

There is also the name William R. "Billy" Bull, who as an armory employee, used his marksman's eye to such excellent advantage that he traveled to England and outshot all rifle marksmanship competitors to gain the world title.

Names such as Erskine Allen, James Cranston, and Lucian Bruce were connected with early developments of small arms; while John E. Murphy and Daniel J. Manning were principally responsible for developing the Model 1903 Springfield Rifle, one of the "guns of glory" which saw service from the Walls of China in the Boxer Rebellion to the beginning of World War II.

Still with us today and already a legend for his work in our field is the name of John C. Garand, the inventor of the M1 rifle which bears his name. He is unique in the fact that his brainchild was he first successful semiautomatic rifle and that much of the machinery he designed for the manufacture of M1 rifle components is still admired and copied by machine-tool and small arms industries. Springfield Armory is honored in claiming him as one of its family.

There is still another side to the Springfield Armory story and this concerns primarily the city of Springfield.

Any historic research into the annals of Springfield would necessarily show the great part this post has played in its history and development. No better illustration of how this is recognized can be cited than the inclusion of the view of the main arsenal here in the seal of the city, which was adopted when Springfield became a city in 1852. The complete seal pictures the town at the time. In the upper part of the seal may be seen the main arsenal just as it appeared then and has existed to this day. Many of you undoubtedly remember the poem "Arsenal at Springfield" written by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

This attention was certainly warranted since the armory's role as an influential social institution in the community is clearly evident when it is realized that most religious denominations established in Springfield were a direct outgrowth of the armory work community.

All denominations, Baptists, Episcopalians, Methodists, Catholics to number a few, came to life as a result of religious creeds of armory employees. Most of them met as combined churchmen for the first time in either the U.S. chapel—a room in the second floor of the present administration building—or military hall here on post.

Two of the offspring of these early religious groups can be seen today in the Universalist Church and St. Michaels Cathedral.

In addition to the prestige the armory has brought to the city because of its manufacturing activities it is interesting to note that the city and the armory gained prominence from the great national horse show held in Federal Square at this installation in 1856. This was the first show of its kind in the United States and attracted persons from all over this country and Canada.

New England and particularly the Connecticut Valley benefited from the founding of the armory for it was here at this installation that a beginning was made in the development of the fine-crafts industry for which this part of the country is so famous. Furthermore, the armory gained distinction throughout the industrial world by being a pioneer in the development and manufacture of interchangeable parts in connection with rifle production, a feature later adopted by industry as essential for all mass production of fabricated articles.

Honored guests, please forgive all of us at the Springfield Armory, if we appear to be blowing our own horn at this time. The fact of the matter is that we are proud to have our tradition, our background, our accomplishments brought to the attention of the Nation. The pride we have shared in our establishment we are now happy to share with the Nation since it is for this Nation that this Springfield Armory has existed at all.

The registering of the Springfield Armory as a national historic landmark gives due recognition to the important role of this Federal arsenal and this site in the cultural history of the United States.

I would, at this time, like to give full attention to the role played by the U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, for this opportunity in bringing to the attention of the Nation the national significance of this installation. The Department of Interior now becomes a full partner in this event of today.

It is with a deep sense of personal pride, accomplishment and satisfaction that I accept this plaque and certificate in behalf of all Springfield Armory personnel, both past, present and future.

This marker is received in trust for all to commemorate the location of the Springfield Armory in the historic annals of this Nation.

It is our hope that future generations will remember full well the significance of this event.

This plaque and certificate support this objective.

This concludes our presentation ceremony. I want to thank you all for witnessing the event. It is my earnest hope that all of us will remember this dedication in our future thoughts and deeds.

Springfield Armory Named as National Historic Landmark on April 2, 1963

The date of April 2, 1963, will be of double-barreled significance to the Springfield Armory, according to Commanding Officer Col. C. L. P. Medinnis.

On that date, the local U.S. Army Weapons Command installation will mark not only its 169th anniversary but also its commemoration as a national historic landmark. The event will be witnessed by key military, congressional, civic, and historical groups of this area.

Naming of the Springfield Armory as a national historic landmark developed as a portion of the registry program instituted by the Department of Interior, National Park Service. The registry is a method by which the Federal Government recognizes sites classified as of exceptional value irrespective of ownership. Such sites are not of the national park system. The registry, in effect, identifies important segments of American heritage and brings them to the attention of the American people.

The event will be highlighted on April 2 with a half-hour dedication ceremony beginning at 10 a.m., immediately in front of the Main Administration Building, Armory Square, where a permanent bronze marker will be unveiled.

Dr. Murray H. Nelligan, of the Department of Interior, Philadelphia, Pa., will present this installation with its plaque and certificate. Other invited guests include Congressman Edward P. Boland, Democrat, of Massachusetts, U.S. Army Weapons Command, civic officials from Holyoke, Chicopee, Westfield, and Springfield; the Springfield Joint Civic Agencies; regional historical groups; and representatives of military units within the Greater Springfield area; key Springfield Armory personnel and representatives of the installation labor groups.

Employees of the Springfield Armory will also be given an opportunity to observe the dedication ceremony.

Specially invited guests of Colonel Medinnis will then be taken on a tour of the major historic sites within the installation. The tour itinerary will include halts at the main arsenal, the west and middle arsenals, the site of Shays' Rebellion, and the dam at Watershops Pond. The final stop of the tour will be the Benton Small Arms Museum at the armory.

The Department of Interior summed up its reasons for choosing the Springfield Armory as a national historic landmark in four data-packed paragraphs which have now become part of the official record. The four paragraphs follow:

"The Springfield Armory, dating from 1794, is the U.S. Government's oldest manufacturing arsenal. Since the dates of its establishment, the armory's ordnance products have figured in every American war, and its name has become synonymous with some of the finest of the world's military arms. The armory is significant also as the site of the defeat of the most dangerous threat posed by Shays' uprising in 1786–87, when the rebellious farmers of Massachusetts were thwarted in their attempt to seize the arms and supplies stored at the Springfield depot.

"The availability of skilled gunsmiths, blacksmiths, and other artisans had made Springfield a firearms manufacturing center prior to the Revolution and for this reason Gen. Henry Knox was prompted in 1777 to propose the town as a laboratory, a manufacturing and repair depot for military arms in the war with Britain. In 1789, the newly elected President George Washington inspected the Springfield site and subsequently recommended it as the location of a national armory.

"The Springfield Armory was the site of the abortive attack by Capt. Daniel Shays and his followers in the Massachusetts uprising of 1786–87 known as Shays' Rebellion. For several months prior to the attack, debt ridden and disgruntled farmers had roamed Massachusetts, preventing county courts from sitting and rendering judgment for debt. In late 1786, Shays and his followers gathered for an assault on the supply depot at Springfield where a quantity of arms, ammunition and supplies were stored. They attacked on January 25, 1787, but were repulsed by the defending garrison. The revolt continued for a few weeks more but the farmers never again made so dangerous a threat.

"Springfield Armory today is the U.S. Army's principal research and development center and pilot manufactory for small arms. A museum in the armory has exhibits not only telling the history of the armory but also interpreting in vivid fashion the story of America's military growth and power. A boulder adjacent to the armory grounds on State Street marks the site of Shays' attack in January 1787. The armory is located at Armory and Federal Squares, Springfield, Mass."

Reform of Congressional Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, those of us who have been pressing for modernization of the congressional organization and procedures were greatly encouraged by a forthright article on congressional reform by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. The article appeared in the New York Times Magazine on April 7.

In his usual vigorous fashion, the senior Senator from Minnesota, who is also the majority whip, made an impressive case for action to improve the functioning of Congress.

His interest will be, I am sure, most helpful in securing hearings on the measures to this end which have already been introduced, including my own bill in which Senator Clark joined. Senator Clark and I have already written to the Rules Committee urging that hearings be held, and we welcome the support and interest of the Senator from Minnesota.

I am confident that if hearings are held, the case for action looking toward improvement in specific problem areas will be demonstrated beyond question. That the need for reform is widely recognized is indicated by the response to a recent poll I made of teachers and practitioners of political science.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Senator Humphrey be printed in the Record, together with a news article also from the New York Times of April 7 which summarizes the comments to which I refer.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

Congress Scored on Archaic Rules—Senator Case's Poll Shows Support for Revisions

(By Cabell Phillips)

Washington.—If Congress is to restore its prestige and effectiveness it had better give prompt attention to its archaic methods of doing business, a cross section of the Nation's political scientists believes.

This nearly unanimous opinion emerges from a nationwide poll of more than 200 teachers and practitioners of political science. The poll was recently completed by Senator Clifford Case, Republican, of New Jersey, who requested comment on a bill he had introduced calling for a special commission to study and make recommendations on congressional reorganization.

One important consensus from the comments is that Congress, as an institution, is losing status in the public mind as an effective arm of Government in comparison with the executive and the judiciary.

While both the Presidency and the courts have geared their thinking and their operations in consonance with the needs of modern times, many believe, Congress, as one respondent put it, gives the impression of "limping along in the harness of the horse and buggy age."

This rather prevalent viewpoint was expressed as follows by Prof. Edgar W. Waugh of Eastern Michigan University:

"Measured by the individual capacities of its Members (this) Congress compares very favorably with any of its predecessors, but when measured by its collective capacity to get things done, it looks much worse. Each House has become, so to speak, a prisoner to procedures which are patently out of step with the swift tempo of the nuclear space age. This needs to be corrected, and swiftly."

Professor Waugh added that it had become essential "to bring the executive and legislative branches into a closer and more cooperative relationship without damage to the balance on which our Government is founded, and without impairing the values provided by a loyal opposition."

The Case bill, one of several introduced this year for congressional reform, centers on a study commission composed of both Members of Congress and experts from other fields of public life. The bill defines 12 problem areas on which the commission would concentrate.

These problem areas cover such subjects as the scheduling of congressional business, staffing and procedure of committees, rules of floor procedure, conflicts of interest of the Members, travel and other spending allowances, financing of congressional election campaigns and "the strengthening of the congressional power of the purse."

The bill has been referred to the Rules Committee but no hearings have been scheduled.

The last substantial reform of congressional procedures occurred under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Its principal achievement was a drastic reduction in the number of standing committees, and provisions for professional staffing of some of those committees. However, rules that contribute most to the cumbersomeness of congressional procedures, the right of committees to bottle up unwanted legislation, the seniority rule in the choice of chairmen, unlimited debate in the Senate, have not been altered in a century.

Virtually all the political scientists replying to Senator Case's inquiry applauded his idea for a broadly based study of reforms. Their viewpoints about what is wrong with Congress and what needs to be done about it fell into several broad categories.

A large group felt that Congress will continue to lose stature in the public eye until it modernizes its procedures. Addressing himself to this point, Prof. John W. Baker, chairman of the department of political science at the College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio, wrote:

"I consider Congress to be the vital center of our representative democracy, and yet I find it very difficult to convince students of this fact. They have seen too many cartoons of Senator Snort and his ilk. Congress has been the butt of too many derogatory jokes. They have heard too much pool reporting of congressional activities. They have also read too much responsible reporting which has pointed out the weaknesses of Congress as it is functioning at present."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

To Move Congress Out of Its Ruts: Americans Know That That Body Could Do a Better Job Than It Does; a Senator Offers His View of What Is Wrong and How Legislators Could Be Made More Effective

(By Hubert H. Humphrey)

(Hubert H. Humphrey, the senior Senator from Minnesota, serves on four committees, including one on reorganization of Government.)

Washington.—Sixteen years ago, the United States held a monopoly of atomic weapons. Jet aircraft were barely operational. The space age could be found only in science fiction magazines. Television was an 8-inch infant in electronics laboratories. The Nation's elementary schools had classrooms to spare. The cold war could be seen on the horizon only by a handful of political wise men. Europe was near economic collapse, Africa was still a continent of colonies and Chiang Kai-shek still ruled the Chinese mainland. Cuba, to most Americans, was a plush and pleasant vacation spot. Fidel Castro was a teenager.

It was 16 years ago when the U.S. Congress last turned to the tedious task of self-criticism and produced a major legislative reform. Since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Congress has changed little. The structure is the same. The committee lineups are almost identical. The traditions are preserved. And the basic attitudes of Congress toward its own prerogatives and centers of power are still tuned to 1946 or the more distant past.

But the needs of the Nation and the demands on Congress have multiplied.

Since 1946 the Nation's population has increased 33 percent, its Government has grown to include many more services and duties, its problems are infinitely more complex, and its involvement in world affairs is no longer fractional and irregular but rather total and constant.

The essential problem of Congress today is simply that there is more to do but only the same number of men to do it. The Members of Congress have to find enough time to fulfill their thousands of obligations and to develop a congressional system in which they can use their time most effectively.

The most pressing day-to-day demands for the time of Senators and Congressmen are not directly linked to legislative tasks. They come from constituents. And the constituency of a Member of Congress is not limited to his home State or district. He gives priority attention to the people back home, but as a U.S. Senator or Representative, his constituency is the whole Nation.

The image of a Member of Congress engaged in debate of issues or in study and reflection on the problems of the Nation and freedom is accurate for only a fraction of his time. At any point in his workday, the Congressman is more likely to be talking about a housing development with municipal officials, or phoning an executive agency for an answer to a constituent complaint, or dictating a letter to a citizen who wants some information for his son's term paper for a school civics class.

Speedy air travel, the low cost of telegrams, or long-distance telephone calls and campaigns to encourage citizens to "write your Congressman" have turned most congressional offices into operations resembling a complex of train station, post office, airline terminal, and communications center. My own experience may or may not be typical, but it is significant of the increased personal workload for Members of Congress.

In 1949, I moved into an office of four rooms. My staff and I had the use of two telephone lines. An average of 50 letters a day were received. Thirty telephone calls a day were considered heavy. A personal visit to the office by a constituent on any day was a special event.

In 1962, my office had doubled to eight rooms. Now, 12 telephone lines funnel an average of 500 calls into the office each day, and I keep two private lines just to be sure I will be able to get through the crowded switchboard to reach my staff. One hundred and twenty personal visitors, not counting large groups of students or tourists, come into the office each day, about half of them constituents from my home State.

How does the Member of Congress handle this workload? He has a staff to help, and he and his assistants work long hours at a fast pace. Any citizen who doubts that he is getting an honest day of work for the salary he pays his Congressman need only walk by the Senate or House office buildings late at night or on weekends. Most of the lights are burning through the evening hours, and many still shine after midnight on any night of the week.

Congressmen do not complain about the demands on their time for service to constituents. They perform that service because it is their job, because it is vital for their political survival, and because they know that the individual citizen with a need, complaint or idea cannot even hope to dent the surface of big government unless he works through his elected representative.

But Members of Congress do complain often that they have little time to perform their duties as legislators. This is perhaps the central, general problem and defect of Congress today: The inability of Congressmen to find the time to inform themselves of the issues they face, to give their best talents to committee assignments, and to legislate responsibly.

The day is long gone when a Member of Congress could be satisfied with mastery over two or three limited, precise subjects and follow a policy of voting the party line on other issues. Today, the Senator or Congressman is expected to be thoroughly informed on hundreds of different subjects and issues, from agricultural economics in Minnesota to the administration of foreign aid in Bolivia, from Federal housing needs in New York to Soviet strategy in the Middle East, from a flood control project in California to the merits of a man-on-the-moon spaceship project.

The complexities and variety of issues which Members of Congress must master will continue to increase in an age of nuclear power, scientific advances, fast-changing social patterns, and international involvement and leadership by the United States.

The pattern is already evident: At the time of the last Legislative Reorganization Act, the 79th Congress (1945 and 1946) initiated 12,656 bills or resolutions. The 87th Congress (1961 and 1962) initiated 20,316 bills or resolutions, a 60-percent increase in the congressional workload.

Most of these measures were relatively routine, but each took some time from Congress in general and individual Members in particular.

There has been a comparable increase in the flow of major, controversial, and thus time-consuming legislative proposals. Traditionally, the average congressional session has seriously considered and attempted to hammer out one major new program or reform in a single year. The second session of the 87th Congress last year made a serious effort on many major legislative programs, including the trade bill, tax reform, social security financing of health insurance, authorization to purchase United Nations bonds, and the Communications Satellite Act.

A realistic accounting by the White House concluded that the 87th Congress approved, and the President signed into law, 73 major legislative proposals. The 83d Congress, representing the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, approved 29 major legislative proposals. The 87th Congress of 1961 and 1962 approved a total of more than 1,000 public bills. The 83d Congress of 1953 and 1954 approved about half that number.

These figures are not mentioned to play a sort of partisan numbers game, but rather to emphasize the increased legislative workload of Congress and its Members.

The result of that heavy workload, in 1962, was one of the longest peacetime sessions of Congress in history. Congress met continually from early January to mid-October. In the final month, a few oldtimers on Capitol Hill grew frustrated enough to look back fondly on the year 1923, when Warren Harding was President and the Congress convened in March just long enough to recess until December.

But even 9- or 10-month congressional sessions do not solve the problem of the individual Senator or Congressman who must find the time to inform himself about the legislative issues he faces.

Most Members of Congress are dedicated and conscientious legislators and public servants, aware of the power they hold over the dollars and destiny of the American people and so many others throughout the world. If they are given extra time, or rather freed from unnecessarily time-consuming duties, they will spend most of it tackling the huge task of informing themselves.

Several steps can be taken to give them that extra time. These are not the final answers to the time problem of Members of Congress, but they would help.

First, more joint meetings of congressional committees. A legislative question involving disarmament and arms control, for example, normally requires consideration by the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Joint meetings would save the time of Members serving on more than one of these committees.

Second, more standing joint committees including Members of both the House and the Senate. Such committees would save time, particularly toward the end of each congressional session, by paving the way to speedier conference agreements between the Senate and the House on controversial issues.

Third, more efficient scheduling of the workdays of Congress. Certain days could be scheduled specifically for floor debate and action by the full House or Senate. Other days could be restricted exclusively for hearings and action by the congressional committees.

In the early months of the session, the full House or Senate would meet only a few days each week. As committees completed their action in the later months of the session, the Senate and House would meet more often. This pattern would save time for Members, and end the absurd necessity of Members literally running from committee room to Senate or House Chamber when issues in which they are involved are up for action at different places at the same time.

Fourth, modification of the morning hour in the Senate, in which Members read miscellaneous speeches of marginal or undated importance and insert various articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Instead, Members would be permitted to send their morning hour speeches and articles to the clerk for insertion in the RECORD, without taking their own time and the time of other Senators to read them word for word.

Fifth, a requirement in the Senate that Members restrict their remarks to the issue formally listed as the business of the Senate. In a debate over agricultural programs, for example, a Senator would not be able to spend an hour discussing a totally unrelated subject. This rule of germaneness now applies only to debate in the House of Representatives.

Sixth, a summer recess of Congress of at least 3 weeks. This would take time away from legislative duties, but ultimately, I am convinced, would save time. The immediate value would be the opportunity for Members of Congress to spend some time with families and constituents in a period (June or July) when schools are closed and citizens are not tied at home because of weather.

The indirect value would be the change of pace and rest such a recess would give to each Member. He would return for the final busy weeks of the session refreshed for more efficient performance of his legislative duties. Congressmen are human beings; they get tired and their nerves can become frayed from long months of pressure and hard work. A summer recess would probably reduce the inevitable tensions and bickering so common in the final weeks of congressional sessions.

Seventh, modification and adoption of the British question period, in which administration leaders would report on and answer questions of general importance before the full Senate and House. This would save time, help to keep Members of Congress better informed on administration programs and policy and sustain the necessary frequent contact between the executive and legislative branches of Government.

This final suggestion, and some of the others, would have a valuable side effect; it would save the time of high administration leaders who have their own crucial problems of too many duties for too few hours.

It is not unusual for the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and other Cabinet officers to give basically the same testimony and answer basically the same questions for several different congressional committees. The Secretary of State, for example, might be called early in the session to outline the foreign aid program, including military aid, to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. He will then repeat the same testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee, and again to the House Armed Services Committee.

The result, I believe, is an excessive demand on the time of these officials. Secretary of State Dean Rusk made 54 personal appearances before congressional committees during the 87th Congress, 29 in 1961 and 25 in 1962. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara spent a total of 203 hours before congressional committees during the 87th Congress, 88.74 in 1961 and 114.25 in 1962.

Standing joint committees, more joint meetings of committees, and a question period for the full House or Senate would save the time of Congressmen and these high officials, and serve to inform all Members of Congress more thoroughly.

Another congressional defect which tends to waste time, and to cause confusion and occasional conflict between Members, rests with the lineup of Senate and House committees. New problems and programs created by a world transformed by nuclear power and the space age are being handled by a congressional committee system which has changed little in 50 years.

There were 2 weeks of confusion following introduction of my bill in 1961 to establish a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This measure was first assigned to the Foreign Relations Committee, then switched to the Government Operations Committee, then back to the Foreign Relation Committee. At one point, it almost went to the Armed Services Committee. (The bill finally remained with Foreign Relations, was approved, and signed into law.)

The Communications Satellite Act bounced from committee to committee before it was finally processed and sent to the floor last year. At one time or another, this bill involved the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, the Government Operations Committee, the Space and Astronautics Committee, and, of course, the Appropriations Committee.

Is a more up-to-date committee lineup, responsive to modern problems and modern opportunities, needed? I believe it is, and that a thorough review of the present committee and subcommittee lineups and jurisdictions is necessary.

That review would be one of the prime responsibilities of a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which would be established by a resolution sponsored by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and 31 other Senators representing both parties. A companion measure in the House agrees that this committee of seven Senators and seven Representatives should conduct a complete review, the first since 1946, of Congress and produce recommendations for its improvement.

I expect this Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to be established. Its work will be one of the most significant efforts of the 88th Congress. And its task will be difficult, because there is little popular interest or direct political advantage in the tedious effort for procedural reform within Congress.

But the American people want good government, and sense that the legislative branch has not been performing its functions with the order and effectiveness the Nation deserves. The waning weeks of the 87th Congress included fights over such petty issues as what room the Appropriations Conference Committee should meet in, and long delays over minor details of legislation.

Displays of bickering and pettiness tend to obscure the real record of achievement written by recent Congresses and to diminish the respect and confidence of the people in their own representative government. Perhaps the greatest need in Congress today is not so much for studies, procedural changes, and committee modernization. It may rather be a more thoroughly responsive attitude by Members of Congress, who need to realize that the rules and traditions of Capitol Hill are not sacred, and that the national interest and public service are more important than individual or committee powers and prerogatives.

Chairman Evins Addresses Independent Dairies—Urges Support for President's Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and today the Nation's Capital has as its guests the members of an outstanding small business organization, the National Independent Dairies Association.

This group is holding its sixth annual convention here in Washington, and at a luncheon yesterday, its members were privileged to hear an address by the chairman of the House Small Business Committee, our distinguished colleague, Representative Joe L. Evins, of Tennessee.

During the course of his remarks, Chairman Evins detailed some of the important advantages to be gained by small business if the President's tax proposals can be adopted. He urged the members of the National Independent Dairies Association, as well as all other independent small businessmen, to support these proposals.

Chairman Evins described the President's tax proposals as one of the greatest single actions that can be taken at this time to provide immediate assistance to small business.

I am sure that the statement of Chairman Evins will be of interest to all of the Members of the House, and I am, therefore, asking that it be reproduced in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOE L. EVINS, DEMOCRAT, OF TENNESSEE, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE NATIONAL INDEPENDENT DAIRIES ASSOCIATION, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, APRIL 8, 1963

I

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Independent Dairies Association, and friends, certainly I am pleased and delighted at the opportunity to meet with you today.

I appreciate the kind remarks of my good friend, Lynn Paulson. They are flattering, but I assure you undeserved.

Let me return the compliment by paying a tribute not only to Lynn but also to our friends here in the audience who are members of this great organization.

II. COMPLIMENTS COUNSEL AND ASSOCIATION

I want to tell you that your general counsel, Lynn Paulson, is one of the most dynamic and effective trade association representatives in Washington. His contacts with Members of Congress are effective. He gets the job done and he is always doing a good job in your behalf. He is an oldtimer around these parts—and I might add with a New Frontiersman's outlook.

The members of your association have achieved virtual perfection, as you provide a grateful citizenry with the cleanest, most nutritious, and most wholesome product to be found anywhere in the world, milk.

You are engaged in a business where the profits are too low and the risks too high.

You are in a business where you must meet the competitive power of some of the largest economic giants in the entire United States.

We all appreciate the importance of small business to our economy and I believe our small independent dairies represent one of the finest segments of all small business enterprises. You are doubly important.

You are not only a group of small businessmen who have fought courageously and relentlessly to keep your industry from becoming monopolized by a few big companies but you are also the purveyors of a commodity that is literally vital to our people.

On one thing all persons agree, That of all foods known there is none more important to the health of the individual than milk.

It is the sustaining food of infants, growing children, youths, young men, full-grown adults, and the aged.

The products of your industry nourish not only the sick and disabled but also the toughest and healthiest and huskiest of athletes. I don't exactly know into which one of these categories I belong; but, one thing I do know, we at our house buy our milk only from the small independent dairies.

I am sure that there must be a high degree of satisfaction to the people in your industry to know and to realize that you are engaged in such a beneficial type of enterprise, and that your contribution to the welfare of your community is immense. It is indeed unmatched by nearly any other type of commercial activity.

So, you have these rewards. On the other hand, we know that the members of your industry also have your problems.

Barriers and obstacles have been placed all too frequently along the competitive trail which you must travel.

I refer particularly to the character of the competitive forces and practices with which you have been compelled to compete and to contend—price discriminations, boycotts, loss-leader sales, corporate mergers, conspiracies, and other forms of unfair competition.

Abe Fortas, a well-known antitrust attorney, tells the story about a small independent dairyman fighting a giant in your industry in an FTC proceeding involving the Robinson-Patman Act. A small dairyman was being cross-examined. This independent testified that the respondent had not made available to him advertising allowances which were offered to his large competitors. The attorney asked the dairyman, "And have you suffered as a result?" With a sad look on his face, the little dairyman summed up the situation in these words, "Mr. Lawyer, how would I know? I suffer so much."

Lynn Paulson has acquainted me and the members of our Small Business Committee, from time to time, with the problems and sufferings of your industry and he has indicated that they have been plentiful.

I believe the worst of the storm, however, is over and that you can now look forward to a less turbulent era of competitive coexistence.

III. ANTITRUST LAWS—AGENCIES FOLLOW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) Subcommittee established

As you gentlemen well know, the House Small Business Committee, during prior sessions of Congress, established a special subcommittee concerned exclusively with the problems of the dairy industry.

The committee investigations and hearings were conducted in Washington and throughout the country in the interest of fair competition and of maintaining the competitive position of members of the Independent Dairies Association.

The chairman of this subcommittee was our distinguished colleague, Congressman Tom Steed of Oklahoma. We of our committee feel that as a result of his work we have helped to bring about a better climate and helpful developments for your industry.

(b) FTC actions

The Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice are following through on the recommendations of our committee. For instance, following the Small Business Committee hearings in Dallas in 1957, formal complaints were issued by the Federal Trade Commission against two giant members dominant in the dairy industry.

About 1 month after the committee hearings in Denver in 1959, the Commission issued a formal complaint against one of the dominant members of the industry doing business in that area.

The company allegedly was competing unfairly by discriminating in price.

(c) Supreme Court action

Less than 2 months ago the Supreme Court made it clear that the sale of milk below cost by a national dairy chain when made with the intent to injure competition, was illegal and in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

This recent and far-reaching decision, incidentally has breathed new life into this particular statute, and it portends other and further vigorous action to preserve our free enterprise system and promote competition, by the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice.

(d) Loss-leader selling

Another matter of concern to your industry and your association is loss-leader selling. I have in mind the practice of using milk as a loss leader.

I believe this is one type of merchandising that we could do without.

It is harmful to small business. The Supreme Court has told us that it is deceptive to consumers, commenting that "it plays on the gullibility of customers by leading them to expect what generally is not true; namely, that a store which offers such an amazing bargain is full of other such bargains."

As you know, the Robinson-Patman Act prohibits the sale of goods at unreasonably low prices or below cost when it is done with the intent to injure a competitor. This is a criminal statute which the Supreme Court just recently told us is entirely constitutional and enforcible. The Antitrust Division, therefore, as a result of this decision, is now in a position to deal more effectively with the loss leader problem than previously.

The Supreme Court's decision seems to point the way for more relief for your industry in the future from the very harmful practice of loss leader selling.

The Department of Justice has recently announced that a grand jury had indicted a large chain grocery store and a large dairy organization for conspiring in a price-fixing agreement in violation of the antitrust laws.

I want to add that the evidence in these cases was first developed during the course of hearings by the House Small Business Committee. So we feel our committee has been most helpful.

I know you gentlemen are aware also of the recent decisions of the Federal Trade Commission against one of your giant dairy competitors requiring this company to divest itself of some of the smaller dairies it had acquired.

In addition, this company was told that it may not purchase or acquire any other dairy within the next 10 years.

A similar order against another chain dairy organization was also entered several months ago and a number of similar cases, I am advised, are presently pending before the Commission.

All of these actions, I believe, indicate a renewed vigor to enforce the antitrust laws, prevent unfair competition, with which your companies have been faced in the past, and they portend a climate of fair competition and better opportunity for the future.

(*e*) *Committee action*

The day-by-day work of the House Small Business Committee serves to promote this climate of fair competition for our small and independent business establishments and to preserve our free enterprise system and the balance of opportunity for all in our country.

(*f*) *Merger cases*

It is difficult to talk about any aspect of our antitrust laws without thinking of the high degree of concentration and mergers existing in our economy.

One aspect of the corporate merger problem reminds us that normally one of the fruits of owning your own business is the realization and perhaps the hope that after you have operated your business for 25 or 30 years and you are ready to retire, that you could sell your business and receive in one big lump sum sufficient money to insure a comfortable means of living for you and your family during your retirement period.

There is this law, however, section 7 of the Clayton Act, that tends to deprive an independent businessman of this privilege of selling his business just to anyone he might choose.

This law says, in effect, that a company may not buy your business if a lessening of competition is apt to result.

Generally this means that you cannot sell your business to any of the large chain dairy organizations.

I would like to suggest, therefore, if you are entertaining the idea of selling your business, that you look to another small business concern as a prospective buyer.

Present indications are that the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice are not going to permit giant members of your industry to increase their capacity by purchasing independent dairies and thereby lessening competition.

(*g*) *Failing company doctrine*

Occasionally you hear talk about the so-called failing company doctrine, wherein a big corporation is permitted to buy another concern provided the company is in a failing or bankrupt condition.

Now I feel that I must warn you that this apparent exception in the antimerger statute is a bit deceptive.

This doctrine was applied once in a case by the Supreme Court, but this was more than 30 years ago.

During the years that have elapsed since that decision, the problem of corporate acquisition and mergers has become acute. Conditions have changed.

Two months ago the Federal Trade Commission in a report told us that corporate mergers increased in 1962 over 1961.

This fact, coupled with the present climate, indicates that in the future greater effort will be made to enforce these laws and the courts urged to interpret them more strictly.

I wanted to supplement the advice and counsel given to you by your own able General Counsel, Lynn Paulson, by expressing the belief that the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice may well interpret, in the future, this so-called failing company doctrine very conservatively and very strictly, with the result that the dominant members in the dairy industry are not going to be permitted to buy up small dairy companies unless they are hopelessly insolvent and determined efforts have been made to find other buyers.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAM OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

And now may I turn to another matter.

Earlier this year when I announced the designation of subcommittees and outlined the program of work and activities of the House Small Business Committee for the 88th Congress, I made a statement that it was my plan initially to designate only four subcommittees—in addition to the work of the full committee—I made further announcement that, from time to time, as particular problems arose and developed, that I would consider the designation of an additional subcommittee on special small business problems to hold hearings and look into matters singular to particular industries as they might develop.

This continues to be my plan for the work of our committee.

The four subcommittees which I have announced to date include: No. 1, Foundations: Their Impact on Small Business—Representative **WRIGHT PATMAN**, Democrat, of Texas, chairman.

This subcommittee will continue to be concerned with the growth of tax-exempt foundations and whether or not these foundations, operating under a charter of Congress, are being used for and serving a charitable purpose or whether such foundations are being used as a device, scheme, or gimmick to avoid taxes and to compete unfairly against small business.

The members of the subcommittee are: Representative **WRIGHT PATMAN**, Democrat, of Texas, chairman; Representative **JOE L. EVINS**, Democrat, of Tennessee; Representative **WILLIAM H. AVERY**, Republican, of Kansas; Representative **JAMES ROOSEVELT**, Democrat, of California; and Representative **RALPH HARVEY**, Republican, of Indiana.

No. 2, Small Business and Government Procurement—Representative **ABRAHAM J. MULTER**, Democrat, of New York, chairman.

With the tremendous amount of Federal procurement, both military and civilian, it is vitally essential that small business receive a just and fair and equitable portion of Government contracts and subcontracts. This subcommittee will be concerned with endeavoring to increase the numbers of contracts and the dollar amounts of contract awards of not only defense contracts and civilian procurement but also an increasing amount of awards in the field of research and development.

During the fiscal year of 1962, research and development awards granted to small business by the Department of Defense increased from 2.9 percent for the preceding year to 3.5 percent. However, during the first 6 months of the present fiscal year—that is, from July through December 1962—this percentage declined to 2.7. We hope this declining trend can be reversed.

Since many of these research and development awards lead to the discovery of new processes, new products, many of which become patented, it is especially important that small business be permitted to share fully in this activity.

The members of the subcommittee are: Representative **ABRAHAM J. MULTER**, Democrat, of New York, chairman; Representative **TOM STEED**, Democrat, of Oklahoma; Representative **H. ALLEN SMITH**, Republican, of California; Representative **JAMES ROOSEVELT**, Democrat, of California; and Representative **HOWARD W. ROBISON**, Republican, of New York.

No. 3, Taxation—Representative **TOM STEED**, Democrat, of Oklahoma, chairman.

This subcommittee will be concerned with helping to write tax legislation and to develop tax policy favorable to small business. President Kennedy has recommended substantial changes in our tax laws. Many of the President's proposals are designed specifically to assist small business.

It is evident that if the President's proposals are enacted into law, American small business will be the principal benefactors.

For instance, corporate income tax rates for small business concerns will drop from 30 to 22 percent, effective January 1.

If your company is not incorporated you could still profit because individual income tax rates would be reduced under the President's proposed legislation now pending in the Congress from 20 percent down to 14 percent.

Should a small independent company earn unusually high profits in any one year, the tax on these higher profits could be paid as if they were earned over a 5-year period.

The new bill proposes that tax treatment of capital gains be altered in such a manner as to benefit especially small business taxpayers.

I believe the President's tax proposal for small business constituted one of the greatest single actions that can be taken to assist small business immediately, and I believe that you gentlemen will want to work with and cooperate with Congressman **STEED**, the chairman of this subcommittee, as you did in the past on the milk hearings and milk investigations affecting your industry.

The members of the subcommittee are: Representative **TOM STEED**, Democrat of Oklahoma, chairman; Representative **ABRAHAM J. MULTER**, Democrat of New York; Representative **ARCH A. MOORE, Jr.**, Republican of West Virginia; Representative **JOHN DINGELL**, Democrat of Michigan; and Representative **HOWARD W. ROBISON**, Republican of New York.

No. 4, Distribution Problems Affecting Small Business—Representative **JAMES ROOSEVELT**, Democrat, of California, chairman.

This subcommittee will be concerned with marketing and distribution problems and particularly the difficult problem concerning dual distribution whereby a manufacturer sells direct to its own outlets and also to competing independent merchants.

Representative **ROOSEVELT** and his subcommittee plan to hold a series of hearings, beginning the latter part of this month, covering dual distribution practices in several different industries, such as petroleum, steel, glass, paint, shoes, and perhaps some others as well.

I noticed in your own industry bulletin, following the announcement of our subcommittees and scheduled program, Lynn Paulson advised you that our House Small Business Committee had not for the 88th Congress designated a subcommittee dealing with the problems in the dairy industry.

I have mentioned earlier that it was my feeling that much had been accomplished in this area in previous sessions and that the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice are following the recommendations and reports of our committee for action in behalf of your industry.

I also stated, and I am happy to repeat, that I shall be pleased to give consideration to the naming and designation of a special subcommittee for any new or particular problems that may arise in your industry, the dairy industry, should we feel that the facts and circumstances warrant such action.

The members of the subcommittee are: Representative **JAMES ROOSEVELT**, Democrat, of California, chairman; Representative **TOM STEED**, Democrat, of Oklahoma; Representative **ARCH A. MOORE, Jr.**, Republican, of West Virginia; Representative **JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI**, Democrat, of Illinois; and Representative **WILLIAM H. AVERY**, Republican, of Kansas.

V. IMPORTANCE OF SMALL BUSINESS—CONCLUSION

In creating the House Select Committee on Small Business in 1941 at the outbreak of

World War II, during the 77th Congress, the Congress made clear its determination to keep itself informed as to whether or not the needs of small business receive adequate consideration.

In passing the Small Business Act of 1958, the Congress demonstrated its continuing interest in small business. In that law the Congress proclaimed:

"It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government (including but not limited to contracts for maintenance, repair, and construction) be placed with small business enterprises, to insure that a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property be made to such enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation."

This is the declared policy of our country.

Today, 95 percent of all American business enterprises are small business.

Some of these small businesses grow into industrial giants.

Some are family, one-man firms. They live for awhile and fade or leave the scene of commercial activity.

Still others operate at about the same level of activity over a number of years, even generations.

Collectively, these small independent businesses constitute a broad-based economy unparalleled in the world.

They provide stability.

They bring new vigor, new ideas to our entire economy.

Because I feel so strongly that small business is vital to the strength and future of our country, I was highly honored by the action of the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Speaker McCormack, when at the opening of the 88th Congress, he asked that I serve as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business.

After sober contemplation of the responsibilities entailed, which would be in addition to my already considerable duties as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I consented to fill the post.

This committee over the years has served to preserve our free competitive enterprise system and to help small business not only to exist but to succeed, this during a period of war when small business was mobilized to make a significant contribution to the war effort.

Since that time, the committee has been reestablished by each succeeding Congress.

During the intervening 2 years, the committee has on many occasions proven to be a powerful force on behalf of the American small business community.

During the 88th Congress and for whatever time I may be privileged to serve as chairman of this committee, it is my hope that we may continue this tradition of aiding small business while also adding new responses to the constantly evolving problems confronting our Nation's small enterprises.

Small business does not exist in a vacuum.

Like other segments of our society it is subject to the forces of which it is a part.

Because our committee works hard to assist small business in matters of financing, securing Government contracts, prevention of absorption of small business by corporate consolidation and mergers, and the promotion of tax and trade policies favorable to small business, we have infrequently been charged by critics who regard these programs as coddling or favoring small business.

They have asked why should the Congress—the supreme legislative body of our Nation, sworn to act in the entire public interest rather than for any particular industry or group—act to help the small businessman.

The answer is because it is impossible to help any segment of our economy without helping all of it.

A thriving small business community contributes to the prosperity of our total national economy.

Equality of opportunity must be present everywhere or soon it will be present nowhere.

Furthermore, there is an even more basic reason for this consideration.

Small independent business of this Nation has a very special function to fulfill.

Small business is creative, dynamic, and flexible. These are the qualities that cause and encourage our economy to thrive and to prosper.

Small businessmen have helped to make our free enterprise system and to help make America great.

We want to preserve and to perpetuate this system and conditions that have made America great.

One of the bywords of this Republic from its earliest days has been e pluribus unum, from many—one, one composite Nation—stronger because it is composed of many diverse parts.

This then is the greatest strength of our country—that we have room for all.

Just as we need the output of our industrial giants, so we must preserve the diversity, the adaptability, the vitality and the creativity of our smaller, independent businesses.

All of us, working together, in a free America, with opportunities open to all, are an unbeatable team in war or peace.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Galatians 2: 20: *The life which I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, may we contemplate the meaning of this Holy Week with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

Grant that we may daily have within our souls the glorious feeling that by commemorating and observing the Lenten service we have been spirtually enriched.

We rejoice that by the cross and resurrection of our Lord, Thou hast sealed and certified unto us the truth of Thy eternal love for all mankind.

On Easter Sunday may we share in the resurrection of the risen Christ by rising with Him in newness of life to build that blessed highway which humanity shall walk together in His spirit of love.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4423. An act permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4. An act to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes;

S. 18. An act to change the name of Harpers Ferry National Monument to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park;

S. 138. An act to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 932. An act relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police.

SILENT SPRING

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that is of the utmost importance. It is also timely in that this legislation, immediately enacted, will help stem the time of another "silent spring." My distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] and others have already called attention to the great problems that confront us through the continued and unwise use of chemical pesticides. Many of my distinguished colleagues have warned about this in the past, and many of us in this House have been concerned with this problem for a long time. We were happy when Miss Rachel Carson received a national audience with her bestselling book, "Silent Spring," which warned of the uncontrolled use of chemical pesticides and said that synthetic chemicals could upset the balance of nature and endanger man's existence.

This legislation, in the form of two bills, will help to insure the maintenance of the critical balance between the life-giving products and the life-destroying byproducts caused by the misuse of insecticides.

In regards to the first bill, I think that it is essential that before any Federal Government program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls there should be advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies. This is the Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act, and would be a vastly important improvement over present standards.

The other bill would amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides.

I would seriously hope that these bills be examined by this Congress in this session. This 88th Congress could perform a great service to the Nation by quickly and sensibly putting these excellent and necessary bills in the form of public laws.

Thank you.

DISTURBING NEW EVIDENCE ON CIA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, additional reasons why CIA was unable to produce photographs of the Russian military buildup in Cuba last autumn were revealed by Secretary McNamara and Pentagon intelligence chiefs in testimony released by the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

According to testimony, CIA had been photographing the wrong end of the island—the eastern end—despite reliable intelligence reports that the buildup was at the western end.

Earlier, poor weather conditions were blamed for CIA failures. However, as I stated on February 28, weather conditions under which CIA had operated were generally as cloudy and difficult as those which the Air Force encountered the morning of October 14 when its first flight obtained conclusive photographs of Soviet offensive strength in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, this disturbing new evidence renews the valid questioning of CIA which has been going on for some time now. It makes close, constant congressional review of this Agency through a joint House-Senate watchdog committee such as I have proposed even more imperative.

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 1, strike out ", Incorporated".

Page 3, line 18, strike out "and".

Page 3, line 18, after "health" insert ": and the furtherance of international good will".

Page 4, strike out lines 9 to 22, inclusive, and insert:

"(5) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual, and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of the law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;".

Page 10, line 11, strike out "Foundation, Incorporated"," and insert "Foundation",".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee explain the nature of these amendments and their effect upon the bill as it has already passed?

Mr. CELLER. The amendments in general are technical except one; namely, adding to the purpose of the incorporation the expansion of international good will.

Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from Senator KEATING, the distinguished junior Senator from the State of New York, this morning. He is a member of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations of the Judiciary Committee. He said he inserted, or, rather, his committee inserted that provision because he felt that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in her lifetime spent a great deal of time in an endeavor to establish international good will. He also said that statement was self-explanatory.

I would say that the purpose would be to improve the image that Europeans have of the American abroad. I think that image was greatly distorted, and one of the purposes of this, of course, would be to improve that image. I will say also that I do not think we need have any fear on this score.

Mr. Speaker, in all probability I will be a member of the board of directors of this organization. I do not think I would breach any confidence when I say that. There is a provision in the charter to the effect that we have the right to make, alter, or amend the charter itself. We have the right of visitation and the right to examine programs and so forth. If anything is done of an untoward nature under that clause with reference to the spread of international good will, I certainly would know about it and report back to the committee and we would have the right to alter, amend, or change the Federal charter.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything about which to be concerned by the addition of that language.

Mr. MATHIAS. Would the gentleman say that the purpose and intent of this amendment would be to permit acts of international good will of a private, eleemosynary rather than political nature?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. As was explained before the gentleman's subcommittee this morning, some of the moneys to be raised would be used for scholarships abroad. In other words, foreigners would come to this country, and vice versa, again in the interest of international good will.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just say in furtherance of what the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has just said, that to be very specific about it there is now in operation an international fellowship program for cancer research which would be supported by this Foundation. It was thought that without some language as proposed on the Senate side, the support of that program might not be justified. Further than that, I have conferred with the members of the committee and they assure me that this, plus such other things as carrying on the interest that my mother had in children throughout the world, would be the type of thing and only this type of thing which would be considered.

Mr. Speaker, may I simply add to what the chairman of the full committee has said. I am not so sure that I will always be returned to Congress, but the chairman, of course, is assured of reelection, nevertheless if I am there—and I hope to be there—I too would certainly resent and I would come back to the House if I were a Member of this group and ask action on the part of the House to prevent anything else in the construction of that language.

Mr. MATHIAS. May I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] about the other amendment of the Senate? It affects or strikes out language which the gentleman from California himself suggested.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman will yield further, my understanding is—and I am subject to correction by the lawyers—that this was inserted by the Senate because they did not want a terminal date to become a precedent in Federal charters. However, in the Senate report there is language which merely indicates that it is the understanding that a one-time effort shall be made for fundraising, and that no fundraising shall continue after November 1, 1965, which would be the anniversary of my mother's death.

I would like to reiterate, and I hope that it would be the understanding of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] and everybody in this House, that they concur in the language of the Senate report. I would also ask the help of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to see to it that this language was lived up to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] who handled this bill in the Committee on the Judiciary—that is true; is it not?

Mr. FORRESTER. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman if, when the bill was before the House under unanimous consent, the bill having been rewritten by his subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, there was any such language as this in it when it passed the House; and if it was not the understanding that this bill would not be amended to put in language of this kind?

Mr. FORRESTER. I will say this; it was certainly the understanding that there would be nothing added to this legislation which would in anywise complement the particular language which was cut out by the subcommittee and the full committee and brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will say that this bill would not have gone through the House by unanimous consent if this language had been in it and I object to the passage of it today.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his right to object to permit me to say something?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation was amended in the Senate in only three particulars, two of them being virtually technical. One of them struck out the provision which was inserted at the instance of the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] which put a stop date on solicitation of funds. The Senate saw fit to take that out. The best answer I can give to that is that it was taken out on account of the fact that they did not want to establish a precedent. Very frankly, I did not see much merit to that argument, but they did incorporate in their report on the other side that they hoped that the solicitations would cease sometime in the year 1965. That is a part of the Senate report. So far as that is concerned I do not think we have too much to worry on that.

The gentleman had some apprehension and I knew he had some apprehension concerning the granting of any power from the international standpoint that would bear the impress or the implied approval of the Congress of the United States and thereby perhaps create some embarrassing situation sometime or other as to whether this was the act of a private corporation or the act of the Government or whether it was done with the permission or with the implied consent of the Government.

I might say here and now that in the hearing we had this morning it was understood and is now understood by the various members of the committee that the language promoting international good will is not to be construed as to permit any involvement in politics or political questions, or even of any political objects which might, because of this phrase, cause embarrassment to the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me interrupt the gentleman to point out that there is no such restrictive language in the bill. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I think we must construe the words "international good will" within the context of the purposes of the Federal Charter. For the purpose of this charter, the phrase must be construed in connection with the obvious purposes of the foundation. We have been assured by the representatives of the foundation that the activities of the foundation will be entirely in furtherance of charitable and educational purposes. The kind of thing that I believe the foundation has in mind is the granting of scholarships and educational and charitable assistance, for example, to underprivileged children.

Mr. GROSS. If they meant some of these things, why were they not put into the bill, if they were going to restrict it, and confine it?

Mr. CELLER. You do not put all those details in a bill. This very debate will be a check and a limitation on anything the directors might do. But I repeat, we have a right to alter and amend, and we have the power of visitation, under the terms of the bill. We have actual control over the situation. I do not think the gentleman need have any fear.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman is reserving the right to object.

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to understand the parliamentary situation. The gentleman from Iowa has objected on two occasions. The Chair has construed the continuance of the colloquy to mean that the gentleman reserves the right to object.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. We have a lot of work to do today. I did not know this was going to take this long.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I object.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 18]

Brademas
Bray
Burton
Corbett
Daddario
Diggs
Farbstein
Fino
Fuqua
Gallagher
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Harris
Healey
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
Lesinski
Mailliard
Powell
Shelley
Sikes
Walter

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 412 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 5517, with Mr. Bolling in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday all time for general debate on the bill had expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVILIAN INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, of advancing civilian industrial technology, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 4, strike out lines 13 through 19.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would cut out the $500,000 appropriation in this bill for civilian industrial technology.

I should like to quote from the hearings with respect to this item, which ought to have been properly considered and brought to the floor in the regular appropriation:

> Mr. Thomas. One would come to the conclusion from what you say that what has been going on in the last 10 or 15 years has been to the embarrassment and chagrin of private industry and it has been caused by Government, and that is not an accurate picture. You do not want Government to go to private industry and tell them to hire x scientists?
>
> Mr. Hollomon. Absolutely not.
>
> Mr. Thomas. That follows from your statement.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We do not want Government in business—

Said Mr. Thomas—

> and here you are doing just that.

Mr. Thomas goes on to point out that the employees of this outfit have an average grade level of 11.5, in other words, they are paid well above the average.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], a member of the Deficiencies Subcommittee, said yesterday on the floor:

> Where is the urgency in starting this program under a supplemental appropriation? Is this the time or the place to lay the foundation for a highly controversial program which may grow into another gigantic Government research effort?
>
> None of the 110 national trade and professional associations in the construction industry were consulted by the Department of Commerce before formulation of its proposed program.

He said further:

> The proposed program threatens to tamper with the delicate free enterprise mechanism of America's largest domestic fabrication industry.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is neither the time nor the place to appropriate half a million dollars for the furtherance of this organization. Let it come in the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman from Iowa realize that this money is for research in the textile industry, which is very sick at the present time?

Mr. GROSS. It does not make any difference whether it is for the textile industry, agriculture, or any other industry.

Mr. ROONEY. No, it is not for agriculture. And, as far as I am concerned, it is not for research in the building construction industry.

Mr. GROSS. I am saying this is neither the time nor the place, for this appropriation as the gentleman from Ohio has well stated, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] seriously questioned it. I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my able and genial friend, the gentleman from Iowa recited the record just exactly right. I did ask those questions: I wanted to know and our committee wanted to know. The amount of money involved here is not $500 million but $1,250,000. We cut the request about 60 percent. This money is needed to do some research in first, textiles and, second, the building industry. Do you know what the biggest industry in the United States is? It is the construction industry.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Surely, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BOW. Since we only have 3 minutes, may I say I reserved on this item in the committee. I opposed it and I spoke against it yesterday. May I point out to the gentleman that there is not a single person in the building industry who has requested this fund. In fact, the building industry and all segments of it are against it. I would support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. THOMAS. May I quote a classical argument by Dr. Detlev W. Bronk who is past president of the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council. He said the best money that industry can spend is for research. This is merely supporting and holding the hands of industry—it is not telling industry what to do. He gave this classical example. He said—compare the transportation industry, the railroads, with the communication industry, like A.T. & T. He said, for the last 30 or 40 years the railroads have spent virtually nothing on research. And where are they today? They are in trouble. Compare that with the A.T. & T. which is certainly one of the blue ribbon industries of America. He pointed out that in the last 30 or 40 years they have spent hundreds of millions of dollars for research. This money is badly needed, gentlemen, and I hope the House will support the committee. We only gave them seven jobs. Let us vote down this amendment. This money is for the general good of the Nation and of the industry of the Nation.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Do I understand the gentleman is suggesting the recommendation of $500,000 of Federal money for research by the Federal Government as contrasted to money being spent by and in private industry?

Mr. THOMAS. No, this is to set up an organization to assist and advise industry. If industry does not want this help, it does not take it. This does not call for the spending of a nickel for research by the department itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there were—ayes 94, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Emergency Planning

Salaries and Expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $240,000.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the proper place where the authorization requested by the Bureau of the Budget and the President for $61 million in supplemental funds for civil defense would appear if it did appear. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will bear with me a minute, I would like to ask him this question. I refer to page 4 of the report, the last line of the civil defense section:

> The committee suggests that the provisions now in hand or on order are adequate for the time being and until more experience is obtained with this program.

I would like to direct this question to the gentleman: As I understand, there is a stock on hand of these very meager and austere rations which amounts to about $3.38 a person which are as yet undistributed. Is that true?

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will pardon me, will he repeat his question?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. My understanding is that under prior purchase there is at this time an inventory of concentrated foods and radiation equipment and other items which would go into shelters and is now in inventory for distribution. Is it the thought of the committee, and I refer again to the language you use:

> There is on hand or in storage provisions adequate for the time being.

I take it that if these supplies are distributed and if there be need for the stocking of the remaining spaces which have been surveyed, is it the intention of the committee to furnish money in the future for the filling of these other shelters? Or are we just going to break off at this point?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my genial friend from California that as the matter stands today they have about $111 million; $40 million or $45 million in provisions is in warehouses ready to be distributed. Perhaps some $30 million or $40 million has been distributed, and the remainder is being put in the pipeline as fast as it can be done.

There is no objection to that. Does that answer the question?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That was my understanding.

My question goes to the point, Will funds for further stocking of the shelters be furnished after the present stock is exhausted?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the gentleman and the committee, I think I am safe in saying it was unanimous. If I am wrong, I hope the members of the committee will correct me. There are not enough funds to complete stocking of all the shelters that have been marked. We took the position that they should spend the $111 million. It is already there, and there is no effort to take that money from them. So what happens? Here is what bothered the committee, and I hope it will bother the gentleman. After all, the Government has no strings on this equipment—crackers, water jugs, and other things. It has no authority to go into this building and put a guard there. They do not have the money to do that. On the other hand, you cannot ask the building owner who is giving the space in the building for nothing to spend the money to guard this stuff. I do not think there is anyone in OCD who would question that. It is only a matter of a few weeks or a few months that the material may deteriorate. We have a lot of souvenir hunters in this country. We just took the position to look, wait, and see what happens for awhile.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue just a bit this civil defense item that the chairman of the subcommittee has been explaining.

I was hopeful that since the Congress had approved the program the committee would see continued good in it.

As I understand it, many of the buildings—are furnished free. I would be hopeful, if the Senate sees fit to add this item, that in conference the committee might give favorable consideration to continuation of this appropriation .

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the gentleman from Florida we will give careful, prayerful consideration.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That gives me great assurance, and I am satisfied with the answer that you will give it prayerful consideration.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think that is probably the strongest endorsement we have had yet from the gentleman from Texas. I am glad to know he is going to take it to somebody above and pray.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was shut off and was not given additional time.

I would like to pursue this for just a moment and refer for a moment to the last response of the gentleman from Texas.

It is true these supplies, once they are put in the shelters, are not under Federal control. But this program envisages a partnership in the operation between local city, counties, and the States, and the Civil Defense organization. This is a partnership by the municipalities and other political subdivisions. These buildings are relinquished for this purpose under contract with the Office of Civilian Defense. Therefore, I believe if we are going to have a partnership program in the United States and not put all the expense on the Federal Government, this is a chance for us to show the partnership and to let the local people do that. They can do it, I am sure. There could be some pilferage in this program. There is some from the storage warehouses of grain in our surplus commodity situation. But there are people who are interested in this subject on the local level. There are some 5,000 county and State and city organizations that are participating on a partnership basis, and I am sure they will protect these vital commodities for their people.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, the availability of nuclear weapons to an enemy power interposes a continuing threat to our national security. There has already been a Cuban crisis. There will be other Cubas. The proliferation of nuclear weapons imposes an increase in this threat. One of the keystones of an effective defense system on our homefront is the development of a system of shelters equipped and stocked to protect our people from the fallout effects of a nuclear attack. Since August 1961 this has been an important part of our defense thinking. The first and most important step in this program has been to take an inventory of existing radiation shielding throughout our Nation so that we will know what we now have and what we should provide for.

The national fallout shelter survey was initiated in December 1961. Stocking of identified shelter spaces meeting minimum Federal criteria for fallout protection is now going on.

Some concept of the magnitude of the program is gained when we consider that it involved the work of over 10,000 employees of private architect and engineering firms, the efforts of 5,000 county and municipal governments, the cooperation of over 100,000 building owners, the services of over 2,600 manufacturers and shippers, and the use of 81 Federal warehouses for the stocking of shelter supplies. The survey reached into every town and hamlet. As originally projected the expected gross yield of the survey was 50 million shelter spaces; however, the survey identified shelter space for 104 million Americans—more than double the amount of space which was anticipated. It is estimated about 70 percent of these can be brought into use as working shelter systems.

Ninety-three million dollars was originally allocated for the purposes of this survey. Through the adoption of sound and modern business procedures and engineering techniques the actual cost of the survey was reduced to less than $68 million. The balance of the money originally provided for survey work was applied to the procurement, warehousing, and transportation of shelter stocks and provisions for approximately 47 million of these spaces.

The total cost of the program has been estimated at $238 million, of which the $68 million is the cost of survey and marking the shelters and $170 million, the cost of provisioning them. One hundred and seventy-six million dollars, or approximately 75 percent of the total cost of the program has been met out of fiscal year 1962 and fiscal year 1963 appropriations. The supplemental request for $61.9 million, which we are considering today, is to complete the initial effort and to maintain the data on a current basis.

Another purpose for which these funds are needed is to complete the marking of identified shelter space. A final purpose is to provision shelter space for an additional 23 million people at a cost of approximately $58.9 million. Current and previous year appropriations have provided provisioning needs for 47 million shelter spaces.

These funds are urgently needed now. If they are not forthcoming the continuity and efficiency of survey operations would be seriously impaired. Both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Yards and Docks which have the responsibility for supervising the survey contracts with private architect and engineering firms conducting the survey must know now if operations are to continue in order to plan for keeping their trained professional personnel for this purpose. Current producers and suppliers of shelter stocks must be able to continue production and if production lines are shut down because of the unavailability of funds, additional Government costs to resume production would be incurred which could otherwise be used to stock additional shelter spaces. If no supplemental funds are made available at this time, the joint effort of the Federal Government and hard-won volunteer local government and private building owner participation in this program would be brought to a premature and confusing halt. Public support would be undermined by our procrastination and indecision and the hard-won local participation in this joint undertaking would be seriously crippled. The net results would be the unavailability for use of many potential shelter spaces, creating shelter voids in areas where none need exist and resulting in an unnecessary risk which seems inexcusable to the public in any new national crisis.

In conclusion, I would like to remind you that this vital program has been conducted by responsible people. This is evidenced by their performances in the past 18 months. When one considers that the allocated $93 million easily could have been spent to accomplish only one-half of what has been accomplished, and that their competent management of the program has saved the Government $25 million which has been used for other purposes for which appropriations would have been necessary, I think they should be accorded some recognition for their spending of these public tax dollars in a prudent manner.

I regret terribly the action of the House deleting $3 million from the budget request of Civil Defense budgeted for a fallout shelter survey program.

It is my hope that when the Senate considers this legislation that it will restore, in full, all of the funds which we have deleted for this very necessary program. And I hope when this appropriation bill goes to Conference Committee, this House will reconsider its action and will agree to a restoration of the deleted funds. It would be a small sum to pay as a premium for low-cost insurance providing for the safety of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster relief

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND:

Page 7, after line 14 insert:

"PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

"For an additional amount for 'Public Works Acceleration', $450,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that has ever been rejected by the Senate or House of Representatives or by any Committee of the Congress: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that does not require a financial contribution from State or local sources except projects dealing with preservation of forests in the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior."

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to restore $450 million for the accelerated public works program. This is the amount that was recommended by the Subcommittee on Deficiencies but was stricken out by a very close vote in the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, the debate yesterday was rather full and complete. Ninety-nine percent of the 4 hours of general debate was taken up by a discussion of the accelerated public works program. It is obvious that words or arguments today will not change any votes, for the arguments on both sides are the same, and they have echoed and reechoed in this Chamber before.

Mr. Chairman, we climbed this hill in the last session of the Congress, and the program authorizing the acceleration of public works was passed by a vote of 221 to 192. And, support for the bill came from both sides of the aisle and from every section of the country.

The purpose of this program, Mr. Chairman, at that time and is now, to relieve the stress of unemployment in economically depressed areas and to build useful and needed and valuable public works throughout the length and breadth of our land and its territories. In the first phase of this program nearly 3,800 projects in over 900 areas of this country have been programed. Applications now on file with the agencies charged with the conduct of this program now total some 6,200, with a dollar value of $1.2 billion.

Mr. Chairman, there are considerable and marked opinions as to this program. It is the kind of a program and the kind of a proposal that sparks and ignites clear and unmistakable differences in political philosophy: Whether to spend more or less in the public sector and whether the Federal Government should assist local and State governments in areas and programs which they cannot handle themselves.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to read the RECORD of yesterday and to find the Members giving meaning to their attitudes on these issues; Members whose areas have been the hardest hit by unemployment; Members from Minnesota and Pennsylvania and Ohio and Michigan and Kentucky and Tennessee and West Virginia and a host of other States.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is a clash of political philosophy here. Many people, and I am one of them, believe that local governments need the strength and the support of the Federal Government. Think of it: No TVA's; no Hoover Dams; no fantastic reclamation projects like the Upper Colorado River; no stimulation of great national forests and recreation areas; no magnificent waterways to carry the wealth from the bowels of our good earth to the market places of the world; no flood control to protect the lives and the property of the people of these United States if the Federal Government were not to participate in these programs. This program, Mr. Chairman, is an extension of the spirit and the dedication that has gone into all of these programs. It is this, and it is more than that, Mr. Chairman, for it is the kind of a program that brings spirit and life and new meaning to people who do not have employment.

I hope we can once more make the stand here and support the President in providing the $450 million for the accelerated public works program which my amendment proposes to do.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, it was most encouraging to learn last week that the unemployment rate has dropped to 5.6 percent—the biggest monthly decline since 1958 when the rate fell from 6.8 to 6.1 percent. Of equal encouragement was the jump in employment of 800,000 for March, a period which normally sees a rise only of 200,000. Employment has reached a March record of 67.1 million, about 800,000 over this time last year. This means the labor force is presently absorbing its own natural growth.

But regardless of the encouragement offered by the latest employment figures, there are still communities and areas in this country that are badly in need of help—chronically depressed areas, which over a long period of time have suffered and still are suffering from substantial unemployment and underemployment.

The Area Redevelopment Act, enacted in 1961, is providing a workable program of alleviating distress and stimulating sustained economic growth. However, this program is designed to solve long-range economic problems, and is not designed primarily to provide the kind of immediate relief these areas require so desperately.

Last year we passed the public works acceleration program which is providing the vital short-term benefits necessary to accompany the long-term restoration of area redevelopment areas.

The Public Works Act of last year authorized $900 million for work on public works projects throughout the country. The $900 million authorized would create an estimated 110,000 man-years of work—the equivalent of employment for 1 year of 110,000 men; plus, of course, the several hundred thousand additional jobs generated by the increased purchasing power of those put back to work. In addition, other related jobs would be created in industries supplying the essential materials for work on the public works projects.

Last year $400 million of the $900 million authorized was actually appropriated. Every State and many congressional districts have already benefited from this original allocation despite severe winter weather that delayed many starts. Thus far, 3,756 projects have been approved. They are estimated to generate 52,000 man-years of on-site employment and are distributed among more than 900 of the 1,228 eligible areas. Work is presently underway on 1,300 of these projects and a total of 45,000 man-months has already been worked.

However, there still exists at this time a backlog of over 6,200 essential and urgent public works projects requiring an additional $1.2 billion in public works funds. There are now nearly 6,000 applications awaiting action.

The $500 million remaining from the original authorization, which has not been appropriated, would generate about 60,000 man-years of on-site employment, which with the 50,000 man-years generated by the $400 million allocated would bring total on-site jobs to 100,000. It is estimated that each man-year of on-site employment creates another man-year of off-site employment. If the total appropriation is approved it will provide employment for nearly 10 percent of the unemployed in those distressed areas eligible for public works projects.

In the State of Connecticut, we have 54 eligible projects, while in the Third Congressional District alone we have 6 eligible projects.

The pending applications involve the city of Meriden, Conn. The projects are as follows: $267,000 for sanitation projects; $353,000 for water systems; $400,000 for improvement of roads; $221,000 for sanitation; $205,000 for water systems; and $80,000 for parks and recreation.

All of these projects are badly needed and will be of great importance to Meriden and its economic future. Meriden's designation as a labor surplus area came in December of 1962 and the city's projects are awaiting the results of our action here today.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I believe that Federal expenditures should be cut wherever possible. I do not believe, however, that the accelerated public works program is the type of program which should be reduced. It is far too important to the economic vitality of our country.

On behalf of the people of Meriden, the State of Connecticut, and all other cities and States whose economic future depends so greatly on this program, I strongly urge restoration of the funds necessary to keep this vitally important and significantly effective program in operation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] desire to withdraw his point of order?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve the point of order until we study it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that this matter should be disposed of before we proceed further.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, the only option I have is to insist upon the point of order at this point. I would like to study the point, but if the Chair insists that I make the point of order now, I will.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that this is the proper parliamentary procedure.

Mr. LAIRD. I make the point of order against the amendment on the basis that you are legislating in an appropriation bill. This particular language which is added by this amendment is, in fact, legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state in what respect it is legislation?

Mr. LAIRD. The legislation is in the proviso as far as the matching formula is concerned, which is contrary to the basic law. The second proviso of the amendment does not follow the basic act which was passed in the last session of Congress and is, in fact, legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard?

Mr. THOMAS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this language is accurate and in order. The gentleman refers to the proviso "providing further that no part of this appropriation shall". It only deals with this appropriation. It is a limitation on the use of the fund and, therefore, I submit it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman has had an opportunity to examine the amendment and feels that the matter discussed is a limitation on the appropriation. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bolton] rise?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Oliver P. Bolton as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Boland:

On page 7, after line 14, insert the following:

"PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

"For an additional amount to carry out the Public Works Acceleration Act, $300,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1963. No part of this appropriation shall be available (1) for any grant-in-aid under such Act if application for such grant is made after the date of enactment of this Act, or (2) for any administrative expenses in connection with an application made after the date of enactment of this Act for assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio, yield, and I ask unanimous consent that this may not be taken out of his time.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Gladly.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully request of the Members that we agree on some limitation of time on this amendment and all amendments thereto? I ask our beloved senior Member on the other side, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], whether or not we can agree on some time limitation? We had high level debate yesterday. It was carefully done. We must have debated this issue for 3 or 3½ hours. May I suggest to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], that all debate on the Boland amendment and all amendments thereto close in, say, 20 minutes?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. May I suggest that all debate end at 1 o'clock?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Boland amendment and all amendments thereto end at 1 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, what is the rush about ramming this bill through this afternoon?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my distinguished friend that there is no rush; we debated this at least 3½ hours yesterday. We are not going to say anything today that we did not say yesterday. We are not going to change a vote. At least, that would be my guess. So let us get through with it.

Mr. GROSS. I am informed that there were 22 standing indicating they wanted to be heard.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I will sit down, for one, and that will make only 21 standing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I must object to this kind of limitation of debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Then please do not get mad at me if I move to limit the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Boland amendment and all amendments thereto close at 1 o'clock p.m.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Oliver P. Bolton] is recognized on his substitute.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the effect of my substitute would be to restore $300 million to carry out the Public Works Acceleration Act and primarily will place a limitation upon the expenditure of these funds which would prevent the administrator from accepting or processing any further applications. Thus the limitation in this substitute would be word to the world that the Congress wanted to put an end to this program.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts stated the issue correctly. This is an indication of a difference in political philosophy, but he erred, in my judgment, in what political philosophy. This is not a question of whether or not we want the Federal Government to assist those local communities which need assistance. This is not a question of whether or not we feel in our hearts that the Federal Government can be of help to those who are unemployed. This is rather a question of whether the House wants to take unto itself the delegated authority that we have under the Constitution, whether we wish to approve, and oversee those expenditures such as those we have under this accelerated public works bill delegated to the President.

We stated, as the gentleman from Ohio stated in the debate yesterday, when the $400 million was granted under the first appropriation, the Congress stated to the authorities that when they came back for the $500 million they must justify their expenditures. This they did not do in the normal course of events. And yet, Mr. Chairman, I find myself on the horns of this dilemma. I believe in this House. I believe in the responsibility for the taxpayers' dollars which we must exercise if we are going to live up to the oath which we took. And yet I know that in this great land of ours there are many areas that have been led to believe by this administration, and have counted on the fact that the money for their projects would be forthcoming. Whether we like it or not, we have been a party to letting this belief exist. Therefore, I have asked this House in this substitute to put back $300 million; yes, for those communities whose projects have already been cleared, for those communities where the need has been demonstrated. I can say to the House that in my own district I have checked those projects, I have followed them closely, and I can answer to this House for the worthwhileness of the projects which have been requested.

Therefore, I hope this House will give very serious consideration to this amendment, which would do two things: First, not cut off the expectations of the communities which the administration permitted to continue by taking in a billion or two of applications that they knew they could not fulfill, and second, to give word that this program will come to an end.

Already in the other body we have word that one of the Members there would authorize an additional billion dollars of public works participation by the executive, if you will, in the public works field. Already the pressure is building up with more and more and more applications that are coming in under this program. And what community would not when they can get 50, 60, or 70 percent of the money as contrasted to 25 or 30 percent?

Therefore, I say that this program has held up the local activity in my area waiting upon this bill. It has been held up for these appropriations. Why? Because they have been permitted to anticipate that this money would be provided under an executive jurisdiction and choice. If they had not been given this hope, their projects would have been considered and processed in the normal manner.

I hope very much the House will pass the language contained in my substitute so as to give notice that from now on programs, whether they be accelerated or not, must be justified and must come to the House in the normal course.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I was concerned about the second part of the gentleman's proviso. I can understand the reasoning on the cutoff of June 30, 1963, but does the gentleman also have a proviso that no application submitted after the passage of this act can be approved, so that communities which have been a little slow in getting their applications submitted and getting them processed will be completely cut out?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Yes. No money can be spent in processing further applications under my substitute. Otherwise there will be no end to applications which are attracted to this program because of the size of the Federal contributions. Without a cutoff, as provided in my substitute, it is my judgment that applications will build up to the point where this will become not a 1-year program, but an executive blank check program for public works at an ever higher level of Federal participation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I had the House Coordinator of Information phone the Budget Bureau on Friday of last week to ask this question: When the President submitted his budget to the Congress in January of this year he included in his budget statement an estimate that the deficit for the fiscal year 1963 would be $8.8 billion. The question I asked the Budget Bureau was, When this estimate was made, did the President include in the estimated expenditure in this fiscal year before June 30 this $500 million supplemental appropriation? The answer received from the Budget Bureau was that none of the $500 million estimated expenditure was to be spent in 1963 when the President estimated the budget deficit for this year was $8.8 billion.

If that is the case, there is no reason for this $500 million being put in this supplemental appropriation bill, because when supplemental requests are submitted it is expected that the funds are needed to be spent between now and the close of the present fiscal year.

Second, the figures as of March 31 showed employment in this country increased by 400,000 people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. BECKER, the time allotted to Mr. BECKER was granted to Mr. BALDWIN.)

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, when the administration submitted its $2 billion standby bill to the Congress last year and Mr. Heller came and testified on the bill before our Public Works Committee, the bill submitted by the administration, that is, the $2 billion standby public works bill, had a trigger in it stating that the $2 billion would not become available to be spent unless unemployment had increased by 1 percentage point in the period of 4 months or 6 months directly before the trigger became effective. Now, instead of the unemployment rate increasing in the last 6 months period by 1 percentage point, the opposite has taken place and there has been a reduction in unemployment, the most decisive reduction in unemployment in the last month of any single month in the last 4 years. This, therefore, would mean that under the bill the administration submitted to us last year, the funds could not be used under these conditions at the present time. If we spend $500 million for the accelerated public works program when unemployment is decreasing, then this is changing from a standby program to a never-ending funnel and I do not think anyone ever intended that to be the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I take this time simply to set the record straight. I am convinced that the Members of the House understand the issues involved here. This is a program for America—for the cities and towns and villages of America. Involved here are a half million jobs and many projects all over our country. The gentleman who just preceded me, the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] recently made the assertion that the projects so far allocated had gone in the ratio of 4 to 1 to Democratic districts.

Now let us get the record straight on this thing. As of now, as of March 14, 1963, a breakdown shows the following:

	Democratic	*Republican*
Number of districts in which projects were placed	149	99
Total number of projects	1,652	862
Total APW cost of projects	$210,888,000	$114.149.000
Average number of projects per district	11.1	8.7
Average cost per project	$127,700	$132,600

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. ROONEY, the time allotted to Mr. ROONEY was granted to Mr. BOGGS.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the record is contrary to the assertion made by the gentleman from California at a Republican meeting here some weeks ago. This program has not been administered on a political basis. It has been administered on the basis of need for the project.

I remember last summer when we debated the authorization for this, the assertion was made here on the floor of the House that enough worthwhile projects could not be turned up to justify the program. As a matter of fact, in my State alone, we have applications involving $120 million while the total amount of allocations for the State amount to $13 million. I am told that nationwide the applications exceed $2 billion. All of these projects are worthwhile projects. So I say to my colleagues, this is for the United States of America and for the development of the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, last week the majority leader described what would happen to America if the Republicans cut the budget by $15 billion.

When he finished, there were those who claimed that he was exaggerating.

But today, the vote of the House Appropriations Committee on the accelerated public works program stands as evidence that he was not exaggerating.

That, if anything, he was highly accurate. And that the bleak picture of "America last" that he painted was not excessively grim, but was based on reality.

For if the $500 million is not restored, then 250,000 jobs will be eliminated.

A quarter of a million men will not be allowed to work, and this will happen in areas that need these jobs the most.

In areas that are the hard core of unemployment.

In areas where workers have long ago exhausted both their savings and their unemployment benefits.

But the importance of these public works projects is not in just providing jobs—although that is vital in itself.

It is also in allowing our depressed areas to pick themselves up by the bootstraps.

For public works projects are not frills to be added to a community as one would trim a window or decorate a cake.

They are much more elemental.

Public works projects include water and sewer systems, streets, hospitals, libraries, fire stations, police stations, and a host of local facilities that are indispensable to our communities.

The projects must be built eventually.

The longer we wait, the longer we deny employment to the people living in our depressed areas, and the longer we delay applying a needed stimulant to the economy, and the longer we deny ourselves an employed and growing America instead of an America that hobbles along, dragging behind it thousands of depressed areas.

This is why it is the responsibility of this Congress to reverse the Appropriations Committee vote.

To restore the $500 million so that the accelerated public works program can use the full $900 million authorized by the 87th Congress in order to provide a total of 500,000 jobs—half a million jobs.

FACTS ABOUT THE BUDGET AND DEBT

I. THE FISCAL 1964 ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET

1. Civilian expenditures are being reduced:

	Billion
Total expenditures (increase)	$4.5
Defense, space, and interest (increase)	4.7
All other (decrease)	.2

This is counter to all trends.

Average annual rate of increase over the previous 9 years:

	Percent
Federal civilian expenditures	5
State and local government expenditures	8

Examples of savings reflected in fiscal 1964 budget: $450 million reduction in postal deficit; $300 million avoidance of additional surplus feed grain storage; and $750 million cancellation of obsolescent or unworkable weapon systems, and savings in logistic operations.

2. The budget reflects primarily the increased cost of national security:

The 1964 budget: more than 70 percent of budget goes for national defense, space, and interest; other outlays for national security and cost of past wars raise this to nearly 80 percent.

Kennedy budget increases:

	Billion
Total budget increase over 1961	$17.3
Defense, space, and interest increase (or 73 percent)	12.6
All others:	
Aid to State and local governments	2.3
Antifarm depression	.6
Area redevelopment	.5
Small Business Administration	.2
Conservation and development of natural resources	.5
All other	.6

While the Federal Government receives nearly 21 percent of our total national output or income, it pays out 9 percent in loans, grants, benefits to needy persons, corporations, local governments, etc., and actually uses less than 12 percent to purchase its own goods and services, of which nearly 10 percent goes for defense.

3. The Kennedy record in perspective:

Total of all increases in domestic civilian expenditures:	*Billions*
1st 3 Kennedy budgets (fiscal 1962–64) (or 19 percent)	$4.7
Last 3 preceding budgets (1959–61) (or 25 percent)	4.8

Same, excluding aid to hard-pressed State and local governments:	*Billions*
1st 3 Kennedy budgets (or 12 percent)	$2.4
Last 3 preceding budgets (or 26 percent)	$4.1

	Administrative budget, billions	*Cash budget, billions*
Fiscal 1964 deficit, with tax cut	$11.9	$10.3
Fiscal 1959 deficit, no tax cut	12.4	13.1

A budget deficit in fiscal year 1964, as large in proportion to gross national product as deficit of 1959, would be a deficit of between $15½ and $16 billion.

4. What causes the budget deficit?

The cost of national security (see above).

Had we not inherited an economy well below full employment, all three Kennedy cash budgets would have shown a surplus.

Were it not for the fact that the cash budget for the Federal Government also includes loans to be repaid and long-term capital outlays, all three Kennedy cash budgets would have shown a surplus.

Were it not for Federal aid to hard-pressed State and local governments, all three Kennedy cash budgets would have shown a surplus.

Enactment of the tax bill (because of the extra income it would produce and the acceleration of corporate tax payments) would only add $2.7 billion to the fiscal 1964 budget deficit.

If we slide into another recession, deficit without a tax cut will be larger than projected deficit with a tax cut.

If we attempt to cut back expenditures to balance the budget (requiring major cuts in defense and space and repeal of existing laws), effect on demand, production and employment would result in lower revenues and continued deficit.

The previous administration learned these same hard facts about the rising cost of Government, as it incurred five deficits in 8 budget years, added $23 billion to the national debt, and spent $182 billion more than its predecessor had spent in the previous 8 years.

II. THE NATIONAL DEBT

1. Public debt as a proportion of gross national product is declining in this administration:

	Percent
Fiscal 1947	116
Fiscal 1960	58
Fiscal 1964	53

2. Calendar 1962 increase in net Federal debt was small in proportion:

	Percent
Federal Government	3
State and local government	11
Private business	6
Consumer (including mortgages)	11

3. Increases in gross debt, 1947–62:

	Billions of dollars	*Percent*
Federal Government (June 30, 1962)	$40	15
State and local government (June 30, 1961)	56	332
Private business (Jan. 1, 1962)	271	189
Consumers (Jan. 1, 1962)	206	371

4. Funds required to pay interest on public debt:

Fiscal year:	*As percent of Federal budget revenues*	*Percent of gross national product*
1946	12	2.3
1962	11	1.7

III. FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY IN THIS ADMINISTRATION IS BENEFICIAL

1. Balance of payments deficit is declining:

	Billions
1958	$3.5
1959	3.7
1960	3.9
1961	2.5
1962	1.9

2. Inflation has been held in check:

	Wholesale Price Index	*Consumer Price Index*
January 1961	101.0	103 .8
December 1962	100.4	105.8
Average annual rate of increase		
	Percent	*Percent*
January 1953–January 1961	1.1	1.4
January 1961–December 1962	—.3	1.0

3. U.S. wholesale and consumer prices have remained more stable in the last 2 years than those of any other major industrial country, except Canada.

IV. FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT

1. There are fewer Federal employees to serve every 100 people in this country now than there were a few years ago.

End of fiscal:	*Percent*
1952	1.6
1958	1.4
1964	1.3

2. Seventy-two percent of Federal civilian employment is in Defense, Post Office, and Veterans' Administration.

3. Increases in Federal services required between 1962 and 1964 (examples):

	Percent up
Number of veterans' pensions	10.0
School enrollment (school lunch and milk programs)	7.0
Visitors to national parks (1961–64)	20.0
Planes landing or taking off (FAA towers)	11.0
Volume of mail (post office personnel up only 3.4 percent)	6.4
Social security beneficiaries (BOASDI personnel up only 9 percent)	16.0

4. Civilian employment, 1952–62:

	Percent
Federal Government (down)	3
State and local government (up)	63

We have heard a great deal during the last few months about the subject of economy in Government. Unfortunately, we have had very little evidence as yet of actual economizing in Government by those who have been talking the loudest.

It is strange, therefore, that those who talk the loudest about economizing have given no credit to those who have achieved the most in economizing on Government expenditures. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the present administration. There is a myth abroad in the land that the administration simply submits a budget to the Congress and then sits back and defies the Congress to make reductions in this budget. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the administration has had the courage to make continuing efforts for greater efficiency in Government and for lower Federal expenditures.

Let us review briefly the budgetary process through which the administration is achieving improved efficiency in Government expenditures. Before submitting the current 1964 budget to the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, serving as an arm of the President, reviewed in great detail all the expenditure requests of the various agencies of Government. The Bureau of the Budget obtained very substantial savings during this period by requiring more efficient operations in the various agencies. We can all remember the period prior to January of this year when all the pundits were referring to expected expenditures of more than $100 billion, in some cases substantially more. Yet, in fact, the budget actually submitted to Congress called for expenditures of $98.8 billion. I think we should give credit to the administration for economizing to such an extent. Its effectiveness in obtaining economies is most clearly demonstrated by the fact that the most vocal budgeteers of Congress are accomplishing so little by way of further reductions.

The extent to which the Bureau of the Budget and the administration has achieved economies in Government operations is indicated by a series of facts:

(1) Federal spending for purposes other than defense is a smaller portion of our gross national product today than it was either before World War II or after World War II. In 1939, nondefense expenditures were 8.8 percent of gross national product. In the typical postwar year of 1949, they were 10.1 percent. For the fiscal year 1963, it is estimated they will be only 7.3 percent.

(2) Twenty-five years ago, Federal nondefense spending was roughly equal to State and local spending. Today it is only three-fifths of State and local spending.

(3) Taking all budget expenditures, including defense, the percentage of these expenditures to gross national product is roughly what it was in the late 1950's. For example, in 1955, it was 17.1 percent; in 1963, it is estimated to be 16.7 percent.

(4) Since World War II, civilian employment in the executive branch has grown less rapidly than population, despite the fact that the Federal Government is designed to serve the total population.

(5) Budget expenditures originally proposed for the fiscal year 1964 for all programs, except defense, space and interest, were held below their 1963 levels, despite $1.8 billion of built-in cost increases such as increases in civilian pay, acceleration of public works, increases for public assistance, veterans' benefits and employment security.

(6) Aside from defense, space and interest, budget expenditures are increasing less between 1961 and 1964 than they did between 1958 and 1961. No wonder the vocal economizers are so hesitant to point out the areas where cuts should be made.

The job done by the Bureau of the Budget and the administration before the 1964 budget was submitted is impressive. For example, 42 percent of the 1963 costs of civilian employee pay increases is being absorbed. The economies being made in defense procurement and logistics operations alone exceed the entire annual costs of the new 1964 legislation requested by the President. These Defense Department economies include inventory reforms which will result in savings of over a half a billion dollars in 1964 alone. Increases in Federal civilian employment will be held to less than 1½ percent, considerably less than what it would be if Federal employment increased merely as fast as the population.

But my purpose here today is not simply to credit the administration for the job of economizing before the budget was submitted to Congress—this is not the end of the story. Immediately after the submission of the budget to Congress, the administration began to look for further areas where additional savings could be obtained. They searched for areas where they could trim the very requests they themselves had made to the Congress. This search for increased efficiency in Government is a continuing and unrelenting one by this administration. Moreover, it has been a successful one.

Let us look at the facts since the budget was formally submitted to Congress on January 17. Between that time and April 1—a period of only 2½ months—the President reduced his appropriations requests for the current fiscal year by $236.5 million. Moreover, he also reduced his appropriations requests with respect to fiscal year 1964 by an additional $142.7 million. These reductions do not take into account the President's announced intention to reduce the 1964 request for foreign assistance by $420 million.

These reductions took rare courage, and it is amazing to me that those of us in Congress who search for efficiency in Government have not applauded and publicized these reductions by the administration. Quite the contrary. These cuts have been ignored, and the implication has been widely dispersed that the administration is engaging in wild and reckless increases in Government expenditures.

How have these further reductions by the administration been obtained? In the Department of Defense alone, appropriations requests for military personnel and operations and maintenance in 1963 have been reduced by over $110 million since the budget was formally submitted. Economies of approximately $40 million have been found in grants to States for public assistance under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Readjustment assistance provided under the Trade Expansion Act has been reduced by over $2.5 million. Efficiency in providing housing for the elderly has resulted in reduced requests of $15 million. Readjustment benefits under the Veterans' Administration have been lowered by over $59 million. And there are many others. All of these—I wish to emphasize—are reductions in expenditure requests made by the Bureau of the Budget on behalf of the administration with respect to the current year, and all have been made since the budget was submitted in January.

Similar examples can be pointed to for the fiscal 1964 budget. For example, grants for public assistance have been improved to permit approximately $50 million of savings. Changes have been made in the policy of loans by the Small Business Administration that will result in decreased expenditures of approximately $70 million.

This search for efficiency in Government will continue, and we can reasonably expect that further reductions in expenditure requests will be forthcoming from the administration. I cannot understand why these economies have not been given the publicity they deserve. They have required real courage. I am sure that all the Members of Congress will join with me in lauding the Bureau of the Budget and the administration for their forthright efforts to obtain continuing improvements in the efficiency of our Government operations.

Action taken by the President since the 1964 budget was transmitted in January to reduce the budget, excluding items transferred from 1964 to 1963

FISCAL YEAR 1963

[In thousands of dollars]

	In budget	Amount of supplemental	Difference
Department of Commerce:			
Trade adjustment activities	500	[1] 0	500
Pay increases	5,460	4,985	475
Department of Defense:			
Military personnel	172,100	89,000	83,100
Operation and maintenance	151,564	121,364	30,200
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Grants to States for public assistance	250,000	210,000	40,000
Department of the Interior: Pay increases	10,461	9,839	622
Department of Labor: Trade adjustment	2,921	[1] 316	2,605
Treasury Department: Pay increases	23,232	22,687	545
General Accounting Office: Pay increases	780	----------	780
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Housing for the elderly	45,000	30,000	15,000
Small Business Administration: Trade adjustment	3,000	(1)	3,000
Veterans' Administration: Readjustment benefits	59,275	----------	59,275
Other agencies: Pay increases	365,355	364,962	393
Total	1,089,648	853,153	236,495

---

[1] In lieu of the supplemental appropriation reflected in the budget for loans, authority was requested to transfer existing funds from other accounts of the agency.

Action taken by the President since the 1964 budget was transmitted in January to reduce the budget, excluding items transferred from 1964 to 1963—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1964

[In thousands of dollars]

	In budget	Amount of supplemental	Difference
Department of Agriculture: Land use program	27,000	19,000	8,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Grants for public assistance	2,950,000	2,900,000	50,000
Department of the Interior: Lead and zinc stabilization program	4,625	----------	4,625
Department of State: Migration and refugee assistance	11,800	10,683	1,117
Small Business Administration: Loans	200,000	130,000	70,00
U.S. Information Agency:			
Project Teak	196,550	184,596	7,954
Informational media guarantee fund	5,000	3,960	1,040
Total	3,394,975	3,248,239	142,736

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio to restore $300 million to this appropriations bill to carry out worthwhile projects under the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962.

Mr. Chairman, this body authorized a program of emergency public works in the amount of $900 million last year. I opposed that bill at that time and I am still opposed to the methods devised by this legislation to construct these projects. These methods completely circumvent our Constitution and take away from the Congress its duly authorized authority to appropriate funds for specific projects on proper justification. It delegates to the President the power and authority of this Congress and I am strenuously opposed to the failure of this administration to properly justify and present specific recommendations for each project and I am extremely fearful that this program may become a permanent program unless this Congress calls a halt to such a possibility.

Mr. Chairman, there are over $2 billion in applications for projects now before the administration and even with these applications, the administration is constructing many ill-advised projects such as ski slides, recreational facilities, and other very nonessential matters. Furthermore, this program necessitates deficit financing and contributes to the necessity for raising the public debt ceiling without getting to the real cause of unemployment.

However, Mr. Chairman, many communities have been misled by the administration and promised funding of their program if they would go ahead and take the necessary initial steps to file an application and make arrangements to provide the necessary local financing to accompany the Federal grant. As a result of this, many communities have undertaken expensive programs and spent many hours in preparing plans to meet the requirements set up by the Federal Government. In some cases, they have even gone so far as to issue bonds to raise the necessary local capital. In short, they have become dependent upon an expected grant from the Federal Government and it is because of this position these communities find themselves in that I feel we have an obligation to them and I, therefore, even over my strenuous objection to the legislation, am willing to provide adequate funds to meet projects such as sewer systems, water systems, sanitary disposal plants, public buildings and other permanent capital investments that will enhance the capital structure of a community.

It is my firm belief that $300 million will meet the demand for worthwhile projects and will cause the administration to delete from their program such ill-advised construction as ski slides, tourist trains, swimming pools, golf courses, and other such recreational attractions. In addition to this, the gentleman's amendment is so worded that it will call a halt to this accelerated public works program with all the discretionary administrative powers improperly vested in the executive office and return this function to the Congress of the United States as set forth in the Constitution.

Furthermore, I would like to add that public works projects never have been effective in achieving anticyclical results during an economic recession. Most public works projects will not provide many jobs for persons who are presently unemployed because much of the cost goes into the purchase of materials, equipment, and for the employment of professional and skilled persons who are not among the large group of unemployed. Furthermore, it normally takes a long time to get public works projects going and they do not provide much employment until economic recovery is well underway.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, because as I said before, many of these communities have been misled into a situation over which they apparently now have no control and I feel we have a responsibility toward those communities to at least provide adequate funds to meet proper projects and I, therefore, am supporting the gentleman's motion to restore $300 million to the appropriations bill.

The gentleman's amendment further will preclude the acceptance of any more applications for accelerated public works programs and under this amendment, the program can be phased out in such a manner as not to create any undue hardship on the communities involved. But let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that there are adequate programs, adequately financed, which will still permit the Federal Government to enter into the same type of projects for which this program calls and the only difference being is that they would not have to be completed within 1 year as the law requires under this program. They would not be limited only to depressed areas, but would include any area in the United States, but the Federal contribution is not quite as high as it is under this accelerated public works program.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the gentleman's amendment would meet our obligation to the cities and areas affected, yet return the responsibility of this program to the Congress where it belongs. I urge my colleagues to restore this $300 million to the bill so we can meet this responsibility to the communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, for 3½ months the House has been dragging its feet and yet when an amendment is offered in the House today, proposing a $450 million boondoggle, debate is limited to 1 minute per Member recognized on the amendment, and the gentleman from Texas first tried to limit time to 20 minutes, or about one-half minute.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. No; I cannot yield. I do not have time to yield. The gentleman set debate limitation. What are you out to do this afternoon? Do you want to vote on this bill tomorrow? You are going to bring it about if you continue these tactics.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. No; I do not yield. I have had my 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Blatnik] for 1 minute.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Miller of California and Mr. Shelley yielded their time to Mr. Blatnik.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, many domestic problems have plagued us with ever-increasing seriousness during the postwar years. But the major problem has been how to utilize to the fullest extent the tremendous and magnificent industrial capacity which is ours, and how best to utilize the available manpower. The pattern of the past three recessions clearly demonstrate that with every succeeding recession the problem of recovery becomes more serious and prolonged. Also, at the end of each recovery, the percentage of unemployment rises. This situation is not going to be improved by reducing the amount of money requested for this public works program. Each year we have seen Federal, State, and local governmental units asked to increase fiscal outlays for unemployment compensation, relief, welfare, food stamps, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, last year we spent over $3 billion for unemployment compensation alone. In more than half of the States unemployment compensation funds have fallen to a dangerously low level. Since 1960, we have spent $10.5 billion for unemployment compensation. If we add on to that the welfare relief costs, the figure goes up to almost $18 billion. Our proposition today in this provision is to help municipalities where the unemployment average is anywhere from two, three, four, yes, even to five times the national average. The economic situation of the workers in many areas is bad. Their problems are distressing. We propose to put about 10 percent of these unemployed to work. Rather than paying them for not working, we propose to pay them to work on facilities that are badly needed to improve the health and welfare of the citizens of their communities. These public works projects will upgrade and improve these distressed communities and will make them more attractive so they can induce small industry to move in.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is making a very impressive argument. The fact that the Bolton substitute was offered to the Boland amendment shows the unsoundness of the position of our Republican friends. First they insisted on knocking out $500 million. The Boland amendment would restore $450 million. The Bolton substitute would provide $300 million. They will probably vote for the $350 million.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, I am appalled at the amazing shortsightedness of our Republican colleagues who seem to think that this great country cannot afford to spend the small sum of $450 million to assist its 4.6 million unemployed workers trapped in the economically distressed regions of the Nation. I find it hard to believe that some of my colleagues have the audacity to talk economy to men who are suffering the despair and humiliation of the relief rolls.

The unemployment problem in the Nation is a serious challenge. It is an issue of long duration. It cannot be put on a shelf and forgotten.

Last year, in passing the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Congress took strong affirmative action directed toward meeting the challenge. The APW program has brought new hope to the unemployed in our distressed regions. More importantly, it has restored self-respect to men long out of work. These are good men. They are proud men. They do not want our charity. They want to work. We cannot allow them to become helpless and undeserving victims of poverty in this land of plenty.

Since the initiation of the APW program on October 13, 1962, $394 million of approved funds have been allocated to 3,756 projects. Fifty thousand on-site jobs of 1 year's duration have been created. Experts estimate that accompanying off-site employment provided 50,000 more jobs, bringing the total number of jobs to 100,000. This does not include the additional generated by the increased purchasing power of those back to work.

If the Congress restores the $450 million supplemental appropriation for which the President has asked, about 55,000 new jobs of 1 year's duration would be created. These, plus the accompanying off-site jobs in related service industries, would bring the total number of jobs yielded by the program to 210,000, thus providing work for nearly

10 percent of the unemployed in economically distressed areas under the program. All of these men thus mobilized, moreover, would be working on vital and necessary projects which would make their communities better places to live and work.

Mr. Chairman, the applications for APW funds have been coming into the agencies from local communities at the rate of $450 million a month. ARA now has pending applications for a grand total of 6,211 projects requiring $1.2 billion in APW funds. Last fall the Congress made a firm commitment to assist the economically distressed communities of the Nation. Encouraged, these communities leaped at the opportunities offered and set into motion the machinery to help themselves. Now the Congress has dared to go back on its word of honor to these good people.

Mr. Chairman, this refusal to appropriate funds already authorized and guaranteed would be a serious failure in duty and in honor on the part of this very distinguished body. Unemployment in most eligible areas remains abnormally high. The national economy is still expanding at a slow pace. The only real solution to the problem of unemployment is to provide jobs immediately to accelerate our economic growth. I find it unconscionable that we can consider spending $4.5 billion in foreign aid, and yet refuse to allocate $450 million in domestic assistance.

Now is the time to take our men off relief rolls, to put them to work on important and essential public works projects, and to restore to them their human dignity and self-respect.

The effectiveness of accelerated public works has already been demonstrated. The need is yet urgent. Mr. Chairman, we are not dealing with cold calculations on sheets of foolscap. We are concerned here with people who are hungry, with people who need the chance to have a good job. I sincerely request that my colleagues consider the human cost of discontinuing the accelerated public works program. I am confident that the Members of this great Chamber will have the courage and the compassion to restore to the appropriations bill the $450 million supplement needed to continue this vital assistance to the good people in our Nation's distressed areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, in the minute allotted me, I would like to talk a little bit about this question of solving unemployment through this accelerated public works program.

This hearing record which I hold in my hand, is replete with evidence that the unemployment problem in this country cannot be solved by this kind of Federal spending program.

As of February 15, in testimony before the Appropriations Committee, we found there were 2,060 projects approved, with a total cost of $244 million. How many man-years of work did these projects provide? They provided only 29,921. Less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of the total unemployed in the United States were taken care of by this expenditure of $244 million.

These cost figures are conservative. Assuming a minimum average local matching of only 25 percent means that the cost per man-year of unemployment would be $10,225 and the total cost to put 4 million unemployed to work for 1 year would be $41 billion which is almost half of the total estimated expenditures for the current fiscal year.

Of the 2,060 projects listed as approved in the February Directory, 357 of them will produce only 1 man-year or less of employment. Nineteen of the projects approved provide only one man-month of employment.

The impact of this program on the 357 local areas involved most surely is not noticeable.

What happens to the recipient of several months of work when the job is done? He reverts back to the ranks of the unemployed. What has been accomplished? Nothing.

The only manner in which a program of this type could possibly cut the unemployment figure is to plow in staggering sums year after year. Otherwise it is a futile effort in many areas.

We may be getting a nice firehouse or a hospital wing here and there but from the standpoint of relieving unemployment we are jumping into a sponge.

If we are going to use this kind of Federal spending program to solve the unemployment problem in this country today, the testimony before the Appropriations Committee proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the total Federal cost of this program would have to be increased to $32 billion for each year of operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. LANGEN, the time allotted to Mr. LANGEN was given to Mr. LAIRD.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the total cost of this program will have to be raised to $32,620 million in fiscal year 1963.

This particular program will not solve the unemployment problem in the United States. We tried this kind of program in the years from 1930 to 1940. All you have to do is to look at the record of the billions of dollars spent during that period of time. This table shows the unemployment level all during that period of time. It was not until World War II that the unemployment level was substantially reduced.

Percent of labor force unemployed

Year:	
1929	3.2
1930	8.7
1931	15.9
1932	23.6
1933	24.9
1934	21.7
1935	20.1
1936	16.9
1937	14.3
1938	19.0
1939	17.2
1940	14.6
1941 (defense and war program)	9.9
1942 (defense and war program)	4.7
1943 (defense and war program)	1.9
1944	1.2

I submit, Mr. Chairman, if we want to get America moving again, we must not go in two directions at the same time, in the direction of increased Federal spending and tax cuts.

The economists who testified before the Joint Economic Committee have told us, and the President of the United States has told us, that the No. 1 priority item, as far as the economy is concerned, is in the area of tax reduction. We cannot ride both horses at the same time. It seems to me that today is our opportunity to make a choice here of sound fiscal management if the No. 1 priority is in the area of tax reduction this is the time not to increase Federal spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment which would restore to the supplemental appropriations bill for 1963 $450 million of the budget request to finance additional projects under the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act. This Congress, in 1962, authorized the appropriation of $900 million to be allocated to the President for the initiation and acceleration of public works in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment and economic underdevelopment. The Congress appropriated $400 million of the $900 million so authorized. I supported the original authorization, the first appropriation, and support the Presidential request for funding the balance of the authorization because it is clear to me such additional appropriation is fully justified.

Mr. Chairman, the general economic conditions which prevailed in the fall of last year have been improved but not to the extent that justifies the cessation of the assistance contemplated under the Public Works Acceleration Act. The specifics on national unemployment and our economic condition generally are part of the record of this debate, and the hearings of the committees of the House and the Senate which considered this supplemental request. I have no reason to doubt that the same necessity and urgency exists today for the type of assistance contemplated under the Public Works Acceleration Act as did at the time the act was passed.

I would like to relate the details concerning my own area. In my area of south Florida, we are coping with a major economic problem. We have for several years had substantial unemployment. The U.S. Department of Labor long ago determined that there were a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens so as to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area. However, Mr. Chairman, we have not only the economic difficulty that arises from the usual reasons of unemployment, but we have in addition, the unusual economic distress and unemployment caused by the impact of approximately 150,000 refugees residing in this area who have fled the tyranny and oppression of the Communist government of Cuba.

While a tremendous number, approximately 56,452, of these refugees have been resettled into other areas of the United States, there are still approximately 105,000 refugees who have registered but have not resettled. Since there are many refugees who have not registered, the estimate is that there are approximately now 150,000 refugees residing in this area.

At the present time it is estimated that there is an American labor force of 409,090, of which 382,900 are employed and 27,000 are unemployed, giving us a real unemployment rate of 6.6 percent. The official unemployment rates for Dade County for recent years, according to information obtained from the Department of Labor, are as follows: 1958, 5.9 percent; 1959, 5.2 percent; 1960, 5.2 percent; 1961, 6.7 percent; 1962, 5.8 percent.

However, Mr. Chairman, this does not include the Cuban refugee labor force and the attendant problems of displacement of American workers, and unemployment of Cuban refugees. The labor force of Cuban refugees is estimated at 53,900, of whom 22,500 are estimated as being employed and 31,400 are unemployed, for the fantastic unemployment rate of 58.4 percent. When the total unemployment rate is considered, it is indicated that there has been persistent and substantial unemployment of approximately 12.6 percent which is far above the national average.

Despite the heroic efforts of our local citizens, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths, local government and voluntary agencies, it soon became obvious that the need of the refugees could not be met solely out of local resources. Two Presidents of the United States and this Congress, at my request, recognized that this was a matter of national concern and responsibility, and accordingly authorized and appropriated funds to assist with the problems of providing for the Cuban refugees. But the economic problem of this existence of unemployment at a high rate in the nonrefugee population as well as the existence of a large labor pool and high unemployment rate among the refugees, has not been resolved by Federal recognition and substantial assistance to the Cuban refugees. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that there has been tremendous economic pressure as a result of the Cuban refugees residing in our area. They quite logically and normally have sought jobs. Much of this employment has been at reduced wages. They not only have displaced American workers, but have tended to depress the labor market.

We in Dade County have tried to solve the problem of additional employment for Americans through every means known to us. Our chamber of commerce, our industries, our local governments have all cooperated in an effort to attract new industry, expand existing industries, construct public works, float bond issues and in general to do everything to create more jobs and to put Americans to work. We have been successful, but not sufficiently. Substantial unemployment and economic distress still exists. It was because of these unusual circumstances that existed not only in my area but in other areas of the United States that I concur in the need for this administration's proposal for the Public Works Acceleration Act. The need still exists in fact and in statistics. I quote two statistics which give an additional measure of the problem faced by us. Residential construction is a major part of our economy. In 1957 there were 12,500 permits for the construction of single family housing units. In 1962 this had dropped to the low of 5,000. It is no secret that the construction industry in Dade County has been slowed to a walk in the last 3 years. In 1957 there were 698 mortgage foreclosures. In 1962 this had risen to 3,123.

We are not pessimistic at all in Dade County, Fla. We have had a record of fantastic, phenomenal, dynamic growth and economic expansion. The fact is, however, Mr. Chairman, that the time came 2 or 3 years ago when we reached a plateau. To the economic distress caused by this slowdown, was added the burden of the Cuban refugee problem. We are not at all disheartened about our future. We expect to grow and prosper and eliminate our economic distress, but we are realistic in assessing our present problem and acting at all levels of government to resolve the problem. This is why public and private institutions and governmental units in my area were prompt in seeking assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act.

On October 13 of last year, we appropriated $400 million of the $900 million authorized. Within less than 5 months, the entire amount of the appropriation had been allocated by the President to the participating Federal agencies, and virtually all of it had been committed to projects all over the country. Institutions and governmental units in the district which I have the honor to represent applied for, and the people of the district I represent received, considerable assistance. I was privileged and honored to assist in the processing of the applications and obtaining approval for assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act. The Area Redevelopment Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce deserves the highest commendation, as do the participating Federal agencies, for the efficient and prompt manner in which the thousands of applications were received, processed, and acted upon.

Of course there were far more applications than funds, and many areas could not be approved under the priority criteria which was established. The area which I represent was a recipient of approved projects under this program. These approved projects have had an important psychological and economic effect in our community. They have given us just the right amount of assistance to provide enthusiasm and encouragement for additional local efforts to resolve our economic difficulties. The following projects have been approved for Dade County:

Accelerated public works projects, Dade County, approved

Name	Amount	Man-months of work
Jackson Memorial Hospital	$200,000	192
Mount Sinai Hospital, Miami Beach	238,178	228
Construction of branch libraries, Miami	133,000	216
Water system, North Miami	261,000	396
Sewage facility and administration building, Dade County	520,500	1,086
Sewage facility, street repair, and fire station, Miami	534,200	1,128
Variety Childrens' Hospital, Miami	755,162	486
South Miami Hospital addition	103,750	104
Miami Heart Institute	116,200	108
Cedars of Lebanon Hospital	530,210	504
National Cardiac Hospital	156,900	256
Miami Beach water facilities	164,100	336
Medley water facility	73,100	84
North Miami Beach street construction	117,000	120

Notwithstanding the employment which will be provided for by these approved projects, there are still essential and urgent public works which must be constructed, and there still exists substantial unemployment and considerable economic distress in our area. Our institutions and governmental agencies are fully aware of this problem and have continued to seek assistance under the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act. The following projects have been submitted and are now pending before the Area Redevelopment Administration for approval under the Public Works Acceleration Act:

Accelerated public works projects proposed	
Renovation of laboratory, Miami	$6,400
Trails, camping facilities, and road construction, Everglades National Park	400,000
Post office modernization and extension, Miami	80,000
Veterans' hospital improvements, Coral Gables	31,000
Doctors hospital addition, Coral Gables	500,000
Coral Gables General Hospital addition	340,500
Cedars of Lebanon Hospital expansion, Miami	350,000
Jackson Memorial Hospital addition, Miami	1,500,000
Miami Heart Institute addition	300,000
North Miami General Hospital addition	87,500
New drainage project, Miami	296,000
Water system improvement, Miami	9,000
New clinics, Florida City	38,000
New waste treatment facilities, Florida City	330,000
Sanitation facilities improvement, Coral Gables	184,000
City streets improvement, Coral Gables	197,000
New libraries, Coral Gables	313,000
New disposal facilities, Miami Beach	2,429,000
Water system additions, Miami	293,000
New water resources, Miami	182,000
New garage, Miami	476,000
New office building, Miami	335,000
New exhibit buildings, Miami	249,000
Improvement of city streets, West Miami	91,000
Water system additions, Miami Beach	213,000
New libraries, North Miami Beach	150,000

Accelerated public works projects proposed—Continued

New disposal facilities, Surfside	$487,000
City streets, additions, Miami Beach	23,000
New drainage, Miami Beach	85,000
New sanitation, Miami Beach	193,000
New sanitation, Miami	1,923,000
Additions to disposal facilities, Miami	1,119,000
Sanitation improvement, Miami	312,000
City streets, improvement, Miami	204,000
Protect buildings, new, Miami	41,000
New drainage, Miami	306,000
Sanitation improvement, Miami	217,000
Protect buildings, new, Miami	43,000
New parks, Miami	49,000
City streets improvement, Miami	36,000
New athletic buildings, Miami	976,000
Protect buildings, new, North Miami	42,000
New municipal buildings, North Miami	296,000
New drainage, North Miami	296,000
Protect buildings, new, North Miami	122,000
Water system additions, Miami	188,000
Water system additions, Miami	438,000
Water system additions, Miami	451,000

As the need for employment in our distressed area continues, so does the need for jobs in the other areas of the United States which are economically distressed, and so does the demand for the initiation and acceleration of additional projects which would serve an essential public need. This demand from the economically distressed areas of our country is proof positive of the need for the budget request in this supplemental appropriation for the Public Works Acceleration Act.

The fact that so many institutions, the county government and various municipalities in the area which I represent have committed their own funds to urgent and essential public works projects which qualify under the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act, establishes that the people whom I represent have faith in themselves and in the future, and welcome the participation and stimulus provided by the Public Works Acceleration Act to improve their well-being and that of the entire country.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the conclusion is obvious that those facts which existed that made it necessary and advisable for the economic well-being of the people whom I represent, as well as the economic well-being of this country for the Congress to pass the Public Works Acceleration Act, still exist not only in the district which I represent but in many other economically distressed areas of the country. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I support fully the amendment which would restore to the supplemental appropriation bill of 1963 $450 million of the sum requested in the President's budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion here about 500,000 jobs being created by this bill.

I should like to get the record straight and read the testimony of William L. Batt, Jr., the Administrator of this program. Let us get on the record exactly how many jobs are involved in this $500 million. This is his testimony:

> It is estimated that the $500 million appropriation would generate approximately 60,000 man-years of onsite employment, which, together with the 50,000 man-years generated by the first appropriation would bring the total to 110,000 onsite jobs of 1 year's duration.

No; it is not 500,000 jobs. The testimony of the administration is 110,000. So, let us keep the record straight and get away from these wild statements of what this is going to do.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in disapproving the restoration of money for the accelerated public works program.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this deficiency or supplemental appropriation bill because we are appropriating money for new projects which is not the purpose of a supplemental appropriation bill. The list of new starts outlined by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], clearly shows this improper procedure.

Further, it is wrong to spend additional money for public works at this time of deficit financing. The accelerated public works project was wrong at its inception this year and restoring money to the program is wrong now. Pump priming did not work before in correcting or relieving unemployment and it will not now.

Our country faces fiscal collapse because of wild Federal spending. We must economize to protect our currency value, gold on hand, and our entire economy.

We must bolster confidence in our economy and Government by responsible action now. Let us reduce Federal spending, not increase. Let us cut the national debt, not add to it. Let us then reduce taxes. Each of these steps separately and collectively will bolster confidence in our Government's fiscal self-discipline, and preserve our private economy.

Let us stop financing socialism. Capitalism is the bulwark of our country's economic health, not Federal spending.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment and expect to vote for it.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted me to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I spoke on this bill yesterday, and there is very little more that I can say now. I sincerely hope that we can defeat both of these amendments. I am not in favor of the Bolton substitute, and I certainly am not in favor of the Boland amendment. It seems to me that the gentleman from Wisconsin has certainly covered the situation. What we should do is reduce the spending of the Federal Government and get ourselves a real tax reduction so that we can get the economy of the country going and provide permanent jobs. There is no question but what unemployment is most serious in America today, but you will not solve unemployment by spot jobs, emergency jobs. You have to get the economy of the country going and give them permanent jobs. America does not want temporary jobs or the kind of a program that is going forward under this program. What we need is permanent jobs so that the economy will move again under a proper tax bill.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, based upon fact I feel constrained to vote for the amendment to provide the $450 million for the accelerated public works program, because of the economic conditions in northern Michigan. The projects that are pending in the 11th Congressional District of Michigan should bring some relief to our domestic economy.

I believe the appropriation of these funds should carry a high priority over appropriations which the Congress will soon be considering in the form of foreign aid. Each year the Congress has been appropriating $3 to $4 billion for foreign aid, and a great percentage of these funds are channeled into the construction of sewer disposal plants, water systems, roads, and public buildings in foreign countries throughout the world. I do not intend to support the President's request of $4½ billion for foreign aid as I do not believe the appropriation is necessary when we have over $11 billion in foreign aid funds which are unexpended.

I do, however, feel that if the $450 million for the accelerated public works program is properly allocated to distressed areas and areas of high unemployment this could well alleviate problems of considerable magnitude.

I supported the legislation in the 87th Congress authorizing $900 million for this program and will support the amendment providing the remaining necessary funds, to carry out the intent of the 87th Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I think any sound program that would help to solve the unemployment situation in this Nation deserves the support of every well-thinking Member in this body. Unemployment is the No. 1 issue in America today. We might point to many other things, but this is one problem that we, as the elected representatives, must solve. I think the unemployed of America have had great patience with those that are in a position of responsibility, because they look to us for help. They are unemployed through no action of theirs, and many of them have exhausted every avenue to be employed and they are looking to us for leadership. So, I think we do have a responsibility to look ahead and to try to solve this problem. I am against the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON], and for the amendment as submitted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. I congratulate the gentleman, not only for his statement today but, over a period of years, his very sincere and earnest interest and deep concern over this problem. There are many areas of America that have defense plants which keeps their economy going, and some can be heard to say, "There but for the grace of defense go we."

Our economy is not in good shape and the problem of unemployment is going to continue to be more and more serious, becoming more and more of a drag on an already sluggish economy. It is about time Congress began to give some real, concentrated thought and attention to this problem and begin to do something about it. This program is at least a start.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is true; it has been said, "Where the people lack vision, they shall perish." Personally, I feel our job is not to plan just for today or tomorrow alone, but for the years which lie ahead and the generations to come. We cannot long remain a strong and virile nation with the canker of unemployment gnawing at the very heart of our land.

Therefore, let us, as Representatives of this great Nation, and individually as American citizens, do what we believe is for the best interest of our Nation and all of our citizens.

This is a positive program, helping each community which is in need in supplying the fundamentals which are necessary to attract industries and improve the general welfare of the areas and the people by providing clean and wholesome water, sewerage systems, good highways, and the like.

This is building a better America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to both the substitute and the amendment which have been offered on the basis that these projects, many of them, do not meet an essential need. Certainly they do not meet the unemployment problem in America today.

Mr. Chairman, the history of this whole program clearly shows it to be haphazard, unrealistic, and a public works grab bag. I have here the latest catalog. They are putting these out now about every 15 days from PWAA within ARA. Here is one dated February 15, 1963, and a new one for March 1, 1963. It is getting to be about the size of the Sears, Roebuck catalog. The only difference is there are not any bargains in it.

Mr. Chairman, here is the March 1, 1963, catalog. Listen to this: They talk about doing something about unemployment. Here is their own record. Here is what ARA says will be accomplished in the way of relieving unemployment. There is going to be spent $312 million, according to the latest catalog, and they are going to employ 35,000 people onsite. The average cost is $10,000 per man-year. If they receive the entire $450 million they will employ 50,000 people, or less than 2 percent of the present unemployment. If this is to be the answer, then the cost of employing 1 million of the nearly 5 million unemployed, only 20 percent, would be, at the rate of $10,000 per person, $10 billion.

Mr. Chairman, this has been presented to the people of America as an answer to the unemployment problem. It is obvious that it is not the answer and it is obvious that it is a first-class boondoggle. Here is an example of how little employment results for the dollars spent. Here is a "recreational facility" at Lexington City, Mo., costing $881,000, and it will employ nine people, or will cost at the rate of $90,000 per man per year. Here are other examples of costs per year per man or to employ one man 1 year as taken from the March 1, 1963, Accelerated Public Works Program Directory of Approved Projects, U.S. Department of Commerce, Area Redevelopment Administration, by transposing man-months into man-years.

State	Area	Agency	Project	Cost	Estimated on-site man-months	On-site man-year costs (per man per year)
Alabama	Bibb	Agriculture, Forest Service	Construct buildings, recreational facility	$11,000	1	$132,000
	Choctaw	Health, Education, and Welfare	Lagoon	292,000	140	25,000
	Limestone	Tennessee Valley Authority	Reforestation	4,000	8	16,000
	Macon	Agriculture, Forest Service	Land treatment	33,000	5	70,000
	Marshall	AIP	Reforestation	3,000	7	----------
			Recreational facility	41,000	48	10,000
	Perry	Agriculture, Forest Service	Land treatment	47,000	25	23,000
	Winston	do	Construct buildings, recreational facility	40,000	2	250,000
Arizona	Apache	Interior, National Park Service	Recreational facility	400,000	600	48,000
Arkansas	Van Buren	Agriculture, Forest Service	Land treatment	24,000	3	96,000
California	San Diego	Housing and Home Finance Agency, Community Facilities Administration.	Coroner's office	----------	180	10,000
	Campo	Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.	Border patrol station	44,000	30	20,000
Florida	Hollywood City	Housing and Home Finance Agency, Community Facilities Administration.	Beach boardwalk	----------	29	9,500
Georgia	Toccoa	Army, Corps of Engineers	Recreation facility	52,000	43	14,000
Missouri	Washington	Agriculture, Forest Service	Construct building, recreation facility	62,000	15	60,000
	Dent	do	do	----------	20	40,000
	Shannon	do	do	----------	5	20,000
New Jersey	Long Branch, Asbury Park.	Housing and Home Finance Agency, Community Facilities Administration.	Boardwalk	----------	136	10 000
New Mexico	San Miguel	Agriculture, Forest Service	Construct building, recreation facility	154,000	41	45,000
	Taos	do	do	148,000	65	30,000
New York	Niagara County	Army, Corps of Engineers	Pier repairs	240,000	108	25,000
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	Housing and Home Finance Agency, Community Facilities Administration.	Swimming pool improvement	----------	90	5,000
	do	do	Recreation facility	----------	82	10,000
Puerto Rico	San Juan	Interior, National Park Service	San Juan recreation facility	400,000	480	30,000

Mr. Chairman, the instruction which was put into this accelerated public works program by the Public Works Committee and the Congress was that these projects should be essential and that they should result in the maximum of employment. But this is not being accomplished. This criteria is being ignored.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I received a telegram from my Governor of Massachusetts showing that my congressional district would be allocated $8 million in specified projects, setting out the amount of money going to each. As I understand it, they are asking for $450 million here. There is a request for $1.2 billion from all over the United States.

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. CONTE. Is there any guarantee that my district will receive this $8 million if this bill goes through?

Mr. CRAMER. I can guarantee that it will not.

The whole State of Massachusetts under this March 1, 1963, catalog receives $7.7 million, and I am sure the administration is not going to put all the money in the gentleman's district. There is a total amount of $7.7 million for the entire State of Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, I say this is the same type of sales talk they are trying to use in an effort to try to sell the program—promise everybody everything. This cataloging proves further that this is going to be a permanent program if they receive this money. Bills introduced already are asking for twice as much as the present authorization as an increase—$1.7 billion above the present $900 million.

Here are examples of projects undertaken that clearly show the make-work, unsound spending of this program—and why it needs closer scrutiny than can be given in this deficiency bill:

List of projects which have been approved under the accelerated public works program as of February 1, 1963, which are typical of many approved projects that appear highly questionable as meeting an "essential public need" (as required by the Public Works Acceleration Act) or as to whether they are, in fact, a public works in the nature of a permanent capital improvement or merely maintenance.

Location and agency	State	Project	APW [1] funds
			Thousands
Bridgeport-Bridgeport City: Housing and Home Finance Agency, Community Facilities Administration.	Connecticut	Municipal stadium	$475.0
Johnston: Interior, Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife	Oklahoma	Fish ponds	121.0
Philadelphia City: Housing and Home Finance Agency, Community Facilities Administration.	Pennsylvania	Swimming pool improvements	40.0
Swain County: National Park Service, Interior	North Carolina	Cemetery maintenance	5.4
Sevier County: National Park Service, Interior	Tennessee	do	3.9
Do	do	Raze old buildings, structures, utilities, and restore sites	8.1
Flathead County: National Park Service, Interior	Montana	Pasture improvement	4.0
Cook County: National Park Service, Interior	Minnesota	Archeological research	9.0
Do	do	Shoreline cleanup	1.0
Mohave County: National Park Service, Interior	Arizona	Planting and clearing	21.0
Do	do	Paint 3 water tanks	15.0
Murray County: National Park Service, Interior	Oklahoma	Raze old sewage disposal plant	6.0
Island of Hawaii: National Park Service, Interior	Hawaii	Exotic plant control and area cleanup (por.)	63.0
Do	do	Exotic plant control	1.0
Lessen County: National Park Service, Interior	California	Raze old hydroelectrical building	2.0
Grays Harbor County: National Park Service, Interior	Washington	Snag felling and storm damage cleanup	10.0
Fresno County, National Park Service, Interior	California	Hazardous tree removal, Cedar Grove, 100 trees	10.0
Do	do	Hazardous tree removal, Grant Grove, 400 trees	40.0
Do	do	Forest pest control, Cedar Grove, 300 trees	22.5
Hancock County: National Park Service, Interior	Maine	Construct swimming beach and pier at Echo Lake swimming area.	60.0
Washington County: National Park Service, Interior	Maryland	Clearing, grubbing, and removal of dead trees (por.)	32.0
Fayette County: National Park Service, Interior	Pennsylvania	Clearing of trails	4.0
Do	do	Clearing of boundary trails	10.0
Washington County: National Park Service, Interior	Maryland	Demolition of residence, roads, trails, signs, etc., and cleanup.	20.0
Jefferson County: National Park Service, Interior	West Virginia	Demolition of Scottish castle and cleanup	7.5
Do	do	Demolition of Brockett and Mosher Falls and grounds cleanup.	25.0
Chester County: National Park Service, Interior	Pennsylvania	Obliterate nonhistoric structures	1.0
Do	do	Preservative treatment of wood structures	2.0
Keweenaw County: National Park Service, Interior	Michigan	Obliterate buildings and docks, park, general	4.0
Spencer County: National Park Service, Interior	Indiana	Clearing, seeding, cleanup	24.0
Ross County: National Park Service, Interior	Ohio	Restoration of mound area including archeological research.	60.0
Gratiot County-Alma: Housing and Home Finance Agency, Community Facilities Administration.	Michigan	Addition to recreation center	25.0
Philadelphia County, Philadelphia: Housing and Home Finance Agency, Community Facilities Administration.	Pennsylvania	Community center	40.0
Do	do	Community center addition	76.0

---

[1] Accelerated public works.

I trust that everyone appreciates that by voting for the Boland amendment it is casting a vote for these grab bag, boondoggle public works programs, a large number of which, by any description, could not be considered capital improvements as was contemplated in the Public Works Acceleration Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy].

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this additional appropriation for the accelerated public works program, it appears to me that many communities have been promised, and actual commitments made, that they receive grants under the program; certainly, that seems to be the case in a number of communities in my own district.

In further respect to this matter, there is a circumstance which duty demands that I call the attention of this House, and to the Appropriation Committee and other interested committees, which appears to demand investigation, and, perhaps, legislation.

As is well known, there have been a number of questions raised in various areas concerning political influence, conflicts of interest, and even criminal misconduct. Certain investigations are even now in progress, in areas apart from this program.

Over the past several months, I have had several reports from counties in my district advising that offers had been relayed to communities desiring accelerated public works, ARA, and other grants, that for a consideration from the community, usually expressed as "paying his expenses," the Area Redevelopment Administration advisor in the area, would see that the grant was made, or that the loan was made, as the case might be. I do not know whether such offer has been accepted in any instance; I hope it has not, but that information would not likely come to me.

In each instance that such a report has come to me, I have advised the agency involved, but I have not been advised of any action that may have been taken thereon. In one instance, I was advised that similar reports had been received from other parts of the country.

I am also in receipt of a number of notes, the substance of which are, "We protest the political immorality of the Area Redevelopment Administration's advisor here in east Texas."

Whether this presents a case of conflict of interest, representing the Government in an official capacity on one hand and an applicant on the other, or a raw case of political influence being offered on the auction block, the immorality is obvious, and the taxpayers should have safeguards against it.

As a Democrat, I hope, for the sake of our Nation, the people, and my party, that there is an innocent explanation of this, and that it is not widespread. I had desired that an explanation would have come forth before now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Jarman].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, my opposition to this program last year and to a continuation of the program this year can be stated very simply: Based upon personal conntacts in the congressional district which it is my privilege to represent, based upon letters and telegrams, based upon a questionnaire that I have circulated widely in my district in recent weeks covering a number of subjects, I am convinced that the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Oklahoma are fed up with deficit spending and are demanding that we do something about a national debt that now exceeds $300 billion.

They look to me as their Representative, and I share their sentiments, to vote against any program that increases the financial load this Nation is carrying, any program that this Nation can do withouut at the present time. I believe this program fits that category and so my vote will be cast against both the substitute and the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, today we must decide whether this House will live up to its pledge to carry through the accelerated public works program. Last fall when the House appropriated the initial $400 million, we committed ourselves to appropriate whatever was needed from the balance of the $900 million originally authorized after we reviewed the administration of the program. The House has a particular responsibility to this program because we were the ones who actually originated it. The accelerated public works program that we have before us was originated by the House and was signed into law even though a different proposal was supported by the Senate and the President.

The local communities, acting on their feeling that the House would live up to its word, have already made many of the necessary preparations for the great variety of sorely needed projects. Following the specific congressional directive, the agencies have done a good job of allocating this money. Needed projects were started so that additional jobs in economically depressed areas could be provided as soon as possible. The administrators are prepared to allocate the additional money as soon as it is available. There is a tremendous backlog of applications from the entire country. Many of the most-needed projects will never get approved because of the lack of funds, but we can certainly make a start. As we know so well, unemployment is still a serious problem. In particular areas the problem is severe. Jobs are needed. Public projects are needed. The agencies and the local communities have met their responsibilities. This House is honorbound to fulfill its pledge and meet this pressing national need.

The House committed itself to passing the balance of the authorized funds when it approved the initial $400 million appropriation on October 4, 1962, by adopting the conference report on the public works appropriations bill. Accelerated public works funds were not included in the origional House-passed bill because the authorizing legislation had not yet become law. In that conference report, the House managers took the unusual step of specifically endorsing a statement in a committee report of the other body:

> The managers on the part of the House endorse the Senate report statements on the accelerated public works program.

That report of the Senate Appropriations Committee stated:

> The committee felt, therefore, that it would be desirable to provide a partial appropriation which would permit this program to get underway at the maximum possible rate for the next 4 months, with the understanding that the administration can submit a supplemental estimate in January, at which time they should be in a position to support a definite program, with specific recommendations for projects to be undertaken and justifications therefor.

There is no doubt that the administrators have fulfilled their responsibility—just the lists of pending applications for direct grants alone took up more than 30 pages in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This accelerated public works program was not the President's original proposal nor was it the Senate's—it was a proposal of the House of Representatives. Last year the Senate-passed bill included most of the President's recommendations. It provided for standby authority for the President to start a $2 billion program of public works that would be automatically triggered by a set rate of national unemployment. The House differed with both the proposal and the figure. We felt that any program to meet the serious unemployment situation by providing additional funds for public projects should be initiated by congressional action including the specific details of being automatically set off by some statistical level with the program details to be filled in by administrative action. We determined that $900 million was needed for an accelerated program of needed public projects to supply additional jobs in areas of chronic unemployment. We set a rather short spending time since we specified the funds for fiscal year 1963 which would end just 10 months after initial passage of the bill, but, we provided only enough money to "permit this program to get underway at the maximum possible rate" so that the administrators would have to come back to Congress for a program review before they received the balance of the money.

The people certainly expect the Congress to live up to its commitment. Local communities all over the United States have proceeded on the basis that Congress would appropriate the balance of the money. They have spent money and a great deal of effort in preparing their applications and engineering surveys. Many communities have already gone ahead to fill their responsiblities by starting to raise local matching funds.

One example from my own district. A fundraising drive for $900,000 is now being completed to raise the local matching money for the construction of a badly needed new 141-bed hospital in Klamath Falls. A drive to raise $900,000 for a hospital in a county of only 47,000 is certainly clear indication that the local people are quite prepared to do everything they can to meet what the county court has designated as their No. 1 priority need.

The program administrators have fully complied, even zealously, with the directions and intent of the Congress when they passed the law and made the partial appropriation. The agencies have done a good job with the difficult task of allocating large sums of money for needed public projects all over the United States so that the extra jobs could be provided as soon as possible. Only the partial appropriation was made in order to force the agencies to report back before they received the balance of the money so that Congress could review their administrative practices and experience. The agencies have filed lists of the allocations approved, a review of their administrative practices up to date, lists of the projects now pending, and a statement of their intended practices in the future. There is no doubt that they have come back with a "definite program, with specific recommendations for projects to be undertaken and justification therefor."

Even the administrative cost has been kept to less than 1 percent of the total money appropriated. In carrying out the congressional directive to allocate this money as fast as possible, the agencies are now prepared to allocate the additional money as soon as the bill is signed. Last week, in my own area, the Pacific Northwest, the various State coordinators met, those people who are most knowledgeable about the relative needs of the projects, in order to assign priorities. The agencies have certainly fulfilled their duties and are ready to proceed. The rest is up to the House.

Last fall's information about the redevelopment areas is still true. Their population of 34.3 million provides 19 percent of the country's labor force while suffering from 33 percent of the unemployment. The average rate is above 10 percent, more than twice the national average. Redevelopment areas, as designated under the congressional legislation, are areas that do not respond to national economic upturn. Many of these areas have been chronically depressed for years. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I certainly recognize that unemployment is a national problem that extends to the whole country. But, there are many areas with chronic economic problems that will not be helped by a national tax cut, no matter how large. Eighty-four percent of the areas eligible under this program, including three counties and an Indian reservation in my district, are redevelopment areas.

Labor surplus areas, now 190 in all, constitute only 16 percent of the eligible areas, but constitute a serious economic problem. These are areas that have had 6 percent unemployment or more for 9 out of the last 12 months. They respond only sluggishly to a nationwide economic upturn. Many economically depressed areas, especially rural ones, have a difficult time qualifying because many of the unemployed leave where they are as soon as they are out of a job because they know they cannot find jobs. That is a fact not reflected in the statistics. This situation is true of three of the counties in my own district—including my home county.

It might be helpful to include the statistics for some of the counties in my own district.

Redevelopment areas (5b):

Wasco and Sherman Counties: 50 percent above national rate, 1962; 8.6 percent versus 5.6 percent nationally.

Hood River County: 50 percent above national rate, 1962; 8.5 percent versus 5.6 percent nationally.

Labor-surplus areas:

Lake County: 75 percent above national rate, February 1963; 12.1 percent versus 6.9 percent nationally.

Klamath County: 50 percent above national rate, February 1963; 10.3 versus 6.9 percent nationally.

Baker County: 65 percent above national rate, December 1962; 8.6 percent versus 5.3 percent nationally.

In every case the latest available report from the Oregon State Department of Employment reports:

First. Steadily declining work force and population as unemployed men move out of the county to look for work. In one case, Lake County, the population, after reaching a peak in 1960, has now dropped down below the 1950 census population.

Second. In most counties the only available jobs are those for skilled workers—and the unemployed do not have the needed skills in order to fill these jobs.

Third. Particularly high rates of unemployment exist among "young, inexperienced, and poorly trained."

One of the few bright spots in the entire picture is the jobs for the unemployed that have been provided through the accelerated public works program. One of the prime reasons that I so strongly back this program is that it provides the maximum number of jobs possible for those who most desperately need them: the less fortunate and less skilled citizens.

Specific language was written into the bill requiring that the projects meet an "essential public need." From the experience in my own district there is no worry about finding projects that completely fulfill that requirement. As I am sure there are throughout the rest of the country, we have a large backlog of needed public projects that have not been financed because of the lack of funds. This is obviously even more true in those eligible areas due to their economic problems. There are many examples:

Water and sewage facilities: Needed just for health reasons. Many of our communities, such as my own hometown, are now in danger of being prosecuted by the State board of health because of their inadequate water and sewage facilities. Proper facilities would make these areas attractive to new business and new people. The overall economic development plan for two of the counties—and this is a plan formulated by local people, not any Federal agency:

One of the major problem areas in public health is the need of nearly every small community or small town within these counties for sewage disposal facilities. It would make them a more suitable location for people to come to live and certainly more attractive to both employers and potential employees.

Hospitals: The present hospital facilities in Klamath Falls have been declared totally inadequate and a firetrap by the State board of health. An application for a hospital in Klamath Falls, pending since December, provides for a 141-bed facility to serve the entire Klamath River Basin—including parts of two California counties.

Forest Service: Many areas need these direct Federal allocations which so effectively utilized the available labor and provide the maximum amount in wages. The unemployment situation in the timber industry in Oregon shows no present sign of any substantial improvement.

The types of examples could be extended almost indefinitely. There is certainly not the slightest support for any statement labeling these projects "make work" or "leaf raking."

Many of the most needed projects will never get approved even if the full $500 million is appropriated, because there are so many more meritorious applications than there is money to service them. There is a tremendous backlog of eligible applications from the entire country. As of the end of January there were $1.2 billion worth of pending applications and more were coming in at the rate of $450 million per month.

There is certainly no doubt that these funds have resulted in a definite acceleration of these public projects. Half of the presently approved projects have already started and the balance will be started within the next 3 months.

There is a definite need to appropriate the additional money as soon as possible so that these extra jobs can be provided. This House has pledged itself. It has a definite responsibility to appropriate the money to complete the authorized program.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, while all Members have considered the merits as well as the long-range implications of the amendment, I believe it should be clearly understood that while the amendment calls for the sum of $450 million, there are applications pending now for accelerated public works projects totaling more than $2 billion. If we adopt the amendment, we will provide for the funding of less than one-fourth of the projects for which applications have been filed by areas declared eligible for these funds.

Last Thursday I requested the Area Redevelopment Administration to furnish me the valuation of applications of eligible areas currently pending with each of the 12 Federal agencies. Mr. Johannas U. Hoeber, Assistant Administrator for public works acceleration, sent me a statistical statement, dated February 15, 1963, described as follows:

Recapitulation by States of the programs submitted by all participating agencies for consideration under the proposed $500 million supplemental accelerated public works appropriation.

This tabulations showed that on February 15 there were $1,227 million in applications for projects under the accelerated public works supplemental appropriation.

I called Mr. Hoeber and reminded him that I was expecting to receive figures on current applications and not figures on applications as of February 15. I called his attention to the fact that while his tabulation of February 15 showed that there were $632 million in applications pending before CFA, I had received a letter from the Commissioner of CFA, dated February 8, stating there were applications in his Agency for more than $900 million in grants. I also called to Mr. Hoeber's attention that while his recapitulation showed applications pending before the Department of HEW for $328 million-plus, I had been advised on February 8 that applications for grants in excess of $450 million had been filed with HEW.

The Assistant Administrator of public works acceleration then stated that the applications for grants shown by their tabulation sheet of February 15 had not been kept up to date and that in fact there were outstanding applications in excess of $2 billion for the accelerated public works program. Apparently, this February 15 statistical sheet was submitted to both congressional committees considering the supplemental request.

The Administrator of ARA stated before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on April 4 that while the $400 million appropriation was being allocated and programed, grant-in-aid applications from local communities were being received by CFA at the rate of $300 million a month and by the Department of HEW at the rate of $150 million a month. This is found on page 12 of his statement. These figures clearly substantiate the fact that in the past 4 months applications for grants for these agencies alone amounted to $1.8 billion.

The ARA Administrator further stated that as of September 8, 1962, 1,069 areas were listed as eligible for accelerated public works assistance and this number has now increased to 1,228 areas. I think it should also be kept in mind that applications are pending in the Department of Labor from many areas in the Nation seeking new economic surveys in order to be classified as eligible for assistance under this program. By June 15 applications from eligible distressed areas will likely total $3 billion.

Can we, in good conscience, say to better than three-fourths of the areas applying for assistance under the APW program that we cannot finance your project even though your area was declare eligible for these funds? To meet the demand of these bona fide eligible areas, the Congress would now have to appropriate in excess of $2 billion—and approximately $3 billion by June 1.

This is the responsibility facing us today. Do we appropriate for one-fourth of the pending projects, or do we ultimately appropriate for all eligible projects; $450 million or in excess of $2 billion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that there have been some conversions on both sides of the aisle in the last few hours. I was delighted to see that although yesterday 100 percent of those speaking on the Republican side of the aisle were branding this program as a useless and unnecessary program, today we have had several who are willing to invest $300 million more. I think that is some progress in the matter of conversions from the debate on yesterday.

I do want to caution my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle not to be led astray by the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Oliver P. Bolton], because there are two hookers in it. One of them is the provision that not a dollar may be spent after June 30, 1963, which would be a very serious impediment to the efficient operation of this program. The second one which the gentleman has advocated says that no more applications may be accepted, which would certainly operate to penalize, and would be unfair to, communities which have had delays in processing their applications and getting them in due form.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of the Boland amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to address the Committee in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to restore the $450 million accelerated public works program funds put in this appropriation bill by the Appropriations Subcommittee, but excluded by the main Appropriations Committee.

I want to commend the subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, on the action which it took with respect to including the $450 million for the accelerated public works program, and the action that the gentleman from Massachusetts is now taking in moving to restore these funds which the main Appropriations Committee cut from the bill. I have observed, in the time that I have been a Member of Congress, that the subcommittee has been extremely careful in scrutinizing budget requests with more than casual care and invariably takes a hard look at all departmental requests—sometimes, I think, too hard as in the case of civil defense, for example. Actually, in the budget item now under consideration, the subcommittee did cut the budget request $50 million or 10 percent—a substantial amount in anybody's language.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the opponents of this amendment have made much of the issue of economy. But, I question whether the basic issue involved here is one of economy. To kill this program at this time might be the most uneconomical action this Congress could take—certainly it would be unjust and inadvisable.

We have heard a great deal about principle. Let us examine this. Congress last session passed a $900 million authorization for the accelerated public works program, pursuant to which the Congress later in the session passed a $400 million appropriation. As a result of the action taken last session, many cities, towns, navigation districts, water districts, and other political subdivisions have gone to great trouble and expense to prepare prospective projects under this program. Whether the opposition to this amendment agree with this program or not, the Congress did approve it and launch it on its way. To stop the program now—at least short of the $900 million authorized—would be a grave injustice to those cities, and so forth, that should be able to rely on the program for at least the full amount of the original authorization. In my congressional district alone, there are pending in various stages about 10 applications amounting to more than $900,000.

Now, why are there so many applications—more than 500 applications from Texas alone; nationally, $1.3 billion in applications—under this program? Obviously, because the folks back home think the program is a good program. It is not a perfect program, to be sure, but it is a good program. It is a local participation program which means that the folks back home have to think enough of the proposed project to bear at least 50 percent of the cost. And the program lends itself much more readily to small projects for towns and villages than do projects under the regular public works program, even though the Government usually bears 100 percent of the cost under the regular program.

The accelerated public works program is a needed program because the local, ad valorem tax-supported political subdivisions, particularly in depressed areas, are not in a position to bear the full weight of the much needed public improvements encompassed in this program.

When I consider the many billions of dollars, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress consistently votes for such programs as foreign aid—much of which is spent for public works projects for foreigners—I feel adverse action by the House on this amendment would be in the category of making this Congress appear to be "millions wise, but billions foolish."

I want to again commend the gentleman from Massachusetts and the subcommittee on the action which is being taken here today, and I support it.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, both these amendments I think have been adequately debated. My only admonition is that we do not get confused. With the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling] in the chair, with my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Oliver P. Bolton] offering a substitute amendment to my amendment, and with the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] for $450 million, I would hope that the committee be alert to the parliamentary situation. I suggest that we vote down the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Oliver P. Bolton] which provides $300 million and that we vote for the amendment offered by myself which restores $450 million to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] to close the debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Oliver P. Bolton], on his amendment. It shows at least that his heart is in the right place even though the amount of money he recommends is not large enough.

May I say to my colleagues that the hunger and the loss of respect of these good people who are unemployed do not recognize the aisle that separates these two able and distinguished parties here. Hunger and unemployment do not recognize party labels. We need all of the $450 million and I respectfully ask the Members, even though I admire my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Oliver P. Bolton], and acknowledge that his amendment is better than no bread at all, to recognize that they should vote for all of the $450 million. So I ask you to vote down his amendment and vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland].

Mr. Chairman, may I say this further word. Somebody talked about the lack of merit in these projects. I have been here a long time as have many of my friends. Go back to your hometown and look at some of these projects that were built 25 years ago. You will find you are still using them. In my town we are still using the city hall, the coliseum, and the biggest charity hospital. This money will put people to work. We can get up here and talk all day, but we all have some common horsesense. We know that when you spend this money and get the dirt flying, people are going to be on the job. Not only that, but the people who saw lumber, who make steel, who make glass, who make pipe, are going to be working, too.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that we should vote down the amendment of our friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Oliver P. Bolton], and vote for the amendment of our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland].

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, to help maintain life in the accelerated public works program, I rise in support of the amendment to restore to the appropriation bill before us, the sum of $450 million initially approved by the subcommittee but stricken by the full committee.

In my opinion there are many reasons for appropriating this item for use in the furtherance of projects all over the country. First and foremost is the fact that the Congress last year, in the process of authorizing the $900 million accelerated public works program impliedly promised our constituents to follow through, on the strength of which promise our fellow Americans all over the Nation have gone to a lot of trouble setting up their respective community projects to create jobs and strengthen their respective areas. Many of these projects have already been started with the $400 million already made available and require additional funding for completion. Many others are being held up by participating Federal agencies pending the appropriation of the remaining $500 million which has been authorized, or substantial portion thereof. Let us, therefore, settle for the $450 million which has been approved by the subcommittee, and thereby keep faith with the public while at the same time going ahead in an orderly and timely manner.

Continuing with reasons why we should adopt this amendment, let me just note that the projects involved will generate jobs to help solve the serious unemployment problem of which all of us are painfully aware. Such help along this line is particularly applicable under this program to the depressed communities wherein live so many of our fellow Americans. Furthermore, most of the projects will meet essential public needs in the communities where they will be effectuated and will, when constructed, constitute capital assets which in any case would eventaully be provided for community improvement. This, in turn, will enable many communities, after establishment of such improvements, to in turn attract private investments for production plants and services, with consequent creation of new jobs and improved local economies.

As concerns my State of Alaska, over 40 community facilities projects are involved all the way from Ketchikan to Nome and Kotzebue, including hospital construction, waste treatment plants, water systems, sanitary disposal sytems, and municipal buildings, and so forth, plus public health facility projects such as pure water supply for 12 Alaskan native communities.

In summary, and for the reasons stated, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this amendment, not only for the benefit of the 49th State which Alaskans are striving to develop and strengthen, but for the benefit of our Nation as a whole.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am appalled that at this stage in our deliberations, some Members of this body should lower themselves to play politics with the potential livelihood of hundreds of thousands of the unemployed. In more than a thousand communities across the country where joblessness is running at a rate of two, three, even four times the national average, we have an opportunity to put men to work on urgently needed local, State, and Federal public works projects. Just as there is a need in these communities for jobs that will bring dignity to idled breadwinners, so also is there an urgent need for sewers, water systems, streets, hospitals, sewage treatment plants, fire and police stations, public buildings of all kinds.

With the first $400 million that was appropriated for the accelerated public works program, we have been able to make an encouraging start on meeting these two most urgent needs—jobs for our fellow citizens and improvements in the public sector of the economy. But to date, we have only scratched the surface. There is an enormous backlog of projects requested by local governments acutely conscious of community needs—projects which are planned, engineered and ready to go. These have been submitted by the economically hardest hit areas of the country, the ones which for decades have failed to keep pace with the general forward movement of the economy, the areas which failed to share in our recovery from the 1960-61 recession.

The needs of these areas have been well documented. The opportunity for helping them is obvious. What is needed now is for the House to restore the accelerated public works funds cut from the appropriation measure before us. To do less would be to fail in our responsibility to people who look to us for help.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment to restore the sum of $450 million for the accelerated public works program in the supplemental appropriations bill for the current fiscal year ending June 30. This program was authorized by Congress last year under Public Law 87-658, and at that time a sum of $400 million was appropriated. In a way Congress had pledged to the Nation its help in financing these badly needed public works as a means of aiding economically distressed communities. That pledge must be kept.

The remaining $500 million under this program should have been approved without any difficulty. These projects are not a waste. The program of public works is not a boondoggle. It is a very vital and necessary means of giving these communities, especially the small and medium size towns and cities, an opportunity to construct sanitation facilities, water systems, roads, harbor facilities, improvement of city streets, bridges, municipal buildings, and the like. Without this Federal assistance the communities could not undertake these projects.

The Appropriations Subcommittee has seen fit to reduce the original request from $500 to $450 million, and many of us I am sure would be willing to go along with that action. The full Appropriations Committee, however, has completely eliminated even the $450 million recommendation of its own subcommittee, and this will be a great blow to many communities throughout the country which had looked forward to this assistance. I regard this action as a rash and thoughtless act on the part of certain elements who would make a political football of this program.

Unless the funds are restored, I feel certain that the people back home are not going to like this. They have come to regard the accelerated public works program as an excellent method of achieving several purposes for the good of the communities. In the first place, it helps to provide needed projects from which the whole community benefits. It provides a considerable amount of employment and helps to alleviate the economic difficulties in many of these areas. It also helps to improve living conditions and to rejuvenate many localities by attracting new industries and people.

Oftentimes all that an economically distressed community needs is one spark to get it back on the road to prosperity, to attract a new plant or factory, to bring in a new commercial enterprise which is a boon to the area, and this spark can be provided by a road, a water system, new or improved sanitation facilities, harbor improvements, or a bridge. These expenditures later pay for themselves over and over through more employment, improved services, better health, better living conditions, and happier communities. The denial of this assistance will prove very discouraging to municipal officials and to many public-spirited citizens who are giving much time, effort and energy to help their communities. When multiplied on a national scale, this can boomerang and prove very damaging to our national economy.

The popularity of this program is attested by the fact that today there are twice as many applications for this type of assistance from all parts of the country than the amount of money requested for the program. About 1,000 counties in the country, or nearly one-third of all the counties, are suffering from chronic and substantial unemployment, and many of them have submitted applications for public works which would not only bring needed improvements but also help them fight unemployment.

It is estimated that some 6,000 public works projects of all sorts can be realized with the help of this appropriation of $450 million. Matching funds have been provided or are in process of being provided by communities all over the country. All of this should prove to be a great economic boon. I know it will be of tremendous help to Connecticut, which until the end of January of this year received a total of $3,963,000 for various projects under the accelerated public works program. We have a number of applications from our State which have already been approved and many others are pending. The people of Connecticut are, therefore, extremely interested in the action being taken here today.

I feel strongly that Congress has made a pledge to the people on this program, and it must not renege on that pledge. On the basis of this pledge many communities have made plans to raise the necessary funds for these projects. They have every right to expect the assistance promised them. I shall vote to restore the $450 million for this program and I urge all my colleagues to do so.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, last fall, when the Congress overwhelmingly voted in favor of the accelerated public works program, it authorized $900 million in expenditures for essential public works projects that would improve the face of our neediest communities and at the same time provide jobs for the jobless.

Although a month after enacting the legislation, the Congress appropriated only $400 million to get the program started, it very specifically instructed the executive branch to come back at this time for the additional funds needed to keep the program moving in high gear.

This was more than a mere budget exercise on the part of the Congress. It was more than a mere promise to the executive branch of a friendly ear to its request for more money. In its very essence, it was a pledge on the part of the Congress to the people in economically stricken communities that more funds would be forthcoming to carry on this program.

On the strength of that pledge and relying on the integrity of this legislative body, thousands of communities assessed their urgent needs and submitted requests for matching funds for their highest priority projects. It was obvious to them, as it must have been to all of us on both sides of the aisle who recommended prompt action by the executive branch to approve these projects and put people to work, that not even the entire $900 million, much less the $400 million actually appropriated, would be sufficient to meet the well-documented needs of these areas. The proof of this lies in the fact that more than a billion dollars worth of requests are now in the hands of Federal agencies and as each of us knows, countless other projects are back in the communities and would be submitted to Washington tomorrow were it not for the freeze that had to be placed on applications because the demand so far exceeded the anticipated appropriations.

Having pledged itself in an unmistakable fashion to the continuance of this program through the appropriation of the remaining $500 million, the Congress cannot now, for whatever reason, turn its back on those whom we promised to help. The $500 million must be restored to the supplemental appropriation if the Congress is to keep faith with the American people.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we have been told repeatedly that the most important item in the President's legislative program for this year is a massive, significant, tax reduction. If this is in fact our most important challenge, and the economic authorities seem to agree on that, then we should prepare for it by reducing Federal expenditures wherever possible. There is no better place to start than in the item before us, area redevelopment.

The waste in the program under consideration cannot be better illustrated than by a recitation of locations in Florida which have been singled out for this aid; for example, Broward County and Dade County. They admittedly contain some of the most prosperous areas in our State and country. In fact, we called some of them America's Gold Coast. If these were needy areas, our own State could care for them, but they are, in fact, affluent areas, not distressed areas. The program should be tightened up to make more sense, and our refusal to grant these additional funds at this time would have the double value of removing waste and refusing to add to the Federal deficit by these amounts.

Only by a shepherding approach to our expenditures can we make sense out of a tax reduction, which authorities seem to agree upon as essential to the security and welfare of our country and its economy.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman. I regard the adoption of this amendment as vital to the welfare of our country. This is a program for America.

Thousands of our communities are suffering economic distress. Millions of American workers are unemployed and unable to provide for their families. The accelerated public works measure was passed by the Congress last year to assist these people and these communities.

Mr. Chairman, I need not remind this House of the enthusiastic reception given the accelerated public works program by hard-hit American communities. Thousands of meetings have been held to agree upon essential projects. Engineers have been hired.

Plans have been drawn. Municipal elections have been held to approve bond issues.

Mr. Chairman, the depressed American communities have placed their money, their trust, their immediate hopes in the fulfillment of this temporary program. We cannot let these people down.

I need not remind the House that this $450 million will go to help pay for needed, essential public projects. Our many depressed communities need this assistance to help them regain their competitive posture. They must have adequate public facilities to attract new businesses and industries. We must help them break the vicious circle of poverty and lack of opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, at the close of last year's session the Congress made an initial appropriation for this vital program. Several thousands of hard-hit and depressed American communities lined up for help for their essential public projects. This House cannot discriminate against those at the back of the line just because they failed to reach Washington first.

We must carry on this program. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief statement in support of the amendment to restore $450 million for the accelerated public works. I do so, not to defend my vote, but to indicate the effect that it will have on the State of Alabama.

I should also like to state that I am in complete accord with the desires of the Appropriations Committee to reduce expenditures and to cut out all unnecessary programs. I believe this can be better accomplished, however, by curtailing new programs of the Federal Government—that is to say, let us stop this ever-increasing trend toward centralization of government which year by year is costing the taxpayers of this country more and more. Let us attempt to restore the responsibilities of government wherever and whenever possible to the State governments. By so doing, I am sure that we can ultimately reduce the budget and again return to a sound fiscal policy.

In this particular instance, however, I do not believe it wise to curtail programs that will give considerable aid to the unemployed of the country by providing jobs and thus take thousands of persons off relief rolls.

Expenditures, such as proposed in this program, are for the welfare of the people and will also provide sources of revenue by taxation, by increasing productivity in plants, and by placing more individuals on the tax rolls.

In the case of my State of Alabama, the restoration of these funds in the bill will mean that 11 hospital additions and nursing homes can be started; 26 sewage treatment plants and interceptors can be started; 48 community facility projects, such as water systems, parks, road construction, sanitation systems, hangars, courthouses, swimming facilities, drainage programs, clinics, and other necessary community improvements that I believe will materially benefit the country as a whole.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I was astounded and shocked to hear last Friday of the committee's vote to kill the balance of the accelerated public works program.

Last year one of our most significant legislative victories was the $900 million emergency public works bill. That hard-fought victory was a bold stroke to combat our persistently high rate of unemployment. The Federal grant funds authorized, plus matching local grants, were designed to stimulate the construction of needed public works and to create hundreds of thousands of jobs to put our unemployed back to work.

In 1962, $400 million of the $900 million was appropriated to initiate the program and it was generally understood that appropriation of the additional $500 million would be made early in 1963.

Once launched, the emergency public works program moved with gratifying speed. Thousands of projects—for hospitals, streets, sewers, and other vitally needed facilities—have been approved and the President's figures show there are now applications on hand for over 6,200 projects in more than 3,000 communities.

Construction activity is rising rapidly and with it site employment and jobs in supporting and supplying industries.

In my own State of Alabama this is what the accelerated public works program has done so far: 94 projects have been approved involving nearly $10 million in funds from the program, and which have directly created 1,300 jobs of a year's duration. Pending applications for Alabama involve 141 projects for a total of $26,725,000 in accelerated public works funds which will create nearly 4,000 jobs. And this is just the direct on site employment—indirectly the projects will provide the stimulus for many more jobs.

Alabama desperately needs these public works projects. She needs the better health and sanitation that these hospitals, sewer treatment works, and water systems projects will bring to her communities. She needs the better facilities that will be provided by the courthouse and municipal building projects. She needs the improvements in her national forests and at dam sites to preserve resources and to use them widely. And she needs the jobs that these useful public works projects will create—jobs that will make it possible for unemployed men to earn a decent living for their family.

Mr. Chairman, the best estimates are that, with approval of the full $900 million, several hundred thousand of our Nation's unfortunate unemployed will be put back to work, either on construction jobs directly or in the factories and mills which supply the materials and in the service trades which benefit from the accelerated economic activity engendered by the program.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, it would be unthinkable for us to deny the remaining $500 million in Federal funds for this crucial and vital program.

We cannot in good conscience break a moral commitment the Congress gave last year to do something for our country's unemployed.

It is true that our economy has made encouraging progress in shaking off the debilitating drag of the 1958 and 1960 recessions. But we cannot be satisfied with the continued high rate of unemployment which still persists in the range of 5½ to 6 percent of our labor force. We must bend every effort to reduce that rate substantially.

Mr. Chairman, these are not just statistics we are talking about; they are flesh-and-blood fellow Americans whose economic suffering is all the more tragic against our overall setting of general affluence.

I say to my colleagues in the House, on both sides of the aisle, it would be an unforgivably shortsighted and heartless act if we were to fail here today to restore the remaining $500 million of public works fund already authorized by the Congress last year. We cannot callously turn our backs on the plight of the unemployed, nor can we fail to give the additional stimulus to economic growth which these funds will supply.

I yield to no man in the desire to achieve a balanced budget and to prevent the resumption of inflation. At the same time, I think experience has proved that the only way a balanced budget can be achieved is to raise our economy to full employment levels. And I think that the accelerated public works program, just as the President's proposed tax cut, will help provide the stimulus we need to reach the twin goals of full employment and a balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that a majority of this body will uphold the amendment both in the name of human compassion for the unemployed and in commonsense recognition of the need to stimulate the higher rate of economic growth we need to achieve our objectives of a full employment economy.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, last fall the Congress passed and the President signed S. 2965, a bill authorizing the expenditure of $900 million to speed up action on needed public works projects, thus helping to relieve unemployment and spur economic expansion in those areas which have failed to keep pace economically with the rest of America.

On October 13, the Congress appropriated an initial $400 million to get the accelerated public works program underway. That $400 million has by now been virtually used up.

President Kennedy has asked the Congress to appropriate the remaining $500 million authorized under the bill. Last Friday the Appropriations Committee cut this item from the deficiency appropriations measure.

So that we may decide whether to restore this cut, let us first see what is resulting from the first $400 million appropriation.

This $400 million has accelerated 3,756 public works projects. These have ranged from projects involving water supply and sewage systems to hospital and health facilities; from projects providing for erosion control to improvements in timber stands, trails, and recreational facilties on public lands.

In my own State of Rhode Island this original appropriation resulted in the approval of 26 much-needed projects for various hospital additions and water and sewage treatment works. The amount of Federal funds thus released to Rhode Island projects totaled over $6 million. This in turn, through required local contribution, permitted the total expenditure of nearly $11 million worth of new construction providing an estimated 4,500 man-months of employment. This has truly been a shot in the arm to our Rhode Island economy.

Mr. Chairman, a listing of these projects follows:

Rhode Island—List of approved accelerated public works projects as of Mar. 1, 1963

[All dollars in thousands]

Location	Description	APW	Total	Estimated onsite man-months
5A Providence-Pawtucket, Blackstone Valley:				
DHEW-PHS	Treatment plant	$440	$2,080	1,056
Woonsocket City:				
DHEW-PHS	Woonsocket hospital addition	128		72
	do	50		60
HHFA-CFA	Construct sewage facilities	270		420
Warwick City:				
HHFA-CFA	Sewage treatment	1,548	4,297	
DHEW-PHS	Sewage facilities	1,827		600
	Interceptor sewers	68	341	164
Cranston:				
DHEW-PHS	Sewers	239	478	
	Osteopathic general, construct	125		144
HHFA-CFA	Construct sewage facilities	333		330
Lincoln:				
HHFA-CFA	Construct town hall	125		124
Pawtucket City:				
DHEW-PHS	The Memorial Hospital addition	19	38	12
Providence City:				
DHEW PHS	Rhode Island Hospital addition	88	175	84
	do	68	135	36
	Addition to Roger Williams Hospital	344	687	408
	Sewage treatment addition	67	337	162
	do	193	963	462
	Rhode Island Hospital addition	83		96
	Water supply	110		112
	do	90		150
	Water facilities	20		19
	do	9		12
State total		6,244		4,523

All these are worthwhile projects. But most worthwhile of all is the fact that these projects have created jobs.

Altogether, the 3,756 projects in the Nation have generated over 500,000 man-months of direct employment.

One of the most serious problems facing America today is the problem of unemployment. Latest figures published by the Department of Labor show that unemployment has dropped from 6.1 percent of the workforce to 5.6 percent of the workforce.

This still leaves a critical situation, but it is a substantial improvement.

No sensible person would give the accelerated public works program credit for this drop. But it certainly is a factor, along with the area redevelopment program, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and all the other legislation that this and previous Congresses have passed in attempts to alleviate unemployment in the United States.

We must continue this drive to bring unemployment in America to a manageable level. We must attack this problem on a broad front. The accelerated public works program is one of our weapons in this attack.

The initial $400 million appropriation has created more than half a million man-months of employment, in areas of high unemployment—where the jobs are needed most. The funds are being used to refurbish our communities, to make them better places in which to live, to work, and to invest.

The accelerated public works program has already demonstrated its usefulness to America. We must see that this program continues. This body must restore the $500 million item in the supplemental appropriations bill so that the accelerated public works program can continue.

Failure to so act would have a serious effect on all States throughout the Nation. Again, Mr. Chairman, may I cite the situation as it exists in my own State of Rhode Island, a situation of which I am understandably fully aware and the importance of which is graphically brought home to me everywhere I turn in my congressional district. There are 27 pending projects, each diverse in nature but all united in one characteristic—need. The total Federal contribution on these 27 projects is $7¾ million A description follows:

RHODE ISLAND

Pending projects—$500,000,000

CFA:	
Warwick, Kent County, library	$310,000
Woonsocket, Providence, water supply	270,000
Pawtucket, Providence, waste treatment	750,000
East Greenwick, Kent, town hall	150,000
Cumberland, Providence, water supply	51,000
Warwick County, water supply	75,000
Lincoln, Providence, sanitary sewer	225,000
Narragansett, Washington, sanitary sewer	142,000
South Kingstown, Washington, town hall	58,000
South Kingstown, Washington, administrative building	19,000
South Kingstown, Washington, administrative building	44,000
South Kingstown, Washington, street	20,000
South Kingstown, Washington, street	30,000
Pawtucket, Providence, street	271,000
South Kingstown, Washington, park	16,000
Bristol, Bristol County, sanitary sewer	115,000
Total (16 projects)	2,546,000
HEW:	
Cranston, Rhode Island Medical Center	124,000
Cranston, Rhode Island Medical Center	48,750
Cranston, Rhode Island Medical Center	15,000
Pawtucket, memorial hospital	1,500,000
Providence, Rhode Island Hospital	75,000
North Smithfield, Mercy Hospital	998,500
Narragansett, Washington, sewage treatment plant	160,700
Providence, sewage treatment plant	35,800
Cranston, Providence, sewage treatment plant	1,266,500
West Warwick, Kent, interceptor sewer	750,000
East Providence, Providence, interceptor sewer	251,000
Total (11 projects)	5,225,250
Grand total (27 projects)	7,771,250

Mr. Chairman, I can make no stronger plea for restoration of these funds than to point out that unless we so vote today, none of these projects will get off the ground. From the effect such failure would have on my small State of Rhode Island, we can well visualize what it will mean to the Nation at large.

There are overall, 6,211 projects pending, awaiting congressional action before they can be acted upon. These projects total more than $1.2 billion. And applications are coming in at the current rate of $300 million a month.

The communities which have made these applications are now waiting for action by the Congress. We can do no less than restore the $500 million to the appropriations bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, yesterday we held considerable debate regarding the extreme need for action to meet our commitments in the field of accelerated public works. I would like to rise to express my strong support of the proposal to appropriate $450 million to carry on a job which we started last year and have only half financed.

From the first $400 million which was appropriated by the 87th Congress, there were many worthwhile projects carried out in the portion of California which I represent. These were primarily done by the Forest Service, National Park Service, and the Bureau of Land Management who were in a position to move ahead rapidly and put the people back to work.

At the same time, municipal and county government and special public districts proceeded in good faith to meet their obligations in this field. A great variety of important public works programs were developed. Local government has financed the preparation of plans and specifications, completed the engineering, held bond elections or raised its share of the money through direct taxation, and now stand ready to proceed on an accelerated public works program.

If, at this crucial point, the Federal Government abdicates its responsibilities in these mutual programs, I think it would be a great tragedy. This, to my way of thinking, is the best part of the accelerated public works program. I feel this way because I believe that we are getting $3 worth of value from every single dollar of Federal funds, which we are investing. I say this because not only must the local government sponsoring this program contribute half of the actual construction funds, but also the local government agency is encouraging employment through the performance of its engineering, financial, and other planning activities prior to the actual awarding of the contracts.

Much was said yesterday about the type of projects which are involved in the next round of the accelerated public works program. I would like to cite to you some of the projects on application in the Second Congressional District of California.

For instance, the East Quincy Services District in Plumas County has applied for assistance to construct a new domestic water system. This project is ready to go to bid. The district is bonded to its capacity and if this program is not approved by the Congress, there is little or no possibility that it can proceed. This is the only hope for this small mountain community.

The question may be raised, Is this a boondoggle, as some referred to the general pattern of accelerated public works projects, or is this a necessary project? I would like to quote the report to me by the county's health officer:

> The dangers inherent to a large group of private wells mixed in with septic tanks have become apparent. Water samples taken by us recently show that the largest motel in East Quincy, the dentist office and many private dwellings are beginning to show excessive contamination. We are on the verge of a very explosive situation from a health standpoint.

The greatest danger as I understand the situation in this community is infectious hepatitis. There is no question as to the urgency of this project.

Although the health threat in the city of Dorris, for instance, is not as great as in East Quincy, there is a desperate need for a new sewer and water system.

Plumas County must have a new public health center. Shasta County needs to expand two of its hospitals. These are the types of public works which I believe can and must be supported by this type of program in the seven counties which I represent that are eligible for assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard estimates that if we are to maintain the status quo in unemployment and if we are to prevent the serious unemployment from becoming even more crucial, this Nation must create 80,000 new jobs every week for the next 10 years. We need to create 10 million jobs in the next decade just to provide employment for the young people who will be entering the labor market for the first time.

If we do not provide these jobs and these 10 million young people join the ranks of the unemployed, think then of the problems this Nation will face. We think we have trouble with unemployment today. We think we have trouble with delinquency and crime today. Add 10 million young people who are not able to get jobs in the first place to the rolls of the unemployed and think of the problems we will have in the future.

This question of employment of our Nation's labor force is the greatest problem this country has to solve today. We cannot be satisfied with holding the line at presently unacceptable levels of unemployment. We must reverse the trend. Congress enacted the Full Employment Act of 1946 and I think it is high time for this Congress to meet its responsibilities of implementing this act. Let us get on with the job. Let us get our people back to work. We can make a good start here today.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] to restore $450 million to the bill under consideration to keep alive the accelerated public works program.

Opponents of this proposal scoff at the idea that the construction of needed public works can help to counter unemployment and they label the accelerated public works program a boondoggle, handout, and other derogatory terms.

Mr. Chairman, let me relate what this public works program did in the congressional district that I represent in Ohio. When the authorization bill was enacted last summer the Toledo area qualified because it had suffered unemployment above the 6-percent level for 9 of the previous 12 months. I arranged a conference with the mayors of six cities and villages in the district to explain the provisions of the bill and the procedures for application. These officials, let me say, were Republican and Democrat alike, and I urged that applications be filed with all possible promptness because they would be considered on a first come, first served basis.

Because these officials responded with alacrity, a number of applications were filed and were quickly considered. The result was approval of four projects totaling just over $2 million and providing approximately 750 man-months of employment. These projects, let me emphasize, would not have gone forward without the Federal contribution under the APW program because there simply were not sufficient local funds available to undertake them.

For those who deride this program, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the employment picture in the Toledo area his improved sufficiently so that we are no longer eligible for continued assistance. To those who might say that this improvement would have taken place regardless of accelerated public works, I can only reply that unemployment was over the 6-percent level for a consistent period of time before the program and that our condition improved exactly at the time that the projects I have referred to went under construction.

As a final word I would like to mention the character of these projects and I do so for the benefit of those who seem to have it deeply ingrained in their minds that any public works project is unneeded and a waste of the taxpayer's money. The projects approved for Lucas County, Mr. Chairman, include an addition and remodeling of Mercy Hospital in Toledo, a water system for Oregon, Ohio, a firehouse and municipal building for Holland, Ohio, and a water facility for Maumee, Ohio. Although my district no longer qualifies under the program, I have complete confidence—based upon the superior administration of accelerated public works by Mr. Batt and his associates—that other worthy and badly needed projects will go forward in every part of the United States, projects which are needed but which in turn need Federal assistance. Finally and most important, the construction of these projects will provide badly needed employment opportunities for men and women who want to work but who find it so difficult to get jobs.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment to restore $450 million to this bill for the accelerated public works program. I supported the original accelerated public works legislation when it passed the Congress last year and I feel that the full amount therein authorized by Congress should now be approved.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the program, so far as it related to non-Federal projects, has not worked out satisfactorily in my district. There are many county, city, and other municipal projects in the 12th District of Michigan which I represent which fully meet all of the criteria provided for under the law, and I hope with the additional funds provided for in this amendment that these projects will receive the consideration and the priority they deserve. The 12th District of Michigan is one of the most seriously depressed areas in the country from an economic standpoint and the unemployment ratio is as high there and in some instances is higher than anywhere else in the country. I therefore trust that the administrators of this program will give full and fair consideration to all of these factors when the additional funds are made available to them for expenditure.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to support the amendment for the restoration of $450 million in accelerated public works funds offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman BOLAND.

Yesterday and today much was said about the need for this program's funds and on the other side of the coin, many remarks have been made about boondoggling. This is not a boondoggle in my district. I have three counties with serious problems of unemployment, and this problem of unemployment began, as you will note from the figures which I quote, not in 1961 but in 1958:

Rate of unemployment

	Percent
Grays Habor County:	
August 1957	8.6
February 1958	15.3
February 1959	8.1
1960 (average)	10.3
1961	9.2
Pacific County:	
November 1960	13.2
December 1961	10.2
Lewis County:	
March 1960	12.0
February 1961	17.3
December 1962	9.9
February 1963	9.9

Moneys which have been spent on accelerated public works and which will be spent through the addition of this appropriation are necessary to the lives of many families in Grays Harbor County, Pacific County, and Lewis County in my State of Washington.

As you are all well aware, the forests products industries have had major difficulties and employment has been steadily declining. Automation has reached into these areas and workers have been displaced by machines. Unemployment compensation has been used up in many instances. Therefore, the problem before us is either work, public assistance, or starve. My district prefers to work. I think it would be interesting to read from a letter which I received from the Oyster Workers Union which says among other things:

> Conditions are the same all over the State. Quite a few people are working only part-time, perhaps 4 to 5 days per month.

The point was raised yesterday that matching funds are unequal. May I point out two particular projects in my district which have been authorized:

First. In Toledo, Wash., a small community including a great many retired people and persons living entirely on social security and with a large area of unemployment among people formerly employed in the timber industry, $47,000 has been authorized for a sewer project. This small town used the limit of its bonding authority for matching funds of $49,000. The installation of this particular sewage project will provide that the last source of raw sewage on the Cowlitz River Basin ceases and this is important, not only to the people of Toledo, but to every person living on the Cowlitz and Columbia Rivers.

Second. In the city of Raymond in Pacific County, a sewage treatment plant intersector is scheduled to start on May 5 of this year, with the Federal Government contributing $220,000 and the local matching funds of $220,000 with an estimated onsite man-hours employment of 211. This same town of Raymond is located in the highest unemployment area in Washington and it also is a victim of the problems inherent in both fishing and lumber industries. We have tried repeatedly in this district to secure new industries and to provide jobs through private industry to the fullest and yet that challenge has not been met. Therefore, it is a question of work, relief, or starve. I know that I reflect the feeling of these people when I say that they prefer to work and to provide to their communities permanent improvements, valuable not only to themselves but to the entire area.

It is a privilege to support this bill and I only trust that we can steadily decrease the number of unemployed not only in my area but in every area throughout the United States, for Americans like to work.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to add $450 million in public works funds to the supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 5517.

I oppose this amendment for the same reasons that I supported a motion to recommit the public works acceleration bill in 1962. I also oppose this amendment as a matter of priority. We are now over halfway through the session and this is the second matter of any importance we have had before us. There are other matters that should be ranked ahead of this one. This amendment adding $450 million to an already costly measure will do very, very little to reduce hardcore unemployment in the United States. The projects for which we are asked to appropriate the additional $450 million have not been justified with any specificity. We are given only a list of towns and a list of projects, some of which are swimming pools, ski slides, rodent control centers and the like. The failure to spell out in detail what these projects are can only indicate that this information is either unavailable or, if its true nature were known, would be extremely questionable. Further, the President has been given excessive discretion to select locations of his own choosing to favor with projects.

This is not a program which as a matter of priority of importance should commend itself to the American people. The amendment in its present form, favoring certain congressional districts as it does, will do little for large urban areas where the need for the creation of employment opportunities is the greatest and where individuals are most deeply affected by population and technological upheavals. Even worse, this program may be a shameful delusion. Once it becomes known how few jobs in relation to the cost are actually being provided, it may foster a climate of dissatisfaction and despair.

The amendment should be rejected.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing Americans are noted for it is finishing what they start. See a thing through. And that is what we are being called upon to do today. Finish the job.

This appropriation is authorized. Now let us vote it. It is greatly needed. Unemployment has decreased somewhat this last month. We all hope it continues. But it is not going to disappear overnight. We saw last year what needed to be done and we had the nerve then to vote a program to do it. Let us finish that program by voting the remaining funds authorized. Besides a stimulation for the economy and a help for the unemployed, it will help satisfy our national needs for construction of essential public facilities. Further, we owe it to the communities that have been led to expect the appropriation, and that have gone ahead in almost assured anticipation of our appropriation. Many, perhaps most, of the applicants were ready or almost so for participation in the first appropriation. But that money could go just so far, and some had to wait or give up their projects.

For example—just to take one instance—in the Hill-Burton hospital construction program administered by the U.S. Public Health Service—one of the grant-in-aid programs participating in this program—there is a reported backlog of 264 projects costing $259,262,300 and requesting $127,297,427 in accelerated public works assistance. We cannot help all these applicants, but we can help some. If we appropriate this money, as we should, some $56 million would be allocated to the Hill-Burton program for construction of these projects.

Beyond this, there is the permanent employment that follows from operation of every medical facility.

We expect others to honor their obligations to us; let us honor our obligations to the country. Vote the remainder of the accelerated public works authorization and stimulate the chain effect of increased employment and construction of needed public works. Do not let the communities look in vain to us for help. Do not let us slam the doors in their faces. Let us complete what we started and put people to work today.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support restoration to the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1963 of $450 million to finance public works projects pursuant to the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962.

In 1962 the House of Representatives authorized $900 million and in that year we appropriated the first $400 million to get the public works projects underway in a great effort to meet the problem of unemployment in the United States. If we appropriate $450 million today we will but fulfill the expectation we created in 1962, namely, that we are concerned with unemployment and that we will do something about it. That is the issue facing us now. We have an opportunity to relieve the stress of unemployment in seriously depressed areas in the United States and to construct useful and meaningful public work projects throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, I will support a restoration of $450 million to the supplemental appropriations bill and I urge each Member of the House of Representatives to support it as well.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BOLAND and Mr. BOW.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 202, noes 172.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Educational television facilities

For grants to assist in construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, as authorized by part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (76 Stat. 64), and for related salaries and expenses, to remain available until expended, $1,500,000, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for such salaries and expenses during the current fiscal year.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIBBONS: On page 10, line 14, strike out lines 14 through 22.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment knocks out $1,500,000. I say to those of you who are for economy that this is a good place to vote yea. To those of you who favor trying to help the President balance the budget, that is a good place to vote yea.

I have examined the report of the committee and the testimony given before the committee, and I find that the delay of this appropriation will not hurt the national picture at all. This does not involve a program to provide more jobs to get America moving. This is to try to provide more educational facilities and stations.

We are already making fine progress in connection with educational television stations without Federal assistance. Most of the States of the Nation already have very fine programs in educational television. This new Federal program will eventually be a $32 million program.

I checked with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare this morning as to whether or not they were able to spend this money right now, and I want to quote from the record of the committee hearing, on page 440, where the witness from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was testifying. He said: "We can put this money to use very quickly."

I called up this morning and talked to the people and asked them whether or not they had their regulations out, which you will find they need in connection with this proposal to spend $1,500,000. They advised us that they hoped to get the regulations out by June 15.

I submit to you that they cannot spend this money in any sensible manner during this fiscal year if they do not have any regulation out. This is just a good way to help balance the budget a little and to cut down on this useless spending.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be defeated. I share the gentleman's position that we want to save a little money. The budget estimate was for $2 million. Your committee, recognizing the facts of life, reduced it to $1,500,000.

Of all the popular programs in the field of communication and television, this is the most popular. These are nonprofit organizations. They include your schools, colleges, your educational and your nonprofit organizations which are interested. This requires a matching amount of 50–50 for new stations. Where you assist an established station the amount is 75 percent.

There are 324 channels available. There are 75 educational television stations now. Do you know how many applications are pending? There are 200 now pending, clamoring to get in this program.

Who are they? Little stations? No. Your colleges, your high schools, and your educational institutions. This is for the benefit of all of us. I sincerely hope the pending amendment will be defeated.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I had intended to offer an amendment identical to the one that is pending.

I rise in support of the pending amendment. This is a new program, it is getting the Congress involved in something that will cost a lot more than is indicated by this bill and report.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the gentleman know of anything good on this earth that does not cost money?

Mr. McCLORY. I know everything costs money, but it has to be paid for in money, according to my theory. The only difference between that rule and the one which seems to prevail here is that here you are authorizing money to be spent without recognizing that the bills have to be paid eventually.

In addition we have State programs for educational TV which are in operation, and we should have faith in the States to assume their prerogatives and responsibilities.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, that the program which is being initiated here today is not merely one involving the construction of TV stations and the improving of TV stations as was indicated by the report and by the legislation authorizing this program. But also the question was raised in the hearings in regard to the operation of these stations. The suggestion was made in the committee hearings that these stations were to be operated by the local communities and by private funds. Whenever the Federal Government gets into the operation of TV, the Federal Government will control its output and take over programing. I think those that say we do not want the Federal Government in the field of education recognize here and now that we are establishing a precedent in regard to this program. These stations are going to have to be operated, and if we are going to spend Federal money, we want to control them.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to say, since this legislation was reported from our committee, under the provisions of the act, it does not permit the Federal Government to spend any funds at all in the operation of these facilities.

Mr. McCLORY. I recognize that.

Mr. HARRIS. These are construction funds only on a matching basis.

Mr. McCLORY. I recognize that, too, but these facilities cannot be operated without any funds to operate them, and it will compel us at a later time to assume huge expenditures for the operation of these programs. That seems to me to be a fundamental question.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. The statement has been made here that there are 200 applications. I want to set the record straight. I checked with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare this morning. They do not have the first single application, because they have not gotten any regulations out by which they can accept any applications.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. The applications must go to the Federal Communications Commission. They are the ones that have the 200 applications.

Mr. GIBBONS. This appropriation is for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for $1.5 million for 2 months, and they do not have any way to spend it.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. There are 76 educational television channels now in operation and there are 200 applications pending, not before the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare but before the Federal Communications Commission, the agency that licenses television stations. This program was passed in May of last year. It was passed overwhelmingly by this House. It came out of the committee chairmaned by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], and it clearly provides against any Federal interference with the operation of these stations. There is no question about it. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, went into this in the hearings. This is one of the best programs we have for television in America. This is one area where we can help education reach all of America, especially in areas where it is difficult to get programs. This is one of the best programs we have, and this House has gone overwhelmingly on record in favor of it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my particular support for educational TV and for the assistance to educational TV contained in this bill. Yesterday my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. Bow] indicated that he was fearful of appropriating funds to support the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities. Among the reasons he cited was the likelihood that local communities would be unable to find operating funds and would look to Washington for help, thus offering the opportunity of thought control.

I can think of no better way of answering these fears than to read a letter which I received only yesterday from Mr. Harry D. Lamb, Director and General Manager of TV education station WGTE–TV. I can certainly say that the contents of this letter and the unstinting and unselfish efforts of local citizens in the Toledo area are the very reason that I support the appropriation for educational TV contained in the bill:

Toledo Public Schools,
Toledo, Ohio, April 5, 1963.

Hon. Thomas Ludlow Ashley,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The University of Toledo and the Toledo public schools are currently defraying all costs of operating WGTE–TV (channel 30–UHF), the Greater Toledo Educational Television Foundation station. The Toledo public school system supplies all paid staff, and the university supplies housing, heat, light, power. In addition, Mildred Cowell, station manager, and a member of my department, trains university students in station operation and production and announcing. The engineering staff, both holders of first-class radio-television licenses, also in my department and paid by the board of education, gives further training to the university students enrolled for credit. From the enclosed program schedule you can see the type of thing done: daytime broadcasts to schools with the emphasis on French language and nighttime programs obtained from our affiliation with the National ETV and Radio Center, New York City. It is underwritten by the Ford Foundation, but we pay $600 a month for their program service. Affiliation also made us eligible for the grant of a videotape recorder and $10,000 worth of videotape—total value approximately $60,000.

Our problem is this: we are operating (with the permission of the Federal Communications Commission) at less than our full power of 1 kilowatt. Our effective radiated signal power is only 0.0296 kilowatt visual, and 0.150 kilowatt aural, with an antenna 190 feet above sea level. Our signal reaches all of Toledo satisfactorily, but it does not serve the 25-mile radius area that it should serve to satisfy FCC. Our original application promised an antenna height of 500 feet above average terrain and that is the height needed to cover the area. You can appreciate the reluctance of Toledo school people to expend money to serve southeastern Michigan and rural communities in a 25-mile radius that includes Fremont and Bowling Green, especially when Bowling Green State University itself is readying itself for broadcasts over WGBU–TV, channel 70–UHF. The convenient solution would be to receive Federal grants as provided in the act passed by the 87th Congress in the amount of $32 million to the States on a matching basis for construction and improvement of ETV facilities.

Sincerely,

Harry D. Lamb.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons].

The amendment was rejected.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $812,300.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas], a question or two.

Is this $812,300 to the Civil Service Commission necessary—all of this amount—in view of the fact that the White House and the Democratic National Committee have taken over the screening of the summer employment of high school and college students? Can the gentleman from Texas help me out on this?

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will yield, I shall be delighted to do so, but my experience has taught me that my able friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], does not need too much help. This applies, may I say to my colleague, only to two items: one is the Pay Act, which was passed by the House. We reduced that by 5 percent.

They are now moving into a new building that they have been trying to obtain for the last 25 or 30 years. They are moving out of the old Pension Building in the District of Columbia.

The remaining part of the money is for furniture, and we cut the furniture request about in half.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not helped me out on the question I asked.

Is the gentleman convinced now that the Civil Service Commission is going to screen the Civil Service applicants for summer employment in Washington, D.C., or are they going to be screened by the Democratic National Committee and the White House?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. GROSS, let me give you my best judgment. It is my understanding that it will be handled just like it has been handled before, under Civil Service. You write over there and ask them to give this chap or this boy or young lady or young woman a job, and they give him or her the test to determine whether he or she can type or file. It is my understanding that it is going to be handled under Civil Service.

Mr. GROSS. It is the understanding of the gentleman that these applicants will be screened by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. THOMAS. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. We can depend on that from here on out?

Instead of sending those who write to us and apply for summer employment to the Democratic National Committee or the White House, we can, on the word of the gentleman from Texas, send them to the Civil Service Commission with assurance that their applications will be processed there?

Mr. THOMAS. That is my understanding, and if I can help my friend any, please call on me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Housing for the elderly fund

For an additional amount for the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), $25,000,000.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this few moments to direct a couple of questions to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling this particular bill having to do with the record of the HHFA and particularly of the CFA regarding elderly housing.

I would like to call his attention to page 713 of the hearings. In this particular bill apparently we are adding $25 million to the revolving fund which the Agency has for direct loans for housing for the elderly.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. SISK. Is it further correct that this raises the total to $250 million in this fund?

Mr. THOMAS. No, sir. It raises total appropriations to the fund to $150 million. The authorization for appropriations was increased from $125 to $225 million last fall.

Mr. SISK. To $150 million?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. SISK. Permit me to ask the gentleman what kind of a case the department made in view of this table to which I call the gentleman's attention which appears on page 713 where over the life of section 202, which was a part of the 1960 Housing Act, they have apparently completed 12 projects for a total unit capacity of 657 units. In other words, apparently, they can house around 1,200 people, assuming these are, let us say, married people.

They have actually invested $6,163,000. I ask these questions not because I want to criticize this program; I was for this program. I think there is a definite need for this program. But I have some concern about the administration of this program in the department downtown and I am curious to know how they can justify an increase in the revolving fund in the face of the history of the activities so far.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend's statement, and he is making a good statement and asking some very intelligent questions which are for the good of the membership of the House. But you must remember that this is a limited program. The only subsidy invloved in this program is the difference between the conventional interest rate and the interest rate which, for practical purposes, is 3¾ percent under the statute.

Here is what we have done. I think the Office of the Administrator has done a very good job. We have cautioned them time and time and time again to go slowly and to make sure they know what they are doing. Here is the reason for that. In the first place these loans are for—how long? Up to 50 years. Think about that.

These are nonprofit. So this is a payback. It is perfectly easy to go back into your section or my section or somebody else's section and build a nice house, but we have to consider cost because these people who are going to live in these houses are not millionaires. They have to pay it back. So we have cautioned the Agency to go slowly and screen them. We have asked further, "Do you have anybody that even looks as though he is going to be in default on any of these projects that are already built?" They have a good many under construction. They said, "No, the loans are all being paid on time and everything looks 100 percent sound."

Mr. SISK. The point that I am making is how much of this is going into administration? I am going to call attention later on in this bill—I think it is page 37—to the fact that we are increasing the amount of money substantially for administrative expenses, and I am wondering if all we have down there is a group of people who are spending the money administratively, because believe you me, when we look at the record—and I spent several years on projects for the elderly and have some real concern on this program, I do not believe they are building houses for these aged people who need this type of housing.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my friend that your committee will watch these administrative costs and see that every nickel that should not be spent will not be spent.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, all of us who strongly support this direct loan for housing for the elderly program want to see it work and we want to see it administered and carried out by the responsible agency so that it will provide the benefits to the needy elderly they urgently need and it was the intent of Congress to provide when section 202 was added to the act in 1960.

I think the record of action revealed by this discussion is deplorable. The accomplishments have not scratched the surface of the need. This national record would not be creditable if it had been accomplished in only one major city, let alone 50 States. I think we must demand that this program proceed as authorized and that it be placed in the hands of people who will carry it out. I urgently request that the responsible committees, the Appropriations Committee which is recommending this increased appropriation, and the Banking and Currency Committee with jurisdiction over housing, find out what is wrong and see that it is corrected. This program can be soundly administered and I do not propose that we stand by and see it turned into a fiasco at the expense of the elderly who desperately need decent housing at a rental cost within their limited resources.

My comments are based not only on the picayunish record revealed by the committee hearings, but upon my personal experience in trying to help along some important projects in California.

I am referring to two housing for the elderly projects, one in my home city of Fresno, and the other in Los Angeles, both of which desperately need these direct loans to prevent enforced increases in rental charges which will price this housing out of the reach of the pensioners it is designed to serve.

In Fresno we have a major project which is better than 97 percent occupied and in which tenants are well housed, securely cared for, contented, and well served. It is housing approximately 1,000 elderly persons—almost as many as the entire direct loan program throughout the Nation has thus far housed. This project was economically built and is being economically administered. This housing was constructed at a cost of $8,200 per living unit, which is about $3,000 per unit less than the average commitment per unit under the direct loan program and is about $1,200 per unit less than the average of costs of projects in operation under the program as reported here today. On the basis of average costs under commitments, the sponsors of this project saved more than $1,600,000 in building this sound project. Yet with all this, this project has been unable to get a loan in an amount and under terms which would make it financially feasible or possible of acceptance. The endless terms and conditions and provisos, the additional guarantees and reserves, the limitless redtape which I have encountered and personally witnessed in endless months of negotiation are incredible and transcend my understanding of blind bureaucracy. In my opinion, the refusal of the agency to develop any feasible or workable loan for this project is completely contrary to the intent of Congress in providing a program of 100-percent financing for these projects and is driving to the wall this going, proven haven for senior citizens.

The same sponsor has completed a similar project in Los Angeles County, and there is every indication it can be immediately filled with elderly tenants at rental rates which would be possible under the favorable interest of a direct loan, but there is also every indication it never will get the chance to get such a loan unless the viewpoint and organization and activities of the agency administering this program are radically altered, by direct surgery if necessary.

I have tried to be patient and to withhold criticism and give the agency a chance to smooth out procedures and establish policy, but my patience is completely exhausted. I want this program to go forward and I urgently request the Congress to see that it does.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask my distinguished colleague from California if it is not true that there is at least one project in his district, very efficiently built, which has resulted in probably the lowest occupancy charge to any of the old people? This Agency seems through administrative expense to have given the project a great deal of trouble and concern; and if this is typical of what is going on in the administration of this part of the act, the whole matter should be looked at very carefully.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. SISK. Of course, this is the whole point of the position I have taken. I am for the basic program which we enacted or which I thought Congress had in mind when we passed the 1960 Housing Act. The testimony of Mr. Woolner before Mr. THOMAS' subcommittee went into this matter in the hearings. They found that not including any land or other items that go into the cost, the structural cost was almost $8,500 per unit, which means, when you add a reasonable land value that it runs up to about $11,000 per unit. We have in California two projects at the present time which have been constructed, including land cost, for less than $8,500 per unit, and still, because of administrative problems and apparent confusion in the Agency they refuse to approve the projects. The fact is that I question whether they even know where they are going in the Agency. We have been unable to get any reasonable consideration on these particular projects.

I might say that the two projects we have in California will house almost twice as many people as the total number of people that will be taken care of by all these 12 completed projects throughout the United States, yet the unit cost of the California project is over $1,000 per unit lower than the unit cost of the 12 approved projects.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank my friend. I should like to say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I hope he will look into this problem about which my friend from California has been talking because I think the actual purpose and intent of the legislation is not taking place in these projects and that we are actually hurting the elderly people we, in the Congress, are trying to help. I hope the gentleman will look into it.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman. I can assure him your subcommittee will go into it from every angle. They are occupying 12 finished units now with some 21 under construction. We will set aside some time, and invite both of you to come before the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF RADIO FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Acquisition and construction of radio facilities", $5,800,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question concerning this $5,800,000 for the acquisition and construction of radio facilities for the USIA. Do I correctly understand that this will result in a project of $20 million or more, and that, although you want to appropriate nearly $6 million, there is no signed agreement as of now for this project, the erection of these radio facilities in either the Philippines or the Ryukyus?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. First I should say that up to this minute as far as I know there has been no signed agreement with the Philippine Government. There are three possible locations for this facility. The committee recommends the appropriation here of the amount of money necessary and needed to be obligated in the present fiscal year for the location which would be the lowest of these in total cost. If this short-wave transmitting facility were to be installed at Agoo in the Philippines it would cost $19,705,000. If it were installed at another location in the Philippines it would cost $24,500,000. And if it were to be installed in the Ryukyu Islands it might cost the highest amount, as much as $32 million. The committee feels we need this transmitter in that part of the world. We are not getting the broadcasts across as we should. We do not have as strong a signal as we should for China, central and eastern U.S.S.R., and south and southeast Asia.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that you now are appropriating money when you do not even have a selected site for the transmitter?

Mr. ROONEY. They have given us three possible sites, two in the Philippines and one in the Ryukyu Islands.

Mr. GROSS. But you really have not picked a site for that?

Mr. ROONEY. That is so, but there is also another angle. As I discuss this with my distinguished friend from Iowa, my memory becomes more refreshed in regard to it. If we appropriate this money as we propose in the pending bill it would help toward getting immediate agreement on the less costly site. That is one of the reasons it is here in this bill. The ten 250-kilowatt transmitters have to be built regardless of the location.

Mr. GROSS. In order to complete a deal with the Philippines after all we have given them we now have to show them the color of our money. Is that it?

Mr. ROONEY. That is always a good idea, to see the color of a man's money when you want to do business with him.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask this question. Why in the world should it cost more money to erect a transmitter on Okinawa than in the Philippines?

Mr. ROONEY. There are a number of reasons for this, principally with regard to the amount of money which would have to be expended in connection with the land.

Mr. GROSS. What does this have to do with it?

Mr. ROONEY. The site preparation costs, in connection with the land, would be more expensive in the Ryukyu Islands than in the Philippines? Also, in the first location in the Philippines it would be an association with existing VOA facilities and would not require certain construction.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, what we are doing today is making a downpayment of $5 million or almost $6 million for a project as to which the agreement has not yet been signed and we do not know whether it will ever be signed.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman understands after reading the printed hearings, that a sufficient leadtime is needed to get the transmitting equipment, the electrical equipment, on the way. The Agency should be permitted to enter into contracts as soon as possible with the producers so as to have this transmitting equipment in time for it to be installed at the selected site.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

Management and Investigations of Resources

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", $658,400.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, do I understand that $400,000 of this $658,000 is for research in development processes to produce a concentrated protein from fish?

Mr. KIRWAN. This sum of $400,000 is in the bill, for the benefit of the fishing industry, to find a process to make protein from billions of pounds of fish not presently used, and I do not mean any fish having to do with the aquarium. This has nothing to do with the aquarium.

Mr. GROSS. I think it has something to do with the aquarium and fish pond business.

Mr. KIRWAN. This is $400,000 to help the fishing industry find a new outlet for its product.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says it has nothing to do with his aquarium. I think it has everything to do with the Kirwan piscatorial palace. If we are going to spend $10 million for a fish research center in Washington, D.C., why not defer this $400,000 until that time? I remind the gentleman that he told the House the aquarium would be used as a research plant as well as an attraction.

Mr. KIRWAN. The money that is going to be spent to build this greatest aquarium in the world is not going to cost the taxpayers a dime. You have been misinformed. Why does the gentleman not state the true facts?

You read the law; why do you not tell them the truth? It is not going to cost the American taxpayer a dime.

Mr. GROSS. I read what law?

Mr. KIRWAN. The law creating this aquarium. It is not going to cost the taxpayer a dime. I proved that the other day.

Mr. GROSS. I have heard that old refrain around here so long that I can almost dance the tune without the music: "It won't cost a dime."

Mr. KIRWAN. It will not cost a dime. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. We have heard some of that same refrain this afternoon.

Mr. KIRWAN. The experience with the aquarium in Philadelphia is that even with a $2 admission fee they cannot keep them out. This will pay for itself.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not think this could be put off until his fish palace is completed?

Mr. KIRWAN. No. This research is needed now by the fishing industry.

Mr. GROSS. I was told this was to be a research plant down on Hains Point.

Mr. KIRWAN. This appropriation is for the fishing industry.

Mr. GROSS. That is just fine. But it costs $400,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, $200,000.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that we will consider later this afternoon an authorizing bill, H.R. 1762, to promote, coordinate, and develop effective programs relating to outdoor recreation, which is to be under the Interior Department. Is this appropriation for that purpose?

Mr. KIRWAN. A Commission was appointed, headed by Laurence Rockefeller, to make a study of recreation and the Commission recommended this new Bureau to coordinate all the agencies dealing with recreation. This money is for the new Bureau and is for functions now authorized. The authority exists to do it.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. Is not that also the effect and direction of a bill that will be called up for consideration this afternoon?

Mr. KIRWAN. The chairman of that committee is here and can explain the new bill, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. ASPINALL.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. This afternoon, or tomorrow, or whenever we bring up the Bureau of Recreation authorizing bill, we will have legislation before this body to authorize additional appropriations. What is being done at the present time in the Department of the Interior is this. They have a Bureau of Recreation at this time. This effort has been carried on for almost a year. What is requested in the bill before us now is a supplemental appropriation to take care of the additional activities of the Bureau for the rest of this fiscal year.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Of course, this appropriation is to start the program. Is it another situation of the youth conservation proposition that was started in March before it was authorized?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is mistaken. We have general authority for setting up the present Bureau in the Department of the Interior. We have been carrying on the work of the Bureau all this fiscal year in the Bureau of Recreation with an appropriation diverted from the National Park Service over to the Bureau of Recreation in the amount of about a million dollars. In order to put this program into a constructive orderly approach we need this $200,000.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Do I understand the gentleman to indicate that if this bill which is to come up later, either this afternoon or tomorrow, is defeated, this money would not then be necessary in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is once again mistaken in his position. As I tried to explain to the gentleman, the Secretary has the right to establish this Bureau at the present time under general authority. What we are trying to do by the authorization bill to be considered later is going to the operation, authority, limitations, and so forth of the powers of the Secretary.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I will discuss that further with the gentleman. I appreciate his response very much.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I do so for the purpose of pursuing further for a moment, if I may, this particular appropriation.

May I ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] how much has been spent by the Outdoor Resource and Recreation Commission since it was established 4 years ago in the preliminary studies?

Mr. ASPINALL. We authorized an expenditure of $2 million. As I presently recall it is the only Commission I know of since I have been in Congress that stayed within its original authorization.

Mr. COLLIER. Two million dollars have been spent for a study of recreation resource areas throughout the country?

Mr. ASPINALL. Resource areas of recreational value. The gentleman was a member of the committee when the authorizing legislation was passed.

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct. I am curious, however, to know whether the Commission spent the $2 million, because at the time it was established I had some very definite reservations as to whether $2 million was needed to make the study when, in fact, almost every State in the Union has information in their own conservation department that would have supplied practically all of the information and data necessary.

Mr. ASPINALL. I am not one who can properly say, perhaps, that such a study is worth $2 million, but it was carried on under the chairmanship of one of the best businessmen I know of, Mr. Rockefeller of New York City. I accepted it as being done in an efficient and businesslike manner.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was authorized by this Congress, and there was appropriated, over the objection of some of the people, $2 million. They did their work within the time designated in the bill and filed its final report. Approximately $50,000 has been turned back in unexpended funds. The Commission performed the functions imposed on it by law, made its report, and it is out of business.

I may say to the Congress that if the Appropriations Committee had had the foresight to give the Commission the money they asked for when they asked for it in the first supplemental appropriation bill after Congress created the Commission, we would have done the job for about $250,000 less.

Mr. COLLIER. My question was not intended to be critical of the Commission or anyone on the Commission. It was simply that I seriously doubt whether we had to go to the extent of spending $2 million on the study.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Travel and miscellaneous expenses", $130,000.

Mr. THOMAS (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill in its entirety be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration

Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals", $1,110,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN of Mississippi: On page 20, line 6, change the figure "$1,110,000" to "$581,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and my colleagues from Mississippi, Congressmen COLMER, WINSTEAD, ABERNETHY and WILLIAMS. What this amendment would do is to require several different agencies of the Government to absorb certain costs. These agencies and the amounts they would absorb are as follows: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, $185,880; Bureau of Prisons, $31,389; U.S. Marshals appropriation, $294,362; U.S. Attorneys appropriation, $491,000; Civil Rights Division, $27,950; Civil Division, $12,337; and $6,591 for the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice.

These amounts represent what these agencies spent in the Federal action at Oxford. In addition to these amounts of course, the military department spent $5 million.

Mr. Chairman, all of you know how strongly we feel about the action of the Federal Government at the University of Mississippi, which is in my district. I attended "Ole Miss," a great university. Having practiced law before coming here, having been district attorney, I not only feel very deeply about the occurrences that have taken place at this fine institution but firmly believe it should never have happened. But, more than that, my friends, involved here is the destruction, in my opinion, of the very basis upon which our Nation was founded. This Nation was created with a clear division between the judiciary, the legislative, and the executive, a balance of power, each equal and independent of the other. This fact has stood us well through the years. Such provisions were initially provided because the people who framed the Constitution knew what had happened in foreign countries, where all-powerful federal governments were the order of the day. The actions at the University of Mississippi were the culmination of practices which have been growing for some years; that is, the executive department, through the Attorney General, has been going to the Federal courts, intervening in pending lawsuits, asking the courts to enter decrees in accordance with the desires of the executive department, and through the years the courts have yielded to the executive department in issuing such decrees. Then, when the decree as requested by the executive department was issued, the executive department provided U.S. marshals, even Federal troops, to carry out the order which the executive department had the courts of the land to issue in the first instance. Clearly the judiciary and the executive have been working hand in hand, through and through. This, in my opinion, was never intended.

Let me tell you some facts with which you perhaps are not familiar. There were 22,000 soldiers used in and around Oxford, Miss., at a time when we had only 6,000 in Berlin. The Supreme Court had not finally acted on the case at the time the Federal Government moved in, in force, at the University of Mississippi. I know that you have heard reference to the Governor of our State and this, that, and the other, but may I say to you that the Governor of the State of Mississippi has no general law enforcement group except the National Guard or the State militia, and prior to the Federal Government moving in, those troops had been taken away from the Governor and federalized. The State Highway Patrol of Mississippi has no authority except on matters on the highways or in the area immediately adjacent thereto. So here you find the Governor with his law enforcement group taken away from him and put in the Federal service. Yes, you find him placed in that position at a time when the Supreme Court had not even rendered a final decree.

These facts may not disturb some of you at this time; but believe me, when the Federal forces move in because it is said one Justice of the Supreme Court said that he had got on the telephone and checked with other Supreme Court Justices, and he said they said what they were going to do at some time in the future, it should disturb you. My friends, this Nation was not built on any such shaky foundation as that and certainly could never have lasted this long if it had been. May I say to you again, in this instance it happens to be my fair State, but when it reaches a point where the Executive and the Judiciary can join together and before the Supreme Court renders a final decree, using three time as many troops as they had in Berlin, take over in any State—first taking away the State militia, I say it is time to begin to look to see if involved is not a deeper principle than that of integration.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. Chairman, the incident at the University of Mississippi last September is one of the most shameful tragedies ever inspired by men in high Federal office. And, it was so inspired, Mr. Chairman, purely for political purposes.

The premature and hasty action of the U.S. Department of Justice, under cover of the tremendous power which it called into action, was designed to impress the Negro minority and to incur their favor on the election days to follow. No consideration was given to the sacrifice that was to be forced upon this great old institution of learning, its student body of more than 5,000, and the people of a proud State. They were all written off, deliberately and designedly.

The basic law of our land provides that any litigant aggrieved by a decision of a lower court shall have the right of appeal to a higher court, and even later to the Supreme Court, the highest court in the land. Except in most extraordinary and extremely rare cases, the judgment of the lower court or courts are stayed pending a rule of the highest court. A stay of judgment was in effect in the case involving the University of Mississippi, pending action on a perfected and legitimate appeal to the Supreme Court.

Although this matter was pendente lite, and undecided by the Supreme Court, the youthful Attorney General of the United States, evidently having concluded that the end justifies the means, decided to and did take things into his own hands. The pending appeal to the contrary notwithstanding, the Attorney General decided to and did force the enrollment of the applicant in question before the Supreme Court had an opportunity to rule on the pending appeal.

The Attorney General forced this action in a highly dramatic and dangerous fashion, with a display of civil and military might and power never before utilized by the Federal Government except in war against a foreign enemy.

This action led to riot and bloodshed, even death; and to physical destruction of properties on the university campus. It left a proud old institution of learning sick, ailing, and deeply hurt. It aroused the animosity of thousands of Americans against the leadership of the Nation, conceding that their action met with the favor and satisfaction of some shortsighted citizens.

When later queried as to why he took this hasty, premature, and forceful action, the Attorney General justified same, or at least attempted to do so, on the ground that he was certain of what the Supreme Court would rule on the matter when it did get around to such a ruling. So, he contended there was no point in waiting for the litigation to run its legal and constitutional course.

Mr. Chairman, if this is to be the criterion upon which our Government is to act it would be just as sound to electrocute one convicted in a lower court of a capital offense, while his appeal was pending before the higher court, on the ground that the executioner was convinced that the higher court would affirm the conviction. This is a new concept of justice in the land of Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the hasty action of the Attorney General was without authority of law. It was an illegal act. Being such, the taxpayers of this country should not be required to pick up the check for the mistakes of the Attorney General—and that is just what the pending item in this bill is designed to do.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from

Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], that yesterday we had debate from one o'clock until five o'clock, and I served notice on the Members of the House then that I would object to any extensions of time. I have done that to a number of Members and I could make no exception on this request. But may I ask the gentleman from Mississippi to explain to me a little more fully the point he was making?

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the kindness of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that the actions taken by the Federal Government were taken prior to a final decision by the Supreme Court of the United States. Point No. 2, that under the law of the State of Mississippi the Governor has only one law-enforcement group, and that is the National Guard, or the State militia, which was taken away from him by the Federal Government.

The courts were called on by the Justice Department to charge the Governor and Lieutenant Governor with the crime of criminal contempt and now the same Justice Department insists they are not even entitled to a jury trial.

Mr. Chairman, in my remarks of yesterday the Members will see a report by the mayor and other representatives of city and county governments describing the situation in Greenwood, Miss. You will note they have one police dog. They point out that there has not been a single person who has been prevented from going to the clerk's office to apply to register. What they have broken up is these large groups walking down the street, headed by a national figure who apparently wants to help his television program, who has said, according to the press, "I am going to stay here until the President sends Federal troops to Greenwood, Miss., like he did at Oxford."

I hope every Member of the House will read my remarks made yesterday in general debate. It is my district that happens to be in trouble today, but it is our Government which is breaking down. Have we reached the place where the executive department through the Attorney General can tell a court what decree to issue, use troops to enforce that decree, and not even wait for it to be a final decree by the Supreme Court and in the process take away the State militia, direct the courts to bring charges of criminal contempt, and then deny to the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of a sovereign State the right to a jury trial when charged with a crime.

Mr. Chairman, we have reached that point and if the President, whoever he may be and from whatever party, continues to rely upon a reported telephone call of one Justice to the other Supreme Court Justices as to what they said they were going to do in the future, sends armed troops in to take over with orders to use all force necessary, truly I say there is little left of the Constitution, of separation of powers, or of protection of rights of the States and of the people from an all-powerful Government.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for clarifying this situation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for the Mississippi delegation is only to prevent restoration of money already spent in the infamous Federal move on the State of Mississippi at Oxford. I regret that time has been limited and does not permit an adequate discussion of this tragic situation. However, it is a well-known fact that during and since the Oxford crisis, the FBI, Department of Justice lawyers, and other Government law-enforcement officials have swarmed over Mississippi like locusts. Every alleged incident involving a white person and a Negro in Mississippi or other Southern States causes more FBI agents to be sent out to make an investigation. All it takes for an investigation to be touched off is for a telegram to be sent to Attorney General Robert Kennedy, charging some white person with violation of so-called civil rights. Such telegrams are immediately made available to the press and publicity is given the charges by every communications medium, and the FBI is sent to investigate. When it is determined that these much-publicized charges are without foundation, neither the Attorney General nor the press makes any effort to furnish this information to the public and neither does the Department of Justice take steps to prosecute those who fabricated these charges.

The recent unfortunate incident in Washington when a white policeman shot a fleeing felon is well known to all of you. Charges were made by certain groups that the white officer who killed the Negro did so without sufficient justification and, in substance, acted in an irresponsible manner. I would like to point out here that some responsible Negroes in Washington, as well as other respected citizens, took the side of the law in this incident. Although no direct charges were made that the white officer was guilty of a so-called civil rights violation, when he shot the Negro, that is what these irresponsible charges amounted to.

Why did not the Attorney General launch a full-scale investigation of this incident? The answer appears to be that the incident occurred in the District of Columbia where no political mileage can be gotten from such an investigation. Had the same incident occurred in Mississippi or Alabama or any other southern State, General Kennedy would have immediately sent a small army of FBI agents and other of his representatives to investigate.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee of the Whole, there is no one here who appreciates the sincerity of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] more than I do. But I cannot agree with him in the slightest with reference to the Meredith case on what he is trying to do in this appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment were adopted the gentleman would deny the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Bureau of Prisons, the U.S. marshals, the U.S. attorneys, the Civil Rights Division, the Civil Division and the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice necessary funds for their regular activities for the reason that the gentleman's amendment would reduce the amount at line 6, page 20, from $1.11 million to $581,000, which is the full amount of the pay increase money and which this Committee recommended should be reduced by 5 percent, or $30,000. Accordingly, he would allow the full amount of the pay increase money, but he would cut out every nickel for the everyday necessary activities of the various bureaus and divisions that I have just recounted.

Mr. Chairman, as of December 31, 1962, $445,100 had already been spent in connection with the Mississippi incident, and it was estimated that an additional $113,900 would be obligated as a result of it through June 30, 1963. This money, the $1.11 million carried in the pending bill would reimburse the various activities of the Department of Justice and take care of their pay increases. After all, the Attorney General had no alternative but to do what he did in connection with the Oxford, Miss., incident.

The usual day-to-day activities of the Bureau of Prisons, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the U.S. attorneys' offices, the U.S. marshals, et cetera, have to be carried out. As far as the Mississippi incident is concerned, the execution of Federal court orders is primarily the responsibility of the U.S. marshals service. At the beginning of the 1962 school term the fifth circuit court of appeals at New Orleans ordered the admission of the applicant—Meredith—to the University of Mississippi at University, Miss. Previously Mr. Meredith had requested admission to the university but school officials would not permit his enrollment.

In order to enforce the court order and protect the integrity of the court the Attorney General determined that a substantial force of U.S. marshals would be required. Actually 130 deputies or chief deputies were detailed from offices throughout the country and participated in the program. These men were also supported by 316 specially deputized enforcement officers from the Immigration and Naturalization Service and 98 custodial officers from 4 penal institutions. These enforcement officers were required to put in many man-hours of overtime work beginning on September 15, 1962, and ending October 8, 1962.

Obligations through December 31, 1962, amounted to $445,100 and it is estimated that $113,900 additional will be obligated through June 30, 1963. The funds already obligated cover mainly the cost of overtime, $194,807; travel, $135,439; communications, $24,329; reporting services and repairs to vehicles, $18,838; and $70,436 for supplies which consist for the most part of gasoline, tear gas, tear gas projectiles, and replacement cost of depleted stock.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge that it would be foolhardy to adopt the pending amendment. It would destroy the day-to-day necessary services of the Department of Justice. I ask that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the House limited debate on the Whitten amendment, I was precluded from getting time to speak in support of it. I certainly associate myself with the views expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] on this amendment.

The deportment of Federal marshals during the Oxford incident was shameful. The truth about what happened at Oxford, including the fact that the marshals themselves precipitated the riot by firing tear gas shells into a group of unarmed students, has been censored out of most of the Nation's press.

I have no desire here to reargue the Oxford case, except to say in my opinion, the action taken by the Federal Government at Oxford presents itself as the most shameful misuse of Executive power ever experienced by the people of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of witnesses", including an additional amount of not to exceed $25,000 for compensation and expenses to witnesses (including expert witnesses) or informants, $600,000.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot remain silent in the face of the statements which have been made in connection with the last amendment. It seems to me that we should at this point commend the Attorney General and the President of the United States for the action which was taken in Oxford, Miss. Any State which seeks to deny to any citizen of these United States his equal rights should have the full power of the Department of Justice brought to bear upon it. For instance, I feel very strongly that the Department of Justice should have intervened with U.S. marshals to protect citizens seeking to register and those active in the registration drive in Greenwood, Miss. I urged that course of action.

For too long a time we have seen, under the color of States rights, the denial of equal opportunity, and the denial of full protection of the laws. We should encourage the Attorney General to use his office, use his powers and use the statutes which are on the books to see to it that American citizens are permitted to register and are permitted to attend any State college or university or any elementary school without discrimination because of race, creed or color.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am in complete disagreement with what he has just said.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I would expect the gentleman to say that.

Mr. WAGGONNER. By contrast the Department of Justice should not be commended but condemned for having done what they did, because they have exhibited that there is no such thing as equality on the face of this earth and the world knows this is not their real concern. Equality does not exist anywhere for anybody at any time and never has.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yielded for a question, not for a speech. But I might point out that I could not disagree more with the gentleman. The foundation principles of this Nation are under attack. The Congress must face this issue and enact meaningful civil rights legislation. The Department of Justice must be constantly vigilant to protect the rights of our citizens and to see to it that equal opportunity is provided to every American.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] if he is fully acquainted with the circumstances in Mississippi; has he been to Mississippi to investigate and does he know firsthand, or is he just peddling hearsay?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I think all of us have read the accounts concerning the situation in Mississippi.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Does the gentleman believe everything he reads in the newspapers? Outside agitation is at the root of all this trouble and is complicating the solution.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I think all of us are familiar with the statements of the President of the United States—his television address to the Nation last fall and the statements he has made in his press conferences. I have discussed the situation with the Attorney General and the Chief U.S. Marshal James McShane, who so ably supervised the marshals at Oxford, Miss. I have also had a firsthand report from one of the students who was enrolled at the University of Mississippi at the time. The facts are well established. I firmly believe it would be a good idea for a congressional committee to go to Mississippi and investigate the situation and report back.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Will the gentleman answer my question? Has he been there?

Mr. RYAN of New York. No, I have not been there.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I did not intend to get into this because I recognize the futility of it, but the gentleman from New York said he fully expected the gentleman from Louisiana to take the position he took. I am sure no one would be surprised at the position the gentleman from New York took. I might add, if the gentleman from Louisiana is interested, that while the gentleman from New York did not actually visit Mississippi, according to his statement he did come pretty close down there, to Georgia, and have his picture made with some these agitators down there from New York who are stirring up all this trouble.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Extension of the Capitol

For an additional amount for "Extension of the Capitol," $300,000.

Acquisition of property, construction, and equipment, additional House Office Building

The appropriation "Acquisition of property, construction, and equipment, additional House Office Building" shall hereafter be available also for necessary furniture and furnishings for such project.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask this question of the chairman of the subcommittee. What extensions to the Capitol are premeditated in this?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the gentlewoman from Ohio that there are none contemplated in this expenditure here.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. What is the money for then? There certainly is $300,000.

Mr. THOMAS. This is for lighting. You have about a $1 million authorization, and this is for lighting fixtures and so forth.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. In most instances the lighting is twice too strong. In many of the new rooms it is almost intolerable. Some of the other works of the Architect in the extensions of the Capitol are utterly shocking. To think what they have done to our nice little dining room, which was comfortable, and which did not have this terrible vibration it has now. All the comfort and the pleasant atmosphere is gone. It looks like nothing but a service dining room in a penitentiary. Blank walls, no sound conditioning, glaring light, crowded seating has transformed a room Members enjoyed to a place where they would rather not go. So far I have not been able to discover who conceived the change and who ordered it although the Speaker, poor man, takes the responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES AND CONTINGENCIES

For an additional amount for "International conferences and contingencies," $315,000, of which $250,000 shall be available for expenses of organizing and holding the World Food Congress in the United States, as authorized by the act of October 18, 1962 (Public Law 87-841), and $65,000 shall be available for the U.S. contribution to the International Secretariat on Middle Level Manpower.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in the bill on page 23, lines 8 through 15, under the heading "International Conferences and Contingencies" on the ground that it is not authorized by law. The authorizations for appropriations for international conferences and contingencies under section 5 of Public Law 84–885 conveys authority for a general appropriation and not authority for a specific appropriation such as proposed under this section which provides that of the $315,000 for "International conferences and contingencies," $65,000 shall be available for the U.S. contributions to the International Secretariat on Middle Level Manpower.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that this appropriation is authorized by law. It is authorized by Public Law 885, 84th Congress, in section 5 of which we find the following:

> The Secretary of State is authorized to (a) provide for participation by the United States in international activities which arise from time to time in the conduct of foreign affairs for which provision has not been made by the terms of any treaty, convention or special act of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the provision of funds carried in the pending bill for this International Secretariat is for a meeting in connection with international affairs and is, therefore, valid and authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard further on his point of order?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bolling). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The language cited by the gentleman from New York is, indeed, very broad. The Chair believes that the point of order is not well taken.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Lipscomb: On page 23, line 10, strike "$315,000 of which $250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000, which";
>
> Beginning on line 13, strike "and $65,000 shall be available for the United States Contribution to the International Secretariat on Middle Level Manpower".

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the amount for International Conferences and Contingencies by $65,000. The amendment only deletes the $65,000 of funds that have been proposed for the Secretariat on Middle Level Manpower which happens to be a fancy name for appropriation purposes for the International Peace Corps Secretariat. It does not delete the funds for the World Food Congress. This is a new international organization which has been set up. It is my understanding the Peace Corps proposes to offer legislation during this session of the Congress to give them authority to go under this program in future years. If we vote this money today, we are putting the stamp of approval on a new international organization of which we do not know how much it is going to cost or how much our contribution is going to be. The background of this particular organization is as follows:

In October of 1962 there was a 41-nation meeting in San Juan, P.R. At this meeting 41 of those nations decided they would propose a resolution which was adopted that set up the International Peace Corps Secretariat to be headquartered in Washington, D.C. Our State Department voted for this resolution, and at the same time our State Department agreed to furnish this Secretariat with its chief administrative officer and all other personnel and funds to meet the expenses of the Secretariat for the first year. The estimated expenditures they agreed to for this first year were $150,000. Of this amount $70,000 was to be in detail of personnel. The U.S. Government and its agencies will pick up the tab for all personnel costs including allowances and benefits.

The State Department at the present time is making the services available of former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Richard N. Goodwin, as the Secretary General of this International Peace Corps Secretariat. His salary is $19,656 annually. The position he left, to go with the International Secretariat, has been filled by another Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, and he is being paid out of the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs appropriation.

The Peace Corps is also contributing personnel to the International Secretariat to the tune of about $50,000. The Agency for International Development is also contributing personnel.

The request before the subcommittee asked for $80,000 to supplement the $70,000 in personnel. The subcommittee wisely cut this to $65,000. This budget juggling act was performed by the State Department. They did not have the authority. There is no authority, there is no law. If they intend to start an International Peace Corp Secretariat this is the time to stop this expenditure until Congress has a chance to develop adequate information to see whether our Government should go into the program.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Is it not a fact that these funds which the gentleman is trying to strike out of the bill are being used not only for Americans, but these funds are going to be used to transport nationals of other countries? In other words, we are going to pay the expenses of bringing nationals of other countries to these international meetings. This is not just for our citizens going to these meetings, but we are going to pick up the tab for all these other nations, too. Is that correct?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. The gentleman from Ohio is exactly right. These finances are to be used to finance the participation of other nations in the International Peace Corps Secretariat which we are financing this fiscal year. We will pick up the tab.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman withhold that until we dispose of this matter? I have a point of order to the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] desire recognition?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I would like a little recognition, but I would like to hear what they have to say before I take my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we have not heard from the gentleman from New York yet, I will ask him a question.

What is the definition, what is the meaning of "middle-level manpower"?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know, but I have a suspicion. These sorts of designations do not trouble me too much. I take it this is just another bureaucratic phrase.

Mr. GROSS. It is worth $65,000 in this bill alone.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Iowa and I discussed this yesterday. This $65,000 appropriation is a contribution toward producing an International Peace Corps that will eventually save millions of our American citizens' dollars and help in keeping peace in this troubled world.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, an International Secretariat for the Peace Corps which has been spawned out of a "middle-level manpower" meeting. Now, what is "middle-level manpower"? I would like someone to describe this father of this latest child, the International Secretariat of the Peace Corps. Who sired this thing? What is "middle-level manpower"?

From whence came this illegitimate child? For those who were not here yesterday, may I say representatives of the Peace Corps and the State Department went down to San Juan, P.R., last October, to the Rockefeller Hotel, and I guess there is none plushier in those parts, with a rate of $56 a day in season. I understand they gave a reduced rate of $26 a day to the representatives of the State Department and the Peace Corps, that great down-to-earth, labor-of-love organization.

Amid these lush surroundings they set up a brandnew international organization for which we have picked up every dime of the expense so far, some $150,000 extracted from funds which Congress delegated power to the Executive to spend but with no authority, not one word of authority on the part of Congress for the establishment of an International Secretariat of the Peace Corps. Now they seek another $65,000, making a total of $215,000 to establish an organization, as the gentleman from California said a few moments ago, still another international organization, for which there is not one scintilla of authority on the part of Congress.

If you are interested in saving a few dollars, here is $65,000 that you can save and thereby put these people on notice that hereafter they must come to Congress for authority to establish these international organizations, rather than this backhanded, back-door deal.

Let me give another illustration of how these things go. Congress appropriated $10,000 for a preliminary study of the feasibility of establishing the Peace Corps. The contract went to the University of Colorado. But before the University of Colorado had reported on its study, the Peace Corps was on the way. If I recall correctly some $13 million had been spent to establish the Peace Corps before it was authorized by Congress.

I urge you to help the taxpayers out to the tune of $65,000 on this one, and I will appreciate it if you do.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you will find that pages 642 and 643 of the printed hearings on this bill show all the details with regard to the moneys involved here. And regardless of whether you call it the middle-level manpower commission or what not, this would be $65,000 appropriated to the State Department for the expenses of this group, the purpose of whom is the formation of an International Peace Corps.

The $80,000 requested of the committee was cut to $65,000. The printed hearings show that the money is for the transportation of documents, training equipment, training and orientation program sessions, communications and utilities, printing and reproduction of conference documents and Secretariat reports, supplies and materials, to include the purchase of train-aids, instructional materials, office supplies, travel and transportation costs.

This is for the expense of bringing together a group from nations all over the world to convince them that it would be to their advantage to settle the unsettled situation in the world today, to form an International Peace Corps to go into the undeveloped nations and do as the U.S. Peace Corps has been doing.

As I frankly said in the full committee meeting last Friday, I originally had my doubts about whether or not the Peace Corps would succeed, but I have since come to change my mind 1,000 percent. It has been one of the best ideas developed in the present administration's program, and it has been very, very well worthwhile.

Now, is it not good sense to get the burden off the backs of the U.S. taxpayers by having other nations form Peace Corps to go into undeveloped countries and use their funds instead of American funds?

At page 647 of the hearings you will find that already, since January 1, when this Secretariat began on a provisional basis—and it is a provisional basis and particularly authorized; there is no question about that. The overruling by the Chair of the point of order made by the gentleman from California should be sufficient proof of that—since January 1, when the Secretariat began on a provisional basis, more than $2 million have been appropriated by just two countries for Peace Corps activities on their own as the result of this Secretariat's work. This is the undisputed testimony; never mind the nonsense about middle-level manpower and what it means. I was frank enough to say I did not know what the phrase meant, and I do not think it is important enough for me to spend my time as a matter of curiosity to find out what it means. All I know is this is $65,000 to get other countries to spend their funds and start Peace Corps and that this is to the advantage of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman still does not know what "middle-level manpower" means. In the hearings on this bill he admits that the expenditure for this purpose should be scrutinized more carefully, and I refer the gentleman to the statement on page 646 of the hearings.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, of course——

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is not the gentleman familiar with the fact that I look at every appropriation request with suspicion?

Mr. GROSS. But you wound up your hearings—whatever little there was—by saying "We haven't looked at this carefully enough."

Mr. ROONEY. I made that statement; of course, I did. And now, after a real careful look, we recommend an appropriation of $65,000.

Mr. GROSS. Well, you apparently have not looked at it recently.

Mr. ROONEY. We made every effort to save the taxpayers' money in the overall appropriation. We cut this request to $65,000. We think it is worth $65,000. We think it will save the taxpayers' money in the long run, and that is why we recommend that it now be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows that if there is established an international secretariat for the Peace Corps, U.S. taxpayers will pick up the tab from now until doomsday, and if there are Peace Corps organizations in any foreign countries we will pay the bill for them, too. If you do not know that, you have not been watching where our money has been going in these foreign giveaway programs for the last 16 or 17 years.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. I rise in support of the amendment about which the gentleman spoke previously.

Frankly, I believe that we as Americans have been relying too much upon these international combines. Sooner or later we are going to have to get back to the basic proposition of putting America first.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this proposal here is an affront to the United Nations. If the United Nations is not designed to promote peace, then we ought to do away with it and we can try this other International Peace Corps, or whatever it is.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], by his own words in the hearings, says he has not looked at this carefully, and I would suggest that he do so before appropriating further funds.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read to the Committee of the Whole from the testimony at page 647 of the printed hearings:

> We hope that as a result of this activity the Peace Corps idea which began in the United States would be adopted by most of the industrialized countries of the world and they would begin to enter into large-scale programs to work overseas in underdeveloped countries. It is a part of our general policy to try to increase the contributions of other countries to foreign assistance. This is the seed money from which we hope to get a very substantial contribution to oversea proposals in what we are vitally interested. As I say, contributions up to now are over $2 million in the first 2 months of operation. And by next year, at projected rates of growth, the value of the contributions of other countries should exceed $5 million.

Now, I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is just plain good commonsense to spend $65,000 of the taxpayers' money to save millions.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's motion be voted down as well as the pending amendment of the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The preferential motion was not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LIPSCOMB) there were—ayes 114, noes 120.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. LIPSCOMB and Mr. ROONEY.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 160, noes 137.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I want to strongly support the subcommittee's recommendation of $450 million for the accelerated public works program.

You will hear a great deal today, Mr. Chairman, about the jobs that will be created by this appropriation, if it is restored to the bill. This appropriation will create about 60,000 on-site jobs of a year's duration. Off-site jobs in supplying the building materials—cement and sand, sewer pipe, hospital equipment, bricks, and heating equipment—that will go into the useful public works to be created by this appropriation will be about an equal 60,000 jobs. The total is 120,000 jobs.

And, as the wages from these 120,000 jobs are spent, the wage earners will buy food and clothing and services and these new purchases will create additional employment—on the order of 150,000 or so jobs or a grand total of 270,000 new jobs.

What will happen if this appropriation is not voted? The labor of 270,000 men will be lost to the country for a year's time. "Labor is the most perishable of all commodities," it has been said. The hours that a man did not work yesterday can never be regained to the country.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to save the fruits of the labor of men willing to work then this appropriation must be voted.

Unemployment is a grinding disease. Those men affected by it lose hope after a while. After weeks and weeks of searching for work the unemployed coal miner of West Virginia or Kentucky or Pennsylvania or the unemployed iron ore miner of northern Minnesota begins to despair of earning his way again. This appropriation will bring not only jobs and wages, Mr. Chairman, it will bring hope to these unemployed. It will show them that their country has not forgotten that all Americans are not all prosperous. It will show them that their country is willing to invest in itself, willing to put its citizens to work on useful public-works projects to improve their own communities.

Let us make America a better place in which to live. Let us bring public water systems to communities that depend upon private wells. Let us clean up polluted streams by constructing sewage treatment plants. Let us bring hospital facilities to communities in need of them. And let us bring hope to the unemployed of this country.

This appropriation will help to do all these things, and I earnestly urge its restoration to the bill.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment which would strike the important and necessary funds for advancing civilian industrial technology.

The growth of our economy, the welfare of our citizens, and the insurance of our national security all depend to a great extent upon research and development, upon the effective use of new technology. As a matter of fact, it has been reliably estimated that nearly one-half of the annual increase in our gross national product is attributable to the use of new techniques and new knowledge.

In view of the enormous increase in the scientific and technical efforts of this country it is difficult to believe that there could be any serious problem with respect to the use of science and the spread of industrial technology, but such a problem does in fact exist.

In recent years, the rate of increase in our gross national product per worker and per capita has slowed, and is substantially less than that of almost all other industrialized nations. Although there are many causes for this development we have not, among other things, made the necessary changes in attitude and investment policies; we have not mobilized our civilian technology sufficiently to insure the continued growth of our standard of living and our wealth.

As we all know, there has been a substantial increase in this Nation's research and development efforts during the last 20 years. Our dollar input has risen from a half billion dollars to approximately $17 billion. The great majority of this effort, however, has gone for the national security and the exploration of space. No more than $30 million—about the cost of launching a single space vehicle—is being spent for the support of civilian technology.

Of particular importance is the fact that this program is designed to help small firms—those with less than 5,000 employees. And let me emphasize that because of the expense involved in research and development today, these firms have not been able to conduct any of this work which is so vital to progress and growth.

The military and space efforts tend to support, as would be expected, firms, industries, and geographic areas already competent in science and technology. This selection, however, tends to further unbalance the technical resources of the Nation. For example, 300 manufacturing firms perform 90 percent of the research and development done in manufacturing industries and 300 firms do 80 percent of the privately supported manufacturing research and development. If properly implemented, this civilian technology program will help to alleviate, in a small, but meaningful way, this situation.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the urgent requirement for us to compete successfully on the world scene in defense and space is now matched by the need to compete successfully in the economic arena—to insure the maximum possible utilization of our resources, both human and material.

The item included in this bill is a small one, but it is an important one. I urge that it be supported and that when new justifications for advances in our civilian industrial technology program can be made, that they be supported as well.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment to delete from the supplemental appropriations bill the funds for the International Secretariat on Middle Level Manpower, whatever that is, or the so-called International Peace Corps.

It is high time for America to rely more upon or own ingenuity, our own strength and resources instead of relying upon these international combines of every description. It is time for us to consider the best interests of America first.

Although the proponents of the measure say that this organization is being set up on a provisional basis, I have found in my limited experience that, in governmental parlance, a provisional bureau usually means a permanent bureau.

Furthermore, this proposal is an implied admission that the United Nations is failing, or has failed, as an effective international peace organization. If this be true, then let us withdraw our financial support of it before venturing into some new international peace scheme, which would ultimately end up as a factory for Communist propaganda with the overburdened American taxpayer footing most of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to associate myself with the remarks of the author of this amendment and to urge its adoption by the House.

The Clerk read down to and including line 2 on page 26.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the language in lines 15 through 20 on page 49, which reads as follows:

> SEC. 203. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall have the authority to transfer not to exceed $1,795,000 from the "Loan guaranty revolving fund" to any other appropriations of the Veterans' Administration to pay for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law for fiscal year 1963 if in his discretion he finds it necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language of section 203 on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I read from the report of the committee:

> The committee has included a provision which will enable the Administrator in his discretion to use not to exceed $1,795,000 from the loan guaranty revolving fund to cover the cost of such pay increases if he finds it necessary.

I submit this goes beyond the scope of the Appropriations Committee and that it imposes additional duties upon the Director of the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the point of order made by the gentleman from Iowa is valid. But, may I respectfully request that the gentleman not press the point of order? For this reason: there are 159,000 employees in the Veterans' Administration. A good percentage of them—about 80,000 of them—are attendants and employees in about 170 hospitals and 18 domiciliaries. This will affect their pay. I have talked with the Administrator. He does not think he is going to use this authority, but the language will give him a little bit of a leeway. But, as I say, Mr. Chairman, the point of order is good if the gentleman wants to press it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will agree that the money will come from the loan guarantee revolving fund and not from funds appropriated to the Veterans' Administration specifically for increased pay costs.

Mr. THOMAS. It is not from appropriated funds.

Mr. GROSS. And the war veterans could be penalized through such use of revolving funds.

Mr. THOMAS. No, the veterans will not be penalized. It will help them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order made by the gentleman from Iowa is well taken.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk reads, may I state that if it should be necessary, we would have to come in and ask for funds to be appropriated. This does not involve appropriated funds and there are ample funds there. I assure my colleagues that the proposed language in the bill makes good sense and I wish our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, could have seen fit to withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already sustained the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Boland amendment providing the $450 million for public works acceleration.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the question on the remaining amendments.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, after line 14 insert:

"PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

"For an additional amount for 'Public Works Acceleration', $450,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that has ever been rejected by the Senate or House of Representatives or by any Committee of the Congress: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that does not require a financial contribution from State or local sources except projects dealing with preservation of forests in the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 184, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—228

Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Ashley
Aspinall
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Cooley
Corman
Curtin
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.

Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Huddleston
Ichord
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Libonati
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher

Poage
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sickles
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
White
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—184

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson

Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres

Baldwin
Barry
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann

Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Downing
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Findley
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Gary
Gibbons
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser

Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin. Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard

Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Udall
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Westland
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—21

Brademas
Bray
Burton
Corbett
Daddario
Farbstein
Fino

Fuqua
Gallagher
Grant
Healey
Hébert
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn

Lesinski
McMillan
Mailliard
Powell
Sikes
Walter
Whitener

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Brademas for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Fuqua against.

Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Mailliard against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Burton.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. BARRETT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CANNON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5517, to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed; and that those Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the Boland amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CLAUSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the affirmative action by this honorable body in approving the appropriation included in the supplemental budget bill, H.R. 5517, for the Point Reyes National Seashore land acquisition, I once again should like to commend the Members for their bipartisan consideration and approval of this item. It truly recognizes the economy of early acquisition and fair treatment to the property owners affected. My primary reason for comment at this time is to request Members of this body to remember their action of today during the fiscal 1965 session. We must keep in mind the overwhelming need to continue this program of appropriation for early acquisition until all lands of this park have been purchased. This will truly be an economy effort and accrue to the benefit of all our citizenry.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 314, Report No. 205), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 103, 88th Congress, the ad hoc Subcommittee on a Science Data-Processing Center of the Committee on Education and Labor consisting of not more than five persons, of whom at least two shall be scientists, may visit in Russia for not exceeding four days to inspect the All Union Institute of Scientific and Technical Information at Moscow.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the standardized Government travel regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expand an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

CHIEF MEDICAL DIRECTOR, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4549) to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4103(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence thereof the following: "Section 62 of title 5 of the United States Code shall not apply to any individual appointed Chief Medical Director before January 1, 1964; however, section 59a of title 5 shall apply, in accordance with its terms, to any such individual."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AFRICAN FREEDOM DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 315) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that April 15, 1963, be recognized as African Freedom Day; and that we extend to the independent countries of Africa our congratulations and assure them of our continued good will.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. ADAIR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman enlighten the House as to the legislative history of this resolution?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I shall be very happy to do so. It is the usual resolution that we annually adopt, recognizing African independence and extending our good wishes. It was cleared by the minority leader and our good colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mr. ADAIR. Is this resolution similar in every respect to those which we have passed in previous years?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I can assure the gentleman this is an exact copy of the resolution we adopted a year ago. It is brought up today because of the time element. The House will not be in session on April 15, which is African Independence Day.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman when this resolution was considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Every year we observe Pan American Day, and every year we observe African Independence Day. This is the 15th of April. Since we will not be in session on the 15th, it is hoped we may have proper observance tomorrow, both Pan American and African Independence Day. The House adopted the Pan American resolution several days ago in manner similar to that being followed in this instance.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that the committee ought to consider resolutions which come to the House floor in the name of the committee? This bill, to my certain knowledge, has never been considered by the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The committee has considered it in previous years. The gentleman from Iowa is a new and valued member on our committee. Our subcommittee last year gave long consideration to the phraseology, which has been followed exactly in the present resolution. It has been a custom, I can assure the gentleman, for a number of years. This is largely a routine matter.

Mr. GROSS. Let us not consider this as a precedent because from here on out, I assure the gentleman, I will object to any other resolutions that are not considered by the full committee. I will not object to this one today. From here on out, I will object to any resolutions not cleared by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House. I would like to add to that that I am not aware as to just what part of Africa is independent.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I can assure the gentleman from Iowa, I know him so well, I know he will never object to anything that extends the spirit of amity.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the time limit involved and the dating of this resolution, I can see that a delay would be most upsetting to the gentleman from Illinois, but I would just like to inquire of the gentleman if he can assure us that support of this freedom-for-Africa resolution does not imply any congressional approval of those African governments that are moving away from what we would consider freedom?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. No, I can assure my friend from Illinois that there is no hidden motivation in this resolution. It is, as I have stated, a blanket recognition of the aspirations of the people of Africa for free, independent, and we hope democratic governments.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois whether this carries with it in any form what would be considered a unanimous approval on the part of this body of our action in Katanga and the Congo.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It does not refer to any specific country in Africa. This is merely a blanket expression of our support of their aspirations and efforts for independence. It is worded to avoid any possible political implication or interpretation as the Africans are the masters of their own destiny. The resolution does not apply to any one country or government.

Mr. BRUCE. In other words, if I may pursue this a little further, what the gentleman is trying to get across to me and what we are saying by this resolution is that we are endorsing the hopes and aspirations of people toward building a truly free society in Africa.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman expresses it much more effectively and melodiously than I could myself.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE
AND FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1963:

Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland; Hon. ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina, and Hon. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1963:

Hon. THOMAS N. DOWNING, of Virginia; Hon. JACOB H. GILBERT, of New York, and Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, of Wisconsin.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

SILVER LEGISLATION

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 313 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5389) to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. No amendments shall be in order to title II of the bill except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means which shall be in order notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, but shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and at the conclusion of my remarks I shall yield to the gentleman from California, [Mr. SMITH] 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 313 provides for the consideration of H.R. 5389, a bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule as to title I of the bill, a closed rule as to title II of the bill, with 2 hours of general debate.

Section I of title I of H.R. 5389 would repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, section 4 of the act of July 6, 1939, and the act of July 31, 1946.

Section 2 would reenact with modifications certain provisions of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 which are still considered necessary. These include the requirement that the Secretary of the Treasury keep within the United States an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates and the provision that the silver certificates shall be exchangeable on demand for silver dollars, except that the latter provision would be revised to permit the redemption, at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury, of silver certificates in silver bullion, in addition to redemption in silver dollars. This section would also require that the Secretary of the Treasury not dispose of any free silver unless the market price of the silver exceeds its monetary value of $1.29-plus per ounce, except that any free silver could be sold to other departments and agencies of the Government or used for the coinage of standard silver dollars and subsidiary silver coins.

Section 3 would permit the Federal Reserve banks to issue $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes.

The basic objectives of H.R. 5389 are:

First, to afford the Government a sure and substantial supply of silver for its coinage needs by making available for this purpose the stocks of silver bullion backing the presently outstanding $1 silver certificates. This amounts to approximately 1,300 million ounces of silver bullion.

Second, to eliminate the obsolete and largely inoperative provisions on the statute books requiring the acquisition and holding of silver in the monetary reserves of the United States, and putting a Government floor price of 90½ cents an ounce under newly mined domestic silver, which is far below the current market price.

The need for this legislation results from the facts that world consumption of silver for industrial uses and for coinage has grown to the point where it greatly exceeds world production of silver and U.S. stocks of free silver have been reduced to a point where new sources of supply for the metal must be found if we are to continue to maintain our present silver coinage.

Title II of the bill provides for the repeal of subchapter F of chapter 39 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This subchapter imposes a tax on transfers of any interest in silver bullion where the price for which such interest is transferred exceeds the total of the cost thereof and allowed expenses. The tax is 50 percent of the amount of such excess.

This 50 percent tax on profits on transfers of interests in silver bullion was originally imposed by section 8 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. Since its enactment in 1934 it has produced about $5 million of revenue. In the last decade, the revenue derived from the tax has averaged less than $50,000 a year.

Because the need for this tax as a complement to and reinforcement of the Government's silver purchase program will cease when that silver purchase program is terminated, and because there will be little loss of revenue, the Committee on Ways and Means in agreement with the Committee on Banking and Currency that the tax be repealed, and that this repeal apply to all transfers in silver bullion after the date of the enactment of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 313.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for a consent request.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I shall make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon on this bill, I may insert the committee report and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] House Resolution 313 provides for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5389, entitled "An act to repeal legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes," for a period of 2 hours.

There are two titles to this bill. Title II, as I understand it, actually comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

We were informed in the Rules Committee this had been cleared by the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule is an open one, so far as title I is concerned. It is closed so far as title II is concerned, due to the fact it amends the Internal Revenue Code that is in force with the long established procedure in the House.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] gave us a very learned explanation of this bill before the Rules Committee. I think I understood what he was talking about, but on this particular legislation it may be a little bit more far-reaching than some of us think it may be. I would recommend the discussion in the Committee of the Whole to your consideration.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] spoke in opposition to the bill before the Rules Committee. Then subsequently thereto, all of us today have received a statement from the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] in opposition, and also a statement from the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] in opposition to the bill.

My understanding of the measure is as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the silver legislation (H.R. 5389) which is before the committee today would do four things, namely:

> (1) Repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and related provisions of the acts of July 6, 1939 and July 31, 1946; (2) retain unimpaired the right of a holder of a silver certificate to redeem the certificate in silver at its monetary value; (3) authorize the issuance of $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes, and (4) repeal the 50-percent silver transactions tax.

As is explained in the committee report this legislation in repealing provisions of law which have now become obsolete and through authorizing the issuance of $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes would enable the Treasury Department to meet anticipated silver coinage needs for many years to come from silver presently owned by the Treasury but unavailable for use for coinage purposes because it is held as security for outstanding silver certificates, most of which are in the form of $1 silver certificates. The gradual replacement of $1 silver certificates with $1 Federal Reserve notes will free Treasury owned silver for coinage purposes.

Title II of the bill would provide for outright repeal of the 50-percent transactions tax on bullion. This regulatory tax to discourage speculation in silver bullion was added to the Internal Revenue Code by section 8 of the original Silver Purchase Act of 1934. Since the Silver Purchase Acts are being repealed it is appropriate also to repeal the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to this regulatory tax.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding the legislation by overwhelming vote was ordered reported favorably by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and at this time yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, not only am I opposed to this bill, but I am opposed to the rule. At this point I am not going to discuss the merits of the bill. I am really going to try to dwell solely on whether or not a rule should have been granted. This matter has not just monetary implications, which is the basic part of the bill and therefore properly under the consideration of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but it also has, as has been pointed out, revenue or tax incidence, and that part of the bill was referred to the committee on which I serve, the Committee on Ways and Means. But, the third aspect of the bill has not been considered by either of those two committees, the fiscal aspect.

Now, this is a complicated matter because the monetary policy and the fiscal policy interweave, and it is a difficult thing to say where monetary policy leaves off and fiscal policy begins or, vice versa, where fiscal policy leaves off and monetary policy begins.

Perhaps one way to demonstrate it is that our present $30 billion of Federal Reserve notes have a backing of gold up to 25 percent, but also having a backing of Federal certificates, bonds. The issuance of bonds and debt management is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, where you get into this business of certificates or evidences of indebtedness against the full faith and credit of the United States.

The point I tried to bring out before the Committee on Rules was that the fiscal aspects of this bill have not been studied, and this I can tell you, whatever the monetary problems are—and incidentally, I made an error in my supplemental views that I want to call attention to. I put them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday, April 8, and they appear on page 5850 where anyone can read them. I made an error in the monetary aspect when I said I thought this was a very immediate critical problem, because already the value of the silver in our vaults exceeded the paper money value, and therefore the incentive for people to actually cash in silver certificates to get the silver bullion and just sell it on the market was there and also the incentive to melt down silver coins. I was in error. The actual situation is that this does not reach that point until silver becomes worth $1.38. So we do not have this critical situation, but it is a situation that can occur and the Committee on Banking and Currency calls attention to, and it is a serious one, one of very great concern.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. May I suggest to the gentleman that the price is $1.29 instead of $1.38. Also, the gentleman said that the fiscal policies were not considered. I suggest the gentleman is in error about that, because outstanding experts were heard. The Secretary of the Treasury was heard extensively, the top fiscal expert of the country, and so was the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board heard.

Mr. CURTIS. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, I suggest, is primarily concerned with monetary matters, and I again point out that the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction, not the Committee on Banking and Currency, over fiscal management. We have the job of debt management. We have the problem of the balance of payments to a large degree, because we have within our jurisdiction the Reciprocal Trade Act, and this whole problem of balance of payments and gold flow moves right into our jurisdiction.

The point I made in the Committee on Rules was that the Committee on Ways and Means issued notice on March 27 that we were going to have an executive session the very next day, on March 28, on this particular measure. There was not time for anyone to get their facts together or know anything about it. And, we did not have public hearings. No testimony was even taken down in the executive session. It was very informal. I interrogated the Secretary of the Treasury, because here was my concern in the fiscal aspect.

Now, what is the fiscal aspect of this thing that bothers us? We have $2 billion of silver in our vaults owned by the United States. This is against the paper currency that we have issued. It is about $2 billion. Under this bill the executive can withdraw that silver and new Federal Reserve notes, not silver certificates but new notes, of $2 billion can be issued, and the security against them is whatever is in our gold stock.

Mr. Speaker, however we face the thing, we end up with $2 billion less of precious metal behind the same amount of currency, which is $32 billion.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. In answer to a direct question on this point, both the head of the Federal Reserve and the Secretary of the Treasury made the statement that they would not retire any silver certificates until sufficient gold had been transferred to the account directly behind and backing up our Federal Reserve notes, which they anticipate they can do at the rate of $35 million a year. Therefore, it will take about 14 years for them to accomplish this purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman, and that is exactly what should be in the bill, if that is the answer, because you would then correct this fiscal problem about which I am concerned. But the point I am getting at is this: I am talking on the rule rather than the merits. The point is that no committee of the House, at least, the committee with jurisdiction of this matter, can give the House any information, because we did not discuss it, we did not consider it, and we did not call the experts before us. Perhaps that is a correct solution to the fiscal aspects, but believe me, when we take a step like this, we cannot rely on the word of who happens to be the Secretary of the Treasury today, fine as he may be and fine as the other present officials may be—we cannot do this. This is a matter that has to do with law, not with men, and it does relate directly to this point.

Mr. Speaker, one other matter is this: I asked the Secretary of the Treasury, "Is this the first step that is being taken toward devaluing the dollar," because there are some reputable people close to the administration who recommend devaluing the dollar. The Secretary of the Treasury said, "No, that was not the contemplation." I said:

> Well, let me turn the question around, then. If you were going to devalue the dollar would you not have to repeal the Silver Act in this fashion?

And his answer was "yes." He reiterated, though, that that was not their intention.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this is a serious matter, as serious as anything I know or I would not have taken the trouble to go before the Committee on Rules and to try to do a little bit of homework, as late as the date was, and as inadequate as has been the amount of work that has been done on this thing. I am telling the House now on the debate on the adoption of this rule, we, your committee to whom you look—the Ways and Means Committee—has not studied the fiscal aspects of this bill and we cannot give you any information. I was the only one on the Ways and Means Committee who even had read the committee reports and hearings in 1934 when the Ways and Means Committee had jurisdiction of the subject matter and had voted out the original act. So the reason why I have suggested to the Rules Committee that this matter be referred—this aspect of it—to the Ways and Means Committee was to get some information, call the experts on this and let us see how we can tighten up, if we can, on this one aspect of the thing the fiscal aspect, we may be depleting the Nation's capital assets to the extent of $2 billion.

Mr. Speaker, my concluding observations are these: I have been putting these materials in the RECORD over the past few months. This administration is pursuing a course of cashing in capital assets and converting them to general revenue. It is a typical example of someone who overspends his income, having inherited a lot, but he keeps overspending. Gradually he sells off his capital assets from which he derives his revenue. This is one further step in the Kennedy administration's selling off of capital assets to make the current deficit look a little bit less. But, gentlemen, if we pursue this course of cashing in the capital assets of the United States, we are simply deferring the day when we are going to have to face up to these matters. When that day comes the consequences are going to be that much worse.

Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons I suggest that the rule be voted down and this fiscal aspect be taken up by the Ways and Means Committee as soon as possible, and brought back on the floor of the House for action. I feel this is a measure that needs attention and something must be done.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] complains about the Committee on Ways and Means not assuming jurisdiction of this and having full and complete hearings. It is my understanding that they did have hearings on the tax proposal.

Mr. CURTIS. No, no.

Mr. PATMAN. We submitted the tax feature to the Committee on Ways and Means with the understanding that we would do exactly what the Committee on Ways and Means recommended, because the Ways and Means Committee has jurisdiction. I understand that the gentleman presented his views and the other members of the committee did not agree with him.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for purpose of clarification?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. I was not registering and I want to make it quite clear I was not registering complaint with the Committee on Banking and Currency, or with that committee's having this matter referred to them. Indeed, I think the bulk of this is in the purview of the Committee on Banking and Currency because it concerns monetary policy. But the gentleman is in error in saying that we held hearings. We did not. As to the attendance in the Committee on Ways and Means there was just barely a quorum. No record was made. No one had studied the matter. I say to the gentleman that we are not in a position as a committee of being able to report with any intelligence on the fiscal aspects of this matter. The only matter considered was the tax aspect, and I do say this, that on the tax aspect we did agree that if in the wisdom of the Committee on Banking and Currency they felt this was necessary, then this 50 percent tax should be repealed and I happen to agree with that position.

Mr. PATMAN. It is my understanding that there was only one objection in the Committee on Ways and Means and there was only one objection in the Committee on Banking and Currency. The bill passed by a vote of 18 to 1.

Mr. CURTIS. There was no record vote. There was no vote of 18 to 1.

Mr. PATMAN. There was a record vote of 18 to 1. I happen to know about that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, that is right; I apologize to the gentleman. I thought that he was referring to the vote in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me comment on the gentleman's arguments.

FISCAL POLICIES

The Committee on Banking and Currency heard the Secretary of the Treasury who, by the nature of his job, is the top fiscal expert of the country.

The bill involves fiscal matters in three respects:

First, it costs $9 million a year to print the $1 bills and the cost will be precisely the same whether $1 silver certificates are printed or $1 Federal Reserve notes are printed.

Second, two-thirds of the silver used in the United States now comes from abroad. If the Treasury has to purchase silver, this would mean that the United States would have to increase purchases of silver from abroad and this would worsen our balance-of-payments position.

Third, over a period of 29 years, from 1934 through 1962, the special transfer tax on silver has produced revenues of only $6½ million; $6½ million in 29 years is hardly a fiscal problem which the Ways and Means Committee should want to spend much time in considering in connection with this legislation.

DEVALUATION

In the first place, the dollar cannot be devalued without the President's coming to Congress for legislation to change the gold content of the dollar. If he intended to ask for a devaluation of the dollar, he could ask for a change in silver at the same time.

In the second place, however, there is no necessary relationship between the quantity of silver and the quantity of gold in the dollar. This country devalued in 1934 without changing the amount of silver in the dollar.

There is no logic whatever to the argument that getting the silver certificates out of the way is necessary to devaluation or makes devaluation any easier.

More than that, in the conditions in which we find ourselves today, with the dollar being used as a reserve currency of all of the central banks of the free world, devaluation is absolutely impractical. The President has recognized this in many public statements and in messages to Congress, and he has made a solemn commitment on the part of this administration that there will not be a request for devaluation.

DEFICIT SPENDING

Contrary to the gentleman's statement, the legislation has nothing to do with trying to solve an economic problem resulting from a fiscal policy of deficit financing.

In the first place, the dollar is worth more than the silver for which it can be exchanged.

In the second place, there is no proposal to sell any "Government assets." The silver is not to be sold. It is to be used for coinage.

I asked the Secretary of the Treasury to answer that point for me, and he did in the following letter:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 10, 1963.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On April 8 Representative CURTIS submitted an extension of remarks for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (pp. 5850–5851) in which he made a very serious charge against the administration's proposed silver legislation. One statement which he submitted said: "The bald effect of the President's proposal to repeal the Silver Act is to permit him to sell off and to use as current revenue $2 billion of precious metals (silver bullion and vault silver dollars) which is maintained as security for $2 billion of our paper currency." This charge reflects a misunderstanding not only of the administration's proposal and its aims, but also of the fundamental procedures of Government accounting. To paraphrase Congressman CURTIS, "the bald fact" is that the proposed release of silver represents a transfer of assets and claims which, apart from relatively minor seigniorage calculations, has no budgetary effect whatever.

If H.R. 5389 should become law, the Secretary of the Treasury would be enabled to retire from circulation outstanding $1 silver certificates for the purpose of releasing the silver now held against those certificates. The released silver could be used only as coinage or, under certain conditions, for sale, to Government departments for public purposes. Apart from the Treasury's present holding of approximately 30 million ounces of "free silver," the Treasury's holdings of bullion against outstanding silver certificates now amount to approximately 1.6 billion ounces ($2.1 billion). All of this reserve impounded against outstanding silver certificates is presently held by the Treasury as an asset against an equal volume of outstanding liabilities (in the form of these silver certificates). In order to acquire these silver certificates from present holders as they are returned through banking channels to the Treasury, the Treasury must make an equal disbursement out of its existing cash balances.

What this means is that the Treasury will, in effect, draw on its present cash balances to buy outstanding silver certificates from the general public. The Treasury, having purchased the silver certificates, will be free to retire them. In this way the Treasury will have purchased the silver for its own use at the same price of $1.29 per ounce as that at which it has been carried as backing for the outstanding silver certificates. This silver, as gradually taken into the Treasury's possession over the years, may go into one of two channels.

The principal use contemplated for the released silver will be that of fulfilling coinage needs. By existing statute, the silver incorporated into subsidiary silver coins is valued at $1.38 per ounce. Consequently, as silver is transferred for this purpose, the Treasury will acquire a seigniorage of 9 cents per ounce, the difference between $1.38 and $1.29. This "profit" would be reflected as a specific item of revenue which is regularly reported to Congress and the public. This minor item of revenue is, in any event, subject to the appropriations process.

Another purpose would be to fulfill necessary uses by various agencies or departments of the Government, notably Defense. On such transactions, apart from any involving the 30 million ounces of free silver which are not relevant to the specific situation covered in Congressman CURTIS' criticism, a payment would be made to the Treasury by the particular Government department out of appropriated funds. If the purchase were made at a price below the $1.29 per ounce at which the Treasury carries the silver on its books, the Treasury would be required to obtain appropriated funds to cover the difference.

I trust this will serve to remove some of the misunderstanding arising from Mr. CURTIS' remarks.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

So I submit that the gentleman from Missouri is in error in his statement in opposition to this bill. This bill has been very carefully gone into. We had extensive and exhaustive hearings. Every witness that any member suggested be brought before the committee was brought before the committee; and every member was permitted to interrogate him, including the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and many other fiscal and monetary experts.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman suggest that there will be, because of the passage of this bill, a change in the use of silver in this country? One-third is mined in this country and two-thirds abroad. Will there not be a change made in that situation?

Mr. PATMAN. The only point I was trying to make is that domestic consumption of silver is much in excess of domestic production of silver. Therefore, we have to buy two-thirds of our silver from abroad. If the Treasury has to enter the market, we will have to buy still more silver from abroad and this will further harm our balance of payments.

I respectfully suggest this is a good bill. It should be passed. It is in the public interest. I hope the rule is adopted.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, may I state that representatives of the Committee on Banking and Currency, both majority and minority members, came before the committee and stated that the bill was recommended 18 to 1, and asked for a rule. We were advised that the Committee on Ways and Means considered the bill insofar as title 2 was concerned and asked for a closed rule on title 2. There was a minority dissent from the Committee on Ways and Means. The point is that the House should adopt the rule and then go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and debate this bill as the House does under ordinary procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EASTER RECESS AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOLLOWING RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that at the conclusion of my remarks, I will offer a concurrent resolution providing that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it shall stand in adjournment until noon, Monday, April 22, 1963.

I would like to advise Members that this action is taken in accordance with an announcement I made to the House last week. I would further like to advise the House that there will be business on Monday, April 22.

On Tuesday, April 23, it is planned to call up the medical education bill. There will be other important business during the first week following the Easter recess.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. This year as in previous years there have been consultations between the majority and the minority as to the Easter recess. I think it is fair to say that the majority leadership on this occasion expressed quite some time ago their hope that we could have this Easter recess. As far as I am concerned, I have cooperated in trying to work out an arrangement for an Easter recess so that Members might have an opportunity to make their plans. I simply want to say to the gentleman as far as I am concerned, I expect to support this resolution. I am glad he is offering it. I am also glad he has indicated that when we come back after the recess there will be important matters before us. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure the majority leader will agree with me, we certainly all would hope that the various committees of the House having to do with matters of legislative importance including the appropriation bills would be bringing such legislation along as rapidly as possible in order that the business of the first session of this Congress may be expedited to the end that the sine die adjournment would not be too long delayed.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

PROVIDING FOR EASTER RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 134, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 134

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 11, 1963, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 22, 1963.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATION RELATING TO PURCHASE OF SILVER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5389) to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5389, with the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries out a request by the administration.

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon testified on behalf of the bill. It has been recommended by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and by Chairman Martin especially, who testified on behalf of the bill.

It was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency by a vote of 18 to 1. The Banking and Currency Committee considered fully all matters under title I of the bill. Title II, of the bill, which repeals the special transfer tax on silver bullion, was handled by the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee on Banking and Currency has acted on the recommendation of the Committee on Ways and Means as to title II.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The need for this legislation results from these facts. First, demand for silver for industrial uses and for coinage has grown to the point where world consumption greatly exceeds world production. Second, Treasury stocks of silver have been reduced to a point where new sources of supply for this metal must be found if we are to continue to maintain our present silver coinage.

Most recently, annual production of newly mined silver in the free world has amounted to about 200 million ounces, compared to a consumption of around 350 million ounces. Production in the United States has been running at around 35 million ounces, while U.S. industrial consumption amounts to over 100 million ounces—about three times current production. In addition, U.S. requirements for coinage last year amounted to about 75 million ounces.

Since two-thirds of our annual consumption of silver already comes from abroad, Treasury entry into the market to obtain silver for coinage would mainly benefit foreign producers, and it would aggravate our balance-of-payments problem.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

There are two main purposes of the bill:

One. To protect the Treasury's stock of silver from withdrawal and use for industrial and other purposes and to enable the Treasury to reserve this silver to meet future needs for coinage, the demands for which are growing very rapidly because of coin-operated vending machines and other reasons. This purpose would be accomplished by authorizing the issuance of $1 Federal Reserve notes. The Federal Reserve is now authorized to issue, and does issue, notes of all denominations except $1 and $2 denominations.

The Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve have indicated that public demands for $1 bills is also expanding very rapidly, and, under this legislation, this expanded demand will be met by issuing Federal Reserve notes, rather than issuing new silver certificates. The Treasury must hold in reserve a certain quantity of silver for each silver certificate in circulation. As silver certificates now in circulation wear out, and are turned in for destruction, they may be replaced with Federal Reserve notes, thus freeing other Treasury silver for coinage purposes.

The second purpose of the bill is to get the Government out of all operations aimed at controlling the market price of silver. Such operations are now clearly impracticable; they are provided for in legislation which is obsolete, namely, the Silver Purchase Acts, which establish a floor price of 90½ cents for silver bullion whereas the market price is now between $1.26 and $1.27 per ounce.

As another necessary step to bring about a free market in silver, the bill would also repeal the special transfer tax on silver bullion, which tax was adopted as a part of the silver purchase and price stabilization program instituted with the Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

ONE- AND TWO-DOLLAR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

The most important feature of the bill from the Treasury's standpoint is the section which would permit the issuance of $1 Federal Reserve notes.

There are now several types of U.S. currency in circulation, but substantially all of this currency is of two types. The first and most important type is the Federal Reserve note which is, of course, issued by the Federal Reserve; and the second most important type is the silver certificate issued by the Treasury.

All types of currency in circulation amount to about $32 billion. Of this, $29 billion is in Federal Reserve notes and slightly under $2 billion is in silver certificates. Silver certificates may be issued in all denominations. Federal Reserve notes may also be issued in all denominations with the notable exception of $1 and $2 bills. The legislation would authorize Federal Reserve notes in $1 and $2 bills, although the total demand for $2 bills is so small that this denomination is not important to the purpose of the legislation one way or another.

Under present law, the Treasury is required to buy such newly mined domestic silver as may be offered at a price of 90½ cents an ounce. The market price of silver has long been above this floor price. Indeed, the market price has jumped about 40 percent since November 1961, when the Treasury stopped selling silver. The present price is between $1.26 and $1.27.

If the $1 Federal Reserve note is not authorized, the Treasury will soon be in a position of being forced into the market to buy silver for its coinage needs. Such purchases would drive the price of silver up to its monetary value of approximately $1.29. If the market price of silver should exceed $1.29, it would become profitable for the public to turn in silver certificates for the silver. This would lead to the withdrawal of all $1 bills from circulation, and business and consumers would be handicapped by the lack of $1 currency.

At a price of $1.38 per ounce for silver, furthermore, the public would find it profitable to melt down subsidiary coins—half dollars, quarters, and dimes—for their silver content.

EFFECT ON GOLD RESERVES

Gradually replacing silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes would, of course, create some increased requirements for gold reserves, This, however, would be small. Under present law, Federal Reserve notes must be backed 100 percent by collateral. In actual practice, this collateral is substantially all gold and U.S. Government securities. Under present law, which would not be amended by this bill, Federal Reserve notes must be backed by a minimum of 25 percent gold.

The Secretary of the Treasury has indicated that the replacement of $1 silver certificates will be done gradually, using only that amount necessary to meet the current needs for silver coinage. Under this procedure, the gold reserve needed to back the new issuance of Federal Reserve notes should not exceed about $35 million annually. However, even if all of the $1.8 billion of silver certificates were immediately replaced by Federal Reserve notes, the additional requirements for gold would amount to only approximately $450 million. This amount is well within the margin permitted by our present stock of monetary gold.

NO EFFECT ON VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

Replacing the silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes will in no way diminish the value of our currency nor diminish its acceptability. In our money system, dollars are good for the purchase of all of the many kinds of goods and services our economy produces; dollars are a claim to any and all kinds of assets, and they are in fact created against many kinds of assets, not just one of two metals.

The fact that the dollar stands on its own feet, and not upon its silver backing, has been proven by the fact that, in the almost 30 years since the passage of the Silver Purchase Act, the dollar has been worth more than its silver content. The recent sharp rise in the price of silver obviously does not reflect a diminishing value of the dollar because the average price of other commodities has not risen. On the contrary, increased industrial uses of silver, particularly in electronic equipment and space vehicles, have simply increased the price of silver.

THE VALUE OF THE DOLLAR RESTS ON ALL KINDS OF ASSETS

The custom of requiring money to be backed by a certain quantity of gold or silver or of some other scarce commodity is a carryover from ancient times when it was necessary to arbitrarily fix money in terms of some scarce commodity, as a way of preventing too much money from being created.

When William Jennings Bryan was making his crusade for the monetization of silver in the 1890's he was, I think, entirely right at that time. The supply of money was then limited by the supply of gold, and he recognized that the supply of money was inadequate. If he were alive today, I strongly suspect that he would now be crusading for a more adequate supply of money, but he would not be arguing for the monetization of silver. He would be arguing for a different kind of management of the money supply by the Federal Reserve officials.

In the 1890's we had, of course, no central bank, no Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve System was established in 1914.

Like all of the other industrial countries of the world today, we have a managed money system wherein the maximum money supply is consciously and deliberately determined by the central bank. And like the money systems of other economically developed nations, our money system makes only a small use of currency.

SILVER CERTIFICATES AMOUNT TO ONLY 1.2 PERCENT OF THE NATION'S MONEY SUPPLY

On January 28, for example, the total money supply of the United States, as the term "money supply" is most narrowly defined, was $148 billion; $117 billion of this was in the form of demand deposits in the commercial banks. Only $31 billion, or 20 percent was in the form of all kinds of currency in circulation outside of banks. Furthermore, only 1.2 percent of the money supply was in the form of silver certificates of all kinds, and only 1 percent in the form of $1 silver certificates.

In our money system the Federal Reserve determines at all times the maximum number of dollars that may be in existence. Under this system of managed money, our economy is not likely to be plagued with too much money. On the other hand, if our money supply were limited to the supply of any one of two commodities, we would most certainly be plagued with too little money.

This is a good bill and should be passed without serious opposition.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I consider this bill to be the most important bill that has reached the floor of this House up to date. The bill would make most drastic major and unnecessary changes in our fiscal monetary policy.

In order to save time, I would like to restate to the House a summarized criticism of this bill which was circulated in a letter to Members of the House this morning.

The major effect of the passage of the bill would be as follows:

First of all, it would repeal the present law requiring the Treasurer to redeem all $1 and $2 U.S. currency in silver dollars containing 0.77 ounces of silver at a monetary value of $1.29 per ounce.

The second effect of this bill would be it would grant new authority to the Federal Reserve Bank to issue $1 and $2 fiat, nonconvertible, nonredeemable Federal Reserve notes in substitution for all $1 and $2 U.S. silver certificate currency.

The bill would authorize the withdrawal from circulation of $1.6 billion of outstanding $1 U.S. silver certificate currency and $90 million of $2 U.S. silver certificate currency.

The next effect of this bill would be it would terminate the issuance of silver dollars of $1 denomination.

The next effect of the bill would be to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, at his option, to redeem outstanding U.S. silver certificate currency in silver bullion in place of silver dollars as now required by law.

The next effect of this bill would be it would increase by $500 million the required 25-percent gold reserve for about $2 billion of substituted Federal Reserve notes, including $350 million of $5 and $10 silver notes being withdrawn under Presidential order.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. May I suggest that the gentleman is reading the wrong column about the issuing of silver certificates. I believe he said there were $90 million outstanding. I think the correct figure is $1,405,000.

Mr. PILLION. Yes; $90 million is correct, of $2 bills, U.S. currencies.

Mr. PATMAN. I know that is correct of U.S. notes but not as to silver certificates of $2.

Mr. PILLION. The next effect of this bill would be that it would reduce to $3.5 billion the free gold available to meet $25 billion of foreign-held dollars and short-term obligations.

Now, this bill is predicated upon the alleged and the erroneous assumption that a complete abandonment of silver convertibility is needed to free enough silver to meet our coinage and currency reserve requirements.

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency that our coinage and reserve requirements for $1 silver certificates is about 113 million ounces of silver per year. He estimated that 300 million ounces would be freed by the withdrawal of $5 and $10 silver certificates; that that would be enough to meet our requirements for about 3 years.

Now, in addition to the 300 million ounces that would be freed by the withdrawal of $5 and $10 silver certificates, the Treasury has on stock as of now about 30 million ounces of silver. The Atomic Energy Commission has 64.7 million ounces for which it has no prospective use, and this 64.7 million ounces available was not disclosed to the committee during the hearings. So, as of now, our Government has on hand a free available stock of silver sufficient to meet all monetary requirements for the next 3½ or 4 years.

This bill is an abrupt, panicky repudiation of our basic monetary and fiscal policies. It threatens our gold reserve, which is at the lowest ratio on record. It will add additional pressures for an international devaluation or a repudiation of our dollar obligations to redeem foreign holdings and foreign obligations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the patience of this House. I know this is rather technical and everybody is impatient to get home, but I ask your indulgence to amplify and summarize the conclusions that I have just given to the House.

I regretfully have to state that this bill does not solve the basic causes of our fiscal and monetary problems. It is a "quickie," overly simplified attempt to postpone the inevitable reckoning caused by inflationary domestic deficit spending, an overexpansion of credit and money supply, and a chronic substantial deficit in our international balance of payments. That is the root of our evil. This bill does not attempt in any way to solve it.

This bill deals with the symptoms, not the causes, of our silver shortage. This bill will not mine, refine, or produce 1 ounce of silver to our stock. It merely reallocates silver by moving it from one stockpile to another.

Now, in thinking about this problem we must deal with both the price and the demand and supply factors worldwide and within this Nation itself. In 1961 the price of silver was 71 cents per ounce.

Since then the price of silver has jumped to $1.27 per ounce, almost doubled in the space of a year and a half.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of the production of silver has not risen appreciably in that year and a half. The cost of production does not account for this price jump. The coinage and the currency requirements of the United States come out of our stockpile and from our national silver production which amounts to about 35 million ounces annually. Our coinage silver is not purchased in the world market so that this is not a factor that created the increase in price from 71 cents to $1.27.

The industrial demand? We talked about that a great deal in the hearings. The industrial demand has been steadily increasing but not to the extent that would warrant this price increase. In fact, the largest users of silver industrially are the film manufacturers because of new processes that have just been developed and which are just going on the market for the manufacturer of film that will require substantially less silver than is now required. So the industrial silver demand will decrease and not increase in the future in that area of industry. Therefore, that is not a major cause for the artificial prices that prevail at the present time in the world silver market.

Mr. Chairman, the present consumption of silver is about 350 million ounces annually and the production is about 250 million ounces. I differ a little bit with the distinguished chairman on that figure, but the difference of that 100 million ounces is made up of our U.S. stockpiles and does not affect the world market or the prices in the world market. So that neither industrial users nor the consumption-production ratio account for the shortages or the price rises in silver.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PILLION. Will the gentleman yield to me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield the gentleman from New York 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, the rise in the price of silver which today is considerably above the cost of production can be accounted for by two elements, and before we find the solution let us find what the causes are. Here are your causes. First there is a speculative manipulated drive by foreign interests to increase prices and corner the free world silver market. The London silver market—the dealers are involved—and the second largest producer, Mexico, has withheld its silver, held it off the market and contributed toward the manipulation which produced the present artificial prices of silver.

Mr. Chairman, at today's prices it was expected that large stocks of silver would go out of Red China into the open market. This did not materialize. One reason given was that the Russian technicians had left and there was a lack of Chinese technicians for the refinement of Chinese silver coins into marketable bullion. I suspect that that is not the true reason. The withholding of silver from the world market by both Mexico and Red China has nefarious political purposes behind it.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon testified that there has been a large foreign speculative interest driving up the price of silver since 1961. I agree with him.

Our problem is how to break up the world silver rigged artificial price level and bring the prices back down to a cost-of-production level.

We can most effectively do this by making our silver stocks freely available for normal demands around the world.

If we do not break the artificial price of silver when we have more than 100-percent silver backing for our currency, how can we defend ourselves against a similar attack upon our gold stocks where the ratio is $1 of gold for $7 of gold liabilities held by foreigners which they may demand at any moment, or at any time, and where our gold has a backing of only 25 percent?

We must remember that the mining, refining, and supply of silver will increase due to the higher prices. But production takes time. It takes time to reoutfit and reopen old mines and to put new mines into production. So I recommend a little patience on the part of the gentleman in that respect.

The second major cause for the increase in silver prices is that of hoarding and a lack of confidence in our fiscal and monetary policies.

The best measurement of the fear of currency inflation and the decreasing confidence in our fiscal and monetary policies can be found in the drain upon our silver dollars out of the Treasury. Let me cite some figures.

On October 1, 1961, 18 months ago, the Treasury had in stock $141 million in silver dollars.

On December 1, 1962, the Treasury had in stock $100 million in silver dollars.

On April 3, 1963, the Treasury had in stock $81 million in silver dollars.

In less than 18 months we lost $60 million of silver dollars and today we are losing silver dollars at the rate of $1 million a day. At this rate, our silver stock will be exhausted within the next 2 or 3 months.

This is a perfect example of the application and operation of the Gresham law, where good money—I am talking now about good silver certificates and silver coins, silver convertible money—is being driven out of circulation by bad money, that is, Federal Reserve notes, that we intend to substitute for good money.

You do not meet this psychological problem in human action by further degrading and devaluating the dollar as proposed in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is of vital concern not only to thousands of people in my State, but also to silver users and consumers all over the country. In fact, it is important to every person in the country.

This bill will permit the operation of a free market for silver by repealing the acts which oblige the Treasury to support the price of silver. It repeals the special tax on transfers of interest in silver which is designed to prevent speculation while the Treasury is required to buy silver. In order to keep the Treasury out of the market this bill provides for the use of present silver stocks for making half dollars, quarters, and dimes. This is accomplished through the issuance of $1 Federal Reserve notes which will permit the retirement of silver certificates, thus releasing silver for coinage.

In the absence of a free commodity market today, we have a market in which the price has risen nearly 40 percent in 16 months. The market is unstable and unpredictable. Secretary Dillon has pointed out that the spectacular increase in the price of silver has benefited the producers, but has created difficulties for the users. He stated that the silverware, jewelry, and related industries have had to cope as best they could with these increased costs. This bill will give the users the much needed assurance of a relatively stable price level. We do not know what the price level will be.

The silver laws which this bill will repeal are not necessary to our monetary system. They were passed to help the mining industry. How much they have helped is shown by the fact that the Treasury has been required to take in approximately 3 billion ounces of silver since 1933. The absence of this silver in the market has forced up the price to its present level of $1.275 per ounce.

It has been said that the passage of this bill will adversely affect the balance of payments and gold flow. On the contrary, failure to pass this bill will have an adverse effect.

It is estimated that approximately 100 million ounces of silver annually will be needed in the next few years to meet the Treasury requirements for silver. At the $1.29 per ounce, this will require the retirement of $129 million in silver certificates. To replace this amount of certificates with Federal Reserve notes will require 25 percent backing in gold, or about $33 million. This gold is set aside as backing, it does not leave the country.

If H.R. 5389 does not pass, the Treasury cannot meet its requirements from its stock on hand which amount to approximately 1.6 billion ounces. It will have to go into the market. We already must import two-thirds of our industrial requirements—70 million ounces—for which payments can be demanded in gold. To this drain on our gold supply the Treasury must add the cost of its requirements of 100 million ounces of silver which it must obtain from foreign sources. This will result in a direct drain on our gold supply.

It has been said that this bill permits the administration to cash in $2 billion of capital assets in silver. It should be made clear that the $2 billion does not belong to the administration. It belongs to the holders of silver certificates—the public. Before anything can be done with this silver the certificates must be bought from the public.

In effect, the silver certificates will be purchased from the public with the half dollars, quarters, and dimes manufactured from the silver. This is the reason why the Treasury will gradually retire silver certificates equivalent to its coinage requirements.

This is not a fiscal problem. It is a monetary problem which the Banking and Currency Committee after 4 days of open hearings has properly resolved by a reported vote of 18 to 1. It was reported that the Ways and Means Committee voted unanimously on the tax provisions.

Typical of the confused thinking about silver is the statement that the value of silver bullion behind our silver certificates is 30 percent greater than the face value of the paper money it supports. The three-fourths of an ounce of silver backing each silver certificate is never worth more than the market price for silver. Today this amount of silver is worth 98 cents.

This bill is for the purpose of permitting the operation of a free market for silver with the Treasury out of the market. In order to keep the Treasury out of the market, provisions must be made for it to obtain silver, for subsidiary coins from silver stocks on hand, and to provide for an adequate supply of $1 bills.

The urgency for immediate action is indicated by the performance of the silver market.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take this time now to discuss the bill itself and its merits. However, for the convenience of the Members and for the Record I am including at this point my supplemental views on H.R. 5389, to repeal the Silver Purchasing Act of 1934, which I have heretofore put in the Record but which I insert now with two corrections. These supplemental views are as follows:

Supplemental Views of Hon. Thomas B. Curtis on H.R. 5389, To Repeal the Silver Purchasing Act of 1934, Including the Tax on Transfers of Silver Bullion

H.R. 5389 is divided into two parts. The first part, sections 1 through 3, is concerned with the repeal of the silver legislation and authorization of $1 Federal Reserve notes. This matter was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee which held hearings on these aspects on March 11–14, expressly reserving to the Committee on Ways and Means jurisdiction with respect to the second part of the measure, the repeal of tax on transfers of silver bullion. The Ways and Means Committee held no public hearings and devoted one morning session of informal executive session to the matter. No testimony was taken, and very short notice was given to the members of the committee that the matter was to be taken up.

Neither the hearings nor report of the Banking and Currency Committee were available during the Ways and Means Committee's consideration. Nor were the hearings and report of the Ways and Means Committee which had jurisdiction of the entire legislation in 1934 made available to the committee. The memorandum prepared by the Ways and Means Committee staff made no reference to the original 1934 hearings and committee report. Upon interrogation of the Secretary of the Treasury and other persons present at the informal executive session it was apparent that they were unfamiliar with these hearings and report.

I received copies from the Library of Congress just as the committee went into executive session.

From the 1934 hearings and report, it is apparent that the Silver Act of 1934 was presented "in developing an improved monetary system."

The committee in its report makes the following points:

The measure is a logical and necessary complement of the Gold Reserve Act passed by this House on January 20 and approved by the President on January 30, 1934. Silver is a valuable component of any monetary system designed to stabilize the money's worth of goods. * * * We may look toward a coordinated use of that silver to check changes in the purchasing power of the dollar.

Section 2 declares the policy of the United States to be to increase the proportion of silver to gold in its monetary stocks with the ultimate objective of having and maintaining in silver one-fourth of the monetary value of the stocks of gold and silver, and three-fourths of the monetary value of such stocks in gold.

The second sentence of the section (5) requires that there be maintained in the Treasury as security for all silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued an amount of silver in bullion and standard silver dollars aggregating in monetary value the face value of such certificates outstanding at the time.

Section 10 states: "'Monetary value' is defined to mean a value calculated on the basis of $1 for an amount of silver or gold equal to the amount at the time contained in the standard silver dollar and the standard gold dollar respectively."

In respect to the tax being imposed, the committee report has this to say: "Holders of silver are thus allowed to make a profit which should at least equal any profits arising from investments in silver or the purchase and sale of silver for industrial use during times when the price is not being increased by governmental action. The tax being in the nature of a profits tax covers transactions taking place prior to enactment. Were this provision not included in the bill, the policy of equitably reimbursing the Government for the increase which its action may bring to the price of silver could easily be obstructed."

The first question asked Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., when he testified before the committee was in respect to the revenue aspects of the tax. I quote from page 9 of the hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 9745, the Silver Purchasing Act of 1934, in the 2d session of the 73d Congress, May 25 and 26, 1934:

"The Chairman (Mr. Doughton). Mr. Secretary, has there been any estimate made as to the probable amount of revenue that may be derived from this 50 percent tax?

"Secretary Morgenthau. It would have to be a very rough estimate, but I would say that it is perfectly possible the Government might get as much as $25 million.

"The Chairman. Per annum?

"Secretary Morgenthau. Well, I would not want to say that; but over the period of the purchase of silver.

Mr. Vinson. The Treasury is deriving no revenue from that source at this time?

"Secretary Morgenthau. No.

"Mr. Vinson. Then that will be additional revenue?

"Secretary Morgenthau. That is correct."

I make this reference to point up two things. The expressed basis for the passage of the act was to establish a monetary policy based upon two precious metals, silver and gold. The purpose of the tax was to collect revenue from the profits that speculators in silver stood to gain from the Government's actions.

The proposal of the Kennedy administration to repeal the act and the tax makes no reference to this historical basis.

The Congress is asked to abandon the monetary policy based upon two precious metals established in 1934 with no reference to its merits or demerits and with little reference to the monetary policy which will supplant it.

The administration presents its arguments in 1962 as if the reasons advanced by the administration in 1934 were specious and sham, that the real purpose of the Silver Act was not to establish a monetary policy, but to provide subsidization to the silver mining industry and that the real purpose of the tax was not to raise revenue, but rather to police the subsidization act.

The question for the Congress is not to determine why the Kennedy administration should treat the Roosevelt administration proposals as sham, but rather whether the 1962 presentation itself is a sham.

Perhaps the Silver Act of 1934 was not to establish a monetary system, but rather to provide a subsidy for the silver industry. Perhaps the tax was imposed not for revenue, but for policing the subsidy measure.

But the proposal of President Kennedy to repeal the act is certainly not designed to improve our monetary system. Rather it is designed to solve a serious economic condition resulting from the fiscal policy of deficit finance and economic circumstances wherein silver bullion may become worth considerably more than the silver certificate for which it may be exchanged.

Repeal of the act adds one other method to the many which have been utilized by the Kennedy administration to cash in capital assets of the Nation to temporarily ease the problems created by the continued high deficits we have experienced and that the administration is planning to continue for several years to come.

In other words, there are more fiscal issues than monetary issues involved in the proposal to repeal the Silver Act.

The bald effect of the President's proposal to repeal the Silver Act is to permit him to sell off and to use as current revenue $2 billion of precious metals (silver bullion and vault silver dollars) which is maintained as security for $2 billion of our paper currency. He may then issue $2 billion of new Federal Reserve notes in place of the $2 billion of silver certificates. This will leave us with an additional $2 billion of paper money backed by our present diminishing gold reserves.

Not only will this leave us minus $2 billion of precious metals to back up our $32 billion of paper currency but it withdraws precious metal which was required to be dollar for dollar of the paper money issued against it. Furthermore due to the rise in value of silver in relation to the paper dollar, the silver bullion behind our silver certificates may become greater than the face value of the paper money it supports. Contrast this to our gold reserves which must be only 25 percent of the outstanding paper money and we begin to see how much the outright repeal of the Silver Act cuts back on our precious metal reserves.

If the Kennedy administration was simply trying to repeal or amend the bimetallic monetary policy we have adopted instead of, as I suggested, cash in capital assets to pay for some of our current expenditures then it would propose one of two things: Readjust the silver reserve required to back up the silver certificates or replace the silver backing the paper currency with gold. Either proposal would correct the problem of silver cash-ins which is the professed concern of the administration.

Certainly it is true that as the policy of deficit financing continues the problems of marketing and managing the Federal debt (a part of fiscal policy within the purview of the Ways and Means Committee) becomes

> more acute. The precious metal standing behind our currency is not just a matter of monetary policy, in these critical times of balance of payment and limited supply of precious metals in our vaults. It deeply involves our basic fiscal policies.
>
> Neither the Banking and Currency Committee nor the Ways and Means Committee have studied or evaluated the implications of the repeal of the Silver Act upon the overall fiscal policy of the United States. This is a responsibility the Ways and Means Committee must meet.
>
> I suggested to Secretary Dillon in executive session that by proposing an outright repeal of the Silver Act the administration lends credence to the belief currently expressed that the administration contemplated devaluing the dollar. Secretary Dillon stated that this was in no sense the policy of the administration. I then asked him if it was true that repeal of the Silver Act was a necessity in order to devalue the dollar. With this he agreed, reaffirming, however, no intention on the part of the administration to do so.

The two corrections relate to the worth of silver now. Silver is not now worth more than the silver certificates.

The cash-in danger occurs if it becomes more.

Mr. Chairman, I want to direct attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] when he stated there was no power to sell silver in the bill. As a matter of fact, there is power to sell silver and that can be done if it reaches a certain price. I would refer to the committee hearings on page 19. I will read part of this where the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss], who supports this bill, is interrogating the Secretary of the Treasury beginning in the middle after the first few paragraphs:

> Mr. Reuss. Congress has been concerned recently with stockpiling generally and feels that in many fields metals have been stockpiled out of all reasonable relationship with anticipated use.
>
> If this bill, as is, is passed, I note that it will put the Treasury in unrestricted possession of 1,300 million ounces of silver, available for coinage, which is in current value somewhere between $1½ and $2 billion. This would, as I figure it, take care of the coinage needs of the country at the present level for some 17 or 18 years.

And I interpolate—"using it for current use."

> Mr. Reuss (continuing). Would it not be worth considering whether this is not an unreasonable stockpile and, particularly in view of the very strong demand situation for silver, whether, perhaps with some reasonable floor, $1.265 at the present level or whatever is wise, to prevent harm to our domestic silver industry, the Treasury could be empowered to sell on the market silver in the years to come?
>
> If, for example, it reduced its supply from around $2 billion to around $1 billion it could pay off an equivalent amount of the national debt and save that 4-percent interest or $40 million a year.
>
> Over 20 years that would be close to $1 billion in savings for the taxpayers, and for the years immediately ahead, in view of the fact that we import for industrial purposes about three times the domestic production, it would be a very real help in our balance-of-payments situation, which I know worries you as much as it does me.
>
> What would be wrong with that, if anything?
>
> Secretary Dillon. Well, I do not think anything would be, but the present bill does, in effect, contain just that authority.

That is what I said, I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman]. I said that the bald effect of the President's proposal to repeal the Silver Act is to permit him to sell off or to use as current revenue $2 billion of precious metal. Now whether he uses it and whether the other limitations are there, you are giving him the authority in this bill. It would have been possible to have restricted his ability to do this in the bill. If this had been done that would be one thing; but it was not.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. I think the legislative history is clear on this as well as the language of the legislation. If the gentleman will look at section 2 of H.R. 5389, that section which relates to the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of any silver, I will quote the relevant sentence contained on line 3, page 2:

> Unless the market price of silver exceeds its monetary value, the Secretary of the Treasury shall not dispose of any silver held or owned by the United States in excess of that required to be held as reserves against outstanding silver certificates, but any such excess silver may be sold to other departments and agencies of the Government or used for the coinage of standard silver dollars and subsidiary silver coins.

The gentleman will see from that language that there is in fact, and in addition the power on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury to sell or dispose of silver at a price less than its monetary value which, I believe, is $1.29.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has stated exactly what the whole reason for the repeal of the Silver Act is because the price of silver is getting beyond that value and, therefore, the Treasury could sell. Furthermore, the other end of the restriction is not a real restriction because the bill also says that the President can issue Federal Reserve notes in lieu of the silver certificates. I would like to get on, if I may, and I want to make this other point and then I will be glad to yield to my colleagues.

I want to make this point. If I have time I will yield.

On page 32 Mr. Martin of the Federal Reserve Board was testifying, and the committee report refers to that. I want to point out what Mr. Martin advised this committee to do, and the committee did not follow this advice. He said:

> If this bill is enacted, it is important that the resulting shift from silver certificates to Federal Reserve notes take place gradually. Roughly $2 billion in silver certificates are outstanding. A complete shift of this amount to Federal Reserve notes would reduce the Treasury's free gold stock by $500 million, because of the 25 percent gold certificate reserve requirement on Federal Reserve notes. I am pleased, therefore, to note Secretary Dillon's statement yesterday that the increase in the required gold certificate reserve resulting from the retirement of silver certificates and their subsequent replacement with Federal Reserve notes should not exceed $35 million a year.

There is no restriction in this bill at all as suggested by Mr. Martin, and this points to the fiscal aspects. This can be moved against our gold supply and it will knock down our gold supply by around $500 million if this program is completed.

Secretary Dillon says he does not plan to do this. But suppose the new Secretary of Treasury were the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Reuss; Secretary Reuss I think would probably want to do this, and this is a perfectly proper thing because he believes that.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. A very important point that we should keep in mind is that the Secretary of the Treasury has no control as to how fast people turn certificates in to the Treasury. These certificates are payable on demand, and when they are presented the Secretary of the Treasury cannot say he will redeem them at the rate of $140 million a year requiring a 25 percent, or $35 million addition to our gold reserves. It is not going to be done that way.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have not really faced up to the possibility of my conduct were I appointed Secretary of the Treasury, but I think the gentleman is probably right; I would probably try to save as many dollars of the taxpayers' money as I possibly could by seeing that they got the interest on this money, which as long as it is held in an excess supply as any commodity prevents their getting that. However, Mr. Dillon is Secretary of the Treasury, and he has said he is not going to do that.

Mr. CURTIS. I was not saying it unkindly, but in disagreement with the basic philosophy which I am trying to point out to the House.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. White].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to approach a problem of the magnitude of this problem in 5 minutes. I think that the entire timing of this bill and its progress today is similar to what is happening to me. It has been improperly considered. It is brought to us without proper consideration by this Congress as a whole, and I know that the number of Members we have today is a minimum number on a subject of great concern to the men and women of the United States of America. I know as a champion of silver for our monetary base that I follow some very illustrious people of the past. I do not think I am as capable as many of them, but I am going to do as well as I can with the meager ability I possess.

Mr. Chairman, I feel first of all that several misstatements have been made here today: As to the retirement of silver certificates, the backing of the silver certificates, the drain on our gold reserves, the balance of payments; and I think it is my duty to attempt to inform the House as well as I can my views and hope they may see this as I see it.

First of all, since the inception of the Silver Purchasing Act there has been a benefit accruing to the American people through the issuance of silver certificates by virtue of two things.

One of these is a minor thing, seigniorage, which is the alloying of other metals and silver that go into a silver dollar, the other being the difference between the monetary value of silver and the price paid therefor.

I do not care how you approach it, it is a real profit. The dollar bill can be used to retire a debt, and the difference between 90.5 cents and $1.29 represents a profit.

I was listening to the gentleman from Wisconsin who said he would like to save the American taxpayers some money. I would like to save them some money too. In retiring $2 billion of silver certificates to be replaced by $2 billion of Federal Reserve notes there would be an increase in interest payments. I might say a note bears interest. I have never seen any that did not.

The statement by Mr. Martin, head of the Federal Reserve Board, made before the committee, was that the cost to keep a Federal Reserve note in circulation is about 5 percent per annum.

I have an old Federal Reserve note in my pocket. It is a $20 bill issued in 1914 after enactment of the Federal Reserve banking law or the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. This old boy at that rate has cost the American people $50 to keep it in circulation. I respectfully submit that the silver certificates issued in 1933, 1934, 1935, and since have not cost the American people any interest to keep in circulation but have in fact provided a saving for the American people.

With respect to the dilution of our gold reserves, as of January 31 the gold reserve requirement for Federal Reserve backing was $12,115 million. Our U.S. gold stocks on that date were $15,975 million. As of April 2, they were $15,877,538,823, a loss in that period of $100 million.

The foreign claims against our gold stocks today are $21,132 million; of this there is, for long-term obligations, $1,304 million; private claims $8,287 million; official claims $11,541 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, with our present stock of gold of $15 billion, we have obligations amounting to $21 billion. We do not have enough gold to pay our gold obligations that are in existence if they were called upon to be redeemed today.

I therefore feel this legislation should be given complete and serious consideration by this body. I feel all of its aspects should be considered. I would say to the gentlemen who say we are going to reduce our silver reserve over a period of 10 years, as was pointed out by the gentleman from New York, that I can see no reason for that length of time. Any person who accumulates silver certificates in any amount can take them to the Treasury of the United States and demand the bullion or silver dollars.

The present price of silver at $1.272, which is the latest quotation, approaches a monetary value of $1.29. The minute it goes above that, there will be a mad rush to the Treasury to redeem all of the silver certificates that they can redeem so that silver can be used for speculative purposes, and the amount left for currency will be a very meager amount indeed.

I believe that this Congress should take the time to actually analyze what will happen. We have been assured by Secretary Dillon that our present stock of silver will last until 1965 for coinage purposes. I believe we should vote this legislation down and come up with a realistic study and approach, with more than 4 days of hearings. I feel that it is more important to the American people than to have just 4 days of hearings.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. It was my pleasure to serve with the father of the gentleman now in the well of this House, and I know of Compton White, Sr.'s great interest in silver, and I want to commend my neighbor and colleague for his statement in connection with this matter. I think it is time that we go slow and know exactly what we are doing. There are implications in this measure which can be rather complicated, and I certainly want to associate myself with what the gentleman has said here.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. BARING. I want to congratulate my colleague on the speech he is making. I also served with your father, and I also worked in the Senate under the great silver leader, Key Pitman, the senior Senator from Nevada, who at that time dictated the Silver Purchase Act. I note you have said that you did not think we had enough gold to back up the Federal Reserve notes that this bill provides for. Does the gentleman know that there is a bill in the Congress right today to do away with gold, too? Do you think that this is the forerunner to take gold out from behind our banking system?

Mr. WHITE. I believe it is, and I do know of the bill. It is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency. It would remove the 25-percent requirement for gold backing of our Federal Reserve notes.

Mr. BARING. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, and I think we should have another hard look at this bill. I think this is dangerous legislation and should be defeated.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to commend the gentleman from Idaho for the presentation he has made, and I wish to assure the gentleman that I shall support him when he brings up his amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman.

There is an alternative solution to this problem. If we are going to bid for time, it is in the power of the President of the United States to raise the monetary value of silver. The present subsidiary value, the coinage value, of silver is $1.38 an ounce. If we would raise silver to this price, we would have an ample amount of silver for coinage purposes and at the same time would not dilute our gold reserve, which would be diluted, as has been said, by $500 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, it is to try to pick up some loose ends here, that I take this time and I want to support what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] said as to the committee's contention on the transfer tax. That was the only direct jurisdictional interest we had at the time in the bill. We did not have any hearing. It was informal. There was no record made. We were relating our views to the transfer tax, of course, connected with sale of silver, the tax which is a part of this bill, because of the tax recommendations that have been made to us by the President and the imbalance of payments in the trade bill which affect both the backing of our money and the gold outflow.

I want to call attention again to an exchange in our committee that has not been recorded except as found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] pointed out, he asked Secretary Dillon if it was thought that repeal of the Silver Act was a necessity in order to devalue the dollar. The Secretary answered in the affirmative. I think it is important to remember that.

Mr. Chairman, then I want to read, too, what Chairman Martin said. He said this would affect our gold outflow by $500 million if the retirement was too quick.

Further, I think this can be said accurately. It is not too complicated. Take a dollar out of your pocket and look at it. It says "silver certificate."

That is worth the full amount 100 cents in precious metal; that is, silver. If we go through with this, the dollar will be worth only 25 cents in precious metal, gold, and it will not be redeemable.

Mr. Chairman, finally I would like to conclude my brief remarks by calling attention to that part of the RECORD of April 8, on page 5851, following the views of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. I put in the RECORD some views that came to me from the chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, as to gold outflow and the increase of liquid liabilities, because I have been challenged in committee several times that my statements on gold outflow were not accurate. It is true they were not accurate because I was including the liquid liabilities which can be redeemed in gold.

Mr. Chairman, in the last 2 years liquid liabilities have increased about $4.6 billion, and if they come back through foreign banks they can be called in gold. Of course, this is in the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I want to quote from Mr. Stam when he says this:

> As a result of five large successive deficits in our balance of payments we have transferred to foreigners some $7 billion from our monetary gold stock and added another $9 billion to our liquid liabilities.

Mr. Chairman, at page 5852 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 8 there are tables given as to the gold outflow and the increase of liquid liabilities which must be considered together.

Inasmuch as the imbalance of payments and old outflow are a part of the hearings on tax recommendations and because of colloquies between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] and myself, I would like to supplement earlier statements with information bringing the gold situation up to date. At my request, Colin Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, submitted the following information which I include at this point:

MARCH 25, 1963.

Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALGER: In response to your request for data on the relationship between the U.S. balance of international payments and declines in the U.S. gold stock, we are enclosing a table which shows the U.S. balance of international payments and the offsets thereto, including changes in U.S. gold stock, during the period 1954–62.

In this connection, you may be interested in the following succinct summary of the U.S. experience in the last 5 years by Hon. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System. In his February 1, 1963, statement before the Joint Economic Committee. Mr. Martin stated: "Finally, let me comment briefly on our balance-of-payments problem. * * * As a result of five large successive deficits, we have transferred to foreigners some $7 billion from our monetary gold stock and added another $9 billion to our liquid liabilities."

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

U.S. balance of international payments and resultant reductions in U.S. gold stock, 1954–62

[In millions of dollars]

Year	U.S. balance of payments	Year	Increase (−) in liquid liabilities to foreigners [1]	Increase (+) or decrease (−) in convertible currencies	Increase (+) or decrease (−) in U.S. gold stock
1954	−1,550	1954	−1,252	----------	−298
1955	−1,145	1955	−1,104	----------	−41
1956	−935	1956	−1,241	----------	+306
1957	+520	1957	−278	----------	+798
1958	−3,529	1958	−1,254	----------	−2,275
1959	−3,743	1959	−3,012	----------	[2] −731
1960	−3,925	1960	−2,223	----------	−1,702
1961	[3] −2,360	1961	−1,618	+116	−858
1962	[3] −2,181	1962	−1,274	−17	−890

[1] To International Monetary Fund, foreign central banks and governments, foreign commercial banks, and other international and regional institutions.

[2] Excludes payment of $344,000,000 as increase in U.S. gold subscription to the International Monetary Fund.

[3] The U.S. payments deficit in 1962 would have been $900,000,000 higher in the absence of certain special receipts: $660,000,000 of advance repayments by France, Italy, and Sweden of postwar debt to the U.S. Government, and $250,000,000 of receipts from sale by U.S. Treasury of 15- and 16-month nonmarketable securities denominated in foreign currency to Italy and Switzerland. Debt prepayments of over $660,000,000 had also been received in 1961. By the end of 1962 most countries experiencing reserve gains had repaid all or a substantial part of their 1946–49 borrowing in the United States.

This information was then more fully explained again in my request by Mr. Stam in the following letter:

MARCH 25, 1963.

Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALGER: This is in response to your request for data showing for the 5-year period 1958–62 the relationship between the U.S. balance of payments on the one hand and the resultant increase in liquid liabilities to foreigners and decrease in our gold stock on the other.

The requested data are as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

U.S. balance of payments	−15,738
Increase in liquid liabilities to foreigners	−9,381
Increase in convertible currencies	+99
Decrease in U.S. gold stock	−6,456
Total	−15,738

If the $344 million increase in U.S. gold subscription to the International Monetary Fund is included as a decrease in gold stock rather than as an increase in liquid liabilities, the figures would appear as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

U.S. balance of payments	−15,738
Increase in liquid liabilities to foreigners	−9,037
Increase in convertible currencies	+99
Decrease in U.S. gold stock	−6,800
Total	−15,738

Thus, as our letter of this morning indicated, the 5-year situation may be summarized as follows:

As a result of five large successive deficits in our balance of payments, we have transferred to foreigners some $7 billion from our monetary gold stock and added another $9 billion to our liquid liabilities.

The above figures were derived from those in the table submitted to you this morning.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

It is appropriate at this point that I include the memorandum of April 5 of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] concerning gold holdings, U.S. dollars owned by foreign countries, U.S. balance-of-payments position, and gross public debts:

Gold holdings (free world countries):	
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1952	$23,252,000,000
U.S. gold outflow to foreign countries, 1952 through 1962	−7,195,000,000
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, reduced to	16,057,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries,[1] Dec. 31, 1952	13,028,000,000
Gold holdings, increase, other countries, 1952 through 1962	+11,630,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries, Dec. 31, 1962, increased to	24,648,000,000
U.S. dollars owned by foreign countries (free world):	
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1952	10,546,100,000
Increase in foreign dollar holdings, 1952 through 1962	+14,437,900,000
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, increased to	24,984,000,000
U.S. balance-of-payments position:	
1950 net deficit	−1,912,000,000
1951 net deficit	−578,000,000
1952 net deficit	−1,100,000,000
1953 net deficit	−2,100,000,000
1954 net deficit	−1,500,000,000
1955 net deficit	−1,100,000,000
1956 net deficit	−1,000,000,000
1957 (only credit in 13 years)	+500,000,000
1958 net deficit	−3,400,000,000
1959 net deficit	−3,700,000,000
1960 net deficit	−3,800,000,000
1961 net deficit	−2,400,000,000
1962 net deficit	−2,200,000,000
U.S. deficit, 1950 through 1962, inclusive	−24,290,000,000
Gross public debts:	
U.S. public debt on Dec. 31, 1962	303,470,080,489
Other free world countries (latest available figures)	201,500,000,000
U.S. debt exceeds debts of other free world countries by	101,970,080,489
U.S. debt exceeds all other countries of world by	24,000,500,000

[1] Does not include Sino-Soviet bloc.

The above indicates clearly what the foreign aid program is doing to our gold reserves and our balance-of-payments position (trade).

It is long overdue but let us hope not too late that the Congress immediately direct its attention to solving the imbalance of payments and the gold outflow. For my part, it is quite clear that restoring fiscal order will require reduced Federal spending, immediate balanced budget, a reduction of our debt and then with that background tax reform which primarily means a drastic cutback in the tax progression and a reduction of rates.

Finally, a further comparative chart from 1950 to 1962 on foreign holdings of Federal securities, balance-of-payments deficits, and gold outflow to which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] referred:

	Foreign and international ownership of Federal securities [1]	As a percent of total Federal securities outstanding [2]	As a percent of total short-term liabilities to foreigners [3]	Balance of-payments deficit [4]	Change in total gold stock [5]
	Billions			*Billions*	*Millions*
End of December—					
1950	$4.3	1.7	50.0	−$3.6	--------
1951	4.3	1.7	46.2	.3	--------
1952	5.3	2.0	50.5	−1.0	$492
1953	5.9	2.1	50.9	−2.2	−1.168
1954	6.3	2.3	48.5	−1.6	−298
1955	7.5	2.7	55.1	−1.1	−40
1956	7.8	2.8	52.3	−.9	305
1957	7.6	2.8	50.0	.5	799
1958	7.7	2.7	47.5	−3.5	−2,275
1959	12.0	4.1	61.9	−3.7	−1,075
1960	13.0	4.5	61.0	−3.9	−1,703
1961	13.4	4.5	59.8	−2.5	−857
1962	15.3	5.0	61.2	−2.2	−890

[1] Source: Treasury Bulletin, February 1963. Consists of the investments of foreign balances and international accounts in the United States.

[2] Securities issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Government, excluding guaranteed securities held by the Treasury.

[3] Derived from data in Treasury Bulletin, February 1963.

[4] Source: 1962 supplement to Economic Indicators.

[5] Source: Treasury Bulletin, August 1959; February 1963.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas if a person went into the Federal Reserve bank with one of these new dollar bills and asked the teller to change that bill for four quarters, what would he get in return?

Mr. ALGER. Well, he certainly would not get gold, if that is what the gentleman is talking about, but he could get silver. That makes my point. We go from 100-percent backing in silver down to 25 percent in gold. That is the problem.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. You would get four quarters back. There is no question about that.

Mr. ALGER. We are talking about confidence in our money, and it is a much more serious thing than change for a dollar.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Actually, he will not be able to get back a silver dollar containing 0.77 grains of silver, because four quarters contain 0.72 grains of silver. So you are devaluing the silver that a holder can get back from the Federal Reserve bank. That is what is being done here.

Mr. ALGER. I appreciate the contribution of both the gentlemen. Perhaps I have not phrased this well, and perhaps we have been missing the point as far as I am concerned. I am talking about the imminent devaluation of our money because of a run on the bank that we as the world banker might experience, because the world holds $24 billion worth of indebtedness against our $15.8 billion worth of gold. I realize that this is a great danger and the pressure is building.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman, I believe, is placing too much importance on the silver certificates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this legislation can best be understood as an ordinary problem of good business management. For various reasons, including the tremendously expanding use of coin vending machines, the demand for U.S. coins has increased to a great extent over the past years. In order to meet this demand the United States needs a great deal of silver.

Mr. Chairman, this problem which faces the United States affords us two choices: First, we can go out into the open market and buy silver. However, because the production of silver in the free world amounts to only 200 million ounces per year compared to a consumption at the rate of 350 million ounces per year, the price of silver will obviously go up and up.

It may go up to the point where it is profitable to melt down your coins, and coins will disappear from our commerce and business difficulty will ensue.

Further, and directing myself particularly to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, if we have to purchase silver in the open market, two-thirds of which comes from abroad, we will be worsening our balance-of-payment situation and we will have a greater drain on our gold supply.

What is the other solution? The other solution is a simple, businesslike one. The Treasury owns 1.6 billion ounces of silver. Why would any businessman buy at $1.275 an ounce what he already has in his inventory at an average price of 50 cents an ounce?

The United States is in this unbusinesslike position because of an antique law. This bill merely repeals the antique law so that the U.S. Treasury can act in a normal, businesslike manner.

Who are the wild-eyed radicals that are supporting this legislation? No. 1, a distinguished member of the Republican Party, the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon. No. 2, William McChesney Martin, who has served as Chairman of the Federal Reserve System under three administrations of both parties. The American Bankers Association, and to my friend from Illinois, I say also the Chicago Tribune. The Chicago Tribune on March 14 had an editorial entitled "Repeal the Silver Purchase Act." The editorial reads:

> The country has enough problems without inviting new ones, and therefore we hope Congress will lose no time in repealing the Silver Purchase Act, as Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Dillon request, and as Republicans have been demanding for years.

The Wall Street Journal is another one of these radicals. An article of March 3 reads:

> If the United States were forced into the market, it might have to buy its silver abroad because of insufficient domestic silver supplies. The result, the administration fears, would be a worsening of U.S. balance-of-payments problems and pressure for increased market prices that would cause trouble for the monetary system.

Mention has been made, I believe, by the gentleman from Missouri, of concern over whether the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, or Secretaries of the Treasury in the future, might decide to sell this silver. Does the gentleman realize that under existing law the Treasury has the right to sell the silver at 90.5 cents and, as a matter of fact, continued to sell silver at 90.5 until November of 1961? Under this legislation, instead of the Secretary of the Treasury being permitted to sell silver at 90.5 cents, the legislation raises the price at which the Secretary of the Treasury may sell silver to $1.29 an ounce. Therefore, this legislation is really a restriction on the Secretary and, therefore, in accord with the views of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. With that aspect, yes, but you couple with it in this bill also the power to use in lieu of silver certificates the Federal Reserve notes. The combination would result in the depletion of the capital of the United States.

Mr. MOORHEAD. The gentleman knows this silver would be needed in the future to supply our need for coins.

Mr. CURTIS. When the silver bullion goes out of the Treasury it will not be backing the silver certificates as paper money, you will have the Federal Reserve notes, that will have behind them only the gold.

Mr. MOORHEAD. If we do not take this action it is very likely the price of silver will go above the monetary value. Then our only choice would be to reduce the silver content of this quarter that you and I have.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree that action must be taken along this line but I am pointing to the fiscal aspect, that there should be some limitations in here, perhaps along the line that Mr. Martin of the Federal Reserve suggested, that the Secretary be limited in how much he can convert in a year.

So the very thing that the Secretary of the Treasury said that he would plan to do, I suggest must be put into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time in support of this bill and to report as the bill came out of the committee, there was only one vote against it and one member abstained from voting at that time. I think it would be well to read again the historical background of this silver legislation. Some of this has been put in the Record by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman].

In 1934 when the Silver Purchase Act was passed and in subsequent years up to about 1959 it was necessary for the Government to support the price for newly mined domestic silver by taking nearly all of it off the market at an artificially high price. The Silver Purchase Act of 1934 had for its main purpose the purchase of silver until that metal would comprise one-fourth of the total gold and silver monetary stocks of the United States. While more than 2 billion ounces of foreign and secondary silver were purchased under the authority of this act at a cost of slightly over $1 billion, these purchases never brought the total silver holdings of the United States near the 25-percent figure. Purchases under the Silver Purchase Act were discretionary with the Secretary of the Treasury and since 1942 no Secretary of the Treasury has found it to be in the public interest to purchase foreign or secondary silver under that act.

Acts passed in 1939 and 1946 required the purchase of all newly mined domestic silver tendered at the mints at artificially established prices. The 1939 act established a floor price of about 71 cents per ounce. The 1946 act raised the floor price to 90½ cents. Since November 1961, when the Treasury stopped selling silver, market forces have caused the price to rise to its present level of $1.27. Thus, the purchase acts are inoperative, and indeed the silver-producing industry has no further need for Government assistance. Since late 1961 the producers have seen a spectacular increase in the price of this product, amounting to 40 percent, and the present price is within a cent or two of the monetary value of $1.29-plus, as compared with a price of about 45 cents when the 1934 law was enacted.

While this increase in price has benefited the producers, the recent rapid rise has created difficulties for the users. The silverware, jewelry, and related industries have had to cope as best they could with these increased costs. Other industrial and defense users have also been greatly affected. The legislation proposed will presumably result in stabilizing the market price at somewhere close to $1.29, a price that is favorable for the producers. At the same time it will benefit the user industries by giving them the much needed assurance of a relatively stable price level. Thus, today is the most opportune time for repealing the silver legislation and taking the Government out of the silver business except as a consumer in the manufacture of its coins.

Briefly the silver position is as follows: Last year U.S. production of silver was estimated at 32.5 million ounces, our consumption was 190 million ounces, of which 80 million was for coinage purposes and 110 million for industrial and arts usage. In the rest of the free world production exceeded consumption until 1959. In 1960 and 1961 and it is estimated in 1962 free world consumption exceeded production—by about 30 million ounces in 1961, the last year for which figures are available. Primarily the sharp increase in consumption of silver in arts and industry of the rest of the free world is the principal factor which has forced the price of silver up from 92 or 93 cents an ounce to $1.25 per ounce since late in 1961. Meanwhile Treasury stocks of free silver—stocks not required as currency backing—have declined to about 37 million ounces.

It is obvious in the above setting that the Treasury faces a real bind in obtaining silver for coinage purposes which as noted above was estimated in 1962 at 80 million ounces. One method of relieving the situation is for the Treasury to retire silver certificates and replace them with Federal Reserve notes. Through the substitution last year of Federal Reserve notes for $5 and $10 silver certificates approximately 107 million ounces of silver became available to the Treasury for coinage purposes. Treasury stocks of silver total approximately 1.7 billion ounces of which roughly 20 percent is "locked up" as collateral for $5 and $10 certificates. With it necessary for the Treasury to "retrieve" silver through substitution of Federal Reserve notes for $5 and $10 silver certificates it is obvious that $5 and $10 silver certificates are fast becoming collectors items, which, of course, will materially slow down and limit the extent to which this can be done.

Since most of the Treasury stocks of silver are "locked up" as collateral for $1 silver certificates it is apparent that the real heart of this bill is the provision allowing the issuance of $1 Federal Reserve notes. Once this is authorized the Treasury should be able to meet silver coinage requirements for many years through applying the same technique on $1 bills that has been used this past year on $5 and $10 bills.

If the $1 Federal Reserve note is not authorized as proposed in section 3 of the bill, the Treasury will soon be in the untenable position of being forced into the market to buy silver for its coinage needs. Such purchases would drive the price of silver up to its monetary value of $1.29-plus per ounce and beyond. At this point it would become profitable for the public to turn in $1 silver certificates to obtain the silver standing behind them.

I think this is in the best interests of our country. I believe it is going to be very, very helpful as far as our coinage is concerned, and we on the minority side of the committee have recommended this legislation to the House.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey.

I have listened to the debate here this afternoon, and I have heard much discussion on this question, but I have heard no one say what is going to happen if this bill does not pass. I may say to the gentleman I think we ought to be concerned with that question, because if this bill does not pass we have only one alternative, as I see it, and that is our Government must go out into the open market, we must pay this high price for silver, and it seems to me if you want to be concerned about the outflow of gold there is the place where you should be concerned, because it is going to be necessary to go out into the market and pay the high prices that the producers realize. It seems to me that is something that all of us should be very much concerned with, indeed. So I compliment the gentleman and rise in support of the bill.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Giaimo] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5389. Silver is an essential material in the production of many commodities of great importance to the entire population of the United States, and high silver prices increase the cost of all of them. Among these are photographic film and paper, silverware, jewelry, electrical contacts and circuits, batteries, mirrors, brazing and soldering materials, dental supplies, and silver nitrates for various uses.

In the Third District of Connecticut, which I have the honor to represent, silver is particularly important, for there we manufacture much of the sterling silver and silver plated flatware and holloware that is distributed throughout the Nation. Already the fantastic increase in the price of silver from 90.5 cents in November 1961 to $1.275 today—about 40 percent in total—has meant that people today have to pay about 20 percent more for their sterling silver flatware than those in 1961 paid.

If the price of silver goes much higher, still further increases in the price of silverware products will be necessary. This will seriously threaten the welfare of the sterling industry—whose total sales amount to about $150 million annually at retail. The sales of the silver-plated flatware and holloware will likewise be adversely affected, and these amount to another $100 million. In my district alone, this could jeopardize the jobs of 3,000 or more workers. In the silver flatware and holloware industry as a whole, some 10,000 jobs could be in jeopardy, to say nothing of the jobs of thousands of others in the retail stores throughout the country who sell these products. In fact, gentlemen, each of you has a greater stake in this situation than you may realize, for every seller and every buyer of these products in your districts will be affected.

It is significant, I believe, that in spite of the fact industrial use of silver in the United States increased only 5 percent in 1962 over 1961, the price of silver increased 40 percent. There were 91 changes in the price of silver from November 29, 1961, to March 13, 1963. There have been more since that date. How can any manufacturer engaged in a business, in which silver is the principal cost of his product, operate successfully or profitably when faced with such conditions? The situation has been critical for manufacturers in the Third District of Connecticut, which alone consumes 6 to 7 million ounces of silver annually. There must be a free market in silver, which can only be accomplished by passage of H.R. 5389. This will not necessarily decrease the price of silver, but it will, in my judgment, stabilize the market at a point and in a manner which will permit users of large quantities of silver to properly plan their manufacturing and sales programs, so that jobs for their workers can be secure.

There are those who fear the effect on our gold supply by gradually withdrawing $1 and $2 silver certificates and replacing them with Federal Reserve notes. The fact is that unless H.R. 5389 is passed, our balance-of-payments deficit and claims on our gold supply will be greatly increased. For then the Treasury will be forced to buy silver in the open market for coinage purposes and for backing of additional silver certificates. The United States currently produces only about one-third of our industrial silver requirements. Today it is buying two-thirds of its needs from foreign sources. It is estimated that another 100 million ounces of silver will soon have to be bought from foreign sources unless H.R. 5389 is passed. At $1.29 an ounce, the figure at which Treasury stocks of silver are valued, this means another 129 million dollars will flow abroad, and obviously to be added to our balance-of-payments deficit. That is a possibility I hate to contemplate in view of the tremendous deficit in our balance of payments now existing.

I urge the passage of H.R. 5389 as being in the best interests of the United States and its people.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to act favorably upon H.R. 5389, which repeals certain legislation relating to the Government's purchase of silver and which will benefit the consumers of our country and the industries using silver.

Some of the finest jewelry made in this country, Mr. Speaker, is made in the factories and shops of my district. They are important users of silver. The success of their enterprise is endangered by the steadily mounting price of the raw material upon which they are dependent.

There have been 90 changes in the price of silver since November of 1961. The price has risen from 25 cents an ounce in 1933 to $1.277 an ounce today, and the price is still rising. A prime mover in the boosting of this price has been the Federal Government, which has purchased 3 billion ounces of silver in the last 30 years, depriving industry of this supply and increasing prices to both industry and the consumer.

Industry and the consumer have been twin victims of this monetary policy—this money madness. Industry is plagued with higher costs, and higher costs have always meant fewer jobs. And the consumer is faced with higher prices for quality merchandise, and must turn to shoddy materials and imported goods. This move hurts the domestic employment situation further.

I am advised that the price of silver has increased 40 percent in just the last 15 months. The price is still rising, and the industry can give no assurance of price stability at any level. Yet the industrial users of my district and the consumers need a relatively stable price level. This bill will probably stabilize the market price at about $1.29 an ounce, a price that is favorable to the producers.

We can give them this stability by passage of this bill today. We no longer need subsidize the silver mining industry. The industrial need for silver is now so great that our domestic mines can produce only one-third of our annual national requirements.

This bill is needed to restore some health and sanity to the silver industry, to give our domestic jewelry companies a fair chance to compete with foreign competition and to protect the jobs of the skilled jewelry workers of the United States.

I urge the prompt passage of H.R. 5389.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the bill will be read for amendment.

No amendments are in order to title II of the bill, except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SILVER BULLION, SILVER CERTIFICATES, AND FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

SECTION 1. The Silver Purchase Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 311a, 316a, 316b, 405a, 448–448e, 734a, and 734b), section 4 of the Act of July 6, 1939 (31 U.S.C. 316c), and the Act of July 31, 1946 (31 U.S.C. 316d), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall maintain the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates. Unless the market price of silver exceeds its monetary value, the Secretary of the Treasury shall not dispose of any silver held or owned by the United States in excess of that required to be held as reserves against outstanding silver certificates, but any such excess silver may be sold to other departments and agencies of the Government or used for the coinage of standard silver dollars and subsidiary silver coins. Silver certificates shall be exchangeable on demand at the Treasury of the United States for silver dollars or, at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury, at such places as he may designate, for silver bullion of a monetary value equal to the face amount of the certificates.

SEC. 3. The first sentence of the ninth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 418) is amended by inserting "$1, $2," immediately after "notes of the denominations of".

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE: On page 2, strike out section 3, lines 15 through 18.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fourteen Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment, as I have already stated, for the purpose of maintaining a good and adequate monetary system in the United States in line with the suggestion of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee. They feel that the first section of the Silver Purchase Act is outmoded. I agree. With the $1.272 market price of silver in excess of the $0.905 treasury buying price. It is. Section 2, the disposition of the silver for other agencies and the use of silver for coinage, is proper. But I feel that section 3, authorizing the issuance of Federal Reserve notes further dilutes our gold reserves, provides us with a fiat currency that historically has been the downfall of nation after nation when they continued to spiral into debt; and that is the case of the United States today.

A question was asked a moment ago as to what we would do if we did not pass this bill. In answer to that I have already suggested that the monetary price of silver should be increased, and I suggest to the committee that this will be the case ultimately. Ultimately you will have to face up to it. Perhaps you can defer this for a few months, or possibly a year or two, but ultimately you are going to have to provide legislation in this area. People well versed in silver, experts, have told me that we can expect a price of $3 an ounce for silver. So I ask you what will we do when the price exceeds $1.29? I ask you further what you will do when it exceeds $1.38? Will you issue shinplasters as was done once before when we did not have sufficient silver? Will you call in the coins and melt them down? Will you call in the silver dollars and change the silver content in the metallic dollar?

I say that this is a move to make available to speculators and others silver at a bargain price. We have already had an example of what has happened when silver was authorized to be sold at 90.5 cents by the Treasury. We had the speculators move in, and the suppliers and the fabricators bought all they could. And, the thinking of the Government was that they were stabilizing the price. It was an impossibility. There was a great deal sold, and the pressure was on the President of the United States to stop the selling of free silver, which he did. I think you will have the same problem again. I think it will face us much sooner than you think at present, because I feel that pretty soon you will have $1.29 silver and better. So, the silver certificate will be redeemable and the silver dollar will be possibly melted down, and I think the price will continue above $1.38, and you will have the problem of what to do about your subsidiary coins. I hope that the repeal of the transfer tax will satisfy this group. I hope that the provisions of title I, section 1 and section 2 will satisfy this group of people, and I hope that you will take an adequate length of time to consider the ultimate effect of the demonetization of silver and the replacing of it by Federal Reserve notes. I hope that this group will look objectively at this, and I hope you will favor my amendment and vote it up.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Idaho. Like many other Members of Congress, I served with his father from the time he came here until he left. I know his interest in silver. His father was a great silver advocate. I am not at all sure that his father would be against this bill if he were here now. I do not believe anybody would know. The situation has changed. If William Jennings Bryan were here now, I believe he would be for this bill. Silver has served its purpose as a backing for currency. There is no occasion for the advocacy of it now, for the reason that the silver advocates advocated this back in the nineties and subsequent to that time, prior to Federal Reserve System.

This bill has been very carefully considered. The $2 bills that were mentioned here, which the gentleman said there were $90 million of, he is clearly mistaken about. There is only about $1.4 million of the $2 silver certificates. They are not very popular; they are not significant.

Now, as to the $1 bills, of course, the silver backing those will not be wasted. We are not dissipating our assets in making this transformation from silver certificates to Federal Reserve notes. Our assets remain the same, exactly the same. And, may I invite your attention to the fact that under existing law the silver could be sold for 90.5 cents per ounce. If this bill becomes law, it could only be sold only if the market price exceeds its monetary value, which is $1.29 cents per ounce, so we have more protection under this bill than we have under existing law.

Now, if we were to strike out this provision that the gentleman from Idaho wants to strike out, there would be no point to the bill; there would be no occasion for it. We need the silver for coinage. There is a great shortage of coins in America today. The vending machines take a lot of coins. The sales taxes in cities and States throughout the Nation use a lot of coins. We must have more coins, and this gives us a good reservoir of silver for the purpose of having coinage in the foreseeable future, as much as we will need. It is a great opportunity to use our silver for great advantage and not permit the speculators to use it.

If we wanted speculators to have it—if the administration did—as has been implied here, the present administration could let them have it for 90.5 cents per ounce when it is worth $1.275 on the market today.

There is no desire on the part of the administration, or any person to my knowledge, to take any advantage of the Government and to do something that will help the speculators in silver. I know that is not true. I know this bill is in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is endorsed by Republican leaders. It is also endorsed by the Democratic leaders. Both great political parties and their leaders are for this legislation. We had exhaustive hearings and fully considered the merits of the bill. We had every witness that any member of our committee wanted heard. We heard all witnesses that wanted to be heard. There was no desire on the part of the committee to withhold any facts or to prevent any person from disclosing his views. Everyone was given a fair opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask that this amendment be voted down. There would be no purpose for the bill if we were to pass this amendment. It takes the heart out of the bill. It would merely repeal the tax on the silver people, but that is all. This provision is very necessary. It is essential. I hope that the amendment is voted down

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. With all due respect to the gentleman from Texas and his long experience here and, perhaps, for a new Member to offer the opposition that I have offered to this is not well received, I am afraid that the gentleman is wrong, and that the gentleman's statement is incorrect. I am afraid that my father has turned over already.

Mr. PATMAN. You do not know which way he turned.

Mr. WHITE. Well, I am sure it is in the direction that I suggested, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that is not the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I would like to submit to this House this statement of fact: The Secretary of the Treasury now has the right to buy and sell silver at roughly 90 cents an ounce. That authorization did not prevent the rise of silver beyond that price to its present price of $1.27 an ounce.

Mr. Chairman, the authority granted to the Secretary of the Treasury in this bill to buy and sell dollars at $1.29 will not guarantee that the price of silver will not rise beyond $1.29. In fact, it will tend to cause the price to rise to a point where it will threaten our subsidiary silver at $1.38 an ounce. Therefore, your subsidiary coins, 50-cent pieces, 25-cent pieces, and 10-cent pieces, will be jeopardized if this bill is passed.

Mr. Chairman, may I just say one word about our gold reserve. This is a prelude to a repeal of the 25-percent requirement of gold reserve for our currency in our Federal Bank deposits. It is said that we have $4 billion of free gold above the 25-percent requirement to meet our foreign obligations. Actually, that is not so, because there are $800 million of gold borrowed by the Treasury from the International Monetary Fund that is not taken into consideration. In other words, the free gold which we have to meet $25 billion worth of foreign holdings is only $3.2 billion, and if we pass this bill it will require another $500 million of gold reserve. Hence, your gold reserve will sink to $2.7 billion with which to meet $25 billion of foreign holdings.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] because I believe that this is not the time to impose a further burden on our monetary system by removing the silver backing from our $1 and $2 bills.

As I think the members of the committee know, I represent a major silver producing area even though much of our operation is associated with lead and zinc production and therefore operating at a somewhat reduced level. According to the most recent Bureau of Mines figures, the State of Colorado produced 160,798 troy ounces of recoverable silver during January 1963; approximately 97,600 ounces during February 1963; and during the calendar year 1962 we produced 2,056,645 troy ounces. So you see, and I admit, we are not without a direct interest in what happens here today.

In addition, as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I am concerned with any legislation that affects domestic metal-mining industries.

Western Representatives, generally, have accepted the proposal to repeal the Silver Purchase Acts. We are pleased that the Banking and Currency Committee has reported a bill, in which the Ways and Means Committee has concurred, that will also repeal the tax on transfers of silver bullion.

But section 3, by amending the Federal Reserve Act to permit Federal Reserve banks to issue $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes, will permit the Treasury Department to withdraw silver certificates from circulation and use the silver back of these certificates for coinage. I realize that Secretary of the Treasury Dillon has said:

> The withdrawal of silver certificates and the use of silver back of them for coinage will be gradual. We estimate that not over $105 million of silver certificates a year will need to be redeemed in order to obtain the silver needed for coinage.

What the Secretary has said is that approximately $80.8 million in silver required each year for coinage will not be purchased from our domestic miners. Naturally, this disturbs the silver-producing areas such as my State of Colorado. However, if this could be shown to be for the national benefit we would readily accept the sacrifice.

I submit that there is no overriding national gain to be achieved by this action and that, quite the contrary, despite the fact that there are "only" $2 billion worth of silver certificates outstanding as compared with $29 billion of Federal Reserve notes. For one thing, as stated at page 8 of House Report No. 183 submitted by the Banking and Currency Committee on this legislation:

> Retirement of silver certificates and their subsequent replacement with Federal Reserve notes will require the use of gold as a reserve back of these notes * * * the 25-percent gold reserve needed to back the net new issuance of Federal Reserve notes should not exceed about $35 million annually.

I recognize that in talking of our gold reserves this is a comparatively small amount; but, I submit that any additional burden on our gold reserve should be very carefully considered. My own conclusion is that this is no time to impose an additional strain on our gold reserve, particularly when we have and can continue to have a silver backing for a portion of our currency.

For these reasons, I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho and I commend him on offering the amendment. I also had the great pleasure of serving in this body with the gentleman's distinguished father. I think there would be no question as to which way his father would vote if he were voting on this legislation today. He was always a champion of sound money.

Mr. Chairman, I am a strong believer in hard-money policies, if we wish to call it that. I am also disturbed over the proposal in this bill to demonetize silver and to replace silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes, to be backed by 25 percent gold and 75 percent Government securities. I have been aware of the constant attacks that are being made upon our financial structure in this country and upon our sound-money policy. I am aware of the bill which is pending, H.R. 642, which would even remove the 25-percent gold backing on our Federal Reserve notes. I think if we pass this bill today in its present form, we are making a very grave mistake, which will be construed as an attack on sound money. I do not want to go to paper money or fiat money. I think this country wants a currency which is backed by silver and gold. I am concerned over our constantly dwindling gold reserves. I have introduced legislation to increase our production of gold and reopen our gold mines which are now closed. We must maintain our fiscal integrity, and this can only be done by backing our currency with silver and gold.

Mr. Chairman, these are the reasons I support this amendment and I urge the Members of the House today to vote for the same. Unless this amendment is adopted I shall be compelled to vote against this bill.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment, if adopted, on our balance of payments would be adverse. Today, when we purchase silver in this country, two-thirds of it comes from abroad. If we restrict ourselves and if we hamper ourselves by isolating our stockpile or inventory of silver which we now own and require ourselves to purchase silver from abroad, the effect inevitably is adverse on our balance of payments. The best way to protect our gold supply is to improve our balance of payments situation. This legislation will do this. I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, since 1934, a body of law known as the silver purchase laws, has been on the books. Also, during this period the silver transfer tax, since incorporated into the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, has been the law of the land.

This legislation, originally intended to shore up a depressed silver industry and to protect the Treasury against speculation in a commodity in which it was a major purchaser, has long since ceased to have meaning in terms of the present realities of silver use and production.

In the first instance, the price of silver has currently risen very close to its monetary value; this, combined with a very substantial demand for silver in excess of United States and world production has made the position of the silver miner probably more secure than that of the miner of any other metal in the world. In the absence of the development or discovery of some new metal which would meet all the requirements of conductivity, weight, durability and beauty of silver, there seems not the remotest need for the Treasury to continue a floor under the price of this metal. Indeed, in view of the many new uses for silver in the aerospace industries, the likelihood points to continued shortages for eons to come.

As to the tax on transfers in silver bullion of 50 percent of profit, the authors and supporters of the legislation stated clearly they felt the tax was needed only as support for the silver purchase laws. The tax successfully obliterated the operation of a freely operated market in silver futures and substituted an administered price for the metal rather than permitting supply and demand to set the price in the marketplace. Again, since the Treasury has purchased no foreign silver since 1941, it needs no further protection against the speculation it feared in the early 1930's, and has so stated.

H.R. 5389, which repeals the Silver Purchase Act along with the silver transfer tax, reflects the considered judgment of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and a host of witnesses from industry, from user groups and governmental experts. It meets a pressing problem the Treasury faces if it is forced to continue to back $1 and $2 bills with its diminishing supply of silver. It permits the reestablishment of a commodity marketplace for silver, and allows the silver fabricator and user to hedge his raw material purchases against price changes. H.R. 5389 is a much-needed and long overdue bill. I endorse its provisions unreservedly.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitancy whatsoever in urging House Members to support H.R. 5389, the silver legislation submitted to Congress by the Treasury.

The increase in price has benefited the producers, but this rise has created difficulties for the users. The silverware, jewelry, and related industries have had to cope as best they could with these increased costs. Other industrial and defense users have also been greatly affected.

The legislation proposed will result in stabilizing the market price at somewhere close to $1.29, a price that is favorable for the producers. At the same time, it will benefit the user industries by giving them the much needed assurance of a relatively stable price level.

We have an opportunity today for repealing the silver legislation and thus taking the Government out of the silver business except as a consumer in the manufacture of its coins.

I speak particularly in behalf of the Towle Manufacturing Co., of Newburyport, Mass., one of the oldest firms of its kind in the Nation and which employs hundreds in that area. The No. 1 problem of this firm for years has been the silver bullion market and the legislative handicaps which affect it. Favorable action by the House today will provide a strong lift for this firm as well as others throughout the country. I urge the passage of H.R. 5389.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 60, noes 73.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WHITE and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 60, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—REPEAL OF TAX ON TRANSFERS OF SILVER BULLION

SEC. 201. (a) Subchapter F of chapter 39 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to silver bullion) is hereby repealed.

(b) The table of subchapters for such chapter 39 is amended by striking out the last line thereof.

(c) Section 6422 of such Code (relating to cross references) is amended by striking out paragraph (7) and by renumbering paragraphs (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), and (14) as paragraphs (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), and (13), respectively.

(d) Section 6808 of such Code (relating to special provisions relating to stamps) is amended by striking out paragraph (11) and by renumbering paragraphs (12) and (13) as paragraphs (11) and (12), respectively.

Sec. 202. Section 201 shall apply only with respect to transfers after the date of the enactment of this title.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Sisk, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5389) to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 313, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. White) there were—yeas 107, nays 59.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 252, nays 122, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—252

Abbitt
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Avery
Baker
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Becker
Beckworth
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Cramer
Curtin
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Devine
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Ichord
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, Calif.
Kunkel
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—122

Abele
Alger
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Battin
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Brotzman
Bruce
Burleson
Cameron
Casey
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen
Cleveland
Collier
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan
Edmondson
Findley
Fisher
Foreman
Forrester
Fulton, Pa.
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Harding
Harrison
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McLoskey
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Montoya
Moore
Morris
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Pillion
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schadeberg
Secrest
Short
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stinson
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Utt
Waggonner
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
White
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winstead
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—59

Abernethy
Auchincloss
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolton, Frances P.
Brademas
Bray
Buckley
Burkhalter
Burton
Celler
Colmer
Corbett
Corman
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Farbstein
Fino
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gavin
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Hanna
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lesinski
McMillan
Mailliard
O'Brien, Ill.
Powell
Randall
Rich
Rogers, Colo.
Roosevelt
Sikes
Smith, Va.
Steed
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Van Pelt
Vinson
Walter
Whitten
Wickersham
Wilson, Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Bell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Walter with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Brademus with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mrs. Kee.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. Kelly.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Henderson.

Messrs. MILLIKEN, BRUCE, and COLLIER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tomorrow to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, April 21, is the first day of National Library Week. It is a time when, throughout the land, each citizen should acknowledge the unpayable debt—contracted in childhood—for the knowledge and guidance he received from the books and the people of his community library. It is a time, also, when this House should recognize a debt of principle to a community library looted of its books by the U.S. Army and the Department of the Treasury 102 years ago.

Not too long ago, in a television dramatic series about World War II, Nazi troops looted the library of a small French town. Troopers of the SS boxed up the books and trucked them off before the tearful eyes of the pretty and helpless librarian. This was hobnailed tyranny at its worst and viewing it on their TV sets the citizens of Beaufort, S.C., nodded in knowing sympathy—they, too, had had their library picked clean by a conquering army.

That was in 1861. Troops of the Union Army, who had invaded South Carolina from the sea, appropriated the several thousand volumes of the Beaufort Library as enemy property. It was probably one of the most valuable confiscations by the North in the entire War Between the States. Among the several thousand books was a copy of the original edition of the King James Bible. Another item was the Elephant Folio of Audubon. Either of these would be worth a fortune today. In the minds of Beaufort people who made up one of the most cultured of 19th century American citizenries, they were worth a fortune then.

As in the television play, the books were boxed up and sent to the homeland of the conquerors—New York City. There they were put up for public auction. Before the sale, however, a Mr. William Fry wrote a protest to President Lincoln. What happened next was reported in the edition of Leslie's Illustrated Weekly for November 29, 1862. Leslie wrote:

> A dirty deed prevented—among the property abandoned by the rebels at Beaufort, S.C., was a considerable public library which was very properly taken charge of by the conquerors. A few days ago the public was astonished to hear that it had been sent on to this city for sale at auction. Thanks to Mr. William H. Fry and to the daily press, which raised an unanimous voice of reprobation, the sale was stopped and the library will be returned whenever the cessation of the war will permit it to be done in safety. We are not ambitious of putting ourselves on a footing with the English who burnt the Archives of the Government at Washington.

Tragically, this was not the end of the story. The books were withdrawn from sale and stored in the Smithsonian Institution, but in January 1865, the Smithsonian had a disastrous fire. The books were destroyed.

In the years—and generations—that followed, attempts were made for restitution but it was not until 1940 that the Congress took concrete action. An act provided that:

> The Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to transfer to the Beaufort Library of Beaufort, S.C., books of the same value as those which were so taken and destroyed. The books transferred under the provisions of this act shall be from duplicates owned by the Library of Congress and shall not exceed in value, in the aggregate, the value of the books so taken and destroyed.

By "duplicate books" was meant extra copies of books on the shelves of the Library of Congress, not duplicates of the volumes in the Beaufort collection.

It was arranged within the latitude of the act that the duplicate books be sold and the money yielded given to the library. This amounted to some $4,300. All parties concerned—then and now—expressed themselves as satisfied. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it should be acknowledged that a mere $4,300 could never be a fair and adequate compensation for a priceless collection of volumes such as this was. The library was famed throughout the Nation for the excellence of its books. I am informed reliably that the "Elephant Folio of Audubon" alone would today bring $60,000. The debt still owed can never be repaid but it is a debt, as I have said, of principle. Mr. Salmon P. Chase, later Chief Justice of the United States but then Secretary of the Treasury, declared, "The Union does not make war on books or libraries." Apparently it did.

I am happy to state, however, that some further measure of justice is about to be done in this tragic matter. On April 21, the beginning of National Library Week, there will be a ceremony at the Beaufort Library in which Mr. Harry Scherman, founder of the Book-of-the-Month Club, will present to the library a $5,000 cash award as the outstanding smalltown library of the Nation. This annual program of recognition is carried out in the name of the late Dorothy Canfield Fisher, noted author and a member of the original editorial board of the Book-of-the-Month Club. Libraries in every State of the Union are selected each year for these honors, but it was the library in Beaufort which exceeded them all for the highest form of the award.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, after 102 years the Beaufort Library has at least reestablished itself as an outstanding American library.

POLITICS IN SUMMER EMPLOYMENT

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of days we have seen an example of responsible Government at its best.

As a former longtime civil servant, I want to extend my warmest congratulations and personal admiration to Chairman John Macy and his U.S. Civil Service Commission for the courage and principle demonstrated in their stand barring political clearance for summer jobs in Government.

It is highly reassuring to see the Commission under its capable leadership carrying out the function for which it was created; that is, to establish in the Federal Government a merit system whereby selection for appointment should be made upon the basis of demonstrated relative fitness without regard to religious or political considerations, aside from membership in subversive organizations.

The manner in which a few thousand summer jobs are filled may not seem too important to some, but the principle involved is of utmost importance. If civil service regulations could be bypassed in this case, they could be ignored in others with the eventual result that there would be a complete breakdown of the system and a return to the discredited spoils system of Government employment.

By his courageous action, Chairman Macy has demonstrated to the White House, to the American people, and to the career civil servant that loyal service and individual attainments remain as the basis of Federal hiring and promotion, rather than political servitude or favoritism.

I have been a firm believer in the merit system ever since my first Government job as a part-time employee of the Department of Agriculture while attending South Dakota State College.

It was with full confidence in that system that I took my first civil service examination in September 1932 and gained my first Federal appointment with the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1933. And it was that system that made it possible for me to enjoy a satisfying and rewarding career in the Federal service covering over 26 years with some time out for military service.

I hope Members of both sides of the aisle and in both Houses of Congress will uphold the hand of Chairman Macy and give him full support for this courageous action.

OTTO A. HARBACH—ARTIST AND BENEFACTOR

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened and deeply grieved by the recent passing of my friend, Mr. Otto A. Harbach, great lyric composer of some of the most memorable songs of American history.

The distinguished, fabulous career of this incredibly talented man is a success story of impressive and most inspiring proportions.

Known as the dean of our librettists and lyricists, he was a charter member, director, and past vice president and president of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers. His life and works stand out in gleaming lucidity as permanent monuments to one of the most gifted men who ever graced American letters and the American theater.

Otto Harbach worked his way to the top of his challenging field in a comparatively short time. Extraordinarily gifted and exceptionally well trained and educated, scholar, savant and teacher, he brought a polish and urbane approach to popular music that gave it new respect and luster. Like his great protege, Oscar Hammerstein, he adhered to highest standards of composition and good taste. His songs were lively, sophisticated, and often romantic.

He was a man who knew what he wanted to do, how to do it. He was endowed with the will and purpose to work tirelessly to accomplish his lofty aims.

Kindly, friendly, sympathetic, and humble by nature, he early won the respect of his colleagues, not only for his ability to achieve great things in his field, but also for his unflagging determination to work indefatigably at his tasks until they were accomplished.

He was ever ready to lend a helping hand to his fellow composers and was most generous in his response to every call that was made upon him by his professional associates, the theater, and the Nation.

He was perhaps unrivaled in the large number of successful songs that he wrote, and this alone is one of the greatest tributes that can be paid to his ability, his earnestness, and his unceasing devotion to his work.

His intellectual stature, eager search for perfection, mature philosophy, the universality of his knowledge and the flexibility of his keen, discerning mind, his power of swift adaptation to a wide spectrum of human values, emotions, and reactions enabled him to appeal very strongly to people of every age, rank, and station. He was a romantic poet who won his way into the hearts of the people.

Notwithstanding the great honors and great success which he received during his lifetime, he always remained, essentially and basically a profoundly sincere and humble man. While he never hesitated to stand firmly and articulately for the things he believed in, he had an inner piety and modesty about him that made him a legion of friends and a breadth of vision and understanding, depth of perception, steadfastness of purpose, and undeviating loyalty to his friends and many great causes to which he was attached. These were all traits and characteristics of a noble spirit and a very great American.

Otto was exceptionally proud of his contributions to ASCAP and his colleagues of the creative world whom he loved. He was a vigorous advocate of the rights of all the members of this great American society and did much for the cause of many aspiring writers.

As the gifted John Redmond, my warm friend, said of him—

> In the passing of Otto Harbach, the artistic world has lost one of its greatest creative geniuses; American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, one of its most illustrious members; and the writers of popular songs, one of their dearest friends and most loyal champions. I am so deeply touched that I cannot find words to express my deep grief, let alone portray the wonderful qualities and unforgettable creative contributions of this great man. May the Good Lord keep him close to Him always.

Our friend, President Stanley Adams, of American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers in his very impressive memorial eulogy also spoke feelingly of Otto's personal qualities and his acknowledged mastery in his field.

At an earlier time, the great and beloved Oscar Hammerstein referred to him as the wisest, most tolerant, and kindest man he had ever met.

His life and works comprise a brilliant chapter in the long, glorious history of American songwriting.

Author of the words of more than 1,000 songs, writer of at least 50 shows and movie scenarios, lyricist of such all-time song hits as "Smoke Gets in Your Eyes," "Indian Love Call," "Who," "One Alone," and "The Desert Song," he passed away at his New York City residence on January 24, 1963, at the age of 89. He was born in Salt Lake City, Utah, on August 18, 1873.

Otto Harbach's long and successful career included close association and collaboration with many of the great names of the American musical theater: composers Jerome Kern, Rudolf Friml, Vincent Youmans, George Gershwin, Victor Herbert, and Sigmund Romberg, lyricist Oscar Hammerstein II, and producers Oscar and Arthur Hammerstein.

He was active throughout his long career in fostering musical creativity, and in protecting the rights of the individual composer and author. Shortly after the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers was founded, he became a charter member; in 1920 he was elected director, he served three terms as vice president, and from 1950 to 1953 he was the society's president.

Son of a Danish immigrant who drove an ox team to Salt Lake City, Utah, Otto Harbach had an educational background that laid the foundation for a career as a professional writer. He majored in English at Knox College in Illinois where he received his B.A. and M.A. degrees. William Jennings Bryan, in 1895, presented him with a gold medal as winner of the annual interstate prize for oratory.

After a brief career as teacher of English and public speaking at Whitman College in Walla Walla, Wash., he came east in 1901 to study toward a doctorate on a scholarship at Columbia University. That same year he took a job as a reporter for the New York Daily News, and in 1903 he became a copywriter for the George Patten Advertising Agency. Almost immediately he also began writing for the theater. An early play led to a rewriting assignment, and next he met composer Karl Hoschna. They decided to try their hand at a musical show—and a fabulous career was launched.

Their very first show, "The Three Twins," was a smash hit in 1907, and gave us the song "Cuddle up a Little Closer, Lovey Mine."

The staging of this song, incidentally, reveals something of Harbach's ideas concerning the integration of the songs in a musical with the plot, or story. Alice Yorke sang "Cuddle up a Little Closer" against a background setting representing the seven stages of lovers—from infancy to old age.

Harbach was a pioneer from the beginning of his career. He believed, as did Wagner in grand opera, that dramatic action and musical action should closely complement one another, and that musical numbers should come at logical places in a meaningful plot, and not merely be inserted haphazardly. As he himself put it in the December 1955, issue of Etude:

> Work out something that will allow music to find a place as logically as the characters find their places. The old, stereotyped musical hung its numbers on the plot the way you hang balls on a Christmas tree. And the Christmas tree is usually dead. * * * Good musical comedy results when the music grows out of the plot, as the living blossoms grow on the branches of a living tree.

Following "The Three Twins," a virtual stream of shows flowed from Harbach's pen—stretching across a span of 50 years: "The Firefly," "Mollie Darling," "No, No, Nanette," "Rose Marie," "Sunny," "The Cat and the Fiddle," "Roberta"—these are but a few. For over 30 years he was represented on Broadway season after season by a new hit show. In one season, 1926, a record was established, with five new Harbach shows appearing. Among them was the unforgettable "The Desert Song" with its ever popular song of the same title.

He collaborated with the late Oscar Hammerstein II on the lyrics of this show, and in Hammerstein's recollection, the events surrounding the composition of the title song came to a conclusion as follows: The two were sitting in the garden of Harbach's estate in Mamaroneck, and had reached a silent impasse, after rejecting many bits, snatches and fragmentary ideas. Finally Harbach broke the silence.

He said—

> Oscar—we are not going to create this song. This song exists right now. It's somewhere in the world. Our job is to find it.

They did. "The Desert Song" was "found" in 1926, and sent out into the world, where it remains popular to this day. The words show another aspect of Harbach's creativity—a striving to make a song text more significant, more important, and, at the same time, a striving for compact, poetic beauty:

> Blue heaven and you and I,
> And sand kissing a moonlit sky,
> The desert breeze whisp'ring a lullaby,
> Only stars above you to see I love you.

Another example of his concise lyric style is this short excerpt from the words for "Roberta" written for composer Jerome Kern:

> Tears I cannot hide,
> So I smile and say,
> "When a lovely flame dies,
> Smoke gets in your eyes."

"Smoke Gets in Your Eyes" has been referred to as one of America's most popular romantic love ballads.

In his meteoric rise to fame across the decades, Harbach's path crossed that of many of this country's great stage personalities: Fay Templeton sang in "Roberta," Bessie McCoy sang in "The Three Twins"—she sang a song which gave her the nickname "Yama Yama Girl," Marie Ellis starred in "Rose Marie," Edith Day starred in "Wildflower," "Sunny" was written as a vehicle for the gorgeous Marilyn Miller, and Arthur Hammerstein commissioned Harbach to write a new musical for the highly volatile operatic star Emma Trentini. Therein lies a story.

Trentini, at the time, was starring in "Naughty Marietta," with a musical score by Victor Herbert. Hammerstein wished to keep his star constantly before the public's eye, and wanted the groundwork started on a new show while "Naughty Marietta" was still playing. The plan was for Harbach to do the book, and Herbert the music, for Trentini's next show; an announcement to this effect was even made in the press. With this in mind, Harbach traveled with "Naughty Marietta" to observe Trentini in action and create a new musical tailored to fit her personal style. In the meantime, however, Trentini played the role of the traditional prima donna and grossly insulted composer-conductor Victor Herbert by refusing to sing an encore during a gala performance—in fact, she walked off the stage. Herbert was outraged, and refused to have anything further to do with her, to say nothing of writing the score for her next show. Rudolf Friml, however, was approached, and he agreed to write the musical score. Harbach finished the book, and the story has a happy ending: "The Firefly," starring Emma Trentini, book and lyrics by Harbach, music by Friml, was an outstanding success.

Another side of Harbach which is of interest is his outgoing nature, his willingness to give advice and to share his years of experience with newcomers in show business. A frequent collaborator, coauthor, and colyricist, Harbach freely gave from his vast storehouse of knowledge and thereby contributed materially to the successes of many other authors and composers. He was the author of several articles analyzing the history and technique of musical comedy writing, thereby aiding others beginning in this field. Here are some of his ideas, taken from two of these articles. This is what he said in Etude, December 1955 issue:

> I call musical comedy the history of a battle. Rehearsals were often a tug-of-war between book and music, in which music won. When I began writing plays, back in 1906, I had three goals: to put more sense into the book of a musical play; to use no vocal numbers without logical motivation; and to make the introduction of music a natural part of the action. I hoped to free the musical stage from its battle aspects.
>
> "The Cat and the Fiddle" was one of the few (musicals) that began with an original play. Music and production came later. I planned a story for which music would be an integral and necessary part. My hero and heroine were both composers, one serious and the other popular; the plot let the hit writer save the serious writer from failure, and worked out a happy ending in romance as well as in business. That's the kind of plot I like for a musical; the people can make music logically.

In the January 4, 1956, issue of Variety, he wrote:

> Ballet has come into its own as a pure art form. So has pantomime, grand opera, and drama before it.
>
> It is when these are blended in various proportions that classifications becomes difficult. Some day some one will write the perfect musical play. That will be when all forms of expression, song, dance, and drama, are blended in such a way that each moment is motivated and developed with logic and regard for reality.

The late Oscar Hammerstein II, in deep gratitude, described his relationship with Otto Harbach in the following words:

> I was born with two gold spoons—one was my uncle Arthur Hammerstein who took me into his producing organization. The second gold spoon was Otto Harbach * * *.
>
> His generosity in dividing credits and royalties with me was the least of his favors. Much more important were the things he taught me about writing for the theater. He was the best play analyst I have ever known. He was also a patient man and a fine teacher * * * he is the kindest—most tolerant and wisest man I have ever known.

This is indeed no small tribute, coming from one who was later to achieve a great reputation in his own right—in particular as lyricist and partner of Richard Rodgers; the words for the great songs in "Oklahoma," "Carousel," and "South Pacific" came from his pen. In a letter to Harbach on the occasion of the latter's 83d birthday, Hammerstein stated the following:

> It is impossible to estimate the extent of your effect upon our theater. Impossible to measure in applause, or laughs, or dollars, but we who have worked beside you know that you have left a mark that will never be erased.

Jerome Kern, his collaborator for "Roberta" and "The Cat and the Fiddle," considered Harbach "second to no American dramatic author in his understanding of musical values."

Carl Sandburg contributed the following anecdote, on the occasion of Harbach's 80th birthday. It concisely sums up a magnificent career:

> I cannot forget the first and only time I crossed Broadway with him, and I heard him murmur with dreaminess within his voice "This street has been good to me," almost as though, if the street had rejected him, he could have let it pass with no rankling.

The following are some of Harbach's memorable shows and songs:

Year 1908. "Three Twins" (Harbach: lyricist); leading song: "Cuddle Up a Little Closer, Lovey Mine."

Year 1910. "Madame Sherry" (Harbach: librettist and lyricist); leading song: "Every Little Movement."

Year 1912. "The Firefly" (Harbach: librettist and lyricist); leading songs: "Giannina Mia," "Sympathy."

Year 1919. "Up in Mabel's Room" (Harbach: coauthor; nonmusical).

Year 1920. "Mary" (Harbach: colibrettist and lyricist); leading songs: "Love Nest," "Mary."

Year 1923. "Wildflower" (Harbach: colibrettist and lyricist); leading songs: "Bambalina," "Wildflower."

Year 1924. "Rose Marie" (Harbach: colibrettist and colyricist); leading songs: "Indian Love Call," "Rose Marie."

Year 1925. "No, No, Nanette" (Harbach: colibrettist and colyricist); leading song: "No, No, Nanette."

"Sunny" (Harbach: colibrettist and colyricist); leading song: "Who."

Year 1926. "The Desert Song" (Harbach: colibrettist and colyricist); leading songs: "The Desert Song," "One Alone."

Year 1931. "The Cat and the Fiddle" (Harbach: librettist and lyricist); leading songs: "She Didn't Say Yes," "The Night Was Made for Love."

Year 1933. "Roberta" (Harbach: librettist and lyricist); leading songs: "Smoke Gets In Your Eyes," "The Touch of Your Hand."

For assistance in the preparation of biographical data and for the comprehensive listing of the works of the late Otto Harbach, I am very thankful to Darius Thieme of the Library of Congress Music Division and William Lichtenwanger, head of the Reference Section of the Library's Music Division.

The following is an account of the death of Otto Harbach which appeared in the January 30 issue of Variety:

OTTO HARBACH, DEAN OF U.S. LIBRETTISTS, DIES AT 89; TUNE CREDITS TOPPED 1,000

> Otto A. Harbach, one of the most prolific librettist-lyricists of the American musical theater, died in New York last Thursday (24). He was 89. A charter member of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers and a director since 1920, he served three terms as vice president and from 1950 to 1953 as president.
>
> Stanley Adams, current American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers president, said upon learning of Harbach's death, "All of us in the world of music and entertainment are deeply saddened by the death of Otto A. Harbach, dean of American librettists. But, just as important as his great talent and fame, was his gentle, thoughtful kindness to everyone. It can be truly said of Otto Harbach that he was a great man, and he will be missed by all those who knew and loved him."
>
> A graduate of Knox College in Galesburg, Ill., and an ex-teacher of English at Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash., Harbach, who was once titled "The Learned Lyricist" in a New Yorker profile, was the author or coauthor of close to 50 plays since he started his theater career early in the century and is credited with more than 1,000 songs.
>
> As a lyricist working with such composers as Jerome Kern, Sigmund Romberg, Rudolf Friml, George Gershwin and Vincent Youmans, Harbach wrote such standards as "Smoke Gets in Your Eyes," "Indian Love Call," "Gianinna Mia," "Cuddle Up a Little Closer," "One Alone," "Rose Marie" and "Love Nest" among a host of others that make up an important part of musical Americana.
>
> Harbach was born in Salt Lake City on August 18, 1873, the son of Adolph Julius Hauerbach, a native of Denmark, a watchmaker and jeweler who emigrated to the United States and drove an ox team to Utah. (The name was changed to Harbach by the librettist just after World War I because the original sounded too German.)
>
> Harbach's show biz itch began when he played violin in a Salt Lake City orchestra and performed in college dramatics at Whitman College. He came to New York in 1901, after teaching English at Whitman, to take courses at Columbia University. He became a newspaper reporter on the original Daily News and in 1933 joined the George Batten Advertising Agency as a copywriter, remaining with the firm until 1910.
>
> Some of his ad slogans became memorable. Among them were "Hammer The Hammer," for Iver Johnson revolvers, and "Built, Not Stuffed," for Ostermoor mattresses. In 1908, Joseph Gaites, a producer, decided to present a musical version of a German farce called "Three Twins" and hired Harbach to do the adaptation and Karl Hoschna to write the music at $100 flat.
>
> The show had a good run and brought recognition to the team of Harbach and Hoschna. Harbach quit his $50-a-week job at Batten's and after a year, wrote "Madame Sherry," which made him a financial success.

BECAME SUCCESSFUL PLAYWRIGHT

> As a successful playwright, Harbach moved into the Hotel Albermarle on West 54th Street, where he shared an apartment with Harold Orlob, who also came from Salt Lake City and who got involved with musical comedies and later composed the music for shows like "Hitchy Koo" and "Listen Lester." (Several years ago Orlob was finally credited for the composition of the music for the song, "I Wonder Who's Kissing Her Now.") When Orlob's show, "Listen Lester," was having book trouble in Syracuse, the composer sug-

gested to producer John Cort to bring in Harbach to rewrite the book. The show came into New York a hit.

In the 1920's, Harbach, who was now affluent as well as industrious, began his collaboration with Oscar Hammerstein II. Their work together on "Wildflower," "Rose Marie," and "The Desert Song," started a great friendship and a fine writing partnership. In the following decade, Harbach continued the pace, collaborating with Jerome Kern on such memorable musicals as "The Cat and the Fiddle" and "Roberta."

Despite his success, Harbach once admitted that he remained in awe of the critics. He said, "I've somehow been frightened to death of them. Perhaps my fear of critics started with Alec Woollcott a long time ago. I went to him and asked his reasons for his cruel criticism of an operetta of mine called 'Suzi.' I don't think he ever forgave me. But perhaps he was entirely right, after all, in his review of 'Suzi.' It ran for only 55 performances."

Harbach was an impressive figure on the New York show biz scene. Slightly above medium height, he walked with his head well back, staring straight in front of him. He was an exceptionally friendly man but would often walk past acquaintances without noticing them. This was probably due to his poor vision, but more often it was because he was preoccupied with a lyric. During this preoccupation he hummed and waved his index finger as he walked along because he believed he had to keep the melody in mind and think of the rhyme simultaneously.

He told A. J. Liebling, who wrote the Harbach profile in the New Yorker, that the sorrow of his life was the small number of monosyllables that will rhyme with "love." Of the rhyme "Rose Marie, I love you—I'm always dreaming of you," he said, "That may not be grade A poetry but it is better than 'by all the stars above you.' "

He is survived by his wife, Ella, whom he married in 1918, two sons, William, a TV producer, and Robert, and three grandchildren. Private services were held at the Campbell Funeral Church in New York on Saturday (26) and the burial takes place today (Wednesday) in Salt Lake City.

The Saturday services at Campbell's were opened by Dick Liebert, Radio City Music Hall organist, who played selections of Harbach songs. Dr. Frank Grebe, minister of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, recited the Lord's Prayer. Stanley Adams, American Society of Composers, Authors, Publishers' president, delivered the eulogy.

Anita Gillette, currently on Broadway in "Mr. President," sang "Yesterdays." Arthur Schwartz read a letter from the late Oscar Hammerstein II to Harbach which was written on the latter's 83d birthday and then recited the lyrics to "Smoke Gets in Your Eyes."

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the tumult and the shouting have died down. The great debate over the accelerated public works appropriation is now a matter of history. The vote restoring the $450 million appropriation is a great victory for President Kennedy, for Speaker John W. McCormack, for Majority Leader Carl Albert, for Majority Whip Hale Boggs, for great stalwarts like the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Blatnik; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Boland; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Thomas; the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Edmondson—to name only a few of the individual heroes, backed up by the Democratic Congress. Above all, this was a victory for the American people, and for those who through no fault of their own are out of work. It was also a victory for local, grassroots initiative in communities across the length and breadth of this great land of ours, for it will enable thousands of communities to take steps to make better places to live.

Passage of this bill means more jobs, more community improvements, and a spur to the economies of many areas. I believe that the vote also makes crystal clear which political party believes more deeply in providing jobs for the critically depressed areas of the Nation. The final rollcall revealed 208 Democrats and only 20 Republicans in favor of the accelerated public works appropriation, while 151 Republicans and 33 Democrats lined up against the $450 million item. This is another way of stating that 87 percent of the Democrats voted for accelerated public works, while 88 percent of the Republicans voted against this program which means so much to people faced with unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, faced with a clear-cut opportunity to act on behalf of those out of work, the National Republican leadership made it a matter of party policy to oppose the accelerated public works bill, they ridiculed it and called it a "boondoggle," and when the chips were down they voted 88 percent against the bill on final passage. This ought to settle conclusively which party is doing the most for the unemployed.

URBAN RENEWAL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] is recognized for 60 minutes.

WHAT IS URBAN RENEWAL?

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, urban renewal is the replanning and rebuilding of our Nation's cities by the Federal Government at the expense of the taxpayer. It is the condemnation of one man's property for resale to another—in violation of our traditional concepts of property rights. It is the demolition of whole areas of our cities. It is the rebuilding of cities in conformity to the schemes of Federal planners, through Federal finance and Federal control. It threatens to end local self-government.

Urban renewal is a political weapon. It is an attempt by liberals using the taxpayers' money, to reduce their opposition to ineffectiveness by buying off large sections of the business community. If an individual accepts his slice of the New Frontier, how can he legitimately deny others their portion? Urban renewal is a planned alliance between local political leaders and the Kennedy administration, aimed at keeping both in power.

Urban renewal is a pretext for introducing public housing into a community. Frequently, public housing—unpopular on its own merits—is tied to urban renewal as a condition for receiving Federal funds, and in this way socialized housing gets a foothold in the local community.

Now a new trend in urban renewal and public housing is developing. If the social planners in Washington get their way, the Government will be able to nationalize your home or choose your neighbors for you.

I would like to call attention to the following articles in Human Events:

"Uncle Sam Will Choose Your Neighbors for You"; "Corruption Unlimited: Urban Renewal"; "A Congressman Unmasks Urban Renewal"; " 'Renewal' In, Prosperity Out"; "Senators Warn on Urban Affairs Department"; "34 States Pay More Than They Receive"; 'Average Man Doesn't Dream of Renewal Dangers"; "Public Housing: An Expensive Failure"; "Moral Cost of Public Housing"; "Renewal Ills Plague Indiana"; "Hoosiers Seek Legal Remedy"; "Planners, Politicians and People"; " 'No Federal Control' a Myth"; "Negro Civic Leader Lashes 'Renewal' "; "Tale of Two California Cities"; and "Voters Say 'No' to Renewal."

BULLDOZERS AND BOONDOGGLES

In urban renewal, the liberal philosophy has completed one full cycle. The seed was planted more than 25 years ago. The tree flowered during the fifties. Now the fruit is being harvested. The crop is a failure.

Disillusionment with urban renewal is raising doubts in believers about other liberal programs shaped by the New Deal—Fair Deal—New Frontier philosophy. That philosophy is built around three simple and appealing propositions, as follows:

First, many people are in need.

Second, the Nation has the resources with which to meet the need.

Third, the Federal Government should use the resources to satisfy the need.

Political opponents of this philosophy can attack only part of it. They must concede, in some cases, that need exists. They certainly must concede that the Nation has great resources. These opponents then are left with the difficult task of proving that the Federal Government cannot and therefore should not try to use the resources to meet the end.

Political opponents of the liberal philosophy might never be successful were it not for the help given them by the liberals. The liberals have had plenty of rope and are now beginning to hang themselves with it. This has become particularly evident in urban renewal.

On urban renewal, the liberals have written their own ticket. They have set the patterns which the Federal Government is following. Now they are being discredited by the results.

A capsule history of urban renewal must begin with the Housing Act of 1937. In that legislation, Congress authorized the first federally financed public housing.

The public housing program has never accomplished its objectives. But it did help establish a Federal financial practice which continues to plague the Nation. It helped confirm "backdoor spending" as a part of national policy.

The Constitution of the United States, article I, section 9, states:

> No money shall be withdrawn from the Treasury except in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Specific advance authorizations for public housing subsidies could not be secured from Congress, because the exact extent of the obligation was not known when the commitments were made. Nevertheless, the executive branch was given authority to pledge the full faith and credit of the United States for these subsidies. This authorization was attacked on the grounds that it was unconstitutional and that it opened a "back door" to the Treasury through which funds could be withdrawn without the required appropriations. The liberals brushed aside the objection and proceeded with the program which has now saddled the people of the United States with billions of dollars in public housing commitments for which no specific appropriations were ever made by their elected representatives.

When the public housing program failed to achieve its objective of slum clearance, the liberals were not disheartened. They insisted that what was needed was an expansion of the program and an increase in Federal expenditures. They secured passage of the 1949 Housing Act which created a new authority for slum clearance and urban renewal, raising another constitutional question of even greater importance.

The mechanics under the Federal law are:

First. The Federal Urban Renewal Administration, bypassing the appropriations process of Congress, lends money—currently at 3½ percent interest—to a local authority authorized to accept Federal aid to make preliminary studies—section 102d, Federal law.

Second. The URA similarly lends additional money for detailed planning of a project.

Third. The URA lends large sums, to acquire by condemnation under power of eminent domain, and otherwise, land and buildings now belonging to private citizens and used for their homes and businesses.

Fourth. The local authority generally demolishes and clears all the structures from the project area.

Fifth. The cleared land is then offered for sale, generally at tremendous loss, for reuse by other private citizens for sites for their businesses and homes.

Sixth. The loss—the difference between what the cleared land will bring when resold, and the cost of acquisition, demolition, preparation for reuse, plus all project overhead—is made up by the taxpayers. One-third of the loss is paid by taxpayers in their local taxes, as a so-called local grant-in-aid—section 104, Federal law. The other two-thirds is paid by taxpayers in their Federal taxes.

As to State law I shall only mention Texas as an example, because each State has its own implementing laws. The Texas urban renewal law is an act which will enable Texas communities to participate under the Federal urban renewal law, and in our case it became effective in 1957.

The Constitution provides:

> No person shall be * * * deprived of * * * property * * * without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

In accordance with this provision of the fifth amendment, the power of eminent domain had been used to take land from private persons. But the land was always bought for a public purpose and devoted to a public use. The Government could not seize one man's property and make it available for use by another private individual.

In order to put urban renewal in effect, the liberals had to change this all-important provision. How completely successful they were in changing the fifth amendment is evidenced by the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Berman versus Parker.

SUPREME COURT BOON TO RENEWAL SEIZURE

In this case, which swept aside 175 years of tradition, the owner of a department store in Washington, D.C., challenged the validity of the Federal act which gives the local redevelopment authority the right to condemn property which is not substandard or blighted, merely because the property is unfortunately in the midst of a run-down area slated for urban renewal.

The Supreme Court upheld the right of Government to seize such property if it promotes the "public welfare" as defined by a legislative majority. The Supreme Court said:

> We do not sit to determine whether a particular housing project is or is not desirable. The concept of the public welfare is broad and inclusive. * * * The values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, esthetic as well as monetary. It is within the power of the legislature to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well balanced as well as carefully patroled. In the present case, the Congress and its authorized agencies have made determinations that take into account a wide variety of values. It is not for us to reappraise them.

This important decision, affecting the property rights of every American, was accomplished by redefining a key term in the fifth amendment, "public use."

Prior to 1954, the Government could use the power of eminent domain to acquire property when necessary for public streets, buildings, schools, parks, sewers, freeways—provided it was for use by the public.

But in 1954, the Supreme Court decided that it could not let this limitation on the use of eminent domain stand in the way of what it considered social progress. So the Court declared that, in effect, "public use" shall mean whatever a legislative body conceives to be in the "public benefit."

> The concept of public welfare is broad and inclusive—

Said Mr. Justice Douglas. He agreed that the department store had violated no laws of public health or safety, but added:

> If those who govern the District of Columbia decide that it should be beautiful as well as sanitary, there is nothing in the fifth amendment that stands in the way.

So they ran bulldozers through Frank's Department Store at 712 Fourth Street SW., Washington, D.C.

The same travesty on the Constitution has been repeated now in dozens of cities across the country. Whole blocks are swept bare by the bulldozer state. And if in the middle of it all, there stands a clean, decent home or business, proudly maintained, and the owner does not want to sell? Then away with him. Who says a man's home is his castle? There is nothing in the fifth amendment that stands in the way.

With "public use" redefined, the liberals had the way cleared for anything they choose to do. As fast as they have been forced to admit that one set of Federal procedures was not winning the battle of the slums they have secured the enactment of new procedures—always more complicated, always more costly, and always extending the control of the Federal Government over local affairs.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS A TIGHT STRAITJACKET

Some liberals will insist that this is an unfair indictment of their activities. They claim, for example, that they are not trying to extend Federal control. One of the best explanations of their position on this point has been given by the General Counsel of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, speaking at the Practicing Law Institute on Urban Renewal and Public Housing in New York City on June 18, 1962:

> I digress to note that under existing law the principal protections accorded to the sovereignty of a local governing body stem directly from Federal statute. Thus, the local governing body must authorize an application for public housing or for urban renewal and related forms of Federal financial assistance. Land sought to be taken for an urban renewal project can be acquired only after notice and public hearing, and the uses to which that land may subsequently be put must conform to the provisions of an urban renewal plan to which only the local governing body can give final approval. That body must also determine that the urban renewal plan itself conforms to the general plan for the development of the community as a whole. All of these and other protections to the integrity of the local governmental process are embodied in title I of the 1949 Federal Housing Act itself.

The validity of such claims was examined at length by my colleague from Illinois, Congressman JOHN ANDERSON, in an analysis which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 12, 1961:

> Put yourself in the position of a member of the local committee considering urban renewal. The contract for loans and grants issued by the HHFA is in two parts. The first part is the signed contract. The second

part incorporates the terms and conditions which apply. The second part is 47 pages long. The detail is great, and the straitjacket is tight.

You want to find out how to go about becoming eligible to participate. Where do you go? To this three-volume set, the "Urban Renewal Manual." You must conform closely to the procedures if you want any of the money which the Congress has appropriated. If your local plans do not conform to what the HHFA office thinks would be appropriate, your plan may be labeled "not feasible" and permanently filed. But just having the set does not mean you have all the regulations. Monthly supplements are sent out to replace various sections—a strictly unilateral procedure on the part of HHFA. The locality has no choice. The price of participation is unquestionable acceptance and having to conform to the unilateral changes.

Now you begin filling out forms. First, there is the form to be used by the applicant in filing an application for the Federal aid. This occurs in book I, part 4, chapter I, section 1. The applicant must certify that "it is cognizant of the conditions that are imposed in the undertaking and carrying out of the urban renewal projects with Federal assistance." A similar provision is contained in other application forms.

Among the conditions imposed by the Administrator is the requirement for special documentation to be submitted by the local authority as its final project report on part I of the "Application for the Loan and Grant." This is described in book I, part 4, chapter 2, section 1. I quote from these requirements:

"The final project report shall be submitted in five binders. Documents shall be arranged in order of their checklist code number."

That checklist is 2½ pages long. An amendatory application is required for changing project boundaries, revising the amount of the loan, or changing any other provisions of the contract.

Let me cite just one other illustration from the manual of the many evidences of control which come with the program. In part 3, chapter 3 of the manual, which deals with the reporting of litigation, there is a requirement that the local public agency shall obtain HHFA concurrence before entering into a contract for furnishing litigation services to defend itself against legal attack.

Space does not permit a full exploration of what the liberals have done with the urban renewal program. A few examples, however, show the expansion of their program.

PUBLIC HOUSING JOYS FOR ALL BUT TAXPAYER

One example has to do with the transformation of the program from a venture in public housing into the entire area of community development. Originally, the program was exclusively public housing. In 1949 it became urban redevelopment with the provision that every project area must be preponderantly housing either before clearance or after redevelopment. The present administration felt the program ought to be weaned farther away from housing objectives and succeeded in obtaining congressional approval of an amendment which earmarks 30 percent of the total $3 billion authorization for commercial and industrial redevelopment, which has little if any relation to housing.

HERE'S HOW

Now if an industry is unsuccessful in purchasing a desirable piece of property for plant expansion, it shifts its efforts to the political arena, using its political influence to have the land designated as an urban renewal area. The power of eminent domain is invoked, and the Federal Government, at the expense of the taxpayer, acquires the property, clears it, and then sells it to the private industry at a price substantially below market value.

WAY OF LIFE

Another example involves the evolution of public housing away from its original objectives. By original intent, public housing was a place to house the needy until they could get on their own feet. The 1961 Housing Act, however, permits tenants to remain in public housing when their incomes increase. In effect, and intentionally, this provides Government-subsidized housing for middle-income families. The 1961 act demonstrates that public housing has become a way of life rather than a temporary relief measure. Big cars, boats, and other obvious signs of affluence are quite typical of public housing areas.

But that is only the beginning if Public Housing Commissioner Marie McGuire gets her way. In a recent interview, she told reporters she wants public housing turned into "happiness housing." Roof gardens, swimming pools, bowling alleys, coke bars, nursery schools, and welfare services are just a few of the items she would like to see built into future public housing projects.

Use of these taxpayer-built facilities would be restricted to public housing tenants and not open to the public. This means that a taxpayer buying or renting a house near such a project could stand by and watch people, subsidized by his taxes, cavorting in swimming pools and enjoying a more luxurious living than he can afford.

Some of the public housers' rhetoric and intentions are hard to decipher, such as Mrs. McGuire's "in family housing, perhaps the highest priority to be given in the application of sociological disciplines to designs is in the treatment of high densities" or "for independent living of the elderly, we know that our focus must be on permitting self-mastery as long as possible even in view of anticipated physical prowess reduction."

Both of these statements can be translated, but one is left wondering why it had to be said the long way around. Interpreted, it means apparently that the Government can and should analyze, orient, and even order our lives. That is quite a new concept for the proud, independent people I think we still are and intend to remain.

Mrs. McGuire still does not get the message from the hardworking taxpayer who foots the bill. Even though public housing has been turned down by the voters in her home city of San Antonio, Tex., she said in a September 1962 speech:

> I find unquestionable confirmation of my own experience of many years as the local administrator of public housing in San Antonio. That experience proved to me that public housing can do the job efficiently, economically, and humanely with not a trace of damage to the psyche of the individual tenants * * *.

Obviously, at all costs, we must avoid injuring the public housing tenants psyche. It does not matter what happens to the hardworking taxpayer's psyche.

That public housing is conceived by Government planners not as a mere relief measure but as a model for future community living is shown in this remarkable statement by Mrs. McGuire:

> Public housing should be designed not just to blend in with the neighborhood as it is. It should be designed for what the neighborhood hopes to be in the foreseeable future.

There may be no other Federal program in which the liberals have had their way as fully as in urban renewal. But none of the other programs have matured as rapidly and have revealed the complete inadequacy of the procedures upon which they have been built.

The record of failure is too long for a complete reproduction. A considerable part of it was printed in a 38-page indictment which I entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 5, 1962. Here I will present a brief summary in the form of answers to these three simple questions:

First, how is need determined?

Second, where does the money come from?

Third, who gets the money?

How is need determined? Much as liberals support Mrs. McGuire's concepts of social progress, I have never heard a liberal Member of Congress suggest that Federal subsidies should be made available unless a need for them can be demonstrated. Differences of opinion on this subject center entirely on the question of what constitutes need.

I have tried to find out how the Housing and Home Finance Agency satisfies itself about need before it makes any financial commitment on behalf of the Federal Government. This is not easy to do.

One point is certain. HHFA has not promulgated any criteria or standards to which all communities must conform. Instead, it seems to be relying almost entirely on the provision of law which requires that, before Federal urban renewal aid is made available to any community the local governing body must make a finding that aid is needed.

The law has been so administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency that many communities which did not require aid have been receiving it. One flagrant case, in Richmond, Calif., has been reported by the HHFA itself. The following account of Richmond's Harbor Gate project is told in the July–August, 1961, issue of Urban Renewal Notes, published by HHFA:

> In 1954, when Harbor Gate project was conceived, the assessed valuation of land and improvements in the area was $260,000, bringing in annual tax revenues of $24,000. The area has been redeveloped for industrial use, and part of the land is already occupied by new structures housing food distribution

> facilities. Although only a portion of the contemplated redevelopment is completed, the current assessed value is $2.5 million, yielding tax revenues 10 times those of 1954. When the additional facilities are completed it is expected that the assessed value will rise to $6.5 million, with revenues 25 times that received in 1954.
>
> Richmond will be the first city in California to liquidate the cost of an urban renewal project financed under the terms of a 1952 amendment to the California Constitution. The amendment is based on the assumption that an area will bring in more taxes after it has been renewed or redeveloped than it has yielded in its rundown state. Any increased revenues are earmarked to pay off the local cost of the project.
>
> This involved the setting up of a revolving fund to pay for the local share of the city's urban renewal activities. The revolving fund advances the money which, after it is repaid to the fund, can be used for the financing of other projects or activities, thus providing a constant source of funds for defraying local costs. As increased taxes from a renewed area are collected, they are paid into the revolving fund until the amount advanced to the particular area has been repaid. Once the advance has been liquidated, the earmarking of the increased revenues ceases; they no longer need be paid into the fund and can be used by the city or other local governmental unit for any purpose it wishes.
>
> In most cases, the money to finance the local share of urban renewal activities is raised through the sale of bonds. These bonds are variously called "tax increment" or "tax anticipation" bonds. Under this type of financing, the amount of real estate taxes collected at the time the renewal is undertaken is established as the base, and any excess revenue from real estate taxes above this amount, i.e., the "tax increment" is "allocated" and used for the repayment of the bonds. During the period of repayment the city continues to collect the amount it collected prior to the renewal. In addition, it receives all revenues from other nonproperty taxes, such as taxes on sales and business licenses.
>
> Normally, these bonds are issued on the assumption that they will be repaid over a period of 30 to 40 years. Richmond's ability to pay off its $600,000 debt in the short space of 4 years underscores the potentialities of the increased tax income which redevelopment makes possible. Furthermore, Richmond was particularly fortunate that its fiscal position made it possible to avoid levying an additional tax rate to support the financing of urban renewal. Unlike most other California cities, the costs were advanced from general government sources.

Please note that the city did not borrow a dime. It advanced all of its share of cost of the project from general funds.

Please note again that, under California law, it could have issued tax increment or tax anticipation bonds with which to have financed the project. The California State Constitution has been amended—article VIII, section 33951—to provide that such bonds can be used, in whole or in part, to finance or refinance such projects. These bonds are outside the debt limit of the city. They are self-liquidating. They have nothing to do with the need or capacity of a city to finance its local government.

When the city of Richmond passed a resolution saying that Federal financial help was necessary to complete that project the members of its city council were passing a false certification. When the Federal Government accepted that certification without question and when later it boasted about the success of the project on which hundreds of thousands of Federal taxpayers' money was spent unnecessarily, the Federal Government was making itself a party to the fraud and was encouraging other communities to make further false certifications.

In Bloomington, Ind., after a public hearing on the first urban renewal project at which more than 90 percent of those in attendance were opposed, the city council passed and sent to Washington a resolution indicating that the project had wide public support. That resolution was accepted without question by Federal officials even after the facts had been made known to them. In Erie, Pa., certain residents displaced from the first urban renewal project were housed in temporary dwellings. The local redevelopment agency passed a resolution declaring that all displaced persons had been relocated in accordance with Federal requirements. HHFA accepted the resolution without question.

However unconscionable may be the excesses permitted by lack of Federal procedures, they pale when compared to the excesses which are permitted and encouraged by actual procedures required by the manual. What they do in many instances is to encourage a community to relieve itself almost entirely of any project cost and to place upon the Federal Government financial burdens which are not necessary for the success of project operations.

SKY'S THE LIMIT WHEN UNCLE SAM IS PAYING

One very interesting example of this kind of excess is to be found in the accounting procedures which have been prescribed in the Urban Renewal Manual. These procedures use technical terms such as "gross project cost" and "net project cost"—terms which are well known to accountants. But the manual suggests items for inclusion in these costs which are completely foreign to sound economics.

By definition, gross project cost includes all the costs which are charged against a project. With respect to Federal urban renewal projects, the manual either permits or requires that expenses be included in gross project cost which no private enterprise project could afford.

A proportionate share of all the expenses of a local public agency can be charged to gross project cost. In most communities the legally established local public agency has no funds with which to undertake projects. It can borrow from the Federal Government 100 percent of the money it needs to put itself in business. It can also borrow additional money from the Federal Government, without security, for preliminary studies and for the formulation of an urban renewal plan. A proportionate share of all that is borrowed becomes part of the gross project cost for each project.

Again without security, the local public agency, after its urban renewal plan has been approved, can borrow the money required to purchase, clear the property, install site improvements, and make arrangements for the resale of the land. While these terms sound similar to those used by private enterprise, the costs involved are frequently far in excess of what any private enterprise project could afford.

The item of land acquisition offers some excellent illustrations of the amount of some of the excesses. In New York City on the first 10 urban renewal projects for which statistics became available, properties bought by condemnation averaged 155 percent of fair market price.

Perhaps the most scandalous acquisition took place in Wink, Tex., a town with a population of 1,863 for which a capital grant reservation of $795,605 was made and about which the following transaction has been reported:

> Druggist Clyde Godfrey points to a precariously sagging store damaged by fire that he owned. "On the open market that building wouldn't have brought a penny." He values three other properties he owned at $2,800. Yet Godfrey pocketed $11,700 from the renewal agency.

These and other excesses constitute the justification for the following quotation taken from House and Home magazine for August 1960:

> The hundreds of millions these writedowns cost were supposed to be subsidies to give slum dwellers better homes, but they have been used as subsidies to make slumowners richer.

In States where vast amounts of Federal urban renewal funds are flowing, slight changes in State laws could eliminate the need for Federal funds and could remove the justification for local claims of the necessity for Federal assistance. A case in point is New York City. My evidence is a report prepared by a special committee on tax policies organized by the Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York, Inc. The report says:

> These data show that under the present real property tax system, after making full allowance for some $75 million in exempt properties, these projects will produce a net tax gain of $5 million a year, sufficient to repay the city's costs in 6 years and all public costs in 18 years. If the net taxes could be dedicated to a special land-acquisition fund, the title I program could be made self-liquidating.

Let me make the point that instead of sending out agents of the Federal Government, trying to get cities to take Federal funds, we should be passing legislation that no project which is capable of self-liquidation should receive Federal aid. This will put pressure on the States to enact their own laws to make such projects self-liquidating.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency has failed not only to make certain that Federal aid was needed, but also to determine the extent of need.

Proof of this is to be found in the answer to a single question. How many projects can any one community undertake?

There is no limit on the number of projects for which any locality can get aid.

Likewise, there is no limit on the amount of money a city can spend on a single project.

Up to the present the record for the most extravagant project appears to be held in Philadelphia. The Eastwick project in that city cost $880,000 just for the planning. A temporary loan of $78 million was approved by the HHFA with which to carry out the project. A grant reservation of $36 million has been approved to cover two-thirds of the estimated loss on that project.

POOR STATES PAY, RICH STATES GAIN

Where does the money come from? My second question becomes particularly embarrassing to liberals. Their philosophy on this point is well set and widely publicized. They are in favor of using the power of taxation to take away from those who have in order to help those in need. They become terribly embarrassed when in urban renewal they discover that the officially established policy of the Federal Government is to do exactly the opposite. The liberals, who have had their way without limit in the establishment of this program, are taking money away from the poor States and pouring it into the great centers of population and wealth.

Of the 50 States, 34 pay more than they receive for urban renewal. Among these States are Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming—all small States with less than average wealth. Among the States which receive more than they contribute are New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania—the centers of population and wealth.

My contention that urban renewal is being financed by taking from the poor to benefit the rich is supported also by figures based on family incomes. The facts are that reservations of urban renewal funds totaling $1.85 billion were made for 254 cities where the average household income was above the U.S. average, while $400 million was committed for 172 cities where average household income was below the U.S. average. In other words, for each $1 reserved for cities with above-average incomes per household, less than 22 cents was reserved for low-income cities.

TABLE 1.—*Percent of U.S. total of Federal taxes paid and urban renewal grant reservations—50 States and the District of Columbia*

State	Allocations to States	
	Payments—Percent of U.S. total taxes	Receipts—Percent of U.S. total of urban renewal grant reservations
(1)	(2)	(3)
Alabama	0.97	1.61
Alaska	.11	.19
Arizona	.62	.11
Arkansas	.45	1.04
California	11.16	5.74
Colorado	.97	.17
Connecticut	2.22	6.59
Delaware	.52	.18
District of Columbia	.69	3.35
Florida	2.52	.31
Georgia	1.33	1.69
Hawaii	.34	1.09
Idaho	.26	0
Illinois	6.93	6.02
Indiana	2.29	1.48
Iowa	1.15	.39
Kansas	.96	.84
Kentucky	1.03	1.12
Louisiana	1.23	0
Maine	.44	.31
Maryland	1.94	2.44
Massachusetts	3.53	5.09
Michigan	4.47	3.92
Minnesota	1.64	1.39
Mississippi	.46	.18
Missouri	2.28	3.67
Montana	.30	0
Nebraska	.65	0
Nevada	.21	.08
New Hampshire	.33	.29
New Jersey	4.29	6.27
New Mexico	.37	0
New York	13.54	15.89
North Carolina	1.45	1.00
North Dakota	.21	.07
Ohio	5.74	5.33
Oklahoma	0.94	0.06
Oregon	.95	.23
Pennsylvania	6.92	11.92
Rhode Island	.52	1.65
South Carolina	.65	.08
South Dakota	.22	0
Tennessee	1.19	3.32
Texas	4.26	1.03
Utah	.37	0
Vermont	.17	.07
Virginia	1.70	2.31
Washington	1.58	.62
West Virginia	.68	.20
Wisconsin	2.07	.66
Wyoming	.18	0
Total	100.00	100.00

Sources: Col. (2): Allocation formula computed by Chamber of Commerce of the United States jointly with other organizations. Col. (3): Computed from data in "Urban Renewal Directory," Sept. 30, 1961, U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C.

The second table which I present in support of my contention that urban renewal is being financed by taking from the poor to benefit the rich has to do with family incomes. It lists by States the dollar amount of urban renewal grant reservations for cities above and below the U.S. average family income. The facts are that reservations totaling $1,855,123,755 were made for 254 cities with income per household higher than the U.S. average: $400,116,944 in grant allocations were reserved for 172 cities where income per household was below the U.S. average. In other words, for each $1 in grant reservations for cities with above average incomes per household, less than 22 cents in grant reservations were made for cities with below average income per household.

The table follows:

TABLE 2.—*Federal urban renewal grant reservations for cities with above U.S. average income per household, and with below U.S. average income per household, by State, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia*

State	Federal urban renewal grant reservations for cities where income per household is—			
	Above U.S. average		Below U.S. average	
	Dollar amount of grant reservations	Number of cities	Dollar amount of grant reservations	Number of cities
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Alabama	0	0	$35,978,681	17
Alaska	$3,932,337	2	0	0
Arizona	0	0	2,441,000	1
Arkansas	0	0	20,760,507	5
California	125,056,309	22	6,585,847	5
Colorado	3,920,433	1	14,560	1
Connecticut	148,670,227	20	1,493,241	1
Delaware	4,205,958	2	0	0
District of Columbia	76,960,624	1	0	0
Florida	0	0	7,117,828	1
Georgia	23,620,866	5	13,989,285	16
Hawaii	25,139,787	2	0	0
Illinois	134,898,516	10	2,362,856	4
Indiana	23,141,418	7	10,126,478	7
Iowa	9,064,986	2	0	0
Kansas	0	0	19,241,049	4
Kentucky	834,308	1	25,122,290	8
Louisiana	0	0	$1,939	1
Maine	$4,647,638	2	2,556,967	2
Maryland	56,099,209	1	0	0
Massachusetts	106,625,362	19	7,987,907	4
Michigan	85,006,491	20	4,402,282	2
Minnesota	30,665,868	2	1,338,154	1
Mississippi	0	0	3,738,183	4
Missouri	79,905,825	7	2,732,309	5
Nevada	1,719,699	2	0	3
New Hampshire	0	0	5,788,337	3
New Jersey	138,738,008	28	2,760,637	0
New York	350,590,027	38	4,954,370	5
North Carolina	18,924,478	6	3,347,261	3
North Dakota	0	0	1,244,246	1
Ohio	121,629,523	10	963,152	2
Oklahoma	0	0	1,344,356	3
Oregon	405,919	1	4,800,011	2

TABLE 2.—*Federal urban renewal grant reservations for cities with above U.S. average income per household, and with below U.S. average income per household, by State, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia*—Continued

State	Federal urban renewal grant reservations for cities where income per household is—			
	Above U.S. average		Below U.S. average	
	Dollar amount of grant reservations	Number of cities	Dollar amount of grant reservations	Number of cities
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Pennsylvania	$212,352,936	29	$51,831,059	17
Rhode Island	1,445,474	1	36,555,305	1
South Carolina	1,193,857	1	550,328	1
Tennessee	0	0	75,462,448	18
Texas	4,939,509	2	14,996,025	10
Vermont	0	0	1,586,068	1
Virginia	$41,706,241	4	$11,469,374	8
Washington	1,260,316	1	12,908,245	3
West Virginia	2,986,413	3	1,564,259	2
Wisconsin	15,127,193	2	0	0
Total	1,855,123,755	254	400,116,944	172

NOTES

1. Definitions:

"Income" is disposable personal income—that is, wages, salaries, and pensions of individuals, proprietors, and rental income, and payments of interest and dividends less all Federal, State, and local income taxes.

"Household" is a broader term than "family" and includes all persons occupying a house, apartment, or group of rooms, or a room regarded as a dwelling unit—in short, any occupied dwelling. This term does not include students, soldiers, and residents of hotels, boarding houses, and institutions who earn income.

U.S. average income per household, in 1960, was $6,723.

2. Cities for which no income data were available.

	Dollar amount of grants	Number of cities
In 50 States	$42,868,793	76
In Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands	29,409,962	37
Total	72,278,755	113

If it is assumed that all these would be below U.S. average income, the grand totals for those categories would be: Dollar amount, $472,395,699; number of cities, 285.

3. No urban renewal grants in the States of Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

Sources: Urban renewal grants: From Urban Renewal Directory, Sept. 30, 1961, U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency. Income per household: From Sales Management, vol. 86, No. 10 (May 10, 1961), Bill Bros. Publications, Philadelphia, Pa.

Who gets the money? My third question is equally embarrassing to devotees of the liberal philosophy, since their record of performance is incompatible with their views.

The liberal philosophy is reflected in the National Housing Policy which was established by the Congress in the Housing Act of 1949, whereby the money is to be used to provide a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family. Almost everyone joins the liberal in his concern for human need.

The performance of the Federal Government in trying to meet this need is a totally different thing. Billions of dollars have been spent and more billions are committed to activities that have little or no relation to stated Government policy.

Do the American families who are not now living in decent, safe, and sanitary housing get the money?

Not so that you can notice it. Many families in project areas get forced out of their homes and neighborhoods without even enough money to pay their relocation expenses.

Homeowners in project areas are paid fair value for their homes. But how is fair value determined? On appraisal techniques designed for Federal use and not for the special circumstances frequently found in slums, some homeowners in slum areas who have had to purchase their homes at inflated prices in order to get a place to live, have received from the Government less than the actual price they paid for the property.

Let me recall for your consideration the famous case of Mayme Riley, of Washington, D.C. Her property was located almost in the shadow of this Capitol. She had been employed at a steady job with a good salary for years. But she had never bothered to establish a credit rating for herself. When she decided to buy a home, she had to go into a slum area and pay a premium price of $9,950 for a deteriorated house. Not only that, but she had to sign a purchase agreement pledging not only the property, but also her personal earnings as security for the loan which she was forced to secure. The area was subsequently selected for urban renewal treatment and her property was taken by eminent domain. The court determined that fair value for her home was much less than the price she had contracted to pay. She was left with no home, with the necessity to find a new place in which to live, and with a debt of almost $2,000 which she must satisfy from future earnings.

Contrast the predicament of Mayme Riley with that of the slum landlord. His property is appraised on a basis different from that used for the homeowner. His appraisal takes into account the revenues he has been deriving from the property. In some cases these revenues are swollen by profits made possibly by illegal uses of the property, by failure properly to maintain the property, and by violation of reasonable building code requirements. These can help increase the price he receives for his property.

Income tax laws also help create windfall profits for the owners of slum properties. Depreciation allowances are so calculated that slum landlords can take capital gains on their profits.

But that is not the full story of where the money goes. Let me illustrate by returning to the Eastwick project in Philadelphia. I have already said that close to a million dollars was spent on planning that project. This money went to the planners, engineers, appraisers, architects, economists, and other experts who made studies and developed plans for the project. Then a Federal loan of $78,593,273 was approved with which to undertake the project. This money was spent to acquire the property in the area, provide fill and utility improvements which were needed and to put the project in shape for its intended new uses. This money went largely to contractors. They are very happy with this kind of urban renewal.

THE RICH GET RICHER AT TAXPAYERS' EXPENSE

That the rich get richer under urban renewal is not in doubt. A few examples will serve. Remember the 1961 law permits 30 percent of the grant authorization for commercial projects. The November 13 Barron's cites some specific instances:

> In Norfolk, Futterman became a joint venturer in a $6.5 million commercial project, the Golden Triangle Motor Hotel, the city's first large convention facility and, in effect, the keystone for its renewal activities, encompassing almost all the downtown area. The other partner, who had purchased the land for $200,000, contributed in all about $1.3 million to the venture (for an equity, including unrealized profit on the land, of $1.5 million); Futterman, for its part, committed some $1.5 million of its funds, and acquired a conventional mortgage of $3.7 million to cover the rest. Based on an average 70-percent year-round occupancy rate, Futterman hopes to earn before depreciation, up to 18 percent of its equity, or at least $250,000 a year, tax free.
>
> More often, the title I development is residential and thus qualifies for Federal financing. Under section 220 of the Housing Act, FHA is authorized to insure a first mortgage on the property of up to 90 percent of replacement value (and, under section 213, 97 percent of replacement value if the project is cooperatively owned). By comparison, nontitle I FHA mortgages are based on 90 percent of appraised value (which, in a slum area undoubtedly would be less than the actual cost of the building), and conventional mortgages seldom exceed two-thirds

of that value. What's more, if the owner also is the builder, the FHA is required to add a 10 percent builder's profit to the actual construction costs before computing the value.

Hence, a property might cost $20 million to build on land acquired for $1 million. By FHA's title I reckoning, its value would become $23 million, and a mortgage would be approved covering 90 percent of that figure, or $20.7 million. (The agency, of course, must be satisfied with the validity of the costs and the adequacy of the construction.) Obviously, in this typical example, the builder borrows almost the full cost of the project, in construction and land; his own cash outlay is only $300,000.

SPONSOR CAN GAMBLE

Variations of this rule of thumb affect all title I residential developments. The upshot is that the sponsor, in exchange for the risk he takes, is able to gamble on a small cash equity. FHA permits him to project his development's earning power in such a way as to permit a maximum override of only one-half of 1 percent in net—his return, based on the principal amount of the mortgage (90 percent of the cost of the project), must be computed at 7¾ percent (on current rates), with 5¼ percent going to interest and 1½ percent amortization of the principal, on standard methods of accounting. However, because he then can take accelerated depreciation on his costs, and his own cash investment is so small, the sponsor's actual earnings, on a cash-flow basis, eventually should work out to a return of anywhere from 10 to 33 percent a year.

This is true of two large Webb & Knapp projects, costing some $54 million, now virtually completed and rented in New York and Chicago. For the sponsor's $6 million estimated cash outlay, these initial operating properties by yearend should begin yielding some $1.5 million of tax sheltered net income. In another Webb & Knapp title I project, the Kips Bay Plaza now going up on Manhattan's East Side, prospects are even brighter. One of the two planned apartment towers has been built and rented. Total costs of the development, subject to the vicissitudes of material and labor price tags, are being projected at roughly $22 million. The sponsor anticipates encumbrances, including a possible second mortgage on top of the larger loan insured by FHA, of some $20.5 million, leaving Webb & Knapp's own cash in the project at only $1.5 million. The sponsor estimates its potential equity in the completed project—the cash investment, plus builder's profit and expected gain in any resale—at roughly $6 million, a 400-percent profit.

Like the other two, however, Kips Bay will be operated for current income for some time before the developer sells out. Based on expected rentals at full occupancy, the project is scaled to produce a 3-percent return on overall costs, in actual cash flow, or some $600,000 a year. This represents a 44-percent return on Webb & Knapp's cash outlay. As an operating property, in short Kips Bay should allow the Zeckendorf concern to get its money out in less than 3 years. As a demonstration of title I's potential profitability, moreover, Kips Bay thus promises to be as lush a big-city realty holding as any in the country.

SMALL TOWN PROJECTS

The demand for industry's services in developing and building title I projects obviously has mushroomed. Indeed, hundreds of suburbs, small towns and whistlestops all over America have begun wiping out previously unsuspected blight. One reason for this phenomenon, which traces to the recent liberalization of title I laws, is that 61 million Americans live in urban areas of less than 50,000 population. By recent count, $292 million in Federal grants have been made to 310 cities of under 50,000 population, and another $9.3 million to 1,700 more as aid for their "comprehensive planning."

For example, Uniontown, Pa. (population, 17,492), a depressed coal town, has received $977,000 in subsidies for three title I projects—Hollow Area, King's Feed Store Site, and Old Feed Store Site, and Old West School House. Mercedes, Tex. (population, 10,943), a cattle town still suffering from the long drought of the 1930's, has just completed a title I job called "Queen City No. 1," which cost the United States $1 million. Even Waverly, Tenn. (population, 2,891), one of the countless remote creek towns in the Cumberland hills, has completed one title I project and started another. The first, involving a Federal grant of $36,000, produced 38 units of new low-rent public housing; the second got a $119,000 U.S. grant to eliminate a "central business district slum" and convert the 5 acres to "much needed commercial use."

Projects like these, invariably sponsored locally, have a considerable impact on today's urban redevelopment. Since towns of less than 50,000 already account for 10 percent of the $2.5 billion committed to title I, they reduce by that amount the funds available for bigger projects—and their share of the total is growing. What's more, they tend to distract attention from perhaps graver slum ills elsewhere, drawing considerably on the Federal and State resources of technically trained urban-renewal specialists, who are still in short supply. Yet they seldom involve high-rise housing, the forte of the big builder.

BIG-CITY VENTURES

To the big-city developer, title I and slum clearance still mean big projects in big towns. At the end of 1960, one-sixth of all authorized projects were in the handful of cities with populations of over half a million, and their grants of $820 million represented 44 percent of the total. Five cities of over a million accounted for $1 of every $4 committed by the United States; New York's share alone was $1 of every $9.

What's more, while nearly 20 percent of the projects represented land areas of 10 acres or less (the smallest was a York, Pa., development consisting of four-tenths of an acre, or about a city block), the top 11 percent, which attracted the lion's share of the funds, were projects of 100 acres or more. (The biggest, Philadelphia's 2,506-acre Eastwick, sponsored by Reynolds and others.) One project in every 10 was scheduled to become exclusively residential, and nearly 70 percent will contain at least some new housing, with the remaining commercial structures mostly of the high-rise type. The 70 percent accounts for over 80 percent of all the project money involved. That, of course, is where the big developers, who think of new or renewed land in terms of its usable vertical space, prefer to take their risks.

Big-city housing projects, then, have attracted most of the burgeoning title I activity. Among the developments devoted entirely to residential needs, the leading ones are in New York City—where, despite the postwar building boom in offices and luxury apartments, low-rent and middle-income housing are still in urgent demand. Urban renewal projects completed, under construction or planned in the five boroughs are adding nearly 50,000 apartments and trebling city realty taxes on those sites. They involve expenditures of nearly $1 billion. The most ambitious program, the so-called West Side project (actually, one of several on the West Side), encompasses a 20-block area that will be completely renovated through rehabilitation and, mainly, new construction split up among some 46 sponsors.

Just to the north is the Park West Village of Webb & Knapp. When completed by yearend, this will be one of New York's largest title I projects. On a 6-block site formerly occupied by a dismal slum containing over 4,000 tenement families, Park West will comprise 2,600 apartments in 7 high-rise buildings. The land cost the city $20.8 million to acquire and improve, and was sold to the sponsor for $3 million. The new construction adds up to nearly $45 million.

PROJECT IN CHICAGO

Outside Gotham, too, some noteworthy title I developments are underway. Webb & Knapp, for example, will complete this year Chicago's Hyde Park project, adjoining the University of Chicago campus. On a 42-acre site, 2 towering buildings, with 540 apartments, are surrounded by 250 townhouses in a revitalized residential area for the university's faculty and married students—who can rent a flat or buy one of the homes. The land, acquired and razed by the city for $10.9 million, was sold to the sponsor for $1.3 million. Costs of construction to Webb & Knapp will total another $20 million.

In Cincinnati, where Reynolds is the sponsor, the Parktown cooperative houses will be completed this year. These buildings are being sold as soon as they are finished. So pleased are the city fathers with the progress of the colorful development that they erected signs downtown in tribute. Some 57 acres of blighted land, containing nearly 2,000 dwelling units, were razed, and all but replaced by 131 townhouses and 192 apartments costing $4 million. Land and planning cost the city $9.6 million; in a joint venture with a Columbus builder, Reynolds acquired the site for $0.5 million.

WASHINGTON VENTURE

One of the most massive title I housing developments anywhere is the Southwest group of projects in Washington, D.C. Here Reynolds, for example, is the sponsor of the River Park cooperative homes, over 518 units in both high-rise apartments and townhouses costing some $9 million, which will be sold upon completion. Going up nearby are the projects of several other sponsors.

The keystone for Southwest is Webb & Knapp's huge part of the development. In return for drawing up the architectural and engineering plan for the whole 450-acre affair, an overall land parcel costing the Government $111 million, the company was designated the sponsor for a 200-acre tract. Altogether Webb & Knapp will spend upward of $100 million for its development. Already occupied is the first phase, 512 units in 2 high-rise apartment buildings costing $10 million, and soon to be completed will be 2 more identical structures. A continuing program which probably will take almost a decade to finish, Southwest, it is hoped, ultimately will serve as a national showcase for urban renewal.

So much, then, for housing projects as such. Of potentially even greater impact are the commercial-institutional-residential complexes, typified by Santa Monica, which now are springing, from drawing boards all across the land. The most venturesome of these, inevitably, is in the Big Town: New York's Lincoln Square. This huge concentration of residential and cultural buildings—a new opera house, concert hall, and other parts of "Lincoln Center" together with apartment houses, commercial structures, and a branch of Fordham University—encompasses 70 acres of formerly blighted land on the West Side. Some 4,600 families have been relocated, all but 200 from substandard tenements. The land and planning alone cost $47.5 million, plus another $7 million to improve it; the Federal grant of $27.3 million is one of the largest for a single project in title I. Construction contemplated for the entire project will run well over $250 million.

While sponsorship for a large part of Lincoln Square has come from nonprofit civic organizations, particularly Rockefeller interests, the residential segment known as Lincoln Towers belongs to Webb & Knapp. Here, on an 18-acre site adjoining the center, is rising a $92 million collection of high-rise apartment buildings. Two of the towers (with 1,400 units) will be ready for occupancy next spring; the 4 others scheduled for completion by 1964, will provide some 2,600 apartments more. Unless the New York market for middle-income housing collapses—and it now seems one of the strongest segments of the city's realty market—Webb & Knapp's Lincoln Towers venture should pay off handsomely.

PHILADELPHIA'S PLANS

Around the Nation, many another ambitious project has come out of comprehensive planning. In Philadelphia for one, is the aforementioned Eastwick development. Covering more than 2,500 acres, it has been authorized $35.9 million in Federal grants, against a total project cost to the city of some $115 million, and a net loss of $70.3 million. It also is the largest project involving Reynolds Metals as a sponsor.

Reynolds' part of Eastwick—which will be 50 percent taken up with industrial and commercial buildings—is, in turn, a half-interest in the sponsorship of a predominantly residential section. The aluminum company will be responsible for 5,000 dwelling units, as well as industrial-commercial structures, costing an estimated $130 million. The community plan under which the entire development has been laid out will constitute the most striking set of buildings in Philadelphia. Since this is a 5-year program, barely underway, Reynolds does not expect its payoff (on sales of the buildings) to begin for at least 2 years.

In Baltimore, the biggest of several projects afoot is the downtown Charles Civic Center. A skyscraper of 23 stories combining glass and aluminum in a Ludwig Mies van der Rohe design, will serve as the focal point of a large central-city area of 32 acres devoted entirely to commercial renewal. So far, the development has attracted several companion structures, such as a massive $24 million Federal building. The center itself, on which an estimated $12 million will be invested, is well underway as the largest of the private facets of the project. The sponsor, selected after spirited competition between six title I developers, is Manhattan Structures, the Chicago firm.

PROJECT IN NORFOLK

In Norfolk, too, the midtown area is being literally transformed by title I projects which may affect the whole city's future growth. Three developments, on Federal grants totaling $20 million, are wiping out some 400 acres of blight, including nearly 5,000 substandard dwelling units. Of these, the biggest is the downtown project, accounting for half the acreage, on which is projected a complex of office buildings, another of retail stores, a major civic center, middle-income and public housing, and a striking motor hotel.

The feature of the plan is the motor hotel, just completed on an imposing 5-acre site at the head of the downtown area known as the Golden Triangle (Norfolk's former skid row). Here, as noted, Futterman Corp. is cosponsor in a joint venture, and will be the operating company. Already, the 400-room (including 15 public rooms) house has attracted $3 million in convention business to Norfolk and is expected to bring in an annual $10 million from such visitors. For its size, Norfolk's urban renewal is perhaps the most ambitious to date in the Nation.

GLIMPSE OF THE FUTURE

Countless other big-city plans are in the works. In Detroit, Miami, Seattle, Dallas, and Santa Monica, for example, comprehensive planning has given birth to a large project, or is about to. Louisville has awarded tentative sponsorship of another communitywide project to Reynolds. Its plan is for a riverfront development with 1,000 high-rise apartments, a motel, restaurants, and other commercial and recreational facilities. Proposed cost of the entire project is $20 million. Louisville has applied to the URA for approval and a starting grant. Newark, as noted, is about to launch a $95 million program under cosponsorship of Major Realty, the firm now merging with Food Fair Properties. On 27 acres west of Pennsylvania Station, construction soon will be begun on a $2 million motel and restaurant, a 20-story office building and 17 multistory luxury apartment buildings.

On the other coast, Perini, which offered $17.3 million of common stock publicly last June, has landed the equally massive San Francisco project called Golden Gateway. On a 20-acre site adjoining both the waterfront and the financial center, the sponsoring partnership, 60 percent held by Perini, hopes to begin building next year a complex of eight 22-story apartment houses, a 25-story office building, a 1,300-car public garage, some 100 townhouses and a block-square park. Perini bid against eight other redeveloper groups, offering the architectural plan with a proposal of $8.5 million for the land.

In nearby Los Angeles, finally, the hottest item on the current national title I list is up for bidding—the 135-acre Bunker Hill slum-clearance project, which already has set the city back by some $65 million in land-and-planning costs (on which it figures to lose $22.3 million) and has been awarded $15 million in Federal grants. As a commercial-residential complex, Bunker Hill will rival the highly publicized, nonsubsidized Century City—assuming the latter gets off the ground. From all appearances, every major title I builder in the country is competing for sponsorship.

Obviously, urban renewal is only getting started. The increasingly impressive financial credentials of those on the ground floor are matched by the widespread demand for their services, stimulated by recent Federal housing policy. One certainty is that the firms specializing in title I today will become more deeply involved in the years ahead. Many in the industry, indeed, predict that perhaps a dozen strong development firms soon will emerge, to do almost nothing but urban renewal. Reynolds subsidiary already approaches that status; Webb & Knapp gives indications of putting its own title activities in a separate division or subsidiary operation. What reward they, or others, will reap in this spanking-new field only the future will show. For the moment, it's clear that many of the Nation's key builders think they see a bonanza in blight. More significantly, important long-term money is backing them up.

Obviously, the rich get richer, the big get bigger; only big firms need apply for such mammoth jobs; contracts are negotiated, not bid. What is wrong with it? First and foremost, it is at the taxpayers' expense.

INVESTIGATION MAY BRING NATIONWIDE SCANDAL

When all the work was done and the land was offered for sale, the principal redeveloper was a large corporation interested in promoting use of its construction materials more than promoting housing for people. It has been responsible for constructing and placing on the market houses not much different in price from other houses which were built without any Federal subsidy.

Eastwick has been no bonanza for families who have bought homes in the project area. But it has been a fine thing for the redeveloper. That company has received the following specific financial benefits from its participation in the project:

First. A write down on the land which it purchased in the project area.

Second. An opportunity to make a market for its building materials and to demonstrate their use.

Third. A special form of mortgage insurance from the Federal Housing Administration designed to permit minimum equity investment in the project.

Fourth. A guarantee from the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase the mortgages already insured by FHA on such a basis that the redeveloper is almost completely protected against financial loss on the project.

Do they suggest how far from its stated purpose the urban renewal program has been allowed to drift? Do they indicate the extent of the deceit which is being practiced on the poor people who have been told that the program is for them?

This entire urban renewal mess should be investigated. When it is, I predict that it will prove to be one of the greatest scandals in the history of the Nation.

In suggesting that the Federal Government has not and will not be able to develop sound and efficient procedures for solving local problems, I have sound technical support. It comes from the efforts of scientists to develop criteria and standards by which to measure the effectiveness of local public services.

The most highly regarded technology in this field has been developed over a period of more than 30 years by Dr. Clarence E. Ridley, executive secretary of the International City Managers' Association. Dr. Ridley concerned himself primarily with the core functions of municipal government—police and fire protection, public health and public works. However, his conclusions have great significance for all who are concerned with measuring the effectiveness of Federal aid programs.

Dr. Ridley had decided by 1930 that while municipal activities lent themselves to some measurement, that measurement must be stated in terms of results achieved rather than procedures or techniques applied. His subsequent studies have served to confirm that conclusion.

It is in the field of social service and welfare programs that Dr. Ridley's research has its most devastating effect. National standards cannot be developed for these programs, because concepts like social welfare are subject to individual definition in accordance with value preferences. In the absence of such standards, results are unpredictable. When the seed of such a national program is planted, no assurances can be given about the fruit it will bear. When Congress authorizes such programs, it is writing a blank check. When people accept and use such programs, they are buying a pig in a poke.

The liberals have chosen to ignore this program not only in urban renewal but also in many other Federal aid programs for which appropriations are included in the budget which the President submitted to the first session of the 88th Congress. These programs offer a field for substantial cuts in the budget to bring Federal spending in line with Federal revenues and to justify the tax cuts in which all Americans are interested.

In all fairness to those in need of better housing, I am not justified in indicting Federal urban renewal unless I am prepared to offer a postive alternative. That is what I propose to do.

TWO REDEVELOPMENT PLANS REQUIRING NO FEDERAL AID

The answer lies simply in the use of the police powers of the community to enforce local codes of public safety and health. In communities throughout the country, such action has served as a spur to community development through private enterprise.

How does a city get started on its own? In my opinion one excellent answer already exists in the community development program now being promoted by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. That program is now being demonstrated successfully in a number of communities. It allows faster, lower cost and more efficient community development than is possible with federally subsidized urban renewal. Most important, it involves neither the use of eminent domain nor Federal subsidy with its inevitable controls.

Another program of local self-help is outlined in an interesting little booklet, "Blueprint for Neighborhood Conservation" published by the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Here are the steps it outlines for community improvement without Federal aid:

First. Establish realistic ordinances specifying health, safety, and sanitary standards for housing. Rehabilitate the substandard housing, at the expense of the property owners, through firm enforcement of these ordinances.

Second. Demolish those slum structures which are unfit for rehabilitation, at the expense of property owners, again through firm enforcement of city ordinances.

Third. Establish systematic public improvements to schools, streets, parks, sewers and to such municipal services as refuse collection, traffic and other facilities.

Fourth. Establish more livable, attractive and convenient neighborhood environment by replanning, rezoning and replanting cleared and long vacant sites and by closing or widening streets.

Fifth. Acquire and remove structures and uses of land which might delay, obstruct or hinder carrying out the program.

Sixth. Attract investment in new construction as well as in rehabilitation and modernization by the application of specific Federal income tax incentives.

Seventh. Elicit the cooperation of local financing institutions to secure credit facilities for property owners' participation in the conservation program. Most banks and lending institutions can offer loans or monthly payment plans or credit may be secured under the FHA section 220 mortgage insurance program and the FHA title I program for insurance of home repair loans.

Eighth. Improve credit facilities for your city through Federal insurance of municipal neighborhood conservation bonds on the basis of an insurance premium, so that these bonds will be readily marketable at favorable interest rates.

In Gadsen, Ala., it is my understanding that no right of eminent domain was used in redeveloping a rundown area. Neither did this city have a proper housing code or proper enforcement. City teams talked to owners about rehabilitation. When the owners refused to clean up the slumlike property, the city teams went directly to the property tenants. Each tenant was asked if he wanted a new home in a nearby residential development to be built with FHA financing under section 221. When most tenants signed up, the realtors, builders, mortgage men, and bankers went to work. A lovely new development was completed. The tenants moved into the new homes. The old shacks were left vacant. The owners then agreed to cooperate.

Take Charlotte, N.C., for example. As of today 12,000 residences have been rehabilitated—10,000 bathrooms were added. Two thousand buildings could not be saved and were demolished, at the owner's expense. Meanwhile the city did its part by paving 65 miles of streets, adding street lights, and providing playgrounds, parks, and other needed improvements. Two thousand families were relocated in privately owned homes, rehabilitated or new. Two thousand new private housing units were built—all of this without Federal aid. Note also the financial impact with increased revenue to the city. There are expenses but urban renewal also generates revenue.

The New Orleans story is much the same, so is the Los Angeles story and the others—each without Federal aid. In fact, the cases where there was no Federal aid involved suggest that the other areas getting Federal aid could have done it on their own.

In all these cases there is no politics as such, as far as whether it was Republican or Democrat. These people decided they would do the job locally, and they did the job. There is the same story in each of them.

To conclude, urban renewal and housing can be solved in one sentence. Local problems can be solved locally with each locality solving the problem in its own way, without any Federal participation whatsoever.

Following is an article by Howard E. Kershner, editor, Christian Economics. Also, Mr. Speaker, articles which I have previously mentioned follow:

RENEWAL IN, PROSPERITY OUT

(By Howard E. Kershner, editor, Christian Economics)

Highway construction and urban renewal are forcing the relocation of many thousands of small businesses every year. Many of them never reopen their doors because they cannot find a satisfactory location at a rental they can afford to pay. Such proprietors are forced to work for others, if they can find jobs, to go on relief, or retire prematurely. The number of small businesses forced to relocate is to be vastly increased, for the last appropriation to the urban renewal agency was $2 billion, or about six times the average amount which the agency has been spending for the last 12 years.

In the long run our cities will not benefit from this type of subsidized, forced-construction program. As the burden of taxation becomes heavier and heavier, urban blight will spread. New substandard areas will be created faster than urban renewal can reconstruct them.

This program is very similar to the practice of a doctor who would take blood from a patient's left arm while giving him a transfusion in the right arm. In the process, of course, he spills or wastes a portion of the blood and the patient grows weaker and weaker.

Financing local operations from Washington is the most expensive way to accomplish them. Not only is there a substantial bureaucratic loss but there is great wastefulness on the part of the municipalities because the local fathers, intrigued by the idea of something for nothing—that the money does not cost anything—are overtempted to splurge. Most people recognize these facts but accept the situation without much resistance because the other fellow is getting benefits and they might as well get theirs. That attitude will destroy us.

Urban renewal, like other forms of Government intervention in the business activities of the people, is Marxism. Its object is redistribution of wealth. Its result is wider impoverishment along with the destruction of freedom. It is one of the tools by which Marxists deceive good people and induce them to speed up the process of their own communization.

FAILURE OF PUBLIC HOUSING EXPOSED IN NATION'S CAPITAL

In the words of the Federal Government, it entered the field of public housing to provide "decent, safe, and sanitary housing" for families of low income.

Laudable as these objectives may be, it has been proved repeatedly in investigations around the country that these goals are not being met. The Nation's Capital, which should be a showcase for all Federal welfare programs and usually isn't, provides excellent documentation of the assertion that Government cannot provide "decent, safe, and sanitary" housing.

Reprinted below are excerpts from a report to the U.S. Congress by the General Accounting Office. The report is based upon an audit of the Washington, D.C., National Capital Housing Authority for fiscal years 1959 and 1960.

"Some projects are so poorly maintained that we question whether the purpose of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 of providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families of low income is being fulfilled. During our visits to certain NCHA projects, we observed such conditions as:

"(1) Bare and eroded lawns.

"(2) Trash-littered grounds.

"(3) Broken windows and shutters.

"(4) Torn door and window screens.

"(5) Roach infestation.

"(6) Interiors and exteriors of projects badly in need of cleaning and painting.

"(7) Sagging and leaking roofs.

"(8) Buckling floors.

"(9) Broken plaster.

"(10) Deteriorated and broken asbestos siding."

The GAO selected four separate projects for individual comment, noting in part.

"Kenilworth Courts, DC-1-19 (constructed in 1959).

"We observed many broken doors and windows. The project's laundry rooms were out of operation, and many basement windows were boarded up. We were informed that these conditions resulted from vandalism and that window guards for the basement and laundry room windows had been requested."

"Parkside dwellings, DC-1-11 (constructed in 1943).

"The tenant-maintained lawns were in poor condition, and many of the buildings were termite infested. In addition, we observed broken windows, sagging roofs and floors, broken screens and doors, broken shingles, and a building with bulging wall * * * all of the dwelling units that we inspected were roach infested, badly in need of painting and generally in an unclean condition.

"The concrete floors in 301 of the projects' 373 dwelling units have never been covered with tile * * * numerous applicants have refused to lease the dwelling units because of the uncovered floors."

"Ellen Wilson dwellings, DC-1-2 (constructed in 1941).

"Two units had been vacant since January 1958 because of a leaking roof caused by a rotted roof structure. These units remained unrepaired and vacant until March 1960. Another unit, vacated because of a leaking roof, remained vacant for about 6½ months * * * eight additional dwelling units * * * had been vacant for extended periods.

"Many prospective tenants, including those displaced under the District of Columbia urban renewal program, have refused to accept the dwelling units to which they were assigned because the units they were shown were dirty, needed painting and generally were considered unfit for occupancy. Some of the prospective tenants commented that they were shown units with (1) debris scattered throughout, (2) walls splattered with what appeared to be food, (3) stoves covered with grease, (4) broken plaster on the walls and ceilings and (5) roach infestation.

"We inspected several units and observed a fallen ceiling, broken plaster, trash and debris inside the dwelling units and evidence of rat and roach infestation.

"Twenty-first Street houses, DC-1-28 (constructed in 1943).

"Many of the window shutters were either missing or broken and * * * the paint on the outside of many of the units was peeling. We observed trash and debris in the yards and cracked baseboards on some of the foundations. We inspected the inside of a vacant unit and observed that it was in a filthy condition. There were roaches crawling on the floor and in the refrigerator. In a memorandum to the Public Housing Administration Commissioner * * * the Public Housing Administration Washington Regional Director stated that 'The project is an eyesore and is in poor condition.'

"Study indicated that the cost of rehabilitation could be as high as $10,600 per unit. NCHA concluded that the project should be demolished."

Beverly Hills Blighted?

(By Representative Charles S. Gubser, Republican of California)

Now Washington is approaching a new summit of tomfoolery. Now the happy plotters are about to feed sugar-coated arsenic to "blighted" Beverly Hills. The city which is famous as a home of the stars will soon receive $100,000 to assist in planning its future development.

I asked the Census Bureau for the latest figures regarding the "poor" people of Beverly Hills. Apparently they are not as well off as some of the $10,000-per-week movie stars who reside there. The median family income in Beverly Hills is just under $1,000 per month, as compared to the national average of about $471. So it seems that Beverly Hills is only twice as well off as the rest of the Nation, despite its well-publicized heart-shaped swimming pools, ermine rugs, poodle dogs and sport cars.

But somebody has made the mistake of calling in the Federal doctors. Now the citizens of Beverly Hills must take Federal medicine—even if it kills them.

The Moral Cost of Public Housing

(By Representative A. Sydney Herlong, Jr., Democrat, of Florida)

I believe in charity and I want to help those people who can't help themselves, but there are many, many people living in public housing units throughout the United States who are making more money than thousands of you are, and yet you are having to pay $35 a month on their rent. That's not charity, that's a shakedown, and I don't think you and the next generation of taxpayers ought to have to continue to bear this heavy burden.

We have a liberal, low downpayment, regular housing program insured through the Federal Housing Administration. If the people who don't belong in public housing and yet who live in it would show enough initiative to go out and make arrangements to get themselves homes they could call their own, they could buy them for just about what they are paying in rent on a public housing unit, but many of them who can afford to get out and do this for themselves prefer to stay in these units and be pampered by the Government.

You know, you can pamper a part of your body, such as your arm, by not using it or exercising it for a period of time and it will atrophy, or wither and become useless. I wonder if the Government, through these pampering projects, isn't doing that to the character of a lot of our people. In their desire to help those who can't help themselves, and believe me I want to do that too, they get over into the field of helping those who will vote for them in the next election whether they are in real need or not.

I am more concerned with what this type of program is doing to the moral fiber of many of our people than I am with the dollars these programs cost.

Senators Warn on Urban Department

Opposition to a new Department of Urban Affairs was based primarily on the argument that it was an effort to achieve, through bigger Federal subsidies, Federal domination of local affairs. The following quotations are from the minority views expressed by Senators[1] who opposed the urban affairs proposal during the Government Operations Committee hearings on June 21 and 22, 1961:

"Every pressure group in the Nation, looking for Federal funds, wants to have its representative crowding to the President's Cabinet table, not to advise and guide him on the problems of Government, but to push for special favors for special interests.

"We are, more and more, moving toward a directed economy in this country. The theory of those who support more Federal intervention is that Washington knows best, works best, pays best; and all lesser segments of government must change—they must reshape their concepts of self-determination, and accept the blueprint of the planners.

"More than hopscotching over the State and county governments, this new Department can eventually nullify local city government.

"We will, in one sweeping gesture create a Goliath which will drain our Treasury and which will keep a watchful, police eye on every urban community and its citizens, planning, spending, directing, until citizens will not call city hall when streets need repair, or a water main needs replacing, but will notify their Congressman to contact the Cabinet member handling such problems, seeking repairs and services."

Average Man Doesn't Dream of Dangers in Urban Renewal: Jail, Graft, Votes

Bruce Alger is one of the few Members of Congress willing to criticize the urban renewal program.

He says: "There are inherent dangers * * * undreamed of by the average citizen. A number of former executive directors of public housing authorities are now in prison, including the former directors of Houston, Galveston, Los Angeles, Contra Costa County, Calif., and others."

Alger quotes from "The Challenge of Housing," a book by Langdon W. Post, former chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, and an advocate of public housing:

"Another danger signal flashes from the political implications and opportunities inherent in a vast public housing program.

"In a housing program, there are sites to be bought, houses to be built, and tenants to be selected. Each step holds great possibilities for the politician and the businessman. The real estate operator has land to sell. The banks have mortgages which they are anxious to have rescued. The architect has plans for sale. There are building contracts to be awarded. The inhabitants of the slums are tumbling over themselves to get into the developments, which means that there will not only be the usual jobs for those in control to give out, but apartments as well.

"This last plum is a new brand of political fruit which has enormous possibilities for exploitation."

Alger calls attention to a letter dated May 1, 1956, from the Urban Renewal Administration showing the shrinkage in land acquired for urban renewal projects in four cities. The letter says:

"The figures * * * show the comparison between actual costs of acquiring land and the final sale price to the redeveloper. No overhead costs or other expense has been included.

"The figures:

"Baltimore, Md.: $1,444,155; $300,000; shrinkage 79.23 percent.

"Jersey City, N.J.: Two projects—$3,966,785; $850,000; shrinkage 78.57 percent.

"New York City: 10 projects—$82,199,479; $25,652,107; shrinkage 68.79 percent.

"Philadelphia, Pa.: Two projects—$1,514,994; $276,074; shrinkage 81.78 percent."

Congressman **Alger** said:

"Why the excessive drop in value when raw land, strategically located, is cleared and ready for use? Generally, the availability for a higher use should enhance the land values sufficiently to offset the cost."

Renewal in Washington, D.C.—Transit Company Buys Back Own Land at 22 Cents on Dollar

The constitutional case against urban renewal rests upon the argument that the Government has no right to use its powers of condemnation to take property from one private individual and turn it over to another private individual.

This process—unconstitutional despite a decision by the Warren Court to the contrary—has now been carried to its logical conclusion.

O. Roy Chalk, a genius at converting "shoestrings" into multimillion-dollar fortunes, sold a piece of property to the urban renewal agency in Washington for $3.5 million. A factor in establishing this high valuation was that the location is only a stone's throw from the Capitol. Chalk then turned around and bought back the site from the urban renewal agency for $767,000. The property was still only a stone's throw from the Capitol, but it shrank 78 percent in value when the difference could be unloaded upon the taxpayer.

---

[1] Senators John L. McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, committee chairman; Sam J. Ervin, Democrat, of North Carolina; Karl E. Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota; and Carl T. Curtis, Republican, of Nebraska.

Losses of 78 percent of the original cost are so typical of urban renewal that a Washington daily newspaper gave the item only a limited amount of space at bottom of page 5.

Ethical consideration, in the days of the Neanderthals, demanded, as protection against graft, collusion, and favoritism, that sales of Government property be made to the highest bidder.

Urban renewal agencies are exempt from that antiquated requirement. They may arbitrarily set the price at which urban renewal land shall be sold; offers of higher sums are disregarded as immaterial, irrelevant and contemptuous of the dignity of political planning. The winning bidder is chosen by criteria which may be almost anything the planners conclude to be in the national interest.

The wishes of the local community carry no weight whatever if they conflict with those of the Washington bureaucracy.

Chalk's payment of 22 percent of the Government's acquisition cost is par for the course. On a high percentage of urban renewal sales, the agencies sell property for 20 to 25 percent of what was paid. Why should the bureaucrats try to get more? The money being given away comes from the taxpayer, and he—think the planners—doesn't seem to care enough to cause trouble.

In the case we are discussing, the $767,000 price was fixed in advance. The bidding was confined to the presentation of development plans.

To quote one observer of the Washington transaction: "The winner obviously was to be the one who would submit the prettiest picture of what would fit the whim of the centralized planners."

Chalk's D.C. Transit System, Inc., was one of 18 firms submitting architectural designs. His proposal was for a combined apartment and rowhouse development to cost $5 million. He submitted "the purtiest pitchures."

Now he will build and own a property which should add several millions to the Chalk fortune.

The significance of this tale is that tomorrow's Horatio Algers will be those who understand, "How To Make a Million Without Half Trying." The secret is to ferret out the get-rich-quick possibilities of the welfare state. Four rules must be followed:

Rule No. 1: Play ball with the powers that be.

Rule No. 2: Know who are who and what they want.

Rules Nos. 3 and 4: If you can't figure these two rules out for yourself, put on a dunce cap and go stand in the corner.

AN ODIOUS COMPARISON

Osborn T. Boyd, Housing Division Chief of the U.S. Agency for International Development, commenting on Russia's poor housing conditions at a realtors' convention, said:

"I take great pleasure in pointing out to Communist delegates at international meetings * * * that in the United States our public housing is far more consistent with the principles of Marxism than theirs in Russia."

A COP'S-EYE VIEW OF NEW YORK CITY

(By Jack Morano)

As one policeman to another, a New York City Housing Authority officer once told me of a standing joke in his circle. "Soon," said he, "all New York will be one big housing project, and the regular police department will become just another branch of the Housing Authority."

A joke, then, but tour New York City with me if you wish to see the inevitable results of compulsory collectivism in the United States. Here may be found, as in East Germany, proof that collectivism does not work.

Two years ago when the Tactical Patrol Force was first instituted by Police Commissioner Kennedy, its purpose was to send into the "rougher" areas a group of 6-foot, judo-trained cops to suppress crime. Today, as a member of "Kennedy's Commandos," I can attest that there are few neighborhoods that haven't required our services. In other words, there are few "decent" residential areas left in New York.

FORMER COP

The transformation of attractive neighborhoods into crime-ridden jungles is largely the result of political actions along socialistic lines. Nor can it be said that this leaning toward socialism comes unconsciously or from forgivable mistakes.

For example, during the recent New York mayoralty campaign a spokesman for Robert Wagner boasted, "There are more people in New York City living in public housing than the entire population of New Haven, Conn." What a thing to boast about when it can be demonstrated that public housing—apart from being morally wrong—is economically unsound. Stated simply, it just doesn't work.

The humanitarian planners can see the housing projects they have built with taxpayers' money, and imagine how noble they are to have provided apartments for people who could not afford them. But what they do not see in their blindness is the unbought milk and children's shoes and clothing and better apartments that could otherwise have been afforded by the people from whom the taxes were taken. For every dollar's worth of "good" political planners do, there is at least a dollar's worth of harm.

The only way in which politicians can raise the level of living of those who occupy these projects is to lower the level of living of the families who are struggling to stay out of them. Any new tax burdens on such families reduce their chances of staying independent, and may thus force them into a project.

Is that what the planners want? Well, bear in mind the political power that is inherent in building projects, and remember that the numbers of people thus "aided" are now the source of arrogant boasts by politicians. Who could dare vote himself out of his own home or apartment? There are so many New Yorkers living in public housing that no New York politician dares oppose it—and hope to get elected.

If there is a salvage value in the New York situation, perhaps it is for others to observe and learn that political "gifts" are a club with which voters may be beaten into line.

THIRTY-FOUR STATES PAY MORE THAN THEY RECEIVE FOR URBAN RENEWAL

States paying more than they receive are as follows: Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, Utah, Arizona, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Minnesota, Iowa, Louisiana, Wisconsin, Illinois, Mississippi, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Florida.

States paying less than they receive are as follows: New York, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Arkansas, Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia.

These States are compiled from the October 5, 1962, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this study on urban renewal to the attention of my colleagues and hope that they will take the time to look into it. I shall be back on the floor of the House at a later date to answer any questions or criticism that might be leveled in this area.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman first and also commend to my colleagues the study that our colleague, Mr. ALGER, has conducted in this area, and point out the fact that before he came to the Congress he was engaged in the real estate business.

The gentleman has on other occasions taken the floor of the House to expound upon and give us the benefit of the very careful studies that he has made into this important field. This represents a great deal of effort and a great deal of work has gone into this study.

Mr. Speaker, this need not be a partisan matter. In fact, I think it is serious enough and to the extent that it can be kept on a bipartisan basis, and it should be.

We have a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, headed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], and it is my recollection that the ranking Republican is the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], which is now going into this question of the urban renewal aspects and public housing as well as other points that the gentleman from Texas has made here today.

I think the subcommittee would do well to take this study that our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, has presented, and the previous studies, and look this over and have their staffs go over them in detail.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for this fine work on a very important subject facing the people of this country today.

Mr. ALGER. I want to thank the gentleman and I want to make it very plain that I will stand ready to provide any of the material I have collected on this subject over a number of years, including four major presentations on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has said so well at other times on this subject, and others, and that is this: that just because I am against Federal money going into this program does not mean I am against urban renewal. As a matter of fact, in the city of Dallas we have some skyscrapers and other buildings going up that represent the finest type of urban renewal effort I have seen anywhere. I think we are the second city in the Nation in that regard. Every bit of it is urban renewal with private funds.

Mr. Speaker, additional cities can do this which are now taking Federal money. It will be my hope that as a result of the investigation and other efforts which will go into this matter that many of the cities will see fit to clean up their own back yard and not ask anyone else to pay part of that expense, and at the same time not have to clean up other cities.

THE ADVANTAGES OF A NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the very principle of disarmament is under attack. The administration's proposals at Geneva are criticized as "inadequate and dangerous." It is suggested that the representatives of our Arms Control and Disarmament Agency are about to be hoodwinked by the Soviets.

I rise to reaffirm my belief that disarmament negotiations must be continued. This House, in September 1961, voted 253 to 50 to set up an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The dedicated officials who have been assigned to this Agency are faithfully carrying out the will of Congress. I cannot believe that the sentiment of the American people of September 1961 has changed, and that we now oppose the work of disarmament.

This is not a partisan issue. Members on the Democratic side supported President Eisenhower's efforts toward controlled disarmament. Republican Members supported President Kennedy's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Concern over the threat of world destruction is certainly not the monopoly of either party.

Last week a small but optimistic step forward was taken. Our disarmament negotiators at Geneva many months ago proposed setting up a "hot line" of communication between Washington and Moscow, that both sides might know what was in the other's mind as the brink was approached. Last week the Russians at Geneva accepted our proposal, and the details are now being worked out for a Pentagon-Kremlin line of communication. It will no doubt be said against the proposal that we "gave something." But I would point out that we also "got something"—a chance to avoid blowing up the world. In my opinion, that is a chance worth taking.

Meanwhile, the test ban negotiations at Geneva continue. The United States has asked for seven inspections on Soviet soil each year, while the Russians refuse to allow more than three. The chances of reaching an accord do not appear at all good. But the question is whether we should hamstring our own negotiators by violent and unreasonable criticism of our own bargaining position.

President Kennedy, at his news conference on March 21, said:

> I am haunted by the feeling that by 1970, unless we are successful, there may be 10 nuclear powers instead of 4 and by 1975, 15 or 20.

The President was referring to the success or failure of our nuclear test ban negotiations.

Every thinking person in the United States today should share this feeling with the President. Unless we are successful in placing some restraints on the nuclear arms race, the spiral will not only continue upward, but it will spread outward to embrace more and more areas of the world. Each additional country that enters the race in earnest, and seeks to acquire its own nuclear weapons, subtracts from our own national security. President Kennedy spoke for all of us when he expressed concern for our future security should the development and spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology continue.

We have heard voices raised in warning about the risks to our national security that an agreement with the Soviet Union to stop further nuclear testing would entail. It cannot be denied that there are risks in any nuclear test ban treaty. But before we permit ourselves to be cowed into inaction by talk of the risks involved in a treaty with the Soviet Union, we must face squarely the risks inherent in a future without a treaty.

On the basis of man's previous experience, we can more confidently predict what will happen with continued unlimited nuclear testing than without. With continued testing and the spread of nuclear weapons across the face of the earth, we can confidently predict a nuclear disaster at some point in the future. The exact dimensions of the disaster and the precise time at which it will occur are impossible to predict. But the fact that a nuclear holocaust would consume a large portion of the world, and certainly what we like to call Western civilization, should be clear to anyone with even a vague notion of the destructive forces that are contained in our nuclear stockpiles.

If we assume the risks of a nuclear test ban, and are successful in taking this small step toward leveling off the arms race the future would still be uncertain. We cannot precisely envisage a future in which nations finally learn to exercise self-restraint on their predatory instincts. We have had no experience in such an international environment. But I would infinitely prefer some of the uncertainties involved in a nuclear test ban to the certainty of the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology without a test ban.

Not only would a nuclear test ban have advantages for us in slowing the spread of nuclear weapons around the world. Such a step would also have advantages in our bilateral relations with the Soviet Union. In the first place, according to the President's key national security advisers, we are at present confident in our nuclear capabilities. According to Director William Foster of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and responsible officials of the Department of Defense, a nuclear test ban would preserve our present nuclear advantages for longer than if testing continues. Therefore, the administration believes that a nuclear test ban at this time would be to our own military advantage.

But a nuclear test ban would have more significance than a purely military one. Indeed, a nuclear test ban may have more value as a symbolic first step toward two important and interrelated goals—control over the arms race, and convincing the Soviets that the road to productive rather than destructive coexistence must be an open one. Secretary of State Rusk has repeatedly emphasized to the world that disarmament and secrecy are incompatible. One of a test ban's most important advantages to us, therefore, would be the opportunities it would create for us to show the Soviets that effective inspection and espionage are not equivalent, and for them to convince us that their interest in disarmament runs deeper than mere propaganda sloganeering.

Today's great papal encyclical, "Pacem in Terris" rightly says that disarmament depends upon mutual trust. This a test ban can help to generate. The encyclical says:

> It is with deep sorrow that we note the enormous stocks of armaments that have been and still are being made in more economically developed countries, with a vast outlay of intellectual and economic resources. * * *
>
> Justice, then, right, reason and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpile which exists in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned: That nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control.
>
> All must realize that there is no hope of putting an end to the building up of armaments, nor of reducing the present stocks, nor, still less, of abolishing them altogether, unless the process is complete and thorough and unless it proceeds from inner conviction: Unless, that is, everyone sincerely cooperates to banish the fear and anxious expectation of war with which men are oppressed.
>
> Not only can it happen but it actually does happen that the advantages and conveniences which nations strive to acquire for themselves become objects of contention; nevertheless, the resulting disagreements must be settled, not by force, nor by deceit or trickery, but rather in the only manner which is worthy of the dignity of man, that is, by a mutual assessment of the reasons on both sides of the dispute, by a mature and objective investigation of the situation, and by an equitable reconciliation of differences of opinion.

Finally, a nuclear test ban would stop the further pollution of the atmosphere with radioactive debris by the nuclear powers. We should remember that this atmosphere is shared by nuclear and nonnuclear powers alike. Although the dangers to ourselves and future generations from radioactive fallout cannot be accurately assessed, there is agreement in the scientific community that any increase in the level of background radiation is harmful.

We should not overemphasize the importance of these advantages, however. A nuclear test ban will not restrict the production of nuclear weapons or of nuclear delivery vehicles. It will not inhibit countries which refuse to become parties to the treaty from achieving nuclear weapons of their own. But a nuclear test ban would be a step in the right direction. It would constitute a mutual restrait on the part of all the parties to the treaty. Having taken this first step, other more substantial steps might follow more easily. In balancing the advantages to be derived from a nuclear test ban treaty against the risks of possible Soviet gains from undetected testing or a sudden abrogation of the treaty, the scales tip decisively in favor of the administration's test ban proposals. These proposals provide a sound and safeguarded basis for continuing negotiations toward an agreement which would be in the interest of all humanity.

The President, and his Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, deserve every effort of our American people and of their representatives here.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1963, the President of the United States transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House the Second Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This report describes the activities of the Agency during the calendar year 1962.

As this report sets forth in its introduction:

> The Agency and its role remains unique as an instrumentality of government which is devoted solely to the problems of arms control and disarmament. It is an organization dedicated to the ultimate goal of a world at peace—a world in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law and international adjustments are peaceably achieved.

This, indeed, is a unique organization. As the report further points out:

> It was brought into existence by the Congress in the belief that arms control and disarmament measures can be acceptable alternatives to a continued arms buildup. Its efforts are directed toward promoting the relaxation of tensions and furthering peace. Yet, it seeks these alternatives without in any way jeopardizing the Nation's security interests.

For nearly 5 years and under two administrations, the United States has been attempting to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on an effective and adequate nuclear test ban treaty. The 5 years of almost uninterrupted negotiations with the Soviet Union on this question is ample demonstration of our country's desire to reach an agreement on halting nuclear weapon tests. However, we have not yet reached agreement and one of the major obstacles has been our inability to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on effective means of verifying the fact that both sides will honor their obligations. Soviet intransigence on this issue is one of the major stumbling blocks in the way of agreement. Based upon their prior conduct, it would be foolhardy for us to depend upon trust in assuring that the Soviet Government is complying with the terms of any treaty we may sign. Where issues of national security are involved, as they would be in a nuclear test ban, we must insist upon an effective means of verifying the fact that the other parties to a treaty are living up to their obligations.

When the Congress passed legislation creating the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, it did so in recognition of the extreme importance arms control and disarmament must play in the modern world. It did so in recognition that these subjects were too important to be left in the hands of part-time individuals or persons encumbered by other responsibilities and duties.

We in the Congress established this unique Agency in order that the President might draw upon the advice of full-time professional experts. Accordingly, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is designated the principal adviser to the Secretary of State and the President on arms control and disarmament matters. The Director of the Agency has primary responsibility within the Government and is required to coordinate U.S. arms control and disarmament policy.

We are indeed fortunate that we have individuals in this country dedicated to the service of their Government and who serve in an agency such as this, whose responsibilities are so great. At times their motives may be questioned; their work criticized. At times their objectives may seem utopian and doomed to failure. Nevertheless, these dedicated men and women, strong in their belief in American principles, continue to apply themselves to their dedicated work.

I join with the many informed Americans who know the true value of their work, in saluting the men and women in doing what they can to assist the President in carrying the very, very heavy burdens of his office in the important area of arms control and disarmament.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, no nuclear test ban treaty will be absolutely foolproof. No matter how perfect our means of detection and identification become there will always remain an element of uncertainty in the inspection system. But conceding this to be the case, it would be foolish to jump to the conclusion that any nuclear test ban treaty would place our national security in jeopardy. The crucial issues are, first, the likelihood that the Soviet Union would try to cheat, and second, the significance of the gains which the Soviets might achieve by clandestine testing which might escape detection.

Based on its previous conduct, we would be foolhardy to rely on the fact that the Soviet Union would honor its treaty obligations. The Soviet offensive missile buildup in Cuba at the very time the Soviet Foreign Minister was at the White House giving assurances to the contrary to President Kennedy is but one recent example of a long history of Soviet perfidy. However, under our nuclear test ban proposals we would not be taking the Soviet word on faith. The verification system, which is an essential part of our test ban position, would not only provide us with assurance that the Soviets were adhering to the treaty, but the very fact that the Soviets were willing to accept the verification measures which we propose would be evidence of an intent on their part, at least at the outset, to live up to the treaty. This is the probable situation because, while we would never be absolutely sure of detecting all clandestine tests of low yield, the Soviets could never be absolutely sure that any clandestine test would escape detection by seismic or other means. Therefore, in agreeing to our proposals in the first place, the Soviets would probably intend to adhere to the agreement.

However, we still should not assume that this would be the case. This is especially true of Soviet conduct after the treaty would have been in force for some period of time. Therefore, we must carefully weigh the significance of possible gains the Soviets might achieve assuming clandestine tests were carried out. In this connection, critics of the test ban have been quick to exaggerate.

Clandestine testing of large-yield strategic weapons would clearly not be possible. It is agreed by proponents and opponents of the test ban that the potential violator would be confined to relatively low yields. Three kilotons was a figure used recently in technical hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on developments in the means of detection and identification of nuclear explosions—Project Vela.

Three kilotons is not an absolute threshold of detectability below which testing could be carried on with impunity. It is a relatively uncertain and ragged threshold of detection by seismic means alone.

However, assuming that the Soviet Union were to conduct a series of low-yield nuclear tests underground, what would be the military consequences?

The gains that can be achieved through testing of low-yield nuclear weapons would be largely confined to tactical nuclear weapons. Test ban critics have claimed that tremendous advances can be made by clandestine testing in the field of tactical nuclear weapons. However, we already have a rather extensive and well-developed arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons. In fact, it is on the lower end of the weapons spectrum that we believe we are ahead of the Soviet Union.

If one side has tactical nuclear weapons and the other side does not, the advantage obviously lies with the side having these weapons. However, if both sides have tactical nuclear weapons, differences in quality should make very much less difference in terms of military advantage, particularly when either side could so easily use tactical nuclear weapons of its own having a larger yield to counter those of lesser more efficient yield developed clandestinely by the other side. Therefore, it has been concluded by high officials of the Defense Department that there appears to be no single tactical nuclear weapons development in sight, nor any combination of developments, which would tilt the balance in a limited war in favor of the side possessing it.

Critics of our nuclear test ban position have also made unsupported claims about the effects a nuclear test ban treaty would have on the development of an antiballistic missile defense. The development of an effective missile defense by one side alone would, in the opinion of responsible officials within the Department of Defense, substantially alter the present strategic balance in favor of the side achieving it. Many believe, however, that in the missile, antimissile race the offense will continue to remain far ahead of the defense for the foreseeable future. A nuclear test ban would deny to both sides the opportunity to gain much of the information about weapons effects which would be an important contribution to the development of an antimissile capability.

However, the development of such a capability is not primarily dependent on further testing of nuclear weapons. Therefore, the critics of our test ban proposals who have injected this issue into the discussion would seem to be interested in creating more smoke than fire. It is clear that the type of low-yield underground nuclear testing which might possibly escape detection would be unsuitable for the development of an antimissile defense capability by either side.

Having thus examined the possible gains which might be achieved by low-yield underground testing which might escape detection, it must be concluded that this possibility would not be worth the substantial risks of detection that violation of the treaty would entail.

Much of what test ban critics have claimed can be done "below the threshold" must therefore be discounted as little more than puffing.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative HENRY REUSS, and others on this day to express our concern over the arms race and our support for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The gentleman from Wisconsin has so often given voice to the hopes of many millions of Americans.

Many of us here today joined in sponsoring legislation to create the Agency in 1961. Many of us have followed its activities with interest. Last August 3, 18 House Members, including myself, wrote to President John F. Kennedy to again renew our support for the Agency.

In our joint letter, we wrote the President:

> We intend to support your request for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, made to Congress this year. But we suspect the task of ending the most dangerous and costly arms race in human history will require even more in terms of dollars and human energy, imagination, and talent. We, therefore, hope that the Disarmament Agency will request additional funds for its program next year with specific emphasis on an expanded research program and a larger public affairs program to acquaint citizens with basic information on disarmament.
>
> Concerning the research program, we recommend that there be much greater emphasis on the economic, political, legal, social, psychological * * * factors related to the prevention of war, as provided in section 31(1) of the act.
>
> We also hope that the Disarmament Agency will assert more active leadership within the executive branch on disarmament, and will view its mandate as one of exploring creative and imaginative new approaches. The Agency should take the lead in developing alternatives to the present spiraling arms race in which you said at the United Nations, "a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase."

As I said—that letter was written almost 9 months ago.

Just recently I and others introduced legislation to lift the ceiling of the $10 million appropriation placed upon the Agency whose funds to date have neared that mark. We did this in order to assist the Agency in its valuable work.

It is particularly appropriate that the gentleman from Wisconsin asked for special time to discuss this today because the afternoon newspapers carry generous excerpts from an inspiring encyclical titled "Pacem in Terris"—"Peace on Earth"—issued by Pope John 23d. The encyclical, Mr. Speaker, is a magnificent document that I am certain will win wide acceptance throughout this strife-torn world among peoples no matter what their religious faith, although I am proud of my Protestant affiliation, the encyclical is the great tradition of the Roman Catholic Church with its concern for the material and spiritual circumstances of man.

In the English translations issued by the Vatican press office the Pope calls for "progressive disarmament and an effective method of control." Pope John justly warns that the "conflagration" of war "may be set off by some uncontrollable and unexpected chance." In keeping with this view, the Pope said:

> Even though the monstrous power of modern weapons acts as a deterrent, it is to be feared that the mere continuance of nuclear tests, undertaken with war in mind, will have fatal consequences for life on the earth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the papal encyclical be placed in the RECORD at this point as well as an excellent and thought-provoking speech entitled "Myths About Disarmament" by Joseph O. Hanson, Jr., national security affairs adviser with the U.S. Information Agency.

ENCYCLICAL OF POPE JOHN 23D

ARMS BURDEN NOTICED

It is with deep sorrow that we note the enormous stock of armaments that have been and still are being made in more economically developed countries, with a vast outlay of intellectual and economic resources. And so it happens that, while the people of these countries are loaded with heavy burdens, other countries as a result are deprived of the collaboration they need in order to make economic and social progress.

The production of arms is allegedly justified on the grounds that in present-day conditions peace cannot be preserved without an equal balance of armaments. And so, if one country increases its armaments, others feel the need to do the same, and if one country is equipped with nuclear weapons, other countries must produce their own equally destructive.

Consequently people live in constant fear lest the storm that every moment threatens should break upon them with dreadful violence. And with good reason, for the arms of war are ready at hand. Even though it is difficult to believe that anyone would deliberately take the responsibility for the appalling destruction and sorrow that war would bring in its train, it cannot be denied that the conflagration may be set off by some incontrollable and unexpected change. And one must bear in mind that, even though the monstrous power of modern weapons acts as a deterrent, it is to be feared that the mere continuance of nuclear tests, undertaken with war in mind, will have fatal consequences for life on the earth.

CALLS FOR END TO RACE

Justice, then, right reason and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease: That the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control. * * * All must realize that there is no hope of putting an end to the building up of armaments, nor of reducing the present stocks, nor, still less, of abolishing them altogether, unless the process is complete and thorough and unless it proceeds from inner conviction: Unless, that is, everyone sincerely cooperates to banish the fear and anxious expectation of war with which men are oppressed. If this is to come about, the fundamental principle on which our present peace depends must be replaced by another which declares that the true and solid peace of nations consists not in equality of arms but in mutual trust alone. We believe that this can be brought to pass, and we consider that it is something which reason requires, that it is eminently desirable in itself and that it will prove to be the source of many benefits.

In the highest and most authoritative assemblies, let me give serious thought to the problem of a peaceful adjustment of relations between political communities on a world level: An adjustment founded on mutual trust, on sincerity in negotiations, on faithful fulfillment of obligations assumed. Let them study the problem until they find that point of agreement from which it will be possible to commence to go forward toward accords that will be sincere, lasting and fruitful.

RESPECT FOR LIBERTIES

But it is never sufficiently repeated that the cooperation, to which reference has been made, should be affected with the greatest respect for the liberty of the countries being developed, for these must realize that they are primarily responsible and that they are the principal artisans in the promotion of their own economic development and social progress.

It is vitally important therefore, that the wealthier states in providing varied forms of assistance to the poorer, should respect the moral values and ethnic characteristics peculiar to each, and also that they should avoid any intention of political domination.

Men are becoming more and more convinced that disputes which arise between states should not be resolved by resource to arms, but rather by negotiation.

Nevertheless, unfortunately, the law of fear still reigns among peoples and it forces them to spend fabulous sums for armaments: Not for aggression, they affirm—and there is no reason for not believing them—but to dissuade others from aggression.

There is reason to hope, however, that by meeting and negotiating men may come to discover better the bonds that unite them together, deriving from the human nature which they have in common: And that they may also come to discover that one of the most profound requirements of their common nature is this: That between them and their respective peoples it is not fear which should reign but love, a love which tends to express itself in a collaboration that is loyal, manifold in form and productive of many benefits.

WORLD MORE COMPLEX

As a result of the far-reaching changes which have taken place in the relations between the human family, the universal common good gives rise to problems which are complex, very grave and extremely urgent, especially as regards security and world peace. On the other hand the public authorities of the individual political communities—placed as they are on a footing of equality one with the other—no matter how much they multiply their meetings or sharpen their wits in efforts to draw up new juridical instruments, they are no longer capable of facing the task of finding an adequate solution to the problems mentioned above. And this is not due to a lack of good will or of a spirit of enterprise, but because of a structural defect which hinders them.

It can be said, therefore, that at this historical moment the present system of organization and the way its principle of authority operates on a world basis no longer correspond to the objective requirements of universal common good.

Public authority having worldwide power and endowed with the proper means for the efficacious pursuit of its objective, which is the universal common good in concrete form, must be set up by common accord and not imposed by force.

Even though there may be pronounced differences between political communities as regards the degree of their economic development and their military power, they are all very sensitive as regards their juridical equality and their moral dignity. For that reason, they are right in not easily yielding in obedience to an authority imposed by force, or to an authority in whose creation they had no part, or to which they themselves did not decide to submit by conscious and free choice.

NOT IN POSITION TO HANDLE

The public authority of the world community must tackle and solve problems of an economic, social, political, or cultural character which are posed by the universal common good. For, because of the vastness, complexity, and urgency of those problems, the public authorities of the individual states are not in a position to tackle them with any hope of a positive solution.

The public authority of the world community is not intended to limit the sphere of action of the public authority of the individual political community, much less to take its place. On the contrary, its purpose is to create on a world basis, an environment in which the public authorities of each political community, its citizens, and intermediate associations can carry out their talks, fulfill their duties and exercise their rights with greater security.

As is known, the United Nations Organization was established on June 26, 1945, and to it there were subsequently added intergovernmental agencies with extensive international tasks in the economic-social, cultural-educational, and health fields. The United Nations Organization has as its essential purpose the maintenance and consolidation of peace between peoples, fostering between them friendly relations, based on the principles of equality, mutual respect, and varied forms of cooperation in every sector of human society.

It is our earnest wish that the United Nations Organization—in its structure and in its means—may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and that the day may come when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable, and inalienable rights.

THE MYTHS ABOUT DISARMAMENT

(By Joseph O. Hanson, Jr.)

What is the role of public opinion in the world's tortuous efforts toward disarmament? Is it the least important part, a waste of the time of experts? Or is it—as some of us believe—potentially the most important of all? Is it possible that this just might be the factor that would tip the scale toward real progress?

Just a comment on the word "public." Although I suspect that some people define the word "public" as meaning "everybody else but me," I think the truth is that "the public" really means all of us.

I used to have an impression that people everywhere are passionately interested in disarmament as the No. 1 subject on the world's agenda. But the evidence indicates that such awareness and enthusiasm are restricted to a minority in each country. Most people do not know what to think about disarmament. They feel it is remote—not their business. They do not follow it day by day. There is not much understanding or interest.

This should not really surprise us. When we look at the problem, we realize that this is one of the hardest subjects in the world to pass clearly from one mind to another: (1) It is complex; (2) it has a strong wishful element of escape from fear; (3) it is frustrating because the protracted talk has not yet led to action.

One expectable result is that this field is pervaded by a set of persistent stereotypes. But the general result is confusion, more perhaps than on any other subject receiving frequent public attention. Our experience indicates that unremitting effort at straightforward explanation is the only way to make headway; resort to oversimplified slogans is not only useless but counterproductive because it carries the inevitable impression of a light-minded approach. Another lesson is that the effort should be oriented toward general understanding of the global problem, rather than narrowly limited to exposition of one's own proposals and criticizing those of others. Nothing endangers communication more quickly than a foray into cold war polemics.

What can be done to generate better public understanding of disarmament?

First of all, who will do it?

The public media do a conscientious and creditable job of communicating what is available to them. But this is a new field, and the amount of material in communicable form is not yet very significant.

The Government can do its share, but not the whole job. There are now many more Americans knowledgeable about disarmament outside the Government than in it. Much has been said about the need for scientists and scholars to speak in terms laymen can understand, so that the vital messages can be widely communicated. In what field is this more important than disarmament? Not in physics, or economics, or even medicine. It is not an overstatement to say that clarity is here a duty.

It may be helpful to distinguish between two types of material: The advanced research * * *, and the basic truths of the problem which you take for granted. The advanced research is on the frontier of the unknown and is often, and properly, controversial. But it is the area of supposedly basic truths—which should be known and noncontroversial—that the difficulties appear.

Now for a very important matter: what to talk about.

First and basic is the need to kindle interest and a sense of purpose—a feeling that disarmament belongs in the human scheme of things. The fact that a scholar is devoting his training and talent * * * is of itself significant.

A major obstacle to be overcome is the set of stereotyped beliefs which have become rooted in the field of disarmament and arms control. Most of these attitudes used to be valid; now they have become, in varying degrees, obsolete and unrealistic. The neutralization of these stereotypes—or myths, if you will—should be a big task of any systematic endeavor to increase understanding.

I would now like to set down some of the more important stereotypes, and to suggest some ideas which offer ammunition for a counterattack against them.

First and basic is the "Utopia" stereotype: "Disarmament will never come to pass because it never has; it is simply a Utopian dream."

Here our essential task is to demonstrate that disarmament is real—to rescue it from the long habit of pale utopianism. We need to show that it is an achievable, though difficult, goal. The place to start is to recognize that the skeptical attitude is a perfectly natural reaction arising from the years of stalemate. The next step is the proposition that there has been a quantum jump between the past and the present, so that the dismal history signifies little. The key point, it seems to me, is that all negotiation and intensive study since World War II have been discouraging in a sense, but emphatically not useless: these were actually tremendously valuable years because the accumulation of realistic expert knowledge is now at an all-time high. Also, of course, the incentive for all nations to disarm constantly increases, in the form of the nuclear arms race with its risk of war and economic burdens. But the best persuasion potential is in showing that disarmament is a practical possibility: that we know many of the answers and are well started on the road to the rest. Overemphasis on the mysteries and unknowns fast leads to hopelessness.

This basic "Utopia" stereotype has collected a family of sub-myths around it. For example, people say that disarmament cannot happen because it requires trust between nations, which obviously does not exist. The answer here is easy; any sound disarmament agreement is based not on trust but on self-enforcing verification measures which both replace trust and begin to build trust through nations working together.

A second variant is that nothing can be done until the cold war stops, outstanding political problems are settled, and tension relaxes. It is not too hard to explain that, in the early stage, disarmament and political settlements should go hand in hand, each helping the other. There is no logical or practical reason why one should stop to let the other catch up. In the later stages of disarming, international settlement of disputes would be a regular function of the peacekeeping machinery.

A troublesome relative of the Utopia family is the cliche: "Governments don't want disarmament: they are insincere." Although the word "sincerity" has been used and overused, it is worth noting that sincerity is not susceptible to proof by words; it is, rather, a quality demonstrated only by actions. Thus the most compelling evidence of sincere belief in a future event is not to claim one is sincere but to act as though one really expected the event to happen. Here it seems to me that any impartial observer could not help but be struck with the spectrum of activity which is taking place in the United States—a confident building toward the expected coming of disarmament. For example, the amount and zeal of intellectual probing of the subject * * * is a striking case in point. These burgeoning studies are not hypothetical but practical; they ask not if, but how.

The creation last year of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the only Government body of its kind in the world, speaks volumes on long-term serious intent. The emergence of a growing group of disarmament experts in the Congress, pioneered by Senator HUMPHREY * * * is a deeply significant political phenomenon. Perhaps most striking is the establishment in the Department of Defense of a permanent office devoted to arms control, accompanied by a doctrine weaving disarmament and arms control factors into the fabric of U.S. military policy. In a recent speech entitled "Disarmament and Defense," Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric intimately linked the two:

"The point is * * * that the responsible defense officials * * * must come to know the special problems of disarmament and arms control. The factors of stability and of the dynamic effect on the arms race should be considered in every decision we make, whether in the area of strategic doctrine, force structure or research and development."

This doctrinal marriage of defense and disarmament may, I think, fairly be called historic.

A final version of the "it can't happen" school appears, happily, to be at last on the road to extinction. This is the myth that disarmament would cause depressions and economic chaos. The key step in laying this to rest was a pioneer United Nations report issued last March, in which an expert panel from 10 countries, including economists of socialist as well as capitalist persuasion, unanimously agreed that disarmament will not cause depressions or large increases in unemployment if proper preventive planning is done by governments. It was further agreed that the resources released by disarmament will make possible a vast range of new human benefits—"so many competing claims * * * that the real problem is to establish a scale of priorities." The most comprehensive contribution to the United Nations report, submitted by the United States, largely consists of a detailed case study of the positive economic and social benefits in the United States which would flow from funds released by disarmament. These studies have illuminated a difficult problem area and supplied the texts for new and clearer perspectives.

I pass now from Utopia to what I call the "weakness" areas. This centers around the mistaken belief that disarmament results in national weakness, rather than strength. A twin misconception is to view disarmament in isolation, as concerned only with arms reductions—i.e., omitting arms control entirely and forgetting the basic purposes: to reduce the risk of war.

Terminology may be part of the trouble. I am often dissatisfied with the term "disarmament," which is too narrow, and with "arms control" which is broad but vague. Clearly the purpose of all this is to reduce war: first by making it less likely, then by eliminating it entirely. So what we are really talking about is not "arms reduction" but "war reduction."

Taking an approach as broad as this, one can fit the parts into a larger, more meaningful whole. Anything which makes war less likely increases national security. * * * When arms reductions or classic "disarmament" is put in the broader context, the fact that there is a net increase in national security can be clearly demonstrated. There is usually little difficulty with the proposition that the spiraling arms race represents a real hazard to national security.

This is enough, I think, to give an idea of the kind of stereotypes frequently encountered, and a sampling of what can be done to erode them. Myths generally die hard, but where survival is at stake, we have no choice but to cultivate understanding.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentlewoman for her fine statement.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman on his statement and say that disarmament must be a never-ending quest because we in the United States and the free world and all peoples of the world must see that it succeeds.

I like the gentleman's approach and feel that he has a very scholarly and practical comment on the disarmament program, and I hope that we can succeed with a fine disarmament agency under the leadership of our good friend William Foster.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments and join in his tribute to the dedicated men and women who are now conducting a difficult assignment in the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT WASTE IN PROPOSED NAVY DEPARTMENT PURCHASE OF DRONE AIRCRAFT RADIO

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Navy is at it again. In the latest case that I have uncovered in my military procurement study, I shall prove today that the Navy is readying to throw another fistful of tax money down the drain in order to channel a contract to a favored producer.

For this, we cannot blame the producer. Winning a development contract put the industry in line for future business. If the Navy asks for a sole-source bid on the equipment again and again, you cannot blame industry. It is in business to make money.

But, Mr. Speaker, we can and should blame those in Navy who—

First, secretly and improperly mailed a bid set on February 15, 1963, which had a closing date of March 4, 1963, leaving but 7 days for the procurement to be studied by any other interested bidder.

Second, purposely failed to sign the usually required "determination and findings" that a sole-source requirement existed before starting purchasing machinery rolling.

Third, deliberately planned a sole-source purchase that will cost at least 100 percent more than necessary.

Fourth, plan to buy a radio to replace another radio that works efficiently.

Mr. Speaker, the equipment of which I speak is known as the AN/DRW 29 radio. It is a small, 9-pound radio set that is mounted in a drone or target practice aircraft. It was last purchased in early 1962 at an average price of about $3,000. The procurement document—2861–63—issued February 15 was to again buy this radio sole-source from Babcock Radios, Costa Mesa, Calif., with a March 4 bid opening. This allowed just 7 working days between mailing of bid set and closing of bids, in itself enough to prevent even accidental discovery of the procurement.

From sources inside Navy, I was told that something was rotten in Denmark. It was to be justified, my informant said, on the basis that no drawings were available when, indeed, drawings were paid for on an earlier contract and exist in Navy files. Although negotiation document 2861–63 went out February 15, no "D&F" was yet signed, my Navy contact told me. This is highly unusual since such a document is usually one of the first steps in such a procurement by sole source.

On February 26, 1963, Capt. John Scott, assistant to the chief of Office of Naval Material was asked for a copy of 2861–63 together with drawings, and technical material on the AN/DRW 29.

I wish to digress for a moment at this point, Mr. Speaker, to pay particular compliment to Captain Scott, a capable, conscientious, and effective naval officer. It is a pleasure to work with him, I wish there were more in Navy like him.

Captain Scott reported later that day that no "D&F" had been signed for the AN/DRW 29 and so there could be no procurement document for the purchase. When I persisted, he assured me he would look into the matter. He also said there were no drawings or plans available, but said he would look into that, too.

Still later, I reported to Captain Scott that on page 3, section B, paragraph 4 of contract No. 62–0619–r, drawings were ordered and had been paid for by the Government.

On February 27, Captain Scott phoned my office to say that his information from people in Navy on the 26th had been "dead wrong." His people, he said, had checked further and found drawings and technical material available. This was being sent, he said. He also said no "D&F" had been signed, although he substantiated that a negotiation document had been sent to Babcock.

After receiving the drawings for the equipment, I set out on the next step in my study—to see if the equipment was specialized to a degree that only Babcock could make it and deliver it as quickly as the Navy desires. I sent the plans to qualified technical people in industry. To shorten my presentation, they said the radio is not highly specialized. All technical people I contacted said they could build the radio and deliver it in any time frame set up by the Navy.

Therefore, any valid technical reason for this radio being purchased sole-source evaporated. Any responsible company, furnished with drawings that were in Government possession, could make it and deliver it on time.

This, then, obviated the second possible "sole source" route of "highly specialized" equipment. The first was "no drawings available."

The third usual justification for a sole-source buy is urgency of delivery. The equipment is needed so sorely that the Navy must buy it from the fastest manufacturer. We have seen in the past how unreliable this avenue is, but I checked it out, anyway.

The radio equipments in the drones are operating satisfactorily at present. My sources inside Navy tell me the ARW

56 is the radio now being used. It was last bought in February 1961 for about $1,143 each. In no way, therefore, can it be considered obsolete.

Since this equipment exists and works properly, how can it possibly be shown that the AN/DRW 29 is needed so urgently that only the sole source developer and producer can build it on time? The answer is simple. It cannot be shown and the third sole-source justification is as full of holes as the first two.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a fourth conclusion and it is that the taxpayer will get it in the neck if this radio is purchased via sole source. The engineering people I contacted in my study said their factories could—and would like to—build the radio. They estimated an average cost of $1,500. Under terms of its 1962 contract, via sole source, Babcock was paid an average cost of $3,100—almost twice as much.

It is easy to see that the taxpayer is going to get soaked if this sole source purchase is allowed to go through.

What is the status of this procurement now? I can best describe it as panic. The Navy sent out one bid set, got back its bid and the stage is set for a sole source contract. There is only one drawback. The sole source "D. & F." still has not been signed. No contract can be issued until this is done—until the proper Navy official puts his name on the dotted line.

Once this is done—once Mr. Kenneth M. BeLieu, Under Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics, puts pen to paper—the taxpayer will get it in the neck. Not until.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I submit that here is another before-the-fact disclosure that proves the fallacy of sole source purchasing, a tactic by which 87 percent of defense purchases were made last year. I submit to my colleagues, to the Secretary of Defense and to the Secretary of the Navy and his Undersecretary Mr. LeBieu that here is a sole source paper that must not be signed.

In just a few short days—and without the beforehand knowledge of the procurement that I was able to get in the early days of my study—I have been able to document that this radio can be built by American industry after competitive bidding and at a terrific saving to the taxpayer.

If the Under Secretary of the Navy will distribute bid sets to American industry and allow it a short time in which to bid, the Navy will get its radios on time and the taxpayers will save at least 50 percent on every single radio. Any other action will be a criminal waste of American tax dollars in the name of defense.

Mr. Speaker, I have also asked Mr. BeLieu, Secretary McNamara and the Comptroller General to supply me with the statutory authority which permits a sole source procurement to roll right up to contract signing time before the document justifying the whole transaction is approved. If they can "justify" such sleight-of-hand tactics, there will be another amendment to the United States Code tossed into the hopper by me on the same day I receive the answer.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleagues for their warm support. I have appreciated their comments in scores of letters received since my presentation on the floor April 1. I want to assure you and them that I will continue to fight to save the taxpayers' money on defense purchasing.

LEGISLATIVE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 I discussed at some length on the floor of the House my concern at the problem of legislative conflicts of interest.

At that time, I said that—

> I believe that this situation threatens to blunt the effectiveness of our message of democracy and to turn upon the Congress both the derision of the very people we seek to influence overseas and the American people themselves.

Since then I have introduced a number of bills aimed at this problem. One would require that incomes of Members of Congress from all sources be filed annually.

Several of us are today filing statements of our financial interests. I know that it might be said that those who have no outside income are the ones most willing to file the public statement. And yet this is not true of the Senators who have made public record of their financial holdings and neither can this be said for some of the Members of the House. As far as my own are concerned they are limited.

I own no stocks or bonds. I own my home in Portland and have an equity in an undeveloped 47 acres in Multnomah County, Oreg. My salary as a Member of the House of Representatives constitutes more than two-thirds of my annual income from all sources.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER], may extend their remarks immediately following mine, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, my holdings, apart from my homes in Washington and Wisconsin and life insurance, consist of stock in the following companies:

American Electric Power Co., American Sugar Refining Co., Central Illinois Public Service Co., Central and Southwest Corp., Johnson Service Co., Madison Fund, Majestic Mines, Marshall & Ilsley Bank, Niagara Shares Corp., Northwestern National Insurance Co., One William Street Fund, Public Service Co. of Indiana, Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Tri-Continental Corp., United Corp., and United States & Foreign Securities Corp.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am joining a number of Members of the House and Senate in filing, for the public record, a statement of my financial holdings. We require such a full disclosure of the executive branch, and I feel that the American people are entitled to the same information where their legislators are concerned.

I, therefore, print in the RECORD the fact that my financial holdings consist of 3,890 shares of common stock, Valley Title Co. of Santa Clara County, a corporation, and ownership of a house and lot in Atherton, Calif. The title company in its normal course of competitive business handles a limited number of transactions where Federal interests are involved.

My principal sources of income outside my legislative salary are compensation and dividends from the above company and rentals from the house and lot. My governmental salary constitutes less than half of my annual income from all sources.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement of my income and holdings:

First. Stocks and bonds: 100 shares ICOA Life Insurance Co.; 19 shares, class B, Southern Oregon Production Credit; Keystone Mutual Fund, B-4, 3.972 shares, and S-1, 2.85 shares.

Second. Financial interests subject to Federal regulatory agencies: None.

Third. Real estate: Residence in Medford, Oreg.; undivided one-half interest in undeveloped 155 acres in Jackson County, Oreg.

Fourth. Member advisory board of ICOA Life Insurance Co., Salem, Oreg.

Own contract interest against Brophy, Wilson & Duhaime, attorneys, Medford, Oreg., as a result of agreement on my retirement from the firm immediately prior to taking office as a Congressman.

Fifth. Annual salary as a Member of Congress will approximate two-thirds of annual income from all sources.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleagues for taking the initiative in making a full disclosure of their financial holdings. If all the Members of Congress would do likewise, I think we would do much to maintain public confidence in the legislative branch of the Federal Government. There seems to be a widespread belief that many Members in both chambers often vote on legislation when there is a possible conflict of interest unknown to their constituents.

Congress imposes on officers of the executive branch the most stringent standards against conflict of interest between their public office and private holdings. I would not want to see Members of Congress barred from participation in the commercial and business life of the country, but I do believe a voluntary disclosure of this kind by all Members would help to increase public confidence in the decisions of the Congress.

For these reasons, I am happy to join this voluntary effort and publish herewith in the Congressional Record the following list of my securities, assets and sources of income.

Stocks: Bank of Tucson, 156 shares; Catalina Savings & Loan Association, 3,400 shares; Modern Pioneers Insurance Co., 200 shares.

Real estate: Equity in residences, Washington, D.C., and Tucson, Ariz.; part ownership or equity in seven tracts of unimproved, vacant acreage in vicinity of Tucson, Ariz.; part ownership of two commercial lots in business section of Tucson, Ariz. One is small building used for law offices and the other is occupied by gasoline station. Both are rented.

Real estate—mortgages and contracts held: Equity in four miscellaneous real estate mortgages and contracts covering various properties in vicinity of Tucson, Ariz.

Sources of income: Congressional salary; rentals of business properties described above; annual royalties on mining claims in Pima County, Ariz.

I am not affiliated with any law firm but have received legal fees for past services to former law firm at Tucson, Ariz.

Annual salary as Member of Congress constitutes more than two-thirds annual income from all sources.

I am a director of the Bank of Tucson and Catalina Savings & Loan Association, both of Tucson, Ariz. I am not a director or officer of any other commercial or trade company or firm.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Congress should enact a code of ethics for its Members and employees. Such a code of ethics should provide for a full public disclosure of any financial interest or holding which might give rise to a potential conflict of interest situation. I am glad to join my colleagues in urging a meaningful code of ethics and in expressing my concern with this problem. I think it is no secret that I have no corporate or real estate holdings and that, as a full-time working Congressman, my principal source of income is my congressional salary.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement of financial holdings: Stocks, none; bonds, none; other securities, none; real estate—equity in personal home; financial interests in any business, firm, or other organization, none; income—congressional salary constitutes more than two-thirds of annual income.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my dear friend and able colleague the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] and our other colleagues, in making this voluntary disclosure of financial income, holdings, and other interests.

Income: My major source of income is my congressional salary, which is over 90 percent of my annual income; stocks, Standard Packaging Corp., 90 shares; mutual funds, investments in four mutual funds; savings account, interest from savings account in a bank and a savings and loan account; real estate, equity in residence, Arlington, Va.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in stating for the Record my personal financial situation.

Upon election to Congress, I withdrew from my law firm and from the practice of law and I receive no legal fees.

I own no stocks or bonds and I am not a member, officer, or director of any business enterprise. My assets consist of a small savings account, life insurance, my contributions to the Civil Service retirement system and an equity in my home in Ohio. My salary as a Member of Congress constitutes more than 90 percent of my annual income.

THE BALTIC STATES QUESTION

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a concurrent resolution calling for a discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations, and for the United Nations to request the Soviet Union to, first, withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and second, return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union.

My resolution would also provide that the United Nations conduct free elections under its supervision in the countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and confer punishment upon the Soviet Communists who are guilty of grievous crimes against the peoples of these countries.

Even though we do not like to admit it, the facts clearly show that within the past few years Soviet communism has made great gains in its efforts to dominate the world with very little sacrifice on its part. Nations have been taken over, one by one, right from underneath the noses of the Western Powers.

The time has come for us to recognize and admit the fact that Soviet communism has but one essential goal—the complete and total domination of all nations. It is time for us to take some decisive and positive steps to stop this creeping menace that threatens to engulf the free world.

While my resolution pertains only to the Baltic nations, it is my conviction that any concrete action taken with respect to these three nations will do much to thwart the Soviets from making further gains in their ceaseless efforts to make the world safe not for democracy but for Soviet communism.

I urge my colleagues to take affirmative action on this resolution.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith the following resolution adopted in the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island:

Resolution of Rhode Island General Assembly

House resolution memorializing Congress, asking that favorable consideration to legislation providing benefits to the aged, ill, and disabled veterans of World War I in the form of pensions or any other means which provide relief so vitally needed

Whereas many hundreds of thousands of our Nation's finest citizens served the cause of democracy during the period of World War I; and

Whereas a large number of these veterans have now reached the age and circumstances in which they are no longer self-supporting, as well as suffering illnesses and infirmities aggravated by this honorable service to their country; and

Whereas through no fault of their own, they have largely become a class of forgotten men, many of whom are close to the grave: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Members of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island recognize the predicament of these veterans of World War I and petition the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to H.R. 2332 (World War I Pension Act) providing benefits to the aged, ill, and disabled veterans of World War I in the form of pensions or any other means which will provide relief so vitally needed; and be it further

Resolved, That the recording clerk of this house of representatives is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Director of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, to the Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, to the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last year on this date I called the attention of the House to the fact that it was the silver anniversary of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson's long service in the Congress of the United States. Today should not pass without our taking notice that it marks the completion of 26 years of his labors as an official of our Government.

There are men now and others in times past who may have marked longer tenure in the service of our Government. But I doubt if there are any who can have rendered the wide variety of essential services to the Government, the Congress and to his party, as has the Vice President in these years.

These 26 years embrace his service in the House, in the Senate, in the position of Democratic Whip and Democratic Leader. They have seen him serve as Vice President of the United States, as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, and as Chairman of the Advisory Council of the Peace Corps. They have found him performing all manner of different and challenging assignments.

I know no better illustration of how our country has profited from LYNDON JOHNSON's zeal for work and his tireless devotion than to recall one of the many extra services he rendered a short time prior to the Cuban crisis last fall. Last year I commented on my impressions of the Vice President from my having observed him in his home, on his ranch in Texas. It was this ranch, this home of LYNDON JOHNSON, to which all the Ambassadors of the Organization of American States were invited last year at the time the OAS officials were visiting in San Antonio.

The Ambassadors from the Central and South American countries surely must have gained from this visit a meaningful insight into the life of their host and in doing so they had opportunity to look closer into the heart of America. I think the country owes appreciation to the Vice President for his never-ending efforts to search for ways in which the people of the world can see the human qualities of our country and our Government. The L. B. J. ranch in Texas does not belong to this Government, but it has served this Government well when the Vice President uses it to advance our interests as he has.

Many in this Congress expressed surprise when in the tense days last fall the Ambassadors of the American States voted with much unanimity to support the program and purposes of the United States when confronted by the dangers in Cuba. I like to think, and I do think, that the Vice President of the United States deserves much credit for this signal diplomatic achievement.

In his 26 years of service, LYNDON JOHNSON has also been a diplomat for America, and I know we can all join in hoping that these 26 years will stretch on and on into the future as far as we can see.

THE WOOL TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on March 14 of this year I introduced a bill (H.R. 4877) designed to correct an unconscionable situation which has been having a serious adverse effect on the wool textile industry of the United States and particularly on that part of the industry situated in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. My bill would close the loophole through which wool cloth of foreign manufacture is entering the United States free of duty after having been subjected to a so-called "showerproofing" process in the Virgin Islands. This denies to the U.S. Government the substantial revenue which would accrue were the identical wool cloth to enter here directly from the foreign country of origin.

A companion bill (S. 941) has been introduced in the Senate by Senators TALMADGE, PASTORE, SALTONSTALL, and MUSKIE.

The wool textile industry of the United States has a most serious import problem. The productive capacity of the industry has declined 50 percent since 1947, while during the same period imports have increased approximately 1,400 percent. Pursuant to the President's seven-point textile program, the administration is now actively pursuing efforts to resolve the import problem of the industry.

Within the framework of this overall wool textile import problem, section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, has emerged as a loophole which adds fuel to the fire of this burning issue.

Section 301, I understand, was originally enacted to stimulate employment in the Virgin Islands and other insular possessions of the United States.

If section 301 must be administered as it is being administered in the "showerproofed" wool cloth area, I favor an overall revision of the section. Such an overall revision would in any event, however, require careful and prolonged consideration, and whether it could be accomplished in this session of Congress is problematical. The wool problem, however, cannot wait for action. Last year the imports of "showerproofed" wool cloth amounted to over 10 million square yards, or about 15 percent of the total importation of wool cloth into the United States. Information reaching industry sources here indicates that, if not remedied immediately, the loophole provided by section 301 of the Tariff Act will permit substantially greater quantities of "showerproofed" wool cloth to be entered duty free in 1963.

The gravity of the import problem of the wool textile industry has been recognized by the President of the United States and his administration, and by leaders of both parties in the Congress of the United States. This problem grew to the stage where its seriousness and the need for remedial action were accorded recognition by the President and the Congress long before the section 301 loophole was discovered. If, as we know is the case, this industry is vulnerable to imports when they bear the applicable tariffs, it is assuredly even more vulnerable to imports which bear no tariff.

I urge every member of the House of Representatives to join me in attempting to secure prompt enactment of my bill, H.R. 4877.

HIGH POINT, N.C.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement, which was delivered in Washington on November 18, 1962, by the Reverend Tom Haggai, pastor of the Emerywood Baptist Church and chaplain of the High Point, N.C., Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Haggai's statement was made to the judges in the All America City competition, annually sponsored by Look magazine and the National Municipal League, which are cosponsors of the annual awards competition. Mr. Haggai's standby in making this statement was Mr. J. V. Morgan, attorney-at-law, of High Point.

This presentation by Mr. Haggai of the validity of High Point's claim to be named the All America City in the annual contest is, in my opinion, a masterful presentation of a city on the march and I feel will be of interest to the Members of this body. I am happy and proud to announce that High Point was one of the 11 All America Cities selected for award in 1963, which is a signal honor, not only to High Point but to our State of North Carolina. I am, of course, very much gratified that this distinction has come to one of the fine cities in my congressional district, and I am looking forward with pleasure to participating in the ceremonies in observation of this award which have been scheduled for April 15, 1963, when the Honorable Luther Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, will be the featured speaker.

It is with pardonable pride, then, that I submit the statement of the Reverend Mr. Haggai, who appropriately points out to the judges that the citizens of High Point, alone and collectively, have by their interest, efforts, and combined determination made it possible for this city to receive this outstanding recognition as one of the 11 All America Cities in the United States in 1963:

HIGH POINT, N.C.: POWERHOUSE OF THE PIEDMONT

It has been said that in the restless voice of dissent lies the key to a city's vitality and greatness. In the city of High Point, for which I speak, this voice was once inaudible.

But in recent years many men found they could no longer pretend all was right and good in our community and their voices began to be heard.

They came from all walks of life and from all stations of society. Over a decade their voices began to blend, and as they found each other, their efforts merged into a clamor for progress and the improvement of our city.

Today, as we enter the final phase of the All America City competition, the voice of dissent in High Point has been transplanted into vigorous action. It has resulted in wide civic accomplishment and expanding community progress.

Before I go any further let me introduce myself. I am Tom Haggai, pastor of Emerywood Baptist Church and chaplain of the High Point Junior Chamber of Commerce.

In a recent issue of the National Geographic magazine North Carolina was labeled the "Dixie Dynamo." If this is true, then I submit High Point is the "Powerhouse of the Piedmont," the projection of North Carolina's most progressive area.

It is located near the center of the State, in the golden triangle section of Piedmont, North Carolina. It is an industrial city of some 64,000 people.

To those who are not familiar with our town, the name may sound peculiar; High Point got its name in a rather inauspicious but logical way.

It was given by a team of surveyors mapping the roadbed for the North Carolina Railroad which ran from Goldsboro in the east to Charlotte in the southwest. They found that what is now High Point was the highest point on the railroad. They drove a stake in the ground and we were on our way. Incorporation came in 1859.

The stake was driven at the point where the railroad intersected the Plank Road which was a highway built of boards from Fayetteville to Winston-Salem. The fortunate fact that the Plank Road had a 100-foot right-of-way has given the city a Main Street of that width through its downtown section.

High Point is the home of a 4-year accredited college of over 1,000 students and is within 25 miles of 9 other colleges and universities.

It has one of the finest heart centers in this area, built in 1957 at a cost of $350,000 by civic donations.

It has an excellent public school system and a council-manager form of municipal government.

The year 1952 could well be considered the turning point for High Point. It was during that year that the forces for change and progress began to make themselves felt on the face of the city.

Since that time, High Pointers, alone and collectively and often against massive opposition, have initiated, and completed a host of civic, community, economic and industrial improvements.

Among them are the following: An approving vote for $24 million to build new school buildings. A hike in the local school tax to supplement the pay of High Point teachers. A new, modern YWCA with indoor swimming pool. A combination YWCA-YMCA for Negroes. Sweeping approval of a $15 million city bond issue for new water and sewer facilities. The annexation—against heavy and entrenched opposition—of 19.6 square miles of outlying areas. The complete rebuilding of our primary park facilities. Renovation of all city parks and addition of new ones. Built a new gymnasium for High Point College. Created a city planning department to guide the orderly growth of the city. Constructed four new elementary schools and two junior high schools, and as a topper, exhibited an astonishing amount of industrial growth—38 percent in 10 years. Last year alone 21 new industries settled in High Point.

Also in this decade of growth—which could almost be compared to a chain reaction—bank clearings in High Point increased by 110 percent and total employment rose 171 percent until we now have one of the lowest unemployment rates in the Nation.

High Pointers have always contributed generously to our charitable organizations and efforts. The united fund supports 26 agencies. Each year more than 1,000 High Pointers give hundreds of man-hours to this campaign and in 1961 our goal of $289,000 was exceeded by $10,000.

On the entry submitted to you by the junior chamber of commerce, 11 major points have been outlined.

In the summer of 1955, the Southern Railway announced its intention to terminate the vital reciprocal switching agreement. This agreement was between local industrialists, a small railroad, and the Southern Railway. It was recognized that cancellation of the agreement threatened access to national markets and that it could mean an increase in freight costs. The chamber of commerce and 16 industrialists initiated legal action to retain the agreement. It is significant that High Point citizens involved in the struggle presented a sustained and constant effort to prevent loss of the agreement which would affect approximately 22,000 employees. Through this cooperative citizen effort, actions were started before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the North Carolina Utilities Commission. Decisions favorable to High Point were obtained from both commissions and later from the North Carolina Supreme Court.

High Point's urban renewal project is distinctive in that it stresses conservation and rehabilitation rather than clearance and that it is the second largest in the southeast and the largest in North Carolina. It involves 606 acres of city business and residential property. We feel that the magnitude of this project indicates our willingness to enter large undertakings in order to reap great things for our city.

Equally significant is the fact that High Point citizens have been willing to support a substantial public housing project along with urban renewal.

Our present public housing plan was adopted after a fight the likes of which has not been seen in High Point in many a year. Forces on either side employed every means available to accomplish this particular end.

Finally, after the battle was done, and the dust had settled, the proposal passed. Under it 200 units for lower income families and 200 more for low-income aging persons will be constructed.

I submit that the very existence of urban renewal and public housing in High Point is strong evidence of the intent of our citizens to make our city a better place for people of every class and distinction.

In the summer of 1959 a number of merchants, property owners, and interested citizens became aware that business was drifting away from our traditional and rather rundown downtown area.

Parking was an acute problem. Store fronts were old and drab. People were going out of town to shop. As a consequence the Downtown Development Corp. was formed, and in the summer of this year a 20-year improvement plan was adopted.

Immediately, parking lots for downtown shoppers began to spring from vacant lots, as stores combined their efforts to solve their mutual parking problems.

Currently the face of downtown High Point is undergoing a startling change. Under the Downtown Development program whole blocks of stores and businesses are remodeling and adding new fronts and stationary canopies are going up over the sidewalks.

As a matter of fact, three new banks and one savings and loan association are being built.

You will rightfully ask us about racial conditions in High Point. We make no pretense that all is as it should be in this area. We have, however, accomplished positive results, and for this we are proud.

Negroes serve on many governmental bodies including our school board, recreation commission and the community planning council. They hold positions of responsibility in business, the police department and the urban redevelopment commission. City recreation facilities are open to all citizens and integration of our public schools has begun with barely a ripple of dissent.

We are aware of the human factor which plays a significant role whenever old traditions are replaced by those of a new and different age. We know that some will resist, that some will tolerate, but others will seek to implement the ideal of brotherhood. In High Point we believe these latter ones are succeeding.

The remaining six items in High Point's application are—

1. The promotion of North Carolina Jaycee President Fred Swartzberg as one of the Nation's five outstanding State Jaycee presidents; the promotion of Louis Fisher as president of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States and the successful efforts to obtain the national headquarters of the American Business Clubs.

2. The completion of a 7-million-gallon sewage disposal plant to implement our annexation.

3. The efforts to widen North and South Main Streets. The widening of South Main Street is virtually finished, and the visit of some 60 citizens to the State capital resulted in the assurance that North Main Street will be widened soon. This was important, because, although Main Street was 100 feet wide in the downtown area, it had a bottleneck at each end. We will now have a six-lane boulevard through the entire city except for an attractive mall in the downtown shopping area.

4. Three industrial parks have been established in High Point encompassing an area of 352 acres. Ten new industries have come to High Point, locating in the parks.

5. Efforts to obtain a television station in High Point were pressed last year. The citizen effort brought the assignment of channel 8 to the city. It will be operated by a semilocal concern.

6. A campaign culminated last year in the construction of a new, modern city-county building. In 1959, the High Point Bar Association and others launched a drive to get better courtroom facilities. The project expanded with increased citizen interest, newspaper backing, and countywide support. This year a $1 million structure housing city and county governmental offices was dedicated.

From the beginning, High Point has been a furniture center. First it was an area market, then a State market, and now it is recognized as the international capital of the furniture industry. Four times each year High Pointers open their homes to more than 25,000 buyers and salesmen from all over the world. The furniture market is perhaps the keystone of High Point's economic structure. In recent years no effort has been spared to spur the growth of the furniture industry and the High Point market.

All the items we have listed here show a dedicated thrust to the future, a search for better things, progress for our city and its people.

There was a time when many regarded the situation in High Point with quiet desperation. It was a southern mill town, stark, drab, and without vitality, shifting aimlessly with the whims of a one-industry economy.

Gradually, in the early fifties, a new life—symbolic of the modern South—began to take hold in High Point. The chain reaction was begun which has brought High Point to its highest point. Today we are in the forefront, the powerhouse of the Piedmont.

UNITED STATES NEEDS STRONG DOSE OF OLD-FASHIONED FISCAL INTEGRITY

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Easter recess is almost upon us, along with the prospect that the flow of major legislation to the floor will increase appreciably following the recess. We will soon be passing judgment on the bulk of the largest peacetime national budget in our history and the largest peacetime request for new obligational authority in our history. We will be asked to go along with the largest planned deficit in our history. We will be asked to push our national debt ceiling, as well as our actual debt, to an alltime high.

All this in the midst of a massive and skillful job of salesmanship by the social and economic theorists of the New Frontier, who do not seem to number old-fashioned fiscal integrity among their virtues.

Administration planners have launched a full-scale effort to pave the way for this deficit spending orgy by attempting to discredit conventional ideas on fiscal integrity. We are told time and again by administration theorists that massive Federal spending and massive borrowing are the only hopes for economic strength and sound development.

We are given a new definition of fiscal responsibility when we begin to protest. We are told by the President himself that, in our fuzzy-thinking way, we are subscribing to economic myths and that we must discard them. It is outmoded to believe that Government, like the individual, must live within income.

The President's chief economist tells us that we must control the untimely emergence of the "Puritan ethic" or else we will never be able to understand that deficit spending is good for the country.

The heart of this effort is the belief that the great majority of the American people have no conception of what is good for them. The ultimate goal is the destruction of any effective countering force to unlimited executive control of the public purse and full-speed pursuit of the welfare state.

This is what we are faced with as we head into this holiday breathing spell, this calm before the storm, and I am quite concerned about the path the House will follow in the months ahead.

This body stands as the last remaining hope for preservation of fiscal integrity—old fashioned, that is—and for leading the American people through the morass of fiscal legerdemain that clutters the way. This is a propitious time to pause and carefully consider whether this body is to roll over and play dead as the administration hustles the country on down the road to fiscal chaos or whether we are going to renew faith with the American people and resist this free spending, collectivist palaver that we are inundated with at every turn.

In making this consideration I think it would be wise to take stock of our financial situation and to see what a fairly consistent record of deficit financing and of no-priority budgeting has brought us over the last three decades.

In all fairness, I should say that the idea of deficit financing is not original with this administration nor was it so with the 87th Congress. The plain and simple truth is that this country has indulged in deficit spending and red-ink financing for 27 out of the last 33 fiscal years. That is an 82-percent batting average that no one should be proud of. Since the balanced budget of fiscal year 1930, the annual accounts of the National Government have shown a surplus on only six occasions. Three of those surpluses, incidentally, occurred under the Eisenhower administration and, although I do not claim clairvoyance, I suspect that will be three more surpluses than the present administration will ever have to its credit. It is also interesting to note that two more of those six surpluses occurred with Republicans in control of the Congress.

The national debt stood at $16,185,309,831 on June 30, 1930, and as of March 29, 1963, the debt stood at $303,171,874,612. A goodly portion of this increase was unavoidable, of course, occurring during the years of serious depression, and during World War II and the Korean conflict. Regardless of the various justifications given for this 1,790 percent increase in the Federal debt, the fact remains that we have engaged in deficit financing to the tune of an average of $10.6 billion a year for the last 33 years.

So we have had ample opportunity to test the validity of the New Frontier contention that deficit spending is good for the country. This idea is not new, although it is certainly being advanced with greater vigor than ever before, and there need be no conjecture on our part as to its merit as a permanent, conscious instrument of Federal fiscal policy.

Interest alone on the national debt will siphon off over $10 billion in fiscal year 1964. This is nearly one-tenth of the anticipated Federal expenditures for the fiscal year and constitutes the second largest single item in the budget. The cost of servicing the national debt—not retiring it, but just paying the interest—has jumped roughly 12.2 percent since 1961. There is every prospect that the cost of debt management will continue to increase as the general cost of living increases and as the size of the debt itself increases. More and more of today's tax revenues will be diverted from meeting today's needs and will be siphoned off to pay the carrying charges on the needs of yesteryear.

It can easily be seen that the cost of deficit financing is far heavier than the simple repayment of borrowed funds. Without repayment of a single dollar of principal, the national debt will have cost us, if present projections hold, nearly $100 billion for the 12-year period from fiscal 1953 through fiscal 1964.

But this direct cost of financing the debt is far from being the only measure of the adverse effect of deficit spending.

It should be clear that not even the strongest nation in the world can continue to accumulate huge spending deficits without risking inflation, a loss of the integrity of its money, and a loss of international confidence in the soundness of its fiscal policies.

Beyond a shadow of a doubt the fairly consistent red-ink performance of the Government has been a major factor in causing the inflationary spiral that has given us the 47-cent dollar. Since 1939 over 53 percent of the purchasing power of the American dollar has eroded away, and the cost-of-living index continues to creep higher and higher.

Inflation eats away at the vitals of our economy. It is a thief that steals from those who can least afford it. Retired people living on fixed pensions, insurance or savings that were accumulated by a lifetime of hard labor—these are the people who must sit by while their subtle enemy, inflation, whom they can never quite see or grasp, gnaws away at the buying power of their few precious dollars. The middle-aged man who slaved extra hours to accumulate some insurance to provide for his family, only to become painfully aware that it would no longer provide one-half or one-third of their needs—this is a man who has been robbed just as surely as if by an armed bandit.

The losers are the people who sometime ago looked into the future and determined that they would need a certain amount of money for a certain purpose at a certain time. In most cases they scrimped and saved and sacrificed to meet this goal—whether it was retirement, a new home, a college education for the children, or what have you—then came the magic day when they found the money they had put away was worth only half its former value and was totally inadequate to do the job.

The average workingman who does not have the economic leverage to keep up with the spiraling cost of living—it is this man and his wife and his children who are the victims of inflation. These are the people who suffer when Uncle Sam year after year after year spends more than he takes in.

Inflation and its running-mates hardship and deprivation for those least equipped to fight it—this is the major crop we have harvested from the seeds of fiscal irresponsibility.

We cannot talk about our deficit-spending record of the last three decades without considering its effect on international confidence in the dollar. We are in a precarious position in this regard.

The figures do not lie. Our total gold holdings have dropped from $23 billion to just under $16 billion in a little more than a decade. Of this amount, roughly $12 billion is required as statutory backing for our currency and another $3 billion is required to meet other U.S. gold obligations. As a result we find nearly all our gold reserve obligated. So far, so good.

But we also find that foreign dollar holdings, that is, foreign claims against the dollar, total the astronomical sum of $25 billions. Each of these dollar holdings is a potential claim on the gold that allegedly stands behind the dollar. As I pointed out a moment ago, over $7 billion of these claims have been honored in the last decade.

If foreign confidence in the stability of U.S. currency should ever be shaken to the extent that any significant portion of the holders of these dollar credits should deem it prudent to turn them in to Uncle Sam and take the gold which they represent, the effect would be disastrous.

It is plain to all that we cannot use $16 billion in gold stocks to honor $15 billion in gold obligations and an additional $25 billion in dollar credits. In the final analysis it would be necessary for the United States to repudiate her obligations to the world, and our currency as a medium of international exchange would become valueless.

It becomes clear at once that it is of the utmost importance to maintain a high level of confidence abroad in the stability of the dollar. It is also clear that we have failed to maintain this level of confidence and are thus confronted with this problem of serious potential.

We are still faced with a serious international payments deficit and the corresponding likelihood that foreign claims against the dollar will continue to grow.

We are also faced with the awful truth that the world is aware that we have resorted to deficit financing 82 percent of the time since 1930, that deficit spending has become a political way of life in America, and that it is highly probable we will continue debasing our currency—there being little likelihood that the immediate future will bring any mending of the ways.

We know that untold billions of our wealth were expended to keep ourselves and our foreign creditors free and to help many of them rebuild war-ravaged societies, but we must also realize that this is a cold world, that memories can oftentimes be short and that, unless our fiscal house is put in order, there may come a day sometime soon when those holding dollar credits will stop slapping us on the wrist and sending us mild warnings and start taking more drastic action.

I know of no more appropriate quote at this point than this one attributed to Franklin D. Roosevelt during the 1932 campaign:

> If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good. If in some crises it lives beyond its income for a year or two it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms. But if, like the spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing up to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Never a truer word was spoken, and it is unfortunate that this prophetic statement did not serve to set the tone for the fiscal policies of this Nation much beyond the time of its utterance.

What has this 32-year record of living beyond our income brought us besides spiraling inflation, a precarious situation for our gold reserves, and an almost incomprehensible national debt that exceeds the debts of all other countries of the world combined by over $24 billion?

Has it brought an end to unemployment? Unemployment has remained one of the most serious problems confronting this Nation during every administration over the last three decades. Henry Wallace has said that the problem of unemployment represented the major failure of the New Deal.

Chester Bowles said this in 1959:

> Let us face the fact that the New Deal failed in its second major objective, which was to restore full employment and prosperity to our country. In 1940, more than 8 million Americans were still unemployed; 14½ percent of the working force.

Unemployment is still with us today as one of the major economic problems of the country and one of the major political problems of the present administration. There still remain over 4 million unemployed across this land. Unemployment levels have all too recently been in excess of 6 percent and, unless our fiscal house is placed in order and unless the shackles are taken off free private enterprise the specter of 7 and 8 percent unemployment looms large.

The Government can spend and borrow until the cows come home and it will not have any appreciable effect on the unemployment situation.

If there has been one lesson to be drawn from 30 years of deficit financing it is that Government spending will not produce prosperity. The private sector of our economy has been responsible for the attainment of our record high gross national product. The public sector, if anything, has served to keep our growth from attaining even higher levels. Continued deficit financing and high levels of taxation have served, if anything, to discourage investment and confidence in the economy.

To quote the American Institute for Economic Research:

> Application of the Keynesian panacea for two decades has fostered numerous serious economic distortions in the United States, distortions reflected today in unnecessary unemployment, stagnation of major industries, extensive depreciation of the dollar, loss of world markets, and fully justified loss of confidence in the dollar. An economy that could be the wonder of the world now falters, not even in second place but nearly the most backward, judged by rates of growth for the world's industrial economies. Such are the consequences of applying the Keynesian notions over a prolonged period. The Council of Economic Advisers not only fails to see the obvious facts but recommends more of the same erroneous prescription. Far from fostering prosperity and sustained economic growth, this prescription has discouraged them.

I would certainly have to agree wholeheartedly with this observation.

The Government cannot spend the country rich. The impetus for sustained economic growth, full employment, and fuller utilization of an expanded productive capacity must come from the private sector of the economy, a vigorous free private enterprise system, aided by a Government which seeks to protect the value and the stability of the dollar.

Quite clearly, 30 years of unbridled public spending, mounting and consistent deficits and incentive-stifling taxation have, on the whole, been a great deal more harmful than beneficial to the economic well-being of this Nation.

Yet are we being asked to come back here after Easter recess to pitch in and restore some order and sanity to the conduct of fiscal affairs? Are we being asked to place the Nation's finances on an even keel?

Quite the contrary. It is true the administration has taken up the cause of tax reduction which so many of us have espoused consistently over the last decade, but nevertheless it continues to plod blindly along the path of its New Deal and Fair Deal predecessors. It proposes a much-needed tax cut, but it more than offsets the beneficial effect of a cut, in fact it even jeopardizes the possibility of obtaining a cut, by urging Congress to vote the largest peacetime budget in history, the largest peacetime request for new obligational authority in history, the largest planned deficit in all our history, and to boost the national debt to an alltime high level.

The New Frontier, spewing its rehashed fiscal ideology in every direction, continues to lead the Nation along that path which its kindred spirit, F. D. R., 31 years ago labeled the "road to bankruptcy." Nothing short of economic disaster will turn it back.

If it continues to march on unhindered, it will have asked for and received by June 30 of next year—a period of a little over 3 years—nearly $285 billion in appropriations, and roughly $305 billion in new obligational authority. It will have led the way in adding over $31 billion to the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, if a return to fiscal sanity is anywhere in sight it will be in spite of, and not because of, the present administration.

Only if the Congress recaptures the initiative will any semblance of order be returned to the conduct of our fiscal affairs. We must renew faith with the American people by seeking resolutely to place national finances on an even keel. We could do no greater disservice to the people whose interests we are here to serve than by ignoring the lessons of the last 30 years and traveling on hand in hand with the most proficient disciples of fiscal irresponsibility the country has yet known.

The Congress will have to go it alone. It is quite obvious that we can expect no significant help from the administration, given its past performance and its desperate reaction to constructive budget-cutting efforts this year.

We are all witnessing the great hue and cry that has arisen over the efforts of the Republican leadership and of some Democrats to carve the fat off the fiscal 1964 budget.

A case in point as to the invalidity of the administration's protests that it had submitted a "barebones" budget was the Clay report, which will surely go down as one of the greatest political boomerangs in modern history. The Clay report, apparently conceived as a blue ribbon whitewash of the foreign aid program, pointed out to the administration a few of the program's faults that responsible elements in the House of Representatives have been telling administrations about for years. This was a bare minimum request for foreign aid, we had been told, and if we cut it we were inviting Communist advances throughout the world. Then, when the President's own committee put the facts on the table, the administration, in a bit of a corner, managed to find some $420 million in the budget that it could somehow cut without advancing the cause of world communism. Is this the kind of tight planning and scrupulous concern for the taxpayers' dollar that goes into the rest of the budget? I suspect it is.

I also suspect that we have seen the last of the Clay Committee and that we shall never see any counterparts in other areas of public spending. There is simply no room along the New Frontier for that kind of honest self-appraisal.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation simply cannot continue indefinitely along its present course for the end of the road is financial oblivion.

We must start now to follow a different path if we are to make the effort at all, because the fiscal program proposed for the coming year is one that certainly contains the seeds of a new inflationary spiral and the promise of higher budgets and greater deficits in the years beyond.

We in the Congress must begin the painful, but necessary, process of establishing spending priorities. We have followed too long the policy of open-end budgeting and we must begin to differentiate between needs and wants.

We must take positive steps to learn our income limitations. All too frequently we return to our respective districts at the end of a session, having voted funds to run the Government for the coming fiscal year, with little or no conception of what revenues will actually be available to meet the expenses. This disorderly method of doing business cannot help but lead to like results.

We must make pursuit of the balanced budget a consistent legislative goal. All too often it has been the practice of the Congress to start from a budget precariously balanced on paper and proceed as rapidly as possible to pay it no more attention.

The American people have a right to expect, and they do expect, that their elected representatives take steps to restore responsibility and integrity to the conduct of fiscal affairs.

I serve notice here and now that I intend to live up to this expectation and that I will not be party to the unbridled spending program proposed for the coming fiscal year.

I say we in this body have to cut our way through the haze and fog of all this fiscal legerdermain and put an end to the irresponsible handling of this Nation's fiscal affairs. I certainly intend to do my part.

SOYBEAN PROCESSING PLANT AT VIENNA, MD.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Delmarva Soya Processors, Inc., has made application to the Area Redevelopment Administration for a loan of $1.6 million to build a soybean processing plant at Vienna, Md. The proposed plant, with a storage capacity of 300 tons per day, will require a 25-year, 4-percent interest loan amounting to about 65 percent of the total cost.

The applicants claim the plant will require 35 employees year around, and as many as 76 during the harvest season. The latter figure was used by the ARA in computing a per job loan cost of $21,000.

According to Mr. Herbert Fenster, Washington counsel for Franklin Perdue of A. W. Perdue & Son, Inc., the application was first reviewed by Mr. Dan McVey, Chief, Grain Branch, Farmer Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, who concluded that the plant could not be operated profitably and therefore recommended against approval.

The Economic Research Service of the USDA as well as the Farmer Cooperative Service has reported unfavorably on the proposed plant. Both divisions reported that the applicant's figures on procurement cost of beans and anticipated price of oil and meal were, in the judgment of the USDA economists, inaccurate and could easily turn their anticipated $600,000 profit into a $200,000 loss.

Mr. McVey, of the Farmer Cooperative Service, and Mr. Donovan McPherson, of the Economic Research Service, are highly qualified in their field, and their recommendations should not be taken lightly. In fact, Mr. McVey is the foremost authority in USDA on the feasibility of projected soybean plants. He investigates feasibility of about one proposed plant per month for the entire Nation.

However, at least McVey's report, if not McPherson's, was edited by REA, which receives and coordinates the work for the USDA on agriculture-related ARA projects such as this. According to my information, REA eliminated the adverse comments on the Delmarva plant sent down by Mr. McVey.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the granting of this loan by the ARA. It appears from all available evidence that the loan would not, as indicated by ARA, result in a net increase in employment.

ARA claims that the proposed plant would, as I have indicated, employ 36 full-time employees, and an additional 38 to 40 during the harvesting season. This claim has no basis in fact. The proposed plant would have the capacity to produce around 300 tons of soybean operation per day. Yet, all available evidence from current soybean millers around the country indicates that plants operating in the neighborhood of 300 tons per day have an average work crew of 22½ men. This total operating crew average includes bean unloading, storage, and handling of bulk products. Furthermore, the larger a plant gets, the more efficient use it gets from its manpower.

One established plant is now running at about 400 tons daily capacity, and employs 29 full-time men, adding only 3 or 4 men during the harvest season. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., which has plants in my own congressional district as well as others around the country, has indicated to me that if they were to build a new plant the size of the proposed Delmarva project, they would employ 19 to 23 full-time people, with no more than 10 to 15 seasonal employees. If employment projections from existing industry are correct—and there is more basis to assume their accuracy than those of ARA—the per job cost of the loan would be $70,000 to $84,000 per job instead of the $21,000 ARA indicates. Furthermore, if this plant begins operation, it is likely that a net loss of at least 45 employees will be incurred by neighboring elevators, grain dealers, and producers already in operation in the area. This loss would be the natural result of increased competition and production in an already flooded market.

While both production and consumption of soybeans have increased remarkably in recent years, soybean processing capacity has increased at an even faster rate. This fact has reduced crushing margins to an extent that some processors have had to close down facilities—for example, General Mills and Archer-Daniels-Midland—and others have withdrawn from the business completely—for example, Spencer Kellogg.

The Delmarva area is no exception. It consumes about 200,000 tons of soybean meal each year. Plants now serving the area have a combined capacity in excess of 450,000 tons, or more than twice the present consumption rate. Present capacity includes a Cargill plant at Norfolk built in 1957 with private capital at a cost of $3.5 million. If the Vienna plant is built, it will either be forced to find export markets for its products, or close down.

In view of the fact that there already is a surplus of soybean plants in the immediate area, it will almost certainly mean that not only the new plant, but existing ones as well will have to operate at a loss to keep going.

With the prospect of a net loss instead of a creation of new jobs, the bleak chances for success faced by the applicants, and the above average investment per man in the proposed facility, it appears that this application certainly does not square with section 2501 of the Area Redevelopment Act, which states in part:

> Under the provisions of this chapter new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources rather than by merely transferring jobs from one area of the United States to another.

On February 18, 1963, my colleague the gentleman from Illinois, William L. Springer, said in a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman:

> From all the facts which I have been able to get, it appears to me that private enterprise is able to crush all of the beans that can be supplied in the Maryland-Delaware area what assurance is there that our taxpayers' money can be repaid by this plant?

In a February 5 letter to ARA Administrator William L. Batt, Senators Byrd and Robertson and the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman Thomas Downing said:

> We have serious doubts concerning the propriety of granting a loan on the basis of the subject application since it appears that the product sought to be financed thereby does not comport with the intent of the Area Redevelopment Act to increase permanent employment; provide funds for worthwhile business projects where private funds are unavailable; and aid in redevelopment of depressed areas by assisting promising and necessary business enterprises. The

> facts which have been presented to us thus far strongly indicate that none of the aforementioned purposes of the act will be accomplished by the granting of the subject application.
>
> It appears that the venture proposed in the application will not increase employment in the depressed area in which it is proposed to be located and may, to the contrary, cause substantial additional unemployment both in the specifically defined depressed area itself and also in surrounding areas of Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware. The members of the applicant group are known to be among the most financially substantial members of their communities and it is difficult therefore to understand why they should not be able to obtain private loans on sound business terms. Finally, the loan would finance an additional soybean processing plant in an area where existing plants present a sound, well-balanced, competitive atmosphere. The result of the operation of such an additional plant may well be to render all plants in the area unprofitable. Under such circumstances, the proposed plant does not appear to be either promising or necessary as a business enterprise in the redevelopment area.

Mr. Speaker, I support the objectives of the Area Redevelopment Act, but it is not my understanding that its purpose is to provide federally financed competition to an industry which is already fully and efficiently serving the needs of consumers in the area involved.

NEED FOR FIRMNESS AND LEADERSHIP

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in light of our continuing concern over the situation in Cuba, I think the following editorial from the Steuben Republican, Angola, Ind., is enlightening and helpful. It expresses a point of view widely held by many Americans:

> NEED FOR FIRMNESS AND LEADERSHIP
>
> In most ways the United States is a great country. But when it comes to our handling of foreign affairs, we rate among the lowest.
>
> The Cuban fiasco is just one evidence of our ineffectual policies. Through stupid handling, we now have a full-blown Communist neighbor just 90 miles from our shores. By calling the Monroe Doctrine, which was recognized by international law, an obsolete policy, we have opened the doors for every would-be dictator in this hemisphere to request Communist help to promote his personal ends.
>
> Our administration has tried to pass off the Cuban situation as unimportant. But already State Department emissaries and even the President himself have had to get busily at work to try and stop the rapid growth in antagonistic feeling toward the United States in Latin America.
>
> We do not recommend warmongering, but we do feel that this lax, ineffectual foreign policy is giving financial and material blood transfusions to our potential enemies and that a continuation of this policy will eventually see our boys receiving this foreign aid back in bullets. This soft policy is encouraging communism.
>
> We need a firm foreign policy. There should be no foreign aid gifts without reasonable controls to see it is used, as intended, for the general betterment of the peoples of the receiving country. We must form a fair, firm policy and then through leadership, see this policy is carried out.
>
> Look at the record. This soft policy which has been tried for 15 years has only fed communism and created enemies out of our onetime friends. We have continued to lose ground. That should be evidence enough that the way we have been going is wrong.
>
> Time is running out. Our Government leaders must start this firm foreign policy at once. There is no other honorable course.

LEGISLATION TO CURB EXCESSIVE IMPORTS OF BEEF

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I introduced yesterday proposed legislation to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of established annual quotas.

I am doing this partially because of the recent sharp decline in fat-cattle prices, and also because of the increasing volume of imports of beef and veal.

My bill would not upset the normal pattern of imports from foreign countries. Instead it would provide a means of discouraging increased imports now—or at any future time—when our domestic cattle market might experience some adversity.

Last year we imported beef and veal in an amount equivalent to about 9 percent of our domestic production, and this is the largest percentage volume on record. The United States imported 1,445 million pounds in 1962—in comparison to 1,037 million pounds in 1961.

We imported live cattle from Mexico in 1961, 540,197 head, and this increased substantially in 1962 to 772,915 head.

While our imports from Canada were down slightly in 1962, it still amounted to 498,782 animals as compared to 506,301 in 1961. A reduction of only 7,519 animals.

There is a definite indication of continuing heavy imports this year. In its reports on sailings from Australia between January 1 and February 4, the Australian Meat Board stated that 15 ships carrying a total of about 50 million pounds of beef and 13.6 million pounds of mutton—which incidentally also competes with our domestic "manufacturing beef"—was sent to various points in the United States.

The New Zealand Meat Producers Board, in its sailings reports, revealed that during January, February, March, and April, the New Zealanders will have delivered almost 50 million pounds of meat to the United States.

The American Cattleman's Association has pointed out—and I agree with their statements fully—that—

> This is strong competition, and particularly so when you consider the condition of the present domestic cattle market which is under pressure from an increased domestic cattle inventory, and is experiencing a weakening in fat-cattle prices due to heavy supplies.

I feel my bill should be given prompt consideration and should be enacted into law. It is important in our import and export agreements to give protection to our own domestic industries; and this is a good place to do so because it involves our food supplies as well as the economic welfare of our domestic livestock economy.

RESTRICT EXCESSIVE BEEF IMPORTS

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CLAUSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to join other Members of this body in giving recognition to a problem that affects a very important segment of my district; namely, the beef and cattle industry.

It is my intent to introduce legislation to bring into line the excessive imports of beef to this country—an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year that exceed the established annual quotas.

The recent decline in cattle prices which appears to be caused by the dramatic increase in volume of imports of beef and veal from Australia, Mexico, and New Zealand. Present and future cattle inventories indicate the domestic cattle market is threatened with a weakening in prices at a time when cattlemen can least afford it. The problem is not created by the established import quotas but rather by the excess inventories literally flooding the market. The smaller, marginal operator is particularly effected and rightfully deserves our consideration before more of our cattle producers are forced out of their present state of self-sufficiency and literally driven to a position of dependency or subservience to our Government. Let us give some semblance of recognition to this problem before it is too late.

FOUR-PARTY DEADLOCK?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am moved to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Four-Party Deadlock." I have found in the past that the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch serves as one of the soundingboards for new themes, dogmas, and arguments of the neo-

Federalists, those who seek to increase the power of the Federal Government vis-a-vis local and State government, and the private sector and who within the Federal Government seek to increase the power of the executive branch at the expense of the Congress.

Prof. James McGregor Burns, of Williams College, has given the neo-Federalists a new takeoff point in his recent book, "The Deadlock of Democracy," which oversimplifies the political history of the United States by speaking of a four-party system, the familiar two-party system split into two each, a congressional and an executive party. There is a modicum of truth to be found for this thesis in the give and take which has always existed between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government, but to take this interesting phenomena and reinterpret our basic political history in light of it is sensationalism. This important factor needs evaluation all right but this overevaluation hurts rather than helps the cause.

This new theme has encouraged the editors of the Post-Dispatch to strike a blow for our incumbent neo-Federalist President, Mr. Kennedy, who admittedly is having a hard time getting his own party in the Congress to support his programs. I think nearer the mark is the fact that the Democratic Party in the Congress is a composition of three elements of basically divergent political views joined together in a political coalition for power. These three elements are the northern city machine Democrat, the southern Democrat, and the ADA or neo-Federalist Democrat who gives the Democratic Party its main propulsion and public image with which it fights Republicans.

The Republican Party in the Congress is not so split in spite of all the efforts of the neo-Federalists to make it appear that it is. Nor was it split in the 83d Congress when Eisenhower was President, the one time in the past 30 years the Republicans did control both the Executive and the Congress. Of course, the neo-Federalists were hard at work trying to implement their programs through their leaders in the Congress and through the entries they had in the Eisenhower Administration. Any time one of their concepts ran into difficulty, the neo-Federalist sought to cast blame on anything and everything except the possibility that the concept itself might be in error.

In keeping with this tone the editorial blames everything except the programs which President Kennedy has been offering the Congress. The merits of the Kennedy proposals are resolved without discussion or debate as follows: "a program which on the whole, in our belief, represents a reasonable consensus of the national electorate." The fact that the national electorate when broken down into the constituencies of the individual Congressmen responds "more to personal, local, and State concerns than to the great and dominating issues of an increasingly urban and homogenous national society" suggests no incongruity to the Post-Dispatch editorialist.

In other words, people are only people when they forget about personal, local, and State concerns and concentrate on great and dominating issues. It is rather that the neo-Federalists are interested in humanity, not in human beings.

Our society is based upon the importance of the individual human being. The American dream is not to make men common but rather to permit common men to become uncommon. This means that humanity thrives as human beings thrive, not that human beings thrive as some abstract concept thrives.

Totalitarian states are based upon the concept of the organization we find among the social insects, the ants and the bees. This concept treats the individual as the servant of the state. It holds each person important only in respect to the whole. The converse concept upon which our society is based is that the state is the servant of the people, the creature of the people. It serves to assist the individual person to pursue what he may deem to be happiness, not what the leaders of the state may decree is happiness, but in this collective pursuit by individuals the entire society is moved forward.

The Post-Dispatch editorial points out that "Mr. Kennedy qualifies as an activist President, anxious and willing to use the full resources of his political power" for his program. The power he has used from time to time, however, has included many powers which freedom dictates no President should either have or use. It follows the philosophy of government by men as opposed to government by law. In the name of abstract humanity it strikes down human beings. The one power which the President has not used to any great extent in dealing with the Congress is the one power which our best Presidents have used, the power of appealing to facts and to reason, to logic and proper persuasion.

Not discussed in the Post-Dispatch editorial is the past and continuing efforts of the President in using untruths and distortions, in making unfair appeals to emotions and in blanking out opposing views and arguments, through his unprecedented use of the device of managing the news as it is politely phrased.

There are many of us who have been anxious to engage the President and his neo-Federalist supporters in straightforward debate on issues of health, education, welfare, foreign affairs, fiscal policy or whatever only to be met by arrogant ad hominem arguments claiming in effect that we, by daring to disagree, are either ignorant or lacking in humanity.

This arrogance is proving to be unproductive. If the President's program is right for our country, let the President and those who advocate it advance their facts and reasons straightforwardly, let them desist in deviously attacking the institutions upon which our freedoms are based, not the least of which is the institution of the Congress of the United States.

The editorial follows:

Four-Party Deadlock

Despite President Kennedy's effort to put a brave face on his reverses in Congress, he and the Nation are facing a grave constitutional problem which only the strongest political leadership can solve. It is no less than the problem of how to forge a truly national party system and to make effective a truly national will.

Mr. Kennedy qualifies as an activist President, anxious and willing to use the full resources of his political power for a program which on the whole, in our belief, represents a reasonable consensus of the national electorate. The trouble is that a national electorate exists only once every 4 years. In the meantime, Presidential power is diluted and offset by a massive power in Congress which derives from local constituencies, many of the critical ones being one-party constituencies, and all of them responding more to personal, local, and State concerns than to the great and dominating issues of an increasingly urban and homogenous national society.

It is easy to say that this is simply the fruit of a noble constitutional system at work, that the Founding Fathers wrought wisely and well and not a single one of their checks and balances should be touched lest democracy itself be damaged. Constitutional safeguards against a dangerous concentration of political power are indeed a vital ingredient of our system which must be preserved. But a surfeit of checks and balances is no more desirable than an excess of power in any branch of our Government. When the process of restraints and countervailing authority reaches the point of near-paralysis of government, the time has come to ask how well the system serves a modern society facing problems not always soluble by infinite delay.

A brilliant analysis of the crisis and some proposals for tackling it have been offered in a recent book, "The Deadlock of Democracy" (Prentice-Hall, Inc.), by James McGregor Burns of Williams College, President Kennedy's biographer. Professor Burns points out that we operate under what is essentially a four-party system, rooted in history. Both Democrats and Republicans are split into a presidential and a congressional party, and except in times of national emergency the overwhelming preponderance of power rests with the congressional parties, which are by nature more conservative, parochial, isolationist, and quiescent than the presidential wings of both parties, based upon a national electorate.

The problem is not new but our society of the 1960's is, and the question is whether four-party deadlock serves that society well. Nobody wants to repeal the Constitution, but the genius of our organic law has been its capacity for adaptation to changing times. The four-party system requires coalition government which tinkers with the fringes of national problems rather than attacking them boldly. We need to make national leadership by two responsible national parties effective.

It is easier to diagnose the disease than to project a remedy. Professor Burns suggests such relatively modest reforms as national control of national elections, expansion of the electorate to include all now disfranchised, the development of grassroots party membership, elimination of the seniority system, the filibuster and other devices of obstruction in Congress. But above all, he calls for strong Presidential leadership—"responsible, committed, effective and, exuberant leadership—in establishing a majority party able to govern and a minority party able to oppose."

It is interesting that Professor Burns concluded his preelection biography of John F. Kennedy by posing the question whether his subject possessed a deep commitment to the ideals and principles he embraced intellectually. The question has still not been answered. Whether the President chooses to grapple with the basic political problem of our time will go far to give the answer.

INTERNAL REVENUE'S UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Internal Revenue is guilty of unfair labor practices—truly slave-labor tactics. We are all part of a vast army of involuntary workers on an unpaid payroll.

The claim by Internal Revenue Commissioner Mortimer Caplin that the cost of collecting Federal income taxes is less than one-half cent for each dollar collected is misleading. Mr. Caplin made the statement in a message to taxpayers printed on the front page of Federal income tax forms.

The one-half cent cost for each dollar collected does not take into account the vast unpaid payroll of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. All individuals and business firms pay tax collection costs and thus the Bureau gets free employees and free record service.

Every taxpayer is an involuntary employee of the Bureau, forced to keep records and make reports—often at great cost. For this he gets no pay. He cannot even deduct this out-of-the-pocket cost in computing taxes. To add insult to injury, the taxpayer does not even get credit from Commissioner Caplin for his servitude.

Unpaid, involuntary employment is an unfair labor practice. Certainly no business can force people to work and not pay them. Yet the Bureau of Internal Revenue can and does. Threat of fines and jail sentences intimidates taxpayers and keeps them working for the Bureau.

I own a country weekly newspaper, and I estimate the cost of keeping records and making reports—solely for tax purposes—exceeds 6 cents for each tax dollar remitted. The half-cent about which Mr. Caplin speaks is only a fraction of the total cost of tax collection.

The time required to keep records, compute taxes, and complete forms represents an unmentioned but substantial hidden cost to each taxpaying business firm and individual. To the cautious and prudent taxpayer the direct out-of-the-pocket cost of tax counseling or attorney fees is not even a hidden expense.

IS CONGRESS ON LAST LEGS?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress must retrieve its lost mandate. An article by the noted columnist, Holmes Alexander, given nationwide distribution in the press yesterday, suggests that the process of yielding to the Executive is resulting in congressional abdication of its responsibilities to the people.

I believe that Congress is composed of serious and dedicated Members who, particularly in the present session, recognize that the current crises in foreign affairs and in domestic fiscal policy are at long last the result of too much crying wolf in the past. I am convinced that this Congress will meet this crisis by acting in the best interests of the country and that in this objective gentlemen on both sides of the aisle will join to save America.

So far as Mr. Alexander's message serves to alert us to our responsibilities in this regard, it is a valuable public contribution. This Congress under the Constitution quite properly will refuse to be a rubberstamp for the Executive.

This is what Mr. Alexander had to say:

Is Congress on Last Legs?

(By Holmes Alexander)

> Several of President Kennedy's henchmen—among them McNamara, Sylvester, and Roosevelt—have recently taken a few licks from congressional committees, but the situation should not be misunderstood. It isn't the executive branch which is on the defensive. It's Congress, which is pinned to the ropes, although fighting back with uneven spurts of ferocity.
>
> Secretary McNamara's ordeal shows how far we have moved into an age where decision at the executive level far outreaches debate at the legislative level. I do not think this is a desirable state of affairs, but it has to be reported nonetheless. The heyday of the lawmaker seems on the wane. The voice of the technician is heard in the land. Whether it is arming the Nation, conquering space or mastering the Budget, the expert from the executive branch not only states the problems, but brings in the solutions.
>
> Some year ago, Candidate Kennedy, speaking of the White House, told a reporter in much-quoted words, "That's where the power is." The President today could add a corollary by nodding toward Capitol Hill and saying: "That's where the power isn't."
>
> Although McNamara has been roughed up in the McClellan committee's probe of the TFX aircraft contracts, there never has been much doubt as to the outcome of the hassle. The aerodynamic complexities, as well as the economic extrapolations, are just too overwhelming for congressional comprehension.
>
> The dogged McClellan may get his teeth into the facts. Some of the airminded Senators like Symington, Jackson, and Goldwater may have informed opinions as to whether General Dynamics or Boeing should build the TFX. Other Senators may even feel qualified to act as referees in the continuous tug of war for the multibillion-dollar contracts.
>
> But Congress as a whole is not competent to make decisions of this magnitude—and Congress knows it. It will pommel the Secretary out of resentment and frustration. But there is not the slightest prospect that Congress would dare substitute its own judgment for that of McNamara's.
>
> Then there's Arthur Sylvester, McNamara's chief of information, who has been catching it on both ends of Capitol Hill. He stands charged with manipulating the flow of information to suit the purposes of his bosses. Sylvester is a man of strong will and sensitive feelings. He has offended Congressmen and Senators from the very beginning of this tenure, and they have dealt him stinging punishment—which he feels. Ten years ago there were congressional committees which could, and did, lash presidential subordinates into submission or out of office.
>
> This may happen to Sylvester, but it's doubtful. Not so much because he is tougher than his predecessors, but because the arm which wields the lash is noticeably weaker. Sylvester's ability to survive this long is a manifestation of where the power lies.
>
> Franklin Roosevelt, Jr.'s, nomination to be Under Secretary of Commerce can only be described as an abomination. It affronted public opinion, the press and political morality. He did not, for many reasons, deserve confirmation, and everybody knew it. But the Senate Commerce Committee, which a few years ago broke the career of a far better man, Lewis Strauss, simply sputtered—and caved in, as did the Senate.
>
> Congress isn't what it used to be. The big, and perhaps the impossible, problems seem to soften its will to the point where even small and manageable problems are muffed. Here in the springtime of everlasting renaissance, one must never abandon hope. But it's hard to look upon these performances and believe that there's much life left in the old lion of Capitol Hill.

MOTOR VEHICLE TRANSPORTATION TAX

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, more than a quarter of a century ago—in June 1934—the Congress enacted the Hayden-Cartwright Act which, among other things, declared that "it is unfair to tax motor vehicle transportation unless the proceeds of such taxation are applied to the construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways." In 1958 this declaration was codified as section 126(a) of title 23, United States Code.

Twenty-eight States have adopted constitutional amendments dedicating highway user revenues to highway purposes. All but two of the existing constitutional amendments were adopted subsequent to the enactment—and presumably at least partially as a result—of the Federal Hayden-Cartwright Act. The history of the adoption of these constitutional amendments demonstrates conclusively that when the public is afforded the opportunity to vote on the subject, it overwhelmingly votes in favor of dedicating special highway user taxes to highway purposes. According to statistics published by the Highway Users Conference, Inc., such "good roads amendments" have been adopted by an average vote of about 2⅓ to 1. In my own State of New Hampshire, the amendment was adopted in 1938 by a vote of 4 to 1.

Despite the policy expressed in the Hayden-Cartwright Act and its effect on State policies, the Federal Government now devotes only about two-thirds of the proceeds of Federal highway user taxes to highway purposes—and about one-third of the proceeds of such taxes to general governmental purposes. As the Speaker and my colleagues know, the Federal aid highway program is financed out of the highway trust fund, which was established by the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. The present distribution of revenues derived from Federal highway user taxes is as follows:

Taxes on gasoline, diesel and special fuels: 100 percent to trust fund.

Taxes on tires, tubes and tread rubber: 100 percent to trust fund.

Taxes on new trucks, buses and trailers: 100 percent to trust fund.

Taxes on certain motor vehicle use: 100 percent to trust fund.

Taxes on new automobiles and motorcycles; None to trust fund.

Taxes on motor vehicle parts and accessories: None to trust fund.

Tax on lubricating oil: None to trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, during calendar year 1962 the Federal Government collected more than $4.7 billion in automotive taxes from the highway users of the Nation. However, more than $1.6 billion—or more than one-third—of this amount was diverted to general governmental purposes rather than the construction, improvement or maintenance of highways.

This reminds me of the traditional and somewhat cynical parental admonition, "Do what I tell you, not what I do."

Today I have introduced a bill to provide for the transfer to the highway trust fund the proceeds of those Federal highway user taxes now being deposited in the general fund. Enactment of this bill will provide tangible evidence to the owners of the Nation's nearly 80 million motor vehicles that their Federal Government intends to accord them fair and equitable treatment. More than that, however, it will provide financial assurance that the Federal-aid highway program will continue on an orderly, scheduled basis, and that the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways will be completed as originally planned.

I am fully aware of the fact that the receipts of the highway trust fund are now expected to be adequate to finance the Federal-aid highway program, including completion of the Interstate System, on the basis of the latest cost estimates. But let me emphasize that qualifying phrase, "on the basis of the latest cost estimates." Historically, cost estimates have proved to be very unreliable.

The current accelerated highway program was launched by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. The Highway Revenue Act of 1956 established the Highway Trust Fund and provided for the deposit therein of revenues then estimated to be sufficient to finance the program, including completion of the Interstate System, on the basis of the latest cost estimates available at that time.

By 1959, it had become apparent that the financial arrangements for the Federal-aid highway program were not adequate, because of increased costs and other factors. The 86th Congress provided for interim relief by enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959, but deferred so-called permanent action until later. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 provided so-called permanent solutions to the financial problems, on the basis of cost estimates prepared in 1960, and submitted to the Congress in 1961.

Despite enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961, it is still not certain that the financial problems of the Federal-aid highway program are solved. The rate of expenditure of Federal funds must still be controlled by reimbursement planning—a device which slows the rate of highway construction in many States. Because of the precarious balance of the trust fund it will be necessary to continue reimbursement planning for several years—unless additional funds are made available to the trust fund.

Also, as I mentioned earlier, the present financial arrangements for the highway program were based on cost estimates prepared in 1960. An index of bid prices on federally aided highway construction prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads showed that costs were falling until 1960. Immediately thereafter, however, costs began to rise, and this trend is still continuing.

Under existing law, the next estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System is not to be submitted to the Congress until 1966. It seems very probable that this estimate will exceed the last estimate by a considerable amount. If so, the Congress again will be faced with a financial crisis, as it was in 1959 and 1961.

Transferring all highway user taxes to the Highway Trust Fund would guard against this, and would also carry out the principle stated in the Hayden-Cartwright Act that "it is unfair and unjust to tax motor vehicle transportation unless the proceeds of such taxation are applied to the construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways." It is for these reasons that I have introduced a bill to accomplish this. I hope that the Congress will give early and favorable consideration to the bill.

EIGHTH ENCYCLICAL OF POPE JOHN

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Sibal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Pope John XXIII has just issued the eighth encyclical of his reign. It is devoted to the overriding problem of peace. With the Pope, all of us feel the weight and tensions of these times when we live under the sword of nuclear holocaust. Pope John's message is an optimistic one filled with faith in the future of mankind. It should cheer us as we, who are also charged with public responsibilities, seek the road to lasting peace.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Healey (at the request of Mr. Murphy of New York) for Wednesday, April 10, 1963, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Cohelan.

Mr. Laird and to include charts and other extraneous matter in his remarks made today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Harsha) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Berry.

Mr. Short.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4. An act to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 18. An act to change the name of Harpers Ferry National Mounnment to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 138. An act to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 932. An act relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4423. An act permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

670. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1964 in the amount of $200,000 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 99); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

671. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 314. Resolution to grant additional authority to the Committee on Education and Labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. First report of the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Second report of the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 5585. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide a special definition of "fair value" in certain cases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 5586. A bill to establish a program to recruit the ablest of our citizens qualified to become leaders in their fields, and to increase their usefulness by preparatory education and training for service to American Government, science, education, commerce, and culture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5587. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the waiting period for disability insurance benefits may be waived in cases where the severity of the disability is immediately determinable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5588. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5589. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 5590. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to prohibit participation of Federal-aid funds in certain State or local taxes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5591. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Council on Architecture and Urban Design, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 5592. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5593. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Myrtle Beach, S.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 5594. A bill to prescribe administrative procedure for the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 5595. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide additional pension and medical assistance to veterans suffering from seriously disabling non-service-connected disabilities; to provide for expansion of health facilities for such veterans; to authorize 5,000 beds for nursing care for veterans, of which not less than 200 shall be in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 5596. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5597. A bill to establish the Channel Islands National Seashore, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 5598. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Temporary Extended Railroad Unemployment Insurance Benefits Act of 1961 to increase the creditable and taxable compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5599. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 5600. A bill to provide for a program whereby the Federal Government may guarantee bonds issued by States and municipalities in carrying out construction programs for certain public sanitary facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 5601. A bill to provide that the proceeds of certain taxes shall be used to finance the Federal-aid highway program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5602. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the filing of reports by surety companies with the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 5603. A bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5604. A bill to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 5605. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to prevent discrimination because of sex in payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 5606. A bill to provide for the disposition of community areas established for reclamation purposes on withdrawn or acquired lands of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 5607. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5608. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1932, relating to the control of possession in the District of Columbia of dangerous weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 5609. A bill to extend service pension benefits to certain persons who served honorably as commissioned officers in the Philippine constabulary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5610. A bill to amend part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act to permit certain common carriers to give free transportation to their agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 5611. A bill to prohibit the exclusion of dog guides for the blind from certain public carriers, transport terminals, and other places of business which operate in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5612. A bill to incorporate the Young Engineers and Scientists of America, for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85-875; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 5613. A bill to enable the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to aid the arts in ways similar to those in which the arts are aided by other cities of the United States, to provide competitions to encourage young Americans in the pursuit of excellence in the fine arts and to acquaint them with the best of our national cultural heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.J. Res. 378. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 379. Joint resolution to provide stricter controls over expenditures by Members of Congress traveling outside the United States, to require employees of Members to serve at specific places, to provide for the reporting of annual financial statements by the Members of Congress, to establish a uniform code of ethics for Members of Congress and employees of the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to gaining the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Con. Res. 136. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to freedom determination for captive nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting to veterans of World War I pensions comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the

President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 5614. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Zafiropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 5615. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nelly Ramirez and Sandra Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 5616. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Brygida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H.R. 5617. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Renee Louise Gabrielle Huffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5618. A bill for the relief of Carlos Pavao Alves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5619. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eric Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 5620. A bill for the relief of Mario Del Signore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 5621. A bill for the relief of Matteo Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

85. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of the City Council of the City of Omaha, Nebr., protesting the Internal Revenue Service proposal to eliminate the Omaha regional office; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

86. By Mr. HANNA: Petition to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

87. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Robert M. Tiller, attorney at law, Louisville, Ky., and others urging the Congress of the United States to conduct a complete and impartial investigation of the U.S. State Department; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

88. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of Martha Dows Society, Children of the American Revolution, Spencer, Iowa, urging enactment of legislation to authorize the designation of Patriotic Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 1963

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of our spirits, we turn unfilled to Thy exhaustless mercy, not in any assurance of our feeble hold of Thee, but in the assurance of Thy mighty grasp of us. By the benedictions of Thy renewing grace, may we be lifted above the mud and the scum of mere things to the holiness of Thy beauty, so that even drab, daily duties will be edged with crimson and gold.

In this tumultuous day when the hammers of Thy purpose are beating out new shapes on the anvil of this changing world, may this dear land, founded in Thy name, be fashioned into a fitting instrument through which Thy will may be done on the earth. So may we, though but earthen vessels, become partners with Thee in a world distraught, uncertain, uprooted, groping, and in desperate need of a pattern for peace found only in Thy will, as there comes to earth the kingdom of redeeming love which casts out all fear.

We lift our prayer in Christ's spirit and name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 9, 1963, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today. Let me say this request has been cleared with the minority leadership, and meets with their approval.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND A PROVISION FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, 1963 (S. DOC. NO. 11)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed appropriation in the amount of $6 million for the Department of the Interior, and a provision for the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year 1963, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

AUDIT REPORT ON GENERAL SUPPLY FUND, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the General Supply Fund, General Services Administration, fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON COMPILATION OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the compilation of General Accounting Office findings and recommendations for improving Government operations, fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING CERTAIN PETITIONS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION A

"Joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Michigan*, That the 87th Congress of the United States of America, at its second session, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States:

" 'JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE—

" ' "SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.' "

"Therefore, in the name of, and on behalf of, the people of the State of Michigan, we do hereby ratify, approve and assent to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"*Resolved further*, That certified copies of this joint resolution be transmitted by the Governor of the State of Michigan, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Attest:

"NORMAN E. PHILLES,
"*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*
"BERYL J. KENYON,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION GRANTING TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I PENSIONS COMPARABLE TO GRANTS TO VETERANS OF AMERICAN WARS PRIOR TO WORLD WAR I

"Whereas the national policy of the United States concerning veterans of the United States has been to grant assistance to them in declining years by a pension, in consideration of their military services in defense of our country; and

"Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I by the United States: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension to veterans of World War I comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted March 25, 1963.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk.*

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, March 27, 1963.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution authorizing the temporary placement in the rotunda of the Capitol of a statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and the holding of ceremonies incident thereto (Rept. No. 139);

S. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota (Rept. No. 139);

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution for ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South Dakota (Rept. No. 131);

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to tender thanks of Congress to South Dakota for the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall (Rept. No. 131);

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document the proceedings at the acceptance of the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall (Rept. No. 131);

S. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part I of Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958" (Rept. No. 132);

S. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business of its hearing of the 87th Congress on "Space Satellite Communications" (Rept. No. 133);

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President (Rept. No. 134);

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled, "Our Flag" (Rept. No. 135);

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of a wall map of the United States (Rept. No. 136);

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document (Rept. No. 137);

S. Res. 113. Resolution to print, as a Senate document, with additional copies, a report on the Alliance for Progress, 1963, by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Rept. No. 129);

S. Res. 117. Resolution relating to printing of "Mission to Southeast Asia" (Rept. No. 130); and

S. Res. 119. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and tendering thanks of Congress therefor (Rept. No. 139);

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments (Rept. No. 138).

MATTIE V. GRUBBS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 122); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mattie V. Grubbs, sister of James O. Martin, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to eleven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EDDIE H. NORWOOD—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 123); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eddie H. Norwood, widow of Thomas E. Norwood, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FANNIE HILL, LEONARD M. HILL, AND LAWRENCE A. HILL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 124); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Fannie Hill, sister, and to Leonard M. Hill and Lawrence A. Hill, brothers of Elijah B. Hill, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to two months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CAROLYN P. MERIWETHER—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 125); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Carolyn P. Meriwether, widow of Yancey D. Meriwether, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of February 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FEBRUARY AND JANUARY 1963, AND PAY, JANUARY 1963 AND DECEMBER 1962

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I, p. 2)

Information in monthly personnel reports for February 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows.

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In February numbered—	In January numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In January was—	In December was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,483,511	2,477,940	+5,571	$1,382,859	$1,337,052	+$45,807
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,421,632	1,413,830	+7,802	800,080	789,232	+10,848
Department of Defense	1,061,879	1,064,110	−2,231	582,779	547,820	+34,959
Inside the United States	2,314,127	2,309,293	+4,834			
Outside the United States	169,384	168,647	+737			
Industrial employment	563,990	565,084	−1,094			
Foreign nationals	168,202	168,766	−564	27,545	28,865	−1,320

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY, FEBRUARY AND JANUARY 1963

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1963, and comparison with January 1963, and pay for January 1963, and comparison with December 1962*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	February	January	Increase	Decrease	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	101,201	101,017	184		$60,942	$49,809	$11,133	
Commerce	30,272	29,890	382		19,853	18,737	1,116	
Health, Education, and Welfare	77,859	77,521	338		42,027	39,428	2,599	
Interior	64,209	61,595	2,614		35,567	33,000	2,567	
Justice	31,874	31,902		28	22,982	20,335	2,647	
Labor	8,954	8,883	71		5,630	5,095	535	
Post Office	582,097	583,991		1,894	314,188	[1] 350,066		$35,878
State [2] [3]	41,430	41,214	216		22,458	20,565	1,893	
Treasury	89,758	85,073	4,685		52,490	47,931	4,559	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	354	351	3		257	236	21	
Bureau of the Budget	463	468		5	444	402	42	
Council of Economic Advisers	52	50	2		56	44	12	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	75	73	2		45	41	4	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	28	28			28	24	4	
National Security Council	40	45		5	35	31	4	
Office of Emergency Planning	418	434		16	375	350	25	
Office of Science and Technology	65	45	20		28	27	1	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	27	27			23	21	2	
American Battle Monuments Commission	385	389		4	84	81	3	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,020	6,992	28		5,562	5,123	439	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	602	607		5	424	387	37	
Civil Aeronautics Board	831	832		1	674	614	60	
Civil Service Commission	4,141	4,145		4	2,714	2,752		38
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	84	85		1	55	52	3	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	2	1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	283	281	2		200	198	2	
Farm Credit Administration	241	240	1		185	170	15	
Federal Aviation Agency	45,332	45,256	76		34,467	30,470	3,997	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	6	6			5	4	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,441	1,443		2	1,075	973	102	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,238	1,246		8	867	786	81	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,217	1,216	1		852	764	88	
Federal Maritime Commission	216	211	5		164	145	19	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	391	391			370	339	31	
Federal Power Commission	1,094	1,063	31		797	724	73	
Federal Trade Commission	1,139	1,139			848	772	76	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	115	111	4		63	58	5	
General Accounting Office	4,584	4,585		1	3,209	2,927	282	
General Services Administration	32,038	31,959	79		16,729	15,148	1,581	
Government Printing Office	7,145	7,135	10		4,238	3,883	355	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,808	13,704	104		9,086	8,268	818	
Indian Claims Commission	21	22		1	23	26		3
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,390	2,394		4	1,786	1,602	184	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	26,673	26,210	463		20,986	18,421	2,565	
National Capital Housing Authority	423	414	9		202	184	18	
National Capital Planning Commission	56	53	3		38	33	5	
National Capital Transportation Agency	85	81	4		64	55	9	
National Gallery of Art	322	323		1	151	136	15	
National Labor Relations Board	2,017	2,004	13		1,485	1,359	126	
National Mediation Board	134	133	1		133	116	17	
National Science Foundation	956	884	72		644	673		29
Panama Canal	15,730	15,634	96		5,320	4,993	327	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	47	43	4		32	30	2	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,004	2,004			1,216	1,117	99	
Renegotiation Board	208	207	1		189	166	23	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	163	158	5		102	99	3	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,402	1,409		7	1,034	946	88	
Selective Service System	6,811	6,817		6	2,344	2,132	212	
Small Business Administration	3,212	3,203	9		2,218	1,971	247	
Smithsonian Institution	1,382	1,351	31		739	668	71	
Soldiers' Home	1,055	1,056		1	373	352	21	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	40	[4] 45		5	39	44		5
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26			23	21	2	
Tariff Commission	267	266	1		211	196	15	
Tax Court of the United States	156	154	2		126	119	7	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,272	17,608		336	11,478	10,130	1,348	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	124	113	11		85	82	3	
U.S. Information Agency	11,553	11,517	36		5,398	4,969	429	
Veterans' Administration	173,405	[4] 173,482		77	83,380	77,682	5,698	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,157	562	595		152	118	34	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,421,632	1,413,830	10,214	2,412	800,080	789,232	46,801	35,953
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			7,802				10,848	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1963, and comparison with January 1963, and pay for January 1963, and comparison with December 1962*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	February	January	Increase	Decrease	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,079	2,075	4		$1,687	$1,660	$27	
Department of the Army	[5] 381,685	383,453		1,768	199,572	190,704	8,868	
Department of the Navy	[5] 343,432	344,438		1,006	199,399	183,686	15,713	
Department of the Air Force	305,293	306,347		1,054	167,324	159,139	8,185	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,019	2,017	2		1,081	1,011	70	
Defense Communications Agency	526	478	48		310	165	145	
Defense Intelligence Agency	311	306	5		219	191	28	
Defense Supply Agency	[5] 24,965	23,427	1,538		11,951	10,094	1,857	
Office of Civil Defense	1,044	1,032	12		913	867	46	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	40		1	36	31	5	
Interdepartmental activities	14	20		6	15	17		$2
International military activities	58	58			42	39	3	
Armed Forces information and education activities	414	419		5	230	216	14	
Total, Department of Defense	1,061,879	1,064,110	1,609	3,840	582,779	547,820	34,961	2
Net change, Department of Defense			2,231				34,959	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [6] [7]	2,483,511	2,477,940	11,823	6,252	1,382,859	1,337,052	81,762	35,955
Net increase, including Department of Defense			5,571				45,807	

---

[1] Includes pay to temporary Christmas employees.

[2] February figure includes 16,536 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 16,401 in January and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The February figure includes 4,218 of these trust fund employees and the January figure includes, 4,179.

[3] February figure includes 872 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 860 in January and their pay.

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

[5] In February 701 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 238 from the Department of the Army and 463 from the Department of the Navy.

[6] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[7] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658), as follows:

Agency	February	January	Change
Agriculture Department	5,974	4,897	+1,077
Interior Department	5,610	3,259	+2,351
Tennessee Valley Authority	32		+32
Veterans' Administration	46	7	+39
Department of the Army	494	495	-1
Total	12,156	8,658	+3,498

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1963, and comparison with January 1963*

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	100,005	99,819	186	
Commerce	29,625	29,254	371	
Health, Education, and Welfare	77,274	76,909	365	
Interior	63,666	61,080	2,586	
Justice	31,533	31,553		20
Labor	8,858	8,786	72	
Post Office	580,646	582,539		1,893
State [1] [2]	10,496	10,393	103	
Treasury	89,135	84,459	4,676	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	354	351	3	
Bureau of the Budget	463	468		5
Council of Economic Advisers	52	50	2	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	75	73	2	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	28	28		
National Security Council	40	45		5
Office of Emergency Planning	418	434		16
Office of Science and Technology	65	45	20	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	27	27		
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,987	6,959	28	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	602	607		5
Civil Aeronautics Board	830	831		1
Civil Service Commission	4,136	4,141		5
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7		
Commission on Civil Rights	84	85		1
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	283	281	2	
Farm Credit Administration	241	240	1	
Federal Aviation Agency	44,323	44,248	75	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	6	6		
Federal Communications Commission	1,439	1,441		2
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,236	1,244		8
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,217	1,216	1	
Federal Maritime Commission	216	211	5	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	391	391		
Federal Power Commission	1,094	1,063	31	
Federal Trade Commission	1,139	1,139		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	72	66	6	
General Accounting Office	4,497	4,498		1
General Services Administration	32,026	31,947	79	
Government Printing Office	7,145	7,135	10	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,625	13,522	103	
Indian Claims Commission	21	22		1
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,390	2,394		4
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	26,661	26,198	463	
National Capital Housing Authority	423	414	9	
National Capital Planning Commission	56	53	3	
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Capital Transportation Agency	85	81	4	
National Gallery of Art	322	323		1
National Labor Relations Board	1,983	1,970	13	
National Mediation Board	134	133	1	
National Science Foundation	944	871	73	
Panama Canal	148	153		5
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	47	43	4	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,004	2,004		
Renegotiation Board	208	207	1	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	163	158	5	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,402	1,409		7
Selective Service System	6,658	6,665		7
Small Business Administration	3,158	3,151	7	
Smithsonian Institution	1,366	1,339	27	
Soldiers' Home	1,055	1,056		1
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	40	[3] 45		5
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26		
Tariff Commission	267	266	1	
Tax Court of the United States	156	154	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,270	17,606		336
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	124	113	11	
U.S. Information Agency	3,213	3,215		2
Veterans' Administration	172,398	172,469		71
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,357,092	1,350,143	9,351	2,402
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			6,949	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,016	2,014	2	
Department of the Army	[4] 329,588	331,293		1,705
Department of the Navy	[4] 319,108	320,086		978
Department of the Air Force	276,982	278,007		1,025
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,019	2,017	2	
Defense Communications Agency	498	452	46	
Defense Intelligence Agency	311	306	5	
Defense Supply Agency	[4] 24,965	23,427	1,538	
Office of Civil Defense	1,044	1,032	12	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	40		1
Interdepartmental activities	13	19		6
International military activities	38	38		
Armed Forces information and education activities	414	419		5
Total, Department of Defense	957,035	959,150	1,605	3,720
Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,115	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,314,127	2,309,293	10,956	6,122
Net increase, including Department of Defense			4,834	

---

[1] February figure includes 2,736 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,720 in January.

[2] February figure includes 595 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 588 in January.

[3] Revised.

[4] In February 701 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 238 from the Department of the Army and 463 from the Department of the Navy.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1963, and comparison with January 1963*

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,196	1,198	--------	2
Commerce	647	636	11	--------
Health, Education, and Welfare	585	612	--------	27
Interior	543	515	28	--------
Justice	341	349	--------	8
Labor	96	97	--------	1
Post Office	1,451	1,452	--------	1
State [1] [2]	30,934	30,821	113	--------
Treasury	623	614	9	--------
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	378	382	--------	4
Atomic Energy Commission	33	33	--------	--------
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1	--------	--------
Civil Service Commission	5	4	1	--------
Federal Aviation Agency	1,009	1,008	1	--------
Federal Communications Commission	2	2	--------	--------
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2	--------	--------
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	43	45	--------	2
General Accounting Office	87	87	--------	--------
General Services Administration	12	12	--------	--------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	183	182	1	--------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	12	12	--------	--------
National Labor Relations Board	34	34	--------	--------
National Science Foundation	12	13	--------	1
Panama Canal	15,582	15,481	101	--------
Independent agencies—Continued				
Selective Service System	153	152	1	--------
Small Business Administration	54	52	2	--------
Smithsonian Institution	16	12	4	--------
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2	--------	--------
U.S. Information Agency	8,340	8,302	38	--------
Veterans' Administration	1,007	1,013	--------	6
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,157	562	595	--------
Total, excluding Department of Defense	64,540	63,687	905	52
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	853	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	63	61	2	--------
Department of the Army	52,097	52,160	--------	63
Department of the Navy	24,324	24,352	--------	28
Department of the Air Force	28,311	28,340	--------	29
Defense Communications Agency	28	26	2	--------
Interdepartmental activities	1	1	--------	--------
International military activities	20	20	--------	--------
Total, Department of Defense	104,844	104,960	4	120
Net decrease, Department of Defense	--------	--------	116	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	169,384	168,647	909	172
Net increase, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	737	

[1] February figure includes 13,800 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 13,681 in January. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The February figure includes 4,218 of these trust fund employees and the January figure includes 4,179.

[2] February figure includes 277 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 272 in January.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1963, and comparison with January 1963*

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,793	3,779	14	--------
Commerce	5,467	5,404	63	--------
Interior	8,543	8,490	53	--------
Post Office	254	252	2	--------
Treasury	5,244	5,184	60	--------
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	253	250	3	--------
Federal Aviation Agency	2,977	2,938	39	--------
General Services Administration	1,782	1,766	16	--------
Government Printing Office	7,145	7,135	10	--------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	26,673	26,210	463	--------
Panama Canal	8,095	8,074	21	--------
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	157	156	1	--------
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,117	14,551	--------	434
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,157	562	595	--------
Total, excluding Department of Defense	85,657	84,751	1,340	434
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	906	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 139,000	[2] 139,711	--------	711
Outside the United States	[1] 4,600	[2] 4,611	--------	11
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	196,974	197,509	--------	535
Outside the United States	1,280	1,279	1	--------
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	133,327	134,064	--------	737
Outside the United States	1,196	1,196	--------	--------
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,956	1,963	--------	7
Total, Department of Defense	478,333	480,333	1	2,001
Net decrease, Department of Defense	--------	--------	2,000	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	563,990	565,084	1,341	2,435
Net decrease, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	1,094	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of February 1963 and comparison with January 1963*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	February	January	February	January	February	January	February	January
Canada	37	35					37	35
Crete	62	61	--------	--------	--------	--------	62	61
England	3,150	3,324	--------	--------	107	102	3,043	3,222
France	21,882	22,007	17,876	18,090	11	11	3,995	3,906
Germany	81,692	81,762	68,805	68,992	85	85	12,802	12,685
Greece	264	266	--------	--------	--------	--------	264	266
Greenland	138	174	--------	--------	--------	--------	138	174
Japan	51,909	51,979	18,507	18,553	14,266	14,225	19,136	19,201
Korea	6,224	6,207	6,224	6,207	--------	--------	--------	--------
Morocco	2,231	2,357	--------	--------	763	786	1,468	1,571
Netherlands	56	54	--------	--------	--------	--------	56	54
Trinidad	557	540	--------	--------	557	540	--------	--------
Total	168,202	168,766	111,412	111,842	15,789	15,749	41,001	41,175

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of February totaling 2,483,511 as compared with 2,477,940 in January. This was a net increase of 5,571, including a net increase of 3,498 in temporary employment under the public works acceleration program authorized by Public Law 87-658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1963, which began July 1, 1962, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1962—July	2,510,950	14,455	
August	2,512,199	1,249	
September	2,485,324		26,875
October	2,482,982		2,342
November	2,498,312	15,330	
December	2,486,628		11,684
1963—January	2,477,940		8,688
February	2,483,511	5,571	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of February was 1,421,632, an increase of 7,802 as compared with the January total of 1,413,830. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in February was 1,061,879, a decrease of 2,231 as compared with 1,064,110 in January.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases (primarily seasonal) were Treasury Department with 4,685, Interior Department with 2,614 and Virgin Islands Corporation with 595. The largest decrease was reported by the Post Office Department with 1,894.

In the Department of Defense the larger decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Army Department with 1,768, Air Force Department with 1,054, and Navy Department with 1,006. The largest increase was reported by the Defense Supply Agency with 1,538.

Inside the United States, civilian employment increased 4,834 and outside the United States, civilian employment increased 737. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in February totaled 563,990, a decrease of 1,094.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,483,511 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 168,202 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during February who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in January was 168,766. A breakdown of this employment for February follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	37			37
Crete	62			62
England	3,150		107	3,043
France	21,882	17,876	11	3,995
Germany	81,692	68,805	85	12,802
Greece	264			264
Greenland	138			138
Japan	51,909	18,507	14,266	19,136
Korea	6,224	6,224		
Morocco	2,231		763	1,468
Netherlands	56			56
Trinidad	557		557	
Total	168,202	111,412	15,789	41,001

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of January 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, JANUARY 1963

INTRODUCTION

This is the 38th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of January 1963.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of January 1, 1963, totaled $14,351,084,895, and as of January 31, 1963, they totaled $14,159,810,325, a net decrease of $191,274,570 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile[1]	$5,888,903,600	$5,879,281,200	−$9,622,400
Defense Production Act	1,500,603,900	1,500,905,400	+301,500
Supplemental—barter	1,298,441,167	1,304,643,502	+6,202,335
Total, strategic and critical materials[1]	8,687,948,667	8,684,830,102	−3,118,565
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	5,232,359,708	5,042,931,625	−189,428,083
Inventory transferred from national stockpile[1]	128,232,289	127,874,190	−358,099
Total, agricultural commodities[1]	5,360,591,997	5,170,805,815	−189,786,182
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	31,228,342	32,377,298	+1,148,956
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	176,922,589	177,403,810	+481,221
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	208,150,931	209,781,108	+1,630,177
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	2,230,800	2,230,800	
National Industrial Reserve Act	92,162,500	92,162,500	
Total, machine tools	94,393,300	94,393,300	
Total, all inventories	14,351,084,895	14,159,810,325	−191,274,570

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, etc., costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

The appendix to this report includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows.

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), January 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, January 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, January 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories, January 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), January 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,989	1,128,989			
Defense Production Act	429 227,500	430,717,600	+$1,490,100	do	848,115	851,575	+3,460		
Total	916,908,100	918,398,200	+1,490,100	do	1,977,104	1,980,564	+3,460	1,200,000	7,830,564
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain:									
Supplemental—barter	5,733,750	7,560,206	+1,826,456	do	19,288	25,476	+6,188	(2)	25,476
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		Short dry ton	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500		do	378,359	378,359		200,000	178,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	20,488,000	20,488,000		Short ton	30,301	30,301			
Supplemental—barter	10,517,931	10,841,007	+323,076	do	18,353	18,858	+505		
Total	31,005,931	31,329,007	+323,076	do	48,654	49,159	+505	70,000	(3)
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	2,637,600	2,637,600		do	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	5,200,748	5,241,890	+41,142	do	20,996	21,246	+250		
Total	7,838,348	7,879,490	+41,142	do	32,701	32,951	+250	45,000	(3)
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,355,700	3,355,700		Short dry ton	6,222	6,223	+1		
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	3,934,500	3,934,500		do	5,532	5,532			
Total	9,392,800	9,392,800		do	14,102	14,103	+1	11,000	3,103
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702,100	702,100		Short ton	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	5,643,177	5,620,877	−22,300	do	20,841	20,841			
Total	6,345,277	6,322,977	−22,300	do	22,408	22,408		(2)	22,408
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	13,925,000	13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	83,510,509	85,249,134	+1,738,625	do	5,417,576	5,543,113	+125,537		
Total	115,603,509	117,342,134	+1,738,625	do	7,667,393	7,792,930	+125,537	2,600,000	5,192,930
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78,583,200	78,572.500	−10.700	do	4,963,468	4,963,201	−267		
Supplemental—barter	45,364,075	45,873,603	+509,528	do	2,897,166	2,927,256	+30,090		
Total	123,947,275	124,446,103	+498,828	do	7,860,634	7,890,457	+29,823	6,400,000	1,490,457
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton.	299,279	299,279		137,000	162,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,770,200	9,770,200		Short ton	23,233	23,233			
Defense Production Act	1,425,000	1,425,800	+800	do	2,544	2,543	−1		
Supplemental—barter	22,739,500	22,739,500		do	11,321	11,321			
Total	33,934,700	33,935,500	+800	do	37,098	37,097	−1	23,100	13,997
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	8,469,095	9,441,032	+971,937	do	73	81	+8	(2)	81
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,674,300	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,342,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,901	22,901			
Supplemental—barter	5,515,200	5,515,200		do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,241,900	8,241,900		do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,000,000	871,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	21,260,000	21,260,000		do	10,829,640	10,829,640			
Supplemental—barter	12,310,663	12,310,663		do	7,448,989	7,448,989			
Total	33,570,663	33,570,663		do	18,278,629	18,278,629		6,500,000	11,778,629
Castor oil:									
National stockpile	55,663,100	55,243,900	−419,200	do	215,755,283	213,720,820	−2,034,463	68,000,000	145,720,820
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1,412,300	1,412,300		Short dry ton	28,816	28,816		22,000	6,816
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12,286,800	12,286,800		do	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	20,200,996	20,200,996		do	608,625	608,625			
Total	32,487,796	32,487,796		do	1,168,077	1,168,077		475,000	693,077

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	$264,771,600	$264,765,600	−$6,000	Short dry ton	3,799,182	3,799,176	−6		
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,646	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	224,616,657	224,615,366	−1,291	do	1,543,109	1,543,114	+5		
Total	525,268,157	525,260,866	−7,291	do	6,327,937	6,327,936	−1	2,700,000	3,627,936
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		do	1,047,159	1,047,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,320,800	5,320,800		do	189,623	189,623			
Total	30,470,100	30,470,100		do	1,236,782	1,236,782		1,300,000	(3)
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	169,507,900	169,363,300	−144,600	Pound	76,847,933	76,788,587	−59,346		
Defense Production Act	52,076,600	52,076,600		do	25,195,172	25,195,172			
Supplemental—barter	2,169,000	2,169,000		do	1,077,018	1,077,018			
Total	223,753,500	223,608,900	−144,600	do	103,120,123	103,060,777	−59,346	19,000,000	84,060,777
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	17,591,500	16,981,400	−610,100	do	116,088,033	112,057,733	−4,030,300	(2)	112,057,733
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton	67,636	67,636		(2)	67,636
Columbium:									
National stockpile	23,860,400	23,860,400		Pound	7,488,972	7,488,960	−12		
Defense Production Act	50,255,500	50,255,500		do	8,222,684	8,222,684			
Supplemental—barter	798,900	799,000	+100	do	388,877	388,877			
Total	74,914,800	74,914,900	+100	do	16,100,533	16,100,521	−12	1,900,000	14,200,521
Copper:									
National stockpile	522,204,700	522,204,700		Short ton	1,008,351	1,008,351			
Defense Production Act	63,521,500	62,779,600	−741,900	do	113,430	112,064	−1,366		
Supplemental—barter	8,242,803	8,242,803		do	12,381	12,381			
Total	593,969,003	593,227,103	−741,900	do	1,134,162	1,132,796	−1,366	1,000,000	132,796
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile	38,291,200	38,198,900	−92,300	Pound	151,852,725	151,574,148	−278,577	150,000,000	1,574,148
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile	43,582,600	43,701,600	+119,000	do	321,857,014	323,078,769	+1,221,755	320,000,000	3,078,769
Corundum:									
National stockpile	393,100	393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,000	8
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act	8,284,900	8,197,000	−87,900	do	30,003	29,685	−318	(2)	29,685
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile	462,800	465,300	+2,500	Piece	14,998	5,313	+315	25,000	(3)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	61,609,500	61,609,500		Carat	31,113,411	31,113,411			
Supplemental—barter	15,456,700	15,456,700		do	5,523,748	5,523,748			
Total	77,066,200	77,066,200		do	36,637,159	36,637,159		30,000,000	6,637,159
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile	100,501,500	100,501,500		do	9,315,183	9,315,183			
Supplemental—barter	185,966,660	186,159,160	+192,500	do	15,394,744	15,394,744			
Total	286,468,160	286,660,660	+192,500	do	24,709,927	24,709,827		18,000,000	6,709,927
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		(2)	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile	38,851,100	38,797,100	−54,000	Pound	9,376,656	9,364,689	−11,967	8,800,000	564,689
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental—barter	33,452,400	33,465,200	+12,800	do	673,232	673,232			
Total	61,014,300	61,027,100	+12,800	do	1,155,981	1,155,981		280,000	875,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,443	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	1,508,100	1,508,100		do	42,800	42,800			
Total	18,840,500	18,840,500		do	412,243	412,243		375,000	37,243
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile	937,900	937,900		do	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1,428			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		3,600	2,283
Graphite, natural, Madagascar, crystalline:									
National stockpile	7,121,800	7,092,500	−29,300	do	34,551	34,410	−141		
Supplemental—barter	90,736	90,736		do	826	826			
Total	7,212,536	7,183,236	−29,300	do	35,377	35,236	−141	17,200	18,036

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Graphite, natural, other, crystalline: National stockpile	$1,896,400	$1,896,400		Short dry ton	5,487	5,487		2,100	3,387
Hydrochloride of quinine: National stockpile	1,400	1,400		Ounce	103	103		(2)	103
Hyoscine: National stockpile	30,600	30,600		do	2,100	2,100		2,100	(3)
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,977,648	2,977,648			
Supplemental—barter	1,020,048	1,018,222	−$1,826	do	996,984	996,958	−26		
Total	5,102,048	5,100,222	−1,826	do	3,974,632	3,974,606	−26	4,300,000	(3)
Iridium: National stockpile	2,525,800	2,525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		4,000	9,937
Jewel bearings: National stockpile	3,805,800	3,805,800		Piece	51,037,267	51,037,267		57,500,000	(3)
Kyanite—mullite: National stockpile	828,700	824,400	−4,300	Short dry ton	9,585	9,536	−49	4,800	4,736
Lead:									
National stockpile	319,298,100	319,298,100		Short ton	1,050,370	1,050,370			
Defense Production Act	2,751,100	2,461,800	−289,300	do	7,262	6,499	−763		
Supplemental—barter	78,127,800	78,225,100	+97,300	do	327,998	327,998			
Total	400,177,000	399,985,000	−192,000	do	1,385,630	1,384,867	−763	286,000	1,098,867
Magnesium: National stockpile	131,434,200	131,338,800	−95,400	do	181,052	180,921	−131	107,000	73,921
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21,025,500	21,025,500		do	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter	14,109,137	14,034,837	−74,300	do	137,671	137,671			
Total	35,134,637	35,060,337	−74,300	do	282,156	282,156		50,000	232,156
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3,095,500	3,095,500		Short dry ton	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act	2,523,600	2,523,600		do	3,779	3,779			
Total	5,619,100	5,619,100		do	25,051	25,051		20,000	5,051
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	2,133,300	2,133,300		do	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter	7,134,700	7,127,300	−7,400	do	103,731	103,731			
Total	9,268,000	9,260,600	−7,400	do	133,038	133,038		30,000	103,038
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	132,600	132,600		do	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter	6,833,200	6,826,200	−7,000	do	99,016	99,016			
Total	6,965,800	6,958,800	−7,000	do	100,838	100,838		53,000	47,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248,310,000	248,293,500	−16,500	do	5,852,002	5,851,828	−174		
Defense Production Act	176,710,900	176,710,900		do	3,056,771	3,056,771			
Supplemental—barter	225,693,708	225,835,908	+142,200	do	3,238,648	3,238,648			
Total	650,714,608	650,840,308	+125,700	do	12,147,421	12,147,247	−174	6,800,000	5,347,247
Mercury:									
National stockpile	20,039,500	20,039,500		Flask	129,525	129,525			
Supplemental—barter	3,446,200	3,446,200		do	16,000	16,000			
Total	23,485,700	23,485,700		do	145,525	145,525		110,000	35,525
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27,644,200	27,644,200		Pound	11,626,674	11,626,674			
Defense Production Act	40,888,800	40,858,100	−30,700	do	6,458,384	6,456,253	−2,131		
Supplemental—barter	4,271,120	4,380,878	+109,758	do	1,301,300	1,334,753	+33,453		
Total	72,804,120	72,883,178	+79,058	do	19,386,358	19,417,680	+31,322	8,300,000	11,117,680
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9,058,100	9,058,100		do	1,733,083	1,733,083			
Defense Production Act	633,300	633,300		do	102,679	102,679			
Supplemental—barter	847,015	867,497	+20,482	do	87,285	88,988	+1,703		
Total	10,538,415	10,558,897	+20,482	do	1,923,047	1,924,750	+1,703	1,300,000	624,750
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile	40,598,300	40,598,300		do	40,040,294	40,040,294			
Supplemental—barter	6,225,800	6,225,800		do	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total	46,824,100	46,824,100		do	44,866,551	44,866,551		21,200,000	23,666,551
Mica, phlogopite block: National stockpile	303,600	303,600		do	223,126	223,126		17,000	206,126
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	2,580,500	2,580,500		do	3,079,062	3,079,062			
Supplemental—barter	1,933,807	1,975,335	+41,528	do	1,673,878	1,690,678	+16,800		
Total	4,514,307	4,555,835	+41,528	do	4,752,940	4,760,740	+16,800	1,700,000	3,069,740

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—**Continued**

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	$89, 184, 400	$89, 184, 400		Pound	84, 062, 802	84, 063, 203	+401	59, 000, 000	25, 063, 203
Nickel:									
National stockpile	182, 004, 400	181, 996, 600	−$7, 800	do	334, 354, 431	334, 329, 580	−24, 851		
Defense Production Act	105, 068, 800	105, 029, 200	−39, 600	do	112, 080, 269	112, 005, 021	−75, 248		
Total	287, 073, 200	287, 025, 800	−47, 400	do	446, 434, 700	446, 334, 601	−100, 099	323, 000, 000	123, 334, 601
Opium:									
National stockpile	13, 661, 700	13, 661, 700		do	195, 757	195, 757		172, 800	22, 957
Palladium:									
National stockpile	2, 079, 000	2, 079, 000		Troy ounce	89, 811	89, 811			
Defense Production Act	177, 300	177, 300		do	7, 884	7, 884			
Supplemental—barter	12, 170, 200	12, 170, 200		do	648, 124	648, 124			
Total	14, 426, 500	14, 426, 500		do	745, 819	745, 819		340, 000	405, 819
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	5, 148, 200	5, 148, 200		Pound	28, 604, 089	28, 604, 089		(2)	28, 604, 089
Platinum:									
National stockpile	56, 879, 900	56, 879, 900		Troy ounce	716, 343	716, 343			
Supplemental—barter	4, 024, 500	4, 024, 500		do	49, 999	49, 999			
Total	60, 904, 400	60, 904, 400		do	766, 342	766, 342		165, 000	601, 342
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415, 000	415, 000		Pound	66, 188	66, 188		66, 000	188
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	69, 625, 500	69, 625, 500		do	5, 647, 292	5, 647, 292			
Supplemental—barter	3, 128, 684	3, 128, 684		do	232, 252	232, 252			
Total	72, 754, 184	72, 754, 184		do	5, 879, 544	5, 879, 544		650, 000	5, 229, 544
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	2, 103, 200	2, 103, 200		Ounce	1, 823, 377	1, 823, 377		1, 600, 000	223, 377
Quinine:									
National stockpile	4, 828, 400	4, 765, 200	−63, 200	do	7, 633, 732	7, 533, 732	−100, 000	(2)	7, 533, 732
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7, 134, 900	7, 134, 900		Short dry ton	10, 042	10, 042			
Supplemental—barter	5, 534, 532	5, 555, 379	+20, 847	do	6, 042	6, 183	+141		
Total	12, 669, 432	12, 690, 279	+20, 847	do	16, 084	16, 225	+141	5, 700	10, 525
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	657, 800	657, 800		Pound	6, 085, 570	6, 085, 570		(2)	6, 085, 570
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78, 100	78, 100		Troy ounce	621	621		(2)	621
Rubber:									
National stockpile	802, 216, 200	795, 887, 000	−6, 329, 200	Long ton	1, 037, 438	1, 029, 234	−8, 204	750, 000	279, 234
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559, 500	559, 500		Troy ounce	15, 001	15, 001		(2)	15, 001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2, 070, 100	2, 070, 100		Short dry ton	18, 599	18, 599			
Defense Production Act	2, 725, 100	2, 725, 100		do	17, 592	17, 592			
Supplemental—barter	1, 061, 300	1, 061, 300		do	11, 632	11, 632			
Total	5, 856, 500	5, 856, 500		do	47, 823	47, 823		65, 000	(3)
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	190, 000	190, 000		Carat	16, 187, 500	16, 187, 500		18, 000, 000	(3)
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757, 100	757, 100		Pound	97, 100	97, 100			
Supplemental—barter	1, 070, 500	1, 070, 500		do	156, 518	156, 518			
Total	1, 827, 600	1, 827, 600		do	253, 618	253, 618		400, 000	(3)
Shellac:									
National stockpile	8, 898, 900	8, 850, 500	−48, 400	do	17, 750, 722	17, 654, 298	−96, 424	7, 400, 000	10, 254, 298
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile	11, 394, 500	11, 394, 500		Short ton	64, 697	64, 697			
Supplemental—barter	26, 792, 300	26, 796, 900	+4, 600	do	131, 805	131, 805			
Total	38, 186, 800	38, 191, 400	+4, 600	do	196, 502	196, 502		100, 000	96, 502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	3, 263, 500	3, 033. 000	−230. 500	Pound	2, 271, 365	2, 124. 769	−146. 596	970, 000	1, 154, 769
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	486, 600	486. 600		do	113, 515	113. 515		120, 000	(3)
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4, 775, 400	4, 775, 400		do	23, 442, 158	23, 442, 158		23, 000, 000	442, 158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	498, 700	498, 700		Short ton	1, 279	1, 279		300	979
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231, 000	231, 000		do	3, 901	3, 901		(2)	3, 901

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	$10,905,500	$10,905,500		Pound	3,422,879	3,422,874	−5		
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do	1,531,366	1,531,366			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do	8,036	8,036			
Total	20,661,000	20,661,000		do	4,962,281	4,962,276	−5	2,420,000	2,542,276
Thorium:									
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		do	848,574	848,574			
Supplemental—barter	15,205,216	15,474,689	+$269,473	do	7,163,937	7,285,212	+121,275		
Total	15,247,216	15,516,689	+269,473	do	8,012,511	8,133,786	+121,275	(2)	8,133,786
Tin:									
National stockpile	826,192,300	824,656,200	−1,536,100	Long ton	339,785	339,153	−632		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	842,596,300	841,060,200	−1,536,10C	do	347,290	346,658	−632	185,000	161,658
Titanium:									
Defense Production Act	176,804,000	176,804,000		Short ton	22,456	22,456			
Supplemental—barter	32,122,100	32,097,700	−24,400	do	9,021	9,021			
Total	208,926,100	208,901,700	−24,400	do	31,477	31,477		(2)	31,477
Totaquine:									
National stockpile	4,853,800	4,853,800		Ounce	7,654,196	7,654,196		(2)	7,654,196
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	369,129,300	369,129,300		Pound	120,072,509	120,072,509			
Defense Production Act	319,498,500	319,498,500		do	78,367,948	78,367,948			
Supplemental—barter	18,628,900	18,647,400	+18,500	do	5,765,752	5,765,752			
Total	707,256,700	707,275,200	+18,500	do	204,206,209	204,206,209		50,000,000	154,206,209
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	31,604,200	31,604,200		do	15,758,802	15,758,802		2,000,000	13,758,802
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	11,967,700	11,967,700		Long ton	42,895	42,895		30,000	12,895
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	49,374,900	49,374,900		do	199,557	199,557		180,000	19,55
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9,992,400	9,992,400		do	39,618	39,618		39,000	618
Zinc:									
National stockpile	364,131,100	364,131,100		Short ton	1,256,012	1,256,012			
Supplemental—barter	79,587,900	79,587,900		do	323,895	323,895			
Total	443,719,000	443,719,000		do	1,579,907	1,571,907		178,000	1,401,907
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	710,600	710,600		Short dry ton	16,533	16,533		(2)	16,533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	419,00C	372,700	−46,300	do	7,082	6,300	−782	(2)	6,300
Total:									
National stockpile	5,888,903,600	5,879,281,200	−9,622,400						
Defense Production Act	1,500,603,900	1,500,905,400	+301,500						
Supplementa.—barter	1,298,441,167	1,304,643,502	+6,202,335						
Total, strategic and critical materials	8,687,948,667	8,684,830,102	−3,118,565						

---

[1] Maximum objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h). The present objectives represent quantities of materials estimated to be necessary in the event of a 3-year war in which oversea sources would not be available.

[2] No present objective.

[3] Not in excess of maximum objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, January 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$1,213,494,128	$1,148,076,131	−$65,417,997	Bushel	1,044,325,049	987,136,997	−57,188,052
Cotton, extra-long staple	4,350,336	4,350,336		Bale	15,865	15,865	
Cotton, upland	810,530,191	809,815,726	−714,465	do	4,688,689	4,684,629	−4,060
Peanuts, farmers' stock	1,438,503	4,068,801	+2,630,298	Pound	14,118,584	37,764,836	+23,646,252
Peanuts, shelled	4,903,967	5,091,378	+187,411	do	23,839,014	25,354,191	+1,515,177
Rice, milled	748,926	637,773	−111,153	Hundredweight	75,581	64,364	−11,217
Rice, rough	95,130	95,130		do	18,641	18,641	
Wheat	2,034,726,416	2,016,161,189	−18,565,227	Bushel	1,044,992,557	1,035,801,588	−9,190,969
Wheat flour	344,767	435,539	+90,772	Pound	6,000,000	7,807,300	+1,807,300
Bulgur	811,726	1,338,538	+526,812	do	14,721,700	24,418,900	+9,697,200
Total, basic commodities	4,071,444,090	3,990,070,541	−81,373,549				

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, January 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*—Continued

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	$24, 275, 664	$24, 263, 065	−$12, 599	Bushel	28, 208, 176	28, 197, 621	−10, 555
Grain sorghum	616, 721, 967	575, 561, 312	−41, 160, 655	do	579, 266, 082	543, 172, 505	−36, 093, 577
Honey	130, 868	130, 868		Pound	1, 045, 076	1, 045, 076	
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	207, 118, 200	197, 728, 332	−9, 389, 868	do	350, 791, 487	335, 843, 465	−14, 948, 022
Butter oil	38, 957, 025	35, 081, 437	−3, 875, 588	do	48, 339, 956	43, 587, 172	−4, 752, 784
Cheese	41, 788, 549	39, 158, 314	−2, 630, 235	do	111, 587, 560	104, 412, 680	−7, 174, 880
Ghee	598, 857	369, 883	−228, 974	do	737, 188	455, 322	−281, 866
Milk, dried	99, 111, 757	97, 761, 792	−1, 349, 965	do	662, 458, 995	655, 273, 510	−7, 185, 485
Oats	9, 219, 597	9, 188, 763	−30, 834	Bushel	15, 352, 061	15, 297, 460	−54, 601
Rye	1, 001, 744	865, 352	−136, 392	do	984, 004	833, 710	−150, 294
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	1, 038, 924, 228	980, 109, 118	−58, 815, 110				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry, edible	5, 997, 718	5, 107, 651	−890, 067	Hundredweight	893, 290	772, 442	−120, 848
Cottonseed oil, refined	1, 014, 923	1, 014, 923		Pound	8, 339, 550	8, 339, 550	
Flaxseed		4, 270	+4, 270	Bushel		1, 574	+1, 574
Soybeans	87, 433, 158	42, 534, 889	−44, 898, 269	do	36, 710, 649	17, 873, 419	−18, 837, 230
Turpentine	907, 639	669, 451	−238, 188	Gallon	1, 729, 744	1, 275, 814	−453, 930
Vegetable oil products	26, 637, 952	23, 420, 782	−3, 217, 170	Pound	145, 204, 004	127, 362, 724	−17, 841, 280
Total, other nonbasic commodities	121, 991, 390	72, 751, 966	−49, 239, 424				
Total, price support inventory	5, 232, 359, 708	5, 042, 931, 625	−189, 428, 083				
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [1]							
Cotton, Egyptian	103, 890, 050	103, 913, 705	+23, 655	Bale	122, 973	123, 001	+28
Cotton, American-Egyptian	24, 342, 239	23, 960, 485	−381, 754	do	48, 397	47, 638	−759
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile.	128, 232, 289	127, 874, 190	−358, 099	do	171, 370	170, 639	−731
Total, agricultural commodities	5, 360, 591, 997	5, 170, 805, 815	−189, 786, 182				

[1] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, January 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings).	$10, 072, 050	$9, 994, 073	−$77, 977	10-mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	1, 867, 884	1, 930, 667	+62, 783	(1)			
Radiological equipment	19, 288, 408	20, 452, 558	+1, 164, 150	(1)			
Total	31, 228, 342	32, 377, 298	+1, 148, 956				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses.	131, 681, 633	132, 244, 022	+562, 389	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	5, 449, 502	5, 449, 502		(1)			
Civil defense emergency hospitals	38, 138, 459	38, 057, 291	−81, 168	Each	1, 930	1, 930	
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals).	1, 652, 995	1, 652, 995		(1)			
Total	176, 922, 589	177, 403, 810	+481, 221				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	208, 150, 931	209, 781, 108	+1, 630, 177				

[1] Composite group of many different items.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, January 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
In storage	$43, 600	$43, 600		Tool	11	11	
On lease	2, 144, 300	2, 144, 300		do	103	103	
On loan	42, 900	42, 900		do	7	7	
Total	2, 230, 800	2, 230, 800		do	121	121	

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, January 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*—Continued

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1963	End of month, Jan. 31, 1963	Net change during month
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	$84,244,100	$84,244,100		do	7,721	7,721	
On lease	27,500	27,500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	1,865,300	1,865,300		do	187	187	
On loan to school programs	6,025,600	6,025,600		do	1,420	1,420	
Total	92,162,500	92,162,500		do	9,329	9,329	
Total, machine tools	94,393,300	94,393,300		do	9,450	9,450	

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

APPENDIX

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase meals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—barter

As a result of a delgation of authority from OEP (32 A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgage collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to a Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201 (h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

As authorized under Public Law 920, 81st Congress, and following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958, the Director, Office of Emergency Planning has delegated responsibility to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan and direct operation of the medical supply portion of the OEP stockpile. The warehousing of the medical stockpile is principally within the OEP warehouse system; in addition, the medical stockpile includes a program designed to pre-position emergency hospitals and other treatment units in communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the

General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462).

Statement by Senator Byrd of Virginia

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of January 31, 1963, totaled **$14,159,810,325. This was a net decrease of $191,274,570 as compared with the January 1 total of $14,351,084,895. Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:**

Major category	Cost value, January 1963	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials	−$3,118,565	$8,684,830,102
Agricultural commodities	−189,786,182	5,170,805,815
Civil defense supplies and equipment	+1,630,177	209,781,108
Machine tools		94,393,300
Total	−191,274,570	14,159,810,325

These figures are from the January 1963 report on Federal stockpile inventories, compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory, and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 95 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. **Maximum objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 95 materials. Of the 76 materials having maximum objectives, 65 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of January 31, 1963.**

Increases in cost value were reported in 21 of the 95 materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 25 materials, and 49 materials remained unchanged during the month of January 1963.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of January 31, 1963, totaled $5,879,281,200. This was a net decrease of $9,622,400 during the month. The largest decrease was $6,329,200 in rubber.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of January 31 totaled $1,500,905,400. This was a net increase of $301,500. The largest increase was aluminum, partially offset by a decrease in copper.

Supplemental-barter stockpile

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of January 31 totaled $1,304,643,502. This was a net increase of $6,202,335. The largest increases were in aluminum oxide, bauxite, and beryllium metal.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report, the largest is $5.2 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during January were reported for corn, soybeans, grain sorghum, and wheat in the price-support inventory.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed increases in radiological equipment and medical stocks; and no change was reported in the machine tools inventories.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Cooper):

S. 1302. A bill to increase U.S. productivity in the national interest and for the benefit of the individual worker and businessman, by promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between labor and management, encouragement of public responsibility in the private economy, and maximization of technical and managerial progress, through the establishment of a National Productivity Council and the support of local and industrywide labor-management-public committees; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1303. A bill to establish the Channel Islands National Seashore, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Engle when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. Javits):

S. 1304. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $2,936,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Morse):

S. 1305. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $1,500,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 1306. A bill for the relief of Oakley O. Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1307. A bill to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize a grant-in-aid program for the collection, preservation, and publication of papers of national historical value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. Eastland, and Mr. Ervin):

S. 1308. A bill to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1309. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. Morton):

S. 1310. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cooper when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

MATTIE V. GRUBBS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 122) to pay a gratuity to Mattie V. Grubbs, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

EDDIE H. NORWOOD

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 123) to pay a gratuity to Eddie H. Norwood; which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

FANNIE HILL, LEONARD M. HILL, AND LAWRENCE A. HILL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 124) to pay a gratuity to Fannie Hill, Leonard M. Hill, and Lawrence A. Hill, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CAROLYN P. MERIWETHER

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 125) to pay a gratuity to Carolyn P. Meriwether; which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY COUNCIL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the present consideration of what we must do about dealing with endemic unemployment and the slowing down of the economy, the one thing that I think is missing is new ideas. If any of us have them, it is our duty to bring them forward at this time for the consideration of the country.

For a long time I have believed that we needed a central mechanism in this country which would not be a war production board, but which would be its equivalent in what we euphemistically call peacetime.

It is for that reason that I send to the desk for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], a bill to establish a 25-member National Productivity Council to replace the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy.

We need something with a lot more teeth and a lot more capability in terms of being grounded in congressional mandate, too, in order to do the job which the country wants done.

The Council could also coordinate and activate more vigorously the councils provided for under the Manpower and Training Act, which, with the kind cooperation of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], includes a provision for local councils, generally speaking, of that character. The Council I contemplate would include public as well as labor and management representatives. It would parallel the system of councils we had during World War II, of which 5,000 functioned with great benefit to productivity, the cutting down of waste, inefficiency and make-work practices in our whole establishment.

The important point is that we are as close to being in war as we could be without shooting all over the world. The question is, How will we organize for it in terms of the productivity race, in which the Russians have said they will bury us?

This proposed legislation follows a unanimous minority recommendation of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress in its 1963 economic report, issued March 13. In the report, the minority endorsed the creation of a National Productivity Council, as a means of stimulating increased productivity, "to promote the organization of voluntary labor-management-public councils at the industry, regional, and community levels."

These councils—

The report said—

> would provide a framework within which all interested parties could cooperate in smoothing the adjustment to technological change by promoting worker training, eliminating make-work practices, stimulating invention and innovation, and taking such other actions as would promote increased productivity.

In my view, the establishment of a National Productivity Council, along with national emergency strike legislation and revision of the antitrust laws, should have the highest priority, ranking with the tax cut in our effort to materially improve the economic growth rate of our Nation.

This is my recommendation for meeting the problem.

I wish to emphasize that the Productivity Council does not involve controls, allocations, wage and price ceilings, and the other aspects of wartime economic centralization which were involved in the War Production Board. But while we are now engaged in a cold war rather than a shooting war, clearly, our need for effective economic mobilization is no less great, particularly in view of the increasing economic warfare waged by the Communist bloc and the unsatisfactory growth rate condition of our economy.

The Council would provide a permanent mechanism for mutual discussion and cooperative efforts to identify and deal with the great variety of new problems arising daily as a result of the enormous changes taking place in the economic world of today—in automation, in the development of multinational trading association, such as the European Common Market, and in the underdeveloped areas just showing the beginning of diversification of the economy, to name only a few of the most dramatic of such changes.

The Council would act on the most authoritative level with the Congress as its partner and with the powers that only Congress can give in terms of calling upon other Government agencies, and in providing for authority throughout the whole Federal Government, especially in the executive department.

I think the measure is an extremely important one. As I have said, we are looking for ideas upon the subject. Here is an idea which follows and parallels tradition and practices and recognizes where we stand today, which is in a position of grave danger, especially in the area of productivity.

The Council would be composed of a broad range of members whose talents and responsibilities would represent all aspects of the U.S. economic complex. Headed by the Vice President, the Council would include the Secretaries of the Treasury, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare; the Attorney General; the Administrator of the Small Business Administration; four representatives of management and four of labor organizations in manufacturing and services industries; two representatives of management and two of labor organizations in extractive and agricultural industries; two labor-management relations experts; and three members from the general public.

The impact of the Council would be most effectively felt through the creation of local labor-management-public boards on a plant, community, regional, or industry basis. An amendment which I sponsored to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which was adopted, calls for the establishment of such groups. This new bill details the areas in which the National Council would assist the local groups: apprenticeship and other training programs; waste and absenteeism; building code revision; transportation, safety and health of the labor force; expanded exports; studies of foreign techniques and programs in these areas; incentive programs; technical information and education.

The Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, which the President created by Executive order on February 16, 1961, is similar to the Council which my bill proposes to establish, since it too consists of Government, labor, and industry members. But it is clear that the existing Committee without a legislative basis cannot do the job which is called for; it has neither the staffing nor the authority to initiate economic policy as between Government and business, and, in particular, it has no relationship with the local councils which must deal with the day-to-day effectuation of policy.

The need for a permanent mechanism of the proposed type is becoming increasingly well recognized. A New York Times editorial on April 10, 1962, said that the steel price battle showed the power the President can wield in economic matters, and added:

> To insure that the revised balance will promote freedom, as well as responsibility, immediate steps should be taken to improve machinery for the cooperation of industry, labor and the Government.

I believe the National Productivity Council should be a major objective in the drive to accelerate the productivity of our Nation's economic plant.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, and may lie on the desk until the close of business tomorrow for the purpose of enabling other Senators who wish to do so to add their names as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from New York; and, without objection, will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1302) to increase U.S. productivity in the national interest and for the benefit of the individual worker and businessman, by promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between labor and management, encouragement of public responsibility in the private economy, and maximization of technical and managerial progress, through the establishment of a National Productivity Council and the support of local and industrywide labor-management-public committees, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. COOPER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Productivity Act of 1963".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDING

SEC. 2. Congress hereby finds and declares that the national interest requires a productivity drive in order to meet the continuing responsibilities of the United States for the development of its own domestic economic strength and that of the free world; and in order to meet the threat of the growing and aggressive Communist bloc economic power. The Congress further finds that the major problems facing such a national productivity drive are an unacceptable rate of endemic unemployment, the underutilization and obsolescence of production facilities, and the inadequacy of means for resolving labor-management disputes resulting in the loss of production vital to the national economy. The Congress declares that efforts to achieve success in a national productivity drive will be advanced through the acceleration of modernization of equipment, the elimination of make work practices in both management and labor, the reduction of absenteeism, the establishment of better procedures to avoid national emergency work stoppages, relieving the worker of hardship caused by any phase of a national productivity drive, and the promotion of higher morale, which can best be achieved through cooperative action among labor, management, farmers, voluntary organizations, consumers, and all levels of government, while preserving the traditional areas of responsibility and interest of each. The Congress also declares that it is the responsibility of the United States under present international conditions to require the most effective mobilization and the maximum utilization of all elements of the Nation's productive forces.

NATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY COUNCIL

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the executive branch an independent agency to be known as the "National Productivity Council" (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), which shall be composed of twenty-five members as follows:

(1) The Vice President of the United States who shall be the Chairman of the Council;

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury; the Attorney General; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of Labor; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration;

(3) Four members who shall be representative of management in large and small businesses (as defined by the Small Business Administration) in manufacturing and service industries (including transportation);

(4) Four members who shall be representative of labor organizations in such industries;

(5) Two members who shall be representative of management in extractive and agricultural industries;

(6) Two members who shall be representative of labor organizations in such industries;

(7) Two members who are recognized experts in labor-management relations, at least one of whom shall be from the academic field; and

(8) Three members who shall be representative of the general public, and who shall be selected without regard to any interest or connection they may have with any of the foregoing areas.

(b) Members of the Council referred to in paragraphs (3) to (8) of subsection (a) shall be appointed by the President for terms of six years, except that of the members first appointed six shall be appointed for terms of two years, six shall be appointed for terms of four years, and five shall be appointed for terms of six years. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments except that a member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of such term.

(c) The Council shall meet at least four times each year at such times as it shall determine or at the call of the President. A quorum shall consist of thirteen members.

(d) Members of the Council referred to in paragraphs (3) to (8) of subsection (a) shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per diem while performing services for the Council, and while away from their homes in connection with attendance at meetings of the Council shall be entitled to transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence at the rate prescribed by, or established pursuant to, section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-2).

(e) The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Executive Director of the Council. The Executive Director shall be the principal executive officer of the Council and shall be paid compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum. The Council is authorized to appoint, in accordance with the civil service laws and regulations, and fix the compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such other officers and employees as may be necessary.

(f) With the consent of the heads of other departments and agencies of the Government, the Council is authorized to utilize the personnel, services, and facilities of such departments and agencies in carrying out its functions under this Act. Such departments and agencies shall cooperate with the Council to the greatest extent practicable for such purpose.

(g) The Council shall transmit to the President and to the Congress an annual report of its activities under this Act.

OBJECTIVES OF THE COUNCIL

SEC. 4. It shall be the objective of the Council—

(1) to enlist the cooperation of labor, management, and State and local governments, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, toward the implementation of the national policy declared in the Employment Act of 1946 to create and maintain "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment activities, including self-employment, for those willing and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power";

(2) to promote peaceful labor-management relations;

(3) to promote free and responsible collective bargaining;

(4) to promote sound wage and price policies in the public interest;

(5) to promote a climate of cooperation and understanding between labor and management and the community, and the recognition by labor and management of the public interest in harmonious labor-management relations;

(6) to promote the maintenance and improvement of worker morale and to enlist community interest in increasing productivity and reducing waste and absenteeism;

(7) to promote the more effective use of labor and management personnel in the interest of increased productivity;

(8) to develop programs to deal with the social and economic problems of individual workers and management personnel adversely affected by automation or other technological change or the relocation of industries and to avoid any hardship to the individual worker and employee; and

(9) to promote policies designed to insure that United States products are competitive in world markets.

FUNCTIONS OF COUNCIL

SEC. 5. (a) In order to achieve the objectives set forth in section 4, the Council shall encourage and assist in the organization and the work of labor-management-public committees and similar groups established pursuant to sections 205 (b) and (c) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, on a plant, community, regional, or industry basis. Such assistance shall include—

(1) aid in the development of apprenticeship, training, and other programs for employee and management education for development of greater and more diversified skills;

(2) aid in the formulation of programs designed to reduce waste and absenteeism;

(3) aid in the revision of building codes, zoning regulations, and other local ordinances and laws, in order to keep them continuously responsive to changing economic conditions;

(4) aid in planning for the provision of adeqaute transportation for the labor force and the promotion of employee safety and health;

(5) aid in the exploration of means to expand exports as recommended in the October 4, 1962, Report to the President from the Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy;

(6) the encouragement of attendance by members of such groups at courses in industrial relations at institutions of higher education, and the fostering of close cooperation between such groups and such institutions for the purpose of developing such courses and for other purposes;

(7) the encouragement of studies of techniques and programs similar to those in paragraphs (1) to (6) of this subsection, as they are applied in foreign countries;

(8) aid in the development and initiation of production incentive programs;

(9) the dissemination of technical information and other material to publicize its work and objectives; and

(10) the dissemination of information and analyses concerning the economic opportunities and outlook in various regions and communities, and of information on industrial techniques designed for the increase of productivity.

(b) The Council is authorized to make recommendations to the President regarding legislation for price, wage, commodity, and materiel control, and commodity and materiel allocation, authorized to be exercised during periods of emergency, as it may deem necessary from time to time.

(c) The Council shall perform such other functions, consistent with the foregoing, as it determines to be appropriate and necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in section 4.

POWERS OF COUNCIL

SEC. 6. (a) The Council shall carry out the functions referred to in section 5 through—

(1) the utilization of the services and facilities of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and of such other governmental agencies, private groups, and professional experts as it deems necessary;

(2) the coordination of such services and facilities in order to supply technical and administrative assistance to labor-management-public committees and similar groups referred to in section 5(a);

(3) grants to groups or individuals for financing up to 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out any project or program, including the setting up of local, regional, or industry-wide labor-management-public committees, in furtherance of the objectives of the Council; and

(4) the holding of regional and industry-wide conferences to formulate ideas and programs for the fulfillment of the objectives set forth in section 4.

(b) The Council may accept gifts or bequests, either for carrying out specific programs which it deems desirable or for its general activities.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I have the honor and the pleasure today to introduce a bill to establish the Channel Islands National Seashore off the coast of southern California.

Since announcing in January my intention to propose this legislation, I have conferred with numerous conservation interests, obtained the views of various State and local groups, and worked with the National Park Service and the Navy in formulating this plan. Accordingly, the bill I am introducing has as its primary purpose the controlled development of public recreation on the islands and at the same time provides special consideration for the conservation and protection of their marvelous marine fauna, birdlife, and existing archeologic values.

The climate of the Channel Islands is ideal. Their rugged terrain is unique and inviting. It is my idea that the principal recreational uses which can be opened up to the people by this legislation are camping on the beaches and in the low mountains, swimming and surf sports, ocean fishing, yachting, hiking, exploration of the many sea grottos and marine gardens, wildlife study, and similar types of natural enjoyment. I believe also that some of the islands are ideally suited for summer cabin leases. Small-craft harbors are possible in a number of the bays.

I propose that the Channel Islands National Seashore include the following five islands which I shall describe briefly:

Santa Cruz: Largest of the group, it is 21 miles long and about 5 miles wide, covering 62,000 acres. It has mountain peaks from 1,700 to 2,400 feet in elevation, dense woods, sea caves including one—Painted Cave—with an entrance 70 feet high, and well-protected coves with suitable anchorage for small boats. The parklike atmosphere of Santa Cruz Island makes it highly suitable for camping and enjoyment of scenery. The clear waters of the sheltered north shore offer ample opportunity for swimming and observation of marine gardens. Santa Cruz Island is privately owned by two families.

To quote the author, Thorne Hall:

> Santa Cruz is an assortment of rich rolling meadows laced with oaks, pines and almond trees, tall grasses, vineyards, fat cows, swift rising mountain ranges, babbling brooks, three rivers, temperate year-round climate, hundreds of waterfalls spilling into the ocean over rugged jutting cliffs. Even the endless parade of seals that guard its secluded grottoes chortle happily in the noonday sun.

Santa Rosa: Second in size, this is 15 miles long and 10 miles wide, covering 55,000 acres. Its shoreline varies in character from bold rocky bluffs to several miles of white sand beaches with dunes up to 400 feet in height on the western end. The island is rich in archeological and paleontological values. Its wildlife includes sea elephants, otters, numerous rookeries of marine waterfowl, as well as a native species of fox and several varieties of deer. Santa Rosa Island is owned by a private estate.

San Miguel: Westernmost of the Channel Islands chain, it comprises about 14,000 acres including 10-acre Prince Islet just offshore. It has 24 miles of unspoiled sand beaches, scenic cliffs and sea caves. Cuyler Harbor is the largest of several places where anchorages and boat landings are possible. Here also sea lions, sea elephants, otters, seals and great rookeries of sea birds abound.

To quote Mr. Hall again:

> The island of San Miguel reeks of desolation, memories, and mysteries unsung. Here California's discoverer, Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo, met his death in 1543. Civilizations of Indians lie buried in the land. Ghosts of shipwrecked sailors haunt its jagged reefs.

San Miguel is presently owned and administered by the Navy as a possible missile site. The Navy Department and the Interior Department presently are working on a cooperative agreement for the protection of the island's outstanding anthropologic and historic values.

Anacapa: Established in 1938 as a national monument, Anacapa is really a slender chain of islands about 5 miles long and one-half mile wide, comprising 700 acres. It is characterized by high sea bluffs, bird rookeries, and rocky rests for marine mammals.

Santa Barbara: Also a national monument, it is the southernmost island in the proposed seashore, triangular in shape, containing 650 acres including 13-acre Gull Island just offshore. It is girdled by vertical cliffs up to 500 feet in height, small bays with numerous caves and rock bridges, occasional sandy beaches, and dramatic seascapes. Santa Barbara Island has the largest stand of giant coreopsis in the world. When in full bloom the brilliant, golden expanse of these huge sunflowers are said to be visable to ships 10 miles at sea.

That is the nature of the new national seashore that I propose. Only two of the islands—Santa Cruz and Santa Rosa—are privately owned, and just three families are involved. It will not be necessary for public purposes to acquire all of the private lands on these two islands. I want to respect the wishes and interests of the present owners as fully as possible.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be printed in the Record at this point and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1303) to establish the Channel Islands National Seashore, in the State of California, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Engle, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the benefit of the people certain property in the State of California possessing unique scenic, scientific, and other natural values, there is hereby established the Channel Islands National Seashore. The national seashore, subject to valid existing rights, shall comprise the islands of Anacapa, Santa Barbara, San Miguel, Santa Cruz, and Santa Rosa in the Channel Islands group, together with the lands, submerged lands, and waters within one nautical mile of the shoreline of such islands.

Sec. 2. Within the Channel Islands National Seashore the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to procure lands and interests in lands, including submerged lands, by purchase, donation, purchase with donated funds, or otherwise. Lands and submerged lands owned by the State of California or any of its political subdivisions within the seashore may be acquired only with the consent of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, federally owned lands or waters lying within the seashore may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary, without transfer of funds, for administration as part of the seashore.

Sec. 3. Lands and submerged lands acquired by the Secretary of the Interior and those transferred to his administrative jurisdiction pursuant to section 2, together with the former Channel Islands National Monument, shall be preserved and administered by the Secretary of the Interior as the Channel Islands National Seashore in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1–4), as amended and supplemented, with special consideration for the conservation and protection of their existing marine fauna, bird life, and archaeologic heritage.

Sec. 4. To further the purposes of this Act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the State of California, its political subdivisions, and other Federal agencies for the conservation and management of wildlife within or in the vicinity of the Channel Islands National Seashore, and for the development of small craft harbors on the islands.

Sec. 5. Any funds that may be available for the purposes of the Channel Islands National Monument shall hereafter be available to the Secretary for the purposes of the Channel Island National Seashore.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as are necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

NEW YORK POLICE FORCE—REIMBURSEMENT OF NEW YORK CITY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am again introducing for appropriate reference bills to reimburse the city of New York for the extraordinary and unprecedented service afforded by the New York City police force during the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in the fall of 1960.

Mr. President, two bills are here involved. One, which is cosponsored by my colleague, Senator Javits, is identical with legislation we introduced in the last session to authorize the appropriation of $2,936,000. This sum, according to estimates prepared by the New York City Police Department, represents the cost of reimbursing the overtime work performed on the basis of the regular salary rate. In my judgment, this sum is reasonable and justified and should be approved.

At the same time, I recognize the practical difficulty that the Department of State has consistently recommended that the payment to the city of New York be limited to $1.5 million. The sum of $1.5 million was approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last year when the bill H.R. 4441 was favorably reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. Unfortunately, it was never motioned up for floor consideration. The second bill, cosponsored by Senator Javits and Senator Morse, authorizes the appropriation of $1.8 million.

It proved impossible to secure action on this measure as an amendment to other legislation because of impending adjournment. Nevertheless, late in the session the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, who was a Senate delegate to the United Nations during that historic session and the Senate majortiy leader both gave their assurances that they would support this legislation when introduced in the next session. In fact, the distinguished majority leader said on October 11:

> If the Senator will not press his proposal at this late point in the session, I assure him that I will do my very best to see that one of the first pieces of business to be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee in the forthcoming 1st session of the 88th Congress will be the proposal now under consideration.
>
> Furthermore, it is my strong belief that the Foreign Relations Committee will report the measure by an overwhelming vote.
>
> In addition, when that action is taken and the measure comes before the Democratic policy committee, I shall make an effort, based on a majority vote, to get the bill out of the policy committee and bring it to the floor of the Senate for a vote either for or against it.
>
> I am sure that the Senator is aware that if the question were brought to the floor in that manner, its chances of success would be greatly enhanced.
>
> I know that the one thing the Senator has consistently wanted is an opportunity of that sort. So if he will give the matter some thought and take what I have said as a promise, I assure him I will do everything in my power to fulfill that promise and obtain action as soon as possible at the first session of the new Congress.

Mr. President, the protection rendered by the city's police force to the 26 heads of State visiting our shores—including several unpopular and ruthless leaders of the Soviet bloc—was most effectively administered and deserves the gratitude of the entire Nation. We can all recall the tremendous anticipation and concern which prevailed from the time the *Baltika* docked in New York Harbor with Khrushchev until the time he boarded a plane at New York's International Airport and headed back to Russia. The scrupulous security precautions of the New York City Police prevented incidents which could have inflamed world tensions and created international havoc. America—in fact the world—should be indebted to the city's police force for the manner in which they conducted themselves and performed their duty.

Mr. President, let me illustrate to what lengths New York City's police force went to protect these heads of state. Castro arrived at Idlewild Airport in the latter part of September and was promptly led to a car which was escorted by a motorcycle and another car containing three officers with submachine guns. Two policemen flanked his car, a bus with 60 policemen followed, and 4 patrolmen were stationed at each bridge along the route. In addition, 200 policemen were waiting at his hotel when he arrived and a 24-hour motorcade was assigned to him for the duration of his stay. With Khrushchev, Tito, Gomulka, and Kadar, similar precautionary measures were taken.

It is very true, Mr. President—and I am first to acknowledge this fact—that New York City must share the responsibility of protecting delegates to the United Nations. We are proud that our city was chosen and we certainly are willing to accept a great deal of the responsibility as well as the brunt for its presence. However, Mr. President, I do not feel that anyone can justify loading the entire burden and expense for the protection of delegates from all over the world on the city of New York.

I am hopeful that this year with bipartisan support it will at last be possible to secure favorable action for the hard-pressed taxpayers of the city of New York. I ask unanimous consent to print, following my remarks, the texts of both bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Keating, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1304. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $2,936,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,936,000 for payment to the city of New York. The said appropriation shall be considered an ex gratia payment to assist the city of New York to defray the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses which the city incurred in affording protection to visiting chiefs of state and heads of government during the Fifteenth General Assembly of the United Nations."

S. 1305. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $1,500,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,500,000 for payment to the city of New York. The said appropriation shall be considered an ex gratia payment to assist the city of New York to defray the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses which the city incurred in affording protection to visiting chiefs of state and heads of government during the Fifteenth General Assembly of the United Nations."

GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAM FOR COLLECTION, PRESERVATION, AND PUBLICATION OF CERTAIN PAPERS.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize a grant-in-aid program for the collection, preservation, and publication of papers of national historical value, and for other purposes.

This legislation is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963. The Administrator of General Services has informed the committee that the legislation originated with and is recommended by the National Historical Publications Commission.

According to the Administrator, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the General Services Administration, within the limits of funds available therefor, to make allocations to Federal agencies, and grants to State and local agencies and nonprofit organizations and institutions for the collecting, describing, editing and publishing—including microfilming and other forms of reproduction—of documentary sources significant to the history of the United States.

Prior to making such allocations and grants, the Administrator should seek the advice and recommendations of the National Historical Publications Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Administrator of General Services, dated March 20, 1963, which set forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record at this point, as part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1307) to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize a grant-in-aid program for the collection, preservation, and publication of papers of national historical value, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McClellan, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McClellan is as follows:

General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is forwarded herewith for appropriate action a draft of legislation "to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize a grant-in-aid program, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963. It originated with and is recommended by the National Historical Publications Commission.

The proposed legislation would amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, by authorizing the Administrator, within the limits of funds available therefor, to make allocations to Federal agencies, and grants to State and local agencies and nonprofit organizations and institutions for the collecting, describing, editing, and publishing (including microfilming and other forms of reproduction) of documentary sources significant to the history of the United States. Prior to making such allocations and grants, the Administrator should seek the advice and recommendations of the National Historical Publications Commission.

Section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 established the present National Historical Publications Commission and charged it with a dual responsibility: first, to "cooperate with and encourage appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and nongovernmental institutions, societies, and individuals in collecting, preserving, and, when it deems such action to be desirable, in editing and publishing the papers of outstanding citizens of the United States and such other documents as may be important for an understanding and appreciation of the history of the United States"; and, second, to "make plans, estimates, and recommendations for such historical works and collections of sources as it deems appropriate for printing or otherwise recording at public expense."

During the past year the Commission has reviewed the progress made over the last decade and considered future needs to achieve a balanced national program. In its report to the President, formally approved by the Commission on November 28, 1962, the Commission concludes that it must take a more positive role both in establishing priorities among projects as regards financial support and in securing funds for approved projects.

The Commission found in its analysis of the major documentary publication projects now underway that not one of them is securely financed through to conclusion and that the progress of all the projects is adversely affected by uncertainties about continuity. The Commission found also a continuing pressing need for support of work in neglected areas. Private source of funds (largely philanthropic foundations), which have financed all of the major projects to date, have been confused by multiple demands for support to an extent that threatens to weaken overall support of the Commission's program.

The Commission feels that a firm and justifiable set of priorities must be established, and that a channel of distribution between sources and need is required. The Commission, as a national agency charged with responsibility for developing a national program, is in a unique position to act as such a channel for private philanthropy and to advise the Administrator of General Services with respect to the disbursement of Government funds.

At its meeting on November 28, 1962, the Commission recommended two specific lines of action: First, that the financial needs of high priority projects (publication of the Adams papers, the Franklin papers, the Hamilton papers, the Jefferson papers, and the Madison papers) should be met by foundation or other private grants of a permanent capital fund nature; second, that the needs of additional projects are so great that not less than $1 million annually should be made available for such projects. Half of this amount, $500,000, the Commission recommends, should be furnished by the Federal Government and half by private philanthropic foundations.

The Commission believes that the bulk of Federal funds should be used to support the microfilming of both Government records and private papers of national importance in order to make them generally available and for the preparation of essential guides, catalogs, indexes, and other finding aids to facilitate their use. The Commission recommends, however, that Federal funds be used to complete the editing and publication of the documentation relating to the debates over the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights and to publish the contemporary documentation relating to the work and debates of the First Federal Congress, which organized the Government under the Constitution.

The proposed legislation would authorize an appropriation of $500,000 annually to the General Services Administration to carry out the program recommended by the Commission. It would also authorize the establishment by the Commission of special advisory committees to assist in the establishment of priorities among projects proposed for the Commission's consideration. Such advisory committees would be selected from among the leading historians, political scientists, archivists, librarians, and other specialists of the Nation.

For the foregoing reasons the General Services Administration strongly recommends early enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

PROHIBITION OF WIRETAPPING BY CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators EASTLAND and ERVIN, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specific categories of criminal offenses. The bill incorporates the legislative recommendations submitted by the Attorney General and it is identical to that which was introduced in the preceding Congress and on which hearings were held by the Committee on the Judiciary on March 29, April 4, 5, 6, and May 10, 17, and 24, 1962.

The Congress has given considerable attention to this matter during the past several years and in the preceding Congress hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, under the chairmanship of Senator ERVIN, on S. 1086, S. 1221, S. 1495, and S. 1822 on May 9, 10, 11, and 12, 1961.

The Attorney General has pointed out that existing law has proved ineffective, both to prevent indiscriminate wiretapping which seriously threatens individual privacy and to afford a clear-cut basis for the legitimate and controlled use of wiretapping by law enforcement officials.

State and local prosecutors, in those States which permit wiretapping under State law, are faced with the problem that the exercise of the wiretapping authority under State law may violate Federal law.

The Attorney General has pointed out that the inadmissibility of wiretap evidence in Federal courts has prejudiced the enforcement of Federal statutes designed to protect the national security.

The legislative proposal recommended by the Attorney General outlaws all private wiretapping and all wiretapping by law enforcement officials which does not conform to the limited authority which the bill would grant.

The bill would permit the FBI or Federal agencies having investigative responsibilities for a limited group of specified major offenses to tap wires to obtain evidence of the commission of such offenses, but only after obtaining a court order. In addition, the Attorney General could, without a court order, authorize wiretapping by the FBI in cases involving treason, espionage, sabotage, subversion, and unauthorized disclosure of classified atomic energy information. The Attorney General would be required to find that a serious threat to the security of the United States existed and that resort to the court order procedure would be prejudicial to the national interest. Wiretaps by State law enforcement officers would be permitted only in States which adopt a statute authorizing the court order procedure as set forth in the bill. If the State does not have an appropriate statute, then the attorney general of that State, or the principal prosecuting attorney for any political subdivision could apply for permission to wiretap in the investigation of the crimes of murder, kidnaping, extortion, bribery, or dealing in narcotic drugs or in marihuana.

I submit a section-by-section analysis of the bill, which has been prepared by the Department of Justice, and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1308) to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. ERVIN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE WIRETAPPING PROPOSAL SUBMITTED IN THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Section 2 contains legislative findings.

Section 3 provides that it shall be a felony, punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years or both, for a person willfully to intercept, disclose or use the contents of any wire communication except as specifically authorized by the act. However, it shall not be unlawful for a switchboard operator, or any telephone company employee, to intercept, disclose, or use a wire communication in the normal course of his employment while engaged in any activity which is a necessary incident of the rendition of service.

Section 4 provides that no part of the contents of an unlawfully intercepted wire communication and no evidence derived therefrom may be received in evidence in any judicial, administrative, legislative, or other proceeding of the United States, or of any State or any political subdivision thereof.

Section 5 establishes procedures by which certain interceptions by law enforcement officers may be authorized.

For cases involving certain felonies affecting the national security—espionage, sabotage, treason, sedition, subversive activities, and unauthorized disclosure of atomic energy information—alternative procedures are provided. The Attorney General or an Assistant Attorney General may authorize an application to a Federal judge of competent jurisdiction for leave to permit the Federal Bureau of Investigation to tap wires. Alternatively, the Attorney General may authorize such wiretapping himself if he finds that the commission of the offense presents a serious threat to the security of the United States and that resort to the court order procedure would be prejudicial to the national interest.

Wiretapping may be authorized for certain other Federal crimes by court order upon application authorized by the Attorney General or an Assistant Attorney General. The Federal crimes for which such wiretapping is authorized are: murder, kidnaping or extortion under title 18 of the United States Code; any offense under 18 U.S.C. 201 (bribery), 18 U.S.C. 1084 (transmission of gambling information), 18 U.S.C. 1952 (travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises); any offense involving violations of the Federal narcotic law; and any conspiracy to commit any of those offenses.

The attorney general of any State or the principal prosecuting attorney for any political subdivision thereof, if authorized to do so by State statute, may petition a State judge for leave to wiretap for the crimes of murder, kidnaping, extortion, bribery or dealing in narcotic drugs or marihuana or any conspiracy involving those offenses.

Section 6 authorizes persons, who have lawfully received information concerning a wire communication which was lawfully intercepted in accordance with the act, to make limited disclosure and use of such information. Any Federal or State investigative or law enforcement officer may disclose such information to another Federal or State investigative or law enforcement officer if such disclosure is appropriate to the proper performance of the official duties of both the officer disclosing and the one receiving such information. An investigative or law enforcement officer may use such information for the proper discharge of his official duties. Any person may disclose such information while testifying in a Federal or State criminal trial or grand jury proceeding.

Section 7 contains the penalty provision.

Section 8 provides procedures for applications for, and issuance of, court orders on both the Federal and State levels. Each application for a court order must contain a complete statement of the facts relied on to show probable cause; the location and nature of the telephone facilities involved; and information concerning all previous wiretapping applications involving the same telephone or the same suspected criminal. The judge may require additional evidence in support of the application. The judge may issue an ex parte order to tap a telephone within the territorial jurisdiction of his court if he finds probable cause for belief that an offense for which an application to wiretap is authorized, has been, is being, or is about to be committed; facts concerning such offense may be obtained by the proposed interception; no other means are readily available for obtaining such information; the facilities to be tapped are used in the commission of the offense for which tapping is authorized, or are leased to, listed in the name of, or commonly used by a person suspected of that offense. The order must specify the nature and location of the facilities to be tapped; the crime as to which information is sought; the identity of the law enforcement agency authorized to tap; and the period of time for which such tap is authorized. No order may authorize a tap for any period exceeding 45 days; extensions of not more than 20 days each may be granted upon the findings referred to above.

Before the contents of an intercepted communication may be introduced in evidence in a Federal criminal trial the defendant must be served with a copy of the court order or other authorization for the wiretap. A defendant in a Federal criminal trial may move to suppress wiretap evidence on the grounds that: the communication was unlawfully intercepted; the order or other authorization was invalid; in the case of court order, there was no probable cause for issuance of the order; or the interception was not made in conformity with the order or other authorization. All applications made to a Federal or State court and all orders granted by such courts must be sealed and may only be made public by order of the court or as provided for in the act.

Section 9 requires copies of all of the applications made and orders issued under this act to be transmitted to the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and to the Department of Justice. The Administrative Office is instructed to report annually to the Congress.

Section 10 contains the definitions.

Section 11 amends section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 1103; 47 U.S.C. 605 to delete the second and fourth clauses of section 605 (dealing with interception and divulgence), and to exempt from section 605 the procedures authorized by this act.

Section 12 contains a separability clause.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a section-by-section analysis, and a letter from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, relating to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section analysis and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1309) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The section-by-section analysis and letter presented by Mr. Sparkman are as follows:

Section-by-Section Analysis

FEDERAL SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Section 1 of the bill would change the name of the Small Business Administration to the Federal Small Business Administration; and section 2 would effect corresponding changes in references to the agency which are embodied in the Small Business Act, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and other laws of the United States. The purpose of this change is to provide the public with a clear indication that the agency is an instrumentality of the Federal Government, rather than a State or private organization. There is reason to believe that the existing name is inadequate for such purpose.

REVOLVING FUND AUTHORIZATION

Section 3 of the bill would effect four amendments to the provisions of section 4(c) of the Small Business Act governing the revolving fund authorization of the Small Business Administration. The first of these amendments would increase the total amount of the fund from $1,666 to $1,775 million. The second would increase from $1,325 to $1,375 million the amount of the total fund which may be outstanding at any one time for the purposes of the business loan program embodied in section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, the disaster loan program embodied in section 7(b) and the prime contract program embodied in section 8(a). The third amendment would make appropriate revisions in the terms of section 4(c) to insure that a disproportionate part of this combined authorization of $1,375 million is not used for any one of the three specified programs.

The fourth amendment would increase from $341 to $400 million the amount of the total fund which may be outstanding at any one time for the exercise of the functions of SBA under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

The reasons for the proposed increase in the $1,325 million figure are to be found in the legislative history of the statute (Public Law 87–550) which established this combined authorization for the three specified programs. The conference report accompanying the underlying bill (S. 2970) contains the following declaration of intent:

"The combined increased authorization * * * is intended to meet estimated needs for a 2-year period (fiscal 1963 and 1964). The agreement of the conferees upon this increased authorization was predicated upon their belief that SBA's business loan program should be reviewed at least every 2 years. In order to assure adequate time for consideration, the estimated business loan program needs for SBA for an additional 2 years should be submitted to the new Congress when it convenes in January 1963, and this process then should be repeated as necessary every 2 years as each new Congress convenes in order to provide for an orderly and recurring review of this program by the Congress and to avoid emergency appeals by SBA for additional authorization." (H. Rept. 1974, 87th Cong., 2d sess.)

In accordance with this expression of intent a review has been conducted to determine the probable requirements of the business loan program through June 30, 1966. The resulting calculations indicate that an authorization of $1,218 million will be needed for the purpose, and this amount has been rounded to $1,225 million to provide a small margin of safety. Thus the probable requirements of the business loan program leave only $100 million of the existing combined authorization available for disaster loans. Unless an appropriate increase is made in the authorization it will not be adequate to meet the needs of both the business loan program and the disaster loan program.

For the purpose of determining the size which this increase should assume, it is necessary also to project the requirements of the disaster loan program through June 30, 1966. In the case of disaster loans other than those for displaced businesses an annual estimate of $20 million has been utilized. This figure represents the average for the 5-year period ending June 30, 1962. For loans to displaced businesses the 1963 estimate is $6 million; and a gradual increase to $16 million, in 1966, is anticipated. These computations indicate that disaster loans and commitments outstanding on June 30, 1966, will amount to approximately $142 million. The latter figure has been rounded to $150 million, again to provide a small margin of safety.

Together with the requirement for business loans, this indicates a need for a combined authorization of $1,375 million. Accordingly the existing combined authorization should, as proposed by section 3 of the bill, be increased in the amount of $50 million.

The proposed increase in the combined authorization, from $1,325 million to $1,375 million, calls for a corresponding revision of the provisions of section 4(c) which are designed to insure that a disproportionate share of this authorization is not used for any one of the three programs. These provisions presently require SBA to report promptly to the appropriate committees of Congress whenever the aggregate amounts outstanding for the purposes of the business loan and prime contract programs exceed $1,222 million and whenever the aggregate amount outstanding for the purposes of the disaster loan program exceeds $103 million. Section 3 of the bill would increase these figures to $1,225 million and $150 million, respectively.

The fourth amendment proposed by section 3 of the bill, increasing from $341 million to $400 million the amount of the total fund which shall be outstanding at any one time for the exercise of the functions of SBA under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, is based upon a projection of requirements through June 30, 1964. It is estimated that, as of the latter date, loans and commitments chargeable against this separate statutory authority will aggregate $393,600,000. In order to provide a small margin for contingencies, this figure was rounded to $400 million.

EXPANSION OF DISASTER LOAN PROGRAM

Section 4 of the bill would broaden the scope of the disaster loan program conducted by SBA pursuant to section 7(b)(2) of the Small Business Act. Under the terms of the latter section disaster loans are authorized to help any small business concern suffering substantial economic injury because of drought or excessive rainfall in the area in which such borrower is located, if the drought or excessive rainfall constitutes a major disaster as determined by the President, pursuant to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g, or a natural disaster as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the provisions of 7 U.S.C. 1961.

It is hardly necessary to emphasize the value of these loans in tiding over small businessmen until the buying power of their customers has been restored.

Nevertheless drought and excessive rainfall are by no means the only disasters which can cause economic injury to small business concerns by destroying or reducing the buying power of their customers. Exactly the same injury is currently being reported, for example, by small enterprises in Florida as a result of the damage inflicted on the citrus crops of that State by the recent freeze. Also, such injury can, and sometimes does, stem from other physical disturbances such as flood, hurricane, fire, earthquake, and storm. No sound reason exists for extending disaster loans to alleviate economic injury in the case of drought or excessive rainfall and, at the same time, refusing such assistance in the other described situations.

Accordingly, section 4 of the bill would extend the benefits of section 7(b)(2) of the Small Business Act to any small business concern located in an area affected by any distaster, if the administration determines that the concern has suffered a substantial economic injury as a result of such disaster and if such disaster constitutes a major disaster as determined by the President, pursuant to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g, or a natural disaster as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the provisions of 7 U.S.C. 1961.

In addition to this substantive amendment, section 4 of the bill would effect certain technical changes in the language of section 7(b)(2) to reflect the enactment of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961.

FRAUD RELATING TO SBA MORTGAGES

Section 5 of the bill would provide criminal penalties for any person who, with intent to defraud, knowingly conceals, removes, disposes of, or converts to his own use, or to the use of another, any property mortgaged or pledged to, or held by, SBA. These penalties (a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both) are the same as those applicable for similar frauds committed against the Farm Credit Administration and other farm credit agencies of the Government.

The need for such legislation is reflected in the fact that, under existing law, the United States has no effective means of punishing persons who steal property mortgaged to SBA as security for a loan. Experience has demonstrated that, unless appropriate sanctions are established for such conduct, the Government will suffer substantial loss.

SEPARABILITY PROVISION

Section 6 of the bill contains the standard separability provision.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1963.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed are four copies of a draft bill, amending the Small Business Act, together with a section-by-section analysis thereof. For the reasons stated in the analysis we consider the changes proposed by the bill to be desirable.

The bill would effect increases in the revolving fund authorization of the Small Business Administration, would expand the disaster loan program in certain respects, and would change the name of the agency from the Small Business Administration to the Federal Small Business Administration. In addition, it would provide criminal penalties for persons guilty of certain fraudulent actions relating to property mortgaged to SBA as collateral for a loan. It is believed that, except for the proposed changes in the revolving fund authorization, none of the provisions of the bill would have a material effect on budgetary requirements.

It is my hope that the bill will be promptly enacted. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection, from the standpoint of the administration's program, to the presentation of the bill to the Congress.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator.

TRANSFERRAL OF FLOODED COTTON ACREAGE FOR PURPOSE OF ACRE HISTORY CREDITS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1310) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have introduced the bill for myself and on behalf of my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] to extend the law allowing flooded cotton allotments to be moved to new farms, and to allow the original farm to count the transferred acreage for purposes of acreage history credits, and I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The House of Representatives yesterday passed an identical bill, H.R. 5067, which has now been referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The need for the passage of the bill is immediate, since cotton farms must make the necessary arrangements to begin planting in the next week or so. The need for such legislation arises from the fact that for 3 successive years cotton farms have been flooded in Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, and Louisiana. While legislation has been approved each year to allow the flooded acreage to be moved, a regulation of the Department of Agriculture states that these transferred allotments "shall be deemed to be released acreage for purposes of acreage history credits under sections 344(f)(8), 344(m)(2), and 377 of the act." Therefore, without legislation of this type, cotton allotments on farms which have been flooded for the past 3 years will be cut down this year.

The Department of Agriculture has estimated that 11,400 acres have been flooded this year, affecting about 656 farms in the 7 States I have mentioned. Because I believe the bill is important and should be passed soon, I have asked the chairman of the Agriculture Committee [Mr. ELLENDER] to have the committee consider and report either my bill or the House bill as soon as possible. I hope that this can be done.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill (S. 1310), is ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 344(n) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the figures "1962" where they first appear therein and inserting the figures "1963"; (2) by striking out the word "substantial" where it appears, and (3) by striking the period at the end of the second sentence thereof and substituting a colon therefor and the following proviso: "*Provided,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 344(m)(2) of this Act, the transfer of any farm allotment under this subsection for 1963 shall operate to make the farm from which the allotment was transferred eligible for an allotment as having cotton planted thereon during the three-year base period."

STATUE OF JOSEPH WARD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 11.

These measures provide that a statue of Joseph Ward be placed in the Capitol as a contribution from my fellow citizens of South Dakota.

It is fitting that South Dakotans present this statue to the Nation. For if any one story of an individual relates the drama of the settlement of the West and the self-sacrificing spirit of the early pioneers, the life and accomplishments of Joseph Ward tell the story.

Born in New York in 1838, Ward grew up in Sudbury, Mass., in a community dominated by New England traditions. He attended Phillips Academy at Andover and graduated from Brown University although his college career was interrupted by service in the Union Army.

Joseph Ward then attended the Andover Theological Seminary, and it was here that he was imbued with a missionary spirit which had a profound influence on his life.

Following his marriage in 1868, Ward accepted a missionary appointment at Yankton, S. Dak., then the capital of the Dakota Territory and he established the Congregational Church in South Dakota on a solid foundation.

Recognizing that the church and school are the twin foundations of a community, Joseph Ward opened a private academy which experienced a rapid growth. He then established a college, at which time his academy became the earliest public high school in Dakota. Yankton College, now one of our leading educational institutions in South Dakota, was founded in 1881, largely due to Ward's efforts.

Joseph Ward protected the school lands from speculators, and drafted the education law of our State. He was a humanitarian who helped establish a hospital for the insane. He was an active citizen who participated in the convention which framed a workable law for our State.

Joseph Ward authored our State motto, "Under God the People Rule." Perhaps this gifted phrase is the most compelling testimony to the conviction and motivation of this brilliant and courageous South Dakota pioneer. His life tells the story of the settlement of the West, and a great deal about the history of South Dakota.

A minister, educator, government leader, humanitarian, and easterner, if you will—these references summarize the life of Joseph Ward and the pioneers who settled the West.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a sketch of Mr. Ward's life written for the Dictionary of American Biography appear at this point in the RECORD along with the texts of the proposed resolutions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator's name will be added as a cosponsor of the concurrent resolutions, and the sketch and concurrent resolutions will be printed in the RECORD.

The sketch and concurrent resolutions are as follows:

WARD, JOSEPH (MAY 5, 1838–DECEMBER 11, 1889)

Pioneer Congregational clergyman and educator of South Dakota, was born at Perry Centre, N.Y., the son of Dr. Jabez and Aurilla (Tufts) Ward, and a descendant of William Ward who settled at Sudbury, Mass., about 1638. Joseph grew up in a community dominated by New England traditions, and in a home strongly influenced by religion. After attending the public schools of his locality, he tried his hand at teaching and at farming for a time, and then entered Phillips Academy, Andover, where he was graduated in 1861. That same year he matriculated at Brown University. His college course was interrupted by service in the Union Army but sickness intervened and sent him back to his studies, although his summer vacations were spent with the U.S. Christian Commission. He graduated from Brown in 1865 and then spent 3 years at Andover Theological Seminary, an institution marked by a missionary spirit which did much to determine Ward's subsequent career. On August 12, 1868, he married Sarah Frances Wood.

Accepting a missionary appointment at Yankton, then the capital of Dakota Territory, he was ordained there on March 17, 1869. His activities in behalf of the religious and educational interests of the region were numerous and varied. Under his leadership the Congregational Association of Dakota was formed, and his influence over the Dakota missions was such that he may be regarded as the father of congregationalism in Dakota. Owing to the fact that Yankton was not then a separate school district and there was no adequate provision for securing funds by taxation, it was practically impossible to maintain common schools. A few years before Ward's arrival, a public school supported by the enterprise of the Yankton women had been started, and to supplement its work Ward opened a private school. It had a larger growth than had been expected and in 1872 was formally converted into the Yankton Academy. Ward continued in charge of it until he began to promote the establishment of a college, at which time the academy was given over to public control and transformed into the Yankton High School, the earliest public high school in Dakota. Yankton College, the first institution of collegiate rank in the Upper Mississippi Valley, the founding of which was largely the result of Ward's activities, was chartered August 30, 1881, and the cornerstone of its first building laid June 15, 1882. This institution he served as president and professor of mental and moral philosophy until his death.

He played a very conspicuous part in keeping the school lands of the territory out of the hands of eastern speculators, and the education law of South Dakota was almost wholly his work. Interested in every humanitarian enterprise, he was largely instrumental in securing the establishment in 1879 of the Dakota Hospital for the Insane. In the struggle for statehood, also he played a large part, especially in the formation of the Citizen's Constitutional Association, which brought about the constitutional convention at Sioux Falls in 1883. This convention, formed by direct authority of the people without authorization from the legislature or enabling act of Congress, framed a worthy organic law for the future State.

Spurning all chances for political advancement, Ward in his last years devoted himself to the service of Yankton College. In 1886 he became involved in a theological dispute over the possibility of future probation for those who died ignorant of Christ's teachings. Scornful of "institutional cowardice," he fought on what he considered the side of liberty, despite the fact that it threatened for a time to wreck the college. The storm soon passed and in 1887 Yankton College graduated its first class. A little more than 2 years later Ward died, the immediate cause of his death being blood poisoning occasioned by diabetes. He was survived by his wife and five children.

(G. H. Durand, "Joseph Ward of Dakota" (1913); W. J. McMurtry, "Yankton College" (1907); Doane Robinson, "History of South Dakota" (2 vols., 1904); "Eighth Annual Catalog of Yankton College" (1890); "State of South Dakota: First Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction" (1890); "Congregational Yearbook" (1890); Andover Review, January 1890; Advance, Dec. 19, 1889; Press & Dakotan (Yankton), Dec. 19, 1889; Charles Martyn, "The William Ward Geneology" (1925).)

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

Resolved by the Senate (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That the South Dakota State Historical Society of South Dakota is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South Dakota, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10

Resolved by the Senate (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That the statue of Joseph Ward, presented by the State of South Dakota, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his leadership as author of the State's motto, framer of the Territorial school law, founder of the first college, and outstanding churchman in the founding of Christian churches among whites and Indians: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of South Dakota.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11

Resolved by the Senate (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Joseph Ward, to be presented by the State of South Dakota in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed three thousand additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and one thousand two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of South Dakota, and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and one thousand two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of South Dakota.

FEDERAL-STATE WATER RIGHTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 4, 1963, the name of Mr. JORDAN of Idaho was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1275) to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. Moss) on April 4, 1963.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON INTERNATIONAL HOUSING

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee plans to hold hearings on the subject of "International Housing." The hearings are scheduled for April 22 through April 25, 1963, and will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, commencing at 10 a.m. each day. Testimony will be received on the contents of papers prepared at the committee's request and published as a committee print.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CHARLES B. FULTON TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 24, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Charles B. Fulton, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of Florida, a new position.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. METCALF:

Statement of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, relating to recreation values in the planning and design of highways.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, tomorrow will make the 10th anniversary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. While it is the newest of our Federal departments, it is performing a job which began even before the adoption of our Constitution. It was in 1785 that the Federal Government first began aiding education in this country. Other important functions of the Department, such as the Public Health Service, also have a long and distinguished history.

It was my great privilege to serve as Secretary of this Department at the start of the present administration. During my 18 months at HEW, I came to have a deep respect for the able men and women who work there. I know of no other department in our Government where ability and idealism are demonstrated to a higher degree by the career employees.

HEW serves all the people of this Nation. It serves them well, in an unbelievable variety of ways.

As new tasks have been assigned to it, the Department has grown rapidly in recent years. Each year, the Congress itself has voted increased funds for the Department, and has also authorized substantial increases in its personnel. In fact, for the 2 fiscal years during which I was associated with the Department, Congress voted for it more funds than the President's budget requested.

This Department has grown because each year Congress assigns it new and challenging tasks. While I served as Secretary, HEW was given responsibility for aid to dependent children of the unemployed, educational television, juvenile delinquency, manpower training, the Cuban refugee program, and expanded programs in radiological health, water pollution, control drug regulations, health research, welfare reforms, and social security benefits, to mention just a few examples.

The Department has a proud past, and I predict for it a bright future. It is the Department of the future. As new breakthroughs are recorded in medical research, as the public increasingly demands greater expansion of educational opportunities in this country, as proper financing of the health costs of the elderly becomes a reality, as increased protection is given the public against the hazards of polluted air and water and unsafe or worthless drugs, HEW will grow to meet these new challenges.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report, prepared by HEW, surveying its 10-year history. The report was prepared by HEW's Assistant Secretary, Wilbur J. Cohen, one of the most brilliant and dedicated men in public service today.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—THE 1ST DECADE: CHANGE AND CHALLENGE

This year marks the 10th anniversary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the newest Federal agency to be represented in the President's Cabinet. However, the responsibilities it bears for the well-being of the American people date back to the early years of our Republic.

They began in 1785, when the Congress of the Confederation made grants of public lands to the States for public schools.

They were added to in 1798, when the fifth Congress established the Marine Hospital Service—forerunner of today's Public Health Service.

In 1867 the Federal Office of Education was established; in 1907 the Food and Drug Administration began as the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture; in 1912 the Children's Bureau was established; in 1920 the predecessor of the present Vocational Rehabilitation Administration began its important work; and in 1935 the Social Security Board was organized.

All these agencies were brought together in 1939 under the framework of the Federal Security Agency, and 14 years later the Agency was given Cabinet status when it became the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In this chronology of the Department's growth, we can trace the Nation's growing recognition of the need for Federal participation in promoting the general welfare of the American people. Through periods of prosperity and depression, through civil strife and world conflict, the Federal Government has shared in the national concern for the well-being of every citizen.

We are now in an era of change and challenge which in many ways eclipses those critical periods of our past.

We are in the midst of a technological revolution which is changing the pattern of life and work of the American people.

As our national strength and prosperity have increased, we have grown more and more aware of pressing problems within our society which cry out for solution—problems of great magnitude and complexity that are beyond the resources of the individual and his local and State governments.

Some of these problems have long been with us and require solution even more urgently today; some are the outgrowth of the technological forces which are altering our society; others have arisen as a natural consequence of the higher human expectations of larger numbers of citizens.

In education, for example, we have a shortage of facilities and well-trained teachers at the same time that we face increasing demands for more schooling for more people. We have millions of young people and millions of adults whose lack of adequate education prevents them from enjoying a full measure of the Nation's prosperity and from making their full contribution to society.

Our aged men and women, those in the lowest income group and most subject to illness, have tragically inadequate insurance against the high cost of hospital care and related health services.

Other problems in our society represent an appalling waste of human lives and human potential: Mental illness and mental retardation, drug addiction, accidents, juvenile delinquency.

Increasingly we are concerned with problems of air and water pollution, and the proliferation of chemicals in the production and processing of foods.

In the following pages are summarized the progress this Department has made during the past decade in carrying out its responsibilities for the well-being of the American people.

As we review the successes of the Department's first 10 years, let us look forward to a second decade of helping to make available to all citizens full opportunities for the development of their talents and abilities. These are our most precious resources—our hope for the future.

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

(By Wilbur J. Cohen and Joseph W. Kappel)

Creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on April 11, 1953, culminated more than 30 years of effort by citizens who believed that the Federal Government needed an agency of Cabinet status to carry out effectively its constitutional responsibility for "promoting the general welfare." Only by such action could the health, education, and welfare interests of the American people receive their due consideration at the policymaking level of the President's Cabinet.

The changing concept of the Federal Government's responsibility with regard to the general welfare over a hundred-year period is evident when one contrasts the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1953 with the veto in 1854 by President Pierce of Dorothea Dix's bill for a grant of land to support the indigent curable and incurable insane in the United States. Despite "the deep sympathies of (his) own heart," the President vetoed this bill on the grounds that it was not proper nor constitutional for the Federal Government to provide "for the care and support of all those * * * who, by any form of calamity, become fit objects of public philanthropy."

Much has happened since that veto message was written. The importance of the change in viewpoint concerning the Federal Government's responsibility is demonstrated by the overwhelming, bipartisan support in the Congress when the legislation creating the Department in 1953 was enacted. After passage in the House by a vote of 291 to 86, it was approved by a voice vote in the Senate.

Senator Taft on that occasion said: "I am very much pleased that we have finally reached our objective. We have sought for a long time to give to the three agencies affected representation in the Cabinet, the policymaking section of the Government, immediately under the President. These activities of the Federal Government are tremendously important to the welfare of the Nation, although the Federal Government does not undertake to assume primary direction in the three fields."

Senator HUMPHREY stated that: "The plan meets a longfelt need for participation by the Federal Government in the services of health, education, and welfare. I concur in the view expressed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft] that the essential function of the proposed Department would be the carrying out of present programs, which are, in the main, State-aid programs, and represent mechanisms for cooperation between the Federal Government, State governments, and local institutions and governments in the field of health, education, and welfare."

DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

Any account of the Nation's programs of health, education, and welfare during the past 10 years can be properly assessed only when viewed against the backdrop of the dramatic growth of our population and economy in recent decades. In the period for which figures are obtainable most closely matching the 10 years of the Department's history, the population increased by an unprecedented 30 million (July 1952 to July 1962). In 1963 the total population had reached 188 million people.

In 1962 we had over 17 million persons aged 65 and over, as compared with 13 million in 1952; our school-age population, largely concentrated in the 5 to 19 age group, numbered 52 million in 1962, as compared with 37 million in 1952. In the brief 30 months since the 1960 census and school age and younger population (under age 20) increased by over 4 million, while the adult working age population (20–64 years) increased by over 2 million.

Looking ahead to the next decades, a total population of about 250 million persons is estimated by the year 1980.

Aside from sheer growth, a remarkable feature of our demographic development in recent decades has been the shift from farm to city. While the population in urban areas increased by 28 million between 1950 and 1960 to a total of 125 million, the rural population actually declined from 54 million to 53 million. We have become an urban society with problems of health, education, and welfare concentrated in urban-suburban areas.

The period 1953–63 has been notable not only for its great increase of population but also for the vast growth of the American economy. The gross national product grew from $365 billion in 1953 to $554 billion in 1962. Personal income increased during this period, and per capita disposable personal income rose from $1,582 in 1953 to over $2,000 in 1963. At the same time, there were rises in the cost of living.

A significant factor from the standpoint of the programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been the unusual increase in the cost of medical care. Whereas the overall Consumer Price Index rose from 93.2 to about 106 during the past decade, the index for medical care increased from 83.9 to 115. Most important of all, analysis of the medical care index reveals that physician's fees were consistent with the overall increase, and prescriptions and drugs declined somewhat, but the "hospital daily service charge" component rose from 74.8 in 1953 to over 131 in 1963. In dollars, this means that hospital care now averages more than $35 a day. This is the most dramatic increase in the Consumer Price Index.

Some significant developments in health, education, and welfare, 1952–62

Item	1952	1962
Mental hospital patients	596,000	604,000
Paralytic poliomyelitis cases	21,269	709
Hospital expense:		
Per patient day	$18.35	$34.98
Per patient stay	$138.73	[1] $267.37
Number of children under age 18	50,200,000	67,400,000
Elementary and secondary school enrollments	[2] 30,600,000	46,700,000
College and university enrollment	[2] 2,302,000	[3] 4,600,000
Educational expenditures (billions)	$11.3	$27.3
Old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries	5,026,000	18,053,000
OASI payments per retired worker (monthly)	$49.25	$76.19
Number of aged 65 and over	13,000,000	17,300,000
Recipients of old-age assistance	2,646,000	2,226,000
Vocational rehabilitants	63,632	102,377

[1] 1961.
[2] 1951–52.
[3] 1962–63.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Federal role in health, education, and welfare, substantial as it is, is but one segment of a large national effort to which important contributions are made by State and local governments and by private individuals and organizations. All of these activities amounted to a total expenditure, public and private, on health, education, and welfare, of $42 billion in 1953; by 1963 this amount had increased to $101 billion. During this period, the ratio between private and public expenditures remained fairly constant, with $1 in private funds expended for approximately each $2 of public funds.

Of the $101 billion[1] estimated expenditures on health, education, and welfare in 1963: $34 billion was spent for health—25 percent from public funds and 75 percent from private funds; $28 billion was spent for education—80 percent from public funds and 20 percent from private funds; $41 billion was spent for social insurance and welfare—86 percent from public funds and 14 percent from private funds.

The significant roles of the public and private sectors of our society, in assuming the financial burden of these enormous expenditures, demonstrate the viability of a highly important and indeed unparalleled partnership in our society among private individuals and organizations, their local and State governments, and the Federal Government.

MAJOR CHANGES IN PROGRAMS

In 1954, Federal payments to States for the needy and destitute constituted 72 percent of the Department's total budget (excluding old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments), whereas they comprise only 51 percent of the Department's budget in 1963. This decrease in comparative importance of programs for the needy during a time when the total budget of the Department has increased symbolizes the major changes in the Department's programs during its first 10 years.

During this period, the other programs of the Department have experienced a fivefold expansion from a level of $540 million to $2.5 billion. While almost all of the Department's programs have shared in this growth, the major developments have been in the following three program areas:

1. Medical research programs of the National Institutes of Health.
2. Federal-State assistance programs in community and environmental health, especially in construction grants for hospitals and sewage treatment plants.
3. Federal aid to elementary, secondary, and higher education under the omnibus provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

The key feature of this 10-year period is patently a change of emphasis from amelioration to prevention and development. The newly born Department of Health, Education, and Welfare took over functions which in large measure looked back to problems created by past emergencies or depressions and other types of crisis, functions designed to help people adversely affected by these problems, whereas the Department of 1963, while making a major effort to improve its ameliorative programs, is stressing solutions to present and emerging problems and opportunities.

LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS

The shift in emphasis from amelioration to prevention has developed, in large measure, by means of the major legislative changes in the fields of health, education, and welfare that have been enacted over the past 10 years. This legislation has effected needed improvements and new directions in basic statutes governing the programs of the Department, and has also established important new programs of Federal assistance to the States and local communities to help solve pressing health, educational and social problems.

Social insurance has been strengthened in its role as the first line of defense against economic insecurity through legislative improvements that have broadened the coverage and strengthened the financial base of the program, raised benefit levels, and added a new category of benefits for disabled workers and their families. The supportive role of assistance programs has been given new dimensions by the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, which emphasize preventive and rehabilitation services and the training of competent staff, and provide the States with new tools for making welfare programs more effective. Extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services have grown out of the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1954, which strengthened the financial base of rehabilitation programs and improved resources and facilities through more effective use of available Federal funds.

Public health legislation during the past decade has emphasized the preventive approach through new programs of Federal grants for environmental health control, of grants to promote research toward the prevention and cure of the physical and mental diseases of man, and of grants-in-aid for the construction of diagnostic centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes, and by strengthening the existing regulatory powers of the Federal Government with respect to food, drugs, and cosmetics.

The role of education as an indispensable factor in economic growth and the maximization of individual potential has been given statutory recognition in the National Defense Education Act, which has as its purpose the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of (the Nation's) young men and women.

MAJOR HEW LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS, 1953–62

During the 10-year period, Congress enacted more than 120 pieces of health, education, and welfare legislation, of which 27 were major new or amended programs.

---

[1] The adjusted total of $101 billion eliminates duplication in use of income-maintenance payments (public and private) for private purchase of health or education services. A complete tabulation of these expenditures will be presented in the May issue of Indicators. For an explanation of what is included in these figures see Ida Merriam's "Social Welfare Expenditures, 1960–61" in the November 1962 issue of the Social Security Bulletin.

No brief discussion can do justice to the important and many-faceted laws which have been enacted by the Congress during this decade. Even the list which follows, within space limitations, only enumerates the most important.

Listed first are enactments which initiated fundamental changes; in a second group are those changes in or additions to existing programs which are of only slightly less importance.

Basic legislation

Environmental

Air Pollution Control Act of 1955: Provides for studies, investigations, and dissemination of information and for grants and contracts for research, training, and demonstration projects in the field of air pollution control; date enacted, July 14, 1955; Public Law 84-159.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956: Provide for comprehensive programs for water pollution control; interstate cooperation; research, investigation, and training; grants for water pollution control programs; grants for construction of treatment works; enforcement measures against pollution of interstate water, etc. Supplants the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 (Public Law 845, 80th Congress); date enacted, July 9, 1956; Public Law 84-660.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961: Broaden and strengthen the Federal Government's pollution abatement powers in this field, provide for a greatly stepped up program of grants for waste treatment works, authorize increased Federal support of State and interstate pollution control programs, provide for an intensified program of research into more effective methods of pollution control, and establish the principle of water quality control as a criterion in planning and building Federal reservoirs; date enacted, July 20, 1961; Public Law 87-88.

Manpower and Facilities

Health Amendments Act of 1956: Assists in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, and in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health; date enacted, August 2, 1956; Public Law 84-871.

Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Act of 1954: Amends the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act (title VI) to provide grants for surveying the need for, and for constructing, diagnostic or treatment centers, hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes; date enacted, July 12, 1954; Public Law 83-482.

Health Research Facilities Act of 1956 (adds title VII to Public Health Service Act): Authorizes grants for construction of health research facilities; date enacted, July 30, 1956; Public Law 84-835.

Food and Drug

Pesticide Amendment of 1954: Amends Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities; date enacted, July 22, 1954; Public Law 83-518.

Food Additives Amendment of 1958: Amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety; date enacted, September 6, 1958; Public Law 85-929.

Kefauver-Harris amendments ("Drug Amendments of 1962") to Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: Broaden factory inspection authority with respect to prescription drugs; require adequate safety and quality controls in drug manufacture; require new drugs to be cleared for efficacy (as well as safety) before they are marketed, permit summary suspension of new-drug clearance if there is an imminent hazard to public health, and otherwise improve new-drug regulation; require batch-by-batch certification of all antibiotics for treatment of humans; require prescription drug advertisements to be more informative; authorize standardization of nonproprietary drug names; require registration of drug manufacturers; date enated, October 10, 1962; Public Law 87-781.

Education

Cooperative Research (in Education) Act of 1954: Authorizes contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities and colleges and State educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education; date enacted, July 26, 1954; Public Law 83-531.

Library Services Act: Authorizes grants to States to promote the further extension of public library services to rural areas without such services, or with inadequate services; date enacted, June 19, 1956; Public Law 84-597.

National Defense Education Act of 1958: Provides, among other things, for college and university student loans; grants and loans for strengthening elementary and secondary school instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages; fellowships for graduate study; payments for programs of guidance, counseling, and testing in secondary schools; university centers for study in rare modern languages and institutes for teachers of modern foreign languages; grants and contracts for research and experimentation in the use of radio, television, motion pictures, and related communications media for educational purposes; grants for area vocational education programs; and grants to improve statistical services of State educational agencies; date enacted, September 2, 1958; Public Law 85-864.

Welfare and Income Maintenance

Social insurance and protection

Social Security Amendment of 1954: Amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits; date enacted, September 1, 1954; Public Law 83-761.

Social Security Amendments of 1956: Provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, reduce to 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, provide for child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before reaching age 18, and further extend coverage; date enacted, August 1, 1956; Public Law 84-836.

Social Security Amendments of 1960: Extend and improve coverage under OASDI and remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system, provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income, amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions; date enacted, September 13, 1960, Public Law 86-778.

Public Assistance

Public Welfare Amendments of 1962: Assist the States in providing more rehabilitation services in order to get individuals off the welfare rolls and in developing better trained staffs to render these services; in increasing payments to the aged, the blind, and the disabled; in improving the aid-to-dependent-children program, to provide for protective payments, payments on the basis of the unemployment of the parent, community work and training programs, and payments to children removed by court order to foster home care, etc. Also provide for substantial increases in the authorizations for child welfare services; date enacted, July 25, 1962; Public Law 87-543.

Vocational Rehabilitation

Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1954: Amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, provide for more effective use of available Federal funds, and otherwise improve the provisions of that act; date enacted, August 3, 1954; Public Law 83-565.

Legislation effecting major program changes

Health

Indian Health Services Act: Transfers the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service; date enacted, August 5, 1954; Public Law 83-568.

Authorizes the transfer of Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University and the construction of a new and modern teaching hospital for Howard's program of medical teaching, research, and service to the community; date enacted, September 21, 1961; Public Law 87-262.

Food and drug

Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act: Regulates labeling of hazardous substances in household-size containers which may cause substantial personal injury or substantial illness. Replaces the Federal Caustic Poison Act, except with respect to foods, drugs, and cosmetics, which remain subject to the latter act; date enacted, July 12, 1960; Public Law 86-613.

Color Additive Amendments of 1960: Amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize the use of suitable color additives in or on foods, drugs, and cosmetics, in accordance with regulations prescribing the conditions (including maximum tolerances) under which such additives may be safely used; date enacted, July 12, 1960; Public Law 86-618.

Training and retraining

Area Redevelopment Act: Provides for Federal financial assistance for industrial projects, public facilities, urban renewal, and occupational retraining in designated areas of chronic unemployment and underemployment. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is responsible for providing assistance for occupational retraining of persons referred to him by the Secretary of Labor, through contracts with State vocational education agencies or with educational institutions; date enacted, May 1, 1961; Public Law 87-27.

Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962: Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to determine the skill requirements of the economy, encourage the development of programs, including on-the-job training, to equip the Nation's workers with the new and improved skills that are required; makes Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare responsible for entering into agreements with States to provide occupational training to unemployed or underemployed persons referred to him by the Secretary of Labor, etc.; date enacted, March 15, 1962; Public Law 87-415.

Welfare and Income Maintenance

Social insurance and protection

Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act (includes Public Health Service officers; also amends title II of the Social Security Act): Extends coverage under the OASDI program to members of the uniformed services on a contributory basis; date enacted, August 1, 1956; Public Law 84-881.

Social Security Amendments of 1958: Increase benefits under OASDI, improve actuarial status of the trust funds, and amend the public assistance and maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the

Social Security Act; date enacted, August 28, 1958; Public Law 85–840.

Public assistance

Public Welfare Amendments of 1961: Amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents; also includes Federal payments for foster home care of dependent children, 1-year extension of appropriation authorization for training grants for public welfare personnel, and increases maximum medical care expenditures (in behalf of old-age assistance recipients) with respect to which there will be Federal participation; date enacted, May 8, 1961; Public Law 87–31.

Juvenile delinquency

Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961: Provides for Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems; date enacted, September 22, 1961; Public Law 87–274.

LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS, 1961–62

In both 1961 and 1962 President Kennedy sent to the Congress special messages on education and health. In addition the President transmitted special messages in 1962 on public welfare and consumer protection—these were subjects of Presidential messages for the first time. During the past 2 years, Congress enacted and President Kennedy approved 26 significant legislative improvements in health, education, and walfare. These enactments brought about needed improvements and changes in the basic programs of the Department. In addition, important new programs of Federal assistance to States and local governments were initiated which will be of great significance in the solution of health and social problems.

Legislation enacted, 1961–62

Health

Drug Amendments of 1962, Public Law 87–781.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, Public Law 87–88.

National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development, and of General Medical Sciences, Public Law 87–838.

Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961, Public Law 87–395.

Transfer of Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University, Public Law 87–262.

Health clinics for domestic migratory farm workers, Public Law 87–692.

Air Pollution Control Act, Public Law 87–761.

Vaccination Assistance Act of 1962, Public Law 87–868.

Education and Training

Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, Public Law 87–415.

Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1961, Public Law 87–22.

Area Redevelopment Act—Vocational retraining, Public Law 87–27.

Training of teachers of the deaf, Public Law 87–276.

Captioned films for the deaf, Public Law 87–715.

American Printing House for the Blind, Public Law 87–294.

Extension of NDEA and impacted area program, Public Law 87–344.

Repeal of disclaimer affidavit in National Defense Education Act, Public Law 87–835.

Educational television, Public Law 87–447.

Surplus property for schools for the physically handicapped and mentally retarded, educational radio-TV, and public libraries; Public Law 87–786.

Welfare and Income Maintenance

Public Assistance Amendments of 1961 (aid to dependent children of unemployed parents), Public Law 87–31.

Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, Public Law 87–543.

Public Works Acceleration Act, Public Law 87–658.

Social Security Amendments of 1961, Public Law 87–64.

Assistance to U.S. citizens returned from abroad, Public Law 87–64.

Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, Public Law 274.

Migration and Refugee Assistance Act (Cuban refugee program), Public Law 87–510.

Alien orphan legislation, Public Law 87–301.

FEDERAL BUDGET AND DEPARTMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

During the period under review, Federal budget expenditures increased from $74 billion in 1953 to $94 billion in 1963, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's appropriations rose from $2 billion to $5 billion. The gross national product increased from $365 billion in 1953 to over $550 billion in 1963. The Department's appropriations amounted to .06 percent in 1953 and .09 percent in 1963—still less than 1 percent of the gross national product.

A consistent aspect of the Department's expenditures has been that 90 percent of its funds are allocated in the form of grants to States, local communities, and institutions. Despite the increase in these programs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare grants have actually declined as a percentage of total grants of the Federal Government. Whereas the Department's grants amounted to 63 percent of total Federal grants in 1953, they had declined to 41 percent in 1963. This change is accounted for by increased Federal expenditures for highways and airport construction, housing and urban redevelopment, preservation of national resources, and promotion of agriculture.

A comparison of the appropriations for the programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in fiscal year 1954 (its first full year) and in fiscal year 1963 reveals important changes in emphasis. As noted above, appropriations moved up from almost $2 billion in 1954 to over $5 billion in 1963. Grants to the States for public assistance increased substantially in this period, reflecting such factors as the increase in the number of recipients of aid to dependent children and frequent congressional enactment of amendments increasing the Federal share of welfare payments and adding new categories of recipients. These Federal payments to States for the needy and destitute account for the great bulk of appropriations to the Department, an amount which is governed by the magnitude of State action and State expenditures on these programs.

INTRAMURAL OPERATIONS

In contrast with the grant programs of the Department, the direct (intramural) activities have averaged about 10 percent of the Department's funds. The largest single activity in this category in recent years is direct research, mostly health research of the National Institutes of Health. Another large amount, almost one-quarter of intramural funds, finances patient care activities through the Indian health program, the Public Health Service hospital system; St. Elizabeths Hospital for the mentally ill, and Freedmen's Hospital. Among other intramural activities, significant sums are used for regulatory programs such as that of the Food and Drug Administration, for civil defense activities, and for special foreign currency research programs.

Administration of the large grant programs of the Department took about six-tenths of 1 percent of the total funds of the Department, excluding trust funds.

STAFF

As Congress has added new responsibilities, the staff of the Department has grown from about 37,000 in 1954 to approximately 82,000 in 1963. Of this total, 45 percent were engaged in administering the old-age, survivors, and disability programs (the cost of which is not borne from general revenue funds), 22 percent for patient care programs, and 19 percent for direct research and technical assistance to the States.

The largest part of the staffing increase between 1954 and 1963 is accounted for by the social security (OASDI) program. Annual benefit payments under this program will reach $15 billion in 1963. A portion of the OASI growth is attributable to the national increase in workload deriving from population growth, and part to the frequent amendments to the Social Security Act which have been enacted by the Congress, giving social security coverage to more people, creating the disability benefit program, and modifying and liberalizing the existing benefits. A testimonial to the efficient operation of this program has been the remarkably small proportion of contribution income—2½ percent—represented by administrative costs.

Apart from the farflung organization of the Social Security Administration, the next largest single group of employees in the Department are those engaged in the direct care of patients in the Public Health Service hospitals, which provide care for merchant seamen, American Indians, and other Federal beneficiaries, and in St. Elizabeths and Freedmen's Hospitals in the District of Columbia. The expansion of staff in these programs is related to the expansion of coverage and the improvement of the quality of this care.

A third large block of employees are those carrying out direct medical research and the administration of research grant programs on the National Institutes of Health campus at Bethesda. The increase of about 7,000 employees over the period is primarily a measure of the extraordinary emphasis placed by the Congress on this field of endeavor in the past 10 years.

Increases of lesser magnitude, but still very significant, have been experienced in most other departmental programs, particularly those concerned with research and technical assistance to States and local communities in the fields of community and environmental health, and the consumer protection programs of the Food and Drug Administration.

TOWARD THE FUTURE

At the close of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's first decade certain signposts pointing to the activities of the Department during the following decade had become visible. The change of emphasis from amelioration to prevention and development was fortified by increased emphasis within the Office of the Secretary upon program interests which are found in more than one agency of the Department, as a result of the related responsibilities of the agencies. Major attention has been devoted to strengthened programs in the field of aging, juvenile delinquency, mental retardation, consumer protection, manpower development and training, and educational television. In recent years the international responsibilties of the Department had expanded considerably along with an increasing realization around the world that social reforms are major factors in national growth and stability.

At the very end of its first 10 years the Department undertook its most important organizational change by creating a new Welfare Administration, separating the Children's Bureau and the Bureau of Family Services from the Social Security Administration in order to give added prominence to these major programs.

Proposals for Federal action to further improve the Nation's health, education, and welfare have been made by President Kennedy this year in five special messages dealing with education, health, mental health and mental retardation, youth, and aging. The last three topics were the subjects of a special Presidential message for the first time in history. These messages indicate the areas in which improvements in existing programs are desirable and necessary.

The departmental developments during the past 10 years, as described above, have added a considerable number of new responsibilities to the programs of each agency of the Department.

A brief account of each agency's developments during the decade is presented. A final page reviews developments in the three educational institutions (Gallaudet College, Howard University, and the American Printing House for the Blind) which are supported by the Department.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, 1953–63

Over the past decade the Public Health Service broadened its support of research studies, training of research personnel, and construction of research facilities by private, nonprofit institutions. The scope of research conducted has undergone similar expansion: a 500-bed clinical center was opened at the National Institutes of Health in 1953; the seventh institute in the NIH complex—the Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases—was established in 1957; and in 1962 Congress approved the creation of Institutes of General Medical Sciences and of Child Health and Human Development.

Highlights of research by PHS scientists and grantees include advances in cancer chemotherapy and in open heart surgery, development of vaccines against influenza and upper respiratory infections, improved drugs for arthritics and mental patients, and the partial "cracking" of the genetic code. Emphasis has been placed on training grants, fellowships, and traineeships to help increase the Nation's supply of doctors, nurses, and other specialized medical and health personnel. Over $1 billion has been spent since 1953 under the Hill-Burton program for the construction of hospitals, nursing homes, and other health facilities.

A major national effort against environmental health hazards has gained momentum, resulting in the establishment of a number of new Public Health Service divisions and field laboratories. Legislation since 1953 has provided authority for expanded programs to study and control air and water pollution. In 1958 responsibility for the collection, collation, and dissemination of data on environmental radioactivity was delegated to the Service by the Secretary of DHEW. Radiological health activities were intensified following the resumption of atmospheric nuclear testing in 1961. Continued progress has been made in combating occupation health hazards and general sanitation problems, including food-borne diseases.

The critical need for comprehensive health services led to passage of the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961 which authorizes PHS grants for community studies and demonstrations to develop new or improved out-of-hospital services, particularly for the aged and chronically ill. The health standards of American Indians and Alaskan natives have been steadily improved through a broad program of preventive and curative medical services since responsibility for health care was transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Public Health Service in 1955.

A National Library of Medicine was established in 1956; work began in 1961 on an electronic data processing system known as Medlars to improve the capacity to store, retrieve and disseminate information. Major PHS components engaged in measuring the Nation's health status were brought together in 1960 in a National Center for Health Statistics.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL, 1953–63

The retirement in October 1962 of Dr. Winfred Overholser, long Superintendent of St. Elizabeths, provided an occasion for assessing the many changes that have taken place at the hospital:

Patient movement: There was a reversal of the long-term climb in the number of patients in the hospital but turnover and general patient activity increased. From a peak of 7,278 patients in June 1955, the average patient census declined at an accelerating rate to 6,771 in June 1962. The number of patients on visit or leave statuses rose from about 250 to over 1,100. Admissions increased by 41 percent from 1,438, 10 years ago, to 2,024 in 1962; discharges doubled from 814 to 1,649. Voluntary admissions increased 2½ times.

Changes in staff and facilities: The staff grew from 2,500 employees to 3,700, and the number of physicians increased from 43 to 82, but staff shortages are still acute. Since 1956 several new buildings have been opened including one for the admission and treatment of patients under age 64, an interfaith chapel, a maximum security building, and a physical rehabilitation building. Older buildings, equipment, and furnishings are being refurbished, and appropriations have been made for a psychiatric-rehabilitation center.

Changes in treatment methods and programs: The use of tranquilizing drugs was shown to be effective; psychosurgery (lobotomy) was discontinued. Racial integration was achieved without notable incident. The development of the "therapeutic community" was begun; studies of the interrelationships of staff, personnel and patients, and partial self-government by patients was initiated. A successful reemployment program for rehabilitated patients was developed. Publication of the report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health stressed new concepts of patient care, and a vigorous attempt was made, with increasing success, to send patients out to nonmedical facilities.

Development of national significance: The Durham decision of 1954 initiated constructive changes in attitudes toward criminal responsibility of the mentally ill. The hospital centennial was observed in 1955 with a 2-day scientific program featuring papers read by U.S. and foreign psychiatrists and subsequently published in book form. The Clinical Neuropharmacology Research Center (1957), and the Behavioral and Clinical Studies Center (1961) were established in collaboration with the National Institute of Mental Health. A 1960 statute made certain U.S. nationals who become mentally ill while abroad eligible for admission to the hospital. In 1962 an effort toward educating the general public regarding mental illness was made in a series of 26 5-minute transcribed broadcasts, heard in every State over some 450 radio stations.

THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, 1953–63

For the Food and Drug Administration, the past decade has been one of steadily increasing responsibility and correspondingly rapid growth. Scientific progress, new legislation, and a new public awareness of the importance of consumer protection contributed to the evolving pattern.

Much of the change was stimulated by new product development in the regulated industries. Miraculous new chemicals for agriculture, strange new additives for processed foods, lifesaving but potentially dangerous new drugs, and useful but hazardous household chemical aids demanded stronger controls to keep public benefits and public risks in balance.

Marking a new trend in consumer protection, the principle of premarketing safety clearance by the Government, pioneered for new drugs and color additives in 1938, was extended to pesticides in 1954 and to additives for processed foods in 1958, and was further strengthened for color additives in 1960. In each case safety controls were provided to limit the amounts of new chemicals allowed in consumer products. These controls aim for prevention of harm rather than after-the-fact punishment or correction of violations. The burden of proof of safety is on the manufacturer.

The Hazardous Substances Labeling Act of 1960 contains labeling requirements aimed at protecting children and others from accidental injury from the many hazardous chemicals in use and storage in every household.

The Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments of 1962 represent another milestone in consumer protection legislation. This new law extends the premarketing clearance principle to require that new drugs be proved both safe and effective before they are marketed, and provides other new controls to assure the integrity of drugs.

To keep pace with scientific and legislative developments, FDA has increased its scientific staff and broadened its scientific competence to assure proper evaluation of the safety of products for their intended use. Through application of the most modern methods and equipment, FDA has become one of the worlds leading laboratory institutions in the analysis of foods, drugs, and evaluating the safety of additives.

The mid-1950's had found the Food and Drug Administration at a low point in its ability to discharge its responsibilities. Despite rapidly multiplying problems in consumer protection, there were fewer enforcement personnel in 1955 than in 1941. Actions against frauds and cheats had to be stopped in order to carry out programs directly related to the public health.

A Citizens Advisory Committee appointed by the Secretary in 1955 to study FDA's responsibilities and resources pointed up the need for additions to staff, better facilities, and better equipment. The Committee report managed to communicate FDA's needs, and marked a turning point that presaged an era of growth and development. Appropriations increased from $5.6 million in 1953 to $28.3 million in 1963; budgeted positions rose from 829 in 1955 to 3,012 in 1963. A new headquarters building in Washington is nearing completion, and new and improved laboratories have been provided for 11 of the 18 district offices.

THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION, 1953–63

Since becoming a part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on April 11, 1953 (Public Law 83–13), the Office of Education has passed through the most significant period in its 96-year history as the primary education agency of the Federal Government. The original mandate of the Office for gathering statistics and facts has been strengthened by legislative enactments. The Office identifies needs, evaluates resources, and provides professional and financial assistance to strengthen areas of education where there is an urgent national interest.

Financial aid for research, experimentation, and demonstration to extend basic knowledge in education was made possible through legislation in 1954 (Public Law 83–531). The cooperative research program enables projects to be supported in such fields as: retention of students, special abilities, mental retardation, staffing of schools and colleges, school and college organization and administration, instructional subjects of special concern, such as mathematics, sciences, and modern foreign languages, and the teaching of English. The Office disseminates information and seeks ways to translate into theory and ultimately into practice in education the findings of the research completed.

Other significant programs that have been added by new legislation during the past 10 years include: A grant-in-aid program to assist States in extending public library services to rural areas was provided by the Library Services Act of 1956 (Public Law 84–597, as amended). The most significant financial assistance for education which was added during the 10-year period was the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–864, as amended). It authorized more than $1 billion in Federal aid from elementary through graduate school with student loans being the largest single item in the program. Federal assistance for the retraining of unemployed or underemployed persons has been provided by the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 (Public Law 87–415). A 10-year program of $1 million a year in grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies to encourage expansion of education in the teaching of the mentally retarded was authorized by the Education for the Mentally Retarded Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–926, as amended). Grants to educational institutions that are training teachers of the deaf, and for scholarships, are provided by the Training Teachers for the Deaf Act of 1961 (Public Law 87–276).

The Office has continued during the past decade to collect, analyze, and publish national statistics on education at all levels.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, 1953–63

The social security programs were significantly improved and expanded during the decade since the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Disability benefits were added to the old-age and survivors insurance program and the coverage of the system was extended to almost the entire working population. There were two general increases in benefit amounts, an additional increase in the minimum payable, and an upward adjustment for aged widows. Other liberalizations in the law included lowering the retirement age from 65 to 62, raising the amount that a worker can earn without losing benefits, and omitting up to 5 years of lowest earnings in calculating benefits. The number of beneficiaries more than tripled during the decade.

The Federal financial share in the public assistance programs was increased over the 10-year period, and provision was made for proportionately more help to those States where need is greatest and income and financial ability least. States were encouraged to extend and improve the medical care available to public assistance recipients, and a special program was started for elderly persons who are medically indigent.

Increasingly over the decade, the public assistance programs assumed the role originally intended for them, i.e., as supplementary to the basic social insurance program. With social insurance providing more and more effectively for minimum economic security, an increasing proportion of those on public assistance rolls were families with multiple problems and disadvantages. Provisions for social services by trained public welfare staff to such families and potentially dependent families were made in amendments to the Social Security Act.

Child welfare services were also expanded to better serve the current needs of the Nation: In this program and the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, increased Federal financial support and leadership served to stimulate State and local action.

Intramural research in social security was expanded, moving toward the exploration of fundamental questions in the area of human resources and social welfare. Extramural research programs were initiated to acquire needed knowledge about causes and prevention of dependency, improvement of child welfare and reduction of delinquency.

Federal credit unions more than doubled their membership and tripled their assets to enhance their worth as a valuable adjunct to the social security programs. From 1958 on, the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions was supported entirely from fees for chartering and supervising local credit unions.

Responsibility for the Department's social security programs was realined effective January 28, 1963. The Social Security Administration was made responsible for the programs of the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, the Bureau of Hearings and Appeals, and the Bureau of Federal Credit Union; and a Welfare Administration was organized with responsibility for the programs of the Bureau of Family Services and the Children's Bureau, the work of the special staffs on aging and juvenile delinquency, and the Cuban refugee program.

THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION, 1953–63

Major progress has been made in rehabilitation of handicapped persons to productive and satisfying life. A new charter of operations passed in 1954 (Public Law 83–565) provided for expansion of the program of vocational rehabilitation through four major devices:

1. Adoption of a new grant-in-aid system to increase Federal and State funds for expanding services to disabled people. Rehabilitations rose from 55,800 in 1954 to 102,400 in 1962. Funds increased from $36 million ($23 million Federal and $13 million State) in 1954 to $173.4 million for 1963 ($100.4 million Federal, $73 million State).

2. Authorization of major programs of research and training: About 600 research and demonstration projects have been approved in many areas, including mental retardation, mental illness, blindness, speech and hearing problems. Research funds of $46.2 million have been committed. Teaching and training grants totaling $47 million have enabled about 6,000 students to obtain training in short-supply professional fields.

3. Temporary authority and support of incentive grants to expand services and facilities brought establishment or improvement of 112 facilities and workshops at a cost of $2.7 million in Federal and matching funds.

4. A continuing program of incentive extension and improvement grants, combined with regular support grants, have resulted in establishment or improvement of 280 facilities and workshops at a cost of $14.4 million in Federal and State funds.

In 1954, the Congress also authorized Federal money for constructing community rehabilitation facilities under the Hill-Burton program. This has resulted in 234 facilities of various types from $48 million of Federal funds and $102 million of local money.

In the same year the Social Security Act was amended to protect the retirement rights of disabled workers under OASI, and subsequent amendments made cash benefits payable to disabled workers, first over age 50, and then for such workers and dependents regardless of age. In these amendments Congress brought the concept of vocational rehabilitation into integral relationship with disability protection and expressed a preference for State vocational rehabilitation agencies to make disability determinations of persons applying for disability benefits, simultaneously affording them an opportunity for vocational rehabilitation services.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration is encouraging State vocational rehabilitation agencies to conduct with public assistance agencies cooperative demonstrations of rehabilitation of public welfare clients. Four such projects are underway or in advanced planning stages in California, Oregon, Vermont, and New Jersey; many more are expected within the year. The recent elevation in status from Office to Administration, coincident with creation of the Welfare Administration, underlines the importance of rehabilitation of dependents through cooperative effort.

FEDERALLY AIDED EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, 1959–63

Gallaudet College, the only college for the deaf in the world, was founded in 1864, to provide a liberal higher education for deaf persons who need special facilities to compensate for their loss of hearing. Gallaudet College's most significant development in the past 10 years has been accreditation by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The completion of 8 new buildings during the past decade have enabled Gallaudet to accommodate an increased enrollment which now numbers 600 and includes students from all over the world. A milestone in the education of the deaf has been achieved with the admission of deaf students into the graduate program for training teachers of the deaf. Gallaudet College is one of the 40 colleges participating in the program for training teachers of the deaf under Public Law 87–276.

The most significant events which have occurred at Howard University in the past 10 years include the establishment of programs leading toward the doctor of philosophy degree, begun in 1955 in the department of chemistry and expanded to the point where Ph. D. degrees are now offered in seven fields of study; the construction of nine new buildings, which have enabled the university to keep its physical plant abreast of academic expansions; the introduction of an academic program in African studies; the election of Dr. James Madison Nabrit, Jr., as president of Howard University in July 1960. In addition, during the past 10 years foreign student enrollment has grown to the point where Howard University now has the largest percentage of foreign students of any American university—approximately 16 percent of the total student body. Since 1953 national honor societies have been added in many areas of study, including the most renowned, Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi.

The American Printing House for the Blind, which is the largest publishing house and manufacturer of special devices for the aid of the blind in the world, is the official channel through which the U.S. Government serves the States and the blind children in them. Allotments of credit are made to the schools for the blind and to the State departments of education against which they send in orders for materials manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind based upon the number of children registered with this establishment by each State. This act has been amended several times, most recently in 1961 by Public Law 87–294, and is reviewed periodically to determine the adequacy of its provisions in light of changing developments in the field. The growing magnitude and complexity of the unmet needs in this area have been cause for increasing concern. Public Law 87–294 removes the limitation on the amount of appropriation and the provision for representation of State educational agencies on the board of trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind.

In 1879 about 2,200 pupils were being educated in our schools for the blind and the Federal appropriation to the Printing House that year amounted to $10,000. In 1952 a total of 6,145 pupils were served under a Federal quota of $125,000. In 1962, 15,973 pupils were served under a Federal quota of $639,000. An additional $41,000 were provided that year so that the Printing House could render advisory services to the States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Senate bill 1, Calendar No. 89, the Youth Employment bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attachés on both sides be instructed to notify all Senators that this may be a live quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that will be done.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. However, the suggestion of the absence of a quorum will be renewed.

SUB HUNTING—UNITED STATES PUSHES RESEARCH FOR BETTER DETECTION OF UNDERSEA BOATS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as this country piles billions upon billions into the long-range missile field, we are perhaps prone to forget one of the chief menaces to our national security, the great and constantly improving Soviet long-range submarine fleet.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent that one of the most thought-provoking articles on this subject I have seen, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of this morning, entitled "Sub Hunting," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 10, 1963]

Sub Hunting—United States Pushes Research for Better Detection of Undersea Boats—Threat of Increasing Soviet Fleet Bases Spurs Trend; More Killer Craft on Way

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON.—One dark night last fall crewmen of the U.S. destroyer *Cecil*, on blockade duty during the Cuban missile crisis, spotted an unidentified object on their radar scope. Soon the destroyer's underwater listening gear picked up the telltale sounds of a crashdiving submarine.

For 34 hours the *Cecil* and Navy patrol planes bearing sophisticated detection apparatus gave chase. At last the sub surfaced for air and recharging of its batteries; it hoisted a small Russian flag. The pursuers moved in, took aim and snapped its picture.

Such scenes, enacted several times during the crisis period, carry double meaning: They underscore both the growing Soviet undersea threat to U.S. security and this country's increasing ability to combat it.

Since the autumn crisis, the Russians have been improving Cuban harbors and building a new fishing port at Banes in northeast Cuba; all might some day accommodate Soviet subs. In Indonesia, Egypt, and Yemen, the Russians are adding to port facilities that might serve the same purpose. Moscow is said to be expanding by half a dozen each year its fleet of fast, long-endurance, nuclear-powered boats; about 20 of Russia's more than 400 subs are believed to be nuclear jobs. And the Soviets are working on long-reaching sub-launched missiles comparable to the U.S. Polaris.

PROBLEM OF DETECTION

U.S. strategists, vividly aware of this danger, are moving ahead on the major remaining frontier of antisubmarine warfare: The need for long-range, accurate, surefire detection. "The problem is not killing an enemy submarine once we've located it," emphasizes one Navy official, "but finding and identifying it."

Hush-hush research is being pushed into some rather exotic possibilities. One project involves employment of infrared heat-sensing equipment to pinpoint the warm-water wake of moving submarines, both nuclear and conventional powered. Another seeks to use magnetic readings to betray the entry of enemy vessels into vital areas of the earth's oceans. Either system might operate from highflying planes or globe-circling satellites.

Under study, too, is the Screamer, a magnetic radio device which might be sown in narrow channels and would lock onto the hulls of passing subs to broadcast a continuous stream of information on its location. Still another bet: The Sniffer, a sensitive airborne electronic instrument which could detect the presence of air whose atoms have been rearranged by the exhaust of sub engines. A variant of the Sniffer might seek out the trail of radioactive sea water behind nuclear subs.

Researchers in a number of laboratories are steaming ahead simultaneously on this urgent development mission. Some major university research facilities are involved. Among the bigger corporate participants are American Telephone & Telegraph Co.'s Bell Laboratories, General Electric Co., Hughes Aircraft Co., Westinghouse Electric Corp., Raytheon Co., Magnavox Co., Lockheed Aircraft Corp., and Bendix Corp.

RADAR AND SONAR

New and better snooping devices, when they come along, will join a corps of eyes and ears already on duty. Besides radar, antisubmariners count heavily on sonar equipment, often dangled deep in the water by ships or aircraft, that picks up sound waves from moving subs. The range of both radar and sonar has been greatly increased in recent years, but still is limited. Already developed, too, are underwater microphones called hydrophones and other devices which may be planted on the bottom of narrow channels to record the passage of enemy subs.

In all, the Kennedy administration has asked Congress for about $462 million for antisubmarine research and development in the fiscal year starting July 1, a jump of almost 60 percent from the current year and nearly double the past year's sum; Congress is expected to heartily approve. Much of the new total, it's understood, is earmarked for detection research.

But the planners are naturally looking beyond detection alone. To close in and help identify a suspect sub already located, the Navy is experimenting with such speedy craft as air-cushion vehicles that glide just above the water's surface and hydrofoil vessels that ride on pontoons; while slower than planes, either kind would have more endurance than aircraft and lots more speed than submarines. The Boeing Co. is developing a jet-powered hydrofoil craft designed to hit 115 miles an hour, more than three times the top known speed of any existing sub.

And the administration is seeking over $1 billion, or nearly half of its entire 1963-64 shipbuilding request, to build new vessels and convert old ones for both sub hunting and killing. Among the new ships requested: 6 specially designed nuclear-powered attack submarines (besides the 18 due to be on duty by mid-1963) and 10 small, fast destroyer escorts. In addition, the Navy proposes to convert 19 destroyers and 5 guided missile ships primarily for antisubmarine work.

SUBROC, ASROC, DASH

From the attack submarines, thought to be the most effective single antisub weapon, nuclear-tipped Subroc rockets may be launched against far distant enemy subs; a similar Asroc rocket may be launched from surface ships. In either case, the warhead detaches from the rocket as it enters the water and homes in on its target with electronic or other guidance.

From the converted destroyers or other surface ships, remote-controlled Dash helicopter drones can be dispatched as far as 15 miles to fire a pair of either high-explosive or nuclear-homing torpedoes against enemy submarines without any need for their mother ships to come within view of the targets. Plans call for equipping 5 ships with 2 Dash drones each by this summer; 80 vessels may be so armed by mid-1964.

It's no happenstance that nuclear weapons figure heavily in these plans. With their wide range of kill, they're considered particularly effective against nuclear-propelled submarines, which can travel faster and deeper than conventional diesel-electric subs. And it's thought no mere coincidence that Rear Adm. John Shaffer, a nuclear weapons specialist, was named to direct the Navy's antisubmarine warfare division more than a year ago. Although any decision to use nuclear weapons must be made by the President, some Navy men feel there would be less reluctance to use them underseas in a limited war than to use similar-yield weapons on land. Their reasoning: The effect of underwater nuclear explosions would be limited to the target and a few fish—whereas weapons detonated on land might inflict all sorts of unintended damage on civilian populations.

UP FROM "NAUTILUS"

The current antisubmarine buildup is already carrying the Nation's undersea defenses far beyond their strength of just a decade ago. It was as recently as 1954 that the *Nautilus*, the first nuclear-powered attack submarine, was launched. And the buildup is destined to continue for at least several years to come. By 1967, according to plans already okayed by Congress, the Nation will have a fleet totaling 48 attack submarines; that would be 7 more than the number of Polaris missile-firing subs due by the same date.

The weapons already available are breeding high confidence in U.S. ability to cope with the Soviet undersea threat. During last fall's Cuba crisis, U.S. sailors made more than 20 sonar and radar contacts with Russian submarines, and 6 of the boats were actually photographed. In a shooting situation, Navy men contend, every submarine detected could have been quickly destroyed.

Some military analysts, in fact, are convinced that the Russians actually intended then to install a fleet of missile-armed submarines in Cuba, and were foiled by U.S. firmness.

Up to now, Pentagon officials report, Soviet subs still haven't used Cuban ports. The consensus is that the Russians won't really try to estalbish a Cuban sub base any time soon. But the United States is keeping close watch on Cuban ports and Soviet sub movements to insure that nothing of the sort happens without our knowledge.

RED SUBS TO EGYPT, INDONESIA

U.S. strategists are concerned, anyway, over Russia's apparent determination to obtain strategically situated warm-water bases elsewhere for potential submarine use. As a possible prelude to establishment of bases, Egypt already has been presented with at least 9 Soviet submarines; Indonesia has received 20. Russian sailors are known to be manning subs operating out of the Indonesian port of Surabaja—just to train Sukarno's submariners, it's claimed. Not only are rubles being spent to improve port facilities in both these countries, but more than $11 million in Soviet money has gone into building up the port of Hodeida in Yemen. All three nations sit astride or beside critically important sea passages; Indonesia on the route between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific, Egypt on the Mediterranean-Red Sea route and Yemen between the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean.

Soviet technological advance, too, is an object of sober U.S. contemplation. The Russians, whose more than 400 submarines outnumber this country's total underwater force about 4 to 1, are laboring hard to catch up in the two areas of major U.S. advantage: Nuclear propulsion and long-reaching sub-launched missiles.

It won't be too long, the Navy told a congressional committee recently, before the number of Russian nuclear subs "will approximate the entire U.S. attack submarine force level." And though early Soviet submarine missiles had a range of only 350 miles (far short of the U.S. Polaris, 1,200 to 1,800 miles) and had to be launched from the surface, there are indications that they've stretched their missile reach quite a bit and may have solved the problem of submerged launchings. At any rate, Russia's Navy chief, Admiral Gorshkov, has claimed as much.

BISHOP IVAN LEE HOLT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as we approach the Easter season, it is a privilege to pay tribute to a great spiritual leader from the State of Missouri.

This leader is Ivan Lee Holt, retired bishop of the Methodist Church in Missouri, who has been characterized as a "20th century saint, whose life has been a beacon to thousands of Missourians, through war and peace, through change and upheaval, through depression and recovery."

Although we claim Bishop Holt as a Missouri citizen, he is also a true citizen of the world, having served as a leader of the world ecumenical movement for many decades.

I would share with my colleagues a recent tribute to this man of wisdom and good works; and therefore ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Missouri's Man of God," by Jack Stapleton, Jr., from the Dunklin Daily Democrat, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI'S SERVANT OF GOD

Who would qualify as Missouri's most distinguished citizen?

The question is a difficult one; actually it is a subjective one, since each Missourian would have his own idea as to the man or woman who qualifies as the State's outstanding living resident.

For some persons, former President Harry S. Truman is unquestionably the State's most distinguished citizen. For during his lifetime, the man from Independence has altered the lives of millions in the world; it was this Missourian who ushered in the world's nuclear age.

Until his death, Dr. Arthur Holly Compton, a Nobel Prize winner and ofttimes called the father of the atomic bomb, may have been considered by some as Missouri's outstanding and most distinguished citizen.

There are perhaps other nominees from other Missourians, in the fields of industry, literature, politics, business, the professions.

Even though the risk may be great, we'd like to submit our nominee for this title, with the full knowledge that those who have not met him, those who have not thrilled to his words may actually be unaware of his magnetism, his intellect and his achievements.

Our nominee is not an honorary colonel and as far as we know has never been appointed to the post by any Missouri chief executive; our nominee is not a Missouri Squire, an organization established by former Gov. James T. Blair, Jr., to pay tribute to the State's outstanding citizens; our nominee is not even listed in "Who's Who in Missouri."

Can he be distinguished then? Anyone who asks the question should realize that such things as colonels, squires, listings in "Who's Who" are transient honors which generally aren't worth the paper they're embossed on.

What makes a man distinguished then? Perhaps it is that quality of a man which is embossed not on bonded parchment but in the hearts and souls of all who know him. Perhaps it is that quality which endears for a lifetime a man to all who hear him, to all who come in contact with him, to all who sit at his feet to listen to his words.

If these are the qualities of a distinguished man, then our nominee must be Ivan Lee Holt, a retired bishop of the Methodist Church in Missouri, a 20th century saint whose life has been a beacon to thousands of Missourians through war and peace, through change and upheaval, through depression and recovery.

This man, Ivan Lee Holt, who was in Kennett this past week, has been counted as one of the world's great church leaders for decades. His service and tenure with the World Council of Churches has earned for him the respect and the love of millions of Christians throughout the world; his name is known as well in the Fiji Islands as in Montgomery County, Mo.

Bishop Holt was to have been the first American to serve as president of the World Council of Churches; but politics entered into the selection and the honor went to another man. Despite this, he has served on the executive committee of the World Council since it was organized. He is a past president of the World Council of Methodist Churches, and has been one of a handful of leaders of his own church. Although he would deny this, Bishop Holt is perhaps the No. 1 leader of the world ecumenical movement; most certainly he has served as the guiding light of this interdenominational movement for decades. His belief in a worldwide ecumenical movement is abiding; he predicts its eventual fulfillment.

These are the honors Ivan Lee Holt has received during his long years in the ministry. As impressive as they are, they are not the only qualities which have earned him the respect of thousands of Missourians.

The important qualities go deeper than this; they go to a man's soul; they become a part of his intellectual and physical makeup.

Ivan Lee Holt has lived so closely to God that his personality has become imbued with the qualities of mercy, tenderness, and compassion so rare in other, more "distinguished" citizens. His entire life, even after his retirement as active bishop in 1956, has been devoted to others—a letter to a despairing friend, a book to a family distraught with physical illness, a note of encouragement to a struggling minister, be he Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian.

If Ivan Lee Holt is a Missourian he is also a southeast Missourian. He spent 4 years as pastor of Cape Girardeau's Centenary Methodist Church at a time when the Little River drainage district was being organized. One of his favorite stories concerns his efforts to close as many of cape's saloons as possible—and in 4 years he helped reduce the number from 28 to 16. But he laughingly tells of the efforts of one cape citizen to assist him in his efforts to close saloons; it seems the citizen was providing him with sufficient information about certain bars to get them closed. Each time the citizen suggested a saloon needed closing, he would provide Preacher Holt with sufficient evidence to get the bar's doors closed. After phenomenal success at saloon closing, the young minister found his informant was merely acting as an agent for a Cape Girardeau brewery, which was anxious to close those saloons not selling cape-brewed beer.

Bishop Holt doesn't drive; he travels by train, bus, or minister-chauffeured automobile wherever he goes. Last week he was in Dunklin County; last month he was in Florida; the month before that on the Tanna Island, in the Coral Sea near Australia, where he was welcomed by the Queen of Tanna and given full state honors. Last year he attended the World Council of Church meeting in New Delhi, flew from there to Italy, to Spain, and back to the United States. He has crossed the Atlantic 58 times, the Pacific 10 times, circled the globe so many times he forgets whether it's 5 or 6. In between, he will journey to Kennett, to Kansas City, to Montgomery County, bringing with him the greatness of the religion which is such a part of his life. We once took Bishop Holt to catch a late train in northwest Missouri, and he was so loaded down with country ham, beaten biscuit and pound cake which my grandmother had thrust upon him that he resembled a redcap far more than any employee at the train station. Yet despite the boxes, the luggage and his inevitable book under his arm, he was still obviously a great bishop.

Bishop Holt knows more Missourians than any one I have ever known, and that includes the late Forrest Smith whose remarkable memory of faces, names and families astounded a State. The retired bishop can cite the name of a minister who served in Kennett 50 years ago, tell where he is living now, cite the number of his children still living, and tell of his complete pastoral career.

Not long ago, Bishop Holt found himself in Orlando, Fla. He didn't recall knowing anyone in Orlando, but he did remember that a former church secretary of his 20 years before had two sisters who both married doctors and settled in Orlando. Scanning the yellow pages, he ran across a checkmark near an eye, ear, nose and throat specialist there, and he remembered one of the sisters had married such a specialist. He called the doctor's office, and inquired if the doctor's wife was from Mexico, Mo., and if her first name was Dorothy. It was the same Dorothy, whose sister had worked for Bishop Holt 20 years earlier at St. John's Church in St. Louis. The next morning in Orlando, a retired bishop and two sisters got together for breakfast and reminisced. Ivan Lee Holt has known Presidents, bishops, World Church Council leaders from almost every nation in the world. He has known kings, queens, royalty. But he has known, in greater abundance, the common citizens of Missouri, and it is to these persons that he has given his life, his great talents and his love.

This, gentle reader, is a mark of greatness.

Ivan Lee Holt is the greatest servant of God I have ever known. His sermons, at the age of 79, contain the same divine inspiration they did 20 years ago. And the chills which run down my back, when he speaks of the quality of mercy of God, are the same chills I have experienced on rare occasions when some moment of greatness touched my life. The tears which have come to my eyes as this man proclaimed the Gospel are the same tears I felt when Franklin Delano Roosevelt died, when a member of my family passed away, or when, on occasion, some American spoke of this Nation's heritage.

Ivan Lee Holt, more than any man I have ever known, loves humanity, all humanity, with the passion of a disciple. A man's church is not important as long as the man is in church; a man's character, with obvious flaws, is still a divine creation which can and will be changed.

A room is empty, although it is filled with people, until he enters. And then his presence adds a lustre which brings forth a knowledge, in one's heart, that one of God's best is near. And the moment that he speaks, that soft southern Oxford speech becomes a message which can fill one's life with meaning, tenderness, love, and compassion.

Bishop Holt has written great books, but he has also written simple but tender words to a family which has just lost a loved one. He has been honored by royalty, but he has also eaten chicken at a church dinner at the most rustic country church in Missouri. He has discussed the prophets with the greatest church leaders of the world, but he has also taught the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth to a rural Missouri Sunday School class. He has traveled to worldwide ecumenical conferences, but he has also taken a midnight bus to a remote church in rural Missouri to deliver a Sunday morning sermon.

Every moment I have been privileged to be in his presence, I have known he was more than a minister, more than a bishop, more than a world church leader. I have known, although he would be the first to deny it, that Ivan Lee Holt was one of the greatest servants of God since the disciples.

I have somehow known that this human man, concerned with mankind's destiny, has been a part of that destiny. And I have believed, as I believe now, that God's hand has been on his shoulder, guiding and directing this life which has had such impact upon the lives of thousands of Missourians. Would you think it strange if I said that there have been times, while Ivan Lee Holt spoke from the pulpit, that I could almost see that hand on his shoulder?

I have, you know.

DANGER TO DOMESTIC SHOE PRODUCTION

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the position of the shoe industry is a matter of urgent concern to many American communities and nowhere is this more true than in New England.

New England leads the Nation in the production of shoes, with New Hampshire as the sixth most important shoe-producing State. Fifty-five plants located in 28 different New Hampshire communities are actively engaged in the manufacture of shoes, with over 18,000 people dependent upon this industry for their livelihood.

I do not question our national dedication to expanding international trade upon which some 5 million American jobs depend, many of them, of course, in the same New England States. But in 1962, national exports of shoes continued to decline while imports rose a startling 50 percent. One hundred and seventy jobs were lost in the State of New Hampshire in 1962, and the average number of hours worked per week dropped from 38.8 in January of 1962 to 36.9 in January of 1963. I submit that the whirlwind increase in leather-type shoe imports from 8 million pairs in 1955 to 55 million pairs in 1962 deserves far more attention than it has received. The administration should give urgent priority and continued attention to this problem so that the shoe industry may retain its important part in the American economy and also so that the interest of the consumer in quality footwear may be protected. We should, in my opinion, work toward a voluntary quota system in any commodity where annual increases in imports are as great as 50 percent. Such action would arrest the speed with which domestic industries are asked to adjust to foreign competition.

INCOME FROM TIMBER SHOULD BE TREATED AS CAPITAL GAIN

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, in a statement on water pollution a week ago I pointed out that New England's natural resource problems can only be solved through long-range management. Nowhere is this more true than in the timber industry. With the declining market for medium growth white pine there has come a need for imaginative forestry practices that will enable us to supply trees of larger size. Rural poverty can only be relieved through sound use, with State and Federal advice, of our 40,000 small woodlots. The State of New Hampshire conducts a splendid forest fire and pest control program, having controlled white pine blister rust on fully 96 percent of its large control area.

Our small woodlot owners and State forest management program would suffer severely if the income from timber could no longer be treated as capital gain. Their progress, while heartening, has been long in coming. I am sure that I speak for all concerned with the future of New England's lumber industry in objecting to proposed changes in the tax treatment of timberland revenue. There would be no surer way to undo the progress that has been made.

I ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the New England Section of the Society of American Foresters and a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury from the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas forest growth can be attained only through accumulation of wood capital in the growing forest and investments in growing time must be held for periods ranging up to 80 years and longer; and

Whereas the capital gains provision of the Internal Revenue Act of 1943 removed a major tax barrier to investment in forestry, encouraging many major improvements in the Nation's forest resources, including those of watershed and recreation, which has stimulated rural employment; and

Whereas continued progress in the management of our total forest resource depends upon maintaining the present system of capital gains taxation of timber revenues; be it

Resolved, That the New England Section, Society of American Foresters, at its annual winter meeting held at Manchester, N.H., on March 14–15, 1963, strongly endorses the current system of capital gains taxation on timberland revenues, under the Internal Revenue Code, section 631.

JOHN J. MAINES,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SOCIETY FOR PROTECTION OF
NEW HAMPSHIRE FORESTS,
Concord, N.H., March 21, 1963.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We here in New Hampshire are disturbed by the proposed change in the law which now permits gains when timber is harvested to be taxed under the capital gains method.

Except in a small portion of the West, we no longer have virgin timber. The whole country is rapidly approaching the condition we here in New England have been in for a long time. Timber must be grown from the start. Furthermore, satisfactory results require expense for starting the crop and cultural operations during its life. Utter neglect of the forest until very recent times has borne little fruit and we were rapidly approaching a diminution of forest products below the needs of a fast growing population.

Our State of New Hampshire recognized that private initiative was heavily penalized in practicing good forest management and in 1951 removed growing wood from the general property tax and substituted a severance tax at time of cutting, at considerable cost to the State.

In 1944 the Federal Government, cognizant of the need for encouraging long-term forest management, and discouraging sale of capital forest assets to achieve a reduction of tax liability, instituted the present method of permitting capital gains taxation for timber cut by the owner from his own land.

We believe this is fully warranted because of the nature of forest growth. Over the long period of 25 years for low value pulpwood up to 80–120 years for sawlogs, the actual return is of the nature of only 4–6 percent.

If much more than 25 percent is taken by the Federal tax, there is little incentive for private forest management, certainly by industry. And it is upon industry, whch has made great strides over the past 15–20 years that we must rely. The small forest ownerships which it is proposed to still favor up to $5,000 per year cannot possibly fill the void that may be created.

Here in New Hampshire we feel this proposed sharp increase will more than offset the encouragement our own law was designed to effectuate, and I may say has succeeded reasonably.

In forestry, improvement is painfully slow. The trend, if reversed, will not be noticed for some time, but once a decline in private activity starts, it will be difficult to correct, and possibly only by drastic new laws, subsidies, or further acquisition for public ownership after the forests are heavily depleted again.

The direct taxation of tree growth is self-defeating and we urge you and your committee to preserve the present capital gains tax on all timber so that present improvement may continue, especially as the rapid increase in population will naturally have need for more forest products rather than less.

Cordially yours,

LAWRENCE W. RATHBUN,
Forester.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE THEODORE R. McKELDIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when the persons who have done the most for U.S.-Israel friendship are finally listed in the annals of history, one of those who will be most highly named will be Theodore R. McKeldin, former mayor of Baltimore, former Governor of Maryland, and consistent champion of minority groups. Governor McKeldin was an organizer of the America-Israel Society. In Israel, a forest and a hospital wing bear the name "McKeldin" in tribute to his activities. He holds an honorary doctor of laws degree from the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, in New York, and he is also a fellow of the Hebrew University, in Jerusalem, and a fellow of Brandeis University, in Massachusetts, where a $50,000 teaching fellowship is named in his honor.

To all who are interested in human rights, the name of Theodore McKeldin is synonymous with our fight against prejudice and bigotry, and the sincerity and perseverance he has exhibited while working in behalf of the brotherhood of man have been acclaimed by his fellow men everywhere.

With such a background, it was especially appropriate for Theodore R. McKeldin to speak recently before the confirmation class of the Baltimore Hebrew Congregation. This Baltimore congregation was chartered in 1830.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. McKeldin's remarks before this confirmation class be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You are Americans, therefore you are heirs of the political tradition that goes back to 1776, as you have no doubt been told day after day in school. But you are at the same time heirs of a spiritual tradition that goes back many centuries beyond 1776, as you have certainly been told many times in this building.

It is not my purpose to describe either of these traditions except in one respect, which is the way they fit into each other. We think of them as separate and apart, and so they are in the formal, legal sense, but in essence, in their basic meaning, there is no break between them.

Let us take the document that created our Nation, and analyze it in the light of the older tradition. Many of you, I feel sure, know it by heart. "When in the course of human events it becomes necessary * * *" and so on. It announces the dissolution of political bands, a very important matter that our people were undertaking, and then adds, "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes."

That is to say, it is not enough to cherish our faith in our hearts. It must be proclaimed abroad, it must be announced to the world. It seems to me that I hear in this an echo of words that are very familiar to you. I think that its essential meaning is that of the familiar proclamation that begins with the words, "Hear, O Israel * * *" and that proclamation is intimately bound up with the whole history of your spiritual tradition.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident," the document continues, reaffirming the Psalmist's words, "I have chosen the way of truth: Thy judgments have I laid before me."

"That all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life * * *." I invite you to stop and consider exactly when it was that the brand of Cain was laid upon the first murderer. It was not when he struck the blow. It was when he sullenly and insolently asked the Lord, "Am I my brother's keeper?" At that moment he denied any responsibility for his brother and that denial stamped him with the infamy of blood guilt. Our political tradition acknowledges the justice of that; for if all men are created equal and endowed with rights, the duty lies upon us to respect those rights and to be responsible for protecting them.

"To secure these rights, governments are instituted among men * * *." There is one in your tradition called the wisest of men, and the foundation of his wisdom was laid when he was called to political power and prayed to God in these words: "I am but a little child: I know not how to go out or come in. Give, therefore, Thy servant an understanding heart to judge Thy people, that I may discern between good and bad: for who is able to judge this Thy so great a people?"

One must be able to discern between good and bad if he is to protect the rights of the people; yet, says our tradition, to secure these rights is the whole purpose of government. The prayer of Solomon is the greatest political platform ever written, according to the American tradition; and the wisdom of Solomon is precisely the wisdom that we hope to find in the men we elect to exercise the powers of government; for who else "is able to judge this Thy so great a people?"

"Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government * * *." What can this mean, other than the judgment that the moving finger wrote upon Belshazzar's wall: "Thou are weighed in the balances and found wanting. Thy kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians." No government, says the American tradition, that fails to secure the rights of the people is fit to survive. Legality cannot save it. Precedent cannot save it. All its good work performed in years gone by cannot save it, any more than the glory and the power of the kings, his ancestors, could save Belshazzar, the lightweight, after he was weighed in the balances of truth and found wanting.

Government of the people must be for the people. Solomon knew it, and that made him the wisest of kings. Belshazzar did not know it and that is why he was found wanting and his kingdom fell. It is the old tradition that rings in the Declaration of Independence, and that is why we hold its truth to be self-evident.

I know that the Constitution of the United States decrees separation of church and state, and I consider that one of its wisest provisions. But the Constitution is the law—the supreme law of the land—but only the law; and besides the law we have the prophets, the proclaimers of the spiritual traditions that are the background of the law. In this field the political tradition and the religious tradition are continuous and cannot be torn apart without damage to both.

I am dealing today with that intangible thing that a great French writer called the spirit of the laws, and I maintain that the spirit of the Judaic tradition and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence are one and the same. You cannot be true to the tradition that traces back to Ur of the Chaldees without being true to the spirit that traces back to Independence Hall in Philadelphia. I think it just as true that you cannot be true to Americanism, real Americanism, without being true to the essence of Judaism.

But in both cases one must be vigilant, one must be able to discern between good and evil, for there are countless false prophets who are proclaiming a false Americanism and a false Judaism. When such voices are heard in the land there is only one thing to do, and that is, go back to the sources, go back to the Declaration for your Americanism, go back to the scriptures for your Judaism. Never mistake partisanship for public policy, never mistake sectarianism for religion.

Pray for an understanding heart to discern between good and bad—not between this party and that, not between this candidate and that, not between this faction and that, but between good and bad. In politics, good is what secures to the people the rights with which their Creator has endowed them; bad is what fails to secure those rights. There is no other standard of measurement, that is, no other true one, although false measures are always being urged upon us—loyalty to party, loyalty to sect, loyalty to some person. But all these have been weighed in the balances and found wanting. The only loyalty that is of full weight is loyalty to the rights of the people.

Is not the same thing true of Judaism? "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord." To one Lord there is one loyalty, one duty, by which all others must be measured, and without which no others count. Whatever the clamorous, disputing voices may say, remember that. "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly * * * but his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in His law doth he meditate day and night."

The law of the Lord is justice. The law of the Lord is truth. The law of the Lord is that we are each his brother's keeper, as far as his brother's rights are concerned; and if any one of us shall repudiate that responsibility the law of the Lord will lay upon him the brand of Cain.

But the man of whom it may truthfully be said, "In that law doth he meditate day and night" is a safe man, one in whose hands your rights and liberties are safe. By what rite he worships is neither here nor there; the question is, What loyalty does he hold sacred? If it is true Americanism, in his public acts he will be true to the spirit of Judaism; if it is not true Americanism, then he will not be true to the spirit of Judaism, no matter how careful he may be to conform to all its rites and ceremonies.

To you young Americans, adherents of the Jewish faith, I offer this urgent advice: hold it to be self-evident that men are created equal and endowed by the Creator with unalienable rights; for if you do so hold, then you must also hold that the greatest gift of God to a ruler of men is an understanding heart to discern between good and bad. Hold to the faith that the Lord our God is one Lord, and you will be bound to hold to the faith that under God men are created equal, and he who disregards the rights of his brother, who disavows his brother is betraying Americanism, no matter how often he waves the flag and screams about his patriotism.

Armed with that faith you may look to the future serenely. For "under God we shall do valiantly; for He it is that will trample down our enemies."

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN A FREE SOCIETY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Justice William O. Douglas recently delivered a notable address at the 15th annual conference of the National Civil Liberties Clearinghouse. Entitled "Education for a Free Society Under the Bill of Rights," his speech is a characteristically eloquent statement of the struggle which must continually be waged against blind conformity in order to keep the vitality of thought among our citizens essential to preserve the basic freedoms built into our Constitution.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech and an editorial in the Washington Post commenting upon it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TASK FORCES FOR FREEDOM

Asserting a need for continuous education in the values of the Bill of Rights, Justice William O. Douglas last night called eloquently for task forces to teach the meaning and utility of restraints on governmental power. "Churches, unions, business groups, professional societies, school boards, parent-teacher associations, the pulpit, and the press," he said, "all have important stakes in the enterprise." Indeed they do. They could exist only in a society where the power of government is limited and where a variety of voluntary associations is left free to advocate the competing ideas and interests of free citizens.

The Justice paid tribute to the example set for the rest of the country by the District of Columbia in putting an end to arrests for investigation this month. "Arrests for suspicion," he observed, "fit the Communist society but they do not fit ours. Our fourth amendment—applicable to State and Federal Governments alike—allows only arrests for 'probable cause.' Our fourth amendment was designed to curb the police—to require them to use brains rather than brawn in solving the mysteries of crime." The fact is, however, that arrests for investigation, though banned in the Capital, are still common in many parts of the country. They have no place in the armory of American law enforcement.

Justice Douglas spoke at the dinner meeting of the National Civil Liberties Clearinghouse currently holding its 15th annual conference. Concerned with the development of understanding in the fields of civil liberties, civil rights, intellectual freedom and human rights, it serves in exemplary fashion as one of those task forces which the Justice summoned to action. Its deliberations should serve again, as they have in years past, to refresh American devotion to the principles of the Bill of Rights.

EDUCATION FOR A FREE SOCIETY UNDER THE BILL OF RIGHTS

(Address by William O. Douglas, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, National Civil Liberties Clearing House, Washington, D.C., March 28, 1963)

Many have been concerned in recent years over the lack of understanding of the Bill of Rights and the role it is designed to play in a free society.

One of several groups organized to promote this educational effort is the Civil Liberties Educational Foundation, of which Frank P. Graham is the president, and whose board contains such outstanding people as Nicholas Kelley, Minna Post Peyser, and Irving Dilliard.

In 1963 it prepared a document some 150 pages in length entitled "Civil Rights and Civil Liberties in the United States," an annotated bibliography. As stated in the introduction, "While CLEF has enjoyed the cooperation, encouragement and guidance of the personnel of the New York City Board of Education, it makes no claim that this volume or any part of its contents have been approved by the board."

Nevertheless, in February 1963, the acting superintendent of schools, Bernard E. Donovan, sent a notice to principals of all day schools in the city of New York: "Heads of schools are advised that these lists do not have the approval of the board of education and the suggested use of the lists and the implementation of 'instructions' contained in the accompanying letter are to be disregarded. Books on these lists, unless they are also found on approved lists, may not be accepted by librarians either as gifts or for purchase of such books from funds provided by the parent-teacher associations and similar sources."

One might think that this notice possibly could have been sent out of an abundance of caution lest the bibliography be thought by some to be a must. But that theory is dispelled by other episodes of the same character. In 1952 the Nation was barred from New York City's schools because it ran an article by Paul Blanshard critical of the influence of the Catholic Church in various phases of community life, including education. In January of this year the Nation was restored to the list. But the board, as if to offset the Nation's deleterious influence, added to the list at the same time the National Review which is hardly revolutionary in any sense of the word.

In California last month a school board banned from its libraries Walter Millis' "A World Without War"; and "The Community of Fear," by Harrison Brown and James Real. Millis has attempted to show how a viable world system could exist if swords were turned into ploughshares and the armies, navies, and air forces disbanded. "The Community of Fear"—the product of the thinking of our leading nuclear physicists—tells in calm terms, in a nondramatic way, the actualities of the hell that would be produced by nuclear war. Also banned was a brochure "The Rule of Law in World Affairs," by a Justice Douglas.

A youngster reading these three books or pamphlets might be disturbed at the complacency of the American people; he might indeed be roused to action. Or he might be so saturated with the tranquilizers of our times to think that the status quo was the rosiest of all possible regimes and remain oblivious of the great dangers inherent in our conformity.

"The Censors and the Schools," by Nelson and Roberts, gives a national account of this passion for sifting books in school libraries to find ideological strays. Many groups would restrict education to those materials which reflect that image of America they espouse. The profit motive and the role of the private and public sectors in the economy make up one controversial area. The Anthony Comstocks bring puritannical standards to the field of the arts and literature. Religious groups with an eye to their dogmas and creeds bear down hard on books like "The Dead Sea Scrolls," by A. Powell Davies. The censor whose world is built around laissez faire ferrets out trains of thought that lead to socialism. The isolationist opposed to the United Nations sees the rule of law in world affairs as part of the Communist conspiracy. Those who espouse segregation, those who oppose Negro membership in trade unions, those who view with alarm Negro voting have easy standards for determining what books have un-American overtones or contents.

Education by those standards is largely propaganda for one point of view or one school of thought. That is indeed pricisely the Communist approach to sociology, political science, history and art. One who visits the art galleries in Moscow that display contemporary drawings and paintings has indeed the distinct impression that he is in the billboard department of the Politburo.

Education in a free society should be radically different. It is education in the dialog—a concept that was put in classical form by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins:

"Education is a kind of continuing dialog, and a dialog assumes, in the nature of the case, different points of view.

"The civilization which I work and which I am sure, every American is working toward, could be called a civilization of the dialog, where instead of shooting one another when you differ, you reason things out together.

"In this dialog, then, you cannot assume that you are going to have everybody thinking the same way or feeling the same way. It would be unprogressive if that happened. The hope of eventual development would be gone. More than that, of course, it would be very boring.

"A university, then, is a kind of continuing Socratic conversation on the highest level for the very best people you can think of, you can bring together, about the most important questions, and the thing that you must do to the uttermost possible limits is to guarantee those men the freedom to think and to express themselves.

"Now, the limits on this freedom cannot be merely prejudice, because although our prejudices might be perfectly satisfactory, the prejudices of our successors or of those who are in a position to bring pressure to bear on the institution, might be subversive in the real sense, subverting the American doctrine of free thought and free speech."

What Dr. Hutchins said about universities is of course equally applicable to all our public schools. For the cause of full and free inquiry is damaged, wherever and whenever it is limited.

If we are to have the strength of men unafraid of ideas, we must be alert guardians of our school libraries. This means vigilant and vocal local groups who insist that school libraries cover the spectrum.

There is, I fear, more propaganda in our education than we appreciate. Many texts subtly downgrade the Negroes in favor of the whites. Some, as a recent report by the B'nai B'rith emphasizes, proclaim Protestantism over Catholicism and Christianity over Judaism by failing to describe the history of religious liberty in a fair way. I remember how misinformed I was on the Crusades. It was my first trip to Jerusalem as an adult that made me realize that we the Christians had been the great wrongdoers. When we took Jerusalem we beheaded thousands—because they did not believe as we did. Saladin, the Kurdish leader of the Arabs who retook Jerusalem a century later, was more Christian than the Christians. For he beheaded no one.

Teaching communism is becoming a fad. But we found that in spite of our preoccupation in denouncing it we had few teachers qualified to teach it. Moreover, the tendency has been to serve a political rather than an educational need. Those who travel Communist lands or who live there know how depressing life in that society is to those who have known the heady atmosphere of the free society. Yet they also know that a Communist regime is not all black, while we are all white. The intermediate shades are numerous. Is there enough courage and independence left to disclose what features of the Soviet system are not evil?

There is often a failure in our education to acquaint the students with the world as it is.

Americanism is often taught as a brief for whatever American foreign policy may be in effect, no matter how defeating it may be.

The bulldozer is the symbol of American power; and the American ideal emerges as one who levels the wilderness. Yet with our vanishing forests and our mounting population, education on conservation is sorely needed, starting with the primary schools.

I do not suggest that books be burned that do not meet the test. Nor do I join the ranks of those who censor books. My plea is different. We need task forces which make as sure as possible that the literature in our schools is adequate for the multiracial, multi-religious, and multi-ideological groups that make up our Nation.

Alert community groups cognizant of the values of the Bill of Rights are needed on many fronts. Lecturers visiting a locality are often the main source of enlightment, as the degeneration of the press has left many areas largely devoid of insight into the forces at loose in the world. Censorship at some universities has endeavored to fence the campus off from the world of controversy. Ohio State University, under the hammering of local newspapers, has been rocked by issues of that kind.

The presence of Gus Hall, Communist official, on the campus of the University of Oregon created quite a storm—not from inside the campus but outside. Irving Brant recently reported the episode in the Northwest Review:

"Hundreds of students heard Mr. Hall speak. What did he tell them about communism? Nothing. Did he advocate the dictatorship of the proletariat? No. Did he call for the nationalization of industry or land? Not a word. Did he tell them that every signer of a Communist Party card is expected to do, say, or think whatever the party bigwigs tell him to do, say, or think? Of course, he did not. Instead, Gus Hall made a respectable speech in support of social reforms and the constitutional rights of everybody. He came out for the welfare state and the Bill of Rights. In other words, he talked like John F. Kennedy trying to live up to the future and Richard M. Nixon trying to live down the past.

"Now what does this Communist tactic signify? It means that the present purpose of the Communist Party in the United States is to prove the respectability of its leaders and suggest the harmlessness of party intentions. That won't rebuild the party. Selling water in a red bottle does not create a market for vermouth. The fact is that Communist propagandists are in a box of their own making. They have the choice of stagnating party growth either by revealing the governing principles of communism or by concealing them."

Mr. Brant went on to say:

"If somebody is seen meandering around the campus dressed in a barrel, it should not be concluded that he lost his pants in Typhoon Freda. It will be Diogenes, looking for one university student who was converted to communism by Gus Hall."

The Communists are such miserable merchants of dreary ideas that they have difficulty getting recruits. Their lack of success under parliamentary regimes where the platform and press are open to them is notorious. They thrive under suppression, not in exposure. In Israel, where parties are freely formed, the Communists are weaker than in any Middle East nation. In India where the illiteracy rate is 78 percent and where grievances pile high, the Communists have only 41 members in a national Parliament of 745, or less than 6 percent. I have often thought that their greatest strength as a political party inside any country comes from fear of them. As Livy said, "The less there is to fear the less there is of danger."

When the Communists are judged as advocates or as purveyors of ideas, they turn out to be quite shabby. Better that they be forced into open debate and exposed than driven underground. American youth is highly critical and discerning. It does our youth an injustice to assume that many of their minds can be corrupted by blandishments either from the extreme left or extreme right.

Community groups interested in promoting debates of unorthodox ideas need not be booking agents either for the left or the right. Yet those who promote the society of the dialog need defend the right of anyone peaceable to assemble and to advocate ideological as well as religious ideas across the entire spectrum. This takes courage beyond the capacity of Madison Avenue. For it writes its slogans to fit the public mood. Promoters of the dialog undertake to reshape that mood, raise the sights of the people, and help create a tradition that honors courage and the independence of thought.

Discussion and debate are often finer badges of bravery than battle itself. Pericles said, "The great impediment of action is, in our opinion, not discussion, but the want of that knowledge which is gained by discussion preparatory to action. For we have a peculiar power of thinking before we act, and of acting too; whereas other men are courageous from ignorance but hesitate upon reflection."

The difficulty of living up to Pericles standards is exceedingly difficult these days. For information is sometimes classified as secret merely because disclosure would expose the Agency to criticism. And the complexity of the affairs of government makes it difficult to ferret out the facts on one's own. Yet the need has never been greater.

We had Committees of Correspondence in the days of our Revolution and they were important in creating unity and cohesion in that effort. We need comparable task forces today. They need to remind the people over and again of the words of Charles Evans Hughes, "Our institutions were not devised to bring about uniformity of opinion."

There is more to the free society than the maintenance of free and open discussion. Our philosopy has been that sovereignty unless restrained builds itself into tyranny. The Bill of Rights—as well as parts of the Constitution itself—places restraints on each of the three branches of Government. With the increase in size and complexity of Government, additional procedural safeguards of individuals have been provided by acts of Congress, by Executive orders, and by court decisions. Yet as time passes, the power of Government becomes more and more awesome and the capability of the individual to stand his own against it becomes more and more dubious. The multiplication of laws and of regulations makes every proceeding more and more of a maze. The power of the bureaucracy is crushing. Only the expert can find his way. One not flanked by lawyers has little chance to enjoy his rights. The lone individual without a spokesman loses his rights by default. That problem promises to get more serious whether it be thought of in terms of fairness of procedures in loyalty and security hearings or of procedures in qualifying business men as contractors or subcontractors.

A recent report of the Administrative Conference states: "Some 340 business firms are now barred from participating directly or indirectly in some or all Government procurement or surplus disposal contracts, and about 60 of these are also excluded from contracts for most federally assisted construction work throughout the United States. Except for a small percentage this Government action is taken without opportunity for an adversary hearing and if based on suspected criminal conduct is generally without being officially notified or informed of meaningful reasons, or opportunity to learn why."

The District of Columbia on March 15, 1963, put an end to arrests for investigation—a practice that had resulted in the arrest of several thousands of persons annually. Arrests for suspicion fit the Communist society but they do not fit ours. Our fourth amendment—applicable to State and Federal Governments alike—allows only arrests for probable cause. Our fourth amendment was designed to curb the police—to require them to use brains rather brawn in solving the mysteries of crime. Yet arrests for investigation are still common in some areas of the country. The persons arrested are not sons and daughters of the upper or middle classes. They come from the lower strata or from minority groups who do not know how to protect themselves and who do not have the prestige, courage, or resources to vindicate their rights through suits for false arrest.

Recent studies of vagrancy show that being poor and looking for a job is a crime in many of our localities. Our magistrates courts touch the lives of the people more intimately than any other. Some are still on the fee system—the judge being paid if he convicts and not being paid if he acquits. Lawyers seldom appear for clients in those courts. Bar associations that assign lawyers to represent indigents seldom assign members of the bar to cases in the magistrates courts; and legal aid societies are not equipped to render service there. Vagrants, whose only crime is poverty, are convicted by the thousands and no bar association committee concerns itself with the matter.

The poor who are accused of felonies often cannot raise bail prior to trial and therefore wait in jail months on end. In New York City Louis Schweitzer and his Vera Foundation found that the accused who were unable to raise bail were held as long as 1 year in jail awaiting trial. For some, that is the equivalent of a graduate degree in crime. As a result of Mr. Schweitzer's efforts the Manhattan bail project is now flourishing under the auspices of New York University Law School. Of the first 200 defendants released on personal recognizance only 2 failed to respond. In Manhattan the fate of indigent defendants is no longer in the hands of the bondsman. Yet in most large centers the indigent feels only the rough hand of the law and is wholly subject to the mercy of the bondsman. There are those who could, if they would, duplicate Mr. Schweitzer's efforts in their own bailiwick.

Some cities—and I speak principally of northern ones—have a widening river of hate between the races. Some are doing something about it; others are not. We know that when racial bias is indoctrinated into the police or when the police are allowed to treat a Negro or the member of another minority as a second-class citizen, the river of hate widens.

Task forces are needed north and south, east and west, to concern themselves with problems of the Bill of Rights in the modern setting. Churches, unions, business groups, professional societies, school boards, parent-teachers associations, the pulpit and the press all have important stakes in the enterprise.

It is the Bill of Rights and all the other protective features of our system of law that put us above the crowd. Other nations share the secret of science and technology and will soon be as far along the road of economic development as we are. But there are not many who have enshrined the ideas of liberty and equality and dignity of man in the manner of which we are proud. It is in those ideas that we find our real distinction. It is those ideas that set our civilization apart, not our automobiles, television sets, air conditioners, or the other earmarks of our high standard of living.

We profess to be anti-totalitarian and we spend much of our time denouncing the Communists. Yet once we substitute propaganda for the dialog, once we enthrone the police, once we make one group dominant in our multiparty, multiracial, multireligious, multi-ideological society, once we deny the poor rights that the rich enjoy, we forsake the tradition of the Bill of Rights. We need continuous education in its values, and only the task forces that are active in a community can turn the tides of intolerance, conformity, and ignorance that often engulf us.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the date of February 23 there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald a letter to the editor entitled "The President's Budget," signed by Prof. Seymour E. Harris, Littauer professor of political economy, Harvard University.

This letter explains in a concise, understandable and emphatic manner the purpose of the President's tax cut and budget proposal and the effect that such will have on the economy.

Dr. Harris reminds the Congress of the importance of timing of a tax cut. He explains it this way:

> The real danger is that the Congress will nibble at the program and prolong the gestation period of the new tax law, with the effect that the tax cut will prove innocuous. It is also necessary for the Congress to realize that the longer the period over which the reduction is spread, the less effective the policy will be.

Then Dr. Harris comes to grips with the issue of the tax cut and the possible effects of a sharp reduction in the budget. He describes it this way:

> It is important for the Congress to realize a tax cut and an accompanying reduction of expenditures mean stimulating the economy by reducing taxes, and then deflating it equally through a cut in expenditures. Nothing could be more foolish.

It would be well for every businessman to read what Dr. Harris has to say. I recall in my visit with the chamber of commerce this year on its legislative program that I attempted to make this point, namely, that a tax cut would lose much of its effectiveness if expenditures were sharply reduced by drastic cuts in the budget. My comment surely was not received by any enthusiastic support. In fact, it was given a less than polite hearing.

Dr. Harris is a respected economist. His advice and counsel is sought and used by government and private industry. And it is Dr. Seymour Harris who tells us clearly what I was trying to say with apparently less clarity. I believe that we are indebted to Dr. Harris for his forthrightness, but, above all, for his intelligence and his ability to articulate and express his views.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Harris' letter, entitled "The President's Budget," be printed in the RECORD. I trust that it will be reviewed and studied carefully by those who make public policy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Neither conservatives nor liberals seem happy over President Kennedy's 1964 budget. Perhaps this suggests the budget is, in fact, the best possible compromise. For the conservatives the criticism is too much Federal spending and excessive deficits. For the liberals the charge is an inadequate tax cut and abandonment of liberal or Galbraithian principles of spending for welfare. In my view both the conservatives and liberals are wrong, and the administration essentially right.

The conservatives consider the total amounts of spending and deficits, and are shocked. But what is relevant is the size of the Federal sector in relation to the economy that has to support it, not the absolute amount of spending. In private life, the conservative mother does not give the 2-year-old the same number of calories as the 18-year-old, but is guided by size, energies used, etc.

Similarly, the conservatives should relate expenditures and deficits to the size of the economy. Federal expenditures in relation to gross national product are no higher than they were in 1959. The deficits seem large. But the three Kennedy deficits are 2 percent of GNP estimated for fiscal 1962–64. In the 8 great depression years, when Government could concentrate on welfare, the deficits were equal to 4 percent of GNP.

The conservatives tell us that the President continues to spend more for nonessentials, that is, welfare. Actually the dollar outlays, exclusive of military and related, are down in fiscal 1964. What is more, if allowance is made for the annual average rise of population, of wage rates (not offset by rising productivity) and of prices, the budget should rise by 3 percent without any new programs or improvements or extension of old ones. Hence, it may be assumed that as a minimum, welfare programs in real resources have been reduced by at least 3 percent and possibly more.

How much of a case have the economists or the liberals? In the 1930's public spending was considered the therapy for a malfunctioning economy. But spending programs have lost much of their appeal and in part because it is difficult to get the right kind of spending programs, or proper timing. Even at that the average economist might well have sought a compromise, say a $3 billion spending program to increase growth and a $9 billion tax cut. But, unfortunately, even this compromise is not acceptable to the country. Hence the President has to recommend not what is best but what is adequate and attainable. Thus we can explain the moderate size of the tax cut, the small recourse to spending programs, the stretchout of the tax cut.

The real danger is that the Congress will nibble at the program and prolong the gestation period of the new tax law, with the effect that the tax cut will prove innocuous. Then the modern fiscal policies, about which many of us have written, preached, debated, and fought since the 1920's, will be repudiated, and with loss to the country. We shall then have the deficits that would have prevailed in any case, and additional deficits related to the tax cut, and yet little stimulus to rising income which would yield additional tax revenues.

It is important for the Congress to realize a tax cut and an accompanying reduction of expenditures mean stimulating the economy by reducing taxes, and then deflating it equally through a cut in expenditures. Nothing could be more foolish.

It is also necessary for the Congress to realize that the longer the tax cut is postponed and the longer the period over which the reduction is spread, the less effective the policy will be.

It requires not only understanding but tremendous courage for the President to lead the Congress in these matters as he has more than any other President, just as only a courageous Congressman will lead his constituency.

It is not easy for the people to swallow a theory that even a deficit over the cycle is sound policy, when we have scarcely persuaded them that balance is not required every year so long as it is attained during the whole cycle.

I just do not believe that men of high intelligence such as Senator BYRD and Congressman MILLS do not understand the simple arithmetic involved in modern economics: inadequate buying by the private economy requires a larger contribution by Government; and vice versa in buoyant periods.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS.

MANAGED NEWS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, Members of this body will recall earlier statements that I have made about managed news and specifically with respect to announcements of contracts awarded by the Defense Department and the manner in which dedicated military officers were made to look like Gilbert and Sullivan comic opera characters and old movie "Keystone Kops" in the notices they delivered to the offices of Congressmen—but only after hours or days after the news had already been given to the favored Democratic Congressmen and Senators by others and thus already announced by them before the military officers had delivered the notices.

In connection with this managed news practice of the White House, I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD at this point an article on this subject appearing in the March 31, 1963, issue of the San Diego, Calif., Union about the exercise of futility in which the defense couriers engage. The title of the article is, appropriately, "Pentagon Scooped On Contracts."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE HOUSE TIPS OFF FRIENDS—PENTAGON SCOOPED ON CONTRACTS

WASHINGTON.—Every working day at 2:30 p.m. uniformed military personnel filter through the Halls of Congress bearing glad tidings.

As regular as clockwork, they move from office to office with announcements of contracts awarded that day by the Defense Department. They visit Republicans and Democrats alike.

Each Congressman is told he is being tipped off in advance so he can notify the news media in his district.

Newspapers and radio and television stations then presumably will carry the story, giving credit, of course, to the man who gave it to them.

This is the kind of news that Congressmen live on. Some figure that if the voters see and hear the Congressman's name linked to enough juicy contracts and grants, they are likely to decide that he is doing a bang-up job in Washington and deserves reelection.

But the Defense Department's congressional courier system, impressive as it is to the casual onlooker, is a dismal flop.

The White House noted for its "managing" of news, sees to it that Representatives and Senators friendly to the administration are the first to learn of Federal aid plums.

Against such competition the Defense Department and other Federal agencies do not have a chance. The White House scoops them every time.

White House aids telephone favored Congressmen each morning about 11:30—3 hours before the Defense couriers start their futile rounds.

ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article I read the other night in the April 1963 issue of the Yale Political. The senior Senator from South Dakota has written an exceptional statement on our foreign aid programs and economic activities. I hope every Senator will take the time to read it for he has painted a crystal-clear picture of what I believe to be the thinking of most Americans on our foreign aid problems. Our esteemed colleague is eminently qualified to speak on this subject for he knows from firsthand experience the results of programs previously implemented, and we would all do well to listen to his wise words.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Senator Karl Mundt be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Economics Activities

(By Senator Karl E. Mundt)

(Senator Mundt, like Senator Humphrey a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, has represented South Dakota as a Republican Member of Congress since 1939. He was first elected to the House, and since 1949 has served in the Senate. Foreign aid is seen by Senator Mundt primarily as a tool to help forward the United States' international objectives. He believes that we should be more discriminating in our aid policy, giving more to those who are in sympathy with the aims of the United States.)

The same reasons in the main prevail for our giving so-called foreign aid to Latin America as those which prevail for our overall global program of foreign aid. That means, realistically, that by far the greatest percentage of the many billions of dollars of foreign aid which we have been providing more than 80 nations around the world is made available for what is believed to be the best national interest of the United States. Our great country, of course, has a longstanding tradition of providing disaster relief and emergency aid for humanitarian reasons wherever a country is suffering from disaster, from famine, from the ravages of insurrection, or from any other cause which brings widespread suffering to the general public. However, in the main, the reasons for providing the aid to Latin America and elsewhere in the amounts and of the type now being made available to them stem from the fact that in this era of challenge from imperialistic communism it is felt to be in the national interest to try to strengthen the economic systems and the political institutions of countries which are outside of the Communist sphere of control.

In my opinion, economic aid if wisely provided for Latin American countries is of more benefit to them and to us than an overemphasis on military aid. For many generations to come the most effective defense against outside attacks by Communist military forces upon Latin American countries must come from the maintenance of a sufficiently strong Defense Establishment in the United States and from policies which impel us to enforce the time-tested provisions of the Monroe Doctrine. Consequently, a wise utilization of economic aid designed to expand the middle-income classes of Latin America, to increase the success of private enterprise institutions in that area, to improve communications, education, and health would seem to be our most productive means of being a friendly neighbor and an effective friend to the Latin American countries.

CONDITIONS OF U.S. AID

The question of the conditions we should attach to this aid relates to the problem of whether our gigantic expenditures in foreign aid in Latin America are to prove beneficial both to the recipients and to the giver or whether they are to be dissipated through a series of isolated projects which fail to follow a consistent pattern of performance and which fail to develop within the recipient countries the attitudes and policies which will help them to help us to help them in an enduring fashion. My major criticism of the present administration of foreign aid both in Latin America and elsewhere grows out of the conviction that I feel that the Kennedy administration is making the same mistake in connection with its foreign aid policies that it is making in connection with its domestic policies. By this, I mean, that in both areas of activity there is a definite and demonstrable tendency to place too great a reliance upon strengthening the powers of the politicians in the capital cities of the countries and to place too little reliance upon developing an opportunity system which enables private entrepreneurs and individual economic enterprises to expand the opportunities so essential to the development of sound economic growth and stability.

Beyond this, the administration of our foreign aid policies both in Latin America and elsewhere should demonstrate a sharp increase in its selectivity. I definitely feel there should be a difference in the degree and type of aid which we provide to countries which demonstrate a desire and willingness to cooperate in the curtailment of communism and in the development of free institutions as against those countries and areas which either insist upon a sterile type of neutralism or, in fact, give aid and comfort to the Communist regime in Moscow.

The contest which the free world is compelled to wage in self-defense against communism cannot be and should not be solely an activity financed and promoted by the United States. We need assistance in diplomatic matters at the United Nations, we need cooperation in developing world opinion opposed to communism, we need the cooperation of many nations both large and small in reducing the effectiveness of Communist subversive ventures around the globe. When countries demonstrate a willingness to undertake a part of this responsibility and to associate themselves with us in the global resistance to communism, they are entitled to greater economic and military assistance from the United States than that which is made available to those who are willing to take everything but offer nothing in return.

Neither in Latin America nor around the world has our foreign aid program lived up to expectations insofar as its results are concerned. It has had a fair measure of both successes and failures. Until and unless we develop a greater degree of selectivity, however, I feel that in the future it is likely to suffer from the law of diminishing returns. Likewise, until and unless more of our economic aid is directly used to help people to help themselves, and to stimulate the growth of private enterprise in other lands, I am afraid that much of it will actually be used to build up the totalitarian techniques of an overly powerful central government which, after all, comprise some of the very evils which are exhibited and demonstrated by the Communist system.

IMPROVING OUR AID PROGRAM

There are several specific ways of making our aid programs more successful in the future. Rather than utilizing so much of our foreign aid in building things and doing things for our friends abroad, I feel we should concentrate more of the money on showing these folks the methods, techniques and procedures by which they can do things for themselves. On the whole, I think it is more important that we export ideas and techniques to the developing countries than that we export machinery, build roads, or construct bridges. Also, we should develop techniques which would tend to eliminate the political usage abroad of American funds to maintain established political regimes and to utilize such funds in the development of an opportunity system, financed by local enterprises, which will upgrade the living standards, increase the income, and expand the opportunities of those in other lands who want to get ahead.

FOREIGN AID AND U.S. NATIONAL INTEREST

Important issues in the administration of foreign aid concern the policies and programs the United States should insist upon or endeavor to promote in those areas where we are providing an abundant amount of either economic or military aid. It would, of course, be the optimum situation if we could work only with democratic representative governments, freely elected, in every area of the world which have not fallen into the clutches of communism. Unfortunately, we live in no such world today. Consequently, on occasion, I feel we are justified in providing economic and military aid to areas and countries which do not fully practice the precepts of representative government as we feel that they should.

Democracy is a way of life utilizing a whole series of practices, self-restraints, customs, and methods which must be learned by doing. And people must "do them" for awhile in order to fully appreciate them and to preserve them. For that reason, while we should certainly never permit our aid overseas to be utilized for the establishment of any type of dictatorship over the people, we must be somewhat tolerant in recognizing that aid at times must be given to countries in which existing conditions fall far short of our desires. We can and should, however, insist upon certain concessions and certain reforms as a quid pro quo for our assistance. And as a minimum, we can increasingly insist upon a cooperative attitude supported by cooperative actions in such forums of the world as the United Nations, and in other areas of activity, which will link the countries which are recipients of American aid in a mighty network of governments and peoples doing at least something in one way or another to combat the growing menace of communism. This support of the free way of life, this cooperation with the United States and other major nations of the free world, can be manifest in many ways, small and large. Increasingly, however, it seems to me that our Government in the United States should insist upon some type of manifestation that the recipient country is not simply taking advantage of a perilous global situation to seek aid from us without in any way doing anything on its own to strengthen the overall position of the free world and to weaken the forces of the Communist conspirators.

An example of what the United States should not permit to occur in a country which is a recipient of our foreign aid is the expropriation of American private property. Obviously, we cannot permit the expropriation of property owned by American citizens at the same time that we are providing economic aid to the government and to the country which is either promoting or permitting policies of that type. Furthermore, in my opinion, we should sharply step up a realistic program of impressing upon the people and the governments of all the countries which receive American aid the fact that they too are in the target area of imperialistic communism and that they should have an interest as active and alert as ours in reducing the dangers of such Communist aggression.

FLEXIBILITY AND IMAGINATION

In conclusion, perhaps the greatest weakness of our whole foreign aid program in Latin America and elsewhere stems from the fact we utilize too little imagination, initiative, and selective judgment in making it available to other lands. Because a certain formula worked rather well in Greece and Turkey under the point 4 program and the Marshall plan many years ago, there is a tendency to continue to use precisely the same techniques and formulas in every country of the world, with people of every culture, and to meet and attempt to solve every problem. That simply will not work. It will not work any more effectively than a careless physician could succeed by giving the same pill to every patient to cure every disease in the neighborhood.

POWER COMPANY OVERCHARGES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, last year I pointed out in my newsletter that electric consumers are required to pay the Montana Power Co. at rates which permit the company to receive the highest profit of any major utility in the country.

The 1960 Montana Power Co. report to stockholders listed $49.3 million as total revenue and $9 million paid out in dividends. The 1961 report listed $51.2 million as total revenue and $9.7 million paid out in dividends. Thus, in both years more than 18 percent of the income went to stockholders. Most of this exorbitant amount, collected from Montana ratepayers, went to non-Montana stockholders.

A study last year by Arnold H. Hirsch, public utility consultant, appeared in the May 1962 issue of Public Power. It listed the average annual rate of return of the largest electric utility operating company in each State, over the 3-year period 1958 to 1960. The rate of return in Montana, for the Montana Power Co., was the highest among all the States, 9.3 percent.

The response of the Montana Power Co. to my illumination of these facts was a personal attack on me, by the president of the company, in a recent report to stockholders.

Mr. President, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has compiled data which show the amount of overcharges by power companies, including Montana Power Co. and 37 others. This compilation of overcharges is based on the assumption that 6 percent is a fair rate of return. The study covers the 5-year period between 1956 and 1960.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the table compiled by NRECA.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER COMPANY OVERCHARGES

Estimated totals for 38 electric utilities, based on taxes actually paid, for 5 years, 1956–60

[Expressed in thousands of dollars]

Name of company	Estimated amount of overcharge					
	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	Total
Alabama Power Co.	12,150	13,640	14,954	11,933	9,992	62,669
Tucson Gas, Electric Light & Power Co.	1,144	1,015	729	1,044	1,500	5,432
Arkansas Power & Light Co.	3,142	5,429	3,696	988	----------	13,255
Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	11,419	6,056	9,754	17,175	31,990	76,394
Public Service Co. of Colorado	3,933	3,083	3,869	3,296	6,160	20,341
Connecticut Light & Power Co.	5,662	3,779	4,685	1,150	1,869	17,145
Delaware Power & Light Co.	1,540	1,088	3,710	4,483	3,044	13,865
Florida Power Corp.	5,800	5,879	6,760	8,525	9,796	36,760
Georgia Power Co.	12,821	14,871	14,383	15,313	14,979	72,367
Commonwealth Edison Co. (Illinois)	----------	----------	11,285	35,879	40,410	87,574
Public Service Co. of Indiana	4,625	5,033	3,158	3,431	2,715	18,962
Iowa Power & Light Co.	4,269	1,817	1,550	1,638	1,196	10,470
Kansas Power & Light Co.	3,196	2,508	2,871	3,531	2,960	15,066
Kentucky Utilities Co.	2,665	2,281	4,571	4,838	4,627	18,982
Louisiana Power & Light Co.	4,965	3,504	4,285	4,402	3,796	20,952
Central Maine Power Co.	----------	----------	433	881	1,329	2,643
Potomac Edison Co.	3,106	3,210	2,604	4,044	3,542	16,506
New England Power Co.	----------	2,731	5,838	4,185	2,317	15,071
Detroit Edison and subsidiaries	11,917	9,685	1,719	3,598	9,306	36,225
Northern States Power Co.	7,046	8,113	7,163	8,404	7,425	38,151
Mississippi Power & Light Co.	4,233	2,677	1,742	817	1,946	11,415
Union Electric Co.	7,060	6,008	----------	5,927	4,304	23,299
Montana Power Co.	7,760	7,010	7,935	7,965	8,721	39,391
Southern Nevada Power Co.	823	1,215	1,913	2,454	2,008	8,413
Public Service Co. of New Hampshire	438	692	----------	260	----------	1,390
Public Service Electric & Gas Co. of New Jersey	19,631	18,250	14,077	9,638	7,252	68,848
Long Island Lighting Co.	6,990	8,927	7,769	7,631	6,613	37,930
Carolina Power & Light Co.	3,233	5,910	5,758	6,717	4,813	26,431
Ohio Edison Co.	16,058	16,596	14,302	15,500	14,388	76,844
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.	4,635	4,242	5,631	5,548	6,777	26,833
Pacific Power & Light Co.	7,502	4,994	2,256	7,117	8,942	30,811
Philadelphia Electric Co.	15,956	14,767	5,481	3,058	----------	39,262
South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.	2,919	3,031	4,629	7,975	7,175	25,729
Black Hills Power & Light Co.	38	----------	248	385	150	821
Houston Light & Power Co.	18,750	17,535	15,917	14,227	13,731	80,160
Utah Power & Light Co.	1,371	1,869	1,198	1,254	1,317	7,009
Virginia Electric & Power Co.	15,290	17,700	16,483	18,854	15,292	83,619
Appalachian Power Co.	10,381	13,023	12,594	17,408	18,602	72,008
Total	242,468	238,168	225,950	271,473	280,984	1,259,043

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD also an Associated Press article based on the NRECA figures and the reply of the Montana Power Co., whose response was again a personal attack, who termed the information released by NRECA "false and vicious."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Feb. 22, 1963]

MONTANA POWER CO. ACCUSED OF OVERCHARGING—CLAIM DENIED BY FIRM'S PRESIDENT

BILLINGS.—Electric cooperative association research economists claim that the Montana Power Co. overcharged its customers by over $39 million between 1956 and 1960 and should give it back.

Economists of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association based their claims on 6 percent as a fair rate of return on investments and used taxes paid as their yardstick.

The study released said Montana Power was one of 38 major electric utilities that overcharged its customers more than $1.25 billion in a 5-year period. Pacific Power & Light Co. was listed at $40.8 million.

The economists estimated Montana Power overcharges in 1956 at $7.76 million, in 1957 at $7.1 million, in 1958 at $7.94 million, in 1959 at $7.96 million and in 1960 at $8.72 million.

The association said the study will be sent to congressional committees, the Federal Power Commission, and consumer groups.

The NRECA legislation and research director in Washington, D.C., Kermit Overby, said the study "shows a critical need for State and Federal legislation which require the companies to return these overcharges to their customers."

ANSWER ISSUED

The president of the Montana Power Co. Thursday branded as "false and vicious" a press release issued by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which alleged that the company had overcharged its electric customers.

"There is absolutely no basis of fact or justification for the fantastic figures contained in this charge," J. E. Corette, chief executive officer of the utility, said.

He also labeled the press release misleading in that it purported to quote "REA research economists."

"The NRECA is a trade organization which claims to be the spokesman for a number of REA-financed cooperatives and is headed by Clyde Ellis, a paid manager," Corette said. "It has no official connection with the Rural Electrification Administration or the Federal Government in any way."

He pointed out that the company's electric rates have been considered thoroughly by the Montana commission, adding that in 1958 the commission granted Montana Power a return of 5.33 percent on the fair value of its electric properties after a public hearing which brought out voluminous testimony and evidence.

The utility president added that NRECA "apparently sets itself up as a more informed authority on electric rate regulation than the commission in 38 States throughout the country, whose intelligence and integrity NRECA has questioned."

"In our opinion, this false and vicious attack by NRECA is nothing more than an attempt to hasten Mr. Ellis' objective, which is the nationalization of the electric utility industry," Corette said. "In addition, it is a deliberate effort to draw the taxpayers' attention away from the fact that the REA-financed agencies which Mr. Ellis purports to represent escape the payment of the Federal income taxes, pay other taxes at a much lower rate than the investor-owned utilities against which they compete and are able to finance their operations by borrowing money at a 2-percent interest rate when it cost the Federal treasury 4 percent to provide that money."

Corette emphasized that these subsidies enjoyed by REA-financed agencies add to the burden of taxpayers throughout the Nation.

"Mr. Ellis and his organization apparently have decided to launch this irresponsible attack on investor-owned utilities and public service commissions throughout the country to divert attention from the increasing demands that REA-financed agencies operate under the same business and tax rules that are applicable to the investor-owned utilities against whom they are competing," he said.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on February 20 of this year I invited attention of my colleagues to an article by Mr. Joseph Young of the Washington Evening Star appeared in that day's paper which uncovered a plan to place summer employment of students under partisan political patronage for all practical purposes. Mr. Young reported that the feeling among Government career personnel officers was that such a plan was wrong and that Civil Service Commission officials had privately expressed dismay over the idea. I expressed the hope that the White House would swiftly make it clear that partisan political considerations would play absolutely no part whatsoever in the consideration of the applications for summer trainee positions and that treatment of these applications would make it clear beyond question that such a policy is indeed being followed. Mr. Young's timely article appears at page 2657 of the Record.

Although the White House unfortunately did not see fit to do anything about the matter, I am pleased to note that the Civil Service Commission itself took action on April 8 to prevent the White House and Federal agencies from appointing students to summer Federal jobs here in Washington on the basis of partisan political considerations.

An article by Mr. Jerry Kluttz appearing in yesterday's Washington Post reports this development, indicating that the Civil Service Commission withdrew from all agencies authority to make these temporary appointments and that the authority will not be restored unless the Commission is convinced that the appointments are made without political clearances and in full compliance with the law and its rules. Mr. Kluttz quotes from a statement released by the Commission which says, among other things:

> The image of the Federal service can be gravely damaged and future quality staffing can be jeopardized unless all doubt as to the integrity of merit system operations is dispelled.

The Commission also is reported to have told agency heads that political clearance in filling competitive jobs for summer employment is clearly illegal.

The article by Mr. Kluttz reveals how the plan to turn these summer jobs into a partisan political patronage picnic was being developed. Although the White House repeatedly gave assurances that it had no plans to require a political test for summer Federal jobs, nevertheless the White House sent agencies data sheets which asked "By whom recommended" in the case of each applicant. College Democrats were carefully advised to have Members of Congress send their completed job applications forms direct to the White House, and a member of the staff of the Democratic National Committee was assigned to advise student applicants on how to get jobs. Agency officials were told that the jobs were to be filled on a political basis despite the Civil Service Commission and the laws.

In an article by Joseph Young appearing in yesterday's Washington Evening Star which made the original disclosure to which I referred in my statement of February 20, Mr. Young also relates the behind-the-scenes maneuvering which has taken place in the last few weeks. It reveals a brazen disregard for the law and for the integrity of the Civil Service Commission by White House and other administration officials in persisting to go through with the original plan and how the Civil Service Commission finally was forced to take the action it did to preserve the reputation and integrity of the Federal Civil Service merit system.

Another article by Mr. Jerry Kluttz appears in today's Washington Post, which sheds more light on the willful and shortsighted attitude of these White House and other administration officials whose actions belied their words to the point that the Civil Service Commission found the situation intolerable. Several opportunities had been given for the White House to retreat gracefully from its unfortunate plan, but these opportunities were spurned. Even a plea by the National Civil Service League, a good-government group, was turned down.

It is reporting such as this on the part of Joseph Young and Jerry Kluttz which is in the best traditions of the free press. It is too bad that some public officials cannot resist the temptation to defy the law and that their fear of the sharp glare of publicity furnished by a free press through the efforts of fearless reporters is the only way the American people can be satisfied that these officials will conduct themselves properly as servants of the taxpayers.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles by Mr. Young and Mr. Kluttz be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 9, 1963]

CSC Acts To Bar Patronage in Summer Jobs—Commission Plans Exams To Prevent Political Favors

(By Joseph Young)

All Federal department and agency heads have been notified that political clearance for summer Government jobs "is illegal and will not be tolerated," the Civil Service Commission said today.

The Commission said it is now developing plans to hold nationwide competitive examinations for these jobs, many of which are filled by students. The decision does not affect numerous summer job appointments available to Members of Congress and not covered by Civil Service regulations.

These examinations, the Commission said, will eliminate both political patronage and nepotism from summer job dispensing. It has been charged by the Republicans, and denied by the Democratic administration, that summer replacement jobs are being handed out as political favors.

The actions resulted from the Star's disclosures that the Kennedy administration was requiring White House clearance of all summer students jobs in Government. Criticism from Republican Members of Congress as well as the press caused the administration to reassess its position.

AUTHORITY SUSPENDED

In order to bar political patronage this year, the CSC has suspended the authority of all Federal departments and agencies to hire for these jobs, except in the case of competitive registers for college interne and trainee jobs, as well as some typist positions.

The CSC suspended authority of agencies to make schedule A non-civil-service appointments for these jobs, as well as the authority to appoint students to summer jobs not to exceed a total of 700 hours or other jobs for which direct hiring has been allowed.

This suspension will be in effect between May 1 and October 1, 1963, the period of summer employment unless an agency convinces the CSC that no politics will be involved.

In order to have the suspensions lifted, each agency head must satisfy the CSC in writing that no political considerations will be given.

Furthermore, specific documentation of the agency's hiring program, to convince the CSC that political factors will not be applied, will be required.

NAMES TO WHITE HOUSE

This also means that agencies must refrain from sending to the White House the names of any job applicants, the CSC said. Once a student is hired and is on the rolls, it then would be all right for an agency to furnish the White House with the name of the employee for the purpose of planning student seminars, the CSC said.

Commission officials said its action was taken without clearance from the White House and that the White House was notified of the action at the same time as the press.

Since the Star first disclosed the White House clearance situation, the administration has been sharply criticized, with the result that many administration officials felt that greater political liability than good would accrue from the policy.

CSC officials said the situation reached the breaking point when the Star a week ago Sunday in a followup to its original story disclosed that the National College Democrat, the official publication of the National Federation of College Young Democrats, gave its members specific instructions on how to get political clearance from the White House.

The Young Democrats also were told to contact the college director of the Democratic National Committee in connection with the jobs.

INTEGRITY AT STAKE

A top CSC official declared, "We couldn't allow the situation to continue. The reputation and integrity of the Government's civil service merit system was at stake."

The entire situation has also made the CSC decide to hold nationwide competitive exams for all student summer jobs starting next year. This not only would eliminate political patronage but also the nepotism in which agency officials hire their sons and daughters and the children of friends.

The CSC heretofore had been opposed to nationwide competitive exams because of the cost involved. But recent events caused the CSC to change its mind. It now feels that whatever extra cost and time is involved will amply justify the protection of merit system principles.

About 6,000 Government summer jobs for students are available in the Washington area, and another 5,000 or 6,000 elsewhere in the country.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1963]

CIVIL SERVICE MOVES TO BAR POLITICS FROM SUMMER JOBS FOR STUDENTS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Civil Service Commission yesterday acted to prevent the White House and Federal agencies from appointing students to summer Federal jobs here on the basis of political pull.

It withdrew from all agencies authority to make the temporary appointments, and the power won't be restored unless the Commission is convinced that the appointments are made without political clearances and in full compliance with the law and its rules.

The tough antipolitical interference order was a departure for the agency, which generally contents itself with issuing warnings to prevent undermining of the merit system and its laws and rules by either agencies or individuals.

"We must make sure," CSC announced, "that no steps are taken to defeat the President's expressed intention to protect fully the civil service merit system." It further explained:

"Recent press reports alleging that political clearance is necessary for summer employment in civil service positions in the Washington metropolitan area indicate serious misunderstandings about this program. The image of the Federal service can be gravely damaged, and future quality staffing can be jeopardized unless all doubt as to the integrity of merit system operations is dispelled."

CSC then informed agency heads in a special bulletin that political clearance in filling competitive jobs is clearly illegal, and it quoted the appropriate rule and the sweeping authority it has to enforce it. To assure compliance with the rules, CSC concluded, it was necessary for it to suspend all agency authorizations to make temporary appointments in the Washington area between next May 1 and October 1.

The Commission also directed its staff to make special inspections during the summer months to make sure that summer appointments comply with its rules and the law.

CSC will restore the hiring authority on an agency-by-agency basis but only after the agency head certifies that he and his staff fully understand the civil service laws and rules and will carry them out.

Chairman John W. Macy also announced that CSC is developing plans for a nationwide competitive exam that would be used to fill summer jobs in 1964. This would be the first time for such a test and it would discourage both nepotism and partisan political considerations.

A CSC official commented: "We were sorry to have to do it but we were placed in an impossible situation where our honor and virtue and the integrity of the system was at stake."

The White House repeatedly assured CSC that it had no plans to require a political test for summer Federal jobholders. But Dorothy Davies of the White House sent agencies data sheets that asked for the names, addresses and other information on applicants. The significant question on the form in CSC's eyes was "By Whom Recommended?"

College Democrats were advised to have Members of Congress send their completed Forms 57's, job application forms, to Mrs. Davies along with recommendations from the Members. James Hunt was assigned by the Democratic National Committee to advise student applicants on how to get jobs.

Agency officials also advised CSC that they were being told that the jobs were to be filled on a political basis despite CSC and the laws.

The hard-hitting CSC directive will have the effect of canceling commitments made to hundreds of students who were promised jobs here this summer. CSC stressed that agencies must use appropriate competitive registers to fill their summer jobs unless their hiring authority is restored.

Incidentally, the order will have the effect of improving job prospects of students who have passed the student aid, trainee, Federal service entrance, typing and other competitive tests. Most of the summer hiring will be from these registers.

Federal agencies last year hired nearly 10,000 students for temporary summer jobs and a recent CSC survey indicates they plan to hire about 6,000 this summer.

But the controversy over summer jobs and cuts by Congress in agency budgets have combined to lower estimates to around 3,000.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 1963]

WHITE HOUSE INVITED CSC CRACKDOWN ON STUDENT JOB POLITICS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The White House invited the black eye administered to it by the Civil Service Commission which has cracked down hard on political interference in summer jobs.

Its behavior on the job issue was strange and contradictory. Although it denied any intention to give political clearances to summer job appointees, its actions aroused deep suspicions of political involvements.

The Commission had cautioned the White House staff several weeks ago that a political clearance system would be illegal and that it would be forced to take actions to prevent its use.

After all, Civil Service officials are realists. They know only too well that the President and White House staff members, in both Democratic and Republican administrations, have been instrumental in getting summer jobs for friends and friends of friends.

CSC or the most partisan Republican in Congress wouldn't have dreamed of making an issue if White House staffers informally recommended and agencies hired a couple of hundred students for temporary summer jobs. In fact, most of them would defend the practice.

What, then, is so different about the job picture this year? What brought on the tough CSC directive that canceled the authority of agencies to make temporary appointments until it is satisfied that no politics is involved in them and to move toward filling summer jobs on the basis of competitive merit tests?

The answer is: at least two new elements. First, Dorothy Davies and her superiors on the White House staff sought to formalize summer hirings through her office, and second, CSC was placed in the intolerable position of not knowing what it was talking about in its own jurisdiction—the Federal personnel field.

Several weeks ago Mrs. Davies discussed summer job problems with two top Civil Service officials at her White House office. She had set up last summer's seminars for students which were generally rated a success. The President and others took time out to give the students an insight of Government and to encourage them to make careers in it.

The CSC was sympathetic to Mrs. Davies' concern over improving the seminars but they failed to understand clearly what she had in mind in the matter of appointments.

At the time the Commission was considering a nationwide competitive test to select students for summer jobs. Mrs. Davies showed little sympathy for the idea. Anyway, the session ended with the first suspicion that the White House had a political interest in the jobs.

The following week Mrs. Davies had another meeting at which no CSC people were invited. Significantly many of those attending handled patronage for their agencies along with a few career personnel directors. Summer jobs were discussed and the suspicion deepened that the White House planned to use the jobs for political purposes. But Mrs. Davies and others promptly denied the reports.

It was at this juncture that Civil Service officials explained to White House staffers that a political test for summer jobs would be illegal. They suggested issuance of a clear-cut statement to explain in effect that the summer jobs would be filled largely from civil service and agency tests as has been past practice. Several staff members liked the idea.

But in the end the White House decided not to go along with any such statement on the ground that none was necessary since no change was planned in summer hirings. It was argued that the statement implied guilt on the part of the White House. The White House action added to the suspicions but at least CSC was partially satisfied with its denials of political interference.

The job issue was down to a simmer 2 weeks ago today when CSC Chairman John W. Macy confidently assured the House Civil Service Committee that the White House interest in summer jobs was confined to planning seminars for students.

But a few hours afterward the Commission was jolted when it was shown a copy of personnel data sheet sent to a few agencies by the White House. The document requested the name, address, and other background information on summer job applicants and appointees. The crucial question, in the eyes of the Commission was "By whom recommended?"

CSC went into a hurried special session and issued an extraordinary warning to agency heads that it would be illegal to submit names of student applicants to the White House for political clearances. It hinted punitive actions against those who might indulge in it. That should have settled the issue and it gave the White House another opportunity, also ignored, to retreat gracefully.

Next came reports that regular agency personnel offices, staffed with career people, were being bypassed and that those who handle patronage in the agencies and dubbed "political commissars," were making commitments to hire students. It was assumed their actions were motivated by political considerations and pressures.

Student Democrats were advised to send their form 57's, the Government job application form, to their Members of Congress and to have them relay the forms, with recommendations, to Mrs. Davies. James Hunt of the Democratic National Committee was the contact man for the students.

Finally, the White House ignored a friendly letter written to the President by the National Civil Service League, a good-government group, which urged him to disavow any plan to have the White House set up a political clearance system for student jobholders.

The situation called for decisive action to recapture some of the lost faith in the merit system which the President is on public record to protect and to strengthen.

CSC did it with its tough antipolitical interference order. The Commission means to enforce the law and its rules. Only time will tell whether it will be allowed to succeed.

WILL KENNEDY BACK AGRICULTURE?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Waterloo Daily Courier for March 27, 1963, the lead editorial entitled "Will Kennedy Back Agriculture?" merits attention. The editorial points out the present deplorable situation arising from the discriminatory variable import duties imposed by the Common Market on some of our agricultural exports. U.S. sales of poultry and eggs dropped 40 percent during the first 4 months these duties were in effect; flour exports dropped 65 percent, and wheat sales dropped 77 percent. With negotiations scheduled in May in Geneva under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the editorial wisely advises that if our Government is devoted to the best interests of American agriculture, it must refuse to bargain on lowering of tariffs on industrial products if the Common Market countries refuse to bargain on lowering these variable import duties affecting our agricultural exports.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Will Kennedy Back Agriculture?

The Common Market countries last August imposed variable import fees on most imports of agricultural commodities. Effect of the fees is to prevent any imports of commodities produced in these countries from selling below the Common Market support price.

Effect of the program was instantaneous. During the first 4 months, according to U.S. News & World Report, U.S. sales of poultry and eggs in Common Market countries had dropped 40 percent below the year's earlier figures. Flour exports dropped 65 percent and wheat sales slumped 77 percent.

These declines were greater than had been anticipated since it was not considered possible for the Common Market countries to replace American supplies that rapidly. But the result has been a serious blow to American farms.

Spokesmen for American agriculture, therefore, must watch closely the tariff negotiations in May in Geneva. This is the meeting of the 41 nations involved in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The American Government, if devoted to the welfare of American agriculture, must refuse to bargain on the lowering of tariffs on industrial products if the Common Market countries refuse to bargain on lowering of the variable fees on American farm imports.

The ideal of world trade is that each nation produces what it does most efficiently and trades for the products in which it is inefficient. But the Common Market countries have abandoned this concept on agricultural products and are returning to the old protectionist concepts. The result can only be a gradual return to high tariffs on both sides.

Because the Kennedy administration is so committed to the concept of an expansion in free world trade, however, it will be tempted to sacrifice American agricultural trade. The spokesmen for American agriculture must organize to determine that this doesn't happen.

DECREASE OF FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from time to time I have placed in the Record reports on free world shipping to Cuba. Sometimes I have been able to obtain the figures for monthly periods. Recently, I have been obtaining them for 2-week periods.

During the period from March 22 through April 5, our allies sent to Cuba 11 ships, including 2 tankers, whose gross tonnages total 51,694. Great Britain appears to have gained the lead again, in shipping 35,384 tons. I state the gross tonnage, because it is in direct ratio with the amount of cargo which can be transported.

Tankers under British and Greek flags totaled 27,390 tons. It is heartening to note that total free world tonnage has dropped off 33,216 tons, as compared with that for the preceding 2-week period, and that tanker tonnage was reduced by 13,292 tons over the same period. A new arrival on the scene is the Moroccan ship *Toubkal*, of 8,748 tons.

Reliable sources indicate that the Soviet Union, in a move said to be designed to strengthen the availability of dry-cargo ship tonnage under direct Russian control for trade with Cuba, has purchased a dozen Liberty ships, in excellent condition, from European owners. The 10,000-ton, 10-knot ships were purchased in Great Britain, Belgium, and Italy, at prices reported to be considerably above the present market level for such tonnage. The average price involved was said to be $180,000, which would be some $25,000 above the current price level for free-transferable Liberty vessels. This circumstance indicates to me that the Russians are beginning to feel the pinch occasioned by the reduction of free world shipping to Cuba.

The tonnage of free world shipping which continues to go to Cuba is still too great and our allies still are not cooperating to the extent to which I believe they should.

The list of free world ships going to Cuba, their flag of registry, and their tonnage during the period of March 22, 1963, through April 5, 1963, is as follows:

Ardmore, British, 4,664 tons.
Athelcrown (tanker), British, 11,149 tons.
Linkmoor, British, 8,236 tons.
Sierra Madre, Spanish, 999 tons.
Lord Gladstone, British, 11,299 tons.
Penelope, Greek, 6,712 tons.
Sirius (tanker), Greek, 16,241 tons.
Toubkal, Moroccan, 8,748 tons.
Tine, Norwegian, 4,750 tons.
Dugi Otok, Yugoslav, 6,997 tons.
Olga, Lebanese, 7,199 tons.

So the free world is still giving the Russians this advantage, in connection with the shipment of supplies to Cuba, by helping them with the shipping and by selling them some of the old Liberty ships.

Mr. President, the last list of freighters serving the Cuban trade is particularly interesting, in that it shows the British to be far out in front in terms of total tonnage.

During a 5½-week period from January 31 through March 8, six British ships totalling 76,066 gross tons, were listed—including two ships in the 16,000- to 22,000-ton class. Greece was the only other country whose combined tonnage was significant. Six vessels in this period accounted for 47,442 tons.

The combined tanker tonnage of 93,555 tons shipped much needed petroleum products in vessels under British, Greek, and Norwegian flags.

I wish to add that in all the weeks I have been putting into the Record from week to week the list of vessels sailing in the Cuban trade, there has been a very conspicuous absence of ships from Central or South America, which shows a fine degree of cooperation of the so-called free nations in the Latin Alliance, which are helping us with the economic problem of quarantining Cuba.

WASHINGTON TO BOSTON RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Claiborne Pell, has proposed a resolution for congressional consent for a multistate authority to help modernize and operate railroad passenger service along the eastern seaboard, Boston to Washington. The number of people traveling in this megalopolitan area increases from year to year. Yet the existing railroad facilities seem to have less and less attraction for meeting the passenger service requirements.

This multistate area's importance is well known. It accounts for the payment of about 27 percent of our Federal income taxes and approximately 30 percent of our annual industrial production.

There is really a great problem with intercity passenger transportation between Boston and Washington. Senator Pell's proposal for a multistate authority is indeed a positive suggestion to meet this great need for modernized and better intercity passenger transportation service. His proposal is attracting increasing interest and support. I think it is worthy of the greatest consideration.

On April 6, 1963, an editorial appeared in the Washington Post endorsing this proposal, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Off the Track—II

The steady deterioration of railroad service is evident to anybody who passes through Union Station, where a shroud of gloom hovers over splendors past. It is the conviction of at least one Senator, however, that the afflictions of the passenger lines are curable in the populous Northeast. Claiborne Pell, Democrat from Rhode Island, is offering a plan that could lead to a rebirth of rail service and make it possible for travelers to speed from Washington to Boston in 4 hours.

Mr. Pell is sponsoring a joint resolution that would give congressional consent to the establishment of a multi-State authority to modernize and operate passenger service between Boston and this city. In addition to the District, the eight States included in the Pell plan are Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland.

The first point the Senator makes is that these Atlantic States are rapidly becoming a megalopolis. The Northeast now has a population of over 37 million and contains 30 percent of the country's manufacturing and 21 percent of the retail establishments. Intercity transportation is vital to the seaboard, and the railroads in theory should be able to provide reliable, swift, and profitable service. Yet though the railroads have the track and right-of-way, they lack the capital necessary to install high-speed service.

As the Senator sees it, a multi-State public authority could raise $500 million under tax-exempt bonds; the money would be used to modernize the rails and install high-speed service that would take a passenger from Washington to Boston in 4 hours. Precisely the same technique of multi-State compacts is already employed for the building of port facilities, bridges, and highway. Why not extend the concept, Mr. PELL asks, to the railroad business?

Why not, indeed. The seaboard megalopolis is sure to become more densely populated and more intricately interwoven. Highways and airways will not be sufficient to meet staggering demands on interurban facilities. One rail line, Senator PELL points out, can carry as many passengers as 32 highway lanes.

As a first step, Congress is being asked to appropriate $1 million for a full-scale study. The request has White House approval, and Richardson Dilworth, former mayor of Philadelphia, is being mentioned as a possible director of the study. Prompt approval of the appropriation would be an investment in the future.

Such a study need not be—and should not be—carried out in a hostile spirit. The railroads have been badly hurt by competition from airlines, which enjoy a Federal subsidy, and trucks, which use a publicly maintained right-of-way. Within their limited capital resources, some effort is being made to improve passenger service. The Pennsylvania Railroad, for example, announced the other day that 50 modern coaches will be added to the fleet operating between New York and Washington. The aim should be to make this affirmative attitude contagious.

COTTON EXPORT PROGRAM

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture has just made the third substantial downward revision in its estimate of cotton exports for the current season. Until just 6 months ago, the outlook for exports was 5.2 million bales. Its latest estimate is about 4 million bales. Trade sources indicate exports will probably not even be this high.

During the first 6 months of the season only 1.3 million bales were exported as compared with 2.6 million for last season—just one-half as much. What caused such a rapid deterioration in foreign markets for U.S. cotton? The answer is simple. U.S. cotton has not been priced competitively in foreign markets as required by section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Let me review why we have a mandatory cotton export program and how it operated for the first few years. As a result of the umbrella which our price support held over prices in foreign cotton producing countries, foreign acreage expanded by leaps and bounds in the late 1940's and early 1950's. As a result, we built up an all-time record carryover of 14½ million bales on August 1, 1956. Our exports dwindled to 2¼ million bales—the lowest in peacetime since 1871.

To combat this situation, Secretary Benson announced a cotton export sales program under general authority accorded him in the CCC Charter Act and the Agricultural Act of 1949. But he failed to offer U.S. cotton at prices which were competitive with foreign growths. After a series of conferences and an exchange of letters, it was clear he would not change the price to a competitive level. There was no alternative but for Congress to take action. This was done and section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 was enacted. This requires that U.S. cotton be made available in foreign markets at prices which are competitive with foreign grown cotton. It also requires that our fair share of the export market be reestablished and maintained.

This forced the Secretary of Agriculture to lower the price at which he was selling U.S. cotton abroad to a competitive level. As a result, export sales shot up dramatically. During the short period of 4 weeks CCC sold as many bales for export as had been exported during the entire 1955–56 season. For that year, we exported a total of 7.6 million bales, which was three times the level of the previous year and the highest since 1932.

During the following marketing year, our export price was raised over 2 cents a pound and exports fell off. In 1958, the higher export price was maintained and exports dwindled to 2¾ million bales. As a result of demands from the cotton industry and insistence by the Congress, the export subsidy was increased from 6 to 8½ cents per pound in 1959 and our export price was made competitive. Again our exports shot up to 7¼ million bales. In 1960, it was possible to reduce the subsidy, as the market price was lowered during that year. Our prices were competitive and we had a good export year.

Once we got our prices for U.S. cotton competitive in foreign markets through the passage of section 203, we had a very successful export program, except for 1 year. That was 1958–59. Exports for the other 4 years averaged 6¾ million bales. Even including that year, we averaged shipping 6 million bales abroad. This contrasted with an average of only 3.6 million bales for the 5 years preceding the establishment of the export program.

We were able to achieve these greatly increased exports largely because the expansion in foreign cotton acreage was brought abruptly to a halt when U.S. prices became competitive. Likewise the expansion in foreign rayon production slowed down appreciably. The U.S. carryover had dropped from an all-time high of 14.5 million bales in 1956 to a manageable 7.2 million bales in 1961. Government stocks had dropped from over 14 million bales to 1½ million bales during this same period. Largely as a result of our increased exports we were able to realize a modest increase in our acreage.

Secretary Benson's able administration of the cotton export program under section 203 is responsible for this remarkable record of building back our export markets and getting cotton on a sound footing.

A few weeks after the present administration took office, I had occasion to discuss the export program personally with the present Secretary of Agriculture. I told him of the good results generally experienced under this program, and pointed out the importance of keeping our cotton competitive in world markets. I cited the splendid record when we were competitive and the miserable failure the year we got our price out of line. During this time, there was talk that the price support would be set at a level which would substantially raise the market price for U.S. cotton in this country. I also told the Secretary that any increase in the price of cotton in the United States must be accompanied by an increase in the export subsidy so that the price at which our cotton is sold in foreign markets would not get out of line.

In a letter which I addressed to him on this subject dated February 13, 1961, I stated as follows:

> Therefore, if the 1961 price support is at a level which increases the U.S. market price of cotton, the export subsidy must be increased by a corresponding amount in order to maintain this competitive relationship as required by the cotton export law.

On February 21, 1961, the price support was set at a level which increased the domestic price by about 3½ cents per pound. In January 1961, the average price for Middling 1-inch cotton in the official spot markets was 30.14 cents per pound. By October, it was up to 33.59 cents per pound.

In spite of the warnings that any increase in the domestic price of cotton must be accompanied by a corresponding increase in the export subsidy, the subsidy was increased by only 2½ cents per pound, whereas the price was increased 3½ cents. This raised the price of U.S. cotton in foreign markets and put the price out of line with competitive growths. As a result, our exports fell from 6.6 million bales to 4.9 million bales.

Our export prices have continued to be out of line. For the current marketing year, which is the second full year this administration has been in office, exports will likely go below 4 million bales. So for the 2 years of the present administration, we will export an average of something less than 4.5 million bales. This contrasts with an average of 6 million bales exported for the first 5 years in which the export policy was set under the 1956 law. This is Secretary Benson's record.

During these last 2 years, foreign cotton acreage made its first significant expansion since 1956. During this time it increased by 3 million acres, and foreign production jumped 4½ million bales. The output of synthetic fibers abroad also climbed sharply. In addition our carryover has jumped from 7.2 million bales to an estimated 10.6 million bales. Government stocks increased from 1½ million bales to over 10 million. CCC's investment went up from $300 million to $1¾ billion. U.S. cotton acreage has been cut from 18.5 million to 16.3 million acres, the minimum permitted under law.

It is obvious that if we continue to go in the direction we have been going during the past 2 years, we will pile up more surpluses and force more restrictions on U.S. cottongrowers. The outlook is that we will produce more cotton under the minimum allotment provided by law than we are consuming and exporting this year.

In the face of this condition, the Department announcd a continuation of the current export subsidy rate of 8½ cents per pound. They did this even though our prices have been 1 to 2 cents higher than the price of foreign cotton in the foreign market during the current season. The announcement stated, however, that the 8½ cents would be the initial subsidy rate. The announcement further stated that the rate would be periodically adjusted. At the same time the Department announced a new cotton sales for export program under which stocks of CCC cotton in inventory will be offered for sale periodically on a bid basis. The sales for export program is intended to supplement the subsidy programs.

I am pleased that the Department has decided to use both these techniques. I hope these programs will result in U.S. cotton again becoming competitive in the world markets in accordance with the purpose and intent of the law. This is long overdue. U.S. cotton has been noncompetitive too long.

But this program cannot be fully effective unless the price of U.S. cotton for the next season is made competitive with foreign growths in foreign markets immediately. In order for this to be done an announcement should be made immediately that the export subsidy rate will be increased so that our cotton can move at competitive prices. Furthermore, the minimum price at which CCC sells for export must be set at the level to meet foreign competition. The announcement should be so worded and the program must be so administered as to reduce uncertainty to a minimum and to provide price stability.

If the CCC minimum price changes with every sale, the uncertainty in the market will increase to the point of chaos.

One of the great needs is to replenish the cotton pipelines around the world, which have been reduced to the lowest levels of record in relation to consumption. This has been due primarily to the uncertainty of U.S. cotton price policy. These pipeline stocks should be 2 million bales larger than they are presently.

This will not happen without a reasonable amount of price stability. No merchant, no mill, no finisher, no converter, no wholesaler will dare make any commitments except for immediate turnover purposes in the face of the uncertainty of an ever-changing Government minimum selling price. They cannot risk the loss that will be imposed upon them by further price reduction. The longer foreign mills hold off buying, the more desperate the foreign sellers will become. They will certainly drop their prices. They will force U.S. exporters to constantly reduce the price at which they bid for CCC cotton in order to compete. This means that many bids will be below the price which the Department of Agriculture officials will be willing to accept.

A minimum should be determined initially by the Department of Agriculture at a level designed to make U.S. cotton generally competitive in world markets during the season, in the light of current conditions and previous experience.

I have repeatedly pointed out to the Department of Agriculture that the competitive position must be considered broadly and over a reasonable period of time. Section 203 certainly does not require the CCC to fix the price of U.S. cotton equal to the price at which every foreign bale is sold every day by every competitor. This obviously is impossible.

The other provision of the law requires the Department to operate the program so as to maintain our fair historic share. I have urged the Department to exercise judgment in carrying out this provision. I have stated that I do not feel it is necessary that they announce a figure because exports will naturally fluctuate depending upon the textile cycle abroad and the relationship of foreign production to foreign consumption.

But I insist that we have not maintained our fair historical share of the export markets during the past 2 years. U.S. cotton exports were 33 percent of the amount of cotton consumed in foreign countries in the 1930–39 period, and about 20 percent in the 1948–52 period. Foreign consumption has risen from an average of 24 million bales in 1948–52 to an estimated 40 million bales in 1962–63. If we had the same share today as we had in the 1930's, we would be exporting 13 million bales a year. Even if we took the lower 20-percent figure which prevailed during 1948–52, our fair share of the export market would be 8 million bales. It is obvious that 4½ million bales is way below our fair share.

The administration must act promptly and decisively to carry out the cotton export law as intended. This is essential if we are to have a sound and prosperous cotton economy. But that is not all. By carrying out the intent and purpose of the cotton export law, cotton can make a greater contribution to the Nation's economic well-being and to the all-important balance-of-payments problem which is plaguing the administration.

SENATORS AND CITIZENS JOIN TO SUPPORT GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at the hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs yesterday, Senator BIRCH BAYH, the dynamic junior Senator from Indiana testified on a major bill for the first time since becoming a U.S. Senator.

His testimony was forceful, cogent, compelling. It was for the GI bill, to provide readjustment assistance to the cold war GI veterans. Senator BAYH'S facts were so clear and his reasoning so just and logical that I ask unanimous consent to print his testimony at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BIRCH E. BAYH BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS ON S. 5, TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a pleasure for me to appear before you today in support of S. 5 which I am cosponsoring. As one who was personally enabled to gain a college education through the GI bill of rights, I know the value of such aid to a young person just mustered out of the service.

The reasons for supporting this measure are compelling and I would like to briefly discuss several of them with you. First, the young people who have served their country in the armed services since 1955 have earned the aid provided in S. 5, just as those who served in the early cold war years did. We need only recall the headlines of these years to realize that these young people served their country in a time of extreme peril to this Nation and themselves. Berlin, Formosa, Korea, Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam are just a few of the areas in which servicemen went to bed at night not knowing whether or not they would wake up the next morning in a shooting war. I point this out because some may argue that benefits should be given only to veterans of a shooting war or those serving outside the United States.

The original GI bill provided benefits to all servicemen and women regardless of the fact that many did not participate in actual combat or leave the confines of the United States. Veterans of the cold war period in the years between the end of active hostilities in 1945 and the beginning of the Korean conflict were eligible for benefits. We were technically at war but active hostilities had ended. The criterion for receiving benefits in both the war and postwar periods was that the veteran had served his country in whatever capacity he was called upon to serve. It is a matter of equity that men and women who serve in a similar cold war period today be accorded equal treatment.

We are all aware that selective service has been in operation during this period. Young men have been taken from their families and their careers to serve their country. Yet, despite selective service, only 46 percent of the young men of eligible age have served in the armed services during this period. Those not required to seve in the Armed Forces have had the opportunity to advance themselves educationally, professionally, and financially. It is only fair and equitable that those men who have had their lives and careers interrupted by service be compensated for that interruption.

The second reason for supporting S. 5 is that not only will individual Americans benefit from the program but so will America herself. The money spent under S. 5 would be an investment in the group most capable of profiting from the expenditure. The young people discharged from the service have undergone a sobering, maturing experience. Most of them are in their early to midtwenties and are purposeful, determined, and dedicated. When these mature young men gain a higher education, our society as a whole is the richer.

The GI bills of World War II and the Korean war provided for our Nation 205,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses, 150,000 physical and research scientists, 500,000 engineers, and 350,000 schoolteachers. In my own State, Indiana, 210,019 young people received additional education from the two bills. This has meant a great deal to Indiana's economy and industrial capability as well as to the people themselves.

Each day more and more untrained people lose their jobs because of automation. In times of economic distress, untrained workers are naturally the first to lose their jobs. We hear a great deal these days about the problems of unemployment. Better trained people, possessing the skills required in space age industry, young men and women, capable of holding a job, represent a long-range bulwark against the unemployment problem.

Money spent under S. 5 will be returned in taxes because of the higher incomes which history has proven almost inevitably come from a higher education. This is a self-financing program in the finest sense of the word.

By the end of this fiscal year, this country will have spent $413 billion on national defense since 1955. The almost negligible fraction of that amount which will be spent to provide benefits for the cold war veterans should be considered part of the obligation incurred during the current cold war period, part of the obligation to keep our country militarily and economically strong. The individual veteran and the entire Nation will profit from our meeting this obligation. I urge you to act favorably on S. 5.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, another energetic Senator, the able Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, like Birch Bayh, one of the 39 cosponsors of the GI bill, also testified yesterday in support of early action on S. 5, the GI bill. I ask unanimous consent that his testimony be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Jennings Randolph, Prepared for the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, April 9, 1963, in Support of S. 5

THE COLD WAR VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. Chairman, I am most appreciative of this opportunity to appear before your committee to offer my support for the so-called cold war GI bill. I would be remiss if I did not also extend my gratitude and my commendations to you, Senator Yarborough, for the conscientious efforts you have made and the leadership you have provided in advancing this measure.

In the interest of equity for the individuals affected and in furthering the economic and social well-being of the Nation as a whole, the pending measure should be enacted by Congress without further delay.

The young men and women inducted into the Armed Forces since January 31, 1955, are presently denied the adjustment benefits which a grateful nation accorded veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. This inequity can be justified neither by the quality of service of Armed Forces members of today nor by a lessening of the importance of national security. Current members of the Armed Forces are on constant airborne alert with the Strategic Air Command, are roaming the seas in Polaris submarines, and are occasionally being killed as "advisers" in the jungles of South Vietnam. These are "peacetime" veterans only in the most euphemistic sense of the word. They are, in all good conscience, entitled to comparable adjustment benefits provided for their predecessors.

In terms of the national welfare, it is doubtful that any other single proposal on the agenda of this Congress will do as much to raise the reservoir of human skills in the United States. Under the Adjustment Assistance Acts for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, more than 10 million veterans advanced their educational and vocational qualifications. And of these, more than 3¼ million attended college. Though the benefits of such education cannot be measured with mathematical precision, the U.S. Bureau of the Census estimates that increased earning power achieved by veterans as a result of the previous GI bills returns more than a billion dollars a year in taxes to the Federal Treasury.

Of even greater importance, however, has been the contribution of such legislation to the tremendous increase in human capacities available in our society and the resultant technical and scientific progress. In our State of West Virginia, some 220,000 veterans have availed themselves of the educational benefits under previous GI bills, of whom 9,200 have become engineers, 7,200 schoolteachers, 2,600 doctors, dentists, and nurses, and 3,000 have been graduated at various levels in scientific studies.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would draw your attention to the unemployment rate among veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. I do not have at my disposal the figures for the United States as a whole, but a recent report from King Parsons, director of veterans' education in West Virginia, states that unemployment among West Virginia's World War II veterans is at the almost irreducible minimum of 2.1 percent—a highly encouraging figure in comparison to West Virginia's overall unemployment rate of approximately 12.5 percent. I believe one may justifiably infer that the highly satisfactory employment rate among veterans is due in considerable degree to the educational and loan benefits they have received from the GI bill.

It is for these reasons that I most earnestly support the pending proposal and hope that it will soon be reported favorably by this subcommittee. Then we of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare can advance S. 5 for action in this session of the Congress.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. Carter L. Layne of Gretna, Va., testified yesterday, as a member of the Association of Young Farmers of Virginia, proving that the GI bill is needed by the farm families and economy of America, and Andrew J. Biemiller, legislative director, AFL-CIO, testified today with one of the finest analyses yet heard of the GI bill and its effect on labor and our economy. The facts set out in these papers are irrefutable. The GI bill is an urgent American need. It should be at the top of a legislative must list.

I ask unanimous consent that both of their statements be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Carter G. Layne, Young Farmers of Virginia, Gretna, Va.

My name is Carter G. Layne. I am a full-time farmer in the Renan community of Pittsylvania County, Va. I am a charter member of the Renan Association of the Young Farmers of Virginia, an organization of young farmers enrolled in continuation classes in vocational argiculture. I am here to testify in behalf of the American Vocational Association.

I am a veteran of World War II and, as one of approximately 20,000 Virginia veterans who received institutional onfarm training for veterans during the period from 1946 to 1961, I am happy to appear before you to relate my experiences as a young farmer and tell you how this type of training has benefited me. I am convinced that my story is no different from that of thousands of other young farmers throughout Virginia and the Nation.

With the exception of the years spent in military service, my entire life has been spent on the home farm. During my childhood, my father practiced general farming with tobacco as the principal cash crop. Upon graduation from the Renan High School before World War II, I decided to make farming my life work. My plans for becoming established in farming were interrupted by the advent of war. I entered the armed services and served for nearly 4 years. I participated in five major campaigns in the European theater. While in service, I realized that I would need additional training in order to be successful in the rapidly changing field of agriculture.

Upon my return to the farm it was gratifying to learn that provisions had been made for a program of onfarm training for veterans. I enrolled in the program at Renan High School and received the instruction provided for the maximum period of 4 years. With instruction received in classes and on field trips and with the advice and guidance of my teachers of vocational agriculture, I soon realized that farming was quite different from that which I had been accustomed. I soon realized that to be a successful farmer it was necessary to expand the operation in order to justify mechanized equipment. I also learned that to effectively use the farm labor necessary for producing tobacco, additional enterprises should be added.

Upon the death of my father I inherited a one-third interest in the home farm. Since my two brothers had decided upon other areas of work, I purchased their share and will become sole owner at my mother's death. In 1948 I purchased a second farm of 225 acres and in 1960 I purchased another 150-acre farm. This size operation has enabled me to establish a dairy herd and operate an economically sound farming business.

I have continued to keep up to date on farming methods and practices by attending Young Farmer classes regularly. Members of these classes are affiliated with the Young Farmers of Virginia in which I have taken an active part. Although this organization has no direct relationship to on-farm training for veterans, it is an outgrowth and one result of that program. A major of our Young Farmer class members are veterans who received training under either Public Law 346 or 550. Without the training and benefits received from the veterans' farm training program, I would not be as well established as I am today. I believe I can name many others in the same category.

The following is a summary of accomplishments of veterans enrolled in institutional on-farm training in Virginia during 1953-54. Enrollment for this period was 1,469, which was many times smaller than the peak enrollment of 8,418 for 1949-50. I use figures for 1953-54 because during that year about half of the enrollment was made up of veterans training under Public Law 550 and the remainder under other GI training provisions.

Significant accomplishments of the 1,469 veterans in on-farm training classes in Virginia in 1953-54 are:

Number who were farmowners	614
Number breeding animals purchased (dairy, beef, swine)	11,080
Number items made in school farm shop	11,952
Number farm soil conservation plans developed	638
Number home orchards established	529
Number acres of pasture developed	7,785
Number tractors purchased	553
Number other farm machines purchased	3,284
Number acres of forestry improved	1,796
Number new homes constructed	260
Number homes in which running water was installed	403

Of course, some of the above would have been done if no training had been available; however, I know from experience that a major portion of these accomplishments was a direct result of instruction and assistance made possible by our veterans' training program.

If training for veterans was important 15 years ago, it is even more important at the present time. Changes in the business of farming are taking place more rapidly than at any time in the history of our Nation.

When a young man was called to serve in the Armed Forces 20 years ago, even if he served 4 years, farm practices and methods changed relatively little while he was away from the farm. Now, when a young man is called to serve his country, he will not even recognize many of the practices being conducted when he returns. It is no longer true that a farmer must know only how to perform a certain practice, he must also know why. In other words, science as well as mechanization has completely changed the farming picture.

We hear much about the increased population that this country faces. We also hear that the need for young men in farming is decreasing. This may be true but it is only part of the story. With increased mechanization and fewer but larger farms, the need for increased education and training opportunities for these young men who remain on the farm is greater than ever before. We in Virginia and throughout this Nation are not beginning to train the number of farm operator replacements needed.

We are losing the "cream of the crop" in agriculture and will eventually face an extreme shortage of young men on farms. Let me illustrate what I mean. A young man is called to serve 2 years in the Armed Forces. He has probably been out of high school 2, 3, or 4 years where he has made a small start toward becoming established in farming. He has accumulated some assets in the farming business. When he goes into service he probably disposes of his livestock or whatever he may own as his share in a farming business. When he returns to the farm, adjustments have been made during his absence, the cost of starting to farm has advanced, and new methods introduced. Rather than start all over again, he seeks employment elsewhere.

We must maintain and increase our productive capacity in agriculture not only for our increased population but for national defense. Many specialized types of farming are coming into existence which require highly skilled and trained farm operators. We realize that it is most difficult for older farmers to adjust to change. It is, therefore, necessary that we keep our best young men on the farm. We feel that making available certain educational and training benefits will induce more of our young men to stay on the farm.

We realize that our country is not engaged in a military conflict and we hope it will never be. We understand that the purpose of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 and related legislation since that time was to aid veterans of the armed services in making the necessary adjustments to civilian life. It was not simply a means of remuneration for serving their country in time of war. If this was true in 1944 and again in 1952, it should still be true in 1963. The adjustments in farming are much more difficult today than in either of the previous periods.

In view of the invaluable contributions of the veterans' training program to young farmer veterans of service in World War II and the Korean conflict and in view of the continuation of the draft, we urge the enactment of legislation that will continue the benefits of this training for veterans of service in the Armed Forces who entered the service since January 31, 1955.

Statement of Andrew J. Biemiller, Director of Legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations Before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs on S. 5, April 10, 1963

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew J. Biemiller. I am director of legislation of the AFL–CIO. I am accompanied by Lawrence Rogin, director of the AFL–CIO department of education.

We are very pleased to testify before this subcommittee in support of the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, S. 5, which has been introduced by Senator Yarborough and a distinguished group of his colleagues.

There are a number of features in this bill which make it particularly attractive to organized labor. We have, of course, always been concerned with Federal legislation for the assistance of the schools and of the young people. But this bill seems to us to particularly merit support, and we can only regret that it was not included among those proposals for aid to education recommended by the President in his message to this session of Congress.

The purpose of this program, as stated in the bill itself, is to provide "vocational readjustment" and restore "lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963," and to aid these young people attain "the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country."

This is the primary consideration so far as this bill is concerned. It is a matter of simple justice. Compulsory military service is not easily compatible with American concepts of democracy and only because of the unusually tense international situation has it been continued in the absence of war.

It has been said that this proposed legislation represents a radical departure from the concept of providing veterans of wartime service with readjustment benefits upon their return to civilian life. In reply to this we would like to suggest that compulsory peacetime military service is itself a radical departure from the traditions of the past. What is more, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—the so-called GI bill of rights—was itself a radical departure from all previous veterans legislation. This was no "40 acres and a mule" program. It was an attempt to compensate veterans for the disruption of their civilian life caused by their service in the Armed Forces. It was an enlightened recognition of the fact that America demands such disruption of civilian life under only the most unusual circumstances, whether the circumstances be war or so uneasy a peace as to bear many of the characteristics of war.

Many of the veterans had distinguished themselves heroically in combat; others had gone through their military careers with no actual combat experience. All of them had experienced the disruption of their lives that selective service necessarily entails.

It is precisely the same with the post-Korean veterans. In Berlin, Vietnam, Laos, and other places, members of the Armed Forces have performed under conditions closely resembling war. Other members of the Armed Forces have not been involved in international conflict at all. But all of them have had their lives disrupted by the unusual demands which the times have placed upon the individual.

Even if there had been no Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or the sequel to that act which extended similar benefits to veterans of the Korean war, there would still be compelling arguments for starting such a program at the earliest possible moment. It is simple justice for a nation which demands service in the Armed Forces even though there is no state of war existing, to compensate those young people when it comes time for them to make their readjustment to civilian life.

Fortunately, however, we do have the experience of the two GI bills of rights. On the basis of that experience we can safely predict the benefits to the individuals and to the Nation, which would be the consequences of this bill.

All in all, more than 10 million veterans, men and women, took advantage of the provisions of the GI bills: 3,435,000 of them entered institutions of higher education; 4,364,000 of them entered schools below the college level; and 2,656,000 of them learned important skills in on-the-job and on-the-farm training programs. Fewer young people would be affected by this proposed bill which simply proposes to do on a modest scale what has already been done before on a much larger scale.

Based upon the sample study of Norman Frederiksen and W. B. Schrader, it is reasonable to guess that at least 600,000 of the veterans who went to colleges and universities would not otherwise have done so.

In higher education the results were spectacular. The ratio between college enrollment and college-age population nearly doubled between 1941 and 1949. Not only that but the entrance of the GI's into the universities marked the beginning of a new era in higher education. To go to college became far more nearly the common practice for young people. Never again did college attendance drop back to prewar levels, and in 1961, college enrollment was at the all-time high of 38 percent of the population in the 18- to 21-year age group.

All of this has nothing to do with higher birth rates. The higher birth rate of the late 1940's has not yet reached the colleges. This is the result simply of a tremendous increase in the proportion of our young people seeking higher education. Not only did the veterans go to college, but in many cases their example inspired their younger brothers and sisters to go to college too. It is an axiom of higher education that the children of college graduates are more likely to attend college than the children of noncollege graduates. It may, therefore, be assumed that the sons and daughters of the veterans, who will soon be of college age, will also be entering college in larger proportions than would otherwise have been true.

The median educational achievement of the American people has increased by two grades since World War II. The GI bills were a major reason for this.

This has all been an inestimable gain to the United States, an investment that has paid off in higher achievements and higher earnings for the veterans. Those higher earnings have, in turn, yielded an estimated $1 billion a year in additional tax revenue to the Federal Government. But the gain to the Nation in the increased knowledge and the increased skills cannot be measured in dollars and cents. This was a bold experiment and the experiment was successful beyond most hopes.

Fortunately, we do not have to approach the cold war Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act as an experiment. The experimental phase is over and we know what this bill can do for the veterans and for the Nation.

There are some special aspects of this cold war bill, however, which we feel are particularly important.

During World War II we needed a tremendous military force. All in all more than 15 million men and women served in the Armed Forces. Under such circumstances the selective service system reached most of the eligible youths.

The demands of a peacetime army are not nearly so severe. It is expected that by 1973 there will be approximately 4½ million post-Korean veterans. Yet there are approximately 25 million men and boys in the age groups which would be subject to the draft between 1955 and 1973. We talk as though this were a time of universal military service, but in fact, it is not that at all.

Back in January 6, 1956, U.S. News & World Report predicted excellent chances that various groups of men would have of avoiding military service altogether. Despite frequently changing regulations, little has happened to change that situation. For some young people it is relatively easy to delay and in some cases, altogether avoid military service. Some recent advice to young people from Lt. Gen. R. L. Vittrup, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, includes the essential point:

"To the young man presently in school, my advice is simple—continue your education as long as you are able to do so. Your decision will depend upon your financial ability as well as your mental potential.

It is a shocking revelation, included in this well-intended piece of advice, that your ability to delay or even avoid military service depends upon, among other things, your financial ability. But it is true, and under present circumstances, it is probably unavoidable. Yet the fact remains that because of this arrangement, youths from low income backgrounds are more likely to be drafted than are youths from high income backgrounds.

What is more, selective service regulations draw a sharp distinction between college education on the one hand and trade, vocational and other post-high school education on the other. Young people pursuing the former are eligible for deferment, but those pursuing the latter are not.

Because of these characteristics of peacetime selective service, the cold war Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act would make it possible for thousands of economically deprived young people to attend college or learn valuable skills. This is one of the aspects of the bill which we find most satisfying; that it offers assistance where assistance is most needed and most merited.

It is also one of the considerable advantages of this bill that it offers this assistance on a noncompetitive basis. Many of the young people who would benefit from this bill would in all likelihood not score among the highest groups in various college aptitude tests, and we feel that this is all to the good. Most existing scholarship programs are competitive and designed to assist young people with the best intellects. But America needs to educate and train its second bests and its third bests too. And this bill can accomplish that better than any existing or proposed scholarship plan.

The cold war Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act is not, strictly speaking, an aid-to-education bill. Its purpose is essentially one of aiding veterans whose lives have been disrupted by their military service. Nevertheless, the bill, if passed, would obviously have important implications to institutions of higher education and these implications add up to an impressive set of secondary benefits which may be expected to flow from the bill.

By aiding students, this proposal would indirectly aid the institutions which they would attend. For several years now Congress has been struggling to find formulas which will satisfy both public and private institutions, church-controlled schools and secularly controlled schools. Here is one bill that provides a completely satisfactory method by which Federal policy can be helpful to all manner of institutions, State-supported universities, church sponsored universities, ivy league universities, junior colleges, and all of the others that contribute to the diversified nature of higher education in America.

Under existing programs of Federal assistance to higher education, the unhappy fact is that the great bulk of Federal funds are concentrated in a very few institutions. Harold Orlans, in his Brookings Institution study of "The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education," has demonstrated that 20 universities now receive more than 60 percent of all Federal funds for higher education. The remaining Federal funds, less than 40 percent, were distributed among the more than 2,000 other institutions of higher education. According to Orlans, the one time in recent years when there was a shift in this trend and Federal funds were more widely dispersed among all of the institutions of higher education, was in 1947-48, the peak year of enrollment under the original GI bill.

We believe that the bill which we are presently discussing would have a similar effect today and that this would be highly desirable. Just as we have said that America needs to encourage not only its best brains but its second and third best brains, so too we feel that the Nation needs widely diversified institutions of higher education. It is not enough that Federal policy encourage only the best institutions. We need to encourage the second best, the third best, in fact all of the institutions which contribute toward meeting our educational needs. Even though this bill has not been primarily conceived as an aid-to-education bill, there are few proposals that could have as stimulating an effect as this one in assisting and strengthening the small schools, the specialized schools, and the schools serving regional areas.

We would particularly like to comment on the vocational training features of the cold war Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act. It is by now well known that technological changes in industry have resulted in a general upgrading of the skills needed in the labor market. Veterans who are released from the Army without skills and in many cases without significant work experience face the likelihood of prolonged unemployment in an economy which has little need for additional unskilled labor.

It is important to these veterans and important to the Nation as a whole that they learn job skills which can equip them for jobs in modern industry.

Not all cold war veterans will desire or qualify for college. Forty percent of them have not graduated from high school, and it is not likely that all of the high school graduates will want to go to college. But America needs skilled workers just as surely as it needs teachers and doctors and lawyers.

Here, just as in the provisions of the bill for higher education, justice for the veteran is fortunately identical with the national interest. The future will be bleak for our veterans if they must simply compete for the diminishing supply of unskilled jobs. And the future will be equally bleak for the Nation if the veterans are merely added to the already much too large ranks of the unemployed.

The GI bills of World War II and the Korean war were responsible for raising the level of education and skills of the Nation. We believe that the cold war veterans' bill will have a similar effect, bringing new skills and greater education to hundreds of thousands of young people who would not otherwise be able to get them.

We trust this subcommittee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will act expeditiously on this bill so that it may reach the floor of the Senate for debate in the very near future.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to present the views of the AFL-CIO in support of the cold war veterans' readjustment assistance bill. Thank you.

CENTRALIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT IN THE HANDS OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I take great pleasure at this time in presenting a speech which deals with one of the more important questions which our country is facing. That is the centralization of the Government in the hands of the executive department. The particular speech to which I refer was delivered by my very able colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] at the directors' luncheon of the National Association of Manufacturers on April 3, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to try and pose for you today—not answer, but simply put into plain words—the one great issue of contemporary American public policy. It is an issue that, more and more with every passing day and every specific debate over every particular item of public policy, it seems to me we must face up to. Must face up to—or else face, instead, the progressive decay and finally the destruction of the American constitutional order. And if this traditional system of government is overturned, so too goes the whole fabric of private liberties and of creative individual enterprise that we like to label "the American way."

A tired old cliche this may be. But surely it is one that most all of us—the overwhelming bulk of the American people—truly cherish. We believe in it. We never cease in reaffirming this belief. But now I feel I must ask: are we prepared to do battle to preserve it?

I measure my words when I thus define this one great issue of American public policy: we must face up to a full-scale, no-quarter assault on the very foundations of the American constitutional system. We live in a revolutionary era—and revolutionary in the deepest sense, pointing to the overturn of all those systems and structures of ordered liberty that have been both sword and shield against every form of tyranny through all the years of the American national experience.

Who or what is the prime agent of this revolutionary assault? Again I carefully measure my words. The attack comes from the executive establishment—not the President as a man, nor even the President as party leader, but from a bureaucratic behemoth that conspicuously lacks any sense of built-in self-imposed limitation, that treats the whole area of public policy and of the national interest as its own exclusive playground, and that responds to every challenge to its undivided authority with thinly veiled contempt and, at the end, with sheer fury. Or, I must add, with cynical manipulation of information and with crude personal blackmail—underscored always with the overwhelming power of government and with pious rationalizations in the name of the popular will.

Who or what is the target of this unrelenting attack? The essential target, I repeat, is the American constitutional system itself and thus the whole fabric of our social and economic order. But in particular, the target is one political institution which I am proud to represent—the Congress of the United States—and the complex of private and voluntary associations of which you gentlemen are by definition leaders and spokesmen—namely, the American system of free and creative enterprise.

I submit to you that we—the Congress, the American business community, and indeed every free American worker and farmer—are equal partners in one overriding enterprise: the defense of traditional American liberties and the preservation of the American Constitution against Executive absolutism. Indeed, the President himself—any President, the leader of either major party—ought to assume a further partnership, because he is increasingly the captive of this same executive establishment which is beyond the power of any one man to comprehend, much less command or control. Even if and when he has the will to do so—as does not now appear to be the case.

That I am not speaking simply of some fantastic "spook," called into being for partisan political purposes, is a fact that can be amply and grimly documented. Mr. Roger Blough can provide some of this documentation—not to mention those newsmen with their hair-raising reports of midnight callers during the appalling April days of the steel price showdown. General Electric and General Motors and a thousand other firms and corporations can add still more—as they confront an Antitrust Division which now treats bigness as a crime and business success as a mortal sin. It is no mere question of antibusiness bias along the New Frontier; it is, infinitely more seriously, an executive establishment whose dream of a new paternalism leaves no room for private initiative or for personal liberties, least of all for the unpredictable and irrepressible choices of free individuals.

And I, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, could pile up an endless catalog of case-histories—all of them with this one factor in common: each one a gross inroad by the Executive into the area, traditionally, of shared responsibility and of balanced power. Let me tick off just a few illustrations of what I mean:

There was the recent case of a steam powerplant to be built in Colorado with REA loan funds. While the question of certification by the State PUC was under active consideration, the U.S. Secretary of the Interior took it upon himself publicly to accuse private power firms of bad faith and to threaten a shift in Federal funds to neighboring States.

There is the present case of new regulations for power transmission lines running across Federal lands, regulations under the uncontrolled jurisdiction of either the Secretary of the Interior or of Agriculture. Even the FPC, a part of the executive branch itself, strongly objected. Its grounds: an invasion of its own statutory responsibilities—responsibilities, that is to say, laid down by Congress in the first instance. But by Executive order, these new regulations, only slightly modified, went into effect just last week.

There are such cases as the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and, more blatantly still, of the so-called Domestic Peace Corps. In neither case is there open and avowed statutory authority—in the latter case, public debate has barely even begun—and yet the funds have been scraped together and the staffs are being hired (with the inevitable promise of yet bigger staffs and of inflated budgets still to come). By Executive order, and by Executive fiat only, these new bureaucracies of enormous potential power have been spawned. Congressional authorization? Merely an afterthought.

And there are grabs for future power, without number and without effective limit, in areas of concern running from urban affairs to national water resources, from agricultural commodity production control to health insurance for the aged. I speak here of requests now under consideration by the Congress, and thus of congressional resistance to Executive power still maintained.

But the pressure is relentless. And by its cynical manipulation and its exploitation of special interest groups, the executive establishment masks these power grabs in the guise of public interest and popular will. If our counterattack is to succeed—ours in the Congress, and yours in the free American business community—we must bring to bear an equal intensity, equal endurance, and still greater devotion to the principles of freedom.

In all these cases, I have been saying, the attack is a full-scale revolution against the traditional American constitutional system, a system of ordered liberty and of balanced power. Let our defenses be mounted in the name, as in the spirit, of these high principles. And let us not be diverted, nor our counsels divided, by the attempt of the executive establishment always to appropriate the banner of national interest and popular mandate for its aggressive power plays. Of course, all the issues to which I've been referring are indeed matters of great and grave public concern. That is not my quarrel. But in spelling out the details of that legitimate concern, I submit that no single institution of Government is more responsive to popular mandate nor more responsible to popular will than the elected representatives of the entire American people—the Congress of the United States, local constituency by local constituency.

We cannot do the job alone, however. We need help. We need sound advice and sober judgment. We need the constant support of the whole American community—and certainly not least of those private and voluntary groups and associations into which the American people freely channel their collective energies. Our purposes are the same. We seek only and always to preserve and extend American freedom.

There is a reflection, across the face of the Nation, of the preoccupation with the Presidency that has fostered and nurtured the growing imbalance in our governmental structure.

How much of the activity and interest of great national organizations, including your own, gentlemen, is oriented toward the executive rather than the legislative branch? I think that, on careful inspection, you will find that a disproportionate amount is so oriented.

The underlying assumption of many such activities is that the character of the man in the White House determines the state of the Union. Certainly his character shapes, through its leadership, a goodly portion of that state. But it is the action or inaction of the legislative branch that must finally determine it.

We can say that this or that administration, for instance, is probusiness or antibusiness. And such evaluations have validity. But the excesses of the executive which, today for instance, have earned the label of antibusiness can be curbed by Congress. You may ask why they haven't, if that's the case.

My answer would be that the Congress today, on both sides of the aisle, does in fact represent an active curb against executive excesses which, if given fully free rein, would completely swamp our free economic system in the bow wave of advancing state economic control by economic theoreticians. We have only to look at the rising bipartisan objection to the President's budget and tax plans to see that the executive party's plans are being subjected to the closest scrutiny by both of the legislative parties.

Still, we often think of elections, of government itself, in terms of the Presidency. When we engage in programs to get out the vote, for instance, we are getting out presidential votes, by and large. When great issues are debated, they often are debated in terms of presidential candidates who espouse or oppose them. The major emphasis, in fact, of most so-called grassroots movements is presidential in emphasis whether consciously or not.

We see, also extensive programs in so-called economic education without any equivalent programs in governmental education. If there were such programs and emphasis we might hear less criticism of Congress for taking its time in considering legislation and more criticism of those times when, at Presidential prodding, it rushes pellmell into programs it has not studied adequately.

Perhaps even more to the point are programs of direct relationship to the legislative branch. While great national organizations pour immense resources into their grassroots programs, to educate the so-called man-in-the-street, what support do these organizations provide for the representatives of the man-in-the-street who, ultimately, must do the work that directs our destiny? There are precious few.

Congress, without the vast research resources available to the executive, must depend upon a comparatively skeletal staff for much of its research. Its Members desperately need informational and research assistance, day by day, session by session. It can, of course, call upon expert witnesses during committee hearings. But even then the information may be too little and too late.

If great public organizations, and individual citizens and corporations, could divert even a fraction of their great grassroots enthusiasms and support toward truly bipartisan efforts to provide research assistance to the legislative branch, a mighty step would have been taken toward restoring the balance between legislative and executive impact. As it is, I can think of only a tiny handful of conscientious research efforts which, without grinding axes, attempt to bolster the Congress directly and effectively.

At election time, of course, the difference in emphasis becomes more painful—from a legislative point of view. We have national organizations aplenty, with millions aplenty, devoted to action during presidential campaigns. At the State level there also are committees and organizations to beat the drum and pass the hat for State officials. Even at the local level, our friends and neighbors get out their precinct books and hiking shoes to work for the sheriff, the councilman, the mayor, and so forth.

The Senator often stands in this equation rather like the poor relative of the State ticket. The poor Congressman stands there almost like an orphan. In off-year contests he is lucky to even have his name mentioned amid the other, apparently really important races, such as that for dogcatcher.

Where are the programs, the committees, the resources devoted year round to the support of good candidates to the most representative and, I think, most crucial house of our entire governmental structure? They are lacking, by and large, because we, all of us, have a diminished sense of Senate and Congress. We are beginning to accept the caricaturists' version of the legislator. We are beginning to stare hypnotically at the televisionlike screen of the Executive's awesome power.

The symbol of this great land is becoming a grin, a smile, a hairdo, a painting on the White House wall. It should be the dome of the mightiest edifice of freedom ever constructed—the Capitol of the United States.

For the public at large this requires firm answers to some questions which have taken on new and crucial meaning.

If Congress puts the brakes on executive agreements to disarm this land, or even disarm the whole free world, will you say that Congress is filled by war hawks? The Executive will.

If Congress demands that the Soviet satellite to our south be put under the full pressures of the Monroe Doctrine, will you say that Congress is moving to the brink of destruction? The Executive has and will.

If Congress asks that every projected Federal expenditure be subjected to careful weighing as to need, cost, and result, will you say that Congress is a stumbling block? The Executive has and will.

If Congress asks that our national budget be handled with the good sense of our business and household budgets will you accuse us of being old fashioned? The Executive will.

If Congress seeks to crack open the walls of secrecy and news management that are arising in Washington, will you say that they are meddling in matters best left to the selected few? The Executive will.

If Congress is jealous of your rights in the making of law, if Congress seeks to strengthen the responsibilities of your States and your municipalities, will you say that we are walking an outdated frontier? The Executive will.

If Congress seeks answers for our major problems outside the Central Government, will you say that we are stone age advocates of an individual responsibility that no longer has a place in our life? The Executive will.

Or will you, instead, return your support and your attention to your own representatives, giving the executive the deference due the office but not abdicating to it all your powers and your future?

A free people will.

Or will you vote away your rights and responsibilities in return for the illusory comforts of having your decision made by the machine processes of an all-powerful Executive?

A frightened people will.

Free or frightened, able to shoulder the responsibilities of our own choices or weakly handing them on to the remote, regal power of purple executive majesty—those are the challenges you face and which you must answer.

These are questions also which must be asked and answered by men such as you who have key responsibilities in business and in organizational activity.

Are your programs balanced between broad, executive-oriented or grassroots movements and tightly targeted programs?

Do they directly enhance the Congress, the quality of its membership, and the ability of those members intelligently to consider legislation?

Do your internal efforts to spur political interest just stir up activity? Or do they encourage a true realization of the issues and the institutions of our form of government?

Do you support activities that simply whoop and holler, seeking headlines? Do you support activities that provide solid research and factual data and seek to help those in Congress who must have such information?

Does your political support, financial and personal, pursue the phantom causes and organizations whose highflying titles appeal to you and attract, or do your activities, personal and financial, support political effort at the place it counts the most in National elections—the election of Congressmen and Senators?

It is often said that a Republic such as ours can only be preserved by the action of all the people. That's true so far as it goes. But, in a republic such as ours, the resolve and spirit of the people, day by day, can only be expressed through one branch of our Government—the legislative branch. The President may try to lead all of the people. He rarely tries to represent them all.

In the transition from freedom to tyranny, wherever it has happened in history, the suppression of the representatives of the people and the substitution of executive authority has been a recurring theme. It can happen anywhere. It can happen slowly and innocently, almost unknowingly wherever people become bedazzled by slogans of executive efficiency and forgetful of freedom's constant demand for individual responsibility and for true representation. It can happen wherever the goal of government becomes the manipulation of the majority rather than the concept of the commonweal. It can happen wherever class struggle becomes the marching order of government and where people are compartmentalized into so-called special interests with no realization of the common interest.

The only answer that history has ever found has been our own concept of government with the consent of the governed and the protection of the minority. If we consent instead, to be ruled by the Executive, there will be no answer—nor any future for freedom.

NEAR AIR COLLISION OVER SYRACUSE, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this morning's newspapers carry the story of a near collision between a commercial airliner with 57 persons aboard and an Air Force jet fighter at 22,500 feet over Syracuse, N.Y., at about 8 p.m. on April 8.

The commercial plane was an American Airlines turboprop Electra flying nonstop from Boston to Detroit. The jet fighter was an F-101 interceptor based at Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.

The collision was averted only through evasive action taken by the American pilot, Captain Biedermann, a veteran of some 20 years of flying experience with the airline. Although a collision was avoided, unfortunately 5 of the 52 passengers aboard the airliner were injured. The result could, of course, have been much worse; and on the basis of the facts now known, Captain Biedermann deserves credit for preventing a major air disaster.

Mr. President, this incident raises serious questions of air safety under the administration of the Federal Aviation Act. Among the purposes of the Congress in passing this legislation in 1958 was to assure better coordination of air traffic control as between the commercial and military sectors of aviation. In this case, the jet interceptor's training flight was controlled by a radar team at Hancock Field, Syracuse, while the airliner's flight was under the control of the Boston Air Traffic Center operated by the Federal Aviation Agency.

As yet there is no apparent explanation—although the incident is under investigation, and I assume there will be—as to how the two aircraft involved had so little separation between them in the air space 22,500 feet over Syracuse, that this extreme "evasive action" on the part of the commercial pilot had to be taken. This incident, therefore, demands an immediate, thorough investigation by both the Federal Aviation Agency and the appropriate military officials. I have this morning contacted Administrator Halaby to this effect, and it is my understanding from the news reports that Brigadier General Elder, Inspector General of the Air Defense Command Headquarters, is already on the scene to determine whether the Air Force had knowledge of the American Airlines plane's presence in the path of the jet training flight.

Mr. President, because of the importance of the safety of air travel throughout the country and the necessity for coordination between military and civilian authorities, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the Associated Press dispatch entitled "Airliner With 57 Dives To Miss Jet," published in the New York Times of today, April 10, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRLINER WITH 57 DIVES TO MISS JET—AIR FORCE BEGINS AN INQUIRY INTO UPSTATE INCIDENT

SYRACUSE, April 9.—A commercial airliner with 57 persons aboard was forced into a sharp dive to avoid an Air Force jet fighter at 22,500 feet last night. The Air Force began an investigation.

The evasive action was taken by an American Airlines turboprop Electra flying nonstop from Boston to Detroit. The action was so violent that 5 of the 52 passengers were injured, none seriously, an airlines spokesman said.

Passengers were thrown into the aisle and across seats, and dishes and cups were tossed about the plane.

The crash threat was "closer than you like to have it," the airliner's pilot, Capt. M. T. Biedermann of Ann Arbor, Mich., said later in Detroit.

The jet was an F-101 interceptor based at Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, near here. It was occupied by 1st Lt. Denis J. Haney of New York, pilot, and 1st Lt. Jerry E. Crown of Kansas City, Kans., radar operator.

Both officers are assigned to the 49th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron of the Air Defense Command.

GENERAL INVESTIGATES

Brig. Gen. William Elder, inspector general of the Air Defense Command Headquarters at Colorado Springs, flew here to determine "whether Air Force officials were informed of a civilian plane in the area of the near-crash."

The planes were about 5 miles northwest of here.

An Air Force spokesman said earlier that he could give no estimate of how close the planes came. "They were close," he said.

Captain Biedermann, 41 years old, an American Airlines pilot for 20 years, said he had had other close calls in the air, but "not like this one." He declined to estimate how close the planes were.

The incident occurred about 8 p.m., while dinner was being served.

A passenger, Ralph McKenney, 17, of Grosse Pointe, Mich., said the Electra dived down and to the right.

"Coffee flew all over the ceiling," he said. "In the back, by the tail section, people were thrown into the aisles."

The flight continued to Detroit and arrived nearly on schedule.

Four injured passengers were treated at Annapolis Hospital at Wayne., Mich., and discharged. They were Mrs. Louise Warman of Framingham, Mass., Vernier Johnson of Woburn, Mass.; M. E. Johmson of Boston, and Roderick Keeler of Detroit.

The fifth injured passenger, who refused hospital treatment, was identified as W. L. Cronin of Longmeadow, Mass.

An Air Force spokesman for the 26th Air Division at Hancock Field, Syracuse, said the jet interceptor's training flight was controlled by a radar team at Hancock. He said the airliner's flight was directed by the Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center. The Federal Aviation Agency is the coordinating Agency.

ASSAULT ON CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in the past several months, I have discerned among my colleagues a growing uneasiness about the relative roles of the Congress and the Executive in the shaping of national policies and national decisions.

This mood is akin to frustration. More and more Senators of both parties have alluded to it, often with a sense of having lost something but not being quite sure what it is.

Our colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], has spelled it out for us in an arresting and memorable speech before the directors of the National Association of Manufacturers here in Washington on April 3.

The simple truth, Senator ALLOTT points out, is that there is mounted in this country today a full-scale, no-quarter assault on the very foundations of the American constitutional system.

It is a thoughtful, reasoned thesis that Senator ALLOTT lays before us. Every Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives should read and ponder it. So should every American citizen, many of whom, like us, are becoming uneasily aware of a subtle change in the constitutional balance of power they were taught as schoolchildren.

Mr. President, some of us have been trying to say what Senator ALLOTT has said. None of us has succeeded as he has. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Senator ALLOTT's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR GORDON ALLOTT

I want to try and pose for you today—not answer, but simply put into plain words—the one great issue of contemporary American public policy. It is an issue that, more and more with every passing day and every specific debate over every particular item of public policy, it seems to me we must face up to. Must face up to—or else face, instead, the progressive decay and finally the destruction of the American constitutional order. And if this traditional system of Government is overturned, so too goes the whole fabric of private liberties and of creative individual enterprise that we like to label "the American way".

A tired old cliche this may be. But surely it is one that most all of us—the overwhelming bulk of the American people—truly cherish. We believe in it. We never cease in reaffirming this belief. But now I feel I must ask: are we prepared to do battle to preserve it?

I measure my words when I thus define this one great issue of American public policy: we must face up to a full-scale, no-quarter assault on the very foundations of the American constitutional system. We live in a revolutionary era—and revolutionary in the deepest sense, pointing to the overturn of all those systems and structures of ordered liberty that have been both sword and shield against every form of tyranny through all the years of the American national experience.

Who or what is the prime agent of this revolutionary assault? Again I carefully measure my words. The attack comes from the executive establishment—not the President as a man, nor even the President as party leader, but from a bureaucratic behemoth that conspicuously lacks any sense of built-in self-imposed limitation, that treats the whole area of public policy and of the national interest as its own exclusive playground, and that responds to every challenge to its undivided authority with thinly veiled contempt and, at the end, with sheer fury. Or, I must add, with cynical manipulation of information and with crude personal blackmail—underscored always with the overwhelming power of government and with pious rationalizations in the name of the popular will.

Who or what is the target of this unrelenting attack? The essential target, I repeat, is the American constitutional system itself and thus the whole fabric of our social and economic order. But in particular, the target is one political institution which I am proud to represent—the Congress of the United States—and the complex of private and voluntary associations of which you gentlemen are by definition leaders and spokesmen—namely, the American system of free and creative enterprise.

I submit to you that we—the Congress, the American business community, and indeed every free American worker and farmer—are equal partners in one overriding enterprise: the defense of traditional American liberties and the preservation of the American Constitution against Executive absolutism. Indeed, the President himself—any President, the leader of either major party—ought to assume a further partnership, because he is increasingly the captive of this same executive establishment which is beyond the power of any one man to comprehend, much less command or control. Even if and when he has the will to do so—as does not now appear to be the case.

That I am not speaking simply of some fantastic "spook," called into being for partisan political purposes, is a fact that can be amply and grimly documented. Mr. Roger Blough can provide some of this documentation—not to mention those newsmen with their hair-raising reports of midnight callers during the appalling April days of the steel price showdown. General Electric and General Motors and a thousand other firms and corporations can add still more—as they confront an Antitrust Division which now treats bigness as a crime and business success as a mortal sin. It is no mere question of antibusiness bias along the New Frontier; it is, infinitely more seriously, an executive establishment whose dream of a new paternalism leaves no room for private initiative or for personal liberties, least of all for the unpredictable and irrepressible choices of free individuals.

And I, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, could pile up an endless catalog of case histories—all of them with this one factor in common: each one a gross inroad by the executive into the area, traditionally, of shared responsibility and of balanced power. Let me tick off just a few illustrations of what I mean.

There was the recent case of a steam powerplant to be built in Colorado with REA loan funds. While the question of certification by the State PUC was under active consideration, the U.S. Secretary of the Interior took it upon himself publicly to accuse private power firms of bad faith and to threaten a shift in Federal funds to neighboring States.

There is the present case of new regulations for power transmission lines running across Federal lands, regulations under the uncontrolled jurisdiction of either the Secretary of the Interior or of Agriculture. Even the FPC, a part of the executive branch itself, strongly objected. Its grounds: an invasion of its own statutory responsibilities—responsibilities, that is to say, laid down by Congress in the first instance. But by Executive order, these new regulations, only slightly modified, went into effect just last week.

There are such cases as the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and, more blatantly still, of the so-called Domestic Peace Corps. In neither case is there open and avowed statutory authority—in the latter case, public debate has barely even begun—and yet the funds have been scraped together and the staffs are being hired (with the inevitable promise of yet bigger staffs and of inflated budgets still to come.) By Executive order, and by Executive fiat only, these new bureaucracies of enormous potential power have been spawned. Congressional authorization? Merely an afterthought.

And there are grabs for future power, without number and without effective limit, in areas of concern running from urban affairs to national water resources, from agricultural commodity production control to health insurance for the aged. I speak here of requests now under consideration by the Congress—and thus of congressional resistance to Executive power still maintained.

But the pressure is relentless. And by its cynical manipulation and its exploitation of special interest groups, the executive establishment masks these power grabs in the guise of public interest and popular will. If our counterattack is to succeed—ours in the Congress, and yours in the free American business community—we must bring to bear an equal intensity, equal endurance, and still greater devotion to the principles of freedom.

In all these cases, I have been saying, the attack is a full-scale revolution against the traditional American constitutional system, a system of ordered liberty and of balanced power. Let our defenses be mounted in the name, as in the spirit, of these high principles. And let us not be diverted, nor our counsels divided, by the attempt of the executive establishment always to appropriate the banner of national interest and popular mandate for its aggressive powerplays. Of course, all the issues to which I've been referring are indeed matters of great and grave public concern. That is not my quarrel. But in spelling out the details of that legitimate concern, I submit that no single institution of government is more responsive to popular mandate nor more responsible to popular will than the elected representatives of the entire American people—the Congress of the United States, local constituency by local constituency.

We cannot do the job alone, however. We need help. We need sound advice and sober judgment. We need the constant support of the whole American community—and certainly not least of those private and voluntary groups and associations into which the American people freely channel their collective energies. Our purposes are the same. We seek only and always to preserve and extend American freedom.

There is a reflection, across the face of the Nation, of the preoccupation with the presidency that has fostered and nurtured the growing imbalance in our governmental structure.

How much of the activity and interest of great national organizations, including your own, gentlemen, is oriented toward the executive rather than the legislative branch? I think that, on careful inspection, you will find that a disproportionate amount is so oriented.

The underlying assumption of many such activities is that the character of the man in the White House determines the state of the Union. Certainly his character shapes, through its leadership, a goodly portion of that state. But it is the action or inaction of the legislative branch that must finally determine it.

We can say that this or that administration, for instance, is probusiness or antibusiness. And such evaluations have validity. But the excesses of the executive which, today for instance, have earned the label of antibusiness can be curbed by Congress. You may ask why they haven't, if that's the case.

My answer would be that the Congress today, on both sides of the aisle, does in fact represent an active curb against executive excesses which, if given fully free rein, would completely swamp our free economic system in the bow wave of advancing State economic control by economic theoreticians. We have only to look at the rising bipartisan objection to the President's budget and tax plans to see that the Executive party's plans are being subjected to the closest scrutiny by both of the legislative parties.

Still, we often think of elections, of government itself, in terms of the Presidency. When we engage in programs to get out the vote, for instance, we are getting out presidential votes, by and large. When great issues are debated, they often are debated in terms of presidential candidates who espouse or oppose them. The major emphasis, in fact, of most so-called grassroots movements is Presidential in emphasis whether consciously or not.

We see, also extensive programs in so-called economic education without any equivalent programs in governmental education. If there were such programs and emphasis we might hear less criticism of Congress for taking its time in considering legislation and more criticism of those times when, at Presidential prodding, it rushes pell mell into programs it has not studied adequately.

Perhaps even more to the point are programs of direct relationship to the legislative branch. While great national organizations pour immense resources into their grassroots programs, to educate the so-called man-in-the-street, what support do these organizations provide for the representatives of the man-in-the-street who, ultimately, must do the work that directs our destiny? There are precious few.

Congress, without the vast research resources available to the executive, must depend upon a comparatively skeletal staff for much of its research. Its members desperately need informational and research assistance, day by day, session by session. It can, of course, call upon expert witnesses during committee hearings. But even then the information may be too little and too late.

If great public organizations, and individual citizens and corporations, could divert even a fraction of their great grassroots enthusiams and support toward truly bipartisan efforts to provide research assistance to the legislative branch, a mighty step would have been taken toward restoring the balance between legislative and executive impact. As it is, I can think of only a tiny handful of conscientious research efforts which, without grinding axes, attempt to bolster the Congress directly and effectively.

At election time, of course, the difference in emphasis becomes more painful—from a legislative point of view. We have national organizations aplenty, with millions aplenty, devoted to action during presidential campaigns. At the State level there also are committees and organizations to beat the drum and pass the hat for State officials. Even at the local level, our friends and neighbors get out their precinct books and hiking shoes to work for the sheriff, the councilman, the mayor, and so forth.

The Senator often stands in this equation rather like the poor relative of the State ticket. The poor Congressman stands there almost like an orphan. In off-year contests he is lucky to even have his name mentioned amid the other, apparently really important races, such as that for dogcatcher.

Where are the programs, the committees, the resources devoted year around to the support of good candidates to the most representative and, I think, most crucial House of our entire governmental structure? They are lacking, by and large, because we, all of us, have a diminishing sense of Senate and Congress. We are beginning to accept the caricaturists' version of the legislator. We are beginning to stare hypnotically at the television-like screen of the Executive's awesome power.

The symbol of this great land is becoming a grin, a smile, a hairdo, a painting on the White House wall. It should be the dome of the mightiest edifice of freedom ever constructed, the Capitol of the United States.

For the public at large this requires firm answers to some questions which have taken on new and crucial meaning.

If Congress puts the brakes on executive agreements to disarm this land, or even disarm the whole free world, will you say that Congress is filled by war hawks? The Executive will.

If Congress demands that the Soviet satellite to our south be put under the full pressures of the Monroe Doctrine, will you say that Congress is moving to the brink of destruction? The Executive has, and will.

If Congress asks that every projected Federal expenditure be subjected to careful weighing as to need, cost, and result, will you say that Congress is a stumbling block? The Executive has and will.

If Congress asks that our national budget be handled with the good sense of our business and household budgets will you accuse us of being old-fashioned? The Executive will.

If Congress seeks to crack open the walls of secrecy and news management that are arising in Washington, will you say that they are meddling in the matters best left to the selected few? The Executive will.

If Congress is jealous of your rights in the making of law, if Congress seeks to strengthen the responsibilities of your States and your municipalities, will you say that we are walking an outdated frontier? The Executive will.

If Congress seeks answers for our major problems outside the Central Government, will you say that we are stone age advocates of an individul responsibility that no longer has a place in our life? The Executive will.

Or will you, instead, return your support and your attention to your own representatives, giving the Executive the deference due the office but not abdicating to it all your powers and your future?

A free people will.

Or will you vote away your rights and responsibilities in return for the illusory comforts of having your decision made by the machine processes of an all-powerful executive?

A frightened people will.

Free or frightened, able to shoulder the responsibilities of our own choices or weakly handing them on to the remote, regal power of purple executive majesty—those are the challenges you face and which you must answer.

These are questions also which must be asked and answered by men such as you who have key responsibilities in business and in organizational activity.

Are your programs balanced between broad, executive-oriented or grassroots movements and tightly targeted programs?

Do they directly enhance the Congress, the quality of its membership, and the ability of those members intelligently to consider legislation?

Do your internal efforts to spur political interest just stir up activity? Or do they encourage a true realization of the issues and the institutions of our form of Government?

Do you support activities that simply whoop and holler, seeking headlines? Do you support activities that provide solid research and factual data and seek to help those in Congress who must have such information?

Does your political support, financial and personal, pursue the phantom causes and organizations whose high-flying titles appeal to you and attract, or do your activities, personal and financial, support political effort at the place it counts the most in national elections—the election of Congressmen and Senators?

It is often said that a republic such as ours can only be preserved by the action of all the people. That's true so far as it goes. But, in a republic such as ours, the resolve and spirit of the people, day by day, can only be expressed through one branch of our Government—the legislative branch. The President may try to lead all of the people. He rarely tries to represent them all.

In the transition from freedom to tyranny, wherever it has happened in history, the suppression of the representatives of the people and the substitution of executive authority has been a recurring theme. It can happen anywhere. It can happen slowly and innocently, almost unknowingly wherever people become bedazzled by slogans of executive efficiency and forgetful of freedom's constant demand for individual responsibility and for true representation. It can happen wherever the goal of government becomes the manipulation of the majority rather than the concept of the commonweal. It can happen wherever class struggle becomes the marching order of government and where people are compartmentalized into so-called special interests with no realization of the common interest.

The only answer that history has ever found has been our own concept of government with the consent of the governed and the protection of the minority. If we consent instead, to be ruled by the Executive, there will be no answer—nor any future for freedom.

OUR NATIONAL BUDGET

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on April 4 my esteemed friend and colleague the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] delivered a speech to a student assembly at Utah State University at Logan, Utah.

In that speech Senator Moss made an excellent and insightful analysis of the controversy on our national budget and what constitutes valid Federal services and expenditures.

Mr. President, I believe that this speech represents a commonsense approach to this problem and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS

In at least one respect, an American politician is not unlike the knights of old—in a doggedly determined manner, he sets out to slay dragons. He chooses dragons because he knows that everyone is against them. He also knows that few have ever seen them. Thus, vague and undefined dragons such as "waste" or "excessive costs" are perennially pursued by the more politically minded among us.

This year's dragon, it would seem, is a familiar one. This year's dragon is "unnecessary Government spending." Everyone is against unnecessary Government spending—by definition one would have to be. Yet few of the dragon slayers ever tell us what it is or where it can be found. We in the West are usually sure that the dragon inhabits the Eastern, urban regions. Midwesterners think he is in the South living on price supports for peanuts, cotton and tobacco. And southerners know that he is on the western frontier, developing powerplants and industrial facilities that will never be needed.

Thus we give stern warning that the dragon must be slain; that unnecessary Government spending must cease; that the big spenders in someone else's district must be thwarted. But, in the end, the dragon reappears, as regularly as clockwork, as undefined as ever, when the next political campaign begins.

Having allowed me this lighter moment, I would like now to give a longer and more serious look at this dragon of unnecessary spending, in the hope that perhaps we can expose him once and for all.

Since the present-day tax load is so large, the burden of proof lies heavily on those who advocate programs which require additional Government spending. We must always be certain that any new expenditure—whether it be for street lights on our own block, for an Interstate Highway System, for waste treatment plants, or a flight to the moon—is important to our welfare and worth the money.

As citizens, we have always been concerned with taxation and spending. And in a year in which the state of the American economy and Government fiscal policy have been made the central issues of a great national debate, there is added concern. Unfortunately, accompanying this added concern, is an added barrage of political propaganda, with no small portion of charges and countercharges. It is this barrage of propaganda which is of particular concern to me, for until we can see our way through the political smoke-screen which has been created, no constructive consensus will be reached.

The subject of Federal expenditures is a particularly difficult one to approach. It is difficult, first, because of the many diverse, and occasionally conflicting, elements and interests involved. When we speak of spending, we are not speaking only of sums, but also of individual, local, State, and regional interests, all of which must be considered. Because of this, it is always difficult, and often impossible, to decide what is a necessary expenditure and what is a wasteful one. This difficulty, however, has not seemed to hamper our ardent efforts to attack the undefined evil, "waste."

Nevertheless, because we do want to spend as little as possible, and because we do want every dollar spent to be spent wisely and well, we must face this difficulty and attempt to draw the line around what is and what is not "necessary." However, while it is very tempting to do so, we cannot draw this line only in terms of our own State, our own economic group and our own interest.

This Nation is first and foremost 1 union of 50 States, not 50 States in 1 union. This is a fine distinction, but one which must be made. History, of course, has proven this point. And, obviously, the strength of this union can be no greater than the strength of each of its component parts. With a mobile population in an industrial and interdependent society, poor schools or inadequate roads—any chronic and consistent weakness—in one section of the country will affect the other sections as well. Thus, Federal expenditures must be viewed in the light of national need.

We in the West, as the relatively underdeveloped area of the Nation, are the main beneficiaries of such a national outlook today. At the present time, Utah is reported to receive more Federal funds per capita than any other State in the Union. These funds have built roads, developed water resources, built missiles, and bolstered the economy of our State. And in doing so, they have bolstered the economy of the Nation. Which of these expenditures do the dragon slayers say are unnecessary?

Where have these funds, which have been used for the development of Utah, come from? In part, they are the taxes of the citizens of Utah. However, this accounts for a very small part of the Federal funds spent in our State, for we receive almost three times as much as we contribute in taxes. Other, more fully developed and wealthier States have, thus, been helping us. These wealthier States receive back in Federal funds a far smaller portion of Federal revenue than their taxes constitute. This may seem, to some, inequitable; however, I feel that this is as it should be, for just as all share the benefits of our Union, all must share its burdens.

Thus, your representatives in Washington must look at the national budget in terms of both Utah and the Nation. The proposed Dixie project in southwestern Utah is a case in point. This reclamation project, at an estimated cost of $42 million, will be invaluable to Utah in providing a supplemental and full irrigation water supply to about 21,000 acres in Washington county. In addition, it would provide municipal and industrial water supply, generate hydroelectric energy and give flood control protection. When the Dixie bill comes to a vote in the Congress, however, we will need the support of other States—Alabama, the Dakotas, Oregon, New York, and so on—other States which will receive no direct benefit from the Dixie project. Only with this so-to-speak uninterested support will we see this reclamation project realized.

By the same token, I will be asked to lend my support to projects which are of little or no direct benefit to Utah, except insofar as they are of benefit to the entire Nation. These, too, will involve spending—spending which is perhaps every bit as necessary to a particular State or area as the Dixie project is to us. For example, there is little need here in the open spaces for maritime subsidies and oceanic research or navigation channels along our coasts and rivers. Yet there is a great need for these in the coastal cities and river ports of the Nation. If they are to receive the funds they need in this regard, they need our support.

For most of us this dragon of unnecessary spending is that which helps the other fellow. This kind of easy and self-interested reasoning serves only to weaken the Nation and warp our purpose.

As I mentioned earlier, if we are realistically to examine and to evaluate Government expenditures, we must consider both national need and individual interests. Such an evaluation is even more difficult than this would indicate, however, for in addition to the tangible needs and interests to be considered, there are intangibles which must be counted. Government spending involves more than an assessment of figures and amounts; it also involves an assessment of ideals and goals. It involves our national purpose. For this reason, in seeking to draw the line around what is necessary and what is not, we must talk not only of dollars and cents, deficits and surpluses; we must also consider human costs and human returns. And we must consider not only the needs of the present, but also our plans and hopes for the future.

With this in mind, I want to take a brief look at our national budget. Before doing so, however, I would like to give you quickly my own philosophy on Government spending and Government assistance to the people.

I believe most fervently, as I have always believed, that everyone should stand on his own feet and do everything possible to meet his own problems. Like many of you, I worked my way through college and law school, and, may I add, long before the GI bill and numerous scholarships. I have fasted not by choice. Those of us who have had the privilege of growing up in Utah are steeped in the tradition of our hardy pioneers. We know what problems our forefathers faced, and how well they met them. We are proud of the extent to which Utah has been able to develop its own human and natural resources.

I believe also that private enterprise should be encouraged to do whatever jobs it can do. And it should be free to do these jobs. This is the basis of our American system, and the basis of America's greatness.

But I feel we must be realistic. When there are problems which private enterprise cannot solve, and which the States or the cities and counties cannot or do not move to meet, the Federal Government will be importuned, will be pressured, to move on them. And I hold with Abraham Lincoln that it is the responsibility of the Government to do for the people what they cannot do so well for themselves—I think this truth is self-evident.

Now, with this brief statement of where I stand, let us take that look at the Federal budget for fiscal year 1964. It proposes to spend $98.8 billion. This is a great deal of money. However, merely because it is a great deal of money, it does not necessarily follow that it is excessive. And merely because we have not needed so large a budget in the past, it does not follow that we do not need it now. The measure of necessity is where this $98.8 billion is to go.

Contrary to what the self-styled prophets of gloom and doom would have you believe, we are not spending this $98.8 billion on unwanted and untested "welfare programs." Note first that over half of our total budget will be spent directly for the defense of this Nation. These expenditures support the most powerful defense network which the world has ever known. And they provide the insurance, without which any dollar which we might save by cutting our defense expenses, would be worthless.

Another 13 percent of the budget similarly relates to our national security and serves to reinforce our defense efforts. This 13 percent includes expenditures in the international field and for space exploration. Thus, 63 percent of the budget—the bulk of our Federal spending—is the result of the great burden of defense which we must bear for ourselves and for freemen around the world. Finally, if we add the allocations for veterans' payments and interest on the national debt—payments which are the price of past wars—we find that a full 80 percent of the $98.8 billion budget relates to the price which we must pay for peace and security.

Eighty percent of $98.8 billion, or approximately $79 billion, is indeed a high price to pay. However, this is where we must assess more than dollars and cents. We must look beyond the face value of the figures. For, of what value would a savings of $1, or $2, or even $10 billion be, if we were not free to enjoy that savings? On the other hand, even $1 is an excessive amount if it is not necessary to that defense.

An interesting illustration of this is afforded by a recent action of the House of Representatives. For several weeks the budget cutters have been prating economy and promising to cut "waste" and "unnecessary spending." They have glibly promised that their Republican colleagues would show us where the budget should be cut. But about 2 weeks ago a military appropriation bill was before the House, and over half of the dragon-slaying, budget-cutters on the Republican side of the aisle voted to appropriate an amount for military spending greater than that thought necessary or proper by the President and the Secretary of Defense.

In fairness I should add that this is not a pure Republican-Democrat conflict. If it were, the increase would have been voted down. The fact is there were many Democrats as well as Republicans on the winning side, but the main driving force for this increase came from some of the more dedicated dragon slayers in the Congress.

Having seen that a full 80 percent of our Federal funds are expended for national security purposes, there is 20 percent as yet unaccounted for. This 20 percent is spent here at home. Again, contrary to what many would have you believe, only about 7 percent of the total budget, or 7 cents out of the tax dollar, relates even remotely to what we might term "welfare." Seven cents—less than the cost of a cup of coffee—or should I say glass of milk—is hardly an exorbitant amount. However, we are looking beyond face value today, and by this standard, even 1 cent is excessive if that penny is not soundly spent.

What, then, would constitute sound spending?

In the case of national security it is easy for us to agree that our vast expenditure represents a sound investment if it buys us freedom. It is easy for us to agree because the threat to our safety is direct and visible. If we are not fully prepared, if we do not have an adequate missile system, and so on, the Soviets will be the victors. It is that simple.

In the case of domestic spending, however, evaluating our expenditures is a great deal more difficult. The threat is not immediate, and the results not as readily apparent. Thus, the small amount spent domestically falls under exaggerated fire.

The 7 cents for welfare includes grants to the States for the aged, the blind, the disabled, and the dependent. It includes grants to the States for water pollution control, hospital construction, aid to education—including funds to land-grant colleges—vocational rehabilitation, and a variety of other programs. And it includes the administrative costs of such Government functions as unemployment compensation programs, health and medical research, and the policing of labor unions.

Critics of these programs point out that if we end the vocational rehabilitation program, for example, those who participate will suffer, but, after all, not everyone will. If we end our medical research efforts, the cure for cancer or heart disease may be somewhat longer in coming, but it will come. By this kind of reasoning, every penny thus spent on these domestic programs is spent unnecessarily and unwisely.

I, for one, cannot agree. For just as we must invest in our future through national security programs, we must invest in the future of our resources—both in the natural resources which surround us and in the human resources which are our ultimate strength.

There are those who would argue that the tradition of independence and self-reliance upon which this Nation was founded does not allow for this type of investment. These apostles of the past cry that we are encouraging weakness and idleness—coddling the citizen from cradle to grave. They wring their hands and warn of creeping socialism and the paternalistic state.

What they fail to note, however, is that our proud tradition of independence and self-reliance, both in 1789 and 1963, and our proud tradition here in Utah, did not and does not preclude a governmental concern with and involvement in the development of its resources. The Government of the United States was ordained and established to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Our Founding Fathers did not specify that the Government was ordained and established to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty only if it can do so without spending any money.

These rules set down in 1789 remain the rules by which we can judge Government's actions today. They were set down for the Government of a small nation of farmers and craftsmen, isolated from the trials and turmoils of the Old World. It is no small tribute to the wisdom of our Founding Fathers that these same rules are equally valid and valuable for the Government of a mighty nation which spans a continent and extends across the sea—a nation of industrial and commerce, upon which all of the Old World and most of the new now depend.

But while the rules remain unchanged, between 1789 and 1963 we have had to adapt to the most far reaching and pervasive social changes which have ever faced a nation in so short a time. That we have accomplished such a change, so successfully and with so little disruption and within the framework of our Constitution, is testimony to the strength of our system.

However, along with these social changes, we have also had to make psychological changes. While we retain the rules and values of old, we have redefined these and related them more realistically to the new face of our Nation. For example, we once thought of freedom or liberty in terms of self-sufficiency. The freeman was the man who had his own land, kept the fruits of his own labor, and relied on no man for aid or comfort. The Government was merely a policeman—and its role was to keep order. Today this definition has little to do with the world we know. Today, we must think of freedom in different terms; we must think of freedom in terms of life in an interdependent and industrial society. Thus, freedom is not self-sufficiency, for many of us own no land. Many of us work for large concerns and depend on men hundreds of miles away for the necessities of life. Yet we are still free—free to choose our job and way of life—free to think and to speak—free from hunger. We cannot qualify or calculate this freedom or estimate whether we have gained or lost with the change. But the change is real, and because it is real it must be reckoned with. It is this kind of adjustment which the apostles of the past have failed to make.

If this Nation is to realize its promise and remain preeminent, we must make this adjustment in our own minds. We cannot bow in blind obedience to the past. Once this has been accomplished we will be able realistically to evaluate the necessity or the validity of Government expenditures for domestic assistance—for the "general welfare." Thinking in terms of current conditions as well as past patterns, we can evaluate each program in terms of:

Is the individual able to protect himself in this regard?

If not, can private enterprise do it?

If not, is there a local, private, or church organization which can accomplish this?

If not, can the State governments do it alone?

And finally, if not, can the Federal Government carry out such an activity successfully within the standards set down in the Constitution?

Only when the first answers are negative and the last question is reached and answered affirmatively is the spending necessary. Note, however, that nowhere do we ask—has it been done before?

By this standard, I do not think that we are advocating socialism or dragging the country to destruction when we propose that the American consumer be given protection—the same protection—which we have given to our cattle since 1913. Because of our giant corporations and vast network of interstate commerce, only the Federal Government is able to accomplish this effectively.

Similarly, I do not think we are sapping the Nation's strength and encroaching upon our freedom in proposing that Federal taxes help to pay those who nurture the minds of our children an amount equal to that which we pay to those who care for our pipes and plumbing. The States themselves cannot always accomplish this.

For example, even though the recent session of the Utah State Legislature voted a larger spending authorization for education than ever before, there is a deep and sincere feeling on the part of a vast majority of the members of the Utah education association that the present financial impasse was not satisfactorily settled, and, as you all know, they have voted to suspend negotiations on next year's contracts.

I regret this most unfortunate situation, but I do understand the interest of Utah's teachers in improving the quality of education in Utah—and I am with them all the way.

To review briefly, I hold that if in judging the necessity of Federal expenditures, we look at them in the light of the world in which we live today, rather than through the eyes of apostles of the past, and we hold all that we do firmly within the framework of our Constitution, the Federal Government will not move beyond its province.

We must keep in mind the mobility of our people, and the fact that no longer is Alabama's problem strictly Alabama's concern. It has become the concern of all of us. We must keep in mind the kind of awesome world in which we live in the 1960's. We must judge today's world by today's standards. We must remember that the Federal Government is our Government every bit as much as the State government is our government, that we are citizens of Utah, but also citizens of the United States.

These, then, are the facts with which responsible citizens must contend when talking about reducing the Federal budget. It is obvious from this analysis that wholesale budget cuts are impossible without dangerously curtailing essential programs. The question remains: are there savings which could be realized in specific areas without hurting our economy, crippling important programs, or undermining our strength in the cold war? I think there are, and I intend to pursue them.

Also, once we have decided that a program is essential by these standards, we must set out to see how carefully and economically it can be administered, and how thoroughly we can eliminate any waste and inefficiency—how we can get the most for every taxpayers' dollar. Waste and inefficiency are unquestionably unnecessary expenditures in anybody's lexicon.

These are not dragons just to be slain at election time—they are the problems of the real world—to be solved only by painstaking analysis and detailed effort. The Congress will give full consideration to anyone who can show us—in dollars and cents—how to get more for the taxpayers' dollar.

But do not be misled by those who claim that billions are being thrown away, just because they do not happen to approve of a program, or those who insist that Federal programs or Federal investment are not needed in today's world.

Members of Congress have a favorite story, which, while it exaggerates, beautifully describes some people who discuss Federal spending in cliches and avoid specifics. Let me read it to you.

ON HIS OWN FEET

A young man lived with his parents in a low-cost public housing development. He attended public school, rode the free schoolbus, enjoyed the free lunch program. Following graduation from high school, he entered the Army and upon discharge kept his national service life insurance. He then enrolled in a university, receiving regularly his GI check.

Upon graduation, he married a public health nurse, bought a farm with an FHA loan. Later going into the feed and hardware business in addition to farming, he secured help from the Small Business Administration when his business faltered. His first baby was born in the county hospital. This was built in part with Hill-Burton funds. Then, he bought considerable additional acreage adjoining his farm, and obtained emergency feed from the Government. He then put part of his land under the Eisenhower soil bank program and used the payments for not growing crops to help pay his debts. His parents, elderly by now, were living comfortably in the smaller of his two farm homes, using their social security and old-age assistance checks. Lacking electricity at first, the Rural Electrification Administration supplied the lines, and a loan from the Farmers Home Administration helped clear the land and secure the best from it. That agent suggested building a pond, and the Government stocked it with fish. The Government guaranteed him a sale for his farm products. The county public library delivered books to his farm door.

He, of course, banked his money in an institution which a Government agency had insured up to $10,000 for every depositor. As the community grew, he signed a petition seeking Federal assistance in developing an industrial project to help the economy of his area. About that time he purchased business and real estate at the county seat aided by an FHA loan.

He was elected to office in the local chamber of commerce. It was rumored he joined a cell of the John Birch Society in the county seat. He wrote his Senators and Congressman protesting excessive Government spending and high taxes, and enclosed John Birch pamphlets, some containing outlandishly false statements.

He wrote, "I believe in rugged individualism. People should stand on their own two feet, not expect Government aid. I stand on my own two feet. I oppose all those socialistic trends you have been voting for and demand return to the free enterprise system of our forefathers. I and my neighbors intend to vote against you next year."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 5067) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 4423) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 5067) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who wish to speak on other matters, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business has been concluded.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment is a substitute for the bill, and, under the Senate precedents, will be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLARK. Unfortunately I was engaged in a colloquy with another Senator and I did not hear the parliamentary ruling by the Presiding Officer. Will the Presiding Officer repeat it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is a substitute for the bill, and, under the Senate precedents, will be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Is the committee amendment now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is the pending question before the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona may proceed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am opposed to the enactment of S. 1. Nevertheless I would like to point out at the outset that I have a deep concern for the problems and challenges faced by our young people today. It is this deep concern that leads me to oppose this bill and urge that the Senate reject it.

The Youth Conservation Corps and the so-called Home Town Corps which would be established by this legislation hold an emotional and political appeal to certain segments of our society; nevertheless, I believe that this program, if enacted, would prove a sham.

The harsh reality of our modern society makes the benefits which would accrue to our young people from this program minimal, at best. The very people the two corps are intended to help would find that the vague promises offered by the administration and the other supporters of S. 1 are illusory. This legislation does not treat the very real problems of America's youth; it merely bypasses them. In short, the youth employment bill does not do the job.

I believe that a problem does exist. Substantial unemployment among our young people between the ages of 16 and 21 is a fact that no one will dispute. The causes of this problem and the means to alleviate it are our concern. I do not believe that shouting slogans and attempts to revitalize the emergency programs of a bygone era contribute to the solution of the problems of our youth in the 1960's.

The problem which faces America's youth can be described in all its essentials is a relatively few words. Lester Velie, in his recent Reader's Digest article entitled "Why Johnny Can't Get a Job," put it this way:

> One out of five boys between the ages of 16 and 19 who looks for work fails to find it. Yet thousands of highly paid jobs are going begging.

Vast unemployment exists side by side with a tremendous demand for workers of all kinds. The key to this riddle lies, of course, in the fact that the great demand is for men and women who possess a variety of skills while our young people enter the labor market often lacking even the most modest skills.

A graphic illustration of America's unemployment dilemma can be found in the Nation's Capital itself. The February 1963 Labor Department figures show that more than 27,000 people are unemployed in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Nevertheless, the Washington newspapers carry want ads which offer an abundance of jobs. On a presumably representative Sunday, March 24, 1963, the Washington Post and the Sunday Star carried classified ads for more than 1,500 and 1,100 job openings, respectively. The problem is, of course, that these positions require a variety of skills which too many of our people, particularly our youth, do not possess.

It would seem, therefore, that the Nation must address itself to the very real task of providing our youth with the proper vocational training rather than trying to treat the symptoms with legislation such as S. 1. President Kennedy himself grasped the reality of the situation when he recently reported to the Congress concerning "the need for providing new training opportunities in occupations which have relevance to contemporary America to the 21 million youth now in grade school who will enter the labor market without a college degree during the 1960's. These youth—representing more than 80 percent of the population between the ages of 16 and 21—will be entering the labor market at a time when the need for unskilled labor is sharply diminishing."

Appearing before the Manpower Subcommittee in behalf of the bill, Secretary of Labor Wirtz stated:

> There is no suggestion that this training program will qualify one of the enrollees for a skilled occupation.

Again, in testimony before a House committee, the Secretary proclaimed:

> There is no future in this country for the unskilled worker. What has been his job is going to be done by machines.

I ask my colleagues to consider the significance of these two statements. When read together, they constitute my reason for opposing this legislation. Our young people need skills and this bill, despite its professed objectives, does nothing to fill that need.

I would like to turn for a moment to the proposed Youth Conservation Corps. During the hearings on S. 1, much was said about the values which the boys would supposedly gain by serving a stretch in the Corps.

The specific values which the Corps is to inculcate into its members include improved physical health, increased weight, cheerfulness, self-confidence, and a feeling of security. These benefits, mostly psychological or esthetic in nature, are not to be depreciated. When they are combined with the conservation aspects of the YCC, the program has obvious appeal as a force for "good."

I do not dispute the possible esthetic or psychological value of this program. I submit, however, that the fact that the Corps would be "nice" or "good" is not enough to justify the expenditure of millions of the taxpayers' dollars. The underlying purpose of the program is said to be the improvement of the employment prospects of our youth. Supplying them with suntans and an appreciation of outdoor living simply will not help them find jobs.

The Youth Employment Act was allotted $100 million in the President's budget. This figure, apparently arrived at by some form of guessing game, was raised by another $20 million in the bill's authorization adopted by the majority of the Labor Committee. Actually, both figures were arrived at through the haziest kind of calculations, and are therefore virtually meaningless.

Consider, for example, the estimated costs of title I, the YCC, submitted by the Secretary of Labor. The estimated 12-month cost per enrollee is $3,985. This cost does not include the expense of materials and equipment; in addition, it assumes camp construction costs of only $250,000—although testimony indicated that such costs would be $385,000—per installation amortized over a 20-year period. That this program is authorized for a maximum of 5 years, not 20 years, was conveniently ignored in these estimates. Nevertheless, forgetting these inaccuracies for a moment, it is interesting to compare these 1963 figures with those submitted by the Kennedy administration in 1961, when a similar legislative proposal was before the Congress.

The Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior submitted figures in 1961 which showed that the annual cost per boy in a 25-man unit would be $12,297. These figures, which included construction costs as well as running expenses, indicated that the cost per boy in the largest conceivable camp—a 200-man unit—would be $7,171, nearly double the administration's "guess" for this year.

We submit that this vast discrepancy proves that the administration and the proponents of S. 1 do not know what the program might cost the taxpayers. The wide variance between the administration's own estimates also illustrates, it seems to me, why this Nation is faced with the largest planned peacetime deficit in its history. "Cost" is a word that the Kennedy administration sometimes refers to, but obviously does not understand.

Senator Prouty brought the 1961 administration cost estimates to the attention of administration spokesman Wirtz during the hearings on this bill. The Secretary's reply was as follows:

> I am just not familiar with that source. You will realize that, thanks very much to the consideration of this committee, we have had an opportunity last year and now this year to do a good deal more careful costing than we were in a position to do before.

The Secretary's "careful costing" represents one of the most fantastic pieces of mathematical legerdemain in history.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I heard some figures mentioned about the cost per boy who will be sent to these camps. Can the Senator from Arizona tell me what the maximum cost per boy has been conceded to be by the proponents of the bill?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I mentioned, before the Senator asked me to yield, that the Deparemtnt of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior submitted figures for 1961 which showed the annual cost per boy in a 25-man unit to be $12,297. In the estimates, as I understand, at that time, for a boy in a 200-man camp, the cost per boy was $7,171, which is almost double the administration's guess. I was trying to point out that a boy can go to Harvard cheaper than we can send him to the YCC camp, or cheaper than we could send a boy to any ivy league college.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 29 of the report there appears the statement:

> The estimated 12-month cost per enrollee is $3,985.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that the maximum figure that is conceded by the proponents of the bill, or is it the minimum figure?

Mr. GOLDWATER. This is merely the cost for this year. If the Senator will read on, he will see the statement:

> This cost does not include the expensive materials and equipment; in addition, it assumes camp construction costs of only $250,000 (although testimony indicated that such costs would be $385,000) per installation amortized over a 20-year period.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the program is authorized for only 5 years. Therefore, it is proposed that we amortize it in 5 years instead of 20 years, which greatly increases the cost.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has there been any challenge of the figures for the year 1961, showing a cost of $12,297 per year per boy?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No evidence was presented that it was incorrect. The committee in its hearings has reduced this figure. The question in my mind is how they came to this latest figure.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, if the cost per boy at Harvard is $2,300 per year, and the cost of sending a boy to the Youth Camp is $3,985, the cost of sending a boy to one of these camps would be about 100 percent more.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The cost of sending a boy to Harvard is less than $3,000 a year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The $2,300 a year figure is mentioned in the report.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes; we can send a boy to any Ivy League college for about half of what it would cost to send him to camp.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish the Senator would yield so I may comment on this colloquy. In the first place, the figure of $2,300 for sending a boy to Harvard is entirely incorrect. It is 100 percent wrong. I happen to know, because I have served on the board of overseers of Harvard for 6 years. The cost to send a boy to the college is almost twice the $2,300 figure. The cost to the boy, if he is a very economical and careful boy, is probably around $2,300. However, Harvard has one of the largest endowments of any university in the country. The boy is taken into Harvard at a substantial loss to the university. The real test is not what it costs the boy, but what it costs the college.

My next point is that the figure of $3,985 as the cost of each enrollee is the result of testimony given by Secretary Wirtz. That figure is not, as the Senator from Arizona implied, the committee's figure. It is the figure of the Secretary of Labor. He took into consideration the estimates for 1961, which were substantially higher. He felt these estimates were wrong. In my opinion, although I know the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Vermont will not agree with me, the Secretary, in very satisfactory testimony, justified this figure, as is shown on page 12 of the report.

One final word. The figure of $250,000 for the cost of the camps is not, as was indicated on the floor yesterday, the cost of building the camps. No one ever mentioned that it was. This is the amortized cost over the useful life of the camp, which is 20 years, amortized on an annual basis of what it would cost to fix the camps or build new ones.

The bill calls for a 5-year program, but any reasonable accountant, who wanted to be fair, would amortize the cost of the camps over their useful life. Of course, they can be used for other purposes than for enrollees in this program. A very large majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, who heard the testimony, stands on the figures in this report, believes them to be accurate, and is satisfied that the testimony of the Secretary of Labor amply justified this figure.

I know the minority does not agree with me. However, we should keep the facts straight.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly the minority does not agree, or there would not be any minority. I might point out to the Senator from Pennsylvania, with respect to his statement about the cost of sending a boy to Harvard is not reflected in tuition fees alone, that that is generally true throughout the United States, not only with respect to Harvard or to any of the other heavily endowed colleges in the East.

It is also true that we are not reflecting in the bill the administrative cost of collecting taxes and the cost of running the Government, any more than the cost of running Harvard is reflected in the actual tuition fees. I will comment on this point in a little while, but first I yield again to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, what is the amount of money that has been asked for in this operation for the first year?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is $100 million, after yesterday's action by the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many enrollees are expected to be financed by $100 million?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Fifteen thousand in title I.

Mr. CLARK. Now, let us be fair. The Senator from Arizona is talking about the whole bill. The Senator from Ohio is talking about title I. The Senator from Arizona said 15,000. There are 15,000 in title I. There are 60,000 in title II.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question on that point. After the cut we made yesterday, will it change the number of people who will be benefited by the bill?

Mr. CLARK. I imagine it will in the end cut it down some, but not much, because actually the figure of $100 million, or $50 million for each title, was in the administration's proposal. They suggested a ceiling of 15,000 for title I and a ceiling of 60,000 for title II. I must be candid in admitting that the exact number of enrollees cannot be definitely stated, because there are, as the Senator has been pointing out rather clearly, a number of variables involved.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I should like to comment on the last statement made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

As a result of the reduction in authorization made yesterday, and assuming that the figure which the proponents have suggested—$15 million—is necessary for the renovation of existing camps—I think the amount is probably double that; but assuming their figure is accurate—only 8,235 boys will be eligible as enrollees in the camps.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I categorically deny that statement. The administration bill provides the full $50 million in the first year for 15,000 enrollees. There is still $50 million in the bill for title I; there will still be 15,000 enrollees.

Mr. PROUTY. I categorically deny the accuracy of the Senator's statement. Later on I shall quote from a statement made by Robert Wolf, a member of the majority staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It appears on page 548 of the hearings. I shall quote in a few moments only the pertinent parts of the statement, which relate to this particular discussion.

> This year Secretary Wirtz estimates the cost per enrollee including the camps but exclusive of work equipment and supplies, at $3,985.

But first let me turn to another matter. I call attention also to the fact that the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] who appeared before the subcommittee, said that work camps in Wisconsin cost $3,100 per enrollee. They were camps which were established to take care of boys for 6 months, but only during the summer. He made that very plain and emphasized that they were only summer camps. Obviously, a year-round installation would be much more expensive.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was a Member of the House when the law authorizing Civilian Conservation Corps camps was passed. Prior to that, Congress had voted President Roosevelt $5 billion to use as he pleased; and then in January of 1935 an additional $4.8 billion. From those funds, he established Civilian Conservation Corps camps. There was no law providing for Civilian Conservation Corps camps until June 1937.

Then we passed a law in which we agreed to pay Director Robert Fechner a salary of $10,000 a year. The bill now before the Senate provides an annual salary of $20,000 for the Director. Two days later we passed the first appropriation bill, which provided $350 million for the Civilian Conservation Corps for 1 year. That program remained in existence until it was necessary to discontinue it because of World War II.

I checked today to see what it would cost to build barracks similar to those which were built in 1937. Both the Census Bureau figures and the military figures show that a barracks today costs 300 percent more than the cost in 1937. So I say there is not enough money in the bill even to house these boys. It is the most absurd financial proposal that has ever been seriously presented to the Senate. The boys could not be housed for $75 million. There is not that much money in the bill. They could not be equipped with the necessary trucks and jeeps and equipment for the barracks, including cooking utensils and other supplies. Funds for those items are not even included in the cost.

I shall have available before long the amounts which were spent in depression years, and only for construction. We are getting into a program which will cost about three times as much. I have just stated that barracks will cost three times as much as they cost in 1937. We paid Director Fechner a salary of $10,000. The bill before the Senate provides a salary of $20,000 for the Director.

They were good jobs in those days. I was able to have more camps located in my district than anyone else in Virginia. I appointed good political leaders. I managed to get good, efficient men. But it was mighty good patronage. They received salaries of $150 a month. Those who will be appointed to similar positions today will get $400. It will still be good patronage, but I do not know whether they will get as good results.

I merely wished to assure the Senator from Vermont, who is attempting to present figures to the Senate, which Senators will not remain here to listen to, and which they will not know about when we vote, that the estimate of the cost of this program is so hopelessly low that, as he said yesterday, it would be absurd if it were not so tragic.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Vermont, who in turn yielded to the Senator from Virginia. He may yield to whomever he wishes, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I refer again to Mr. Wolf's report, or study, on page 548 of the hearings. As I understand, Mr. Wolf was loaned to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by the Senate Committee on Interior, so he is an expert in this field. I quote briefly from his statement:

> This year Secretary Wirtz estimates the cost, including the camps but exclusive of work equipment and supplies, at $3,985. The camp cost on an amortized 20-year basis, using the 50-man camp (estimated to cost in total $250,000) becomes $250 per enrollee per year. Added to the $3,985 is the cost of work equipment and supplies which run between $150 per man-year and $1,000 per man-year, depending upon the complexity of the work undertaken. Last year's comparable figure was an average of $500, and this would be reasonable to use.

I question the accuracy of that statement. I think the amount would be much higher. However, I am quoting Mr. Wolf. I call the particular attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania to this statement by Mr. Wolf:

> Therefore, a fair average estimate for the current legislation of the total cost would be $3,985 plus $500 or about $4,500 per enrollee.

Using those figures, we find that the total authorization, as a result of the amendment adopted yesterday, would be $50 million; the cost of renovation of existing camps would be $15 million; leaving a balance of $35 million for the remainder of the program, at a cost of $4,250 per enrollee.

Assuming that the camps have been renovated, I have eliminated any figure for amortization and have reduced the amount per enrollee to $4,250 instead of $4,500.

Mr. Wolf estimated that 8,235 boys could be accommodated. I am using figures presented by the proponents of the measure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Fifty million dollars is now available. What was that amount cut to?

Mr. PROUTY. According to the proponents, 11,000 boys could be cared for under the $60 million figure, with a $15 million cut for renovation. The Senate has now reduced that figure. It would have amounted to $45 million. Now we have reduced it to $35 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So it is not possible to take care of 15,000 boys, at $4,500 a boy, with $35 million.

Mr. PROUTY. Not within the $50 million appropriation, or anywhere near it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the basis of the calculation by the Senator from Vermont, the maximum number of boys who could be taken care of would be 8,000.

Mr. PROUTY. That would be the very maximum. I think the number would probably be nearer 5,000. These figures are "guesstimates," not accurate estimates. There has not been sufficient time to present a true picture.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Even on the basis of a cost per boy of $3,985, it would not be possible to take care of 15,000 boys with the money authorized?

Mr. PROUTY. No.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, what is the situation with respect to who has the floor?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield back the floor to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I may say to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]—and I ask the attention of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] also—that the President of the United States, through five Cabinet officers, came before our committee and told us that with a $60 million authorization and appropriation they could train 15,000 boys. I believe that. I think they made a good case. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is very astute with his mathematics. He adds, subtracts, divides, and multiplies and reaches the conclusion that it is not possible to train as many as 15,000 boys.

In the end, this will not be a question of mathematics; it will be a question of administration. I dispute the figures of the Senator from Vermont; he disputes mine. I think the administration knows what it is doing. I think the President of the United States would not have sent a bill to Congress and said, through the five Cabinet officers who testified, "If you will provide $60 million, it will be possible to train 15,000 boys in the camps," if he did not believe that that was correct.

The majority of the committee, after hearing the testimony, thought he was correct. Of course, one can add, subtract, multiply, and divide all one pleases; but a very overwhelming majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare believes the administration, believes the Secretary of Labor, and believes that 15,000 young men can be trained by the expenditure of $60 million.

Let me say to the Senator from Virginia—who knows how much I love him—that it seems to me that in his speech he "missed the boat" in two regards. In the first place, the vast sum of money he mentioned in connection with the CCC program of many years ago is in contrast with the proposal to spend the amount here contemplated for the training of 15,000 young men in this program. In the CCC program in 1936, 378,000 were enrolled; in 1937, 270,000—and so on, through the years. The average was approximately 200,000, and the cost per young man was approximately $1,000. Under those circumstances, it was necessary to build the camps. But today, as the record shows, in most instances—although not in all—the camps have already been built, and merely have to be renovated.

I suggest that those in the administration who have gone through all these figures are at least entitled to the presumption that they know more about this matter than do Senators who are considering it for the first time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the first place, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania did not know the distinguished grandfather for whom I was named——

Mr. CLARK. Robert E. Lee? [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, although he was my hero. My grandfather used to tell me, when I was a boy, that the tendency of everything is to be more so.

The Senator from Pennsylvania does not know that in 1935, when it was proposed that Congress give the President the power to spend more than $4,800 million, which included the funds for the CCC camps, I predicted that if any such amount was spent, we would live to see the day when the national debt would be $50 billion. Was I correct? The national debt today is in excess of $300 billion.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Virginia is correct; and I ask him, too, if the gross national product has also increased, and today is much greater than it used to be.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In my opinion the gross national product is a misnomer. Some items are included at factory prices and some at retail prices and the billions of Government spending are included in the gross national product. We cannot get rich simply by increasing the spending of borrowed money. It is clear that if we do not stop spending such large amounts of borrowed money, we will live to see the day when the interest will be a billion dollars a month, and our grandchildren will live to see the day when the payoff will be in 10-cent dollars; the cost of the national debt being more than they can bear.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I hope the Senator from Virginia will also live to see that day—and I am sure he will, because I know he will be very long lived; and, in the second place, let me say that I think the average American observer will agree that the people of the United States are much better off today than they were in 1935.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree that there have been many technological advances which have resulted in gains, and the standard of living of our people has risen.

But when we already face a deficit of $12 billion in the next fiscal year, and when, if a tax cut is made and becomes fully effective, there will be $10 billion on top of that, certainly the time has come to stop many of these huge spending programs.

On March 7, in a Senate speech, which many Senators have neither read nor paid any attention to, I called for reduction of authority to spend $107 billion, with actual expenditure to be nearly $100 billion. I recommended the amount of $6 billion as unnecessary new spending. In that connection I listed the cost of the proposed mass transportation program. But the Senate voted for it. I also listed this program, as a second one. But on the basis of the vote taken yesterday, the Senate will also vote for this one.

So I repeat that in 1935 I quoted my grandfather, who said, "The tendency of everything is to be more so."

I ask my friend, where will we ever stop all this?

I thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding to me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have enjoyed the colloquy very much.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask the Senator from Ohio to wait just a minute, please; I have about yielded myself out. [Laughter.]

In reply to the question of the Senator from Virginia in regard to how these figures were arrived at, I should like to quote from page 478 of the hearings, in order to give the Senator some idea of the dependability of one of the sources of the figures. At that point in the hearings the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] read from a statement which quoted the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, as follows:

> Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has acknowledged to me that a rosy statement on unemployment he issued on the eve of the November 6 elections contained "invalid" statistical comparisons.

But even though a man is big enough to admit errors, that still does not eliminate, in my opinion, the probability that he will make other errors.

In order to give some idea of why I think he has made errors, I shall quote now from page 134 of the hearings, where we find the 1961 estimates for the cost of building these camps. They were as follows: for a 25-man unit, $200,625; for a 50-man unit, $260,550; for a 100-man unit, $456,900; and for a 200-man unit, $776,500.

My simple arithmetic indicates that the average is about $300,000 and that the total cost just "to get the show on the road" will be approximately $43 million.

In order to give Senators a further idea of these rather ridiculous estimates, I shall refer to a field about which I know a little. In 1961, they called for a radio network; and the estimated cost for one for a 25-man unit was $7,000, and the estimates went up to $19,000 for a 200-man unit. I suggest that the finest radio equipment which could be purchased to link together these camps—which, according to the plans, would vary in size from 25 men to 200 men—could be obtained for approximately $200,000, total.

I merely state that these costs are guessed at, and they have not been accurately worked out.

When the Senator from Vermont states that the proposed costs are totally inadequate, I can speak better of the situation in my own State than I can of the situation elsewhere. I know the places the Senator from Minnesota listed in the RECORD the other day at page 5666. They are supposed to be the locations for all-year-round camps. When I examined the list, I found that one camp is located in a forest which is closed almost 8 months of the year, because of snow; another one is also covered with snow a good part of the year; and the next one is not an all-year-round camp either. The next one happens to be at a place we call Blue Point, which is where the sheep track crosses the Salt River. It is located in delightful country, if one loves the desert. The temperature there in the summer is about 120° in the shade. I do not know how the trainees would help the sheep get across the river. They have been doing it for more than 100 years. But even if learning to help the sheep get across the Salt River will be of benefit to boys from New York, Detroit, or Washington, I do not know how that will help the country.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator said the temperature there is 120° in the shade. Is there any shade there?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly, if one wishes to stretch out under a cactus. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Considering the costs during the depression, when the expense would have been about one-third of what it will be now, and considering the fact that an expenditure of $10,000 during the depression would require an expenditure of approximately $30,000 now, and that during the depression assistants could be employed for $150, whereas now the cost would be $300 or $400, would it be safe to say that if the program is begun again—and I point out that it is said that the cost will be amortized over a period of 20 years, which is a rather long time—would it not it be safe to say that in the first 5 years the program would ultimately cost $500 million if we did anything at all about taking boys off the streets and giving them any worthwhile training?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I cannot say definitely that I would agree that it would be $500 million or $1 billion. But I know it would be much more than we have estimated, because of one simple fact I shall mention. I have read the figures pertaining to 1961. We all know that the cost of construction has increased in the time that has intervened. I estimate that in the past 2 years the cost would have gone up perhaps 2 or 3 percent. Nevertheless, it would be far greater than the average figure that I have arrived at, which is $300,000 a camp.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that no limitation would be placed upon what would be appropriated after the first year? Would not blanket authority be given.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The camel's nose would be under the tent. Then the whole camel would come in. The program could become one of the greatest boondoggling acts of history. It could even surpass the boondoggling of the 1930's. That is all we are trying to eliminate. We oppose the bill because the program was tried back in the 1930's, as were many other plans, and the program was not eminently successful at that time. So we are resisting it, not because we are against youth, but because we think that there is a better way to take care of the boys than the program proposed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that the committee rejected the recommendation that only boys of good character should be accepted?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct. I have an amendment pertaining to that feature of the bill. I shall discuss it later today.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have watched the Senator from Virgina [Mr. Robertson] as he has looked at the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], and as the Senator from Arizona has looked at the Senator from Virginia. The Senators have been talking about the failure of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930's. I have listened very carefully to what has been said by my beloved friend from Virginia [Mr. Robertson]. I was a Member of the House of Representatives in the period to which the Senator has made reference, as was also the Senator from Virginia. I should like to have the Record indicate that on the vote which created the Civilian Conservation Corps by law on May 12, 1937, the present Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], then a Representative of a district in Virginia, voted with the majority to create the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have never denied that statement. My Virginia district had more camps than others in the State. I thought it was a fine program. But I was disappointed that the value of the work done was only 50 percent of what could have been done by contract. I suggest that we would not receive 10 cents out of every dollar spent under the proposed program. At that time we received 50 cents out of every dollar spent. I thought that the program would be a good thing. I am trying to tell the Senate what the program would cost. The cost would be three times what it was then.

Mr. RANDOLPH. As I discuss the question I assure the Senator that I am in good humor. The vote in the House of Representatives on that date was 389 for the measure to 7 opposed. Prior to the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, through an Executive order of the President of the United States, there was a beginning of the program.

I now desire to speak of the other distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], who was a Member of the Senate on May 20, 1937, and joined 66 other Senators in voting for the program. The vote in this body to create the original Civilian Conservation Corps was 67 for and only 2 against.

It is my hope that both Senators from Virginia [Mr. Byrd and Mr. Robertson] will now vote on the measure before the Senate as they voted in the Senate and in the House of Representatives at that time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Apparently the Senator from West Virginia believes that we never learn by experience. At that time we were in the worst depression of our history. We were turning to many devices of a "pump priming" nature to bring ourselves out of that condition. We tried many approaches. They did not work. We know they did not work. It required the rearmament program of 1940 to get us out of that depression. We never gave up those camps until war spending and the draft forced us to do so. We could not afford to operate both the camps and the Military Establishment at the same time.

Certainly, I will not vote for the program in a period of our greatest prosperity, with the knowledge that what we would do would be merely a piddling start. We would ultimately spend hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in a period of our greatest prosperity. To do what? We are told it would relieve unemployment. I checked with Ewan Clague. I asked him how unemployment was figured.

He said, "I take a sampling of 35,000 families out of 180 million. On the basis of the replies we receive, the figure goes up or down."

We know that the figure includes housewives who have never had a job. It includes boys who have dropped out of high school with no ambition or desire to work at anything. It includes those who have preferred to get exactly the job they want. So I say that the situation is entirely different.

In addition, we have learned through bitter experience that pump priming does not lift a nation out of a depression.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia in a moment, but first I should like to state that the Senator from Viriginia [Mr. Robertson] has placed his finger on the difference between the situation in the 1930's and the present situation. In the 1930's, when the Civilian Conservation Corps was created, our country was in a rather deseparate financial situation. At the time the bill was passed I believe unemployment was in the neighborhood of 17 or 19 million. Today unemployment is running at an unsatisfactory figure, but it is not running at that rate.

The Civilian Conservation Corps program plus the other measures that were tried in the 1930's did not pull this country out of a depression. So I agree with the Senator from Virginia, who as a Representative at that time voted for the measure, and I agree with the attitude of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. If he were present, I know he would state that we have learned our lesson. I am not impressed by a vote of 389 to 7. Such a vote does not necessarily mean that the bill was a good one. In my opinion it was a healthy vote for an unhealthy act.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I intend to speak later at length—I hope not too great length—on the pending measure. I now wish merely to say that there is another America besides the so-called affluent America of which we speak. I shall touch on that aspect later. Today in the State of West Virginia the unemployed represent 12.5 percent of the total work force. If the Senator from Arizona observed such a rate of unemployment in his State, I am sure that he would stand on the issue as I now stand, and support the proposed program, which is not pump priming, but dividend paying. I believe this to be such a program. I shall work for the passage of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. How many unemployed coal miners between the ages of 17 and 22 would go into the proposed camps?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have not yielded. In a moment I shall do so. I desire first to answer the allegation of the Senator from West Virginia.

The present Congress has given President Kennedy every antidepression measure for which he has asked. I ask the Senator from West Virginia whether those measures have done West Virginia any good. Have they relieved unemployment? Have the public works program, the area redevelopment program, the increase in the minimum wage, and the increase in unemployment compensation, done the good that was supposed to have been done?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, first I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Virginia as to how many youths would go into the camp program. In the Civilian Conservation Corps program the average was about 5,000 West Virginia boys a month. With regard to the figures for teenage unemployment, today it is not the figure mentioned, but it is approximately 15.6 percent unemployed for teenage youth.

Now, in reply to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the programs of this administration have been of great value to the State of West Virginia. It was not expected that this or any administration would remake the State in 2 years. However, several new industrial plants have been established with the assistance of the Area Redevelopment Administration. More than 90 projects had been approved as of March 1 of this year under the accelerated public works program, including libraries, water facilities, sewage treatment plants, recreation facilities, and hospitals. And there are many others pending. These and other programs have contributed significantly to the economic development and higher employment of our work force in West Virginia.

When we speak of the figures related to unemployment, I return to the statement that there is another America which calls for a program of the type proposed. It is not a leaf-raking program. The investment would not only pay 100 cents on the invested dollar, but would also return a dividend to the people of America, and especially to the youth who would participate directly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at the very outset of my remarks I recognize that there is a problem. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia that there is a problem. I must remind the Senator from West Virginia that the problem is caused by virtue of the fact that the young people have not been taught skills.

The statements I have read during the course of my remarks attest to the fact that unemployment exists today because the unskilled labor field is being covered more and more by automation. What we should be doing for these young boys, in my estimation, is training them in some skill.

My remarks are directed toward title I. To some extent title II does get at this problem.

I think I made my position adequately clear during the course of the discussions in the committee. I think we are very deficient in this country with respect to training boys and girls who have no intention of going beyond high school. We give them a good education in high school, and then they quit school or drop out and want to go to work. There are no longer a sufficient number of unskilled jobs available for them to fill.

I previously mentioned the fact that in 1 day in Washington, D.C., both the morning and the evening newspapers listed 1,500 and 1,100 jobs, respectively, waiting for people to fill, but those were skilled jobs. The want ad sections of the big metropolitan dailies list hundreds of jobs going begging, because we have not taught the young people how to use their hands—how to run a lathe, how to do welding, how to operate a drillpress, or how to work in a factory. I suggest that teaching boys how to wield an ax or how to shovel will not increase their skill one bit.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield again?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We have indicated in the report that these skills would be taught: automotive repairing, baking, carpentry, clerical, construction equipment operation, conservation and engineering aid, electrical wiring, masonry, metalworking, photography, plumbing, surveying and mapping, truck and tractor driving, and a host of other jobs. Do these categories not involve skills which would increase the employment prospects of the enrollees.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not refer to title II. I remind the Senator that I am talking about title I.

Mr. RANDOLPH. These that I referred to come under title I.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have not seen any place in the bill where it calls for the teaching of that kind of skill.

I point out Secretary Wirtz' language again. He said:

> There is no suggestion that this training program will qualify one of the enrollees for a skilled occupation.

I take the word of the Secretary of Labor in that regard. He jumps around a bit, and he is inaccurate at times, but he should know what causes unemployment in this country, and I think he has put his finger on the problem very adequately.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my colleague again yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I ask the Senator to turn to page 542 of the hearings. I should like to clarify whether I misunderstood the reference to title I.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am looking at that page.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not title I to which reference is made?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask the Senator from West Virginia a question. The Senator sat through the hearings. How would a boy be taught automotive repairing?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I ask the Senator how we taught them in the earlier CCC program? I should like to read a statement on that subject.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I remind my friend that they did not learn skills in that period, either. That was one of the troubles.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We disagree on this question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I had to participate in the reeducation of a thousand of those boys, when they came into the armed services. That work did not help them a bit, so far as skills were concerned. It took them off the streets, put them into camps, and got some trails built.

I can understand that a boy, in certain types of that work, would be carried some place in an automobile or a truck, and be exposed to it. He might be exposed to baking, if he worked in the kitchen. He might be exposed to some carpentry.

I am talking about the teaching of skills, so that the boy could come back from the camp and qualify for a skilled job. The Secretary of Labor himself said the program would not accomplish that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to quote for the Senator what General Marshall said in 1940 about the skills learned in the Conservation Corps program.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be glad to hear it again.

Mr. RANDOLPH. He said:

> My opinion is that the CCC offers a natural setup and opportunity for the specialized training in a large number of activities that are very important.
>
> They are engaged daily in actual work which is the best form of training that can be had. They have companies that are working every day operating bulldozers, tractors, trucks, road graders.

Then from the report of the Civilian Conservation Corps itself, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, I wish to read a partial list of the fields in which enrollees received training:

> Auto mechanics, blacksmithing, blueprint reading, bridge construction, building construction, bulldozer operation, care of tools, carpentry, clerking, office, compressor operation, concrete construction, crusher operation, dam construction (small dams)—

I remember that there were more than 50 small dams in West Virginia—

> diesel engines, drafting, drainage, equipment maintenance, explosives, farm woodlot management, foreman and leader training.

Those skills were taught in the earlier CCC program. What reason would we have to believe they would not again, at least in part, be taught under this program?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has read the comment by General Marshall, written about 1940. I am talking about 1963. Many of the skills which the Senator mentioned are skills in which people today cannot find employment, because many of those fields have been taken over by automation. If the people really were trained in those skills to the point where they could come out of the camps and really know how to do these things, it would be different.

I repeat that I can speak only from my experience. Before the war and in the early stages of the war, my job was training. Many a boy who came into the Air Corps at that time came from the CCC camps. We not only had the problem of retraining them, but also many of them—not most of them, but many of them—had not absorbed those skills. This year I do not think the situation in that respect would be different from what it was in 1935 or 1940.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I should like to quote some testimony on that subject, given by Richard G. Farrow, Director, Bureau of Youth Services, Office for Children and Youth, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare.

In Pennsylvania there are operated a number of 50-man camps of the same type contemplated under the pending proposal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To what page is the Senator referring?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Farrow's testimony begins on page 398 of the hearings. I shall go into this subject in more detail at a later time, but I think perhaps it would be well to quote briefly from the testimony at this point in the debate.

I asked Mr. Farrow if these boys, after they had served in the camps, acquired any outstanding skills. I mentioned brick masonry, carpentry, plumbing, and so forth. Mr. Farrow's answer was:

> No, sir; they are not. They get learning in the use of tools, what a saw is, and what a hammer is and what a level is, and what an ax is—although we don't cut down many trees—but they do get an idea of how to work with men and how to work with a boss, to take orders, and what the tools are for.
>
> I would not say that many of them develop a great deal of skill in a trade that they can apply outside, but they are prepared to work as an apprentice or a helper.

Then I asked the question:

> They are unskilled when they leave the camp?

Mr. Farrow replied:

> By and large, yes. A few of them, who might work as unskilled workers, might get what would be called beginning skills. They are not journeymen by any means.

As the Senator from Arizona has indicated, Secretary Wirtz on numerous occasions has admitted that that is the fact. These boys will not acquire any worthwhile skills. That is why I am so opposed to title I.

Going further, I refer the Senator to page 542 in the hearings, where there is listed subjects which can be taught at the YCC camps through accredited home study schools, including the Armed Forces Institute.

I should like to read a list of some of these subjects:

> Accountancy, agriculture, air conditioning, aircraft and drafting mechanics, appliance servicing, auto body and fender, automotive work—

I will skip some—

> boilermaking, bookkeeping, bricklaying, building construction, estimates and maintenance, cabinetmaking, camera repair, carpentry, civil engineering.

Just how is a boy who has perhaps never been to high school and who is going to camp in the woods for 6 months, or even a year, going to become a civil engineer?

I continue with the list:

> Club and camp management, college preparatory, concrete engineering, construction, diesel engines, drafting, electroplating, engines, farm management, marketing, shopwork, foremanship, forging, foundry, gardening, high school subjects—

Of course, high school subjects might be possible—

> horticulture, instrumentation, jewelrymaking, landscaping and gardening, livestock management, lumberyard management.

I happen to know something about lumberyards. I certainly would not hire a boy who had been to camp for 6 months and think he was qualified to manage a lumberyard or any other lumber enterprise.

I continue with the list:

> Machine shop, machine trades, mechanical engineering, merchandising, metalcrafts, metallurgical engineering—

This is the place for all aspiring engineering students to go, I guess. I continue:

> mining, mapping and surveying, patternmaking, photography, plumbing, poultry raising, showcard and sign lettering, stenotypy (machine shorthand), telephony (electronic and nonelectronic), textiles, typewriter repair, waterworks and sewage plant operation, welding, wiring, woodworking.

In only a few instances will they be able to receive any training. Based on the figures given to the subcommittee, only two instructors will be available for a 50-man camp. How are two men going to be qualified in all these different fields, and, even if they were qualified, give training to 50 of these boys who might be interested in 50 different skills?

That is what is so ridiculous about the whole program. The boys will go to camp, and when they come out of camp they will be without any experience. We are going to waste a lot of money which could be given to benefit unemployed youth in many better ways.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, to continue with my remarks, it was also pointed out during the hearings that the cost of sending a boy to a YCC camp is considerably higher, based on any estimate, then it would be to send him to an Ivy League college. A boy can spend a year at Harvard for less than $3,000 while his year with the Conservation Corps would run the taxpayers from $4,000 to $12,000. I submit that the taxpayers would not be getting their money's worth.

Another aspect of the Conservation Corps particularly bothers me. It seems to me that these YCC camps offer a very real possibility for serious trouble. This potential for trouble arises from the fact that groups of boys, some having police records, will be thrown together in unusual environments,

In his appearance before a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to consider S. 812 during the 86th Congress, Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, who was closely associated with the former Civilian Conservation Corps, stated:

> We had one camp in Yellowstone that came from the Bronx, N.Y. It was a 200-man camp. The camp had been back in the remote section of Yellowstone for barely 2 weeks, when the superintendent got a call for help from the camp commander, who was a Reserve officer in the Army. He had a riot on his hands.
>
> The superintendent sent some rangers in to help the commanding officer and in short order they had the boys quieted down again. The investigation routed out about 19 boys and they were shipped back to the Bronx.
>
> The only thing they could get out of these boys was that they just could not stand the quiet nights and the coyotes howling and a few things of that kind.
>
> It is funny, but it is pathetic. They had to get back to the concrete, the noise, the subways, and so forth, because that was their way of life.

This incident indicates the type of problem which will face the directors of the Youth Conservation Corps if it is authorized by Congress.

In this conection, I noticed that one of the witnesses who appeared in behalf of the bill ran into a discipline problem of his own the other day. A UPI wire service story of March 6, 1963, described this young man's plight.

The headline read, "Youth Corps Backer Charged in Burglary," and the story went as follows:

> Michael Ford, 16, who last month testified before a House subcommittee on the city's Youth Conservation Corps, was arrested Tuesday on burglary charges.
>
> The boy's stepfather, Robert Williams, went to police after finding a loaded revolver in the suspect's room. "I think I made the right decision," Williams said.
>
> Police charged Ford in the burglary last Saturday of a bakery near his home. They said $1,070 in cash and $642 in checks was taken. The youth said he found the gun and money in an alley over the weekend. He said he discarded the checks and spent all but $13 of the money on clothes and a portable radio.
>
> Williams said the boy is "in the clutches" of a street gang. "I knew damned well he was mixed up in something" Williams said.
>
> The youth testified last month at the invitation of Representative CARL D. PERKINS, Democrat of Kentucky, and told the subcommittee if more boys were interested in the Youth Conservation Corps "there would be less tendency for them to get into trouble."

The bill approved by the committee contains a vague requirement that enrollment in both Corps be limited to individuals "whose participation * * * will be consistent with the purposes of this title." In the case of the YCC, this language means that the boys enrolled must enhance the two purposes of the title, namely "conservation" and their "increased employability." In effect, no meaningful limitation has been placed on the type or character of boy to be admitted into the Corps. A young man who had committed murder might actually meet these enrollment requirements and join the YCC.

The enrollment of unruly, incorrigible boys is looked upon as the duty of the Corps by some of its proponents. Social workers, judicial officers, and others who work with juvenile delinquents consider the Conservation Corps camps as "outdoor reform schools."

Consider, for example, the testimony of Dr. Carl Hansen, the Superintendent of Schools for the District of Columbia. During questioning by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] on this subject the following colloquy took place:

> Senator PROUTY. If I understand you correctly, you are suggesting that we should take the delinquents and send them to the camps.
>
> Dr. HANSEN. This would be my suggestion. Now, I understand, I know this, from the point of view of the product at the end of 6 months, and being able to make a record to show that this has been very successful and productive, it is much more difficult, and there is a far greater risk of failure and upheavals and assaults in the camp and that sort of thing.
>
> But what are you going to do? Leave these youths out on the streets alone?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to note for the RECORD that Dr. Hansen, for whom I have the highest regard, was called as a witness at the request of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. His point of view does not represent either that of the majority of the committee or the administration.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would be the first to recognize that. I am finding it rather strange that the Senator from Pennsylvania expects all committees to agree unanimously on everything we do. The purpose of committees is to allow the minority to voice their views and the majority to voice their views. I did not know Dr. Hansen was called at the request of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], nor did I understand that Dr. Hansen would testify that he felt this way. I merely read, from the testimony, what he said. We all have a high regard for him.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I asked that Dr. Hansen be called because I believe that, if he was not the only one, he was one of a very few educators who appeared before the subcommittee. I thought we should have their advice on a matter as important as this, which is supposed to involve education and training.

As the Senator from Arizona has pointed out, Dr. Hansen views this program as a way to get a few delinquents off the streets of Washington. That was his chief interest. I can quite understand that. But that is not the purpose of the legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am faced with a problem. I had a 20-minute speech, which has been going on now for nearly 2 hours. I have an appointment in my office at 12 o'clock. If the Senator will keep his questions short and not engage in a prolonged colloquy, I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Dr. Hansen said he wanted to get juvenile delinquents off the streets. My question to the Senator from Vermont is: At what cost per delinquent? It is about $4,200 a year, is it not?

Mr. PROUTY. It is $4,250, I believe, using the committee's figures, with which I disagree.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That means that, to get a juvenile delinquent off the street, we would spend $4,250 a year, knowing that many families do not have that much money even for their whole families.

Mr. PROUTY. There are better ways of accomplishing the purpose of the bill, which will be far more beneficial to juveniles.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Despite the obvious potential for trouble at the camps, the program's planners have chosen to ignore the problem rather than prepare for it. The old Civilian Conservation Corps, the model for the present legislation, maintained the necessary discipline through the use of Army personnel and methods. The final report to the Secretary of Interior on the CCC praised the War Department's role in insuring "cooperation and team play" at the camps. In fact, Brig. Gen. George P. Tyner, one of the representatives of the War Department on the Advisory Council, stated before a committee of Congress that he felt that the training of the boys in the CCC camps was equal to 75 percent of the type of training required of the soldiers in the Army.

The exclusion of the Defense Department and the Armed Forces of the United States from a role in the YCC is one of the program's most serious defects. The absence of military guidance in keeping a potentially explosive situation under control is further proof that the programs authorized by this bill are divorced from reality.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues these questions: Will the people of their States welcome having a Conservation Corps camp nearby? How many communities will like the idea of groups of undisciplined juvenile delinquents as their neighbors?

I contend that this legislation, in addition to failing to meet the problems of our young people, would do positive harm. Several provisions of the bill consciously weaken the family relationship which has been a backbone of our free society for hundreds of years.

The tie between parent and child is severed by some of the bill's provisions. For example, young men and women, some as young as 16 years of age, may join either corps without the permission of his or her parents. Once in the Corps the child will be given whatever money he or she earns without reference to the parents or legal guardian. The enrollee may provide an allotment for his parents; however, the decision is left up to the youth, a complete reversal of the traditional pattern of parent-child relationships.

These aspects of the Youth Corps smack ominously of totalitarianism. Removing young people from their homes without the permission of their parents and placing them in a Federal corps is reminiscent of the Hitler youth programs of Nazi Germany and bears a striking resemblance to the various young Communist organizations. The Soviet Union's Young Pioneers seem particularly close to the proposed Youth Conservation Corps in both name and spirit.

During the committee's consideration of S. 1, I offered amendments which would have returned some responsibility for the enrollees to the parents. Unfortunately, the bill's proponents rejected these amendments and chose instead to permit the Federal Government to act as a sort of "big brother" in place of the parents or guardians.

This, I submit, is no way to go about solving the problems facing America's youth. The family concept must be strengthened, not weakened, if our young men and women are to become useful citizens of a free society.

The weakening of family ties is a primary goal of totalitarian states. Let us not let it happen here.

Placing young men in uniform and sending them off in a politically inspired Youth Corps to learn how to live in the forest will not solve the problem. Boys and girls mopping hospital floors will not solve the problem, either. If the youth employment bill is enacted, the tragic result will be that the members of both corps will return from serving their "time" no better equipped to obtain the skilled work that is available today than they were when they enrolled.

I believe that the problem facing our young people is one of attaining the skills necessary to gain regular employment in this modern age. This bill does not meet this real problem; its most fervent proponents have admitted this time after time.

I urge the Congress and the Nation to address itself to the real world of the 1960's. The outmoded concepts of the thirties are no longer applicable to the problems of today. Accordingly, I urge the Senate to reject the bill now before it.

Mr. President, before I yield the floor I am fortunate in seeing on the floor of the Senate at this time both the author of the bill and the Senator in charge of the bill on the floor. I have a few questions to ask of both those Senators, to clear up some points in my own mind with respect to the bill.

The first question is this: The pending bill contains no provisions dealing with racial or religious discrimination and segregation. Amendments to prohibit these practices were rejected by a majority of the committee consisting almost entirely of members of the opposite party. I would therefore like to address a few questions to the Senator handling the bill on the floor in connection with this question.

The statute creating the old CCC in the 1930's specifically prohibited racial or religious discrimination in the selection of enrollees. The pending bill contains no provisions against discrimination or against segregation. My question to the Senator from Pennsylvania is this: Does he know what policy would be followed on racial discrimination and segregation by those who administer these programs, should they become law?

Mr. CLARK. In answer to the Senator's question, I invite the Senator's attention to the testimony of the Attorney

General at pages 136 to 138 of the record, where the Attorney General indicated his opposition to writing civil rights riders into the bill itself, but assured the committee that the administration will be working in opposition to any discrimination in the administration of the act, if passed. He gave assurances to the committee that if there is any discrimination, action will be taken to eliminate it. There is a similar statement in the record by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, which appears at page 431 of the record, I believe.

The committee stands on the statements of these two members of the administration on the issue which the Senator has raised.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is a lawyer, and I am quite a bit handicapped because I am not; at least I think so.

Mr. CLARK. I would not say that the Senator from Arizona is ever handicapped by any lack of any kind of formal education.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On what ground would the Attorney General act, when there is no specification of these grounds in the proposed act?

Mr. CLARK. He would act under the provisions of the 14th amendment and the decision of the Supreme Court in Brown against Board of Education.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I find these assurances completely unsatisfactory. The Senator from Arizona is absolutely correct about the fact that they come after the fact. There can be suits if the act is administered in a discriminatory way. I do not know under what section the Attorney General would proceed, in view of the fact that the so-called part III, which gives the general right to sue under the 14th amendment, has been consistently defeated in the Senate.

The Attorney General is very uncertain about where he can sue and where he cannot sue. The only way in which this problem can be handled is in the administration at the beginning. We must have more solid assurances than are contained in the bill, to the effect that the administration by the man who will hand out the money will operate the program so that it will not be conducted in a discriminatory way, by controlling it at the source.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I call attention to the fact that when the Manpower Training and Development Act was enacted in 1961 assurances were given along the lines of those that have been given by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. The Manpower Training and Development Act did not contain a civil rights rider. The act has been administered properly.

Furthermore, the present occupant of the chair, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], when he was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, made that crystal clear by his pronouncements that thenceforth Federal aid to school districts where there was a substantial impact caused by Federal activity would be administered in a nondiscriminatory manner. This pledge is being unimplemented by his successor.

I wish to say in all candor that it is well known in the Senate that when we seek to attach legislative riders affecting so-called civil rights, it generally results in tying up legislation and dooming it.

In connection with certain housing legislation a number of years ago, some of us voted to table such an amendment, because we wanted to have housing legislation.

A national policy has been established, which has been enunciated by the executive branch of the Government, which has been enunciated by the Supreme Court, and which is contained in the Constitution of the United States under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. I have no reason to believe that this policy will be deviated from. To the contrary, it will be applied.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to tell the Senator from Minnesota that I have no intention of injecting any type of amendment along that line into the bill. However, I have great concern about this subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not believe the pending bill can be compared to the Manpower Training and Development Act. The pending bill envisions more than 100 camps all over the country. My next question to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] will bear on this point. However, first some of my colleagues in the Senate have asked me to yield to them. I yield first to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania or the Senator from Minnesota, What are the arguments against including in the bill specific provisions which would prohibit the denial of enrollment because of race, creed, or color? What is the argument against having in the bill specific provisions which would prevent the camps from being segregated? What is the argument against having in the bill an amendment or a specific provision which would preclude Conservation Corps members or the beneficiaries under title II from working on segregated facilities? I still do not see why we should not nail down our express legislative intent in the bill. If it is said that these conditions will be met anyway, I do not know why this is a mischievous proposition.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Apparently the Senator has not been a Member of the Senate very long. If he does not think it would be mischievous, let him go back in history and see what happens when such language is offered. I am not so naive that I am not interested in the sudden conversion to the cause of civil rights of the Senator from Texas. I shall be happy to join with him in introducing basic civil rights legislation. I shall be happy to cosponsor with him right now a fair employment practices bill, since he is so interested in civil rights. I hope that his interest will be sustained and maintained through many years until our efforts shall have culminated in success. Although I have not witnessed any such conversion up to this moment, there is always rejoicing in heaven over the repentance of a single sinner. If the Senator from Texas wishes to join with the faithful, I shall be happy to have him come.

I have been a Member of the Senate long enough to know that if we want to tie up such legislation in an endless filibuster, one need only do what the Senator from Texas has suggested.

If it is desired to give such proposed legislation a fair chance, since the record of this administration and the previous one is pretty good, we should permit this bill to be passed. It will be administered in a responsible, sensible, sane manner. There will not be any discrimination in terms of recruitment. If any Senator wishes to add to the bill a clause that there should be no discrimination with respect to recruitment, it is his privilege to offer such an amendment. We have in the record statements from the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General as to how the program will be administered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, that I may respond to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think I understand the interest of other Senators in this particular question. The old CCC legislation prohibited discrimination.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In selection.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Nevertheless, the camps were segregated. They were either all white or all Negro. We have probably come a long way since those days; but since the original bill provided that there should be no segregation, and so much emphasis was placed on that issue in the original bill, I was caused to ask the question as to why such a provision was not included in this bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I readily concede that I have not been a Member of the Senate long enough to become an authority on everything. In due course, I hope to become an authority on many things, as are many of my colleagues. I did not take a position either for or against civil rights legislation; I merely asked, if this is the way the act will be administered, why not provide legal authority for doing so? I think these actions should be taken with legal authority.

I voted to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission. I have never advocated the denial of constitutional guarantees to any American citizen.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, so I may answer the question specifically?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I will yield if the Senator will be brief.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be brief.

If the Senator from Texas will turn to page 136 of the hearings, he will note that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] was interrogating the Attorney General of the United States as to whether the Attorney General did not think it desirable to have written into the bill a provision which would prohibit discrimination in the corps because of race, creed, or color.

The Attorney General answered:

> I do not think it is necessary in this bill.

The Senator from Vermont asked if the Attorney General would give his reasons for that statement. The Attorney General replied:

> I think we have made progress over the period of the past 20 years. I think the administration of this program under the Secretary of Labor, the direct interest that he is going to have in it, the interest of other members of the Cabinet will have in this program, is such that it will be administered in such a way that that kind of provision would not be necessary or helpful.

On page 138 of the hearings, we find an elaboration of this statement by the Attorney General:

> But I do not think by putting in this kind of a provision in this very important bill it would be of assistance. I think it would be a hindrance. And so I would be against it, Senator.
>
> Senator Prouty. Can you give categorical assurance that there will be no discrimination by reason of race, color, or creed, if this program becomes effective?
>
> Mr. Kennedy. I can give you the assurance that this administration will work toward that end. If we find that there is any discrimination, action will be taken.

The reason why the Attorney General felt that way, although I do not attempt to read his mind, is the reason so ably stated by the Senator from Minnesota. I have not been a Member of the Senate as long as he has, but I know, as he knows, that when an attempt is made to attach a civil rights rider to a bill of this sort, or to a manpower retaining act, or an education act, the purpose is to kill the bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield a moment to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. The testimony given by the Attorney General and the questions asked of him are not a part of the legislative history. They have not the force and effect of legislation.

I further ask the Senator if he means that a southerner can salve his conscience and vote for the bill if there is not in the bill a provision that the Administrator can do something he may do anyway?

Mr. CLARK. It is my task, as the Senator in charge of the bill, to endeavor to have the bill passed. I will do my best to have it passed, but "I ain't agonna get it done if I take your civil rights rider."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield briefly to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am not at all satisfied with what is to be done with the money, unless we have some assurance from the Administrator as to who is to disburse it. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has reported that in the handling of the money of the Federal Government there is a most outrageous use of it in segregated and discriminating ways. That is one of the big points made by the Civil Rights Commission.

I want the bill to pass, although I am not for title I, which I shall probably vote to strike. But I should like to have the bill pass. I am not for an amendment of the type discussed.

This case is not like other cases, in which Federal money is statutorially required to be given. In this case the Administrator and Secretary of Labor can give aid to a project. I am not worried about the YCC camps; but I am bothered about title II, which would give aid to communities where there is a pattern of segregation and discrimination in the particular communities.

Therefore, I say to the Senator that before the bill has run its course, assurance must be given as to how the money will be administered.

I think if such assurance is given, there will be a clear legislative road, to which we are entitled. We who favor the bill are also entitled to an assurance that the money will be dealt with in the way we intend it shall be used, and not on the basis of local custom.

Mr. GOLDWATER. One of the reasons why I have not joined the Senator from New York and one of the reasons why I do not have the complete faith in the Attorney General which the Senator from Pennsylvania has, is that the Attorney General has not moved to end segregation in the labor movement. Time and again I have offered amendments to bills in committee which would do this. Time and again such amendments have been defeated. The hackneyed old argument is made that it would defeat the whole measure. If the bill is no good, it may be that it ought to be defeated. I think it is time for us to live up to our responsibilities. The only time we do anything about civil rights is in the overall field of civil rights. In this bill, we have an opportunity to spell out what we mean.

The Attorney General has not moved under the 14th amendment to end discrimination in the labor unions; but we know that discrimination exists. So we shall hear this argument again and again, until some day we meet it and defeat it.

I should like to address my third question to the Senator from Pennsylvania: Under the old CCC, despite the prohibition of discrimination in the selection of enrollees, camps were established on a segregated basis—either all white or all Negro. What would be the policy in this respect under the pending bill?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know what the record shows with respect to the testimony of both the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General. But speaking for myself, I would be much surprised if segregated camps were found to exist.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think the time is appropriate for me to make this comment. I have become alarmed about the frequency with which we accept statements made by Secretaries concerning what they will do, instead of writing into the laws that which we expect to be done. In practically every bill which comes before the Senate with respect to the subject of grants, I listen to statements made by one Secretary or another about what he will do. We then allow those extra senatorial declarations to become what is supposed to be written into the bills.

In connection with the mass transit bill we accepted the word of the Administrator of the HHFA as to what he would do. We did not write into the bill what we expected would be done. I, for one, will begin to insist that we exercise our responsibilities, and no longer abdicate them in favor of men whose opinions may change from day to day when they are not bound by provisions written into the law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. My next question is as follows: If the policy is to require integration in the YCC camps, will any of the integrated camps be located in the Southern States?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know. In the CCC days, the Army was completely segregated, but it is no longer segregated. So progress has been made; and I expect further progress to be made. But I am not in a position to commit the administration on this point. I stand on the record which has been made.

Mr. GOLDWATER. My next question is as follows: Under title II, enrollees will be assigned, in many cases, to work on or in local facilities, such as hospitals, parks, playgrounds, recreation areas, schools, nurseries, and so forth. Will enrollees in title II projects be required to perform such work on segregated facilities?

Mr. CLARK. I think that, again, it must be remembered that title II projects must be initiated at the local level by either the State or the county. The local community will put in a matching grant. The Federal Government will screen the projects. I would interpret what the Attorney General and the Secretary of Labor have already stated for the record, which is that they will be working against discrimination.

Mr. GOLDWATER. They are to be initiated at the local level; but I must point out that it will be done with Federal money, and that factor has a great bearing.

Mr. CLARK. It is to be partly with local money, too.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have asked the Senator this question, and he has not yet figured out the full answer. When he gets it, I shall appreciate his placing it in the Record.

Yesterday, the Senate approved an amendment decreasing the total authorized appropriation from $120 million to $100 million. Does this mean $50 million for each title instead of the $60 million provided in the bill? And if so, would not this require a reduction in the number of enrollees from 150,000 in title I and 60,000 in title II? And if so, how much of a reduction in each?

What does the cut from $120 million to $100 million, which was voted yesterday, do to the entire bill? How will it reduce the number of enrollees under title I and title II?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Vermont and I had a rather spirited argument about that question. My position is that the cut will not do anything to the program, because the administration bill calls for the exact authorization we now have after the Proxmire-Symington-Goldwater amendment was adopted, and therefore, in my opinion, that will not have any effect on the number of enrollees.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for adding my name to that axis. After all, all these Senators will be running for reelection next year; and I ask that my name be added as a cosponsor of all such amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all budget-cutting amendments include, among the names of the sponsors, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. CLARK. I object.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And including amendments dealing with Arizona projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attention of Senators should be called to rule XIX, which provides that no Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and that to obtain such consent a Senator should first address the Presiding Officer. The Chair asks that Senators observe the rule.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have one more question to ask the Senator in charge of the bill. I understand that the Peace Corps has prohibited certain religious activity by its members. Will that prohibition be carried out in the proposed Youth Conservation Corps?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know. I did not know that had been done.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I refer to the denial in some instances of places of worship. I believe the Civilian Conservation Corps had churches or places of worship. I wonder whether anything in this measure calls for the erection of a proper place of worship in each camp.

Mr. CLARK. I understand that there will be no interdenominational services in the camps. I have no understanding of the details in regard to the buildings to be erected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his help in answering the questions, because they deal with matters which are vital if the program is to succeed.

Again I thank the Presiding Officer for the courtesy he has extended to me; and I hope rule XIX will be scrupulously observed. We usually do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As a member of the committee, can the Senator from Arizona advise me who will select the members of the Corps, and how they will be selected? From reading the bill, I find that a committee is to be established. Who will make the selections, and how will the selections be made?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is better able to answer that question. I yield to him.

Mr. PROUTY. I think they are to be selected with the cooperation of local and State authorities.

Mr. AIKEN. Who are the local and State authorities?

Mr. PROUTY. They will be officials of the various governments involved.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the enrollees be selected in the same way that postmasters are selected?

Mr. PROUTY. My guess is that the U.S. Employment Service would select them.

Mr. AIKEN. That is very reassuring.

Mr. PROUTY. For the information of my colleague, I shall read a table which indicates the numbers who will be eligible from each State based on the population formula:

Youth Corps enrollees—Approximate distribution by State (for fiscal year 1964) under population half of formula

	Percent	Number
United States	100.0	----------
American Samoa	(1)	
Alabama	1.8	60
Alaska	.2	15
Arizona	.7	52
Arkansas	1.0	75
California	9.2	690
Colorado	.8	60
Connecticut	1.3	98
Delaware	.2	15
District of Columbia	.4	30
Florida	2.6	195
Georgia	2.2	165
Guam	(1)	----------
Hawaii	.4	30
Idaho	.4	30
Illinois	5.1	382
Indiana	2.4	180
Iowa	1.2	90
Kansas	1.0	75
Kentucky	1.8	135
Louisiana	1.8	135
Maine	.6	45
Maryland	1.6	120
Massachusetts	2.8	135
Michigan	4.3	323
Minnesota	1.8	135
Mississippi	1.2	90
Missouri	2.4	180
Montana	.4	30
Nebraska	.6	45
Nevada	.2	15
New Hampshire	.2	15
New Jersey	3.5	262
New Mexico	.4	30
New York	9.0	67
North Carolina	2.6	195
North Dakota	.4	30
Ohio	5.0	375
Oklahoma	1.2	90
Oregon	.9	67
Pennsylvania	7.3	547
Puerto Rico	1.9	142
Rhode Island	.6	45
South Carolina	1.4	105
South Dakota	.3	27
Tennessee	2.0	150
Texas	4.9	367
Utah	.4	30
Vermont	.2	15
Virginia	2.0	150
Virgin Islands	(1)	---
Washington	1.6	120
West Virginia	1.4	105
Wisconsin	1.8	135
Wyoming	.6	45

(1) Less than 0.1.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for his splendid leadership on the bill, and congratulate him not only for his lucid presentation of the Youth Employment Act, explaining each and every provision, but also for his outstanding leadership in seeing that S. 1 was properly processed through the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower and finally the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with such success.

As I noted in my remarks on S. 1 last week, the hearings on this bill were highly constructive in nature, gave both proponents and opponents an opportunity to express their opinions and develop evidence, and developed a wealth of information and opinion concerning the Youth Employment Act.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The minority views on S. 1 contain the assertion that we rushed headlong into a public relations campaign to pass this legislation. Somewhere along the line, the Republican critics overlooked the extensive legislative history that has been developed over the past 6 years.

I should like briefly to review that legislative history. I first proposed the establishment of a pilot Youth Conservation Corps program in the 85th Congress. However, no action was taken on this pilot proposal and the bill died. In the 86th Congress, despite the opposition of the Eisenhower administration, the Youth Conservation Corps bill was reported favorably by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, largely through the fine efforts and leadership of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. The Senate passed this bill, S. 812, by a narrow margin of 47–45 in August 1959. The House of Representatives failed to act and once again the legislation died at the end of the 86th Congress. In the 87th Congress, my original bill to create a Youth Conservation Corps, S. 404, was supplemented with President Kennedy's proposals to establish a broader youth employment opportunities program. This committee amended S. 404 to include a Hometown Youth Corps and favorably reported the bill in September 1961. The legislation remained on the Senate Calendar throughout the second session of the 87th Congress waiting for favorable action in the House. Once again, this action was not forthcoming.

To recapitulate: The legislation has been introduced in four Congresses, considered three times by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, each time winning a favorable report, and passed by the Senate once.

I find it difficult to understand how we can be justly accused of "rushing headlong" into advocating this legislation in the 88th Congress. A headlong rush ought not to take 6 or 7 years.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has explained the contents of S. 1 as favorably reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I would like to review briefly once again the principal arguments in favor of the legislation.

I wish to compliment the committee on its report, because I believe that every point that has been raised in the debate thus far has been fully covered by the report.

BASIC CAUSES OF YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

First. What are the basic causes of youth unemployment? If we go to the roots of the problem, what do we find?

We find an economy that is lagging behind its potential in terms of providing new jobs for both adults and young people. That is not a new experience. It has been lagging for some years. Fortunately our rate of unemployment is a little less now than it was some time ago. But the economy is still not providing opportunities for gainful employment that a growing population forces upon it and that automated industry makes inevitable.

We find also an elementary and secondary school system that often fails to provide the education each American child rightfully deserves. We find a society that considers vocational education to be second-rate education and has never provided adequately for such instruction. We find the American society—both urban and rural—undergoing profound transformations that radically alter the traditional modes of employment, family living, and social organization.

Do the proponents of the Youth Employment Act claim that the Youth Conservation Corps or the Hometown Youth Corps will provide the solutions to these root causes? Of course they do not.

Do the opponents of this legislation presume to possess solutions to these basic problems? If they do, they have been remarkably circumspect in bringing these solutions to the attention of Congress and the American people.

It is even more revealing to note that many of the same Senators who oppose the Youth Employment Act, because it supposedly is unable to provide adequate vocational training, voted to eliminate training allowances for young persons, 16 to 21, in the Manpower Development and Training Act. These same Senators attempted to cut the entire manpower retraining program from 4 years to 2 years.

I would have my colleagues note that the main argument used thus far against the bill is that it would not go far enough, that it would not result in employment of a sufficiently large number of young people.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]—who, regrettably, is not presently in the Chamber, but who will have an opportunity to review the RECORD—made his case this morning primarily on the assertion that the program would not meet the basic problem of youth unemployment; yet the same Senator joined with two Democratic Senators to sponsor an amendment which would have cut back the amount of appropriations to be allowed for this particular program. One cannot have it both ways.

The fact of the matter is, of course, that this is to be a beginning program. This is to be a modest program. The program has been held down because of our budget considerations and because of the fiscal situation facing this Government and our country.

It also will be a program which begins to pioneer in the area of providing gainful employment for our young people; affording one-the-job training, affording academic instruction, permitting vocational instruction, and developing work habits, a vital factor in any future employment opportunity.

Mr. President, it is even more revealing to note that many of the opponents of the Youth Employment Act oppose it supposedly because it would not provide adequate vocational training, yet many of these same opponents voted to eliminate training allowances for young persons from the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, and voted against the Clark substitute for the Prouty amendment, a substitute which would have put into the Manpower Training and Development Act a certain percentage of the total funds to be used for youth training allowances, for youths between the ages of 16 and 22.

Mr. President, vocational education has suffered in this country for years. I am delighted to see this sudden new interest in it. If the bill has not done anything else, it has convinced some Senators that the several vocational training acts which are a part of the public laws of this country ought to be implemented further, ought to be expanded, and that vocational training ought to be greatly enlarged and facilitated in this country.

Mr. President, this program would provide some vocational training. It would provide more vocational training than the school dropouts and other young people involved are getting under the present circumstances. More importantly, it would provide work. It would provide gainful work for restless, energetic young people who, when they stand on the street corners of our large cities, become involved in trouble.

I heard one Senator today talk about the cost of this program being, oh, $4,500 per boy. I submit to any reasonable citizen, whether he be a Senator or not a Senator, that the cost of one delinquent in any community far exceeds $4,500. But, more importantly, there is a cost of heartbreak. There is a cost of the stigma upon that boy, his character, his background, and his experience. It is a cost which is incalculable.

It has now been judged by the juvenile courts that one delinquent costs the taxpayers approximately $25,000. Under the proposed program a young man could be put into gainful employment—doing constructive work, strengthening his country, protecting our natural resources—while at the same time building his body, educating himself, enlightening his mind. And what would he be paid for that? Sixty dollars a month for his salary plus his food, his clothing, his medical care, and education.

I submit that this will be a wise investment. We never hear Members of the Senate say that we ought not provide for our military camps. We provide for good food and clothing for members of our Armed Services, as we should. We provide everything that is necessary for the security of this country, as we should.

But I submit that when we are considering a youth employment program, which will provide gainful work, constructive work—which will save this Nation millions and millions of dollars worth of its resources—suddenly we start to get out a yardstick and ask, How much is this going to cost?

We should be concerned about young people who no longer can work in their fathers' grocery stores, because their dads do not have grocery stores; who no longer can work on their fathers' farms, because there are no longer that many small farms; who no longer can work in their fathers' tin shops, hardware stores, or drugstores, because there are no longer that many private enterprises. The big chains, the big organizations, have taken over in many areas. When a person works now, he works as a wage earner, not as a member of a family getting work experience.

Mr. President, this program involves something which is needed in this country; namely, the developing of good work habits. That is a skill every person needs. Work habits are valuable. They train a man how to work. A man can be put through school for 20 years, and if he has never been taught how to work—taught the discipline of good, wholesome work—he is never going to be much of an employee.

Mr. President, again I return to the sudden conversion to vocational education, which is refreshing to me.

I ran a vocational education program in the State of Minnesota; and it was a good one. I have been closely associated with the vocational Education Association of the United States. I have been given awards by that organization for my work in Congress, my attempts to get money and programs for vocational education.

But I tell Senators it was a lonesome fight. I did not have all of these new recruits and all these sudden enthusiasts for training our young people. It is interesting to note the current interest in vocational education and technical education.

I am willing to join with any Senator in this body to double or triple the vocational education program of this country.

I say to Senators, you will have to go a long way before you will find a better vocational institute than the Dunwoody Industrial Institute in Minneapolis. There are many other such training and vocational schools. We pioneered in vocational education, gentlemen. We have put our money into it.

I have stood in this Chamber time after time during my 14 years in the Senate and fought for funds under the George-Barden Act, under the Smith-Hughes Act, under a host of acts which deal with industrial arts and agricultural education; and it has been a lonesome, hard fight. Now we find out what is wrong. It is that we do not have enough vocational education.

Mr. President, if the opponents of the youth bill seriously believe they are able to curb the youth unemployment problem through programs that only treat the final stage of a cancer that affects the entire society—the cancer of unemployment, inadequate education, and social upheaval—then I say they do not understand the problem in its full dimensions.

What, then, do the proponents of this legislation claim? What is it that those of us who have sponsored the bill say?

Simply this: The Youth Employment Act provides a unique opportunity for thousands upon thousands of young Americans victimized by fundamental social and economic ills far beyond their power to control or to alleviate. We propose employment opportunities that are particularly relevant to assisting these young Americans who have never experienced anything but frustration, failure, and defeat.

I may add that the rate of school dropouts is a problem that necessitates not only the attention of the Senate, but the attention of every school authority in America. Many such authorities have testified in favor of this bill. This program will not answer the problems of school dropouts. Why is it that young men and women drop out of school? Why is it?

Perhaps we ought to examine what is wrong with American education. Perhaps we ought to ask ourselves if American education is adequate to the needs of modern society. Does it do its job?

We do not make the pretense of claiming that the Youth Conservation Corps or the Hometown Youth Corps will remove the cancer of youth unemployment from our society. But we do claim—and claim most emphatically—that the on-the-job experience and the complementary vocational training provided for in this legislation will provide the impetus for a high percentage of these youths to become productive and self-sustaining members of society.

We do not claim that the methods contained in this legislation are applicable in all cases of unemployed young people. We do not say that the more traditional methods of vocational training should not be expanded, or that specialized manpower training programs should not be enlarged. We say none of these things.

What we do say this this: For many young people, particularly those who have abandoned regular school attendence, the more traditional and formalized training procedures are practically useless. They lack the personal self-discipline, maturity, self-confidence, and work experience to profit from such opportunities.

It offers these young men and women who, through no fault of their own in many instances, have become victims of the social structure and have dropped out of school before completing their education. This act offers them an opportunity which they so urgently seek—the opportunity to succeed in a job within their limited capabilities, the opportunity to work, the opportunity to labor diligently, the opportunity to gain maturity, the opportunity to gain self-confidence and self-fulfillment, and the opportunity to acquire basic job skills.

When a program is proposed that offers those opportunities, I think it is one which is worthy of the confidence and the support of the Senate, the Congress, and the entire country.

Many of the young people today who cannot get jobs, cannot do so because they have never had jobs. They have never had work experience. They have never been with a group of men or women who had work experience. What we offer here is a kind of apprenticeship, giving young men an opportunity to work, to gain experience, an opportunity to develop their minds, bodies, and skills. I submit that without those qualifications or characteristics, vocational education or any other kind of education does not make for a skilled worker or a happy worker.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is not on the street corner that there exists the climate for a teenager to find work, but in the woodlands, in the forests, in the fields. There we find the atmosphere which is conducive to this kind of work and these skills. We have never claimed that this program will create a journeyman in 6 months or a year. But neither does any program. However, within 6 months or a year there will be the beginning of skills in a climate and in an atmosphere which will allow these young people to stand alongside others, to join hands, so to speak, and say, "Let us get the job done."

That is certainly the essence of the thought behind this work program.

I do not want to indulge in a mere pleasantry, but I wish the RECORD to clearly indicate that the Senator from Minnesota, who now addresses his colleagues on this subject, has made a notable contribution, not only in his remarks today, but in the vigorous manner in which he has proposed this program through the years.

In my judgment, when the history of the U.S. Senate during the era in which the Senator serves, is written, his achievements in connection with the plans, programs, and purposes for the youth of America will loom large in that history.

What I have now said is a very genuine tribute, and I want the RECORD to indicate that in the passage of this act—and I believe it will pass the Senate; I cannot conceive that this effort will be rebuffed—much credit, in fact, the major credit, will go not only to the astuteness and the adroitness of the Senator from Minnesota, but the rightness of his efforts in behalf of American youth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his generous remarks. I expressed earlier—and I do not repeat merely to respond in kind—my deep appreciation for the work of the Senator from West Virginia in the 87th Congress on this legislation.

I have a deep interest in this subject. I was a scoutmaster for 6 years. We had several Eagle Scouts in my troop. We won the President's Award for 3 years in succession, which was no small task. I have been interested in juvenile work. We have a hard time passing any kind of measures on education, but within a few days, if not within a few hours, there will be a military procurement bill brought before the Congress that will represent many millions of dollars, and it will pass in a few hours or a few minutes.

I have been in the Senate when we passed a $50 billion appropriation for the Defense Department, and it did not take half a day.

May I say that the Civilian Conservation Corps proved its worth. Western Reserve University made a study of those programs back in the depths of the depression, at a time when unemployment was serious. It made a sampling of 6,500 youths in the Greater Cleveland area.

Specialists from the university interviewed these boys, and found that 80 percent of them had been unemployed before they went to the CCC camp. Upon returning home, 70 percent of them obtained jobs, and 50 percent of these found full-time employment.

What else do we do in this program, in addition to giving experience? I repeat, it offers them the opportunity they so urgently seek, the opportunity to succeed in a job within their limited capabilities, the opportunity to labor diligently, the opportunity to gain maturity, self-confidence, and self-fulfillment, and the opportunity to acquire basic job skills.

Let me quote from the hearings at page 541 with respect to education:

> EDUCATION
>
> In addition to the job-related training every enrollee will have an opportunity for supervised home study choosing subjects from the extensive curriculums provided by the Armed Forces Institute and many other accredited correspondence schools. A partial list of these subjects is attached. Completion of these courses will be evidenced by certificates which are accepted by employers. The entire staff of the camp will participate in the educational program insofar as their abilities permit, and the school resources of nearby communities will be utilized to the greatest extent possible. Many enrollees will be enabled to complete eighth grade and high school education and will receive certificates and diplomas as evidence of their satisfactory completion of their schooling. Every enrollee will also receive meaningful information on the purposes of the conservation work in which they are engaged. Some may choose vocations in the natural resources field as a result of this experience.

In connection with what has been said about this experience out of doors, I have a son who is going into conservation work. It is not necessary to learn to be a machine tool worker to acquire a skill. There are jobs for park rangers, and geologists, and forest rangers. The great lumber companies of this country are looking for forest rangers with experience in forestry. This is a tremendous enterprise in the United States. The YCC will provide a start in learning such occupations. Sometimes we get the feeling that if we are not learning to drive a diesel engine or how to be an astronaut or how to be a physicist or how to be a craftsman, that we are not learning anything.

I could not help overhearing the Senator from Rhode Island refer to the driving of a foreign sports car—that, if one does not learn how to drive a foreign sports car, he is not learning anything. It may be far more important for a young man to learn about conservational forestry or recreation. This is a very important occupational pursuit and he can begin his education in conservation through participation in the YCC.

I devoutly hope that our civilization has not reached a plateau of technical sophistication where hard, honest labor is no longer required in the successful employee. The evidence submitted by dozens upon dozens of expert witnesses suggests quite another answer.

Let me quote from the Senate hearings on S. 1.

The Honorable John J. Skiffington, a State representative from Rhode Island and a former member of the CCC, testified about the benefits he received from his work-camp experience:

> As far as the good it did, I think it did a tremendous amount of good—physically and mentally.
>
> I have seen, myself—I am not big today, but while I was in there, I think I went in weighing about 115 pounds or so, and I came out weighing about 145 pounds. And I have seen scrawny, underfed, underprivileged youth at that time in America go into the CCC's and come out physically and mentally alert.
>
> Some of them, you might say, were gigantic when they came out. At least it seemed that way when they came home. They were used to doing a day's work. The money was not great, but at that time it was well appreciated.
>
> I think it gave me a background as far as working is concerned. I never had a job before. And meeting people, living with them, and getting to understand people—I think it did me a world of good.

Eli E. Cohen, executive secretary, National Committee for the Employment of Youth, testified:

> The young people get discouraged. Many of them are frightened in the first place. They lack confidence, often give up before they start seriously seeking work. In a great many instances they just do not know how to look for a job, how to handle themselves in a job interview, et cetera.
>
> In this kind of situation, it seems to me terribly important that there be provided some type of bridge, some transition, between school and work for these young people. We need to create a situation in which they can have tryout work experience, where they can learn how to work, where they can learn how to take orders from a boss and get along with their coworkers and report to work on time and follow through on responsibility, where they can develop some self-confidence; where they can develop hope for themselves in the future; where they can get training and supplementary education to further equip themselves for employment; where they can have a job reference when they go out to seek regular employment.
>
> In other words, what I am trying to say is that what we need here for many of the young people today is the kind of developmental experience, through which they might mature into better employees and better citizens. I think this is really the essence of what is important about the proposed Youth Employment Act.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Along the same line, I should like to quote from the testimony of Mrs. Agnes Meyer, who, we all know, is an outstanding American and certainly a very fine person, who is familiar with and very much concerned about the problems of youth, as well as the problems of other people. She said:

> No matter how much a young man may profit from the training and helpful influences of the Youth Conservation Corps, he will eventually have to return to the home from which he came and be again subjected to the detrimental influences from which he has temporarily escaped. This proved to be a great difficulty to many of the CCC graduates (p. 153, hearings).

If the Senator from Minnesota will yield further, I should like to quote also from the testimony of Richard G. Farrow, director of youth services of Pennsylvania, in response to a question by a member of the subcommittee about the skills that the boys would learn in the camp. Mr. Farrow said:

> One of the big problems in this program, as with the institutional programs which we also run, is: What happens to the boys after they leave camp? We feel that a boy changes a great deal within a month or 2 months after he arrives at camp. A good deal of his hostility, his suspicion disappears. He becomes more cooperative, more relaxed, more interested, and he works better. This change persists until he leaves, and then he has to go back to a community which by and large has not changed as much as he has. He has to fit in with his change to an old situation which he finds often to be very difficult.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have tried to make it clear that we do not consider this program to be a panacea for all the social ills of the country. What the testimony indicates is that while the boy is in camp it is good for him.

Mr. PROUTY. He is going to be better fed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is going to be better fed, he will develop good working habits, and he is going to do constructive work.

Mr. PROUTY. Then he returns home without any skills.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. That is not what the testimony shows.

Mr. PROUTY. That is the whole experience.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is not what happens. The Senator knows that. What the testimony shows is that when he returns home it is the same old world.

Mr. PROUTY. I did not say that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to help change the world.

I want to make it better. What the testimony of Mrs. Meyer showed was that after the young man returns home, he returns into the conditions that existed before he left home.

Mr. Farrow said it was a good idea to have the boys in camp, but that when they left camp and returned home, it was the same old world.

Perhaps we ought to do something about the world or the community in which we live.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does that not happen to every young man who goes away to college?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly.

Mr. PASTORE. After he returns home he comes back to the same old world. Is that a reason for not going to college? How ridiculous can we get?

Mr. PROUTY. That is far from analogous.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know about that. It is the same analogy that has been used here.

Mr. PROUTY. What this woman said was that it does not do them any good, because when they return, it is the same old world.

Mr. PASTORE. That is nonsense.

Mr. PROUTY. What I believe should be done is to provide the youngsters with schools, so that they can qualify for useful employment.

Mr. PASTORE. That is exactly what the bill provides.

Mr. PROUTY. That is not exactly what the bill provides. It does not provide for that.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the way the Senator from Vermont reads the language, but it is not the way the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Rhode Island reads it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In response to the statement of the Senator from Vermont, who has been harping on this string for weeks and weeks, and I must say without too much effect, the simple fact is that vocational training programs are available to these young people. On-the-job training will be available. The young man in the camp will be under the supervision of a trained professional superior or foreman. He will be at work, learning how to work. He will be doing the job to which he will be assigned. He will receive work experience. He will be recruited by the U.S. Employment Service. When he leaves the camp, he will be followed through by the U.S. Employment Service, which will help to find jobs for these young men. They will have work experience and have a work reference, which they would not have had had they not received camp experience.

These young men can have the very educational courses which the men in the U.S. Army have. They will have the facilities of local high schools available under contract.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is painting a very rosy picture, but it is far from accurate or realistic. How many personnel will be engaged in the 50-man camps to do that which the proponents of the bill have been talking about? How many personnel will be involved in the educational training program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will enter into educational contracts with local school authorities to provide such training. In some cases, local teachers will be brought to the camps. In other cases, the enrollees will travel to local schools.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Basic training is provided in the schools under contract.

Mr. PROUTY. But these camps will be out in the wilderness. The only communities will be small ones, having populations of 500 or 600. They will not have the educational facilities to benefit men living in camps 40 or 50 miles away.

Under the budget as suggested by the proponents, only 2 individuals in a 50-man camp will be on the payroll whose purpose it will be to give instruction and educational training of one kind or another.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They will be there for the purposes of supervision, and for running an educational program, for which school facilities also will be available.

Mr. PROUTY. They will not be available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. College correspondence courses will be available. First of all, the enrollee will have two more teachers than he would have had were he not in the camp.

Mr. PROUTY. I shall offer an amendment at the appropriate time which I believe will take care of the situation. It will offer quite a substantial authorization. So I am not opposed to a program of some kind.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to know that.

Mr. PROUTY. However, I favor a program which will achieve the results which we all hope will be available at such camps.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With all due respect, this great, new interest in vocational education is welcome. I am delighted. I think it is marvelous. I wish there had been the same interest in manpower training and development in 1961, when the Senator from Vermont offered amendments to cut portions of that program.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator has referred to me—and I anticipated such a development—I have prepared a brief statement which, with his permission, I should like to make.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks, I shall be happy to listen to the Senator from Vermont make that statement.

Mr. PROUTY. I should like to have it appear at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on April 4, 1963, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota made the following statement regarding votes that took place on the Manpower Development and Training Act:

> In the 87th Congress, for example, the same persons who now oppose the Youth Employment Act for the reason that it fails to provide sufficient vocational training, voted to eliminate training allowances for young persons—16 to 21—in the Manpower Development and Training Act. The same persons attempted to cut the entire manpower retraining program in half by reducing the program's authorization from 4 to 2 years.

At the time the Manpower Development and Training Bill was before the Senate, there were a million persons who had been seeking work for more than half a year. This total was equal to the postwar high reached in August of 1958.

Men 45 years and over represented 30 percent of those out of work more than 6 months, as compared with 25 percent of the civilian labor force.

The rate of unemployment nationally at that time was 6.9 percent and had remained unchanged for 8 straight months.

Furthermore, at that time two-fifths of the jobless married men had been out of work for 15 weeks or longer.

It seemed to me under the circumstances the better part of wisdom to make a maximum amount of money available for the training of married men with families to support.

Indeed to a large extent the then Secretary of Labor went along with this point of view. In a letter to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania he stated:

> It is my firm conviction that priority and emphasis must be accorded the experienced unemployed heads of families.
>
> I do not anticipate the need to expend much of the authorized funds for training allowances for youths. Careful review of the needs and the resources leads me to conclude that less than 5 percent of the total funds authorized for carrying out the purposes of this bill would be required for training allowances for youths. In administering the bill, I would not expend more than this sum for this purpose.

It should be pointed out also that under the Clark amendment which imposed a 5-percent ceiling on training allowances for youths, a 16-year-old boy could receive an average of $32 a week while he went through vocational training. Remuneration of this kind would certainly entice many youngsters to leave high school, one of the very things many of us have tried to prevent.

Later on in conference, special provision was made for young people but the weekly allowance was limited to $20 or less.

In regard to another matter, I did ask the Senate to limit the Manpower Development and Training Act to a 2-year program but I made it unalterably clear at that time that I would support its continuation if it proved to be successful, and I think it has.

Just prior to the debate in the Senate with respect to the question of whether we should have a 2-year program or a 4-year program, the Armour Co. in Oklahoma City conducted a training program for many employees who were laid off. The program was pretty much a failure.

In addition, the chairman of the Michigan Employment Security Commission had testified before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee that there were thousands of people in Michigan for whom retraining would do little if anything.

It is significant to note that when the matter of appropriations came under consideration in the Senate, the committee controlled by members of the majority party sliced in half the request for funds to implement this program.

The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan and I attempted to round up support for full restoration of the cut, only to find later that a compromise had been reached between the majority leadership and the committee whereby only a part of the cut was restored.

The implication that I was ever opposed to getting the manpower development and training statute underway with ample funds for its implementation is an implication that is misleading and false.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to have the RECORD clear as to what the program will offer. The Senator was in committee. He knows what the program will offer in terms of employment and educational opportunities. It will offer vocational education. There will be the option of providing academic instruction through the facilities of the Armed Services Institute courses. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will contract with local school authorities for educational training.

But more importantly, if the Senator from Vermont will only listen, it will offer the men a valuable education in how to work and how to gain the kind of work experience which will make it possible for him to be a good employee.

All this sudden interest in vocational education and guidance, much as it is appreciated, is designed primarily, it seems to me, to becloud the issue about the youth employment bill. There will be education, to be sure; but I repeat that a young man who will enter one of these camps will receive more education in the camp than he would by standing around a street corner as a school dropout. A school dropout will not return to a vocational school merely because someone tells him he ought to do so. What he needs is work experience. He needs to have an environment in which he will learn how to work and take instruction vocationally, and also how to learn in an academic manner.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. PROUTY. Does the Senator believe that all the camps which are listed on page 5666 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 4 are in existence or could be rehabilitated within 60, 90, or 120 days?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not sure that they can be.

Mr. PROUTY. I may advise the Senator from Minnesota that some of the camps listed are nonexistent. I mentioned two of them yesterday; I learned about another one today. If this list is supposed to be accurate, but is not, how can we rely on the testimony and evidence given?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The list which the senior Senator from Minnesota placed in the RECORD under date of April 4 is the list.

Mr. PROUTY. That is the list to which I have reference. It contains the names of two camps which are nonexistent. I dare say there are many more.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest that the Senator not make generalizations. Because he sees a mosquito, it does not mean that there is a plague.

Mr. PROUTY. I was told by Secretary Wirtz that there was a camp in Vermont.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The list does not show any camp in Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. There is none shown on the list, but I was told by the Secretary of Labor that there was. Obviously, he got the information from someone else.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not going to gnat pick about nits.

Mr. PROUTY. There was supposed to be a camp located in South Dakota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not yield for this purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Apparently the Senator does not wish the facts to be brought out. I think it is high time that someone brought them out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to have facts brought out. I want to have them brought out in a friendly, persuasive, pleasing, lucid manner. I want the Senator from Vermont to have all the facts brought out. I think he should be treated with respect and dignity. When I have finished my remarks, I shall listen to the Senator from Vermont tell us all of the little mistakes he believes are in the RECORD. I shall listen attentively. If the camps are not in existence, he can arrange to have them built.

Mr. PROUTY. They could not be built under the appropriation to be authorized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The camps which are listed will provide for the first year's enrollment under the program.

Mr. PROUTY. It is not possible to provide for 8,200 individuals——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not yield for this purpose.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Vermont should not get too excited. We shall be here awhile.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator from Minnesota and I rode together on the subway last week. We were supposed to make a television program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember. For the first time in my life, I did not have a chance to get a word in. It was a unique experience.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator from Minnesota insisted that the whole program be made over again.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thought it was a good idea.

Mr. PROUTY. It came out on the television yesterday, and it was pure propaganda in support of the youth employment program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted. I did not know we did so well.

Mr. PROUTY. Did remarkably well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his praise. I thought my performance on the program was less than I had hoped for. But if it was so effective as the Senator says it was—and he is an opponent of the bill—I am overwhelmed.

Mr. PROUTY. It was pure propaganda.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his compliment. I did not know I would receive it.

Mr. President, I wish to quote the statement of another gentleman who had a wonderful work experience in the Civilian Conservation Corps. He spoke before the Clark subcommittee. His name is A. L. Ratliff. He is a land acquisition engineer from Arlington County, Va. He said:

> I feel personally that this thing you people are considering is one of the most important bills that we have before us today. There are many men like me who with an opportunity will go ahead and make good citizens and take advantage of the opportunity. Otherwise I don't think they will.
>
> I haven't too much more to say. I just say it was my salvation.

Mr. President, these men are responsible citizens. They testified as to their experience with the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps will be the salvation of many thousands of young Americans today. Why will the programs contained in the Youth Conservation Corps offer such an opportunity for salvation?

Enrollees will leave their depressing local surroundings for a totally new start, among new companions and friends. They will travel to a well regulated community under the direction of experienced camp foremen. They will receive work assignments within their capacity to complete satisfactorily. They will participate in additional educational and training activities. They will engage in organized recreation, sports, and intracamp activities. Each of these factors will play an important part in transforming the outlook, attitudes, job skills, and employability of the YCC enrollees.

The opponents of this legislation dismiss the impact of this work experience as being essentially esthetic in nature, as being "nice" and "good" but not contributing to the employability of the enrollees. They say in the minority views:

> Supplying them with suntans and an appreciation of outdoor living simply will not help them find jobs.

I say that giving them the opportunity to work diligently, under professional, trained leadership is precisely what will help them to find jobs and to keep them, and also to find themselves and be able to become better citizens.

I also contend that a YCC enrollee will acquire on-the-job skills that will compare most favorably with those learned in a vocational education program conducted for a similar period of time. But the enrollee will also benefit from the additional personal experiences found only in a resident work-camp experience. Rather than describing the YCC as being seriously deficient in its training potential, I prefer to look at a YCC experience as job training—plus.

One should also understand that many industrial firms and businesses provide extensive job training courses for their employees. These companies do not expect new workers to come fully trained, ready to begin their particular jobs. In fact, they frequently prefer to train new workers to the requirements of their specific assignments in a manner that corresponds directly with the established procedures of the company.

However, these companies are seeking employees with mature and responsible work habits. If these basic work attitudes exist, the employee can be trained to his specific responsibility, and often at company expense.

Other enrollees may graduate with a new awareness and determination to resume formal academic training, or to seek enrollment in a particular job training program. They will enter into such an experience with a full realization of their abilities, and possessing a new sense of personal confidence.

On April 4, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an extensive list of the job and training opportunities that would exist in the Youth Conservation Corps. Moreover, I demonstrated that this would not be make work, but would be planned and programed conservation work accomplished under the direction of experienced foresters and rangers. In fact, every job is one which the Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture or the National Park Service, of the Department of the Interior, or some other similar service of a Federal agency or a State agency has found to be necessary and needed. These programs are waiting to be accomplished. They have been authorized, planned, and programed. I also suggested various approaches that could be used to provide the complementary academic and vocational training in each camp. The use of teaching machines and home study courses under the general supervision of an education specialist offers many possibilities.

I also wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for his committee amendment that emphasized the need for vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of Youth Conservation Corps enrollees.

That amendment was adopted. So all the talk about whether there will be educational opportunities is beside the point, inasmuch as there was written into the bill that specific language which makes that mandatory. Where such services were shown to be deficient in a particular camp, the Javits amendment provides for the enlargement, improvement, and development of such services. I believe this amendment made quite explicit the intentions of the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators who originally sponsored this legislation.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Finally, a word about fiscal responsibility. Any businessman who approved an audit of his business affairs which took into consideration only the annual expenses would be rightfully judged an economic ignoramus. This is no less true in regard to the Youth Employment Act, particularly the Youth Conservation Corps. In response to an inquiry from Representative AL ULLMAN, of Oregon, the Forest Service recently calculated that a very conservative dollar estimate of the direct and indirect benefits of a Youth Corps would be about $7,000 per enrollee, or $7,000 for a $3,985 annual cost per enrollee—or let us say approximately $4,500, including costs of job equipment. These figures and their supporting evidence are to be found on page 5839 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 4, 1963.

Recently, I had printed in the RECORD examples of expenses and income in relation to two specific YCC camp locations. Once again, the annual operating funds would clearly bring an excellent return over a period of years.

I notice that the present Presiding Officer of the Senate is the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. When he was Governor of Wisconsin, his State had experience with the youth camps, as did Minnesota. So we have an idea of the cost to build the camps and to put young men to work in them. I hope that at an appropriate time during the debate, the distinguished former Governor of Wisconsin, now the junior Senator from that State, will give the Senate the benefit of his observations.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Is it not true that the Senator from Wisconsin stated before the committee that the cost per enrollee in the camps in that State was, $3,100?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe it was approximately that amount.

Mr. PROUTY. But they are summer camps, used mostly for 6 weeks, generally for high school boys while on vacation, are they not? The cost is not comparable to the cost under this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that the comparison is not complete. For example, a long session is more expensive than a short one. As another example, let me point out that I maintain a summer home on a lake in Minnesota. We do not use it during the winter. Our experience while using it in the summer is very rewarding, but is more costly, on a monthly basis, than the cost if it were used during the entire year. One does not have to be very wise to ascertain that the total cost of a long program will be greater than the cost of a short one; but I believe the testimony is that the annual cost per boy in the camps will be between $3,900 and $4,900. We shall go into that matter in full; and I did that on April 4. Certain camps have already been constructed. Many of them need rehabilitation. The YCC enrollees will be able to rehabilitate some of them. We have had other camps—for military purposes—which needed rehabilitation, and they have been put into good shape.

If any new camps are needed, they will be constructed in due time.

However, the figures used for the cost of the camps are misleading in terms of what are considered to be the high costs. In that connection, I refer to the statement I made on this point on April 4. At that time I said:

> ACTUAL COST OF PROGRAM
>
> Opponents of this legislation have charged that it will cost between $9,000 and $12,000 per year to support one YCC enrollee.

That is quite a span or spread in the estimates; namely, between $9,000 and $12,000.

Then I said:

> As Secretary Wirtz repeatedly testified before the Clark subcommittee, these figures are exaggerated and misleading.
>
> They are exaggerated and misleading in two fundamental respects: one, they are flatly contradicted by the cost data supplied by the Departments of Labor, Interior, and Agriculture; two, they fail to take into consideration any of the substantial financial returns that will accrue from the conservation projects undertaken by the YCC.

Then I placed in the RECORD the "Estimated Annual Costs Per Enrollee," as prepared by the executive agencies; and that totaled $3,985. These estimates were prepared through the cooperative efforts of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, the Army, and the Bureau of the Budget. They are based on a 50-man camp operation.

I must confess that if I had to choose between an estimate made by a single Senator, even though I had the highest regard for him, and an estimate made by an interagency group, composed of such Departments as the Interior Department, the Labor Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the U.S. Army, and the Bureau of the Budget, I would tend to believe that the Government agencies estimate would be just a little more accurate.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. PROUTY. Is it not a fact that the hearings of June 12, 20, 21, and 23, 1961, set forth on pages 409 and 410, estimates made by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, which are listed as follows:

For a 25-man unit, $12,297 per boy per year.

For a 50-man unit, $9,016 per boy per year.

For a 100-man unit, $8,203 per boy per year.

For a 200-man unit, $7,171 per boy per year.

These are the same agencies which are estimating costs under this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But, in addition, Mr. Farrow, who was in charge of similar camps—50-man camps, in Pennsylvania—said they are paying $385,000 a camp.

I never knew the Federal Government to construct anything or to engage in any activity for less money than a State or municipal government would require.

Let us assume that everything that the Senator has said is correct. I have no right to dispute the authenticity of his figures. However, the trouble is that the Senator from Vermont is speaking about operation of the camps for 1 year. The Senator is not talking about amortizing the camps even over a period of 5 years.

If we were to make estimates in that manner, we would have to say that the rental cost of a U.S. Senator during his first year in office would be $25,000 because perhaps that is what he had to pay for his house. If such a figure were to go to the Senator's constituents, it would be very misleading. No businessman—and I am sure the Senator is a businessman with business principles and business understanding—would ever contemplate talking about the cost of a project that was not amortized.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I would never contemplate amortizing a 20-year program when it might continue only from 1 to 5 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said 5 years.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I should like to use the figures suggested by the Senator or perhaps an amount less than those figures. The Senator knows that it has been estimated that the cost per enrollee might run as high as $4,500.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would be the outside cost.

Mr. PROUTY. According to the Senator's figures, that amount is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Actually the amount was estimated at $3,955.

Mr. PROUTY. But that figure made no provision for materials or work equipment which would be necessary in the camps. Using the figure of $4,250—and forgetting all about the amortization figure of $250 to which the Senator objects——

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I do not object. I am for it.

Mr. PROUTY. I am not including it anyway. I am decreasing the figure from $4,500 to $4,250. As a result of yesterday's $10 million cut in the appropriation for title I, it was stated—and the Senator's report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, April 4, so demonstrates—that approximately $15 million would be used for rehabilitation purposes in camps which are now in existence. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not recall that particular figure.

Mr. PROUTY. It would be very close to $15 million. It might be $14,667,000, or some such figure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. PROUTY. If we subtract $15 million from $50 million, which was authorized yesterday, the remainder is $35 million. If we divide $4,250 into that $35 million, we discover that we would have accommodations for only 8,235 boys within that appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator from Vermont that, first, the amounts that were dealt with yesterday were for the first year. The program is a continuing one.

Mr. PROUTY. I am talking about the first year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is talking only about the first year?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not for a 1-year program. The proposal is not an authorization for 1 year.

Mr. PROUTY. Will the Senator tell me how many boys would be enrolled the first year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly. One of the reasons there was printed in the

Record a list of available camps was to point out that many of the camps are ready to be used now, without great additional expenditures.

If the Senator will turn to page 529 of the hearings, he will observe that the rehabilitation cost to the Interior Department of making YCC camps ready for immediate occupancy would be $1,367,800.

The cost of YCC camps which would be ready to be occupied in 90 to 120 days would be $604,000. Camps varying in size from 25 to 200 men would be available at less than $2 million. That would presume that the program would be used to its maximum.

I should like the Senator to read what I said in the Senate on April 4, when I pointed out that there was a controversy over construction costs. As the Senator has pointed out, the cost of a 50-man camp was estimated to be $250,000, but amortized over a 20-year period, and rightfully so. They are considered to be usable structures with some rehabilitation. So we cannot estimate the cost on the basis of 1 year's use. We cannot lump in 1 year the total cost of the camp as the cost of an enrollee. The enrollee would be in for 1 year, let us say, but another man would follow him the next year. He would be in the same camp, as was indicated in the hearings. The camps that are already established would be used first.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to finish my statement first.

As I said on April 4, the opponents' figure of $9,000 annual cost per enrollee results from absorbing the entire permanent construction cost of a 50-man camp in the initial year of operation. It is unfair. It does not bear any resemblance to what we call cost accounting. In other words, the $9,000 per enrollee cost figure includes $5,000 that represents the entire payment per enrollee of constructing new permanent facilities.

First, some of the camps are already established.

Second, we should never under any stretch of the imagination try to prorate the cost of a camp in 1 year upon one enrollee.

The manner in which the opponents have used this $9,000 figure is seriously misleading. They have taken permanent construction costs, absorbed these costs in a single year of operation—as opposed to amortizing them over a longer time period—and then portrayed this extremely high cost figure as the average cost of supporting an enrollee in any year of operation.

I submit that is misrepresentation, misleading, and ought not to be permitted. If they choose to absorb all construction costs in the first year, then they must make quite clear that all future annual costs per enrollee will contain no construction funds at all.

So the second year the total cost would be $3,995 or less because that amount of money includes the share of the construction costs for an enrollee for 1 year. So the next year of the program would be entirely free of construction costs.

In any event, as I said on April 4, I submit that amortizing the cost of permanent facilities over their normal 20-year life expectancy provides a more accurate perspective of the true costs involved in supporting a YCC enrollee for a single year and over a reasonable length of time.

There are, moreover, additional factors which further discredit the cost figures used by the opposition. For instance, the estimated construction cost of $250,000 for a 50-man camp represents a maximum figure. Many camps built of local building materials and prefabricated structures will cost much less. Some 100- to 200-man camps will also cost proportionately a great deal less than the $250,000 allotted for each 50-man unit.

Finally—and this is most important—there currently exist enough camp facilities to accommodate almost 12,000 YCC enrollees on a year-round basis. These camps need only marginal improvements to bring them to operating conditions.

Then I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a list of those camps. They appear in the Record at page 5666. The State of Vermont does not appear in the listing, but in Minnesota there are camps at Grand Marais, Sawbill, Long Lake, Cold Springs, Rochert, and Holt. Those are good camps. They have been used. The amount of money that would have to be expended in the State of Minnesota for such camps would be very limited. Some of those camps have been used already for a conservation program.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. For what are those camps now being used?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The State of Minnesota had a Youth Conservation Corps program for a period of time before we got a Republican administration.

Mr. PROUTY. The camps were built back in the 1930's.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In Minnesota we try to help young men. They were used under Orville Freeman, the then Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. PROUTY. Is it intended that they should be used in the proposed program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They will be used again under the new Governor. As the Senator knows, recently there was a recount of votes in the gubernatorial election, and we have a Democratic Governor. Some of the camps will be used. There was a total camp capacity of about 275, which is more than the bill would provide for the State of Minnesota in enrollees.

Mr. PROUTY. How long have they been in existence?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some of them have been in existence since the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mr. PROUTY. Then I submit——

Mr. HUMPHREY. We take care of our facilities.

Mr. PROUTY. Then they were not constructed in the manner in which camps would have to be constructed under this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. These are camps which are usable. They are camps in which one can sleep, eat, and go to school. They are warm and comfortable. They are situated in northern Minnesota, where it is as cold as it is in Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Perhaps colder.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Minnesotans are able to live in those camps.

So the camps are there. We do not have to build a new camp in the State of Minnesota. We will build one for the Senator. Vermont is not listed. We will build a brandnew camp for the Senator, but not an expensive one, since he wants to cut this program. We will build one on the easy side.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator does not know what I want to do with this program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have a pretty good idea, and I do not want to spell it out.

Mr. PROUTY. I do not think the Senator does.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us continue with a discussion of the income factors and the cost factors.

I believe it is about time for the opponents of the bill to come to a recognition of the economic facts relating to this program. Then they will come to a realization of the savings which will come to the American public through the conservation projects, and the good which will come to the young men who participate in them.

When income factors are taken into account, the Youth Conservation Corps clearly represents the essence of fiscal responsibility. Personally I find it difficult to place a price tag on an opportunity to rescue a young man from a wasted, meaningless, and unproductive life. But those Senators solely obsessed with the notion of fiscal responsibility have their answer if they would look for it.

While I have dealt primarily with the proposal to establish a Youth Conservation Corps, the same arguments apply to title II of this bill, the State and community youth employment programs or the so-called hometown youth corps. The Senate report on S. 1 provides examples of where similar programs have brought amazing results, including the "workreation" projects in California, the urban service corps in Detroit, the jobs-for-youth program in Philadelphia, the mobilization-for-youth project in New York City, and the youth employment service in Cincinnati.

These local projects have given the Congress hard evidence that such local employment programs improve the employability of the enrollees and accomplish many needed public services that are currently not being done.

Those who oppose this legislation unfortunately find it necessary to overlook the almost unanimous support for S. 1 that was voiced during the recent Senate hearings. The minority views conveniently avoid noting the 60 public and private witnesses who favored the Youth Employment Act in comparison to the lone dissenter, the National Association of Manufacturers.

The only adverse witness on the Youth Employment Act who appeared was the representative of the National Association of Manufacturers.

They ignore the dozens of supporting statements as opposed to the two dissenting statements filed by the American Farm Bureau Federation and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. They neglect to say that witnesses from such professional associations as the National Social Welfare Assembly, the National Education Association, the American Parents Committee, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Municipal Association, the National Association of Counties, the Young Women's Christian Association, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Jewish Welfare Federation, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the American Personnel and Guidance Association, among others, found the programs contained in S. 1 quite worthy of their support.

I will match the witnesses for this bill against the opponents. Every religious group—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—the veterans organizations, judges, the county and State officials, municipal officials, and Governors testified in support of S. 1. Who was against it? The one live witness who came in was from the National Association of Manufacturers; which is a fine organization, entitled to its right of dissent. That representative presented its program against S. 1, primarily on cost. The chamber of commerce opposition was primarily on cost. The Farm Bureau was the other organization recorded in opposition.

Mr. President, I have a feeling that it is important to know that the National Education Association, which has more than a little idea about education, says it is a good program. Perhaps the educational aspects of the bill are satisfactory to the educators.

The National Conference of Catholic Charities, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Young Women's Christian Association, the American Municipal Association, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Parents Committee, among others, all say, "We want this legislation."

That is pretty good support. I call these advocates of the proposal to the attention of Senators because, I say in all due respect, these organizations have rather substantial memberships in many States of the Union.

Instead, the minority views open with the allegation that the supporters of the Youth Employment Act are merely shouting slogans of a bygone age and close by comparing the Youth Conservation Corps to the Soviet Union's Young Pioneers.

I regret that that had to be in any minority views. There is not a single Member of this body who would propose a program which came anywhere near what the Soviet Union proposes in its Young Pioneers. It is a disservice to every group that testified for this bill—among others, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the National Conference of Catholic Charities—to compare them to the Soviet Union's Young Pioneers. I think that attitude itself demonstrates that the minority views are on rather weak ground. This unfortunate attack on the YCC is indeed "sloganeering," using slogans from a not-so-bygone era.

I respectfully suggest that the tragic problems of our unemployed young Americans will be neither understood nor alleviated through such tactics. I am proud to stand here as the principal author of this legislation; proud of the opportunities that the Youth Employment Act will bring to thousands of our young people. I call upon my colleagues to join me in supporting this urgently needed legislation.

I call upon my colleagues to join with this galaxy of witnesses, with this fine group of witnesses and supporters who have come in to support the proposed legislation. The testimony before the committee indicates that there has been strong national support, not merely from the organizations to which I have invited the attention of the Senate, but also from prominent individuals.

The judge of the juvenile division of the court of common pleas in Cincinnati, Ohio, Benjamin S. Schwartz, wrote to his fellow judges as follows:

> I am writing you because I am aware of your judicial position and concern about youth. We judges strive to provide a better and more constructive rehabilitation and employment program than furnished by commitment to State schools; and so we are deeply interested in the development of youth work camps and employment programs.

I ask Senators to listen to this language:

> The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges at its convention in 1959, and subsequent thereto, approved of the proposed Federal program in this regard, and for the past 2 years I have been chairman of the National Work Camp Committee. Presently we are interested and in favor of Senate bill No. 1 and House bill H.R. 1890, which are now pending in Congress. Enclosed is a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for your study. From it you can readily see that Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, has been an indefatigable worker for this program, and has spearheaded the effort. I am not putting in a political plug, as his and my politics are different; but we both believe that politics should play no part in this program. These bills are at a critical stage and we have a golden opportunity to accomplish their passage—but they require our utmost effort and support.
>
> If you will, contact your U.S. Senators and Representatives and let them know of your endorsement. Because of your high and respected position in your community, you can effectively arouse widespread citizen interest and support by your speaking and public contacts. Let the people know that these camps and employment training will be of inestimable value to our communities and Nation. Above all, these projects will be important for the youth with problems, who because of idleness and other handicaps appear increasingly before us. They will help the school dropouts and those youngsters who are presently walking the streets looking in vain for jobs.
>
> Appreciating your effort and interest, and with best wishes, I am,
>
> Sincerely,
>
> BENJAMIN S. SCHWARTZ.

Mr. President, this man represents judges of the juvenile courts of this Nation, who in conference on three occasions have supported this legislation. They came before the committee to testify for this legislation.

I will take the word of men who see, day after day, the heartache and tragedy of broken young lives, before the bench of the law; who try desperately to refashion those lives by providing young men and women with an opportunity for better lives.

What is their considered judgment? This man, as he says, is not of my political faith. He is a Republican. He says he disagrees with many views expressed by the Senator from Minnesota, yet he says he believes politics should play no part in this program.

But this distinguished citizen, who is intelligent and learned in the law, is speaking for the National Council of Juvenile Judges; and I suppose it would be fair to assume that judges of juvenile courts have an understanding of the proposals in this Congress. They are lawyers, students, and many of them are scholars. They live day in and day out with juvenile and youth problems. They support the legislation.

I ask any reasonable man to consider the evidence in the bill, the provisions of the bill, the testimony for the bill, and the many organizations that support the bill, and then compare that list to those who brought in testimony against the bill.

I have a complete list of the organizations which are for the bill:

The Association of State Foresters has written in support of the bill. Also the Commission on Youth Welfare, city of Chicago; the House of Representatives of the State of Kentucky; the Delaware Commission on Children and Youth; the Cook County, Ill., Department of Public Aid; Illinois Commission on Children; Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth; Michigan Youth Commission; Common Council, city of Detroit; City Council, Virginia, Minn.; Youth Division, Department of State, New Jersey; Department of Public Welfare, State of New Mexico; Department of Employment, State of Oregon; Committee on Children and Youth, State of Oregon; Division of Youth Conservation Services, city of Philadelphia.

We have heard a great deal about Mr. Farrow, of Pennsylvania, but the city of Philadelphia, Division of Youth Conservation, supports this bill.

Also the Commission on Youth Guidance, State of Tennessee; Department of Social Welfare, Virgin Islands; National Education Association; Public Education Association, New York City; Institute of Education Research, Inc.; AFL–CIO; Louisiana Police Jurors' Association; Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

The Izaak Walton League, one of the great voluntary conservation organizations of the world vigorously supports this legislation. Also the American

Municipal Association; American Parents Committee, Inc.; Family and Child Service, Bangor, Maine; Jewish Welfare Federation; Association of American Indian Affairs; Lower Eastside Neighborhoods Association, Inc.; Neighborhood Commons, Washington, D.C.; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Friends Neighborhood Guild, Philadelphia; Human Relations Council, Knoxville, Tenn.; National Catholic Welfare Conference; Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States; Jewish War Veterans, and the William J. Kerby Foundation, Inc.

Also the American Personal and Guidance Association; Americans for Democratic Action; National Council of Jewish Women; Young Women's Christian Association; Manpower Utilization Commission, city of Philadelphia; Mobilization for Youth, Inc., New York City; UAW; American Legion; United Neighborhood Houses, city of New York, and the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers.

Also the National Congress of American Indians; National Jewish Welfare Board; National Conference of Catholic Charities; National Association of County Officials; National Urban League; National Social Welfare Assembly; Veterans of Foreign Wars; the Wilderness Society; and the National Parks Association.

They cannot all be wrong. Considering the variety and diversity of associations I have presented, one cannot ignore the fact that they have come out for this legislation. They cannot all be wrong. These are people who deal with the problems of youth, and they have studied this legislation. They have gone into it meticulously.

The National Association of County Officials met in Washington, D.C., and spent 2 days in their urban congress studying the legislation while the hearings were underway. They support the legislation. Why? If one ever was a local government official, he knows what the problems are at the local level. The mayor of a city, the Governor of a State, the youth commissioner, the social worker—all must face the problems.

I submit that the bill merits the favorable action of the U.S. Senate. My only regret is that it has taken so long. My regret that it is not a bigger bill. But we are trying to face the fiscal needs of the country and keep within reasonable budget limitations.

I say to those who think the bill should be bigger and who want to make it bigger and stronger, that I shall be delighted to join them; but the trouble is that those who want to make it bigger are those who most want to cut the budget. I do not think it adds up.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his leadership.

I am prepared now to listen attentively and patiently, as has been the case previously, to the Senator from Vermont make his case and comments, because I know he feels strongly about this bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me so I may ask the Senator from Minnesota a question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I read in the RECORD the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota and also his explanation of the bill. I have also read in full the statements of the Senator from Vermont. I expect to say something about the bill later, but I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question or two about these provisions.

As I understand the argument of the Senator from Minnesota, he gives great weight to the fact that the Youth Conservation Corps as well as the State and community program would establish a work discipline.

I notice, on page 30, that a youth may enroll for 6 months, but his total enrollment may not exceed 2 years. It seems to me that is a long period of enrollment, not only in view of the fact that so few could participate in the program—15,000 in the beginning—but also because of the fact that if it takes 2 years to establish work habits, we do not have much hope of any real work habits ever being established. Why was the period of 2 years fixed? Why not 1 year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think it requires 2 years to establish work habits; but this bill is really, in part, essentially an employment bill. I do not think it goes as far as it should as an employment bill. Therefore, if there were a necessity for a young man to have a job, 2 years' experience would be to his advantage, and to the advantage of the country, since he would be working on projects already authorized, and which the Department of the Interior or the Agriculture Department have already planned. I would have no objection if the enrollment were limited to 1 year.

Mr. COOPER. That is not the most important point of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But 6 months is a minimum period. I do not think the enrollment period should be less than 6 months, because the administrative costs would go up substantially.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that is not the most important point of the bill, but the purpose of the bill is to return these young people to the regular labor market, with the hope that they may obtain employment.

I suggest that 2 years is a pretty long time to inculcate work habits.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is only one of the attributes of the program. The matter of work experience is covered by page 30 of the bill, where it is stated, in subsection (c):

> Enrollment in the Corps shall be for a period of not less than 6 months; if permitted by the Secretary, an individual may reenroll, but his total enrollment shall not exceed 2 years.

It might be that he would like to stay on; the matter is under the discretion of the YCC officials. But he is not going to be overpaid. His cash income will be $60 a month. I doubt that very many would want to make a career out of it, so to speak.

I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that, if he wanted to modify that period of time—I do not have any strong feelings about it—in order to assure a greater turnover of young people, I would have no objection.

Mr. COOPER. On page 9, line 12, the section refers to the criteria——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is that on page 9 of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator have the committee bill, the new bill, report No. 111?

I believe it is on the desk. The committee revised the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I refer to section 107(d).

Mr. HUMPHREY. "Composition of the Corps."

Mr. COOPER. Yes. It establishes a formula for apportionment. From the language it would appear that if a camp were established in a certain area, it would diminish the apportionment for that area. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I do not understand that to be the case.

Mr. COOPER. I will read the language. I read from page 30, the last line:

> (2) the extent of additional allocation which should be made to any State in order to compensate for benefits accruing to other States from the placement within such States of camps established or maintained under this title.

It seems to me that language would intend that if a camp were established in the State of Minnesota, other States must be compensated. This would mean that there would be less enrollment in the State of Minnesota. I do not see any relevancy to that section.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This language is placed in the bill as a compensating factor for many Eastern States which have very few Federal parks and Federal forests, to give them a little extra consideration in light of the land holdings in Federal parks and Federal forests located in the Western and Midwestern States.

I do not feel bound by these provisions. It is a compensatory factor to accommodate highly populated Eastern States.

Mr. COOPER. These are rather small items that I have noted——

Mr. HUMPHREY. They are worthwhile items, and they should be discussed.

Mr. COOPER. The first point I raised seemed to show that the intended purpose of training these people in work habits was contradicted by planning to keep them enrolled for 2 years. My second point goes to the fact that it does not seem relevant or proper to reduce the number of enrollees in a State because it might happen to have a camp in it. It might be a State which has the greatest unemployment under the other factor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The unemployment factor is another compensatory factor. A State gets additional enrollees on the basis of the degree of unemployment. There is a 50-percent enrollment on the basis of the population of the State, and the other half is based on need. I do not believe I had in my original bill this language:

> (2) the extent of additional allocation which should be made to any State in order to compensate for benefits accruing to other States from the placement within such States of camps established or maintained under this title.

I believe that amendment was offered in committee by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

Mr. COOPER. Yes; it is new language.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was to take care of some of the Eastern States which had no Federal lands.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to discuss with the Senator this committee amendment, but I believe that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may wish to have something to say about it.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am a member of the subcommittee and of the full committee, and have had contact with the proposed legislation during the time it has been pending, both in this Congress and the preceding Congress. I should like to state my position with respect to the bill.

First, there is no question about the need. The need is extremely urgent. If anyone had any doubt about that, the rate of high school dropouts, at about 30 percent of those in vocational schools at an even higher rate, brings so many new claimants into the labor market as to make it necessary for us to do something about the situation, if we are not to be inundated, not alone with unemployment, but with crime and juvenile delinquency. In my opinion, this is one of the main reasons why such legislation is needed.

The figures show a rate of unemployment by those in the 16-to-21 age bracket which is verging on three times the unemployment rate for the country generally. The unemployment rate in this age bracket is about 15.6 percent; that for the country generally is 5.6 percent, in round figures. Those figures are not nearly so impressive as the numbers. In February, 1,081,000 young people in the 16-to-21 age bracket were unemployed. In March, 1,202,000 young people in the 16-to-21 age bracket were unemployed.

This situation is completely intolerable on any grounds, let alone on economic and social grounds. So as we endeavor to cope with the general problem of unemployment, which hits this age group so heavily, we must do something special about it. So, in my view, a bill which seeks to meet that problem must be supported.

It is a grave problem in the city of New York, which represents about half the population of the whole State of New York, where in round figures there are at least 5 percent or more, as it is a great city and concentrates this problem. But New York City has roughly 1,100,000 unemployed in the 16-to-21 age bracket. It is a grave social problem, not only with us in our big city, but also in other big cities throughout the country.

The question is: What to do, and what to do which will give us the most for the money and the longest mileage for what we plan to do.

It is for that reason that I have opposed title I, the provision for the Youth Conservation Corps. I do not think we begin to buy in that provision what we ought to buy for what we expect to spend, considering the size of the problem. A mere reference to the bill demonstrates what I mean.

Under title II, provision is made for 60,000 enrollees. That is a community program, in which young men and women will be employed in the community on useful works—and there are legions of them. That title provides $50 million for the first year.

For the same $50 million, jobs would be provided for 15,000 persons in the YCC camps. Considering the size of the problem, this would be a completely uneconomical utilization of resources. It has been said that there are grave conservation problems in many States and that the Federal Government should help to solve those problems. I agree that it should; but the help should come through Department of the Interior conservation programs, not in this way, under the guise of helping to relieve youth unemployment, when we are doing it most economically by trying to implement conservation needs in the bill.

I agree that the members of the Civilian Conservation Corps had a fine experience in the 1930's. But there was not the draft then. That activity took place during the depths of an unemployment situation which ran, at one point, to about 25 percent of the employable population, and throughout the period of World War II in the 15-percent range. No such comparable situation exists today. In addition, we have the draft today. The YCC camp project which is provided in the bill will be nothing but paramilitary organization preliminary to the draft. Again, I do not think that activity ought to be bracketed into the bill under the guise of an effort to furnish employment to young people. Therefore, I am fully cognizant of what is afoot in title I.

When a motion is made to strike title I, I shall support it. If I support it, it will be only because I believe it is our duty to increase the number provided in title II, not to 60,000, but to 100,000, and to provide more money so that that program can function. It is a fine program on the homefront, with local participation. Incidentally, it will not penalize States and communities which cannot afford to contribute money, because their contributions can be as little as 25 percent and can be in kind as well as in money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from New York is correct in saying that title II is much more practical than title I of the bill. I shall certainly vote to remove title I. I know several Members of the Senate who will support the bill if it is reduced to title II, but who will not do so if title I remains.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator restate his reasons for his judgment that title I should be stricken?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the size of the problem, which is a problem running into 1,100,000 unemployed between the ages of 16 and 21, when related to the numbers to whom we need to give some special help, which is what the bill is all about, makes the use of that money for the YCC camp operation uneconomical in an area in which we cannot afford to use it economically. A mere reference to the bill will demonstrate that. Title II provides for 60,000 enrollees. For the same amount of money, there would be 15,000 enrollees under title I.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator realizes, does he not, that title II is financed, in part, probably to the extent of 50 percent, by the States?

Mr. JAVITS. I do. I see nothing wrong with that, especially in view of the fact that the States financing need not be in the form of money; it can be in kind—buildings, facilities, structures, personnel. It can be in anything other than money.

Mr. CLARK. But in results, so far as the taxpayers are concerned, much more money would be put into title II than into title I.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand; but at least it is broken down on the basis of local responsibility. Even in the conservationist area, title II entitles the States themselves to use personnel for conservation within the States. I see no reason why that is not a very mature, balanced approach, following the lines of the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Retraining Act.

In case the Senator from Pennsylvania has any worries, I intend to vote for the bill. However, I shall lend myself to the effort to strike title I, because I do not believe it provides an economical use of our resources.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York further yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Ohio has 5 percent of the population of the country. If we divide the 15,000 enrollees under title I, Ohio would be entitled to supply 750 enrollees. The Senator from New York believes, does he, that the cost which would be entailed would not measure up to the good which would be done in solving the country's unemployment problem?

Mr. JAVITS. I must add a corollary to that, if the Senator will permit me to do so. It is that the utilization of the same amount of money under title II begins so much better to reach the great numbers of persons who are involved that I think, taking the scheme of the proposed legislation in totality, it would be an improvident utilization of the funds which are devoted to title I. That is the totality of my argument. That is the argument I made in committee.

I believe we have an opportunity to render a greatly needed service. I believe that the idea or concept of a corps—let us call it a domestic peace corps, because that is what it really is—which is broken down by communities is an extraordinary idea, one well worth the support of Congress.

There is a delineation, based upon a survey made by the mayor of the city of New York—my home city—which shows areas in which this kind of service can be very fruitfully rendered. The mayor of New York indicated a minimum of 1,800 jobs in departments and nonprofit agencies in New York City alone.

They include jobs in hospitals, libraries, schools, law courts, children's homes, public housing projects, settlement houses, social and civic centers, day camps, recreational facilities, including playgrounds, and private community service agencies, such as the Visiting Nurses' Association. For example, there is a strong movement in my city to keep school buildings open after hours, but the difficulty is to secure personnel to supervise them.

Incidentally, these opportunities would afford employment to youths who otherwise might turn their attention to lawless activities. Also, they would take off the streets youths who otherwise might give their attention to lawless activities.

So I believe title II is excellent. I am all for it. I should like to see title I and title II combined, and the funds proposed to be used for title I used in title II, where they can be expended most economically in the best interest of the scheme of the proposed legislation.

Finally, the vocational training amendment, which I had the honor to sponsor, and which is on page 42, lines 3 to 12, of the bill, ties directly into title II. I am grateful to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], who is in charge of the bill, for having accepted that amendment. I think we all feel that it was a measurable improvement in the bill. But it ties directly into title II, and emphasizes the fact that we shall be training these young men for permanent roles in life, not merely to take them off the streets during the time they are enrolled in the program.

It would also accomplish tying this program in with other programs, notably the area redevelopment program and the manpower retraining program. It would also make it possible to use some of the resources made available by this act in order to supplement what may be going on locally, in terms of vocational training. I think that would greatly strengthen the bill.

Finally, the local contribution is really reduced to a minimum. The formula is excellent—as low as 25 percent, if the Secretary of Labor believes that a particular community cannot do any better. Again I emphasize that the contribution is to be one in kind.

So it seems to me this provision emphasizes the desirability of local interest; and any community in the country, no matter how poor, will be able to find an inkind contribution of 25 percent for so desirable a program.

A mixed Federal-local program is always desirable, especially when it can be managed without deprivation to communities which are under par economically.

So I think the plan is excellent, and I believe it will be strengthened if we combine titles I and II. If the motion to strike out title I, which I understand will be made by the Senator from Vermont, is agreed to, I shall move to combine titles I and II and to increase the amount to $100,000, and to increase the various other amounts so that they will be sufficient to carry on a program of $100,000, rather than one of $60,000. I think we would then have a much better piece of legislation which would command a much greater majority both in this body and in the other body.

Mr. RANDOLPH obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in commenting on the measure now before the Senate, let me state that the State of Washington has made a beginning in this particular field with the establishment of a so-called State youth conservation group. It is a very modest beginning. Last year fewer than 100 young people were working on the program; but their accomplishments were amazing. In particular in the forests, where 56 of those who were eligible were employed, in a short period of time they built more than 14 miles of roads, opened up approximately 100 camps which had been more or less abandoned in the forest reserve and other places, and, above all, created a great number of fire lanes, which in turn more than pay for their cost, because the reduction in the number of costly forest fires in our area is in proportion to the increase in the number of fire lanes, with the resultant increased access to these timber resources. So the State of Washington is ready for this sort of national program. I am sure the cooperation there will be great, and the results will be exactly as they have been described today by many Senators.

I had intended to speak at length on the bill. Today, I came across an editorial entitled "If We Look Around Us, We'll See That the President Is Right." The editorial was published in the Seattle Times on March 31; and it pertains to this bill and to the program under it, and deals at some length with the waste of manpower which occurs when there are idle youth and when there are problems in connection with teenagers and juvenile delinquency. The editorial also deals with the matter of work camps similar to the CCC camps of the late 1930's.

I wish to have the editorial printed in the Record, because it states succinctly and briefly my views on this bill and this program. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Seattle Times of Mar. 31, 1963]

If We Look Around Us, We'll See That the President Is Right

Critics of President Kennedy's recommendation that Congress enact a Youth Employment Act frequently contend that it is "unnecessary because States and local communities can accomplish what needs to be done."

The simple truth is, however, that neither local and State agencies of government nor privately supported welfare agencies are getting even close to meeting the critical need for expanded employment opportunities for youth.

Mr. Kennedy has cited statistics that demonstrate that the situation has reached a condition of national emergency.

"The annual birth rate since 1947," Mr. Kennedy told Congress, "has been 30 percent higher than it was in the 1930's. As a result, the number of youths under 20 rose from 46 million in 1945 to 70 million in 1961. They will number 86 million by 1970.

"Unemployment among young workers today is two and a half times the national average, and even higher among minority groups."

While Mr. Kennedy's figures are based on national surveys, the situation in our own community is equally bad for youngsters—especially those who have dropped out of school. And, as Mr. Kennedy emphasizes with national statistics, youngsters of minority races have fewer employment opportunities here than do others.

The Reverend Samuel B. McKinney, pastor of Mount Zion Baptist Church, spoke of the plight of Negroes here last week when he lamented conditions in the community which contribute to such incidents as when two teenagers were shot to death and another was wounded. While Mr. McKinney mentioned a broad sweep of social conditions (which are by no means confined to Negroes) he gave emphasis to the lack of employment opportunities available to youths.

Mr. McKinney suggested the need for "work camps" similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, which even old critics of the New Deal recall as having served useful purposes.

Mr. Kennedy's program, in the opinion of the Times, contemplates action even superior to the former Conservation Corps. It would, of course, reestablish such forest camps. But even more important it would be the beginning of incity training programs for youths to give them work experience and discipline aimed at fitting them for private employment.

Briefly described, Mr. Kennedy's program calls for local youth corps to work in hospitals, schools, parks, and on other nonprofit community projects. Payment, shared equally by the local agency and the Federal Government, would be $60 monthly with board where needed.

This is not envisaged as a program solely to "get the teenagers off the streets." It is one to carry on useful work which otherwise would not be done, and, more important, to teach the youngsters how to work.

The waste of manpower from idle youth is something the Nation can ill afford, in addition to what is being done to the teenagers born of a generation where vocational opportunities are becoming increasingly limited.

> It is true enough that many would prefer to take the easy route of becoming welfare charges. But it is equally true that economic conditions which deny them job opportunities are a compounding factor to moral stagnation.
>
> It is this situation that Mr. Kennedy seeks to get at in his pleas that Congress act on his recommendations. And it is this situation his critics contend can be met by local agencies without Federal pump priming.
>
> Mr. Kennedy's critics ought to get out and see how the situation is not being met. And Seattle is no exception to the national rule.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, No. 47, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 49, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

> Sec. 301. The term "State" as defined in this Act shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. To the extent there are qualified applicants, programs, and appropriations, each State as defined herein shall be assured of not less than fifty enrollees under title I and fifty enrollees under title II.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I offered a very simple amendment that will assure that no State shall receive less than 50 enrollees respectively under title I and title II, subject however to the availability of qualified applicants, programs, and appropriations.

American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia are included in the definition of "States" for the purposes of this amendment.

As the companion bill was reported in the House there is an amendment which protects the sparsely populated States, such as Alaska, Nevada, New Hampshire, Delaware, South Dakota, and Hawaii; however, the House amendment fails to give adequate assurances for such areas as American Samoa and Guam.

My amendment does this and in addition encompasses title II in the same way as the House amendment affects title I.

I have tried my best to be reasonable in this amendment. I am pleased to advise my colleagues that I have discussed this amendment with the prime sponsor of the measure and with the Senator in charge of the bill and have received their approval.

Under this amendment, the State must have qualified applicants. Further, under this amendment, the State must have a qualified program. Finally, there must be adequate appropriations. I believe that the floor I have suggested is at a reasonable level. For example, under the present bill under title I, Hawaii would draw four-tenths of 1 percent of the national enrollment. Based on population figures Hawaii would therefore get 30 enrollees and such additional enrollees as may be allocated due to unemployment. Under this amendment, Hawaii would be assured of a floor of 50 enrollees to work in our national parks and in other Federal and State conservation, recreational, educational activities.

Under the present bill, American Samoa and Guam would also be entitled to less than 10 enrollees per territory. My amendment would give them 50 enrolees under title I plus 50 under title II.

May I assure Senators from the heavily populated States that the amendment will not adversely affect their States. The amendment would give the sparsely populated States an opportunity of carrying out an effective and meaningful youth program. I am certain my colleagues will agree with me that it would be most difficult to carry out any program which will have any impact if such area be entitled to less than 10 enrollees. Further I believe that my amendment draws attention to the modesty of this bill. I believe it represents an effort to meet a program facing our national youth. The program will be developed on a sound basis and if it works well it can be expanded. Through this amendment the smaller States would be assured of full participation.

Like many of my colleagues I am impressed by the fact that General of the Army George Marshall, who worked closely with the CCC program in the thirties said of this program and his work that it had been "one of the most inspiring experiences which I have ever had." We can build on a record of a tried and effective program that was an unqualified success.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand the amendment, it would establish a floor of 50 enrollees below which no State would be required to fall, so that there would be at least 50 enrollees from the smaller States. Is that correct?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope very much that the ranking minority member of the committee will agree to the amendment, which is quite noncontroversial, so that it may be disposed of now by voice vote and the Senate may move on to the next order of business.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am privileged to yield to my friend, the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I highly commend our distinguished colleague from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], who has greatly strengthened the bill and has taken into consideration the onetime stepchildren outside the so-called continental United States, two of which are now happily a part of the Union. But he is no less solicitous for those who still do not have the full measure of self-government to which all Americans properly feel themselves entitled. I congratulate the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] on his valuable amendment. As time goes on, those of us who knew that the admission of Hawaii to the Union would greatly strengthen our Union have had our expectations daily confirmed by observing the actions of the distinguished junior Senator from our 50th State. His amendment will be beneficial to the citizens of Hawaii, Alaska, Guam, Samoa, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Senator.

THE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT—A HANDCLASP, NOT A HANDOUT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am astounded and perplexed when I read some of the reasons advanced in opposition to the Youth Employment Act, S. 1. For example, let me quote from the minority views on S. 1 appearing in Report III:

> We do not believe that shouting the slogans and attempting to revitalize the emergency programs of a bygone era contribute to the solution of the problems of our youth in the 1960's.

That so-called bygone era gave to this Nation a rebirth of confidence in many ways, one being the effective administration of the Civilian Conservation Corps which put more than 3 million jobless young men to work building forest trails and shelter cabins and creating improvements of lasting value.

In writing my book, "The State of Alaska," I was pleased to acknowledge the positive value of the CCC. One unique Civilian Conservation Corps project in the then Territory of Alaska was the restoration and relocation of a great number of totem poles, monuments of the culture of the Northwest Indians which would otherwise have disintegrated and been lost. Thanks to the work of the CCC the colorful, descriptive, and monumental totem poles stand today—continuing tributes to the men and women who carved them, continuing tributes to the men who helped preserve them when as youths they went north to Alaska, and in so doing kept a valued portion of Alaskan lore for posterity.

There is no need to relive the past as it was. But one can learn by past experience. If that experience proved bad, it should be tabled. If that experience provided building blocks which can be reused, perhaps in different shapes, let us set to work confident and reassured, rather than creating doubts where only illusory shadows flit.

In my discussion of President Kennedy's proposed Youth Conservation Corps on March 21, 1961, I said:

> This is a most refreshing new look by the executive branch of the Government at a vital program.

In 1960 as a cosponsor of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota's [Mr. Humphrey] Youth Conservation Corps bill, I discussed the need to set to work developing our natural resources.

In Alaska the CCC enrollees built trails, shelter cabins, cleared away obstructions, planted trees, checked soil erosion, and did other sorts of work needed but which did not fit into a category of Federal, State, or private activity. The need continues. Man still requires trails, and cleared lands upon which and in which he may better appreciate this great country.

The U.S. Senate has in past years expressed its approval of this legislative need, and I trust it will do so again.

The New York Times in 1961 observed editorially:

> In the spirit of the CCC almost a generation ago, the YCC today can be a tremendous force for the conservation of American youth in the 1960's.

So let us take a page from our progressive past, examine it positively, and then, if you will, copy the best and mix it with the new.

In its 9 years of productivity the Civilian Conservation Corps, established by act of Congress in March 1933, gave employment and work training to 3 million men, most of them joining up at the ages of 17 or 18.

The bill we consider today is different in many ways. It spells out precisely the age limitations. It allows its participants to keep regular hours of work, perform useful activities, complete their education, learn to live together, and to practice personal and public hygiene.

Title I, the Youth Conservation Corps, provides for a YCC to be administered by the Federal Government for work on Federal lands, mainly forest and park lands. For young men only, it provides them with the opportunity to learn, and it gives us here today the opportunity to strengthen the Nation internally.

Title II, the State and community youth employment program permits all States and communities to participate if they desire. Conservation camps could be established on State lands to improve existing natural resources of recreational facilities.

Work opportunities are vast—in hospitals and libraries, for example, and in improving blighted city areas. Both young men and women could participate in title II. The cost-sharing formula is similar to that incorporated last year in the Accelerated Public Works Act, giving us yet another example of why it is never to late to reuse.

The educational scope of the bill is illustrative of the thinking which has accompanied the proposal. Subjects can be taught at the YCC camps or at community facilities.

I will not detail what has been detailed. But I believe we would do well to consider the calculable and incalculable benefits embodied in the text of the proposed bill.

Mr. President, Congress appears no closer to enacting a general education bill today than yesterday, nor indeed we seem no closer this Congress than during the last. The passage of S. 1 will give us some progress in this important area.

I am convinced that S. 1 will help correct the national high school dropout deficiency which persists.

I am convinced that S. 1 will in a modest way meet the advances of automation which give us statistics such as 15.6 percent of youths aged 16 to 21 are unemployed, a disproportionately large number.

I am convinced that the young men and women, aged 16 to 21 seek no handout, but rather a handclasp. Our handclasp can be inspired or insipid.

I have read the report on S. 1 and consider it an excellent analysis of the need for the legislation. No one asserts that S. 1 provides the only answer to unemployment, lack of skills, inadequate education, or automation, but the bill does provide some tools to help meet these specters which will, if untended, grow to enormous size.

The merits of S. 1 are known in Alaska and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time a copy of a letter I received from Mr. Victor Charles, secretary, Northwestern Alaska Chamber of Commerce, Nome, Alaska.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 3, 1963.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The Northwestern Chamber of Commerce at Nome heartily endorses your bill S. 1 and the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps in Nome.

A suggested site for location of a Youth Conservation Corps is the U.S.S.R. Mining Co. Camp No. 5, which is no longer used by the mining company.

Your good efforts in behalf of S. 1 are appreciated and we gladly give you our support in favor of this bill.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR CHARLES,
Secretary, Northwestern Alaska Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum on the bill prepared by a staff member, testimony on the bill by Dr. Austin S. Murphy, which I thought was very thoughtful and helpful, and an editorial published in the Washington Evening Star of March 11, 1963.

There being no objection, the memorandum, editorial, and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON S. 1

I. THE COST OF THE YCC

The Secretary of Labor estimated that the 12-month cost per enrollee is $3,985. This cost does not include the expense of materials and equipment, estimated to add between $150 and $1,000 per enrollee. It assumes camp construction costs of only $250,000 per installation amortized over a period of 20 years.

However, Department of Agriculture and Department of Interior figures in 1961 showed annual costs per boy as follows:

In a 25-man unit: $12,297 per boy per year.

In a 50-man unit: $9,016 per boy per year.

In a 100-man unit: $8,263 per boy per year.

In a 200-man unit: $7,171 per boy per year.

Moreover, Richard G. Farrow, director, Bureau of Youth Services, Office for Children and Youth, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, testified that the cost per camp was $385,000 for camps in Pennsylvania, built in accordance with specifications of the general State authority.

The cost per camp is amortized for 20 years, but the program is authorized for only 5 years, and the congressional annual appropriations process does not provide for amortization. For the authorized 15,000 enrollees in the title I program, 300 camps of 50 men each would be required. At $250,000 per camp, this amounts to $75 million, $15 million more than the total annual appropriation for the first year of the program. The Secretary of Labor estimated the cost per enrollee for housing, amortized over 20 years, would amount to $250 per year. Assuming that materials will cost $1,000 per enrollee, this gives a total annual cost per enrollee of $4,985. Subtracting $250 for housing gives $4,730 per enrollee minus housing costs. If 15,000 men are enrolled in title I, this gives a possible full cost for title I, without housing, of $70,950,000, or $10,950,000 more than the amount to be appropriated for title I.

II. ARGUMENTS AGAINST TITLE I (FROM MINORITY VIEWS IN REPORT)

1. Title I does not meet the problem: The problem is that of giving employment opportunities to youths coming into the labor market, not make-work or stopgap jobs. This is the view of the Washington Post, not noted as antiadministration. Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified that "there is no suggestion that this training program will qualify one of these enrollees for a skilled occupation."

2. The case for S. 1 was poorly conceived: In a list of existing camps submitted by Secretary Wirtz, one such camp supposed to be located in Vermont was nonexistent. Another camp located in Arizona was in an area with an average daytime temperature of 125°.

3. The YCC will not provide skilled training: (See Secretary Wirtz' quoted statement above).

4. The cost of the YCC. (See above.)

5. The potential discipline problem in the camps: There is nothing in the bill, which has been modeled after the old CCC, to provide the necessary discipline through the use of Army personnel and methods as was the case in the CCC.

6. The Corps would weaken family ties: The $60 per month pay goes directly to the enrollee who may enroll without permission of his parents. Senator GOLDWATER proposed an amendment to provide permission in writing of parents for enrollment and to provide that a portion of the enrollee's pay would go directly to his parents.

7. Antidiscrimination: Senator GOLDWATER proposed an amendment to bar discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color, pointing out that the old CCC model contained a specific provision prohibiting racial or religious discrimination, but his amendment was rejected.

III. OTHER ARGUMENTS RELATED TO TITLE I

1. The educational purpose of the bill infringes upon State responsibilities and powers: Although the stated purpose is to provide work experience, the clear intent of the bill is also to give educational experience to the high school dropout, a student not now effectively reached by conventional educational methods. The 5-year authorization plus the 20-year amortization of construction costs implies a continuing program of an educational nature for title I. This raises the question whether an amendment to the bill would be appropriate to provide grants-in-aid to States who would themselves administer title I type work experience on Federal park and forest lands in addition to their authority to provide work under title II of the bill.

2. Educational opportunities are hard to provide through Federal auspices in newly constructed camps by comparison to their provision by existing State educational organizations, whether at home or in camps within the State.

3. States and communities are already showing some initiative in youth employment programs: "Workreation" programs

in California, other local work programs in Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Seattle, Detroit, Philadelphia, New York City; and Youth Conservation Corps activities in Massachusetts, Oregon, Wisconsin, and the city of Philadelphia.

IV. TITLE II

The language of title II provides "useful work experience opportunities for unemployed youths" in "programs for the employment of young people in State and community service activities, hereinafter authorized, including the conservation, development, and management of the natural resources of the State and community and the development, management, and protection of recreational areas within the State and the community."

Senator Clark, on the floor of the Senate, Tuesday, April 9, said:

"State recreation facilities and forest lands are deteriorating for lack of hands on the State and local payrolls to do the work. Help is needed in the cities' playgrounds, libraries, and hospitals, and to clean up blight."

This seems to imply that title II authorizes programs of work experience in city community facilities, including hospitals, by a generous interpretation of the language of the bill.

Although the report, in describing title II, does not explicitly refer to such programs, nothing in its language is inconsistent with Senator Clark's interpretation.

V. ARGUMENTS FOR TITLE II

1. Title II provides far more work experience for the money expended.

2. Title II provides for education at the State and local level according to the constitutional authority for education. If title I were deleted and title II amended to provide for State administration of work experience on Federal lands within a State as well as State and local lands in that State, the potential expenditure in the first year of the program would be $150 million even though the Federal appropriation were only $100 million.

3. Several of the arguments against title I do not apply directly to title II, such as, weakening of family ties, the difficulty of providing training in camps through Federal auspices, and the unreality of the work experience in park lands for city bred youths. Also, title II provides for the employment of young girls as well as young men.

VI. GENERAL COMMENT

A hasty study of the bill and the report suggests that the Congress is groping toward a new type of education for the high school dropout whose needs are not met with conventional programs. It is generally agreed among educators that many high school dropouts also find vocational education a poor substitute for on-the-job experience. The question is raised whether the Congress is moving toward a new type of educational system for such unskilled but healthy and physically mature young people. If this surmise is correct, it strengthens the argument that Federal legislation should move in the direction of grants-in-aid to States, and that the responsibility for education of this type should remain in control of the States.

STATEMENT OF DR. AUSTIN S. MURPHY, DIRECTOR OF THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

(Statement before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, on S. 1, the Youth Employment Act, February 28, 1963)

My name is Austin S. Murphy, and I am director of the education department of the National Association of Manufacturers. I appreciate your courtesy in providing an opportunity for me to present the association's views on the Youth Employment Act.

Our organization includes more than 16,000 companies in all industries and in all parts of the Nation. While we are not specifically a spokesmen for either small business or large business, the fact is that more than 80 percent of the association's members employ fewer than 500 workers and 28 percent employ fewer than 50. The association's policies are formulated by its members, and more than 3,000 individual representatives of member companies participate in the policy forming process. For these reasons I can assure you that this statement reflects the views of a broad and representative cross section of manufacturing industry.

The Youth Employment Act has two objectives. Title I establishes a Youth Conservation Corps to provide temporary employment for young men and to accelerate conservation programs. Title II authorizes the initiation of local area youth employment programs in which young people will be trained and employed in State and local community service activities. Both of these proposals are of major concern to us because they bear directly on the long-range interests of our members in the fields of education, conservation, fiscal policy, and industrial relations.

The National Association of Manufacturers regards passage of the proposed legislation as inappropriate and unnecessary at the present time. In our opinion, it appears unlikely that these programs will make a significant contribution to a meaningful solution of the problem of unemployment among youth. At the same time, initiation of the programs would require an increase in Government expenditures, starting at $100 million in the next fiscal year, at a time when the size of current and prospective Government deficits is being questioned by many citizens and Members of Congress. In addition, the proposals appear to envision direct Federal participation in the education process, which we regard as undesirable.

We are in complete accord with those who regard unemployment among youth as one of the serious problems facing our economy today. We cannot, however, accept the view that creation of jobs by Government flat represents a worthwhile solution of that problem. To the contrary, it is our opinion that there is much greater promise for both unemployed youth and for the economy as a whole in a program designed to create an ever-growing number of jobs through stimulation of our rate of economic growth.

In the time at my disposal, I should like to do two things. First, I would like to review briefly the provision and implications of the proposals which the committee has before it. Second, and of equal importance, I would like to outline an alternative program which, in our opinion, represents a constructive approach to a lasting solution of the youth unemployment problem.

THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Title I of the bill, the Youth Conservation Corps Act, establishes a Youth Conservation Corps in the Department of Labor for the dual purpose of providing temporary employment for young men between the ages of 16 and 22 and of accelerating conservation programs. Enrollees are to be drawn from each of the States on the basis of population with consideration given to the additional needs of depressed areas. Enrollees will be provided with supplemental training and educational services in addition to the program of work and on-the-job training which stems from the primary mission of the Corps.

This proposal represents an attempt to solve the problem of unemployment among youth by means of made work and the creation of jobs on Government payrolls. No attempt appears to have been made in previous testimony on this proposal to document a need for this particular approach. Nor, have estimates been provided as to the probable impact of the Youth Conservation Corps on the economies and levels of employment in the local areas where such camps may be located.

Specifically, consideration of the program, as outlined in the bill, gives rise to three objections. First, establishment of the Youth Conservation Corps represents a relatively weak and unsatisfactory solution to the problem of youth unemployment. Second, there appears to be a very real question as to whether the establishment and operation of such camps is feasible at the present. Finally, there is also a question as to whether participation in the Corps will have a favorable effect on the well-being, development, and safety of the individuals concerned.

EMPLOYMENT ASPECTS

Clearly, the proposed Youth Conservation Corps is patterned after the CCC camps of the 1930's. The differences between today's conditions and those that gave rise to the original program, however, are substantial. More importantly, this proposal raises a question as to the wisdom of approaching the problem of unemployment through the discredited theory of make-work programs particularly during periods of prosperity.

During the 1930's the country was fighting a major depression. The unemployment rate at times exceeded 20 percent of the labor force and periods of joblessness affected virtually every family. In this context employment opportunities for youth were sharply curtailed. The CCC program was designed to ease the problem by providing work, maintaining morale, and improving the skills of the enrollees. The Corps appears to have gained general public approval at the time.

The conditions which gave rise to the CCC program of the 1930's, however, are not present today. Although the rate of unemployment, in total and especially among younger workers, is undesirably high, it is far from a level which indicates the need for a depression program. In this connection it is significant that then Secretary of Labor Goldberg when he presented this program to your committee in 1961 voiced some doubt as to whether the Youth Conservation Corps approach is suited to current needs. He said:

"I know that, measured against the task assigned to it, the Civilian Conservation Corps compiled a constructive record in the thirties, and I have been impressed by the number of people I know who profited through an association with the corps.

"But times are very different now. We feel we should try this type of program on a pilot basis first to determine whether it is geared to work as well today as it did in the 1930's." [1]

In addition this approach raises the more fundamental problem of the consequences for our economy of an attempt to solve the unemployment problem through the creation of additional jobs and public payrolls. True, this instance involves only a handful of men on a tentative basis. Experience has shown only too well, however, the rapidity with which such tentative pilot projects lead to vast, unwieldy, and well-entrenched programs.

The well-being of our economy and the standard of living of our people depends, in the first instance, on a steady growth in the production of goods and services by the private economy. There is widespread agreement today that the current tax burden which has resulted, in large part, from past expansions of public agencies, has the effect of erecting a barrier to growth and investment in the private economy and contributing to unemployment. The solution suggested here of increasing public payrolls to reduce unemployment will, in my opinion, inevitably worsen our problem rather than serving to provide a meaningful solution.

---

[1] Hearings on S. 404 and S. 2036. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, 87th Cong. 1st sess., June 1961, p. 41.

FEASIBILITY

There are two aspects to the problem of whether the Youth Conservation Corps program is feasible under today's conditions. One is whether young boys in the 16-to-22-year-age bracket will voluntarily participate in such a program. The other is whether an adequate number of qualified supervisory personnel will be available to operate the camps.

The first of these problems appears to be imponderable. To my knowledge the Labor Department has not documented a desire on the part of any substantial number of young people to become members of the Corps. The experience of the military, which in many respects offers a somewhat similar life, has been that even under the compulsion of potential draft, not enough volunteers appear to fill their quotas. There seems to be a substantial question, therefore, as to whether there is a sufficiently large number of potential enrollees to make the project worthwhile.

It is equally difficult to estimate whether there will be an adequate supply of competent supervisory personnel for the projected camps. The Civilian Conservation Corps was organized on the basis of camps of 180–200 men, each of which had 10 to 14 civilian supervisory employees and technicians including an educational adviser. Primary responsibility for the administration of each camp rested with two Army Reserve officers, and the Army also provided supplemental services such as dental officers, chaplains, and the disbursing facilities of its finance offices.

Two characteristics of the CCC organization appear to be lacking today. One is the fact that the Department of Defense will not participate in the proposed program. The other is that the abnormally high unemployment rates during the 1930's provided an unusually large pool of individuals that could be drawn upon to fill the administrative positions in the camps. It is somewhat doubtful, however, that under today's conditions there would be an adequate number of qualified individuals, willing to leave their homes and friends for extended periods, to participate in this program, especially in view of the shortages which are said to exist of doctors, dentists, teachers, and other skilled workers.

For example, one of the specific requirements of S. 1 is that the Secretary of Labor shall "insure the provision of a system of training and educational services to enrollees of the Corps, in addition to the regular program of work and on-the-job training." In the CCC a similar requirement was satisfied by assigning an educational adviser to each camp. Yet we find that, even in the 1930's when unemployment in general was high and educators were hard hit, the Civilian Conservation Corps experienced some difficulty in maintaining its staff of educational advisers. The American Youth Commission describes the situation as follows:

"Turnover rates for educational advisers have been chronically high throughout the life of the Corps; educational advisers with excellent qualifications for their work have usually left the Corps for other employment at the earliest opportunity."[2]

EFFECT ON THE INDIVIDUAL

Evaluation of a program such as the proposed Youth Conservation Corps must, in the final analysis, rest on its effect on the individuals who participate in the program. Will the existence of the Corps cause potential dropouts to leave school sooner than would otherwise be the case? Will the later employment experience of enrollees be better than it would have been without the training? Will it aid their individual development? Will it contribute to their well-being?

There is probably no way to measure the employment effects of a program such as we are considering. The life of the CCC paralleled the expansion following 1933, the recession in the late 1930's, and the early phases of World War II. Individual experience was probably governed as much by these factors as by the effects of Corps' enrollment. One can only conjecture, therefore, as to whether membership in the Youth Conservation Corps will effectively increase the employability of the individuals concerned. We have no guides.

There appears to be a substantial question, however, as to whether participation in this program during a period of general prosperity will aid in individual development and adjustment or whether it will lead to a feeling of isolation, demoralization, and the development of "poor attitudes." A question can be raised as to whether the fact of being socially and economically isolated from his contemporaries during this formative period could lead to development of a sociophychological pattern, which would result in the enrollee becoming a potential member of the hard-core unemployed rather than a productive and useful member of society. Some light is cast on this problem in the report of the American Youth Commission which comments on the adjustment problems of trainees to camp life as follows:

"It is not surprising that many new enrollees give up and go home before they have had time to get acclimated to camp life. Others become sullen or rebellious, defiantly breaking the rules until they get themselves expelled with a disciplinary discharge. Records show that out of a total enrollment of 2,500,000, nearly 500,000 have ended their camp experience through desertion or for disciplinary reasons."[3]

At another point the Commission stated that:

"The major weakness of the CCC consists of the limited extent to which it prepares most enrollees to participate in self-governing forms of group action or even to direct their activities as individuals. From this standpoint the Corps is of little assistance in the development of contributing citizenship."[4]

As to the physical health of the individual, camp life in the CCC apparently presented something of a hazard. The accident rate seems to have been a major problem throughout the life of the organization although concerted safety programs reduced the rate from 288.5 per thousand in 1934 to 127.52 in 1938. Also, although the death rate in the camps was lower than that for the general population in cases of tuberculosis and appendicitis, it appears to have been somewhat higher in cases of automobile and truck accidents, pneumonia, drowning, railroad accidents, and meningitis.

SUMMARY

In the foregoing paragraphs I have drawn several conclusions from the experience of the Civilian Conservation Corps. This did not stem from any desire to criticize that organization. Rather it was necessitated by the fact that the CCC experience offers the only parallel on which to base a judgment.

Granting the many differences between the Civilian Conservation Corps and the proposed Youth Conservation Corps, I believe that the following conclusions are justified:

1. Establishment of the corps represents a weak solution to the problem of unemployment among youth, yet contains the dangerous precedent of attempting to solve the problem by the creation of jobs on public payrolls.

2. There has been no apparent effort to document either (a) the willingness of a sufficiently large group of potential enrollees to participate in the plan to indicate a need for it, (b) the availability of a sufficiently large group of qualified supervisory personnel to indicate its feasibility, or (c) the probable effect of youth conservation camps on the economy of the local areas in which the camps will be located.

3. The experience of the Civilian Conservation Corps casts serious doubt on whether the proposed Youth Conservation Corps will contribute significantly to the future employability, personal development or the health and well-being of the enrollees, or whether it may have an opposite and undesirable effect.

In view of the many doubts and uncertainties surrounding the proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps and its fundamental inadequacy as a means of correcting youth unemployment, we believe that its adoption is undesirable. Such an organization would tend to deprive participants of the employment opportunities that might arise in their own communities during their absence at camp. Furthermore, substituting Government paternalism and regimentation for community, church, and family influences is a departure from the traditional American way of life and hinders the objectives of promoting responsible citizenship in its broadest sense.

LOCAL AREA YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Title II, the Local Area Youth Employment Act, establishes a program of work experience for unemployed young people between the ages of 16 and 22. This section provides that the Secretary of Labor will notify State and local government officials as to the number, skills, and qualifications of available unemployed youth; assist and cooperate with local authorities in developing employment programs for those available; and provide, in cooperation with local school authorities, for the selection and referral of the youths for enrollment in approved programs.

The program is designed so that it will in no way interfere with existing activities. It is specifically provided that enrollees in the program will be employed either on publicly owned or operated facilities, or projects sponsored by nonprofit private agencies, that the program will permit or contribute to an undertaking that would otherwise not be initiated, and that no enrollee will displace a regular worker.

The National Association of Manufacturers is opposed to this proposal. It contains the weakness noted earlier in connection with the Youth Conservation Corps of attacking the unemployment problem by adding the unemployed to the public payroll. In addition, the employment is provided on wholly make-work projects. The procedures established destroy individual initiative and self-reliance in seeking employment. And, the training aspects of the programs appear to duplicate, to a large extent, those provided by the Manpower Development and Training Act.

In our opinion, this proposal is wholly deficient as a contribution to the development of a meaningful solution to the problem of unemployed youth. As is the case with the proposed Youth Conservation Corps, the solution suggested is to create jobs on the public payroll for those who happen to be unemployed and thus reduce the apparent rate of unemployment for this group. It is true, of course, that to the extent that this program would take individuals out of the labor market, it would ease the unemployment problem. It is difficult to believe, however, that anyone seriously thinks that the creation of make-work projects, by administrative order is in any way, other than pure semantics, a solution to the problem of youth unemployment.

---

[2] "The Civilian Conservation Corps" Recommendations of the American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, 1940, p. 11.

[3] Ibid. p. 9.

[4] Ibid., pp. 16–17.

Another objection to this program is that it distorts traditional views as to individual responsibility for employment. Finding employment is generally considered a responsibility of the individual while the function of the Government is limited to providing a climate conducive to industrial growth and expansion and to individual development. The philosophy underlying this proposal, however, appears to be that the Government should assume responsibility both for creating jobs and for tailoring them to the needs and qualifications of specific groups of individuals.

There appears to be no justification for centralization in the Federal Government of a vast program of community helps under the guise of a solution to the unemployment problem. Such programs sap individual initiative and self-reliance, they inhibit the development of a feeling of pride and accomplishment in their work on the part of individuals concerned, and they impose an intolerable burden on both individuals and industry who will be expected to underwrite these ventures by accepting higher tax burdens.

I should also like to note that the objectives of on-the-job training and the continuance of school programs established in title II seem to duplicate the programs already available under such authority as the Manpower Development and Training Act, the programs of the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education and those provided for in the National Education Improvement Act. For example, the Labor Department has recently announced the initiation of demonstration projects under the Manpower Development and Training Act that will provide training as industrial draftsmen, X-ray and laboratory technicians, skilled garment workers and other occupations.

In sum, then, this program appears to have the twin deficiencies of failing to provide a meaningful solution to the unemployment problem and of creating unnecessary and burdensome make-work programs that destroy individual initiative and self-respect. For these reasons, our association opposes this proposed legislation.

THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS

Both the program of the Youth Conservation Corps and that of the local area youth employment program provide for a substantial extension of Federal authority in the educational process. The Youth Conservation Corps program appears to anticipate the development of "a system of training and educational services" wholly under Federal control and without reference to State and local programs. The local area youth employment program anticipates the use of local school facilities by enrollees but contains an implicit budgetary control by the Department of Labor.

The position of our association in regard to Federal aid to, or participation in, the educational process is well known and has been presented to committees of Congress frequently in the past. Briefly, we believe that the framework of education in this country should be the exclusive responsibility of the States and should be free of Federal intervention. In our opinion, neither the provision of education, the promotion of educational content, nor financial participation in State or local school systems is the business of the Federal Government.

Clearly the programs proposed in this bill are in opposition to these views. While we recognize and are fully sympathetic to the seriousness of the unemployment problem among some younger people we do not regard it as sufficiently drastic to justify reversing or making an exception to views which we have developed as a result of investigation and discussion over an extended period of time.

We must conclude, therefore, that even by itself this aspect provides a compelling reason for opposing this legislation.

AN ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM

In recent years two approaches have been developed to a solution of the problem of unemployment among youth. One emphasizes working with the individual to insure that he is qualified for, aware of, and able to take advantage of available employment opportunities. The other stresses the need for increasing the total number of employment opportunities in the economy through a heightened rate of economic growth.

The National Association of Manufacturers gives greatest weight to the latter approach. We recognize the need for adequate training and motivation of the individual. We also realize that jobs must exist before any degree of skill can be translated into productive activity and individual earning power. Accordingly, our analysis emphasizes the need for creation of an ever-growing number of jobs in the economy and we rely on existing education institutions to provide necessary training.

This approach appears well suited to current conditions. Although there would probably be general agreement that there is room for constructive improvement in our educational system, my contacts with employers do not reveal a degree of dissatisfaction that warrants an important extension of Federal influence in the educational process or the establishment of a separate Federal system. At the same time, the present level of unemployment among youth clearly indicates the lack of a sufficient number of job openings.

In my opinion, therefore, a solution to the problem of unemployed youth can best be achieved by adopting programs that will increase the rate of growth in the years immediately ahead. As the President pointed out in his 1963 Economic Report (p. xii):

"Yet past experience tells us that only sustained major increases in production can reemploy the jobless members of today's labor force, create job opportunities for the 2 million young men and women entering the labor market each year, and produce new jobs as fast as technological change destroys old ones."

In the context of rapid economic expansion and an ample number of employment opportunities it can be confidently expected, on the basis of generations of experience, that the educational system will adapt its programs to whatever needs emerge.

I recognize that consideration of specific programs that will insure a more rapid rate of economic growth is not the concern of this committee and I shall not presume upon your time to discuss the problem at length. I should like to note, however, that the three elements which are common to industry's decisions and thus are key factors in stimulating or retarding the rate of economic change are profit opportunity, capital investment, and the assumption of risk. For several years profit performance has been unsatisfactory, reflecting, in part, the steady upward trend of wage costs. Capital formation has been blocked by the steep graduation of individual tax rates and the excessive top rate of corporate tax. And, in some cases, burdensome intrusions by overzealous Government officials have created an unwillingness to accept risk.

In its current session, the Congress is being urged to take action aimed at reducing unemployment and reducing the barriers to investment through tax rate reform. I feel that proper tax rate reform will prove highly constructive and effective in stimulating the rate of economic growth and reducing the level of unemployment among youth. Our association is striving to achieve this objective by endorsement of the concepts in the Herlong-Baker bills. I urge you to support them.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 11, 1963]

NOT THE CCC AGAIN

Thirty years ago this country, engulfed in a cataclysmic depression, turned to such innovations as the Civilian Conservation Corps for a way out. In that period of massive unemployment, the CCC was a desperation move, one of the emergency strokes dreamed up by the New Deal to stem the receding tide of prosperity.

If there were few who questioned the logic of a "make work" program in those dark days, there are many who wonder whether a CCC-type Youth Conservation Corps (a high-priority administration goal) should be considered even as a stopgap for today's comparatively low-scale unemployment. And this holds true, we think, despite President Kennedy's most recent appeal for enactment of his youth opportunties bill. Among those who have their fingers crossed on this proposal is Dr. Austin S. Murphy, director of the National Association of Manufacturers' Education Department.

Testifying before a Senate Labor Subcommittee, Dr. Murphy raised many questions, among them: (1) Would there be enough volunteers between 16 and 22 to make the corps worthwhile? (2) With no Army officers such as directed the CCC, would there be adequate and competent camp supervisory personnel? (3) Would a corps encourage more school dropouts? (4) Would the sociopsychological effect cause the enrollee to become "a potential member of the hard-core unemployed rather than a productive and useful member of society?"

Whatever its value, the CCC won no prizes for character building. That was indicated by the fact (Dr. Murphy noted) that nearly 500,000 youths, or one-fifth of the corps, washed out through desertion or for disciplinary reasons. In short, Dr. Murphy found the whole idea of make-work by Government fiat reprehensible and destructive of individual initiative and self-reliance in seeking employment.

He added:

"Finding employment is generally considered a responsibility of the individual while the function of the Government is limited to providing a climate conducive to industrial growth and expansion and to individual development. The philosophy underlying this proposal, however, appears to be that the Government should assume responsibility both for creating jobs and for tailoring them to the needs and qualifications of specific groups of individuals. The solution suggested here of increasing public payrolls to reduce unemployment will, in my opinion, inevitably worsen our problem rather than serving to provide a meaningful solution."

The real solution, Dr. Murphy suggested, can be found in the Herlong-Baker tax rate reform bills. Unlike the administration proposal, the NAM-supported plan stresses sharp reductions in corporation as well as upper and middle personal income tax brackets during the first stages of a 5-year program. This approach, NAM believes, would stimulate economic growth and create new jobs. Of course, it does not necessarily follow that the NAM is right or that its recommendations, if adopted, would produce the needed jobs. But its approach seems more promising than a revival on a small scale of the old CCC.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, those who seek to bring into being the proposed legislation and secure its final enactment into law are attempting to weld together two aims to achieve a twin goal. First, we are intensely interested in the conservation of the human resources of youth—often the disadvantaged youth—of the United States. Second, we are most earnest in our efforts to bring about the conservation of the natural resources of water and woodland in our Republic.

I had thought that this afternoon I might speak of the period when I had joined with other legislators in the other body in the 1930's to bring the Civilian Conservation Corps into being. I shall not allow myself to indulge in that nostalgia.

Mr. President, again the Senate is confronted with the responsibility to bring forth legislation which will effect partial remedy for some of the hundreds of thousands of young people in America whose lives have been denied a sense of purpose and direction.

For 7 years the eloquent senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has given leadership in this effort to weld into one legislative program the two aims of conservation of the human resources of our youth and conservation of the natural resources of water and woodland. For the past 4 years I have had the privilege of being closely allied in this task with my colleague from Minnesota and with the capable senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who conducted the hearings on the pending measure and who guided S. 1 through to its favorable report by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

As chairman of the former Special Subcommittee on the Youth Conservation Corps, and as floor manager of the Youth Conservation Corps bill which passed the Senate in 1959, I have deep and fundamental convictions about the importance of this measure in regard to both the rehabilitation of our disadvantaged young people and the conservation of our water and forest resources. And with the exception of the larger enrollment authorized by the earlier bill, I believe that S. 1 is a better measure than that passed in this forum in 1959.

It has been broadened by means of title II to include the provisions of the State and community youth employment program. It has received the benefit of further reflection by Members of the Senate, and further hearings and expert testimony. And finally, it has benefited from the advice of experts in the various departments of the executive branch, in an administration which supports the measure rather than opposing it, as did the previous administration.

In view of the many thousands of man-hours which have, during the past 4 years, been invested in the framing of the Youth Employment Act, it disturbs me that the minority report would employ such trivial and specious terms in its attack on the bill. Regardless of one's views on this legislation, one might hope that a committee report, whether of the majority or the minority, would address itself to the substance of the bill rather than deal in ridicule and fear fostering.

In illustration, I shall quote one short paragraph from the minority views at this time, Mr. President, before turning to the positive features of the pending measure. But this passage is, I believe, revealing of the general lack of objective inquiry or factual discipline on the part of the minority in its so-called report on S. 1. Writing of the lack of compulsory allotments from the pay of enrollees to their parents, the minority moves into a flight from reality:

> These aspects of the Youth Corps smack ominously of totalitarianism. Removing young people from their homes without the permission of their parents and placing them in a Federal corps is reminiscent of the Hitler youth programs of Nazi Germany and bears a striking resemblance to the various Young Communist organizations. The Soviet Union's Young Pioneers seem particularly close to the proposed Youth Conservation Corps in both name and spirit.

I remember that in 1937 the very distinguished senior Senator from Virginia who now sits in this body [Mr. BYRD], then a Member of this body, voted for the Civilian Conservation Corps, as did also the able senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], my good friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who now presides over the Senate Armed Services Committee and the highly respected senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and President pro tempore of the Senate.

I remember also that in that same year the equally distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], then a Member of the House of Representatives, voted for this legislation. He was joined by other Members of that body who are now members of the Senate, including the two eminent Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and [Mr. SPARKMAN], as well as the very able senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I also remember that Representative Clifton Woodrum, of Virginia, in 1939, after the Civilian Conservation Corps had been in being for more than 5 years, requested an additional $50 million. Why was that? Was it because the program had failed? No. It was because in 5 years a distinguished Virginian like Cliff Woodrum, a man who was interested in the dollar but also interested in human resources, joined in the effort.

I have gone back these few moments to indicate that some of the present opposition was not then opposed when the Executive order created the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1933, by the greatness of the vision of the then President of the United States. This became, with the action by the Congress in 1937, the original act and the precedent for the pending measure.

I remind Senators that the vote in May of 1937 in the House of Representatives was 389 to 7 in favor of the Civilian Conservation Corps; and in the Senate of the United States in 1937 the vote was 67 to 2 that the Civilian Conservation Corps should be created.

Why do I go back and give the Senate these votes? Because there has been a direct attack upon title I of the bill. It was all we had in 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939. We had no title II. We had only title I. Yet an attack has been made by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] upon title I. Attacks have been made by others upon title I.

I say sincerely that it would not only be wrong, but it would be less than realistic if the amendment which will be offered to cut out title I from the bill should receive a majority vote of the Members of the Senate.

To return to the quotation I cited a moment ago in the minority report, Mr. President, it tests the credulity of serious-minded men and women to suppose that one can really perceive such a threat implicit in the practice of making allotments home on a voluntary rather than a compulsory basis. Especially is this so when the tender parent-child relationship, invoked by the minority report, may, in fact, often be one between a son and an irresponsible father who would use the allotment to continue his dereliction. But I shall not unduly labor this relatively minor point. I have emphasized this passage only to indicate that the minority view presents something less than a searching and scholarly analysis of the pending measure.

Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has offered a systematic explanation of the different provisions of S. 1. I shall not cover the same material. However, I do draw the attention of my Senate colleagues to some of these points in more detail.

There are approximately 800,000—though some estimates range as high as 1 million—young Americans who are out of school and out of work. Not only is this age group expanding rapidly due to the high birth rate of the late war years and early postwar years, but the unemployment rate among these young people is also increasing.

In 1953, the rate of unemployment among youths 18 to 19 years old was 6 percent. Since 1954, 1 out of every 10 male youths in this age bracket has been unemployed, with every recession being followed by leveling off at a higher rate of unemployment. This is not fictional—it is factual. Thus, in 1962, the unemployment rate for the age bracket of 18 to 19 years old was 13 percent for white males and 22 percent for nonwhite. For the overall age group of 16 to 21, the most recent figures indicate an unemployment rate of above 15 percent. Yet, depressing as these figures are, they do not fully indicate the intensity of the problem as it is registered in certain locales.

I see on my left the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee of the Senate [Mr. MCNAMARA]. May I refer to his city of Detroit? In one Detroit neighborhood, of approximately 125,000 persons, 70 percent of the youth between the ages of 16 and 21 were out of school and unemployed, according to a recent survey. This neighborhood certainly is not unique among the metropolitan areas of our country. It is gratifying to know that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and other Senators who come from metropolitan areas, who know the problems of unemployment in Detroit, in Akron, in Chicago, and other cities, are among the most ardent supporters of the pending legislation.

This deficit in the fulfillment of the needs of our young people is matched, Mr. President, by the large and accumulating backlog of needs in the field of resource conservation. Of the more than 770 million acres of land in the public domain, 260 million are in national parks and forests and 110 million are in State, county, and other local public ownership. In West Virginia there are more than 1,824,000 acres in national forest lands. Our State parks comprise approximately 76,000 acres. These areas are scenic wonderlands and tourists will increasingly visit the mountain domain. The Governor of West Virginia, who favors this bill, has written that the facilities and natural resources in our State are available.

It is estimated that in those lands under the management of the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture the backlog of conservation needs for the next decade would provide work for 41,000 men annually in the national forests, and 45,000 men annually in parks, refuges, reservations, and other public lands.

Among all classes of forest ownership, according to Secretary of Interior Udall, we "now have 40 million acres requiring reforestation, and not less than 150 million more than are overcrowded, insect-infested, diseased, or are of low quality, second-growth timber." The importance of meeting these needs is not a matter of mere sentiment or theory, Mr. President; it is a question of plain economics and commonsense.

In the southeastern United States alone, there are over 11 million acres of publicly owned forests. Again, to quote Secretary Udall:

> If these lands could be thinned of valueless second-growth scrub oak, thereby releasing the young pine for normal development, pulpwood harvest could start in 10 years and continue on an annual rotation basis. In these humid States, where pine makes rapid growth, the expenditure of $3,000 on improvement of timber stands will produce, in 10 years, a revenue of $5,000.

I would suggest that this is a fair return on the investment, especially when viewed in conjunction with the many other tangible and intangible benefits to the young people who would participate in this activity.

This is the program, Mr. President, which the minority refers to as a "throwback to the thirties," one of the "desperation procedures that may have been appropriate in the 1930's." Presumably, because the CCC worked with such outstanding success and almost universal acclaim in the 1930's, this fact alone would, according to the minority, negate the validity of the YCC as an approach to the problems of our unemployed youth today. I confess myself somewhat at a loss to understand this line of reasoning, especially as it emanates from proponents of a conservative economic and political philosophy. For it has always been my belief that the political conservative attempts to conserve the tried and tested methods and values of the past. Surely, the experience of 9 years with the CCC, with an enrollment of 2,500,000 to 3 million, and more than 20 years in which to follow the record of CCC alumni would remove this program from the limbo of radical experiments.

The validity of the approach of the YCC does not rest on re-creating circumstances identical with those of the 1930's. Let us hope that the minority does not insist on this. For in addition to the basic economic improvements created through reforestation, fire protection, seeding, maintenance of park recreation areas, and a host of other activities, the values realized by the young men are of a fundamental and enduring nature and are just as meaningful in the context of the 1960's as in that of the 1930's.

The late Gen. George Catlett Marshall, one of the most eminent of Americans, was generally regarded as having some knowledge of the character of men. As Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, he was closely involved in the supervision of the CCC. In an appearance before a Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations on May 31, 1940, in his capacity as Chief of Staff, General Marshall had this to say of the CCC:

> My connection with this organization has been one of the most inspiring experiences which I have ever had. I told Mr. Fechner * * * I thought it was one of the greatest moves we had ever made in this country, and that it was a most unique movement.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that General Marshall was ever regarded as a wild-eyed liberal, profligate spender, or man of desperation.

As a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives during the entire New Deal, and as an early proponent of the CCC, I remember well the circumstances that generated that program. The record is replete with individual testimonials to its value, such as that I have quoted from General Marshall. And the record of the many hearings on the YCC is rich with the testimony of those who perceive similar values in the measure which is now pending before the Senate. To illustrate, I quote from a letter addressed to me in 1959 when I was serving as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Youth Conservation Corps, a letter from a juvenile judge in the State of Oregon:

> As a juvenile judge of ——— County, I am deeply interested in your YCC bill which presently is in your committee. It was my good fortune to spend several years in the CCC camps for which you helped draft the legislation back in the 1930's.
>
> Personally, I can think of no motivating force that could equal the inspiration which I received as a result of this camp experience. Although 25 years have lapsed since I was first involved in the program, I want to personally acknowledge to you my thanks for helping draft the camp program which I am sure has left an everlasting and inspirational impression upon the minds of many thousands of our citizens. It gives me great pleasure to know that you again are associated with a similar program, especially at a time when people in all walks of life are wondering about working opportunities and rehabilitation methods for helping our youth.

This, Mr. President, is the testimony of a former CCC enrollee who is now a distinguished juvenile judge. I believe he speaks with some authority on this subject. I believe his testimony, and that of thousands of others who have benefited from the CCC, reveals the travesty of the minority statement that dispenses with this program in terms of "romantic images of sunburned, well-fed and happy young men tramping through the woods dressed in uniforms."

The minority also extends this line of attack in assailing the presumed inadequacy of the pending measure as a means of increasing the employability of the enrollees.

> The underlying purpose of the program—

States the minority report—

> is said to be the improvement of the employment prospects of our youth. Supplying them with suntans and an appreciation of outdoor living simply won't help them find jobs.

By adroitly amputating the statements of Secretary of Labor Wirtz and ignoring much of the testimony submitted in the hearings, the minority makes it appear that its opinion is substantiated by Secretary Wirtz.

Nothing could be further from the facts. In addition to instilling such fundamental habits as self-discipline, a sense of responsibility, the capacity to work with others, and a sense of group morale—not inconsiderable factors in themselves in improving the employability of a young man.

Title I of the Youth Employment Act will provide the opportunity for training in such skills as automotive repairing, carpentry, construction equipment operation, electrical wiring, masonry, metalworking, plumbing, surveying and mapping, truck driving, and many other skills. The young men will not, of course, be journeymen in these skills after 6 months or a year in the corps, but neither would they be journeymen after a similar period in any school of vocational education or union apprenticeship program. To refer once again to the testimony of General Marshall regarding the CCC:

> They have companies that are working everyday operating bulldozers, tractors, trucks, road graders. They have dynamite explosive squads; they have bridge builders, and at the same time, what is a tremendous advantage, they have a going organization to feed them, house them, look after their health, and generally administer them.

Finally, Mr. President, in addition to the skills which will be employed in the actual operations of the Youth Conservation Corps, I draw the attention of my colleagues to page 542 of the hearings on S. 1, where there are listed some 59 subjects which can be taught at the camps through accredited home study schools and the Armed Forces Institute.

On the question of the average enrollee costs of title I, a subject which moves the minority to some of its more impassioned rhetoric, administration experts and committee staff members have, after hearings conducted over 4 years on three different proposals, arrived at an average camp construction cost of $250,000 and annual enrollee costs of

$3,985. Despite the careful analysis and frequent reexamination of these figures, the minority would substitute a camp construction figure of $385,000, based on the experience in Pennsylvania with an embryonic program of 3 camps ranging in capacity from 14 to 40 enrollees.

By ignoring the already existing and partially prepared facilities of camps listed on pages 526-529 of the hearings, and by selecting the now discarded tentative figures of the administration in 1961, the minority arrives at an average enrollee cost of from $4,000 to $12,000, which is then compared, in a process of irrelevance, to the $2,300 cost of maintaining a young man at Harvard. To pass by the fact that $2,300 is but a fraction of the total annual cost of maintaining and educating a young man at Harvard, a much more relevant comparison would be with the $25,000 estimated by Prof. Charles Shireman, of the University of Chicago, to be the costs to society for sending a juvenile delinquent through a succession of correctional institutions.

One should hardly need to point out to the minority that the choice offered the Senate, and American society, is not between enrolling these young men in a Youth Conservation Corps or Harvard. Rather, it is quite possibly a choice between the Youth Conservation Corps, and thus a sense of purpose and direction, or a life of aimlessly loitering on the street corners of our cities and towns and eventually drifting into a pattern of delinquency.

Yet on this point, also, the minority seems to have entered the world of make believe. In the effort to discredit title I the minority has completely reversed the thrust of a program which is designed, in part, to prevent delinquency, and has substituted instead the image of camps which would provide harbor for hardened young criminals and even murderers. This fearsome picture has been created almost solely out of the lack of reference in the bill to the term "good character" as a prerequisite for enrollment.

As is known by persons familiar with the bill, the original draft of S. 1 contained the provision of good character, as did the earlier measures presented to the Senate. The phrase was not lightly dispensed with by the majority. On the contrary, it was deleted only after considerable discussion in committee and in the light of particularly poignant testimony offered by some young people in hearings chaired by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The deletion was accepted by the majority on the grounds that the restricting phrase might disqualify some young people who had experienced only minor brushes with juvenile authorities. But, as the minority well knows, the legislative history of this measure clearly reveals that the intent of Congress is that the YCC not be used as a dumping ground for incorrigibles. The bill is phrased so that experienced administrators and youth workers will be allowed to use their own discretion in the important work of youth rehabilitation and the prevention of juvenile delinquency. This feature of the program is but one aspect of the multifaceted approach of this administration to the problem of the prevention, control, and eradication of juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, the minority has had at least 4 years to come forth with substantive and constructive proposals to meet the burgeoning problems of our unemployed and disadvantaged youth. I grow weary of this constant nay saying and nit picking when proposals such as the one now before the Senate are made by the majority. The problems of this segment of American youth and the problems of our unmet conservation needs have been held under searching inquiry during the 4 years since the first YCC bill was passed by this body. Questions of camp costs, staffing, educational provisions, contributions to employability, and character building have all been raised. In my judgment they have been adequately answered in the hearings, and sound and prudent solutions are offered in the pending proposal. It is now time—and past time—for action.

I urge the Senate to pass the bill and the House to concur in its passage. We already have the pledge of the President of the United States that he will immediately sign the measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk. I ask that in lieu of its being read, the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 42, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

"REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO GRANTS TO PRIVATE NONPROFIT AGENCIES

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary shall, immediately after making any grant under this title, or otherwise making available (directly or indirectly) funds appropriated for carrying out the purposes of this title, to any private nonprofit agency, submit to the Congress a full and complete report concerning—

"(1) such private nonprofit agency, including (but not limited to) (A) the number, identity, and salary, of its officers, directors, and principal employees, (B) when, by whom, and for what purposes such agency was organized, and (C) other relevant data with respect to the organization, its functions, purposes, and methods of operation, and

"(2) the amount of such grant or of such funds, the purposes for which such grant was made or such funds were made available, and any conditions or limitations imposed with respect to such grant or to such funds by the Secretary.

"(b) Any audit reports made by or to any instrumentality of the Federal Government on the expenditures of any such agency which has received any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title shall be available to any Member of Congress upon request of such Member.

"(c) (1) No private nonprofit agency which is organized or incorporated after the date of enactment of this Act shall be eligible to receive (directly or indirectly) any funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title if any of the incorporators or individuals who organized such agency is, at the time such agency applies for any such funds, a Member of Congress or an officer of the Executive Branch of the Government who is required to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(2) No nonprofit agency shall be eligible to receive, directly or indirectly, any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title, if at the time such agency applies for such funds, or at any time thereafter, any of the officers, directors, or principal employees of such agency is a Member of Congress or an officer of the Executive Branch of the Government who is required to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

On page 42, line 22, strike out "205" and insert "206".

On page 43, line 19, strike out "206" and insert "207".

On page 45, line 9, strike out "207" and insert "208".

On page 46, line 17, strike out "208" and insert "209".

On page 48, line 12, strike out "209" and insert "210".

On page 48, line 20, strike out "210" and insert "211".

On page 49, line 8, strike out "211" and insert "212".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is—

First, to require that immediately after any grant is made under this title to any private nonprofit agency a full and complete report be submitted to Congress giving the name of the company, a list of its directors, employees, and so forth, and their salaries along with the purpose for which such grant was applied.

Second, to provide that funds made available under all grants shall be subject to audit and that all such audit reports shall then be available to any Member of Congress upon his request.

Third, to provide that no nonprofit agency shall be eligible to receive, directly or indirectly, any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title, if at the time such agency applies for such funds or at any time thereafter, any of the officers, directors, or principal employees of such agency is a Member of Congress or an officer of the executive branch of the Government who is required to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

I understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is in charge of the bill, is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has been kind enough to show me a draft of the amendment. We have gone over the text of it together. I think the purpose he has in mind, which is sound, is to prevent undue influence on the part of Members of Congress or the executive branch in the granting of funds under title II, to nonprofit organizations.

I ask the Senator, because the amendment was not read in full, whether, as he agreed, subsection (b) has been stricken.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. The amendment is exactly as we have agreed upon it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am prepared to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I too, have seen the amendment. It is an excellent proposal. I am happy to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert in the RECORD excerpts from the audit reports of two earlier grants which were approved under Public Law 87-274, the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1962.

These two reports show the need for more careful auditing and supervision of these grants.

For 2 months I have been trying to get copies of the audit reports on the estimated 18 to 20 grants that were approved last year under the above authority, but thus far I have been furnished with only these 2 partial reports.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL REPORT ON THE AUDIT OF HARLEM YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES UNLIMITED, INC.

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, March 6, 1963.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In response to your telephone request to Mr. Bernard Russell, I am enclosing our regional auditor's report of his examination of the financial records of Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc.

For your information, there is also enclosed a chronology of events leading up to the visit of our regional auditor. In all grant programs, we are concerned that grantees follow proper financial procedures. Thus, the request for an interim financial report was followed by an examination of the financial records by our regional auditor. His report noting specific deficiencies will be followed up by a visit now scheduled for early next week to insure correction of those deficiencies. (Note copy of follow-up letter to Dr. Kenneth Clark, executive director.) This visit will include the regional auditor and members of the staff of the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.

I hope this answers your questions.

Sincerely,
IVAN A. NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary.

FEBRUARY 8, 1963.

AUDIT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY GRANT—HARYOU

At the request of the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Juvenile Delinquency we have made a review of the fiscal transactions of Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., Demonstration Project No. 62008, as reported on a preliminary financial statement for the period July 1, 1962, through November 30, 1962. Although we made the usual verification of the actuality and accuracy of expenditures and fund balances, our chief attention was directed toward the propriety of expenditures to date and acceptability of the fiscal and related procedures now in use. We made no attempt to evaluate program operations or personnel qualifications since these areas are outside the scope of our competency. We were accompanied during the review by Mr. ——— of the Special Assistant's staff.

We invite your attention to the following:

1. Mr. C. L. Alexander was appointed program director August 15, 1962, at an annual salary of $13,500. Available documentation showed that his services were terminated January 15, 1963, but that he is to continue receiving his full salary through March 15, 1963. According to Dr. Clark, executive director, this payment ($2,250) represents terminal leave. The attached statement of personnel policies makes no provision for this expenditure.

2. The budget includes a listing of positions and salaries. Comparison of payroll data with the approved budget is shown on the attached schedule. It will be noted that although the budget provided only one consultant, four positions with variations of that title have been filled, three on a part-time basis.

In connection with the position of chief project consultant (executive director), a special meeting of the Haryou executive committee on October 2, 1962, took the following actions.

(1) The salary of an executive director was set at $20,000 a year.[1]

(2) Dr. Kenneth B. Clark was retained on a prorated basis at a salary of $20,000 a year to be drawn against the item in the budget for project director.[2]

(3) An additional fund of $2,000 was made available to Dr. Clark to meet special demands of his position.[3]

3. Legal fees amounting to $2,653.75 (see attached invoice dated November 27, 1962) involved services before and after July 1, 1962, the approved beginning date for this project. The estimated dates of the various services were based on information supplied by the attorney during our visit to the project. Of the total amount billed, $900 was paid by the Harlem Neighborhoods Association and the remainder ($1,753.75) expended from the Haryou Federal Fund account. There was no other data available to support the equity of this allocation of the costs of legal services. No attempt was made to relate the amount of the fee charged to the value of the services rendered.

4. The statement of conditions governing these grants provides that the funds may not be used for entertainment. It is not clear whether the following expenditures fall within that prohibition:

Haryou Open House—Nov. 20, 1962:	
Catering	$350.00
Flowers	63.20
Invitations	56.00
Total	479.20

5. The rental lease provides that the lessor (YMCA) will be responsible for arranging and erecting partitions. Despite this clause, Haryou paid the YMCA $343.25 to reimburse it for costs incurred due to partition work in the leased premises.

6. Of the 16 people on the payroll at one time or another during the period, 6 were either part-time or hourly employees. Nevertheless, no time, leave or attendance records were kept.

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

Dr. KENNETH CLARK,
Haryou
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. CLARK: We have just received the auditor's report of the audit conducted of your books on January 29, 1963. A number of deficiencies were noted, including the following:

1. An inordinate amount of terminal leave payment for the resigning program director.

2. The listing of positions and salaries is not consistent with the same listing on the approved budget.

3. No attempt was made to relate the amount of the legal fees to the value of services rendered.

4. There was question about the expenditure for entertainment.

5. There was question about the reimbursement to the lessor for construction work done on the premises.

6. Inadequate attendance records were kept.

Because of these and other deficiencies noted, it is imperative that I meet with you and our regional auditor at your earliest possible convenience to discuss remedying these deficiencies.

I look forward to hearing from you very soon.

Sincerely yours,
BERNARD RUSSELL,
Director, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.

PARTIAL REPORT ON THE AUDIT OF ASSOCIATED COMMUNITY TEAMS, INC.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1963.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your letter dated February 7, 1963, to Secretary Celebrezze, regarding expenditures made by Associated Community Teams, Inc. The delay in response, as I explained by telephone, was due to the fact that we were awaiting an interim financial audit of the project expenditures which was initiated on January 8, 1963.

The following is in response to your questions:

1. Total expenditures to November 30, 1963	$29,296.67
Funds obligated	6,337.89
Total	35,634.56

Questions 2 through 5 are answered in the two enclosures, "Summary of Salary Expenditures" and "Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements."

6. Amount of private capital pledged, $9,315.

7. Amount of private capital advanced, none.

I trust this answers your questions.

Sincerely yours,
IVAN A. NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary.

Associated Community Teams, Inc., statement of cash receipts and disbursements Aug. 2, 1962, to Nov. 30, 1962

Receipts:	
Grant from U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	$62,500.00
Disbursements:	
Salaries, gross	16,537.00
Rent	7,155.74
Office supplies and expenses:	
Stationery	985.09
Repairs	140.39
Moving expense	50.00
Miscellaneous	189.50
Total	1,364.98

---

[1] No such position or salary provided in the budget.

[2] According to Dr. Clark, he is employed at Haryou on a one-half time basis. See item 6.

[3] No charges were made to this fund during the audit period. However, on Dec. 11, 1962, a payment was made to Dr. Clark ($46) as reimbursement for expenses incurred in August and November of 1962. As indicated on the attached memorandum dated Nov. 30, 1962, this amount was charged against the special $2,000 fund.

Associated Community Teams, Inc., statement of cash receipts and disbursements Aug. 2, 1962, to Nov. 30, 1962—Continued

Disbursements—Continued	
Telephone	$369.52
Luncheons	21.50
Periodicals	38.44
Travel	[1] 181.55
Postage	160.31
Press and publicity	25.00
Security service	40.00
Insurance	333.92
Payroll tax expense	573.94
Consultant fees	500.00
Accounting	75.00
Rent appraisal fee	150.00
Incorporation expense	350.00
Purchase of office equipment	1,019.77
Telephone security deposit	400.00
Total	29,296.67
Less: net payroll taxes deducted	1,281.91
Total disbursements	28,014.76
Balance Nov. 30, 1962	34,485.24
As follows:	
Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.	34,460.37
Petty cash	24.87
Total	34,485.24

[1] Not staff travel but travel reimbursement for candidate as director.

OFFICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT,
February 21, 1963.

Enclosed is a copy of the audit of the Associated Community Teams, Inc., which you requested. In addition I am enclosing copies of a memorandum detailing the chronology of this audit and a letter indicating our followup of the audit.

If I can be of any further help, please feel free to call upon me.

At the request of the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Juvenile Delinquency we have made a review of the fiscal transactions of the Associated Community Teams, Inc., training project No. 63201, as reported on a preliminary financial statement for the period July 1, 1962, through November 30, 1962. Although we made the usual verification of the actuality and accuracy of expenditures and fund balances, our chief attention was directed toward the propriety of expenditures to date and acceptability of the fiscal and related procedures now in use. We made no attempt to evaluate program operations or personnel qualifications since these areas are outside the scope of our competency. We were accompanied during the review by Mr. ———— of the Special Assistant's staff.

We have the following comments:

1. Accounting system: At the time of our visit, January 30, 1963, the accounts consisted of a cash disbursements book and a check book. The last posting to the cash book was November 30, 1962. Check transactions, as reflected in the stubs, involved a number of errors which were not adjusted in any systematic way. The balance in the checking account was not carried forward after January 7, 1963. These accounts are inadequate to control the expenditures being made by this agency. When requested to prepare a statement of expenditures (as of November 30, 1962) it was necessary to call in a CPA for this purpose. The position of bookkeeper-auditor provided in the approved budget has not been filled.

2. Board of directors meetings: Although an official minute book was purchased, the formal (original) minutes were not available. Loose copies in a manila folder were provided and covered the following meetings: August 11, 16, 23; September 7, 27; October 11, November 8, 20; December 13, 20, all in 1962. After encountering a reference to a meeting on October 25, 1962, we asked about the corresponding minutes. A freshly made photocopy was given us. We were assured by Mr. Wingate, acting executive director, that the file of minutes was now complete. Other than as noted in this memorandum, no particularly significant entries were found.

3. Rent of premises: Associated Community Teams, Inc., has formally rented space (approximately 25 rooms) on the first (3,737 square feet) and second (3,917 square feet) floors of the Adam Clayton Powell Community Center on West 137th Street in New York City. The period of the lease is July 9, 1962, through December 1963 (6 months beyond the present project termination date). Use of furniture and fixtures in the space and maintenance of the premises are included in the rental which amounted to $1,155.74 for the initial period from July 9, 1962, to August 31, 1962, and $6,000 per quarter, payable in advance, for the remainder of the lease term until December 1, 1963, when a payment of $2,000 will be due. Before establishing this rate the agency obtained two appraisals of the premises. The first (Frost) resulted in a $3-per-foot estimate including furniture, utilities and maintenance. The second (Hanson) produced the same rate including janitor services but no utilities. The lease at the rate of $2,000 per month was thereafter completed.

The terms of this lease provide for $6,000 payments on September 1, December 1, 1962, March 1, June 1, 1963, etc. It should be noted that any payment on June 1, 1963, for a quarterly period will cover 2 months beyond the present approved termination date of this project.

4. Personnel: There is attached a schedule setting forth the salary data concerning personnel employed during the period of audit and comparing titles and rates of pay with the approved budget. In addition, the minutes of November 20, 1962, authorize the appointment of Mr. Carl Johnson as director of peace corps and acting project director at a salary of $15,000. This rate exceeds any of the salaries provided in the approved budget.

During the period under audit there were no time, leave or attendance records department. Some time thereafter a procedure for daily sign in and out sheets was instituted.

No procedure was in effect for formally documenting personnel actions (appointments, changes in pay, etc.). The minutes indicated Board approval of some appointments but made no mention of others.

No written statement of conditions of employment or personnel policies (leave policies, working hours, etc.) could be located.

5. Other: Two reported expenditures require future adjustment. A payment of $400 (miscellaneous) covers a deposit with the telephone company and a reported unliquidated obligation (subsequently paid—check No. 1134, $483.16) covers expenses of Mr. ————, a per diem consultant. A refund is due on this payment because only a portion of Mr. ————'s time was devoted to Associated Community Teams, Inc. According to correspondence between Associated Community Teams, Inc., and Mr. Russell of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the remainder of Mr. ————'s time is chargeable to the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

Copies of some of the Associated Community Teams, Inc., publicity material are attached for your information.

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

Mr. LIVINGSTON WINGATE,
Associated Community Teams, Inc., Adam Clayton Powell Community Center, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WINGATE: We have just received the report of our regional auditor in New York who audited your books on January 30, 1963. He notes a number of deficiencies, including the following:

1. The accounting system: The balance in the checking account was not carried forward after January 7, 1963. The last posting to the cashbook was November 30, 1962. The position of bookkeeper-auditor provided in the approval has not been filled.

2. Board of directors meetings: The formal (original) minutes were not available.

3. Rent of premises: The terms of the lease provided for payment beyond the life of the grant.

4. Personnel: Inadequate time records were kept.

These and other deficiencies noted make it important that I discuss this with you and our regional auditor at your earliest convenience. Please contact me immediately so that we can arrange this meeting for a followup on the audit.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD RUSSELL,
Director, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I speak in opposition to the bill. I shall not vote for it, for a number of reasons.

First. The bill will not result in a 5-year program entailing the expenditure of $100 million a year. It envisions a program which will last interminably, except that it might be ended by an international involvement of great consequence or by the acute distress of the Treasury of the United States. The bill provides that the act shall expire at the end of 5 years. I feel rather safe in saying that not one of the proponents has a sincere belief that at the end of 5 years the act, by expiration of time, will die. If there is to be any change at the end of 5 years, the change will be in the direction of an expanded program, rising in cost, precipitating the Federal Government into still greater debt, cheapening the dollar, and not solving the problem of youth unemployment.

Second. The bill, if passed, will cost the Federal Government at least $4,250 a year per youth to take boys, both delinquent and nondelinquent, out of local communities, where there are resident families, frequently not having an income in excess of $4,250 a year.

Certainly the program can be lauded. It can be described as one concerned with the conservation of our youth. I join with those who aim at that objective; but I respectfully submit that there are better methods of trying to solve the problem than the expenditure of $4,250 per person in the various communities of the Nation.

I have before me the statistical abstract of the United States, for the fiscal year 1962. A moment ago I listened to the argument made by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] who vigorously supports the bill. The per capita income in West Virginia is $1,674 a year. Yet, Mr. President, under the most optimistic appraisal we contemplate the expenditure of $4,250 a year to keep a 16-year-old boy at one of the contemplated camps.

Third. The bill does not contain any provision to insure fair and impartial treatment of enrollees on the basis of religious and racial background. Under the provisions of the bill to insure nondiscriminatory, nonprejudicial treatment, reliance will have to be placed on the magnanimity and fairness of those who administer the law. I concede that those who will administer it will aim to be impartial and fair; but their declarations and promises are but a poor substitute for the historic concept that ours is a government of laws, not of men.

It is argued that the Secretary of Labor is a man of magnanimity, impartiality, and objectivity. Conceding that he is, what justification is there for the Congress to abdicate its responsibility in connection with the passage of law, by substituting therefor the minds of individuals?

For the past several years I have listened to the argument, "Do not write into law what you expect the law to be, but depend upon those who will administer it to be fair, just, and impartial."

Mr. President, I cannot subscribe to such an operation. If we demand objective, impartial treatment on the basis of racial and religious background, the way to achieve it is to write it into the law.

Fourth. The calculation of the cost of the program is hazy and confused, and obviously is not supported by the admitted facts. On page 29 of the report is set forth the testimony given 2 years ago; namely, that the per-person cost of the 1961 program was to be $12,297. On page 12 of the report is set forth a compilation of figures prepared by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. In his opinion, it will cost $3,985 per enrollee, without some incidental costs. When they are included, I have calculated that the figure will be $4,250 per enrollee.

Mr. President, I cannot understand what figures were used when the bill was formerly before us and when the per capita cost was said to be $12,297, whereas the present figure is $3,985.

I heard the Senator from Pennsylvania argue that the figures submitted by the Secretaries of the various departments must be accepted as sacrosanct. However, a mere use of pencil and paper will demonstrate that the calculations made by the Secretary of Labor and by others cannot be supported. If the figures they gave are correct, under title I there will not be 15,000 enrollees and under title II there will not be 60,000 enrollees.

Fifth. The program envisioned under the bill deals with symptoms of unemployment, not with the real causes. We have listened to arguments about opportunities to stimulate employment. It is argued that this can be done by reducing taxes and by spending more money at the Federal level. Mr. President, the arguments that employment will be stimulated by reducing taxes and spending more money at the Federal level are based upon opinions expressed and principles declared, I believe, by the economist, Mr. Keynes. However, although he argued that these two modes will help relieve unemployment in times of depression, he included a third factor, which is completely disregarded by the proponents of the proposed tax cut and of increased spending, which are urged by the proponents of the bill; and that third element is that when one tries to stimulate employment by cutting taxes and increasing public spending, it is necessary to insure the stability of prices and wages.

But it is impossible to reduce taxes, increase spending, and at the same time permit the cost of goods and services to continue to rise without always standing still; and that is exactly what we are doing: We are contemplating taxing less, spending more, and subscribing to cost increases and wage increases which have no relationship to productivity, but would neutralize and destroy every measure taken by the Government to relieve unemployment.

Within the past 2 months the Administrator of the World Bank, Per Jacobsson, made two statements on this subject.

He very effectively pointed out that if we desire to put people to work, by reducing taxes, and increasing spending, we must not forget the responsibility of stabilizing wages and prices.

I ask the question, to what extent have we in this Congress tried to stabilize prices? Everything we have done has tended to lift them far beyond a justified increase commensurate with increased productivity. Since this program will deal only with symptoms and not with causes, I will not support it.

Sixth. The bill, if passed, instead of inducing youth to remain in school, will act as an incentive for them to depart from school.

Seventh. While the bill on its face is a public works bill, it contains provisions in title II requiring the payment to enrollees of the age of 16 to 22 of the same regular wage scale and work wage paid to adult employees in the area. I cannot subscribe to that provision in the bill. The provision is found on page 41 of the measure. I should like to read it:

> SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to approve for assistance under this title any State, county, municipal, or local programs submitted hereunder if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—
>
> (5) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment are appropriate and reasonably consistent with the rates and conditions applicable with respect to comparable work in the locality.

I interpret that language to mean that as a condition of a right to obtain grants, the wage scales and the working conditions fixed shall be those that prevail in the community where the project is to be promoted.

Finally, I am opposed to the bill because the Federal Government ought not to enter this field. As has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate on a number of occasions, the debt of the Federal Government is $305 billion. According to the figures submitted by the administration, in the fiscal year 1964 we shall have a deficit amounting to about $11 billion. In my judgment, the deficit will be far more than $11 billion. The purchasing power of the dollar has dropped from 100 cents in 1941 to about 45 cents in 1963. Our short-term foreign creditors are calling upon our gold in payment of their claims against our Government. Those conditions are too menancing for me to support the proposed program, the cost of which cannot be predicted.

It is argued that the program worked well in the 1930's. However, a different condition prevails in 1963 than existed in the 1930's. I am not one who will join those who say that conditions in 1963 are similar to the conditions that prevailed when the Civilian Conservation Corps was adopted in the 1930's.

Now, Mr. President, coming to a different topic, I send to the desk four amendments, which deal with different parts of the bill. If agreed to, they would write into the bill provisions that there shall be no discriminatory adverse treatment of enrollees on the basis of religion, race, or creed. I ask that they be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, what did the Senator from Ohio say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is seeking recognition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the clerk will continue to call the roll.

The clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 48 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. TOWER obtained the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Senate agreed to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] be reconsidered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk amendments to S. 1, and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed on page 30, line 7, to strike the period, insert a colon and the following:

> *Provided*, That the Director may exclude from enrollment such classes of persons as he may consider detrimental to the well-being or welfare of the Corps except that no person shall be excluded on account of race, color, or creed.

On page 43, line 3, strike the period, insert a colon and the following:

> *Provided*, That the Secretary may exclude from enrollment such classes of persons as he may consider detrimental to the well-being or welfare of the Corps except that no person shall be excluded on account of race, color, or creed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. TOWER. Yes; or as one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. TOWER. The effect of the amendments would be simply to place in the bill what was essentially the language in the bill establishing the CCC camps. It is similar to the language of the act establishing the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], who is handling the pending bill on the floor of the Senate, what the attitude is on his side about the amendments. It is my belief that some form of rapprochement has been arrived at.

Mr. CLARK. In my opinion, while I believe the amendments are unnecessary, they do no particular harm to the bill, and I am perfectly willing to take them to conference. I will accept the amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not want to see any tags added. If the amendments are taken to conference and then kicked out on the first meeting of the conferees, all this will have proved to be an exercise in futility. I believe the Record had better show that this action means something more than taking an amendment to conference. I will not go along with any such attitude.

Mr. CLARK. Let us be candid. I will be a conferee. I will support the amendments in conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is generally understood in legislative practice that when it is said, "I will take it to conference," there is about a 90-percent chance against such an amendment remaining in a bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the Senator will not say that too many times. The Senator from Texas has offered an appropriate amendment. Similar language was contained in the basic law establishing the CCC. It is not a matter of taking the amendments to conference. It is a matter of adopting them. I congratulate the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then it is understood that this is something more than merely taking an amendment to conference.

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And that it will not be dumped at the very first meeting of the conferees.

Mr. CLARK. It is my intention to support the expression of the sense of the Senate.

Mr. TOWER. Does not the Senator feel that we should have a yea-and-nay vote on it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. HRUSKA. Would it not be a better understanding of the sense of the Senate in expressing its view on the amendment if there were a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are all men of experience in the Senate. We are all men of good faith and integrity. Why not have a voice vote on it? I would suggest a voice vote, unless there is some intention to delay the Senate, and to take extra time in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. TOWER. I have no intention of engaging in any dilatory tactics. I would like to be in Texas tomorrow, but I believe it is important that the sense of the Senate be recorded, so that the question may not be dealt with lightly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not the Senator feel that the sense of the Senate is recorded just as well by a voice vote?

Mr. TOWER. The Senator has had many years of experience in this body. Certainly he knows that a yea-and-nay vote carries much more weight in reflecting the sense of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be glad to amplify what I said before. If I am the chairman of the conference committee, the amendments, if they are adopted by a voice vote, will be just as binding on me in conference as would be any other provision in the bill. I shall support them.

Mr. TOWER. I am sure the Senator will be bound. A yea-and-nay vote, however, would be much more impressive on the conferees from the House of Representatives.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are two parties to a conference. There are the Members from the House on one side of the table, and Members of the Senate on the other side. If I were the chairman of the House conferees, and I did not want to accept the amendments, I believe the first observation I would make in the conference room would be that the Senate did not even bother to record itself on the amendments. Therefore, I would conclude that this was just another of those things. However, on the other hand, if an impressive vote is had on the amendments, it would be possible to say to the House conferees, "This is the way the Senate feels, and it has recorded its feelings." In other words, the conferees would have a weapon in their hands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before the vote, let us understand what this proposal amounts to. Let us understand that the amendments, although I agree with my colleagues in the Senate that they are valuable amendments, and I shall support them on a yea-and-nay vote, do not do what we are discussing earlier today. We were talking about the possibility of segregated CCC camps, and we were talking also about the possibility of segregated units in communities which employed title II.

The pending amendments, in my view, will deal with the policy of the administration of the act not to exclude an individual because of his race or color. There is no danger that anyone will be excluded on that ground. However, there is the danger that there may be segregation and discrimination in the operation of the camps, on the basis that I have described.

Therefore, in voting for the amendments, I still say that before I would be prepared to see this bill become law, I would insist on assurances from the Secretary of Labor, which I am seeking now, that in the way in which he hands out the money he will not allow the operation of separate Negro and white CCC camps and separate Negro and white units. I shall support the amendment. It is a fine amendment. However, let us not assume that it blankets the field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, offered by the Senator from Texas. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "yea."

Mr. HUMPHREY. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMATHERS. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver]. Were he present and voting, he would vote "yea." Were I at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I, therefore, withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 15, as follows:

[No. 49 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Engle
Fong
Goldwater
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smith
Symington
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—15

Byrd, Va.
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hill
Johnston
Long, La.
McClellan
Robertson
Russell
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond

NOT VOTING—14

Allott
Bartlett
Bennett
Edmondson
Gruening
Holland
Humphrey
Kefauver
Long, Mo.
Morton
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. Tower's amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendments were agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I intend to offer an amendment which at this point I wish to read and explain. I understand that the distinguished majority leader will move that this amendment be laid on the table. Therefore, I wish to have the Senate understand what the amendment provides, because after the motion to lay on the table is made, there will be no opportunity to debate; and I think it important that Senators understand what they will be voting on.

The amendment I intend to propose is as follows: On page 25, in line 20 after the word "responsibility," insert the following: "which agreements with Federal agencies shall (A) prescribe that there shall be no discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin in the employment of the resources, areas, and facilities to be protected, conserved, developed or managed, and further, there shall be no such discrimination practiced in the use of any facilities provided for enrollees, and (B) shall give the Attorney General of the United States the right to enforce such proscription."

The intent of the amendment which I intend to offer is to provide that young people will not work on any project or facility which will be segregated and, further, that they will not be segregated in their camps or their living quarters or the facilities they use, and that no facility provided for the enrollees, regardless of where the facility may be located, may be segregated.

Today it was said that this amendment is not needed. But I submit that if we wish to be sure that a practice of nondiscrimination will prevail in the administration of this measure, it is encumbent upon us to fix it into the law.

Furthermore, if the Attorney General or other appropriate Federal officials are going to administer the law in this manner anyway, I think they should have the appropriate legal authority.

Mr. President, when I offer the amendment, I understand that a motion to lay the amendment on the table will be made. In that case, a Senator who favors the adoption of my amendment will vote "nay," on the question of agreeing to the motion to lay the amendment on the table.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, let me say that I intend to support the amendment.

Second, I wish to ask the Senator from Texas whether I am correct in my understanding that the text of his amendment represents the law of the land today.

Mr. TOWER. That is my understanding. Certainly the amendment is in the spirit of the Bill of Rights, and is in the spirit of the decision in the case of Brown against the Board of Education of Topeka, Kans.; or, at least, I would say it is consonant with the rule of that case. There may be debate as to whether this is the law of the land or whether this is the law of that case.

Mr. KUCHEL. I rise to congratulate the Senator from Texas; and if a motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Texas is made, I hope the Senate will reject the motion to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas will be read.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President——

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, first, I may yield to the Senator from Arizona, before the amendment is read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely wish to add, following the answer the Senator from Texas gave to the Senator from California, that it is also the determination of the President, as witnessed by his housing order during the past year; namely, his order that wherever Federal funds are spent, there will be no discrimination. I call that fact to the attention of Senators.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas will be read.

The Chief Clerk. On page 25, in line 20, after the word "responsibility," it is proposed to insert the following: "which agreements with Federal agencies shall (A) prescribe that there shall be no discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin in the employment of the resources, areas, and facilities to be protected, conserved, developed, or managed, and further, there shall be no such discrimination practiced in the use of any facilities provided for enrollees, and (B) shall give the Attorney General of the United States the right to enforce such proscription."

Mr. MANSFIELD. I recognize a triple play when I see one; I recognize the combination of Tower to Kuchel to Goldwater.

I was happy to note that the distinguished acting minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], stated that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is the law of the land, and to hear that statement corroborated by both the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater].

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senate has already adopted an antidiscrimination amendment, and the further fact that these additional facts have come to light in the public debate, I move that the amendment of the Senator from Texas be laid on the table.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. TOWER. Are we to understand that in voting on this question, a vote "yea" will be to lay on the table my civil rights proposal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. I thought the Senator from Texas was about to say something in further explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] that the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] be laid on the table. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 41, as follows:

[No. 50 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman

Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—41

Aiken
Beall
Boggs
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Engle
Fong
Goldwater
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Mundt
Nelson
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smith
Symington
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—9

Allott
Bennett
Edmondson
Holland
Kefauver
Long, Mo.
Morton
Scott
Simpson

So the motion to lay on the table Mr. Tower's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I intend to offer another perfecting amendment to the bill, which I shall read. I expect the same fate for this amendment as the previous one met, so I shall not offer it until I have had an opportunity to explain its intent to the Senate.

On page 42, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following new subsection:

> (c) The Secretary of Labor shall provide no assistance or cooperation to any private agency or any agency of any State, county, or local government, unless such agency (A) shall prescribe that there shall be no discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin in the employment of the resources, areas, and facilities to be protected, conserved, developed, or managed, and (B) shall give the Attorney General of the United States the right to enforce such proscription.

Mr. President, I think this amendment which I am about to offer is even more important than the previous amendment. Though we might not expect discrimination in the enrollment of people in the program, and might not expect the program to be operated in such a way that there would be segregated facilities for the corps members, still there is some doubt about whether the program could not be made beneficial to certain facilities privately or publicly owned in which segregation and discrimination are practiced.

I do not believe that there is any ironclad protection against that, so the intent of my amendment is to provide that the enrollees in the program may not work on facilities with respect to which there is segregation or discriminatory practices exist.

If a motion to table the amendment is made, Senators should realize that if they vote "yea" they will be voting for discrimination.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk. On page 42, between lines 20 and 21, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

> **(c) The Secretary of Labor shall provide no assistance or cooperation to any private agency or any agency of any State, county, or local government, unless such agency (A) shall prescribe that there shall be no discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin in the employment of the resources, areas, and facilities to be protected, conserved, developed, or managed, and (B) shall give the Attorney General of the United States the right to enforce such proscription.**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it appears to me that the third amendment on the same subject is being offered for the purpose of killing the measure under consideration. Therefore, I have no hesitation in moving that the pending amendment be tabled, and on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I am still at a loss to understand, Mr. President, why, if it is said that these amendments are unnecessary to prevent discrimination, we cannot put them into the bill. It is said that if these amendments are put in the bill they would kill the bill. Am I to understand that some of my good friends from the South will vote for the bill with the understanding that there will be an antidiscriminatory administration of the bill, even if such provisions are not in the bill itself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. TOWER. I wonder if this does not impugn the rationality of my colleagues.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Texas, who I thought was about to propound a question, but instead he has made a political speech, which I am sure will come in handy in the coming campaign.

Mr. TOWER. No.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. President, I think it is unfair to direct a question to the South generally, because as I look over the delegation on this side of the Chamber I do not see a southern delegation, a western delegation, a northern delegation, or an eastern delegation, but rather a democratic grouping representing all parts of the Nation. I think we are aware of what is transpiring this afternoon. The purpose is to kill the bill. I am not at all certain that the Senator from Texas is in favor of the bill now under consideration.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 33, as follows:

[No. 51 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—33

Aiken
Beall
Boggs
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fong
Goldwater
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Smith
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—9

Allott
Bennett
Edmondson
Holland
Kefauver
Long, Mo.
Morton
Scott
Simpson

So Mr. MANSFIELD'S motion to lay on the table Mr. TOWER'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Senate laid on the table the amendment of the Senator from Texas, be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—and I would like to have good attention from the other side of the aisle to this statement—the other day I appeared on a television program with a distinguished Ph. D. named Dr. Burns, who has written a book entitled "Deadlock of Democracy."

In that book, in a number of chapters, he makes a great deal of the wicked coalition between the Republicans and southern Democrats.

I told Dr. Burns at the time we were making the telecast that the chapters I read seemed like interesting fiction, and nothing more. I do not know where Dr. Burns is this afternoon. I assume he is at Williams College. I wish he had sat in the gallery this afternoon and had heard these votes, and had heard the nay votes, with some exceptions, on the tabling motion on this side, and so many yea votes to table on the other side. If any thesis was ever disproved in this piece of fiction called "Deadlock of Democracy" it was done here on the Senate floor this afternoon. All hail to this wicked coalition they have been talking about.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Wickedness is being banished this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This has added to our theme of salvation of last week.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope that my friend from Minnesota will get on his knees, where I will join him, so that we may supplicate providence in the interest of salvation. May our entreaties be loud and long, because all of us will need it, and his program will need it more than anything else.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, what I have to say will be neither loud nor long. It is not a time now to evaluate phrases or test motivations of any yea-and-nay vote today. I speak as one who has been troubled ever since I came here with respect to what the right approach is in connection with this basic problem: Shall we shut off money to certain regions or shall we not when they discriminate in their use of schools and when we are told, "No. Education must come first. The children shall not be denied it. Give us time."

This is what has troubled many of us. I have reached the point, with some continuing doubts as to the wisdom of the course, but nonetheless with determination to pursue it, that instead of approaching this problem tangentially, as we did this afternoon, we had better hit it head on.

The money which we in Congress appropriate comes from the pockets of all Americans. I do not want any longer to be put in the position of explaining to some Americans, "Yes, we take your money, but you cannot use the facilities."

I do not care whether it relates to a youth in a camp in a forest, or to a little girl seeking admission to a school whose parents happen to be in the military service of this country, or to a child seeking a vocational education or rehabilitation, or anything else.

Now is the time, since so many seem to be demonstrating a new concern, to say, "All right, let us say it first to those agencies of the Federal Government on the executive side who disburse some of this money. Are they free to withhold it when they find a State program discriminates?"

Michigan has just been told that its program for aid to dependent children of unemployed parents does not qualify because it discriminates. How does it discriminate? It makes eligible parents who are under covered employment under the unemployment insurance system. They say it discriminates against children of parents who are not under covered employment, more or less.

I salute the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for standing up and saying it is a discriminatory program and they will not get any money, though it is tough to explain it to some children. What are they going to do about continued disbursement of Federal money to impacted school districts, where there is no semblance of a school district seeking to desegregate?

Is there not here chapter and verse for discriminatory treatment? What are they going to do about that? What are they going to do about that, not next year, but now?

They have already told Michigan.

Let each agency of the executive branch examine the statutes and find out whether they can or cannot now, as we seek explicitly to prohibit or bar disbursement of these Federal funds, contributed by every American, to programs and facilities into which some Americans cannot get.

It just does not make sense. It does not make sense as a matter of right and wrong, and as a matter of our appearance in the eyes of the rest of the world. Either way, we are wrong. Let us get right.

How do we get right? We get right by telling the executive agencies to get right where they can. Where they cannot, let us make it right. Let us do so, not by action such as this bill contemplates, by trying to tack on the kind of amendment that has been proposed.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey and I had an embarrassing experience a couple of years ago when a very small bill came through here to return to a State a facility which the Army had been using as a hospital, so that the State could use it in a vocational or rehabilitation program. I forget which it was.

We were beaten when we sought to attach a condition that the facility shall be used openly and without discrimination. We tried it on the floor, and we were overwhelmingly rejected. We were told by our good friends that the way to accomplish one purpose was not in a hit-or-miss fashion, but that the way to do it was by doing it right across the board. That was a couple of years ago, and we have not done anything in an across-the-board fashion. I believe that we had better develop a basic statute which will have the effect of being applicable to every program that we propose to adopt, and say that which by implication we tell the rest of the world anyway, that we will treat each American equally and freely when we take his money.

If we cannot do it on an across-the-board basis, then I welcome some who have joined us today, and let us do it with every program.

This is 1963. I heard something said about the Emancipation Proclamation. It is time to get right on it. How can we defend a practice of sending money which enables a State to deprive a program or an institution, which, I understand the Constitution says, ought not to be.

I do not see how it adds up. As I say, I for one have resolved this dilemma which has bothered me ever since I came here, in part having seen what I saw this afternoon, to approach it this way. I hope other will join me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I might say that I am not offering an amendment at this time. I shall speak on the bill. If any Senators wish to leave now, I do not see any reason why they cannot leave. We will have a quorum call later.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat his statement?

Mr. PROUTY. When I have concluded my remarks, we will have a quorum call.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it the Senator's intention to offer an amendment at the conclusion of his remarks? I ask the question only for the information of the Senate.

Mr. PROUTY. I am not in a position to say at this time. I shall let the majority leader know.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator in any position to tell us about how long he will take?

Mr. PROUTY. I believe it would be perfectly safe for the Senator to be absent for an hour. I will make sure that it is.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, Mr. BONNER, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, had appointed Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. LENNON, and Mr. MAILLIARD as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1963, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, Mr. BONNER, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, had appointed Mr. DOWNING, Mr. GILBERT, and Mr. VAN PELT as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1963, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 134) establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 11, 1963, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 22, 1963, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the young people of our country will never get to know what a wonderful thing a free society is unless we enable them to play a part in it.

We tell them in their textbooks that ours is a land of opportunity; and yet, when they close their textbooks and face the world, they find no such opportunity.

If these young men and women ever come to believe that ours is the land of unfulfilled promises—not a promised land—we will be sitting on a powder keg that has more explosive force than all the atom bombs of unfriendly nations.

At this very moment almost 800,000 young people are both out of school and out of work. America needs their fresh ideas and their bright young hope, but the ideas will stagnate and the hope will dim unless we find a way to use them—and find it we must.

The situation is getting worse instead of better and day by day a tremendous economic waste walks hand in hand with a great human tragedy.

During the 1960's, the increase in the number of 16- to 21-year-olds in the work force will be 5½ times greater than the increase during the 1950's.

Statistics are a key to bookkeeping, but by themselves they do not open the door that lays bare all that they mean in the way of bitter frustrations, hopelessness and despair.

When we hear that 31 percent of all colored girls in the 18-to-19 age group are without jobs, how much do the figures really tell us about what this means in terms of humiliation and loss of pride? When we hear about the overall rate of 14-percent unemployment among the 16-to-21 age group, what do the figures tell us about the resentment that is building up and the faith in our society that is being washed away?

If America fails to get on the move, the number of unemployed youths in 1970 will be one-third greater than today.

Twenty-six million youths will enter the labor force in the 1960's. Almost 3 out of 10 of these youngsters will not have completed high school, and 2½ million will not have finished the eighth grade.

How are these boys and girls—without adequate training, without sufficient education—going to find the path to the great satisfactions of a working life?

In the good old days, the untrained young man or young woman could find an unskilled job, and in rural communities they could always turn to employment on the farm. But the good old days are gone. The need for unskilled workers and farmers will decline by 12 percent during the 1960's, in the face of the fact that the number of youngsters then entering the labor force will be 40 percent higher than the number during the previous decade.

Technological changes have altered the character of employment in this country; and we need, as never before, skilled, well educated workers.

If, then, the times are new and the problems are new, why does the administration recommend, and the committee report, two programs which resemble very closely the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration of the 1930's?

True, there is something beautiful about a campfire, something grand and glorious about open air and sunshine; but when we transport thousands of young men to woody fairylands for 6 months or a year, and then return them to city streets, ill equipped to face life, we do them a great disservice.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has conceded that when these boys come back from a year's camping in the woods, they will not be ready for skilled or semiskilled occupations.

A table which I have before me shows the projected percentage change in the various types of occupations during the 1960's. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Median school years completed by major occupational groups

Occupation	Median school years completed		Employment	
	1952	1962	Percent change, 1952–62	Projected percent change during 1960's
Professional and technical workers	16+	16.2	56.2	43
Clerical and sales workers	12.4	12.5	20.1	28
Proprietors and managers	12.2	12.5	19.1	21
Skilled workers	10.1	11.2	−3.1	20
Semiskilled workers	9.1	10.1	−6.3	13
Service workers	8.8	10.2	30.9	34
Unskilled workers and farmers	8.3	8.8	−20.8	−12

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the table demonstrates how truly fantastic and out of date the Conservation Corps scheme really is. The figures show that during the 1960's, the demand for professional and technical employees will increase by 43 percent. The need for skilled workers will increase 20 percent, and the required number of service workers will jump 34 percent.

It is in the face of facts such as these that the Senate is about to act on a bill, costing millions of dollars, which will not give our teenagers the skills the times demand.

Young people do not need a pick-and-shovel operation in the tall timbers. They need the kind of advanced vocational or technical training that will qualify them for the skilled and technical jobs that are available.

This situation was brought sharply to focus by Dr. William B. Logan, a member of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, who recently said:

> There are 4 to 6 million unemployed; at the same time there are 4 to 6 million job openings. The difference is skills.

Why do we find ourselves in a situation in which hundreds of thousands of teenagers are looking for jobs, and at the same time hundreds of thousands of jobs are going begging?

To a large extent, our public education system is at fault. It has failed to keep in tune with the social and economic changes that have been going on during the past 30 years.

Our schools are teaching skills that now are obsolete, and they are failing to teach new ones that are needed in order to meet changing industrial patterns.

An 18-month national survey conducted by Judge Mary C. Kohler, concluded that there was—

> A conspicuous failure to attack archaic vocational and trade schools on a national level; no attempt has been made to temper the academic methods to the student's ability; with but few exceptions trade schools are not teaching service skills; vocational training exists in a fairyland that has not much relation to the real world of work.

In the name of commonsense, why should we train people for jobs that existed yesterday? The technological revolution in our economy has produced a demand for so many skills of so many new and different types, that we have, in fact, developed large labor shortages—shortages that can be found even in areas with long and persistent unemployment.

As an example of the need, 900,000 more persons could be employed, if they were available in the field of health services, alone.

Training and education will not solve all our problems; but if they are more fully financed and are more adapted to the times, they can help us make a real beginning.

If even an administration Cabinet member, such as Secretary of Labor Wirtz, will admit that Youth Conservation Corps boys will not learn enough in the woods to prepare them for skilled occupations or semiskilled occupations, how can any Member of the Senate be led to believe that the solution of the 1930's is an answer to the problems of the 1960's?

I recall the words which are written under the bust of Mark Twain in the Hall of Fame:

> Loyalty to petrified opinion never yet broke a chain nor freed a human soul.

Mr. President, the clock will not be, cannot be, and must not be turned back.

I have spoken earlier about what the unemployment problem of our young people costs this Nation in the way of human values and human attitudes. I am quite conscious of the fact that it is a problem that will not be solved without the expenditure of a substantial sum of money. But if we have to spend more money in order to prepare our children for the needs of tomorrow, let us spend it wisely and well; and let us try to reduce other, less essential, programs.

In 1961, the present administration gave the members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee some information that is wishes we would forget, about the cost of the Youth Conservation Corps. Yet this information was based upon estimates submitted by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, and we cannot forget it.

These Departments told the committee that the annual cost per boy of the Youth Conservation Corps would be as follows:

In a 25-man unit: $12,297 per boy per year.

In a 50-man unit: $9,016 per boy per year.

In a 100-man unit: $8,263 per boy per year.

In a 200-man unit: $7,171 per boy per year.

Pause and reflect for a moment, if you will, Mr. President, on this unreasoning disregard of the solvency of the Federal purse and the welfare of the American boy.

Herman Melville, the great writer once said:

> The sea was my Harvard and my Yale.

He meant that it was on the sea that he had come to grips with life.

At a cost of $12,000 a year for a tour in the forests, the Youth Conservation Corps boys will be able to do Melville one better, by saying: "The woods were my Harvard and my Yale, and my Cambridge and my Oxford, too."

Let us compare what it costs a parent to send a boy to an Ivy League college with what it will cost the Federal Government per boy in the Youth Conservation Corps. Annual tuition fees and room-and-board costs at Harvard are $2,300. The same figure holds true for Yale, and smaller amounts for Dartmouth and Princeton. In a word, a worthy American boy could be given a complete college education for what it would take under the Youth Conservation Corps, to send a lad into the birches.

A few minutes ago I mentioned the persistent labor shortages that exist at the same time that millions of young persons are unemployed. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, programs to match the unemployed with the unfilled jobs are now being established.

The estimated total cost per trainee in the manpower statutes projects was $1,178, of which $492 represented the average training cost, and $686 the average training allowance charge.

This training, which enables people to qualify for work, costs but a small fraction of the camping expenses per boy in the Youth Conservation Corps.

Recognizing that the public would regard the corps as sheer folly if the 1961 cost estimates were spotlighted, the administration is now telling us that the annual camping cost per boy would be around $4,000.

How is this fantastic reduction in estimates now possible? Believe me, it is more political than actuarial in nature.

Sar A. Levitan, a Library of Congress scholar, wrote a paper for the W. E. Upjohn Institute in which he pointed out that it would cost about $5,000 per enrollee to construct new camps. This expense, he said, would be in addition to the cash outlays for enrollee compensation, food, clothing, supervision, transportation, work equipment, and so forth.

How, then, does the administration maintain now that the Youth Corps will cost $4,000 per boy per year? Secretary of Labor Wirtz gave his answer to this question when he told the Senator Labor and Public Welfare Committee that all construction costs would be amortized over a 20-year period.

I asked the Secretary whether he contemplated a 20-year Youth Conservation Corps program and he answered in the negative.

Listen for a moment to what the impartial expert on employment matters, Sar Levitan, has to say about how the costs of the Youth Conservation Corps should be calculated:

> It would cost about $5,000 per enrollee to construct new camps. This amount would have to come out of the first year's appropriation and cannot, according to Federal budgetary practices, be amortized over the useful life of the camp.

He goes on to point out that if unutilized facilities were available, it would still require an appreciable though indeterminate initial outlay to alter and renovate such facilities.

During the course of the Senate hearings, I asked Secretary of Labor Wirtz where the Federal Government would house the 15,000 enrollees in the Youth Corps if existing facilities are used. The Secretary replied as follows:

> Where are we going to put them? That question I cannot answer.

In view of all the circumstances I have set forth, neither the Senate nor the public has a clear picture of what the Youth Conservation Corps will cost, whether old facilities are used or new ones are constructed.

All we know is that the expense will be tremendous even if we accept the most modest estimates.

Many words might be said regarding title II of the bill which authorizes a public employment and training program largely in public service jobs.

Such a program, properly drafted, might well prove to be of some use as a temporary remedy or stopgap measure.

However, the language of the bill will tend to encourage its use for political purposes. There are no firm criteria by which it can be ascertained what the Federal share of program costs will be in any given State.

Under the terms of the bill the Secretary of Labor would be at liberty to pay as much as 75 percent of the costs of a given program. The bill requires only that he consider certain factors among others in making his decision.

Apparently, if the administration encounters a rough political situation in a particular State, one of its Cabinet members will have the privilege of dumping in Federal money so that jobs can be doled out to alleviate the situation.

There is no question that there is a growing need for educational and medical services, including help of all kinds in schools and hospitals. Needs such as this should be given priority in title II but they are not.

A community employment program can do much to improve the services in our health and educational institutions, but such a program must be written with a view to public and not political needs.

It is to be hoped that by providing work opportunities in schools and hospitals, thousands of our youngsters will be encouraged to continue their education.

In the meantime we must revamp our institutional vocational educational programs so that they will be able to cope with the scientific and technological revolution which is shaking our social and cultural foundations to the roots.

We are still training people to work on machines that are rarely, if ever, used by industry, and at the same time industry is begging for people to perform other skills and jobs remain unfilled.

If we can make major revisions in our vocational training activities we will be able to entice many of our young people to stay in school. When that is accomplished, make-work programs such as that contemplated in title II may no longer be necessary.

During the past year the American taxpayer, through all forms of taxation, paid a total public school bill of $18.1 billion. Of this, $5.6 billion was for high school education. Only $254 million, or 4.5 percent of this high school budget, was spent on vocational education.

Are we not really behind the times? Consider the fact that only 4½ percent of the secondary school budget was spent to supply the types of skills needed by the 80 percent of our school population who will enter the labor force without a college education. In its school message the administration asks for only $73 million for vocational and technical courses that will meet a pressing need.

In asking for approval of a Youth Conservation Corps it decided in favor of relief and against supplying young citizens with skills and job opportunities.

In this day of $100 billion Federal budgets and at this time when we are facing an annual deficit that may exceed $14 billion, some programs must be reduced or postponed in the interest of national solvency.

At the appropriate time I shall offer a substitute measure for the pending bill. This substitute is adapted to the needs of our swiftly moving times and will give our young people the opportunities they have read about in school but have not seen.

My substitute proposal would be expensive, but it would cost substantially less than the administration bill, and, in my judgment, it would do far more to promote the welfare of our teenagers.

At this time when the Federal purse is subject to heavy drains, we must give top priority to programs which will safeguard and enhance our traditions of liberty and opportunity.

As I told the Vermont Legislature only 2 weeks ago, a nation that can spend billions of dollars to send a man to the moon can surely afford the small investment it takes to plant the feet of our children firmly on the ground.

Simply giving young boys from city streets a tour of the woods will not solve their adjustment problems nor will it give them the skills and training they need to face life and play a working role in our society.

I have quoted the words of Mrs. Agnes Meyer several times during this debate. I think repetition may be a good thing, because she expresses a point of view which I share 100 percent.

In 1961, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, of the Meyer Foundation, in her appearance before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee, pointed out:

> No matter how much a young man may profit from the training and healthful influences of the Youth Conservation Corps, he will eventually have to return to the home from which he came and be again subjected to the detrimental influences from which he has temporarily escaped. This proved to be a great difficulty to many of the CCC graduates.

Dr. Kenneth Clark of the faculty of the College of the City of New York, who is research director of the Northside Center for Child Development, has stated that we are really looking for the easy way out when we send youngsters to work camps. I quote now from Dr. Clark:

> Realism would argue that it would be easier for the society to send youth to work camps rather than to strengthen the schools and enrich their curriculums; it would be more economical in the short run to send youth to work camps rather than to tackle the complex social and economic problems which are related to the deprivation and deterioration found in underprivileged communities; it would be less disturbing to send youth to work camps than to deal with the basic problems of prejudice and discrimination which blunt the motivation of a substantial proportion of the young people in our society. The fact remains, however, that these unsolved and difficult social problems will not disappear and will confront these same youth when they return to society.

Richard G. Farrow, director of the Bureau of Youth Services of the Pennsylvania State Department of Welfare, also brought sharply to focus the fact that young people have real problems after they leave forest camps. In his testimony during the hearings, Mr. Farrow said:

> Each of the boys must return to a community after his enlistment. He must once again start on his search for employment.
>
> Assume he is better equipped, following his camp experience, than he was before. Still, in our present labor market he may not find his place.

Mr. Farrow also pointed out that while sometimes a boy changes his attitude during camp enrollment, the change persists, and I am quoting him now: "until he leaves and then he has to go back to a community which by and large has not changed as much as he has. He has to fit in with this change to an old situation, which he finds often to be very difficult."

Because of the fact that young people, once their camp tour is over, must return to the bad environment they came from, frequently a great deal of disillusionment sets in.

Mr. Farrow, of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Youth Services, also commented on this point. He said:

> We are only too well aware that some of our graduates have been unable to sustain the change that was effected within the program and have become involved in further difficulties with further institutional experience resulting.

In conclusion on this point, may I say that many supporters of the Youth Conservation Corps have suggested that boys who drop out of school because they have no aims in life will find themselves properly oriented after a year in the country.

If, Mr. President, rural life is what gives a boy aim, direction and motivation, how do we explain the fact that the rural dropout rate is as high as the urban dropout rate?

For example, both New York and New Jersey have lower dropout rates than many of the rural States such as Virginia, West Virginia, and Mississippi.

THE CAUSES OF DROPOUTS

The various studies and articles concerning the dropout problem and unemployment among the young indicate a few basic facts. A brief summary of these factors follows:

First. Psychological problems cause students to leave school.

Irene M. Josselyn, M.D., editor of the Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, calls dropping out of school an escape. Youths who are hostile and rebellious toward authority leave school, according to Dr. Josselyn, only to find themselves unable to accept the authority of a foreman on a job.

Edgar Friedenberg, an associate professor of education at Brooklyn College, claims that dropouts leave school because of moral revulsion from the middle-class life of the school.

Second. Inadequate vocational training causes dropouts and then prevents those who have left school from finding work.

The Nation's vocational training programs are criticized for not being professional enough; for leaving too little time for specific training; generally unskilled teachers; and for not starting soon enough in the student's school career.

A more basic criticism, in terms of S. 1, is that much vocational training is not designed to prepare the young for the types of jobs that are available. On January 25, 1963, Senator PROXMIRE inserted a Reader's Digest article entitled "Why Johnny Can't Get a Job," into the RECORD. The article presents an eloquent plea for a revamping of our vocational training system so that our young will be able to learn trades that are in demand.

The National Education Association Journal of May 1962 pointed out that "the inexcusable tragedy of unemployment lies in the fact that the number of available, but unfilled, skilled jobs in the United States is generally equal to the number of those unemployed because they possess no skills."

Third. Marriage, in the case of girls particularly. The Conference on Unemployed, out-of-school youth in urban areas has pointed out that one-fourth of the Nation's 18-year-old girls are married, and the figures for 17- and 16-year-olds are high also.

Fourth. Feeble enforcement of attendance laws is blamed for some dropouts, particularly in agricultural States.

Fifth. Economic and cultural deprivation is a major cause, again according to the 1961 Dropout Conference. Poverty, lack of intelligence, and the problems of minority groups are all included within this subheading.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I dislike to inject myself into this discussion, which is a very profound one, not only on this legislation, but also on the subject of training our youth for their future livelihood.

Some weeks ago I made a statement on the floor of the Senate in regard to the need for expanding our vocational education programs. I said at that time that there were probably 1,600,000 jobs available for persons who were not able to fill them, because they were not trained to fill them. I said I thought we were living in an age in which we should devote more of our Federal funds to training our young men and women to use their hands, which is not a bad idea even in this space age.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct. I had hoped to have an amendment prepared, which I would offer as an amendment to this bill, providing for a more realistic vocational education program; but it would have been too complex and too involved to offer as an amendment on the floor. I think it should be sent to committee, so it can be given thorough consideration. I shall certainly do that when the President's educational request is under consideration.

Mr. CARLSON. I assure the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I shall be glad to assist him when that amendment comes to the floor, because I believe this is one field which we have sadly neglected in the training of our youth.

Mr. PROUTY. That is true. As I stated in the course of the debate, many of the skills being taught in some of our vocational schools today are obsolete. There is no need for them. I have used Milwaukee, Wis., as an outstanding example of what can be done in the field of vocational education. I think the school dropout in that city is only about 5 percent, which is much lower than it is in other cities of comparable size, primarily because a great deal of money is spent on vocational education within the confines of Milwaukee. The program has demonstrated what can be done under a proper vocational education system.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to bring up at this time a subject which I had intended to discuss this morning with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is in charge of the bill, in regard to the employees necessary to manage the agency. I have read the bill and the report. Is there any reference in the bill or the report that would indicate the number of personnel required to establish the proposed agency?

Mr. CLARK. There is nothing specific. I think the Senator has reference to title I.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. The cost figures appear on page 12 of the report. The Senator will note the item, "Camp and work supervision," $700 per enrollee.

Mr. CARLSON. May I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania the number of camps expected to be constructed under this program?

Mr. CLARK. There is no estimate in that regard. The position of the administration is that they do not intend to commit themselves as to where and how many enrollees there will be in each of the camps.

If the Senator will refer to page 526 of the printed hearings, he will see there a list of various existing camps, furnished at the request of the Senator from Vermont.

I point out that the information appears in the appendix of the hearings. It is not completely accurate. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Arizona have already found one or two instances of inaccuracy, but the information is generally accurate. The administration is not prepared at this time to state how many new camps would have to be built, and how many of the existing camps could be utilized for the purpose of the program.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania agree with me that there might be 300 camps, in order to have a figure on which to base this discussion?

Mr. CLARK. Let me do a little mental arithmetic: 300 divided into 15,000 would be an average of 50 boys to a camp. I hope it would not be that small a number, because, for reasons of economy, and also in order to expedite the work program the average number of enrollees in a camp should be nearer 100 than 50. In some instances, as in the larger national forests and parks in the West, the number of enrollees might be as high as 200.

The administration wished—and the committee agreed with it—to keep a good deal of flexibility in this regard.

One of the problems is the ability to distribute the camps equitably across the country, and, if possible, to place one camp in each State. I do not think it will be possible to do that. For example, the Senator from Rhode Island was much concerned that there should be a camp in Rhode Island. Yet there are no available Federal lands in that State.

I think I can hazard the statement that most of the camps under title I would be located in the Mountain and Western States, where the largest percentage of national park land, fish and wildlife and game preserves, and national forests exists.

I think I am revealing no secret when I say I shall try very hard to have a camp located in the Allegheny National Forest in northwestern Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Pennsylvania would be justified in doing that. The Senator referred to the list on pages 526 to 528. I find that Kansas is one of the States that does not have listed an area for a proposed camp.

Mr. CLARK. Is there a substantial area of Federal land in the State of Kansas? I do not know, although perhaps I should.

Mr. CARLSON. Many areas are occupied by military installations, and there were a number of the earlier CCC camps. There were at least five or six within our State.

Mr. CLARK. I cannot give the Senator any assurance as to whether Kansas will get a camp. But I am sure that he will be assiduous in trying to get one, if the bill is passed.

Mr. CARLSON. My purpose in raising this question this afternoon is that I am somewhat familiar with the original CCC program. As I remember, each of those camps required a substantial number of personnel. Was any thought given to the number of personnel that would be required to operate the camps that would be established under the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. I can give the Senator the figures for 1961.

Mr. CLARK. We have figures. The figures appear at page 717 of the hearings. It shows a comparison of the number of staff jobs in the Civilian Conservation Corps with the number of staff jobs in the Conservation Corps plan submitted by the Kennedy administration in 1961, both under the Wirth plan, which is the CCC plan, and the Kennedy administration plan, for a 50-man camp, a 100-man camp, and a 200-man camp.

In all candor, I must tell my good friend from Kansas that the estimate of the cost per enrollee given by the Secretary of Labor Mr. Wirtz, for the 1963 plan is substantially less than the estimate of the costs for 1961.

As the Senator from Vermont has been careful to point out, it is susbtantially less. I suspect that the 1961 figures are a little higher than the Kennedy figures would prove to be.

Mr. CARLSON. I was trying to check the figures found at page 717. I note that under the Wirth plan, for a 50-man camp, there would be 7 positions, whereas under the Kennedy administration plan there would be a total of 14 new positions.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure the Senator is correct. I have stopped looking at the exhibit on that page. My staff assistant has called my attention to Secretary Wirtz' testimony on page 153 of the record, where he states that his expectation is that the Wirth staffing will be closer to the fact than the 1961 expectation.

Mr. CARLSON. Under the Wirth plan, shown at page 717, the total number of positions would be seven. There would be a superintendent, two foremen, a mechanic, a clerk, a recreational leader, and one cook.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure the Senator is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Following the schedule under the administration's proposal, there would be a total of 14 positions. For a 100-man camp, under the Wirth plan the number of positions would be 15, whereas under the Kennedy administration proposal the number would be 24. For a 200-man camp, the Wirth plan shows a total of 22, and the Kennedy plan a total of 35.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure the Senator is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I should like to have this table placed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. CLARK. I would be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. CARLSON. I ask unanimous consent that the table found at page 717 may be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF STAFF JOBS IN THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS WITH THE NUMBER OF STAFF JOBS IN THE CONSERVATION CORPS PLAN SUBMITTED BY THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION IN 1961

THE 50-MAN CAMP

Wirth plan: total positions, seven: superintendent, two foremen, one mechanic, one clerk, one recreational leader (with first-aid training), one cook.

Kennedy administration plan: total positions, 14: superintendent, 1 general foreman, 3 foremen, 1 mechanic, 2 clerks, 1 medic, 1 education and recreation, 1 assistant, 1 chief cook, 1 cook, 1 administration superintendent.

THE 100-MAN CAMP

Wirth plan: total position, 15: superintendent, 1 assistant superintendent, 4 foremen, 2 mechanics, 1 recreational leader, 1 chief clerk, 1 clerk, 3 cooks, 1 medical aid.

Kennedy administration plan: total positions, 24: superintendent, 1 assistant camp superintendent, 1 general foreman, 4 foremen, 2 mechanics, 1 education and recreation, 3 clerks, 1 chief cook, 3 cooks, 2 medics, 2 assistants, 1 supply, 1 administration superintendent, 1 administration aid.

THE 200-MAN CAMP

Wirth plan: total positions, 22: superintendent, 1 assistant superintendent, 7 foremen, 3 mechanics, 1 recreational leader, 1 chief clerk, 2 clerks, 1 physician, 1 storekeeper, 4 cooks.

The Kennedy administration plan: total positions, 35: superintendent, 1 assistant camp superintendent, 1 general foreman, 8 foremen, 3 mechanics, 1 educational and recreation, 4 assistants, 3 clerks, 1 doctor, 3 medics, 1 chief cook, 5 cooks, 1 supply, 1 administration superintendent, 1 administration aid.

Source: Conrad L. Wirth, final report to the Secretary, Civilian Conservation Corps, Department of the Interior, January 1944, pp. 9–10. "Annual Cost—Youth Conservation Corps Estimates," Department of the Interior, found at p. 409 of hearings on S. 404 and S. 2036, 1962.

Mr. CARLSON. As the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania well knows, I am concerned over the ever-increasing Federal employment rolls. That is one reason why I bring this question up at this time. If 250 or 300 new camps were established in this country, with the schedule of employment shown under the Wirth plan, the number of additional Federal employees could run to 7,500 or 10,000.

Mr. CLARK. I have not done the mathematics on what the Senator says, but I have no reason to question the accuracy of the Senator's statement. The figure sounds rather high, but I am willing to take his word for it.

Mr. CARLSON. It could well reach that figure, based on the number and the average size of the camps proposed.

Mr. CLARK. My attitude on this point is that we are really straining at gnats, when we ought to go out, like St. George, and kill the dragon. If we want to cut Federal expenditures, and if we want to curtail or reduce the number of Federal employees, the place to do it is in the space program and in the Defense program, in which we will spend a billion dollars a week. In the program here proposed it is proposed to spend $100 million for a whole year. That is one-tenth, for a whole year, of what we are spending on defense in 1 week.

I do not know whether the Senator agrees, but I do not have much sympathy with the mad race between us and the Soviets to get the first man to the moon, at a cost of $8,800 million. We could save a little money there.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Pennsylvania has made a good statement. Of course, we must realize that this is a new program. This is not a matter of curtailing an old program.

We already have two and a half million Federal employees on the rolls. If I wanted to be political, I might say that in the past 2 years the administration has increased the number of Federal employees by 127,000.

Mr. CLARK. I know that my friend does not want to be political. He is one of the most nonpolitical Members of the Senate. I honor him for that point of view. Title I does not embrace a new program. It deals with an established policy and program of earlier Democratic administrations, when the CCC plan was in effect. Those of us who support the pending bill feel very strongly that the program was a good program, and should not have been abandoned.

While it was in effect, in 1939, there were 14 CCC camps in Kansas, with an average of 3,000 enrollees.

Mr. CARLSON. I know that there were a great number of them in Kansas. I visited them, and I became familiar with the work of those camps. I make these remarks because we shall be confronted with a problem, and I did not want to let this occasion pass without at least making reference to it.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator's observations are quite pertinent with respect to title I. However, under title II the same situation does not apply.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to have yielded to the Senator from Kansas. The information with reference to the camp personnel was given to the committee this year, and the facts which are found in the record were furnished at my request. These studies were made in 1961. The costs seemed to be of not too much consequence or importance to some of the administration witnesses, I regret to say.

Furthermore, I found that some of the camps, which are listed as being available for occupancy within a reasonably short period of time, are actually nonexistent. People in the areas who are familiar with the situation have told me that they are not there.

One such situation arose in Vermont. We were told that a certain camp could be used within a short period of time. That camp was found to be nonexistent.

A short time ago, the senior Senator from Minnesota, mentioned a camp that was located in his State. I have consulted some persons in Minnesota with respect to four of such camps. He said that the camps are supposed to handle anywhere from 50 to 70 occupants, and that the most that 4 of them could handle would be 18. They are more or less of the rural, primitive type of construction. With respect to the fifth camp, he said he had never heard of it. It is not where it is supposed to be. When we go down the list we shall probably find that about half of the camps are nonexistent. Those that are in existence will require a great expenditure of money in order to rehabilitate them.

We have not gone into this subject very thoroughly. That is why I was justified in trying to have the bill referred to the Committe on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe it could look into the subject better than the Labor Committee could, because we are not familiar with these problems. Unfortunately, that proposal was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. When the Senator was talking about Minnesota, was he talking about the Federal camps listed on page 527?

Mr. PROUTY. I was referring to page 5666 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. CLARK. I invite the attention of my friend to the fact that the Minnesota camps are listed on page 527 of the hearings. It shows four Forest Service camps and two Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife camps.

I wonder whether the adverse comments he has made would apply to the information furnished by the administration, or whether he is talking about something else.

Mr. PROUTY. I am talking about the insertion made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on page 5666 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 4. Senators have been given so many facts and figures which do not jibe that I do not know what the situation is. I make that statement quite frankly to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I have quickly compared the two lists, and they are identical. These are Federal camps. I cannot answer for the Senator from Minnesota, but I am sure he will wish to make some comment on that point when he returns to the Chamber.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield, without losing the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I wish to ask him two or three questions about the bill with a view possibly to clearing up some legislative history, which I am sure that he as a lawyer recognizes might be desirable.

The first question is: What about the failure of an enrollee to maintain proper standards of conduct, as a result of which it is determined by his administrator that for the best interests of the program and his fellow enrollees he should no longer be an enrollee? Is there anything in the bill which indicates how such a situation would be handled?

Mr. CLARK. It is clear enough from the experience of the CCC and also from the testimony in the record, which I shall ask my assistants to see if they can locate while we are speaking, that if an enrollee is dismissed for disciplinary reasons, his way will be paid back to his home. If he deserts—and a number of them will desert; they did in the CCC—he will be on his own.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator said he would be discharged. Suppose the infraction is not quite so severe as to warrant discharge, but that perhaps some disciplinary action should be taken short of actual expulsion.

Mr. CLARK. I assume the situation would be the same as it would be in any other work camp.

Mr. MILLER. Would there be any provision for activities similar to the guardhouse activities in the military? Is there any thought along those lines? I am wondering how discipline could be enforced under certain conditions.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Iowa served with me in the Air Force in the China-Burma-India Theater during the war. I am sure he will agree with me that that kind of situation can best be left to the commanding officer or superintendent of the camp. No effort should be made by Congress to write any such provisions into the bill. In my opinion, this is clearly a case for administrative discretion.

Mr. MILLER. If the Senator will forgive me, I was not old enough at the time the CCC camps were operating full swing to know exactly how they were operated; but I know the Senator from Pennsylvania was. Can he tell me how they were operated?

Mr. CLARK. I regret that fact, but I must admit it.

Mr. MILLER. Can the Senator tell us how the CCC actually handled disciplinary problems under such circumstances?

Mr. CLARK. I must plead a good deal of ignorance, because although I was old enough to know, I was not smart enough to have found out.

Nevertheless, I think I can say that, in general, those camps were operated as civilian, and not military, installations. A kind of discipline was enforced on those young people which I think would be enforced on any older people who were working under contract in a national park or a national forest.

I observe the senior Senator from Vermont on his feet. I am sure he can enlighten both of us on that point.

Mr. AIKEN. No. I was about to ask whether the commanding officer could discipline a member of the Youth Corps unless the laws of the State where the camp was located so provided. Would the bill take the members of the Youth Corps out of the jurisdiction of the State? I do not see how that could be done.

Mr. CLARK. This is a problem which would have to be handled on an ad hoc basis, depending on the kind of discipline the Senator has in mind. But if we are to enter into a situation involving enforcement of State laws, by that time we had better provide for sending the enrollee home. I cannot take the problem seriously.

Mr. AIKEN. If a member of the Youth Corps were given a rating at the end of his period of service, I could see how the commanding officer might give him demerits on his rating. But I do not see why the laws of the State would not apply for any other purpose.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sure my colleague from Vermont is correct in that respect. The camp director is in charge of discipline within the camp only.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it intended that members of the Youth Corps should take an oath of office of any kind, so that they would be subject to military discipline?

Mr. PROUTY. No.

Mr. CLARK. There is no such provision. The Department and the majority of the committee were strongly of the view that the bill should not have any military implications whatever.

Mr. AIKEN. Then I should say that such discipline could be administered only if it were authorized by the laws of the State.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure that is correct. I do not believe it is a serious problem.

Mr. MILLER. Following up that question, is it not correct to say that there is nothing in the bill which would cause an enrollee not to come under the jurisdiction of the State and local authorities in cases of violations of the law?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. State law is applicable on Federal lands.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. While he may not be very much concerned about such situations, I think it well for us to consider disciplinary problems. Sometimes if disciplinary problems are not handled properly, an entire program can get off to a bad start.

My next question relates to the phrase "in the public interest," on page 41, line 15, of the bill. The subparagraph (3) reads:

> The program will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest.

I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania what is intended by that phrase.

Mr. CLARK. Again, this is a general and all-encompassing phrase. Let me give a couple of examples. The Senator is referring to title II, which relates to State and local projects. The bill provides that upon the application of a State, county, or municipality, or on the application of a nonprofit private civic organization, Federal funds may be made available. In the case of a private civic institution, it must have clearance from the State agency which regulates the particular nonprofit institution.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps I can clarify my question and save a little time. Is it the intention that these shall be projects which are available to the general public? Is that what is intended by the language? Are they to be parks, playgrounds, and things of that nature, which are available to the general public? If that were the intention, I would be satisfied.

Mr. CLARK. The only exception I would make—and I do not really think it is an exception—would be that this language would include hospitals.

Mr. MILLER. Hospitals available to the general public?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Some of them might be private hospitals, but they would be available to the ill. They might not necessarily be public hospitals or public recreational centers, but they could be privately operated facilities.

Mr. MILLER. But facilities available to the general public?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. That explanation satisfies my question on that point.

On page 42 of the bill, line 13, subsection (7) provides:

> The program includes standards and procedures for the selection of applicants including provisions assuring full coordination and cooperation with local and other authorities to encourage students to maintain or resume school attendance.

However, the language does not tell us the kind of standards.

Mr. CLARK. That is purposely left flexible, within the discretion of the Administrator. He is supposed to establish standards by administrative regulation, so that the public generally and the prospective enrollees in particular will be able to tell before they apply for enrollment what standards they will have to comply with. Generally speaking, they would be commonsense standards, which the Senator from Iowa or I would write if we were attempting to enroll young people in this program.

Mr. MILLER. I trust they would be commonsense standards; but it seems to me that it is for the legislative body to set guidelines regarding standards, rather than merely to say that an Administrator or an executive officer shall set standards. I notice in the first title of the bill that something is said about standards. I believe that in a moment I can find the part to which I have referred.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say that of course the standards would have to be for the purposes set forth in the bill. For my part, having been an executive—I refer to my service for some 6 years as mayor of Philadelphia—I have a real horror of trying to write into a legislative bill strict standards and procedures. I believe it better to have the bill lay down the principles, and then give the Administrator discretion as to how he will carry out the directions of the legislature.

Mr. MILLER. I agree. My hope had been that we might point out that the standards for the selection of the applicants under this title would be such educational, intellectual, and moral standards as would make it reasonable to believe that following a suitable training period under this program, the enrollee would be capable of exercising acquired, specialized skills which would give him a reasonable prospect of permanent employment.

The Senator from Pennsylvania will notice that I have mentioned three things: educational, mental, and moral qualifications. Let me ask whether that would fall within the framework of what he would consider to be reasonable standards to be drawn up.

Mr. CLARK. I would prefer not to write them into the bill. I have no objection to making a little legislative history right now. Primarily, the bill is intended to take care of school dropouts, although others will be included. But I think that one who dropped out of school at, let us say, the 8th grade or the 9th grade would be as eligible for admission as would one who dropped out of school when he was in the 11th grade or the 12th grade.

I am not much in favor of writing moral standards. I believe there has been too much of that in the history of our country.

The Senator's third suggestion was——

Mr. MILLER. Educational and intellectual capabilities.

Mr. CLARK. Of course these young people will be screened; and I assume that low-grade morons who could not do the work would not be enrolled.

I point out that in section 205(a) on page 42, in lines 25 and 26, there is a vague criterion: "whose participation in such programs will be consistent with the purposes of this title."

Then the bill refers to the purposes of the title; and, again, they are rather general.

Again I say I would much prefer not to have any legislative criteria written into the act.

Mr. MILLER. Let me point out that I did not mention the criteria of health or physical condition.

The Senator from Pennsylvania will note that on page 25, section 104 provides, beginning in line 5, that the Secretary is to have authority to "establish adequate standards of safety, health, and conduct for enrollees of the Corps."

My point is that in title I we have attempted to write adequate standards; but we have not done that in title II. That is why I should like to write a little legislative history here, for the guidance of the Secretary.

Mr. CLARK. Well, I am glad to state my view of the standards to be established, for the guidance of the Secretary. Under subsection 7, on page 42, we might well refer to the standards of "safety, health, and conduct" which are referred to on page 25, in lines 5 and 6. Obviously, those standards under title II will be somewhat lower than those under title I, because the young people will live at home and will be doing part-time work. It might well be that there would be included under title II boys and girls who had some physical handicaps in terms of health, but who nonetheless were able to perform work as clerks in libraries or were able to do some hard work in hospitals. So there would have to be some different standards.

Nevertheless, I think there should be standards of "safety, health, and conduct" under title II, as well as under title I; and I am glad to join the Senator from Iowa in making that legislative history.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

One statement the Senator from Pennsylvania made disturbs me—namely, his statement to the effect that the primary purpose of this legislation is to cover school dropouts. If I correctly heard the Senator's statement, I wish to say that I am surprised that that is indeed the purpose, because we have a very serious problem with respect to the lack of employment among bona fide high school graduates who did not drop out of school; and if any priority is to be given as regards those who would be permitted to enroll in the program, I hope it will be given first to those who have actually persevered in their school work, but who, because of circumstances, are not able to obtain employment without additional training.

Mr. CLARK. The record as to dropouts shows that among those who dropped out of high school between January and October 1961, 28 percent were unemployed, whereas among those who did graduate from high school, 18 percent were unemployed. That is still too high a percentage, of course. But I think this training should be made available to both, because the high school graduate is likely to be able to find himself a skill, in terms of the educational opportunities available to him from both private sources and public sources, after he graduates from high school; and, indeed, this is one of the major arguments being made at the moment by the Senator from Vermont as to why we should step up the program in vocational education. In my opinion, such a program would not be nearly as useful for school dropouts as it would be for high school graduates, in view of the upgrading of the labor force, with which all of us are familiar.

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me, however, that the difference between 18 and 28 percent, while great, is not too great. But if we were to say that this measure is primarily for the purpose of helping school dropouts, such a statement might serve to induce larger numbers to become dropouts. A certain amount of glamour will be attached to this program; and it seems to me that if it is to be successful, it would be extremely undesirable to set up the program directed primarily at the enrollment of school dropouts—thus inducing still others to drop out.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator's argument relates to a discussion which continued at some length in the subcommittee, and also particularly in the full committee. One of the committee members took the position which the Senator from Iowa is now taking.

Mr. MILLER. The Secretary of the Interior took a similar position. Examination of House Report 199, dated April 8, 1963, shows the following at the bottom of page 62:

> However, Secretary Udall commented:
>
> "I think it would be a mistake to have this program be a dropout program."

Mr. CLARK. I do not wish to become involved in an argument with the Senator from Iowa. I merely read to him, from page 11 of the committee report, the point of view accepted by the 11 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare who voted to report the bill to the Senate:

> Dropouts will be encouraged to resume school and high school graduates will be

> encouraged to continue their education. Job referral services will be available to the enrollee.
>
> This is a voluntary program. No one is to be "drafted" into it. The Director must take every step possible to encourage applicants to stay in school and complete their education, or to return to school if at all possible.

The problem is a philosophical one on which people can differ. It is the point of view of the majority of the committee which I share.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize that there is a philosophical difference in point of view, but I would hope that the philosophical point of view that could be agreed upon would be that the program is not directed necessarily and preferentially toward either the dropout group or the high school graduate group.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct in that regard. Perhaps I overstated myself when I said that the program is designed primarily for school dropouts. It is for both. It is for high school graduates as well as for dropouts. But I would say that I do not think we would have a bill before the Senate now if we were not faced with the fact that there are 750,000 to 800,000 school dropouts each year. That fact has caused grave concern both to the administration and to the committee. It is one of the principal reasons why the proposed legislation is now before the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator. I should like to end the colloquy by expressing the hope and, I might suggest, the admonition, too, that should the proposed legislation become law, the administrators would be well advised to see to it that when applicants are enrolled, those in charge bend over backwards to screen out the proposed enrollees who may be diverted from their high school or vocational educational training because they feel that the program is a more attractive program and perhaps would result in less homework and less study.

I believe the proper administration of the program should be calculated to see to it there are no artificial dropouts as a result of the program.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me for these questions.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I might ask a question of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. My question is rather basic. Why would it be considered preferable to establish a completely new agency of Government rather than giving to established agencies of Government increased authority and increased funds with which to employ part-time workers? Of course, I refer to the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Army Engineers, the Department of Commerce, and possibly the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also. What would be gained by establishing a completely new agency rather than giving the long-established agencies of Government increased authority and increased funds to hire the youth?

Mr. CLARK. In the opinion of the committee and the administration, the Department of Labor was best qualified because of the employment service work it is presently conducting to administer the program. The program was placed within the Department of Labor, an existing governmental department, for purposes of supervision and administration.

Mr. AIKEN. Would other departments of the Government, such as the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and I would certainly include the Army Engineers, and other agencies of the Government, have an equal voice with the Department of Labor in administering the program?

Mr. CLARK. No. The setup would be something like the following: First, with respect to title I, in instances in which camps would be located on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior—that is to say, in national parks—the Department of the Interior, through the National Park Service, would have general supervision over the work which the boys in the camps would do. But the Department of Labor would be responsible for recruitment, not only of the boys themselves, but of the supervisory staff which would administer the actual camp services. The work would be done under the supervision of the Department of the Interior. But, I point out to my friend, the boys would receive a good deal of instruction. They would have some education. They would receive technical training. That would be arranged for them by the Department of Labor.

The same would be true with respect to work in the national forests which is under the Department of Agriculture.

However, when we come to title II, Federal agencies other than the Department of Labor would have nothing whatever to do with the program.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not talking about title II. I was asking the question only with reference to title I. What would the young men be taught in the camps?

Mr. CLARK. I should like to refer to the report, where the subject is set out at great length. I refer to paragraph G at the middle of page 11 of the report, which refers to the subjects which could be taught at the time in conjunction with the work described, and it runs a very wide range. It is set forth at considerably greater length at page 542 of the hearings. It includes agriculture, civil engineering, concrete engineering, diesel engines, foundry, machine shop, stenotype, welding, and metal crafts, to name a few.

If the Senator will turn to page 542 of the hearings, he will find that statement amplified.

Mr. AIKEN. The boys would also be given guidance services, I believe.

Mr. CLARK. Yes. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Who would supply the instructors?

Mr. CLARK. The Department of Labor.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department of Labor would supply all the instructors. The bill at page 31 provides as follows:

> (b) Enrollees as well as applicants for enrollment may be furnished with such quarters, subsistence, transportation (including travel from and to the place of enrollment), equipment, clothing, training, educational and recreational services, medical, dental, hospital, and other health services, and such other expenses (including funeral and burial expenses) as the Secretary may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

Does the Senator feel that that provision might be subject to abuse? When an enrollee even applies for enrollment, he is entitled to all of those benefits over a 6-month period, including training and the health provisions? I am not saying that the provision is bad. I am saying that it would appear possible to be abused.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, there is a possibility of abuse.

Mr. AIKEN. It depends on the administration completely.

Mr. CLARK. Applicants for enrollment, if rejected, would be returned. They would not get into the corps. They would be there for only a few days to be screened.

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that the Forest Service is pretty well overwhelmed with applications from boys coming out of high school at the present time, or from those who are in high school or in college.

Mr. CLARK. They are overwhelmed with applications for summer employment. The ceiling on the appropriation in my opinion is quite inadequate. Of course, the rate of pay for that work is substantially higher than the boys would receive under the proposed program.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose the Secretary of Labor says that we are going to put 200 boys in a certain park. Would the Secretary of the Interior have veto power?

Mr. CLARK. Oh, yes.

Mr. AIKEN. He would have such power?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Jobs cannot be instituted contrary to the desires of the heads of the departments in which the jobs would be located. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. The Senator is correct. An interdepartmental committee consisting of the Secretaries or their representatives of the various interested departments would work that out.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it also possible that the Department of Labor would designate what subjects would be taught?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Department designate also what subjects could not be taught? I am thinking of the wrangling going on in the civil defense program at the present time, where all reference to communism was to be restrained, and the order was issued that no reference could be made to J. Edgar Hoover or any of his writings used.

What is there to guard against that?

Mr. CLARK. I think the principal safeguard in that regard is that this is a work program, not an ideological program. The extent to which the enrollees would be working with books would be largely confined to the use of such books for instruction in a particular skill.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would be fine to teach the enrollees skills, to help them carry on jobs, but I think it would be very bad if some of the instructors intended to indoctrinate in any philosophy whatsoever other than the doctrine on which our own Government is founded.

Mr. CLARK. I thoroughly agree with my friend from Vermont. I think we can make a little history to that effect now.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I point out that I was not quite accurate when I gave all the authority to the Department of Labor. It would enlist, recruit, administer, and work out the housekeeping involved, but the educational program would be directed by the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. AIKEN. I wished to be sure that work in a national forest, for example, would be under the supervision of the Forest Service.

Mr. CLARK. It would be.

Mr. AIKEN. Rather than to have a new agency come in and say, "We are changing our practices to fit the needs."

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. We all agree that there is a need. We know that more boys would like to work in the forests if they could. I was very close to the old CCC program. The sad part about it was that when the boys had to go home, after they had stayed the limit, many of them did not wish to go home, any more than the people who come from foreign countries, on student visas or visitor visas, wish to go home when their time expires.

Mr. CLARK. Many of them did not have homes to which to go.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. We want to make sure that these young people have jobs to which they can return.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Earlier in the colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania I stated that I was not familiar with the national park areas in my State. Through the kindness of a very excellent staff I have been informed that on page 209a of the hearings of the Senate there is a table which lists the fact that Kansas has at the present time 107,114 acres of national forests eligible under title I, plus 110,808 acres of State parks eligible under title II.

I wished to clear up the record. I thank the excellent staff for this information, and I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from Pennsylvania, who is in charge of the bill.

Who would select and employ the instructors who would carry on the education?

Mr. CLARK. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. CURTIS. What qualifications would be required of an instructor?

Mr. CLARK. I suppose that the instructors would have to be competent to teach the skills which the particular camp needed to have taught. That would depend on what kind of work was to be done at the particular camp, and whether it was in a national park, national forest, or a wildlife refuge.

Mr. CURTIS. Would all of the instruction be in the manual arts, work with the hands or machines, and forestry; or would there be instruction in academic subjects?

Mr. CLARK. I think if it were found—and I am sure it would be, in all too many instances—that the young people at the camps could not read and write adequately, and therefore could not assimilate instruction books relating to the various kinds of skills, they would teach reading, writing, and elementary arithmetic. I do not think they would go into American history, philosophy, atomic energy, or anything like that.

Mr. CURTIS. Civil engineering is mentioned.

Mr. CLARK. That would consist of running a transit. It would be very elementary.

Mr. CURTIS. Is there anything in the bill relating to the qualifications of instructors?

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. CURTIS. Who would do the job of evaluating, counseling, and guidance services, which would be coordinated with the work of the program in order to direct the boy through the preenrollment phase of private employment?

Mr. CLARK. In most instances that would come from the local high school counseling and guidance service. Very few of the camps would be located so far away from a high school that the guidance and counseling service would not be available on a part-time basis.

Mr. CURTIS. Is that what the bill provides?

Mr. CLARK. No; there is nothing in the bill about it.

Mr. CURTIS. I raise the question because some very fine physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, and others have pointed out that a grave mistake is being made in connection with the National Defense Training Act. They have said that people who are literally amateurs—who have perhaps no training, or 6 weeks' training—are carrying on counseling and guidance services. In some instances they analyze the students, they inform him that he has a problem, and they proceed to solve it; though perhaps he is a very normal individual who needs a pat on the back, a smile, and a little encouragement, rather than to have an amateur operate on his emotional and nervous system.

I am concerned about a bill which would allow the carrying on of an educational program with nothing in it as to the qualifications of those who are to instruct.

I have another question. Would there be a chaplain service?

Mr. CLARK. I doubt that there would be. The bill provides for the conduct of religious services. Again, I am speaking for myself. There was no testimony on the subject, because I do not think any member of the committee thought it worthwhile to raise the question. I doubt that there would be a resident priest, rabbi, or chaplain, but I am sure there would be interdenominational religious services.

Mr. CURTIS. Would those be provided in facilities of the Youth Conservation Corps?

Mr. CLARK. That question was never raised in the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. It has been raised in the Supreme Court. I think the Court was wrong, but it has been raised. I wondered if the Congress was bowing to the Supreme Court and bypassing the question, or what provision had been made.

Mr. CLARK. All I can say to my friend from Nebraska is that this seemed to members of the committee to be a matter of ordinary common sense, and nothing to become excited about. There would be religious services. That is all I can say.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the bill provide for that?

Mr. CLARK. I am trying to find that in the report, if the Senator will indulge me a moment.

Mr. CURTIS. I looked at the report, under the subject of education and training. I found nothing about it.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, and perhaps go to another subject while we are looking it up, I am sure we can find that information.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, while the Senator is having that subject checked, if the distinguished Senator from Vermont would permit me to proceed on his time for a couple of minutes, I should like to make an observation or two.

My sympathies are with the young men of America who will need this program. I point out that the bill under consideration by the Senate today is the symptom of something radically wrong in our economy. A growing economy, providing jobs, would be far better. An opportunity to have a job, to seek promotion, to learn, and to advance in a position with some permanency, would be much better than "made work" under a Government organization.

I am aware that made work can sometimes be very helpful to the public. It is helpful to have our national forests cared for, brush cleared, trees trimmed, and all the other things that must be done. But to rotate boys in those areas for from 6 months to 2 years does not offer them anything permanent. It cannot be justified as an educational system, because we are inaugurating it without curricula or requirements on the part of anyone who will instruct.

I now turn to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania in reference to my question as to what the bill provides in regard to religious services.

Mr. CLARK. In response to the Senator from Nebraska, there is nothing in the bill, but on page 11 of the report, under the heading "Education and Training," there is this sentence:

> There will be recreational facilities with sports, and religious services will be provided for enrollees of all faiths.

Mr. CURTIS. Is that a part of the Federal responsibility?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. While I have grave doubts as to many parts of the bill, I commend the committee for putting that section in it, and not bowing to the Supreme Court and its philosophy in this field. In the New York prayer case, the majority opinion was bad enough, but under the concurring opinion by Justice Douglas, if carried out, this body could not have a chaplain. The chaplaincy service of the Armed Forces would have to be abolished, and all sorts of ridiculous things done that go far beyond the concept of the Founding Fathers; namely, that the Government should not operate a church and tax the people to do it.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding so generously.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 52 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). A quorum is present.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

Beginning with line 1 of page 24 of the bill, strike out all through line 7 on page 39, and insert the following:

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'State and Community Youth Employment Act'."

On page 39, line 12, strike out "SEC. 202" and insert "SEC. 2".

On page 39, line 12, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 39, line 24, strike out "SEC. 203" and insert "SEC. 3".

On page 39, line 25, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 40, line 2, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 41, line 2, strike out "SEC. 204" and insert "SEC. 4".

On page 41, line 3, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 42, line 18, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 42, line 22, strike out "SEC. 205" and insert "SEC. 5".

On page 42, line 22, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 43, line 1, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 43, line 19, strike out "SEC. 206" and insert "SEC. 6".

On page 43, line 21, strike out "204" and insert "4".

On page 45, line 9, strike out "SEC. 207" and insert "SEC. 7".

On page 45, line 9, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 45, line 13, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 46, line 3, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 46, line 8, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 46, line 9, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 46, line 13, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 46, line 17, strike out "SEC. 208" and insert "SEC. 8".

On page 47, line 7, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 47, lines 8 and 9, strike out "209 of this title", and insert "2 of this Act".

On page 47, line 11, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 47, line 13, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 47, line 19, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 48, line 12, strike out "SEC. 209" and insert "SEC. 9".

On page 48, line 12, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 48, line 20, strike out "SEC. 210" and insert "SEC. 10".

On page 48, line 21, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 48, line 25, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 49, line 2, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 49, line 6, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 49, line 8, strike out "SEC. 211" and insert "SEC. 11".

On page 49, line 12, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

On page 49, line 16, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

Mr. PROUTY. I might explain to Senators that, except for a technical change, the amendent is identical with my printed amendment 44, which is on Senators' desks at the present time. It seeks to strike out title I.

Mr. President, before Senators leave the Chamber, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Many Senators are eager to know whether they should go to dinner or remain in the Chamber. It would be an act of kindness if the Senator would let us know how soon the Senate may be able to vote.

Mr. PROUTY. If the amendment that I am proposing is agreed to, the Senate should be able to move very rapidly insofar as the bill is concerned.

Mr. CLARK. When will the Senate be able to vote on the amendment?

Mr. PROUTY. I do not believe it will take too long. I have a rather short statement to make. I believe Senators would be well advised to remain in the Chamber.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the basis of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I suggest to the attachés of the Senate that they notify all senatorial offices to the effect that there may be a vote within the next half hour.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am not in the least opposed to healthful recreation, out-of-doors experience, or the spirit of comradeship which exists among campers. I spent much of my young life in such an environment. Such a life—for 6 months or even 2 years—has a great deal of emotional appeal. It would be, in the words of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], a very popular program.

I submit, however, that if popularity is the basis upon which we should legislate, the Congress should adjourn and go home.

There are several reasons why I have offered this amendment. I shall consider each of them briefly.

First. Admittedly, the problem of youth unemployment is essentially one of lack of skills in unemployed youth. With the advent of automation, unskilled labor is rapidly disappearing, at least in relation to the vast increase in our labor supply. The increased sophistication in the most minor jobs in our economy requires skills which our educational system has not provided.

Thus, the primary objective in any Federal program to cope with unemployment among our young people should be to assure them the opportunity for training in order that they may assume a proper place in our economic structure.

Training is sorely lacking under the provisions of title I of the bill. The entire record of hearings on S. 1 establishes that title I is a conservation measure, to clean up our national parks with the help of young men living in camps—far removed from training facilities and competent instructors.

Secretary Wirtz, several times in his testimony before the subcommittee, emphasized, as on page 123 of the hearings:

> I call attention to this: First, there is no suggestion that this training program will qualify one of the enrollees for a skilled occupation. That, we should dismiss completely.

What is the point, I should like to know, in spending $50 million to "dismiss completely" the thought of training these young men for skilled work? Everyone admits they must have training to be employed, and that the lack of such training is the real reason why they are not employed now.

Hence, title I of the bill ignores the root of the problem. In effect, it proposes that we shift unemployed young men into the woods for 6 months or 2 years; and then return them to an unemployed status, no better equipped to enter the labor market, with no essential change in them other than that they are 6 months or 2 years older. On return from camp, they still would be beset by the same problem—no job; and they would have less chance to obtain one, because they would still have no skill, and they would then be much older than their competition.

Indeed, the proposal of title I might be popular. Time spent in the wilderness is a magnificent opportunity. But I have no doubt that the proponents of title I are going to be revisited rudely by a multiplication of the present problem should the YCC get underway and return older, unskilled men to the labor market.

Lipservice has been paid to training in title I. It is, however, only lipservice. The West is a big place, and its distances are far. I cannot imagine these boys at hard work during a day and then being transported to the "local public education facilities" as suggested by Secretary Celebrezze of Health, Education, and Welfare, for training. There are not that many hours in a day.

Second. I oppose title I, and am seeking to have it deleted from the bill, for a second reason. The chief administration witness on this bill, Secretary Wirtz, testified:

> We are satisfied completely that the experience, the work discipline, and in effect the certification, that we can give employers, at the end of this 6-month training period will open employment doors to them * * *. We would be able to say: This is a boy who has shown himself to be responsible. He has been exposed to work.

It is my firm belief that there is no justification for spending the vast sums proposed to be authorized in the bill—$50 million for 15,000 young men to go to camp for "work experience."

In view of the reduction made yesterday in the authorization for title I and the expense involved in renovating certain camps which are supposed to be available, it would be impossible under the program to accept many more than 8,200 enrollees unless the present authorization were exceeded.

That experience can just as easily be acquired under title II of the bill or, indeed, in the on-the-job training under the Manpower Development and Training Act. In short, there is nothing sacred about the work experience, on jobs largely unrelated to labor's requirements, which one would acquire in these camps. He could much more profitably acquire such experience under existing programs in his own hometown, and at one-fourth of the cost as shown by the administration figures in title II.

Third. S. 1, and more particularly title I, is essentially a conservation measure.

I would not be misunderstood. Of course I favor conservation legislation. My action during the last few days of debate on wilderness legislation shows my attitude with respect to conservation of our wilderness and our park areas.

Under our committee system, however, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is not the place to consider conservation legislation. That is within the jurisdiction of the Interior Committee. They have had no chance at all to look into what is essentially a conservation bill.

There has been a massive propaganda and advertising campaign to promote title I of the bill. I think it is wrong to obscure the serious problems of our unemployment situation among young people by disguising the fallacies of title I as a conservation program.

Certainly we need conservation legislation. I am in favor of it. But it is wrong to pull the wool over our conservationists' eyes by attempting to convince them that this is fine legislation. Not only would conservation suffer a setback as a result of title I; the serious problem of unskilled youth on our street corners would likewise receive little relief from it.

The Director of the National Park Service, Conrad Wirth, who has held that post since 1951, testified at the hearings on the bill. He, more than any other man, should certainly know something about conservation and the people to do the job.

Under extensive questioning, Mr. Wirth testified that he now has 6,000 permanent employees who are "rangers, road maintenance people, and things like that." He stated several times in his testimony that he needs 1,000 more permanent employees in the field of the Park Service. He also has 4,000 temporary summer employees and could use 4,000 or 5,000 more each summer; that is, as Mr. Wirth testified, "during the season when we can work."

From his testimony, I gather that Mr. Wirth has little doubt that he has enough applicants for these seasonal jobs. His problem is budgetary sums large enough to hire them. However, that problem should not be solved by a Youth Conservation Corps. It is not a labor problem or an unemployment problem. It is one of conservation and budget with which the Labor Committees are not and should not be concerned.

Certainly the 1,000 additional permanent and 4,000 additional temporary personnel which Mr. Wirth can use in the Park Service cannot possibly cost $60 million per year, as would the Conservation Corps under title I.

So that there may be no doubt about the nature of the YCC and its real intentions, I asked Mr. Wirth what he considered to be the objectives of title I. He listed three objectives—none of which has much to do with providing skills to unemployed youth in order that they would be better equipped to enter the labor market.

At page 195 in the hearings, Mr. Wirth listed the objectives of title I as he sees them. They are:

> (It) is a conservation program.
>
> (It) will be of great social value to the boys.

And almost parenthetically—

> (It) is a training program for work and to learn how to work and to take orders and do those kinds of things.

Almost any job—certainly any job under the present training programs of the Federal Government—will provide work experience, discipline, and good work habits. But the difference is that under such programs a young man can also acquire skills to assist him in the competitive labor market.

Mr. President, I should like to sum up my feelings and attitudes about title I of Senate bill 1.

The YCC does not, cannot, and will not get at the root of our problem of unemployed youth—not even if twice the already exorbitant price of $60 million is authorized for it. It makes only a pretense at training, which everyone recognizes as the real essential to solve the unemployment of youth.

The expense of the program—ranging from the administration's figures of as high as $12,000 to only as low as $4,000—is nothing short of unthinkable. Especially is this true when a quick look at title II of the same bill provides more nearly for a combination of work experience and training which may be a partial answer to this problem. Even title II of S. 1 requires an expenditure of only approximately $1,000 per man.

In closing, I should like to quote again from Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz. The Secretary is an extremely able and dedicated man. His view of the Youth Conservation Corps sums up well, I think, the sheer folly of title I, especially as it relates to the problem of unemployed youth.

He said:

> The largest shortages ahead, or the enlargement of the shortage for the future, as part of the technological development which we call automation, are going to be principally in skill jobs. Those are where the shortages would develop during the next 10 years.
>
> And, consistently with my answer to an earlier question, it would not be thought that there would be any high percentage of qualifications as a result of these programs for the complete satisfaction of any skilled or even semiskilled or semiprofessional jobs. They would not do that.

There, Mr. President, is title I in a nutshell. It does not get at the heart of the problem. It is simply the icing on the cake, the popular thing to do, the something-for-everyone provision which will make other programs, some of which are necessary, seem palatable.

Mr. President, this youth unemployment situation is far too serious for us to be playing games with.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending amendment would cut the bill in half, and would murder the part of the program which calls for work by youth on Federal lands, national forests, or national parks.

The case for title I is made in the committee report, which was placed in the Record yesterday, and has been referred to many times during the debate today. I do not need to refer again to it.

The case in support of title I has been made today on the floor. Accordingly, I shall not attempt to answer the arguments of the Senator from Vermont, which in my opinion have already been adequately covered.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the pending amendment will be defeated, and that the Senate will vote promptly.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I shall take only a few minutes to read from the minority views of the House committee members on this Youth Employment Act. I begin to read from page 60:

Cabinet Officers Disagree Over the Real Purpose of the Corps and the Training It Will Provide

One of the most discouraging aspects of this legislation is the fact that it is apparently all things to all people. Arm waving and high-sounding platitudes have been substituted for specifics and clarity of purpose. There is confusion among the various Cabinet officers as to just what title I is expected to do. Although both Secretary Wirtz and Secretary Celebrezze insisted that young men would be trained effectively in the camps, when questioned on this point, Secretary Celebrezze stated: "Occupational training will be provided. The object of this program should be to assure that the youth is better prepared for a job in his home community than he was when he joined the Corps."

While Secretary Wirtz stated: "It will not qualify them for many of what we consider the usual skills."

And Secretary Freeman said: "I don't conceive that every one of these young men is going to be able to go back to the labor market with a fully developed skill * * *. This program isn't designed to turn someone out of a camp to go and run Univac or even to be a bricklayer or even to be an apprentice carpenter."

Also in reply to a question by Congressman Landrum as to whether or not the enrollee will have to go to vocational school when he gets out, Secretary Freeman stated: "I think many will; yes."

Moreover, both the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture emphasized that in their opinion the primary purpose of this legislation is conservation. As Secretary Udall put it: "My responsibility is, of course, the conservation responsibility and, as far as my own view of the program is concerned, the benefit to the young people is coincidental."

Finally, the experience gained in the old CCC program clearly demonstrated that real education in fields unrelated to daily tasks cannot be accomplished in conservation camps. As Conrad Wirth stated: "Growing kids need their rest. And so the idea of putting in a lot of hours at night for study after putting in 8 hours of work was not good, in my opinion."

Of course, he was referring to the experience with the CCC camps.

I read further:

Notwithstanding this experience and the realistic evaluation by Mr. Wirth, Secretary Celebrezze testified: "We will form a regular class section where they can work during the day and go to school during the evening."

THE RETURNING ENROLLEE—UNTRAINED, UNSKILLED, AND UNEMPLOYED

When the enrollee returns from the corps, his problems will not be any less than they were when he first enrolled. As has been noted, he will not receive training in a particular, employable skill. If he is a school dropout his class will be 6 months to 2 years further ahead of him. The best that can be said is that with nothing more than a "changed outlook" he will once again have to compete for an ever-diminishing number of unskilled jobs or seek further training and education.

The plight of the returning enrollee was unwittingly but dramatically underscored by Secretary Celebrezze when he stated: "When he comes out he can go to work for a city in their parks department trimming trees, these are skills which you can learn in the 6-month periods and have some useful employment when you go back, either working for your city or working for a private nursery as far as that goes."

The following colloquy between Congresswoman Green, Secretary Udall, and Congressman Perkins is also a fair evaluation of the employment problems of the returning enrollee:

"Mrs. Green. I was wondering for the young man who comes from one of the urban centers, who may be a school dropout or may not. How much value would it be really to that person to transport him to one of our beautiful parks or forests in Oregon, for example, for 6 months and then he would go back to the city streets? What skills would he have?

"Mr. Perkins. He could learn how to operate all types of farming equipment and it would stimulate him so that he may want to go and seek employment on the farm.

"Secretary Udall. I am sure this is what will happen as a practical matter. I think this was the experience under the old program."

Certainly jobs on farms are not too plentiful in many parts of the country at the present time.

The minority views continue, as follows:

With respect to the proposed employment of returning enrollees in city parks and on farms, it should be noted that under title II young people are supposed to find employment in city parks. This would mean that title I and title II enrollees would be fighting over the same seasonal jobs, the same pick and shovel, or possibly sharing them. The potential farm employment picture was also graphically described by Secretary Freeman when he stated: "Only 1 in 10 of the boys now on farms can expect to make a good living in agriculture and if the underemployment now existing on our farms were translated into man-years of unemployment, it would add more than a million to our figures of unemployed."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

On the vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Aiken
Beall
Boggs
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—47

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Engle
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Kefauver
Kennedy
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—12

Allott
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Edmondson
Ellender
Hayden
Holland
Long, Mo.
Morton
Scott
Simpson
Young, Ohio

So Mr. Prouty's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table. [Putting the question.]

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer repeat the vote? Was it 41 in favor and 47 opposed?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The vote was 41 to 47, as previously stated.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, let us be clear. The vote for the amendment was—

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. 41 yeas and 47 nays. The amendment was rejected.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and other interested Senators, I should like at this time to raise the question of the possibility of a time limitation on remaining amendments—say 10 minutes to each amendment, divided 5 minutes to each side.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Before the majority leader puts that request, Mr. President, I wonder if he would object to a show of hands or an expression of the sentiment of the Senate, as to the number of amendments likely to be offered.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I believe that is a good suggestion. How many Senators have amendments which they are contemplating offering at this time?

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Mr. President——

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. One.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Yes.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. I have five.

Mr. **PROUTY**. Mr. President, I think I have about five.

Mr. **KEATING**. I have one amendment. I am perfectly willing to agree to a time limitation.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. There will be 10 or 12.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Mr. President, before the Senator makes a unanimous-consent request, let me say that I have no intention of trying to delay the Senate. I doubt that I shall ask for a record vote on any of my amendments. I think my explanations of the amendments will be well within the 10 minutes on each amendment.

I suggest that nature be allowed to take its course. So far as I am concerned, I have no desire to discuss the amendments at great length. I am long overdue on an engagement with my wife, which I do not wish to miss.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. The Senator is not alone.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. I know that. I would suggest that the debate be allowed to continue. I think my amendments are necessary to make the bill a better bill; but even if they are rejected I think it is necessary to establish a record. I do not intend to delay the Senate. The longest explanation I have will probably be no longer than 2½ double spaced, typewritten pages.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, in reply, I wish to say that the Senator from Arizona is always most considerate.

Would it be agreeable for me to propound the unanimous-consent request that there be 20 minutes on each amendment, to be divided 10 minutes to a side, exclusive of the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Arizona, who has indicated that his amendments can be considered in a shorter period of time?

Mr. **PROUTY**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I yield.

Mr. **PROUTY**. I am agreeable to that request, with the exception of a substitute amendment which I intend to offer later. I assure the distinguished majority leader that I shall not take a great deal of time.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the limitation, with the exception of the substitute amendment to be offered by the Senator from Vermont and with the exception of the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Mr. President, I assure the majority leader that I shall not consume more than 10 minutes on any amendment.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. We understand.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Unless some Senator wishes to engage me in a discussion. This morning I had a 20-minute speech, which required 2 hours.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. We shall do our best to give the Senator the field to himself.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. As it turned out, there was a great deal of discussion.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 39 and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, between lines 16 and 17, and on page 43, line 2, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

> Male individuals who have attained age eighteen shall not be eligible for enrollment or participation until they have fulfilled their obligation of military service under the Selective Service Act or can present a certificate from their local Selective Service Board indicating that they have volunteered for induction and that they have been rejected or deferred for a legitimate reason.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Mr. President, before I yield to my friend from Oregon, I wish to make a correction of an error which was inadvertently made in the printing of the amendment. On line 2 of the amendment appear the words "line 2," which should be "line 1." I call the attention of the clerk to that correction. It was an error in printing, and not an error in reading. I ask unanimous consent that that correction be made.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The correction will be made.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. I am happy to yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute to comment on the last vote of the Senate, dealing with the amendment to strike title I. I had hoped that this brief comment of mine might be made before the vote, but I was in the cloakroom talking with one of the most able and best informed conservationists in our country, Mr. Spencer Smith. By the time I reached the Chamber, the rollcall had already started.

I wish the RECORD to show that a large group of conservation organizations have been for the purpose of title I long before the bill was introduced. I wish to have the RECORD show that title I has had the enthusiastic, longtime support of such organizations as the Wildlife Management Institute, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the National Parks Association, and the National Audubon Society.

I know of no group of organizations more dedicated to the cause of sound conservation, both of our so-called natural resources and our human resources, than this group of ardent supporters of title I. I think the RECORD should show, and I am pleased to have it show through my lips, the support by these conservation organizations of title I of the bill.

Further I wish to thank Prof. Spencer Smith for his great help in bringing the facts in support of title I to the attention of Senators. For some years now I have relied heavily upon Spencer Smith for factual assistance in the preparation of many of my arguments in the large number of debates I have engaged in on conservation and natural resource issues. I have found him to be one of the best informed conservationists in the country. Spencer Smith is dedicated on the major tenet that guides and directs me in all my work on conservationist issues, namely, "each generation is but the trustee of God's gift of natural resources to our country. Each generation has an obligation to see to it that we leave those natural resources to future generations of American boys and girls in a better condition than that in which we found them." Title I of the Youth Corps bill now before the Senate is essential to our keeping faith with that trusteeship obligation.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Mr. President, in explanation of my amendment, it would make the programs for young men under both titles, in effect, supplementary to the military draft program by limiting male eligibility to those who, being of the proper age, have either completed their military obligations under the Selective Service Act or who have been legitimately rejected—such as for health reasons—after having volunteered for induction.

This linking together of the programs set forth in the bill with the selective service program is justified by every consideration of logic and fact. Under repeated questioning, the Secretary of Labor admitted that the work experience acquired by young men under the bill would not train them specifically to fill jobs for which the labor supply was insufficient to meet the demand. He merely speculated hopefully that the youngsters who completed a stint in the corps would acquire habits of work and discipline that would make them more attractive as possible employees to employers looking for workers.

If this be so, military service would be far more effective in achieving the professed objective than the programs proposed in the bill. Not only would such service help to strengthen the national security, it would also instill principles of patriotism and national loyalty which are not acquired on the streets by idle and unemployed young dropouts. Far more than under the bill, military service would inculcate habits of work and discipline, and under conditions which would not single out or stigmatize individuals in any way, as enrollment under the S. 1 program would do, the requirement of military service being, at least in contemplation of law, universal in its applicability to our male young people.

Moreover, a tour of duty in any branch of our service provides excellent opportunities and facilities for education and vocational training in skills designed to enhance the future earning power of the young draftees after they have completed their military service. Nothing in the programs proposed under S. 1 offers equal advantages for self-improvement both educationally and vocationally.

A further consideration which should not be overlooked is that the young men at whose enrollment the bill's programs are primarily directed are precisely those who, in all logic and fairness, should be the first ones drafted. Military service will not interrupt their education, the assumption being that their education has in most cases already been interrupted, in fact, terminated. Being unemployed, their military service will in no way adversely affect their dependents; to the contrary, most of the enrollees will themselves have been dependents, and those responsible for their support can only profit by their induction.

Thus, my amendment, by requiring fulfillment of their obligation under the draft laws as a condition precedent to enrollment under the bill, serves not only the primary national goal of an adequate military defense, but achieves the objectives professed by S. 1 in a far more effective and comprehensive manner.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Arizona was carefully considered in committee, and rejected by a vote of 11 to 3. I hope the Senate will also reject it. In my opinion, and that of the committee, it would create an administrative situation which would be very difficult to deal with. It would be impossible to administer, as a practical matter. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in brief reply, I may observe that the failure to enact this amendment would create equally difficult administrative problems in the area of defense. I hope the Senate, in its wisdom, will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Is there further discussion?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Would enrollment in the corps relieve the enrollee from discharging his military obligation?

Mr. GOLDWATER. As I understand the bill—and the Senator in charge of the bill can correct me—enrollment in the corps would not overrule the possibility of the enrollee's being drafted.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. We wrote that provision in on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. COOPER. If a boy were enrolled in the corps and his number were called by the local draft board, would he be required to enter the military service?

Mr. GOLDWATER. As I understand, that is correct. My only purpose in offering the amendment is to give the boy what is actually a better opportunity for training and discipline, under the tutelage of the military service, rather than under this loosely knit organization.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator that service in the Army, Navy, or Air Corps would provide better training and discipline.

I wish to ask one further question.

Suppose a boy between the ages of 16 and 22 should be rejected by the armed services. Would the amendment of the Senator from Arizona affect that boy in any way?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. In fact, a part of my amendment carries the language that if he displays a physical-disqualifying certificate from the draft board, he will be available for this particular corps.

Mr. COOPER. May I ask one further question? Assume that a boy had registered but had not been called up, and there was no necessity for him to report. Could he become a member of the corps even though he had not been called up?

Mr. GOLDWATER. As I understand, he could become a member of the corps, but he would be subject to the draft. As I have said, and I repeat, my only purpose is to try to—I do not like to use the word "force," but induce the boy to try the military service before he tries this avenue.

Mr. COOPER. Would he be required to enlist before he could become a member of the corps?

Mr. GOLDWATER. As I understand the language of the bill, the answer is "No"; he would not be required to do so.

Mr. COOPER. He would not be required to do so under the amendment of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. He would have to show a certificate that he was disqualified physically, technically, or otherwise; but, as I understand, under the terms of the bill, he could still be drafted if he were physically qualified to be drafted.

I repeat, my interest is to try to induce young people to seek military service before they seek the rather nebulous training of hacking out trails in the woods.

Mr. COOPER. Would the amendment of the Senator from Arizona require the boy to make an effort to join the military service?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Would the Senator consider that a form of coercion?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, I would not, because, under the full language of the bill, if it is used in the way in which I think it will be used to rid the streets of juvenile delinquents, coercion is already written into the bill. My amendment would give young persons an opportunity to seek what I think is a better way of training than is offered by the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I agree. I would rather see them in the military service, but my question is whether it would require them to enlist before they would be eligible to join the corps.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not think that is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered 40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 29, line 13, after the word "individuals" to insert the words "of good character" and on line 15, to strike the comma and all the language following the comma on lines 15 and 16.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think this amendment, of all those that I will offer, is the most important one. As I understand, in the original draft this subject was covered, but the language was removed during subcommittee considerations of the bill.

As the amendment well defines its purpose, it deals with the question of character. Whom are we going to admit into the corps?

In his appearance before our subcommittee in 1959, dealing with the bill, S. 812, Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, testified that when he was Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps there was a 200-man camp in Yellowstone with enrollment made up of boys from a very large city. The camp had been operating for barely 2 weeks, and here I quote from Mr. Wirth's testimony, "when the superintendent got a call for help from the camp commander, he had a riot on his hands."

Considering the lives and backgrounds of many of the youngsters who will be enrolled in the YCC under this bill, such outbreaks would not be surprising. In other words, discipline will be an important problem and no amount of advance verbal reassurance can guarantee that such outbreaks will not occur or that they can properly be handled when they do.

Despite this problem, and despite the recognition in the final report of the old CCC of the valuable contribution to that program made by the armed services, the committee rejected my amendment to provide participation by the armed services in the proposed programs. Moreover, the subcommittee previously had eliminated the requirement that enrollees be of "good character" which had been in the first committee print considered by the subcommittee. In its place was substituted a general requirement that enrollment would be limited to individuals "whose participation in the corps will be consistent with the purposes of this title."

This requirement is so vague as to be meaningless; it merely confers unlimited power on the Federal authorities in charge of the YCC to determine who shall be accepted for enrollment without a single concrete standard in the legislation to guide them. This is not only a dangerous procedure, representing as it does a further abdication by the Congress of its constitutional legislative function, but it is entirely impracticable. If genuinely undesirable characters are to be excluded from the Corps, and no specific criterion exists for determining their acceptability, it would require an entire corps of social workers, psychiatrists, social psychologists and educational and vocational counselors to make an individual determination of acceptability for each separate applicant for enrollment. I see nothing in the bill or in the testimony for that matter, to indicate how and by whom these determinations would be made, and how extensive an investigation and study of each applicant would be necessary to make a correct determination on his eligibility.

My concern is not a mere phantom. I notice that when he appeared before the subcommittee, Dr. Carl Hansen, the very able and estimable Superintendent of Schools for the District of Columbia, testifying on the original bill before the subcommittee added the enrollment requirement of "good character" answered a question of Senator PROUTY's as follows:

> Senator PROUTY. If I understand you correctly, you are suggesting that we should take the delinquents and send them to the [YCC] camps.
>
> Dr. HANSEN. This would be my suggestion. Now, I understand, I know this, from the point of view of the product at the end of 6 months, and being able to make a record to show that this has been very successful and productive, it is much more difficult, and there is a far greater risk of failure and upheavals and assaults in the camp and that sort of thing.
>
> But what are you going to do? Leave these youths out on the street alone?

It is plain that Dr. Hansen sees these YCC camps as a repository for intractable youngsters, even for hardened juvenile delinquents. I do not believe the American people want that sort of thing. Hence, I offer my amendment to restore the bill's previous language requiring applicants to be of "good character" as a qualification for enrollment.

I believe this is a very serious question. I wish that more Senators were present in the Chamber. If there are repercussions from the enactment of the pending bill, I feel certain that they will come from the failure of the bill to provide any basis for judgment of good character. The proponents of the bill might argue contrarywise. However, it seems to me that a convicted murderer, or a man suspected of murder, could well qualify as an applicant. If Dr. Hansen's views are held generally across the country by people concerned with juvenile delinquency, we are creating, in effect, in title I, a juvenile delinquency corps to be placed in the Nation's forests and lands.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. COTTON. I was not present during all of the colloquy which took place before the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into. Was there any agreement entered into between the distinguished Senator from Arizona and the majority leader that there would be no yea-and-nay votes on any of his amendments?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. I merely said that I did not believe I would call for a yea-and-nay vote. I believe it is important enough that we should have one. If our colleagues were still within earshot of the bells, I would certainly yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. COTTON. The amendment is of paramount importance. I was prosecuting attorney of a rural county during the CCC camp days. We had some problems that were baffling to the civilian authorities, particularly those of our rural county. We ran into extreme difficulties. The Senator's amendment goes to an extremely sensitive point.

I sincerely hope that if no such agreement has been entered into, none will be. I hope the Senator will ask for a yea-and-nay vote. If he does not, I would like to ask for it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. At the suggestion of my friend from New Hampshire, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for the moment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator knows that the good character requirement was initially included in the bill. It was stricken out. It is a matter on which the committee toiled for quite a long time. I personally believe it is tweedledee and tweedledum, whether it is good character or whether it is the way it is written in the bill.

The principal advocate of the present language in the bill is the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I would not like to accept the amendment in the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts, because I know he feels very strongly about it. If the Senator would be willing temporarily to withhold his amendment and bring up his next one, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts whether he wants a yea-and-nay vote or whether he will accept the amendment. I have asked the Senator from Massachusetts to come to the Chamber.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would naturally be very much interested in hearing what the junior Senator from Massachusetts has to say about this amendment. I was quite surprised that it was his vote that eliminated this provision.

As I said in my explanation, I cannot believe that the American people are willing to accept such a bill without some guarantee that their children will be going to camp with people of good character.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will withhold his amendment, it can be discussed at greater length.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have some more discussion of it. I should like to read an article published in the Northern Virginia Sun of March 6, 1963.

> YOUTH CORPS BACKER CHARGED IN BURGLARY
>
> PHILADELPHIA.—Michael Ford, 16, who last month testified before a House subcommittee on the city's Youth Conservation Corps, was arrested Tuesday on burglary charges.
>
> The boy's stepfather, Robert Williams, went to police after finding a loaded revolver in the suspect's room. "I think I made the right decision," Williams said.
>
> Police charged Ford in the burglary last Saturday of a bakery near his home. They said $1,070 in cash and $642 in checks was taken. The youth said he found the gun and money in an alley over the weekend. He said he discarded the checks and spent all but $13 of the money on clothes and a portable radio.
>
> Williams said the boy is "in the clutches" of a street gang. "I knew damned well he was mixed up in something," Williams said.
>
> The youth testified last month at the invitation of Representative CARL D. PERKINS, Democrat of Kentucky, and told the subcommittee if more boys were interested in the Youth Conservation Corps "there would be less tendency for them to get into trouble."

I do not believe I could offer any better testimony for the need of my amendment than that which this supporter of the bill has given.

If the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes, I shall be glad to defer the further consideration of the amendment until the junior Senator from Massachusetts comes to the Chamber. However, I hope the Senator in his wisdom, will accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. If I may interrupt the Senator, it was my hope that we might arrange to accept the amendment and thus avoid the necessity for another yea-and-nay vote.

As to the boy from Philadelphia, we can never tell whom the other body will call as a witness. We did not call him as our witness.

Would not the Senator from Arizona consider taking up his next amendment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be happy to do so; but, as I mentioned earlier, I do not preclude the possibility of a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment. This is probably the most important amendment I shall call up. However, I shall be glad to sidetrack it by unanimous consent, with the understanding that it will be taken up again when the junior Senator from Massachusetts is present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Massachusetts has just entered the Chamber.

I should like the attention of the junior Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Arizona has called up his well-known "good character" amendment. The Senator from Massachusetts may recall that he very ably sustained his position with the committee, and the committee went along with him to strike "good character" from the bill and to substitute language to the effect that the members of the Corps should be composed of those whose participation in the Corps would be consistent with the purposes of this title. The Senator from Arizona now suggests that he would like to have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment to substitute the words "good character."

While the Senator from Massachusetts was not in the Chamber, I did not wish to make a decision whether to accept the amendment or to let it proceed to a yea-and-nay vote and to stand by the committee. Perhaps Senators would be more enlightened if the Senator from Massachusetts would state the principal reasons why he persuaded the committee to strike "good character" and to write in the other language. I assure the Senator from Massachusetts that I shall support him in whatever he chooses to do.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the committee report shows the reasons for the changes in the initial language. In the proposed language guidelines are established in the reference back to the purposes of the title itself.

What we are really attempting to do by this provision is to provide guidelines and at the same time give a degree of flexibility to the director. Language should not be adopted which places the director in a straitjacket. By having the guidelines and flexibility provided with regard to enrollment the administrator can protect the purposes of the legislation and insure the success of this program.

The paramount question is the motivation of the young people who apply for this opportunity. We cannot by the words "good character" better insure the correct motivation of these young people.

The administrator would have a degree of flexibility, which is of the utmost importance. Any administrator would be interested in the successful implementation of the program itself. Therefore, we must assume he would be judicious in admitting into the program persons who would take proper advantage of the program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts has given a very good explanation of the language on page 29, lines 12, 13, 14, and following, in the bill. It is my understanding that the Senator from Arizona desires to include, after the word "individuals" on line 13, the words "of good character." It is my further understanding, reading the bill as it covers the subject, that individuals of good character are not excluded. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Therefore, it appears to me that what the Senator from Massachusetts has desired to do is to open the program to all persons, those who may not be of good character, but who may need assistance—and the bill provides them an opportunity to better themselves—as well as those of good character, because they are not excluded.

The Senator from Massachusetts has a good point. I hope that on the basis of his explanation the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be rejected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let us pursue the point a little further. Let us read the statement of purpose which the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Pennsylvania, and the Senator from Montana believe will cover the situation. I read the statement of purpose, section 102:

> STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
>
> SEC. 102. The purpose of this title is (1) to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed youths so that their employability may be increased through participation in such programs of conservation planned and designed by, and under the immediate supervision of, the various Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of planning and carrying out such programs; and (2) to enable the Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving and developing natural resources and recreational areas to accelerate programs planned by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility.

I ask any Senator to explain how this language would solve the problem of good character. When the subject was discussed in committee, I offered the language contained in my amendment, but it was rejected. A question was raised as to what constitutes "good character."

Let us take a negative approach. Let us consider the case of a boy shipped out of a large metropolitan city, a boy who has become a nuisance to the police because of repeated crimes and because of gangster associations. Certainly such a boy is not a boy of good character; he is not a boy with whom American families would want their children to associate.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator will recall, at the time of the subcommittee hearings four young people appeared and testified on the mobilization program on the East Side of New York City. The record shows that two of them had some desire to drop out of school, while two of them had had brushes with the law. All four had indicated their association with the mobilization program and stated that they were benefiting substantially from it.

I am concerned that the purpose of the bill might not be fulfilled by adding the words "good character." A rigid definition of this phrase would exclude many young people who today have the appropriate motivation and could benefit substantially from the proposed legislation.

I do not believe that the proposed language would turn this into a program for hardened juvenile delinquents. To assume so would be to fail to recognize what any capable administrator would try to do if he were trying to make the program successful.

What we are attempting to do by this language is to avoid the possibility of a narrow, strict construction being placed on the words "good character" which might exclude very deserving young people.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Massachusetts has given us four examples. Two of them are dropouts. I do not consider a boy who drops out of high school to have a bad character. In fact, I think I am more concerned than are the proponents of the bill about the dropouts, because I believe we are not here providing the real answer for them. However, that is beside the point.

Two of the examples the Senator from Massachusetts gave are dropouts. Two of them had "brushes with the law." What kind of "brushes with the law" did they have? Did they receive a parking ticket, or did they exceed the speed limit, or did they violate a curfew? Certainly such things would not brand them as having bad character.

But suppose the "brushes with the law" had been participation in a gang holdup or participation in a gang which beat up an elderly person—such as occurs night after night in the city of Washington, D.C. Can such a boy be said to have a good character? No.

So it seems to me that the Senator's premise about these youths having good character does not apply.

The bill refers to providing employment for youths, and refers to developing the natural resources. We do not point the finger at a boy who has had a minor altercation with the law, and therefore say, "You are a bad citizen; you have a bad character." The courts decide such things.

Under the bill, however, in the absence of language such as is proposed in the amendment, the administrators could select anyone they might wish to select. Frankly, I think Congress has to provide some legislative guidelines in order to guide the administrators in the exercise of discretion in connection with such matters.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in further explanation let me say that it is felt that the standard of good moral character as a qualification for admission to the Corps is unsatisfactory. It lacks precision in definition, and presents the danger of an unduly restrictive interpretation which possibly would deny a second chance to a deserving young person.

The section on composition of the Corps clearly does establish standards for qualification. The Director is required to limit enrollment to those whose participation in the Corps will be consistent with the expressed purposes of the two programs contemplated in this legislation. These purposes are: First, to increase the individual's employability; and second, to enable the appropriate Federal agencies to accelerate their programs and fulfill their responsibilities in conserving and developing natural resources and recreational areas.

It is clear that the Director would violate his statutory duty if he were to admit individuals whom he felt were not likely to benefit in a way which would result in their increased employability. In the case of title I, he would also be derelict if he selected individuals who possessed a character history which made it doubtful that they would contribute and cooperate within the program so as to help carry out the mission of the Federal departments involved.

It is also to be assumed, in construing this section of the bill, that the Director, who is to be charged with the responsibility for an effective administration of this program, will not adopt a selection procedure which will make a successful performance by him impossible. It is not tenable to assume the contrary.

The proposed criteria to guide the Director in determining enrollment are, in essence, good character standards, which are preferable to a rigid "good moral character" prerequisite which could be construed to exclude any individual who had had a brush with the law. The present language would enable a judgment to be made on the basis of the capacity of the individual to work in a healthy way with others in the group and to develop the work disciplines, skills, and educational opportunities offered by the program.

This legislation is not intended as a juvenile delinquency program. However, the Director should be allowed the discretion to make available the benefits of this program to a properly motivated young person whose background suggests that his participation in the program would be entirely consistent with the objectives of this legislation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to be able to agree with the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. President; and I should like to be able to agree that every Administrator appointed in connection with the program, by whatever administration might be in office, would be one who would carefully select those who would be admitted to this Corps. But knowing human nature as I do and knowing politics as I do, I cannot believe that would be so. Therefore, I believe we have to write into the act enough legislative guidelines so that we shall have some control over the action of the administrators, no matter what they might be doing.

I repeat that the statement of purpose, as referred to by those who oppose the amendment—namely, that we are offering this provision merely as an alternative—simply does not fill the bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Arizona recalls the admonition that he who is without sin should cast the first stone.

A few minutes ago the Senator referred both to the determination of good character by the courts and its determination by the Administrator. As a lawyer, I know that the establishment of good character is a matter of proof in court.

Would the distinguished Senator require the Administrator to hold a public hearing in order to determine, for each youth who might have cast a stone or might not have cast one, whether he had a good character, before the Administrator acted upon the applications? If so, would that be an adversary procedure? Would it be under oath? How would the Senator require the Administrator to proceed in establishing "good character"?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator from Tennessee will read my amendment, I think he will find merely the words "of good character." I do not make any reference to hearings or procedures or anything of the sort. I think "good character" is susceptible of a fairly acceptable definition which all of us understand.

I am directing my remarks to the problem of juvenile delinquency, which today is not a small problem. When we refer to enrolling 15,000 boys in the one program and 60,000 in the other, we must keep in mind the words of Dr. Hansen, the Superintendent of Schools for the District of Columbia, which is one of the most crime-ridden cities in the United States; namely, that he looks upon this program as a good place to dump these boys. For example, FBI figures show that in 1961, city arrests totaled 3,851,000; and these crimes extend from criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, auto theft, other assaults, and so forth and so on.

I assume that if the words of my amendment were in the bill, the Administrator would be very careful in asking questions. If there were doubt in his mind, I think he might well ask for a court record or a police record. I am not suggesting any investigation. I am merely suggesting the application of commonsense.

While we would like to assume that commonsense will be used in the administration of this act, I think all of us are at least wise enough or at least not so naive as to believe that the act would be universally well administered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield again to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. There is no question in my mind that the distinguished Senator from Arizona has the best of motives in mind. I am raising the question of the administrative procedures. In each case, how would an administrator undertake to establish good character? The Senator from Arizona has referred to court records and court procedures and hearings; yet he says he does not want to make the procedure impracticable.

I suggest that perhaps the Senator from Arizona would wish to give more consideration to this requirement. If it were a rigid requirement, and if it called for a determination which the Administrator would have to reach before admitting an applicant, that would involve a rigid and costly procedure, and it might very well make the administration of the program quite impracticable, if not impossible.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In reply, Mr. President, let me say, to begin with, that I really have grave doubts that a great many persons of bad character would seek to be admitted to the program. I merely wish to include the words "good character" as a requirement, so they will always be a guideline to the administrator. Certainly he will have access to records. The administrators will be established in the cities concerned. If there is a question, there will be access to the courts and to the police; and in case of deeper questions, I have no doubt that the FBI would be glad to answer them.

I see no real administrative problem here, but I do see a problem of greater magnitude if the bill should be used as a dumping ground for bad characters, as Dr. Hanson has suggested.

I yield to my friend, the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator.

I should like, if I may, to make a brief statement of my attitude toward the bill, and then I should like to ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill or one of its proponents.

The section of the title referred to has given me real concern. I am concerned about many questions. One of them is that we should not, through the title referred to, constitute a kind of withdrawn group of boys who would be marked by delinquency, or relative mental incompetence, or something less than normal intellectual capacity, or any other thing which would create a stigma upon them for the rest of their lives, and which would make them, in association with others of the same kind, worse rather than better citizens later on.

I am concerned about the question which the Senator from Arizona has raised. I am not assured by the answers made by some of the proponents of the measures who have attempted to put the argument on legalistic grounds in speaking of the difficulty of proof of good character and that sort of thing.

If I can, I should like to get the assurance of one of the sponsors of the bill—perhaps the majority whip or one of the other proponents in a position to speak with authority—to make a legislative record that would be solid and sound, and with which we could go to our constituents and to the country. I should like to have it well settled on the floor of the Senate now that it is not intended that the use of the Corps, as suggested by Dr. Hansen, shall be as the Senator from Arizona fears it might be. I should like to have it clear in the RECORD that it is not intended to herd off by themselves boys who are not able to get along in the world. If the program is to be successful, we must have it across the board. We must have a cross section of American youth of the best sort.

Therefore I should like to have the question gone into a little bit more on the affirmative side rather than continuing the attempt to take the amendment apart on the grounds of technical difficulty in administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from New Jersey places too much emphasis on the name of one person who has been mentioned time and time again by the Senator from Arizona. That is a Mr. Hansen who, I believe, is the Superintendent of Schools for the District of Columbia. After all, he was only one of the many witnesses before the committee. Too much emphasis has been placed on the possibility that the YCC would be composed of juvenile delinquents, hoodlums, and the like.

I should like to point out that section 107(a) reads as follows:

> The corps shall be composed of male individuals who are permanent residents of the United States—

And so forth.

What does a draft notice state? Does it state that before a man can be inducted into the Army he must be of proven good character? We have placed too much emphasis on Dr. Hansen and what he has had to say based upon conditions in the city of Washington, and most especially in the Washington schools. We ought to place emphasis on the majority of youngsters in our country. I would be willing to wager that they number 99 percent of the juvenile population. They are good, decent, young men and young women.

I believe we are wasting a great deal of time over a great deal of littleness. I most respectfully suggest to the Senator from Arizona that he ask the reaction of the junior Senator from Massachusetts as to whether or not he would be willing to accept the language proposed by the Senator from Arizona, and thereby bring the question to a head. With the permission of the Senator from Arizona, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts for his reaction.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KENNEDY. The examples which the Senator from Arizona has stated have done a great deal to clarify what he believes the words "good character" really mean.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield, I should like to suggest most respectfully to the Senator from Massachusetts that he seriously consider withdrawing his objection to the proposal of the Senator from Arizona and accept the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Massachusetts withdraws his objection.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to know the attitude of the Senator in charge of the bill and whether he accedes to the action of the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in view of the colloquy, which I think has made a good deal of useful legislative history, I commend the junior Senator from Massachusetts for being willing to withdraw his objection to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, and I am happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania. It is a very wise move. I believe it will make the bill far more palatable to many of us, and certainly to the House.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I should like to speak for a moment so that the legislative record may reflect my concern and, I believe, the concern of other Senators. By the colloquy in which we have engaged, I understand that it is not intended to create a corps into which young men who have had bad records may not be accepted.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No.

Mr. CLARK. Definitely not. I believe there is really no difference between the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself as to what is intended. We do not want the YCC to be reform school camps. We do not want them to be camps for young men who have been vicious criminals, who have violated the law and are probably beyond redemption. We desire the camps to be available to young men who have had an occasional brush with the law, who may have strayed a little from the path of righteousness, but who are capable of being rehabilitated. And we definitely wish the camps to be available for men of good character.

Mr. HART. I should like to cite an example that occurs to me. If a boy steals a car, it is more than merely a brush with the law. What about the boy 15 years old or 14 years old who commits such a crime? Is the opportunity to be accepted in a camp to be denied him?

Mr. CLARK. Not necessarily. That is what I desire to make clear. If the subsequent record of the boy who had stolen the car had been good, if the officer who had looked into his background believed that he should be given another opportunity, certainly he should be admitted to the Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would hope that a requirement of "good character" would be applied with a good deal of liberality and compassion. I make that statement as one who was court-martialed twice before he was 16 years old while serving in the Navy in the first war. The court-martials were only deck and summary court-martials, but they could very likely be considered a blot on my character. But thanks to a great many other good people who helped me, I was able, in a sense, to be rehabilitated. [Laughter.]

So I think the Senator from Michigan has a good point. It is not a case of being 100 percent perfect in character. Many in this body may have had brushes one way or another with the law, although most of us would probably not admit it, at least not to our constituents. But it has happened and will happen again.

I plead that it be the intent of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona that compassion, understanding, and tolerance be shown, and that the amendment would not mean, as I do not think it does, that a boy must have a perfect character before he could become enrolled in the YCC.

Let us suggest the requirement be administered with understanding. Let us make the intent clear so that no one will be penalized; so that in effect what the Senator from Massachusetts intended when he corrected the language in the bill will be carried into operation. Let us keep in mind that, so far as the Selective Service Act is concerned, as a comparison, there is no designation in that act that I am aware of calling for "good character."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall yield in a moment. The legislative record made here makes definitely clear that it is not the intention of the Senator from Arizona to apply a hidebound definition to the words "good character." I think "good character" is universally understood.

Character varies throughout a person's life.

So long as the majority leader has confessed some of his misdeeds, I might say that I spent the better part of a day in a Mexican jail for hitting a Mexican policeman with a pot of mustard. I was not aiming at the policeman, but I hit him.

While I do not claim perfect character, I think that little blot on my record, which cost $25, has been forgotten even by the Mexican police.

By my amendment I do not wish to prohibit acceptance of any boy who has done something for which he has served which in the judgment of the courts has been satisfied, so that he is again a citizen in good standing.

I think we are all talking about the same thing. The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and I have been discussing the same thing, and we are all in agreement.

I am very happy that the Senator in charge of the bill is willing to accept the amendment.

I now yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as I said earlier, I consider the good will of the distinguished Senator from Arizona manifest. There is no question of his own character or good will in this case. I have raised a question as to procedure, and I should like to have it clarified.

If the effect would be as the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, and senior Senator from Pennsylvania have stated, with which I understand the junior Senator from Arizona agrees, I raise no objection, but I should like to have the situation clarified.

Is it the purpose of the Senator, by his amendment, that before any youth could be admitted in this program the administrator would have to make an affirmative finding that he was a youngster of good character?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. That would not be a universal requirement. If the administrator had some doubt, he could take that into consideration. He might interview the boy and then say, "Something bothers me about this boy. I think I had better look into it more." Then he would have the right to do so.

The only thing I am trying to do is to establish that "good character" will be a part of the determination. As I said earlier, although there are a large number of juvenile delinquents in this country, I do not think this program is necessarily going to be flooded with them. I do not think what Dr. Hansen suggests necessarily is going to be adopted by similar officials across the country.

I merely wished to get back to the original language which was in the bill at the outset, which I think is good language. It is only binding on the Administrator when he has some doubt, and then he would have to take that factor into consideration.

Mr. GORE. Do I correctly understand the distinguished Senator to say that only in cases in which questions are raised, either by someone else or within the mind of the Administrator himself, would a determination of good character be necessary?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator has stated it properly.

Mr. GORE. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to give one quick example.

Let us assume that this language is not provided, and the Administrator takes in a boy the town knows to be bad. With the absence of the "good character" provision the Administrator would be pretty much bound to take anybody who might come along. This provision would merely say, "We have given you this backing, to use your judgment. If you like the boy, take him in. If not, take another look."

Mr. President, I do not believe there has been action on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point table 20, "City Arrests by Age Groups, 1961," which appears in "Crime in the United States."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 20.—*City arrests by age groups, 1961*

[2,776 cities over 2,500, population 85,158,360]

Offense charged	Total	Age																	
		Under 15	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25–29	30–34	35–39	40–44	45–49	50 and over	Not known
Total	3, 851, 8252	38, 0389	3, 9311	15, 0561	19, 6571	19, 6481	07, 4449	8, 4711	06, 1829	4, 3058	9, 8438	7, 5133	94, 0414	11, 9324	32, 1903	85, 9193	28, 8126	26, 176	2, 667
Criminal homicide:																			
(a) Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	4, 625	79	48	114	143	162	157	168	167	145	164	164	693	649	519	396	312	545	-------
(b) Manslaughter by negligence	1, 618	15	11	32	57	72	62	56	68	55	58	71	259	200	181	122	98	200	1
Forcible rape	7, 143	238	228	376	521	551	520	515	452	381	324	275	1, 058	645	457	270	143	189	-------
Robbery	33, 175	2, 909	1, 266	1, 637	1, 963	2, 450	2, 207	2, 007	2, 029	1, 713	1, 605	1, 352	4, 875	3, 084	1, 995	988	561	526	8
Aggravated assault	55, 355	2, 446	1, 249	1, 629	1, 865	2, 048	1, 770	1, 651	1, 940	1, 863	1, 844	1, 724	8, 258	7, 510	6, 550	4, 802	3, 335	4, 862	9
Burglary—breaking or entering	126, 477	31, 682	10, 164	10, 358	9, 304	8, 166	6, 488	5, 317	4, 777	4, 018	3, 436	3, 073	11, 090	7, 301	4, 949	2, 813	1, 660	1, 864	17
Larceny—theft	228, 067	62, 381	17, 445	18, 101	15, 692	12, 138	8, 609	6, 783	6, 015	5, 075	4, 450	4, 130	16, 028	13, 611	11, 158	8, 269	6, 559	11, 583	40
Auto theft	58, 547	10, 241	9, 210	9, 498	6, 765	4, 512	3, 125	2, 384	1, 814	1, 373	1, 201	893	2, 911	1, 807	1, 303	776	379	349	6
Other assaults	141, 784	5, 876	2, 369	3, 133	3, 711	4, 201	4, 086	4, 323	5, 062	4, 760	4, 907	5, 076	23, 622	21, 214	18, 058	12, 607	8, 184	10, 520	75
Embezzlement and fraud	34, 286	219	137	200	278	474	605	681	1, 051	1, 064	1, 065	1, 215	6, 287	6, 208	5, 375	3, 979	2, 450	2, 926	72
Stolen property; buying, receiving, etc	10, 745	1, 241	455	612	632	620	563	480	424	344	335	291	1, 225	1, 038	854	603	403	623	2
Forgery and counterfeiting	21, 613	292	225	408	497	775	825	792	898	890	949	937	3, 889	3, 463	2, 800	1, 825	1, 025	1, 115	8
Prostitution and commercialized vice	26, 843	109	73	144	218	631	787	986	1, 669	1, 769	1, 676	1, 512	5, 952	4, 171	2, 903	1, 692	1, 057	1, 493	1
Other sex offenses (includes statutory rape)	46, 204	3, 903	1, 895	2, 163	2, 051	1, 611	1, 617	1, 607	1, 698	1, 555	1, 492	1, 411	5, 854	5, 274	4, 629	3, 240	2, 265	3, 932	7
Narcotic drug laws	25, 080	394	289	387	631	870	1, 067	1, 260	1, 439	1, 478	1, 426	1, 215	5, 643	4, 157	2, 290	1, 036	665	830	3
Weapons; carrying, possessing, etc	35, 985	2, 029	1, 235	1, 734	1, 862	1, 889	1, 704	1, 517	1, 624	1, 392	1, 237	1, 156	4, 957	4, 040	3, 180	2, 295	1, 554	2, 556	24
Offenses against family and children	35, 017	572	112	160	226	751	792	954	1, 214	1, 250	1, 353	1, 391	6, 889	6, 342	5, 347	3, 589	2, 048	2, 017	10
Liquor laws	99, 048	1, 502	2, 278	5, 664	9, 256	11, 297	9, 943	7, 675	2, 598	1, 901	1, 507	1, 516	6, 540	7, 340	7, 392	6, 763	5, 688	10, 167	21
Driving while intoxicated	164, 222	29	52	289	837	1, 674	2, 148	2, 690	4, 064	3, 972	3, 914	4, 155	20, 540	23, 180	25, 632	22, 595	18, 967	29, 442	42
Disorderly conduct	434, 886	19, 796	8, 395	12, 360	15, 076	19, 085	17, 107	15, 564	16, 657	14, 299	13, 050	12, 361	51, 852	49, 501	47, 735	39, 046	30, 025	52, 811	166
Drunkenness	1, 399, 293	1, 450	1, 627	3, 935	7, 195	12, 636	14, 116	15, 263	22, 718	21, 267	21, 693	22, 632	116, 177	157, 481	200, 622	203, 891	188, 348	386, 906	1, 336
Vagrancy	147, 526	1, 859	1, 162	2, 202	4, 920	5, 913	5, 057	4, 356	4, 455	3, 824	3, 380	3, 179	13, 194	13, 863	15, 918	15, 661	14, 788	33, 696	99
Gambling	108, 571	213	186	394	559	959	1, 122	1, 282	2, 792	2, 402	2, 537	2, 498	14, 324	15, 604	15, 238	13, 046	11, 940	23, 462	13
All other offenses	480, 099	83, 244	30, 931	34, 821	27, 207	17, 177	15, 341	13, 478	13, 980	12, 028	11, 455	10, 899	45, 385	41, 287	37, 037	28, 597	21, 153	35, 435	644
Suspicion	125, 616	5, 319	2, 889	4, 705	8, 191	8, 986	7, 626	6, 682	6, 577	5, 487	4, 785	4, 387	16, 539	12, 962	10, 068	7, 018	5, 205	8, 127	63

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 41 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, line 12, after the word "enrollees" it is proposed to insert the following:

> by providing work experience and training in occupational skills for which the Secretary of Labor certifies an existing labor shortage.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the explanation of this amendment is very brief. It was discussed earlier today.

The "Statement of Purpose" set forth in titles I and II of the bill (sections 102 and 202) specifically asserts that the purpose of both programs is to increase the "employability" or "unemployed youths."

Despite persistent questioning during the hearing, the administration's spokesmen for the program—particularly the Secretary of Labor—were unable to inform the subcommittee what categories of labor shortages, what occupational skills in short supply, would be met by either of the programs. The best the Secretary of Labor could predict was that a tour of duty in the Corps would inculcate desirable work habits and discipline in the enrollees, thus making them more attractive as employees to potential employers.

In view of the purely speculative nature of the Secretary's prediction in the face of the unequivocal statement of purpose contained in the bill, I offer an amendment designed to assure that the projects established or expanded under title II are not mere boondoggles by requiring the Secretary of Labor to determine what skills are in short supply and to assist State and local projects which provide experience in such skills.

Earlier today I alluded to the fact that on March 24—I believe that is the correct date—in checking both the Washington Post and Times Herald and the Evening Star, I found in the morning newspaper 1,500 help-wanted advestisements and in the evening newspaper 1,100 help-wanted advertisements. The reason these jobs cannot be filled is simply that young people today do not have the necessary skills. As I mentioned earlier, the unskilled laborer is being replaced by automation. The boy we should worry about in the future and the boy we should worry about today must receive better training and skill. The problem is as simple as that.

I would ask that the Secretary of Labor keep close scrutiny on the whole process, to the end that we do not get into—I will not use the word "boondoggling," for that is an old word—programs which would not produce skilled workers. If one goes into the metropolitan centers on the west coast, where the aerospace industry is more or less concentrated, one would find not 1,500 ads, I dare say, but 5,000 help-wanted ads on every weekend in the classified ad section.

Mr. President, I am very hopeful that the Senator in charge of the bill will agree to accept this amendment. It would insure that the Secretary of Labor would keep a rather sharp eye on what is being done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to have a point of clarification in respect to the Senator's amendment.

Of course, the main purpose of the bill is employment. One of the other purposes of the bill, as the Senator well noted, is training, development of work habits, and development of certain skills or at least semiskills.

As I understand the intent of the Senator's amendment, it is to see that the enrollees at least develop toward employability, once they leave the camps, "by providing work experience and training in occupational skills." I believe that that part of the language, that far, is highly desirable.

There is one point which might cause some difficulty, and I ask for the Senator's tolerant consideration of this point. The amendment would require the Secretary to certify that there is an existing labor shortage at some particular time. This would mean a great deal of examination of an area or a region as to whether there was a labor shortage in a particular skill. It might well be, for example, that a young man might get some training which would be very helpful to him later in life, and with respect to which at the moment there might not be an existing labor shortage.

I think the standards the Senator would apply are desirable. If the Senator would give consideration to my suggestion, I would feel that the amendment was highly desirable. I suggest inserting on line 12, page 41, after the word "enrollees" the following: "by providing work experience and training in occupational skills."

Mr. GOLDWATER. I point out that the bill already so provides, if not by direct language, by inference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; the inference is there.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not want to be redundant, but the Secretary of Labor himself has testified this bill would not accomplish training in the skills that are needed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is highly questionable; is it not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is what he said. It may be highly questionable. At times persons in public life say things that are highly questionable. But the Secretary of Labor is charged with the preparation of unemployment figures, and he has at his fingertips knowledge of the skills in which there is a shortage of labor.

Let me give the Senator an example. No kind of training in the world is going to get a West Virginia coal miner, or the son of a coal miner, back to mining coal, but let us say that in the State of West Virginia, or Pennsylvania, or Minnesota, there is a shortage of good welders or men who understand the operation of machine tools. Instead, then, of teaching a boy about the problems of coal mining, which industry for the time being is pretty dead in this country, he is taught something by means of which at least he can go out in the labor field and demonstrate his skill.

All I am suggesting is that the Secretary of Labor keep a sort of overseer's eye on the situation, so as to preserve a proper balance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that point is well made. The only difficult point is providing that the Secretary of Labor must certify an existing labor shortage. This is an administrative process which requires a good deal of examination of the labor shortage.

There may be a labor shortage this month, and not later, or vice versa. If the language were, "by providing work experience and training in occupational skills which the Secretary of Labor determines would be helpful to the labor market," or something along those lines, I think we would have standards that would be desirable. But it is proposed to have the Secretary certify that there is now an existing labor shortage, per se. I do not believe this program, in the 6 months' or 1 year's time which will be provided an enrollee, would necessarily develop a fully qualified welder in that period of time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Nor do I. I am not asking the Secretary of Labor to do something that is going to be an added burden to him. I know the figures are available on almost a monthly basis on the skills in which there is a deficiency of labor. I do not propose, by this amendment, that every day there will be a certificate or edict from the Secretary of Labor that "tomorrow we must train 25 percent in this skill, or 35 percent in the other," but I suggest the meaning that the Secretary of Labor keep the administrators of the corps constantly appraised of the skills across the Nation in which there is a deficiency of labor.

Frankly, I think this proposal gets to the real meat of the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator from Minnesota wants young people trained in skills that are needed in the employment field. The Secretary of Labor says there is no suggestion that this training program will qualify one of the enrollees for a skilled occupation.

I am merely asking the Secretary of Labor to sit in as a sort of umpire, as a sort of third base coach, so that if the enrollee heads for home from third base, he may be headed in the right direction and have the proper tools before he hits home plate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to consult with the Senator from Arizona on this question. The amendments the Senator from Arizona has offered have been helpful and thoughtful and have helped make the legislative history on this bill. The debate has been extremely helpful. For example, with reference to the good character reference, I am one of the Senators who thought it was a helpful proposal, particularly in light of the colloquy which took place.

I should like to make a suggestion, while discussing this question on the floor. What would the Senator think of having this language in his amendment: "by providing work experience and training in occupational skills or pursuits in classifications in which the Secretary of Labor finds there is reasonable expectation of employment"?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I find nothing wrong with that language.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It does what the Senator says he wants done.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is exactly what I suggested needs to be done, and it does it in a way which removes the objection of the Senator from Minnesota to the word "certify," which has a stronger connotation than the word "finds." I am willing to modify the language in the way suggested by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will send the amendment to the desk. The modifying language reads:

> By providing work experience and training in occupational skills or pursuits in classifications in which the Secretary of Labor finds there is a reasonable expectation of employment.

Is that modifying language agreeable?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask that the language suggested by the Senator from Minnesota be substituted for the appropriate language in my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to as follows:

> On page 41, line 12, after the word "enrollees," insert the following: "by providing work experience and training in occupational skills or pursuits in classifications in which the Secretary of Labor finds there is reasonable expectation of employment."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator be lenient with me and allow me to retain the floor technically while I consult with my attorney?

Mr. HUMPHREY. While the Senator from Arizona is doing that, let me say to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] that I feel the observations he made with respect to the prior amendment on good character were very much to the point of what the original sponsor of the bill had in mind.

The Senator will recall that 4 years ago there was a discussion along this line in the Senate, and the phraseology was clarified. I wish to add my word, as one of the sponsors of this legislation, to the history which has been made.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am very happy the Senator from Minnesota has made that statement.

I have no further amendments to offer. In closing, I wish to say that I hope, in the course of this Congress, we can really get at what I refer to as the guts of this problem. It is education. It is vocational education.

One reason why I like the proposal of the Senator from New Jersey, generally speaking, is that it offers a new avenue for dropouts. There were dropouts when I was in high school. There were dropouts when he was in high school. There will always be dropouts. I would like to see industrial high schools, manual arts high schools, and manual training high schools come back. We do not have to hand out degrees to every man, woman, and child in this country. That does not necessarily make them better educated. Give them a chance to follow the education they wish to follow during the 4 years of their lives devoted to that pursuit. In that way I think we can solve the problems of juvenile delinquency and unemployment to a remarkable degree.

I hope that in the coming days of this Congress we can enter into a serious discussion of the deficiencies of our educational system as it exists and our seeming refusal to recognize that not all young people want to go or can go to college.

I thank the Senator for his complimentary remarks. I am in sympathy with the objectives of the bill. I wish I could vote for the bill.

If it were not for title I in the bill, I think the Senator might find me marching down the aisle with him, arm in arm. He has at least planted a germ of thought in this body, and I hope it grows.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask the clerk to state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator agree to a limitation of time on his amendment?

Mr. KEATING. Five minutes would be satisfactory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand it comes under the limitation of debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 26, line 6, between the word "services" and the word "to", to insert the words "consisting of at least 10 hours of vocational training per week per enrollee in subjects other than those connected with conservation."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senate has heard much debate about the need for vocational training of young people, and the various opportunities for continuing education under the provisions of this bill.

In fact, the bill does contain a number of phrases acknowledging the necessity of a program of vocational education in conjunction with work experience, and authorizing the Secretary of Labor to set up such a program in conjunction with State and local authorities. The language of the bill however, is neither mandatory nor explicit.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota assured us, in a statement in this body on April 4, that at least 10 hours a week should be devoted to instruction in these conservation camps. I have searched this bill in vain looking for such a provision, and finding none I offer an amendment to require, under title I, at least 10 hours of vocational training a week to prepare these boys for useful work when they return to their homes. Further, my amendment provides that this instruction be in skills other than those connected with conservation. It may be a fine idea to work outdoors in the parks and forests for 2 years. The boys will get fresh air and sunshine, and, hopefully, will acquire good work habits and a sense of responsibility. Unfortunately however, speaking for my own State, there are very few jobs for conservationists in Queens, botanists in Brooklyn or timbermen in Troy. What we need is more appliance repairmen, more office workers and sales people, more auto mechanics, cooks, and more skilled workers.

I believe this amendment will provide realistic training for our young people in conjunction with conservation work experience and will better prepare them for work as useful citizens, contributing to their communities and their country, when they return home from the camps.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I discussed it earlier, of course, with the Senator from New York. I believe it is a worthy amendment. It would fulfill the objective of the legislation. Speaking for the Senator who is in charge of the bill and as one of its sponsors, I am happy to accept it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the Youth Employment Act now under consideration by the Senate, numbered S. 1, is directed at one of the most vexing and serious problems facing the Nation's economy today: the unemployment of vast numbers of our young people.

It is indeed a baffling anomaly that in a Nation which undoubtedly enjoys the highest standards of living in the history of the world, and in a Nation which boasts one of the most comprehensive educational systems in the world, there are over half a million unemployed teenagers today—a figure, according to latest Government statistics, that represents an intolerably high rate of 15.6 percent of all youth in the labor market, a figure that is nearly three times the national average; a figure that represents over 10 percent of the jobless persons in the United States. In my own State, unemployment among youths 16 to 21 years old is 14.1 percent.

These figures become even more startling in view of Labor Department predictions that of the 26 million youngsters who enter the work force during the 1960's, 7.5 million will be high school dropouts who will be thus ill equipped for space-age work.

Moreover, new workers have swelled the labor force by 21 percent since World War II, but there was only a 17 percent increase in jobs.

Two years ago, 2.6 million Americans attained their 18th birthday. Two years from now the number reaching that age will be one-half more than that figure.

Simultaneous with this explosion of youth into the Nation's labor force during the 1960's will be the elimination of some 2.5 million jobs annually because of mechanization and automation, and a yearly loss of a million "entry" or low-level training jobs—the kind whereby young people matriculate in the work world.

We all know that young persons have a more difficult time competing for jobs when the economy is in a sluggish condition and that their problem is considerably aggravated by the failure of many to finish high school.

In today's labor market, unskilled jobs account for only 5 percent of all U.S. employment, and the number is steadily declining. In other words, to be able to get and hold good jobs, workers must have at least a high school education or be proficient at some skill.

Yet, at the critical dropout age, 16 to 17 years, almost 20 percent of the Nation's boys and girls were not enrolled in school. The comparable rate for my State is about 13 percent. The rate of high school dropouts on the national level has continued at high levels, despite a steady decline in jobs available to those without high school education, and despite the fact that the unemployment rate among dropouts is far higher than for high school graduates.

Each year there are about 750,000 to 800,000 teenagers who drop out of high school, 3 to 4 out of every 10 students. In vocational schools the figure is higher still—2 out of 3.

The consequences of this are not hard to predict: for example, of the 350,000 high school dropouts between January and October 1961, 27 percent were jobless in the fall of 1961, compared with 18 percent of those who finished high school.

These figures show that we are faced with a momentous educational challenge to school, retrain, and prepare these youngsters for gainful employment.

This measure represents only a modest beginning, but nonetheless a beginning, and a step in the right direction to tackle what the President called America's No. 1 economic problem, our high level of unemployment.

S. 1 is designed to somewhat alleviate the unemployment of young people by giving jobs and training to them, so that their employability may eventually be increased.

Under the bill, 75,000 youths 16 to 22 years old will be enrolled in the next year—and perhaps thousands more in the 5 years scheduled for the program—to work on public service projects in their own States and local communities, and on national projects to preserve our natural resources.

What results can we expect to see, if this measure is enacted?

First, youth employment enrollees will acquire a wide array of skills from their on-the-job work experiences, as well as from vocational schooling on which the bill places special emphasis. Many will also be able to complete their basic high school education.

It is hoped that the acquisition of these skills and the experience on these jobs will enhance the future employability of the enrollees.

Second, the nature of youth employment work projects is designed to help build reliable, dependable, and mature work habits which form the basis of any successful employment experience.

The enrollees in the programs will be trained to self-discipline and will learn some of life's valuable lessons of the meaning of work and of give-and-take living.

Third, the work to be performed under the act's programs covers a broad field of services valuable to the Nation and to the many communities in which they are performed.

They will perform services in our hospitals, libraries, playgrounds, and other welfare activities; in eliminating blight from our burgeoning urban complexes; and in preserving our vast acreages of national wildlife reservations, watersheds and forests, outdoor recreation facilities, and other conservation projects.

The bill calls for an initial appropriation of $100 million for fiscal 1963, a pilot year which may be expanded 4 additional years into 1968.

While it is true that our large national debt and our shaky economic condition render many Federal programs ill-advised at this time, the youth employment bill is a proposal which deserves high priority.

Even with the millions of dollars in matching funds the States must provide under the bill, the measure is not designed to wipe out, or even put a small dent in our intolerably high unemployment rate. My own State stands to benefit, according to Labor Department estimates, only to the extent of 60 boys under the conservation programs and $200,000 under the State and community youth employment programs. Mr. President, I will vote for this measure for the proposal is a start in the right direction to conserve primarily our youth and, in so doing, conserve our national resources and serve our communities.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], and myself, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 31, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

> (e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title construction which has traditionally been performed by construction trades workers shall continue to be contracted out for construction by such workers.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, during his testimony in 1961, Pat Brown, the Governor of California, indicated some of the projects that a youth employment program could work on in California. He listed among others the following types of work: first, construction of fences on State property; second, development of campsites; and third, construction and maintenance of roads involving bulldozer operations, and so forth.

Now, if Governor Brown is right in his belief that the youth program will be used for road projects involving construction and maintenance, then we are going to find that in approving this bill we are taking jobs away from older men with families.

On an annual basis, some of the highest unemployment rates are in the construction industry and if the committee reported youth bill takes jobs away from older construction workers, the present situation will get worse instead of better.

Andrew Biemiller, representing the AFL–CIO, had this to say about the problem in 1961:

> We would like to urge, however, that the legislation make clear that work performed by these young men should not be permitted to create greater unemployment for others.

Now I have read title I very carefully, and I find in it no safeguards which would prevent the Youth Corps from usurping road construction work normally performed by breadwinners with families.

As Mr. Biemiller stated:

> Road construction which has traditionally been performed by construction trades workers should continue to be contracted out.

My suspicion that the Youth Conservation Corps may be used as a device to give young people jobs normally performed by older construction workers was confirmed by a statement inserted in the Record on page 5663, April 4, 1963. That statement was entitled "Types and Descriptions of Conservation Work Which Youth Conservation Corps Enrollees Can Accomplish."

It was put into the Record by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, a sponsor of S. 1.

I quote now from the statement described on types of work which Youth Conservation Corps enrollees can accomplish:

> Road and trail development: Maintenance, reconstruction and construction of roads and trails.

If there was ever any doubt that S. 1 might harm the construction trades, that doubt was removed by the statements of Governor Brown and the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to add to what the Senator from Vermont has stated by saying that the original thought on the amendment was to confine it to road construction.

On further study of the problem, however, it seemed to us that there might be some other type of construction work which people in the trades unions might be working on which also could conceivably be the subject of some work by Conservation Corps members.

Therefore we broadened the initial amendment to provide for construction, rather than merely road construction.

I understand that the senior Senator from Minnesota agrees fully with us in that observation. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would like to refer to the report at page 10. I will not read all of it, but I ask that the excerpt be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> The YCC groups will be employed in a great variety of tasks. Camps, picnic grounds, trails, boundary marking, forests, croplands, timber management, small bridge building and maintenance, fencing, range seeding, brush control, water management, plant control, weed eradication, building and levee maintenance, dam repairs, gully control, tree planting, seeding and sodding, historical and archeological projects and biological work on grasslands are some of the areas where useful employment can be provided.
>
> The work classifications would involve instruction in and operation of construction equipment, both hand and power, electrical wiring, masonry, plumbing, carpentry, truck-driving, automotive repairing, metalworking, photography, conservation and engineering, surveying, mapping, cooking, and clerical tasks.
>
> The Director will not assign enrollees of the Corps to direct construction work where historically such work is normally (and clearly more efficiently) performed by skilled mechanics and laborers employed by construction contractors under contract with the conservation agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I accept the amendment on behalf of the Senator in charge of the bill,, and as one of the sponsors of the bill. I thank the Senators for their thoughtfulness in bringing up the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], for himself and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 41, line 22, insert after the word "workers" the following: "or impair existing contracts for services".

Mr. MILLER. This is a very simple amendment, Mr. President. The bill seeks to protect employed workers from being displaced by certain activities called for under title II of the bill. I believe the intention, however, is not to confine itself merely to those workers who are employed by such agencies as these young people will be working for, but also to contracts for services provided by private organizations doing work for the city. I have in mind, for example, employment contracts for private janitorial services. Such contracts would not be impaired, either. I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Pennsylvania. I understand he has no objection to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The amendment proposed by the Senator is very desirable. Speaking for the Senator from Pennsylvania and as a sponsor of the bill, I say to the Senate that the amendment is acceptable. We hope the Senate will vote in favor of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, line 12, it is proposed to strike out through line 20 and substitute the following:

> (2) enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies (for the purposes of this title "State" shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa) charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the natural resources of the Nation, and of developing, managing, and protecting recreational areas, whereby the enrollees of the Corps may be utilized by such agencies in carrying out, under the immediate supervision of such agencies, programs planned and designed by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility. The Secretary may enter into such agreements with the State agency wherever he finds that such utilization of the Corps will best serve the purposes of this Act. Any such agreement with the State agency shall apply cost-sharing procedures prescribed by section 206(a) in title II.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assume the Senator will wish to make a statement with reference to his amendment. He knows that I have been one of his strong supporters on the amendment. I believe it is very desirable that there be the closest cooperation between Federal and State Governments with respect to activities that take place on State lands and in connection with State projects. The amendment would permit such close cooperation and permit these activities to take place. That would be very beneficial. Speaking for the Senator in charge of the bill, and as the principal sponsor of the bill, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have one observation to make about the amendment. At least, in many States this would be true. There might be a Federal project on Federal lands. If an important project of greater conservation significance on adjoining or nearby State park lands, or wet lands, or recreational lands needed some work, the amendment would authorize the Secretary, in his discretion, to evaluate the project. If he thought the work ought to be done on that land, he could arrange with the appropriate State authority, under the 75-25-percent sharing arrangement, to have the work done on such land. I believe that frequently, especially if the program continues, there will be high-priority projects on State lands, and it would seem rather ludicrous to have a group of men stationed on Federal lands unable, without an agreement with the Secretary, to do some constructive conservation work on the State lands. All that is needed is to provide discretion for the Secretary to act, if such action would further the purpose of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 45 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, line 3, it is proposed to insert after the period the following: "Only existing facilities may be utilized to furnish quarters for enrollees or applicants for enrollment, and the Secretary shall not have authority to construct or to cause to be constructed any new facilities for the purpose of providing quarters to enrollees or applicants for enrollment. Whenever necessary, existing facilities for such quarters may be repaired or renovated, but the cost of the repair or renovation of any facility shall not exceed an amount equal to one-third of the cost of the construction of a similar new facility."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the pending bill is a perfect example of the administration's approach to current domestic problems: "Legislate now; develop a program later." The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare conducted extensive hearings on this measure and the revelation of administration unpreparedness was astonishing. The language of the bill appears quite simple; its impact, however, could be severe.

The Secretary is authorized to build new camps for boys under this program. During the hearings on this bill he exhibited more than a ready willingness to construct new camp sites. His instant liberality with the taxpayers money is of great distress to me.

The Secretary testified, for example:

> Our present best estimates indicate a cost of $4,000 per enrollee for a 12-month period, as far as title I is concerned.

I asked the Secretary if this figure included any capital expenses. He replied:

> It perhaps includes where it should not. Capital expenditures for camps in working out these figures we have assumed we will have to build new camps and they will cost us $250,000 apiece, which we can amortize over a 20-year period.

The camps he referred to would house 50 boys. He then said:

> I think that $4,000 per enrollee for 12 months is an inflated figure. I think we can do it for less than that, substantially less.

To my way of thinking, a $250,000 camp for 50 boys should by itself cost $5,000 per boy, making the total cost per boy $8,735 instead of $3,985. But, the Secretary decided it would be a good idea to amortize that cost over a 20-year period bringing the cost down to $250 per boy per year. This amortization scheme might be meaningful if the youth program was to last for 20 years, but certainly such a poorly planned program could not be tolerated for that long. I will talk more about this amortization ruse in just a minute but first let us get the administration's figures straight.

The Secretary of Labor says that the construction of new 50-man camps will cost $250,000. I challenge the Secretary on that point. In 1961 a youth bill was before the Senate. At that time the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior testified to construction costs for 50-man camps of $315,000. At the hearings on the present bill, the director of the bureau of youth services for Pennsylvania testified that the construction costs for 50-man camps presently being built in Pennsylvania were to run to $385,000. The Secretary explains this problem by saying that they have had some more time to do a little close costing. That would suggest to me that either the previous bill was developed and presented in great haste, something which the Secretary alludes to, or that the present bill was developed and presented in equally great haste but the figures made a little more palatable for our consumption. From the unpreparedness and lack of specific information on the projected program at the hearings, I am inclined to think that not much thought went into this piece of legislation.

For example, I asked the Secretary for a breakdown on the number of camps and campsites that he had earlier testified could be renovated rather than built from the ground up. In particular, I asked if he could tell me what camps the boys were going to be put in. He replied:

> In anticipation of the legislation, I cannot, sir.

I asked if he could give the committee the cost of renovation for these camps. He replied affirmatively, but never furnished me with a figure. I was heartened to note that the senior Senator from Minnesota read answers to these questions into the RECORD 1 month after the Secretary testified.

Given enough time, I feel the administration might develop some program, but at present they have no program; they are asking this Congress to vote them a blank check for a program they have not yet developed.

The fact that there are wide and irreconcilable conflicts in the testimony concerning this bill was dramatically brought home to me when the Secretary testified that there was a 10-man camp at Swanton, Vt. No such camp exists.

The amortization question is still another example of administration attempts to give this bill enough sweetening for easy swallowing. The committee was told that although new 50-man camps would cost $250,000, the cost would be amortized over 20 years because that was the life expectancy of the camps. Now, under our budgetary system, an appropriation is an appropriation for the year in which it is made. The full cost of the camps is to be paid out of contemporaneous appropriations. For a 50-man camp costing $250,000, the cost per man is $5,000. That $5,000 per man is the actual cost per man over the life of the youth program. If the program were to last for 5 years, the cost per man would be $1,000 per man per year.

But, the Secretary did not think this type of amortization reflected a suitable amortization schedule precisely because it made the cost for enrollees in the program too high, too unacceptable for a budget-conscious Congress. So, he steadfastly maintains that the true amortization period should be over the expected life of the buildings without reference whatsoever to the youth program for which these campsites would be built.

Admittedly, if the costs are amortized over 20 years instead of 5, the yearly cost per man is low, but it is my contention that the 20-year amortization period is a totally meaningless and misleading concept if these campsites are to lie fallow and unoccupied for 15 of those 20 years. Even a member of the majority staff of the Interior Committee recognized this type of "amortization" for what it is. In a memorandum to Senator CLARK which appears on page 548 of the hearings, Robert Wolf said:

> Amortization on camp costs is an interesting fiscal exercise, but since Federal funds are appropriated on an annual basis, amortization is not realistic.

It is my fear that if the Congress does not take a long hard look at what can be done under this bill, we shall face the day when once expensive campsites, vacant and deteriorating, dot the countryside as monuments to our imprecision on this piece of legislation.

Inasmuch as the bill as reported has no termination date it is conceivable that this costly and indefinite program of camp construction could be perpetuated merely by the same broad stroke of the legislative pen that might extend the program from year to year. We must demand of the Secretary that he spell out his program and list his costs realistically before we become a party to such imprecision.

The proponents of the bill say that under title I of the bill as many as 15,000 youths the first year can receive training in those skill areas craving employees. But, not only does this bill not spell out how those boys are to receive that training, it empowers the Secretary to spend all but a piddling sum on construction and virtually ignore training altogether.

This bill is not touted as a "youth housing bill" and it should not be permitted to have that effect. Even if housing were the objective, a $5,000 expenditure per boy is excessive; it exceeds the per person cost of a $12,000 home for a family of three; namely, $4,000 by a full $1,000. How do we explain that extravagance to the people at home?

I have been critical of this program because the administration cannot seem to juggle its figures consistently. I cannot understand why the youth program before us in 1961 was to cost up to $9,000 per boy while virtually the same program in 1963 is to cost $4,000 plus an average of $500 for work equipment and supplies per boy. But, my apprehension about the money aspects of this bill is even greater because of the failure of the administration to settle one simple point.

The Secretary of Labor and the senior Senator from Minnesota have both testified that there are in existence almost enough camps to take care of the first year's quota of 15,000. Assuming for the moment that they are correct why must there be any authority to build expensive new campsites under this bill until the existing facilities are utilized. If there is in fact to be any training for these boys under this bill there must be some appropriations left to support it. If new camps were constructed at $250,000 per camp there would be no money left for training for the first year enrollees and the program would be entirely valueless to them.

The distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota told the Senate on Thursday, April 4, that there were 156 year-round camps that would require about $15 million to renovate and that these 156 camps would house about 11,240. Now this is better economy because new camps to house these boys would cost over $56 million. But even the $15 million necessary for renovating the camps is disturbing because such renovation would in itself eat up one-fourth of the total authorization under title I for the first fiscal year.

When the administration cast its budget for title I it proposed that by amortizing construction over 20 years housing would constitute only one-sixteenth of the total cost per boy. But, if $15 million is spent for renovation out of a total authorization of $60 million the cost of housing then represents one-fourth of the total cost per boy.

If the cost estimates for compensation, subsistence, camp maintenance, clothing, medical, and dental care remain the same, the allowance for training may have to be eliminated; but at least there will be the chance of a training program that there would not otherwise be if new campsites were constructed. If the training program allowance is not reduced, the $45 million remaining after renovation will only support 10,000 boys at the $4,500 cost figure which includes equipment.

In conclusion, I must emphasize again how poorly planned the present youth bill is. As I have shown, unless presently existing campsites and facilities are used for this program and unless renovation of these camps is limited strictly to making them habitable, all the pious claims about youth training that have been bantered about by the bill's proponents will prove to be the volatile spirits that they are and will evaporate with the passage of this bill.

I therefore introduced an amendment which will remedy some of the evils of the present bill by limiting the quarters provided enrollees and applicants of the program to existing facilities and limiting the cost of renovation or repairing existing facilities to one-third of the cost of the construction of a similar new facility.

Mr. President, the amendment would restrict the program to the use of existing facilities in existing camps. In other words, no new camps could be established. The proponents have stated repeatedly throughout the debate that in a short period of time sufficient facilities could be obtained from existing camps, those which have been listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the record of the hearings. It seems to me that in the interest of economy, when the proponents say there are already sufficient facilities to take care of the needs, at least for this year, Congress should restrict the facilities to that number. To do so would not place a hardship on anyone.

As a result of the reduction in the amount of the authorization, which was approved yesterday, only about 8,200 boys would be able to enroll during the first year, in any event. It seems to me that this is a sound, constructive amendment, one which would save considerable money for the taxpayers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate has voted to retain title I, the Youth Conservation Corps proposal. That proposal would require, when the project was fully underway, some new construction. A number of camps could be rehabilitated, but many areas, in the East in particular, would be without any facilities.

This particular amendment would prejudice the bill in favor of certain sections of the country where existing facilities are now usable, but would prejudice the bill against other sections of the country where no such facilities exist. Kentucky and Vermont are 2 examples. I could mention others.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment. I do not believe that it would serve the interests of the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall support the bill. I intend to vote for it. I shall briefly state my reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Kentucky speaking on the bill?

Mr. COOPER. I am speaking on the bill—not on any amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield as much time on the bill as the Senator from Kentucky may desire.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

In considering whether I should vote for the bill, I was doubtful for a time that I would do so. I was moved very much by the arguments made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] during the course of the hearings; and his questioning of witnesses raised several important questions. He has ably raised the same issues during the debate. A most important question is whether the program would be conducive to equipping young men and women in the programs to secure employment after their period of enrollment had ended. Perhaps it would have been better had a more comprehensive program of vocational training or education been provided for the enrollees in the program. This I know that our colleagues Senator JAVITS and Senator PROUTY insisted on, and the bill was improved. Yet I know it to be true that many young people do not have an education or a skill which would enable them to immediately undertake vocational training of even an elementary character. For them, and there are thousands, there must be some kind of pretraining, such as that offered in the bill, before they can learn vocational skills or obtain the elementary education which they need to get a job. This is not a speculation.

I have talked to the directors of vocational schools in my State. They have told me that a number of boys and girls who apply for vocational training do not have the elementary education to undertake vocational training.

With reference to this personal experience and knowledge, I was impressed by the argument of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that the two programs would provide work discipline and a set of work habits for young men and women to prepare them for further training necessary for employment. And the bill provides that appropriate vocational training and schooling will be a part of the program.

My second concern—and I know it is the concern of many—is the question of cost. Today, on every side we hear the insistence of the people and the insistence of Members of Congress that the budget be reduced and that expenditures be placed at a lower level. I agree with this position. Reductions in the budget can be made—I believe on the order of $3 to $4 billion. But we must face the question—and I as a Member of Congress must face it: Where shall reductions be made? If there should be a tax cut, and I favor a tax cut, we would agree that its main purpose was to stimulate the economy, and to relieve unemployment.

But while the process—tax cut, increased consumption, and greater investment—is taking place, thousands of men and women will remain out of work. As shown by the record of hearings, 800,000 boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 22 are out of work and out of school. It is not right to cast them aside and leave them without consideration in this process of stimulating the economy—by cutting taxes, and of reducing expenditures.

Last night I viewed a television program entitled, as I recall, "The Lament of the Miner." It was a documentary of conditions in my own State of Kentucky. It showed, as I have seen in that section, men out of work, young men out of work, with very little possibility of obtaining employment.

This question is raised by my constituents; it is raised by Members of Congress; it is raised by my party: Shall a Member of Congress hew precisely to a doctrinaire line, and refuse to vote for new or additional expenditures even though needed?

I wish to express my own feeling in connection with this question. I intend to vote for reductions in the appropriation bills which will come before the Senate; but I do not intend to vote against this bill, or against others which would penalize those who are out of employment and who have little opportunity to obtain employment.

This is the chief reason why I shall vote tonight for the pending bill, although it offers no permanent solution, I shall vote for it because it would provide work, training, and some basic education for at least 75,000 of our young people this year. It will give them some training, and it will inculcate disciplines and habits which can lead to employment, make them better citizens, and give them hope for the future.

I intend to vote to reduce appropriations during this session, but I will also vote for bills which will give some help and hope to the young people of our country, to the unemployed, whether in or out of school, and to the older men and women of our Nation who are out of work through no fault of their own.

I pay my respects to my colleagues on this side of the aisle for their effective work on the bill, and, among others, to its chief sponsor, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and my neighbor from West Virginia, and fighter to relieve unemployment, Senator RANDOLPH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. On behalf of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and myself, I call up my substitute amendment No. 46.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the amendment is read, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I wish to state that the minority leader and I have discussed this possibility with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], whose substitute amendment is about to be read, and also with the assistant minority leader and with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

On behalf of the minority leader and myself, I ask unanimous consent that 30 minutes be allocated on the substitute amendment, with 25 minutes to be in charge of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and 5 minutes to be in charge of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; and that at the conclusion of that half hour, a yea-and-nay vote be taken on the question of agreeing to the substitute amendment which will be pending at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Now, Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont wish to have the amendment printed in the RECORD without being read?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes, Mr. President; I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment submitted by Mr. PROUTY, on behalf of himself and Mr. MUNDT, is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Youth Training and Employment Opportunities Act of 1963".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is (1) to develop methods for promoting the most effective utilization of the production potential of untrained and inexperienced youths; (2) to provide useful work experience and training opportunities for a limited number of youths through the use of programs authorizing projects for on-the-job and other appropriate training and local public service employment; (3) to determine the effectiveness of different types of such programs for the training and useful employment of youth to meet current and future technological requirements of an expanding labor market; and (4) by means of the foregoing, to provide the Nation with tested and proven training and work experience programs for school dropouts and other youths who will be seeking work in increasing numbers during this decade.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

SEC. 101. (a) Subsection (c) of section 203 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by striking out "1954" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof "1954."

(b) Section 203 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) The Secretary of Labor may pay training allowances at a rate not exceeding $20 a week to youths over sixteen but under twenty-two years of age where such allowances are necessary to provide them occupational training except that—

"(1) no such allowance shall be paid to any youth who has not finished high school unless such youth has absented himself from school classes for a continuous period of not less than six months immediately prior to the date he begins to receive occupational training under this Act;

"(2) during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allowances shall not be paid to more than forty-five thousand of such youths; and

"(3) during each of the two fiscal years immediately following such fiscal year, not more than 20 per centum of the estimated total training allowances paid annually under this section may be paid to such youths."

(c) Section 304 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title II with respect to youths over sixteen but under twenty-two years of age, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary."

TITLE II—STATE AND COMMUNITY YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Development of State and community employment programs

SEC. 201. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall assist and cooperate with the agencies of State (which for the purposes of this title shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa), county and local governments and private nonprofit agencies in developing programs for the employment of young people in State and community service activities, hereinafter authorized, including programs in health, education, and the field of conservation, development, and management of the natural resources of the State and the community and the development, management, and protection of recreational areas within the State and the community, which shall be coordinated with a program of training and education provided by local educational authorities, or a program carried out pursuant to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended by title I of this Act. In those States where the public landholdings of the Federal Government are less than 5 per centum of the land area within the State, the Secretary when requested, may offer such additional assistance as may be required in the development of programs of conservation and recreation. The Secretary shall advise such State and local governments as to the number and availability of unemployed young people, their skills and qualifications for various types of work, and shall provide, in cooperation with local school authorities, for the orderly selection and referral of youths for enrollment in such programs.

(b) For purposes of this title, the term "private nonprofit agency" means an organization which (1) is exempted from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and (2) no part of the net earnings of which inures or may inure to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.

Approval of programs

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary is authorized to approve for assistance under this title any State, county, municipal, or local programs submitted hereunder if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

(1) enrollees in the program will be employed either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects, sponsored by private nonprofit agencies approved by the appropriate State agency;

(2) the program will increase the employability of the enrollees, or will enable student enrollees to resume or to maintain school attendance;

(3) the program will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest which will not otherwise be provided, or will contribute to health and education programs of the community or to the conservation, development, and management of the natural resources of the State or community or to the development, management, or protection of State or community recreation areas;

(4) the program will not result in the displacement of regular workers;

(5) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment are appropriate and reasonably consistent with the rates and conditions applicable with respect to comparable work in the locality; and

(6) the program includes standards and procedures for the selection of applicants including provisions assuring full coordination and cooperation with local and other authorities to encourage students to maintain or resume school attendance.

(b) In approving projects under this title, the Secretary shall give priority to projects with high training potential.

Enrollees in programs

SEC. 203. (a) Enrollment in programs under this title shall be limited to young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age twenty-two, and whose participation in such programs will be consistent with the purposes of this title.

(b) Enrollees shall not be subject to the provisions of any other Federal law relating to Federal employment including hours of work, rates of compensation, or employee benefits.

(c) The number of enrollees in programs under this title shall not exceed at any one time the equivalent of fifteen thousand full-time enrollees during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and during the next four fiscal years such numbers as may be maintained within the appropriations made therefor by the Congress.

(d) The Secretary shall provide for testing, counseling, job development, and job referral services through either governmental or private nonprofit agencies to youth in order to carry out the purposes of this title.

Federal share of program costs

SEC. 204. (a) Whenever a State, county, municipal or local youth employment program is determined under section 202 to be appropriate, the Secretary may enter into an agreement with the State, county, or municipal government, or agency or political subdivision thereof, or a private nonprofit agency. Under any such agreement such government or political subdivision thereof or agency shall pay 50 per centum of all costs of the program, including those of administration. The contributions by such government, or political subdivision thereof, or agency, pursuant to such agreements may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. Such agreements shall further provide that the Secretary will pay grants to such governments or political subdivisions thereof or agencies covering the balance of all costs of such programs, including those of administration.

(b) Funds available for grants in any fiscal year under agreements authorized by subsection (a) shall be allocated among the States on the basis of the ratio that the number of persons who are unemployed in the age group of sixteen years to twenty-one years, both inclusive, in each State bear to the number of persons in such age group in all States.

Authority of Secretary

SEC. 205. (a) In carrying out this title, the Secretary is authorized to—

(1) delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government any of his functions, powers, or duties under this title as he deems appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation thereof by the heads of such departments and agencies.

(2) utilize with their consent the services and facilities of Federal agencies and, with the consent of any State accept and utilize the services and facilities of the agencies of such government or of any county or municipal subdivision thereof; to establish State and local advisory committees; and to utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed.

(3) make such contracts or agreements, establish such procedures, and make such payments, either in advance or by way of reimbursement as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(4) encourage the enrollees to participate in a systematic program of training and education provided by State and local educational authorities, or by a program carried out pursuant to the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 as amended by title I of this Act.

(5) prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) Any agreement under this title shall contain such provisions as may be necessary to promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss, and insure the application of funds in a manner consistent with the provisions and purposes of this title and the terms of such agreement.

National Advisory Council on State and Community Youth Employment Programs

SEC. 206. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Labor a National Advisory Council on Youth Employment Programs (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be Chairman, and nine members, at least four of which shall be members of the minority party, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. The appointed members of the Council shall be persons (including persons from public and voluntary organizations) who are recognized authorities in professional or technical fields related to the employment of youth or who represent the fields of conservation, agriculture, education, training, labor, management, and urban development or persons representative of the general public who are leaders in programs concerned with employment of youth. The Council shall advise the Secretary on the administration of this title. The Council shall also include, whenever appropriate, the various agency heads designated in section 207 of this title.

(b) Upon request of the Secretary, the Council shall review the operation of this title in general and shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the execution of his responsibilities under this title. The Council may also make recommendations to the Secretary on projects referred to it by the Secretary. The Council shall meet at least twice each year and at such other times as the Secretary may request. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters relating to this title for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

(c) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings of the Council or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept the services of appointed members under this section without the payment of compensation therefor (and with or without payment of travel expenses or per diem in lieu of subsistence).

Interagency consultation

SEC. 207. In the administration of this title, the Secretary shall seek the advice and assistance of the Secretaries of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Agriculture, and Interior, of the Attorney General, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and of such other agency heads as the Secretary deems appropriate.

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 208. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, the sum of $15,000,000 and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years thereafter such amounts as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this title may be transferred between departments and agencies of the Government for use for the purpose for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated and may also be granted to State and local governments for the purpose provided in this title.

Report by the Secretary

SEC. 209. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report on the activities and programs authorized by this title during such year; and not later than January 1, 1966, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report evaluating the activities and programs authorized by this title from its inception together with such recommendations as he may deem desirable.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, first, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I warmly commend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] for the fight he has been making to protect the taxpayers from a new and needless spending program.

While the $60 million proposed in the pending bill to start a replica of the CCC camps of the depression 1930's is apparently a very modest undertaking, no one should delude himself into believing that if a program of this character is started, it can be any more easily stopped than the program of 1934, which ran for 8½ years, and was not ended until war spending and the draft forced Congress to abandon it. Instead of the new conservation camp program's being less expensive than the CCC program was during the great depression, my personal belief is that it could easily be three times as expensive. For instance, both the Census Bureau and the Army are agreed that the current cost of building a barracks is 300 percent higher than it was during the depression years; and the pending bill recognizes the inflation that has occurred, when it provides a starting salary of $20,000 a year for the Director of the YCC, as against $10,000 for the Director of the CCC in the bill of 1937.

I have previously pointed out that even to house the 15,000 men contemplated by title I of the bill would cost not less than $75 million. My colleagues may be interested to know what was spent on barracks for the old CCC camps. The General Accounting Office informs me that the total under the general heading of "Shelter" was $69,877,649.13. And if to that is added what, of course, will have to be added to the new camps, if established—equipment, supplies and materials, structures and parts, and land—the total for what might be termed capital outlays for the old CCC program was $402,220,869.06. When we add to that the money paid to the enrollees and the contributions made to their dependents, we find that in 8½ years the Government spent on the old CCC camps $2,328 million.

Therefore, I feel safe in asserting that if we start this program—and Government witnesses have testified that they are figuring the per-man cost on the basis of amortizing the capital outlay over a period of 20 years—it may ultimately cost over $6 billion.

So far as character building in the CCC camps is concerned, the answer lies in the fact that 500,000 members of those camps either deserted or were discharged for misconduct. Between the years 1934 and 1943, inclusive, the total amount spent in aids to youths in the CCC and the Youth Administration was $3,229 million; and now we are asked to duplicate that failure, but at a much greater cost.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, my explanation of the substitute amendment will be brief.

Title I of the amendment provides, for the first year, an authorization of $45 million to expand the Manpower Training Act programs. This expansion would give unemployed youths skills needed in the labor market.

For the fiscal years 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968, this title authorizes the appropriation of such sums as Congress may determine to be necessary.

Forty-five thousand youths would receive the training.

Let me point out that they will be receiving actual training—either on the job or otherwise—and will become qualified, sooner or later, to assume their places in society and to be self-supporting.

Up to 45,000 youths between the ages of 16 and 22 may receive training allowances during the fiscal year 1964. The allowance paid to such youths will be not more than $20 a week.

For the fiscal years 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968, not more than 20 per cent of the total amount of money used for training allowances may be paid to young people in the 16 to 21 age group.

I am told that under existing law not more than 5 percent of such allowances may be paid to young people.

Title II of my substitute amendment follows very closely the provisions of title II of Senate bill 1, and is supposed to stimulate State and local community service activities by public and nonprofit agencies to increase job opportunities and the employability of young people. The community service activities authorized under this program might include employment in schools, hospitals, welfare agencies, and on natural resources projects.

The Federal share of the program would be on a 50–50 matching-grant basis.

The eligibility requirements for community service programs would be as follows: These programs must first, increase the employability of enrollees; second, contribute extra public service, or must contribute to health and education programs or to the conservation of natural resources; third, not displace regular workers; and fourth, provide wages and working conditions consistent with those applicable to comparable work in the locality.

In other words, we would be providing real opportunities for approximately 60,000 of our young people, at a cost which would be $40 million less than that under the program provided in Senate bill 1.

It seems to me that my proposal is a logical and realistic approach. It certainly belies any statements that some of us who are opposed to S. 1 are without a workable program as a substitute. It seems to me that the proposal is to some extent a palliative. It is not the ultimate answer to the problem of school dropouts. But, in my judgment, it would help to take care of some of the young people who are now unemployed and unemployable.

I am now very happy to yield 10 minutes to my distinguished friend the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, first I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Vermont for having come forward with a constructive, useful, and productive program. His substitute would eliminate the two glaring deficiencies which I find in the committee bill.

The first great weakness of the committee proposal is that, given its best look, it would provide a bonus for dropouts of schools. It would place a premium on the individual who has dropped out of school, and would apply pressure on others to drop out, because they would then have the opportunity to enjoy the glamor and adventure of a few months or a couple of years in the open at public expense. We should be trying to hold young people in our schools and not providing new magnets to pull them out.

The second great deficiency in the committee bill is that it would do nothing constructive and useful from the standpoint of its participants to equip them the better to lead a useful life and to contribute to the economy of the country. Instead, we have merely tried to take some old ideas from the 1930's and apply them to the new problems of the 1960's. Instead, we should be applying some new ideas to the old problems of school dropouts and juvenile delinquency which have existed for a long time. I do not envision that in peacetime and prosperity we can correct any better the problems with which we dealt in the days of the depression 30 years ago than we could at that time.

I like the proposal originated by the Senator from Vermont because it provides a ladder by which young people who are out of work can climb to higher goals of achievement, instead of providing what I submit the committee bill does, and that is a $100 million revolving door through which they would pass and, 6 months, a year, or 2 years afterward, come back exactly to where they were before, no better trained.

If we are to spend a substantial sum of money to try to do something for young people—and I should like to do something to meet the challenge of delinquency, and to eliminate the problems of youthful employment—let us do it by providing them with training which will equip them with skills and the necessary know-how so that they can earn a useful living.

In my opinion, if we would do that, the expenditure of the $60 million recommended by the substitute proposal would not be an expense. It would be an investment that would be reimbursed to the Government, because we would have increased the earning power, and thereby the taxpaying capacity, of the trained young people who have had an opportunity to develop vocational skills as against those who otherwise would spend some happy days in the out of doors for $60 a month, and would return perhaps a little healthier, but no wiser, no better trained, no better equipped and, conceivably, even more maladjusted to the city life to which they would be compelled to return after they had had such an experience.

During the entire discussion, the problem has been stated that unemployment rates for youth stand at a higher percentage even than the inordinately large rate of unemployment of our total work force. Against that background of information it would seem that the Senate should devote itself to trying to develop a plan to train young people, to give them skills, and to give them the equipment needed to meet the challenges of the 1960's. Thirty years ago it was easier for an untrained worker to get a job than it is in 1962. Thirty years ago there was more plausibility to the argument that if a young man is kept out of doors for 6 months, a year, or 2 years, he will at least come back a healthier individual and can then use his brawn and muscle to earn a living.

Today the areas in which brawn and muscle enable a young man to earn a decent living have been sharply reduced. He now needs training, skills, procedures, techniques, and background, which he could get under the program proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and myself, with the spending of available money to train young people and to equip them better to serve society and better to serve themselves.

We will wrestle with less than 10 percent of the youthful unemployed in our country. Under such a program it seems to me that for those 10 percent, at least, we should be desirous primarily to make sure that they can get the kind of jobs to which they are entitled.

As presented, the measure is a costly program because, we were told in the hearings, it would cost anywhere from $150 to $1,000 per enrollee merely for the materials, equipment, and plant. It would cost about $15 million for the 15,000 enrollees, in addition to the very expensive costs involved in managing, transporting, housing, and supervising the enrollees. We are told that the cost would probably run about $3,985 per individual. By spending a smaller amount of money per individual and by helping to develop training facilities and vocational areas, in my opinion we would get much more for the dollar invested than we would on a program designed primarily to let young men develop another year or two of age without correspondingly equipping them with another year or two of knowledge, practical training, and know-how in that area.

I used to serve as superintendent of schools in a typical small American community. I know how hard it is, even in a rural community, to hold young people in high school. I am sure that if someone had come down the streets in the little town in which I served as superintendent of schools offering to high school sophomores and juniors an opportunity to go out into the woods and enjoy fishing, scenery, and adventure at $60 a month, I would have been unable to persuade them to remain until they graduated from high school.

If that kind of attraction, opportunity, and substitute activity were offered to youngsters in the city, it would have an even greater appeal.

Why in the world the Congress, dedicated as it presumably is to trying to develop better educational facilities and programs for American children, should, on the one hand, devote itself in that direction, and, on the other hand, provide a premium to those who have dropped out by giving them an excursion into the wilderness at $60 a month, I do not know. In my opinion, those are very inconsistent approaches.

I like much better the approach which would continue to keep the goal of educating and training young Americans before us, as we propose in the substitute training program.

I regret that the proposed legislation would not train our youth with the skills to meet the future. Dr. William B. Logan, a member of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, has said that there are 4 to 6 million unemployed and at the same time there is a like number of job openings. He said the difference is skills. The difference is lack of training. The difference is too many people who would be like the young Conservation Corps men—able to work, probably willing to work, but unable to turn their hand to productive enterprises because they lack the vocational training necessary. They lack the apprenticeship. They lack experience. They lack know-how.

I invite the attention of Senators to an interesting article in the January issue of Reader's Digest by Lester Velie entitled "Why Johnny Can't Get a Job."

Mr. Velie points out clearly that one reason so many teenagers are out of work is because their schooling has failed them.

Regarding the curious national problem of acute shortages of skilled workers and rising unemployment, especially among our young workers, Mr. Velie says:

> Last year approximately a million teenagers ended their schooling and looked for work. Not long ago, these youths could be absorbed in industry or on the farm. But galloping automation has wiped out 2 million blue-collar jobs in the last 5 years. (In farming alone, 800,000 jobs have vanished since 1957.) True, automation has created 3,500,000 new jobs in service industries—in stores, garages, banks, real estate offices. But these jobs require training. And so many of our young people lack the needed training that 1 boy out of every 5 between 16 and 19 fails to land a job. Automation, then, like a huge searchlight, makes painfully visible a giant flaw in our educational system; our schools are flunking the job of preparing our young for the workday world.

As Mr. Velie points out, this is an indictment of our educational system, because, on the one hand, we have failed to provide, training for those who are in school, in vocational areas, adjusted to their mentalities and capabilities; and, on the other hand, in some areas we have failed to provide the training schools themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in summary I wish to say that I think the Congress of the United States and the taxpayers, who must attempt to provide funds under these trying circumstances, should be interested not only in developing some Americans who are good but also in developing some Americans who are good for something, who are trained for something, who are equipped for something, who are able to do something in this great economic area in which we find ourselves, so that when all the expenditures are made, at the end of the road, we shall not merely have added a couple of years of maturity to young people, but shall have added even more to their capabilities and abilities.

The program which was proposed as a substitute would cost less and would produce more. It is not likely to be expanded as rapidly, because it would be limited automatically to the areas in which there can be provided vocational training, and by the capacity of vocational training institutions and schools to absorb additional students. It would be limited to the capacity of industry and unions to absorb young people who come in to get assistance while developing apprenticeship skills.

I plead, in conclusion, for a program which would not return to the thirties, but which would look forward to the sixties, the seventies, and the eighties. This program, in my opinion, would do exactly that.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Oklahoma may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the Prouty amendment. I regret that many of my very best friends, with whom I have served many years in the Senate, will be on the other side.

My mind goes back to the days when I first came to Congress, in 1938. At that time there were six or seven CCC camps in my congressional district. They were good camps. They were good camps established to take boys off the road—boys who were "bumming" back and forth on the railroad trains, on the freight cars, and hitchhiking across country. Mainly they were hitchhiking because the families of those boys did not have sufficient food to keep them at home, and it was necessary to have some place to tuck them away. They were good boys, but they were being taught the skills of building log fences, planting trees, building sidewalks, and so on—none of the great and adventurous things, in my State, which have been attributed to some of the works of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Those boys were kept out of trouble, because they were well fed, well clothed, and well supervised. For each 100, as I seem to recall, there were some 10 or 15 rather well paying jobs, to supervise these boys who helped to absorb our unemployment.

Today, some 25 years later, the great DC-3's, then a super plane, have given way to the 707's and the DC-8's. The skills needed today for these boys, to make them useful in America, are not the skills of building sidewalks or building fences or doing such things as that, no matter how pleasurable they may be in a recreation area in the woods. It is important that they be equipped for the aeronautical and space age.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 additional minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I feel that it is desirable to meet the problem of unemployment and of dropouts from our schools, for the boys of this age who cannot find employment. We must give them something worthy of the challenge of America. In my State there are many great vocational schools and other great educational institutions. Every vocational school class is filled. The boys are going to school, to be equipped for employment in the context of the opportunities of modern technology, as fast as they can graduate.

For that reason I intend to vote for a more realistic program, which will help these boys not to stay on the Government, not to stay in the backwoods tucked away from sight, but will send them to schools to be trained in the kinds of skills modern America needs and wants, for which jobs can be found which they can fill. This is the best way to invest our money, if we are to reach the level of employment and the level of industrial production for which the President cries.

I do not think we should find that by educating some 60,000 or even 160,000 young men in woodsmanship, no matter how pleasurable that might be.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I commend very sincerely the statements made by the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], a cosponsor of the substitute amendment, and the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. I think they have figuratively hit the nail on the head. They recognize that the substitute would provide a realistic program, which would be helpful to the unemployed young men and women of this country. It would get results immediately.

Mr. President, I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Vermont.

I wish to join in the favorable expressions which have been made about the Prouty-Mundt substitute, and to indicate that I intend to support this amendment. If it does not prevail, I shall be constrained to vote against passage of the bill, much as I recognize that there is a serious problem which we are attempting to solve.

The bill as it now stands is pointed in the wrong direction. The failure of the Senate—by a very close vote, I point out—to delete title I from the bill pretty well removed any inclination I might have felt to support the bill.

I note that title I would not provide anything more than a scratching of the surface of the problem, and this at a very large cost per enrollee.

In this connection it is well to point out what was said recently in a lead editorial of the Washington Post and Times Herald, on March 26, entitled "Growth and Jobs."

This editorial points out the serious unemployment situation and also recognizes the unemployment problem facing our younger generation. The editorial states:

> Such benefits as those contemplated in the bill to set up a Youth Conservation Corps and a Home Town Youth Corps for example are only patches on the main problem. Last year there were 700,000 youths from 16 to 21 out of work. Some 3.8 million youths will become 16 in 1963. The sponsors of the Youth Conservation Corps are talking about 15,000 youths in the first year and 60,000 a year in the first 4 years. The backers of the Home Town Youth Corps are talking about 45,000 in the first year. Such proposals, whatever other merit they have, are no solution to the over-all problem of the youth coming into the labor market. These two projects with their maximum of some 100,000 jobs will not soak up an inundating flood of nearly 4 million young workers a year.

This is the main thrust of the editorial:

> What is needed is not made work or stopgap jobs for a few disadvantaged youths but full-time jobs with a future for the whole mass of new workers who are moving into the ranks of the employable.

Mr. President, the substitute that is offered is pointed in the right direction, because it is calculated to provide the skills that these unfortunate young people must have if they are going to build a future for themselves.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

I yield back my 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the amendment in the nature of a substitute which is offered by the Senator from Vermont brings into focus again the fact that already, by a rollcall of 47 to 40, the Senate has endorsed title I. Senators have been recorded on this matter. It has done so, in principle, because this attempt, the Prouty amendment, goes to title I.

In lieu of the Youth Conservation Corps, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] would increase the size of the youth training features of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. He would raise additional funds in the amount of $45 million for that program.

I remind my colleagues that we are concerned here with youths who have dropped out of school, who have left the instructional programs in which they have been participants.

It is important, I feel, to stress the fact that we are not attempting to bring a substitute plan into being for the Manpower Training and Development Act. We are supplementing that program.

I take only 2 minutes to read what the report of the majority states in reference to the matter based on the testimony of the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz. He set forth that the youngsters within this group "will be better prepared," to quote him, "for entry into the work force" by direct training under one of the programs to be established under S. 1. That effort at discipline and learning is, of course, embraced in title I.

By direct training, the Secretary indicates the group we have been talking about would be helped. The Secretary continues to state that this is the best approach to the job potential for a practical work force.

We agree with Mr. Wirtz. The whole purpose of the administration of the YCC program would be to qualify each individual for the highest degree of realization of whatever potential that enrollee possessed.

The Secretary went on to further designate the program envisaged under S. 1 as a method of integrating the various approaches to the problems of this particular work group, in which vocational education is a valuable part.

Then he noted that the program would be administered with the thought in mind of making it, as I outlined earlier, a supplement to the education program and increasing the amount of education these enrollees would receive.

Mr. President, this body has already given its verdict in reference to this question; in fact almost directly on the subject matter set forth in the amendment of the Senator [Mr. PROUTY]. Now our colleague from Vermont comes again with his plan of defeat for this meritorious measure by offering a substitute. I believe we will not approve his proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is there any time remaining on the amendment?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, have I any time left?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will yield back my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me half a minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield my time to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, just prior to the vote which will be taken shortly, several memorandums.

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Explanation of Prouty Substitute for S. 1, the Youth Employment Bill

Total cost of substitute, $60 million for fiscal 1964.

TITLE I—TRAINING PROGRAM FOR YOUTHS

Cost and purpose of title I

The first year: Authorizes $45 million to expand Manpower Development Training Act programs. The expansion will give unemployed youths skills needed in the labor market.

For fiscal years 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968: Such sums as Congress may determine to be necessary.

Number of youths who will receive training

Forty-five thousand.

Number and description of training allowances

Up to 45,000 youths between 16 and 22 years of age, may receive training allowances during fiscal year 1964.

The allowance paid for such youths will be no more than $20 a week.

For the fiscal years 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968, not more than 20 percent of the total amount of money used for training allowances may be paid to young people in the 16 to 21 age group.

(NOTE: Under present law not more than 5 percent of such allowances may be paid to youths.)

TITLE II—STATE AND COMMUNITY YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Cost of title II

First year: $15 million.

For following 4 fiscal years: Whatever Congress determines to be necessary.

Number and description of enrollees in the program

First year: 15,000 full-time enrollees (male or female, age 16 or more but not yet 22).

Following 4 fiscal years: Whatever numbers Congress may determine.

What the program does

Stimulates State and local community service activities by public and nonprofit agencies to increase job opportunities and employability of young people.

Community service activities authorized under this program might include employment in schools, hospitals, welfare agencies, and on natural resources projects.

Federal share of program costs

Fifty-fifty matching grants will be made to public and nonprofit agencies.

Eligibility requirements for community service programs

These programs must:

1. increase employability of enrollees;
2. contribute extra public service or must contribute to health and education programs or to the conservation of natural resources;
3. not displace regular workers;
4. provide wages and working conditions consistent with those applicable to comparable work in the locality.

A Comparison of S. 1 and the Prouty Substitute

S. 1

1. Authorizes $50 million to build and operate facilities similar to the CCC camps of the thirties. Few, if any skills will be acquired by enrollees.[1]

Authorizes $50 million for youth employment programs with emphasis on conservation and "work experience" in unskilled jobs.

2. The YCC offers only work to boys with little or no training.

3. Permits the Secretary to allocate funds to the States largely at his discretion.

4. Sets up a 10-man Advisory Council on Youth Employment Problems.

PROUTY SUBSTITUTE

Authorizes $45 million to expand programs for unemployed youth designed to provide skills needed in the labor market.

Authorizes $15 million for "work experience" but with more emphasis on educational and health programs.

Provides needed training to boys and girls through expansion of training programs in progress under Manpower Development and Training Act.

Requires funds to be allocated to the States according to number of unemployed youth and school dropouts of each State as related to all States.

Requires the Council to be bipartisan in nature.

How the Manpower Development and Training Act Works With Respect to Young People

1. They may receive occupational training under it.

2. They may receive training allowances equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment if: (a) they have 3 years of employment experience and are heads of families or heads of households.

3. If they do not have such experience and do not head a family they may, at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, receive training allowances not exceeding $20 a week—but they must be 19 years of age or more to get the smaller allowance.

4. Youths are further limited by the Manpower Act in that they may not receive more than 5 percent of the estimated total of all training allowances.

CHANGES IN THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT MADE BY THE PROUTY SUBSTITUTE

1. For the first year the Secretary may pay training allowances to not more than 45,000 youths at a rate not exceeding $20 a week to youths who are 16 but under 22 years of age.

2. Beginning with fiscal year 1965, youths could receive up to 20 percent of the total amount of training allowances paid under the Manpower Act.

3. Youths who now qualify for the higher training allowance which equals unemployment compensation because they are heads of families and have 3 years' work experience will still qualify for such higher allowances.

4. The Prouty substitute adds an authorization of $45 million to the Manpower Development and Training Act to take care of the costs of training and compensating 45,000 additional young persons during the next fiscal year.

Outline of Memorandum on YCC Costs

I. Introduction.

II. Errors in estimating new camp construction: (a) Previous estimates of administration—$315,000; (b) current estimate by Director of Bureau of Youth Services, Pennsylvania, $385,000; (c) construction costs may rise by time of construction—no account taken of this factor; (d) proponents say figures are maximized, but no evidence of this.

III. Deception in failing to state work equipment costs: (a) The $500 average equipment cost should have been added directly to the $3,985 to realistically reflect cost per boy of at least $4,500.

IV. Error in amortization of construction costs: (a) Amortization of expenditures of Federal Government not the budgetary practice; (b) amortization over 20-year period entirely unrelated to life of youth program which might be 1 year or perhaps 5 years; (c) elimination of amortization puts costs of program in proper perspective. Cost per boy $9,000 instead of $4,000; (d) alternate amortization over 1–5 years would be better, but no cure-all.

V. Renovation of existing campsites puts cost errors in true perspective: (a) Renovation costs of 156 camps for 11,240 boys—$15 million; (b) only $45 million left to fulfill program objectives; (c) but would require $63,750,000 for objectives, exclusive of housing, and total of $78 million with housing when considering the $500 added for work equipment costs. (d) Still need for 3,000 additional spaces; with construction of 60 new 50-man camps at $250,000, need another $15 million. Total to be spent on housing for first 15,000 boys—$30 million. (e) Leaves only $30 million for a program costing $63,750,000. Can only use half the boys or 7,500, maybe less.

VI. There will be little or no financial return under this program: (a) Because so much money is needed for housing, little money left to support any work program. No money for training; (b) work program conducted by only 7,500 boys instead of 15,000 because housing funds ate up money for other programs; had to reduce participants; (c) if 15,000 boys to be enrolled appropriation must be doubled and what financial return is produced is far offset and exceeded by additional appropriation necessary.

THE COSTS ESTIMATES OF THE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT BILL ARE UNREALISTIC AND REPLETE WITH ERROR

The senior Senator from Minnesota chastised opponents of his youth employment bill because of their attack on the bill's cost. He said that critics of the program's cost erred by citing cost data directly contradictory to the cost data presented at the current hearings and by failing to take into consideration the substantial financial returns that would accrue from projects undertaken by the YCC.

The senior Senator from Minnesota erred on the question of costs by presenting figures and data directly contradictory to previous testimony before the committee.

For example, the cost data supplied the committee erred on the two critical areas of new camp construction and renovation of existing camps.

---

[1] Prouty substitute trains 60,000 boys and girls which equals the administration estimate of 50,000 to 65,000 youths (mostly boys). The Prouty substitute costs slightly more than half the cost of S. 1.

ERRORS IN ESTIMATING NEW CAMP CONSTRUCTION COSTS

In the hearings held before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in 1961 the Departments of Agriculture and Interior supplied charts projecting the cost of construction of 50-man youth camps at $315,000. In testimony before the committee in the current hearings the Director of the Bureau of Youth Services for Pennsylvania estimated that current construction costs for 50-man camps being construction in Pennsylvania were $385,000. If the legislation is passed in its present form it is unlikely that any construction would or could be undertaken until some time in 1964; construction costs may rise in the intervening period. But, even in the face of such strong evidence that construction of 50-man camps would exceed $300,000 per camp the senior Senator from Minnesota, at the signal from the Secretary of Labor, continues to contend that the camps will cost less than $250,000. They have said, time and time again that $250,000 is a maximum figure, that all expenses are maximized and that every expenditure can be substantially reduced under its projected cost.

In the hearings at page 495 the Secretary said: "I do want to make it clear that the basis on which these figures have been prepared is a basis which in my judgment is conservative, in the sense that we have erred, if at all, on the high side."

Yet, on not one occasion has any one of the bill's proponents demonstrated where any single expenditure could be reduced; the evidence indicates that practically every cited cost figure is in reality far too low."

DECEPTION IN FAILING TO STATE WORK EQUIPMENT COSTS

Secretary Wirtz and the senior Senator from Minnesota have both concluded that the projected cost of the Youth Conservation Corps, which is title I of the bill, on a boy-per-boy basis is only $3,985. To arrive at this figure they have performed some neat bookkeeping gymnastics. They did not include the cost of equipment, material and supplies necessary to set up work programs but made a footnote to their cost estimates indicating that the cost range for such equipment would range from $150 to $1,000, depending upon the work the particular enrollee was going to perform. They did estimate that the average cost of equipment would be about $500. To be more realistic they should have stated that the cost per boy was about $4,500.

ERROR IN AMORTIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The figure of $3,985 settled upon by the bill's proponents as the cost per boy for the total program consisted of a figure of $250 for housing or quarters. This $250 was arrived at by taking the cost of construction for new 50-man camps of $250,000 dividing it by the number of boys, 50, and amortizing the resultant figure over 20 years. The use of the amortization technique is deceptive and misleading.

As one of the majority staff members of the Committee said in a memorandum to Senator CLARK on page 548 of the hearings: "Amortization on camp costs is an interesting fiscal exercise, but since Federal funds are appropriated on an annual basis, amortization is not realistic."

But amortization as resorted to here is more than unrealistic; it is exceedingly deceptive and misleading. The proponents propose that the Secretary of Labor be empowered to construct new camps for 50 boys. These camps would require a Federal expenditure of $250,000 in the year that they are built. The bill only provides certainty that the youth program will last for one year although there is some authority for continuing its functions for a total of five fiscal years, providing that the Congress makes subsequent appropriations for operation of the program. Should Congress deem it to be not in the public interest to make subsequent appropriations to the youth program, the program would last for only one year. Over that period the cost of the new camp construction alone would be $5,000 instead of the $250 figure relied upon by the bill's supporters. If the Congress made appropriations for the four following years the cost per boy per year would be reduced to $1,000 for new camp construction alone. Five years was the maximum term contemplated for this program by the bill's sponsors. But the Secretary of Labor and the senior Senator from Minnesota maintain that the way to justify the cost of the new camp construction is to amortize the cost over 20 years. What they are in effect saying is this:

1. Two-hundred and fifty thousand dollars will be paid from the U.S. Treasury for single camps housing 50 boys at the time those camps are built.

2. But, this is a sham transaction because it is really as though only $12,500 is spent per year for 20 years.

Such a contention is an absurdity because the $250,000 is actually paid out of the Treasury at the time of construction. And even if the cost could be prorated, the maximum conceivable term for the amortization should be the life of the program which might be 5 years and possibly only 1 year. To say that the proper amortization period for the camps is 20 years is to maintain that the camps are valuable assets for the betterment of youth for the 15–19 years that they may lie vacant and deteriorating. This is the type of fiscal logic that drives the taxpayers to distraction.

When the cost of new camp construction is not amortized the cost of the total program per boy on the basis of the 50-man camps becomes about $9,000 per boy. The cost per boy will decline over the life of the plan as more and more useful life is derived from the camps and the work equipment, but the rate of declining cost is very slow and the program would have to continue for many, many years before it ever approached the $4,000 figure estimated by the administration.

RENOVATION OF EXISTING CAMPSITES PUTS THE COST ERRORS IN TRUE PERSPECTIVE

Both the Secretary and the senior Senator from Minnesota have indicated that the Congress should not be too concerned about the construction of new camp facilities because there are almost enough campsites presently in existence to take care of the 15,000 boys under the program for the first year. There are two fallacies in this argument.

First, the senior Senator from Minnesota told us on Thursday, April 4, that the cost of renovating the 156 year-round camps that would house 11,240 boys would cost $14,667, or close to $15 million. The bill authorizes a total appropriation of $60 million for the first year. After renovation of the existing camp facilities for these 11,240 boys there would only be $45 million left. At the Senator's adjusted estimated of $4,500 per boy less the housing allowance of $250 which the Senator said would be necessary if new camps were constructed, but which is eliminated by the renovation of existing facilities, or a cost per boy of $4,250, the total appropriation necessary to furnish the 15,000 boys with the necessities to carry out this program over and above housing would alone be $63,750.000. The total cost for renovating existing facilities and furnishing all the other items promised by the proponents under this bill would be about $78 million. And yet the proponents prepared themselves so well on this bill that they only asked for $60 million. This wide disparity reflects extremely sloppy planning.

Secondly, they have sometimes argued that there are almost enough existing campsites for 15,000 boys. I have seen no higher estimate than 12,000. On last Thursday the senior Senator from Minnesota admitted there were only 12,000. This means that new camps for 3,000 boys will need to be built. At $250,000 for a 50-man camp, with 60 new camps needed, the allotment for new camp construction alone would have to be $15 million. The total cost for renovation and new camp construction for the first year alone would be $30 million meaning that the Secretary would have to limit the program to far fewer than the 15,000 boys planned or entirely limit what few beneficial programs the plan might have. The cost estimating of the youth employment bill was so poorly planned that few if any of its objectives are obtainable.

THERE WILL BE LITTLE OR NO FINANCIAL RETURN UNDER THIS PROGRAM

The senior Senator from Minnesota said last Thursday: "In order to assess the true costs of the YCC it is absolutely essential to move beyond the shortrun cash outlay for annual operating costs and examine the financial returns that will be eventually created by this annual outlay."

The emphasis should be on the word "eventual" and it should be construed to read "eventual if ever." If all the appropriations under this bill must go to new camp construction or the renovation of existing facilities, there will be no funds to support any conservation work. If the number of boys under the program is reduced to come within the budget, which must of necessity be revised after the actual costs have made their full presence known to the proponents, there will be so few boys working under the program that any benefits of their work will be lost by the insignificance of their numbers. If all the boys do all the work projected by the proponents then the authorizations and appropriations will have to be doubled, thereby far offsetting and exceeding any financial returns.

MEMORANDUM

The record shows very little provision is made for training facilities in the camps.

The administration plan in 1961 provided for a total of one man to serve each camp in an "education and recreation" capacity. This was true in both 500 and 100 men camps. It was also true in 200 men camps.

In the hearings (page 492) Senator PROUTY inquired about educational and training facilities at the camps. The Labor Department's reply (page 531) was as follows: "The information requested under this heading is available only in such small quantity that it would be purposeless to describe it. In saying as much the Department's task force which has been studying the program believes that this item should be left until the size of the program and its authorization was determined by the Congress."

This seems to suggest that any little amount of training or education contemplated would be among the first areas of the programs to be deleted should appropriations be reduced.

The cost figures of the administration to support the YCC, deliberately omitted cost of materials and equipment for training of the enrollees. The administration tentatively suggests the cost to range between $100 and $1,000 per man. It would seem that not much training or education was considered specifically in the planning of the camps.

Senator HUMPHREY envisioned the following kinds of skills to be learned in the camps: automotive repairing, carpentry, baking, clerical, construction equipment operation, cooking, conservation and engineering aid, electrical wiring, masonry, metalworking, photography, plumbing, sign painting, surveying and mapping, and truck driving.

Just a listing of this "vision" would seem to indicate the impossibility of any usable training benefiting the enrollees.

The Requisites of a "Good" Youth Conservation Corps Program

The testimony of Commissoner Charles Foster of the Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources listed the following requirements for a "worthwhile" YCC program (page 396, hearings): (1) A good skill-training program; (2) Quality leadership; (3) Remedial schooling; (4) Counseling service; and (5) An active job placement program.

Such a worthwhile program is virtually impossible for one man responsible for education and recreation; or even for two men in a hundred or two hundred-man camp.

Neither is such a program possible on the administration figure of $300 per man for education and training.

Memorandum

The provisions of title I, Senate 1 are lacking in training for enrollees—Two comments by Secretary Wirtz on the training aspects of YCC camps:

"I call attention to this: First, there is no suggestion that this training program will qualify one of the enrollees for a skilled occupation. That we should dismiss completely."

"The largest shortages ahead, or the enlargement of the shortage for the future, as part of the technological development which we call automation, are going to be principally in the skill jobs. Those are where the shortages would develop during the next 10 years.

"And consistently with my answer to an earlier question, it would not be thought that there would be any high percentage of qualification as a result of these programs for the complete satisfaction of any skilled or even semiskilled or semiprofessional jobs. They would not do that."

Mrs. Agnes Meyer who is certainly socially conscious of problems affecting youth has the following to say: "No matter how much a young man may profit from the training and helpful influences of the Youth Conservation Corps, he will eventually have to return to the home from which he came and be again subjected to the detrimental influences from which he has temporarily escaped. This proved to be a great difficulty to many of the CCC graduates."

If, as Secretary Wirtz says there will be little or no training to prepare a young man for increased skills in the labor market, his lack of training together with Mrs. Meyer's concern over his return home will actually put him in a worse position jobwise than before he entered camp.

Mr. Richard G. Farrow, Director of the Bureau of Youth Services of the Pennsylvania Deparment of Public Welfare who has considerable experience in running camps similar to YCC, and who was a witness on this program had this to say in response to Senator Prouty's question about the skills boys would learn in the camps (page 401, hearings): "I would not say that many of them develop a great deal of skill in a trade that they can apply outside * * *"

When Senator Prouty asked if they were unskilled when they leave the camp: "By and large, yes. A few of them, who might work as unskilled workers might get what would be called beginning skills."

In commenting on the question of lack of training in YCC camps Mr. Farrow said: "Even if employment can be provided through projects in some areas, it should be the type of work that involves training, which in turn can lead to industrial, commercial, or other employment. Anything less than this, I fear, may become another dead end activity for young people, with consequent loss of self-respect and community standing."

Subjects Which Can Be Taught in Youth Conservation Corps Camps

The Department of the Interior lists a total of some 60-odd courses ranging from jewelry making and poultry raising to diesel engines and mechanical engineering. All of these courses would be learned through correspondence with the Armed Forces Institute (p. 542, hearings).

It is a highly unnecessary waste to spend $60 million to put 15,000 men in a camp just to provide them with a place to read correspondence books. If this is the greater part of their training, which it probably will be, they can take such courses any place in the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The issue is on the Prouty amendment in the nature of a substitute. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty].

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 50, as follows:

[Leg. No. 54]

YEAS—37

Aiken
Beall
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—50

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Engle
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smith
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—13

Allott
Bennett
Edmondson
Ellender
Hayden
Holland
Long, Mo.
Morton
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Young, Ohio

So Mr. Prouty's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall reluctantly vote against the pending bill. I say reluctantly because I believe that the Senate has missed a great opportunity to come up with some genuinely constructive legislation to meet a real need of our society.

There can be no question but what the employment opportunities for a large number of our young people are discouraging. The reason is that they do not possess the skills needed by industry. The skills are not being provided because we do not have enough technical and trade schools to accommodate them. Moreover, some of the schools we already have are not geared to the needs of our economy.

But the bill does not meet the needs. Any inclination I might have felt to support the bill was removed when the Senate, by a close vote of 47 to 40, defeated the amendment by Senator Prouty, of

Vermont, which would have deleted title I of the bill, establishing the Youth Conservation Corps of 15,000. Under this title, Iowa will be entitled to less than 100 enrollees, so it is evident that the program will only scratch the surface. Moreover, the cost of the program will amount to between $4,000 and $5,000 per enrollee—an amount which a good many families do not receive in their annual income. In short, the program is extravagant, reaches only a few people, and does not give promise of providing the skills needed.

It would be far better to take the $100 million authorized for the Youth Employment Act and use it to establish technical trade schools which would equip a greater number of young people with skills on which they could build a future.

In this connection, I invite attention to the lead editorial in the Washington Post of March 26, entitled "Growth and Jobs," which points out that the Youth Employment bill represents only a "patch" on the main problem of unemployment. The editorial shows that the maximum of 100,000 temporary jobs for young people which this bill, when fully implemented, will provide represent only a fraction of an inundating flood of nearly 4 million young workers a year. Most important, the editorial wisely says that what is needed is not made work or stopgap jobs for a few disadvantaged youth but full-time jobs with a future for the whole mass of new workers who are moving into the ranks of the employable; that the country primarily needs more jobs—not just more numerous and more varied kinds of relief and special panaceas.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

Another excellent editorial from the Post appeared on April 1. It is entitled "Combating Unemployment," and while it does not directly treat the Youth Employment bill, it does provide some interesting statistics on the unemployment figures for our country during the 20th century. These will provide a greater understanding of the underlying issues relating to unemployment which is needed if Congress and the administration are to successfully meet this great national problem.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 26, 1963]

Growth and Jobs

President Kennedy's warning that we face a 7-percent unemployment rate even without a recession unless we step up our rate of economic growth ought to awaken the whole country to the importance of a reduction now in the war-born tax rates that are dragging down the national economy.

The consequences of a slow rate of growth become more understandable when stated in human terms of rising unemployment. As the President pointed out, an economy expanding at the rate of 3 percent is producing jobs at the rate of 10 million in 15 years while the civilian labor force is growing at the rate of 12 million in 15 years. Even with relative prosperity, the result is going to be rising unemployment. The country lost as much by the idleness of those willing but unable to find work in 1962, the President told an audience in Chicago last Saturday, as it would lose from shuting down the whole country and suspending all production, services and pay for 3 weeks. This is an intolerable waste which a civilized state cannot countenance.

The idle come from many places—from farms where employment is declining at the rate of 200,000 jobs a year, from the schools which will put 26 million new young workers on the labor market in the sixties, from automation which is enabling 800,000 fewer workers to produce 20 percent more manufactured goods.

There are many specific projects required to take care of the particular needs of different pools of labor, but none of these narrow approaches will have the total effect on employment that could be achieved by a tax cut of $10 billion which the President has recommended. To attack separately the problem of each idle group, in the long run, will be as ineffective as meeting the problems of a leaky roof with a bucket for each drip. Some of this may have to be done, in areas and age groups and labor elements with special and peculiar problems that even relatively full employment will not solve. But this is a cleanup job, a mopping-up operation, a bit of social tidying up to be done in addition to raising general employment to acceptable levels.

Such benefits as those contemplated in the bill to set up a Youth Conservation Corps and a Home Town Youth Corps for example are only patches on the main problem. Last year there were 700,000 youths from 16 to 21 out of work. Some 3.8 million youths will become 16 in 1963. The sponsors of the Youth Conservation Corps are talking about 15,000 youths in the first year and 60,000 a year in the first 4 years. The backers of the Home Town Youth Corps are talking about 45,000 in the first year. Such proposals, whatever other merit they have, are no solution to the overall problem of the youth coming into the labor market. These two projects with their maximum of some 100,000 jobs will not soak up an inundating flood of nearly 4 million young workers a year.

What is needed is not make-work or stopgap jobs for a few disadvantaged youth but full-time jobs with a future for the whole mass of new workers who are moving into the ranks of the employable. The specialized solutions offer a retail answer to a wholesale question. The country primarily needs more jobs—not just more numerous and more varied kinds of relief and special panaceas. A more rapidly expanding economy will produce those jobs. A swift and substantial reduction in the taxes that are restricting growth will produce an expanding economy.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 1, 1963]

Combating Unemployment

In his first "Manpower Report" President Kennedy declared:

"The ideal of full employment, in the large sense that each individual shall be all that he is capable of becoming, and shall contribute fully to the well-being of the Nation even as fully as he shares in that well-being, is at the heart of our democratic belief. If we have never achieved that ideal, neither have we ever for long been content to fall short of it. We have measured ourselves by the persistence of our efforts to meet the standard of full employment and the use of our human resources. As we still fall short of that standard, we are still not satisfied."

Although this eloquent statement ends on a note of hopeful determination, it summarizes a record of past failures which underscores the problems which must be surmounted before the rate of unemployment can be drastically reduced.

A historical perspective on the unemployment problem in the United States can be gained from the series on unemployment as a percentage of the labor forces, beginning in 1900, which appears in "Historical Statistics of the United States," a volume prepared by the Bureau of the Census. The average rate of unemployment for the 63-year period, 1900–62, is 18.9 percent, but that figure is distorted by the great depression in which unemployment reached an all-time high of 24.9 percent in 1933 and remained above 14.5 percent until 1941. A more meaningful appraisal of the unemployment record can be made by considering the number of years in which unemployment was below 4 percent, a level adopted by the Council of Economic Advisers as an "interim" full-employment goal. Unemployment ranged below 4 percent in only 23 of the 63 years, and if the war years are excluded, the number drops to 15.

It should not be inferred that higher rates of unemployment are historically inevitable. What the long record of unemployment levels does indicate is that the problem is not likely to be solved without a massive effort on the part of Government, private industry, and the labor movement.

For the past 5 years the rate of unemployment has exceeded 5.5 percent, and while this is a far cry from the catastrophic levels of the 1930's, it represents a degree of economic waste and social degradation which should not be tolerated in a democratic society. Much of the current unemployment can be ascribed to the unsatisfactory rate of economic growth, but it would be naive to assume that the persistent problems of unemployment will vanish if, by enlightened fiscal and monetary policies, the overall rate of economic growth is increased to 4.5 or even 5 percent. There would still be economically depressed areas with industries rendered obsolete by the dizzy pace of technological change; hordes of school dropouts destined for lives of idleness, because they lack the requisite technical skills; and those victims of racial discrimination or generations of poverty who are patently lacking in the motivation to seek gainful employment.

The job-retraining provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 mark the beginnings of a long-delayed assault on these problems, but they are only beginnings. Congress should carefully consider the intelligent recommendations set forth by the minority members in the report of the Joint Economic Committee. They include measures which would provide tax relief for individuals enrolled in technical training programs on the posthigh school level and for expenses involved in moving to new jobs; encourage States to permit persons undergoing retraining to receive normal unemployment compensation; disqualify from unemployment compensation benefits those workers who refuse to enroll in retraining programs without good cause.

The hard core of persistent unemployment can be drastically reduced if not eliminated, but the task will never be accomplished by sentimentalists who hold that all the unemployed are innocent victims of society or the sanctimonious souls who are equally convinced that all idleness is voluntary. What is required is a greater understanding of the underlying issues and willingness to experiment with a variety of imaginative programs.

LET US CONSERVE OUR MOST PRECIOUS RESOURCE—OUR YOUTH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the pending bill would provide for a Youth

Conservation Corps composed of 15,000 youths between the ages of 16 and 21 who would work on useful outdoor projects in our national forests and parks. The measure envisions employment, educational and social discipline designed to strengthen our youth. It seeks to put idle hands into service on useful public projects.

The second section of the bill would provide useful work experiences for 61,000 youths in State or local parks, recreation areas, hospitals, libraries, and other public facilities. I feel strongly that no action we take in this session will reflect more faithfully the quality and concerns of our American civilization in the second half of the 20th century than our action on the bill before the Senate.

It was not idle rhetoric that caused the President to recall Disraeli's words that "the youth of a nation are the trustees of posterity," when he delivered his message on youth to the Congress. For it is true that no resource of this Nation is more precious than our young people, and no problem affecting them more urgent than that of continued unemployment. The conservation of our youth must have the highest priority if we are to remain true to our trust as parents and Americans, as well as legislators. No motive of political advantage, or false economy, or loyalty to a particular ideology, should obscure any Senator's vision of the seriousness of the crisis we face.

The crisis is here—now. Already out-of-school youths between the ages of 16 and 21, who comprise 7 percent of the labor force, make up 18 percent of the jobless. We are rapidly approaching the time when a million young men and women in this age category will be out of school and out of work. Joblessness among young workers is today 2½ times the national average. It is even higher among the nonwhite population. It will grow still more serious if present trends continue.

Think for a moment what this means to a young man in the midst of the wealthiest civilization in all human history: his daily lot is one of idleness or the discouraging search for a job commensurate with his meager talents and abilities. In one of our largest cities, Dr. James B. Conant, an educator and public servant of world renown, found that 59 percent of the male youth between the ages of 16 and 21 were out of school and unemployed.

> They were roaming the streets. Of the boys who graduated from high school, 48 percent were unemployed, in contrast to 63 percent of the boys who had dropped out of school. In short, two-thirds of the male dropouts did not have jobs, and about half of the high school graduates did not have jobs.

Said Dr. Conant.

Small wonder that so many of these frustrated young people become criminals and delinquents. In a world growing constantly more specialized, they have no special skills. In a society geared to lavish consumption and high standards of living, they know the demeaning pressures of want. As the Attorney General so well expressed it, we are "racing the clock against disaster." Many of them feel, he said "that the wheel of fortune is rigged against them. They are falling farther and farther behind in the race for the good things of life. Is it any wonder that more and more of these young people are turning to crime in a hopeless effort to catch up?"

According to the somber estimates of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we can conservatively estimate that, at current delinquency rates, nearly 4 million children will come to the attention of the courts in the next decade, for delinquency charges other than traffic offenses.

Mr. President, it was said on the Senate floor earlier today that it would be cheaper to put a boy in Harvard University than to enroll him in the Youth Conservation Corps. But the choice before many of our idle youths is not the Youth Conservation Corps or Harvard; rather it is, for many of them, a chance between the Youth Corps and continued idleness and possibly crime.

The youth employment opportunities bill is an attempt to defuse one segment of this social dynamite. We already know that one of the best ways to combat juvenile crime is to provide jobs for potential delinquents. The cost is modest in comparison with the cost of treating a case of delinquency. According to the best estimates that have been made, it will cost $3,985 for a year's training in the Youth Conservation Corps. In contrast, $25,000 is the estimated cost to the taxpayer for every juvenile delinquent who travels the police courts-reformatory road.

It is not only in the cities that concern is mounting over the growing crisis in juvenile unemployment, idleness, and delinquency. We in South Dakota are especially concerned about the problem of dwindling opportunities for our youth. Almost 10,000 South Dakotans are leaving our State each year and the great majority of them are young people. In our State are State and National parks, reservoirs, forests, and potential recreational centers where our young people might be given suitable work. In South Dakota are located more than 2 million acres of federally owned land, including the Black Hills National Forest, and in these healthful surroundings hundreds of young Americans, including South Dakotans, might find employment during the difficult interlude between leaving school and finding their life's work.

Behind us, too, is the successful decade of experience with the Civilian Conservation Corps, which provided work and hope for 2½ million young men in every State of the Nation during the dark days of the great depression. No program of this period gained more universal approval; none inspired more hope in the hearts of youngsters in whom the flicker of hope had burned dangerously low. During the 1959 hearings on S. 812—similar to S. 1—the beloved Senator James E. Murray summed up his impressions of the experience with the CCC:

> Of all the programs tried under the conservation administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, I know of none which achieved as great a reputation for success and value as the Civilian Conservation Corps. Recalling the experience we had in Montana, the establishment of these camps brought boys together from all over the country and in the process helped acquaint them with their country and with the knowledge that they were all Americans. In addition, a tremendous amount of effective conservation stems from the experience many of our people had in the CCC program.

No social program of the 20th century has done more than the CCC to inspire Americans with a sense of confidence in the creative possibilities of government acting imaginatively to relieve human problems.

Finally, let me repeat the conclusion of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission on the great benefits to the boys and the Nation of the kind of healthful outdoor experience provided in this bill:

> The outdoors lies deep in American tradition. It has had immeasurable impact on the Nation's character and on those who made its history. When an American looks for the meaning of his past, he seeks it not in ancient ruins, but more likely in mountains and forests, by a river, or at the edge of the sea. Today's challenge is to assure all Americans permanent access to their outdoor heritage.

Our vote on this bill is a vote of confidence in our heritage and in our young people. In approving it, we are saying to our young people and to the world that we have faith in them, that we remember our heritage—particularly the democratizing and life-giving effects of the CCC—that we believe in the possibility of self-help and regeneration, and that we still believe, in the complex and impersonal world of 1963, that government can act with a heart.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I would like to express my strong support of the bill before us to establish a Youth Conservation Corps and local youth employment programs.

My interest in this problem of unemployed youth goes back almost 30 years, to the time when President Roosevelt established the National Youth Administration. I was fortunate enough to become the first Director of that program in the State of Connecticut.

We worked with thousands of young boys and girls whose lives had been uprooted by the depression. We tried to see to it that they learned a skill or that they were provided with part-time employment that would enable them to continue their education. We provided on-the-job training. This program helped to bridge over what would otherwise have been a very destructive period in the lives of these young people.

Thirty years later, wherever I travel in Connecticut, I encounter people who have had productive, fruitful lives, people who have made a contribution to their community and to their country which would not nave been possible had they not been helped to attain the skills and the education which made it possible for them to play a productive role in our society.

Of the various posts I have held in my lifetime, there is none which has given me so much satisfaction as my work in the National Youth Administration. I am immensely pleased to have this opportunity to vote for a bill which in some ways revives and carries on this sort of program for the people of a new generation.

In the daily work of the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, we constantly see the dismal results of idleness and unemployment among our youth, the tragedy of empty lives, the hopelessness and desperation of young people whom we have told in so many words, "We don't need you, there is nothing for you to do in this great land of ours."

A million such young boys and girls walk the streets of American towns and cities and their number is bound to increase as an expected 25 million additional young people attempt to enter the labor force during the present decade.

But even now the unemployment rate for the age group between 16 and 20 is twice as high as that for any other segment of the population in the labor market.

We cannot allow this trend to continue. We cannot shut out from our Nation's economic life thousands of young men and women in the first years of adulthood, because if we do we will be forced to shut some of them up in jails, in penitentiaries, in reformatories, and in mental institutions.

It is imperative that we decide here in these halls of Congress what this country wants for its money. Will it be well-kept forests and parks where tourists can marvel at the beauty of their land, or will it be asphalt jungles in our cities where policemen walk in pairs with dogs in tow?

Will it be national gain from youth work in public service, or will it be national loss in idle youth on public welfare, in public institutions, in courts and in reformatories?

But, even beyond the material considerations, the question is moral in nature.

Do we as a people have the foresight, the will, and the confidence to invest in our youth, to give them a future, or must they grow old in age only in the city streets, in the dark alleys, and in the cell blocks of prisons that stand as so many monuments, not only to the failure of the men within, but to the failure of the society without.

I do not propose to say that all delinquency, all idleness, all crime, and all employment will be wiped out by the legislative proposal before us here today, but I am confident that the Youth Conservation Corps and the youth employment programs set up by this measure will do a great deal to reduce the problem we face today and the even greater problem that will face us tomorrow.

Last year my staff and I undertook to study the extent of the youth unemployment throughout the Nation. We studied the relationship it has to juvenile delinquency and we studied the programs available on the local, State, and Federal levels for helping boys and girls who leave school to find an appropriate occupation.

The findings were less than encouraging. We discovered that virtually no State, no municipality, had adequate programs in this area. We discovered that although a number of both private and public organizations, agencies, or governmental offices are concerned with the problem, their success is unimpressive. We discovered that not only must the economic problem, the general unemployment problem be overcome, but that young people looking for work are often met with discrimination and prejudice.

Automation, requirements of more specialized skills, of better education and comparatively fewer openings have blocked the younger generation from the opportunities it should have. In addition to these conditions, the evil forces of discrimination and prejudice have put further obstacles in the way of young people from minority groups.

Unless we in the Congress open the door for them, hundreds of thousands of boys and girls are permanently trapped between poverty and ignorance and, between the impersonal forces of economic competition on the one side, and the callousness and prejudices of men on the other side.

Again, I want to reemphasize that these are problems that cannot be solved by any one measure, by any one law, by any one administrative decree. These are circumstances, rather, which will only be disentangled by many approaches and by new laws.

By this time the administration, the Federal Government, and the State and local governments are becoming aware of what the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee has stated in its reports for several years, that unemployment, poor educational opportunities and discrimination are among the basic factors contributing to delinquency.

Last month I introduced legislation to abolish discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia. This is the kind of measure that I think will help considerably. It is a measure that would give some young people a chance, if nothing else, to compete with others for a job, for trade training, for a constructive way of life. But we must accomplish this purpose on a wider scope, on a national scale.

Today, many young men and women do not even have the chance to take a chance. They are categorically barred from certain economic opportunities because of lack of resources, lack of education or experience, because of their color and because of the racial or ethnic background of their parents.

Lastly, it is important to realize that this question of youth employment is related to still another problem area. It is related to the cultural and the educational sphere as well as to the economic. Why do we have a large number of school dropouts every year? What must be changed in the educational programs of the elementary and secondary schools to retain more pupils? What can be done to spur them on to higher education and thus keep a larger number of boys and girls from overflooding the labor market? These are questions that the staff of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee and I plan to study this year. The answers we hope to get will be answers to the question of how we can keep boys and girls out of courts, out of training schools, and ultimately out of adult penitentiaries.

But before we can find all the answers, before we can reformulate our educational programs, before we can adjust our economy to absorb all of these young people, we cannot leave them hanging in the air. We must give them constructive activities lest they find destructive ones instead. We must and can give them some training, some experience and some preparation for eventual entrance into the occupational world and into adult life and responsibilities. And the more we help our youth along these lines, the less crime and delinquency we will have.

It is because of my concern with youth, crime, and delinquency that I strongly support the measure before us today. Although this bill may not eliminate all delinquency, it contains partial solutions to each of the problems I have outlined in my brief remarks.

It will afford constructive work opportunities for young people of all classes, of all minority groups, and of all ethnic backgrounds. It will give these young people the training they did not or could not obtain in school, and it will place many young people in public service, in jobs some of them could not obtain on their own. But more important, the law will broaden the horizons of these future adult citizens of our land. Many who have never been 10 blocks from their home will find a new world, new interests, new inspirations, and new freedoms. Any honest work is better than no work at all. Any constructive activity is better than breaking the law.

I would like to commend the President and the administration for taking an interest in this measure. I also want to commend Senator HUMPHREY and the several other Senators who have put forth relentless efforts to get this legislation passed.

Mr. President, I express the hope that both Houses of Congress will consider favorably this effort to help American youth.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during the past debate on S. 1, I have heard many arguments as to why this legislation should not be enacted. These arguments range from the dilatory "there is no need to pass this bill before the Easter recess" to the quasi-cost-conscious declarations that it is too much money to expend. With all due respects to my colleagues who are in opposition, I can only say that there appears to be little substance to their arguments.

Here is a program that is practical, useful, and certainly worthy of attempt. These are not the days when we can afford merely to deplore the pitiable situations and problems facing the youth of this Nation. We are confronted with hard facts—rising school dropouts, increasing unemployment of our young people, juvenile delinquency. These are facts, and I find no one who disputes them.

I do not say that the enactment of this legislation will cure all the ills that beset our youth. I do say that it is a positive program which can help to alleviate some of these problems. And positive programs are what we need if we are to progress.

The establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps and a Hometown Conservation Corps is surely a step forward. I would hope that all my colleagues will grant this recognition, and will join the Senator from Minnesota who has labored so long for this bill's passage.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1963—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk House Concurrent Resolution 134 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 11, 1963, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 22, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 134) was considered and agreed to.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is about to vote on the Youth Conservation Corps measure, which has been before the Senate for the past 2 days. I commend and compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is in charge of the bill and who has conducted himself with circumspection and dignity. I also compliment the author of the bill, the assistant majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Also, I express thanks to the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who battled hard and valiantly for a cause in which he believed, and who accepted the results of the votes which were taken.

I also commend and compliment the Senate as a whole upon the high level of debate and the good sense it showed during the course of the proceedings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Considering the time devoted to the bill, probably less time was devoted to external and extrinsic matters than at any other time on any other measure that I am aware of in several years. I join with the majority leader in the compliments he has paid Senators who were in charge of the bill.

I pay especial tribute to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who did his homework so well, who had a deep conviction about the bill, who thought the country ought to be better informed, and who was willing, against, shall I say, carrot-and-stick overtures and proposals that might have been made, to forfeit an Easter vacation, if necessary, and even to impose that kind of restriction on other Senators, in the interest of his convictions. For that, I salute him as a great Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. When we characterize Senators as heroes of particular campaigns, we should include not only the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] but also the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. He finally brought the issue out: Who are the phonies on civil rights? His question has been answered without a doubt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe the majority leader and the minority leader will join with me in a warm expression of commendation of the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for the fine work he has done. He was effective not only on the bill now before the Senate, but on the YCC legislation which he handled in 1959, as Senators will recall. In that year he conducted the hearings and was the floor manager of that bill, which passed the Senate. In 1961 he was again an ardent advocate in committee and when another bill for our young people was reported to the Senate. I commend him for his steadfastness and his knowledge concerning the present measure. He was an original CCC sponsor and supporter, when serving in the House in the thirties. Without his help I am sure that this legislation would not have succeeded this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am in wholehearted accord with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I willingly give full credit to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for the continuous and outstanding work which he has done on this measure.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been concluded, the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Senate ready to vote?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the Senate votes, I should like to query the majority leader as to what the order of business will be for the remainder of the day—whatever is left of it—and what the order of business will be tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is the intention of the leadership to call up a few measures on the calendar to which there is no objection. The distinguished minority leader and I have discussed them, and they will be brought up following the vote on the passage of the Youth Conservation Corps bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator state the bills which are involved?

Mr. MANSFIELD. They are Calendar No. 96, S. 22, to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Hayburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve; and Calendar No. 97, S. 873, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada.

It is the intention of the leadership to lay before the Senate Calendar No. 105, H.R. 2440, the so-called military procurement authorization bill. No action will be taken on that bill tonight; it will be the pending business for consideration following the morning hour tomorrow.

Also, it is proposed to have the Senate consider this evening Calendar No. 93, S. 388, if the Senator from Oregon will give his consent. That is the bill to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park and to provide for certain adjustments necessitated by the installation of a park tour road, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. I would be more inclined to give consent tomorrow morning.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is said to be a noncontroversial bill. Other measures will be brought up tomorrow.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that following the morning hour tomorrow the military procurement authorization bill will be the pending business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. It is my understanding that tomorrow, when the military procurement authorization bill is made the pending business, the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] intends to move that the Senate consider the bill in executive session. I must admit that this will be a new experience for me, because I was not a Member of the Senate when a formal executive session was held.

It is my understanding that under rule XXXV it is the right of any Senator to make such a motion, and that only a second to the motion is necessary to have the request agreed to. Therefore, in view of the fact that such a motion may be made tomorrow, I should like, in an effort to keep the business of the Senate under control and to expedite it to a degree, to propound a unanimous-consent agreement to the effect that there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour on each amendment offered to the bill, 30 minutes to a side, the time to be under the control of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the offerer of the amendment, whoever he or she may be.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I modify my request. I suggest that the debate be limited to 2 hours, 1 hour to a side.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object. I do not know what part I shall take in the debate tomorrow. I do not feel prepared to agree to a unanimous-consent request to limit debate on the bill. I have no desire to be dilatory, but I do not desire at this time to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as I am concerned, it is immaterial whether action on the bill be finished tomorrow or on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday of next week. I am thinking of the many Senators who have made commitments. We ought to give them every consideration. That was why I made the request. But any Senator may object; and when objection is heard, that is all there is to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My understanding of rule XXXV is that it requires only a motion and a second in order to close the doors. Such action requires the Chair to clear all the galleries, so that only Members of the Senate will be on the floor of the Senate. Is my understanding correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry, the answer to which might be elicited from the Parliamentarian. When was the last time the Senate had an executive session when the doors were closed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that it is his belief that it was in 1943, during the war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So there has not been a closed-doors session of the Senate in the past 20 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it so happens that I was a participant in the executive session in 1943. Certainly it failed of its purpose; for what we thought would be taken in executive session and would remain in the bosom of the Senate was all over the country and was disseminated through the press even before the executive session concluded.

I have no objection to having an executive session held; but, of course, any yea-and-nay vote taken then would be recorded just as if it were taken in open session.

I have no objection whatever to having an executive session held; and it may be wise to have one held. I am of the opinion the issues could be discussed in open session if we exercise a little care. However, I shall not oppose the holding of an executive session.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. If an executive session were held, would a transcript of the proceedings be made?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon speak louder, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has asked whether a transcript of the proceedings would be made, in the event an executive session were held.

The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the answer to the question of the Senator from Oregon is in the affirmative, and that if the matter related to nominations or treaties, the record would be kept by the executive clerk; if it were legislative business, then by the Journal clerk of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Could the Senate thereafter remove the injunction of secrecy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By majority vote, the injunction of secrecy could be removed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not understand the parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary inquiry of the Senator from Oregon was whether, after an executive session, the injunction of secrecy could be removed. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that by majority vote that could be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but any vote taken in executive session is carried on the Journal of the Senate, just as any other vote is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut, who has been very patient.

Mr. DODD. Most of the questions I had in mind have recently been answered by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Georgia or by the answers the Chair gave to the questions they asked.

Let me ask whether there would be special notice as to when the executive session would begin.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I presume there would be a short morning hour, tomorrow—at least a morning hour.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the majority leader will not insist on having a morning hour tomorrow. I say this, not on behalf of myself, but on behalf of a number of Senators who, I know, are very desirous of getting away during the afternoon; and we are hoping that it may be possible for the Senate to vote before 3 o'clock tomorrow on the two or three very important issues involved in this measure, so that Members who desire to do so may leave early in the afternoon. However, if the Senate became involved in a morning hour, there would be no telling when the vote would be taken.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow there not be a morning hour at the beginning of the session, but that a morning hour be held at the conclusion of consideration of the military procurement bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, Senators know that I could accomplish that by having the Senate take a recess tonight.

Mr. JAVITS. I was about to make a suggestion to the Senator from Montana. He knows that I do not cross him if I can avoid doing so.

I suggest that there be included in the request a provision that Senators who wish to introduce bills may do so and may have their statements on the bills printed in the RECORD as if a morning hour had been held.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is an excellent suggestion; and I add it to my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that the amended request be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has requested that at the session tomorrow, following the conclusion of the proceedings in connection with consideration of the military procurement bill, there be a morning hour; and it was also suggested that Senators who wish to introduce bills during the session be allowed to do so and be allowed to have their statements in connection with the bills printed in the RECORD as if they had been made during the morning hour.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not clearly understand the statement made by the Chair in regard to the record to be made of votes taken during the executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated that a majority of the Senators present could, by majority vote, remove the injunction of secrecy in connection with the proceedings.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any vote taken during the executive session appear in the Journal and in the RECORD of the Senate. Certainly that could not affect the status of any classified material; and I do not approve of the suggestion that any votes taken in executive session not be made public to all the people of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will permit me to make a request at this time, let me ask whether the request of the Senator from Georgia was granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it was.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand that when a motion for an executive session is made and is seconded, at that point it is mandatory that the Chair have the galleries cleared and have the floor of the Senate cleared of all attendants, and that the executive session will become effective at once.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was present at one time when the Senate tried to have an executive session, but the attempt failed. Is it not true that there would be no great point in holding one, because immediately upon the conclusion of the executive session, the Senate could, by a majority vote, require that every word spoken in executive session be made public, just as the votes would be made public, as the Senator from Georgia has proposed—in which suggestion I heartily concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that no reporters would be present during the executive session, and there would be no recording of the remarks made at that time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If no reporter were present, how could Senators be sure in their own minds about exactly what happened during the executive session? After all, it could be that some of what was said would "leak out"; and the result perhaps could be that there would be 100 different stories or versions of what occurred, and there would be no record to back them up.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Georgia has asked—and his request has been agreed to by the Senate—that the votes taken be made public. But if no reporter were present——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that during an executive session, one of the clerks reports the minutes of the proceedings, but not the actual remarks which are made.

Mr. DODD. In the absence of a reporter, how could a vote be recorded?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the interest of accuracy, and for the benefit of having a clear record, I ask unanimous consent that at least one reporter be on the floor during the Senate session tomorrow, if it is an executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader——

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry. I am not sure what the executive session is to be about, but I have an idea; and I think it might involve the security of the country. If so, and if the matter is a vital one, I believe we should be very careful about it. I really do not know as to this; and the Senator from South Carolina knows that I do not know.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DODD. Of course I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the information I expect to present to the Senate is highly classified information. Therefore, it would be necessary to close the doors. I do not like to have that done, because I always wish to have the people informed. But I agree with the Senator from Georgia that the vote on the issue can be recorded; that would not interfere with keeping the material secret. But the material to be brought out on the floor is highly classified, and therefore I think it would be necessary to close the doors, and not to have that information go into the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that in previous executive sessions, permission has been granted to have reporters on the floor, and to keep a record of the proceedings. I think it is in the best interests of the Senate that that be done; and if unanimous consent for that to be done is not granted, I am prepared to move that it be done.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not misunderstand the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I do not know enough about this matter; but I and other Senators have been involved——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest to the majority leader that if he is to control——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was recognized by the Chair; and I do not know how I lost the floor. The Chair recognized me; and I was about to make a suggestion to the majority leader.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am glad to wait.

Mr. MUNDT. The Chair recognized me. I was about to propound a suggestion to the majority leader. I suggest to the majority leader that in addition to his unanimous-consent request that one reporter be present to report the statements made, to which I agreed, the majority leader also include in his request that, insofar as the transcription is concerned, no majority vote of the Senate subsequently can make a transcript public. Otherwise we would vitiate the whole sense of the executive session. The Senator from South Carolina has something which is classified information. The rest of us should not vote to strip him of his right to talk to us in secret. I am asking to have it one way or the other.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to reply to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, while his suggestion has merit, I would leave the final decision to the good sense of a majority of the Senate as to whether or not that should or should not be done.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Has a motion been made that the Senate go into executive session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No such motion has been made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then I suggest that the Senate vote on the pending bill. If a Senator then makes a motion that the Senate go into executive session, we can discuss it at that time.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McINTYRE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL: I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 55 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Engle
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smith
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—34

Aiken
Beall
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—16

Allott
Bennett
Edmondson
Ellender
Hayden
Holland
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McIntyre
Morton
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

So the bill (S. 1) was passed.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed as passed.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1), as passed, follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Youth Employment Act".

TITLE I—YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Short title

Sec. 101. This title may be cited as the "Youth Conservation Corps Act".

Statement of purpose

Sec. 102. The purpose of this title is (1) to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed youths so that their employability may be increased through participation in such programs of conservation planned and designed by, and under the immediate supervision of, the various Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of planning and carrying out such programs; and (2) to enable the Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving and developing natural resources and recreational areas to accelerate programs planned by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility.

Establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps

Sec. 103. In order to carry out the purposes of this title, there is hereby established within the Department of Labor a Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). There shall be a Director of the Corps who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and whose annual salary shall be $20,000. The Director shall perform such functions in connection with the Corps as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary").

Authority of Secretary

Sec. 104. The Secretary shall have authority to—

(1) establish adequate standards of safety, health, and conduct for enrollees of the Corps, and enter into agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the provision, by the latter, of medical, dental, hospital, and other health services to enrollees, either directly or through other public or nonpublic facilities and personnel;

(2) enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the natural resources of the Nation, and of developing, managing, and protecting recreational areas, whereby the enrollees of the Corps may be utilized by such agencies in carrying out, under the immediate supervision of such agencies, programs planned and designed by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility. The Secretary may enter into such agreements with the State agency wherever he finds that such utilization of the Corps will best serve the purposes of this title. Any such agreement with the State agency shall apply cost-sharing procedures prescribed by section 206(a) in title II;

(3) utilize, with their consent, the services and facilities of Federal agencies and, with the consent of any State, accept and utilize the services and facilities of the agencies of such government or of any county or municipal subdivision thereof; and to utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed;

(4) insure the provision of a system of training and educational services consisting of at least ten hours of vocational training per week per enrollee in subjects, other than those connected with conservation, to enrollees of the Corps, in addition to the regular program of work and on-the-job training: *Provided*, That to the maximum extent practicable such programs shall be provided by State and local educational authorities under agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(5) expend such amounts as he deems necessary within available appropriations for supplies, materials, and equipment for enrollees to be used in connection with their work, instruction, recreation, health, or welfare;

(6) prescribe such rules and regulations, establish such procedures, enter into such contracts and agreements, and generally perform such functions as he may deem to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title; and

(7) authorize the performance by the Director of any functions of the Secretary under this title.

Interdepartmental Committee on the Youth Conservation Corps

Sec. 105. (a) There is established a committee to be known as the Interdepartmental Committee on the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee"). The Committee shall be composed of four members as follows: The Secretary of Labor (or his designee) who shall be Chairman, and a representative of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a representative of the Department of Agriculture, and a representative of the Department of the Interior, each of whom shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Department of which he is a representative.

(b) The Committee shall consult with and advise the Secretary with respect to all phases of the operation of the Corps.

(c) Each member of the Committee shall act in a liaison capacity between the agencies of the Federal Department represented by him and the Corps in carrying out any agreement between such agency and the Corps.

National Advisory Council on the Youth Conservation Corps

Sec. 106. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Labor a National Advisory Council on the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be Chairman, and not more than fourteen additional members appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. The appointed members of the Council shall be persons (including persons from public and voluntary organizations) representing the fields of conservation, agriculture, education, training, youth employment, labor, management, and the public in general. Upon request of the Secretary, the Council shall review the operations of the Corps in general, the kind of work performed and the training provided and shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the execution of his responsibilities under this title. The Council shall meet at least twice each year and at such other times as the Secretary may request.

(b) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings of the Council or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept the services of appointed members under this section without the payment of compensation therefor (and with or without payment of travel expenses or per diem in lieu of subsistence).

Composition of the Corps

SEC. 107. (a) The Corps shall be composed of male individuals of good character who are permanent residents of the United States, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age twenty-two at the time of enrollment. Enrollment or participation in the Corps shall not be grounds or a legitimate reason for deferment or rejection under the Selective Service Act. The number of enrollees shall not exceed at any one time fifteen thousand during the first fiscal year of its operation and during the next four fiscal years such numbers as may be maintained within the appropriations made therefor by the Congress.

(b) In order to enroll as a member of the Corps, an individual must agree to comply with rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary for the government of the Corps: *Provided*, That the Director may exclude from enrollment such individuals as he may consider detrimental to the well-being or welfare of the Corps except that no person shall be excluded on account of race, color, or creed.

(c) Enrollment in the Corps shall be for a period of not less than six months; if permitted by the Secretary, an individual may reenroll, but his total enrollment shall not exceed two years.

(d) For purposes of accepting enrollment in the Corps in any year, (A) 50 per centum of the total number of the authorized enrollment of the Corps for such year shall be allocated to the various States on the basis of the ratio that the total male population of each State within the age group referred to in subsection (a) bears to the total male population of the United States within such age group, (B) 50 per centum of the total number of the authorized enrollment of the Corps for such year shall be allocated by the Secretary to the various States, determined each year in accordance with (1) the ratio that the total unemployment of each State bears to the total unemployment in the United States, using in both cases the previous year's annual average following its publication; and (2) the extent of additional allocation which should be made to any State in order to compensate for benefits accruing to other States from the placement within such States of camps established or maintained under this title; and (C) allocations not utilized in (A) shall be reallocated under (B). The population categories and the other relevant factors referred to above shall be determined in accordance with the most recent statistics available from the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Labor.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title construction which has traditionally been performed by construction trades workers shall continue to be contracted out for construction by such workers.

Compensation of enrollees

SEC. 108. (a)(1) The base compensation of enrollees shall be $60 per month for the first enrollment and an additional $5 per month for each subsequent enrollment. Up to an additional $10 per month may be paid on the basis of assigned leadership responsibilities, or special skills.

(2) The Secretary shall establish procedures whereby each enrollee may make an allotment to his parent, dependent, legal guardian, or any fund established for his benefit, of part of the periodic compensation to which he is entitled under this title, and such allotment shall be paid directly to the person or fund in favor of which it is made.

(b) Enrollees as well as applicants for enrollment may be furnished with such quarters, subsistence, transportation (including travel from and to the place of enrollment), equipment, clothing, training, educational and recreational services, medical, dental, hospital and other health services, and such other expenses (including funeral and burial expenses) as the Secretary may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

(c) In the case of any individual who is an enrollee within the meaning of this title, the value of items furnished shall be exempt from income tax under subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, except to the extent that the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, determines any portion thereof to be additional base compensation.

Application of provisions of Federal law

SEC. 109. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this title, an enrollee is deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of Federal laws relating to Federal employment including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits such as retirement, life insurance, and health benefits.

(b)(1) Section 210 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 410) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"SERVICE AS ENROLLEE IN YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

"(p) The term 'employment' shall, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), include service performed by an individual as an enrollee in the Youth Conservation Corps established by title I of the Youth Employment Act and all such service shall be deemed to have been performed by such individual as an employee of the United States."

(2) Section 209 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 409) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"For purposes of this title, in the case of an individual performing service to which the provisions of section 210(p) apply, his 'wages' for such service, shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, be deemed to be $150 for each calendar month during all of which he is an enrollee within the meaning of title I of the Youth Employment Act, or $5 per day for any calendar month during part (but not all) of which he is such an enrollee."

(3) The first sentence of section 205(p)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 405(p)(1)) is amended by striking out "and including service," and inserting in lieu thereof "service," and by inserting "and service, performed as an enrollee within the meaning of title I of the Youth Employment Act, to which the provisions of section 210(p) are applicable," after "to which the provisions of section 210(o) are applicable,".

(c)(1) Section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(q) SERVICE AS ENROLLEE IN YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'employment' shall, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, include service performed by an individual as an enrollee in the Youth Conservation Corps established by title I of the Youth Employment Act, and all such service shall be deemed to have been performed by such individual as an employee of the United States."

(2) Subsection (i) of such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) SERVICE IN THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS.—For purposes of this chapter, in the case of an individual performing service to which the provisions of subsection (q) apply, his 'wages' shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (a)(1) of this section, be deemed to be $150 for each calendar month during all of which he is an enrollee within the meaning of title I of the Youth Employment Act, or $5 per day for any calendar month during part (but not all) of which he is such an enrollee."

(3) The first sentence of section 3122 of such Code (relating to Federal service) is amended by striking out "and including service," and inserting in lieu thereof "service," and by inserting "and service, performed as an enrollee within the meaning of title I of the Youth Employment Act, to which the provisions of section 3121(q) are applicable," after "section 3121(p) are applicable,".

(4) Section 6051(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of compensation for service as an enrollee in the Youth Conservation Corps, the statement shall show, in lieu of the amount required to be shown by paragraph (5), the total amount of wages as defined in section 3121(a), computed in accordance with such section and section 3121(i)(4)."

(5) Section 3401(a) of such Code (relating to the definition of wages for purposes of the collection of income tax at source on wages) is amended by striking out ", or" at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", by striking out the period at end of paragraph (12) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (13) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(14) pursuant to section 108(b) of title I of the Youth Employment Act, other than any portion determined thereunder to be additional base compensation, for service performed as an enrollee within the meaning of such title."

(6) Section 121(a) of such Code is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (18) and inserting in lieu thereof ";", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(19) Amounts received by enrollees under section 108 of title I of the Youth Employment Act, see such section 108(c)."

(d) The amendments made by subsection (b) of this section and by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (c) of this section shall apply with respect to service performed after the date of the enactment of this Act. The amendment made by paragraph (5) of subsection (c) of this section shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e)(1) Enrollees under this title shall, for the purpose of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742, as amended), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 40 of such Act and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

(2) For purposes of this section—

(A) The term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of an enrollee—

(i) while he is on authorized leave or pass; or

(ii) while he is absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Corps.

(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed to be $150 a month, except that with respect to compensation for disability accruing after the individual concerned reaches the age of 21, such monthly pay shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-2 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(C) The term "injury" as defined in section 40 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall include disease, illness, or injury if it arises out of service in the Corps.

(D) Compensation for disability, including medical care, shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the injured enrollee is discharged from the Corps.

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 110. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, the sum of $50,000,000, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years thereafter such amounts as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this title may be transferred between departments and agencies of the Government for use for the purpose for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated and may also be transferred to State governments for the purposes provided in this title.

Reports

SEC. 111. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress during such year, and not later than January 1, 1966, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report evaluating the activities of the Corps from its inception, together with such recommendations as he may deem desirable.

TITLE II—STATE AND COMMUNITY YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Short title

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "State and Community Youth Employment Act".

Statement of purpose

SEC. 202. The purpose of this title is to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed youths so that their employability may be increased through participation in State and community youth employment programs thereby enabling the agencies of the State, county, or municipality or political subdivision thereof to carry out programs in the field of conservation and development of natural resources and recreational areas, or various other programs which will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest which will otherwise not be provided.

Development of State and community employment programs

SEC. 203. In order to carry out the purposes of this title the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall assist and cooperate with the agencies of State (which for the purposes of this title shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa) county and local governments and private nonprofit agencies in developing programs for the employment of young people in State and community service activities, hereinafter authorized, including the conservation, development and management of the natural resources of the State and the community and the development, management and protection of recreational areas within the State and the community, which, whenever appropriate, shall be coordinated with a program of training and education provided by local educational authorities. In those States where the public land holdings of the Federal Government are less than 5 per centum of the land area within the State, the Secretary when requested, may offer such additional assistance as may be required in the development of programs of conservation and recreation. The Secretary shall advise such State and local governments as to the number and availability of unemployed young people, their skills and qualifications for various types of work, and shall provide in cooperation with local school authorities for the orderly selection and referral of youths for enrollment in such programs.

Approval of programs

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to approve for assistance under this title any State, county, municipal, or local programs submitted hereunder if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

(1) enrollees in the program will be employed either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects, sponsored by private nonprofit agencies approved by the appropriate State agency;

(2) the program will increase the employability of the enrollees by providing work experience and training in occupational skills or pursuits in classifications in which the Secretary of Labor finds there is reasonable expectation of employment, or will enable student enrollees to resume or to maintain school attendance;

(3) the program will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest which will not otherwise be provided, or will contribute to the conservation, development, and management of the natural resources of the State or community or to the development, management, or protection of State or community recreation areas;

(4) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services;

(5) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment are appropriate and reasonably consistent with the rates and conditions applicable with respect to comparable work in the locality;

(6) to the maximum extent feasible, the program will be coordinated with vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of enrollees in such program and sponsored by State, county, or local school authorities: *Provided*, That where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the program may make provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of, or where appropriate pursuant to agreement with, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(7) the program includes standards and procedures for the selection of applicants including provisions assuring full coordination and cooperation with local and other authorities to encourage students to maintain or resume school attendance.

(b) In approving projects under this title, the Secretary shall give priority to projects with high training potential.

Requirements and limitations with respect to grants to private nonprofit agencies

SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary shall, immediately after making any grant under this title, or otherwise making available (directly or indirectly) funds appropriated for carrying out the purposes of this title, to any private nonprofit agency, submit to the Congress a full and complete report concerning—

(1) such private nonprofit agency, including (but not limited to) (A) the number, identity, and salary, of its officers, directors, and principal employees, (B) when, by whom, and for what purposes such agency was organized, and (C) other relevant data with respect to the organization, its functions, purposes, and methods of operation, and

(2) the amount of such grant or of such funds, the purposes for which such grant was made or such funds were made available, and any conditions or limitations imposed with respect to such grant or to such funds by the Secretary.

(b) Any audit reports made by or to any instrumentality of the Federal Government on the expenditures of any such agency which has received any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title shall be available to any Member of Congress upon request of such Member.

(c) (1) No private nonprofit agency which is organized or incorporated after the date of enactment of this Act shall be eligible to receive (directly or indirectly) any funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title if any of the incorporators or individuals who organized such agency is, at the time such agency applies for any such funds, a Member of Congress or an officer of the Executive Branch of the Government who is required to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) No nonprofit agency shall be eligible to receive directly or indirectly, any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title, if at the time such agency applies for such funds, or at any time thereafter, any of the officers, directors, or principal employees of such agency is a Member of Congress or an officer of the executive branch of the Government who is required to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Enrollees in programs

SEC. 206. (a) Enrollment in programs under this title shall be limited to young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age twenty-two, and whose participation in such programs will be consistent with the purposes of this title. Enrollment or participation in such programs shall not be grounds or a legitimate reason for deferment or rejection under the Selective Service Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exclude from enrollment such individuals as he may consider detrimental to the well-being or welfare of the Corps except that no person shall be excluded on account of race, color, or creed.

(b) Enrollees shall not be subject to the provisions of any other Federal law relating to Federal employment including hours of work, rates of compensation, or employee benefits.

(c) The number of enrollees in programs under this title shall not exceed at any one time the equivalent of 60,000 full-time enrollees during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and during the next four fiscal years such numbers as may be maintained within the appropriations made therefor by the Congress.

(d) The Secretary shall provide for testing, counseling, job development, and job referral services through either governmental or private nonprofit agencies to youths in order to carry out the purposes of this title.

Federal share of program costs

SEC. 207. (a) Whenever a State, county, municipal or local youth employment program is determined under section 204 to be appropriate, the Secretary may enter into an agreement with the State, county, or municipal government, or agency or political subdivision thereof, or a private nonprofit agency, under which such government or political subdivision thereof or agency shall pay not more than 50 per centum and not less than 25 per centum of all costs of the program, including those of administration, in such proportion as may be determined by the Secretary, considering among other relevant factors (1) the severity of the rates of unemployment and underemployment in the area and the duration of such unemployment and underemployment, and (2) the income levels of families in such area. The contributions by such government, or political subdivision thereof, or agency, pursuant to such agreements may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. Such agreements shall further provide that the Secretary will pay grants to such goverments or political subdivisions thereof or agencies covering the balance of all costs of such programs, including those of administration.

(b) Funds available for grants under agreements authorized by subsection (a) shall be allocated among the States in the following manner: (A) 50 per centum of such funds in any fiscal year shall be allocated among the States on the basis of the ratio that the total population of each State within the age group referred to in subsection 205(a) bears to the total population of the United States within such age group, and (B) 50 per centum of such funds in any fiscal year shall be allocated by the Secretary in accordance with the ratio that the total unemployment of each State bears to the total unemployment in the United States, using in both cases the previous year's annual average following its publication, and (C) allocations not utilized in (A) shall be reallocated under (B). The population categories and the other relevant factors referred to above shall be determined in accordance with the most recent statistics available from the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Labor.

Authority of Secretary

SEC. 208. (a) In carrying out this title, the Secretary is authorized to—

(1) delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government any of his functions, powers, or duties under this title as he deems appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation thereof by the heads of such departments and agencies.

(2) utilize with their consent the services and facilities of Federal agencies and, with the consent of any State accept and utilize the services and facilities of the agencies of such government or of any county or municipal subdivision thereof; to establish State and local advisory committees; and to utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed.

(3) make such contracts or agreements, establish such procedures, and make such payments, either in advance or by way of reimbursement as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(4) encourage the enrollees to participate in a systematic program of training and education provided by State and local educational authorities.

(5) prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) Any agreement under this title shall contain such provisions as may be necessary to promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss, and insure the application of funds in a manner consistent with the provisions and purposes of this title and the terms of such agreement.

National Advisory Council on State and Community Youth Employment Programs

SEC. 209. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Labor a National Advisory Council on State and Community Youth Employment Programs (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be Chairman, and nine members appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. The appointed members of the Council shall be persons (including persons from public and voluntary organizations) who are recognized authorities in professional or technical fields related to the employment of youth or who represent the fields of conservation, agriculture, education, training, labor, management, and urban development, or persons representative of the general public who are leaders in programs concerned with employment of youth. The Council shall advise the Secretary on the administration of this title. The Council shall also include, whenever appropriate, the various agency heads designated in section 210 of this title.

(b) Upon request of the Secretary, the Council shall review the operation of this title in general and shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the execution of his responsibilities under this title. The Council may also make recommendations to the Secretary on projects referred to it by the Secretary. The Council shall meet at least twice each year and at such other times as the Secretary may request. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters relating to this title for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

(c) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings of the Council or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept the services of appointed members under this section without the payment of compensation therefor (and with or without payment of travel expenses or per diem in lieu of subsistence).

Interagency consultation

SEC. 210. In the administration of this title, the Secretary shall seek the advice and assistance of the Secretaries of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Agriculture, and Interior, of the Attorney General, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and of such other agency heads as the Secretary deems appropriate.

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 211. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, the sum of $50,000,000 and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years thereafter such amounts as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this title may be transferred between departments and agencies of the Government for use for the purpose for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated and may also be granted to State and local governments for the purpose provided in this title.

Report by the Secretary

SEC. 212. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report on the activities and programs authorized by this title during such year; and not later than January 1, 1966, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report evaluating the activities and programs authorized by this title from its inception together with such recommendations as he may deem desirable.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. The term "State" as defined in this Act shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. To the extent there are qualified applicants, programs, and appropriations, each State as defined herein shall be assured of not less than fifty enrollees under title I and fifty enrollees under title II.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, I regret that I missed the vote by 2 minutes, but I am very grateful to the Senator from Montana, the distinguished majority leader, for giving me a live pair. I was detained necessarily and could not get to the Chamber in time.

TRIBUTE TO STAFF MEMBERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before leaving this item, I wish to express, on behalf of the committee and the sponsors of the bill, our thanks to the staff members who have worked so diligently on this measure—Edward D. Friedman, Robert E. Wolf, Ralph Widner, John G. Stewart, Stewart E. McClure, Kathryn Fletcher, and Margaret Porcher—and who gave their time so fully. We are very indebted to the staff members, and we wish to express our thanks and appreciation for their extraordinarily competent and able assistance.

VICKSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 93, S. 386.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 386) to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park and to provide for certain adjustments necessitated by the installation of a park tour road, and for other purposes.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, line 13, after the word "Fort", to strike out "Garret" and insert "Garrott", and on page 4, line 13, after the word "Fort", to strike out "Garret" and insert "Garrott"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to preserve and protect the essential historical features of Vicksburg National Military Park in the State of Mississippi and to enhance visitor enjoyment and safety by means of a park tour road and through the consolidation of park lands, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, and under such terms and conditions as he determines are in the public interest—

(a) to quitclaim to the city of Vicksburg, Mississippi, approximately one hundred and fifty-four acres of land, including the roads thereon and the park land abutting said roads, in exchange for the city's agreeing to place the roads in its road system and thereby assume jurisdiction and maintenance thereof, and upon the further agreement of the city to maintain the parklike character of so much of the park land conveyed to it and abutting the road as the Secretary may precribe, said land being generally that part of Vicksburg National Military Park lying south of Fort Garrott with the exception of Navy Circle, South Fort, and Louisiana Circle: *Provided,* That title to so much of said abutting park land prescribed by the Secretary and covered by said agreement of the city to maintain the parklike character thereof shall revert to the United States if its parklike character is not maintained; to quitclaim to Warren County, Mississippi, upon like terms and conditions approximately twenty-four acres of land, including the road and abutting park land, being known as Sherman Avenue and the Sherman Avenue spur; to release or quitclaim to Warren County or any other appropriate political subdivision of the State all interest which the United States of America has, if any, in those portions of any public road located on park land which are no longer required for park purposes: *Provided*, That the United States shall reserve from the conveyance or conveyances made pursuant to this subsection title to all historical monuments, means of access thereto, and such other easements as the Secretary determines are required for the continued administration of said monuments as a part of Vicksburg National Military Park; and

(b) to acquire not in excess of five hundred and forty-four acres of land, or interests in land, for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park, such authority to include purchase and condemnation with appropriated funds but not to constitute a limitation upon existing authority to accept donations; and

(c) to enter into agreements with duly authorized officials of the city of Vicksburg and Warren County relative to the effect which the installation of a one-way park tour road with controlled access will have upon the existing local road systems; subject to the availability of funds, to obligate the United States to make provision for such alterations, relocations, and construction of local roads, including procurement of rights-of-way therefor and the subsequent transfer thereof to the State or its appropriate political subdivisions which shall thereupon assume jurisdiction and maintenance, as the Secretary and said officials agree are directly attributable to the installation of the park tour road; and to transfer to the city or county jurisdiction and maintenance of service roads which the Secretary constructs on park lands to properties that otherwise would be denied access because of the installation of the park tour road.

The Secretary of the Interior shall not, without first obtaining the consent of the city and county officials referred to in subsection (c), convert the portion of the existing road known as Confederate Avenue lying between Graveyard Road and Fort Garrott into a one-way park tour road with controlled access, or otherwise limit the use of such portion by local traffic, until the United States has provided for such alterations, relocations, and construction of local roads (including procurement of rights-of-way) as the Secretary and said officials agree are directly attributable to the installation of such park tour road.

SEC. 2. Upon the delivery and acceptance of the conveyances herein authorized, any jurisdiction heretofore ceded to the United States by the State of Mississippi over the lands and roads transferred shall thereby cease and thereafter vest in the State of Mississippi.

SEC. 3. Funds required for the purposes of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the bill, S. 386, contains two main provisions. First, it authorizes the gratuitous conveyance to the city of Vicksburg, Miss., of 154 acres of land and to Warren County, Miss., of 24 acres of land.

Second, the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire not in excess of 544 acres of land for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park. This particular aspect of the bill does not, in any way, involve the Morse formula because the land to be acquired would become part of a military park owned by the United States.

I take these few minutes to comment on the bill, so that in the future no one will misunderstand the fact that the bill did not in fact violate the Morse formula. As the Presiding Officer knows, I have tried to be very careful over the years to see to it that when there was any question raised, or any doubt created, as to whether a given transfer of property would violate the Morse formula, I would make a statement of explanation for the record for future reference. That is why I make this statement today.

There are two principal reasons why the conveyance of the 154 and 24 acres of land to Vicksburg and Warren County, Miss., respectively, does not violate the Morse formula. In the first place, the terms of the bill itself and the comments contained in Senate Report No. 115 make it clear that the gratuitous conveyance of land to Vicksburg and Warren County, respectively, will consolidate the Vicksburg National Military Park area and will preserve the parklike characteristics of the lands conveyed. Thus, it is clear that the conveyance will enhance a national military park and the Morse formula is never applied in such a manner as to prevent such enhancement.

A second reason why the Morse formula is not violated in this instance is one which relates to the fiscal aspects of the transaction. At page 5 of Senate Report No. 115, it is stated:

> The land which will be conveyed by the United States to the City of Vicksburg and Warren County has a value of approximately $25,130.

At page 4 of the report appears the statement that the transfer of the South Confederate Avenue area would result in savings to the Federal Government in maintenance costs estimated at about $4,000 per year. The report adds "moreover, if this land is retained as a part of the military park, erosion control must be undertaken at the estimated cost of $250,000."

Mr. President, the gratuitous transfers involved in this case will result in an initial savings to the Federal Government of $250,000. In just a little over 6 years, the savings and maintenance costs resulting from the transfer of the South Confederate Avenue area will equal the value of all the land conveyed by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think there is a very important national interest involved in this field, for it is very important that historic spots such as this be preserved for future generations of American boys and girls to enjoy, and as a lesson to them of the great struggles which brought this country into being and preserved this country as a result of the great War Between the States.

I close by expressing my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] for the cooperation and courtesy he extended to the senior Senator from Oregon in our discussion of this subject, and in giving the senior Senator from Oregon adequate time to make the analysis he has just presented tonight.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his consideration of this bill, and his fairness and objective approach to it. I am glad of his conclusion that this is a historical site. I thank the committee for their consideration of the bill and favorable report on it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the committee report on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND

The city of Vicksburg, Miss., besieged during the Civil War in a Union effort to control the Mississippi River, is still encircled and restricted by the Confederate and Union lines.

Following the Civil War, the War Department acquired a relatively narrow semicircle of land around the north, east, and south of the city incorporating the ridge on which was located the Confederate defense positions and the paralleling line of the Union forces. The property was transferred to the Interior Department for administration as a national military park in 1899. Together with the Mississippi on the west, the park completely encircles the city.

When the Federal lands were acquired, Vicksburg had 14,000 population, and there was much land within the crescent for growth. Today, residences, filling stations, hamburger stands, and other establishments crowd against the 600 monuments, statues, plaques, and memorials erected within the narrow, irregular park area to memorialize participants in the siege. Some have spilled over beyond the park. City traffic jams Confederate Avenue, the relatively narrow north-south roadway acquired with the property by the Federal Government and now the main park tour road.

Park visitors—there were more than a million exclusive of the city commuters in 1961—interfere with this city traffic as they peer from slow moving cars at the memorials along the road. They are in turn endangered by the large volume of nonpark traffic using the roadway as a street to and from their homes and businesses.

There are 75 access roads onto Confederate Highway within the park, leading to and from everything from single residences to subdivisions.

The ridge on which Confederate Avenue is located is the only natural, traversable north-south highway location available to Vicksburg. High ridges separated by deep ravines run into the city itself from the old defense and assault lines, making difficult and expensive the construction of an alternative north-south street within the city.

As matters stand, the city's growth is being retarded by inadequate traffic lanes across the park property to the north, east, and south. Park visitors are being endangered by the city traffic on the park road, and the Park Service is unable to establish an even reasonably adequate presentation of the significance and features of the park for its visitors. It cannot establish a proper park tour road unless the city traffic is eliminated.

Because of the pressing nature of the problem, the city employed planning engineers and, in cooperation with the Park Service, has developed what the committee feels is a wise and equitable solution to the problems of both Vicksburg and the Park Service.

The plan involves transfer of the southern one-third of the park's total length, comprising 154 acres, to the city of Vicksburg on the agreement of the city to maintain the statues and memorials involved and the parklike character of the siege-line strip. If this is not done, the lands revert to the Federal Government. The city will construct at least two traffic crossings to the south in this stretch of the present park area.

It is proposed that the Federal Government construct three crossings to the north and east, which are to be over or under park roads at points where they will not interfere with the character or features of the park.

The city, aided by the Federal Government, will construct a new north-south street west of the park to take city traffic off of Confederate Avenue within the park. The National Park Service can then develop a one-way park road loop within the park on Confederate Avenue and Union Avenue, giving park visitors an opportunity to view the area in safety and have it interpreted to them so it can be understood.

It is proposed to acquire 544 acres to fill out the portion of the park retained by the Federal Government, eliminate inholdings, and permit the Park Service to control erosion of gullies, now just outside the park boundaries, which threaten important features within either, by dumping silt into the park or by eating their way into the parks' perimeter. At some points the safety of park roads is involved.

Washington hearings on S. 765, a similar bill in the last Congress, were held in 1961 and final action withheld until a subcommittee could conduct hearings in the area. This was done August 25, 1962, and an excellent presentation of the cooperative plan of the city and Park Service was made by the park superintendent, both in his testimony and during an inspection of the park, and by city officials, their planning advisers, and citizens.

AMENDMENT

Page 2, line 10, and on page 4, line 9, correct the spelling of the proper name from "Garret" to "Garrott."

COST

The National Park Service estimates that land which will be conveyed to the city of Vicksburg, and Warren County, Miss., have an approximate value of $25,000. Land to be acquired has an estimated value of $534,000. Road construction authorized is estimated to cost $1,515,200.

CONCLUSION

The Vicksburg Park is one of the Nation's most important military parks. It has great historic significance and interest. In the South, its importance rivals Gettysburg in the North. It contains most of the original entrenchments, gun placements, and features of the siege period. It is the battlefield where brother fought brother in a war which precluded the possibility of secession or breakup of the States of the Union. It contains perpetual memorials to patriots of both the North and the South from nearly every State in the Nation.

The committee feels that delay in making the needed adjustments at Vicksburg will probably mean increased cost, and that S. 386 should pass promptly.

AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 105, House bill 2440, the military procurement bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations, during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment.

CERTAIN STREETS IN VILLAGE OF HEYBURN, IDAHO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the majority leader asked me, a few minutes ago, whether or not I had had an opportunity to study Calendar No. 96, Senate bill 22, to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve.

Since then I have studied the committee report on S. 22. I am satisfied it does not in any way violate the Morse formula.

I want to say good-naturedly that what was needed by the Department of the Interior when they first made this transfer, was a little better legal work, because if there ever was a transfer of property that was confused legally, it was this transfer in Heyburn, Idaho.

What is involved is a transfer by the Department of a dedicated townsite which at one time was really a reclamation project. The streets were all balled up. The Department kept the reversionary right to the streets and sought to transfer the lots, and then seemed to be a little surprised when the title insurance company found it impossible, or refused, to give title insurance to the lots. Who could blame them for that? It could not very well give clear title.

I am satisfied there is no oil or gold or silver or copper or other precious metal under these streets. In fact, there was no good reason for keeping the reversionary interest in a dedicated townsite that was a part of a reclamation project.

Ordinarily the street would be transferred to the municipality, and it would have the right to the streets in that municipality if there was to be a dedicated townsite.

I see no violation of the Morse formula in this transfer, because there was confusion, and there was bound to be confusion in an attempt to hold the reversionary interest in the streets.

Furthermore, it would be more costly to the Federal Government to hold the reversionary interest than to get rid of it.

Therefore, I see no objection to the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon and to compliment him on his memory, because he had to do a bit of back thinking in a hurry. As he explained what happened last year, my mind went back to the arguments which he brought forth at that time.

I am delighted that he is once again in support of this bill, after giving it his most serious consideration.

So, Mr. President, on the basis of the remarks made and the approval given by the senior Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 96, Senate bill 22.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 22) to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Hayburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "that", to strike out "adjoint" and insert "adjoin"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "hereby", to strike out "released and quitclaimed to the adjoining owners by the United States" and insert "released"; and in line 6, after the word "hereby", to strike out "repealed, and any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to Lincoln Boulevard or any street hereafter to be vacated within said townsite adjoining the lands described in said patent is hereby released" and insert "repealed"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to streets that were dedicated upon the filing of the townsite plat for Heyburn, Idaho, a reclamation townsite established pursuant to the Act of April 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 116), as amended, and that adjoin lands which have been sold, which streets have been vacated, or any street that may hereafter be vacated within the original townsite of Heyburn, Idaho, is hereby released.

SEC. 2. The clause included in patent numbered 1048499 issued by the United States to the village of Heyburn on July 27, 1931, providing for reversion of title to the United States is hereby repealed.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN ATTITUDES TOWARD CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the March 31 issue of the Register-Guard of Eugene, Oreg., contained a very useful and favorable editorial about the speech given recently by our colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] on American attitudes toward Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXAMINING AN UNWORTHY FIXATION

GEORGE MCGOVERN, the new Senator from South Dakota, arose in the Senate the other day and said he felt "constrained to speak out against what seems to me to be a dangerous fixation that is not worthy of this great Nation." The fixation, he said, is this country's apparent preoccupation over Castro as such. A greater problem, he suggested, is the long-range interest of this country as it relates to all of Latin America. He is afraid that the combing of old ashes as we review such events as those at the Bay of Pigs will focus attention on the wrong thing—on the man Castro instead of the meaning of Castro.

The "real bombshells" in Latin America, he argued, are these: 1, 2 percent of the people own more than half the wealth; 2, 80 percent dwell in squalor; 3, more than half are illiterate; 4, one-crop economies are so subject to ruin in case of price fluctuation; 5, archaic tax structures coupled with heavy military budgets; 6, a rate of population growth that is fastest in the world. (At the present growth rate, the 12 million who live today in the six tiny Central American countries will increase to 416 million by 2063).

Senator MCGOVERN speaks from a special background. Early in the Kennedy years he was Director of the food-for-peace program. In this, his major concern was hungry people, most of whom have never known anything but hunger all their lives. Such people, he knows, are likely desperate, willing to try the strongest medicine in the chest. In Cuba that medicine was Castro.

But back to this country's fixation. Too many people who ought to know better speak as if Castro sprang fully armed from Moscow, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, crying "Cuba Si, Yanqui No." This is patently false. He and his backers were carefully nurtured in the poisoned soil of Cuba. They were nurtured not by Moscow, but by Batista and what he represented.

Cuba is far worse off today than it was 5 years ago. But such is often the case with those who take the strongest medicine on the shelf. The symptoms, some of which might be eventually fatal to the Castro regime, include food consumption that is down 15 percent, a gross national product down 25 percent, the loss of a quarter-million people, most of them skilled or professional people, and the second smallest sugar crop since the end of World War II.

There is nothing short of war (which a decreasing number of Americans, even among the war-whoopers, seem to want) that we can do directly at this point to oust Castro. We can, of course, continue trying to isolate him economically and politically. This we have done with some success, to the point that it now costs the Russians $1 million a day to keep the Cuban economy breathing at all. Our only practical hope of getting rid of Castro is our hope that he will fall victim to the power struggle within his own country.

Meanwhile, however, we must not let the Castro "fixation" divert us from the more important goal of seeing to it that the soil in other Latin American countries is not the kind that nurtured Castro. This, not anguished screaming, is the long-range answer to the Castro problem.

THE WORLD FOOD SUPPLY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a very sobering article appeared in the March-April, 1963, edition of Corn, published by the Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., of Washington, D.C. The short article previews the proceedings of the World Food Congress which will be held here on June 4 to 18.

The purpose of the World Food Congress is, in effect, to bring to public attention the magnitude of the problem of bridging the gap between available food supplies and those needed for the nourishment of the world's peoples.

One paragraph alone in this article contains statistics which are shocking in their implications. The paragraph reads:

> Between one-third and one-half of the world's 3 billion people suffer from hunger and/or malnutrition. On top of this, the population is expected to double in the next 35 years. To bring about a moderate improvement in the level of nutrition it has been estimated that the world's food supply will have to be doubled by 1980 and tripled by the turn of the century.

Because of the magnitude and importance of the problem portrayed, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD FOOD CONGRESS

An estimated 1,200 delegates from more than 100 countries will attend a World Food Congress to be held in Washington, D.C., June 4–18. The event comes at the midway point of the International Freedom from Hunger Campaign, a 5-year program launched in 1960 by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations.

The World Food Congress is an effort to make the world conscious of the related population and hunger problem and its magnitude. Primary emphasis will be placed upon helping the countries in need to help themselves in bridging the gap between available and adequate food supplies. The Congress is not the kind of event where a once-and-for-all solution will be found, but it may make a substantial contribution toward a world of self-reliant nations no longer plagued by such things as hunger, ill health, and poverty.

FOOD AND POPULATION

Between one-third and one-half of the world's 3 billion people suffer from hunger and/or malnutrition. On top of this, the population is expected to double in the next 35 years. To bring about a moderate improvement in the level of nutrition it has been estimated that the world's food supply will have to be doubled by 1980 and tripled by the turn of the century.

Behind the rapid population increase are certain arresting features. In the first place, the rate of increase in the less developed regions, where hunger is most prevalent, is greater than in the more developed ones. Secondly, because of advances in medical science people are now able to live longer under worse conditions or without a rise in their standard of living. The result of these two features is that the population of the less developed areas is becoming an ever-larger proportion of the world population.

Participants at last year's World Food Forum, which was also held in Washington, dispelled the notion that agricultural surpluses in one part of the world can alleviate hunger in any substantive, lasting way in another part. A repeated theme was that the developing nations must, for a variety of reasons, depend primarily on a substantial expansion of agricultural production at home. In Asia alone (excluding Red China) the projected need is for an increase of some 90 million tons of food grains by 1980. Commercial or noncommercial trade is simply not feasible to supply grains of such magnitude. Today only 10 percent of world food production goes into export. The bulk of our country's agricultural exports through the food-for-peace program has been to relieve hunger in emergency situations.

MEANS ARE AVAILABLE

There seems to be general agreement that science today has the solution to abundant food supplies in terms of modern technology—increased use of fertilizer, the killing of pests, irrigation and drainage, genetics of plant improvement, the cultivation of more arable land, and so on. But effectuating such changes requires the resolution of a host of politico-socio-economic questions for the countries involved. Social values and public opinion must be changed to overcome certain static situations and create climates conducive to the acceptance of modern technology. Dissemination of agricultural know-how requires that people be educated enough to receive the help offered; thus the pervasive problem of illiteracy is directly caught up in the agricultural struggle. One educational institution the United States is fostering is the organization of rural youth clubs patterned after the 4–H Clubs.

Of particular interest to the visiting delegates will be the successful example of a handful of countries that have succeeded in increasing agricultural production substantially above the population growth rate. This has been true in the past 10 years of such countries as Israel, Mexico, Yugoslavia, Greece, Japan, and Austria. From these experiences the developing nations should learn much that will enable them to become more self-reliant. In addition, of course, the United States, a land where agricultural abundance is consistently attained, will be the center of much attention.

The visiting participants will be asking why it is that American farmers are, say, about five times as efficient as Russian farmers. In other words, what are the conditions that lead to agricultural abundance. If any conclusion is reached on this question it will most likely be that success can only be attributed to a combination of factors—good climate, adequate capital, free incentive, sound technological background, and an effective farm communications system, among others. In its development, however, the American experience did not have to cope with an impatient population. Today people of the developing countries know there is a better life and are determined to achieve it in their own lifetime.

Efforts to increase food production have been concerned traditionally with agrarian reform, or who shall own the land. It is here that American agriculture may convincingly cite its own experience in calling for individual ownership of the land by those who cultivate it: no method of ownership—collective, plantation, feudal, or state-owned—has ever achieved the efficient productivity of the American family farm.

ROLE OF UNITED STATES

Last fall Congress authorized the United States to serve as host country for the World Food Congress. Leadership for our participation is being furnished by the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation through designation of its trustees as Citizens' Host Committee for the World Food Congress. In addition, President Kennedy appointed a Government Committee to work in association with the freedom-from-hunger campaign. Freedom From Hunger Week, observed this March 17–23 in this and many other countries, is one of the events of the campaign.

All reports indicate that the response of the American people to the coming World Food Congress has been especially warm. A subcommittee charged with arranging tours of various area farms and food industries reports that firms and individuals are generously offering their help. These tours will provide the visitors a means of seeing firsthand how our food is produced and processed.

Designed to be a "people-to-people" rather than a "government-to-government" event, the World Food Congress will include participants from all walks of life. Some 300 to 400 persons from the United States are expected to attend. The June 4 opening date was designed to coincide with the 20th anniversary of the Hot Springs, Va., conference called by President Roosevelt. This conference laid the foundations for the FAO, which became a part of the United Nations 2 years later in 1945. Common to both the conference 20 years ago and the coming World Food Congress is a recognition that food and agriculture transcend national boundaries, that only a joint effort can solve the problems of world hunger.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have on previous occasions brought to the attention of the Senate the helpful information contained in the publication of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools entitled "Changing Demands on Education and Their Fiscal Implications." There remains but one chapter of the study to which this morning I wish to devote my attention. This is the chapter entitled "Findings and Conclusions."

I ask unanimous consent that this chapter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chapter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Basic research, application of new knowledge to industrial processes, and automation are remaking the economy of the United States. The depth and speed of economic change are having heavy impacts on the labor force and on education.

IMPACTS ON THE LABOR FORCE

Our population as a whole must have more and better general education. This is essential if the labor force is to have the educational background and flexibility of mind required to respond to rapid occupational change. Some old occupations decline in numbers, and some disappear. New ones arise. Retraining and even lifetime learning are becoming the price of employment.

A larger percentage of the labor force must have advanced technical and professional education. There is also a rising demand for skilled and semiskilled workers. But the opportunities for employment of unskilled workers and laborers are declining and will continue to do so.

The insistent calls for more and more highly trained and skilled workers and the declining demand for unskilled workers are bringing about major changes in the composition of the labor force of the United States. In 1956, for the first time in our history, the majority of the employed population were classified as white-collar workers. It is estimated that by 1970 white-collar workers will far outnumber blue-collar workers.

IMPACTS ON EDUCATION

Occupational changes hold many implications for public education. The schools and colleges must provide more and better basic and general education. These institutions must provide more personnel with advanced technical and professional education. They must provide alone, or in cooperation with various public and private agencies, a labor force with a growing percentage of skilled and semiskilled workers.

The rising demands of our technological economy for trained manpower are being met to a degree by our educational institutions. The level of schooling of our population is rising. A larger percentage of highly educated, professional, technical, and skilled personnel is being supplied. The professions and industry readily absorb the increased flow of the more highly trained.

Technological progress and automation increase productivity, but they also breed serious problems for many individuals. There is an insidious growth of unemployment in a number of occupational fields and especially in agriculture. When the jobs of older workers disappear, they find it difficult to prepare for and find new ones. Unemployment among dropouts from the schools is much higher than in the labor force as a whole.

As hundreds of thousands of jobs are wiped out, new ones appear. But many who lose their jobs cannot qualify for them. They lack the training required.

Many proposals are being made to correct the imbalance between the training demanded and that possessed by our manpower. There is no general agreement as to how the needed training and retraining can be accomplished. However, all proposals include needed improvements in the offerings of the public schools. These range from action to eliminate illiteracy and to step up the level of general education of our whole population, to the provision of much more effective programs of technical and subprofessional training.

Such educational improvements will require substantial additional expenditures. Can the cost be met? The answer depends in large degree upon the public's conception of the economic significance of education.

EDUCATION AS INVESTMENT

Economic research is leading toward the conclusion that expenditures for education are more than a tax levy against the economy. Educational expenditures are a productive investment.

INDIVIDUAL RETURNS

It has long been known that persons with larger amounts of education earn larger incomes. Research is beginning to disentangle the various factors, including schooling, which result in increased individual earnings. It appears that the direct returns to individuals, solely from investment in schooling, are at least as high as other forms of investment. Even though the general level of schooling has continued to rise during the past generation, the substantial differentials in the average earnings of those with less schooling and those with more schooling have continued to hold.

INCREASED NATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY

Probably more important than the economic research that has revealed the benefits to individuals from investment in education are studies that take account of the diffused, indirect benefits that increase national productivity. Some economists are suggesting that investment in human capital, in such forms as education and health services, deserves to rank with investment in physical capital as a factor in economic progress.

The rapid growth in the productivity of agriculture in the United States is of special significance. Agricultural output has continued to mount, although the acreage under cultivation and the number of agricultural workers both continue to decline. Some economists claim that the agricultural revolution in the United States is in large degree the outcome of the comprehensive program of educational investment in agriculture which has been developed during the past century. The farmers in the United States are the only occupational group that has enjoyed substantial public investment in general education, in specialized instruction at both the secondary and higher education levels, in research and experimentation, and in an extension program providing for the rapid dissemination of new knowledge.

The relation of education to economic growth is now a matter of worldwide study. It shows that there is a high correlation between literacy and per capita production among the nations of the world. No illiterate nation has achieved a high level of productivity; all literate nations have relatively high per capita incomes.

The educational level attained by a nation's population is more important than the possession of natural resources in determining its per capita income.

In some nations that possess abundant natural resources, people live in semistarvation. Other nations that have invested in human capital have achieved high productivity, even though they have meager natural resources.

The rapid economic growth of the U.S.S.R. is partly the result of heavy investment in education made since the Bolshevik revolution.

The superior productivity of Western Europe is in part an outcome of its early establishment of universal education. Its rapid recovery after World War II was facilitated by its stock of educated human capital. The lack of such capital in the less-developed nations is partly responsible for their laggard economic gains.

Probably the most significant returns from investment in education are certain qualities and insights that are essential for growth in economic as well as other spheres of life. Education contributes to the development of a literate and informed people capable of maintaining free institutions and achieving democratic aims. Education helps in maintaining the degree of political and social stability that is essential for economic and other forms of national growth. Education develops respect for scientific research and for the new knowledge it discovers. Education aids in developing readiness to apply new knowledge to economic and other areas of life. Education plays a major role in developing the specialized technicians and the broadly educated and responsible leaders demanded in all fields in a complex and highly developed society such as that of the United States.

It is imperative that we recognize the many and highly significant returns which accrue from wise investment in education. It is also imperative that we avoid the social penalties that have their origins in neglect of education.

PENALTIES OF INADEQUATE SCHOOLING

It is a shocking fact that while the United States stands for equality of opportunity, it permits gross inequalities in educational opportunity.

Far too high a percent of our citizens suffer handicaps that result from lack of functional literacy. Fewer and fewer children are denied schooling completely, but many children attend poor schools and only for a short period. Lack of adequate schooling, both as to quality and amount, is partly responsible for the millions of disadvantaged Americans who have recently been migrating from underdeveloped rural slums to congested urban slums.

Low educational achievement is associated with low earning capacity, unemployment, high rates of rejection for military service, and dependence on various types of relief.

The plight of the dropouts from school deserves special attention. They are thrown into a labor market where there is a declining demand for unskilled labor. The possibility of their being called for military training discourages employers from offering them opportunity for employment and training. The out-of-school, unemployed youth is a potential delinquent.

Adequate schooling is one of the factors which can aid in ameliorating some of our most serious social problems. Provision of adequate schooling for all is fully justified solely on the basis of our commitment to equality of opportunity. The cost of providing education, right in amount and kind for every child, would probably be less than expenditures to cure the results of inadequate schooling.

MAXIMIZING RETURNS

To realize full economic and other benefits from investment in education will require several types of action. There must be quality schools available and attended by all children and youth in all communities. Good schools require well prepared teachers, adequate school buildings, and other essential physical facilities. These are lacking in too many communities today.

Curricula must be developed that take account of the wide range of aptitudes and life goals of the heterogeneous population now enrolled in public schools. There must be full response to the fact that those in the upper grades of elementary schools and in high schools are no longer a select group. Public schools now include the talented and those of average and below-average ability.

Accordingly, the public school program must provide more than a single track of general education for all. There must also be varied provisions for all groups, so that the Nation may fully capitalize on its total human resources.

There must be effective guidance programs in every school system to help each student achieve his potential. Well-trained guidance counselors with facilities for effective performance must reduce waste of human resources.

COUNTING THE COST

Substantial increases in expenditures for public schools will be required if economic and other returns from investment in human capital are to be maximized. While money is not everything in providing quality schooling, it is something. Quality schools almost universally are high-expenditure schools.

The problem is one of making additional funds count most in buying the quality of schooling demanded by the type of society and economy to which we aspire.

Currently wide variations in the quality of schools in the United States are in considerable degree a result of enormous and indefensible differences in the financial support of schools in different regions and localities. States and communities with low levels of financial support for schools are the sources of millions of disadvantaged citizens.

There has been inadequate response in school expenditures to the mounting demands made upon the schools. Between 1900 and 1958, the purchasing power of the money available to pay for each day of schooling provided in public schools declined. Taking account of all factors, boards of education in the United States generally had less ability to buy first-rate schooling for each child, for each day he was in school, in 1958 and 1900.

A recent congressional study concluded that this low elasticity in the support of public schools should be of deep concern to those convinced that improvements in education are essential if the United States is to remain a leading world power.

A number of citizens committees have estimated what it would cost to finance quality schools in all communities in the United States. They agree that there must be a substantial increase in school expenditures to achieve this end. Their estimates are that approximately a doubling of present expenditures for public schools will be needed during the 1960's.

Adequate support for public schools will require decisive action on the part of many citizens. There must be recognition that investment in public education pays handsome dividends. The fiscal obstacles that now block the road to adequate financial support for public education must be removed.

The rewards of decisive and intelligent action in providing excellent schools everywhere in the United States would be substantial. The penalties of failure in this regard would be severe. Leaders throughout the Nation should ponder these alternatives with great care.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I salute the national committee, under the leadership of Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, for having performed the great public service of bringing this information to the attention of the American public. She and those who work with her deserve high commendation for the program they have initiated. I look forward particularly to reviewing the results of the first national conference held at the Statler-Hilton on April 7–9.

At this point, Mr. President, I feel it is most appropriate to draw the attention of Senators to the program of that conference. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the brief biographical sketches of the discussion leaders.

There being no objection, the biographical sketches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST NATIONAL CONFERENCE: THE COMMUNITY FACES THE CRISIS OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Convened by the executive committee of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools)

Agnes E. Meyer, chairman; Harold Taylor, vice chairman; William Benton, Omar N. Bradley, Marion B. Folsom, John Hersey, David E. Scoll, secretary-treasurer; Mary C. Kohler, James G. Patton, John I. Snyder, Jr., Ralph W. McDonald, executive director.

SUNDAY, APRIL 7, 2 P.M.–9 P.M.

Registration, second floor, upper lobby, Statler-Hilton.

MONDAY, APRIL 8, 9:30 A.M., FIRST SESSION

Federal room

Welcome to the Conference

Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, chairman, National Committee for Support of the Public Schools.

Realities of the Present

Presiding: Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D.C.

"The Crisis in the Cities," Dr. Mark C. Schinnerer, vice president, Shaker Savings Association, Shaker Heights, Ohio.

"In the Suburbs," Dr. Harold Taylor, vice chairman, National Committee for Support of the Public Schools.

"The Towns and Rural Areas," Dr. Warren G. Hill, commissioner of education, Augusta, Maine.

"The Deprived Americans," Dr. Albert W. Dent, president, Dillard University, New Orleans, La.

Discussion

At 12:30 p.m. (luncheon).

Congressional Room

Presiding: Dr. Rosemary Park, president, Barnard College, New York, N.Y.

"The Federal Role in Education," the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

At 2:30 p.m. (second session).

Federal Room

Public Schools—An Investment in People.

Presiding, John I. Snyder, Jr., president, U.S. Industries, Inc., New York, N.Y.

"Public Schools and the Development of American Manpower," Dr. Eli Ginzberg, professor of economics and director of conservation of human resources project, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

"Education and the Investment in Human Capital," Dr. Theodore W. Schultz, professor of economics, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Discussion

At 5:30 p.m. (reception in honor of the Governors).

Congressional Room

At 7:30 p.m. (banquet).

Presidential Ballroom

What Are the States Doing To Strengthen Their Public Schools?

Presiding: Marion B. Folsom, director and managing consultant, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y.

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor, State of California.

The Honorable John H. Chafee, Governor, State of Rhode Island.

The Honorable Terry Sanford, Governor, State of North Carolina.

TUESDAY, APRIL 9

At 9:30 a.m. (third session).

Federal room

How To Make the Public Schools Fully Effective

Presiding, Marquis Childs, chief Washington correspondent, St. Louis Post Dispatch.

"The Kind of Public Schools We Want," the Honorable Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education.

"Financing Our Schools—The CED Position," Dr. T. V. Houser, chairman, board of trustees, committee for economic development, Washington, D.C.

"The Cost of Good Public Schools," Dr. Arthur F. Corey, executive secretary, California Teachers Association.

Discussion

At 12:30 p.m. (luncheon).

Congressional Room

Presiding: Gen. Omar N. Bradley, chairman, Bulova Watch Co., Washington, D.C.

Address: The Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor.

Summary of the conference: Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, chairman, National Committee for Support of the Public Schools.

At 2:30 p.m. (final session).

Federal Room

Meeting of the Membership, Closed Session

Meeting of NCSPS members to discuss future policies and program.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF LEADERS OF NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Agnes E. Meyer: Lecturer, author, social worker. Founder of NCSPS. Her vigorous efforts through the years in the interest of public education and social progress have made her one of the Nation's most forceful spokesmen for human freedom and dignity. Writings include "Out of These Roots: Education for a New Morality."

Harold Taylor: Educator, author, former president of Sarah Lawrence College, has unusual insight into school needs of rapidly expanding urban and suburban communities. Dr. Taylor believes "the educator must have an image of the child in the reality of his school, and his society." Books include "On Education and Freedom."

William Benton: Connecticut Yankee who thriftily uses one lifetime for multisuccesses as master of advertising, university administrator, publisher, Senator, diplomat. From his energy came the Voice of America; from his insight, our first awareness of the potency of Soviet education.

Omar N. Bradley: The Missouri schoolmaster who trained a citizen army and led it across Africa and Europe to defeat Hitler. General of the Army and first head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he is the quiet "GI's general" who now fights militantly in pursuit of adequate education for peacetime Americans.

Marion B. Folsom: Shares with sputnik some top credit for arousing America to the school gap. Scholar, corporation manager, community leader, his zeal cut through red tape and prejudice to show executives there is room at the top for effective public service. As HEW Secretary, scored highest for education.

John Hersey: Noted American author, says "A great national hypocrisy stands in the way of our children. It is to be seen in the gap between our pretensions and our performance in public education." Books include "A Bell for Adano," "The Wall," "The Child Buyer," and just published "Here to Stay, Studies in Human Tenacity."

Mary C. Kohler: Retired from the San Francisco Juvenile Court in 1953 after 15 years on the bench. She has served on a number of organizations concerned with young people and their futures. Presently she is chairman, executive committee, National Committee on Employment of Youth.

James G. Patton: Has served in a wide range of private and governmental activities to improve the security of the farm family. A farm leader with the world view, he is a founder of International Federation of Agricultural Producers, the organization of farmers throughout the free world. Book: "The Case for Farmers."

John I. Snyder, Jr.: Cochairman of the Foundation on Automation and Employment, is actively engaged in alleviating the impact of automation on employees, believing employers must assume some responsibility. Member: board of trustees, Committee for Economic Development; NYU-Bellevue Medical Center Board.

Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold of Concord, N.H., is the youngest president in the history of General Federation of Women's Clubs. A graduate of Syracuse, she served as director of speech and dramatics for the Syracuse schools. Author of a textbook on speech, an expert parliamentarian, she has lectured in every State.

Mark C. Schinnerer: Member, Ohio House of Representatives. Former long-time superintendent of Cleveland schools, he recently made a heralded one-man study of New York City schools for State department of education. Received 1963 Distinguished Service Award from the American Association of School Administrators.

Warren G. Hill: Maine's Commissioner of Education. Having served as elementary school principal, college instructor, acting college president, Dr. Hill has intimate knowledge of rural school problems and is particularly qualified to lay the foundation for better understanding of similar problems throughout the country.

Albert W. Dent: In his 20 years as president, Dillard tripled its enrollment and became a leading private liberal arts college. Active in education and health, he was three times a delegate to the World Health Organization; is a member, National Advisory Council, Peace Corps; vice president of United Negro College Fund.

Rosemary Park: A distinguished scholar, served as president of Connecticut College for 15 years before moving to Barnard. During her years as president, the college expanded to accommodate a one-third increase in student body. She has received Radcliffe College's Graduate Chapter Medal for Distinguished Achievement.

Anthony J. Celebrezze: Was serving an unprecedented fifth term as mayor of Cleveland when called to Washington. He gained nationwide recognition for outstanding achievement in slum clearance, voluntary neighborhood rehabilitation and improvement in health, welfare, recreation, and traffic programs.

Eli Ginzberg: Internationally known for research and writings on the human aspects of economics. Consultant to Departments of Army, State, Labor, and the Executive Office. His many publications are standard works in the field. Books: "The Negro Potential," "Human Resources," "The Ineffective Soldier," "The Nation's Children."

Theodore W. Schultz: Considered the Nation's outstanding researcher on the economic values of education, has stressed that, "Truly, the most distinctive feature of our economic system is the growth in human capital." Former Chairman, Department of Economics, University of Chicago. Author of numerous books and articles.

Edmund G. Brown: Is a native Californian. Worked his way through night school, became District Attorney, Attorney General, and in 1959 Governor. His concern for welfare of all citizens, hard work, and administrative ability caused voters to express their confidence by reelecting him last November. Education was a key issue.

John H. Chafee: Is only the second Republican in over 2 decades to gain the governorship in usually Democratic Rhode Island. A fighting Marine who served for 6 years in World War II and Korea, he rose from buck private to captain. In politics he started as precinct worker and ended in the Governor's chair in 1962.

Terry Sanford: The South's new voice, says, "We need our own Emancipation Proclamation which will set us free to grow and build, set us free from the drag of poor people, poor schools, from hate, from demagoguery." North Carolina's Assembly approved greatest increase for school support of any State since his governorship.

Marquis Childs: Suave as a diplomat as he moves among summits and battlefronts, ignites journalistic rockets which illuminate the events, men and movements of today. The unwavering analyst-reporter, he insists on defining the real issues which spell history—refusing to come to terms with poverty, misery and ignorance.

Francis Keppel: U.S. Commissioner of Education. Under his resourceful, imaginative leadership as dean of Graduate School of Education, Harvard, new techniques for improving quality of teaching were introduced. Perhaps no American today is better equipped to describe the kind of schools needed at this critical period.

T. V. Houser: Retired corporate executive, serves as chairman of the board of trustees of the Committee on Economic Development. Formerly with Sears, Roebuck & Co. A director of Bell & Howell Co. and trustee of Northwestern University, Mr. Houser feels "the quality of education is critical for American society."

Arthur F. Corey: Has been a teacher, principal, district superintendent. As head of the largest State professional organization of teachers in the United States, he believes professional prestige cannot be bought or legislated—but that it must be earned by making teaching a quality profession, our preeminent profession.

W. Willard Wirtz: U.S. Secretary of Labor, began his career as a high school teacher and taught law at Iowa and Northwestern Universities. Former General Counsel of War Labor Board; Chairman of National Wage Stabilization Board. As labor arbitrator, became vitally concerned with effects of unemployment and automation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I intend to bring to the attention of my subcommittee during the course of our hearings on the President's comprehensive education bill the papers presented and the results of the discussions when they are published.

AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations, during fiscal year 1964, for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending business is the military procurement bill, Calendar No. 105, H.R. 2440.

POPE JOHN XXIII AND WORLD PEACE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as we look back over the past several years and examine the words of all our rulers, spiritual and temporal, we find that the one who has spoken out most often, most forcefully, and most cogently for the cause of world peace is Pope John XXIII.

Five years ago, shortly after he was elected to the Papacy by the College of Cardinals, he came out with his first appeal for peace, when he addressed church leaders, saying:

> Look at the people entrusted to you and listen to their voice. What do they seek? What do they implore from you? Not these new monstrous instruments of war which our times have produced and which can be the cause of fraternal slaughter and annihilation of all—not these, but peace. We say peace, by which the whole human family may live freely, thrive, and flourish.

Later in the summer of 1961, he said:

> Everything is lost and lost to everyone through war. Nothing will be lost through peace.

Then, last year at the time of the Cuban crisis, he said:

> To promote, favor, and accept negotiations, at all levels and at all times, is a rule of wisdom and prudence which calls down the blessings of heaven and earth. * * * Let them do everything in their power to have peace. By so doing, they will spare the world the horrors of a war that would have disastrous consequences such as nobody could foresee. * * * Let them continue to negotiate * * * at all levels and at all times.

And now today he has again expressed himself on behalf of the same cause, this time with a full-fledged, deeply thought-out encyclical entitled "Pacem in Terris"—Peace on Earth. I believe this will prove one of the most significant contributions that have come forth in the last 2 years toward the long-awaited lasting peace.

This document is significant in many ways, but paramount to its commanding logic is the universality of its appeal—for it is not addressed to Catholics alone but also to all men of good will. And all men will certainly be affected by it.

It is interesting to note that of the temporal rulers who have taken public cognizance of the Pope's appeals, Premier Khrushchev is one of the most prominent. The efforts that Pope John is making today to lower the politically high temperature in the world is shown by his securing of the release early this year of Archbishop Josef Sleipyj who had been incarcerated for so many years; by the permission granted Stefen Cardinal Wyszynski to attend the Ecumenical Council in Rome; by his conversations with Khrushchev's daughter and son-in-law, Rada and Aleksey Adzhubey; and now by this remarkable encyclical.

Pope John, by his efforts to lower the political temperature in the world and hence be better able to ameliorate the conditions of people behind the Iron Curtain, has made a very real contribution to world peace. Even more important though is that in this period of our history when jingoism and war talk is all too rampant he gives to the cause of peace a public dignity and a worthiness that it would not otherwise enjoy. Christianity has been with us for almost 2,000 years, steadily spreading and increasing throughout the world. Taking the long look at history and looking to the future, I think this fact, plus the basic inadequacies of communism to meet the normal, natural desires of human beings to worship freely, work freely, speak freely, travel freely, vote freely, and possess property freely will show which system will survive in the long haul. The only problem is to insure first that there is not mutual self-destruction in order that there will be a long haul.

RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES IN RURAL AMERICA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] has today introduced a bill, which I am pleased to cosponsor, to establish a Commission on Rural Life. The commission would be instructed to study problems related to food supply, costs and markets for farm and manufactured goods, job opportunities, and individual and community initiative in maintaining and developing community institutions and services.

We are living in a time of rapid change in community living as well as in technology. It is well for us to focus our attention on what is happening to the millions of people in our rural communities.

A quick look at my own State of Michigan, for example, shows that we have long prospered from the development of our resources and from the export of our wealth to other States and other nations. The abundance of our fields, our forests, and our mines created income in Michigan. Then the automobile and machinery industries were born and thrived there.

All these cornerstones of the Michigan economy—farming, forest products, mining, and manufacturing—continue to provide jobs and income for the people of Michigan. We cannot but realize, however, that our timber and mineral resources are now less to be counted on as a source of income than heretofore. We are well aware of the fact that autos are now being made in other States and nations, even if not quite as well or as economically as in Michigan. We know that the growing productivity of agriculture, some of it in areas once only deserts, is competing with the great Michigan fruit belt and other agricultural resources of our State.

Michigan is not alone in having to face up to some of these facts. It confronts all of us in America. When we recognize that of every 10 young people living on the Nation's farms today only 1 can expect to be gainfully employed in agriculture, it is sufficiently urgent that we set in motion work and program proposals from which can come fuller utilization of new opportunities for gainful employment in rural areas.

We also need the analysis and study of the full range of problems confronting our citizens in rural America that would come from the establishment of this Commission on Rural Life.

We, in Michigan, are not alone in straining our ingenuity in order to gain from the old sources the growing income needed for a better living for more people each year. The productivity of man and his machines, together with new agricultural and industrial productivity of new areas, is making the marketplace a little tougher for all of us. Man and his machines are building a material abundance which we can celebrate but which we must at the same time regard as a challenge.

It is in these circumstances that Michigan and other States must look to a further development of that relatively new source of major income: recreation and tourism. We have beautiful lakes and bountiful trout streams. We have quiet forests and peaceful open land where a man can breathe. And we have all this in a time when millions of people need the exercise, the pleasure, the tranquillity, and the relaxation that these great outdoors offer.

It is to the opportunities that are present to us in Michigan and throughout the United States for fuller utilization of programs for developing these recreation resources that I wish to direct my remarks today. We are making progress in Michigan in utilizing the tools that are presently available through Federal and State programs. This effort enjoys widespread support among the farm organizations and increasing interest on the part of individual farmers and rural community leaders.

Today, Mr. President, as we propose this Commission on Rural Life and look toward enhancing the economic well-being of this root spring of our Nation's strength, I would like to mention some of the experiences we have had in Michigan in putting these programs to work, as well as some experiences in other parts of the United States.

Let us look first at some national facts and figures:

First. There is more land in the United States than is needed to produce the food and fiber we need currently for ourselves and for export. So great has become the productivity of the American farmer that the Department of Agriculture reports 50 million acres of farmland could be taken out of production by 1980 without creating any shortages. Shall we produce even greater surpluses or shall we help rural people find a more productive, profitable use for some of their land?

Second. While we ponder this question, more and more millions of people, crowded into cities and suburbs need, and are willing to pay for, more outdoor recreation. Shorter hours and better incomes have already built outdoor recreation into a $20 billion-a-year business and tourism into a $25 billion annual volume. And this is only the beginning; it is estimated that outdoor recreation needs will treble by the end of this century.

So we have the land available for new uses on one hand, and the need for outdoor recreation on the other. Why, then, are these acres, these rural resources not automatically diverted to the full need for public and commercial recreation?

Actually, of course, more and more land is being devoted to outdoor recreation, but not at a rate fast enough to take care of idled acres or to meet growing needs satisfactorily. It is in the interest of our rural landholders, in the interest of people who need jobs, in the interest of people who seek outdoor recreation, and in the interest of the Nation to accelerate that rate.

The need for speed in developing outdoor recreational facilities is based partly on the urgency of the need for land diversion and partly on the growing demand for leisure-time play space. Time is important in another way: Unless we move now, the recreation land will not be where we need it, not accessible to the people who will use it, and much of its beauty will be spoiled.

In examining what Government can do to help individual citizens and local communities develop outdoor recreation, we ought to look at public facilities and at those that are privately owned.

There is an acknowledged need for public recreation facilities: Federal, State, and community parks, lakes and other publicly owned recreation areas. Each year these facilities are being increasingly overloaded. Each year the cost of land acquisition by cities, counties, States and the Federal Government is rising. Each year land ideally suited to recreation near population centers is being put to other uses.

Under this administration, the Federal Government is serving the need for outdoor recreation through accelerated improvement and expansion of national park facilities.

The Recreation Advisory Council, a Cabinet-level body created by Executive order of President Kennedy in 1962, is working on this problem. So is the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, created in the Department of Interior last year following the report of a bipartisan committee which had been studying the problem for several years. Legislation has been introduced to establish a program to help States purchase lands for public recreation.

The open-space land program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency can also be of help to communities and States in meeting their need for public recreation facilities.

In low income and high unemployment counties over the country, the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962 has helped to meet public recreation needs. Federal grants can be provided for improvements needed—the boathouse, the cabin, the bridge, or the pool—to make a public park usable, just as this kind of financing can be used to help finance a town's water system.

We must continue and improve our efforts to develop more publicly owned recreation facilities. Whatever we accomplish will almost certainly be less than enough to meet the need.

Some people oppose the use of land for public recreation facilities because they say this takes the land off the tax rolls. While the land itself may not be taxed, I question whether the creation of good public recreation facilities has ever reduced the total tax base of a city, a county, a State, or the Nation. Availability of such facilities generally increases the value of other properties, and stimulates business incomes more than enough to offset any tax losses.

Important as public development is in putting land to its best use and providing our people with adequate outdoor recreation, it is only part of the answer. The development of commercial recreation on privately owned lands is at least equally vital. The diverting of excess acres into commercial recreation uses can provide more jobs and more income for rural people, in Michigan and in other States. By turning to more profitable, productive use of marginal farmland, we can reduce agricultural surpluses. And simultaneously, we can help provide people with close-to-home recreational opportunities they need, want, and can afford.

We can all think of numerous commercial recreational possibilities. They range from the farmer who houses and feeds city vacationers to huge recreation complexes with lakes, lodges, golf courses, tennis courts, and theaters. In between, there is the farmer who builds a few cabins and a boat dock on a lake, the one who rents camping sites or provides hunting and fishing services for a fee. There is a place for all these in meeting the commercial recreation needs of people for a few hours, for a weekend, or for a vacation. There is a place for all these in stimulating greater economic activity in rural areas.

The previous Congress and the administration can take pride in recognizing this potential and doing something about it.

For example:

First. The Area Redevelopment Act, passed in 1961, provides loans to help launch industries and businesses in the lowest income-highest unemployment areas, rural as well as urban. Commercial recreation projects may be eligible for these loans if they result in permanent employment and if financing cannot be found elsewhere.

Second. The Food and Agricultural Act of 1962 contained several provisions specifically designed to divert more land into commercial recreation.

Through the rural areas development program launched in the Department of Agriculture in 1961, help is available to rural people in making use of the provisions of these and other programs in developing commercial recreational enterprises.

Under this program, the Federal Extension Service has been given primary responsibility for assisting rural people to get organized to make their community what they want it to be.

The Farmers Home Administration, in addition to providing help through its own programs, is coordinating the Agriculture Department's various programs with State, area, and county programs.

Recreation facilities and programs in the national forests are being expanded with an eye to future needs.

The Agricultural Act of 1962 authorized recreational activities as one of the purposes of small watershed projects.

The Rural Electrification Administration is assisting its borrowers, as well as the other rural people in ARA-designated areas, in the development of specific enterprises.

MICHIGAN EXTENSION SERVICE EMPHASIZES TRAINING

The rural areas development program, supported by the agencies of USDA, has provided a basis for expanding the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service work in developing the State's recreational resources.

The Michigan State Rural Areas Development Committee, consisting of leaders representing various State economic and social interests, provides basic policy guidance to rural area development activities as well as assistance to the Area Redevelopment Act program. Working through RAD and ARA, the Michigan Extension Service anticipates that recreation will be more and more important to the economy of the State. Rapidly expanding needs for recreation and the particular character of Michigan's land and water resources make Michigan especially adaptable to this type of development. The financial assistance made possible through the Area Redevelopment Act, the Manpower Training and Development Act, and the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 will contribute to the expanding recreational activities in Michigan.

Special projects for training of motel operators, waitresses, and other types of occupations needed in this field have attracted public attention and enthusiastic support of local groups. An article entitled "Boosting the Tourist Economy" by Clare A. Gunn, Tourist and Resort Specialist, School of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Management, Michigan State University, which appeared in the January 1963 issue of the Extension Review, details some of the successes of the program.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION SPURS RURAL RENEWAL IN MICHIGAN

There is a tremendous need in most of the Nation's rural areas today for money to finance basic capital improvements, such as farm enlargement, community facilities, shifts in land use, rural industries.

One agency in the Department of Agriculture that has begun to move in the direction of helping meet what I would call "the capital gap in rural America" is Farmers Home Administration.

As organized programs of rural area development take hold in more and more counties, under local leadership, this agency will be called on increasingly to support and to finance local projects when private capital is not available.

Farmers Home Administration just recently emerged from the doldrums of the 1950's, a period in which it was reduced to virtually the liquidation stage. A period, I might also add, when 2 million farms went out of business and 1,600 rural counties lost population.

Under the leadership of Secretary Freeman, Assistant Secretary Baker, and Administrator Howard Bertsch, this agency has been revitalized in just 2 short years.

In 1961 Farmers Home Administration was authorized to expand and modernize its farm lending programs, and to begin meeting some of the limitless need in rural America for housing credit and loans for community facilities and community development.

Last year this process of arming FHA for the tremendous tasks and challenges of the present decade was continued. Congress set up a loan program for the elderly living in rural areas, one of the Nation's most disadvantaged groups, and authorized some fundamental new approaches to rural development.

The latter include credit and technical assistance for on-farm and communitywide public recreation projects; shifts in land use to more suitable, more needed enterprises; and assistance to public agencies as they move to build a more satisfactory rural environment.

Modernization of FHA was begun in 1961, continued in 1962 and, I trust, will be enlarged upon this year.

For plainly the work of this agency, in all its many facets, adds up to the most practical kind of rural area development.

FHA's supervised credit programs are helping reverse the economic deterioration which has blighted so many of the small town and countryside communities of America in the past decade.

I cannot speak for the rest of the Nation. But I testify that the Farmers Home Administration program in Michigan serves as a vigorous force making for general farm and rural prosperity.

In 1962 the agency loaned nearly $13.5 million in my State for a variety of purposes. This was more than twice the amount loaned in 1960.

This large investment that Farmers Home Administration is making in rural people and rural America is a net gain for the people concerned. The money would not otherwise have been available. The loss of farm families, of households, of community improvements would not have been prevented.

In some areas of Michigan, the growth of the recreation business has been handicapped by a lack of capital. This is particularly true where farmers would like to convert farm resources, such as lake shore lines, woodlots and fields, to recreation uses. Now Farmers Home Administration is authorized to supply some of this capital, at least.

Another example from my State. In the Upper Peninsula, important economic advantages would result from some long-range land planning and development measures. Such measures not only would strengthen agriculture but also enable large-scale recreation and other developments. Under another new loan program of Farmers Home Administration, capital is now available for this purpose. Here is a field in which private capital has too often been insufficient or completely lacking.

Although the program is only a few months old, Farmers Home Administration already has 138 applications for loans to finance on-farm recreation enterprises and other shifts in land use. New York and North Carolina lead all the other States, with 23 and 13 applications, respectively. Proposed projects include plans for hunting preserves, fishing and camping enterprises, public parks, and swimming pools.

REA AIDS RURAL RECREATION

The 1,000 REA-financed rural electric systems and 800 REA-financed telephone systems can be of assistance to local people in rural areas in the development of additional commercial recreation enterprises. They can provide these enterprises with modern electric and telephone service. They can help provide technical assistance needed to develop sound enterprises and help in finding credit sources, calling on REA itself for additional help in these areas when it is appropriate. Under section 5 of the Rural Electrification Act, the electric borrower can, when other sources of credit are not available on reasonable terms, help provide financing for electrical equipment, wiring, and plumbing needed in enterprises of this type which are within their rural service areas.

For some years now REA borrowers providing service in remote and isolated rural areas have been helping local people develop recreational sites. When the Southern Illinois Power Cooperative built a 3,000-foot earthen dam for its generating plant, the result was an artificial lake of 29,000 acres which now furnishes a tourist attraction south of Marion, Ill. Nearby Halsey, Nebr., an REA borrower provides electric service which makes possible summer camping for 3,000 4-H members each year on a site leased from the Forest Service.

Many rural electric co-ops in North Carolina work hand in hand with local groups to develop that State's recreational opportunities. One example is the Blue Ridge Electric Membership Corp., which serves a complete western village near Blowing Rock. At some distance from Jackson, Ga., another rural electric cooperative serves a modern camp and swimming area. A country club in western Pennsylvania was evolved from a farm, and its handsome building which was once a dairy barn is now served by the Central Electric Cooperative of Parker, Pa. Up to 2,400 young folk will enjoy the facilities of a 4-H club camp in Nicholas County, Ky., which depends upon a REA-financed system for its electricity. And in my own State of Michigan, where the gross income from tourists was in the neighborhood of $140 million a year as far back as 1959, REA borrowers serve a large number of hunting lodges, lake cottages, tourist camps and related businesses.

This is all rural area, and it is precisely in these rural areas that we look now for recreational potential.

Government assistance in launching sound commercial recreation enterprises can sometimes lend itself to ridicule when the nature of the assistance, the objective of that assistance, and the beneficial effects for all taxpayers are not understood. Most Members of the Senate have probably read some of the publicity on a $23,800 REA section 5 loan an Illinois rural electric co-op made to help a resort in its area finance snowmaking and other equipment. But look at the effect of the loan:

The president of the local bank has written that, combined with the loan he made to the resort, this REA loan helped get the new enterprise over the hump.

Jobs of some 10 to 20 people were provided at the resort itself.

One Saturday this winter, the local people report 5,000 people came to the resort, spending money for skiing, but also for food, lodging, gasoline, and other goods and services.

A new 64-unit motel has been built.

The electric co-op serving the resort is selling more power, helping its members use electricity and strengthening itself financially so that it can repay the REA loans and continue to provide good service.

And the taxpayer? The electric co-op guaranteed the repayment of that loan even if the resort failed. That is required under REA policies. And who can possibly determine the added income collected by all levels of Government due to the extra income of the people in that rural community?

Or consider a $50,000 recreation type loan by the Farmers Home Administration in Taos County, N. Mex. This county reported almost 14 percent of its labor force unemployed in 1961 and another 21 percent either working part-time or scratching a meager existence from farming. It will be interesting to see in a few years, as that Federal loan is being repaid, what the tourist income to the lodge and resort will do to those figures, and what the effect is on tax revenues to the local, State, and Federal Governments. Then we can determine how good an investment of Federal funds this has been from the viewpoint of taxpayers far from New Mexico.

ASC FARMER—COMMITTEES TEST NEW PROGRAM

As a part of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the Congress authorized the Department of Agriculture to use up to $10 million to assist farmers in the conservation of cropland to grass, forests, wildlife habitat, and recreational facilities.

Since sufficient funds were not available to conduct the program on a national basis, a total of 41 test counties in 13 States have been selected to provide a broad cross-section of experience with different kinds of crops, land, and farms, different income levels, and different types of land use adjustment opportunities. Included in these counties are 75,147 farms and 7,246,075 acres of cropland.

Under this phase of the program farmers are being assisted in making needed conversions primarily to pasture or trees through adjustment payments, cost-sharing payments for the establishment of needed conservation practices, technical assistance, and in some Northern States forestry incentive payments.

Farmers in counties designated in these 13 States may file applications to participate in the program through March 22.

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, including State and county ASC committees, will have responsibility for administration of the program. Farmers who are interested in participating in the program may file their applications at the county ASCS office. Farmers whose applications have been approved will then enter into either 5- or 10-year agreements with the county ASC committee, depending upon the type of enterprise being undertaken.

The agreements with individual farmers will be based on farm conservation plans which have been developed in cooperation with soil conservation districts and with technical planning from the Soil Conservation Service.

In addition to the 41 test counties, every State has been requested to recommend one or more projects for the conversion of cropland to an approved type of recreation use. Studies are currently being conducted in each State aimed at developing and recommending a list of suitable recreation projects. However, due to the limited nature of the program, only a small number of projects can be approved in each State.

In order to give farmers participating in the program as much help and encouragement as possible in making what, in some cases, may be an expensive, long-time, and difficult transition to other enterprises, adjustment payments are being made in a lump sum soon after a farmer enters into an agreement.

Conservation cost-share and forestry incentive payments will be made as soon as a practice is properly carried out or forest trees planted.

Technical assistance is being provided by such agencies as the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service. Where projects meet loan requirements, financial assistance may be provided by the Farmers Home Administration.

Until the present time, very little publicity has been given availability of funds or program details relating to recreational projects. Despite this fact, requests for more than 200 proposed projects have already been submitted from all parts of the country.

In most instances, farmers are requesting help in developing fishing, hunting and other outdoor recreation projects.

The following are examples of projects that Michigan farmers have suggested:

A 180-acre farm with 160 acres of cropland near Port Huron, Mich. The farmer is interested in developing a picnic area, riding trails, swimming pool, fish pond, ball park, miniature golf course, and a children's playground. A creek running through the farm could be further developed.

A 101-acre farm with 54 acres of cropland near Jackson, Mich. This farmer is interested in devloping a camping area, picnic area, swimming facilities, and a bridle path. His request indicates other such private or public facilities are not available in the area.

A 200-acre farm with 160 acres of cropland east of Morley, Mich. This farmer is interested in developing fishing, a hunting preserve, a limited boating area, and riding facilities. Income possibilities include six to eight saddle horses, with trails for riding and hiking and three or four fish ponds. He plans to build two cabins capable of housing a total of 16 persons, and in addition provide room and board for additional guests. The Little Muskegon River runs through the farm, thus providing a potential for added income through further development of fishing and boating facilities.

WATERSHED PROJECTS CAN BUILD RECREATION

As a former member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry passing on watershed projects I have been impressed by the tremendous potential of watershed protection and flood prevention projects.

At least three aspects of watershed projects appeal to me greatly. One is their multipurpose character, the fact that they can be used to solve practically every community resource problem and meet every community resource need.

Each project can serve any or all of these purposes: Flood prevention, agricultural water management, municipal and industrial water supply, recreation, and fish and wildlife development.

A second aspect of watershed projects that impresses me is the fact that they offer a splendid mechanism through which rural and urban interests can work together to solve common community problems related to land and water.

The third appealing aspect of watershed projects is that they are initiated and controlled by the local people with the approval and assistance of the State. These are not Federal projects—the Federal Government merely gives technical and financial assistance in developing local projects.

The Congress, in the Agriculture Act of 1962, expanded the usefulness of watershed projects. Among other things it provided for Federal cost sharing on recreation developments in watershed projects. This was a big step forward. Congress also made it possible to provide for future water supply for municipal and industrial use in watershed projects. This, too, was an important new development. We of the Congress were pleased to provide these additional conservation tools. I am distressed to note that the President's budget does not provide for increases to take advantage of them. Except for additions earmarked for the pay act increase and higher postal rates, new fund requests for the watershed program are held to last year's levels.

This simply is not realistic. The new tools were provided because the people want them and because they are needed. But these tools are no good whatever unless we use them. If we are to use them we must have increased funds that will make such use possible.

I hope my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will give full consideration to this real need for additional funds to implement additional authorities in multipurpose watershed projects. I urge them to consider also the acute problem of providing additional technical help in soil conservation districts.

RECREATION IN THE NATIONAL FORESTS

We take great pride in Michigan in making all outdoors our classrooms where our young people and their parents can study science, conservation, arts, and crafts, and where they can enjoy recreation. The classrooms are the camp and picnic sites, the wildlife habitat, the boating docks, and the trails of our forests.

There are now nearly a thousand-family units in campsites in the four national forests in Michigan. The demands on them are heavy.

There is special interest in seven areas in these forests. These are the areas that the U.S. Forest Service has designated to demonstrate multiple-use management of public and private lands.

Private capital has financed the development of our popular winter sports sites—Silver Valley, Caberfae, and the Manistee winter sports area on the Huron and Manistee National Forests, and Thunder Bowl, Mission Hill, and Indianahead Mountain on the Hiawatha and Ottawa National Forests.

The resort complex in each instance is enhanced by the winter sports, organization camps and other public facilities which are provided by the U.S. Forest Service.

We are strengthening our recreational facilities in many ways. This past year the Congress at my urging enabled the Forest Service to add a 1,400-acre shoreline tract to the Manistee National Forest, on Lake Michigan.

The Accelerated Public Works Act made it possible to speed up work that has been underway in the national forests for several years. One thousand two hundred men have been employed in 43 recreation areas of the national forests in Michigan—building tent and picnic sites, fireplaces, boat docks, and parking areas, and roads.

All of these improvements are necessary if the national forests are to serve the increasing number of visitors from our cities and from out of State.

What is being done now will help us meet the demands on forestry for recreation in the next 2 or 3 years. Our people are making long-range plans to draw more fully on Michigan's superb forest resources for recreation. They have formed more than 50 committees on rural area development in the heavily wooded counties. Within the past year the committees in more than half of these counties have drawn up inventories of their resources and long-range plans for using them.

WHAT IS THE TASK AHEAD?

In these and other ways, a beginning has been made. What we must do now is:

Recognize the recreation needs of our rapidly growing population in considering all legislation affecting both public and private recreation facilities;

Recognize the fact that more income must be provided for more people and that, in this era of automation, many of these must be the service-type jobs created by recreation; and

Recognize that fewer acres of land will be needed to produce food and fiber and that the creation of nonfarm income is the most humane, economical solution to many of the resulting problems.

Recognizing these things, the Congress should consider greater expenditures to divert more acres to publicly owned recreation, whether that acreage is controlled by the Federal Government, State government or local governments. The Congress should appropriate the necessary funds to accelerate the various Federal programs operating under existing legislation. Then the Congress should design additional legislation to fill the gaps.

One of the gaps we know exist is in financing a large recreation complex in an area which cannot get an ARA loan. The needs are too great to be met by the Small Business Administration. The complex is not being started by an association of farmers, so it is ineligible for a Farmers Home Administration loan. It cannot get private financing which finds more attractive opportunities elsewhere. Despite all the benefits it might bring to the area and to the Nation, a project conceived in such a situation will not be built.

During this session, we should devise ways to provide the help that is needed for the develpment of adequate recreation facilities in the public interest. We must recognize the contributions of programs like the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and the Small Business Administration to the development of recreation enterprises, and we must supply them both the tools to do the job and the direction to assure their appropriate attention to the problem.

We must stretch Federal dollars by participating in matching programs with the State and local governments to the maximum extent possible. In encouraging commercial recreation, we must concentrate, to the extent possible, on low interest, longterm loans rather than grants, although there may be instances where even grants will be justified in order to serve the greatest public need.

If we do these things, we will be making investments, not expenditures. The way the books are now kept, these may appear as red ink, but we and our children will be reaping the benefits. While the loans are being repaid, we and they will be enjoying happier, fuller lives. Rural people will have better incomes, and surplus farmland will be in more productive, profitable uses.

We often hear about bequeathing our children a public debt. None of us wants to do this, but if we do not begin developing now our recreation resources, we will bequeath them a still greater debt plus a life confined to the asphalt and concrete of crowded cities, miles from any open field on which they can step, any woodland in which they can walk, or any stream to enjoy.

THE CUBAN EXILES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been considering all day breaking into the Senate debate for the insertion in the RECORD of an article published in this morning's Washington Post entitled "U.S. Rejects Terms Set by Cuban Exile." However, I thought I would wait until the Senate had disposed of the Youth Corps bill. This is the first opportunity I have had to make these very brief remarks on the article.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES REJECTS TERMS SET BY CUBAN EXILE—DEMAND MADE FOR $50 MILLION INVASION FUND

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The row over American policy toward Fidel Castro's Cuba blew up again yesterday with an administration charge that a Cuban exile leader had tried to serve a $50 million ultimatum on the U.S. Government.

Earlier yesterday news dispatches from Miami reported that Jose Miro Cardona was offering his resignation as president of the Cuban Revolutionary Council in token of a clash with the Kennedy administration over Cuban policy.

A few hours later the State Department said publicly that while the administration and Miro Cardona had seen eye to eye on the goal of a free Cuba they were not in accord on steps to attain that goal.

EXILE LEADER'S DEMAND

Almost simultaneously U.S. Government officials reported that Miro Cardona had made what they said amounted to an ultimatum to the United States: either give him $50 million to train and equip an exile army to invade Cuba or give him an intimate role in the preparation and implementation of an early invasion of Cuba by U.S. forces.

Both parts of the ultimatum, these officials said, were unacceptable to the administration.

The Cuban exile leader was in Washington last week to confer with American officials responsible for Cuban affairs. He returned to Miami last Saturday. He was reported to have spent last weekend preparing a 13-page statement charging the United States with going back on promises to encourage action against the Castro regime.

Many Cuban exile leaders now in the United States were dismayed at President Kennedy's recent firm crackdown on any more hit-and-run attacks on Cuba, including attacks on Soviet ships in Cuban ports. However, there have been differences of opinion among the exiles on how best to harass Castro.

The Presidential crackdown on hit-and-run raids created less of a political reaction within the United States than some administration officials had feared. Yesterday's prompt revelation of Miro Cardona's reported ultimatum may have been designed to cut off further criticism which almost certainly would have followed news of his resignation.

Whether the reported ultimatum will squash a new round of calls for action against Castro, especially from critical Republican Members of Congress, remains to be seen, however.

A spokesman for the Cuban Revolutionary Council in Miami was quoted yesterday by the Associated Press as saying the group will reject Miro Cardona's resignation.

The spokesman said that a four-man delegation from Washington, headed by Robert Hurwitch of the State Department's Cuban Desk, met with Miro Cardona yesterday in an attempt to dissuade him from resigning.

He said the Kennedy crackdown meant that anti-Castro forces now have no more bases in the Bahamas, British islands near Cuba, and he commented that this could have disastrous results for the Cuban underground movement. Britain has cooperated with the United States in the crackdown.

Miro Cardona was the American-picked leader of the combined Cuban exile groups at the time of the April 1961, Bay of Pigs invasion fiasco. He was supposed to go to Cuba and proclaim a free government once the troops won a beachhead. He never got there; instead he was kept incommunicado during the invasion by a Central Intelligence Agency team in a Miami area house.

He has been criticized for being too close to the United States. His resignation apparently was intended to show both his independence and the frustration of many Cuban exiles at the Kennedy crackdown.

The President's position is that the hit-and-run raids cause no real harm to the Castro regime and indeed have a contrary effect by making it more difficult to get Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev to remove the 12,000 to 13,000 Soviet troops still in Cuba.

Mr. Kennedy's critics have implied that he must have made some secret deal with Khrushchev, a charge flatly denied. The new disclosures may add a new round of accusations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the article points out that Jose Miro Cardona, chairman of the Cuban Revolutionary Council, is reported to have made a $50 million ultimatum on the U.S. Government for the financing of another attempt on the part of Cuban exiles to invade Cuba, and thereby at least through the back door—although I think most of us agree it would be through the front door—seek to involve the United States of America in war.

Mr. Cardona happens to be the recipient of a privilege, the recipient of the privilege of being a refugee in this country, an exile, entitled, through the sufferance of the United States, to sanctuary in the United States.

Several days ago on the floor of the Senate I spoke on the subject of Cuban exile attempts to involve us in war. I shall continue to speak about it, as long as there is a group of Cuban exiles in this country who are violating the privilege that we have granted to them, and until all the necessary steps have been taken to hold them responsible and restrict them to their rights of sanctuary in this country.

There is no doubt about what Cardona is up to. He will be satisfied with nothing less than war with Cuba. He will be satisfied with nothing less than American intervention in Cuba, and the sacrifice not only of American boys in that intervention, but also the sacrifice of many thousands of civilians in this country if even a limited war with Cuba comes about. It will not be a limited war.

I repeat what I said the other day, that the decisions on American foreign policy should be made by the United States, not by Mr. Cardona. He has not even been able to unite the Cuban exiles in this country in any united program. They are composed of a host of factions. He has not been able to give them united leadership, although the Cuban Revolutionary Council is reported by the Washington Post as having refused to accept his resignation from the chairmanship of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. It is their privilege to do so if they want to follow that course of action.

Let us take a look at what the article goes on to say:

> The Cuban exile leader was in Washington last week to confer with American officials responsible for Cuban affairs. He returned to Miami last Saturday. He was reported to have spent last weekend preparing a 13-page statement charging the United States with going back on promises to encourage action against the Castro regime.
>
> Many Cuban exile leaders now in the United States were dismayed at President Kennedy's recent firm crackdown on any more hit-and-run attacks on Cuba, including attacks on Soviet ships in Cuban ports. However, there have been differences of opinion among the exiles and how best to harass Castro.

Mr. President, as one American, I am fed up with Cuban exiles attacking American foreign policy while they are here in our country by our suffrance. I am sick and tired of hotheaded Cuban exiles, many of whom are Batistaites. Let us look at the cold, ugly truth.

If a great many of these exiles were put in power in Cuba they would attempt to reestablish a Facist order such as existed under Batista, just as harmful to human rights as the Communist order of Castro. They both are intolerable.

The American people ought to be told that a surprising number of these Cuban exiles are Cuban oligarchs.

In my judgment they were as serious enemies to Cuban democracy while they were there as are the Castroites now. The senior Senator from Oregon has been heard to say before, as far as human rights and human liberties and civil liberties are concerned, that there is no difference between a Fascist and a Communist.

Be that as it may, I say the time has came to make clear to the Cardonas that if they do not like it here, they should get out. It is time to lay down the American policy that if they continue to attempt to interfere with and intervene in American foreign policy, they must be deported. The sooner the Cardonas are deported, the better, if they are going to take the position that they will violate their so-called sanctuary in this country by preparing a 13-page attack on the President of the United States. It is about time that we make clear to them who is the Commander in Chief of American foreign policy. It is about time that Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, make clear to the President that we are united when it comes to the matter of interference and intervention on the part of a group of foreigners, to whom we have given sanctuary on our soil in order to save their very lives from Castro assassination, if they were still in Cuba.

As one member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I once again serve notice on the Cuban exiles that I will not hesitate to speak out against what I consider to be their illegal course of action in this country in violation of their sanctuary and their rights of refuge, when they persist in attacking the foreign policy of the United States.

It is about time to tell them that while they are in this country they must keep their mouths shut, and stop their efforts to get us into war, or they must get out of this country.

I say to my President again, as I said the other day, when these exiles hold some of their press conferences, as they did when some of these exiles came back from an attack on a Russian ship the other day, that they ought to be met by U.S. marshals and thrown into jail until they can be deported. They have no right under international law while they are in this country to seek to intervene in American foreign policy.

That is for Americans to determine, not for the Cuban exiles. That goes for Mr. Cardona and for all the rest of the Cuban exiles, as well.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MAINE LEGISLATURE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], I present, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing Congress to extend the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to some point located on the northern boundary of the State of Maine.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works; and, under the rule, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF MAINE

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to extend the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to some point located on the northern boundary of the State of Maine

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 101st legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

Whereas it has been recognized that the Nation's economy and the Nation's security require the construction of a National System of Intertsate and Defense Highways; and

Whereas the primary responsibility for construction of such a system rests in the Federal Government; and

Whereas the objective is to complete the presently designated national system by 1972; and

Whereas the people of Maine through appropriate action have deemed it essential that the highways of this State be integrated into the Interstate and Defense System; and

Whereas the Department of Defense of the U.S. Government has extensive defense installations in northern Aroostook County; namely, Loring Air Force Base located in Limestone, Maine, and supplemental installations to this base also located in the general area of northern Aroostook County, in the State of Maine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, recommend and urge to the Congress of the United States that appropriate action be taken to require the Department of Commerce through the Bureau of Public Roads to relocate the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to some point on the northern boundary of the State of Maine which would more adequately serve the more heavily populated areas of central and northern Aroostook County and would provide additional highway facilities for defense installations in northern Aroostook County; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A joint resolution was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution designating the corn tassel as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

DESIGNATION OF THE CORN TASSEL AS THE NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators LONG of Missouri, and MCCARTHY, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to have the corn tassel designated as the national floral emblem. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and that it lie on the desk until the end of business on April 24, 1963, for additional cosponsors.

Mr. President, the recent warm weather seems to have stirred the hearts of those people who would have the United States adopt as a floral emblem flowers which are neither native to our great Nation nor productive to its great economy. While I love all flowers and have no negative attitude toward any of them, I do believe that the United States should adopt as its national floral emblem the corn tassel, the unique symbol of America in all its strength and beauty.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 69) designating the corn tassel as the national floral emblem of the United States, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas for more than three and one-half centuries from the birth of the United States, through the development of the Thirteen Colonies and the stern years of the Revolutionary War, to the prospering of all parts of this great land, corn and corn products have helped build the United States; and

Whereas in the Nation's Capital recognitions of and tributes to our wonderful American plant have been carved in marble, the cornstalk columns, first decoration in our Capitol, placed there by order of President Jefferson; the thirty ears of corn carved in pink granite on the Lincoln Memorial testifying to the thirty frugal years of the Emancipator's early life during which he was nourished by corn; and

Whereas in the White House a further tribute to corn is to be seen on President Harrison's china, bordered with gold sprays of the corn plant; and

Whereas corn with its myriad byproducts has built vast industrial plants, great schools of learning, costly temples of worship, and has given employment to countless millions of men and women; and

Whereas our national floral emblem should be distinctively and wholly American, and corn is native to our Nation; and

Whereas since 1607 corn has been rooted in the very fabric of the United States, and it is as significant and distinctive as our flag and as necessary to and as much a part of our Nation as the air we breathe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the corn tassel, the floral element of corn, is hereby further honored and is hereby designated as the national floral emblem of the United States, and the President is requested to declare such fact by proclamation.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 11, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Imperative Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater problem facing the Nation and the world today than the prospect of unlimited nuclear proliferation. The continuing arms race already presents a grim and foreboding picture, and as the nuclear club expands the balance of terror becomes ever more precarious.

President Kennedy, in his March 21, 1963, press conference, said:

> Personally I am haunted by the feeling that by 1970, unless we are successful, there may be 10 nuclear powers instead of 4, and by 1975, 15 or 20. With all the history of war, and the human race's history has been a good deal more war than peace, with nuclear weapons distributed all through the world, and available, and the strong reluctance of any people to accept defeat, I see the possibility in the 1970's of the President of the United States having to face a world in which 15 or 20 or 25 nations may have these weapons. I regard that as the greatest possible danger and hazard.

The road to an effective treaty banning nuclear testing and to a meaningful program of arms control and reduction is without question difficult. We are confronted with opponents who are all too often intransigent. But I believe that we must persevere in our efforts to secure such a treaty.

As a distinguished group of American scientists reported in an open letter appearing in this morning's Washington Post:

> Careful studies by the formost experts in the United States and by the President's advisers on national security, including those in the Defense Department, have furnished the conclusion that the risk of continuing the arms race without a test ban treaty is considerably more than the risk that such a treaty might be violated by secret testing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this very thoughtful letter and the excellent article by Mr. Max Freedman, which appeared recently in the Washington Post, deserve our attention, and I commend them to our colleagues for their consideration.

The letter and article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1963]

A Communication: Statement on the Test-Ban Treaty

In view of recent controversy concerning the desirability of concluding a nuclear test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union, we wish to make the following statement in support of the efforts of the U.S. Government to conclude such a treaty as soon as it can be negotiated.

Our primary reason for support lies in the fact that a test-ban treaty is in the best interests of the United States and of world peace. A treaty would reduce the speed of the present arms race, inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear powers, reduce the likelihood of nuclear war, and prevent the extension of the hazards of fallout. We therefore commend the President of the United States for his sincere attempt to reach a workable agreement with the Soviet Union on a test ban, and urge that Members of the U.S. Congress and of the general public consider the question of the test-ban treaty in the light of scientific fact and rational argument rather than in terms of partisan politics.

Unfortunately, public debate on the issue has been confused in recent weeks by some Members of Congress and by public figures who have attacked the test-ban treaty by spreading a completely false view of the test-ban situation. They also would appear to be operating on the fallacious assumption that American security can best be maintained by unlimited development of our nuclear weapons capability no matter what the other nations may be free to do in this regard. The attackers have failed to recognize the clear fact that once the overkill capabilities of the Soviet Union and the United States have reached their present level, and hardened missile bases are in place, making a successful disarming attack impossible for either side, an increase in nuclear capacity by one side or the other does not upset the balance of deterrence.

DETERRENCE REMAINS

Even though we probably possess between three to eight times as much intercontinental nuclear weapons capability as the Soviet Union, we would still have little chance of escaping an incredibly destructive retaliation were we to strike first with our strategic force. Since the smaller Soviet force is enough to deter us from a nuclear attack on the Soviets, a considerable change in force levels would still leave us with more than sufficient force to deter the Soviets from making a nuclear attack on us.

The opponents of the test ban treaty also base their argument on the fallacious assumption that any attempt on our part to negotiate with the Soviet Union means that we are taking a soft political line and making dangerous concessions. The treaty opponents therefore consider any lowering of the number of onsite inspections by the United States simply as a sign of weakness and of yielding to the advantage of the Soviet Union, rather than as realistic negotiation to improve national security. In fact, during the period since the testban discussions began in 1958, detection techniques have been rapidly improving and may be expected to improve still further. It is now possible to detect many of the explosions within a given country by stations outside that country, and the number of onsite inspections required for checking the identification of earthquakes versus explosions has been greatly reduced. Research has also shown that there are many fewer earthquakes in the Soviet Union than was formerly thought, thus making a reduction in the possibility of their being confused with nuclear tests.

The strategy of the opponents of a treaty is to exaggerate the risks of clandestine testing and to minimize the risks of a continuing nuclear arms race. Among the most flagrant violations of fact which they have publicized in these matters are the recent statements by Dr. Edward Teller that a test ban agreement "would be virtually unpoliced" and "would not interfere with Russian progress," and Senator DODD's claim that the test ban policy of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations "has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets."

MISSTATEMENT CHARGED

In making this claim, Senator DODD is completely misstating the facts as set forth by responsible Department of Defense officials. If the Soviets learned more than we did in the 1961–62 testing and narrowed the gap between us, it was because they had more to learn. There is every reason to believe that they would have narrowed the gap even more rapidly had there not been a moratorium and had there been continuous testing on both sides after 1958. Conversely, if we had been able to conclude a test ban treaty in 1959, the Russian tests of 1961–62 would not have taken place and we would still have our great superiority of nuclear weapons technology. By no stretch of the imagination could these tests have been carried out secretly underground.

The direct advantages to the United States of a test ban treaty are these:

1. Dependable assurance that no atmospheric testing, which is the really important kind, is taking place.

2. Reasonable assurance that underground testing of small nuclear weapons is not taking place.

What assurance do we have that in the event of a test ban treaty the Soviet Union would not conduct secret underground tests?

Even though a single small test might be concealed by being confused with an earthquake if the test were conducted in a region of frequent earthquake occurrences, any significance series of tests would be almost impossible to conceal.

RISK IS EMPHASIZED

It is extremely unlikely that the Soviet Union would be willing to risk the breakdown of the treaty for the marginal gain they might achieve by testing explosions small enough to escape detection. It is important to recall that American nuclear weapons experts insisted that underground testing was of little value for military purposes when, in 1961, our testing was temporarily limited to underground explosions. We have additional assurance in the fact that the Soviet Union has agreed to three onsite inspections should suspicious indications of underground testing be discovered by the detection system of the United States and the United Kingdom, and is willing to permit a number of automatic seismic stations on Soviet territory.

The Soviets surprised us by starting big atmospheric tests in 1961 when we thought at that time they would continue negotiations for a test-ban treaty. The opponents of a present treaty now claim that this means the Soviets broke a test ban agreement in 1961. On this basis they warn against entering another agreement. It is too often forgotten that there was no test ban agreement (much less a treaty) in 1961; and that President Eisenhower on December 29, 1959, terminated the 1-year informal moratorium by announcing, "The voluntary moratorium on testing will expire on December 31." Even though the Soviets and most other nations have broken treaties, a test ban treaty would be very different from a mere cessation of tests, particularly if adhered to by an increasing number of nations, because it would be in the interest of the United States and the Soviet Union to abide by it. To be on the safe side, our developments and preparations would continue as far as possible without testing, and there should be no doubt that American testing would be resumed if the Soviets should break the treaty by again resuming tests in the atmosphere.

Even if the treaty should be abrogated after a time or should fail to develop into a world test ban because of the recalcitrance of France or China, it would not have interfered with our nuclear development appreciably more than the Soviet. The treaty would emphasize above all the common interest of the United States and the Soviet Union in trying to avoid nuclear war.

In summary, the test ban treaty, as proposed, will stop atmospheric testing as long as the treaty is in effect. It will leave some uncertainty about very small tests (one ten-thousandth the size of the H-bomb) but could reasonably be expected to deter the Soviets from even small-scale cheating (a) because it would teach them relatively little, (b) because of the serious risk of being caught and (c) because there are good reasons for the Soviets to want the treaty to function.

Careful studies by the foremost experts in the United States and by the President's advisers on national security, including those in the Defense Department, have furnished the conclusion that the risk of continuing the arms race without a test-ban treaty is considerably more than the risk that such a treaty might be violated by secret testing. We support the President in this conclusion and believe that once the Members of Congress and the people of the United States are aware of the realities of our present situation and of the facts of the test-ban case, that they too will support the President in his effort to find answers to the greatest question before the world today, the question of survival.

> Dr. Bernard Feld, Department of Physics, MIT; Dr. David Inglis, Argonne National Laboratories, Argonne, Ill.; Dr. James Watson, Department of Biology, Harvard University; Dr. Bruno Rossi, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, MIT; Dr. Donald Glaser, Department of Physics, University of California; Dr. Hans Bethe, Department of Physics, Cornell University; Dr. Freeman Dyson, Institute of Advanced Studies, Princeton University; Dr. Francis Low, Department of Physics, MIT; Dr. K. T. Bainbridge, Department of Physics, Harvard University.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 1963]

In Perspective: Humphrey and Disarmament

(By Max Freedman)

Without Senator Humphrey the debate on disarmament would proceed against hopeless odds. He has been President Kennedy's chief supporter in Congress for a prudent and responsible treaty. When Mr. Eisenhower was President he gave the same kind of courageous support to a Republican administration. It is not the least of his merits that he believes that disarmament, like defense policy, should be above mere partisan skirmishing. In view of this record he is entitled to a thoughtful hearing when he makes a major statement on the disarmament negotiations at Geneva.

Yet this careful examination of his proposals is precisely what has been lacking. It almost seems as if the cynical principle is being followed of ignoring Senator Humphrey's points because one cannot answer them. Some time ago he delivered an elaborately documented analysis of the disarmament deadlock but his address met with little response in the Senate and with only scattered attention in the country. This surely is shabby treatment for a Senator who is carrying the lonely burden of protecting the public interest in a safeguarded disarmament treaty.

It may therefore be some contribution to the public debate if one summarizes the main points which Senator Humphrey is now making.

He points out that in 1958 it was the belief of both Russian and American scientists that there would have to be an international inspection system with about 180 control posts, of which 19 would be in the Soviet Union. It would have taken between 4 to 6 years to install this system; scores of international technicians would have been included in the project; the system would have cost $2 billion to build and several hundred million dollars a year to maintain. Today no such system needs to be established at all.

The United States, like Russia, can now identify nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space. If Russia would agree to a treaty outlawing such tests, the risks of successful evasion or cheating would form no problem. The real concern is with tests conducted underground where they may be harder to detect or may be confused with earthquakes.

Senator Humphrey reports that in the past 5 years the United States has greatly improved its ability to identify earthquakes in Russia. It is a generous figure to suggest that these unidentified occurrences in any one year will be "only a few dozen at most." Under the British-American treaty each of these mysterious events would be subject to inspection. From a scientific or technical standpoint, the problem of security is wholly manageable. Russia would soon learn this fact if it were willing to give the proposed treaty a fair trial.

Senator Humphrey asked the Kennedy administration to make available the results of studies of underground events in Russia from 1958 through 1962. He has quoted "a competent administration official in whom I repose the highest confidence" as saying that the United States has the present ability to monitor a test ban agreement with full safeguards for American security.

Under these new arrangements it would be necessary to supplement these monitoring devices by inspections inside Russia carried out by inspectors who could be accompanied by Soviet observers. The inspected area would be small and would be located by using the records of at least four detection stations. There would be no more than seven inspections each year. The treaty would lapse and the United States would be free to resume its tests if Russia refused to agree to any suggested inspection or was caught in a secret test.

Since the 1960 campaign Mr. Kennedy has shown much more eagerness than the general public to reach a disarmament agreement with Russia, above all on a test ban treaty. The public has tended to view the Geneva talks with resigned apathy as a meaningless charade. Yet all the time hard-working and often misunderstood officials have been closing the gap between the Russian and American positions, while always striving for a treaty that would be endorsed by two-thirds of the Senate. It is high time that we realize that American public indifference is very helpful to Russia in resisting a treaty. For Russia can twist and equivocate at Geneva without being called to account by a bored American press.

Tax Cut and Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, let us face it. J.F.K.'s program for tax cut and deficit spending to avoid a business slump is nothing less than an admission of bankruptcy.

After 2 years in the White House he says that we can no longer pay our way and keep the economy rolling. Since the taxing end of the tax-and-spend philosophy has become politically unpopular, his plan obviously is to write off the debt through inflation—just about 10 percent the first year.

Here we are in peacetime, a creditor nation, with gross national product at its historical peak, with more people employed at higher wages than ever before anywhere, and now he tells us that we can no longer pay our way, and he wants to start the printing presses.

If the country is not insolvent, then where is the bankruptcy, except in the minds of the inexperienced idea men in the White House?

SOS: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in January of last year the bipartisan Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, authorized in the 85th Congress, issued its comprehensive report entitled "Outdoor Recreation for America." Most of us are aware of the outstanding job done by the Commission and its staff in preparing this report.

The Commission was headed by Chairman Laurance S. Rockefeller and included as members several of our distinguished colleagues in this and the other body. All Americans have reason to be thankful to the Commission for its thorough and excellent analysis of what must be done to insure recreation opportunities for our citizens.

As the letter of transmittal for the report points out:

> The report surveys our country's outdoor recreation resources, measures present and likely demands upon them over the next 40 years and recommends actions to insure their availability to all Americans of present and future generations.

As the junior Senator from a State which possesses an abundance of outdoor recreation resources, I congratulate the Commission for its outstanding contribution to the discussion of recreation needs of our citizens.

I have studied the ORRRC report carefully and find myself in complete agreement with respect to many of the recommendations it contains. Several of the important proposals before this Congress follow the recommendations of the report. One of its recommendations—one with which I am immediately concerned—has to do with routing of highways and the effect on recreation resources.

Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to recommendation 8-13 regarding highways on page 136 of the ORRRC report. It states:

> Federal and State Governments should give explicit recognition to recreation values in the planning and design of highways.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the ORRRC report statement supporting this recommendation be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HIGHWAYS

> Recommendation 8-13: Federal and State governments should give explicit recognition to recreation values in the planning and design of highways.
>
> Mobility is a key factor affecting outdoor recreation. Routing, design, extent, and capacity of highways exert profound influences on the kind and location of pressures brought to bear on recreation resources.
>
> Through a number of programs, the Federal Government is concerned with the construction of every major road in the Nation. These programs, which collectively involve large sums of Federal money each year, strongly influence the availability of recreation opportunities. Yet with the single exception of the billboard provision of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, there is no formal consideration of outdoor recreation values in any Federal legislation concerned with financing and constructing the Nation's roads.
>
> Highway policies thus far have been directed primarily toward the accommodation of greater speeds and larger volumes of traffic. While the design and location of roads for efficient and safe transportation is clearly of high priority, other considerations merit recognition. Travel to reach outdoor recreation facilities is a major use of many of our highways. Roads and highways are multiple-use structures serving a variety of public purposes, and outdoor recreation is an important one of these purposes. Wherever feasible, provision should be made for such compatible recreation opportunities as hiking, bicycling, and picnicking. In some cases, highway fills can serve as dams to impound water for recreation purposes.
>
> New highway design should take esthetic considerations into account. Wherever possible, highways constructed along any body of water should be so designed as not to impair recreation values. Additional measures should be adopted to prohibit objectionable developments from marring roadside scenery.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has pointed out that, with one exception, there is no formal consideration of outdoor recreation values in any Federal legislation concerned with financing and constructing the Nation's roads. This is in spite of the fact that the Federal Government is involved in one way or another in construction of nearly every major highway in this country.

Mr. President, the recommendation of the ORRRC report substantiates what many people have been saying for years, that highway construction is damaging some of this country's finest recreation resources. With this problem in mind, I introduced S. 2767 in the 87th Congress. The bill died in the Committee on Public Works with the adjournment of the Congress last fall.

Early in the current session of Congress I introduced, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and myself, an identical bill which has been designated S. 468 and referred to the Committee on Public Works. Since S. 468 was first introduced, two more of our colleagues, the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] and the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], have joined in cosponsoring the bill.

S. 468, known as the S O S—save our streams—bill, proposes amendment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act to require approval of the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with appropriate State agencies, of plans and specification for Federal-aid highway construction. The bill is designed to help protect fish, wildlife, and recreation resources from damage due to such highway construction.

Mr. President, adoption of S. 468 would represent a big step in the direction recommended by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. The bill would give "explicit recognition to recreation values in the planning and design of highways," as recommended in the ORRRC report.

I have taken the floor many times in the last 2 years in support of this bill. The Congressional Record has carried literally dozens of articles, editorials, statements, letters, and other supporting materials from all parts of the country.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to study this problem as it relates to their own States. When they have thoroughly considered the arguments for and aganist S. 468, I am sure they will decide, as I have, that legislation is desperately needed in this area to help protect what remains of our once abundant fish, wildlife, and recreation resources.

Part 15: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Castro and Cuba (February 1, 1963–February 7, 1963)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part of my chronology could be termed the "confessional" because various Government officials now began confessing that things had taken place in the Cuban affairs which the public had already learned of through other public statements.

For example, on February 1, Secretary of State Dean Rusk conceded there was indeed a "significant Soviet military presence in Cuba which is of great concern to the United States." Although not news to many, this nevertheless made it official.

Senator Strom Thurmond—southern Democrat—now entered the controversy by statements in a newsletter home as to the military buildup in Cuba. He gave a figure of between 30,000 to 40,000 troops in Cuba, under command of a Soviet general. Secretary Rusk had stated there were 16,000 Soviet troops in Cuba. Pentagon "spokesmen" declared the Senator's information was at wide variance with U.S. intelligence data—and suggested they would appreciate the Senator providing proof of his statements. Although ignoring the challenge he did not change his estimates—instead announced there was between 100 and 200 ballistic missiles, with ranges of up to 2,200 miles, still in Cuba. Pentagon "spokesmen" countered with a statement that there was no evidence of such ballistic missiles in Cuba, and neither was there any evidence of nuclear warheads. Neither won the argument—and neither gave an inch. However, no one cried "partisan politics" for the obvious reason that the Senator was a majority party member.

An Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs also conceded in a television appearance that it was possible Russian troop strength in Cuba was 10 times what it was before the missile crisis in October—but explained the discrepancy in figures by claiming original estimates had undoubtedly been faulty.

Senator Stennis, whose subcommittee was to investigate the Soviet buildup in Cuba, called for a firm, hard policy in dealing with Soviets in Cuba—and was joined in this by various majority party members, and others.

Congressman Donald Bruce, of Indiana, announced that the Soviets had originally sent 82 to 88 medium-range ballistic missiles to Cuba, which meant obviously that since 42 had been removed, almost that same number still remained as a threat to our security. This, too, was promptly disputed.

Several majority and minority party members now took turns making public statements on how bad the situation really was in Cuba—always being swiftly contradicted by Pentagon "spokesmen" and others.

The now famous "eat your hat" offer was made to Secretary McNamara by Senator Keating. The Secretary accepted the challenge, although admitting he did not really own a hat but would be glad to provide one since he meant to refute the Senators statements. He then made his unprecedented appearance on a nationwide television hookup—on orders of the President—and tried to prove by aerial photographs of missile sites that there were dismantled sites and the missiles sent back to Soviet Russia.

Everyone was admonished to "keep our heads" by the President, and when a reporter sympathetically asked what the administration could now do to convince Republican critics that the Russians had withdrawn all offensive weapons the American public gave a collective snort of derision because it was now obvious the administration was having as much, if not more, trouble convincing members of its own party that this was true.

Which all goes to prove that our beloved Will Rogers was wrong when he said:

> There is no more independence in politics than there is in jail.

A Selected Chronology on Cuba [1]—February 1, 1963 to February 28, 1963

February 1, 1963:

Secretary of State Dean Rusk conceded that there was a "significant Soviet military presence in Cuba which is of great concern to the United States."

---

[1] Unless otherwise stated excerpted from the Washington Post and the Washington Star; reproduced with the permission of the Washington Post and Washington Star.

In his news conference, the Secretary of State did not depart from earlier administration estimates of the strength of Soviet military personnel in Cuba.

He said the 16,000 Soviet troops there are something "which this entire Hemisphere must be concerned about." He added that he does not believe there has been a recent significant buildup of any major proportions in Cuba.

Sharply different views and figures on the military situation in Cuba were given by Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina.

Senator THURMOND said there are reliable estimates that between 30,000 and 40,000 troops in Cuba are under command of a Soviet general. A Pentagon spokesman contradicted the statement.

"Behind the brush curtain around Cuba is a formidable Soviet strategic military base," THURMOND said in weekly newsletter to constituents.

He listed an array of missiles, bombers and other armament which he said "indicates the presence of a complete Soviet army, and the inventory normally assigned to a Soviet air army."

A few hours after THURMOND made the remarks public, a Pentagon spokesman told newsmen:

"The information contained in Senator THURMOND's weekly newsletter is at wide variance with carefully evaluated data collected by U.S. intelligence from continued surveillance and other sources.

"The information obtained by our intelligence has been and is being made public to the extent it does not comprise intelligence sources.

"If Senator THURMOND has proof of any kind to support the information he has released, which differs from official intelligence information, the Department of Defense would like to receive the evidence."

THURMOND made public his estimates without identifying his sources. The size of the Soviet force which he said is under command of Gen. C. O. Slakenzo is at least double the 16,000 to 17,000 Soviet military personnel President Kennedy said are still in Cuba.

The Pentagon spokesman contradicted the Senator's figure of 30,000 to 40,000 Russian troops and took issue with his statement that there are in Cuba missiles with ranges up to 2,200 miles.

THURMOND's statement that there are between 100 and 200 ballistic missiles with ranges up to 2,200 miles was countered with Pentagon insistence that "there is no evidence of any ballistic missiles."

The spokesman also said "we have no evidence of any nuclear warheads."

February 2, 1963:

Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, charged the Defense Department with being less than frank about the size of the arsenal.

Brushing aside a Pentagon challenge to supply data on his claim that the island is fast becoming a strategic base for increased Soviet troops and missiles, THURMOND said in a statement:

"The business of gradually and reluctantly admitting more and more Soviet power in Cuba can never bring about a facing up to the situation as it is now.

"Even if the latest admissions by the Defense Department represented all that is in Cuba—which they don't—the most serious questions are raised about our security and our policy on Cuba."

In a newsletter to constituents, THURMOND said he had learned from reliable sources that Cuba is a formidable Soviet strategic base with ballistic missiles and 30,000 to 40,000 troops. A Pentagon spokesman disputed the report.

February 3, 1963:

The United States may be forced to demand that Russia pull its troops out of Cuba just as it demanded that the Soviets remove their offensive missiles and bombers, Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat of Mississippi, stated.

STENNIS, who heads a Senate subcommittee that will investigate the Soviet buildup, made the statement as the Government prepared to issue a new crackdown against foreign shippers engaged in trade with Cuba.

An order that may be issued soon will bar U.S. Government cargoes to shipowners whose vessels have traded with Cuba since January 1. Shippers could free themselves from the ban by removing their vessels from the Cuban trade.

In another development a little more light was thrown on the activities of Soviet troops in Cuba last night by Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. He said in a television interview that the Government believes some of the troops are helping to build "defensive facilities and storage facilities" for the Cuban armed forces.

Martin, appearing on the Howard K. Smith program (WMAL–TV, ABC) said it was possible that Russian troop strength is now 10 times what it was before the missile crisis in October.

Immediately after the crisis, the administration said Russia had between 7,000 and 8,000 troops in Cuba. Officials have said the number is now between 16,000 and 17,000.

"I don't think our figure for last July is accurate enough for me to be sure that it would be 10 times, but I think that this is within the range of possibility," Martin said.

STENNIS, in a separate radio-television interview, said that intelligence data suggested that the Soviet buildup was designed in part to promote "blackmail, subversion, intimidation, threats of coercion, and even an invasion" of smaller countries in the hemisphere.

STENNIS' Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is undertaking an investigation of the Soviet buildup.

"I want to get all the facts, but with this formidable strength, I think we must have a hard, firm policy about it—convince them we are going to be hard about it," he said. "It could lead to the proposition that we'd have to make demands for this force as we did for the missiles and bombers.

He said the subcommittee would try to find out whether the missiles and bombers that Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev purportedly removed from Cuba last October "are really gone."

STENNIS said he hoped to make public "basic facts" developed by his subcommittee. He added that "without anyone being accused of wrongdoing," the people have not been told all the facts.

"I think we ought to have a hearing so that there will be congressional information as well as that for the people," STENNIS said. He said he expects the sessions to start with testimony from Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Director of of Central Intelligence on Soviet strength in Cuba.

February 4, 1963:

Representative DONALD C. BRUCE, Republican of Indiana, declared in a House speech that diplomats of friendly governments have informed the State Department that Russia originally sent 82 to 88 medium-range ballistic missiles to the Red-controlled island and removed only 42 of them.

The Defense Department promptly disputed the statement, declaring:

"No friendly government has so informed the United States. There remains no credible evidence that there are offensive Soviet weapons in Cuba."

Senator KEATING, in a copyrighted interview published in the U.S. News & World Report, reiterated his charge that Russia is "continuing to maintain medium-range missile sites" in Cuba and is working at some of them around the clock.

He also declared that there are "20,000 or more" Russians in Cuba, including 6,000 to 8,000 combat troops.

Two other Members of Congress contributed to the mounting pressure for tougher administration action in Cuba. Representative AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Republican of Michigan, introduced a resolution calling upon President Kennedy to clear Cuba of all foreign Communist armed forces by whatever means required.

And Representative PAUL ROGERS, Democrat of Florida, asked in a House speech for "effective action" instead of "timid overtures" to end the Communist menace in Cuba.

The Associated Presss quoted McNamara as saying that five types of Russian defensive missiles "undoubtedly are stocked in Cuba."

The five types listed by McNamara were: "(1) Air defense missiles; (2) air-to-air missiles used by fighters to attack other fighters; (3) surface-to-sea missiles used for coastal defense purposes; (4) missiles for coastal purposes fired from patrol-type boats; and (5) ground-to-ground missiles for short-range use against troops in the field."

Meanwhile, the State Department clarified a statement by Assistant Secretary of State Edwin Martin that there might have been a tenfold increase in the number of troops in Cuba since last summer. It declared that Martin meant 10 times the estimate of 1,500 Soviet technicians believed to have been on the island in July.

February 5, 1963:

The United States is moving to tighten up its Cuban policy as the controversy over the extent of the Soviet military buildup continues.

The administration is acting in two ways:

1. Original measures to discourage shipping to Cuba announced in October before the missile crisis will be strengthened and implemented immediately.

2. Brigade 2506, which invaded Cuba in April 1961, will not be supported as a unit by Washington. Members will be encouraged to join Cuban units attached to American forces.

Under a four-point shipping restriction plan announced by the United States about 4 months ago:

1. American ports will be shut to the vessels of any country whose ships carry arms to Cuba.

2. U.S. Government cargoes will be denied to the vessels of any firm whose vessels are employed in Cuba-Communist bloc trade.

3. U.S. shipowners will be prohibited from engaging in Cuban trade.

Secretary McNamara was reported to have told the House Armed Services Committee that statements by lawmakers questioning Defense Department information about the Soviet military establishment in Cuba were "disgraceful" and "irresponsible."

Representative STRATTON charged that Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, "has been guilty of disgraceful irresponsibility in his frantic efforts to get headlines by pretending he knows more about what is going on in Cuba today than do the properly designated intelligence agencies of our Department of Defense."

Senator HUMPHREY, in calling for public hearings, said that Senator KEATING and other Members of Congress unnecessarily created doubt and suspicion by making accusations before giving their information to the CIA.

Simultaneously, Senator DIRKSEN supported charges that Soviet offensive missiles remain hidden in Cuba despite administration denials.

February 6, 1963:

MIAMI (Associated Press).—Manuel Artime, leader of the anti-Castro brigade in the

Cuban invasion, said that U.S. military personnel soon will begin training members of the brigade, liberated last Christmas from Cuban prisons.

Artime, in a news conference at his home, said the training would be voluntary and that 1,400 to 1,500 members of Brigade 2506 had been invited to take part.

He said the training by the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force would last 6 to 8 months. It would be conducted at different sites within the United States, according to the type of training.

February 6, 1963:

The United States prohibited foreign-flag ships that trade with Cuba from carrying U.S. Government-financed goods, in an initial step to tighten the free-world economic boycott of that country.

The ban, a White House announcement said, would apply to vessels that have engaged in Cuban trade since January 1, through foreign shipowners who promise to refrain from conducting such trade in the future will be allowed to share in U.S. Government trade.

Already in effect is an edict prohibiting U.S. shipowners from shipping strategic materials to Cuba.

February 6, 1963:

Both the Defense Department and Central Intelligence Agency presented detailed intelligence data and aerial photography to support administration statements that no offensive Soviet weapons remain in Cuba.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara appeared before an extraordinary, 2-hour news conference carried on radio and television to lay out his evidence and submit to questioning by reporters.

Under reporters' questioning, McNamara said he believed that the Russians moved nuclear warheads into Cuba during last fall's missile buildup. But he said that "we observed" the shipment of the vehicles believed to have had A-warheads out of Cuba and back to the Soviet Union.

Earlier in the day, John A. McCone, Director of the CIA, appeared before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee behind closed doors to present the full top-secret intelligence picture on the Russian military situation in Cuba.

A censored version of McCone's statement summarized the same data about the Soviet military force in Cuba that was given in greater detail by McNamara and an aide at the news conference.

The unprecedented presentation of intelligence data, including both high and low-level photographs of Cuban bases and ports, was made by McNamara in the State Department auditorium.

The lengthy intelligence briefing and question-and-answer session were ordered by President Kennedy.

For well over an hour, John Hughes, a top official of the Pentagon's Defense Intelligency Agency, presented slides giving data on the Russian weapons in Cuba, and showing aerial photographs of missile sites, airfields, ports and weapon-laden Soviet ships on the high seas.

The long series of remarkably clear photos traced the early buildup of Russian forces on the island late last summer and fall, and revealed the progress of dismantling the offensive missile bases, the loading of missiles and bombers aboard Soviet ships and their movement back to Russia.

Hughes' commentary also told how the Air Force and Navy reconnaissance planes followed the offensive weapons on trucks along the roads and into the ports. He listed what missiles left on which ships from named ports on specific days.

Other photographs showed the buildup of the defense weapons still remaining—Mig–21 fighters, beach defense areas with antiwarship missiles, SA–2 antiaircraft missiles and the military camps of four Soviet Army armored units, with the latest Russian weapons.

McNamara said the United States has a record of the missiles observed in Cuba and that the exact number has been recorded being removed. He also declared that the entire island was photographed and that only 42 offensive ballistic missiles were located and that they were observed being shipped back to Russia.

The Secretary was reminded that Senate Republican Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, has said that the aerial photography would not show what missiles may be in caves in Cuba. McNamara said it is "unlikely beyond any reasonable doubt" that such weapons could have been unloaded and stored underground.

McNamara seemed to differ a bit from McCone in his appraisal of the reliability of aerial reconnaissance to reveal what is going on in Cuba. The CIA Chief said yesterday that absolute assurance that no missiles are stored in caves can come only from "continuing, penetrating on-site inspection."

The Pentagon leader said aerial reconnaissance would not provide completely reliable data on the number of Soviet troops in Cuba, but that he was satisfied it showed what weapons are there.

KEATING called a new conference before the McNamara appearance to answer questions and propound a long list of questions he felt the Secretary should answer. He also stressed that the 1,100-mile medium-range ballistic missile sites in Cuba were "still in place."

The New York Senator offered to eat his hat in front of the Capitol if McNamara could refute this statement. McNamara was asked about this after photographs described as dismantled IRBM sites were put on the screen.

"I don't have a hat, but I hope he does because he is going to have to eat it on the basis of the evidence we have presented today," said the Secretary.

KEATING later said he had no intention of eating his hat, as McNamara had not satisfied him.

McNamara told reporters that the evidence showed that 5,000 of the 22,000 Russian troops in Cuba last October left when the missiles and bombers were withdrawn.

Remaining in the hands of 17,000 Soviet troops, he said, are: some 24 operational antiaircraft missile sites, each with 6 launchers and a total of 500 missiles; about 42 Mig–21 fighters and 60 other Mig's; 4 operational coastal defense missile sites with 150 missiles; 12 Komar guided-missile patrol boats; 4 armored groups with a total strength of about 5,000 men.

Newsmen wanted to know why these were ruled "defensive," as the question of whether they are for offense or defense depends on intent.

The Secretary said there were no amphibious ships in Cuba able to move any such small force to other countries in this hemisphere. He also declared that the Mig–21's were not now adapted to carry A-weapons, and if they were they would have only enough range to bomb the tip of Florida.

McNamara said he had no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries. He also declared that there is positive evidence that no Russian submarine bases have been built there.

As the conference ended, a reporter asked McNamara whether the newsmen should conclude from his comments that Cuba has become less of a threat, rather than more, in recent weeks.

"Cuba is a lessening military threat to the extent that the military personnel of the Soviet Union and their equipment are being removed," he replied.

"Five thousand Soviet military personnel have moved out in the last 8 or 9 weeks, and there appears to be some continuing movement out. What the future holds, I can't say."

February 7, 1963:

President Kennedy assured the Nation that the Soviet Union's forces and weapons in Cuba are not a military threat to the United States.

He was talking at a news conference about the Cuban situation as it is at the moment. Refusing to prophesy about the future, he said, it could not be proved that the Russians won't again try to ship nuclear missiles to the island.

"The Soviet Union and Cuba and the United States must all be aware that this will produce the greatest crisis which the world has faced in its history.

"So I think that the Soviet Union will proceed with caution and care, and I think we should."

Mr. Kennedy, backing up a statement by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, said the Russians have reduced the size of their forces and the amount of their equipment since the pull-out of missiles and bombers last fall.

He said it was a time to "keep our heads," that Premier Fidel Castro has been "discredited" in recent months and that the United States and the Soviet Union are continuing talks about the removal of Russian forces and weapons from Cuba. He indicated that the United States had no present thought of an invasion of Cuba.

"You have said that the presence of Russian forces on the island is a matter of concern," a reporter said. "I would like to ask this question: Do you think that Cuba is a serious military threat to the United States?"

"I think we ought to keep a sense of proportion about the size of the force we are talking about," Mr. Kennedy replied, adding that the Russians had about 4 organized military groups in Cuba, totaling about 6,000 men.

"Obviously," he continued, "those forces cannot be used to invade another country. They may be used to maintain some sort of control within Cuba, but obviously they are not a force that can be used externally.

"And, in addition; Cuba cannot possibly, it lacks any amphibious equipment, and, quite obviously our power in that area is overwhelming."

Mr. Kennedy said the big dangers in Latin America—illiteracy, bad housing, maldistribution of wealth, and so on—were unrelated to Cuba. It was at this point that he said that Castro had been discredited since October. But he went on to say that he was concerned about Cuba being used as a training center for Red agents and as a base for propaganda and subversion.

He repeated that Cuba was not a military threat now, and would not become one unless Russia reinforced offensive weapons there.

Asked about the chances of eliminating communism from Cuba, the President refused to make an prediction. One way, he said, would be for the Cubans to revolt, which he thought would be difficult now.

"The other way would be by external action," he said. "But that is war, and we should not regard that as a cheap, or easy way to accomplish what we wish."

A reporter wanted to know what more the administration can do to convince Republican critics that the Russians have withdrawn all offensive weapons from Cuba.

Mr. Kennedy said he didn't know—that Secretary McNamara and CIA Director John McCone had asked anybody possessing information aboute a Russian buildup to turn it over to the Government so that it could be checked.

But even some Members of Congress have refused to do this, after spreading reports and rumors, the President said.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican of New York, said after the President's news

conference that he still cannot accept the much touted distinction between offensive and defensive weapons.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican of Florida, another critic of the President, said that Congress had authorized the Chief Executive to use armed force, if necessary, to prevent any further buildup in Cuba, but that mandate is being ignored.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., and professor of Latin American history, Marymount College, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, author of life and of love, let the light of Thy countenance shine brightly upon the Speaker of this House and all the Members of the U.S. Congress.

Impart, we beseech Thee, Thy choicest blessings to the Presidents of the American Republics, their legislatures and judicial bodies.

Grant to all peoples and governments the graces necessary to uphold freedom, family ideals, religious principles, and genuine social progress.

In every hour of peril, grant that Thy inspiration and the example of the Founding Fathers of our beloved country may strengthen us to endure the gravest hardships, rather than to abandon our friends and fellow Americans to a slavery that, if we fail to provide vision, valor, and leadership, will be our own destiny.

In our devotion to these ideals, dear Saviour, we implore new gifts of wisdom, courage, resourcefulness, and imagination, characteristic of men and women of prayer. In this way, may we grow in Thy friendship and in our love for one another.

We ask for these divine favors in the name of our most Holy Redeemer, the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 9, 1963:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; and

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes.

On April 10, 1963:

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 11, 1963, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 22, 1963.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1. An act to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs;

S. 22. An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve; and

S. 386. An act to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park and to provide for certain adjustments necessitated by the installation of a park tour road, and for other purposes.

PAN AMERICAN DAY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 300, this day has been designated as Pan American Day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 316

Whereas April 14, 1963, will mark the seventy-third anniversary of the session of the First Conference of American States, held in our national capital, out of which has developed an inter-American system of free Republics of this Hemisphere, our Organization of American States; and

Whereas the purpose of the Organization of American States as set forth in its charter are to achieve an order of peace and justice throughout the American Republics, promote their solidarity, strengthen their collaboration, and defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence; and

Whereas the United States, which during seventy-three years has adhered to and upheld the inter-American system and its pledged objectives, and which is now actively engaged with the other free Republics of America in carrying forward a vast Alliance for Progress designed to satisfy the basic needs of all our citizens for opportunity and development: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in honor of this seventy-third anniversary the House of Representatives of the United States of America extend cordial fraternal greetings to the legislative body of each of the other free Republics of this Hemisphere, and to the peoples of the American Republics, with assurance of continued energetic cooperation in our common purpose of realizing effectively and speedily the objectives of the Organization of American States and the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, April 14 marks the 73d anniversary of the Western Hemisphere's regional organization—which is now known as the Organization of American States.

From a small conference establishing a commercial bureau to distribute trade information in 1890, the Organization of American States has broadened its functions until today it is a vital agency of inter-American cooperation.

In the beginning, the Organization's only guideline was the ideal of men like Simon Bolivar, who envisioned a united community of free nations in the New World dedicated to peaceful pursuits and united against foreign aggression.

The history of the Organization of American States has been one of constant experiment and innovation. Occasional setbacks, disputes, and clashes of opinion have not altered the long-range view—Bolivar's ideal of "the most extraordinary and strongest—league—which has ever appeared on earth."

Several generations of Americans—both north and south of the Rio Grande—can be justifiably proud of the progress made in the past 73 years by this remarkable, unique regional organization. To the patient men who struggled toward a dream of hemispheric solidarity and to the freedom of future generations, we owe a special duty to preserve the values of the American Republics as reflected in the OAS Charter.

As an instrument of multinational purpose, the OAS antedates both the United Nations and NATO by many decades. Today, however, the inter-American system is threatened by the greatest challenge in its history. Its future as an international agency depends on how it measures up to this challenge.

Today, we need only to look to the heartlands of the Americas to see a Moscow-Peiping puppet regime, which is conducting an extensive campaign of subversive aggression against the nations of the hemisphere. As a result, the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere is threatened as never before. If it is to survive, the inter-American system must meet and surmount the present crisis.

At the 1962 foreign ministers conference at Punta del Este, the OAS members first faced up to the menace of Castro's Cuba by approving a program of action to curb the menace of international communism to the freedom of the hemisphere. The OAS acted to oust Marxist-Leninist Cuba from the inter-American system, and, at the same time, reaffirmed the Alliance for Progress as the only concrete hemispheric path to democratic development and economic improvement.

Following the Punta del Este meeting, only five Latin American nations still maintained diplomatic relations with Cuba. In addition, our own Government announced a ban on Cuban imports.

As these events indicate, the conference signaled a strengthened hemispheric attitude toward the Communist threat. Faced with a grave challenge, the conference took an important step toward meeting it. Had Punta del Este ended in failure to meet our hemispheric responsibility, or had there been an appeasement of Cuban communism, a tragic chapter would have been written in the history of the hemisphere. The inter-American system itself would have been reduced to worthless scraps of paper.

But the system did not fail. When the showdown came, our Latin American allies, with few exceptions, joined us in a determination to uphold the inter-American principle.

At Punta del Este, the hemisphere took a large step forward, but it was only a beginning.

The preservation of democratic institutions requires the acceleration of political and economic progress in Latin America. In the Alliance for Progress—a new dimension in inter-American cooperation—the hemisphere has a comprehensive blueprint for long-range economic action. As such, it is a great improvement over stopgap aid which this country has furnished our Latin American neighbors since the end of World War II.

We should never lose sight of the fact, however, that the Alliance represents a long-range answer to the economic troubles that beset the Western Hemisphere. If it is to succeed, we must first reach our hemispheric short-range objective—that of eliminating Castroism and communism from the Americas.

Castro threatens every facet of the Alliance. His policies usurp the principles of the Alliance. The very existence of a Communist Cuba blocks all hemispheric plans for stable economic progress. Communist terrorism and sabotage act to cripple and destroy the Alliance, and, if unchecked—it can even destroy the entire inter-American system.

The history of the Organization of American States will note that at the 1962 Punta del Este Conference, the U.S. delegation pointed the way, and Latin American delegates—despite the conflicting pressures which threatened to destroy any attempts at harmony—joined together in breathing new life into hemispheric unity.

Future historians will also record that when the United States dramatically assumed its role of hemispheric leadership last October, the principles of the inter-American system were reaffirmed by the quick and overwhelming endorsement of the nations of the OAS. Latin American members of the Organization rallied to President Kennedy's side when he took a firm stand, and the issue was clearly drawn.

The swift action of the OAS during the October missile crisis and the stand of the Latin American delegations at Punta del Este clearly indicate that if the inter-American system is to remain strong, the United States must live up to its role of hemispheric leadership.

At this crucial juncture in OAS history yet another nation of the hemisphere should be asked to reconsider its present policy toward the inter-American system. To make our hemispheric unity complete, Canada should seriously consider joining the Organization of American States and other intercontinental endeavors to bolster hemispheric security and solidarity.

The partnership of Canada in such programs would add a vital link to the chain of hemispheric security. It would write a bold new chapter in the fulfillment of Bolivar's dream of a free and unified New World.

For certainly, if the Western Hemisphere's international system is worthy of its conception and in its ideals, and more important, if our concepts concerning government and freedom are to survive—the nations of the Americas can spare no effort, afford no delay, permit no misunderstanding of their intention to maintain a great bulwark of freedom and prosperity in the western half of the globe.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is most appropriate that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] should be making these remarks on Pan American Day because of the very excellent work which the gentleman has done as chairman of his subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for Latin America which certainly needs action in these days.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman has pointed out very recently in the report from his committee, the report which the gentleman's committee issued is most revealing. In my opinion if we could carry out some of the policies enunciated therein, as I believe they will be, we may well accomplish some of these objectives under the watchful eye of the gentleman and then we can see a great change come about in this continent.

Also I want to say that the gentleman's participation in the conferences that have been held in South America, for the Organization of American States and Central American countries has been most helpful I am sure in firming up a stronger position in this whole area.

Also, I would like to note that Pan American Day would not be Pan American Day without Father Thorning here to offer the prayer. His great interest and leadership in this field have always been noticed by this House and recognition is due him in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is paused today to reflect on the well-being of this hemisphere. Pan American Day gives us a fitting opportunity to examine the relationships existing between the nations of North and South America.

Never in the history of this Nation has the need for harmony and good will between North and South America been more imperative. In Cuba, international communism has established a bridgehead to the continent to the south. Our Latin neighbors, their economic problems providing fuel for Communist agitation, are currently engaged in an unprecedented battle against Communist subversion and control.

The history of Latin America is a proud one. The nations of that continent have long been concerned with freedom. Many of them won their freedom and independence at great cost.

This historic struggle against communism in Latin America has many of these same nations engaged in the struggle against another form of colonialism—20th century Communist brand.

As a champion of freedom, the United States once again finds itself very deeply involved in the fate of its allies. This Nation has based its hemispheric policy on the Monroe Doctrine, and has thus been strongly opposed to extracontinental influence in this hemisphere.

On this Pan American Day, it would be well for those whom the American people have entrusted with the preservation of freedom to reflect on the seriousness of the Communist problem in this hemisphere. Those whose hands hold the key to freedom and order in this hemisphere should consider the extracontinental influences of international communism now spreading in the hemisphere.

Pan American Day should signal the strengthening of U.S. leadership in this hemisphere. The United States must lead the nations of this hemisphere in a drive for concerted action through the Organization of American States to halt the spread of communism.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his very kind remarks. He has been one of the leaders in alerting the Congress and the American people to the dangers we face in the southern half of this hemisphere. Also, I join him in welcoming Father Thorning who has always been a great friend of the nations of the Latin American area.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman directing his remarks on Pan American Day to a resolution.

Mr. SELDEN. A resolution has been introduced.

Mr. ALGER. When was the resolution introduced?

Mr. SELDEN. At the beginning of my statement.

Mr. ALGER. I just asked for a copy of the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the gentleman whether we will be given any opportunity to debate this?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the resolution has not been adopted as yet. Unanimous consent was granted for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for that purpose?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is this being considered under the 1-hour rule; in other words, the gentleman has 1 hour to proceed, is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman intend to yield some time to the minority on this?

Mr. SELDEN. I certainly do. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman or to anyone else who would like to speak on the subject.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman propose to yield half his time to the minority side?

Mr. SELDEN. I shall be happy to yield to anyone who wants to speak on this subject.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me ask, When was this resolution before the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. SELDEN. This or a similar resolution is introduced each year in the same way it was introduced today. Appropriate remarks Members may wish to make in connection with Pan American Day usually follow the introduction of the resolution. This has been an annual custom since I have been a Member of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, does not the gentleman think that a resolution of this nature ought to be printed so that Members of the House may know what is contained therein?

Mr. SELDEN. This same type resolution has been introduced each year and has been adopted by the House. I am sure the gentleman was on the floor on other occasions when similar resolutions were introduced and adopted. If he had had any objection to them, I am sure he could have so stated.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, if he will yield further, that I am not particularly enamored of some of the wording in this resolution. I do not feel that we are getting the cooperation that the resolution implies from some of the American states and those nations which are part and parcel of the Alliance for Progress. This resolution assumes that we are. I am at a loss to know the objectives of of the Alliance for Progress in light of testimony before the gentleman's Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, of which I am a member.

I would certainly hope that next year before any of these resolutions come to the floor of the House that they be brought before the Committee on Foreign Affairs where we can scrutinize and know what is in them, at least have printed copies, so that we may know to what we are lending our consent.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Is this the identical language that was used in the one last year? Here is the point. If this resolution is to have any meaning and is to be bipartisan, which of course it should be, and I think it could be, certainly courtesy as well as good understanding would suggest submitting the language to those of us on this side who are interested in this, particularly the appropriate committee, in this instance our members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, so that we can be sure, without this business of coming in with a resolution that has not been printed in the RECORD and which no one has seen. I respect the gentleman. I am sure his motives are very fine. But if the Congress is going to make its resolutions meaningful, let us have this kind of proper consideration so they can be.

I would suggest the gentleman withdraw the resolution at this time and give the minority an opportunity of going over the language to be sure that it is the kind of attitude and consideration that all of us feel. I think we could get together on it. I am worried. I glanced at the resolution at the Speaker's desk. This great buildup of the tag "Alliance for Progress" is something that requires a lot of consideration. I have read that there has been mostly public relations and very little getting down to the hard-core problems.

I was on a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee on inter-American economics. I was distressed to find out, and I must use this expression, how much of it was President Kennedy's public relations approach and how little had to do with reality. I do not want to be just another patsy to another one of President Kennedy's public relations ideas, and have the Congress just put a rubber stamp on it. If we are to be meaningful about these things in our relations abroad, I just wish the gentleman would withdraw his resolution at this time and submit it to our members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am sure you can come up with strong, mutual language, and let the Congress express itself.

Mr. SELDEN. Pan American Day is held each year. On March 28, 1963, a resolution was passed in the House designating April 11, 1963, for the celebration of Pan American Day. The resolution stated that, after the reading of the Journal, remarks appropriate to such occasion could occur. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], a ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, stated there was no objection to it on the Republican side of the aisle and added that it was an excellent idea. Also, the senior Republican member of the subcommittee of which I was chairman was reminded yesterday, and again today, that Pan American Day was scheduled——

Mr. CURTIS. Who is that?

Mr. SELDEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WHALLEY] was notified that this resolution would be introduced today, and if there was anyone on the Republican side of the committee who wished to make any remarks it would be most appropriate for them to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. Who on the Republican side of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was notified?

Mr. SELDEN. We attempted to contact the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] but he was out of town. Mr. WHALLEY, the second ranking Republican, was notified. There was no effort on my part to bring this resolution to the floor without proper notification to the Republican Members.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I would like to join in a resolution of this kind, and I have, with the gentleman, all through the years. I think it is a day we have always recognized and should in the future. But I must agree with my colleague from Missouri that not only are there changes in this resolution from what has been passed here before but there also is a change in the situation in that part of the world that ought to be recognized. I would like to have the resolution be the type that could come on the floor and we could all heartily join in passing it, and let the world know how we feel about the Pan American countries who are cooperating with us, and at the same time let the world know that the Monroe Doctrine is a sound doctrine for this part of the world. I think we could do this by following my suggestion to the gentleman from Alabama, who has been carrying this on for years. I was hopeful we could do this in such a way that when we brought it on the floor we could do it in so wholehearted a manner that there would be no doubt in anyone's mind. I would suggest to the gentleman that we do this.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Was there any particular reason why—was it haste?—that this ended up in our not having a printed resolution? I do not even know what the language is. I have listened to the gentleman and I have listened to the history that he has been giving us here of the OAS, and I must remind the gentleman that a lot has happened since last year. We are deeply concerned. The gentleman from New York mentioned the Monroe Doctrine. Without going into details, and many of us are endeavoring to find out, and the record, as the gentleman knows, shows that much has happened since last year including the OAS and including our study of how our foreign aid has gone; and those Members that do not join with us including what happened at Del Estes and other things that do trouble us. We would simply like a printed resolution and we would like to be able to look at this and see and understand it because without meaning to, the gentleman is forcing many of our colleagues to join those of us who feel we ought to read before we sign. I am sure we join the gentleman in spirit, and it is my hope that we can have a copy of the resolution.

Mr. SELDEN. I do not think the gentleman will find anything in this resolution with which he would drastically disagree. It is a simple resolution designed to appropriately commemorate the founding of the Organization of American States.

Mr. ALGER. Our procedure always is to have a printed resolution.

Mr. SELDEN. This is the last day before the Easter recess on which we can commemorate this occasion. April 14 is Pan American Day, and appropriate remarks are customarily made on that particular day. Since we will not be in session on April 14, today was designated by resolution passed by the House more than a week ago.

Mr. ALGER. But there is no reason for not printing the resolution otherwise?

Mr. SELDEN. No; there is no reason except that it has not usually been done in connection with similar resolutions.

Mr. ALGER. We have printed resolutions available here for other matters that we will consider, but there is nothing at the Clerk's desk with reference to this resolution.

Mr. SELDEN. This is generally done this way. I have seen similar resolutions in connection with Pan American Day adopted this way for 10 years. As a matter of fact, I have never seen it done any other way. If the gentleman has any objection to this procedure, however, I would join next year with the gentleman in having it brought before the Committee on Foreign Affairs before it is considered on the floor of the House.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes of time?

Mr. SELDEN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the resolution itself, the resolution that was passed last year, in the resolving clause stated this:

> That on this seventy-second anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, the House of Representatives of the United States extends to the legislative bodies of each of the other Republics of the Western Hemisphere its warm greetings and expresses a sincere hope for the continuance and intensification of the cooperation of the Americas in the Organization of American States and in other peaceable ways.

I am confident that the gentleman is familiar with that language. But, listen to the language this year—and, perhaps, the gentleman could explain that—and I thank him for the time—for the 5 minutes—as to what is meant by the language in this year's resolution which is far more definitive. It says:

> With assurance of continued energetic cooperation in our common purpose of realizing effectively and speedily the objectives of the Organization of American States and the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

Now I do not think there is any question but that is a far more definitive statement than was contained in the previous resolution. And I think this would justify the Members of the House being advised in advance as to the contents.

Let me say, parenthetically, as far as I am concerned, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, particularly with regard to the investigation of his subcommittee into Latin American subversion, has rendered a great service to this country. I am not being critical of the gentleman or of his objective of commemorating Pan American Day in this instance, I want it clearly understood, but I do think when there are such changes in substance as appear here, I think, for instance, it would be well to have a discussion as to what we are talking about when we say "common purposes," "energetic cooperation," "effectively and speedily the objectives of the OAS," and "the goals of the Alliance for Progress." I would like to know what some of those goals are. I do not think the goals are what they should be. For instance I think we should use the Alliance for Progress to encourage other Latin American nations to withdraw recognition from Castro, for instance, and to stop other nations from permitting the Russians and Red Chinese as well as the Cubans to infiltrate, for instance, as Brazil is doing. Yet, Brazil came here and asked for hundreds of millions of dollars in a loan to aid the buildup of its activities so that it could continue to trade even further with the Russians, Red Chinese, and the satellite nations. Brazil continues to recognize Cuba.

I think it is interesting to note on this date or this anniversary that we are commemorating, the anniversary of the Pan American Union, that on this date which also is the second anniversary of the Bay of Pigs fiasco what we find on the ticker—what do we find in the Associated Press reports?

We find Cuba's Premier Castro is praising the U.S. Government for doing what? For halting rebel raids on Cuba, and he indicated hope that the United States will accept other Communist terms, other Communist terms for peace in the Caribbean, including the abandonment of the big Guantanamo Naval Base. In an hour-and-forty-minute speech broadcast by Havana Radio Castro said the U.S. crackdown on the refugees fulfilled one of his five points for peace, which have been endorsed by the Soviet Union.

Castro said:

> It is a step toward reducing the risk of crisis and war—

And—

> It can be said that of the five points we have now achieved one—

We have now achieved one—

> Four still have to be fulfilled. The only sensible thing the U.S. rulers can do is to cease violations and aggressions against our revolution and our country.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, on this which is almost the second anniversary of the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion, Castro's statement that the United States has now surrendered on one of his five demands puts our soft policy toward Cuba in clear focus. We have surrendered to Castro's and Khrushchev's demands for coexistence in this hemisphere. The United States has given its one-fifth acquiescence to coexistence with Castro's government by surrendering to the Communists in this demand for coexistence, to the abandoning of the Monroe Doctrine, to the guaranteeing of Communist Cuba against invasion.

I do not think this is a very laudable record either in respect of the Alliance for Progress or as we celebrate this second anniversary. On this date, which is almost the second anniversary of the Bay of Pigs invasion, recalling that 2 years ago Castro was cursing our efforts in support of the Bay of Pigs invasion by the Cuban exile freedom fighters, we find today Castro praising the United States for siding with him and the Communists—with giving in to one of his five demands.

Is it any wonder that Miro Cordona, leader of the Consejos Revolutionarios, a group of Cuban exiles, would charge the United States with "softness"? Such a reaction should have been expected when we abandoned the freedom fighting forces of the exiles for those of Castro tyranny. This leads to the obvious next question: Is America to suffer further humiliation in acceding to the additional demands of Castro who is the puppet for the Communists? Is America considering giving in on the other four demands of Castro? For instance, are we considering a second demand for the abandonment of the Guantanamo Naval Base? After all, the same reasoning used by the New Frontier for the quarantining of the freedom fighting Cuban refugees could be used for giving up Guantanamo, that is, to do so would lessen tensions and the prospects of a crisis.

Under what possible policy does the United States, as the freedom-loving and powerful leader of the free nations of the world, give aid and comfort to the enemy Communist Cuba to the extent that Castro praises this country for taking a step toward reducing the risks of crisis and war, and giving in to one of his five demands for peace? It would be well at this point to state in the RECORD what the full five demands were that were made on October 28, 1962, over Havana radio by Castro to the United States, noting particularly that these demands were made after the quarantine had been put into effect, but at a time when our lack of intention to press it to its obvious objectives of onsite inspection or guaranteed, properly supervised, and inspected removal of weapons endangering the security of this hemisphere. These are those demands, and it is obvious that we have acceded to the first and, as a matter of fact, are taking steps that indicate further accedence, and this only leads to the conclusion that the administration's ultimate policy appears to be coexistence.

Those demands are as follows:

First. End all subversive activities, dropping and landing of arms and explosives by air and sea, organization of mercenary invasions, infiltration of spies and saboteurs, all of which are organized in U.S. territory and certain accomplice countries.

Second. Withdraw from Guantanamo.

Third. End U.S. economic blockade and all measures of commercial pressures.

Fourth. End United States and Puerto Rican based pirate attacks.

Fifth. End all violation of air and naval space by North American military aircraft and ships.

The full statement made by Castro to a group of 79 graduates of a Communist-indoctrination course, is as follows:

> MIAMI.—Cuban Premier Castro praised the U.S. Government early today for halting refugee raids on Cuba and indicated hope that it will accept other Communist terms for peace in the Caribbean—including abandonment of the big Guantanamo Naval Base.
>
> In an hour-and-40-minute speech broadcast by Havana radio Castro said the U.S. crackdown on the refugees fulfilled one of his "five points for peace," which have been endorsed by the Soviet Union.
>
> "The measure adopted by the U.S. Government to restrict the exiles is an action of positive character," Castro said. "It is a step * * * toward reducing the risks of crisis and war.
>
> "It can be said that of the five points, we have now achieved one * * * four still have to be fulfilled * * * the only sensible thing the U.S. rulers can do is to * * * cease violations and aggressions against our revolution and our country."
>
> Castro's five points included a demand that the United States halt American-based "counterrevolutionary" attacks on Cuba as well as a demand for abandonment of Guantanamo.
>
> In a speech directed specifically to 79 graduates of a Communist-indoctrination course, Castro jeered at refugee leaders who are protesting the "soft" U.S. stand.

It appears that some concessions toward demand No. 3 are being considered and negotiated. It has been announced publicly that the resumption of the ferry line between Key West and Havana is being "negotiated" with Fidel Castro. I can only assume it is being negotiated by either the Swiss Embassy or Mr. Donovan, the latter being completely without portfolio or official authority to act in any capacity on behalf of the United States or any trading interest in the United States. This leads to the obvious question—is this the forerunner of acceding to Castro's third demand—that of having the U.S. economic blockade lifted and all measures of commercial pressure?

For all practical purposes the United States has also acceded to the fourth demand with its quarantine and blockade against the Cuban freedom fighters, by stopping their boats, including *Violin III* recently, which had aboard some 17 refugees intending to reinfiltrate into Cuba to take up the fight against Castro internally.

I think these recent developments should give every American cause to be concerned and every right to demand to know what our policy is and every reason to be dissatisfied with what events indicate our policy to be—that is—of softness, indecision, and lack of determination to rid the hemisphere of Castro's communism and the subversion throughout the Americas that is resulting.

I have thus raised the question on this resolution as to my not wanting to rubber stamp such a policy which appears to be implied in the present wording of the resolution in that I unalterably oppose any concessions to Castro, any thought of coexistence, but rather insist upon the restatement and implementation of the Monroe Doctrine meaning to rid this hemisphere of this cancer.

How proud has been the history of our country—of our unflinching fight for freedom—of preventing any alien philosophy from establishing its system in this hemisphere. Only a few years ago, the United States helped oust communism from Guatemala. Teddy Roosevelt, in 1903, intervened in Panama and Venezuela. Woodrow Wilson, in 1914–17, took action in Latin America to preserve constitutional republics in this hemisphere—readily remembered by the events at Vera Cruz, the message to Pancho Villa, the gallantry of General Pershing. What has happened to this freedom-fighting American spirit?

Mr. SELDEN. Let me read this resolution to you gentlemen from Florida.

After the "whereas" clauses:

> *Resolved*, That in honor of the seventy-third anniversary, the House of Representatives of the United States of America extends cordial fraternal greetings to the legislative body of each of the other free Republics of this hemisphere, and to the people of the American Republics with assurance of continued energetic cooperation in our common purpose of realizing effectively and speedily the objectives of the Organization of American States and the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

If my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have any objection to this specific wording, certainly I do not wish to be unreasonable about it. I will be very happy to withdraw this present resolution and submit the identical resolution which was passed last year, if that is in accord with the thoughts of all Members on both sides of the aisle, and will remove what should be a bipartisan matter from the political arena.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that would be very good.

Mr. SELDEN. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw this resolution and submit the identical language which was passed by the House unanimously last year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I do want at this time to make it very emphatic that an agreement to the withdrawal of this language does not indicate, so far as this Member is concerned, any lack of enthusiastic support for the Alliance for Progress and for its objectives, because these are part of the declared policy of the U.S. Government, and of this Congress, and of the President who is the actual architect of our foreign policy.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In light of the previous remark let it also be noted that on this side of the aisle the objection is simply to the way this resolution is brought up without our having had a chance to consider its wording in advance. We do not know what it is, we have had no opportunity to go over it. I hope no one will draw any other conclusion. By resubmitting last year's resolution which does express what I know is our unanimous feeling on this it clears the matter up.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to make it clear that the acceptance by this Member of the substitute language is not to be construed as giving any cognizance of validity to the specious contention that there has been any softness on the part of this Government toward the Castro regime.

I reject any such contentions as being totally lacking in support or validity.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN]?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] has carried on a series of exhaustive and excellent hearings with respect to the whole situation in this hemisphere. Those hearings were held by the Inter-American Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, of which the gentleman from Alabama is the chairman, and I compliment him.

I am pleased that he has agreed to go back to last year's resolution, for I am still unable to learn what the objectives of the Organization of American States may be, especially with respect to Cuba. The Chairman of the Organization of American States stated only a month or so ago that he did not know the policy of the United States; that he and other members of the Organization of American States were waiting for the United States to arrive at a policy with respect to Cuba.

So I think the language previously referred to ought to come out of any resolution, since it would be incompatible with the statement made by the Chairman of the Organization of American States. I am pleased that the gentleman will substitute other language.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on April 14 we salute the 73d occasion of Pan American Day. Western Hemispheric solidarity is embodied today in the Organization of American States, and represents the oldest international organization in the world.

The year through which we have just passed has tested as never before the qualities of the inter-American system. The unanimous support by our southern neighbors, moral and material, for the U.S. interdiction of the delivery of offensive weapons to Cuba was a crucial reaffirmation of the principle of hemispheric cohesion. It proves to the world once more that the nations of the New World will not tolerate outside intervention in our affairs. We will not tolerate threats to the peace of the peoples of the Americas. These are the principles suggested by Simón Bolívar, enunciated by President Monroe, and fought for and accepted by generations of Americans ever since. They are living, persisting principles, for which, as Mr. Khrushchev learned, Americans are willing to face the risks of war—even in this day and age, the awesome risks of nuclear war.

But though we have successfully faced an outsider's challenge to hemispheric peace, and backed him off, we are still faced with our own backyard problem of Cuba. The meeting of this threat to the peace will be as crucial to the future of the Organization of American States as was the meeting of the threat of Mr. Khrushchev last October. And let us be honest—many Americans have hoped that the inter-American system would be more forthright and effective in meeting the challenge of Castro-Communist subversion and agitation in the Western Hemisphere. But men of good will and high hopes are still laboring on this problem, and it may be that this 73d year of pan-Americanism will witness the welcoming back into the fold of sister nations a free and independent Cuba. That is a consummation devoutly to be desired.

Other hemispheric problems challenge us in addition to the immediate threat of Cuba. And they are the problems of backwardness, poverty, inequality, and injustice that the Alliance for Progress has been formed to eradicate. But the road is steep, the burden formidable, and the hour late for the accomplishment of these worthwhile ends. The forces which resist change in Latin America are still powerful and in many instances unconvinced of the dangers of the revolution bound to come if evolution is thwarted. We in the United States must understand that these problems are not amenable to quick and easy solutions. We must gird ourselves for a long and strenuous pull, confident in our conviction that what we seek is good and just and honorable, worthy of any sacrifice which we can sustain.

Therefore, it behooves us on this 73d Pan American Day to be thankful for what we have accomplished in this last year, but to be humble before the challenging tasks which still lie ahead. May we not be found wanting in the meeting of those challenges.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, once again this month we observe Pan American Day. April 14, 1963, marks the 73d anniversary of the inter-American system—a system which has grown from very humble beginnings into today's Organization of American States.

The United States is a proud member of this Organization, and a proud partner in the hemispheric endeavor to make the Americas a clean, healthy, progressive, safe, and happy place in which to live. Such goals are not attained easily and without difficulties, but the year through which we have passed since we last marked Pan American Day shows that the Organization of American States can be an effective instrument for action when its members are convinced that vital interests are at stake.

The crisis of last October, and the willingness of our southern partners to take their places beside us on the nuclear firing line, clearly show the value and potential effectiveness of inter-American solidarity.

This remarkable system was first conceived of in 1815, by the Liberator of South America, Simón Bolívar. Even before the task of throwing off the yoke of autocratic Spain was completed, this remarkable man foresaw a system of American Republics which would be the wonder of the world.

> More than anyone—

He wrote—

> I desire to see America fashioned into the greatest nation in the world, greatest not so much by virtue of her area and wealth as by her freedom and glory.

Bolívar convoked a conference of the American Republics in Panama City in 1826 in an attempt to achieve his dream—but this first attempt failed to obtain widespread support, and the idea of a pan-American community receded until 1889.

In that year, the Secretary of State, James Blaine, called for a conference to be held here in Washington. The First International Conference of American States, held in 1890, is the occasion of which we here take note—Pan American Day's 73d anniversary, thus making the Organization of American States the oldest international organization in the world.

From its beginnings as a commercial bureau in 1890, the system evolved into the Pan American Union in 1910; achieved real solidarity with the hemispheric adherence in 1933 to the Monroe Doctrine, an event which inaugurated the era of the "good-neighbor policy"; formalized a collective security arrangement in 1947 with the adoption of the Rio Treaty; formalized its overall form and juridical structure in 1948, becoming the Organization of American States; and there the amazing story of international cooperation which we are now engaged in really began to take shape.

The Program of Technical Cooperation was inaugurated in 1950, and marked the beginning of a massive hemispheric effort to raise the health standards, educational level, and social, cultural, and material well-being of every citizen of the Americas. The foundation of the Inter-American Development Bank in 1960 was a great stride in this effort; but the year 1961 will be remembered as the year for formal dedication to inter-American development.

In that year, the Alliance for Progress was formalized at Punta del Este, Uruguay, at the behest of President John F. Kennedy. This challenging and imaginative undertaking resolves a decade of development effort for the American Republics in the task of achieving a better life for all citizens of this hemisphere. Planning and working together, we hope to achieve concrete goals set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este, in the matters of personal and national income, housing, health and sanitation, education, agricultural production and just ownership of the land, and social and cultural betterment.

In all these events, the role of the United States of America has been, and continues to be, central and of vital import. The tasks before us are formidable, but the goals worthy of our best, our continuing, efforts. We must be patient with the slow and complex unraveling of events in Latin America—let us remember, that while we are dealing with essentially a Western European culture, it still differs from ours in many respects.

We must not expect to see things done as we might do them, for we are not doing them; we are helping our partners in the Alliance to accomplish these things themselves. If ever there existed an area of the world which was threatened by the forces of Sino-Soviet conquest, and was in need of a stanch, patient, understanding friend and ally, that area is Latin America today. The United States must be, by virtue of location, history, culture and ideology, that friend and that ally.

Together, as one member working with all other members of the family, we shall continue to strive for hemispheric solidarity in understanding, in purpose, in common welfare and in security.

I commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] for scheduling this observance of Pan American Day and I congratulate him on his remarks today. He is a great chairman of a great subcommittee of which the gentleman from Illinois has been a member in four Congresses.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, this Pan American Year just ending—the period between April 14, Pan American Day, 1962, and April 14, Pan American Day, 1963—has had its full share of doubt, uncertainty, and danger, but it has had also splendid successes. It is more than possible that historians in the year 2063 may consider that a great climacteric in human destiny occurred on October 22 of this Pan American Year just past.

In every pan-American area of planning and action throughout the year, two factors inevitably have had to be taken into consideration: on the one hand, the continuous efforts of the Communist regime occupying Cuba to subvert freedom in this hemisphere; on the other, the increasing momentum of the Alliance for Progress to which our Governments and peoples are pledged as freedom's surest safeguard.

Certainly one outstanding fact of the Pan American Year has been a notable agreement by the free American Republics with respect to fundamental principles and ultimate objectives, in spite of various differences regarding method. Above all, there has been an increasing awareness that, for all of us, the independence of free peoples has become inseparable from their interdependence. Cuba itself is visible, outstanding proof that when one of our peoples loses its freedom, the freedom of all is threatened.

During this Pan American Year the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, meeting in Mexico City, made plans for accelerating the Alliance for Progress; and before the year ended, seven countries presented national programs of economic development under the Alliance, while programs in the other countries are being readied.

It has been a year in which Peace Corps groups, invited into Latin American countries, have shown by fine young example ways of community self-help and at the same time have won better understanding and better friends for the United States.

It has been a year of memorable visits: among them, President and Mrs. Kennedy's visit to Mexico, where they were greeted with demonstrations of cordial friendship at every hand and category, from children in the schoolroom to President López Mateos and his Cabinet. It was a year marked also by the visit to our country of President Betancourt of Venezuela, in spite of subversive outbreaks of violence in that country which tried to prevent his trip. We gave a wholehearted welcome to this chief of state who has been shot at because he upholds the freedoms we believe in. Among other good neighbors who visited us during the year were President Alessandri of Chile and, just before his inauguration, President Bosch of the Dominican Republic, leader of a people newly free after a long dictatorial regime.

Above all, this has been the memorable year that has seen the President of the United States place the responsibility for the rocket bases in Cuba squarely where responsibility belonged: on the Soviet Union. And it is the year that unforgettably on a most historic occasion last October saw the Soviet Union, confronted by that stern ultimatum, concede and give way.

It is the year that in that same month of October saw the Organization of American States in splendid unanimity resolve without a dissenting vote to recommend that the member states take all necessary measures, including the use of armed force, to insure the dismantling and removal of Communist rocket missile systems in Cuba and to prevent entrance into that unhappy subjugated land of military supplies endangering hemisphere security.

Among the final events of this historic Pan American Year was the meeting of the Presidents last month at San José, Costa Rica. There the President of the United States and the Presidents of the Central American Republics, conferring together, accelerated steps toward the economic integration of Central America and toward reforms in tax laws, education and agrarian planning, public administration, and measures for public health which will make the Alliance for Progress more speedily effective in that area and consequently throughout the hemisphere.

Independence, interdependence, freedom, and progress—these have been the key words of our Pan American Year.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, today, April 12, is the 30th anniversary of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's historic address on the "good neighbor policy," delivered at the Pan American Union on April 12, 1933. In his first inaugural address the preceding March 4 he had announced his intention to:

> Dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who resolutely respects himself, and because he does so, respects the rights of others * * *.

To reread that address, as fresh and vital now as it was this day 30 years ago, is to realize how forcefully it relates to our present hemisphere relations.

President Roosevelt might have been consciously laying the bases for the Alliance for Progress when he explained the good neighbor policy in these terms:

> Friendship among nations, as among individuals—

He said:

> Calls for constructive efforts to muster the forces of humanity in order that an atmosphere of close understanding and cooperation may be cultivated. It involves mutual obligations and responsibilities, for it is only by sympathetic respect for the rights of others and a scrupulous fulfillment of the corresponding obligations by each member of the community that a true fraternity can be maintained.
>
> The essential qualities of a true pan-Americanism must be the same as those which constitute a good neighbor; namely, mutual understanding, and, through such understanding, a sympathetic appreciation of the other's point of view. It is only in this manner that we can hope to build up a system of which confidence, friendship, and good will are the cornerstones.

President Roosevelt was not speaking of, nor can he have had prescience of, the present Communist occupation of Cuba—though it sounds as if he had—when he went on to say:

> In this spirit the people of every republic on our continent are coming to a deep understanding of the fact that the Monroe Doctrine, of which so much has been written and spoken for more than a century, was and is directed at the maintenance of independence by the peoples of the continent. It was aimed and is aimed against the acqquisition in any manner of the control of additional territory in this hemisphere by any non-American power.

Finally, in 1963 as in 1933, President Roosevelt's pledge of mutual faith rings true:

> Your Americanism and mine must be a structure built of confidence, cemented by a sympathy which recognizes only equality and fraternity. It finds its source and being in the hearts of men, and dwells in the temple of the intellect.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate, on this Pan American Day to remind ourselves of the truism that the world we live in grows smaller every day. The technology of the 20th century has made our oceans shrink to moats. Weapons surpass the imagination of the capacity for mass destruction and in the speed with which their wantonness can be visited on the most distant point of the globe. Surely at no time in man's history has John Donne's thought expressed so many centuries ago been more appropriate than now: "No man is an island entire of itself."

In a world where no man is an island, we in the Western Hemisphere have united for our collective security in the Organization of American States. The charter which established the OAS says that the Organization was developed "to achieve an order of peace and justice, to promote their solidarity, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence."

We all recall the resolute action of the OAS at the time of the missiles crisis last fall when the Organization adopted a strong resolution calling for the withdrawal of offensive missiles from Cuba. But the OAS role was not limited to the passing of a resolution.

Important military contributions were made by several countries. Ships from 3 Latin American countries participated in the quarantine, and offers of other types of assistance were received by the OAS from a total of 12 Latin American countries.

Six months have elapsed since the October crisis in Cuba. The menace of offensive missiles has passed, but the menace of subversion and Communist intervention in the hemisphere remains. We are actively working with Latin American countries in developing programs to counter this subversion. As President Kennedy said last month at San José, we are building a wall of men determined to protect their own freedom and sovereignty. This wall is being created through the Alliance for Progress.

Thus, the security of the hemisphere is being strengthened through the collective determination of the American Republics acting in concert through the OAS. The road ahead is difficult. There are no shortcuts. But thus it has always been.

In 1861, the independence of the Dominican Republic was forfeited and Spanish colonial rule reintroduced. Four years elapsed before freedom was restored.

Some day Cuba shall be free again. On this Pan American Day let us pledge ourselves to that end, and let us rededicate ourselves to the ideals of the hemisphere so that its security can be achieved through the collective determination of our governments; and so that an ever richer and freer life for all our peoples can be secured for ourselves and future generations.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], for taking the leadership in observing Pan American Day.

The 14th of April marks the 73d anniversary of the inter-American system. Pan American Day marks the anniversary of the world's oldest international organization, now formally known as the Organization of American States. It is appropriate on this occasion to assess this system of international hemispheric cooperation. This is especially true on this 73d anniversary, since, in the past year, we have passed through the gravest crisis ever faced by the nations of North and South America. Furthermore, despite the fact that the missile crisis of last October was surmounted, urgent, unmet needs still remain to challenge the viability of the inter-American idea—the need to return Cuba to the fold of free nations in the Western Hemisphere and the need to face and overcome the obstacles to the accomplishment of the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

As early as 1815 the great liberator of South America, Simón Bolívar, had conceived of a hemispheric America which would be the greatest in the world, "greatest not so much by virtue of her area and wealth as by her freedom and glory," according to his since-famous Jamaica letter.

After liberating half of the South American Continent from the colonial rule of autocratic Spain, Bolivar called for a Conference of the American Republics in Panama City in the year 1826. He hoped that the nations of the New World would unite in a permanent association for their collective defense.

However, this idea was advanced by the liberator before the nations were ready for it, and the "Perpetual Union, League, and Confederation" created by the poorly attended Panama Conference never materialized. Nevertheless, in Bolivar's words, the Conference established "the plan of the first alliance that marked the beginning of our relations with the universe."

The anniversary we call Pan American Day relates to the First International Conference of American States, called in 1889 by Secretary of State James Blaine. Held in Washington, this Conference created in 1890 the International Union of the American Republics and, as its initial concrete form, a central office called the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics. Thus, the early stages of inter-American cooperation were limited to trade and commercial relations. The pan-American idea was to develop gradually and carefully over the coming years.

In 1910 the Commercial Bureau was renamed the Pan American Union, and its Washington headquarters building, the "House of the Americas," was dedicated at 17th and Constitution Avenue. The Pan American Union is still with us today as the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States.

But the years from the turn of the century until the initiation of the good neighbor policy in 1933 were dark ones from a standpoint of hemispheric solidarity. There was no acceptance of the U.S. self-appointed role as the policeman of the Western Hemisphere, and the big stick and dollar diplomacy interventions left scars of fear, mistrust, and resentment on our Latin American neighbors which are still visible today.

Fortunately, at the Montevideo Conference of 1933 we reversed our policies of the previous three decades and pledged nonintervention, thus opening the gates to the development of the good neighbor policy of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, which led to the close wartime cooperation between the United States and its hemispheric trading partners to the south.

The Second World War, drawing our peoples together as it did, led to the adoption of a system of collective security against external aggression by the Western Hemisphere. This was embodied in the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, known as the Rio Treaty of 1947. It was under the terms of this important pact that our neighbors supported our actions during the October crisis of 1962.

The Ninth International Conference of American States held in Bogotá, Colombia, in 1948 marked a turning point in the evolution of the inter-American system by adopting a charter giving it juridical form and structure. This Charter of Bogotá changed the name of the Union of American Republics to the Organization of American States and designated the Pan American Union as its General Secretariat. The American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, the first intergovernmental document of its kind in history, was adopted by this Conference. The machinery was thus erected for the evolution of pan-Americanism into its next stage of cooperative development.

That step took place in 1950, with the inauguration of the Organization of American States' Program of Technical Cooperation. To raise the economic, social, and cultural standards of their peoples, the members of the OAS undertook vital programs touching almost every human need: the improvement of rural life, livestock, crops, and food supply; public health and sanitation; housing and city planning; and the training of teachers and technicians in a score of basic professions. After 12 years of operation this program constitutes one of the most important chapters in the pan-American story.

In July of 1956 the Presidents of the American Republics met in Panama City to commemorate the 130th anniversary of the Congress of Panama and to honor the man who had called it, Simón Bolívar. The once utopian dream of the liberator was constantly evolving, and a new chapter in inter-American unity was begun with the Declaration of Panama, which called for an intensive, cooperative effort to make human liberty and decent living conditions a reality for all the peoples of the Americas. The Government of Brazil responded in 1958 with a plan called Operation Pan America, which laid the foundations for what a dynamic President of the United States would come to formalize as the Alliance for Progress 3 years later.

The pan-American concept, however, is much more idealistic and human in its scope than mere economic development efforts. In 1959 the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights was created by the fifth meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, which requested draft conventions on human rights and the exercise of representative democracy.

The year 1960 saw fulfilled yet another dream of the founders of the inter-American system. First called for in 1890, the Inter-American Development Bank was inaugurated on the 70th anniversary of that first meeting. The Act of Bogotá, by which it was established, set forth measures of social improvement and economic development within the framework of Operation Pan America and laid the foundations for the Alliance for Progress. This bank, run by Americans for Americans, has done a great deal in its first 2 years of operations. Loans have been granted for housing, sanitation and irrigation projects, agricultural and industrial development, educational projects, and many more vital areas of needed investment in Central and South America. Its securities and bond issues are being accepted very well on the international financial market, and it has an established reputation for competence, efficiency, and sound operating principles.

The major event in pan-American annals for the year 1961 was the adoption of the Charter of Punta del Este and the Declaration to the Peoples of America on August 17. This event heralded the realization of President John F. Kennedy's proposal for an Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere, inaugurating a new era for the inter-American community in its efforts to secure a better life, under freedom and democracy, for present and future generations. Facing these formidable problems has been a sobering task so far—perhaps some of us were overly hopeful for quick results for the Alliance. But we have learned much in the first years of this massive endeavor; and one of the primary points driven home was reemphasized recently by the Clay Committee report, which stated:

> The Alliance for Progress is a long-term venture of extraordinary complexity and scope, demanding a decade or more of sustained effort by all involved to attain truly significant results; the American public should cease to judge the Alliance on whether it has accomplished in 2 years what must take much longer.

The year 1962 was of tremendous significance in the annals of the international affairs of the Western Hemisphere. The January Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the OAS at Punta del Este was ably attended, at the request of the President, by two Congressional observers—Senators WAYNE MORSE and BOURKE HICKENLOOPER. Their report to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate describes how Secretary of State Rusk, by virtue of patient but arduous negotiating, secured sufficient support among the 20 Republics to exclude the present Government of Cuba from the activities of the Organization of American States and to condemn it as incompatible with the inter-American system. Senators MORSE and HICKENLOOPER stated that this move proved that OAS was capable of effective action and was significant in the precedent that it set.

In addition to the exclusion of Cuba from the activities of the OAS, the remaining 20 American Republics agreed to restrict trade to Cuba in a further effort to isolate the Castro regime.

But October 1962, marked the passage of not only the United States, but of all our hemispheric neighbors, through the gravest crisis of the nuclear age. The direct confrontation of the Soviet Union by the United States over the erection of offensive missile sites in Cuba brought the world to the edge of an abyss. Every one of our partners in the Organization of American States joined in declaring, under the Rio Treaty, the right of the United States to interdict the delivery of further offensive missiles to Cuba—and many joined this effort physically, with naval or air forces, or the offering of the use of naval and air facilities. This unanimous stand by the Western Hemisphere considerably strengthened the hand of the United States in its eventual diplomatic resolution of that terrible crisis.

Mr. Speaker, there is a greater awareness, on Pan American Day this year, of the crucial importance of aiding our Latin American neighbors to establish political and social justice, than there has been for many years. In the spirit of the great men of the Americas—the Bolivars, the San Martins, the Jeffersons, the Roosevelts—we salute the Americas and join with all in this hemisphere in the hope for equality and social justice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 316

Whereas April 14 marks the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, from which the present Organization of American States has evolved;

Whereas the Organization of American States seeks to promote understanding and cordiality among the Republics of the Western Hemisphere;

Whereas understanding and cordiality among the American Republics is a foundation for the peace and economic and social progress of the Americas;

Whereas the Organization of American States is playing an important role in the success of the Alliance for Progress, in which the United States is banded together with the other American Republics to create a better way of life for all the peoples of the hemisphere: Therefore be it

Resolved, That on the seventy-third anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union the House of Representatives of the United States extends to the legislative bodies of each of the other Republics of the Western Hemisphere its warm greetings and expresses a sincere hope for the continuance and intensification of the cooperation of the Americas in the Organization of American States and in other feasible ways.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD following the remarks that have been made on this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on Pan American Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CUBA: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on this day, when we recognize Pan American Day, I feel it is important that we assess our situation in the Caribbean area.

Cuba is clearly the No. 1 testing ground today in the great struggle between international communism and the free world. This is not because of any fear of invasion of the United States from Cuba, but because the island represents a nearby base for subversion and insurgency throughout Latin America.

The attempt by some people to play down the threat of Communist Cuba to our security is both dangerous and foolish. It is also unfortunate that some have tried to label responsible critics of our policies toward Cuba as warmongers or destroyers of the spirit of bipartisanship in foreign affairs.

The fact of the matter is that by planting themselves so firmly in Cuba, the Soviets have shown their ability—and their daring—to set up camp in our own backyard. To many people around the world, Cuba demonstrates that the Soviet Union has the power and gall to establish a significant military, political, and economic base only 90 miles from our coast.

Yet, in only one respect—the introduction of long-range missiles and bombers last fall—has the United States acted to block the Communists. In every other way since the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion, we have done little more than talk.

As a result of our indecision, the Russians have in effect maintained the initiative in the Caribbean. They have even gained most credit in some countries for pursuing a "course of moderation" when we forced them to withdraw as a result of the missile crisis.

The continued rule of Fidel Castro, the Communist puppet, in Cuba reduces the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the world. It is obvious evidence that our Government lacks the purpose to eliminate a Communist threat in its own backyard.

Where, then, do we go from here? There are no easy nor readymade solutions. What we need is a change in attitude in certain quarters and implementation of a firm program to eradicate communism from Cuba.

First of all, there is need for a frank facing up by leaders in our Government to the grave threat to the security of the free world posed by Communist domination of Cuba. This threat cannot be swept under the rug if we expect our allies to join us in effective actions to squelch the Red menace in the Caribbean.

There is today a sort of "crisis of confidence" in the foreign policies of the United States, simply because we have failed to articulate a consistent and firm policy with regard to Cuba. We have been flooded with bold words, but there is a drought of concrete action by our Government.

In the place of consistency, we have had zig-zagging. Instead of planning, we have had improvisation. Rather than determination and boldness, we have had indecision and timidity.

Instead of steering a straight course, dictated by thoughtful policy decisions, we have too often adopted a wait-and-see attitude in dealing with Cuba. This drifting indecisiveness led us to the brink of disaster last October. We may well be in the same situation again if we do not soon launch counterinitiatives of our own.

A continued national debate over Cuban policy—responsibly pursued—can be healthy if it finally prods our Government to take a firm and determined stand. For if there is any lesson that we should have learned from the missile crisis last year it was that when we take a strong stand against Communist expansionism, the result is an easing of tensions.

A clearly enunciated policy to rid the Western Hemisphere of Castroism, followed up by concrete acts to implement it, will show the Soviets we mean what we say. It will demonstrate that they have nothing to gain by their belligerent tactics.

The formulation of an effective policy will not be easy. It must certainly include the wholehearted cooperation of our friends in the Organization of American States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. By exploiting the island nature of Cuba, we can strangle communism there by economic rather than military means.

Formulate a decisive policy we must—and the sooner the better. Furthermore, our policy must have a sense of urgency. The longer we delay taking determined steps, the harder it will be to blunt the Communist design to take over South America.

History has shown time and time again that the real peacemakers are not those who try to compromise with unscrupulous aggressors, but those who see danger in time and act resolutely to counteract it. Peace is something that we, leading the free world, must win—through policies which prove to the Soviets that they have nothing to gain by hostility and that we intend to protect our freedoms at any cost.

The risks involved in a concerted effort to extinguish the flame of communism in Cuba are admittedly great. But there will be even greater risks if we procrastinate further.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 314

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], introduced House Resolution 314, which would have authorized three members of my subcommittee and two outstanding American scientists to visit the Soviet Union in order to examine the All Union Institute on Scientific and Technical Information at Moscow. The trip is part of a program our committee is carrying on to see whether or not we can bring some sort of correlation or coordination between the vast research activities that are going on in our Nation today at the universities throughout America. We are spending millions and even billions of dollars on this research, and it appears to me some effort must be made to develop a better system of inventorying this huge research program.

Our committee is holding hearings to see if some program can be worked out to coordinate those activities. It is our hope that we will be able to ultimately have a more efficient manner of assembling, codifying, and retrieving all of this research material so that duplication can be kept to a minimum. I am certain that American taxpayers can be saved vast sums of money by reducing duplication. More important, researchers can use their valuable time more effectively on new research if that work already done is quickly made available to them.

The Soviet Union is the only nation in the world at this time that has a central institute where all research data is assembled and made available to others through the use of retrieval computers. It is our hope to personally examine this operation so we can fully evaluate its effectiveness.

In view of the fact that neither one of the two minority members on the subcommittee are able to make the trip during the Easter recess, we have made a request, and we have discussed this with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, also the minority leader, the Speaker of the House, and the chairman of the Rules Committee, that we temporarily postpone final action on House Resolution 314 until such time as at least one of the minority members can participate in the trip. I have been informed this can be done sometime in May.

Mr. Speaker, I do feel very strongly that the minority should be represented on such a visit, and, therefore, I have requested that House Resolution 314 not be called up at this time but seek a more propitious time when both sides of the committee can make the trip. I have been informed the delay will not interfere with plans already initiated by the State Department for the visit.

UNAUTHORIZED TRIPS TO CASTRO'S CUBA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that our good friend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has introduced today a bill designed to prevent the unauthorized trips to Castro's Cuba.

The first stage of studies and investigations conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities has already provided evidence that such unauthorized trips take place and that most of these excursions are designed to establish contacts with Soviet and Cuban Communist activists, in order to obtain propaganda material in behalf of Castro and his regime.

The bill would give the President of the United States authority to control the travel abroad of U.S. citizens in time of war or national emergency. On that point it appears important to stress that the United States is at this time still in a state of national emergency proclaimed by President Truman in 1950 at the outbreak of Korean hostilities. That proclamation has never been revoked by either President Eisenhower or President Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, there is obvious need for diligent investigation and legislative action based on the facts developed by such investigation. What we know so far is that U.S. citizens do travel to Cuba without legal authority and in order to conceal their visits they obtain through the cooperation of Castro's consular agents Cuban visas not stamped in their U.S. passports or other travel documents but simply issued on plain sheets of paper which are disposed of after an entry to Cuba is made. This, of course, is done for the purpose of avoiding any evidence or indication that such trips to Cuba are being made. This is an urgent matter, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that we may have action on the bill soon.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor today to introduce on behalf of myself and 36 colleagues the President's National Service Corps legislation, known to some as the Domestic Peace Corps. Essentially, Mr. Speaker, the wonderful objectives of this legislation are to work with people who are in great need, to dramatize human needs, to motivate other Americans to serve, and to attract more Americans into the helping provisions.

I shall include following these brief remarks a communication to the President from the Attorney General and from the President to the Speaker, along with a section-by-section analysis of the bill. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues, and I believe that the great majority will agree that this is indeed a splendid and forward-looking program which can help many Americans to realize their needs. I have the honor to have as my cosponsors the following Members:

The gentleman from Michigan, Congressman O'HARA; the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman SICKLES; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman DENT; the gentleman from California, Congressman BROWN; the gentleman from Hawaii, Congressman GILL; the gentleman from California, Congressman HAWKINS; the gentleman from California, Congressman ROOSEVELT; the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman BLATNIK; the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman FOGARTY; the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman ST GERMAIN; the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman VANIK; the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman UDALL; the gentleman from Delaware, Congressman MACDOWELL; the gentleman from New York, Congressman GILBERT; the gentleman from Washington, Congressman HANSON; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman MOORHEAD; the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman DIGGS; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MACDONALD; the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman DINGELL; the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman RODINO; the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman DANIELS; the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman JOELSON; the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman MINISH; the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman PATTEN; the gentleman from New York, Congressman RYAN; the gentleman from West Virginia, Congressman HECHLER; the gentleman from New York, Congressman DULSKI; the gentleman from Montana, Congressman OLSEN; the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman STAEBLER; the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman ASHLEY; the gentleman from New York, Congressman STRATTON; the gentleman from Hawaii, Congressman MATSUNAGA; the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman SENNER; the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman BASS; the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman LIBONATI; the gentleman from Florida, Congressman PEPPER.

APRIL 10, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft bill relating to the creation of a national service program which you indicated in your "Message on Our Nation's Youth" of February 14 would be submitted to the Congress shortly.

Our recommendation for a national service program is rooted in the paradox of critical human need in the midst of general prosperity. Unfortunate numbers of Americans live in substandard conditions—people who despite efforts to help themselves or because they cannot help themselves, are denied the essentials of a decent life in a generally prosperous society.

These citizens who need help are found among residents of depressed areas and rural and urban slums, the mentally ill and mentally retarded, the elderly, dependent children, those without sufficient education. They include American Indians, Cuban refugees, and migratory farm workers.

Dedicated volunteers in unprecedented numbers work constantly in their own communities to aid these deprived people, and they are doing an excellent job. But the task they face is overwhelming and their human resources are inadequate. Therefore, I am submitting to you a draft bill entitled the National Service Corps Act of 1963, which is designed to accomplish four goals:

To work with people in great need: The program would provide an opportunity for full-time service. At the request of local agencies, institutions, or organizations, corpsmen will work with those Americans in greatest need to help them help themselves.

To dramatize human needs: Many Americans in greatest need are isolated—unseen and forgotten. By informing the Nation pointedly and dramatically of their needs, a national service program—while not solving all these problems—will help to expand the attack on the forces producing deprivation in the United States.

Motivating other citizens to serve: Because projects will be planned, initiated, and supervised by the localities, and will include local counterpart volunteers, the national service program will be a vehicle through which communities can help themselves. Corpsmen, working full time will, by their example, motivate many more citizens to give part-time service in their own communities.

Attracting more Americans into the helping professions: The experience of helping others will inspire many people to choose careers in the service professions—social work, teaching, nursing—all of which suffer from critical shortages of trained personnel.

We envision a National Service Corps small in numbers, modest in cost. A huge national program is neither practical nor consistent with American tradition. It is our recommendation that the program begin with 1,000 corpsmen the first year at an estimated cost of $5 million, gradually expanding to a maximum of 5,000 corpsmen in perhaps 3 years.

Through these corpsmen and the demonstration projects to which they are assigned, the national service program will act as a catalyst to promote greater citizen effort toward the elimination of critical human needs.

We know that Americans have responded to a call from their Government in a time of war. Now we are confident they will respond to another great challenge from their Government in time of peace.

This program will help to awaken Americans to the pockets of poverty and human misery. Americans have demonstrated countless times their willingness to assist their less fortunate countrymen.

In preparing this draft legislation, the study group sought the advice of hundreds of organizations including those which would be most concerned with a national service program. The program has received the enthusiastic support of city and State governments, youth and senior citizens groups, farm and labor organizations, religious groups. Also, groups with which corpsmen would cooperate have endorsed the formation of a corps.

The study group feels that the National Service Corps Act would be a vital supplement to the pending Youth Employment Act. Where youth employment is concerned with finding constructive employment opportunities for boys and girls 16 through 21 who lack adequate skills for today's labor market, the National Service Corps—with skilled and carefully selected men and women of all ages—is aimed at stimulating volunteer efforts in local communities to expand the attack on deprivation in the United States.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 10, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the Congress a legislative proposal to authorize the establishment of a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States. This proposal is an outgrowth of a study by a Cabinet-level committee under the chairmanship of the Attorney General and composed of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

Poverty in the midst of plenty is a paradox that must not go unchallenged in this country. Ours is the wealthiest of nations, yet one-sixth of our people live below minimal levels of health, housing, food and education—in the slums of cities, in migratory labor camps, in economically depressed areas, on Indian reservations. In addition, special hardships are faced by our senior citizens, dependent children, and the victims of mental illness, mental retardation and other disabling misfortunes.

As I stated in my "Message on Our Nation's Youth" to the Congress on February 14, recommending a National Service Corps, this legislation will provide for a carefully selected corps of men and women of all ages who are willing to serve and whose skills and knowledge can contribute in a most valuable and practical way to the ongoing attack upon these problems of national concern. These men and women will be made available, upon local invitation and in cooperation with interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies, to serve for a limited time in projects directed toward the critical human needs of our countrymen.

The example of men and women rendering full-time service within the corps should motivate additional Americans to volunteer their services in their own communities. I am also enclosing a letter discussing the proposed legislation in greater detail which was sent to me by the Attorney General. Also enclosed is a section-by-section analysis of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS BILL AS SUBMITTED BY THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The following is a section-by-section analysis of the executive branch proposed National Service Corps bill. The bill was prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis of the findings and recommendations of the President's study group on a national service program. The provisions of the bill are patterned upon those of the Peace Corps Act with modifications to reflect the fact that the proposed program would operate in the United States rather than in foreign nations. The bill contains a proposed authorization of $5 million for the fiscal year 1964.

Section 1 provides that the bill may be cited as the "National Service Corps Act."

Section 2 states the purposes of the bill. These are to open new opportunities for full-time service working with those Americans in greatest need; to illuminate those needs, so as to expand the attack on deprivation in the United States; to motivate many more citizens to volunteer their services in their own communities, thus encouraging communities to help themselves; and to inspire more people to choose professions that serve their fellow citizens.

This section declares that it is the policy of the United States to carry out the purposes of this act through a National Service Corps, patterned after the Peace Corps, which will be composed of carefully selected men and women of all ages who shall be made available—upon local invitation and in cooperation with interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies—to serve for a limited time in projects directed toward the critical human needs of our countrymen. Projects may include projects designed to make corpsmen available for work with persons in institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded and during their return to normal living; in meeting the health and education needs of migratory workers and their families, Indians living on and off reservations, and residents of depressed areas and rural and urban slums; in care and rehabilitation of the elderly, the disabled, the delinquent young and dependent children; in improving standards of educational opportunity; and in other projects directed toward critical human needs. To the extent possible, each project carried out under this act shall provide for contributions by the cooperating agencies.

Section 3(a) authorizes the President to carry out projects in furtherance of the purposes stated in section 2 on such terms and conditions as he may determine. This bill, like the Peace Corps Act, provides for the granting of all authority and the appropriation of all funds to the President, with power to delegate any or all functions and to allocate any or all funds as he sees fit. (See secs. 4(b) and 7(c).)

Section 3(b) provides that before undertaking a project, the President shall assure himself that it will not displace regular workers or duplicate or replace an existing service in the same locality.

Section 3(c) authorizes an appropriation to the President for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, of not to exceed $5 million to carry out the purposes of the bill.

Section 4(a) authorizes the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Director of the National Service Corps. The President may fix the salary of this officer at a rate not exceeding $20,000 per annum. This section authorizes the President to appoint a Deputy Director of the National Service Corps and to fix his salary at a rate not exceeding $19,500 per annum.

Section 4(b) authorizes the President to exercise any functions vested in him by the bill through such agency or officer of the Government as he shall direct. The head of any agency or any officer performing functions under the bill delegated by the President is authorized to promulgate rules and regulations and to delegate his functions under the bill. This subsection is identical to section 4(b) of the Peace Corps Act. Under the authority of this subsection it is intended that the National Service Corps would be established by the President as a semiautonomous agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with most of the operating functions delegated to the Director of the National Service Corps.

Section 5(a) authorizes the President to enroll in the National Service Corps for service in the United States, qualified citizens and nationals of the United States, to be known as corpsmen. It is intended that the terms and conditions of the service of National Service Corps men be exclusively those stated in the bill and those consistent with the bill which the President prescribes. Because many of the statutory rules relating to persons regularly employed in Government agencies would be inappropriate or irrelevant to this new type of temporary volunteer service, this subsection, patterned after the Peace Corps Act, provides that corpsmen are not to be deemed to be officers or employees of the United States for any purpose except as provided in the bill. By providing that service as a corpsman is not to be considered Government employment, this subsection would, for example, permit retired Government personnel to serve as corpsmen and receive the same benefits as other corpsmen without loss of pension rights.

Section 5(b) provides that whenever the President determines that it is in the national interest, he may, under such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, enroll qualified foreign nationals in the Corps for service in the United States. It is intended that the authority granted in this subsection would be sparingly used to permit the enrollment, for example, of Cuban nationals resident in the United States for service on a project serving the needs of Cuban refugees or of Mexican nations for service on a project serving the needs of migrant workers and their families.

Section 5(c) is similar to the comparable subsection in the Peace Corps Act and provides that corpsmen shall be furnished with such living, travel, and leave allowances and such housing, transportation, supplies, equipment, subsistence, and clothing as the President determines to be necessary for their maintenance and to insure health and effectiveness. It is intended that, as nearly as practicable, the corpsmen will live on the same level as their counterparts in the host community. This subsection also authorizes the furnishing of transportation and travel allowances to applicants for enrollment and former corpsmen en route to or from places of examinations, training, enrollment, and termination. The authority with respect to applicants is included because persons will not be enrolled in the National Service Corps until they are finally selected, following training, and actually report for service.

Section 5(d) is similar to the comparable subsection in the Peace Corps Act and provides for payment of an adjustment allowance to corpsmen at rates fixed by the President but not to exceed $75 for each month of satisfactory service as determined by the President. These payments would accumulate monthly but would normally not be paid until the termination of service, as they are intended primarily to assist corpsmen during the period of transition back to life at home. However, in order to enable the corpsman while in service to meet important obligations, such as contribution to the education of other members of his family, payment of life insurance premiums, or emergency expenses, the President could permit a portion or all of the accrued amount of the adjustment allowance to be disbursed while the corpsman was in service.

Section 5(e) authorizes the designation of corpsman leaders from among the corpsmen. Corpsman leaders would be persons, generally senior to corpsmen in age and experience, who were required for supervisory or other special duties or responsibilities in the field. All the provisions of the bill relating to corpsmen would apply to corpsman leaders, and the term "corpsmen" throughout the bill includes "corpsman leaders."

Section 5(f) provides that corpsmen shall be treated as Government employees for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, which provides for disability compensation payments and medical care in the case of injury or disease arising out of Federal employment. For the purpose of fixing the level of disability benefits, which is related to earnings, corpsmen would be deemed to be receiving monthly pay at the lowest rate provided for GS–7 in the executive branch. Under this provision, at present GS rates, a corpsman who became permanently and totally disabled would receive $—— per month.

As under the Peace Corps Act, where a corpsman suffered injury or illness while located in the United States, the rules applied in similar cases by the Federal Employees' Compensation Board would determine whether the illness or injury arose out of the corpsman's service. Although covered by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act at all times, a corpsman would not begin to receive disability payments and other benefits so long as he was in service, since he would be receiving living expenses and full medical care during that time and would continue to accrue his adjustment allowance. This subsection also insures that the injured corpsman, or his dependents in the case of death, will not receive double benefits, by providing that any payment on account of the same injury or death received from the entity to which the corpsman was assigned shall be credited against any benefits payable under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

Section 5(g) provides that corpsmen shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and of title II of the Social Security Act, and any service performed by an individual as a corpsman shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States. It is intended that corpsmen would be treated equally with other persons not in the National Service Corps, with respect to income and withholding taxes, social security taxes, and social security coverage. There are no provisions in the bill comparable to sections 201 and 202 of the Peace Corps Act which amended the Internal Revenue Code and the Social Security Act to provide for exemptions from gross income for certain allowances, and for special "backpay" treatment of termination or readjustment payments.

Section 5(h) is similar to the comparable provision in the Peace Corps Act and authorizes the President to make provision for health examinations and immunization of corpsmen preparatory to service and complete health care during service. Under regulations prescribed by the President, such examinations, immunization, and care could be provided through available medical facilities of other agencies and in such cases the agency operating the medical facility would be reimbursed from National Service Corps appropriations. Where examination, immunization, or care were not furnished through other Government facilities, other arrangements would be made either by the National Service Corps or, in the case of some projects administered through other agencies, by the administering agency pursuant to agreement with the National Service Corps.

Section 5(i) enables corpsmen to obtain credit for the period of their volunteer service for the purposes of retirement, and also generally for the purposes of seniority, reduction in force, leave accumulation or other rights and privileges based on length of service, in the event they later became employed in any of the various Federal civilian employment systems. Under such conditions as the President might specify, examinations and other prerequisites for admission to other Federal employment established by laws administered by the Civil Service Commission could be waived for corpsmen who had successfully completed volunteer training.

Section 5(j) authorizes the President to detail or assign corpsmen or otherwise make them available to other agencies of the U.S. Government or any State or subdivision thereof, private nonprofit organizations, and other organizations, individuals and firms. Corpsmen so assigned or detailed would continue to be entitled to the benefits, allowances and privileges provided for corpsmen.

Section 5(k) provides that corpsmen shall be deemed employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act and other similar Federal claims statutes (such as the Suits in Admiralty Act) which waive the Government's immunity from suit. This means that the Government could be sued for damages for the negligent act or omission or certain other wrongful conduct of a corpsman under circumstances where the Government, if a private person, would be liable. Claims of this nature not in excess of $2,500 could be settled administratively under the Federal Tort Claims Act. This subsection also provides that corpsmen shall be subject to provisions of the Hatch Act which limit the political activities of employees of the United States.

Section 5(l) authorizes the President to terminate the service of a corpsman at any time at his pleasure.

Section 5(m) provides that upon enrollment every corpsman shall take the following oath prescribed for persons appointed to any office of honor or profit by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

Section 5(n) authorizes the President to provide training for applicants for enrollment as corpsmen and for corpsmen following enrollment. It is intended that actual enrollment in the National Service Corps take place after the basic period of training and after final selection for service on a particular project. During training, however, applicants for enrollment would be treated in all respects as corpsmen and would be subject to the same conditions of service as corpsmen, except that their training period would not be credited toward retirement or other benefits in other Federal services in which they may subsequently be employed. (See sec. 17(c).)

Section 5(o) provides that the number of corpsmen enrolled in the National Service Corps shall not exceed 1,000 during the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, and shall not exceed 5,000 at any time thereafter, unless otherwise authorized by the Congress.

Section 6 authorizes the President to employ such personnel other than corpsmen as the President deems necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of the bill. Such personnel, unlike corpsmen, would be subject to the usual rules of Government employment and to the provisions of the bill applicable to employees.

Section 7(a)(1) is similar to section 10(a)(1) of the Peace Corps Act, and authorizes the President, in furtherance of the purposes of the bill, to make contracts and agreements and otherwise cooperate with agencies of the U.S. Government or of any State or subdivision thereof, private nonprofit organizations, and other private organizations, individuals, and firms.

Section 7(a)(2) authorizes the President to accept voluntary services and gifts of money or property for the use of the National Service Corps in furtherance of the purposes of the bill. This provision is similar to one contained in section 10(a)(3) of the Peace Corps Act. It makes clear the National Service Corps' authority to accept gifts of money or equipment or to accept contributions, for example, to establish training or operating facilities which might provide the framework for National Service Corps projects. This subsection also authorizes the President to dispose of such donated property in furtherance of the purposes of the bill.

Section 7(b) provides that a contract or agreement for services of corpsmen may obligate current fiscal year funds available under the bill for a period of not more than 2 years, including funds for the purpose of paying or providing for the allowances and other benefits of corpsmen. Such contracts or agreements would be subject to termination if Congress terminated the program. This subsection is based upon section 10(c) of the Peace Corps Act which provided 3-year contract authority.

Section 7(c) is similar to section 10(e) of the Peace Corps Act, with minor modification. It permits funds available for the purposes of the bill to be allocated to any Government agency in connection with activities under the bill. Funds so allocated could be spent in accordance with the authority of the bill or in accordance with authority governing the activities of the agency to which the funds were allocated.

Section 7(d) is the same as section 10(f) of the Peace Corps Act. It authorizes any officer of the Government carrying out functions under the bill to utilize the services and facilities of other Government agencies to procure commodities from other Government agencies.

Section 7(e) is the same as section 10(g) of the Peace Corps Act. It sets forth the manner in which reimbursement or payment, when required, is to be made to another agency furnishing facilities, services, or commodities to carry out the bill.

Section 8(a) is substantially identical to section 12(a) of the Peace Corps Act. It authorizes the President to appoint persons to membership on a National Service Corps Advisory Council to advise and consult with him with regard to general policies and programs designed to further the purposes of the bill. The members of this Council are to be broadly representative of various public and private organizations and groups as well as individuals interested in the programs and objectives of the National Service Corps.

Section 8(b) provides that members of the Council shall serve at the pleasure of the President and meet at his call. It further provides that members who are not employees of the Government may receive out of funds available for purposes of the bill compensation not exceeding $75 for each day, not to exceed 20 days in any fiscal year, spent away from their homes or regular places of business in connection with meetings or conferences of the Council, and while so engaged may receive travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2). This provision is similar to section 12(b) of the Peace Corps Act.

Section 9(a) is similar to section 13 of the Peace Corps Act. It authorizes the employment of experts and consultants and organizations thereof in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 55a, with compensation at rates not exceeding $75 per diem plus travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2). The proviso at the end of this subsection authorizes annual renewal of all contracts under this subsection.

Section 9(b) exempts experts and consultants appointed under section 9(a) from Federal conflict-of-interest laws except insofar as they prohibit any individual from receiving compensation from nongovernmental sources with respect to any particular matter in which he was directly involved in the performance of his Government service. Exemption is also provided from laws governing reemployment of retired officers or employees and simultaneous receipt of compensation and retired pay or annuities. The same exemptions are provided for members (except regular Government employees) of the Council referred to in section 8. These exemptions are the same as those provided in section 13(b) of the Peace Corps Act for experts and consultants and members of the Peace Corps National Advisory Board.

Section 10 provides express authority for a number of specific kinds of expenditures. Most of these provisions are designed to provide the express authority to make specific uses of appropriated funds which is (or appears to be) required by various statutes and Comptroller General rulings, or to overcome or modify certain Government-wide restrictions which would inhibit effective and efficient National Service Corps operations. Each of these authorities is provided with respect to the Peace Corps program by section 15 of the Peace Corps Act. Specifically, this subsection authorizes:

(1) payment of rents in the United States, for which express authorization is required by the provisions of 40 United States Code 34, 40 United States Code 304c, and Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950. Rental funds for Peace Corps activities have been included in the Peace Corps appropriations rather than in General Services Administration appropriations. It is intended to continue this practice for the National Service Corps. This would enable the National Service Corps to rent recruitment or training facilities outside of Washington. This paragraph also permits expenditures for repairs, alterations, and improvements to leased properties in excess of 25 percent of the first year's rent, the ceiling imposed by 40 United States Code 278a.

(2) expenses of printing and binding without regard to the provisions of section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C 111). This provision, similar to that contained in section 15(a) of the Peace Corps Act, would be utilized sparingly as necessary to meet the needs of the National Service Corps for recruiting materials and for printed matter in a time schedule which cannot be met under existing regulations.

(3) expenses in connection with meetings concerned with the purposes of the bill, including meetings of experts or consultants appointed under section 13(a). This paragraph has been included, as in section 15(d)(2) of the Peace Corps Act, in view of the provisions of 31 United States Code 551 and 31 United States Code 673.

(4) expenses of preparing, transporting and disposing of remains of corpsmen dying while away from their homes participating in activities under the bill. This is similar to the provisions of section 15(d)(10) of the Peace Corps Act and to authority presently available for employees of the Government and their dependents under 5 United States Code 103a.

Section 11 requires the President to transmit reports to Congress on operations under the bill at least once in each fiscal year.

Section 12 provides that all persons employed or assigned to duties under the bill and all corpsmen enrolled in the National Service Corps shall be investigated to insure that the employment, assignment, or enrollment is consistent with the national interest in accordance with standards and procedures established by the President. Under this provision, the security investigations of all persons employed by the National Service Corps and all corpsmen would be governed by the provisions of Executive Order 10450, as amended. Corpsmen would receive the same security investigation now conducted of all persons who are candidates for a "nonsensitive" position with the U.S. Government.

Section 13 authorizes the President to adopt a seal or emblem for the National Service Corps.

Section 14 is the same as section 20 of the Peace Corps Act. It amends the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to suspend principal and interest payments on such loans for student borrowers during the period of their National Service Corps service, as is now provided with respect to borrowers in military service. Because of possible constitutional objections to this amendment if applied mandatorily to loans outstanding on the date of enactment of the bill, a proviso has been added which would apply the amendments to loans outstanding on that date only with the consent of the lender.

Section 15 is the same as section 21 of the Peace Corps Act. It contains a technical amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act to assure that a corpsman who later became a participant in the civil service retirement system would not receive both annuity payments under that system and social security benefits based upon his period of volunteer service.

Section 16 defines various terms used in the bill. In particular, subsection (d) defines the period of service of a corpsman so as to include the training period prior to enrollment, except for the purpose of accruing retirement or other credit in connection with subsequent Federal employment. These definitions are substantially the same as those in section 25 of the Peace Corps Act.

Section 17 is a standard separability provision.

Section 18 provides that the bill's effective date shall be the date of its enactment.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] in sponsoring the legislation which President Kennedy today has transmitted to Congress to establish a National Service Corps.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces critical human needs—needs which are often overshadowed by our concern with foreign affairs and obscured by the fact that ours is the most prosperous Nation in the world. Poverty is a way of life for a large segment of our population.

President Kennedy has put the challenge, "Poverty in the midst of abundance is a paradox that must not go unchallenged." The skills, talents, and leisure of Americans of all ages could be utilized in renewed attacks upon unmet needs.

President Kennedy's proposed national service program is designed to awaken every citizen to our human problems and to stir an individual sense of responsibility for the public welfare. The program can do this in two ways.

First, the legislation would provide a small national service corps of skilled men and women, embodying a totally new concept of voluntaryism: a year of full-time service work with people in great need—in mental hospitals, in urban slums, and underdeveloped rural areas, in migrant labor camps, on Indian reservations—at local invitation.

Second, and most important, the work of these corpsmen, by focusing immediate attention on problem areas, will stimulate many more Americans to join volunteer programs attacking problems in their own communities.

Thus, the goal is a great citizen response to needs at the community level, through public and private agency programs. The National Service Corps would trigger this response, which would benefit existing volunteer programs throughout the country.

For example, there is an urgent need for volunteers to help young people who fail in school or quit before graduation because of lack of help and guidance.

School failure and school dropouts represent a tremendous challenge to the future vitality of our Nation, yet there are simply not enough professional teachers to give badly needed personal attention to these young people. The New York City Board of Education suggests that an auxiliary worker—a corpsman or a local part-time volunteer—

serving as an aid to the professional teacher, could help close the gap. The roles of these aids would be as varied as the reasons for school failure.

One of the most serious disadvantages of many children entering school from deprived home backgrounds is limited verbal skill. The child has not been exposed to the varieties of spoken expression that most children hear in their homes. Thus, he may fall behind and never catch up in the basic skills of reading and writing. With professional guidance, corpsmen would organize speech clinics and other group activities to improve the verbal ability of these children.

Another often neglected group of children are those with better than average IQ's who do poorly in school because of emotional difficulties caused by problems in their home life. Often well behaved in school, these children quietly drop out before graduation. Under professional guidance, a corpsman would work with 20 to 30 such students on an individual basis. He would serve as a combination caseworker, friend, and counselor, trying to help the children solve—or at least learn to live with—their home problems. He would tutor them after school and generally serve as a guide throughout the critical period when they might ordinarily quit school.

The New York City Board of Education proposal also calls for the corpsmen to help develop new school community programs for local volunteers. These new programs would be cosponsored by local community organizations.

Thus, a National Service Corps could pave the way for increased citizen involvement in this field and others by showing where there is a need and by pointing out how local part-time volunteers can give useful service.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of narcotic addiction is one of the most serious problems in the country. At last we are beginning to deal with it as an illness. In my congressional district the New York City Department of Health is experimenting with clinics which provide psychiatric help and guidance and vocational counseling for narcotic addicts. This is an imaginative approach which has been developed in cooperation with local civic and political groups which comprise the West Side Narcotics Council. I have worked closely with those involved in this effort in presenting the program to the mayor and board of estimate.

National Service Corps volunteers could play a major role in expanding this program. I strongly recommend that the proposed National Service Corps develop a project to work with narcotic clinics to provide aftercare and rehabilitation services for addicts.

Mr. Speaker, if our Nation is to continue as a beacon of hope and inspiration to the rest of the world, we must use our full resources to meet the unfilled needs of millions of our fellow Americans who live in ignorance, poverty, and disease. I believe that thousands of dedicated volunteers will come forward to help millions of our underprivileged citizens achieve better health, education, and opportunity for a decent life.

The national service program is an effective way to expand existing volunteer programs on the local level. Let us consider it as a spark which will kindle community concern and reflect American idealism at home as the Peace Corps does overseas.

TO ESTABLISH THE OZARK NATIONAL RIVERS AREA

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings this week on S. 16 and H.R. 1803, and H.R. 2884. These bills are identical. S. 16 has been introduced by the Honorable Senators STUART SYMINGTON and EDWARD V. LONG of Missouri. H.R. 1803 has been introduced by me and H.R. 2884 has been introduced by my colleague, the Honorable FRANK KARSTEN, Member of Congress from the First District of Missouri. The purpose of the legislation is to establish the Ozark National Rivers Area to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior under the objectives of the 1916 act establishing the National Park Service for the purpose of preserving and interpreting the unique qualities of the area while allowing its use.

The preservation and development of the Current, Eleven Point, and Jacks Fork Rivers in Missouri is something that has been under discussion and study for many years. I first became interested in the proposal while serving in the Missouri House, when the house in 1956 appropriated funds to match Federal funds for the purpose of making a study of the area. Later, when I was speaker of the Missouri House of Representatives, I made a trip to Washington in behalf of the proposal.

During recent years a great deal of attention has been devoted to the need for setting aside in public ownership the unspoiled portions of our rivers, lakes, and ocean shorelines. The need becomes more apparent each year as our population increases. The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers country in my district in southern Missouri represents a striking opportunity for preservation in the interest of not only the Midwest, but the entire Nation—clear, cold, beautiful, spring-fed streams, but not assured of remaining in that state unless something is done.

Located within the proposed park area are some of the largest springs in the world. Big Spring, at Van Buren, has flowed as much as 840 million gallons a day and it has averaged over the last 20 years better than 250 million gallons a day. The area has six springs which flow more than 65 million gallons a day each. Within the area close to the rivers are 13 named caves, 11 interesting geological sites, 40 archeological sites, a number of splendid ecological sites and many sinks. There are few places in the world where so much of nature's beauty can be preserved by setting aside so little.

The bills introduced in the 87th Congress gave the proposed park area the classification of a monument within the national park system. Approximately 16 percent of the land was already in State or Federal ownership. The area had 117 miles on the Current, 39 miles on the Jacks Fork, and 34 miles on the Eleven Point, in Oregon County. No land was to be taken within 2 miles of the city limits of Van Buren, Doniphan, and Eminence, which was for the purpose of leaving room for future growth of those towns.

The boundaries of the proposed park are located in an underdeveloped section of the Ozarks. Forty percent of the farmers in the region have an income of less than $1,000 per annum, and it is an area of diminishing population. The population today is only 70 percent of what it was 50 years ago. Employment opportunities are very meager and there are relatively few people of working age in the area. Certainly, something needs to be done to improve the economy of the area and all studies have shown that establishment of the proposed park will increase the economic opportunities of the region.

Even though the area did consist of 113,000 acres of land and running along 190 miles of the three rivers, there was a surprisingly small number of people living full time in the area. But these people do present a difficult problem. Many of the families have lived for generations in the area, and it is a pretty harsh procedure to compel them to leave the area in the interest of preservation. There are many values other than monetary which they attach to the land. To alleviate the difficulties of the residents we wrote into the bill a provision permitting the owners to reserve a life estate. That is, the Government could only purchase the remainder—the interest after the life of the owner and his or her spouse. There are also other provisions in the bill designed to protect the interest of the landowner.

When I began the Ozark Rivers project, my primary consideration was improving the economy of the area, rather than preservation. However, today I am just as strongly motivated by the need of preservation. Many people not being familiar with the area have written me asking why we do not leave the area as it is. Why change? These people fail to realize that to keep the area as it is without governmental action is impossible. The beauty of the area has begun to erode; and the erosion will continue at a more rapid pace in the years ahead. Today most of the land along the rivers is owned by nonresidents, and it has become increasingly difficult for the public and even residents of the area to gain access to the river.

Further provisions of the original bill provided for the U.S. Government to make payments to the county in lieu of taxes in order to compensate the counties for tax losses due to land being taken off the tax rolls prior to the operation and buildup of the park.

It further provided that hunting and fishing in the park would be permitted in accordance with the laws of Missouri. Several people have asked why we designated the park as the Ozark Rivers National Monument indicating that the word "monument" is not very descriptive of the area. They were correct. The only reason we designated the area as a monument was because hunting was frowned upon in national park areas and nearly everyone agreed that hunting should be permitted in this area. The Missouri Conservation Commission which has 15,000 acres of land in the area felt very strongly that hunting should be permitted. Then, too, monuments in the National Park System are usually employed in areas with one outstanding feature. In the Ozark Rivers area we have several thousand acres and many attractive features. The name definitely was not appropriate. H.R. 1803 and S. 16 differ from the bills introduced in the 87th Congress in only three respects.

First. The name is changed from the Ozark Rivers National Monument to Ozark National Rivers. This is a change in name only. The area will still be administered by the National Park Service.

Second. All the area in Howell, Oregon, and Ripley Counties is omitted. The Eleven Point River is not included in the bill due to objections from people in Oregon County.

Third. The National Park Service is given the explicit power to negotiate the purchase of scenic easements. This is new authority given the National Park Service. However, this is authority to negotiate and purchase alone. The Park Service is not given the power to condemn a scenic easement.

H.R. 1803, H.R. 2884, and S. 16, Mr. Speaker, represent an outstanding opportunity to set aside in public ownership one of the most beautiful areas in the United States. I sincerely hope the Congress will act favorably upon the legislation during this session of Congress.

AFRICAN FREEDOM DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago on April 15 the President of the United States joined in the observance of African Freedom Day in the ceremonies in Washington. The occasion was the third anniversary of a gathering of representatives of the then free African states, eight in number, at which was adopted a resolution that spoke the spirit of independence and of amity among the nations and the peoples of the continent of Africa in working out their destiny in a world of freedom.

The fifth anniversary of African Freedom Day will fall on April 15, when the House will not be in session. I am happy to take this opportunity, before we adjourn for the Easter recess, of extending congratulations and good wishes to all the peoples and all the free nations of Africa. Sincerely do we wish them well in meeting the problems of new nations; problems that are never easy and that challenge the utmost in effort, in hard work, and in dedication. Those were the problems faced by our own Nation when we broke from colonialism years ago and started on the task of building a nation that now has become the leader and the bulwark of the world of freedom.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa I have followed closely the developments in that continent. I have had the privilege and the pleasure of acquaintance with many of the leaders in many countries in Africa. I have been heartened and my faith in the future has been strengthened by the marvelous progress that has been made. To all the new emerging nations of Africa, to all the African nations on the threshold of independence, to all the people of Africa do I extend warmest good wishes.

We are in a changing world. We are in a world in which peoples everywhere are looking for freedom from poverty, from disease, from the handicap of ignorance. We are looking forward to a rebuilt world in which there will be the blessing of permanent peace because there will be no causes to incite nations to the destructive tragedy of war.

We are building to a tomorrow in which men everywhere will enjoy dignity. Communism is certain to fail because in communism is a denial of human dignity. Nowhere is that recognized more thoroughly than in Africa. As the new emerging nations of Africa in increasing numbers take their places among the sovereign nations of the world, some of them destined to greatness because of the character of their people and their potential wealth, I am confident they will be strong forces for freedom in the world of the tomorrow. Again, my congratulations and good wishes.

THE "PAUL REVERE RIDERS"

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the morning press that the opposition party is going to send out a task force over the country during the Easter recess which they claim will act as informers.

Mr. Speaker, I was rather surprised that they would name this group "The Paul Revere Riders" because in my opinion if Paul Revere were alive today he would be a Democrat. He was a man of vision and courage and a man who was working in the interest of freedom and progress for the great American people. It might be, however, that they have named this group "The Paul Revere Riders" in order to date the type of information and education which they will try to portray on this futile tour.

I would say to my friends that the Democrats are going home to listen.

We are going home to talk to our people and to listen to them and to do the things that we have always done. That which is inspired by our constituents back in the district. But I am afraid some of my Republican friends are going on this trip because they do not want to go home. They do not want to have to explain the vote that they cast yesterday on the bill which was designed to stimulate our economy and bring progress to the country. Some of the city and county officials and people who are the recipients of that program may want them to explain their reasons for that vote yesterday, against the public works appropriation.

FATHER JOSEPH F. THORNING

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great American who today offered the prayer in the House of Representatives on the anniversary of Pan American Day. I am referring to Father Joseph F. Thorning, of Carrollton Manor, in the heart of Maryland. Farther Thorning, as you know, is the pastor of St. Joseph's Church there. I would like to remind the House that Father Thorning has offered the prayer here in the House of Representatives on this day ever since the year 1944, for 19 consecutive years.

He is a great American and he has done much in the Latin American area in the cause of freedom, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I hope, and I know we all hope, that we will be privileged to have him here to offer the prayer in the House of Representatives for many years to come on the anniversary of Pan American Day.

PORK OR PRINCIPLE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was rather amazed to hear the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] take the floor to gloat over the vote yesterday. The vote was very clearly one on a question of pork or principle. Every Congressman in the House had something in his district involved in that bill, in all probability; indeed, I did. And I shall go back to my people and tell them that the national interests are such that they transcend what might be the provincial interests of my community, because we have a serious problem of balance of payments, of gold flow, of deficit financing. The vote yesterday was one in which a Member had to make up his mind whether the provincial interest in his district ought to prevail over the national interest.

Let anyone on the Democratic side deny that it was not placed on that kind of a low level by this administration. Each one of us was contacted and in one way or another appealed to in his local interest and the desire of a Congressman to get reelected, on the assumption that if he voted for a project in his district, whether it was justified or not or whether it was in context with the national interest, that it would help him.

I am hopeful that when my Democratic colleagues go back home they will find that the people have a better understanding of the importance of the national interest and are willing to put aside what might be to their momentary advantage in some of these ill-conceived projects and in the case of worthy projects defer them until our revenues reveal we can afford them.

GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in the month of May, farmers who grow wheat will vote to determine what type of Government program shall rule their destiny. That destiny is more than economic. The decision's import will touch every American citizen.

To put this matter in perspective, the gentleman from Iowa would ask these questions:

If the U.S. Government can, through a compulsory program, determine what a farmer will plant, and how much he can plant, that same Government has the same fundamental authority to tell a newspaper what to print and how much to print—to tell a preacher what to preach or a teacher what to teach. Can that statement be refuted? Is there some philosophic or legal conception which sets agriculture apart from other considerations—which places farmers under a different set of privileges or restraints?

And in the final analysis, does it make a particle of difference whether the farmer voted for the loss of freedom willingly, or under duress, or because of misleading or misunderstanding?

Is there yet one among us, Mr. Speaker, who can relate the history of any nation which traded some of its freedom for security, and ever retained either?

This is proper season, Mr. Speaker, to note that "man cannot live by bread alone," even if the bread is made from $2 wheat.

Apropos of the previous comment is the following letter which was received by the Honorable DURWARD HALL, Representative from the State of Missouri:

> DEAR MR. HALL: I understand that Freeman and Kennedy contemplate the complete control of the dairy industry. The deal as explained in the Springfield paper would practically ruin me and others around here for we milk in the spring and summer off the grass. A monthly quota system would simply mean to give most of it away. Cows milk after they freshen and if they are geared to calve in the spring it is time and production consuming to change them to suit the shims and fancies of politicians. Tell the boys they milk much cheaper from grass than even from Government grain. I milk cows, raise hogs, beef, corn, and hay. If my farm is state controlled and I don't have the freedom to run it as I choose, do I really own it? If I don't own it what is the difference between this and Russia?
>
> Now I realize that to simply be against something is not enough. We must find some constructive answers to the dairy problem, if there is a problem. Perhaps something that could be seen about in Washington would be the finding of some other medium besides milk to test the amount of fallout. This has hurt milk sales no doubt. Then about the world trade deal—I don't understand that Dr. Hall and I don't think anyone else around here does; perhaps you should enlighten us as well as Mr. Kennedy is going to do.
>
> I've got three boys, 7, 5, and 1; sure would hate to see politics and schooling get mixed up together. We don't need any Federal aid in Jenkins. I've said enough, just wanted you to know that we, the people, are still interested in our country, and are behind you 100 percent.

DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from New York with reference to the "Padre of the Americas," who offered the prayer here today. I certainly echo his sentiments in hoping that Dr. Thorning can be here on Pan American Day for many years in the future.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I am delighted that Members are taking time for this purpose today, and I associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MATHIAS. I would also like to comment on the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee, with whom I often agree. I do not know, however, how he can determine that Paul Revere was a member of either of our parties, because I believe Paul Revere had all the qualities of patriotism that all Americans would want to emulate today. I have to admit there is an affinity that is recognizable and timely. Certainly Paul Revere was a man who had an ambition to manage the news.

FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, in response to some of the spending activity that has taken place on the floor of this House this week, and partially in response to a question posed to me by some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee, I am prompted to make a brief reply.

Being new in this body, I was somewhat surprised this week at the number of times I heard the statements:

"This program won't cost us a dime."

"This program will actually save us money."

"Don't you want to do something for the people?"

It was amazing also, that almost every program presented was the best program ever offered.

Now, I do not know about other parts of the United States, but I do know about west Texas and, frankly speaking, Mr. Speaker, we supposedly saved so much money this past week in appropriating new funds to help aid depressed areas that I am concerned that west Texas received such a savings that we could also, very possibly, become a depressed area if such savings programs are continued. I am glad we will not be saving money this next week during the Easter recess like we did last week.

In answer to some of my free-spending colleagues, yes, I do want to do something for the people. I want to grant them a little relief from their continually growing tax burden. I want them to have the freedom to make their own decisions and spend their own money instead of some Federal bureaucrat doing it for them.

For some strange reason, I find the folks in my district of west Texas are sick and tired and fed up with the sort of savings programs we have been enacting this past week. The folks back home, in west Texas at least, are looking for a Government "hand out"—they want the Government's hand out of their pockets.

Some have posed the question, in response to my reasoning and statements, "What kind of a nut is he?" The answer is best given by my hometown daily, the Odessa American, as follows:

> WHAT KIND OF A "NUT" IS HE?
>
> He wants to run his own business.
> He wants to select his own doctor.
> He wants to make his own bargains.
> He wants to buy his own insurance.
> He wants to select his own reading matter.
> He wants to provide for his own old age.
> He wants to make his own contracts.
> He wants to select his own charities.
> He wants to educate his children as he wishes.
> He wants to make his own investments.
> He wants to select his own friends.
> He wants to provide his own recreation.
> He wants to compete freely in the marketplace.
> He wants to grow by his own efforts.
> He wants to profit from his own errors.

He wants to take part in the competition of ideas.

He wants to be a man of good will.

What kind of a nut is he? He's an American who understands and believes in the Declaration of Independence, that's what kind.

Aren't you glad you are too? And don't you wonder why so many of our fellow Americans are trying so hard to destroy the kind of life that has made us the aim and the envy of every other people on earth?

The question is: What kind of nuts are they?

NUCLEAR SUBMARINE—THE "THRESHER"

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach this Easter season, this being Holy Thursday, tomorrow Good Friday, and on Sunday our Lord rises from the dead and is resurrected, I am impelled to say a word about the 129 young Americans whose bodies probably are entombed at the bottom of the North Atlantic in our great attack submarine, the *Thresher*.

I am sure every Member of this House feels just as I do that it is a great tragedy and that if one of our sons were there, it would be a terrible personal tragedy.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members of this House with a tremendous responsibility in passing the Selective Service Act and drafting or otherwise inducing our young men into the service of the United States for the protection and freedom of our citizens, my prayers, and I am sure those of my colleagues, today and over this weekend go out for sympathy to the parents and the members of the families of these young men.

Our first prayers express hope that they may be rescued and returned; yet, at this time I have the feeling and it has been voiced in official circles that there is little hope left for them.

So my prayers, our prayers, go out to the families of these young men. Surely, it is some consolation to them that these men died in the service of their country. It is our duty to see that their deaths shall not have been in vain and that this House of Representatives now and in the future will see to it that we try to preserve that peace for which they gave their lives.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1962—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 27)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10(b)4 of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *April 11, 1963*.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight Saturday, April 13, to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HEED WARNINGS ABOUT REDS IN THE CARIBBEAN

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the April 6, 1963, issue of the Miami Herald, and in the April 9, 1963, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, editorials appeared concerning my efforts to warn the Congress and the American people of the Communist conspiracy pushing toward impending disaster in certain areas in the Western Hemisphere. Although the editorials, for which I am dearly grateful, speak for themselves, I would like to remind this great body that the Herald is the largest daily newspaper in the State of Florida and the largest American daily sitting closest to Cuba and to the Caribbean while the Chicago Sun-Times expresses a similar view many miles to the north. I hold a great deal of respect for their evaluation of the present situation in the Caribbean and am, therefore, inserting their editorials in the Record at this point. I believe the Herald's and Sun-Times' evaluation of my statements to be a further substantiation of the facts and for my concern. I have asked the British Government to advise me of the number of Russians, Red Chinese, and satellite nations' passports they have issued in the last 2 years. The British have an open door to the Caribbean for the Communists—still do business with those countries—including Castro's Cuba. The United States has made no public request to Great Britain to end this aid to the Communist. Is it not about time such a demand was made?

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 6, 1963]

Red Dominoes From Cuba?

The possibility of a "domino effect" in the West Indies has existed since Cuba fell to the Reds 4 years ago. Representative William C. Cramer, Republican, of Florida, cites disturbing signs of stepped-up Soviet activity to topple the chain of islands which form the eastern shore of the Caribbean, the Mediterranean of the New World.

Mr. Cramer predicts flatly that Haiti will fall within 3 or 4 months unless the United States takes emergency action. This won't be news to Herald readers who have followed on-the-scene reports of impending disaster in Haiti, which shares the island of Hispaniola with the Dominican Republic.

All that separates Haiti from Communist Cuba is the deep and narrow Windward Passage, a major world sealane. The two countries are literally within sight of each other, and many Haitians work in Cuban sugarfields.

Mr. Cramer attributes his information to "sources which I consider completely reliable." They tell him there are Russians—"as many as 1 Russian to every 10 natives"—in major cities of such key islands as Trinidad, Barbados, and Curacao.

The reliability of Mr. Cramer's sources may be appraised by his recent reports of travel to Cuba from Mexico. He got his facts from the manifests of Cubana Airlines planes. They showed 3,447 trips to Cuba by this route in a 6-month period last year. Nearly half the travelers were from 17 Latin American countries. There were 265 from Russia and its satellites. Ninety-nine citizens of the United States made the journey in defiance of a U.S. ban.

No one has challenged the accuracy of Mr. Cramer's figures on the comings and goings between Mexico City and Cuba. No one in official position has done anything about it, either.

If his reports on Russian infiltration of the West Indies are correct, the danger to the Americas is obvious. The islands command all the eastern approaches to the Panama Canal. They are the "soft underbelly" of the Western Hemisphere, like Europe's relation to islands in the Mediterranean and the north coast of Africa.

The Congressman from St. Petersburg is serving as a present-day Paul Revere. What counts will be the response to his warnings.

We need help.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Apr. 9, 1963]

Another Caribbean Threat

The Windward and Leeward Islands stretch like a curved necklace of green jewels from south of Puerto Rico almost to the coast of Venezuela. The islands, rich in history, separate the Atlantic Ocean from the Caribbean Sea. First discovered by Columbus the islands for long years were a first port of call for European ships, riding the trade winds down the long reaches of the Atlantic.

Representative William C. Cramer, Republican, of Florida, has charged that many of the Windward and Leeward Islands are heavily infiltrated with Russians. He says that in many of the towns in the island chain the ratio of Russians to natives is 1 to 10.

If this is true, and Representative Cramer says his information is completely reliable, then Great Britain now has reason to be an active partner in the U.S. efforts to rid the Caribbean of the Russian influence. The islands are under the protection of Great Britain.

It is easy to see why Russia would make a great effort to influence this island chain. The Windward and Leeward Islands stand squarely athwart the ocean highway leading to the Panama Canal. In a strategic sense they dominate the entire northern and eastern coast of South America and they afford many deepwater harbors suitable for naval bases.

Representative Cramer also says that Russia is training Haitian sugar field workers in Cuba in the arts of sabotage and subversion.

He declares that Russian arms caches in Haiti and the Dominican Republic are extensive and ominous.

Haiti is an even more sensitive area than the Windward and Leeward Island chain, so far as the safety and defense of the United States is concerned. If Haiti, a miserably poor and backward country ruled by an ironfisted dictator steeped in voodoo mysticism should fall into the Red orbit then the most important sea passage in the Caribbean, the Windward Passage, would be flanked on the one side by Cuba and on the other by Haiti. The free world cannot afford the loss of this strategic seaway; the United States cannot tolerate such a loss.

Haiti has long been ripe for a political change of an abrupt and bloody nature. The country seethes with rumors of conspiracies by one or more of a score of clandestine organizations that range from the pro-Castro and anti-Castro Communists to Roman Catholic action groups.

The United States has emphasized its disapproval of Haiti's president, Francois "Papa Doc" Duvalier, by cutting off almost all of the U.S. economic assistance program to Haiti. This action has enraged even the pro-U.S. factions in Haiti.

The eventual fate of Haiti is not yet clear but the threat posed by Russian infiltration of the Windward and Leeward Islands, as outlined by Representative Cramer, is very clear. Great Britain has seen fit to cooperate with the United States in deterring Cuban patriots from making punitive attacks on Russian shipping; now Great Britain should clear the Russians out of Britain's island protectorates. The United States and the Organization of American States should offer all possible assistance.

VACILLATING CUBAN POLICY CONCERNS MANY MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record, an editorial which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale News, Fort Lauderdale, Fla. I am also inserting two articles, one written by Columnist Henry J. Taylor and the other through the services of the North American Newspaper Alliance.

Although written by different men from throughout the world, all have one thing in common—concern over this country's vacillating, timorous, and highly questionable policy with regards to Cuba. I think their messages are of primary concern to all Americans and I recommend them to the attention of my colleagues for their careful study and consideration.

For many years now, I have been advocating a firmer U.S. policy toward Castro and the Communist threat in this hemisphere. A careful analysis of these articles most assuredly justifies my growing concern and raises many interesting questions which I feel the administration has a duty to answer:

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Mar. 29, 1963]

Price on Cuban Policy May Run Even Higher Than We Bargained For

Despite the Kennedy administration's obvious success in getting some of the top Republican leaders to soft-pedal the Cuban issue, this entire situation continues to be a highly irritating bone in the throats of the American people as a whole.

Why this is so isn't difficult to see. The Communist-controlled Government and the Soviet troops in Cuba are an accomplished fact and no amount of administration doubletalk can hide this situation.

This, in turn, leads to only one conclusion. Again, despite doubletalk from the White House and the State Department, this Nation's long-standing Monroe Doctrine has definitely been sidetracked as our official policy now amounts to nothing more than a "containment" of the Communist regime in Cuba rather than a positive program of removal or ejection.

Now, there may be reasons why this administration is fearful of removing the Communist plague in Cuba. We have been told that one of the basic reasons happens to be that we don't want to force Russia into a position where the Soviets will have to resort to war to save face. We have also been told that Cuba cannot be separated from other trouble spots throughout the world and that any action on our part to oust the Soviets from Cuba is quite apt to trigger repercussions in Berlin and elsewhere that could easily bring on a devastating war.

So, to avoid these things we have adopted the policy of trying to solve the Cuban problem with words rather than with deeds. Our Government tells us no concessions have been given to the Russians in return for the removal of Soviet missiles and Soviet long-range bombers from Cuba. Yet everything that has happened since the missiles were supposedly removed indicates that concessions or pledges were made on our part.

One of these concessions may or may not have been a pledge by us to discourage or prevent attacks by rebel forces on Cuba. Russia, in bitterly protesting an armed attack against a Soviet ship a couple of weeks ago, charges that this represents a violation of the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement and that if the attacks are continued the result may well be to heat up the crisis again.

Hardly had this protest been received in Washington than another and reportedly more serious attack on a Soviet vessel took place. This brought immediate orders from Washington for a full-scale investigation by the Coast Guard, FBI, and other agencies to determine if these attacks were being launched from U.S. soil.

Already Washington has decried these rebel attacks as being "irresponsible" and dangerous. Dangerous they might well be. But if it is "irresponsible" for courageous Cubans to use every method they can devise to strike back at invaders who have taken over their homeland, then a lot of people in this country and in Cuba have to learn a new definition of this word.

From all these events it is clearly evident to any sensible person that rather than winning a victory in forcing the Russians to take their missiles from Cuba we have suffered a rather inglorious defeat. It may be true we avoided a serious threat of war by calling off our blockade and pulling back our forces when we unquestionably had the upper hand.

But, if the price is now to be acceptance of a full-blown Russian military base in our own backyard, then we, and a great many other Americans, gravely question the thinking behind this policy.

It will be recalled that for a while Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, of Great Britain, was acclaimed as a great hero for preserving "peace in our time" by virtue of the concessions he gave Adolf Hitler. Yet, history has shown that these concessions added up in the long run to one of the sorriest mistakes ever made by any world leader. They didn't avert war, they only made it more inevitable, and the same may well be true of the appeasement policy we are now following in regard to Cuba.

No nation can avoid a war by displaying weakness or fear. Yet, weakness and fear are the hallmarks of our Cuban policy today. This our people realize, and this is why they simply cannot understand nor accept the indecisive and spineless attitude our Government is taking today.

President Kennedy and his advisers don't have to look very hard or very far to understand why his popularity, as evidenced by the Gallup Poll, is dropping off at an increasing pace. The hard truth happens to be that more and more of our people each day are becoming sick and disgusted with our timorous and vacillating policy on Cuba.

It is an issue that cannot be tucked quietly under the rug by inducing congressional opponents to stay quiet on the subject. It is the big, burning issue of the day, and until there is less talk and more action out of Washington to meet it forthrightly and courageously, it is not going to be shoved aside or forgotten.

Our Cuban Policy's a Leaky Beanbag

(By Henry J. Taylor)

British General Ritchie, later relieved by Montgomery, was defeated by Marshal Rommel in the desert battle at Knightsbridge, leading to the fateful fall of Tobruk.

Ritchie's headquarters were camouflaged in great disarray behind a mesa in the Libyan sands. I traveled there to see him with doughty U.S. General Scott. Ritchie, crouching over the maps, showed Scott his field position. "What should I do?" he asked.

"Well, General," Scott replied, "I don't know what you should do. But I know this. You're going to have to do something different from what you're doing now, because you're getting the hell beat out of you."

So it is with our policy toward Castro, built along the lines of a leaky beanbag.

Who would have dreamed that mighty America could have come full circle? In one's wildest imagination could anyone conceive a foreign policy that could arrive at such a dismal, defunct, and dangerous end?

Here we said, as the minimum demand of the American people, that "a Communist state will not be tolerated in the Western Hemisphere," that "communism is not negotiable in the Western Hemisphere," that the Castro cancer would defeat our security throughout Latin America and even pledging to the ransomed freedom fighters that their bloodied pennant will be returned to them in a freed Cuba, and what happens? We end up protecting, guaranteeing, and solidifying Red Castro and the Soviet lodgment there with all the power of our great Air Force and the U.S. Navy.

If we have a foreign policy, or, rather, if what we have can be called a policy, you might as well call Humpty Dumpty the Rock of Gibraltar.

This is not a policy; it is a debacle in thinking. The results are cumulative, like cancer is cumulative, finally spreading beyond correction. And who can deny the frightful cost of historic errors which quickly become impossible of correction?

That's the really lethal damage in our wrongheaded thinkers' manipulation of the news. By employing an acute sense of timing, and such distractions as the President's appearance before the ransomed freedom fighters in Miami, the grim failures can be—and are—compounded one after the other along a retreat road never made clear to the American people.

With each one, as in the case of the Bay of Pigs and then our October 22 Munich, the choice of corrections narrows. It becomes limited to a choice of bad choices among worse choices.

Thus, mile by sandy mile, President Kennedy has negotiated our position downhill. Step by step, as the resulting situation has closed in (which is the purpose of the enemy), our Government is forced into the inevitable alibi: that to do something different from what it next proposes would be worse than what it now must do. Then that bad choice is called wisdom. Accordingly, we end up what we're doing now. Knightsbridge to Tobruk to where?

A Humpty-Dumpty policy is not good enough for the world's leading power nor will it allow us to remain that. There are always barbarians outside the walls. No leading nation, no matter how productive or apparently powerful, can live through our incredible behavior in a decisive area like Cuba without correction. Either we correct our fantastic blunders, as Montgomery corrected Ritchie's, someway, somehow, or Rommel in the form of the U.S.S.R. will correct them for us.

Politicians skin our ears with baroque oratory, cliche piled on cliche, announcing that the United States must meet its world responsibilities. Yet the first responsibility of a government is to supply security to its own citizens by correcting its own failures.

We talk of healing the world when we are not securely governing ourselves. We're giants when pronouncing of the universe and pigmies in our own performance.

In tragic truth, Castro's Russian masters have outthought us, outmaneuvered us, and cast us out of control of the situation besides. How else—how else—could we now find ourselves forced to order a wrong-way blockade against fighters for freedom instead of against Castro?

UNITED STATES, RUSSIA MADE DEAL, FRENCH SAY

PARIS.—The idea Russia and the United States have made a secret bargain involving the withdrawal of American missiles from Europe in exchange for the Soviets pulling their missiles out of Cuba is now official French doctrine.

This was revealed by an article in the "Revue Militaire d'Information" regarded as the most authoritative publication put out under the imprint of the French Defense Ministry.

The two great powers bypassed their allies, the magazine asserted, and came to an arrangement between themselves. This was the meaning of the disclosure so soon after the Cuban crisis that Jupiter missile installations in Turkey and Italy would be dismantled, it added.

The magazine went on: "There was thus indeed an agreement between the great powers on the 'demissilization' of Western Europe, an operation evidently demanded by the Soviets in return for their own nuclear disengagement in Cuba. This is a strange alliance in which the most exposed allies are deprived of a part of the means of assuring their security through an accord reached over their heads and with the principal opponent."

The article's anonymous author declared the whole idea of a NATO multinational nuclear force—which France has spurned—was cooked up afterwards as a maneuver to disguise the truth.

"Western public opinion was tricked," he declared. There was "clearly nothing" to America's insistence that a multinational force based on seagoing Polaris missiles was a decisive step forward in modernizing Western Europe's defenses.

Allied diplomatic sources here were startled by the vehemence and bitterness of the article, appearing as it did in an official publication. They agreed it could not have been published without President de Gaulle's approval and confirms that he regards present American nuclear policy as, firstly, a step toward total subjugation of Western Europe to American strategy, and, secondarily, a Soviet-American settlement prejudicial to the interests of America's allies whose views, in the final analysis, Washington will simply ignore.

The article dismissed the Nassau agreement between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan as nothing more than a move to insure Britain also would be dependent on American strategy and her nuclear independence limited.

The article makes clear that De Gaulle regards the multinational nuclear force proposal as more of a political move designed to give Washington absolute control of Allied destinies than fulfilling a genuine strategic need.

The French military writer declared that whatever the vulnerability of the Jupiter missiles on the ground, they compelled a potential aggressor to use nuclear weapons first in order to destroy them before mounting his main attack.

But, he added, removal of missiles from the soil of Western Europe meant the decision on whether nuclear weapons were to be used to check an attack on the Continent had switched from the aggressor to Washington.

He declared "under the pretext of modernizing the armaments of Turkey and Italy, the United States has cleverly disengaged itself by absolutely reserving for itself the privilege of an eventual intervention."

SHAME!

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the precipitous action of this administration in confining anti-Castro Cubans to the Miami area and halting their symbolic raids on Cuba, their supplying men and arms and food to the underground, will, I think, be regarded by future historians as the true turning point in America's long and distinguished fight for individual freedom and human dignity.

For never before, in the history of our great country, have we purposefully and deliberately hampered the efforts of men who are willing to fight for what all men have traditionally wanted—and died for—their homeland's freed.

The administration's effort to stop these brave Cubans from exercising their will violates the sacredness of all that we, as Americans, hold so dear: liberty and freedom.

I believe it will be discovered, as Americans awake to what has actually transpired, that this administration has misjudged completely the temperament of the people.

At this point, I would like to insert in the Record an editorial which appeared in the April 3, 1963, issue of the Richmond News-Leader, entitled "Shame!"

SHAME!

The most melancholy manifestation of the administration's "no win" policy is to be seen in the maddening restrictions newly clamped upon the anti-Castro raiders. In heaven's name, who are we fighting—our friends, or our enemies? What new heights of hypocrisy and timidity is Mr. Kennedy reaching for now?

In cracking down on these heroic men, our Government has announced that the United States does not propose "to see our own laws violated with impunity, or to tolerare activities which might provoke armed reprisals."

It makes you a little sick at the stomach. At the time of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, our own Government violated every neutrality act on the statute books, and a dozen other laws besides. As recently as last October when the President's spine was stiffer, our own Government engaged in activities that might well have provoked full-scale armed reprisal. To this day, we are engaged in Vietnam in a military action filled with risk of a broadened war.

What is to be gained by hobbling the raiders? It is said that their continued hit-and-run attacks will provide a justification to the Russians for keeping troops in Cuba. This is the only line of reasoning that makes any sense, and it doesn't make much sense. If the Russians want to keep their troops in Cuba, they can trump up a justification on their own. And when did the Russians justify their course of conduct anyhow?

A second argument is that these sporadic raids will provoke attacks on American shipping in the Caribbean. All right. Suppose they do. The U.S. Navy is not helpless to protect ships flying the American flag. There is a French proverb to the effect that you can't make an omelet without breaking some eggs. We ought not to imagine that effective pressure can be kept on Castro without risking some loss of life and property.

Against these pusillanimous and legalistic arguments, every consideration of patriotism and every factor of morale have been discounted. It is said that the raiders accomplish nothing significant: They sink a freighter, they blow up a dock, they drop leaflets, they land a few rifles. These achievements are counted as nothing at all.

We count such activities for a very great deal. "Exiles feed on hope," says Creon in "Antigone." These brave conspiracies, these heady raids along the Cuban coast, are visible symbols of the fire of counterrevolution. They are feats of derring-do from which legends are made. To thousands of Cubans longing for freedom from Castro's Communist rule, the raiders bring a message that sustains: Have courage. You are not forgotten.

Mr. Kennedy would snuff out this spark of resistance; he would jam the message. He will not countenance a Cuban Government in exile; he will not tolerate attacks on Castro's Cuba. The British are brought into this disgraceful affair, in order to round up a band of 17 raiders in the Bahamas; the presumption is strong that our own Central Intelligence Agency exposed their hideout. Henceforth the Cuban commandoes must fight two foes—the Communist enemy in front, the American "friend" behind.

Bravery. Personal heroism. A certain impudence. A sense of glory. These are qualities once highly esteemed in the American tradition. Why must they now be suffocated in a fog of diplomacy and a blanket of neutrality law? Shame, Mr. Kennedy. We cry shame.

LAO SITUATION EXAMPLE OF DESTINY MANAGEMENT

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, last July when the Declaration and Protocol on Neutrality in Laos was signed, I sent a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk in which I raised very serious questions about the wisdom of entering into an agreement under the terms contained in that document. The doubts I expressed in that letter and in the subsequent exchange of letters seem to have been well founded in the light of the recent outbreak of fighting between the neutralists and the Communist Pathet Lao in the Plaine des Jarres. At the conclusion of my remarks, I will insert into the RECORD the letter I sent to Secretary of State Dean Rusk last July. I will also include the reply sent to me by then Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Averell Harriman, at the direction of Secretary Rusk, as well as my reply to him.

Mr. Speaker, I do not rise today to claim credit for accurately predicting what would transpire in Laos; I do not claim any prescience or foreknowledge denied to my colleagues or to the executive branch. But I do claim that in the case of Laos, the administration was given ample warning by many of the Representatives of the people on both sides of the aisle concerning what would happen if we entered into that troika arrangement.

Time after time, in the situation in Laos, in South Vietnam, in Cuba, in Berlin, in the Middle East, in Africa, in almost every crisis spot we have faced, the Executive was warned by Democrats and by Republicans in the Congress of the consequences we would face if our policy were not altered.

And time after time, the executive branch has seen fit to ignore completely the advice and counsel that was offered on a truly bipartisan basis by the representatives of the people.

From this deliberate decision to ignore the counsels of Congress, we have a sorry record of rollback defeats, sorry frustrations, decline of prestige, and diminishment of freedom. This failure of bipartisanship is evident on two levels. When the Executive chooses to ignore the counsel of Congress as a whole, he thwarts what we might loosely call a bipartisanship between those two major branches of the Government. Having destroyed bipartisanship on that level, it is small wonder that bipartisanship also breaks down within the legislative branch itself.

Mr. Speaker, far worse than any news management we have witnessed thus far is this commitment on the part of the executive branch to engage in destiny management. By arrogating to itself the sole prerogative of determining what our actions should be, the executive branch is usurping what should be the responsibility of all Americans whether they live on Pennsylvania Avenue or Main Street. This destiny management bypasses the traditional role of the Congress and the people who in the past participated meaningfully in the formulation of consensus that goes far beyond the formalities of foreign policy declarations.

In every single instance one could cite in which the United States faced a cold-war crisis, there have been legislative voices raised urging a correct policy. These voices were heard but not heeded by the Executive. Instead, the Executive has chosen to ignore those voices in order to pursue a policy that at best has been questionable.

Need I recall, for example, the legislative voices that demanded dismantlement of the Berlin wall as it was being raised? We know now that the Russians were expecting this and no nuclear holocaust would have been unleashed.

Need I recall the voice of Senator KEATING, who demanded action in Cuba long before the Executive would even admit that missiles were being placed on that island? Hindsight demonstrates that KEATING was correct, the Executive wrong.

Need I list the long roster of legislators, Democrat and Republican, who urged the establishment of a blockade or quarantine on Cuba long before Russian missiles zeroed in on the majority of our cities?

Is it necessary to recall the constant questioning of our incomprehensible policy in the Congo both by Democrats and Republicans?

Is it possible that we have not as yet learned the lesson of our own past mistakes? With such a long list of accurate predictions by the representatives of the people, is it not time to reestablish real bipartisanship? With such a long list of frustrations and failures whenever the executive unilaterally decided to ignore the right solution by pursuing the questionable one such as in Laos, is it not time for the Executive to heed the counsel and advice of the representatives of the people?

Is it conceivable that only a calamity of the proportion visualized by a loss of all southeast Asia will be the only way to reestablish true bipartisanship?

Mr. Speaker, I call for the executive branch of this Government to put real meaning back into bipartisanship by listening to those men on both sides of the legislative aisle who have accurately forecast the failure of this present unilateral policy in which a built-in capacity for error is apparent. With my colleagues, I stand ready to join in a truly bipartisan effort to formulate and execute effective cold war policies.

The letters referred to above follow:

JULY 24, 1962.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is, of course, no secret that grave doubts and deep concern are being expressed in many quarters over the present Lao situation. I, too, as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, am deeply troubled. I have been for many, many months.

On the basis of information recently made public concerning the Declaration and Protocol on Neutrality in Laos, the only possible conclusion one could draw is that Laos is being surrendered to the Communists, as Poland was at Yalta 17 years ago.

The oft-expressed fear, now apparently a fact that Communist forces are being replaced in Laos to carry on the fight in South Vietnam in which 8,000 American troops are now deeply involved should be sufficient to shake administration complacency. Obviously it is not.

I strongly believe that the net effect of this agreement on Laos will be the intensification of war in southeast Asia and a weakening of the confidence of free Asians in the value of close cooperation with the United States.

The provisions of article 14 of the declaration and protocol appear to confer a veto power on Communist Poland over the policies of the United States and all other signatory powers in relation to Laos. This, I regard as a nullification of the promises of the agreement.

I gravely disapprove of the procedure, presently being followed, which fails to submit the declaration and protocol to the U.S. Senate for ratification as a treaty.

The Congress and the country deserves a full and frank report from you on future American policy toward Laos. You will recall that President Kennedy, on March 23, 1961, told the American people, "if the Communists were to move in and dominate this country, it would endanger the security of all, and the peace of all southeast Asia, that quite obviously affects the security of the United States."

I would be interested in receiving from you a plausible explanation of what makes today any different from March 23, 1961.

Other specific questions to which I would respectfully request detailed replies would include the following:

1. On what tangible facts do you base the expectation, expressed in the declaration and protocol, that this agrement will "assist peaceful democratic development of the Kingdom of Laos" and "the strengthening of peace and security in southeast Asia"?

2. What provisions, contained in the declaration, prevent complete domination of Laos by the Communists?

3. Does the treaty specifically prohibit Communist troops presently in Laos from moving into South Vietnam?

4. How would the United States regard a veto by Poland? Would it be looked upon as a barrier to action by the non-Communist signatories of the declaration? Would it be a barrier to action in the event of a Communist takeover in Laos? Would it prevent action if the practice of dispatching Communist troops through Laos to Vietnam were continued?

5. What action would the Government of the United States take in the event of a violation of the treaty and in the face of a Polish veto on action?

It is my profound hope that you will draft an early reply to this letter, a reply that I and the American people can only hope will allay our fears about the present direction of administration policy in southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

AUGUST 10, 1962.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of July 24 which raises a number of important questions about the recently concluded Geneva agreements. I am glad to have this additional opportunity to clarify our policy toward Laos and to answer your specific questions on the Geneva agreements.

We have considered, in close consultation with the congressional leadership of both parties, the various possible approaches to a settlement of the Laos question. Certainly the course of action that has been adopted is not without risk, but we believe that our present policy is the one most likely to further the national interest of the United States. That policy is to assure the maintenance of a peaceful, independent, and neutral Laos within the framework of the 1962 Geneva agreements.

I am enclosing a copy of the full texts of the agreements which were signed at Geneva. I think you will see upon a careful reading of them that, far from surrendering Laos to the Communists, the effect of these agreements is to prevent that from occurring. All the signatories at Geneva, including the Communists, have agreed to respect the sovereignty, independence, unity, neutrality, and territorial integrity of Laos. For its part, the United States fully intends to abide by its commitments under the agreements and to assist the Royal Government of Laos to maintain its independence. We will, of course, expect the other signatories likewise to live up to their undertakings. The latter aspect will be the real test of Communist intentions. If contrary to their commitments the Communists were, as President Kennedy said on March 23, 1961, "to move in and dominate this country, it would endanger the security of all, and the peace of all southeast Asia * * * that quite obviously affects the security of the United States." We continue to hold this view.

As one of the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, the Soviet Union bears a particular responsibility to see that the Geneva agreements are properly implemented. It is written into the agreements that, "The cochairmen shall exercise supervision over the observance of this protocol and the declaration on the neutrality of Laos" (art. 8 of the protocol). In effect this means that the Soviet Union is responsible to see that the Communist countries, particularly Communist China and North Vietnam, live up to the agreements.

The Geneva agreements were concluded by the United States as an executive agreement. The President has adequate authority under the Constitution, by virtue of his power to conduct the foreign relations of the United States and as Commander in Chief, to enter into an executive agreement of this kind. No obligations created by the Geneva agreements on Laos in any way impinge on the constitutional powers or prerogatives of the Congress or of the States. While the formal advice and consent of the Senate has thus not been sought for these agreements this administration has as I stated earlier fully consulted with appropriate congressional committees and leaders on all aspects of the Lao situation.

With respect to the provisions of the agreements themselves, you raise in your letter the question of the interpretation of article 14 of the protocol relating to voting procedures of the International Control Commission. The general rule prescribed in that article in the second sentence of the second paragraph, is that decisions of the Commission shall be made by majority vote. To this general rule, specified exceptions are made in the first sentence of that paragraph to which the rule of unanimity applies: (a) "decisions" on questions relating to violations of certain articles, (b) "conclusions" on those major questions which are sent to the cochairmen, which it is felt, will be very limited in number; and (c) "recommendations" of the Commission. These exceptions should be viewed in the light of the provisions of article 15 of the protocol. That article provides that all decisions of the International Commission on initiation and carrying out of investigations shall be made by majority vote and that the Commission shall submit reports on its investigations in which differences of view may be expressed, thus enabling publications of minority and majority opinions.

On the five other specific questions you raise I would comment as follows:

1. The preamble to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos expresses the view that "the independence and neutrality" of Laos "will assist the peaceful domestic development" of Laos and "the achievement of national accord and unity in that country as well as the strengthening of peace and security in southeast Asia." After years of hostilities and factional strife largely fomented from without, the independent and neutrality of Laos and the termination of foreign interference in the internal affairs of Laos should permit the restoration of peace in that country and give to the people of Laos an opportunity to develop their democratic institutions. The cessation of hostilities in Laos, the maintenance of that country's independence and neutrality, and the prevention of the use of Lao territory for interference in the internal affairs of other countries will contribute to the peace and security of southeast Asia. In this connection I think it is significant that Thailand, Vietnam, Burma, and Cambodia—all southeast Asian countries concerned with the peace and security of the area—fully participated in the negotiation of the Geneva agreements and are signatories of them.

2. There are a number of important provisions of the Geneva agreements designed to prevent Communist or other foreign domination of Laos. There is, for example, the undertaking by all the signatories to respect and observe in every way the independence and neutrality of Laos and not to commit or participate "in any way in any act" which might "directly or indirectly" impair that independence or neutrality. There is a specific undertaking to refrain from all direct or indirect interference in the internal affairs of Laos and not to use the territory of any country for such interference. There are obligations on all parties to withdraw all foreign military personnel from Laos and not to introduce such personnel into that country. The agreements establish an International Control Commission with important supervisory, investigatory and reporting functions. These and other provisions of the agreement are designed to help safeguard the sovereignty, independence, neutrality, unity and territorial integrity of Laos.

3. The agreements do specifically prohibit Communist troops presently in Laos from moving into Vietnam.

The Communist signatories to the agreements have agreed "not to use the territory of the Kingdom of Laos for interference in the internal affairs of other countries," and Laos, in its statement of neutrality, has undertaken not to allow its territory to be used for such purposes. These provisions were specifically designed to prevent North Vietnamese troops from being introduced into South Vietnam from or through Laos. In addition, article 3 of the protocol specifies that all foreign troops are to be withdrawn from Laos "only along such routes and through such points as shall be determined by the Royal Government of Laos in consultation with the [International] Commission." Under article 10 of the protocol the Commission "shall supervise and control" this withdrawal.

4. As I indicated earlier, the veto power of the members of the International Commission is very limited. The Commission cannot be prevented by a veto from initiating or carrying out investigations if it or the Government of Laos believe a violation has occurred. A majority or minority of the Commission cannot be prevented by a veto from immediately reporting on investigations to all parties to the agreements. In the event of a Communist takeover in Laos or if Communist troops continue to be dispatched through Laos to Vietnam, the signatories to the agreements are in no manner bound to inaction by a veto in the Commission. Indeed, should there be a violation of the agreements, the signatories are bound by paragraph 4 of the declaration to consider measures to be taken to insure observance of the agreements, regardless of the decisions or recommendations of the Commission itself.

5. As pointed out above, there is no veto which can prevent action in the event of a violation of the Geneva agreements. Should such a violation occur, the U.S. Government would take whatever action is necessary and appropriate in the circumstances.

The new 14-nation Geneva agreements cannot end the struggle for power among the various factions in Laos. The agreements do, however, shift the struggle from the military arena to the political and economic arena. If the non-Communist elements in Laos are to be successful in this competition it is essential that they be supported by the United States and other free world powers. To insure his success we must assist Prince Souvanna Phouma and his government of national union during this critical period. We laid the groundwork for this cooperation during Prince Souvanna's visit in Washington last week. We hope for continued bipartisan support for this policy, which is the only peaceful possibility for a non-Communist Laos.

Sincerely yours,

W. Averell Harriman.

(Enclosure: Text of the Geneva agreements, 1962.)

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1962.

Hon. W. Averell Harriman,
Assistant Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Harriman: Thank you for your letter of August 10 responding to certain questions I had raised about the Lao peace treaty.

In candor, I must state that your letter has heightened the fears which led me to write to Secretary Rusk in the first place. I agree with the perceptive reporter, Richard Starnes, that the administration's justification of the agreement of July 23 on Laos is "another fable * * * added to the dangerous mythology that is the foundation for much of what passes for American policy in southeast Asia." I think that Mr. Starnes is right in saying, "To believe the Communist world means to keep the peace in a neutral Laos, one must first believe Communist policy has undergone a sharp and total reversal since the disgraceful rout of the United States-backed royal Lao Army at Nam Tha in May. This was the final disaster for the West in Laos, the ultimate proof of the bankruptcy of our policy, and it was a Communist victory as decisive as Dien Bien Phu."

Your letter assures me that "the Communists have agreed to respect the sovereignty, independence, unity, neutrality, and territorial integrity of Laos." I find this flat assurance incredible in one who had direct personal experience with the Communists at Yalta. Have we not learned from this experience and many others since World War II that promises of this type made by the Communists are valueless?

The declaration and protocol on neutrality in Laos establishes a troika composed of Communist Poland, neutralist India, and Canada to supervise the execution of the agreements. When the Soviet Union proposed the establishment of a troika to handle the duties of the Secretary General of the United Nations, President Kennedy quite properly said: "To install a triumvirate in the United Nations administrative offices would replace order with chaos, action with paralysis, and confidence with gross confusion." It seems to me that the same results, against which the President warned, can be expected from the installation of a triumvirate to supervise the execution of the Geneva agreements.

Further, the troika which is responsible for supervising the execution of the declaration and protocol is the same one which failed in the performance of a similar responsibility with respect to the Geneva agreement of 1954. If this three-member International Control Commission had done its job after 1954, there would have been no Communist aggression in Laos or Vietnam—and no need for new agreements in 1962.

You write that the "general rule (applying to the work of the International Control Commission) * * * is that decisions of the Commission are made by majority vote." But article 14 of the protocol clearly states that "decisions of the Commission on questions relating to violations of articles 2, 3, 4, and 6 of this protocol or of the cease-fire referred to in article 9, conclusions on major questions sent to the Cochairman and all recommendations by the Commission shall be adopted unanimously." The articles of the protocol specified in this sentence cover the entire range of the authority granted to the International Control Commission—the withdrawal of foreign troops from Laos, the prohibition of the introduction of more foreign troops and of arms, and the maintenance of a cease-fire in Laos.

It is true that the Commission may by majority vote undertake investigations, but article 15 of the protocol clearly declares, "The conclusions and recommendations of the Commission resulting from investigations shall be adopted unanimously."

Consequently, I cannot accept your statement that the general rule is that the Commission will act by majority vote. On the contrary, the general rule is that the Commission can act only by unanimous vote, including the vote of Communist Poland.

In fact, the veto is stitched into every part of the fabric of the incredible Geneva agreements. It is given to Communist Poland as a member of the International Control Commission. It is given to Prince Souphanouvong, the Communist representative in the troika which rules Laos, without whose concurrence the Control Commission cannot exercise any of its functions.

I am hardly reassured by your statement that a vote on the part of one of the members of the International Control Commission is not final since the 14 signatory nations can "consider measures to be taken to insure observance of the agreements, regardless of the decisions or recommendations of the Commission itself." I find it hard to believe that the Soviet Union, Communist China, North Vietnam, Poland—and all signatories of the agreements—can be expected to take corrective action when a violation of the agreements by the Communists occurs. Indeed, press reports indicate that the agreements have already been violated by the movement of Communist forces from Laos into South Vietnam. Yesterday noon the deadline on agreeing to exit routes for foreign troops to get out of Laos expired. Already the treaty will be violated.

The negotiations at Geneva were an unbroken retreat by the United States from positions which our President, our Secretary of State, and our Government had taken over the past 12 months. President Kennedy in March 1961 said that he would not permit Communist aggression to succeed in Laos. Secretary Rusk said that he would not sit down to negotiate in Geneva until there was an effective cease-fire in Laos. Mr. Rusk and the Lao control body "should not be paralyzed by a vote." You yourself sought to include in the protocol a provision requiring the integration of the three armies in Laos. This was not included. You sought to include a provision prohibiting reprisals against the Lao who fought against the the Communists at the urging of the United States. This was not included. The fate which these Lao allies of ours now face can be judged from the reports that the recently freed American prisoners give of their treatment by Communist captors.

The disappointment which our Nation experienced at Geneva is understandable. But when responsible spokesmen for our Nation return from Geneva to tell us that this defeat is really a victory, to assert that peace has thereby been made more secure, to profess confidence that the Communist aggressors will keep their promises, their behavior is so like that of Neville Chamberlain at the time of Munich that it should send cold chills down the spine of all whose memories go back to the 1930's.

Prime Minister Chamberlain said of Hitler at the time of Munich "* * * here was a man who could be relied on when he had given his word." The Washington Post of July 26, 1962, reported "W. Averell Harriman, former Ambassador to Moscow, says he trusts Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev to keep his word in carrying out the Geneva agreement guaranteeing the independence of Laos."

Every effort is made by me to support our foreign policy on a bipartisan basis. To ask me or the members of my party to support your actions regarding Laos which were directly opposite to the pronouncements of our President and our Secretary of State is most difficult to understand.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 310 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 179, Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on Banking and Currency is hereby authorized to send two of its members to Caracas, Venezuela, the latter part of April 1963 to attend the Directors meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated fund shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGREEING TO SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 4715

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 317, Rept. No. 210) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill H.R. 4715, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby, agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has to do with the Roosevelt Memorial. I understood there was some ceremony to take place in the near future and was asked by the author to get this through. I am informed now that the ceremony does not take place until after we return from the Easter recess. There was some controversy about it on the floor yesterday. I would suggest, however, that it be taken up the Monday we return, because I believe on Tuesday some ceremony is to be held in connection with the memorial.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we had planned to put that on the program for Monday, April 22.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is another resolution similar to the one just passed. The Judiciary Committee wishes to send two members to a conference in Geneva which takes place next week on the immigration question. The Speaker will recall that the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over immigration problems, and I would hope that the Speaker would recognize me a little later to ask that it be passed today.

AMENDING LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 309, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3845) to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766). After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and following that, I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 309 provides for the consideration of H.R. 3845, a bill to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of

October 3, 1961. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 3845 will assure that the benefits of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act are received only by persons and firms who are in fact small producers and will not be extended to persons and firms who may be major producers of other metals or minerals. This will be accomplished by first, providing that a small producer must have as his principal product or products lead and zinc; and second, defining the term "principal produce and products" to mean that more than 50 percent of the value of metal or minerals produced or sold is lead or zinc or a combination of both.

The present act provides a program of payments for assistance to small domestic producers of lead and zinc. Payments are based on the difference between the market price of lead and zinc and the statutory stabilization price. The term "small domestic producer" is defined so as to limit qualification to those who have not in any one year since 1956 produced or sold more than 3,000 tons of lead and zinc combined.

It has been possible for major producers of other metals or minerals to qualify under this definition for benefits of the act because qualification is based only on the amount of lead and zinc without regard to other metals or minerals.

H.R. 3845 is designed to preclude major producers of other metals or minerals from participating in the program. Advice is that six or seven participants might be disqualified by adoption of the bill.

Enactment of the bill will not result in an increase in budgetary requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 309.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], has very ably given a résumé of this resolution making in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 3845. I know of no objection to the resolution, and I know of no objection to the bill.

I also urge, Mr. Speaker, that it be passed without further ado.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS TO ISSUE GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 307, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1989) to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, following which I shall yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 307 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1989, a bill to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 1989 is to amend section 8(b) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands in order to permit the Virgin Islands Legislature to authorize the issuance of general obligation bonds. A similar bill passed the House in the 87th Congress.

By act of October 27, 1949, the Congress gave the Virgin Islands government authority to issue general obligation bonds up to the level of 10 percent of the aggregate assessed valuation of the taxable real property in the territory. The 1954 organic act omitted this bonding power and provided that the Virgin Islands Legislature should have "no power to incur any indebtedness which may be a general obligation of the Virgin Islands government."

The enactment of H.R. 1989 will reinstate the power to issue general obligation bonds for certain specified purposes, including schools, firehouses, slum clearance, libraries, electric systems, and so forth. Many of these purposes are not revenue producing and, therefore, cannot be financed except by current taxes or by such borrowing as the bill will sanction. The enactment of the bill will entail no additional expenditure of Federal funds. The bill specifically provides that the bonds shall not be obligations of the United States and that interest thereon shall be tax free.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 307.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I again wish to second the motion of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK]. This resolution did pass the House in the 87th Congress and makes in order the consideration of H.R. 1989, which was introduced by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. O'BRIEN]. We know of no objection to the bill and hope for its speedy passage.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3845) to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3845, with Mr. FEIGHAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the author of H.R. 3845, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of H.R. 3845, a bill designed to plug a loophole in the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

That act, Members will recall, was designed to help the small businessman-producer. However, the definitions in the act permit a few major producers of other metals or minerals to come in as small producers of lead and zinc and obtain the benefits of the law.

I think you will all agree that this loophole should be closed quickly.

In connection with the presentation of this bill, we should like to bring Congress and the Nation up to date concerning the lead-zinc industry generally.

The Congress, in 1961, enacted the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act for the purpose of assisting small businessmen who had come to the help of the Nation when it needed them in time of emergency, and who had either been forced out of business or were threatened with being driven out of business by reason of distressed conditions in the peacetime lead-zinc industry. I do not like subsidies; your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs does not like subsidy payments. But, it is not unusual for Congress and the American people to approve subsidy payments to essential industry when all else fails.

The program approved for the small domestic producers of lead and zinc was and remains a modest program. It was not thought that this act would alleviate the general distressed conditions of the entire lead-zinc industry.

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in reporting H.R. 84, 87th Congress, which became the Small Producers Stabilization Act, pointed to the endorsement by the administration of a limited program that would gradually phase out and stated:

> The committee accepts the principle advanced by the administration and joins in the hope that the administration will, at an early date, submit to Congress its long-range solutions to the basic problems of the entire industry.

While we still do not have a solution on which all can agree, I want you to know that we are studying alternative proposals. Last month, on March 14, 1963, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, John M. Kelly, met with representatives of a broad cross-section of the lead-zinc mining and smelting industries. A general review was conducted, including a look at economic conditions as well as the continuing impact of export and import programs.

Since that time I have been in communication with both the White House and the Secretary of the Interior in an effort to appraise the current situation.

While it is generally too early to fully assess the impact of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, I would like to call to the Members attention the fact that the first petition under that act for assistance to displaced workers came as a result of a closing by the New Jersey Zinc Co. of a zinc mine and mill at Hanover, N. Mex., on December 1, 1962. The workers were laid off and the union petitioned the U.S. Tariff Commission on January 9, 1963, for assistance under the Trade Expansion Act.

The Tariff Commission, on March 11, 1963, rejected the petition and denied relief. The Tariff Commission's announcement is a revealing document and I recommend that everyone read it. It demonstrates the difficult path ahead for anyone seeking to utilize this type of relief. Because, despite their knowledge of how imports have hurt the domestic lead-zinc industry, the Tariff Commission came to the conclusion that competition from imports "was not the major factor" in the closing of the mine and mill.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the Tariff Commission announcement of March 11, 1963, for the information of all concerned:

TARIFF COMMISSION REPORTS TO THE PRESIDENT ON ZINC WORKERS' PETITION FOR ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

The Tariff Commission today reported to the President the results of its investigation No. TEA-W-1, conducted under section 301(c)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The investigation was made in response to a workers' petition for determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance. The petition was filed with the Commission on January 9, 1963, by the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers on behalf of a group of 126 workers of the zinc mine and mill at Hanover, N. Mex., owned and operated by the New Jersey Zinc Co. These workers were laid off when production operations at the mine and mill ceased on December 1, 1962. The whole of the Commission's report cannot be made public, since it contains much data received in confidence, such as that pertaining to the operations of an individual concern. However, the following excerpts from that report give the Commission's finding and summarize the principal considerations in support of the finding:

"On the basis of its investigation the Commission unanimously finds that unmanufactured zinc[1] is not, as a result in major part of concessions granted under trade agreements, being imported in such increased quantities as to cause the unemployment of a significant number or proportion of the workers at the zinc mine and mill of the New Jersey Zinc Co. at Hanover, N. Mex."

Before the Commission can make an affirmative finding under section 301(c)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, it must determine (1) that the imports in question are entering the United States in increased quantities; (2) that the increased imports are due "in major part" to trade-agreement concessions; and (3) that such increased imports are "the major factor" in causing, or threatening to cause, unemployment or underemployment of a significant number of the workers of the firm or subdivision of the firm in question.

In the instant case, the Commission determined that unmanufactured zinc is not being imported in increased quantities. Commercial imports for consumption[2] of unmanufactured zinc have not increased since 1958 * * *. Such imports have been prevented from rising since October 1, 1958, as a result of the imposition of absolute quarterly quotas equal, on an annual basis, to 80 percent of the average annual imports during the years 1953–57.[3] Annual commercial imports during 1953–57 averaged 651,300 tons. The import quota, on an annual basis, was established at 520,960 tons * * *. In the last 4 years, 1959–62, actual commercial imports averaged 501,406 tons per year, or 23 percent less than the rate during 1953–57. The average annual commercial imports during 1959–62 also were considerably smaller (by 22 percent) than the average for the preceding 7 years, 1952–58.

The absolute import quotas reduced the flow of imports below the rate that had prevailed (under the trade-agreement concessions) for a period of about 7 years prior to the imposition of the quotas. The Commission therefore finds that unmanufactured zinc is not "being imported in increased quantities," within the meaning of the statute. The petitioners' contrary claim rests on the ground that the average annual imports were much higher in 1959–62 than in 1946–50—a decade and a half ago. Even if the Commission accepted the petitioners' claim, it could not agree that the alleged increase in imports occurred "as a result in major part of concessions granted under trade agreements" inasmuch as the concessions have been largely or completely offset by the absolute quotas imposed on imports of zinc.

In filing the petition in this case the workers were seeking a determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance under chapter 3 of the Trade Expansion Act. Among other things, chapter 3 provides for trade readjustment allowances to be paid to "adversely affected" workers. In the report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on H.R. 11970 (which, after various amendments, ultimately became the Trade Expansion Act of 1962), the provisions of the bill relating to adjustment assistance to workers are discussed. On page 30 of the report it is stated: "Your committee believes that the scale of trade adjustment allowances [for workers] is appropriate in view of the fact that the finding that the unemployment was caused by increased imports resulting from the removal, in whole or in part, of tariff protection implies that continuation of the prior tariff would have provided full job protection. This worker assistance is, therefore, in the nature of an adjustment to conditions brought about by removal of prior job protection."

Thus the Committee defined the "concession" as meaning "the removal, in whole or in part, of tariff protection."

The tariff protection that was removed by trade-agreement concessions on unmanufactured zinc consisted of the removal of part of the duties originally established for such zinc under the Tariff Act of 1930. The changes in the rates of duty since the act of 1930 are summarized below:

Item	Zinc-bearing ores [1]	Zinc blocks, pigs, or slabs [2]	Zinc scrap, dross, and skimmings [2]
Effective date:			
June 18, 1930	1.50	1.75	1.50
Jan. 1, 1939	1.20	1.4	----------
Jan. 30, 1943 [3]	.75	.875	.75
Jan. 1, 1948 [3]	.75	.875	.75
June 6, 1951	.60	.7	----------
Total rate reduction since June 18, 1930	.90	1.05	.75

[1] Cents per pound on zinc content.

[2] Cents per pound gross weight.

[3] The trade agreement with Mexico, which became effective Jan. 30, 1943, was terminated Jan. 1, 1951. The duties did not change as a result of the termination, however, because the same rates established by the agreement with Mexico were provided for, effective Jan. 1, 1948, in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

As reported above, the first concessions on unmanufactured zinc became effective on January 1, 1939, and the most recent ones became effective on June 6, 1951. The rates shown above were the only import restrictions imposed on unmanufactured zinc until the quotas were imposed. The increased protection afforded the domestic zinc industry by the subsequent imposition of the import quotas offsets in the main, if not entirely, the reduced protection that had resulted from the trade-agreement concessions. It is clear that the "remnant" of the original trade-agreement concessions after modification by the import quotas could not contribute in major part to the alleged increased imports.

In the course of its investigation, the Commission obtained considerable evidence to indicate that even if it could regard imports of unmanufactured zinc as entering in increased quantities, it could not find that the claimed increase was the major factor leading to the recent closure of the Hanover mine and mill.

The Commission's report then summarizes the evidence in support of that position, and concludes with the following observation: "In view of the considerations set forth above, it appears that the closing of the Hanover mine and mill was based primarily on ordinary business considerations. While competition from imports was no doubt a factor in the decision, it was not the major factor. In any event, since the level of imports has been stable for the past 4 years (and may be expected to remain so in the absence of change in the tariffs and absolute quotas applicable thereto), increased imports could not have been the major factor that caused the New Jersey Zinc Co. to close the Hanover mine and mill."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, in substance, I regret to report that conditions in the lead-zinc industry have not improved measurably since we came before this body approximately 2 years ago with the stopgap program for assistance to the small domestic producers. Nor has that program been as successful as its proponents had hoped that it might be in the degree of help that it would extend to small producers. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] the chief sponsor of the small producers program and chairman of the Mines and Mining Subcommittee, will bring you up to date on that program.

---

[1] The term "unmanufactured zinc" refers to zinc-bearing ores; zinc in blocks, pigs, or slabs; old and wornout zinc; and zinc dross and zinc skimmings. These articles are provided for in pars. 393 and 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

[2] The term "commercial imports for consumption" refers to direct entries for consumption plus withdrawals from bonded warehouses for consumption, exclusive of imports for U.S. Government account and exclusive of imports free of duty under bond for smelting, refining, and export.

[3] The quotas were established on a quarterly basis by Presidential Proclamation No. 3257 following an escape-clause investigation by the Tariff Commission under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended. The years 1953–57 were used as a base period by the three Commissioners who had recommended the imposition of quotas and also by the President.

Suffice to say at this time that even the limited objectives of the Small Producers Stabilization Act have not been fully realized. As a result, payments for 1962 production totaled $1,002,781 as compared to the authorization appropriation of $4.5 million.

The fact that we are not using up all the allotted money is no reason to permit payments to be made to persons and firms who are not in fact small producers of lead and zinc. The availability of funds does not justify opening the door to any except those for whom the legislation was intended.

Early in this Congress, during a review of Interior Department programs, the Mines and Mining Subcommittee learned that at least a few major producers of other metals or minerals had qualified and received payments for 1962 production as small producers of lead and zinc. That was on February 8, 1963. Ten days later, on February 18, 1963, the ranking minority member of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the ranking minority member of the Mines and Mining Subcommittee joined with the chairman of that subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee in sponsoring the legislation we are now discussing.

In order to protect the program for legitimate small producers of lead and zinc, we propose to amend the definition of a "small producer" so as to provide that the principal product or products of such producer is either lead or zinc or a combination of lead and zinc. We then would define the term "principal product or products" so as to require that the dollar value of lead or zinc sold must have been 50 percent or more of the total dollar value of all minerals and metals produced and sold during the qualifying base period of any year since 1956.

I do not criticize a silver company or a tungsten producer, that produces a byproduct of lead and zinc in small quantities, for coming in and qualifying as a small producer of lead and zinc if the loophole is left for them. But having discovered the loophole we have moved to close it as quickly as possible.

I think everyone will agree that this is needed legislation and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleauge, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], chairman of the full committee, in urging the passage of this bill. I think that what has happened pursuant to the passage of the lead-zinc stabilization program, the act of 1961, should be a lesson not only to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs but to all of the other committees of the House. That lesson is that you cannot be too careful in the drafting of legislation; because while the avowed purpose of the original act was to make sure that the small lead and zinc producers of this country were given some relief, the mere fact that we did not limit it to those whose principal product is lead and zinc requires the amendment which is now before us.

What this amendment and the bill that you are now considering do is merely to say to the people of the minerals industry that unless lead and zinc which you produce constitute 50 percent or more of your mineral production you do not qualify for relief under the lead and zinc stabilization program.

As the chairman of the full committee pointed out the reason for this grows out of the fact that several large companies which produce lead and zinc as a byproduct in the production of other minerals, and produce lead and zinc in the quantities that are covered in the original act, came in and applied for and received payments under that act. The purpose is to make sure that from the date of the final passage of this act, those companies which presently qualify because lead and zinc are a side issue with them will not be able to receive Government payments and that the small producers, those who produce less than 3,000 tons of concentrates of lead and zinc combined will qualify.

I urge that the bill be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is probably a good idea to keep some people in the business of producing lead and zinc in this country for the reason that gold is disappearing and apparently we are looking at a silver shortage. It might be that the monetary base for our currency in this country will have to be lead and zinc or some iron washers, or something of that kind, pretty soon.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say that I joined with my colleague yesterday, and did not like the idea of backing up our paper money with more paper. I think the American people would still like to see it backed up with silver. However, even though we lost out in that fight yesterday we must maintain a strong minerals industry in this country. One of the complaints which the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and I have had of this administration and the prior administration, since we have been in the Congress, is that they have not come forward with a strong domestic minerals program.

If there is any one thing which the present Secretary of the Interior could do and which in my opinion would increase his stature and increase the stability of this country it would be to come forward with a program not just for lead and zinc but for all our minerals, so that we would have a strong domestic minerals industry.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, initially I would like to say to the distinguished chairman of the full committee and also to the ranking member of the full committee that I appreciate very much the presentation they have made in connection with this legislation. I do not believe there are two more careful legislators in this body than the distinguished gentleman from Colorado and his counterpart on the other side of the aisle from Pennsylvania, who is ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, because I know the care and attention which they give to every line that is in a bill that is reported out of our committee.

I can agree with them wholeheartedly that it was a complete surprise to us to discover that there was a loophole in this legislation and that action was necessary to close that loophole.

I must say that the reporting of this legislation followed as speedily as possible after the discovery of this loophole in the legislation that was passed in 1961.

May I say with reference to the surprisingly low level of participation in 1962 that the regulations were not actually completed and made available to the industry until August of 1962, and there was only a short portion of the year 1962 in which to become active and to participate. At the same time I would agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Colorado that we have not had the level of participation up to this time that we had hoped for in this program.

I do not think that there can be any controversy concerning the enactment of H.R. 3845. As indicated by the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, this bill is fair and equitable. It is designed to plug a loophole in the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of 1961.

My plea to you is for unanimity in passing this bill. Through unanimity this body can demonstrate its clear-cut support of the program to help small producers of lead and zinc. The loophole that this bill will close has permitted some major producers of other metals to come in and qualify as small producers of lead and zinc.

As author of the bill which led to enactment of the Small Producers Act in 1961, I can tell you that we had no idea of helping a large silver producer who mined small quantities of lead and zinc.

I think it is important for our friends in and out of Congress to act quickly in bringing to light and eliminating any loopholes. We in the Interior Committee are proud of the dispatch with which we have moved in this situation.

The loophole that will be closed by the enactment of H.R. 3845 came to light February 8, 1963, during a meeting of the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman. On February 18, the majority and minority leadership of the committee joined in introducing legislation to close the loophole. Our report was filed on March 28, 1963, after full and extensive hearings and consideration. I trust that today, 2 months and 3 days after we learned of this situation, a bill to correct the defect in the law will have passed the House.

Before discussing the bill further, I would like to take this opportunity to inform everyone concerning the administration of the Small Producers Stabilization Act. The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], has stated that the program has not been as successful as we who sponsored it had originally hoped. Nonetheless we think it is a good program, that it is working well, and that it is helping a very important segment of the lead-zinc industry.

The 1961 act provides for stabilization payments to small domestic producers of newly mined lead and zinc. The payments are based on 75 percent of the difference between 14½ cents per pound and the average market price of lead and 55 percent of the difference between 14½ cents per pound and the average market price of zinc, calculated on a monthly basis. During 1962, the price of lead fluctuated between approximately 10 cents and 9½ cents per pound while the market price of zinc started out at 12 cents per pound and dropped last April to 11½ cents per pound, where it has remained.

In order to qualify as a "small domestic producer" the applicant must show that he has not produced or sold over 3,000 tons of lead and zinc combined "during any 12-month period between January 1, 1956, and the first day of the period for which he seeks payment under this act."

Two years ago when our Committee considered and the House acted on the Stabilization Act, we reported that there were in 1956—according to Bureau of Mines statistics—a total of 638 lead-zinc mines each of which produced not more than three thousand tons of lead and zinc combined, the limit for qualification under the 1961 act. We further reported that by 1960 the number of small producers reported by the Bureau of Mines had been reduced to 273. We then based our estimated cost for the program on a number of assumptions, among which was one that the year 1960 represented the low or minimum level for small producers; and we concluded that not all of the producers eligible to participate would resume production.

We were apparently wrong in estimating that 960 was the low point for small producers. A great number of additional small producers have gone out of business since then. Our conclusion that not all of the producers eligible for participation would resume production is now seen as a gross understatement. Apparently very few small producers could find sufficient incentive in the stabilization program to resume business.

Of a potential participation of between 273 and 638 small producers, only 84 were certified as eligible for the program on March 1, 1963. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point tabulations showing the distribution of small producers by size and by State for the years 1956 and 1960 along with the number participating in the lead-zinc stabilization program:

Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act

1. DISTRIBUTION OF SMALL PRODUCERS BY SIZE

Size of mine	1956	1960	Participants in the program as of Mar. 1, 1963
Production per annum:			
499 tons or less	558	244	51
500 to 999 tons	27	8	11
1,000 to 1,999 tons	29	14	20
2,000 to 2,999 tons	24	7	3
Total	638	273	85

2. DISTRIBUTION OF SMALL PRODUCERS BY STATES

State	Small producers		Participants in the program, as of Mar. 1, 1963
	1956	1960	
Alaska	1	3	0
Arizona	43	24	2
Arkansas	0	1	1
California	27	11	3
Colorado	93	40	0
Idaho	69	50	15
Illinois	9	6	0
Kansas	40	5	6
Kentucky	1	1	0
Missouri	13	1	0
Montana	98	38	6
Nevada	55	29	8
New Mexico	29	11	2
North Carolina	1	1	1
Oklahoma	74	3	20
Oregon	2	0	0
Tennessee	3	2	0
Utah	54	39	20
Washington	13	1	0
Wisconsin	13	7	1
Total	638	273	85

Mr. Chairman, in his report to the Congress on the first year's operation of the lead-zinc small producers stabilization program, the Secretary of the Interior, whose estimates 2 years ago concerning the scope of the program had guided the committee, stated:

> Participation in the program for the calendar year 1962 did not reach expectations. Interest was not as great as it was prior to the enactment of legislation financing the program. Apparently, many former small producers do not believe the benefits of the program to be sufficient for them to reopen their closed mines.

Of those who filed and have established their eligibility for participation in the program, 55 received payments on their 1962 production. These payments, as of March 1, 1963, amounted to $1,002,781.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a list of the participants who have received payment in the program. For the information of all concerned, under leave previously granted to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the Record the listing prepared in the Office of Minerals Exploration in the Department of the Interior showing recipients of payments made to March 1, 1963, for 1962 production under lead-zinc small producers stabilization program:

Lead and Zinc Mining Stabilization Program—Participants in Payments on 1962 Production to March 1, 1963

Arizona Michigan Mining, Post Office Box 829, Prescott, Ariz.

Foreman & Foreman, 564 Cliff Drive, Laguna Beach, Calif.

Celtor Chemical Corp., 1694 Union Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Frank N. Marr, 611 Peyton Building, Spokane, Wash.

Clayton Silver Mines, Box 890, Wallace, Idaho.

Edward J. Bailey, Box 660, Kellogg, Idaho.

Martin C. Thompson, Elizabeth Park, Kellogg, Idaho.

McLin-Asher Lease, Box 641, Kellogg, Idaho.

Sunshine Mining Co., West 300 Mission Avenue, Spokane, Wash.

Silver Star-Queens Mines, 1370 South Third West, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Silver Dollar Mining Co., 409 Radio Central Building, Spokane, Wash.

Mountain Goat Lease, Post Office Box 469, Wallace, Idaho.

Mid-Continent Lead & Zinc Co., Post Office Box 229, Baxter Springs, Kans.

Helen H. Mining Co., Post Office Box 29, Baxter Springs, Kans.

B. & I. Mining Co., Box 305, Picher, Okla.

Trout Mining Co., 233 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

The Taylor-Knapp Co., Box FF, Philipsburg, Mont.

Percy Goodwin & C. A. Porte, Rural Route A, Helena, Mont.

Hoco, Inc., Post Office Box O, White Sulphur Springs, Mont.

Ida B. Hand, Argenta Star Route, Dillon, Mont.

Lahey Leasing Co., Post Office Box 8, Jefferson City, Mont.

Caeser Caviglia, 659 Mill Street, Ely, Nev.

Charles A. Vaccaro, Post Office Box 234, Eureka, Nev.

Gold Note Group, 2453 Tyler Avenue, Ogden, Utah.

Hamilton Corp., Post Office Box 337, Ely, Nev.

Tungsten Mining Corp., Henderson, N.C.

Scotty Mining Co., Inc., Box 96, Picher, Okla.

Max Mining Co., 400 North Francis Street, Picher, Okla.

Virgil Lee Mining Co., Post Office Box 216, Picher, Okla.

C. & M. Mining Co., Post Office Box 229, Baxter Springs, Kans.

Wesah Mining Co.-Tom Kiser, 1903 F Street NW., Miami, Okla.

Mark Twain Mining Co., Post Office Box 187, Picher, Okla.

Tuck Mining Co., Box 366, Picher, Okla.

Charles Marie Mining Co., 212 North River Street, Commerce, Okla.

William H. Stone, Rural Route 2, Galena, Kans.

Merit Mining Co., 409 South Main Street, Picher, Okla.

Contack Mining Co., Inc., Post Office Box 849, Miami, Okla.

Estate of Dewey S. Sims, 205 East Street, NW., Miami, Okla.

John Henderson, Post Office Box 281, Picher, Okla.

The Quapaw Co., Post Office Box 187, Picher, Okla.

Keystone Mining Co., 163 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Peter S. Martin, Post Office Box 636, Milford, Utah.

Cardiff Industries, Inc., 404 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Arundel Mining Co., 1701 Greenhill Avenue, Wilmington, Del.

Bowman & Williams, 310 West 5300 South, Murray, Utah.

Tony Bullock, Lark, Utah.

George C. Duncan, 1471 Roberta Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Duncan and Sears, 1471 Roberta Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Jesus Avila, Lark, Utah.

Leonard Steel, Lark, Utah.

Gilbert Sears, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Anton Kennikar, 393 West 6260 South, Murray, Utah.

Roy Bendixon, 2820 East 7000 South, Salt Lake City, Utah.

William Keller, 324 East 5900 South, Murray, Utah.

Peter S. Martin, Post Office Box 636, Milford, Utah.

John D. Torres, Post Office Box 246, Magdalena, N. Mex.

Mr. Chairman, we do not know exactly how many of these participants in the program will be eliminated by enactment of this bill. The Department of the Interior in its report and in testimony before the committee stated that "six or seven" producers now participating in the program might be eliminated. The elimination of six or seven will leave a strengthened viable program.

The approach we have used in H.R. 3845 is to require participants to obtain from lead and zinc at least 50 percent of the monetary return from their metals and minerals production. In order to preserve the program for the legitimate small producer we have worded the amendment so as to impose this 50 percent lead-zinc requirement during the entire base period from 1956 to date of application.

In other words, if before the stabilization payments were authorized, a company was a major producer of silver or tungsten, for example, it was not our intent to induce such a company to transform its operations in order to qualify for these Government payments. We intended these payments to assist small producers and by adopting the amendments contained in H.R. 3845 that purpose will be maintained.

Again in urging adoption of this measure I emphasize the need for unanimity to underline to the American people our good faith in providing this assistance only to those who need it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SAYLOR. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3845

A bill to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6(a) of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766, 768; 30 U.S.C. 686), is amended by (a) adding the following before the period at the end of clause (2): "*Provided,* That the principal product or products of such producer is either lead or zinc or a combination of lead and zinc"; and (b) adding the following clause: "(6) The term 'principal product or products' means that the dollar value of lead or zinc or the combination of lead and zinc must have been 50 per centum or more of the total dollar value of all metals sold by the small domestic producer contained in the ores and concentrates produced, calculated on the basis of the product of the settlement assays for all metals sold and the quoted market prices of those metals at the time of sale."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, after the colon strike out all of clause (6) through page 2, line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(6) The term 'principal product or products' means that the dollar value of lead or zinc sold or the combination of lead and zinc sold must have been 50 per centum or more of the total dollar value of all minerals and metals contained in the ores and concentrates produced and sold by the small domestic producer, calculated on the basis of the product of the total metal and mineral content of the ores and concentrates sold, as determined from the settlement assays, and the quoted market prices of those metals or minerals at the time of the sale."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having assumed the chair, Mr. FEIGHAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3845) to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766), pursuant to House Resolution 309, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in connection with the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING VIRGIN ISLANDS TO ISSUE GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1989) to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1989, with Mr. FEIGHAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1989, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know there is no opposition to this legislation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the ranking member of the committee, will have an amendment to offer, which amendment he offered in the subcommittee. But with what little controversary may develop with regard to the amendment, the legislation, I think, is very well supported by all members of our committee.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1989 has for its chief function the improvement of the economic situation in the Virgin Islands through permitting the sale of bonds by the territorial government. The bill provides that bonds in the amount of 10 percent of the aggregate assessed valuation of the Virgin Islands may be offered for sale. The most recent assessed valuation is approximately $70 million and this is conservative figure. The $7 million that would be realized from the bond sales would be used for hospital, school, library, firehouse, sewerage, and similar construction. Since these purposes are not revenue producing, they must be supported by the local government. The legislation specifically provides that the bonds shall not be obligations of the Federal Government but of the territorial government.

The Virgin Islands Organic Act of 1936 made no reference to a bonding authority, but subsequently a 1949 act gave the territorial government authority to issue general obligation bonds up to 10 percent of the aggregate assessed valuation of the taxable real property. No bonds were sold under this authority.

When we revised the 1936 organic act in 1954, we omitted this bonding power by providing that the legislature would have "no power to incur indebtedness." Now in order to meet some of the pressing needs of the administration, the Virgin Islands and the Secretary of the Interior have asked that the power under the 1949 act be reinstated.

The Virgin Islands have made remarkable progress during the past 10 years. The islands' revenues have increased from roughly $4 million in 1953 to about $14 million in 1963. The Virgin Islands are able to meet their day-to-day expenses but such projects as those contemplated under this legislation must be paid for from other funds.

The Secretaries of the Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare and the Virgin Islands Territorial Legislature have all reported favorably on H.R. 1989.

The Governor of the Virgin Islands appeared before our committee and explained to our satisfaction how the funds would be used. I recommend the enactment of the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that in many respects is unusual. It might best be described as a bill to permit the people of the Virgin Islands to go into debt. Up until now the Virgin Islands, because of the Organic Act of 1954, are not permitted to issue any general obligation bonds and to go into debt. You heard the chairman of the full committee refer to the act of 1949 which Congress passed, and under which we authorized the Virgin Islanders to go into debt. He stated that no bonds were issued pursuant to that authority, and that is correct. I have been told that people of the Virgin Islands, at that time, checked and found out that the bonds were not salable or were salable only under such conditions that the financing would be prohibitive.

In 1954 Congress adopted what is now known as the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands. In that act we did something which in and of itself, I think, is unusual; we provided that the local government could collect taxes based upon the income tax of the United States, and that those moneys would not be covered into the Treasury of the United States but would be covered into the treasury of the Virgin Islands, and that anyone who lived in the Virgin Islands would not have to pay Federal income tax per se in addition to his local taxes. As a result the Virgin Islands have grown and prospered.

Last year the present Governor, several members of the legislature, and a number of business people came up from the Virgin Islands, appeared before our committee. They made the statement that of all the things the United States has done for the Virgin Islands since 1917, nothing that Congress has done, including the acquisition of those islands by the U.S. Government and subsequently their operation by the Department of the Interior, has been so effective in increasing their prosperity as the Organic Act of 1954.

The bill we have before us authorizes them to go into debt to the extent of 10 percent of their assessed valuation, and I think we should give them that authority. But we have been very generous with the people who live in the Virgin Islands, and by the way, a number of people have moved to the Virgin Islands merely because they only have to pay one tax. They pay their income tax down there, and so far they have had no other taxes to pay.

In this bill, if you will read it, you will find they are authorized to engage in all types of public works. Many of them that they indicate are non-revenue-producing, others are revenue producing. I feel that we owe to the people of the Virgin Islands and the taxpayers of these United States, who receive no benefit whatsoever from the Virgin Islands, the right to provide some guidelines on the expenditure of this money. At the proper time I expect to offer an amendment that will strike out all of the things that are presently in the bill for which they are authorized to spend money, and limit it to hospitals, schools, libraries, gymnasiums, and athletic fields.

The reason I have picked these five categories is that the Governor and the members of the legislature, to whom I have talked, say that these five categories are the principal needs of the Virgin Islands to bring them into line with modern society; and while some of the others might be desirable, they can accomplish the other things which are asked for in the bill from general revenues that they receive.

I hope the committee will see fit to accept the amendment and limit the projects for which money can be expended under this bonded indebtedness.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee is aware of the fact that our committee is in substantial agreement on the need for giving to the Virgin Islands the same authority that is given to any municipality in the United States.

I believe we have reason to be proud of the development of the Virgin Islands during recent years. It is not too long ago many of us can recall we were terribly disturbed about the abject poverty there, and the common use of the expression "the poorhouse of the Caribbean."

The Virgin Islands have reached a point in their development where, instead of scratching along in the mud and not even thinking of capital improvements and expansion, they are ready for that and should have the right to obtain that. It should be made clear the only difference between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself is over the amendment he proposes to offer. In effect, he is going to say through his amendment that the things we permit our municipalities and agencies of government to finance from bonds shall be limited in the case of the Virgin Islands.

I might point out that some of the things which would be eliminated are things which are very close to most of the municipalities in our country: bridges, wharves, harbor facilities, sewers, sewage disposal plants, electric distribution systems. Now, I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is on a very high plateau. He wants to give the Virgin Islands authority to build hospital facilities, which they need desperately; he wants to give them authority to build schools, which they need desperately. But, unfortunately it becomes my unpleasant duty at this Eastertide to get down to more mundane things, and I doubt very much if any of us would want to live in a community where we had a wonderful hospital, beautiful schools, but no sewage. And, I am sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not want to put the Virgin Islands in that position.

And, I might point out, too, that quite recently a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations made it very clear that we were appropriating for the last time moneys for the electric plant in the Virgin Islands. Now, that means that the Virgin Islands are going to have to take over that plant. I am sure that the Government will allow very easy terms for taking it over, but there will immediately emerge the necessity for improving that plant, which is not capable today of taking care of the needs of a growing area. That could run into millions of dollars, and I think if we are going to at this time allow the Virgin Islands to have the 10-percent borrowing authority, which we give to all our municipalities, we should not limit it and exclude things which we know are necessary and force this Congress, our committee, to come back year after year and ask that the borrowing authority be extended to these other vital areas.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated by the three speakers who preceded me, this bill pretty much meets with the approval of all the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I personally voted for the legislation with some reluctance.

Mr. Chairman, the Virgin Islands today consist of three islands with a population of about 30,000 to 35,000 people. It has an annual budget of about $17 million. I would ask any Member of this House of Representatives to take a look at any community in his district of similar size, 30,000 to 35,000 people, and ask himself what the annual budget of that town or city might be. And, I think he would find that $17 million would be certainly considered to be adequate for running the affairs and solving the financial problems of that particular city.

Now, the Virgin Islands are in a little bit different category, of course, in that they went into this thing from scratch, and as the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], who preceded me, just stated, the "poorhouse of the Caribbean" which is about right, but with the advent of the 1954 act and with the advent of the airplane, for which I do not think Congress should take any credit, arriving on a nonstop hop to St. Croix, things really began to pop in that area. Now you can buy a lot in some of these places for $10,000 to $20,000, $30,000 to $50,000. So, their economy is pretty good.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the House should also know that the Federal Government chips in to the tune of about $7 million a year, I think it is, in the way of the contribution of excise taxes from the rum that is produced in the Virgin Islands. I might add that it is real good rum, too.

So, it was with some regret that we voted for this bill to let these people go in debt. They have all of this money, the $17 million a year. Yet now they want to go on the cuff for another 10 percent of the assessed valuation of the property which is somewhere in the area of $70 million, and probably will mount very quickly. However, if we do believe that these areas should be self-governing to the greatest extent possible, we ought to give them this authority to bond themselves. They wanted more. They wanted 15 percent. The committee cut it down to 10 percent. I think that was good judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I must disagree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] in one respect where the gentleman said that they might use this money to purchase the electrical producing facilities in the Virgin Islands. If you have ever seen a Rube Goldberg setup, this is the power producing facilities of the Virgin Islands. Several of us have been down there and have taken a look at it, and you have never seen such a haywire outfit in your life. These things are jiggling all over the place. Some of them have nameplates of "40 kilowatts," "18 kilowatts," and they have a half-dozen different generators. No two of the spare parts will fit and, therefore, different spare parts have to be kept of every different type. It is about as bad a setup as you could have. Why the Virgin Islands government would want to buy that kind of a deal I would not know, unless it would be to put some people on the payroll through patronage.

Mr. Chairman, on the other hand, if they should sell this property to an electrical utility company which knows something about its business, they would probably junk most of it and come up with a good operation and with this borrowing capacity that we are giving them here today they could use it to build their hospitals and schools, which I am sure all of us favor.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that the Committee on House Administration has just approved the purchase of another high-speed printing press for the printing of money down at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I understand this press operates at fantastic speeds and prints on both sides in the same operation. It is my further understanding that it costs about $400,000.

I wonder if it might not be the better part of good judgment to just buy the people of the Virgin Islands a printing press and turn them loose the way we are doing in this country rather than letting them go into debt?

Mr. WESTLAND. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa now that we have repealed the $1 and $2 bills and, perhaps, they will not need that printing press quite so quickly. These are bonds, and they are tax-exempt securities. They, of course, carry a very low interest rate.

Basically, Mr. Chairman, I think the House should grant them this authority.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be in enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (b) of section 8 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, as amended (68 Stat. 497, 500; 48 U.S.C. 1574(b)), is redesignated as paragraph (i) of such subsection (b), and is amended by deleting the last sentence thereof and by striking out the word "subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "paragraph (i)".

(b) Subsection (b) is further amended by adding the following new paragraph (ii):

"(ii) (A) Subject to the provisions of this paragraph (ii), the legislature of the government of the Virgin Islands may cause to be issued such negotiable general obligation bonds or other evidence of indebtedness as it may deem necessary and advisable to construct, improve, extend, better, repair, reconstruct, acquire, and operate any and all types of public works, which shall include, but not be limited to, schools, streets, bridges, wharves, harbor facilities, sewers, sewage-disposal plants, municipal buildings, libraries, gymnasia and athletic fields, firehouses, electric distribution systems or other projects pertaining to electric systems, and other public utilities, or to clear slums, accomplish urban redevelopment, or provide low-rent housing: *Provided,* That no public indebtedness of the Virgin Islands shall be incurred in excess of 10 per centum of the aggregate assessed valuation of the taxable real property in the Virgin Islands. Bonds issued pursuant to this paragraph (ii) shall bear such date or dates, may be in such denominations, may mature in such amounts and at such time or times, not exceeding thirty years from the date thereof, may be payable at such place or places, may be sold at either public or private sale, may be redeemable (either with or without premium) or nonredeemable, may carry such registration privileges as to either principal and interest, or principal only, and may be executed by such officers and in such manner, as shall be prescribed by the legislature of the government of the Virgin Islands. In case any of the officers whose signatures appear on the bonds or coupons shall cease to be such officers before delivery of such bonds, such signature, whether manual or facsimile, shall nevertheless be valid and sufficient for all purposes, the same as if such officers had remained in office until such delivery. The bonds so issued shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed that specified by the legislature and shall be payable semiannually. All such bonds shall be sold for not less than the principal amount thereof plus accrued interest. All bonds issued by the government of the Virgin Islands, including specifically interest thereon, shall be exempt from taxation by the Government of the United States, or by the government of the Virgin Islands or any political subdivision thereof, or by any State, territory, or possession or by any political subdivision of any State, territory, or possession, or by the District of Columbia.

"(B) The proceeds of the bond issues or other obligations herein authorized shall be expended only for the public improvements set forth in the preceding subparagraph, or for the reduction of the debt created by such bond issue or obligation, unless otherwise authorized by the Congress.

"(C) Bonds or other obligations issued pursuant to this paragraph (ii) shall not be a debt of the United States, nor shall the United States be liable thereon."

Mr. SAYLOR (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any place.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "an" and insert in lieu thereof "and".

Page 2, line 10, strike out "atheletic" and insert in lieu thereof "athletic".

Page 3, line 8, strike out the words "shall be" preceding the word "payable".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 2, lines 6 to 13 inclusive, strike out "any and all types of public works, which shall include, but not be limited to, schools, streets, bridges, wharves, harbor facilities, sewers, sewage-disposal plants, municipal buildings, libraries, gymnasia and athletic fields, firehouses, electric distribution systems or other projects pertaining to electric systems, and other public utilities, or to clear slums, accomplish urban redevelopment, or provide low-rent housing:" and insert "hospitals, schools, libraries, gymnasia and athletic fields:"

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the Virgin Islands, three small islands in the Caribbean, with a total population of somewhere in the neighborhood of 35,000, have an annual income in excess of $17 million. I have carefully checked and I find that there is no municipality in the United States with a population of 35,000 that has an income in the neighborhood of $17 million a year. With that income they are certainly able to provide, and they have provided, many of the things that they have needed. They have come far in the past 9 years from nothing. But one of the important things that I think this Committee should realize is that they have failed to provide the basic necessities of a modern society. They have not built the kind of hospitals they should have to take care of their people. They have not built the kind of schools they should have, and most of the 35,000 people who live there are of school age. They do not have libraries to supplement their schools, the schools that they do have. And they do not have the athletic fields and gymnasiums and equipment that should go with them. Therefore, if these people are going to go into debt for the first time I feel that some slight limitation should be placed upon them. I am trying to make sure that these people will build the things that they need most, the things that they have failed to provide from the money that they have had over the years.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will my friend from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Among other things, as I understand it, the gentleman has stricken from the bill by his amendment the matter of electric distribution systems or other projects pertaining thereto. If we provide that the government of the Virgin Islands take over the Virgin Islands Corporation and thereby take over this part of the activities of the Virgin Islands Corporation, would it not be well to permit them to have the bonding authority to go ahead and use some of this money that they secure from bonds for the construction of electrical systems? I know that we are not united in our committee on whether or not this property should go to the Virgin Islands government or whether it should go to private businesses, as was referred to by the gentleman from Washington. We have not yet come to that point. But if it should happen to go to the Virgin Islands government, should they not have the authority to go ahead and construct these facilities?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I might say to my colleague that if the time comes when the people of the Virgin Islands and their legislature decide that is what they want to do I am perfectly willing to go along and have that included. But that time has not come. At the present time the Virgin Islands Corporation is furnishing all of the power for the Virgin Islands.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. This is a matter that has to do, of course, with our present bill. The authority granted under the bill as presently written is more or less in line with general authority that municipalities of the United States have at the present time for such purposes; is that not correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is making an exception by his amendment because of the reasons he has given to the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right. I feel that in view of the amount of money the Virgin Islands is getting from general tax revenue, many of the things that municipalities are required to bond themselves for, the Virgin Islanders should pay out of their income.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Along with a number of others on the majority side of the Committee, I feel that it would be desirable to retain the full powers for the municipalities that are envisioned by this bill, but I recognize the situation. I recognize the difficulty that will be encountered if this bill should be forced to a vote on this particular day with a controversy in progress.

I just wonder if the gentleman would be willing to enlarge the language of his amendment to include sewers, sewage disposal plants, and water systems, which are certainly areas of activity in which there is no question at all of any competition with any private company, and which are also areas in which the need for bonding and financing would be, I think, very apparent in any community of any size.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will say to my colleague I would be willing to accept that amendment. I do not want to get down into the sewer from the high plane on which I have been placed by my friend the chairman of the committee, but I would be perfectly willing to accept that amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to add the following language to the Saylor amendment: After the language that has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, add "sewers, sewage disposal plants, and water systems."

Mr. CRAMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman inform me then what the total authority will be for bonding projects? What will be involved?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the amendment would then provide authority to bond for hospitals, for schools, for gymnasiums, for athletic fields, for sewers, for sewage disposal plants, and for water systems.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Saylor: On page 2, line 6, after "operate" strike out the remainder of line 6 and down to and including the words "low-rent housing" in line 13, and insert "hospitals, schools, libraries, gymnasia and athletic fields, sewers, sewage disposal plants, and water systems".

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to prolong this discussion. I think we have a practical situation here, but I do think before we vote on this amendment it is my responsibility as manager of the bill to point out that the committee instructed us to support the bill as it appears as reported by the committee. While I am inclined to limit this to certain specific activity, I do think we should be aware of the fact that too often in this Congress when it comes to legislating for offshore areas, where the people are not citizens in the full sense, we are inclined to adopt a double rule. We have one rule for those on the mainland and we have another rule for the offshore areas.

I intend to support the amendment because it is the practical thing to do, but I do not intend to support it in a paternalistic way or attitude toward those people because I think they have as much responsibility and ability to govern as any municipal council throughout the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct the bill on page 2, line 14, in a matter of spelling to change the word "pubic" to "public".

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Albert, having assumed the Chair, Mr. Feighan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1989) to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds, pursuant to House Resolution 307, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Aspinall). For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma rise?

CONSENT CALENDAR AND PRIVATE CALENDAR TO BE CALLED ON MONDAY, APRIL 22

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, April 22, 1963, it shall be in order to consider business under clause 4, rule XIII, the Consent Calendar rule, and clause 6, rule XXIV, the Private Calendar rule.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND AUTHORIZING SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. ALBERT. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 22, 1963, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH ON APRIL 24

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, April 24, 1963, may be dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar a week from Monday next be the only business to come before the House on that day?

Mr. ALBERT. There will be other business on Monday, but it was necessary to get that order making the Consent and Private Calendars in order on that day.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 22, 1963, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the distinguished majority leader what the program will be for the House of Representatives for the week of April 22.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the gentleman's inquiry, under the order just obtained, on Monday the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar will be called.

Monday is also District Day and there are five bills as follows:

H.R. 3190, pour-over trusts.

H.R. 4330, amend District of Columbia Business Corporation Act.

H.R. 5044, mutual-aid fire protection.

H.R. 5081, power line right-of-way.

H.R. 5338, establish uniform commercial code.

Also, on Monday, the House will take up the resolution—House Resolution 317—to agree to Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 4715 establishing the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

Tuesday: H.R. 12, Medical Professions Assistance Act. This is an open rule, with 3 hours of debate.

Wednesday: H.R. 4997, to extend the feed grains program. This is an open rule with 3 hours of debate.

Thursday and the balance of the week: H.R. 3120 to simplify administration of Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act. This is an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 1762, Outdoor recreation, coordinate programs. This is an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made of course with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations advises that his Committee on Appropriations desires to bring up the Labor-HEW bill on April 29, that is the Monday following the date of reconvening.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

WHY SHED TEARS?

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, other Members of this House will have to excuse me for not shedding the same crocodile tears regarding the article that Jack Anderson recently wrote for Parade. While I cannot speak to the merits of the particular cases of "cheating" which he mentioned, I can say from my own experience that it ill behooves us to loudly protest general criticisms from outside these halls when we pay little attention to specific criticisms pinpointing specific abuses within these halls.

The public is not so easily fooled. All of the statements which purport to tell what we would do about the alleged malefactors in this body were we to get their names and the details of their unethical conduct is so much hogwash. What we would do concerning abuses we do not know about can only be honestly judged in the light of what we do not do about abuses we do know about.

On March 12, 1963, I outlined a situation in specific detail which exists regarding the reporting of counterpart funds under title 22, section 1754 of the United States Code. This law clearly requires the reporting and full disclosure of the counterpart funds expended by Congress. This speech, which appears on pages 4017–4019, indicated beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Committee on Education and Labor, through its chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell], did not correctly report the counterpart funds expended by the chairman, other members and staff personnel.

On March 21, 1963, I again addressed the House and pointed out the impasse which I had reached regarding efforts on my part to secure information to rectify the situation presented. This speech appears on pages 4612 and 4613. As I pointed out then, no one seems to have responsibility for enforcing the law. The Justice Department says it is not their obligation; the Committee on House Administration says it is not their responsibility; the State Department says it is not their responsibility since they furnished the figures on counterpart expenditures to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] on February 28, 1963. At the same time, they will not furnish these figures to me. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] refuses to even answer the letter in which I requested a copy of the State Department letter to him.

Up to now, I have felt that our committee report represented a failure to comply with the law. However, when the facts are presented and there is a refusal to do anything about it, the matter ceases to be a question of complying with the law and instead becomes the obligation of the House to do something about it. When will we require compliance with the law? This House is countenancing a violation of the very laws that it has enacted at the same time it commands compliance by the rest of our citizenry.

There can be little doubt that the report submitted by the chairman of my committee was woefully inadequate. Without going into elaborate detail, note the report on just one trip. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] together with two staff members, Miss Corrina A. Huff and Mrs. Tamara J. Wall, conducted a factfinding mission to Europe which took the chairman to five countries, Mrs. Wall to seven countries, and Miss Huff to six countries. The total transportation bill for this factfinding trip comes to $100 for the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], $109 for Mrs. Wall, and $115 for Miss Huff, as indicated by the report which was filed on March 11, 1963, pursuant to the provisions of title 22, section 1754. The report was as follows:

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Powell, Adam C.:											
Great Britain (9 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		70.00		5.00		76.50 12.00		243.50
France (5 days)	do		110.00		87.50				48.00		245.50
Italy (6 days)	do		150.00		99.00				64.00		313.00
Greece (11 days)	do		192.50		181.50		75.00		88.00 10.00		547.00
Spain (4 days)	do		72.00		66.00		10.00 10.00		37.00		195.00
Wall, Tamara J.:											
Great Britain (4 days)	Pound		100.00		85.00		23.00		72.00	100	280.00
France (5 days)	New franc		110.00		82.50		12.00		45.50	1,250	250,00
Italy (9 days)	Lira		205.00		148.50		25.00		71.50	286,300	450.00
Greece (4 days)	Drachma		80.00		70.00		15.00		35.00	6,000	200.00
Austria (5 days)	Schilling		65.00		52.50		12.00		22.50	3,800	152.00
Germany (3 days)	Deutsche mark		55.00		51.00		14.00		30.00	600	150.00
Denmark (5 days)	Kroner		75.00		62.00		8.00		26.00	1,200	171.00
Huff, Corrinne A.:											
Great Britain (4 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		17.50		28.00		168.00		293.50
France (5 days)	do		110.00		82.50		12.00		46.00		250.50
Italy (5 days)	do		150.00		99.00				56.00		305.00
Greece (11 days)	do		192.00		181.50		75.00		84.00		532.50
Spain (4 days)	do		72.00		76.00				37.00		185.00
Denmark (4 days)	do		72.00		66.00				37.00		175.00

Does it stand to reason that such a trip can be made for this extremely small figure? No, it does not; so let us stop fooling ourselves. Someone had to pay for the basic travel expense. Possibly, MATS or other Government transportation could have been provided. No; this was clearly not the case as witness the following State Department telegram which alerted the oversea diplomatic corps to this trip:

> Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, accompanied by Mrs. Tamara J. Wall and Miss Corrine Huff, staff members, traveling Western Europe accordance following itinerary: August 8, sailing *Queen Mary*, arriving Southampton August 13; Paris, August 16; Venice, August 20; Rome, August 23; Athens, August 27; Delphi, August 30; sailing *Leonardo da Vinci*, September 15 from Gibraltar. Arrival times and flights forwarded when firm.
>
> Provisions handbook congressional travel apply. Codel and party authorized use local currencies 19FT561 funds. Meet assist appoint control officers.
>
> Request one single and one double with bath as follows: London-Cumberland Marble Arch Hotel; Paris Hotel San Regis; Venice Royal Denieli; Rome (1) Excelsior (2) Flora (3) Victoria whichever has special embassy rates; Athens beachhouse at Astir Hotel Delphi, new government hotel name unknown. Confirm Department soonest.
>
> London, request three tickets August 14 and 15, best shows playing, except Broadway plays.
>
> Paris-Codel desires use U.S. Army car and chauffeur. Reserve three for first show and dinner best table Lido August 16.
>
> Southampton-Codel requests be met at *Queen Mary* Cherbourg with $100 U.S. equivalent in local currencies for each member party.

This certainly indicates that the trip was made on the *Queen Mary*. Patently on the face of the report, therefore, is the obvious fact that it does not truly reflect the cost of the trip unless the funds came from some private source. At this point, secrecy takes over and I cannot report further.

Secrecy is at the heart of most of the abuses which persist here in Congress. In the particular instance of counterpart funds, the practice of making the figures available only to committee chairmen and then relying on them to present the figures to the House has obviously not worked. I, therefore, have introduced H.R. 5622 which would amend title 22, section 1754, by adding the simple provision that "Each such record shall be available for inspection by any Member of Congress upon his request."

Before we shed too many crocodile tears about the criticism that we are receiving, let us honestly look at our own basic weakness of refusing to enforce the law as far as legislators are concerned. My bill would at least make it possible to get a true accounting of moneys expended and not give committee chairmen a cloak behind which they can hide when their reports are incorrect and in direct violation of the law.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 5622

A bill to amend section 502 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 relating to the reporting of foreign currencies expended by Members of Congress

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 502 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Secretary of State shall keep a complete detailed record of each local currency owned by the United States which is made available during each calendar year under authority of subsection (b) of this section to each Member and employee of a committee of Congress. Each such report shall specify the amount furnished each Member and employee in each territory, possession, and commonwealth of the United States and in each foreign country visited, the dates of such visit, and the dollar-equivalent value of each such local currency. Each such record shall be available for inspection by any Member of Congress upon his request."

U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill designed to limit U.S. contributions to the United Nations in accordance with recommendations of the Clay Committee on foreign aid, and in keeping with the original intent of this Congress. My bill places a 33⅓-percent limit on U.S. contributions to all U.N. budgets and funds.

Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers now foot the bill for up to 100 percent of some U.N. funds, while other nations ignore their obligations to support the U.N. financially. If my bill is approved—and the principle already has received widespread vocal support—the savings to the American taxpayers could amount to approximately $50 million a year. And the other nations would be put firmly on notice that they must face up to their obligations to the U.N., if they wish the U.N. to continue to function.

As this House knows, I have been investigating the U.N.'s foreign aid activities for 2 months. It was the unpublicized extent of U.N. aid to Communist nations that first convinced me that U.N. aid is not now being administered in the best interests of the United States, despite the fact that the United States is the greatest supporter of the U.N. and the world's true champion of international peace and understanding.

Further checking reveals that U.N. aid is not even being administered in the best interests of the United Nations, and that continued bailing out of the U.N. by American tax dollars must come to a screeching halt.

The United States is obligated by charter—and by hope—to pay its fair share of U.N. costs. We are equally obligated by a domestic budget deficit and for the good of the U.N. itself, not to pay 1 cent more than our fair share.

The Clay Committee recommended just that with respect to United Nations assistance agencies, saying:

> U.S. contributions to the budget of these (assistance) organizations should not exceed our proportionate share of our regular U.N. budget.

Thus, the Clay Committee, in accord with the wisdom evidenced by the rest of its conscientious and meticulous report, advised the Nation to do exactly what the Congress of the United States had intended for us to be doing all along.

It should be noted here that American taxpayers now finance the U.N.'s myriad budgets and funds in widely varying amounts. For instance, our basic contribution to the U.N. general budget is 32.02 percent, but we give 40 percent to the Special Fund, some 70 percent to the Middle East emergency force, and 100 percent to some research programs. In other cases we give less than 32.02 percent.

My bill provides simply for the establishment of a flat rate ceiling above which no U.S. contribution to any U.N. budget or fund may go.

In fact, it is possible that American contributions to the U.N. in excess of 33⅓ percent of U.N. budgets already are illegal. At the very least those contributions are in direct opposition to the intent of the Congress as embodied in the State Department Appropriation Act of 1953.

In that act—now Public Law 82-495—the Congress, with foresight we unfortunately have not followed, provided this:

> No representative of the United States Government in any international organization after fiscal year 1953 shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the budget of any international organization.

Since 1953 there have been occasions upon which it has been found convenient for that basic limitation to be circumvented. It has been claimed that "voluntary" funds are not covered by the above law, although the law makes no such exception in its language. On the basis of that dubious reasoning the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 provided in section 301(b) that U.S. contributions to the U.N. Special Fund and the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance could be made, up to 40 percent of those funds' budgets.

And, by conveniently neglecting to remember the intent of the Congress, our State Department has gotten the United States into the deep financial waters of the U.N.'s emergency operations at rates up to 70 percent of U.N. expenditures.

My bill would return us to the intent of the 82d Congress and is designed to close the elusive "loopholes" by which we have ignored the wishes of that wise Congress.

The bill strikes out section 301(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and inserts in lieu thereof the following:

> Contributions, whether in cash or in goods and services, and other payments made by the United States for the calendar year 1964 or any subsequent calendar year to the United Nations or to any program or activity thereof (whether or not financed in whole or in part by assessments against member nations) may not exceed 33.33 per centum of the total amount contributed and paid by all nations for the calendar year involved to the United Nations, or the program or activity thereof, as the case may be.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that if the 33⅓-percent ceiling were applied to U.N. funds as they turned out in 1962, the American taxpayers would have been saved $37,836,000 last year. Even so only 10 of the 28 U.N. budgets would have been cut at all.

The table below shows the cuts that could have been made in 1962. Since the U.N. budgets are all continually increasing, it is apparent that savings in 1964 could be even larger—probably in the neighborhood of $50 million.

TABLE 1.—*Savings in U.N. contributions by the U.S. in 1962 if U.S. contribution limit had been 33.33 percent*

U.N. Fund:	*Saving*
Emergency forces	$1,233,000
Congo	10,193,000
Children's Fund	2,643,000
UNESCO (special)	1,364,000
ETAP	3,083,000
Palestine relief	12,941,000
Special Fund	4,223,000
WHO projects	2,156,000
Total	37,836,000

Mr. Speaker, the percentages which American taxpayers gave to the above projects in 1962 ranged from 40 percent to the special fund and the expanded technical assistance program to 100 percent for two of the three special projects of the World Health Organization.

The 18 U.N. funds and budgets to which the United States is now contributing less than 33⅓ percent include: General U.N. budget, International Maritime Consultive Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO joint support program, International Labor Organization, International Telecommunications Union, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Universal Postal Union, World Health Organization general budget, World Meteorological Organization, and the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees.

The proposed cutting back of our support to the U.N. is an effort to keep our own financial house in order, and to encourage added backing of the U.N. by other nations. This cutback is not supported only by myself and the Clay Committee. It has, indeed, received vocal support and active implementation by the Department of State.

The State Department announced March 13 that the United States no longer will support U.N. operations in the Middle East and in the Congo at rates in excess of our 32.02-percent general-budget assessment. In explaining that stand, our delegation to the United Nations under Delegate Francis Plimpton pointed directly to the 33⅓-percent limitation in U.S. law.

My bill, presented here today, is to clarify that law so that the State Department and the U.S. delegation to the United Nations will understand that Congress wants that 33⅓ percent ceiling aplied all the time and across the board—not just when the State Department decides it is convenient to apply the law.

I note also that the State Department itself has evidenced a similar opinion. On March 12, 1963, just 1 month ago, Mr. Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, said in a speech before the American Association of the United Nations:

> It is true that the regular budget scale involves a ceiling for U.S. contribution. This ceiling derives from a fundamental principle long accepted by the General Assembly—that, in an organization of sovereign states where each nation has one vote, it is not in the interest of the organization to depend too much financially on any one state * * *. The financial load simply must be more broadly based, and the carefully worked out cost-sharing formula to accomplish this is the regular budget scale.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is based on just the cost-sharing formula Mr. Gardner described. It would establish the U.S. limit at a point just above the 32.02 percent now determined for us in the United Nations budget formula, allowing a margin for minor fluctuations in our fair-share rate. Such action by us would encourage other nations to pay their fair share—whether out of dedication or disgust—unless they are willing to accept a cutback of United Nations activity especially in the foreign aid field.

Let us remember that the difficulties of the U.N. do not arise from its ordinary operations. It is the extra operations that have turned the U.N. into a bottomless financial drain for American taxpayers.

Over the last few years almost 90 percent of the U.N. membership has been granted relief from making payments at their regular assessment level to the special U.N. operations of emergency forces and of foreign aid. As a consequence, the United States has been called upon to support those programs via large "voluntary" contributions.

To do that we had to wink at our limitation law.

Mr. Speaker, this situation has two unacceptable aspects:

First. It has placed a disproportionate share—nearly half—of the cost of these operations on the United States.

Second. Under this arrangement a large number of U.N. members are not meeting their obligations.

The Communist bloc pays nothing or makes only token contributions. In the case of some specific funds, France, South Africa and the Arab countries refuse to pay their fair share. Other underdeveloped nations do not pay their share, arguing that they are too poor.

Beside that, the Communist bloc limits the convertibility of currency it gives to the U.N. so that such currency often can be spent only for Communist goods and experts and only in Communist nations.

There have been several attempts to straighten out the finances of the U.N. The most notable attempt involved that $100 million bond issue in which the United States hesitatingly agreed to participate last year.

In addition the International Court of Justice handed down last July an opinion that costs incurred by the U.N. in the Congo and Middle East operations are "expenses of the Organization" and that assessments levied to pay for them constitute binding legal obligations.

Please note that my bill does not propose that the United States refuse to meet such legal obligations. The 33⅓ percentage is, in fact, a little higher than our current legal U.N. assessment figure of 32.02 percent.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the United Nations is not being supported in many of its funds and budgets. These arrearages will continue to grow so long as both major and minor powers refuse to fulfill their legal obligations. And, so long as the American taxpayers pay the bill, there is no reason to expect that other nations will be bothered with paying them.

The United States contributes to at least 28 United Nations funds and budgets. That makes for a lot of different U.S. relationships with a lot of different international organizations each in a varied and complex field.

Thus, we find ourselves approaching something of a showdown this year. We have had some 18 years of experience now in building international organizations under the United Nations. It has been an enterprise in which the U.S. executive branch and the Congress have been partners in a great many decisions to establish or help finance international organizations.

We have arrived now at the point where it is a major responsibility of the United States to manage this complex web of relationships. But at the present point the management problems involved are almost staggeringly complex.

The U.S. Congress and our delegation to the U.N. are having to function to a significant degree as the legislature of an international organization that lacks an effective internal legislature. We have a very big voice in the U.N. budget process. We have the problem of examining U.N. programs, trying to make sure they are sensible, and meantime keeping our percentage of financial commitment down to a fair-share level.

Mr. Speaker, the financing of the United Nations has just gotten out of hand. The U.N. cannot manage it. Now it becomes apparent that the United States—saddled with its own debt—cannot finance the U.N., too.

I do not reach this conclusion lightly. I have studied U.N. finances closely and have detailed a number of questionable U.N. projects in 15 previous speeches in this House.

What is happening now, Mr. Speaker, is that the American taxpayer—who has a massive foreign aid program of his own—is being drawn unknowingly into a second foreign aid program which he finances but over which he has no effective control.

Our United States is facing the first $12 billion planned budget deficit in all its history. We simply cannot afford to support two foreign aid programs.

We already have substantial agreement in principle to the cutting of our unilateral aid program. It is equally obvious that we must apply the cutting principle also to our donations to the United Nations. My bill proposes a realistic method of doing that. It does not end our membership in the U.N. It does make our membership a fair-share affair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since the question is always near at hand in these cold war days, I want to deal briefly with the amount of U.N. foreign aid that has gone to or is programed for Communist bloc nations in 1963–64.

Many of these projects I have discussed here in detail in previous days. The aid includes that from the Special Fund and the expanded technical assistance program and from other U.N. funds and budgets—none of them limited to a 33⅓-percent U.S. contribution.

My research indicates that there are now in operation—or planned—103 U.N. aid projects in the Communist bloc. These will cost the U.N. $9,791,373 as detailed in the accompanying table.

TABLE 2.—*Total U.N. aid to or programed for Red bloc, 1963–64* (*includes Special Fund, ETAP, other funds*)

Nation	Projects	Cost
Cuba	16	$2,336,680
Poland	30	2,007,200
Yugoslavia	32	4,695,643
Albania	3	70,000
Interregional with Red Nations involved	12	583,000
Total	103	9,791,373

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the coming days of debate and lawmaking in the foreign aid field, we in this Congress will be successful in closing all loopholes and in providing specifically that no American contribution to any U.N. fund ever shall exceed that 33⅓ percent now in our laws.

I have proposed a step in the right direction; the direction of fiscal sanity; the direction of realism. It is a realistic step that has widespread support and that can be accomplished quickly. It follows the recommendations of General Clay's committee for decreased, selective aid to international organizations. It could save us $50 million.

The step I propose provides for a limit on U.S. contributions to any and all U.N. funds and budgets and will encourage other nations to assume their moral obligation to pay their fairer share of U.N. financing. Many of these nations have been rehabilitated by our unilateral aid and by U.N. aid financed chiefly by Americans.

My colleagues, let us legislate a positive 33⅓ percent ceiling on U.S. aid to the U.N.

Let us enact a "fair share" ceiling.

A "fair share" ceiling will help make the United Nations stronger and more financially sound while at the same time making the United States of America stronger and more financially sound.

That is a good bargain.

Let us take advantage of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend from Missouri for the wealth of information he has brought to the attention of the House in connection with the United Nations and its subsidiary organizations. I would ask the gentleman this question, Will your bill put a stop to the vicious practice of so-called voluntary contributions that have run into many, many millions of dollars?

Mr. HALL. No; I would have to say to the gentleman from Iowa who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of this House, that it would not within itself put a stop to the setting up by the United Nations or by their vote in the General Assembly of the voluntary fund, but it would keep us from participating more than the legal limit as established by the law of this Congress, which is 33⅓ percent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I was speaking of the voluntary contributions made by the United States, not by the United Nations; the voluntary contributions made by the United States to the United Nations and certain of its subsidiary organizations.

Mr. HALL. It is my opinion that it would stop those voluntary contributions over and above the regular assessments and as to those we could participate only up to 33⅓ percent. I am sorry I missed the gentleman's point in the beginning, but he is exactly right; that is the intent of this amendment to the bill which will take us back to the original concept of this House.

Mr. GROSS. It has been through this voluntary contribution gimmick that the executive branch of our Government has been evading what Congress said was a fair share contribution, 33⅓ percent.

Mr. HALL. It is 33⅓ percent at the present time, but we are assessed by the U.N. only 32.02 percent as a result of the action of the Finance Administration Committee in that organization's assessment upon us.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I thoroughly agree with him; I am sick and tired of a little group of people, mostly foreigners, going to New Delhi, India, or some other faraway place, holding a meeting and fixing the share of the contribution of the United States to the United Nations or one of its many agencies. These people are actually imposing taxes upon Americans by so doing.

Mr. HALL. That is correct. I will say as I did in the body of my speech that we have exercised considerable authority and participation in the Financial Administrative Committee, as I believe it is called. We have progressively reduced our legal limit of support, with

U.N. approval, and I say that not facetiously but in quotes, "approval," from 50 percent at the beginning to 32.02 percent at the present time. I would hope it would go much lower in the future, and that any future assessments by the U.N. would be progressively lessened to our true, fair share.

I want to make it obvious that I am not in this bill trying to hog-tie the United Nations. I am trying to make it legal, and for us to have even stiffer legal limitations. I think this will strengthen the United Nations. It will make more nations meet their obligations. It is supported not only by me but by others, including the State Department and the President's Committee on Foreign Expenditures. Many people feel that showdown time is here. This bill is one solution. I think it is reasonable support.

CUBA, TITO, AND THE TROJAN HORSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Tito, the Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, has been very much in the news in recent days and none of that news augers well for freedom's cause.

Titoism in Yugoslavia is one of the major issues to come before this Congress for resolution. It is an issue because of efforts being made to regain a favored nation status for Yugoslavia through an amendment to the foreign aid bill. The last Congress wisely removed Yugoslavia from the list of favored nations and the wisdom of that action has been amply confirmed by events in recent months.

There persists, however, remnants of the myth about Tito and the Communist regime in Yugoslavia—that Tito communism is somehow different from imperial Russian communism and that Titoism is a neutralist movement if not a movement friendly to the United States and the cause of the free world. That myth persists because of skillful manipulation of the news and a general failure to examine and understand the hard facts about Tito, Titoism, and the role of the Trojan horse in the global plans of imperial Russia.

Here are some of the hard facts which bear upon the issue before Congress on whether Tito's Yugoslavia should or should not be accorded favored nation status.

Tito is expected to pay a visit to Russian-occupied Cuba sometime in the immediate future. This visit may occur as early as June, but certainly within the next 6 months. There is some evidence, beyond the rumor stage, that Tito hopes to visit other countries in Latin America while he is in the Western Hemisphere. Within the past 10 days, President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, of Mexico, paid a so-called state visit on Tito during which he invited Tito to visit Mexico. Tito naturally accepted with enthusiasm. Such a visit to Mexico would make it that much easier for Tito to visit his comrade Castro in Russian-occupied Cuba, considering the problems of travel to Cuba these days and that the only regular airline service to Cuba is from Mexico City. Of course Tito could use a Russian jet for the trip, but that would uncover much of his Trojan Horse role in the schemes of imperial Russia. Moreover, the invitation from Mexican President Mateos provides additional "diplomatic cover" for Tito in his efforts to penetrate further the Russian cause into other Latin American Republics. The action taken by President Mateos makes him the first among the Organization of American States heads of state to break the ice for Tito in this hemisphere. The burden of resistance on other Organization of American States heads of state is thus considerably weakened and others may go the way of President Mateos.

It is generally agreed that Castro has been well exposed as a Russian Trojan Horse in the Western Hemisphere. President Kennedy played a vital role in bringing about that exposure. The Western Hemispheric crisis of last fall, when the Russians were caught redhanded in their military buildup in Cuba, provided our President with a unique opportunity to turn the floodlights of reality on the Castro regime. The impact of President Kennedy's exposure operation had a profound effect throughout all of Latin America. As a consequence, Castro is no longer useful to imperial Russia as a symbol of their wave of the future in this hemisphere. Castro is no longer the revolutionary symbol for the downtrodden and neglected masses to the south of our borders. He is now nothing more than an exposed Russian agent, a tool of an alien and despotic system.

The Russians are fully aware of what has happened to the Castro regime in terms of its appeal throughout Latin America. They have lost a long-term and expensive investment in that particular Trojan horse. But the Russians have many Trojan horses and Tito has been their most dependable one. He has weathered many storms—not the least of which was his sponsorship of a conference of so-called neutral nations arranged to coincide with the opening of the last series of Russian nuclear weapon tests. Tito and the neutralist conference provided propaganda cover to justify the Russians breaking the oral test ban understanding entered into during the Eisenhower administration. In the general political confusion which followed, Tito escaped detection of the crucial role he played in that maneuver. After we poured over $2 billion worth of American aid into Yugoslavia, Tito rewarded us with the public promise that he would stand shoulder to shoulder with the Russians in any showdown with the free world. But Tito is, as I have said, a rather special Trojan horse of the Russians and our Government has simply refused to take him at his word.

Now Tito has been assigned the mission to take up the slack in the Russian plans for this hemisphere caused by the exposure of Castro.

Let us not forget that Tito is the symbol of that nebulous system called national communism. He has been built up as the leader of a different kind of communism, a peaceful kind, a nonviolent kind, yes, even a kind of "democratic communism." All of this is, of course, a Russian-manufactured myth which some intellectuals and many theorists in the United States swallowed hook, line, and sinker. But the record shows that national communism is a propaganda technique to open the way for Russian takeover of legitimate revolutionary movements in countries where revolutionary change is the order of the day. This technique applies in countries seeking their national independence by escape from colonial rule and as well in countries where existing social and economic conditions invite revolutionary action to secure justice for the masses.

Much of Latin America is today in revolutionary ferment. There the revolution has both social and economic objectives. Revolutionary change, whether peaceful or violent, opens the door for Russian agents to enter the fray with their various techniques and methods calculated to capture leadership of the revolution. Once they have captured leadership of the revolution they immediately begin to apply their counterrevolutionary methods which we have come to call communism. Castro stands as a classic of that technique.

It is against this background that the mission of Tito to Cuba and Mexico takes on realistic meaning. Tito hopes, as I have said, to be invited to other republics in the hemisphere, after his visit with Castro.

These questions are pertinent to the upcoming Tito mission to Castro.

Will Tito advise Castro on the techniques of national communism and school him on the art of pilfering the pockets of the American taxpayers by promising to be a "good Communist?" Tito is proficient in both these games.

What methods will Tito use in his efforts to assume the role of Trojan horse for Moscow in the Western Hemisphere? Will he praise Castro as a reform leader who is misunderstood or will he urge the Yugoslav experiment in fraud as the answer to Castro's problems?

What is the role of Mexican President Mateos in the plans for the Tito mission? The free press reports that Lopez Mateos was in Berlin a few days ago and refused to leave his car to inspect the Berlin wall, for fear it would involve him in the East-West conflict. Does this mean that we will soon see a wave of neutralism infecting the Western Hemisphere? Neutralism follows a period of uncertainty about U.S. intentions and will in the conduct of the East-West conflict. Moreover, neutralism paves the way for the special mission of Trojan horse Tito. Tito can prove that it is highly profitable to pose as a neutral and at the same time be a shoulder-to-shoulder ally of the Russians. Fifteen years' experience at that game has made him a qualified and recognized expert.

Will the Tito visit to Cuba and Mexico create a situation in which it would be embarrassing for the United States not to invite him to make a stopover in Washington? In this age of confusion it is not at all difficult to engineer situations which on the surface can be built up as embarrassing. Not so long ago astute political leaders called this the art of fait accompli.

How many other republics in this hemisphere have heard the Tito knock on their doors and what will be their response if the United States in any way becomes a party to this Moscow scheme?

These questions deserve honest answers. Time will provide the answers and they will be unpleasant ones if Tito and his friends are given a clear field of operations. Answers should be forthcoming now from the Department of State whose duty it is to be on top of these insidious developments. If the answers are not now known in the Department of State, a search for them would serve to raise the alert signals throughout the hemisphere.

Only yesterday the delegates of the Communist Party in Yugoslavia adopted a new constitution. It is as unique a fraud as Tito. That constitution, prepared by the Communist Party, does not reflect the will of the people in the Yugoslav empire. It certainly does not reflect the feelings of the people in the Croatian nation, the Slovenian nation, or the Serbian nation, which are held by force within that empire. It does, however, reflect the wishes of the Communist Party and the big bosses in Moscow.

The most significant revelation about the new Yugoslav Communist constitution is a change in name for the state apparatus. The new name is "Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia." It will be recalled that the former name was "Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia." This change brings the regime in Yugoslavia into closer alignment with the Moscow pattern. All the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are known as "Socialist Republics." That name was pinned on such formerly independent nations as Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan, before they were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. The change in name from "Peoples" to "Socialist" Republic just paves the way for the incorporation of Yugoslavia into the Soviet Union. This very likely will be accomplished by Russian legal methods—the same ones they used to bring about the illegal annexations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in 1939 or 1940.

It should be noted that only Czechoslovakia among the nations occupied by imperial Russia following World War II has changed from a "Peoples" to a "Socialist" Republic. As is known, that forced federation of once-independent nations is for all practical purposes a Soviet Republic. The Czechoslovak Communists have been rigidly loyal to mother Russia, supplying arms to Communist guerrillas in the free world, always voting the Russian line in the United Nations and more lately acting for the Communist regime in Cuba in dealings with the United States. The only difference between the Czechoslovak Communists and the Tito Communists is that the Czechoslovaks operate openly for mother Russia and the Titoites operate covertly for mother Russia.

Tito is now 71 years of age. His time in the service of Moscow is obviously limited by the norms of life expectancy. Some informed observers hold that the new Communist constitution just adopted is insurance against a change of Communist control after Tito goes the way of all mortal men. He is made President of Yugoslavia for life under the new constitution, but the way is now cleared to incorporate Yugoslavia into the Soviet Union when Tito passes out of Russian service, should any serious problems arise in transferring Russian control to Tito's successor from among the Communist elite.

In any case, if there has been any doubt in official circles about where Tito stands on the East-West conflict, that doubt should be removed by the adoption of a Moscow-dictated constitution by the delegates of the Communist movement in Yugoslavia. It is time the old Trojan horse of Moscow was unmasked. Otherwise Tito will carry on the propaganda work of Moscow in the Western Hemisphere which was exposed last fall.

THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY'S STAKE IN THE WHEAT REFERENDUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, the wheat farmers of America will be called upon to vote on the proposition of whether to accept the programs for wheat, as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture predicated upon a bill passed by the 87th Congress, or to reject it.

This referendum will provide no choice as between one program and others—no choice as to the degree of benefits—no choice as to the lesser of two or more evils—just a simple yes or no. A "yes" vote by the wheat farmers will say we accept the program—its mixed-up price system and marketing controls, its lack of minimum acreage, its complete authority in the hands of the Secretary, the strictest control and regimentation of private enterprise ever seriously proposed in the United States, which would virtually convert farms into State enterprises. A "no" vote will say—we think the Congress will do better—that we still value our freedom, that we believe in the system that made us the greatest country in the world, the free market system.

But that is not all there is to this coming referendum. Wheat farmers are not the only producers involved; but their vote on this proposal of the Secretary will affect the livestock producers of the Nation; the dairymen, poultry and egg producers, and the entire farming industry. In the first place, it should be recalled that most of the commodities produced by our farmers and ranchers, both numerically and dollarwise, are not under any Government program, and, generally speaking, they are not in serious trouble. True, the markets of these commodities have fluctuated. They will continue to do so if they remain free—but the farmer is a businessman—he watches the markets and adjusts accordingly.

On the other hand, there are those who feel that since a few commodities are under Government programs, they should all be there. Apparently, they would even go further than that. They would go to any length to bring all commodities under the control of a central government. Having failed several times to bring various producers to "heel"—to have enacted programs to "help" these commodities—they would now adopt the indirect approach. They mean to win, one way or another.

So let us look at some of the questions posed above.

What is all the fuss about? Simply stated, this wheat referendum involves the most severe controls ever proposed for any segment of American agriculture. It is an authoritarian approach to a perplexing problem. Farmers are bewildered by the attitude of the Secretary—Why should he take a personal interest in promoting any program? Traditionally, this office has played referee, umpire, and arbiter. Today, it is the leading participant. Historically, the Department has dispensed fair, dependable, and reliable information. Today the facts and figures are tinged with slants and slopes toward the Secretary's program. So farmers are confused, befuddled, and bewildered—and so are a lot of other folks.

Is this all there is to the coming referendum? Well, hardly. This may be the first step but surely not the last. If this program is approved, the discretion will be in the hands of the Secretary—so some of the ideas of controls and controllers will be accomplished fact. The rest will be easy.

Are wheat farmers the only producers involved in this referendum? Again, hardly. The feed values of wheat are directly related to the feed value of corn and other grains—and these feed values are all directly related to livestock and livestock products. So all farmers are involved—but especially those who feed the dairy cows, the range and feeder cattle, the pigs, the chickens, the turkeys, and those who produce and nurture those products to fill the markets and the tables of the public. So even the consumer is concerned.

It is a melancholy fact that the nations of the world whose people are nearest to starvation and most unable to feed themselves, are the ones whose agriculture is run by a central government—an agricultural commissioner—or a dictator.

Finally, what is the stake of the livestock producers in the wheat vote? At least twofold. For many years, producers of livestock have resisted the various efforts of well-meaning people to help the livestock industry. The resistance has stood them in good stead. They have done well. It is true that prices move up and down—but overall the industry is healthy. The turkey producers recently voted down a similar program, but it was not so severe as this. Attempts have been made to control hogs, cattle, and so forth.

But failing the direct approach, the Secretary, seemingly, has chosen the indirect route—control the wheat, the feed grains, the market. Break the livestock prices, bring the producers to their knees, and they too will become easy prey for any program, for complete control in return for a handout from Uncle Sam.

The livestock people have a very real stake in this referendum. They need to help, even though they cannot vote, to defeat this vicious octopus—this insatiable desire for power, this sharp-fanged wolf in sheep's clothing before they get taken in.

Consumers also need to have a second look—before this referendum leaves them and their food supply in the hands of a patronizing government—before it follows the pattern of many other nations and leaves their stomachs empty and their children crying for milk and succor.

No nation is today better fed—at less cost, than we.

Why trade off a system which has been and is working, the system of free competitive enterprise, for one which has failed in every attempt, the system of centralized control of the right to produce, of supply management?

If you think about it a moment, you would not trade. So this referendum should be soundly defeated.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS IN RELATION TO THE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a summary of the appropriation bills of the 88th Congress up to this time and data updating the President's January budget recommendations as to new authority to obligate the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members and others who may be interested, I include a summary of the action in the appropriation bills down to date in the current session and an approximation of the portions of the President's obligation authority budget yet to come before the House for consideration in future bills:

Summary of the appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of Apr. 11, 1963

(NOTE.—Does not include any "back-door" appropriation bills)

Fiscal year and bill	Budget requests	House action: Reported by committee	House action: Passed	Senate passed	Enacted	Bill at latest stage compared to budget requests
Fiscal 1963:						
Supplemental, Agriculture (shifted from original budget request for 1964)	[1] $508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	
Supplemental, 1963	1,641,507,106	988,756,506	1,438,691,506			−$202,815,600
Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)	( )	(450,000,000)			(−50,000,000)
All other	(1,141,507,106)	(988,756,506)	(988,691.506)			(−152,815,600)
Total, 1963	[2] 2,149,679,106	1,496,928,506	1,946,863,506	508.172,000	508,172,000	−202,815,600
Fiscal 1964:						
Interior and related:						
Appropriations	998,009,000	929,690,200	922,625,200			−75,383,800
Borrowing authority	13,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000			−7,000,000
Contract authority	17,500,000					−17.500,000
Total	1,028,509,000	935,690,200	928,625,200			−99,883,800
Treasury-Post Office and related	6,146,842,000	5,997,026,000	5,997,026,000			−149,816,000
Total, 1964 to date	7,175,351,000	6,932,716,200	6,925,651,200			−249,699,800
Grand total reductions to date on the portions of the budget processed through the regular appropriation bills (based on latest action on each bill)	9,325,030,106					−452,515,400

[1] Shifted from the 1964 budget request (which was reduced accordingly).

[2] This accounts for virtually all of the supplementals for fiscal 1963 specifically projected for 1963 in the January budget except for the $2,000,000,000 additional for the Export-Import Bank now pending as a "back-door" appropriation proposition.

Mr. Speaker, we will report another bill in the week following the Easter recess. The hearings on several other major bills are either completed or well advanced. But some major bills will again be delayed pending consideration of the related annual authorization bills which under the rules must precede the appropriation bills.

No further supplemental bills from the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal 1963 are now foreseen. There is pending in the House, however, a $2,000,000,000 "back-door" appropriation in the bill from the Banking and Currency Committee for the Export-Import Bank. As may be noted from the table I have included, the House has considered $7,175,351,000 of the new appropriation budget requests for fiscal 1964 in the two regular bills.

AMOUNTS YET TO BE CONSIDERED

The President's January budget proposed $107,927,000,000 in new obligational authority for fiscal 1964, of which $11,781,000,000 is for permanent appropriations recurring under prior law, principally interest on the debt, thus leaving, in round figures, $96,146,000,000 proposed for consideration in the present session applicable to fiscal 1964. The President has subsequently submitted several revisions to the January budget for fiscal 1964 totaling approximately $1,070,000,000 in reductions, principally the $508,172,000 switched over to fiscal 1963 and the $419,700,000 downward revision in foreign aid; there are approximately $142,700,000 in other downward adjustments. Thus the current total new obligational authority proposed for 1964 for action in the current session is, again approximately, $95,076,000,000. And the January budget identifies about $2,727,000,000 of that with propositions of legislation for new programs initially for consideration in legislative rather than appropriation bills; therefore it remains uncertain how much of that will eventuate in formal budget requests for actual appropriation. And some portion of the remaining $92,349,000,000 will probably also be affected as the Congress processes the annual legislative authorization bills for such major programs as space, military construction, and foreign aid; any changes will presumably also affect the budget request for actual appropriation.

So, Mr. Speaker, while we cannot at this point give the precise budget amounts yet to come before the House in the appropriation bills, on the basis of what is now pending before the committee the magnitude and character is approximately this:

Labor-HEW bill, $5,759,000,000;

Agriculture bill—and $855,000,000 loan authorization—$6,375,000,000;

Defense bill, $49,014,000,000;

State - Justice - Commerce-Judiciary bill, $2,158,000,000;

Independent offices bill, $14,513,000,000;

Public works bill, $4,558,000,000;

Military construction, $1,978,000,000;

Foreign aid bill, $4,840,000,000;

Legislative branch bill, $166,000,000;

District of Columbia bill, $34,000,000;

And, as usual, a closing supplemental bill, amounts now unknown.

Mr. Speaker, a necessary precautionary word for anyone who may take the time to balance out all these figures with the budget totals. The budget concept of "new obligational authority" is slightly different from the traditional "appropriation" concept—for instance, an appropriation to "liquidate prior contract authority" is counted as an "appropriation" but it is not "new obligational authority." And whereas in the foregoing tabulation the Post Office appropriations are counted, as heretofore, on a gross basis, in the budget only the estimated postal deficit, chargeable to the general Treasury, and being the excess of the appropriations over the estimated postal revenues, is reflected as "new obligational authority."

REVISED SUMMARY OF NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY REQUESTED BY THE PRESIDENT, 1963 AND 1964

For the fiscal year 1963 ending this coming June 30, the President's January budget estimated total new obligational authority, including supplementals to be submitted to the present session, aggregated $103,192,000,000. Subsequent revisions from the President thus far increase that figure by the net amount of approximately $272,000,000—to a new total of $103,464,000,000; there have been formal downward revisions of $236,500,000, more than offset by the $508,100,000 switch from the 1964 budget for the Commodity Credit Corporation. A few small increases submitted by the President and not specifically identified in the January budget for fiscal 1963 are chargeable to the contingency allowance within the overall total.

For the fiscal year 1964, the revised total new obligational authority request, after adjustments as noted, is approximately $106,857,000,000.

Comparatively, then, the President's adjusted recommendations for new authority to obligate the Government for fiscal 1964 are as follows:

The 1964 total budget request exceeds the currently adjusted 1963 total by about $3,393,000,000.

The 1964 revised request exceeds fiscal 1961 by about $20,182,000,000.

The 1964 revised request exceeds fiscal 1954 by about $44,092,000,000.

And as previously documented, using official budget and Treasury figures, approximately 53 percent of the recommended increase, 1964 over 1963, is for "Other than national defense"; approximately 49 percent of the recommended increase, 1964 over 1961, is for "Other than national defense"; and approximately 60 percent of the recommended increase, 1964 over 1954, is for "Other than national defense."

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY VERSUS BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Mr. Speaker, a source of much confusion is the matter of just what set of figures correctly measures the size of the budget on which the Congress acts. Contrary to widespread impression, the House does not act directly on the more generally familiar $98,802,000,000 spending budget for fiscal 1964. The House acts on the new obligational authority budget of $107,927,000,000 for 1964—that is the 1964 total of the propositions submitted, and now revised to about $106,857,000,000. The grant of authority to obligate is the significant point of decision in the appropriation process. The actual expenditure in payment of the obligations necessarily follows in due course of time. If you do not appropriate, no obligation can be created. If no obligation is created, then no expenditure—disbursement—is made. The $98.8 billion spending budget is the checking account budget—it represents the checks drawn to pay the bills. The new obligational authority budget represents the authority to create the obligation. That is the key figure to keep in mind. An increasingly higher obligational authority budget and appropriation signifies, inevitably as night follows day, a higher disbursements or expenditure budget.

Members of the House, the press, and others from time to time during the year, and especially in the closing weeks and days of the session, inquire as to what Congress has done to the spending budget. Unfortunately, we cannot tell them because the figures are not available. And they cannot be precisely and authoritatively compiled here. The House will have opportunity to vote on approximately $44,668,000,000 only of the $98,802,000,000 spending budget figure for fiscal 1964—principally for two reasons. And even this diminished total will be fragmented among some 14 or 15 appropriation bills and numerous legislative bills, handled on a piecemeal basis throughout the session. About $42,353,000,000 of the spending in 1964 will be from obligational authority already voted in past years by previous Congresses. Then, roughly $11,781,000,000, will ensue from permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law and therefore not required to be voted on in the current session. These total $54,134,000,000, or over 54 percent of the 1964 spending budget of $98.8 billion not directly before the House for action this session.

As to the remainder, a portion is related to propositions of new legislation first for consideration in sundry bills in the legislative committees, or, on the other hand, if such be the decision, to be cut from the budget by failure to report or enact the new proposals. The separately identifiable January budget total for these new propositions of legislation, within the $107.9 billion total new obligational authority request, is $2,727,000,000 of new obligational authority for fiscal 1964, of which, according to the budget, $1,202,000,000 would be expended in 1964 and therefore included in the $98.8 billion spending figure for 1964.

SAVINGS IN APPROPRIATIONS THUS FAR IN FISCAL 1963 RELATED TO FAILURE OF THE CLOSING SUPPLEMENTAL BILL IN THE LAST SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday while the House was voting to expend vast sums we do not have, money which must be borrowed; while we were plunging the national debt toward the highest point in history, much was said here on the floor about savings that had been made. But no mention was made of the very substantial savings made in the last hours of the last session of the Congress when by failing to pass the last supplemental appropriation bill, we saved more than a quarter of a billion dollars in appropriations without any accompanying loss to the Government.

I want to say a few words about that.

At a time when we have accumulated the highest national debt since 1789.

At a time when we are called upon to act on the largest spending budget in our history.

At a time when we are confronted with the second highest budget deficit in time of peace and the possibility of setting a new record in that respect.

At a time when the cost-of-living index is at an all-time high.

At a time when our gold supply keeps draining away overseas.

At a time when appropriations of approximately $107,000,000,000 are proposed for the coming fiscal year of 1964.

At a time when we are spending more and more every year, and beyond our record national revenues—and more and more for nondefense items.

At a time when we are considering lightening the tax burden on American families—and, incidentally, increasing the debt burden on future generations.

At this especially critical time, Mr. Speaker, certainly every Member on both sides of the aisle can agree that we ought to take advantage of every opportunity to hold appropriations to the lowest possible minimum consistent with good government and to do so by every feasible means available to us. Certainly, that is the minimum the American people have a right to expect.

Now, when you want to reduce spending, all you have to do is to cut appropriations—a very simple matter.

When you do not want to start a new program or you do not want to accelerate an old program because you do not think we can afford to do so—and that is the situation at this time—all that is necessary is to deny the appropriations. Of course, sometimes it is painful. Often it involves desirable but not essential things; but it is nonetheless direct.

Often it is unpopular. You do not win popularity contests when you deny appropriations.

When you want to stop waste and extravagance, nothing in the long run is so effective as tightening the belt on the appropriation bills. We have the machinery—you have the machinery—all you need is the will to act.

Lest there be some mistaken impressions, may I say that the long record of the appropriation bills, going back over many years, will show that the bills as reported from the Committee on Appropriations to the House are the low-dollar point in the legislative process. Not that the committee bills were perfect. Seldom if ever do we report a bill satisfactory to everyone. Not that they have not—and not infrequently—been above the minimum necessary. Not that they have, on the other hand, always been too big, but that at times they have not been drafted to meet the situation. Nonetheless, of all the stages of the legislative process, they have represented the minimum.

But to return to the original question, I want to record a $251,601,000 appropriation saving in the current fiscal 1963 budget. I will include a tabulated statement, unmistakably convincing, of a quarter of a billion dollars not appropriated, not spent, not loaded on the Treasury, and not added to the record-breaking public debt by reason of not passing that closing supplemental bill in the last session.

You will recall that in the closing hours of the last session objection was made to sending to conference for last-minute adjustment the final supplemental appropriation bill. In consequence, you adjourned and went home leaving it to die with the 87th Congress. Why did you let it die? Why did you adjourn without submitting it to conference, adjusting the differences, and sending it down to the President for approval so the departments could begin to use over a quarter of a billion dollars now demonstrated as appropriation savings in fiscal 1963? The question answers itself—the appropriations were excessive, or unnecessary, and certainly of no urgency, just as was said here on the floor when the objection was made. The chairman who reported the bill at that time said that there was nothing in it of immediate urgency; that it would in no way discommode the Government if you failed to pass it; that such items as might in the future require consideration could very well be put over to the current session.

It was especially objected to because it was loaded with many propositions to initiate entirely new projects and programs, some of which had just been rejected in the regular bills. A catchall supplemental in the closing days and hours of a long, weary session is no place to be initiating new programs—least of all when the Treasury is empty—as it was then and as it remains today. They ought to receive whatever consideration they merit in the regular order, in the regular bills, along with the other expenditures of the particular departments.

But, Mr. Speaker, we were widely and severely excoriated for killing the bill carrying the excessive and unnecessary appropriations. So I am happy to report, after item-by-item comparison of the amounts and purposes considered in connection with the bill that failed and the amounts resubmitted for substantially the same purposes to the present session as supplementals and deficiencies for fiscal 1963, that thus far there is a savings in appropriations of $251,601,000. That is a substantial amount, even in the context of present-day multibillion-dollar budgets.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the valiant part he played last year in the dying days of the last session in blocking the passage of the last supplemental appropriation bill, thereby saving the taxpayers of this country a quarter of a billion dollars in appropriations.

I also want to commend the gentleman for the speech he made on the closing day of the last session. I shall never forget that speech. It was a memorable event in my life, and I commend the gentleman for the contribution he made at that time.

Mr. CANNON. May I say we are gratified to be able to cooperate with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the gentleman and associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], which made many friends in the First District of Nebraska. They informed me of the remarks made by the gentleman from Missouri on the closing day of the last Congress. I was here and heard it. I hope the gentleman continues here for many long years of service, and I wish him happiness for the coming Easter holidays and the years to follow.

Mr. CANNON. We are glad to cooperate with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I include as documented evidence a self-explanatory table.

The table referred to follows:

Summary of savings in appropriations thus far to the Treasury in fiscal 1963 related to the closing supplemental bill in the 2d session of the 87th Congress, H.R. 13290, which failed of final passage

[NOTE.—Total Presidential requests for appropriations considered in connection with the defunct bill were $631,785,376. In addition, pertinent unbudgeted amounts totaling $49,684,000 were pending in the bill, for a grand total of $681,469,376, of which $251,601,000, as shown below, has been saved thus far based on resubmissions for fiscal 1963 in H. Docs. 61 and 90]

1. Budget requests considered in connection with the defunct bill for which there are no current resubmissions in H. Doc. 61 or 90 for fiscal year 1963		$56,591,000
2. Unbudgeted amounts inserted in defunct bill by House or Senate for which there are no current submissions in H. Doc. 61 for fiscal 1963 ($55,769,000, less $845,000 for 3 research construction projects included in 1963 Agriculture bill; less $1,265,000 for 7 corps projects included in 1963 public works bill; less $35,000,000 for defense education which was contingent on passage of enabling legislation which, however, did not pass, and less $45,000 for gratuities)		18,614,000
3. Unbudgeted amounts inserted in defunct bill by House or Senate for which there are now current budget requests submitted for fiscal 1963 in H. Doc. 61 ($31,025,000 in bill as passed Senate, less $30,625,000 now requested for the same purposes)		400,000
4. Budget requests for items of appropriation now submitted in H. Docs. 61 and 90 for 1963 supplementals and deficiencies and the corresponding budget requests for the same items considered in connection with the defunct bill:		
(a) Total budget requests involved in this category of items in connection with the defunct bill	$679,494,000	
Deduct amounts deferred in the 1963 annual bills, and therefore shown as reductions in reports thereon, and reconsidered in connection with defunct bill	−104,300,000	
Net budget requests, this category, defunct bill	575,194,000	
(b) Budget requests now resubmitted as fiscal 1963 supplementals and deficiencies in H. Docs. 61 and 90 for the same items of appropriations for substantially the same purposes as were embraced in the corresponding budget requests under (a) above. (Total now resubmitted for fiscal 1963 under these titles is $513,313,000, but $120,515,000 of this is for purposes different, principally general civilian pay raises, than those embraced in the defunct budget requests)	−392,798,000	
Deduct also the budget requests now resubmitted for fiscal 1963 in H. Doc. 61 for "restoration" of a portion of the $104,300,000 deferred in the annual bills and listed above	−6,400,000	
Savings in fiscal 1963 under this category of items based on resubmissions in H. Doc. 61 and 90		175,996,000
Total savings in appropriations thus far, fiscal 1963, as result of failure of the supplemental bill		251,601,000

MEMBERS OF THE WYOMING STATE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 10, an article appeared in a Washington morning newspaper, written by a well-known and very respected columnist. I regret very much that this columnist has seen fit in his article to impugn the integrity and the motives of the leaders and members of the Wyoming State Senate and House of Representatives as well as that of the people of Wyoming generally. It is quite apparent that he has made no real effort to check his statements because if he had done so, he would have found that the charges he makes are completely untrue. I have known the leaders of our State legislature for many years, as well as most of the members. They are honest men and women who are not controlled in any way by anyone except their own conscience. We in Wyoming are very proud of the fact that our political campaigns are clean. There is no mudslinging and no personal attacks. When this columnist makes the charges that our State legislature was more or less openly controlled by a so-called rightwing organization, he is making charges which are completely unfounded and completely untrue and, in my opinion, are nothing short of libelous. When he criticizes the actions of our legislature in adopting resolutions and requests for constitutional amendments, then he is attacking the sovereignty of the State of Wyoming. Certainly he has no right to sit in judgment over the actions of our legislature nor to criticize such actions because they do not coincide with his own thinking. The article is all the more unfortunate because it appears that its purpose is purely political and partisan. If this columnist is as fair as I think he is, I am sure that he will make an honest attempt to check the charges he has made and will apologize to the State of Wyoming and its citizens for the attack he has made on their honesty and integrity.

EAST EUROPEAN ANTI-RED EXILES SUPPORT POLICY BEING REVERSED

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, few articles that I have had the privilege of reading have so aroused my curiosity and resentment as the one by columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, published in the Northern Virginia Sun, yesterday, April 10.

I have directed a letter to the Secretary of State requesting a copy of the undisclosed paper which is quoted by Mr. Allen and Mr. Scott in the following article:

EAST EUROPEAN ANTI-RED EXILES SUPPORT POLICY BEING REVERSED

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

President Kennedy's harsh crackdown on Cuban exile groups is being broadened to include the activities of the anti-Communist Eastern European refugee groups in the United States.

Behind the scenes, and without taking the American people into his confidence, the President is drastically reversing U.S. policies which have importantly aided these exiles since the late 1940's.

This undercover policy shift calls for hamstringing the efforts of the European refugees by sharply curtailing the cover funds supplied them by Government agencies, among them, the Central Intelligence Agency.

Although these financial curbs will not be fully effective until around July 1, the secret crackdown already is compelling Baltic and Russian exile groups to restrict their anti-Communist activities.

These groups are closing down anti-Russian and clandestine publications, broadcasts, and the doors of their assembly hall in New York, the so-called Baltic House.

In recent years, the Baltic House has served as a major exiles headquarters for exposing Soviet tyranny, helping defectors escape from the Iron Curtain, and rallying support in the United Nations to block Russian efforts to legalize their World War II territory grabs.

Leading architects of this new policy are McGeorge Bundy, ambitious foreign policy assistant to the President, and Dr. Walt Rostow, head of the State Department Policy Planning Council.

These two key policymakers have convinced the President that if the exile groups are squelched, the chances for working out a deal with Khrushchev on Berlin, Cuba and Central Europe would be greatly improved.

At the instigation of Bundy and Rostow the President has privately offered a quid pro quo to the Soviet for withdrawal of its combat troops from Cuba, in return for which the U.S. would reduce its garrison in West Berlin and withdraw several thousand troops from West Germany.

Even if the Kremlin rejects this accommodation Bundy and Rostow argue, the activities of the exile groups should be brought under tight control because they distract from the President's grand design of building a community of free nations, which will expand by its inner strength and attractive power * * *.

Equally curious is the backstage explanation given exile leaders for the timing of the crackdown. They are being told that their funds are needed for urgent efforts in Latin America. Beyond this bare claim no details are tendered.

The Bundy-Rostow policy also flatly rules out any military aid or intervention should a revolt develop in the Communist-dominated Eastern European nations.

As outlined in their undisclosed position paper, this hands-off policy is as follows:

"If revolt breaks out in East Germany or any other Communist satellite in Eastern Europe, we should bear in mind that our grand design is to build a community of free nations which will expand by its inner strength and attractive power when combined with the assertion of increasingly nationalistic trends within the Communist bloc.

"We do not wish to jeopardize this design by allowing Eastern Europe to become a battlefield between ourselves and the U.S.S.R. unless we are attacked.

"Accordingly, if turbulence erupts in the area, we should maintain this posture, and urge our allies to do the same, meanwhile exerting all the influence we can muster during such crises to yield less repressive and more nationalist regimes as the outcome.

"We should refrain from encouraging or supporting armed uprising, as distinct from peaceful demonstrations, strikes, and similar means of exerting public pressure against Communist regimes.

"Should a national Communist regime be established, we should make a maximum effort short of military action to permit its survival."

In ordering the crackdowns against the exile groups, the President has executed a complete flip-flop from the position he took in the 1960 campaign.

Then, in a speech in Johnstown, Pa., on October 15, he resoundingly declared:

"We must end the harassment which this Government has carried on of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands. While we cannot violate international law, we must recognize that these exiles and rebels represent the real voice of Cuba, and should not be constantly handicapped by our Immigration and Justice Department authorities."

THE LOSS OF 129 AMERICAN SAILORS ON THE SINKING OF THE ATOMIC SUBMARINE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, 129 American sailors today lie in a steel tomb a mile and a half below the ocean's surface. They are dying that others may be free. Supreme sacrifices such as this have been repeated time and again throughout the history of mankind, and these gallant men join a galaxy of authentic heroes.

Are they to be pitied? They are giving their lives for a noble cause, and how many among us will be able to say as much when the time comes to draw the mantle of our couch about us?

Rather, we are the ones to be pitied. Thrust upon us is the awesome responsibility to see to it that these brave men shall not die in vain, that the time their sacrifice buys will be used wisely by those of us in responsibility.

We must raise our eyes from the dust of petty politics to the guiding star of freedom. We must exhibit a bit of the same courage displayed time and again by our men in uniform. We must measure our every deed by this question: Will it save and strengthen for future generations our great heritage of freedom?

This sacrifice has special meaning in Holy Week, and we can take comfort from the promise that all things work together for good. The entombment of Jesus led to great things for the children of God. The entombment of these 129 sailors, in a different but worthy way, may, too, lead to great things for mankind. The responsibility lies squarely in our hands.

It forces us to take a new and sober look upon our conduct both at home and abroad. Are our goals and deeds proper companions for the goals and deeds of the 129 American sailors? Are we doing all we can to weld effectively and permanently the great resources of freedom throughout the world? In candor, we must admit we are not.

As George Washington would suggest, let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair, and then courageously carry this standard.

With American sailors dying, let us listen to the ship's company as it sings:

Eternal Father, strong to save
Whose arm doth bind the restless wave
Who bid'st the mighty ocean deep
Its own appointed limits keep
O, hear us when we cry to Thee
For those in peril on the sea.

AMENDMENT TO RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to amend the rules of the House to the extent that each bill placed before the House of Representatives must contain an estimate of Federal funds required to implement it. This regulation would reveal to each of us and to our Nation's citizens the hard, cold facts of the cost of each piece of legislation. Many proposals which may appear attractive on the surface will take on a different hue when "priced out" for all to see.

This is a conservative measure which in itself is a must. My resolution also requires that in instances where no cost will be involved, that a statement be included in the legislation to that effect.

Greater care will be used in introducing further legislative proposals when the requirements of my resolution are put into effect. This proposal to put a price tag on all House bills is clearly in the best interest of protecting our national economic strength. Not only will a higher grade of proposed legislation result, but we will eliminate many monetarily treacherous proposals of which even the study and consideration requires much of our valuable time to process.

I urge my colleagues to give favorable consideration to this proposed resolution, which in content is essentially the same as a resolution introduced by my colleague Louis C. Wyman, of New Hampshire.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Oliver P. Bolton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day, an irate American brought to my attention a recent release of the Department of Agriculture.

When I read it, I shared his reaction, and have asked for this time to bring the matter to the attention of the House.

In order to save time, I enclose, for the Record, the release of the Department and my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture expressing my reaction to it.

April 11, 1963.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: This is with reference to the press release of the U.S. Department of Agriculture dated April 3, 1963, entitled "Bad Weather in 1962 Cut Agricultural Production in U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe." Being an official release of your Department, it can be presumed that this was widely distributed not only within the United States but was available to the foreign press, as well as to the controlled press behind the Iron Curtain. It is not inconceivable to me that it was also carried by the USIA abroad as well as by information media throughout the free world.

The lead paragraph of that release read:

"The Soviet Union and her East European satellites, plagued by bad weather, experienced another disappointing agricultural year in 1962, according to a recent report by the U.S. Department of Agriculture."

As I read this release, the entire theme of your Department's position seems to be that the failures of Soviet agriculture were due to bad weather alone. Frankly, I was shocked to see a department of our Government in effect offering substance to the argument which Premier Khrushchev uses to explain away communism's failure in agricultural production.

You must know all too well that despite a land mass 2½ times larger than the United States, despite cropland 40 percent greater than the United States, and despite the allocation of 45 percent of the Soviet labor force to agriculture, the United States exceeds the annual agricultural output of the Soviet Union by over 60 percent.

At a time when the American farmer is being asked to take on quota allocations of feed grains, we should be pointing out that, though the United States and Russia have approximately the same amount of land planted to feed grains, U.S. production of these grains exceeds that of the Soviet Union by over 154 percent.

Obviously, with the whip of the dictator on his back, the Soviet farmer, with his communized agriculture, is simply not in the same league as the 2 million free commercial farmers in the United States.

Communism's failure as a way of life is most apparent in its agricultural collapse. I am in no position to deny that weather conditions undoubtedly did affect production in the Soviet Union this year—but, Mr. Secretary, I am unable to understand how our Government can take an official position which does not recognize the basic reasons for their lack of production—namely, the Communist society itself.

When Khrushchev was here in 1959 and visited some of our farms, he had to admit openly that our farm machinery, management, methods and research far surpassed those in the Soviet. How, then, çan our Government take the position that the food shortage in Communist Europe was caused entirely by poor weather conditions.

I sincerely hope that you will see to it that the members of your Department will understand and appreciate the serious damage done by a release of this nature, which examines only the statistics of one element of a large subject and, therefore, is neither accurate nor helpful to the position of the free world in the cold war.

Ever sincerely,

Oliver P. Bolton.

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, April 3, 1963.

Bad weather in 1962 cut agricultural production in U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe:

The Soviet Union and her East European satellites, plagued by bad weather, experienced another disappointing agricultural year in 1962, according to a recent report by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Winter crops for 1962 harvest were damaged by drought in the fall of 1961, and spring field work was delayed by cool, wet weather in East Germany, Poland, and the central and northwestern regions of European U.S.S.R. Crops in the Danubian countries, southern regions of European U.S.S.R. and the Soviet Union's new lands, were hit by drought last summer.

The report, by USDA's Economic Research Service, shows the poor agricultural year aggravated food shortages throughout Eastern Europe. Shortages were especially acute in east Germany where meat and milk production were reduced.

According to official Soviet statistics, extremely poor growing conditions caused a 20 percent drop in potato production from 1961. Russia also suffered a drop in cotton production because the second dry winter in a row reduced the supply of irrigation water.

Poland's overall agricultural output was about 5 percent less than in the previous year and fruits, vegetables, butter, milk, and eggs are in shorter supply this year, the report shows.

In Czechoslovakia, the shortage of livestock feed forced farmers to slaughter cattle and other livestock.

The corn crop in Yugoslavia was about 5 percent above 1961 but output of both barley and oats was about the same. Wheat production was about average, 5 percent less than in 1961.

According to the report, total grain production in Hungary fell for the third consecutive year. Cabbage, carrots, and parsley were hit by drought, and production did not meet quotas.

Except in large urban centers, bread rationing is prevalent in most of Rumania because of a disappointing corn yield in 1962, the smallest since 1958.

Bulgaria's important export crops of tomatoes, grapes, and tobacco showed marked increases over the low 1961 levels. Low production forced rationing of onion, rice, beans, and potatoes.

Single copies of the report, "The 1963 Eastern Europe Agricultural Situation, Supplement No. 3 to the 1963 World Agricultural Situation," may be obtained from the Division of Information, Office of Management Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

AMERICA MUST NEVER FORGET THE NAZI HORRORS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, we must never forget the horrors that Fascist nazism perpetrated on a whole race of human beings in the torture and death camps of Adolf Hitler. This awful record of man's inhumanity to man should be writ in marble so we who now live and those younger folk whose world is to come will so order our Government, so conduct our personal affairs, and so fashion our individual and collective political philosophy that such terrible totalitarianism will never rise again.

Time fades memory. Of these horrors we must never forget. The obsession of racial superiority that was Hitler's is a curse and invention of the devil incarnate. This is proved by the documents now being found portraying the absolute hell of gas chambers and crematoriums gassing and burning 8,000 to 12,000 human souls each day.

Today in 1963 the West should note well that the history of communism's blood baths has not yet been fully told. As the Kennedy administration gives us a policy of weakness, of compromise, of appeasement, of coexistence with communism even in this hemisphere—which is every bit as much evil as was nazism under Hitler—let us ponder well the story of Mr. Ascherson of the London Observer as it appears in today's American press:

Finding of Jar at Auschwitz Uncovers an Act of Heroism

(By Neal Ascherson)

London.—The discovery of a small glass jar, buried under a handful of burned bone behind the crematorium sites at Auschwitz concentration camp, has revealed an act of heroism.

The jar—originally 1 of 36—contained day-to-day statistics of the numbers gassed in Auschwitz extermination centers in occupied Poland during October 1944.

The men who took these notes and buried them were one of the "Sonderkommando" teams, themselves Jews, who searched the luggage of each trainload of victims, stripping their bodies of hair and valuables, burning their corpses and burying the ashes.

After 3 months, each "Sondkerkommando" was itself gassed.

In late 1944, however, the inflow of victims became so vast that the Auschwitz commanders allowed one experienced team to survive for many months.

PRECISE STATISTICS

This group buried precise statistics in tins and jars concealed in a site where human ash brought from the crematories was dumped.

Members of this group wrote out a precise plan of where they had buried the statistics.

Later, the whole team rose against the Nazis, but after killing some SS men and blowing up one crematorium, they were overpowered, tortured, and executed.

The only surviving witness to the tins' burial was a Pole named Henryk Porebski, a prisoner employed as an electrician on the crematorium power circuits. But the document describing where the containers had been buried had vanished, and nobody believed his story.

After the war Porebski returned to the camp, where he now works in the Auschwitz museum. He found that the whole area where the tins had been buried had been disturbed by the gruesome "gold rush" that followed the camp's liberation.

People from as far away as Cracow had come to sieve the ash fields and debris for money, jewelry, and gold tooth fillings and it seemed impossible that the tins would still be where they were buried.

Finally, Porebski convinced a woman who had also been a prisoner that he was telling the truth, and she persuaded the authorities to make a search.

Two years ago, a digging team began to trench the site with the methods of scientific archeology, impeded by the countless small possessions of the dead—from spoons to lipsticks—that were imbedded in the earth.

They kept a watch for patches of calcined human bones, which Porebski said had been scattered by the "Sonderkommando" as markers when they buried each tin.

JAR DISCOVERED

Last summer, after periodic lapses in the search, the glass jar was discovered. The contents have only been deciphered, but they give accurate data of the scale of executions when the death installation was working at maximum power.

Nazi records and the crematoria and gas chambers themselves were destroyed by the S.S. before the camp was evacuated.

So far, Polish authorities studying the papers found in the jar have not announced the figures of deaths that they record. They will have to be checked against previous estimates: those based on the number of prison trains arriving in late 1944 calculate that between 8,000 and 10,000 people were being gassed and cremated every 24 hours.

No other containers were found, although the diggers went to search the whole area. But Porebski's story has been justified, and the courage of the Jews of the "Sonderkommando"—whose notes in the jar also described what happened within the gassing block where they worked—can be properly honored.

INCREASE FROM $10,000 TO $25,000 COVERAGE FOR DEPOSITORS BY THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **HALPERN.** Mr. Speaker, I introduce today for appropriate reference a bill to increase the amount of insurance coverage under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from the present $10,000 to $25,000.

Beginning with the Banking Act of 1933, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insured accounts up to a maximum of $2,500 for each depositor. In July of 1933 this figure was increased to $5,000.

The Banking Act of 1935 provided a permanent plan of insurance, replacing a plan in the Banking Act of 1933 that never came into force. The act of 1935 continued the $5,000 coverage for each depositor, provided for an annual assessment of one-twelfth of 1 percent of deposits, and specified in more detail the supervisory responsibilities of the Corporation. These provisions were unchanged for the next 15 years, a period during which the chief legislative action affecting the Corporation was provision for retirement of the Corporation's original capital that had been provided by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Act of 1950 made a number of revisions in deposit insurance: The insurance limit was raised to the present maximum of $10,000 for each depositor, provision was made for an annual assessment credit to insured banks after allowance for Corporation losses and expenses, and additional measures for dealing with failing banks were authorized. A 1960 statute provided new methods for determining assessments, and increased the assessment credit to insured banks from 60 percent—under the 1950 act to 66⅔ percent of the assessment income remaining after deduction of Corporation losses and expenses.

A total of 13,021 banks, or 86 percent of all banks in the United States, became insured when the insurance took effect on January 1, 1934. The proportion of banks participating in Federal deposit insurance has increased each year; the 13,445 so insured on December 31, 1961, comprised 97 percent of the number, and held 98 percent of the deposits of all incorporated banks of deposit.

At the end of 1961 there were 514 banks, of varied types, outside Federal deposit insurance. Of this number, 195 were mutual savings banks, 141 were incorporated commercial banks operating under the general banking codes of various States, 81 were unincorporated banks, 52 were trust companies not regularly engaged in deposit banking, 34 were industrial banks, 13 were banks of deposit operating under various special charters, and 8 were branches of banks chartered in foreign countries which are included in the statistics of banks because they are engaged in deposit banking in the United States. The unincorporated banks, the trust companies not regularly engaged in banking and the branches in the United States of banks chartered in foreign countries are not eligible for Federal deposit insurance.

During the period 1934–61 the FDIC made disbursements to protect depositors in 445 failing banks. These banks had about 1,460,000 depositors and total deposits of $611 million.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the existing record of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is one of which we can be proud. I believe also that this would be an appropriate time to look into the advisability of increasing the amount of insurance coverage under the FDIC. As we have seen the figure has changed a number of times since the original act of 1933.

In light of modern depositor trends, an increase in the present maximum would be very helpful. The legislation I am introducing would amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act—relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts—with respect to the amount of insurance which may be provided increasing from $10,000 to $25,000 the maximum amount of insurance.

HELP!

Mr. **LIBONATI.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FASCELL.** Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1963, I rose before the House to draw attention to the conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment existing in the district which I represent. My statements were reported on page 4109 of the Congressional Record of that date. I now wish to reiterate that such deplorable conditions exist not only because of the usual reasons for unemployment but are aggravated by the unusual economic distress and unemployment caused by the impact of approximately 150,000 refugees residing in this area who have fled the tyranny and oppression of Castro's Communist Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion, as I have been since the passage of this act, that the area which I represent should be eligible under the terms, the spirit, and the intent of the Area Redevelopment Act, which was specifically adopted by the Congress to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

In an effort to alleviate a situation so corrosive and deleterious to the economic future of Dade County, on March 13, 1963, I introduced H.R. 4848 which goes one step further than the administrative action which I have been calling for, for so long. Congress has heretofore, at my request, recognized the problem of the Cuban refugees as one for national concern. This House, and I am grateful to each one of my colleagues, and this Congress have approved the authorizations and the appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare and other costs for the care of the Cuban refugees. Without this program, the whole cost would fall on local resources which are already strained to the limit. I am now, today, again calling, urging, and requesting the sympathetic and favorable consideration of my colleagues in this legislative body to continue their recognition of the impact and economic distress caused by the residence of approximately 150,000 refugees in the district which I represent, and the adjoining one, as still of national concern. I call the problem again to the attention of this House because the problem has not yet been completely resolved. Severe unemployment still exists—almost 13 percent. There is considerable economic distress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my bill would provide an additional criteria for eligibility under Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act. This additional criteria would provide benefits to those areas wherein 50,000 or more Cuban refugees have resided for 1 of the 2 preceding calendar years. Such a fact would be certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who administers the Cuban refugee program, to the Secretary of Commerce, who administers the area redevelopment program. Under the bill we would also retain the criteria that the Secretary of Labor must determine and certify to the Secretary of Commerce that a condition of substantial unemployment has existed for the last 9 of the preceding 12 calendar months, which is a requirement now carried in the present public works acceleration law.

The exact language of the bill is as follows:

> A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment areas
>
> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subsection (a) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2504) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall also designate as 'redevelopment areas' those areas within the United States where the Secretary of Labor determines that a condition of substantial unemployment has existed for at least nine of the preceding twelve calendar months, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies to the Secretary that the number of Cuban refugees residing in such areas has equaled 50,000 or more for one of the two preceding calendar years."

Florida's distinguished Senators, the Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND and the Honorable GEORGE A. SMATHERS, jointly introduced S. 1257 embodying the same provisions. My respected colleague, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER, representing Florida's Third Congressional District, introduced a similar bill, H.R. 5232, providing the same criteria together with needed additional authorization, which I fully support.

Mr. Speaker, since the Castro Communist Government of Cuba has enslaved the people of that unhappy country, it is authoritatively estimated that 200,000 persons have escaped the tyranny and oppression existing there and sought refuge in the United States.

The bulk of these people are in the Miami area. Despite the generous assistance of the Catholic church and others, our local citizens, individually, local governments and many voluntary agencies—it soon became obvious that the needs of these refugees could not be met solely out of local resources, no matter how willing the local citizens nor how desirable such a solution might be. I thereupon immediately urged recognition of the existence of the Cuban refugees and the problems caused thereby as being the primary responsibility of the Federal Government.

Two administrations and the Congress of the United States have generously responded to my requests to assist the people of the district which I represent in dealing with the problems, economic and otherwise, created by the Cuban refugees.

Today I must again ask my colleagues and advise the Nation that the people of Florida's Fourth District are in need of additional assistance as a result of approximately 150,000 Cuban refugees still residing in our midst. This has caused tremendous economic pressure since the refugees, very naturally, have tried to obtain and have been successful in obtaining employment. Much of this employment has been at reduced wages, tending to depress the labor market. Every refugee so employed has displaced an American normally employed so that in addition to many thousands of refugees who are unemployed, there are many thousands of Americans also unemployed.

The U.S. Department of Labor had long ago determined that there were a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens so as to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area. However, we have not been certified for assistance under Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act specifically adopted by this body to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically distressed areas.

Mr. Speaker, since the fall of 1962 I have repeatedly requested the Department of Labor to certify that the unemployment condition in the district which I represent is sufficient to qualify the area under the Redevelopment Act. This has not yet been accomplished for a variety of reasons. Whatever the reason, the point is that we have not yet been so certified so as to be eligible for the employment and economic benefits which would be available to us under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The economic situation in Dade County is distressing. Total unemployment, both American and Cuban, is fantastically high. Citizens and refugees are in open competition for a limited number of jobs. Wages have tended to become depressed. Feelings are running high. The laboring classes, and particularly the Negro, have felt the brunt of this distress.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of the United States is one of long standing and great tradition—down through history we are known as a sure haven from persecution and the upholders of individual rights and freedom. But it is this very foreign policy, in action, which has permitted these refugees—mothers, fathers, wives, and children—to escape tyranny, fear, and death and to seek refuge and security in the United States.

I have no quarrel with this policy nor does the overwhelming majority of the people in the district which I represent. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the American citizens who are directly affected as a result of this policy, and who are the citizens of the district I represent, are entitled to consideration in obtaining whatever Federal assistance can be made available.

Today's problem, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is to obtain additional unemployment and economic benefits for the American citizens in Florida's Fourth District, which I represent, who are without jobs and who are otherwise economically distressed. My bill, Mr. Speaker, would seek to provide employment opportunities by making the area which I represent eligible for benefits under the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. Speaker, I, of course, do not imply that no assistance has been rendered to the citizens of the district which I represent. I strongly supported this administration's program, now known as Public Law 87-658, the Public Works Acceleration Act.

Just yesterday, I arose in support of the amendment which would restore to the supplemental appropriations bill for 1963 the full amount of the budget request to finance additional projects under the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act. My remarks on this subject appeared in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Because of the unemployment situation, the district which I represent has been certified as eligible to receive assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act. Under this act we have thus far obtained several million dollars in approved programs. Under this act, which requires local participation, the district which I represent will secure approximately 5,600 additional man-months or 980,700 man-hours of employment. As long as the unemployment and economic distress exist in the district which I represent, we shall continue to request assistance and urge favorable consideration for approved projects under this very worthy program.

However, Mr. Speaker, the economic distress and unemployment in the Miami area arises not only from the usual sources, but also because of the tremendous number of refugees who are residing therein. Whether the refugee is employed or unemployed, his presence contributes directly to the economic distress and high unemployment of American citizens. It is this factor which my bill deals with. It is because of the persistence of these unusual factors that I have sought relief under Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act.

I have also long sought relief under this law by administrative determination under existing criteria. Since the middle of last year, I have requested and urged repeatedly that in the criteria determination for Area Redevelopment Act eligibility, all unemployed shall be considered regardless of whether they are Americans or refugees. While the Department has had this matter before it all these many months, it has not yet been resolved.

On March 13, 1963, I directed letters to the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor, and Commerce urging that immediate action be taken on this problem. I now report to you that I have received the following responses to my letters:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.

Hon. Dante B. Fascell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fascell: This will acknowledge your letter of March 13, 1963, regarding the eligibility of Dade County for area redevelopment assistance.

It is my understanding that the Department of Labor is now engaged in making the necessary survey to determine whether unemployment in the area, including the special situation created by the influx of Cuban exiles, qualifies the area for assistance under the standards of the enabling act. Top officials from ARA and the Department of Labor have been meeting in Miami this week with local officials in order to expedite this determination, and we should have the results very soon.

I appreciate your calling this to my attention and understand your interest. You will be promptly advised of any further developments.

With cordial regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Luther H. Hodges,
Secretary of Commerce.

The Secretary of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Washington, March 22, 1963.

Hon. Dante B. Fascell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fascell: This is in reply to your request that I "certify" to the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce the number of Cuban refugees residing in Dade County.

There are two figures on Cuban refugees about which we can be certain: the number of refugees registered at the Miami Center and the number relocated with our assistance.

On March 8, 1963, these figures were, respectively: 161,151 and 56,452. This leaves 104,699 refugees registered but not resettled through the assistance program.

While we are quite sure that the Department of Labor has these figures since the U.S. Employment Service is associated with us, both in Washington and Miami, in assisting Cuban refugees, we are immediately communicating them to Secretary Wirtz and to Secretary Hodges.

Our information is necessarily limited to figures on refugees who have registered with us and who have been resettled through our program. We, therefore, do not have any figures on the number of Cuban refugees who have resettled from Miami without our assistance or on the number of refugees who may be living in Miami that have not registered with us.

If we can be of further assistance we shall be pleased to do so.

Sincerely,
Anthony J. Celebrezze,
Secretary.

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1969.

Hon. Dante B. Fascell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Fascell: I have been informed that Area Redevelopment Administrator William L. Batt, Jr., met with you this past week and that you had a full discussion of the situation in Dade County. I am thankful for this exchange and I know that he reiterated my concern for the very difficult situation arising from the presence of the large number of Cuban refugees in the Miami area.

Let me assure you that we will act just as soon as the data to be provided by the Secretary of Labor becomes available. I understand that the promised survey is underway and that we can expect results within weeks. We have the personal assurances of officials of the Department of Labor that they are actively pressing the investigation.

Mr. Batt also informed me of recent special legislation that you have introduced on this matter. I am certain that through our common efforts we can find a reasonable solution to the unusual situation in Miami.

Sincerely yours,
Luther H. Hodges,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to report today that hearings were conducted before the Banking and Currency Committee on April 9 in support of the proposed legislation to amend the Area Redevelopment Act.

At that time corroborating testimony to existent conditions in Dade County was given by the Honorable Robert King High, mayor of the city of Miami, Fla.; the Honorable Joseph A. Boyd, Jr., chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, Fla.; Mr. W. J. Owens, president of the Dade County Federation of Labor; the Honorable Arthur Patten, Jr., county commissioner of Dade County; and the following Representatives to the Florida State Legislature from Dade County: the Honorable Leo Furlong, the Honorable Richard Pettigrew, the Honorable Maxine Baker, the Honorable Lee Weissenborn, and Mr. John Frederick Thomas, director of the Cuban refugee program welfare, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Also in attendance to lend his support was the Honorable Irving G. McNayr, county manager of Metropolitan Dade County.

Testifying in absentia by the submission of statements were the Honorable Charles R. Hadley, chairman of the Citizens Committee of Dade County, and Mr. John B. Turner, president of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce.

Unable to be present but represented by a telegram of support was Florida's State representative, the Honorable Mary Ann MacKenzie, from Dade County.

Showing the unanimity of support for immediate legislative action, House Memorial 229 was received from the Florida State Legislature, to wit:

House Memorial 229

Memorial to the Congress of the United States to more fully recognize that the impact of approximately 150,000 Cuban refugees has created a substantial and persistent unemployment and social problem, which has and does exist in the heavily populated Dade County area and that further and immediate action must be taken and prompt remedies be found to alleviate the harmful conditions that do now exist and will continue to exist and become acute with the continuous heavy influx of these refugees among the residents of this State

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore given recognition to the existence of the large numbers of Cuban refugees in this State and to the problems caused thereby; and

Whereas this large number of refugees who continue to flee from the tyrannical and oppressive conditions of the communistic government of Cuba to seek a haven in a democratic country where human rights and dignity are recognized supreme; and

Whereas it has become obvious that the needs of these refugees who, through no fault of their own, have become a burden on certain local areas of this State and that the local resources and facilities of these areas have been taxed beyond their capacities; and

Whereas the education of Cuban refugee children is now pressing hard on the educational funds and facilities provided by the State of Florida, and

Whereas the present existence of this large number of Cuban refugees has already placed tremendous and herculean economic burdens upon the local residents and the local governments of these areas in that the local labor market has been drastically affected to the detriment of the permanent working population; and

Whereas many of these local residents are being displaced from their regular employment and thus becoming an additional economic burden to the local welfare bureau and in many instances causing the permanent residents in these areas to become a burden on their friends and relatives; and

Whereas the charitable organizations in these areas have also had placed on them an unduly heavy economic burden arising as a result of the tremendous influx of Cuban refugees which has strained their resources to the breaking point; and

Whereas it has become obvious that the needs of these refugees cannot be met from local resources and facilities which have been substantially depleted; and

Whereas regardless of previous measures to alleviate this burdensome problem, the continued increase in the numbers of refugees to be found in the Dade County area, which is the major port of entry for these helpless and unfortunate refugees, due to the existing policy of the U.S. Government, and

Whereas there is the ever-present danger that the problems created by this tremendous influx of Cuban refugees may spread to other areas of Florida and aggravate their problems; and

Whereas this tremendous problem must be immediately alleviated in order to prevent irreparable harm, both to the economic and social well-being of the citizens of this State; and

Whereas these helpless and unfortunate Cuban refugees and local residents who have been displaced from their places of employment because of these problems in these local areas, now have more than doubled in number the unemployment in these local areas and have brought the unemployment situation in these areas to a critical stage; and

Whereas there is pending legislation in the Congress of the United States with a definite purpose to alleviate the acute economic and social problems caused in these local areas by Cuban refugees fleeing the tyrannical and oppressive pressure of the communistic government of Cuba: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully urged and requested to give full recognition to the fact that the Cuban refugee problem in this State is primarily the responsibility of the Federal Government and of national concern and ask that additional assistance and relief be provided to Dade County and any other counties similarly affected and that other Cuban refugee centers be established in the United States and other ports of entry be established for the entrance of these unfortunate and helpless refugees from Communist tyranny; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Secretary of Commerce of the United States; to the Secretary of Labor of the United States; to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States; and to each member of the Florida congressional delegation.

Supporting statements and/or formal resolutions supporting the request for the extension of ARA assistance to Dade County were submitted by the Honorable Farris Bryant, Governor of the State of Florida; City Council of Miami Beach; South Dade Council of Miami-Dade Chamber of Commerce; the county commissioners of Dade County, Fla.; City Council of City of North Miami Beach; Dade County League of Municipalities; North Miami Beach Chamber of Commerce; and the City Council of Miami Springs.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to reiterate my previous remarks that for many years now the people of the district which I represent have willingly, courageously, and generously borne the brunt of the problems brought about by the approximately 150,000 non-American refugees living and working with us. We have been and are proud of the part which we have been called upon to play in the longstanding humane concepts of a free society, indicating to the refugees and to the world, proof of its concern for the dignity and the worth of an individual. This principle, among others, separates us clearly from the Communists or any other system which seeks to enslave mankind, and holds individual worth and dignity as secondary or even unnecessary. But, Mr. Speaker, in doing all this, we must also take every step to see to it that our own citizens receive assistance from our Government, particularly and especially when such assistance is within the spirit and intent of laws already enacted by this body.

I wish to remind my colleagues that the situation now existing in Dade County is not the result of the actions or foreign policy of the Floridians, but rather a direct result of American tradition and policy, many times reaffirmed by every administration of the U.S. Government. The burden of responsibility and solution must not remain with the citizens of Dade County, Fla. It must be shared by all.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to present this companion measure to the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963 which is designed to provide effective medical care for our senior citizens.

The provisions of this bill are too well known to necessitate a further explanation at this time. However, it is impossible to overstress the great need which exists for the prompt enactment of this legislation.

There are now approximately 17.5 million people in this country who are age 65 or over. With few exceptions, these persons lack adequate health protection and are unable to pay for it. These senior citizens have great need for health protection since their medical expenses are 2½ times greater than those of younger people while their incomes are only half as large.

Approximately 90 percent of those who reach 65 will have to be hospitalized at least once during the remainder of their lifetimes. A large number of these persons will require two periods of hospitalization, and many will require three or more hospital stays.

The expenses incurred by such periods of illness can often wipe out a person's life savings which frequently makes it necessary for such a person to look to his children or other relatives for help. Since those who are asked for assistance often have families of their own to raise, the dual burden of helping the older person and caring for their own families is greater than they can reasonably bear.

Pensions and current social security benefits may help an older person to meet his day-to-day expenses, but such payments cannot even come close to taking care of the cost of prolonged major illnesses.

The senior citizens of our country have made outstanding contributions to our national well-being. It is incumbent upon those of us who enjoy the fruits of their efforts to help them in their time of need. The adoption of the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963 will give new hope to the older people of America for a future with dignity and security.

BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the city of Buffalo, N.Y., is one of the great milling and railroad centers in the Nation. It can also be proud of its many other industries, and its contributions during World War II and in defense efforts that followed are outstanding. Today our city is playing a key role in nuclear development.

But to keep these industries alive, markets are needed to absorb the products they manufacture. Our Buffalo Chamber of Commerce is most cognizant of this problem, and it has relentlessly directed its efforts to find new markets for our products. Its constant drive to stimulate business—both domestic and overseas—is commendable.

In recent years, the Buffalo chamber has sponsored five foreign trade missions. Its sixth trade mission—a 2-week tour of the Orient—will be undertaken from April 26 to May 12 of this year. The itinerary for this trip contains a listing of meaningful and advantageous travel stops for the American businessman.

Tokyo, the Fifth Tokyo International Trade Fair, Nagoya, Osaka, and Hong Kong will be visited. En route the group will meet with outstanding Japanese representatives of their respective business and professional fields. Mindful of the recent trade liberalization in Japan, plus the continuing rise in its standard of living, the American businessman can look to an increased market for his consumer goods in Japan.

The rapid development of this Japanese consumer market is opening up substantial new opportunities for U.S. exporters. Japanese consumers are greatly interested in American-made products and, in return, Japan is also exporting to the United States a growing volume of all kinds of machinery and technological equipment.

Reservations for this mission have been received from area representatives in the fields of advertising and public relations, banking, electrical design and contracting, cast iron manufacturing, municipal fire apparatus, hospitalization insurance and service organizations. Representatives of these companies include Mr. Baldwin Maull, president director, Marine Midland Corp.; Mr. Lester W. Young, president owner, Young Fire Equipment Corp.; Mr. Edmund J. Felt, president, the Moss-Chase Co. (advertising and public relations firm); Mr. George C. Ostendorf, director, hospital relations, Hospital Service Corp. of Western New York; Mr. Whitworth Ferguson, president and treasurer, Ferguson Electric Construction Co.; Mr. William C. Baird, president, Buffalo Pipe & Foundry Corp.; Mr. George F. Rand, vice president, the Marine Trust Co. of Western New York; Mr. Ray C. Neal, executive director, Buffalo-Niagara Sales & Marketing Executives, Inc.; Mr. Charles F. Light, executive vice president, Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce.

The benefits to be derived from United States-Japan trade are most promising. During the postwar period, the greatest growth of trade has been between the highly industrialized nations, and Japan's income-doubling program foresees American sales to Japan reaching the $3 billion level by 1970—more than twice as much as the United States sold to Japan last year. The market for industrial machinery and sophisticated technological equipment should be particularly strong.

Because of the close parallel in the industrial development of the Niagara Frontier and Japan, the outlook for American exports to Japan should be of substantial benefit to our area. In particular, the growing Japanese market for capital equipment, chemicals, and the like, is important to Buffalo area firms for it is precisely in these products the Niagara Frontier excels.

According to the Department of Commerce, $136 million of the manufactures of Erie and Niagara Counties went into world trade in 1960. It is not unrealistic to foresee greater expansion of sales and exports in the Orient market for the western New York businessman after this mission is completed.

I take this opportunity to laud the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce for its active program to open a wider range of markets to Buffalo area firms. Our products are second to none, and we are prepared to compete anywhere.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler spoke to Group 1 of the Virginia Bankers Association at Virginia Beach last Saturday, April 6. His remarks were concerned with the leading economic and financial issue of the day—whether Congress should substantially reduce Federal tax rates on individual and corporate income in 1963.

Secretary Fowler's address merits the attention of this body, and I would recommend that each of my colleagues secure a copy. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including pertinent excerpts from the address. These follow:

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

It is against the background of continued and intensive Communist challenge throughout the world and in space, and the inadequate performance of our own economy over the past decade, that the Treasury Department supports the President's tax reduction program—in the full knowledge that it will add to a projected deficit. We believe that he was right in refusing to either postpone his tax program or cut into essential national security programs so as to present his tax program in the context of a balanced budget. We believe this was a fiscally responsible decision under the circumstances for the following reasons:

1. One of the primary causes of slow economic growth—our major economic and financial problem—is the existing tax system. It is our belief that the proposed tax reduction will so invigorate the economy that, in a few years, our revenues under the new, lower rate structure will be larger than if we continue our present rate structure, which stifles growth.

2. The tax program was the clearly preferable action course to other alternatives designed to increase the rate of growth. To achieve growth by more massive increases in Federal spending well beyond the limits of the 1964 budget would have risked confidence at home and abroad. And, while increasing demand, it would fail to increase the incentives to private investment and effort that the reduction of taxrates provides. The other alternative, an increased use of credit and monetary tools to provide still lower interest rates and substantially increased supplies of money and credit, was not feasible because, as the President pointed out, "Our balance-of-payments situation today places limits on our use of those tools for expansion."

3. To wait for increasing revenues from slow growth to reach a balanced budget before enacting the President's tax proposals might be costly and self-defeating. In 1959, for example, a planned surplus became a record deficit of $12.4 billion, largely because of a recession. As long as we have slack markets for our goods and services and dampened incentives for investment, the threat of sliding into an unanticipated recession remains. Continued slow growth will not generate the revenue required for fiscal 1964 expenditure levels even at current tax rates of some years. In the interim the additional gross national product, wealth, profits and jobs that are expected to result from the tax stimulus will be lost.

4. The tax program itself is designed to keep budget deficits within manageable proportions. By spacing out the rate cuts over 3 calendar years, and by offsetting a portion of the revenue loss through some measures of structural reform, and putting collections from 12,000 of our largest corporations on a more current basis, the effect of the tax program on the budget is reduced.

5. The President has acted positively on the premise that a large-scale tax reduction calls for strong restraints on spending. Accordingly, his fiscal 1964 budget holds proposed Government spending (other than defense, space and interest outlays) below fiscal 1963 levels—only the fourth time in 15 years that this has been done. In fact, for the past 9 years the average annual increase in this sector of the budget has been 7.5 percent. Nor did the President relax his efforts to cooperate with the Congress in holding down expenditures after the submission of his budget in January. Since then, he has reduced spending requests for 1963 and 1964 by more than three-quarters of a billion dollars.

6. More important—and, perhaps, the most overlooked aspect in discussions of fiscal responsibility—the President, in his 1964 budget message, pledged progressive reduction in the Federal budget deficit as an accompaniment to the tax reduction, proposing, for both the Congress and the executive branch, an entirely new policy and program of disciplined expenditure control. As he stated in the budget message: "The prospect of expanding economic activity and rising Federal revenues in the years ahead does not mean that Federal outlay should rise in proportion to such revenue increases. As the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy moves toward full employment, a substantial part of the revenue increases must go toward eliminating the transitional deficit. Although it will be necessary to increase certain expenditures, we shall continue, and indeed intensify, our effort to include in our fiscal program only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of fulfilling important national needs."

7. Finally, the new tax program, with related expenditure control, is compatible with, and can be coordinated effectively with, appropriate balance-of-payments policy, monetary policy, and debt management—each of which forms a vital environmental factor in our overall financial plan.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. DOWDY, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. CANNON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for 1 hour today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include tables and extraneous matter in Committee on H.R. 3845.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include tables and extraneous matter in Committee on H.R. 3845.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. ST. GEORGE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. KING of New York.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan.

Mr. MATHIAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. ROUSH.

Mr. SHELLEY.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 386. An act to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park and to provide for certain adjustments necessitated by the installation of a park tour road, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4423. An act permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 134, 88th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 22, 1963.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 134, the House adjourned until Monday, April 22, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

672. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1964 in the amount of $80,000 for the special representative of trade negotiations and a decrease of $445,000 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 100); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

673. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1964 involving a decrease in the amount of $419,700,000 for foreign assistance (H. Doc. No. 101); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

674. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

675. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the February 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

676. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 28th Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, pursuant to section 23 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, approved June 6, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

677. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of each of the following publications: (1) "Federal Power Act, Revised March 1, 1963", and (2) "Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1961"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

678. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1958, with respect to payment of moving expenses of owners and tenants of land acquired for the national park system"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

679. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 11, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on central and southern Florida, Hendry County west of levees 1, 2, and 3, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 9, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 102); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5555. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 209. Report on the disposition certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 317. A resolution taking H.R. 4715 from the Speaker's table and agreeing to Senate amendments; without amendment (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4655. A bill to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the Commitee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 318. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 319. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on the Judiciary; without amendment (Rept. No. 213). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 320. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4997, a bill to extend the feed grain program; without amendment (Rept. No. 214). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 5622. A bill to amend section 502 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 relating to the reporting of foreign currencies expended by Members of Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5623. A bill to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 5624. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5625. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 5626. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 5627. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5628. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5629. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5630. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 5631. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 5632. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 5633. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5634. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5635. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5636. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 5637. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5638. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 5639. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 5640. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 5641. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 5642. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 5643. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5644. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5645. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5646. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5647. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 5648. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 5649. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5650. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 5651. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 5652. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 5653. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAEBLER:

H.R. 5654. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 5655. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 5656. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 5657. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 5658. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 5659. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BASS:

H.R. 5660. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 5661. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 5662. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5663. A bill to eliminate the population limitation as it affects the eligibility of communities in redevelopment areas for certain benefits under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5664. A bill to make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5665. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 5666. A bill to amend section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to limit contributions and other payments by the United States to programs and activities of the United Nations to 33.33 percent of the cost thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5667. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act (relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts) with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 5668. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 5669. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit the use of the term "mahogany" in connection with woods and other products which are not in fact mahogany; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 5670. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 5671. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for personal and corporate income tax reductions, to liberalize certain deductions and provide deductions for certain additional expenditures, to provide additional personal income tax exemptions for handicapped taxpayers, spouses, and dependents, to repeal certain excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 5672. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 5673. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 5674. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5675. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5676. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5677. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the age requirements for entitlement to wife's insurance benefits and widow's insurance benefits, and to eliminate the provisions which reduce a woman's benefits in certain cases where she becomes entitled thereto before attaining age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5678. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5679. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer increased personal exemptions for his children while they are attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5681. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5682. A bill to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 5683. A bill to grant authority to the President to control the travel abroad of U.S. citizens in time of war or national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 5684. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5685. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 5686. A bill to provide a percentage deduction for certain expenses paid for the higher education of the taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5687. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct, for income tax purposes, the expenses incurred by him for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5688. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the coverage of a deduction for expenses incurred by a gainfully employed woman or widower for the care of certain dependents by raising the age limitation for one category of dependent from 11 to 15 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 5689. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway from Tampa, Fla., to Miami, Fla., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 5690. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances or a joint committee or joint board empowered to interpret provisions of collective bargaining agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 5691. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 5692. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 5693. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5694. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 5695. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5696. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5697. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5698. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 5699. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 5700. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 5701. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.J. Res. 380. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in September after Labor Day in each year as Old Granddad Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 381. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H. Con. Res. 137. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to set aside and proclaim a National Country Music Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Res. 321. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that introduced bills include an estimate of cost, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of the rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 5702. A bill for the relief of Mildred B. Nodell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 5703. A bill granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5704. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Dalva Calazans and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5705. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Shek Mah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 1963

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, from the noise and hurry of the world without and from the tyranny of selfish moods and motives within, we seek the peace of Thy changeless love. In this sacred week which reminds us that there is no gain except by loss, may we fear only to be disloyal to the best we know and to betray those who love and trust us and to disappoint Thy expectations concerning us.

Help us this new day to meet its joys with gratitude, its difficulties with fortitude, its duties with fidelity. Deliver us, we pray, from petty irritations which spoil the music of life and distort our perspectives. As once again in the pilgrimage of the year we come on the morrow to the place called Calvary—

We stand atremble and afraid,
On the small world that we have made;
Afraid lest all our poor control,
Shall turn and rend us to the soul;
Afraid lest we shall be denied
The price we hold our ragged pride;
But in the end we pass all by,
For a lone cross against the sky.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 10, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 9, 1963, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 27)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10(b)4 of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 11, 1963.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4549. An act to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 5389. An act to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5517. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4549. An act to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 5389. An act to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5517. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R 2440) to authorize appropriations, during the fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 56 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). A quorum is present.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in view of the extraordinary circumstances attending the session this morning, I am compelled to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, then I would assume the objection would apply to all committees which do not now have permission to meet.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Am I to understand that no committees are to be permitted to sit today while the Senate is in session?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We would not quite make that "today," but it would apply so long as there is a closed-door session.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, as I understand the situation, there would be objection so long as the Senate is in executive session.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Behind closed doors.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I have unanimous consent for the Senate Committee on Government Operations to meet while the Senate is in session when the Senate is not in executive session? Would there be objection to that? The committee must meet today, if possible, on a legislative matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the committee is to meet later, that might be different. The closed door session will begin soon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Tentatively I have set the hearing for 2:30 this afternoon, if permission can be obtained to meet after the Senate concludes its executive session.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may meet at 2:30 this afternoon, provided the Senate is not in closed-door session at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I understand that my committee already has been given permission to meet, although it is not meeting this morning. However, I had intended to have the committee meet as soon as the closed-door session is over. Must I ask unanimous consent again?

Mr. DIRKSEN. When was permission granted?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The day before yesterday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator applied at that time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. Two scheduled executive hearings were held.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think, with the understanding that the committee will not meet while the Senate is behind closed doors, it would be all right.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following completion of the closed-door session by the Senate, the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce may meet this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations, during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had assumed that a Senator would wish to be recognized to make a motion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had assumed the Senate might take up the bill and have it made the unfinished business, and that I might then make a relatively brief statement as to the overall aspects of the bill. The statement would deal only with unclassified material.

Then I shall make a motion which will bring before the Senate the issue of the amendment which will be the subject of the closed-door session. At that time, undoubtedly, a motion will be made to go into session with closed doors. I see no reason for starting in such a session until I have made a brief overall statement with respect to the bill. That is a decision to be made by the leadership.

Has the bill been laid before the Senate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. The bill is the pending business.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this bill would authorize appropriations for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces in the amount of $15,147,491,000. By far the largest portion of that amount will apply to the purchase of what is called military hardware.

Under the congressional procedure, an authorization is, in effect, a ceiling upon appropriations to be made subsequently.

The weapons which would be procured and on which research and development would be conducted under this bill will be reviewed again by the Committees on Appropriations in acting on the Department of Defense appropriation bill. In making that statement, I certainly do not wish to be understood as depreciating the significance of the bill, for it represents the views and recommendations of the committees having legislative responsibility for the Department of Defense, a responsibility which is constitutional in nature, as distinguished from the appropriations responsibility.

Historically, the views of the legislative committees have influenced final congressional action on appropriations in a most significant manner.

Mr. President, the pending authorization, as recommended by the committee, is $708,900,000 less than is contained in H.R. 2440 as it came to us from the other body. The recommended authorization is $211,200,000 less than that requested by the Department of Defense.

Since the committee added authorizations for two programs not sought by the Department of Defense—$363,700,000 for the RS–70 and $196 million for Nike-Zeus—it follows that the programs proposed by the Department of Defense were reduced by the committee in the amount of $770,900,000.

Mr. President, I hope that I may be clearly understood in stating most emphatically that the committee's action in reducing some of the items proposed by the Department of Defense is not predicated on any attitude of complacency or any unrealistic thought that our enemies have relented in their hostility toward us and in their determination to destroy us. The programs approved are substantial, and they are an integral part of a 1964 defense budget involving more than $52 billion.

The committee is confident that the reductions it has recommended are in areas which would not constitute a crucial difference, even in the event of an unexpected conflict. The reductions are largely stretchouts in the periods over which the weapons would be procured, and in many instances they are in areas in which we have a large inventory of the specific weapons to be reduced in number under the committee action.

In reducing the authorization the committee has been mindful of the deficit facing us this year and the one that is almost certain to be incurred next year. It is extremely important that we make reductions in every area, including national defense, in which we safely may do so.

Of course, the committee is human, and thus it is certainly not infallible. Before the conference with the other body on this bill we shall have an opportunity to consider the views of the Department of Defense, the so-called "reclama." For reasons it is not necessary to go into now, that is a word which was not found in the English language before it was introduced by the Department of Defense.

If the Department follows the practice of the past, it will contend that none of the cuts which have been made are acceptable.

The committee will not accept that contention out of hand; but, of course, we will consider any suggestions that may be made for shifting a part of the reductions by the Defense Department to other programs if valid reasons for such a transfer can be given.

Although this is the third year that the committee has considered a specific authorization for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, this is the first year in which the authorization bill has applied to research, development, test, and evaluation programs. As this was a relatively new area, the committee was less confident about making reductions in specific research and development programs.

The bill carries almost $3.4 billion for all items of research and development. We applied to these items a 3 percent across-the-board reduction, in the belief that programs in the amount of the reduction could normally be reoriented during the year and that more careful bargaining and an efficient administration of the research and development program could result in savings of at least 3 percent.

In the procurement area, the committee generally has been more specific in its identification of the weapons to which modest reductions have been applied.

An exception to this specificity in weapon procurement is a recommended 3 percent reduction in certain support areas, such as spare parts and modifications. The reprograming actions submitted to the committees tend to indicate that these "below the line" items are rather flexible, and that they frequently are cited as the source of funds to procure increased quantities of other items not in the programs originally presented to the committee.

That is done through the process that is called reprograming. The Department will come in and request that funds be transferred from one program to the other. Those requests are passed upon by the Armed Services Committees of the two Houses, as well as the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses.

The bill provides the amounts that are set forth in the report for each of the specific categories of weapons for research and development.

The reductions were not applied with absolute uniformity to the three military departments, but they came out surprisingly nearly uniform, in relation to the amounts requested by each.

ARMY

The authorization for Army aircraft is $471,200,000. This is intended to procure 1,485 aircraft, most of which are helicopters. This authorization is $50,900,000 in money and 123 aircraft less than that requested by the Department. The committee has made slight reductions in several of the types proposed for procurement. The reductions and general information on the aircraft to be procured appear on pages 6 and 7 of the committee report.

Let me point out that this increment of Army aircraft is not intended to implement the somewhat controversial recommendations of the so-called Howze Board. This Board has recommended an expansion in the Army's air program and the Secretary of Defense has approved a test of some of the concepts advocated by the Board. The aircraft in the 1964 program, however, are principally for the conversion of Army divisions to the new flexible ROAD concept, which involves increasing the number of aircraft assigned to each of the 16 Active Army divisions.

For missiles the Army authorization is $746,700,000, a larger program than that sought by the Department. The addition results from committee action is providing authorization for the procurement of Nike-Zeus components offset by a recommended $30 million reduction in the Pershing missile procurement program. Later in my remarks I shall comment more extensively on the Nike-Zeus addition.

Pages 7 and 8 of the committee report give information about the missiles included in this year's procurement.

Research and development programs in the Army on aircraft and missiles would be authorized $79,748,000 and $559,301,000, respectively. These amounts reflect a 3 percent reduction in the programs presented to the committee. A great deal of the Army research efforts on aircraft are devoted to improvements of existing aircraft in the development of vertical and short takeoff and landing types. Much of the missile research and development authorization is in the ballistic missile defense field.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The bill provides $1,830,900,000 in authorization for the procurement of aircraft for the Navy and the Marine Corps. This amount is intended to finance the procurement of 644 new aircraft, spare parts and modifications and modernization of aircraft already in inventory. The committee reduced the proposed procurement program by 37 aircraft having a total estimated cost of $127,800,000. Specific reductions by types are shown on page 12 of the committee report. This page also contains a description of the Navy and Marine Corps aircraft types to be procured.

For Navy missiles the bill authorizes appropriations of $1,095,100,000. This is a $12,200,000 reduction in the departmental request.

The amount of the reduction is intended to be applied to the Subroc program. Subroc is a promising missile that will be used by submarines in antisubmarine warfare. The committee made this reduction in an attempt to avoid an excessive commitment to a new system before its effectiveness has been more thoroughly tested. The Navy now is spending substantial sums in improvements on missile systems that were adopted hurriedly.

A very large part of the Navy missile authorization is for the procurement of missiles for Polaris submarines.

The Marine Corps would be provided $14.7 million in authorization for the procurement of Hawk missiles.

For naval vessels the bill carries $2,159,600,000 in authorization for the construction of 36 new ships and the conversion of 36 old ones. The new ship authorization is $150,400,000 below the amount sought by the Department. This reduction is a result of the Committee's eliminating eight vessels from this year's program. The vessels deferred are one amphibious transport dock, one combination oiler and ammunition ship, four motor gunboats, and two surveying ships.

Included within the construction program are six additional Polaris submarines which will complete the presently planned program of 41 ships. Also included are 6 nuclear powered submarines. Two additional nuclear powered submarines were included in the version of the bill as it passed the other body, but the committee recommends only the six proposed by the Department. The senior Senator from Maine intends, I believe, to offer an amendment on this subject.

For research and development by the Navy and Marine Corps on aircraft, missiles, and ships the bill proposes authorization of $1,054,724,000. Again this is 3 percent less than the amounts requested of the committee. Of this sum $198,083,000 is for research and development on aircraft, $572,433,000 is for research and development on missiles, and $284,208,000 is for research and development on naval vessels.

AIR FORCE

The bill provides $3,329 million for the procurement of 879 new aircraft, modifications to aircraft now in service, spares, and other related items. The program approved by the committee is a reduction of 85 aircraft and $230 million in authorization. Page 18 of the committee report indicates the manner in which the reduction is to be applied. Pages 18, 19, and 20 of the committee report give general information on the types of aircraft that will be bought with appropriations based on this authorization.

For Air Force missile procurement the bill provides $2,101,200,000 in authorization. This is $75,800,000 less than the amount requested. The reduction represents a 3 percent cut in the amounts asked for modifications and spares, in addition to an almost token deferment of Minuteman procurement. A great deal of this authorization is for Minuteman. Other Air Force missiles in this authorization are outlined on pages 20 and 21 of the committee report.

The amount provided for reseach and development, test, and evaluation on Air Force missiles and aircraft is $1,705,318,000. Of this total $676,986,000 is for research and development on aircraft, and $1,028,332,000 is for the missile R. & D. effort.

The committee reduced the $322,986,000 requested by the Department by 3 percent, but it also concurred in the House addition of $363,700,000 for use in the further development of the RS–70 weapon system.

This authorization bill involves no program that is strikingly new. Instead, it represents largely the continued procurement of systems and weapons that are known to be essential components of our defense strategy.

In two respects the bill as reported by the committee differs fundamentally from recommendations of the Department of Defense.

The first of these involves the accelerated development of the RS–70 weapon system. All Members of the Senate are familiar with that program. It has been before the Senate for the past 3 years.

The bill contains $336,700,000 in authorization that is a downpayment on the procurement of two more RS–70 prototypes. These prototypes would be equipped with the necessary subsystems, such as a new strike missile, a new radar, and new data display equipment.

Implementation of this recommendation would make possible a full test of the RS–70 as a reconnaissance-strike weapon, and not merely as an aircraft that can fly at a speed three times that of the speed of sound. This addition was made in the other body, and the Senate committee has concurred in it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he prefer to complete his statement first?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it might be well to complete the statement with respect to this item first.

The Secretary of Defense presented a full explanation of his reasons for not proceeding with the full development of the RS–70. The committee carefully considered his views that intercontinental ballistic missiles are a better way to attack targets against which the RS–70 might be used and that there are better ways to obtain the reconnaissance capability that this aircraft would possess. In essence, the committee's view is that the RS–70 would furnish an element of diversity and variety in our strategic capabilities that would cause an enemy great trouble in defending against it, and that it provides a margin of safety that is worth every expense in this era of transition to missiles.

The committee believes the additional cost is a justifiable investment to avoid excessive reliance on missiles alone for our vehicles of delivery of nuclear warheads.

I shall be glad to yield now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have agreed to let the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] proceed first.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I was about to make a brief statement after the Senator from Georgia had completed his statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be through in a moment. It is highly doubtful whether the Department of Defense will spend this money, but the committee did not feel absolved from its responsibility of making suggestions to the Department, and giving it the ways and means of keeping our country in the preeminent position it has always occupied in the field of manned aircraft, in case the Department might change its mind.

Last year the Department curtailed the program. It was restored in Congress. At a later period the Department expanded this program with respect to expenditures for the RS–70 beyond that which it had originally justified. Three of these planes are now under development.

The major area of difference in the bill is one with respect to which I regret to find myself in disagreement with the majority of the committee over which I have the honor of presiding. So far as I can recall, this is an unprecedented situation for me to find myself in, because unless it is a matter on which I feel rather deeply, I go along with the majority of the committee, even though I do not agree with its views at the outset.

The matter to which I refer is the 9-to-8 vote of the committee which resulted in adding $196 million to the Army missile procurement authorization. This vote was in the nature of a vote to reconsider the previous vote of 9 to 4, whereby the committee had rejected this amendment. The amendment had been offered in previous years to expedite this particular program, and had been rejected by the committee.

It was not brought to the floor when it was rejected before; but on this occasion, the committee—as it had every right to do and as it properly did, if it suffered a change of opinion—did reconsider its previous vote before the report was filed, and it added this authorization.

I would not have brought this difference to the floor of the Senate if the sum of $196 million were all that is involved. This is a very large sum of money, but it is a very small sum when viewed against what we would be spending ultimately by the downpayment of the $196 million.

If the committee action is agreed to and this recommendation is followed through, it could result in the acquisition of a weapons system that could cost $12 billion at the very minimum. Some of the witnesses before the committee who have knowledge of the facts have testified that it would involve an expenditure of $20 billion.

This authorization, as I have said, would be available only for the procurement of the component parts of the Nike-Zeus system. It would embark us upon a program of acquiring and siting a large number of the Nike-Zeus batteries, the merits of which are very highly controversial and which the Secretary of Defense and others have testified before the committee could not be justified at this time.

As I understand the position of the proponents of this action—and they will state their views at some length, I am sure—it is that the procurement should be begun now on the Nike-Zeus components with a view to deployment as soon as possible of a system incorporating the present state of the art in this field, and later modifying these installations by incorporating improved radar and a new fast reacting missile which has been named Sprint.

In the pending bill, at the request of the Department of Defense, we have included the sum of approximately $335 million for research and development on the Sprint missile, and a new radar in order that the Department of Defense might hope to bring a new and improved and effective missile defense system into production without having to build and resite a weapons system of the Nike-Zeus type.

We have been dealing with this Nike program, in all of its progressions, over many years.

Senators will recall that we started with Nike-Ajax. We put that into production and sited it around the cities of our land. This was done at an expense considerably in excess of $1 billion.

While the pending bill was under consideration, there came to the committee a request from the Army to dispose of some of these missile sites, which had been acquired at very great cost. When real estate is purchased by the Government, sometimes under condemnation in the courts, and then sold within a period of 2 or 3 years, the Government usually suffers great losses in the transaction. That expense, of course, could also be added to the cost.

We then developed the Nike-Hercules system, which is now sited and which is a reasonably effective ground-to-air missile, the purpose of which is to stop enemy attack by manned aircraft on the areas that are defended.

We have expended considerably more than $2 billion on that program, which would be superseded by the Nike-Zeus system, the subject of this amendment.

The Department of Defense did not want to go into the procurement and deployment of this expensive system. Instead, it proposes to eliminate the admitted faults and defects in the system, so that when we incur the expense of production, we will have a reasonably reliable weapons system against an attack by intercontinental ballistic missiles.

This is a subject on which the Joint Chiefs of Staff are in disagreement. Secretary McNamara testified at some length before the committee on that subject. I will not deal with that until the Senate goes into executive session, when we will be able to use the testimony on this subject more fully than it could be used in this open session.

General LeMay is a witness who, in my opinion, can express himself very clearly without dealing with too many technical expressions. General LeMay, in responding to questions proposed by the author of the amendment, summed up his opposition to the execution of the Nike-Zeus system by saying that if it went into production, it would cost $20 billion to defend 26 cities, and that they would not be defended very well. That was his conclusion.

Because of the very substantial expense involved in producing and deploying a ballistic missile defense system, I am sure that every Member of the Senate wants to be reasonably sure that the system which is deployed will be effective. Such a system must be able to intercept and destroy all the missiles directed at a target.

I do not believe that the record made at the hearings, which were very exhaustive in their nature, is sufficient to demonstrate that we should produce and deploy this missile in the present state of the art. That is my own opinion.

Accordingly, I move that the bill be amended——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he makes his motion on the other subject?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia, I assume, is about to move that the Senate go into closed-door session.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I was about to offer an amendment to rescind the 9-to-8 vote action of the committee in approving this weapons system.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I will wait until the Senator has made that motion.

Mr. RUSSELL. In order that the entire Senate may have an opportunity to express itself on this very important and expensive matter, I move that the bill be amended on page 3, beginning on line 14, by striking out "$746,700,000, of which amount $196,000,000 is authorized only from production of component parts of the Nike-Zeus system" and substituting in place thereof "$550,700,000," the latter being the amount involved in Army missile procurement before the addition of this program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the committee, I first wish to commend the chairman of the committee for his fairness and the opportunity he has afforded for a full discussion of this important subject. The bill which was before the Committee on Armed Services was the bill requiring authorization prior to appropriation of funds for missiles, airplanes, ships, and research and development for these objectives.

The Department of Defense recommended $15,358 million for procurement and research. The committee unanimously deducted $770,900,000 from the recommendation of the Department of Defense. There was no difference of opinion in the committee on that question.

In addition, the committee added to the amount recommended by the Department of Defense $363,700,000 for continuing research on two more RS-70 planes, with respect to which the Senator from Georgia has made a brief statement.

As the Senator from Georgia has stated, a divided vote, the committee added $196 million for the development and operation of the so-called Nike-Zeus, or Sprint, missile.

I am in hearty accord with the chairman of the committee that his amendment should be adopted and that this amount should be stricken from the authorization bill.

The other item about which there was divided opinion in the committee concerns the recommendation of the House for two additional nuclear submarines at a cost of $134 million. By a divided vote, the committee reduced the authorization for these submarines to the recommendation of the Department of Defense for six additional nuclear submarines.

So the items which we are considering represent a reduction of $770,900,000, which was the unanimous report of the committee; an amendment to cut out $196 million, which was by a divided vote; and to reduce the House recommendation for two additional submarines in the amount of $134 million, which was by a divided vote.

The report of the committee was unanimous on all items except the $196 million for the Nike-Zeus and the two additional submarines in the amount of $134 million.

It is the responsibility of the Committee on Armed Services to conduct hearings and to report an authorization bill to provide for missiles, airplanes, ships, and research. That is what the bill consists of.

I heartily support the motion of the chairman in support of what the full committee has recommended. I hope that after the debate the Senate will support the amendment of the chairman of the committee. Again, I commend him for his fairness in conducting the hearings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it fair to say that the item of $196 million now in the bill, which the chairman proposes to strike, is in the nature of a downpayment on what will ultimately become a $20 billion obligation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not certain about the figure of $20 billion. I want to be meticulous and not exaggerate. The cost suggested for a complete military weapons system, an anti-missile-missile system, ran anywhere from about $11,500 million to $20 billion. Of course, if the amendment should be agreed to, it would lead to the expenditure of many billions of dollars—$10 billion, $11 billion, or $12 billion. But it is believed that if the new Sprint, a new effective weapon, is developed, a large part of that amount can be salvaged. The Department of Defense stated that the direct loss which would be incurred by the adoption of this proposal, following the completion of this system, after it had been turned into an effective system, would be $2,800 million.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would be the loss?

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be the net loss.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think this can be stated without having the Senate go into closed-door session. If we carry through with the authorization in the bill and do not adopt the Senator's amendment, we shall be authorizing the development and operation of an antimissile missile which we know can be improved upon and which will not be as effective as it could be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Even the strongest advocates of this missile system admit that it has definite limitations and can be greatly improved. The Department has launched almost a crash program of research and development to do that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. For many years the senior Senator from Oregon has followed the leadership of the Senator from Georgia, both on subjects of military authorization and military appropriations. The few times we have differed were when I voted for more funds than the committee recommended.

For the most part, I intend to follow the Senator from Georgia again this year. However, I should like to ask two or three questions concerning items in the committee report which bother me.

The Senator from Georgia himself said, in speaking of the RS-70 program—I think this is what he meant to say—that in all probability the administration might impound the funds if the money were appropriated by Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing secret about that. I think that has been generally understood. The Secretary of Defense has indicated that he proposes to follow that course. I happen not to agree with the Secretary on that point. However, he is not adopting any new policy. Differences concerning appropriations for defense have existed since the birth of our Nation. Any number of Presidents have refused to expend additional appropriations made for defense.

Mr. MORSE. If the probability of impoundment is great, it seems to me we are going through a rather empty gesture by adopting this phase of the committee report. Is it not true that if the situation changed and the administration had new evidence which would cause it to want to change its policy, it could very quickly get the approval of the new policy from Congress, based upon the evidence it might then present?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. Undoubtedly the administration could obtain approval of any change it might wish to make. But this matter has been in issue for a long time. For 3 years Congress has expressed the view that manned strategic aircraft should not be phased out of construction. The Senator from Oregon will recall that year before last not only did we carry forward the B-70 program—now it is called the reconnaissance strike 70 program but we also authorized and appropriated funds for the procurement of an entire new wing of the B-52, on the concept that they would carry the Skybolt.

The proposal first presented to the committee by the Department of Defense was that we not have the RS-70, because the Skybolt as carried by the B-52 would be more effective and would be a more reasonable program in cost. Congress finally did not undertake to direct the procurement of the RS-70 plane but provided authorization and appropriations to the Department of Defense. Since that time the Skybolt program has been canceled.

The procurement bill as it came to the committee provided additional authorization not only for the RS-70 program but also for two additional attack submarines. The committee did not feel justified in saying that the Senate had been in error on the other two occasions in undertaking to authorize further development on the RS-70. However, we rejected the proposal which came to us from the other body for two attack submarines in excess of the six which were provided in the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield, in order that the Senate may have a further explanation on this point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If Senators will refer to page 43 of the hearings, they will find it there stated that, following the approval of $1,300 million for the B-70 development program of three aircraft, it is proposed by the Department to use $50 million of the extra $192 million provided by Congress last year for the RS-70 program, and to use that $50 million to continue the development of selected sensor components. So in authorizing this money, this year, it is not entirely clear that they will not use some of it.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true, because some of the equipment developed for use on the RS-70 is quite new and revolutionary.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Georgia will yield further——

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is fair to say that, considering the American people as a whole, the presumption they extend is in favor of the believed-in experts in the Defense Establishment, in contrast to the opinion of Members of Congress. I think that attitude is taken by most of the people.

Mr. RUSSELL. But on that score there is a very wide divergence of opinion among the experts in the Department of Defense.

Mr. MORSE. That is the subject of my next question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes, indeed.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder what the Senator from Georgia can tell us about that situation in the Defense Establishment.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are four members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Three of them favor proceeding with the RS-70 program. The chairman, General Taylor, withheld his approval, I understand. General LeMay, who is an aviator, Admiral Anderson, and General Wheeler all approved proceeding with the development of the RS-70 program; and many experts throughout the Department—those who have been connected for many years with the design of weapons systems—were overwhelmingly in favor of proceeding with the RS-70 program.

A great deal can be said against it; and it has been said very eloquently for the past 2 or 3 years by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, who in my opinion is one of the ablest men ever to fill that position. I was in Washington when the separate military services were brought under one Department of Defense. Many Secretaries of Defense have come and gone. Many able men have served in that position. But Secretary McNamara has a mind which is almost startling in its capacity to acquire and retain information about the thousands of items involved in the Defense program.

He has believed that we should make the change now to principal reliance on missiles; but he is not in favor of doing away with the strategic, manned aircraft we have at the present time. He favors utilizing the capacity of the B-52, with the Hound Dog missile; but he has canceled the Skybolt, a missile which was supposed to be fired from the B-52 for as far as a thousand miles—with great accuracy, so its proponents claim. Last year, Secretary McNamara favored the Skybolt; but he changed his mind after viewing the results of the research over this 12-month period, and he has a very able staff of experts to advise him. I am sure he would be one of the first to admit that no one can be absolutely sure, categorically, about decisions in this field. By and large, Senators have taken the position that they were not willing to rely altogether on missiles, rather than manned aircraft. We have favored what we called a mixing of the two—in short, some long-range aircraft, while undertaking to improve our missiles system.

I do not wish to go into that on the floor of the Senate. But this year, since the first of January, there have been some disappointing experiences in connection with tests on missiles under development. They are far from perfect.

However, I do not think our enemy has much better missiles than what we have at the present time. Our enemy has a much more powerful booster to aid in putting large objects into space, but there is no reason for us to conclude that the enemy has a better weapon than the Polaris and the Minuteman.

But we now have a great deal of trouble with improvements on the new Polaris missiles and with tests on the Minuteman. Congress was not willing to risk this gap of 3 or 4 years during the perfection of these weapons.

Therefore, we have tried to persuade Mr. McNamara to go ahead with the RS-70 in the meantime. He has declined to do so. In my opinion, he will continue to decline to do so, unless there is some major reversal in the missile program or some break in the RS-70 program. Of course, he might change his mind—perhaps at a time when Congress was not in session.

He did spend $50 million more in this fiscal year than he expected he would or that he told the committee he would spend.

In view of the opinion which Congress has held, we thought it unwise to abandon completely the one area in which our Nation has been preeminent; namely, with the long-range manned bomber. No one has been able to challenge our preeminence in that field. However, I think we would have been well advised to go ahead with bomber production a little later than the Secretary of Defense believed would be best. I am not critical of him; but, of course, no one is omniscient. I think he can make mistakes, too.

I believe we should have gone ahead with accelerated development and construction of some of the RS-70's. I believe it would be worthwhile for the United States to have some of the RS-70's going around the world and landing at airfields, where the people of various countries could see them. The long-range missiles could be placed in silos all over the United States, and we could have a thousand or 10,000 of them, but that would not impress people all over the world and lead them to believe that we are still the most powerful nation on earth.

On the other hand, if we put RS-70 aircraft all over the world and let the people of other nations see them, they could recognize them as symbols of the great destructive power we possess. But we could not convince them of that by telling them we have in silos in North Dakota or Montana 800 Minuteman missiles which we could use to destroy targets.

So I stress the psychological value of such matters.

I hope that of the three planes we have authorized, one of them will fly this summer. Even if we do not benefit from it in any other way, let us get some value from it by having it fly around the world and let the people of other countries see it. It is a tremendous aircraft, which can fly at three times the speed of sound; and it is sure to make a profound impression on the people of the earth.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield again to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When there is a very great difference of opinion among the experts—in this case, among the Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense—I think the Senator from Georgia will agree that it is our responsibility to appropriate sufficient funds to be used in the way we believe best in the interest of the national defense. If the Department of Defense does not want to spend those funds, that will be its responsibility. But at least we shall have fulfilled our responsibility in a situation in which, as civilians, we hear conflicting evidence on very technical subjects.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that since I have been in the U.S. Congress, there has not been any controversy regarding missiles or weapons systems, that has generated among the experts as great a difference of opinion as that which has been generated in connection with the RS–70. When I refer to the experts, I mean men of real capability, on both sides—men completely sincere in the position they take.

Senators will remember the controversy that arose several years ago in relation to the B–36 and the carrier. That controversy was nothing in comparison with the difference of opinion among the best minds in this Nation as to what is the best thing to do about the RS–70.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in inferring from page 4 of the committee report that the Department, while opposing the added appropriation of $363 million, nevertheless does not intend to abandon the RS–70 program, but intends to spend $81 million to complete the three prototype RS–70's which are now under construction?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the proposal of the Department of Defense.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the issue is not whether we shall abandon the RS–70 program. The Department is not so proposing. The issue is whether we shall extend the proposal by the construction of two additional RS–70 planes.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I wish it were that simple, but it is not. The issue is whether or not we shall proceed with further research and development that would make the RS–70 a weapon instead of merely a shell of an airplane with engines that will permit it to fly. We have reached such a complex stage in weaponry now that the major cost of almost every device, including even tanks, is the electronic systems involved—the radar and supporting devices.

A great deal of money goes into such systems. The program of the Department will not equip one of the planes so that it could be really tested and evaluated as a fighting weapon.

The position taken by the committee—a position which was approved in the other body—would authorize the Secretary of Defense to act. We did not put into the measure any compulsory language. We did not undertake to say that the Secretary was "directed." We made the money and authority available, but available only for that purpose. If the Secretary of Defense does not spend the money, it will be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, perhaps the questions I should like now to ask should not be asked in open session. If the Senator feels that it would be inadvisable to reply, I shall understand.

Do I correctly understand that the question is in relation to equipping the RS–70 planes with weapons?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it does not go that far. The proposal relates to the radar and electronic systems. It does involve research on a new strike missile.

We now have the Hound Dog with which the Senator is familiar. I do not know how it got that very inelegant name. I suppose it was on the theory that no one could kick us around as long as the B–52's had the weapon. But it is a very effective air-breathing missile, with large capacity for nuclear warheads which the B–52 can launch a considerable distance from its target.

One of the advantages of such a system is that it could knock out the ground fire which now could reach heights that, frankly, are greater than any airplane can reach.

For a time we had the U–2 airplane. It flew over Soviet Russia. The very best antiaircraft batteries that were available could not hit it. Today that is not the case.

So the proposal would involve some study and development of a new missile launching system that could be attached to the RS–70. It would not involve any procurement in that area. It would involve the procurement of two more of the prototypes and a more thorough test of the RS–70.

Generally I agree with the Secretary of Defense. I have the greatest admiration for him. However, I regret that he has seen fit to cut off the program, along with that of the Skybolt. I believe he has transferred our dependence on missiles too rapidly at their present stage of development.

The Secretary of Defense is a very able man. He is acting in the best of faith. He has competent advisers and scientists to assist him.

This is not a question of interservice rivalry. The Army and Navy have agreed that the development should be pursued further. I doubt that it will be. But Mr. McNamara changed his mind to the extent of $50 million last year and took that much from the funds given to him over and above what he said he wanted or would spend, and he did increase the expenditure. I do not want to deny him the opportunity to do the same thing in fiscal year 1964.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may be pardoned in asking a further question, Why is it necessary to construct two additional prototypes? Why cannot the work be carried out on at least one of the planes?

Mr. RUSSELL. We have had a very unfortunate experience. I should not say it has been "unfortunate." We have had a remarkable experience in the development of new planes. We almost always lose one or two of the first prototypes that are constructed before we locate the bugs. Very small things sometimes cause trouble in the construction of an airplane.

A very little defect can cause the loss of two or three airplanes.

Provision has been made for the flying of one of the planes. It will be test flown this coming summer, we hope. But it will not have any electronic gear. There will be some little differences in any one of the planes. But each of them, up through five, would have improvements. It is believed that the system can be demonstrated then.

The committee and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, supported by many experts in the field, would like to go through the five.

The Secretary of Defense has said he does not want more than three. Last year he did not want to spend more on the development of the radar but he changed his decision.

There is nothing compulsory in the program. If the money is not spent, there will be no cost except the money required to print the provision in the bill. If it should happen that there was some breakthrough on the planes when they are tried, an opportunity would be available, without further delay, to launch into procurement.

Secretary McNamara is the type of man who would reverse himself in a moment if the planes should demonstrate to him that he had been a little too precipitate in sawing off the development program. We have an enormous investment in the program already. We have invested in it around $1,400 million at the present stage. Certainly we should at least get all the information we can out of it, even if this does cost more money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in inferring that the issue is merely whether we shall carry out the program on three planes or on five planes?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I wish that were the issue. The existing program will be carried out on three planes. We have authorized two more planes and supporting subsystems. In my opinion the Department will not carry out the proposal in full.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Congress were to approve the proposal and if the Department were to carry it out, they would make two tests in addition to those that they had planned to carry out. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. It would at least give us an opportunity to completely analyze the RS-70 as a weapons system; and we cannot fully analyze it and test it on three prototypes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice that toward the bottom of page 4 of the committee report there is the following sentence:

> A superficial examination would cause one to think that each of the fourth and fifth prototypes would cost more than $500 million.

The committee goes on to say that it does not think this is true.

I ask the question: How much additional cost does the committee think the approval of these two additional prototypes would occasion? It was stated before that approximately $364 million was proposed to be authorized in the pending bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I fear I cannot answer that question; to be perfectly frank with the Senator, I do not know.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think this is a very crucial question. Apparently what is involved is not merely $364 million, large as that may be, but a further and additional sum which will be needed, which is indefinite; but with respect to which some claims have been made that a total of $1 billion would be required.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot give the exact amount in dollars and cents. In my opinion, at least four-fifths of the funds which would be required to complete this system would be expended on the radar and other electronics equipment and supporting systems. Less than one-fifth of it would go into the shell and frame of this aircraft.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is not quite what I meant. I meant to refer to the total cost.

Mr. RUSSELL. To the total cost of what?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To the total cost of the two additional planes.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be a little less than $1.1 billion, including a finished weapons systems.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that what is really involved is not merely $363.7 million but well over a billion dollars?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true, if the Senator believes that Mr. McNamara is going to reverse himself and spend the money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know. We can only make the authorization on the assumption that he will reverse himself.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish I could say that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There would be no purpose in passing the proposed authorization and saying, "It will not be carried into effect." We must take responsibility and assume that it will be carried into effect.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we did so, we would mandate him and direct him to spend this money. We do not say that.

Last year I hoped to entice him to do this, with the language in the appropriation bill. He did not get in up to his ankles. He did take a little of the money and expanded the program somewhat.

This year it is put in with a hope—but a very faint hope—that he will develop this plane as a weapons system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator one further question, and then I will stop.

From the experience in the past, has it been necessary to try out new methods on 5 planes? Have 3 planes in the past proved to be adequate to eliminate the initial errors, to get a better design, with better functioning, or has it been necessary to have 5? Is 5 enough? Must we have 7? Or 9? Or 11?

When will we reach the point of greatly diminishing returns?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a difficult question to answer. There has never previously been a manned aircraft of the same characteristics of the RS-70. The RS-70 really will be a manned missile. It is to be a missile which is operated by a man. It will travel at 3 times the speed of sound. It will have a vast range. It will be able, among other things, to evaluate what has been done in case of a war, something that another missile cannot do.

I do not know exactly how many prototypes we have constructed in all of the weapons systems of the past. It would run somewhat higher for a fighter bomber or a plane like the RS-70 than it would for a transportation plane, for example. I think we built seven of the U-2's, before we put one of them actually on a flight. That was a plane of a very unusual character, with many peculiar qualities. It was not nearly as fast as the RS-70, nor did it have the range of the RS-70; but I have in my head somewhere the figure of seven that were developed before we put it under procurement.

I think that five would be about the right number in this area. This is an unusual plane. It is different from anything we have ever dreamed of before in this country in the way of an aircraft.

It is not likely to be exceeded.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me, I will yield further to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have only a few more questions to ask the Senator. I should like to clarify for my own thinking the present status of the three RS-70 planes. They have been authorized and money has been appropriated for them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, but they are in the stage of development. While the plane belongs to the Government, it is not considered a weapon. It is in the development stage. We have passed the research stage.

Mr. MORSE. Has any been flown?

Mr. RUSSELL. One will be flown this year. I stated a moment ago I thought it would be flown this summer; but I now believe, upon reflection, that it will be this fall before one will be flown.

Mr. MORSE. Most of the money needed, then, is for the development of the electronics phase and the radar phase? Why would it not be feasible, as implied by the Senator from Illinois, to authorize only that amount of money and to appropriate that amount of money, to put three planes into final working condition?

Mr. RUSSELL. I can only answer the Senator as I answered a few minutes ago. If the Senate wants to discontinue the development work on the RS-70, the Senate has that right. I think it would be unwise. I should like to see the money made available, in the hope that if the very pathetic record on our missile tests should continue, the Secretary of Defense would say, "We must continue in the manned bomber field."

I stated a few minutes ago that I did not think the Secretary would spend the money, but I hoped that the money would be made available. The Senate has a right to do what the Senator says, but I think it would be a mistake.

Mr. MORSE. The point on which I am confused is this: Would we be cutting it out, if we voted sufficient money to complete the development necessary to put the three planes into operation? Would it not require the same research and development for 3 as it would for 20?

Mr. RUSSELL. A few minutes ago I undertook to make clear to the Senator from Oregon that there is a great deal of difference between having the frame of an aircraft with engines perhaps not nearly as powerful as required for a flight when completed and having an aircraft complete with all electronic gear and other devices that will be necessary on the plane, if ever utilized and put in the operational inventory of the Air Force. There is no doubt in my mind that before we are through with it, if the Secretary proceeds with it, the electronic gear and weapons system of this plane will cost much more than the skeleton airframes.

Mr. MORSE. This is the point we need to clear up for the record. To put these three planes which have already been authorized, and for which at least some money has been appropriated into the final striking force the Senator is talking about, would require a considerable amount of money for research and development, in order to develop the electronics, the radar, and the missile devices necessary to make it the plane which was originally contemplated.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is a fair statement. That is what the authorization is intended to do; $363 million is a large sum of money.

Mr. MORSE. If we do that, we can talk about three planes and forget about the five, can we not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be true if we had absolutely no misfortune in flying them, in getting the original bugs ironed out of the plane and if the new radar and missiles and other devices could be installed on them. If we did that, it would be something never done with any other plane or any other missile we have ever built in this country.

Mr. MORSE. I have two further questions. If the Senator is correct that the probabilities are great that the Secretary of Defense would impound this money, anyway, and not spend it, and if we should go ahead and vote for it and it should become a part of the total budget, would it not follow, it being a part of the total budget, that it would carry a great weight in the votes in the Congress in respect to including or eliminating other items from the budget, especially on the part of those who feel that the budget should not be permitted to go beyond a certain ceiling?

By following that course of action, would we not run the danger of eliminating some other programs that are vital for the defense of the country, for which the money would be saved?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a question of psychology that I cannot answer. It might have an effect and might be persuasive on some Members of Congress in their voting. All I can say is that I undertook to go through this bill very carefully and bring the total of the bill below what was requested by the Department of Defense. As presented to the Senate, the bill is below that amount.

I have discussed that subject with officials of the Department. I do not want to bring any names into this debate, but I am confident this bill can be justified as it stands today. But if the Senate wishes to discontinue any further program on the RS-70, the majority of the Senate can vote it out. I will vote against such action, but the Senate can do it.

I think we would be in a stronger position today if we had gone ahead and bought the B-52's, but the Secretary did not see fit to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Georgia tell us if it is his opinion that the Secretary of Defense holds to the view that we now have in being a sufficient quantity of manned bombers capable of meeting any existing potential of Russia in the air?

Mr. RUSSELL. He stated that, in his judgment, the manned bomber force of this Nation was adequate to deter any action against the United States until we had completed a missile program that could supersede or replace the manned bomber.

Mr. MORSE. My last question: Would it be necessary to build any additional aircraft plant installations to carry out this program, or are adequate installations already in being?

Mr. RUSSELL. They are in being. People are at work in them. I do not know where those RS-70 facilities are. I believe it is in California. It is on the west coast. But the program would not require any additional facilities; and, in my opinion, it would not require the plants to employ additional personnel unless a production program were later approved.

Mr. MORSE. This is my last question. It is a delicate one. I hope it will not be misunderstood. Does the Senator from Georgia feel that there is any drive in support of the amounts requested of the committee on the part of those who are greatly concerned about diminishing the productive activity in existing aircraft plants in the period of time it will take to transfer from a war economy into a peace economy, if such a happy day should ever arrive?

Mr. RUSSELL. No one has broached me on that matter. Human nature would have changed suddenly if there were not those who were eager to see a continuation of the programs for economic reasons. We have a widespread defense production now. A great deal of the work is located in two or three States, but some of it is being done in every State of the Union. When efforts have been made to discontinue those programs, or reduce them to a great extent, I have been amazed to see the dismay that has been caused. Nobody communicated with me about the RS-70 program, largely, I suppose, because 3 years ago I took the position that it should be fully developed to see what it could do. That was not the result of lobbying. I am sure there are groups interested in the program, because there are a number of contractors, of subcontractors, involved. But none of them have communicated with me.

I have felt, and still feel today, that it is a mistake for us to abandon the one weapons system in which this country has been preeminent throughout the world and which has been the symbol of the military might of America since the conclusion of World War II; namely, the manned bombers of Strategic Air Command.

Mr. MORSE. The senior Senator from Oregon wants to vote for every last dollar needed to defend his country. I want to gamble in favor of having more than just enough. That has been my position in all my years in the Senate. At the same time, I am aware of the fact that there is a great deal of waste in the whole field of military expenditures. I am aware there are powerful lobbies of economic forces in this country who do not want to see a single man-hour reduced or a single war plant closed. Yet I am satisfied that a great many man-hours can be reduced and a great many plants closed in the interest of the economy of this country, and those man-hours put to work in pursuits of peace rather than war production. How to strike that balance, I do not know. At the same time, when I go through such a report as this, I must be on guard as to whether or not we could take action to support a move for reduced war plants and have those men put to work in other pursuits.

I hope, at least, that world conditions will change so that in the next decade we can be closing airplane plants, and not enlarging them, and not be voting for wasted expenditures to produce war equipment not needed for the defense of our country.

That is why I raised the question earlier. We have a Secretary of Defense whose patriotism is certainly beyond question and, who, as the Senator from Georgia said, is one of the most able men in public service today. He thinks we do not need the expenditures. Of course, there are those on the Joint Chiefs of Staff who do not agree with him, although, as a former member of the Armed Services Committee and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I know something about the military mind and how it can become fixed and set for the continuation of previous practices long after their usefulness is past.

I am raising the question to suggest that we must be on guard and satisfied that the expenditures are needed.

Mr. RUSSELL. What the Senator has just said has caused me more frustration than anything else in my public career. The problem is to be sure we are getting full value for each dollar spent on these gigantic programs for weapons systems, many of which cannot be let through the process of awarding the contract by formal advertising. There has been great waste, running into the millions of dollars, and perhaps billions of dollars, in our weapons systems contracts. We have complex weapons today. We will let a contract to one company for one weapon. Then we will award another contract to another company for a different weapons system. The two of them require men with certain skills. What happens is that contractor A immediately advertises in the newspapers for electrical engineers and electronics engineers and others whom he needs to employ to help carry out the contract.

He raises the payments somewhat because of the competition of the contractor in the next block—it could be in the next block in some areas where these companies are so thick—and I have seen whole pages of advertising competing for people with these skills in the same areas in one State.

I do not see how that is the play of free enterprise, when contractors bid against one another for the services of these people, who are going to be paid out of the same pocket, the pocket of the taxpayer of the United States. We have greatly added to the vicious spiraling of costs to the Federal Government, by permitting the award of these contracts without proper restrictions on the expenditures, even if the people involved are perfectly honest and anxious to complete the job and get the weapon into production. All this runs up the cost.

It got so bad the Government had to create private corporations, which were not subject to civil service laws, to be able to retain enough scientists to be able to check properly on some of these developments.

There may be some answer to that problem. I have told Secretary McNamara that if he applied his genius to this subject, he could save more money in the long run than by banishing any one weapons system. He is applying himself to it. He said that he hoped to increase by $5 or $6 billion, I believe, the amount of contracts that were let on a fixed price or incentive price basis rather than on a cost-plus type.

If we can solve that problem and still produce the best weapons on earth, he will be entitled to the acclaim of the country. However, we must have the best weapons on earth. We hope to devise means by which we can hold down the cost.

But cost is not the most important consideration. You cannot place a monetary value on the life of any American boy or compensate his family in dollars if his life is snuffed out. I do not propose to vote to take any American away from his home and peaceful pursuits and to send him into what could be the inferno of a nuclear war unless he is supplied with the finest weapons on earth. I hope that we can provide these weapons at a reasonable cost, but in the final analysis, they must be the best. Ours is the richest and most powerful country on earth. This imposes on us an obligation to see that the American serviceman is equipped with the finest weapons that the American industrial machine can produce. It must be the best even if the cost in dollars is great, and whether it be a rifle, an airplane, a tank, or a flamethrower.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have listened to what the senior Senator from Oregon has said with great interest, because I believe it concerns a significant point and ties in with what the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has been saying on the floor of the Senate this morning.

First, before I get to my question, I believe I can corroborate, at least in part, some of the evidence presented by the Senator from Georgia this morning in certain areas.

Yesterday I heard on the radio, while going home late at night, that there had been a Polaris missile failure off Cape Canaveral. This was, I believe, though I'm not absolutely certain, either the eighth failure in 11 tries or the fifth failure in 8 tries. That, of course, indicates that the missiles which we have at the present time are not absolutely dependable, and therefore, contrary to the publicly expressed views of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, it would appear to me that the day of the manned bomber is not immediately at hand, and that missiles still need to be developed to a greater extent and of greater accuracy; and that, therefore, there is room for both manned bombers and improved missiles in the foreseeable future. That is only my personal opinion. I could be wrong, and Mr. McNamara could be right.

The Senator has said that the Secretary of Defense, whom he praised very highly, is not omniscient. I venture to state that the Secretary of Defense would be the first to endorse that statement. However, he does have the power of decision, which he has not taken arbitrarily unto himself, but which was given to the office of the Secretary of Defense under the Reorganization Act, which brought about a combination of the Armed Forces into one Department.

There have been differences—and still are—between the Joint Chiefs of Staff; there have been differences—and still are—among Senators, both on and off the Armed Services Committee, as to whether the RS-70 ought to be built or not built, and as to whether this or that should be done in the field of defense.

Sometimes those differences have been influenced by the particular affinity which an individual Senator may have for a particular service. I am speaking of no one but myself, because I do have a particular affinity for the Marine Corps. I do go a little out of my way to do what I can, along with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], and others, to see that its interests are protected. Not that the interests of the Marine Corps need any protection, but we are always ready, able, and willing, to go to bat for the corps.

Mr. RUSSELL. I might say that those efforts are most effective. It is the only service that has a floor under it; its strength cannot be reduced below three divisions and three wings. The marines have taken care of their own.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For which we are thankful to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] the author and, may I say, the successful advocate of the legislation making this possible as well as distinguished chairmen of the Armed Services Committees in both Houses, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Representative from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

There are the differences which have been mentioned. We have a responsibility in committee, in the Senate, and in the Congress. The Congress believes that additional funds should be made available to further the development and research on the RS-70. We are exercising that responsibility, despite the fact that differences do exist. In the Department of Defense there are differences also. There are differences among the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On occasion they are not unanimous on matters of great importance, because here again, I have the idea, people naturally are looking out for the interests of their own services. Being human, they cannot avoid it. They try to be impartial. No matter what one does in life, no matter how hard one tries to be impartial, it is practically impossible because prejudices and aversions and predilections must be taken into consideration.

However, when there is a difference among the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it is the duty of the Secretary of Defense to take over and make his decision. It is not only his duty, but his responsibility to do that. I wish to say publicly that in my opinion this country has never had a better or a greater Secretary of Defense than Mr. McNamara. I am glad to know that even though Senators may have differences with him on particular points, they all have a great respect for him, and do not question in any degree his honesty, or his sense of responsibility. It is my belief that we are extremely fortunate as a Nation to have a man of his character and capacity in the office of Secretary of Defense.

Getting down to the question I wish to raise, I should like to ask the Senator whether there were differences among the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to whether or not this additional money for the Nike-Zeus should be appropriated or should be authorized this year?

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe there were. I know that the Army Chief of Staff, who is a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, favored this authorization and appropriation. General Taylor, the chairman, had adopted a similar attitude.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The other Joint Chiefs of Staff, even though they did not oppose, did not express support for it. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry that I cannot answer that question categorically. I know that General LeMay was very much opposed to it. He thought it would be an extremely wasteful program to be approved. I cannot state from my own knowledge what the Chief of Naval Operations had recommended about it. He was asked no questions about it that I remember.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the basis of this difference, the question was referred to the Secretary of Defense to make a decision.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. He made it. He said it was not needed, and he so reported to the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. He stated that it would be wasteful to proceed with a procurement program until research and development had produced an adequate system. That was the Secretary's position, in as few words as I can state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that was in relation to the Nike-Zeus and the development of other missiles?

Mr. RUSSELL. That was only one generation. We started with the Nike-Ajax. We positioned many batteries of it. They were scattered around the Nation. Then we went to Hercules and did the same thing. Now it is Nike-Zeus. But it would not be effective against a sophisticated attack by ballistic missiles.

The Secretary took the position before the committee that he favored a research and development program for a new missile system rather than to go into the production of one which General LeMay said even the Army felt had its weaknesses and was not an effective weapon against many intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Georgia to say that the additional $196 million which is being requested would be only the forerunner of a program which would ultimately cost anywhere between $12 billion and $20 billion?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct; but I wish to make it perfectly clear that it is intended to build a system sometime. Expense will have to be incurred in order to develop an improved system which will do the job.

The Department of Defense said that the amount of waste which would be involved in rebuilding the Nike-Zeus if it were deployed before the completion of Sprint and the improved radar would be $2,800 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In further answer to the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, it is my understanding that there are four developments in the so-called Nike-Zeus, leading to what we know can be done. If we now spend $196 million as a start to put into operation Nike-Zeus, we will be putting it in with two of these four developments. So we shall be putting into operation a weapon which we know can be improved if more time is given.

The other side of the question is that these two developments are an improvement and can be used as an effective weapon in 2 or 3 years, rather than waiting 4 years to attain any such development and have a more perfect, more useful instrument. As I see it, that is the difference from the RS-70, so far as laymen like the Senator from Georgia and me and other members of the committee can determine. We can go forward with a weapon which we know is not as perfect as it can be made, whereas the RS-70 is the only airplane that is now a strategic bomber. It is the only airplane for the future. Until we are secure with missiles, we should, in my opinion, go forward with research on the airplane.

As I see it, that is the difference from the Nike-Zeus. We know we can develop that instrument to greater advantage without spending so much money on putting into operation one which we know is not perfect.

Mr. RUSSELL. Senators may turn to page 67 of the printed hearings, where the Secretary of Defense deals with this subject in about two pages in his unclassified testimony.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who has for many years labored for this Republic and its defense.

The junior Senator from Nebraska has an open mind concerning the decision which should be reached in regard to Nike-Zeus. I have a question; but first permit me to say that as I view certain problems in foreign policy, in defense procurement, in what is taking place with respect to disarmament, and the testimony to which I listened in the Committee on Government Operations involving military decisions on contracts, it is an understatement to say that I am not greatly disturbed. For that reason, I believe the Senate should go into closed-doors session and explore this issue to the fullest extent.

My question involves certain figures which I believe should be developed before the Senate goes into closed-doors session. The distinguished chairman mentioned the figures $20 billion, $10 billion, $12 billion, and $2.8 billion in connection with the long range. I should like to have each of those figures set in proper perspective. I realize that $196 million is the figure for the first year. But what is meant by the $20-billion figure; the $10-billion and $12-billion figures; and the $2.8 billion figure?

Mr. RUSSELL. As to the first two figures which the Senator suggested, perhaps it would be better to answer his question in detail in closed-door session. The $2.8 billion is not classified. That is the amount which would be required to modernize the Nike-Zeus system, if it were adopted as proposed in the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not asking for classified information. A while ago, the Senator mentioned $20 billion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did.

Mr. CURTIS. What does that amount relate to?

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated that the cost of the complete system, whether it be Nike-Zeus or Sprint—Sprint will be the next successor to the Nike-Zeus missile—had been estimated to be anywhere between $12 billion and $20 billion. I believe we shall have to buy a system before we are through. The question is whether it is wiser to embark on this system, with its imperfections, or to push as vigorously as we can a research and development program that will eliminate the weaknesses in the Nike-Zeus system, and then install the sort of system that we believe will be effective.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the Senator saying that we are about to spend between $12 and $20 billion on some system?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think we will.

Mr. CURTIS. So that sum of money is not involved in the narrow decision as to what system to select.

Mr. RUSSELL. I tried to make it clear that the Department of Defense had estimated that it would be a waste of $2,800 million to push into this program rather than to wait for the perfection of the next class of missile and radar.

Mr. CURTIS. The term "waste" was used. Also the term "loss" was used. Neither is quite accurate, is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. CURTIS. If something requires trial and error, and the evolvement of it leads to the defense of our country, it is neither waste nor loss, is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. It would all depend on how much protection Nike-Zeus would give over and above that afforded by the Nike-Hercules, which is now in position.

Mr. CURTIS. It is somewhat similar to my insuring my house last year. Although I did not have a fire, my insurance premium was neither loss nor waste.

Mr. RUSSELL. To that extent, the Senator is correct. I do not know how to determine what value would be received from the Nike-Zeus system.

Mr. CURTIS. Our responsibility as Senators is to try to find the best answer to the question whether to have Nike-Zeus from the standpoint of the defense of the country, and not an earlier system.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is true. If I were convinced that Nike-Zeus were an effective weapon, its cost would not disturb me in the slightest degree. I would support this amendment today as vigorously as I was capable of supporting it.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

As I understand, there are well-qualified experts on both sides of this controversy.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suppose that is correct. I have not heard the testimony of the scientists or technicians who favor the Nike-Zeus, but I assume such testimony can be obtained.

Mr. CURTIS. If the proponents are correct—although I do not know that they are—this course would not be any more expensive than the alternative course, would it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; if the proponents of the Nike-Zeus program are correct, Congress should authorize it now.

Mr. CURTIS. And if they are right, that would be the most economical thing to do, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I cannot say it would be the most economical, because everyone—including the Army personnel who are pushing this most vigorously—admits that there are defects in this system, and that they will have to be corrected before it will be an effective weapon. I think the Army estimates that cost at $1,500 million.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, history proves that that has occurred in connection with many complicated weapons.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it has. This will be the fourth generation of these Nike weapons. We began with the Nike-Ajax; then the Nike-Hercules; then the Nike-Zeus, which has been in the process of development for some years. We have had considerable test firings with it. Some of them have been very successful—when there were no complications.

The question is whether we shall proceed with this system, even with all its defects, or whether we shall emphasize the development of the improved system and deploy it.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee. My observation has been that in all walks of life, those who develop strength are the ones who do the impossible, and keep on doing the impossible.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. First, I wish to say that I share completely the viewpoint of the Senator from Georgia that we should have the most modern weapons system in the world. I also share his frustration at times as to how this can be done without vast expenditures of money, with much of it wasted. This great cost was brought home vividly, recently, when we offered to give the Skybolt missile to the British, after we had spent approximately $650 million on research on it; but the British could not even afford to finish the research on this one missile.

But we are trying to develop all kinds of costly weapons.

From the report, I note that the bill would cover approximately $15,147 million of expenditures for procurement. Does the Senator from Georgia have any figures he can disclose as to the amount of money the several military services have asked for in their requests to the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. It was slightly over $67 billion.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. For the same purposes?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; that was for the entire budget. Secretary McNamara reduced it; in making his budget request, he reduced the total from $67 billion to slightly less than $52 billion.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think the Secretary of Defense performed a good service in cutting down these requests.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree. However, that is not unusual. For the last 10 or 15 years the armed services have requested much more of the Secretary of Defense than he has approved for the budget. Secretary Gates rejected a number of requests, and Secretary McElroy turned down some of them.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

If we were to appropriate all the money that all the people in the Pentagon request as well as all other departments of Government want there would not be enough money in the United States to pay for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not. James Forrestal, a man of great ability, who served as Secretary of Defense once referred to a saying of a wise man; namely, that "if you left it to the generals and the admirals, they would fortify the moon."

At that time, everyone thought the statement quite fantastic. However, today we are seriously thinking about fortifying the moon.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I wish to ask a question in connection with the present difference of opinion between the Department of Defense and the committee concerning the procedure for the followup on the RS–70. In the report it is indicated that the Defense Department intends to spend $81 million of available funds for the completion of prototypes which I understand they say they will never use. I do not know why they intend to keep on producing something which they will never use.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is rather difficult to answer that question. I understand that they wish to continue with the programs they now have underway. Furthermore, I do not think any of these aircraft will be put into inventory in the Department of Defense, for military use. I would be less than frank if I did not make that statement. I think we will learn something from this; I think we always learn something when we complete the development of prototypes.

Mr. HARTKE. But that is rather expensive education.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but we are trying to defend something that is very valuable. There is nothing more valuable than the American way of life. If a man has a fine, expensive house, he has to carry more insurance on it than the amount of insurance he would carry on a shack.

We in the United States have a better civilization and a better way of life than anyone else under the canopy of heaven has ever known. We must be prepared to spend the amount of money required to defend it.

Mr. HARTKE. Those are very beautiful words, of course. However, let me ask this question: Did they not junk the Skybolt?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. But it was not related to the RS–70 program. It was to be attached to the B–52.

Mr. HARTKE. Yes. However, they spent a great deal of money on it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, more than $500 million.

Mr. HARTKE. And even if they had spent more millions on it, it would still have been unsuccessful, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. But this recommendation on the RS–70 program occurred after the Skybolt program was killed.

Mr. HARTKE. And if Congress decides that it should eliminate it, Congress should also eliminate additions to the $81 million, should it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think a strong argument can be made for that. Of course, I oppose the elimination of any of it.

Mr. HARTKE. I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. But if an irrevocable decision is made to abandon the manned bomber and to concentrate solely on the missiles, I do not think any case can be made for continuing with this development program.

Mr. HARTKE. I understood the Senator to state that the Secretary of Defense has decided that the manned bomber program should not be continued.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said that he has already spent $50 million more this year than he had planned to spend on the RS–70.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to return to the subject of the RS–70. I understood the distinguished chairman of the committee to state that the position of the Secretary of Defense is that we now have an adequately manned bomber fleet which will be adequate until the time when the missile force is sufficient to replace and to supersede our manned bomber force.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, until the time when it will give us sufficient retaliatory strength to deter aggression against our country. I understand that to be the position of the Secretary of Defense. I do not see how in any other way he could justify curtailing the RS–70 program.

Mr. MILLER. I turn now to page 43 of the hearings:

> The next issue I had to face was the development of the B–70, or the RS–70 as it was later called. The issue here was not the future of manned strategic aircraft in general. Rather, it was whether this particular aircraft, in either of its configurations, could add enough to our already programed capabilities to make it worth its very high cost.

If I correctly understand what is stated there, it seems to me that the position of the Secretary of Defense is that he is not opposed to continuing the manned bomber capability of our country in the future.

Mr. RUSSELL. He said manned aircraft. He drew a distinction. If the Senator will read the testimony before the Senate committee he will see that the Secretary drew a distinction between the bomber and the tactical fighter and interceptor. We are getting ready to embark on a program which has been the subject of extensive hearings in the Committee on Government Operations. Under that program we would buy several hundred manned aircraft, but they would be tactical fighters and interceptors in nature and not a part of the strategic air force.

Mr. MILLER. In other words, the understanding of the chairman is that the position of the Secretary is that the issue here is not the future of manned strategic aircraft which are not of the bomber category.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. That is a little too restrictive. If the Senator will pursue the subject, he will find, when he reaches a further section of the Secretary's testimony, that the Secretary was asked about that subject. He stated he had never been in favor of doing away with manned aircraft. The Secretary said he could not foresee when we would not need large numbers of tactical aircraft in the fighter-bombers. Of course, today a one-man plane can carry a larger payload than could the B–17 of World War II days. We have made tremendous strides in the development of aircraft.

Time and again the Secretary asserted that he was in favor of pursuing the development of manned tactical aircraft and fighter-bombers. Indeed, the entire TFX contract revolves around the tactical aircraft. But he said that he did not now believe in adding to our inventory any new strategic bombers.

The Senator is an Air Force officer. He understands the difference between a strategic plane and a tactical plane. We shall acquire thousands of tactical planes. We have no plans now to acquire any new strategic planes after the B–52's have been exhausted by attrition.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the chairman making that point, because that is what I was trying to establish. We observe the Secretary of Defense stating that the issue is not the future of manned strategic aircraft at all. Rather, it is whether or not this particular RS–70, with its configurations, could add enough to already programed capabilities to make it worthwhile. If that is his position—and he is not denying the desirability of having manned strategic aircraft in the future, and has said that the RS–70 does not have the capabilities or potentials which he feels are desirable—then the question is, What does he have to suggest as a replacement?

Is the Air Force doing nothing in that area but sitting, hoping, and praying that the Secretary will expend the funds that we appropriate? Or is the Air Force seeking, under the guidance of the Secretary of Defense, to develop something which the Secretary of Defense could determine would offer sufficient potential, as distinguished from the RS–70, to warrant going ahead with it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not understand that the Secretary of Defense advocated construction of a strategic manned bomber to replace the planes which are now in inventory. The transition would be from planes now in inventory into reliance upon missiles. That is why I parted company with the Secretary of Defense because, in my opinion, it would be too early to take the risks that would be involved in relying upon missiles that have demonstrated their unreliability in the past, and have been failures week after week.

Mr. MILLER. Would the chairman say that the issue on that point is whether the Congress thinks there should be a future development of manned bombers or manned strategic aircraft as distinguished from the position of the Secretary of Defense, which is apparently not agreed to by several members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that there should not be such a future?

Mr. RUSSELL. My position—and I think I express the view of the majority of the Committee on Armed Services—is that I would not be willing to take the chance of abandoning deterrent power in bombers in view of the state of the art in missiles today. I still think that the aircraft is maintaining peace on earth today. It has been the greatest deterrent to world war III. It is the greatest deterrent to an atomic holocaust that the Communists would not hesitate one moment to perpetrate if they were sure that they themselves would not be destroyed in the process. I refer to the Strategic Air Command and its manned bombers.

I could go into that question in detail. I would prefer to do so in a closed-doors session.

I am not willing to hazard the security of the United States on missiles when our present bombers are exhausted. I would prefer to run the risk of the waste of $300 million, $400 million, $500 million, or $600 million to develop an effective manned strategic aircraft.

Mr. MILLER. I thank my friend from Georgia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to ask a very practical question relating to the RS-70 program. As the Senator from Georgia knows, the Senate Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations has, for about 4 years, proposed the appropriation of substantial sums of money for research for the development of a supersonic airplane for the Federal Aviation Administration.

I believe that last year the amount appropriated was $32 million. I shall place the exact figure in the RECORD. I am not sure.

The purpose of the research was to develop a commercial airplane of the same type as the RS-70. Constantly we have asked the question of the FAA: Is not the military developing the same plane? Why is there any duplication? Do the programs overlap?

The administration, including the Bureau of the Budget, has always approved X number of millions of dollars to proceed with the same development we are now talking about.

Now a suggestion is made by the committee that the executive branch is unlikely to obligate appropriations that may be made based on the authorization unless the Department of Defense changes its views. Why, on the one hand, do we appropriate money for the Federal Aviation Agency to proceed toward the same general objective—the RS-70—while, on the other hand, the money for the project is not spent? Is there a conflict, a duplication, or an overlapping? Should we proceed to approve the amount requested every year, or should we cease doing so?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I cannot answer that question. I believe the question will be pretty well settled this year. Very frankly, I would not favor adding the authorization to the bill if the Secretary of Defense had not utilized in the present fiscal year more than he said he would use at the beginning of the year. We allowed him more than he said he needed, and he has utilized $50 million of that amount this year.

I did not want to deny to him the opportunity to utilize more of the money next year. I cannot answer the Senator's question as to where the Department of Commerce spends its money.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have referred to the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Federal Aviation Agency. I do not remember where I read this, but it has been stated that the development of the RS-70 would have some value in determining the future characteristics of commercial planes. As the Senator knows, the commercial companies until now have utilized for commercial purposes all of the larger type aircraft built by the Department of Defense for military purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They have utilized the jets and everything else.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have had an indirect subsidy through the use of the research and development money. I do not complain about that, because this also has been of real military value.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to ask the Senator a practical question. Does the Senator from Georgia see any conflict between having the Federal Aviation Agency going ahead with its research and the controversy over the RS-70?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Judging from what I know. I am not familiar with the details of the Federal Aviation Agency program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator has of course approved money to permit the Federal Aviation Agency to go into its research program. I shall put the exact figure in the RECORD. It involves millions of dollars.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unfortunately, I was probably engaged on the defense appropriation bill at the time and was not present when the Senator from Washington held hearings on the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Oklahoma and I have been faced with the request every year. We think the Congress feels we should go ahead with the research.

Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. PROXMIRE addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had promised the Senator from Missouri I would yield to him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think this is a serious matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are talking, on the one hand, of going ahead; and, on the other hand, of not doing so. The Appropriations Committee has been giving the Federal Aviation Agency millions of dollars a year to go ahead with research for the same thing. I do not mean it is exactly the same thing. They are two different airplanes, but the objective is the same.

Mr. RUSSELL. The objective is the same. If the RS-70 is developed even to the limited stage now proposed for it, it should have great value in assisting with the development of commercial planes of the mach 3 type.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. SYMINGTON addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will yield briefly to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Secretary of Defense does not want this authorization?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Secretary of Defense did not request the money.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has he stated he does not want it, before the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe he did. He did not ask for the money. I do not know whether he stated he did not want it. I received the impression he was not at all enthusiastic about enlarging the program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I wish to clarify is that although the Secretary possibly does not want it, at least we know he did not request it.

Mr. RUSSELL. He did not request it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We do not know whether he will spend it. We are merely placing ourselves in the position of making possible the appropriation, so that the Congress will not have the responsibility, and the responsibility will be entirely on the Secretary as to whether to spend the money and whether the program is processed or not.

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opinion, the motivating factor in the Committee on Armed Services at least of the Senate—and I would undertake to say of the other body—was the fact that we were not willing to assume the responsibility of jumping from manned aircraft to missiles at their present rather ineffective stage of development.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Without passing on the merits in my own mind at the moment, I wish to make it clear that what we would do, in effect, if we put this into the bill, is say, to the Secretary, "We do not wish to take the responsibility. We are going to make the money available to you, so that ultimately you may decide."

Mr. RUSSELL. I would go a bit further than that. By my vote I would say that I think he should go ahead and develop the RS-70.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We would say we think he should.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe he will, but in my opinion he should do so. There is a difference of opinion between us on this.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In voting for it not only would we say that we think he should, that we hope he will, but also we would make the money available.

Mr. RUSSELL. We would make it available.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would be his responsibility ultimately, if he refused to do this.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I must go to my State later this afternoon. I have a short statement I would like to make.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri to make his statement. Then I shall be glad to yield to any other Senator who has a question with respect to this issue.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, first I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services with respect to the RS-70 and Skybolt programs.

Mr. President; I present a few thoughts with respect to proposed increase in the Nike-Zeus program.

Two approaches have been carefully considered in the past few years which the United States can use to provide itself with an anti-intercontinental ballistic missile capability as quickly as possible.

One approach would be to start production of the currently developed Nike-Zeus system, while continuing the development of some very major and essential improvements to the system, including an advanced radar and a high performance missile.

These two components are the essential parts of the Nike-X. The initial Zeus deployment would then be followed by a Nike-X deployment, and the original Zeus batteries would be replaced by Nike-X batteries.

The second approach would be to develop, with all available resources, the Nike-X, which would be available for initial deployment some time after the year in which the Nike-Zeus system could begin to be deployed. However, the time of full deployment of Nike-X in the second approach would be the same as that which in the first approach, the Nike-Zeus, would see full deployment.

The limitations of Nike-Zeus bear on its inability to cope with a threat, whose technology is already well in hand, and which is designed to penetrate the Zeus system.

The Nike-X system, which is designed to overcome most of the Zeus limitations by use of more advanced radar and interceptor technology, would have a far greater capability against decoys, jammers, nuclear blackout, multiple warheads, and other penetration devices, than Nike-Zeus.

The Defense Department decided not to request authorization of funds for Nike-Zeus deployment because of the following considerations:

First. Deployed Nike-Zeus batteries would be ineffective against the kind of penetration aids already planned for our own strategic systems, and at a date earlier than Zeus could be deployed.

Second. An AICBM of much greater capability than Nike-Zeus could be made available soon after Nike-Zeus.

Third. The overall Nike-Zeus engineering and deployment effort would interfere with the development of the essential changes to the system to make it into the Nike-X type.

Fourth. To establish some batteries of Zeus, and then replace them later with the improved Nike-X, would cost $2.8 billion additional—a very great deal of money.

The earlier, or additional protection the Zeus batteries would provide would be very small against the threats designed to overcome Zeus.

Fifth. The issue of whether Nike-Zeus should be deployed has arisen every year since 1958; and has been decided consistently in the negative because of its poor performance characteristics. Although the original system has been modified several times, its basic limitations have not been overcome.

As I see it, the Department of Defense should not embark on a $20-billion expenditure to deploy a system of capabilities greatly inferior to those of a system—the Nike-X—now under design.

As many of my colleagues know, for many years, along with other Senators senior to me on the Armed Services Committee, I have been consistently skeptical about these Nike programs up to the Nike-X.

On page 584 of the hearings, Senators will note what already has been spent on these efforts. I read the totals:

Nike-Ajax $1,250,900,000.
Nike-Hercules, $2,171,400,000.
Nike-Zeus, $1,372,200,000.
Nike-X, the Sprint, $62.6 million.

Under any truly modern concept of how a possible enemy would attack, the Nike-Ajax is worthless.

Therefore, we have put $1,250.9 million down the drain on that development.

Nor do I believe in the ability of the somewhat improved Nike-Hercules to stop a modern attack.

Therefore I believe there may be another $2,171.4 million down the drain from the standpoint of what is true defense today.

Again, because of developments in offensive capacity, I am skeptical about the Nike-Zeus.

So we have another $1,372.2 million which also may well be down the drain.

Of this some $4.8 billion, therefore, it would appear that our hope now lies with the Nike-X, which has cost us so far a little over 1 percent of the cost of the total Army ground-to-air missile effort.

But it goes further than that. The Air Force has spent $2,160 million on the ground-to-air Bomarc; and I am confident this unit is not adequate either with respect to required modern defense as against offensive developments.

In addition, it should be noted that we are not being niggardly in our current efforts with respect to ICBM defense, in that today we are asking for over $450 million in this field in the current budget, of which a large proportion is for the Nike-X and an additional amount to continue the Nike-Zeus test program.

Therefore, the total of all the money expended by this country in the ground-to-air effort, which would seem to be down the drain, from the Nike-Ajax through the Nike-Hercules and the Bomarc to the Nike-X, is about $7 billion.

The Nike-X may do the job. The others, in my opinion, will not. If I am correct, in this question of effective anti-ICBM's, there is a maginot line concept here which somewhat disturbs me.

For these reasons, I cannot support the request for the additional authorization of this large amount of money for statutory procurement of parts for the Nike-Zeus.

I believe our Nation is running into serious fiscal problems.

Therefore, I urge the Senate not to add this additional amount for the procurement of Nike-Zeus parts.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point, before leaving those figures?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I agree with him in his lucid, forceful statement, in which he is giving a brilliant, brief analysis of the situation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, the Senator from Missouri is strongly in favor of pushing an antimissile missile program and is supporting the Sprint feature, which is the ultimate one planned now, but does not think it wise to go into procurement now of the Nike-Zeus, which he considers inadequate and thinks will not do the job.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. We have offensive missiles that could not be stopped by the Nike-Zeus.

Mr. STENNIS. So the point made by the Senator with respect to the amendment involving $196 million is that it does not involve research and development for either system, because we have money in the bill for that, but it solely involves money for procuring for the Nike-Zeus missile, which the Senator has described as being inadequate. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is entirely correct. The money would be for procurement of Nike-Zeus.

We have in the bill several hundred million dollars for Nike-X development and more millions for a Nike-Zeus test program, which will be useful to the Nike-X program.

Mr. STENNIS. May I ask the Senator another question about the Nike-Zeus being adequate now? The Senator from Missouri has already stated he has followed this matter over the years. Does the Senator know of any scientist, outside the scientists who are promoting the Nike-Zeus, who judges it to be adequate to do the job?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know of any independent scientist who expects the Nike-Zeus to do the job. In addition, many of the great scientists working in great corporations, assigned to study and design systems of this character, as, for example, Bell Laboratories, believe that while there may be something in the Nike-Zeus, they are unanimous in believing that the Nike-X is a major improvement over the Nike-Zeus, and that the Nike-X will do the job which we all agree that the Nike-Zeus cannot do.

Mr. STENNIS. I will come to that later. I understood the Senator from Missouri to say the Nike-Zeus is inadequate to do the job in its present state and therefore we should not go into procurement now. When he says it is inadequate, he illustrates that it is inadequate by pointing out that we have already gone beyond the Nike-Zeus intercepting capacity.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. He and I were opposed to Nike-Ajax many years ago. We spent over $1 billion on that. It is clear that it is useless, from the standpoint of modern nuclear attack. He and I were also opposed to the Nike-Hercules, because we thought it would not be developed in the time period where it could defend the country from attack. We have put over $2 billion in Nike-Hercules.

We were extremely skeptical of the Bomarc, because we did not regard it as a modern defense effort. But over $2 billion was spent on Bomarc because we were overruled and it was decided to go on with the project.

My position is that the Nike-X may be able to do the job. There is always a danger that it may not, because of the concepts involved. On the other hand, expenditures on the Ajax have gone down the drain. Expenditures on the Hercules, the Bomarc, and on the Nike-Zeus may be down the drain. So there is $7 billion.

Mr. STENNIS. While we do not know too much about the subject, just to show that we are not newcomers to it, several years ago, with reference to our position on the military authorization bill, and the Senator from Missouri backed that effort, I have figures to show that, because the Senate refused to approve construction of a site, we saved $1½ billion on those programs. Secretary McNamara testified just last year, in the open hearings, that his estimate of the amount saved every year in the operation of the missile, because we had cut that item out, was $500 million a year.

I cite that fact, not with any pride, but to show that we have been following this matter for years.

I think that fact is highly significant now because of the Senator's opinion that Nike-Zeus is not able to do the job.

May I quote General LeMay? I point out that, after all, he is the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. He is the one who will give the bombers the orders. The Air Force will have the responsibility for the missiles, if the order is given. It is the responsibility of the Air Force.

I refer to page 928 of the hearings, when General LeMay was testifying. He made several points, but I will read just one or two of them. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] had asked some very good questions.

The Senator asked:

> You mean you do not think it is worth the effort to develop it at all?

Talking about the Nike-Zeus.

General LeMay said:

> No, only not to go into production—

And that is what we are talking about, production—

> at this time with what we can do with the Nike-Zeus.

In other words, it would not do for us to go into production.

General LeMay said, further:

> I want to continue on with the development at the fastest possible speed.

That is what the money is in the bill for—development, what the scientists can use. Is that not correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

In this connection, I would like to read from a letter I received from the No. 1 scientist in the Pentagon Building. He said he believed Nike-Zeus batteries would be ineffective against the kind of penetration aids which are already planned for our own strategic systems at a date earlier than Zeus could be deployed.

I do not say that, if conditions were just right, Zeus could not knock down some ICBM's, as they have done in tests. But tests are different from actual operations. As General LeMay has pointed out, the losses from an actual attack would be different from what they are in theoretical or test raids.

What I am saying is that, according to the Department of Defense, even though it might be effective today, Nike-Zeus batteries would be ineffective against the kind of penetration aids which are already planned for our own strategic systems at a date earlier than Zeus could be deployed.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his contributions to this discussion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have listened to the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Mississippi. I repeat and ask the Senator if he does not agree with the testimony which appears on page 67 of the hearings, which is the testimony with relation to the subject we are discussing now.

The Senator mentioned the three choices:

> The first alternative was rejected because it would not be a system which would be effective against the kind of attack we could be faced with by the time the system could be built.
>
> The second alternative would lead to a final system which is very similar to the Nike-X in both time and performance, but with an initial configuration only slightly better than that furnished by alternative 1.
>
> It was considered that the marginal protection offered by the early limited capability would not be sufficient to offset the additional costs which would be involved.

Is that the position of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. I thank the Senator for his contribution. That was stated by the Secretary of Defense, I believe.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. If we add the $196 million we would be adopting an alternative which in the opinion of the Department of Defense would not give the additional capability that would be worthy of the cost.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I read from page 5 of the report. The statement appears on that page that by a vote of 9 to 8 the committee reconsidered its earlier vote to adopt an amendment to add $196 million to the Army missile procurement authorization. It states that the original vote was 9 to 4 against the amendment, and that the additional $196 million is intended to authorize appropriations only for procurement of component parts of the Nike-Zeus system.

It is my understanding that the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Mississippi feel that this does not give the improved efficiency of the Sprint system and that it is inadvisable to authorize the added expenditure of $196 million for Nike-Zeus. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. We have great respect for those who differ with us on this subject, but this is our considered opinion after following for many years the ground-to-air program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. General LeMay expressed the opinion that inasmuch as Sprint was so much more efficient, it was not advisable to spend more on Nike-Zeus. Did other representatives of the Air Force testify to a different opinion?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not remember their being asked. But for some time the Army has favored the ground-to-air missile.

In one way, I deeply regret the consistent effort of the Army in the missile picture. There have been years when more than 90 percent of the Army's research and development budget was for missiles. I have felt, especially since the Navy was doing work in this field, on missiles like Talos, which is ground-to-air system, and the Air Force was doing work in this field on missiles like the Bomarc, that the research and development of the Army could have been better used.

Not too long ago, according to the commanding general, a very competent officer, our ground troops in Berlin had radios that weighed 20 pounds, whereas the children on the streets had radios just as good that weighed only 2 pounds.

As many Senators know, I have been skeptical about the whole ground-to-air Nike program. A reason for General LeMay's apprehension about much of the program may be that all the theories of defense, as to how many planes would be knocked out in raids in World War II, were invariably knocked into a cocked hat when we got into actual operations; many more planes always got through than the estimates indicated.

In addition, I think it is very important to realize that if 20 missiles are sent against a target and if the defense is successful in knocking down 19 of them, and not successful in knocking down the 20th, one city is still lost.

Therefore it is extremely important that we utilize the best possible system we can in our defense effort.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the present status of the Nike-Ajax and Nike-Hercules missiles?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am not an authority on that subject, but I know—and I am sure the able Senator from Ohio also knows—that the Nike-Ajax has an extremely limited range. The Nike-Hercules is more advanced. The Nike-Zeus is a very much greater advancement in the art than either Ajax or Hercules. However, from the standpoint of a missile attack, Ajax, Hercules, and Bomarc are not capable of doing the job.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I have great respect for the opinion of the Senator from Missouri, whose name is so properly associated with the security and defense of this country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DODD. Was the Nike-Ajax an efficient weapon at the time it was produced? Did it become inferior later? Did it serve our needs at one time?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I personally feel that it was not an efficient weapon. Of course it was not a weapon for use against missiles and was not effective against any air-to-ground missile.

The number of the Nike-Ajax that was needed to defend a city against airplanes was very large. We had a thousand B-17's over Berlin in 1 night and over 300 B-29's over Tokyo in 1 night.

Mr. DODD. Was it the best that could be produced at that time to give us the best available defense?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that Bomarc was the better system. It was better than Nike-Ajax or Nike-Hercules. I believe that Talos was a better instrument than Nike-Ajax or Nike-Hercules. However, the usual situation prevailed that the Pentagon compromised by making everything.

Mr. DODD. Am I in error in understanding that these weapons came in succession? I understood from the Senator that we had Ajax and then Hercules and then Zeus. I had been under the impression that this was a kind of progressive development, and that each time we were making a better weapon than the one before.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is true. Nike-Hercules was a definite improvement over Nike-Ajax, especially in range. Bomarc was always a longer range weapon than Nike-Ajax or, for that matter, Nike-Hercules. Talos was designed primarily for ship operation, but it was a very good weapon. However, great advances have been made in the offensive ballistic missile field.

Most, if not all, of these weapons are either obsolete or obsolescent. Possibly—and I emphasize the word "possibly"—the only weapon that could do a real job of defense, because in this business we are trying to defend ourselves against a vehicle going many thousands of miles an hour, which is quite a problem for the best scientists—is the Nike-X.

Mr. DODD. I read in the press that General Taylor said that if we had gone ahead with the Nike-Zeus when the Army asked for it, we would be in a better defense posture today. Does the Senator care to comment on that point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that is true. It would be better to have them than not to have them. But as to whether or not it would have been a justifiable expenditure of our treasure, as against what the enemy could do in this particular offensive weaponry field, I do not know.

We delayed a long time with Nike-Zeus, and that unquestionably has hurt Nike-Zeus because in the delay we have the same type and character of problem that we have with the B-70. If years ago we had gone ahead with the B-70, we would have them flying now, and we would not have the problem of whether they are or are not capable of being effective in the time period in which they can be brought into production.

Mr. DODD. Is the Nike-Zeus competitive with Nike-X, or not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Many people working on the Nike-X worked on the Nike-Zeus. People who are working on Nike-Zeus, as well as on the Nike-X, naturally believe in the Nike-Zeus. But, to the best of my knowledge, all of them recognize that the Nike-X is superior. There is a problem; and anyone having shop experience knows what it is. If we go ahead with the production of Nike-Zeus, we can only halt the development which is necessary for the production of Nike-X.

Mr. DODD. Why is that so?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Because there are only so many engineers who are skilled in this field. There are only so many design engineers, tool engineers, and production engineers that can do this work.

Mr. DODD. It occurs to me that those people ought to work together. If the Nike-Zeus men are working to perfect their weapon, and the Nike-X people are working to perfect theirs, and they are not competitive, why should they not get together?

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is such a rarified atmosphere, from the standpoint of scientific capacity, that only a few companies in the country can do the work. It is probably as complicated as any kind of work that is done for the Defense Department today.

Mr. DODD. Does the Senator feel that perhaps it was an overstatement to say that the development of Nike-Ajax was money down the drain?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. I think the Nike-Ajax was worthless.

Mr. DODD. It was never worth anything at any time?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I never thought it was. It is not an overstatement so far as I am concerned, but there may be those who think it was worthwhile. One advantage of being a Senator is that one can give his honest opinion. I think the Ajax is worthless. I never thought much of Hercules and Bomarc.

The record will show that over the years there has been an extended discussion, in which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] always joined, as to whether or not we were not fooling ourselves on a Maginot Line basis by thinking we could put up these limited range missiles, and destroy incoming offensive weapons.

The Nike-Zeus is entirely different from the Nike-Ajax and the Nike-Hercules. I have suggested to the Army many times that they not designate these missiles with the same word. The demarcation between systems is not clear when one name is used consistently.

However, Nike-Zeus is certainly a better weapon. Actually, Nike-Ajax and Nike-Hercules are used against manned bombers, whereas Nike-Zeus is used against ballistic missiles.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator stated that Nike-Zeus is inadequate. I ask the Senator if Nike-X or Sprint is not nonexistent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not entirely within the realm of possibility that it will be possible to develop a better antimissile missile than Nike-Zeus, which may fail of realization?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes; that is possible. I respectfully say to the Senator from North Carolina that, to the best of my knowledge, Nike-Zeus is not a reality either. No Nike-Zeus units and no Nike-X units are in production.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that Nike-Zeus has reached the point where it could be put into production?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct, with this reservation: There are certain items on the Nike-Zeus which are not yet developed to the point where the Department of Defense feels that Nike-Zeus can be put into production without further development.

Mr. ERVIN. But does not the Senator agree with me that there is a difference of view on this point between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct; and that difference has existed for some time.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator agree with me that the only possible defense that we can have, that can be visualized against hostile intercontinental ballistic missiles, is an antimissile missile which will destroy the hostile missile in the air before it reaches our territory?

Mr. SYMINGTON. One of the best antimissile missiles could be neutralization through some form of ionization with an attack weapon, which would make it impossible for the offensive weapon or retaliatory ICBM to operate. With that reservation, I believe the statement of the able Senator from North Carolina is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Army have the clearest responsibility in respect to the defense of this continent against hostile attacks of any kind?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I say most respectfully to the able Senator that I would rather say that the Department of Defense has the responsibility. I do not believe the Army has any particular mission as distinguished from the Navy or the Air Force. I believe the mission should be a defense mission, and that the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Chiefs of Staff should change it as they see fit, from the standpoint of what is best for the country and what can be done on a most efficient and effective basis for the country.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator agree with my thought that the Army is one of the salient agencies by which the Department of Defense will undertake to defend our country?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I certainly do. Forty-five years ago I was a private in the Army. I have always felt very friendly toward the Army. But sometimes the Army—as do the other services—gets into fields and programs which I question. For example, the Army developed an atomic cannon. Some of us who are members of the Committee on Armed Services were opposed to it. The atomic cannon was soon shown to be pretty ridiculous.

I do not limit my statement to the Army. The Navy and the Air Force also get into programs which I question and oppose.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Missouri agree with the thoughts which were advanced a moment ago by the able and distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] in his questions that the whole subject of the development of weapons of offense and defense is one of constant changes and improvements and evolution?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do.

Mr. ERVIN. While we would scorn the bow and arrow today, the bow and arrow were a very decided improvement over the rocks and clubs which were used before the bow and arrow were developed. Is that not true?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ERVIN. Also, when gunpowder came into existence, it was a vast improvement over the bow and arrow, was it not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The able Senator from North Carolina is now talking about offensive weapons. What worries me is that we have seen a very rapid development of offensive weapons. At the end of World War II, the speed of the fastest airplane, which was the best offensive weapon, was well under 500 miles an hour. Now we are talking about vehicles which travel at 9,000 miles an hour. I agree that from an offensive standpoint there has been a gigantic development. What worries me is the possibility of a Maginot line type of thought in this country. If we decide to have an AICBM, which we think will work, we might find, unfortunately, if the balloon went up, which I hope will not happen, that it would not work. Therefore, I think the Department of Defense should be listened to carefully when they say that we now have under development offensive weapons which the Nike-Zeus could not stop.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Army maintain that it has conducted sufficient experiments with the Nike-Zeus to establish the fact that the Nike-Zeus has a capability to destroy a hostile intercontinental ballistic missile?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Certainly. The Army is very strong for its position in the missile field. In my opinion, it had at Huntsville, Ala., under the supervision of Werner Von Braun, a missile organization not surpassed anywhere in the world.

On the other hand, the Army is only one component part of the Department of Defense; and the Secretary of Defense, the No. 1 scientists in the Department, and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, who has probably had more experience in the field of offense and defense in the air than any five people who are still around, combined, do not agree.

Mr. ERVIN. It is quite possible, since all men are fallible—we are not infallible—that the Army may be right and the Secretary of Defense wrong.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is true; and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force may be wrong. But I respectfully say to the able Senator from North Carolina that the Army would be the first to agree that Nike-X is a vastly superior weapon to the Nike-Zeus.

Mr. ERVIN. If it were in existence—if the dreams of what the Nike-X may be were already realized—I would go along with that proposal.

I should like to ask several other questions.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no Member of this body for whom I have more respect than for the able Senator from North Carolina, with whom I have served for many years on the committee.

I should like to read this statement from the Department of Defense:

> The issue of whether the Nike-Zeus should be employed has arisen every year since 1958—

That, in itself, shows that—unfortunately—5 years of delay has occurred—

> and has been decided in the negative, because of its poor performance characteristics. Although the original system has been modified several times, its basic limitations have not been overcome.

That letter was written on April 9, 1963; and we are talking about a potentially $20 billion program.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Missouri says there is a difference between the Nike-Ajax, the Nike-Hercules, and the Nike-Zeus. Is there not a very substantial difference between their respective functions, in that the Nike-Ajax and the Nike-Hercules were designed to afford defense against aircraft, whereas the Nike-Zeus is designed only to afford defense against intercontinental missiles?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes; and I have already stated that fact for the record.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri and the attention of the Senate as a whole to the testimony of Lt. Gen. Dwight E. Beach, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army—testimony given before the Armed Services Committee, as set forth on pages 646 and 647 of the hearings. Does the Senator from Missouri have a copy of the record of hearings?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes; and I have turned to those pages.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Missouri agree with me that General Beach advocated going into the production and deployment of the Nike-Zeus?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator from North Carolina says so, I am sure that is true. I have that page before me, but I do not know the line to which the Senator from North Carolina is referring.

Mr. ERVIN. As set forth in the middle of that page, we see that General Beach testified as follows:

> We recommended that the Nike-Zeus be deployed—

When he said "we," he referred to the Department of the Army.

I shall not read the other part of that statement, because there was a deletion because some question of security was involved, and that part is not very intelligible.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I see the part to which the Senator from North Carolina refers.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. He then said:

> We—

Meaning the Army—

> recommended that the Nike-Zeus be deployed—

I ask the Senator from Missouri to observe whether I correctly read the following question and answer:

> Senator ERVIN. The Nike-Zeus is the only antimissile missile that we have proceeded with far enough to know that it would work, isn't it?
>
> General BEACH. It is the only one in existence in the free world that has ever demonstrated actual capability of shooting down a reentry body.

I have read that correctly, have I not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from Missouri also agree that I then asked the following question, and received the following answer from General Beach:

> Senator ERVIN. It is on that basis that you think it would be better to have it than to take the chance on having none, due to the length of time in developing the Nike-X.
>
> General BEACH. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Missouri agree with me that in stating that view, in effect General Beach was stating the viewpoint of the Army?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question about that. The Army has been very strongly in favor of the Nike-Ajax and very strongly in favor of the Nike-Hercules and very strongly in favor of the Nike-Zeus.

Let me say to the Senator from North Carolina that I have always felt that the Nike-Zeus was a more significant weapon than either Nike-Ajax or Nike-Hercules. I was against them when they began, but I have supported the Nike-Zeus.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding. Despite the fact that he and I disagree with respect to this particular proposal, I wish to state that, based on my long service with the Senator from Missouri on the Armed Services Committee, he has been completely devoted to the defense of our country, and he has rendered what I conceive to be great and inspiring public services as a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the senior Senator from North Carolina. There is no one who is more patriotic or more capable or more devoted to his country than is the Senator from North Carolina; and there is no one from whom I would rather have that undeserved commendation.

He and I do not entirely disagree on this question—we partially agree. Both of us want to see the most effective system developed as soon as possible—this is the first time I can remember when he and I have not been in full agreement on what was essential for the security of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Is it not a fact that offensive-type weapons, in their development throughout the years, have consistently been able to maintain a lead over defensive types?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That has been especially true in recent years. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Nevada, who was a great combat pilot in World War II, and has a great combat record.

But it is a fact that in aerial warfare, the capacity for defense has, in theory, been consistently overrated; and the capacity for offense has, in actual operation, been consistently underrated. The Senator from Nevada knows at least as much about that as I do—based upon his experience in combat.

Mr. CANNON. One of the reasons for that is that defensive-type weapons are based on the offensive-type weapons then in existence, whereas offensive-type weapons are developed with future operations in mind.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question about that.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his remarks. He has made some excellent points.

Although I do not agree entirely with him when he says the Nike-Ajax and the Nike-Hercules were useless—for I think they served a purpose at the time, because if we had been subjected to attack by manned aircraft, which they were designed to meet, they would have provided us with some kind of protection—yet, as things turned out, no such attack was made.

Therefore, I agree that today the Nike-Ajax is, in my opinion, worthless. So I think we are wasting money by continuing those sites at the present time.

But I do think that the Nike-Hercules has a very valid part in our mission in that, if we have an attack of manned aircraft in the reasonably near future, the Nike-Hercules would give us an added capability insofar as protecting the areas around which the Nike-Hercules is sited.

But I agree with the Senator that it is not worth the additional expenditure of from $1.5 billion to $2 billion to attempt to bring the Zeus in at a slightly earlier date than the Nike-X, particularly in view of the testimony of all the experts in this field who have testified before our committee, and whom I have heard. As the Senator knows, there is a very great division of opinion. But I respect the judgment of the Secretary of Defense and also that of the Secretary of the Army in their final decisions. I concur completely with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator. I desire only to make one point. I agree that the Nike-Ajax could have been effective and the Nike-Hercules would have been effective if the attack had a relatively small number of planes. But based upon our concept of the bomber forces of the Soviet—the number of planes that we used to have over targets and the number of planes we believed the Soviets could have over targets—I did not see, inasmuch as they operated in battery formation against single planes, how we could ever stop a really determined desire to destroy a city.

As the Senator knows better than I, during World War II, if we got 5 percent of the attackers, it was considered a very fine job. In the present situation, if we should get 95 percent of the attackers and miss 5 percent, a city would be lost.

I thank the Senator for his statement. If it is satisfactory with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I should like to yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his very fine statement. I share the views expressed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] that the Ajax served a purpose when it was first installed. It was an antiaircraft missile. When it was first used, it was a short-legged weapon. I believe its range was about 40,000 feet. Its present range is classified, but the range has been lengthened considerably.

The big mistake we made with the Ajax was that we installed a great many of them after they had become obsolete. We installed many Ajax batteries after they were no longer effective even against high-flying aircraft. Hercules would be a rather effective weapon against most aircraft.

Mr. SYMINGTON. One of the two greatest generals, if not the greatest general, of the War Between the States, Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, once said, "I git thar fustest with the mostest."

I have always believed that the way things were going in offensive weapons development, offensive weapons were surpassing any possible defense.

I am impressed by what was said by the able chairman of the committee, who, I have said a great many times, and am glad to repeat, is the wisest man on the subject in our country today. I am impressed with what he has said and what the able junior Senator from Nevada has said. I shall be more tender in my opinion about the Nike-Ajax. As the chairman knows, in the committee I was very strongly opposed to it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator not only opposed it, but he also opposed the Bomarc, which the Air Force was building for the same purpose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator was fair and impartial in his position. He did not think that either would do the job.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I apologize for asking questions at this late hour. I know that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] has been waiting a long time. The Senator from Georgia has been patient in answering questions. I shall make my questions brief.

I wonder how the committee accomplished what I believe was a unique action in reducing the proposed expenditures in the way it did. On page 3 of the report appears the following language:

> The defense program was reduced by $770,900,000. A reduction of this amount was accomplished by applying a uniform 3-percent reduction in the amount sought for research, development, test and evaluation, by a 3-percent cut in certain support areas such as spare parts and modifications, and by selectively reducing the proposed procurement quantities of specified aircraft, missiles, and ships.

I think that statement is most heartening to those who have confronted the problem of reducing Government spending and who have felt that if expenditures are to be reduced in a big way, they would have to be reduced in the area of defense.

We all know that we should spend as much as we possibly can afford to spend to make our defenses as strong as possible.

In view of the fact that the Secretary of Defense had previously reduced the requests submitted by the Army, Navy, and Air Force by between $13 billion to $14 billion, I wonder how this year, for the first time, the Committee on Armed Services was able to arrive at the conclusion which it reached.

Mr. RUSSELL. This year is only the third year that the Committee on Armed Services has operated under a new law which requires authorization for appropriations for the current year. It is the first year in which we have authorized certain appropriations for research and development. So research and development has not been before the committee prior to the present year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Nevertheless there were opportunities before when appropriations came back.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and we have reduced them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They were reduced, but not in that particular way.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. We once reduced them in one category by 2 percent. We did it to provide money for the acceleration of the Polaris submarine program. That was in the appropriation bill. It was not in the authorization.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. Two or three years ago we were operating under a general World War II authorization that was open ended. There was practically no limit to the weapons that were authorized. We thought we should study the program each year to see if some savings could not be made without impairing the country's defense.

I shall tell the Senate why I think we can stand the proposed 3-percent reduction in modifications and the replenishment of spare parts.

When the Department has reprogramed funds, it has always been able to find a surplus in those accounts. There is no doubt in my mind that in the course of the next fiscal year the Department will find some money for reprograming by refining or redetermining requirements in those accounts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The bill involves $15 billion, does it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. More than that. I think it is $15.1 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. $15 billion plus. The committee's recommended cuts far exceed 3 percent of $15 billion.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of the reductions did not come from the 3-percent cuts. We deferred the production of a number of planes. In other words, where we determined, for instance, that we had 1,500 of a certain type of plan in inventory, 800 in procurement, and 700 provided in the bill. We removed 10 or 12 there, feeling that the reduction would not injure the program in any way. That minor deferment could not affect our defense posture.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As far as the bill is concerned, that was more than a 5-percent cut.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. We labored arduously to try to get it to 8 percent. There were certain items I felt we could cut in excess of 5 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Considering the example of the Armed Services Committee, in activating economy following the excellent record of the Department of Defense, this should be very encouraging for those who would work for economies in other programs. If we can make this kind of cut across the board, the 5-percent cut in this bill, with respect to which all Members consider there should be high priority, it would seem quite sensible that we could make cuts elsewhere.

I understand, also, that the Secretary of Defense was the only head of a department in our Government who succeeded in reducing his civilian personnel for the coming year. He will reduce his civilian personnel by several thousand, and will reduce personnel by 10,000 next year. Every other agency of the Government has increased its personnel, in some cases greatly.

I asked the Secretary about this when he appeared before the Joint Economic Committee. He said he is reducing personnel because with hundreds of thousands of people employed, one can assume that there must be a possibility of greater productivity, and there must be available improvements in efficiency if that efficiency is forced to come into play by a personnel cut. Therefore, he says, "You can cut personnel and find ways to do the job more efficiently." It was not on the basis of eliminating service, but on the basis of saying that the Secretary thinks the job can be done more efficiently.

I presume, judging from the explanation given by the Senator from Georgia, that he is following the same philosophy and psychology with respect to achieving economies in this particular way.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not hear the testimony to which the Senator adverts and have not had an opportunity to read it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall place that in the RECORD later today.

Mr. RUSSELL. That philosophy was one of the things which convinced me that a 3-percent reduction could be handled without any impairment in our defense posture.

I have always given priority to the Department of Defense. Time and again I have urged the Congress to appropriate more than the Department has requested. For that I have no apologies, particularly with respect to the Polaris submarine. For 2 or 3 years the Congress increased that program above what the Department requested.

That does not mean that there never comes a time when it might be possible to find items that can be reduced. This is the largest request which has ever been made by the Department of Defense of the Congress in peacetime for the maintenance of the military forces and the acquisition of military hardware.

The Committee concluded that these very modest reductions or stretchouts of procurement would not impair this country's defense preparedness.

I do not wish my attitude with respect to other appropriation bills to be based upon the fact that this reduction is limited to about 5 percent. I am quite confident that with respect to the operations of some of the other agencies which are not so vital to our survival as a free people much more substantial reductions can be made, and I hope they will be made.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is exactly the point I wished to bring out.

I have one other question to ask the Senator. It seems to this Senator that the Secretary of Defense has made a very conclusive argument with respect to the RS-70. I do not intend to offer any amendment to eliminate the RS-70 from the authorization bill. I think that would be repetitious. Possibly I would lose. Later the Senate will consider the appropriation bill. I shall defer until that time any amendment to eliminate the RS-70. The Appropriations Committee should have as broad a discretion for decision as possible.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator will have another opportunity, when the appropriation bill comes before the Senate. The Senator will not be precluded from bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and having the Senate pass upon it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I merely wish to say for the record that I think the Secretary of Defense is correct; and if the amendment were before the Senate, I would vote to eliminate the RS-70.

Several Senators have talked about the position taken by the Secretary of Defense. I ask unanimous consent, with the permission of the Senator from Georgia, to insert in the RECORD at this point some 3, 4, or 5 pages from the hearings, in which the Secretary of Defense states his position first with respect to the RS-70 and why he thinks it should be eliminated; and, second, with respect to the bomber forces and the necessity for bomber forces and the role they play.

With the Senator's permission, I ask unanimous consent to have pages 42 to 44, on the RS-70, and pages 47 to 49, on the bomber forces, of the Senate hearings, printed in the RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of our hearings?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is all I ask.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be happy to have the Senator include in the RECORD any part of our hearings, so long as it would not encumber the RECORD unduly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is a relatively brief amount of testimony.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have that done.

There being no objection, the excerpts from Secretary McNamara's testimony were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

B. THE RS-70

The next issue I had to face was the development of the B-70, or the RS-70, as it was later called. The issue here was not the future of manned strategic aircraft in general. Rather, it was whether this particular aircraft, in either of its configurations, could add enough to our already programed capabilities to make it worth its very high cost.

Many of the arguments that have been advanced in support of the RS-70 actually support the case for postattack reconnaissance in combination with an improved ICBM force. We believe that there are more promising ways of performing this mission than the RS-70, when both cost and effectiveness are considered. Other than this, the RS-70 is said to have two distinct capabilities: (1) transattack reconnaissance; that is, reconnaissance during our missile attack, and (2) the ability to examine targets and attack them on the spot with strike missiles, if required. Quite apart from the technical feasibility of developing, producing, and deploying such a system within the time frame proposed by the Air Force (which we do not think possible), there are better ways, when one considers both cost and effectiveness, to obtain both of these capabilities.

The principal advantage of having a "reconnaissance" and a "strike" capability in an aircraft is one of timeliness. That is, it may be possible to process and interpret enough of the "recon" data in the few minutes the aircraft is still within range of the target to permit an effective air-to-surface missile strike, keeping in mind that the aircraft would be moving at a speed of over 30 miles per minute and that the missile would have a relatively short range—i.e., a few hundred miles. If this can be done "effectively" there is the advantage of being able to deal with the target within minutes instead of an hour (or more) if the "strike" had to be accomplished by some other weapon system. Quick attack is not always important, but to the extent that it is and can be accomplished effectively, a strike capability in the aircraft is an advantage. However, postattack reconnaissance and subsequent strike—whether by air-to-surface missiles or ICBM's—is important in two principal cases:

1. Where fixed targets whose location was not known precisely must be attacked.

2. In "mopup" operations against fixed targets of known location that have been programed for initial attack by ballistic missiles, but which may not have been destroyed.

Initial attack on targets of known location can be accomplished effectively with

ICBM's, which have the important advantages of shorter time-to-target, lower cost, and higher survival potential. Mobile targets simply cannot be successfully attacked with an RS-70 and, in fact, such a role has not been proposed for that aircraft.

The issue, therefore, resolves itself to the question: How much could we gain from a capability to attack the two types of targets I referred to earlier, with air-to-surface missiles instead of ICBM's?

With regard to the first case, if a target is known to be somewhere within a relatively small area, usually its exact location can eventually be established. Moreover, such targets can be attacked by ICBM's after postattack reconnaissance. With regard to the second case, other means are expected to be available to determine whether targets previously attacked by ICBM's have been destroyed. These targets, too, once it is known that they have not been destroyed, could be attacked again with ICBM's.

The RS-70, by carrying air-to-surface missiles, would provide only a very small increase in overall effectiveness. In my judgment, this increase is not worth the large additional outlay of funds estimated at more than $10 billion above the $1.35 billion already approved.

Accordingly, we propose to complete the presently approved $1.3 billion B-70 development program of three aircraft and, in addition, continue the development of selected sensor components using, in the current fiscal year, $50 million of the extra $192 million provided by the Congress last year for the RS-70 program. The Air Force has not yet completed its analysis of the effect on development costs of the 3-month delay already encountered in the flight testing of the first B-70.

Senator Case. When is that scheduled for now, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary McNamara. There is no firm estimate at the moment, Senator Case. It was scheduled to fly in December. At the time I prepared this text it was estimated it would fly late March or early April, hence the 3-month delay. At the present time the contractor is inclined to believe it can fly in May.

The Air Force estimates, however, that its delay could extend as far as October. I should say there is about a 50-50 chance it will fly in May or June.

Now, turning to Skybolt——

Senator Engle. May I ask a question there?

Secretary McNamara. Yes.

Senator Engle. What is the use of building a prototype if you are not going to fly it?

Secretary McNamara. This was a question we faced 2 years ago and again last year. We had spent about $1 billion up to that point without achieving a flyable airplane. It seemed wise to us to spend the small amount of funds required to, in effect, translate the billion dollar's worth of development work up to that point into metal, and achieve the advantages from test flight that we will achieve—knowledge of mach 3 flight in an airplane of this size. It will add definitely to our knowledge of aeronautics, and it seems worth while to me to proceed with the small expenditures required to achieve that knowledge.

Senator Engle. That is to go the rest of the distance——

Secretary McNamara. Yes, sir.

Senator Engle. And to preserve for you the alternative in case you might be wrong in this decision?

Secretary McNamara. Yes, sir.

Senator Engle. Thank you.

Senator Case. Not the weapons system.

Secretary McNamara. Not the weapons systems, just the airplane and the associated systems, which include a bomb navigation system in a prototype form and which includes substantial development of associated sensor equipment that can be used on that or other planes.

Senator Stennis (presiding). All right, Mr. Secretary, proceed.

2. BOMBER FORCES

We plan to continue a mixed force of missiles and manned bombers throughout the entire planning period—1964-68. Although most of the aiming points in the Soviet target system can be best attacked by missiles, the long-range bombers will still be useful in followup attack, particularly on certain hardened targets. Accordingly, all 14 of the B-52 wings will be maintained in the force.

Senator Goldwater. Will you yield at that point?

Senator Stennis. All right, Senator.

Senator Goldwater. Is this figure 615 in 1962 the total inventory?

Secretary McNamara. No. The next sentence states that advance attrition aircraft have been procured with prior year funds to support this force. The B-47 subsonic medium bombers will be completely phased out of the forces by the end of fiscal year 1966 on the same schedule I presented last year. We still have about 700 B-47's in the force, operational force.

Senator Goldwater. How many would that be?

Secretary McNamara. I do not know how many we have on hand estimated for 1968. I will be happy to check them for you for the record.

(The material requested is classified and has been furnished separately to the Committee on Armed Services.)

Senator Goldwater. Would it be 200 or 300?

Secretary McNamara. Oh, no, nothing like that. There might be enough to cover attrition; attrition on B-52's is not great, and I would guess it would be on the order of [deleted]; something on that order.

Senator Goldwater. I will get that later?

Secretary McNamara. [Deleted], I am told.

Senator Goldwater. I doubt very seriously that you can reach 1968 with the figure you have today, even with [deleted] coming into the inventory.

Secretary McNamara. This is 1968 we will have [deleted] left above the 630 or did I give [deleted] in the attrition reserve for 1968.

Senator Goldwater. You will have [deleted] left?

Secretary McNamara. Yes.

Senator Goldwater. How many do you have now?

Secretary McNamara. We have procured a total of 744 aircraft. I would like to check this figure for the record, Senator Goldwater. These are the Air Force figures, and I believe they are calculated correctly.

Senator Goldwater. The reason I rather questioned it was that General Powers last year in testimony before the Preparedness Subcommittee gave the life of this aircraft from 10 to 15 years, and by 1968 some of them will already have gone through their 10-year period.

Secretary McNamara. Yes, but not the 15-year period.

Senator Goldwater. Yes. Well, that is true. But the normal rates of attrition, I do not think will support this table. I will be ready to argue that this afternoon.

Secretary McNamara. I think the Air Force is the one to argue it with because they prepared the figures and they consider them on the conservative side.

Senator Stennis. All right, Mr. Secretary, proceed.

Secretary McNamara. Proceeding then in the middle of the page, the B-47 subsonic medium bombers will be gradually phased out of the forces over the next several years. Some of these aircraft could be continued in operation for a longer period of time than now planned if the need should arise over the next year or two Two wings of the B-58 supersonic medium bombers will be continued in the force throughout the program period.

Some of these aircraft could be continued in operation for a longer period of time than now planned if the need should arise over the next year or 2. The B-58 supersonic medium bombers, of which two wings totaling 80 operational aircraft are now in the force, will also be retained at least through our 5-year planning period. [Deleted.]

Senator Goldwater. What is your total of attrition aircraft at the present time?

Secretary McNamara. I would like to insert that in the record, if I may, Senator Goldwater, for the B-58.

(The material requested is classified and has been furnished separately to the Committee on Armed Services.)

Senator Goldwater. Isn't 80 about the total force structure?

Secretary McNamara. Eighty is the total authorized unit equipment aircraft.

Senator Goldwater. And we are not building any more?

Secretary McNamara. We are not building any more. [Deleted.]

Senator Goldwater. And 10 years is about the life expectancy of this?

Secretary McNamara. Yes; it may be less. We have so much trouble with it that it is possible that its life expectancy would be less than 10 years, not because of the factors associated with life per se but rather because of poor operational experience with it, although I am told that many of our problems have been corrected and that it is anticipated the aircraft will function satisfactorily.

In summary, by the end of fiscal year 1968 we would still have a total of about 700 operational bombers in the force.

Since July 1961 we have maintained approximately 50 percent of the manned bomber force on a 15-minute ground alert. Because this measure is essential to the survival of the force in a ballistic missile attack, we plan to continue it throughout the program period. But I should caution that a 15-minute ground alert may not be sufficient to safeguard the bomber force—particularly during the latter part of this decade. By that time the Soviet Union could have a large number of missile-firing submarines on station within reach of most of our bomber bases. The increasing missile threat underscores both the importance of maintaining our on-the-shelf airborne alert capability and the value of the special provisions contained in section 512b of the fiscal year 1963 Defense Appropriation Act. This is the section which authorizes the Secretary of Defense, upon determination by the President that such action is necessary, to provide for the cost of an airborne alert as an excepted expense. This provision should be retained in the law.

Although we are planning to continue the present airborne alert training program and the maintenance of an on-the-shelf capability to fly one-eighth of the force for 1 year, we must always be ready to increase promptly the scale of this operation. Indeed, during the early phases of the Cuban crisis last year, we did just that. We may be able to finance the additional cost of that action from our current year's appropriations, in which case we may not have to resort to section 512b this year; provided, of course, that no new crisis again forces us to expand our airborne alert operations.

Senator Symington. What is the amount of money involved in that section 512b, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary McNamara. It is an unlimited authorization to carry out an airborne alert.

Senator Symington. There is no limitation on the money?

Secretary McNamara. No, sir; I do not believe there is.

Senator Stennis. That was put in the appropriation bill, was it not?

Secretary McNamara. That is correct.

Senator Stennis. That was a compromise on the way the argument was met about the unforeseen possibilities and need for an alert.

Secretary McNamara. Although we did put a one-eighth alert in effect in the Cuban crisis, as I mentioned earlier, we hoped to be able to cover the cost of all the incremental costs associated with the Cuban crisis in our regular budget without a deficiency appropriation.

Senator Symington. I remember when it came up before the Appropriations Subcommittee. But it said "incurred deficiencies," and I was wondering if there was any limitation on the deficiencies you are allowed to handle unless there is a formal recognition of trouble.

Secretary McNamara. No; I do not believe there are.

Senator Symington. Thank you.

Secretary McNamara. Now, turning to ICBM's and Polaris missiles.

Senator Stennis. Just a minute. Have you finished down to there?

Secretary McNamara. Yes, sir.

Senator Stennis. I believe this will be a good stopping place.

Are there any special questions now or brief questions from any member?

Senator Goldwater. Mr. Chairman, when he finishes page 64, we will review the whole thing?

Senator Stennis. Certainly, no one is precluded from asking questions.

All right, without any questions at this time, the committee will resume at 2:30.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I compliment the distinguished Senator for finding economies in the bill, particularly with reference to the 3-percent reduction made below the line, but I am very much concerned about a 3-percent reduction, or an amount similar to that, in respect to funds for repair and improvement of the bomber forces.

As the distinguished Senator knows, nothing in the bill before the Senate would provide anything that even looks like a bomber within the next fiscal year.

The flying platform and the development of the RS-70 may produce a bomber in 5 years. The other planes which we are considering are either tankers, cargo planes, fighters, trainers, or helicopters.

I am in favor of this program; but I feel that, in the absence of any availability of a new bomber for us to put into the inventory this year, we should be very careful. The distinguished Senator has often said that he does not like to rely solely on missiles, and that we should have a man-piloted bomber force. I feel that it is incumbent upon us, since there will be no new bombers produced this year, to see to it that the repair, maintenance, and improvement possible for the B-52's, the B-47's, the B-58's, and B-66's, or other existing bombers, be made, in order to protect us during the period when there will be no new models of long-distance strategic bomber aircraft.

I wonder if the bill is so tightly written, on the 3-percent reduction, that the modification of, and improvement of the existing bomber fleet would be hampered, so that we could not maximize the utilization of the aircraft we have on hand.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that same question occurred to me when the committee was considering this item and before it was approved by the committee.

In the first place, a very large sum of money is involved. The figure is classified, but it is considerably more than a half billion dollars for the modification, repair, and improvement of all types of aircraft.

The Senator is well aware that the Strategic Air Command, in numbers, is a very small portion of the total air fleet which is operated by the Department of the Air Force. In my opinion, there is not the slightest possibility of the Bomber Command suffering in any way.

Another thing which led me to conclude that there was not any reason for writing language in the bill to set aside a special amount for the bombers is that the Department of Defense is phasing out the B-47's much faster than it thought it would at the time of the Berlin crisis. The Department is phasing out that bomber, which is the oldest in service, with very great rapidity. Frankly, I think it is being done too rapidly.

The bill provides an amount which would afford adequate funds to take care of the B-52's, the B-58's, and the tanker fleet.

Mr. MONRONEY. And the B-66's? That is a very fast plane, reconnaissance and bomber.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. That is very limited in the inventory.

Mr. MONRONEY. There is a limited number. I do not wish to retire those aircraft too early, because of lack of availability of funds to keep them modern, up to date, and safe. Experience in the past has always seemed to be that the Department has run out of funds and postponed for 3 or 6 months the work with respect to modification and improvement of the planes which are available today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not know that there had been any great deferment for lack of funds in this area in the past several years, because, generally speaking, we have allowed the amount of money the Defense Department has sought. As I said before, the Department of Defense has dipped very liberally into this fund and transferred money for the purpose of acquiring other military equipment which is not in anywise related to the Strategic Air Command. There is no doubt that the funds are adequate. If they are not, the Secretary of Defense has emergency authority in the Defense Appropriations Act and he could transfer for this purpose.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished Senator from Georgia is not only chairman of the Armed Services Committee, but also chairman of the Armed Services Appropriations Subcommittee, and when the matter comes before his committee, may we be sure that there will be enough money provided for modernization of our existing air fleet?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to see to that. We have an understanding with the Department of Defense on that score. I do not anticipate any difficulty in securing an understanding that the Strategic Air Command should have priority. A greater difficulty is the speed of eliminating B-47's from the active forces and the storing of the aircraft in cocoons out in Arizona.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is because they are worn out. I hope Senators realize that there is nothing in the inventory plans beyond the B-52, which is 4 or 5 years beyond the design stage, or the B-47, which reaches to before that period. We have nothing in the way of inventory. The Air Force is not encouraging the replacement of a long-range bomber. The bill carries no funds for long-range bombers, because there is none in being.

Sure, the RS-70 may be a weapons system in 5 years, if we are lucky, but we should be looking for improvements of the B-52 or the B-58, and we should get improvements off the shelf to modernize our bomber fleet, which is rapidly becoming obsolescent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator, but the only point on which I could disagree is that he is apprehensive that the 3-percent reduction will cripple that effort.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not apprehensive.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Department has enough money to keep those planes flying if they want to apply the money for that purpose.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To support the committee's position, I think the modernization and spare parts funds have been used quite extensively for reprograming, and that the estimates are of a generous size.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not concerned with spare parts, but with the actual work.

It would be the Senator's feeling that all funds necessary should be available to keep in the Strategic Air Command the most modern and recent bombers?

Mr. RUSSELL. They should have priority—not only the most recent bombers, but all the planes of our Strategic Air Command capable of performing their mission, whether they are in the last category or the first. I am one who believes that the B-47 has considerable use in that command.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree, as a member of the committee.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. Did the Defense Department continue the program on the mobile midrange ballistic missile program?

Mr. RUSSELL. Is that the mobile program for the intercontinental missile?

Mr. HARTKE. No; the mobile midrange ballistic missile.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is money provided in the program for research and development.

Mr. HARTKE. Did the Defense Department request it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. HARTKE. They approved of it?

Mr. RUSSELL. We have approved of that, with the 3 percent reduction that applies to all research and development items.

Mr. HARTKE. I am not questioning whether the committee approved it, but whether the Department of Defense did.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The Department of Defense made a request for it. I hope the Department will follow through better than they did on the mobile intercontinental ballistic missile program. We were convinced that was a very promising deterrent, and yet that program was phased out before it was developed.

Mr. HARTKE. Is any money being spent on it?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; not for research and development.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do so only to make the suggestion to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] that perhaps his motion is now in order. I thought we ought to expedite the business of the Senate, because I anticipate that after he makes his statement there will be a good deal of discussion.

I respectfully suggest to the majority leader that the motion be made, because the distinguished Senator from Nebraska will second the motion, as I understand, and that will automatically resolve the Senate into closed session. We can then hear the Senator's statement. But prior to that, perhaps we should have a quorum call.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Senate Armed Services Committee amendment to authorize the appropriation of $196 million to put the component parts of the Nike-Zeus system in production.

Before asking that the doors be closed, on account of the classified material that will be brought out, I should like to refer to a couple of matters.

One is as to the cost of this weapons system. I think we may as well get the figures straight now. Figures have been brought out on this matter. I should now like to give the correct figures for this system.

The Department of Defense estimates that the Nike-X system will cost $17,607 million.

The Department of Defense estimates that advancing the Nike-Zeus and the Nike-X system will cost $20,370 million.

In other words, the Department of Defense estimates that, to go forward with the Zeus system along with the X system, will cost $2.8 billion more.

The Army estimates that the X system will cost $12,625 million, and that advancing the Zeus with the X system will cost $14,124 million.

In other words, the Army estimates it will cost, to advance the Zeus system along with the X system, $1½ billion more.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from South Carolina said he wanted to get the accurate figures into the record. Those are the exact figures I gave in differentiating the two. I said the Defense Department estimated it would cost $2,800 million.

Mr. THURMOND. I may say that these figures were checked yesterday by the Department of the Army representative and the Defense Department. So, the only question here is not whether or not we are going forward with a $20 billion system. The plan is to develop a system. The Army is developing the system. The plan is to go forward with the system, and it is simply a question of whether or not we are going to agree today to put $196 million in the bill to put the component parts in production, with a total increase in cost of advancing this system. As I shall go into more detail after the doors are closed, the additional cost will be somewhere between $1½ billion, as estimated by the Army, and $2.8 billion as estimated by the Department of Defense.

I believe that the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has been quoted as not favoring this system. On Air Force matters the Chief of Staff of the Air Force would certainly be a great authority. This, however, is an Army matter. I would assume that the Army people would be the best authorities on this question. Notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary of Defense prefers to delay on this question of Zeus, the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Wheeler, answered clearly and succinctly as to where he stands on this question in the hearings on the military procurement authorization for fiscal year 1964 of the Senate Armed Services Committee, at the bottom of page 547 and going over to page 548. I asked General Wheeler whether his thinking was in line with the Army on the Nike-Zeus. General Wheeler answered "Yes, sir."

I quote further from the testimony:

> Senator THURMOND. The Nike-Zeus should be developed?
>
> General WHEELER. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator THURMOND. What is your feeling if Nike-Zeus is not developed, is not made available as early as possible, do you think there might be a defense gap?
>
> General WHEELER. This, of course, is where you get into a judgment factor, Senator THURMOND.
>
> My own feeling is that the advantages in protection of a goodly number of millions of people, and a large segment of our economy by deploying as early as possible is worth the additional cost of about $2.8 billion, as I recall. The Army proposal basically is to deploy as soon as possible what the state of the art will permit now and then move toward the Nike-X concept as R. & D. and production will let us do so.
>
> The figures, there is a gap of about [deleted]. I would say if nothing happens in those [deleted], why delaying until [deleted] perhaps is wise. But if something does happen, I think it would be deplorable.

Mr. President, that is the position of the Chief of Staff of the Army, a four-star general. This is an Army system, not an Air Force system.

On Friday, March 29, 1963, there appeared an article on the front page of the Evening Star, which I hold in my hand. The headline reads: "Taylor Sees Red Victory in Antimissile Race—Hearing Shows Rift in Pentagon Over Developing Nike-Zeus Defense." The article was written by Richard Frykland. It states:

> "We face the possibility of a cold war defeat," Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, believes, because the Russians may beat this country to an antimissile missile.
>
> General Taylor also told Congress that he disagrees with a decision by Secretary of Defense McNamara to further postpone installation of the first American defense against enemy ICBM's.
>
> The dispute was revealed today in a transcript of testimony by high Defense officials before the House Armed Services Appropriations Subcommittee. Congressmen questioned Mr. McNamara and General Taylor on the new defense budget in closed sessions in February.

Then General Taylor refers to the propaganda victory in connection with this matter. The article states:

> Despite the technological problems, General Taylor told the subcommittee, the first side to get an antimissile missile into operation will at least score a propaganda victory.
>
> If the Zeus had been put into production when General Taylor first recommended it, in the Army's fiscal year 1959 budget request, the first units would have been installed this year.
>
> "We would have had a technological triumph over the Soviets," General Taylor told the subcommittee.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The censored transcript does not reveal whether General Taylor told the subcommittee about Russian progress in missile defense, but Defense officials do believe the Reds may be installing the weapons today.
>
> Intelligence reports say the Russians are building a complex of missile sites around Leningrad. It is possible, according to intelligence analysts, that they are a Zeus-type antimissile missile.

That is a portion of the article which appeared in the Evening Star. It shows clearly where the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stands on this subject. He is a former Army general. He went out of service and came back. He takes the same position today, even though it is contrary to the Secretary of Defense, as he took when he was Chief of Staff of the Army some years ago.

Mr. President, in order to discuss this matter and the really pertinent facts which bear on the issue, reference must be made to facts which are classified, the divulgence of which would affect the security of the Nation. If anyone doubts that the pertinent facts are classified, he need only examine the hearings in the Senate Armed Services Committee on the pending bill, the hearings on the same matter before the House Armed Services Committee, and the House Appropriations Committee hearings on the Defense Department's appropriations, and it will be obvious that the major part of the testimony, and even some of the questions, are deleted for security reasons. Senators have not had an opportunity to read the classified transcript of the hearings, and no knowledgeable decision can be made without a consideration of all the facts which bear on this admittedly technical and vital issue. The discussion of this subject, therefore, requires secrecy.

Mr. President, I therefore move, under the provisions of standing rule of the Senate XXXV that the doors of the Senate be closed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I second the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion has been made and seconded that the Senate go into closed session. Pursuant to rule XXXV, the Chair now directs the Sergeant at Arms to clear the galleries and to close the doors, and that all officials of the Senate not cleared for secrecy be excluded from the Chamber.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Chair makes that ruling——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. William H. Darden, of the professional staff of the Armed Services Committee, and the only member of that staff who attends the hearings when the CIA presents its matter to the committee, be permitted to stay in the Chamber. He is charged with secret documents and records which pertain to this matter. I might be handicapped in finding them if he were excluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask the same privilege for Mr. Fred B. Rhodes, Jr., a member of the Appropriations Committee——

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I cannot hear what the Senator is saying. Will the Senator repeat his request?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask the same privilege for Mr. Fred B. Rhodes, Jr., who is the senior clerk of the minority staff of the Appropriations Committee, and who has worked on this subject in the Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Committee. I ask that he be permitted to remain in the Chamber. He has the highest secrecy clearance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Chair has ordered that the Sergeant at Arms clear the galleries?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And also that the Chamber is to be cleared except for those persons who are to be in the Chamber by right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; other than those persons who are sworn to secrecy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has the Chair indicated that he intends to order the Sergeant at Arms to place guards at all entrances to the Chamber, so that no person who is not entitled to access will be in a position to come in or to go out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the customary procedure; and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, after the doors have been closed, I suggest that there be a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bells are ringing now.

(At 1 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m. the doors of the Chamber were closed.)

At the conclusion of the closed-door session, the doors were reopened, at 6:10 o'clock p.m., and the Senate was called to order by Hon. DANIEL B. BREWSTER, a Senator from the State of Maryland.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Chair state the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to strike out on page 3, lines 14 to 16, the following: "$746,700,000 of which amount $196,000,000 is authorized only for production of component parts of the Nike-Zeus system," and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "$550,700,000," so that the section will read as follows:

> MISSILES
>
> For the Army, $550,700,000; for the Navy, $1,095,100,000; for the Marine Corps, $14,700,000; for the Air Force, $2,101,200,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virigina (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 16, as follows:

(No. 57 Leg. in closed session.)

[No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dominick
Engle
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Humphrey
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—16

Case
Curtis
Dodd
Douglas
Ervin
Fong

Hartke
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
McClellan
Smith,
Sparkman
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—26

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Beall
Bennett
Byrd. W. Va.
Carlson
Clark
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Goldwater
Hill
Holland
Kefauver
Long, Mo.
McNamara
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Scott
Simpson
Symington
Tower
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like, first of all, to commend the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] for the splendid presentation he has made today. He has presented in a forthright, candid, dedicated manner crucial facts which every Senator ought to know. I believe he has opened some eyes here today. I congratulate him for what he has done and I am proud to support the position he has taken.

I also wish to express my deep regard, respect, and, if I may say so, my affection for the great senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] who has once again shown his characteristic mastery of the factors involved in our national defense. Watching him today has been an inspiration and an education to me and to all of us. Because of my vast respect for his judgment, I am deeply disturbed over the fact that I might take an opposite view on this issue.

I have for some years now been concerned over the lag in our anti-missile missile program.

Speaking about this matter on the floor of the Senate, on May 12, 1960, I said that the development of the antimissile missile by either side would have strategic implications comparable to the development of the A-bomb or H-bomb.

I pointed out that the corps of exceptionally competent scientists and engineers who had been working on the Nike-Zeus project for the U.S. Army were completely convinced that the problems of guidance and of a suitable warhead could be solved. Indeed, they believed their project was far enough along at that time to warrant the advanced procurement of vital components.

I said that I was sufficiently impressed by the progress of the project and by the confidence of the men responsible for it, to favor a full-speed-ahead program.

But for some strange reason, the responsible authorities ruled that there should be no procurement until the Nike-Zeus had been completely tested and proved as a weapons system.

I want to point out that the Nike-Zeus project has from the beginning had the unqualified backing of the Army Chief of Staff. Only several weeks ago, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, told the House Armed Services Appropriations Subcommittee that we face the possibility of a cold war defeat if the Russians beat this country to an antimissile missile. General Taylor pointed out that if the Zeus had been put into production when he first recommended it in 1959, the first unit would be installed this year.

The Nike-X system on which the Army is now working may ultimately prove to be more effective than the Nike-Zeus. But the research on the Nike-X system is still in its infancy and it will probably be a number of years, at the best, before we are in a position to construct Nike-X installations to defend our cities.

Even admitting the imperfections in the Nike-Zeus, I think that we would have been in a far stronger position today and in the critical years ahead of us, if we had followed the Army's recommendations in 1959.

Obviously, some kind of antimissile system, even an imperfect one, is better than none. And clearly it is our duty to provide ourselves at every juncture with the most effective weapons our technology makes possible—knowing that such weapons may be superseded within the decade by weapons systems of greatly improved effectiveness.

I know that in certain scientific quarters there is a psychological opposition to the antimissile missile because they believe that this would upset the precarious balance of power between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In his speech at Cornell University last January 5, Dr. Hans Bethe reiterated his oft-stated opinion that the anti-ICBM is "virtually hopeless." Dr. Bethe has by no means been alone in the expression of such negative opinions. I am certain that all of these opinions have represented honest estimates. But their net effect has been to create so much doubt in the minds of the responsible authorities that the Defense Department refused to engage in procurement for an anti-missile-missile program until it had passed all the tests. In consequence, even if further developments demonstrate the capability of an antimissile missile beyond any possibility of doubt, several precious and irretrievable years will have been lost in providing our people with the protection of an antimissile defense.

I find it difficult to understand Dr. Bethe's persistently negative attitude on the question of the antimissile missile, just as I find it difficult to understand the persistent tendency of the school of scientific advisers to which he belongs to discount the importance of all potential developments in the field of nuclear weapons technology.

In the case of Dr. Bethe and the anti-ICBM, I have reason to believe that his negativism may be another manifestation of his tendency to tailor his scientific opinions to conform with his political views.

Dr. Bethe, as I have already pointed out, believes that we are all safer if the Soviets enjoy near-parity with the United States in nuclear weapons. This situation in his opinion creates a "stable deterrent." In an article written for the Christian Science Monitor last March 3, Dr. Bethe, after again stating his belief that there is no effective anti-ICBM system, concluded with the words: "But I believe that this is good because after all we want the stable deterrent to remain stable."

I note with satisfaction that Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his recent presentation to Congress, asked for funds for the development of the Nike-X, an advanced derivation from the Nike research.

As I did three years ago when I first addressed myself to this subject, I would again urge that the development of the antimissile missile be given top priority and that, in the light of the highly encouraging progress recently made, we honor the Army's request for advance procurement in the interest of expediting the program.

The prospect of an effective antimissile missile again brings us back to the importance of the neutron bomb. Because, of all the developments now on the horizon, the neutron bomb offers perhaps the greatest promise for use as an antimissile warhead in the Nike-X system on which the Army is now working.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "$2,159,600,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$2,293,600,000."

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I am offering this amendment, which would add $134 million authorization for two additional nuclear submarines which were included in the bill as it passed the House. I feel that the House took very wise action on this, and the House fully justified the action taken as explained in the House committee report.

Mr. President, I read from the House report No. 62 the section on "Attack Submarines":

ATTACK SUBMARINES

As indicated under "Explanation of Amendments," the committee added two attack or "killer" submarines to the six which were requested in the bill as submitted to the Congress. The committee wishes to point out that the Department of the Navy had requested the Secretary of Defense to include not six, but eight, of these submarines in the bill. The Secretary of Defense, however, made the decision that six was the proper number.

Historically the submarine has always been strictly a weapon of opportunity because of its extremely low speed submerged and because of the short range of its weapons. Its targets have been limited necessarily to those ships which happen to come within its small combat range. Nuclear power has transformed the submarine into a ship able to operate submerged for unlimited periods at speeds in excess of all except the few very fastest surface ships. There is now almost no target which cannot be overtaken and destroyed. This makes the submarine a tremendously more vital ship in future naval warfare than its diesel-electric predecessor.

The Soviets represent the main threat to our security. Our ability to contain and defeat that threat will depend on our sea power and its ability to protect our own sea lanes and to deny portions of the sea to the Soviets.

The primary threat to our sea power is the Russian submarine. While Russia today does have a significant numerical advantage in the total size of her submarine forces, we have an advantage in the number of nuclear powered submarines. However, current trends indicate that it will not be too far in the future when the Soviet nuclear submarine strength will approximate the entire U.S. attack submarine force level.

Our present inventory of attack submarines contains a large number of conventional submarines, some post-World War II, but a large number are World War II ships.

Further modernization or conversion of World War II submarines is not practicable either from a cost effectiveness or operational standpoint. No conventional submarine can be modernized to give it a significant combat capability against nuclear submarines. The most that can be accomplished by modernizing conventional submarines is an increased interim ASW capability against other conventional submarines. Our World War II submarines are 20 years old and plagued with material difficulties. The most that can be accomplished for these submarines is some improvement in material condition and a marginal increase in combat capability. However, by the early 1970's the World War II submarines will be approximately 30 years old and they can expect to have problems of reliability and safety even if modernized.

The nuclear attack submarine represents a weapons system with a capability several orders of magnitude greater than the conventional submarine (modernized or otherwise) in almost every area essential to combatant capability: increased maximum and sustained speed, vastly increased endurance, increased test depth, greatly improved passive and active sonar, large reduction in radiated noise with resultant low detectability by passive sonar system, increased detection and search capability, and increased kill capability. These effectiveness factors are true whether SSN's are deployed in forward areas acting independently in area patrols, or are units of a barrier acting in concert with other ASW forces. The kill capability of the SSN in either deployment is manifold that of the conventional submarine against conventional submarine targets. Against nuclear submarine targets they are effective, while the conventional submarines are relatively ineffective regardless of the scheme of employment. Against future enemy nuclear submarines, contacts will be less frequent and therefore enemy contact must be exploited to insure a kill to the maximum extent possible. A barrier must live up to its name. Detection and kill is the object, not solely early warning.

With the increasing threat of enemy nuclear submarines, conventionally powered submarines will progressively become inadequate to the task. Moreover, as Soviet capabilities increase, the long submerged endurance and high submerged speed of nuclear submarines become primary requisites. With respect to Soviet SSN the United States has a 4- to 5-year lead. This lead has been developed at great expense and effort and can be maintained only through a shipbuilding program which modernizes our submarine forces at a rate commensurate with the threat. Construction of eight SSN per year is the minimum program to insure the modernization of our submarine force against the developing threat.

I yield to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Maine for her amendment and to associate myself with her in supporting the amendment. She has always been a champion of the very necessary and vital submarine as a weapon.

Our sympathy goes out to the loved ones of those who have lost their lives in the service of their country, however, many of us still believe the *Thresher* will be to the submarine, in its future development, what the Alamo was to Texas. It will be a tragic inspiration to improve the safety and efficiency of nuclear submarines and make them what they are destined to be—the effective right arm of America's striking powder.

I am heartily in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Maine. I think the people of this Nation should realize and appreciate the long, hard fight that she has made for this effective weapon.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire.

I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff].

THE LOSS OF THE SUBMARINE "THRESHER"

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I think I speak the sentiment of every Member of the Senate in expressing sadness at the loss of the submarine *Thresher*. The *Thresher* operated out of the Connecticut submarine base. Many of the brave men who went down with that ship were residents of the State of Connecticut, many coming from the New London and Groton area.

Those men and the people who live in the New London-Groton area have always been aware of the hazards faced by the men who go out in submarines, whether in peace or war. Yet there are many others who forget these hazards.

It just so happens that from my front porch, overlooking New London Harbor, one can always see the submarines going down the Thames River, out of the harbor, and into the sea, and coming back again.

It was also my great privilege, when I was Governor of Connecticut, to have participated in many celebrations that took place when the nuclear submarines were racking up the fantastic records they made, indicating the new era of the nuclear-powered submarine.

It was also my privilege to know many officers and men who operated out of the submarine base in the New London-Groton area. I think there is no group of men in the Nation, whether in the Armed Forces or out, who represent more intellectual qualities, physical courage, and emotional balance than do the men who operate the submarine force of the United States of America. They are all hand picked.

The loss of this submarine is a great tragedy and a great loss to our country.

I express, on behalf of myself, and I know I do for all the other Members of the Senate, deep sympathy to the families of those men who were lost when the *Thresher* went down.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. This is another example where we had better err in the direction of too much rather than too little, when there is requested an increase of six to eight of these submarines, and when we realize that in certain parts of the world it is reported to us that our submarine force is the best defensive weapon we have, as well as the best offensive weapon.

I am thinking, for example, of the waters of the Alaska area, so close to Russia. I am thinking of the waters of Latin America, where we are greatly concerned about the potential influx of Russian submarines, particularly if they are able to get a submarine base nearer to us than they have at the present time. I know we are apparently ahead of them in the quality of our submarines, but we certainly are not ahead of them yet in quantity.

Therefore, we should not take a chance. I would rather make a mistake in the direction of providing too much than too little, in providing submarines. Therefore, I am happy to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. I am grateful to the distinguished Senator for his support and for his kind remarks.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I feel I would be remiss if I did not express my commendation to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] for the motion he made last night that the Senate go into executive, or closed, session, in order to discuss the subject which he proposed to the Senate today.

Debates are intended to analyze, synthesize, inform, eliminate the chaff, and produce the grain, so that intelligent judgment can be achieved. I did not vote in conformity with the views of the Senator from South Carolina, but I can definitely state that, in my 6 years and 3 months in the Senate, at no time has an issue been discussed with the clarity, with the concept of full information and sincerity, as was the issue this afternoon.

We sat here, I think, for about 3 hours, with no time wasted, no distraction from the discussion, on the floor or in the galleries, and no distraction from people moving back and forth.

I learned today, more than I learned before in 6½ years, certain aspects about our military posture.

I owe my thanks for the information thus acquired to the Senator from South Carolina.

I want to say to the Senator that frequently, as important issues arise, I hope we shall again have the same type of meeting we had today. I, of course, would not subscribe to the general proposition that there be private meetings without the public's knowing what was going on; but there are times when confidential matters have to be discussed. This afternoon's meeting showed the effectiveness of a discussion such as we had.

I commend the Senator from South Carolina for his thoughtfulness, and I thank him for making available to me today information that will aid me in the future. I also thank the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] for his help in guiding my course in the future.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator for his kindness.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Ohio in what he has said. It was a most interesting afternoon. The audience to the discussion was very much interested in what went on. I believe it was a beneficial couple of hours in a discussion of very important subjects.

I wish to commend not only the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who in my opinion has performed a real public service, but also the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who ably defended the point of view which he advocated. The matter is now settled. I express the hope that we will not have another meeting of this kind for at least a quarter of a century.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the words of condolence and sympathy which have been expressed to the next of kin and friends and survivors of the men who went down in the atomic-powered submarine *Thresher*. It is always a great tragedy when men go down to the sea in ships and do not return. It is especially true in the case of these men, who went out on this trial run, testing the diving capability of this atomic-powered submarine.

I may say, Mr. President, that we have been rather fortunate in years gone by in not having lost an atomic-powered submarine. We have a large number of the *Thresher* class, and many more in production.

This is the first such submarine we have lost through an accident of this kind, and I pray a benign Providence will vouchsafe it the last.

I should like to be in a position to accept the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Maine. I cannot in good conscience do so, however, because I do not believe that the addition of these two attack submarines to the six that are already included in the bill, is justifiable at this time.

The amendment does not refer to a Polaris-type submarine, but to an antisubmarine submarine. As the committee report indicates, 39 nuclear-powered attack submarines have been authorized in previous programs, 19 of which will have joined the fleet by the end of this fiscal year. Others will be added through the year 1968.

The fact that we have lost a submarine of this type should cause us to defer action on the amendment if for no other reason. The submarines that are involved in the amendment and involved in the bill are the same class as the one lost, the *Thresher* type. Until we have some report from the board of inquiry on what caused this submarine to fail and to bring about this tragic result, we can very well defer the addition of these two submarines.

The bill provides authorization of appropriations for the construction of 6 of these nuclear-powered attack submarines, in addition to the 39 that are already authorized. Senators will bear in mind that this is not the Polaris-type submarine, but is in the nature of an antisubmarine submarine. It is a very expensive submarine. It costs about $67 million.

In view of the tremendous additions that we have made to the fleet by way of construction and contract for the next few years, we can defer this proposal for these two additional submarines of this type until we find out what caused the catastrophe to the *Thresher* submarine.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Georgia, in his splendid tribute to the men of the *Thresher*. I was born and raised a few miles from the submarine base at New London. I still have a home nearby. I have known many, many people in the submarine service. They are very fine and wonderful people, and they have served our country for a long period of time with devotion, courage, and self sacrifice. This tragedy came as a numbing shock to the people of Connecticut and the people of the country. It is a reminder to all of us that these men of the submarine service, and their families, live in the shadow of death at all times, in peace and in war. I offer no opinion on the merits of the amendment, but I did not want this occasion to pass without joining in the tribute to the men of the submarine *Thresher*, and expressing my deep sorrow to their families.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not discuss this subject at any great length. We all know that the bravest men and the most active and venturesome young men volunteer for this type of duty. None of these men is conscripted. Everyone of them is a volunteer. They are the finest men we have. When we lose this many men in one submarine, there is no way to calculate the value that we have lost. We know the submarine costs $67 million, but that does not approximate the cost of the loss to the Nation.

The attack submarine program recommended by the President and the Secretary of Defense in the fiscal year 1964-68 program submitted to Congress in January contemplates a force of over 100 ships excluding 41 Polaris types. When this program is completed, well over half of the force will be nuclear-powered and nearly all of the remainder would be modernized conventional-powered submarines.

While the nuclear-powered attack submarine is a very important element in our Nation's antisubmarine warfare capability, it is not the only one that is important. Some authorities believe the Navy is better off in the size of its nuclear-powered attack submarine force than it is in other elements of a well balanced antisubmarine capability.

The committee labored earnestly and valiantly to make some reductions in the bill this year. Since this committee amendment involves a difference with the House, the matter will be in conference if the Senate rejects the amendment of the Senator from Maine. If the Senate were to make this addition, I am sure the other programs that are not justified by the budget estimates that have been recommended by the President and by the Secretary of Defense could prove to be equally appealing.

Much as I dislike to do so, I must reluctantly urge the Senate to accede to the budget recommendations of the President and the Secretary of Defense, which have been very generous in this submarine field, and to stand by the committee's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators who have spoken so highly of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I have the privilege of serving on that committee. I appreciate his patience and tolerance in his dealings with all of us throughout the hearings.

I fully acknowledge the right of our distinguished chairman to his opinion. I respect him and his opinions even though I differ with him on the subject dealt with in my amendment.

I think that the headlines in the papers today illustrate the wisdom of this amendment. I refer to the tragic loss of the submarine *Thresher*.

In my opinion, we would be wise to authorize the two additional submarines that this amendment proposes. It does not mean that the President would have to order their construction, but it would give him the authority. And that authority would give him greater flexibility with which to cope with such tragic losses as that of the *Thresher*.

This amendment would carry no mandatory obligation. Instead it would give the President greater latitude on meeting our defense requirements—requirements that can quickly change as a result of such developments as the tragedy of the *Thresher*.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McINTYRE. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. At the same time, I should like to join with the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], my neighbor and friend, in support of the amendment.

The tragic event which has occurred in what appears to be one of the greatest of peacetime naval disasters has saddened all of us in New Hampshire. At the same time, we are proud of the outstanding record of the Navy and of our submarine fleet.

We are proud that the type of submarine involved in this tragedy has already proved itself to be one of the greatest fighting submarines in the world. I urge the Senate to add to our growing strength in this nuclear type of submarine. I commend the senior Senator from Maine for offering the amendment.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire. Throughout the years, it was my privilege to work with our beloved former colleague, the late Styles Bridges, who was long a Senator from New Hampshire. It is gratifying to know that we have with us in the Senate Senator COTTON and Senator McINTYRE, who are following in the footsteps of Senator Bridges in doing all that it is possible to do to make our submarine fleet a credit to our Nation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to join in the sentiments of great sorrow expressed by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Maine upon the recent loss of the submarine *Thresher*. Together with other Senators, I am proud to say to the parents and loved ones of the men who were lost that they gave their lives as truly as anyone ever did for their flag and their Nation. Among all military men, the crews of the submarines are at the very top and are among the finest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 59 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Case
Cooper
Cotton
Dodd
Fong
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy
Kuchel
McClellan
McIntyre
Morse
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Ribicoff
Smith
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—48

Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Engle
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Moss
Nelson
Neuberger
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—30

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Clark
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Goldwater
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Kefauver
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McNamara
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Scott
Simpson
Symington
Tower
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So Mrs. SMITH's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed to the committee amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 2440) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the agreement, I understand the Senate will now take up morning-hour business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

CERTAIN STREETS IN VILLAGE OF HEYBURN, IDAHO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of House bill 1087, to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve, and that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 1087) to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 22 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 97, and continuing with the following calendar measures in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 97, will be stated.

CONVEY CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN NEVADA TO COUNTY OF LINCOLN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 873) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the word "approximately", to strike out "2,920" and insert "2,844"; after line 5, to strike out:

> Range 67 east, township 3 south, northwest quarter of section 2; west half, southwest quarter section 2; all of section 3; northeast quarter and northwest quarter and southwest quarter and northeast quarter of southeast quarter and northwest quarter of southeast quarter and southwest quarter of southeast quarter of section 10. Northeast quarter and northwest quarter and southwest quarter of section 15. Also, northeast quarter of southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of southeast quarter and southeast quarter of southeast quarter of section 15. All of section 14. All of southeast quarter of section 11 and southeast quarter of northeast quarter of section 11, and northwest quarter of northwest quarter of section 11.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

The northwest quarter, west half of southwest quarter section 2; all section 3; north half, southwest quarter, west half of southeast quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter section 10; southeast quarter of northeast quarter, northwest quarter of northwest quarter, southeast quarter, section 11; all section 14; north half, southwest quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter of northwest quarter of southeast quarter, southeast quarter of southeast quarter section 15, all in township 3 south, range 67 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Nevada.

On page 4, after line 8, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 6. This Act shall not preclude the county of Lincoln from acquiring title or leases to any lands described in this Act for public or recreational purposes under the Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended (43 U.S.C. 869, et seq.).

And, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 7. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of any of the following named minerals for which the land is deemed valuable or prospectively valuable: coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, together with the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, upon the payment of the purchase price by the county into the Treasury of the United States, not more than five years after the Secretary has notified the county of such price, which shall be an amount equal to the sum of the costs of extinguishing any adverse claims to the lands to be patented, the costs of any necessary survey, and the fair market value of the lands as determined by the Secretary after the appraisal of the lands by contract appraisal or otherwise, a patent for the following-described lands, situated in the State of Nevada and comprising approximately 2,844 acres (all range references are to the Mount Diablo base and meridian):

The northwest quarter, west half of southwest quarter, section 2; all section 3; north half, southwest quarter, west half of southeast quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter section 10; southeast quarter of northeast quarter, northwest quarter of northwest quarter, southeast quarter, section 11; all section 14; north half, southwest quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter of northwest quarter of southeast quarter, southeast quarter of southeast quarter section 15, all in township 3 south, range 67 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Nevada.

Sec. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made subject to any existing valid claims against the lands described in the first section of this Act, and to any reservations necessary to protect continuing uses of those lands by the United States.

Sec. 3. Nothing contained in the preceding provisions of this Act shall be construed to preclude the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, from purchasing, in accordance with such preceding provisions, only such portion or portions, by legal subdivision of the public land surveys, of the above-described lands as such county elects, nor shall the purchase by such county of only a portion or portions of such lands be construed to constitute a waiver or relinquishment of any of its rights under this Act to purchase, in accordance with such preceding provisions and by legal subdivisions of the public land surveys, the remainder of such lands, or any portion thereof.

Sec. 4. All moneys received from the conveyance of lands under the terms of this Act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands, except that moneys received as reimbursement for costs of appraisal, surveys, and extinguishing adverse claims may be used by the Secretary for said purposes without appropriation.

Sec. 5. The lands described in section 1 of this Act shall be segregated from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, from the date of approval of this Act until the Secretary shall provide otherwise by publication of an order in the Federal Register.

Sec. 6. This Act shall not preclude the county of Lincoln from acquiring title or leases to any lands described in this Act for public or recreational purposes under the Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended (43 U.S.C. 869, et seq.).

Sec. 7. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of any of the following-named minerals for which the land is deemed valuable or prospectively valuable: coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, together with the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 119), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 873) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 2 line 4, strike out "2,920" and substitute "2,844". This amendment corrects an error in the acreage description in the bill.

On page 2, strike lines 6 through 18 and substitute the following language:

"The northwest quarter, west half of southwest quarter section 2; all section 3; north half, southwest quarter, west half of southeast quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter section 10; southeast quarter of northeast quarter, northwest quarter of northwest quarter, southeast quarter section 11; all section 14; north half, southwest quarter, northeast quarter of southeast quarter of northwest quarter of southeast quarter, southeast quarter of southeast quarter section 15, all in township 3 south, range 67, east, Mount Diablo meridian, Nevada."

This is a technical amendment more accurately describing the legal subdivisions described in the bill.

On page 3, following line 23, add a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 6. This Act shall not preclude the county of Lincoln from acquiring title or leases to any lands described in this Act for public or recreational purposes under the Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended (43 U.S.C. 869, et seq.)."

The purpose of this amendment is to assure that this legislation does not diminish the opportunity for Lincoln County to acquire lands under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.

Add a new section 7 as follows:

"Sec. 7. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of any of the following named minerals for which the land is deemed valuable or prospectively valuable: coal, native asphalt, solid and semi-solid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, together with the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law."

The purpose of this amendment is to reserve minerals to the United States.

PURPOSE

The county of Lincoln has excessively heavy Federal land holdings, and it has desired to develop a broader industrial base. In recent years its rural development committee has been working in cooperation with the Nevada Area Development Committee to achieve this goal. The lands involved are located in Meadow Valley Wash, 6 miles north of Caliente, within an area designated as depressed. It is principally open land of little value for livestock grazing, recreational, or subdivisional use, and of unknown value for agriculture. This legislation will permit Lincoln County to attempt to develop industrial or other uses in this area.

COST

No budgetary increase is involved. The legislation requires that Lincoln County pay the fair market value of the lands plus the cost of necessary surveys and the cost to the Government of extinguishing any adverse claims on the lands involved. In setting the fair market value, the Secretary will be expected to guard against speculative practices and assure that the price paid to the Federal Government is representative of the value of the property and that it will not be resold in a manner disadvantageous to either the Federal Government or to the county of Lincoln.

The legislation provides that the revenue received by the Federal Government will be deposited in the Treasury in the same manner as other public land revenues, but does make available to the Secretary the moneys received from Lincoln County to cover the cost of appraisal, surveys, and extinguishing adverse claims.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION OF NEVADA

The bill (H.R. 277) to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relating to the transfer of certain lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 120), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 277 will extend, for 5 years (i.e., until April 22, 1968), the time within which the Nevada-Colorado River Commission may submit its plan for development of certain areas of public land previously authorized for purchase, and extend for 10 years (i.e., until April 22, 1970) the time within which the State may complete the purchase.

NEED

The act of April 22, 1960 (74 Stat. 74), provides for the conveyance of certain public lands by the Department of the Interior to the State of Nevada. Under the terms of the act it was provided that the Secretary should segregate from all forms of entry under the public land laws, for a 5-year period, approximately 15,000 acres of public lands.

Within 3 years after the effective date of the April 22, 1960, act, the Colorado River Commission is required to submit to the Secretary of the Interior a proposed plan of development for the area referred to above. In the meantime, the Secretary was required "at the earliest practicable date" to have an appraisal made of the fair market value of the lands. Finally, it is provided that, within the 5-year segregation period referred to above, the State of Nevada, acting through the Colorado River Commission, would have a continuing option to purchase the lands involved.

In May 1962, the Department of the Interior advised the Governor of the State of Nevada of the appraised fair market value of the land as of January 1962. Although work by the commission has been proceeding, the development plan has just recently been completed and it may or may not be feasible to have it submitted to the Department by April 22, 1963. Review of the plan will take time, and orderly procedure indicates the desirability of extending the time for submission of the plan, as well as the period in which the option to purchase must be exercised.

COST

There will be no increase in budgetary requirements as the result of enactment of H.R. 277.

AUTHORITY TO BRING SUIT AGAINST the UNITED STATES BY DAVID H. AND JULIA FORMAN

The bill (H.R. 1544) to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz., was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 121), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 1544 grants the consent of the United States to the institution of a civil suit for the purpose of quieting title to a portion of a 0.9-acre parcel of land of which the remaining portion is utilized in connection with the Salt River Federal reclamation project. The act is the substitute bill submitted by the Department of the Interior.

NEED

The land described in H.R. 1544 was acquired by the Grand Canal Co. in 1890 from a Mr. and Mrs. F. W. Smith. Thereafter, most of the works and property of the canal company were acquired in 1906 by the United States in connection with the Salt River irrigation project. In 1919, Mr. W. H. Forman purchased from the Smith heirs the property described in H.R. 1544. The Government acknowledges that the Forman family retained possession of the land until 1947 when the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association took possession of a portion of the land and developed an irrigation well thereon.

When use of the property by the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association on behalf of the United States became necessary, the conflicting claims became known. The United States took the position that it had acquired the real estate as part of the property it acquired from the Grand Canal Co.; the Formans took the position that they had acquired the land from the Smith heirs.

The committee is convinced that it is necessary to have a judicial determination of the rights involved.

COST

No increase in budgetary requirements is involved in H.R. 1544.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AUTHORIZE SURVEY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF TOWNSITE FOR JUNEAU INDIAN VILLAGE IN ALASKA

The bill (S. 247) to authorize survey and establishment of a townsite for the Juneau Indian Village, in Alaska, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 629; 48 U.S.C. 355a–355d) is hereby extended and made applicable to all lands of the Juneau Indian Village of Alaska, including uplands and filled in tidelands occupied on the date of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 124), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The Native Townsite Act does not apply to tidelands, and this village is located largely on filled-in tidelands. The legislation will permit survey of the tideland areas which are an integral part of this town.

COST

No increase in budgetary requirements is involved.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

A favorable report was submitted by the Department of the Interior; which follows:

Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

Hon. Henry M. Jackson,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Jackson: This is in response to your request for a report on S. 247, a bill to authorize survey and establishment of a townsite for the Juneau Indian village in Alaska.

We recommend that the bill be enacted.

The bill makes the Native Townsite Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 629, 48 U.S.C. 355a-d), applicable to all lands of the Juneau Indian village of Alaska, including uplands and filled-in tidelands occupied on the date the bill is enacted.

Under the Native Townsite Act a townsite patent can be issued to a townsite trustee conveying nonmineral public lands in Alaska that are claimed or occupied by natives. The Secretary can survey the townsite into lots, and the trustee can convey the lots to the native occupants or claimants. A title conveyed to a native is inalienable without approval of the Secretary, and is not subject to taxation, sale to satisfy debts, or claims of adverse possession. Upon sale by a native, with the approval of the Secretary, the title becomes unrestricted. The Secretary can also remove restrictions upon application of the native.

The Native Townsite Act does not apply to tidelands, and a substantial portion of the Juneau native village is located on filled-in tidelands. Although the present law could be used to establish a townsite on the part of the village that is located on the uplands, legislation along the lines of this bill is needed in order to permit the townsite patent to include the entire village site.

We are not aware of any dispute about the use or occupancy by the natives of the tideland portion of the village. Native occupancy predates the founding of the city of Juneau, and the native occupancy is protected against disturbance by the Alaska Organic Act of May 17, 1884 (23 Stat. 24). In the early case of *Heckman* v. *Sutter*, 119 F. 83 (1902), it was decided that tidelands are included in the organic act's protection against disturbance, and this Department has consistently acknowledged and respected the native use and occupancy.

In an opinion dated September 16, 1960 (M–36604) the Solicitor of this Department concluded that the tidelands occupied by natives at the Juneau Indian village were not transferred to the territory of Alaska by the act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 623), or to the State by the Statehood Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339). The lands are still subject to the control of the United States and can be made subject to the townsite law.

Although the Native Townsite Act of 1926 applies only to nonmineral public lands, in 1962 (by Public Law 87–742) the act was made applicable to coal, oil, and gas lands with an appropriate reservation of the coal, oil and gas to the United States.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
John A. Carver, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

VALIDATION OF HOMESTEAD ENTRIES OF LEO F. REEVES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 394) to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "on the basis of the most recent sales of similar land in the vicinity of the lands to be patented under the provisions of" and insert "as of the date of approval of"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the status of lots 3 and 4, section 1, township 4 north, range 11 west and lot 12 and the south twenty acres of lot 13, section 31, township 5 north, range 10 west, Seward meridian, Alaska, and the requirements of the homestead laws relating to settlement on entered lands, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to consider that the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves of Soldatna, Alaska, Anchorage 031423 and 034503 became valid and subsisting as to the above-described lands as of the date of said Reeves' actual settlement on any portion thereof and to issue patent for the lands to the entryman upon the entryman's compliance with, and subject to, the homestead laws applicable to public lands in Alaska, and upon the entryman's payment to the Secretary of the Interior of the fair market value of lot 12 and the south twenty acres of lot 13, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior as of the date of approval of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 125), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to patent certain lands under the Homestead Act and to permit the sale of other land entered under the Homestead Act, both exclusive of mineral rights, to the entryman, Leo F. Reeves, a homesteader in the State of Alaska. Reason and equity indicate that Mr. Reeves deserves the consideration contemplated by the legislation.

NEED

Leo F. Reeves properly filed and was allowed homestead entry Anchorage 031423 on lots 3 and 4 and S½NW¼ sec. 1, T. 4 N., R. 11 W., Seward meridian, Alaska. He moved on the land and commenced cultivation, residing in a trailer. Subsequently, he relinquished S½NW¼ sec. 1 and made an additional entry (034503) on lot 12 and the south 20 acres of lot 13, sec. 31 T. 5 N., R. 10 W., Seward meridian, Alaska, and proceeded subsequently to construct a residence and to live in it.

This additional entry was rejected and Mr. Reeves was placed in the position where his original entry upon which he was farming, was now endangered for failure to meet residence requirements, while his additional entry on which his house stood was held invalid.

Testimony before the committee, including an examination of verified copies of the land office records clearly established that Mr. Reeves was a homesteader proceeding in good faith. His subsequent entry was contiguous to the portion of the original entry he retained. He waited 4 months for notice on the allowance of his additional entry before commencing home construction, but feared waiting longer because of the need to house his wife and three children in a healthier winter residence than a trailer.

It is a fact that his original entry was allowed, and he proceeded in good faith thereunder.

It is also a fact that Mr. Reeves was advised not to occupy his additional filing. It is equally a fact that Reeves was told the land upon which he filed his additional entry was open to entry and it was not until the records were modernized later that a clear typewritten note was made to the effect that the Reeves lands under the additional entry and others nearby were not open to homesteading.

Reeves was the victim of an innocent error for the tract book at the time did not reveal the unavailability of the additional land for homestead entry. Reeves relinquished a part of his earlier entry at the time he filed his additional entry. Reeves proceeded as a homestead entryman in good faith as to the requirements of the Homestead Act.

To cancel Reeves out, as the law contemplates, would be to take from Reeves the fruits of his labor in agricultural work and home construction, the latter which is estimated to here involve a cash expenditure of over $5,000.

The Department cannot change existing law, but the Congress can. To amend the Homestead Act would involve departures not deemed advisable, therefore, the committee has selected a course based upon reason and equity. Under the Homestead law, Reeves would receive title upon meeting requirements as to cultivation and residence with only minor payments. Under this bill, Reeves will receive a patent to the unrelinquished part of his original entry and the opportunity to purchase lot 12 and the south 20 acres of lot 13 at the fair market value as of the date of approval of the act based upon the value less improvements by Reeves. The patents will contain the usual reservations of oil, gas, and other mineral rights to the United States.

COSTS

No costs are involved. The Government will receive revenue from the sales of the portion of the lands to be sold.

HOMESTEAD ENTRY OF LEWIS S. CASS

The bill (H.R. 2291) regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 126), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 2291 directs the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate the homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass so that it may be processed in accordance with provisions of the Homestead Act, other than time requirements.

NEED

The homestead entry referred to in H.R. 2291 (Anchorage No. 031055) was allowed by the acting manager of the Anchorage Land Office on September 20, 1955. Nearly 2 years later it was determined by the land office that the land was not subject to homestead entry because it had been withdrawn in 1949 for "classification and examination, and in aid of proposed legislation" and the Department of the Interior canceled the entry made by Mr. Cass.

The Department of the Interior has advised the committee that the land involved is not needed for any Federal purpose and, in fact, has been made available for disposition. Since the entryman, Mr. Cass, acted in good faith and made improvements to the property between the time of his initial entry and the time that it was disallowed, the committee believes that he should have a preference in obtaining the lands for private development.

H.R. 2291 does not modify the Homestead Act in any way. The bill provides for reinstatement of the homestead entry and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to afford Mr. Cass a reasonable period of time within which to meet the requirements of the homestead law.

COST

No increase in budgetary requirements is involved in H.R. 2291.

CONVEY CERTAIN LAND IN VICINITY OF UNALAKLEET, ALASKA, TO MRS. WILLIAM E. BELTZ

The bill (H.R. 2294) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this bill was passed last year. I ask that the bill go over while the Senator from Oregon is considering the report on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, may I have the attention of the majority leader in regard to Calendar No. 104, House bill 2294?

The committee report shows that the market value will be paid for the property involved; therefore, I have no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I move that we return now to Calendar No. 104, House bill 2294.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 2294) was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The resolution (S. Res. 119) to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for obligations incurred during the Eighty-seventh Congress, $300 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

REPRINTING OF COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT, 87TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "PART 1 OF CONCENTRATION RATIOS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, 1958"

The concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part 1 of Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958" was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the concurrent resolution be re-referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The concurrent resolution was reported by accident.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING FOR USE OF SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF ITS HEARINGS OF THE 87TH CONGRESS ON "SPACE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business of its hearing of the 87th Congress on "Space Satellite Communications" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business one thousand additional copies of its hearings of August 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 11, 1961, Eighty-seventh Congress, entitled "Space Satellite Communications."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 1 OF HEARINGS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON JANUARY 1963 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee fifteen hundred additional copies of part 1 of its hearings on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President, current Congress.

PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENT THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR FLAG"

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 86) to authorize the printing as a House document, the pamphlet entitled "Our Flag" was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF WALL MAP OF THE UNITED STATES

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) to authorize the printing of a wall map of the United States was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENT OF "HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 108) to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENT OF CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments in line 6, after the word "that", to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "one hundred", and in line 7, after the word "which", to strike out "five" and insert "fifteen".

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ACCEPTING STATUE OF THE LATE JOHN BURKE, OF NORTH DAKOTA, AND TENDERING THANKS OF CONGRESS THEREFOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) accepting the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and tendering thanks of Congress therefor, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 3, after the word "Dakota", to strike out "now in the Capitol Building,"; so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of the late John Burke, presented by the State of North Dakota, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered to the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his historic renown and distinguished civic services; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

TEMPORARY PLACEMENT AND HOLDING OF CEREMONIES OF STATUE OF THE LATE JOHN BURKE, OF NORTH DAKOTA, IN ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) authorizing the temporary placement in the rotunda of the Capitol of a statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and the holding of ceremonies incident thereto was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the North Dakota National Statuary Hall Commission is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF CEREMONIES IN CONNECTION WITH ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF THE LATE JOHN BURKE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of John Burke, to be presented by the State of North Dakota in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and one thousand six hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of North Dakota, and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and two thousand eight hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

CEREMONIES IN ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL IN CONNECTION WITH STATUE OF THE LATE JOSEPH WARD, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) for ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South Dakota, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the South Dakota State Historical Society of South Dakota is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South Dakota, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

TENDER THANKS TO SOUTH DAKOTA FOR STATUE OF JOSEPH WARD, TO BE PLACED IN STATUARY HALL

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) to tender thanks of Congress to South Dakota for the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Joseph Ward, presented by the State of South Dakota, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his leadership as author of the State's motto, framer of the Territorial school law, founder of the first college, and outstanding churchman in the founding of Christian churches among whites and Indians: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of South Dakota.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF CEREMONIES IN CONNECTION WITH ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF JOSEPH WARD TO BE PLACED IN STATUARY HALL

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) to print as a Senate document the proceedings at the acceptance of the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Joseph Ward, to be presented by the State of South Dakota in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed three thousand additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and one thousand two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of South Dakota, and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and one thousand two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of South Dakota.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT "A REPORT ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS, 1963," BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The resolution (S. Res. 113) to print, as a Senate document, with additional copies, a report on the Alliance for Progress, 1963, by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a report entitled "A Report on the Alliance for Progress, 1963", submitted by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations and that seven thousand additional copies be printed for the use of those committees.

PRINTING OF "MISSION TO SOUTHEAST ASIA"

The resolution (S. Res. 117) relating to printing of "Mission to Southeast Asia" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed, as a Senate document, a report entitled "Study Mission to Southeast Asia", submitted by Senator GALE W. MCGEE to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that twenty thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

MATTIE V. GRUBBS

The resolution (S. Res. 122) to pay a gratuity to Mattie V. Grubbs was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mattie V. Grubbs, sister of James O. Martin, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to eleven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EDDIE H. NORWOOD

The resolution (S. Res. 123) to pay a gratuity to Eddie H. Norwood was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eddie H. Norwood, widow of Thomas E. Norwood, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FANNIE HILL, LEONARD M. HILL, AND LAWRENCE A. HILL

The resolution (S. Res. 124) to pay a gratuity to Fannie Hill, Leonard M. Hill, and Lawrence A. Hill was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Fannie Hill, sister, and to Leonard M. Hill and Lawrence A. Hill, brothers of Elijah B. Hill, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to two months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CAROLYN P. MERIWETHER

The resolution (S. Res. 125) to pay a gratuity to Carolyn P. Meriwether was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Carolyn P. Meriwether, widow of Yancey D. Meriwether, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

TRANSFER OF COTTON ALLOTMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky wishes to make a unanimous-consent request which I understand has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 5067, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5067) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly.

The bill was introduced in the House by Representative STUBBLEFIELD, of Kentucky. The bill has been passed by the House. A descriptive title of the bill is "Transfer of Farm Allotments for Flooded Acres." Similar bills have been passed in previous years.

Certain cotton lands and cotton acreage—some in my State along the Mississippi River and, I understand, some in other States along the Mississippi River—have been flooded, and still are flooded. This acreage must be planted in the next week or two, or it will be too late, so I am informed.

In past years when this situation developed, these farmers were permitted to plant their cotton quotas on lands other than their own farm lands, in order to maintain their planting history.

I may say the Department of Agriculture approves of this bill.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 5067) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1989. An act to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds; and

H.R. 3845. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H.R. 1989. An act to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds; and

H.R. 3845. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS ACT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United

States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report on Department of Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on procurement from small and other business firms, for the 8-month period ended February 28, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Publications of Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the publications entitled "Federal Power Act, Revised March 1, 1963" and "Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1961" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Act Relating to Payment of Moving Expenses of Owners and Tenants of Land Acquired for the National Park System

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of May 29, 1958, with respect to payment of moving expenses of owners and tenants of land acquired for the National Park System (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Audit Report of the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association

A letter from the Secretary, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Association, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent values or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Power To Apportion Membership in Legislatures—1963

"A joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Utah memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to preserve to the respective States their power to apportion among their citizens their representation in the various State legislatures

"Whereas the representation enjoyed by the citizens of the State of Utah, as well as by the citizens of the various States of the Union in their respective State legislatures, is best determined by consideration of local importance; and

"Whereas the courts of the United States are construing the Constitution of the United States so broadly as to empower them to intervene in the rights of the respective States to determine the membership of their respective legislatures; and

"Whereas it is the considered opinion of this legislature that the power of determination of problems relating to apportionment of legislative representation is best exercised by the direct representatives of the people of the States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah,* That it is fitting and proper for the citizens of this State and of their representatives in the Legislature of the State of Utah to determine the membership of their senate and of their house of representatives, and to apportion representation therein among the various portions of the State; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we believe that this power of legislative determination and apportionment therein is best exercised by the people and the legislatures of the respective States of the Union; be it further

"*Resolved,* That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to take all necessary legislative steps including the possibility of initiating a constitutional amendment to protect and preserve the powers of the various States of the Union to determine the membership of their respective legislatures and the apportionment of representation therein; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Utah is hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this memorial to the Senate and to the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in the National Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"A Resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Utah Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Maintain the Name 'Flaming Gorge Dam and Reservoir' for the Dam and Reservoir That Now Bears That Name

"Whereas the dam and reservoir which has been constructed on the Green River in northeastern Utah is presently known as the Flaming Gorge Dam and Reservoir; and

"Whereas the proposal has been made before the Congress of the United States to change the name of this dam and reservoir to "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area"; and

"Whereas in view of the location of this dam and reservoir in relationship to the States of Utah and Wyoming, it would seem desirable to retain its present name: Now therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein),* That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to maintain the presently existing name of the Flaming Gorge Dam and Reservoir as to said dam and reservoir; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of Utah be, and he hereby is, directed to send copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in Congress."

By Mr. MOSS:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"A Concurrent Resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 35th Legislature of the State of Utah Petitioning the Congress of the United States To Call a Convention for Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, Unless Congress Shall Sooner Have Submitted Such an Amendment, To Provide for the Election of the President and Vice President in a Manner Fair and Just to the People of the United States

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States, presidential and vice presidential electors in the several States are now elected on a statewide basis, each State being entitled to as many electors as it has Senators and Representatives in Congress; and

"Whereas the presidential and vice-presidential electors who receive the plurality of the popular vote in a particular State become entitled to cast the total number of electoral votes allocated to the State irrespective of how many votes may have been cast for other elector candidates; and

"Whereas this method of electing the President and Vice President is unfair and unjust in that it does not reflect the minority votes cast; and

"Whereas the need for a change has been recognized by Members of Congress on numerous occasions through the introductions of various proposals for amending the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That application is hereby made to Congress under article V of the Constitution of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an article of amendment to the Constitution providing for a fair and just division of the electoral votes within the States in the election of the President and Vice President; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if and when Congress shall have proposed such an article of amendment this application for a convention shall be deemed withdrawn and shall be no longer of any force and effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the proper officer of this State be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the several members of said bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States."

REAPPOINTMENT OF JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN AS CITIZEN REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 140)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I report to the Senate, without amendment, House Joint Resolution 234, which will provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and I submit a report thereon.

As chairman of the Subcommittee of the Smithsonian Institution, I am particularly pleased that I have been designated by the Rules and Administration Committee to report this joint resolution because I can think of no citizen of Rhode Island or of the United States who is more qualified to be on the

Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution than is Mr. Brown.

He has long played a leading role in the arts and has manifested his abilities in this direction during the past as a Smithsonian Regent. Furthermore, throughout his life he has occupied positions of very real responsibility and public service. I know that he will continue to do this during his 6-year statutory term.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The report will be received and printed, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1311. A bill for the relief of Alice Schonberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1312. A bill to amend paragraph 368(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to electrical indicating instruments; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 1313. A bill for the relief of Tim L. Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1314. A bill for the relief of Claudita C. Plavnous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1315. A bill to incorporate the Young Engineers and Scientists of America, for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. PELL, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. RIBICOFF):

S. 1316. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1317. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage adjustments in milk marketing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. CASE, and Mr. MORTON):

S. 1318. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act 1921; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1319. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1320. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the regulation of cooperative advertising activities of certain small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. BAYH):

S. 1321. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 1322. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Commerce.

RESOLUTIONS

CREATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey submitted a resolution (S. Res. 126) to create a Standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXXV, RELATIVE TO CLOSED SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. **MORSE** submitted a resolution (S. Res. 127) to amend rule XXXV, relative to closed session of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MORSE, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT RELATING TO CLASSIFICATION OF ELECTRICAL MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Mr. **SALTONSTALL.** Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Tariff Act with respect to the classification of electrical measuring instruments.

For nearly 50 years electrical indicating instruments such as ammeters and voltmeters have been imported at a duty of approximately 50 percent under paragraph 368(a) of the Tariff Act, which covers, among other things, devices suitable for measuring the flowage of electricity. Recently the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals upheld a Court of Customs ruling that these instruments should be classified under paragraph 353, as articles having as an essential feature an electrical element, rather than under paragraph 368(a). This ruling has the effect of reducing the duty on these instruments to approximately 12½ percent.

The recent tariff classification study which was undertaken as a result of the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 recognized that there was no satisfactory paragraph describing electric indicating instruments and proposed that paragraph 368(a) be split into two parts with one specifically covering electric indicating instruments at the historical duty of 50 percent. Thus the study recommended retaining the duty that has been in effect for half a century. The purpose of this bill is to maintain that duty level.

Instrumentation to measure electrical quantities is vital to the Nation, to our industrial development, and to our products for defense. Its production involves operations which require skilled handwork and which do not lend themselves to a high degree of mechanization. This makes these products particularly vulnerable to Japanese and European imports.

The reduction of tariff rates on imports from the historic level of 50 percent to the newly established level of 12.5 percent places the electrical indicating instrument business in the United States in jeopardy.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1312) to amend paragraph 368(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to electrical indicating instruments, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE NATIONAL ARTS AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators PELL, JAVITS, CLARK, and RIBICOFF, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the "National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963." This proposed legislation will establish a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation.

I would like to set forth briefly the interesting history of this legislation. In the 87th Congress I introduced S. 741 to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. Under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Special Subcommittee on the Arts of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held 3 days of public hearings on S. 741; S. 785, to establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts as introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]; and S. 1250, to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation as introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The full committee reported my bill, S. 741, as amended, which combined the principal features of S. 785 and S. 1250 and deleted the original provision to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. I believe S. 741 would have passed the Senate if it had come to a vote. But since approval by the House of Representatives was impossible, the legislation remained on the Senate calendar. Nevertheless, the fact that S. 741 had been reported favorably by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee constituted a significant step forward in securing long-overdue support for and recognition of the cultural and artistic activities of this country.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] for his outstanding efforts that brought S. 741 to the Senate calendar last year. I am confident that he will continue to provide such effective leadership in the 88th Congress.

Early in the present session of Congress the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] introduced a proposal which was almost identical to the reported version of S. 741. I was privileged to appear as a cosponsor of S. 165 that proposed a U.S. Arts Foundation. Since January, I have been developing a revised and expanded version of this legislation that establishes both a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation in separate titles.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Title I of this bill creates a National Council on the Arts in the Executive Office of the President. This proposal has been before the Congress in various forms since 1955. Members of both political parties have advocated its establishment.

Recently it has been noted in the New York Times and the Washington Post that President Kennedy is considering establishing a National Arts Council by executive order. I profoundly hope the President will take precisely such action. It is clearly within his authority as Chief Executive and there is great need for such a council. Congress has had ample opportunity to act on such a proposal but has repeatedly postponed taking any action. It is my further hope that the legislation I introduce today will provide a vehicle for subsequent action by Congress to establish the Arts Council permanently by statute.

My bill proposes that this 25-member Advisory Council be established within the Executive Office of the President. Members would be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President's Special Consultant on the Arts would serve as chairman of the National Arts Council.

The Council would recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States, propose methods to encourage private initiative in the arts, advise and consult with private and public groups and bodies concerned with the arts, and conduct research and surveys in the arts. The Council would be called upon to file an annual report with the Congress. This document should prove extremely valuable in providing the entire country with an annual inventory of major artistic and cultural activities in this country.

In effect, the Arts Council would serve as a national focal point for bringing together the most qualified and knowledgeable persons in the arts and as a vehicle whereby these persons could bring their thinking to the attention of Congress, the President, the States, and general public.

NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

Title II of this bill establishes a National Arts Foundation to provide grants-in-aid to private groups and States in support of programs and projects which will make a significant public contribution in the arts. The Foundation is charged with encouraging and assisting the development of the arts in this country. This legislation is patterned after the committee version of S. 741 of the 87th Congress. I am indebted to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for working out the basic principles that are incorporated in this title.

There are, however, significant differences from earlier proposals to establish such a Foundation. Principally, earlier versions were limited to the "visual and performing arts"; this legislation has been broadened to include "the arts" generally.

For example, in addition to encouraging artistic and cultural production, this legislation provides for the support of projects by private groups or States that will encourage and assist artists domiciled in the United States, including the training of artists, the commissioning of works, artistic and cultural presentations, and research, surveys and planning in the arts. The bill has been drafted to include the activities of museums, such as artistic appreciation courses, public lectures, training classes, as eligible to receive assistance.

I wish to emphasize that all such activities assisted by the National Arts Foundation would be undertaken by private groups demonstrating highest professional standards and appropriate State agencies concerned with the arts. The Federal Government would not be directly involved in any of the artistic endeavors that might receive support.

The Foundation would be subject to the supervision and direction of a board of 21 trustees appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The administrative activities of the Foundation would be supervised by a director.

Grants to private groups could not exceed one-half of the total cost of any project or production. A small percentage of the Foundation's funds would be kept aside for nonmatching grants in those few cases where all efforts by the private groups to raise matching funds had failed. Grants to States or State agencies could not exceed 50 percent under any circumstances. The bill authorizes funds not to exceed $5 million in the first fiscal year of operation and not to exceed $10 million thereafter.

Mr. President, I think it is essential to take a moment to outline once again why passage of this legislation would be so much in the public interest. It is often said that Government support of artistic and cultural activities will result in Government control of these activities. It is interesting to note that the United States is the only major nation in the Western World where the Government offers no financial assistance to the arts.

Great Britain, on whose institutions' concepts so many of ours are modeled, had a long tradition of private patronage of the arts. But during World War II, when faced with annihilation, when all her energies and resources were taxed to the utmost in a struggle for survival, it was discovered that danger and hardship could be better endured by people who came to know the finer things that free men could create. The British Government—to provide solace and encouragement to its embattled citizens—began to support such enterprises as music and the theater. The theory that the Parliament should appropriate funds for the arts has won consistent approval from both Conservative and Labor Governments. The Royal Opera and Ballet are thus supported. Orchestras, repertory theaters, museums, painters, sculptors, and composers enjoy the patronage of the British Government. The artistic talent of England is encouraged and developed in a manner befitting the precious resource that it is.

Has this stultified the talent of England? Howard Taubman, music critic of the New York Times, had this to say: "There is a ferment in the British creative world. New young voices are raised in the theater, music, graphic arts. Sometimes they are angry and derisive; sometimes they probe quietly. They are sources of stimulation and provocation."

In France, the Opera, the Opera Comique, the Comedie Francaise, are French national institutions known throughout the world. France is proud of their contributions to the world of art and rightfully so.

West Berlin, beleaguered and only recently resurrected from the debris of the last war, has erected a 1,900-seat opera house at a cost of $7 million in Federal and city tax moneys. Its performances are subsidized at the rate of $4 per seat per performance. The Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra receives Federal and city subsidies of more than $625,000. Indeed, the arts are the sharpest weapons in the competition for men's minds and are fully recognized and appreciated as such by all governments in this border city.

Throughout the Western World, many of the great artistic achievements today are being accomplished with the support of government. The Bayreuth Wagner Festival, the Scala Opera of Milan, the Vienna State Opera, the Amsterdam Concertgebouw are all government supported and are flourishing.

Why is it that their governments can encourage art and it is not retarded—instead it is enjoyed within each of these countries and admired throughout the world?

Art has not been stifled in these lands—it has not been subjugated—and neither shall it be in the United States. The contention that Government support for the arts in our country would lead to the ruination of our art forms is a counsel of fear born of a strange lack of faith in the American people and their institutions—both governmental and artistic.

We only do harm to ourselves by accepting the thesis that art and democratic government are natural enemies. Other nations and freedom-loving peoples know that is not so. And while many of our artists of great ability find it difficult to earn a living and many of our art institutions fail for lack of funds—ironically—governments with far less financial resources have come to the aid of American art. It is worthy of note that in recent years the Italian Government has granted a subsidy to the Chicago Lyric Opera Co. and the West German Government has pledged $2,500,000 for the new Lincoln Center Opera House in New York.

Therefore, Mr. President, I view this legislation as providing the United States with an opportunity to take the first step in catching up with policies that have existed throughout the Western World for years and that have greatly stimulated artistic and cultural development in these nations.

In 1788, our first President, George Washington, wrote:

> The arts and sciences are essential to the prosperity of the State and to the ornament and happiness of human life. They have a primary claim to the encouragement of every lover of his country and of mankind.

President Washington was aware that the goal of every great society is to encourage the creative abilities of its members in those peaceful activities that make our lives rich and meaningful. To encourage enjoyment of and participation in the arts which make our life meaningful and worthwhile—and also pleasant—has been a primary purpose of every great civilization since the dawn of time.

This proposed legislation essentially represents a continuation of this human tradition within this great country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for an additional 2 weeks if other Senators desire to become cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 1316) to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that the encouragement and support of the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government;

(2) that the Nation's prestige and general welfare will be promoted by providing recognition that the arts are a valued part of the Nation's resources;

(3) that it is in the best interests of the United States to maintain, develop, and disseminate the Nation's artistic and cultural resources; and

(4) that, in order to implement these findings, it is desirable to establish a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to provide such recognition and assistance as will encourage and promote the Nation's artistic and cultural progress.

TITLE I—NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "National Council on the Arts Act of 1963".

Establishment of the Council

SEC. 102. There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President a National Council on the Arts (hereinafter referred to as the "Council").

Membership of the Council

SEC. 103. (a) The Council shall be composed of the Chairman provided for in section 104 of this title, and twenty-four members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such members shall be selected (1) from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, one or more of the arts; (2) so as to include practicing artists, civic and cultural leaders, members of the museum profession, and others who are professionally engaged in the arts; and (3) so as collectively to provide an appropriate distribution of membership among the major art fields including music, drama, dance, folk art, literature, architecture and allied arts, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, costume and fashion design, motion pictures, radio, and television. The President is requested in the making of such appointments to give consideration to such recommendations as may from time to time be submitted to him by leading national organizations in these fields.

(b) Each member of the Council shall hold office for a term of six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, eight at the end of the second year, eight at the end of the fourth year and eight at the end of the sixth year after the date of enactment of this Act. No member of the Council shall be eligible for reappointment during the two-year period following the expiration of his term.

(c) Any vacancy in the Council shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Special consultant on the arts

SEC. 104. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Special Consultant on the Arts (hereinafter referred to as the "Special Consultant") from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, the arts. The Special Consultant shall serve as chairman of the Council. In addition, he shall advise the President with respect to the activities of the Federal Government in the arts. If a vacancy occurs in the Office of Special Consultant, the President shall fill the vacancy in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) The Special Consultant shall serve at the pleasure of the President, but not in excess of eight consecutive years, and shall not be eligible for reappointment during the four-year period following the expiration of his last period of service as a Special Consultant. The provisions of this subsection shall apply to any person appointed to fill a vacancy in the Office of Special Consultant.

(c) The Special Consultant shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum, and shall be reimbursed for travel and subsistence expenses incurred by him while away from his home or regular place of business in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 836–842), and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

Duties and responsibilities of the Council

SEC. 105. (a) The Council shall meet at the call of the Special Consultant but not less often than twice during each calendar year. Thirteen members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

(b) The Council shall (1) recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States, (2) propose methods to encourage private initiative in the arts, (3) advise and consult with the National Arts Foundation, and other local, State and Federal departments and agencies, on methods by which to foster artistic and cultural endeavors and the use of the arts both nationally and internationally in the best interests of our country, and (4) conduct studies and make recommendations with a view to formulating methods or ways by which creative activity and high standards and increased opportunities in the arts may be encouraged and promoted in the best interests of the Nation's artistic and cultural progress, and a greater appreciation and enjoyment of the arts by our citizens can be encouraged and developed.

(c) In selecting subjects to be studied pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the Council (1) shall consider requests submitted to it by the chairman of the National Arts Foundation, and the heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and (2) may obtain the advice of any interested and qualified persons and organizations. In making its studies pursuant to such subsection, the Council may obtain assistance from such committees and panels as may be appointed by the Special Consultant from among those persons professionally qualified in the fields of art with which such studies are concerned, who are recommended to him by the Council.

(d) Not later than ninety days after the end of each fiscal year, the Council shall submit to the President and the Congress an annual report setting forth its activities pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. In addition, the Council shall submit to the President reports and recommendations with respect to its activities at such time or times as the President shall request or the Council deems appropriate. The President shall transmit such recommendations as he may deem fit, together with his comments thereon, to the Congress.

Compensation of members of the Council

SEC. 106. Members of the Council, and persons appointed to assist the Council in making its studies, while attending meetings of the Council, or while engaged in duties related to such meetings, or while engaged in the conduct of studies authorized by this title, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Special Consultant, but not exceeding $75 per diem and shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Staff of the Council

Sec. 107. (a) There shall be an Executive Secretary of the Council who shall be appointed by the Special Consultant after consultation with the Council. The Executive Secretary shall receive compensation at a rate prescribed by the Special Consultant, but not in excess of the scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for grade GS–18 in the Classification Act of 1949.

(b) The Special Consultant is authorized to appoint, subject to the civil service laws, such secretarial, clerical, and other staff assistance as is necessary to enable the Special Consultant and the Council, its Executive Secretary, and its special committees, to carry out their functions and duties, and to fix the compensation of persons so appointed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949.

(c) The Special Consultant is authorized to procure in accordance with such policies as the Council shall from time to time prescribe, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of $75 a day.

Donations of funds or gifts

Sec. 108. The Council is authorized to receive and use funds or marked gifts donated by others, if such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Council. Moneys received by the Council under this section shall not be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, but shall be kept in a special account, maintained by the Treasury Department, or kept by the Council in commercial banking institutions, or invested in securities eligible for trust funds in the District of Columbia, and shall be available to the Foundation for the purposes of this title.

Expenses of the Council

Sec. 109. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Council such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

General provision

Sec. 110. This title shall not be deemed to invalidate any provision in any Act of Congress or Executive order vesting authority in the Commission of Fine Arts.

TITLE II—NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the "National Arts Foundation Act of 1963".

Establishment of Foundation

Sec. 202. There is hereby established in the Executive Branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Arts Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

Trustees of Foundation

Sec. 203. (a) The Foundation shall be subject to the general supervision and policy direction of a Board of Trustees which shall consist of twenty-one members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such members shall be selected (1) from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, one or more of the arts; (2) so as to include practicing artists, civic and cultural leaders, members of the museum profession, and others who are professionally engaged in the arts; and (3) so as collectively to provide an appropriate distribution of membership among the major art fields listed in section 211(a) of this title. The President is requested in the making of such appointments to give consideration to such recommendations as may from time to time be submitted to him by leading national organizations in these fields and the National Council on the Arts.

(b) The term of office of each trustee of the Foundation shall be six years; except that the terms of the trustees first taking office after the enactment of this title shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, seven at the end of two years after the date of enactment of this title, seven at the end of four years after such date, and seven at the end of six years after such date. If a vacancy occurs in the term of office of a trustee, such vacancy shall be filled only for the unexpired portion of such term. Any person who has been a trustee of the Foundation for twelve or more consecutive years shall be ineligible for appointment during the two-year period following the termination of his duties as such a trustee.

(c) Any vacancy in the Foundation shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A majority of the trustees of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum.

(e) The President shall call the first meeting of the trustees of the Foundation, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman, who shall serve until two years after the date of enactment of this title. Thereafter each Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected for a term of four years in duration and each such election shall take place at the annual meeting occurring at the end of each such term. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Foundation shall elect an individual from among the trustees to fill such vacancy for the remainder of such term.

(f) The trustees of the Foundation shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less than four times each year. The Chairman shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the trustees so request in writing. Each trustee shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

Director of Foundation

Sec. 204 (a) The Director of the Foundation shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In the appointment of the Director the President is requested to give due consideration to any recommendations submitted to him by the Board of Trustees. The Director shall serve as an ex officio trustee of the Foundation. In addition, he shall be the chief excutive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum and shall serve for a term of six years unless previously removed by the President.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, a Deputy Director, who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the trustees, may prescribe, and shall be Acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director. In the event of a vacancy in the office of the Director, the Deputy Director shall serve as Acting Director until the President shall fill such vacancy. The Deputy Director shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed the scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for grade GS–18 in the Classification Act of 1949.

(c) The Director shall have general authority to carry out and execute the programs of the Foundation on a full-time, continuous basis, to recommend programs to the Foundation, and to discharge such other functions as the Foundation may delegate to him consistent with this title.

(d) The Director and the Deputy Director shall be reimbursed for travel and subsistence expenses incurred by them while away from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

(e) The Director and the Deputy Director shall be appointed without regard to the civil service laws and regulations.

(f) The Director and the Deputy Director shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as Director or Deputy Director, or hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act.

Grants to groups and States

Sec. 205. (a)(1) The Foundation is authorized to establish and conduct a program of grants-in-aid in a manner consistent with the Declaration of Policy set forth in the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963, from the funds appropriated to the Foundation or otherwise obtained pursuant to section 207(a) (3) or (4) of this title, to nonprofit professional groups (and nonprofit groups meeting professional standards) engaged in or concerned with the arts, for the purpose of enabling such groups to provide (1) productions which have substantial artistic and cultural significance, giving preference to works of persons domiciled in the United States, (2) productions of significant merit that, without such assistance, would otherwise be unavailable to our citizens in many areas of the country, (3) projects that will encourage and assist artists domiciled in the United States, (4) projects that will encourage and develop the appreciation and enjoyment of the arts by our citizens, and (5) other relevant projects including surveys, research, and planning in the arts. No portion of any moneys granted under this subsection shall be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any lands.

(2) No payment may be made to any group under this section except upon application therefor which is submitted to the Foundation in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Foundation.

(3) The amount of any grants allotted to any group pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of such project or production, except that not more than 20 per centum of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for the purposes of this section for any fiscal year may be available for allotment by the Foundation in such fiscal year without regard to such limitation in the case of any group which submits evidence to the Foundation that it has attempted unsuccessfully to secure an amount of funds equal to the grant applied for by such group, together with a statement of the proportion which any funds it has secured represent of the funds applied for by such group.

(4) Any group shall be eligible for financial assistance pursuant to this section only if (A) no part of its net earnings inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or stockholders, or individual or individuals, and (B) donations to such group are allowable as a charitable contribution under the standards of subsection (c) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(b)(1) The Foundation is authorized to establish and conduct a program of grants-in-aid, in a manner consistent with the Declaration of Policy set forth in the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963, from the funds appropriated to the Foundation or otherwise obtained pursuant to section 207(a) (3) or (4) of this title, to assist the several States in supporting existing projects and productions which are making a significant public contribution in one or more of the arts, and in developing projects and productions in the arts in such a manner as will furnish adequate programs, facilities, and services in the arts to all the people and communities in each of the several States. No portion of any monies granted under this subsection shall be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any lands.

(2) In order to receive such assistance in any fiscal year, a State shall submit an application for such grants prior to the first day of such fiscal year and accompany such application with a plan which the Foundation finds—

(A) designates a State agency (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "State agency") as the sole agency for the administration of the State plan;

(B) provides that funds paid to the State under this title will be expended solely on projects and productions approved by the State agency which carry out one or more of the objectives of this title; and

(C) provides that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Foundation may from time to time require.

(3) Each State which has a plan approved by the Foundation in effect on the first day of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, or any succeeding fiscal year, shall be entitled to a maximum allotment in any such fiscal year of an amount equal to half the total amount appropriated to the Foundation for the purposes of this section for such fiscal year divided by the total number of States. In the event that any sum is remaining out of the maximum allotment available for grants to each State in any fiscal year after all allotments are made to States with approved plans in effect on the first day of such fiscal year, the Foundation, in its discretion, may grant the aggregate of such remaining sums or any portion thereof to any group eligible for financial assistance under subsection (a) of this section or State agency for projects and productions which the Foundation finds will encourage the arts in areas where such assistance will be of value. In making grants to any group pursuant to this subsection, the Foundation shall require matching funds in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a)(3) of this section.

(4) The amount of any grants allotted to any State or State agency pursuant to this subsection for any project or production shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of such project or production.

(c) Whenever the Foundation, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any group or State agency, finds that—

(1) any such group is not complying substantially with the provisions of this title;

(2) any such agency is not complying substantially with the terms and conditions of its State plan approved under this title; or

(3) any funds granted to such group or agency under this title have been diverted from the purposes for which they were allotted or paid the Foundation shall immediately notify the Secretary of the Treasury and the group or State agency concerned that no further grants will be made under this title with respect to such group or State agency until there is no longer any default or failure to comply or the diversion has been corrected, or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until the group or State repays or arranges the repayment of the Federal funds which have been improperly diverted or expended.

Advisory committees, councils, or panels

SEC. 206. The Foundation may appoint persons other than trustees of the Foundation to committees, councils, or panels concerned with particular regions of the country or with particular aspects of the arts, or both, to advise and consult with the Foundation with respect to the duties of the Foundation and the projects and productions for which financial assistance is sought by groups and States. Such appointments shall be made without regard to the civil service laws and regulations.

Administrative powers and duties of the foundation

SEC. 207. (a) The Foundation is authorized to—

(1) prescribe such rules and adopt such bylaws as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operation and its organization and personnel;

(2) make expenditures, and enter into contracts or other arrangements, as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this title, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (4 U.S.C. 5);

(3) acquire by loan or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this title;

(4) receive and use funds or marked gifts or property donated by others, if such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

(5) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel;

(6) pay fees for and enter into contracts with persons for the performance of services required by the Foundation;

(7) pay to persons rendering services to the Foundation on an uncompensated basis or on a fee or contract basis, as provided in paragraphs (5) and (6) of this subsection, travel and subsistence expenses while away from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations; and

(8) maintain an office in the District of Columbia.

(b) The Foundation is authorized to procure assistance, as specified herein, from any department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, or any independent agency of the United States. with the consent of the head thereof, and each such department, agency, or instrumentality is authorized to render such assistance to the Foundation by the donation or loan of employee services and by the donation or loan of supplies, office or building space, or other property, either on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, upon request made by the Director or Deputy Director of the Foundation.

(c) The Foundation shall not itself produce or present any project or production.

(d) Not later than ninety days after the end of each fiscal year, the Foundation shall submit to the President and the Congress an annual report summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

Staff of the Foundation

SEC. 208. The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that the Director may, in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel or personnel with experience in or relating to any of the arts, and fix their compensation without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this title.

Compensation of the trustees of the Foundation and the members of its councils, committees, and panels

SEC. 209. The trustee of the Foundation, and the members of the councils, committees, and panels shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the President in the case of the trustees, and by the Foundation in the case of the members, but not to exceed $75 for each day in which they are actually engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, and shall be allowed travel and subsistence expenses while away from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Travel Subsistence Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

Appropriations

SEC. 210. (a) For the purpose of making grants authorized in section 205 of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such sum, not exceeding $5,000,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sum, not exceeding $10,000,000 annually, as the Congress may determine. The moneys appropriated to the Foundation shall remain available for expenditure for two years following the expiration of the fiscal year for which appropriated.

(b) Moneys received by the Foundation under section 207(a) (3) and (4) of this title, shall not be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, but shall be kept in a special account, maintained by the Treasury Department, or kept by the Foundation in commercial banking institutions, or invested in securities eligible for trust funds in the District of Columbia, and shall be available to the Foundation for the purposes of this title.

(c) The Director shall determine any payments to be made under this title and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts thereof. Upon receipt of such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in accordance with such certification. Sums alloted to any group or State for any fiscal year under this title and not transferred during that fiscal year shall remain available to such group or State for the same purposes for the next fiscal year in addition to the sums allotted for such next fiscal year.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to administer the provisions of this title.

Definitions

SEC. 211. As used in this title—

(a) The term "the arts" means (1) the major art fields including music (instrumental and vocal), drama, dance, folk art, literature, architecture and allied fields, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, costume and fashion design, motion pictures, television, and radio; and (2) the arts related to the presentation, performance, execution, and exhibition of such major art fields.

(b) The term "production" means plays (with or without music), ballet, dance and choral performances, concerts, recitals, operas, exhibitions, readings, motion pictures, radio, and television, and any other activities involving the execution or rendition of the arts and meeting such standards as the Foundation may establish.

(c) The term "project" means programs organized by groups, States, and State agencies to carry out the purposes of this Act, including educational programs, artistic and cultural appreciation courses, training of artists, commissioning of works, artistic and cultural presentations, and research, surveys, and planning in the arts.

(d) The term "group" includes any society, institution, organization, association, museum, or establishment, whether or not incorporated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963 which Senator HUMPHREY is introducing today, I believe we can get this bill through the Congress. This is the most important question before us as I believe a national program for the arts to be vital to our country at home and in the cold war. This bill combines the proposal for a National Council on the Arts with my bill to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation.

As far back as 1949, I introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution calling for the establishment of an American national establishment for theater, opera, and ballet. Last year the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on which I serve reported favorably the bill for a U.S. Arts Foundation which I had been advocating since I came to the Senate in 1957 and which also included the program of assistance to the States sponsored by Senator JOSEPH CLARK. I introduced this combined bill early this year with Senators CLARK, PELL, and HUMPHREY as cosponsors.

An effective Government support of the arts consistent with our traditions is essential in the national interest. I believe the time has gone by when the optimum need exists for an Advisory Committee on the Arts as called for by this bill. I believe we are ready for and need a definitive plan like the U.S. Arts Foundation. But I see no harm in the Advisory Committee and believe it more important to get together on a bill that has a chance; hence I cosponsor this bill.

The U.S. Arts Foundation legislation which I have proposed in the Senate, the essential features of which are now incorporated in this bill, would encourage through matching grants and subvention to nonprofit groups, the distribution of live performances and exhibits in cities and towns which could not otherwise receive and support them. It would help stimulate a revival of the arts in entire regions through the work of nonprofit groups, municipalities, and State agencies able to provide cultural services because of the subvention available from the Foundation to cover the difference between production and operating costs and admissions. Within the framework of free enterprise and with no Federal control, the Foundation would help in the development and training of new talent in the fields of all the arts, and also make it possible for many more people in many more places to see and hear the best in American culture.

The Foundation would require in its first year an appropriation from the Federal Government of $5 million for the entire country and $10 million in succeeding years, half of which would be available for grants to the States. This would serve essentially as seed money with the largest amount of its expenditures anticipated to come from funds contributed by private foundations and other benefactors interested in the advancement of the arts. I expect that this modest Federal appropriation could stimulate the expenditure of as much as $50 million a year in non-Government support for the arts. New talent as well as going programs in all the arts could be assisted.

This proposal has the support of a great many artists of international fame as well as Actors' Equity and many organizations in the academic and cultural world. It would supplement and enhance other Federal Government activities, such as our international cultural exchange program; and expand the areas served by theater, opera, ballet, music—in fact, all the arts—and other cultural resources so that no populated place in the United States would have to be culturally starved.

This legislation is not the first in which the Federal Government concerns itself with assistance to the arts. In 1891, the National Conservatory of Music was incorporated by an act of Congress, and men like Chauncey DePew, Fitz Hugh Lee, John Hay, and Enoch Pratt served as trustees. ANTA, the American National Theater and Academy, operates under a congressional charter granted in 1935. In July 1956, the Senate did adopt a bill (S. 3419) providing for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, although the House of Representatives took no action on it.

AMENDMENT OF ANTIDUMPING ACT OF 1921

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

Antidumping acts exist in virtually every major trading country in the free world. They are designed to prohibit unfair international trade practices, are expressly authorized by the 1947 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and are consistent with the 1962 Trade Expansion Act.

The objective of the U.S. Antidumping Act is to prevent foreign manufacturers from injuring American industries by dumping surplus merchandise here at prices below those charged in the exporting country. If the Treasury Department finds a price differential, and the Tariff Commission finds an American industry is injured, the foreign manufacturer must pay the differential to the Treasury in dumping duties.

The basic philosophy and purpose of the act is as essential today as when first enacted in 1921. However, procedural and technical overhaul is now urgently needed.

Segments of many industries have in the past expressed concern regarding the effective operation of the act—cement, chemicals, copper and brass, manmade fibers, pharmaceuticals, steel, wire and cable, and others. Labor representatives, such as the United Cement, Lime and Gypsum Workers of the AFL–CIO, have stressed the need to improve the act.

Last session I introduced legislation (S. 3606) to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921. The bill was introduced so late in the session that full consideration by the Committee on Finance was impossible.

The amendment I introduce today does not alter the philosophy or purpose of the Antidumping Act in any way. Its only purpose is to make the act more effective in achieving its original purpose and to help insure that international trade will be conducted in a fair and equitable fashion.

The proposed amendment deals with the following situations that have hampered the effective administration of the existing act or have permitted certain foreign companies to evade the act's original intent.

First. Treasury's proceedings in cement dumping cases have averaged 17 months, and one took more than 3 years. Uncertainties caused by such delay hurt importers and foreign manufacturers as much as American industry. In 1954 Congress limited the Tariff Commission's investigations to 3 months. The amendment imposes a limitation of 6 months on Treasury's proceedings; however, an escape valve is available permitting additional time when needed.

Second. Congress amended the Antidumping Act in 1958 to require Treasury and the Commission to state reasons for their findings. The proposed amendment further specifies the content of Treasury's opinions in order to carry out the intent of Congress.

Third. American manufacturers, as well as importers, presently have little opportunity to participate in Treasury's proceedings. The amendment would require Treasury to issue proposed findings, prior to its final determinations, for the parties' reaction. This is analogous to the standards contained in the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946.

Fourth. The Administrative Procedure Act also provides that all agencies' actions can be reviewed by courts, but there is confusion as to whether courts can review the Treasury's findings in antidumping cases. The amendment would make clear that judicial review is available.

Fifth. Some importers have attempted to evade the act by creating dummy foreign export corporations. One provision plugs this loophole.

Sixth. Dumping from Communist countries not only injures American industry, but prevents manufacturers in friendly countries from selling in the United States. The present act is ineffective in preventing dumping from Communist countries, which can control their home prices by state fiat. The amendment will help solve this problem.

Seventh. Other provisions deal with the problem of importers, exporters, and foreign manufacturers who refuse to provide the Treasury Department with pricing information, or who file false information. The present act is ineffective in this regard.

Eighth. To enable the Tariff Commission to make more meaningful investigations of injury to American industry, it is proposed that the Treasury Department aggregate complaints regarding the dumping of the same class of merchandise. Treasury now sends cases to the Commission on a country-by-country basis.

Ninth. A final provision provides that when Treasury calculates price differentials it can consider the quantity discounts foreign manufacturers give American importers only if the discounts are justified by the foreign manufacturer's reduced costs, similar to the quantity discount provisions applicable to U.S. manufacturers under the Robinson-Patman Act.

In summary, this legislation is a moderate and constructive attempt to amend the existing statute without in any way altering its basic philosophy, purpose, or function. It has been designed to: First, improve the substance of the act through elimination of loopholes; and, second, provide for more effective procedures.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and the other cosponsors of this important legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 2 additional weeks so that other colleagues who desire to do so may join as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that the full text of this proposed legislation be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 1318) to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, introduced by Mr. Humphrey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201 (a) of the Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 160(a)), is amended by inserting in the first sentence after "determines" the words "in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 214", and after "value" the words "(hereinafter called an affirmative 'fair value finding' or findings)", and after "United States" the words "from the country or countries with respect to which the Secretary has made an affirmative fair value finding or findings". Section 201(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting in the second sentence after "Secretary shall" the words "forthwith publish in the Federal Register", and for "finding" the words "dumping finding", and after "of his determination" the words "the existence of his fair value finding", and by deleting from the second sentence the words "make public" and the words "his determination". Section 201(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting in the fourth sentence after "Secretary's" the word "dumping".

Sec. 2. Section 201(b) of the Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 160(b)), is amended by inserting after both occurrences of "made public a" the word "dumping".

Sec. 3. Section 201(c) of the Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 160(c)), is amended by deleting after the word "The" the words "Secretary, upon determining whether foreign merchandise is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than its fair value, and the", and by deleting after the word "shall" the word "each".

Sec. 4. Section 201 of the Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 160), is amended by adding the following subsection: "(d) Section 592 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1592) shall be applicable to any merchandise as to which a complaint has been filed in accordance with section 214(a) of this Act."

Sec. 5. Section 202(a) of the Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 161(a)), is amended by substituting for the words "has made public a finding", the words "has published a dumping finding", and substituting for the words "so made public, if the" the words "so published, if either the", and by inserting before the period the words ", *Provided,* That if both the purchase price and the exporter's sales price are less than the foreign market value (or, in the absence of such value, than the constructed value), such special dumping duty shall be an amount equal to the greater difference". Section 202(a) of such Act if further amended by substituting "dumping finding" for "finding".

Sec. 6. Subsections 202(b)(1) and 202(c)(1) of the Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 161(b)(1) and 161(c)(1)) are both amended by inserting before "the fact that" the words "differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from".

Sec. 7. Section 204 of the Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 163) is amended by inserting after the words "(2) the amount of the commissions" the words "and profits", and by inserting before "(4)" the words "(4) an amount equal to the expenses and profits of the exporter in the foreign country (unless (a) the exporter is the foreign manufacturer or is owned or controlled by the foreign manufacturer, or (b) the foreign market value includes such expenses and profits), and (5)", and by deleting "and (4)".

Sec. 8. Section 205 of the Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 164) is amended by inserting before the first sentence "(a)", and by adding the following subsection:

"(b) If any of the imported merchandise is manufactured or produced in a country or area dominated or controlled by Communism the foreign market value for such merchandise may be determined by reference to alternative values, such as (1) the price at which such merchandise is sold or offered for sale for exportation to countries other than the United States from such country or area, (2) the foreign market value of merchandise of the relevant class or kind in appropriate non-Communist countries, and (3) the constructed value of merchandise of the relevant class or kind in appropriate non-Communist countries."

Sec. 9. Sections 208 and 209 of the Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 167 and 168) are amended by substituting for all occurrences of the word "finding" the words "dumping finding".

Sec. 10. The Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 160–172) is amended by adding the following section:

"Sec. 214. Procedure for fair value proceedings.

"(a) Initiation of fair value proceedings. The inquiry or inquiries of the Secretary of the Treasury or any person to whom authority under this section has been delegated (hereinafter in this section called "the Secretary"), to determine whether a class or kind of merchandise is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value (hereinafter called a "fair value proceeding") shall be initiated by him at the earliest practicable time after receiving from any customs officer or other person (hereinafter called the "complainant") a communication of his belief or suspicion that a class or kind of merchandise is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value (hereinafter called a "complaint"), together with such supporting information as the Secretary may require by regulation and is available to the complainant. *Provided,* That if the Secretary determines within fifteen days after receiving a complaint that there is no evidence to support it supplied by the complainant and no evidence to support it available to the Secretary from customs forms or other sources, and that any differential between the prices at which the imported merchandise and domestic merchandise of the relevant class or kind are offered for sale in the United States cannot reasonably be attributed in whole or in part to the possible existence of sales below fair value, he shall forthwith notify the complainant of his determination, and of such supporting information of the character required by subsection (c) of this section as is available to the Secretary, without initiating a fair value proceeding or publishing any document in the Federal Register, and such determination shall be considered a negative fair value finding or findings for purposes of subsection (g) of this section. The Secretary shall consolidate in a single fair value proceeding (hereinafter called a "consolidated fair value proceeding") initiated as a result of a complaint, or complaints received together, all of his inquiries regarding the same class or kind of merchandise regardless of the number of importers, exporters, foreign manufacturers, and countries involved. The Secretary shall make reasonable effort to give notice to all known interested parties of the initiation of a fair value proceeding, and shall publish such notice in the Federal Register. The notice shall identify the complainant and the date and nature of his complaint. Such notice may be published in conjunction with the notice required to be published by section 201(b) (19 U.S.C. 160(b)) prior to the withholding of appraisement reports.

"(b) Fair value investigation. The Secretary shall obtain, by investigation or other means (hereinafter called a "fair value investigation"), sufficient information to enable him to determine whether a class or kind of merchandise is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value, and to enable him to prepare the proposed fair value finding or findings required by this section.

"(c) Proposed fair value finding. The Secretary shall prepare a proposed fair value finding or findings for each of the inquiries he conducts in a fair value proceeding at the earliest practicable time and shall publish it, or them together, in the Federal Register: *Provided,* That the Secretary may prepare and publish a negative proposed fair value finding or findings and negative fair value finding or findings regarding an inquiry or inquiries in a consolidated fair value proceeding prior to the preparation and publication of the proposed fair value finding or findings for the consolidated fair value proceeding. The Secretary shall make reasonable effort to send copies to all known interested parties. The proposed fair value finding shall state the Secretary's conclusion regarding fair value. It shall also indicate the specific data (such as manufacturers, dates, prices, discounts, quantities, home consumption, cost of containers, taxes, duties and commissions, as well as delivery, selling, advertising, technical service, and other expenses, but not including confidential costs used in ascertaining constructed value in the absence of foreign market value) used by the Secretary, and his computations and reasoning in arriving at the concepts used in the Act (such as foreign market value, such or similar merchandise, purchase price, exporter's sales price, and constructed value). If, in a particular fair value proceeding, the disclosure of some of the detailed information required by this subsection would, in the judgment of the Secretary, impede his obtaining similar information in confidence in the future, he may so declare in his proposed fair value finding and omit that information. If the Secretary does withhold such confidential information, however, he shall prepare for the use of the complainant a confidential statement of the information required by this subsection which has been so withheld, and the reasons for so withholding. The information in such confidential statements shall not be published or otherwise be made public by the complainant, subject to such sanctions as may be established by the Secretary, but may be considered in confidence by a reviewing court as if otherwise a part of the record.

"(d) Fair value hearing. The Secretary shall accord fair value hearings by permitting any interested party to communicate in writing with the Secretary regarding a proposed fair value finding or findings within thirty days after publication in the Federal Register. This communication may include such matters as factual or legal argument, additional factual information in the form of affidavits or other documents, and requests for informal conferences or an oral fair value hearing. The Secretary may call for an oral fair value hearing on his own motion, or on the request of any interested party. Any denial of a request for such hearing shall be in writing with reasons. Notice of an oral fair value hearing, or denial of a request or requests for one, shall be given to all known interested parties and shall be published in the Federal Register. Notice of an oral fair value hearing shall state the time and place of such hearing, and summarize or refer to the Federal Register publications of the notice of the initiation of the fair value proceeding, and the proposed fair value finding. All interested parties will be accorded at an oral fair value hearing the rights to counsel, to present evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and fair disclosure of the facts. A transcript shall be made of all oral fair value hearings, and the Secretary may prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary for their fair and orderly conduct. The record in fair value hearings shall consist of the notice of initiation of a fair value proceeding, the proposed fair value finding or findings, any written communications between interested parties and the Secretary regarding the proposed fair value finding or findings (unless the Secretary has made a judgment regarding a given document, or part thereof, under the standard of subsection (c) of this section, which shall then be made available, in confidence, only to interested parties and a reviewing court), the transcript of any oral hearing, the fair value finding or findings, and any other relevant documents the Secretary chooses to include on his own motion or the request of any interested party.

"(e) Fair value finding. The Secretary shall prepare a fair value finding or findings and shall publish it, or them together, in the Federal Register. The Secretary shall make reasonable effort to send copies to all known interested parties. The contents of the fair value finding or findings shall comply with the standards for proposed fair value findings contained in subsection (c) of this section. In addition, it shall contain the Secretary's reply to any new facts or arguments advanced during the fair value hearing. The Secretary shall make his fair value finding or findings at the earliest practicable time after receiving a complaint, but in no event more than six months after such date, unless, within the said six months, he shall have submitted a report to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate stating the reasons why a longer period is required within which to reach such fair value finding or findings and the estimated extent of such longer period.

"(f) Failure or refusal to furnish requested information. Subsections (c), (d) and (e) of this section shall be modified in accordance with this subsection if the Secretary determines that the importer, exporter or foreign manufacturer has failed or refused to funish information which the Secretary has requested and deems necessary to make his proposed fair value or fair value findings under subsections (c) or (e), and which the Secretary shall not have obtained from other sources. Upon such determination it shall be presumed that the class or kind of foreign merchandise under question is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value, and the Secretary shall forthwith publish an affirmative fair value finding or findings.

"(g) Judicial Review. (1) Any interested party shall be entitled to seek judicial review in the United States Customs Court and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals of (A) the Secretary's fair value finding or findings that a class or kind of foreign merchandise is not being, or is not likely to be, sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value (hereinafter called a negative "fair value finding" or findings) within thirty days after publication in the Federal Register, and (B) the Secretary's affirmative fair value finding, or findings, the United States Tariff Commission's determination under section 201(a) of this Act, and the dumping finding, within thirty days after the publication of the dumping finding. (2) Such judicial review shall be in accordance with section 10(e) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1009(e)), and shall be independent of that provided in section 516 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1516). Any reviewing court may, in its discretion, order the withholding of appraisement reports as to the merchandise in question. (3) The United States Customs Court and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall establish rules of procedure necessary to effectuate this subsection."

Sec. 11. The Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 160–172) is amended by adding the following section:

"Section 215.

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the 1963 amendments to this Act shall apply with respect to all merchandise as to which no appraisement report has been made on or before the date of the enactment of such amendments: *Provided*, That with respect to such merchandise as to which, on or before such date, the question of dumping shall have been raised by or presented to the Secretary he shall determine within six months from the date of the enactment of such amendments whether the merchandise is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value.

"(b) The 1963 amendments shall not apply with respect to any merchandise which—

"(1) was exported from the country of exportation before the date of the enactment of such amendments, and

"(2) is subject to a finding under the Antidumping Act, 1921, which (A) is outstanding on the date of the enactment of such amendments, or (B) was revoked on or before the date of the enactment of such amendments, but is still applicable to such merchandise.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement by the principal cosponsor of this bill, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] be printed at this point in the Record. Senator Scott is absent today on official business but did want to be recorded as heartily in favor of this bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Scott

I am most pleased to join today with the distinguished majority whip, Senator Humphrey, in introducing this vitally important amendment to the Antidumping Act.

Senator Humphrey and I joined together last session in S. 3606, which was also designed to produce needed reform of the Antidumping Act, and have continued our joint interest in this subject. Our present bill, as he has said, represents further intensive study and review of the Antidumping Act in an even broader effort to remove loopholes and provide appropriate procedures for the administration of this act.

In a statement in the Record only last week I pointed out the tragic impact of the dumping of foreign steel upon the steel workers and companies in our country. The cement industry is another which has been severely damaged by the dumping of foreign cement. And, of course, few, if any, industries and unions are free from the potential threat of unemployment and economic injury brought about by these unfair international trade practices.

All major trading countries have antidumping acts. They are expressly authorized by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known as GATT, which explicitly condemns dumping. Our Antidumping Act does not prevent foreign manufacturers from selling in the United States at prices below those charged by American producers. American manufacturers have never feared legitimate competition. It does prevent, however, the dumping of large surpluses at distress prices far below the price the foreign manufacturer charges in his home market.

Senator Humphrey has described the problems in our present Antidumping Act which our amendment is designed to relieve. As he has said, our amendment in no way affects the basic purpose of our act and its compatibility with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and our present foreign-trade relations. The amendment is urgently needed, however, in order to insure the fair and effective operation and administration of our act. The amendment represents a matter of urgent importance to those industries in this country which have suffered millions of dollars in losses as the result of unfairly dumped foreign merchandise, and we are anxious for a thorough consideration of these problems and passage of the bill this session.

THE HANDLING OF FEDERAL JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for proper reference, a proposed amendment to title 18 of the United States Code which would provide penalties for juvenile offenders who escape or attempt to escape from custody.

Mr. President, although section 751 of title 18 now prescribes strong penalties for adult escapees detained or committed in connection with a criminal proceeding, the Justice Department has refused to allow prosecution of juvenile escapees under these provisions because the latter are not subjected to a criminal proceeding and are not convicted of a crime.

The point is well taken that juveniles should not be exposed to penalties applicable to adult felons. It is imperative that rehabilitation and treatment, rather than punishment, always remain the basic goals and the main substance of any handling procedures directed against minors.

This does not mean, however, that punishment and penalties have no value or place in the treatment and control of juvenile offenders. Indeed, some penalties as disciplinary measures are very much a part of any rehabilitative process.

A case in point is the need for such penalties to discourage young offenders from attempting to escape after detention or commitment in an institution.

We must recognize here that by their very nature as treatment centers rather than penal institutions, juvenile detention and commitment facilities are operated with minimum security provisions, both in terms of personnel exercising guard functions and in terms of the mechanical security measures of the physical plant.

On the other hand, we know that many delinquents exhibit the same kinds of disturbances as adult offenders.

A juvenile delinquent is often equally as hostile, equally as aggressive, and equally as anxious to escape from an institution as his adult counterpart. Indeed, with the enthusiasm, the energy, and the rebellion against authority characteristic of the delinquency-prone segment of our youth population, a juvenile offender may often be more escape-minded than the most vicious adult inmates of penitentiaries.

The present lack of legal penalties allows a juvenile to plan and attempt escapes time after time without jeopardizing his release from an institution at the predetermined time, but often at the risk of physical violence, at the risk of physical harm to the institution's personnel or himself, and at the expense of rehabilitation and treatment programs beneficial to all juvenile offenders.

The following records submitted to my committee indicate that several correctional officers have been either killed, have suffered permanent brain damage, or have been otherwise seriously injured in the course of attempts to escape by youthful inmates.

In April of 1958 three boys escaped from the Natural Bridge Camp in Virginia after assaulting an officer. The officer underwent a 5-hour operation requiring 50 stitches to close his head wounds. Even after a long period of hospitalization and convalescence, he was unable to return to duty and had to be retired.

In May of 1958 two boys assaulted an officer in an attempt to escape, striking him with a heavy metal object. The officer sustained serious injuries.

In December of 1959 five juveniles trying to escape from the National Training School for Boys struck an officer with a baseball bat and knocked him unconscious. The officer was seriously injured and in a coma. In spite of the long period of hospitalization and treatment, he never completely recovered from the injuries and had to be transferred to a position where he could function at a reduced level of effectiveness.

In September of 1960 an officer at the National Training School was attacked by four boys attempting to escape and struck in the head with a desk lamp, the end of a broomstick handle, and fists. He died from multiple skull fractures and resultant complications.

In November of 1961 four boys attempted to escape from the National Training School after hitting an officer over the head with a heavy wastebasket.

In January of 1962 two escaping boys attacked an officer at the youth center in Ashland, Ky. The officer suffered severe injuries.

In January of 1962 a senior officer at the National Training School was attacked by a number of boys, garroted with a towel, and as a result was injured seriously.

These are only the most dramatic and the most tragic examples of escape attempts staged by young delinquents in Federal institutions. The records of the Federal Bureau of Prisons show that from January of 1961 to November of 1962 over 600 boys either escaped or attempted to escape from the several juvenile institutions under the Bureau's jurisdiction. Some months the combined total of both successful and unsuccessful escapees is as high as 45 individuals. But even these figures do not tell the whole story, because they may not reflect all attempts to escape, nor do they reflect the damage done to the rehabilitative programs by continuous preoccupation with plans to escape by a large number of young inmates.

In a letter to me concerning the above information and concerning the amendment I propose today, Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, made the following statement:

> As you can readily understand from the attached tabulation, the number of escapes and attempted escapes involving juvenile delinquents seriously interferes with the orderly administration of our institutional programs, particularly at the National Training School for Boys. The juveniles are aware that they will incur no penalties for trying to escape and therefore give little thought to the possible consequences of such acts. Further, many of the juveniles who are involved in these episodes are 18 and 19 years old and should be held accountable for their actions.
>
> It is our opinion that the enactment of this amendment, which would authorize the imposition of a sentence of up to 1 year on juvenile delinquents who escape or attempt to escape, would greatly reduce the number of such incidents. Many of the juveniles contemplating escape would be effectively deterred by the knowledge that they would be subject to prosecution.

Mr. President, the physical and emotional health, safety, and general well-being of the juvenile offender and of persons associated with him dictate that preoccupations with plans and attempts to escape be discouraged among the inmate population of juvenile institutions.

The proposed amendment to section 751 of title 18 of the United States Code would substantially contribute to solution of the problems I have outlined.

This measure would subject juvenile offenders who attempt to escape to the penalty of 1 year's imprisonment, a $1,000 fine, or both.

I respectfully ask that this bill be given favorable consideration by the appropriate committee of the Senate and by the Members of this legislative body.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1319) to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 751 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting the subsection symbol "(a)" at the beginning thereof, and by adding, immediately following subsection (a) of such section as hereby so designated, a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Whoever escapes or attempts to escape from the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative, shall, if the custody or confinement is by virtue of a lawful arrest for a violation of any law of the United States not punishable by death or life imprisonment and committed before such person's eighteenth birthday, and as to whom the Attorney General has not specifically directed the institution of criminal proceedings, or by virtue of a commitment as a juvenile delinquent under section 5034 of this title, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect the discretionary authority vested in the Attorney General pursuant to section 5032 of this title."

Sec. 2. Section 752 of such title is amended by inserting the subsection symbol "(a)" at the beginning thereof, and by adding, immediately following subsection (a) of such section as hereby so designated, a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Whoever rescues or attempts to rescue or instigates, aids, or assists the escape or attempted escape of any person in the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative, shall, if the custody or confinement is by virtue of a lawful arrest for a violation of any law of the United States not punishable by death or life imprisonment and committed before such person's eighteenth birthday, and as to whom the Attorney General has not specifically directed the institution of criminal proceedings, or by virtue of a commitment as a juvenile delinquent under section 5034 of this title, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

SMALL BUSINESS ADVERTISING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to permit small independent retailers to advertise cooperatively the prices of their merchandise.

This morning the Washington Post carried an article commenting on a recent decision of the Federal Trade Commission holding that the cooperative advertising of a common price by independent retailers was violative of the antitrust laws. This decision, which was concurred in by the Justice Department, makes necessary the bill I am offering.

I speak from personal experience when I say that this method of advertising is the most effective way that small business can compete with the giant chainstores and discount houses. Because of FTC opinion, small business retailers could be put in jail for engaging in this traditional and widespread method of advertising. How can we expect small independent merchants to compete against the giant chains and discount houses if they are not permitted to pool their limited advertising resources?

I should not have to remind the Federal Trade Commission or the Justice Department that our antitrust laws were designed as a protective shield, as a means of preserving small business competition—not as a sword to cripple independent merchants.

It is pertinent to refer to Commissioner Anderson's concurrence with the majority opinion, where he states:

> It offends my sense of justice to find that the small industry members are unable to avail themselves of the same benefits as do their big brothers and so, for that reason, I would very much like to join Commissioner Elman in his dissent hereto, but I believe that the law and the decisions as they now stand preclude such "junction." It is, therefore, with reluctance that I am compelled to subscribe to the view that the program of cooperative advertising as contemplated by the inquirants would probably be in violation of law.

When a member of the majority makes such a statement, it indicates a clear need for legislation to correct this misapplication of our law.

I think, Mr. President, that the statement of Mr. Elman, who issued the dissenting opinion, deserves great consideration by this body, and I quote from his dissent at this point:

> As everyone knows, it is becoming more and more difficult for small retailers, particularly in the drug and food industries, to withstand the overwhelming competition of chain stores and supermarkets. The chains have all the advantages of mass buying power, large capital resources, and choice locations in busy shopping centers. In addition, and this is most pertinent here, a large food and drug chain can take a single ad in a newspaper to advertise products sold at the same price in all of its stores. Under cooperative advertising arrangements, the cost of these advertisements is largely borne by manufacturers of the advertised products.
>
> Preservation of small independent businessmen is a central objective of every statute that Congress has directed this Commission to enforce; and unlike my colleagues, I find nothing manifestly illegal per se in the proposals submitted.

I also wish to call attention to an explanatory memorandum issued on this subject by the National Association of Retail Druggists to its 36,000 independent drugstore members. I find this pertinent analysis indicative of the vital need to pass this legislation as soon as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Washington Post of this morning, the full opinion of the Federal Trade Commission dated March 29, 1963, and the April 1, 1963, Bulletin of the National Association of Retail Druggists be printed at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, I introduce this bill with the firm belief that it is necessary in order to permit small business to compete with the giants of our economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article, opinion, and bulletin will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The bill (S. 1320) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the regulation of cooperative advertising activities of certain small business concerns, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The article, opinion, and bulletin ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 11, 1963]

FTC AIMS BLOW AT COOPERATIVE ADVERTISING

(By Edward S. Cohen)

The small businessman is about to be pushed farther onto the sidelines if the Federal Trade Commission and Justice Department have their way.

The latest ruling by the FTC, an advisory opinion, holds that independent small businessmen who join together in a cooperative advertising program may not publish retail selling prices without risking criminal prosecution under the antitrust laws.

That businessmen may be sent to jail for listing prices in cooperative advertising was concurred in by the Department of Justice.

Cooperative advertising, as it is practiced, is an attempt by small retailers to compete more effectively with larger retail chains or discount stores.

Typically, a group of small businessmen will join together, pool their advertising funds and buy joint ads in newspapers. The objections raised by the Commission concern the listing of the prices in these ads, which the FTC majority holds is price fixing per se, and therefore subject to prosecution.

The strongly worded but unpublicized opinion was issued just over a week ago and contained a vigorous dissent by Commissioner Philip Elman.

Copies of the Commission's opinion were sent to those parties requesting FTC sentiments in the matter, including Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, small business watchdog, and the National Association of Retail Druggists (NARD). The latter at its convention passed a resolution directing that advice on the legality of various cooperative advertising schemes be sought from the FTC.

Later, Marketing Programs, Inc., of New York, advertising consultants, asked the Department of Justice to advise whether a cooperative advertising program created for the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association was legal. The Iowa group then asked the FTC for an opinion. PATMAN forwarded the Marketing Programs proposal to the FTC.

The proposed Iowa plan, as described by Earl W. Kintner, NARD's special antitrust counsel and former FTC Commissioner, contemplated full-page newspaper ads listing the names and addresses of all participating pharmacies. Each ad would list specific prices for specific products, thus allowing the inference that the stores would charge the same price for each product advertised. A slight variation of this plan was also submitted.

Letters to the parties from the FTC stated that a cooperative advertising program by the druggists "would be subject to question under the laws administered by the Commission unless * * * use of the program would not involve any understanding or agreement, express or implied, among the members of the group concerning the retail selling price or the terms or conditions of any item advertised * * *."

In other words, the FTC went on, this meant "among other things, that no prices, terms or conditions of sale of any of the items should appear in the advertising."

If the Justice Department and FTC decide to back up this broad policy statement with antitrust enforcement, many other advertising plans are likely to be open to attack.

In a typical case independent liquor stores buy cooperative advertising and feature particular stores sponsoring a particular product at a special price. The ads are divided into distinct boxes with each store represented in a box.

Another form of joint advertising occurs when cooperatives are formed by small retailers such as grocers, who buy their merchandise, distribute and advertise as a group.

So far these ads have not been challenged.

Commissioner Elman's dissent, reportedly the subject of a controversy within the Commission pointed out that small independent retail businessmen can compete effectively against large chainstores and discount houses only by placing point advertisements which quote selling prices.

"What is proposed here (the Iowa plan), Elman argued, "is not an agreement among competing retailers to prices, which of course is a per se violation of the antitrust laws, but an agreement among independent retailers in different neighborhoods, and who do not compete with each other in any practical sense, to combine their advertising allowances, to which they are legally entitled under the Robinson-Patman Act, for the purpose of advertising cooperatively.

"I think the Commission is making a great mistake." Elman wrote. "Preservation of small independent businessmen is a central objective of every statute that Congress has directed this Commission to enforce."

PATMAN, author of the Robinson-Patman Act, designed to protect the small entrepreneur, would not comment on the FTC opinion. He said he could not "remember it." When he did recall the Marketing Programs proposal, he said he would "need more time to look into it."

If the Government decides to base future antitrust prosecution on this opinion, it was pointed out, the big chains will be given a competitive advantage. They will be able to list prices in their large ads.

But those who depend on cooperative promotion for survival will have to resort to institutional advertising or quit the cooperative effort and take out smaller ads of their own.

Thus, the antitrust laws have come full circle. Once designed to preserve competition, they may now limit rivalry.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

EARL W. KINTNER, Esq.,
Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KINTNER: This is with reference to your letter dated October 24, 1962, concerning the legality of various cooperative advertising schemes proposed to groups of retail druggists by Marketing Programs, Inc., New York, N.Y. We interpret your letter to be primarily concerned with the legality of the participation in this program by the various local associations which belong to the National Association of Retail Druggists.

You are advised that the Commission, as provided for in its advisory opinion procedures, has given careful consideration to the proposed plan. The Commission has concluded that there are several aspects of the plan which should be referred to separately. They include the following:

1. We comment upon that aspect of the plan which provides for the members of local associations to combine advertising allowances legally made available to them by suppliers and to utilize such advertising allowances in buying advertising space and in advertising through the utilization of that space the names and addresses of the cooperating members and the items, including brand names of the items they are offering for sale. To the extent this aspect of the plan would involve nothing more than is stated in the preceding sentence, the Commission has concluded that it sees no reason to challenge that aspect of the plan under the laws entrusted to the Commission.

2. To the extent that any aspect of the plan would involve a common understanding, agreement or approval by members of the group, express or implied, of any price, term, or condition of sale of any item advertised by the group, the plan would contravene laws entrusted to the Commission for enforcement. In this connection, it is the Commission's opinion that the group publication of an advertisement containing any selling price raises a serious question whether the members of the group have agreed to and will sell at those prices. Consequently, the cooperative consideration of any advertisement which would contain any price or prices or other terms or conditions of sale as indicated on the mockup which has been submitted would be open to challenge as part and parcel of price fixing by agreement. Thus, the Commission is in no position to give its approval to any plan which would contain a basic flaw such as that.

3. Another aspect of the plan which is worthy of comment is the amount of the advertising allowances involved and the manner in which they are secured. If the agent for the members of the group should induce or knowingly receive advertising allowances which from the viewpoint of the supplier would contravene either subsection 2(a), 2(d), or 2(e) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, then all members of the group, as well as their agent, would be liable to charges of violation of either subsection 2(f) of the Clayton Act, as amended, or section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, or of violation of both.

In other words, the Commission is of the opinion that a program of cooperative advertising by the members would be subject to question under the laws administered by the Commission unless:

(a) The fund used by or on behalf of the participating group to purchase advertising space should consist solely of the aggregate of advertising allowances properly available to the members individually under the terms of section 2(d) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act;

(b) Use of the program would not involve any understanding or agreement, express or implied, among the members of the group concerning the retail selling price or the terms or conditions of sale of any item advertised, which would mean, among other things, that no prices, terms or conditions of sale of any of the items should appear in the advertising; and

(c) Use of the program would not involve the inducement or knowing receipt by any of the members of the group, or by their agent, of prices or allowances, the granting of which by the suppliers would be unlawful under subsections 2(a), 2(d) or 2(e) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

We appreciate your interest in this matter and if any questions remain we hope that you will feel free to contact us.

By direction of the Commission, Commissioner Elman dissenting.

Joseph W. Shea,
Secretary.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ANDERSON

It goes without saying that the many small members of an industry should be able to compete on equal footing with its larger competitors. Unfortunately, there seem to be instances where that is not possible. I wish that I could dissent from what appears to be the majority in this case. I fear that for the individual industry members to join in an advertisement which would set out a single price to be charged by all those who participate in the advertisement would be looked upon with some suspicion. I call attention to the fact that the Special Counsel for the National Association of Retail Druggists has heretofore indicated his reluctance in the matter by stating to the annual meeting of the National Drug Trade Conference at New York, N.Y., on January 22, 1963, as follows:

"I venture the prediction that the antitrust enforcement agencies may frown upon a straightforward advertisement which lists a single price for a product that will be charged by all stores participating in the advertisement."

It offends my sense of justice to find that the small industry members are unable to avail themselves of the same benefits as do their big brothers and so, for that reason, I would very much like to join Commissioner Elman in his dissent hereto, but I believe that the law and the decisions as they now stand preclude such "junction " It is, therefore, with reluctance that I am compelled to subscribe to the view that the program of cooperative advertising as contemplated by the inquirants would probably be in violation of law.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM

This request today evokes a moment of truth for this Commission. With unquestioned sincerity, the able and distinguished dissenting Commissioner beseeches us to cast aside years of precedent in price fixing cases. It was in 1940, and thus after its decision in *Appalachian Coals, Inc., et al.* v. *United States,* 288 U.S. 344 (1933), that the Supreme Court stated:

"Thus for over 40 years this Court has consistently and without deviation adhered to the principle that price fixing agreements are unlawful per se under the Sherman Act and that no showing of so-called competitive abuses or evils which those agreements were designed to eliminate or alleviate may be interposed as a defense." *United States* v. *Socony Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.*

The holding of this case remains undisturbed.

We are not unaware of the legal maximum "Cessante ratione legis, cessat et ipsa lex," nor of the cases which rest on such reasoning. But the function of an advisory opinion is to declare the applicability of the present state of the law to novel and sometimes disturbing facts. To chart the future course of the law is not its task. Neither the thin subtleties of semantics nor the sharp but barren thrust of logic will much warm a businessman subject to the wintry blast of possible criminal prosecution.

Commissioner Elman does not dispute that price fixing is a per se offense. Rather he says that the plan involved herein does not factually amount to price fixing. We are constrained to note our exception.

The fact that the businessmen involved may have unhampered discretion to depart from the scheme involved does not mitigate the offense:

"The fact that no penalties are imposed for deviation from the price schedule is not material." *United States* v. *National Association of Real Estate Boards,* 399 U.S. 485, 489 (1950).

2. The agreements, even if only "incidentally" affecting price may still be offensive under the antitrust laws. In *Socony Vacuum, supra,* the court asserted that:

"Prices are fixed * * * if the range within which purchases or sales will be made is agreed upon, if the prices paid or charged are to be at a certain level or on ascending or descending scales, if they are to be uniform, or if by various formulas they are related to the market prices." *United States* v. *Socony Vacuum, supra,* at 222.

3. There is no doubt that retail drug stores operating in the same city may be held to be in competition. In *Brown Shoe Co., Inc.* v. *United States,* 370 U.S. 294, 338 (1962), the court held:

"We believe, however, that the record fully supports the district court's findings that shoe stores in the outskirts of cities compete effectively with stores in central downtown areas * * *."

See also, *United States* v. *Cunningham Drugstores* (complaint filed June 30, 1960, Civil Act No. 20266, D.C., E.D. of Mich., Southern Division), complaint charging violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act by Cunningham's acquisition of other retail drug stores, both being located in Detroit.

4. No one could quarrel with the dissent's assertion that particular cases pivot on particular facts. And once allowed to frame the question in terms of the facts as it sees them the dissent's answer is inescapable. Thus, Commissioner Elman declares that the proposed plan has "neither the purpose nor effect of restraining competition and involves no agreement by participating retailers to adhere to advertised prices." Obviously if all these assertions were inescapably true, or were the only permissible inference from the "facts," a different result might be reached. But that is the very issue—whether in fact the purpose and effect of the plan could be construed to restrain competition.

In sum, if one assumes price fixing, one need not examine all the relevant factors. Conversely, if one assumes no price fixing, one may examine all the relevant factors. To employ such reasoning is to become encased in conundrums. Moreover, it is clear from the differing opinions within the Commission itself that the plan at best is on the periphery of violative behavior, and that reasonable men differ concerning its impact. And as Mr. Justice Holmes asserted in *Nash* v. *U.S.,* 229 U.S. 373, 376, 377 (1913):

"The statute contains in its definition an element of degree as to which estimates may differ, with the result that a man might find himself in prison because his honest judgment did not anticipate that of a jury of less competent men * * *.

"But * * * the law is full of instances where a man's fate depends on his estimating rightly, that is, some matter of degree."

In view of the uncertainties and the substantial risk inherent in civil or criminal prosecution, no administrative agency should give this plan the "green light."

The function of this Commission—as I see it—is not to resolve a lover's quarrel over who loves the small businessman more. Hopefully, it is evenhanded justice we dispense—not bouquets for or vendettas against one class or group.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER MACINTYRE

The Commission's advisory opinion in this important matter correctly advises the representatives of small business organizations regarding the application of Federal antimonopoly laws to their proposed plans. It is the duty of the Commission to so advise the representatives of these small business firms. We would do them a disservice if we should advise them otherwise. Of what benefit would we be to small business firms if we should advise them that the course of action they propose to take is approved and then they should find themselves in the toils of the law for having followed that course of action? Our duty is to assist business firms in avoiding any such result.

The Supreme Court of the United States in recent cases brought by the U.S. Department of Justice against firms for engaging in price fixing in violation of the Sherman Act have made it clear that such course of action constitutes per se violation of the Sherman Act (see *U.S.* v. *Socony Vacuum Oil Co., et al.*, 310 U.S. 150, decided in May 1940). In more recent cases in which small business firms were charged with violating the Sherman Act, the Department of Justice has insisted that prison sentences be given to those found guilty. As a result, some small businessmen in Ohio in recent years were ordered to serve prison terms for violation of the Sherman Act. We should do all possible to assist small businessmen in avoiding such a predicament.

DISSENTING STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ELMAN

As everyone knows, it is becoming more and more difficult for small retailers, particularly in the drug and food industries, to withstand the overwhelming competition of chainstores and supermarkets. The chains have all the advantages of mass buying power, large capital resources, and choice locations in busy shopping centers. In addition, and this is most pertinent here, a large food and drug chain can take a single ad in a newspaper to advertise products sold at the same price in all of its stores. Under cooperative advertising arrangements, the cost of these advertisements is largely borne by manufacturers of the advertised products.

Congress has recognized the need for giving small independent neighborhood retailers the opportunity to meet this kind of competition from the large chains. Under section 2(d) of the Robinson-Patman Act, a manufacturer who grants cooperative advertising allowances to some of his customers is obligated to make them available on proportionally equal terms to all of his customers. As a practical matter, however, a small neighborhood retailer cannot afford, by himself, to take a large ad in the local newspaper. The only realistic way for him to take advantage of the benefits of section 2(d) is to join with other small retailers, pool the advertising allowances to which each is legally entitled, and publish joint advertisements containing prices of the products which they sell. Obviously, a joint advertisement by small retailers which does not quote selling prices would be a waste of money. The owner of a corner grocery store is not interested in "institutional" advertising. That kind of advertising would hardly attract business away from his larger rivals, whose ads invariably feature "weekend specials" and the like.

What is proposed here, as I understand it, is not an agreement among competing retailers to fix prices, which of course is a per se violation of the antitrust laws, but an agreement among independent retailers in different neighborhoods, and who therefore do not compete with each other in any practical sense, to combine their advertising allowances, to which they are legally entitled under the Robinson-Patman Act, for the purpose of advertising cooperatively. In its advisory opinion here, the Commission flashes a red light on such cooperative advertising by small businessmen. I think the Commission is making a great mistake. Preservation of small independent businessmen is a central objective of every statute that Congress has directed this Commission to enforce; and unlike my colleagues, I find nothing manifestly illegal per se in the proposals submitted.

Per se violations of the antitrust laws comprise those restraints of trade which inherently have no function other than the stifling of competition. As the Supreme Court stated in *Northern Pacific Railroad Co.* v. *U.S.*, 356 U.S. 1, 5, per se violations are "agreements or practices which because of their pernicious effect on competition and lack of any redeeming virtue are conclusively presumed to be unreasonable and therefore illegal without elaborate inquiry as to the precise harm they have caused or the business excuse for their use."

Although an agreement to fix or maintain prices is unquestionably illegal per se, this does not mean that every agreement or arrangement which has incidental effects on prices can similarly be condemned by a per se test. *Appalachian Coals, Inc.* v. *U.S.*, 288 U.S. 344; *Chicago Board of Trade* v. *U.S.*, 246 U.S. 231, 238. In his opinion for the Court in the latter case, Mr. Justice Brandeis stated:

"The true test of legality is whether the restraint imposed is such as merely regulates and perhaps thereby promotes competition, or whether it is such as may suppress or even destroy competition. To determine that question the court must ordinarily consider the facts peculiar to the business to which the restraint is applied; its condition before and after the restraint was imposed; the nature of the restraint, and its effect, actual or probable. The history of the restraint, the evil believed to exist, the reason for adopting the particular remedy, the purpose or end sought to be attained, are all relevant facts."

As the Supreme Court held in *Brown Shoe Co.* v. *U.S.*, 370 U.S 294, 330, and *White Motor Co.* v. *U.S.*, decided March 4, 1963, slip opinion pp. 9–10, a restraint of trade cannot be condemned as a per se violation if "(w)e do not know enough of the economic and business stuff out of which these arrangements emerge to be certain. They may be too dangerous to sanction or they may be allowable protections against aggressive competitors or the only practicable means a small company has for breaking into or staying in business * * * and within the 'rule of reason'."

It begs the question, the answer to which necessarily depends on the particular facts, to hold that the appearance in a joint advertisement of any "prices, terms, or conditions of sale of any of the items" establishes, without more, the per se illegality of the advertising plan. Plans for joint advertising by retailers are not necessarily, and in all circumstances, the equivalent of price-fixing conspiracies. Where, as is represented here, a plan has neither the purpose nor the effect of restraining competition, and involves no agreement by participating retailers to adhere to advertised prices, a per se test is inapplicable. Such a simple yardstick may be used only—as the Supreme Court pointed out in the Northern Pacific Railroad case—in dealing with practices whose "pernicious effect on competition and lack of any redeeming virtue" have been conclusively shown. Here, however, the Commission cannot escape the necessity for determining the legality of a joint advertising plan by examining it in the light of all the relevant factors stated by Mr. Justice Brandeis in the Chicago Board of Trade case and reiterated the other day by the Supreme Court in White Motor.

It seems to me that the Commission, charged as it is with the duty to promote rather than discourage competition and to strengthen rather than impair the ability of small businessmen to survive, should take a more positive and encouraging attitude toward programs for joint advertising by retailers. As has recently been pointed out, "Prosecuting a practice of this kind would injure rather than preserve competition, and encourage instead of preventing monopoly." (Henry Bison, Jr., general counsel, National Association of Retail Grocers, Nargus Bulletin, Feb. 1963, p. 92.) The notion that small businessmen should be sent to jail for engaging in such a practice seems to me too fantastic to be taken seriously.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS,
Chicago, Ill., April 5, 1963.

To: Presidents and secretaries of all State and metropolitan city pharmaceutical associations.

At the 1962 NARD meeting in New York a resolution was adopted directing that advice be sought from the Federal Trade Commission with regard to the legality of various cooperative advertising schemes proposed to groups of independent retail druggists. Thereafter, Marketing Programs, Inc., of New York sought the advice of the Department of Justice as to the legality of a cooperative advertising program designed by that firm for the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association. In view of the NARD convention resolution, the Iowa association requested that the NARD have the same program reviewed by the Federal Trade Commission. As a result the Federal Trade Commission reviewed the proposed program, in consultation with the Department of Justice.

Several other proposed cooperative advertising programs have been sent to me for advice by retail drug groups. I have referred these programs to Earl W. Kintner, NARD's special antitrust counsel, for study and comment. Mr. Kintner has made preliminary observations in each instance but withheld final comment until the Federal Trade Commission should complete its review of the Marketing Programs-Iowa proposal.

We have just received the Federal Trade Commission's advisory opinion on the Marketing Programs-Iowa plan.

The advisory opinion contains these principal rulings:

1. Joint institutional advertising by local associations or groups of independent retail pharmacists is lawful under the antitrust laws.

2. Members of local associations or groups of independent retail pharmacists may combine advertising allowances legally made available to them by suppliers to publish advertisements promoting specific brands of products offered for sale without violating the antitrust laws, provided that no reference is made to the prices, terms, or conditions of sale of a product in such advertisements.

3. Over the vigorous dissent of Commissioner Elman, a majority of the Commissioners ruled that the dissemination of an advertisement by a group of retail pharmacists containing any selling price for a specific product "raises a serious question whether the members of the group have agreed to and will sell at those prices" and that any such group may be charged with price fixing.

Some knowledge of the proposal submitted on behalf of the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association is required in order properly to assess the impact of the ruling on price advertising by the Commission majority. The proposed program developed for the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association by Marketing Programs, Inc. of New York City contemplated full-page newspaper advertisements listing the names and addresses of all pharmacies participating in the advertising program. The proposal contemplated that such advertisements shall list specific prices for specific products, thus permitting the inference that all participating stores would charge the same price for all advertised products. Under one variation of the program proposed to the Iowa Association, it was contemplated that the following disclaimer would appear in each advertisement: "Prices shown on this page are only manufacturers' suggested selling prices. In each store listed in the column at left, your pharmacist sets his own price—usually lower, never higher." This, then, is the ambit of the proposal placed before the Federal Trade Commission on behalf of the Iowa Association.

The proposal submitted did not include the method of advertising that Earl W. Kintner, Special Antitrust Counsel for the NARD, refers to as the "Thrifty Liquor Stores" plan. Under that plan, a voluntary group of independent liquor stores in the Washington, D.C., area has engaged in extensive advertising programs featuring prices for commodities for some time. So far, this group has not been challenged by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission. The advertisements of the Thrifty Liquor group do not suggest a unified pricing system because each item featured in each advertisement is sponsored by an independent store in the group. The advertisements are divided into distinct boxes and the name of a store sponsoring a particular commodity appears in the box in which the commodity appears.

The language of the Federal Trade Commission majority with respect to price advertising by groups of independent retail pharmacists is quite broad. The majority opinion stated that "a program of cooperative advertising by (group) members would be subject to question under the laws administered by the Commission unless * * * use of the program would not involve any understanding or agreement, expressed or implied, among the members of the group concerning the retail selling price or the terms or conditions of sale of any item advertised, which would mean, among other things, that no prices, terms or conditions of sale of any of the items should appear in the advertising * * *."

Commissioner Elman forcefully dissented from this ruling. After pointing out that small independent retail businessmen can compete effectively against large chains only by placing joint advertisements which quote selling prices, Commissioner Elman goes on to state that "It begs the question, the answer to which necessarily depends on the particular facts, to hold that the appearance in a joint advertisement of any 'prices, terms or conditions of sale of any of the items' establishes, without more, the per se illegality of the advertising plan" Commissioner Elman stated his understanding of the issues in this manner:

"What is proposed here, as I understand it, is not an agreement among competing retailers to fix prices, which of course is a per se violation of the antitrust laws, but an agreement among independent retailers in different neighborhoods, and who therefore do not compete with each other in any practical sense, to combine their advertising allowances, to which they are legally entitled under the Robinson-Patman Act, for the purpose of advertising cooperatively. In its advisory opinion here, the Commission flashes a red light on such cooperative advertising by small businessmen. I think the Commission is making a great mistake. Preservation of small independent businessmen is a central objective of every statute that Congress has directed this Commission to enforce; and unlike my colleagues, I find nothing manifestly illegal per se in the proposals submitted."

Commissioner Higginbotham, in a separate statement, opined that on the facts presented, it must be assumed that pharmacists engaging in joint price advertising are engaging in price-fixing and that once this assumption is made, the conclusion follows from established legal principles that such joint price advertising is illegal per se. In the opinion of Commissioner Higginbotham, this conclusion precludes any examination into competitive circumstances or the laudable motives of the participating pharmacists. He concludes that: "In view of the uncertainty and the substantial risks inherent in civil or criminal prosecution, no administrative agency should give this plan the 'green light'."

Commissioner MacIntyre has expressed his agreement with the ruling of the Federal Trade Commission majority on the price advertising question in a separate statement. In his view, the Commission's duty to assist small businessmen is best served by a warning that engagement in joint price advertising programs may result in prosecution.

Commissioner Anderson explained his reluctant adherence to the majority view with respect to price advertisting by pharmacists groups in a separate statement. Commissioner Anderson stated that his sense of justice was offended by the fact that small businessmen are unable to avail themselves of the benefits enjoyed by their large competitors but he feels that the program of joint price advertising submitted would probably be in violation of law. Commissioner Anderson quotes a cautionary comment by Mr. Kintner before the recent meeting of the National Drug Trade Conference in his statement. Careful attention must be given to the broad context of Mr. Kintner's remarks, which are printed in full in the April 1, 1963, issue of the NARD Journal. He referred only to advertisements which list a single price for a product that will be charged by all participating stores with no explanation or disclaimer as to price variations between stores. Nor did Mr. Kintner's comment embrace the so-called Thrifty Liquor Stores example.

I refer again to Commissioner Elman's dissent. It appears to me that the ultimate question that must be resolved is whether joint price advertising by a group of independent pharmacists necessarily implies that such pharmacists are engaging in a price-fixing conspiracy. It seems clear to me that independent small businessmen who have no desire to fix prices but who do desire to compete effectively against giant chains which conduct massive advertising campaigns with cooperative advertising allowances furnished by manufacturers should have effective means of joint advertising available to them. This goal is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act.

In summary, the Federal Trade Commission advisory opinion appears to hold:

1. Any joint advertising sponsored by independent retail pharmacists which states specific uniform prices, terms, or conditions of sale for products subjects the participating pharmacist to danger of prosecution for price fixing.

2. The Federal Trade Commission is not disposed otherwise to challenge joint institutional advertisements by groups of retail pharmacists.

3. In addition to avoiding inferences of price-fixing, groups of retail pharmacists participating in joint advertising programs must be careful to comply with the Robinson-Patman Act prohibitions against inducing discriminatory allowances from manufacturers.

Mr. Kintner is now actively considering many requests for advice on particular joint advertising programs which were placed in suspense pending receipt of the Federal Trade Commission advisory opinion. The NARD will undertake to refer any additional requests for advice to Mr. Kintner as a part of its service to its members.

Mr. Kintner is now preparing a special bulletin for NARD members commenting upon certain specific alternatives in other plans which were not submitted to the Federal Trade Commission for its opinion, and which may be available to pharmacists desiring to participate in joint advertising programs. He also will elaborate upon the Robinson-Patman aspects of such plans.

The advisory opinion of the Federal Trade Commission does not mark the end of the search for effective competitive weapons for small businessmen but rather a beginning. The advisory opinion of the Federal Trade Commission leaves many questions unresolved. We at the NARD have embarked on an exhaustive study of the implications of the Federal Trade Commission opinion and the statements of the various Commissioners. Copies of the Federal Trade Commission opinion and the statements of the various Commissioners are attached to this bulletin for your study. You may be sure that the NARD will continue to exert every effort in this area of concern on behalf of the best interests of independent pharmacists, including seeking amendatory legislation, if such is necessary to permit the independent retail druggists to compete successfully against the cooperative advertising programs of the giant chains.

Sincerely,

Willard B. Simmons,
Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Kennedy, Morse, Clark, Randolph, Pell, Javits, Humphrey, Inouye, Ribicoff, Bartlett, Gruening, Hart, Pastore, Nelson, Hartke, McGovern, Yarborough, and Bayh, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a National Service Corps, which will alleviate the serious and extensive problems that confront so many of our fellow Americans. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk through April 24 so that other Senators may join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 1321) to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the vitality of our Nation depends upon the productivity and well-being of its citizens. We have made great progress in this country, and we can be proud of our achievements. Today, our Nation has the highest standard of living ever attained by any nation anywhere at any time in history. But we must not allow our strengths to conceal our weaknesses. Many millions of our fellow citizens needlessly suffer from economic deprivation, sickness, and neglect. When we realize that we have tolerated for so long the neglect of so many, our achievements have a hollow, dissonant ring. The needs of no single segment of our society can be forgotten or ignored. It is, therefore, up to an enlightened public to see to it that the progress of man in each century benefits all men, as is basic in a democracy.

The National Service Corps program is one of the most realistic programs developed to eliminate the problems that confront so many of our citizens. In essence, the National Service Corps is a program for Americans to help Americans. The volunteer corps, patterned after the oversea Peace Corps, will help to consolidate the talents and idealism of our citizens to assist those who are socially and economically handicapped. Service Corps volunteers will work with deprived groups including migrant farm families, American Indians, and refugees. Other areas of corpsman activity include mental health, education, welfare services in low-economic areas, and correctional institutions.

Volunteer corpsmen will not displace or interfere with local personnel, nor would they require the establishment of complicated new machinery for social programing. The corpsmen would merely augment the efforts of local public and private agencies already grappling with existing problems. The activities of the volunteer corpsmen would be under the direction and supervision of local sponsoring agencies requesting corpsmen. In short, the National Service Corps program will merely provide volunteers where they are wanted and where they are needed.

The National Service Corps will begin functioning with 150 to 300 men and women in early Fall. The number of corpsmen will gradually expand to 1,000 during fiscal year 1964, and eventually in 3 years the program might utilize as many as 5,000 volunteers.

We must realize that this modest number of volunteers will only be able to accomplish a limited amount of work throughout the Nation, especially when we remember that there are anywhere from 32 to 45 million citizens suffering from serious economic and social handicaps. But although the number of corpsmen is small, and the overall task large, these few corpsmen can make a very real contribution by setting an example for others to follow.

The broad goal of the Service Corps program is to direct public attention to the problems of the deprived American and to spur local public and private organizations to solve these problems. Serving as a pace setter, then, the corpsman volunteer will encourage other citizens to serve their own communities and thereby serve the Nation.

Once a project using corpsmen is underway, every effort will be made to bring it to a point of achievement at which the local agency staff members or local volunteers can take over the tasks originally assigned to corpsmen.

The National Service Corps is eminently realistic. I have seen a similar program in action. Last summer, I helped to develop a summer corps of college students to help migratory workers and their families in New Jersey. The volunteers, students at Douglass College, did a fine job. I said at that time that I hoped the example of the Douglass Summer Corps would be a precursor to a domestic service corps on a more comprehensive national scale. This broad program has been developed, and I consider it one of the most stirring legislative measures ever to come before the Congress.

The National Service Corps will be an invaluable adjunct to the other fine programs now before the Congress that attempt to make possible the fullest development and utilization of each citizen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Service Corps Act".

SEC. 2. In the United States there remain critical human needs in this time of general prosperity. In this nation of great human resources, many more of our citizens should be encouraged to serve in their local communities to help meet these needs.

The purposes of this Act are to open new opportunities for full-time service working with those Americans in greatest need; to illuminate those needs, so as to expand the attack on deprivation in the United States; to motivate many more citizens to volunteer their services in their own communities, thus encouraging communities to help themselves; and to inspire more people to choose professions that serve their fellow citizens.

The Congress of the United States declares that it is the policy of the United States to carry out the purposes of this Act through a National Service Corps which will be composed of carefully selected men and women of all ages who shall be made available—upon local invitation and in cooperation with interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies—to serve for a limited time in projects directed toward the critical human needs of our countrymen. These projects may include projects designed to make corpsmen available for work with persons in institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded and during their return to normal living; in meeting the health and education needs of migratory workers and their families, Indians living on and off reservations, and residents of depressed areas and rural and urban slums; in care and rehabilitation of the elderly, the disabled, the delinquent young and dependent children; in improving standards of educational opportunity; and in other projects directed toward critical human needs. To the extent possible, each project carried out under this Act shall provide for contributions by the cooperating agencies.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 3. (a) The President is authorized to carry out projects in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, on such terms and conditions as he may determine.

(b) Before undertaking a project, the President shall assure himself that it will not displace regular workers or duplicate or replace an existing service in the same locality.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, not to exceed $5,000,000, and for each succeeding fiscal year such amounts as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS AND DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The President may appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Director of the National Service Corps, whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $20,000 per annum. The President may appoint a Deputy Director of the National Service Corps, whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $19,500 per annum.

(b) The President may exercise any functions vested in him by this Act through such agency or officer of the United States Government as he shall direct. The head of any such agency or any such officer may promulgate such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out such functions, and may delegate to any of his subordinates authority to perform any of such functions.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS CORPSMEN

SEC. 5. (a) The President may enroll in the National Service Corps for service in the United States qualified citizens and nationals of the United States (referred to in this Act as "corpsmen"). The terms and conditions of the enrollment, training, compensation, hours of work, benefits, leave, termination, and all other terms and conditions of the service of corpsmen shall be exclusively those set forth in this Act and those consistent therewith which the President may prescribe; and, except as provided in this Act, corpsmen shall not be deemed officers or employees or otherwise in the service or employment of, or holding office under, the United States for any purpose.

(b) Whenever the President determines that it is in the national interest, he may, under such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, enroll qualified foreign nationals in the Corps for service in the United States.

(c) Corpsmen shall be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation, supplies, equipment, subsistence, and clothing as the President may determine to be necessary for their maintenance and to insure their health and their capacity to serve effectively. Transportation and travel allowances may also be provided, in such circumstances as the President may determine, for applicants for enrollment to or from places of training and places of enrollment, and for former corpsmen from places of termination to their homes in the United States.

(d) Corpsmen shall be entitled to receive an adjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed $75 for each month of satisfactory service as determined by the President. The adjustment allowance of each corpsman shall be payable at the termination of his service, or may be paid during the course of his service to the corpsman, to members of his family or to others, under such circumstances as the President may determine. In the event of the corpsman's death during the period of his service, the amount of any unpaid adjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f).

(e) Corpsman leaders may be designated from among the corpsmen under this Act and assigned supervisory or other special duties or responsibilities.

(f) Corpsmen shall, for the purpose of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742, as amended), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 40 of such Act and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

(1) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of the corpsman shall be deemed to be at the lowest rate provided for grade 7 of the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) Entitlement to disability compensation payments and other benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall commence on the day after the date of termination of service.

(3) In any case in which the injured corpsman, or his dependents in case of death, receives from the entity to which the corpsman was detailed or assigned or made available pursuant to section 5(j) of this Act any payment (including any allowance, gratuity, payment under an insurance policy for which the premium is wholly paid by that organization, or other benefit of any kind), on account of the same injury or death, the amount of such payments shall be credited against any benefits payable under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act as follows:

(A) payments on account of injury or disability shall be credited against disability compensation payable to the injured corpsman; and

(B) payments on account of death shall be credited against death compensation payable to dependents of the deceased corpsman.

(g) Corpsmen shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and of title II of the Social Security Act, and any service performed by an individual as a corpsman shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States.

(h) Corpsmen shall receive such health care during their service, and such health examinations and immunization preparatory to their service, as the President may deem necessary or appropriate. Subject to such conditions as the President may prescribe, such health care, examinations, and immunization may be provided for corpsmen in any facility of any agency of the United States Government, and in such cases the appropriation for maintaining and operating such facility shall be reimbursed from appropriations available under this Act.

(i)(1) Any period of satisfactory service of a corpsman under this Act shall be credited in connection with subsequent employment in the same manner as a like period of civilian employment by the United States Government—

(A) for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251, et seq.), section 852(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1092(a)(1)), and every other Act establishing a retirement system for civilian employees of any United States Government agency; and

(B) except as otherwise determined by the President, for the purposes of determining seniority, reduction in force, and layoff rights, leave entitlement, and other rights and privileges based upon length of service under the laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, the Foreign Service Act of 1946, and every other Act establishing or governing terms and conditions of service of civilian employees of the United States Government: *Provided*, That service of a corpsman shall not be credited toward completion of any probationary or trial period or completion of any service requirement for career appointment.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection, corpsmen shall be deemed to be receiving compensation during their service at the rate of adjustment allowances payable under section 5(c) of this Act.

(j) The President may detail or assign corpsmen or otherwise make them available to any entity referred to in paragraph (1) of section 7(a) on such terms and conditions as he may determine: *Provided, however*, That any corpsman so detailed or assigned shall continue to be entitled to the allowances, benefits and privileges of corpsmen authorized under or pursuant to this Act.

(k) Corpsmen shall be deemed employees of the United States Government for the purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act and any other Federal tort liability statute and for the purposes of section 595 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118i).

(l) The service of a corpsman may be terminated at any time at the pleasure of the President.

(m) Upon enrollment in the National Service Corps, every corpsman shall take the oath prescribed for persons appointed to any office of honor or profit by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (5 U.S.C. 16).

(n) The President shall make provision for such training as he deems appropriate for each applicant for enrollment as a corpsman and each enrolled corpsman. All the provisions of this Act applicable to corpsmen shall be applicable to applicants for enrollment as such during any period of training occurring prior to enrollment, and the term "corpsmen" shall include such applicants during any such period of training.

(o) The number of corpsmen enrolled under this Act shall not exceed one thousand at any given time during the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1963, and shall not exceed five thousand at any time thereafter, unless otherwise authorized by the Congress.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS EMPLOYEES

SEC. 6. The President may employ such persons as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, such persons (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "employees") shall be employed in accordance with and shall be subject to the laws applicable to personnel employed by the United States Government.

GENERAL POWERS AND AUTHORITIES

SEC. 7. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the President may—

(1) enter into, perform, and modify contracts and agreements and otherwise cooperate with any agency of the United States Government or of any State or any subdivision thereof, other governments of places subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and departments and agencies thereof, and educational institutions, nonprofit health, welfare, and rehabilitation agencies, farm organizations, labor unions, and other organizations, individuals, and firms;

(2) accept in the name of the National Service Corps and employ in furtherance of the purposes of this Act—

(A) voluntary services notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665(b), and

(B) any money or property (real, personal or mixed, tangible or intangible) received by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise, and dispose of such property in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

(b) Subject to any future action of the Congress, a contract or agreement for services of corpsmen which entails commitments for the expenditure of funds available for the purposes of this Act, including commitments for purposes of paying or providing for allowances and other benefits of corpsmen authorized by section 5 of this Act, may extend at any time for not more than twenty-four months.

(c) The President may allocate or transfer to any agency of the United States Government any funds available for carrying out the purposes of this Act including any advance received by the United States from any State, local, or other organization under authority of this Act. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure for the purposes of this Act in accordance with authority granted in this Act or under authority governing the activities of the agencies of the United States Government to which such funds are allocated or transferred.

(d) Any officer of the United States Government carrying out functions under this Act may utilize the services and facilities of, or procure commodities from, any agency of the United States Government as the President shall direct, or with the consent of the head of such agency, and funds allocated pursuant to this subsection to any such agency shall be established in separate appropriation accounts on the books of the Treasury.

(e) In the case of any commodity, service, or facility procured from any agency of the United States Government under this Act, reimbursement of payment shall be made to such agency from funds available under this Act. Such reimbursement or payment shall be at replacement cost, or, if required by law at actual cost, or at any other price authorized by law and agreed to by the owning or disposing agency. The amount of any such reimbursement or payment shall be credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which there may be procured replacements of similar commodities, services, or facilities, except that where such appropriations, funds, or accounts are not reimbursable except by reason of this subsection, and when the owning or disposing agency determines that such replacement is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 8. (a) The President may appoint to membership in a board to be known as the National Service Corps Advisory Council twenty-five persons who are broadly representative of health, welfare, and rehabilitation agencies, of education institutions, and of business, farm, labor and other public and private organizations and groups, as well as individuals interested in the programs and objectives of the National Service Corps, to advise and consult with the President with regard to policies and programs designed to further the purposes of this Act.

(b) Members of the Council shall serve at the pleasure of the President and meet at his call. Members who are not officers or employees of the United States Government shall each be entitled to receive out of funds made available for the purpose of this Act compensation at a rate to be fixed by the President, but not exceeding $75 for each day, not to exceed twenty days in any fiscal year in the case of any such member, spent away from his home or regular place of business for the purpose of attendance at meetings or conferences and in necessary travel, and while so engaged may be paid actual travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other provision of law, the President may accept the services of appointed members under this section without payment of compensation therefor (and with or without payment of travel expenses or per diem in lieu of subsistence).

EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS

SEC. 9. (a) Experts and consultants or organizations thereof may, as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), be employed by the President for the performance of functions under this Act, and individuals so employed may be compensated at rates not in excess of $75 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of said Act (5 U.S.C. 73b–2), while so employed: *Provided*, That contracts for such employment may be renewed annually.

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Council authorized to be established by section 8 of this Act or as an expert or consultant under subsection (a) of this section shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 13 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2263), section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a), section 872 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, or any other law limiting the reemployment of retired officers or employees or governing the simultaneous receipt of compensation and retired pay or annuities.

UTILIZATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 10. Funds available for the purposes of this Act shall be available for the exercise of any authority granted by this Act, including, but not limited to:

(1) rent of buildings and space in buildings in the United States, and for repair, alteration, and improvement of such leased properties;

(2) expenses of printing and binding without regard to the provisions of section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111);

(3) expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this Act, including (notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 60–328 (31 U.S.C. 673)) expenses in connection with meetings of persons whose employment is authorized by section 10(a) of this Act;

(4) expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes or places of burial, and of care and disposition of the remains of corpsmen who may die while such persons are away from their homes participating in activities under this Act.

REPORTS

SEC. 11. The President shall transmit to the Congress, at least once in each fiscal year, a report on operations under this Act.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

SEC. 12. All persons employed or assigned to duties and all corpsmen enrolled under this Act shall be investigated to insure that the employment, assignment, or enrollment is consistent with the national interest in accordance with standards and procedures established by the President.

SEAL

SEC. 13. The President may adopt, alter, and use an official seal or emblem of the National Service Corps of such design as he shall determine, which shall be judicially noticed.

MORATORIUM ON STUDENT LOANS

SEC. 14. Section 205 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (20 U.S.C. 425) is amended by deleting the word "or" immediately preceding clause (iii) of section 205 (b)(2)(A) and by adding immediately after that clause the following: "or (iv) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a corpsman under the National Service Corps Act: *Provided*, That this clause shall apply to any loan outstanding on the effective date of the National Service Corps Act only with the consent of the then obligee institution."

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

SEC. 15. Subsection (j) of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2253), is amended to read as follows:

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or section 5(f) of the Peace Corps Act or the National Service Corps Act, any military service (other than military service covered by military leave with pay from a civilian position) performed by an individual after December 1956 and any period of service by an individual as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act, or as a corpsman under the National Service Corps Act, shall be excluded in determining the aggregate period of service upon which an annuity payable under this chapter to such individual or to his widow or child is to be based, if such individual or widow or child is entitled (or would upon proper application be entitled) at the time of such determination, to monthly old-age or survivors benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402), based on such individual's wages and self-employment income. If in the case of the individual or widow such military service or service under the Peace Corps Act of the National Service Corps Act is not excluded under the preceding sentence, but upon attaining age sixty-two, he or she becomes entitled (or would upon proper application be entitled) to such benefits, the Commission shall redetermine the aggregate period of service upon which such annuity is based, effective as of the first day of the month in which he or she attains such age, so as to exclude such service. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall, upon the request of the Commission, inform the Commission whether or not any such individual or widow or child is entitled at any specified time to such benefits."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 16. (a) The term "United States" as used in this Act in a territorial sense, includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands and all other places, continental or insular, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(b) The term "health care" includes all appropriate examinations, preventive, curative and restorative health, medical, and dental care, and supplementary services when necessary.

(c) For the purposes of this or any other Act, the period of any individual's service as a corpsman under this Act shall include—

(1) except for the purposes of section 5(h) of this Act, any period of training under section 5(m) prior to enrollment as a corpsman under this Act; and

(2) the period between enrollment as a corpsman and the termination of service as such corpsman by the President or by death or resignation.

(d) The term "United States Government agency" includes any department, board, wholly or partly owned corporation, or instrumentality, commission, or establishment of the United States Government.

CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 17. If any provision of this Act or the application of any provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 18. This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

CREATION OF A STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution to create a single standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs and to place under its jurisdiction those important veterans matters now divided between the Labor Committee and the Finance Committee. The important subjects which this committee would deal with include the pensions, the medical care and rehabilitation of veterans and the operation of the Veterans' Administration.

The important problems of veterans are such that they warrant the attention of a permanent committee adequately supported by a full-time staff. It seems to be a matter of simple logic and sound public policy that legislation which affects millions of American citizens—not only veterans but their widows, wives, children, and dependents—receive the continued careful study of a permanent committee. We now have standing committees that deal with legislation affecting farmers, our banks, our judiciary, the District of Columbia, and our post office employees. Certainly no one would argue that veterans are less important. Surely the lives and welfare of our more than 20 million veterans merit the same attention these groups receive.

Mr. President, this resolution is not intended as any criticism of the fine work of either the Labor Committee or the Finance Committee. In fact the new Veterans' Committee would bring together the experience and knowledge of these committees, for three of its members would also serve on the Labor Committee and three on the Finance Committee. The new committee would be strengthened by the addition of three members from the Armed Services Committee. In effect, the present fragmentary approach to veterans legislation would be replaced by a committee whose members would be familiar with the problems of veterans in all their aspects.

The cold war will be with us for a long time to come. As long as it lasts, a large number of our young men will do military service, which is often dangerous even in a cold war, and always a burden on their wives. To these men as well as veterans of past wars we all owe a great debt. A standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs would give these Americans a forum where their views could be heard, and their needs studied; it would serve as an indication of the country's serious and continuing concern for their well-being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 126) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (l) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, three who are also members of the Committee on Finance, three who are also members of the Committee on Armed Services, and three who are also members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs."

Sec. 3. Section 6(a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the designation of ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations) is amended by adding at the end of the tabulation contained therein the following new item: "Committee on Veterans' Affairs—For the Veterans' Administration."

Sec. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-eighth Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

FLYING OF THE AMERICAN FLAG OVER THE REMAINS OF THE U.S.S. "UTAH"—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] appear as cosponsors of the measure (S. 703) to provide for the flying of the American flag over the remains of the U.S.S. *Utah* in honor of the heroic men who were entombed in her hull on December 7, 1941, at any future printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON REVISION OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] may be added as a cosponsor of S. 1255, for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States which I introduced on April 2, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of April 4, 1963:

S. 1270. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the retail sales of meat, meat food products, livestock products, and other food items: Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Yarborough.

Authority of April 9, 1963:

S. 1283. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Fong, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, and Mr. Proxmire.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, for the benefit of those Senators who might be interested, I would like to announce that the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will conduct hearings on S. 283, the Small Reclamation Projects Act on April 23 and on the S. 793 and S. 784, bills to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake and Klamath Wildlife Refuges on April 24.

On May 7, it is my intention to hold hearings on S. 26, the Dixie project located in the State of Utah.

All of these hearings will be held in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, commencing at 10 a.m.

SOVIET OIL MENACE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the weapons of Communist conquest are many and diverse. The Kremlin pushes its expansion vigorously and with every means at its command.

As the Soviet Union has continued to broaden its industrial capabilities, international trade has become one of the most subtle, yet effective and dangerous instruments of Red aggression. As members of this Senate are aware, one of the most serious examples of the Kremlin's use of international trade in furthering Red influence is the invasion of free world petroleum markets by Russia.

This is indeed a serious feature of the continuing struggle against communism, because the Kremlin understands full well that oil is a vital and indispensable requirement of every nation. Having developed a large oil producing capacity, the Soviet Union is literally and figuratively flooding selective and sensitive free world markets. Not only does this endanger a healthy economy in these nations, but it gives Communist trade representatives an entree into these areas which otherwise would not be accessible, were it not for the below-the-market prices at which Soviet oil is being offered.

If we are to meet and overcome this Red oil offensive, we must have a full understanding of its meaning in terms of Soviet capability, intentions, and limitations with respect to oil production and distribution.

What is probably the most comprehensive, authoritative, and understandable analysis of the Russian oil situation, both in the Soviet Union, and as an instrument of international trade, appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of Sunday, March 31, 1963. The article was an extensive reprint of excerpts from a recent speech delivered in Fort Worth, Tex., by Mr. George F. Getty of Los Angeles, Calif., president of the Tidewater Oil Co.

This is a particularly valuable contribution to our understanding of Communist oil export for two reasons. First, Mr. Getty is recognized as one of the most progressive and capable figures in the oil industry today. Secondly, he bases his report upon personal observations made by him in the course of an extended tour of important oil producing areas in the Soviet Union. Thus his first-hand observations, coupled with his vast experience in the oil industry, serve to make this speech both authoritative and informative.

I believe that after reading this speech, reprinted from the Washington Star, Members of this Senate will share my opinion that this is a most valuable contribution to our understanding of Russian techniques of expansion through the use of trade. It underlines the seriousness of the problem confronting us, and the necessity of keeping our Nation's petroleum industry technologically advanced and economically sound.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech of Mr. Getty printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Expert Sees Rising Soviet Oil Offensive

(Editor's Note.—George F. Getty II, president of the Tidewater Oil Co., recently returned from an inspection tour of the Soviet oil industry. Here are excerpts from a report he made to the American Petroleum Institute meeting in Fort Worth, Tex., earlier this month.)

We meet today as the oil industry is threatened on many fronts. Such a confrontation is not unusual for us, but today's threats are possibly the most ominous to date in our industry's history.

Most of you are concerned mainly with exploration and production work. Your work is challenging and difficult. It would be doubly challenging—in fact, confounding—if you had to work amidst violent revolutions, border wars or Communist subversion. Yet this was the case recently for our oilmen in Iraq and Yemen; while those working in Venezuela are in the middle of communism's No. 1 target in Latin America.

Added to the oil operators' troubles these days is the cut-throat competition of the largest oil organization in the world—the government-controlled Soviet oil industry. We think our domestic oil business is competitive. Well, many of you may be familiar with an example of really tough competition. In a recent "price war," the Russians forced free world companies to lower prices by offering India Soviet oil at 10 to 20 percent below prevailing world prices—which were already somewhat depressed.

THE BATTLE AND THE WAR

They were shrewd. They dealt the free world a blow merely by cutting prices on a bid; they didn't have to use up even one barrel of oil to win a trade war victory. To keep the business, Western companies were forced to make the sale at Soviet prices. Isn't that called winning the battle but losing the war?

The Soviet oil industry is unique. From the seismograph to export marketing it is operated—perhaps inefficiently, and often dangerously—with only one goal in mind: defeating the aims and ideals of everyone in this room.

As you may know, I was a member of the U.S. petroleum delegation that spent a month getting a first-hand, on-the-spot view of certain Soviet oil operations. Although there is a great temptation when one comes back from a foreign country to be an expert, even a Russian would have difficulty being an expert in the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Union is a difficult, complex country.

WHAT U.S. OILMEN SAW

Nevertheless, our tour of Russia gave us a reasonable opportunity to observe the Soviet oil industry at work. Let me sketch for you what our visiting oilmen saw in the Soviet Union.

We like to pride ourselves on our accomplishments in oil development. But the agency running the Soviet exploration and production is a hard-working crew that cut our time in half. In 15 years, from 1946 to 1962, they increased oil production from only 432,000 barrels a day to 3.3 million barrels. That's quite a jump. Some time ago, we made the same increase in our own production, but it took us 31 years, from 1907 to 1939.

Even though the Soviets had all the technical advances since 1907 working in their favor, their record is an obvious accomplishment. With 3.3 million barrels, in world production they are second only to our own 7 million barrels daily. For the end of their present 7-year plan, in 1965, they have targeted production at 4.8 million barrels daily.

NO LABOR PROBLEMS FOR THEM

Oil field development is controlled carefully under the 7-year plan. The nation itself owns the land and the minerals, of course. There are no leases, no royalties. There are no labor problems—despite the fact that 25 percent of the oil industry workers are women. The government just goes ahead and does as it pleases. Labor, for example, is freely transferred from one region to another to balance quality and quantity.

The Soviet production objective is maximum recovery of reserves in the shortest period of time. They have a use for all the oil and gas that they can get their hands on. They want to get the oil out and use it, not to produce it over a long period of time; the latter would be better oil field engineering practice, but poor overall economic and political practice for the Soviets. About 10 percent of Soviet wells are wildcats.

Our trip had many surprises. For example, counter to our thinking that Baku was the great source of Soviet oil, this region produces only 22 percent of the Soviet's total. After World War II, the Soviets began exploring other regions. They were handed an energy gift on a silver platter when they discovered the Volga-Urals fields, strategically located between Moscow and their tremendous, newly industrialized area east of the Urals. The Soviets couldn't have gotten a more economic supply of oil if they had designed the situation in one of their own 7-year plans.

Under the present 7-year plan, they are constructing huge petroleum pipelines. These amounted to 19,700 miles of oil line and 18,300 miles of gas line in 1961; about twice their trunk pipeline mileage in 1958. This doesn't sound like much compared with what we're doing here in the United States. On the other hand, when you consider that the average diameter of these pipes is 40 inches, their carrying capacity is tremendous. These pipelines carry oil to the satellite countries, the Black Sea, and may eventually carry it to the Sea of Japan—all places where their export potential is greatest.

The Soviet Union also is expanding its merchant fleet. Soviet officials stated that luckily they don't have to build tankers because the free world has been so nice and built so many extra ones which are available at low charter rates. But we gathered from several conversations and recent reports that large tankers, 25,000 to 35,000 tons, are being constructed on the Black Sea. We also know they have contracted for large ships in Japan and Italy.

This tanker and pipeline expansion certainly adds to the free world's increasing problems with Soviet oil exports, as you have seen pointed up by the newspaper accounts of a possible Soviet deal with England for ships.

Refinery capacity has been a bottleneck in their plans. Refinery runs in 1958 totaled a shade over 2.6 million barrels a day. These increased to 4.25 million barrels daily in 1962 and are scheduled to reach 5 million in 1965. With this capacity, it is possible that after satisfying home requirements, they will have about 440,000 barrels of refined products daily for free world export.

THE MODELS ARE IMPRESSIVE, BUT—

We visited the Novo Ufa refinery. It employs about 5,000 people, 600 of these are engineers and technicians. It's basically a large topping plant with limited cracking and reforming facilities. But don't forget, the Soviets primarily require fuel oil and middle distillates, not high octane gasoline. They see no point in putting in a lot of octane and gasoline building equipment.

Characteristically, Soviet industry in most areas lags substantially behind the United States. At the permanent exhibition of Soviet achievement in Moscow, where they have a Hall of Geology, a Hall of Oil and Gas, and a Hall of Petroleum Science, we saw models of wonderful drilling rigs, bits, refineries, and petro-chemical plants. But the actual equipment we saw in the field was nothing to get excited about.

We trekked through four oilfields, toured four of their largest refineries, visited the four best research institutes, but we saw little evidence of this wonderful equipment. It just wasn't in operation where we were.

NOT VERY IMPRESSED

After we had seen Soviet oil operations we put our heads together to compare notes. We were not particularly impressed. But realistically, we had to recognize their tremendous potential. You cannot deny their great oil and gas fields, their vast reserves. You can't deny their successful, almost explosive development of oil and gas resources and oil export opportunities.

At this point it might be well to see what kind of conclusions can be drawn from this sketch of what we saw of the Soviet oil industry.

I am convinced that the Soviets have used and will continue to use their abundant oil resources to expedite their own industrial expansion and to extend their political influence, undermine freedom, and spread communism in the free world.

The Soviets' crude oil production allowed them in 1953 to export 35,000 barrels a day to the free world. In 1961, this jumped to a 610,000-barrel-a-day average, or 3 percent of the free world oil demand. They flatly told us they intend to up that 3 percent to 4 percent, and you know they aren't going to spend the rest of their lives doing it. Their present 7-year plan calls for exports of 1 million barrels a day to the free world in 1965. To do this, they're going to use their system of moving into oil markets, upsetting them, withdrawing from them and moving into others.

We face a massive, aggressive competitor who can cut prices at will and barter, accept soft currencies, and do business in ways that would stymie or ruin a Western oil company. In 1961, this competiton cost traditional exporting countries, particularly Venezuela and certain Middle Eastern States, $486 million in lost revenue. And the competition will get tougher.

WHAT THE SOVIET NEEDS

The Soviet oil industry is in dire need of exploration, production, and transportation equipment. To an important extent, the success of the Soviet oil threat depends on how successful they are in obtaining line pipe, drilling rigs, pumps, oil country tubular goods, and so on. They also need tankers and complete refinery units, petrochemical plants, and electronic gear in order to fulfill their 7-year goal.

Let's not kid ourselves. They are going to trade their oil for this equipment and these facilities, as well as for raw materials, food, chemicals, and other commodities from manufacturers and producers in the free world. One can't get around the fact that this trade with the Communists has been, and will be, freely entered into by many nations because, as in all enduring commercial relationships, both parties expect to benefit. Over a billion dollars' worth of plant, equipment, and metal goods were sold to the Communist bloc by the free world in 1960.

Take Italy, for example, the Soviets bartered 100,000 barrels of crude oil a day over a 5-year period—about 20 percent of the Italian oil requirements—in return for specific quantities of much needed 40-inch pipe, pumps, synthetic fibers and other essentials. Italy picks up the oil at Black Sea ports at a price equivalent to $1 a barrel. At that price, it's hardly worth taking oil out of the ground in Texas.

It could be said that all of your work in finding reserves, to meet future production requirements will be a waste of time if the Soviets are allowed to carry out this threat and to undermine the security of the free world. However, while I am completely convinced of the Soviet threat, I am equally convinced that the free world's oil companies can be counted on to resist to their utmost in any struggle for the world's oil markets.

SOVIET EXPORTS HAVE LEVELED OFF

Already there is evidence supporting this conviction. After increasing at an annual rate of about 40 percent for the past 3 years, Soviet oil exports have leveled off. Remember, oil export potential does not necessarily mean sales, even for as aggressive a competitor as the Soviets.

But let's not drop our guard. The leveling off might just be due to a lack of present capacity in Soviet pipelines and tankers.

My conviction that Western oil companies can resist Soviet competition is not based on blind faith. It is based on the expectation that certain things must happen.

To meet Soviet competition, American oil companies must at least remain as strong and healthy as they are today. They must effectively supply a steadily growing demand in the United States and in the free world. They must continue to operate a vast distribution and marketing network which guarantees delivery of petroleum products where and when they are needed.

The Soviets don't yet have such a network and can't guarantee delivery. Most important, American oil companies must continue to develop present reserves and build future strength by discovering new reserves.

THE FIRST DECADE: CHANGE AND CHALLENGE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is 10 years old this month. In its first decade the Department has faced new problems that were foreseen only by a very few farsighted persons during the 30-year struggle to estabish such a Department. Our school population, for example, has increased from 37 million in 1952 to 52 million in 1962, and the number of persons 65 years or over has increased from 13 million to 17 million in the same decade. Great numbers of our citizens are moving from farm to city; our economy has grown from $365 billion in 1953 to $544 billion in 1962.

These changes have brought social and economic problems of vital concern to HEW, and the Department has become more and more concerned about the impact of such change upon the citizens of our Nation. The present Secretary, Anthony Celebrezze, has said that it will be the responsibility of the Department in the next decade, as it was during the first 10 years, to help make available to all citizens full opportunities for the development of their talents and abilities.

The Secretary's words were printed in an introduction to the April 1963 edition of the HEW Indicators. The same introduction also summarizes the history and importance of the Department. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the introduction was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST DECADE: CHANGE AND CHALLENGE

This year marks the 10th anniversary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the newest Federal agency to be represented in the President's Cabinet. However, the responsibilities it bears for the well-being of the American people date back to the early years of our Republic.

They began in 1785, when the Congress of the Confederation made grants of public lands to the States for public schools.

They were added to in 1798, when the Fifth Congress established the Marine Hospital Service—forerunner of today's Public Health Service.

In 1867 the Federal Office of Education was established; in 1907 the Food and Drug Administration began as the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture; in 1912 the Children's Bureau was established; in 1920 the predecessor of the present Vocational Rehabilitation Administration began its important work; and in 1935 the Social Security Board was organized.

All these agencies were brought together in 1939 under the framework of the Federal Security Agency, and 14 years later the Agency was given Cabinet status when it became the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In this chronology of the Department's growth, we can trace the Nation's growing recognition of the need for Federal participation in promoting the general welfare of the American people. Through periods of prosperity and depression, through civil strife and world conflict, the Federal Government has shared in the national concern for the well-being of every citizen.

We are now in an era of change and challenge which in many ways eclipses those critical periods of our past.

We are in the midst of a technological revolution which is changing the pattern of life and work of the American people.

As our national strength and prosperity have increased, we have grown more and more aware of pressing problems within our society which cry out for solution—problems of great magnitude and complexity that are beyond the resources of the individual and his local and State governments.

Some of these problems have long been with us and require solution even more urgently today; some are the outgrowth of the technological forces which are altering our society; others have arisen as a natural consequence of the higher human expectations of larger numbers of citizens.

In education, for example, we have a shortage of facilities and well-trained teachers at the same time that we face increasing demands for more schooling for more people. We have millions of young people and millions of adults whose lack of adequate education prevents them from enjoying a full measure of the Nation's prosperity and from making their full contribution to society.

Our aged men and women, those in the lowest income group and most subject to illness, have tragically inadequate insurance against the high cost of hospital care and related health services.

Other problems in our society represent an appalling waste of human lives and human potential: mental illness and mental retardation, drug addiction, accidents, juvenile delinquency.

Increasingly we are concerned with problems of air and water pollution, and the proliferation of chemicals in the production and processing of foods.

In the following pages are summarized the progress this Department has made during the past decade in carrying out its responsibilities for the well-being of the American people.

As we review the successes of the Department's first 10 years, let us look forward to a second decade of helping to make available to all citizens full opportunities for the development of their talents and abilities. These are our most precious resources—our hope for the future.

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education,
and Welfare.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—PAYMENT IN GOLD FOR U.S. ASSETS ABROAD

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, on February 14, I spoke in the Senate about reports in the press and on the radio that France might organize with other countries of Western Europe to demand payment in gold for the U.S. assets they hold.

I have already placed in the RECORD the reply I received from Treasury Secretary Dillon to my inquiry about the truth of these allegations. That material, as it relates to France, appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 28.

Today I wish to insert material on this subject sent to me by the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Facts regarding the position of the Federal Republic of Germany with respect to the United States balance of payment

[Millions of dollars]

	German trade with the United States		
	1960	1961	1962
Imports	1,422.5	1,515.8	1,758.3
Exports	886.6	870.1	965.7
U.S. surplus	535.9	645.7	792.6

NOTE.—The above mentioned figures include German purchases of United States military equipments

(2) The German Government agreed in buying U.S. military equipment for approximately $700 millions annually. This amount matches the annual military expenditures of the United States in Germany. The Federal Republic of Germany makes anticipated payments for the supply of military equipments generating additional receipts in the framework of the U.S. balance of payments.

(3) In 1961 the Federal Republic of Germany made a debt prepayment in the amount of $587 million, larger than any other prepayment made by any other country.

(4) The "Deutsche Bundesbank" (the independent central bank in Germany) has concluded "swap" agreements in the amount of $150 million with the U.S. monetary authorities in 1962.

(5) The Bundesbank has credited to the Treasury deutsche marks in the amount of $200 million against medium-term bonds in January and February 1963.

(6) During 1962 the Bundesbank has bought practically no gold from the U.S. monetary authorities although the German short-term claims climbed near to the $3 billion mark.

(7) Mr. Blessing, the president of the Bundesbank, and other top ranking German bankers have declared repeatedly and publicly their confidence in the soundness of the U.S. currency thus contributing considerably to the stability of the dollar in the German and the international finance market.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, while I am somewhat reassured by the cooperation Germany has extended us so far on this financial problem, I do not view with any assurance at all the continuation of such large obligations in the hands of both Germany and France. As this data indicates, West Germany has short-term U.S. claims close to $3 billion in value. France has claims on us of at least $1 billion.

The United States must make every effort to reduce these obligations in Western Europe just as fast as possible. A 1962 report of the Joint Economic Committee on this subject made this observation:

> The tendency for countries like Germany, France, and Italy to continue accumulating gold and dollars rather than to spend more of their rising export income on imports, on capital investment in other countries, and on foreign aid, has been responsible for a large part of the free world's payments imbalance.

The report I have quoted from is entitled, "U.S. Payments Policies Consistent with Domestic Objectives of Maximum Employment and Growth," and is a report of the subcommittee on international exchange and payments.

I shall have more to say on this subject at a future date, but in the meantime, I welcome the statement from West Germany and I hope we can continue to count on her help in easing what has become for us a serious financial problem.

EASTER, 1963

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, with the advent of the joyous season of Easter, it is fitting that we pause in reverent contemplation of the meaning to the Christian world of the momentous event which renders this commemoration so sacred, so historic, so imperishable. Easter is at once a feast of solemnity and joy, a call to the silence of adoration and to the ecstasy of rapture, as the full significance of the Resurrection touches our hearts. As His death was the ultimate expression of Christ's love for man, so was His Resurrection an affirmation of the eternal victory of the spirit over the flesh. This sublime event symbolizes as well the high destiny reserved to God-created man, and reminds us anew of the common brotherhood we share in this mortal world, and of the deep and hallowed obligations such a brotherhood imposes. May the sacred and joyous feast of Easter find voice in our lives as well as in our thoughts, and make us more worthy of the love that has made this moment immortal in the history of Christian man.

PAN AMERICAN DAY, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, April 14 marks an anniversary of unusual significance to Americans. It is the 73d anniversary of the inter-American system, and it is called Pan American Day. This system of free and sovereign nations, now formally embodied in the Organization of American States, is the oldest international organization of its type in the modern world. We Americans of the north are proud of this Organization. We are proud of its concepts of equality, peaceful settlement of disputes, and cooperation for mutual social, economic, and cultural betterment for the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

It was the "George Washington" of South America, Simón Bolívar, who first envisaged and tried to organize the young nations of the Western Hemisphere, newly independent of European colonialism. These earliest efforts failed to crystallize, and it was not until 1890, at the initiative of the Secretary of State, James Blaine, that the First International Conference of American States was held here in Washington, and the pan-American idea took concrete form.

Since that time, this oldest of international organizations has come a long way. One of the fundamental precepts of the pan-American idea was that here, in the New World, we Americans could start afresh on a system of international relations which would differ from the older European habits of wars and entanglements. In these limited aims we have been largely successful. But it is the more recent, positive aims that we Americans have set for ourselves that challenge our concept of peaceful cooperation for progress.

The Alliance for Progress embodies these positive aims of the Organization of American States. We must not weary of the burdens or the complexities of the noble tasks which we have set for ourselves, but on this 73d Pan American Day must dedicate ourselves anew to the accomplishment of hemispheric solidarity, peaceful progress, and justice and equality for all Americans.

THE YOUTH CORPS BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters I have received in support of the Youth Corps bill, passed yesterday, from three prominent citizens of my State of Oregon.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIRCUIT COURT OF
THE STATE OF OREGON,
Salem, Oreg., April 5, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I urge favorable action by this session of Congress on Senate bill 1 and House bill 1890. The immediate development of youth work camps and employment programs are a must in an effective attack on the serious and the increasing problem of delinquency that faces America today.

This proposed legislation is necessary to help youth with problems—problems that are daily becoming more imminent because of the lack of employment for youth and because so many youngsters, who are school dropouts, find themselves walking the streets in idleness and no foreseeable purpose in life.

We must act now to help those unfortunate products of our rapidly changing society accelerated by automation and other aspects of this technological age.

Yours very truly,
JOSEPH B. FELTON,
Circuit Judge.

PARISH OF ST. MARK
THE EVANGELIST,
Hood River, Oreg., April 3, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Grace be unto you and peace from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ:

I would add my voice to the several with whom I've had the opportunity to discuss the matter on urging your support of the Youth Employment Act of 1963 (S. 1 and H.R. 1890).

Even in such communities as Hood River, which certainly has a present low youth problem, the situation facing the young men and women who can neither go on to school or find adequate employment; or who are for that matter, potential delinquency candidates, we recognize a definite need for adequate program. We have pioneered the summer work camp, and the benefits of this bill would certainly extend the effectiveness of such programs.

Perhaps the opponents to this measure (and I understand it is being opposed mainly on cost) should see that a few millions of dollars spent in saving youth is better spent than $1 building weapons which could destroy them.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
ALBERT E. ALLEN.

OFFICE OF COUNTY COURT
OF POLK COUNTY,
Dallas, Oreg., April 3, 1963.

Sen. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: I am writing to you in regard to Senate bill 1 that I believe is in committee at this time, and would like to express my interest in this type legislation. Although I do not approve of all provisions of the bill, I think it is a splendid start in the right direction. I believe the original CCC we worked under during the depression would come as near accomplishing the desired results with our many unemployed young men. I also believe the time is at hand when we must realize the seriousness of the unemployed youth in our country and, under our present system of automation, it is impossible for all of them to find jobs. The last report I read in the Juvenile Journal, we have 700,000 youths drop out of high school every year who are ill prepared to meet the challenge of today's living standards. Serving in the capacity of juvenile judge, many young people come before me throughout the year requesting a chance for employment, and, of course, we have nothing to offer them. I am sure if we had something of the YCC program it would give these young people a chance to keep busy and have a tendency to lead them away from a life of delinquency, giving them a good foundation for citizens of our country.

If there is anything I can do on the homefront to help promote this type legislation, feel free to call upon me. At your convenience, please keep me informed as to the status of the bill at this time.

Sincerely yours,
C. M. BARNHART.

P.S.—I intended to include this in my letter too: Many of us in the county are greatly disappointed with the accelerated work program that was inaugurated by Congress. I am sure the people who sponsored this bill had no intention that the Government agencies, such as the Agriculture and Interior Departments, would take advantage of the moneys that were appropriated. They already come under the national budget for large sums and I feel this money should have been, and was intended to be, for local programs and be distributed to take care of the unemployed situation throughout the country. As I understand the bill, it calls for $900 million, but only $400 million was appropriated. I hope Congress sees fit to appropriate the other $500 million and tie it up so that it will be assured it will go to small local projects in communities throughout the United States.

ANTI-SEMITISM WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, an article which appeared recently in the Christian Science Monitor presents a short analysis of anti-semitism within the Soviet Union and is illustrative of one aspect of Communist racism which is being called to our attention with increasing frequency. I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

During this week in which the people of the Jewish faith throughout the world are celebrating the religious observance of Passover, I think it is appropriate to take note of the growing worldwide concern over Soviet policy reflected in the discriminatory treatment of certain minority groups within the U.S.S.R. Numerous reports coming out of the Soviet Union make reference to the overt and subtle pressures being exerted against persons of the Jewish faith. The latest manifestation of Soviet policy is the continued prohibition against public baking or sale—or even importing—of matzoth, the sacred wafer so important in the celebration of Passover.

Soviet propagandists have been ready to exploit, especially in the newly emergent lands of Asia and Africa, what they conceive to be evidence of racism within the free world. But today they are becoming subject to embarrassment in these very areas by the growing mass of evidence of racism within the Communist world.

The free world was most recently shocked over the outbreaks in Bulgaria involving young African students studying there. It must be pointed out that when such manifestations are viewed against the backdrop of other similar occurrences within the Red bloc, it becomes evident that racism in the Communist world is not an isolated phenomenon. Anti-Negro disturbances in Bulgaria and elsewhere and persecution of minority groups within the U.S.S.R. form a disturbing pattern.

Evidence has been presented to indicate that Jews in the Soviet Union are subjected to cultural and religious deprivation not applied to any of the other recognized nationalities or religious groups in the U.S.S.R. Although official Soviet policy promotes antireligious ideologies and a continual propaganda campaign against organized religion, many religious privileges are still enjoyed by the Russian Orthodox churches, the Lutheran churches of Latvia and Estonia, and even the Moslem religious groups in the U.S.S.R.; harassment of Jewish religious activities in the Soviet Union is a marked contrast to the selective freedoms of these other groups.

It has been noted that no Jewish cultural or religious exchange activity has been permitted with institutions in the free world. It would appear, therefore, that the Soviet Government's discrimination against the Jews, both as a nationality group and a religious movement, has served to stimulate a "popular" anti-Semitism within the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 31, 1963]

Red Anti-Semitism Scrutinized

(By Judd L. Teller)

During the last year, scores of Soviet Jews were publicly pilloried, tried, and convicted for economic crimes against the state. Some were executed.

Those trials and executions took place mainly in the Ukraine and in the former Romanian territory annexed by the Soviet Union after World War II. In addition, the Moscow synagogue has been threatened with closing as an alleged center of black marketing and pro-Israel agitation.

An analysis of these reports, undertaken by this writer last summer in personal interviews with Soviet Jews from all walks of life, shows that there are two kinds of anti-Semitic discrimination at work in the Soviet Union.

ASSIMILATION RESISTED

One is at the seat of power in Moscow, the other in the Ukraine.

The Moscow bias is ideological and geopolitical. It is based on Jews' resilience to total assimilation which at least partially has been due to a Soviet reluctance to assimilate them. It is based on suspicion of Jews as an element with international affinities—5 million Jews in the United States and the pro-Western State of Israel.

The press attacks on the Moscow synagogue, which is only nominally a symbol of Jewry, since the majority are not religious, are probably intended as an oblique warning to all Soviet Jews to avoid nationalistic digression.

This ideological anti-Semitism at the power center is counterbalanced by a genuine feeling of penance among the Soviet intelligentsia for the anti-Semitism of the Stalin period and collaboration in the Nazi-occupied territories of the U.S.S.R.

HISTORIC TRADITION

This penance is evident less among technologists and managers than among writers and artists. The poet Evgeny Yevtushenko has not been the only one to raise his voice on the subject. Penance has also been evident in works of fiction.

Popular anti-Semitism in the Ukraine and the annexed former Rumanian territory has a long historic tradition. Moscow is compelled to compromise with Ukraine nationalism. That nationalism is directed largely at the Jews as Jews, as "Russifiers," preferring Russian to Ukraine schools, and as competitors, solely on merit, for high posts in education, the economy, and the civil service.

Discrimination against Jews follows a spiral pattern in the Ukraine. Both Jewish faculty and students are unhappy at its universities. It is difficult for a Jew to obtain a cab driver's license in Kiev, capital of the Ukraine. It is difficult for Jewish war veterans to obtain employment. Even Jews in high positions in Kiev wait about 5 years for new apartments in the meantime residing in the slum areas near the Dnieper River banks, while peasants brought in from outlying villages are placed, within months, in new apartment houses.

OCCASIONAL FRAMEUPS

Economic discrimination in the Ukraine and the former Rumanian territories compels some Jews into peripheral, extralegal ways of making a living. He is also, too often, the victim of deliberate frameups. When the security police close in on a suspect plant or management, the true culprits quickly line up witnesses to blame a Jew, any Jew who though sheer circumstance of the office he occupies can be made to appear as the villain.

Soviet Jews must also be alarmed by the latest decision of the Committee of the Party Government Control to enlist every worker in every job as a spy against his fellow workers. This kind of spying provides incentive for framing "the stranger." With his passport designating him as neither Ukrainian, nor Russian, but a member of a displaced nationality, the Jew becomes a natural target.

MANAGEMENT IN A VACUUM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an address by Mr. Harvey Banks, former director of the California Department of Water Resources and now vice president of a large west coast engineering firm, delivered at the March 11 meeting of the National District Attorneys' Association.

Mr. Banks is widely respected in the water field. The multibillion-dollar California water plan was largely developed under his direction.

Mr. Banks' address is a perceptive and thoughtful discussion of Federal-State water rights issues and of the potentialities of S. 1111 in helping to resolve such conflicts and facilitate river basin planning.

The address includes suggestions for amendment of S. 1111 which deserve and will have careful consideration by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Some are quite acceptable. One or two of them I question. All of the amendments, however, reflect a careful and constructive approach to planning our river basins.

I commend the address to all those who have a serious concern with finding the best practical solution to the problem of planning for the best development of our great watersheds.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Management in a Vacuum"—Presented at the Western Water Law Symposium's 14th Annual Spring Conference of the National District Attorney's Association, Los Angeles, Calif.

(By Harvey O. Banks[1])

The problem areas in Federal-State relationships extend beyond the legal issues concerning the ownership and control of the water resources of the Western States and the authority to administer those resources, that are being so ably discussed by others here today. Irrespective of the manner of resolution of the legal issues—or lack of final resolution, as the case may be—these other problem areas will continue to impede optimum utilization of water resources and to prevent full participation by the States and local agencies in water resource development, unless positive action is taken by the Congress.

It is the purpose of this paper:

1. To discuss specific problems of Federal-State relationships in California, the manner of resolution of certain of these problems, and the nonresolution of others.
2. To identify a few of the problem areas in Federal-State relationships.
3. To comment on some of the possible solutions that have been offered.
4. To discuss the Water Resources Planning Act of 1963 as a possible vehicle to achieve more harmonious Federal-State-local relationships in the future.

NEED FOR PARTICIPATION BY STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES IN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The need for greater participation by the States and local agencies in development of the Nation's water resources has been documented by the Select Committee on National Water Resources which was appointed pursuant to S. Res. 48, 86th Congress. In its report to the U.S. Senate, dated January 30, 1961, the select committee stated:[2]

"The magnitude of future demands on fresh water supplies will require giving very careful attention to possible conflicts among alternative purposes as future programs for water supply developments are planned and revised from time to time. Congress, of course, should not be faced with the necessity of deciding matters that can with mutuality best be resolved locally in cooperation with the Federal and State agencies concerned. Congress has recognized the importance of this in the past by enactment of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1944. This has been reenacted in all subsequent rivers and harbors and flood control legislation. It calls for State participation in planning for water resources developments prior to consideration being given to authorization. Implementation of these provisions should be strengthened, and the views of State and local agencies should be considered in connection with the formulation and operation of all Federal water resources programs.

The importance of Government policy in meeting the water resources problems ahead cannot be denied. The recommendations which follow are based on the committee's belief that future demands can be met best by finding the proper combination of (a) construction program; (b) scientific research; (c) development of known technical methods; and (d) strengthening of Government policies affecting water development and use. Such a combination of efforts cannot be achieved overnight, and will require the combined efforts of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government as well as a continuation and strengthening of work in these fields by State and local governments and private enterprise."

---

[1] Formerly assistant State engineer in charge of water rights administration, State engineer, and then director of water resources, State of California.

[2] Report of the Select Committee on National Water Resources pursuant to S. Res. 48, 86th Cong.; Rept. No. 29, 87th Cong., 1st sess., p. 17.

The select committee recommended: [3]

1. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up-to-date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins of the United States.

Such plans should take into account prospective demands for all purposes served through water development giving full recognition to non-revenue-yielding purposes such as streamflow regulation, outdoor recreation, and preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and keeping in mind the ultimate need for optimum development of all water resources.

2. The Federal Government should stimulate more active participation by the States in planning and undertaking water development and management activities by setting up a 10-year program of grants to the States for water resources planning.

5. The Federal Government in cooperation with the States should take the following steps to encourage efficiency in water development and use:

(a) Regulate flood plain use as a means of reducing flood damages whenever such regulation provides greater net benefits to the national economy than would be provided through other methods of preventing flood losses. Additional steps should be taken to delineate flood hazard areas so that the public will be aware of the risks involved in occupying flood plains.

(b) Study the emerging water problems of the areas in which water shortage will be most acute by 1980, with a view to finding ways that these water shortages can be dealt with in such manner as to minimize adverse effects on the economy of the area.

(c) Study the future needs for major storage reservoirs for river regulation for all purposes, and report to the Congress with specific recommendations as to steps that should be taken to preserve any necessary sites so that they will be available for use when needed at minimum cost.

(d) Provide for public hearings to be held in the vicinity of federally sponsored water resources facilities whenever such facilities are proposed for development or whenever any major change in works or policies is to be made. Prior to the hearings, the proposed chance or development should be made public, and comments should be solicited from State and local agencies and from organizations and individuals affected.

Quite apart from their own internal legal, organizational, funding and staffing problems, which are often severe, the States and local agencies face formidable obstacles in attempting to formulate and implement their own water resource programs. Because of the dominant position the Federal interests and programs now have on many stream systems where Federal projects have been built, are authorized or are under consideration, these other programs must be completely integrated and coordinated with the Federal programs. Under present circumstances it is often difficult to achieve the degree of integration and coordination necessary for optimum management of the resource and full participation by the States and local agencies. Not infrequently, the States and local agencies find themselves operating in a vacuum of unknowns, uncertainty and even conflicts among the Federal agencies themselves.

CALIFORNIA'S EXPERIENCE IN FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS

A few examples from California's experience may be instructive. The State of California itself is now constructing the world's largest water project, the State water resources development system, sometimes called the Feather River project or the State water project. This is being financed by revenues accruing to the State from tideland oil development, and by a $1.75 billion general obligation bond issue approved by the voters on November 8, 1960.

California also has extensive water resource development programs undertaken by local agencies and private entities.

In excess of 75 percent of the natural runoff in California originates on federally withdrawn lands. Most of the larger dam and reservoir sites involve such withdrawn lands. Furthermore, Federal projects have already been built or are authorized on many of the stream systems on which the State and the local agencies are building or propose to build works. So the Federal interest is extensive.

California is fortunate in many ways, waterwise—its people, most of its State legislators, and several of its congressional delegation are extremely water conscious, it has a reasonably adequate body of water law, and it has strong and well-financed local public agencies. The State government has a good organizational structure with respect to all aspects of water resource development, control and utilization, with adequate staffs of competent professional and technical people, for which, with few exceptions, the legislature has always provided sufficient funds.

The State has a long history, dating back to 1874, of active interest and participation in the development of its water resources, first in basic data collection, investigations and planning, and now in the actual construction and operation of projects.

The State likewise has a long history of active and continuing cooperation and coordination with Federal agencies and makes large financial contributions to the several Federal programs of water development. For example, the State underwrote the repayment of the costs allocated to water conservation for the Black Butte project on Stony Creek in northern California and the New Hogan project on the Calaveras River near Stockton in central California. These projects are being built by the Corps of Engineers and will be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation.

But, in the matter of Federal-State relationships, perhaps California is most fortunate in that in 1927, the legislature, foreseeing the need for comprehensive, integrated development of its water resources and for large interbasin transfers of water, authorized [4] the State itself to set aside the unappropriated water necessary for general and coordinated plans for development. This has been accomplished by the State filing applications for the appropriation of such water, which applications are exempt from diligence until assigned for the actual construction of projects that are in furtherance of or not in conflict with the general and coordinated plan of development for which the applications were originally filed.

Over the years, a number of these State filings have been made until today at least 95 percent of the remaining unappropriated water of the State is covered by them. Several have been assigned, or releases from priority granted, for the construction of projects by the Federal agencies, by the State, by local public agencies, and by private entities. In the assignment, or in granting releases from priority, the California Water Commission, which has custody of the unassigned applications, must include conditions to reserve sufficient water for the future development of the counties in which the water originates,[5] and may insert other conditions determined to be necessary to protect the public interest and to insure proper development of the water resources and reservoir sites concerned.

The Bureau of Reclamation is the major Federal agency in California developing water for consumptive as well as other purposes. The Bureau which, by law,[6] must acquire its water rights in conformity with State water laws and procedures, has requested and received assignment of the State filings necessary for its projects which it has then processed through the State water rights board. In so doing it has accepted and abided by the conditions imposed in the assignment.

Thus, through the mechanism of the State filings, the State has been able to exercise a measure of control over the destiny of its water resources which otherwise would not have been possible. Other Western States may not be so fortunate.

However, the Bureau of Reclamation has refused to acknowledge that the State, acting through the State water rights board, has any authority to control the operation of its projects.

Responsible to legislative directive, the State developed the California water plan, a long-range master plan to guide the future development, conservation, control, protection, distribution and utilization of all the State's water resources for all beneficial purposes throughout the State by all agencies. The California water plan was approved by the legislature in 1959 and has been tacitly accepted by most, if not all, the Federal agencies involved. It has proven to be a most useful tool in achieving coordination of effort among all agencies, Federal, State, and local.

Within this framework then, what else has been necessary to harmonize the activities of the State and its local agencies with those of the Federal agencies?

The Federal central valley project and the State water project will each divert from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for transfer to central and southern California. Each has or will have major storage reservoirs on the streams tributary to the delta from which water will be released to flow into the delta for rediversion there. In addition, unregulated runoff flowing into the delta will be diverted for storage and use under each project.

The Bureau of Reclamation and the State department of water resources have entered into an agreement [7] which puts their rights to the surplus waters at the delta on a parity as between the two agencies but not, of course, with respect to third parties. The agreement calls for sharing any shortages that may develop in the delta supply in the future, in accordance with a predetermined formula.

In furtherance of the terms of the agreement, the two agencies are now making additional studies for the coordinated and integrated operation of the two projects.

There are unfortunately, indications that some of the Federal interests involved may be having second thoughts about this Federal-State agreement. Should it be abrogated by the United States, the State water project might be in serious difficulties.

---

[3] Ibid., p. 17, 18, and 19.

[4] Secs. 10500–10504, California Water Code.

[5] Sec. 10505, California Water Code.

[6] Sec. 8, act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

[7] Agreement between the United States of America and the Department of Water Resources of the State of California for the coordinated operation of the Federal central valley project and the State Feather River and delta diversion projects, May 16, 1960, contract No. 14–06–200–8363.

The Congress has authorized a Federal financial contribution to the State's Oroville Dam and Reservoir, now under construction, equal to the portion of the cost allocated to flood control. Considerable controversy developed during congressional hearings on the authorization bill as to whether the Federal or State interest rates should be used in computing the allocated cost—use of the lower Federal rate gave an allocation some $14 million less. A compromise was reached.

The San Luis unit, on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, is a joint Federal-State undertaking; it comprises a large dam and reservoir for offstream storage of the surplus waters pumped from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, certain pumping-generating plants, and a large canal to transport the water southerly from the reservoirs for use.

Storage at the San Luis site and a canal running southerly therefrom are needed both for the Federal central valley project and for the State water project. The Bureau of Reclamation and the State agreed upon the principles for the joint undertaking which were incorporated in the authorizing act.[8] Heated controversy developed in the Congress as to whether the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law must be applied to the service of State water within the State's service area. The issue was finally resolved in favor of the integrity of State law as governing the service of water by the State. Repercussions are still being heard from time to time.

The San Luis unit is being constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation with the State paying its share of the costs as construction proceeds under agreement[9] between the Bureau and the State. The State will operate it upon completion under further agreement with the Bureau, to serve the purposes of both projects.

Several problems of interrelationship between the Federal central valley project and the State water project remain to be resolved, however. The respective responsibilities for salinity control in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, or the provision of substitute water supplies, and with respect to the maintenance and enhancement of the fish and wildlife resources of the delta, must be worked out. The relative extent of Federal and State service of water for agricultural purposes in certain areas in the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, is under discussion at the present time; clarifying legislation may be required.

There have been some notable examples of Federal-local cooperation in California, too. The Congress has made or has authorized financial contributions to certain local projects to cover the costs allocated to flood control—the Cherry Valley project of the city and county of San Francisco in the Tuolumne River and the Comanche project of the East Bay Municipal Utility District in the Mokelumne River, for example.

On the American River, the Bureau of Reclamation has built Folsom Reservoir at the edge of the foothills and is seeking congressional authorization for Auburn Dam and Reservoir immediately upstream. In the upper reaches of the American River system, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District and Placer County Water Agency are building projects for power generation and for municipal and irrigation water supplies. Both local agencies have entered into agreements with the Bureau covering their respective water rights and the operation of the projects. The water rights agreements were executed prior to issuance of permits by the State water rights board.

Not all potential Federal-local conflicts in water resource development in California have been settled so amicably. The Turlock and Modesto Irrigation Districts have been unable to reach agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as certain local fishery interests with respect to the fish releases to be made from the proposed New Don Pedro project on the Tuolumne River, a project in which the city and county of San Francisco also has an interest for municipal water supply. The case is now pending before the Federal Power Commission.

But perhaps the most serious example of complete lack of Federal-State-local cooperation involves the Santa Margarita River in San Diego County. Here, in one of the most severely water short areas of the State, urgently needed conservation of the few remaining undeveloped water resources has been frustrated since 1949 by litigation instituted by the United States. Efforts to reach a compromise have been blocked. The net result has been a continuing waste of water to the ocean, to the detriment of everyone including the plaintiff, the United States.

It is notable that the successful examples of Federal-State and Federal-local cooperation in California have been characterized by a case-by-case approach and by long negotiations, compromise on both sides, and, finally, by formally executed agreements.

PROBLEM AREAS IN FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

Aside from the current legal uncertainties concerning the ownership and control of the West's water resources, perhaps the greatest bar to more effective water resource management and to greater participation by the States and local agencies, is the fact that the Congress has never adopted a coherent national water policy—nor is it likely to do so. Rather, Congress has adopted and implemented a number of distinct development programs—the reclamation program of the Department of the Interior, the flood control program of the Corps of Engineers, and the small watershed protection and flood prevention program of the Department of Agriculture, for example—each functioning under somewhat different, and often conflicting policies. Furthermore, not infrequently Congress modifies the basic policy in the authorization of a specific project; for example, the acreage limitation provisions of reclamation law were modified for the Washoe project in Nevada and for the Santa Maria project in California.

In this regard, Theodore M. Schad,[10] formerly executive director for the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, has written: [11]

"In the evolution of national policies affecting water resources planning, many ideas that are of current significance have been perennial subjects of consideration by the Congress since the early years of the 19th century. In reviewing the history of water resources development in the United States, one is impressed by the perspicacity of such leaders as Albert Gallatin, Alexander Hamilton, John Wesley Powell, Senator Francis G. Newlands, the leaders of the conservation movement in the Theodore Roosevelt administration after the turn of the 20th century, and others. One is also struck by the fact that the same ideas for improving national water resource planning have been proposed repeatedly during the past 50 years, only to be turned down again and again because of the unwillingness of interested groups to compromise. The particular issue that seems to recur most frequently is the question of the extent of Federal participation in water resource development.

"During the first half of the 19th century the question, 'Do we need water resources planning on a national level?' might have been appropriately raised and debated. Many of our leaders then had enough vision to foresee that the needs for water and water-related activities would increase, and that the number of problems that transcend State and river basin boundaries would increase at an ever-increasing rate as the United States develops; therefore, the question was answered in the affirmative, through national policy, many years ago. But the means and methods through which national planning may be efficiently and effectively conducted is yet to be perfected.

"We must recognize that there may never be a more explicit statement of national policy than has already been expressed. It seems probable that the Congress of the United States is going to devise such water resources policy as it deems necessary. As in the past, it will be guided considerably by the recommendations and advice of the executive branch of the Government. Leadership will change from the Congress to the executive branch as with the tenure of members and officials, with dominant personalities exercising a long-lasting influence. This appears inevitable with the form of government established by the Constitution in which national powers are divided among the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of the Federal Government. This form of government was adopted for the basic reason that the people of the Original Thirteen States feared that concentration of power in a strong Central Government could permit their freedom to be surrendered. The constitutional division of responsibility is undoubtedly one of the primary factors that has prevented the establishment of a consistent national policy for water resource planning and development. It has provided a weakness that has permitted pressure groups, in many instances, to prevent what might have been desirable changes in water resources policies. Yet, this weakness has also tended to prevent the adoption of rigid policies that could have been ill-fitted to some of the diverse physical conditions that may be found throughout the United States.

"Conflicts between the Federal Government and the States appear to be inevitable because of the ill-defined and changing line of demarcation that has emerged between the responsibilities of the State and Federal Governments.

"Little has been said herein concerning the differences in policy caused by the differences in the basic legislation under which the major Federal water resource planning agencies operate. These differences will undoubtedly continue as long as the several agencies programs come under the jurisdiction of different committees of Congress; however, a trend has been begun that may lead gradually to consistency. This trend is toward enactments such as the Water Supply Act of 1958,[12] the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act,[13] and the Federal Water

---

[8] Act of June 3, 1960 (74 Stat. 156).

[9] Agreement between the United States of America and the Department of Water Resources of the State of California for the construction and operation of the joint use facilities of the San Luis unit, Dec. 30, 1961.

[10] Senior specialist, Engineering and Public Works, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

[11] "Perspective on National Water Resources Planning," by Theodore M. Schad, journal of the hydraulics division proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, vol. 88, No. HY4, July 1962, pp. 38–40.

[12] Public Law 85–500, title III, July 3, 1958, 72 Stat. 297, 319.

[13] Public Law 85–624, Aug. 12, 1958, 72 Stat. 563.

Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, which establish identical policies under which the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers can cooperate in certain limited fields of their activity."

Nor has Congress acted to definitively delineate the nature and extent of the Federal responsibility in water resource development. With the possible exception of navigation, Congress has never accepted full responsibility for any particular aspect of water development; rather, it has acted on a project-by-project basis. The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources recognized the problem but made no recommendations with respect thereto.

The new "Policies, Standards, and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for Use and Development of Water and Related Land Resources," prepared under the direction of the President's Water Resources Council and approved by President Kennedy on May 15, 1962,[14] fails to define the Federal interests, objectives and responsibilities in meaningful terms. The result is that the Federal agency preparing a report on a particular project is, within rather broad limits, free to define the national interest and objective as it may see fit. Not infrequently, in cases where several Federal agencies are involved, their views and objectives are conflicting among themselves.

The difficulties in achieving harmonious relationships between Federal programs on the one hand and State and local programs on the other, are increased by:

1. The fact that Federal projects are funded by annual appropriations from the general funds of the United States, whereas States and local agencies generally must rely on the sale of bonds, a far more difficult and costly method of financing.

2. Differences in interest rates used in project formulation and for repayment.

3. The economic bias toward certain uses of water, such as agriculture, quality control, navigation, fish and wildlife, and recreation, caused by the pricing, repayment, and nonreimbursability policies under which the Federal programs operate. The States, and particularly local agencies, are not in a position to be so generous with their funds as is the U.S. Government. This bias may result in inefficiency in use and overallocation of the resource to these purposes. The matter of proper resource allocation will be of increasing concern, particularly to the States and local agencies, as the cost of new water supplies progressively grows greater with time.

4. The project-by-project approach in both planning and execution of most Federal programs, particularly on intrastate streams.

5. Competition and conflicts among the Federal agencies and programs.

6. The inadequacy of the present requirements for cooperation and coordination with States and local agencies, imposed by law and by directive upon the Federal agencies.

These problem areas, combined with the current uncertainty as to ownership and control of the basic resource, have resulted in a vacuum in which it is increasingly difficult for the States and local agencies to operate. The stimulus and initiative for corrective action must come through the Congress.

This is not to say that the States do not have their own internal problems, similar in many respects to those cited at the Federal level, which must be resolved before fully effective action can be taken. But until Congress acts affirmatively and positively with respect to the problem of Federal-State relationships, the States and local agencies will continue to find themselves forced to operate on case-by-case basis irrespective of their own best efforts. Because of the increasing scarcity of undeveloped water resources in relation to the ever-growing and expanding demands therefor, and the increasing costs of development, we can no longer afford the luxury of the present uncoordinated and haphazard approach.

SOME PROPOSALS FOR SOLUTION

David R. Warner, Chief, General Litigation Section, Lands Division, U.S. Department of Justice, has stated:[15]

"The problem is to ascertain the areas within which there is room for accommodation and then, to the extent such is not already provided for under existing law, to agree upon legislation within those areas which will work to the mutual advantage of the Nation at large and local interests in water resource development.

Mr. Clark (Assistant Attorney General) has suggested that the national interest in water resource conservation, development and use would be better served were Congress first to provide for a special study and delineation of all Federal claims of rights to the use of water, including claims based on reservations of the public lands, in areas where there is need for this knowledge. The results of such study and delineation would give the States and local interests information which would enable local determinations of the waters remaining available for local development. Such provision, if coupled with authorization for the appropriation of waters on reserved lands in excess of the anticipated needs for accomplishment of the purposes of the reservations, would very materially further those objectives of the various proposals for legislation which can be accommodated without hindrance to the national interest.

"To provide against waste of this precious resource pending the time when the reserved waters may be applied to the purposes for which reservations have been made, authorization of temporary use might be provided for. While this suggestion might be deemed impractical because of the unattractiveness of making substantial investments on the basis of temporary permits, this difficulty could be overcome if the United States were to guarantee return of the investments should the water supply of the projects for which permits are granted be impaired by exercise of the reserved rights within specified times after issuance of the permits."

While at first glance, the specific delineation and qualification of the Federal claims to water might appear to be a feasible solution, the proposal has extremely serious drawbacks, not the least of these would be the time required. Because of multiplicity of the Federal interests involved, such a study would take several years to complete and additional time for congressional consideration. During that period, little or no additional water development, especially by States and local interests, would or could be undertaken. The economic impact would be severe.

It must be recognized that in all of the Western States, as in case in California, most of the developable water resources originate on or flow across federally reserved lands, or occur in streams which are legally navigable. To allow the non-Federal interests to appropriate and develop only the excess remaining after full reservation for the anticipated Federal needs, would effectively preclude any further water development by the States and local interests for economic reasons—such excess water would be extremely costly and uneconomic to develop by itself.

The concept of allowing States and local interests to proceed under temporary permits with the United States guaranteeing return of the investments if the water involved were subsequently taken for a Federal purpose within a specified time, is hardly attractive. A State or local agency would find it difficult to justify proceeding with water development and to allow an economy to be built or expanded upon the water supply made available thereby under such conditions, unless at the same time, the United States guaranteed to continue to furnish a water supply for that economy at no greater cost. While the integrity of investment is highly important, the assurance of a continuing, dependable water supply is even more important to the people concerned.

It seems obvious that a different approach to the difficult problem of harmonizing Federal-State-local relationships and to provide for coordinated, cooperative action, is badly needed.

THE WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT OF 1963[16]

In furtherance of the recommendations of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, the Water Resources Planning Act of 1961 was introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress as S. 2246 with the backing of President Kennedy. Extensive hearings were held at which vigorous protests were voiced, particularly by some of the States, as to the inadequacy of State representation and participation. No action was taken by the 87th Congress but extensive amendments to meet the States' objections were prepared by the staff of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for consideration by the 88th Congress.[17] A clean bill has been introduced in the House of Reprsentatives as H.R. 3620.

Pertinent extracts from the Water Resources Planning Act of 1963 follow:

"STATEMENT OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the conservation, development, and utilization of the water and related land resources of the United States shall be planned on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

"EFFECT ON EXISTING LAWS

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

"(a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the field of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, or limit the jurisdiction or responsibility or any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects; nor to limit the use of other mechanisms, if preferred by the participating governmental units, in the water resources field;

"(b) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

---

[14] S. Doc. No. 97, 87th Cong., 2d sess.

[15] "Water Resources for the Future: A National Problem," by David R. Warner, Chief, General Litigation Section, Lands Division, Department of Justice, before the Southern California Water Conference, Los Angeles, Feb. 4, 1963.

[16] H.R. 3620, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

[17] Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, confidential committee print, tentative draft of a revision of S. 2246, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 11, 1963.

"TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

"Creation of commissions

"SEC. 201. (a) The President is authorized to declare the establishment of a river basin water resources commission upon request therefor by the (proposed Water Resources) Council, or request addressed to the Council by a State within which all or part of the basin or basins concerned are located if the request (1) defines the region, river basin, or group of related river basins for which a commission is requested.

"(b) Each such commission for a region, river basin, or group of river basins shall—

"(1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate, and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in its region, river basin, or group of river basins;

"(2) prepare a comprehensive coordinated, joint plan for Federal, State, interstate, and local development of water and related land resources;

"(3) recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning, and construction of projects; and

"(4) foster and undertake such studies of water and related land resources problems in its region, river basin, or group of river basins as are necessary in the preparation of the plan described in clause (2) of this subsection.

"Membership of commissions

"SEC. 202. Each river basin commission shall be composed of members appointed as follows:

"(a) A chairman appointed by the President who shall also serve as chairman and coordinating officer of the Federal members of the commission and who shall represent the Federal Government in Federal-State relations on the Commission;

"(b) One member from each Federal department or independent agency determined by the President to have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken by the Commission, such member to serve as the representative of such department or independent agency;

"(c) One member from each State which lies wholly or partially within the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the Commission is established, and the appointment of each such member shall be made in accordance with the laws of the State which he represents. In the absence of governing provisions of State law, such State members shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Governor.

"(d) One member appointed by any interstate agency created by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is created.

"(e) When deemed appropriate by the President, one member, who shall be appointed by the President, from the United States section of any international commission created by a treaty to which the consent of the Senate has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is established.

"Organization of commissions

* * * * *

"SEC. 203. (b) State members of each commission shall annually elect the vice chairman, who shall serve also as chairman and coordinating officer of the State members of the commission.

* * * * *

(d) Voting on the commission shall be only by the chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and by the vice chairman, upon instruction from the State members.

Duties of the commission

"SEC. 204. (a) Each river basin commission shall—

* * * * *

"(2) submit to the Council and the Governor of each participating State a report on its work at least once each year. Such report shall be transmitted through the President to the Congress. After such transmission, copies of any such report shall be sent to the heads of such Federal, State, interstate, and international agencies as the President or the Governors of the participating States may direct;

"(3) submit to the Council for transmission to the President and by him to the Congress, and the Governors and the legislatures of the participating States a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan, and any major necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which such commission was established. Before the commission submits such a plan or major revision to the Council, it shall transmit the proposed plan or revision to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and each of the interstate agency, from which a member of the commission has been appointed, and to the head of the United States section of any international commission if the plan or revision deals with a boundary water or a river crossing a boundary, or any tributary flowing into such boundary water or river, over which the international commission has jurisdiction or for which it has responsibility. Each such department and agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and the United States section of an international commission shall have ninety days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan or revision to report its views, comments, and recommendations to the commission. The commission may modify the plan or revision after considering the reports so submitted. The views, comments, and recommendations submitted by each Federal department or agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall be transmitted to the Council with the plan or revision.

"(4) submit to the Council at the time of submitting such plan, any recommendations it may have for continuing the functions of the commission and for implementing the plan."

It is suggested that the Water Resources Planning Act of 1963, with certain amendments which are discussed below, presents a workable means of resolving the present somewhat chaotic situation.

To be more fully effective in resolving current problems of Federal-State relationships, the Water Resources Planning Act of 1963, as set forth in H.R. 3620, should be amended to provide:

1. For greater representation by the States on river basin commissions concerned only with intrastate river basins or regions.

2. That a river basin commission once established, will be permanent unless its discontinuance is requested by all the States concerned or specifically directed by congressional action.

3. That in formulating its comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan for Federal, State, interstate and local development of water and related land resources, the river basin commission shall recognize and take into account all rights to the use of water which are valid under the laws of the State[s] involved. If such rights must be taken for any Federal purpose envisioned under the plan, the United States should be required to pay proper compensation therefor at the time of taking and to provide a replacement supply at no greater cost for any deprivation in water supply caused by such taking.

4. That the river basin commission shall recognize all existing Federal-State or Federal-local agreements.

5. That the joint plan as submitted to the Congress and to the State[s] shall clearly set forth the commission's recommendations concerning respective responsibilities as to financing, construction, and operation of the Federal, State, and local interests in controlling and developing the water resources concerned including water for quality control, enhancement of fish and wildlife resources, and for recreational purposes, and in providing the necessary water supplies for the land resources involved.

6. That the river basin commission shall recommend to the Congress and the State[s] the extent of cost sharing among Federal, State, and local interests for the specific units of the plan in which there is a common interest.

The Water Resources Planning Act of 1963 would also be helpful in eliminating some of the current problems among the Federal agencies themselves.

A precedent for joint Federal-State action in all aspects of water development is to be found in the Delaware River Basin Commission formed by interstate compact,[18] with very broad powers with respect to the control, development, protection and utilization of the waters of the Delaware River. The United States is a fully participating member of the Commission.

Careful consideration should be given to the appointment of such a river basin commission as envisioned in the Water Resources Planning Act of 1963 before proceeding with the lower Colorado River project[19] as proposed by then Secretary of the Interior. The areal extent of the proposal, extending as it does to the north coastal area in northern California, and the great diversity and complexity of the Federal-State-local interests involved, make it extremely unlikely that the Department of the Interior, acting alone, would be able to prepare an acceptable plan.

CONCLUSION

The present problems of Federal-State relationships encompass not only the current legal uncertainties as to ownership and control of the West's water resources, but also matters of policy, financing, cost sharing, respective extent of responsibility, interagency relationships and others. The Water Resources Planning Act of 1963, properly amended, appears to offer a mechanism for more harmonious Federal-State-local relationships and for achieving more effective development and utilization of the Nation's water resources. It is respectfully suggested the National District Attorneys Association, in addition to its efforts to find a proper solution to the legal issues concerned, also direct its attention to these other problems and their solution.

NEW U.S. AIRCRAFT DESIGNS TO MEET FOREIGN COMPETITION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, one of the greatest adventures in the history of mankind has been the development of the airplane. Safe, dependable air transportation is now taken for granted, though it was completely unheard of and undreamed of a few decades ago.

---

[18] Public Law 87–328, approved Sept. 27, 1961, 75 Stat. 688.

[19] "Future Water Resources Development in the Lower Colorado River Basin," committee print No. 1, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 88th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 21, 1963.

Much of the remarkable growth of the worldwide aviation industry during the last 25 years has been accurately attributed to the ingenuity which, under our American free-enterprise system, went into the design of one particular U.S. transport plane. I refer, of course, to the old and reliable workhorse of the airways, the DC-3, a product of the Douglas Aircraft Co.

This week Donald W. Douglas, chairman of the board of Douglas Aircraft, announced that his firm will proceed immediately to produce a new twin-jet commercial airliner to be known as the DC-9. Perhaps never again will the aviation world have the benefit of a breakthrough comparable to the DC-3, but the decision of the Douglas Co. to undertake production of a so-called "compact jet" transport has rightfully drawn applause and expressions of good wishes to the company from throughout the world. The U.S. aircraft industry has thrived on competition. Douglas, in announcing the DC-9 project, made it clear that the company expects this aircraft to meet a need in the highly competitive market for versatile transport airplanes.

It has been growing more evident every day that our airlines need a jet transport somewhat smaller than the existing jet airliners such as the marvelous Boeing 707's, the DC-8's and the Convairs. These larger and more expensive planes have helped improve the financial condition of our air carriers, but they require large airports and a large volume of passengers to show a profit. Of the 727 airports in the United States with scheduled airline service, only 61 now are serviced by pure jets. Washington National Airport, of course, is the outstanding example of an airport not suited for existing jet airliners.

This week, during hearings of the Aviation Subcommittee on the Federal Airport Act, witness after witness has testified on various problems concerning the continuing development of our air transport industry. The committee has been reminded by highly qualified witnesses that emphasis must be given to the design and development of air transports compatible with the existing and planned airports in this country. A fast, economical jet airliner adapted to a larger proportion of the existing airport system is a well-defined and much sought after objective. The Boeing 727, now undergoing flight tests, is a three-engine design which is expected to require runways of less than 6,000 feet in length. It will carry a unit cost of about $4,200,000, according to the Federal Aviation Agency, and will have a maximum gross takeoff weight of 142,000 pounds. The DC-9, still in the design stage, also will need less than 6,000 feet of runway and will cost about $3,100,000 per plane, according to the FAA. It will have a maximum gross takeoff weight of about 77,000 pounds. The DC-9 passenger capacity will therefore be smaller.

Mr. Douglas has cited the requirement for a somewhat smaller and more economical jet aircraft to operate at ranges of from 100 to 1,100 miles. He believes that hundreds of obsolete and obsolescent aircraft eventually will be replaced by aircraft of the DC-9 type. His statements concerning this decision reflect well upon the citizenship and statesmanship of the entire aircraft building industry.

Mr. Douglas said:

> While our decision to build the DC-9 had to be, and is, based on our best business calculations, we are also conscious of the benefit to our national interests of this project. American-built aircraft have been preeminent in world air commerce for almost 30 years. We shall be pleased to help, once again, in maintaining that position of leadership.

Several aircraft companies in Europe already have taken aim on this target. It is good to have another U.S. company join these highly qualified foreign firms in competing to fill the need. The defense of the free world depends to a large extent upon the continued growth and improved health of private industrial organizations capable of producing such highly complex machines.

The economy of the United States stands to benefit also. I was particularly interested to note that the Douglas Co. disclosed a new cost-sharing arrangement with major subcontractors in connection with the DC-9. It was noted that these subcontracts will be divided among companies located in 27 States and Canada. However, the main production of the plane will be at Long Beach, Calif., providing employment for 6,000 there.

Although there may never be another giant stride forward like the DC-3, many improvements in the art of flight are yet to come. Millions upon millions of Americans have not yet flown. We have hardly touched the tremendous gains in our economy and our standard of living which air transport, both for cargo and passengers, can bring.

Every major innovation in aircraft design improves our opportunity to realize these potential benefits. The decision to build this new aircraft, the DC-9, follows the pattern of progress which not only Douglas, but many other U.S. aircraft companies have pursued. It is a most timely and most important decision.

THE BIRTH OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, by proclamation of President Lincoln, on April 20, 1863, West Virginia was to be admitted to the Union as the 35th State on June 20, 1863. The State magazine section of the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail has been running a series of articles by John G. Morgan detailing the events and incidents which led to West Virginia's severance from Virginia and the declaration of its independence as a separate State.

Almost 2 years earlier, on July 9, 1861, the citizens of western Virginia had elected two Senators to represent them in the U.S. Senate. Since the State of Virginia had seceded from the Union, but formal steps had not been taken leading to the severance of the region west of the mountains, there was doubt as to the legality of the election. The U.S. Senate, however, accepted the new Senators by a vote of 35 to 5.

Sentiment in western Virginia was growing rapidly for complete separation from the mother State and the emergence of a new State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD another of Mr. Morgan's articles highlighting the drama of these portentous months as an emerging State sought admission to the Union, pledging complete loyalty to the principles of our Constitution.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LOYAL LEGISLATURE

(By John G. Morgan)

The first legislative assembly of the Reorganized Government of Virginia elected two outstanding Union men to the U.S. Senate on July 9, 1861.

They were John S. Carlile, 44, of Clarksburg, and Waitman T. Willey, 50, of Morgantown. Both had won distinction as delegates to the Virginia State Convention earlier in the year.

Carlile, a strong radical and former Member of Congress was elected 38 to 0. Willey, a conservative, received 22 votes to 10 for Peter G. Van Winkle of Parkersburg and six for Daniel Lamb of Wheeling.

The aggressive Carlile was at the fountainhead of the new State movement. At the time of the election, he was at the height of his popularity.

In an editorial endorsing him for the Senate post, the Wheeling Intelligencer said on the day of his election:

"Where is the man who has done so much in the movement, now so far along on its successful accomplishment, as Mr. Carlile? He has led the van * * * Mr. Carlile has been a leader, a bold and persevering one."

A contemporary writer, who saw Carlile in action at the Virginia convention, wrote this capsule description:

"A man of fine talents—a ready, keen, solid and impressive man * * * somewhat singular looking, being very sallow and angular in his face; flat on his head, compact and well-knit in his framework * * * a rich, deep, voice, fine power of expression, imperturbable coolness and a great deal of tact."

Willey, a slaveowner and lover of old Virginia, was accused of being lukewarm in his unionism. On his way home from the Virginia convention, while laboring under some misinformation, he accused President Lincoln of precipitating the Civil War.

But at the time of his election, Willey's popularity star obviously was on the rise again. Here's a contemporary sketch of the Senator:

"A very tall, elegant, dignified gentleman * * * long, bony face, large brilliant eyes, large nose, heavy eyebrows, large mouth, long chin, black hair, dark complexion, exceedingly long arms, skeleton-like hands, spectacles, no whiskers, fine clothes, looks like a great man, as he is, and his very presence casts a feeling of awe over you.

"Voice peculiar, and his style of speaking remarkable. Raises his voice up to a certain pitch, which is impossible to describe, more than to say it is a pleading, sorrowful, trembling voice, its effect is powerful, thrilling the hearts of his hearers as if by magnetism, and almost irresistibly carrying away the feelings of an audience, if not their judgments."

The new Senators were elected fill the seats vacated by Robert M. T. Hunter and James M. Mason after old Virginia seceded from the Union. Carlile was elected to serve until 1865 and Willey until 1863.

Carlile was in Washington at the time of the election, and Willey soon joined him there. Their credentials were presented by a loyal Tennessee Senator, Andrew Johnson.

The eligibility of the Senators from western Virginia was challenged, and a brisk debate followed.

One Senator claimed that seating Carlile and Willey would mean recognition of a minority of the Virginia people, who would have the power to overthrow the State government. That argument was countered with statements that seating the two Senators would mean recognition of the loyal citizens of the State—those who believed in the Union and supported the Constitution.

By a vote of 35 to 5, the Senate decided to accept the two new members. The action gave the people of western Virginia two strong voices in a very strategic place. It was good news for the backers of the new State movement.

The State legislative assembly, or loyal legislature, elected three additional officers on July 9. They were Lucian A. Hagans of Preston County, secretary of state; Samuel Crane of Randolph County, auditor; and Campbell Tarr of Brooke County, treasurer.

Election of the Senators and the three other officers was the main business completed by the assembly in a 26-day session.

The session opened in Wheeling at noon July 1, with the house convening in the U.S. customhouse and the senate in the Linsly Institute. Elections were conducted by joint action of the two houses.

In an organization meeting, Daniel Frost of Jackson County was elected Speaker of the House, defeating Fontain Smith of Marion County by a vote of 24–10. Daniel L. Polsley of Mason County, the loyal lieutenant governor, presided at sessions of the senate.

A total of 11 senators and 49 members of the house, representing 48 counties, were reported present at the session. However, part of them were absent or didn't participate in the voting on the U.S. Senators and State officials.

From the new loyal Governor, Francis H. Pierpont, each house received a written message, which said:

"We are passing through a period of gloom and darkness in our country's history, but we must not despair. There is a just God who 'rides upon the whirlwind and directs the storm.'"

Another part of the message said:

"There is only one thing now for each American citizen to decide in this controversy. Do you desire to stand by and live under the Constitution which has contributed so long and so greatly to the happiness and prosperity and transmitted its blessings to our posterity?

"Or do you desire the Union broken up and an oligarchy or military despotism established in its stead? The leaders in the South are striving for the latter. The Government of the United States is exerting its whole force to maintain the integrity of the former. There can be no neutral ground."

Papers showing that Pierpont had communicated with Federal authorities were transmitted to the two houses along with his message.

Copies of correspondence showed that on June 21, 1861, 1 day after he was formally elected Governor, Pierpont addressed a letter to President Lincoln.

The letter described conditions in Virginia and asked for a military force to aid in suppressing the rebellion and to protect the good people of the Commonwealth from domestic violence.

A reply came from U.S. Secretary of War Simon Cameron, who was directed by Lincoln to say: "A large additional force will soon be sent to your relief."

Cameron's letter added: "Instructions have now been given to the agents of the Federal Government to proceed hereafter under your direction, and the company and field officers will be commissioned by you."

In keeping with popular demand among western Virginians, a bill to create a new State was introduced in the house of delegates.

A preamble in the bill mentioned mountain barriers between eastern and western Virginia and the lack of a community of interests for the two sections.

Delegate George J. Arnold of Lewis County offered to amend the bill by inserting the name of "West Virginia."

While the measure was up for consideration, a resolution terming the statehood bill "inexpedient" was introduced.

In arguing for the bill and against the resolution, Delegate William B. Zinn of Preston County said:

"I am well aware that the whole people in my section of the country, and in all the counties surrounding the county which I represent here, are looking with anxiety every evening for the proceedings of this great and absorbing subject.

"Let the result go out that we declare it inexpedient to take the subject under consideration, and it will cast a gloom over their feelings and a discouragement that they perhaps have never experienced before."

Zinn stressed that "by moving in this matter now, we only prepare the subject and have it ready for future action. We do not know what the future may produce.

"All we ask is to prepare the whole matter and have it ready, then we can let it lay as long as we please, until the proper time for submitting it to Congress."

Supporters of the resolution and opponents of the bill contended that it still would be premature for the loyal legislature to act on a statehood measure.

They said the matter properly belonged to the Second Wheeling Convention, which was scheduled to resume its session on August 6. The resolution was rejected 16 to 14, and then the bill was defeated 17 to 10. House Speaker Frost was among those voting against the bill.

When time neared for adjournment, Delegate Charles Hooton, of Preston County, said no member wanted to go home as badly as he.

He said the rebel army was in his county, had been in his village and perhaps in his house. Neverthless, he said, he didn't want to leave until all business was finished.

Another member observed that the "world is governed too much already," and said he saw no point in continuing in session when "there is nothing to do but talk."

Delegate John C. Vance, of Harrison County declared that the longer the house remained in session the more business it had to consider.

The session adjourned on July 26. Frost's final comment was:

"Let each one of us do something for the maintenance of the supremacy of the general (Federal) Government and of our own reorganized State government, if need be shoulder the musket and march to the field of battle."

Meanwhile, the war continued. Northern troops retreated after the first Battle of Bull Run, Manassas, Va., on July 21, 1861.

In western Virginia, the July fighting was hot and heavy.

In his first skirmish of the war, Confederate Gen. Stonewall Jackson was defeated on July 2 at Falling Waters, near Martinsburg.

Union troops were victorious July 11 in the Battle of Rich Mountain, Randolph County, and 2 days later they captured Romney and won the Battle of Corrick's Ford in Tucker County. Harpers Ferry was evacuated by Confederates on July 15.

On July 17, Confederates won the close Battle of Scary in Putnam County. A week later, rebel forces under Gen. Henry A. Wise started retreating up the Kanawha Valley.

There were other skirmishes in Gilmer, Jefferson, Upshur, Barbour, and Cabell Counties.

Gen. Robert E. Lee took personal command of Confederate Forces in western Virginia on August 1, 1961.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the State of West Virginia, which observes its centennial this year, grew out of the dissatisfaction of a determined minority of the citizens of Virginia to their State's seceding from the Union. On May 23, 1861, a majority of Virginia's citizens voted to ratify the Ordinance of Secession which had been passed in Richmond on April 17. Even before this vote of ratification, residents of the western part of the State, aware of the strong sentiment for secession in other sections, but resolute in their loyalty to the Union, sent their delegates to the First Wheeling Convention to develop preliminary plans for a course of action which would spell out in unmistakable terms their opposition to secession.

The growing protest to ratification among the citizens of western Virginia was sparked by a rising clamor for independence. On June 11, 1861, their delegates assembled for a second time in Wheeling for the Second Wheeling Convention to determine their future course.

An account of this history making period has appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail in a series of articles by John G. Morgan.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Mr. Morgan's article covering the incidents of the Second Wheeling Convention.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Second Wheeling Convention

(By John G. Morgan)

The Second Wheeling Convention, with about 100 delegates attending from 34 counties, opened at 2 p.m. June 11, 1861, and remained in session 2 weeks.

On the second day, a 37-year-old, black-bearded Parkersburg lawyer named Arthur I. Boreman was elected permanent president.

Boreman told the delegates, assembled in Washington Hall: "If you gentlemen will go with me, we will take definite, determined, qualified action as to the course we will pursue.

"We will take such action as will result in western Virginia, if not the whole of Virginia, remaining in the Union of our fathers."

The gentlemen went with him, and action was taken. During the 2 weeks, the convention:

Adopted a declaration of rights.

Adopted ordinances to reorganize the State government and to provide means of financing it.

Elected a loyal Governor and seven other principal State officers.

Issued an address to the people.

Delegates caucused on the night of June 19 and chose Francis H. Pierpont as the loyal Governor. Named at the same time were:

Daniel L. Polsley of Mason County, Lieutenant Governor; James S. Wheat of Ohio County, attorney general; William Lazier of Monongalia, Daniel Lamb and James W. Paxton of Ohio, Peter G. van Winkle of Wood, and William A. Harrison of Harrison, members of the council of State.

All of the officers were formally elected on the floor of the convention June 20, precisely 2 years before West Virginia became a State.

Pierpont, elected unanimously, was a 47-year-old Fairmont lawyer with a reputation for rugged individualism, good speech-making and strong leadership in the movement to save Virginia to the Union.

The Wheeling Intelligencer made this comment:

"Frank Pierpont is one of those men well fitted for the stormy and revolutionary times that are upon us. He has the moral, mental and physical power of a leader.

"A truer man to the cause of the Union does not live; and he has the vigor of apprehension, that incisiveness of speech, and that indomitable will and courage that carries the people with him."

Pierpont said in a letter, dated June 20, to his wife: "The convention today unanimously conferred on me the position of Governor of Virginia. In this revolution, Divine Providence only knows what is to be the result of this step."

Technically speaking, Pierpont and the other officers were elected to fill vacancies created by the declaration of rights.

The declaration stated, in effect, that all of the State offices were vacated because the government of Virginia had decided to unite with the Confederacy.

The reorganized State government was deliberately created to do business with the Federal Government in Washington, to look after the cause of the Union and the people west of the Allegheny Mountains. Meanwhile, the old State government was expected to continue its relations with the Confederacy, which had headquarters in Montgomery, Ala., later moved to Richmond.

Thus, in June of 1861, there were two State governments for Virginia. One was the loyal (to the Union) government, with offices in Wheeling; and the original government still functioning at Richmond.

At that time, there still was no West Virginia, no official proposition to create it. But the ideas were cooking, and soon they wouldn't be denied.

In June of 1861, Pierpont himself didn't favor creation of a new State. Before he was elected Governor, he said in an address to the convention: "Two plans have been prepared for the purpose of meeting the present emergency. One is by division of the State, the other is by forming a government for the whole State * * *.

"The proper course, I maintain, for us to pursue is to institute a government for the whole State of Virginia. We are the loyal people of Virginia, entitled by law to the control of its military civil powers as soon as we can get it.

"As to dividing the State—which I have no doubt will ultimately be done, and which I will favor at the proper time—I would remark that the putting down of rebellion, the lending of a helping hand to aid the Government, the maintenance of our constitutional liberty in this land of ours from the St. Lawrence to the Rio Grande is of vastly more importance to us and to the world than the formation of a new State out of western Virginia at this time.

"But, * * * we lose by every moment we delay; even now, as is reported, ex-Governor [Henry A.] Wise is about taking command of forces to invade western Virginia. He will probably not have a great force to command, but, large or small, we will not wait for him to come here, but will meet him at the top of the Alleghenies, and at the tap of the drum, and at the point of the bayonet, will welcome him to a grave that he has merited for his treason heretofore."

Wise was recruiting Confederate troops in the Kanawha Valley at about the time Pierpont made his speech. The news of his presence irritated Federal forces, which were enjoying some major successes in northwestern Virginia.

Earlier, on June 3 at Philippi, in the first important land engagement of the Civil War, Federal troops defeated the Confederates, who retreated into Randolph County.

The victory at Philippi boosted the morale of pro-Union officials, who proceeded to hold an election on June 4. Delegates were chosen on that date to attend the Second Wheeling Convention a week later.

The convention passed resolutions to thank Federal authorities for responding to "our call for protection" and Federal Gen. George B. McClellan for rescuing northwest Virginia from the "destruction and spoliation" of rebel forces.

The declaration of rights was approved by a vote of 56 to 0. This caused Delegate John S. Carlile of Harrison County to remark: "We have 56 votes recorded in favor of our declaration, and we may remember there were just 56 signers to the Declaration of Independence."

Delegates responded with great applause, mingled with expressions of surprise and deep feeling.

However, additional members of the convention later voted their approval and added their signatures to the declaration. The final total of signatures was 83.

The vital part of the declaration stated in behalf of the people of Virginia that: "The preservation of their dearest rights and liberties and their security in person and property imperatively demand the reorganization of the government of the Commonwealth, and that all acts of said (Richmond) convention and executive, tending to separate this Commonwealth from the United States, or to levy and carry on war against them, are without authority and void; and that the offices of all who adhere to the said convention and executive, whether legislative, executive, or judicial, are vacated."

Election of Pierpont and the other State officers called for a demonstration on the evening of June 20.

Wheeling residents rang bells, beat drums and shouted. Two cannons boomed occasionally from hills east of the city.

The newly elected State officials visited nearby Camp Carlile, where they witnessed a dress parade of 600 soldiers. The uniformed men gave three cheers, and the officials replied with speeches.

On June 25, the last day of the convention, a written "address to the people" was issued by Boreman. The document appealed to the people "for countenance and support in this hour of great anxiety and trial," and added: "In every county where the free expression of your views has been permitted, your majorities in favor of the maintenance and perpetuity of the Union, have far exceeded the calculations of the most sanguine of your friends.

"Persevere then, in your most holy war against the corrupt and perjured oligarchy, who have usurped your government and would have sold you to the ambitious despots of an unholy affiliation."

In a final talk to the delegates, Boreman said: "We came here, some of us through difficulties, some at the peril of their lives, some yet trembling, fearing not the consequences of their action, but fearing lest the call for this convention should not be responded to by neighboring counties. But how agreeably have we been disappointed * * *.

"Then it is for us, gentlemen, after having inaugurated this government, to go home, not to idle away our time—not to fold our arms in inaction, but to go home with the determination to execute the government which we have reorganized; to put it in motion in every county and in every neighborhood within our power."

The convention adjourned until August 6. Governor Pierpont issued a call for the loyal legislature to convene on July 1.

Meanwhile, musket fire thickened in western Virginia. Skirmishes between the Federal and rebel forces were reported in Mineral Hampshire, and Tucker Counties and at other points.

Despite the uncomfortably, close background of Minie balls and the excitement of big conventions, there still was time for comment on the commonplace in Wheeling. One newspaper columnist wrote on June 20: "Yesterday was one of the dullest, laziest days we ever encountered. It was duller even apparently than the day before, or the day before that; people sat in their stores with their feet upon tables and high stools, reading their papers and slapping at flies, which are now beginning to be troublesome."

On July 1, a little news item called "horse visitation" appeared. It said the Army advertised that it wanted to buy 100 draft war horses to be inspected at Camp Carlile.

"Accordingly," the story said, "at an early hour on Saturday morning, horses of all ages, sizes, colors and condition, came hobbling, trotting, and whinnying over both bridges toward the quartermaster's office. Some of the horses looked as if they had been turned out to die and only resurrected for the occasion * * *."

Earlier, a reporter who visited Camp Carlile said some of the soldiers had christened their bunks with lampblack or chalk. Among the names he noted: "Pig's Misery," "Camp Hog Hole," "Devil's Dam," and "Astor House."

IMPACT OF ADMINISTRATION'S TAX PROPOSALS ON SMALL BUSINESS FIRMS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last Friday, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and I announced that the Subcommittee on Taxes of the Select Committee on Small Business, of which Senator BIBLE is chairman, will hold hearings later this month on the administration's tax proposals as contained in the President's message to the Congress of January 24. Our purpose will be to determine the impact which these proposals might be expected to have upon the 4.5 million business firms in America that are classified as "small."

Obviously the proposals made by the President for changes in our tax laws will have a significant effect upon small business. I am happy to say that there is every indication that the net effect upon small firms will be beneficial. The reversal of the normal and surtax rates for corporations will mean a reduction of about 27 percent in the tax liabilities of corporations having taxable incomes of $25,000 or less. This is, indeed, meaningful tax relief. The reduction in rates applicable to individuals will likewise have a significant effect upon small partnerships and sole proprietorships, as will also the proposal to allow income averaging. Mr. President, I have served for a number of years as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee. In that capacity I have come to know the burden which the Federal income tax places upon small businesses.

Secretary Dillon stated before the Ways and Means Committee the other day that small business is the keystone of our competitive economy and its potential for growth. I was delighted to see Mr. Dillon give expression to this fact. It was for the purpose of facilitating the realization of small business growth potential that the small business investment company program was created in 1958. This program has made a good start toward providing small firms with a source of external capital. However, the capital drought which plagues small business is caused in large measure by the high rates of Federal income taxation, which prevent small firms from generating internal capital with which to finance growth and expansion. For this reason, Mr. President, I was indeed pleased with the rate reduction proposed by the President.

On the other hand, I am concerned about the possible adverse effect which one of these proposals might have upon our economy in general and upon small business in particular. I have reference to the recommendation that the capital gains tax be made applicable to any gain on capital assets transferred at death.

Mr. President, the part played by Federal tax considerations in decisions by small firms to merge or sell out, has been a matter of concern to our committee for many years. The Federal estate tax has long been recognized as a factor contributing to the increasing trend toward concentration within many industries. This remains true, even though survivors may be allowed 10 years within which to pay the estate tax. The scales are still weighted heavily in favor of mergers or sellouts, where, at worst, capital gains taxes are paid, and more likely, a tax-free exchange of stock can be arranged.

About the only factor presently on the scales in favor of a decision by the one-owner independent to keep his business is the fact that, if he sells he may have to pay capital gains tax but if he keeps the business and passes it on to his heirs upon death, no income tax is paid on whatever gains may have accrued to the assets of the business. Naturally, Mr. President, my present concern is over the fact that it seems to me that we are now proposing to remove this lone factor from the balance. This is a matter which I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate, Mr. President. It is something which the subcommittee of which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is chairman, plans to go into carefully at the hearings. I know that the Senator from Nevada will do an excellent job of analyzing this and the other proposals from the standpoint of their effect upon small business. I want to commend the Senator from Nevada for his interest and his efforts in this matter. He has always served with distinction as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Taxes, and the small businessmen of his State and of the entire Nation owe him a debt of gratitude for the job that he has done. I look forward to his report to the Senate on this vital and timely matter.

WHAT THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION IS DOING ABOUT MILK

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, during the period of the past year or longer, a number of Members of the Senate have referred to the Senate Small Business Committee complaints received from independent dairy processors about unfair, discriminatory, and predatory competitive practices in connection with the sale of milk and milk products. In every case, I have advised my colleagues that intensive work in connection with the situation in the dairy industry is being carried on by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and by the Federal Trade Commission. I may add that the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives has done considerable work in behalf of the dairy industry. Last Monday, at the sixth national convention of the National Independent Dairies Association, Mr. Francis C. Mayer, Chief of the Division of Discriminatory Practices of the Federal Trade Commission, delivered an informative and helpful address entitled "What the Federal Trade Commission Is Doing About Milk." Because of the widespread interest in the Senate about the competitive conditions in the dairy industry, frequently described as "chaotic," I should like to bring Mr. Mayer's remarks to the attention of this body, and I ask unanimous consent that his speech be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION IS DOING ABOUT MILK

(Remarks of Francis C. Mayer, Chief, Division of Discriminatory Practices, Federal Trade Commission, at Sixth National Convention of the National Independent Dairies Association, the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 8, 1963)

Please permit me to express my appreciation to you for the invitation to appear here today. Of course, the views expressed are my own and do not necessarily reflect those of the Federal Trade Commission.

Our good friend, Lynn Paulson, advised me that he wanted me to explain "What the Federal Trade Commission is doing about milk." In answer, the Commission is vitally interested in the problems confronting all members of the industry, including the over 400 independent concerns that are members of the National Independent Dairies Association. The Federal Trade Commission, which is charged with preserving free and fair competition, is devoting a significant amount of its total effort to the dairy industry and its competitive problems.

This effort has been directed toward stemming the tide of rising concentration and the elimination of unlawful discriminatory pricing practices. We are presently moving in other areas in an effort to reach other types of practices, such as selling below cost, using milk as a loss leader, and pricing problems which arise from use of private label.

A. CONCENTRATION IN THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

The Commission has attacked the rising concentration in this industry by issuing merger complaints. The dairy industry in the United States has historically been characterized by thousands of firms processing and selling their products locally. In recent years, however, the number of companies participating in the industry has declined drastically while eight national companies have been acquiring hundreds of dairy concerns. Between 1950 and 1961, the total number of milk processors in the United States declined 57 percent from 16,089 to 7,179 and the total number of frozen dessert manufacturers, excluding retail counter freezer operations, declined 24 percent from 4,203 to 3,228.[1] Between 1954 and 1958, the number of companies producing creamery butter, natural cheese, concentrated milk, fluid milk and frozen desserts declined by an average of 17.4 percent. Also during this period, National Dairy Products Corp., the Borden Co., Beatrice Foods Co., Foremost Dairies, Inc., Carnation Co., Arden Farms Co., Pet Milk Co., and Fairmont Foods Co., all nationwide dairy corporations, acquired at least 505 dairy concerns throughout the country. Since 1905, these 8 companies have made at least 1,949 dairy acquisitions in the United States.

In 1958, these eight national companies accounted for 31 percent of the value of shipments of fluid milk in the United States. These eight and Swift & Co., a large foods company which also manufactures ice cream, accounted for 44.4 percent of the value of shipments of frozen desserts. The individual companies shares are as follows:

Fluid milk

	Percent
Borden	9.2
National	8.9
Foremost	4.3
Beatrice	3.4
Carnation	2.3
Arden	1.4
Farimont	.9
Pet	.6
Total	31.0

Frozen desserts

	Percent
National	13.1
Borden	10.6
Foremost	6.4
Beatrice	4.9
Swift	2.7
Carnation	2.4
Arden	2.1
Fairmont	1.5
Pet	0.7
Total	44.4

In 1958, therefore, the eight largest companies averaged approximately 4.0 percent of the total value of shipments of fluid milk and 5.5 percent of the total value of shipments of frozen desserts in the United States. The remaining milk processors in the United States in 1958 had an average of 0.001 percent of the value of shipments of fluid milk making the average national company 400 times larger than the average remaining milk processor. The remaining frozen dessert manufacturers had an average of 0.05 percent. Thus, the average national company was 110 times larger than the average remaining manufacturer of frozen desserts.

The Commission has issued merger complaints against the four leading national concerns; viz, National Dairies, Foremost, Beatrice, and Borden. These cases are at various stages of completion.

In the National Dairy case, docket 6651, a consent order was recently signed which provides that for the next 10 years, National Dairy Products Corp., may not acquire any domestic manufacturer, processor or seller of fluid milk, ice cream, ice milk, mellorine, sherbet or water ices, natural or processed cheese or butter without prior approval of the Federal Trade Commission. In addition, National Dairy must sell to a purchaser approved by the Commission, two dairies it acquired in 1954. The companies are the White Ice Cream & Milk Co., of Wilmington, N.C. and the Plains Creamery, Inc., of Amarillo, Tex. Further, National Dairy may not sell processed fluid milk for 5 years after the sale in 10 North Carolina counties where White did business and in 27 Texas counties and 3 Oklahoma counties where Plains operated.

The Commission on April 30, 1962, issued an order in the Foremost case, docket 6495, ordering divestiture of 10 companies. This divestiture will reduce Foremost to half its present size. The Beatrice and Borden cases have not yet reached the Commission for final disposition. In Beatrice, docket 6653, proposed findings of fact and order were filed on December 19, 1962, requesting divestiture of 37 corporations engaged in commerce and a cease-and-desist order inhibiting all future acquisitions. The initial decision is due on May 1, 1963. Hearings are presently being held in the Borden case, docket 6652, and this case is nearing completion.

---

[1] Source of statistics used herein is in the matter of Beatrice Foods Co., docket No. 6653.

So you can see that we have taken on the majors in the merger field. These cases are complex—giant records are made slowly in the course of extensive litigation—many market areas must be examined minutely—no detail can be overlooked for the record must withstand the scrutiny and attacks of the most experienced trial counsel employed by these big concerns. But these cases are finally being brought to a close and it is hoped that, whatever the final determination by the Commission, the courts will ultimately enforce, indeed applaud our efforts in this area. The Commission's concern about concentration in the dairy industry is both timely and real and, I believe, one of its major accomplishments in its efforts to protect small business.

B. ANTIMONOPOLY COMPLAINTS INVOLVING DAIRY RESPONDENTS

In recent years, the Commission has filed numerous formal complaints against both national and regional companies alleging violations of the Robinson-Patman Act and Federal Trade Commission Act. Except for two consent orders, In the Matter of United Farmers of New England, Inc., docket 8406, and In the Matter of Kelly Creamery Co., docket 7783, the cases have been vigorously contested requiring extensive investigations, protracted hearings, and tremendous records.

The complaints referred to and the companies involved are: National Dairy Products Corp., docket No. 7018; the Borden Co., docket No. 7474; Foremost Dairies, Inc., docket No. 7475; Beatrice Foods Co., Inc., docket No. 7599; Dean Milk Co., docket No. 8032; Central Arkansas Milk Products Association, docket No. 8391; H. P. Hood & Sons, Inc., docket No. 7709; H. P. Hood & Sons, Inc, and the Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co, Inc., docket No. 8273; in the matters of Adams Dairy Co. and Adams Dairy, Inc., and the Kroger Co., docket No. 7596; Safeway Stores, Inc., docket No. 7597; and the Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co., Inc., docket No. 7598.

In some of these cases hearings are in progress and some have been decided. Some orders have been entered by the hearing examiners and some by the Commission. In summary, the Commission has issued a substantial number of formal antimonopoly complaints involving your industry. The complaints name as respondents national concerns as well as regional dairies, chainstores, and producers. Many of the complaints are national in scope but some primarily involve regional markets. The practices involved include, but are not limited to, territorial and competing customer, price discriminations, disproportionate advertising allowances, conspiracy to fix prices, exclusive dealing, selling below cost, and illegal acquisitions and mergers.

These cases have brought to light many serious interpretation and evidentiary problems which must be solved before effective Commission action can be felt in these areas. At the threshold of any action we are met with a series of objections directed toward what I believe is an unrealistically narrow interpretation of what is interstate commerce, a basic prerequisite of any Commission action. However, the seriousness of these objections cannot be ignored. A recent decision of the Sixth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, *Willard Dairy* v. *National Dairy Products Corp.*, 1962 Trade Cases, par. 70,556 (Sixth Cir. 1962), raises some serious questions but, in and of itself, does not represent an unsurmountable obstacle to our efforts to curb the activities of the interstate giants who are discriminating in local markets.

Then we always have the problem of "who struck John." In several of the cases in which our trials have been completed we have been unable to affix responsibility for the price break that triggered the war. Somewhere lurking in the wings is the jugoperator or the discounter who, for his own purposes, is insistent upon depressing the price sometimes until it reaches below cost proportions. Somehow in this maze of statistics, claims and counterclaims the majors sometimes emerge smelling like the proverbial rose.

This is not to say that these proven obstacles will deter us in our efforts but I would be less than candid if I did not recognize the seriousness of our problems, indeed your problems, if we are to render any effective aid to the small dairy processor.

But all is not grim.

Sometimes our efforts result in definite contributions to clarification of the status of industry practices as well as to the type and style of remedy which may emerge to eliminate the practices. Consider our recent Borden decision, (docket 7129), in which the Commission prohibited discrimination in price between identical products even though they were different brands. And I should note that a cease and desist order can have broad implications. Although the discrimination was limited to evaporated milk, the Commission's order encompassed all "food products." The Commission took the position that the same or similar price discrimination practice could be used as well for other food products and the order, to be effective, was made to include all food products.

Recently the Commission has demonstrated an increased awareness of the inequities which arise from piecemeal action directed against individual companies who are engaged in industrywide practices.

If competitors are free to ignore Commission regulation, any individual company operating under a cease-and-desist order operates at a serious disadvantage. Accordingly, we intend to proceed against all offenders and even the smaller members of the dairy industry if their conduct warrants such action. In fact, some of our investigations have disclosed that in some instances small, independent companies have initiated practices which have touched off price wars.

C. INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO PRICING

Numerous complaints are received every week concerning pricing problems in the dairy industry by the Division of Discriminatory Practices. This division is responsible for the trial of cases involving violations of sections 2 and 3 of the Clayton Act, and cases brought under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act against buyers for knowingly inducing and receiving discriminatory allowances from suppliers.

The staff located in Washington, with the assistance of the field office personnel, has expended a substantial number of man-hours devoted to investigations involving discriminatory pricing in the sale of fluid milk. Over 27 such cases are presently under investigation, excluding numerous and time-consuming investigational hearings.

The cases involve allegations of sales below cost, territorial price discriminations, and discriminations among competing customers. The investigations cover most of the Nation including market areas located in the States of Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The Commission is very much aware of the problems in this industry and authorized a broad, nationwide investigation in its resolution dated July 3, 1962. The resolution stating the Commissions reasons for initiating the investigation reads:

"Whereas the Commission has received complaints and information to the effect that some corporations may be engaged in unfair and discriminatory acts and practices in connection with the production, distribution, purchase and sale of fluid milk alone or in combination with other products or services in Indianapolis, Ind.; Denver, Colo.; St. Louis, Mo.; Topeka, Kans.; Peoria, Ill., and other trade areas throughout the United States; and

"Whereas, instances have come to the attention of the Commission where some corporations have engaged in the practice of selling fluid milk alone or in combination with other products or services in selected market areas at below cost prices; and further have engaged in the practice of selling fluid milk alone or in combination with other products or services in certain selected geographical areas at extremely low prices while maintaining much higher prices in other areas; * * *

"Whereas the Commission has received complaints and information to the effect that such acts and practices result in severe economic injury to many small businesses; and

"Whereas such acts and practices may constitute violations of section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act (15 U.S.C. 13), or section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45), statutes administered by the Commission, or may require additional legislation. * * *"

Investigational hearings have been held pursuant to the Commission's resolution in Indianapolis, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Dayton, and Long Island. These records are presently being reviewed with a view of determining whether complaints should issue. The Commission is making a concentrated effort to stop the demise of small business concerns because of unlawful pricing practices.

But decisions to proceed by the complaint process are not easily made. We are very much aware of the problems which have arisen in past cases and the difficulties of proof which I have already mentioned. But we are not fainthearted. And I am proud of the fact that many of the criticisms of the Commission in the recent past have been directed toward an excess of zeal in its efforts to secure compliance with the statutes which it enforces rather than the negative harpings that the Commission is not making all-out efforts to enforce the law.

I must say, however, that all does not come out roses with regard to the complaints filed by this association. We have found in many of our investigations that the assistance that we receive from industry members is inadequate.

They are not completely informed as to the chronology of events that have taken place in the market. They have not saved advertisements showing price changes and have not documented injury such as loss of customers; sales volume or profits. These are some of the reasons why investigations are time consuming.

In many instances our investigations have disclosed that the pricing practices complained of are purely local and entirely intrastate. Formal complaints cannot issue in these circumstances because of jurisdictional limitations. Much time and effort would be saved if members of the industry would be more selective in making complaints. In these cases, the complaints should be called to the attention of State regulatory agencies. Competitive pricing is the jugular vein controlling your very existence. Direct your complaints to all who can or will help whether they be on the community, city, county, State or Federal level.

It must be noticed that once complaint is issued, there are many dilatory tactics that can be and are utilized to delay litigation. However, we must remember that all persons charged with violations of laws administered by the Commission are entitled to a fair trial. Yet complaints are numerous concerning the pace at which litigated cases proceed. It is felt that the recent revision in the rules requiring continuous hearings will help speed up litigation. Authority to issue temporary cease and desist orders, if granted to the Commission, would be of inestimable help to the Commission in halting unlawful practices prior to termination of protracted proceedings.

Although the dairy industry is only a small part of the total economy with which the Commission is concerned, the record of formal complaints issued and investigations undertaken demonstrates the vigilance of the Commission in its efforts to insure the continued existence of this industry comprised of small, independent entrepreneurs such as yourselves.

Thank you for the privilege of discussing these important matters with you.

THE CHANGING ROLE OF WOMEN IN A CHANGING SOCIETY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Deseret News, one of Utah's outstanding newspapers, recently published a series of feature articles on "The Changing Role of Women in a Changing Society—6 Months Later," which was the subject of a seminar held recently at the University of Utah.

A featured speaker at this seminar was Mrs. George A. Ballif, member of the Education Committee of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, and one of Utah's most prominent and distinguished women. This Commission is to make its report to the President next October and I commend the Deseret News article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Modern Woman Told: Accept Intellectual Challenges

(By Rose Mary Pedersen)

For today's woman, studying philosophy may be more important than baking a cake.

Or, to put it a bit differently, a woman is making a serious mistake if she allows surface things to take precedence over basics.

(And the most important basic of all is education.)

This was the contention of Mrs. George A. Ballif, member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, and featured speaker at a symposium held last week at the University of Utah.

INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION

Mrs. Ballif, lecturing at the conference on "The Changing Role of Women—6 Months Later," emphasized that every woman—be she young or old—needs a generous amount of intellectual stimulation in her life.

"If women are to fulfill their promise as individuals, as well as bring the best they can of themselves to their families, they must keep studying," the University of Utah seminar speaker stated.

"With all the New Frontier emphasis on culture, women now, more than ever, need to become better informed individuals. One of the tragedies of our 20th century is that woman brainpower has been allowed to go virtually untapped."

Explaining this point of view, Mrs. Ballif said that being a member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women has put her in direct contact with facts and figures concerning women in the professional world.

"It has been shocking and disheartening to discover that although more girls are going to college now than ever before, fewer are putting their college educations to work for them."

She continued that although our Nation's colleges and universities are turning out vast numbers of well-qualified, scholarly young ladies who show promise in a variety of academic directions, few of those graduates are doing much with what they have learned.

SCAN STATISTICS

According to Mrs. Ballif, a mere scanning of the statistics shows few young women interested in anything but suburban housewifery.

"And there is absolutely no excuse for this," chided the seminar speaker. "Girls have great intellectual potentialities. And they must not, because of social pressure (or lackadaisical attitudes) neglect to develop them."

Referring back to this idea, the symposium speaker remarked that society must not allow its women to become apathetical, or to fall prey to defeatist so-what-does-it-matter points of view.

"This way of thinking will sow seeds of national destruction," Mrs. Ballif warned.

Using as her reference the newly published book, "The Feminine Mystique," by Betty Friedan, Mrs. Ballif said many American women are suffering a "slow deterioration of mind and spirit" because the pattern into which the have been told they must fit does not inspire them at all; require mature capabilities or the stretching of mental muscles.

FRUSTRATED WOMEN

In other words, in Mrs. Ballif's opinion, American women today are becoming frustrated because they feel there should be something more for them in life than dusting, doing dishes, and making peanut butter sandwiches.

Is anything being done to alter this condition?

Mrs. Ballif remarked that the President's Commission currently is involved in studies to make the lot of women brighter and more intellectually challenging.

"We have people on our committee investigating the possibilities of sending women back to school even during their childbearing years; we have groups looking into the possibilities of providing better jobs with better pay for women; we have people examining statistics about the older women and analyzing how a more rewarding life for her might be found after her family is grown and gone."

Mrs. Ballif told those in attendance at the U. of U. conference that these studies (they began under the direction of the "very well-educated" Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt) have pointed up again and again that there is nothing more fundamental to a society than the opportunity to learn.

GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY

Without this opportunity, Mrs. Ballif said, "human beings feel stifled, futile and have no real reason for going on from one day to another."

She stressed quietly but intently, "Women, as well as men, have the inherent right to be considered as human beings—as human beings entitled to the opportunity to learn."

And again quoting Betty Friedan, she said: "If we continue to produce millions of young mothers who stop their education, short of identity, we are contributing to the mass burial of the American woman."

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the present time on the calendar are three bills still to be considered. There are three bills only. One is the bill (S. 2), to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 2 be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges, and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no action taken on that bill today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK MONDAY, APRIL 15, THEN TO 12 O'CLOCK THURSDAY, APRIL 18, AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next, and that following the adjournment on Monday next, the Senate adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no business on those 2 days. The meetings of the Senate will be pro forma. Any Senator who desires to make speeches may feel free to do so.

A week from Monday the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities will be the pending business before the Senate. We intend to have the bill before the Senate on that day.

Consideration of that bill will be followed by consideration of Senate bill 1007, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Consideration of that bill will be followed or taken up concurrently with consideration of the confirmation of the nominees for the directors of the Satellite Communications Corp.

CONGRESSIONAL BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, some of the country's newspapers, some of its political scientists, and some of its public officials have recently joined in a chorus of dismay over the failure of the

Congress to get down to business. With a unanimity of opinion and even of phrase they have belabored the committee system of the Congress, the chairmen of the committees, the President, the party leadership in Congress, and something called the Senate establishment.

This kind of criticism has a way of snowballing, and I expect that other newspapers, political scientists, and officials will join in the criticism, perhaps even—as in past years—after the Congress has succeeded in passing a substantial legislative program. There is a certain lag in these matters.

Therefore, before we celebrate the Easter season, Mr. President, I think it would be wise to take stock of the past 3 months, and to assess the work of the 88th Congress as of April 11. This may give us a better judgment of the criticism that has been leveled at the Congress in recent weeks.

We began the session with a prolonged controversy over an amendment to the cloture rule. I shall not undertake to judge the merits of prolonging that debate to the extent it was. Nevertheless it did consume those weeks we usually devote to the organization of committees and the commencement of hearings on the President's program.

It required another 2 weeks after the rules fight had ended before we were able to complete committee assignments and provide funds for investigations and other committee activity.

Finally, the ordinary mechanics of the Senate were set in motion. Committees began their hearings and deliberations, and we received the first major bills of the Congress.

Since that time we have completed action on the following measures:

The Youth Employment Act—a 5-year program to employ and retrain jobless youngsters between the ages of 16 and 22, in a youth conservation corps and a hometown service corps.

The mass transit bill—a grant and guaranteed loan program to assist urban areas in providing better transit for their people.

The wilderness bill—a program by which 35 million acres of federally owned land will be set aside as wilderness, unavailable for commercial use.

The military procurement bill—authorizing $15 billion for aircraft, missile, and naval vessel procurement for fiscal 1964.

In addition, we have passed an agricultural supplemental of $508 million; we extend the draft to July 1, 1967; we authorized the preparation of a comprehensive outdoor recreation plan; we voted to establish a Commission on Science and Technology; and we conferred honorary citizenship on one of the great statesmen of world history, Sir Winston Churchill.

The quality of this record, in my opinion, commends itself to our people. Certainly it is not the record of a prolific Senate; but the well-being of the country is not automatically served by a long list of bills adopted. What counts for the country is the quality of legislation, whether it meets a real need, and whether it meets it in a rational manner. In both regards I think the bills we have passed measure up quite well.

This is not to say that the record might not have been improved. Of course it might have been improved; sacrifices might have been made which would have enabled us to get underway at an earlier date. Once we began to legislate, however, we moved swiftly and effectively.

When we renew our efforts on Monday week, we hope to get the committees into full-scale operation at once, and to consider their recommendations as quickly as they are reported. During that week of April 22 we expect to have the supplemental appropriations bill before us, if it is reported early in the week as we hope it will be. We will also consider S. 2, the water resources bill, and S. 1007, the Pacific Northwest power bill. There will not be many days thereafter, so I fervently hope, when we shall be without major legislation on the floor or imminent. I commend the Senate committees and the Senate as a whole for the fine work done since the committees were organized less than 2 months ago.

TRIBUTE TO THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think it would be only right and proper, not as a deputy or majority whip but as a Senator from Minnesota, that I congratulate the majority leader for the excellent leadership he has been giving to the Senate. I think we saw it last night, when many problems were resolved. We witnessed it again today. We surely witnessed it under the difficult situation prevailing at the time the mass transit bill was under consideration, as we have all through this session.

I, for one, wish to say to the Senator from Montana, our distinguished majority leader, it is a joy, a privilege, and an honor to be associated with him, to follow his leadership, and to work with him.

We have proved in this Senate that we can get the job done, and we shall continue to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the feeling is reciprocal. I am distinctly honored and privileged to have the opportunity to serve side by side with my good friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota.

THE DISASTER OF THE NUCLEAR SUBMARINE "THRESHER"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Nation mourns today the tragic loss of 129 brave men, skilled men, irreplaceable men, in the sea off New England.

The disaster of the nuclear submarine *Thresher* should remind us that this Nation is not defended without great danger to those relatively few Americans who serve us in the Armed Forces.

For those who daily place their lives in jeopardy in the engines of defense that the Nation supplies but only a few of us man, let us take this solemn moment to express the gratitude of the American people.

And let us also remember, as we mourn the loss of the officers and men of *Thresher*, that for all too many years the Congress has kept down the salary levels of the military forces, as compared with the salaries of their opposite members in the civilian economy.

Thresher's men asked much of their wives and families—to live on inadequate incomes—in order that those seamen, those petty officers, those young commissioned officers might serve their country. I daresay that every man on *Thresher* could have left his ship and his service to go into far higher paying employment in industry. What kept them in the service? Leadership, loyalty to their officers, dedication to the welfare of their country—yes, American patriotism.

Mr. President, it is a national disgrace that the American people and Congress continue to ask so much of so few for so little.

I am referring in this instance to the military pay bill and all that it means.

Yes, let us mourn the dead men of *Thresher* and extend our sympathies to their families. Let us also resolve now that the Congress will wipe out the disgraceful discrimination in salary against the bravest of us all.

Mr. President, I thought it was an appropriate moment for us to take note of the sacrifices which these men make, even when tragedy does not befall them. What a sad and unhappy day this is when we hear the reports that there is little or no hope for their safety or for their recovery.

"PACEM IN TERRIS"—ENCYCLICAL OF POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today we voted on a great defense measure, the military authorization bill, involving billions of dollars. I voted for the bill. I followed the leadership of those in whom I place trust and in whom I have confidence as to their judgment as to the defense needs of our country. Our Nation is faced by a powerful enemy, and the world is in the throes of tremendous social upheaval. Our Nation must be strong not only for ourselves but also for others who seek to live in freedom.

In these closing moments of the legislative day, Mr. President, I think it is proper that one's thoughts turn not only to the business of legislation; not only to the hard, cold facts of the world in which we live in terms of the struggle now underway; but also to the solemnity of the religious season.

Our brethren of the Jewish faith are in the midst of their annual celebration of the Passover—a time of communal devotion and thankfulness for deliverances. For Christians the weekend brings the climax of Holy Week. Tonight we remember the vigil and the betrayal of Our Lord at Gethsemane; tomorrow His crucifixion; Sunday His resurrection. It is fitting, therefore, that men of all faiths and of all hues of religious or social doctrine take to heart the wise words which have just been received from His Holiness, Pope John XXIII.

Mr. President, this morning I was privileged, among millions of people, to glance through and to read many of the pronouncements of the great Pope John XXIII. This great spiritual leader is giving the world a ray of hope, a feeling of a better day.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Pope John's encyclical, entitled "Pacem in Terris"—peace on earth—may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks; and I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the New York Times of April 11, 1963, entitled "The Pope's Plea for Peace," may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, no words of mine can add to the significance of this paper encyclical. It is one of the most liberal, one of the most universal, one of the most human documents of our time. The name of the encyclical recalls the words of the angels to the shepherds in the fields at the birth of Christ; the message itself has meaning for all men, whatever their citizenship, religious faith, or condition of life. Almost Jeffersonian in spirit, the Pope's encyclical breathes the ancient inspiration and wisdom of the Christian fathers. It is contemporary in application yet timeless in its language and tenacious in its reverence for Christian doctrine.

"Pacem in Terris" is permeated with concern for all men—Catholics and non-Catholics, Christians and non-Christians, believers and nonbelievers. In his profound respect for the dignity of man, Pope John XXIII reminds us of those Renaissance masterpieces which adorn his residence in the Vatican. In his insistence on the rights of man, drawn from an immutable natural law, the Pope is articulating a philosophy shared by our own Founding Fathers of the 18th century. In his emphasis on social justice combined with the interlocking rights and obligations of men at all levels of society, the encyclical of John XXIII is in the tradition of the "Rerum Novarum" of Leo XIII in 1891, of the "Quadragesimo Anno" of Pius XI in 1931, and of his own "Mater et Magistra" in July 1961. The net effect of these papal pronouncements is to put the church at the vanguard of the world movement for peace, for a community of nations, for the rights of individuals, for aid to the less fortunate nations of the world, for evolutionary reforms, for constitutional government, for strengthening the United Nations, and for achieving controlled disarmament as well as an end to nuclear testing. No one in authority can read this document without experiencing a keener sense of his responsibility to those under him. No individual can read it without acknowledging his relationship to his fellow man. If the document were inscribed on the conscience of all national leaders there would be no more wars, no more violation of human rights, no more exploitation of man by man.

Yet the Pope, although a visionary in the best sense of the term, is by no means utopian. He warns of the danger of "the appalling destruction and sorrow * * * that may be set off by some uncontrollable and unexpected chance" unless the headlong arms race is ended. He himself recognizes that "the problem of bringing social reality into line with the objective requirements of justice is a problem which will never admit of a definitive solution." Therefore, Mr. President, let us not idly dismiss the Pope's earnest wish that:

> The United Nations Organization—in its structure and in its means—may become even more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and that the day may come when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable, and inalienable rights.

I close, Mr. President, by citing a passage of the encyclical which should serve as a guide to every Member of this body. Cautions the Pope:

> Rather than relax and feel satisfied with objectives already achieved all human beings ought * * * to reckon that what has been accomplished is but little in comparison with what remains to be done: because organs of production, trade unions, associations, professional organizations, insurance systems, legal systems, political regimes, institutions for culture, health, recreational, or sporting purposes—these must all be adjusted to the era of the atom and of the conquest of space, an era which the human family has already entered, wherein it has commenced its new advance toward limitless horizons.

In other words, Mr. President, man can indeed take his place "only a little below the angels" if he seizes his opportunities. The 17th-century French philospher Blaise Pascal reminds us that man is not only the supreme creation of nature in one sense, but also that in another sense he is the puniest and the most insignificant of God's works. It is up to us, under divine guidance, to determine whether we shall take the path of insignificance or of glory. The encyclical, "Pacem in Terris," has clearly pointed us in the right direction.

EXHIBIT I

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1963]

TEXT OF POPE JOHN'S ENCYCLICAL "PACEM IN TERRIS," CALLING FOR A WORLD COMMUNITY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following, in translation supplied by the Vatican Press Office, is the text of the encyclical "Pacem in Terris" ("Peace on Earth"), issued today by Pope John XXIII.)

Encylical letter of His Holiness John XXIII, by divine providence Pope, to the venerable brothers the patriarchs, primates, archbishops and other local ordinaries in peace and communion with the Apostolic See, to the clergy and faithful of the whole world, and to all men of good will, on establishing universal peace in truth, justice, charity and liberty.

To our venerable brothers the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops and other local ordinaries in peace and communion with the Apostolic See, to the clergy and faithful of the whole world and to all men of good will: Pope John XXIII; venerable brothers and beloved children, health and apostolic benediction.

INTRODUCTION

Order in the universe

Peace on earth, which men of every era have most eagerly yearned for, can be firmly established only if the order laid down by God be dutifully observed. The progress of learning and the inventions of technology clearly show that, both in living things and in the forces of nature, an astonishing order reigns, and they also bear witness to the greatness of man, who can understand that order and create suitable instruments to harness those forces of nature and use them to his benefit.

But the progress of science and the inventions of technology show above all the infinite greatness of God, who created the universe and man himself. He created all things out of nothing, pouring into them the abundance of His wisdom and goodness, so that the holy psalmist praises God in these words: "O Lord our master. The majesty of Thy name fills all the earth."[1] Elsewhere he says: "What diversity, Lord, in Thy creatures. What wisdom has designed them all."[2] God also created man in his own image and likeness,[3] endowed him with intelligence and freedom, and made him lord of creation, as the same psalmist declares in the words: "Thou has placed him only a little below the angels, crowning him with glory and honor and bidding him rule over the works of Thy hands. Thou has put all under his dominion."[4]

Order in human beings

How strongly does the turmoil of individual men and peoples contrast with the perfect order of the universe. It is as if the relationships which bind them together could be controlled only by force. But the creator of the world has imprinted in man's heart an order which his conscience reveals to him and enjoins him to obey: This shows that the obligations of the law are written in their hearts, their conscience utters its own testimony.[5] And how could it be otherwise? For whatever God has made shows forth His infinite wisdom, and it is manifested more clearly in the things which have greater perfection.[6]

But fickleness of opinion often produces this error, that many think that the relationships between men and states can be governed by the same laws as the forces and irrational elements of the universe, whereas the laws governing them are of quite a different kind and are to be sought elsewhere, namely, where the Father of all things wrote them, that is, in the nature of man. By these laws men are most admirably taught, first of all how they should conduct their mutual dealings among themselves, then how the relationships between the citizens and the public authorities of each state should be regulated, then how states should deal with one another, and finally how, on the one hand, individual men and states, and on the other hand, the community of all peoples, should act toward each other, the establishment of such a world community of peoples being urgently demanded today by the requirements of universal common good.

PART I—ORDER BETWEEN MEN

Every man is a person with rights and duties

First of all, it is necessary to speak of the order which should exist between men. Any human society, if it is to be well-ordered and productive, must lay down as a foundation this principle, namely, that every human being is a person, that is, his nature is endowed with intelligence and free will. By virtue of this, he has rights and duties of his own, flowing directly and simultaneously from his very nature, which are, therefore, universal, inviolable and inalienable.[7]

---

[1] Psalms VIII, 1.

[2] Psalms CIII, 24.

[3] Cf. Genesis, 1, 26.

[4] Psalms VIII, 5-6.

[5] Romans II, 15.

[6] Cf. Psalms XVIII, 8-11.

If we look upon the dignity of the human person in the light of divinely revealed truth, we cannot help but esteem it far more highly. For men are redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ, they are by grace the children and friends of God and heirs of eternal glory.

Rights

The Right to Life and a Worthy Standard of Living

Beginning our discussion of the rights of man, we see that every man has the right to life, to bodily integrity and to the means which are necessary and suitable for the proper development of life. These are primarily food, clothing, shelter, rest, medical care and, finally the necessary social services. Therefore, a human being also has the right to security in cases of sickness, inability to work, widowhood, old age, unemployment, or in any other case in which he is deprived of the means of subsistence through no fault of his own.[8]

Right Pertaining to Moral and Cultural Values

By the natural law every human being has the right to respect for his person, to his good reputation, the right to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating his opinions, and in pursuit of art, within the limits laid down by the moral order and the common good. And he has the right to be informed truthfully about public events.

The natural law also gives man the right to share in the benefits of culture, and therefore the right to a basic education and to technical and professional training in keeping with the stage of educational development in the country to which he belongs. Every effort should be made to insure that persons be enabled, on the basis of merit, to go on to higher studies, so that, as far as possible, they may occupy posts and take on responsibilities in human society in accordance with their natural gifts and the skills they have acquired.[9]

The Right To Worship God According to One's Conscience

Every human being has the right to honor God according to the dictates of an upright conscience, and therefore the right to worship God privately and publicly. For, as Lactantius so clearly taught: We were created for the purpose of showing to the God who bore us the submission we owe Him, or recognizing Him alone, and of serving Him. We are obliged and bound by this duty to God. From this religion itself receives its name.[10] And on this point our predecessor of immortal memory, Leo XIII, declared: "This genuine, this honorable freedom of the sons of God, which most nobly protects the dignity of the human person, is greater than any violence or injustice. It has always been sought by the church, and always most dear to her. This was the freedom which the apologists claimed with intrepid constancy, which the apologists defended with their writings, and which the martyrs in such numbers consecrated with their blood." [11]

The Right To Choose Freely One's State of Life

Human beings have the right to choose freely the state of life which they prefer, and therefore the right to set up a family, with equal rights and duties for man and woman, and also the right to follow a vocation to the priesthood or the religious life.[12]

The family, grounded on marriage freely contracted, monogamous and indissoluble, is and must be considered the first and essential cell of human society. To it must be given every consideration of an economic, social, cultural, and moral nature which will strengthen its stability and facilitate the fulfilment of its specific mission.

Parents, however, have a prior right in the support and education of their children.[13]

Economic Rights

Human beings have the natural right to free initiative in the economic field, and the right to work.[14]

Indissolubly linked with those rights is the right to working conditions in which physical health is not endangered, morals are safeguarded and young people's normal development is not impaired. Women have the right to working conditions in accordance with their requirements and their duties as wives and mothers.[15]

From the dignity of the human person, there also arises the right to carry on economic activities according to the degree of responsibility of which one is capable.[16] Furthermore—and this must be specially emphasized—there is the right to a working wage, determined according to criterions of justice and sufficient, therefore, in proportion to the available resources, to give the worker and his family a standard of living in keeping with the dignity of the human person. In this regard, our predecessor Pius XII said: "To the personal duty to work imposed by nature, there corresponds and follows the natural right of each individual to make of his work the means to provide for his own life and the lives of his children. So profoundly is the empire of nature ordained for the preservation of man." [17]

The right to private property, even of productive goods, also derives from the nature of man. This right, as we have elsewhere declared, is a suitable means for safeguarding the dignity of the human person and for the exercise of responsibility in all fields; it strengthens and gives serenity to family life, thereby increasing the peace and prosperity of the state.[18]

However, it is opportune to point out that there is a social duty essentially inherent in the right of private property.[19]

The Right of Meeting and Association

From the fact that human beings are by nature social, there arises the right of assembly and association. They have also the right to give the societies of which they are members the form they consider most suitable for the aim they have in view, and to act within such societies on their own initiative and on their own responsibility in order to achieve their desired objectives.[20]

We ourselves stated in the encyclical "Mater et Magistra" that, for the achievement of ends which individual human beings cannot attain except by association, it is necessary and indispensable to set up a great variety of such intermediate groups and societies in order to guarantee for the human person a sufficient sphere of freedom and responsibility.[21]

The Right To Emigrate and Immigrate

Every human being has the right to freedom of movement and of residence within the confines of his own country; and when there are just reasons for it, the right to emigrate to other countries and take up residence there.[22] The fact that one is a citizen of a particular state does not detract in any way from his membership of the human family as a whole, nor from his citizenship of the world community.

Political Rights

The dignity of the human person involves the right to take an active part in public affairs and to contribute one's part to the common good of the citizenry. For, as our predecessor of happy memory, Pius XII, pointed out: The human individual, far from being an object and, as it were, a merely passive element in the social order, is in fact, must be and must continue to be, its subject, its foundation and its end.[23]

The human person is also entitled to a juridical protection of his rights, a protection that should be efficacious, impartial, and inspired by the true norms of justice.

As our predecessor Pius XII teaches: That perpetual privilege proper to man, by which every individual has a claim to the protection of his rights, and by which there is assigned to each a definite and particular sphere of rights, immune from all arbitrary attacks, is the logical consequence of the order of justice willed by God.[24]

Duties

Rights and Duties Necessarily Linked in the One Person

The natural rights with which we have been dealing are, however, inseparably connected, in the very person who is their subject, with just as many respective duties; and rights as well as duties find their source, their sustenance, and their inviolability in the natural law which grants or enjoins them.

For example, the right of every man to life is correlative with the duty to preserve it; his right to a decent standard of living with the duty of living it becomingly; and his right to investigate the truth freely, with the duty of seeking it and of possessing it ever more completely and profoundly.

Reciprocity of Rights and Duties Between Persons

Once this is admitted, it is also clear that in human society to one man's right there corresponds a duty in all other persons: the duty, namely, of acknowledging and respecting the right in question. For every fundamental human right draws its indestructible moral force from the natural law, which, in granting it, imposes a corresponding obligation. Those, therefore, who claim their own rights, yet altogether forget or neglect to carry out their respective duties, are people who build with one hand and destroy with the other.

---

[7] Cf. Pius XII's radio message on Christmas Eve, 1942, "Acta Aspostolicae Sedis," vol. 35, pp. 9–24, and John XXIII's sermon Jan. 4, 1963, "Acta Apostolicae Sedis," vol. 55, pp. 89–91.

[8] Cf. Pius XI's encyclical letter "Divini Redemptoris ("Of the Divine Redeemer"). Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 29, p. 78, and radio message by Pius XII on the Feast of Pentecost, 1941, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 33, p. 195–205.

[9] Cf. Pius XII's radio message on Christmas Eve, 1942, op. cit., pp. 9–24.

[10] Divinae Institutiones, vol. 4, chap. 28, subheading 2, editions P. L. 6, 535.

[11] Encyclical letter "Libertas praestantissimum" ("freedom of the most excellent"), acts of Leo XIII, vol. 8, pp. 237–238.

[12] Cf. Pius XII radio message on Christmas Eve, 1942, loc. cit.

[13] Cf. Piux XI's encyclical letter "Casti Connubii" ("Of Chaste Marriage") Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 22, pp. 539–92, and Pius XII's radio message on Christmas Eve, 1942, loc. cit.

[14] Cf. Pius XII's radio message on the Feast of Pentecost, 1941, loc. cit., p. 201.

[15] Cf. Leo XIII's encyclical letter "Rerum Novarum" ("Of New Things"), acts of Leo XIII, vol. 11, pp. 128–29.

[16] Cf. John XXIII's encylical letter "Mater et Magistra" ("Mother and Teacher"), Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 53, p. 422.

[17] Cf. Pope Pius XII, loc. cit.

[18] "Mater et Magistra," p. 428.

[19] Cf. ibid., p. 430.

[20] Cf. "Rerum Novarum," pp. 134–42; Pius XI's encyclical "Quadragesimo Anno" ("in the 40th year"), Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 23, pp. 199–200, and Pius XII's encyclical letter "Sertum Laetitiae" ("A Garland of Joy"), Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 31, pp. 635-44.

[21] Cf. Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 53, p. 430.

[22] Cf. Pius XII's radio message on Christmas Eve, 1942, op. cit., pp. 33–46.

[23] Cf. Pius XII's radio message on Christmas Eve, 1944, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol 37, p. 12.

[24] Cf. Pius XII's radio message on Christmas Eve, 1942, op. cit., p. 21.

Mutual Collaboration

Since men are social by nature they are meant to live with others and to work for one another's welfare. A well-ordered human society requires that men recognize and observe their mutual rights and duties. It also demands that each contribute generously to the establishment of a civic order in which rights and duties are progressively more sincerely and effectively acknowledged and fulfilled.

It is not enough, for example, to acknowledge and respect every man's right to the means of subsistence: One must also strive to obtain that he actually has enough in the way of food and nourishment.

The society of men must not only be organized but must also provide them with abundant resources. This certainly requires that they observe and recognize their mutual rights and duties: It also requires that they collaborate together in the many enterprises that modern civilization either allows or encourages or even demands.

The dignity of the human person also requires that every man enjoy the right to act freely and responsibly. For this reason, therefore, in social relations man should exercise his rights, fulfill his obligations, and, in the countless forms of collaboration with others, act chiefly on his own responsibility and initiative. This is to be done in such a way that each one acts on his own decision, of set purpose and from a consciousness of his obligation, without being moved by force or pressure brought to bear on him externally. For any human society that is established on relations of force must be regarded as inhuman, inasmuch as the personality of its members is repressed or restricted, when in fact they should be provided with appropriate incentives and means for developing and perfecting themselves.

Social Life in Truth, Justice, Charity, and Freedom

A political society is to be considered well ordered, beneficial, and in keeping with human dignity if it is grounded on truth. As the Apostle Paul exhorts us: "Away with falsehood then; let everyone speak out the truth to his neighbor; membership of the body binds us to one another." [25] This demands that reciprocal rights and duties be sincerely recognized. Furthermore, human society will be such as we have just described it, if the citizens, guided by justice, apply themselves seriously to respecting the rights of others and discharging their own duties; if they are moved by such fervor of charity as to make their own the needs of others and share with others their own goods: If, finally, they work for a progressively closer fellowship in the world of spiritual values. Human society is realized in freedom, that is to say, in ways and means in keeping with the dignity of its citizens, who accept the responsibility of their actions, precisely because they are by nature-rational beings.

Human society, venerable brothers and beloved children, ought to be regarded above all as a spiritual reality: in which men communicate knowledge to each other in the light of truth; in which they can enjoy their rights and fulfill their duties, and are inspired to strive for moral good. Society should enable men to share in and enjoy every legitimate expression of beauty, and encourage them constantly to pass on to others all that is best in themselves, while they strive to make their own the spiritual achievements of others. These are the spiritual values which continually give life and basic orientation to cultural expressions, economic and social institutions, political movements and forms, laws, and all other structures by which society is outwardly established and constantly developed.

God and the Moral Order

The order which prevails in society is by nature moral. Grounded as it is in truth, it must function according to the norms of justice, it should be inspired and perfected by mutual love, and finally it should be brought to an evermore refined and human balance in freedom.

Now an order of this kind, whose principles are universal, absolute and unchangeable, has its ultimate source in the one true God, who is personal and transcends human nature. Inasmuch as God is the first truth and the highest good. He alone is that deepest source from which human society can draw its vitality, if that society is to be well-ordered, beneficial, and in keeping with human dignity.[26] As St. Thomas Aquinas says: "Human reason is the norm of the human will, according to which goodness is measured, because reason derives from the eternal law which is the divine reason itself. It is evident then that the goodness of the human will depends much more on the eternal law than on human reason." [27]

Characteristics of the Present

Our age has three distinctive characteristics. First of all, the working classes have gradually gained ground in economic and public affairs. They began by claiming their rights in the socioeconomic sphere; they extended their action then to claims on the political level; and finally applied themselves to the acquisition of the benefits of a more refined culture. Today, therefore, workers all over the world refuse to be treated as if they were irrational objects without freedom, to be used at the arbitrary disposition of others. They insist that they be always regarded as men with a share in every sector of human society: in the social and economic sphere, in the fields of learning and culture, and in public life.

Second, it is obvious to everyone that women are now taking a part in public life. This is happening more rapidly, perhaps, in nations of Christian civilization, and, more slowly but broadly, among peoples who have inherited other traditions or cultures. Since women are becoming ever more conscious of their human dignity, they will not tolerate being treated as mere material instruments but demand rights befitting a human person both in domestic and in public life.

Finally, the modern world, as compared with the recent past, has taken on an entirely new appearance in the field of social and political life. For since all nations have either achieved or are on the way to achieving independence, there will soon no longer exist a world divided into nations that rule others and nations that are subject to others.

Men all over the world have today—or will soon have—the rank of citizens in independent nations. No one wants to feel subject to political powers located outside his own country or ethnic group. Thus, in very many human beings the inferiority complex which endured for hundreds and thousands of years is disappearing, while in others there is an attenuation and gradual fading of the corresponding superiority complex which had its roots in social-economic privileges, sex or political standing.

On the contrary, the conviction that all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity has been generally accepted. Hence racial discrimination can no longer be justified, at least doctrinally or in theory. And this is of fundamental importance and significance for the formation of human society according to those principles which we have outlined above. For, if a man becomes conscious of his rights, he must become equally aware of his duties. Thus he who possesses certain rights has likewise the duty to claim those rights as marks of his dignity, while all others have the obligation to acknowledge those rights and respect them.

When the relations of human society are expressed in terms of rights and duties, men become conscious of spiritual values, understand the meaning and significance of truth, justice, charity and freedom, and become deeply aware that they belong to this world of values. Moreover, when moved by such concerns, they are brought to a better knowledge of the true God who is personal and transcendent, and thus they make the ties that bind them to God the solid foundations and supreme criterion of their lives, both of that life which they live interiorly in the depths of their own souls and of that in which they are united to other men in society.

PART II—RELATIONS BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS AND THE PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

Necessity and divine origin of authority

Human society can be neither well ordered nor prosperous unless it has some people invested with legitimate authority to preserve its institutions and to devote themselves as far as is necessary to work and care for the good of all. These, however, derive their authority from God, as St. Paul teaches in the words, "Authority comes from God alone." [28] These words of St. Paul are explained thus by St. John Chrysostom: What are you saying? Is every ruler appointed by God? I do not say that, he replies, for I am not dealing now with individual rulers, but with authority itself. What I say is, that it is the divine wisdom and not mere chance that has ordained that there should be government, that some should command and others obey.[29] Moreover, since God made men social by nature, and since no society can hold together unless someone be over all, directing all to strive earnestly for the common good, every civilized community must have a ruling authority, and this authority, no less than society itself, has its source in nature, and has, consequently, God for its authority himself.[30]

But authority is not to be thought of as a force lacking all control. Indeed, since it is the power to command according to right reason, authority must derive its obligatory force from the moral order, which in turn has God for its first source and final end. Wherefore our predecessor of happy memory, Pius XII, said: "That same absolute order of beings and their ends which presents man as an autonomous person, that is, as the subject of inviolable duties and rights, and as at once the basis of society and the purpose for which it exists, also includes the state as necessary society invested with the authority without which it could not come into being or live * * *. And since this absolute order, as we learn from the sound reason, especially from the Christian faith, can have no origin save in a personal God who is our Creator, it follows that the dignity of the state's authority is due to its sharing to some extent in the authority of God himself.[31]

---

[25] Ephesians, iv. 25.

[26] Cf. Pius XII's 1942 radio message, op. cit., p. 14.

[27] St. Thomas Aquinas, "Summa Theologiae," I/A–II/AE, ques. 19, par. 4, cf. par. 9.

[28] St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, xii, 1–6.

[29] Op. cit., xiii, 1–2; Homily 23, Edition P.G. 60, 615.

[30] Leo XIII's encyclical letter "Immortale Dei" ("Of Immortal God"), Acts of Leo XIII, vol. 5, p. 120.

[31] Cf. Pius XII's 1944 radio message, op. cit., p. 15.

Where the civil authority uses as its only or its chief means either threats and fear of punishment or promises of rewards, it cannot effectively move men to promote the common good of all. Even if it did so move them, this would be altogether opposed to their dignity as men, endowed with reason and free will. As authority is chiefly concerned with moral force, it follows that civil authority must appeal primarily to the conscience of individual citizens, that is, to each one's duty to collaborate readily for the common good of all. Since by nature all men are equal in human dignity, it follows that no one may be coerced to perform interior acts. That is in the power of God alone, who sees and judges the hidden designs of men's hearts. Those therefore who have authority in the state may oblige men in conscience only if their authority is intrinsically related with the authority of God and shares in it.[32]

By this principle the dignity of the citizens is protected. When, in fact, men obey their rulers, it is not all as men that they obey them, but through their obedience it is God, the provident Creator of all things, whom they reverence, since He has decreed that men's dealings with one another should be regulated by an order which He himself has established. Moreover, in showing this due reverence to God, men not only do not debase themselves but rather perfect and enoble themselves. For to serve God is to rule.[33]

Since the right to command is required by the moral order and has its source in God, it follows that, if civil authorities legislate for or allow anything that is contrary to that order and therefore contrary to the will of God, neither the laws made nor the authorizations granted can be binding on the consciences of the citizens, since God has more right to be obeyed than men.[34] Otherwise, authority breaks down completely and results in shameful abuse. As St. Thomas Aquinas teaches: Human law has the true nature of law only insofar as it corresponds to. Insofar as it falls short of right reason, and therefore is derived from the eternal law. Insofar as it falls short of right reason, a law is said to be a wicked law. And so, lacking the true nature of law, it is rather a kind of violence.[35]

It must not be concluded, however, because authority comes from God, that therefore men have no right to choose those who are to rule the state, to decide the form of government and to determine both the way in which authority is to be exercised and its limits. It is thus clear that the doctrine which we have set forth is fully consonant with any truly democratic regime.[36]

Attainment of the common good

Purposes of the Public Authority

Individual citizens and intermediate groups are obliged to make their specific contributions to the common welfare. One of the chief consequences of this is that they must bring their own interests into harmony with the needs of the community, and must dispose of their goods and their services as civil authorities have prescribed, in accord with the norms of justice, in due form and within the limits of their competence. This they must do by means of formally perfect actions, the content of which must be morally good, or at least capable of being directed toward good.

Indeed, since the whole reason for the existence of civil authorities is the realization of the common good, it is clearly necessary that, in pursuing this objective, they should respect its essential elements, and at the same time conform their laws to the needs of a given historical situation.[37]

Assuredly, the ethnic characteristics of the various human groups are to be respected as constituent elements of the common good,[38] but these values and characteristics by no means exhaust the content of the common good. For the common good is intimately bound up with human nature. It can never exist fully and completely unless, its intimate nature and realization being what they are, the human person is taken into account.[39]

In the second place, the very nature of the common good requires that all members of the political community be entitled to share in it, although in different ways according to each one's tasks, merits and circumstances. For this reason, every civil authority must take pains to promote the common good of all, without preference for any single citizen or civil group. As our predecessor of immortal memory, Leo XIII, has said: The civil power must not serve the advantage of any one individual or of some few persons, inasmuch as it was established for the common good of all.[40] Considerations of justice and equity, however, can at times demand that those involved in civil government give more attention to the less fortunate members of the community, since they are less able to defend their rights and to assert their legitimate claims.[41]

In this context, we judge that attention should be called to the fact that the common good touches the whole man, the needs both of his body and of his soul. Hence it follows that the civil authorities must undertake to effect the common good by ways and means that are proper to them. That is, while respecting the hierarchy of values, they should promote simultaneously both the material and the spiritual welfare of the citizens.[42]

These principles are clearly contained in the doctrine stated in our encyclical, "mater et Magistra," where we emphasized that the common good of all embraces the sum total of those conditions of social living whereby men are enabled to achieve their own integral perfection more fully and more easily.[43]

Men, however, composed as they are of bodies and immortal souls, can never in this mortal life succeed in satisfying all their needs or in attaining perfect happiness. Therefore, all efforts made to promote the common good, far from endangering the eternal salvation of men, ought rather to serve to promote it.[44]

Responsibilities of the Public Authority, and Rights and Duties of Individuals

It is agreed that in our time the common good is chiefly guaranteed when personal right and duties are maintained. The chief concern of civil authorities must therefore be to insure that these rights are acknowledged, respected, coordinated with other rights, defended and promoted, so that in this way each one may more easily carry out his duties. For to safeguard the inviolable rights of the human person, and to facilitate the fulfilment of its duties, should be the essential office of every public authority.[45]

This means that if any government does not acknowledge the rights of man or violates them, it not only fails its duty, but its orders completely lack juridical force.[46]

Reconciliation and Protection of Rights and Duties of Individuals

One of the fundamental duties of civil authorities, therefore, is to coordinate social relations in such fashion that the exercise of one man's rights does not threaten others in the exercise of their own rights nor hinder them in fulfilment of their duties. Finally, the rights of all should be effectively safeguarded and, if they have been violated, completely restored.[47]

Duty of Promoting the Rights of Individuals

It is also demanded by the common good that civil authorities should make earnest efforts to bring about a situation in which individual citizens can easily exercise their rights and fulfill their duties as well. For experience has taught us that, unless these authorities take suitable action with regard to economic, political and cultural matters, inequalities between the citizens tend to become more and more widespread, especially in the modern world, and as a result human rights are rendered totally ineffective, and the fulfilment of duties is compromised.

It is therefore necessary that the administration give wholehearted and careful attention to the social as well as to the economic progress of the citizens, and to the development, in keeping with the development of the productive system, of such essential services as the building of roads, transportation, communications, water supply, housing, public health, education, facilitation of the practice of religion and recreational facilities. It is necessary also that governments make efforts to see that insurance systems are made available to the citizens, so that, in case of misfortune or increased family responsibilities, no person will be without the necessary means to maintain a decent standard of living. The Government should make similarly effective efforts to see that those who are able to work can find employment in keeping with their aptitudes, and that each worker receives a wage in keeping with the laws of justice and equity. It should be equally the concern of civil authorities to insure that workers be allowed their proper responsibility in the work undertaken in industrial organization, and to facilitate the establishment of intermediate groups which will make social life richer and more effective. Finally, it should be possible for all the citizens to share as far as they are able in their country's cultural advantages.

Harmonious Relations Between Public Authority's Two Forms of Intervention

The common good requires that civil authorities maintain a careful balance between coordinating and protecting the rights of the citizens, on the one hand, and promoting them, on the other. It should not happen that certain individuals or social groups derive special advantage from the fact that their rights have received preferential protection. Nor should it happen that governments, in seeking to protect these rights, become obstacles to their full expression and free use. For this principle must always be retained: that state activity in the economic field, no matter what its breadth or depth may be, ought not to be exercised in such a way as to curtail an individual's freedom of personal initiative. Rather it should work to expand that freedom as much as possible by the effective protection of the essential personal rights of each and every individual.[48]

---

[32] Cf. Encyclical Letter "Diuturnum Illud" ("That Longlived"), Acts of Leo XIII, vol. 2, p. 274.

[33] Cf. Ibid, p. 278, and encyclical "Immortale Dei," op. cit., p. 130.

[34] Acts of the Apostles, v. 29.

[35] St. Thomas Aquinas, op. cit., quest. 93, par. 3; Cf. Pius XII's 1944 radio message, op. cit., pp. 5–23.

[36] Cf. "Diuturnum Illud," op. cit., pp. 271–72; and Pius XII's 1944 radio message, op. cit., pp. 9–23.

[37] Cf. Pius XII's 1942 radio message, op. cit., p. 13, and Leo XIII's "Immortale Dei," op. cit., p. 120.

[38] Cf. Pius XII's encyclical letter "Summi Pontificatus" (Of the Supreme Pontificate"), Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 31, pp. 412–53.

[39] Cf. Pius XI's encyclical letter "Mit Brennender Sorge" ("For With Burning Sorrow"), Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 29, p. 159, and encyclical letter "Divini Redemptoris," Acta Apostolica Sedis, vol. 29, pp. 65–106.

[40] "Immortale Dei," op. cit., p. 121.

[41] Cf. "Rerum Novarum," op. cit., pp. 133-34.

[42] Cf. "Summi Pontificatus," op. cit., p. 433.

[43] Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 53, p. 19.

[44] Cf. "Quadragesimo Anno," vol. 23, p. 215.

[45] Cf. Pius XII's 1941 Feast of Pentecost radio message, op. cit., p. 200.

[46] Cf. "Mit Brennender Sorge," op. cit., p. 159; "Divini Redemptoris," op. cit., p. 79, and Pius XII's 1942 radio message, op. cit., pp. 9–24.

[47] Cf. "Divini Redemptoris," op. cit., p. 81, and 1942 radio message, loc. cit.

The same principle should inspire the various steps which governments take in order to make it possible for the citizens more easily to exercise their rights and fulfill their duties in every sector of social life.

Structure and operation of the public authority

It is impossible to determine, once and for all, what is the most suitable form of government, or how civil authorities can most effectively fulfill their respective functions, i.e., the legislative, judicial, and executive functions of the state. In determining the structure and operation of government which a state is to have, great weight has to be given to the historical background and circumstances of given political communities, circumstances which will vary at different times and in different places. We consider, however, that it is in keeping with the innate demands of human nature that the state should take a form which embodies the threefold division of powers corresponding to the three principal functions of public authority. In that type of state, not only the official functions of government but also the mutual relations between citizens and public officials are set down according to law, which in itself affords protection to the citizens both in the enjoyment of their rights and in the fulfillment of their duties.

If, however, this political and juridical structure is to produce the advantages which may be expected of it, public officials must strive to meet the problems which arise in a way that conforms both to the complexities of the situation and the proper exercise of their function. This requires that, in constantly changing conditions, legislators never forget the norms of morality, or constitutional provisions, or the objective requirements of the common good. Moreover, executive authorities must coordinate the activities of society with discretion, with a full knowledge of the law and after a careful consideration of circumstances, and the courts must administer justice impartially and without being influenced by favoritism or pressure. The good order of society also demands that individual citizens and intermediate organizations should be effectively protected by law whenever they have rights to be exercised or obligations to be fulfilled. This protection should be granted to citizens both in their dealings with each other and in their relations with government agencies.[49]

Law and Conscience

It is unquestionable that a legal structure in conformity with the moral order and corresponding to the level of development of the political community is of great advantage to achievement of the common good.

And yet, social life in the modern world is so varied, complex, and dynamic that even a juridical structure which has been prudently and thoughtfully established is always inadequate for the needs of society.

It is also true that the relations of the citizens with each other, of citizens and intermediate groups with public authorities, and finally of the public authorities with one another are often so complex and so sensitive that they cannot be regulated by inflexible legal provisions. Such a situation therefore demands that the civil authorities have clear ideas about the nature and extent of their official duties if they wish to maintain the existing juridical structure in its basic elements and principles, and at the same time meet the exigencies of social life, adapting their legislation to the changing social scene and solving new problems. They must be men of great equilibrium and integrity, competent, and courageous enough to see at once what the situation requires and to take necessary action quickly and effectively.[50]

Citizens' Participation in Public Life

It is in keeping with their dignity as persons that human beings should take an active part in government, although the manner in which they share in it will depend on the level of development of the political community to which they belong.

Men will find new and extensive advantages in the fact that they are allowed to participate in government. In this situation, those who administer the government come into frequent contact with the citizens, and it is thus easier for them to learn what is really needed for the common good. The fact, too, that ministers of government hold office only for a limited time keeps them from growing stale and allows for their replacement in accordance with the demands of social progress.[51]

Characteristics of the Present Day

In modern times, where there is question of organizing political communities juridically, there is observable first of all the tendency to write in concise and limpid phraseology a charter of fundamental human rights, which is, as often as not, inserted in the State constitutions, or is an integral part of them.

Secondly, there is also an inclination to determine, by the compilation of a document called the Constitution, the procedures through which the governing powers are to be created, along with their mutual relations, the spheres of their competence, the forms and systems they are obliged to follow in the performance of their office.

The relations between the government and the governed are then set forth in terms of rights and duties, and it is clearly laid down that the paramount task assigned to Government officials is that of recognizing, respecting, reconciling, protecting, and promoting the rights and duties of citizens.

It is of course impossible to accept the theory which professes to find the original and single source of civic rights and duties, of the binding force of the Constitution, and of a government's right to command in the mere will of human beings, individually or collectively.[52]

The tendencies to which we have referred, however, do clearly show that the men of our time have become increasingly conscious of their dignity as human persons. This awareness prompts them to claim a share in the public administration of their country, while it also accounts for the demand that their own inalienable and inviolable rights be protected by law. It also requires that Government officials be chosen in conformity with constitutional procedures, and perform their specific functions within the limits of law.

PART III—RELATIONS BETWEEN STATES

Subjects of rights and duties

Our predecessors have constantly maintained, and we join them in reasserting, that political communities are reciprocally subjects of rights and duties. This means that their relationships also must be harmonized in truth, in justice, in a working solidarity, in liberty. The same moral law which governs relations between individual human beings serves also to regulate the relations of political communities with one another. This will be readily understood when one reflects that the individual representatives of political communities cannot put aside their personal dignity while they are acting in the name and interest of their countries. And that they cannot therefore violate the very law of their being, which is the moral law.

It would be absurd, moreover, even to imagine that men could surrender their own human attributes, or be compelled to do so, by the very fact of their appointment to public office, whereas they have been given that noble assignment precisely because the wealth of their human endowments has earned them their reputation as outstanding members of the body politic. Furthermore, authority is a necessary requirement of the moral order in human society. It may not therefore be used against that order. And the very instant such an attempt were made, it would cease to be authority, as the Lord has warned us:

"A word, then, for the kings' ears to hear, kings' hearts to heed: A mesage for you, rulers, wherever you be. Listen well, all you that have multitudes at your command, foreign hordes to do your bidding. Power is none but comes to you from the Lord, nor any royalty but from one who is above all. He it is that will call you to account for your doings with a scrutiny that reads your inmost thoughts." [53]

Lastly, it is to be borne in mind that also in the regulating of relations between political communities, authority is to be exercised for the achievement of the common good, which constitutes the reason for its existence.

But a fundamental factor of the common good is acknowledgment of the moral order and respect for its prescriptions. Order between the political communities must be built upon the unshakable and unchangeable rock of the moral law, made manifest in the order of nature by the Creator himself and by Him engraved on the hearts of men with letters that may never be effaced. Like the rays of a gleaming beacon, its principles must guide the plans and policies of men and nations. These are the signals—of warning, safety, and smooth sailing—they will have to heed if they would not see all their laborious efforts to establish a new order condemned to tempest and shipwreck.[54]

In Truth

First among the rules governing the relations between states is that of truth. This calls, above all, for the elimination of every trace of racism and the consequent recognition of the principal that all states are by nature equal in dignity. Each of them, accordingly, is vested with the right to existence, to self-development, to the means fitting to its attainment and to be the one primarily responsible for this self-development. Add to that the right of each to its good name, and to the respect which is its due. Very often, experience has taught us, individuals will be found to differ considerably, in knowledge, virtue, talent, and wealth. Yet these inequalities must never be held to excuse any man's attempt to lord it over his neighbors unjustly. They constitute rather a source of greater responsibility in the contribution which each and everyone must make toward mutual improvement.

Similarly, political communities may have reached different levels of culture, civilization, or economic development. Neither is that a sufficient reason for some to take unjust advantage of their superiority over others. Rather should they see in it an added motive for more serious commitment to the common cause of social progress.

---

[48] "Mater et Magistra," op. cit., p. 415.

[49] Cf. Pius XII's 1942 radio message, op. cit., p. 21.

[50] Op. cit., 15–16.

[51] Op. cit., p. 12.

[52] Cf. apostolic letter "Annum Ingressi" ("The Year of the Entry"), Acts of Leo XIII, vol. 22, pp. 52–80.

[53] "Sapientia," vi, 2–4.

[54] Cf. Pius XII, op. cit., p. 16.

It is not true that some human beings are by nature superior and others inferior. All men are equal in their natural dignity. Consequently, there are no political communities which are superior by nature and none which are inferior by nature. All political communities are of equal natural dignity, since they are bodies whose membership is made up of these same human beings. Nor must it be forgotten, in this connection, that peoples can be highly sensitive, and with good reason, in matters touching their dignity and honor.

Truth further demands that the various media of social communications made available by modern progress, which enable the nations to know each other better, be used with serene objectivity. That need not, of course, rule out any legitimate emphasis on the positive aspects of their way of life. But methods of information which fall short of the truth, and by the same token impair the reputation of this people or that, must be discarded.[55]

In Justice

Relations between political communities are to be further regulated by justice. This implies, over and above recognition of their mutual rights, the fulfillment of their respective duties.

Political communities have the right to existence, to self-development and to the means necessary for this. They have the right to play the leading part in the process of their own development and the right to their good name and due honors. From which it follows as a simultaneous consequence that they have also the corresponding duty of respecting these rights in others and of avoiding any act of violation. Just as an individual man may not pursue his own interests to the detriment of other men, so, on the international level, one state may not develop itself by restricting or oppressing other states. St. Augustine rightly says, "What are kingdoms without justice but bands of robbers?"[56]

Not only can it happen, but it actually does happen that the advantages and conveniences which nations strive to acquire for themselves become objects of contention. Nevertheless, the resulting disagreements must be settled, not by force, nor by deceit or trickery, but rather in the only manner which is worthy of the dignity of man; i.e., by a mutual assessment of the reasons on both sides of the dispute, by a mature and objective investigation of the situation, and by an equitable reconciliation of differences of opinion.

The treatment of minorities

From the 19th century there has been a rather widespread tendency in historical evolution that political communities equate themselves to national communities. However, for various reasons, it has not always been possible to make geographical boundaries coincide with ethnic ones. This gives rise to the phenomenon of minorities and to the relative complex problems.

In the first place, it must be made clear that justice is seriously violated by whatever is done to limit the strength and numerical increase of these lesser peoples. The injustice is even more serious if such sinful projects are aimed at the very extinction of these groups.

On the other hand, the demands of justice are admirably observed by those civil authorities who promote the natural betterment of those citizens belonging to a smaller ethnic group, particularly when that betterment concerns their language, the development of their natural gifts, their ancestral customs, and their accomplishments and endeavors in the economic order.[57]

It should be noted, however, that these minority groups, either because of a reaction to their present situation or because of their historical difficulties are often inclined to exalt beyond due measure anything proper to their own people, so as to place them even above human values, as if that which is proper to humanity were to be at the service of that which is proper to the nation. Reason rather demands that these very people recognize also the advantages that accrue to them from their peculiar circumstances. For instance, no small contribution is made toward the development of their particular talents and spirit by their daily dealings with people who have grown up in a different culture. This, however, will be true only if they will know how to act as a bridge, which facilitates the circulation of life in its various expressions among different traditions or civilizations, and not a zone of discord which can cause great damage and choke natural development.

Active Solidarity

Certainly relations between states must be regulated by the norms of truth and justice, but they also derive great benefits from active solidarity, through mutual cooperation on various levels; such as, in our own times, has already taken place with laudable results in the economic, social, political, educational, health and sport spheres. We must remember that, of its very nature, civil authority exists, not to confine its people within the boundaries of their nation, but rather to protect, above all else, the common good of that particular civil society, which certainly cannot be divorced from the common good of the entire human family.

This entails not only that civil societies should pursue their particular interests without hurting others, but also that they should join forces and plans whenever the efforts of an individual government cannot achieve its desired goals. But in the execution of such common efforts, great care must be taken lest what helps some nations should injure others.

Furthermore, the universal common good requires that in every nation friendly relations be fostered in all fields between the citizens and their intermediate societies.

There are groupings of people of more or less different racial backgrounds. However, the elements which characterize an ethnic group must not be transformed into a watertight compartment in which human beings are prevented from communicating with their fellow men belonging to different ethnic groups. That would contrast with our contemporary situation, in which the distances separating peoples have been almost wiped out. Nor can one overlook the fact that, even though human beings differ from one another by virtue of their ethnic peculiarities, they all possess certain essential common elements, and are inclined by nature to meet each other in the world of spiritual values, whose progressive assimilation opens to them the possibility of perfection without limits. They have the right and duty therefore to live in communion with one another.

Proper Balances Between Population, Land, and Capital

As everybody knows, there are countries with an abundance of arable land and a scarcity of manpower, while in other countries there is no proportion between natural resources and the capital available. This demands that peoples should set up relationships of mutual collaboration, facilitating the circulation from one to the other of capital, goods, and manpower.[58]

Here we deem it opportune to remark that, whenever possible, the work to be done should be taken to the workers, not vice versa.

In this way a possibility of a better future is offered to many persons without being forced to leave their own environment in order to seek residence elsewhere, which almost always entails the heartache of separation and difficult periods of adjustment and social integration.

The problem of political refugees

The sentiment of universal fatherhood which the Lord has placed in our heart makes us feel profound sadness in considering the phenomenon of political refugees: a phenomenon which has assumed large proportions and which always hides numberless and acute sufferings.

Such expatriations show that there are some political regimes which do not guarantee for individual citizens a sufficient sphere of freedom within which their souls are allowed to breathe humanly. In fact, under those regimes even the lawful existence of such a sphere of freedom is either called into question or denied. This undoubtedly is a radical inversion of the order of human society, because the reason for the existence of public authority is to promote the common good, a fundamental element of which is the recognition of that sphere of freedom and the safeguarding of it.

At this point it will not be superfluous to recall that such exiles are persons, and that all their rights as persons must be recognized, since they do not lose those rights on losing the citizenship of lands of which they are former members.

Now among the rights of a human person there must be included that by which a man may enter a political community where he hopes he can more fittingly provide a future for himself and his dependents. Wherefore, as far as the common good rightly understood permits, it is the duty of that state to accept such immigrants and to help to integrate them into itself as new members.

Wherefore, on this occasion, we publicly approve and commend every undertaking, founded in the principles of human solidarity and Christian charity, which aims at making migration of persons from one country to another less painful.

And we will be permitted to signal for the attention and gratitude of all right-minded persons the manifold word which specialized international agencies are carrying out in this very delicate field.

Disarmament

On the other hand, it is with deep sorrow that we note the enormous stocks of armaments that have been and still are being made in more economically developed countries, with a vast outlay of intellectual and economic resources. And so it happens that, while the people of these countries are loaded with heavy burdens, other countries as a result are deprived of the collaboration they need in order to make economic and social progress.

The production of arms is allegedly justified on the grounds that in present-day conditions peace cannot be preserved without an equal balance of armaments. And so, if one country increases its armaments, others feel the need to do the same; and if one country is equipped with nuclear weapons, other countries must produce their own, equally destructive.

Consequently, people live in constant fear lest the storm that every moment threatens should break upon them with dreadful violence. And with good reason, for the arms of war are ready at hand. Even though it is difficult to believe that anyone would deliberately take the responsibility for the appalling destruction and sorrow that war would bring in its train, it cannot be denied that the conflagration may be set off by some uncontrollable and unexpected chance. And one must bear in mind that, even though the monstrous power of modern weapons acts as a deterrent, it is to be feared that the mere continuance of nuclear tests, undertaken with war in mind, will have fatal consequences for life on the earth.

---

[55] Cf. Pius XII's radio message on Christmas Eve, 1940, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 33, pp. 5–14.

[56] St. Augustine's "De Civitate Dei," book IV, ch. 4, ed. P. L. 41, p. 115; cf. Pius XII's radio message on Christmas Eve, 1939, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 32, pp. 5–13.

[57] Cf. Pius XII's 1941 radio message, op. cit., pp. 10–21.

[58] Cf. "Mater et Magistra," op. cit., p. 439.

Justice, then, right reason, and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease. That the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned. That nuclear weapons should be banned. And that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control. In the words of Pius XII, our predecessor of happy memory: "The calamity of a world war, with the economic and social ruin and the moral excesses and dissolution that accompany it, must not be permitted to envelop the human race for a third time."[59]

All must realize that there is no hope of putting an end to the building up of armaments, nor of reducing the present stocks, nor, still less, of abolishing them altogether, unless the process is complete and thorough and unless it proceeds from inner convictions: unless; that is, everyone sincerely cooperates to banish the fear and anxious expectation of war with which men are oppressed. If this is to come about, the fundamental principle on which our present peace depends must be replaced by another, which declares that the true and solid peace of nations consists not in equality of arms, but in mutual trust alone. We believe that this can be brought to pass, and we consider that it is something which reason requires, that it is eminently desirable in itself, and that it will prove to be the source of many benefits.

In the first place, it is an objective demanded by reason. There can be, or at least there should be, no doubt that relations between states, as between individuals, should be regulated not by the force of arms, but by the light of reason, by the rule; that is, of truth, of justice, and of active and sincere cooperation.

Secondly, we say that it is an objective earnestly to be desired in itself. Is there anyone who does not ardently yearn to see war banished, to see peace preserved, and daily more firmly established?

And finally, it is an objective which will be a fruitful source of many benefits, for its advantages will be felt everywhere, by individuals, by families, by nations, by the whole human family. The warning of Pius XII still rings in our ears: "Nothing is lost by peace. Everything may be lost by war."[60]

Since this is so, we, the vicar on earth of Jesus Christ, Saviour of the world and author of peace, and as interpreter of the very profound longing of the entire human family, following the impulse of our heart, seized by anxiety for the good of all, we feel it our duty to beseech men, especially those who have the responsibility of public affairs, to spare no labor in order to insure that the world events follow a reasonable and human course.

In the highest and most authoritative assemblies, let men give serious thought to the problem of a peaceful adjustment of relations between political communities on a world level: an adjustment founded on mutual trust, on sincerity in negotiations, on faithful fulfillment of obligations assumed. Let them study the problem until they find that point of agreement from which it will be possible to commence to go forward toward accords that will be sincere, lasting, and fruitful.

We, for our part, will not cease to pray God to bless these labors so that they may lead to fruitful results.

In Liberty

It has also to be borne in mind that relations between states should be based on freedom, that is to say, that no country may unjustly oppress others or unduly meddle in their affairs. On the contrary, all should help to develop in others a sense of responsibility, a spirit of enterprise and an earnest desire to be the first to promote their own advancement in every field.

The Evolution of Economically Underdeveloped Countries

Because all men are joined together by reason of their common origin, their redemption by Christ and their supernatural destiny, and are called to form one single family, we appealed in the encyclical "Mater et Magistra" to economically developed nations to come to the aid of those which were in the process of development.[61]

We are greatly consoled to see how widely that appeal has been favorably received. And we are confident that even more so in the future it will contribute to the end that the poorer countries, in as short a time as possible, will arrive at that degree of economic development which will enable every citizen to live in conditions in keeping with his human dignity.

But it is never sufficiently repeated that the cooperation, to which reference has been made, should be effected with the greatest respect for the liberty of the countries being developed, for these must realize that they are primarily responsible, and that they are the principal artisans in the promotion of their own economic development and social progress.

Our predecessor Pius XII already proclaimed that in the field of a new order founded on moral principles, there is no room for violation of freedom, integrity, and security of other nations, no matter what may be their territorial extension or their capacity for defense. It is inevitable that the powerful states, by reason of their greater potential and their power, should pave the way in the establishment of economic groups comprising not only themselves but also smaller and weaker states as well. It is nevertheless indispensable that in the interests of the common good they, as all others, should respect the rights of those smaller states to political freedom, to economic development, and to the adequate protection, in the case of conflicts between nations, of that neutrality which is theirs according to the natural, as well as international law. In this way, and in this way only, will they be able to obtain a fitting share of the common good, and assure the material and spiritual welfare of their people.[62]

It is vitally important, therefore, that the wealthier states in providing varied forms of assistance to the poorer, should respect the moral values and ethnic characteristics peculiar to each, and also that they should avoid any intention of political domination. If this is done, a precious contribution will be made toward the formation of a world community, a community in which each member, whilst conscious of its own individual right and duties, will work in a relationship of equality toward the attainment of the universal common good.[63]

Signs of the Times

Men are becoming more and more convinced that disputes which arise between states should not be resolved by recourse to arms, but rather by negotiation.

It is true that on historical grounds this conviction is based chiefly on the terrible destructive force of modern arms. And it is nourished by the horror aroused in the mind by the very thought of the cruel destruction and the immense suffering which the use of those armaments would bring to the human family. And for this reason it is hardly possible to imagine that in the atomic era war could be used as an instrument of justice.

Nevertheless, unfortunately, the law of fear still reigns among peoples and it forces them to spend fabulous sums for armaments: not for aggression, they affirm—and there is no reason for not believing them—but to dissuade others from aggression.

There is reason to hope, however, that by meeting and negotiating, men may come to discover better the bonds that unite them together, deriving from the human nature which they have in common. And that they may also come to discover that one of the most profound requirements of their common nature is this: that between them and their respective peoples it is not fear which should reign but love, a love which tends to express itself in a collaboration that is loyal, manifold in form and productive of many benefits.

PART IV—RELATIONSHIP OF MEN AND OF POLITICAL COMMUNITIES WITH THE WORLD COMMUNITY

Interdependence between political communities

Recent progress of science and technology has profoundly affected human beings and influenced men to work together and live as one family. There has been a great increase in the circulation of ideas, of persons, and of goods from one country to another, so that relations have become closer between individuals, families, and intermediate associations belonging to different political communities, and between the public authorities of those communities. At the same time the interdependence of national economies has grown deeper, one becoming progressively more closely related to the other so that they become, as it were, integral parts of the one world economy. Likewise the social progress, order, security, and peace of each country are necessarily connected with the social progress, order, security, and peace of all other countries.

At the present day no political community is able to pursue its own interests and develop itself in isolation, because the degree of its prosperity and development is a reflection and a component part of the degree of prosperity and development of all the other political communities.

Insufficiency of modern states to insure the universal common good

The unity of the human family has always existed, because its members were human beings all equal by virtue of their natural dignity. Hence there will always exist the objective need to promote, in sufficient measure, the universal common good, that is, the common good of the entire human family.

In times past, one would be justified in feeling that the public authorities of the different political communities might be in a position to provide for the universal common good, either through normal diplomatic channels or through top-level meetings, by making use of juridical instruments such as conventions and treaties, for example: juridical instruments suggested by the natural law and regulated by the law of nations and international law.

---

[59] Cf. Pius XII's 1941 radio message, op. cit., p. 17, and Benedict XV's exhortation Aug. 1, 1917, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 9, p. 418.

[60] Cf. Pius XII's radio message on Aug. 24, 1939, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 31, p. 334.

[61] Cf. Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 53, pp. 440–441.

[62] Cf. Pius XII's 1941 radio message, op. cit., pp. 16–17.

[63] "Mater et Magistra," op. cit., p. 443.

As a result of the far-reaching changes which have taken place in the relations between the human family, the universal common good gives rise to problems which are complex, very grave, and extremely urgent, especially as regards security and world peace.

On the other hand, the public authorities of the individual political communities—placed as they are on a footing of equality one with the other—no matter how much they multiply their meetings or sharpen their wits in efforts to draw up new juridical instruments, they are no longer capable of facing the task of finding an adequate solution to the problems mentioned above. And this is not due to a lack of good will or of a spirit of enterprise, but because of a structural defect which hinders them.

It can be said, therefore, that at this historical moment the present system of organization and the way its principle of authority operates on a world basis no longer correspond to the objective requirements of the universal common good.

Connection Between the Common Good and Political Authority

There exists an intrinsic connection between the common good on the one hand and the structure and function of public authority on the other. The moral order, which needs public authority in order to promote the common good in human society, requires also that the authority be effective in attaining that end. This demands that the organs through which the authority is formed, becomes operative and pursues its ends, must be composed and act in such a manner as to be capable of bringing to realization the new meaning which the common good is taking on in the historical evolution of the human family.

Today the universal common good poses problems of worldwide dimensions, which cannot be adequately tackled or solved except by the efforts of public authorities endowed with a wideness of powers, structure, and means of the same proportions: that is, of public authorities which are in a position to operate in an effective manner on a worldwide basis. The moral order itself, therefore, demands that such a form of public authority be established.

Public Authority Instituted by Common Consent and Not Imposed by Force

A public authority, having worldwide power and endowed with the proper means for the efficacious pursuit of its objective, which is the universal common good in concrete form, must be set up by common accord and not imposed by force. The reason is that such an authority must be in a position to operate effectively yet, at the same time, its action must be inspired by sincere and real impartiality; in other words, it must be an action aimed at satisfying the objective requirements of the universal common good. The difficulty is that there would be reason to fear that a supernational or worldwide public authority, imposed by force by the more powerful political communities, might be or might become an instrument of one-sided interests and even should this not happen, it would be difficult for it to avoid all suspicion of partiality in its actions, and this would take from the efficaciousness of its activity.

Even though there may be pronounced differences between political communities as regards the degree of their economic development and their military power, they are all very sensitive as regards their juridical equality and their moral dignity. For that reason, they are right in not easily yielding in obedience to an authority imposed by force, or to an authority in whose creation they had no part, or to which they themselves did not decide to submit by conscious and free choice.

The Universal Common Good and Personal Rights

Like the common good of individual political communities, so too the universal common good cannot be determined except by having regard to the human person. Therefore, the public authority of the world community, too, must have as its fundamental objective the recognition, respect, safeguarding, and promotion of the rights of the human person, this can be done by direct action when required, or by creating on a world scale an environment in which the public authorities of the individual political communities can more easily carry out their specific functions.

The Principle of Subsidiarity

Just as within each political community the relations between individuals are governed by the principle of subsidiarity, so too the relations between the public authority of each political community and the public authority of the world community must be regulated by the light of the same principle. This means that the public authority of the world community must tackle and solve problems of an economic, social, political, and cultural character which are posed by the universal common good. For, because of the vastness, complexity, and urgency of those problems, the public authorities of the individual states are not in a position to tackle them with any hope of a positive solution.

The public authority of the world community is not intended to limit the sphere of action of the public authority of the individual political community, much less to take its place. On the contrary, its purpose is to create, on a world basis, an environment in which the public authorities of each political community, its citizens and intermediate associations, can carry out their tasks, fulfill their duties, and exercise their rights with greater security.[64]

Modern Developments

As is known, the United Nations Organization (UNO) was established on June 26, 1945, and to it there were subsequently added intergovernmental agencies with extensive international tasks in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields. The United Nations Organization had as its essential purpose the maintenance and consolidation of peace between peoples, fostering between them friendly relations, based on the principles of equality, mutual respect, and varied forms of cooperation in every sector of human society.

An act of the highest importance performed by the United Nations Organization was the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, approved in the General Assembly of December 10, 1948. In the preamble of that declaration, the recognition and respect of those rights and respective liberties is proclaimed as an ideal to be pursued by all peoples and all countries.

Some objections and reservations were raised regarding certain points in the declaration. There is no doubt, however, that the document represents an important step on the path toward the juridical-political organization of the world community. For in it, in most solemn form, the dignity of a person is acknowledged to all human beings. And as a consequence there is proclaimed as a fundamental right, the right of free movement in the search for truth and in the attainment of moral good and justice, and also the right to a dignified life, while other rights connected with those mentioned are likewise proclaimed.

It is our earnest wish that the United Nations Organization—in its structure and in its means—may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and that the day may come when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable, and inalienable rights. This is all the more to be hoped for since all human beings, as they take an ever more active part in the public life of their own political communities, are showing an increasing interest in the affairs of all peoples, and are becoming more consciously aware that they are living members of a world community.

PART V—PASTORAL EXHORTATIONS

Duty of taking part in public life

Once again we deem it opportune to remind our children of their duty to take an active part in public life, and to contribute toward the attainment of the common good of the entire human family as well as to that of their own political community. They should endeavor, therefore, in the light of the faith and with the strength of love, to insure that the various institutions—whether ecconomic, social, cultural, or political in purpose—should be such as not to create obstacles, but rather to facilitate or render less arduous man's perfections of himself both in the natural order as well as in the supernatural.

Scientific Competence, Technical Capacity and Professional Experience

Nevertheless, in order to imbue civilization with sound principles and enliven it with the spirit of the gospel, it is not enough to be illumined with the gift of faith and enkindled with the desire of forwarding a good cause. For this end it is necessary to take an active part in the various organizations and influence them from within. And since our present age is one of outstanding scientific and technical progress and excellence, one will not be able to enter these organizations and work effectively from within unless he is scientifically competent, technically capable and skilled in the practice of his own profession.

Apostolate of a Trained Laity

We desire to call attention to the fact that scientific competence, technical capacity and professional experience although necessary, are not of themselves sufficient to elevate the relationships of society to an order that is genuinely human: that is, to an order whose foundation is truth, whose measure and objective is justice, whose driving force is love, and whose method of attainment is freedom.

For this end it is certainly necessary that human beings carry on their own temporal activities in accordance with the laws governing them and following the methods corresponding to their nature. But at the same time it is also necessary that they should carry on the activities as acts within the moral order: therefore, as the exercise or vindication of a right, as the fulfillment of a duty or the performance of a service, as a positive answer to the providential design of God directed to our salvation. In other words, it is necessary that human beings, in the intimacy of their own consciences should so live and act in their temporal lives as to create a synthesis between scientific, technical and professional elements on the one hand, and spiritual values on the other.

Integration of Faith and Action

It is no less clear that today, in traditionally Christian nations, secular institutions, although demonstrating a high degree of scientific and technical perfection, and efficiency in achieving their respective ends, not infrequently are but slightly affected by Christian motivation or inspiration.

It is beyond question that in the creation of those institutions many contributed and continue to contribute who were believed to be and who consider themselves Christians and without doubt, in part at least, they were and are. How does one explain this? It is our opinion that the explanation is to be found in an inconsistency in their minds between religious belief and their action in the temporal sphere. It is necessary, therefore, that their interior unity be reestablished, and that in their temporal activity faith should be present as a beacon to give light, and charity as a force to give life.

---

[64] Cf. Pius XII's allocution on Sept. 19, 1948, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 40, p. 412.

Integral education

It is our opinion, too, that the above-mentioned inconsistency between the religious faith, in those who believe, and their activities in the temporal sphere, results—in great part if not entirely—from the lack of a solid Christian education. Indeed, it happens in many quarters and too often that there is no proportion between scientific training and religious instruction: the former continues and is extended until it reaches higher degrees, while the latter remains at elementary level. It is indispensable, therefore, that in the training of youth, education should be complete and without interruption: namely, that in the minds of the young, religious values should be cultivated and the moral conscience refined, in a manner to keep pace with the continuous and ever more abundant assimilation of scientific and technical knowledge. And it is indespensable too that they be instructed regarding the proper way to carry out their actual tasks.[65]

Constant endeavor

We deem it opportune to point out how difficult it is to understand clearly the relation between the objective requirements of justice and concrete situations, namely, to perceive the degrees and forms in which doctrinal principles and directives ought to be applied to reality.

And the perception of those degrees and forms is all the more difficult in our times, which are marked by a pronounced dynamism. For this reason, the problem of bringing social reality into line with the objective requirements of justice is a problem which will never admit of a definitive solution. Meanwhile, our children must watch over themselves lest they relax and feel satisfied with objectives already achieved.

In fact, all human beings ought rather to reckon that what has been accomplished is but little in comparison with what remains to be done: because organs of production, trade unions, associations, professional organizations, insurance systems, legal systems, political regimes, institutions for culture, health, recreational or sporting purposes—these must all be adjusted to the era of the atom and of the conquest of space: an era which the human family has already entered, wherein it has commenced its new advance toward limitless horizons.

Relations Between Catholics and Non-Catholics in Social and Economic Affairs

The doctrinal principles outlined in this document derive from or are suggested by requirements inherent in human nature itself, and are, for the most part, dictates of the natural law. They provide Catholics, therefore, with a vast field in which they can meet and come to an understanding both with Christians separated from this Apostolic See, and also with human beings who are not enlightened by faith in Jesus Christ, but who are endowed with the light of reason and with a natural and operative honesty. In such relations let the faithful be careful to be always consistent in their actions, so that they may even come to any compromise in matters of religion and morals.

At the same time, however, let them be, and show themselves to be, animated by a spirit of understanding and detachment, and disposed to work loyally in the pursuit of objectives which are of their nature good, or conducive to good.[66]

However, one must never confuse error and the person who errs, not even when there is question of error or inadequate knowledge of truth in the moral or religious field. The person who errs is always and above all a human being, and he retains in every case his dignity as a human person, and he must be always regarded and treated in accordance with that lofty dignity. Besides, in every human being, there is a need that is congenital to his nature and never becomes extinguished, compelling him to break through the web of error and open his mind to the knowledge of truth. And God will never fail to act on his interior being, with the result that a person, who at a given moment of his life lacks the clarity of faith or even adheres to erroneous doctrines, can at a future date be enlightened and believe the truth. Meetings and agreements in the various sectors of daily life, between believers and those who do not believe or believe insufficiently because they adhere to error, can be occasions for discovering truth and paying homage to it.

It must be borne in mind, furthermore, that neither can false philosophical teachings regarding the nature, origin, and destiny of the universe and of man, be identified with historical movements that have economic, social, cultural, or political ends, not even when these movements have originated from those teachings and have drawn and still draw inspiration therefrom. Because the teachings, once they are drawn up and defined, remain always the same, while the movements, working on historical situations in constant evolution, cannot but be influenced by these latter and cannot avoid, therefore, being subject to changes, even of a profound nature. Besides, who can deny that those movements, insofar as they conform to the dictates of right reason and are interpreters of the lawful aspirations of the human person, contain elements that are positive and deserving of approval?

It can happen, then, that a drawing nearer together or a meeting for the attainment of some practical end, which was formerly deemed inopportune or unproductive, might now or in the future be considered opportune and useful. But to decide whether this moment has arrived, and also to lay down the ways and degrees in which work in common might be possible for the achievement of economic, social, cultural, and political ends which are honorable and useful; these are the problems which can only be solved with the virtue of prudence, which is the guiding light of the virtues that regulate the moral life, both individual and social. Therefore, as far as Catholics are concerned, this decision rests primarily with those who live and work in the specific sectors of human society in which those problems arise, always, however, in accordance with the principles of the natural law, with the social doctrine of the church, and with the directives of ecclesiastical authority. For it must not be forgotten that the church has the right and the duty not only to safeguard the principles of ethics and religion, but also to intervene authoritatively with her children in the temporal sphere, when there is a question of judging about the application of those principles to concrete cases.[67]

Little by Little

There are some souls, particularly endowed with generosity, who, on finding situations where the requirements of justice are not satisfied or not satisfied in full, feel enkindled with the desire to change the state of things, as if they wished to have recourse to something like a revolution.

It must be borne in mind that to proceed gradually is the law of life in all its expressions, therefore in human institutions, too, it is not possible to renovate for the better except by working from within them, gradually. Pius XII proclaimed: Salvation and justice are not to be found in revolution, but in evolution through concord. Violence has always achieved only destruction, not construction the kindling of passions not their pacification, the accumulation of hate and ruin, not the reconciliation of the contending parties. And it has reduced men and parties to the difficult task of rebuilding, after sad experience, on the ruins of discord.[68]

An Immense Task

There is an immense task incumbent on all men of good will; namely, the task of restoring the relations of the human family in truth, in justice, in love, and in freedom: the relations between individual human beings, between citizens and their respective political communities, between political communities themselves, between individuals, families, intermediate associations, and political communities on the one hand, and the world community on the other. This is a most exalted task, for it is the task of bringing about true peace in the order established by God.

Admittedly, those who are endeavoring to restore the relations of social life according to the criterions mentioned above, are not many. To them we express our paternal appreciation, and we earnestly invite them to persevere in their work with ever greater zeal. And we are comforted by the hope that their number will increase, especially among those who believe. For it is an imperative of duty, it is a requirement of love. Every believer in this world of ours must be a spark of light, a center of love, a vivifying leaven amidst his fellow men: and he will be this all the more perfectly, the more closely he lives in communion with God in the intimacy of his own soul.

In fact, there can be no peace between men unless there is peace within each one of them: unless, that is, each one builds up within himself the order wished by God. Hence St. Augustine asks: Does your soul desire to overcome your lower inclinations? Let it be subject to Him who is on high and it will conquer the lower self: there will be peace in you true, secure and well-ordered peace. In what does that order consist? God commands the soul, the soul commands the body and there is nothing more orderly than this.[69]

The Prince of Peace

These words of ours, which we have wished to dedicate to the problems that most beset the human family today and on the just solution of which the ordered progress of society depends, are dictated by a profound aspiration which we know is shared by all men of goodwill: The consolidation of peace in the world.

As the humble and unworthy vicar of Him whom the prophet announced as the Prince of Peace,[70] we have the duty to expend all our energies in an effort to protect and strengthen this gift.

However, peace will be but an empty-sounding word unless it is founded on the order which this present document has outlined in confident hope: An order founded on truth, built according to justice, vivified and integrated by charity, and put into practice in freedom.

---

[65] Cf. "Mater et Magistra," op. cit., p. 454.

[66] Ibid, p. 456.

[67] Ibid; cf. "Immortale Dei Actas," op. cit., p. 100; Pius XI's encyclical "Ubi Arcano" ("Where in the Inscrutable Design"), Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 14, p. 698, and Pius XII's allocution on Sept. 11, 1947, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 39, p. 486.

[68] Cf. Pius XII's allocution on June 13, 1943, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, vol. 35, p. 175.

[69] Augustinian Miscellanea, p. 633.

[70] Cf. Isaias, ix, 6.

This is such a noble and elevated task that human resources, even though inspired by the most praiseworthy goodwill, cannot bring it to realization alone. In order that human society may reflect as faithfully as possible the kingdom of God, help from on high is necessary. For this reason, during these sacred days our supplication is raised with greater fervor toward Him who by His painful passion and death overcame sin—the root of discord and the source of sorrows and inequalities—and by His blood reconciled mankind to the Eternal Father, for He himself is our peace. He it is that hath made both one. * * * "And coming He announced the good tidings of peace to you who were afar off, and of peace to those who were near."[71]

And in the liturgy of these days we hear the announcement: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, after His resurrection, stood in the midst of His disciples and said, 'Peace be to you, alleluia.' The disciples rejoiced seeing the Lord."[72]

"He leaves us peace, He brings us peace; peace I leave with you, My peace I give to you, not as the world gives do I give to you."[73]

This is the peace which we implore of Him with the ardent yearning of our prayer.

May He banish from the hearts of men whatever might endanger peace, may He transform them into witnesses of truth, justice and brotherly love. May He enlighten the rulers of peoples so that in addition to their solicitude for the proper welfare of their citizens, they may guarantee and defend the great gift of peace. May He enkindle the wills of all, so that they may overcome the barriers that divide, cherish the bonds of mutual charity, understand others, and pardon those who have done them wrong. By virtue of His action, may all peoples of the earth become as brothers, and may the most longed for peace blossom forth and reign always between them.

As a pledge of this peace, and with the ardent wish that it may shine forth on the Christian communities entrusted to your care, especially for the benefit of those who are most lowly and in the greatest need of help and defense, we are glad to impart to you, venerable brothers, to the priests both secular and religious, to the religious men and women and to the faithful of your dioceses, particularly to those who make every effort to put these exhortations of ours into practice, our apostolic blessing in propitiation of heavenly favors. Finally, upon all men of goodwill to whom this encyclical letter is also addressed, we implore from Almighty God health and prosperity.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's, on Holy Thursday, the eleventh day of April, in the year 1963, the fifth of our Pontificate.

JOHN XXIII.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1963]

THE POPE'S PLEA FOR PEACE

Raising his voice above the turmoil of this world, Pope John XXIII appeals not only to Catholics but to everyone, irrespective of race, creed, or political persuasion, to work together to establish peace on earth. He reiterates a plea that has echoed and reechoed through the millennia since the prophecy of Isaiah. But he gives it new urgency by emphasizing that the only alternative to peace in the atomic age is the possible annihilation of mankind. Realist enough to recognize that exhortation is not enough, he offers his own "grand design" for an "edifice of peace."

The cornerstone of this edifice is to be the United Nations, to which the Pope would give worldwide authority with the power and the means to safeguard peace. Such an authority is necessary, he holds, because national governments can no longer guarantee peace. He does not specifically call for a United Nations peace force, but his words certainly do suggest it. At the same time, the Pontiff calls for settlement of disputes by negotiation instead of war, for a nuclear test ban and for progressive disarmament under effective control, starting with a reduction of armament stockpiles. Pope John urges respect for human rights and freedoms, an end to racism, colonialism, and religious persecution; the free movement of capital, goods, and manpower to fill up empty spaces; and aid to the poorer nations by the richer ones.

Most of these suggestions and principles are already being practiced by the United Nations and the United States. They acquire added potency by being espoused by an authority to whom even Premier Khrushchev has made his symbolic bow. Unfortunately, the world does not consist of men of goodwill alone and too many forces continue to obstruct a fuller realization of the Pontiff's program.

The United Nations, for example, faces financial bankruptcy because many nations, of the free world as well as the Soviet bloc, refuse to pay their assessment for relatively minor peacekeeping operations in the Congo and in the Middle East. The Geneva disarmament conference has recessed after another no-progress report. And the West must continue to arm itself against the Communist threat in order to preserve peace by the only means now available—an effective balance of power on which depend our survival and the cause of freedom.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate receive, and the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier today I notified the leadership I had a very serious matter that I had to discuss tonight, involving a problem which has arisen in the State of Oregon concerning the General Services Administration and the administration—a problem that could very well, if it did not receive the attention of the administration, result in a serious scandal which would greatly embarrass the Kennedy administration in my part of the country. But, as usual, I agreed to postpone the delivery of this speech until after we had disposed of the military procurement bill.

My good friend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is confronted with a very serious emergency in connection with his time schedule.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to him while he makes a speech he desires to deliver, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE BERLIN SITUATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for being so courteous. I am most appreciative.

Now that the Communist pressures appear temporarily eased upon Berlin, and our own national prestige is not presently under attack in that part of the world, it is the time for us to seek some sort of resolution of the Berlin problem.

It would seem particularly appropriate at this time, when our Government is once again holding discussions with the Soviets on Berlin. Another session is scheduled to be held in the next few days, and I for one hope that our negotiators will at long last take the diplomatic initiative.

It is very much in our national interests to do so, since there is no situation in the world today where our forces and our flag occupy a more vulnerable position than in this island of freedom surrounded by Communist East Germany. And to seize the opportunity now when a few cracks seem to be appearing in the monolithic Communist structure might be particularly good from the viewpoint of our own American national interest.

The United States has naturally always wished that there would be an abatement of the German problem and more particularly of its more acute, though tributary, Berlin problem. We have a lot to lose there, and little to gain. But the problem has been that in order to secure an easing of tensions, a detente, both parties to the dispute must desire it.

This has not been the case since the Soviets, through their East German puppets, have intentionally created each of the various crises that have occurred in Berlin. Now, though, the position appears a little changed.

The Kremlin actually expressed interest that discussions on Berlin take place, both last January and just a month ago.

The reason for this Soviet effort toward an easing of tensions may result from their problems with Peiping. It may result from the very real fears of the holocaust that would be World War III; fears which must be in the Soviet mind when they saw what almost happened as a result of their clumsy efforts to change the nuclear balance of power in Cuba last October. Or it may be the final realization of Khrushchev that his country, too, has more to gain through peace than war.

But, no matter what the reason, it would appear that for the first time since World War II the Soviets genuinely desire some sort of negotiations leading to an easing of tensions in Berlin. Then, too, let us recall Pope John XXIII's plea to all rulers at the time of the Cuban crisis:

> To promote, favor and accept negotiations, at all levels and at all times, is a rule of wisdom and prudence which calls down the blessings of heaven and earth.

Now, let us briefly examine what are our own national interests there. Our national interests are the preservation of the freedom, of the liberty, and of the economic viability of West Berlin, along with our right of garrisoning West Berlin and, most important, our right of land access. At the moment, we have all of these except for the question of the right of access. And here, as a result of the somewhat fuzzy agreements drawn in good faith at the end of World War II, we did not press for any rights of specific land access to Berlin, instead preferring to have rights of general access. Moreover, the West Germans right of land access to Berlin is presently subject to the whim of the East German authorities, a matter of very real concern to the Federal Republic.

---

[71] Ephesians, ii, 14–17.

[72] Responses to matins on the Friday after Easter.

[73] St. John, xiv, 27.

What we must gain in any resolution of the Berlin problem is a clearly defined corridor of land access to West Berlin, backed up by ironclad guarantees for the freedom of West Berlin together with the West's complete freedom to garrison West Berlin. To achieve these ends, we can afford to acknowledge the continuing existence of the two German governments and agree upon the Oder-Neisse frontier. Such an agreement must equally spell out the right of land access to Berlin. In so doing, we would profit, since we would have gained what we have never yet had, the West's clearly defined and mutually agreed upon right of land access to Berlin, while the Communists would not have gained control over a single human being or a single square inch not already under their rule.

We would have gained in another way, too, since our present policy has led us to the ironic policy position that we depend upon the Russians staying in East Germany. Why? Because we refuse to deal with the East Germans, the de facto government of the area. By this refusal we strengthen the Soviet position that, not only do they want to remain in East Germany, but the United States makes it impossible for them to do otherwise.

The thought of a specific land corridor brings back distasteful memories of the Polish corridor, which proved impractical. In this case, though, the road highway from Berlin to Helmstedt in Western Germany could be internationalized in accordance with the suggestion of President Kennedy last spring. And, because there are 79 overpasses and 65 underpasses along this 110-mile highway, there would be virtually no interference with the economic life of Eastern Germany. Specifically, these overpasses and underpasses include not only roads that traverse the highway but also 21 railroads. To my mind, the West and West Germany would gain an immense amount if this highway could be pinned down as its road of access.

There are additional steps that could be taken, too, to help cool the temperature. The thought has been advanced of moving the United Nations headquarters to Berlin. I think that would be a bit difficult and extreme. However, there is no reason in the world why the European headquarters of the United Nations, presently at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, presently in Paris, should not be moved to Berlin, preferably East Berlin. But, no matter if they were in East Berlin or West Berlin, the presence of these United Nations' bodies would have a cooling down effect upon the political temperatures in all of Berlin.

While the cruel Berlin wall is a permanent reminder of the failure of the Communist empire to retain the loyalty of its subjects, the present thinking in West Berlin is concentrating more upon amelioration and the improvement of conditions for the Germans on the other side of that wall. Of particular interest to the Berliners would be the seizing of the initiative in pressing far more vigorously for a relaxation of the Communist controls at the wall. As it is, East Berliners cannot cross to West Berlin to attend burials—only the coffin with its dead body is permitted through.

An additional cooling-down thought here, and a way of strengthening Mayor Willy Brandt's hand, would be to work out a revised status of forces agreement with West Berlin whereunder our American, British, and French forces would be garrisoned in West Berlin at the invitation of the West Berlin Government.

A further step in this direction would be to take the initiative in suggesting to the Communists in Berlin a mutual slacking off of propaganda and intelligence operations in each other's territory, in both East and West Berlin.

Along the lines of the cooling down of temperatures and the amelioration of relations between East and West would be the legitimization of today's almost half billion dollars worth of annual trade that exists between Western Germany and Eastern Germany.

Actually, the West German Government is presently making efforts to normalize its own relations, especially its trading relations, with the satellite nations behind the curtain, particularly with Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary.

Moreover, a reduction of tensions in Germany could result in a considerable reduction in the United States present adverse balance-of-payments position since at this time we are presently spending more than $50 billion a year in defense and supporting more than 400,000 men in Europe. All the other NATO members put together are spending less than $20 billion a year, none of them have a longer draft period, only two have as long a draft period and all the rest have either shorter draft periods or no draft at all. In addition, too, perhaps we could participate in some of the more than $4 billion trade in consumer, nonstrategic goods with the Soviet bloc which our NATO allies find so profitable.

Now, let us examine this question of a unified Germany. Some day, it will come. But, when that happy day comes, there will, in itself, no longer be a Berlin problem.

In fact, it is high time that we faced the impossibility of having a peacefully unified Germany in the near future. The present actual impossibility of unifying Germany is perceived by nearly all Europeans, Western and Eastern, many Americans, and quite a few Germans, though this thought is rarely uttered in public. Why? Because, as so often happens in democracies, when we come to questions of foreign policy, we become frozen in our position. Discussion of a change in direction becomes most difficult and, at times, very unpopular.

Yet, we should bear in mind what Lord Palmerston once said:

> We have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual and those interests it is our duty to follow.

This means that policies must be determined by national interests, that national interests can and do change in a changing world, that it is the national interests which must be followed and which must determine policy and that the policies in themselves are not immutable. This sound advice should certainly apply to our American policy towards Germany. We must always ask ourselves the question, "where lies our American national interest?"

Original Western support for the concept of a unified Germany was based on the assumption that such a unified Germany would be neutral and would have neither arms nor the potential for making arms. When in September 1946, Secretary of State James Byrnes, in his "hand of friendship to Germany" speech expressed our national support of a unified Germany, the world had not yet become so polarized between the East and the West. We thought then that the unified Germany of the future would be a peaceful, unarmed Germany in a world at peace. Also, at that time, we hoped that we and the other nations of the world would disarm. We had proceeded to do so and had virtually dismantled our Armed Forces. But, the Soviets did not follow suit. Since then, we have had to rearm with the result that the death-dealing and destructive potential of weapons available to both West and East has increased fantastically.

More paradoxical, since 1954, we have urged the West Germans to build up their armed forces. With our support, they have established a strong army of 11 divisions of 253,000 men. It is actually the most effective and powerful land contribution to NATO and, excluding the Russians, the most powerful ground force in Europe. The West Germans also have a navy of 177 ships and 28,000 men and an air force of 90,000 men.

By the same token, East Germany has become the second leading industrial satellite nation today with an estimated gross national product of $19.5 billion in 1961, or $2 billion less than that of its leading satellite rival, Poland. It also has become a military power of some force with an army of approximately 200,000 or more, a 14,000-man navy and an air force of 10,000 men.

The present armed state of both East and West Germany is an existing fact. Moreover, in this time of world pressure, it is unlikely that any alliance will consent to give up any significant portion of its arms until the tensions between the East and the West have abated. The NATO nations certainly will not want Western Germany, the very bulwark of its land forces, to withdraw its troops from their strength. Nor will the Warsaw Pact nations, the Communist nations, permit East Germany, with all its industrial and military resources to withdraw from the Communist orbit. In any event, it is a fact that nature abhors a vacuum, particularly in times of crisis. Hence, it is not likely that either the United States or the Soviet Union, the Western alliance or the Eastern bloc, will agree on a disarmed, neutral Germany.

This being the case, would it not be better if we faced and accepted the fact of two separate German Governments until hopefully the international situation evolves to a more peaceful, temperate point where we can get agreement on a single, unarmed and democratic Germany?

Then, too, whenever the question of a rearmed and reunified Germany is discussed, there looms like a cloud in the back of our minds, the recollection that Germany has engaged in three aggressive wars within the past 100 years. Unfashionable as it is to mention today, this is a fact very much in the European mind. It is one of the reasons, too, for the general acceptance of the fact that Germany should not have nuclear weapons. From a long-term viewpoint, though, no one nation can be permanently pointed out in this connection, no matter what her history or whether or not she won or lost a war. Accordingly, there must be continued and strong emphasis on our present policy to prevent proliferation of those nations with the atomic weapons. This is perhaps the most important single policy that we and the Soviets share.

In Eastern Europe, the malaise concerning German rearmament is especially true. The people in the Eastern European countries, particularly Poland, Russia and Czechoslovakia, have almost traumatic fears of German rearmament. The fact that these fears are vociferated by the Communist governments of these countries does not obliterate the fact that the fears of these Eastern European people are genuine. They are fears derived not only from their brutal experiences and memories in World War II, but from centuries of prior unhappy attack and occupation by Germans. We must recognize the fact that the Eastern Europeans still fear the Germans even more than the Russians. The Poles know, too, that some of the West Germans calling most loudly for unification are thinking in terms of the next step, the regaining of the former German territories under Polish rule. For good or bad, only Poles live today in the Oder-Neisse Territories, scarcely a German is left there. Yet, even Dr. Adenauer recently said, "The Oder-Neisse line is not Germany's eastern frontier." Any attempt at reconquest by Germany certainly would produce a war with the Poles and probably turn Europe into an inferno.

A more strident West German minority has a third step in mind, the regaining of the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia.

But, many Germans are aware of the dangers inherent in a reunited and armed Germany. In fact, the Social Democrats in 1959 advanced the Deutschland plan which accepted the Oder-Neisse frontier. Recently, Klaus von Bismark, director of the North Rhine-Westphalia radio and grandson of the famous Iron Chancellor, and seven other leaders of German public opinion, advocated for the time being, the acceptance of the present West German boundaries and suggested that the emphasis of German policy be directed more toward the amelioration of conditions in East Germany and toward bringing more freedom to the East Germans, rather than upon reunification.

Historically, Germany has existed as a single country, united within her early-Hitler borders, for only one hundred of the past thousand years. Actually, if history and culture are to be used as criteria, West Germany has a greater affinity with Austria than with East Germany. They have certainly more cultural and social ties in common.

But, when thinking about Germany or any other problem in our world today, our paramount consideration must be that the Communists are the present main threat and danger to our lives and to our very civilization. The Communists are our No. 1 enemy, we are their No. 1 target. Those Communists who have the least to lose, like the Red Chinese, may well believe that war is their best means to attain world domination. Those with more to lose like the Soviets, and their satellites while still wanting world domination, may be more anxious to avoid war. In connection with the Communist threat, there are those in the West who believe that a rearmed and reunified Germany is the best bulwark against the Soviets. I submit that this is not necessarily the case. Twice before in the last half century, the Germans have made arrangements and understandings with the Kremlin so that they could concentrate their efforts on the West.

First, there was the Rapallo Agreement of 1922 and then the Ribbentrop Agreement of 1939. Perhaps, if there were a reunited and rearmed Germany with an awakened sense of lebenstraum, this could happen again.

Accordingly, I think we should give our present policy toward Germany a critical reexamination with a view toward acceptance of the fact that Germany is divided as long as we have not reached the millennium of a world and a time when we can achieve a unified, unarmed Germany. From a tangible viewpoint, does such a de facto acceptance of a divided Germany give the Communists control over a single additional person or square inch? No. Nor would such action preclude our continuing to seek a solution for Germany which would result in the unified and unarmed Germany for which we all hope and where all its people might exercise their democratic rights.

Moreover, recognition of the Oder-Neisse frontier would have an exhilarating impact upon the Poles and a Pandora's Box effect of potential trouble and unrest for the Soviets. At present, while President de Gaulle has accepted the Oder-Neisse frontier, only the Communist countries formally recognize Poland's 283-mile western frontier. This recognition is highly important in influencing the ties of Poland to the Kremlin. If the West recognized the Oder-Neisse frontier as well, one of the main bonds tying Poland to Russia would have been cut. Poland's own restiveness and basic anti-Russian feelings could soon produce vehement outbursts against the Soviets.

Actually, de facto acceptance of East Germany and recognition of the Oder-Neisse line in exchange for concrete agreements for clearly defined land access to West Berlin and ironclad guarantees of its freedom would serve to hasten the day when a unified, neutral, disarmed, and democratic Germany might be achieved. For, if these steps were taken, they would result in the relaxation of tension and alleviation of the anxiety of Europeans, Western or Eastern, friend or foe, that is the first condition for such unification.

We would have gained something we do not now have, specific land access to Berlin. And the Communists would not have gained dominance over a single person or area they do not now control.

We and the whole free world would be the gainers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for the all too few speeches he makes in the field of foreign policy. I say all too few because I know of his splendid background, his training in the field of diplomacy, and, from personal observation, his interest in the affairs of nations outside our own country.

The distinguished Senator has raised for consideration and possible negotiation the question of access roads to Berlin, not only north and south, but perhaps east and west as well, and not only on the land, but perhaps in the air also.

He has raised the question of the Berlin wall.

He has also raised the question of the possibility of moving certain subsidiary elements of the U.N. to Berlin, where they would become headquarters for this organization.

He has gone beyond the question of Berlin and has discussed the possibility of a unified Germany; or perhaps I should say, in his opinion, at the present time, the lack of the possibility of a unified Germany.

He has discussed the question of the Oder-Neisse line and the relationship of that line of demarcation to modern-day Poland.

He has also impressed upon the Senate the ever-present Russian fear of a revived and reunified Germany.

There are many questions which the Senator has raised and which are worthy of consideration and worthy of negotiation.

In commending him for his courage and straightforwardness in making his views known and laying the groundwork for possible negotiations, would recall to his mind the statement of President Kennedy in his first inaugural address, when he said:

> We should never fear to negotiate. But we should never negotiate out of fear.

Again, I commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to join in the compliments being paid to the junior Senator from Rhode Island. I do not know of a single Member of this body who has a greater knowledge of foreign policy and foreign relations than does the Senator from Rhode Island. I hope to see the day when the Senator from Rhode Island will be a permanent member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He is at present a member of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, and I know that he will make a distinct contribution to the work of that subcommittee and the work of the Senate.

The junior Senator from Rhode Island has a willingness to venture into complex, controversial areas of policy, and to do so in a manner that is constructive and thoughtful and which lends itself toward solution. I compliment him.

It is not a question of the individual views which the Senator expresses or the policy position he takes. The most important thing is that the Senate consider the proposal along the lines he has advanced.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very happy to have yielded to the Senator from Rhode Island, because it afforded me the privilege of listening to his speech. I commend him for his thoughtful and thought-provoking remarks. His speech very well forms the basis for a considerable amount of discussion both in the Committee on Foreign Relations and in the State Department.

THE PROMOTION OF THE ARTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has today introduced a comprehensive bill with respect to the arts of the country and has done me the honor of including in his bill the text of a bill I have sponsored ever since I have been a Member of the Senate to provide for a U.S. Arts Foundation.

I wish to emphasize that I know of very few areas of domestic concern which more urgently require the consideration of Congress for the benefit of the morale of our people, as well as the fruit of all we are working for and fighting for, than the progress of literature and music in our Nation.

The bill, which I consider to be a splendid amalgam of what the Senator from Minnesota would like to see in the form of an Advisory Committee on Arts and what I would like to see in the form of a U.S. Arts Council, is splendidly combined. I urge upon the Senate the early consideration of the proposed legislation.

It will be a proud moment in our country, indeed a moment of maturity, when the bill shall be passed. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported it favorably at the last session, with the kind help of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and other Senators, but it did not reach a vote because of the lateness of time when the bill was reported.

I am hopeful that the bill of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], which really brings the matter to a pitch of perfection in terms of legislative draftsmanship and a combination of ideas, will again be favorably reported; and I sincerely hope that the Senate will consider it favorably this year.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has submitted its fourth annual report to the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Senators will recall that in 1959, the Congress enacted Public Law 86–380 which established an Advisory Commission on Intergovernment Relations. The Commission, as constituted by Congress, has seven basic purposes:

First, to bring together representatives of the Federal, States, and local governments for consideration of common problems;

Second, to provide a forum for discussion of the administration of Federal grant programs;

Third, to give critical attention to the conditions and controls involved in the administration of Federal grant programs;

Fourth, to make available technical assistance to the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government in the review of proposed legislation to determine its overall effect on the Federal system;

Fifth, to encourage discussion and study at an early stage of emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation;

Sixth, to recommend, within the framework of the Constitution, the most desirable allocation of governmental functions, responsibilities, and revenues among the several levels of Government; and

Seventh, to recommend methods of coordinating and simplifying tax laws and administrative practices to achieve a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the levels of Government and to reduce the burden of compliance for taxpayers.

In carrying out its responsibilities, the Commission has been composed of representatives of each level of Government and from the legislative and executive branches thereof. I was privileged to be one of the principal sponsors of the legislation establishing the Commission, and it has been a distinct pleasure to serve as a member of the Commission since its establishment. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] have also served on the Commission since its inception. On the House side, Mr. FOUNTAIN of North Carolina, chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations and the original sponsor of the bill creating the Commission, as has his colleague on the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER]. Mr. KEOGH, of New York, is the third House Member on the Commission.

A year has elapsed since the submission of the Commission's third annual report. I think it appropriate to inform the Senate of how the Commission has been progressing since that time, and of the extent to which it has been measuring up to the responsibilities placed upon it by the statute. I will give today an overall report on the Commission's work; subsequent reports on particular subjects will be placed in the RECORD by other Members of Congress or by me, depending upon the subject matter involved and our respective interests in it.

At the outset, I should again like to pay tribute to the very able chairman under which the Commission has proceeded—Mr. Frank Bane of Virginia, a man known to many Senators for his lifetime career of work and leadership in Federal, State and local governments. He was appointed the first Chairman of the Commission by President Eisenhower and last year was reappointed for a second term as Chairman by President Kennedy.

The Commission, in addition to the six members from the Congress, has three members from the executive branch—the Secretaries of the Treasury and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Its other membership includes four Governors, four mayors, three State legislative leaders and three elected county officials. In addition to the Chairman, the general public is represented on the Commission by two other members.

The Commission has been assisted in its undertakings by an excellent professional staff which is under the able supervision of the Commission's Executive Director, Mr. William G. Colman. With 7 new appointments, the total staff was brought to its full 25-man complement.

It has been a stimulating experience for me to work with the distinguished people who have served on the Commission and to discuss and debate major questions of Federal-State-local relations with them. During the course of last year, the Commission published three new reports which were primarily of an informational nature and which did not require legislative or executive implementation. These technical studies which have been made available in order to provide much needed reference material to State and local governments, include:

First. "Factors Affecting Voter Reactions to Governmental Reorganization in Metropolitan Areas," Report M–15, May 1962;

Second. "Measures of State and Local Fiscal Capacity and Tax Effort," Report M–16, October 1962; and

Third. "A Directory of Federal Statistics for Metropolitan Areas," Report M–18, October 1962.

General meetings of the Advisory Commission were held last year on May 4–5; June 28–29; October 10–12, and December 13–14. During the course of these sessions, five reports inquiring implementary action were considered and acted upon. These reports are as follows:

First. "Alternative Approaches to Governmental Reorganization in Metropolitan Areas," Report A–11, June 1962;

Second. "State Constitutional and Statutory Restrictions Upon the Structural, Functional, and Personnel Powers of Government," Report A–12, October 1962;

Third. "Intergovernmental Responsibilities for Water Supply and Sewage Disposal in Metropolitan Areas," Report A–13, October 1962;

Fourth. "State Constitutional and Statutory Restrictions on Local Taxing Powers," Report A–14, October 1962; and

Fifth. "Apportionment of State Legislatures," Report A–15, December 1962.

The Advisory Commission's reports have been widely distributed and have received considerable attention from Federal, State, and local legislative and administrative officials and from the professional, business, and academic communities. Five of the 1961 reports and one of the 1962 studies were reprinted last year in order to meet the demand.

I am sure Senators will be interested in what is taking place as a result of the Commission's reports. The Commission, as a continuing national body, is not content with merely making studies and recommendations. Commission members want to see the recommendations put into effect and have devoted considerable attention to following through in behalf of their recommendations in terms of legislative or administrative action. Permit me to summarize briefly what has happened in regard to the Commission's recommendations for action at the Federal and State levels.

Of the 13 recommendations requiring congressional action that were advanced in 1961, 6 have now been enacted into law and 1 has received executive implementation. Four of these proposals coincided with provisions subsequently incorporated into the Housing Act of 1961. These included: Expanded financial support for metropolitan planning agencies; Federal technical assistance to State and local urban planning; congressional consent in advance to interstate compacts for metropolitan area planning, and Federal financial assistance for mass transportation. The passage of Public Law 87–870 during the 2d session of the 87th Congress, in which I was proud to play a part, marked a clear-cut instance wherein the Advisory Commission assumed a major role in generating support for its recommendations. This legislation, among other things, provided for: (a) admission of State and local tax personnel to Internal Revenue Service training programs; and (b) the authorization for the performance of statistical and other services for State tax agencies. The most recent implementation of one of the Advisory Commission's 1961 proposals came through administrative action, rather than by legislative enactment. On December 14, 1962, in his testimony on the role of the Federal Government in metropolitan areas before the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations, the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, announced that HHFA had just revised its policies in administering section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 so as to provide for continuing assistance to metropolitan planning agencies, as well as to other planning agencies eligible under this program. In response to my question as to whether this action would implement the basic purpose of S. 3362 which incorporated the Advisory Commission's recommendation for continuing financial support for comprehensive planning in metropolitan areas, Mr. Weaver reported:

> Yes. We recognize that comprehensive planning is a continuing process which does not stop when one over-all plan has been prepared. I am advised that we do have the authority to provide grants to support certain and continuing planning functions in the comprehensive planning process and we intend to use this authority to strengthen the activities of planning agencies. * * *

The Housing and Home Finance Agency and its esteemed Administrator are to be congratulated on this implementary step.

The items remaining from the 1961 agenda for congressional action are: (a) review of Federal grant-in-aid applications by metropolitan planning agencies; (b) revision of Federal estate tax credit for taxes paid to States; (c) authorizing transfers of funds among public health grants and provision of a standard allocation formulated for such grants; (d) provisions for retrocession of exclusive Federal jurisdiction of various Government lands and properties; and (e) providing uniform congressional policy and procedure under which all new grants-in-aid would be examined periodically. Bills to carry out these various recommendations are in the process of being, or already have been introduced in this session of Congress.

Since most of the Advisory Commission's 1962 action reports had a State and local emphasis, only three of last year's recommendations require congressional implementation. These include: (a) Amendment of the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 to provide, first, an additional matching incentive for the development of sewage disposal facilities on a regional or area-wide basis; and second, an increased dollar ceiling in Federal grants to larger cities for sewage treatment works;

(b) Amendment of the statute governing public facility loans program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to permit, first, communities of 50,000 or more to qualify for sewer and water loans, and second, the joining together of communities with an aggregate population of over 50,000 for purposes of such loan assistance; and (c) amendment of statutes governing the FHA mortgage insurance program and the home loan program of the Veterans' Administration to, first, tighten eligibility requirements for individual well and septic tank installations, and second, include as insurable site preparation and development costs of water and sewer lines and systems.

Despite the relative recency of the report on "Intergovernmental Responsibility for Water Supply and Sewage Disposal in Metropolitan Areas," its recommended amendment of the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 has already been incorporated into bills filed in this session: S. 649 and H.R. 3166—Representative **Blatnik**, Democrat, of Minnesota. The two remaining proposals are receiving the preliminary analysis necessary for their later introduction.

Of the Advisory Commission's 21 recommendations for State legislative action, 10 have been developed into draft bills and 1 into a proposed State constitutional amendment. The draft proposals cover: (a) establishment of a State office of local affairs; (b) authorization for voluntary transfer of functions between municipalities and counties and vice versa; (c) authorization for interlocal contracting and joint enterprises; (d) authorization to local governments to invest idle funds; (e) authorization to secure and preserve "open spaces"; (f) establishment of State responsibilities for mass transportation in metropolitan areas; (g) authorization of establishment of metropolitan function authorities; (h) authorization of establishment of metropolitan area planning commissions; (i) authorization to municipalities for exercise of extraterritorial powers; and (j) regulation of new municipal incorporations.

The draft constitutional amendment is concerned with the removal of constitutional barriers to intergovernmental cooperation.

The Council of State Governments has approved 9 of these draft measures and 9 of the 10 policy recommendations. These have been included in the council's 1963 legislative program. Both the Governors' conference and the National Association of Counties have endorsed 14 of the advisory commission's 21 State legislative recommendations. The American Municipal Association has passed resolutions approving 18 of the proposed bills and the U.S. Conference of Mayors has formally taken action in favor of 10. The State Legislatures of Kentucky, Oklahoma, Oregon, Minnesota, and Michigan have enacted or are in the process of considering one or more of these draft measures.

The Commission has performed other activities in 1962 in order to carry out its statutory responsibilities for technical assistance in the review of proposed legislation and encouraging discussion of emerging public problems. Members and staff of the Commission made presentations at the 1962 conventions of the major organizations of government officials and of other groups concerned with the intergovernmental aspects of public policy issues, taxation and finance, and urban area problems. Comments and advice were rendered to the executive branch and Congress on certain pieces of proposed legislation affecting Federal-State-local relations. During the year, consultations have been held between the Commision staff and Federal and State officials in an attempt to broaden the scope of administrative cooperation at these government levels.

In concluding, I am happy to report that during the last calendar year the Commission has demonstrated its ability to accomplish four things: (a) To focus its attention on selected issues and to face up to and take definite positions on them; (b) to prepare and distribute eight reports that have brought forth approval as to both their intellectual caliber and commonsense; (c) to secure widespread formal support from various organizations of State and local officials; and (d) to help secure the enactment of two of its recommendations requiring congressional action and executive implementation of another Commission proposal, thus bringing the record of Federal implementations to seven; and to effect an implementation of three of the Commission's recommendations for State legislative action. One is embodied in the Kentucky Interlocal Cooperation Act and the others in two provisions of the newly proposed Michigan constitution.

The Commission has been able to do these things with a reasonably small staff and without internal or external repercussions or recriminations. It is important to note that members of the Commission have not divided into blocs in considering the issues with which they have been confronted.

The major problems still confronting the Commission are threefold. Despite increased public awareness of its work, the Commission still has not received the widespread publicity in national periodicals and in newspaper coverage that its work warrants. Second, the significant contribution that the Commission has made to the body of literature dealing with intergovernmental relations has yet to have the kind of legislative impact that the Commission desires. Finally, although increasing somewhat, the Commission still is doing relatively little to discharge its statutory responsibility of assisting the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government in the "review of proposed legislation to determine its overall effect on the Federal system."

Despite these shortcomings, I think it will be agreed that the positive accomplishments of the Advisory Commission constitute a commendable record for a body that has existed for such a very brief time. I confidently predict that its effectiveness will continue to grow.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT McNAMARA

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, several committees of both the House and Senate are deeply involved in questions of defense policy, the structure of our Department of Defense, and the organization of our Armed Forces. At the center of every such inquiry is the Secretary of Defense, a man of great intelligence, immense capability, force, and integrity. Secretary Robert McNamara is a decisive man. He is, therefore, a controversial man.

I know that many Senators are concerned with several areas of defense policy and decisions. Therefore, I think, it is important to bring to their attention an important and penetrating article entitled "Revolution in the Pentagon," written by Theodore H. White, and published in the April 23 issue of Look magazine. Mr. White is a distinguished reporter and author. I am sure Senators will find his observations enlightening and helpful in considering the problems of the Pentagon and the kind of administration which Secretary McNamara is directing. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVOLUTION IN THE PENTAGON

(By Theodore H. White)

No office in Washington receives a visitor more peacefully than the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

This tranquil chamber—white-walled, high-ceilinged, beige-carpeted—calms the visitor as much with its vast dimensions as with its hush. Certainly, it gives no hint that this is the most dangerous of all the ornate command posts of Washington leadership.

Yet it is. Eight Secretaries of Defense have occupied this post. One or two survived the ordeal with vigor and honor. But for the most part, here famous captains of industry have been stripped of magic and sent home, ham-fisted politicians defeated, great national heroes gutted of their vitality. And one, his reason cracking under the strain that pulses here, jumped from a window and killed himself.

This is, therefore, a room of peril. Yet no foreign enemy creates the peril—it is shaped by dedicated Americans whose imagination, will, and passion clash at peak intensity in this room over the policies the Secretary of Defense must set. For more than 15 years, until now, no one has been able to say who was master of the forces gathered here.

There is little to tell the roving eye that today matters have changed in this room. The paint has been freshened; the battle paintings on the wall have been replaced by color blowups of the High Sierras. A cheap black-and-white Rouault print, crudely pasted to the glass of its frame, is a new touch at this level of American command. But the Rouault faces a man who sits, as all the Secretaries of Defense have sat, behind the same 8½-foot-long General Pershing desk. Beyond him is the traditional General Sherman table. The remorseless wall clock, with its sweep hand and its chart, marks the same globe-girdling problems that tormented his predecessors—problems ranging from CINCEUR in Paris (operating on ZULU time plus 1, which is 6 hours later than Washington time) to CINCPAC in Hawaii (on ZULU time minus 10, 5 hours earlier than Washington time). time).

The change in this room can be measured neither in decor nor in charts, for this room disposes of power, and the nature of power is that it is felt—not seen. No sign announces here that the striking force of America's homeland reserve has tripled in 2 years, while abroad its political response has changed from 1961's nervous search for compromise in Laos to 1962's hammer blow poised to frustrate Khrushchev's Cuban attempt.

The man who has captained this change—Robert Strange McNamara, eighth Secretary of Defense—is already, after the President and his brother, the most important man in the American government. Power becomes him—gravely and easily. As you walk across the long Mussolini-sized room to visit Robert McNamara, you find the Secretary's eyes fixed on what he is reading, his left hand penciling the tiny cramped handwriting now famous in the Pentagon. He does not lift his eyes until you are right there standing before him. This, of course, is disconcerting. It will also be disconcerting when he silently dismisses you by dropping his eyes to the memorandum you interrupted. But this is McNamara, the man in white shirtsleeves, the IBM machine with legs, the man whose brown eyes behind the rimless, oval-cut eyeglasses are emotionless.

It is difficult to associate this McNamara with the man who, pacing the large room late one night during his first few weeks in office, burst out, "I tell you this place is a jungle—a jungle." It is difficult also to associate the muscular quality of the tall body, the high, inflectionless voice, the slick black hair with the surgical quality of his thought. It is, lastly, difficult to associate this McNamara with the bubbling-charming evening McNamara, one of the most completely engaging dinner companions on Washington's inner social circuit. But the evening McNamara must wait on the man behind this desk, for the daytime McNamara is an artist of a particular kind who has, after 2 years, created news that should now be recorded.

First, the civilian authority in American Government has won full control of the power of the Pentagon.

Second, American striking power is in a historic process of multiplication and change.

Third, the purpose and use of this power have been redefined.

These are developments of vast importance. Translated into simpler language, they mean that if America's leaders invite Americans to die in battle or under bombardment in the next few years, it will be by reasonable decision, rather than by accident or spastic reaction.

This may seem like a simple achievement. But to explain how it happened is a complicated story, reaching back through 15 years of merciless strife and chaos, as generals, admirals, scientists, and statesmen—all seeking American security—set their hands, one against the other, in the corridors of this building.

The story starts in 1945 with the destruction of the U.S. Army in its hour of triumph. Americans did not demobilize their magnificent Army, they destroyed it. So swift and chaotic was the dismantling of the Nation's force around the world, as homesick GI's rioted from Marseilles to Manila, that all prospect of a reasonable and expectable balance of strength with the war-weary Russians evaporated in a few months. American ground power ceased to exist. So did the airlift and mobility that made this power global. Ten months after V–E day, the 3.5 million Americans (68 combat divisions) in Europe had shrunk to 400,000. The 149 American air groups that had reduced Germany to rubble were sinking to their nadir of two combat wings; and in all the United States, the combat backup of this force was 90 bombers, 460 fighter planes—and only 175 first-class pilots to man them.

Seized with the belief that the world was at peace, Americans cut their arms budget to a low of $9.7 billion (which, in 1948, maintained only one combat division in Europe). Within the confines of this ever-contracting budget, America's generals and admirals swiftly learned to fight first over money, then over strategy.

The Korean war reversed matters momentarily. But once it was over, American ground power again shriveled. And since no reasoned strategy could rest on a ground force whose combat strength shot up and down like a yo-yo (from 12 divisions in 1950 to 23 in 1952 and 14 in 1960), American strategy, by default, began to tailor itself to a single new instrument, SAC—the Strategic Air Command, which sheltered all the Western World with its ability to wipe out Russia.

SAC was a reflection of the scientific, rather than political, "input" in Pentagon thinking. While the world abroad went from political explosion to more dramatic political explosion, American science went from technological breakthrough to more dramatic breakthrough, pouring the most dazzling developments into SAC. Nuclear physics leaped from fission to fusion bombs; new transistors invited ultra-swift new computers; these, wedding to rocketry development, ushered in the age of intercontinental missiles. The weapons they spawned created industries, then entire communities, dependent solely on weapons-systems decisions in Washington. Strategic decisions became live-or-die sentences for communities (from Suffolk County, N.Y., to San Diego, Calif.) whose political and industrial leaders intruded in the squabbles of the Pentagon.

The most experienced leadership would have had difficulty in absorbing such a torrent of "input." But the Pentagon from 1947 on was under new management. In 1947, Congress decided to make the Army, Navy, Air Force all equal and to place over them an instrument and a man entirely new to U.S. history—an Office and a Secretary of Defense—to "coordinate." What "coordinate" meant, Congress never defined. As if giving each nominee a "may-the-best man-win" sendoff, it ratified seven successive Secretaries, and tossed each of them into the Pentagon ambuscades to explore what his true authority was.

The game, as it was played, could have been called: "Who's Boss Now?" Who really directed American military posture—civilian or military, amateur or professional? Who had the right to make what claim on America's total resources? For what defense purposes?

It was a lethal game. James Forrestal, a fragile man, was the first Secretary at bat. Neurotic, he thought of himself as being beaten by the uniforms and jumped to his death. Only in retrospect has he come to be recognized as a truly creative boss. After Forrestal, on the other hand, apparent victors in the game turned out to be Pentagon patsies. The toughest civilian team installed in the Pentagon was that of Charles E. (Engine Charlie) Wilson and Roger Kyes, both imported from General Motors. Pentagon generals still wince at the remembered rudeness of Wilson, and Kyes' treatment of one general is legendary. "I didn't come down here to shovel snow," said Kyes to the general. Then, bending over, he flicked the general's stars and continued, "I came down here to pluck stars." But such apparently "tough" civilians could be briefed, flattered, outwitted and finally absorbed by generals and admirals who systematically study all leadership patterns among men, from Red Square to Wall Street. By the end of the Eisenhower administration, control of American strategy lay not in the hands of civilian leadership, but in the hands of the uniformed Chiefs of Staff.

This was tragedy. The duty of a Secretary of Defense is to get out of the Pentagon that kind of power which best advances the policies of America over the turbulent globe. If the Secretary fails to interpret to the Pentagon what kind of power his President wants, then power makes its own rules and strategy, like an inertially guided missile that moves only by interior technical reference.

This was tragedy, most of all for generals and admirals. The decay of civilian leadership should have made them happy. But it did not. They could no more agree among themselves as to what was a right and proper American military effort than could a college debating society. Year in, year out, in gross and detail, the Chiefs of Staff battled each other over disposition of American resources. Occasionally, their bitterness and anguish burst into the open—as when a general publicly denounced the admirals before Congress as "Fancy Dans." Occasionally, two services ganged up on a third—as happened in 1956, when the Air Force and Navy agreed to all but abolish the Army, reducing it to a civil defense police force at home and a number of atomic task forces abroad. (A calculated Army press leak exploded that plan before it got off the ground.) Occasionally, civilians, too, were destroyed—as when the Air Force shot down Robert Oppenheimer, the genius who tooled the first atom bomb, because it suspected him of forcing the Air Force to share its monopoly of atomic weapons with the Army and Navy.

Gradually, a pattern developed. Within the Air Force, the elite corps of SAC dominated thinking, and the Air Force thus spoke for the strategy of "massive retaliation," a strategy pleasing to both the most ferocious and most economy-minded American political thinkers. The Army spoke for a strategy of "flexible response," pleading, through spokesmen like Maxwell Taylor and James Gavin, for the manpower and equipment to face the changes of a changing world The Navy was the cat that walked by itself, casting its vote, when it had to, for massive retaliation against flexible response.

Civilians controlled the feuding service chieftains mainly through budget recommendations. Gradually, strategy became the offspring of the budget. The Chiefs of Staff finally arrived at a bitter budgetary compromise, behind the blurred words of which lay this formula: Of any sum appropriated for defense, the Army would have 23 percent, the Navy 28 percent, the Air Force 46 percent. Under the compromise, each service planned its own future war against Russia; each had its own intelligence net and its own supply system; each had its own missile program. The plans might not fit, of course. The Army had plans for airlifting emergency reinforcements to meet a threat in Europe, but the Air Force had no plans for providing the matching lift. The Army planned for a long war and stockpiled 2 years of some combat consumables; the Air Force planned for a short war and stockpiled a few weeks of combat consumables. But all three services felt they were ready—more or less.

Thus, at the beginning of March 1961, barely 6 weeks after his inauguration, John F. Kennedy gathered the Joint Chiefs of Staff to consider the Communist thrust in Laos. At this point, clarity struck. For, as the new President sat down in the long, gloomy Cabinet room off the White House rose garden to inquire what he might do to meet the threat, he found this: The forces at his disposal were incredible—or else they were a joke. He might, if he chose, unleash the frightful power of SAC, which could wipe out any capital on earth with a spasm of its muscles. But, short of that, he was told, the Armed Forces could provide only a few combat teams for an operation in Laos—provided the emergency lasted no more than 30 days and there was no crisis in Berlin. Those present recall the President's disbelief. Unwilling to risk total war over Laos, the United States would have to settle for what it could get. Matters would grow worse in the next few months as Cuba followed Laos, and Berlin followed Cuba.

Yet, by this time, a superior if civilian intelligence had begun to examine the ailing American giant whose cramped muscles could respond to crisis in only one way—with a single cataclysmic spasm. Robert Strange McNamara had taken over at the Pentagon and was trying to find out how to restore flexibility to American power.

Robert McNamara, the new man in charge of the musclebound giant, was in 1961 no stranger to the Pentagon. During World War II, he had served an apprenticeship (as captain) in the building's C–3 ring, where he could look out over an air well and get what is called a "bowel view" of Pentagon leadership.

McNamara, then 26 years old, was by all accounts a rather perplexing fellow, as he had been since school days. One of his earliest friends remembers him from high school (where he was president of the yearbook, president of the French club, a member of the glee club, and a member of the board of student control). With the puzzlement that characterizes all memories of him, she says, "He was so painfully good; he was so neat, so clean; he was the kind of boy you'd trust with either your money or your sick kittens. But when I say that, I make him sound like a square. Yet he wasn't, he wasn't—a square is an object of ridicule, and Bob was a great talker, a good dancer; it was always fun to have him around. He was never left out of anything."

McNamara moved brilliantly from high school to college (the University of California), made Phi Beta Kappa in his junior year. After going on to Harvard Business School, he married Margaret Craig, of San Francisco, and later became an assistant professor at the school. "We were all broke," recalls Eugene Zuckert, a junior dean at the business school, now Secretary of the Air Force. "We were all kids then, and the McNamaras lived at Morris Hall, and we would go out to parties just to sneak some punch. But smack at 10:30, the McNamaras would go home to bed, because he had to be ready for work the next day."

It was McNamara's teaching specialty—statistical control—that brought him to the Pentagon in midwar. (He had wanted to volunteer after Pearl Harbor, had instead been assigned to teach his specialty to Army Air Force officers at Harvard.) The war, at this point, was giving Americans their first experience in dealing swiftly with waterfalls of data under emergency conditions. For the first time, men were groping for instantaneous decisions based on calculations involving thousands of miles, millions of human beings, billions of gallons of gasoline. After months of instructing air officers in such methods of calculation, McNamara, in February 1943, decided simply to join them.

There is little romance to statistical control. Its purpose is to dump the drudgery of calculation on computers and machines. The supervising human is required only to think: first, to pose questions to the calculators; and finally, once questions have conscripted answering data, to make decisions on the basis of such data. It was in these statistical vineyards that McNamara first labored, then starred.

The ability to ask the proper questions governing oceans of data is rare today. It was even rarer in 1945. When the war ended, McNamara and a band of nine AAF companions were invited to move as a package (called the Quiz Kids) from Pentagon desks to the ailing Ford Motor Co. McNamara was 29 when he arrived to probe Ford with his questions. The giant company, the outstanding invalid of the prewar automobile industry, was once again facing financial crisis with the end of military production. When McNamara left Ford as president, 14 years later, the company had an annual net profit of $427 million.

In Michigan, as everywhere else, there were always the two McNamaras. The Ford or daytime McNamara was a paragon of efficiency. Tough enough to recommend, as division chief, that Ford liquidate its Edsel venture and admit its $250 million error, he he foreshadowed the man who could later wipe out the half-billion-dollar Skybolt project with the same surgical precision.

The evening McNamara lived in a rambling, white-trimmed brick Tudor house at Ann Arbor, home of the University of Michigan, 30 miles from Detroit. The evening McNamara was a contributor to the NAACP and the American Civil Liberties Union, a recognized egghead in a university community. This McNamara, a vivid, rambling conversationalist, first joined a monthly discussion group of 10 of Ann Arbor's leading businessmen-intellectuals. Then, his curiosity unslaked, he helped Prof. Ralph Gerard, the university's distinguished neurophysiologist, organize another evening discussion group of out-and-out eggheads (an art historian, a sociologist, a physicist, several professors, two other business executives) to explore ideas in new books.

The evening McNamara was home folks. When discussion groups met at the McNamara home, Mrs. McNamara served; the house remained comfortable, not fancy—a place "where you found kids' boots and kids' hockey sticks stacked in the entryway, not a picked-up house," says one friend. But the daytime McNamara was rising rapidly from division to division at Ford. As the salary of the once-broke professor climbed from Ford's $12,000 starting stipend to the $420,000 of 1960, the McNamaras became contributors—to civic improvement in Ann Arbor and Detroit, to an effort to establish an art theater in Michigan and to politics. Now, high-minded, non-favor-seeking political contributors are as scarce in politics as albino candidates. And as McNamara contributed across the board to Republicans here, Democrats there, be began to appear on the radar screens of politicians. But it was difficult to label him: In 1960, he gave his dollars and support to Prof. Paul Bagwell, Republican candidate for Governor, and Senator John F. Kennedy, Democratic candidate for President.

One cannot linger long over the dramatic timing that brought John F. Kennedy to the Presidency of the United States on Tuesday, November 8, 1960, and Robert S. McNamara to the presidency of the Ford Motor Co. the next day; or the frantic screening of the horizon by the Kennedy staff for a Secretary of Defense; or how McNamara's name was raised again and again during the hunt—by Wall Streeters, labor leaders, politicians, business leaders.

Two items of testimony stand out. The first is from the President's brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver, now Chief of the Peace Corps, who on December 7, 1960, flew to Michigan to explore with Robert McNamara two jobs—Secretary of Defense and Secretary of the Treasury. Shriver recalls that he was impressed by several things: The matter-of-fact way that McNamara moved to a discussion of the posts—without surprise, or arrogance, or false modesty, or self-depreciation; the ease with which he could rattle off the three or four main problems of both the Treasury and Defense; his worry about deserting the Fords, who had just made him president, and his total indifference to money. According to Shriver, McNamara leaned back in his chair at one point and remarked that, of course, he'd have to give up any stock or options in Ford; and that this would cost him several million dollars. "You know," McNamara added, "I've got more money now than anybody in my family ever dreamed of having. I've got more money than I'm ever going to need or use." He straightened his chair, and that was that. ("Like that," says Shriver. "That was all there was to the matter.")

The second item comes from his friend Congressman Neil Staebler, then Democratic national committeeman in Michigan, with whom McNamara discussed the Defense post the night before his decision. "It was as if," says Staebler, "McNamara were asking the question: 'Why should I hire McNamara for the job?'—as if McNamara were trying to see McNamara as the President saw him. It was as if he were trying to write a report on himself to himself. Could the job be done? Could you get all the people involved at the Pentagon to agree? Could the thing truly be unified? McNamara had seen enough throatcutting at Ford to prepare anybody for the Pentagon—but did anybody have the power to unify the Pentagon? And then, finally—I can't remember the words—there was this phrase: That maybe nobody could do the job; that maybe he couldn't last 6 months; maybe nobody was qualified; but that after all, he had been asked, and therefore he would try."

About 10 day later, Bob McNamara visited the then Secretary of Defense, Thomas Gates, for what was to be a short briefing on the duties he was about to assume. The session ran to 6 hours. When it was over, so the story is told at the White House, McNamara returned to the Ford Motor Co. suite at the Shoreham Hotel and telephoned President-elect Kennedy. "I've just been over talking with Tom Gates," said McNamara, "and you know—I think I can do that job."

Oh, Kennedy is said to have replied. Well, you know, I've been talking to Eisenhower this morning. And I think I can do that job too.

With this, the takeover of the Pentagon began.

To take over the military establishment of the United States is a stupefying task—rendered even more difficult than it might otherwise be by the stupefying character of the Pentagon itself.

Squat and ugly, dank and drafty, the tawny building on the Potomac mud flats is one of the most bleakly depressing anthills in the world. The first of its qualities is that it is huge. An enormous labyrinth of 7,000 offices, 1,900 toilets, 150 staircases, 17½ miles of dingy corridors, it rouses in almost all its 25,000 working citizens, whether clerks or generals, the fear they may be lost and forgotten. The second of its qualities, for those who are not lost and forgotten, is tension. Though promising young officers, just in from healthy field duty, insist that their new ulcers, headaches, flu and colds are symptoms of a specific disease called Pentagonitis, the medical staff of the Pentagon insists there is no such disease—it is simply nerves. And nervous tension increases at the Pentagon the higher one rises in the hierarchy. At the heights, the effects of an alternation between the humiliation of obedience and the ecstasy of command become more acute.

To understand the Pentagon, it is essential to grasp one fact—that only a handful of men in the building are important. Cut a wedge out of the huge perimeter between the fashionable Mall and River entrances; slice off this wedge the outer rim, the sunlit E ring; make the slice two layers thick, the 2d and 3rd floors—and then, in this tiny sliver of the world's biggest office building, you have trapped the 20 or 30 men who shape the military policy and strategy of America.

A new Secretary of Defense has only two ways of imposing his authority on the 3,500,000 men and women of the American Military Establishment, all of whom get orders from this building: One is by power of the budget; the second, by power of appointment. And since men write budgets, not vice versa, one should look first at the 20 or 30 individuals who direct the Nation's military effort—at the small team of civilians who man the Defense, Army, Navy, and Air Force policy staffs, then at the team of generals and admirals they are supposed to select and supervise in running the services and commands. Rarely, indeed, have both civilians and military teams offered so romantic an intertwining of old and new in American tradition as do McNamara's teams, which now, after 2 years, show the Secretary's emerging touch.

One is struck immediately, for example, by how topheavy McNamara's choices have been in ivy-leaguers. Deputy to McNamara, second man in the Department, is Roswell L. Gilpatric, Yale; followed by another Yale as Secretary of the Army, another Yale as Secretary of the Air Force, another Yale as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower. A Harvard man and a Yale man serve as first and second in Defense's International Security Affairs Section, and a Princeton man serves as Assistant Secretary of Public Affairs. Yet it would be a narrow view to consider such a concentration of fashionable ivy-leaguers as an expression of social connections. All through the Kennedy administration runs the most intense, if unrecognized, desire to attach itself to the older traditions of American Government. And the Gilpatric-Vance-Zuckert-Nitze team at the Pentagon can be seen as the direct descendant of the great Ivy League team of Stimson-Lovett-McCloy-Patterson - Forrestal (again predominantly Yale) that directed American effort in World War II for another President from Harvard, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Smooth, polished, tough under their good manners, the Pentagon's current leaders are men shaped by a tradition of public service almost as old as the uniformed forces they direct. They are part of the invisible web of Government, gossip and private connections that links Pentagon with White House and State.

Yet one tradition can no longer stretch over the vast diversity of American life, and so, as a balance to his ivy-leaguers, McNamara has developed another civilian team that can be called only the think staff. Many journalists have tried to style the think staff: they are called by some, Randsters (for Rand Corp., which so heavily nourished their thinking), or technipols, or Defense intellectuals, or the whiz kids, or the Wizards of ODD. What is common to these people is that almost all of them have been trained since the war either in science or in defense analysis at the direct expense of the armed services of the United States. They are as much children of the Pentagon as its uniformed personnel, and are hated by the leadership of the armed services because now they no longer serve, but apparently direct the generals. If the Ivy League crowd is predominantly east coast-New York, then the think staff is predominantly west coast-California. The ivy-leaguers are older; the think staffers are, at first glance, rather academic, generally young, interested in war as a system of intellectual propositions, most at home with a piece of chalk and a blackboard.

It would be too much to inspect all of the top civilians to find the answer to the question: Who runs the Pentagon? Yet, certainly, the leaders of both civilian wings, as they jointly confront the military team, must be examined.

The leaders of the Ivy League team are almost all the kind of men, from the kind of families, who would have gone charging up San Juan Hill with Teddy Roosevelt. Chief among them is Roswell Gilpatric, tall, curly-haired, gray-eyed, Windsor knot to his necktie, an aficionado of Elizabethan poetry and yachting, extraordinarily able, closer to McNamara than anyone else. If ever Gilpatric were to leave his post to go back to his rich New York law practice, then the two chief rivals for the succession would be Paul Nitze (Harvard), silver-haired, graceful, the man chiefly responsible for the new seemingly frictionless alliance of Pentagon and State Department; and Cyrus Vance (Yale), the capable, abrasive, thinly handsome Secretary of the Army. All three are of finest New York polish; all three have moved from good prep schools to good colleges to distinguished marriages; and all three have enough wealth and devotion to make America's welfare their primary concern in life.

The leaders of the think staff wing are more difficult to group and define, partly because there is no hard-and-fast cutoff between Ivy Leaguer administrator and think staffer. Adam Yarmolinsky, for example, McNamara's personal counsel and troubleshooter, bridges both groups. By education an Ivy Leaguer, he is by temperament and function a think staffer. So is the Defense Department's General Counsel, the able John McNaughton. Senior among the pure think staffers, however, is probably Charles Hitch, 58, the Department's Comptroller, a mild-mannered, gentle Missourian, a one-time professor of economics. Clustered about Hitch are Alain Enthoven, a tall, darkly handsome Seattle-born economist of 32, and Henry S. Rowen, a professorial Bostonian, 37. These three were all research associates at the Air Force's Rand Corp. think factory in Santa Monica, Calif.; all three studied economics at Oxford. All helped transfer the British military doctrine of operations analysis to American military thinking.

To these must be added Dr. Harold Brown (New York, Bronx High School of Science and Columbia), a vastly impressive, if inscrutable man, who at 35 directs the expenditure of $5.5 billion in scientific research and engineering; and his deputy, John Rubel, 42, a lithe and graceful Chicago-born scientist, a thoroughly brilliant and charming man, who like his chief, won his laurels in the West, in California.

Together, these are the top civilians who direct the top military team of the Pentagon. Actually, the point where brook meets river, where civilian meshes with military, can be made more precise.

Each Monday afternoon at 2:30, McNamara and Gilpatric (they are so close that their appearance anywhere is called the Bob-and-Ros Act) descend from the third to the second floor, where, off the barred and barricaded ninth corridor, a bay leads to the "tank," the "Gold Room," the meeting place of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Here, around the huge table, scarred by cigarette and cigar butts abandoned in anger at past disputes, McNamara and Gilpatric discuss and decide the problems and plans of American strategy with the uniformed Chiefs of Staff.

Two of the Chiefs are relatively new and untested. The Army Chief of Staff is Gen. Earle G. Wheeler. Lean, dark, tense, a chain-smoker, Wheeler is the most important new military personality on the Washington scene. Clear and precise of speech, he is one of the most lucid thinkers in the Pentagon; all acknowledge this. The criticism of this attractive man comes chiefly from those who insist he is a staff man, not a man of combat-command experience. Traditionally, the military thinking of a new administration shows itself in its choice of a new Army Chief of Staff, and Wheeler speaks the language of the new administration. Philosophically a child of the Army's tradition of extreme mobility, Wheeler voices a doctrine that would have appealed to Nathan Bedford Forrest as much as John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Had Maxwell Taylor not been available, Wheeler might have won nomination as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs to succeed Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer (whose blandness discouraged the administration, which sent him to Paris to soothe NATO). If Wheeler delivers as Army Chief of Staff, he should someday succeed to the chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs.

Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations—a husky, masculine sailor and the most perfectly typecast of the four Chiefs—is also relatively untested in high combat command. The U.S. Navy is the closed service; it chooses its own leaders by its own promotion mechanisms, and civilians rarely dare interfere. (It took a near revolt by Congress to save Hyman Rickover when the Navy brotherhood wanted to dismiss the nuclear admiral.) Generally, the Navy offers for civilian ratification as Chief of Naval Operations only its finest, and Anderson runs a superbly efficient Navy. Like all Chiefs of Naval Operations, Anderson feels his basic responsibility is to national security—and only secondarily to any particular civilian administration installed over him. Traditionally, the Navy has been the most intellectual of the services. But the think staffers who rove the Pentagon have, finally, in this year's budget, also begun to close on the Navy, summoning it to account. And Anderson's resentment is as natural and bitter as that of any salt-sprayed seadog against any landbound civilian.

Wheeler and Anderson are the lesser Chiefs.

Then there are the greater Chiefs.

What separates the lesser from the greater Chiefs is "presence." America is running out of combat-tested leaders. Both Anderson and Wheeler belong to an untried generation of senior commanders. But the other two Chiefs, Gens. Maxwell Taylor and Curtis E. LeMay, are the last active personalities of America's military age of heroes. These two, when the world was troubled, commanded great forces in anger, and won. They are rivals, as they always have been. Only a respect for each other's achievements keeps them this side of outright clash. For if General LeMay is "Mr. Massive Retaliation" himself, then General Taylor is "Mr. Flexible Response."

General Taylor, 61, has begun to mellow but is still biting of phrase. As newly appointed Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, he has returned to the Pentagon from long exile, totally vindicated. Three years ago, as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, he bade farewell to the armed services, crushed and dispirited by an Air Force strategy he despised. As a parting volley, he fired at his enemies a book called "The Uncertain Trumpet." No military blast ever hit target more squarely than did his book, which became the military bible of the New Frontiersmen, from the new President to the new Secretary of Defense, on down the line. Invited back to the arena of his torment as master of the beasts, General Taylor is the first Chairman of the Joint Chiefs since Omar Bradley to regard civilians as intelligent partners in a joint venture of defense. A soldier loyal to the tradition of his cloth, Taylor indignantly opposes any civilian interference in the choice of military leaders. But he is himself, par excellence, the choice of civilians to command the apparatus of American power.

Contrast Taylor with his archrival, Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force: Where Taylor is thin and intellectual (he speaks French, Japanese, German, knows arts, music, science as well as airborne jump tactics), LeMay is burly, bluff, primeval. Taylor is eloquent in argument; LeMay normally grunts. Taylor likes to read classics (in Greek and Latin) or play tennis; LeMay likes to hunt. Now on the defensive, the great LeMay settles down in his chair, silver haired and stout, his tunic unbuttoned, and regards civilian questioners warily, suspiciously, as if they were stalking him. LeMay created SAC. Dutiful, obedient to present strategy, he rumbles like a slumbering volcano. During the Cuban crisis, Taylor was for the escalated response, LeMay for the hard strike. Those who deal with both LeMay and McNamara report that no two men could be further apart in the way they think; yet LeMay has earned McNamara's hard respect. It was LeMay's drive and prowess that for 10 years made SAC the dominant chess piece on the board of world power; and it is behind SAC's shield that McNamara and Taylor have, finally, been able to redeploy the strength of America toward different ends.

The United States owes Curtis LeMay much. But if there is any thread to the story of 2 years of McNamara administration, it is the way in which the use of power has been brought back from LeMay's imagination and restored to civilian hands. In following this thread, we shall see not only how the Pentagon was taken over, but the particular art that distinguishes McNamara from other men.

At the heart of McNamara's art lie questions. The first tattoo rattled out of his office within 4 weeks of his arrival, as drafts of questions, seeking not answers but suggestions as to where and by what deadline answers could be had. Then, 6 weeks after taking office, McNamara fired the broadside known as "McNamara's 96 Trombones"—the famous 96 questions of March 1, 1961, each tagged with a deadline and the name of the man who must bring in the answer.

What of the missile gap? was a question McNamara had asked even before taking office.

All through 1960, the secret national intelligence estimates reported that Russia had an enormous margin of missile superiority; and appropriate leakage to the press by the armed services had made the gap a matter of clamorous political alarm. Now, on inquiry, it turned out that the separate intelligence services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force each had different measures of the gap and peril, but none could offer hard evidence. The Pentagon, McNamara decided, could not afford three rival intelligence services, competing with each other and warping the flow of information in order to bolster particular missile programs. There followed the decision to unify the three intelligence services in a Defense Intelligence Agency, which would coordinate and cross-check all information.

Even before the new Defense Intelligence Agency took over, the use of new intelligence methods had led to periodic reductions in estimates of the size of the missile gap. By September 1961, a major intelligence breakthrough of new sources established firmly that it was America, not Russia, that led in missile capacity—and by a wide margin. That margin has been maintained. The United States has today something more than 200 ICBM's ready to go, plus almost 200 target-ready Polaris missiles in submarines. It will have about 1,000 on-target missiles ready by the end of 1964, and approximately 2,000 on-target missiles by the end of 1967. Production capacity for the Minuteman is already beyond any current need. For the next 2 years, the U.S. Air Force will be adding on-target missiles at a rate of better than 1 every working day, to give us a total of 800 pushbutton-ready Minutemen by July 1, 1965. Russia's ready missile strength, in ICBM's that can hit the United States, is probably under 100. But it is growing.

McNamara's 1961 questions on organization and procedure brought information that the Army, Navy, and Air Force each maintained a division charged with examining its organization and procedure. But the Department of Defense, charged with supervising all three services, had none. Also, some 3,000 committees buzzed through the Pentagon, and McNamara could see little use in many of them. (Over 400 were abolished in his first 6 months in Office.) McNamara had pulled Ford out of similar confusion, first by questioning, then by seizing the comptroller's reins. Now, at the Pentagon, he established in the Secretary of Defense's Staff a brandnew Office of Organizational Management. Says an Assistant Secretary, "You must remember that, even in industry, McNamara is a new breed. Most industrial chiefs come up from the production or sales side. McNamara came up through the comptroller's side; in American industry, the comptroller's office is what the party secretary is in Russian Government."

Other McNamara questions probed procurement and supply, budget and arms production. In the years since Korea, electronics, missile, and other new weapons systems had jumped from 12 percent to 52 percent of the Pentagon's annual contract placement. How could competitive bidding be restored in this area of negotiated costs? How could the services be kept from bidding against each other for old-fashioned supplies? How could the missile race between services be controlled? A Defense Supply Agency for procuring all items of common use was set up, and space-missile development was concentrated under the Air Force.

Still other questions probed all international military commitments, from Morocco to Japan; the laboratories, procedures, perspectives of defense science; installations and logistics; Reserves and readiness; control and command. All answers were required to be "comprehensive and complete." Deputies, to spare McNamara from a torrent of paper, tried to boil the answers down. One recalls sending up a 5-page answer. "Back it came in 20 minutes with his own little handwriting: 'This is not sufficiently comprehensive and complete.' So we upped the answer to 9 pages. Back it came again. So I asked him what he wanted, and he looked at me and said, 'Just make it comprehensive and complete.' We finally gave him a white paper of 16 pages, and it stayed. When you figure there were 96 questions in the first round—and 34 more later—you know what his reading must have been."

This lust for detail offended many officers on the Joint Staff as intrusive, juvenile and amateurish. But one must see McNamara's performance for what it really was: an athlete's feat. The mind is a large muscle, and its ability to grasp, sort and organize information can reach an artistry as perfect as an outfielder's leap for a backhand catch. This ability, like any muscular ability, withers apparently with age; but McNamara at 46 possesses it to an extraordinary degree. He can sit almost impervious to interruption and chatter as he concentrates. His staff knows that, for McNamara, the most important hours are the "alone hours" when he reads and thinks. What he reads, he compresses in notes, absorbs—and then files. Off his large office is a pantrylike vault lined with loose-leaf notebooks. These are his personal notebooks. Here are all the studies, reports and analyses on which he has penciled the marginal notations that tie the information into a whole.

All this makes Robert McNamara sound a very forbidding man—unless one enjoys the performance of a beautiful mind at work. Normally, McNamara talks in a dry, reedy voice; but when, in conversation, he begins to clarify a point, patterning new associations, his enthusiasm will begin to carry him away. His voice will rise several decibels, his head will wag back and forth, a huge smile will light his face—and, suddenly, he is your favorite professor, kindled by the excitement of talk. Whenever a problem becomes complicated, McNamara's zest rises—as when he finally devised the questions for a study of military dollar-and-gold outflow. The questions were hunting tools. "Those figures are going to pop out, just pop out," he all but squealed to a friend, as if he had flushed a pheasant out of the bush.

Over the years, the armed services have developed an information-delivery system for their masters that reaches its pinnacle in the Pentagon briefing. A truly great Pentagon briefing, complete with five-colored charts, flip cards, illuminations and slides, photo blowups the size of a wall, colonels dancing attendance and voices in the darkness, is an artistic production, like a ballet. "But briefings," says a close associate of McNamara's, "evaporate like the morning dew. When the briefers disappear with their charts and slides, you ask yourself: What did they say? McNamara wants it in writing first, so he can question it, and wants it in writing after they go, so other people can come in and argue with it. That's the way he gets to decision—by asking questions." For the armed services, which had entertained, befuddled and informed a long line of civilian secretaries with briefing performances over the years, the adjustment to McNamara was slow and painful. "To be questioned by McNamara," said one unhappy victim, "is like being picked over by bees."

Slowly, as 1961 turned the corner into 1962, the pace of questions slackened. It became apparent that McNamara hugely enjoyed not only his job, but Washington life in general. And Washington, like Detroit before it, began to recognize the different McNamaras. There was a puckish McNamara—who, when briefed for the umpteenth time on communications and reassured that this particular phone would reach Gen. Lauris Norstad anywhere in Europe within 30 seconds, simply lifted the phone, asked for Norstad and demonstrated conclusively that when Lauris Norstad was naked, taking a shower, at home in Marnes-la-Coquette, he could not be reached in 30 seconds. There was another McNamara, one of Washington's most earnest self-improvement characters and eggheads (he was a charter member of Robert Kennedy's Hickory Hill study group); there was McNamara the cold automaton, who treated his generals "like provincial branch managers of Ford factories." There was also the McNamara who could laugh at both executives and eggheads, and enjoy being neither—as when a cherished professorial assistant struggled to close the door of his office, and McNamara strode over, closed it with a clap, then, with a twinkle and a laugh, said: "That's because I've met a payroll."

McNamara the bleak and McNamara the gay were both the same man. "He sits there at the table before a Cabinet meeting," recalls one watcher, "and he's cold business. Other Cabinet members come in, chat with each other, say hello, the way men do before a meeting begins. McNamara sits at his place, studies his papers, talks to no one. But, then, some night, there you are at a White House party, and you're supposed to be home at 2 o'clock in the morning, and who's still there twisting away? McNamara."

Like any man of size, McNamara can be seen from many angles. The best view offered this reporter was that of a scientist, John Rubel, deputy director of Defense Research, one of the prime architects of the destruction potential that overhangs the world.

"When he came in," says Rubel, "we were infinitely troubled people. Everyone is troubled—but we were 'troubled' troubled people. We didn't see how we could get out of some of our problems—this endless escalation of the arms race, this needless multiplication of strategic weapons. We couldn't see how we were going to get a grip on the enormous programs we were supposed to supervise; we were worried about command control of nuclear weapons; we were worried about response. You don't know how worried we were right here in the Pentagon—much more than the public worriers who do it out loud.

"And you know what is the most significant observation I've made since McNamara came? Just the enormous difference one man can make, the tremendous changes in practice one can bring about with no effort at all to alter the laws. All of us live, in one way or another, by reacting to our environment; he's changed the environment."

Let us see how the environment has changed; and let us follow the change by examining the key words in the logic that has shaped American power and strategy to new ends.

"Quantify" is a favorite McNamara word, which means simply "to measure." On his entry into office, McNamara found that the last Eisenhower budget had asked Congress to give the Air Force one new wing of B-52's, the superdreadnaughts of the air. But one wing of B-52's, with the tankers, missiles and ground support necessary to maintain it for 5 years, would cost $1 billion. By McNamara's logic, such an expenditure had to be measured, "quantified," or "balanced" (another favorite word of his) against other possibilities. The Air Force already had 14 B-52 wings, 2 B-58 wings and obsolescing squadrons of B-47's. More money for the B-52's might increase our striking power by 7 percent. But the same amount of money would buy and maintain 250 Minutemen missiles or 6 Polaris submarines. Which was the best way of doing what we wanted to do? Obviously, then "quantification" required a corollary judgment, and this judgment depended on "functions" (another key McNamara word).

How did each exertion of the Army, Navy, or Air Force fit the grand function or "functions" of our strategy? For a long time, scholars (as well as soldiers) had felt that the Defense effort was distorted by separate Army, Navy, and Air Force submission of budget demands to Congress. Most persuasive among the scholars who argued for a new approach was Charles Hitch, coauthor of "The Economics of Defense." Hitch advocated that all defense funds be allocated by function, by the purposes that animated them, not by the color of the uniform of the man who spent the money. McNamara read the book, then, immediately after he was nominated, recruited Hitch as comptroller of the Defense Department. Once installed, Hitch suggested to McNamara that they experiment by presenting a few programs to Congress as Defense requests, not Army, Air Force, or Navy requests. McNamara's reply was "No." There would be no experimental effort; instead, the entire Defense effort would be offered to Congress in terms of combined "programs" clarifying functions. Right then, and at that time.

Thus was born program packaging. And program packaging brought clarity out of confusion, making plain, for the first time, to friend and foe alike, the new direction of American strategy.

Two nuclear war program packages governed direct interchange of death with Russia: a strategic retaliatory forces program (which considered the Titan, Atlas, Polaris, Minuteman, and manned aircraft as a single family of weapons) and a complementary continental air and missile defense program (against the Russian nuclear threat).

But two conventional war programs—one for general purpose forces and the other for complementary sealift-airlift forces—directed attention back to the old-fashioned clash of men on battlefields.

It is significant that old-fashioned battlefield war is so much more expensive than new-fashioned nuclear war and growing more so. The nuclear war programs, now cut to $9.3 billion for 1964, can eliminate civilization from the globe and thus provide an alltime biggest bang for the buck. The conventional war programs now cost more than twice as much—$20.5 billion in next year's proposed budget. War, by American strategy, is to be brought back to the battlefields where men can best defend the women and children of the cities.

This has been the decision and the change. The civilians who control the Pentagon now offer the White House an entirely new instrumentation of power—and a doctrine to manage it. They now offer the President options. Since "options" is another key McNamara word that has colored all Washington thinking, we should examine what "options" means, and where the word has brought us.

"Options" means simply that civilized leadership should have at all times a variety of choices, an orchestration of forces, a range of responses that will permit instant dispatch of a company to quell a southern riot, a battalion to beef up the Panama Canal defenses, a division to stabilize the Congo—or a total commitment in a clash over Berlin.

The Pentagon still retains, as it must, the fixed contingency plans for war, which the Joint Chiefs freshen regularly (there are 228 such contingency plans, according to the latest official report). These plans are necessary, but they no longer control American response. American power is no longer remorsely locked in by them. McNamara's 1961 round of questions has been followed by another year of innovation. Underlying all the innovations lies the same urge to unlock, unfreeze, make flexible the retaliation to the United States to challenge. The speedup of the hard-base Minutemen program, guaranteeing and multiplying America's second-strike capacity, reduces SAC's previously critical vulnerability—and takes nervous fingers off nuclear triggers. The elaboration and reelaboration of signals and command communications (there is now an airborne command of SAC in the air 24 hours a day) give new assurance that SAC will not act by button response alone. Military programs run forward on 5-year plans; new procedures sensitively control, yet invite, changes in these programs.

Above all else, there is this achievement: The paper language of the laws that describe America's military leadership has finally become reality. The Army, Navy, and and Air Force are now service organizations—they train, equip, procure, and make ready Armed Forces that they no longer command. The forces they make ready are handed over to nine great unified and specified commands, which alone operate our military machine. These commands act only at the direct order of the civilian Secretary of Defense, who is advised by uniformed Chiefs of Staff beneath him and directed by the President above him.

Every turning in American strategy has been symbolized by a mighty new command. SAC in its day spoke American doctrine clearer than words. Today, no better symbol of the McNamara-Kennedy doctrine exists than the newest of the nine great commands, the administration's favorite and its own creation: Strike.

It takes time for the imagination to grasp what Strike Command (Stricom) is, what it means. A visitor may stand in a frost-covered meadow, at dawn, watching the sun glisten through the parachutes of 450 men as they soundlessly drop from the sky. Last night, these men were alerted 600 miles away at an Appalachian base. The two Stricom combat teams from which today's unit was drawn are always ready for exactly such no-notice alerts—on call to fly, and jump, within an hour and a half. If this were war, two full airborne divisions would follow them to the airfields, where Strike's planes would be arriving to airlift them into combat. Across the country, six more divisions would, in days, be ready for air haul or sealift. Every combat-ready element in the continental reserve—eight divisions, three air forces, atomic artillery battalions, new transport fleets, new communications units—would act as part of one command: Stricom.

Stricom is not only a new system of using power, it is in fact also new power. Eighteen months ago, had there been such a command, it would have found only three divisions available in the United States; now it calls on eight. Eighteen months ago, Army would have negotiated with Air Force for airlift; now Stricom commands its airlift, and that airlift has doubled, will shortly triple, in capacity. When Washington gives the word, Stricom moves—anywhere in the world, in any strength, to cow riots or confront empires.

At MacDill Air Force Base in Florida, Stricom headquarters bubbles with the excitement of ideas in ferment. There is, for example, the ferment of rediscovery, as Army and Air Force once again find themselves joined organically in a single unified command. Gen. Paul D. Adams of the Army, a silver-haired, chunky field commander, is boss of Stricom; his deputy is Lt. Gen. Bruce Holloway of the Air Force, a tall, soft-spoken wartime ace. They work together; they enjoy it. The officers under them have blended into a new, unified staff. New field tactics, new fire patterns, new air-support doctrines rise from conversations suspended too long by bureaucratic separation. In their offices or homes, Stricom officers keep packed three kits—one for arctic war, one for tropical war, one for temperate-zone war. When Stricom chooses the units that must move overnight to combat, it delivers also the leadership and plans to go with them. From its roster of 11 generals and 35 colonels (all combat veterans), Stricom is prepared to peel off at once, without notice, a Task Force Alpha that commands anything up to regimental size; a Task Force Bravo that commands elements up to corps size. If more is required, Stricom can lift itself and set up a headquarters for an entire Theater of Operations, ready to receive whatever the United States can mobilize.

Stricom is the best example of what McNamara, in another key phrase, calls useful power.

"Everyone missed the point about Cuba," the Secretary reminisced recently. "It wasn't just power. It's true, a year and a half ago, we didn't have the combat-ready ground divisions, the combat consumables. We didn't have sufficient power to apply. But we also didn't have the theory of application of force, if we had had the power.

"Massive retaliation as a form of power just wasn't credible in response to a situation like the Berlin Wall, or to a situation like Vietnam, or Cuba. Massive retaliation had given us no usable power to prevent the U.S.S.R. from expanding its interests in Cuba. So we had to develop forms of usable power.

"Now, I'm not an engine engineer. But people who drive an automobile know almost as much about engines as an engineer—they know what they want the engine to do. Enough people know enough about driving an automobile to determine the form and characteristics of the engine. I never had to know the characteristics of metal stress when I was at Ford. I feel I don't have to be an expert in combat leadership of troops to lay down what we need in useful power in a situation like Cuba. We have an actual difference of physical force today. We had three ready divisions in the United States in 1961—now we have eight combat-ready divisions with their backup.

"But the application of power, how it should be applied, is even more difficult than any concern with the type or quantity of power. This was a major part of the Cuban question—the President knew the reasons for conceiving this delicate application of power, this sophisticated use of power. But this sophistication had to come from the top of the Government. A naval commander who blockades wants to blockade—period. He wants to stop all ships. That's his job. What complicates his decision is that the actions he takes during the blockade are also telegraphic messages to the Soviet Union, a way of signaling our intentions in a world where both sides have the military power to destroy a large part of civilization. This situation requires that the important signals come from the highest political power in the country. As a result, we've had a basic shift in the level where decisions on the application of power take place.

"At least until the world has developed a workable rule of law in international affairs, the foundation of foreign policy is power—but it has to be usable power, controlled to serve reasonable political ends. And that's the way we're moving—from unreason to reason."

Which is all any reasonable citizen can reasonably ask of his leadership.

PROPOSED REVISION OF RULE XXXV—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I discuss the major subject of my remarks tonight, I wish to submit a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and printed, and will be appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 127) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the text of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"On a motion made and carried by vote of a majority of the Senators present and voting to close the doors of the Senate, on the discussion of any business which may, in the opinion of the Senate require secrecy, the Presiding Officer shall direct the galleries to be cleared; and during the discussion of such motion the doors shall remain closed."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the majority leader commented a few minutes ago that he hoped that the Senate's secret session this afternoon would be the last of its kind in 25 years. I share that opinion. I have offered the resolution because I do not believe any two Members of the Senate at any time should have the authority, under rule XXXV, as they now have, to throw the Senate into a closed-doors session and have the galleries cleared and the public excluded from a discussion of the public's business. In a democracy, there is no substitute for a full public disclosure of the public's business.

I believe it is necessary to have in the Senate Manual a rule which permits a majority of the Senate to have the Senate close its doors and clear the galleries, but I do not believe that the galleries of the Senate of the United States should ever be cleared except by a majority vote of the Senate. I do not believe we can justify leaving in the rules an archaic rule which permits two Senators at any time to evict the public from the galleries of the U.S. Senate. I do not believe that such an action can be reconciled with democratic procedures. The public is protected in connection with matters of high secrecy by the application of the basic principle of a democracy—majority rule.

I attended the session this afternoon. In my judgment, practically little was said in that session which could not have been said to the public. I do not share the views of some flattering Senators that a great, important record was made in the U.S. Senate this afternoon. I think it was a record which it was unnecessary to make in secret. It is true that some classified matter was discussed; but I believe it would have been better discussed in the appropriate committee.

The Committee on Foreign Relations discusses much classified material; and every Member of this body, before any subject before the Committee on Foreign Relations is voted upon or considered on the floor of the Senate, has access to the file in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

How well I remember, in January 1955, when the Senate held its now historic debate on the Formosa resolution. The galleries were not cleared.

Mr. President, I do not know of any time in my 18 years of service in the Senate when we had an issue as vital to this country as the Formosa resolution.

We then had a meeting which lasted for a good many days; it was a joint meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee. It is true that we were handicapped a little in the debate on the Formosa resolution; but those who examine the record will see how we handled that situation. From the record, they will find that we said to the other Members of the Senate, when we were dealing with certain top-secret matters, "Go downstairs to the Foreign Relations Committee room, where the files are kept, and read for yourselves the confidential information on this matter."

I say to the Senate that it is better to do that than to run the danger of beginning a precedent in the Senate that whenever two Senators wish to do so, they can have the galleries cleared and throw the Senate into a secret session.

One of the greatest checks possible in a democracy is a check by the public upon the processes of the administration of government. I propose to press for this change in the rule; and I am satisfied that once the American people come to understand the implications of the rule, they too, will press for a change in it, because I am sure they will be as startled as many Senators were to discover the meaning of rule XXXV, which was applied today.

So much for that, Mr. President. I reflect on no one when I make these critical comments, because I am commenting critically on procedure. But this is another example of the old, archaic, bewhiskered rules of the Senate which need to be changed; and I hope the Senate will change rule XXXV at an early date.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some weeks ago the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] held a meeting of the Finance Committee to which he invited many Senators who are not members of that committee. It was a public hearing, and testimony was taken from agricultural leaders across the Nation. The hearing was devoted primarily to what was happening in connection with the poultry industry vis-a-vis U.S. foreign trade; and spokesmen for the poultry industry were there from most of the States. A great many witnesses were presented by the Senator from Virginia. Each of them spoke for 2 or 3 minutes, or in some instances for 4 minutes. They pointed out what the foreign policy of the United States, under the administration of the U.S. State Department, is doing to this segment of our agriculture; and during the hearings references were made to similar damage being done to a good many other segments of American agriculture.

As usual, spokesmen for the State Department sought to alibi for what I think is the inexcusable record of the State Department—and for a good many years it has continued to be inexcusable—in connection with the entire matter of providing adequate protection to American agriculture in connection with the administration of the U.S. foreign policy. At the hearing, the usual alibis were given—alibis in regard to inability to get international councils to meet, and about delays, and whatnot.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, was a witness there. I have a very high regard for him; and I thought that on that occasion he performed his duty very ably. The trouble was that his major thesis was wrong.

He was trying to defend a policy of the administration which, in my opinion, cannot be defended in the interests of the economy of the United States. Several times in his testimony he pointed out that we still sell to Europe more than we buy from Europe. That is the State Department line. But, of course, as I pointed out at the hearing, De Gaulle and other European leaders are trying to change that just as quickly as they can. So apparently the State Department thinks we should wait—with no action—until De Gaulle and the Common Market countries pick off our industries, one by one.

Furthermore, little attention or note was given by the State Department spokesmen who were at the meeting in regard to the balance-of-payments situation or in regard to the billions of dollars which we have poured into Europe to rehabilitate Europe and to put Europe industrially in a better position than she has ever before been in during all her history—including, for example, the building of the greatest, most efficient steel mills in the world, for the most efficient steel mills in the world are no longer in the United States. Instead, we have built them in Europe—for the most part with U.S. taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. President, I voted for most of that aid, and I would do so again, for, as I have previously said, we have a moral obligation to rebuild a war-torn Europe which was bled white in the defense of the United States, as well as in the defense of Europe. It also was in our national interest to grant this great amount of aid; and since World War II we have granted to Europe aid in the amount of more than $41,500 million.

But, Mr. President, those who participate in an alliance have mutual obligations; and I say most frankly and respectfully that too many of our allies have forgotten their mutual obligations to the United States.

There is no question about what De Gaulle is up to. Let me say to the Secretary of State that I have not been impressed by the pronouncements which have come from the State Department since the visit of the Secretary of State with De Gaulle. I wish to point now, as was pointed out at the meeting with the Finance Committee which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] conducted, that I agree with those agricultural leaders, who made this matter very clear to this administration; and they also made it very clear to the Eisenhower administration, and they got from the Eisenhower administration the same treatment that they are getting from the Kennedy administration. I agree, as I said, with those agricultural leaders that this administration has a clear duty to take the necessary steps to put a check on the State Department and its negotiators in respect to what those negotiators have been doing in these international trade conferences, in respect to selling short American agriculture.

I say on the floor of the Senate tonight, as I said at that meeting called by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], "Farmers of America, make clear to this administration that you do not intend to permit this administration to continue the liquidation of American agriculture in respects to its rights in relation to foreign trade. Make clear to this administration at the ballot box, for it is the only language that any administration ever understands in the last analysis."

At that meeting I tried to make that point clear to the Secretary of Agriculture. I told him I did not buy his argument that we ought to continue to countenance this discrimination against American agriculture merely because at the present time we sell more to Europe than we buy. That will not last very long.

As a result of the comments that I made at the meeting there apparently appeared in what is called a State Department Congressional Record Summary some quotations from my comments to that farm group and to the Senate Finance Committee. The quotations printed in the State Department Congressional Record Summary moved Mr. William R. Rivkin, U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg, to write me a letter, which was certainly his privilege to do. I always welcome people in our foreign services expressing their points of view to those of us who serve the people in the Senate. I shall read that letter and my reply:

American Embassy,
Luxembourg, Luxembourg,
March 18, 1963.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Morse: I recently noted with interest a quotation in the State Department Congressional Record Summary in which you expressed grave concern that the State Department would not protect the interests of American poultry producers in the continuing negotiations with the European Economic Community.

I for one know that we have vigorously and continuously sought to defend and protect American interests in direct approaches to members of the Commission; the Minister of Agriculture of Luxembourg; the Prime Minister of Luxembourg; the Chairman and officers of the Centrale Paysanne (Farmers Association of Luxembourg); Ambassadors from Western Europe assigned to Luxembourg; private agricultural interests in Luxembourg; mayors of Luxembourg cities and whomever we thought might in any way have a voice in a resolution of this problem or who was in any manner involved therein.

These approaches have been made in a manner that could leave no uncertainty in the minds of the listener as to American concern, not only in the agricultural community but in the White House, the Department of State and the Congress. So blunt in fact has been our approach from time to time that what might be considered the niceties of diplomacy have been eschewed. They know full well that we regard elimination of discrimination against our poultry as the very test of their good faith and as a most meaningful harbinger of attitudes which will determine the course of our forthcoming TEA negotiations.

I know from my own experience here that Ambassador Tuthill in Brussels as well as other American Ambassadors serving in Western Europe have similarly pressed our case.

I should like to know therefore what it is that you think that the State Department or those of us who are serving here as Ambassadors can do that we have not done and are not doing.

Respectfully yours,

William R. Rivkin,
Ambassador.

I replied, and I sent a copy of my letter of reply to the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, and to the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Ball. My letter reads as follows:

April 11, 1963.

Hon. William R. Rivkin,
Ambassador to Luxembourg,
American Embassy,
Luxembourg, Luxembourg.

Dear Mr. Ambassador: The statements of mine relative to the inadequacy of State Department efforts to protect American producers in trade negotiations are based on one thing—my 19 years of experience with the Department in such matters.

It has been my sad but consistent experience that the State Department operates on the theory that the United States is so big and so rich that we can absorb whatever trade inequity another country imposes on us without effective complaint or retaliation. Too much the same attitude has prevailed in connection with the foreign aid program. The net result has been the very bad balance-of-payments situation that is draining our economic strength.

I know very well that whenever this problem is raised in connection with one given trade problem, the answer always comes back that because our overall trade balance is favorable, we need not worry about the loss of our poultry market, or our fruit market in Europe or any other trade problem a Member of Congress seeks to raise. We are told that this country can stand it because we have an advantage in other products.

That argument is no longer acceptable to me. Our total international economic situation is not good, and it must be improved wherever and whenever it can, in whatever area possible. If our trade balance is still favorable, it must be made more favorable.

Take the market for Oregon fruit in France, a subject on which I have a good deal of background. Late last fall, France imposed a discriminatory quota on U.S. fruit, allowing imports from Switzerland and other European countries to continue to come in.

The fall session of GATT found the French action a violation of GATT and authorized the United States to take retaliatory action against French imports. We have not yet been able to prevail upon the State Department to take that action. We have received a lot of soothing syrup about the continuation of negotiations, but the Christmas fruit market is long gone and our growers have already suffered. This inaction will only encourage France and other nations to do the same thing later, since they apparently can feel safe from American retaliation no matter what they do to us.

Very much the same result occurred with respect to imports of lumber from Canada. With the help of the Canadian Government, Canadian producers of softwood lumber have greatly improved their competitive situation in the United States. The Canadian share of the U.S. market for this lumber has risen from 8.2 percent 10 years ago to 15 percent today.

Again, the State Department did little but defend the Canadian action, on the ground that we continue to have an advantage in Canadian trade in other products. American producers and their employees have had to suffer the consequences of what I consider a raid upon the American lumber market carried out with the assistance of the Canadian Government. As a result of all these excuses offered for foreign governments, our balance-of-payments deficit is just about as bad as when this administration took office.

I can almost hear you saying that these matters must be considered within the context of our overall policy and overall relations with each nation. That is what we always hear from State Department people. We are beginning to get the same line in connection with foreign aid.

I have listened to all of that I am going to listen to. I am no longer interested in anything but results, and I am satisfied that the only way the United States can get results in either the trade program or foreign aid is for Congress to act.

I should like to digress from the letter long enough to say that at the meeting with the farmers and the Finance Committee, that is exactly what I said, but in much greater detail. I said to those farmers, "You have them up here sitting in front of you, these political representatives of yours. Make clear to them what it is you expect from them by way of service in protecting the economy of our country. If you do not get it from them, then take care of them in the only way that they can be taken care of in a democracy when they do not protect the public interest."

I say to Members of Congress and to this administration that that issue is drawing itself clearer and clearer week by week and month by month as we approach 1964.

I happen to believe, Mr. President, that on both sides of this aisle and on both sides of the aisle in the House of Representatives in the elections of 1964 there will be an accounting in respect to the record which Members of Congress make relative to what they do to protect the economic interests of the people of this country in this whole matter of the relations of economic problems to foreign policy.

Let me say to the people in the State Department who have never faced a ballot box, who have never held an elective office, who have no responsibility to the voters as do elected officials, that the time has come for this Congress, in this session, to see to it that the checks are put on them as the checks have never been put upon them for years in this country.

As one member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I repeat my notice to this administration that I propose to do exactly that to the extent of my ability in the consideration of every foreign policy economic question that comes before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate in this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the letter:

We have left too much of both programs to the discretion of the President and the State Department. I am not telling you, Mr. Ambassador, or the Department, in what ways and by what methods you should exercise your discretion because that is supposed to be your job, not mine. If you have to ask what to do, then you obviously are unqualified for your post. I have simply concluded that your discretionary powers and those of your colleagues should be severely curbed, and that statutory protection for American producers and taxpayers must be written more fully into law.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

April 11, 1963.

Hon. William R. Rivkin,
Ambassador to Luxembourg,
American Embassy,
Luxembourg, Luxembourg.

Dear Mr. Ambassador: The statements of mine relative to the inadequacy of State Department efforts to protect American producers in trade negotiations are based on one thing—my 19 years of experience with the Department in such matters.

It has been my sad but consistent experience that the State Department operates on the theory that the United States is so big and so rich that we can absorb whatever trade inequity another country imposes on us without effective complaint or retaliation. Too much the same attitude has prevailed in connection with the foreign aid program. The net result has been the very bad balance-of-payments situation that is draining our economic strength.

I know very well that whenever this problem is raised in connection with one given trade problem, the answer always comes back that because our overall trade balance is favorable, we need not worry about the loss of our poultry market, or our fruit maket in Europe or any other trade problem a Member of Congress seeks to raise. We are told that this country can stand it because we have an advantage in other products.

That argument is no longer acceptable to me. Our total international economic situation is not good, and it must be improved wherever and whenever it can, in whatever area possible. If our trade balance is still favorable, it must be made more favorable.

Take the market for Oregon fruit in France, a subject on which I have a good deal of background. Late last fall, France imposed a discriminatory quota on U.S. fruit, allowing imports from Switzerland and other European countries to continue to come in.

The fall session of GATT found the French action a violation of GATT and authorized the United States to take retaliatory action against French imports. We have not yet been able to prevail upon the State Department to take that action. We have received a lot of soothing sirup about the continuation of negotiations, but the Christmas fruit market is long gone and our growers have already suffered. This inaction will only encourage France and other nations to do the same thing later, since they apparently can feel safe from American retaliation no matter what they do to us.

Very much the same result occurred with respect to imports of lumber from Canada. With the help of the Canadian Government, Canadian producers of softwood lumber have greatly improved their competitive situation in the United States. The Canadian share of the U.S. market for this lumber has risen from 8.2 percent 10 years ago to 15 percent today.

Again, the State Department did little but defend the Canadian action, on the ground that we continue to have an advantage in Canadian trade in other products. American producers and their employees have had to suffer the consequences of what I consider a raid upon the American lumber market carried out with the assistance of the Canadian Government. As a result of all these excuses offered for foreign governments, our balance-of-payments deficit is just about as bad as when this administration took office.

I can almost hear you saying that these matters must be considered within the context of our overall policy and overall relations with each nation. That is what we always hear from State Department people. We are beginning to get the same line in connection with foreign aid.

I have listened to all of that I am going to listen to. I am no longer interested in anything but results, and I am satisfied that the only way the United States can get results in either the trade program or foreign aid is for Congress to act. We have left too much of both programs to the discretion of the President and the State Department. I am not telling you, Mr. Ambassador, or the Department, in what ways and by what methods you should exercise your discretion because that is supposed to be your job, not mine. If you have to ask what to do, then you obviously are unqualified for your post. I have simply concluded that your discretionary powers and those of your colleagues should be severely curbed, and that statutory protection for American producers and taxpayers must be written more fully into law.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. I am not happy, Mr. President, to have to serve this notice on my administration, nor am I happy to find it necessary to write that letter to an Ambassador, but I wish to make it very clear to our Ambassadors that, by and large, in this field I do not think they are doing a good job. I wish to say to the representatives of the United States, acting through the State Department, at these international economic conferences, "I think that your record is a very poor record in protecting the vital economic lifeline of this country."

The strongest defense weapon of this country is our economy. I do not propose to sit silent in the Senate or in the Committee on Foreign Relations and not do everything I can to stop what I think is a very bad record being made by the State Department in this whole matter of protecting the best economic interests of the United States in respect to these matters of international negotiations in the field of our foreign trade interests.

TONGUE POINT NAVAL BASE, ASTORIA, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. I turn now, Mr. President, to another very serious matter. I do it in a spirit and out of a motivation of wanting to help my administration. The best way I can help my administration tonight is to warn it that its failure to act on the basis of the evidence which the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation have submitted to it over and over again in respect to putting the Tongue Point Naval Base at Astoria, Oreg., to work in connection with a Federal program is developing into what may very well prove to be in the months ahead a serious scandal which will embarrass the Kennedy administration.

The record of the part which the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation have played over the months on the Tongue Point issue is a record which must go into the RECORD tonight. I have gone through the voluminous files in my office dealing with the Tongue Point Naval installation in Astoria, and I have selected from that file the pertinent and important documents a reading of which will leave no room for doubt in the mind of anyone who seeks to be objective that this administration cannot justify under any circumstances the junking of the Tongue Point Naval Base.

Mr. President, this is no temporary installation. This is one of the finest permanent installations, consisting of permanent facilities, that one can find not now in use by the Federal Government anywhere in the United States.

Before I get through putting this record into the RECORD, I will leave no room for doubt that what I have just said has been verified by high administration officials themselves.

Yet, Mr. President, Tongue Point Naval Base has been declared surplus, and the General Services Administration impresses the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation as speeding ahead with full steam to get rid of it as quickly as it can, thinking by getting rid of it it will have solved the problem. I warn the General Services Administration tonight, "If you get rid of it before we have had an opportunity for a thorough consideration and full airing of this problem, then your problems have only started with regard to the Tongue Point Naval Base."

Mr. President, this case is at the White House, and the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation, through the senior Senator from Oregon, have had assurances from the White House that Tongue Point Naval Base will not be junked until there has been further full consideration of its use as a Federal project by the Federal Government. There are many projects which could be located there, and we have outlined them to the President in great detail, as well as to his assistants.

Yet we understand that today, this afternoon, an official of the General Services Administration held a meeting in Oregon with some prospective and anxious possible purchasers of Tongue Point, who hope to get it for a pittance. There was an exchange of wires between the General Services Administration and the senior Senator from Oregon this afternoon, which I shall shortly put into the RECORD.

Let the record be perfectly clear that the senior Senator from Oregon represents the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation in respect to this matter, for this has been a project I have been working on in behalf of those members now for many months. I repeat tonight, as I did in the wires this afternoon, that I serve notice on the General Services Administration not to dispose of this property until there has been ample opportunity given to various agencies of the Government, at the White House request, to consider certain programs which we are recommending and proposing might be located at Tongue Point.

What this administration needs is some imagination in regard to the use of Tongue Point.

I hold in my hand a brochure on Tongue Point. I only regret that the pictures cannot be put in the RECORD, but the pictures will be available to any Member of the Senate who is interested in this controversy, because the controversy is not going to end with the speech of the Senator from Oregon tonight.

Here are permanent buildings, as permanent, well built, and architecturally desirable as some of the finest public buildings of the Federal Government in Washington, D.C.

Not only that, Mr. President; here is a project on which permanent homes, expensive homes, valuable homes, accommodating more than 500 family units, have been built, a large residential area built on a beautiful bluff overlooking the Pacific Ocean.

Admirals know how to take care of themselves in supplying themselves with living conditions when they have the opportunity, as they did when Tongue Point was built. The Democratic members of the Oregon delegation just simply say to this administration, "You are not going to junk them without a fight, and a serious fight." For, Mr. President, to junk this base would be such a waste of the taxpayers' money that I have the right to say to this administration, "Justify for me, will you, a single dollar that you are asking to be spent on a single new installation for the armed services until you first make an economical use of Tongue Point." And I do not propose to vote for any new installations for the Military Establishment in respect to any instance where I am satisfied the installation cannot be justified as long as Tongue Point remains unused.

I say this calls for some imagination. As will be seen in a part of this RECORD, I notified the President, many months ago, that I had come to the conclusion that one of the reasons why the Military Establishment, or any branch thereof, does not want to use Tongue Point for any of the new expansion programs of the Military Establishment is that it is not located near nightclubs and various extracurricular activity resorts, dives that may be enjoyable to Federal personnel, but a consideration of which has no place in the determination of whether or not Tongue Point shall be used for a Federal program.

The sad thing is, Mr. President, that we happen to know that underneath the objections of some of the branches of the Military Establishment to the use of Tongue Point has been their pointing out that it is not a place where some of these extracurricular activities can be indulged in, as they can be at Puget Sound, or San Francisco Bay, or San Pedro Bay.

I have made clear to the White House that that objection had better be rejected; that the Military Establishment ought to be told, in no uncertain terms, "It is rejected."

I had a dispute with one of the Navy admirals, as did my colleague from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], about a year ago—and that material will be put into the RECORD later—with respect to the Geodetic Survey expansion program; and all the alibis one could possibly imagine that an admiral would use for not wanting to use Tongue Point will be found in the communication which I shall put in the RECORD. My colleague from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and I answered it point by point, and we made it very clear to the President what our answer was, and we made it very clear to the Secretary of Commerce what our answer was.

A short time ago we received an answer from the Secretary of Commerce, which I shall read and put into the RECORD, apologizing to us, admitting we were right and the admiral was wrong, but telling us that in the meantime contracts had been entered into and they could not get out of them and the Geodetic Survey expansion program had to be placed elsewhere.

Tell it to the taxpayers of my State. I also say to the occupant of the White House, "Tell it to the taxpayers of my State." Unless this matter is settled equitably and fairly, he is going to have an opportunity to tell it to the taxpayers of my State, because in 1964 they are going to know what his answer is, if there is a failure to do justice to the taxpayers of my State and the Nation in respect to such installations as Tongue Point.

The senior Senator from Oregon has fought for the economic use of facilities elsewhere in the United States, too. Over the years I have taken the same position in regard to installations elsewhere in the country, as well as in my own State. This installation being in my own State, I have to plead a special knowledge of the facts.

I say to the General Services Administration that a proposal I understand they have under consideration, to sell this property to a few private businessmen, in the neighborhood of about $1 million, would be a scandalous return to the taxpayers of this country for this property, in which the taxpayers have more than $14 million invested. In addition, the value of the property has gone up since the United States built the houses and the installation.

I will put the figures on Tongue Point in the RECORD in a moment. Tongue Point is an installation of more than 800 acres. There is one area on the installation that contains a huge stone quarry. I am told by competent roadbuilders that the stone there is unmatched for many, many miles around. I am advised that the stone in that area, alone, is worth at least one and a half million dollars.

Mr. President, do you think the senior Senator from Oregon and the other Democratic members of the Oregon delegation are going to sit here in the Congress and permit our administration to be "taken" by the General Services Administration with that kind of shocking scandal?

There is no other answer to this matter than for the White House itself to take a hand in it, as it has already started to do, and make clear to the Government departments that this fine installation is not going to be junked, but it is going to be put to work for the taxpayers of this country, and it is going to earn a return that will justify the original investment by the taxpayers, where it can repay itself over and over again into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, the naval base was closed by the Navy December 1959. I asked for the facts. I became perfectly satisfied, and said so to the people of my State; and it was not good politics to do so. I have always demonstrated that I will follow where the facts lead. In taking the stand I took I was subjected to considerable criticism at the time. However, I went into the Navy's case for the closing of the Tongue Point base for the use to which the Navy was then putting it. I became satisfied that the Navy was right. Tongue Point Naval Base was obsolete to the use that the Navy had been putting it to, because that use was no longer needed by the Navy.

I have never asked and will never ask for the keeping in operation of a Federal installation which has become obsolete as far as its then present use is concerned.

I do not propose to sit here and knowingly vote to waste the taxpayers' money. I said at the time I was satisfied that this base, along with 70 others, which the Federal Government closed at that time, was a sound program as far as those installations about which I knew the facts were concerned.

I learned the facts about Tongue Point. I decided the Navy was right. I proceeded immediately then to say to my Government, "However, you cannot junk this fine installation. We must find another Federal use for it."

Mr. President, I do not care for any noise from the press gallery when I am making a speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The press gallery will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. I proceeded then to work, along with my Democratic colleagues in the Oregon delegation, in trying to find some other Federal use for this project. I worked with my State government to see if there was another use to which it could be put for State purposes, such as a community college, or some use in connection with some other need in the educational system, or for a possible vocational training center.

I have worked on this matter month after month. If we look at the statistics of the project it will be seen that it is a project that cannot justifiably be junked. It is 871.9 acres of land. It cost the Federal Government to acquire and build the facilities, $13,944,721.46.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the statement made by the Department of the Navy at the time that they issued the first notice that they were going to close Tongue Point as far as the then naval use was concerned.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBMITTED BY: DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, CHIEF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS, DISPOSAL REPORT NO. 81

Station designation: Columbia River group, Pacific Reserve Fleet, Tongue Point, Astoria, Oreg.

Former use: Headquarters, Pacific Reserve Fleet.

Area, 871.29 acres; land, $18,400.46; acquisition cost improvements, $13,926,321; total, $13,944,721.46.

Consideration: none (to be reported to GSA as excess).

1. The Department of the Navy proposes to report to the General Services Administration 871.29 acres of excess land, together with improvements located thereon, located approximately 5 miles east of the city of Astoria, Oreg., at Tongue Point. This property is excess to the current and future needs of the Navy and it is proposed that it be reported to the General Services Administration for disposal without restriction, except for the reservation for access and utility lines to serve the proposed joint Army Reserve Center and Naval Reserve Electronics Facility and the U.S. Coast Guard.

2. This property was originally acquired for the establishment of the Naval Air Station, Tongue Point. Since the disestablishment of the Air Station, the property has been utilized by the Columbia River Group, Pacific Reserve Fleet, which is scheduled for disestablishment on January 31, 1962. However, the property will continue to be required, on a diminishing basis, until June 30, 1962, the presently scheduled completion date for the shipment of personal property from the facility, which will be accomplished by the Naval Supply Depot, Seattle.

3. The property has been screened with the Departments of the Army and the Air Force and no defense requirement has materialized.

4. The property was acquired by the Government at a cost of $18,400.46 as follows: 729.84 acres by various deeds from Clatsop County, Oreg.; 141.45 acres by five condemnation actions.

The improvements consist of approximately 320 buildings and structures, of which about 120 are housing or barracks type buildings. Others include the station hospital, recreational and service facilities, four flammable storage buildings, ammunition storage and 108 high-explosive magazines, 19 covered storage (general warehouse), 3 hangar-type buildings (general warehouse and administration offices), marine fueling and other industrial-type facilities. In addition, the property contains a radio transmitter antenna, 10 piers comprising a total of 349,730 square feet of space, 3,620 lineal feet of railroad trackage, roads, streets, sidewalks, paved parking areas, street lighting, fire alarms, TV antennae and distribution system, and propane, steam, water, electric, and compressed air distribution systems, and storm and sanitary sewers including sewage treatment facilities. These improvements, including precut structural timbers, intended for use in the repair of pier No. 8, have a plant account value of $13,926,321. There are no runways at this activity as it was originally constructed as a seaplane base.

5. The plans of the Navy Department do not include the acquisition of any land or improvements for similar use at or near the

station excess property within the foreseeable future.

6. The estimated annual protection and maintenance costs of the property is $204,400.

7. This submission is in accordance with the provisions of section 511, Public Law 86-500.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point certain letters taken from my files on Tongue Point, in their chronological order. They show clearly the history of this case up to March 17, 1963.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 21, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM B. FRANKE,
Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Mr. Charles DeFoe, manager of the Astoria Chamber of Commerce, Astoria, Oreg., has written to me, as follows, with respect to the Tongue Point installation:

"Firstly, Tongue Point is still losing personnel each week, and reports have it they will suffer a major cut after their new budget becomes effective July 1. Naturally with the type of operations at the base, they are having a rough time competing for an adequate budget; and in all likelihood will continue to experience budget cuts continually hereafter, which practically speaking is all very logical.

"However, as you well know, Tongue Point is a fine base, has some excellent facilities, with most of the buildings and all the postwar housing rated as Class A. There must be some additional activity for which the base is suited, especially something that could fit in with the current operations of the station.

"Another Navy inspection team was here last week and my sources at the base tell me they were making further inquiry as to the stations suitability for a missile personnel training school. Maybe you can learn something about this.

"Since the original 371 acres of Tongue Point was given the Navy by the citizens of Clatsop County, and since it is the only naval station in Oregon and since its activity is so vital to our economy maybe you could make a case of it when reviewing Navy budgets and other Navy proposals. It's too darn good of a station to let dry up and blow away."

Apparently, the above quoted comments were prompted by the forthcoming reduction in force of 30 civilian employees as announced in Commander Barackman's letter addressed to me under date of May 11 (Refer OLA:ADC:EER:atp).

I agree with Mr. DeFoe's observation that the Tongue Point installation might very well be put to good use for other important functions carried out by the Department of the Navy. I assume that the matter of making more complete and full use of the Tongue Point installation is now under study by the Department. Any information you may be able to supply in that respect will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in reply to your letter of May 21, 1960, in which you inquired concerning the Navy's plans for utilization of Naval Station, Tongue Point, Astoria, Oreg.

You will recall that the naval station was disestablished on December 31, 1959, and its facilities were transferred to the Commander, Columbia River Group, Pacific Reserve Fleet. I know that you are aware that the Columbia River Group does not constitute a base loading of suitable size to utilize fully our fine facilities at Tongue Point. Further, you are aware of the fact that our entire Reserve Fleet is dwindling as more and more stockpiled ships become obsolete. For these reasons I can well appreciate your concern about the future of Tongue Point.

The Navy shares your concern and is endeavoring to find means of utilizing Naval Station, Tongue Point more fully. In early May of this year a team of planning officers visited the area for the purpose of becoming fully acquainted with the extent and condition of facilities there so that they could more intelligently determine what possible future use might be made of the station. The observations of the team were encouraging, but their studies have not as yet been completed and a decision relative to their findings has not been reached.

As soon as a decision has been made, you will be informed. Meanwhile, I trust that the foregoing information will be sufficient for your immediate needs.

Sincerely yours,

F. A. BANTZ,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

ASTORIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Astoria, Oreg., June 29, 1960.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I sincerely appreciate the interest you have taken relative to certain Federal projects in the Astoria area.

Your help in bringing to the attention of the National Park Service the need for an immediate park superintendent at Fort Clatsop was most helpful. Last week Mr. Charles T. Peterson arrived at Fort Clatsop, and has taken necessary steps for hosting the visitors at the fort. I am sure this is only the beginning of a great development at Fort Clatsop, something that will be beneficial to all of Oregon.

I have been informed (unofficially), by local naval personnel, that the prospects for the missile personnel training school at Tongue Point are very good. From what I have been able to learn, the present station offers most everything the Navy is seeking, and that a definite decision will be made soon. Any further help you can give us on this will be most appreciated. The continued loss of personnel at Tongue Point is of great concern to all of us in the Lower Columbia area.

The contractor has begun work on the Columbia River bar jetty, which is so important to the water commerce of this area, and I wish to extend our thanks to you for helping to secure the appropriations for this vital project.

All of us in Astoria appreciate your continued interest and support on these important matters.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES DEFOE,
Manager.

JULY 7, 1960.

Mr. CHARLES DEFOE,
Manager, Astoria Chamber of Commerce, Astoria, Oreg.

DEAR MR. DEFOE: Thank you very much for your letter of June 29. I appreciate your very helpful comments concerning local developments on a number of problems of interest to the city of Astoria and the Astoria Chamber of Commerce.

I was particularly interested to learn that the Department of the Navy is giving serious consideration to the use of the Tongue Point facilities for the missile personnel training school. It seems to me that the use of this facility for training school purposes would be most wise. I am informing the Navy Department of my concurrence on this point.

As soon as I have any further news of importance, I shall get in touch with you again.

In the meantime, I send kindest regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Secretary of the Navy has asked me to acknowledge your inquiry of July 7, 1960, concerning the possibility of the Navy making use of the facilities at Tongue Point, Oreg., for a missile personnel training school.

This matter is receiving prompt attention and you may expect a reply shortly.

Sincerely yours,

B. A. ROBISON,
Commander, U.S. Navy Congressional Liaison Division.

JULY 7, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM B. FRANKE,
Secretary of the Navy,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is my understanding that the Department of the Navy is giving consideration to the possibility of making use of the facilities at Tongue Point, Oreg., for a missile personnel training school.

It is my sincere hope that the Department will be able to make use of the existing facilities at this installation for training school purposes or for the many other governmental purposes to which the Tongue Point facility might be devoted.

Should the Department of the Navy decide to expand its operations at Tongue Point, I know that you can count upon the wholehearted concurrence of local and civic business leaders as well as the entire Oregon delegation.

As soon as a decision has been reached concerning the possibility of using Tongue Point for a missile personnel training school, I would appreciate information in that respect.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in reply to your letter of July 7, 1960. wherein you requested knowledge of any decision regarding utilization of the facilities at Tongue Point for a missile personnel training school.

I regret to inform you that very recently it was decided not to locate the West Coast Missile Training School at Tongue Point. Reasons for this decision were threefold. First, it was found that costs to convert the hangars to classrooms and laboratory use would be excessive as compared with other possible locations. Secondly, since most of the students for the school will be entering from the San Diego area, transportation costs and time consumed in transporting students to Tongue Point would be excessive. Finally, it was determined that locating this school at Tongue Point would allow for no possible expansion in future years without providing expensive new construction.

You will recall from my letter of June 16, 1960, that we are attempting to find means of utilizing facilities at Tongue Point more fully than at the present time. You may be assured that these studies will continue.

Sincerely yours,

F. A. Bantz,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

July 28, 1960.

Mr. Charles DeFoe,
Manager, Astoria Chamber of Commerce, Astoria, Oreg.

Dear Mr. DeFoe: From the attached copy of a letter dated July 28, 1960, from the Department of the Navy, it would appear that the Navy Department has decided against locating the West Coast Missile School at Tongue Point. While I cannot concur in the decision of the Department in this instance, you can understand I am sure that in such matters at this time the decision of the Department is necessarily controlling.

I was pleased to learn, however, from the final paragraph of Under Secretary Bantz' letter that the Navy is still interested in utilizing the Tongue Point facilities more fully than at present. Let us hope that the study being carried on will result in concrete proposals.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

Wayne Morse.

U.S. Senate,
December 13, 1960.

Mr. W. J. Troudt,
Chairman, Columbia River Marine Industries and Affiliates, Portland, Oreg.

Dear Mr. Troudt: Your recent letter concerning developments at the Tongue Point Naval Station, Astoria, was placed on my desk in Washington, D.C., for my personal attention. Today, upon a stopover from New York, where I am serving as a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, I read the comments you and the cosigners of your letter supplied.

I share your apprehensions over the conditions outlined in your letter. My interest in the maritime economy of the Columbia and Willamette River areas has been deep and continuing. Earlier this year, in recognition of the problem of the gradual withdrawal of Navy Department activities at Tongue Point, I communicated with Navy Secretary Franke, expressing concern over the Tongue Point situation, and urged that he study the possibility of initiating other naval activities at this station. Under Secretary Bantz replied under date of June 16, 1960 and July 28, 1960. Copies of these replies are enclosed. Needless to say, I was disappointed to learn that the Navy decided against locating the West Coast Missile Training School at Tongue Point.

Today I discussed this matter further with top Navy Department officials. They advised me that the prospects for more complete utilization of the Tongue Point installation do not appear any better at the present time than they were when Under Secretary Bantz wrote to me in July. They indicated that their studies would continue because they, too, desire to have maximum rather than partial use of any facility under the jurisdiction of the Department.

At this point, it occurs to me that it might be well to supply a few examples of the Columbia River projects for which I have worked over the years in the interest of our Columbia River maritime industries.

You are probably aware that back in 1948 I led the Oregon delegation in Congress in a hard-fought battle to bring the National Defense reserve fleet ships, then under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission, to the Astoria area so that they could be berthed in Cathlamet Bay. We won that battle against tremendous competition from Puget Sound interests who came to Washington, D.C., to plead for the placing of these Reserve ships in Puget Sound. We deserved to win, because the merits were on our side. I presented the case on behalf of Astoria to Maritime Commission and Navy Department officials. My presentation prevailed, because I had received excellent briefings from the people in Oregon who were directly concerned with these projects.

In 1953 Oregon grain growers and grower associations informed me of the serious lack of storage facilities for the 1954 wheat and barley crops. They made the very wise suggestion that the layup Liberty ship fleet in Astoria be made available by the Government for grain storage. I took this up with the Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, and Maritime Administration along with other members of the Oregon delegation, and I had the pleasure of being advised on February 16, 1954, that the Department of Agriculture and other agencies had approved the use of 83 layup ships at Astoria for grain storage purposes.

Just 1 year after the ship grain storage was initiated, Washington State interests sought to have 75 ships of the Astoria reserve fleet taken to Puget Sound for further storage use in that area. Once again our Oregon delegation made strong representation on behalf of keeping the storage fleet in Astoria, and the case we presented on the merits convinced the Government officials. On March 11, 1955, the Department of Agriculture issued a release to the effect that the 75 Liberty ships would remain in Astoria.

In 1956 we were confronted with the possibility that reconditioning of the ships *Mariposa* and *Monterey*, involving a $28.8 million project would take place outside the Columbia River area. Recognizing the importance of this multimillion-dollar project for the State of Oregon, I spent many hours in conferences with various Government officials to convince them, as I was convinced, that the work on these ships should be done in our own drydock in Portland. Other members of the Oregon delegation did likewise, and the result was a victory for Oregon's maritime industries. This was another success we achieved, because we had excellent briefing from local interests.

I cite the foregoing to indicate that whenever there is the slightest possibility that Oregon is in a competitive position to receive Federal Government and military awards or installations, I intend to work to the best of my ability to assure that Oregon's case is considered thoroughly by the appropriate departments and that the case in favor of Oregon may be the strongest possible. In all these instances I serve, as I have often said, as legislative counsel on behalf of Oregon. But I depend upon the local interested parties to give me the facts so that I can present them effectively.

In discussing the Tongue Point situation with Navy officials today, I was told that the studies mentioned in Under Secretary Bantz' letter of July 28, 1960, relative to full use of the facilities at Tongue Point will continue. As soon as the new administration takes over, I shall request further consideration of ways and means to better utilize this installation.

In a further effort to be of help, as soon as Congress convenes in January, I shall discuss with the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee the importance, from the standpoint of national defense, of placing not only defense facilities in Oregon, but the wisdom of expanding our present installations. I shall ask that this be considered particularly with respect to the provisions of the military construction authorization bill. In addition, I shall discuss with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and particularly with my good friend, Senator Paul Douglas, of that committee, the importance of considering Astoria in connection with our efforts to further assist the economies of areas that have been hit by unemployment and losses of business and industry. The facts you supplied concerning the disproportionate expenditures by the military in Oregon as compared to California and Washington reflect a condition that has existed for many years. In the past I have called this matter to the attention of the people at the Pentagon and have emphasized the importance of installing the maximum number of defense facilities in Oregon. After all, Oregon is at Russia's back door and would be a primary target in the event of a surprise attack from Russia. Our demands for more defense facilities were almost met, in part, about 4 years ago when the Woodburn-St. Paul Air Base, for which I worked for many months, was about to be approved, a change in our defense program with respect to the use of manned aircraft resulted in the Pentagon's abandonment of this airport project.

As I indicated above, I shall continue to work on these various projects through the administration and through the appropriate Senate committees. You and other businessmen engaged in Oregon's marine industries can help in this respect by supplying suggestions concerning specific installations that might logically be placed in our State. I shall follow through vigorously on those suggestions.

You may be sure of my continuing interest on this problem and of my willingness to be of help at all times. Would you kindly advise the cosigners of your letter concerning this reply?

With best wishes of the season.

Sincerely,

Wayne Morse.

Astoria Chamber of Commerce,
Astoria, Oreg., January 5, 1961.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: The Tongue Point Study Committee of the Astoria Chamber of Commerce has instructed me to call your attention to the following information and urge your immediate attention.

At the close of World War II, more than 450 Navy vessels were mothballed at Tongue Point. With the obsolescence of these vessels, and being considered no longer useful in combat, there has been a rapid decline in the number of Navy vessels based here. Today there are less than 96, with all indications that in a short time, these too will be scrapped or removed from Tongue Point. The Navy has indicated, in the reliable information that we have available to us, that as a reserve fleet base, Tongue Point has no further use.

The Navy is aware of the fact that Tongue Point houses and service buildings are far beyond the quality of temporary war type construction, and were built at a cost of more than $40 million, with a replacement cost today of twice that amount. This permanent, well-kept facility can accommodate handily, 3,000 military personnel and their families, plus 500 civilian employees.

We also wish to remind you that Oregon has long been ignored when it has come time to divide the defense dollars spent by the United States. Quoting from a recent article in the Oregonian by staff writer Erick Wentworth, California has 26 naval facilities, Washington has 8, while Oregon has only 1, this being Tongue Point at Astoria, and it being used only to a bare minimum.

The article further stated that Oregon was getting back only $2 from the Government for every $17 paid in Federal taxes, while California was receiving $34 for every $17, and that Oregon businessmen are finding it harder and harder to compete with California and Washington interests because of Oregon's lack of military facilities.

Therefore, we are calling on you, as an elected representative of the people in the State of Oregon to explore every possibility of the Navy or some other Armed Forces department to utilize the facility of Tongue Point to its maximum potential. Such possibilities which we might suggest are: training school for missiles, submarines, coast guard; a helicopter training base; research and development facility; submarine base; and the like.

A complete brochure is now being prepared, which will be mailed to you very soon. It will contain all of the statistics, data and information, including pictures, of Tongue Point. This information will help you in your efforts to promote this facility.

Sincerely yours,

FORREST VAUGHN,
Chairman, Tongue Point Study Committee, Astoria Chamber of Commerce.

FEBRUARY 20, 1961.

Hon. JOHN CONNALLY,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is my understanding that an installations task force of the Department of the Navy is now making a thorough study of the facilities at the Tongue Point Oregon Naval Station for the purpose of determining the best possible utilization of this installation.

My intense interest in Tongue Point goes back to my first term in the U.S. Senate when I led the fight on behalf of the Oregon congressional delegation to have Tongue Point designated as storage area for national defense reserve fleet ships. We were confronted with strong opposition from Puget Sound and California interests who contended that the reserve fleet ships should be placed in their respective States. We won that battle on the merits, because our facts in support of Tongue Point as the best location for the reserve fleet could not be refuted. In my opinion, an equally strong case can be made today in support of full utilization of the Tongue Point Naval Station for a military defense installation.

As you know, there are many fine, well-constructed buildings at Tongue Point which could be converted to various defense uses at minimum cost to the Government. In fact, if there is any project of the military establishment now under consideration which calls for the construction of a sizeable quantity of new buildings, it seems to me that it would be extremely wise, from the standpoint of economy in Government, to utilize the existing Tongue Point facilities in lieu of new construction.

I am greatly impressed by the very pursuasive facts presented by numerous Oregon individuals and groups, including the Tongue Point Study Committee of the Astoria Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of full utilization of Tongue Point. The facts that have been assembled in this case demonstrate very convincingly that Tongue Point would be ideally suited for use as a missile personnel training school, training schools for submarine or helicopter personnel, a Coast Guard installation, or a submarine base. It could also be put to excellent use as a general research and development facility.

Tongue Point is in the near vicinity of the city of Astoria, Oreg. Astoria is in a position to supply all of the requirements of a major defense installation. It has an ample supply of low-cost electric power, fine water supply and sewerage facilities, and excellent housing for personnel of a defense installation. The port of Astoria is one of the major deep water ports of the west coast and the harbor installations are available to handle a maximum volume of water traffic. Astoria has ample rail transportation facilities connecting with all of the major western railroads.

Recreation facilities in the immediate area of Astoria are among the finest in the entire United States. Water sports, deep sea fishing, fine beaches and mountain areas are practically at Astoria's door. Geographically and climatically, Astoria offers everything to be desired for a defense installation and for the personnel of such an installation.

In addition to Tongue Point's ideal location and its excellent facilities, there are other compelling reasons why serious consideration should be given to full utilization of the Tongue Point Naval Station. The entire State of Oregon, and the Astoria area in particular, have been hit hard economically in recent months. Astoria has a serious unemployment problem and if the fine skilled labor force of that city is to be retained, we must find ways and means to improve the employment situation. Since World War II we have had a large number of individuals skilled in ship repair and industrial operations as well as in management activities on hand in Astoria. This is a fine defense reserve which should be retained for defense emergency purposes.

Another point—one which I brought to the attention of President Kennedy recently, and the importance of which cannot be underestimated—is the fact that for many years, going back to the post-World War I period, Oregon has not had its fair share of defense and other Government installations. I make this plea on behalf of Astoria as well as the entire State of Oregon for serious consideration by the Department of the Navy of a greatly expanded program of defense installations for Oregon.

I make this plea for military and other Government installations for Oregon, not as a make-work program but on the basis that Oregon has been neglected in this respect for many years. As a matter of fact, we are militarily at the back door of the Soviet Union. In the event of a surprise attack on the part of the Communists we would be in the frontline of defense operations. Thus, we must have at the earliest possible date a maximum of defense installations in our State. The Tongue Point project is but one of many which should be considered for the State of Oregon.

I urge that this request be given thorough study on your part and would appreciate having your views at your earliest convenience.

With every good wish.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

ASTORIA, OREG., *February 9, 1962.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senator, The State of Oregon,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Clatsop County Tongue Point Corp., established in 1919 and equipped with stockholder's promissory notes as security, obtained $100,000 from four Clatsop County banks and purchased approximately 223 acres of land near Tongue Point in the name of Clatsop County. A $100,000 tax was levied on the people in 1920 to pay the several banks and retire the promissory notes. In January 1921, Clatsop County deeded said land to the United States of America in expectation of a permanent naval installation similar to that in Bremerton.

Finally, with the advent of World War II a lesser impermanent naval installation was authorized for Tongue Point. Even this modest installation was not ours until Clatsop County acquired and deeded to the United States of America a $58,000 bridge and access road in 1930, 133 acres in 1941–42, 290 acres in 1949 and 269 acres in 1950. I am enclosing transcripts from the deed records of Clatsop County to confirm our community effort to secure a permanent naval installation in our community and state.

Our economy has been disrupted through the years by numerous closures of United States of America installations. The several closures follow:

Installation	Maximum complement	Established	Closed
Port docks, naval station		1942	1945
Airport, naval air station		1942	1945
Fort Stevens	3,780	1862	1946
Naval hospital		1943	1946
Tongue Point, naval air station		1939	1946
Immigration Service office			1958
Tongue Point, assistant industrial manager			1958
Federal Bureau of Investigation		1950	1959
Fish and Wildlife market news service		1940	1960
Port security office	20	1942	1960
Coast project office			1961
Tongue Point Naval Reserve Fleet	3,449	1946	1961
Radar bomb scoring squadron	70	1960	1962

The Pillsbury Flour Mill Co. produced flour for export from 1920 through 1961 with employment up to 125. Federal financed competition in South America and the Philippines is responsible for this closure. Many in our community believe the many Federal dams on the Columbia River have adversely affected our fishing industry.

The people of Clatsop County would convert Tongue Point into an industrial park. Through aggressive action, we would attract an industry or industries with permanent payroll and taxes. A bill is now before the Congress which would return Tongue Point to Clatsop County free of charge.

We believe the Federal Government is morally obligated to return Tongue Point to Clatsop County without charge. Your assistance is asked to hunt for ways to make Tongue Point available to Clatsop County on the most favorable terms.

Sincerely,

GUY BOYINGTON,
County Judge, Clatsop County.
VERNE STRATTON,
Commissioner.
WALTER H. NELSON,
Commissioner.

FEBRUARY 28, 1962.

The Honorable GUY BOYINGTON,
County Judge.
The Honorable VERNE STRATTON,
Commissioner.
The Honorable WALTER H. NELSON,
Commissioner.
Clatsop County Court, Astoria, Oreg.

GENTLEMEN: This will acknowledge your recent letter in which you provided very helpful information concerning the history of the proceedings and actions, including the transfers of land to the United States, which led to the establishment of the Tongue Point Naval Base.

At the outset, I should point out that for many months I have cooperated to the greatest possible extent with local interests in Clatsop County, including businessmen, service organizations and interested citizens, as well as with State officials, in exploring every alternative for full utilization of the Tongue Point Naval Base by various Federal agencies. Some of the possibilities we have investigated include a Polaris submarine base, a substantial Coast Guard installation, a Coast and Geodetic Survey headquarters, an oceanographic research institute, a missile personnel training school, and a school for submarine or helicopter personnel. The Federal survey team which visited Astoria last year to explore the possibilities at Tongue Point came to Oregon at my request.

I shall do everything I can to assist Clatsop County in converting Tongue Point into an industrial park. As you know, I cooperated fully with State officials in connection with the Boardman Space Age Industrial Park, and it will be my pleasure to work closely with you in attracting private industry to Astoria.

With specific reference to the proposed conveyance of the Tongue Point Naval Base to Clatsop County, you are probably aware of the fact that under existing law, preferences are granted State agencies in the acquisition of surplus Federal real property. Transfers for public park or public recreational area purposes may be made at 50 percent of fair value; transfers of historical monuments may be made gratuitously; conveyances for public health or educational purposes may be made with up to 100 percent public benefit allowance as determined by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Federal lands may be conveyed without consideration for wildlife conservation.

Also, it is quite likely the Federal Government could negotiate a sale of the Tongue Point property at fair market value under the procedure outlined in 40 U.S.C. 484 (e) (3) (H).

The details concerning the transfers mentioned in the preceding paragraphs are set forth in the General Services Administration's pamphlet entitled, "Disposal of Surplus Real Property," a copy of which is enclosed for your information.

In all frankness, I should tell you that I could not support a proposed gratuitous transfer of the Tongue Point Naval Base. The land and buildings comprising the base legally belong to all of the people of the United States, including the people of Oregon. For many years, I have taken the position in the Senate that the property of the American people should not, in good conscience, be given away regardless of how meritorious the proposed transfer might be. This principle has come to be known in the Congress as the "Morse formula." My insistence upon the uniform application of the principle in every State of the Union, including Oregon, has saved the taxpayers of the United States millions of dollars. I can assure you that it has not been easy to apply this principle insofar as the proposed transferees and their congressional sponsors are concerned, but I am satisfied that the great majority of the Members of the Congress appreciate the fact that I have been willing to defend this principle in every case, without exception.

Under the Morse formula, where the Federal property is to be transferred for a nonpublic use, payment of 100 percent of fair appraised market value is required. Where the transfer is for a true public purpose such as a public park, a courthouse, a public library, or school, the Morse formula, in recognition of the local public benefits conferred, permits the transfer of 50 percent of fair appraised market value. A thorough examination of the precedents does not disclose any ground for a possible exception in this area.

In view of the fact that Clatsop County proposes to acquire Tongue Point for industrial park purposes, I would urge that serious consideration be given at this stage to proceeding under 40 U.S.C. 484(e) (3) (H) for an acquisition under a negotiated sale at fair market value. I shall do everything I can to assist in the working out of such a negotiated sale.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I should point out that proponents of a gratuitous transfer to Clatsop County have suggested that this might be a case calling for an application of the principle of the Roseburg Veterans Hospital case (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 7, p. 9324) inasmuch as substantial portions of the lands comprising the naval base were donated.

In the Roseburg Veterans Hospital case, I pointed out that the appropriate Federal agency had agreed that an unimproved portion of the donated land should be returned to the donor city inasmuch as it was no longer needed for the original hospital purposes for which the land was granted to the United States.

The facts of that case differ from the case now under consideration because Clatsop County seeks a gratuitous transfer of the entire base, not merely an undeveloped portion as in the Roseburg Veterans Hospital case, and no Government agency has found that there should be a gratuitous transfer of any portion of this base to Clatsop County.

My work on behalf of the Astoria area and my cooperation with you shall continue until we find some worthwhile maximum use for the Tongue Point Base.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

MARCH 22, 1961.

The Honorable ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the interest of the United States and the State of Oregon, I most respectfully urge your personal and thorough consideration of action directed toward restoration to maximum use of the excellent and strategically located facilities of the Tongue Point Naval Station, Astoria, Oreg.

Unquestionably, the interest of the United States would be served by placing this installation on a full-capacity operational basis. Located near the mouth of the Columbia River, it offers, for immediate Government use, a fine assortment of permanent buildings, including an administration building, warehouses, offices, a hospital, a heating plant, several shops, and almost 500 housing units. The installation also has eight well-constructed piers, a marginal wharf and three seaplant ramps. From the standpoint of economy in Government, the Tongue Point buildings and port installations which are ready for immediate use should be considered as an alternative to the construction of costly, new defense facilities in other parts of the Nation.

The Federal uses to which the Tongue Point Naval Station could be devoted are many. The President has pointed out the need for a speedup in an oceanography program. It would be difficult to select a better location in which to carry an oceanographic research. It could be utilized as a submarine training base, a missile training base, an Air Force training base, a Coast Guard installation, as well as for defense training and research programs.

All of the advantages of a major city are in the immediate vicinity. The city of Astoria, to which the Tongue Point Naval Base is adjacent, is in a position to supply all of the requirements of a major defense installation. It has an ample supply of low-cost electric power, fine water supply and sewage facilities, and excellent housing for personnel of a defense installation. The port of Astoria is one of the major deepwater ports of the west coast and the harbor installations are capable of handling a very substantial volume of water traffic. Astoria has an excellent airport and it has ample rail transportation facilities which connect with all of the major western railroads.

Recreation facilities in the immediate area of Astoria are among the finest in the entire United States. Water sports, deep sea fishing, fine beaches and mountain areas are practically at Astoria's door. Geographically and climatically, Astoria offers everything to be desired for a defense installation and for the personnel of such an installation.

From the standpoint of the State of Oregon, as well as the Nation, full utilization of the Tongue Point Naval Station is of tremendous importance.

A serious economic emergency confronts the State of Oregon. Our major industry is lumber and I am deeply concerned over the fact that lumber mills throughout the State have been shutting down or have been working on reduced schedules. The latest statistics made available to me from the Department of Labor show that unemployment in Oregon is at one of the highest levels in the Nation. In Oregon we need new defense installations instead of action by the Defense Department which will shut down one of the few installations of this type in the State. The city of Astoria, like other Oregon cities, has a serious unemployment problem and if the fine skilled labor force of that city is to be retained for immediate call in case of a defense emergency, we must find ways and means to improve the employment situation of the area. Since World War II there have resided in Astoria many individuals who are skilled in ship repair, industrial operations, and in management activities. This fine defense reserve should be on hand for emergency purposes.

Another point of vital importance is one which I have brought to the attention of President Kennedy, namely, that for many years, going back to the post-World War I period, Oregon has not received its fair share of defense and other Government installations. Recently I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a Senate joint memorial adopted by the 51st Legislative Assembly of Oregon, pointing out the indisputable fact that California has 20 U.S. naval installations, the State of Washington 8, and the State of Oregon only 1—which is now threatened by deactivation. The memorial also reminded us of the fact that in 1960 California had 23.7 percent of the total prime military contracts awarded by the Federal Government. Washington had 3.5 percent and Oregon only one-tenth of 1 percent of these contracts.

These figures point to either discrimination against the State of Oregon or disregard of the State in the locating of defense installations and the awarding of defense contracts. They warrant immediate action upon the part of the Department of Defense whereby an expanded program of defense installations and defense contracts may be channeled to Oregon.

I make this plea for military and other Government installations for Oregon, not as a makework program but on the basis that Oregon has been neglected in this respect for many years. As a matter of fact, we are militarily at the back door of the Soviet Union. In the event of a surprise attack on the part of the Communists we would be in the frontline of defense operations. Thus, we must have at the earliest possible date a maximum of defense installations in our State. The Tongue Point project is but one of many which should be considered for the State of Oregon.

Finally, in fairness to you I point out most respectfully, that if the Department of Defense should decide to deactivate the Tongue Point naval installation, I would be constrained to examine with care any military construction authorization requests for projects here at home for which the Tongue Point installation might be substituted.

I urge that this request be given thorough study on your part and would appreciate having your views at your earliest convenience.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1961.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As indicated in his special message on the defense budget, the President has directed the Secretary of Defense to inactivate, and dispose of, where feasible, bases and installations which are clearly surplus to the present and future needs of the Military Establishment. In accordance with this directive, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the military departments and other appropriate offices of the Defense Department, has determined that 52 installations, or components thereof, in the United States fit within the category described above, and steps are being taken to accomplish the various actions required in each case.

Although in many cases these actions will cause hardships to the communities and individuals involved, the actions cannot be deferred. Every practicable effort will be taken to alleviate these hardships.

The Department of the Navy installation affected in your congressional area of interest is set forth in the attached fact sheets for your information.

Sincerely,
ROBERT E. M. WARD,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Chief of Legislative Affairs.

FACT SHEET A

Fact sheet on: Columbia River group, Pacific Reserve Fleet at Astoria (Tongue Point), Oreg.

Brief of mission: Inactivation, preservation, maintenance and security of assigned ships of the Pacific Reserve Fleet.

Nature of action: Disestablishment of group and reduction of real estate to caretaker status.

Reasons for action: (a) All of the ships in the Navy Reserve Fleets on both coasts are of World War II vintage. Continuing reappraisals of these ships for naval potential has resulted in a progressive decrease in the total number in reserve. Those found unfit for or excess to modern naval requirements are disposed of. Reserve fleet ships have been dispersed by types among several groups (at present, 11). In order to realize the maximum economies from disposal it is necessary to periodically consolidate the surviving ships into fewer groups thereby reducing administrative overhead and other general costs of maintaining and servicing ships; (b) in fiscal year 1962 it becomes both feasible and economically prudent to disestablish one group from the Pacific Reserve Fleet. Of five groups on the Pacific coast (Bremerton, Columbia River, Mare Island, Stockton, and San Diego), the Columbia River group has been selected for disestablishment for the following reasons:

(1) Fewer tows from Columbia River than from any other group will be required to reberth ships and craft which will be retained. There are now 62 ships at Columbia River (largest being an LST) of which 32 have been authorized for disposal or foreign transfer; there are also 28 service craft (small harbor units including barges) of which several will be disposed of. It is estimated that a maximum of about 30 tows will be needed to reberth the ships and craft retained. The next smallest group at Stockton, Calif., has 58 ships (mostly destroyer escorts and destroyers) none of which are scheduled for disposal; it is estimated that at least 50 tows would be required to reberth this group of larger ships, all of which have long-term retention value. It is worth noting at this point that Stockton and Mare Island acquired a number of long-term retention ships when the San Francisco group was disestablished in fiscal year 1960.

(2) Maximum reduction of overhead costs can be realized by disestablishment of the Columbia River group. All other Pacific coast sites have existing basic shore establishment support organizations which must be maintained operational for other Navy requirements (e.g. Navy shipyards, supply depots, schools, operating bases, training commands, etc.). The shore establishment at Columbia River serves no other purpose than to support the Reserve fleet group. Estimated dollar savings to the Navy by disestablishing the Columbia River group and placing real estate in a caretaker status are: Fiscal year 1962, $550,000, and in fiscal year 1963 and each subsequent year, $1,435,000. In addition, about 550 military personnel can be made available for reassignment to other than Reserve fleet duty.

(3) Other remaining sites are adjacent or proximate to Navy industrial facilities (shipyards) for emergency activation. At these locations there are ready at hand the special technical "knowhow," craftsmen, shops, and so forth, necessary for immediate application to the work and problems of earliest possible emergency activation of Navy ships. In this connection, being World War II ships which have had no modernization, there is substantial and highly technical work involved in making them effective for modern warfare.

Action: The Columbia River group, Pacific Reserve Fleet will be disestablished about January 31, 1962. The real estate, buildings, and fixtures will be placed in a caretaker status. Reserve ships and craft now berthed at Columbia River group and which are planned for continued retention by the Navy will be towed out and reberthed primarily at Bremerton but with some being distributed to San Diego, Stockton, and Mare Island. The present (March 1) personnel strength at the site is 63 officers, 492 enlisted men and 239 civilians; this will be reduced to a custodial force of 1 officer and 21 civilian employees by January 31, 1962. Details of the personnel phase down are shown below under "personnel statistics." When placed in a custodial status, management of the real estate and facilities will be transferred to the Commandant 13th Naval District at Seattle from the Commander Pacific Reserve Fleet at San Francisco.

a. This facility has been utilized below potential for several years. The Department of the Navy has during this time sought without success to increase or find an alternate utilization through possible transfer to the site of other activities of the Navy. Such utilization by the Navy does not appear feasible. A continuing effort will be made in the Department of Defense to find a substitute tenant; through the General Services Administration other agencies of the Federal Government will also be solicited for possible utilization.

Vital statistics: Personnel statistics—(a) There are 256 civilian employees on board as of March 1, 1961; (b) estimated yearly salaries of these employees, $1,290,000; (c) predicted reduction in civilian positions, 235 (see subpar. (h) below for phasedown schedule); (d) number of positions to be transferred to other activities, none. The commander of the Columbia River group will provide maximum assistance to employees being separated in obtaining other employment through State and Federal agencies; (e) military personnel on board as of March 1, 1961: officers 65; enlisted 513 and total, 578; (f) estimated annual military salaries, $1,900,000; (g) predicted military personnel reductions, 577; (h) schedule of anticipated personnel phasedown.

Personnel strength as of 1st day of month indicated

	March 1961	July 1961	October 1961	November 1961	January 1962	February et seq. 1962
Officers	65	44	40	6	3	1
Enlisted	513	315	200	7	7	0
Civilian	256	230	179	147	72	21

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INSTALLATION

a. The Columbia River group of the Pacific Reserve Fleet is located at Tongue Point, Oreg., about 4 miles north of Astoria.

b. Land area in acres and acquisition cost: 920 acres, $618,882 (Government owned).

c. Total value of plant account: land, $618,882; buildings, $14,675,000, and equipment, $1,579,000.

d. Predominant type of building construction: permanent, 152; semipermanent, 107; temporary, 10.

FINANCIAL OPERATIONS

a. Maintenance and operating costs of Columbia River group:

Fiscal year	Amount	Estimated savings over fiscal year 1961 costs
1959	$1,924,000	
1960	1,875,000	
1961	1,685,000	
1962	1,135,000	$550,000
1963	250,000	1,435,000

(b) Estimated costs of disestablishing the Columbia River group are included in the maintenance and operating expense for the group in fiscal year 1962. These expenses include: Redistribution of material for utilization elsewhere; closing up buildings as vacated and placing them in a secure condition for caretaker status; towing of ships and craft to new berthing area; and disposal of excess and obsolete property (including ships most of which have already been prepared).

(c) Effect on other areas: There will be no increase in costs or military personnel at other reserve fleet sites on the Pacific coast by virtue of this disestablishment. Ships from Columbia River group will be berthed in under utilized facilities at other sites which space is a product of previous and continuing disposal of excess and obsolete ships.

OPERATIONS

(a) Approximate numbers of reserve ships and craft berthed at Columbia River group: End fiscal year 1959, 180; end fiscal year 1960, 150; March 1, 1961, 90 (of which 33 are in process of disposal or foreign transfer). The foregoing illustrates the declining utilization of the Columbia River group.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT TO DISCONTINUE OR REDUCE OPERATIONS AT 73 LOCATIONS

Plans to discontinue or modify operations at 73 installations and activities in the United States and in foreign countries, as indicated in President Kennedy's special message on the Defense budget, were announced today by the Department of Defense.

Those installations and activities which are located in the continental United States were specifically identified by the Department. Those located outside the continental United States were not listed at this time pending notification of the governments of the countries concerned.

These plans result from a continuing study of Department of Defense installations initiated by the Secretary of Defense on instructions from the President. In his state of the Union message on January 30, the President announced that he had directed the Secretary of Defense to appraise the opportunities of eliminating obsolete bases and report his preliminary conclusions by the end of February.

There are approximately 6,700 separately identifiable defense installations and activities of all types, 2,230 of which are outside the continental United States. Each must be specifically evaluated against military requirements for peacetime and mobilization purposes. This is being done systematically and will be continued.

As the first step, 73 domestic and foreign installations and activities have been identified which are excess to Department of Defense needs and can be discontinued or reduced in scope in order to produce future significant savings. The costs of closing these installations will more than offset anticipated savings in fiscal year 1962, but savings of over $220 million in annual operating expense will be realized in future years.

Of the domestic installations, 36 will be declared excess and made available for use by other Federal agencies, or disposal by sale. Industrial plants which might be needed to support a mobilization effort would be sold under contracts containing a recapture clause.

Reasons for these actions include:

1. Changes in missions, weapons systems and force levels have reduced the need for some facilities such as air bases and training stations;
2. Certain industrial installations are no longer required as part of the Government-owned production base;
3. Some overhaul and repair facilities are operating at less than economical capacity;
4. Reductions in inventory achieved through improved property disposal and utilization programs have resulted in freeing several million square feet of storage space at major supply installations in the Continental United States;
5. Workloads at some facilities can be redistributed to other more modern and efficient installations and save personnel and overhead costs.

Major actions will be phased to minimize the impact on the employees and communities concerned to allow adequate time to work with employees in planning their relocation and reemployment and with community leaders on community readjustments. Special procedures are being developed at the direction of Secretary McNamara to assure that all possible steps are taken to minimize the impact on employees and communities. This will involve cooperation with Federal, State and local agencies and groups concerned.

The location of the installations to be reduced or discontinued in the continental United States, and the action to be taken is attached.

LIST OF DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS TO BE REDUCED OR DISCONTINUED IN THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alabama—Ordnance Depot Activity (Army) located at Redstone Arsenal: Phase-out this reserve storage depot in the near future and transfer facility to Missile Command at Redstone.

California—Alameda Administration Center (Army), Alameda, Calif. Declare unneeded portions excess during next 2 years, and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. Three warehouses to be transferred to Navy. Perishable shipment activity to remain. Benicia Arsenal (Army), Benicia, Calif. Inactivate, declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. To be phased out over 3-year period. Air Force Plant No. 10 (Northrup), Hawthorne, Calif. Declare excess in fiscal year 1962. Turn over to General Services Administration to negotiate sale to contractor. Star Com Minor Relay Station (Army), Los Angeles, Calif. Discontinue by fiscal year 1963. Transfer traffic for Los Angeles users to the major relay station at Davis, Calif. Elliott Annex to Naval Supply Center, San Diego, Calif. Inactivate, declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition in fiscal year 1962.

Nuclear Weapons Supply Annex (Navy), San Diego, Calif. Inactivate and declare unneeded portions excess in near future. Turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. Government facilities at Bethlehem Steel Corp. (Navy), San Francisco, Calif. Declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition in near future.

Delaware—Lenape Ordnance Modification Center (Army), Newark, Del. Declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition in fiscal year 1962.

Florida—Atlantic Reserve Fleet site located at Green Cove Springs, Fla. Inactivate, declare excess, and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. Transfer ships having continuing potential to other sites. Phase out during fiscal year 1962. Naval Industrial Shipyard, Tampa, Fla. Declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition in fiscal year 1963.

Illinois—Chicago Administration Center Buildings (Army), Chicago, Ill. Transfer to General Services Administration ownership and operation effective July 1, 1961.

Indiana—Air Force Plant No. 30 (General Motors), Indianapolis, Ind. Declare excess. To be phased out during next 3 years. Return to city, which owns the land.

Kansas—Naval Air Technical Training Unit, located at Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kans. Transfer to Glynco, Ga., to consolidate air control training. Buildings vacated remain as part of station.

Kentucky—Louisville Medical Depot, (Army), Louisville, Ky. Inactivate, declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. To be phased out over 1 to 2 years.

Louisiana—Headquarters, 8th Naval District and Naval Station, New Orleans, La. Disestablish during fiscal year 1962. Inactivate station, declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. Transfer headquarters and accounts office elsewhere. Other naval activities in New Orleans area are not affected.

Maine—Long Island (Maine) Storage Annex of the Naval Fuel Depot, Casco Bay, Maine. Reduce to partial maintenance status by July 1, 1962. Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine. Inactivate, declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. (Family housing units will be retained for use by personnel at Loring, Maine. Inactivation will be in fiscal year 1962.

Maryland—Inspection and test performed at U.S. Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis, Md. Reduce operation by relying on manufacturers to perform more inspections and tests. (The work represents about 10 percent of station.)

Massachusetts—Atlantic reserve fleet site located at Boston Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass. Inactivate and transfer ships with continuing potential to other sites during during fiscal year 1962. Facility remains as part of shipyard complex. Air Force Plant No. 69 (General Electric), Pittsfield, Mass. Declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. To be phased out during next 3 years. Air Force Plant No. 29 (General Electric), West Lynn, Mass. Declare excess during fiscal year 1962 and turn over to General Services Administration to negotiate sale to contractor.

Michigan—Grand Blanc Storage Facility No. 1 (Army), Grand Blanc, Mich. Declare as excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. Facility will be vacated during next 2 years.

Mississippi—Supply Operations on Construction Battalion Center (Navy), Gulfport, Miss. Complete planned curtailment of supply operations during fiscal year 1962.

Missouri—Area Support Center (Army), St. Louis, Mo. Transfer to General Services Administration ownership and operation, effective July 1, 1961.

St. Louis Ordnance Plant (Army), St. Louis, Mo. Declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. Two existing production lines will be moved to another Government-owned facility. This action will occur during the next 2 years.

New Jersey—Government facilities at New York Shipbuilding Corp. (Navy), Camden, N.J. Declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition in near future. Government facilities at Bethlehem Steel Corp. (Navy) at Hoboken, N.J. Proceed with negotiations to sell to contractor who has option to purchase. Raritan Arsenal (Army), Metuchen, N.J. Phase out over 3-year period. Declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition.

New Mexico—Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex. Negotiate arrangements with city to permit Air Force to remain as a tenant, with city to have full title and control of runways, taxiways, and northwest portion of the field.

New York—Air Force Plant No. 38 (Bell Aircraft Plant), Modeltown, N.Y. Declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. To be accomplished during next 3 years.

Air Force Plant No. 68 (Olin Mathieson), Modeltown, N.Y. Declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition during fiscal year 1962. U.S. Army Building, 39 Whitehall Street, New York. N.Y. Vacate, declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. To be vacated during next 12 months. Medical Maintenance Activity located at Schenectady General Depot (Army), Schenectady, N.Y. Phase out during next few months. Facility remains as part of depot complex.

Ohio—Cincinnati Ordnance District Storage Facility (Army), Kings Mills, Ohio. Declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition within the next few months. Rossford Ordnance Depot, (Army), Toledo, Ohio. Inactivate, declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. To be phased out over 3-year period.

Oregon—Pacific Reserve Fleet site, located at Tongue Point, Oreg. Inactivate, declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. Transfer ships having continuing potential to other sites. Phase out during fiscal year 1962.

Pennsylvania—Government (Navy) facilities at Erie Forge and Steel Corp., Erie, Pa. Sale to contractor. Storage Annex, Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa. Inactivate, declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition during fiscal year 1962. Air Force Plant No. 32 (AVCO), Williamsport, Pa. Declare excess in fiscal year 1962 and turn over to General Services Administration to negotiate sale to contractor.

Texas—Air Force Reserve Unit, located at Dallas Naval Air Station, Dallas, Tex. Transfer to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex., in fiscal year 1963. Facilities vacated will revert back to Navy. Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex. Inactivate, declare excess, and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. Present mission will be relocated during fiscal year 1962. South Field of Naval Auxiliary

Air Station, Kingsville, Tex. Inactivate and place field in standby status. Transfer Training Squadron Seven to Naval Air Station, Meridian, Miss., in near future.

Atlantic Reserve Fleet site located at Orange, Tex. Reduce maintenance operation by consolidating at this site Reserve ships with low mobilization priority and long-term potential. To be accomplished during fiscal year 1962. U.S. Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Port Isabel, Tex. Inactivate, declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition in near future. Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Tex. Inactivate, declare excess, and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. Transfer mission to Connally Air Force Base during fiscal year 1962.

Utah—Naval Supply Depot, Clearfield, Ogden, Utah. Disestablish supply mission and phase out stocks over next 4 years. Lease available space or declare excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition.

Vermont—Air Force Plant No. 55 (11,000-acre tract), Burlington, Vt. Declare 8,800 acres excess and turn over to General Services Administration for disposition. Army to use balance of property for Army National Guard. To be phased out over 3-year period.

Washington—Camp Hanford (Army), Richland, Wash. Phaseout over next 2 years and return property to Atomic Energy Commission. Mount Rainier Ordnance Depot (Army), Tacoma, Wash. Inactivate and phaseout over 3-year period. Property will be held in standby. U.S. Naval Degaussing Station, Bremerton, Wash. Reduce to partial maintenance status in the near future. Government (Navy) facilities at Isaacson Iron Works, Seattle, Wash. Sale to contractor at fair market value.

Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1961.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Morse: This is in further reply to your letter of March 22, 1961, which urged that a thorough study be made of possible Defense Department use of the naval installation at Tongue Point, Astoria, Oreg.

The unused capability of this installation has been the subject of several studies in the recent past, both in connection with decisions for housing new activities, and in consideration of potential advantages that might be derived from moving existing activities from present locations to Tongue Point. The scope of these considerations has not been limited to Navy but has encompassed Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps activities as well. A plan for effective, economical utilization of Tongue Point has not as yet evolved and to avoid possible misunderstanding, I must point out that the prospects for such utilization are not encouraging.

Conditions of unemployment in many areas of the country are deplored, however, it continues to be the responsibility of the Department of Defense to administer resources available to it in the most effective possible manner consistent with evolutions in weapons systems and changing military requirements for both intermediate and long-term periods. Within this management concept, it is inevitable that expenditures to modernize and expand essential installations will be required whereas excess installations will be disposed of.

Tongue Point is well recognized as a potential asset and you may be assured in the event its effective utilization within a balanced Defense program becomes evident that decisions to implement such action will be expedited. It is regretted that circumstances preclude a more optimistic forecast for Tongue Point at this time.

Sincerely yours,

Edward J. Sheridan.

April 5, 1961.

Hon. Dan A. Thiel,
Oregon State Senate,
Salem, Oreg.

Dear Senator Thiel: Thank you very much for your letter of March 31 concerning the Tongue Point naval installation. It was with deep concern that I received the news of the closure of this and other defense installations in many parts of the country.

As you probably know, I do not understand the meaning of the word "quit," and I shall continue to do everything possible to convince the administration that the excellent Tongue Point facilities should be put to work for some usable Government function.

I agree with you completely that the Tongue Point base would make a fine site for an oceanography research laboratory. As you may recall, I have mentioned this in discussing Tongue Point on a number of occasions and I shall continue to remind the new administration that it would be difficult to find a better site for an oceanography research center than at Tongue Point.

I appreciated hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Wayne Morse.

State of Oregon,
Oregon State Senate,
Salem, March 31, 1961.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: With the advent of the proposed closing of the Tongue Point Pacific Reserve Fleet at Astoria, Oreg., as a general curtailment order from the Defense Department phasing out this type of defense installation throughout the United States, I respectfully urge your full support to consider this site as an exceptional and ideal plant to establish a research laboratory for the study of the secrets of the ocean. "Our own survival may hinge upon it" quoting President Kennedy in his request before Congress on Wednesday, March 29.

This site, as you are well aware, affords ideal quarters for an oceanography educational center and could well become the headquarters for the entire Northwest of the United States as well as the States of Alaska and Hawaii.

I need not qualify the appointments this base presently possesses such as permanent buildings, hangars, living quarters, hospital, recreation buildings, laundry, workshops, et cetera, including central heating facilities.

Its location near the Pacific Ocean, deep-water features, and thousands of feet of ship piers, with air, rail, and ideal highway connections, affords an ideal natural location. With the proper utilization, this unit could well encompass the State of Oregon's high educational field of fisheries as the seafoods study in the ocean has yet much to be analyzed and researched for its nutrition benefits for a growing country.

I was delighted with the President's request for funds from Congress for such a program and ask your full cooperation in this endeavor. The defense of our country must and will be dependent more and more upon knowledge and research analysis in this vast area, encompassing the field of science.

Very truly yours,

Dan A. Thiel.

April 6, 1961.

Mr. Norris E. Johnson,
Manager, Astoria Chamber of Commerce,
Astoria, Oreg.

Dear Mr. Johnson: This will acknowledge, with thanks, your letter of March 20 concerning the Tongue Point naval installation.

I was deeply concerned, as I know you were, to receive the news that the Department of Defense will close down the Tongue Point installation as well as many other defense installations throughout the Nation.

In cases of this type I do not know the meaning of the word "quit," and you may be sure that I shall continue to do everything I can do to convince the administration that some usable Federal installation should be placed at Tongue Point. I was greatly impressed by the brochure prepared by the Astoria Chamber of Commerce relative to Tongue Point and I feel that such excellent facilities as these should not be allowed to remain idle for any appreciable length of time. Recently the new administration announced a rather extensive oceanography research program. It seems to me that the Tongue Point station would be ideally suited as a research center for oceanography and I have so advised the administration.

I shall look forward to receiving your new brochure on the maritime base and I do hope that from time to time you will let me have your suggestions as to actions I can take back here to be of help on these and any other matters of interest to your chamber.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

Wayne Morse.

Astoria Chamber of Commerce,
Astoria, Oreg., March 20, 1961.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Good Morning Senator Morse: I wish to take this opportunity to personally express the sincere thanks and appreciation for all of the people of Astoria and Oregon for the work you have done on behalf of Tongue Point. We are indeed grateful.

Incidentally, I replaced Mr. Charles DeFoe as manager of the Asoria Chamber of Commerce only recently. Mr. DeFoe is now in Wyoming with that State's retail association. I came to Astoria from McMinnville where I was manager of their chamber for the past 2½ years. Prior to my coming to this great State I was in Montana and originally from Minnesota. Senator Mansfield and Senator Humphrey are both acquaintances of mine and I have had the pleasure of working with them on projects in their two States.

The Oregon press has picked up your action on behalf of Tongue Point and have released numerous stories and editorials. As our brochure has pointed out, and as you personally know, Tongue Point is an outstanding facility. Further, Oregon has not had much consideration when it has been time to dole out the defense dollars, as has Washington and California.

I want to call your attention to a sister facility at Tongue Point, namely the Maritime Reserve Fleet Base at Astoria. Presently there are approximately 250 vessels moored here of which 40 are of the priority Victory ships and the balance the Liberty ships that are being rapidly scrapped. It is obvious to us that this big multimillion dollar installation will soon be abandoned in favor of other areas because the Liberty ships are going out, but no other priority ships come in to take their place. Rather these top priority ships are being moored in salt water basins elsewhere, such as at Olympia, where they are rusting and corroding rapidly. We have observed ships that have been moored here for more than 7 years that are in top condition due to our fresh water moorage basin. This compares with the corroding of barnacles and marine growth, plus deep pitting that takes place in salt water basins. In response to our inquiry as to why we do not get ships is that the maritime people want the ships "close to a Navy yard" for greater savings in dollars and in time to put them in operation in time of need. Nonsense. What about the facilities we have for that purpose right here in the Columbia River at Portland? They can handle the job handily.

We plan on preparing a factually and pictorial brochure on the maritime base as we have done on Tongue Point, if we can receive official release and permission to get pictures made and data compiled. Of course, you will receive such material.

Thank you again very much, for your efforts. We have just begun the fight. We will stop only after Tongue Point and Oregon receives its just share. I know this is your intentions too.

With kindest regards.

NORRIS E. JOHNSON,
Manager, Astoria Chamber of Commerce.

JULY 6, 1961.

Mr. GLENN JACKSON,
Medford, Oreg.

DEAR GLENN: The other day, after your long distance telephone call to Bill Berg, I wrote to the Secretary of the Navy suggesting that the Navy continue the maintenance of Tongue Point after the closure and that the replacement pier timbers be retained on site.

Assistant Secretary BeLieu replied under date of June 29, and I enclose a copy of his letter for your information. Although the Navy will not have actual custody, I was very much encouraged to observe that a security force will remain at Tongue Point until a purchaser has been found or, I might add, until we find a new and beneficial Federal use for the installation.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1961.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of June 20, 1961, relative to safeguarding Tongue Point, Oreg., plant account following its declaration as excess.

Regulations of the General Services Administration require that following a declaration of property as excess by a department or agency of the Government, the holding agency which in this case will be the Navy, continue responsible for the care, handling, protection, and maintenance of such property for 1 year following the excess declaration. Subsequently, the GSA would assume this responsibility.

You may be assured that the Navy will discharge these responsibilities adequately. In fact special steps are being taken with regard to the security force remaining at Tongue Point in view of its relatively isolated location, high value, and excellent state of repair. I sincerely hope that the 1-year period will be sufficient for the State of Oregon to find a purchaser of this fine property. If this proves not to be the case, it is suggested that the Administrator of GSA be alerted to your concern.

With regard to your excellent suggestion regarding disposition of the replacement pier timbers now stored on site, arrangements have been made for leaving them intact so that they may be used subsequently for the purpose intended.

Your interest and sound advice in these matters have been deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH E. BELIEU,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics).

JUNE 20, 1961.

Re Tongue Point Naval Base, Oreg.
Hon. JOHN BOWDEN CONNALLY, Jr.
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Last Saturday I had a long-distance telephone conversation with an Oregon businessman who expressed his deep concern over the maintenance of the Tongue Point Naval Base after the Department of the Navy withdraws from this installation. The businessman raised two points which I shall discuss in the order of their importance in the paragraphs that follow.

First, he urged in the strongest possible terms that the base be manned by an adequate custodial force after the closure. It was his opinion, and I think there is a great deal of merit in his view, that as soon as signs are placed on the premises indicating that the property has been transferred to the General Services Administration for disposal, vandalism immediately sets in. Apparently, a for sale sign is an invitation to vandals to break windows, steal fixtures, and to do other actions substantially deteriorating the property. The businessman urged that the Department of the Navy retain the property in its possession for a sufficient length of time to give Oregon businessmen and industrialists an opportunity to notify potential purchasers so that there may be a prompt purchase of the base as soon as it is turned over to the General Services Administration for disposal as property in excess of the needs of the Government.

If an arrangement could be made to have the Navy Department maintain the property after the present use of the facility terminates, I believe that such maintenance would be in the best interest of the Government because the depreciation of the property would be negligible. At your convenience I would appreciate receiving a report on this suggestion for transmittal to Oregonians who brought the matter to my attention.

The second point that was raised in my conference with the Oregon businessman relates to the material that is now stored at the Tongue Point Naval Base to be used for reconstruction of one of the piers upon which a railroad track is situated. Apparently the timber on the pier had reached the stage at which it would have to be replaced. The timber was cut to size, shipped to the base, and was piled awaiting the reconstruction work. The reconstruction was stopped as soon as it was learned that the base was to be deactivated. It was suggested to me that in the long run the Government would benefit if the timber were left at Tongue Point to be used on the reconstruction of the pier when the installation is sold. In any event, it would seem that timber cut to special dimensions would have somewhat limited use elsewhere and the cost of shipping it back to the Bremerton Navy Yard would be substantial.

At your convenience, I would also like to have your views relative to the suggestion that was made for retention of this timber at its present location.

With appreciation.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

JULY 21, 1961.

Book wire to:

Editor, Astorian Budget, Astoria, Oreg.

Editor, Columbia Press, Astoria, Oreg.

Hon. Harry M. Steinbeck, mayor of Astoria, Astoria, Oreg.

Mr. Lloyd Classen, Route 3, Box 321, Astoria, Oreg

Mr. Norris E. Johnson, manager, Astoria Chamber of Commerce, Astoria, Oreg.

The Honorable Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon, Salem, Oreg.

Editor, Portland Reporter, 1710 Northwest Overton, Portland, Oreg.

Associated Press, Portland, Oreg.

United Press International, Portland, Oreg.

News editor, radio station KAST, Astoria, Oreg.

News editor, KVAS, Astoria, Oreg.

JULY 21, 1961.

On July 11 I informed you of a visit to Astoria tentatively scheduled by team of Federal Government officials for August 31 to explore potential Federal, State, local government or educational institute uses of Tongue Point Naval Base and to assist local community in attracting new industry.

Since then I have been in close touch with Defense Department economic adviser and have urged earliest possible date for team visit.

Pleased to advise date of team's arrival has been scheduled definitely for July 31 and you may make your plans accordingly.

Also pleased to learn that Defense Secretary McNamara has urged Commerce Secretary Hodges to give sympathetic consideration to proposals to designate Highway No. 30 from Portland to Astoria as part of Interstate Highway System. If favorable action should be taken on this proposal, it would not only strengthen community attractiveness for tourist and travel purposes but would also strengthen community attractiveness for commercial and industrial enterprises.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in offering these letters, I wish to say that these are but a very few of the letters that could be taken from my files, and similar letters from the files of other Democratic members of the Oregon delegation. However, I thought tonight I would put these letters in the RECORD because they will give to the General Services Administration and to the White House a very clear record as to what the delegation has been doing in trying to get the administration to recognize, before it is too late, that a junking of Tongue Point would amount to an unjustified and unconscionable economic waste on the part of the administration, with respect to which it would rightly and justifiably be held to an accounting if it engaged in such a waste.

Mr. President, we seem to be getting nowhere fast with regard to our attempt to save Tongue Point for Federal use. As a result, on March 17, 1962, with the approval of my delegation, I wrote a letter to the President of the United States, which I shall read:

MARCH 17, 1962.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When I talked to you the other day, I mentioned that I was deeply concerned over a recent development having a direct relationship to the State of Oregon, and I suggested that you discuss this matter with your assistant, Mr. Dungan, whom I had briefed on the subject earlier in the afternoon.

The problem to which I allude—the decision of the Coast and Geodetic Survey against the use of the Tongue Point Naval Base at Astoria for expansion of its oceanographic activities—is so serious that I regard it as deserving of your personal consideration.

The shocking aspect of the situation is this: The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, for good and sufficient reasons, must seek additional facilities for its oceanographic base which is now located at Seattle. But for reasons I regard as wholly unsatisfactory, this agency is bypassing the Government installation at Tongue Point Naval Base, Astoria, Oreg., which would be ideally suited for use as an oceanographic base and which is ready for immediate occupancy. Rather than use an existing facility consisting of permanent buildings and pier facilities adjacent to deepwater navigation, the Coast and Geodetic Survey proposes to build, at the taxpayers' expense, new facilities at Seattle, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Actions such as those proposed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey under the circumstances of this case defy rational explanation to the taxpayers of the United States. The people of Oregon are at a loss to understand why a permanent installation such as Tongue Point should stand idle while the Federal Government spends hundreds of thousands of dollars to build new facilities to serve purposes which could be carried on with high efficiency at Tongue Point.

There is enclosed for your consideration an excellent brochure on the Tongue Point Naval Station prepared for my use by the Astoria Chamber of Commerce. It presents in impressive fashion the full story of what is available at Tongue Point. The photographs, descriptive materials, maps and charts in this brochure will, I am sure, convince you, as it did me, that the Federal Government should make the maximum use of Tongue Point by agencies of the Federal Government.

In a letter I addressed to Admiral Karo today, a copy of which is enclosed, I indicated that this matter is being brought to your attention for thorough consideration. In the interest of economy and efficiency in Government, I most respectfully urge that the action of the Coast and Geodetic Survey be reviewed by a member of your personal staff; that proceedings for the issuance of invitations for bids for the construction of new facilities at the Geodetic Survey ship base be held in abeyance pending review of the proposed expansion, and that if necessary, interested local individuals and groups, including those at Astoria, be requested to present their views, either in writing or in person.

As I have indicated on a number of occasions, for 8 years during the Eisenhower administration, Oregon was discriminated against in the allotment of Federal contracts and Federal installations.

The issue of discrimination against Oregon in preference to Washington and California when it comes to the expenditure of Federal dollars on a per capita basis or on the basis of any other criterion such as the number of military installations, regional offices of Federal agencies and other Federal projects has stirred up the people of Oregon into a very serious and critical state of mind. The Oregon delegation is simply without any basis in fact in trying to justify a failure on the part of the Federal Government to make use of the multimillion-dollar Tongue Point installation.

Frankly, Mr. President, what is needed is instructions from the White House to the appropriate officials in your administration to proceed without further delay to make use of Tongue Point with any such agency as the Geodetic Survey expansion program or any other agency that is seeking money for new installations of this type. Such expenditures simply cannot be justified so long as this very fine installation at Tongue Point remains unused.

Although I regret that it is necessary to ask you to take time from your extremely busy schedule to consider domestic problems of this type, I believe that the waste in Government operations which is proposed in this instance makes the case of sufficient importance to warrant your personal consideration. I am sure your review of this case would constitute a step in the right direction toward correcting this longstanding discrimination against Oregon.

With appreciation and my best personal regards.

Respectfully,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. President, under date of March 17, 1962, I addressed a letter to Admiral Karo, a copy of which, as I noted in reading the previous letter, was sent to the President.

My colleague from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] also wrote a letter to Admiral Karo, protesting the decision which he had made against the use of Tongue Point and his setting forth, in the letter which he wrote to us, what he considered to be a chain of non sequiturs.

In my letter of March 17, 1962, to Admiral Karo, I wrote:

Dear Admiral Karo: This will acknowledge your letter of March 15, in which you commented with respect to the proposed expansion of the oceanographic base facilities and establishment of an oceanographic center in Seattle, Wash. I appreciated your courtesy in also supplying detailed information as to ship base requirements for which bids will be invited, in cooperation with the General Services Administration, for long-term leasing of oceanographic base facilities.

Mr. President, the General Services Administration has been involved in this matter in several respects. It has been involved in the leasing arrangements connected with the location of the oceanography program of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in Seattle. I do not believe its record bespeaks any justification for great compliments. I have a little suspicion that one of the reasons why the General Services Administration has been pressing so hard for such a fast disposal of Tongue Point is that it would like to get the subject behind it.

General Services Administration also has obligations to the taxpayers. It cannot justify the wasteful disposal of any piece of Federal property. I am one "watchdog" who does not intend to let General Services Administration get by with such action at Tongue Point, to the extent that I can do anything to prevent it.

I return to my letter to Admiral Karo:

Your report of March 15 has been studied very carefully. It is completely unsatisfactory in its attempt to explain why the Coast and Geodetic Survey is against the use of the very fine and immediately available facility at Tongue Point Naval Base. Frankly, the factors you listed against the Tongue Point Naval Base are so unconvincing that I shall make only the following brief comments:

The bar at the mouth of the Columbia River has been navigable for well over a century and has been used by vessels of many types, both large and small, during that period. In recent years, the mouth of the Columbia River has been deepened and the navigability improved under a major Corps of Engineers project, for which I have vigorously sought, and succeeded in obtaining, maximum appropriations. In view of the major works that have been completed at the mouth of the Columbia, I am not convinced, and I know the people of Astoria and Oregon will not be convinced, by your statement to the effect that the crossing of the bar can be hazardous and may result in expensive delays to survey operations.

Your second point, namely, that the oceanographic facility would require only very small portions of the Tongue Point Naval Base is beside the point. No one is contending that the entire base should be utilized completely at the outset by any one Federal Government agency. We have long contemplated the possibility that several Government agencies could make use of this excellent and permanent facility on an efficient and economical basis.

The third point you mentioned against the use of the Tongue Point Naval Base has little merit. The cost of moving personnel from Seattle to Astoria would be comparatively minor, especially when we recall that Government personnel are almost daily being transferred by Government agencies, at Government expense, across the length and breadth of the United States. Technically trained career employees who are dedicated to their work will follow the Government installations wherever it may be relocated and if they do not desire to transfer, I am satisfied there are others of equal competence who can take their places.

Your fourth point alludes to the fact that Seattle provides a good labor market for the recruitment of vessel employees. So does Astoria, and so do the other port areas on the Columbia River. You state that medical facilities furnished by the Government for vessel employees and their dependents are not available at Tongue Point. If these facilities are not presently available at Tongue Point, it is attributable to the fact that there are no patients to be served at this time. You are aware, I assume, that there is an excellent hospital building on the Tongue Point Base. This can be made ready on short notice to provide whatever medical facilities may be required for vessel employees.

The fifth point you raise against Tongue Point hardly deserves comment. If Tongue Point should be utilized as an oceanographic center, I have no doubt that Astoria or public bodies can supply public transportation and other personal conveniences. Above all, your fifth point loses sight of the fact that Federal Government installations are designed to foster the interest of the Government. The convenience of the Government and the interests of the Government are the primary considerations.

The Federal Government survey team which visited Astoria last year at my request had an opportunity to observe not only the Tongue Point installation but also the Astoria community. I am sure they found excellent housing for personnel at Tongue Point and that Astoria offers every type of facility and accommodation that can be desired by personnel stationed at Tongue Point. Astoria has an abundance of fine schools, excellent highways, deepwater navigation, railroad and truck transportation facilities, airline and bus transportation. A very healthy climate and nearby mountain and seashore areas contribute to the pleasure of living in this remarkably fine area of the Pacific coast.

It seems to me to be unthinkable that the Coast and Geodetic Survey should decide to expand its facilities in Seattle at the expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money when a multimillion dollar permanent Government installation on deep water can be utilized at very little cost to the Federal Government for oceanographic facilities and an oceanographic ship base. It is my opinion that there is a very strong presumption in favor of the use of this nearby existing facility and against the expenditure of huge sums of Federal money to create a new facility in the same general coastal area.

In fairness to you, I should point out that I intend to take this matter to higher authority at the White House level with the request that your decision to expand the facilities and ship base at Seattle be thoroughly reviewed. I am fully convinced that the course of action I am following is in the interest of good government and economy for the taxpayers of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne Morse.

Unfortunately, Admiral Karo, with the assistance of General Services Administration, went full speed ahead and as rapidly as possible, as will be seen in a moment when I read another interesting document, and negotiated some contracts for the location of their expanded program at Seattle. In my judgment, they were guilty of an affront to the White House and to the Department of Commerce, because I had given Admiral Karo notice that this subject would be taken up at the White House level.

As I have made clear to the President on other occasions, what are needed in the Pentagon are some orders from the White House on such matters as this, for apparently there are in the Pentagon Building too many persons who think they can give the White House a runaround; and as we look at the record in this case, I am afraid that is what they have been succeeding in doing. But that is not the fault of the President, because in most instances he is not aware that they are following that course of action.

But, Mr. President, the White House has notice of it in this case; and in this case the time has come for those in the Pentagon to get some orders from the White House, and the time has also come for some Cabinet officers in charge of some other agencies and departments to take a look at the kind of waste of money the General Services Administration apparently contemplates by going forward with an attempted negotiated sale of this base at far, far below its value, and thereby, in my judgment, "laying an egg" of scandal for this administration, to be hatched in the heat of the 1964 campaign.

As a Democrat and as a loyal supporter of the President, I can do no more tonight than warn him that this one cannot be "swept under the rug." A State is aroused. My State is entitled to justice from the White House, as regards the use of Tongue Point; and I do not propose to let the people of my State down on this issue, even though it brings me into conflict with my administration, for my administration will be dead wrong if it does not put Tongue Point to Federal use.

My administration will be guilty of an unconscionable, shocking waste of the taxpayers' money if it junks Tongue Point for a price anywhere near $1 million.

Let me say to the business interests in Astoria, Oreg., for some of them will not be happy with my words tonight, inasmuch as a group of them would like to get Tongue Point for a million dollars, or thereabouts—that, of course, if Tongue Point is going to be junked, if the President tells me he is going to approve a junking of Tongue Point for a million dollars, if that is the decision from on high, then I will do the best I can to see to it that the business interests of my State get every opportunity to "get in" on Tongue Point. But I will do that with a sad heart, Mr. President, for that is not good for the economy of my State. I know the various proposals being made for so-called industrial use of some of the facilities at Tongue Point; but let me say to the people of Astoria that the jobs which would be created from that kind of use of Tongue Point would be but a pittance of economic return to my State, compared to what the economic return to my State would be if Tongue Point were put to a fit and proper use. The difference between the two is the difference between pennies and dollars, Mr. President, for any one of the several potential Federal projects now under consideration at various levels of this administration, including the White House, would result in a tremendous economic lift to the Astoria area, which is one of the most economically depressed areas in all the West.

Mr. President, we are talking about an economic area in my State which has gone through the economic wringer since Tongue Point Naval Base was closed. Tongue Point Naval Base became the economic lifeline of the Astoria area. But since then, businesses have closed, and hundreds and hundreds of people have moved away.

I say to this administration, come with me to Astoria, and take a look at the economic hardships you have caused by closing the Tongue Point Naval Base. I have not taken the position that you were wrong in closing it, insofar as the use to which it was being put by the Navy was concerned. I did not take the position that under no circumstances should you close it. I never have, nor will I, take such a position under such a fact situation.

But, Mr. President, I say to this administration, from the very beginning I did say, "All right; it no longer is useful for the use to which the Navy has been putting it. The Navy no longer needs it for that purpose. But do not destroy this fine base. Put it to other Federal uses. Do not be adding to your budget requests millions of dollars for the construction of Federal facilities or services elsewhere, when many of those services could be moved to Tongue Point, and thus would put this base to economic use which would be to the advantage of both parties and would also be to the advantage of the economic position of the State of Oregon."

That has been my position, and it is my position of equity tonight. We are entitled to a fair deal from this administration. We are entitled to have this administration move forward in Astoria in keeping with its promises of a progressive program for the welfare of the American people.

The facts are on the side of the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation, and the justice is on the side of the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation and the people of Oregon. I do not believe, I refuse to believe, that once the President fully understands the symbolism of the Tongue Point case, he will not make clear to the officials of his administration that he wants no more "run around" such as we got from the Geodetic Survey, under the directorship of Admiral Karo, as regards putting to use, for a Federal purpose, the facility of Tongue Point.

Mr. President, I have received certain other letters which deal with this problem. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record, in chronological order.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The White House,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Just a hasty note to acknowledge the copy of your letter of January 31 on the Tongue Point facility.

At the meeting last week of congressional liaison representatives at the White House I discussed the urgency in my opinion of utilizing this fine establishment. Commerce is giving it a real hard look. I will advise you of developments.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,
Lawrence F. O'Brien,
Special Assistant to the President.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: In the absence of Secretary Hodges, who is out of the country, I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 31, 1963, concerning Tongue Point Naval Base, Oreg. In accordance with your request to have an independent review within the Commerce Department regarding Tongue Point facilities, I shall look into this entire matter and make a report as soon as possible. As soon as I have completed this study I shall be in further touch with you.

Mr. Ralph Dungan of the White House has called regarding this matter and I shall see that he is kept abreast of any developments.

Many thanks for your kind wishes.
Sincerely yours,
Eugene P. Foley.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me refer now to a letter dated January 31, 1963, which I addressed to the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges. Because of the lateness of the hour, I shall not take time to read this long letter. But, Mr. President, it is a letter in which I call the attention of the Secretary of Commerce to the record which the Geodetic Survey had been making in respect to Tongue Point; and the Geodetic Survey falls under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce. It is a letter in which I enclosed the correspondence that I had in behalf of the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation with Admiral Karo, the Director of the Geodetic Survey. It is a letter in which I presented to the Secretary of Commerce the merits of the position of the Oregon delegation and the procedure that we had been following with the administration in trying to get it to take the necessary action to prevent the great injustice that it continues to visit upon the Astoria community and the people of my State. I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 31, 1963.

Hon. Luther H. Hodges,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: It was most kind of you to take time out of your very busy schedule to consider my comments relative to the Tongue Point Naval Base, Oreg. The conference with you was particularly appreciated because the full utilization of the Tongue Point facility has become one of the major objectives of the entire Oregon congressional delegation and the leadership of the State government of Oregon.

Early last year, I was informed of plans that were then under consideration for the expansion of the Coast and Geodetic Survey at its oceanographic center in Seattle, Washington. The availability of Tongue Point for this purpose was made known to Admiral Karo, Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and under date of March 15, 1962, Admiral Karo wrote to me supplying an adverse report concerning the possible use of Tongue Point. A copy of Admiral Karo's letter is enclosed. In my reply to Admiral Karo I informed him that I completely disagreed with his reasoning. A copy of my reply letter of March 17, 1962, is attached. On the same date, I wrote to the President pointing out to him the importance of placing any expanded Coast and Geodetic Survey facilities at Tongue Point and alluded to the fact that it is extremely difficult to try to explain our failure to use the multimillion-dollar installation while expanding other facilities for which Tongue Point is ideally suited. A copy of my letter to the President is also enclosed.

According to the latest information I have received, the Coast and Geodetic Survey is giving consideration to other locations, such as San Francisco, for expansion of the Survey's program.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. Secretary, that the great bulk of the installations at Tongue Point are permanent in nature, are completely modern and are ready for immediate use. They will last for scores of years. The living quarters on the hill overlooking Tongue Point consist of permanent homes, not barracks housing. These homes have been kept up extremely well, have spacious lawns and are located on paved streets. They are ideal for family use. The business center of the city of Astoria, 5 or 6 miles distant, contains department stores, shopping centers, theaters, hotels and restaurants and the Astoria area is noted for its excellent recreational facilities. In addition, the chairman of the State Highway Commission of Oregon has assured me that if highway transportation between Portland and Astoria is regarded as a problem in this instance, the State of Oregon stands ready to supply $3.5 million immediately in highway improvements on the lower Columbia River highway. This would make the Portland-Astoria highway one of the finest superhighways in Oregon.

In view of the foregoing considerations and many others, the Tongue Point installation, which is both ideally situated and equipped, should be given serious consideration for expansion of the activities of the Survey.

Although it is not admitted openly by any of the top people in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, I feel that one of the reasons for their reluctance to make use of Tongue Point is the feeling that outside entertainment facilities in Astoria are not comparable to those in Seattle, San Francisco, or other large metropolitan areas. I commented on this last summer when I wrote to the President. In my memorandum to the President, I said:

"We recognize that Astoria, Oreg., does not provide Navy personnel or other Federal Government personnel with the variety of so-called extra curricular living enjoyments available at Puget Sound, San Francisco Bay, or the Los Angeles-San Pedro area. However, Astoria, Oreg., does provide fine living conditions for Government personnel, and our military personnel and other Government personnel should have it made very clear to them that Government services are going to be located not in accordance with the whims of Federal personnel but in accordance with a system of fair distribution of Government services among the States and in the best interests of the Federal Government. I am convinced, Mr. President, that if the Tongue Point Base were located in Puget Sound or the San Francisco Bay area or the Los Angeles-San Pedro area, the Defense Department would have climbed all over itself in its haste to find a use for it.

"In the long drawn out discussions with your staff advisers and various officials of the Pentagon Building and other Departments, we have suggested that Tongue Point be used in connection with expanding facilities for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Some weeks ago, we notified Mr. Larry O'Brien of the controversy we were having with Admiral Karo concerning his proposal to expand Coast and Geodetic facilities at Puget Sound. In behalf of the Oregon delegation, I answered point by point his lame excuses for preferring Puget Sound over Tongue Point. I said at the time and repeat now that what should have happened was that the White House should have ordered him to make use of Tongue Point, because I am satisfied that if you had been given the opportunity to review his rationalizations, you would have rejected them as did not only the Oregon delegation but one newspaper after another in Oregon which blasted your administration for Admiral Karo's silly performance in rejecting Tongue Point."

Frankly, Mr. Secretary, I am convinced that Admiral Karo and his associates are unable to consider this case with complete objectivity. I am strongly of the opinion that nothing would be gained in the interest of fair consideration of Tongue Point if Admiral Karo and his associates were given the assignment of reviewing the possible use of Tongue Point. Efficiency and economy in Government, I feel, require an independent review within the Department of Commerce. This is all I ask because I am satisfied that such an independent review would reveal that Tongue Point is a highly desirable facility for expanded activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Again, my appreciation and best personal regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include the information that we received from the Geodetic Survey setting forth the set of specifications that they would need for any facility that they were to move into. They are specifications which Tongue Point completely met and more than met, as the Secretary of Commerce subsequently admitted was true, but only after contracts had been entered into which the Secretary found were binding upon the Federal Government, and therefore made the move to Seattle necessary.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIP BASE REQUIREMENTS—SEATTLE

The Coast and Geodetic Survey will require a ship base and oceanographic laboratory in the fresh water area of Lake Union or Lake Washington, in the vicinity of Seattle, Wash., by June 1, 1963. The base must have facilities capable of berthing eight ships; a small boat basin of sufficient size to accomodate five launches; sufficient buildings space for use as warehouses, workshops, administrative offices, drafting offices, oceanographic laboratories (wet and dry) and a centralized utilities building for distribution of heat, water, and electricity throughout the base. A shed for small boat covered storage, an open storage area, parking areas and vehicular access and maneuvering areas are also required.

In order to assist the contractor in planning completion of the base the required availability of space for occupancy is listed as follows:

1. Warehouse space to be completed by June 1, 1963. If construction is not completed by the date specified, the contractor will provide temporary warehouse space at another location.

2. Wharfage, including the completed piping for steam, water, sewage disposal and electrical connections at all ship berths will be required by September 1, 1963. The water, electrical and sewage disposal connections to be ready for use by the specified date. (See note below.)

3. Office space to be completed by September 1, 1963.

4. Laboratories, shops and boat shed to be completed by September 1, 1963.

5. Final implementation of service utilities, including heat for buildings, to be completed by September 30, 1963.

The following is a general breakdown of space requirements for the base:

1. Dockage:

	Linear feet
4 ships at 310 feet overall length (52-foot beam)	1,240
2 ships at 212 feet overall length (42-foot beam)	424
2 ships at 163 feet overall length (33-foot beam)	326
25 feet clearance between stem and stern of berthed ships (7 by 25)	175
Total	2,165

(NOTE.—Adequate sewage disposal facilities for docked vessels, as well as for the ship base, shall be provided in conformance with applicable city, county, and port regulations. Water, and electric powerlines shall be routed through the utility and boiler room for control and distribution purposes.)

Berthing facilities can be in the form of either slips and/or piers so arranged to accommodate the eight listed ships.

The dockage must be in a single area directly adjacent to area occupied by buildings of the base.

If piers are used for dockage they shall have minimum clear deck width of 25 feet with not less than 150 feet clearance between piers. If a slip, or slips, are used, the alongside deck for loading and offloading shall be clear for at least 30 feet. Slips are to be of such width as to allow two 52-foot beam ships to be berthed abreast with maneuvering space between ships.

The minimum required water depth alongside of piers and/or slips is 25 feet at low water.

All individual ship berths must have steam heat, water, electricity, and sewer connections.

2. Small boat basin:

	Square feet
5 launches at 36-foot length plus piers for landing platforms	4,000
Maneuvering room within the basin	5,000
Total	9,000

The small boat basin shall be adjacent to the land area of the base. It is to have weather protection from all directions. Landing platforms shall be low-level piers of 2-feet height above lake level. The piers shall have the minimum width of 6 feet. There shall be a sufficient number of piers to individually tie up five 36-foot launches and four skiffs. Ample space for maneuvering the launches within the basin shall be provided. Two floodlights of sufficient intensity to light up the entire area of the basin is required.

3. HEATED SPACE

	Number of employees[1]		Square feet
	Male	Female	
Offices, general:			
Administration	4	1	700
Personnel	1	1	400
Laboratory (offices)	8	5	2,000
Field parties	4		500
Subtotal			3,600
Offices, drafting:			
Ship office	6		1,600
Processing office	5	1	2,200
Laboratory (drafting room)	1		200
Subtotal			4,000
Laboratory:			
Oceanographic:			
Wet	5	1	1,200
Dry (see 4(b))			1,600
Electronic	2		1,200
Subtotal			4,000
Special purpose (special to USC and GS):			
Conference (office grade)			500
Library (office grade)			500
Vault (see specifications)			200
Workshops			4,500
Subtotal			5,700
Grand total			17,300

[1] Initial number beginning in 1963 with gradual annual increases.

4. General requirements for heated space:

(a) Wet laboratory (oceanographic), 1,200 square feet: The wet laboratory can be on any floor level, preferably the ground floor. It shall be located in the same area of the base as the rest of the laboratory complex. It shall have 115-volt electrical outlets spaced at 6 feet along all permanent walls; hot and cold running water at a height of 4 feet and spaced at 14 feet or less along the length of permanent walls; sewer connections, suitable for servicing kitchen-type sink at each pair of water outlets. Movable wall partitions of Johns-Manville Transite wall universal type or E. F. Hauserman Co. Masterwalls type, or equivalent, which can be arranged to suit the user, shall be installed throughout the wet laboratory. The laboratory rooms shall be heated and have lighting suitable for drafting purposes. Floor load requirements are 100 pounds per square foot.

(b) Dry laboratory (oceanographic), 1,600 square feet: This laboratory to be general office type of space for special equipment. It is to be adjacent to the library and conference room and to the oceanographic laboratory offices. It is to be heated and have general office type lighting. The facility may occupy any floor, preferable location would be adjoining or above the wet laboratory. Floor load requirements are 100 pounds per square foot.

(c) Electronics laboratory, 1,200 square feet: This laboratory, due to handling of heavy gear, shall be located on the ground floor. It shall be heated and have drafting room type lighting. Floor load requirements are 150 pounds per square foot.

(d) Special-purpose space:

	Square feet
Library	500
Conference room	500
Vault	200
Workshops (see item (g))	4,500
Total	5,700

The library and conference room should be adjacent to the dry laboratory and general office space. Heating required.

The vault is to be walk-in type and fully fireproof including the door. Only a conventional lock for minimum security is required. The type of construction of the vault will determine the floor on which it may be located. It should be readily accessible to dry laboratory, processing office, and ship office. Floor load limits shall be 150 pounds per square foot. Heating and lighting are required.

(e) Drafting offices:

	Square feet
Processing office	2,200
Ship office	1,600
Oceanographic offices	200
Total	4,000

The drafting offices may occupy any floor. They shall be open space equipped with lights suitable for drafting. Floor load requirements are 100 pounds per square foot. Heating required.

The 200 square feet of drafting space required in the oceanographic offices may be a portion of a room within the offices having suitable lighting for drafting purposes. If so located, the 200 square feet shall be added to the space required by the laboratory offices.

(f) General office space:

	Square feet
Administration	700
Personnel	400
Oceanographic laboratory	2,000
Field parties	500
Total	3,600

The general office space may occupy any floor; however, the 2,000 square feet required for the oceanographic laboratory offices is to be in the vicinity to the dry laboratory space.

All general office space shall be heated and have adequate lighting. Floor load requirements are 100 pounds per square foot.

The space for the oceanographic laboratory offices shall be divided into five separate offices of approximately equal size. Movable wall partitions, as referred to in item (a) wet laboratory, shall be used for dividing the space.

(g) Workshops:

	Square feet
Carpenter and machine shop	1,500
Boat repair shop	2,000
Crating, shipping, and receiving shop	1,000
Total	4,500

The workshops shall be on the ground floor of buildings. They should be interconnected and so arranged as to place the boat repair shop nearest the water edge.

The boat repair shop shall be of 40 feet minimum width with two 16-foot-wide doors opening to the outside and high enough to allow entrance of a 36-foot launch and cradle.

The carpenter and machineshop shall have at least one 12-foot-wide door opening to the outside.

The crating, shipping, and receiving shop shall have an 8-foot-wide door at a truck loading dock. The dock shall be truck bed height.

All shops shall be heated and be fully lighted. Fire prevention facilities shall be provided. Floor load requirements are 300 pounds per square foot.

5. Warehouse space, 10,000 square feet: Warehouse space to be on ground floor of buildings. Multiple buildings may be used if the minimum space requirements are met. Adequate lighting and fire prevention facilities are required. Ample size doorways for easy access to all parts of warehouse area are required. Floor loading requirements are 400 pounds per square foot.

6. Small-boat storage shed, 4,000 square feet: The shed shall be in the vicinity of the small-boat basin and adjacent to the boat repair shop if possible. (In order that boats up to 36 feet may be hoisted from the water into the shed.) (Boat hoist to be furnished later by agency.)

Minimum width of shed cover shall be 35 feet. The length of the shed shall be dictated by location. Floor load requirements are 400 pounds per square foot.

7. Open storage area, 5,000 square feet: The open storage area can be located anywhere on the base but shall be all in one area. It shall be used for storage of items that can be left in the open such as propellors, boat cradles, etc.

8. Vehicular parking space, 9,500 square feet: 50 vehicles at 190 square feet per vehicle. The parking space can be distributed throughout the base.

9. Access and vehicle maneuvering space: Ample vehicular access to all buildings, parking areas, storage areas, berthing areas, the small-boat basin and storage shed shall be provided.

10. Special requirements: (a) Utilities building and boiler room, 1,600 square feet.

This utilities building can be located anywhere on the base (ground floor). It shall have the capacity of providing—

(1) Electrical power, 440 volts, 60 cycle, 3 phase:

	Kilowatt-hours per day
4 ships, 250 kilowatts each (1,000 kilowatt-hours)	24,000
2 ships, 150 kilowatts each (300 kilowatt-hours)	7,200
2 ships, 80 kilowatts each (160 kilowatt-hours)	3,840
Base buildings 60 kilowatts	1,440
Total	36,480

(2) Potable water:

	Gallons per day
8 ships at 2,600 gallons per day	20,800
Base facilities	500
Total	21,300

(NOTE.—Ships flushing and fire main waters not included.)

(3) Steam (35 p.s.i. at shipside):

	Pounds per hour
4 ships, 2,000 pounds per hour each	8,000
2 ships, 1,800 pounds per hour each	3,600
2 ships, 1,000 pounds per hour each	2,000
Base buildings, approximately	1,200
Total	14,800

(NOTE.—Total steam demand, except for heating of buildings, will not be required until the base is in full operation. This may not be needed until early 1964 or later.)

The utilities building shall have connections to all ship berths and buildings requiring the service utilities.

(b) Security: The base grounds shall be surrounded by an 8-foot-high link-wire security fence. Fire prevention facilities are required throughout the base and buildings. Floodlighting of sufficient intensity and placement as to light up all the base grounds and wharf areas are required.

11. Surfacing of grounds: Except for landscaping areas, the entire area of the base shall be surfaced. All access, vehicular maneuvering and open storage areas shall be surfaced by blacktop or concrete of suitable strength to withstand heavy loads. Parking shall be surfaced by blacktop or crushed rock. Piers or access areas alongside slips shall be surfaced with wood, blacktop or concrete according to methods of construction.

Appropriate drainage for the entire base shall be provided.

(NOTE.—A fuel tank of at least 15,000 gallons capacity shall be provided, in conformance with all applicable safety codes, and located in such a manner as to not interfere with operation of the base. A large boiler for the above dockside steam requirements and a smaller boiler for office heat requirements, provided with a manifold distribution header for operation of either or both boilers (at the same pressure) shall be furnished.)

NOTES CONCERNING TONGUE POINT INSTALLATION

This project cost the Federal Government approximately $18 million. It was declared excess to the needs of the Navy and was turned over to the General Services Administration as surplus property. The General Services Administration has appraised it most recently at $1 million.

The attached brochure supplied by the Astoria Chamber of Commerce contains a complete description of the facility. Its main installations are the following: A mooring basin, eight berthing piers, including several which admit deep-draft ships, a marginal wharf, seaplane ramps, marine fuel storage and fueling facilities, three buildings consisting of ship facilities, ammunition storage, magazine hangars, supply offices, warehouses, a lumber storage yard, a vehicle storage shed, dispensary and hospital building, administrative headquarters and other office buildings, all of permanent nature, almost 400 family units, barracks buildings, a gymnasium and theater, a steam generating plant, a sewage treatment facility, a railroad spur and railroad siding and various miscellaneous buildings.

Several months ago, we communicated with Admiral Karo, pointing out the availability of this excellent facility for an installation of the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Department of Commerce.

Under date of March 15, Admiral Karo supplied a report indicating that the Coast and Geodetic Survey would stay in Seattle, and maintain its oceanographic center there. On March 17, 1962, we wrote to Admiral Karo indicating that his reply was not satisfactory. Copies of this correspondence are enclosed.

It is our understanding that proposals are now being made for expansion of the Coast and Geodetic Survey Center in Washington State.

Tongue Point, with all of its facilities, would make an ideal location, situated as it is on the Columbia River.

The State of Oregon would cooperate in every way possible if the Coast and Geodetic Survey were to come to Tongue Point. Oregon State University is establishing an oceanographic center on Yaquina Bay, and this center will be the source of a great many technicians who will graduate from Oregon State and will become available locally for work at an oceanographic center.

If the Coast and Geodetic Survey were to come to Tongue Point, the State would begin an immediate $3.5 million highway improvement program on the Columbia River Highway between Portland and Astoria. This would be a through highway, permitting rapid transportation between Portland and Astoria.

Astoria offers every facility needed by personnel, and the State of Oregon will do everything possible to apprise the Coast and Geodetic Survey of these facilities and the advantages of living in this very desirable area of Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. All one would have to do would be to read the specifications of facilities needed for the Geodetic Survey and then study the facilities available at Tongue Point to understand why I wrote such a letter of understatement to Admiral Karo in protest of this inexcusable, unjustifiable position.

I turn next to a letter that I wrote to Mr. Ralph A. Dungan, Special Assistant to the President, under date of March 5, 1963, in which I discuss another use of part of Tongue Point. It is well known that some of the Washington personnel of the Geodetic Survey will be moved out of Washington, D.C. I called the attention of Mr. Dungan to the fact that I knew of no facility that could better accommodate this latest proposed move of another part of the Geodetic Survey program. I pointed out, of course, that in view of the treatment that the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation has received in regard to the matter, I thought we had a special equity in the premises. I wrote to Mr. Dungan because many months ago, in a personal conference with the President of the United States about Tongue Point, he called in Mr. Dungan and personally assigned to Mr. Dungan the Tongue Point matter with instructions that Mr. Dungan was to work with me in regard to Tongue Point and see what could be done in order to try to find a suitable Federal use of Tongue Point.

I desire to say, as I have said in some letters that I shall shortly introduce in the RECORD, that I could not have received finer cooperation than I have received from Mr. Dungan. He has never failed to extend to the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation every possible consideration of our interests in respect to getting some Federal service or agency moved into Tongue Point. I know I am correct when I say that Mr. Dungan is completely sold on Tongue Point. He thoroughly agrees with the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation that something must be done to put Tongue Point to Federal use. It is in fairness to him that I should make that statement. I have no criticism of the handling of our problem at the White House level. The difficulty is outside the White House level. I hope that the White House will do something about that.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter which I wrote to Mr. Ralph A. Dungan dated March 5.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 5, 1963.

Mr. RALPH A. DUNGAN,
Special Assistant to the President,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR RALPH: This supplements my telephone conversation of the other day with reference to the desirability of assigning Coast and Geodetic Survey personnel now in Washington, D.C., to the Tongue Point Naval Base, Oregon.

It is my understanding that many States have requested that the Coast and Geodetic Survey personnel who are scheduled to leave Washington, D.C., should be assigned to their respective States, and I further understand that there will be an immediate need for approximately 250,000 square feet of floor space in connection with relocated facilities. Although I have not had an opportunity to check out precisely the area of floor space now on hand for use at Tongue Point.

I believe that it is well in excess of the amount required by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. If the requisite floor space is not presently on hand at Tongue Point, I have the assurance of top officials of the State of Oregon that the State will immediately undertake the construction of whatever floor space may be required by the Government for use at Tongue Point. This could be done on a lease-purchase basis and the construction would conform wholly to Government specifications.

It seems to me, Ralph, that the existing ideal housing for personnel and the excellently situated and improved Tongue Point installations, when coupled with the offer of the State of Oregon to initiate the immediate construction of a top quality highway between Portland and Astoria and the willingness of Oregon to build on a lease-purchase basis, whatever facilities may be needed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey at Tongue Point, make Tongue Point the most practical, suitable and economical location in the entire United States for the Coast and Geodetic Survey's relocated facility.

It is my hope that in the very near future there will be a favorable decision on my request for this specific utilization of Tongue Point.

With appreciation and best personal regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Some weeks ago the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation had a conference with the Secretary of Commerce. I presented the case for the delegation on Tongue Point. The delegation protested the treatment that we had received from the administration in respect to Tongue Point. At that time I said:

> Mr. Secretary, we have but one request, because of our confidence in you, and that is that you appoint an independent survey team. You appoint a team of people not connected at all with the Geodetic Survey or with any other agency, other than the Department of Commerce, to go out to Tongue Point, survey the installation, and survey the written record that you will find in the files of the Department of Commerce and the written record that you will find in the office of Mr. Robert Dungan at the White House level, for the record in Mr. Dungan's office, I am assured, will be made available to you.

The Secretary of Commerce agreed to do just that. That is all we asked for.

On the date of March 18, 1963, I received the following letter from the Secretary of Commerce:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have reviewed in detail the decision made last year by the Coast and Geodetic Survey to locate its Northwest Pacific ship base and oceanographic laboratory in Seattle rather than Tongue Point, Oreg. I have concluded that the overall economy of the Government would have been better served if the base had been located at Tongue Point. Unfortunately, we cannot retrace our steps and revoke the contract that was entered into without my personal knowledge by GSA August 13, 1962, on behalf of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for a site in Seattle. That contract is binding and it is impossible for the Government to escape its terms.

I digress from the letter for a moment to say that I am fast becoming satisfied that the GSA needs an investigation from top to bottom in its handling of surplus property of the Federal Government and in the handling of such contracts as the one to which reference is made, for if GSA went ahead and negotiated that contract, and the Secretary of Commerce, who has jurisdiction over the Geodetic Survey, was not even aware of it, somebody at the GSA ought to be fired. There is complete inefficiency and malfeasance in office.

The GSA has not heard the last of this matter, for I intend to proceed to find out all I can about the procedures of the GSA to see what checks on procedure may be needed to be imposed on the GSA. I think it is pretty shocking that the Department of Commerce, which has jurisdiction over the Coast and Geodetic Survey, was not even aware of lease contracts that were negotiated by the GSA without, as he says, the personal knowledge of the Secretary of Commerce.

So, Mr. President, this is why I have a suspicion as to why the GSA is apparently going ahead with such breakneck speed to get Tongue Point behind it. GSA is worried about this group of Oregon Democratic Members of Congress, and has good reason to be worried about it, for we are not at all happy with the record. And the Kennedy administration had better take a long, hard look at what they are doing, because when the public business becomes involved, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, partisanship is out the window.

I am just as much opposed to Democratic malfeasance as I am to Republican malfeasance. I represent all the people of my State—those who voted for me and those who voted against me, Democrats and Republicans alike—so long as I have the responsibility of serving my term in the Senate. Any time any official of my administration follows the course of action that does not protect the public interest, he will not get silence from the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I continue to read the letter from the Secretary of Commerce of March 18:

> If it had not been for your forceful presentation of the comparative advantages of Tongue Point over the Seattle location, this matter would not have been as carefully reviewed by me as it ultimately was. I may offer little comfort to you or your constituents at this late date, but it may give you some satisfaction to learn that because of the mistakes made in the Tongue Point decision, I intend to see that similar decisions in the future are more carefully made and at a much higher level than this one. I want to apologize to you for this most unfortunate incident on behalf of the Department of Commerce. I also want to apologize for the fact that you were never definitely notified that the Coast and Geodetic Survey had reached a final decision on the subject.
>
> This was handled badly and, I may say, somewhat arbitrarily by Admiral Karo of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> LUTHER H. HODGES,
> *Secretary of Commerce.*

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point, so that it will not contain the digressions in which I engaged when I read the first part of it, and then spoke, and then read the second part.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1963.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have reviewed in detail the decision made last year by the Coast and Geodetic Survey to locate its Northwest Pacific ship base and oceanographic laboratory in Seattle rather than Tongue Point, Oreg. I have concluded that the overall economy of the Government would have been better served if the base had been located at Tongue Point. Unfortunately, we cannot retrace our steps and revoke the contract that was entered into without my personal knowledge by GSA August 13, 1962, on behalf of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for a site in Seattle. That contract is binding and it is impossible for the Government to escape its terms.

If it had not been for your forceful presentation of the comparative advantages of Tongue Point over the Seattle location, this matter would not have been as carefully reviewed by me as it ultimately was. I may offer little comfort to you or to your constituents at this late date, but it may give you some satisfaction to learn that because of the mistakes made in the Tongue Point decision, I intend to see that similar decisions in the future are more carefully made and at a much higher level than this one. I want to apologize to you for this most unfortunate incident on behalf of the Department of Commerce. I also want to apologize for the fact that you were never definitely notified that the Coast and Geodetic Survey had reached a final decision on the subject.

This was handled badly and I may say somewhat arbitrarily by Admiral Karo of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wrote to Secretary Hodges in response to that letter as follows:

APRIL 9, 1963.

Hon. LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want you to know that I deeply appreciate your letter of March 18, 1963, in which you so forthrightly and in keeping with your intellectual honesty stated in part in regard to the Oregon Tongue Point controversy;

"I have reviewed in detail the decision made last year by the Coast and Geodetic Survey to locate its Northwest Pacific ship base and oceanographic laboratory in Seattle rather than Tongue Point, Oreg. I have concluded that the overall economy of the Government would have been better served if the base had been located at Tongue Point."

Since receiving your letter, I have been conferring with other officials in the administration in an endeavor to see what can be done to put the excellent facilities of Tongue Point to Federal use. The several hundred fine family dwelling units, plus the permanently constructed, excellent public buildings on this base, are the best exhibit and proof I can offer that the Federal Government cannot justify junking this installation while at the same time the administration is making budget requests calling for appropriations for additional millions of dollars for new Federal installations elsewhere.

The Tongue Point issue has become such a cause celebre in my State that I cannot justify voting for appropriation requests by this administration for new installations elsewhere while it continues to waste the taxpayers' money by junking Tongue Point.

There are many Federal uses to which Tongue Point can and should be put to use. In my opinion, Tongue Point should receive priority consideration for any transfer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey personnel out of Washington, D.C. Tongue Point should receive priority consideration for any expansion of any military service of any branches of the service that could possibly make use of this fine facility.

Furthermore, the State Department and the Peace Corps should give favorable consideration to the use of Tongue Point for a technical assistance training center where hundreds of young people could and should be brought from the underdeveloped countries of the world for a 6 to 12 months' vocational training program.

Apparently what is needed most on the part of the various officials within the departments of the administration is the use of some imagination and objective foresight in respect to the great potentialities of the Tongue Point base as a vehicle for carrying forward some of the forward-looking programs, both domestic and foreign, of the present administration.

I want to assure you that my confidence in you is such that I would be perfectly satisfied if the administration would only charge you with complete responsibility to make whatever decisions are necessary to put Tongue Point to use on its merits for any one of several sound Federal programs for which it is so well suited.

With best wishes always.

Yours respectfully,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, I sent a letter dated March 28 to Mr. Ralph A. Dungan, special assistant to the President, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 28, 1963.

Re Tongue Point Naval Base.
Mr. RALPH A. DUNGAN,
Special Assistant to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RALPH: Enclosed is a photostatic copy of a letter dated March 18, addressed to me by Secretary Hodges. As you will note, the Secretary concluded that overall economy in the operation of the Federal Government "would have been better served if the base had been located at Tongue Point," when the status of the Northwest Pacific ship base and oceanographic laboratory at Seattle was under consideration last year.

To say the least, this is a very difficult situation for me to explain to my constituents. Under the circumstances, I feel it is imperative that the President's attention should be called to the justice of my claim that the Washington, D.C., Coast and Geodetic Survey, or a substantial portion thereof, should be transferred to Tongue Point.

The entire State of Oregon is stirred up about Tongue Point not being used; every time I visit the State I receive numerous questions on this topic, and frankly, I don't have the answers.

I think the least this administration can do is to grant the State of Oregon favorable consideration on my request for the transfer of all, or a substantial portion of, the Washington, D.C., Coast and Geodetic Survey to Tongue Point, Oreg. Secretary Hodges' attached letter certainly constitutes the best possible evidence in support of such action.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the letter I enclosed a photostatic copy of the letter I received from the Secretary of Commerce, and I pointed out again that the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation were very much stirred and disturbed about this development. I again, in behalf of the delegation, advised Mr. Dungan that in my opinion the White House had a clear duty to see that fair treatment was given to my State in respect to this matter.

After that, Mr. President, there were a series of disturbing reports and rumors that GSA was doing everything it could in Oregon to speed up the disposal of Tongue Point.

I had been told by Mr. Dungan that the White House had put in a stop order against any quick disposal of Tongue Point until there could be the completion of a thorough review by Mr. Dungan, in behalf of the President of the United States, as to the possible use of the Tongue Point facility for some Federal purpose. But, irrespective of the fact that Mr. Dungan had assured me that such a stop order was in effect, we continued to get reports, which I considered to be very reliable, from very high State officials in my State that there seemed to be a full head of steam being generated by the GSA to get rid of Tongue Point.

So one of my many calls to Ralph Dungan was to report the information that these State officials had given me. He called me back and asked me to call Mr. Boutin in the GSA. I was unable to reach Mr. Boutin. I have not been able to reach him, but I did reach a Mr. Walter Moreland, and he talked with me over the telephone. He stated that they were, of course, considering various possibilities for the disposal of Tongue Point, under the rules and regulations of the GSA—the typical report one gets from a bureaucrat—but he wanted me to know that there would be an adequate time element, before there would be any disposal, for the consideration of the delegation, and, of course, before a final decision was made they would have to come before the appropriate committees of Congress, and that the time element might be 4, 5, or 6 weeks.

I patiently related to Mr. Moreland the history of the case, the White House interest in it, the assurance of Mr. Dungan that GSA would not dispose of the case until there had been adequate time for the White House to complete the review it was undertaking, in an endeavor to find a Federal use of the property.

I thought the matter was settled for a while, but subsequent events, which I shall relate shortly, give further reason for my developing in this matter something that is not very typical of me—suspicion. I do not very often engage in suspicions, but I am suspicious of the GSA—let the Record show it—and I think I have cause to be. But before I discuss the last incident which occurred today in regard to reports of GSA activity in Oregon, and after I had talked to Members of the Oregon delegation in regard to storm clouds developing in the sky again over Tongue Point, I wrote a letter to the President, which reads as follows:

April 10, 1963.

The Honorable John F. Kennedy,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I would not think of bothering you again with the Oregon Tongue Point installation issue if I did not know that a critical situation is developing in regard to it that is bound to embarrass your administration unless something is done to prevent it. I am writing to you in behalf of the entire Oregon delegation with the approval of the members of the delegation, because each one of them shares my concern about the failure of your administration to make use of the Tongue Point installation for some Federal program for which it is suitable.

Recently, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges wrote me a letter in which he apologized for the failure of the Department of Commerce last year to locate the Northwest Pacific ship base and oceanographic laboratory of the Coast and Geodetic Survey at Tongue Point rather than at Seattle. He admitted in his letter that the matter had been "handled badly and I may say somewhat arbitrarily by Admiral Karo of the Coast and Geodetic Survey."

You may recall that at the time Senator Neuberger and I both protested the way the matter had been handled by the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

I am enclosing a copy of Secretary Hodges' letter and a copy of my reply.

Needless to say, the people of Oregon take little comfort in the fact that our case was a meritorious one for the location of the Geodetic Survey expansion program at Tongue Point, but we lost the decision because of an arbitrary course of action followed by the administrators of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The real danger, Mr. President, is that the General Services Administration may end up disposing of the Tongue Point installation, consisting of more than 800 acres of land and some 500 first-class family housing units, plus excellent permanent public buildings, for about $1 million. The Government investment in the project is more than $14 million. The economic potential of the installation to the economy of Oregon would amount to several millions of dollars a year if your administration would only insist that some very worthwhile Federal program be located there rather than spend millions of dollars for new installations elsewhere for servicing some program that could just as well be located at Tongue Point. What I am very anxious for you to understand is that if Tongue Point is junked for a price of around $1 million, such action will take on the proportions of a scandal in Oregon, and I want to do everything I can to fulfill my obligation to you by making certain that you have due notice of the seriousness of this situation.

Ralph Dungan, with whom I have been working on the Tongue Point problem at your request, has been doing a grand job, and I want to assure you that the entire Oregon delegation is deeply grateful to him for his never-failing cooperation.

I am making this plea directly to you, because all of us on the Oregon delegation believe it is very important that the recommendations made by Ralph Dungan with respect to Tongue Point should be recognized by various Government departments and agencies to be White House policy.

The Oregon delegation is at your service and that of Mr. Dungan in connection with any information or further assistance you may need from any of us in regard to Tongue Point.

With best wishes, always.

Yours respectfully,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. President, this morning I received a very disturbing long-distance telephone call from Mr. Glenn Jackson, chairman of the Oregon State Highway Commission, one of the most prominent business leaders in my State, a great, dedicated public servant, a man who is a philanthropist, who has worked for great charitable causes, whose devotion to the best interests of the State in regard to one program after another is so outstanding that if one were to name the 10 most outstanding citizens in Oregon at the present time, in my judgment, Mr. Jackson would have to be included in the list.

I say this about Mr. Jackson because, Mr. President, I want you to know that when the Democratic Members of the Oregon delegation hear from Mr. Jackson, we are hearing from a man whose reliability is beyond question. He is a man, incidentally, although Republican, who is well known by this administration, and has worked closely on a nonpartisan basis on projects that involve the general welfare, irrespective of the partisanship of any administration that may be in majority control in Washington, D.C., at any time.

For 19 years through various administrations in Washington, I have worked closely with Mr. Jackson in behalf of the interests of Oregon, as those interests relate to the Federal Government.

So when he called this morning and suggested that we look into other matters, it is true, and told me that GSA was holding a meeting out in Oregon today with certain business interests, with the hope of speeding up a consummation of a purchase of Tongue Point, I explained to him the latest developments in regard to Tongue Point. I told him of my telephone conversation of a few days ago with Mr. Moreland, of GSA, and of what I consider to be assurances that there was not going to be any precipitate action with regard to Tongue Point, but that there was going to be continued time for the White House to complete its study of possible Federal use of Tongue Point, and I told him that I was willing to take judicial notice of the fact that there was not any basis in fact for any such rumor. I told him that I would get in touch with GSA and with the White House and check it with them, although I was sure that I did not have to worry about it at all.

Mr. Dungan happened to be out of the city today. However I did get in touch with two other Presidential assistants at the White House. They assured me that they would look into the matter immediately, I happen to know that they did. I could not reach Mr. Boutin, the Administrator of GSA. My administrative assistant did get in touch with one of his assistants and got an account of the situation from him. I sent Mr. Boutin a telegram, which reads as follows:

> APRIL 11, 1963.
>
> Mr. BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
> *Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.:*
>
> I have just received a disturbing report from Glenn Jackson, chairman of Oregon State Highway Commission, that GSA is about to close deal with group of businessmen in Astoria, Oreg., for sale of Tongue Point installation for purchase price in neighborhood of $1 million. Just a few days ago Walter Moreland of your staff assured me at request of Ralph Dungan of White House staff that no such sale of Tongue Point was presently contemplated and that under no circumstances would a sale of Tongue Point be completed without both my office and the White House notified in advance. I hope Jackson's report to me this morning is another unfounded rumor with respect to Tongue Point.
>
> Just yesterday, I had a long conference with Dungan about Tongue Point, and he assured me that the White House had requested GSA not to dispose of Tongue Point until the White House had given further consideration to use of Tongue Point base for one of several Federal purposes now under consideration. As I notified President Kennedy yesterday in a letter, any sale of Tongue Point base by GSA for any such figure as $1 million would be scandalous.
>
> Therefore, I respectfully request that my office be notified well in advance of any proposal of GSA to complete any final negotiations for sale of Tongue Point. This matter is so serious from the standpoint of public policy questions involved that I shall discuss it at some length on floor of Senate today. Immediate response to Commissioner Jackson's report to me is requested.
>
> WAYNE MORSE,
> *U.S. Senator.*

Mr. President, in the telephone conversation that my administrative assistant had with one of Mr. Boutin's assistants, he was told, in effect, that there was a conference being held in Oregon today, but that it was just a preparatory step, one of those procedural steps, for the purpose of discussing the matter with the businessmen who had interested themselves in the possible purchase of Tongue Point, and that the purpose of the meeting was explained to them, with the procedures that they would have to go through, and the procedures that were binding upon GSA.

If that is the purpose of the meeting, no one can have any objection, certainly not I. Certainly a group of businessmen in my State are entitled, as a matter of right, to sit down with representatives of GSA and have explained to them the procedures that they would have to follow if it fell finally to the lot of GSA to dispose of the property.

I hope that in that conference with the Oregon businessmen today, the representative of GSA made clear to them the interest of the Federal Government in trying to find a Federal use for Tongue Point.

I hope that the representative of GSA at the Oregon meeting today pointed out that every effort was being made by the Government to find a suitable Federal use for this very valuable property.

I hope that the representative of GSA at the Oregon meeting today made clear the position of the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation.

I hope the GSA representative made clear to the Oregon businessmen that the Democrats in the Oregon delegation have been doing their best to negotiate an agreement whereby the Tongue Point base will be put to Federal use, because of its vital value to the economy of the State, and because of the equitable justice that such an arrangement would deal to the taxpayers of the country as a whole.

There was telephoned to my office a telegram. It was subsequently sent, and I imagine it has now been received, from GSA, signed by Mr. Robert T. Daly, Acting Administrator, GSA, Mr. Boutin being out of town. It was addressed to me. It reads as follows:

> Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C:*
>
> Reurtel April 11, the report that GSA is about to close a sale of the former Tongue Point Naval Station at Astoria, Oreg., is an unfounded rumor. The following advice, previously furnished during your telephone conservation with Mr. Walter Moreland, is confirmed:
>
> (1) Should the city of Astoria submit a negotiated sale offer for the property, the consideration of such proposal by GSA and, if the offer were found to be acceptable, the submission of an explanatory statement to the House and Senate Government Operations Committees in advance of the negotiated sale as provided by law, would require a minimum of 5 weeks' time;
>
> (2) Any sale of the property by public bidding after advertising would also require at least 5 weeks' time.
>
> In accordance with your request, you will be notified well in advance of any sale of the property.
>
> ROBERT T. DALY,
> *Acting Administrator, GSA.*

Mr. President, I appreciate the telegram. I only hope that the General Services Administration made that very clear to the Oregon businessmen in the conference that was held this afternoon.

I speak in complete defense of Mr. Glenn Jackson, Chairman of the Oregon Highway Commission, who reported to me this morning that his information came directly from parties in interest. They could very well have been mistaken, and apparently were mistaken, if they thought that the meeting they were going to attend today was a meeting in which they had no chance to negotiate the final purchase of the property. But I am greatly indebted to Mr. Jackson for keeping the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation informed. He has performed another fine service in doing so.

Let me say also in his defense that if the Government is going to make the final decision to dispose of Tongue Point to private interests in our State, Mr. Jackson will be in there, doing everything he can to see to it that the maximum use of Tongue Point is made to the extent of its capacities by private interests in our State. But Mr. Jackson knows that private interests in our State cannot begin to make economic use of Tongue Point to the dollar return to our State which the Federal Government could do. That is why this dedicated public servant has been cooperating with the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation in an endeavor to have Tongue Point used for a Federal purpose.

As he has said to me many times:

> Let me know the moment you become satisfied that the Federal Government has turned thumbs down permanently as to any use of Tongue Point for Federal use. Then we shall have to get busy and do the best salvage job we can in making whatever use of those parts of Tongue Point that private industry can use.

I stress that, in my opinion, Mr. Jackson has been completely right, as are the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation, in taking the position that the Federal Government simply cannot justify the turning over of Tongue Point to a minimum use, so far as the economic advantage to our State is concerned, when it has an obligation to put it to maximum use for the benefit of Oregon.

Yesterday, in my conference with Mr. Dungan, there was associated with me Mr. Frederick Rarig, who is chairman of the board of directors of International House, of the University of Pennsylvania. He has been a special consultant to the State Department for some time in connection with the whole foreign student exchange program and the other programs of the State Department which have had to do with bringing over young people from the underdeveloped areas of the world, particularly Africa. Although the program has encompassed other students, Mr. Rarig's interest has been primarily limited to African young men and women who have been brought to the United States. He is one of the most brilliant lawyers I know. At one time he was an Assistant Attorney General of the United States, one of the top men in the Antitrust Division, not only a close adviser to the Attorney General, but also called in by President Roosevelt for special consultation on some of the antitrust problems which have faced the country.

I mention this because I desire to have the RECORD show again the caliber of man who has interested himself in a program which could very well involve Tongue Point. Without my knowledge, sometime last year Mr. Rarig, in connection with his student exchange work, flew to the West Coast and inspected Tongue Point. Do not forget that he is a dedicated citizen, who works on a volunteer basis and who, incidentally, also has raised, by way of volunteer contributions from many people throughout the country, but mostly in the East, a good many thousands of dollars to be used as assistance to the foreign students. He saw in Tongue Point a great potential as the facility to be used by the State Department and the Peace Corps in a combined cooperative program for the bringing of a large number of young men and women from the underdeveloped areas of the world to Tongue Point for special training, sometimes called vocational training. I understand that in some places in the State Department "vocational training" is almost an ugly phrase; that "leadership training" is more acceptable. Yet, as Mr. Rarig points out, what the young people who come from Africa, Latin America, and southeast Asia need is some training in technical skills, training which will enable them to go back into the villages of the underdeveloped areas and be of assistance in any one or more of a number of vocational training areas, in which special skills are completely lacking in many of those villages.

Such skills include training in the use of tools, repairing of machinery, operating tractors and farm machinery, and the like. As Mr. Rarig puts it, that kind of training will do more good in many of those villages than a Ph. D. degree. Important as it is that we train doctors, important as it is that we train Government servants, important as it is that we train people in the so-called higher echelons of the economic strata, the greater need is to provide technical training, vocational training, and long service training to hundreds and hundreds of young people who could be brought to such a center as Tongue Point for from 6 to 12 months.

Housing facilities are located there. In addition to family housing units, such as I have talked about, there are dormitories of a high-class barracks type—made to order, as Mr. Rarig says. Let him speak, as he has at the State Department, as he did some months ago at the Peace Corps, as he did yesterday in a conference with Mr. Dungan.

I merely cite this, as I did in my letter to Mr. Hodges, as one of the potential uses of Tongue Point, for Mr. Rarig has done just that on a smaller scale at Lincoln University, because last year the State Department was finally convinced, rather belatedly, to do something about the young African students who, during a vacation period between the closing of school in June and the starting of school in the last part of September or the early part of October, were found walking the streets in many of the metropolitan areas of our country. That is not the way to build up good will ambassadors to be sent back to Africa. They were getting themselves into many difficulties and trouble; in some instances, they had no money.

So this great, public-spirited man of Philadelphia, this brilliant counsel of Rohm & Haas, persuaded the State Department to set aside a little money to support a program that he initiated or inaugurated at Lincoln University, a program of the kind of training in technical skills that I have already mentioned.

As he said yesterday:

> We taught those young Africans how to drive an automobile. Many of them never expected they would sit behind an automobile steering wheel; but most of them got driver's licenses before the summer was over.

Mr. President, I wish you could have heard him describe to Mr. Dungan and to me, yesterday afternoon, the psychological therapy of that training on those young people and what it meant to them from the standpoint of individual prestige and a sense of accomplishment in Western ways. He said that he explained to them:

> In your country, apparently many of you think it should be beneath your dignity to use your hands in the soil. But let me point out to you that in a democracy we take the position that any leader should be well informed and well versed in, and have some experience with, the development of food and fiber. You ought to know the chemistry and the scientific facts involved in the development of man's sustenance from the soil.

He said there was a complete change in their attitude after the leaders and teachers at Lincoln University took them through courses—courses which really were rather elementary, but to them were full of knowledge theretofore unknown to them—in agriculture and in other subjects. They were taught how to tear down a tractor and put it together again. The girls were taught courses in business, typing, and stenography.

He told a dramatic story. His conclusion was that such training could not be given nearly as well in the little hamlets and towns of Africa or Latin America or southeast Asia. It is his belief that it would be most advantageous if in those hamlets and towns there were picked out not only the few students capable of competing in American universities—and he had plenty to say about some of the serious mistakes and the drawbacks involved in that program, too, Mr. President; and we are making some terrible mistakes in the student exchange program—but also groups of young men and young women who would be capable of coming to the United States and spending 6 months or a year at Tongue Point or at a similar center in the Midwest or at one on the east coast. His program calls for three such centers, and also for enlarging the program at Lincoln University. He said:

> If that is done, I guarantee that, year by year, there will be returned to those countries groups of ambassadors who, after that training in the United States, will, when they return to their native lands, constitute one of the best defenses we shall have against the constant threat of communism in those lands.

Mr. President, to make use of Tongue Point for such a facility calls for imagination, foresight, and understanding of the needs of individual people in the underdeveloped areas of the world. We are just "muffing the ball" in connection with such a program. We are pouring millions of dollars into our so-called foreign aid program; but this gentleman has a constructive program based on imagination and foresight; and he is asking for three centers of vocational training in this country—one on the west coast, one in the Middle West, and one on the east coast.

He said:

> I have gone through Tongue Point. The Senator did not know about that; but after I found out about those facilities, I came to him.

And so he did.

Mr. President, I wish to say that such a program offers much to the State Department and to the Peace Corps. He has had a conference with Mr. Shriver; and in the conference he pointed out that the Peace Corps should work both ways—that we should send American young men and young women abroad, but we should also bring to the United States young men and young women from these countries. Furthermore, at such centers American young people could receive training while they were associated with the young men and the young women from those foreign lands, before those young Americans were sent to those lands.

Consider Ghana or Sierra Leone or any other African country: Suppose that half a dozen or a dozen young people from one of those countries were studying at the center, and suppose that half a dozen or a dozen American young people were also studying there. What a wonderfully constructive program could be worked out by means of such an association of the the two groups, before those young Americans went to the foreign countries.

Mr. President, Mr. Rarig left with us his notes on the foreign student problem, and also his recommendations in regard to a U.S. program for foreign students, particularly Africans and Latin Americans. I ask unanimous consent that these two memorandums be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES ON FOREIGN STUDENT PROBLEM

(By F. J. Rarig)

The community experiences of foreign students during their stay in the United States are of great and lasting importance to them and of even greater importance to us. Good community experience can make up for failure of academic programs due either to poor academic performance or academic achievement unrelated to home environment. It can be argued with considerable force that the community experience constitutes for many students their true educational experience in the United States.

Our National Government should develop techniques and programs to assure constructive community experience. Our objective should be to send these students back home more truly sophisticated, mature people who have developed a better appreciation of their own culture, as well as a familiarity with the 20th century industrialized world. They should return home with real insight into the true nature of the struggle for social justice and the function of freedom.

United States has almost unlimited resources to do a superb, sensitive job of community exposure and orientation to 20th century mechanical, industrialized, supermarket society.

United States is also superbly equipped to demonstrate the effectiveness of democratic government as a creative social, economic, and cultural force. Most students think the choice is between communism and capitalism. They have no appreciation of the creative role government plays in the United States at all levels.

To date our program is utterly unrealistic and fails to make use of more than a fraction of our available resources. We have pretended that this is purely an academic exercise and that the job can be done by our schools and colleges. We have largely neglected the opportunity which the presence of these students offers us to "infect them with the spirit of liberty." In the process of carrying out the fiction that this is an academic problem, we have belittled and concealed the effectiveness of our Government instead of demonstrating it.

RECOMMODATIONS WITH REGARD TO U.S. PROGRAM FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS, PARTICULARLY AFRICANS AND LATIN AMERICANS

We must:

1. Recognize that vocational and administrative training, though unpopular, are

really what most African and Latin American students can absorb and what will enable them to meet their countries' real needs.

2. Recognize that voluntary agencies in U.S. communities cannot cope with African and Latin American student influx unless these students and trainees are staged into the United States through control points in the United States where they will be evaluated and oriented.

3. Take advantage of summer vacation period to supplement academic experience by providing employment experience internship in Government and experience in agriculture, conservation, community development, social service; that is "Peace Corps—in reverse."

4. We need arrival centers to serve as staging areas and as orientation centers and special summer experience centers. Need one on west coast (Tongue Point), Middle West and east coast (Lincoln University).

5. Centers should be comparatively isolated so we control contacts with Americans and American community.

6. Failures and problem students are the special concern of the U.S. Government. They are no one's special concern today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say to my administration that I felt I owed it to the administration to make this detailed report on the possibility of the establishment of such a center to be devoted to courses of study for these two groups, in association. So I felt that I owed it to my administration to make this report on the Tongue Point issue, because I want the Tongue Point issue settled not only in the interests of the people of Oregon and in the interests of all the people of the United States, but also in the interest of having it serve as a symbol of the way in which many of these cases can best be handled, because I am satisfied that there are other examples of proposed waste of Federal facilities; and I believe this administration should take a careful look at its budget requests, and should assure Congress that it will not ask for a single dollar for the construction of a new installation anywhere, so long as there are in existence unused facilities, such as Tongue Point, which can be used to serve the purpose of any facility being proposed in the budget as a new installation to be constructed in order to meet the needs of that Department.

The American people are entitled to a sound economy program. I happen to be one who will continue to vote for the necessary appropriations to promote the general welfare of the people of this country. But I do not propose to vote for funds for new installations that would involve waste. I intend to scrutinize very carefully every dollar of appropriation request of this administration for any new installation anywhere or for any expansion of any Government service anywhere until the administration can give me assurance that we are not wasting existing facilities.

I hope that by making this record the administration will understand that I am doing it motivated only by a desire to be of help to my administration. I hope that I will receive from my administration the same cooperation that I am offering it in respect to this matter. But whatever course this administration follows in regard to Tongue Point or any other, if that course of action does not protect the financial interests of the American people, I shall oppose the position taken by the administration.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 15

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 15, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 11, 1963:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

John H. Cook, Dozier, Ala., in place of L. C. Sirmon, retired.

Carrie M. Mann, Pleasant Grove., Ala., in place of S. J. Green, resigned.

James T. Carroll, Stevenson, Ala., in place of E. O. Mann, retired.

ARIZONA

Oscar W. Schahn, Morenci, Ariz., in place of F. B. Moore, retired.

ARKANSAS

Roy L. Sharpe, Little Rock, Ark., in place of I. C. Bellville, retired.

Alph Herron, Mayflower, Ark., in place of L. P. Gentry, deceased.

Arnold B. Sikes, North Little Rock, Ark., in place of O. W. Neely, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Richard L. Byington, Boron, Calif., in place of S. C. Slack, retired.

Irving A. Cleek, Chico, Calif., in place of R. C. Brown, retired.

Mary L. Johnson, Keyes, Calif., in place of L. M. Hinson, retired.

Rosalie L. Rhodes, Lakehead, Calif., in place of E. A. Ranney, resigned.

Irvin J. Burt, Roseville, Calif., in place of R. A. Bates, retired.

COLORADO

Clifford E. Anderson, Grover, Colo., in place of W. L. Robbins, transferred.

CONNECTICUT

Lolita C. Splaine, East Granby, Conn., in place of W. A. Wilcox, retired.

Charles E. Hatheway, Ellington, Conn., in place of E. F. Charter, deceased.

Charles W. Latimer, Pleasant Valley, Conn., in place of E. M. Norton, retired.

FLORIDA

Carl P. Geiger, Cocoa, Fla., in place of A. E. Booth, retired.

GEORGIA

Joseph R. Bowers, Fayetteville, Ga., in place of S. L. Morgan, retired.

C. Lawrence Mize, Toccoa, Ga., in place of G. H. Busha, retired.

HAWAII

Steven K. Kaneda, Wailuku, Hawaii, in place of J. T. Correa, resigned.

IDAHO

Donald W. Heath, Winchester, Idaho, in place of B. A. Roberts, retired.

ILLINOIS

John R. Frymire, Enfield, Ill., in place of C. M. Jordan, deceased.

Theodore C. Geocaris, Mount Prospect, Ill., in place of Joseph Knuth, retired.

Kenneth Cole, Norris City, Ill., in place of W. S. Smith, retired.

INDIANA

Robert H. Wilson, Albion, Ind., in place of C. A. Davis, retired.

Melville A. Mix, Jr., Brownsburg, Ind., in place of R. M. Huddleston, retired.

Virginia E. Ross, Brownsville, Ind., in place of W. J. Wissler, deceased.

Charles J. Murray, Jamestown, Ind., in place of J. L. Kincaid, retired.

James E. Rainford, Lake Village, Ind., in place of L. E. Rainford, retired.

Glendon R. Hinshaw, Mooresville, Ind., in place of Ruth Quillen, resigned.

Maurice G. Whitaker, Paragon, Ind., in place of A. K. Costin, retired.

Richard R. Conley, Rome City, Ind., in place of T. J. Conley, deceased.

Robert H. Meier, Westphalia, Ind., in place of Oscar Nierste, retired.

IOWA

Ronald L. Grant, Bondurant, Iowa, in place of L. L. Flannery, retired.

Leland J. Gorshe, Hornick, Iowa, in place of J. L. Harrison, retired.

Clarence E. Pittman, Morning Sun, Iowa, in place of C. F. Wunnenberg, retired.

Derrel D. Waring, Reasnor, Iowa, in place of Mabel Jones, retired.

Gordon L. Elwood, Silver City, Iowa, in place of F. A. Deitchler, retired.

KANSAS

Willis J. Ross, La Harpe, Kans., in place of A. A. Peterson, deceased.

KENTUCKY

Walter E. Burkhart, Cawood, Ky., in place of G. C. Cawood, retired.

John S. Humphrey, Jr., Jeffersontown, Ky., in place of R. H. Dickson, deceased.

Lester G. Nanny, Murray, Ky., in place of H. I. Sledd, retired.

Matthews Fletcher, Pewee Valley, Ky., in place of C. L. Snyder, retired.

Jean P. Crouch, Verona, Ky., in place of Mayro Hayden, resigned.

Kenneth E. Brock, Worthville, Ky., in place of Nellie Clubb, retired.

LOUISIANA

Edward W. Cruse, Alexandria, La., in place of J. W. Lewis, Jr., resigned.

Leslie C. Sutton, Baker, La., in place of N. M. Austen, retired.

William J. Broussard, Carencro, La., in place of J. H. Crouchet, retired.

MAINE

Thomas W. Adell, Readfield, Maine, in place of Charlene Adams, retired.

MARYLAND

George L. Hart, Sudlersville, Md., in place of E. W. Hart, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Lydia J. Hartnett, Millville, Mass., in place of A. M. Butler, retired.

John G. Barry, South Hadley, Mass., in place of R. A. Glesmann, Jr., deceased.

MICHIGAN

Noble G. Haver, Jr., Durand, Mich., in place of N. J. Morrow, retired.

John J. Cheney, Elmira, Mich., in place of W. R. Cremeans, transferred.

Leola A. Rugg, Shaftsburg, Mich., in place of A. F. Beers, retired.

Glenna A. Brooks, Somerset Center, Mich., in place of G. W. Fisher, retired.

MINNESOTA

Grant D. Vagle, Lake Bronson, Minn., in place of L. C. Locken, transferred.

John E. Murphy, Marshall, Minn., in place of W. C. Culhane, removed.

Eugene C. Howe, Palisade, Minn., in place of L. E. Johnson, transferred.

Darold J. Osterloh, St. Francis, Minn., in place of R. E. Leathers, retired.

John E. Patterson, Westbrook, Minn., in place of E. E. Flynn, retired.

MISSOURI

J. Warren Campbell, Edwards, Mo., in place of C. H. Babbitt, retired.

Allen E. Buetzer, Forest City, Mo., in place of P. B. France, retired.

Marcella F. Boyer, Herculaneum, Mo., in place of J. E. McDowell, deceased.

Amherst W. Maphies, Jericho Springs, Mo., in place of E. M. Gelsinger, retired.

Robert A. Woodward, Lamar, Mo., in place of C. E. Schreiner, retired.

MONTANA

William M. Dysart, Harlowton, Mont., in place of C. F. Walton, retired.

NEBRASKA

Eldon W. Marsh, Brunswick, Nebr., in place of G. E. Beltz, transferred.

Charles F. Obrist, Steinauer, Nebr., in place of P. R. Wenzl, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

John Cook, Florence N.J., in place of T. R. Boyle, deceased.

Harold R. Braun, Holmdel, N.J., in place of F. L. Pitcher, resigned.

Dominic J. Zambello, Lambertville, N.J., in place of E. J. Meskill, deceased.

NEW YORK

Laurence M. Sucher, Alton, N.Y., in place of E. F. DeZutter, deceased.

Frances W. Flynn, Burke, N.Y., in place of L. F. Sellers, deceased.

Clyde W. Barber, Castile, N.Y., in place of Martin Carey, retired.

Joseph A. Peckovitch, Cementon, N.Y., in place of H. W. Johnson, retired.

John J. Powers, Jr., Eagle Bridge, N.Y., in place of E. F. Curtis, retired.

Olga A. Mihanowich, Glenham, N.Y., in place of O. B. Timmons, retired.

Mildred H. Burd, Greenwood, N.Y., in place of Jerry Burd, retired.

Carl J. Barry, Kent, N.Y., in place of R. K. Fishbaugh, deceased.

Edwin D. Jennison, Sr., Milton, N.Y., in place of M. A. Jannelli, retired.

John G. Davis, Stone Ridge, N.Y., in place of S. C. Lounsbery, retired.

Raymond A. DuFour, Wynantskill, N.Y., in place of I. R. Puffer, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Charlie O. Williams, Central Falls, N.C., in place of A. M. York, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Joseph R. Walter, Devils Lake, N. Dak., in place of F. W. Kelly, retired.

Gilbert W. Kessler, Martin, N. Dak., in place of D. M. Tofteland, transferred.

OHIO

Thomas F. Fenton, Chandlersville, Ohio, in place of Z. M. Wolfe, resigned.

Robert L. Lowry, Green Camp, Ohio, in place of C. A. Williams, retired.

John Karalius, Rock Creek, Ohio, in place of G. D. Keaney, retired.

Jack A. Pancher, Uhrichsville, Ohio, in place of W. P. Wilcoxon, deceased.

Marlin F. Gehres, Wren, Ohio, in place of R. D. Stewart, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Ward W. Newport, Cushing, Okla., in place of T. A. Holland, retired.

Finis Ward, Foyil, Okla., in place of I. M. Kehler, retired.

Ernest E. Buffington, Westville, Okla., in place of Fred Allison, retired.

OREGON

Richard J. Halverson, Garibaldi, Oreg., in place of S. S. Partridge, retired.

Susan H. Wick, Keno, Oreg., in place of A. E. Cecil, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Anthony J. Del Vecchio, Canonsburg, Pa., in place of S. J. Bondi, removed.

John A. Zoppetti, Darlington, Pa., in place of A. K. Hunt, retired.

Patrick J. Moran, Gladwyne, Pa., in place of W. C. Herbert, removed.

Emily T. McDaniel, Groveton, Pa., in place of S. J. Leonard, retired.

Blair I. Showalter, Huntingdon, Pa., in place of S. E. Resley, retired.

Robert G. O'Neill, Pleasant Mount, Pa., in place of J. A. O'Hara, retired.

Dorothy M. Sherbondy, Ruffs Dale, Pa., in place of E. B. Weaver, retired.

Myrtle E. Smith, Spinnerstown, Pa., in place of Rudolph Simitz, deceased.

John H. Stangarone, Springs, Pa., in place of F. M. Bittinger, retired.

Dawn M. Ressler, Talmage, Pa., in place of M. T. Hornberger, resigned.

Nicholas A. Morelli, Williamsburg, Pa., in place of J. G. Butler, resigned.

RHODE ISLAND

Katherine M. Purnell, Clayville, R.I., in place of P. C. Walker, resigned.

Francis M. Burns, Pawtucket, R.I., in place of F. L. Giard, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Phillip C. Seigler, Batesburg, S.C., in place of R. G. Kennedy, retired.

James C. Riley, Piedmont, S.C., in place of W. F. Adkins, retired.

Margaret H. Leary, Troy, S.C., in place of R. A. Russell, transferred.

Thomas W. Suber, Whitmire, S.C., in place of T. P. Scott, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Kathryn A. Hight, Deadwood, S. Dak., in place of Lyle Elward, retired.

Christian B. Jordan, Fort Meade, S. Dak., in place of R. B. Allen, retired.

Elmer T. Fitzgerald, Rapid City, S. Dak., in place of G. W. Lampert, retired.

TENNESSEE

Walter F. Church, Roan Mountain, Tenn., in place of C. F. Heston, resigned.

Betty S. Watkins, Talbott, Tenn., in place of B. T. Newman, retired.

Joseph W. Gore, Wartrace, Tenn., in place of A. S. Shriver, retired.

TEXAS

Michael M. McCully, Clarendon, Tex., in place of J. R. Moore, deceased.

Wilburn Piefer, Devers, Tex., in place of O. S. Cousins, retired.

Luther G. Pool, Garland, Tex., in place of F. B. Crush, resigned.

Grover C. Gibbs, Jr., Glen Rose, Tex., in place of W. E. Porter, retired.

Douglas L. Garrett, Hempstead, Tex., in place of G. V. Norman, retired.

John L. Boyd, Lake Dallas, Tex., in place of W. L. Hunter, retired.

Carlos I. Palacios, Laredo, Tex., in place of J. R. Goodman, retired.

Hiram C. Dubose, Port Arthur, Tex., in place of F. C. Toups, deceased.

Leopoldo Martinez, Jr., Zapata, Tex., in place of Peregrina Benavides, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Herman L. Bundick, Painter, Va., in place of A. H. LeCato, retired.

Joseph C. Rucker, Shenandoah, Va., in place of V. C. Griffith, retired.

Archibald E. Sutton, Tappahannock, Va., in place of Edward Ware, retired.

WASHINGTON

Arvith M. Christiansen, Belfair, Wash., in place of M. W. Newkirk, retired.

Paul B. Coffey, Chewelah, Wash., in place of D. P. Salisbury, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Maurice B. Morrison, Charlton Heights, W. Va., in place of M. S. Robinson, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Robert A. Weinhold, Adell, Wis., in place of L. H. Dulmes, transferred.

John F. Rochon, Florence, Wis., in place of C. E. Rochon, retired.

Echo I. Fisk, Holcombe, Wis., in place of L. G. Bernier, retired.

Russell J. Myers, Monroe, Wis., in place of J. J. Burkhard, retired.

Cora D. Manthei, Pleasant Prairie, Wis., in place of A. J. Goff, retired.

Mary E. Suihkonen, Sheldon, Wis., in place of E. L. Grendahl, retired.

WYOMING

Orval Horton, Chugwater, Wyo., in place of E. N. Greff, retired.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Wilhelm A. Wulff
Robert W. Miller
John M. Wypick
Robert D. St. Aubyn
Billy E. Murphy
George F. Merritt
Benjamin E. Joyce
Jarold C. Carlton

The following persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

James L. Haas
Robert I. Ivans
William E. Newland
John A. Blanchard
Robert A. Wombacher
Dom Degnon, Jr.
Marshall H. Shytle
Ralph O. Moore
Duane A. Coppock

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-4, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Lavine Hubert
Eugene P. Farley
Eugene C. Colson
Harry A. Lessey
John W. Stamback
Arloy F. Jensen
Louie W. Stanley
Jack D. Rodgers
Arch "D" Grainger, Jr.
Artell B. Crowley, Jr.
Lloyd T. Twiford
Daniel W. Cluff
Robert C. Ashdon
Harry J. Backman
Morris J. Marshall
Hugo A. Cruz
William E. Hughes
Joseph L. Richardson
Norman R. Hundwin
John T. Mears, Jr.
George D. Doll
Robert C. Sykes
Charles I. Carpenter
Jack S. Breschini
Ernest T. Bittman
Julian R. Sherman
Leo V. Walsh, Jr.
Adrian Fulcher
Shelbert P. Creech
George J. McKinlock
David A. Smith
Walter S. Yeargain
Frederick D. Mann
James W. Berry
William F. Brock
Dolly Fulcher
Robert F. Konrad
Cornelius A. Johnson
Palmer F. Guarente

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-3, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Richard D. Mellette
Eugene L. Davis
Dewey F. Barfield
Frank J. Diersen
Howard Janke
Fleming C. Walker
Harry W. Perdue
Bill M. Aldridge
Alfred E. Spori
Aubrey R. Patten
Robert Jiudice
Robert E. Penny
Frederick J. Alles
Carl A. Carlson
Jack K. Halbert
Melvin G. McCoy
Richard J. Zwally
Thomas A. Gauld
Melvin C. Mize
Harlan Montgomery
Roland A. Woodward
Ernest G. Crispi
Edward T. Rollins
Morgan C. Hutto, Jr.
Paul P. Sherrill
Charles H. Buckley
James A. Winslow
Merle L. Cochran
Roger G. Stanton
Thor B. Olson
Gilbert Shaw
Stephen T. Watson
Slavko Stokich
Donald W. McNaughton
Harry C. Strother, Jr.
John J. Lencmeyer.
Thomas M. Hall, Jr.
Robert G. Cameron
Timothy J. Crowley
Wilbert D. B. Williams
Olos F. Marshall
Bruce L. Sifford
Everett J. Matteson
Earl J. Wesner
Russell A. Scruggs, Jr.
John H. Liedke
Thomas D. Galliher
John H. Deboe
William B. Miner
John F. Minster
William A. Vasquez
Robert C. McClanahar
Grover C. Newberry
William F. Kortlang
Edwin H. Cornell
Lawrence A. Taylor
James Szokolay
Andrew Yackovetsky
Richard J. Laflin
Richard P. McMullen
Donald R. Myers
Frederick R. Nickerson
Clark W. Straus
Robert E. Bonville
Robert L. Williams, Jr.
George G. Bannan
Neil H. Endsley
Russell R. Hickman
Walter W. Hake
Charles J. J. McGrath
William T. Morrison, Jr.
Charles O. Franklin

Arnold S. Knudsen
Anton J. Foydl, Jr.
Herman H. Keith
Charles R. Fowler
Melvin Midgett
Clyde S. Delanoy
Russell H. Stockfleth
Robert B. Collins
Wilbur E. Lincoln
Paul G. Patrinos
Wilfred E. Cobb, Jr.
Joseph C. Gimbl
Wilton A. Hockenberry
Dallas W. Palmer
Cyril L. Fennelly
David C. Adkins
Donald W. Olson
Hollis L. Beard
William F. Queen
John W. Laine
Andrew J. Brovey
Robert W. Conway
James F. Jones
Robert A. McCarten
John C. Revels
Raymond E. Masker

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Paul W. Bicking
Russell L. Holt
William R. Greene
James R. Reese
Jerry R. Cox
John F. Hevener
Geoffrey H. Briggs
John R. Cromwell
James J. Torpey
Kenneth J. Sweeney
Donald R. Karwedsky
Aloysius P. Seiler
Oscar B. Hall
Eugene E. Ockrassa
Earl F. Moore
Eugene O. Thorson
Elmer L. Hicks
Edwin J. Jonas, Jr.
Benney B. Bacon
John R. Scott, Jr.
Louis J. Grebbien
James "W" Jay, Jr.
John R. McMahon
Robert L. Jacks
Wallis N. Zimmerman
Billy Hopper
Bobbie L. Bentley
Wayne E. Nunnenkam
Allie C. Woodcock
Edward E. Godlewski
Edgar L. Parker
George E. Montfort
Dale E. McElfresh
Arthur L. Lucier
Eugene R. Amlong
Richard B. Page
Robert J. Baker
Arnold Brooks
Robert T. Gray
Warren G. Berto
Henry E. Brunet
Lysle G. Laussade
Jamie Smith
Alston H. White
Donald K. Byrd
Delbert F. Summers
Joseph E. Bruce
Raymond R. Close
Frederick F. Drzal
Daniel M. Wirzburger
Allen V. Walker, Jr.
Joe M. Clapp
John R. Bunn
Edward H. Monson
William Jackson
Frank W. Kurtz
Raymond W. Nickerson
Davis Rogers
Burr K. Vail
Wray A. Stout
Wilbur J. Hall, Jr.
Earle W. Dorr, Jr.
Clifford E. Reeves
Elmer Berrish
Garath H. Stephenson
Carl A. Powers
Loyd B. Reach, Jr.
Allen W. Craven
Forrest E. Colbath
William T. Mack
Thomas P. Connell
Jack G. Albert
Ernest C. Moore III
Howard H. Holman
Joe L. Franklin

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 11, 1963.

POSTMASTER

The nomination sent to the Senate on March 1, 1963, of Gary E. Helms to be postmaster at Stafford, in the State of Virginia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

African Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 this Congress designated April 15 as African Freedom Day. The emergence of the African Continent is one of the most spectacular and dramatic stories of our time. My very keen interest in this "continent God has held in reserve" goes back many years. During my service as delegate to the Eighth General Assembly of the U.N. my interest was greatly increased as we on the Fourth Committee debated the problems of the mandated and colonial areas.

In 1955 I undertook the first special study mission to Africa, south and east of the Sahara, on behalf of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Those 3½ months of study and travel were most illuminating and beneficial. The African has come a long way and like all humanity has a long way to go. I cannot agree with all practices carried on in the name of democracy on the continent, just as many Africans would take exception to certain aspects of the American scene. But now is not the time to be discouraged, indeed, there is every good reason to be hopeful.

The Communists had hoped to take over Africa. Now they are not so sure. The Washington Post on April 6, 1963, carried an article entitled, "Soviet Reported Trying for African Comeback." As the intervening years have served to strengthen my first impressions rather than to change them, may I again cite what I set down in my report of the Special Study Mission to Africa 8 years ago.

> The United States, in its position of leadership in the free world, cannot sidestep its responsibility in the unfoldment of Africa. We must take a deep interest in the social, economic, and political changes taking place in that great continent since they affect our own national goals.
>
> I know that always there will be a great bond of interest and affection between the people of the United States who from colonialism became a great power and the people of Africa who so recently assumed the mantle of independence. We all rejoice in Africa's independence and pray that with the grace of God freemen will temper their freedom with responsibility and dignity.

Forecast for 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Granville Sentinel newspaper, Granville, N.Y., one of the leading weekly newspapers in the 30th Congressional District. The new owner of the Granville Sentinel is Lt. Col. MacArthur Manchester, grandson of the late James L. Manchester, who, in 1875, established this newspaper, which today is an integral part of the village of Granville and its surrounding communities. While presently serving as regional field officer of the Selective Service System in Lebanon, N.H., Colonel Manchester, as the new editor and publisher of the Sentinel, has given unstintingly of his time and resources toward improving Granville's welfare and its esthetic standards.

As an indication of Colonel Manchester's determination to continue the Granville Sentinel in the same journalistic philosophy of its founder, I wish to include an enlightening editorial, written by the Honorable LEON H. GAVIN, of Pennsylvania, entitled "Forecast For 1963." As a top-ranking member of the powerful Armed Services Committee, Representative GAVIN is fully conversant with the tremendous armed thrust of America's might. Representative GAVIN's warm personality, firm patriotism, and dedication to the public interest is well reflected in his thoughts on the future of America's business.

The following guest editorial is one of many that has appeared from week to week under the new management of Lt. Col. MacArthur H. Manchester:

FORECAST FOR 1963

> The plain truth about the business outlook for the next few months is that it is shrouded in heavy fog. Seldom before have so many professional forecasters been so cautious. If they agree at all, it is that the economy is sluggish and will remain so in the immediate future. If this seems pessimistic, at least no serious recession is in sight. By some miracle we escaped what could have been a really sharp downturn after the market dropped so swiftly last May 28. That is to say, we have escaped it so far.
>
> Ignoring the spreaders of doom and gloom, some customers boosted retail sales in November to an annual rate of $235 billion, or about $15 billion higher than in 1961 (there was a 2 percent dip in department store sales during the last week of November and the first week of December). Durable goods are likely to reach a 1962 total of $75 billion, a comeback from the lackluster year of 1961 when the total was $67 billion. Auto sales, too, seem to be close to a big year, if not a record year.
>
> But it is not fair to imply that all consumers are easy spenders. Savings and the purchase of Government E and H bonds are up. A good part of this increase represents not only new savings, but money no doubt that was switched from the stock market during and after the drop in the market. This savings account and Government bond money now represent what the economists call "liquid funds." When and if public confidence in the market increases, these funds can quickly be reinvested in stocks—or used to purchase consumer goods. This is a definite plus sign.
>
> The fog arises almost entirely from the doubt about what the administration and Congress will do this year about spending and taxes.
>
> No one doubts the need for tax reductions. The big questions are: When should they be made? Can reduction be combined with tax reform? Will tax cuts really be accompanied by spending cuts? Will the administration at long last propose a really sound tax program?

If these problems can be resolved favorably, the whole economic outlook would change. The corporate and individual income taxes place a higher penalty on extra effort and incentives here than in any other modern country. They are among the major blocks to our moving ahead.

The question is: Should the larger share of tax cuts go to those fewer individuals who tend to invest in stocks or corporate bonds or to the lower income groups? The first kind of tax cuts would stimulate the economy over the long range by helping to set up new jobs. The latter would stimulate consumer spending, which is so greatly needed, and so act as a quick shot in the arm.

The administration has not committed itself to any meaningful reduction in spending. And there are many who do not believe that tax cuts alone, any kind of tax cut, will help the economy, if they bring more deficits, more inflation. There have been consecutive deficits in the last 3 years, totaling $18 billion, and the national debt now stands at $305 billion. Any tax cut, without a spending cut, would simply add to this deficit, diminishing confidence in the business outlook.

So there really is no magic formula to restore the kind of prosperity the country enjoyed during prior administration.

This is not to say that nothing can be done or that our economy is weak. If the administration presented a balanced budget with both spending and taxes reduced; if the huge deficits in our balance of international payments were cut; if the integrity of the dollar and our gold reserves were restored; if the administration's economic advisers show some understanding of the role of profits in a free enterprise economy, the economy would move ahead with vigor. Surely, these proposals are not unreasonable.

And in all honesty, it must be said that business itself has a role to play. Neither tax cuts nor spending cuts will restore full prosperity. They cannot take the place of imaginative management. The fact is that the great consumer rush to buy which followed World War II is gone. We are now in a buyers' market. The consumer is not simply looking for things to buy. He is looking for new things to buy. And he is beginning to look at the price tags again. American business has returned to the old law of survival of the fittest. Businessmen who are slow to recognize this cannot be rescued by tax cuts, nor pamphlets from the Department of Commerce.

To sum up, business will grow and prosper if Government will get out of its way, and if businessmen revive the old American tradition of pleasing the customer—who, by the way, is king once more.

The Honorable LEON H. GAVIN,
House of Representatives, U.S. Congress.

Re H.R. 5389, a Bill To Substitute Fiat, Nonconvertible Federal Reserve Notes for All $1 and $2 U.S. Currency Redeemable in Silver Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on April 10, I addressed the House in opposition to the passage of H.R. 5389. The time allowed me expired before the conclusion of my criticism of this bill.

Although I was given permission to extend and revise my remarks at that point in the RECORD, the remaining portion of my statement was not added to the remarks that I made on the floor. The remaining portion of my statement, pointing out the irreparable damage that this action would cause follows:

This bill will result in a further run on, and a drain upon our subsidiary silver, 50-cent, 25-cent, and 10-cent pieces, where the silver content is 0.72 ounce per $1 of coins. It will become profitable to hoard or melt down silver coins—subsidiary—at $1.38 per ounce.

The best and most effective way to meet this problem is to balance our budget, retain our silver currency monetary system, and make silver currency freely available to the general public.

Our present silver redemption monetary policy reinforces our gold reserves.

The replacement of silver dollars by Federal Reserve notes would further dilute the monetary system. It would further weaken the faith and credit of our Nation, both domestically and internationally.

As of March 27, 1963, the Treasury's stock of gold was $15.88 billion.

The Federal Reserve currency outstanding was $29.89 billion.

The Federal Reserve deposits were $17.63 billion.

The Federal Reserve liabilities, requiring a 25-percent gold reserve were $47.52 billion.

The 25-percent gold reserve requirement was $11.88 billion.

The Treasury gold assets were $15.88 billion.

The U.S. gold available for meeting foreign-held dollars and short-term obligations was $4 billion.

The present bill would add $500 million to the required gold reserves by the substitution of $2 billion Federal Reserve notes for silver certificates. This would reduce U.S. gold available to meet foreign holdings to $3.5 billion.

The U.S. Government has borrowed $800 million of gold from the International Monetary Fund which should be deducted from our holdings. This leaves a net gold stock available to meet foreign holdings to $2.7 billion.

Our short-term banking liabilities to foreigners on March 30, 1964, was $24.9 billion.

Our short-term claims on foreigners as of March 30, 1964, was $4.9 billion.

Our net short-term liabilities to foreigners, payable in gold on demand was $20 billion.

The ratio of our liabilities to our free gold—$20 billion to $2.7 billion—is about $7 in liabilities to $1 in available gold. The United States could only pay off 14 cents for each dollar of our gold liabilities to foreigners.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill will exert great pressures for the complete abandonment of our 25-percent gold reserve presently supporting $30 billion of Federal Reserve currency and $17 billion of Federal Reserve deposits.

This bill is a mere prelude to the repeal of the 25-percent gold reserve requirement for our currency. It is another major step toward devaluation, repudiation, and international bankruptcy.

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION

There are a number of possible alternative solutions that would insure the retention of our silver redeemable currency and, at the same time, assure the Treasury of an adequate silver supply to meet coinage and silver reserve requirements.

The possible alternatives are—

First. Continue the minting of $1 silver coins with a reduction of silver content from 0.77 ounce to 0.72 ounce.

Second. Retain our $1 and $2 U.S. silver certificates redeemable in silver dollars with a content of 0.72 ounce of silver.

These two steps would equalize at $1.38 instead of at $1.29 per ounce the redemption monetary value of our silver certificates and dollars with that of our subsidiary silver coins of 10, 25, and 50 cents.

Third. Substitute U.S. Treasury notes for U.S. Treasury silver certificates and require a 60-percent reserve instead of a 100-percent reserve for silver notes.

This action would free 40 percent of our $1.6 billion ounces of silver and make it available for either normal or emergency needs.

The 60-percent reserve would be substantially higher than our 25-percent gold reserve for Federal Reserve notes and 45 percent for U.S. Treasury notes.

Fourth. Authorize the U.S. Treasury to protect our silver supply by the purchase or sale of free silver at a predetermined price between $1.29 and $1.38 per ounce.

Permit me to amplify my statement to the effect that we do have a sufficiency of silver to meet our coinage and currency requirements.

The April 3, 1963, Treasury statement states that we have on hand—

First. 1.633 billion ounces of silver on hand, valued at $1.29 per ounce, carried on the books at $2.111 billion.

Second. Against this silver, there are outstanding silver certificates, in face amount of $2.131 billion.

We have a 100 percent backing for our $1, $2, $5, and $10 silver certificates.

Third. We have $81 million of silver dollar coins.

Fourth. We have 37 million ounces of bullion, valued at $31 million.

Fifth. We have 64.7 million ounces stockpiled with the Atomic Energy Commission, having no present nor prospective use, valued at $85 million.

Sixth. About $300 million of silver will be freed and become available through the withdrawal and the substitution of Federal Reserve notes for $5 and $10 silver certificates.

The alleged purpose of this bill is to free silver, held as a reserve for U.S. silver currency, for coinage purposes.

Our coinage and currency requirements today are sufficient to last for at least 3 to 4 years. This does not include the additional purchase of U.S. production of about $30 to $40 million of silver per year.

This bill would cause irreparable damage to our monetary system. It would invite a disastrous run on our gold supply by foreign holders. This bill should be returned to the Banking and Currency Committee.

The Padre of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it may be interesting to my distinguished colleagues to know that Father Joseph F. Thorning, the world-renowned priest-scholar who offered the prayer today on the 19th annual celebration of Pan American Day is a citizen of the Free State of Maryland and a resident of my own community in the heart of Maryland. It may also be considered noteworthy that this friend of many Members of the U.S. Congress, including myself, was first described as "the padre of the Americas" by one of the great leaders of the legislative branch of our Government. I refer, of course, to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, now the majority leader of the U.S. Senate. It was this gentleman, himself distinguished for his vision and valor in the development of the good-neighbor policy, who, speaking on the floor of this House many years ago, characterized Dr. Thorning as "The Padre of the Americas." The title became the popular characterization of my friend and constituent.

Indeed, in recent years, the achievements of this apostle of good will have added luster to his name and to his reputation. We in Maryland are happy to know that, each year, Dr. Thorning, by conscientious research, study, and writing, enriches our Maryland heritage by his devotion to religious principles, great American traditions, and the ideals of freedom. This is added evidence of his love of God and country. It also explains why numerous leaders of the Congress of both political parties and all religious faiths have welcomed this Maryland priest, educator, author, and diplomat to the House of Representatives for 19 consecutive years to invoke God's blessing upon us and our labors for the Commonwealth.

It is a privilege for me, as the Representative for the Sixth District of Maryland, to join my esteemed colleagues of both parties in expressing respect, admiration, and affection for a servant of God who has deserved well of the Republic. In the words of another friend and a distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, we can all believe that the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Frederick County, Md., will be remembered in the history of the United States of America and the Western Hemisphere and throughout the Iberian Peninsula as "a great American and a man of God."

The archdiocese of Baltimore can be happy that such a faithful priest serves in its historic jurisdiction. And, as a Member of the Maryland congressional delegation, I would like to congratulate Father Thorning's archbishop, the Most Reverend Lawrence Joseph Shehan, D.D., LL.D., upon the contributions to the cause of inter-American amity which have been made by Father Thorning and other members of his archdiocese, both priests and lay leaders, at a time when such service to God is also national service.

Sir Winston Churchill: Honorary U.S. Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy on Tuesday signed a proclamation declaring one of the greatest Englishmen of history, Sir Winston Churchill, to be an honorary citizen of the United States. As a Member of the 88th Congress, I was proud to cast my vote in favor of this honor bestowed upon Great Britain's wartime Prime Minister. His magnificent contributions to the cause of freemen assure him a place in history as one of the truly great leaders of all ages.

Under unanimous consent I wish to have Sir Winston's message to President Kennedy, the President's remarks at the ceremony, and the Presidential proclamation printed with my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

CHURCHILL'S MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. President, I have been informed by Mr. David Bruce that it is your intention to sign a bill conferring upon me honorary citizenship of the United States.

I have received many kindnesses from the United States of America, but the honor which you now accord me is without parallel. I accept it with deep gratitude and affection.

I am also most sensible of the warm-hearted action of the individual States who accorded me the great compliment of their own honorary citizenships as a prelude to this act of Congress.

It is a remarkable comment on our affairs that the former Prime Minister of a great sovereign state should thus be received as an honorary citizen of another. I say "great sovereign state" with design and emphasis, for I reject the view that Britain and the Commonwealth should now be relegated to a tame and minor role in the world. Our past is the key to our future, which I firmly trust and believe will be no less fertile and glorious. Let no man underrate our energies, our potentialities, and our abiding power for good.

I am, as you know, half American by blood, and the story of my association with that mighty and benevolent Nation goes back nearly 90 years to the day of my father's marriage. In this century of storm and tragedy I contemplate with high satisfaction the constant factor of the interwoven and upward progress of our peoples. Our comradeship and our brotherhood in war were unexampled. We stood together, and because of that fact the free world now stands. Nor has our partnership any exclusive nature: the Atlantic community is a dream that can well be fulfilled to the detriment of none and to the enduring benefit and honor of the great democracies.

Mr. President, your action illuminates the theme of unity of the English-speaking peoples, to which I have devoted a large part of my life. I would ask you to accept yourself, and to convey to both Houses of Congress, and through them to the American people, my solemn and heartfelt thanks for this unique distinction, which will always be proudly remembered by my descendants.

KENNEDY'S REMARKS AT THE CEREMONY

We meet to honor a man whose honor requires no meeting—for he is the most honored and honorable man to walk the stage of human history in the time in which we live.

Whenever and wherever tyranny threatened, he has always championed liberty.

Facing firmly toward the future, he has never forgotten the past.

Serving six monarchs of his native Great Britain, he has served all men's freedom and dignity.

In the dark days and darker nights when Britain stood alone—and most men save Englishmen despaired of England's life—he mobilized the English language and sent it into battle. The incandescent quality of his words illuminated the courage of his countrymen.

Given unlimited powers by his citizens, he was ever vigilant to protect their rights.

Indifferent himself to danger, he wept over the sorrows of others.

A child of the House of Commons, he became in time its father.

Accustomed to the hardships of battle, he has no distaste for pleasure.

Now his stately Ship of Life, having weathered the severest storms of a troubled century, is anchored in tranquil waters, proof that courage and faith and the zest for freedom are truly indestructible. The record of his triumphant passage will inspire free hearts for all time.

By adding his name to our rolls, we mean to honor him—but his acceptance honors us far more. For no statement or proclamation can enrich his name—the name Sir Winston Churchill is already legend.

KENNEDY PROCLAMATION

Whereas Sir Winston Churchill, a son of America though a subject of Britain, has been throughout his life a firm and steadfast friend of the American people and the American Nation; and

Whereas he has freely offered his hand and his faith in days of adversity as well as triumph; and

Whereas his bravery, charity and valor, both in war and in peace, have been a flame of inspiration in freedom's darkest hour; and

Whereas his life has shown that no adversary can overcome, and no fear can deter, free men in the defense of their freedom; and

Whereas he has expressed with unsurpassed power and splendor the aspirations of peoples everywhere for dignity and freedom; and

Whereas he has by his art as an historian and his judgment as a statesman made the past the servant of the future;

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, under the authority contained in an act of the 88th Congress, do hereby declare Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 9th day of April in the year of our Lord 1963, and of the independence of the United States of America the 187th.

Third Annual Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to call to the attention of other Members of the House the final results of the third annual questionnaire conducted in Michigan's Eighth Congressional District. I only regret that I am unable to also list the many additional notes and comments by many of the 6,000 persons who participated in the voting. These additional notes were most interesting and poignant. Exactly 5,794 replies were tabulated by Data Processing Services, an increase of over 500 from last year's return. The questionnaire was published in 18 weekly newspapers and in the 4 dailies that cover the Eighth District. In addition, it was mailed to approximately 30,000 persons in my district. I am still receiving returns today. I am most grateful for the wonderful cooperation of all news media in publicizing the questionnaire, and for the interest in their Government shown by the citizens who took time to make their views known.

The questionnaire results are as follows:

1. Do you favor placing medicare for the aged under social security and raising social security taxes in a sufficient amount to cover cost?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	311	456	8	775
Percent	40.1	58.8	1.0	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	250	724	12	986
Percent	25.4	73.4	1.2	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	113	660	18	791
Percent	14.3	83.4	2.3	100.0
Professional:				
Number	105	501	12	618
Percent	17.0	81.1	1.9	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	139	606	14	759
Percent	18.3	79.8	1.8	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	99	438	17	554
Percent	17.9	79.1	3.1	100.0
Retired:				
Number	263	483	29	775
Percent	33.9	62.3	3.7	100.0
Other:				
Number	54	148	1	203
Percent	26.6	72.9	.5	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	104	223	6	333
Percent	31.2	67.0	1.8	100.0
Total:				
Number	1,438	4,239	117	5,794
Percent	24.0	73.2	2.0	100.0

2. Do you favor a tax cut aimed at stimulating the economy even though it results in our going deeper in debt?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employees:				
Number	198	550	27	775
Percent	25.5	71.0	3.5	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	162	805	19	986
Percent	16.4	81.6	1.9	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	104	664	23	791
Percent	13.1	83.9	2.9	100.0
Professional:				
Number	85	510	23	618
Percent	13.8	82.5	3.7	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	99	647	13	759
Percent	13.0	85.2	1.7	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	74	461	19	554
Percent	13.4	83.2	3.4	100.0
Retired:				
Number	110	641	24	775
Percent	14.2	82.7	3.1	100.0
Other:				
Number	41	158	4	203
Percent	20.2	77.8	2.0	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	49	276	8	333
Percent	14.7	82.9	2.4	100.0
Total:				
Number	922	4,712	160	5,794
Percent	15.9	81.3	2.8	100.0

3. Do you favor formation of a Domestic Peace Corps to work on local community problems?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	283	446	46	775
Percent	36.5	57.5	5.9	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	284	657	45	986
Percent	28.8	66.6	4.6	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	170	559	62	791
Percent	21.5	70.7	7.8	100.0
Professional:				
Number	209	377	32	618
Percent	33.8	61.0	5.2	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	176	496	87	759
Percent	23.2	65.3	11.5	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	158	349	47	554
Percent	28.5	63.0	8.5	100.0
Retired:				
Number	238	457	80	775
Percent	30.7	59.0	10.3	100.0
Other:				
Number	73	112	18	203
Percent	36.0	55.2	8.9	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	96	212	25	333
Percent	28.8	63.7	7.5	100.0
Total:				
Number	1,687	3,665	442	5,794
Percent	29.1	63.3	7.6	100.0

4. Do you favor Federal grants to subsidize city buslines in financial need?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	128	609	38	775
Percent	16.5	78.6	4.9	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	93	842	51	986
Percent	9.4	85.4	5.2	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	58	706	27	791
Percent	7.3	89.3	3.4	100.0
Professional:				
Number	65	517	36	618
Percent	10.5	83.7	5.8	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	61	647	51	759
Percent	8.0	85.2	6.7	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	81	409	64	554
Percent	14.6	73.8	11.6	100.0
Retired:				
Number	153	560	62	775
Percent	19.7	72.3	8.0	100.0
Other:				
Number	25	164	14	203
Percent	12.3	80.8	6.9	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	50	267	16	333
Percent	15.0	80.2	4.8	100.0
Total:				
Number	714	4,721	359	5,794
Percent	12.3	81.5	6.2	100.0

5. Do you favor continuing our foreign aid?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	270	421	84	775
Percent	34.8	54.3	10.8	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	387	454	145	986
Percent	39.2	46.0	14.7	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	243	428	120	791
Percent	30.7	54.1	15.2	100.0
Professional:				
Number	252	255	111	618
Percent	40.8	41.3	18.0	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	222	396	141	759
Percent	29.2	52.2	18.6	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	187	260	107	554
Percent	33.8	46.9	19.3	100.0
Retired:				
Number	190	453	132	775
Percent	24.5	58.5	17.0	100.0
Other:				
Number	80	94	29	203
Percent	39.4	46.3	14.3	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	91	182	60	333
Percent	27.3	54.7	18.0	100.0
Total:				
Number	1.922	2,943	929	5,794
Percent	33.2	50.8	16.0	100.0

6. Do you favor administration's general handling of the Cuban situation?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	342	361	72	775
Percent	44.1	46.6	9.3	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	299	592	95	986
Percent	30.3	60.0	9.6	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	183	528	80	791
Percent	23.1	66.8	10.1	100.0
Professional:				
Number	164	397	57	618
Percent	26.5	64.2	9.2	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	273	380	106	759
Percent	36.0	50.1	14.0	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	149	328	77	554
Percent	26.9	59.2	13.9	100.0
Retired:				
Number	229	437	109	775
Percent	29.5	56.4	14.1	100.0
Other:				
Number	64	122	17	203
Percent	31.5	60.1	8.4	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	105	175	53	333
Percent	31.5	52.6	15.9	100.0
Total:				
Number	1,808	3,320	666	5,794
Percent	31.2	57.3	11.5	100.0

7. Do you favor new Federal legislation to deal with strikes affecting our national welfare?

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Hourly employee:				
Number	585	166	24	775
Percent	75.5	21.4	3.1	100.0
Salaried employee:				
Number	836	115	35	986
Percent	84.8	11.7	3.5	100.0
Businessman:				
Number	708	60	23	791
Percent	89.5	7.6	2.9	100.0
Professional:				
Number	538	60	20	618
Percent	87.1	9.7	3.2	100.0
Farmer:				
Number	675	62	22	759
Percent	88.9	8.2	2.9	100.0
Housewife:				
Number	454	59	41	554
Percent	81.9	10.6	7.4	100.0
Retired:				
Number	700	46	29	775
Percent	90.3	5.9	3.7	100.0
Other:				
Number	164	30	9	203
Percent	80.8	14.8	4.4	100.0
Not stated:				
Number	279	43	11	333
Percent	83.8	12.9	3.3	100.0
Total:				
Number	4,939	641	214	5,794
Percent	85.2	11.1	3.7	100.0

World Trade Club, San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1963, the World Trade Club of San Francisco will celebrate the third anniversary of the opening of its headquarters in the World Trade Center at the Ferry Building in San Francisco.

Dedicated to the promotion, encouragement, and expansion of international trade and world travel, as an adjunct and integral part of the San Francisco World Trade Center, the World Trade Club has grown in the past 3 years to a present membership of 1,380 firms and individuals who are associated either directly or indirectly with the field of international trade and world travel. During this period the club has gained international stature as a meeting place for the various organizations directly concerned with the basic purposes of the club, such as the San Francisco Area World Trade Association, the San Francisco Consular Corps, the Pan American Society, the Export Managers' Association, the Marine Exchange, the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce Marine Committee, and others, and has also gained renown for its receptions and dinners honoring foreign trade delegations and other government representatives, both foreign and domestic, and has sponsored such special receptions and celebrations as Australia Day, New Zealand Day, India Day, and Philippine Day. One interesting recent event was the staging by the World Trade Club of a reception for the Commonwealth consuls general under joint sponsorship with International Business Week of Stanford University.

It is a matter of particular interest that the bylaws of the World Trade Club provide for the issuance of special memberships on an honorary basis to the heads of all foreign diplomatic corps located in the bay area, with the result that the other members of the club interested in world trade and travel may have direct and continuous contact with all of the representatives of the foreign countries around the world who necessarily have a similar interest.

The World Trade Club has been extremely fortunate in having for its president during the past 3 years George Killion, president of the American President Lines and a member of the National Export Expansion Council of the U.S. Department of Commerce. At the annual meeting of the board of directors of the club held on March 4, 1963, Mr. Killion was unanimously reelected as president of the club for the ensuing year, in recognition of the invaluable services he has rendered to the club and to the foreign trade community centered in San Francisco. J. Monroe Sullivan, the secretary of the World Trade Club, is executive director of the San Francisco World Trade Center Authority, a State agency, and is a member of the San Franciso Regional Export Expansion Council of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Among the well-known individuals presently serving on the board of directors of the World Trade Club are Cyril Magnin, president of the San Francisco Port Authority, Adolph P. Schuman, chairman of the San Francisco World Trade Center Authority and an international figure in import and export trade, Albert L. Reeves, senior vice president of Utah Construction & Mining Co., and William A. Pomeroy, identified with J. H. Pomeroy & Co., both firms being favorably known and identified in the international contractor field, and Otto N. Miller, president of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

Additional Views of Mr. Wilson, Mr. Gubser, and Mr. Chamberlain to H.R. 5555

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the House Committee on Armed Services favorably reported H.R. 5555, the military pay bill. My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] and I had serious reservations regarding the manner in which this bill treats members of the military services on the retired list. We have, therefore, filed additional views which will be a part of the committee report and have been joined in these views by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit our additional views herewith and commend them to the attention of all Members who are interested in fair treatment of those who have devoted a lifetime to military service:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. WILSON, MR. GUBSER, AND MR. CHAMBERLAIN TO H.R. 5555

This bill contains a major inconsistency. While purporting to encourage competent members of our armed services to make lifetime careers of the military service, it breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to the service.

For more than 100 years, it has been traditional that retired military pay should be based on active duty pay. Some have stated that the right to recompute retired pay on the basis of new and increased active duty pay was only a moral obligation. However, just last year Secretary McNamara submitted a memorandum to the Senate Armed Services Committee which demonstrated beyond doubt that the authority for recomputation of pay is definitely based on clear provisions of law rather than on a mere practice. The Comptroller General, Secretary McNamara disclosed, has consistently held that section 6149 United States Code, title 10, and other laws establish this right. The abovementioned section reads in part, "* * * the retired pay to which the officer is entitled shall be recomputed on the basis of the new rates."

In 1922, Congress departed from the traditional principle of recomputation but promptly corrected its error in the next Congress. The principle prevailed until 1958. In a drastic and sudden action, with no warning to retired personnel, Congress provided that all officers who retired prior to June 1, 1958, would only receive a 6-percent "cost of living increase." Because the 1958 Pay Act corrected the situation where grades of lieutenant colonel and above had been underpaid for many years, this created a considerable injustice to officers on the retired list. Ironically, many of the officers affected by this repudiation of a long-standing commitment were those who served in two world wars.

At page 1577 of the hearings an experienced recruiting officer testified as follows:

"Every man on the retired rolls and on active duty has been told by the recruiting officials that his retired pay would be based upon the active duty pay scales."

We all know that fringe benefits, including retired pay, have always been offered as an inducement for servicemen to accept less money in the military than they would receive in civilian life.

We believe it is out of character for the U.S. Government to make a promise and then refuse to keep it. We do not believe that budgetary considerations can replace morality.

Former President Eisenhower urged Congress to correct the mistake it made in 1958, and on May 12, 1960, the House unanimously passed H.R. 11318 which would allow those retired after June 1, 1958, to recompute on the basis of the 1958 act. President Kennedy committed himself to the principle of recomputation in his campaign of 1960 and Defense Secretary McNamara recommended that the bill before you today allow recomputation on the basis of the 1958 act. Additionally, Subcommittee No. 1, after weeks of hearings on this bill, accepted the principle of recomputation and reported it to the full committee.

While we admit that the Department of Defense proposal and the subcommittee recommendations fall short of retaining the traditional concept of recomputation for the future, they at least overcame the wide discrepancy in retirement pay between those who retired May 31, 1958, and those who retired on the following day. We believe the full committee erred in not accepting the subcommittee recommendations.

According to established scales of comparability with civil service, active duty military personnel have always been underpaid. Part of this has been made up through noncontributory retirement, hospital benefits, commissary privileges, and other benefits. Even after decreasing comparable civil service pay by the 6½ percent retirement deduction and increasing military pay to include the taxes which are not paid on subsistence and quarters allowance, the pay of a colonel under this bill is almost $200 a month below that of his civil service counterpart. Certainly with such a differential, the military man should be able to look forward to the fulfillment of what he had been promised upon entering the service. Removing the right to recompute will be one fringe benefit gone. Already we have taken the practical benefit of commissaries away, and present policy is to eventually make it impossible for retirees to receive medical care and hospitalization. One by one, the fringe benefits are disappearing and the pay differential remains. How long can we expect our military people to feed their families on their great sense of duty and patriotism?

It is a common error to state that the military retiree does better than his civil service counterpart. The truth is that the military man who serves a full 30 years is not doing as well as the civil servant who gets longevity and can increase his "high 5" average years. After 30 years of service he can go up to as high as 80 percent of his "high 5" average. On the other hand, the military man gets only 75 percent of his basic pay and is not given retirement credit for his allowances. Figures clearly show that the civil servant draws more retirement pay than military men of equal rank and equal years of service. After 2½ to 3 years, the civilian has gotten back all of his contribution.

In fiscal year 1963 the Government's share of civil service retirement was $896 million. At present the civil service retirement fund is deficient actuarily by $36 billion.

Military retirees have generously contributed to their retirement through acceptance of substandard wages based upon comparability tables. Furthermore, military retired pay was not conceived as a pension and has never been considered as such. In the case of *United States* v. *Hooper* (U.S.C.M.A. 643–645) in 1958, the Court of Military Appeals held in part: "Officers on the retired list are not mere pensioners in any sense of the word * * * the salaries that they receive are not solely recompense for past services, but a means devised by Congress to assure their availability * * * in future contingencies." This is why members of the retired list are still subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Retired pay is different than civil service pensions and should not be compared with them. But if one insists upon making a comparison, then he should remember that it is not more of a financial drain on the Nation's future revenues than civil service retirement, it is not as generous, and it has been earned by the serviceman through the accptance of comparably lower rates of pay.

It is true that the retired list will be expanded dramatically in the near future. But this is the cost of World War II and the Korean conflict and the huge force levels required in the past 25 years. This is the fulfillment of a promise made to those who served their country during its period of greatest trial.

A good portion of the national debt is represented by the cost of our national defense in the past 25 years. No one would suggest that we repudiate our bonded indebtedness and refuse to pay interest to our bond holders. Why then should we repudiate our promise to the men and women who served in our military forces?

For the sake of $32 million, the cost of recomputation, a vital tradition has been destroyed and a solemn commitment has been violated. The $32 million cost would decrease each year as the numbers of those who retired prior to June 1, 1958, would deplete. It will eventually disappear as an annual cost.

The $32 million increase in the cost of this bill will still keep the total figure below that which has been requested by the President in his fiscal year 1964 budget.

Appropriations for veterans benefits continue to increase and the deficit in the civil service retirement fund increases. Always there is money to pay these increased costs. We believe we can find the money to keep our commitments to retired military men.

We strongly urge that as a matter of honor and justice, the Department of Defense recommendations allowing those on the retired list to recompute their retired pay on the basis of the 1958 act, should be adopted.

The Federal Reserve Board Should Immediately Reduce the Discount Rate to 2½ Percent—This Would Do as Much as a Tax Cut Toward Bringing About Economic Expansion and Reducing Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Members return to their hometowns during the Easter recess, no doubt many well-meaning constituents will ask, in the style of the day, what they can do for their country.

My answer is that they can call upon the Federal Reserve Board to reduce the discount rate immediately from 3 to 2½ percent and, of course, follow through with the kind of monetary policy that such a reduction implies.

We are now witnessing some very encouraging signs of business expansion. It is entirely possible that, given half a chance, the economy will recover to something approaching reasonably full employment of our labor force and productive plant. It is even possible that, given half a chance through a congenial monetary policy, the economic system will generate a sufficient expansion, on its own, without our having to reduce taxes and expand the Federal deficit in order to pump purchasing power into the economy.

We have been treated to a long series of excuses, scares, and bugaboos to justify a tight credit, high interest rate policy. Throughout the Eisenhower administration, the bugaboo was inflation. Throughout the Kennedy administration, to date, the bugaboo has been balance of payments.

The Joint Economic Committee has considered very carefully, with continuous studies of more than 2 years, the role of interest rates, tight money, unemployment, and slow economic growth in the United States in the balance-of-payments picture; and it has not been able to find any justification for the tight-money policy. On the contrary, the evidence is extremely persuasive that the tight-money policy is actually worsening our balance-of-payments problem.

The Joint Economic Committee's report on this subject, filed on March 14 of this year, has not had, I believe, sufficient attention. Naturally the committee recognized that monetary and debt management policies go hand in hand and must be coordinated to bring about a level of interest rates conducive to economic expansion and continuing ecoomic growth. I urgently commend to the attention of the Members a brief section from this report of the Joint Economic Committee as follows:

MONETARY AND DEBT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

We do not agree with the Council of Economic Advisers that: "Monetary policy has remained favorable to economic expansion." The widespread urge for supplemental fiscal action is evidence of the general feeling that monetary policy has not been favorable enough to bring forth enough expansion. Since mid-1962 active consideration has, accordingly, been given by the executive departments, by Congress, and in public forums, to tax reduction and reform as necessary Federal moves for reducing unemployment and stimulating growth.

This shift in emphasis which has pushed fiscal policy to the forefront in current policy discussion in no way eases, however, the responsibility of the Federal Reserve authorities to do more than in the past to restore the desired growth pattern. Indeed, if there has ever been any uncertainty as to the force of the public mandate in calling upon the monetary authorities for stimulative measures, vigorously pursued, that uncertainty can no longer exist. The widespread demands for stimulative tax reductions are by the same token demands for stimulative monetary action. Monetary policy must now help fiscal policy to do the stimulative job which, unfortunately, the monetary authorities have not done. Similarly, in these circumstances debt management should be handled so as to reinforce expansionary fiscal policies.

"We recommend that the monetary authorities follow a policy of assuring that the money supply expands in line with the rising needs of an expanding economy. Such a policy will reinforce the proposed fiscal policies and at the same time spare the Federal Reserve System their perennial explanations of why monetary policy is blameless in the face of a lagging economy."

The failure of monetary measures, unaided, to bring about a satisfactory reduction in unemployment and an improved rate of growth stems in part from the policies which have been pursued. Increases in money supply have been allowed to lag behind the growth of the economy. Another aspect of recent policy involves the alleged constraints imposed by the balance of payments.

The adverse effects on the economy, when emerging from recession, of a tax system which operates to impose a drag upon the economy by rolling up a disproportionately large tax "bite" out of the increased activity are being recognized in current tax discussions. On the monetary side, the economy has had to contend with a similar institutional drag. The "money supply" has been allowed to level off with each weakness in the economy but is not permitted to expand to appropriate new high levels as the economy struggles to come out of the downswings.

As the volume of transactions of goods and services grows, something like a similar expansion in the media of exchange is necessary. Under our banking system, this means an expansion of the volume of credit. The Federal Reserve System was expressly designed—and is expected—continually to adjust the money supply to the increasing needs of the economy. If an expansion in available reserves is not forthcoming, either the volume of transactions must be curtailed or the existing money supply called upon to do extra duty. But money conservation measures are not costless. They are likely to be used only when the needs of expanding trade strain the available means of settlement. The upward trend in the turnover of demand deposits, most rapid in years of monetary restraint, is thus an indication that the public has not been supplied with sufficient amounts of new money in relation to transactions and income.

The ratio of money supply, that is, currency in circulation together with demand deposits, to gross national product, has steadily declined since 1950 (table 2). At the end of 1954, when the distortions of the Korean war had been liquidated, the money supply amounted to 35.9 percent of gross national product. As recently as 1958 it was 31.1 percent, down more than 10 percent, while in 1962 it was down to 26.4 percent, a decline of more than one-fourth in the decade.

TABLE 2.—*Money supply, total liquid assets, and gross national product with comparisons*

[Amounts in billions of dollars; ratios expressed as percentages]

Period	Gross national product	Demand deposits adjusted and currency outside banks	Total liquid assets held by the public [1]	Ratio to gross national product	
				Money supply	Total liquid assets [1]
1951	329.0	119.2	281.0	36.2	82.6
1952	347.0	125.2	296.0	36.1	81.8
1953	365.4	128.3	311.5	35.1	85.6
1954	363.1	130.3	320.3	35.9	85.9
1955	397.5	134.4	332.5	33.8	81.3
1956	419.2	136.0	343.2	32.4	79.6
1957	442.8	136.7	356.0	30.9	80.3
1958	444.5	138.4	373.1	31.1	80.2
1959	482.8	142.3	393.9	29.6	80.5
1960	503.4	140.9	399.2	28.0	79.0
1961	518.7	143.2	424.6	27.6	78.2
1962	553.6	146.0	458.3	26.4	80.9

[1] December each year, seasonally adjusted.

Source: Federal Reserve System data.

Stated another way, at the end of 1954 the money supply was called upon to support a gross national product 2.8 times its size. Eight years later it was being called upon to do one-third more; that is, the gross national product was 3.8 times the money supply.

If combined currency and demand deposits today had the same ratio to business activity as they did a decade ago, the money supply (demand deposits plus currency) would be over $200 billion instead of $146 billion. No one would suggest that the postwar lag in the money supply now dictates an immediate, or drastic, effort to catch up. Congress and the people have a right to insist, however, that in the decade ahead, the economy will not again have to make a 70-percent increase in gross national output of goods and services fit a 23-percent increase in money supply.

An expanded concept of money, including other so-called "liquid assets," is often used by the Board of Governors in its annual report discussions. The extent of the lagging financial means for carrying on business is less marked with this concept, but nonetheless real. Even when these other popular ways of holding substitute "money" balances are included, the liquid wherewithal for doing an enlarged volume business has been declining relatively. From 1954, after the Korean war, to 1961, total liquid assets held by the public have fallen from 85.9 percent to 78.2 percent of 1961 gross national product. It has been up somewhat in late 1962, returning to the 1957 levels. Recent evidence, coupled with the statement of the Chairman of the Board of Governors that some lessening of ease was decided upon in December 1962, shows that the authorities are already returning to the pattern which prevailed before this yearend increase in the ratio of liquid assets to gross national product.

"We again recommend that the monetary authorities provide the basis for secular increases in the money supply as the economy grows, through open market purchases of longer term Federal Securities, rather than by lowering reserve requirements."

We have in the past repeatedly recommended that the Federal Reserve provide the basis for an expanding money supply for our growing economy by open market purchases of longer term Federal securities. This policy gives the taxpayer a break through return to the Treasury of earnings of the Federal Reserve on such security holdings, instead of providing a free gift of earnings to the private banking system as occurs when expansion is provided through the lowering of reserve requirements. In addition, such open market purchases of longer term securities help the Treasury lengthen the debt, and tend to keep prices of longer term securities up and interest rates on these securities lower than would otherwise be the case. In turn, lower interest rates in the long end of the market tend to encourage investment, particularly in plant, equipment, and housing, which contributes to a higher rate of long-term economic growth. We can see no excuse for any other policy.

The monetary authorities have been going directly contrary to this committee's recommendation on this matter. They have reduced reserve requirements. The recent report of the Advisory Committee on Banking to the Comptroller of the Currency indicates that further reductions in reserve requirements are under consideration. The Joint Economic Committee, therefore, requests that the monetary authorities advise this committee before taking any further actions which run contrary to this committee's repeated recommendation that secular increases in the money supply be provided through open market purchases of longer term Federal securities rather than by lowering reserve requirements.

"We disapprove of the action of the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee in December 1962 when it moved to tighten monetary conditions. Tight money is not now needed either to fight inflation or to 'protect the dollar.'"

The hope that monetary policy will aid, rather than hinder, fiscal measures was vitiated by the ready confession of the Chairman of the Board of Governors to this committee on February 1, 1963, under questioning: "I will say to you now that you are correct in your analysis that the Federal Reserve is pursuing a slightly less easy policy." This statement was made in answer to a question as to whether policy had changed in December 1962, for the first time in 2½ years. The Chairman of the Board of Governors did not satisfactorily explain the grounds for even a slight deliberate tightening of credit. The change of policy was confirmed and reasons for the action were set forth in the record of the Open Market Committee's actions for 1962 that was made available to the committee after the hearings in response to our request. The action still seems to us both perplexing and premature.

It is thoroughly irrational to tighten monetary conditions while business activity is unsatisfactory, unemployment is high, large amounts of our capacity are idle, and the price level is stable. We hope that, if Congress should enact tax reduction measures, the monetary authorities will demonstrate enough faith in the judgment of Congress to lend their active aid and cooperation well in advance of the need for financing a deficit. They should not wait idly by while a tight credit situation is allowed to develop because of rising business credit requirements in an economy striving to grow.

Not even the balance-of-payments argument about "protecting the dollar" provides excuse for tighter money and higher interest rates. The extensive hearings of our Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments provided no evidence that differentials in interest rates between United States and foreign countries provide any substantial stimulus to capital outflows and hence to gold losses and a deficit in our balance of payments. Indeed, evidence points to many other factors, such as the needs of trade, and so forth, as being of far greater importance.

A distinguished Swiss economist, amplifying views expressed to the committee by other international witnesses, emphasized that—

"In general, it must be recognized that international capital flows do not depend just on interest rates, but on interest rates plus the state of confidence in the currency concerned.

"If this confidence is high, a country may be able to sustain very low rates, thus Switzerland probably has about the lowest interest rates anywhere.

"If, on the other hand, this confidence is shaken, even rather high interest rates may be insufficient to stabilize capital flows. In fact, some of the money the United States has been losing in recent months was going to a country with even lower rates, that is, Switzerland. Conversely, Germany found in 1960–61 that low rates did not stop the influx of foreign money."

Additional evidence against the overemphasis on differential interest rates lies in the relative smallness of recent differentials. When the risks of foreign exchange are insured, rate differentials have at times been in favor of New York. In any case the advantage or disadvantage has been small and swinging back and forth, with major difference easily accounted for by the special circumstances, e.g., those involving Canadian exchange, which have tended to outweigh interest considerations.

Several empirical studies presented during the year likewise suggest that the needs of commerce for strategically placed working balances, tax considerations and other non-interest-rate factors are far more likely to be primary forces behind short-term capital movements than are modest opportunities for interest arbitrage.

The Nation has now been brought to the active consideration of tax reduction for economic stimulation. Even if such measures are adopted and succeed, we will nonetheless require domestic monetary expansion. Instead of continuing to rely upon an asserted need for relatively high interest rates, we think that trade expansion and other avenues offer the preferable approach to the serious balance-of-payments problem.

Raising interest rates for balance-of-payments reasons can also be ruled out because such action merely provides an opportunity for other countries to raise interest rates. A competitive race toward higher interest rates would not be in the interest of this country or of other economies abroad. In fact, with postwar inflationary pressures eliminated, the case for a somewhat lower structure of interest rates is overpowering. To the extent that international capital movements provide any basis for corrective action at this time, the appropriate remedy is to be found in a multilateral payments agreement of the type suggested later in this report. The alternative of stifling our economy through high interest rates is unconscionable.

"The Federal Reserve must either be persuaded or compelled by law to institute a better and more timely system of reporting to the Congress and the public the actions taken by the Open Market Committee and the Board of Governors, together with the specific reasons for such actions."

The Federal Reserve is a direct servant of the Congress. It acts solely as the agent of Congress in carrying out its functions of controlling the supply of money. This power is given to Congress by the Constitution and the Federal Reserve authorities merely act for Congress under delegated powers. By both law and sound principle, the Board of Governors and the Open Market Committee must report their actions to Congress, together with their reasons for taking these actions. This information must be so explicit and clear that Congress can reasonably judge whether the monetary authorities have exercised the delegated monetary powers in accord with congressional instructions and in the national interest. The reports also must be timely, and hence should be submitted to Congress in time for their review by this committee in connection with its annual hearings on the President's Economic Reports; that is, by January 20.

The report of actions, and the reasons for actions taken, as is set forth in the Board of Governors annual report, have been notoriously inadequate, uninformative, and confusing, as this committee has noted in the past. We are quite disappointed to discover in the record of actions for 1962 no significant improvement in this respect.

The meeting of December 18, 1962, at which a change in policy took place is typical. A few phrases from that record are illustrative of the unsatisfactory character of the record. At this meeting it will be remembered that while the country was talking about the need to stimulate the economy by tax reductions, the Open Market Committee was deciding upon a contrary program of less monetary ease. From the report of the meetings we learn what everyone knew, that "evidence of solid additional achievement was still limited," or, to use the words of the directive, "recognizes the unsatisfactory level of domestic activity, the continuing underutilization of resources, and the absence of inflationary pressures." In spite of these preponderant considerations, clearly dictating no less "ease" in the money markets, that committee voted 7 to 5 for "maintaining a firmer tone in the money markets while continuing to provide moderate reserve expansion in the banking system." The contradiction in this portion of the directive calling at once for a "firmer tone" and "moderate expansion," confusing as it is, does not obscure the fact, as Chairman Martin told this committee in his oral testimony, that a new policy of less ease had been instituted.

The most disturbing aspect of the problem is the conclusion implied by their 1962 report, if we can accept it as a complete, clear, and accurate record. The confused nature of their annual report and the vague words of the so-called "directives" suggest that the monetary authorities themselves have hazy and unclear concepts of what they are trying to do. When one undertakes to give operational significance to such expressions as "somewhat" less ease, "moderate" expansion or similar differences, the confusion is not necessarily that of the observers but more probably that of the actors. We would prefer to think that this is not the case but the alternative is to believe that the authorities are unable to make an effective report on their policies. This matter remains a troublesome issue involving the relationship of Congress with one of its own agents.

"Under present conditions of high unemployment and excess capacity, debt management should be handled so as generally to reinforce expansionary fiscal and monetary policies."

A Federal deficit of sizable proportions must be financed during 1963–64, regardless of whether action is taken to reduce taxes. Indeed, as we have earlier pointed out, the cumulative deficit to be financed over the next 3 fiscal years will be smaller if an effective tax reduction and reform program is adopted, than if no such action is taken.

Under present conditions of high unemployment and excess capacity, debt management must be handled in ways which generally reinforce the needed expansionary fiscal and monetary policies. Baseless fears of inflation or balance-of-payments considerations must not be allowed to constrain public debt operations occasioned by the transitional budget deficits.

These considerations dictate that "lengthening the debt" should be given less weight for a while. This is no occasion for large amounts of Treasury borrowing at long term, since this places the Treasury in competition with the demands of private businesses and individuals for investment funds. Furthermore, Treasury borrowing on short term under these conditions may actually aid the balance of payments by supporting domestic short-term interest rates while weakening long-term rates. To the extent that changes in short-term interest rates have any influence on international capital flows, such a policy would be all to the good.

On the other hand, there is no reason to pursue a policy of extreme shortening of the debt structure. To the extent that the Treasury enters the long end of the market, they should do so via the auction method of selling Government bonds. This is a policy we have urged repeatedly in the past. The Treasury is commended for its initial exploratory move in this direction, and for the success which attended the sale of the $250 million issue of bonds of 1988–93 on January 8, 1963. We recommend that the practice of offering longer and medium-term Treasury bonds at competitive bidding be employed regularly and be made an established part of debt management practices.

The United States has for some years faced the problem of bringing its balance of payments under control in a manner consistent with its objectives of maximum employment and a more rapid rate of growth of the domestic economy. We reject the notion that the United States must raise domestic interest rates or follow restrictive fiscal policies—causing a low growth rate and high domestic unemployment—in order to solve the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. Indeed, the strength of the dollar ultimately depends on the strength and growth of the underlying U.S. economy.

The committee is of the conviction—shared by responsible authorities in Europe—that the United States must move rapidly toward maximum employment, production, and more rapid growth.

Address by Senator Bayh at the Indiana Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a speech recently delivered by the junior Senator from Indiana, BIRCH BAYH. It was delivered on the occasion of the Indiana Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, April 6, 1963, in Indianapolis, Ind. The speech displays an appreciation for the accomplishments of President Kennedy's administration as well as an awareness of the opportunities we have for serving this generation. Senator BAYH is the pride of Indiana and we have every reason to believe that his service will be long and distinguished. The text of the Senator's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BAYH AT THE INDIANA JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER

Tonight we meet to celebrate a victory—a victory most Hoosiers thought an impossible task only 12 short months ago. Through your faith and devotion, with your energy and dedication to purpose, together we won the good fight. Words are insufficient to express the deep gratitude which Marvella and I feel in our hearts for you who honored me by bestowing the honor of serving as your U.S. Senator from Indiana.

Yes, there were those who said Democratic victory in Indiana was impossible. There are those who utter this same sterile sounding slogan tonight. Let us here and now proclaim to those pitiful prophets of doom who declared it impossible to elect VANCE HARTKE to the U.S. Senate, who thought it impossible to seat Matthew Welsh in the Governor's chair, who pessimistically prophesied that a young State legislator from the city of Terre Haute was wasting his time—let us say to them at this very hour that the Democratic Party does not now nor will we ever again believe that the election of Democrats in Indiana is impossible.

Let us start now determined to elect and reelect Democratic mayors throughout this State. Let us decide now that a Democrat will be elected Governor, that Indiana will continue to have two Democratic Senators, that Democrats shall control the next general assembly and that Indiana shall cast its electoral votes for John Fitzgerald Kennedy in 1964.

The people of Indiana want good government and we are giving it to them. Hoosier citizens demand straight talk and solutions to complicated problems. This we pledge. This is our goal.

As Democrats we can be proud of the heritage to which we fall benefit. From the time the principles of the Democratic Party were laid down by Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, ours has been the party of the people—the defender of minority groups—the party of progress.

Shortly after the founding of our party, Thomas Jefferson defined its goals, characterized its philosophy and contrasted it with opposing forces when he said:

"Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties; those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the high classes; and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as most honest and safe * * *."

In the span of nearly a century and a half from Jefferson to Kennedy, a great nation and the world's oldest democracy has sprung from the waiting lands of a continent and the hearts of a people and has spread around the world. And across this Nation is emblazened the record of the Democratic Party, its belief in the people, its belief in the dignity of every man, its belief that there is no more noble aspiration for a political party or government than to tend to the needs of its citizens and to promote the basic opportunities of each individual American.

The Democratic Party has pursued these goals with a concrete legislative program. Democrats have been responsible for the cornerstones of family security, the social security program, unemployment compensation, consideration for the aged, the blind, our children. Democrats established the minimum wage and throughout the years we have improved it and increased its coverage. We have made considerable progress in the field of civil rights.

But we need not dwell in the past to talk of Democratic accomplishments. The Democratic Party is a party of the present and the future. After 2 years of the New Frontier, at the quarter post of the Presidency of John F. Kennedy, we can see progress that has improved life here and around the world. Great progress has been made. Yet we are determined to solve problems still unsolved.

America has long been known for its Bill of Rights. Franklin Delano Roosevelt spoke eloquently of the Four Freedoms. Today a space-age America must echo these thoughts and must rededicate itself to insure certain basic opportunities for each American.

Each American must be given the opportunity to secure a job sufficient to provide for his family. Through the leadership of President Kennedy more Americans are gainfully employed today than at any other time in the history of our Nation.

Over 71 million American working men and women labor in the industries, shops, farms, and mines of this country. Yet the challenge remains as long as many American workers cannot find jobs; as long as young minds and bodies are not properly equipped to find employment in space-age occupations. We, as Democrats are determined to meet this challenge with tax reviews to spur lagging economic growth; with retraining programs to assist those with unneeded skills; with a special youth program to guide and assist our younger citizens.

We are equally determined to provide this opportunity for those who labor on the farms of America. The efforts of the present administration have brought about an increase in farm income of approximately 10 percent during the last 2 years. Yet we will not rest until the American farmer enjoys equal prosperity with the rest of America, and the abundance from American farms is utilized as a blessing to a hungry world rather than as a stumbling block to high farm income.

Those who labor in business, large and small, must be guaranteed the opportunity to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home and abroad. We, as Democrats, believe in a truly free economy, free from government control and free from the oppression of monopolistic power. Ample opportunity for the small businessman is an important goal.

Each American, as a member of a family group, should be afforded the opportunity for compatible family living. The opportunities for jobs, for decent housing, and for adequate medical care during the twilight years of life are important steps toward attaining this goal. And we as Democrats must continue the efforts made in past years to see that adequate legislative programs are enacted in this important area.

Finally, each American child must have the opportunity for a good education. No investment we make as a nation is more important than that which we make in providing adequate training for our most valuable natural resource, our children. Every child must have the opportunity to develop fully his own potentiality. To be sure it takes classrooms, it takes teachers; and these take money. But investment in our Nation's future through education is our best guarantee of meeting the challenges of the space age and the future.

If these opportunities are to be provided for Americans today, each of us must be resolute in opposition to those few persons who would deprive them to some Americans because of race, religion, or national origin; for full American citizenship means freedom of worship, freedom of access to public places, freedom to speak without fear of reprisal, and freedom to vote one's own convictions in the privacy of a polling place.

The cold war struggle today finds communistic totalitarianism and democratic freedom locked in mortal combat.

A waiting world is watching the American response to the challenges of this age. Awakening nations, searching for a better way of life, are asking, Will democracy and freedom work?

Let us answer with a hearty chorus of yes. Let us answer by renewing our determination to keep the United States a land of opportunity—for all Americans—for each American.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 15, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. E. Kendall Scouten, minister, First Methodist Church, Ogdensburg, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, before Thy throne of grace we offer our petition, though we do not know Thy name. We lift our voice through the maze of human concepts, knowing that in Thine eternal abode Thou dost hear and answer prayer. Upon the circle of the universe we sense the beauty of Thy majestic being. Within our conscience we feel the incisive edge of Thy truth. Both within and without Thou hast set Thine hand upon us. We cannot escape Thy tender concern. We cannot plumb the depth of Thy power and authority; nor can we flee the responsibility with which Thou hast characterized our existence as free spirits, made in Thine image.

We confess that the orders of the day have distracted us, that the pressure of programs and interests has bedeviled us, that we have sinned the sins of indifference, of things done and undone. Ours have been the errors of conscious guilt and unconscious blundering. We have in calculated fashion set ourselves first. We have unknowingly submitted to hidden forces that have shaken our purpose. Forgive us.

As the day of work goes forward, we implore the inspiration of Thy spirit. To Thee we commend our ways as a republic and as a democracy. We pray that this dedication may light a beacon for freedom that will warm the heart of a sick and dejected world. We pray that our proferred service to mankind may signal Thy love and intimately reflect our universal need of Thee.

Bless us and keep us for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 11, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

REAPPOINTMENT OF JOHN N. BROWN TO BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 126, House Joint Resolution 234, a measure which I understand is absolutely noncontroversial.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say, for the record, that this item has been cleared by the minority.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Department of the Army Research and Development Contracts

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (R. & D.), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on research and development contracts, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Audit Report on Exchange Stabilization Fund

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report of Securities and Exchange Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Section 4(b) of Communications Act of 1934, Relating to Applicability of Conflict-of-Interest Provisions

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the applicability of the conflict-of-interest provisions to persons serving in the Federal Communications Commission unit of the National Defense Executive Reserve (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Communications Act of 1934, With Respect to the Filing of Certain Schedules of Charges

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 203(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the filing of schedules of charges by connecting carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Drafts of Proposed Legislation Relating to the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, construct, operate, and regulate a public offstreet parking facility (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled, "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, as amended, to exempt from licensing thereunder physicians employed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of Section 152(b)(3) of Internal Revenue Code of 1954, Relating to Certain Nationals of the United States

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 152(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of including nationals of the United States within the definition of the term "dependent" in connection with deductions for personal exemptions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Audit Report of Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A., Inc.

A letter from the National Adjutant, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A., Inc., Daytona Beach, Fla., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that corporation, for the fiscal year ended July 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"S. 289

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation which will provide additional income tax exemptions for persons attending institutions of higher learning

"Whereas as a college degree has become and is becoming more and more an absolute necessity to adequately prepare our youth to compete in our modern world of specialization; and

"Whereas the costs and expenses of attending institutions of higher learning are continually increasing; and

"Whereas the taxpayers are already overburdened with an alltime high in the cost of living and excessive taxation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate, the house of representatives concurring,* That Congress be memorialized to enact legislation to provide that in addition to all other exemptions provided by law, a parent shall be allowed an additional Federal income tax exemption of $2,000 for each child of such parent who is regularly enrolled in and attending an accredited institution of higher learning, or if such child is emancipated and is paying the major portion of the costs and expenses of such education, then he or she shall be allowed such additional exemptions; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the clerk of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each U.S. Senator and Congressman from South Carolina."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 28

"Joint resolution relating to encouraging passage of the National Education Improvement Act of 1963

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:*

"Whereas the proposed National Education Act of 1963 expands the opportunities of persons interested in attending institutions of higher education and graduate schools by increasing the number of student loan benefits; and

"Whereas the National Education Act will expand and improve higher education by providing funds for construction loans and funds for the expansion of other facilities; and

"Whereas the National Education Act will improve the educational quality of all schools by expanding the institute program of the National Defense Education Act; and

"Whereas the National Education Act will expand and improve vocational and special education programs by providing increased allotments for States in need of special and vocational education programs; and

"Whereas the National Education Act will strengthen elementary and secondary education programs by providing grants to States for needed improvements in teacher salaries, classroom construction, and classroom equipment; and

"Whereas the National Education Act provides for the expansion of extended education by authorizing grants to States for expansion of university extension courses in land-grant colleges and State universities; and

"Whereas Federal assistance to education, properly authorized and implemented, does not require or imply Federal control of public education, and such assistance may render State control more effective by expanding and implementing State policy: Now, be it

"*Resolved,* That Congress is respectfully urged to favorably consider the National Education Act of 1963; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable Anthony Celebrezze, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Honorable Lister Hill, chairman, Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee; the Honorable Harry Flood Byrd, chairman, Senate Finance Committee; the Honorable Adam Powell, chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor; the Honorable Wilbur Mills, chairman, House

Committee on Ways and Means; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate March 12, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house April 2, 1963.

"Bruce Kendall,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"Patricia R. Slack,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"William A. Egan,
"Governor of Alaska."

Two resolutions of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 57

"Resolution relating to the need for remedial action in connection with Alaska's air transportation problems

"Be it resolved by the senate:

"Whereas the State of Alaska encompasses an area one-fifth the size of the older 48 States; and

"Whereas the State of Alaska with approximately 5,000 miles of road within its boundaries is dependent on air service for the prompt dispatch of its inter- and intrastate mail, for travel inside and outside the State, and for the transportation of freight, items of food and clothing, and building materials and such; and

"Whereas the State of Alaska is an area as wide and as deep as the 48 States, stretching 2,700 miles from east to west, and 1,400 miles from north to south and extending into the Eastern Hemisphere and into the Arctic; and

"Whereas air carriers supply virtually the only transportation for people and airmail between the lower 48 States and Alaska; and

"Whereas on intra-Alaska routes the intent of the Civil Aeronautics Board seems to be to curtail service, leaving many communities with no transportation at all: Now, be it

"Resolved, That the legislature of the State of Alaska strongly objects to the curtailing of air service to Alaska and respectfully urges that the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, appoint an Alaskan to the next vacancy on the Board in order to facilitate a better understanding of Alaska's air needs; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be directed to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee; the Honorable Oren Harris, chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress; and the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

"Passed by the senate April 4, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"Senate Resolution 58

"Resolution relating to medical care for persons employed or engaged on vessels

"Be it resolved by the senate:

"Whereas the right to medical care of operators of vessels and self-employed seamen under Federal law has been denied by administrative ruling; and

"Whereas the restoration of these Federal medical care rights has been proposed by the U.S. Representative from Alaska, the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, through the introduction of H.R. 2108; and

"Whereas the restoration of this right is not only equitable but essential to the revival of the vital maritime industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress is urged to approve the restoration of medical care rights to owner-operators of vessels and self-employed seamen by the passage of H.R. 2108; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of Senate Commerce Committee; the Honorable Herbert Bonner, chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate April 4, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Two resolutions of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 61

"Resolution relating to the safeguarding of homesteader rights through the establishment of an independent Board of Public Lands Appeals

"Be it resolved by the Senate:

"Whereas there exists no effective right to appeal decisions by the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey concerning the uses of or claims to public lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; and

"Whereas the lack of such an effective right of appeal adversely affects many actual and potential public land users in Alaska; and

"Whereas the lack of such an effective right of appeal thwarts the carrying out of the acts of Congress governing the uses of the public lands; and

"Whereas this lack of an effective right to appeal has existed for too many years and should be promptly remedied; and

"Whereas a bill to correct these inequities has been introduced in the Senate of the United States by Alaska's Senators, the Honorable Ernest Gruening and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, and other Senators; and

"Whereas this corrective legislation would establish a Board of Public Lands Appeals to hear locally appeals from decisions by the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey concerning the uses or claims to public lands; and

"Whereas untold numbers of homesteaders in Alaska, in making original application for land patents, have been advised of the alleged proper procedure to follow by representatives of the Bureau of Land Management only to discover at a later date that such procedure was not proper and that as a result their patent application is invalid; and

"Whereas such careless actions have caused homesteaders in Alaska to experience undue hardships and mental anguish; and

"Whereas such hardships have cost said homesteaders wasted hours of labor and wasted expenditures of money; and

"Whereas such action by a Federal agency is intolerable, unnecessary, and inexcusable; and

"Whereas such irresponsible actions point up the long overdue need for corrective measures: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the senate supports legislation establishing a Board of Public Lands Appeals established as an independent agency outside the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior to hear appeals from decisions rendered by the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey concerning the uses or claims to public lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Department of the Interior, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Members of the Alaska congressional delegation.

"Passed by the senate April 4, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Certified true, full, and correct.

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"Senate Resolution 65

"Resolution relating to legislation pending in Congress authorizing compensation to the Yakutat community of Tlingit Indians for the extinction of their original Indian title

"Be it resolved by the senate:

"Whereas it has been the traditional policy of the United States to perfect its title to its public domain by purchase of any outstanding original Indian title, or to provide for appropriate compensation to the Indians where land has been taken without its full title having been so cleared; and

"Whereas the United States during the past ten years has granted hundreds of oil and gas leases upon federally owned land (outside the Tongass National Forest) in that coastal area of Alaska which extends along the Gulf of Alaska from Cape Fairweather to the Copper River, without first having purchased the original Indian title to said land; and

"Whereas under the provisions of a special jurisdictional act, the Court of Claims on October 7, 1959, authorized further proceedings for determination of compensation for the 1909 taking by the United States of such part of the aforesaid coastal area as lies within the boundaries of the Tongass National Forest, there being, however, no statutory or other provision for compensation for the more recent taking of the above-referenced part of that area which is exterior to that forest; and

"Whereas it appears that the United States still retains approximately $500,000 of the rentals which it has received from the above-described leases over and above the percentage thereof which it has remitted to the Territory of Alaska and the State of Alaska; and

"Whereas there is presently pending in the Congress of the United States, House Joint Resolution 273 which would have the effect of compensating the Yakutat community of Tlingit Indians with at least the full amount of revenues from leases presently held by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas it is altogether fitting and proper that the original inhabitants of Alaska receive full and adequate compensation for land which was exclusively theirs from time immemorial but which are now necessary for the full development of the State of Alaska; be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Alaska urges prompt consideration and adoption of House Joint Resolution 273 by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable

Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the Honorable Philleo Nash, Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and to the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate April 10, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Certified true, full, and correct.

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 60

"Resolution relating to the completion of studies on the Rampart Dam project

"*Be it resolved by the senate:*

"Whereas a sound and vigorous development of Alaska's resources is desirable, and indeed essential, not only from the standpoint of the people of Alaska but of the Nation whose great northernmost and westernmost outpost and underdeveloped dominion and potential is the State of Alaska; and

"Whereas a diversification and enlargement of Alaska's economy is need for the above declared objective; and

"Whereas the resources on which the people of Alaska depended when their numbers were far fewer in territorial days, namely gold mining and fishing—both now diminished in quantity and in economic impact—will not suffice to create a vigorous, thriving, and expanding economy; and

"Whereas for years the Federal Government has developed the hydroelectric resources of the 48 older States with such projects as the Tennessee Valley Authority, Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, Bonneville Dam, Hungry Horse Dam, and others, and is now engaged in the continuance of this sound utilization of our water resources with Glen Canyon, Arkansas Frying-Pan, and other hydroelectric projects; and

"Whereas the greatest hydroelectric project on the North American Continent, and indeed in the free world, is available on the Yukon River in Alaska, which can generate power at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, which will be the lowest cost power under the American flag; and

"Whereas studies by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army have already established the engineering feasibility of the dam at Rampart on the Yukon; and

"Whereas the marketability of its low-cost power and the consequent attraction to Alaska of diverse industries and the utilization thereby of Alaskan and other raw materials not practically exploitable without low-cost power has been determined in the authoritative study by the Development and Resources Corp. of New York, a qualified agency retained by the Corps of Engineers for that purpose; and

"Whereas the United States, through its foreign aid program, is financing hydroelectric projects in many parts of the world among people who pay no taxes to the United States, and the products derived from them will be competitive with our own U.S. products; be it

"*Resolved,* That the Alaska Senate strongly urges the Federal agencies involved to speed the conclusion of the remaining Rampart and other Yukon River studies, and to report promptly to the Congress, and make possible the early request by the Alaska delegation in Congress for legislation providing authorization and appropriation for the Rampart Canyon Dam; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of the Army; the Honorable Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Jr., Chief of the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate April 4, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Certified true, full, and correct.

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

"Whereas a democratic nation requires an enlightened citizenry; and

"Whereas the current shortage of teachers and the lag in school construction seriously threaten the quality of education and the equality of educational opportunity in the United States; and

"Whereas local and State governments are unable to provide adequate finances for public education at a time when enrollments are rapidly increasing and when national survival depends on the quality of public education: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1963, the Senate concurring,* That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation which will provide Federal aid to education, leaving to States the right to determine whether such funds are to be spent for teacher salaries or for school construction; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the chairman of the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor, and to the Members of Hawaii's congressional delegation.

"ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*
"SHIGETO KANEMOTO,
"*Clerk, House of Representatives.*
"NELSON K. DOI,
"*President of the Senate.*
"SEICHI HIRAI,
"*Clerk of the Senate.*"

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

"Whereas the veterans education program established by the Federal Government has provided for the training and education of thousands of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict; and

"Whereas the education of these veterans has increased the educational level of the citizens of our great Nation and has contributed greatly to the strength, well-being and economy of this Nation; and

"Whereas since February 1, 1955, educational benefits provided for persons serving in the Armed Forces have not been available; and

"Whereas thousands of our veterans have been deprived of the educational opportunities once available under the veterans education program; and

"Whereas it is believed that the benefits enjoyed by veterans under the veterans education program should be extended to apply to all qualified veterans of the Armed Forces for such time as the selective service law remains in effect: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Second State Legislature, regular session of 1963, the Senate concurring,* That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to extend educational benefits to all persons who have entered military service since February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be continued for as long as the selective service law remains in effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*
"SHIGETO KANEMOTO,
"*Clerk, House of Representatives.*
"NELSON K. DOI,
"*President of the Senate.*
"SEICHI HIRAI,
"*Clerk of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to aid the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District

"Whereas the people in the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Francisco in November 1962 approved construction of a three-county rapid transit system and authorized general obligation bonds to cover the cost of such project in the amount of $792 million; and

"Whereas these bonds and bond service will be supported in part out of a uniform property tax levied throughout the three counties comprising the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District; and

"Whereas certain financial provisions will make it necessary to extend the construction period over an 8½-year period; and

"Whereas the Board of Supervisors of Alameda County and other public agencies have indicated their desire to supplement the property tax base as a means of financing construction of the rapid transit system; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has recognized the importance of Federal participation in the financing of transportation systems in order to provide better balance and has provided certain funds and Federal aid for urban mass transportation; and

"Whereas Federal financial aid for the bay area rapid transit system would have the dual beneficial effect of reducing the property tax rate which bay area property owners would otherwise be required to pay, and would make it possible to reduce the construction period by at least 3 years, thus bringing the benefit of rapid transit to the bay area populace many years earlier than otherwise would be possible: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly),* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully urges Congress to enact Federal legislation to provide Federal grants and low-interest loans in sufficient amounts to substantially help construct and develop new transit facilities and to expand existing systems in the national metropolitan areas, and in the San Francisco Bay area in particular; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 13

"Joint resolution relative to pensions for veterans of World War I

"Whereas Congressman DENTON has introduced H.R. 2332 which would provide a pension for World War I veterans whose income is under $2,400 annually, if they are single, and $3,600 annually, if they have dependents; and

"Whereas one of the principal domestic problems in all areas of the Nation is the care of the aged, the importance of which is emphasized by the fact that there are now approximately 16 million men and women over the age of 65 years; and

"Whereas, of this number, about 2 million are those who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the First World War, and whose present circumstances are below the average for the Nation, which fact may be traced in part to the service rendered their country during that war; and

"Whereas these veterans have not enjoyed the extensive benefits accorded their younger brethren who served during World War II and who were given the opportunity for training at Government expense and assistance in securing home and business loans; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has not given any general pension to the veterans of World War I: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact H.R. 2332 to alleviate the dire conditions in which those who made the sacrifices for this country, in their youth, now find themselves; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each Member of the California delegation in the Congress of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 8

"Joint resolution relative to the economic development of California tide and submerged lands

"Whereas there is a controversy between the United States of America and the State of California as to the title to, the ownership of, and the right and power to manage, administer, lease, develop and use large and important areas lying off the California shore; and

"Whereas significant portions of these areas are believed to contain commercially valuable deposits of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon substances and other minerals; and

"Whereas the exploration and economic development of these areas is in the best interests of both the United States and the State of California; and

"Whereas the existence of said controversy tends to impede or delay such exploration and development: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California strongly urges the responsible officials of both the United States of America and the State of California, as a joint venture, to take all measures necessary or expedient to promote the early and efficient exploration and economic development of these offshore areas regardless of the pendency of this controversy; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the said officials are hereby strongly urged to agree on leasing methods permitting such exploration and economic development and providing for a royalty or rental which is a fair return to the State and adequate safeguards for the protection of marine life, the coastline, and aesthetics and for the protection of existing activities of this sort along the coast; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That said officials are hereby strongly urged to seek and explore methods of resolving said controversy, if possible by means of negotiation, agreement, or federal and state legislation; and be it further

"*Resolved,* that the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Attorney General of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the Solicitor General of the United States, to the attorney general of the State of California, and to the California State Lands Commission."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 8

"Joint resolution relative to the Auburn Dam and Folsom South Canal

"Whereas there has been submitted to the Congress of the United States legislation to authorize construction by the Secretary of Interior, as part of the Central Valley project, of both the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Folsom South Canal; and

"Whereas this proposed development is known to be economically justified, and has been determined to be engineeringly feasible; and

"Whereas the multiple-purpose project of the Auburn Dam will furnish additional water which can be used in the American River watershed, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region, the San Joaquin Valley, and areas to the south, and will produce additional electric power which would be available for pumping water to areas of deficiency in California's statewide water program; and

"Whereas the Folsom South Canal will serve to bring urgently needed supplemental water supplies to areas in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region and the northern San Joaquin Valley area, which supplies would be made available from storage of water in Folsom Reservoir, as supplemented by the proposed Auburn Dam and Reservoir; and

"Whereas both the proposed Auburn Dam and the Folsom South Canal are part of the California water plan and would complement the State's efforts to meet the water requirements of California's rapidly expanding population: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law, at the earliest possible time, the necessary legislation to authorize the construction of the Auburn Dam and the Folsom South Canal, including authorization to include in such canal and related operating structures such additional works or capacity as the Secretary of Interior deems necessary and economically justified to provide for the future construction of the east side division of the Central Valley project, provided that the incremental cost of providing additional works or capacity in the Folsom South Canal to serve the east side division of the Central Valley project shall be assigned to deferred use for repayment from Central Valley project revenues; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 14

"Joint resolution relating to Red Bluff diversion dam boat bypass

"Whereas the U.S. Department of the Army permit to the Bureau of Reclamation authorizing the construction of the Red Bluff Diversion Dam contains a proviso that 'if at any time in the future the interests of navigation shall require it, such alteration in the structure, or construction of lockage facilities, as may be required by the Secretary of the Army in the interest of navigation, shall be promptly executed by the permittee at its expense, so as to render means for navigation to pass the damsite'; and

"Whereas the recent report of the Bureau of Reclamation entitled 'Passage of Small Boats, Red Bluff Diversion Dam, Sacramento Canals Unit, Central Valley Project,' contains a study of three alternative plans, two incorporating methods to lift or carry boats over or around the dam at the damsite, and plan C including a 4-mile channel through Paynes Creek Slough to transfer the boats from below the dam to the river above the dam; and

"Whereas plan C would give boaters on the river much better utilization of the river and avoid the hindrance and delay caused by a lift or ramp which would be manually operated; and

"Whereas plan C would provide an excellent means of preserving the existing salmon and steelhead fishery which otherwise would be endangered by the dam even with a fish ladder, since many of such fish will not use a fish ladder, but under plan C, since the fish could use a natural waterway, these fish would be allowed free migration; and

"Whereas the initial cost of plan C would be higher than the cost of plans A or B; but in the long run plan C, which does not require daily maintenance or supervision as do plans A or B, would cost no more, and in fact may even be less expensive than the other plans; and

"Whereas the local interests are heartily in support of plan C for this project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Bureau of Reclamation, the Secretary of the Army and all other persons or agencies involved are respectfully requested to approve plan C for the passage of small boats at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Bureau of Reclamation, the Secretary of the Army, the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

The petition of the Yakima Indian Association of Washington State, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 537. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States (Rept. No. 141).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Acting Archivist of the United States, dated April 8, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1323. A bill for the relief of Wilbur G. Leary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1324. A bill to change the name of the Small Business Administration to the "Federal Small Business Administration"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1325. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1326. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1327. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct certain inequities with respect to the taxation of life insurance companies; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO TAXATION OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, proposed amendments to the Life Insurance Income Tax Act of 1959, designed to give equitable relief by providing that the 8-year carryover of operating losses to new life insurance companies be made of general application; and exempting life insurance companies from paying a phase 3 tax upon the equivalent of a loss instead of a profit.

Under existing law, new life insurance companies as defined in section 812(e) are entitled to an 8-year carryover of operating losses whereas in the ordinary case a 5-year carryover is allowed. The existing operating loss provisions of the law dealing with life insurance companies were a part of the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959. That act as amended provides that a new life insurance company otherwise eligible is denied the 8-year carryover if it is affiliated with another corporation through stock ownership of 50 percent of the voting stock. In 1962, this was changed to permit a life company affiliated with a casualty insurance company taxable under part 3 or part 2 of the insurance tax provisions to be considered as a "new" company. This change in 1962 is of extremely limited application and should be broadened to permit any life insurance company which is organized and owned by another corporation to get the 8-year carryover.

The legislative history in connection with section 812(e) is not very satisfactory in that it is impossible to determine exactly why stock ownership with another corporation would be considered undesirable for operating loss purposes. There would appear to be no real reason why a bona fide life insurance company which incurs operating losses should not be entitled to the same 8-year carryover as other new life insurance companies even though its stock is owned or it is affiliated through stock ownership with another corporation.

The second proposed amendment was adopted by the Finance Committee as part of H.R. 8952 and deals with the effect of operating losses on policyholder surplus. This amendment was dropped in conference primarily because it had not been previously considered by the Committee on Ways and Means.

In substance, the provision would reduce the policyholders' surplus by an amount equal to that portion of the unused loss carryforward that occurred as a result of the nonpar deduction. Its effect would be to prevent life companies from paying an ultimate phase 3 tax upon the equivalent of a loss instead of a profit.

Under existing law, a young company would have a loss carryforward artificially increased by the nonpar deduction; a sum equal to this deduction would go into the policyholders' surplus; eventually, when withdrawn to meet losses, this would be subjected to taxation under phase 3.

The proposed amendment would eliminate future phase 3 taxation upon an artificially created loss carryover that was not used. The Treasury Department had no objection to this amendment last year, and it is my understanding that it has no objection to either of these proposed changes now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1327) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct certain inequities with respect to the taxation of life insurance companies, introduced by Mr. Smathers, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 64(a)(2) OF BANKRUPTCY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 9, 1963, the names of Mr. Bible, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Carlson, and Mr. Randolph were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1295) to amend section 64(a)(2) of the Bankruptcy Act, introduced by Mr. Johnston, by request, on April 9, 1963.

NOTICE OF A HEARING ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION PERTAINING TO THE REPEAL OF THE SILVER PURCHASE ACTS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], I desire to give notice that on April 29, 1963, the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a public hearing on H.R. 5389, a bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.

We shall begin the hearing at 10 a.m., and it will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearing are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capital 4-3121, extension, 3921.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] I desire to give notice that the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold public hearings commencing May 7, 1963, on S. 757, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small-business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance, repair, or construction.

Commencing May 14, 1963, the Small Business Subcommittee will hold hearings on S. 298, a bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and S. 1309, a bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes.

We shall begin at 10 a.m. in each case, and the hearings will be held in room 5302 New Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. Reginald W. Barnes, counsel, Small Business Subcommittee, room 5300 New Senate Office Building, telephone Capital 4-3121, extension 3921.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 935 RELATING TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE MENTALLY ILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce that hearings will be held on May 2, 3, and 8, 1963, on S. 935, a bill to protect the constitutional rights of certain individuals who are mentally ill, to provide for their care, treatment, and hospitalization, and for other purposes.

The hearings will begin at 10:30 a.m. in room 457 of the Old Senate Office

Building. Any person who wishes to appear and testify on this bill is requested to notify the subcommittee by letter.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1117 AND S. 1219, BILLS RELATING TO THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce that hearings will be held on May 21, 22, and 23, 1963, on S. 1117, a bill to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; and S. 1219, a bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes.

The hearings will begin at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to appear and testify on these bills is requested to notify the subcommittee by letter.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Article on U.S. foreign policy with regard to Cuban communism, prepared by Mr. Hugh J. Boyd, principal of Lake View High School, Lake View, S.C.; column entitled "Broken Treaties," written by Robert Morris, and published recently; and newsletter by him dated April 8, 1963.

BERLIN AND GERMANY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on April 10 the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] delivered an address on the subject of Berlin and Germany and our foreign policy with respect thereto. It was a most thoughtful and distinguished statement, and represented an exceptional contribution to public understanding of the realities of the German situation and the constructive possibilities which may exist for an improvement in the Western position.

I am delighted that the distinguished and learned journalist of the New York Times, Mr. Arthur Krock, has perceived immediately the importance of the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island, and has seen fit to comment on it at length in his column in the April 12 issue of the Times. I would underscore his observation that it would be useful if copies of the speech were among the papers called to the attention of the Secretary of State and the Soviet Ambassador, in connection with their discussions of Berlin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column by Arthur Krock and an editorial from the Washington Star of April 14, 1963, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times of Apr. 12, 1963]

In the Nation—What Was and Is Commonsense About Berlin

(By Arthur Krock)

Washington.—It is too much to hope that, instead of coming to the conference table on the Berlin problem tomorrow with "position papers" reextracted from the deep freeze, Secretary of State Rusk and Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin will put at the top of the agenda a speech on the subject made in the Senate today by Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island. But it would be a day to celebrate if the commonsense and the honorable, practical policy proposals which distinguish this speech from tired diplomacy could somehow penetrate the Rusk-Dobrynin discussions.

In the late summer of 1961, Senator Pell made his first notable exposition of the hard facts of the Berlin problem that both Washington and Moscow must acknowledge before any real progress toward the kind of agreement he outlined—the only one possible—can be made. The speech was largely submerged in the clamor over Soviet Russia's unilateral violation of the moratorium on nuclear weapons testing. But President Kennedy mentioned Pell's viewpoint and proposals favorably, to one of his visitors at the time, and today's updated version did not alter these fundamentals.

The key to Pell's door of escape from one of those "frozen foreign policy positions" he described as typical of democracies is furnished by the following passage in the speech:

"The recollection that Germany has engaged in three agressive wars in the last 100 years * * * is a fact very much in the European mind. It is one of the reasons * * * for the general acceptance of the fact that Germany should not have nuclear weapons. * * * This is perhaps the most important single policy that we and the Soviets share * * *."

Accordingly, I think we should give our present policy toward Germany a critical reexamination with a view toward acceptance of the fact that Germany is divided as long as we have not reached the millennium of a world and a time when we can achieve a unified, unarmed Germany * * *. Nor does * * * de facto acceptance of a divided Germany give the Communists control over a single additional person or square inch * * * (but) what we must gain in any resolution of the Berlin problem is a clearly defined corridor of land access to West Berlin * * * a gain of what we have never had * * *, backed up by ironclad guarantees for the freedom of West Berlin, together with the West's complete freedom to garrison West Berlin. To achieve these ends, we can afford to acknowledge the continuing existence of the two German Governments and agree upon the Oder-Neisse frontier * * *."

OTHER U.S. GAINS

There would be another gain for the United States, Pell told the Senate, because "our present policy has led us to the ironic position that we want the Russians to stay in East Germany," the consequence of a refusal to deal with the government of the area that "makes it impossible" for the Soviets to withdraw. And, he contended, a realistic new policy also would "legitimize" the annual $500 million in trade current between West and East Germany; and clear the path for "efforts the West German Government is now making to normalize its trading relations with the various (Soviet) satellite nations."

A broader beneficial effect, he predicted, would be a "a considerable reduction in the U.S. present adverse balance-of-payments position, since at this time we are spending more than $50 billion a year in defense and supporting more than 400,000 men in Europe."

Among the other realistic steps the Senator proposed, in the belief that Moscow—confronted with the rising threat of Communist China and the steady increases in nuclear arsenals—"genuinely desires an easing of the tensions in Berlin" were these: transferring the European headquarters of the United Nations from Paris and Geneva to Berlin; internationalizing the access highway into West Berlin from Helmstedt in West Germany; and revising the allied status-of-forces whereby they would be present in West Berlin at the invitation of that city government.

The speech should, but won't, be read aloud as prolog at the Rusk-Dobrynin conversations.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 14, 1963]

Bargaining on Berlin

It is noteworthy that Rhode Island's Democratic Senator Pell, one of the President's close social and political friends, has spoken out as he has in connection with the resumed talks between Secretary of State Rusk and Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin. In the Senator's view, the talks should not be allowed to bog down in futility. Instead, he hopes that our country "will at long last take the diplomatic initiative" in seeking "some sort of resolution of the Berlin problem."

The Senator has his own prescription for the situation. He holds that both the United States and the Soviet Union have reason to feel that the time has come to thaw their frozen bargaining positions. As far as our own country is concerned, he holds as follows: "What we must gain * * * is a clearly defined corridor of land access to West Berlin, backed up by ironclad guarantees for the freedom of West Berlin together with the West's complete freedom to garrison West Berlin. To achieve these ends, we can afford to acknowledge the continuing existence of two German governments and agree upon the Oder-Neisse frontier" between Poland and Germany.

In sum, it would seem that Senator Pell, whether or not he reflects or has influence on Mr. Kennedy's thinking, is in favor of some down-to-earth Soviet-American horsetrading. Thus, pending the eventual creation of a unified, neutral, disarmed, and democratic Germany, he would have the United States extend de facto recognition to the East Germany regime and do business with it in exchange for the ironclad guarantees on Berlin. As he put it, "It is very much in our national interests to do so, since there is no situation in the world today where our forces and our flag occupy a more vulnerable position than in this island of freedom surrounded by Communist East Germany."

The Senator feels that there are many steps that can be taken toward a genuinely trustworthy settlement of the issue. By way of example, he has suggested that certain key agencies of the United Nations be transferred from Geneva and Paris to East Berlin, and he has also called for "a mutual slacking off of propaganda and intelligence operations" in the cruelly divided city. Further, to quote him again, "Along the lines of the cooling-down of temperatures and the amelioration of relations between East and West would be the legitimization of today's almost half billion dollars worth of annual trade that exists between Western Germany and Eastern Germany."

In some respects, Senator Pell's views seem to involve a lot of wishful thinking. He himself does not deny the mild impeachement, but he has made an effective point in declaring that "we should bear in mind what Lord Palmerston once said, 'We have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual and those interests it is our duty to follow.' This means that policies must be determined by national interest, that national interests can and do change in a changing world * * * and that the policies in themselves are not immutable."

Well said. The gentleman from Rhode Island has addressed a thought-provoking speech to the Senate, and Mr. Rusk and Mr. Dobrynin could do worse than read and mull over the text of it.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH PEW, JR.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, probably the most difficult times of a man's life are those when it seems an abundance of words should pour forth but none can come for none can be found. Those are the moments of despair when a close personal friend passes on and one suddenly discovers that the pressure of a hand or the tear in the eye says far more than any word could ever do. It may be then that silence would be the greatest expression, but there are some of these friends whose passing cannot stand for silence even though the spoken word will never be adequate.

Last Thursday such a man was laid to rest in Pennsylvania. His name was Joseph Pew, Jr. His faith was pegged on his God and his country, and his every action throughout a successful life reflected this. The only thing he ever asked was a chance to do good for people and his country, and he did both in an abundance matched by few men. His interest in politics was only an interest in good government at all levels; but this characteristic shows the material sides of a good man.

What was equally important, if not more so, was his devotion to his wife Alberta and to his children and grandchildren. His great concern for them was, in my opinion, a strong reason why he always worked for a better America.

He had a deep understanding of the importance of history, so he knew that with man being the weakling he is and has always been, there could come a time in this country's history when men seeking only power for their own uses might come forth into leadership through the refusal of the many to be strong. He devoted himself, therefore, to doing his part in the prevention of any lessening of the greatness of freedom, so that his family, his children and grandchildren, and the children and grandchildren of all of us, might enjoy freedom's blessings forever more.

He was a friend, and I shall miss him. But he was a devoted American, and I shall remember him.

HENRY N. TAYLOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the April 11 issue of the Washington Daily News appears an article concerning the placing at the University of Virginia of a bronze plaque in honor of the memory of Henry N. Taylor. Mr. Taylor, a Scripps-Howard correspondent, was killed in action in the Congo in 1960, while reporting the fighting in Kasai Province. His death was a tragic loss to the Nation, for it cut down an exceptional newspaperman of great courage, integrity, and professional competence. It is most fitting to have his memory honored at the University of Virginia, where he was educated, and where his ties had remained close and intimate until his untimely death. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Daily News, which contains a brief sketch of Mr. Taylor's career, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 11, 1963]

HENRY TAYLOR HONORED BY VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.—Henry N. Taylor, Scripps-Howard correspondent killed in 1960 on assignment in the Congo, was honored here today at the University of Virginia's Thomas Jefferson birthday celebrations.

President Edgar Finley Shannon, Jr., announced that the institution's Seven Society has presented a bronze plaque in Mr. Taylor's memory, for placement in the entrance of alumni hall.

The plaque is headed by the words: "He died to find and tell the truth." It is an enlargement of the Pulitzer School of Journalism Medal annually awarded by Columbia University as a memorial to the correspondent's standards.

Mr. Taylor was a member of the Seven Society, whose members are unknown until their death. He attended the University of Virginia from 1947 to 1951, played varsity baseball and edited the college newspaper. On graduation Mr. Taylor received the Algernon Sidney Sullivan Award as the student who contributed most to the university while here.

He served as a naval intelligence officer in London from 1951 to 1954, became a Cincinnati Post reporter in 1954 and won the American Political Science Association's Award for State and local political coverage in 1956.

Mr. Taylor won the 1959 Ernie Pyle Memorial Award for reporting "most nearly exemplifying the style and craftsmanship" of war correspondent Ernie Pyle, killed in World War II, and was given posthumously the George Polk Tablet, the highest recognition of the Overseas Press Club, New York.

He was killed by machinegun fire while covering the fighting between Congolese Army and secessionist troops in the interior of Kasai Province on September 4, 1960. He was 32.

INCREASE IN STEEL PRICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Wheeling Steel and now Lukens have both announced selective price increases in steel, ranging in the neighborhood of 6 percent. The question now is: What will the rest of the steel industry do, and what will the reopening of contract negotiations by labor on May 1 or 90 days thereafter result in?

The question which steel has to answer is this: Will an increase in price, even though selective, be able to prevent inflation at home and stop competition from abroad and the import of steel products from Japan, West Germany, South Africa, and elsewhere?

Steel also has to recognize and labor, too, that wage rates abroad are much lower, and that efficiency in foreign production, based to a large extent on modern steel plants, is increasing. The question is, therefore, can, or will, this country remain competitive in the field of international steel economics? Profits in the steel industry last year, so I am informed, amounted to $567 million, which I understand is the lowest in 10 years. If steel raises its prices, labor will seek a wage increase; a wage increase will increase costs; and it may well be that with increases in prices and in wages, the steel industry will find itself in difficulties in competition with steel imports, and also may bring about an increase in the use of substitute metals, or plastics.

The questions facing steel and steel labor are many and difficult. What they do will be a demonstration—or a lack of it—of business and economic statesmanship, because what is done will be felt here at home, not only through increased costs, but perhaps by increased low-cost import competition, as well.

Because of the bellwether aspect of the steel industry, what it does in relation to the whole economy will be of the greatest significance. The times call for industry statesmanship of the highest order.

ECONOMIC POLICIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, two influences, among many, have had a detrimental effect on the economy of this Nation since 1961. One has been the lack of confidence of the businessman in the theoretical and wrong philosophies advocated by the professional economists advising the President. It has become more and more obvious that these men, imbued as they are with an affection for Lord Keynes, have never understood the operation of our economic system; and the suggestions they have advanced as New Frontier economic positions have constantly troubled those who must make the economy go. It is heartening, therefore, to read that the President has asked Henry Ford, Jr., to head a group of businessmen whose purpose will be to recommend a more sensible way to achieve tax correction and tax reduction. It is to be hoped that a sensible and workable plan will evolve. It is also hoped that in the future the President will give more and more attention to the recognizable problems, and less and less to the theoretical ones, so that all business may participate in the achieving of a rate of economic growth consistent with the unlimited possibilities of this country.

The other depressing influence has been the generally held feeling that the present administration is antibusiness. This started in earnest with the uncalled for intervention in the steel price adjustment. The excessive use of power at that time and the ugly language going with it naturally caused fear among the businessmen of America. The laws of supply and demand are inflexible; and to tamper with any facet of those laws is to call down disaster. Labor cannot be given every advance asked for and not have those advances be demonstrated in higher prices, unless those increases are called for by productivity advances. Likewise, prices cannot be advanced without market justification and still have stability prevail.

The President's present attitude toward the announced steel price increases is commendable; and it is to be hoped that he will continue on this enlightened trail. I ask that his entire statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The White House: Statement by the President

This administration is watching closely the possibilities of a general across-the-board price increase in steel. I opposed such an increase last year—I oppose such an increase now.

This administration is not interested in determining the appropriate price or profit levels of any particular industry. We are interested in protecting the American public, and it is the American public which would suffer most from a general increase in steel prices.

It would invite another inflationary spiral in place of the present wage price stability. It would hamper our export expansion and increase import competition. It would adversely affect our balance-of-payments position on which our worldwide commitments depend. It would reduce the gains of our economic growth and reduce job opportunities in this country.

This Government in the past year has taken major steps to improve the economic position of the steel industry and assist in its modernization. Depreciation and investment tax benefits of some $100 million were provided in 1962 to the steel industry alone; and its increased cash flow has made possible a planned increase in plant and equipment investment more than twice the national average. Additional tax gains will be realized in this year's tax reduction program.

I therefore strongly urge the leaders of the steel industry to refrain from any across-the-board price increases which will aggravate their competitive position and injure the public interest. The steel industry—which has been hard hit by competition from lower priced substitute products and foreign producers—has been operating far below capacity. What it needs is more business at competitive prices not less business at higher prices.

I urge similar restraint on the Steel Workers Union. With over 100,000 steelworkers still unemployed, their need is for more jobs with job security, not fewer jobs at higher wages. Across-the-board price increases could precipitate labor demands and unrest that would cause great difficulties for the country.

I realize that price and wage controls in this one industry while all others are unrestrained would be unfair and inconsistent with our free competitive market—that unlike last year the Government's good faith has not been engaged in talks with industry and union representatives—and that selected price adjustments, up or down, as prompted by changes in supply and demand, as opposed to across-the-board increases, are not incompatible with a framework of general stability and steel price stability and are characteristic of any healthy economy.

In a free society both management and labor are free to do voluntarily what we are unwilling to impose by law, and I urge the steel industry and the steel union to avoid any action which would lead to a general across-the-board increase. I urge this in their own enlightened self-interest and in the public interest as well.

DISARMAMENT STORIES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, several weeks ago I asked a question of the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency relative to a plan I had heard discussed that would cause the United States to contribute 30 B-47's to an equal number of Badgers by the Russians, all planes to be destroyed, as a gesture toward disarmament. At first the Agency denied there was this plan, then under questioning by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, Secretary Rusk admitted it existed. I have been thinking about it since that time, and the more I pondered it, the less important 30 airplanes became, so I began to wonder if it might not involve a plan of broader dimension, say 30 of these aircraft a month for 30 of the Russians. Sure enough, the New York Times of April 3, under the byline of Hedrick Smith, stated that the proposition, which is still in "study stage," calls for United States to burn 30 B-47's a month in return for the destruction by the Russians of an equal number of their Badgers.

Now once again I must ask the Disarmament and Controls Agency if the Times is correct and, if it is, could they spell out for the Congress and for the American people just what the total is that they have in mind. If this continues for 2 years there would not be enough of a B-47 fleet left to call it by that name, and we would have gotten rid of this weapon 2 or 3 years before the phasing out would call for their final removal.

I have often stated that we are engaged in unilateral disarmament, and if this proposed action as reported by the Times is true, it once again confirms it. Once we have destroyed our manned bombers we will be on a parity with Russia when her superior ground forces, and at least equal missile forces will put the balance of power on her side. If we were planning new manned aircraft into our inventory, the Agency's proposal might make sense, but because we are not, it makes nonsense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the article from the New York Times to which I referred, and an editorial from the Dallas Morning News.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1963]

Arms Plan Draws Goldwater Scorn—Proposal To Burn Obsolete Bombers Is Assailed

(By Hedrick Smith)

Washington, April 2.—Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona has criticized the U.S. Disarmament Agency for a plan to propose to the Russians the joint burning of obsolete bombers.

The agency was carefully checking out the "bomber bonfire" plan with other agencies and key leaders on Capitol Hill, when the Arizona Republican assailed it.

The proposal, which is still in the study stage, calls for the United States to burn 30 B-47 bombers a month in return for the destruction by the Russians of an equal number of their TU-16 Badger bombers.

Officials conceived the idea to head off Soviet "dumping" of such obsolescent aircraft in trouble spots such as Middle East and southeast Asia. The United States, they observed, is already phasing out its B-47 fleet, so the exchange would not involve a sacrifice.

"CRAZY" PLANS DECRIED

Initially, Senator Goldwater's criticism in a speech at Aurora, Ill., on March 9 brought carefully phrased denials that such a proposal was being offered the Russians.

Later, there was acknowledgment from Secretary of State Dean Rusk that such a plan "has been discussed inside the Disarmament Agency and with the [other] departments as one possible step which might at some stage be seriously considered."

Senator Goldwater followed up with a speech on the Senate floor March 21 asserting that public's "right to know about any and all crazy disarmament plans that are being hatched within this Government."

The Senator's attacks have baffled disarmament officials, who felt they had come up with a reasonable suggestion that was winning favor on Capitol Hill.

"It's pretty rough to be attacked on something that may not even see the light of day," said Nedville E. Nordness, public affairs spokesman for the Disarmament Agency.

"It seemed like a good idea. It would not be a gimmick or a phony. We felt it was a measure consistent with national security which might create some movement in the field of disarmament."

NEUTRALS' SUPERVISION WEIGHED

The idea was that since the United States and Soviet Union are phasing out their medium range B-47 and Badger bombers, they might conceivably agree to fly them to a neutral site and destroy them at a given rate under the supervision of neutral observers.

"One of the elements of this sort of an idea," Secretary Rusk told Senators, "is to be sure to limit the extent which weapons which are highly sophisticated, but which become obsolete [between the major powers] * * * do not find themselves spread all over the world and become a part of other arms races * * * and do not feed out into a lot of countries which would find them a burden and would stimulate the dangers elsewhere."

Officials said they had checked out the plan with such Senators as William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, Richard Russell, Democrat, of Georgia, and Republican Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania without running into opposition.

Already the Soviet Union is reported to have begun selling Badgers, twin-jet medium bombers, to the United Arab Republic, Indonesia and Iraq. Informed sources report that each of the first 2 countries have received fewer than 10 of the planes and that Iraq may have received 2 with more to come.

The Soviet Union has sold other aircraft, such as Mig-15, Mig-17, Mig-19, and Mig-21 fighters and IL-26 bombers to Cuba and to several countries in the Middle East and Asia.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 5, 1963]

Bomber Bonfires

Several weeks ago, Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, thought he had a big one. In a speech he delivered in Aurora, Ill., the Senator said that he had been informed the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was preparing a proposal calling for the joint destruction by fire of American and Russian bombers.

In the Illinois speech, and later on the floor of the Senate, Goldwater described the "bomber bonfire" plan as "crazy" and demanded that the American people had the right to know about such idiotic schemes being hatched by the administration.

No sooner had Goldwater stepped down from the rostrum than half a dozen administration officials began issuing denials. "No such plan has ever been considered," they said. "It's all in the Senator's mind. Mr. Goldwater is imagining things."

It seems now that the story wasn't just a figment of the Arizona Senator's imagination. A story in the New York Times discloses that Secretary of State Dean Rusk has now admitted there has indeed been such a proposal for "bomber bonfires." He also confessed that the proposal was not merely discussed within the disarmament agency, but that it had been making the rounds of other departments and was being seriously considered as a step to break through the deadlock in arms negotiations with the Soviets.

The specific plan calls for the United States to burn 30 B-47 bombers per month, in return for the destruction by the Russians of 30 TU-16 Badger bombers. An embellishment on the idea was for both nations to fly the planes to some neutral site and to destroy them under the supervision of observers from neutral nations.

A spokesman for the disarmament agency has defended the plan by saying: "It seemed like a good idea." He went on to say that it was felt the move at least would "create some movement in the field of disarmament."

There you have it, in a nutshell. These frustrated disarmament negotiators haven't got the heart to admit that it is highly improbable that the Soviet Union will ever agree to any workable disarmament proposal which contains solid guarantees protecting the security of this country.

Of course, these people have jobs and a lot of spare time on their hands. And so they have been turning to the old pastime of straw grasping, coming up with gimmicks and trying desperately to "create some movement" for the sake of movement.

That's not what we need. If we are ever going to reach any kind of acceptable disarmament agreement with the Soviets, our negotiators have to be as tough and stubborn as theirs. They will have to outline our minimum terms and stick to them, not run helter-skelter in search of new gimmicks and concessions whenever the Russians say "Nyet."

The "bomber bonfire" proposal—as silly as it is—stands out as a symptom of decay in our national will to win. It ranks with the "study" reportedly undertaken a few years ago in the Pentagon to determine methods and procedures by which the United States would surrender to a conquering enemy, when and if we should lose our next war.

Senator Goldwater deserves credit for smoking out the arsonists on this one and putting out their little bonfire. He has illustrated that we not only have to keep our powder dry these days, but we also have to keep the firehose ready.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I ask the Senator if there is anything in the newspaper article to which he has referred which would indicate that, as a part of the rumored undertaking, an agreement would be made which would be subject to approval or rejection in the Senate?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I read the article twice, but I did not see anything in it on that point. However, I am convinced that under the powers that we have given the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, such a proposal would not have to meet with the customary Senate approval. I hope I am wrong, but I believe the Executive does have those powers.

Mr. KUCHEL. I hope, too, that my friend is wrong on that point. While we all know that the so-called theory of Executive agreements has been indulged in for the past three decades as a basis for agreements of presumedly slight importance or of temporary concern, I still do not like them. In any event, I do not want any agreement resulting from any part of any disarmament or arms control negotiation to bypass the Senate in any fashion whatsoever. In my judgment, the American people are passionately devoted to the constitutional responsibility of the Senate of the United States. They believe, as I believe, that the Senate should have the opportunity to approve or reject agreements entered into between our Government and foreign nations no matter what President is in the White House.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, to quickly sum up——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Our Government did not seek the advice and consent of the Senate on the question of the removal of missiles from Turkey or Italy. I am not sure that we were consulted in the instance of their being put into those countries. Also I understand that, contrary to an existing agreement and understanding, our Government did not confer with the governments of NATO before that action was taken. So I am glad that the Senator from California has injected a constitutional warning.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. My time has expired. I do not have the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Arizona and the Senator from California have raised an important question. The disposition of defense forces, unconnected with an agreement between the Soviet Union or any other country and our own, is within the power of the President as Commander in Chief. The President might very well withdraw or commit forces any place in the world.

However, the Senator from California is absolutely correct that if the disposition, change, or a destruction of our forces, planes or other elements of our defense is connected with an agreement with the Soviet Union bearing upon disarmament, then I certainly would say that would be an agreement which I believe would have to be submitted to the Senate for a two-thirds vote.

RECLAMATION BENEFITS STILL TO COME

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there appeared in the Arizona Daily Star of Thursday, April 4, an editorial entitled "Reclamation Benefits Still To Come."

The editorial quotes the U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Floyd E. Dominy, concerning the extraordinary benefits which Federal Reclamation developments have brought to the Lower Colorado River Basin.

More importantly, the article points up the growing and critical situation which we, in water-short areas of the Nation, face, and the measures which we must anticipate to solve it.

Because this same situation also exists in other parts of the Nation as the result of expanding population and increased per capita use of water, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the Record, that all may read how we are facing up to our water problems in Arizona.

The editorial is also appropriate to the bill S. 2, which is now unfinished business of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reclamation Benefits Still To Come

The U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation is authority for the statement that developments under the Bureau of Reclamation on the Colorado River and its tributaries serve 2,212,000 acres of arable land producing crops worth $345.6 million last year. The past benefits are undeniable; the future can be made just as sure.

Reclamation means not only building large dams, such as Hoover, Davis and Glen Canyon—there are few such sites left anywhere in the United States, and only a couple on the lower Colorado River. Reclamation also means studies aimed at controlling evaporation, desalting brackish or salton water and doing many other things to protect and preserve the water supply for the wisest of human use.

Tucson has a tremendous stake in this because this city presently is using pumped water—water that comes from a considerable distance underground. The basin may be vast; no one knows exactly how vast. But pumping is almost always a mining operation, and Tucson's water to a large share is fossil water, laid down in the basin eons ago. A new source of water will be needed before many years pass.

A PROPOSAL FOR LIBERATING CUBA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last week the esteemed David Lawrence wrote an article, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, entitled "A Proposal for Liberating Cuba." In his article he outlines a program for liberating Cuba which someone has suggested to him.

In the course of the article, Mr. Lawrence implies that there has yet not been anybody who has recommended a course for the liberation of Cuba. I wish to invite the attention of this very esteemed writer to the fact that on the 22d of last month I made a rather lengthy, and I thought rather logical, speech outlining what I considered to be a sensible course of action for this Government to follow if it really thought Cuba should be liberated—which I think it does. I urge an examination of what I recommended, in the behalf that it is the only logical and practical way we shall ever accomplish getting rid of communism and Fidel Castro from Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROPOSAL FOR LIBERATING CUBA: U.S. OFFER OF COMPLETE REHABILITATION IS URGED TO WIN SUPPORT OF PEOPLE

(By David Lawrence)

Strangely enough, a comprehensive plan that could really help to overthrow Fidel Castro and liberate Cuba has never been formally presented to the world by the United States.

In conformity with international law, and without involving in any way the use of American troops or invading armies from the outside, a plan could be devised that would appeal today to every man and woman on the island of Cuba. The expression of their concerted will could end the Castro regime.

The plan would cost money—maybe a half billion dollars a year for 5 years or more. But that's a lot less expensive than the loss of human lives in even a limited war. Besides, it could hardly provoke that awful nuclear war which is so often cited as the reason for American forebearance, if not timidity.

The liberation plan would require, first of all, the appointment by President Kennedy of a special commission of Americans familiar with the economic capacity and potential of Cuba. The Commission would make a detailed report recommending a broad-scale program for the rehabilitation of Cuba. This would spell out exactly how many new jobs would be created and what the probable range of wages would be for various types of workmen in Cuba.

The program would, of course, be basically agricultural and would outline the ways by which the whole Cuban farm industry could be rehabilitated and what this could mean to the average farmer. Cost figures, however, would be included for each segment of the economy. The whole thing is in line with the fundamental principles of the Alliance for Progress scheme that has been so widely publicized.

When the "liberation" plan for Cuba is ready for announcement, it can be turned over to the U.S. Information Agency and its numerous outlets for radio broadcasting. A detailed report, covering as many phases of Cuban economic life as possible, should be presented in Spanish to the Cuban people. It should be expressed in the simplest phrases, so that the average person in Cuba could quickly grasp what is really meant. The mere announcement of the plan would cause a sensation inside Cuba, and the news of it would spread quickly over the island by word of mouth.

But, it will be asserted, the Cuban army has been trained by the Russians, and is estimated at a strength of about 200,000. No revolutionist group is strong enough, it will be contended, nor in possession of adequate arms to do the job of defeating the Castro army. But this kind of argument assumes that a revolution in Cuba has to start with an organized revolutionary movement of substantial size. Actually, the most successful and far-reaching revolutions against autocracy in Europe and Latin America and Asia in recent years have come from inside the armed forces.

In Cuba, the 200,000-man army is an integral part of a large population, and its members have relatives and friends throughout the island. They are all aware of the suffering that prevails and the hopelessness of the future under Mr. Castro. Given a chance to rescue their countrymen, this same standing army could quickly take charge and get rid of Mr. Castro. A whole army can suddenly shift its allegiance at the behest of a few officers.

Unfortunately, in recent months the Washington Government's policies have created the impression inside Cuba that the United States is afraid to give Cubans any substantial help. It is true that more than $50 million was raised to ransom the patriots who invaded Cuba in the Bay of Pigs episode, but the Cuban people now have been told that no raiders are to be permitted to go from American shores into Cuba. All this implies that there will be no help of a military nature forthcoming, either directly or indirectly. It creates discouragement and certainly doesn't make Cubans feel they will be helped if they do rise against Mr. Castro.

The only way to take over the government of Cuba is from within, and this depends on an aroused and unified public sentiment. Since economic difficulties are the most pressing at present, it is logical to expect that the Cuban people will be attracted by the publicized pledges of financial and economic assistance from the United States which the proposed plan would give them. It would open up a new era of hope for everybody.

As every individual translated the American economic plan into what it would mean to him and his family—the chance to earn decent wages and have a free government—public sentiment under a barrage of publicity would grow to such an extent that thousands in the army would themselves privately embrace it and seek ways to get a new government so that the American plan could be put into effect.

But without any plan at all for the future, and without any concrete offer of assistance of any kind from the United States—except some vague phrases in official utterances—the people of Cuba, and particularly the 200,000 men in the Cuban army, can see no future for their country. That's why a plan that is repeated over the radio day after day could become the very weapon that would get rid of Mr. Castro as well as the Soviet troops. The revolution would restore Cuba's place in the Organization of American States and give her an opportunity to become a participant with the other Latin American countries in the Alliance for Progress.

FEDERAL FINANCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in today's Washington Post and Times Herald there is an article written by Mr. Harold B. Dorsey which is entitled "Critics Miss Point on Federal Finance," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITICS MISS POINT ON FEDERAL FINANCE

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

There is a propensity among critics of government expenditures and taxes to concentrate on the Federal Government's financial operations and to ignore those of the State and local governments. There have been instances where the word "government" has been used so loosely that the Federal Government tends to be criticized for State and local government actions.

In the 5 years through 1962, the number of workers on the Federal Government payroll increased 124,000 (5.6 percent). The number of employees on the payrolls of State and local governments increased by 1,435,000 (26 percent). State and local government workers outnumbered Federal employees by 2.9 times last year.

Federal Government debt in the same 5-year period increased about 14 percent. The debt of State and local governments increased by about 55 percent. On a cash basis, Federal Government expenditures in the same period increased about 34 percent and the State and local government expenditures increased 43 percent. Furthermore, the increase in the Federal expenditures includes substantially larger grants-in-aid to the State and local governments.

When we think of government levies siphoning off an increasing proportion of the productive efforts of the nongovernment economy, perhaps we should note that, on a cash basis, Federal receipts increased by approximately 27 percent in the 5 years through 1962, whereas the State and local government receipts increased by about 43 percent.

Five years ago (1957), Federal Government purchases of goods and services accounted for 11.8 percent of total gross national product and last year the proportion was 11.3 percent. The proportion for similar State and local government purchases was 8.3 percent in 1957 and increased to 10.3 percent last year.

It is quite clear then that in all of these measurements of employment and fiscal operations, the State and local government figures have been rising much more rapidly than those of the Federal Government. I doubt that there is a broad comprehension of these facts. This is unfortunate because it leads to many misunderstandings in the interpretation of business and government statistics.

For example, the Federal tax burden is not difficult to follow—and to criticize—because the bulk of it consists rather simply of income and social insurance taxes. The bulk of the States revenues comes from property taxes and from various types of sales and excise taxes, and license fees. Most of the sales and excise taxes are directly added to the price of goods and services sold and tend to be overlooked. Some portion of the increase in the cost-of-living index is caused directly by these taxes.

The rising importance of State and local government activities vis-a-vis the Federal Government deserves more attention in the projections of business prospects. Business analysts labor over the economic effects of Federal receipts and expenditures, but usually do not have a proportionate interest in the same figures for the State and local governments.

Similarly, the effect of Federal debt on the banking structure is analyzed carefully with little thought being given to the effects of State and local government deficit financing. In the past 18 months there has been little change in the commercial bank holdings of Federal securities whereas their holdings of State and local government issues have been rising quite sharply.

There is not enough space here to even tabulate the economic, sociological and political interpretations that are distorted by a failure to comprehend the rapidly changing relationship between the Federal Government's financial operations and those of the State and local governments.

One small item occurs to me that may be germane to the current situation. The beneficial effects of a reduction of, let us say, $10 billion in Federal income taxes are likely to be offset, in part, by the steady increase in the tax burden of State and local governments, even though these latter levies may be fairly well hidden in sales and excise taxes that increase the prices of commodities and services.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I think the article is worthy of the attention of Members of Congress, because it points out in a clear fashion how the cost of State and local governments has risen over the past 5 years, until it is much greater than the cost of the Federal Government; and how it is entirely possible, if the State and local governments continue this increased cost, this might well negate the proposed $10½ billion tax cut which Congress currently is considering.

I commend the article to the attention of all Members of Congress.

EYES OPEN ON CUBA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there was published in the Birmingham News an unusually thoughtful editorial. In fact, I think it is one of the best thought-out statements on the Cuban situation I have yet read. It is entitled "Eyes Open on Cuba." I invite the attention of Senators to the editorial; and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Eyes Open on Cuba

> Barry Goldwater said over the weekend that he favors an economic blockade of Cuba and U.S. support of Cuban exile raids—active support, including airdrops, for example, if an exile invasion of Cuba were undertaken—in preference to the Kennedy administration's position that blockade would run a war risk and the exile raids can do more harm than good.
>
> As a last resort, Senator Goldwater said, he favors an invasion to rid the island of Communists. He thinks the effort should be multilateral—that is, involving the Organization of American States—instead of purely a U.S. undertaking.
>
> This sort of talk will find a wide sympathetic audience among Americans chafing under a feeling of relative do-nothingism about Castro. The administration's policy is not do-nothing—it is simply do-something-else, the "something else" being diplomatic and economic pressure as alternative to direct action.
>
> The indirect approach may or may not work, we may or may not have to resort to direct action sooner or later—but should that time come, we should make our decision in full knowledge of what it involves, not as a result of political haranguing.
>
> This becomes especially pertinent as time for the more formal kind of campaigning approaches. As weeks and months pass toward 1964, abstract arguments will evolve into solid campaign issues. We should be careful not to paint ourselves into a corner—either corner—with the brush of political oratory.
>
> It would not be wise to limit ourselves to any particular strategy and advertise the fact of our limitation to our adversaries. Our policy should remain flexible, as it might not if politics makes us choose up sides with the winner bound to one approach to the exclusion of all others. David Lawrence in his column on this page today gives an example of fresh thinking about Cuba approaches. His suggestion merits study.
>
> It may well be that indirect action will fail to bring about Castro's downfall in Cuba or the removal of Russian troops. But when we set out to do so directly, as Senator Goldwater suggests, let us not fool ourselves about what we're getting into.
>
> If it comes to invasion, it would be foolish to proceed in belief that "we can accomplish it without having to commit our own troops," as the Arizonian says he believes. We might get some help from Latin American OAS members, but by no stretch of the imagination could they be expected to carry the load alone. Neither should we smugly assume that we can send a division of marines ashore and have matters neatly tidied up by sundown. If we commit ourselves militarily, let's do so in full awareness that it's going to cost us dearly.
>
> Senator Goldwater also shrugs off any idea such action on our part would bring on a world war—"Russia is not going to risk losing her world empire over a tiny island in the Caribbean," he said Sunday. Maybe not. But there is a risk, at least, that the Senator is wrong. We would have to be aware of that.
>
> None of this is to say that direct action will not become necessary sometime in the future, or that we should avoid it for fear of what it might bring. It is only to suggest that we keep our eyes—and our minds—wide open and act accordingly.

THE INCENTIVE OF THE INVESTMENT CREDIT FOR TAX PURPOSES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last week I made some comments about the wisdom of the administration in recommending the investment credit and the manner in which the adoption of that investment credit in our tax laws has served to encourage manufacturers to make capital expenditures of large sums of money, which, of course, have the result of strengthening our economy and providing additional jobs for the people in our economy.

I should like to add to what I said on that occasion by reading some excerpts from a column which appeared in the Wall Street Journal last Friday:

> Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. reports orders received in the first quarter were a full 42 percent higher than in the like 1962 period. The spurt reflects "a more promising capital goods climate, due partly to more favorable depreciation rules and tax credits," says a spokesman for the Milwaukee producer of construction equipment, farm machinery and other industrial equipment.
>
> Bookings of International Harvester Co. were up substantially in March from the previous month and from March 1962, reports an official. Recently introduced models of trucks and construction machinery are spurring the rise, he says.
>
> "March was a banner month for incoming orders," says Galen Smith, president of Towmotor Corp., a Cleveland manufacturer of lift trucks and other materials handling equipment. Towmotor's orders in the first 1963 quarter topped the previous record set in the first 3 months of 1962, Mr. Smith notes, despite the fact orders in the 1962 period were inflated by strikes in competitors' plants.

I could read further, though I shall not, to cite all the other companies listed in the article, each of which indicates that the additional orders being placed by them and being placed with them are a direct result of the administration's highly fought over tax incentive credit of last year, as a result of which the 7-percent incentive credit was provided. This demonstrates, of course, the wisdom of the administration in recommending that particular proposal.

THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA IN THE DEFENSE OF THE NATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the national defense importance of the State of Florida was clear to the Nation during the Cuban crisis, and the people of the State responded, as freedom-loving Americans would be expected, to the unprecedented demand for the emergency buildup of military forces.

The Nation is also aware of the generosity and continuing sacrifice of the people of Florida in the handling of the Cuban refugee problem.

But Florida plays another role in the defense of the country, for both today and the future. In a recent speech to the officers of Patrick Air Force Base and the Atlantic Missile Range about the future of the Air Force in space, the Secretary of the Air Force, Hon. Eugene Zuckert, also talked about the present and future of the State of Florida in the defense of the Nation.

Everyone knows that Cape Canaveral is the principal launch site for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. But the complex of facilities along Florida's central east coast is also "the primary NASA-Air Force interface," in the words of the Secretary, where the foundations of defense capability of the free world in space are being laid.

Mr. Zuckert said the Air Force has two objectives in its space program. The first is to "acquire the capability to utilize space in support of military forces operating in the familiar environment of land, sea, and air," through improvements in observation, warning, military geodesy and meteorology. The second objective is to "acquire the necessary defense capability for the aerospace regions themselves."

Secretary of the Air Force said that both manned and unmanned systems will be required to "protect the peaceful activities in space of the nations of the free world."

The people of Florida are part of the great program at the Cape to assure freedom in space, and their contribution is important. Floridians are also equally proud of their contribution to and support of defense activities on Florida's west coast.

Mr. Zuckert explained the purpose of President Kennedy's expansion of our general purpose forces, to give the Nation a broader basis of deterrence of Communist aggression and a greater range of response to the Communist use of military force.

This calls for the combining of ground and air power through the new Strike Command, headquartered at MacDill Air Force Base on Florida's gulf coast.

Mr. Zuckert said we must maintain our superiority of forces at the top, with strategic bomber and missile forces, but we "must also have it at levels of war more likely to be brought against us." What the Secretary of the Air Force had to say on this subject goes a long way toward clearing up U.S. policy with respect to the use of nuclear weapons.

And for the levels of warfare even below the type of conflict in which STRICOM forces would be employed, for what we know as counterinsurgency, Florida again is the center of developmental activity.

Mr. Zuckert pointed out that at the Air Force Special Warfare Center at Eglin Air Force Base, also on Florida's gulf coast, "the accumulated experience of four decades of air operations is being applied to the job of developing airpower techniques for the very low rungs on the ladders of war's intensity."

Mr. Zuckert made clear the role of airpower in both today's and tomorrow's defense and the part Florida is now playing, and will continue to play in its development. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the remarks of the Secretary of the Air Force at the dining-in ceremony at Patrick Air Force Base in Florida, Saturday, March 2, 1963, be printed in the RECORD. It was an important talk, and I commend it to everyone interested in national defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, AIR FORCE MISSILE TRAINING CENTER, PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLA., SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1963

General Davis, officers of the Atlantic Missile Range and Patrick Air Force Base, and honored guests: the "dining-in" is a time-honored military affair which the Air Force adopted from the British. The after-dinner speaker, however, is our own idea, and I am happy to take advantage of it to join in honoring three of our own who are blazing the path of the future—Maj. Donald K. Slayton, Maj. Gordon Cooper, and Maj. Virgil I. Grissom.

It is also an honor and pleasure to welcome two other architects of the future, Walt Williams and Dr. Kurt Debus of NASA, and to have with us members of the Army, Navy, and Marine families at this traditional Air Force gathering.

Of course, those from the other services who measure tradition in centuries may think I make liberal use of the word, but the NASA people understand. Both the Air Force and NASA are products of 20th century technology, so we borrow freely from everybody else's past. Our past is just beginning. We call it future.

It was suggested that I speak tonight about the future of the Air Force in space. As both starting point and finish line for everything I say, just keep in mind that the job of the Air Force is not space, it is defense. It is not research and development, not strategic, not tactical, nor any of these. It is the application of airpower or aerospace power to the defense of the United States and the free world.

Some of my remarks may be responsive to the suggestion about space, but it seems more important to me to talk about the future of the Air Force in the defense of the United States. The future is from now on, and now is cold war.

The cold war, reduced to essentials is a confrontation of sovereign powers in which one side maintains a pressure of aggressive expansionism, forcing the other to maintain a defense against it. The most urgent requirement of that defense is to deter the aggressor from using military force to attain his ends. We are the defenders.

I would like to make four points about that defense.

First, we must have superiority at the top level of intensity of war, and must extend that deterrent superiority to lower levels in order to contain or limit war and aggression.

Second, we must have flexibility and control of the application of destructive power at each level.

Third, we must be prepared to protect ourselves against the extension of aggressive pressure into space, and

Fourth, the Air Force role in this overall defense requirement presents the greatest challenge in the history of any military organization.

In this cold war confrontation, the technological and industrial capabilities of both sides are such that sooner or later, if not now, the unrestrained use of that power for nuclear destruction would make its employment in war a net losing proposition for both sides. The defender must have power to wreak unacceptable damage on the aggressor as a first requirement of his defense. This is where strategic deterrence starts.

But an aggressor whose political system may make expansion a necessity will, if deterred by fear of retaliation from using his full power, seek other opportunities. He will try to find the place to apply his power which he calculates will not provoke his own destruction. Close one avenue to him, he tries another. He can logically be expected to stay short of triggering his own destruction. The aggressor naturally has the initiative in this game so we must be able to apply whatever force is necessary to deny him his objective.

So far, we have been able to do so. The risk has been too great for him. We must keep it that way. We have our own reasons for desisting from war but until we can make him apply the same reasoning to his national behavior, we have no choice but to make sure—and make sure he knows—that war—any war he starts—means certain military defeat for him. We know, of course, that all-out war makes no sense for either side, nor for the rest of the world.

The defender, of course, has to maintain a force adequate to prevent ultimate defeat. This requirement may change, but the use of the force is his final effort. Two courses are then open. The defender can, as a matter of judgment, wait and weigh each application of the aggressor's power in order to or until he can decide it is sufficiently threatening to warrant the jugular response. As a second course, he can prepare to overcome the aggressor's military power before that point is reached. It seems to me that the first course is closed at the end. A sensible defense is to be ready to respond at a lower level with whatever force is deemed necessary to stop the aggressor—and at a net loss for his attempt.

The United States is leader of the free world, in President Kennedy's words, by both strength and conviction. Our conviction, both moral and military, is that we must be prepared to stop aggression at levels of intensity below the level of the maximum destruction.

Our basic strength, our power to deter aggression, our ability to defend ourselves must always be greatest at the top. In our strategic bomber and missile forces, we maintain power adequate to deter an enemy from striking for our jugular. Strategic forces, of course, have the capability of counterforce attack which does not constitute total devastation of a nation.

We have to maintain this superiority at the top, but we must also have it at levels of war more likely to be brought against us. That is why we are building deterrence down from the top level of intensity. The reason is simple. The only way we know of forcing an aggressor to keep down his use of military force is to make each level of intensity of conflict more certain of defeat for him than the one below it. He won't be deterred unless he knows that as his commitment goes up, his chances go down.

One hears talk about the danger and probability of escalation. The effect of my first point, extending the deterrent with superiority at each level is make escalation a penalty and not an opportunity for an aggressor.

At each level where we determine we want to stop aggression, we must be prepared to make the most efficient possible use of every resource available to us, skillfully employing advancing technology to save human resources. It is imperative that for the long haul, we hold the investment at each level to the absolute minimum necessary to maintain effective deterrent superiority. The cheapest way to stop war is at the lowest level of conflict with the quickest possible stop to aggression. To me, this means we use tactical nuclear weapons whenever we determine the military situation demands their use, whether by Army, Navy, Marines, or the Air Force.

If we would have the aggressor desist from any course of action which may be desirable to him but unacceptable to us, we must have him know that we will use whatever force it takes, nuclear or nonnuclear, to stop him. This kind of deterrence employs all services.

The President has made clear his determination to have more choices than no response or total response. This is the purpose of counterforce. This is the reason we must have flexibility in strategic forces. This is why the great increase in what has been called tactical forces, now designated in the budget as General Purpose Forces. One phase of the buildup is the combining of groundpower with airpower in the new STRICOM, headquartered across the State of Florida at MacDill.

At the Air Force Special Warfare Center at Eglin, the accumulated experience of four decades of air operations is being applied to the job of developing airpower techniques for the very low rungs on the ladder of war's intensity. This is the AFCOIN program, or the Air Force part of the Nation's preparation for counterinsurgency struggles.

For this work, we are trying out beefed-up T-28's and B-26's with more power and more weapons—14 50-caliber machineguns and a dozen external ordnance stations, for example on a B-26 with 1,000 more horsepower than the original.

Support techniques are keeping pace. We can snatch a 10,000-pound cargo package off a C-123 without touching down. We can get a C-130E fully loaded into a grass or clay runway of less than 1,000 feet. We are working on a system for snatching a cage-like capsule of 20 to 25 men off one of these planes without landing it. This technique will be a big help to the Army in getting over that first difficult period of concentration of men during an airborne operation.

For the general roles of air superiority and interdiction, our effective power will go up by an order of magnitude with the advent of the F-4C added to the F-105, with both then to be supplemented by the first fighter designed from scratch for dual-service use, the F-111, better known as the TFX.

While we are extending downward the effectiveness of our deterrent power, great changes are taking place at the level of the strategic deterrent. Missiles are coming into the inventory to provide a very special kind of delivery system for nuclear explosives.

The concept of strategic deterrence, of course, is a progression from the strategic bombing concepts of the thirties. The B-47's and B-52's, also progressions from those early bombers, will continue to carry the burden of strategic deterrence for some years. Current projections of the strategic forces, however, assume that a major part of the job can be done by missiles—land based or sea based—at a lower investment of men, money, and machines than would be possible with manned bombers of today's design.

In other words, the B-52 is passing the heavy explosive delivery part of its job on to the missiles. The Air Force believes that the effective life of the B-52 could be extended, in a joint role with missiles, through use of the Skybolt, but the return on the projected Skybolt investment was judged not worth the cost in the light of all the factors involved.

The missiles, as I say, do only the explosives delivery job. They have to be pretargeted and once launched, cannot be recalled or redirected. They cannot follow a movable target. They cannot discriminate. They cannot assess damage, nor report battle conditions. They make for a rigid defense posture. While they necessarily carry the brunt of the strategic strike, total dependence upon them would not be consistent with our objective of controlling destruction and preserving always some kind of foundation for ending the conflict.

Because of the variety of such requirements in our approach to strategic warfare, some type of manned system seems called for. The type of aircraft we've been calling strategic bombers are characterized by extreme range capabilities, very high ceiling, great load-carrying capacity, long endurance, multiman crews, and multijob possibilities. Our current studies are directed at determining the possible application of these flight characteristics at the point within the missions bracket between missiles on one side and high performance fighters on the other. The RS-70 is the most advanced of these concepts but it is not by any means the only type of manned system of significant strategic potential.

We can't say now just where we will come out, but there doesn't seem to be any question as to the value of manned vehicles able to stay aloft for long periods, travel very great distances, fly high or fly low, and fly fast. There are many jobs to be done, reconnaissance-strike missions, observation or surveillance, command and control, or weapon launching.

We can get the flexibility of my second point with airpower. This is one reason why I have no taste for the salty beer that results from the crying into it by those who seem to write off manned systems because of the job changes I've been talking about.

But the main reason why I don't intend to join in drinking any tear-salted beer is that while we still have to do all the old jobs assigned to airpower, we have the difficult, demanding, challenging, and expanding new job to do in space.

Before I say anything about our future in space, let me establish two benchmarks. The first is that the Air Force needs everything it can get from NASA. NASA needs us, too, as the record of how NASA puts things into space indicates, but if there weren't a NASA, the same facility and capability would have to be created some other way.

There is reassuring precedent for the principle of having an outside-of-defense civilian agency provide the type of support we need. The case at point is the Atomic Energy Commission. Our own nuclear weapon flexibility as well as the Polaris-carrying submarine is sufficient testimony.

The clear lesson for us in the space field is that we must put requirements on NASA to meet whatever part of our needs can be met in this way. We must utilize every possible resource to build the necessary military capability and I can assure you that NASA is ready to respond. Jim Webb, the NASA Administrator, harbors no illusions about NASA's responsibilities in support of national defense requirements.

The second benchmark is that there is no such thing as peaceful space or military space. There is just space. A new and massive space program in a civilian agency was launched nearly 5 years ago, with—for reasons which seemed not unreasonable at the time—a great hullabaloo about peaceful objectives.

The Nation is holding to those peaceful objectives, but we also know that the military services will have to do the same thing in space that they have always done in the media of the land, sea, and air. The Air Force forward space program is, therefore, aimed at two general objectives.

The first is to acquire the capability to utilize space in support of the military forces operating in the familiar environments of land, sea, and air. Space offers new aids. Observation warning, communications, military geodesy and meteorology are areas for the application of space technology to defense. All of the services have requirements of their own and it is up to the Air Force to provide them the access they need for their purposes. The Secretary of Defense has assigned the responsibility to us.

Right here, let me caution you against letting any interservice differences blur your judgment or your vision. It is my position that competition in ideas among the three services is desirable. The imaginative strong minded people we need in this business are going to have differences, and they must be resolved constructively.

Our second general objective is to acquire the necessary defense capability for the aerospace regions themselves. We must be able to protect the peaceful activities in space of the nations of the free world. We believe that space can be free to all for peaceful activity only if somebody keeps it free. We are that somebody. The job involves mastering the space environment in order to deny to a hostile power the uninhibited military exploitation of space. We can only do this if we have the ability to detect and counter any military threat. We believe that both manned and unmanned systems will be required, but we cannot say now in what relative investment.

We have a lot to learn. The recent agreement with NASA for joint participation in the Gemini program is one way. That agreement represents an answer from both DOD and NASA to critics who said there was no place in space for military man. Our own activity directed toward manned space vehicles will increase, and with NASA's backup, we'll attain the needed capability earlier than we would otherwise.

A term you hear around Washington to denote the areas of cooperation between Government agencies is "interface." Here at Patrick is one of the primary "NASA-Air Force interfaces." Such terms usually leave me pretty cold but this one does have some descriptive value.

There will be plenty of problems between the Air Force and NASA, but not by any means all at the interface points such as the Cape. We wouldn't either one be true to trust or tradition if there weren't. Any machine as big as the national space effort is bound to have some kind of friction. But just remember, a clutch is a friction interface. Its purpose is to join two shafts for the transmission of power.

The power we can get will provide protection for the free world in space. This was my third point—to make sure that no aggressor can exploit space, either for expansionism on earth or interference in space with the peaceful pursuits of the free world.

The people of the United States know they must have an Air Force second to none if they are to apply their strength constructively in peace. My fourth point covers just a few things, then, that the Air Force officer must believe, know, and practice.

Get these ideas straight:

The Air Force is at the highest state of readiness and response capability in all its history.

It is strengthening that posture almost monthly.

It needs better people than ever before. It has more opportunity for their professional growth and potential contribution to the Nation's defense than ever before.

It needs the old skills, but to a far greater degree, for AFCOIN and general purpose forces, for airlift and air defense, and for the new mission of heavy multiman crew, long endurance aircraft.

And then it needs that whole new range of skills, the skills and techniques which are being developed by the Slaytons, the Coopers, the Grissoms—and all of their colleagues, civil and military—to enable America to keep her place as freedom's leader by strength and conviction.

The Air Force is an organization of professionals. It takes brains and hard work to keep up. The competition is tough, but the opportunities to serve your country and make a mark in the service to which you have dedicated your lives, will continue to expand.

It all adds up to a reminder for those who wear the Air Force uniform that the wild blue yonder is still beyond.

PROPOSED TAX REFORM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, many of our religious denominations are greatly concerned about a proposal for revision of our income tax laws which would change the exemption for gifts to churches and charitable organizations.

I share their concern regarding the proposed revision, and sincerely hope no action will be taken on the part of Congress that will in any way deter our citizens from contributing generously to our churches and charitable organizations.

At a recent annual meeting of the board of administration of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of America, a resolution was adopted expressing their concern over the proposed change.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PROPOSED TAX REFORM

Whereas President Kennedy has gone on record as favoring a revision in the Federal income tax laws to change the exemptions for gifts to churches and charitable organizations by making the first 5 percent (based upon the individual income) subject to income tax; and

Whereas the Wesleyan Methodist Church of America is a denomination which teaches that it is the religious duty of Christians to contribute 10 percent of their income to the work of God and of the church; and

Whereas the proposed change in the Federal income tax laws would thus presumably affect every earning member of this and all other denominations of similarly minded Christians, singling out for increased taxation the charitable givers of the Nation, the very group who ought to be, and have in the past been encouraged, presuming upon their willingness to continue the voluntary giving without which this tax would be meaningless, and discouraging even minimal continued giving: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this board of administration of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of America declares its respectful opposition to this proposal of the President as not being in the national interest and urges our Congressmen to oppose any specific legislation designed to make this proposal effective.

Resolved further, That the secretary of the board send copies of this resolution to every Member of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

STOCKPILE SCANDAL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the January report of this Nation's stockpile inventories, the point of absolute absurdity was reached.

It is interesting to note that the stockpile of castor oil of nearly 216 million pounds has been reduced by about 2 million pounds. This means that our castor oil stockpile is nearly 146 million pounds beyond the maximum projected need way into the future. In dollars, Mr. President, our taxpayers have approximately $55 million tied up in castor oil. This dates from the Eisenhower administration.

With respect to feathers, the Federal Government stockpiled 600,000 pounds of feathers beyond any projected need, during the Eisenhower administration. It takes a lot of feathers to make a pound, so 600,000 pounds of feathers are feathers indeed.

The junior Senator from Ohio very regretfully reports that at this time $38 million of the taxpayers' money is still represented in stockpiled feathers. What to do with this fluffy stuff is even beyond the intelligence of New Frontiersmen at the White House or in the Congress.

If I may make a suggestion, Mr. President, it would be an excellent idea if we made good use of some of this stockpiled castor oil by administering it—and I believe it would be putting it to good use—to some of the officials of the Eisenhower administration responsible for stockpiling this huge amount of feathers?

GREATEST COLD WAR VICTORY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our Nation's greatest cold war victory came as a result of President Kennedy's firm, determined and unyielding action toward Castro and Khrushchev last October. It is a matter of record that Khrushchev turned tail and withdrew his offensive missiles and aircraft from Cuba.

It is unfortunate that the fruits of this triumph are being recklessly squandered by partisan political criticism from certain persons no longer officials of our Federal Government. Last month former Vice President Nixon charged that President Kennedy blundered in failing to provide air cover for the Bay of Pigs invasion—in other words, that we should have sent air power in to kill thousands of Cuban men, women and children; which, incidentally, would have caused the loss of American lives in so doing.

Americans should note that this Monday morning quarterback—I refer to former Vice President Nixon—was exceedingly silent during 1959 and 1960 when he was Vice President of the United States and Castro was expropriating without compensation the property of American individuals and firms and attempting to spread his communism revolution throughout Latin America. Then he was silent. Today he is a war hawk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, now a new voice in American politics has been added to the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out in our country on the heels of the President's success. Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York has recently criticized the President for restraining Cuban exiles from their hit-and-run raids on Soviet merchant shipping in the Caribbean. By innuendo he has implied that in doing so we are appeasing the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, Governor Rockefeller should know better, and probably does. He should know that these raids do nothing for freedom. Responsible leaders of both parties agree that the raids are ineffectual and carry the possibility of igniting a war. Their continuance would constitute an open invitation to the Soviet Union to send airplanes into the Caribbean to protect its merchant ships. They encourage Khrushchev to slow down, if not stop, the withdrawal of Russian troops from Cuba which is proceeding as a result of negotiations between him and President Kennedy.

In a recent press conference Governor Rockefeller stated:

> Well, it is very hard for me to understand why we are supporting in South Vietnam freedom fighters, and why we are holding them back and preventing them from operating in Cuba. And I hope it is not as a means or as an endeavor to placate or to appease the Soviet.

Mr. President, the situations we face in Vietnam and Cuba are entirely different. In Vietnam we are aiding an established government to rid itself of Communist guerrilla infiltrators. In Cuba the goal of our policy is to oust a regime which is presently in complete control of that unhappy island. As the situations are different, the approaches we take toward them must differ. The policy of the administration toward Castro has been firm and unrelenting. I feel confident it will result in his ouster and the establishment of a free and democratic government in Cuba. We have reason to hope this will be accomplished without the loss of hundreds or thousands of American lives.

It is discouraging to hear these unfounded statements from a leader of one of our two great political parties. There is always room for constructive criticism of our Government regardless of which party is in power. However, it is unfortunate that the Governor of the second largest State in the Union and a leader of that Grand Old Party of which I am not a member should stoop to this kind of partisanship over an issue of such vital importance to our country and to the entire free world.

Mr. President, in the Plain Dealer, one of our Nation's great newspapers, published in my home city, Cleveland, there appeared on April 12, 1963, a column by James Reston entitled " 'New' Rockefeller bows."

In this column Mr. Reston displayed his usual keen insight into the problems facing our Nation, and once again showed why he is universally recognized as one of the Nation's outstanding journalists. I commend this column to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Apr. 12, 1963]

"NEW" ROCKEFELLER BOWS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—Nelson Rockefeller was in Washington this week, but his old friends scarcely recognized him. He talked like Harold Stassen and acted like Dick Nixon.

The presidential bug has really got him. You could tell because he denied it.

He was in town to gather support for his campaign. Everybody knew it, and he knew everybody knew it, but he followed the old deceptive ritual even though it was obvious to everybody, including himself, that he was deceiving nobody.

Harold Stassen started on the left and when he began to get the White House itch he lurched over to the right. Nixon started on the right, then turned left in trying to beat Kennedy, and right again in trying to beat Pat Brown in California, thereby proving that it's easy to lose both ways.

Governor Rockefeller is following the Stassen route, only with less justification.

This is not so surprising in a candidate seeking to pull the Javits and the Goldwater wings of the party together, but what was surprising here was his reliance on the old Nixon technique of the loaded question, and the vague suggestion of dishonorable practice.

He was asked in his news conference here what he thought the relations of this Government should be with the anti-Castro exile movement.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Well, it is very hard for me to understand why we are supporting in South Vietnam freedom fighters, and why we are holding them back and preventing them from operating in Cuba. And I hope it is not as a means or as an endeavor to placate or to appease the Soviet.

Question: Do you think it is?

Governor ROCKEFELLER. I hope it is not, I said.

Question: Governor, does this mean that you think there is a possibility of some secret arrangement between the President and Mr. Khrushchev on the matter of holding back the freedom fighters in Cuba?

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Well, I have no idea. But maybe Mr. Khrushchev will release some more of the correspondence and we will find out.

This exchange raises some interesting questions. If the governor were president, would he have us do in Cuba what we are doing in Vietnam? Or is it our intervention in Vietnam he does not understand?

Meanwhile, does he have any evidence that President Kennedy has made a deal with Khrushchev over Cuba? He says he has "no idea" about this. But if he has "no idea" why raise it?

The tolerance for political baloney in Washington is pretty high. The town has produced and swallowed more than its share. Politicians all stoop to conquer sooner or late, but Rockefeller seemed to be stooping pretty low pretty soon.

THE SUBMARINE "THRESHER," AND THE U.S.S. "UTAH" AND U.S.S. "ARIZONA"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, like all other Americans, I have mourned this past weekend the 129 men lost on the submarine *Thresher*. The tragedy has stunned and shocked the Nation. It is even more crushing because it came just at Easter—a time of rejoicing for the entire Christian world.

But Easter also offers hope to those who mourn, and eases the pain of the bereaved families. My heart goes out especially to the young wives and mothers who have had to face up these past few days to the cruel task of telling their youngsters that daddy will not be home again. We must try to unlock from the unfathomable sea the cause of the tragedy, and see that it never happens again.

The entombment of 129 brave men some 8,000 feet down in the Atlantic Ocean off Cape Cod calls to mind the similar fate of the men of the U.S.S. *Arizona* and the U.S.S. *Utah* at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. These men will also lie forever in silence on the ocean's bottom. Today this Nation over, Old Glory flies at half mast for the men of the *Thresher*. We are now doing what we can to pay tribute to the men who sacrificed their lives on the *Thresher*, just as long ago we did what we could to honor the men of the U.S.S. *Arizona*. And we honor the men of the *Arizona* day in and day out by the magnificent memorial which we have built over her hulk, and by raising the colors over her at dawn each morning and taking them down at sundown.

But the men of the U.S.S. *Utah* seem to have been forgotten. They lie in the hulk of the *Utah* less than a mile from the *Arizona*'s splendid memorial—but—too far away to be definitely associated with the *Arizona*'s glory. The small plate which adorns the *Utah*'s hull does not even list the names of the 54 officers and men who went down with the ship and whose bodies have never been found. Thousands pass the *Utah* after seeing the *Arizona* without even knowning that it is the tomb of equally brave men who died defending their country.

In February I introduced a bill to erect a simple flagpole over the *Utah* so we may fly the colors over the men who lie entombed there. I am gratified that 37 of my colleagues are cosponsoring the bill. A report was received from the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget this morning on this bill, and I am asking the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] to hold hearings as soon as the committee schedule permits. When we do have a way of paying eternal tribute to our heroic dead we must do it; the tragedy of the *Thresher* has shown us again how cold and empty the tributes can seem when we have no tangible and lasting way to show gratitude, at the place where the tragedy occurred, to the men who have gone forever into the depth and silence of the ocean.

Since I first began my campaign to honor the dead of the U.S.S. *Utah*—a campaign, incidentally, which was sparked by Bill Kreh of the Navy Times—many additional facts about the *Utah* have come to light. I was pleased to receive a letter from the man who was the *Utah*'s captain at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack, Capt. James M. Steele, and to find that he is now retired and living in Washington, D.C. He has advised me that, far from being an unarmed target ship, as had been stated in many magazine and news articles, the vessel had the most advanced antiaircraft guns in our Navy on board, some of which had not yet been installed on any of our major combatant ships. Her big guns had been removed, it is true, when she became a target ship for high level and divebombing aircraft of the Navy and the Army, but she was by no means an unarmed ship.

In fact, as Captain Steele pointed out to me, the highly trained and competent gunnery crew from the *Utah* was able to remove 16-inch and 14-inch guns and ammunition from some of the damaged battleships at Pearl and to assist in the salvage of those ships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. They also removed serviceable 5-inch AA batteries from damaged ships and set them up ashore and manned them for the defense of the Pearl Harbor area. I am glad to be able to clear up the misconception that the U.S.S. *Utah* was not a worthy target for the Japanese bombers, and to stress again the service of her surviving crew in the defense of Pearl Harbor and in the salvage work on the battleships there.

Captain Steele's recollections and the later reports of salvage work on the *Utah* indicate the presence of large amounts of hydrogen sulfide gas trapped within the hull. The ship was the victim of two torpedoes and possibly a large bomb, all taken in the port side.

The Navy tells me there is little question that the *Utah* could have been salvaged as were most of the other battleships, but other ships like the *Nevada* and *California* and *West Virginia* were given precedence because they could restore to the fleet the offensive capability of large caliber guns. The plans for the salvage of the *Utah* continued to be sidetracked by other more urgent work right up to the war's end, and then the battleship *Mississippi* assumed much the same function as the *Utah* after the war when her main batteries were removed and she became AG–128, a test bed for new weapons. Thus the hulk of the *Utah* with its brave dead has been left undisturbed at Pearl Harbor.

Almost every State—and certainly every area of the country—has one or more of its boys listed among the *Utah* dead. Of the 54 men whose bodies were not found or identified, 13 gave California as their home State; 11 Texas; 3 each Illinois, Iowa, Washington State, and New York; 2 each Colorado, Missouri, Virginia, and Massachusetts; 1 each Kentucky, Arkansas, Minnesota, Louisiana, Michigan, Oregon, Ohio, Nebraska, and 1 who did not list his home. His address however, showed he was born in Iowa. Another man was a native of the Philippine Islands. Many men showed next-of-kin in States other than their home at the time of enlistment, so there is hardly a State which is not touched in some way by the ghostly hand of those entombed in the U.S.S. *Utah*.

These U.S.S. *Utah* dead have not been specially honored because the U.S.S. *Utah* was officially decommissioned at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack, and the flag is not flown over a decommissioned ship, and because the Navy holds that the *Arizona* memorial should spread enough glory for all. I feel that neither reason is valid enough to deny the men of the *Utah* the honor of resting under the flag for which they died. Congress can rectify this slight, and I hope we will do so without any further delay.

for Canyonlands National Park.

CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Senate is not unaware, I am sure, that I have again this year introduced a bill—S. 27—to create Canyonlands National Park in southeastern Utah. The RECORD carries several speeches that I made on Canyonlands.

The Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has set a hearing on the bill for the 25th of April in Washington, D.C.

Last session I introduced a Canyonlands bill, and hearings were held in Washington, D.C., and Utah. Support was widespread and general, but opposition was local.

The bill was reported to the Senate for action, but no action was taken. This year the local opposition has subsided, and Utah now presents a united front

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Deseret News of April 9 and one from the Salt Lake Tribune of April 10, 1963, which explain that there has been agreement on the Canyonlands National Park, and that Utah now unitedly supports the bill which I have introduced for the creation of that park.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, Apr. 9, 1963]

NOW LET'S MOVE ON CANYONLANDS

This is the year of decision and time's speeding on. So it was refreshing and heartening to all Utahans interested either in the glories of nature or the economic progress of the State to note the agreement reached Saturday by former opponents on the Canyonlands National Park issue.

Hopefully, this agreement provides the common ground upon which all Utahans can stand in pushing for congressional approval of the park this year.

The time certainly is right. National interest has been created by magnificent pictures in recent publications. Several organizations, including the National Parks Association, are crying for action. And by next year, if rumors prove true, Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, one of the strongest advocates of a Canyonlands National Park, will be a candidate for the Senate. His successor may be far less interested in Canyonlands.

The potential of a park including the weird and beautiful erosion-sculptured stone wonderland of southeastern Utah is tremendous, particularly as transportation into the area is opened up.

That is coming in the near future. Already, half a million cars a year pass within an hour's drive of the proposed park, on U.S. Highways 160 and 50–6. When Interstate 70 is completed along the route of U.S. 50–6, the great bulk of traffic en route from the East or Midwest to the Las Vegas or Southern California areas will pass close to the park.

Moreover, if legislation is finally approved to build a National Scenic Parkway linking Canyonlands to the Zion-Bryce-Grand Canyon area by way of Glen Canyon, it will open up what is beyond question one of the world's greatest scenic areas.

Utah cannot afford to have this great potential slip away unused.

The compromise worked out between Governor Clyde and Senator Bennett on one side and Senator Moss on the other seems entirely workable. It includes a park of about 250,000 acres in which traditional national park single-use policy would be followed, except that mineral and oil exploration could continue for another 25 years. Mines and wells developed during that time could continue to operate indefinitely.

To minimize such activities in the park, however, areas believed to be of potential value will remain outside the park. So will the area most used for grazing and deer hunting.

The result will be a park that includes all the features that are becoming so well known and loved—Chesler Park, Virginia Park, Druid Arch, Angel Arch, Elephant Canyon, Upheaval Dome, the Needles, the Basin of Standing Rocks.

Tied together with the Dead Horse State Park to the North, it should protect and make accessible a veritable wonderland, both for the tourist who wants to see it from the air-conditioned comfort of his automobile and for the adventurer who wants to set out afoot into some of America's most stark, primitive wilderness.

Utah's leaders in Congress and the statehouse deserve the State's thanks and commendations for putting aside partisan differences and uniting on this program. The same spirit of selfless unity will be necessary to put the bill through Congress at the earliest possible date.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Apr. 10, 1963]

Canyonlands Pact

All Members of the Utah's congressional delegation and Governor Clyde are to be commended for reaching an agreement on basic framework for the proposed Canyonlands National Park in southeastern Utah.

Details are yet to be ironed out in Congress which, subject to Presidential approval, has the responsibility for setting up the park. For the first time, however, the Utah lawmakers and Governor have a plan all can support.

The compromise, as we understand it, calls for a national park of about 253,000 acres, embracing some of the most breathtaking scenery in the area adjacent to the confluence of the Colorado and Green Rivers. Excluded would be some mineral-rich land in the northeast corner of the originally proposed park, with other acreage added in the south.

The National Park Service's original plan called for about a million acres, an area sliced to 333,000 acres in Senator Moss' bill last year. Unrealistic multiple-use provisions for the park proper also were dropped.

The Tribute has preferred the creation of a national recreation area under Park Service administration for Canyonlands. This would permit recreation as well as full resource development—and in a State so gravely in need of increased funds for schools, exploitation of all natural resources is needed.

But if State and congressional leaders in Utah agree a national park is the only answer, then it should be kept to a minimum in area, as the present compromise plan seems to do.

There is no question that Utah would benefit from establishment of another national park.

However, except for a few delicate formations and arches and undesirability of permanent developments in improper places, it is foolish to regard the Canyonlands as slipping away forever if not immediately given park status.

Early in 1960 the Tribune called attention to the need for protection in their primitive form of the Needles, Chesler Park, and other popular scenic spots, with less rigid protection for adjacent lands. We feel that in the long run, as the national recreation area concept proves popular and feasible, most of the Canyonlands will come under this type of administration.

AMERICA IS LAST WITH THEM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, most of us remember the "American Firsters," who were so vociferous about 25 years ago. I remember very distinctly, as Congressman at Large from Ohio at that time, addressing a crowd of "American Firsters," in Cleveland Heights and being jeered and threatened in the course of my speech. It did not bother me at that time, nor would such a thing bother me now.

They were demanding critics at that time of decent dealing by our Government with friendly foreign nations. They wanted us to build up again a high-tariff wall around our Nation. Congressman Hale Boggs, Democrat of Louisiana, a distinguished leader in the House of Representatives stated recently that the John Birchers and other right-wing lunatic fringe groups seem a resurgence of these virulent and misguided critics of fellow Americans. "They are best described as 'America lasters,'" he said. They always insist our Nation's position is wrong. They demand, "Get the United Nations out of the United States and the United States out of the United Nations." They overlook danger from Red China and Communist Russia but falsely claim Communists occupy official positions in the State Department, are prominent in university faculties, and even in Protestant churches and the PTA. Their right-wing literature and pamphlets make a hero of Moise Tshombe and their hearts bleed for the "oppression" of Katanga as they spread the propaganda of the well-heeled Katanga lobby. They praise De Gaulle of France, Diefenbaker's anti-Americanism, make a martyr of former Venezuela tyrant, Jiménez. America is always in the wrong, according to these pamphleteers. They denounce former leaders, such as President Eisenhower, as "conscious tools of the Communist conspiracy" and become apoplectic with rage over Chief Justice Warren and our great Supreme Court. They are truly "America lasters."

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON THE SUBJECT OF STEEL PRICES, PROFITS, PRODUCTION, UNIT LABOR COSTS, AND FOREIGN COMPETITION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Joint Economic Committee has decided to hold hearings on the subject of steel prices, profits, production, unit labor costs, and foreign competition. It is doing this in the context of the program of the committee to hold hearings on the subject of the domestic economy as soon as possible. These hearings on steel, of course, have been touched off by the recent action of Wheeling Steel and Lukens Steel in raising their prices in a selective way.

We believe that such hearings, if properly conducted, could have a salutary effect in helping to inform Congress and the public of the actual effects concerning these matters.

We hope to start the hearings either on Monday, April 22, or Tuesday, April 23.

It is the intention of the committee that before the views of conflicting parties are heard, the committee will attempt to lay a groundwork of fact and detail, on which all can agree, so that the opinions, results, and recommendations will, so far as possible, reflect an informed view of the problem.

THE POLLUTION OF THE COUNTRY'S WATER SUPPLIES BY DETERGENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point an excellent broadcast by Edward P. Morgan, commenting on the bill which the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] have introduced calling for the protection of the country's water supply from the damage caused by detergents.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Last week the junior Senator from Oregon, Maurine Neuberger, and two freshmen Senators, Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, and Tom McIntyre, of New Hampshire, all Democrats, tackled a growing national health problem which, if neglected much longer, may literally have Americans foaming at the mouth. Jointly they introduced a rather simple bill to call a halt, within 2 years, to pollution of the country's water supplies by detergents.

We Americans use almost 4 billion pounds of this stuff a year and although it may delight housewives by washing away tattletale gray, the product is rapidly emerging as a first-class menace. As reported in this corner previously, it has already spoiled drinking water supplies in a number of communities with insoluble suds, drowned wild ducks by permeating their feathers with chemicals, harmed fish, menaced livestock, and added to the ruination of the beauty and utility of streams.

The diabolical ingredient in modern detergents is a powerful oil-based type of chemical—known as ABS—which although it cleans effectively, contains a stubborn refractory hard core which resists decomposition by bacterial action of waste treatment systems and natural waters. ABS can be washed hundreds of miles down rivers and pollute the water supply of downstream users in other States. It may persist in underground water supplies for years. Senator McIntyre pointed out that its concentration increases as water is reused. For example, "in the Ohio River, where water is reused 4 times, the concentration (of ABS) is already 10 times the national average for streams." He added that in many places in the country billows of foam clog municipal treatment plants, choke large apartment house drains, backing up water to create very serious health hazards.

Edging up to the problem with a cutting comment on another issue—the deceptive packaging of merchandise—Senator Neuberger said: "The housewife * * * has now discovered that it is impossible to buy a container of detergent in a standard size and shape with its contents clearly marked. She is met at the supermarket counter with a cockeyed array of squeezable, narrow-waisted, slant-shouldered detergent packages in odd and mystical measurements. The selection of a suitable detergent at an economical price has become a dismal, new, and unrewarding chore.

"But one dispenser of detergents that the housewife has not bargained for was her own tap faucet." Undissolved ABS has charged out of the plumbing in sickening sudsiness in a number of States.

The Senators' bill would provide Federal standards of breakdown which detergents would be required to meet or be barred from manufacture. Paradoxically, West Germany, where detergents were invented, has already enacted a similar law, and Congressman Henry Reuss, of Milwaukee, recently introduced legislation, in the House embodying its basic elements. Senator Nelson, who, when he was Governor of Wisconsin, earned something of a national reputation in crusading against detergent pollution and for conservation of natural resources, stressed that a detergent has already been developed, with a sugar instead of an oil base, which breaks down satisfactorily in water. The price reportedly was some 15 percent higher than present detergents but the savings in other ways could be incalculable.

However, Nelson doubted that legislative action would succeed until the problem—which he described as in a crisis stage—is better understood. He emphasized that the bill would not be a hardship on the detergent industry or deny detergents to housewives. Nelson argued that Federal action was necessary, in part, because of the extreme difficulty for a single State to do the research and testing necessary to set standards and impose adequate controls, and furthermore because water does not respect State boundaries, water pollution is, as it were, already in interstate commerce.

It was obvious that he had a broader issue in mind. Unless the country girds for battle immediately, Nelson said in his Senate speech, against the ruination of our natural resources and our very environment, Americans "are not going to have clean water to drink, clean air to breathe, decent soil in which to grow their food, and a green outdoors in which to live a few decades from now. This is a battle to preserve the simplest, basic elements necessary to human survival."

Individual State efforts—such as a special $50 million conservation fund in Wisconsin—Senator Nelson argued, "* * *cannot begin to save the environment in which we live against the powerful assaults of industrialization, congestion, pollution, erosion, blight, and decay.

"We need a comprehensive, nationwide program to save the natural resources of America." And, he maintained, "we need this just as desperately as we need a defense against atomic missiles."

The ordinary citizen cannot do much directly about our missile defense but preservation of natural resources surely is something he can take a personal hand in. And if that's soft soap, let the detergent lobby make the most of it.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, hearings have already begun on the proposal to establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and public support for the creation of such an institution is steadily growing.

There would seem every good reason why all Government employees should have the right to further constructive education, as is already given members of the State Department itself.

In the past, legislative proposals providing for institutions to train our foreign affairs personnel have been consistently opposed by the Foreign Service Corps itself.

It is particularly significant, therefore, that the Foreign Service Journal, unofficial spokesman for the Foreign Service, now gives its full editorial support to the bill currently under consideration, S. 865.

As the Journal points out, the proposed Academy "is in no way intended to compete with the activities of established colleges and universities or of the National War College and the services war colleges; rather its role is to fill a gap in the national security training which cannot, for obvious reasons, be systematically conducted in non-Government institutions. The academy thus represents a major conceptual reassessment of training requirements and reflects the radically changed world environment of the 1960's.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Blueprint for Training," from the March 1963 Foreign Service Journal, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Blueprint for Training

Journal readers are aware of the dialog between certain Members of Congress and the Department through the last 5 years and more over the preferred manner in which to recruit and train civilians for roles of responsibility in the conduct of foreign affairs. The debate has been active and enduring since 1959. We have in the past editorialized against proposals that a West Point of diplomacy be established at the undergraduate level; the Department has consistently maintained, without prejudice to its acknowledged responsibilities for providing adequate advanced inservice training, that Foreign Service officers should be a product of the diversified American educational system. Throughout this period, the suspicion has lingered in high quarters that the Foreign Service Institute and the Department's training activities in general were inadequate to the times.

On February 11, however, legislation was introduced into Congress for a National Academy of Foreign Affairs Act of 1963. There now exists an administration blueprint for postgraduate training in the complexities of foreign affairs which has the support of the President and the interdepartmental community. All who have been engaged in this enterprise deserve congratulations. It is hoped that the Congress will see its merits and give it the support it deserves.

The rationale of the Academy is stated in the findings and declaration of policy of the bill:

"The Congress further finds and declares that our responsibilities can be fulfilled more effectively by the establishment of an institution at which training, education, and research in foreign affairs and related fields may be undertaken on an interdepartmental basis which would support integrated U.S. efforts overseas and at the seat of government."

The Academy thus forwards the insights of the successful interdepartmental country team seminar now being conducted at the Foreign Service Institute, i.e., that the integration of national security policy into an effective operational strand requires the careful coordination of the unique capabilities of all affected operational agencies (economic, military, psychological), even though responsibility for coordination will normally rest with the Department of State. The object is to expose each agency's personnel to the capabilities and responsibilities of all others'—to make each knowledgeable of the others' business in the widest possible range of problems and contingencies.

The concept of the Academy is that in the broadest sense its program of instruction and research will be designed to cover all significant aspects of foreign affairs in order to meet the needs of all U.S. departments and agencies actively involved in foreign relations. Its purpose is to short circuit the heavy costs of "trial and error" education while drawing to the maximum on case studies of successful and unsuccessful experience. It is in no way intended to compete with the activities of established colleges and universities or of the National War College and the services war colleges; rather its role is to fill a gap in national security training which cannot, for obvious reasons, be systematically conducted in nongovernment institutions. The Academy thus represents a major conceptual reassessment of training requirements and reflects the radically changed world environment of the 1960's. In scope, depth, purpose, function and structure, its program and purpose are designed to transcend those carried out by the Foreign Service Institute created by act of Congress in 1946.

In supporting the Academy, we can also acknowledge the enormous contributions which the Institute has made to the efficiency of the Service and the allied agencies through its senior training, course content, its programs in languages, area specialization, Communist theory and practice, and techniques of coordinating interagency programs.

The advantages of moving from the Institute to the Academy have been carefully assessed during the past year by two distinguished citizens' panels (the Herter committee and the Perkins' panel); and under the Department's leadership, they have been studied and adopted within the interdepartmental community. We think the concept of the Academy fits the times and represents a solid program of training requirements which can immeasurably strengthen the Department and the Service in the years ahead.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE McNAMARA'S PROGRAM TO REDUCE COSTS IN DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY—A GREAT AND COURAGEOUS SECRETARY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise today to use this forum as a means of expressing to both the Senate and the public in general the great respect and admiration in which I hold the present Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. I believe him to be one of our truly great Secretaries, not only ranking with Stanton and Marshall, but perhaps the best Secretary of Defense of all time. He is not only a man who understands the complex and intricate details of the Defense Establishment, but he has shown the courage to take actions on behalf of the public interest to make our country stronger.

I have never considered myself qualified to speak about those defense matters concerning weapons, tactics, and strategy, and I have kept silent on these matters. However, for a long number of years, I have been deeply concerned with the questions of supply and procurement in the Defense Department and I have gone into these in considerable detail. Perhaps the best way of indicating the respect with which I hold the present Secretary of Defense is to report to the Senate and the country about the way he has unified these activities and greatly improved their efficiency. The facts will stand as testimony both to his ability and his courage.

PREVIOUS CRITICISMS OF WASTE

For many years, a number of us have been concerned about the waste in the military procurement and supply systems. A number of excellent studies have been done by the Hoover Commission and by House subcommittees, including especially those by Congressmen BONNER and HÉBERT. These studies have proved in depth the problems of procurement and supply. Here I want to pay tribute to the way in which a number of very hard-working subcommittees in the House over the years have provided invaluable information to the public and to the Congress. Such has been the work of Congressmen BONNER and HÉBERT. In addition, the then majority leader and now Speaker of the House JOHN MCCORMACK and Congressman TOM CURTIS have shown an unusual understanding of the problems of procurement and supply and, under the McCormack-Curtis amendment, they have provided the legislation by which the procurement and supply activities of the Department could truly be unified and made efficient.

Mr. President, further legislation on this subject is not needed; there is already enough to justify the Secretary of Defense in acting.

For my own part, from time to time in the past I have pointed out great inefficiencies in the letting of contracts, the duplication of the supply systems, the inefficiencies of the military stock funds, and the disposal of excess and surplus property by some agencies and competing services within the Defense Department when other agencies were buying new items of the same kind.

In addition, over the years the General Accounting Office under two great Comptroller Generals, Lindsay Warren and Joseph Campbell, have issued report after report concerning wastes in contracting and supply which have provided the facts which indicate great inefficiencies and the recommendations which could be a springboard for change.

The Defense Procurement Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, has, over the years, provided detailed analyses and criticisms of the procurement and supply system of the Department of Defense. Behind almost all of these congressional activities has been the work of an unsung member of the staff of the Congress; namely, Mr. Ray Ward, who has done the daily work on the intimate details affecting these areas.

SAVINGS OF $1 BILLION NOW IN EFFECT—WILL RISE TO $3.5 BILLION

When Secretary McNamara appeared before the Defense Procurement Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee last month, he was able to state that he had already taken actions which have saved in the fiscal year 1964 budget alone over $1 billion, I repeat, and that he has initiated actions to go into effect before the end of this fiscal year; namely, fiscal 1963, which will ultimately produce annual savings of almost $2 billion. Furthermore, he has scheduled actions which, when completed, and if he is not prevented, will increase the rate of savings to $3.5 billion a year by the end of fiscal 1965. This is a truly great record and one which needs to be known both by the Senate and the public.

LETTER TO SECRETARY M'NAMARA

As a result of the activities of the Hoover Commission, various congressional committees, and the work of Representatives McCormack, Curtis, Bonner, and Hébert, and of the late Senator O'Mahoney, I addressed a letter to Secretary-designate McNamara on December 30, 1960, drawing attention to what I believed were appalling and even scandalous wastes in the Defense Department's procurement and supply systems.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of that letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. MCNAMARA: May I first congratulate you on your appointment as Secretary of Defense. I want to wish you well in this post which is of the highest responsibility and where the opportunity to serve the country is unsurpassed.

I am writing to draw your attention to my concern, and I think that of almost every Member of Congress and of private persons who have gone into it, over what is appalling and even scandalous waste in the Defense Department's procurement and supply system. I am enclosing a number of reports and other documents concerning this. May I mention only a few points.

1. Some 86 percent of all contracts—both in dollar and number—are now negotiated rather than let by competitive bidding. This is inexcusable and results in millions of dollars in excessive prices.[1] In fact, in the reports on the latest Defense Department appropriation bill both the House and Senate urged radical reform in this area. We have been met, however, by little more than a series of justifications of the existing system instead of action to carry out the congressional mandate.

2. In the last 2 years alone, the General Accounting Office has submitted over 50 reports going into detail concerning waste in procurement and supply. The testimony of the Comptroller General before my committee indicates that these are representative samples of a much larger universe. Almost every time they go into this question, malpractices and bad practices are found.

3. There is almost a complete lack of integration between and among the supply systems of the individual services and, equally important, within the services. There is vast duplication of personnel, inventories, warehousing, etc., which can only be solved by centralizing the supply systems. This should be done immediately at least with respect to those items which are common to all of the services.

4. The stock fund system has resulted in the accumulation of excess stocks and cash. Each service seems to operate them in a different way. There is no common practice concerning them. They often involve a double appropriation. In addition, the reimbursable requirements have had the effect of preventing other services and agencies from using stock fund materials which have subsequently been disposed of as surplus.

5. The amount and disposal of surplus property is also of scandalous proportions. We are now selling off some $8 to $10 billion of surplus supplies. The question arises, "What kind of a supply system do we have which could conceivably generate such amounts?" In addition, we are receiving only 2 to 3 cents on the dollar when they are disposed of.

Furthermore, there are literally hundreds of examples of concurrent buying and selling—where one agency of the Government buys new supplies which another agency is at the same time disposing of as surplus. A recent Budget Bureau study showed that this was true in two-thirds of the examples and in their study the equipment was new, available in the same geographic area, etc.

6. The Defense Department has at hand one agency which could radically help in solving some of these problems. That is the Armed Forces Supply Support Center. But it is not being properly used. Services have, in effect, a veto over its activities and its hands have been tied.

At the moment the Armed Forces Supply Support Center is attempting, under great difficulties, to match the excess or surplus supply inventory with requirements of the services. But much more is needed. There should be a complete inventory of all supplies so that new procurement or requirement can be matched, against existing stocks. This is not now true and calls for a central agency where all procurement requests can go and be matched against existing supplies before new purchases are made.

In this connection also, many of us believe that the services have excessive quantities in their various inventory categories, i.e., mobilization reserve, etc.

I believe that great savings can be made in procurement and supply in the Defense Department. To summarize—there must be more competitive bidding, greater centralization of purchase and supply, much more efficient handling of the surplus supply and disposal system, and the reform of the stock fund and reimbursable requirements.

---

[1] May be billions.

Fortunately, these reforms can take place under existing law. The Defense Department does not need legislation to effect these reforms.

I think the motto of the Department should be to "use it up, wear it out, make it do," wherever possible. As a minimum, I believe that $2 to $3 billion per year could be saved by merely beginning on these reforms. These savings should then be translated into more missiles, tanks, and combat troops so that our country can be more adequately defended and our people protected.

With best wishes.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it will be noticed that the letter was written just after the appointment of Mr. McNamara had been announced, but before he had taken office. I believe it initiated much action which has been beneficial, for as a result of that letter and of the activities of the persons whom I have mentioned, Secretary McNamara has met with groups of us at intervals of about every 3 months over the past 2 years. We have held many sessions together.

SECRETARY M'NAMARA'S GRASP OF DETAILS

Secretary McNamara's grasp of the intimate details of the procurement and supply system and his willingness to act on them has impressed all of us tremendously.

When we first met with Secretary McNamara in the early spring of 1961, he not only had read the criticisms which we had made, but he had grasped their complex details intimately and proposed specific actions which he intended to take to make improvements. At the next meeting he held, he reported on what actions he had actually taken and how he was going about improving the situation. For my own part, I must say that this was a great change over what I had seen happen many times in the past. In the past when we made criticisms, they were almost always dismissed as being untrue and no action or little action was ever taken. The Defense Department was almost always defensive and, instead of saying we will try to improve things, denied that any problems existed. But Secretary McNamara not only understood the problems; he was willing to admit the need for action and then to act.

ACTION TAKEN ON NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS

Let me be specific about the way in which Secretary McNamara acted on our recommendations.

First, let me talk about the area of negotiated contracts. We repeatedly pointed out that the Federal Government had been paying excessive prices for military procurement because of the negotiation of contracts. The reports by the Comptroller General, which I have here by the score on the adjoining desk, show that the Comptroller General had been pointing this out over and over again to the Department of Defense, but the Department of Defense previously had taken little or no action upon the criticisms made by the Comptroller General or the steps suggested by him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, I congratulate the able senior Senator from Illinois for his talk on the accomplishments of Secretary McNamara. Naturally, all of us cannot agree with everything the Secretary does, we know that. The senior Senator from Illinois is one of the great authorities in government on the problem of the taxpayer getting the maximum return for his tax dollar. Do I correctly understand that he believes that with Secretary McNamara as the head of the Defense Establishment, for the first time, or, at least, more than ever before, the taxpayer is getting a greater return for his defense tax dollar?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the comments of the Senator from Missouri, a table which shows the savings already underway and those which will be carried out when the program of Secretary McNamara goes into effect. He has already saved for the taxpayers a billion dollars. By the end of this fiscal year, he will have saved about $2 billion. In a couple of years, he will be saving $3.5 billion; and the end is not yet.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of Defense procurement and logistics cost reduction program

[In millions]

	Recurring annual savings to be realized from actions in fiscal years 1962 through current year				
	As estimated Jan. 15, 1963			As reported to President	
	1963	1964	1965	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1967
1. Buying only what we need:					
a. Refining requirements calculations:					
(1) Major items of equipment	[1]	[1]	[1]	0	0
(2) Initial spares provisioning	$104.0	$157.0	$210	0	0
(3) Secondary items	420.0	502.0	550	$150	$300
(4) Technical manuals	8.0	25.0	30	0	0
Total from refinement of requirements	532.0	684.0	790	150	300
b. Increased use of excess inventory in lieu of new procurement:					
(1) Equipment and supplies	189.0	284.0	394	225	450
(2) Idle production equipment	2.0	10.0	21	0	0
(3) Excess contractor inventory	20.0	20.0	20	0	0
Total from increased use of excess inventory	211.0	314.0	435	225	450
c. Eliminating "goldplating"	64.0	100.0	100	64	100
d. Inventory item reduction	1.0	4.0	5	0	0
2. Buying at the lowest sound price:					
a. Shift from noncompetitive to competitive procurement:					
Total percent competitive [2]	37.0	38.4	39.9		
Amount of saving	281.0	402.0	494.0	160	480
b. Shift from CPFF to fixed or incentive price:					
Total percent CPFF [3]	25.8	19.1	12.3		
Amount of saving	322.0	502.0	684.0	100	600
3. Reducing operating costs:					
a. Terminating unnecessary operations	292.0	357.0	442.0	257	600
b. Standardizing and simplifying procedures:					
(1) Consolidation of 16 requsition systems into 1 on July 1, 1962	10.0	20.0	20.0	20	20
(2) Consolidation of 81 transportation docs into 1	0.0	22.0	32.0	30	30
(3) Reduction of contractor reports	1.0	4.0	25.0	30	30
c. Consolidation and increasing efficiency of operations:					
(1) DSA operating expense savings	$31.0	$33.0	$42.0	$28	$50
(2) DCA and communication system savings	16.0	20.0	25.0		00
(3) Improved transportation and traffic management	17.0	23.0	23.0	40	65
(4) Improved equipment maintenance management	108.0	109.0	297.0	48	300
(5) Administrative vehicles	3.0	9.0	11.0	0	0
(6) Improved military housing management	6.0	11.0	19.0	3	27
(7) Improved real property management	24.0	34.0	45.0	0	0
Total program	1,919.0	2,738.0	3,480.0	[4] 1,155	3,082

---

[1] Savings will be reported as identified. In fiscal year 1962 "requirements" for major items of equipment were reduced by $24,000,000,000. In fiscal year 1963, the Army reduced 1964 pipeline requirements by $500,000,000: and substituted an expanded production base for a mobilization reserve inventory, saving a net of $36,000,000, a total saving of $536,000,000.

[2] Fiscal year 1961 was 32.9 percent; total annual conversion from sole source of $1,900,000,000—savings are 25 percent per dollar converted.

[3] For the first 9 months of fiscal year 1961, CPFF was 38 percent; a reduction of $6,000,000,000 is required to reduce that percentage to 12.3 percent; savings are 10 percent per dollar converted.

[4] Fiscal year 1963 goal reported in July 5, 1962, memo to President, on a conservative basis, as $750,000,000

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is true, is it not, that the very large number of reports which are on the Senator's desk, and which came from the Comptroller General, came from a man who was appointed by the previous administration?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I asked that question so that no one would think this was a partisan comment on the part of the able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Joseph Campbell is a great public servant.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe he was previously a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, and prior to that was with President Eisenhower at Columbia University.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; he was comptroller of Columbia University.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As I understand the import of the talk which the Senator from Illinois is making today, the text of which I have read, he believes that Secretary McNamara is the first Secretary who has really put into practice the recommendations of the Comptroller General to save the vast sums of money which the Comptroller General believes have been wasted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; and he is the first Secretary to put into effect the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Of course, I cannot speak for Secretary McNamara; but based upon my years of service with the able senior Senator from Illinois, I cannot imagine anyone whom the Secretary would be more pleased to have commend him for his actions in this field. I am sure that Secretary McNamara will be very grateful, as will the country, for the remarks which the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois is making this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate what the senior Senator from Missouri has said. The senior Senator from Missouri was a great Secretary of the Air Force, a splendid administrator, and a devoted patriot, as well. He knows whereof he is speaking.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in fiscal year 1960, 86 percent of the defense contracts were negotiated instead of being let by competitive bidding. Under the practice of negotiated contracts, which the Department does business with only one or a very few contractors, and the bids are not subject to outside scrutiny or competition, the possibilities of abuse are manifold. We recommended that far more contracts be let by competitive methods. Secretary McNamara agreed with these criticisms and took the following action:

First of all, he ordered an immediate reduction of negotiated contracts by 5 percent. Furthermore, he and his excellent staff are pressing—and have set goals for it—to move more contracts from the negotiated type to the purely competitive bidding type. Where contracts could not be let under purely competitive bidding type. Where contracts could not be let under purely competitive methods, he has shifted negotiated contracts from the cost-plus-fixed-fee type to fixed or incentive-price type. The cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts gave no incentive for efficiency, and, indeed, actually stimulated increased costs. As I have said, he shifted then to fixed-fee or incentive-price contracts. Under the incentive-price contracts, if the contractor is able to reduce costs below the figure of the initial bid, he receives a fraction of the saving. So in the case of the incentive-price contracts, there is a direct stimulus to reduce costs. For every dollar shifted from cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to either fixed-fee or incentive-price contracts, the Defense Department estimates that the savings are 10 cents on every dollar involved. The proportion of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts has been reduced from 38 percent, in the first 9 months of the fiscal year 1961, to 26 percent in the fiscal year 1963; and by the fiscal year 1965 the Defense Department goal is to reduce this percentage to 12.3—or, in other words, from three-eighths to one-eighth.

Shifts from sole-source contracts to contracts subject to price competition provide savings of 25 cents on the dollar. It is in these areas that the Secretary has moved to make savings in the procurement system. If his targets are achieved, the savings in this area alone will amount to over $1.1 billion, on an annual basis, by 1965; and savings which are already in effect this fiscal year have saved $500 million in this area.

INTEGRATION OF THE SUPPLY SYSTEM

The studies of the Bonner committee and of our committee on the management of the nonweapon supply activities within and among the military services have disclosed great wastes which have been caused or permitted by the duplication of the supply systems. This waste has come about because of excessive inventories—to some of which the Senator from Ohio referred in discussing the civilian stockpiling; failure to secure the lowest prices by coordinated buying; excessive employment of personnel; the duplication of warehouses and storage space; and other inefficiencies. The Bonner committee recommended, and the Joint Economic Committee recommended time and time again, that the supply activities for nonweapon items be consolidated under a single agency responsible to the Secretary of Defense.

I emphasize that this recommendation was made, not for weapons—which we believed should be handled by the combat services, but for nonweapons items. The fight to get this change accomplished has gone on for over a decade, and has been resisted by the individual services and by some of the contractors who benefited by the previous inefficient system. But in this area, too, Secretary McNamara acted.

He has integrated the single-manager supply systems, along with the other nonweapon supply groups, into a single Agency, called the Defense Supply Agency, which is responsible to him. This single Agency has been put under the direction of a very able gentleman who bears the same name as the Secretary, but is not related to him—General McNamara.

Under a single head, the supply activities of clothing, subsistence, petroleum, medical and dental supplies, construction parts, automotive parts and equipment, industrial hardware, general stores, electronics, and services such as traffic management have now been brought under one Agency, instead of being under three, as before, or under a single manager. This has been done with a net reduction of a total of at least 3,700, and probably 3,900 jobs. I wish to emphasize that the new Defense Supply Agency and the supply agencies of all the services are now employing from 3,700 to 3,900 less employees than the number of persons the separate services previously employed in these activities.

As of the 1st of July 1963, approximately 1.9 million items, out of a total number of supply items of almost 4 million, will be under the jurisdiction of the Defense Supply Agency. This is only a beginning; and much more needs to be done, especially in the area of standardizing items. But great savings have already been made by this consolidation. Furthermore, the Defense Supply Agency was tested under fire during the Cuban crisis; and the results proved that such a centralized supply system can both save money and be efficient.

That was a real test, last fall, because quick action was required. It had been feared that the consolidation of the services would make them musclebound, and that they would not be able to move swiftly enough. But the Defense Supply Agency moved with great efficiency; and the troops, the air forces, and the naval vessels were equipped and made ready for war, if that had broken out.

That was an extremely courageous decision on the part of the Secretary of Defense, against tremendous opposition from groups which had a selfish interest in perpetuating the old methods.

In this area, much more still needs to be done, for there is no genuine reason why areas such as hospitals, chaplains, construction, housing, contract and auditing services, legal services, and PX's, to name only a few, should not be consolidated, instead of continuing the present system—to give an example—of having separate hospitals for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and with some of the hospitals only half used.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORTS

We further urged that the Defense Department carry out, wherever possible, the recommendations made in the General Accounting Office reports. I think it fair to say that in the past, these were, far more often than not, ignored.

The record of what happened to the reports bears out that statement. Secretary McNamara has taken several steps to carry out this recommendation to consider very carefully the reports of the General Accounting Office.

First of all, he has cut in half—and perhaps more than in half—the time allowed for his own subordinates to process the General Accounting Office reports. This time has been reduced from a previous 120 days to 60 days or less.

Second, either he or his deputy—and in some cases both of them—review the General Accounting Office reports and the recommendations it has made, and they have set up a system to make certain that the recommendations are carried out or that there is a very good reason why they cannot be carried out. In other words, he has personally seen to it that the General Accounting Office reports are acted upon.

Third, he has agreed to set up, outside the Defense Department, an independent group to make a review and judgment as to whether the Department of Defense has followed through on the General Accounting Office reports.

It is unprecedented for the Defense Department to be willing to let outsiders pass upon the question of whether the Department has really tried to deal with the recommendations of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, what a change this is over the previous system of largely ignoring these valuable reports of the General Accounting Office. What an improvement this is over the previous system.

OTHER ACTIONS

The Secretary has also taken action in many of the other areas about which we have made recommendations—including the stock funds, the disposal of excess and surplus property, and greater use of the General Services Administration for control over general and nondefense-type activities common to many agencies of the Government. In this connection, I may say that the new Administrator of the General Services Administration, Mr. Boutin, has also been making a good record. I hope next week to submit a report on his activities; and I hope the report will be very reassuring. In the area of stock funds, however, I would say that the progress made thus far is not as great as that made in the areas of consolidation of the supply systems and in savings in contracts and procurement. Our committee will continue to press the Defense Department about these matters.

There are additional areas in which great savings have already been made. These include the refining of requirements, especially of spare parts and secondary items; the increased use of excess inventory; the elimination of gold plating; the reduction of operating costs; and the ending of unnecessary operations. Examples include standardizing and simplifying procedures, such as the consolidation of 16 requisitioning systems into 1; the consolidation of 81 transportation documents into 1; and the reduction of the number of contractors' reports.

AN AMAZING PERFORMANCE

Mr. President, this is truly an amazing performance. In my judgment, in this area of procurement and supply, Secretary McNamara's actions are unprecedented. He is a great Secretary of Defense. The country is privileged to have him as our Secretary of Defense and our country is stronger and the public interest better served because of him. He has shown, as only few men have the ability to show, an unprecedented understanding of the complexities of this vast Department.

I am making this speech today because I think the public should know this and because I believe that the public and my colleagues should stand behind him in the difficult decisions he has to make and help protect him from the sniping which is already underway.

Mr. President, former President Eisenhower, as he was leaving office, issued a farewell message to the Nation in which he warned the Congress and the country against the power of the military-industrial complex, with which he was well acquainted, but which, I am sorry to say, he had not been able to check. As he left office, the former President gave as his final injunction to his successor that we should prevent that military-industrial complex from committing the nations to excessive expenditures and wasting its resources, although the former President, as well as the present President, of course, have sought to defend our Nation to the very limit.

That military-industrial complex is a reality among contractors who made enormous amounts by getting excessive prices from the Government and among military services which want to run their own show and which were and are indifferent to economy.

Secretary McNamara is performing some of the labors of Hercules. I will not describe which one of the seven labors he is carrying out, but they are important.

There is danger that the Secretary will be undermined by criticism and by reversal. The Senator from Missouri properly said that, of course, we do not agree with everything which the Secretary does. After great perturbation of spirit, I voted against his recommendation last Thursday on the question of Nike-Zeus missiles. But one can say that the Secretary is a dedicated and efficient executive. Even though we may differ with him from time to time on individual items, the net effect of his work is for the great benefit of our Nation, and we should all stand behind him.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Secretary McNamara's testimony before the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee also be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. MCNAMARA BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PROCUREMENT OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, MARCH 28, 1963

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is indeed a pleasure for me to come before this committee for the first time to discuss the progress made by the Department of Defense in improving the economy and efficiency of its procurement and logistics operations. The Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee is among the pioneers in this effort. To the continuing interest and prodding of this and other committees of the Congress, we owe much of the progress achieved in this area over the last 10 years. The personal interest and warm support of the chairman and Mr. CURTIS and the other members of the committee have been a source of strength to me in my efforts to bring about improvements in our logistics management, many of which stem directly from the committee's recommendations.

As the members of this committee well know, it is extremely difficult to change the traditional way of doing things in the Defense Establishment. Many of the actions we have taken during the last 2 years to improve the management of our procurement and logistics operations were recommended by this and other committees of the Congress and by various nongovernmental committees and commissions, 10 and even 15 years ago. For example, the reorganization of the Army technical services, which we put into effect last year, had been recommended to the President by Secretary of Defense Lovett in 1952 with the comment that "a reorganization of the technical services would be no more painful than backing into a buzz saw, but I believe that it is long overdue."

Resistance to change is not unique to the Defense Department. This same problem is also found in almost any large business organization. Change means that people have to relearn the way they are doing things and this is always a painful and time-consuming process, whether in defense logistics or private business.

The term "logistics," in its broadest application, encompasses the entire spectrum of activity beginning with research and development and extending through procurement, production, construction of facilities, deployment, supply, maintenance, transportation, etc., and ending with the disposal of surplus materiel and facilities. In this sense, our logistics operations account for about three-quarters of the total Defense budget. Looked at in another way—our total payroll for active duty, reserve and retired military personnel and all civilian personnel accounts for roughly two-fifths of our total budget, with the balance (about $30 billion out of a total of $50 billion) accounted for by the purchase of goods and services of all kinds, that is, research and development; the procurement of weapons, equipment, spares, and other consumables; military construction; maintenance; utilities; etc.

Truly important savings in defense expenditures can be achieved only by attacking this entire spectrum of logistics activities, and that is precisely what we are trying to do. Decisions in the development phase of a weapons system will affect not only the cost of development but also the cost of production and operation of the system throughout its life. As this subcommittee noted in one of its recent reports, "It is apparent that two identical items can be procured, stored, inventoried, issued and maintained in a common way much more economically and efficiently than can two different items." Yet, each new weapon or piece of equipment that enters the inventory brings with it thousands of new and different items of spares and supporting equipment. That is why any serious attempt to reduce the number of different items in our logistics system and thereby reduce costs, must begin in the research and development phase.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The research and development phase itself can be broken down into a number of significant sequential steps:

1. Research (basic and applied): The effort directed toward the expansion of knowledge in such fields as the physical and environmental sciences, that is, mathematics, physics, psychology, biology, and the medical sciences.

2. Exploratory developments: Work directed toward the solution of specific military problems, but stopping short of the

actual development of experimental hardware for technical or operational testing.

3. Advanced developments: Projects which have advanced to a point where the development of experimental hardware for technical or operational testing is required, prior to the determination of whether the item should be designed or engineered for eventual service use.

4. Engineering developments: Developments which are being engineered for service use, but which have not as yet been approved for production and deployment.

5. Operational systems development: Continued development, test, evaluation, and design improvement of projects which have already entered the production-deployment stage.

It is from the first three categories—research, exploratory, and advanced developments—that we acquire the "technical building blocks," that is, the new technologies and critical components, that we need for major systems development. We cannot do a proper job of engineering development, least of all operational systems development, unless these building blocks are available. Lack of attention to this principle in the past has been one of the major causes of waste and inefficiency in the research and development program. All too often large-scale weapon system developments, and even production programs, have been undertaken before we had clearly defined what was wanted and before we had clearly determined that there existed a suitable technological base on which to draw in developing a system. And, all too often insufficient attention has been paid to how a proposed weapon system would be used; what it would cost; and, finally, whether the contribution the weapon could make to our military capability would be worth the cost. Let me give you a few examples to illustrate this point.

NUCLEAR-POWERED AIRCRAFT

Here is a case where a major development program was undertaken before a suitable technological base had been created. Nearly 15 years and about $1 billion had been devoted to the nuclear-powered aircraft project before it was terminated in 1961. Throughout its history the program was characterized by attempts to find shortcuts to early flight. Only a relatively small fraction of the money expended was applied to the really critical pacing item, namely the development of an efficient reactor with a potentially high performance. Most of the funds were consumed in aircraft and weapon system design, in trying to develop turbine machinery, aircraft components, radiation resistant tires and oils, and for the construction of various facilities, many of which would be needed only in support of a flight test program. The powerplant development was oriented primarily to the goal of early flight, an approach which yielded little, if any, potential for further growth into a militarily useful system. Neither of the two powerplants under development at the time the project was canceled held any great promise as practical propulsion units. Both would have required very large aircraft with limited speed and altitude characteristics, and involving severe operational and ground handling problems and hazards. Thus, due to the lack of the pacing item, it is highly unlikely that we would ever have obtained anything useful from a military point of view, had we continued the project.

THE P6M JET-POWERED FLYING BOAT

Here is a case where a project was advanced into the production phase long before even the basic design problems were solved. The project was started in 1951 to meet an anticipated requirement for a fast, mine-laying, jet-powered seaplane, capable of flying at transonic speeds at sea level and at high altitudes, with an ability to take off and land in 6- to 8-foot waves and carry a payload of 30,000 pounds over a range of 900 miles. Even though various model tests conducted in 1953 and 1954 disclosed a number of serious design deficiencies, the development was continued. Further technical deficiencies were disclosed during flight tests in 1955 and 1956. Nevertheless, the first production contract for operational aircraft was placed in late 1956. By the time this project was terminated in August 1959 the Government had expended almost $450 million, of which more than $200 million was spent on the production contract. Even then, most of the technical problems had still not been solved.

SM-73—GOOSE AERODYNAMIC DECOY MISSILE

Here is a case where the operational use of a weapon was not clearly foreseen prior to the commencement of full system development. The project was started in June 1955 and terminated in December 1958 at the cost to the Government of about $80 million. The Goose was essentially a pilotless aircraft which was designed to fly at about the speed of a B–52 and appear on enemy radar as a manned bomber. The operational concept called for launching Goose at the same time the manned bombers took off. However, the manned bombers could be recalled and returned to their bases but the Goose could not be recovered once it was launched. Thus, the Goose was incompatible with the new concept of positive control (under which the bombers automatically return to base unless specifically directed to continue to target) and had to be abandoned.

CONSTRUCTION OF A RADIO TELESCOPE AT SUGAR GROVE, W. VA.

Here is a case where the construction of an extremely complex research facility was started before all of the technical problems had been thoroughly studied. Construction of this radio telescope, known as the Big Dish, was decided upon in the fiscal year 1959 budget at which time its total cost was estimated at $80 million. Two years later the cost estimate had risen to $135 million and to preclude a further increase, the House Appropriations Committee established this amount as a ceiling on the project. By the spring of 1962 it was clear that the cost would amount to $190–$200 million, without any assurance the facility would meet the originally stated requirements. In the light of this, and other factors, the project was terminated last July at a cost to the Government of about $70 million.

PROGRAM DEFINITION

In order to minimize such problems in the future we are now following the practice of inaugurating large system development projects only after completion of what we call a program definition phase. This is the phase in which we, together with our contractors, do our thinking and planning—before we start "bending metal."

Very briefly, the program definition phase begins with the solicitation of proposals from industry and involves a number of early study contracts whose purpose is simply to define the program, prior to authorizing full-scale development. In the early stages of the program definition phase we do not attempt to establish rigorous specifications, preferring to encourage initiative and innovation on the part of our contractors or contractor teams. Indeed, where competing approaches present an unusually difficult choice, we may support more than one approach throughout the whole program definition period.

Working together, a contractor team can explore in depth the many unknowns which are present in any new effort. They can accomplish the overall system, design, define the subsystems and major components and begin the early stages of laboratory experimentation and design. Most important, they can identify the critical problems and make good estimates of how long and how much money it will take to solve them.

With this information at hand, we are in a much better position to decide whether or not to proceed with full-scale development. And if we decide on full-scale development, the basic scientific and management team will have already been established, with a visible history of successful collaboration during the program definition phase. Finally, it will be possible to make the decision for full-scale effort with far greater assurance that the cost estimates are sound, that the performance of the system will meet the promise, and that the military requirement will be filled at the time needed.

Prior planning, and even feasibility testing of pacing components, are a lot cheaper than having to reorient, stretch out, or terminate expensive projects after they have been started. There are, of course, exceptions to this general rule. Where a development can add a new and unique dimension to our military capability like the A- and H-bombs and the ICBM, great costs and risks are justified. But such cases are rare. The typical development promises, if successful, to achieve a capability that can also be achieved in other ways or represents an improvement of but modest proportions in our total military capability. In these cases the urgency is not as great and the employment of a more measured and orderly approach to development and production is fully justified. In fact, I have observed that in most cases careful and comprehensive prior planning actually saves time as well as money and results in more effective and more dependable weapons.

Another major source of waste, as I noted earlier, is the parallel development of projects and systems designed for the same general mission. The cost of developing new aircraft today is reckoned in the hundreds of millions of dollars. In the case of the B–70 the development of three prototype aircraft will probably cost us about $1.5 billion and they will still not be designed as operational vehicles. The cost of developing a new major missile system is even higher. We have invested well over $1 billion in the Nike-Zeus already and the Atlas and Titan developments ran well over $2 billion each. Even the cost of developing a new aircraft engine to the point of production is about $150 million.

But this is only the beginning of the increased cost. If two models are produced where one could do the job, the cost of production is also increased. Two production lines instead of one must be set up and tooled and the economies of large scale, repetitive production are lost, thus significantly increasing the cost per unit. Two separate pipelines of spares and unique support equipment instead of one must be established in the logistics system, with all the additional costs involved. And, finally, two sets of obsolete spares and support equipment instead of one will eventually have to be disposed of when the end item is finally phased out of the inventory. We have on hand, at this very moment, more than $12 billion of "excess and long supply" items in our inventories, excluding the billions of dollars of surplus obsolete major end items which have to be disposed of each year. Thus there are very great economic incentives for reducing the number of different weapon systems and major items of equipment in our inventories.

NIKE-TALOS CONTROVERSY

Yet the record is replete with instances of duplicate developments. One of the most memorable cases of parallel weapon projects conducted under the auspices of different services was the Nike-Talos controversy. The land-based Talos, an Air Force sponsored adaptation of the Navy shipborne Talos, was directly competitive with the Army's Nike–B (later the Nike-Hercules) development, the follow-on effort to the Nike-Ajax. The history of this controversy was complicated by the roles and missions issue which need not concern us in this context. What is of interest here, however, is the fact that these parallel developments proceeded right up to the point where both were about to be produced and deployed.

At this point, however, Congress balked at the prospect of such an obvious duplication and refused to authorize the use of construction funds for Talos until the Department of Defense completed an evaluation of the two systems and came forth with specific recommendations. As the report of the Senate Armed Services Committee stated: "The committee concluded that both the Army and Air Force are assigned overlapping roles and missions in the antiaircraft and continental air defense fields. * * * The committee believes that unless concise responsibilities are assigned, duplication of weapon systems costing in the multibillion-dollar ranges might result and that such duplication would obviously be too costly as well as inexcusable from a military standpoint." Faced with this mandate, responsibility for land-based Talos was transferred to the Army in the fall of 1957. Following an evaluation study, the Army cancelled the project in July of 1958 at a cost of the Government of $118 million.

I know that I need not burden this committee with a recitation of the Thor-Jupiter controversy which involved essentially the same kind of issue.

MULTIPLE AIRCRAFT ENGINE DEVELOPMENT

Another area in which unnecessary duplication has long existed is in jet aircraft engine development. While there may have been a justification in the early stages for a large number of differing projects, jet engine technology has now reached a point where parallel development is no longer justified. Indeed the time has come where we should make use, wherever possible, of engines already developed. This we have done in the case of the new C-141 cargo transport aircraft. Here we had a choice of developing an entirely new engine, which would probably have given this aircraft perhaps a 2 to 3 percent improvement in overall performance, or of using an already developed engine, the TF-33, at a saving in development costs alone of well over $100 million. Considering the additional saving which will accrue in production costs and later in supply and maintenance costs, it was clear that we should use the TF-33 engine.

MULTIPLE FIGHTER AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENTS

One of the most costly areas of duplication has been that of fighter aircraft. For example, in the 1955-58 period there were no less than four aircraft under development to perform the fighter mission—two in the Navy and two in the Air Force. The Navy aircraft were the F4H-1 and the F8U-3. The Air Force aircraft were the F-105 and the F-107. One might argue that there were special requirements associated with Air Force and Navy missions which necessitated basically different aircraft. Even so, both the F4H-1 and the F8U-3 were, as the House Appropriations Committee noted in its report on the 1958 defense appropriation bill, "all-weather fighters with approximately the same mission and operational characteristics." Accordingly, the committee directed the Navy to "take prompt action to decide which of these aircraft it will place in production. This should be accomplished at an earlier date and with fewer test and evaluation aircraft than is presently scheduled." The Navy eventually chose the F4H-1 for production, but by the time the F8U-3 development was terminated, it had cost the Government over $136 million.

In the case of the Air Force, the F-107 was terminated at a cost of about $85 million. Even so, two of the four aircraft, the F4H and the F-105, were actually placed in production. A comprehensive analysis of these two production programs in 1961 convinced me that one aircraft, the F4H, could meet the need of the Air Force as well as the Navy, and do it better than the F-105. Accordingly, further procurement of the F-105 has been terminated and the F4H, now designated the F-4, will be bought for both the Air Force and the Navy. In addition, I have assigned supply management responsibilities for all spare parts and components peculiar to the F-4 aircraft to the Department of the Air Force and I have asked the Air Force and the Navy to develop and submit to me, for my approval, joint plans for the maintenance of this aircraft.

TFX

Perhaps the most important single action we have taken thus far to reduce the number of different weapon systems in our inventory is the TFX, which has been so prominent in the news of late. This aircraft development is designed to provide a replacement for the F-4. Instead of developing and producing two separate aircraft, one for the Navy and another for the Air Force, as was done in the case of the F-105 and the F4H, we decided to develop and produce one aircraft which would meet the requirements of both services. Admittedly, this is not a simple undertaking. The development of a major weapon system to meet the requirements of more than one service is something of a precedent in the Department of Defense. It took more than a year and a half and tens of thousands of man-hours of intensive study by both the Defense Department and industry to perfect this plan.

Yet it should be clear to all who are interested in economy and efficiency in the Defense Establishment that we can no longer afford to undertake major development projects to meet unilateral service requirements where a single project can meet the requirements of more than one service. The additional costs involved are much too great. From here on out, we must seek to develop weapon systems to perform a military task, and if it so happens that more than one service has the same task then they will be required, as a general rule, to use the same weapon system wherever this can be accomplished without compromising essential military requirements. Where operational conditions vary, as for example, in attack carrier operations, the minimum number of changes in the common system will be made to accommodate these differences.

This is the principle involved and I think everyone will agree it is an entirely sound one. While one might argue as to precisely how much one system would save as compared with two, I believe everyone would agree that the saving in logistics costs, as I am using the term here today, cannot help but be very substantial. In the case of the TFX we believe these savings will amount to at least a billion dollars in development, production, and operating costs over the life cycle of this aircraft.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COST REDUCTION PROGRAM

Because of the great uncertainties inherent in research and development, we have not attempted to establish precise monetary savings targets of that part of the "logistics spectrum," as we have for procurement, production, construction, supply, maintenance, transportation, etc. For the latter, we have established specific time-phased Defense Department goals for some 24 areas of logistics management. Selected goals in turn have been established for the Military Departments and Defense Agencies (i.e., DSA and DCA) so that our key logistics managers know exactly what is expected of them. These goals are admittedly ambitious and will be achieved only if all management levels in the Defense Department give them continuing, high priority attention. Accordingly, the service Secretaries and agency heads have been directed to make a monthly or quarterly review of progress achieved and to report the results to my office. These reports are audited by the Comptroller, both with regard to the goals and the progress against them.

The current cost reduction goals are summarized in the attached table. [Not printed in RECORD.] The last two columns show the goals reported to the President last July. Management improvement actions instituted in 1962 and planned for fiscal year 1963 should ultimately produce annual savings of about $1.9 billion. Our goal for end fiscal year 1965 is to initiate actions which will increase the rate of savings to about $3.5 billion a year. These are higher goals than those reported to the President, but I believe they can be achieved with a real effort on the part of all concerned.

Mr. Morris will discuss these goals in detail later and give you an up-to-date progress report on their attainment. What I would like to do at this time is to discuss some of the basic concepts and principles upon which these objectives have been developed.

BUYING ONLY WHAT WE NEED

Before we can intelligently decide what to buy, we must first determine precisely what is needed, and what is needed must be directly related to realistic and soundly conceived military plans and policies. All too often in the past, materiel requirements were determined on the basis of unrealistic military plans which themselves reflected the wide divergence of views among the services as to the probable nature of a future war. For example, the Air Force, planning essentially for a short nuclear war, was not buying enough combat consumables to support the Army in a conventional limited war. And the Army, envisioning a long, large-scale general war, was generating requirements so large as to be useless in planning its actual procurement programs. As a result, serious imbalances developed in the stocks of weapons, equipment, and combat consumables held by different services and even within the inventories of a single service.

Therefore, one of my first actions in the logistics management area was to insure that the requirements calculations for our major combat items were soundly based on unified contingency planning and realistic, attainable logistics objectives. By redefining our logistics objectives to accord with approved Defense Department-wide contingency plans we were able to reduce our total stated material requirements by some $24 billion. By setting out realistic goals that could be achieved within a reasonable period of time, we have been able to assure that the readiness levels of all related elements of the military forces are raised together and maintained in balance, one with another.

The first step was taken in 1961, in connection with the development of the fiscal year 1963 budget, with the establishment of a specific procurement objective for a large number of important items needed to insure that all of our forces could engage in sustained nonnuclear combat operations for a reasonable period of time. In the 1964 budget, now before the Congress, we propose to take another step to a still higher level of readiness, but again with an eye to the balance among all the related elements of the forces.

In moving toward this goal, we are giving priority to those items in which we are most seriously short, and to those new items which offer large improvements in combat effectiveness in relation to their cost. Modernization simply for its own sake is a luxury we cannot afford. Only by carefully husbanding our resources can we insure that all of our essential materiel requirements are met and that all of our forces are supplied and equipped, on a balanced basis, and are able to carry out the plans we have set for them.

We are also taking steps to get away from the use of often arbitrary and wasteful rule-of-thumb measures for determining pipeline requirements. Instead of simply adopting a standard factor for pipeline computations, we must, at least in the case of high cost, major end items and components, determine quantitative requirements on an item-by-item basis. We must explore every opportunity to shorten leadtimes by using our transportation resources more effectively, by taking steps to increase the post D-day production potential, etc. It is obvious that very great savings are possible if we are able to reduce the pipeline requirements without adversely affecting combat readiness. Let me give you a specific example: in the case of the M–88 tank recovery vehicle, we found that the substitution of a fully adequate transit pipeline factor of 55 days for the previously used arbitrary factor of 120 days enabled us to realize savings of $12.5 million on just this one item. These actions not only reduce procurement requirements, they also reduce storage and maintenance costs for the entire operational life of the item and, eventually, the amount of surplus which has to be disposed of.

The problem of setting sound requirement standards for major items of equipment is admittedly difficult; however, in the area of "supply inventories" the logistics management problem becomes far more complicated. This complexity is caused primarily by the great number and diversity of the items involved—nearly 4 million different items, having a value of $40.6 billion, currently being carried in our supply system. Because these items are so numerous and diverse, we simply must decentralize their management. However, when we do so, we then encounter the tendency of each echelon in the supply system to introduce unilateral safety factors into its requirement calculations. The final result, of course, is that the computed requirement often grossly overstates true needs. To improve the soundness of our supply item requirement calculations, we are undertaking a series of management improvement actions such as wider application of automatic data processing equipment, the increased use of fast logistics communication links, and the continuous review and redefinition of safety factors in our requirements computations.

It is not enough to determine simply the quantitative requirements for equipment and supplies. We must also determine the qualitative requirements as well. There is no point in paying for performance or quality features that are not needed to accomplish the essential military task. In any meaningful sense, procurement of excessive quality, which we call gold-plating, is just as wasteful as procurement of excessive quantities. While it is understandable that an item costing $1,000 may perform more effectively than another costing half as much, we must always make a judgment as to whether the additional performance is worth the doubled cost. This will always be a most difficult area, since informed judgment is required in all such determinations. It is an area, however, in which we have only just scratched the surface of potential management improvement and in which we feel that substantial additional savings can be made in the future.

CONSOLIDATION OF COMMON SUPPLY AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES

In order to be sure that we are "buying only what we need" we must know exactly what we already have on hand and on order; and this, in an organization as huge, diverse and far flung as the Defense Department is far from a simple problem. This is particularly true with regard to long supply and excess items, one of the most galling and troublesome areas of logistics management. Instances of one Service buying items that are being disposed of by another are, to the taxpayer, the most unexplainable and inexcusable kind of waste. Yet this problem can never be entirely avoided as long as you have different parts of the organization buying and managing the same items. One solution, of course, is to have only one element of the organization purchase and manage all commonly used supplies and services, wherever centralized procurement is indicated. And this has been the solution long favored by many Members of the Congress.

The trend toward the consolidation of the logistics functions, including the procurement of common items of supply and services, has been underway in the Defense Establishment for a long time. Certainly, since the end of World War II, the sentiment, especially within the Congress, for faster progress toward consolidation grew markedly stronger. Following the Unification Act, the problem of overlapping logistics functions in the Defense Department drew the repeated attention and criticism of the Congress. Beginning with the recommendations of the Bonner subcommittee in 1952, the efforts of members of this committee in effecting passage of the O'Mahoney amendment to the 1953 Defense appropriation bill and later the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Reorganization Act of 1958, Congress continually prodded the Department in the direction of truly unified logistics management.

The Defense Establishment, however, moved very cautiously toward that objective with various improvisations such as coordinated procurement, joint procurement agencies and later the establishment of single managers for common supplies and services and the creation of certain defensewide coordinating agencies such as the Armed Forces Supply Support Center. These improvisations, however, did not get to the core of the problem—the need for a single agency charged with the responsibility for procuring and managing all commonly used and centrally procured supplies and services.

I remember a presentation made to me back in 1961 dealing with the lack of standardization in the clothing area. Each service, for example, was buying a different type of butcher smock, each in several sizes—a total of 18 different inventory items. Today we stock only two types in fewer sizes—a total of seven different inventory items. You all know the story of the belt buckles and the exercise bloomers.

Thus one of the first and most pressing tasks I had to face when I assumed the office of the Secretary of Defense was the solution of this long-standing problem of the management of common supplies and services. In reviewing the efforts that had been made since World War II, I concluded that this problem must be attacked head-on. It seemed clear to me, as it had to this committee for many years, that only through the establishment of a separate, single supply support agency could we ever hope to find a lasting solution. The result was the creation of the Defense Supply Agency, which now does the buying, the stocking, and where necessary, the surplus disposal of a wide range of commonly used supplies and services. Within its area of responsibility, it will greatly help to insure that we "buy only what we need."

Already, the new Agency has made possible a personnel reduction of 3,700 in the fiscal year 1964 budget with an operations and maintenance saving of $33 million. Inventory is expected to be reduced by $232 million during the current fiscal year with a further reduction of $112 million in fiscal year 1964. DSA now handles about 1 million supply items but the number of different storage points is being reduced from 77 to 11.

The basic principle that there should be a single agency to procure and manage common items of supply or services for all users is, as this committee has repeatedly pointed out, as valid for the Government as a whole as it is for the Department of Defense. Therefore, in our own efforts to obtain greater efficiency through the consolidation of common logistics support activities, we should not restrict ourselves to Defense agencies alone. Whenever we find that it is more economical to use the capabilities or facilities of other Government agencies, with no loss in military effectiveness, and at the same or less cost, we should not and have not hesitated to do so. The General Services Administration annually buys for us about $770 million of common-use items such as office supplies, furniture and automatic data processing equipment. This agency also helps us in the screening and disposal of surplus property, in the leasing and maintenance of real property, the storage of records, the purchase of utilities, etc.

BUYING AT THE LOWEST SOUND PRICE

Once we have determined what it is we need to buy, the next problem is to procure it at the lowest sound price considering, of course, quality and delivery dates. For over 100 years, formal advertising has been the preferred method of Government procurement. This method not only insures that the price discipline of the competitive system is harnessed to the advantage of the Government but it also minimizes the risk of bias and preferential treatment in the awarding of contracts. However, since the end of World War II only a small portion of defense procurement has been awarded on a formally advertised basis. To a major extent this was unavoidable, as only conventional classes of equipment and supplies, purchased repetitively in volume, lend themselves fully to procurement by this method.

Formal advertising is inappropriate for virtually all research and development work and for the acquisition of many of today's sophisticated weapon systems, where it is impossible to draw up detailed specifications in advance and make firm fixed-price contracts, with selection based on price alone. Moreover, there are a number of other situations where formal advertising is not applicable by law; for example, small business set-asides, small purchases (under $2,500), emergency purchases, the procurement of perishable subsistence, and items subject to military security classification. These, too, serve to reduce the portion of defense procurement that can be accomplished through formal advertising.

Notwithstanding these limitations, we are making a vigorous effort to expand the use of formal advertising. In this connection, the so-called two-step procurement procedure recently approved by the GAO should prove extremely helpful where precise design is not as important as specific performance characteristics. Under this procedure bidders are first asked to submit proposals to meet specific performance criteria without providing a price quotation. These proposals are then examined by the Government engineers and buyers, and those which meet the desired performance characteristics are approved. In the second step, bidders whose products have been approved then submit sealed bids and the contract is awarded to the lowest responsible bidder under the formal advertising procedure.

INCREASING PRICE COMPETITION

But the fact that for much of our procurement we cannot rely on formal advertising does not mean that we should not demand and facilitate competition for defense contracts. This, in fact, has been one of my principal objectives, not only in the procurement area but also in research and development.

One way in which we can increase competition is to minimize sole-source procurement wherein, for example, we automatically buy spares and spare parts from the original producer of the end item. By breaking out these spares from the main contract we can procure them separately through competitive procedures. This, of course, entails the identification of the spares or spare parts, the preparation of procurement specifications, and the seeking out of sources of supply in order to permit competitive bidding. In this effort, we have concentrated first on the high dollar value items already in the defense supply system. Now we are seeking to apply this technique to new items as they enter the supply system and to develop uniform procedures for screening and identifying such items in current and future procurements.

We are also trying to introduce competition at an earlier stage in our procurement process at the point where a new item is ready to be moved from development into production. If successful, this would enable us to avoid paying a price premium on the first large-scale production buy. But use of this method does open up a whole series of new and difficult problems. In order to introduce competition early in the procurement cycle, we must see to it that the necessary drawings and technical data are produced during the development phase so that they may be available at the time the first procurement is made. This is not always possible, especially where time is critical or where the design is still subject to major change. Also, where large engineering and tooling costs are involved, it is unlikely that any new source would be able to compete successfully against the development contractor who may have already completed a large part of the production engineering and tooling.

Experience has demonstrated that very large savings can be achieved by increasing competition. We estimate these savings at about 25 cents on each dollar shifted from noncompetitive to competitive procurement and this is the basis upon which we have computed the savings of nearly $500 million per year to be achieved by fiscal year 1965, as shown on the following chart (chart not printed in RECORD).

REDUCTION IN CPFF CONTRACTS

It has long been recognized that cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts usually provide no incentive for economy, or superior performance. Nevertheless, in recent years, an increasing share of our procurement has been carried out under CPFF contracts, rising from about 13 percent in 1952 to nearly 38 percent during the first 9 months of 1961. To some extent, this shift to CPFF contracting was unavoidable because of the exploding technology of the 1950's which introduced unprecedented complexity and sophistication in our equipment.

However, even where firm fixed-price contracting is not feasible, penalties and rewards can still be utilized. There are other techniques available through which we can provide incentives to the Defense contractor to perform economically and efficiently. The most important method is the use of incentive contracts in which the contractor's fee is increased if he betters the target price or target performance goals, or conversely, is reduced or eliminated entirely if he fails to meet the contract targets. By fiscal year 1965, we hope to reduce cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to about 12½ percent of our total contract awards, with an eventual annual savings of nearly $700 million. Already in the first 8 months of the current fiscal year we have reduced the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to about 23.3 percent of the total as compared to 38 percent in the first 9 months of 1961, as shown on the following chart (chart not printed in RECORD).

REDUCING OPERATING COSTS

An equally important part of our cost reduction program is our effort to reduce the day-to-day costs of operating the Defense Establishment. One important aspect of this effort has been our program for the closing of unneeded bases and installations. To date, we have announced plans to close or reduce in scope some 330 activities, of which 72 are located overseas and 258 within the United States. As Assistant Secretary Morris will report in detail later, good progress has been made in carrying out these announced closures and continuous studies are being made to identify additional installations and bases that can be reduced or closed in future years. We expect by the end of fiscal year 1965 to have initiated actions which will eventually save over $440 million per year. Progress to date is shown in the following table:

Actions announced as of Dec. 31, 1962

	Total
Number of locations	330
Acres to be excessed	274,000
Acquisition cost	$1,922,000,000
Personnel to be released	44,923
Annual savings when action completed[1]	$270,000,000

[1] Many actions require 2 or 3 years to complete.

In an organization as large as the Department of Defense, efforts to simplify procedures can yield surprisingly large savings. Therefore, we are examining our contractor reporting requirements, our requisitioning and transportation procedures, and other types of logistics paperwork with the aim of eliminating unneeded or overlapping procedures and achieving the greatest degree of standardization where elimination is not practicable. Substantial success has already been achieved, and we expect to make even greater progress in the coming years.

Another area where increased management effort can yield significant monetary savings, as well as greater combat readiness, is equipment maintenance for which we spend about $11 billion a year. Actions which we have already taken and plan to take through fiscal year 1965 should produce savings of about $300 million a year. But this is an area in which we have barely scratched the surface. To insure top-level attention to this function and to coordinate the efforts of the entire Department a full-time Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Equipment Maintenance has recently been appointed.

One of the key ways in which we can make savings in the operations of the Department is through the consolidation of like activities. I have already mentioned the Defense Supply Agency but I am sure you will agree that the underlying principle applies to other areas of defense activity as well. The swiftly expanding requirements for modern military communications, for example, and their even more swiftly rising costs have made Department-wide management of certain portions of the communications system both militarily necessary and financially imperative. Accordingly, a new Defense Communications Agency has been established to guide the development of unified long-line communications systems for use by all elements of the Department. This Agency is also responsible for other important functions such as the development and support of the national military command system and the supervision of the military communications satellite development program.

Still another area where consolidation appeared to be a necessity was in headquarters intelligence activities. For this reason, we created the Defense Intelligence Agency not so much, in this case, to reduce costs but rather to utilize more effectively our resources in this vital area.

Real property management, including military family housing, provides another area for reducing operating costs. We have now brought family housing under centralized management in each department and established a new cost accounting system to facilitate better management. And with the cooperation of the Congress, we hope to bring together in a single appropriation all funds for construction, operation, maintenance, improvement and leasing of family housing.

Our efforts to improve the management of the entire logistics spectrum have resulted in some important changes, not only Department of Defense-wide, but also within the military departments. The Air Force in 1961 substantially realined its organizational structure to meet better the management requirements imposed by the radical change in the nature of modern weapon systems. The Army has virtually completed its reorganization started last year, and has significantly reduced the operational complexity and administrative overlapping of the former technical services. And now the Navy, too, is considering a substantial realinement of its organization to fit it better to the demands of modern warfare.

Mr. Chairman, the task of management in the Defense Department is never done. New problems arise as old ones are solved, as evidenced by the constant flow of GAO reports. I can assure you that these reports, as well as constructive criticism from any other source, receive top-level attention in the Defense Department. For example, I examine all GAO reports as they come into the Department and all of the written replies are reviewed and initialed by either Mr. Gilpatric or me, in terms of approving their substance, before they go back to the GAO.

I am sure that the logistics management improvement program, which I have outlined here this morning will not prove to be the final word. But I am equally sure that this program will correct many deficiencies of long standing and result in savings of several billion dollars per year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the excellent statement by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. As I read his speech, and as I listened to him, my mind went back over my 10 years in the Senate. I do not recall a single 1 of those 10 years in which the Senator from Illinois did not raise his voice on questions of waste in the military, of negotiated contracts versus cost-plus contracts, of the supply system, and other questions. I am sure that the Senator must feel a sense of personal as well as patriotic satisfaction that, after all those years, like a voice crying in the wilderness, so to speak, we now have a Secretary of Defense who not only reads reports, but also tries to do something about the constructive criticisms which have been raised over the past decade or more.

The Senator has indicated that he is making his speech in part to serve warning to those who would seek to undermine Secretary McNamara. To my knowledge, no one in this Chamber has indicated that he or she seeks such a result. But I dare say that there are others who find fault with the Secretary because of the fact that, when called upon, he does make decisions, which he is authorized to do. When called upon, he "knocks heads together," so that a decision can be arrived at. That also is his responsibility.

I suggest that anyone who seeks to undermine Secretary McNamara had better be very sure of the ground on which he is standing before he does so. The Republic is extremely fortunate to have a man of Secretary McNamara's ability, integrity, knowledge, and know-how in this most difficult of departments. He must handle in excess of 50 percent of our Nation's budget. He must know his way around in the field of foreign policy as well as defense. I understand he works from 12 to 16 hours a day. We are very, very fortunate in having Secretary McNamara head that particular Department. I join the Senator from Illinois wholeheartedly in his statement the Secretary McNamara is a great Secretary of Defense. The country is privileged to have him in that position; the country is stronger and the public interest better served because of him.

Secretary McNamara needs, not our sympathy, but our understanding. He knows what he is about. In my opinion, he is one of the best, if not the greatest, Secretary of Defense our country has ever had. Our Nation, as a whole, ought to be very grateful that a man of his caliber heads that particular Department at this particular time. Again I commend the distinguished Senator for bringing his statement to the attention of the Senate today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Montana for his statement, which is precisely what we have learned to expect from him. His statement that in his judgment the Senate is unanimous in its support of the general program of the Secretary of Defense is very reassuring.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post there appears an excellent article by Chalmers Roberts entitled "Political Lines Forming on a Test Ban Treaty." The article analyzes some of the major arguments of both proponents and opponents and makes it clear that these arguments rest on proposals which have been advanced for a test ban treaty, and not on any agreed-upon draft of a treaty. This point is well taken, because it should be well known that the Soviet Union has firmly turned down all Western proposals relating to effective inspection and controls to insure that such a treaty is kept inviolate.

One significant statement appears in the article which I believe merits comment. It is this:

> And whatever his current degree of passion for a test ban, President Kennedy could be counted on to use every trick in the trade to put over a treaty if he signed one.

This statement should be considered in light of the fact that widespread concern has been expressed that our negotiators at Geneva have steadily reduced the number of onsite inspections which we say must be agreed upon—to the point that Dr. Edward Teller has felt it necessary to warn that the Russians want us to sign a Munich-type agreement and in this they are supported by widespread public clamor. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Teller's short statement, which appeared at page 1588 of the Record, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Consequences of a Test Ban

(By Dr. Edward Teller)

> Russian acceptance of a small number of control stations and on-site inspections have raised the hopes for an agreement on a test ban. Such a ban is considered as an important step toward ending the arms race. It is claimed that this serves the interest of the United States. Actually such a ban would be virtually unpoliced. It would endanger our security and would help the Soviet Union in its plan to conquer the world. The reasons for this statement are the following:
>
> #### I. THE TEST BAN WOULD PREVENT VITAL IMPROVEMENTS OF OUR ATOMIC EXPLOSIVES
>
> The Russians have announced that they have solved the problem of missile defense. Our missile defense is unsatisfactory. In the absence of testing, our defense will not improve because we need more knowledge concerning the use of nuclear explosives in missile defense and in the penetration of such defense. If the Russians install a satisfactory defense system while we are unable to do so, this will put us at the mercy of Soviet blackmail and aggression.
>
> We have started the development of clean and cheap nuclear explosives. We need more tests to complete this development. Clean and cheap explosives are needed for battlefield use, for peaceful applications, and for missile defense.
>
> Testing has frequently stimulated the invention of new approaches in the development of nuclear explosives. Past advances of this kind are classified; future advances are unpredictable. Nevertheless these advances are real and important. Without them our weapons laboratories will lose their competence in weapons research.
>
> #### II. THE TEST BAN WILL NOT INTERFERE WITH RUSSIAN PROGRESS
>
> The difficulty to police small underground explosions has been pointed out. The present Russian concessions will certainly not permit the control of small underground tests. Tests of small explosives are helpful in all branches of weapons development.
>
> Even bigger tests can be carried out secretly in space. This fact has been jointly asserted by American, British, and Russian experts meeting in Geneva in June and July 1959.
>
> The Russians have prepared an effective test series while negotiating with us. They have executed this series in the fall of 1961. In the closed Russian society such a maneuver is possible. In the open American society it is not. Repetition of the 1961 tactics may place the Soviet Union into a position of commanding leadership.
>
> Only great and comprehensive openness could guarantee the observance of a test ban.
>
> #### III. A TEST BAN MAY ENDANGER THE NATO ALLIANCE
>
> The avowed purpose of the test ban is to halt the arms race and to set limits to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is hoped that a test ban will be applied in a universal manner.
>
> It is unlikely that the ban will restrain the Chinese. But it is highly probable that the ban will be resisted by the French and we shall be expected to exert pressure on them. This may strain NATO to the breaking point. The Russians may desire a ban for this very reason.
>
> In 1938, the Western Allies abandoned Czechoslovakia. This led to World War II. Had the Munich agreement prohibited fighter planes and radar, the consequences would have been the fall of Britain.
>
> The Russians want us to sign a Munich-type agreement and in this they are supported by widespread public clamor. I hope that patriotic Congressmen of both parties will resist the pressure of a public frightened by crises and misled by the mirage of peace.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this statement should also be considered in light of the thinking on the subject which the President has evidenced. For example, in his February 21 news conference, the President was asked:

> Question: Mr. President, just before Senator Humphrey left Geneva, he said that unless a nuclear test agreement were in final stages of preparation by April, that mankind might lose forever this unique opportunity for agreement. Do you think that April should be more or less the deadline month which will determine whether the Soviets ever intend to agree to this?
>
> Answer: No, I don't think April is in the sense of sort of an ultimatum * * *. I wouldn't put down the date and say by this date we will know finally. We have been on this business for 15 years. I must say that a good many people are opposed to this effort which is being directed by Mr. Foster in Geneva, and quite obviously it is a matter which we should approach with a good deal of care. But the alternative, if we fail, of increasing the number of nuclear powers around the world over the next 5, 10, 15, or 20 years, that alternative which I think is so dangerous keeps me committed to the effort of trying to get a test ban treaty * * *. I think people who attack the effort should keep in mind always that the alternative is the spread of these weapons to governments which may be irresponsible, or which by accident may initiate a general nuclear conflagration.

And again:

> Question: Mr. President, what basis do you have, sir, for your belief that a test ban treaty would inhibit the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and if you got a test ban treaty, how would this be used in the case of France?
>
> Answer: Well, in my judgment, the major argument for the test ban treaty is the limiting effect it might have on proliferation. Quite obviously, if it did not have that effect, then the treaty would be abrogated, and any treaty would so state, that either side would have the right to abrogate the treaty if proliferation resulted. Now, on the question of France, France has been recognized as a nuclear power by the Soviet Union. It would be up to the Soviet Union to make a judgment as to what action they would take on the treaty, if France continued to test. There is no guarantee, if we sign a nuclear test ban, that it will end proliferation. It is, however, our feeling that the Soviet Union would not accept a test ban unless they shared our view that proliferation was undesirable, and it might be a weight in the scale against proliferation, and I so regard it.

In summary, then, it appears that the President's main argument for a test ban treaty is that it "might" be a "weight" in the scale against proliferation. Accordingly, we find arguments resting on a balancing of the risks—the risk of proliferation if no test ban treaty is negotiated and ratified versus the risk of cheating by the Soviets and the risk that our own failure to test may prevent us from developing an antimissile defense and improved nuclear devices such as the neutron bomb.

As one who voted for the establishment of an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, I believe I do not have to explain that I favor a stop to the arms race provided it is accompanied by effective inspection and controls which will insure an effective stop. However, I regret that the main argument for a test ban treaty which the President has advanced is that it just might be a weight against proliferation. This seems to me to be a very weak argument. In fact, there is no indication at all that France or Red China are going to be deterred from going ahead with their nuclear weapon development just because the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union enter into a test ban treaty. So I suggest that the risks of proliferation are going to remain anyhow. On the other hand, the risks of cheating by the Soviets are great—and they will be all the greater if the number of onsite inspections is reduced. We know that the Communist leaders in the Kremlin hold to the philosophy that their end of one world of communism justifies the means; and that lying, cheating, stealing—anything goes. So let us not be naive about the so-called good intentions of the Soviets in these test ban negotiations. And if there are going to be any risks involved, let us make abundantly sure that the risks are in favor of the security of the United States.

In all fairness, I should point out that the President gave assurance in his news conference of March 6 that no test ban agreement would be accepted which would permit a series of underground tests by the Soviets to go undetected. However, this raises the question of what is meant by a series and how effective an inspection system is to be if it is to prevent a series from going undetected. These are rather vague generalities, and I do not believe that they will suffice when and if a negotiated test ban treaty comes before the Senate for ratification.

Finally, Mr. President, let us have it clearly understood that if indeed, as the Washington Post article states, President Kennedy will use every trick in the trade to put over a test ban treaty if he signed one, this is not going to help its ratification in the Senate. Since the legislature is an independent branch of our Federal Government, I believe the American people can have confidence that tricks and emotionalism will, if anything, prejudice the Senate against such a treaty. If the treaty, when and if it is negotiated, is one that is clearly consistent with the security of the United States, it will not require tricks or emotionalism to have it ratified.

I would urge our negotiators in Geneva and those in the State Department and the White House from whom they are receiving their instructions to bear in mind what I have said. There may be a few people in our Government who want a test ban treaty at almost any price, but I am quite certain they are not speaking for the people of the United States. Rightly or wrongly, the impression seems to have been generated that the United States and Great Britain are conducting these negotiations from a position of weakness, because it is our negotiators—not those of the Soviet Union—who have expressed a sense of urgency and willingness to do most of the giving. There is no reason for us to be any more urgent about this than the Soviets, Mr. President. I do not agree with those who say that time is on their side in the arms race. This is defeatist and pure conjecture. In fact, history would show the reverse to be true.

All of us recognize that the work of our negotiators is tedious and requires a great deal of patience and perseverance. However, it should be understood that their work may well go on for many years. The President was wise to make it clear that we are not going to try to meet any deadlines—April 1963, or later. In this, I am sure that most of my colleagues concur.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, April 14, to which I alluded in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL LINES FORMING ON A TEST BAN TREATY

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

"It would be the biggest battle since the Treaty of Versailles."

That is the considered judgment of a key administration official about what would happen in the U.S. Senate if President Kennedy were to present it with a nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union. And in the Senate, a key Member who would be in the forefront in defending a Kennedy treaty concurs completely with that judgment.

Maybe there never will be a treaty. It has been a case of close-but-not-quite, or apparently so, so many times that skepticism and wariness are the rule in Washington. Yet if ever hope was eternal, it is the hope of those within and without the administration who continue to push for a test ban treaty.

A PARTY-LINE DIVISION

The reason for the comparison with the epic 1919 Versailles Treaty struggle, which crippled President Wilson and kept the United States out of the League of Nations, is that for the first time in the history of the test ban controversy, the lines are hardening. The opponents are consolidating their position; the proponents seem to be counting mostly on the President and have yet to rally their forces fully.

And, perhaps most significant of all, the division on the test ban treaty is showing major signs of becoming a political division. There are and will be exceptions, of course, but, by and large, Republicans are the major opponents and Democrats the major proponents—of a treaty not yet signed.

Something should be said here about the prospects for such a treaty between the United States and Britain on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other. The prospects are uncertain but not hopeless. Probably the greatest unknown factor is the effect of current Kremlin policy deliberations on Soviet policy.

For Soviet policy will have to be altered if there is a treaty. And if the Soviets do move an appreciable amount, there very likely will be enough American-British movement to bridge the gap. Something like that appears to be the assessment of both opponents and proponents of the treaty.

REPUBLICANS ORGANIZED

The chances of a treaty thus have stirred the opposition into action. Consider these facts:

The Republicans in Congress, a number of whom have badgered both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations for their various negotiating postures over the past 5 years, now have organized their opposition. They have created the Republican Conference Committee on Nuclear Testing with Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, as chairman. HOSMER is a member of the important Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The two leading GOP presidential possibilities, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, are critical of Kennedy test ban negotiations.

The big political question is whether former President Eisenhower would support a Kennedy test ban treaty. Quite probably, and quite properly, he will take no position until he can examine the text of such a treaty, if there ever is one.

COMMITTED TO IDEA

On a number of occasions involving major policy, President Kennedy has gone out of his way to give his predecessor an intelligence fill-in and to seek his counsel. General Eisenhower has responded in terms of national, not partisan, interest, and some Republicans have grumbled at the effective Kennedy tactic.

But whether the same thing would occur in the case of a test ban treaty remains to be seen. If General Eisenhower stood with the President for a treaty, it would forestall what otherwise might well be a division along party lines, at least as much of a division as was the case with the Versailles Treaty.

On a good many occasions as President, General Eisenhower spoke passionately of the desirability of a test ban. In 1958, his administration came close to a treaty. But as President, Mr. Eisenhower never really prodded his subordinates; indeed, some of them seriously undercut his test ban aspirations.

A QUESTION OF DEGREE

President Kennedy likewise has spoken with great earnestness of the need and hopes for a test ban. But there are differing appraisals of how deeply committed he really is.

To some in the administration, the President seems passionately determined to get a treaty if a reasonable one can be had. To others in the administration, Mr. Kennedy is far less passionate in this desire than he is, for example, about improving the Nation's sluggish economic growth rate.

All agree, however, that the central point in whatever degree of enthusiasm he does have for a treaty is the hope that it might dampen the arms race and do so, first of all, by retarding the proliferation of nations with their own nuclear weapons. These were basic hopes in the Eisenhower administration, too.

Up to April 10, there had been 427 reported nuclear tests. Of these, 253 were American tests, 145 Soviet, 23 British, and six French. It is known, however, that a number of both American and Soviet tests have never been reported. Perhaps the grand total since 1945 is close to 450.

CUBA CRISIS A FACTOR

A central factor in the early pressure for a test ban was the massive amount of radioactivity thrown into the atmosphere by the aboveground tests on both sides. This is still a major factor in pressure here to approve a test ban, but the pressure has diminished as the United States has gone underground (and France, too) and as the Soviets have halted testing. Most Soviet tests have been atmospheric, however, and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, returned from the Geneva negotiations recently with a feeling that more Soviet tests may come this fall.

Khrushchev's clandestine attempt to set up a missile complex in Cuba also has encouraged test-ban treaty opponents. How, they argue, could the United States put any faith in a treaty when Khrushchev was capable of that sort of thing? And since the United States barely discovered the missiles in time, though they were so close to this country, how could we ever be sure what was going on deep inside the remote Soviet Union?

It has been stated publicly that American ability to detect Soviet tests has increased through refinement of seismological techniques. But what has not been made public is the degree to which American information on the entire Soviet military strength and disposition—including test preparations—has been increased by such means as the Samos and Ferret satellites and other eavesdropping techniques.

Just how good these devices are is top secret; the Soviets almost certainly know more about them than do the American people. Indeed, the Soviets probably know more about them than do most Members of Congress. But the administration insists that even to talk about such techniques would endanger the national security.

Whether true or not, the result is to rob test ban proponents of an effective argument. If a treaty is signed, President Kennedy quite likely will reach a point of having to decide whether to lift the secrecy curtain to bolster his case for ratification. And it must be remembered that ratification requires a two-thirds vote of the Senators present.

Another argument being pushed by test opponents, and which has not been fully answered by the proponents, is whether a test ban would not now be far less effective as a means of slowing the arms race than it might have once been. China's refusal to accept a Soviet nuclear monopoly within the Communist bloc and France's determination to create her own nuclear force independent of the American deterrent make it evident that no American-British-Soviet treaty would bind either of them.

Finally, there is a gnawing feeling on the part of many Americans that somehow the Soviets might achieve a breakthrough in nuclear weaponry through testing. An effective antimissile missile would be a major gain, though test ban proponents argue that that is less a matter of nucelar testing than of engineering and electronics.

Furthermore, the sort of ultimate weapon that the term "neutron bomb" conjures up leads many to worry that a test ban might prevent the United States from perfecting it while the Soviets might do so by cheating. The recent administration disclosure that the United States now has "enhanced radiation," or relatively fallout-free weapons, only adds to this kind of anticipation.

The argument over possible Soviet cheating by hiding smaller tests in caves dug in particular types of soil; the argument over the number of on-site inspections each side would be allowed in the other's territory, and related issues have dominated much of the debate in the past couple of years. But even if the President did satifsy two-thirds of the Senate that these risks were acceptable, the other considerations could lose him vital votes for ratification.

It is now quite clear that much of the American opposition to a test ban comes from those who simply do not want this country to limit in any way its weapons development, above all its nuclear weapons development. And to many who are working for a treaty, it appears that a good many members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee are in this category. They have powerful supporters among the military in the Pentagon and among the politically minded scientists outside the Government.

Only the President can counter all the specific points of opposition with a summing up of the risks involved in rejecting a treaty as well as in accepting one. Only he can go to the public and say that the risks of a totally unhindered arms race are greater than the specific risks inherent in a test ban treaty.

It is extraordinary that there has been so much argument for so long over a treaty not even negotiated. The reason, of course, is that such a treaty, whatever its actual efficacy in slowing the arms race, would be widely considered as just such a step. It would relieve anxieties the world over, rightly or wrongly.

However, treaty opponents have an argument when they contend that the kind of test ban now possible in sight would not make it any easier subsequently to cut back missile production, abolish nuclear submarines or bombers or keep space free from nuclear weapons. Here the test treaty proponents are on the defensive.

Nonetheless, no one is more aware than are the test ban's opponents of what a powerful force a President of the United States can generate in favor of any particular action if he really tries. And whatever his current degree of passion for a test ban, President Kennedy could be counted on to use every trick in the trade to put over a treaty if he signed one.

Woodrow Wilson, historians now say, was too rigid in his struggle with the Senate; had he accepted some reservations to the Versailles Treaty, he could have won ratification, and the effects of the reservations would have been minor compared to the results of the entire treaty's defeat.

The Wilson debacle in the Senate has haunted every Chief Executive since Wilson. And no one has been more history-minded than John F. Kennedy.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in the Washington Evening Star on March 29, 1963, written by Crosby S. Noyes and entitled "Nuclear Proliferation Hobgoblin."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nuclear Proliferation Hobgoblin

Paris.—The recurring nightmare which petrifies the Western camp and apparently conditions all American foreign policy is that of nuclear proliferation.

Quite evidently, the nightmare afflicts President Kennedy most acutely.

"I am haunted," he declared to a recent press conference, "by the feeling that by 1970 unless we are successful (in banning nuclear tests) there may be 10 nuclear powers instead of 4 and by 1975 15 or 20."

One wonders what disagreeable morsel of intelligence or intuition produces this particular specter. At any rate, it is entirely contrary to the evidence available in Europe. It is also contrary to informed estimates of many nuclear experts. Which are the 10 potential nuclear powers in 6 years' time?

With the exception of Red China and conceivably Israel, one must assume that the other candidates must be among the technically advanced and affluent nations of Western Europe. The possibility of less-developed countries' possession of nuclear weapons within a few years could only be based on an assumption that these weapons would be supplied by some outside power.

What then is the situation in Western Europe which leads to such disturbing predictions?

Britain, which participated actively in the wartime Manhattan project and shared all benefits of the early American effort, has been an active nuclear power since 1952. But the increasing costs and political liabilities of the more advanced weapons systems is today making Britain's future status highly problematical.

France has been actively working on development of nuclear weapons since 1954. By the end of this year it is expected to have a modest stockpile of atomic bombs capable of being transported in supersonic bombers. Thermonuclear weapons and missiles are not scheduled before the 1970's.

ONLY TWO INDICATED

Apart from France and Britain, there is no evidence that any other European country is engaged in a nuclear weapons program.

Of the other NATO countries, most of them have neither the inclination nor the means for such an effort. Most of them, in fact, follow the lead of the United States in actively deploring the spread of nuclear weapons. So far as the smaller countries are concerned, complete American responsibility for nuclear defense of Europe is still an ideal state of affairs.

Of the non-NATO countries of Europe, there has been some speculation that Sweden and even possibly Switzerland might muster the wherewithal to produce a poor man's atomic bomb.

There is, however, no suggestion that either of them is seriously considering such a program.

THE QUESTION OF GERMANY

There remains, of course, West Germany.

It is hard to avoid the impression that, in fact, the cause of the recurrent American nightmare about nuclear proliferation really boils down to a problem of the Federal Republic. Here, at least, is a country with the means and perhaps the ambition to possess nuclear weapons. And one may guess that it is this single possibility—rather than 15 or 20—which Mr. Kennedy regards as the greatest danger and hazard.

How many times has one heard this explanation from anonymous American official sources:

"Of course, we can't help the French with their nuclear program. If we did, what could we tell the Germans when they come around in a few years and ask us for the same thing?"

In any event, the assumption appears to be almost universal that sooner or later the Germans will renege on their formal commitments not to manufacture nuclear weapons. It is also assumed that when this moment arrives it will be a perilous one for the West. Much of American nuclear policy toward the Alliance—including the scheme for a multilateral NATO nuclear force with a built-in American veto—is obviously geared to prevent this moment from arriving.

It may be, however, that the fear of Germany as a nuclear power is based on a completely false premise.

This premise, to put it bluntly, is that Germany on the basis of its past record is chronically unreliable in military matters. It assumes that the Germans, once they possess nuclear weapons, might use them or threaten to use them offensively to attain political objectives.

And yet, surely, given the nuclear situation as its exists today, not even an Adolf Hitler would be mad enough to attempt any such thing. Neither the United States nor Russia can attain political objectives today by threatening each other with their nuclear forces.

The idea that Germany, with an inevitably limited nuclear arsenal, could use it to bring about the reunification of the country is simply preposterous. And once the use of this force for offensive purposes is ruled out the threat to use it is meaningless.

Few people, of course, would suggest that the Germans should be given the bomb or that proliferation of nuclear weapons is a good thing. Yet, when an obsessive nightmare lies at the heart of American policy, one may at least question the reality of the hobgoblins.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Evening Star of Saturday, March 2, entitled "A-Blast Detection Difficult."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO CATCH A CHEATER: A-BLAST DETECTION DIFFICULT

(By Earl H. Voss)

When the United States conducted its first peaceful-uses nuclear explosion 1,200 feet underground in New Mexico, 7,000 ground squirrels came scurring out of their holes within an hour after the shot.

If the United States had been trying to cheat on a test ban treaty and if Soviet onsite inspectors had been close by, the squirrels might have been an important clue.

Onsite inspectors are not expected to be that well positioned, however, even under the U.S. verification program, which is stricter than the Soviet Union's.

How good a job onsite inspectors can or will be allowed to do is one of the major issues of controversy in the test ban negotiations in Geneva.

Identification of underground nuclear explosions at close range is a matter of longstanding controversy which probably will not subside until, and unless. a cheater is actually caught in the act.

THREE PHASES OF INSPECTION

The United States sees three phases in a typical onsite inspection: First, aerial reconnaissance in the general area to which long-distance seismic evidence points; second, surface investigation of an area hopefully measuring only a few square miles, isolated in the first phase; third, drilling to find radioactive debris from the suspected nuclear explosion.

Under the American inspection plan, which Russia has not accepted, a team of 20 to 30 men would go by plane to the area of 40 to 200 square miles within which seismology can now pinpoint a possible violation of a treaty.

If the suspicious event happened in the Soviet Union, some members of the team might be American, but all might be other non-Soviet nationals. The United States recently dropped its demand for American representation on onsite teams sent to the Soviet Union.

FIRST PHASE IS CRITICAL

The first phase of aerial inspection would be to reduce quickly the area of suspicion to 1 square mile or so.

A helicopter would comb the area to look for visible characteristics of an underground explosion such as craters, circular patterns of surface cracks, disturbed soil, and vegetation patterns.

A nine-lensed aerial camera is being developed to use the latest color, infrared, and other techniques to seek varying patterns in the terrain.

There is no disagreement that the job will be difficult. Defense Department officials want to complete the difficult aerial-survey phase within a day or two. They know this is the crucial moment in the on-site inspection process. Each day's delay makes the task of surface inspectors, in the second phase, more difficult.

If no pattern turns up in the aerial sweeps, the whole project becomes hopeless. Drilling at random for underground pockets of radioactivity would involve hundreds of thousands of holes, each taking a month or more. Unless suspicious evidence is found, the inspection are just about bound to conclude their suspicions were ill founded.

PATTERN FOUND IN NEVADA

Experimenters with aerial surveillance have been encouraged by their findings since 1961, at the Nevada underground test site and at the Carlsbad, N. Mex., experiment in peaceful uses of nuclear bombs, code named Project Gnome.

At the Gnome site, ordinary black-and-white aerial photos showed a definite pattern of surface cracks around the explosion. Roots of shrubs like mesquite and yucca were damaged, the plants started to wither and the results showed up in color photography.

The upward push of the explosion shook the soil above, as if the earth had been in a giant flour sifter. The surface was left with a refined or granulated look.

Superimposing all these indicator patterns on one map pointed clearly to ground zero.

The Gnome explosion, however, was buried less than a quarter mile, about 1,200 feet in an area of soft alluvium near the surface, salt beneath. Surface effects could be expected to be more noticeable there than in other environments.

PROBLEMS OF SECOND PHASE

Unless the first phase aerial reconnaissance succeeds in a day or two, the most promising technique of phase two would be handicapped.

This technique is a recording unit for registering aftershocks of earthquakes. The unit is small enough to be transported on a small panel truck, and presumably would be airlifted to the vicinity of the 1-square-mile area singled out in phase one.

In tests at the Nevada underground tests, and on earthquakes, major distinguishing characteristics have been found. Nuclear explosions produce aftershocks for only 3 or 4 days, and their number falls off drastically after the first few hours. Earthquakes produce aftershocks for many days, even weeks.

Aftershocks caused by explosions emanate from a central point, but those from earthquakes occur over a much broader area.

On the basis of this experience, one Defense Department expert concludes that if on-site inspection teams could reach the site within 3 to 4 days after the event, "the presence of aftershocks would be a strong indication that the event was natural in origin."

The event could then be identified as an earthquake and the on-site inspection team could go home.

Absence of aftershocks, however, would not necessarily indicate an underground explosion. It might merely mean that the first-phase aerial survey had pointed to the wrong place.

Aftershocks might even be used as a mask for a sneak test by a clever cheater. Since 1958 seismologists have been warning that one of the major methods for beating a test ban would be to trigger a clandestine nuclear explosion on an earthquake.

EVIDENCE OF CHEATER

Other methods besides monitoring aftershocks are available in the second phase of surface surveying. One is visual inspection, by which some officials in the Defense Department put great store. Clever as a cheater may be, he is likely to leave telltale evidence behind, they believe.

The shot might not be completely contained, thus allowing radioactivity to escape and be picked up by surface monitors. Many of the Nevada explosions vented in this way, officials report.

Minerals and rocks in the area of the shot also might undergo recognizable changes, some scientists say. In some previous American tests, small rocks and pebbles on the surface were flipped over, exposing a different face to the sky which could be picked up easily in aerial photography, it is said.

Radon, a kind of radioactive gas, has been found to seep out of the ground above some Nevada tests, again raising hopes that underground shots cannot be fully hidden. Gamma rays have also been found to leak from crevices near ground zero.

THIRD PHASE: DRILLING

If any of these evidences is found by the onsite inspection team, it must decide where to drill in hope of finding the pocket of intense radioactivity produced by the suspected underground nuclear test.

In this third phase, it is as yet unclear whether more than one drilling rig could operate at a time, to cut the time-consuming operation as much as possible. With a 20- or 30-man team, however, it is doubtful whether more than one crew could be brought in.

Gamma-ray logging would be an important technique in the third phase. As the drilling proceeds, gamma radiation should be picked up well in advance of penetrating the actual pocket of radioactivity.

Mining experts on the onsite team would search mines, if any were nearby, to look for suspicious conditions.

CHANCES "CLOSE TO ZERO"

As late as 1960 American scientists advised the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee that the chances of catching a cleverly concealed shot would be "close to zero." Onsite inspection was singled out as one of the weakest links in the detection-identification chain.

Aside from finding a realistically small area in which to drill, there is the problem of how deep to dig.

In the United States' first underground shot, the 1.7 kiloton Rainier explosion in Nevada in 1957, it took 4 months to find the radioactive pocket, even though the drillers knew exactly where the bomb had been fired.

Presumably drilling times have by now been drastically shortened. But the Rainier shot was buried only 900 feet. Now there is talk that a sneak shot would be buried 6,000 to 10,000 feet.

If each drill hole dug by an onsite inspection team had to go 10,000 feet the time to cover even a small suspect area obviously would be long. And few would expect the Soviet Union to permit a large number of drill teams to work on its territory, in order to cut the time.

This question of Soviet cooperation is one that hangs heavy over the whole onsite inspection idea.

If the inspectors were to encounter a hostile environment, which is not at all hard to imagine in the Soviet Union, the prospects of catching a sneak shot would be less favorable, even the optimists acknowledged.

SENATE HEARINGS SET

The Senate will get a chance to judge the pluses and minuses of the test-ban control system if American, British and Soviet negotiators do reach agreement at Geneva.

One of the most influential committees in making up the Senate's mind will be the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. As preparation for the decisions that may lie ahead, Chairman PASTORE, Democrat of Rhode Island, has ordered public hearings next week.

Test-ban supporters and foes are now preparing to present their views. Their starting point may well be this recent summary of the prospects for onsite inspection by Dr. Charles C. Bates, chief of the underground test-detection unit in the Department of Defense:

"On the basis of results to date, it would appear that the localization and identification of contained nuclear explosions of greater than nominal yield that occur within one or two thousand feet of the surface can be achieved through seismic detection and use of full-scale onsite inspection techniques. This is provided the detonations take place in typical land areas having reasonable amounts of daylight. However, the onsite inspection techniques * * * may well have major deficiencies when applied to searching for possible nuclear explosion cavities where there is a shallow water cover, where the explosions take place at an extremely great depth, or where full advantage is taken of polar darkness followed by spring flooding.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Evening Star, February 28, 1963, entitled "Value of A-Test Held in Secret Is Discounted."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALUE OF A-TEST HELD IN SECRET IS DISCOUNTED

A high American disarmament official conceded today that "a determined cheater" could sometimes outsmart the proposed inspection system for a nuclear test ban.

But he discounted the value of isolated shots in erasing the lead the United States claims in nuclear weapons development.

The Soviet Union could not pull off a secret series which would be needed to catch the United States, Jacob D. Beam, assistant director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said in a speech prepared for delivery before the Rochester, N.Y., Advertising Club.

IMPROVEMENT SEEN

Capabilities for policing a test ban are "far better than we assumed them to be a few years ago" and are likely to improve "over the years," Mr. Beam said, but added: "I would not like to convey the impression that a determined cheater could not on occasion outsmart the man who is attempting to catch him. It is likely that in this game of cops and robbers, the robber, because he has by definition the advantage of surprise, can, if he goes to great lengths, occasionally fool the cop.

"If, for example, the cheater constructed a very large cave underground, or if he sent a nuclear warhead millions of miles out into space, he might succeed in detonating a nuclear bomb without being caught."

LEAD TOO GREAT

"But this kind of capability would not give the Soviet Union a chance to make any substantial inroads into the U.S. nuclear lead. The chances of the Soviet Union conducting a series of tests which would remain undetected are vanishingly small.

The probability that the advantage to be gained from a single test would be sufficient to make an attempted evasion worth while, is also vanishingly small."

Mr. Beam acknowledged that a nuclear test ban "by itself will not prevent the spread of nuclear weapons." His remarks were taken as an elaboration of the views expressed by President Kennedy at his press conference last week when he said his primary aim in seeking a test ban was to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons.

* * * * *

Kremlin representatives have stuck by a suggestion made by eight neutral nations at Geneva that onsite inspections be conducted only by invitation of the power suspected of having violated the treaty.

WOULD ACCEPT

The United States has indicated to Russia it can accept as few as seven onsite inspections per year inside the Soviet Union if other features of the system to verify that no nuclear tests are being conducted are adequate.

Premier Khrushchev repeated yesterday the Soviet Union will allow no more than two or three inspections a year inside Russia.

He has offered to allow three unmanned seismic stations on Soviet territory but the United States presently requires seven.

Instead of the previously planned 19 international control stations inside the Soviet Union, the United States is now willing to accept 73 existing seismic stations without international monitors inside the Soviet Union.

LONG-DISTANCE "EARS"

Primary reliance to detect tests would not be placed on these systems inside Russia, but on long-distance detection equipment in the United States and friendly countries on the edge of the Sino-Soviet land mass.

News that another treaty was being prepared coincided with an expression of optimism by Jacob D. Beam, assistant director of the bureau of international relations in the Disarmament Agency.

In a speech prepared for delivery before the Rochester, N.Y., Advertising Club this noon, Mr. Beam said: "Right now, the chances for an agreement on a nuclear test ban are perhaps relatively brighter than anything else we can see on the horizon."

SOME BLANK SPOTS

Like the comprehensive treaty of last August, the new document being drafted reportedly leaves some blank spots for numbers to be filled in by negotiation.

Last year's treaty left blank the annual quota of onsite inspections as well as the percent of the annual number of inspections which could be carried out each year in areas where there are few earthquakes.

The draft of last August also left blank the radius of the area within which long-distance detection units would be required to pinpoint a suspected violation.

In the past the Soviet Union has demanded that the area be kept smaller than long-distance detection stations could pinpoint.

Soviet Ambassador Semyon K. Tsarapkin said in Geneva yesterday Russia will not allow the "black boxes" to form an independent detection network covering all of Soviet territory. In the Russian view, the Associated Press reported from Geneva, the black boxes would only be auxiliary instruments in the Soviet Union's three most earthquake-prone areas which would cross-check reports from other nations' seismic stations.

Western delegates said this would leave most of the Soviet Union outside the range of the "black boxes" and would render the whole "black box" idea virtually meaningless.

Officials here said there is an outside chance the draft treaty will not be presented at Geneva, but they acknowledged it is more likely the document will be advanced soon to put more pressure on the Soviet Union to accept a nuclear test ban.

Mr. MILLER. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by the esteemed columnist, David Lawrence, entitled "Danger of Expressing War Fears: Russians May Get the Wrong Idea," which, I might add, ties in with what I said in my remarks about the sense of urgency appearing on our side rather than on the side of the Soviets.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGER OF EXPRESSING WAR FEARS: RUSSIANS MAY GET THE WRONG IDEA

(By David Lawrence)

Paradoxical as it may seem, the greatest danger of war today is the constant expression of a fear of war.

The sacrifice of principle to expediency in the past—a readiness by one side to yield to the terror of war—has led to miscalculation and misjudgment by the other side and has brought war just the same.

It is for this reason that a close analysis of what the President has been saying lately about world policy in terms of the Cuban situation is essential to an understanding of the dangers that lie ahead.

One must start with the feeling that Mr. Kennedy is a sincere, conscientious public servant who wants to avoid a war. But so were some of his predecessors who nevertheless found themselves in a war because an impression appeared to prevail in this country that anything is better than war. In many countries, moreover, one even hears nowadays some prominent persons crying out, "better Red than dead."

The policy of the U.S. Government is based at present not on a fear of war as such, but on a belief that war can be avoided, and yet no compromise on principle made. In official circles, however, there is a constant repetition of expressions on fear of war.

This could lead to misjudgment in the camp of our adversaries. The other day on television a commentator read to some Congressmen an extract from what Mr. Kennedy had said, and then, in effect, bluntly asked them, "Now, do you want war?"

The President himself, of course, has not closed the door to the possibility of a major war arising out of Soviet deception and military operations in Cuba. In his last news conference, as he discussed the importance of being certain about our information concerning missiles, he said: "Now, as I say, these things may all come about and we may find ourselves again with the Soviet Union toe to toe, but we ought to know what we have in our hands before we bring the United States—and ask our allies to come with us—to the brink again."

Later on in the conference, Mr. Kennedy came back to the same theme—the possibility of an external action by the United States to get rid of the Communist base in Cuba. He said: "We live with a lot of dangerous situations all over the world. Berlin is one. There are many others. And we live with a good deal of hazard all around the world and have for 15 years. I cannot set down any time in which I can clearly see the end to the Castro regime. I believe it is going to come, but I couldn't possibly give a time limit. I think that those who do, sometimes mislead.

"I remember a good deal of talk in the early 1950's about liberation, how eastern Europe was going to be liberated. Then we had Hungary and Poland and East Germany, and no action was taken. And the reason the action wasn't taken was because they felt strongly, if they did take action, it would bring on another war.

"So it is quite easy to discuss these things and say one thing or another ought to be done. But when they start talking about how, and when they start talking about Americans invading Cuba and killing thousands of Cubans and Americans, with all the hazards around the world, that is a very serious decision, and I notice that that is not approached directly by a good many who have discussed the problem."

But these words of a President are read everywhere, including Moscow. Do these utterances mean that, unless this country is directly attacked, a resolute stand will not be taken by the United States, even if it means war?

The Soviet Government may ponder that question, for it never stops testing its adversaries. Mr. Kennedy stood firm last October, but questions have arisen now as to what will be done by the United States about the continued presence in Cuba of 17,000 military men from the Soviet Union. The critics have helped by bringing this issue to a head.

The reason, to be sure, why nothing was done in Hungary and Western Europe is that the West lost its nerve. The Soviets knew the West wouldn't dare to go the limit to uphold the principles of the United Nations Charter and protect the oppressed peoples who sought to assert their independence only to find the Soviet armies overwhelming them by force.

Yet in 1950, collective action by the United Nations saved Korea and repelled aggression. Many American boys died in that cause, as indeed some Americans have been killed recently in South Vietnam to check Communist infiltration of an independent country.

Neglect of Hungary led to the assertion of Soviet arrogance in East Berlin. Now, if the United States despite all its outward show of firmness—should really lean to a policy of peace at any price in Cuba or anywhere else, there could finally be a provocation to war. Winston Churchill, after World War II was over, wrote of the mistakes of the 1930's:

"Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival.

"There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

TRIBUTE TO COL. BARNEY OLDFIELD

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure to have known Col. Barney Oldfield for many a year through my Regular and Reserve relations with the Air Force. Colonel Oldfield, an accomplished writer and speaker, has given much to the Air Force and to the military strength of our country, so I am happy to see that, even though he is retired from active duty, he is continuing to speak out on matters of concern to our offensive and defensive capabilities. I ask unanimous consent that a speech he made before the convention of the National Lime Association be printed in the RECORD at this place in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY COL. BARNEY OLDFIELD, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED, BEFORE THE CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL LIME ASSOCIATION, LAS VEGAS, NEV., APRIL 4, 1963

Members of the National Lime Association: Since this is the third day of your Las Vegas convention, it is assumed by the turnout that you have all had your losing streak and that's behind you. This is one of the few convention cities in the United States which is strong on the unconventional, where you actually make money by sitting safely away from temptation in a convention hall. This is only true, of course, if you took the precaution to lock your wife in her room while you're here.

The first thing you have to do to make a speech or otherwise communicate with a group here is to be sure you get some of the atmosphere and the language of the community in what you have to say. This came to me most forcefully in 1957 in July, when we were here for the first live firing of the nuclear warhead rocket at Yucca Flats. Sunday came that first week, and I wondered what kind of a sermon a minister would preach here, so I went to church. He chose the 10 Commandments that day as his text, and made the usual admonitions about keeping them. Nothing new so far. As he came to the summation of his sermon, he pointed his finger out generally over the congregation and said: "And verily I say unto you, if you keep these Commandments, yours will be a jackpot of divine grace."

I don't know whether he changed any minds that day, but as they would say around the green tables, he made his point.

My assignment today is to make some points for aerospace defense. My appearance here is in the nature of a man's past catching up with him, since before joining Litton Industries in Beverly Hills, Calif., in January, I had the distinction of serving longer straight time in aerospace defense than anyone else—almost a third of my 30 years in uniform.

In my time, it went from World War II leftover prop-driven planes with machinegun and cannon mounts and antiaircraft guns to an ability which it now possesses to track every manmade object in air and space over or approaching North America as well as an ability to considerably shatter a manned bomber or cruise missile attack in the atmosphere.

This very existence of an Aerospace Defense Force, which is called the North American Air Defense Command, is a fascinating continental development. It came about because two nations, Canada and the United States, looking up and out at threat avenues, thought their mutual security was really one problem to which each country within its resources could allocate weapons systems and people trained and ready to be employed on a moment's notice. It came about, but it wasn't easy. It is always hard when two or more countries and two or more political leaders sit over two or more military establishments trying for a single strategy.

North America had a traditional view of warmaking, once it was forced on the peoples who live here. That view was to mount an offensive as soon as the production line could be mobilized, and flood the enemy at some far away point or points with all the newest technologies until he was overwhelmed and sued for peace. This was when time was plentiful, but the year I was commissioned—1932—a 12-month chain of coincidences (February 1932 to February 1933) was the time of some seemingly routine history which changed all that.

Roosevelt became President, Hitler took power in Germany, and a man named James Chadwick made a discovery. Hitler was to start a war which would change the outlook of the world at large. Roosevelt was to give the go-ahead to a project to make an atomic weapon useful in war. And James Chadwick discovered the neutron which was the key to atomic fission. That chain of unrelated events in that 12 months gave those of us who survived some of the catastrophic consequences a new point of view.

Everything from then on had to be bigger, except the globe we live on. It had shrunk. Ideas were bigger. Nations were bigger. Power alliances were grander in concept. Politics spilled over national boundaries, and tried to stake out space. Men thought with greater scope, were willing to play for greater prizes against greater odds, and in some areas of the world it became official policy to court the death of a third of a population to gain something called world domination.

In these days of rapidly expanding knowledge about advancing technologies, it is possible for everything to happen quicker and to be known quicker, for the tragic to be more devastating and total. Weaponry advantages have taken on such great connotations politically, they can hold an aggressive nation or power bloc at bay, or failure to acquire them by a friendly government or bloc may so upset the public, or the electorate that the affected governments may shake or fall, or both.

It is safe to say today that more of world affairs turn on security of nations and peoples than on anything else. The age-old question is still: "How safe are we?" and if there is any doubt, the question still is: "How much to fix it?" and the fork-over is pretty cheerfully accomplished.

One of the smaller expenditures in the military budget has consistently been in aerospace defense, but even so, there has been some remarkable progress. Right now, when it is possible for an orbiting device to be on opposite sides of the world in a half hour, the North American Air Defense Command has come to be a focal point for the free world. It notes from minute-to-minute the status of unknown aircraft and submarines approaching the continent. It has the character and speed of the jet stream and other winds aloft to indicate the cheap traffic routes for an air attack at any given hour. It has the number of payloads in orbit, as well as the space junk which accompanied them. It is NORAD's position that it must keep track of everything in order to see whether there have been any new joiners, and what, if any, they represent in security danger. Not only is all this information sent to the Canadian and U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff regularly, but it is also fed by undersea cables and microwave relays to fighter command in England and Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers, Europe, in Paris.

As far as complementing warning of attack in the atmosphere, U.S. Air Force and Marine Corps and Royal Canadian Air Force fighter interceptors, U.S. and Canadian Bomarc missiles, and U.S. Army Nike batteries could rise to meet it and make a rather rough picket fence for an enemy attacker to slide into the target complexes.

But when it comes to the ballistic missile attack, the polar oriented Ballistic Missile Early Warning System would signal approach from the Eurasian land mass, but we have no ability as yet to shoot down such a weapons system. In fact, areospace defenses need to advance into capabilities such as these:

(1) The antimissile missile. The best bet is the Army's research and development program called Nike X. Although its forerunner Nike-Zeus has had some successes in major tests over the Pacific, it is still not in production, or deployed.

(2) The improved manned interceptor, or IMI, this is a fighter aircraft, capable of 2,000 miles an hour in speed, and range of at lease a thousand miles. It is necessary to go far out and catch, as well as shoot down a bomber carrier of an air-launched ballistic missile. The standoff employment of a missile from a bomber unopposed would be a way of pitching a lethal warhead into the target without the carrier exposing itself to close-in defenses.

(3) A warning system which will cover all approaches to the continent, rather than just the northern routes, with particular capability to detect sublaunched missile firings. This undoubtedly has to be an orbital system.

(4) A satellite inspector, plus a follow-on satellite destroyer.

There are some who pooh-pooh these things as having no meaning if we just maintain a strong offensive position. Deterrence is only credible, however, if we are flexible enough to make an enemy pay so heavily for entry he stays put. To have an offense without a complementing defense is risky business. Very few professional fighters, even a Sonny Liston, would stand with hands behind their backs and give Floyd Patterson one roundhouse punch hoping to be able to recover and beat him. The number of punches which get through are lessened if a man, or a power bloc keeps dukes up.

It is popular in many quarters to say that no defense could block a determined attack, but what is a determined attack? On that long ago July day, 1957, when we fired the first atomic rocket here at Yucca Flats it turned several hundred cubic yards of the atmosphere into a molten ball—even a near miss would be effective, and it would be no picnic, even with determination, to stand up to that kind of opposition in either a manned bomber or cruise missile. The Bomarc and the Nike-Hercules could make the same nuclear impression. Determination can terminate in destruction, and the present aerospace defense system of North America packs a lot of destruction potential.

This has been a tough century for the pooh-pooher. At its turn, in 1900, a prominent man said of the automobile that a town the size of Philadelphia should expect to have as many as 100 cars by 1950. When Louis Bleriot flew an airplane over the English Channel in 1909, it was mostly assessed as a nervy and foolhardy stunt. The first Army requirement for an aircraft was that it be able to fly 3 days march ahead of the Infantry, and return, and otherwise be collapsible so it could be hauled on a wagon. And World War I was to be a war to end wars, and make the world safe for democracy.

We look back on these things, with the help of hindsight, and say, "How foolish? How could smart men have been so dumb, so short in visualizing what the future would hold?" But then, we come to the present day, and what happens?

A man named Khrushchev has said the Russians have an antimissile missile, which, as he puts it, could hit a fly in the sky.

Last August, two Russians, Nikolayev and Popovich made more than 112 orbits of the earth over a 4-day period, and in that 112 orbits, they were over North America 70 times. Just 6 weeks ago, one of Russia's military leaders declared his country was now able to launch a rocket from a satellite.

Much to the dismay of those who are genuinely concerned, these utterances tend to be dismissed as propaganda, and because we do not yet have these capabilities ourselves, a fallacious premise is resorted to—if we haven't got it, they possibly couldn't have it. Most of us would prefer even the partial protection of a deployed but less than ultimate weapons system designed for aerospace threats than a poorly founded premise. Imagine the predicament we would have been in for aircraft if Orville and Wilbur Wright had been told in 1910 that what they had wasn't good enough, that we would wait until they built a jet which would carry atomic armament.

A wisecrack, deprecating opinion, or statement of airy dismissal is often hard to live with when the future turns into the present as it does rather rapidly these days.

In aerospace defenses, we are now at a very critical point.

It is one thing to have missiles of intercontinental range in silos on your own soil, and manned bombers based in your own country or on the soil of allies, but it is quite another if weapons of mass destruction were to be placed in orbit. While space is so far the province of everyone, free and clear, the regular passage of a thermonuclear warhead of origin in any country which holds its electronic trigger is bound to make political ruffles of high order as it passes over others. Our country has already ruled this development out, in a speech made by Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric last September, but he did say that we would defend ourselves in space if the Soviet Union forces us to do so.

So the gauntlet is down for the scientific and engineering fraternity to meet the military specifications in this regard, and for none to say that the defensive is not worth the doing. It may well be that it will be the only thing left which can be done.

In many quarters now, there is wishful thinking that our best defense, aerospace or otherwise, is apt to be the growling between the Soviet Union and Red China. The safest way to size that one up is this: suppose you were dead and at an undertaking parlor, but were permitted to hear an argument between that undertaker and a collegue about fee-splitting for your funeral. Would it make you any less dead? Or make you feel better about your impending interment at their collective hands?

We have had considerable success in achieving an aerospace defense capability, which 10 years ago would have been thought fantastic, and we should go on from here. The country or man who sits on past successes is apt to smother under the future successes of others. Thank you.

WASHINGTON REPORT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the American Security Council has been publishing many outstanding articles for the purpose of encouraging and supporting the maintenance of a strong national defense posture in this country. One of the best reports issued by the American Security Council through its Washington Report is being made available to the public today and is entitled "Toward a Technological Pearl Harbor?" This issue of the Washington Report, dated April 15, 1963, was written by an outstanding educator and expert on communism and psychological warfare, Dr. Stefan T. Possony.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent report be printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Toward a Technological Pearl Harbor?

The Cuban affair offered a unique opportunity to test how well the United States is being prepared to forestall surprise attack. How did we make out? Unfortunately, not very well.

By the summer of 1962, we had sold ourselves on the notion that Khrushchev was operating on a genuinely peaceful coexistence policy and that, therefore, any major nuclear maneuver by the Soviets was out of the question. Hence, we disregarded numerous indicators which were pointing to a massive Soviet military buildup on Cuba.

Two days after the Air Force was allowed to fly reconnaissance missions, clearcut intelligence of an offensive Soviet nuclear missile and aircraft buildup was obtained. Had we hesitated only a few days longer, the initial Soviet missile force in Cuba would have been in operational readiness.

Confronted with unmistakable evidence, the United States reacted sharply. We forced the Soviets to withdraw their offensive missiles and light bombers. Perhaps a deal was involved by which we abandoned our 45 Thors and Jupiters in Italy and Turkey for the Soviet recall of 42 missiles from Cuba. In any event, the Soviet force went. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara went on television and presented an unprecedented intelligence briefing to the Nation which demonstrated that the offensive threat from Cuba had evaporated.

However, subsequent testimony by various intelligence chiefs showed that the Soviets are making considerable use of a large number of caves on the Caribbean island. The impression was left that they are setting up arms stores as well as supplies for defensive ground-to-air rockets and the more than 100 Mig-17's, 19's, and 21's which, in addition to thousands of Soviet military men and technicians, admittedly have stayed behind. (A prominent American traveler in Cuba recently gave a private estimate of 30,000.)

Yet the conclusions which Mr. McNamara presented to his audience are valid only if one particular assumption is granted, namely, that the Soviets do not now possess neutron bombs and warheads. Soviet understanding of neutron technology is well documented. Programs designed to achieve a neutron capability are of such a kind that intelligence would discover them only through a lucky break. Notably, many of the test shots needed to develop this technology would not be nuclear and therefore, even if detected, might be disregarded. Most nuclear shots leading to the fusion of deuterium and tritium, whether with or without an initial fission trigger, would be on the fractional kiloton level. Hence, they would escape detection.

If the Soviets were in possession of neutron devices, they could fit them into very small missiles which do not require fixed-launch installations but could be fired from trucks. They also could fit light neutron bombs on their Mig fighters. If so, the Migs would have a good portion of the Southeastern States, some parts of Texas, and a number of SAC bases within their range.

The moral of this discussion is that overreliance on air reconnaissance, though it is a most valuable intelligence technique, may cause disaster. This is particularly true in all those cases where coverage is spotty and infinitely less complete than the coverage we obtained over Cuba.

To avoid surprise, it is not good enough to send out, in the last minute, reconnaissance aircraft to get photographic evidence. It is even more necessary to interpret the enemy's intention accurately and in time. Above all, it is imperative to anticipate his technological moves which precede the actual act of aggression by many years. On this point, the present administration has proved itself to be particularly bemused. The civilian leadership in the Pentagon ignores the possibility that perhaps the Soviets are embarked upon a neutron bomb program. They have made it abundantly clear that the United States will not go in for such a weapon. It is being suggested in Washington that a technological plateau has been reached, which allegedly allows us to pause before we decide on acquiring new weapons systems.

Evidence on continuing and accelerating technological advances in the Soviet Union is pooh-poohed systematically or passed over in silence. It may be useful, therefore, to take a short look at some of the weapons which the Soviets seem to be developing in order to insure our "burial."

Chief Marshal of Aviation Konstantine Vershinin has reiterated frequently that though the decisive role in war henceforth will be played by long-range missiles, no future military operations will be feasible without the participation of large numbers of aircraft. The main role in aviation, according to Vershinin, will be assigned to rocket-carrying bombers capable of striking not only stationary but also moving land and sea targets from a long standoff range. The Soviet Badger and Bear bombers, which have been overflying our carriers, are known to be equipped with air-to-surface missiles. On March 13, 1963, Soviet news broadcasts boasted that Russia has a missile that "can be delivered to any point on the globe" from an intercontinental bomber. The range from bomber to target was claimed to be "a few hundred miles." Future Soviet bombers which will be using air-to-surface missiles as their "basic equipment" (Izvestiya, Dec. 23, 1962), will have supersonic speed and reach an altitude of 98,000 feet. (The Soviets have a limited number of supersonic bombers now.) Insofar as the Pentagon is concerned, it has canceled our long-range Skybolt missile and would like to kill the RS-70. Our B-52 bombers will be phased out in 1968. Without the RS-70, there will be no replacement.

Chief Marshal Vershinin also disclosed: "The further perfecting of new types of aircraft is intended to increase their ceilings, speed, and range. With this goal in mind, work is being done to create atomic engines." One of Mr. McNamara's first acts as Secretary of Defense was to cancel the atomic jet engine.

Col. Gen. V. F. Tolubko, first deputy commander in chief of strategic rocket forces, disclosed in Krasnaya Zvezda (Feb. 20, 1963) the official organ of the Soviet defense ministry, that the Soviet Union already possesses antimissile defense weapons. The Washington Evening Star revealed on March 14, 1963, that the U.S. intelligence has spotted a probable antimissile defense complex being erected around Leningrad. This was apparently revealed at closed hearings before the House Armed Services Appropriations Subcommittee in February, during which both Mr. McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were questioned. Confronted with reports of the Leningrad missile complex, McNamara refused comment, saying that the information was "sensitive." But General Taylor warned that "we face the possibility of a cold war defeat" because the Soviets may beat the United States to an antimissile missile. (Washington Evening Star, Mar. 29, 1963). Nevertheless the Pentagon has put the quietus on the Nike-Zeus system and is now embarked on a substitute project, the Nike-X, which will take many years to complete, and which in the end might not be approved either.

The well-known aircraft designer, Artem Mikoyan, predicted a "semicosmic" airplane, with variable geometry wings, an extended range of several times 100,000 miles, and a speed of 6 to 8 Mach. The Pentagon is most anxious to kill our experimental orbital plane, the X-20 or Dyna-Soar, because it allegedly duplicates a NASA project. This contention is not entirely unjustified because the X-20 would be flown some time after NASA's Gemini and would have a smaller crew. On the other hand, the X-20 has a far superior landing capability—a feature which, of course, is of the greatest importance, if we ever are to obtain a genuine space capability.

But let us grant that Gemini has many advantages over the X-20. Secretary McNamara recently visited the Boeing plant where the X-20 is being designed. After his return, it was announced that a decision on the X-20 was postponed for 6 months, which implies that the decision to kill the X-20 will be made when Congress no longer is in session. But if we can improve on the X-20, why waste money for 6 months and lose time?

Suppose Gemini is the project behind which we should put all our resources; why then is the Pentagon still dragging its feet in allowing the Air Force to participate, in an effective manner, in this NASA project? In October 1960 Mr. Kennedy, in a now forgotten speech, recognized that control of space would entail control of the earth. This was a correct assessment, but we are making no determined effort to achieve, at an early date, a full capability for manned and militarily useful space flight. We still are paying lipservice to the ridiculous dogma that space is good only for peaceful purposes and we are deflecting most of our massive space budget away from using space as a medium to enhance the security of the United States.

The commander of the Soviet Union's strategic rocket forces, Marshal S. S. Biryuzov disclosed (Feb. 22, 1963) that it "has now become possible to launch, at a command from earth, rockets from a satellite, and this at any desirable time at any point in the satellite trajectory." Privately, Khrushchev has made a similar statement, although he declared that the first such device developed by the Soviets will not be put in operation because his scientists are working on a better model. The Cosmos series of Soviet-launched satellites—this is the type with which they carried out their first rendezvous experiment—may be related to this development. Yet the Pentagon continues to insist that it makes no sense to place nuclear bombs into orbit. It even goes so far as to assert that at the present time there is no discernible military function in space, not even a need to defend the United States against nuclear weapons which the Soviets might launch from orbital vehicles.

It is noteworthy that Marshal Biryuzov, who obviously is a partisan of the orbital bomb, has since been appointed chief of staff of the Soviet armed forces. This is the first time that an expert in nuclear long-range warfare has held that position, which heretofore was reserved to proponents of ground warfare.

It will be said that statements by Soviet marshals or even Khrushchev are nothing but "Communist propaganda." But experience has proved, time and time again, that the Soviets talk about new weapons systems only when they have such weapons under development. Perhaps the Soviets will prove unable soon to build a nuclear jet engine. Perhaps the semicosmic plane will appear only in 15 or 25 years. There is no question however that the orbital bomb is entirely feasible now. And, there is no doubt that the Soviets have tested antimissiles and could be deploying them now as an antimissile defense system. Such an initial system might be relatively ineffective, but its propaganda effect would be enormous.

There are a number of additional facts which the Pentagon never disputed but which it is anxious to keep concealed. Colonel General Tolubko derisively compared the biggest American warheads installed in Titan with Soviet missile warheads "whose powers attain 100 million tons." Some skeptics may dispute that the Soviets have 100 megaton warheads now, but hardly any expert denies that their warhead capability is in the 50-million-ton range and will reach the 100-million-ton level in the future. General Tolubko is absolutely right: Yield-wise, U.S. warheads are limping behind Soviet warheads by one full order of magnitude. Yet the Pentagon has announced no decision to correct this deadly deficiency.

Even more frightening is the fact that according to lieutenant general of the air force N. Sbytov, the Soviets possess a bomb with a yield of 160 million tons (Kraznaya Zvezda, Feb. 12, 1963). This claim may be somewhat inflated as yet, but to judge from the Soviet tests of 1961, such a bomb is fully within Soviet capabilities. Our biggest bombs have only about half the yield of the biggest devices tested by the Soviets and they are smaller than several of the bombs which the Soviets tested during 1962. As things stand today, the Soviets have tested twice as many high-yield devices as the United States. Hence they should be ahead of us in the technology of high-yield bombs and warheads. In March 1962, this was almost admitted by President Kennedy himself. But there again, nothing is undertaken to correct the deficiency.

This policy of no-decisions has been creating almost unmanageable problems for the United States. For example, in the summer of 1962, the Secretary of Defense announced that henceforth the United States, whenever possible, would pursue a counterforce instead of a countervalue strategy. This means that we would prefer to attack military targets such as missile sites and air bases, but seek to spare cities. A counterforce strategy has undisputed merits, but it is not enough to announce it: One almost must develop the means to implement the concept.

Yet under Mr. McNamara's administration, missiles with small rather than large warheads are preferred and bomber aircraft which carry the largest firepower are to be "phased out." Not surprisingly, half a year after his counterforce announcement, Mr. McNamara, suddenly recognizing the probability that the Soviets would harden their missile sites, indicated that in the future a counterforce strategy may prove impractical. Moreover, Mr. McNamara is now buying a strategic force which, by type and numbers of weapons, can be used effectively only against cities.

But this is not the end of the contradiction: With growing accuracy and super yields the Soviets are acquiring a counterforce capability which can be used against our hardened missile sites. Mr. McNamara wants to get rid of bombers because he prefers an invulnerable missile force. Present Soviet weapon trends show that our missile force will not be invulnerable. Any good military historian might have told Mr. McNamara that the concept of invulnerability always proved to be a snare and an illusion.

By hook or crook, we are abandoning the nuclear race. Frantically, we pursue the nuclear test-ban treaty. Instead of catching up, we continue to negotiate.

The pattern has been that, with the exception of a minor beefing-up of our guerrilla capabilities, the ordering of a joint Air Force-Navy fighter, and the contracting of Titan III—not for a military space program but as a "building block" should such a program become necessary in the dim future—Mr. McNamara, during more than 2 years in office, has not authorized a single new weapon system. He is slowing down our technological progress deliberately.

If we allow the Soviets to acquire vastly superior nuclear firepower; if we confront a mixed Soviet strategic force consisting of missiles as well as aircraft, with only a missile force; if we do not have the missile defenses while the Soviets possess a capability to shoot down our missiles; and if the Soviets achieve military space capability against which we cannot defend ourselves and for which we have no offensive equipment—then there is no doubt that we would be defeated or could win only at the price of excessive American casualties.

The fact that we presently are investing in R. & D. 50 cents for every dollar we are spending on procurement means that we are financing many exploratory research programs. It does not mean that we are modernizing our decisive weapon systems. Perhaps the philosophy of "the biggest bang for the buck" had its faults. But the present philosophy of "the least bangs for the most bucks" courts disaster. All things considered, it does not look as though under the stewardship of Robert Strange McNamara, the United States is being equipped to forestall a nuclear and technological Pearl Harbor.

ADDRESS BY GOV. TERRY SANFORD, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the administration of North Carolina's distinguished Governor, Terry Sanford, has, with great success, pursued a program of quality education for our State. On April 8, Governor Sanford, in a speech before the First National Conference of the National Committee for the Support of Better Public Schools, explained North Carolina's education program and how other States might benefit from our mission for better education.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech, which I believe will be of great interest to my colleagues, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. TERRY SANFORD AT FIRST NATIONAL CONFERENCE, NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MONDAY, APRIL 8, 1963

Friday night a leading American educator was at my house for dinner, and I gathered for discussion several school leaders, college executives, and others charged with the future of North Carolina.

The rambling, easy conversation ranged across our dreams and hopes, our attempts and failures, our spirit and faith, and our purpose as the people of an American State.

One of the guests suggested that we no longer seem to have any goals, and sense of mission.

We talked of the depression of the thirties, the war of the forties, the university in the twenties and thirties looking to the needs of the people of the region who somehow were not sharing in the life of America.

Those indeed, they reminisced, were the days of mission. We knew we had a job to do. Scholars, political leaders, and people generally dedicated themselves to the task and nobody could fail to recognize the dedication. Professors came and stayed at lower salaries than they could have received elsewhere because they "believed."

These were the days of war—war against poverty and then war against tyranny. We had a mission and the mission was simple and the people were united and determined. Even frustrations and failure did not dampen the spirit of the mission. We understand war.

But today those missions of the past several decades seem to have been accomplished. The New Deal is history. We have economic problems, but no longer are we the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. We continue to have tyranny loose in the world, but the sciences have changed the risks in war.

What now should be our purposes? What now should be our mission?

We cannot warm over the past, and shouldn't. Everything seems so complex now, so big, often so frightening. Small wonder that people look for easy solutions, attempt to find answers in simple alternatives. This may explain the fear so many people have of change, any change. This may explain the rash of organizations and political winners whose creed calls for the return of the "good old days."

It is difficult to see the future, to understand the present needs, to recognize, grasp, and follow our mission for the sixties.

Difficulty, however, is no excuse for sitting still, or turning back. This is not the nature of the people of North Carolina, and I am sure it is not the nature of the people of America.

In North Carolina we do have a mission, and our people believe in it, and we are moving and working and finding greater hope than at any time in our history.

Like the people of most States we are proud of many things. We were the site for the first English colony in the New World. Here to Roanoke Island came Sir Walter's bold adventurers and sturdy settlers, determined to make a new world and to know a better chance for every man. It was here at this spot in North Carolina that Virginia Dare was born the first child to English parents in America.

What were these people, a part of our heritage, seeking? They were looking for the chance for the individual that couldn't be found in the confines of the narrow England of their day.

Paul Green described this bit of North Carolina soil as the place where "once walked the men of dreams" singing a new song, "a song for ages yet unborn."

"O new and mighty world to be," they sang, "O land majestic, free, unbounded."

For 375 years since the birth of Virginia Dare and the days of Gov. John White and the disappearance of the first colony beyond the tree marked "Croatoan" this dream has remained the song of settlers, pioneers, immigrants, and Americans seeking the chance for the individual.

This may very well be the goal we are attempting to define today. I think it is. We are still trying to achieve the chance for the individual. Many individuals have that chance, but many do not, even in North Carolina, even in America. Certainly our part in the Alliance for Progress shows we comprehend that this goal is worth seeking in Latin America. Surely we recognize this desire among the people of the emerging nations of Africa. Our foreign policy contemplates that all freemen, and men who hope to be free, are seeking some degree of individual dignity and opportunity.

Today in America this goal means that every child should have the room and place to grow and live, to get the most out of life, to give the most back to his generation, no matter where born, no matter who his parents or how much money they might have or might not have, no matter what his color, no matter what the extent of his capacity or the limitations of his abilities. The Governor of North Carolina at the turn of the century, Charles Brantley Aycock, put it much better: "The equal right of every child born of woman to burgeon out all that is within him."

The several States of our country must understand that these opportunities for the individual cannot be achieved except by the action of the State. It cannot be done if States are going to sit by and wait for the Federal Government.

This is true because the needs are too broad and too diverse for central solution.

It is also true because achieving these individual opportunities is the beginning of the achievement of all of our goals, and the way to do it remains the largest and most fundamental job of the American State.

The way is education.

The communities must be joined as partners, must provide leadership, must put in their share, but the States cannot avoid the responsibility by saying this is a local problem. First leadership must come from the State.

I believe education is the mission of North Carolina, and indeed the primary mission of all American States.

I know there are other goals for which people speak, but if you will examine these goals you will find their achievement depends on the individual and the education of the individual.

The fundamentals of self-fulfillment, the responsibility of citizenship, and the success of democracy itself depend on the quality and scope of our education.

Scientific advancement, all cultural progress, and an effective growing economy will be determined by the excellence of our education.

Adjustment to technological changes, farm practices, urban environment will be found only through a more dynamic system of education.

The health of the people, their rehabilitation where needed, will be served by education.

The stability of government is a result of education.

Education itself in the future will be a product of the education of today, for the level of attainment of future teachers will be a result of the level of excellence of today.

Diplomacy, defense, foreign policy, emerging countries and the other headlines are written today and will be written tomorrow by the performance of our educated men and women, so the hope of the free world will be determined by education.

In spite of the importance of education to world peace and national defense, the job of education remains the primary task of the State. It is a constitutional duty in most States.

I think the States understand this. In talking to Governors, in reading messages to most of the legislative bodies, I am impressed with the official attention being given to education.

Our job is to get the attention and support of the people.

Our job is also to design the kind of school program which reaches everybody. Remember Governor Aycock said "every child."

We will reach all of our goals if we give attention to the individual and his chance in life.

That we haven't remembered this is the reason so many have not shared in the American dream.

Too many are left out.

The child of the disadvantaged area, who comes from a world of poverty to the strange world of school, finds a system not designed for him, and from which most likely he will drop out.

The teenager who didn't learn a skill, who cannot find a job, who is tempted into criminal activities, has missed out on the individual chance.

The Negro child who may study and work but cannot find admission to a job is denied his individual chance.

The retarded child for whom there are no training programs has missed what little chance he might have had.

The older man, employed but unskilled for years, suddenly eased out by automation, missed his first chance and is now missing his last chance.

The talented and brilliant child, unchallenged, allowed to drift along in school, is missing his chance and the Nation is missing his services.

The ordinary student, who goes to an ordinary school, is going to miss his individual chance if his teachers are second rate, if his courses are out of date, if his choice of studies is sharply limited, if his school is less in quality than that of other students in other places with whom he must compete.

The good student who doesn't want to go to college is going to miss his chance if he cannot find technical and other post high school training.

The good student who would do good college work will be missing his individual chance if college is too remote, or too expensive.

These are individuals who will miss the individual chance, who might move on through life without ever having realized the dream of the "new and mighty world to be."

The way for the State to progress is for individuals to progress. The reason for the activities of the State is to help individuals find their chance.

North Carolina thinks this goal is worth the effort.

This is our mission, and we are seeking our mission through education.

I cite North Carolina as one example of what a State must do. Mainly, a State must take what it has, and start where it is, and dedicate itself to the task.

North Carolina has embarked upon the most ambitious program of public school improvement in the history of the State. For the first time we have put education first. It shows what the people will do. This was illustrated when our 1961 general assembly appropriated funds that raised North Carolina to first place in the Nation in the increase of educational expenditure over the previous biennium. New taxes were voted, too, and that is a real test of a sense of mission.

It is further illustrated by the fact that a few weeks ago the chairman of the State board of education appeared before the 1963 legislature to declare that he had no additional requests, that for the first time in the history of the State all of the school requests were contained in the recommended budget.

Considering total Government expenditures, only three States spend a greater percentage than does North Carolina on education.

We have substantially expanded our programs for retarded children, in and out of institutions, in and out of schools, and we expect to continue until these folks have their best individual chance.

We have started programs for gifted children, with over 2,000 enrolled last year, over 5,000 this year, and we expect to reach 50,000 within a few years. In addition this summer we will have, as an incentive for the talented child, a free summer school for 400, with no credit but with demanding work. This is financed by the Carnegie Foundation and other private sources, to help point the way for requiring the best of the best.

We are working with ways now to ease the bewilderment of the disadvantaged child.

To help meet the requirements of rapid industrial growth, to find a convenient opportunity for the unemployed to develop new skills, to pick up the dropouts, we have established 20 industrial education centers across the State, with the capacity to teach almost anything in almost any area. Last year 26,000 students benefited, and we are just beginning.

Salary raises for teachers and faculty members draw more people into the teaching profession, and keep more from leaving.

The legislature is now setting up a system of comprehensive community colleges that will reach all sections of the State, and will greatly expand the ability of the existing schools to provide educational opportunity of quality for our young people. We have completed and are now implementing by legislative and administrative action a far-reaching and comprehensive master plan for higher education.

I do not suggest that North Carolina has achieved everything, but I do suggest that the most effective starting point is the State—State government which reaches out and puts education in front.

If there is any story to report from North Carolina it is that the people will support advances in education when the question is put to them fairly and directly. The people will respond to the needs of education even against heavy odds and under adverse and difficult circumstances. This applies to every State. They will support it, pay for it, believe in it, promote it, and make it their mission as a people.

The people of North Carolina are doing this. Within their means they are providing the financial support, but more important they have given it their spirit.

All across the State teachers are working harder and students are understanding better than ever before the importance of education. Superintendents, principals, school board members, parents, college leaders, all understand that education is the path to progress, and all are caught up in the enthusiasm of making education the mission of our people.

It so happens that this also must be the mission for America. It so happens that this also must be the mission for the free world.

This is something new for us. We have been bent over pulling on our bootstraps so that our goals have had to be limited to part of America. We had regional problems, regional needs. When we talked of leadership we meant leadership of the South. When we spoke of striving to be the best, we were talking of the best in the South.

This is no longer true. We understand the mission. We are preparing to do our part in providing leadership for the Nation. We know something about depressed areas and our people will be helping in this country and in Latin America. We know something about disadvantaged people and our leaders will be helping in this country and in Africa. We know something about the value of giving everybody his best individual chance, and we know about the needs for schools. We know what happens when some of our people do not have that chance, and we are moving out to show the rest of the Nation that the solutions can be found.

We do have a mission. That mission is education.

TAPER-OFF SYSTEM—NORTH CAROLINA PRISON REFORM PROGRAM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, recently I called to the attention of the Senate a phase of North Carolina's progressive prison reform program, as reported in a news article by Robert Baker. Further recognition of this beneficial plan, which allows certain inmates to work in a free society by day, has come in an editorial that appeared in the April 11, 1963, edition of the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled, "Taper-Off System," which praises North Carolina's work release program, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Taper-Off System

North Carolina has rendered a great service to the science of penology by experimenting with a work-release program for prison inmates. The work-release idea goes a step further than the parole system, which makes it possible for a prisoner with a good record to be released before the termination of his sentence if he has a job and good prospects for staying out of trouble. Under the new plan worked out in North Carolina, a prisoner with a good record, who is serving 5 years or less, may work in private industry by day and return to prison at night.

The economies resulting from the plan are substantial. Instead of living in idleness at the expense of taxpayers, the prisoners released to work on the outside reimburse the State for their board and lodging, support their families and, in some instances build up trust funds that become available to them when they are finally discharged. Of much greater importance, however, is the rehabilitative effect upon the prisoners themselves.

As explained in a report from Raleigh by Robert E. Baker, of our staff, the North Carolina system holds out new hope to prisoners, and the 20 percent who are selected for the work-release privilege have the great advantage of a job and some adjustment to the outside world before they regain complete freedom. The reasoning behind the program starts with the fact that nearly all prisoners (97 percent in North Carolina) will be released sometime. The interests of both society and the prisoners are best served if they are allowed to demonstrate their ability to hold a job and live within the law before the expiration of their terms.

The day may come when all prison inmates will be required to test their stability through the work-release method before being paroled. If this taper-off system is coupled with compulsory schooling for the illiterates, vocational training, psychiatric counseling, and a rehabilitation program for alcoholics, the States may be able to reduce the population of their prisons as some have done with their mental hospitals.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY NEXT

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Under the order of Thursday last, the Senate is to stand adjourned until noon on Thursday of this week. Accordingly, the Senate is now adjourned.

So, at 1:30 p.m., under the order of Thursday last, the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 15, 1963:

Foreign Service

E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Libya.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister:

Aaron S. Brown, of New Hampshire.
Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana.
Fulton Freeman, of California.
Graham A. Martin, of Florida.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Manuel Frederick Cohen, of Maryland, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1968.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Frank E. Smith, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1972. (Reappointment.)

Civil Service Commission

L. J. Andolsek, of Minnesota, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1969, vice Frederick J. Lawton, term expired.

Bureau of Customs

Frank H. Tuohy, of New Jersey, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Cuba and Broken Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an article on U.S. foreign policy with regard to Cuban communism as prepared by Mr. Hugh J. Boyd, principal of Lake View High School in Lake View, S.C., in eloquently expressing his opinions in U.S. handling of the Cuban problem. Mr. Boyd has reflected much of the sentiment that I have detected among my constituents in South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an impressive column by Mr. Robert Morris, of Dallas, Tex., entitled "Broken Treaties"; and also my newsletter of April 8, 1963, which, like Mr. Boyd's article and Mr. Morris' column, is also on the subject of Cuba.

There being no objection, the article, column, and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE CUBA OF TYRANNY

(By Hugh J. Boyd)

It's time for us of the United States to stop our wrist-slapping of those Cubans who are making heroic efforts to destroy a few of the vermin who have occupied their homeland. Our own people constantly remind us that we might anger someone if we allow such activity to continue. Some say we must tread lightly or we will step on some little Red toe. We have heard so much of this that we are beginning to draw the conclusion that our country, the United States, is afraid to put its foot down anywhere for fear of its touching the ground. We are told it is better to wait.

What are we waiting for? When are we supposed to get mad? What side are we on anyway? Have we so perverted our sense of justice and reasoning that we now condemn those who would gladly strike for freedom, knowing full well the possible if not inevitable consequences? Have we forgotten the courage displayed by our own heroes who struck for freedom against overwhelming odds and won?

To those who say, "Oh, we must not let them do such things, the blood will be on our hands," we say, "On whose hands is the blood of all those who have died under the oppression in Cuba? Is it not already dripping from the hands of those who for reasons of poor judgment, or pure ignorance are responsible for the rise of Castro?" This we cannot justify, but we can certainly face up to our responsibility, admit a mistake, and make every attempt to free Cuba of its tyranny.

As to a fear of war, this seems stupid; for have not the little rats run for their holes each time their hand has been called? Certainly, no one wants to die, but neither does anyone want to survive in a living hell. This is the blueprint for us, the United States, for the Americas, and every time we give in, or back up, or fail to support those who fight hand-to-hand combat with the Communists, we are asking for just that living hell. Every time we show embarrassment at a mistake—or apologize as we withdraw from an impasse—the beady-eyed little tramps sharpen their teeth for a little larger bite—and lick their chops with a little more anticipation.

The Communists, as individuals, are a weak, slimy lot—the fishy handshakers. Certainly, they are devoted to their cause and collectively they are strong; individually they are cowards, losing themselves in a cause for the simple reason they lack the courage to face the world's problems as individuals. It's about time we reduced them to the sniveling, incipid denominator which is common to all of them; and if not actually act to annihilate, at least to aid and abet those who are devoted to that cause. It's time we pictured ourselves in the position of the Cubans for a few minutes with the stinging tears of anger and insult streaming down their faces, seeking only one thing in life; the privilege of going home to live in peace. We say that we cannot help them, in fact we say we must prevent such provocative attacks against those who occupy Cuba for we run the risk of starting a war.

Is there one among us who believes that if the Communists believed that they could destroy us that they would hesitate one minute with or without provocation, or righteous justification? To whom do they have to answer, or to whom must they plead for mercy for such a sin against mankind? They know no God. There is no consciousness of right or wrong, only that which says "we can win, or we can lose," which would serve to stay their execution of us in their distorted "hall of justice."

Make no mistake, when the Communists think they can win, they will strike; until then, and this need not ever be if we seize the initiative, they will continue to head for the ratholes when we show the necessary determination. Of course, they will continue to gnaw away at our freedoms while still "holed up," creating new pockets of resistance which we must also ferret out and destroy. Give them no peace anywhere.

The dictates of commonsense demand that we take cognizance of the fact that we are losing a war; that there are those who sincerely want to win in their struggle for freedom. We must help them, but more than this, we must realize that we, you and I, are much more involved in international affairs than were our predecessors when entering World War I and World War II; and yet we are still sitting on our too-wide "dead ends," doing absolutely nothing.

It is time the United States set its foot down, and, if necessary, make the whole of South America shake with its thunder. When the "commies" set tail and run from there, follow them to their nests, ferret them out, and make them continue until they are again back in their own paradise with Niki or Maw. There is certainly such a thing as righteous anger.

BROKEN TREATIES

(By Robert Morris)

There was a day when the image we cast around the world was the subject of deep preoccupation on the part of our leaders. If this were so today the mood of those concerned would be one of abject shame.

A few years ago our present Chief Executive complained that we were not sufficiently helping Cuban exiles to restore freedom to their homeland. Later he stated that we could not tolerate a Soviet satellite on our doorstep.

The spectacle for all to see today is that we are indeed tolerating a Soviet satellite at our doorstep. Dramatizing that abject fact, we are conspicuously apprehending, even illegally, not the Castro agents who are radiating from Cuba to destroy freedom in Latin America but the Cuban exiles who aspire to free their homeland.

How dread must this spectacle appear to the people of Central and South America, the next targets of Castro and Khrushchev, particularly in the light of other reflections of the underlying abject mood?

The legal framework that solemnly exists today is clear. Not only do we have the Monroe Doctrine but it has been specifically implemented by the treaties of Rio de Janeiro, Caracas and Punta del Este. These are serious treaties under which we pledged to eradicate not only Soviet power but Soviet ideology from the hemisphere. A Soviet beachhead is proscribed. We are expressly committed by these solemn pacts not to tolerate it, coexist with it or guarantee its integrity. Yet we are patently flouting these compacts.

The Cuban exiles, on the other hand, apparently take the solemnity of these OAS treaties seriously and we now know what is in store for them. We even seize them, and have them seized, in international waters without waiting until they come within our territorial waters.

Of course despair prevails among the Cubans. To show how deeply committed to this illegel posture, emotionally, our State Department people are, they even smear, with dishonorable leaks to the press, the leader of the Cubans in exile.

As if to mock the folly of this Cuban performance, the similar mood of surrender that we engaged in with respect to Laos is now turning into a possible disaster.

In Laos, as in Cuba, to induce Khrushchev to keep his word we pressured General Nosavan's forces, the loyal Laotians, to cease resistance to the Communists and enter into a Soviet-leaning coalition government, on the troika basis.

The pro-Western forces withdrew militarily, according to their pledges. The pro-Soviet forces, reflecting their nature, not only did not withdraw from strategic positions but aggressively moved forward, with augmented strength, from North Vietnam.

Now Secretary Dean Rusk complains that the Communists are not keeping their word. In other words in 1963 he is still attributing to them what have been our standards and our meaning of "keeping one's word." The Communist meaning of a treaty is officially set forth—and put to practice thousands of times—"treaties like pie crusts, are made only to be broken." They will keep a pledge only as long as it serves their purpose.

But an even more chilling spectacle can be found by looking ahead. If we, by our example and by our flouting of protective treaties, continue to crush resistance to Soviet power in Latin America, one country after another will topple. Strategic Brazil and British Guiana are already well on the way.

Castro's agents are moving aggressively ahead. When the leaders of Central America showed signs of taking protective action against Soviet power, our Chief Executive went there to discourage them, promising nevertheless to aid them in stopping subversion.

The subversion—even sabotage—however, continues. Our State Department is not lifting a finger. No, I am wrong, they are lifting a finger—a forbidding finger but the finger is directed at Frances Knight, the competent head of the Passport Division of the State Department who wants to deny passports to Soviet agents going abroad to further world communism.

As we have pointed out, previously, Miss Knight has testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that her superiors forced her to issue passports to 547 persons she knew to be Communists, who were going abroad, obviously to subvert.

The conditioned American who does not seem to be disturbed at the prospect of a Communist Latin America should think twice when he beholds the trend toward control over our destiny by the United Nations. There we of the West are a minority today. But if we lose the supporting Latin American bloc that makes us somewhat respectable in this minority position, we will be almost alone, surrounded by our enemies, but this time—helpless.

A Choice for Americans

(By Senator Strom Thurmond)

The raids carried out by Cuban exiles against Castro and Russian Communist forces in Cuba have inspired a reaction of official displeasure from the United States. U.S. reaction has been expressed in both action and words. The action has been in the form of arrests of some Cubans in the United States suspected of participating in the raids. Verbally, the United States has officially characterized the raids as irrational.

The actions taken by the United States may have less effect on the Cuban raiders than the raiders themselves have on the combined Castro-Soviet military grip on Cuba. The raiders, so far as is known, do not operate directly from U.S. soil. Those not arrested have announced their intention of continuing their anti-Communist raids.

Verbal expressions of displeasure unleashed by U.S. officials against the Cuban raiders may, in the long run, have a far graver significance than the official U.S. actions, for they will surely be interpreted as an indicator of U.S. policy toward all those who rise up in arms against their Communist captors and rulers.

The Cuban raiders have been labeled "irrational" by State Department spokesmen. However badly the actions of the Cuban raiders may conflict with real or imagined U.S. interests, the charging of Cuban raiders with irrationality ill becomes Americans, of all people.

Cuban refugees have lost much, including their homes, their jobs, friends, loved ones, and above all, their liberty. Political asylum in a foreign land is no substitute. Having lost virtually all else, is it "irrational" for them now to risk their lives, even against hopeless odds, when there appears no other hope that their country will soon escape the terror, hunger, and captivity of Communist tyranny? After all, it is a fact that no country which has been taken behind the Iron Curtain has ever been freed, and the United States has never supported any movements toward liberation.

The Cuban raiders are by no means the first men to gamble against seemingly hopeless odds to gain liberty. Almost 187 years ago, other men, against almost equally hopeless odds, undertook to free their country from foreign tyranny, and to this end, they pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. To American patriots in 1776, there was no other honorable course. So it may seem to Cuban refugees today.

The Cubans are not alone in their plight, however. Millions in eastern Europe, in the Balkan states, in Korea, on the mainland of China, even in non-Russian areas of the U.S.S.R. itself, are suffering from the same tyranny. There are those among these peoples who may again reach the limit of their endurance and conclude that they have no other honorable course but to rise up against hopeless odds.

Would the official reaction of the U.S. Government to such an uprising be condemnation for "irrationality?" Were the uprisings in East Germany 1953 "irrational?" Was the uprising in Hungary in 1956 an example of "irrational" conduct? Both these events caused a crisis in relations between the Communists and the free world. According to our policymakers, had the United States actively supported these uprisings, or even threatened to interfere with Soviet efforts to crush the uprisings, there would have been a risk of escalation into general war. For those who participated in the uprisings, the risk was already total—and most of them paid with their lives, either in the fighting, or in the executions which followed.

For the United States to aline itself with the aspirations of captive peoples for liberty involves a risk. It has been and is official U.S. policy to discourage "nonevolutionary changes" in Communist-held countries in hope of minimizing the risk of war to the United States. It also keeps us on the defensive against the constant efforts of the Communists to continue extending their tyranny worldwide.

Captive people all over the world will recognize in the charge of "irrationality" against Cuban raiders the U.S. policy of minimizing the risk—to Americans. Indeed, it may for them be the "convincer" that captive peoples can never hope to gain American support for their liberty hopes, and trigger against Communist rulers uprisings born of the belief that the future holds no better odds for throwing off the tyranny of communism than the present. At some such point, all Americans, and not just their policymakers, must face the sober choice—to minimize the risks to ourselves, or like our ancestors, to pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor to the cause of liberty.

SENATE

Thursday, April 18, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. John H. Ristow, pastor, Seymour Avenue Methodist Church, Lansing, Mich., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, we stand before Thee in reverence and humility, acknowledging Thee as the Creator and sustainer of a universe in which goodness cannot die, or truth be eclipsed in darkness.

May Thy divine guidance direct today's deliberations and the decisions that shall be made.

Especially in these restless and troubled times, give each of us the awareness of our responsibility to the great heritage which has given this land her place of leadership in all the world.

Continue in us the unselfish desire to serve our fellow men in the spirit of the Galilean, that peace on earth and good will to all men shall become the living truth among men everywhere.

To Thy glory in the name of the living Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 15, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

The Food Stamp Act of 1963

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Addition of Certain Lands to Cache National Forest, Utah

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to add certain lands to the Cache National Forest, Utah (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Air Force Military Construction Contracts Awarded Without Formal Advertising

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded by that Department without formal advertising, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on Review of Causes of Overpayments of Military Pay and Allowances, Department of Defense

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of causes of overpayments of military pay and allowances, Department of Defense, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Followup Review of Supply Management of Selected Radio Communication Sets Within the Department of the Air Force

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the followup review of supply management of selected radio communication sets within the Department of the Air Force, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reimbursement to Owners and Tenants of Certain Lands

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interests therein acquired by the United States for certain moving expenses and losses and damages, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint Resolution 7A

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to extend the coverage of the Farmers Home Administration for recreational enterprises to include resort owners

"Whereas the resort owners find it difficult to obtain a loan in amounts sufficient to upgrade and expand present facilities at reasonable rates of interest; and

"Whereas Professor Fine's survey of the resort industry indicates that the earnings of resort owners is below the average income of tradesmen; and

"Whereas Wisconsin is endowed with many fine natural resources which need further development in order to improve the State's economy and thereby make the northern part of Wisconsin more self-sufficient; and

"Whereas the resort operation is so closely allied to the basic objectives of the Farmers Home Administration that it seems logical to extend its privileges to the resort owners: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly* (*the senate concurring*), That the Wisconsin Legislature memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend the coverage of the recreational loan program of the Farmers Home Administration to include resort owners; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this joint resolution be submitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, and to each Member of the Wisconsin delegation to Congress.

"Jack B. Olson,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Lawrence R. Larsen,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
"Robert Haase,
"*Speaker of the Assembly.*
"Kenneth E. Priche,
"*Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Joint Resolution 57A

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to appropriate funds to construct a regional dairy cattle forage utilization research laboratory by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and locate it at or near Madison, Wis., and the University of Wisconsin.

"Whereas the dairy industry is currently suffering from low returns to producers, and must meet increased competition from other foods; and

"Whereas one of the ways to attack this problem is to decrease the cost of producing milk; and

"Whereas the proposed regional dairy cattle laboratory would have for its purpose both basic and applied research in such important areas as:

"1. Improving the handling, preservation and utilization of forages—the principal and most economical feed for dairy cattle.

"2. Studying bacterial, chemical and physiological processes of digestion in cattle and their role in forage utilization.

"3. Studying the effect of forage-concentrate ratios on production costs, milk yields and milk composition.

"4. Developing modern feeding standards for dairy cattle, as many of our present-day guides and standards were developed nearly a half century ago and are no longer adequate in modern dairying.

"5. Determining the genetic factors influencing the capacity of dairy cattle to convert forages to milk.

"6. Developing feeding and management practices that will reduce production costs and increase farm incomes; and

"Whereas the Midwest is the largest and one of the mostly highly developed dairy areas in the country and is also the area where the lowest milk prices prevail; and

"Whereas Wisconsin with 12 percent of the Nation's dairy cattle, produces 15 percent of the milk, far outranking any other State; and

"Whereas Federal scientists could join with university scientists in several strong, related departments in both applied and basic research; and

"Whereas Wisconsin is the largest producer of forages for dairy cattle and has long been active in improving forages for dairy feed; and

"Whereas the proposed dairy cattle research laboratory will not compete with current programs, but will substantially strengthen them: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly* (*the senate concurring*), That the Wisconsin Legislature memorializes the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds to construct a regional dairy cattle forage utilization research laboratory by the U.S. Department of Agriculture at or near Madison, Wis., and the University of Wisconsin; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this joint resolution be submitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of the Wisconsin delegation to Congress.

"Jack B. Olson,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Lawrence R. Larsen,
"*Chief Clerk of the Senate.*
"Robert Haase,
"*Speaker of the Assembly.*
"Kenneth E. Priche,
"*Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*"

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Orange County, Santa Ana, Calif., relating to the classification of Orange County as a separate standard metropolitan area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RESOLUTIONS OF IOWA BEEF PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, and appropriately referred, a series of resolutions adopted by the Iowa Beef Producers Association at their annual meeting in Des Moines, Iowa.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolutions Passed by the Iowa Beef Producers at Their Annual Meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, March 27, 1963

I. IMPORTS

Resolved, That the Iowa Beef Producers Association go on record to support a program to decrease imports of beef as domestic supplies increase and bring about unfavorable lower prices for beef.

Whereas Iowa produces more pounds of beef for slaughter than any other State, we feel we should be considered and respectfully heard; and

Whereas imports for 1962 increased 50 percent over 1961, we feel this is a tremendous factor in the drop in cattle prices today. It is reported in December alone beef imports into this country amounted to nearly 11 percent of the domestic supply. This is a staggering amount and would be a big factor in helping our market prices drop; and

Whereas we recognize trade is needed to improve the world economy we feel we are being hurt by the increasing tonnage of beef entering this country: We hereby

Resolve, That we as individuals and members of the Iowa Beef Producers Association that a program be developed to decrease imports immediately as domestic supplies increase and the trend of lower prices exists.

II. DUAL GRADING

Resolved, That the Iowa Beef Producers Association go on record of reaffirming their position opposing dual grading.

Whereas Iowa is the top producer of quality corn-fed beef, it is important that we maintain the wonderful image of beef; and

Whereas it is doubtful if the consumer will realize any benefit or advantage from this system; and

Whereas it increases the cost and the beef producer cannot afford any additional hidden costs in merchandising his product; and

Whereas it will discourage heavy grain feeding to cattle and this will tend to increase our huge supplies of corn that we produce so abundantly here in the Corn Belt: We hereby

Resolve, That we as individuals and members of the Iowa Beef Producers Association do now strenuously reaffirm our opposition to dual grading. We, as producers and feeders here in Iowa have much at stake in changing anything that will affect the appeal of beef to the consumer.

III. EXPENSE ACCOUNTS

Resolved, That the Iowa Beef Producers Association go on record as demanding more clarification and general understanding of "expense accounts" ruling; and

Whereas Iowa is the prime beef center of the world we are directly affected by this ruling; and

Whereas hotels, restaurants and institutional trade are big customers of top-grade beef, we are concerned by their declining business; and

Whereas there is a question in the minds of many cattle feeders that there is much misunderstanding on this "Federal expense account" ruling: We hereby

Resolve, That the Federal Government present more clarification and understanding of the "Federal expense account."

IV. WHOLESALE AND RETAIL BEEF PRICES

Resolved, That the Iowa Beef Producers Association go on record as wanting to know why the spread in live beef prices and retail prices; and

Whereas the wholesale prices of choice carcass beef have dropped from 47 to 37 cents in recent weeks. To date this drop in price has not been reflected to the consumer and live cattle prices have dropped far below cost of production; and

Whereas in view of this situation, the Iowa Beef Producers Association asks the following questions:

1. Why have the major food chains failed in recent weeks to feature beef?
2. Why has no organization, on a State and National level, developed a program to sell beef and help the present price situation?

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1328. A bill for the relief of Woo Zee-Ching; and

S. 1329. A bill for the relief of Han Ah Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1330. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1331. A bill to assist individuals to obtain retirement benefits protected against increases in the cost of living by providing for the issuance by the Treasury of a new series of bonds containing adjustments, under certain conditions, in maturity and redemption values to compensate for increases in the cost of living which may be purchased by individuals and eligible institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1332. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Leitzel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1333. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Shek Mah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. HART, and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 1334. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1335. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1336. A bill to provide that the price at which the Coast and Geodetic Survey sells radio avigation charts and certain related material to the public shall not be less than the cost thereof; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1337. A bill for the relief of Frank Mramor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STRENGTHENING PRESIDENTIAL POWERS TO DEAL WITH NATIONAL LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to give the President of the United States new, and, in my opinion, critically necessary, powers to assert the public interest in labor disputes of a national character and labor disputes which threaten to imperil the national health and safety.

The proposed legislation would:

First. Authorize the President to appoint a board of inquiry to make recommendations for a settlement, in addition to factfinding.

Second. Authorize the President to order a 30-day freeze, during which both parties would be under a duty to bargain upon the recommendations, even though neither party is required to accept the recommendations.

Third. Authorize the President to seek appointment by a Federal court of a special receiver to operate such struck facilities, which in the opinion of the court are necessary to protect the national health or safety.

The bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act.

This legislation is designed to reflect a growing consensus that we must have an established procedure to assert the public interest in major and critical labor disputes.

The Taft-Hartley Act has proved to be an inadequate instrument for this purpose even where the national interest is seriously jeopardized. The administration is forced to rely now upon a procedure which is one of inadequacy and improvisation. I believe we must give the President greater flexibility and new tools to safeguard more effectively the public interest while at the same time providing maximum freedom for collective bargaining.

The statistics bear out our faith in and reliance on the collective bargaining process in a quantitative sense. Man-days of production lost through strikes shows a steadily declining curve: 1.43 percent of total working time in 1946; 0.29 percent in 1956; 0.16 percent in 1962. Since the tumultuous pioneering days of the 1930's, labor and management have slowly, often painfully, worked out techniques of negotiation and resolution of differences under our Federal labor relations statutes. Each is rightly proud of its record; each is rightly apprehensive of unwarranted outside interference.

But the disruption and danger of key work stoppages in critical industries, and services, in communications, transportation, and utilities and in defense industries has become constantly more concerning. This is the public interest which requires new safeguards and new techniques. Disputes which can halt production of steel and basic metals, defense items, fuels and foods, or disrupt our communications can endanger our national health or safety.

In such disputes, the National Labor Relations Act does not provide sufficient safeguards of the public interest. Indeed, it is precisely because of the deficiencies and omissions of these statutes that we seem to be in an era of continuing labor-management crisis, each separate crisis having to be dealt with on an emergency basis in a climate of haste and high emotional feeling. This pattern scarcely contributes constructively to developing the orderly, rational, and objective policy which is necessary to meet the threat to the paramount public interest. What is needed is impartial and objective statutory direction to the parties to the dispute and to the Executive, representing the public interest.

I am putting forward this plan to consider properly the public interest in national strikes as a tried friend of labor. I deeply believe that labor is challenged in this field as never before, and it represents a real opportunity for labor statesmanship. There are certain labor disputes in which the national interest is so deeply involved that they just cannot be fought out to a conclusion by a trial of strength. The people have to have some way to assert their interest through government. It is for this reason that I believe the process of recommendations by a fact-finding board appointed by the President, with a stand-still period during which these recommendations must be considered, is the best plan. The element of compulsion is not invoked except that compulsion which is even more effective—that is, the public being advised of what is a fair settlement and then being able to bring its weight to bear on both management and labor to see that a settlement is made. When this is coupled with some ultimate seizure right, which means that at no time can the government be paralyzed, I believe we have a plan to deal with major strikes that takes us about as far as we can go without inhibiting fundamental freedoms or taking punitive action against unions or employers.

The bill amends section 206 of the National Labor Relations Act to read as follows:

> Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States, after consultation with the Director, a threatened or actual strike or lockout or other labor dispute affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, may, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the

> dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including each party's statement of its own position, and shall, if the President so directs at any time, make recommendations in such a report or in a supplemental report for the settlement of some or all of the issues in dispute.
>
> Upon receiving a report of a supplementary report from a board of inquiry which contains recommendations for the settlement of some or all of the issues in dispute the President may direct that for a specified period not to exceed 30 days no change in the conditions out of which the dispute arose shall be made by the parties to the dispute, except by agreement. During such period the parties to the dispute shall be under a duty to bargain with respect to the recommendations for settlement of the board of inquiry, but neither party shall be under a duty to accept in whole or in part any such recommendations.

Under current law, a Presidential board of inquiry reports on the facts in a dispute, but is specifically prevented from making recommendations for settlement.

The amendment providing for possible seizure authorizes the President to go into Federal court to seek "appointment of a special receiver to take immediate possession in the name of the United States of any plant, mine, or other facility which is the subject of such labor dispute and to use and operate such plant, mine, or other facility in the interests of the United States; and if the court finds that the exercise of the power and authority provided by this section is necessary to preserve and protect the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to appoint such a special receiver and to make such other orders as may be appropriate."

The amendment further provides that such operation by the special receiver is for the account of the employer, but the employer may elect to waive all claims to the proceeds of the receiver's operation and receive instead fair and reasonable rent for the facilities as long as the court deems necessary but no later than 30 days after restoration of labor relations between the parties to the dispute.

The purpose of this legislation, is to recognize and reaffirm the paramount, overriding public interest in the continued effective operation of facilities necessary to protect and preserve the national health and safety.

The bill leaves unchanged the 80-day injunction provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, except for technical amendments. I recognize the pro and con arguments on the 80-day injunction, but it is consistent with my bill in that neither adopts the principle of compulsory arbitration.

The bill would not cover such strikes as the recent New York City newspaper strike, which could not be considered a dispute affecting the national health and safety. However, this bill, in the provision for public recommendations for settlement, could serve as a model for State legislation, which might under specific conditions be applied to a newspaper strike.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1330) to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be permitted to have the bill he introduced today remain at the desk for a week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTANT PURCHASING POWER BONDS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue "constant purchasing power bonds."

The purpose of this bill, which is explained in its title, is to protect the future retirement income of individuals from the possible ravages of inflation.

This would be accomplished by allowing them to purchase bonds from the Treasury, the face value of which would be adjusted to keep pace with any subsequent increases in the cost of living.

The result would be that a dollar saved during the working years, would still be worth a dollar—in terms of purchasing power—in retirement. It would mean protection to those living on fixed incomes from the eroding effect of inflation.

Under my bill, individuals and eligible institutions, such as pension plans and insurance companies, also could buy these bonds with certain limitations on amounts.

The cost-of-living protection provision would remain in force only if the bonds were kept until the person reached the age of 60, with certain exceptions such as death or disability. Pension plans and insurance companies would have to retain the bonds for 20 years. The bonds would bear the same interest rate as other savings bonds.

While I am submitting a detailed analysis of my proposal along with the bill, I would just like to point out that individuals could purchase up to $10,000 worth of constant purchasing power bonds a year, with total holdings limited to $60,000.

At the age of 60, the bonds could be redeemed at face value, plus any adjustments due to any increase in the cost of living between the date of purchase and the date of redemption.

Mr. President, this concept of a financial instrument providing constant purchasing power is not new. It has been used extensively in several countries of the world, both by Governments and private institutions, for many years.

A few of the countries where this concept has been used—successfully—include Finland, Sweden, Iceland, Israel, France, Chile, Mexico, and the Peoples Republic of China.

This concept was one of the basic recommendations of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and the Aging, of which I was chairman from 1959 to 1961.

In 1961, the Special Committee on Aging engaged Dr. Joseph Seidenberg, a consulting economist with impressive credentials, to study this proposal. Dr. Seidenberg's findings were published by the Special Committee on Aging.

I first introduced this bill in 1960, and reintroduced it in 1961 because I believe it would go a long way toward meeting some of the inadequacies of the present social security benefits and pension plans.

I should like to examine, briefly, some of the principal arguments that have been raised against this proposal by the Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and other opponents.

In a report to the chairman of the Committee on Finance, dated August 7, 1961, the Treasury Department raised three principal objections to S. 2181, the constant purchasing power bill I introduced in the 87th Congress.

First, said the Treasury Department, adoption of this proposal would be a tacit acceptance by the Government of the inevitability of inflation.

It would be an admission by the Government that it could not control inflation, and, as such, would increase the strength of inflationary forces.

This same argument—which I regard as specious—could be used against efforts to correct any social or economic ill, such as programs to alleviate unemployment or combat juvenile delinquency.

The answer to this argument, it seems to me, is that while the Government does have a duty to try to keep the dollar stable, the Government also has a responsibility to protect the thrifty retiree, who has saved for his old age, from the ravages of inflation.

As Dr. Seidenberg pointed out in his report to the Special Committee on Aging:

> The introduction of a constant purchasing power bond is but a recognition of an almost incontrovertible fact—a gradual increase in the price level (and) little likelihood of the trend being reversed in the foreseeable future.

As a matter of fact, the issuance of a security with a price index feature could equally well be interpreted as a statement of faith and confidence on the part of the Government that it can and will control inflation. Otherwise, it would not undertake to assume this potential liability.

Secondly, the opponents of this proposal argue that since these bonds would be offered only to one segment of the economy—the potential retirees in the work force—it would constitute unreasonable discrimination against other groups in the population. In other words, protection for one group would be offered at the expense of the general public.

The answer here, it seems to me, is that this Government quite often has recognized the need to pay unusual attention to certain groups within the general public that are in need of special protection.

This is why we have child labor laws. And it is one of the reasons why the Congress and the President have paid increasing attention in recent years to the special problems of the growing elderly sector of our population.

I might point out, also, that the argument of selectivity did not bother the Congress last year when it adopted special legislation benefiting the self-employed and their retirement programs.

In any event, participation in the program I propose would be open to everyone.

One of the reasons we need this program is that we have a constantly increasing number of senior citizens, who are living longer after retirement from gainful employment, and who are without adequate assets or income for their longer life span.

We are, indeed, giving this sector of our population special attention, but only because the need for it is so apparent.

Thirdly, the opponents of my bill argue that this program would drive existing Government savings bonds off the market.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that past campaigns to promote sales of existing Government savings bonds have not been very successful. Dr. Seidenberg, in his report to the Committee on Aging, points out that at no time during the 10-year period, 1950–60, did sales of savings bonds exceed redemption, including earned interest.

This would indicate to me that wage earners and middle-income salaried persons already are quite aware of the inflation-eroded purchasing power of savings bonds.

Other objections of a less substantial nature have been raised. All of them are answerable.

In conclusion, I would say that a constant purchasing power bond program would be a firm step toward meeting one of the most important problems in the area of retirement income security—a problem that will increase in dimensions in the years ahead as the number of aged and aging Americans inevitably increases.

Each year, this proposal has drawn increased attention, and I am hopeful that this year it will receive the additional serious study it deserves.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be placed in the Record a detailed analysis and the complete text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1331) to assist individuals to obtain retirement benefits protected against increases in the cost of living by providing for the issuance by the Treasury of a new series of bonds containing adjustments, under certain conditions, in maturity and redemption values to compensate for increases in the cost of living which may be purchased by individuals and eligible institutions, introduced by Mr. McNamara, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 26. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue, for purchase only by individuals and eligible institutions (as defined in subsection (b)(2)), United States bonds which shall, in the manner and to the extent provided by this section, compensate the holders of such bonds for increases in the cost of living occurring after the date of purchase of such bonds. The various issues and series of bonds issued under the authority of this section shall be in such forms, shall be offered in such amounts (subject to the limitation imposed by section 21 of this Act), and shall be issued in such manner and subject to such terms and conditions consistent with this section, as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time prescribe. Except as otherwise provided in this section, bonds issued under authority of this section for purchase by individuals shall be subject to all provisions of law (including this Act) applicable in the case of bonds issued under authority of section 22 of this Act, and bonds issued for purchase by eligible institutions shall be subject to all provisions of law (including this Act) applicable in the case of bonds issued under authority of the first section of this Act.

"(b) For purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'approved pension or profit-sharing plan' means a pension plan, or a profit-sharing plan the primary purpose of which is to provide retirement benefits for employees and benefits for their beneficiaries, which—

"(A) meets the requirements of sections 401(a) (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and

"(B) is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, under regulations prescribed by him, as providing satisfactory periodical adjustments of benefits under such plan to compensate for increases in the cost of living. The adjustments under subparagraph (B) must be required under the plan to be made at least annually and not more frequently than quarterly.

"(2) The term 'eligible institution' means—

"(A) a trust described in section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code which is a part of a pension or profit-sharing plan of an employer, and

"(B) a life insurance company (as defined in section 801(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) which has obligations under contracts described in sections 805(d)(1) (A), (B), (C), and (D) of such Code.

"(c) Bonds issued under authority of subsection (a)—

"(1) may be issued on an interest-bearing basis or, in the case of bonds issued for purchase by individuals, on a discount basis or on a combination interest-bearing and discount basis;

"(2) shall mature twenty years from the date as of which issued;

"(3) shall be sold at such price or prices, and may be redeemed before maturity, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe;

"(4) shall provide an interest rate (or in the case of bonds issued at a discount, an investment yield) which is the same as that provided for savings bonds issued under section 22 of this Act;

"(5) shall be issued in such denominations, expressed in terms of their maturity values, as the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time determines fulfills the needs of individuals and eligible institutions;

"(6) may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President, be retained after maturity by their owners and continue to yield interest at rates consistent with the provisions of paragraph (4);

"(7) shall be nontransferable; and

"(8) may be purchased only by or for individuals and eligible institutions.

"(d)(1) The amount of bonds issued under authority of subsection (a) which may be purchased by or for an individual in any one year shall not exceed $10,000 (computed with respect to the issue price). The total amount of such bonds which may be held by or for an individual at any time shall not exceed $60,000 (computed with respect to the issue price).

"(2) The total face amount of bonds issued under authority of subsection (a) which may be held at any time by an eligible institution shall not exceed—

"(A) in the case of an eligible institution which is a trust described in section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, an amount (determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury) necessary to meet obligations of the trust under an approved pension or profit-sharing plan; and

"(B) in the case of an eligible institution which is a life insurance company, an amount equal to the pension plan reserves which are allocable to contracts described in sections 805(d)(1) (A), (B), (C), and (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which are purchased or provided under an approved pension or profit-sharing plan.

"(e)(1) Subject to the conditions prescribed in paragraphs (2) and (3), upon the surrender at or after maturity, or upon redemption before maturity, of a bond issued under authority of subsection (a), of the Consumer Price Index (as published by the Secretary of Labor) for the month preceding the month in which such bond is surrendered or redeemed exceeds the Consumer Price Index for the month in which such bond was issued, there shall be paid to the holder of such bond (in lieu of the amount otherwise payable with respect to such bond without regard to the provisions of this paragraph) an amount determined—

"(A) by multiplying the amount otherwise payable with respect to such bond by the Consumer Price Index for the month preceding the month in which such bond is surrendered or redeemed, and

"(B) by dividing the product obtained under subparagraph (A) by the Consumer Price Index for the month in which such bond was issued.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to a bond purchased by or for an individual only if such individual—

"(A) before the month in which such bond is surrendered or redeemed, has attained the age of sixty years or has died after attaining the age of sixty years, or

"(B) after the purchase of such bond, has become disabled or has died after becoming disabled.

For purposes of this paragraph, in the case of a bond purchased by or for two individuals as joint owners or as coowners, any condition prescribed in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be satisfied with respect to such bond if such condition is satisfied by either of such individuals. For purposes of subparagraph (B), an individual shall be considered to be disabled only if he is unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of a medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration, and if proof of the existence thereof is furnished in such form and manner as the Secretary of the Treasury may require.

"(3) Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to a bond purchased by an eligible institution only if—

"(A) such bond is held to maturity, or

"(B) in the case of a bond redeemed before maturity, the eligible institution establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that such redemption is necessary to enable the eligible institution to fulfill obligations described in subsection (d)(2)(A) or contracts described in subsection (d)(2)(B)."

Sec. 2. Section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of this section, the face amount of obligations issued under authority of section 26 shall be determined without regard to the provisions of subsection (e) of such section."

The analysis presented by Mr. McNamara is as follows:

Analysis of the McNamara Purchasing Power Bond Bill

Section 1 of the bill adds a new section, section 26, to the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Subsection (a) of the new section authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to issue purchasing power bonds subject, unless otherwise provided for in the bill, to the provisions of existing law.

Subsection (b) defines the pension and profit-sharing plans, and the institutions which are eligible to purchase the bonds, and requires that, in case of profit-sharing and pension plans, periodical adjustments be made in the paid-out benefits for the purpose of compensating for increases in the cost of living.

Subsection (c) states that the bonds to be issued—

1. May be interest-bearing (coupon) or discount type, or a combination of the two.
2. Shall mature in 20 years.
3. May be redeemed before maturity.
4. Shall bear interest rates identical with the going rate of interest on ordinary savings bonds.
5. Their denominations shall be geared to the needs of the purchasing individuals and institutions.
6. May be retained after maturity.
7. Shall be nontransferable.
8. May be purchased only by or for individuals and eligible institutions.

Subsection (d) limits the amount of purchasing power bonds that may be purchased by individuals to $10,000 annually, and the total holdings of individuals to $60,000 (both figures computed on the basis of purchase price); it also limits the purchase by, and holdings of, eligible institutions to amounts required to back their obligations under the pension and profit-sharing plans under their management.

Subsection (e) provides for the calculation of the cost-of-living adjustments in the face value of the bonds; it also specifies that such adjustments are to be made in case of individual holders only if the holders have either reached the age of 60 or have become permanently disabled, and in case of institutions only if the bonds are held to maturity or, if redeemed before maturity, if such redemption is necessary to enable the institutions to meet their obligations under the plans under their management.

Section 2 of the bill states that, for purposes of calculating the statutory debit limit, the face amount of the bonds—before cost-of-living adjustments—shall be considered the amount outstanding.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators Humphrey, Morse, Clark, Engle, Hart, and McNamara, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until April 26, so that other Senators may join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 1334) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SALE OF CERTAIN CHARTS AND MATERIAL BY COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], a bill to amend the act of January 12, 1895, dealing with printing of public documents, by requiring that charts and reference material for radio avigation be sold to the public at not less than cost. The factors to be included in the computation of cost are delineated in the bill, and include cost of paper and printing, expenses incurred in actual reproduction of the charts after the original cartography, such as photography, opaquing, platemaking, press time and bindery operations, and the full postage rates applicable. It would also allow the Secretary of Commerce to add any cost factors deemed appropriate by him, such as overhead and administrative expenses allocable to the production of the material covered by the bill.

I feel that such a measure is required because our Government, for the last several years, has been in direct competition with private enterprise in this particular field, competing, with the help of Federal subsidy, with an established, reliable private company. I speak of the company involved as being established and reliable from my own personal knowledge. I have visited the facilities of the company, and I have known the founder and president for a great many years. I am well aware also of the importance of high quality avigational material because of my own wartime experience in the U.S. Air Force, and I can state that Jeppesen & Co. meets the highest standards of quality in its field.

Under the act which I seek to amend, the Government may sell, and does sell radio avigation aids for the cost of the printing and paper alone. Clearly this does not reflect the true cost of such material, and obviously when Government puts out a service available to the public at a figure far below its true cost, and a private company is also engaged in furnishing the same service, that company simply cannot compete. In the last session of Congress, the Coast and Geodetic Survey asked for $693,000 not only to continue its unfair competition with private enterprise, but to expand such competition. The increased amount asked was not granted, the Subcommittee on Appropriations having recommended against the increase with the statement, "The committee continues to approve the general policy that it is unwise to put the Federal Government in competition with private business."

As a result of the attention focused on the problem, however, a committee headed by Thomas H. Carroll, president of George Washington University, was appointed by Mr. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, with the concurrence of FAA, to study governmental aeronautical charting activities with particular reference to the respective roles of Government and private enterprise. The report of that committee was released by the Commerce Department on March 6, 1963. The bill which I introduce today is based on the recommendations contained in that report. It is not intended to eliminate Government participation in the field of radio aeronautical charting and avigation aids, but will tend to bring the cost of Government charts more nearly in line with the realistic cost and thereby effect a saving to the taxpayers of substantial sums annually.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Sparkman in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1336) to provide that the price at which the Coast and Geodetic Survey sells radio avigation charts and certain related material to the public shall not be less than the cost thereof, introduced by Mr. Allott (for himself and Mr. Kuchel), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 76 of the Act entitled "An Act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents", approved January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 620; 44 U.S.C, sec. 246) as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "practicable" the following: "except that charts and reference material for radio navigation shall be sold to the public at not less than the cost thereof. The Secretary of Commerce, shall, by regulation, from time to time, but not less than once in each calendar year establish the price at which such charts and reference material for radio navigation shall be sold to the public. Such price shall include in addition to the cost of paper and printing, the following: all expenses incurred in actual reproduction of the charts after the original cartography, such as photography, opaquing, platemaking, press time, and bindery operations; the full postage rates, according to the public rates for postal services used; and any additional cost factors deemed appropriate by the Secretary, such as overhead and administrative expenses allocable to the production of the aforesaid charts and reference materials: *Provided, however,* That the costs of basic surveys and geodetic work done by the Coast and and Geodetic Survey shall not be included in establishing the price of such charts and reference materials."

WATER RESEARCH CENTERS AT LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND STATE UNIVERSITIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ALLOTT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2) to establish water research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ENFORCEMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1283, a bill to enforce constitutional rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to India.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that Monday, April 15, 1963, the Senate received the nominations of E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of Maine, to be Ambassador to the United Kingdom of Libya, and the following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister:

Aaron S. Brown, of New Hampshire.
Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana.
Fulton Freeman, of California.
Graham A. Martin, of Florida.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF EDUCATION HEARINGS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am pleased to announce that open hearings upon S. 580, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, and related bills will commence at 10 a.m., in room 4232, New Senate Office Building, on Monday, April 29, 1963.

Senators who have sponsored or cosponsored bills relating to education, or who desire to be heard by the subcommittee in connection with any of the measures which will be taken up at that time are cordially invited to appear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the bills to be heard be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since it is anticipated that several days may be necessary to hear all individuals and representatives of organizations who have, or will, express an interest in presenting testimony, I am asking that those concerned with any of the measures indicate their interest, in securing an invitation to appear, to the subcommittee staff in room 4230, New Senate Office Building, in writing or by telephone to Capitol 4-3121, extension 5375.

It is presently planned that the first day of the hearing, April 29, will be devoted to the testimony of Senators and to that given by the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. On April 30, it is planned to take testimony from additional Senators and from the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor.

On subsequent days, to be announced later, it is planned to take testimony from public witnesses on each title of S. 580 separately. Thus the first day of public hearings would encompass the student loans, work-study, graduate fellowships and student loan insurance proposals of S. 580 plus such other bills as have been introduced bearing upon these student benefit subjects. Following this, measures relating to title II of S. 580, the higher education section of the administration bill, would be heard.

In a similar fashion testimony will be taken on separate days for title III, improvement of education quality measures; title IV which is concerned with elementary and secondary education, amendments to titles III and V of the National Defense Education Act, and Public Laws 815 and 874; title V, relating to vocational and special education; and title VI, which is concerned with an expansion of continuing education, including library measures.

In order to accommodate witnesses who may wish to be heard on more than one title subject matter area, the subcommittee will be pleased either to have them appear on each title or to file supplementary statements for inclusion in the hearing record at the appropriate place.

The concluding sessions of the hearings will be devoted to the testimony of Commissioner Keppel and the Office of Education. It is the hope of the subcommittee that observers from the Office of Education will attend each day's session for the purpose of taking notes upon the testimony offered, in order that the final statements of the Commissioner and his assistants can reflect the views of the administration with respect to the points raised by witnesses.

While no length restrictions of an unreasonable nature will be placed on the written statements submitted, it is the hope of the subcommittee that witnesses will confine oral presentations to under 15 minutes. Wherever possible upon a common subject matter, the subcommittee would like to hear witnesses in a panel format, in order to conserve time and to permit full opportunity to the members to raise questions.

Exhibit 1

Measures Proposing To Be Heard Starting April 29. 1963

COMPREHENSIVE

S. 580: Senators Morse, McNamara, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Pell, Mansfield, Humphrey, and Kefauver.

IMPACTED AREAS

S. 105: Senator Cotton.

S. 151: Senators Engle, Long of Missouri, and Burdick.

S. 236: Senators Dodd, Long of Missouri, and Pell.

S. 415: Senators Moss, Pastore, Randolph, Bible, Young of Ohio, Fong, Long of Missouri, Gruening, McGee, Cannon, Hart, and Brewster.

HIGHER EDUCATION

S. 500: Senator Javits.

S. 956: Senators Case and Scott.

S. 1174: Senator Case.

LOANS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

S. 389: Senators Humphrey, Gruening, Long of Missouri, and Pell.

S. 390: Senators Humphrey, Fulbright, Gruening, Long of Missouri, and Pell.

S. 1115: Senator Hartke.

NDEA

S. 275: Senator Inouye.

S. 373: Senators Inouye and Fong.

S. 392: Senator Humphrey.

S. 423: Senator Mundt.

S. 569: Senators Prouty and Keating.

S. 571: Senators Keating and Prouty.

S. 1264: Senator Javits.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

S. 8: Senators McNamara and Hart.

S. 892: Senator Scott.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

S. 1222: Senator Boggs.

MISCELLANEOUS

S. 181: Senators Goldwater, Young of North Dakota, Allott and Morton.

S. 70: Senator Proxmire.

S. 990: Senator Cotton.

OREGON EDUCATOR HONORED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on April 8 I had the privilege of addressing the national convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association in Boston. I thoroughly enjoyed this opportunity of meeting with scores of dedicated men and women from all parts of the country who were gathered there in their annual meeting.

The occasion has been additionally enjoyable to me since I have learned that the association later honored a distinguished Oregon educator, Dr. Daniel W. Fullmer, who is assistant dean of the general extension division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, and director of the Counseling Center for Adults of that division, by bestowing upon him the Nancy C. Wimmer Award.

This recognition of Dr. Fullmer by the profession is one which I feel sure will receive wide approbation among those who have known of his fine work. I join in extending to him my personal congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the American Personnel and Guidance Association dated April 11, 1963, announcing the award be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANIEL W. FULLMER GIVEN TOP PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE AWARD

Daniel W. Fullmer was named last night as recipient of the 1963 Nancy C. Wimmer Award at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention now being held in Boston. The award of $1,000 is made annually for outstanding initiative, creativeness, or leadership in establishing, developing, or improving guidance and counseling practices in educational institutions, business, or industry in America.

Dr. Fullmer, director of the Counseling Center for Adults, General Extension Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education, was chosen as winner of the Nancy C. Wimmer Award for:

1. Stimulation and development of the first student counseling service in the Portland Extension Center, Oregon System of Higher Education, that has rapidly expanded to become a community guidance project and effective counseling center.

2. Establishment of an inservice training program for counselor educators in the Oregon General Extension Division staff with the University of Oregon Medical School. This cooperative plan is at the postdoctoral level for all staff members.

3. Organization of an experimental program of family group consultations for possible utilization of the method as a counseling tool for public school counselors.

4. Direction of an experimental workshop on the counseling of minority youth for educators in the Pacific Northwest region.

5. Initiation of a series of educational television programs for high school students and their parents while utilizing to the fullest extent all phases of educational media in the total program of the Portland Extension Center.

A 1940 graduate of Valley High School, Fairview, Ill., Daniel Fullmer attended Western Illinois University where he received a B.S.E. in elementary and secondary education, and an M.S.E. in public school administration.

He taught in the public schools of Illinois and Colorado for 7 years. This teaching experience included work at the elementary, junior, and senior high school levels in teaching, counseling, and administration. In 1955 he received a Ph. D. in education and psychology from the University of Denver.

From Colorado, Dr. Fullmer moved to the University of Oregon to the duties of personnel director for the School of Education where he was responsible for the school's master degree program. During the 2 years he held this position he helped to establish an extension of this office in the Portland Extension Center. He was later transferred to the Extension Center to fill the position of coordinator of graduate studies for the University of Oregon School of Education. At the center he developed a counseling center designed to serve the evening and summer session students and to provide a training facility for school counselors. In addition to serving a limited number of evening extension students, he helped to form a basic program of counselor training designed specifically for school counselors.

In addition to his administrative duties, he completed teaching assignments in educational psychology on the undergraduate level and included measurements in education and statistics among the courses he taught on the graduate level.

During 1959 and 1960 Dr. Fullmer served as director of summer counseling and guidance training institutes under the National Defense Education Act at the Portland Center. From November 1962, to March 1963, he served on special assignment to a consultant in the Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes Branch of the U.S. Office of Education. Author of a number of articles and publications, he is currently in the process of coauthoring a textbook about the school counseling process and preparation of counselors.

THE NANCY C. WIMMER AWARD

The Nancy C. Wimmer Award was established to honor the memory and ideals of Nancy C. Wimmer who served on the staff of Science Research Associates, Inc., in Chicago from 1944 until her death in 1958. The award is made possible through the assured contribution of a major anonymous donor and others who wish to perpetuate her accomplishments and spirit as a member of the personnel and guidance profession.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. McINTYRE:

Text of an amendment to the rules and regulations for the Federal Savings and Loan System.

"THE SCOPE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING"—ADDRESS BY HON. BOYD LEEDOM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Judge Boyd Leedom has for 8 years been a member of the National Labor Relations Board, and during this time has made an extensive study of our labor-management problems.

On Tuesday, April 16, Judge Leedom spoke at the University of Chicago seminar on collective bargaining. The title of his address was "The Scope of Collective Bargaining." In his address he discussed a method of rescuing our free and private bargaining from decay and destruction. He proposed that there be established a labor peace corps to bring labor and management together in formulating steps to improve the collective-bargaining system.

This labor peace corps would be made up of three men each, of "wisdom, stature, and influence," from the ranks of management and labor.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD Judge Leedom's address and an article entitled "Idea for Deadlocks: Labor Peace Corps," which was published in the New York Herald Tribune on April 17, 1963.

There being no objection, the address and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SCOPE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(Address of Boyd Leedom, member, National Labor Relations Board, before University of Chicago, Ill.)

Chicago seminar on Collective Bargaining, Most of you already know that the Labor Board has always been fair game for the sharpshooters. But, of the criticism leveled against the Board, most of it is extravagant and unwarranted. Generally, it comes from partisan sources. Often, it is not made for its intrinsic value but rather to serve a critic's special purpose that is sometimes fairly clear, sometimes obscure. Board decisions are continuously under attack either for being prolabor or promanagement; for disregarding stare decisis or for blindly following precedent; for being too short or too long; and for various other reasons.

Recently, two rather sharp attacks on Board decisions occurred in this city. One was by a prominent labor attorney from New York, Frederick Livingston,[1] and the other by a former General Counsel of the Board, Ted Kammholz.[2] Their remarks had a common theme—that the Board has injected itself unduly into the collective bargaining process. Now, in the light of the long history of criticism, this new assault should not be particularly disturbing. Because, however, of the great interest in collective bargaining due to recent lengthy and costly strikes—and I shall have some comments about these later—I think it useful to clear the air a bit by dealing with the Board's role in the collective bargaining process.

I want to talk with you today at some length about (1) the obligation of employers to bargain with unions on basic management decisions; and (2) deal very briefly with those proposals—such as performance bonds—which it seems neither an employer nor a union may insist upon as a condition of entering into a contract.

I would like to help you understand what the Board has done, even though, as many of you may know, I have disagreed with the majority in a number of important decisions during the past year. I shall indicate at which point the other Board members and I part company.

Let me begin with certain fundamentals. Collective bargaining is, I believe, the cornerstone of our national labor policy. Section 1 of the National Labor Relations Act states that the policy of the United States is "encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining." In implementation of the policy, in sections 8(a)(5) and 8(b)(3), the act makes it an unfair labor practice for either employers or unions to refuse to bargain collectively with the other. Through its power to decide representation cases, the Board (1) determines which union represents the employees involved, and (2) which grouping of employees constitutes the unit for which the employer and the union must bargain. Finally, the Board is charged with the duty of making certain that the parties sit down and bargain in good faith with each other—a key job of the Board and one of the most difficult.

It should be emphasized that we have no authority under the act to decide for the parties what the substantive terms of their agreements should be. Section 8(d) explicitly states that the act "does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession." Or, as the Supreme Court said, the National Labor Relations Act "does not undertake governmental regulations of wages, hours, or working conditions. Instead, it seeks to provide a means by which agreements may be reached with respect to them."[3] The Board, while compelling the parties to bargain, has never attempted to dictate to the parties the terms of their agreement. The question arises then, why all this criticism of the Board for intruding into the collective bargaining process? The answer, in my opinion, is relatively simple: In deciding whether parties are bargaining in good faith, the Board necessarily defines what subjects employers and unions must bargain about. The only guide we have as to the subjects to be bargained about is section 8(d) of the act which requires that parties bargain in good faith "with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment." The Board's problem is one of definition of these terms, and it is this process of definition which has given rise to so much controversy.

---

[1] Address of Frederick R. Livingston, at Midwest seminar on NLRB policy changes, University of Chicago, Feb. 2, 1963, "Changing Obligations Under the Duty to Bargain."

[2] Address by Theophil C. Kammholz, at American Management Association Midwinter Personnel Conference, Chicago, Ill., Feb. 10, 1963, "A Forecast of Labor-Management Developments to Come."

[3] *Terminal Association* v. *Trainmen,* 318 U.S. 1, cited in *NLRB* v. *American National Insurance Co.,* 343 U.S. 395.

Probably the most controversial issue that has arisen recently in the collective bargaining area is whether an employer's decision to make changes in his business structure—for instance, whether to subcontract certain work, or to eliminate a department or to close down the business entirely—is a mandatory subject of bargaining. In general, employers have claimed that such decisions are management prerogatives and need not be bargained about. Unions, on the other hand, claim that since such decisions affect employees' rights, they are mandatory subjects of bargaining. The Board is split in several ways.

The key decisions on the issue are Fibreboard and Town and Country.[4] In each of these cases, the question was whether an employer was required to bargain with the union regarding its decision to subcontract a portion of its business for economic reasons, resulting in discharge of employees.

The Fibreboard decision was originally handed down in March 1961. A majority of the Board, consisting of Member Rodgers, former Member Jenkins, and myself, found that the employer did not subcontract the work to beat the union. Therefore, inasmuch as the subcontracting was not to discourage union membership, there was no violation of section 8(a)(3). The majority then found (the decision to subcontract being for economic reasons) that section 8(a)(5) does not impose an obligation on an employer to bargain with the union regarding the basic decision to subcontract work. Member Jenkins and I agreed, however, that the employer was, in such circumstances, obligated to bargain with the union regarding the impact of the subcontracting on employees. For example, in our view, the employer must discuss with the union which employees shall be selected for termination, and whether employees may be entitled to receive benefits on termination. Member Ray Rodgers disagreed and would have found that the employer did not have to bargain with the union at all, not even regarding the impact of the subcontracting on employees. Member John Fanning dissented from the majority's decision and would have found that an employer must bargain with the union regarding its basic decision to subcontract and also on all matters flowing from it. Chairman McCulloch, who had just joined the Board, did not participate in that decision. So, the four participating members split three ways on the issue.

The Fibreboard principle lasted until April 13, 1962, about a year. The Board's composition changed and the Town and Country decision, which involved essentially the same issue as Fibreboard, a majority of the Board, comprising Chairman McCulloch, Members Fanning and Brown, decided that (1) the employer had subcontracted work and discharged employees for discriminatory reasons and therefore violated section 8(a)(3); and (2) even assuming that the employer had subcontracted the work for economic reasons, it had an obligation to bargain with the union regarding its basic decision to subcontract the work, the position of Member Fanning in the original Fibreboard decision.

I concurred in the result, but for a different reason. In my opinion, since the employer had subcontracted the work and discharged its drivers for discriminatory reasons, in violation of section 8(a)(3), the drivers remained employees, and the employer was accordingly obligated to bargain with the union as their representative. Its failure to do so, I would have found, violated section 8(a)(5). I made it clear, however, that if, as in Fibreboard, the subcontracting had been for economic rather than discriminatory reasons, I would have disagreed with the result. Member Rodgers again dissented in Town and Country. He would have found that the subcontracting was not discriminatory and that, in any event, an employer has no obligation to discuss with a union either its basic decision to subcontract work or the impact of such decision on employees. Again, the Board was split three ways on the issue, but with a different majority.

In September 1962, on a motion for reconsideration, the Fibreboard decision itself was reversed, with Member Rodgers dissenting, and Member Brown and I not participating, though our positions on the issue differed from each other's and had been stated and reiterated in Town and Country.

While, as I have said, Town and Country and Fibreboard dealt with the issue of subcontracting work, the Board majority has applied the same rule to other types of decisions by an employer in changing the structure of his business. For example, in the recent Star Baby[5] case, a majority of the Board found that an employer was required to bargain with the union regarding its basic decision to go out of business altogether on economic grounds. I concurred, but for the same reasons as in Town and Country. I would have found that as the employer had closed its business for discriminatory reasons, in violation of section 8(a)(3), it had an obligation to discuss the status of employees with their representatives. Member Rodgers took the position that an employer may go out of business entirely, when he wishes, for whatever reason he wishes, even if it is for discriminatory reasons.

To recapitulate, there are three views on the Board as to whether an employer must bargain with the union regarding his decision to make changes in the structure of his business.

The majority position is this: An employer must bargain with the union regarding such decision, even if it is for economic reasons.

Member Rodgers' position: The employer need not bargain with the union at all.

My position: If the decision is based on economic grounds, the employer must bargain only as to its effect on employees; if the decision is on discriminatory grounds, the employer must bargain as to the decision itself.

Let me explain the basis for my disagreement with the majority, on the one hand, and with Member Rodgers, on the other, in cases of shutdown and of contracting work out for economic reasons.

First, the majority position: It requires an employer to bargain with the union as to whether he will close out a segment of his business even though the sole reason is that he cannot afford to operate it. This decision, to close out part of his business, clearly is not one "with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment"—the statutory words. But it does affect "conditions of employment." This "effect" of the shutdown is the nub, it seems to me, of the majority position. The fallacy in this position, as I see it, is that it requires bargaining as to a matter not directly respecting the statutory subjects of bargaining, a matter outside the employer-employee relationship; namely, the nature of the business enterprise in which the employer shall engage. The legal error in the majority rule, is that it goes beyond the statutory requirements, literally. The serious consequence, as a practical matter, is that the rule impedes the employer's decision to operate the kind of business he chooses, by imposing on such decision the consequences that flow from the slow and sometimes tortuous bargaining process when an immediate partial shutdown or other change in the nature of the business might mean survival.

Next, Member Rodgers' position: It has the virtue of permitting management to decide for itself the nature of the business it shall operate. Granting the employer has the unilateral right to close his machine shop, for instance, and contract out the work previously done there, the Rodgers' position seems to me to overlook the fact that significant events "with respect to * * * conditions of employment" are involved in the shutdown, in which the employees as well as the employer have a stake. The shutdown may have eliminated some of the work being performed, but it cannot summarily destroy the employer-employee relationship. This relationship rests on a continuing obligation to bargain about the "terms and conditions of employment" that are directly involved, that is to say, the question of what disposition is to be made of the employees' stake in that relationship. Thus, there are involved such items as existence of other jobs for them, whether the jobs in other departments should go to the affected employees in preference to others, whether there should be severance pay, possible recall rights; and other kindred items separate and distinct from the decision to close the department. It cannot be denied that these are vital areas of bargaining and that the bargaining representative still has an important function to perform in behalf of these employees.

Finally, my position: It seeks to draw a line between the management prerogative of deciding the nature of the enterprise, and the separate, but inevitable questions flowing therefrom respecting the consequences, employment-wise, to the employees, consequences quite clearly, it seems to me, covered by the statutory umbrella of "conditions of employment." This position, as I see it, has the advantage of permitting freedom of action to an employer in an area basically and essentially managerial, and of providing, at the same time, full bargaining protection of employees' rights as they are affected by the employer's exercise of his managerial prerogatives. Thus, he can change the nature of his business as and when he pleases, and take his chances on the consequences, with respect to his employees, in the bargaining process.

So far, I have discussed those matters regarding which the parties must bargain. I want to give only cursory attention to another controversial area of collective bargaining—that is, the types of proposals which employers and unions are prohibited from insisting upon in bargaining negotiations.

This area is governed basically by the Borg-Warner rule, which takes its name from the Supreme Court decision of 1958. The Court, by a divided vote, upheld the Board and ruled that it is a violation of section 8(a)(5) for an employer (or a union) to refuse to sign an agreement unless the agreement contains a proposal which is not a mandatory subject of bargaining—that is, a subject which is not a "term or condition of employment" within the meaning of section 8(d).

The Supreme Court agreed that any lawful proposal, mandatory or nonmandatory, could, if the parties agreed, be included in a collective bargaining agreement. Justice Burton, however, for the majority, reasoned that a party's insistence to impasse on a nonmandatory proposal was in substance a refusal to bargain about other subjects that are within the scope of mandatory bargaining, and such refusal is a violation of section 8(a)(5). The Court made it clear that such insistence was unlawful, even if the parties otherwise bargained in good faith.

---

[4] *Fibreboard Paper Products Corporation*, 130 NLRB 1558; 138 NLRB No. 67; *Town & Country Manufacturing Company, Inc.*, 136 NLRB 1022.

[5] *Star Baby Co.*, 140 NLRB No. 67.

It is important to emphasize the far-reaching impact of the Borg-Warner[6] decision. The Board, as you know, has broadened the meaning of "terms and conditions of employment" to require bargaining on such matters as pensions and insurance. But, under Borg-Warner, certain lawful subjects may not be discussed to the point of impasse. Realistically, this means that it may be futile to propose a nonmandatory subject of bargaining. If the other party objects to the proposal, it cannot be insisted upon and must be dropped.

There has been considerable criticism of the Borg-Warner rule. In the original Board decision in Borg-Warner, Chairman Farmer and I disagreed with the majority, and said, in effect, that it is futile to regard a proposal as bargainable if the other party, by opposing, can sweep it off the table. In the Supreme Court, Justices Harlan, Clark and Whitaker dissented. Justice Harlan, for the dissenters, asserted that the Board has intruded into the bargaining process, since "the right to bargain becomes illusory, if one is not free to press a proposal made in good faith to the point of insistence." Solicitor General (then Professor) Archibald Cox[7] said that the Borg-Warner rule was "unsound and inconsistent with the basic philosophy of collective bargaining." In a very real sense the Board may be making a part of the contract for the parties by holding any given subject not one for mandatory bargaining. The Supreme Court, however, has spoken and the Borg-Warner rule is the law of the land, making it necessary for parties at the bargaining table to consider, and for the Board to decide, which are mandatory subjects of bargaining.[8]

It may be arguable that Borg-Warner has made possible a new approach to the old question of whether furnishing a bond for performance of a collective bargaining contract is a mandatory subject of bargaining. Before and since Taft-Hartley, and also since the Borg-Warner decision was handed down by the Supreme Court, the Board has held, with somewhat varying rationale, that neither an employer nor a union could insist on a bond as a condition of signing the contract. The Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has recently affirmed the Board's holding to this effect in the A. D. Cheatham case.[9] But such view is not unanimous. Judge Edgerton vigorously dissented in Cheatham, arguing that performance bonds are a "means of enforcing the agreement" and therefore necessarily a condition of employment. Member Brown in a recent speech,[10] expressed some doubt as to the Board's rule. And now a trial examiner has held there was no refusal to bargain when a union insisted, to an impasse, on a bond to guarantee wages and payments to the employees' insurance fund—where the employer had defaulted on such obligations in the past.[11]

So far, I have discussed collective bargaining when it is functioning well enough for the Board to settle any problems that arise, through unfair labor practice proceedings. But a critical question confronting the public today is, what should be done when employers and unions bargain in good faith and no agreement is reached? We all know the immediate result: we have strikes; strikes which are often lengthy; strikes that are costly; strikes that affect not only the parties to the dispute but the general public as well. Recent examples of such strikes are the New York City and the Cleveland newspaper strikes; the east coast dock strike; and strikes at missile bases. What, if anything, should be done to avert such strikes? Secretary of Labor Wirtz felt the need to observe, in a recent address, that "public tolerance for strikes is diminishing rapidly."[12]

The means presently available for dealing with work stoppages that affect the national welfare, such as the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are not adequate to end the strikes. Thus, in the case of the recent dock strike, after the 80-day cooling-off period ended, the strikers rejected the employer's final offer; the strike resumed and the public continued to suffer. And, of course, Taft-Hartley was not involved in the newspaper strikes, as they were not deemed to create national emergencies. And I do not believe that the efforts of the Federal and State mediation services, or the various improvised solutions, such as the Morse Committee which settled the dock strike, are an adequate answer.

I would say that there have been four basic types of proposals advanced to deal with the problem of strikes: (1) Stronger Government intervention as through "an arsenal of weapons" vested in the executive branch; (2) compulsory arbitration; (3) do nothing; and (4) provide more effective collective bargaining.

Compulsory arbitration and the other forms of Government intervention seem to be undesirable to unions and management alike. While such procedures would have the superficial advantage of eliminating most strikes, I believe that the disadvantages would far outweigh the advantages. Further governmental interference in private economic affairs, and especially compulsory arbitration, might well put an end to collective bargaining as we know it.

Nor do I agree with the do-nothing approach, though some knowledgeable people in industrial relations advocate it. One justification they make is that with unemployment running as high as 5 to 6 percent of the work force, we can bear up under the comparatively small additional manpower loss resulting from strikes. This justification serves to remind me forcibly that two wrongs do not make a right. The do-nothing approach seems hazardous in that it may produce a tremendous ground swell of public resentment that could easily result in excessive, unwise, new regulation.

Because it seems to be open season for pointing out weaknesses in the bargaining process, I join with what I think a constructive suggestion. I would go along with those who seek to create improvements in the process and leave the bargaining up to those who must live with the bargain; that is, management and the unions. If collective bargaining as we know it, and I think it is uniquely American, is to be saved, unions and employers must, simply must, improve the system. Ideas are being expressed toward this end, by union, management, and government people. Among the ideas are prebargaining sessions to create better understanding of the problems that are likely to go on the bargaining table. Another is for intermittent joint conferences between management and employee representatives, the year around, to establish a relationship not built entirely on the antagonisms that arise at contract termination time. And there are others that seem to have merit.

I think it would be a forward step if representatives from the very highest echelons of labor and management—perhaps three men from each side—were chosen to constitute a permanent national body to foster and implement all meritorious ideas for improving the bargaining processes. They could also deal directly with disastrous work stoppages, either through direct intervention themselves, or through capable local men selected by them from the working ranks of management and union officials or, possibly, other sources. They should also provide for studies, and direct the resolution of problems related to automation and other causes of unemployment. Their wisdom, stature, and influence would be their only authority. Functioning properly such a group might well break up a stubborn impasse with dispatch.

Following a New Frontier pattern, such a group might be called the labor peace corps. The men in it should be the real statesmen in their fields—not the zealous crusaders for unions nor the union haters from management. Men of stature and good will, they would be big enough to serve not only the rights of the employees and the management they represent, but the interests of the beleaguered public as well. There are such men, of course, on both sides of our barbed wire entanglement—men such as, in an earlier era, were sought by Moses when another system of settling disputes was breaking down, "able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness,"[13] a search that resulted in the judicial system we enjoy today.

A sad commentary on the real prospects of industrial peace, however, is that in all probability neither organized labor, on the one hand, nor the business community on the other, could ever agree on the men who should constitute such a group.

Perhaps most everyone directly involved in industrial relations, often a dog-eat-dog business, would relegate the suggestion for a labor peace corps quite quickly to the status of "Alice in Wonderland." Perhaps it would be more realistic for me to suggest that if effective men, not greatly different from the kind I have described, coming directly from the ranks of management and labor, do not move in soon themselves to solve their own problems, then very likely collective bargaining as we know it will pass into limbo. And the rest of my realism would be this: when free collective bargaining passes from the scene, other cherished aspects of our way of life will be on their way out also.

A short, enigmatic sentence came to mind as I thought of an appropriate end to a speech such as this on industrial relations. I pondered the exact language and the source of the phrase. Then in a state of confusion as to whether it came from the words of some famous Sioux chieftain or from a great prophet, or possibly from Dave Garroway, I decided to use the sentence from my memory, for fear it had no other source at all:

Peace! Peace! But there is no peace.

---

[6] *Wooster Division of Borg-Warner,* 113 NLRB 1288, affirmed, 356 U.S. 342.

[7] Cox, "1957 Supreme Court Labor Decisions," 44 Virginia Law Review 1059, at 1074.

[8] Cases dealing with performance bonds: *Jasper Blackburn,* 21 NLRB 1240; *Conway's Express,* 87 NLRB 972.

[9] *Local 164, Painters, (A. D. Cheatham Painting Co.)*, 126 NLRB 997, enforced, 293 F. 2d 133 (C.A., D.C.), cert. denied, 368 U.S. 824.

[10] Address by Gerald A. Brown, member, National Labor Relations Board, at seventh annual Southeastern Conference on Current Trends in Collective Bargaining, University of Tennessee, November 7, 1962, "Collective Bargaining in a Free Society."

[11] *Excello Dry Wall Co.,* Case No. 7–CB–917, Trial Examiner Maher.

[12] Address of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz before National Academy of Arbitrators on February 1, 1963, Chicago, Ill.

[13] Exodus 18: 21.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 17, 1963]

IDEA FOR DEADLOCKS: LABOR PEACE CORPS

(By Victor Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—When employers and unions bargain in good faith, but no agreement is reached, what can be done to avoid a strike?

A Government official came up yesterday with a possible answer to this question which thus far has baffled the experts.

Forming a prestigious national labor peace corps is the solution offered by Boyd Steward Leedom, a member of the National Labor Relations Board, and Chairman of that body under former President Eisenhower from 1955 to 1961.

Corps members, by Mr. Leedom's definition, "should be real statesmen in their fields, not 'zealous crusaders' for unions, nor 'union haters' from management."

They should be "men of stature and good will; they should be big enough to serve not only the rights of employees and management they represent, but the interest of the beleaguered public as well."

"There are such men, of course, on both sides of our barbed-wire entanglement," Mr. Leedom asserted, "men such as, in an earlier era, were sought by Moses when another system of settling disputes was breaking down—'able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness * * *' a search that resulted in the judicial system that we enjoy today."

Mr. Leedom, a Republican, made this series of suggestions about their selection and duties:

"It would be a forward step if representatives from the very highest echelons of labor and management—perhaps three men from each side—were chosen to constitute a permanent national body to foster and implement all meritorious ideas for improving the bargaining process. They could also deal directly with disastrous work stoppages, either through direct intervention themselves, or through capable local men, selected by them from the working ranks of management and union officials, or, possibly, other sources.

"They should also provide for studies, and the direct resolution, of problems related to automation, and other causes of unemployment. Their wisdom, stature and influence would be their only authority. Functioning properly, such a group might well break up a stubborn impasse with dispatch."

Mr. Leedom made his suggestion in an address to a University of Chicago seminar on collective bargaining in that city. Copies of his speech were distributed here.

He told his audience that in the "dog-eat-dog" atmosphere of industrial relations, his proposal would probably be relegated to an "Alice in Wonderland status."

If so, he predicted, and management and labor "do not move in soon themselves to solve their own problem, then, very likely, collective bargaining passes from the scene, other cherished aspects of our way of life will be on their way out, also."

EXECUTIVE ORDER NEEDED TO END FEDERAL SUPPORT OF SEGREGATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most indefensible practices of the Federal Government in the area of civil rights is the continued contribution of Federal tax funds to State programs and projects carried out on a discriminatory or segregated basis.

The Commission on Civil Rights called attention yesterday, for example, to a grant by the Federal Aviation Agency of over $2 million for the construction of an airport in Mississippi "without questioning the airport's plan to build separate eating and restroom facilities." This is only one of many illustrations of direct Federal financial support for segregation, amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

The irony in this situation is that the Department of Justice has initiated several lawsuits to prohibit just such practices. Despite these suits, however, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and many other Federal agencies continue to ignore the requirements of the Constitution and insist that they have no administrative authority to condition Federal grants on a policy of nondiscrimination.

What these Federal officials overlook is the fact that the Constitution is part of every one of our enactments. No official sworn to uphold the law can ignore the Constitution in carrying out his authority. It is no more legal or moral for Federal agencies to spend Federal funds on unconstitutional projects than it is for State officials to subsidize white-only schools, parks, transportation or other public facilities.

In his special message on civil rights, the President indicated that "legalistic evasions" designed to thwart civil rights would not be tolerated. The Commission's special report, however, makes it evident that "legalistic evasions" continue to frustrate efforts to curb segregationist practices. I applauded the President's statement at the time when it was made, and hope it means that the Commission's recommendations will be heeded. A uniform policy on this subject is very much needed; and I would strongly urge the President to issue an Executive order requiring all Federal agencies to insist upon a nondiscrimination requirement under Federal grant-in-aid programs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to associate myself with the recommendations which the distinguished junior Senator from New York has just now made.

The Constitution is the law of this land. It is incumbent upon all American citizens and all U.S. agencies to follow the law of the land. The Civil Rights Commission came into existence under Dwight Eisenhower. When it made recommendations, General Eisenhower sent them to the Congress, for action; and where possible, he instituted on his own ipse dixit, that which was necessary in order to carry them into effect.

The Civil Rights Commission has now made recommendations to President Kennedy; and I join the Senator from New York in urging the President to accept those Civil Rights Commission recommendations and to carry them out, so that the law of the land will apply equally to all Americans.

I congratulate the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from California, Mr. President.

THE LOS ANGELES BOMBING

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, police are investigating the explosion of a homemade bomb in the San Fernando Valley offices of the American Association for the United Nations at 17214 Ventura Boulevard, Encino, Calif., March 31.

The bomb, placed on an outside window ledge, exploded at 10:30 p.m., blowing out the window, spraying glass throughout the office, and igniting a fire which destroyed many of the association's records.

No one was in the office at the time of the explosion and, fortunately, no one was injured.

The bombing occurred on the same night that the Reverend Dr. Brooks Walker, minister of the Emerson Unitarian Church, Canoga Park, was sworn in as president of the San Fernando American Association for the United Nations.

The AAUN in the Los Angeles area is not a newcomer to the threat of the homemade bomb.

On December 8, 1961, a homemade bomb was discovered in front of the downtown Los Angeles offices of the AAUN at 5110 Wilshire Boulevard. The bomb did not explode and the risk of human injury and physical damage was avoided.

Then, on February 1, 1962, homemade bombs went off in two sections of the Los Angeles area. The first exploded at about 8:55 p.m., in the garage of the Reverend Dr. Walker located at 8100 Sale Avenue, Canoga Park. The second exploded at about 9:25 p.m., outside the living room window of the home of the Reverend Dr. John Simmons at 4351 Beck Avenue, North Hollywood. The Reverend Dr. Simmons, a Lutheran minister, is administrator of the Memorial Lutheran Hospital in Pacoima, Calif.

The Reverend Dr. Simmons, like the Reverend Dr. Walker, is active in AAUN functions, and is, in fact, a past president of the San Fernando chapter.

The explosion in the Reverend Dr. Walker's garage shook the home considerably, sending plaster crashing against the crib where the Walkers' 6-month-old son usually slept. Mrs. Walker had moved him into another room on this night and no one was injured.

Similarly, the explosion outside the home of the Reverend Dr. Simmons blasted glass and shrapnel into the living room where Mrs. Simmons had been sitting seconds before the bomb—believed to have been thrown from a passing car—went off.

On the night of these two explosions the Reverend Dr. Walker and the Reverend Dr. Simmons were participating in a panel discussion at the Temple Sinai, a synagogue in Beverly Hills. Their topic was: "The Extreme Right—A Threat to Democracy?"

Then there was a lull in the anti-AAUN activity—except the hanging in effigy of Ambassador Adlai Stevenson on the roof of the organization's Los Angeles offices—until the most recent bombing of the San Fernando chapter headquarters a week ago Sunday.

In all of the bombing incidents, the bombs were homemade, consisting of a pipe capped at both ends and filled with an explosive. The bombings were directed at either the AAUN or at its members.

We can only conclude the obvious. The bombings are the work—or the result of the work—of individuals who make a full-time job of hating, or inflaming old hatreds and nursing new ones, or aiding, abetting and baiting the deep-seated prejudices which have long burdened our society.

I am talking about professional hatemongers. Return to the night of February 1. Before the panel discussion, leaflets were scattered on the ground outside the Temple Sinai. The leaflets contained pictures of the star of David, a hammer and sickle, the initials "U.N." and the words: "Know Your Enemy."

That is how the professional hatemonger works. He drops his refuse and runs. He never concerns himself with facts—only foregone conclusions, prejudices.

It makes no difference to these people that included on the AAUN's national board of directors are the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, Senator Neuberger, and Walter Reuther, Frank P. Graham, Ralph Bunche, and that among its membership are the names of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, Senator McGee, Bishop James A. Pike, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, and John Cowles. It matters little that the President of the United States has said:

> The American Association for the U.N. has a vital task in helping to project the urgent need for strong and vigorous public understanding and support of our participation in the United Nations. In this effort, you have my full encouragement.

These bombings undermine our most basic principles of freedom. They undermine our society itself. If threats, intimidation and, finally, outright violence and terrorism are used to win argument, how many arguments will be carried on?

Terrorism is an alien word to most Americans. But it does happen here. How else can the bombings directed against the AAUN be described?

I condemn these bombings and the professional hatemongers who inspired them. They are a blot on America. They are a blot on freedom.

WARSAW GHETTO DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in April 1943 the Jewish inhabitants of the Warsaw ghetto rose in rebellion against the tyranny of Nazi rule. In an epic struggle of incredible valor, the people of the Warsaw ghetto defied the armed might of Nazi military power, and gave to the entire world an example of courage and self-sacrifice that has never been equaled.

Although the valiant freedom fighters of the ghetto well knew that they were hopelessly outnumbered and that they alone could never succeed in bringing down Hitler's military power, their rebellion was a triumphant reaffirmation of the eternal striving of all mankind for freedom, dignity, and spiritual independence. Faith and religious dedication filled them; and with the bravery of desperation they were able to inflict substantial setbacks on the Nazi army.

Mr. President, I am proud to have been the author of Senate Joint Resolution 179, which was passed by the Congress of the United States in August 1962, and was signed by the President on August 28, 1962. This resolution rightly called the attention of the country to the 20th anniversary of this tragic uprising, and specifically called upon the President to issue a proclamation for the observation of April 21 as Warsaw Ghetto Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. President, I was very much pleased, indeed, to observe that on March 5 of this year, in consonance with the joint resolution of Congress, the President invited the people of the United States to observe this historic occasion. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the text of the joint resolution which I introduced in the Senate last April and the proclamation recently issued by the President, under the terms of that joint resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution and the proclamation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the twenty-first day of April 1963 is hereby marked in recognition of the astounding courage displayed by the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto against the Nazis. Through such uprising, the men, women, and children who met death on that tragic day and those who perished in concentration camps and in the gas chambers, symbolize the indestructible spirit of liberty which throughout history has ultimately triumphed against the forces of tyranny.

The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 5, 1963.*

Of the more than 400,000 Jews whom the Nazis had previously walled into the Warsaw ghetto, only about 70,000 remained in April of 1943. With deadly efficiency, most of the other inhabitants had been transported by the Nazis to concentration camps and had there been exterminated. The surviving Jews, suffering from malnutrition and disease, with pitifully few weapons and virtually no hope of assistance from any source, determined to sell their lives as dearly as possible. They engaged the Nazis in battle.

The result was known by the Jews to be foredoomed. Yet, though they lacked both military resources and a military tradition, they were able to conduct their struggle against the overwhelming forces of the Nazi occupiers for more than 3 weeks, thereby providing a chapter in the annals of human heroism, an inspiration to the peace-loving people of the world, and a warning to would-be oppressors which will long be remembered.

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, in consonance with the joint resolution of Congress approved August 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 407), do hereby invite the people of the United States to observe the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, April 21, 1963, with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 4th day of March in the year of our Lord 1963, and the independence of the United States of America the 187th.

[SEAL] JOHN F. KENNEDY.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

PRESENTATION TO CHARLES B. BOLTON OF THE ALBERT H. KETCHAM AWARD

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last year the Albert H. Ketcham Memorial Award was made to Charles Bingham Bolton for the contribution he had made for the continuation of research in dentofacial growth and development which is today the basis of orthodontic practice.

This is one of the many accomplishments and contributions this young man has made to the welfare and improvement of his fellow men. In his acceptance of the award, Mr. Bolton disclosed his admirable and worthy motivation with the Williams James statement of "the great use of a life is to spend it for something that outlasts it."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the presentation statement of Mr. J. A. Salzmann, president of the American Board of Orthodontics, and the acceptance statement of Mr. Bolton.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION OF THE ALBERT H. KETCHAM MEMORIAL AWARD FOR 1962 TO MR. CHARLES BINGHAM BOLTON BY J. A. SALZMANN, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN BOARD OF ORTHODONTICS

The name Bolton is well and honorably known not only to orthodontists but in the annals of our country as a whole. Orthodontics is indebted to the Bolton family for its generous support of health, education, and welfare programs and especially for establishing the Bolton fund at Western Reserve University. To you, Charles Bingham Bolton, our debt goes beyond financial support, important as this has been in making possible continuing research in dentofacial growth and development which is today the basis of orthodontic practice.

The American Association of Orthodontists, of which you are an honorary member, is fully aware of your own labors in behalf of orthodontics and of dentistry in general. This award is given in recognition of your own services and contributions.

The following are only a few of your activities and the awards which have been bestowed on you: Fellow, American College of Dentists; honorary member, Angle Society of Orthodontia; citation of merit, Angle Society of Orthodontia; honorary member, Alumni Association, Dental School, Western Reserve University; citation of Western Reserve University Dental Alumni Association; citation from Oxford University; honorary member, Cleveland Dental Society; honorary member, Great Lakes Society of Orthodontists; member, National Advisory Dental Research Council, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.; trustee, Western Reserve University; trustee, Wooster College; vice president, Greater Cleveland Council, Boy Scouts of America; trustee, Cleveland Museum of Art; member, executive committee, Bolton fund, Western Reserve University. The foregoing are only a few of the many educational, philanthropic, and civic agencies which have benefited and are continuing to benefit from your dedicated efforts. We are truly indebted to you for your devoted personal interest and attention over the years, which have helped greatly in achieving orthodontic advancement.

It is my honor and privilege, as president of the American Board of Orthodontics, to present this award to you, Charles Bingham Bolton, in behalf of the American Association of Orthodontists and the American Board of Orthodontics.

Response by Charles Bingham Bolton to the Presentation of the Albert H. Ketcham Memorial Award

In May of last year, I received the greatest surprise of my life when the chairman of the Albert H. Ketcham Award Committee of the American Board of Orthodontics, Dr. Salzmann, informed me that I had been selected as one of the recipients of the 1962 Ketcham Award.

In accepting this distinguished honor, I do so with a feeling of deep gratitude and a humble realization that you are recognizing not so much my minute contributions to the fields of orthodontics and oral health but, rather, the efforts and visions of those I have been privileged to be associated with during the past 33 years. The clearer understanding of the process of developmental growth, especially of dentofacial morphology from conception to adult life, that is comprehended today has not been the result of any one individual's efforts. Rather, it is a composite of all the knowledge of men, both great and small, over the many years of scientific endeavor.

I have been more than fortunate to have had a part in the great good work of Holly Broadbent and my distinguished mother, both of whom had unbounded faith and clear vision beyond that of ordinary man. Neither could foresee the total concept, developmental problems, and ultimate use of the roentgenographic cephalometer, as well as the development and use of standards of normal growth. Rather, each had, and still has, the faith that skillfully conceived basic research, provided with sufficient funds, will ultimately benefit mankind by revealing patterns of growth previously unknown. Actually, we are, in my humble opinion, only beginning to comprehend the basic processes involved in dentofacial morpholo and will probably not in our short span of years reach a pinnacle from whence there is no further upward path. This is inherent in basic research, as you know. Once its never-ending challenge has been accepted by a true scientist or those helping him achieve, nothing is a greater stimulus to continued efforts on all fronts—scientific, financial, and coordination between each. In such an atmosphere of expanding horizons have I spent these last years. It has been a most exciting experience.

Accomplishments and rewarding honors such as you have given me today carry a real burden of expectation. Dr. Bronk, President of the National Academy of Sciences, said recently: "A laurel wreath has in it the prickly reminder that more is expected of the wearer." This, in truth, expresses in part the philosophy of the Bolton fund of Western Reserve University. As a group, we look forward to many years of expanding endeavor in the field of growth and development, and we expect to share our experiences with others as we go forward. Thus, we hope to add small particles of luminosity to orthodontics and to oral health. We shall always be doggedly striving to discover and realize the order that exists in nature.

You will wonder why, as a layman, I have wanted to play a part in this quest for basic knowledge. It is simply because I have come to realize that there is a place on the team for a layman who has been exposed to the techniques of the clinician, the researcher, the teacher, the scholar, and the layman and has consequently developed sufficient understanding of these often conflicting points of view to be able to bring the varying methods of attack together to reach a common goal. I have had the good fortune to find the many varying interests of my life focused by countless friends in the field of coordination and cooperation between such disciplines of thought and training. I hope that I can in some small way be worthy of their faith and trust, as well as your expectations.

William James succinctly summed up my fervent hopes when he said: "The great use of a life is to spend it for something that outlasts it."

May I again express my layman's gratitude and humble thanks to you for this most cherished professional honor.

INTERIM REPORT OF COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask that it be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks, a copy of the interim report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, filed last Tuesday with the President of the United States.

I wish every American would read this report on Mississippi by the Commission on Civil Rights. It seeks to end an intolerable irony.

Currently, the Federal Government with one hand employs its troops, attorneys, and courts to fight discrimination, while with the other hand it continues to supply the funds that sustain racial bias. Clearly, this is indefensible.

On the Senate floor last week, I urged every Federal agency to examine its statutes for authority to cut off funds that support discrimination and segregation in any State or community. I also urged stronger action by Congress.

So I commend the Commission for serving as the conscience of the Nation, and I wholeheartedly support its report, which will supply fresh encouragement for the vigorous civil rights program which the administration already has under way.

There is, I believe, need for very careful and intensive review by every agency of the Government, to make sure that its programs which provide financial support in no way underwrite or sustain the continuance of facilities or programs which segregate in any manner because of race.

Within the next few days, I intend to request each of the agencies to respond to letters I will send asking specific questions as to practices under existing federally assisted programs.

However, I wish to direct an inquiry as to whether the agency feels they have sufficient authority now to hold up funds for programs underwritten by Federal moneys which are operated on a segregated basis or whether additional legislation is required. Frankly, I have an open mind on the subject, although some deep and strong suspicion. I will certainly look with interest upon replies that we receive.

I am also intensely interested in learning whether or not the agencies feel there is sufficient authority available to them to hold up funds where the programs underwritten by these Federal moneys are operated on a racially segregated basis or discriminate in a manner that places members of one race at a disadvantage in benefiting from this Federal assistance.

For a number of years, Mr. President, we have debated whether or not additional Executive action, such as that taken by the President when he issued his housing order, can be more fully utilized, or whether the responsibility lies basically with the Congress to enact additional legislation and place conditions on expenditure of operating funds. I will look with interest to the replies I receive from the agencies.

It is certainly my view that the time to act, both here in Congress and at the executive agency level, is now at hand.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Parallel with what the Senator from Michigan has said, I, too, am addressing the various Government departments upon this subject in order to ascertain why they are administering the law and making grants through their departments in Mississippi and elsewhere, notwithstanding violations of the Constitution, as has just been so eloquently discussed.

For years I have attempted to amend appropriation bills on the floor of the Senate to deny the use of Federal funds for discriminatory use, on the same theory adverted to by the Commission report: funds contributed by citizens of all States, and I would add, of all shades of color, should not under the Constitution be restricted to citizens of only one color. As far back as its 1959 report the Commission found that nondiscrimination could validly be required as a condition of the receipt of Federal aid, and in connection with the field of housing, it found that this could be done either by Congress or by the President by Executive order. Again in its comprehensive 1961 reports the Commission repeated this principle, stating that "Federal financial support should be withheld from programs which are so administered as to discriminate on racial grounds."

The legal authority for this principle is clear beyond reasonable doubt. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed in the Record a fine analysis of the legal basis for the Executive order on housing which is relevant here, prepared by the New York County Lawyers Association's Committee on Civil Rights. The committee recommends, it should also be noted, that the order be amended to cover all public housing, urban renewal projects, and other housing programs to which Federal grants are made, irrespective of when the commitments for their construction were made; subsequent sale or lease of property covered by FHA or VA insurance; and mortgage loans by federally supervised mortgage lending institutions.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON THE PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ORDER ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HOUSING

This report discusses the legal basis of Executive Order No. 11063, issued by President Kennedy on November 20, 1962, which directs various Federal executive agencies to take certain action with respect to discriminatory practices in housing and related areas; the further responsibilities of government with respect to equal opportunity in housing; and the extent to which further action may be required.

BACKGROUND

There has long been strong agitation among persons and groups concerned with the assurance to all Americans of equal opportunity regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, for action by the Federal Government to assure that housing programs which receive Federal assistance, either directly or indirectly, are operated without discrimination. The increasing importance of Federal assistance in meeting the housing needs of American families, particularly those of lower and middle income in which minority groups are most heavily represented, has resulted in an anomalous situation in which housing constructed with the assistance of tax funds secured from all citizens is not freely available to all citizens on an equal basis.

Despite the basic policy statement in the Housing Act of 1949 (sec. 2, 63 Stat. 413, 42 U.S.C.A. sec. 1441), in which Congress set a national goal of "decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family," and the even earlier provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, in which Congress proclaimed that "all citizens of the United States shall have the same right in every State and territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof, to * * * purchase * * * real and personal property," the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights was still to find, in 1959, that "* * * housing * * * seems to be the one commodity in the American market that is not freely available on equal terms to everyone who can afford to pay." (Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1959, p. 534.)

In 1961, the Commission on Civil Rights devoted an entire volume of its report to the question of housing, making unanimous findings regarding the seriousness of this problem. The Commission found (report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1961, vol. 4, pp. 144–145), in part, as follows:

"First, a considerable number of Americans, by reason of their color or race, are being denied equal opportunity in housing. * * *

"Of the many Federal agencies concerned with housing and home-mortgage credit, none has attempted to exert more than a semblance of its authority to secure equal access to the housing benefits it administers, or to insure equal treatment from the mortgage lenders it supports and supervises."

The Commission made detailed factual findings, based on hearings in many parts of the country, on the degree of discrimination which exists, not only in the Southern States, but in most northern communities also. Subsequently, in a report on housing in the Nation's Capital (report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights U.S.A.—Housing in Washington, D.C., 1962), the Commission made further unanimous findings regarding the continued existence of housing discrimination in the Nation's Capital.

The increasing impact of such discrimination upon the public conscience was illustrated in 1960 by the fact both major political parties in their platform statements pledged action to prohibit discrimination in housing built with Federal subsidies, and the candidate who became President pledged himself specifically to the issuance of an Executive order to eliminate discrimination in connection with federally assisted housing programs.

In addition, the Commission on Civil Rights, in 1959, had recommended the issuance of an Executive order, and in its fuller 1961 report on housing reiterated this recommendation in a unanimous statement:

"Recommendation 1: That the President issue an Executive order, stating the national objective of equal opportunity in housing and specifically directing all Federal agencies concerned with housing and with home mortgage credit to shape their policies and practices to make the maximum contribution to the achievement of this goal; and that the President use his good offices to stimulate the participation of all elements of the housing and home finance industries in the achievement of the national objective of equal housing opportunity."

The Commission also made further recommendations as to specific housing programs.

On November 20, 1962, the President of the United States signed Executive Order No. 11063, entitled "Equal Opportunity in Housing."

FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

A full understanding of the coverage of the Executive order requires a brief review of the various programs in the housing area in which the Federal Government is presently engaged. Most Federal housing programs operate under the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA), which in turn is made up of a number of constituent agencies that actually operate the programs authorized by Congress:

1. The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insures private lending institutions against losses on mortgage loans and loans for home repairs on single-family homes, multi-family homes, cooperatives, and rental projects. It also operates a new middle income program which, under certain circumstances, may receive Federal loan funds. Since its creation, FHA has insured mortgages on nearly 6 million homes, and projects with almost 900,000 units, as well as home improvement loans for more than 24 million homes.

2. The Public Housing Administration (PHA) makes loans and annual subsidy payments permitting local governmental housing authorities to construct and operate low-rent public housing projects. This has resulted in 3,217 projects with 585,000 dwelling units.

3. The Urban Renewal Administration (URA) makes grants and loans for slum clearance and redevelopment, sharing the net cost of such projects with local communities. Four billion dollars has been authorized for such grants, for areas in which many hundreds of thousands of persons reside.

4. The Community Facilities Administration (CFA) operates a number of special programs including loans to higher educational institutions and hospitals for student and faculty housing, loans to certain sponsors for housing for the elderly, and other nonhousing activities.

5. The Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA) provides supplemental mortgage market assistance by maintaining a liquid market in home mortgages. It has spent over $10 billion to buy over 1 million mortgages.

In addition, there are a number of agencies outside HHFA which are or could be concerned with the housing market. These are:

1. The Veterans' Administration (VA), among other functions, operates a program of mortgage guarantees and direct home loans for veterans, which are generally comparable to those granted by the FHA. These represent $50 billion in mortgages on 5.5 million homes, and direct loans of $1.5 billion more on 177,000 homes.

2. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board (HLBB), formerly a constituent agency of HHFA but independent since 1955, which is a central reserve and coordinating agency for Federal savings and loan associations. Its constituent agency, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC) insures the safety of savings in savings and loan associations up to $10,000, in a manner comparable to the functions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (see below). Its insured institutions hold in excess of $65 billion in mortgages.

3. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) insures deposits in most U.S. banks up to $10,000. The bulk of such deposits are used to make loans, a substantial portion of which cover housing mortgages, which are in excess of $40 billion.

4. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Capital's governing body, whose responsibility includes housing in the District.

5. Other agencies which own or operate housing such as the Defense Department, the Bureau of Public Roads, etc.

COVERAGE OF THE EXECUTIVE ORDER

The President's Executive order covered only certain of the housing programs set out above. It was made directly applicable to four general classifications of property, as follows:

1. Property that is owned or operated by the Federal Government (principally housing repossessed by FHA or VA, and housing on Government installations);

2. Property which is constructed with loans or contributions from the Federal Government, such as low-rent public housing, housing for the elderly, and college, and hospital dormitories;

3. Property built with FHA or VA insurance or loans; and

4. Property developed through federally assisted slum clearance or urban renewal programs.

Except for housing owned or operated by the Federal Government, the Executive order applies only to housing contracted for subsequent to November 20, 1962, although Federal agencies are directed to use their good offices with respect to ending discriminatory practices affecting other housing.

The Executive order also governs the issuance of mortgage loans directly insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government.

The most obvious areas not covered by the Executive order are:

1. All housing constructed under contracts entered into prior to November 20, 1962, including public housing, FHA and VA insured housing, housing on urban renewal sites, and housing for the elderly and urban renewal projects whose preliminary contracts but not final loan and grant contracts were executed prior to November 20, 1962;

2. Mortgage loans not directly insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government, but made by institutions who operate under Federal supervision, such as those whose deposits are insured by FDIC or FSLIC (i.e., the conventional mortgage).

The approach of the Executive order is to direct each Federal agency (and these agencies have, for the most part, issued further orders implementing the Executive order with respect to their own operations) to "take all action necessary and appropriate to prevent discrimination because of race, color, creed, or national origin" in the designated programs. In addition, the order provides for implementation by departments and agencies, enforcement where appropriate, and for the establishment of a President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing which is to recommend general policies report on the progress, and consider other matters relative to the Executive order.

LEGAL BASIS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF THE EXECUTIVE ORDER AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

The Constitution of the United States prohibits racial and religious discrimination by both the Federal Government and the States and their subdivisions. The due process clause of the fifth amendment contains the clear implication that the Federal Government may not deny any person the equal protection of the laws (*Bolling* v. *Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954), the District of Columbia school desegregation case; *Hurd* v. *Hodge*, 334 U.S. 24 (1948), the District of Columbia restrictive covenant case). Similarly, the 14th amendment bars any State or State agency from denying any person the equal protection of the laws (*Brown* v. *Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), the school desegregation decision; *Shelley* v. *Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1 (1948), the restrictive covenant case). Under these provisions, any Federal or State action which discriminates against any person because of race, color, or creed is violative of the Constitution, and it necessarily follows that this applies equally to Federal and State officials who carry out functions pursuant to Federal housing statutes.

The Constitution also imposes on the President the duty to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed" (Article II, Section 3), and the Supreme Court has held that this obligation includes the protection of rights, duties, and obligations growing out of the Constitution itself (*Cunningham* v. *Neagle*, 135 U.S. 55, 71 (1889)).

In addition, while the 14th amendment does not operate against purely private conduct (*The Civil Rights* cases, 109 U.S. 3 (1883)), the Supreme Court has held in many cases, that the purview of the 5th and 14th amendments extends to situations in which private individuals take on quasi-governmental responsibilities or accept public funds or other assistance in carrying on private functions. Thus, for example, *Shelley* v. *Kraemer, supra,* stood for the principle that governmental enforcement is not available for private discriminatory practices; *Kerr* v. *Enoch Pratt Free Library*, 149 F. 2d 212 (C.A. 4th, 1945) certiorari denied, 326 U.S. 721 (1945), for the principle that a privately administered library receiving public funds was subject to the 14th amendment; *Nixon* v. *Herndon*, 273 U.S. 536 (1927), and other cases, that privately run primary elections could not exclude Negro participation; and *Marsh* v. *Alabama*, 326 U.S. 501 (1946), that a company town was bound by the constitutional guarantees of the first amendment, just as a publicly run town would be.

Clearly, when the Government itself sells or rents housing, it cannot discriminate or segregate. When it makes housing available through others, the same principle necessarily operates, for if it did not, the spirit and words of the Constitution would be a nullity for all practical purposes.

It is not necessary that the statute under which the governmental assistance is granted contain such a prohibition, because the Constitution runs through the text of every statute which is enacted. Nevertheless, the constitutional requirements are reinforced, in the case of most housing programs, by the clear mandate of the National Housing Act, setting a national goal of "a decent home * * * for every American family." Irrespective of this, however, the Enoch Pratt Free Library case, supra, is typical of a number of cases which made it clear that, if a party chooses to seek the aid of Government, he is subject to the constitutional limitations imposed on governmental action.

On the basis of these and many other well established decisions, it appears clear that the executive branch of Government has not only the power to but also the duty to bar discrimination in Federal housing programs. Thus, in effect, the Executive order did not establish any new rights, but merely established long overdue means for implementing existing constitutional and statutory requirements.

The only significant court decision to the contrary is by New York Court of Appeals in *Dorsey* v. *Stuyvesant Town Corporation*, 299 N.Y. 512 (1949), cert. den. 339 U.S. 981. We have concluded after examination that that case cannot be strongly urged as binding constitutional precedent today. The Dorsey case, decided by a 4-to-3 vote (with the then minority now representing the majority of New York's highest court), involved discrimination by a corporation which had received assistance in assembling land and had a local tax exemption. The court of appeals found that this was private housing, subject only to certain limited supervision, despite the governmental assistance which it had received. In view of the fact that legislation was enacted by the State of New York to bar a repetition of such discrimination prior to the time the Supreme Court denied certiorari; the fact that such a case cannot again come before the New York courts in order to permit a reconsideration of this decision since these practices are now barred by statute; and the fact that many of the leading Federal cases in this area have been decided since 1949; it is our conclusion that the Dorsey case does not truly represent Federal constitutional law in this area.

There is also a second ground which was apparently relied on by the President in support of the Executive order. That is the Government's power to insert reasonable conditions for the public good in contracts entered into between the United States and other parties. This approach is basic to the Executive order, and the subsequent implementing orders of the constituent agencies of HHFA. Such a contractual clause would be in line with the public policy of the United States under the various cases previously mentioned. Similar Federal authority has for some time been exercised with respect to employment under other Government contracts in procurement for defense and other governmental purposes.

In the special case of the District of Columbia, there is an additional basis for governmental action, applying not only to programs receiving Federal assistance but to housing generally. The District of Columbia has a special status under the Constitution, and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia act as the local executive for the District, under the Constitution and the District of Columbia Code enacted by Congress. Under their general powers, the Commissioners have power to implement the recommendations of the 1962 report of the Civil Rights Commission to issue appropriate regulations prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion or national origin in the sale, rental or financing of housing accommodations within the District, and to take related necessary action, on the same basis as has successfully been done in a number of States, including New York. The Nation's Capitol is marred by large slum areas due in great part to discriminatory housing practices. This tarnishes the image of a free America in the eyes of resident and visiting diplomats from all nations of the world.

OMISSIONS FROM THE PRESIDENT'S ORDER

Two major housing areas not covered by the Executive order: (1) Housing constructed under contracts entered into prior to November 20, 1962; and (2) loans for the construction or purchase of housing made by federally supervised institutions.

It does not appear that there is any legal impediment to covering both these fields as well.

If the Executive order is based upon constitutional requirements that there be no discrimination in housing constructed with Federal assistance, then this prohibition necessarily extends to previously constructed housing as well as to housing constructed subsequent to the issuance of the Executive order. The order itself does not change the constitutional mandate, but only deals with agency implementation of the Constitution's requirements.

On the other hand, if the ban on discrimination were based only upon the power of the United States to insert reasonable contract provisions into Federal contracts, they would, presumably, be subject to the constitutional prohibition against impairment of contracts previously entered into by the United States. This argument, however, could apply only to agreements with private parties, such as borrowers under FHA or VA mortgages, since contracts with local government authorities are in any case subject to the State's clear obligations not to discriminate under the 14th amendment.

It is difficult to presume that this Executive order, whose preamble begins with citation of "the public policy of the United States as manifested in its Constitution and laws," and which is issued "by virtue of the authority vested in [the President] * * * by the Constition and laws of the United States * * *," is based on any other grounds than the basic constitutional requirements heretofore discussed. On that basis, there appears to be little legal support for distinguishing between the constitutional requirements applicable to existing federally assisted projects and those henceforth to be placed under contract.

Perhaps the most striking example of the legal and practical inconsistency of such a distinction is illustrated by a public housing project, the contract for which may have been signed on November 19, 1962, which may be ready for occupancy in November 1964, and which will be receiving Federal subsidies until, perhaps, the year A.D. 2024. During all those years, under the terms of the present Executive order (although not under the 14th amendment as interpreted by the courts), the project presumably could be maintained on a segregated basis. The resulting anomaly, existing at a time when projects contracted for subsequent to November 20, 1962, are also in full operation with a prohibition on discrimination, is obvious. Section 102 of the President's order does direct executive departments and agencies to take "other appropriate action" permitted by law to end discriminatory practices in federally subsidized housing under existing contracts, but this falls far short of the mandatory provisions contained in section 101, governing future contracts.

The second distinction among housing programs made by the Executive order is that which excludes from its coverage mortgage loans made by federally supervised mortgage lending institutions. As has been noted, the type of Federal assistance granted to housing varies from program to program, from direct Federal grants, loans and subsidies to mortgage insurance and guarantees. In addition, to these specific housing programs, "conventional" mortgages granted by federally supervised institutions play a major role in the Nation's housing growth. These are estimated to represent the great majority of mortgage financing today. The 1961 report of the Commission on Civil Rights (p. 151, recommendation 3) included a recommendation with a dissent by one Commissioner and a dissent in part by a second), that the Federal Government "* * * take appropriate measures to require all financial institutions engaged in a mortgage loan business that are supervised by a Federal agency to conduct such business on a nondiscriminatory basis, and to direct all relevant Federal agencies to devise reasonable and effective implementing procedures." (The Commission's findings in support of this recommendation are annexed as appendix B.)

This recommendation refers to conventional mortgages granted by institutions under Federal supervision such as those whose deposits are insured by FDIC and FSLIC. The Federal relationship to these institutions does not extend specifically to their mortgages, other than the FHA and VA mortgages already covered. Any exercise of Federal power, therefore, would be based upon Federal benefits to the institution such as Federal deposit insurance, with the leverage the Federal Government has over the institution as a result of public demand for safety arising from such insurance, the absence of which caused widespread public suffering during the depression years of the 1930's. It is not altogether clear whether the general constitutional requirements against discrimination applicable to federally supported housing programs would extend to other activities affecting housing administered by institutions supervised by the Federal Government, but not directly related to the form of Federal assistance received by those institutions. This question is particularly difficult in the case of FDIC and FSLIC insurance, the benefits of which run, in the first instance, to the depositor, although the widely advertised existence of such insurance coverage benefits the institution as a substantial factor in obtaining deposits. On the other hand, it does appear that the Federal Government could, by such devices as writing in nondiscrimination clauses, in contracts of deposit insurance, direct regulation, or other means, require that a nondiscrimination policy be established. Whatever the means adopted, the fact cannot be escaped that there is still a wide area where housing discrimination exists within reach of Federal supervision and control, and that some procedure must be found to end this discrimination at an early date.

There is a further basic defect in the Executive order to which we must also call attention. This is the procedural power granted to various agencies to grant exemptions from the scope of the Executive order. Under this provision, FHA has already excluded the resale of single family homes, an exemption of dubious validity. The power exists to exempt other forms of housing, without standards upon which exemptions must be based. It is an unusual and potentially dangerous provision, in that it grants to an agency authority to determine the extent to which it wishes to enforce constitutional guarantees or Presidential directives.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the committee's conclusions:

1. The Executive order against discrimination in housing issued by the President on November 20, 1962, is based on sound and well-established constitutional grounds, and is well within the authority of the President—and his duty—to enforce the Constitution of the United States.

2. The Executive order does not establish any new rights which did not heretofore exist, but does establish procedures and directives for agency enforcement of such rights.

3. The exclusion of contracts entered into prior to November 20, 1962, is not based upon any appropriate legal distinction between such contracts and those subsequently executed, with the possible exception of FHA and VA mortgage contracts.

4. The power of the President to enforce the Constitution extends substantially beyond the scope of this Executive order, and the executive power to implement public policy through the inclusion of contract provisions extends even further.

The committee therefore recommends as follows:

1. That the Executive order be amended to cover all public housing, irrespective of when constructed; all urban renewal projects, irrespective of when contracted for; and all other housing programs to which Federal grants, loans, or subsidies are made.

2. That the Executive order be amended to include subsequent sale or lease of property covered by FHA or VA insurance, on the ground that such sale or transfer subject to FHA or VA mortgages is a new action which should extend to new individuals the benfits of Federal action after the date of the Executive order.

3. That the recommendation of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission with respect to the elimination of discriminatory practices in mortgage loans by federally supervised mortgage lending institutions be given early implementation, through the use of the contract power or other proper tools of Federal supervision and action, with a minimum interference with concepts of free enterprise consistent with achieving effective results.

4. That the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission with respect to housing in Washington, D.C., which should be a model community demonstrating American freedom and equal opportunity in housing, be implemented at an early date by the Commissioners for the District of Columbia.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

While we are acting, in this report, in our capacity as lawyers considering the legal implications of the Executive order, it is incumbent upon us, as American citizens, to add a further comment regarding the Executive order, its background, and its future. We are pleased that some action has been taken in this important area of human need. The continuation of segregation in housing has long been one of the blots on the American image both at home and abroad, and is a basic cause of many other inequalities resulting from segregation, such as schools with students from only one race, unequal employment opportunities, unequal recreational opportunities, and the like, resulting from the racial living patterns created by housing discrimination. Experience in the enforcement of State laws against discrimination in housing, illustrates that such regulations do not necessarily have a depressing effect on home construction, as some uninformed members of the public believe, and that they are a useful and necessary first step in the elimination of other patterns of segregation.

We believe that it is incumbent upon the President in the near future to further implement and expand the Executive order, to the extent we have found in this memorandum to be within his powers. We further believe that it is incumbent upon the agencies concerned to carry out this Executive order, not only as to the letter of the provisions, but in the spirit in which it is written.

This Nation will soon celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation and the 100th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, which proclaimed the right of all citizens to equal rights to purchase and hold real property. Many individual States have successfully implemented this policy by adopting strong measures to guarantee full equality in housing. The U.S. Government can and must do no less.

Respectfully submitted.

Committee on Civil Rights, New York County Lawyers' Association: Whitney North Seymour, Jr., Chairman; Harold Baer, Jr., Edward F. L. Bruen, William C. Chanler, Herbert J. Deitz, Benjamin P. DeWitt, Saul C. Downes, Richard W. Hulbert, Isadore B. Hurwitz, Eric M. Javits, Robert M. Kaufman, John J. Loflin, Jr., Leah Marks, Harold Mitherz, Sophia A. Olmsted, Theodore Pearle, Charles Planick, Sol Rabkin, Herbert Schrank, Thomas G. Weaver, Henry Weiner.

Mr. JAVITS. The Commission's present recommendation goes beyond this background only insofar as it recommends withholding of Federal funds for all purposes in Mississippi until the State demonstrates its compliance with the Constitution and laws of the United States. I see no legal difficulty with this application of the principle: since the entire governmental machinery of the State seemingly is arrayed against enforcement of constitutional rights. Even the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the State are currently under charge of defiance of orders of the courts of the United States. Yet, as the Commission finds in this report, massive Federal assistance to the economy of Mississippi has continued: $270 million for fiscal year 1962 was collected from the State in taxes, but the Federal Government has poured in more than $650 million in grant-in-aid programs, construction contracts, military contracts, and direct civilian and military payrolls. The Commission notes that an additional $400 million moon rocket engine test center is being planned for the State.

And I am particularly appalled that, among all the other appalling statistics spelled out by the Commission, the problem of airport segregation, which was thought to have been solved as a result of my repeated assaults in the Senate upon appropriation bills including airport funds, has reappeared in connection with a jet airport being built at Jackson, Miss., with $2,180,000 of Federal money. As recently as last August 31, when the independent offices appropriation bill for fiscal 1963, including airport construction funds for the Federal Aviation Agency, was before the Senate, I reported with satisfaction that substantial progress had been made, that the FAA had changed its regulations, that the Justice Department had been successful in several suits, and that the problem remained only in one case in which the suit was still pending. Now the U.S. Civil Rights Commission itself reveals that the FAA has failed to adhere to the change which I had been led to believe had been made in its policy, and has failed to question the Jackson Airport's plan for segregated eating and restroom facilities. An airport financed with Federal funds is going to be segregated. Such action is absolutely intolerable in our country.

Unless the Senator wishes to continue to speak, I have another observation to make on that point.

Mr. HART. No. I recall distinctly the action of the senior Senator from New York with respect to airports. I thought we had resolved that question. Let us find out how we stand on this and all other activities of a similar kind. Certainly the continued efforts of the Senator are welcome. Together we shall see what we can accomplish. I hope that it will be significant.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan, if he desires to finish any thought on the question.

Mr. HART. Not at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to mention a fact relating to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission report which is very significant to me: that the report now has the support of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's Advisory Committee locally functioning in Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent that a story appearing in the New York Times from Jackson, Miss., quoting the vice chairman of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the Civil Rights Commission, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MISSISSIPPIANS BACK A U.S. FUND CUTOFF

(By Claude Sitton)

JACKSON, MISS., April 17.—The Mississippi Advisory Committee to the Civil Rights Commission today backed a recommendation for drastic action by President Kennedy to protect Negro rights in this State.

The panel of five white and four Negro Mississippians said it was gratified by the Commission's proposal that Mr. Kennedy consider a moratorium on Federal spending in the State, though it acknowledged the necessity for it with deep regret.

"We find that the existing conditions under which our Negro citizens must live are in the main intolerable, with a continuing deprivation of rights, and an ever-present threat of police brutality and economic reprisal against any citizen who attempts to break the established patterns of segregation," they said. The statement was read by Mrs. Wallis I. Schutt, of Jackson, the chairman, after a 1-day hearing here into reports of violence and police intimidation of Negroes in the Mississippi Delta.

The Commission recommendation to President Kennedy late yesterday urged him to cut off Federal aid to this State unless it acted promptly to halt widespread civil rights violations. Gov. Ross R. Barnett refused this morning at a news conference to comment on the subject.

The Commission's action, according to observers here, may create political difficulties for former Gov. J. P. Coleman, a firm friend of the Kennedy administration. He is expected to seek the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in the August primary.

Mr. Coleman's chances have already been hurt by animosity over the use of deputy Federal marshals and troops to enforce Federal court desegregation orders at the University of Mississippi.

This situation is considered one of the chief factors underlying the behind-the-scenes opposition of some administration leaders in Washington to the Commission recommendation.

Friends of Mr. Coleman averted a similar situation recently in Greenwood. It seemed at one point that it might become necessary for the President to send marshals into that delta city to protect Negro voter registration workers.

However, an agreement was reached under which Greenwood officials released eight Negro registration workers from prison. The Justice Department, in turn dropped its efforts to obtain an injunction against city officials.

There was no doubt here that Negroes and white liberals considered the steps urged by the Commission necessary to preserve civil rights in this State.

In its statement of support, the Advisory Committee said that even persons encouraging Negroes to assert their legal rights were subjected to harassments and threats. The statement went on to say that "if individual rights are not assured by the State government, citizens have no choice but to turn to the Federal Government for protection."

The Committee accused the State of consistently abdicating its responsibilities in this field.

"It has brazenly espoused racist mythology as official policy, thus serving notice on some 42 percent of the population that they are inferior in the eyes of the State," the committee declared. "It has encouraged the people of Mississippi to disregard laws and judicial decisions of the United States, and to place State loyalty above national loyalty.

"It has fostered a spirit of enmity toward our duly constituted National Government, based on false ideas of Federal-State relationships in our American system of government."

The Committee said the Kennedy administration could not continue to allow this situation to exist.

"Unless the Federal Government, too, is derelict in the fulfillment of its constitutional duties, it cannot forever ignore such gross irresponsibility, not to say subversion, on the part of the State government," the Committee said.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to read one paragraph which I think is greatly informative:

> The Committee accused the State of consistently abdicating its responsibilities in this field—

To wit, the field of individual rights.

> And—

Said the spokesman for the Committee, its chairman, Mrs. Wallis I. Schutt, of Jackson, Miss.—

> it has brazenly espoused racist mythology as official policy, thus serving notice on some 42 percent of the population that they are inferior in the eyes of the State.

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission now puts this problem squarely to the President of the United States. In addition to recommending that he withhold Federal funds, the Commission "urgently requests" the President to "formally reiterate his concern" by requesting all persons" in Mississippi "to join in protecting the rights of U.S. citizens" and by "directing them to comply with the Constitution and laws of the United States." The Commission here refers to the President's constitutional duty "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed," a direct quotation from article II, section 3, of the Constitution. The Commission also urgently requests the President to "continue and strengthen" the administration's efforts to provide Federal protection to the "exercise of basic constitutional rights." What more the Justice Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation could do under existing law than they have done in Mississippi is not stated by the Commission, but the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission made the following finding in its January report, which bears repetition here:

> This committee finds that the Federal Government has not provided the citizens of Mississippi the protection due them as American citizens. The Department of Justice has acted in good faith, but the present interpretation of the function of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department is unduly and unwisely narrow and limited. This may be due to the inadequacy of funds available to the Division for staff and the like, and it may be due to a reluctance to bring cases to trial under existing Civil Rights Acts in view of the prospect of facing an all-white jury likely to return a verdict in favor of a white law enforcement official accused by a Negro. Whatever the reason, the fact that police officers are rarely tried on civil rights charges has led the public to believe that few serious charges are ever made, and has reinforced the belief among offending peace officers that they may treat or mistreat Negroes as their whims direct them.

The committee then recommended:

> That the President direct the Department of Justice to investigate every allegation of physical abuse of authority by State or local officials in Mississippi, and institute criminal proceedings in all cases in which such action appears to be warranted, regardless of the prospects for conviction.

Since this recommendation was made, so far as I know, no Federal criminal actions have been brought against State and local officials although the acts of violence against Negroes who attempt to register to vote have, as the Commission outlines in its report, increased in frequency and intensity and although meager efforts are apparently made by the local authorities to apprehend or bring to justice the wrongdoers.

With the Mississippi Advisory Committee report and the U.S. Civil Rights Commission report, which the advisory committee supports, the question has now been put squarely up to the President of the United States. I believe it is his duty to do the following. It is not sufficient for us merely to ask or demand that the President instruct the government departments appropriately. I think our attitude must be more specific than that. I think it is now the duty of the President of the United States, if he feels that he needs legislation, to send us a message and ask for it. It is my judgment that he does not need such legislation, even to withhold funds. As a President can withhold funds appropriated by the Congress for the construction of bombers—which President Truman, President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have done—so a President can, it seems to me, withhold other appropriated funds including those from a State which is directly violating the Constitution of the United States.

But if the President feels that he needs legislation, it is his duty to ask for it by special message to the Congress. He sent us a special message on civil rights the other day relating to bills which, with all respect, are not the most critical in this field. Certainly the situation of complete lawlessness in a State demands even more urgently a special message.

Secondly and very importantly, even if the President feels he does not need legislation and even if the Attorney General advises him that he does not need legislation, the President may himself be reluctant to make so critical and important a decision as this, in view of the statements of colleagues from the South to cut off Federal funds to Mississippi that would be one of the most horrendous violations of the Constitution of which they know, then the President ought to do what was done, for example, by President Eisenhower in the case of sending the Marines into Lebanon, and ask the Congress for a concurrent resolution alining itself with him on the question of policy which is here involved.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the crisis is a real national crisis. The country cannot tolerate such suppression of individual rights of citizens as is going on in Mississippi. Democrats are just as alined on the question as we are on this side as Republicans, as the Senate heard from my colleague [Mr. Keating] and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel]. The country cannot tolerate lawlessness. That is what it comes down to. We must find a way in which to deal with it. The Senate has been offered time and again the way of litigation in the courts, through the famous part III provision, which it has rejected.

Mr. President, as pointed out by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, there is another way. Either the Attorney General must be given the right to sue in the courts in civil rights cases, if that is the route we will travel, or the President must exercise the power of denying to a State the money received in taxes from all taxpayers when that State flies in the face of the rights of all taxpayers.

I believe the President has the necessary power. If he does not have it, he should ask the Congress for legislation. If he has—and I think he has—then he may desire the comfort of congressional concurrence in an action which would be a drastic one, but which in my opinion the situation calls upon him to take.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is my deep conviction that the clock of history now points to this year as the time when we shall see this Government, in all its branches, concentrate on the job of rooting out Federal programs which, in effect, subsidize discrimination.

Here we have a situation where the tax contributions taken from all Americans are used for programs that only some Americans are permitted to participate in.

This to me resolves the troublesome conflict which many have held as existing—the risk of abandoning programs which are good, in order to achieve the overriding principle of equal treatment.

This administration's record excels any in American history in its efforts, in its determination to practice here in this country what we preach to the rest of the world. This proposal will help achieve that purpose.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INTERIM REPORT OF THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Pursuant to its statutory duty to submit reports to the President and to Congress at such times as either the Commission or the President shall deem desirable, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights submits the following special report with respect to the status of equal protection of the laws in the State of Mississippi:

Since October 1962, the open and flagrant violation of constitutional guarantees in Mississippi has precipitated serious conflict which, on several occasions, has reached the point of crisis. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has become increasingly alarmed at this defiance of the Constitution. Each week brings fresh evidence of the danger of a complete breakdown of law and order.

Citizens of the United States have been shot, set upon by vicious dogs, beaten, and otherwise terrorized because they sought to vote. Since October, students have been fired upon, ministers have been assaulted, and the home of the vice chairman of the State advisory committee to this Commission has been bombed. Another member and his wife were jailed on trumped-up charges after their home had been defiled. Even children, at the brink of starvation, have been deprived of assistance by the callous and discriminatory acts of Mississippi officials administering Federal funds.

All this affronts the conscience of the Nation.

The Commission is fully aware that the administration has followed developments in Mississippi closely, that it has taken strong and vigorous action in assuring that violators of Federal law are prosecuted, and that court orders are enforced. Despite the diligent and aggressive handling of each case as it has arisen, the Nation must be concerned that the pattern of unlawful activity shows no sign of abating. Moreover, 9 years after the Supreme Court unanimously decided that segregation in public elementary and secondary schools violates the equal protection clause of the Constitution, Mississippi has taken no step to comply with the law of the land.

Since its organization, the Commission has been deeply concerned with developments in Mississippi. Its hearing scheduled for October 1962 in that State was first postponed at the request of the Attorney General of the United States, and finally canceled. On March 26, the Attorney General, after referring to the Barnett case, stated that:

"While this case is pending, I continue to hold the view that a public hearing in Mississippi by the Civil Rights Commission would not be appropriate. In the meantime, I hope that the work of the Commission staff can continue as in the past on the question of the operation of Federal programs in Mississippi as elsewhere."

Since October the Commission has received more than 100 complaints from Mississippi alleging denials of constitutional rights. Investigation of these complaints, reports of our State Advisory Committee and other evidence confirm the conclusion of the Commission that prompt and firm action is now required. The Commission has concluded unanimously that only further steps by the Federal Government can arrest the subversion of the Constitution in Mississippi.

The Commission notes the action taken by the President of the United States in employing the force necessary to assure compliance with the court decrees in the University of Mississippi case. It is mindful of the unequivocal public statements of the President expressing his belief that discriminatory practices are morally wrong. The Commission, nevertheless, believes that the President should, consistent with his constitutional and statutory authority, employ to the fullest the legal and moral powers of his Office to the end that American citizenship will not continue to be degraded in Mississippi. We urgently request that:

(1) the President formally reiterate his concern over the Mississippi situation by requesting all persons in that State to join in protecting the rights of U.S. citizens, and, in accordance with his duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, by directing them to comply with the Constitution and laws of the United States;

(2) the President continue and strengthen his administration's efforts to suppress existing lawlessness and provide Federal protection to citizens in the exercise of their basic constitutional rights; and

(3) the Congress and the President consider seriously whether legislation is appropriate and desirable to assure that Federal funds contributed by citizens of all States not be made available to any State which continues to refuse to abide by the Constitution and laws of the United States; and, further, that the President explore the legal authority he possesses as Chief Executive to withhold Federal funds from the State of Mississippi, until the State of Mississippi demonstrates its compliance with the Constitution and laws of the United States.

The people of Mississippi and of the other States should know that according to information available to the Commission in fiscal year 1962, the Federal Government received from all sources in Mississippi $270 million. During the same period, payments from the Federal Government to the State, counties, municipalities, and individuals exceeded $650 million for grant-in-aid programs, U.S. Corps of Engineers construction contracts, military prime contracts, and direct civilian and military payrolls. Examples of additional Federal programs benefitting Mississippi include area redevelopment loans and grants, small business loans, accelerated public works projects, and Federal Aviation Agency grants.

Massive assistance to the economy of Mississippi has continued past the time when the State placed itself in direct defiance of the Constitution and Federal court orders. For example, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency is proceeding with plans to build a $400 million Moon rocket engine test center in Pearl River and Hancock Counties, Miss.

Taking into account the need to comply with statutory requirements which limit the discretion of the executive branch, and recognizing that the location of large Federal installations must reflect national needs, the Commission believes there is an overriding constitutional obligation to make certain that Federal funds are expended in a manner which will benefit all citizens without distinction. The Federal Aviation Agency failed to take cognizance of such an obligation when it granted $2,180,000 for the construction of a jet airport to serve Jackson, Miss., without questioning the airport's plan to build separate eating and restroom facilities.

The financial benefits accruing to Mississippi and its citizens as a result of Federal programs are necessarily financed by American citizens throughout the Nation. The Commission deems it appropriate and desirable that the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government inquire into the moral and legal considerations arising out of a situation where, in large measure, the lawless conduct and defiance of the Constitution by certain elements in one State are being subsidized by the other States.

The Commission does not want the people of Mississippi, either Negro or white, to lose benefits available to citizens of other States. Rather, its goal is that all citizens in the United States be assured the full enjoyment of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. It is upon adherence to that great charter with its powerful moral premises that our survival as a free society depends.

Respectfully submitted,
John A. Hannah,
Chairman.
Robert G. Storey,
Vice Chairman.
Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh,
C.S.C.
Robert S. Rankin,
Spottswood W. Robinson, III,
Erwin N. Griswold.

April 16, 1963.

VERRAZANO DAY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in 1909 a statue of Giovanni da Verrazano was unveiled and dedicated at Battery Park through the dedicated efforts of Italian-Americans. The inscription in Italian on the statue notes that Verrazano, a Florentine, was the first to sail the waters of New York Harbor, and that he preceded another, Hudson, for whom they were named and whose shores were destined to be the site of one of the capital cities of the world:

> Giovanni da Verrazano, Florentine che primo Europeo precorrendo altro piu fortunato dal quale ebbero il nome navigo queste acque le cui terre erano destinate per una della citta capitali del mondo.

On April 17, 1524, Verrazano, sailing for the King of France, entered what is now New York Harbor. His report to the King read as follows:

> We found a very agreeable site located within two small prominent hills (those overlooking what is today the Narrows), between which flowed to the sea a very great river.

He reported that his ship, the *Dauphine*, "anchored off the coast in a good shelter—probably Gravesend Bay—since we did not wish to venture in without knowledge of the entrances." A small boat was put to sea and went through the Narrows, whose waters were found to be deep; the report noted that, "Any laden ship might have passed." After about half a league, it was discovered that the river "made a very beautiful lake with a circuit of about 3 leagues." The "lake," of course, was upper New York Bay, viewed for the first time by white men.

Verrazano named this bay for the sister of the King of France, Marguerite. He and his men did not stay long since "a gale of unfavorable wind" began to blow, putting the *Dauphine* in imminent danger of running aground on the low shore of what is today Long Island. Verrazano's report noted that, "Because of its commodiousness and beauty we much regretted leaving the said land."

It is fitting that a bridge more than 2½ miles long linking Brooklyn and Staten Island at the Narrows will bear his name. The Verrazano-Narrows Bridge will be a huge double-deck structure, with six traffic lanes on each deck. Its twin towers will rise 690 feet, 90 feet higher than the towers of the George Washington Bridge. The main suspension span, measuring 4,260 feet, will be 60 feet longer than San Francisco's Golden Gate Bridge. This great bridge will be a tribute at long last to the greatness of Verrazano's place in our history.

THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING, APRIL 1943

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, when we think of a wall around a captive people today, Berlin comes immediately to mind. The 19th of April will mark the 20th anniversary of an uprising against another wall surrounding and sealing off from the outside a group of people. This will be the anniversary of an uprising of the Warsaw Jews, forced from their homes into the confines of a ghetto by Nazi occupiers, and from that ghetto, systematically taken to the gas chambers and death.

The fact of death being so near was slow to come to these poor and forgotten peoples of the Jewish quarter in Warsaw—what was happening and had happened to them was so beyond comprehension that not even those living with it knew what was in store. First, with the arrival of the Nazi invaders in 1939, came restrictions of civil freedoms, then all the Jews of the city were forced into one area to live, were cut off from the outside, "Aryan" world. Then came the mass deportation to work camps outside the city. Whole families were forcibly deported to those camps, and nothing was heard from them again. Slowly, but in mounting horror, the word came back that the work camps were really death camps. Those marched from the ghettos were never heard of again because they were marched to the slaughter.

When those of the ghettos finally realized their fate there was no more talk of compromise with the awful reality that had surrounded them for the last 3 years—it was either to fight and die as a martyr to the fact of their being, or it was passive acceptance of being murdered at the will and convenience of the Nazi.

The decision was to fight. The obstacles were not considered, the store of arms limited, but the will was there. It was the season of the Passover, a time of remembrance and hope for all Jews. It was also the time that the Germans picked to make a last cleanup drive of the 40,000 Jews remaining in the ghetto, and start them on the trip to the extermination camps.

On the morning of April 19, the storm troopers, with their Polish and Ukrainian allies, started into the ghetto area, but this time instead of the cries of mothers, their children torn from protecting arms, they were met with bombs and bullets—the uprising was on.

Poorly equipped, with little food or water, the heroic fighters held out against repeated attacks by troops and planes—while the young and old, mothers and children, hid from the fight. The resisters concealed themselves in attics and cellars; they slept during the day and prepared their traps for the Nazis at night. Finally, in an effort to break their stubborn resistance, the entire ghetto area was put to the torch. Driven from attic hideouts, the people of the ghetto went underground. They were beaten but would not give up. They would die by their own hand rather than be taken by the Germans. On May 8 the central command post was taken, and most of the leaders of the uprising met their end. Still, the struggle went on until finally, by the end of May there was almost nothing left but rubble and a few buildings. Defeat came, defeat in death.

It is for us today to remember these heroic days 20 years ago, and to dedicate ourselves, as the governing body of a nation devoted to freedom with justice and equal opportunity for all, that the deaths of the Warsaw ghetto defenders shall not be forgotten. Their sacrifice should inspire us, in our deliberations, to insure this liberty and equality to all peoples.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR HOUSING DISCRIMINATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, all of us are aware that the achievement of equal opportunity in housing is a complex job. In this area, even more than in others, buckpassing is the order of the day.

Recently, I had an opportunity to read excerpts from an address by the executive director of the National Urban League, Mr. Whitney M. Young, Jr., delivered at the 15th Annual National Civil Liberties Clearinghouse Conference in Washington last month. Mr. Young quite candidly illustrated how widely shared is the responsibility for discrimination in housing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Young's remarks be printed at this point in the Record in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts From Address by Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director, National Urban League, Washington, D.C., March 28, 1963

HOUSING DISCRIMINATION—WHO'S RESPONSIBILITY?

Mr. Chairman, distinguished colleagues on the platform, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply conscious of the importance of this subject at this time, the competence and wisdom of my fellow speakers and certainly awed by the array of experts present in this audience. On an impulse, I have nevertheless discarded my previously prepared speech, on which my staff and I struggled so hard. It was an excellent speech, filled with the kind of technical details and reflecting the type of erudition which this audience deserves and expects. My reason for this decision to talk in rather simple, frank language stems from the fact that only a few hours ago I arrived in Washington from a 5-day tour of Army and Navy bases in this country, as a member of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. One of our main concerns was housing for the Negro serviceman and his family, the great bulk of which must be obtained off base. This experience, fresh in my memory, gave me an opportunity to see firsthand, not only the tragic situation to which these defenders of our Nation must involuntarily submit, but also the deplorable state—both quantity- and qualitywise—of housing for most Negro citizens around the country. I stand here today angry and ashamed of man's inhumanity, his indifference and his cruelty to his fellow human being, his fellow American. That we should permit or subject citizens to live in the hovels and the hellholes I have seen is unworthy of a great country and a damaging indictment against our claim as leaders of a free and democratic society.

Housing discrimination—Whose responsibility?

All of us, our sin is either that we did it, or we permitted it. Let's be specific.

1. The real estate broker and the builder, who reacting to a real market or trying to create an artificial one, aroused or appealed to prejudice by establishing neighborhoods and developments on the basis of racial exclusiveness. This was more than a pitch for snob appeal. It was a deliberate, ofttimes

overt propagandizing of the dangers of living in racially inclusive neighborhoods by implying that life was safer and better in the exclusive neighborhood.

2. The moneychangers, which includes most lending institutions and the insurance brokers with the Federal Government, setting the example and leading the way. They not only swallowed the myth, but most often worked hand in hand with the builders and realtors in making the system firm and airtight.

3. City planning boards, on which Negro citizens are rarely if ever represented, are now aided and abetted by urban renewal boards who make a mockery of citizen participation. These officials sit at drafting boards and in strategy sessions planning or plotting, not how to open a city for all ethnic groups or even how to eliminate future slums and ghettos, but rather preoccupied with expressways to transport the commuter and shopper quickly to town; with clearance of land largely inhabitated by Negroes, to build new industry; high rise commercial buildings and high rent apartments to attract the tired and retired commuter back to the city. Relocation which comes as an afterthought with low priority rarely shows imagination or creativity. It usually consists of putting the displaced in public housing, older homes made vacant by panic-selling white citizens and panic-buying Negro citizens. Not infrequently a moment of conscience will yield a development of low income or middle income minimum standard housing, which by the nature of the approved site and the demand, these few homes become another Negro ghetto.

4. Mayors, city councils, and public housing authorities have somehow managed to place practically every public housing project that is to be occupied by Negro citizens either in or on the fringes of the Negro community. And even those built for white occupancy were usually placed fairly close by out of a fear that some day the Federal Government might even decide that Federal money should not forever continue to support racial segregation.

There are also the city officials who create and perpetuate slums by almost universally adopting an unwritten double standard when it comes to city services, zoning considerations, and code enforcement. In some cases, this is even interpreted and admitted as a concession made to the Negro to maintain his housing supply. In reality, it is a concession to wealthy owners of slums and also compensation for the guilty officials who do not move more forcefully to open the entire city for all citizens.

5. Finally, even some Negro citizens have played a role, though minor, white realtors have no monopoly on block busting. They have taught the art to some Negro real estate brokers who have gotten into the act. Some Negro citizens, out of desperation and resignation, have built large and beautiful but segregated developments. Another handful have perpetuated segregation by not capitalizing on the efforts of a few fair housing committees or not fully exploiting the few good laws that exist.

Yes, we can with validity and ample justification, point our fingers at all these individuals and groups as performing a role in housing discrimination. But, they could not have accomplished this, if just a few citizens had indicated otherwise. The truth is that each of us has within him somewhere the need for privilege, advantage, distinctiveness, exclusiveness. It is everyone's secret desire to be a big shot—American style—but since only a few can be the "tops" in their chosen profession or art, they fall back on whatever they have that is different. With white, it is whiteness. In some communities and facilities it is a combination of whiteness and being Christian. In this situation, all that is needed is an elementary knowledge of psychology and Madison Avenue promotion. Not only do the bigot and the dumb succumb, but also the liberals and the intellectuals. People can be both, but not necessarily. It would be an interesting survey to see how many liberals, including intergroup relation professionals, who live in these lily white neighborhoods or apartments. I know several rather prominent ones.

All this leads me to my first suggestion and the one that to me is basic. Somehow, we must help people to see integration as an opportunity not a problem. For the Negro it is obviously a better opportunity for decent housing and education, but it is an opportunity also for white citizens: (1) To rid themselves of some of the drab sameness that so characterizes their neighborhoods, schools, clubs, etc.; (2) to increase their creativity which only comes through diversity; and (3) to better and more realistically prepare themselves and their children for the kind of a world which exists in part today and certainly in full tomorrow.

We must begin now to reverse the distorted norms and the stupid status symbols of the past which did more to reflect our insecurity and our "nation of sheep" behavior than it did to reflect our intelligence. We must rid ourselves of the desperate need for the protection of color similarity in anything. This calls for some real soul searching and a rather drastic change for most Americans around what is important. What is success? What is good? Then and only then will we move into the intelligent realization that exclusiveness of any type can lead only to stagnation while inclusiveness helps us grow, mature, and become creative in the ways that are truly important.

My second suggestion is that we quit deluding ourselves by trying to identify a single factor as the all-important one in the struggle against race discrimination. The dangers are twofold: (1) People always pick the answer most remote to their personal responsibility and so do nothing; and (2) it just is not true that there is a single solution. Unless you have a good education, you cannot get a good job, and without a good job you cannot buy a decent house in a decent neighborhood where your child can get a good education.

Finally, let us recognize that without law and firm aggressive administrative action nothing much is really likely to happen in housing. Only a handful of States and cities have truly effective legislation. I am also convinced that here again legislation and administrative action must come from the Federal Government. In city after city I was told by public officials and military base commanders that only legislation and clear directives from Washington would solve the problem. And let's face it, the recent Executive order which graciously excluded all existing housing and generously exempts the sources of finance is only a feeble first step. It is significant only because nothing had been done and our praises and commendation to the President reflected more the sordidness of our past and the sickness of our present society, than it did the revolutionary nature of the order itself. And even here, I am optimistic only about its implementation because of what I have heard about Governor Lawrence.

I only hope he will get a staff and a committee which will be more concerned about making life livable for suffering minorities than about whether they are antagonizing real estate boards, builders' associations, and chambers of commerce. This will not be easy as most commissions have found, but some have done it and not only relieved the oppressed, but earned the respect and affection of their fellow citizens.

All of us, as well as our organizations, are challenged. Certainly, we in the Urban League, who for over a half century have been pursuing this goal are challenged. Through our 65 affiliates, hundreds of full-time staff and thousands of volunteers in the strategic urban areas, we are preparing for a dramatic push in this area which will include not only our own organizational effort, but a new level of cooperation and consultation with other private and governmental institutions.

I submit our alternatives are tragic to contemplate. The time for courageous action is now. Tomorrow will be too late.

MSU SAYS WELCOME HOME TO PEACE CORPS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am pleased to be informed by R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, that Michigan State University has established 20 or more graduate assistantships for returning Peace Corps volunteers.

At first glance, the fact that one of our finest universities would find a place for the volunteers, on their return, might seem a lucky break for them. Actually, I believe the institution itself will be the gainer by having in its midst these young men and young women of intelligence and dedication whose 2 years' service overseas will have given them a new perspective and a maturity which will enrich the educational experience of those who come in contact with them. I congratulate MSU and the volunteers.

THE PROBLEM OF HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the problem of health care for the aging will continue to grow more urgent and more complex unless Congress takes action on a practical solution. With the percentage of the aging in our population steadily increasing each year, and costs for hospital and other health care rising rapidly while the retirement incomes of the aging remain relatively static, it is obvious that prompt action to provide assistance in meeting these high costs is essential. Millions of Americans are not going to be able to afford the health care they need without the kind of health care insurance proposed in my bill.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record an article entitled "Chances Brighten for Passing Medicare Measure—in 1964" which appeared in the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Sunday, March 10, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHANCES BRIGHTEN FOR PASSING MEDICARE MEASURE IN 1964

What are the chances for enactment of a national program of health benefits for elderly citizens in 1963?

Since such proposals have bounced around Congress for several years, it is understandable that millions of Americans are once more anxiously asking that question.

Chances are slim that the President's proposals to pay for hospital and nursing home care through social security will get far this year. But there are reasons to believe that a medicare bill will squeak through in 1964, an election year. But it will have to survive an explosive battle.

For like it or not, the health problems of nearly 17 million Americans 65 years old and older are hopelessly tangled in politics.

The social security-financed program has never reached the House floor for a vote. Prospects for such are brighter because of a political move placing two medicare backers on the House Ways and Means Committee to replace retiring opponents. Up to now the committee has been dominated by a majority against the bill. This brings the majority against it down to one.

Medicare supporters hope to manipulate the slim margin and get the plan out. Once the bill reaches the House floor—still an "iffy" assumption—its backers hope for enough grassroots support to overcome the counterpressures. The American Medical Association, trumpeting its tired fears that the program would open the doors to State medicine, will mobilize its biggest drive in opposition and conceivably could succeed in killing the medicare bill.

If the measure passes the House, the bill should have easier going in the Senate. Three more Democratic Senators are expected to avert the narrow medicare defeat of 1962. Some improvements in the administration's newest bill and modifications offered from both sides of the aisle should attract more Republican support.

An educated guess is that this won't happen in 1963. Up to now Congress has shown little enthusiasm for the Kennedy legislative program. The Ways and Means Committees, which handle medicare, will be involved with the tax program throughout most of the year.

The real battle over the legislation is months away, but the illnesses and hardships of the aging cannot be postponed. They are with us.

Older persons are the victims of a medicare paradox. Science has checked the great killers of the past—the infectious diseases—but in so doing it has enlarged to staggering totals the aged population with its concomitant afflictions. Over the age of 60, two of five people have some form of chronic disease. The pattern of the needs for medical science clearly lies in the degenerative field.

The Kennedy proposal of 1963 comes closer to meeting those needs than the 1962 model.

Its major points are uniform national coverage; social security payment of inpatient hospital costs for up to 90 days; care in a skilled nursing home; home health care visits and some diagnostic services. The costs would be met by a one-quarter of 1 percent boost in the social security tax and an increase in the taxable annual earnings base from $4,800 to $5,200.

The new program removes a glaring flaw in last year's proposal—it sets up a separate health insurance trust fund to cover more than 2.5 million aged people not eligible for social security benefits. This improvement results from a compromise proposal offered last year by Senators Jacob K. Javits and Clinton P. Anderson.

Another provision should be added—option to let beneficiaries have their benefits paid by private health insurance which would be reimbursed by the trust fund. There is much to be said for letting a private nonprofit organization with experience in the field, such as Blue Cross, administer medicare instead of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We urged that a medicare program be enacted last year provided it carried the basic improvements just enumerated. It failed. In the meantime the over-65 population has increased by many thousands. Their health woes have multiplied, too. How much longer must they wait for this humanitarian program to eventuate? Politics or not, it could come this year if Congress cared enough.

THE NEW GERMANY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the visit to Israel of Dr. Eugen Gerstenmaier, President of the German Bundestag, last November, marked a high point in the relations between the two countries. Dr. Gerstenmaier was a member of the German resistance to Hitler and the Nazi movement, and was held prisoner in a concentration camp until U.S. troops freed him in April 1945. His presence in Israel and frank discussions about the political transformation of Germany from a totalitarian Nazi state to a democracy and its sincere efforts to make amends for Nazi crimes made a significant contribution to better understanding between the two countries.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record excerpts from his address entitled "Are the Germans Changing?" which he delivered at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, November 21, 1962.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Are the Germans Changing?

I

The breakdown of the Weimar Republic and Hitler's seizure of power, his racial phobia and the ensuing war led to the death of a total of 50 million people, of whom 6 million were Jews and 7 millon Germans; as a further result, Germany was divided into three parts and the Communists extended their sphere of domination from the former eastern frontier of Poland right into the center of Germany. Germany ceased to be a great power, let alone a world power. It is not in a position to safeguard itself or even its capital city by its own means. Although it has been able to offer 12 or 13 million refugees and expellees the opportunity of starting a new life, it cannot provide reasonable living conditions for 17 million of its citizens in central Germany, to say nothing of achieving a social and political community with them.

I believe that the fact that Hitler had to lose the war in the end has come nowadays to be at least an intellectual if not a moral recognition by the greater part of the German people. However, the fact that afterward the free world had to lose the peace is still beyond the comprehension of most Germans. Here lay one of the chief unconscious obstacles raised against putting Adenauer's foreign and security policy into effect. The setting up of the Bundeswehr, introduction of military service and German entry into NATO met with fierce opposition, since these acts implied an engagement with other powers whom many Germans bore a grudge, not because the partners were former war enemies, but because they had let themselves be hoodwinked by Soviet Russia.

Such grudges were mixed in many cases with a feeling of unbounded resignation. "What next, little man?" many Germans had already asked themselves in the clamour of the prewar Nazi period, when faced with the ruthlessness of the totalitarian state. During the war this feeling of being nothing more than an object developed into a sense of complete powerlessness, also in those who had joined in quite readily at the outset. Finally, with the unconditional surrender, this state of affairs seemed clinched by other absolute forces. The reeducation carried out in Germany by the Americans did not succeed in overcoming this feeling. Nor was the political situation in the world—with the development of two giant blocs which met with arms at the ready on German territory—likely to refute the average German's conviction that he was no more than an object of world politics. An object under Hitler, an object afterwards—this feeling became an inner danger and even today has not been completely overcome.

The feeling has, however, also played its part in doing away with many illusions, because in this idea that Germany was merely an object in the hands of stronger powers came the final fall of both national socialism and the nationalism handed down from the 19th century. Nevertheless, however highly one may rate this development, such opinions and feelings are not sufficient. As much as the reality may seem to speak in their favor, they do not do reality justice, with their de facto denial of every opportunity for action worth mentioning. Indeed, the virtual withdrawal from resistance, which this attitude implies, as well as withdrawal from personal and national commitment to the demands of right and duty, is amoral. True, the dreadful superiority of unscrupulous powers has a paralyzing effect, but it is nevertheless blameworthy to let oneself lapse into surrendering one's own responsibility. The consequence is a void or vacuum which renders the individual (as well as the entire nation) incapable of looking his deeds and misdeeds, and therefore himself and his future, seriously and compellingly in the face. The central question which I must set myself is therefore not whether a transformation has taken place in Germany—that goes without saying—but whether this transformation is the result of such serious and critical soul-searching on the part of the Germans; what are the powers behind it; and what is its aim?

II

The political transformation of Germany since the Second World War is based on the systematic renunciation by German policymakers of the sovereign policy of a nation-state. I do not in the least doubt that this renunciation is also approved of by the greater part of the German population behind the Iron Curtain. It is of far-reaching significance since it consummates Germany's abdication of its own great power policy between east and west. It also represents Germany's refusal to undertake any separate action with respect to the east. This renunciation is not quite unchallenged in Germany even today, not because old forms of thinking inherited from the days of Bismarck are still alive, but because some people still hold fast to the illusion that a neutral Germany would be able to obtain its unity and assert its free existence. However, since the Social Democrat Opposition adhered to the line of the Adenauer foreign policy, this neutralism has lost every serious possibility of political success in Germany.

One of the basic reasons for this change is found in the threat deriving from the ever-increasing expansion of power on the part of Soviet Russia and its satellites. One can, however, go as far as to say that even without such a threat a fundamental change would have taken place in the philosophy of German foreign policy and would have called for practical consequences. The recent visit paid by the French head of state to the Federal Republic provided a striking example of this. The welcome given General de Gaulle was so hearty and even tumultuous that it surpassed all expectations. Inevitably, the opinion was voiced that this was precisely a proof of the German's bent for the Fuhrer cult. However, without doubt this interpretation overlooks the decisive point. Whoever has walked over the bloodstained Franco-German battlefields of two or even three wars, and opened his eyes to the urgent need for peace between these two peoples, can understand how sincerely the French head of state was welcomed in Germany. Enough of these wars between Germany and France. Enough of the long history of disaster between us and our neighbors.

This determination burst upon De Gaulle in all its intensity in Germany. It is this determination that alined Germany wholeheartedly with the idea of European unity. In the "Kreisauer Kreis" we envisaged the future of Germany, ever since the beginning of the Second World War, only on the basis of a lasting partnership with our European neighbors. Others saw it likewise. But apparently it took the hostilities of the Second World War and the rise of such powerful political realities as the United States and the Soviet Union to do away with the opposition—which existed not only in Germany—against the ideas. European integration and the Atlantic alliance were not considered by the Germans merely as an opportunity of making a political virtue of necessity; we regarded them as the positive meaning, in terms of world history, behind a terrible catastrophe. And German policy had to be put to the service of this meaning, that is, of setting up a new and lasting order of freedom and peace in Europe.

This attitude represented a mixture of political reasoning and instinctive willingness to start afresh. German foreign policy was only a proof of this; nor did it abandon its goal when that goal was challenged in the name of national reunification. In Germany, reunification is recognized as an obligation. But this does not alter the fact that postwar German foreign policy is determined by a carefully considered order of precedence, in which freedom—and thus solidarity with the free world—hold the first place; peace—and therefore renunciation of any aggressive or revisionary war—the second; and national unity, logically, the third. That is by no means an unproblematical concept of policy, but it is one which the great majority of Germans have freely endorsed. I believe that one can regard this, as well as the reasoning which lies behind it, as the sign of a real transformation in Germany.

III

It is obvious that in such a transformation not only does the structure of foreign and military policy undergo a change, but the traditional national sentiment and consciousness are also affected. It would be even more exact to say that without the transformation of both policy and opinion such a deeprooted political change cannot take place. To be sure, it is a very tricky matter to define the nature of German national sentiment today. Even whether it still exists and may be spoken of as such is controversial. I am convinced that this national spirit is constantly called forth and kept alert by the demand for German reunification and also by the struggle for Berlin. There is nevertheless no doubt about it that this national sentiment and consciousness have changed through and through.

Everyone is aware of the fact that Hitler and his companions were supercriminals; but the question the older generation is thus set remains unsolved: How is it possible that you could have followed and obeyed him? Actually, the question in itself is such an irrefutable reproach that it scarcely needs to be posed. Everything that could be said in reply is insufficient to wipe out this reproach. The result is that the subject is usually avoided in the hope that time, with its new problems, will make the questioners forget their query. For even those who refuse to admit the theory of collective guilt know that they cannot answer otherwise than with open self-humiliation.

The German national spirit did not run riot for the first time with national socialism; just as did the national consciousness of other peoples, it already fell prey to impassioned nationalism of the 19th century, at least temporarily. German conservatism and, all the more so, German liberalism were too weak to prevent this impassioned and corrupting outburst. Later, defeat in the First World War and acceptance of the war guilt imposed on Germany in the Treaty of Versailles hindered, rather than aided, German national consciousness in recovering and returning to normal after 1918. But it was national socialism with its racial madness and uncontrolled demands that finally completely poisoned the feverish national spirit of the Weimar period. We have seen nationalism, hysterical nationalism, at work before and since in other countries. But Nazi racial hatred poisoned German nationalism to such an extent that mass crimes, unequalled in modern history, could be committed on its behalf. In my opinion it is untrue that totalitarian compulsion alone could bring about the extermination of millions; this required the deadly poison of an ideology fanatic enough to produce the class of executioners and henchmen needed for such an operation.

Are the Germans changing? What are the elements of this change? Let me answer these questions as follows in summary form:

1. The change lies in the fact that there has been a basic change in German politics. The turning away of present day German politics from the idea of the national sovereign state, and the entry of the free part of Germany into the integrated structure of the European and Atlantic world, is just as much a historically evidenced truth as is the spiritual and religious change. The change not only has altered the conception of state, but also has entered deeply into the national consciousness and has changed that too. It has not only effected a critical distance from national socialism, but it has also led to its rejection as a matter of conscience. It has not only called the picture of German history into question, but has also changed the historical thinking of the German people.

2. The aims of this German change are, according to the will of all parties, powers and groups represented in the Bundestag today, none other than the strengthening of our dearly won, liberal constitutional state. In conformity with the extent of its power, it is ready to take the responsibility for the burdens and obligations of its past. It also sees the realization of German national unity as a human obligation to its 17 million fellow countrymen who are being denied the human right of self-determination. It is our aim to live together with them in permanent association with the free world and to be a dependable partner of every honestly disposed state.

3. The danger for the Germans is neither the return of national socialism in any form nor a turning towards communism or revenge. The internal danger for Germany is much more a spiritual and mental vacuum and the widespread illusion that this can be overcome by the maximal satisfaction of material needs. The external danger for Germany is the nonacceptance of a morally valid settlement by Soviet Russia.

This survey of Germany has been undertaken with careful consideration and in the knowledge that only a few individual aspects of the picture could be considered at all. In almost everything, I have risked mentioning only those aspects that had to be mentioned, were questionable or which could have caused doubt. Perhaps, however, the effort has enabled you to understand how one German, who has made mistakes, but who has nevertheless striven toward sincerity, sees and feels able to see Germany today.

I know quite well that almost everything I have said can be seen two ways. Nobody need go to any effort in order to find examples of narrowmindedness, thoughtlessness, indeed of malicious stubbornness in all the aspects discussed in this address. But this element is not typical; it is atypical. Nevertheless, it is there. It is confirmed by the fact that the German people have never been nor are now identical units. The picture that I have drawn here on the soil of Israel stems from the contact of one German with his people in widely varying realms of external and internal circumstance. It may be that the light in which the picture has been presented comes, more than I realize myself, from hope and from faith.

I confess that as soon as I remind myself of where and before whom I have been making this effort, there fall on me again, and with terrible force, some of the images and documents that stand not only between you and the Germans, but also between a great part of the world and my people. These images of the past suffice to reduce us Germans to silence. It is a silence of the shame and heartache of countless people of my people before the people of Israel.

HAZARDS IN OUR ENVIRONMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, public attention is focused as never before on problems of environmental hazards and their effect on our way of life—our crops, on wildlife and on people themselves. Actually, the problems have been with us for some time and are growing worse. Some hope that if we ignored them they would go away. But that hope is forlorn. These problems thrive on public inertia.

Rachel Carson's book "Silent Spring" has awakened us all to the hazards in our environment that were nonexistent 25 years ago. Her book, which has generated much public discussion and debate, concentrated on the hazards of chemical poisons used so abuntantly today to control pests, insects, plant diseases and so forth.

Today health authorities all over the Nation are hunting down a contaminated fish product which is already known to have killed two women in Detroit, Mich. Most people thought the high standards required in food production had eliminated that kind of hazard. The fact is, unfortunately, that food poisoning is still with us.

We read with a hopeful "it cannot happen here" attitude of hundreds dying in London as a direct result of breathing poisonous air. We forget that it did happen here, in Donora, Pa., and it can happen again just as it has in the past.

Frequent reports of fish kills in our Nation's watercourses go almost unnoticed except by dedicated conservationists and others who have for years fought for adequate pollution control measures to protect our streams and lakes. But the problem of water pollution hits home hard in the New York metropolitan area when hundreds of people contract infectious hepatitis as a direct result of eating shellfish taken from beds contaminated with sewage.

These are but a few examples of the hazards confronting each one of us in his daily life. As the summary report of the Committee on Natural Resources of the National Academy of Sciences points out:

> Man is altering the balance of a relatively stable system by his pollution of the atmosphere with smoke, fumes, and particles from fossil fuels, industrial chemicals, and radioactive material; by his alteration of the

energy and water balance at the earth's surface by deforestation, afforestation, cultivation of land, shading, mulching, overgrazing grasslands, reduction of evapotranspiration, irrigation, drainage of large swamplands, and the building of cities and highways; by his clearing forests and alterations of plant surface cover, changing the reflectivity of the earth's surface and soil structures; by his landfilling, construction of buildings and seawalls, and pollution, bringing about radical changes in the ecology of estuarine areas; by the changes he effects in the biologic balance the physical relocation of water basins through the erection of dams and channel works; and by the increasing quantities of carbon dioxide an industrial society releases to the atmosphere.

There is a continuing worldwide movement of population to the cities. The patterns of society are being rapidly rearranged, and new sets of aspirations, new evaluations of what constitutes a resource, and new requirements in both type and quantity of resources are resulting.

The effects on man himself of the changes he has wrought in the balance of great natural forces and in the new microenvironment which he has created are but dimly perceived and not at all well understood.

It is time to take stock, to determine where we have been, where we are, and where we are going. We cannot continue to pollute our environment if we are to keep this earth habitable. The Washington Post last Saturday editorially asked:

> How close are we coming to Miss Carson's nightmare of a silent spring, in which the sedge is withered on the lake and no birds sing?

To find some of the answers, at least, will be the purpose of the study to be conducted on "Interagency Coordination in Environmental Hazards" by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from the New York Times for April 14 entitled "Great Debate Over Pests—And Pesticides."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT DEBATE OVER PESTS—AND PESTICIDES

(By Lawrence Galton)

Across the country today people are debating matters that once were of concern only to a relatively few specialists and special groups: conservation and nature's balance, and which may be worse, depredatory pests or the means used to try to obliterate them.

The means, of course, are pesticides—a large and rapidly growing group of compounds designed to control insects, weeds, plant diseases, and rodents.

Their dangers were the theme of National Wildlife Week, recently sponsored by the National Wildlife Federation. A concerned Government has set up a special investigating group, a pesticides committee of the Federal Council for Science and Technology. The pesticide industry, which does a $300 million annual business, is disturbed.

Nature lovers, conservationists, and others who have been warning for some years that pesticides do not stop with pests but are killing birds, fish, and small game as well—and, worse still, constitute a vast threat to human health—are delighted and encouraged that an earnest, rousing indictment by biologist-author Rachel Carson in her book "Silent Spring" finally focused public attention on the problem.

At the same time, many scientists—including those who recognize that there is a problem—worry that, in an emotionally surcharged atmosphere, the public may become confused and unduly apprehensive and there may be pressure for unwise, ill-conceived restrictions on the use of existing—and the development of new—pesticides; this, they fear, could cause incalculable harm.

Just how valuable and necessary are the chemicals? What is known—and what is not—about their possible dangers? How widely are they used, how much abused? Are there feasible substitutes for them? And can the present furor serve a useful purpose?

Although chemical pest control has been practiced to some extent for centuries—even 4,000 years ago, sulfur was being used against insects—it was the introduction, in 1942, of DDT, a potent synthetic compound, that opened up a whole new era. With DDT—and, soon thereafter, other new synthetics, all far more effective and at much lower rates of application than anything known before—it came to be considered practical to use chemicals on an unprecedented scale to protect farm and forest crops and for public-health purposes.

Today more than 50,000 compounds, employing 490 basic chemicals are on the market. Pesticide production in the United States has reached a total of about 1 billion pounds a year.

The impact on agriculture has been profound. In 1940, the average farmer produced enough for himself and 10 others; in 1962 he produced enough for 26 others. Certainly not all the productivity gain has been due to pesticides; mechanization and genetic improvements in crops and livestock played important roles.

But some 3,000 species of insects, perhaps as many plant diseases, and an unknown but huge number of rodents, weeds, and other pests adversely affect cultivated crops grown in the United States. Even now, with widespread use of chemicals, agricultural pests still cause an estimated $15 billion worth of crop destruction yearly—a quarter of total production. Before, the loss was far greater—sometimes almost catastrophic.

In 1946, for example, blight attacked tomatoes, destroying over 50 percent of the crop in 10 States; yields in Pennsylvania fell so precipitously that discouraged farmers cut tomato culture back from 34,200 to 19,400 acres. In the Midwest, during World War II, when the European corn borer attacked millions of acres of sweet corn, production of the crop was largely abandoned. It required development of suitable chemical spray programs to put the crops back on an economically sound basis in the two areas.

Without pesticides, it has been estimated that production in the United States of apples, citrus fruits, cotton, and potatoes would be reduced by 50 percent; of meat, milk, and wool by about 25 percent.

Not just helpful, the chemicals have become essential now—and for three reasons, according to Dr. D. E. H. Frear, professor of Agricultural and Biological Chemistry at Pennsylvania State University: (1) Rapid, worldwide transportation leads to swift importation of many insects and diseases; (2) farmers are going in for intensive production with high-cost-per-acre crops, and insects or diseases that would destroy even a small part of such a crop must be eliminated; and (3) consumers who once, for example, would cheerfully cut a worm from an apple and eat the remainder, now are accustomed to perfection and won't consider buying a wormy apple.

In 1961, a report of a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, a distinguished body which serves as an official scientific adviser to the U.S. Government, noted: "It seems indicated the American people cannot be fed adequately unless crops and livestock are protected from insects and other pests"; and chemical pesticides today are "as much a part of farming as the tractor."

In forests as well as on farms, insects, if unchecked, take a huge toll. Even now, more than 160 destructive types annually chew up 1 billion cubic feet of young forest growing stock and 7 billion board feet of saw timber—enough, it has been estimated, for 60 percent of the homes constructed annually. Many authorities foresee need for far more intensive use of pesticides in the future to meet rising demands for forest products.

As for public health, pesticides are credited with bringing profound benefits. Once prevalent over a large part of the United States, malaria has been virtually eradicated through DDT spraying (the disease still kills 2 million annually elsewhere and a worldwide eradication program is underway). Typhus and dysentery are kept in check with the help of chemical control of insect vectors.

"No less than 5 million lives have been saved, no less than 100 million illnesses have been prevented through the use of DDT for controlling malaria, typhus, dysentery and many other diseases," estimates E. F. Knipling of the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

But if pesticides are valuable, they can also be dangerous. Not all are poisonous to humans, but many are. In 1961 they caused 89 accidental deaths.

The toll, if not huge, is deplorable. But it must be viewed in perspective, say scientists who defend pesticides. Almost twice as many fatalities a year are known to be caused by aspirin, almost half as many by bee stings. Moreover, most victims are, on the one hand, children who accidentally get hold of a pesticide and drink it, and, on the other, sprayers who fail to follow established safety rules. For example, two farmhands dusting turnips in Massachusetts ignored the need for protective clothing, worked in jeans and short-sleeved shirts, complained of being sick a few days later at 5 p.m., were hospitalized by 7 p.m., and dead, despite treatment, by 10 p.m.

"There has never been one medically documented death due to proper use of insecticides," says Dr. Frederick J. Stare of the Harvard School of Public Health. All chemicals have toxic levels if used improperly. Even table salt, innocuous in ordinary amounts, becomes poisonous in large—as it did in the tragic incident at a Binghampton, N.Y., hospital when it was substituted accidentally for sugar in formulas fed to babies.

Before any pesticide can be sold (only 1 of 2,000 original candidates ever reaches the market), it must undergo feeding tests on laboratory animals which may continue for 2 years or longer. With data from such tests, the Food and Drug Administration sets a tolerance—an allowable level of pesticide trace that may persist in or on food crops after harvest. The level always is well below any amount that may have begun to produce trouble in test animals. The safety factor often is 100. And checks are made on interstate shipment of crops for compliance with tolerance requirements.

In a recently completed special study, FDA scientists analyzed food samples representing the total diet of a 19-year-old boy, statistically the biggest eater in the U.S. population. The samples—about 60 pounds of groceries, 1 week's supply—were obtained every 3 months from chain stores in the Washington, D.C., area beginning in May 1961 and—starting May 1962—in Atlanta, Minneapolis, St. Louis, and San Francisco as well. Most foods showed no pesticide residues; others contained only minute traces. The findings are interpreted by the FDA as indicating that the American food supply is safe.

It is a fact, however, that even slight traces of DDT on food accumulate in human tissues. "But not," insists Dr. Stare, "to harmful levels. There is no evidence that ill health in man, except for those who may have a true allergy to DDT, has ever been caused from DDT residues on food."

Long before the present furor, charges were made that increasing use of DDT and other pesticides was linked to the rise in cancer, hepatitis, and many other disorders, even including sinusitis and insanity. Reviewing the facts in 1960, Dr. Wayland J. Hayes, Jr., of the Public Health Service, noted that some diseases supposed to have increased because of DDT had, in fact, shown no increase; others, such as cancer and heart trouble, had indeed increased but because a greater proportion of people were living to be old enough to have them.

"The very existence," he wrote, "of highly active compounds, some of which are stored in the tissues of a majority of people, requires prolonged investigation of those whose occupations enforce exposure many times greater than that of the general population. However, there is nothing to be gained * * * by irresponsible statements * * * in the absence of epidemiologic proof that a wide variety of illnesses from which mankind has suffered for generations is now caused * * * by the newer economic poisons."

As recently as the summer of 1962, an editorial in the Journal of the American Medical Association declared: "There is no confirmed record of clinical effect from eating food treated with pesticides according to approved agricultural practice."

Concern has been expressed that long-term ingestion of pesticide traces could, at some point in the future, impair fertility, and perhaps lead to genetic defects. Responsible scientists do not outrightly dismiss such possibilities. "Most scientists who are familiar with the field," says Dr. I. L. Baldwin, professor of Agriculture Biology at the University of Wisconsin, "feel that the danger of damage is slight." But they underscore the need for careful, continuing research and, in the meantime, for respectful, discriminating use of pesticides.

Some new light on possible pesticidal effects on human health—not from residues on food but from careless use of sprays—comes in a recent report by Dr. Douglas Gordon Campbell, a psychiatrist of the University of California Medical School, who cites a patient referred to him after many medical examinations had failed to show any organic cause for his blurred speech and loss of coordination.

On a hunch, Campbell had a test made of the man's fatty tissue. It showed six times the average amount of DDT. "When I asked about insecticides, he reported a pattern of use which corresponded to flareups of his symptoms. I am convinced he was suffering from chronic DDT poisoning." So, believes Campbell, were a number of other patients with obscure, seemingly neurotic symptoms, all of whom were either agricultural workers or avid gardeners.

When it comes to wildlife and fishery resources, pesticides have produced losses, sometimes alarming. There have been reports of marked declines in the numbers of chickadees, warblers, woodpeckers, blue jays, thrashers, and other varieties of birds in some places.

One study at Michigan State University covering an area that had 370 robins in 1954 revealed only 15 in 1957 after 3 years of spraying for mosquitoes and elm bark beetles. DDT apparently had stuck to tree leaves; earthworms ate the poisoned leaves when they fell; robins were poisoned when they ate the worms.

Soon after DDT became available, reports of farm-pond fish kills began to appear. In 1950, extensive fish kills were noted simultaneously in 14 fish streams tributary to the Tennessee River in Alabama, and investigation showed the cause to be insecticides washed from cotton fields when a storm front produced intensive thundershowers.

A Public Health Service investigation underway since 1959 indicates that water pollution by pesticides is no small affair. But it also appears that the problem of wildlife and fish losses has stemmed in large part from improper use of pesticides.

"Part of these losses," says Dr. V. H. Freed, chairman, Department of Agricultural Chemistry, Oregon State University, "occurred at a time when our knowledge concerning use of these chemicals was inadequate to avoid such unfortunate incidents. Today, however, our more advanced knowledge is such as to provide safeguards. * * * Suitable control and commonsense in the use of these chemicals need not result in serious hazard to either man or animals."

Many of those most concerned about damage to wildlife do not make blanket condemnations.

"Many and perhaps most control programs have been conducted without causing significant or longlasting effects upon wildlife," says Clarence Cottam, director of the Welder Wildlife Foundation. "These generally have been well directed where a minimum of poison has been used. Many other extensive projects, some less skillfully or less wisely directed, where large quantities of highly toxic, broad-spectrum, stable poisons have been broadcast, have proven highly destructive to wildlife resources."

In checking reports of serious wildlife losses, the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council has found that a very high percentage relate to special programs involving less than 10 percent of all acres treated with pesticides. Such programs—a notable example is the one against the fire ant in several Southern States—are aimed at total eradication rather than immediate practical control and have used high dosages of insecticides.

"A review of accumulated literature on wildlife losses * * * seems to indicate clearly that increased dosage rates are a major factor. In such cases it should be the responsibility of the control agencies to keep dosages to the minimum required to obtain desired results," the Academy-Council report observes. And it also notes that pest-control agencies now are using, even in the fire-ant program, two spaced, low-dose applications that may be just as effective as the one walloping dose that is hazardous to wildlife.

Recently, too, H. Page Nicholson, Director of the Public Health Service investigation of water pollution by pesticides, has reported that aerial application of the chemicals is a frequent cause of acute fish poisoning. "In many such cases, improved skill in application or perhaps repair of leaky equipment may be all that is necessary to mitigate such losses."

Along with consideration of revised legislation in some States to tighten control of airplane spraying, Nicholson also notes the need for better soil-conservation practice to retard surface-water runoff, a significant factor in water contamination. And he strongly urges better education of farmers, pest control operators and the public about the consequences of misuse of pesticides. "Such instances as cleaning a spray rig in a creek, 'letting a little poison go into a lake to see what would happen,' or similar thoughtless or careless acts too frequently have been causes of serious episodes."

An argument heard increasingly today is that large-scale use of pesticides is upsetting natural balance—that in trying to suppress certain organisms, man has "tripped the delicate balance of populations by which nature accomplishes far-reaching aims."

"It would be more accurate to say that pesticides are used to suppress organisms already out of balance," declares Entomologist George C. Decker. "Nature recognizes no such categories as pests (and) beneficial forms. * * * in nature every living organism is engaged in relentless competition with every other organism upon which its interests impinge.

"Man is part of that environment, but by virtue of a unique attribute called intellect * * * has risen to a position of dominance. * * * in his ascent, man selected, protested, and propagated certain plants and animals. * * * other species detrimental to him or to (his desired) organisms he regards as pests to be suppressed."

Adds Chemical and Engineering News, an American Chemical Society publication: "Any human society beyond the nomadic tribes has developed through assault on the balance of nature."

Argues an editorial in the December 1962, issue of Progressive Farmer: "We upset the balance of nature to some extent whenever we break ground for a crop, kill a timber wolf, or cut a tree to build a house. It is unavoidable. It is only through disturbing nature's balance by intervening drastically in his own behalf that man has been able to live on earth in a civilized way."

What of possible alternatives to chemical pesticides?

Farming practices—plowing under crop refuse in which pests otherwise can survive over winter, use of crop rotation which breaks their food chain, and, where possible, planting at dates unfavorable for pests—are valuable but have not unfortunately, provided complete solutions.

Nor have resistant crop varieties. While many plants have been developed to resist specific pests, they may be attacked by other pests—and, after a time, even by new tough strains of the original pests against which they were bred.

Parasites and disease organisms have been introduced with some success. One notable example: use of imported beetles to combat the poisonous Klamath weed, widespread in California, has returned some 100,000 acres of land to useful production.

Sterilization clearly has possibilities. It is being used successfully in a campaign against the screwworm fly, which attacks livestock. Male flies treated with radiant energy from cobalt 60 are released in heavily infested areas. The sterile males mate with normal females. Eggs are produced but do not hatch. Since the female screwworm mates only once, the result is race suicide.

Along with radiation, more than 2,000 compounds have been under study for sterilant activity. Some have been found active for houseflies, mosquitoes and Mexican fruit flies. Although still experimental, there is reason now to believe, Dr. Alexejb Borkvac of the Agriculture Department's Entomology Research Division reported recently, "that chemosterilants will, possibly within the next decade, assume an important place in the control and eradication of many harmful insects and perhaps starlings, rats, and nematodes."

Recently, Dr. R. A. Harton of the Army Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command reported isolation of the sex attractant of the female cockroach, a substance so potent only a few molecules are sufficient to excite a male. "It may be used to control the insect by attracting the male to traps baited with it," Dr. Harton suggests. "As more insect attractants become known and available by synthesis, they can be expected to aid or even supplant existing methods of control.

Last December, University of Hawaii zoologists reported that 160 decibels of sound will kill a cockroach in 30 seconds and that male mosquitoes can be lured to an electrified screen by a device which imitates the noise of female mosquitoes wings. Although many practical obstacles remain to be overcome, the day may come, the researchers reported, "when a person could carry with him a little box about the size of a portable radio that would give off a sound, preferably ultrasonic, to drive insects from the area around him."

As of now, however, chemicals remain the mainstay. Many who worry about them clamor for more intensive efforts to develop practical, nonchemical methods of pest control. And perhaps one healthy result of the present controversy will be increased emphasis on, and financial support of, such research.

There could be other healthy results.

It seems clear that pesticides have made important contributions to human health and progress but that they can be dangerous when abused—and that they have been abused in the past.

It has been alleged that even some Government agencies have been callous in carrying out pest-control programs, failing to give enough consideration to hazards to animals and to how pesticides could be used with minimum risk.

In June 1961, before the present controversy erupted, a Federal Pest Control Review Board was appointed to scrutinize Federal agency programs. It points to some progress in promoting more refined and safer techniques—for example, substitution of spot treatment of breeding areas of grasshoppers and Mormon crickets in the West to head off incipient infestations, in place of widespread aerial spraying after pest populations have built up.

It has been suggested that the board be given definite authority by law to review, modify or veto pest-control programs proposed by Federal agencies. The special Pesticide Committee of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, set up in the summer of 1962 to review the whole problem of pesticides, may have something to say on this score along with making recommendations for other measures.

It has been suggested, too, that other States might well follow the lead of Massachusetts, which now has a pesticide board in the State department of public health with power to license aerial sprayers and others who apply pesticides commercially and to issue rules and regulations covering application of pesticides to protect public health, wildlife, waters and other natural resources.

But even the best legislation cannot solve the whole problem. Pesticides would seem to belong in the same category as automobiles—with great potential for good or harm, depending upon how they are used. And the present controversy, if it teaches not only farmers and pest-control operators but every home gardener and housewife to respect and use them with caution, will have served a very great purpose.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, within the past few months there has been a preponderance of articles in our Nation's newspapers on the Cuban situation. Nearly every syndicated writer has devoted at least one column to this subject, and I would venture to say that there is hardly a daily newspaper in our country that has not expressed an editorial opinion on the matter.

Although the positions taken in these articles range from advocacy of a U.S.-led invasion of Cuba to a policy of temporary containment and coexistence, they all agree that Castro-communism cannot be permanently tolerated in the hemisphere and that something must be done to eradicate it once and for all.

This preoccupation over Cuba among our news media, not only in the abundance of printed words but also in the general tenor of the articles, I believe reflects two things. First of all, the American people are deeply concerned over Cuba and regard it as a serious threat to world peace. Secondly, because Cuba does not lend itself to an easy solution and because the problem has had such a long and unsatisfactory history, there is the feeling that somehow from the outpouring of words, the careful analysis of past events, and the calculated appraisal of future consequences and alternatives, someone might stumble upon an answer to this difficult problem.

Unfortunately, this has not been the case. Almost every article on Cuba that I have read in the past 3 months—and there have been many—goes to great lengths to explain why the United States cannot and must not support an invasion from its shores and warns that a blockade of the island might lead us into a direct confrontation with Russia and perhaps nuclear war. And with these observations, I generally agree.

But is there not some course of action we can follow which, while avoiding a conflict of American and Russian troops, will provide a realistic and long-range solution to the Cuban affair? I believe there is.

On March 15 of this year I made a lengthy Senate speech on Cuba, in which I proposed that the United States recognize a Cuban Government in exile. I do not intend to expound on this proposal, as I am sure that my Senate colleagues who are interested in this idea can refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the aforementioned date.

I would not be presumptuous enough to state that my plan provides the only possible solution to the Cuban situation. But I do submit that it has as its final goal the ridding from the hemisphere of Fidel Castro and communism, and proposes to do this with the least possible involvement of the United States.

Furthermore, it seems to me incumbent upon us to offer to the displaced refugees from Cuba—men and women who have been driven from their homeland because they refuse to knuckle under the Communist dictatorship—some source of hope. We must do more than pay lip service to the sacrifices which they have made for the ideals of individual liberty and democracy which we in this country extol. This must be done if we are not to suffer a tremendous loss of prestige in the eyes of the world. And it must be done to provide much needed inspiration to the Cuban refugees, lest they become completely disillusioned with democracy as a way of life and a form of government.

Furthermore, all Latin Americans must know that we mean what we say about communism; that, actually, not only will we make speeches about it; but also we will in fact oppose it and we will help others to oppose it, and that our opposition is total and unrelenting.

Anyone, I am sure, who has been reading the papers in the past few days will agree that our relations with the Cuban exiles in the United States have never been worse. While not having all the facts in the matter, or being in a position to make a judgment in the dispute, I do believe that the frustration and resentment which exists among the exiles is due primarily to the fact that they do not see any U.S. proposal being thought out, much less implemented, to bring about the downfall of Castro communism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, let me make it clear that while the United States has a great stake in freeing Cuba, this is essentially a problem of the Cubans and the Latins. It is not the obligation of the United States to send a division of marines into Cuba, but I do believe that it is up to the United States to help develop an effective plan, a plan that places the major responsibility for the liberation of Cuba in the hands of the Cubans and Latins of Central and South America. In this way the final program undertaken would be one of Cubans versus Cubans, and Latins versus Latins.

Recognition of a Cuban government in exile, I believe, is the best way to make a start toward eliminating communism in Cuba from the hemisphere. Based in some Central American country and headed by Cubans, assisted by Latins, an exile government would necessarily require the material and financial assistance of the United States. But the manpower, the involvement of military troops—should that unhappy situation ever occur—and all the consequences of the use of arms, would rest collectively upon all the nations of this hemisphere, and not primarily upon the United States.

Because I believe in this program and think it should be afforded the consideration of those nations and peoples whose task it would be to implement this plan, I again recommend that a meeting of the Organization of American States be called for the purpose of submitting for their evaluation a proposal calling for recognition of a Cuban government in exile.

In suggesting this action, I am not attempting to force my idea for an exile government on the United States or any nation in the hemisphere.

I am happy to say, however, that since I first offered this proposal nearly 2 years ago, a number of spokesmen from Latin America, representing Latin American nations, have exhibited an interest and a desire to see an exile government for Cuba established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. In the Washington Post of April 15, Max Freedman, whose literary style and artistry in the use of the English language are unexcelled, mentioned in his column my idea for a Cuban government in exile. Although

Mr. Freedman opposes this plan for several reasons, he states that it has gained some strength.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point the article by Max Freedman to which I referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLUTION IN CUBA WILL NOT BE CHEAP—U.S. ATTITUDE TOWARD EXILES REFLECTS ABSENCE OF UNITY AMONG REFUGEES

(By Max Freedman)

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has deserved, and has received, a widespread rebuke for his slapdash and mean-spirited comments on the Cuban problem. It is the beginning of wisdom, in everything that concerns Cuba, to resist the allurement of cheap solutions. This lesson is particularly true about the role of the Cuban refugees.

One must be strangely insensitive to the suffering of the Cuban people to look with anything but admiration and respect upon the determination of these refugees to overthrow the Castro regime. Many of these people know from cruel, personal experience the magnitude of the tyranny which has caught Cuba in its grip. All of them resent Cuba's inglorious drift into Communist servitude. They are ready to fight, and if necessary to die, for the redemption of their country. Their devotion is in the great tradition of freedom. Only a churl would question the credentials of their faith or remain skeptical about the ultimate triumph of liberty over despotism.

But idealism by itself does not make a policy. The harsh tasks which confront the refugees and the American Government require the most careful exercise of responsible judgment. They require the selection of the right men, the right objectives, and the right time. Otherwise the enterprise of Cuban freedom will flounder in failure.

There is a common impression, whose popularity does not atone for its error, that the Kennedy administration in some craven way has kept the refugee leaders from more resolute action. This version of recent events will be supported by no official in Washington who has been given a significant part in the shaping of Cuban policy. The administration, despite many contrary rumors, has vetoed or diluted no heroic program of unified action for the sufficient reason that no such program has been presented. It is dramatic but misleading to picture the Cuban refugee leaders as men aflame with a noble purpose which they are unable to reach because of the awkward timidities of American officials.

It is closer to the mark to suggest that the refugees must still compose all their differences and agree on a policy that can be defended in terms of success and not merely in terms of splendid aspiration. Sweetening one's judgment with every measure of generosity, it is still necessary to say that the refugee leaders have not always been the wisest or the most farsighted counsellors on Cuban policy.

Perhaps it is unreasonable to expect this wisdom from men suffering such adversity. But here is one neglected element of the problem that deserves to be taken into account before the United States makes its next move in Cuban affairs.

Nor is it possible to ignore this problem when one weighs the risks and the gains of forming a Cuban Government-in-exile entitled to full and open support from the United States. This proposal, first advanced many months ago by Senator SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, had a dusty reception but it has gained strength, if only because of the failure of better ideas to emerge in the debate. More will be heard of it in coming weeks.

The history of governments in exile is not encouraging. Few of them ever succeed in becoming the real government of the country for a significant period. Think back to the days of the last war. A cluster of exiled governments took refuge in London.

They had access to the British and American governments. In some cases they had promises of political and military support. But in the main this comradeship was a delusion. Events went their own way, and the chatter of exiled leaders signified little. The most notable exception was General de Gaulle, and he, significantly enough, was always the exile who showed the greatest independence in his dealings with Washington and London.

Has this experience any meaning for Cuba today? It has a direct lesson for the refugee leaders no less than for the American Government. The United States may blunder into a premature and avoidable risk if it sponsors a Cuban Government in exile now. It may choose the wrong men for such a government. There are other objections, but that one is enough to justify patient analysis before any final judgment is made. The Cuban leaders must ask themselves whether they would really wish to be thus identified, in public, as the clients and wards of the United States. That may not be the passage to power in Cuba.

The future of Cuba will be determined less by Washington or Miami than by what happens inside Cuba itself. The refugees and the American Government can succeed in their common task only if they place themselves on the side of the emergent forces in Cuba that will one day be dominant in a free country. That day may not be as distant as the impatient advocates of immediate action now fear. It certainly will never be hastened by the reckless advice of Governor Rockefeller.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it is entirely possible that the Latin American nations, upon closer examination of this proposal for a Cuban government in exile, will also reject it as being infeasible, or because the time is not "ripe" for undertaking this kind of program. I only ask that, by calling a meeting of the Organization of American States, we give them the opportunity to decide—no matter what their decision may be.

It is my judgment that after all the facts are in and the situation carefully weighed, the Organization of American States will conclude that recognition of a Cuban government in exile is the best course of action on which we should embark in order to free the hemisphere from Castro and communism.

Some time ago, our esteemed majority leader, the great Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], encouraged all those who have constructive solutions to the Cuban problem to come forth with them. I have done so. In some areas my plan has been criticized, but I submit that at least one of its virtues is that it is a plan, and I do not know of any other constructive plan that has been proposed. I think it will work.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Florida is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the Senator from Florida that shortly I intend to make some remarks on the Cuban situation, and most especially on the speech being made during the noon hour by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I may say, though, relative to what the distinguished Senator from Florida has just said, that he has offered proposals, that his statements on the Cuban situation have not been general, and one particular proposal, his idea of a government-in-exile, is worthy of serious consideration, because we cannot operate with 12 major groups of Cubans, and numerous smaller groups going off in all directions. That has been one of the weaknesses in our relations between the Cubans-in-exile and the Government of the United States. That is one of the weaknesses which must be corrected before any effective policy can be found.

I congratulate the Senator from Florida for being consistent in this instance, as he has in the others, and, most important, for coming here with proposals which he thinks will be effective and which are worthy of serious consideration.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Montana.

MIDDLE EAST POLICY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in recent weeks a number of disturbing reports have appeared in the press regarding the growing missile capacity of Nasser's Egypt. The fact that these missiles are being built with the help of German scientists, many of whom are former Nazis, is a bitter reminder that evils spawned by their Hitler regime still exist. There can be no doubt about how President Nasser intends to use these short-range weapons; they are and will be a direct threat to Israel, still the No. 1 enemy of the Arab States. In the shifting morass of Arabian politics, with its constantly changing alliances and regimes, the one solid ground of agreement has been the irrational hatred for the free, democratic State of Israel. The dangers of this situation are now increased by the new alliance of Iraq, Syria, and Egypt—all three ancient enemies of Israel. Syria and Egypt both border directly on Israel, while the well-equipped army of Iraq is separated only by the small Kingdom of Jordan. Israel had some respite while General Kassem ruled Iraq and the Arab world was split by his bitter feud with Nasser. With the formation of a new United Arab Republic, Iraq, Egypt, and Syria will again constitute a powerful threat to her security.

Mr. President, our ties with Israel have been close from the very foundation of that country. We have watched with sympathy and admiration her struggle for independence and her growth as a free and democratic nation. In the beginning many thought that this small country could not long survive. But Israel, approaching her 15th anniversary, has grown to a point where she is now lending valuable technical assistance to the developing nations of Africa. Yet, in a part of the world where politics are too often marred by bloody revolutions, dictatorial rule and feudal despotism, Israel has always remained faithful to free democratic institutions. The progress of Israel is vivid proof that even in the Middle East a nation can defend itself and develop its economy without recourse to authoritarian rule. Israel has always exemplified the ideals of the free world.

Are Egyptian threats to Israel genuine or only for propaganda purposes? It does not seem logical that a country with the meager capital resources of Egypt would spend the vast sums required for missile development just for their parade value. Neither can these weapons be dismissed as defensive, for the facts show the weapons are ground-to-ground missiles with the range to strike Israel's major cities. If President Nasser ever decides to use the missiles he has developed at such great expense, they will give him a very great, and possibly decisive, military advantage.

Mr. President, the delicate balance of power in the Middle East has maintained a precarious peace so far. It is now undergoing a radical shift. The Middle East is beginning its own small-scale version of the expensive East-West arms race. It must be remembered that Israel is developing a nuclear capacity of her own, a nuclear capacity that would probably be turned to warlike uses, if the external threats become great enough. We face an explosion in the Middle Eastern tinderbox that would endanger the life of our faithful friend, Israel, and open the way for renewed Russian intervention. Now is the time to press for a peaceful settlement to the issues that divide Israel from her neighbors before negotiations have to be conducted in the heat and confusion of a crisis atmosphere. We must continue to make every effort, both through the United Nations and our own diplomacy, to bring an end to the Middle Eastern arms race.

There is no excuse for standing by while the forces for conflict gain momentum. Nothing is more tempting to a potential aggressor than the feeling that he might be able to get away with something. Let Nasser be absolutely sure of the disastrous consequences of starting a war against Israel.

There are three steps that should be taken to preserve the balance of power and the peace of the Middle East. First, this Government should reaffirm our intention to uphold our moral obligation to defend the independence of Israel.

Secondly, the strongest pressure should be brought to bear on Egypt, already a substantial beneficiary of our aid, to abandon the senseless development of unnecessary missiles. Just because Egypt has in recent months adopted a strongly anti-Communist line does not give her an absolute guarantee of U.S. aid, particularly if this aid is indirectly used to threaten the security of other nations.

Thirdly, we should also call upon the German Government to use every legal means to prevent the employment of their citizens in this deadly work. Although we cannot blame the German Government for the unworthy actions of some of her citizens, Germany has a heavy responsibility to do everything in her power to put an end to their activities.

The aim of our Middle Eastern foreign policy is not merely making sure that everyone is suitably anti-Communist. Our goal is to insure the peaceful political and economic development of all the Middle Eastern nations. If these nations become truly independent and economically strong nations providing a decent life for their people, we would have nothing to fear from Communist infiltration. But the outbreak of war would mean the total failure of our Middle Eastern policy. Now is the time to make sure that such a war never comes about, however small the possibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from Newsweek magazine and an editorial from the Washington Post which describe the dangerous situation in the Middle East be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Apr. 15, 1963]

ROCKETS IN EGYPT

Once before the small one had entered Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion's office in Jerusalem. All he said was: "Adolf Eichmann is captured. He is on his way to Israel." Ben-Gurion held out his arms and embraced Iser Helperin, his secret service chief. Last week, the small one was back again, visiting the Prime Minister at a vacation hotel on the banks of Lake Tiberias. By the time the interview was over, Helperin knew that he had to resign over a matter of policy—and he did.

Helperin quit because his latest mission had carried him into the delicate realm of international politics—particularly the relations between Israel and West Germany. In his efforts to see to it that the 300 German technicians who work in Egypt's Military Factory 333 return home, he has poached on B-G's particular strategy to keep Israel and West Germany on amicable terms.

Military Factory 333 (mainly devoted to the assembly of small jet trainers) is the place on the banks of the Nile, near Cairo, where the Egyptians are reported to be producing ground-to-ground rockets. By modern standards, these missiles are not very good, hardly more advanced than the V2's which Hitler rained down on Antwerp during World War II. This reflection is of little consolation to the Israelis, for there is no defense against these rockets with their high explosives and they are powerful enough to reach Israel's crowded cities.

The key German rocketeers—perhaps 12 altogether—are headed by Prof. Wolfgang Pilz, a silver-haired veteran of Nazi wartime rocket development. Protected by a heavy security guard, the team lives in and around the fashionable Kubba suburb of Cairo, changing residence every few months and never appearing in public.

THE PAST

Other scientists and technicians in Egypt—around 200 of them—are working on the prototype of a supersonic jet fighter for President Nasser. The brains behind the team, from his headquarters in Augsburg, is Hitler's ace designer Willy Messerschmitt, whose planes gave the Luftwaffe air supremacy during the early part of World War II. Two of Messerschmitt's top men in Egypt are former Nazis. Ferdinand Brandner, a 51-year-old Austrian, was a colonel in Hitler's Storm Troops. Senior medical officer of the team is the notorious Hans Eisele, who conducted human guinea pig experiments at Buchenwald.

These scientists have been living dangerously in recent months. Although there is no concrete proof, it would seem that they have been hounded by the agents of the small one. Six Egyptian workers were killed when they opened a crate and picked up a book of instructions that blew up. The German wife of Egyptian scientist Hassan Kamel was killed when a bomb, intended for her husband, exploded in a plane over Germany. One German rocket expert, Heinz Krug, working for the Egyptians, mysteriously disappeared, and is rumored to be in the hands of the Israeli secret police.

THE ENEMY

There is no evidence that Ben-Gurion is against this campaign of intimidation. But he does believe that it should not interfere with good relations with West Germany, particularly as Bonn is still sending Israel payments under its $820 million reparation agreement. Helperin evidently didn't agree, since he launched a worldwide press attack that tried to place the blame on Adenauer's government for condoning a Nazi-like effort to help Nasser, a sworn enemy of the Jews. Moreover, the ominous fact that Egypt may soon possess an arsenal of ground-to-ground high-explosive missiles was obscured by inflammatory talk of nuclear and bacteriological warheads.

The whole affair has actually deeply embarrassed the West German Government which is trying to live down its Nazi past. Bonn's Foreign Minister is seriously considering canceling passports held by the scientists if they continue their missile-building activities in Egypt.

ISRAEL'S SECURITY

The American anxiety about armaments in the Middle East was inadequately reflected in Under Secretary of State Harriman's curious letter to a New York Congressman. Writing to LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Mr. Harriman said that alarm over German scientists in the United Arab Republic was exaggerated—after all, if the Germans weren't there, Egypt would be more dependent on the Soviet Union for developing missiles and jet aircraft. This comes close to arguing that we should be grateful for the Soviet forces in Cuba because otherwise there might be a Chinese army in the Caribbean.

What is missing in Mr. Harriman's note—and indeed in most of the lofty State Department utterances on the Middle East—is any real feeling for the plight of Israel. Here is a tiny country wholly surrounded by nations that have sworn its elimination. The United Arab Republic, now flushed with political success in Iraq and Syria, is on the verge of developing ground-to-ground missiles that could rain terror on Israel. It is of small comfort to Israel that these may be good, non-Communist missiles developed with the help of Germans so thoroughly anti-Russian that some of them worked for Hitler.

The air surely ought to be cleared, and quickly, by a reassertion of American interest in the continued security of Israel. Of course this will be interpreted by some Arabs as further tribute to the so-called "Jewish vote" which, like a pernicious ectoplasm, is supposed to permeate American policy. But where was the Jewish vote at the height of an election campaign in 1956 when the United States not only opposed Israeli aggression but also Great Britain and France—all partners in the folly of Suez?

In point of fact, the United States has leaned over backward to encourage cordial relations with President Nasser and all other Arab States. There is broad sympathy for the social goals of the United Arab Republic. This support has taken concrete form in foreign aid, and in the case of recognizing the republican regime of Yemen, Washington has crawled out on a limb in good part in order to demonstrate good faith toward Arab nationalism.

But if the United Arab Republic is determined to develop an offensive missile capacity, then it should be made plain that the United States will not simply express pained disapproval and find comfort in the political purity of the weapons. Ground-to-ground missiles would place Israel at a perilous disadvantage, even if conventional bombs were lodged in their nose. Missiles can strike at a compact target and nullify the reserve power of Israel's Army. If Mr. Nasser develops an operational offensive missile, then there will be no alternative but to see that Israel has an adequate deterrent capacity too.

No American can contemplate without sorrow such an escalation in the Middle East arms race. Even the Soviet Union has given tacit recognition to the delicate balance of forces in the area; though Moscow has been willing to provide defensive missiles to Arab countries, it has stopped short of assistance in equipping Iraq or the United Arab Republic with offensive ballistic missiles.

The immediate task of American diplomacy is to explore every reasonable means of curtailing arms shipments to the Middle East on a multilateral basis. Specifically, this could include informal approaches to the Soviet Union, now in a mood of disenchanted reappraisal concerning the Arab world. There is at least a theoretical common ground between East and West on the desirability of preserving the peace in the Middle East. The world would breathe easier if both offensive missiles and nuclear devices were ruled out of the region under an agreement that provided effective inspection.

This should be the goal of American policy, and it would be vastly encouraging if the United States would state a large purpose rather than retreat into the lifeless platitudes of the Harriman letter ("the U.S. Government is, and has been, exploring all avenues of approach to an effective amelioration of a worrisome and complicated problem"). At the same time, it ought to be made clear that if all attempts at regional arms control fail, Israel will get the help it needs and not just snappish lectures about "worrisome and complicated problems."

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, once in a while some of us receive communications which are really outstanding, commenting on events of the day. Some time ago I received a letter from Thomas Patterson Campbell, of Denver, a longtime friend of mine, whose grandfather was a Member of this body. The letter was later printed in the Denver Post. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER COLO.,
February 20, 1963.

HON. GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: As the years sneak by, we all become somewhat accustomed to the sights and sounds of idols tumbling off their pedestals. But, in the idiom of the day, I was really bugged when the revered Walter Lippmann suddenly appeared in the role of pitchman for Doc Heller's shell game (Denver Post, Feb. 1, 1963). True to type, of course, Walter was a bit condescending in his spiel and quite evidently annoyed that some of the yokels were a bit reluctant to be fleeced again.

Well, out here on the old frontier, some of us peasants are not convinced that if the same mistake is repeated often enough, everything will turn out right—even when assured by the learned Walter that "the principle of the 1964 budget is a new one—because the country is confronted with an economic problem which first appeared toward the end of 1957."

Nor were we greatly reassured when another self-appointed (though lesser) prophet, one Sylvia Porter (Post, Jan. 30, 1963), proclaimed that all our economic woes can be cured by greater consumer spending, by "increasing the disposable personal incomes of consumers. The Federal Government can help achieve this by paying out more than it takes in or by cutting personal income taxes—or both. The Federal Reserve System can help achieve this by making borrowing easier and cheaper, for this encourages consumers to borrow and spend more than they earn."

In passing, we got a covert chuckle out of Conrad's heretical cartoon (Jan. 30, 1963), depicting a wife telling her frantic, debt-ridden husband: "According to Mr. Kennedy, the reason we're broke is we're not far enough in debt."

For whatever reason, it is evident that the Messrs. Lippmann and Heller (and their assorted shills) have chosen to ignore (if they ever knew) the history of money and debt. Otherwise they would have noted that their wonderful new principle was first tried out in Athens some 2,600 years ago; that it has been repeated, without significant variation, in every land, language, and age, by both public and private crooks, innumerable times, and that it has been a uniform and dismal failure in each and every attempt.

But apparently the lesson is never learned. Some 200 years after Solon rescued the farmers and shopkeepers of Athens from bondage to creditors (594 B.C.), by abrogating all debts and debasing the coinage, Aristophanes ("Frogs") wrote: "In our Republic bad citizens are preferred to good, just as bad money circulates while good disappears." (Some 1,900 years later, Sir Thomas Gresham rediscovered this truth); and about 2,000 years after Aristophanes, Thomas B. Macauley (History of England) commented: "It may be doubted whether all the misery which had been inflicted on the English nation—by bad kings, bad ministers, bad parliaments and bad judges was equal to the misery caused by bad crowns and bad shillings."

Again, and hastening to a period the venerable Lippmann should remember in his own experience, in 1919 the Weimar Republic found itself with an unmanageable internal debt. Perhaps the Germans did not realize that they should not worry about such trivialities; after all, they owed it to themselves. But their duly elected rulers chose to pay off that debt by increasing the disposable personal incomes of consumers in a simple, direct method; namely, by printing more and more money. By 1923 the Reichsmark was worth (in purchasing power) one-trillionth of its original gold value; the debt had been wiped out, along with the entire middle class, and the way had been paved for the advent of Hitler, the Third Reich, and the Second World War.

Surely Uncle Walter remembers October 24, 1929. But one wonders if he knows that the speculative stock bubble was punctured by selling based initially on distrust of foreign borrowing in New York (to stimulate artificial gold movements) and by a break in the bond market in May 1928? Does he know what closed the Kreditanstalt in Vienna in September 1931, and how that forced England and France off the gold standard; not to mention what later happened to their currencies?

Surely Lippmann, Heller and Co. recall the 8 years of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect under F.D.R.; 8 years of pumppriming, killing pigs, plowing under crops, confiscating gold, tinkering with the discount rate, clipping the dollar by 41 cents; 8 years of pirouetting to the arcane incantations of John Maynard Keynes—then and now (as Lord Keynes) the high potentate of the ancient order of the greek swindle—and finally sideslipping into World War II with some 14 percent of the civilian labor force still unemployed.

That's all history; and maybe Uncle Walter holds with G. B. Shaw that history is a set of lies agreed upon. Anyway, say both Walters, things are all new and different now: "The chronic sluggishness since 1957 has been due to insufficient total demand."

I do not know, of course, how or by what yardstick the learned Lippmann defines "total demand." We who are not included in the sacrosanct circle of economic advisers to the President have the quaint notion that consumer demand is measured by personal consumption expenditures, is published regularly (component of gross national product) in the Department of Commerce Survey of Current Business. Consumer spending, in turn, is related to national income. The record shows, however, that changes in national income do not cause equivalent changes in consumer spending because many ordinary people have the weird habit of saving a part of their disposable income. For instance, in the period 1949–51, the national income increased some $64 billion a year, or 30 percent, while consumer spending rose only about $29 billion, or 16 percent. Again, in the period 1956–58, the national income increased by only about $9 billion (4 percent), but consumer spending went up some $23 billion (9 percent). The reason for this seeming anomaly is that personal savings more than doubled in the 1949–51 period and remained almost constant in the fateful 1956–58 years. Or, in brief, people do not always and invariably spend 93 percent of their disposable income; nor will total demand rise quickly after a tax reduction. Nor, by the same token, would the elimination of some $12 billion in wasteful, deficit spending send our economy roaring to hell in a Jaguar.

Heller, et al., complain bitterly that the alleged sluggishness of the economy is entirely the fault of private business: lack of enterprise, no imagination, timidity, outright restraint of trade, etc. Therefore, they conclude, Government must make a bold attempt to overcome the sluggishness. This involves the tacit assumption, so dear to all Socialists, that once a person or a group of people are elected, appointed or in any way associated with the Federal Government, he or they undergo a miraculous metamorphosis: singly and collectively they become omniscient; they would rule, under Divine Right, more and more by regulation and less and less by law.

As for private business, it is no better or worse off now than it has been for the last 18 years. It is caught between the Scylla of Big Government and the Charybdis of Big Labor. The usual pattern of events has been, and will be again, that as business improves, manufacturers have to use their less efficient facilities; they hire more inexperienced workers and pay increasingly higher wages; costs increase, profit margins narrow—and may become negative even while sales are still rising. Then comes a "recession"—and the cycle starts over again, but at an even higher wage level.

If there is anything, any one factor, which is relatively new in our economic picture, it is foreign competition. We rebuilt Europe and Japan; we have poured out billions in foreign aid to all and sundry; and in the last few years the EEC (Common Market) has become an increasingly important factor in all Western bloc trade (see Balance of Payments, Survey of Current Business, p. 17 et seq., January 1963).

But even this adverse condition does not make our prospect hopeless. If big labor were made responsible and accountable, by having to incorporate and being subject to the antitrust laws; and if big Government will stop repeating the same childish mistakes ad nauseam and refuse to swallow the nostrums offered by the Keyneses and the Hellers, we cannot only survive, but continue to grow and prosper. If, however, we insist that consumers (we, the people) must "borrow and spend more than they earn" and that the Federal Government, by plan and design, must pay out more than it takes in, then it is inevitable that our burden of debt, both private and public, will become intolerable and unmanageable. In that unhappy event, we shall have to contrive our own version of Solon's "Seisachtheia": either repudiate all debts outright or wipe them out by inflation. In either case, of course, our economic structure would be shattered and all creditors of all classes and types ruined, together with pensioners, annuity holders and a host of other innocent bystanders living on fixed-dollar income. Hoc facto, the way will be wide open for the Lippmanns, the Hellers, and their fellow travelers to lead us down the primrose path, to the lilt of lunatic laughter, into the promised land of socialism and equal poverty for all.

Nonetheless, and with best personal regards, I beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

T. P. Campbell.

PRESERVING GOVERNMENT CONTRACT INTEGRITY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of an interview by Ralph W. Crosby, of Iron Age magazine, with Senator Clifford P. Case on the subject of defense contracts. I have been glad to join with Senator Case in his efforts to achieve safeguards to insure the integrity of our Government contract processes.

I was glad to see the Iron Age article, and also to read in the press that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and his deputy, Roswell Gilpatric, have endorsed the objectives of the proposed legislation which some of us have joined the Senator from New Jersey in sponsoring.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Safeguards Needed for Contract

(Government contracts have come under heated attack. Political influence and other pressures have been charged. In this exclusive interview Senator Case warns of the dangers, suggests measures and safeguards.)

(By R. W. Crosby)

Question. Senator Case, you are in the center of a broad controversy over Government contract policies. What would you say is the basic issue in the whole controversy over influence on contract awards, lack of competitive bidding, and the other problems involved?

Answer. The basic issue is protection of the national interest. As we all know, Government defense contracts are big business. In the past fiscal year, the Defense Department awarded more than $28 billion in contracts. Approximately 35 percent of these were on the basis of competitive bidding. The remaining 65 percent—almost two-thirds of the total—were made in the category of negotiated contracts.

With such huge sums involved and with decisions made in the private way in which negotiated contracts are developed, it is more important than ever that the national interest be the sole criterion in awarding Government contracts and, among other things, that we get a dollar's worth for a dollar spent.

These contracts are of such substantial amounts that in some cases success or failure in winning a particular contract may well mean making or breaking a particular firm. They have heavy impact on the welfare of hundreds of thousands of people—employees, management, and stockholders. They affect vitally the interest of entire communities and, indeed, the interest of many States, including my own.

Question. Do you believe, then, that the U.S. contract award system needs revision?

Answer. If the official contract policy were carried out, we would need no revision. But recent actions and statements in high official circles, indeed in the highest, raise doubts as to whether what actually goes on conforms with official policy.

Question. What, exactly, are the problem areas in the contract controversy?

Answer. The problem area most prominent in the news these days is where evaluation panels, consisting of officials of an agency or outside experts, make recommendations as to a contract award, which are subsequently reversed by the head of the agency.

A full disclosure of all relevant facts would benefit everybody. An informed public opinion would exert irresistible weight in support of decisions which are soundly based and against those which are not.

Another problem area revolves around reports of political influence in contract awards. Again, the principle of full disclosure of all ex parte communications by Members of Congress or the executive branch, or anyone other than the bidder, would help protect the integrity of the contracting system.

A third problem is that while several committees of the House and Senate have partial jurisdiction over these contracts, the responsibility is not centralized in one committee. Because of this lack, Congress does not have an experienced, continuing watchdog organization to check large and complicated contract awards.

Question. Would you give us some examples which would illustrate these problems?

Answer. Yes, I would refer to two situations.

A major project in the scientific world is the so-called Mohole project, to drill a hole in the bottom of the sea as a part of a tremendous geological project being undertaken by the National Science Foundation to pierce the earth's crust and sample its interior. This has been termed "man's greatest geological project," and the 5-year contract was originally estimated to cost $43,600,000. Brown & Root, Inc., of Houston, Tex., was awarded this plum despite the fact that one NSF panel rated this firm third best in the field of three and another NSF panel rated four firms as better qualified.

Initial progress reports on this project indicate a minimum cost of $65 to $70 million—more than 50 percent over the original estimate—and that the project is behind schedule.

A similar topside reversal of evaluation panels is apparently involved in a major Defense Department aircraft contract award, for the TFX fighter plane.

The hearings by the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee have featured charges of substantial errors in mathematical computations as well as some unusual procedures in selecting the winning bidder.

Question. How do you propose that these problems be solved?

Answer. I have proposed legislation to carry out a three-point program based on my experience on the Armed Services, Space, and Appropriations Committees. The legislation, embodied in bills S. 960 and S. 961, would:

1. Require that a record be maintained, open to public inspection, of all ex parte communications, whether written or oral, in regard to a defense or space contract by anyone, including Members of Congress or the executive branch, other than the bidder.

2. Require full, complete, and prompt public disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract award is made, except for information classified for security provisions or where forbidden by existing law.

3. Establish a special joint House-Senate committee authorized to review defense and space contract awards with primary attention to negotiated contracts. This watchdog committee would consist of a Democrat and a Republican appointed from each of the following committees: Senate and House Armed Services Committees, the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, the Senate and House Government Operations Committees, and the Senate and House Space Committees.

Timely disclosure is important for several reasons. From the point of view of the Government, if there has been an error or favoritism in an award, it can be corrected before funds are committed or work has been started for which the Government is obligated to pay. From the point of view of both the Government and the contractors who lost out, review after the point of no return, as it were, has been reached may be helpful for the future but does nothing to right the immediate wrong.

Question. What are the chances of passage for these bills?

Answer. Many people agree action is necessary, but it will be difficult to attain even though five other Senators have joined in sponsoring the bills. The proposed Joint Committee on Contracts cuts across many privileges and prerequisites which present committee chairmen cling to.

Unless we take corrective action, and take it soon, there is a real danger that the "I can do more" pattern will become deeply fixed in our politics and economy. Not only will this lower the standards of political campaigning across the country, it involves the very real hazard that the military-industrial complex of which former President Eisenhower warned in his farewell address, may become entrenched as a military-industrial-political complex. Such a development could have far-reaching and serious implications for our society here at home and our relations in the world at large.

Question. Do you believe, as some Congressmen have charged, that certain contracting rules are rigged to assure certain companies will win specific contracts?

Answer. I am not familiar with these charges. Of my own knowledge, I have no evidence that contracting rules are rigged in favor of certain companies. My general impression of the career personnel in the Pentagon is that they are dedicated, honest people who are eager to maintain the integrity of the Government's contracting system. I believe, therefore, that they and many of the political appointees would welcome the legislation which I have proposed.

Question. Senator, what about the use of contracts to coerce companies into following a certain Government policy?

Answer. I have not sufficiently studied the issue nor the legislation proposed to curb it to make a judgment on that. However, it seems to me that public disclosure of contract communications, as sought in my bills, would take care of this problem, if it is a problem. In fact, the legislation I am proposing would create a place for everyone to go. It would operate against influence and pressure all along the line.

Question. Are businessmen included in this "everyone"?

Answer. Yes. It is disturbing to me that a contractor may remain quiet in these cases for fear that he will get in disfavor with Government officials. The contractor must always worry about how his actions will affect his position on the next contract. Because future contracts mean so much to his business, the contractor is liable to yield to pressures. But bringing contract negotiations before the public and having Congress review the contracts should relieve the burden.

Question. You mentioned the controversy over the TFX contract, Senator. What do you believe will come out of the investigation of the handling of this contract?

Answer. It is difficult to predict, since the investigation is still underway. I do believe that the investigation has been a useful one in that it has reminded the public how important individual contracts can be to particular communities and States, and has demonstrated the need for giving the public more facts on how the successful bidders on such major contracts are chosen. Comments by editorial writers and columnists have indicated that they feel that this incident has demonstrated the need for legislation along the lines of the bills which I have proposed.

THREAT TO ISRAEL'S SECURITY

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], has called my attention to an editorial entitled "Israel's Security," which appeared in the Washington Post Saturday, April 13.

As one of the Senators who recently wrote to the President about the problem of German scientists participating in the development of missiles and other offensive weapons in the United Arab Republic, I, too, was much interested in this editorial.

Since my colleague is today necessarily absent, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement by Senator CASE and the text of the editorial on which he comments.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

The participation of German scientists in the development and construction of missiles and other offensive weapons in the United Arab Republic is a matter of deep concern to all those interested in the preservation of peace, not only in the Middle East, but for the entire world.

The development of such weapons would threaten the very existence of the State of Israel, whose Arab neighbors have repeatedly expressed their intent to drive Israel into the sea.

Our own Government's role in this matter is a crucial factor. I am disturbed by the apparent lack of any firm policy on our part with regard to the acute dangers of a spiraling arms race in the Middle East. I am also deeply troubled by the apparent lack of concern for the desperate situation in which Israel would find itself in the event that an expanding United Arab Republic, aided by German scientists, developed ground-to-ground missiles which could overcome the rugged ability and defensive skills of this brave little land.

It would certainly not be an adequate response by this country to let this matter drift, as the Middle Eastern arms race escalates. I hope that we will soon have more positive word from the Department of State on the results of its reported exploring all avenues of approach.

The lead editorial in the Washington Post of April 13 called attention to the lack of any real feeling for the plight of Israel in the Department's recent note. I believe it will be of interest to all who are seriously concerned with this problem.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1963]

ISRAEL'S SECURITY

The American anxiety about armaments in the Middle East was inadequately reflected in Under Secretary of State Harriman's curious letter to a New York Congressman. Writing to LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Mr. Harriman said that alarm over German scientists in the United Arab Republic was exaggerated—after all, if the Germans weren't there, Egypt would be more dependent on the Soviet Union for developing missiles and jet aircraft. This comes close to arguing that we should be grateful for the Soviet forces in Cuba because otherwise there might be a Chinese army in the Caribbean.

What is missing in Mr. Harriman's note—and indeed in most of the lofty State Department utterances on the Middle East—is any real feeling for the plight of Israel. Here is a tiny country wholly surrounded by nations that have sworn its elimination. The United Arab Republic, now flushed with political success in Iraq and Syria, is on the verge of developing ground-to-ground missiles that could rain terror on Israel. It is of small comfort to Israel that these may be good, non-Communist missiles developed with the help of Germans so thoroughly anti-Russian that some of them worked for Hitler.

The air surely ought to be cleared, and quickly, by a reassertion of American interest in the continued security of Israel. Of course this will be interpreted by some Arabs as further tribute to the so-called Jewish vote which, like a pernicious ectoplasm, is supposed to permeate American policy. But where was the Jewish vote at the height of an election campaign in 1956 when the United States not only opposed Israeli aggression but also Great Britain and France—all partners in the folly of Suez?

In point of fact, the United States has leaned over backwards to encourage cordial relations with President Nasser and all other Arab States. There is broad sympathy for the social goals of the United Arab Republic. This support has taken concrete form in foreign aid, and in the case of recognizing the republican regime of Yemen. Washington has crawled out on a limb in good part in order to demonstrate good faith toward Arab nationalism.

But if the United Arab Republic is determined to develop an offensive missile capacity, then it should be made plain that the United States will not simply express pained disapproval and find comfort in the political purity of the weapons. Ground-to-ground missiles would place Israel at a perilous disadvantage, even if conventional bombs were lodged in their nose. Missiles can strike at a compact target and nullify the reserve power of Israel's Army. If Mr. Nasser develops an operational offensive missile, then there will be no alternative but to see that Israel has an adequate deterrent capacity, too.

No American can contemplate without sorrow such an escalation in the Middle East arms race. Even the Soviet Union has given tacit recognition to the delicate balance of forces in the area; though Moscow has been willing to provide defensive missiles to Arab countries, it has stopped short of assistance in equipping Iraq or the United Arab Republic offensive ballistic missiles.

The immediate task of American diplomacy is to explore every reasonable means of curtailing arms shipments to the Middle East on a multilateral basis. Specifically, this could include informal approaches to the Soviet Union, now in a mood of disenchanted reappraisal concerning the Arab world. There is at least a theoretical common ground between East and West on the desirability of preserving the peace in the Middle East. The world would breathe easier if both offensive missiles and nuclear devices were ruled out of the region under an agreement that provided effective inspection.

This should be the goal of American policy, and it would be vastly encouraging if the United States would state a large purpose rather than retreat into the lifeless platitudes of the Harriman letter—"the U.S. Government is, and has been, exploring all avenues of approach to an effective amelioration of worrisome and complicated problems." At the same time, it ought to be made clear that if all attempts at regional arms control fail, Israel will get the help it needs and not just snappish lectures about worrisome and complicated problems.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—MONTANA

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, the Federal grant-in-aid program has been one of the most beneficial aspects of our Federal system. Through various grant-in-aid programs the Federal Government has come to the aid of cities, communities, and institutions by supplementing local funds, participating in local betterment projects, and making technical and planning services available. The Federal agencies have stepped in where others have not been able or willing.

Perhaps one of the most successful grant-in-aid programs has been the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Since the beginning of the program in 1957 and up to the end of March of this year 67 projects have been approved in Montana. Grants under the program totaled $3,750,311.56 during this period. These funds aid local pollution projects costing in excess of $15 million. These projects have benefited 309,625 Montanans, and 933 miles of streams in the Treasure State have been improved because of this program.

The Water Pollution Control Act has provided incentive and the means for improved sanitation, improved water systems, and clean streams. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the

Congressional Record a tabulation of individual projects approved in Montana. It is an impressive documentation of a Federal-State program which has been of tremendous service to the people of Montana.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Addendum to project register, Dec. 31, 1962

Status	Location	Name of applicant	Population code	Description	Type construction	Estimated eligibles	Federal grant offer	Month
	MONTANA							
1	Belt	City of Belt	1	9	1	160, 856	$48, 256. 87	May 1962.
3	Big Timber	City of Big Timber	1	9	1	53, 893	16, 167. 89	January 1958.
1	Bigfork	Flathead County Board of County Commissioners	1	5	1	217, 191	38, 571. 43	July 1962.
3	Billings	City of Billings	5	3	1	338, 157	101, 447. 24	March 1957.
3	do	do	1	1	2	410, 000	123, 000. 00	March 1963.
2	do	do	5	3	1	623, 064	150, 518. 80	May 1961.
3	Boulder	Montgomery State Training School	1	9	1	87, 740	26, 322. 03	October 1958.
3	Box Elder	County of Hill	1	9	1	31, 792	9, 537. 55	January 1960.
3	Bozeman	City of Bozeman	4	1	7	34, 373	10, 311. 96	October 1960.
2	do	do	4	3	2	62, 245	18, 673. 46	October 1962.
2	do	do	4	3	2	85, 681	25, 704. 22	June 1962.
3	Bridger	Town of Bridger	1	9	1	25, 574	7, 672. 27	April 1960.
1	Butte	Metropolitan Sanitary Storm Sewer District 1	6	3	1	1, 118, 877	250, 000. 00	November 1957.
3	Cascade	Town of Cascade	1	9	1	50, 248	15, 074. 40	April 1961.
3	Columbus	Town of Columbus	1	1	1	105, 748	31, 724. 32	September 1961.
3	Culbertson	Town of Culbertson	1	9	1	46, 062	13, 818. 60	May 1957.
3	Cut Bank	City of Cut Bank	2	9	1	200, 971	60, 291. 20	August 1957.
3	Deer Lodge	City of Deer Lodge	2	9	1	212, 492	63, 747. 60	July 1958.
3	Dodson	Town of Dodson	1	9	1	25, 440	7, 632. 00	August 1957.
3	Drummond	Town of Drummond	1	9	1	43, 272	12, 981. 49	April 1960.
3	Eureka	Town of Eureka	1	6	1	68, 687	20, 606. 22	October 1959.
3	Fort Benton	City of Fort Benton	1	9	1	129, 057	38, 717. 22	Do.
3	Fromberg	Town of Fromberg	1	9	1	46, 200	13, 860. 00	April 1960.
3	Geraldine	Town of Geraldine	1	9	1	12, 546	3, 763. 99	March 1957.
3	Glasgow	City of Glasgow	2	9	4	145, 167	43, 550. 02	October 1958.
3	do	Valley County Improvement District 2	3	9	1	15, 000	4, 500. 00	April 1962.
3	Glendive	Rural Improvement District 1	1	9	1	83, 163	24, 948. 80	May 1958.
3	do	City of Glendive	3	9	1	428, 046	128, 413. 71	February 1959.
3	Great Falls	City of Great Falls	5	5	1	1, 620, 011	250, 000. 00	October 1958.
3	Harlowton	City of Harlowton	1	9	1	47, 949	14, 384. 61	April 1958.
3	Helena	Vocational school girls	1	9	1	40, 309	12, 092. 68	October 1959.
3	do	City of Helena	4	5	1	542, 000	162, 600. 00	April 1958.
1	Hingham	Town of Hingham	1	9	2	5, 500	1, 650. 00	November 1962.
1	Joplin	City of Joplin	1	9	1	41, 110	12, 333. 00	January 1962.
3	Kalispell	City of Kalispell	3	1	7	217, 070	65, 120. 95	August 1958.
1	Kevin	Town of Kevin	1	9	1	61, 293	18, 387. 77	April 1960.
2	Laurel	City of Laurel	2	7	4	451, 058	135, 317. 37	October 1960.
1	Libby	Lincoln County SID	1	5	5	736, 248	220, 874. 40	February 1963.
3	Livingston	City of Livingston	3	5	1	436, 128	130, 838. 37	October 1959.
3	Malta	City of Malta	1	9	1	131, 360	39, 408. 07	September 1957.
3	Manhattan	Town of Manhattan	1	9	1	50, 790	15, 236. 97	April 1960.
3	Miles City	City of Miles City	3	9	1	248, 540	74, 561. 91	October 1960.
2	Missoula	City of Missoula	5	1	1	1, 183, 976	355, 193. 05	March 1962.
2	do	do	5	8	5	1, 085, 392	325, 617. 60	Do.
2	Philipsburg	Town of Philipsburg	1	1	1	87, 520	26, 255. 80	September 1961.
3	Plevna	Town of Plevna	1	9	1	19, 973	5, 992. 14	July 1957.
2	Polson	City of Polson	1	9	1	243, 000	72, 900. 00	January 1960.
1	Poplar	City of Poplar	1	9	1	54, 760	16, 428. 00	May 1962.
3	Richey	Town of Richey	1	9	1	29, 685	8, 905. 64	March 1957.
2	Roberts	Carbon County Board of Commissioners Improvement District 3.	1	9	1	35, 281	10, 584. 33	February 1962.
1	Ronan	City of Ronan	1	9	1	192, 000	57, 600. 00	January 1963.
3	Shelby	City of Shelby	2	9	1	91, 137	27, 341. 21	May 1958.
3	Sheridan	Town of Sheridan	1	9	1	70, 326	21, 097. 84	April 1958.
3	Sidney	City of Sidney	2	9	1	127, 054	38, 116. 17	March 1959.
1	Stanford	Town of Stanford	1	9	1	26, 400	7, 920. 00	November 1962.
3	Stevensville	Town of Stevensville	1	9	1	32, 779	9, 833. 61	November 1959.
3	Three Forks	Town of Three Forks	1	9	5	87, 000	26, 100. 00	July 1960.
3	Townsend	Town of Townsend	1	9	4	48, 851	14, 655. 12	May 1958.
1	Twin Bridges	Town of Twin Bridges	1	9	1	91, 511	27, 453. 29	July 1962.
3	Twin Bridges	Montana State Children's Home	1	9	1	40, 871	12, 261. 30	September 1957.
3	Valier	Town of Valier	1	9	1	35, 254	10, 576. 20	August 1959.
3	Warm Springs	Montana State Hospital	2	5	1	128, 897	38, 669. 10	Do.
3	White Sulphur Springs	Town of White Sulphur Springs	1	9	1	64, 540	19, 362. 05	September 1957.
3	Whitefish	City of Whitefish	2	5	1	350, 000	105, 000. 00	October 1960.
3	Whitehall	City of Whitehall	1	9	1	79, 425	23, 827. 46	November 1959.
3	Winifred	Town of Winifred	1	9	1	26, 565	7, 969. 61	January 1960.
3	Wolf Point	City of Wolf Point	2	5	1	78, 954	23, 686. 29	May 1958.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

STATUS

Status of projects is indicated as follows:

1. Project approved (grant offer made).
2. Project under construction.
3. Project completed.

LOCATION

Listed alphabetically by State.

NAME OF APPLICANT

As listed in the project application.

POPULATION CODE

Federal grants made on a basis of population:

1. Less than 2,500
2. 2,500 to 5,000
3. 5,001 to 10,000
4. 10,001 to 25,000
5. 25,001 to 50,000
6. 50,001 to 125,000
7. 125,001 to 250,000
8. 250,001 to 500,000
9. 500,001 and over

DESCRIPTION

Description of the project as outlined in project application:

1. Treatment plant
2. Outfall sewer
3. Intercepting sewer
4. Other
5. Treatment plant, outfall sewer, and intercepting sewer
6. Treatment plant and outfall sewer
7. Treatment plant and intercepting sewer
8. Outfall sewer and intercepting sewer
9. Waste stabilization ponds with appurtenances

TYPE CONSTRUCTION

Type of construction as described in the application:

1. New
2. Extension or addition
3. Remodeling and alteration
4. New, extension and remodeling
5. New and extension
6. New and remodeling
7. Extension and remodeling

ESTIMATED COST OF PROJECT

Estimated project cost in which Federal grant funds are participating.

FEDERAL GRANT ORDER

Amount(s) of the Federal grant(s) offered to the applicant. Accelerated public works grants are always identified. Water pollution control grants are identified as such only when a project has also received an APW grant.

PROJECT APPROVED

Month and year in which the project was approved and the offer of a grant was made to the applicant.

CUBA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when I turned on the radio this morning I was greeted with the announcement on the news broadcast that "KEATING Strikes Again."

Naturally I was interested. I always wonder what is happening when one of my colleagues strikes. In the broadcast, I was informed that the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] was going to make a speech on the Cuban situation before the American Newspaper Publishers Association today.

I have had an opportunity to read the speech of the distinguished Senator, and I find it is a well prepared speech, and that in many respects it is a most constructive speech.

There are areas in which I would disagree with the junior Senator from New York. However, by and large I believe that he is making a distinct contribution to a better understanding of the situation which confronts us all, regardless of party affiliation.

In reading the speech of the distinguished Senator from New York, I note that he says, on the first page:

> It is foolish for anyone to pretend that there are easy answers to the Cuban problem. There are not now. There never were.

I agree with that statement completely.

Then he continues:

> The candidates in every national campaign—when interest in public affairs is at its highest—do a great deal to confuse and mislead the public by excessive promises of solutions, results, and changes.

I would suggest there that in addition to the word "national," he might use "State, district, local, and county campaigns." I say that because it is not confined to presidential campaigns, as I assume that is what the Senator is speaking about, and in the past tense.

I would say it would be more accurate to include all kinds of campaigns.

On the second page the Senator states:

> In my own judgment, both major parties have made serious blunders in Cuba and must share responsibility not only for the conditions which now exist, but for the lack of any consistent policy for coping with them.

I would agree with that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further morning business, morning business is closed. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the second page the distinguished Senator from New York states:

> In developing a common policy, we must start with agreement on certain premises. I see no useful purpose to be served, therefore, by recriminations over past mistakes. The only hope for bipartisanship on Cuba, in my judgment, is for our political leaders to leave the past to historians and devote their energy to devising a common policy for the future.

Again I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from New York.

In the next paragraph he states:

> The first lesson of Cuba is that—

Let me say parenthetically that it seems rather strange for me to be making this speech before the Senator from New York has even had an opportunity to make his speech before the Newspaper Publishers Association.

The Senator states:

> The first lesson of Cuba is that we must concentrate our attention on the key pieces, not the pawns of the cold war struggle. Khrushchev is the problem in Cuba, not Castro. Castro himself is no more of a menace to the United States than any other Latin American dictator, past or present, who has put his own personal megalomania and position ahead of the welfare of his people.

Well, Mr. President, I would not give the chief credit to Mr. Khrushchev, that he is the real problem in Cuba. I would go a step further, and, instead of dissociating Castro from Khrushchev, I would lump them both together, because they are made of the same cloth.

In the next paragraph the Senator states:

> The missile crisis showed that there were limits to our forbearance, but of late we have also given the impression that under some circumstances we will take steps to protect the Communist establishment in Cuba.

Mr. President, I would agree with the first part of that statement, that there are limits to our forbearance. However, I certainly disagree with the second part of the statement, that "of late we have also given the impression"—he does not say that we are doing it, but that we have "given the impression that under some circumstances we will take steps to protect the Communist establishment in Cuba."

Nothing could be further from the objective of this administration.

Then on the next page the distinguished Senator from New York says:

> Those who say we must deal with communism in Cuba by concentrating all our efforts on social and economic problems in Latin America, however eloquent they may be and however worthy and necessary such efforts may be, just aren't fully facing up to the facts.

That is a questionable statement, because, if I recall the historical background of the Alliance for Progress, it did not state that a concentration of efforts under the Alliance or under any other program would cure the social and economic problems of Latin America.

I think the emphasis was that the "cure" so-called, would have to be administered by the nations themselves, and that all that our country could do would be to help on the periphery.

I emphasize, however—and I think history—even modern history—will bear this out—that there are Castro columns in many countries in Latin America, and that if something is not done by the countries of the hemisphere to help themselves, along with the peripheral assistance from us, those Castro columns will take advantage of the difficulties, such as hunger and poverty, which will make themselves felt and are even now making things extremely difficult for the governments now in power.

In the next paragraph, the Senator from New York continues:

> I have supported the Alliance for Progress in the past and expect to continue to do so. But the Alliance can no more be relied upon as a complete cure for Castroism in Latin America than a few additional public works projects would be regarded as a complete cure for unemployment in our own country.

I am delighted that the Senator from New York will continue, as I knew he would, his support of the Alliance for Progress in the future, but again I reiterate that we know that neither the Eisenhower administration, which started the Alliance for Progress, nor the present administration, which continued it, has stated that the Alliance for Progress would be "a complete" cure for Castroism in Latin America or anywhere else. Continuing, the Senator from New York says:

> While I do not regard the recent outburst of refugee hit and run attacks on Cuba as a very promising or effective remedy for Castroism, these outbursts mirror the frustration and confusion that has overcome our Cuban friends.

I would agree with that statement in all details, as I suppose every other Member of this body would, too. Further down on page 3, the Senator from New York refers to what he calls the fourth lesson of Cuba. I should say, after reading the paragraph beginning his discussion of the fourth lesson of Cuba, that what the Senator has said there and in the succeeding paragraph would meet with the approval of all Senators. On the next page, on the same point, he says:

> On this same point, I also understand from Navy personnel that in spite of the surveillance we are conducting to make sure that weapons, personnel and other tools of subversion are not clandestinely shipped out of Cuba, some Navy ships have specific orders not to searchlight smaller vessels that are constantly moving in the Cuban and Caribbean waters at night.

I should assume that the information which the Navy personnel is disseminating would be available to the Chief of Naval Intelligence and would most certainly be available to Mr. John McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I express the hope that there is no division or split among the various intelligence agencies which are supposed to combine their findings and report them to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, who in turn, after an analysis, is supposed to bring the intelligence before the National Security Council and the President for their consideration. Continuing, the Senator from New York states:

> The Soviets will continue to advance, to test us, to apply Communist pressures on the frontiers of the free world wherever and whenever they thing they can gain by it.

That is true. Continuing, the Senator from New York states:

> It is up to us, not to tell them to stay home, but to make it so unpleasant for them that they will come to that conclusion on

their own. We cannot tell them what to do. We have to prove to them that there is nothing else they can do. That is what we did in October, but we have not done it before or since. Until we convince them that these excursions—and incursions—are a part of a "travel now—pay dearly" plan on their part, we are inviting them to continue planning their all-expense tours to this hemisphere.

Well, what program does the Senator from New York propose that the administration enforce in carrying out what he suggests in that respect? In the next paragraph the Senator refers to his 14-point program. I believe that that program, either in whole or in large part, has been elucidated on the floor of the Senate. I believe also that the Senator from New York stated that this program had been given to the Director of the CIA, Mr. McCone. I am glad to note that later in his speech the Senator from New York mentions that he has been in fairly close contact with both Mr. McCone and Secretary of State Rusk. In his speech, the Senator states:

> After all, nothing is older and more traditional than a naval blockade as it was applied by the President in October. Although I do not favor such action now, that so-called quarantine was one of the standard tools of the 19th century diplomacy. We made it work again, against a 20th century threat by using our own 20th century enforcement ability.

I am glad that the Senator from New York is so emphatic with respect to where he stands on the question of a naval blockade at this time. On the next page of his speech, the Senator from New York states:

> For instance, I see little to be gained in engaging in any numbers game with regard to Soviet troops in Cuba.

But then the Senator states:

> But, according to my information, since the withdrawal of the technicians who accompanied the MRBM's and IRBM's and bombers in mid-November, there has been no substantial reduction of Soviet military personnel in Cuba. There were and are in the neighborhood of 17,000 men there.

He compares those figures with the figures given out by the administration, and then states:

> Frankly, however, I don't think the basic problem in Cuba is affected substantially by whether there are 17,000, 14,000, or 20,000 Russian troops in Cuba.

I point out—and it is, of course, public information—that the statement made by the administration as to the number of troops and technicians in Cuba was made on the basis of information furnished by Mr. John McCone, Director of the CIA. Mr. McCone, in turn, got his information from the combined intelligence agencies which make up an aspect of this Government's security arm. I believe also that Mr. McCone, Mr. McNamara, and the President have all stated that they were not in a position, and could not be in a position, to give hard and fast figures as to the number of troops that were in Cuba, and that what they gave to the appropriate congressional committees, to the people of the country, and to the press, was their best estimate based upon the best intelligence they could compile..

Later in his speech the Senator from New York states:

> The sixth lesson I draw from the Cuban situation is that while disagreements are inevitable, attempts to discredit the motives and sincerity of every critic are bound to contribute to disunity.

I certainly would not find it difficult to appreciate what a critic of this administration has said, provided that when he criticized, he did so in a constructive manner and offered something in the way of possible alternatives. I am happy to say that so far as the Senator from New York is concerned, he has, by and large, always been constructive. He has presented ideas and made suggestions. I wish I could say the same for other critics of the administration, who can find disagreement with everything but nothing constructive to replace it. The junior Senator from New York also says:

> Yet our own officials often, dangerously often, are more concerned to discredit their critics than to use the national concern as a powerful part of their diplomacy. This national conviction and determination should be one of the diplomatic strengths of a representative form of government. Instead one gets the impression that it is regarded as an embarrassment, that many would rather defend the status quo, whatever it is, than try to alter it. Again and again, the flashes of anger, the outbursts and the concentrated attacks of our top officials are directed not at the Communists, but at those who are worried over the present situation and working, and fighting to defend the very same ideals to which we are or should be publicly committed.

Let me say that I, as one Senator, certainly would not approve of any attempt to bring discredit upon any Senator or any other American, either in or out of Congress, for expressing the right to disagree. I think that is an inherent American right. I would qualify that only to this extent, again, as I have previously done—namely, that when criticism is made, I would hope it would be constructive.

Toward the end of the speech, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] made it clear that he has had opportunity to meet both with Secretary Rusk and with Mr. McCone, the Director of the CIA, on Cuba, and that he has the impression that his recommendations have been given serious consideration. In fact, I am sure they have.

The Senator from New York stated:

> In fact, while many points of my program, obviously, have not been implemented, a number of measures have been taken by the Government in recent months, paralleling some of my proposals for an economic squeeze on the Communists. While I certainly have not been consulted in the formulation of the policies—nor is there any reason why I should have been—the attitude of both Secretary Rusk and CIA Director McCone was entirely constructive and from a personal point of view, very encouraging.

I think that is a sound statement and a statesmanlike comment.

And toward the end of his speech, the Senator from New York said:

> In my judgment, a consensus of the American people can be developed in support of a firm and realistic program designed to drive the Communists from Cuba. This consensus would be reflected by a return to bipartisanship in the spirit of the Vandenberg era. What this will require, as I have tried to point out in my remarks, is better communication, a sharing of responsibility for the conditions which exist in Cuba, a more candid disclosure of facts to the American public, confidence that leaders in either party will not attempt to make political capital out of success or failure in Cuba, and the articulation not of an easy, but of a clear and consistent program of action.

I wish to say that, by and large, I agree with what the distinguished junior Senator from New York said. There are points of difference; but his is the kind of speech which I think is constructive in large part and can be considered a contribution to a better understanding and a better facing up to a difficulty which confronts us in this hemisphere.

Mr. President, at this moment the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is delivering a major address on the Cuban situation—or, more accurately, on our Government's response to that situation—to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. The major purpose of his speech is to define and examine the concept of bipartisanship in foreign affairs, as it has developed in recent years, and as it relates to Cuba.

In this speech the Senator from New York very rightly calls bipartisanship "a means of strengthening the role of the United States in its international and diplomatic ventures." He says it represents "a symptom of the consensus shared by the American people on foreign policy issues." He says:

> Communist Cuba is an obvious case on which no clear consensus of opinion exists.

In part, that is clearly true.

Mr. President, in our country there are voices—Walter Lippmann calls them "the voices of the warwhoopers"—who call for an immediate invasion of Cuba. Some of them would have us participate in such an invasion, and some believe the job could be done by other countries in the Organization of American States. The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is not one of those "warwhoopers." As he says in his remarks, he opposes a blockade now, and has always opposed an invasion.

But there are other voices, even in high places, who insinuate that the administration has "appeased" the Soviets in the Cuban affair. But, Mr. President, as the Senator from New York says about "easy answers to the Cuban problem"—

> The course of events in Cuba shows how unwise and dangerous such campaign oratory is, and I hope it will serve as an object lesson as to the need for restraint in future political contests.

Mr. President, I am reminded of the visit of the Governor of the great State of New York to the Capital of the Nation during the past week, and I am reminded of some of the things he said and some of the insinuations he made and some of the peculiar comparisons he made. He did not in my opinion, speak in a statesmanlike manner on the Cuban issue while he was here—in contrast to the way in which the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is today addressing the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Other voices are calling for "unleashing" the Cuban exiles on our shores, no matter what consequences that might have on the conduct of U.S. foreign policy in the area. Again, the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] is not among those voices.

We do hear the voice of the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] asking for a forthright and firm policy aimed at the elimination of the Soviets from Cuba. In other speeches he has presented a plan for economic action against the Communists in Cuba—a plan which seemed to me to be directed not so much against the Soviets as against Cuba itself. But the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] says that a Castro Cuba, with the Russians absent, would be more an object of pity than an object of fear. What concerns him is the continued existence of Soviet forces in Cuba. He calls for firm action by the President. The Senator from New York says he believes this strengthens the President's hand, and does not undermine him "as do cries for caution, more accommodation," and so forth.

At this point, Mr. President, I may suggest that the voice of caution is not to be abhorred, even in connection with the Cuban situation. Voices, such as that of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], which call for an end to our obsession with Cuba as the only matter of consequence in Latin America, should be listened to. Anyone who believes that the excision of the last Russian from Cuba will "cure" the problem of Latin America, is indeed a dreamer.

It is part of the duty of responsible Government officials not only to urge firm action against obvious dangers, but also to caution the people against self-delusions of that kind.

I share the faith of the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] in the wisdom of bipartisanship in foreign affairs. As he says, he has had numerous meetings with officials of the State Department and the CIA over the Cuban matter. The Republican leadership in Congress has been kept informed of developments. Ultimate responsibility for the conduct of our policy vis-a-vis Cuba rests, of course, with the President.

I should like to point out, in following up what the distinguished Senator from Florida said earlier today, that there are other suggestions which might be considered, in addition to the setting up of a government-in-exile to which recognition might be extended by this country.

But let me say that recognition of a Cuban government-in-exile should be seriously considered only when the various anti-Castro groups get together under a responsible and recognized leadership. That is not the case today, because, as I understand the situation, there are at least 12 major groups of anti-Castro Cuban refugees, and there are many more smaller groups. If there is to be a possibility of recognition of a Cuban government-in-exile, solidarity and real accommodation and real leadership must be forthcoming.

In addition to giving serious consideration to the recognition of a Cuban government-in-exile, I think consideration might well also be given to a hemispheric quarantine of Cuba, on the model recommended by the Organization of American States in imposing economic sanctions against the Dominican Republic in 1960, and that ways should be found to prevent the training of propagandists between Cuba and Latin America—both ways—and in that way to lessen contacts between Communist leaders and parties in Latin America with their counterparts in Cuba.

The OAS should not only proclaim principles and adopt resolutions, but should also take the leadership in a matter which is not only a U.S. problem but a hemispheric problem as well. The authority exists in the Organization of American States if its members wish to exercise it.

I would hope that we would not become so involved in any one particular problem that we would lose sight of the other problems which confront the President of the United States. Of course, he must consider Cuba. He does give it prior consideration. He must consider the rest of Latin America, Western Europe, the emerging African situation, the situation in the Middle East, the difficulties which confront us now in southeast Asia, and most especially in Vietnam, and possibly in Laos. He must consider also the situation as it affects the 7th Fleet in our relations with Taiwan; the situation in Korea, which is far from settled, because there all we have is a truce and an uneasy one.

This man who is President of the United States, who is criticized so often and so easily by so many, not only must consider the foreign policy of our country in at least a dozen areas, if not more, but he also must consider the domestic policy of our Nation. Problems are brought to his attention day after day after day by people who do not have to make the decisions. They can make speeches. But there is only one man in our country who has final authority and responsibility under the Constitution in the field of foreign policy. That man is the President of the United States. He has it whether he is a Democrat or a Republican President of our country.

What he needs is support. I hope that regardless of party, that support, based on sound and good bipartisanship, will be forthcoming, because the President is one man in this Nation who needs that kind of backing.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. New York seems to be very much in the news this morning and in the forefront of the Senator's mind. Since I am at the moment New York's sole representative on the floor of the Senate, I hope the Senator will allow me a minute to speak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted, because I have some more information on New York if the Senator wishes to bring it up.

Mr. JAVITS. I think that what the Senator has said about my colleague [Mr. Keating] will be very much appreciated by him. I gather that the general thrust of the Senator's feeling is that the remarks of my colleague [Mr. Keating] represent on the whole an exercise of bipartisanship in the development of our policy in Cuba in a responsible way.

I appreciate what the Senator has said about the President's burden. I have just been through a very intensive campaign in New York, where 10 percent of the Nation's population live. I know of nothing in the foreign policy field—and though I am not too happy about it, I am almost tempted, because I feel so strongly about the civil rights issue, to say that it is probably the paramount issue, both foreign and domestic. It gives the American people a deep sense of malaise that there is something wrong about what is going on in Cuba. Americans desire very much to find a course on which they can feel more secure on Cuba.

They not only feel that the situation in Cuba is very dangerous, since that country is so close to our shores, but also in a personal sense, too, they believe that it is a very serious source of infection for the whole Western Hemisphere.

We talked about the Marshall plan and NATO to deal with the Communist threat to Europe. I believe the American people were never more cognizant of the fact that the Communist threat is right here at home. Perhaps every policy, economic as well as military, may have to be revised to take care of the Cuban situation.

It is very understandable to me, therefore, that my colleague has addressed himself in such a thorough way to it. That he was proved right last fall is now a matter of history. Therefore, I am glad to note that his words are being listened to with the respect that they deserve. But I emphasize to the Senator that those of us who talk about Cuba are impressed with the way it appeals to the people we represent and how it appeals to our sense of urgency and concern. It is fair to say that they consider it the No. 1 security issue before them.

As to the constructive aspects, I join with the Senator, as does my colleague [Mr. Keating], in a bipartisan effort to strip this whole discussion of partisan aspects or partisan advantage. I have noted the important points which the Senator has made which would represent affirmative American policy.

I should like to make two observations to the Senator.

First, I believe what is disquieting the American people more than anything else is that they do not know accurately what commitments, if any, President Kennedy has made to Chairman Khrushchev. They do not know whether there is any vestige of a commitment with respect to Cuba which does tie our hands. I do not believe that there is any. I so much respect the President's view and appreciate the delicacy of his position that I myself have not uttered words which would force him to disclose precisely whether there are any commitments. In the same way I have said that I support the President in his action regarding Cuban refugees at the present moment. I may not feel that way tomorrow if I think the situation has changed. But for the present I feel that he must be supported because he is the man at the gun, and he has the best understanding of the delicacy of his situation.

As the Senator is commenting on the question, and since he is a man of such authority in respect to the administration, I desire to say that sooner or later the American people, to obtain some integration in their thinking about Cuba, need to understand that our hands are really completely untied in every conceivable respect in respect to any action we might feel called upon to take, whether it is a quarantine or anything else.

Our colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who is the present occupant of the chair, desired to be sure that we were free to reimpose the quarantine. I joined with him in his question.

The people wish to know—and they have a right to know—that we are completely free to take any action on Cuba necessary to our national interest.

The other subject I should like to place before the Senator is a question in relation to a security organization or a mutual defense organization in the Caribbean and Central America. Again recognizing the delicacy of the President's position, I do not wish to force any suggestion on him. I only point out that here is something critically important that could complement the idea that we keep a check on who goes in and out of Cuba. We should give the Central American and Caribbean countries a sense of strength in respect of resistance either to Communist subversion or infiltration from Cuba. I know very well the problems of Mexico. But I think even Mexico would be very much affected by the impressive demonstration of the willingness of Central America and the Caribbean nations to commit themselves to a mutual defense obligation. Those are two of the points which are not covered in the Senator's statement which I should like to submit to the Senator for his observation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not believe I heard everything that the Senator said. But I believe he mentioned the fact that the President should have a free hand to decide what should be done under any circumstances. In other words, the President should have the same kind of flexibility in the conduct and carrying out of our foreign policy as the Senator has expressed his point of view in regard to his present position on the question of Cuban exiles and the hit-and-run raids on the islands of Cuba and certain Soviet ships.

"Freedom" is a pretty hard word to define in relation to an individual who has the responsibility which the President of the United States has. As I see it—and I am sure that the Senator will agree—the President cannot look at merely one piece on the chessboard, but must see the whole board and how all the pieces fit. What he may do in one part of the world will undoubtedly, in this day and age, have an effect in other parts of the world as a consequence.

The President does retain a degree of flexibility. When a situation arises which puts a different slant on a particular question, it has been the President's policy, by and large, in his less than 2½ years in office, to call down the leadership and discuss many of his problems.

I see the acting minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], on the floor. He has been there on a number of occasions. His colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has, also. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and other Senators on that side of the aisle, as well as their counterparts on the Democratic side, have been called on occasion. So I would say that, if we can intertwine the words "freedom" and "flexibility," that would be about the best way we could describe the responsibilities which must be administered by any President of this country.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I know that my colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], apparently is under some compulsion to catch a plane. Could we suspend this discussion temporarily, for I wish to continue it, so that the Senator from Iowa may be recognized?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader and also my good friend from New York.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS MIRAGE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the American Institute for Economic Research, in its Research Reports dated April 15, 1963, explores again the question of "The Balance-of-Payments Mirage." It calls attention to the need for more definitive information from the Government on its policies regarding this vitally important matter. And it warns of the consequences of continuing deficit financing of international payments by the Government, asserting that "further tampering with the Nation's purchasing power could open the floodgates to the ravage of domestic inflation."

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Balance-of-Payments Mirage" from the April 15, 1963, issue of Research Reports of the American Institute for Economic Research, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Iowa?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS MIRAGE

In the 1962 balance of payments of the United States the net value of all receipts for goods, services, long-term investments, and unilateral transfers was less than payments for the same items by $1.3 billion. However, the Department of Commerce reported a deficit of $2 billion.

The $1.3 billion is a measure of the change in net short-term indebtedness of the U.S. Government and all residents of the United States. If the purpose is to show only the Government liquidity position, which appears to be the Commerce Department intention, that purpose should be stated more clearly than it usually has been. At present the official definition of balance-of-payments deficit twists the transactions into a form that serves this particular purpose. In doing so, it gives rise to uninformed proposals for elimination of the deficit.

In one sense the balance of payments is always in balance, like the balance sheet of a corporation. This is not an absurd idea to those who understand double-entry bookkeeping. Exports of goods, for example, are offset either by receipt of goods from abroad or creation of credit obligations. The credit obligations would appear in the balance of payments as long-term investments or short-term loans. In this way all payments offset all receipts, including settlements made by transfers of gold ownership for those who are able and willing to convert claims into gold.

The gold outflow from the U.S. Treasury in 1962 was $890 million; in 1961, $857 million.

In 1962 net short-term obligations to foreign countries increased $445 million; in 1961 they decreased $52 million (see table 1). This may be interpreted as a deterioration of our balance-of-payments position in 1962 by one-half billion dollars. Since these obligations included an increase in short-term loans to the U.S. Government, they represent deficit financing of international payments by the Government.

This may be compared with official reports of an improvement in the balance-of-payments deficit from $2.4 billion in 1961 to $2.2 billion in 1962.

Separating private transactions from Government transactions and Government-financed transactions in the 1962 balance of payments, we find that private receipts exceed private payments by $879 million. When short-term loans are eliminated, the excess is $1,441 million, a possible measure of balance-of-payments surplus on private accounts.

Table 2, which separates private transactions from Government transactions, is based on Department of Commerce figures. Although it is the best information available, nobody really knows exactly how much of private transactions results from Government grants and spending abroad. Although aware of these limitations, we are taking the official reports at face value for the purposes of this particular analysis.

Net private receipts from goods, services, and long-term investments were $2,122 million more than private payments. Included in this figure are payments for private foreign investments of U.S. residents amounting to $2,584 million. However, in seeking to improve the balance-of-payments position it would be shortsighted to restrict investments and lose future receipts from income on those investments.

Private exports of goods and services in 1962 topped private imports by $4,460 million. Artificial devices to increase this trade balance, if successful, can lead to undesirable distortions in the American economy. Devaluation, unpegged foreign exchange rates, exchange controls, and protective tariffs are proposed solutions that fail to come to grips with basic causes.

Some urge that balance-of-payments deficits require either a domestic price decline or foreign exchange depreciation as a corrective. This reasoning may be more suitable when economic maladjustments are the cause of the balance-of-payments deficit. When political decisions are behind the problem, economic solutions are not in order.

Excluding gold exports, the Government's international payments exceeded receipts from those exports of goods and services that were directly financed by Government payments. Here is the crux of the balance-of-payments problem.

TABLE 1.—*Changes in short-term indebtedness reflected in the U.S. balance of payments*

1962

[Millions of dollars]

Receipts:	
Net short-term foreign loans to U.S. Government	990
Sales of foreign convertible currency	17
Gold sales	890
Total	1,897
Payments:	
Net trade and capital payments	1,335
Net private U.S. short-term loans abroad	467
Net decrease in private short-term foreign loans to United States	95
Total	1,897

1961

Receipts:	
Net increase in private short-term foreign loans to United States	1,552
Gold sales	857
Total	2,409
Payments:	
Net trade and capital payments	805
Net decrease in short-term foreign loans to U.S. Government	17
Purchase of foreign convertible currencies	115
Net private U.S. short-term loans abroad	1,472
Total	2,409

TABLE 2.—*U.S. balance of payments*[1]

1962

[Millions of dollars]

Private receipts:	
Exports of goods and services	25,723
Net foreign direct and long-term investments in United States	246
Total	25,969
Private payments:	
Imports of goods and services	21,263
Net U.S. direct and long-term investments abroad	2,584
Private remittances to foreign countries	681
Net U.S. short-term loans abroad	467
Net decrease in short-term foreign loans to United States	95
Balance	879
Total	25,969
Government receipts and Government-financed receipts:	
Nonmilitary exports of goods and services financed by Government grants and capital	2,798
Net short-term foreign loans to U.S. Government	990
Sales of foreign convertible currency	17
Balance from private sector	879
Gold sales	890
Total	5,574
Government expenditures:	
Net military expenditures	2,368
Nonmilitary grants	1,872
Pensions, etc	243
Net payments for nonmilitary services	75
Net U.S. long-term loans abroad	16
Unrecorded transactions	1,000
Total	5,574

[1] Excluding exports of goods and services transferred under military grants and payments made on military grants of goods and services.

Maladjustments in the balance of payments due to political considerations do not lend themselves to correction by tampering with the motivating forces of a market-directed economy. A better approach is to apply corrective action to the Government sector of the balance of payments, where the problem originated.

The fact is that the United States has, by governmental actions, created much of the balance-of-payments deficit. The deficit was not created by the hand of God, or an unkind fate. They planned it that way. The problem could be solved in part by reversing the steps taken.

Any other balance-of-payments remedies will be self-defeating. Devaluation would destroy some of the value of foreign loans to the United States, nullifying our attempts to be the benefactor of those countries suffering dollar losses from devaluation. Moreover, further tampering with the Nation's purchasing media could open the floodgates to the ravages of domestic inflation. In one way or another this Nation must live within its means. If it is going to do so, we should protect the stability of the dollar and avoid other harmful consequences, including a serious loss of prestige throughout the world.

DEMOCRATS USE GUILE ON MONEY BILLS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star for April 15, 1963, there appeared an article entitled "Democrats Use Guile on Money Bills," written by Jack Bell, of the Associated Press. I believe the point made by Mr. Bell in this article merits attention by readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP OUTFOXED—DEMOCRATS USE GUILE ON MONEY BILLS

(By Jack Bell)

Democratic congressional leaders have found a pinchback formula they believe will lessen the political impact of Republican economy demands and help gain passage of major administration bills.

Their formula is a simple one. They get committee approval of measures calling for a relatively high level of expenditures. When the bill is brought before the full membership for action, they support a Democratic amendment to reduce the amount while resisting all Republican efforts to cut deeper.

The Senate leadership followed this procedure in gaining passage of the administration's mass transit bill. A committee had put a price tag of $500 million on the program. A floor amendment by Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, trimming the total to $375 million, was adopted and the bill was passed after all Republican proposals were beaten down.

Similarly, a youth-employment measure which had called originally for a $100 million outlay was increased to $120 million in committee.

When it reached the Senate floor, Senators PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and SYMINGTON got it reduced to $100 million. Republicans got nowhere in efforts to trim it further.

The Democratic House leadership found itself in a dilemma when Republicans joined with southern Democrats in committee to knock a $500 million public works item out of a supplemental money bill.

In this case, they marshaled their forces and restored the item by a House vote—but only after cutting it back $50 million.

The upshot of all of this activity is to put administration Democrats in a position to reply to Republican charges that they are spenders by pointing to specific instances where they voted to cut President Kennedy's proposals.

The Republicans give every evidence they intend to continue pounding away on efforts to cut at least $10 billion from the $108 billion Mr. Kennedy asked in advance appropriations for his $98.8 billion spending budget for the year beginning July 1.

THE PRESIDENT-TO-THE-RESCUE STORY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in last night's Washington Evening Star the lead editorial, entitled "Just a Bit Phony," commented on the alleged telephone conversation between the President and Mrs. Martin Luther King. I believe the point of the editorial is well taken, so I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST A BIT PHONY

If one is merely a reader of headlines, an Associated Press story from Atlanta could be taken to mean that the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., now jailed in Birmingham, Ala., was able to call his wife, who has just had a baby, only through the gracious intervention of President Kennedy. To the extent that the story conveyed this impression, it was a phony.

What happened, as far as we can find out, is that the President, according to Mrs. King, "had been in touch with Birmingham." This is a bit on the vague side. Mrs. King added, however, that the President phoned and told her: "I've arranged for your husband to telephone you very shortly. You probably know we sent FBI agents in last night to talk with him and he's all right."

Having in mind that the burdens of the Presidency are said to be the heaviest in the world, it is good to know that Mr. Kennedy, even while on a brief vacation at Palm Beach, could spare the time and energy to intercede in the Reverend Mr. King's behalf. The only thing that concerns us is whether the President really did much, and if so, what it was that he did.

To the best of our knowledge, no one in Birmingham was preventing the Reverend Mr. King from calling his wife. In fact, Police Chief Jamie Moore, who enjoys a local reputation in Birmingham as an honest man, say that the Kings talked to each other on the day before the President-to-the-rescue story appeared, and that the telephone conversation between husband and wife was not arranged by Kennedy or anyone connected with the President.

All of which causes us to wonder. If President Kennedy called Mrs. King and told her he had been in touch with Birmingham, we certainly do not question the accuracy of the statement. But what, precisely, does this mean? With whom did the President get in touch? Was it this getting in touch which made it possible for the Reverend Dr. King to call his wife? We doubt it very much. And we wonder what this business is all about. Could it possibly have anything to do with such things as votes, gullible people, or politics?

SOME ECONOMIC FACTS OF LIFE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star the esteemed columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, had an article entitled "Some Economic

Facts of Life," relating to financial figures of the 15 steel firms, which he feels are vital data for the United States. In view of the impending hearings on the steel price increase by the Joint Economic Committee, I believe this merits the attention of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME ECONOMIC FACTS OF LIFE—1962 FINANCIAL FIGURES ON 15 STEEL FIRMS ARE CALLED VITAL DATA FOR AMERICA

(By David Lawrence)

Much has been said about the difference between so-called liberals and conservatives. Perhaps the simplest definition is that the latter have a profound respect for the economic facts of life, usually obtained through actual experience, while the former cling to the illusion that there is some magic way by which two and two can make five.

A most interesting example of the value of economic facts is to be found in a table of figures printed on the financial page of the New York Herald Tribune on Tuesday of this week. This gives the actual capital expenditures and depreciation allowances of the 15 largest steel companies and contrasts them with the dividends and the net income of the same companies in 1962.

If capitalism in the United States is to survive, and if Nikita Khrushchev's prophecy that our grandchildren will live under communism is to be proved wrong, then the four categories of figures in that table constitute the most essential piece of information that has been furnished in the perennial controversy about prices and wages.

This ought to be read and studied, particularly by those Members of Congress who, at the behest of the White House, start investigations designed to persecute and intimidate businessmen who venture to raise prices, though no such scrutiny occurs when labor unions raise wages.

For what does the table show? First of all, there is the plight of the smaller company—like Lukens Steel—which has just raised its prices on selective items of steel. The net income of Lukens for 1962 was $3,273,000, but, out of this, $1,240,000 had to be paid in dividends—which, like profits, seems to be an ugly word, though dividends are really a wage payment for the use of invested money. People will never furnish new capital to a company that doesn't pay back what it has borrowed or whose stock diminishes in value when earning capacity deteriorates and dividends grow less and less.

Every company has to figure out how much it can pay to the investors each year. If it borrows from banks, it must also give some assurance as to when repayment of loans will be made. Also, while companies may get a tax deduction for all expenses incurred in the operations of a business, capital expenditures are by no means covered to the same extent. As plant wears out there are some deductions for depreciation, but this doesn't pay for the new cost of replacing a factory or old equipment.

Now, Lukens Steel in 1962 spent $6,611,000 for plant and equipment, but its net profit—after paying $1,240,000 in dividends—was about $2,033,000. This is the sum that has to be put into surplus or used to pay off capital borrowed. The depreciation allowance of $3,918,000 isn't enough to cover all outlays for plant and equipment.

Is the situation any different with a larger company? The case of Bethlehem Steel Corp. is even more discouraging. Thus, the net income in 1962, after paying operating expenses, was $88,677,000. This seems like a lot of money and usually figures like these get headlines as big profits. But the word big applies only to the size of the company and not to the economic facts of the case. For, while Bethlehem paid a low rate of dividends, the total amounted to $105,523,000, or more than was earned for the year.

So there was nothing to put into surplus. In fact, surplus of other years had to be used for dividends, and nothing was available out of 1962 earnings for new plant and equipment, for which a total of $192,831,000 was expended in 1962. The sum of $155,466,000 was available from depreciation allowance, but there was still a gap of $37,365,000 in capital expenditures that had to be borrowed or taken from funds accumulated in previous years.

Yet there is a faith on the part of the American investor that somehow the steel companies will make better earnings in future years. So, based on a belief that communism is not just around the corner and that economic sense will prevail in Washington—especially in Congress—the steel companies have gone ahead with a capital-expenditure program of $1 billion every year for the last 3 years, and are making selective price increases now so as to earn a profit to cover in part the wage increases granted over the last 5 years.

Profits are essential. Increased wage costs can be destructive when they wipe out profits or reduce them to the point where investors hesitate to invest their money in an enterprise. Economic facts like these, however, are not taught in most of the schools of journalism or in the colleges where the favorite textbooks are those written by some of the economists who become presidential advisers. They hold that deficit spending by the Government is sound finance and, by inference, that private companies can operate on the same theory.

THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, last August 20 in the Des Moines Tribune the columnist, Sylvia Porter, had an article entitled "Living Costs May Inch Up, but That's Still Not Inflation." Miss Porter pointed out:

> The price index is up about 1.2 percent from the level of summer, 1961. It is almost 1 percent above the level at the start of 1962.

She further stated:

> When the statistic is released next week, it will be front-paged. News that the consumer price index has hit a new high always is headlined and it almost surely will revive talk of inflation—inflation even in this cycle of sluggish business advance, stickily high unemployment, excess plant capacity in industries throughout the Nation.
>
> Will this talk be justified? Is a rise of 1 to 1¼ percent in the consumer price index in 1962 on top of a rise of ½ percent in the index in 1961 "inflation"?

She added:

> It is not.

Mr. President, I considered making a comment on Miss Porter's article at the time, but I did not feel that it merited the attention of the people, because I thought the facts would speak for themselves. Unfortunately, Miss Porter has not seen fit to leave well enough alone; and, accordingly, on Tuesday, April 16, 1963, in the Evening Star she has another article entitled "Cost of Living Continues Crawl," in which practically the same approach is taken. She points out:

> The cost of living will continue to climb in 1963 as it climbed in 1962. As the year rolls on, the Government's index of consumer prices will hit new peaks. As always, the rise of this index will bring cries of alarm about "inflation."

She also said:

> This degree and type of rise in consumer prices cannot be called inflation by any accepted definition of inflation—even though new alltime highs in living costs are a certainty.

Then she pointed out, Mr. President:

> We cannot ignore the tragedy of the millions who are unemployed and the millions who are wholly dependent on small, fixed pensions. These challenges we must meet.

Mr. President, I do not know whether Miss Porter is familiar with the meaning of the king's English, but although I am not an economist I think I know what inflation means. I believe that the American people know what inflation means. I believe it does an injustice to the English language to say that an increase in the consumer price index such as she has pointed out is not inflation by any accepted definition of the term. I think Miss Porter would do well to consult a dictionary.

Mr. President, I appreciate Miss Porter's sympathy with the millions of people who are unemployed and the millions who are wholly dependent on small, fixed pensions, but I should like to find out what Miss Porter suggests when she says, "These challenges we must meet."

I suggest that the solution is very simple, Mr. President. It is for a majority of the Members of Congress to practice the moral and political courage of seeing to it that we do not spend more than we take in Federal revenues and that we maintain a stable dollar, which is what we are not now doing.

During the past 2 years, using the figures of the Council of Economic Advisers, we know that while the United States was going $14 billion deeper into debt, there also was inflation which shrunk the purchasing power of our people's hard-earned money by more than $14 billion.

Mr. President, if there is another $12 billion deficit for fiscal year 1964, we can be very sure that there will be a continued erosion of our dollars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the two articles by Miss Porter to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVING COSTS MAY INCH UP, BUT THAT'S STILL NOT INFLATION

(By Sylvia Porter)

Early next week, the U.S. Government will report that our cost of living either is holding at the highest level in history or, more probably, again has risen slightly to another alltime peak.

This will be disclosed in the monthly report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics showing that in July the Consumer Price Index—the only measure we have of living cost changes in our country—was at or a bit above the 105.3 mark it hit in June. (The index has been updated so that the base of 100 is now the 1957–59 period. An index of 105 means that today it costs $105 to buy the goods and services $100 bought in the closing years of the 1950's.)

The price index is up about 1.2 percent from the level of summer, 1961. It is almost 1 percent above the level at the start of 1962.

THE ODDS

There is virtually no chance that the index will decline during the rest of this year. Rather, the odds are that when the books are closed on 1962, the record will show prices of typical goods and services in an average city family's marketbasket 1 to 1½ percent over 1961.

When the statistic is released next week, it will be front paged. News that the Consumer Price Index has hit a new high always is headlined and it almost surely will revive talk of inflation—inflation even in this cycle of sluggish business advance, stickily high unemployment, excess plant capacity in industries throughout the Nation.

UNJUSTIFIED TALK

Will this talk be justified? Is a rise of 1 to 1¼ percent in the Consumer Price Index in 1962 on top of a rise of one-half percent in the index in 1961 "inflation?"

It is not. I've said this before, I say it once more. The one-half-percent rise in 1961 was remarkable stability, so extraordinary it had few precedents in modern U.S. economic history. A rise of the magnitude now foreseen for 1962 will be reasonable stability.

The very idea of a price index holding absolutely steady is unrealistic in a dynamic society such as ours is; inherent in the definition of dynamic is "change."

EXAMPLES

The to-be-published overall price index, for instance, probably will show food prices have risen because of seasonal forces while clothing prices have declined because of summer clearances, the cost of medical care has climbed because of hikes in hospitalization insurance rates, while prices of new cars have slipped because of concessions on 1962 models.

Even more indicative is the fact that a big question mark in the July index is the cost of gasoline—with seasonal pressures suggesting more costly gas while price wars suggest cheaper gas.

More of the same is shaping up for the balance of the year. The cost of services will still be mounting month after month, although the pace of the postwar climb is definitely slowing and the signs are clear that service costs finally are catching up.

Rents still will be going up a bit month after month, but also at a slower pace, a reflection of the increase in apartment vacancies and the softness in the housing market in general.

Food prices will be at least firm with higher prices for restaurant meals pulling the food index up.

PAY INCREASES

But the increases will be moderate, spotty—nothing like the big across-the-board rises we saw in past inflation periods—and alert managers of the household budget easily will be able to sidestep many of them.

And most important is the picture that emerges when the 1962 price climb is placed against the 1962 employment-pay background. For the fact is that tens of millions of Americans do have jobs and are getting pay increases that average substantially more than the increases in the prices of goods and services they buy.

They are not only matching the cost of living rise but also beating it by around 2 percent on average, gaining "real" purchasing power.

Not sharing in this good fortune are the unemployed and their families. Their plight is the blackest spot in our economic pattern.

Also not sharing are the millions entirely dependent on fixed pensions. They lose every time a price of an essential product or service climbs.

But bitter though this part of the story is, it cannot hide the shining fact that the higher incomes of the vast majority of U.S. families have more than offset living cost increases in recent years, and in 1962 this vast majority again will be enjoying the best bread-and-butter year of their lives.

Your Money's Worth—Cost of Living Continues Crawl

(By Sylvia Porter)

The cost of living will continue to climb in 1963 as it climbed in 1962. As the year rolls on, the Government's index of consumer prices will hit new peaks. As always, the rise of this index will bring cries of alarm about "inflation."

Despite the increase in steel prices, despite the fact that service costs are still rising, despite the early winter jump in fruit and vegetable prices, the increase in living costs this year will be held to a crawl. Barring events that cannot now be foreseen, the best forecast is that for the whole year the increase in the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index will be under 1½ percent.

This degree and type of rise in consumer prices cannot be called inflation by any accepted definition of inflation—even though new alltime highs in living costs are a certainty.

INCREASE IS ESTIMATED

The probability is that at the start of 1964 it will cost between $1.07 and $1.08 to buy the same market basket of goods and services $1 would have bought more than a half decade ago—not much of an upswing considering the length of time involved. And while on the index the dollar will be worth less in the marketplace in January 1964, than in January 1963, prices of some important things are declining. There are hidden markdowns in many areas.

When the BLS reports the March consumer index next week, the chances are it will be approximately where it was in February—slightly over 106 (1957–59 equals 100). The rise in the index early this year was due almost entirely to the big increase in fruit and vegetable prices after the winter freezes, but this trend has run its course. Meat prices were lower in March. Sugar prices have skyrocketed, but sugar doesn't have much weight in the index.

Here's a rundown of the 1963 outlook for prices of goods and services.

Food: Seasonal upturn in summer, seasonal downturn in fall and early winter, without any significant factors pushing prices sharply one way or the other. The food price index will be tilted upward, though, if the increase in the cost of sugar is translated into higher prices for bakery products, soft drinks, candy, etc.

Durable goods: Some price increases are on the way and the reasons go far beyond the steel price increase, but competition is too rough to permit major across-the-board price increases.

Housing costs: Prices will be pulled up by gradual increases in the cost of maintenance and repairs and quite possibly by rises in real estate taxes and interest rates. The cost of a house itself, however, isn't going to change much in this competitive era.

Rents: Still climbing despite vacancies in areas throughout the country, but the rate of rise is now a creep.

Clothing: Up a bit. When the April index is issued, it well may be higher because of the introduction of the spring lines.

SERVICES STILL GOING

Services: Higher. Costs of medical and personal care are still climbing, but again the rate of rise has perceptibly slowed.

So, where do you come out? If you have a steady job with year-to-year pay increases of more than 1½ percent, you come out ahead. Your "real" purchasing power is continuing to increase an average of 2 percent a year.

As a housewife, you also can come out ahead if you shop with moderate care. Taking advantage of the food specials and bargain sales in reputable stores can cut big chunks from your expenses.

We cannot ignore the tragedy of the millions who are unemployed and the millions who are wholly dependent on small, fixed pensions. These challenges we must meet.

But for the vast majority, 1963 is shaping up as another good year.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am sure the record will reveal that I have refrained from making any extremist type statements on the Cuban situation, but I have been sitting here long enough to have heard some of the comments made about some of the positions of the Republican Party. I wish to say, speaking as only one Member on the Republican side of the Senate, I wholeheartedly endorse the principle of a bipartisan foreign policy and particularly with respect to Cuba. I also point out that we do have a bipartisan foreign policy with respect to Cuba. That is not the problem.

The problem is that while we have a bipartisan foreign policy with respect to Cuba, and the Republicans and Democrats alike are joined together on it, one reason why the Republicans and a good many of the Democrats, I might point out, are unhappy about the situation is that we have not had an implementation of that policy. Until we have an implementation of the policy, I fear and regret this is going to be an issue.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I know I share the feeling of all those who heard the majority leader. We commend him upon the dispassionate and objective critique that he has made of the speech of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]—the speech which he is now making before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It is characteristic of the majority leader's fairness.

The speech of the majority leader has meaning because, in the last few weeks and months, there has been some criticism, which I believe unjustified, of the junior Senator from New York because he has made from time to time comments and recommendations regarding our policy in Cuba. I know that on several occasions, after hearing his speeches or reading them, I have said on the floor that I have considered his speeches to be constructive, informative, and useful. They did not bear the mark of a "war hawk" or, as the majority leader has said, "war whooper."

I know that a great many of us feel strongly that bipartisanship in foreign policy is essential, particularly in regard to issues which bear upon the security of the country.

Bipartisanship is always difficult to describe. I know I have attempted to do so several times. I believe it means we should be mutually thoughtful, constructive, moderate, just, and fair in our discussion of these issues, and have the knowledge that when a decision is made at last by the President of the United States, we must support him, and support him gladly.

I think it is also agreed there should be an opportunity, under bipartisan policy, to discuss these matters and discuss them fully.

I know we remember, at the time of the crisis last fall, the great concern we felt when we were briefed and knew the country might be very close to war. There was deep concern among the people of the country, and we stood by the President when he made his courageous decision.

What happened at that time points up the danger of the continuing situation—one which under certain circumstances might again lead to war.

What has troubled me, and I think it has troubled a great many people in this country, is the feeling which the Senator from New York mentioned a while ago—a feeling of unclearness, a feeling that the policy or goals of the administration on Cuba are unclear, unclear to the people, difficult as is the problem.

I believe the Soviet presence in this hemisphere is really the issue which troubles the people. It is their presence in Cuba which gives power and authority to Castro. It is troubling not only because it establishes a base for arms and subversion, but also because it gives strength and force and support to Castro and to Communist elements throughout this hemisphere.

I consider that a goal which the people of our country would understand, and one which is rightful, is the continued insistence by the administration that Soviet Russia must withdraw its troops. For if circumstances develop because of their presence which provoke or increase the danger to our security, we might again have to face the issue which the President faced last fall.

Now I wish to ask the majority leader a question, and I speak with knowledge and understanding of the problems facing the President of the United States—a man whom we knew in the Senate, whom we respected then, and respect today. I have no doubt that the President is trying to bring about the removal of Soviet troops. It was stated last fall, and on many occasions since, that Soviet Chairman Khrushchev said the Soviet troops would be withdrawn.

If it is a matter of which the majority leader has cognizance, and on which he can speak out, I would like to know if that was his understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that that was the understanding of the Senator from Montana, and still is his understanding. However, I would point out that, to the best of my knowledge, no date certain was set when they would be taken out of Cuba; and, to the best of my knowledge, the President's statement to the effect that there are approximately 12,000 Soviet troops and technicians remaining in Cuba, from a high of 22,000 last October or November, is approximately correct.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] cites the figure 17,000. I do not know what the source of his information is, except that he does refer to naval personnel as having informed him on some subjects. But certainly, if the President of the United States cannot depend on the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, who in turn is alert not only to intelligence which his own Agency furnishes, but that which is furnished by other intelligence groups in our country, then I do not know on whom he can depend. I personally am prepared to take the President's word, and I do so wholeheartedly and unquestionably.

The Senator from New York has said we should not play the numbers game. He cites the figure 17,000. He refers to the administration figure of 12,000 or 14,000. He brings in 20,000 somewhere. I agree with him that we should not play a numbers game, but we should recognize that our intelligence agencies in this country are adequately staffed with personnel and adequately financed, so far as money is concerned, and these are the agencies which must furnish the administration in power—or any administration—with the best intelligence at their disposal. Only on that basis can the Chief of the Nation, the President, and the National Security Council operate the plans and work out the problems which concern them.

Mr. COOPER. I have never questioned the authority of the President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Kentucky has not.

Mr. COOPER. I have always assumed the President and the Government have more sources of information and better means of evaluating information than has a Member of the Senate. I accept that as a fact.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield, that was the assumption under which I worked even when Mr. Eisenhower was President of the United States. I think it is a good assumption to work under at all times, because the Congress has made adequate preparations to take care of the right kind of agencies to furnish the right kind of information to the persons who have the right to conduct the foreign affairs of this country.

Mr. COOPER. I have always assumed the thesis expressed by the distinguish majority leader, although these agencies can make mistakes. But I want to get off the subject of numbers, and emphasize the policy—the goal which the people of the United States will understand; one which is valid, and one which the majority leader has said, and I think correctly, can be bottomed upon the promise of Khrushchev. It is that our administration will do everything in its power to secure the removal of the Soviet presence in Cuba.

Our country stands upon solid ground in pursuing this policy. If Mr. Khrushchev promised the removal of the Soviet force, I cannot see that the continued insistance of our administration that he keep his promise will lead to any confrontation that would be different from that which existed last fall.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all.

Mr. COOPER. But Mr. Khrushchev's promise is not the true base of such a policy. The extension of Soviet force into this hemisphere violates even the kind of status quo that Khrushchev has urged for the Soviet Union's purposes. Not long ago he spoke about East Berlin and East Germany. He said that they had become an integral part of Communist Eastern Europe, and that the Soviet Union would not tolerate any intrusion by the Western Powers, including the United States, into that area.

Yet he has extended Soviet force into this hemisphere.

I say this reluctantly: Taking into full consideration the very strong position of our country last fall at the time of crisis—when Mr. Khrushchev was required to admit his wrong by the withdrawal of missiles—if the Soviet Union continues to maintain its forces in Cuba, then the Soviet Union has made the great gains in the whole affair.

I am sure the President is using all the means, other than force, which are available to him at this time, to insist upon the withdrawal of the Soviet forces—and we support him.

Nevertheless, if the country can know that, with respect to Cuba, it is our purpose to secure the withdrawal of Soviet forces, and to take every step that can properly be taken to do this, it would be indeed helpful, and it would give more comfort to all of us.

If these means fail, if provocations occur, and if the danger to our security continues because of the Soviet presence, I would believe that it could lead in time to a crisis such as we faced last fall.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the Senator is making an assumption which could possibly turn out to be a justified assumption. I do not know. The Senator from Kentucky does not know. I do wish to assure the Senator that, so far as the President is concerned, he is doing everything in his power to bring about not only a reduction in the Soviet troops and technicians in Cuba, but also to bring about a withdrawal of both from that island back to their homeland or elsewhere outside the Western Hemisphere.

I know that the President is doing all he can do, in his position, and in the light of the circumstances which confront him. I assure the Senator from Kentucky that what he has said has been taken to heart.

I compliment the Senator from Kentucky on his consistency, and I wish to say that, while it is true he has not spoken much on Cuba or any other aspects of our foreign policy, that fact has meant a loss to the Senate, to the country, and to the administration.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first I wish to say to the distinguished majority leader that he has my continuing respect, simply because of the fairness with which he comments on all public questions, in this instance on the very excellent address made by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] today.

It is needless for me to add that he has also my fond friendship, just because he is a "good guy."

I wish to make some comments on the subject he has discussed, if I may. I am a Republican. I am a Republican U.S. Senator. I am an American first, just as the Presiding Officer is first an

American, and just as every other Member of the Senate is first of all an American.

There will be some lurid, emotional, and ill-considered comments made by some people, whose intellectual gyrations get a little phrenetic on foreign policy generally. Some of these statements will be made by Democrats, and some of them will be made by Republicians.

I believe that my friend, the majority leader, will not mind my recalling that when Dwight Eisenhower determined to cancel our recognition of the Castro government, because Mr. Eisenhower would not make the people and the Government of the United States take anymore insults from that vile little person, some of my brethren across the aisle denounced Eisenhower for doing it. I do not believe that served a very constructive purpose. Eisenhower was right in what he did. I hope we over here on this side of the aisle will try to be constructive when we speak out on public questions, particularly on those questions which involve the very future of America.

A few days ago the second anniversary of the Bay of Pigs occurred. It was from Eisenhower on down that the tone of the Republican Party in this country was set. It was General Eisenhower, speaking from Gettysburg, who said, "We all face the same evil. Let us not now engage in partisan, political comment. I suggest we do not now make the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs one of political discussion." There was a responsible, patriotic American speaking. There was a great American, who acted as he saw the light in the best interest of the country as, indeed, he always did. Yet, occasionally, some of the lunatic fringe have denounced Eisenhower as a "Communist dupe." Think of it.

My able friend, the Democratic leader in the Senate, has mentioned the goal of our country. What is the goal of the Government of the United States and the people of the United States? Is it not the security of our country? Is it not the perpetuation of our liberty? Is it not the advancement of this world toward peace and justice with honor?

I think it is; and particularly with respect to Cuba, I believe the goal of the American people and of our Government was reflected in the Cuban resolution which we wrote here in the Senate and in the other body last year.

I want this country to be united. I want the country to recognize that the President of the United States, whoever he is, during his term, speaks for all of us in matters of foreign policy. But I want it also to be clearly understood that when able men, like the junior Senator from New York, rise in the Senate or in the country to make constructive comments, they have a right—indeed, a duty—to do so, and that they reflect the heartfelt, soulfelt concern of the American people when they do so. The American people are concerned—deeply concerned—and will continue to be concerned so long as there is any communism in this hemisphere; so long as there is communism anywhere on the globe.

Let us never forget the duplicity and the deceit by which the Soviet Union took into Cuba rockets which could have blown into ruin and rubble great cities in the United States and in this hemisphere.

I think some of us can be pardoned for wondering whether a promise on any subject by the Soviet Union is susceptible of complete credibility. The American people—and I believe the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] reflects their thinking—want firmness, vigor, and honorable dedication to principle by any occupant of the White House. That is what we want. The people of the country are united with respect to that desire.

We seek peace; but in the words of the present occupant of the White House, we have fought wars before. We seek to advance the cause of peace with justice in this country. And, in advancing that cause, responsible and constructive comment is the duty of each of us.

I merely say to my friend, MIKE MANSFIELD, a great Senator, a great representative of the Democratic Party, a great leader in this Chamber, that there will be no division between Senators whom he represents on his side of the aisle and Senators on this side of the aisle in wanting and urging the President of the United States to apply firmness and vigor in the conduct of the foreign policy of this country.

MODEL U.N. ASSEMBLY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this year on April 19 and 20 the Ninth Model United Nations Assembly is to be held at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City. Students will participate and represent member nations in sessions similar to those held by the real U.N. Assembly in New York City. These students will concern themselves with the same international problems with which that organization must deal. They will endeavor to see problems through the eyes of the nationals whom they are designated to represent. Even the Iron Curtain countries will be represented with vigor and zeal. The realism of the debate and the insight displayed by these high school students is reassuring to oldsters who wonder how our land will fare for leaders when we are gone. Through such participation, these students seek to better understand the underlying principles and actual operations of the United Nations as well as gain insight into the complex and often confusing problems which face the nations of the world today. For "ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

I commend the high school students of Utah for their efforts, Mr. President, and wish them success in their endeavor. For they are demonstrating not only sound scholarship but also sound American citizenship. They are developing an understanding of the peoples of the world in which we must live.

As we are all aware, an informed and active citizenry is one of the greatest assets a nation can claim; and it is an asset essential to a strong democratic society. I am thus deeply disturbed to find that there are some among our citizens who object to this Model U.N. Assembly. There are some, who because they may disagree with the activities of the United Nations do not want it to be discussed. These citizens seek to inflame rather than to inform our students—they wish to convince them with half-truths rather than let them make up their own minds based on the whole truth.

With this purpose in mind, one Robert W. Lee, secretary and editor of a group which styles itself as the Citizens' Information Committee, which apparently is composed of people who are unalterably opposed to the United Nations and that for which it stands, have mailed out widely a propaganda package purporting to expose the truth about the United Nations. This particular package is made up of several mimeographed articles and a copy of "The Dan Smoot Report." All of this material deals with the U.N. as an instrument of the Communist conspiracy, opposed to the ideas and principles upon which our Nation was founded. Their charges are substantiated by such tried and trusted principles as guilt by association.

One of the avowed purposes of this package, Mr. President, is "that those who have undertaken to protest the Model United Nations Assembly may have additional material with which to document their case." Obviously, objectivity, or any attempt to present both sides of a given question, is ignored. An examination of one or two of the so-called arguments presented by the Citizens' Information Committee will reveal their total disregard for fact and figure and total dependence on the irrational and the irrelevant.

In an article entitled "Eyewitnesses Refute U.N.," it is charged that the U.N. has wrecked the Congo and brought chaos and crisis where none had existed. The statement or misstatement that "The United Nations has started all this scandalous mess—destroying a prosperous young country where black and white were working and living together" is typical. No attempt is made to explain why the U.N. went into the Congo or what it has done there. Only the mistakes of U.N. troops or administrators—and admittedly there have been mistakes—are mentioned.

The article does not point out, however, that the United Nations entered the Congo only at the urgent request of the legitimate government of that nation after law and order had broken down within the newly independent state, after the Army had mutinied, and only after the infant Congolese Government was unable to maintain control. Mobs roamed the streets, hunger haunted the countryside, and divisive elements broke into open conflict.

In this desperate situation the Congolese Government sought aid, first from the United States, and then sought it from the U.N.

President Eisenhower saw that only the United Nations could render such assistance without involving the infant Congolese nation in a cold-war power struggle. That is why the United States did not respond to the plea of the Congolese. We did not want the Soviets to enter the Congo and, by giving their so-called aid, create a Soviet satellite in the heart of Africa. On the other hand, had the United States alone given aid, in the minds of the Congolese we would have been guilty of colonialism from which they had only recently been freed. In either case the cold war would have moved into the heart of Africa. Thus, the only suitable alternative was the United Nations. Wisely, both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have given U.S. support to the U.N. presence in the Congo.

Because of U.N. action the Congo today is free and whole. It is edging forward along the path of law and order. No American soldier will die there. And, perhaps most important, no Soviet soldier will live there. The Congo has a chance for real independence. If the Citizens' Information Committee is in reality concerned with spreading the truth about the United Nations, this, too, should be pointed out.

In a second article included in the package the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" of the U.N. is compared with the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. The Citizens' Committee implies that because there is a similarity between the two, and differences between the universal declaration and our own Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights, the U.N. document is obviously a Communist treatise. Such reasoning would seem to smack of the guilt-by-association principles which we have all come to disavow.

For example, it is pointed out that article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states "everyone has the right to education. Similarly, article 121 of the Russian Constitution states, "Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to education." It is implied that the statement in the Declaration of Human Rights is thus communistic in design. There is no attempt, however, to point out at the same time that while not in our Constitution, the system of universal free public education has been the cornerstone of our society and the strength of the American system.

I would ask the Citizens' Information Committee which sees subversion in similarity, are then our public schools communistic in design?

Mr. President, I could point out many more half-truths and erroneous implications which are found throughout the statements issued by this committee, but I do not feel that these statements merit such attention. Indeed the only attention merited by these articles is that attention which brings about awareness of the tactics which are being used in an attempt to misrepresent and misinform for motives known only by those who have issued them. For if we are aware of these tactics, they cannot accomplish their aim of misrepresentation and misinformation; and then they will be unable to destroy the value of free and open discussion which the Model United Nations Assembly represents and promotes.

I am confident that the high school students of Utah will not fall prey to these propaganda efforts. I am confident that they will seek objectivity in their understanding of the United Nations. They will consider its faults and failures as well as its strengths and successes. And in doing so they will reaffirm our proud heritage of informed and active citizens seeking to strengthen our society and solve its problems.

Mr. President, these interested and intelligent students do not deserve the disruptive attentions of the Citizens' Information Committee and similar groups. Rather they deserve our attention and our support. I know that they have all of our good wishes that the Ninth Utah Model U.N. Assembly will be effective and informative.

Mr. President, the Deseret News has said better than I, in an editorial on April 11, the purpose and value of this model assembly. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODEL FOR UNDERSTANDING

In a world of 3 billion human beings, half of them living in Asia, 250 million more in Africa and three-fourths of the inhabitants of the earth members of nonwhite races, few things are more important than the building of mutual understanding.

Creation of understanding is, of course, a prime goal of the United Nations. It is also the goal of such activities as the Model U.N. for high school students, held annually throughout the Nation.

Utah's Model United Nations Assembly will convene Friday and Saturday at the University of Utah, with 1,400 students from 76 high schools in attendance. Regardless of one's feelings about the U.N. itself, there can be little doubt of the value of this annual effort to analyze its weaknesses and strengths as well as the issues before it.

The intriguing feature of the Model U.N. is the way its play acting helps develop fuller understanding of world issues and peoples and at the same time fosters an appreciation of the very real and technical difficulty of reaching agreement among nations.

Each school chooses the nation it will represent throughout the year. Under the guidance of faculty members, students study their nation and its problems in relation to the world community. To make the best possible preparation for the assembly, students must employ all conventional methods of study and in addition hold caucuses with other schools and discussion groups. Delegates who attend the Model U.N. must come exceptionally well prepared. They should leave with more patient understanding of the complexity of world affairs, less inclined to insist on oversimplified, dramatic solutions that actually create greater problems and dangers than they solve.

Success to Utah's high school Model United Nations Assembly in its great effort to influence students to join hands and work together cooperatively to keep our land of liberty a land where there is always the freedom to come to grips with hard issues and to better understand our neighbors.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1963

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 22, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named person to be lieutenant commander in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Edward J. Ard

The following-named person to be lieutenant in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Lawrence R. Montali

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Richard C. Binzley
Robert M. Massenburg
Robert G. Rugur
Theodore E. Deming
Karl F. Wassenberg

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

In the grade of general

Gen. Samuel E. Anderson, 92A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., 387A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Truman H. Landon, 93A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

In the grade of lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. George W. Mundy, 358A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. James E. Briggs, 356A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code:

In the grade of general

Lt. Gen. Robert M. Lee, 590A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Jacob E. Smart, 592A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Joe W. Kelly, 612A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Gabriel P. Disosway, 654A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

In the grade of lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William O. Senter, 648A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, 1082A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Maurice A. Preston, 1337A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David Wade, 1582, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Edwin B. Broadhurst, 1350A, Regular Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Edward H. Underhill, 421A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, under the provisions of section 711, title 10 of the United States Code.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. George F. Beardsley, U.S. Navy, to have the grade of vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Rear Adm. Morris A. Hirsch, U.S. Navy, to be reappointed Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy for a term of 1 year.

The following-named officer of the Chaplain Corps of the Regular Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James W. Kelly.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Aid to Housing for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 18, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the need for increased private financing for housing for the elderly is very clear. This point has been made repeatedly by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, with whom I was pleased to join in offering S. 1170, a bill to open new sources of financing for such housing.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board recently implemented the provisions of the Housing Act of 1961 providing for a special housing for the aged lending program for Federal savings and loan associations, authorizing them to invest up to 5 percent of their assets in loans on housing for the aged. Federal associations will be permitted to make mortgage loans up to 90 percent of value with maturities running up to 30 years. The new regulation helps to meet a pressing social need. Needless to say, this authorization for the institutions of the Federal Home Loan Bank System is barely a beginning. It will take a determined effort, including legislation such as S. 1170, before satisfactory progress can be made toward achieving a solution of this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of an amendment to the rules and regulations for the Federal Savings and Loan System (12 CFR Part 545) be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 545.6–16. Housing Facilities for the Aging:

(a) General provisions: Subject to the provisions of this section and the provisions of paragraph (a) of section 541.12 of these regulations, a Federal association may, if permitted by the terms of its charter, invest in installment loans or participating interests therein which are secured by improved real estate designed for the purpose of providing accommodations for occupancy by aging persons over 55 years of age, or of providing rest homes or nursing homes, so constructed or altered as to be suitable primarily for the occupancy of aging persons over 55 years of age, and limited principally to the occupancy of such persons. Said authority shall be exercised by a Federal association only by the making of loans in accordance with the provisions of this section. Such loan plans, practices and procedures, not inconsistent with this section or with other provisions of this part otherwise applicable to such loans, as may be used in the making of such loans, are hereby approved by the Board.

(b) Basic limitations: (1) A Federal association may make or invest in loans, or participating interests therein, under this section only when (i) the real estate security is located within such association's regular lending area, (ii) the loans are made on a monthly installment basis and (iii) the aggregate amount of the investments made under this section does not at any one time exceed 5 percent of the association's assets.

(c) Limitations on specific loans: (1) the principal obligation of each such loan shall be specified in the security instrument with respect to such loan and shall not exceed (i) 90 percent of the value of such real estate security therefor, if the loan is not an insured loan as defined in section 541.15 of these regulations, or (ii) the maximum percentage of the value of such real estate security acceptable to the insuring agency, if such loan is an insured loan as so defined. Each such loan shall be repayable monthly within 30 years or, if an insured loan, within the period acceptable to the insuring agency.

(2) A Federal association shall not make any loan pursuant to this section unless and until it has obtained a statement signed by the borrower or, if the borrower is a trust, partnership, corporation, or syndicate, signed by its authorized officer or agent, certifying that the security property has been or, as a result of such loan will be, constructed or altered to provide housing accommodations suitable primarily for aging persons over 55 years of age or to provide a rest home or a nursing home for such persons and certifying that the initial occupancy of such property will be limited principally to aging persons over 55 years of age.

(3) A Federal association shall not make any loan on existing housing accommodations for the aging, rest homes, or nursing homes pursuant to this section unless and until it has obtained evidence from the appropriate State or local authorities that the security property has been approved by such authorities, for occupancy by aging persons over 55 years of age or, if applicable, as a rest home or a nursing home for such persons. In any jurisdiction where such facilities are not subject to regulation under State or local laws or ordinances, a Federal association shall not make any loan pursuant to this section unless and until it has obtained a statement signed by an architect or, in the absence of an architect, such other qualified person as the board of directors of the association may designate certifying that the security property is designed primarily to provide housing accommodations for aging persons over 55 years of age or, if applicable, to provide a rest home or nursing home for such persons. If the security property is to be constructed or altered as a result of a loan made pursuant to this section, a Federal association shall not make such a loan unless and until it has obtained evidence from the appropriate State or local authorities that the plans and specifications for the construction or alteration comply with all applicable State and local laws or ordinances and that the security property, if completed according to such plans and specifications, will be approved by such authorities for occupancy by aging persons over 55 years of age or, if applicable, for occupancy as a rest home or a nursing home for such persons. If the security property to be constructed or altered as a result of the loan is located in a jurisdiction where such facilities are not subject to regulation under State or local laws or ordinances, a Federal association shall not make any loan pursuant to this section unless and until it has obtained a statement signed by an architect or, in the absence of an architect, such other qualified person as the board of directors of the association may designate, certifying that he has inspected the plans and specifications for the construction or alteration and certifying that the security property, if constructed or altered according to such plans and specifications, will be designed primarily to provide housing accommodations for aging persons over 55 years of age or, if applicable, to provide a rest home or a nursing home for such persons. Notwithstanding any other provision of this subparagraph 3, if the loan is an insured loan as defined in section 541.15 of these regulations, the association may accept the determination of the insuring agency as evidence of compliance with the requirements of this subparagraph 3.

(d) Relationship to the other provisions of the regulations: Except as expressly provided by this section, the exercise of any authority conferred on or vested in any Federal association by this section shall be subject to, and limited or restricted by, all other provisions of this part: *Provided*, That loans or investments made pursuant to this section shall not be included in the aggregate amount of investments referred to in section 545.6–7.

(Sec. 5, 48 Stat. 132, as amended; 12 U.S.C. 1464. Reorg. Plan No. 3 of 1947, 12 F.R. 4981, 3 CFR, 1947 Supp.) (Effective May 13, 1963.)

By the Federal Home Loan Bank Board:
HARRY W. CAULSEN,
Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalms 118: 24: *This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.*

Almighty and ever-blessed God, as we face the duties and tasks of this new day and again look unto Thee for guidance, may we be abundantly blessed with wisdom and understanding.

Fill us with a passion for justice and righteousness and may we not only be zealous and eager for our own rights but may we respect and safeguard the rights of others and help supply their needs.

We pray that the legislation, which the Congress is proposing and seeking to enact into law, may be for Thy glory and for the welfare of our beloved country and all humanity in its search for a happier and healthier way of life.

Hear us in the name of the Master who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 11, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 19, 1963, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4423. An act permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2440. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 247. An act to authorize survey and establishment of a townsite for the Juneau Indian Village in Alaska;

S. 394. An act to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves;

S. 873. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada;

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and tendering thanks of Congress therefor;

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution authorizing the temporary placement in the rotunda of the Capitol of a statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and the holding of ceremonies incident thereto;

S. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota;

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution for ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South Dakota;

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to tender the thanks of Congress to South Dakota for the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall;

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document the proceedings at the acceptance of the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall;

S. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business of its hearing of the 87th Congress on "Space Satellite Communications"; and

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An Act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 63–10.

OVERTONES OF DICTATORSHIP IN KENNEDY EFFORTS TO MANIPULATE STEEL PRICES

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, does the President believe he has dictatorial authority? The attitude of President Kennedy as it concerns the setting of prices by various steel companies indicates the President misunderstands his role in our capitalistic, private enterprise system. Without specific legislation authorizing price and wage control, the Chief Executive has no constitutional right to intervene in the price structure of any business or industry.

Yet, what has been the history of the President's actions in steel? Last year he brought the full weight of his Office to bear to prevent the steel industry from taking action for which the steel companies alone, in a free society, were solely responsible. We remember too well the midnight raids by the FBI, the threatened antitrust suits, and the scare headlines engineered by the White House to set public opinion against the steel companies. President Kennedy succeeded in forcing price control on free industry just as surely as if he had assumed the role of a total dictator.

Many gave him the benefit of the doubt last year and accepted the explanation he may have acted in haste and that such action would not be repeated. What is now happening? Again the steel companies have announced certain price increases. While we have not yet had a display of Kennedy tantrums, nor has the President issued any threats, we do have statements from the White House to the effect that selected steel price increases would be acceptable to the President. Evidently the President does assume he has the power to dictate prices without regard to legislation, without consultation from Congress and in complete disregard of his constitutional powers. Are we to see in this attitude of President Kennedy the dark shadows of dictatorship? Does President Kennedy already feel he has sole responsibility in the management of our economy? If he has already assumed this power, the people should be made aware of it.

As a Member of Congress who is sworn to uphold the Constitution in the name of the people of the Fifth District of Texas, I demand to know, Mr. President, what is your master plan? What power and authority do you think you have, and what form of government and changes in our society are you contemplating as your prerogative as the U.S. President?

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

APRIL 15, 1963.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on April 11, 1963, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on Monday, April 15, 1963, the following messages:

That the Senate passed H.R. 277, entitled "An act to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 1087, entitled "An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 1544, entitled "An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County Ariz.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 2291, entitled "An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 2294, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 5067, entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.";

That the Senate passed without amendment House Concurrent Resolution 86 entitled "Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled, 'Our Flag'.";

That the Senate passed without amendment House Concurrent Resolution 98 entitled "Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of a wall map of the United States."; and

That the Senate passed without amendment House Concurrent Resolution 108 entitled "Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document."

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

U.S. SCIENCE EXHIBIT, SEATTLE WORLD'S FAIR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b), Public Law 85–880, approved September 2, 1958, I transmit herewith the final report of the U.S. science exhibit, Seattle World's Fair.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 1963.*

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1049) to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI—arrangement—proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 334 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 334. Within ten days after the petition is filed the court shall give notice by mail to the debtors, the creditors, and other parties in interest of a first meeting of creditors to be held not less than fifteen days nor more than thirty days after the date of the mailing of such notice. The last date for filing claims shall be set forth in such notice."

Sec. 2. That after section 354 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 754) a new section is added to read as follows:

"Sec. 355. Where a petition is filed under section 322 of this Act, subdivision n of section 57 of this Act shall apply."

Sec. 3. That paragraph 3 of section 367 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 767) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the consideration deposited, if any, shall be distributed and the rights provided by the arrangement shall inure to the creditors affected by the arrangement whose claims (a) have been filed prior to the date of confirmation but within the time prescribed by section 355 of this chapter and are allowed or (b) have been filed after the date of confirmation but within the time prescribed by section 355 of this chapter and are allowed; and".

Sec. 4. Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 769) are amended to read as follows:

"(2) are disputed or unliquidated, have been scheduled by the debtor, and are filed within the time prescribed by section 355 of this chapter; or

"(3) arise from the rejection of executory contracts by the debtor and are filed within the time prescribed by section 355 of this chapter."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMULGATION OF RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE UNDER THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2859) to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask someone who has knowledge of this bill the purpose of it?

Mr. CELLER. The Supreme Court of the United States already has authority to prescribe rules regulating bankruptcy proceedings. This would give the Supreme Court the same general rulemaking authority in bankruptcy that it has already been given in civil procedure, admiralty, criminal procedure prior to and including verdict, and review of decisions of the Tax Court.

Mr. GROSS. Does the Supreme Court not have that authority?

Mr. CELLER. Apparently there is some question about it. To resolve that question we seek to pass this bill.

Mr. GROSS. That is the only thing involved?

Mr. CELLER. That is all.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how we are getting along with bankruptcies these days? Are they increasing or decreasing?

Mr. CELLER. In some sections of the country, as far as I can gather, there are a good deal of increases. In other sections, while there are no decreases, they are about the same as heretofore. I would say by and large there is a slight increase in bankruptcies.

Mr. GROSS. With 2 years of the New Frontier, we do have an increase in bankruptcies?

Mr. CELLER. I think that is a moot question. I do not think I can say about that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 28 of the United States Code, is amended by inserting in chapter 131 thereof immediately following section 2074 of that chapter a new section reading as follows:

"§ 2075. Bankruptcy rules

"The Supreme Court shall have the power to prescribe by general rules, the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act.

"Such rules shall not abridge, enlarge, or modify any substantive right.

"Such rules shall not take effect until they have been reported to Congress by the Chief Justice at or after the beginning of a regular session thereof but not later than the first day of May and until the expiration of ninety days after they have been thus reported.

"All laws in conflict with such rules shall be of no further force or effect after such rules have taken effect."

Sec. 2. The analysis of chapter 131 of title 28 of the United States Code, immediately preceding section 2071 of that chapter, is amended by inserting therein immediately after item 2074 thereof a new item reading as follows:

"2075. Bankruptcy rules."

Sec. 3. Section 30 of the Bankruptcy Act is repealed but its repeal shall not operate to invalidate or repeal rules, forms, or orders prescribed under the authority of that section by the Supreme Court prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF LANDS WITHIN THE SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 180) to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Whereas portions of the Kaweah number 3 plant of Southern California Edison Company consisting of diversion works, water conduits, and related facilities were constructed and are being operated and maintained on the Middle and Marble Forks of the Kaweah River near the southwesterly boundary of Sequoia National Park under a permit dated March 5, 1912, granted by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Act of Congress dated February 15, 1901 (31 Stat. 790); and

Whereas said permit expires on March 5, 1962; and

Whereas the power and energy generated by the Kaweah number 3 plant is used to serve the public including use in connection with the administration and enjoyment of the park; and

Whereas Southern California Edison Company has made application to the Secretary of the Interior to renew such permit to occupy and use said lands which are necessary for the continued operation of its Kaweah number 3 plant; and

Whereas the continued operation and maintenance of said facilities within Sequoia National Park upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem necessary for the protection and utilization of the park is in the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue a permit to occupy and use lands of the United States within Sequoia National Park necessary for the continued operation, maintenance, and use of the hydroelectric project known as the Kaweah number 3 project of Southern California Edison Company.

Sec. 2. The term of such permit shall expire not later than August 6, 1974, and the permit shall contain such other terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem necessary for the protection and utilization of Sequoia National Park.

Sec. 3. Such permit shall specifically recite that the privileges granted thereby are to be exercised in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Federal Power Commission which are determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be applicable.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 14, through page 3, line 4, strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

Sec. 3. Such permit shall specifically recite that the privileges granted thereby are to be exercised in accordance with the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791(a)-825(r)) and the rules and regulations thereunder which the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Federal Power Commission, determines to be applicable.

Strike out all of the preamble.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUDDEBACK LAKE AIR FORCE RANGE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3574) to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, Calif., for defense purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subject to valid existing rights, the public lands, and the minerals therein, within the areas described in section 2 of this Act are hereby withdrawn from all appropriations and other forms of disposition under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws and disposals of materials under the Act of July 31, 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 681; 30 U.S.C. 601–604), except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, and reserved for the use of the Department of the Air Force for a period of ten years with an option to renew the withdrawal and reservation for a period of five years upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior, and subject to the condition that the reservation may be terminated at any time during either of such periods by the Secretary of the Air Force upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Air Force, authorize use or disposition of any of the lands or resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Upon request of the Secretary of the Interior at the time of final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Department of the Air Force shall make safe for nonmilitary uses the land withdrawn and reserved or such portions thereof as may be specified by the Secretary of the Interior, by neutralizing unexploded ammunition, bombs, artillery projectiles, or other explosive objects and chemical agents. Thereafter the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to law shall provide for the appropriate use or disposition of all or any part of the land withdrawn and reserved under provisions of this Act. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Air Force at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of all or part of said lands under laws and regulations then existing.

SEC. 2. The lands withdrawn and reserved by this Act are those that are now or may hereafter become subject to the public land laws within the area described as follows:

Approximately 7,546 acres, more or less, within the Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, San Bernardino County, California, and more fully described as follows: Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 29, 30, 31 (except the south half of lot 2 in the southwest quarter of section 31), and 32, township 30 south, range 43 east, Mount Diablo Meridian, San Bernardino County, California, a total of 7,546 acres, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAY COUNTY HOSPITAL, BRAZIL, IND.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2364) for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Clay County Hospital, of Brazil, Indiana, the sum of $7,057.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all the claims of the Clay County Hospital against the United States for payment of civil defense matching funds for an emergency generator for an addition to such hospital which payment was not made in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, because funds were not available for such purpose, and cannot now be made because of regulations which prohibit the retroactive payment of such funds: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAZARDOUS DUTY PAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1159) to amend the Classification Act of 1959 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title VIII of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1131–1133), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 804. The Commission shall establish a schedule or schedules of pay differentials for irregular or intermittent duty involving unusual physical hardship or hazard. The appropriate differential shall be paid to any officer or employee to whom this Act applies for any period in which such officer or employee is subjected to physical hardship or hazard not usually involved in carrying out the duties of his position. Such pay differential—

"(1) shall not be applicable with respect to any officer or employee in any position the classification of which takes into account the degree of physical hardship or hazard involved in the performance of the duties thereof;

"(2) shall not exceed an amount equal to 25 per centum of the rate of basic compensation applicable with respect to such officer or employee; and

"(3) shall be paid under regulations which shall be prescribed by the Commission."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins more than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "ninety" and insert "one hundred and eighty" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL HEALTH BENEFIT PLANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1819) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3517) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]?

There was no objection.

ACCELERATION OF DATE FOR TAKING ECONOMIC CENSUSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3545) to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 131 of title 13, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 131. Collection and publication; five-year periods

"The Secretary shall take, compile, and publish censuses of manufactures, of mineral industries, and of other businesses, including the distributive trades, service establishments, and transportation (exclusive of means of transportation for which statistics are required by law to be filed with, and are compiled and published by, a designated regulatory body), in the year 1964, then in the year 1968, and every fifth year thereafter, and each such census shall relate to the year immediately preceding the taking thereof."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM "CHILD" UNDER RETIREMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3612) to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1(j) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251(j)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The term 'child', for purposes of section 11, shall include an adopted child and a natural child, but shall not include a stepchild.".

SEC. 2. The provisions under the heading "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85-844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, this is the day set for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

COL. FRANK D. SCHWIKERT, USAF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3623) for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to Colonel Frank D. Schwikert, 6311A, United States Air Force, Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, the sum of $3,539.22 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire on April 19, 1962, at the Perry Moving and Storage, Incorporated, Seattle, Washington, while the property was stored in a warehouse under a Government contract: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. LEONARD H. POTTERBAUM, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3625) for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Major Leonard H. Potterbaum, 35382A, United States Air Force, Box 7235, Area B, Aerospace Systems Division, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, the sum of $5,777.93 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire on December 4, 1956, at the National Movers Company, Incorporated, East Rutherford, New Jersey, while the property was stored in a warehouse under a Government contract: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR C. BERRY AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3627) for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the hereinafter named persons are relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the amounts listed opposite their names or such lesser amounts as may be outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act. Said amounts represent overpayments of retired or retainer pay resulting, through no fault of the payees, from erroneous computations of retired and retainer pay, due them from the Department of the Navy, or the amount of service on which such pay was based in the several amounts set opposite their respective names as listed therein:

Chief Yeoman Arthur C. Berry, United States Fleet Reserve, $1,801.72;

Chief Boatswain's Mate William W. Brewer, United States Fleet Reserve, $236.75;

Lieutenant Commander William R. Davis, United States Naval Reserve (retired), $90; Machinist's Mate First Class Rufino De Las Penas, United States Fleet Naval Reserve, $190; Chief Commissaryman Theodore E. Denno, United States Fleet Reserve, $44; Chief Boatswain's Mate Albert T. Diedrich, United States Fleet Reserve, $462.77; Chief Pay Clerk (W-2) Stephen Hruska, United States Navy (retired), $320.58; Lieutenant Junior Grade Thomas C. Ingle, United States Navy (retired), $123.60;

Lieutenant Junior Grade Bruce C. Jeppson, Medical Corps, United States Naval Reserve (retired), $37.02; Chief Machinist's Mate James L. Keppel, United States Fleet Reserve, $1,439.28; Commander Austin S. Kibbee, United States Naval Reserve (retired), $5,847.85; Chief Aviation Structural Mechanic Lee J. King, United States Fleet Reserve, $85.68; Lieutenant John J. Lowe, United States Navy (retired), $1,161.76; Chief Machinist Donald A. McFarland, United States Navy (retired), $1,395.64; Chief Boatswain Hugh F. MacNichol, United States Navy (retired), $9,686; Chief Machinist's Mate Everett Murphy, United States Fleet Reserve, $340; Chief Storekeeper Arthur V. Newell, United States Fleet Reserve, $1,839.21; Lieutenant Commander Benjamin D. Parish (Medical Corps), United States Naval Reserve (retired), $48.42; Chief Warrant Officer Opie G. Ray (W-2), United States Navy (retired), $742;

Ensign Nathan R. Sewell, Junior, United States Naval Reserve (retired), $549.18; Rear Admiral Kirby Smith, Civil Engineering Corps, United States Naval Reserve (retired), $4,400; Boatswain's Mate First Class Anastacio Torres, United States Navy (retired), $184.24; Chief Pharmacist James W. Walker, United States Navy (retired), $665.28; Lieutenant George A. Whitlock, United States Navy (retired), $1,783.92.

SEC. 2. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD GAMES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1213) for the relief of World Games, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the outstanding success of the 1959 Games of the Modern Pentathlon in promoting international good will toward the United States of America, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the World Games, Incorporated, a Pennsylvania corporation, the sum of $41,567, to enable the corporation to discharge the obligations incurred by the corporation in connection with the 1959 Games of the Modern Pentathlon held at Hershey, Pennsylvania, September 26–30, 1959. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the corporation shall use such sum to discharge such obligations: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum of not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARMELA CALABRESE DiVITO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1292) for the relief of Carmela Calabrese DiVito.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carmela Calabrese DiVito shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Pasquale and Lucy DiVito, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE E. BIRD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1267) for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,867.17 to Lawrence E. Bird, 5689 Valley Street, Dayton 24, Ohio, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for expenses incurred in January and February of 1960 in connection with replacing a well on his property destroyed by certain construction activities at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. This claim is not cognizable under the tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$2,867.17" and insert "$2,517.17".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. CLAUDE V. WELLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1286) for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lieutenant Claude V. Wells, United States Navy, retired, is relieved of any liability under the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62), to pay to the United States all amounts received by him as a civilian employee of the Department of the Navy from February 9, 1959, through September 17, 1960, and as an employee of the General Services Administration from September 18, 1960, through July 5, 1962; and is relieved of all liability to pay to the United States all amounts received by him as a retired commissioned officer of the United States Navy between February 9, 1959, and July 5, 1962, in contravention of the Act of July 30, 1932 (5 U.S.C. 59a). In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, following line 6, insert the following:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. Claude V. Wells an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ETHEL KNOLL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1428) for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That national service life insurance policies V-320-78-33 and V-322-62-08 issued on the life of George L. Knoll (Veterans' Administration claim numbered XC-5392945) shall be held and considered to have been in force on the date of his death, January 7, 1959. Payments made by reason of this Act shall be made out of the national service life insurance appropriation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

T. W. HOLT & CO. AND/OR HOLT IMPORT & EXPORT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1447) for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to T. W. Holt and Company and/or Holt Import and Export Company, the sum of $8,478.19. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the said T. W. Holt and Company and/or Holt Import and Export Company against the United States for repayment of excessive customs duties erroneously collected by the Bureau of Customs on canned meat imports from Argentina, which were imported by the said T. W. Holt and Company and/or Holt Import and Export Company between December 8, 1948, and July 3, 1950, and on which the customs duties were liquidated between January 9, 1951, and January 6, 1953: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLIVER BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1459) for the relief of Oliver Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Oliver Brown, 122 East Routzong, Fairborn, Ohio, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $395.86, representing an overpayment of salary between the period May 1960, and July 1, 1962, due to an error in computation by Wilkins Air Force Station, Shelby, Ohio. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oliver Brown the amount certified to him by the Secretary of the Air Force as the aggregate amount paid to the United States by the said Oliver Brown, or withheld by the United States from amounts due him, on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$395.86" and insert "$387.82".

Page 1, line 6, strike "May 1960" and insert "July 10, 1960" and strike "July 1, 1962" and insert "May 19, 1962".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MELBORN KEAT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1561) for the relief of Melborn Keat.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to Melborn Keat, of Pen Argyl, Pennsylvania, in full settlement of his claims against the United States for the refund of the amount of a bail bond which another individual was required to post in connection with a hearing in Allentown, Pennsylvania, in April of 1960, which was furnished by the said Melborn Keat in the form of a certified check for $1,000 drawn to the order of a United States commissioner and delivered to him in his official capacity which amount was not returned because the check or the proceeds therefrom were never deposited with the United States district court: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATTI JEAN FULTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1853) for the relief of Patti Jean Fulton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, Patti Jean Fulton shall be deemed to be the adopted daughter of Harold E. Fulton, deceased former employee of the Ordnance Ammunition Command, Joliet, Illinois. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits payable by reason of the enactment of this Act shall be paid from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. RITA M. BRAVI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1876) for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Rita M. Bravi may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of that Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following:

"*Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DAVID ISHMAEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2179) for the relief of Mrs. David Ishmael, Manhattan, Kans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $862.17, to Mrs. David Ishmael, Manhattan, Kansas, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for the reimbursement of the amount of expenses and other losses and damages occurred in resettlement as a result of her displacement in connection with the acquisition of land (tract numbered A–54) due to the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam and Reservoir project, Kansas: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike "occurred" and insert "incurred." Page 2, line 2, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STELLA McKEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2245) for the relief of Stella McKee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 33), with respect to the filing of claims and the institution of suits for the return of property or any interest therein pursuant to section 9 or 32 of such Act (50 App. U.S.C. 9 or 32), Stella McKee, a United States citizen, may, within six months after the enactment of this Act, file a claim for the return of certain property, namely, her interest under item 7 of the will of Fritz Glogauer, deceased, the title to her interest having been acquired by the United States under the Trading With the Enemy Act by vesting order numbered 4907 of the Office of Alien Property; and that claim shall be considered on its merits in accordance with the remaining provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That if no such return is made within a period of sixty days after the filing of such claim, the said Stella McKee shall be entitled within one year of the expiration of such period, to institute suit pursuant to section 9 of such Act (50 App. U.S.C. 9) for the return of such property.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KENNETH F. MILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2257) for the relief of Kenneth F. Miller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Kenneth F. Miller of North Tonawanda, New York, the sum of $50, such amount representing reimbursement to said Kenneth F. Miller for paying out of his funds a settlement of claim for damages arising out of an accident which occurred May 2, 1961, in the Dominion of Canada when he was operating a Treasury Department vehicle in the course of his duties as an inspector with the Bureau of Customs: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary nothwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARVIN M. GREENLEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2292) for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee.

There being no objection, the Clerk, read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marvin M. Greenlee, of Fairbanks, Alaska, the sum of $5,000 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for his expenses incurred in 1953 in salvaging Marine Corps helicopter HRS–2, Bureau Number 129037, which crashed December 5, 1952, on San Gorgonio Mountain, California, while rendering assistance to an Air Force rescue team: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JAMES M. NORMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2302) for the relief of James M. Norman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That James M. Norman, of Memphis, Texas, is hereby relieved of all obligation to refund to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation the sum of $2,001.48, representing the sum he has been determined to owe by reason of erroneous payments made by such Corporation.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "Corporation", insert the following proviso: ": *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to reimburse the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,001.48 representing the overpayment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAURICE CASNER AND EILEEN G. CASNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2326) for the relief of Maurice Casner and Eileen G. Casner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Maurice Casner and Eileen G. Casner, his wife, are hereby relieved of all liability to pay the United States the amount of $574.53, representing financial assistance extended in the years 1943 through 1946, when Eileen G. Casner and her son, Michael Allen Casner, were interned by the Japanese at Shanghai, China. The amounts claimed by the United States include funds furnished for subsistence during the period of internment and transportation at the end of the internment period. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6: Strike "1943" and insert "1942".

Page 1, line 9: Strike "subsistence" and insert "comfort, medical aid, and maintenance".

Page 1, lines 10 and 11: Strike "and transportation at the end of the internment period".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. EDWARD C. CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2327) for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Campbell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant Colonel Edward C. Campbell, Army of the United States, retired, the sum of $427.83, in full settlement of his claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses and losses incurred by him during the period beginning September 14, 1959, and ending October 1, 1959, both dates inclusive, during which period he was required to travel from Fort Sill, Oklahoma, to Fort Sam Houston, Texas, for the purpose of submitting to physical and medical examination in connection with his application for correction of his military record to indicate his retirement from military service for physical disability: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR L. ASHLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2699) for the relief of Victor L. Ashley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Victor L. Ashley, of Green Cove Springs, Florida, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $6,848.44, representing an overpayment of compensation from January 27, 1957, through October 2, 1961, received by him while employed with the Florida group, Atlantic Reserve Fleet, Green Cove Springs, Florida. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Victor L. Ashley an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike out, "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS JANIS AND CERTAIN OTHER INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2700) for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following Indians are respectively relieved of liability to the United States in the amounts set opposite their names:

Francis Janis, $450; Arthur Pat Janis, $360; Isaac Brave Eagle, $720; Donald Leroy Little, $720; Thomas Big Owl, $360; Charles Thunder Hawk, $360; Benjamin White Face, $360; Morris Eugene Kills Back, $360; Jackson One Feather, $720; Wallace Henry Little, $720; Betty Ann Merrival, $180; Paul Stands, $180; Theodore Kills Ree, $180; Ralph Ghost Dog, Senior, $360; Garvard Good Plume, $180; Eldred O. Brave Eagle, $180; Wallace Red Shirt, $180; Calvin W. Fast Wolf, $180; Lawrence O. Cross, $180; Gerald One Feather, $180; Maurice One Feather, $180; Edward E. Two Bulls, $180; Kenneth J. Short Bull, $180; Benton Rowland, Junior, $180; Eugene Rowland, $180; Paul J. Little, $180; David Bald Eagle, $180; Augustine Gus Knox, $1,080; Norman L. Knox, $180; Donald R. Knox, $180; Alexander E. Swalley, $180; George Brave, $360. Such amounts were advanced by the Department of State in 1958 to pay for the transportation of the persons named and members of their families to the United States from the World's Fair at Brussels, Belgium, where they were stranded when the organization which brought them there to take part in an exhibit, and which was obligated to return them to the United States become insolvent. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

VASILIKI MOUNDROUKAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2708) for the relief of Vasiliki Moundroukas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vasiliki Moundroukas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Vasiliki Moundroukas. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Vasiliki Moundroukas shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM C. JESSUP

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2736) for the relief of William C. Jessup.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William C. Jessup of Portland, Oregon, is relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $778.70, representing the amount due the United States as an indebtedness for the cost of shipment of household goods in excess of costs allowable under section I of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-1), in connection with shipping his personal and household effects from Portland, Oregon, to Ankara, Turkey, during March 1960, incident to an official change of duty station.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States, or his designee, shall relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents, of the Army, Navy, and Air Force from accountability or responsibility for any payments described in section I of this Act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of these officers or agents for payments which are found to be free from fraud and collusion.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said William C. Jessup, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the indebtedness referred to in section I of this Act.

No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 15, add: "No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARY E. O'ROURKE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2743) for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Act of August 12, 1955, entitled "An Act to provide for settlement of claims resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Texas, on April 16 and 17, 1947" (69 Stat. 707) and the 1959 Amendment to the Texas City Disaster Relief Act (73 Stat. 706), the claim of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke (formerly Mrs. James V. Pharr) for personal injuries to her former husband shall be deemed to have been filed with the Secretary of the Army before February 9, 1956.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $12,500 to Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke of New York, New York, in full settlement of her claims against the United States for an award under the Texas City Disaster Relief Act, as amended (69 Stat. 707, as amended), due her under the laws of the State of Texas based upon the injuries sustained by her former husband, James V. Pharr, in the Texas City disaster on April 17, 1947: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. HARLEY BREWER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2772) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer, of San Ildefonso Pueblo, New Mexico, the sum of $9,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all their claims against the United States for compensation for losses sustained by them when they were forced to abandon a house which they had constructed on Pueblo Indian land in the State of New Mexico without having first obtained the approval of the Secretary of the Interior as required by section 17 of the Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 636): *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HELEN VESELENAK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2798) for the relief of Mrs. Helen Veselenak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the requirements relating to time in section 202(h)(1)(B) and 202(p) of the Social Security Act that proof of support be filed by the dependent parent of an insured individual within a specified period after the date of such individual's death in order to qualify for parent's insurance benefits on the basis of such individual's wages and self-employment income shall not apply with respect to the application of Mrs. Helen Veselenak, Byesville, Ohio, for parent's insurance benefits under section 202(h) of such Act on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of her son Joseph Veselenak, Junior (social security account numbered 275-16-7991), if she files such application, together with such proof of support, within the six-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "requirements" insert "relating to time".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENE H. KING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3022) for the relief of Gene H. King.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to relieve Gene H. King of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $200. Such sum represents per diem paid him for the period April 27, 1956, to June 15, 1956, while he was stationed at Fort Devens, Massachusetts, as a second lieutenant in the United States Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. ARNOLD M. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3029) for the relief of Maj. Arnold M. Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Major Arnold M. Anderson, United States Air Force (Air Force serial number AO590173), of Yuba City, California, the sum of $1,723.17. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Major Arnold M. Anderson against the United States arising out of the destruction of his personal property while it was being transported from Middlesex, England, to Beale Air Force Base, California, in connection with his transfer as an officer in the United States Air Force from duty in the United Kingdom to duty at Beale Air Force Base, California: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by an agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JOSEPHINE DUBINS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3240) for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Dubins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to Mrs. Josephine Dubins of 7031½ North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois, the widow of Sheldon Dubins, deceased, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for refund of the amount of a departure bond deposited by her deceased husband, Sheldon Dubins, on behalf of the alien, Edith Herse. Such bond was declared breached, and the amount thereof forfeited, because of the failure of alien Edith Herse to depart from the United States in accordance with the conditions of the bond: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPHINE MARIA (BONACCORSO) BOWTELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3356) for the relief of Josephine Maria (Bonaccorso) Bowtell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josephine Maria (Bonaccorso) Bowtell shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 354(5) of that Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the award of death compensation which the Veterans' Administration has held that Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason, of Houlton, Maine, is entitled to receive as a result of its finding, because of the death of her late husband, Major Theodore P. Mason, who was killed in combat in Belgium on September 9, 1944, shall be held and considered to be effective as of the day following the said Theodore P. Mason's death on the basis of her original claim for such death compensation which she filed in March 1945, six months after her husband's death; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to make retroactive payments in accordance with such entitlement.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HERBERT B. SHORTER, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3450) for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the limitations contained in the Act of October 9, 1940 (31 Stat. sec. 71a), or in any other limiting statute, the application made by Herbert B. Shorter, Senior, of Pompano Beach Florida, received by the General Accounting Office on April 29, 1957, for additional retainer pay for the period from February 1, 1940, to April 28, 1947, for United States Navy Fleet Reserve service shall be held and considered to have been timely filed and the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to consider that claim and pay any amount found due the said Herbert B. Shorter, Senior, for the period covered by the claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. DONALD B. POWERS, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3624) for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Major Donald B. Powers, AO941107, United States Air Force, of Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, the sum of $688.81 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire of unknown origin on January 31, 1962, which razed his assigned Government quarters which he occupied at Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGARET PATTERSON BARTLETT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3662) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett, of Greeneville, Tennessee, great-granddaughter of former President Andrew Johnson, the sum of $15,000, which shall not be subject to any Federal tax liability, in lieu of the living quarters which she understands were to have been provided for the use of herself and her mother (deceased) during their lifetimes as part payment for the property acquired from them for inclusion within the boundaries of Andrew Johnson National Monument in Greeneville, Tennessee.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike "$15,000" and insert "$10,000".

Page 1, line 8, after "liability," insert "in full settlement of her claims for compensation".

Page 1, line 13, after "Tennessee" insert: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLENDAL W. HANCOCK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3755) for the relief of Glendal W. Hancock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Glendal W. Hancock of Sacramento, Calif., is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the amount of $787.93 representing overpayments of active duty pay as a member of the United States Army and the United States Air Force for the period from September 29, 1942, through January 31, 1960, which he received as the result of an erroneous computation of creditable service for longevity purposes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Glendal W. Hancock, the sum of any amount received or withheld from him on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this bill.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, following line 4, add: "No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STELLA REORGANIZED SCHOOLS R–I, MISSOURI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4214) for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri, the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of its claims against the United States for reimbursement of amounts paid by it to the United States for rental of space at Fort Crowder, Missouri, for educational use: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 10 and 11, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT O. NELSON AND HAROLD E. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4349) for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the application of section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended (5 U.S.C. 62) (pertaining to the concurrent holding of more than one Government office), is hereby waived with respect to the service performed, in good faith, by Retired Warrant Officer (Army of the United States) Robert O. Nelson as an employee of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Social Security Administration, from May 15, 1961, to February 16, 1962, inclusive; and with respect to the service performed, in good faith, by Retired Warrant Office (Army of the United States) Harold E. Johnson as an employee of the Public Health Service from September 18, 1961, to June 22, 1962, inclusive.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4965) for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

SALE OF CERTAIN RESERVED MINERAL INTERESTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1492) to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart of Marion County, Florida, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in section 2 of this Act, which right, title, and interest was reserved to the United States in the original deeds of conveyance executed by the United States, upon payment to the United States by the said Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart of an amount equal to the fair market value of the interest of the United States conveyed under this Act, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this Act is situated in Marion County, Florida, and is more particularly described as follows:

1. Northeast quarter of southwest quarter, northwest quarter of southeast quarter, southeast quarter of southwest quarter and west half of southwest quarter of southeast quarter of section 7, township 14 south, range 22 east, Tallahassee meridian, Florida.
2. East half of southwest quarter of southeast quarter and southeast quarter of southeast quarter of section 7, township 14 south, range 22 east, and the east half of northwest quarter of northeast quarter, east half of west half of northwest quarter of northeast quarter and northeast quarter of northeast quarter of section 18, township 14 south, range 22 east, Tallahassee meridian, Florida.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, change the period to a comma and insert "plus such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse the United States for the administrative costs of the conveyance."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF RIGHT-OF-WAY AT LAUREL, MD.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5081) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered, in their discretion, on behalf of the United States, to sell and convey to the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company a right-of-way over approximately seven acres of the grounds of the District Training School, located in the Fourth Election District of Anne Arundel County at Laurel, Maryland. Any such sale shall be at fair market value, as determined by the said Commissioners, and subject to such conditions as they shall determine to be in the best interests of the United States and the District of Columbia, including, but not limited to, a requirement that the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company and its successors and assigns furnish any District of Columbia institution on such grounds with an alternate source of electric service and reserving to the United States and the District of Columbia an easement of access and travel over the right-of-way to be conveyed under the authority of this Act.

Sec. 2. The said Commissioners are further authorized to pay from the proceeds of such sale the reasonable and necessary expenses of the sale of the right-of-way sold pursuant to the provisions of this Act, and shall deposit the balance of the proceeds of the sale in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMillan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to enable the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell to the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. a right-of-way for the construction of towers for a high-voltage transmission line to cross a portion of the grounds of the District Training School at Laurel, Md. Congressional sanction for this sale is required because the property lies outside the boundaries of the District of Columbia.

A representative of the electric company has stated that there is an urgent need for a transmission line between the National Security Administration substation at Fort Meade and a proposed new substation in the vicinity of High Ridge in Howard County, in order to serve the public properly with electric power. Also, the company has agreed to furnish the District Training School with a much-needed alternate source of electric current as a part of this project. At present, extended periods of loss of service result when the single power source for the institution is inoperative.

The proposed right-of-way is 66 feet wide and comprises some 7½ acres. This land is sufficiently removed from probable areas of future building expansion that its sale would not represent any serious loss to the institution, and the proposed transmission line would present no danger to the mentally retarded patients who are housed more than a mile away on the other side of the grounds. The District would retain a right of access across the right-of-way.

The power company has offered $17,500 for this right-of-way, this figure being based upon an estimate of the value of the land made by an appraiser designated by the District, and has agreed to amend this offer to include any increase in value which the land may sustain at the time of actual sale.

The District Training School grounds, comprising some 827 acres, were acquired in the name of the United States but were placed under the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Commissioners pursuant to a provision in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act approved February 28, 1923 (42 Stat. 1360).

At a public hearing held on April 9, 1963, the Commissioners recommended the enactment of this legislation on the grounds that the sale of this right-of-way at its fair market value to the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. not only will aid the company in meeting its responsibility to provide the public with adequate power supply, but also will provide the District Training School with a badly needed alternate source of power.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Commissioners that it has no objection to this proposed legislation, and no opposition to its passage has been expressed.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

THE MUTUAL-AID FIREFIGHTING AGREEMENTS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MARYLAND, AND VIRGINIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 5044) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes," and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes", approved August 14, 1950 (64 Stat. 441, D.C. Code, sec. 4-414(b), 1961 edition), is amended (a) by inserting a colon and the subsection designation "(a)" between "shall" and "waive"; (b) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon in lieu thereof; and (c) by adding the following subsection:

"(b) indemnify and save harmless the other parties to such agreement from all claims by third parties for property damage or personal injury which may arise out of the activities of the other parties to such agreement outside their respective jurisdictions under such agreement."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to require that all parties to mutual-aid firefighting agreements indemnify each other from all claims arising from the operations of firefighters outside their own jurisdictions.

Legislation authorizing the District of Columbia to enter into mutual-aid firefighting agreements with appropriate governmental units in Maryland and Virginia was enacted in 1950 (64 Stat. 441). This legislation provides that each of the parties to such an agreement shall waive all claims against the other parties thereto which may arise out of their activities outside their respective jurisdictions under the agreement.

Despite this legislative authority, however, no agreements have yet been entered into between the District of Columbia and any of the specified adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia. The difficulty encountered in attempts to draft such agreements has been the question of liability of the various jurisdictions for damages resulting from the operations of the various fire companies outside of their own jurisdictions. It is questionable whether the District of Columbia might successfully invoke the defense of governmental function in cases of alleged negligence of District firemen while operating outside the District of Columbia; and similarly, adjacent communities might also be held liable for damages resulting from the operations of their fire companies in the District of Columbia.

At a public hearing conducted on April 9, 1963, the Board of Commissioners expressed its desire to enter into these agreements with adjacent communities for the mutual benefit of all concerned, and strongly recommended the enactment of this amending legislation which will remove the only existing impediment to such agreements. It is felt that this action by the Congress will undoubtedly spur similar legislation in Maryland and Virginia to authorize the specified adjacent communities to indemnify the District of Columbia from claims arising from the operations of District firefighters in coming to their aid in emergencies.

The Chief of the District of Columbia Fire Department also testified in favor of this bill, and no opposition to its passage was expressed. The Board of Commissioners has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that they have no objection to this proposed legislation.

This committee was advised that the County Council of Montgomery County, Md., adopted a resolution urging the adoption of this legislation, at its meeting on October 30, 1962.

During the 2d session of the 87th Congress two bills similar to H.R. 5044 were introduced in the House of Representatives—H.R. 12796 and H.R. 12975—and one in the Senate—S. 3424.

UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Huddleston] for the purpose of calling up bills from the gentleman's subcommittee.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H.R. 5338) to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Page 133, line 19, strike out "part" and insert in lieu thereof "party".

Page 133, line 20, strike out "holders" and insert in lieu thereof "holder".

Page 235, line 11, strike out "on" and insert in lieu thereof "no".

Page 249, line 12, strike out "aginst" and insert in lieu thereof "against".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 259, line 9, strike out "nontification" and insert in lieu thereof "notification".

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 259, strike out lines 4 through 10, and insert in lieu thereof:

"(1) A transferee of a document, whether negotiable or nonnegotiable, to whom the document has been delivered but not duly negotiated, acquires the title and rights which his transferor had or had actual authority to convey.

"(2) In the case of a nonnegotiable document, until but not after the bailee receives notification of the transfer, the rights of the transferee may be defeated."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 269, line 7, strike out "prices" and insert in lieu thereof "price".

Page 283, line 14, strike out "Delievery" and insert in lieu thereof "Delivery".

Page 299, immediately after line 10, insert:

"(3) If the eight-year period specified in this section expires prior to one year after the effective date of this subtitle, such period is extended to one year after such effective date."

Page 299, in line just above line 14, strike out "articles" and insert in lieu thereof, "article".

Page 299, delete lines 14, 15, and 16.

Page 307, line 9, strike out "obliged" and insert in lieu thereof "obligated".

Page 308, line 4, strike out "deaing" and insert in lieu thereof "dealing".

Page 308, line 18, strike out "28:2–102" and insert in lieu thereof "28:8–102".

Page 309, immediately after line 14, insert: "Filing Office. Section 28:9–401(1)".

Page 331, line 13, strike out "fixture" and insert in lieu thereof "fixtures".

Page 338, line 4, strike out "encumbrance" and insert in lieu thereof "encumbrancer".

Page 343, line 11, immediately after the period, insert: "In this article, 'filing officer' means said Recorder."

Page 347, line 9, strike out "security" and insert in lieu thereof "secured".

Page 350, line 22, through page 351, line 1, delete "mark the statement with the hour and date of filing and shall note the same upon the margin of the index of the filing of the financing statement." and insert in lieu thereof "attach the statement of release to the instrument to which it relates and shall enter on the released instrument and on the index record thereof the word "released", the date of filing of the statement of release, and a facsmile of his signature."

Page 351, line 23, delete "$0.50 per page." and insert in lieu thereof "$3.00 for the first two pages or less, and $1.00 for each additional page, plus $0.50 for certification."

Page 357, line 13, strike out "this state" and insert in lieu thereof "the District".

Page 359, line 12, strike out "this state" and insert in lieu thereof "the District".

Page 371, immediately after line 7, insert "sections 546–A and 546–B, as amended, of the code of law for the District of Columbia approved March 3, 1901 (chapter 854, 31 Stat. 1275), as so renumbered by the Act approved June 5, 1952, chapter 370, section 1, 66 Stat. 126 (D.C. Code, 1961 ed., secs. 42–101 and 42–103) or pursuant to".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to all of the amendments to this bill, and operating in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, I am wondering if the bill is being written here on the floor of the House.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will say to the gentleman that these amendments were adopted in the committee. This is from the committee.

Mr. GROSS. They may have been adopted in the committee, but it is unusual to have so many amendments.

I am not going to object to the bill——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If the gentleman will yield, practically all of these amendments are technical changes in language and spelling, changing of plurals to singular, and singular to plural. So on a review of the size of this bill, 379 pages, I am sure the gentleman from Iowa would be very happy to notice that the Committee on the District of Columbia practices a little economy in the printing of bills around here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that fact but still I do not like to see bills practically written on the floor of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, may I say in justification of the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that personally I am in agreement with him. But as to this particular bill I believe there was merit in doing it the way we did it. This would have cost several thousand dollars to have a reprinting job done. There were errors made by the printer himself in the first printing. This is a little unusual situation. I know the gentleman from Iowa is very much for economy. The committee felt this was the wise way to do it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose of this bill is the adoption for the District of Columbia of the Uniform Commercial Code.

In general, this code would replace the District of Columbia uniform acts on negotiable instruments, warehouse receipts, sales and stock transfers, as well as District of Columbia statutory provisions dealing with bulk sales and several District of Columbia Code provisions relating to bank checks.

This code would not replace the District of Columbia Code sections relating to pawnbrokers, money lenders, liens on motor vehicles, and installment sales of motor vehicles.

A number of the uniform acts have been enacted in the District of Columbia with few, if any, modifications. The experience with these acts has been highly satisfactory. The Uniform Commercial Code is actually just another uniform act which, however, is more comprehensive and more thoroughly developed than any of the other uniform acts.

The Uniform Commercial Code does not represent an abrupt change in commercial law concepts. It codifies commercial law in its present stage of development, filling many gaps and settling a number of questions raised by conflicting judicial decisions.

Although uniformity with the statute law of other jurisdictions should not be the sole criterion, nevertheless, it is extremely important in this age of quick transportation and communication when every commercial lawyer is constantly coming into contact with transactions involving the law of one or more other jurisdictions. The adoption of the Uniform Commercial Code in the District of Columbia would certainly tend to minimize conflict of laws problems in situations involving the District and other "code" jurisdictions. Moreover, with the relative paucity of judicial decisions on commercial law matters in the District of Columbia, the feature of uniformity would make more pertinent the more numerous decisions of other jurisdictions and assist District of Columbia lawyers in their interpretations of the Uniform Commercial Code.

The comprehensiveness of the Uniform Commercial Code should prove extremely helpful to the practicing lawyers and the people they represent. At the present time, a District lawyer faced with a commercial law problem often finds a complete void in both the District of Columbia Code and the reported District of Columbia opinions. He is then forced to resort to standard texts on the subject, to law review articles, legal encyclopedias or digests, and then to follow the references to judicial opinions of other jurisdictions. At the conclusion of extensive and time-consuming research he is often still in doubt. On the other hand, the Uniform Commercial Code with its reasonably good coverage of the whole field will by itself answer many of the questions.

This committee has concurred in the recommendations of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia that there should be at least 1 year between the enactment date and the effective date, in order to give all interested members of the District of Columbia community ample time to become thoroughly familiar with the code and to make the necessary adjustments.

At the public hearing held on this bill, its enactment was urged by the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia, the Bar Association for the District of Columbia, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade and the District of Columbia Bankers Association. No expression in opposition to the substance of the bill has been presented to the committee.

BACKGROUND

Drafting of the Uniform Commercial Code and revisions thereof are under the joint sponsorship of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and the American Law Institute. Work was begun on this code in 1942 and completed in 1952, in which latter year it was approved by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association. The reported bill, to become the District of Columbia Uniform Commercial Code, is based upon the latest official revision of the Uniform Commercial Code.

As of the present time 23 States have adopted the Uniform Commercial Code as follows: Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Your committee is also informed that the Uniform Commercial Code is also still pending—as of March 13, 1963—before the legislatures of 10 other States; namely, California, Hawaii, Maine, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Texas, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1 of H.R. 5338 provides for the adoption of the Uniform Commercial Code as subtitle I of title 28 of the District of Columbia Code. The following is a brief review of the 10 articles of the Uniform Commercial Code—hereinafter referred to as UCC:

Article 1: This article deals with matters of general application, and contains general definitions and principles of interpretation.

Article 2: This article would completely supersede the Uniform Sales Act as contained in chapters 11 through 16 of title 28 of the District of Columbia Code. The Uniform Sales Act has been completely rewritten and much new material added to conform to present day commercial practices.

Article 3: This article would replace the Uniform Negotiable Instruments Act—NIL—as contained in chapters 1 through 10 of title 28 of the District of Columbia Code.

The law pertaining to commercial paper of the short-term type, like checks, drafts, certificates of deposit, and promissory notes, has been completely rewritten in modern commercial language, conforming to the remainder of the UCC. Numerous conflicting judicial interpretations, which have developed concerning provisions of NIL over the last 65 years, have been eliminated in the drafting of article 3. The parts of NIL dealing with negotiation of securities have been transferred to article 8 on "Investment Securities."

Article 4: This article, dealing with bank deposits and collections, does not replace any uniform act, and covers a branch of commercial law for which there is virtually no statutory counterpart in the District of Columbia aside from several relatively small sections of the District of Columbia Code.

Article 4, which is of tremendous importance to banks and all customers of banks, codifies in relatively simplified form the law pertaining to the handling of the vast number of collection items which are processed daily by banks and to the relations between a customer and his bank. Article 4 is, of course, integrated with article 3 dealing with negotiable instruments and article 8 dealing with investment securities.

Article 5: This article puts in statutory form the basic legal principles relating to letters of credit, and should prove of great assistance to any attorney who becomes involved in a letter of credit situation.

Section 28-5-102(1), however, differs from the official text in that the former makes it absolutely clear that issuers of letters of credit are entitled, if they so desire, to operate under the Uniform Customs and Practice for Commercial Documentary Credits, instead of under the UCC. In view of the substantial national and international acceptance of the Uniform Customs and Practice, it is considered that the right to continue under them should be expressly reserved.

Article 6: This article relates to bulk sales, and would replace chapter 17 of title 28 of the District of Columbia Code.

Article 6 continues the basic policy of protecting creditors of a merchant who sells in bulk by permitting such creditors to treat the sale as ineffective. Article 6, however, is more detailed and less ambiguous than the existing District of Columbia law enacted in 1904.

Article 7: This article, dealing with warehouse receipts, bills of lading, and other documents of title would replace the Uniform Warehouse Receipts Act as contained in chapters 18 through 22 of title 28 of the District of Columbia Code.

Article 7 combines as an integrated unit of legislation the Uniform Warehouse Receipts Act, the Uniform Bills of Lading Act, and those sections of the Uniform Sales Act dealing with the negotiation and transfer of documents of title. It is subject to any treaty or statute of the United States or District of Columbia regulatory statute or tariff, classification or regulation filed or issued pursuant thereto. Accordingly, the Federal Bills of Lading Act, 49 U.S.C. secs. 81-124, would continue to control interstate shipments and foreign exports, and the Carriage of Goods by Sea Act, 46 U.S.C. secs. 1300-1315, would continue to control ocean bills of lading covering both exports and imports.

Article 8: This article, dealing with investment securities, would replace the Uniform Stock Transfer Act as contained in chapter 29 of title 28 of the District of Columbia Code. In addition, it deals with bonds now covered by the Uniform Negotiable Instruments Act.

As stated in the 1958 official text with comments of the Uniform Commercial Code, article 8 is neither a "blue sky" law nor a corporation code. It may be likened rather to a negotiable instruments law dealing with securities. In general, it covers investment securities like stocks and bonds in both bearer and registered form.

Article 9: This article, dealing with the field of secured transactions, would replace little of the District of Columbia Code while making great advances in that field. In general, it applies to all transactions which are intended to create a security interest in personal property as well as to sales of accounts receivable contract rights, and chattel paper. Although it does not use the terms "mortgage," "conditional sale," and the like, existing security devices are not abolished and may continue to be used. Article 9, however, does abolish formal distinctions between existing security devices, and deals with the interests which the secured creditor may obtain under the code by the same designation, namely, a "security interest" defind in section 1-201(38), as an interest in personal property or fixtures which secures payment or performance of an obligation, which includes any interest of a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, or contract rights. In general, the term "chattel paper" refers to instruments—like notes and chattel mortgages—used by the owner thereof, like a dealer, to secure his own financing.

The security interest under article 9, to be enforceable, must either be a possessory interest—like a pledge—with the secured party in actual possession or be in a writing referred to in the article as a security agreement. The only requirements of a security agreement are that it be signed by the debtor and contain—section 9-203(1)(b)—"a description of the collateral and in addition, when the security interest covers crops or oil, gas or minerals to be extracted or timber to be cut, a description of the land concerned." However, a security agreement may contain the usual provisions now included in existing instruments, like chattel mortgages and chattel deeds of trust, and other agreements of the parties, except a few types of provisions expressly prohibited by the UCC.

With several exceptions—section 9-302—in order to perfect a security interest that would create a lien effective against third parties, the creditor must have possession of the collateral in case of a possessory interest—like a pledge—for the debtor must, in addition to entering into a security agreement, file a financing statement in the appropriate office, which in the District of Columbia would be the Recorder of Deeds—section 9-303. A financing statement may be a very simple document, being legally sufficient—section 9-402—"if it is signed by the debtor and the secured party, gives an address of the secured party from which information concerning the security interest may be obtained, gives a mailing address of the debtor and contains a statement indicating the types, or describing the items, of collateral."

Article 10: This article deals briefly with the matter of the construction of UCC with other laws.

Sections 2 to 14 of H.R. 5338 make appropriate changes in existing statutory law to conform it to the UCC.

Section 15 of the bill provides for, first, repeal of superseded statutes; and second, continued validity of transactions entered into prior to the effective date of the bill.

Section 16 states that the bill will become effective January 1, 1965.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4330) to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senator and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, approved June 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 179; D.C. Code 29-901), is amended as follows:

(1) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end of subsection (h) the following new sentence: "No corporation formed hereunder shall plead any statutes against usury in any action."

(2) Section 11 of such Act is amended by adding the following subsections at the end thereof:

"(e) The registered agent of one or more domestic corporations may change the address of the registered office of such domestic corporation or corporations by filing with the Commissioners a statement setting forth:

"(1) the name of the registered agent;

"(2) the present address, including street and number, if any, of such registered agent;

"(3) the names of the corporation or corporations represented by such registered agent at such address;

"(4) the address, including street and number, if any, to which the office of such registered agent is to be changed; and

"(5) the date upon which such change will take place.

"(f) Such statement shall be executed in duplicate by such registered agent in his individual name, but if such agent is a corporation, domestic or foreign, such statement shall be executed by such corporation by its president or vice president and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary and delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such statement conforms to law, they shall, when all fees and charges have been paid as prescribed in this Act:

"(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word 'Filed' and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

"(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office; and

"(3) return the other duplicate original to the registered agent.

"(g) The change of address of such registered agent as to the domestic corporation or corporations named in such statement shall become effective upon the filing of such statement by the Commissioners or on the date set forth in such statement as the date on which such change of location of such registered office will take place, whichever is later."

(3) Subsection (b) of section 12 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Whenever a corporation shall fail to appoint or maintain a registered agent in the District, or whenever any such registered agent cannot with reasonable diligence be found at the registered office of such corporation in the District, or whenever the articles of incorporation of any domestic corporation shall be revoked, then the Commissioners shall be an agent of such corporation upon whom any process against such corporation may be served and upon whom any notice or demand required or permitted by law to be served upon such corporation may be served. Service on the Commissioners of any such process, notice, or demand shall be made by delivering to and leaving with the Commissioners, or with any clerk having charge of their office duplicate copies of such process, notice, or demand. In the event any such process, notice, or demand is so served, the Commissioners shall immediately cause one of such copies thereof to be forwarded by registered or certified mail, addressed to the corporation at its registered office."

(4) Section 32 of such Act is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "Unless otherwise provided in the articles of incorporation or bylaws, the board of directors, by the affirmative vote of a majority of the directors then in office, and irrespective of any personal interest of any director, shall have authority to establish reasonable compensation of all directors for services to the corporation as directors, officers, or otherwise."

(5) Section 99 of such Act is amended by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Without excluding other activities which may not constitute transacting business in the District, a foreign corporation shall not be considered to be transacting business in the District for the purposes of this Act by reason of carrying on any one or more of the following activities in the District:

"(1) maintaining or defending any action or suit or any administrative or arbitration proceeding, or effecting the settlement thereof of the settlement of claims or disputes;

"(2) collecting its debts, taking security for the same, or enforcing any rights in property securing the same;

"(3) appointing or maintaining an agent for the solicitation of business not to be transacted in the District.

"(4) selling personal property to the United States within the District unless a contract for such sale is accepted by the seller within the District or such property is delivered from the stock of the seller within the District for use within the District;

"(5) holding meetings of its directors or shareholders or carrying on other activities concerning its internal affairs;

"(6) voting the stock of any corporation;

"(7) maintaining bank accounts;

"(8) maintaining offices or agencies for the transfer, exchange, and registration of its securities; or appointing and maintaining trustees or depositaries with relation to its securities;

"(9) effecting sales through independent contractors;

"(10) conducting an isolated transaction completed within a period of thirty days and not in the course of a number of repeated transactions of like nature.

"(c) Nothing in subsection (b) of this section shall be construed as affecting the amenability of any foreign corporation to the service of any process, notice, or demand to which such corporation would be amenable without reference to the provisions of such subsection (b)."

(6) Section 3 of such Act is amended by striking therefrom the following: ": *Provided further,* That no corporation may be organized under this Act unless the place where it conducts its principal business is located within the District of Columbia."

(7) Section 71(b) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "and" in paragraph (2), (2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and "and", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) a post office address to which the Commissioners may mail a copy of any process against the corporation that may be served on them."

(8) Section 107 of such Act is amended by adding the following subsections at the end thereof:

"(f) A registered agent of one or more foreign corporations may change the address of the registered office of such foreign corporation or corporations by filing with the Commissioners a statement setting forth:

"(1) the name of the registered agent;

"(2) the present address, including street and number, if any, of such registered agent;

"(3) the names of the corporation or corporations represented by such registered agent at such address;

"(4) the address, including street and number, if any, to which the office of such registered agent is to be changed; and

"(5) the date upon which such change will take place."

"(g) Such statement shall be executed in duplicate by such registered agent in his individual name but if such agent is a corporation, domestic or foreign, such statement shall be executed by such corporation by its president or a vice president and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, and delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such statement conforms to law, they shall, when all fees and charges have been paid as in this Act prescribed:

"(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word 'Filed' and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

"(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office; and

"(3) return the other duplicate original to the registered agent.

"(h) The change of address of such registered agent as to each corporation named in such statement shall become effective upon the filing of such statement by the Commissioners or on the date set forth in such statement as the date on which such change of location of such registered office will take place, whichever is later."

(9) Section 108 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SERVICE OF PROCESS ON FOREIGN CORPORATION

"SEC. 108. (a) The registered agent so appointed by a foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District shall be an agent of such foreign corporation upon whom process against such corporation may be served, and upon whom any notice or demand required or permitted by law to be served upon such corporation may be served. Service of any process, notice, or demand upon a corporate agent, as such agent, may be had by delivering a copy of such process, notice, or demand to the president, vice president, the secretary, or an assistant secretary of such corporate agent.

"(b) Whenever a foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District shall fail to appoint or maintain a reigstered agent in the District, or whenever any such registered agent cannot with reasonable diligence be found at the registered office of such corporation in the District, or whenever the certificate of authority of a foreign corporation shall be revoked, then the Commissioners shall be an agent of such foreign corporation upon whom any process against such corporation may be served and upon whom any notice or demand required or permitted by law to be served upon such corporation may be served. Service on the Commissioners of any such process, notice, or demand shall be made by delivering to and leaving with the Commissioners, or with any clerk having charge of their office, duplicate copies of such process, notice, or demand. In the event any such process, notice, or demand is served on the Commissioners, they shall immediately cause one of such copies thereof to be forwarded by registered or certified mail, addressed to such corporation at its principal office in the State under the laws of which it is organized as the same appears in the records of the Commissioners.

"(c) If any foreign corporation shall transact business in the District without a certificate of authority, it shall, by transacting such business, be deemed to have thereby appointed the Commissioners its agent and representatives upon whom any process, notice, or demand may be served. Service shall be made by delivering to and leaving with the Commissioners, or with any clerk having charge of their office, duplicate copies of such process, notice, or demand, together with an affidavit giving the latest known post office address of such corporation and such service shall be sufficient if notice thereof and a copy of the process, notice, or demand are forwarded by registered mail or certified mail addressed to such corporation at the address given in such affidavit.

"(d) The Commissioners shall keep a record of all processes, notices, and demands served upon them under this section, and shall record therein the time of such service and their action with reference thereto.

"(e) Nothing herein contained shall limit or affect the right to serve any process, notice, or demand required or permitted by law to be served upon a foreign corporation in any other manner now or hereafter permitted by law."

(10) Section 116 of such Act is hereby amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(c) A foreign corporation whose certificate of authority has been revoked shall, upon reentering the District, comply with all of the requirements of law applicable to an original application for a certificate of authority including the payment of the filing fee for filing an application for a certificate of authority, but it need not file again a copy of its articles of incorporation or any amendment thereof that is then on file with the Commissioners. After the revocation of the certificate of authority of a foreign corporation, the Commissioners shall retain the articles of incorporation and amendments theretofore filed and the original application for a certificate of authority for a period of ten years."

(11) Subsection (b) of section 121 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(20) filing by a registered agent of corporations of a statement of change of address of such registered agent, $5, plus $1 for each corporation, domestic or foreign, listed in such statement; and

"(21) for furnishing a certificate as to the status of a corporation, domestic or foreign, or as to the existence or nonexistence of facts relating to corporations, domestic or foreign, $1."

(12) Section 127 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"REINSTATEMENT OF PROCLAIMED CORPORATIONS

"SEC. 127. (a) A domestic corporation, the articles of incorporation of which have been revoked by proclamation, may at any time after the date of the issuance of the proclamation of revocation deliver to the Commissioners a petition for reinstatement, in duplicate, accompanied by the delinquent annual report or reports, or payment of delinquent annual report fee or fees in full, or both, as the case may be, plus interest thereon as provided by this Act, together with any penalties imposed by this Act.

"(b) If the petition for reinstatement of a proclaimed corporation is delivered to the Commissioners after the period for reservation of the name has expired and if they find that the name is not available for corporate use pursuant to the provisions of this Act, then, in addition to complying with the provisions of the preceding paragraph, the proclaimed corporation shall set forth in its petition for reinstatement its name at the time of issuance of the proclamation of revocation and the new name by which the corporation will thereafter be known, which shall be a name available for corporate use pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

"(c) If the Commissioners find that all such documents conform to law, and that the period for reservation of the name has not expired, or if such period has expired, that the name is available for corporate use pursuant to the provisions of this Act, they shall, when all fees, charges, interest, and penalties have been paid as in this Act prescribed—

"(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals and any such annual report or reports the word 'Filed' and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

"(2) file one of such duplicate originals and any such annual report or reports in their office;

"(3) issue a certificate of reinstatement to which they shall affix the other duplicate original;

"(4) deliver such certificate of reinstatement and other duplicate original to the corporation or its representative.

"(d) Upon the issuance of the certificate of reinstatement, the revocation proceedings theretofore taken as to such corporation by proclamation shall be deemed to be annulled, and such corporation shall have such powers, rights, duties, and obligations as it had at the time of the issuance of the proclamation with the same force and effect as to such corporation as if the proclamation had not been issued."

(13) Section 128 of such Act is amended by striking out "$25" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10".

(14) Subsection (a) of section 130 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing in this section shall prevent the filing, without the payment of all such fees, charges and penalties, of a written notice of resignation by a registered agent of a corporation, domestic or foreign."

(15) Section 136 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"ACTION WITHOUT A MEETING

"SEC. 136. Any action required or permitted to be taken at a meeting of the shareholders of a corporation or of the board of directors or of any committee thereof may be taken without a meeting if a consent in writing setting forth the action so taken shall be signed by all of the shareholders entitled to vote with respect to the subject matter thereof, or by all of the members of the board or of such committee as the case may be, and such written consent is filed with the minutes of proceedings of the shareholders or the board or the committee. Such consent shall have the same force and effect as a unanimous vote of the shareholders or the board or the committee, as the case may be, and may be stated as such in any article or document filed with the Commissioners under this Act."

(16) Such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"VERIFICATION NO LONGER REQUIRED

"SEC. 151. A requirement in this Act that any instrument be verified by oath need not be complied with after the effective date of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act Amendments of 1962. A person who signs any instrument delivered to the Commissioners pursuant to this Act knowing it to contain a misstatement of fact shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court."

SEC. 2. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Business Corporation Act Amendments of 1962".

With the following committee amendments:

Page 6, line 10, strike out "."" and insert in lieu thereof ", or as affecting the liabilities, duties, or obligations of any foreign corporation under any Act of Congress (other than this Act) or any regulation in force in the District of Columbia."

Page 10, beginning line 23, delete through page 11, line 12.

Page 11, line 13, strike out "(11)" and insert in lieu thereof "(10)".

Page 12, line 1, strike out "(12)" and insert in lieu thereof "(11)".

Page 12, line 4, strike out "domestic".

Page 12, line 5, immediately after "incorporation", insert "or certificate of authority".

Page 1, line 21, strike out the word "the".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDDLESTON: Page 12, line 23, immediately after "and" insert "its".

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remaining committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 21, strike out "by which the corporation will thereafter be known".

Page 13, delete lines 24 and 25.

Page 14, line 1, strike out "(14)" and insert in lieu thereof "(12)".

Page 14, line 7, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(13)".

Page 14, line 24, strike out "(16)" and insert in lieu thereof "(14)".

Page 15, line 5, strike out "1962" and insert in lieu thereof "1963".

Page 15, line 13, strike out "1962" and insert in lieu thereof "1962".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4330 is to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (June 8, 1954, 68 Stat. 179), as amended, to correct inaccuracies, improve the language of the act, and to make substantive changes to keep the act current and similar to the Model Business Corporation Act prepared by the American Bar Association, and with the statutes of the States.

At hearings held by a subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of

Columbia, testimony was received from the Assistant Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia who represented the Commissioner, from the Superintendent of Corporations, from the Recorder of Deeds, and from the District of Columbia Bar Association Committee on Corporate Law.

This testimony indicated general approval of the provisions of the bill with recommendation to the committee that consideration be given to amendments presented to some sections of the bill. The bill as amended and reported by the committee incorporates many of the suggested amendments.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the bill amends section 4(h) of the act by providing expressly that corporations organized under the act may not plead usury. This defines more clearly the intent of the present statute which provides that corporations may borrow money "without regard to the restrictions of any usury law."

Section 2 of the bill adds new subsections to section 11 of the act to provide that the registered agent of a domestic corporation, for his own purposes, may change the address of the registered office of the corporation by filing required statements.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 12(b) of the act to provide that the Commissioners shall be an agent of a domestic corporation upon whom process against such corporation may be served in the additional instances whenever, one, after reasonable diligence, the registered agent of the corporation cannot be found at the registered address of the corporation; and, two, the articles of incorporation of any domestic corporation shall be revoked. The subsection as rewritten eliminates the last sentence of the present subsection which provides that such service had on the Commissioners "shall be returnable in not less than 30 days", since the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, applicable in the courts of the District of Columbia, govern the service of process on corporations.

Section 4 of the bill adds a new sentence to section 32 of the act providing that absent any restriction in the articles of incorporation or bylaws, the directors of a corporation by affirmative majority vote may establish compensation for directors for services to the corporation.

Section 5 of the bill amends section 99 of the act by striking subsection (b) and adding new subsections (b) and (c). Subsections (b), as written, contains a more complete enumeration of activities by foreign corporations which are not to be considered as "transacting business" in the District of Columbia for purposes of the act. Except for paragraph 4, the provisions in the amended section are comparable to those appearing in section 99 of the Model Business Corporation Act of the American Bar Association. The new subsection (c) provides that nothing in subsection (b) affects the amenability of foreign corporations to the service of process or affects the liabilities, duties, or obligations of any foreign corporation under any other act of Congress or any regulation in force in the District of Columbia.

Section 6 of the bill amends section 3 of the act by striking out the proviso that "no corporation may be organized under the act unless the place where it conducts its principal business is located within the District of Columbia."

Section 7 of the bill amends section 71(b) of the act so as to require that if a corporation, which results from a merger or a consolidation of a foreign or domestic corporation, is governed by the laws of some other State then it must advise the Commissioners of a post office address to which the Commissioners may mail a copy of any process against the corporation that is served upon them.

Section 8 of the bill amends section 107 of the act to permit the registered agent of a foreign corporation to change the address of the registered office in the same manner as a resident agent of a domestic corporation may do under section 2 of this bill.

Section 9 of the bill amends section 108 of the act so that the wording of the section relating to service of process on foreign corporations conforms as nearly as possible with the provisions of section 12 of the act relating to service of process on domestic corporations. Also, the last sentence of subsection (a)—providing that "Any services so had on the Commissioners shall be returnable in not less than 30 days: *Provided however*, That, if a period of less than or greater than 30 days is prescribed by law or by rules of a court in the District or the rules or regulations of any agency of the United States or of the District, such prescribed period shall govern"—is eliminated inasmuch as the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are applicable in the District of Columbia.

Section 10 of the bill amends section 121(b) of the act so as to authorize two additional changes; namely, first, a charge upon a resident agent who files a statement of change of address of a foreign or domestic corporation, in the amount of $5 plus $1 for each corporation listed in the statement, and, second, a charge of $1 for the furnishing by the Commissioners of a certificate as to the status of a corporation, or as to the existence or nonexistence of a fact relating to a corporation.

Section 11 of the bill would amend section 127 of the act, first, by changing the language in order to make the provisions relative to the filing of petitions for reinstating proclaimed corporations conform to the provisions relating to the filing of other corporate papers.

Section 12 of the bill would amend section 130(a) of the act so as to permit a resident agent to resign despite the fact that the corporation may not have paid all fees, charges, and penalties which the corporation is required to pay.

Section 13 of the bill would amend section 136 of the act so as to permit action to be taken by a board of directors or committee thereof, by unanimous written consent without the requirement of a meeting, in the same manner that stockholders are presently permitted by section 136 to act without a formal meeting. This amendment will bring the section into conformity with other State corporation statutes.

Section 14 of the bill will add a new provision to the act which will eliminate the necessity of verifying documents under oath, but will impose penalties upon any person who signs any instrument delivered to the Commissioners knowing it to contain a misstatement of fact.

Section 2 of the bill provides that it may be cited as the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act Amendments of 1962.

"FOUR OVER" TRUSTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 3190) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devices and bequests by will.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, title 19, chapter 2), is amended by adding the following new section (D.C. Code, sec. 19–206).

"SEC. 2. (a) BEQUESTS OR DEVISES TO TRUSTEE UNDER, OR IN ACCORDANCE WITH TERMS OF, EXISTING TRUSTS.—A devise or bequest may be made in a will or codicil, otherwise valid, in form or substance to the trustee or trustees under, or in accordance with the terms of, a written inter vivos trust (including an unfunded life insurance trust, although the settlor has reserved any or all rights of ownership in the insurance contracts) which has been executed and is in existence prior to or contemporaneously with the execution of such will or codicil and is identified in such will or codicil, without regard to the size or character of the corpus of such trust, or whether the settlor is the testator or a third person.

"Such devise or bequest shall not be invalid because the trust is subject to amendment or modification or may be terminated or revoked after the will or codicil is executed (whether by the settlor or any other person or persons), nor because the trust instrument or any amendment thereto was not executed in the manner required by law for wills or codicils.

"Unless the will or codicil otherwise provides—

"(1) such devise or bequest shall not be invalid because the trust was amended or modified after the will or codicil was executed and such devise or bequest shall be given effect in accordance with the terms of the trust as they appear in writing on the date of death of the testator, including any such amendment or modification;

"(2) property passing under such devise or bequest shall be deemed to pass directly to the trustee or trustees of the inter vivos trust and shall become a part of the assets of such trust, and shall not be deemed held under a separate testamentary trust;

"(3) an entire revocation of the trust prior to the death of the testator shall invalidate the devise or bequest even though such revocation was not effected in the manner provided by law for the revocation of wills and codicils;

"(4) a termination of the trust, except by way of revocation, in accordance with the terms of said trust or by its exhaustion or by operation of law or otherwise shall not invalidate the devise or bequest.

"(b) BEQUESTS OR DEVISES TO TRUSTEE UNDER, OR IN ACCORDANCE WITH TERMS OF, TESTAMENTARY TRUSTS.—A devise or bequest may be made in a will or codicil, otherwise valid, in form or substance to the trustee or trustees, under, or in accordance with the terms of, a testamentary trust established under another valid will or codicil. Such devise or bequest shall not be invalid because the testamentary trust or the will or codicil establishing such testamentary trust was not in existence when the will or codicil containing such devise or bequest was executed, if the testator of the will or codicil establishing such testamentary trust predeceases the testator of the will or codicil containing such devise or bequest, and such will or codicil establishing such testamentary trust had been or is subsequently admitted to probate.

"Unless the will otherwise provides—

"(1) property passing under such devise or bequest shall be deemed to pass directly to the trustee or trustees of the testamentary trust and shall become a part of the assets of such trust, and shall not be deemed held under a separate testamentary trust;

"(2) a termination of the trust in accordance with the terms of said trust or by its exhaustion or by operation of law or otherwise shall not invalidate the devise or bequest.

"The provisions of this section shall apply to any devise or bequest made by a testator living on the effective date of this Act or born subsequent thereto, without regard to the date of execution of the will or codicil containing such devise or bequest or of the trust instrument, or any amendment thereto: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this Act shall not be construed as casting any doubt upon the validity as heretofore existing of (a) any devise or bequest made by a testator who shall have died prior to the effective date hereof, or (b) any devise or bequest which does not come within the provisions of this Act."

SEC. 3. Any provision of law inconsistent with the provisions of this Act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. This Act shall become effective upon the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

1. Page 1, line 4, strike out "(D.C.".
2. Page 1, line 5, strike out "Code, title 19, chapter 2)".
3. Page 1, line 6, immediately after the word "section" insert the words "after section 1628 thereof".
4. Page 1, line 6, strike out "(D.C. Code, sec. 19-206)".
5. Page 1, line 7, strike out "2" and insert in lieu thereof "1628a".
6. Page 3, line 6, strike out "affected" and insert in lieu thereof "effected".
7. Page 3, line 10, immediately after the word "revocation" insert ",".
8. Page 5, line 1, strike out "Sec. 3" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 2".
9. Page 5, line 3, strike out "Sec. 4" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 3".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is explicitly to authorize a testator, by the terms of his will, to "pour over" or add properties passing under his will to existing inter vivos trusts or testamentary trusts, and gives increased flexibility in the distribution of funds by a testator. The effect of the legislation is to stratify into statutory form the existing common law of the District of Columbia which it is believed already permits such transfers to be made.

The bill is considered necessary, however, because of the lack of statutory provisions or existing court decisions on the subject in the District of Columbia. It is desirable because in permitting the testator to add to existing trusts property passing under his will it thus allows him to avoid duplicating existing specific trust provisions in the body of his will. In effect, it incorporates into the will, by reference, the provisions of existing trusts to which the testator adds his property.

The proposed legislation follows closely the Maryland statute on the subject, since the District of Columbia has drawn most of its testamentary law from the State of Maryland. The similar Maryland provisions are to be found in article 93, sections 350A and 350B, of the Maryland code adopted by L. 1959, chapter 612.

This legislation carries the endorsement of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Register of Wills of the District of Columbia, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Bankers Association, and the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade. At the public hearing on the measure, no objection was expressed to the bill, and no adverse comments have been received thereon.

Similar legislation validating "pour over" trusts has already been adopted by 36 States, as follows: Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The favorable report of the Board of Commissioners is as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1963.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have been asked to report on H.R. 3190, 88th Congress, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will.

The purpose of the bill is to provide clear statutory authority to permit testators in the District of Columbia to transfer additional properties to existing inter vivos and testamentary trusts by way of testamentary devises or bequests.

The Commissioners have been informed that these so-called pour-over trusts are being established by testamentary devises and bequests at the present time despite the lack of specific statutory authority. It appears that some attorneys in the probate field believe the common law in the District does permit such testamentary devises and bequests; but there also appears to be a widespread feeling that enactment of H.R. 3190 is desirable in order to erase any doubts as to the validity of the "pour over" testamentary devise. In brief, the bill provides that a devise or bequest may be made in a will or codicil to pass properties to the trustee or trustees of an existing inter vivos trust or to the trustee or trustees of a testamentary trust established under another valid will or codicil.

It is understood by the Commissioners that a committee of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia has studied the matter and has reported favorably with respect to the bill. Mr. Theodore Cogswell, Register of Wills for the District of Columbia, also has informed the Commissioners of his approval of the bill.

Accordingly, the Commissioners offer no objection to the enactment of H.R. 3190.

However, it is suggested that in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of the proposed section 2 that the word "affected" be amended to "effected" and in paragraph (4) a comma be inserted following the word "revocation."

Very sincerely yours,
WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The first section of the bill adds a new section to the act of March 3, 1901, as amended, which new section will become section 1628a.

Paragraph (a) provides that a devise or bequest may be made by a testator to an inter vivos trust which is in existence at the time the testator executes his will. It further provides that the testator need not be the person who established the trust, the trust may be an unfunded life insurance trust (the corpus of which consists solely of the trustee being designated the beneficiary of certain life insurance policies on the life of the grantor of the trust), the trust may be subject to modification or termination at any time, and the trust need not be executed in the manner required by law for the execution of wills.

Subsection (1) of paragraph (a) provides further that, in the absence of contrary provisions in the will, the devise or bequest shall not be invalid even if the trust is amended after the will is executed, except that amendments occurring after the testator's death shall be ineffective as to the devise or bequest.

Subsection (2) of paragraph (a) provides that the property passing under the devise or bequest shall become part of the assets of the trust and shall not be held as a separate trust.

Subsection (3) of paragraph (a) provides that if the trust is revoked before the testator's death, the devise or bequest shall be invalid.

Subsection (4) of paragraph (a) provides that if the trust should terminate for some reason other than its revocation, the devise or bequest shall not be invalid. The effect of this provision is to permit the distribution of the property covered by the devise or bequest to the persons who were entitled to distribution of the trust corpus at its termination, in the event that the testator neglected to change his will after termination of the trust.

Paragraph (b) of section (1) provides that a devise or bequest may be made by a testator to a trust under the will of another person, if the other person dies before the testator's death and if the other person's will, which establishes a trust, is admitted to probate.

Subsection (1) of said paragraph (b) provides that, in the absence of contrary provisions in the testator's will, the property passing under the devise or bequest shall become part of the assets of the testamentary trust and shall not be held as a separate trust.

The concluding paragraph of section 1 provides that it shall apply to any devise or bequest made by testator living on the effective date of the act, or born thereafter, without regard to the date to the execution of his will or of an inter vivos trust, and provides further that the provisions of the proposed legislation shall not cast doubt upon the validity of the use of the pour-over device by testators who died before the effective date of the proposed legislation or any devise or bequest which does not come within the legislative provisions.

Section 2 of the bill repeals inconsistent law.

Section 3 of the bill provides that the act shall become effective upon the date of its enactment.

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 317 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

> *Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill H.R. 4715, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby, agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from California if he desires to consume any time?

Mr. SMITH of California. I have some requests on this side. I understand we will have to handle this in the time limit provided for the discussion of the rule, because once the rule is adopted the amendments are agreed to and we do not have any further time. So I do have requests for time from some individuals who desire to ask questions, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this resolution pertains to the bill recently passed by the House providing for the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, to be privately financed. It carries no burden for the Federal Treasury. The bill passed the House I believe with substantial unanimity. It went to the Senate, and there there were some amendments. When the bill came back to the House and the request for unanimous consent was made to take it from the Speaker's table and agree to the Senate amendments, there was objection, which under the rules required a rule to bring it to the floor of the House for consideration.

As the gentleman from California has stated, the adoption of the rule is the adoption of the Senate amendments and the final action on the bill. There will be no further discussion on the bill except under this rule, because as the rule reads:

> *Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill H.R. 4715, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby, agreed to.

I had not been aware of any controversy particularly about it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The wording of the resolution from the Committee on Rules forecloses any further amendments to the bill, is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes. The adoption of this rule is the end of the bill. It completes the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman from Virginia has said about the rule. That is precisely as I understand the situation. If we adopt this resolution, then the Senate amendments to H.R. 4715 are approved. The only alternative is that if it is voted down the bill then, it is my understanding, would go to conference, where the members of the committee of conference from the House and Senate would consider the amendments added to the bill.

The only question I and some of the other Members on this side of the aisle have is as to the language the Senate added starting on page 3 on line 17, where the words "and the furtherance of international good will" are added. Some Members have asked me specifically what this means. To be very frank, I am not certain what the Senate may have had in mind in adding this particular language. So inasmuch as we have just the half hour's time on this side, if there are any Members who at this time desire to ask any questions on this particular resolution, speak now or forever hold your peace.

Does anybody have any questions they wish to ask?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. As the gentleman from California knows, I did object to this the other day so far as final passage by unanimous consent was concerned. My reason for objecting was that I thought some of these very points that you and the gentleman from Virginia have brought out should, perhaps have been brought out and perfected and discussed and explained on the floor of this House by the Committee on the Judiciary to which it was referred.

Furthermore, I felt it should go through the "due process" of conference and/or further discussion on the floor. There is considerable question in my mind about the cost as set forth on pages 4 and 5, in the language that was added to this bill by the other body, for example, wherein it says, "to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, or otherwise from any public body." It just happens that on the same day that we had this up on the floor of the House, and I objected to it, we also had a supplemental or a so-called deficiency appropriation bill before the House which involved several thousands of dollars for the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, and even for the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Foundation. It seems obvious then that this will thereby, under these terms of new language reference, eventually cost the taxpayers a considerable amount of money. I would like to hear from the committee or from the proponents of the bill such explanation as they have. I do have a serious question about the meaning of the term that has been added "international good will."

Furthermore on page 3 of the bill it sets forth specifically that additional persons may be appointed by the President at any time and, finally, on page 10 it says that the report shall not be printed as a public document—and this pertains to an audit. I would like to see, if we are going to give our blessings to this type of memorial foundation, as worthy as it may be as far as the individual memorialized is concerned, that we have "due process" and authority for audits and reports back to the Congress concerning the foundation. I wonder if the gentleman would yield to someone who can explain these items for us? It was my understanding that that might be available today—if, indeed, this did not go to conference?

Mr. SMITH of California. I wonder if the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] would answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this time?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just wanted to resume control of the time for a moment in order to yield to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, answering the questions that have been propounded, I would say that the language inserted by the other body concerning the taking by lease, gift, purchase, grant, and so forth is proverbial boilerplate. We use that language in all Federal incorporations—allowing those in charge of the incorporation to accept gifts in this manner. Without such language, there might be some legal difficulties and entanglements. Therefore, this language has always appeared in incorporations of this sort.

Secondly, there was some query as to whether or not we have the right to check on finances. There is a clause in this bill requiring the books to be audited annually and for a report of that audit to be made to the President of the United States and the Congress.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman state where it is in the bill?

Mr. CELLER. On page 9, line 20; section 14 deals with audit of financial transaction; and then in subdivision (b) page 10, line 10, we have the language as follows:

> A report of such audit shall be made by the Corporation to the President of the United States and to the Congress not later than 6 months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit is made.

As for publication of the report as a public document——

Mr. HALL. Before the gentleman goes further, if the gentleman will yield——

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HALL. Speaking of the language the gentleman referred to as boilerplate, would that allow the Congress subsequently to contribute to this memorial foundation or, indeed, maybe lead us to expect that it might contribute to it?

Mr. CELLER. This says nothing about the Congress appropriating any funds. Congress would have the right, of course, to do that, but there is nothing in here suggesting it or encouraging it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, what does the gentleman think about the prospects of Congress being called upon to appropriate for this organization?

Mr. CELLER. I do not think Congress will ever be called upon for that purpose, because of the language here which indicates that the moneys necessary for the maintenance of the Foundation are to be raised by private subscription.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman be opposed at some later time to Congress appropriating for this purpose?

Mr. CELLER. I think I would be opposed to it, because of the history that would be established concerning this Foundation.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, that is exactly what we are trying to establish here and now, some history with respect to the intent of Congress, what is proposed to be done in the future.

Will the gentleman now tell me the meaning of the phrase "furtherance of international good will"? What would the gentleman think this would mean?

Mr. CELLER. May I first indicate that the member of our committee who was in charge, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. FORRESTER, is unfortunately ill. He is in favor of that proposal. The subcommittee over which he presided likewise was in favor of those amendments added to the bill by the Senate, the amendments to which the gentleman has referred. You may recall, sir, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, that on the last occasion when we considered this bill I read to this body a communication received from the distinguished junior Senator from New York, the Honorable KENNETH KEATING, Republican, who stated that the Senate Judiciary Committee put that clause in the bill because it comported with one of the missions of Eleanor Roosevelt, and he hoped that that provision would be accepted by the House.

The language to which the gentleman has referred appears in quite a number of incorporations. If the gentleman will bear with me I will just make this statement. I draw the attention of the House to the language in other incorporations which are no narrower than the language here proposed.

In the charter of the American Red Cross we find the words:

> And to continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in time of peace.

In Big Brothers of America, the language reads, in part:

> To aid and assist boys throughout the United States of America and Canada in the solution of their social and economic problems.

The federally chartered Military Chaplains Association of the United States carries the language:

> To promote justice, peace, and good will.

The federally incorporated American Society of International Law has among its purposes:

> To promote the establishment and maintenance of international relations on the basis of law and justice.

This charter, therefore, makes no history, establishes no precedent. Permit me to read from the report of the House which naturally would have to be somewhat of a guide for further interpretations of the act itself. The report of the House reads as follows:

> The bill provides that the corporation is to devote itself to continuing certain major interests with which Mrs. Roosevelt was deeply concerned, the relief of the poor and distressed and underprivileged, the promotion of economic welfare, and of public health.

Then the foundation, of course, is to be financed from private sources. I do not think, therefore, that the language is of such nature as to cause us any disquiet; it is general in tone. I do not think there is anything to cause us any worry or perturbation of mind or spirit whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I see no comparison between the charter for this foundation, or approval of this foundation, and the American Red Cross.

I note on pages 1 and 2 of the bill what appears to be a blue ribbon roster of the Americans for Democratic Action. I do not recall that the Red Cross was organized by the ADA, or any group of that nature.

Are we in the business of approving, from an international standpoint, another organization similar to the Red Cross?

Mr. CELLER. Only a few days ago in the interest of international good will and further cementing the relations between Great Britain and the United States, we bestowed upon a citizen of Great Britain the title of "Honorary Citizen of the United States."

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and I think that was a great mistake.

Mr. CELLER. Of course the gentleman is entitled to his opinion, but the House did overwhelmingly pass that bill. In concrete fashion similarly we seek to honor a great First Lady of America. By granting this charter to the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation, it is proposed to continue the wide and humanitarian interests of the great First Lady of our land. I think international good will at this stage of our civilization is something that should attract all of us, it is something that we should all try to further, because we need greater international good will.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on the question raised by the gentleman from Iowa, we discussed in the subcommittee very carefully the implication of the addition by the Senate of the words "international good will." At that time the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] was present. We discussed it and he explained what was intended, according to his understanding. He further explained his understanding was relevant because he felt he would be a trustee. So that the act of international good will, which would be pursued by the Foundation, would be of a private or eleemosynary nature, such as international fellowships and cancer research.

He undertook to say within his ability that that understanding of the nature of the international functions would be conveyed to the trustees that might be appointed by the President under the bill. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary stated, I think it was the complete understanding both in subcommittee and here on the floor when the matter was last discussed that this was not the kind of international good will to which the Foundation would be limited.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am unable to understand why this bill takes the route it does when it comes back to the House. It should come back as a conference report. It went to the Rules Committee.

Now, why was this necessary?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is the simple and ordinary process of getting a bill from the Speaker's table. When the bill comes back from the Senate and lays on the Speaker's table it can only be taken up either by the rule or by unanimous consent, or it can be taken up to go to conference. Any of these forms may be objected to by any Member of the House, in which case the only way to move the bill from the Speaker's table is to apply to the Rules Committee for a rule, which is normally granted as a matter of course. I see nothing in the difference in the Senate bill that would arouse any particular controversy, and I had assumed it was one of the usual matters. And, I assure the gentleman that it is the customary way in which all of these matters are handled in a parliamentary way.

Mr. GROSS. With the restrictive language contained in this resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Restrictive language?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. It is the usual language that we use in the Committee on Rules to take a bill and send it to conference or to take a bill and agree to Senate amendments.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. This is identically the same thing we do when we send a bill to conference. This procedure is very seldom used, but it is the identical sort of thing.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just explained that to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the privilege granted me by the House to insert remarks at this point in the RECORD, I wish to say that I most sincerely regret I cannot be present in the Chamber today. Strange as it may seem, I am forced to be in bed with a case of the mumps, and cannot personally thank all those who worked so hard for passage of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation bill. I am certain the Foundation will live up to its very fine stated purposes, and that it will be a credit to those who are pledged to work for it to carry out the purposes for which mother worked so hard all her life.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL COTTON CONFERENCE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 318 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 38, Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on Agriculture is hereby authorized to send two of its members to India in late April and early May, 1963, to attend the meeting of The International Cotton Advisory Committee.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is an International Cotton Conference taking place in India within the next few days. We have a very substantial interest, as the House knows, in the question of cotton, and in order that we may have a voice at that international conference, this rule provides that the Committee on Agriculture may send two members to that conference which convenes sometime in the latter part of this weekend. I think that is about all I need to say on the subject.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The Bureau of the Budget has revised figures on travel allowance. Can the gentleman tell us what this figure is for the nation of India?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, I do not know anything about what changes may have been made by some agency of the Government with respect to travel allowance. I can say to the gentleman, as the gentleman probably knows, that at the beginning of this session the Committee on Rules held hearings and gave very thorough consideration to this matter of foreign travel, and under the rule which we reported and which the House approved, I think practically unanimously, we restricted very much the question of foreign travel by committees of the House, and in restricting it we laid down some very careful rules about spending.

The thing is very much restricted. We have followed in this resolution and the one which is to follow those restrictions that we laid down in the first instance, and it is in conformity with the policy which I stated on the floor at the time the original resolution was passed, that if it were the desire of any committee to send delegates to any international affair that seemed to have merit and where we should be represented, the Committee on Rules would be agreeable to hearing any further resolution for specific instances where in the opinion of the House it might be merited.

We merely report this to you as one instance in which we think a certain relaxation of the rules is in conformity with the public interest.

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield further, I will say that the sole purpose for bringing up this subject at this time is the fact that these figures, which are the stipulated expenditure allowances for foreign countries, are in most instances ridiculous. They are indeed so low that unless other provision is made there will be a means found to circumvent that procedure, because these people traveling abroad in foreign countries on the budget allowances of the Bureau of the Budget just will not be able to subsist on the amount which is permitted.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, of course, that is a matter over which the Committee on Rules has no jurisdiction.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I trust that the restrictions laid down by the Committee on Rules apply to Puerto Rico as well as more distant foreign countries?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This does not deal with Puerto Rico.

Mr. GROSS. I know, but I am talking about the action previously taken by the Committee on Rules with respect to other requests for travel.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But I am dealing with this matter and am not dealing with Puerto Rico or the situation which exists in Puerto Rico at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, may I simply say that it was my understanding when the Committee on Rules brought certain language down here to the floor of the House—and I so made the statement on the floor of the House—that in restricting these various committees from traveling abroad, if they did come in before the Rules Committee and justified the purpose of sending members abroad we would consider those matters and would consider them in every way we possibly could.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Committee on Agriculture have come before the Committee on Rules and in my opinion they have justified the reason for this particular travel, and so far as I am concerned I am in support of the resolution and think it is the proper manner in which to handle this matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING ADDITIONAL TRAVEL AUTHORITY TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 319 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 36, Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to send two of its Members and one staff assistant to Geneva, Switzerland, to attend the meeting of Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration on April 29, 1963, and to Frankfurt, Germany, and London, England, on matters concerning immigration, the duration of the trip to be from April 26, 1963, to May 8, 1963, inclusive.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated fund shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that, yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is similar to the one just adopted and has reference to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. As you know, that committee has jurisdiction over immigration matters. It is a very complicated subject involving a great deal of work and a great deal of international contact. There is a meeting in Geneva in the next few days on this subject.

This resolution is in conformity with the policy laid down by the House in adopting the original resolutions and authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to send two of its members and one staff member to this meeting in Geneva concerning international matters of immigration.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I concur completely in the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I think the Committee on the Judiciary has done an excellent job over the years in connection with their work on the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration. I think it is extremely important that they make this trip. I should like to make one or two comments with reference to what the gentleman from Iowa mentioned. I had the opportunity on two different occasions of going with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] to Geneva. I can say that you might be able to do your work, but you just cannot live in a hotel room and pay your other expenses on $15 per day. The time will come when this regulation will give us difficulty. I hope that it will not be necessary to do as the gentleman from Iowa suggested might be necessary, to try to circumvent this regulation to handle the matter in some other way. The Committee on Rules has been trying to do the best it can on these particular difficulties that have been presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution and ask for its passage.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Suppose we have this situation arise at Geneva. Members from the U.S. House of Representatives are attending such a meeting and it comes the turn of this American group to take a foreign group out to dinner. Under the rules governing foreign travel such an amount must appear on some individual Congressman's expense account, is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of California. That is my understanding.

Mr. KYL. And when the press reports the expenditures, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of Members of the House traveling abroad, that amount does reflect totals that have to be spent on entertainment; is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of California. That is correct. I did say that that presents one of the problems because, after all, one of the individuals has to pick up that check out of counterpart funds.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Under the wording of the resolution the allowance per diem at Geneva would be $16 and at Frankfurt would be $14. It would be impossible to take anybody out to dinner under that sort of allowance.

Mr. KYL. The sole point in bringing this up is not to try to get away from the regulations on travel, but is an effort to set up the kind of reasonable regulations which would improve and help to promote an honest reporting system instead of promoting circumvention of the rules passed by the House.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate on tomorrow, April 23, 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

BALTIC INDEPENDENCE: A NECESSITY FOR OUR TIMES

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the resolution I am introducing today calls on the United Nations to bring about the independence of the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

In making this proposal I seek but one goal: To give the Baltic peoples an opportunity to determine for themselves through free elections supervised by the U.N. the course they wish their own national life to take. There is no doubt that the avenue they would choose would be that of freedom and democracy.

The right of self-determination is a natural right of mankind. This right was taken from the Baltic peoples in 1940 and again after the second Soviet conquest in 1944–45.

What I ask through this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more than the fulfillment of the pledges set forth in the constitution of the Soviet Union. In this document, as in the laws of all the Soviet peoples, the right of self-determination is an established guarantee.

On many occasions Soviet leaders have reasserted this solemn Leninist right that they claim is due all Soviet peoples.

A traditional claim to independence and nationhood is the existence of a distinct community of peoples called a nation. In this regard, the Baltic peoples fulfill the requirement. The Baltic peoples are not Russians; they are Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians. They are a people separated from the Russians, ethnically, linguistically, and culturally. They share no common religious tradition. By and large, the Baltic peoples are imbued with the traditions of Lutheran and Roman Catholic Christianity. They are not orthodox. In every sense, they are a unique people whose historic past is marked by centuries of independence and grandeur. It is also a past marked regrettably by the conquest of Russian power.

During the interwar period of the 1920's and 1930's the Baltic peoples demonstrated beyond question their capacity for independence and nationhood. Neither then nor now could their independent status be seriously regarded as a threat to the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union could gain a great deal by agreeing to free elections which would surely mean the institution of a genuine democratic system in the Baltic states. In the first place, I do not doubt that such an action would contribute to a further easing of tensions in international relations. Moreover, the Soviet propaganda image would be improved so that Soviet credibility in world affairs would be enhanced. And finally a free Baltic people would be an economically productive people, for it is an axiom of life itself that the freeman is the most productive man. Geographic proximity would predetermine a close economic as well as a political orientation toward the Soviet Union. Thus, in the long run the Soviets would gain economically.

It is with this range of considerations in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I present this resolution today. Let it be adopted by the House of Representatives as a hopeful first step in freeing a truly courageous and heroic people, the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

THE PUBLIC EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1963

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 I introduced H.R. 5344, the Public Education Improvement Act of 1963. I did so to express my deep commitment to the imperative necessity of improving America's public schools. No matter what the pessimists may say about the prospects of enacting sound legislation in the field of general aid for elementary and secondary education, we must strive to further the conviction that the Nation can only be as strong and as prosperous as the health of our public schools permits.

I have been heartened in recent days by a steady flow of correspondence commenting favorably upon H.R. 5344 and, above all, urging me to continue my efforts in behalf of this legislation. This I pledge to do unequivocally and without reservation.

In response to requests from my colleagues as to the financial provisions of the Public Education Improvement Act, I would like to include in the RECORD at this time two charts showing estimated State allotments under the provisions of my bill.

Table I indicates the distribution of the $6 million authorized in title I—Surveys of Educational Needs by the States. These funds would be used by State educational agencies to establish and to describe educational priorities within the respective States. Among other things these funds would help the Congress to learn more than we now know about:

First. The adequacy of the curriculum and the quality of instruction in our schools, particularly in such basic subjects as English, history, government, science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and vocational education.

Second. Particular problems of education for special groups in our schools—the retarded, mentally or physically handicapped, prospective dropouts, underachieving pupils, the gifted.

Third. The status of guidance and other personnel services for all pupils.

Fourth. The needs for vocational and technical education in our revolutionary society.

Fifth. The condition of our school plants and the relative financial ability of local education agencies to afford modern, safe, and healthy school facilities.

Sixth. The need for additional funds in selecting school districts to relieve overcrowding, to upgrade teacher preparation, to provide adequate libraries, equipment, teaching aids, or library services.

Seventh. The relative cost of current operation per pupil in average daily attendance and the relative economic ability of local education agencies to finance the rising cost of public education.

TABLE I.—*Estimated distribution of $6 million, on basis of school-age (5-17) population, Apr. 1, 1960, under the provisions of H.R. 5344*

[*Estimated State amount*]

Aggregate United States	$6,000,000
50 States	5,825,000
Alabama	118,855
Alaska	20,000
Arizona	46,302
Arkansas	62,674
California	489,324
Colorado	58,136
Connecticut	76,923
Delaware	20,000
Florida	150,637
Georgia	140,209
Hawaii	22,454
Idaho	24,536
Illinois	305,024
Indiana	152,783
Iowa	89,847
Kansas	69,418
Kentucky	105,387
Louisiana	117,933
Maine	31,759
Maryland	101,671
Massachusetts	153,306
Michigan	262,859
Minnesota	114,596
Mississippi	82,741
Missouri	131,241
Montana	23,425
Nebraska	44,880
Nevada	20,000
New Hampshire	20,000
New Jersey	180,731
New Mexico	36,075
New York	481,603
North Carolina	164,898
North Dakota	22,736
Ohio	312,945
Oklahoma	75,623
Oregon	58,815
Pennsylvania	347,085
Rhode Island	25,310
South Carolina	92,161
South Dakota	23,654
Tennessee	121,626
Texas	327,209
Utah	33,806
Vermont	20,000
Virginia	132,966
Washington	94,025
West Virginia	66,858
Wisconsin	129,954
Wyoming	20,000
District of Columbia and outlying parts	175,000

Table II indicates the distribution of funds according to the formula in title II of H.R. 5344. This title provides general assistance grants for the maintenance and improvement of State and local financial mechanisms for the support of our public school system.

TABLE II.—*Estimated State allotments under the provisions of H.R. 5344, "Title II: General Assistance"*

	Total estimated State allotments	Estimated allotment based on—	
		Estimated expenditures, 1962-63 [1]	Per capita income, 1960-61
Aggregate, United States	$974,801,816	$387,316,980	$587,484,836
50 States and District of Columbia	966,637,653	385,625,220	581,012,433
Alabama	17,023,639	4,117,500	12,906,139
Alaska	1,255,160	686,000	569,160
Arizona	10,920,309	3,620,000	7,300,309
Arkansas	11,536,044	2,731,860	8,804,184
California	82,371,712	49,600,000	32,771,712
Colorado	10,859,900	4,620,880	6,239,020
Connecticut	8,538,014	5,930,000	2,608,014
Delaware	1,512,835	1,247,000	265,835
Florida	29,429,572	9,122,620	20,306,952
Georgia	23,614,114	6,160,900	17,453.214
Hawaii	2,947,554	1,240,000	1,707,554
Idaho	4,520,058	1,280,680	3,239,378
Illinois	40.820,540	21,850,900	18,969,640
Indiana	27,929,671	10,157,500	17,772,171
Iowa	17,091,351	5,852,000	11,239,351
Kansas	14,583,347	5,043,000	9,540,347
Kentucky	15,438,340	3,980,000	11,458,340
Louisiana	23,417,597	6,040,040	17,377,557
Maine	5,584,924	1,614,000	3,970,924
Maryland	16,770,328	7,446,000	9,324,328
Massachusetts	18,167,363	9,037,500	9,129,863
Michigan	50,433,482	19.102,000	31,331,482
Minnesota	24,359,648	8,480,000	15,897,648
Mississippi	14,178,434	3,056,000	11,122,434
Missouri	19,871,794	7,440,000	12.431,794
Montana	5,277,559	1,634,000	3,643,559
Nebraska	7,339,879	2,588,000	4,751,879
Nevada	1,217,098	987,600	229,498
New Hampshire	3,129,937	1,075,920	2,054,017
New Jersey	25,614,015	14,330,000	11,284,015
New Mexico	8,288,778	2,349,760	5,939,018
New York	68,236,340	44,596,000	23,640,340
North Carolina	28,732,160	7.470,000	21,262,160
North Dakota	5,400,000	1,350,000	4,050,000
Ohio	52,791,864	20,908,000	31,883,864
Oklahoma	14,494,456	4,298,500	10,195,956
Oregon	11,783,149	4,472,700	7,310,449
Pennsylvania	52,831,100	19,880,000	32,951,100
Rhode Island	3,621,494	1,352,000	2,269,494
South Carolina	13,125,517	3,090,000	10,035,517
South Dakota	4,445,029	1,307,800	3,137,229
Tennessee	19,300,443	4,926,800	14,373,643
Texas	59,384,333	18,720,000	40,664,333
Utah	7,241,950	2,277,400	4,964,550
Vermont	2,184,336	651,500	1,532,836
Virginia	23,688,295	7,102,000	16,586,295
Washington	18,824,122	7,756,000	11,068,122
West Virginia	10,061,202	2,680,000	7,381,202
Wisconsin	22,596,082	8,110,000	14,486,082
Wyoming	2,574,425	976,500	1,597,925
District of Columbia	1,278,360	1,278,360	
American Samoa	29,727	[2] 6,160	[3] 23,567
Canal Zone			
Guam	435,773	[2] 90,300	[3] 345,473
Puerto Rico	7,307,480	1,514,240	[3] 5,793,240
Virgin Islands	391.183	81,060	310,123

[1] "Estimates of School Statistics, 1962-63," Research Division, NEA, Washington, D.C.

[2] "Statistics of State School Systems, 1959-60" (OE-20020-60), Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

[3] Per capita income assumed to be one-half of national average per capita income.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that every Member of this House will dedicate a few moments of his busy schedule to consider the health of our public schools. In this connection I believe that he will find H.R. 5344 has much to commend it.

THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 18 I introduced H.R. 4955, the Vocational Education Act of 1963. As I indicated at the time, 8 out of 10 of our youngsters now in elementary schools will not complete 4 years of college. In our changing world of work unskilled and semiskilled jobs are rapidly decreasing. More and more, our society demands highly skilled and well-trained individuals. If our public schools are to meet this challenge, our long established vocational education programs must be expanded and improved and increased Federal aid must be authorized by the Congress.

Under H.R. 4955, 5 percent of the sums appropriated would be used by the Commissioner of Education to make grants to pay part of the cost of experimental, development, or pilot programs developed by such agencies and designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities, who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps.

The remaining $69,350,000 in fiscal 1964 would be allotted among the States as indicated in the following table. Also shown are the total State allotments during their first 4 years of operation of the Vocational Education Act of 1963:

Estimated distribution of $69,350,000 for fiscal year 1964 and of $796,100,000 for fiscal year 1964 through fiscal year 1967, under the provisions of H.R. 4955, "Title I: Vocational Education"

	Estimated State amounts	
	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal years 1964–67
Aggregate, United States	$69, 350, 000	$796, 100, 000
50 States and District of Columbia	67, 626, 922	776, 320, 008
Alabama	1, 789, 413	20, 541, 481
Alaska	99, 727	1, 144, 811
Arizona	553, 078	6, 349, 032
Arkansas	973, 433	11, 174, 477
California	4, 439, 800	50, 966, 471
Colorado	638, 629	7, 331, 111
Connecticut	635, 588	7, 296, 202
Delaware	103, 531	1, 188, 479
Florida	1, 965, 153	22, 558, 880
Georgia	2, 074, 037	23, 808, 808
Hawaii	268, 726	3, 084, 827
Idaho	311, 892	3, 580, 349
Illinois	2, 920, 185	33, 522, 124
Indiana	1, 777, 754	20, 407, 642
Iowa	1, 083, 112	12, 433, 532
Kansas	855, 865	9, 824, 861
Kentucky	1, 587, 231	18, 220, 542
Louisiana	1, 624, 021	18, 642, 871
Maine	432, 714	4, 967, 320
Maryland	1, 059, 586	12, 163, 467
Massachusetts	1, 604, 546	18, 419, 309
Michigan	2, 758, 675	31, 668, 077
Minnesota	1, 327, 448	15, 238, 376
Mississippi	1, 327, 127	15, 234, 691
Missouri	1, 577, 103	18, 104, 278
Montana	275, 876	3, 166, 905
Nebraska	535, 763	6, 150, 266
Nevada	74, 594	856, 298
New Hampshire	236, 865	2, 719, 080
New Jersey	1, 668, 667	19, 155, 383
New Mexico	451, 461	5, 182, 525
New York	4, 329, 954	49, 705, 499
North Carolina	2, 534, 309	29, 092, 479
North Dakota	313, 671	3, 600, 771
Ohio	3, 325, 452	38, 174, 367
Oklahoma	1, 064, 930	12, 224, 813
Oregon	638, 397	7, 328, 448
Pennsylvania	4, 016, 728	46, 109, 837
Rhode Island	328, 399	3, 769, 841
South Carolina	1, 464, 247	16, 808, 753
South Dakota	306, 615	3, 519, 772
Tennessee	1, 879, 958	21, 580, 888
Texas	4, 201, 464	48, 230, 504
Utah	414, 049	4, 753, 056
Vermont	175, 368	2, 013, 129
Virginia	1, 905, 238	21, 871, 088
Washington	1, 011, 744	11, 614, 267
West Virginia	$919, 421	$10, 554, 449
Wisconsin	1, 458, 642	16, 744, 411
Wyoming	120, 325	1, 381, 265
District of Columbia	186, 411	2, 139, 896
American Samoa	14, 123	162, 124
Canal Zone		
Guam	42, 813	491, 470
Puerto Rico	1, 645, 605	18, 890, 644
Virgin Islands	20, 537	235, 754

NOTE.—State distributions are based on the product of (1) the Federal allotment percentages, based on average per capita income for 1959, 1960, and 1961 and (2) the State population, as of Apr. 1, 1960, (*a*) aged 15–19, (*b*) aged 20–24, (*c*) aged 25–64, plus a distribution on the basis of the total amount received by the State under (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*), above. The Federal allotment percentage is 50 percent for Alaska and 75 percent for American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

MR. Y. FRANK FREEMAN—MR. HOLLYWOOD

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, it has become hackneyed and trite, I know, to speak of some person being honored as Mr. This or Mr. That. Overuse has made this cliche almost threadbare and meaningless.

But, Mr. Speaker, I shall use it today. For, in my mind, there is no way more adequate or more genuine to describe a man who is being honored by his colleagues at a testimonial dinner in California this coming Sunday evening.

He is Mr. Y. Frank Freeman. And he is, indeed, Mr. Hollywood.

For a quarter of a century Frank Freeman, whom I am privileged to call my friend, has stood for all that is good, for all that is best, in the American motion picture and in the film capital of the world—Hollywood.

There was never a worthy call that Mr. Freeman has not answered. There was never a constructive cause that Mr. Freeman has not assisted. There was never an enterprise for the benefit of the community that has not had behind it the immeasurable talents of Frank Freeman.

So, I feel it is wonderfully fitting that both the motion picture community and the Los Angeles community should be joining in this dinner to celebrate Mr. Freeman's 25 years in Hollywood.

He went to California in 1938 as vice president in charge of production of Paramount Studios. It is a tribute to his talents that many of the pictures produced at this studio will long be remembered for their contributions to the advancement of the cinematographic art.

As is true of other gifted men, Frank Freeman's talents were ample enough to spread to many other activities. Just a bare listing will give you an idea of scope and magnitude of his interests.

He served for 5 years as president of the Association of Motion Picture Producers, and has been chairman of its board since 1947. He has also contributed importantly to these organizations: Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; Los Angeles Welfare Federation and Community Chest; Los Angeles chapter, American Red Cross; Greater Los Angeles Building Fund; and the Los Angeles World Affairs Council.

From 1954 through 1961, he was deputy chairman of the board of the Federal Reserve Bank in San Francisco, and from 1943 to 1950 was chairman of the Los Angeles branch of the bank.

He is a trustee of the Vniversity of Southern California, and for my friends from Georgia, I want to recall that he was born there and was graduated from Georgia Tech.

I could go on and on listing his accomplishments but I want to turn now to say a word about Frank Freeman as a human being, for that is the true mark of a man—how he measures up as an individual.

It is difficult to do more than suggest the depth and the breadth and the fervor of feeling that Frank Freeman kindles. But this feeling will be understood by anyone who knows him.

I have said that Frank Freeman is a shining symbol of the best in Hollywood. To me, he is more than that. He symbolizes what is good in mankind. Words such as "honorable" and "dependable," "charitable" and "faithful," inevitably pop into mind when you think of Frank Freeman.

Are these not the human qualities that make the world we know, our world of freedom and democracy, better beyond compare than the world where these qualities are scorned and expunged?

There is a proverb that comes to mind as I think of Mr. Freeman. It goes: "Life is not a vessel to be drained, but a cup to be filled."

Certainly, this captures the guiding spirit of Frank Freeman's inspiring career.

BLIND-AID PROGRAMS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit residence requirements in State programs of aid to the blind supported by Federal participating funds.

My sponsorship of this measure is neither a courtesy gesture, nor a casual action on my part. Rather, it is a reflection of my firmly held conviction that residence laws in blind-aid programs retard rehabilitative opportunities of blind persons. They deny to blind persons, I believe, the chance to seek for a livelihood and a better life throughout the entire Nation.

Over the past several years, it has been my privilege to become acquainted with a considerable number of blind men and women. Therefore, in speaking about these people and their problems and needs, I am speaking from personal knowledge when I state with all the emphasis at my command, that there is no other group of our fellow citizens who are doing more to help themselves than are our fellow citizens who are without their sight.

Learning of their aspirations, becoming aware of their courageous efforts, I have worked with these people to the best of my ability to help them. I have not worked for them, I have worked with them, to help them as they have worked and tried to help themselves.

I have introduced and worked for the adoption by Congress, of bills to guarantee to blind persons their right to organize, to protect them in their right to join organizations of their own choosing.

I have introduced and worked for the adoption by Congress of measures to give statutory minimum wage protection, not alone to blind workers in sheltered workshops, but to all physically handicapped people employed in such places.

The bill I am introducing today is but another effort by me to help blind persons realize the goals and hopes they have so often expressed to me—the chance to live on the basis of equality with others, to work as others do, in jobs for which they are qualified by ability and training; to earn a decent living, not in a sheltered, protected environment, but as full and equal competitors in the open labor market of our economy—supporting themselves, paying their family bills from their labors.

These are the goals, I believe, for the vast majority of blind persons—and I am sure you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that these goals are worthy of every help that we can give that they may be fulfilled.

My bill would be such a help—it would serve to remove laws which act as barriers to block the way of blind men and women who would seek employment for their talents, but are unable to find such employment in their home State.

If such a person is a blind-aid recipient, however, it is very difficult, in fact, it is almost impossible for him to look for work in another State.

Unable, under the laws of many States, to qualify for assistance if he is unsuccessful in finding a job, he risks possible starvation by going to a new State, by venturing to improve his lot. So, many of them stay where they are, probably on the welfare rolls for the rest of their lives.

This is the problem: A blind-aid recipient, receiving a monthly subsistence grant of aid, hardly enough to keep body and soul together, is not able to save sufficient money to live on for several weeks, or even several months, in another State while he remains there looking for work.

In most of the States, he would not be able to apply for and receive public aid to live on during this time because of his inability to meet the residence requirements.

If he does risk it, if he does go to another State and somehow manage to live while seeking work, and then, unsuccessful and discouraged, goes back to his home State—he may then find, if he applies for blind-aid in his home State, that he no longer meets the residence requirements in his home State, that he has forfeited his claim upon the State by leaving it, and remaining away, even though briefly.

What are these blind people to do, Mr. Speaker, what would you do under these circumstances? The answer, of course—many of these people stay in their home States, remain on relief the rest of their lives, when they could be working, when they could be gainfuly employed, paying their own way, paying taxes.

I believe that State residence laws in blind-aid programs are obstacles to rehabilitation and because of this, they should be prohibited.

Time and time again Congress has expressed its determination that programs of public assistance should be more than subsistence programs, meeting the basic needs of people in want; they should also serve to promote the restoration of aid recipients to lives of economic independence and self-sufficiency.

This, I think, was made very clear in the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act when self-care and self-support were made purposes of the federally supported State programs of aid.

Again, in the public welfare amendments adopted by Congress last year, vigorous endorsement to rehabilitation in public welfare was given, and specific statutory steps were taken to implement the earlier asserted self-care and self-support purposes.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the proposal I am offering today to prohibit State residence laws in blind-aid programs would, I believe, encourage and assist many blind people, now aid recipients, to gain employment and independence.

These laws now act as restraints upon the ambitious and energetic.

As they make their valiant struggle to achieve full and equal citizenship in our Nation's life, these residence laws act as insurmountable roadblocks in their way.

I believe they should be removed.

My bill, enacted into law, would remove them.

PACEM IN TERRIS—THE COMPLETE TEXT OF THE ENCYCLICAL DELIVERED BY POPE JOHN XXIII

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine in its April 26 edition stated, in an editorial entitled "The Future Is Ours—Pope John," as follows:

> The most amazing new force in world affairs is that simple, friendly, unpretentious man, the Pope of Rome, age 81. In 1958 John XXIII set in train a series of events which have since moved that huge old galleon, the Roman Catholic Church, back into the mainstream of world history and have profoundly altered the silhouette it presents to mankind. One culmination of these events is the Ecumenical Council. Another is the encyclical "Pacem in Terris" which the Pope issued just before Easter. He chose Maundy Thursday because it was the day on which Christ said to His disciples, "Love one another." The Pope seeks nothing less than the "unity in charity" of the whole human family, Christian and non-Christian, everybody in the world.
>
> "Pacem in Terris" was the first encyclical ever addressed to everybody in the world. And it had an impact on all the capitals of the world, including Moscow. It behooves Americans of all faiths and no faith to understand John's reverberating message. "Pacem in Terris" is a prodigious effort to relate the beliefs of an authoritarian church, whose faith is based on events of nearly 2,000 years ago, to the realities of modern industrial society and the intellectual currents of a scientific age.

President Kennedy, in his inspiring message at Boston College over the weekend, praised the encyclical. Likewise, Mr. Speaker, editorial writers throughout the world have been praising this courageous statement by His Holiness Pope John as setting the tone for a new approach toward the solution of the world's problems.

I join in praising this profound statement by Pope John as indeed being a document which men of all faiths and all political philosophies can use as a basis toward seeking a new solution to the problems which beset our mid-20th century world.

Because I know scholars all over the world would want to have the opportunity to read this inspiring message in its entirety and because I believe this encyclical should become a permanent record of our deliberations on this subject, I am today asking unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my own remarks the entire encyclical of His Holiness John XXIII by Divine Providence Pope.

I should like to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the apostolic delegation for providing me with the official English language text of his holiness' pronouncement.

Mr. Speaker, the encyclical follows:

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS JOHN XXIII, BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE, POPE TO THE VENERABLE BROTHERS, THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS, AND OTHER LOCAL ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE, TO THE CLERGY AND FAITHFUL OF THE WHOLE WORLD AND TO ALL MEN OF GOOD WILL, ON ESTABLISHING UNIVERSAL PEACE IN TRUTH, JUSTICE, CHARITY, AND LIBERTY

INTRODUCTION

Order in the Universe

Peace on earth, which men of every era have most eagerly yearned for, can be firmly established only if the order laid down by God be dutifully observed. The progress of learning and the inventions of technology clearly show that, both in living things and in the forces of nature, an astonishing order reigns, and they also bear witness to the greatness of man, who can understand that order and create suitable instruments to harness those forces of nature and use them to his benefit.

But the progress of science and the inventions of technology show above all the infinite greatness of God, who created the universe and man himself. He created all things out of nothing, pouring into them the abundance of His wisdom and goodness, so that the holy psalmist praises God in these words: "O Lord our Master, the majesty of Thy name fills all the earth.[1] Elsewhere he says: "What diversity, Lord, in Thy creatures! What wisdom has designed them all!"[2] God also created man in His own "image and likeness,"[3] endowed him with intelligence and freedom, and made him lord of creation, as the same psalmist declares in the words: "Thou has placed him only a little below the angels, crowning him with glory and honor and bidding him rule over the works of Thy hands. Thou hast put all under his dominion."[4]

Order in human beings

How strongly does the turmoil of individual men and peoples contrast with the perfect order of the universe. It is as if the relationships which bind them together could be controlled only by force. But the Creator of the world has imprinted in man's heart an order which his conscience reveals to him and enjoins him to obey: This shows that the obligations of the law are written in their hearts; their conscience utters its own testimony.[5] And how could it be otherwise? For whatever God has made shows forth His infinite wisdom, and it is manifested more clearly in the things which have greater perfection.[6]

But fickleness of opinion often produces this error, that many think that the relationships between men and states can be governed by the same laws as the forces and irrational elements of the universe, whereas the laws governing them are of quite a different kind and are to be sought elsewhere; namely, where the Father of all things wrote them; that is, in the nature of man. By these laws men are most admirably taught, first of all how they should conduct their mutual dealings among themselves, then how the relationships between the citizens and the public authorities of each state should be regulated, then how states should deal with one another, and finally how, on the one hand individual men and states, and on the other hand the community of all peoples, should act toward each other, the establishment of such a world community of peoples being urgently demanded today by the requirements of universal common good.

PART I—ORDER BETWEEN MEN

Every man is a person with rights and duties

First of all, it is necessary to speak of the order which should exist between men. Any human society, if it is to be well-ordered and productive, must lay down as a foundation this principle, namely, that every human being is a person, that is, his nature is endowed with intelligence and free will. By virtue of this, he has rights and duties of his own, flowing directly and simultaneously from his very nature, which are therefore universal, inviolable, and inalienable.[7]

If we look upon the dignity of the human person in the light of divinely revealed truth, we cannot help but esteem it far more highly; for men are redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ, they are by grace the children and friends of God and heirs of eternal glory.

Rights

The Right to Life and a Worthy Standard of Living

Beginning our discussion of the rights of man, we see that every man has the right to life, to bodily integrity, and to the means which are necessary and suitable for the proper development of life; these are primarily food, clothing, shelter, rest, medical care, and finally the necessary social services. Therefore a human being also has the right to security in cases of sickness, inability to work, widowhood, old age, unemployment, or in any other case in which he is deprived of the means of subsistence through no fault of his own.[8]

Rights Pertaining To Moral and Cultural Values

By the natural law every human being has the right to respect for his person, to his good reputation; the right to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating his opinions, and in pursuit of art, within the limits laid down by the moral order and the common good; and he has the right to be informed truthfully about public events.

The natural law also gives man the right to share in the benefits of culture, and therefore the right to a basic education and to technical and professional training in keeping with the stage of educational development in the country to which he belongs. Every effort should be made to insure that persons be enabled, on the basis of merit, to go on to higher studies, so that, as far as possible, they may occupy posts and take on responsibilities in human society in accordance with their natural gifts and the skills they have acquired.[9]

The Right To Worship God According to One's Conscience

Every human being has the right to honor God according to the dictates of an upright conscience, and therefore the right to worship God privately and publicly. For, as Lactantius so clearly taught: "We were created for the purpose of showing to the God who bore us the submission we owe Him, of recognizing Him alone, and of serving Him. We are obliged and bound by this duty to God; from this religion itself receives its name."[10] And on this point our predecessor of immortal memory, Leo XIII, declared: "This genuine, this honorable freedom of the sons of God, which most nobly protects the dignity of the human person, is greater than any violence or injustice; it has always been sought by the church, and always most dear to her. This was the freedom which the apostles claimed with intrepid constancy, which the apologists defended with their writings, and which the martyrs in such numbers consecrated with their blood."[11]

The Right To Choose Freely One's State of Life

Human beings have the right to choose freely the state of life which they prefer, and therefore the right to set up a family, with equal rights and duties for man and woman, and also the right to follow a vocation to the priesthood or the religious life.[12]

The family, grounded on marriage freely contracted, monogamous and indissoluble, is and must be considered the first and essential cell of human society. To it must be given every consideration of an economic, social, cultural and moral nature which will strengthen its stability and facilitate the fulfillment of its specific mission.

Parents, however, have a prior right in the support and education of their children.[13]

Economic Rights

Human beings have the natural right to free initiative in the economic field, and the right to work.[14]

Indissolubly linked with those rights is the right to working conditions in which physical health is not endangered, morals are safeguarded, and young people's normal development is not impaired. Women have the right to working conditions in accordance with their requirements and their duties as wives and mothers.[15]

From the dignity of the human person, there also arises the right to carry on economic activities according to the degree of responsibility of which one is capable.[16] Furthermore—and this must be specially emphasized—there is the right to a working wage, determined according to criterions of justice, and sufficient, therefore, in proportion to the available resources, to give the worker and his family a standard of living in keeping with the dignity of the human person. In this regard, our predecessor Pius XII said: "To the personal duty to work imposed by nature, there corresponds and follows the natural right of each individual to make of his work the means to provide for his own life and the lives of his children; so profoundly is the empire of nature ordained for the preservation of man."[17] The right to private property, even of productive goods, also derives from the nature of man. This right, as we have elsewhere declared, is a suitable means for safeguarding the dignity of the human person and for the exercise of responsibility in all fields; it strengthens and gives serenity to family life, thereby increasing the peace and prosperity of the state.[18]

However, it is opportune to point out that there is a social duty essentially inherent in the right of private property.[19]

The Right of Meeting and Association

From the fact that human beings are by nature social, there arises the right of assembly and association. They have also the right to give the societies of which they are members the form they consider most suitable for the aim they have in view, and to act within such societies on their own initiative and on their responsibility in order to achieve their desired objectives.[20]

We ourselves stated in the encyclical "mater et Magistra" that, for the achievement of ends which individual human beings cannot attain except by association, it is necessary and indispensable to set up a great variety of such intermediate groups and societies in order to guarantee for the human person a sufficient sphere of freedom and responsibility.[21]

---

[1] Psalms 8, 1.

[2] Psalms 103, 24.

[3] Cf. Genesis 1, 26.

[4] Psalms 8, 5–6.

[5] Romans 2:15.

[6] Cf. Psalms 18:8–11.

[7] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1942, A.A.S. XXXV, 1943, pp. 9–24; et Ioannis XIII Sermo, habitus die 4 mensis Ianuarii anno 1963, A.A.S. LV, 1963, pp. 89–91.

[8] Cf. Pii XI Litt. Encycl. Divini Redemptoris, A.A.S. XXIX, 1937, p. 78; et Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus in festo Pentecostes, die 1 mensis Iunii, anno 1941, A.A.S. XXXIII, 1941, pp. 195–205.

[9] Cf. Pii XII Nuntis radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1942, A.A.S. XXXV, 1943, pp. 9–24.

[10] Divinae Institutiones, lib. IV, c. 28, 2; PL. 6, 535.

[11] Litt. Encycl. Libertas praestantissimum, Acta Leonis XIII, VIII, 1888, pp. 237–238.

[12] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1942, A.A.S. XXXV, 1943, pp. 9–24.

[13] Cf. Pii XI Litt. Encycl. Casti Connubii, A.A.S. XXII, 1930, pp. 539–592; et Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D. N. I. C. anno 1942, A.A.S. XXXV, 1943, pp. 9–24.

[14] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus in festo Pentecostes, die 1 mensis Iunii anno 1941, A.A.S. XXXIII, 1941, p. 201.

[15] Cf. Leoniis XIII Litt. Encycl. Rerum Novarum, Acta Leonis XIII, XI, 1891, pp. 128–129.

[16] Cf. Ioannis XXIII Litt. Encycl. Mater et Magistra, A.A.S. LIII, 1961, p. 422.

[17] Cf. Nuntius radiophonicus, datus in festo Pentecostes, die 1 mensis Iunii anno 1941, A.S.S. XXXIII, 1941, p. 201.

[18] Litt. Encycl. Mater et Magistra, A.A.S. LIII, 1961, p. 428.

[19] Cf. Ibid., p. 430.

[20] Cf. Leonis XIII. Encycl. Rerum Novarum, Acta Leonis XIII, XI, 1891, pp. 134–142; Pii XI Litt. Encycl. Quadragesimo Anno, A.A.S. XXIII, 1931, pp. 199–200; et Pii XII Epist. Encycl. Sertum laetitiae, A.A.S. XXXI, 1939, pp. 635–644.

The Right To Emigrate and Immigrate

Every human being has the right to freedom of movement and of residence within the confines of his own country; and, when there are just reasons for it, the right to emigrate to other countries and take up residence there.[22] The fact that one is a citizen of a particular State does not detract in any way from his membership of the human family as a whole, nor from his citizenship of the world community.

Political Rights

The dignity of the human person involves the right to take an active part in public affairs and to contribute one's part to the common good of the citizens. For, as our predecessor of happy memory, Pius XII, pointed out: "The human individual, far from being an object and, as it were, a merely passive element in the social order, is in fact, must be and must continue to be, its subject, its foundation and its end."[23]

The human person is also entitled to a juridical protection of his rights, a protection that should be efficacious, impartial, and inspired by the true norms of justice.

As our predecessor Pius XII teaches: "That perpetual privilege proper to man, by which every individual has a claim to the protection of his rights, and by which there is assigned to each a definite and particular sphere of rights, immune from all arbitrary attacks, is the logical consequence of the order of justice willed by God."[24]

Duties

Rights and Duties Necessarily Linked in the One Person

The natural rights with which we have been dealing are, however, inseparably connected, in the very person who is their subject, with just as many respective duties; and rights as well as duties find their source, their sustenance and their inviolability in the natural law which grants or enjoins them.

For example, the right of every man to life is correlative with the duty to preserve it; his right to a decent standard of living with the duty of living it becomingly; and his right to investigate the truth freely, with the duty of seeking it and of possessing it ever more completely and profoundly.

Reciprocity of Rights and Duties Between Persons

Once this is admitted, it is also clear that in human society to one man's right there corresponds a duty in all other persons: the duty; namely, of acknowledging and respecting the right in question. For every fundamental human right draws its indestructible moral force from the natural law, which in granting it imposes a corresponding obligation. Those, therefore, who claim their own rights, yet altogether forget or neglect to carry out their respective duties, are people who build with one hand and destroy with the other.

Mutual Collaboration

Since men are social by nature they are meant to live with others and to work for one another's welfare. A well-ordered human society requires that men recognize and observe their mutual rights and duties. It also demands that each contribute generously to the establishment of a civic order in which rights and duties are progressively more sincerely and effectively acknowledged and fulfilled.

It is not enough, for example, to acknowledge and respect every man's right to the means of subsistence: one must also strive to obtain that he actually has enough in the way of food and nourishment.

The society of men must not only be organized but must also provide them with abundant resources. This certainly requires that they observe and recognize their mutual rights and duties; it also requires that they collaborate together in the many enterprises that modern civilization either allows or encourages or even demands.

An Attitude of Responsibility

The dignity of the human person also requires that every man enjoy the right to act freely and responsibly. For this reason, therefore, in social relations man should exercise his rights, fulfill his obligations and, in the countless forms of collaboration with others, act chiefly on his own responsibility and initiative. This is to be done in such a way that each one acts on his own decision, of set purpose and from a consciousness of his obligation, without being moved by force or pressure brought to bear on him externally. For any human society that is established on relations of force must be regarded as inhuman, inasmuch as the personality of its members is repressed or restricted, when in fact they should be provided with appropriate incentives and means for developing and perfecting themselves.

Social Life in Truth, Justice, Charity, and Freedom

A political society is to be considered well-ordered, beneficial and in keeping with human dignity if it is grounded on truth. As the Apostle Paul exhorts us: "Away with falsehood then; let everyone speak out the truth to his neighbour; membership of the body binds us to one another."[25] This demands that reciprocal rights and duties be sincerely recognized. Furthermore, human society will be such as we have just described it, if the citizens, guided by justice, apply themselves seriously to respecting the rights of others and discharging their own duties; if they are moved by such fervour of charity as to make their own the needs of others and share with others their own goods: if, finally, they work for a progressive closer fellowship in the world of spiritual values. Human society is realized in fredeom, that is to say, in ways and means in keeping with the dignity of its citizens, who accept the responsibility of their actions, precisely because they are by nature rational beings.

Human society, venerable brothers and beloved children, ought to be regarded above all as a spiritual reality: in which men communicate knowledge to each other in the light of truth; in which they can enjoy their rights and fulfill their duties, and are inspired to strive for moral good. Society should enable men to share in and enjoy every legitimate expression of beauty, and encourage them constantly to pass on to others all that is best in themselves, while they strive to make their own the spiritual achievements of others. These are the spiritual values which continually give life and basic orientation to cultural expressions, economic and social institutions, political movements and forms, laws, and all other structures by which society is outwardly established and constantly developed.

God and the Moral Order

The order which prevails in society is by nature moral. Grounded as it is in truth, it must function according to the norms of justice, it should be inspired and perfected by mutual love, and finally it should be brought to an evermore refined and human balance in freedom.

Now an order of this kind, whose principles are universal, absolute and unchangeable, has its ultimate source in the one true God, Who is personal and transcends human nature. Inasmuch as God is the first truth and the highest good, He alone is that deepest source from which human society can draw its vitality, if that society is to be well ordered, beneficial, and in keeping with human dignity.[26] As St. Thomas Aquinas says: "Human reason is the norm of the human will, according to which its goodness is measured, because reason derives from the eternal law which is the divine reason itself. It is evident then that the goodness of the human will depends much more on the eternal law than on human reason.[27]

Characteristics of the Present Day

Our age has three distinctive characteristics.

First of all, the working classes have gradually gained ground in economic and public affairs. They began by claiming their rights in the socioeconomic sphere; they extended their action then to claims on the political level; and finally applied themselves to the acquisition of the benefits of a more refined culture. Today, therefore, workers all over the world refuse to be treated as if they were irrational objects without freedom, to be used at the arbitrary disposition of others. They insist that they be always regarded as men with a share in every sector of human society: in the social and economic sphere, in the fields of learning and culture, and in public life.

Secondly, it is obvious to everyone that women are now taking a part in public life. This is happening more rapidly perhaps in nations of Christian civilization, and, more slowly but broadly, among peoples who have inherited other traditions or cultures. Since women are becoming ever more conscious of their human dignity, they will not tolerate being treated as mere material instruments, but demand rights befitting a human person both in domestic and in public life.

Finally, the modern world, as compared with the recent past, has taken on an entirely new appearance in the field of social and political life. For since all nations have either achieved or are on the way to achieving independence, there will soon no longer exist a world divided into nations that rule others and nations that are subject to others.

Men all over the world have today—or will soon have—the rank of citizens in independent nations. No one wants to feel subject to political powers located outside his own country or ethnical group. Thus, in very many human beings, the inferiority complex which endured for hundreds and thousands of years is disappearing, while in others there is an attenuation and gradual fading of the corresponding superiority complex which had its roots in social-economic privileges, sex, or political standing.

On the contrary, the conviction that all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity has been generally accepted. Hence racial discrimination can no longer be justified, at least doctrinally or in theory. And this is of fundamental importance and significance for the formation of human society according to those principles which we have outlined above. For, if a man becomes conscious of his rights, he must become equally aware of his duties. Thus he who possesses certain rights has likewise the duty to claim those rights as marks of his dignity, while all others have the obligation to acknowledge those rights and respect them.

---

[21] Cf. A.A.S. LIII, 1961, p. 430.

[22] Cf. Pii Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D. N. I. C. anno 1952, A.A.S. XLV, 1953, pp. 33–46.

[23] Cf. Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D. N. I. C. anno 1944, A.A.S. XXXVII, 1945, p. 12.

[24] Cf. Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1942 A.A.S. XXXV, 1943, p. 21.

[25] Ephesians 4:25.

[26] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Natvi. D.N.I.C. anno 1942, A.A.S. XXXV, 1943, p. 14.

[27] Summa Theol., Ia-IIae, q. 19, a. 4; cf. a. 9.

When the relations of human society are expressed in terms of rights and duties, men become conscious of spiritual values, understand the meaning and significance of truth, justice, charity, and freedom, and become deeply aware that they belong to this world of values. Moreover, when moved by such concerns, they are brought to a better knowledge of the true God who is personal and transcendent, and thus they make the ties that bind them to God the solid foundations and supreme criterion of their lives, both of that life which they live interiorly in the depths of their own souls and of that in which they are united to other men in society.

PART II—RELATIONS BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS AND THE PUBLIC AUTHORITIES WITHIN A SINGLE STATE

Necessity and divine origin of authority

Human society can be neither well ordered nor prosperous unless it has some people invested with legitimate authority to preserve its institutions and to devote themselves as far as is necessary to work and care for the good of all. These however derive their authority from God, as St. Paul teaches in the words, "Authority comes from God alone."[28] These words of St. Paul are explained thus by St. John Chrysostom: "What are you saying? Is every ruler appointed by God? I do not say that, he replies, for I am not dealing now with individual rulers, but with authority itself. What I say is, that it is the divine wisdom and not mere chance, that has ordained that there should be government, that some should command and others obey."[29] Moreover, since God made men social by nature, and since no society can hold together unless some one be over all, directing all to strive earnestly for the common good, every civilized community must have a ruling authority, and this authority, no less than society itself, has its source in nature, and has, consequently, God for its author.[30]

But authority is not to be thought of as a force lacking all control. Indeed, since it is the power to command according to right reason, authority must derive its obligatory force from the moral order, which in turn has God for its first source and final end. Wherefore our predecessor of happy memory, Pius XII, said: "That same absolute order of beings and their ends which presents man as an autonomous person, that is, as the subject of inviolable duties and rights, and as at once the basis of society and the purpose for which it exists, also includes the state as a necessary society invested with the authority without which it could not come into being or live. * * * And since this absolute order, as we learn from sound reason, especially from the Christian faith, can have no origin save in a personal God who is our Creator, it follows that the dignity of the state's authority is due to its sharing to some extent in the authority of God Himself.[31]

Where the civil authority uses as its only or its chief means either threats and fear of punishment or promises of rewards, it cannot effectively move men to promote the common good of all. Even if it did so move them, this would be altogether opposed to their dignity as men, endowed with reason and free will. As authority is chiefly concerned with moral force, it follows that civil authority must appeal primarily to the conscience of individual citizens, that is, to each one's duty to collaborate readily for the common good of all. Since by nature all men are equal in human dignity, it follows that no one may be coerced to perform inferior acts. That is in the power of God alone, who sees and judges the hidden designs of men's hearts. Those therefore who have authority in the state may oblige men in conscience only if their authority is intrinsically related with the authority of God and shares in it.[32]

By this principle the dignity of the citizens is protected. When, in fact, men obey their rulers, it is not at all as men that they obey them, but through their obedience it is God, the provident Creator of all things, Whom they reverence, since He has decreed that men's dealings with one another should be regulated by an order which He Himself has established. Moreover, in showing this due reverence to God, men not only do not debase themselves but rather perfect and ennoble themselves. For "to serve God is to rule."[33]

Since the right to command is required by the moral order and has its source in God, it follows that, if civil authorities legislate for or allow anything that is contrary to that order and therefore contrary to the will of God, neither the laws made nor the authorizations granted can be binding on the consciences of the citizens, since God has more right to be obeyed than men.[34] Otherwise, authority breaks down completely and results in shameful abuse. As St. Thomas Aquinas teaches: "Human law has the true nature of law only insofar as it corresponds to right reason, and therefore is derived from the eternal law. Insofar as it falls short of right reason, a law is said to be a wicked law; and so on, lacking the true nature of law, it is rather a kind of violence."[35]

It must not be concluded, however, because authority comes from God, that therefore men have no right to choose those who are to rule the state, to decide the form of government, and to determine both the way in which authority is to be exercised and its limits. It is thus clear that the doctrine which we have set forth is fully consonant with any truly democratic regime.[36]

Attainment of the Common Good Is the Purpose of the Public Authority

Individual citizens and intermediate groups are obliged to make their specific contributions to the common welfare. One of the chief consequences of this is that they must bring their own interests into harmony with the needs of the community, and must dispose of their goods and their services as civil authorities have prescribed, in accord with the norms of justice, in due form, and within the limits of their competence. This they must do by means of formally perfect actions, the content of which must be morally good, or at least capable of being directed toward good.

Indeed since the whole reason for the existence of civil authorities is the realization of the common good, it is clearly necessary that, in pursuing this objective, they should respect its essential elements, and at the same time conform their laws to the needs of a given historical situation.[37]

Essentials of the Common Good

Assuredly, the ethnic characteristics of the various human groups are to be respected as constituent elements of the common good,[38] but these values and characteristics by no means exhaust the content of the common good. For the common good is intimately bound up with human nature. It can never exist fully and completely unless, its intimate good is intimately bound up with human nature and realization being what they are, the human person is taken into account.[39]

In the second place, the very nature of the common good requires that all members of the political community be entitled to share in it, although in different ways according to each one's tasks, merits and circumstances. For this reason, every civil authority must take pains to promote the common good of all, without preference for any single citizen or civic group. As our predecessor of immortal memory, Leo XIII, has said: "The civil power must not serve the advantage of any one individual, or of some few persons, inasmuch as it was established for the common good of all."[40] Considerations of justice and equity, however, can at times demand that those involved in civil government give more attention to the less fortunate members of the community, since they are less able to defend their rights and to assert their legitimate claims.[41]

In this context, we judge that attention should be called to the fact that the common good touches the whole man, the needs both of his body and of his soul. Hence it follows that the civil authorities must undertake to effect the common good by ways and means that are proper to them; that is, while respecting the hierarchy of values, they should promote simultaneously both the material and the spiritual welfare of the citizens.[42]

These principles are clearly contained in the doctrine stated in Our Encyclical, "Mater et Magistra," where we emphasized that the common good of all embraces the sum total of those condtions of social living whereby men are enabled to achieve their own integral perfection more fully and more easily.[43]

Men, however, composed as they are of bodies and immortal souls, can never in this mortal life succeed in satisfying all their needs or in attaining perfect happiness. Therefore all efforts made to promote the common good, far from endangering the eternal salvation of men, ought rather to serve to promote it.[44]

Responsibilities of the Public Authority, and Rights and Duties of Individuals

It is agreed that in our time the common good is chiefly guaranteed when personal rights and duties are maintained. The chief concern of civil authorities must therefore be to insure that these rights are acknowledged, respected, coordinated with other rights, defended and promoted, so that in this way each one may more easily carry out his duties. For "to safeguard the inviolable rights of the human person, and to facilitate the fulfillment of his duties, should be the essential office of every public authority." [45]

---

[28] Rom. 13: 1–6.

[29] In Epist. ad Rom. c. 13, vv. 1–2, homil. XXIII: PG. 60, 615.

[30] Leonis XIII Epist. Encycl. Immortale Dei, Acta Leonis XIII, V, 1885, p. 120.

[31] Cf. Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D. N. I. C. anno 1944, A.A.S. XXXVII, 1945, p. 15.

[32] Cf. Leonis XIII Epist. Encycl. Diuturnum illud, Acta Leonis XIII, II, 1881, p. 274.

[33] Cf. Ibid., p. 278; et eiusdem Leonis XIII Epist. Encycl. Immortale Dei, Acta Leonis XIII, V. 1885, p. 130.

[34] Act. 5, 29.

[35] Summa Theol., I^{a}–11^{ae}, q. 93, a. 3 ad 2^{um}: cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, dated prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1944, A.A.S. XXXVII, 1945, pp. 5–23.

[36] Cf Leonis XIII Epist. Encycl. Diuturnum illud, Acta Leonis XIII, II, 1881, pp. 271–272; et Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1944, A.A.S. XXXVIII, 1945, pp. 5–23.

[37] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1942, A.A.S. XXXV, 1943, p. 13; et Leonis XIII Epist. Encycl. Immortale Dei, Acta Leonis XIII, V, 1885, p. 120.

[38] Cf. Pii XII Litt. Encycl. Summi Pontificatus, A.A.S. XXXI, 1939, pp. 412–453.

[39] Cf. Pii XI Litt. Encycl. Mit brennender Sorge, A.A.S. XXIX, 1937, p. 159; et Litt. Encycl. Divini Redemptoris, A.A.S. XXIX, 1937, pp. 65–106.

[40] Epist. Encycl. Immortale Dei, Acta Leonis XIII, V. 1885, p. 121.

[41] Cf. Leonis XIII Litt. Encycl. Rerum Novarum, Acta Leonis XIII, XI, 1891, pp. 133–134.

[42] Cf. Pii XII Litt. Encycl. Summi Pontificatus, A.A.S. XXXI, 1939, p. 433.

[43] A.A.S. LIII, 1961, p. 19.

[44] Cf. Pii XI Litt. Encycl. Quadragesimo Anno, A.A.S. XXIII, 1931, p. 215.

This means that, if any government does not acknowledge the rights of man or violates them, it not only fails in its duty, but its orders completely lack juridical force.[46]

Reconciliation and Protection of Rights and Duties of Individuals

One of the fundamental duties of civil authorities, therefore, is to coordinate social relations in such fashion that the exercise of one man's rights does not threaten others in the exercise of their own rights nor hinder them in the fulfillment of their duties. Finally, the rights of all should be effectively safeguarded and, if they have been violated, completely restored.[47]

Duty of Promoting the Rights of Individuals

It is also demanded by the common good that civil authorities should make earnest efforts to bring about a situation in which individual citizens can easily exercise their rights and fulfill their duties as well. For experience has taught us that, unless these authorities take suitable action with regard to economic, political, and cultural matters, inequalities between the citizens tend to become more and more widespread, especially in the modern world, and as a result human rights are rendered totally ineffective, and the fulfillment of duties is compromised.

It is therefore necessary that the administration give wholehearted and careful attention to the social as well as to the economic progress of the citizens, and to the development, in keeping with the development of the productive system, of such essential services as the building of roads, transportation, communications, water supply, housing, public health, education, facilitation of the practice of religion, and recreational facilities. It is necessary also that governments make efforts to see that insurance systems are made available to the citizens, so that, in case of misfortune or increased family responsibilities, no person will be without the necessary means to maintain a decent standard of living. The government should make similarly effective efforts to see that those who are able to work can find employment in keeping with their aptitudes, and that each worker receives a wage in keeping with the laws of justice and equity. It should be equally the concern of civil authorities to ensure that workers be allowed their proper responsibility in the work undertaken in industrial organization, and to facilitate the establishment of intermediate groups which will make social life richer and more effective. Finally, it should be possible for all the citizens to share as far as they are able in their country's cultural advantages.

Harmonious Relation Between Public Authority's Two Forms of Intervention

The common good requires that civil authorities maintain a careful balance between coordinating and protecting the rights of the citizens, on the one hand, and promoting them, on the other. It should not happen that certain individuals or social groups derive special advantage from the fact that their rights have received preferential protection. Nor should it happen that governments in seeking to protect these rights, become obstacles to their full expression and free use. For this principle must always be retained: that state activity in the economic field, no matter what its breadth or depth may be, ought not to be exercised in such a way as to curtail an individual's freedom of personal initiative. Rather it should work to expand that freedom as much as possible by the effective protection of the essential personal rights of each and every individual.[48]

The same principle should inspire the various steps which governments take in order to make it possible for the citizens more easily to exercise their rights and fulfill their duties in every sector of social life.

Structure and Operation of the Public Authority

It is impossible to determine, once and for all, what is the most suitable form of government, or how civil authorities can most effectively fulfill their respective functions, i.e., the legislative, judicial, and executive functions of the state. In determining the structure and operation of government which a state is to have, great weight has to be given to the historical background and circumstances of given political communities, circumstances which will vary at different times and in different places. We consider, however, that it is in keeping with the innate demands of human nature that the state should take a form which embodies the threefold division of powers corresponding to the three principal functions of public authority. In that type of state, not only the official functions of government but also the mutual relations between citizens and the public officials are set down according to law, which in itself affords protection to the citizens both in the enjoyment of their rights and in the fulfilment of their duties.

If, however, this political and juridical structure is to produce the advantages which may be expected of it, public officials must strive to meet the problems which arise in a way that conforms both to the complexities of the situation and the proper exercise of their function. This requires that, in constantly changing conditions, legislators never forget the norms of morality, or constitutional provisions, or the objective requirements of the common good. Moreover, executive authorities must coordinate the activities of society with discretion, with a full knowledge of the law and after a careful consideration of circumstances, and the courts must administer justice impartially and without being influenced by favouritism or pressure. The good order of society also demands that individual citizens and intermediate organizations should be effectively protected by law whenever they have rights to be exercised or obligations to be fulfilled. This protection should be granted to citizens both in their dealings with each other and in their relations with government agencies.[49]

Law and Conscience

It is unquestionable that a legal structure in conformity with the moral order and corresponding to the level of development of the political community is of great advantage to achievement of the common good.

And yet, social life in the modern world is so varied, complex and dynamic that even a juridical structure which has been prudently and thoughtfully established is always inadequate for the needs of society.

It is also true that the relations of the citizens with each other, of citizens and intermediate groups with public authorities, and finally of the public authorities with one another, are often so complex and so sensitive that they cannot be regulated by inflexible legal provisions. Such a situation therefore demands that the civil authorities have clear ideas about the nature and extent of their official duties if they wish to maintain the existing juridical structure in its basic elements and principles, and at the same time meet the exigencies of social life, adapting their legislation to the changing social scene and solving new problems. They must be men of great equilibrium and integrity, competent and courageous enough to see at once what the situation requires and to take necessary action quickly and effectively.[50]

Citizens' Participation in Public Life

It is in keeping with their dignity as persons that human beings should take an active part in government, although the manner in which they share in it will depend on the level of development of the political community to which they belong.

Men will find new and extensive advantages in the fact that they are allowed to participate in government. In this situation, those who administer the government come into frequent contact with the citizens, and it is thus easier for them to learn what is really needed for the common good. The fact too that ministers of government hold office only for a limited time keeps them from growing stale and allows for their replacement in accordance with the demands of social progress.[51]

Characteristics of the Present Day

In modern times, where there is question of organizing political communities juridically, there is observable first of all the tendency to write in concise and limpid phraseology a charter of fundamental human rights, which is, as often as not, inserted in the state constitutions, or is an integral part of them.

Second, there is also an inclination to determine, by the compilation of a document called the constitution, the procedures through which the governing powers are to be created, along with their mutual relations, the spheres of their competence, the forms and systems they are obliged to follow in the performance of their office.

The relations between the government and the governed are then set forth in terms of rights and duties; and it is clearly laid down that the paramount task assigned to government officials is that of recognizing, respecting, reconciling, protecting and promoting the rights and duties of citizens.

It is of course impossible to accept the theory which professes to find the original and single source of civic rights and duties, of the binding force of the constitution, and of a government's right to command, in the mere will of human beings, individually or collectively.[52]

The tendencies to which we have referred, however do clearly show that the men of our time have become increasingly conscious of their dignity as human persons. This awareness prompts them to claim a share in the public administration of their country, while it also accounts for the demand that their own inalienable and inviolable rights be protected by law. It also requires, that government officials be chosen in conformity with constitutional procedures, and perform their specific functions within the limits of law.

---

[45] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus in festo Pentecostes, die 1 mensis Iunii anno 1941, A.A.S. XXXIII, 1941, p. 200.

[46] Cf. Pii XI Litt. Encycl. Mit brennender Sorge, A.A.S. XXIX, 1937, p. 159; et Litt. Encycl. Divini Redemptoris, A.A.S. XXIX, 1937, p. 79; et Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1942, A.A.S. XXXV, 1943, pp. 9–24.

[47] Cf. Pii XI Litt. Encycl. Divini Redemptoris, A.A.S. XXIX, 1937, p. 81; et Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1942, A.A.S. XXXV, 1943, pp. 9–24.

[48] Ioannis XXIII Litt. Encycl. Mater et Magistra, A.A.S. LIII. 1961, p. 415.

[49] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1942, A.A.S. XXXV. 1943, p. 21.

[50] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D. N. I. C. anno 1944, A.A.S. XXXVII, 1945, pp. 15–16.

[51] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D. N. I. C. anno 1942, A.A.S. XXXV, 1943, p. 12.

[52] Cf. Leonis XII Epist. Apost. Annum ingressi, Acta Leonis XIII, XXII, 1902–03, pp. 52–80.

PART III—RELATIONS BETWEEN STATES

Subjects of rights and duties

Our predecessors have constantly maintained, and we join them in reasserting, that political communities are reciprocally subjects of rights and duties. This means that their relationships also must be harmonized in truth, in justice, in a working solidarity, in liberty. The same moral law, which governs relations between individual human beings, serves also to regulate the relations of political communities with one another.

This will be readily understood when one reflects that the individual representatives of political communities cannot put aside their personal dignity while they are acting in the name and interest of their countries; and that they cannot therefore violate the very law of their being, which is the moral law.

It would be absurd, moreover, even to imagine that men could surrender their own human attributes, or be compelled to do so, by the very fact of their appointment to public office, whereas they have been given that noble assignment precisely because the wealth of their human endowments has earned them their reputation as outstanding members of the body politic. Furthermore, authority is a necessary requirement of the moral order in human society. It may not therefore be used against that order; and the very instant such an attempt were made, it would cease to be authority, as the Lord has warned us: "A word, then, for the king's ears to hear, king's hearts to heed: a message for you, rulers, wherever you be! Listen well, all you that have multitudes at your command, foreign hordes to do your bidding. Power is none but comes to you from the Lord, nor any royalty but from One who is above all. He it is that will call you to account for your doings with a scrutiny that reads your inmost thoughts."[53]

Lastly it is to be borne in mind that also in the regulating of relations between political communities, authority is to be exercised for the achievement of the common good, which constitutes the reason for its existence.

But a fundamental factor of the common good is acknowledgment of the moral order and respect for its prescriptions. "Order between the political communities must be built upon the unshakable and unchangeable rock of the moral law, made manifest in the order of nature by the Creator Himself and by Him engraved on the hearts of men with letters that may never be effaced. * * * Like the rays of a gleaming beacon, its principles must guide the plans and policies of men and nations. These are the signals—of warning, safety, and smooth sailing—they will have to heed, if they would not see all their laborious efforts to establish a new order condemned to tempest and shipwreck."[54]

In truth

First among the rules governing the relations between states is that of truth. This calls, above all, for the elimination of every trace of racism, and the consequent recognition of the principle that all states are by nature equal in dignity. Each of them accordingly is vested with the right to existence, to self-development, to the means fitting to its attainment, and to be the one primarily responsible for this self-development. Add to that the right of each to its good name, and to the respect which is its due. Very often, experience has taught us, individuals will be found to differ considerably, in knowledge, virtue, talent, and wealth. Yet these inequalities must never be held to excuse any man's attempt to lord it over his neighbors unjustly. They constitute rather a source of greater responsibility in the contribution which each and everyone must make toward mutual improvement.

Similarly, political communities may have reached different levels of culture, civilization, or economic development. Neither is that a sufficient reason for some to take unjust advantage of their superiority over others; rather should they see in it an added motive for more serious commitment to the common cause of social progress.

It is not true that some human beings are by nature superior, and others inferior. All men are equal in their natural dignity. Consequently there are no political communities which are superior by nature and none which are inferior by nature. All political communities are of equal natural dignity, since they are bodies whose membership is made up of these same human beings. Nor must it be forgotten, in this connection, that peoples can be highly sensitive, and with good reason, in matters touching their dignity and honor.

Truth further demands that the various media of social communications made available by modern progress, which enable the nations to know each other better, be used with serene objectivity. That need not, of course, rule out any legitimate emphasis on the positive aspects of their way of life. But methods of information which fall short of the truth, and by the same token impair the reputation of this people or that, must be discarded.[55]

Relations between political communities are to be further regulated by justice. This implies, over and above recognition of their mutual rights, the fulfillment of their respective duties.

In justice

Political communities have the right to existence, to self-development and to the means necessary for this. They have the right to play the leading part in the process of their own development and the right to their good name and due honors. From which it follows as a simultaneous consequence that they have also the corresponding duty of respecting these rights in others and of avoiding any act of violation. Just as an individual man may not pursue his own interests to the detriment of other men, so, on the international level, one state may not develop itself by restricting or oppressing other states. St. Augustine rightly says, What are kingdoms without justice but bands of robbers?[56]

Not only can it happen, but it actually does happen that the advantages and conveniences which nations strive to acquire for themselves become objects of contention; nevertheless, the resulting disagreements must be settled, not by force, nor by deceit or trickery, but rather in the only manner which is worthy of the dignity of man, i.e., by a mutual assessment of the reasons on both sides of the dispute, by a mature and objective investigation of the situation, and by an equitable reconciliation of differences of opinion.

The treatment of minorities

From the 19th century there has been a rather widespread tendency in historical evolution that political communities equate themselves to national communities. However, for various reasons, it has not always been possible to make geographical boundaries coincide with ethnic ones; this gives rise to the phenomenon of minorities and to the relative complex problems.

In the first place, it must be made clear that justice is seriously violated by whatever is done to limit the strength and numerical increase of these lesser peoples; the injustice is even more serious if such sinful projects are aimed at the very extinction of these groups.

On the other hand, the demands of justice are admirably observed by those civil authorities who promote the natural betterment of those citizens belonging to a smaller ethnic group, particularly when that betterment concerns their language, the development of their natural gifts, their ancestral customs, and their accomplishments and endeavors in the economic order.[57]

It should be noted, however, that these minority groups, either because of a reaction to their present situation or because of their historical difficulties are often inclined to exalt beyond due measure anything proper to their own people, so as to place them even above human values, as if that which is proper to humanity were to be at the service of that which is proper to the nation. Reason rather demands that these very people recognize also the advantages that accrue to them from their peculiar circumstances; for instance, no small contribution is made toward the development of their particular talents and spirit by their daily dealings with people who have grown up in a different culture. This, however, will be true only if they will know how to act as a bridge, which facilitates the circulation of life in its various expressions among different traditions or civilizations, and not a zone of discord which can cause great damage and choke natural development.

Active solidarity

Certainly relations between states must be regulated by the norms of truth and justice, but they also derive great benefits from active solidarity, through mutual cooperation on various levels, such as, in our own times, has already taken place with laudable results in the economic, social, political, educational, health and sport spheres. We must remember that, of its very nature, civil authority exists, not to confine its people within the boundaries of their nation, but rather to protect, above all else, the common good of that particular civil society, which certainly cannot be divorced from the common good of the entire human family.

This entails not only that civil societies should pursue their particular interests without hurting others, but also that they should join forces and plans whenever the efforts of an individual government cannot achieve its desired goals; but in the execution of such common efforts, great care must be taken lest what helps some nations should injure others.

Furthermore, the universal common good requires that in every nation friendly relations be fostered in all fields between the citizens and their intermediate societies.

There are groupings of people of more or less different racial backgrounds. However, the elements which characterize an ethnic group must not be transformed into a watertight compartment in which human beings are prevented from communicating with their fellowmen belonging to different ethnic groups. That would contrast with our contemporary situation, in which the distances separating peoples have been almost wiped out. Nor can one overlook the fact that, even though human beings differ from one another by virtue of their ethnic peculiarities, they all possess certain essential common elements, and are inclined by nature to meet each other in the world of spiritual values, whose progressive assimilation opens to them the possibility of perfection without limits. They have the right and duty therefore to live in communion with one another.

---

[53] Sap. 6, 2–4.

[54] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1941, A.A.S. XXXIV, 1942, p. 16.

[55] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus, prid Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno 1940, A.A.S. XXXIII, 1941, pp. 5–14.

[56] De civitate Dei, lib. IV, c. 4; PL. 41, 115; cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid Nativ D.N.I.C. anno 139, A.A.S. XXXII, 1940, pp. 5–13.

[57] Cf. Pii XII Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ D. N. I. C. anno 1941, A.S.S. XXXIV, 1942, pp. 10–21.

The proper balance between population, land, and capital

As everybody knows, there are countries with an abundance of arable land and a scarcity of manpower, while in other countries there is no proportion between natural resources and the capital available. This demands that peoples should set up relationships of mutual collaboration, facilitating the circulation from one to the other of capital, goods, and manpower.[58]

Here we deem it opportune to remark that, whenever possible, the work to be done should be taken to the workers, not vice versa.

In this way a possibility of a better future is offered to many persons without being forced to leave their own environment in order to seek residence elsewhere, which almost always entails the heartache of separation and difficult periods of adjustment and social integration.

The problem of political refugees

The sentiment of universal fatherhood which the Lord has placed in our heart makes us feel profound sadness in considering the phenomenon of political refugees: a phenomenon which has assumed large proportions and which always hides numberless and acute sufferings.

Such expatriations show that there are some political regimes which do not guarantee for individual citizens a sufficient sphere of freedom within which their souls are allowed to breathe humanly; in fact, under those regimes even the lawful existence of such a sphere of freedom is either called into question or denied. This undoubtedly is a radical inversion of the order of human society, because the reason for the existence of public authority is to promote the common good, a fundamental element of which is the recognition of that sphere of freedom and the safeguarding of it.

At this point it will not be superfluous to recall that such exiles are persons, and that all their rights as persons must be recognized, since they do not lose those rights on losing the citizenship of the states of which they are former members.

Now among the rights of a human person there must be included that by which a man may enter a political community where he hopes he can more fittingly provide a future for himself and his dependents. Wherefore, as far as the common good rightly understood permits, it is the duty of that state to accept such immigrants and to help to integrate them into itself as new members.

Wherefore, on this occasion, we publicly approve and commend every undertaking, founded on the principles of human solidarity and Christian charity, which aims at making migration of persons from one country to another less painful.

And we will be permitted to signal for the attention and gratitude of all right-minded persons the manifold work which specialized international agencies are carrying out in this very delicate field.

Disarmament

On the other hand, it is with deep sorrow that we note the enormous stocks of armaments that have been and still are being made in more economically developed countries, with a vast outlay of intellectual and economic resources. And so it happens that, while the people of these countries are loaded with heavy burdens, other countries as a result are deprived of the collaboration they need in order to make economic and social progress.

The production of arms is allegedly justified on the grounds that in present-day conditions peace cannot be preserved without an equal balance of armaments. And so, if one country increases its armaments, others feel the need to do the same; and if one country is equipped with nuclear weapons, other countries must produce their own equally destructive.

Consequently, people live in constant fear lest the storm that every moment threatens should break upon them with dreadful violence. And with good reason, for the arms of war are ready at hand. Even though it is difficult to believe that anyone would deliberately take the responsibility for the appalling destruction and sorrow that war would bring in its train, it cannot be denied that the conflagration may be set off by some incontrollable and unexpected chance. And one must bear in mind that, even though the monstrous power of modern weapons acts as a deterrent, it is to be feared that the mere continuance of nuclear tests, undertaken with war in mind, will have fatal consequences for life on the earth.

Justice, then, right, reason and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control. In the words of Pius XII, our predecessor of happy memory: "The calamity of a world war, with the economic and social ruin and the moral excesses and dissolution that accompany it, must not be permitted to envelop the human race for a third time."[59]

All must realize that there is no hope of putting an end to the building up of armaments, nor of reducing the present stocks, nor, still less, of abolishing them altogether, unless the process is complete and thorough and unless it proceeds from inner conviction: unless; that is, everyone sincerely cooperates to banish the fear and anxious expectation of war with which men are oppressed. If this is to come about, the fundamental principle on which our present peace depends must be replaced by another, which declares that the true and solid peace of nations consists not in equality of arms but in mutual trust alone. We believe that this can be brought to pass, and we consider that it is something which reason requires, that it is eminently desirable in itself and that it will prove to be the source of many benefits.

In the first place, it is an objective demanded by reason. There can be, or at least there should be, no doubt that relations between states, as between individuals, should be regulated not by the force of arms but by the light of reason, by the rule; that is, of truth, of justice and of active and sincere cooperation.

Secondly, we say that it is an objective earnestly to be desired in itself. Is there anyone who does not ardently yearn to see war banished, to see peace preserved and daily more firmly established?

And finally, it is an objective which will be a fruitful source of many benefits, for its advantages will be felt everywhere, by individuals, by families, by nations, by the whole human family. The warning of Pius XII still rings in our ears: "Nothing is lost by peace; everything may be lost by war."[60]

Since this is so, we, the vicar on earth of Jesus Christ, Saviour of the world and Author of Peace, and as interpreter of the very profound longing of the entire human family, following the impulse of our heart, seized by anxiety for the good of all, we feel it our duty to beseech men, especially those who have the responsibility of public affairs, to spare no labor in order to insure that world events follow a reasonable and human course.

In the highest and most authoritative assemblies, let men give serious thought to the problem of a peaceful adjustment of relations between political communities on a world level: an adjustment founded on mutual trust, on sincerity in negotiations, on faithful fulfillment of obligations assumed. Let them study the problem until they find that point of agreement from which it will be possible to commence to go forward toward accords that will be sincere, lasting, and fruitful.

We, for our part, will not cease to pray God to bless these labors so that they may lead to fruitful results.

In liberty

It has also to be borne in mind that relations between states should be based on freedom; that is to say, that no country may unjustly oppress others or unduly meddle in their affairs. On the contrary, all should help to develop in others a sense of responsibility, a spirit of enterprise, and an earnest desire to be the first to promote their own advancement in every field.

The evolution of economically underdeveloped countries

Because all men are joined together by reason of their common origin, their redemption by Christ, and their supernatural destiny, and are called to form one single family, we appealed in the Encyclical Mater et Magistra to economically developed nations to come to the aid of those which were in the process of development.[61]

We are greatly consoled to see how widely that appeal has been favorably received; and we are confident that even more so in the future it will contribute to the end that the poorer countries, in as short a time as possible, will arrive at that degree of economic development which will enable every citizen to live in conditions in keeping with his human dignity.

But it is never sufficiently repeated that the cooperation, to which reference has been made, should be effected with the greatest respect for the liberty of the countries being developed, for these must realize that they are primarily responsible, and that they are the principal artisans in the promotion of their own economic development and social progress.

Our predecessor Pius XII already proclaimed that "in the field of a new order founded on moral principles, there is no room for violation of freedom, integrity and security of other nations, no matter what may be their territorial extension or their capacity for defense. It is inevitable that the powerful states, by reason of their greater potential and their power, should pave the way in the establishment of economic groups comprising not only themselves but also smaller and weaker states as well. It is nevertheless indispensable that in the interests of the common good they, as all others, should respect the rights of those smaller states to political freedom, to economic development and to the adequate protection, in the case of conflicts between nations, of that neutrality which is theirs according to the natural, as well as international, law. In this way, and in this way only, will they be able to obtain a fitting share of the common good, and assure the material and spiritual welfare of their people.[62]

---

[58] Cf. Ioannis XXIII Litt. Encycl. Mater et Magistra, A.A.S. LIII, 1961, p 439.

[59] Cf. Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D.N.I.C. anno. 1941, A.A.S. XXXIV, 1942, p. 17; et Benedicti XV Adhortatio ad moderatores populorum belligerantium, data die 1 mensis Augusti anno 1917, A.A.S. IX, 1917, p. 418.

[60] Cf. Nuntius radiophonicus, datus die XXIV mensis Augusti anno 1939, A.A.S. XXXI, 1939, p. 334.

[61] A.A.S. LIII, 1961, pp. 440–441.

It is vitally important, therefore, that the wealthier states, in providing varied forms of assistance to the poorer, should respect the moral values and ethnic characteristics peculiar to each, and also that they should avoid any intention of political domination. If this is done, "a precious contribution will be made towards the formation of a world community, a community in which each member, whilst conscious of its own individual right and duties, will work in a relationship of equality towards the attainment of the universal common good."[63]

Signs of the times

Men are becoming more and more convinced that disputes which arise between states should not be resolved by recourse to arms, but rather by negotiation.

It is true that on historical grounds this conviction is based chiefly on the terrible destructive force of modern arms; and it is nourished by the horror aroused in the mind by the very thought of the cruel destruction and the immense suffering which the use of those armaments would bring to the human family; and for this reason it is hardly possible to imagine that in the atomic era war could be used as an instrument of justice.

Nevertheless, unfortunately, the law of fear still reigns among peoples, and it forces them to spend fabulous sums for armaments: not for aggression, they affirm—and there is no reason for not believing them—but to dissuade others from aggression.

There is reason to hope, however, that by meeting and negotiating, men may come to discover better the bonds that unite them together, deriving from the human nature which they have in common; and that they may also come to discover that one of the most profound requirements of their common nature is this: that between them and their respective peoples it is not fear which should reign but love, a love which tends to express itself in a collaboration that is loyal, manifold in form and productive of many benefits.

PART IV—RELATIONSHIP OF MEN AND OF POLITICAL COMMUNITIES WITH THE WORLD COMMUNITY

Interdependence between political communities

Recent progress of science and technology has profoundly affected human beings and influenced men to work together and live as one family. There has been a great increase in the circulation of ideas, of persons and of goods from one country to another, so that relations have become closer between individuals, families, and intermediate associations belonging to different political communities, and between the public authorities of those communities. At the same time the interdependence of national economies has grown deeper, one becoming progressively more closely related to the other, so that they become, as it were, integral parts of the one world economy. Likewise the social progress, order, security, and peace of each country are necessarily connected with the social progress, order, security, and peace of all other countries.

At the present day no political community is able to pursue its own interests and develop itself in isolation, because the degree of its prosperity and development is a reflection and a component part of the degree of prosperity and development of all the other political communities.

Insufficiency of modern states to insure the universal common good

The unity of the human family has always existed, because its members were human beings all equal by virtue of their natural dignity. Hence there will always exist the objective need to promote, in sufficient measure, the universal common good, that is, the common good of the entire human family.

In times past, one would be justified in feeling that the public authorities of the different political communities might be in a position to provide for the universal common good, either through normal diplomatic channels or through top-level meetings, by making use of juridical instruments such as conventions and treaties, for example: juridical instruments suggested by the natural law and regulated by the law of nations and international law.

As a result of the far-reaching changes which have taken place in the relations between the human family, the universal common good gives rise to problems which are complex, very grave, and extremely urgent, especially as regards security and world peace. On the other hand, the public authorities of the individual political communities—placed as they are on a footing of equality one with the other—no matter how much they multiply their meetings or sharpen their wits in efforts to draw up new juridical instruments, they are no longer capable of facing the task of finding an adequate solution to the problems mentioned above. And this is not due to a lack of goodwill or of a spirit of enterprise, but because of a structural defect which hinders them.

It can be said, therefore, that at this historical moment the present system of organization and the way its principle of authority operates on a world basis no longer correspond to the objective requirements of the universal common good.

Connection between the common good and political authority

There exists an intrinsic connection between the common good on the one hand and the structure and function of public authority on the other. The moral order, which needs public authority in order to promote the common good in human society, requires also that the authority be effective in attaining that end. This demands that the organs through which the authority is formed, becomes operative and pursues its ends, must be composed and act in such a manner as to be capable of bringing to realization the new meaning which the common good is taking on in the historical evolution of the human family.

Today the universal common good poses problems of worldwide dimensions, which cannot be adequately tackled or solved except by the efforts of public authorities endowed with a wideness of powers, structure and means of the same proportions: that is, of public authorities which are in a position to operate in an effective manner on a worldwide basis. The moral order itself, therefore, demands that such a form of public authority be established.

Public authority instituted by common consent and not imposed by force

A public authority, having worldwide power and endowed with the proper means for the efficacious pursuit of its objective, which is the universal common good in concrete form, must be set up by common accord and not imposed by force. The reason is that such an authority must be in a position to operate effectively; yet, at the same time, its action must be inspired by sincere and real impartiality; in other words, it must be an action aimed at satisfying the objective requirements of the universal common good. The difficulty is that there would be reason to fear that a supernational or worldwide public authority, imposed by force by the more powerful political communities, might be or might become an instrument of one-sided interests; and even should this not happen, it would be difficult for it to avoid all suspicion of partiality in its actions, and this would take from the efficaciousness of its activity.

Even though there may be pronounced differences between political communities as regards the degree of their economic development and their military power, they are all very sensitive as regards their juridical equality and their moral dignity. For that reason, they are right in not easily yielding in obedience to an authority imposed by force, or to an authority in whose creation they had no part, or to which they themselves did not decide to submit by conscious and free choice.

The universal common good and personal rights

Like the common good of individual political communities, so too the universal common good cannot be determined except by having regard to the human person. Therefore, the public authority of the world community, too, must have as its fundamental objective the recognition, respect, safeguarding and promotion of the rights of the human person; this can be done by direct action when required, or by creating on a world scale an environment in which the public authorities of the individual political communities can more easily carry out their specific functions.

The principle of subsidiarity

Just as within each political community the relations between individuals, families, intermediate associations and public authority are governed by the principle of subsidiarity, so too the relations between the public authority of each political community and the public authority of the world community must be regulated by the light of the same principle. This means that the public authority of the world community must tackle and solve problems of an economic, social, political or cultural character which are posed by the universal common good. For, because of the vastness, complexity, and urgency of these problems, the public authorities of the individual states are not in a position to tackle them with any hope of a positive solution.

The public authority of the world community is not intended to limit the sphere of action of the public authority of the individual political community, much less to take its place. On the contrary, its purpose is to create, on a world basis, an environment in which the public authorities of each political community, its citizens and intermediate associations, can carry out their tasks, fulfill their duties and exercise their rights with greater security.[64]

Modern developments

As is known, the United Nations Organization (UNO) was established on June 26, 1945, and to it there were subsequently added intergovernmental agencies with extensive international tasks in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields. The United Nations Organization had as its essential purpose the maintenance and consolidation of peace between peoples, fostering between them friendly relations, based on the principles of equality, mutual respect, and varied forms of cooperation in every sector of human society.

An act of the highest importance performed by the United Nations Organization was the Universal Declaration of Human

---

[62] Cf. Nuntius radiophonicus, datus prid. Nativ. D. N. I. C. anno 1941, A.A.S. XXXIV, 1942, pp. 16–17.

[63] Ioannis XXIII Litt. Encycl. Mater et Magistra, A.A.S. LIII, 1961, p. 443.

[64] Cf. Pii XII Allocutio ad iuvenes ab Actione Catholica ex Italiae dioecesibus Romae coadunatos, habita die 12 mensis Septembris anno 1948 A.A.S. XL, p. 412.

Rights, approved in the General Assembly of December 10, 1948. In the preamble of that declaration, the recognition and respect of those rights and respective liberties is proclaimed as an ideal to be pursued by all peoples and all countries.

Some objections and reservations were raised regarding certain points in the declaration. There is no doubt, however, that the document represents an important step on the path toward the juridical-political organization of the world community. For in it, in most solemn form, the dignity of a person is acknowledged to all human beings; and as a consequence there is proclaimed, as a fundamental right, the right of free movement in the search for truth and in the attainment of moral good and of justice, and also the right to a dignified life, while other rights connected with those mentioned are likewise proclaimed.

It is our earnest wish that the United Nations Organization—in its structure and in its means—may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and that the day may come when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable rights. This is all the more to be hoped for since all human beings, as they take an ever more active part in the public life of their own political communities, are showing an increasing interest in the affairs of all peoples, and are becoming more consciously aware that they are living members of a world community.

PART V—PASTORAL EXHORTATIONS

Duty of taking part in public life

Once again we deem it opportune to remind our children of their duty to take an active part in public life, and to contribute toward the attainment of the common good the entire human family as well as to that of their own political community. They should endeavor, therefore, in the light of the faith and with the strength of love, to insure that the various institutions—whether economic, social, cultural, or political in purpose—should be such as not to create obstacles, but rather to facilitate or render less arduous man's perfectioning of himself both in the natural order as well as in the supernatural.

Scientific competence, technical capacity, and professional experience

Nevertheless, in order to imbue civilization with sound principles and enliven it with the spirit of the gospel, it is not enough to be illumined with the gift of faith and enkindled with the desire of forwarding a good cause. For this end it is necessary to take an active part in the various organizations and influence them from within. And since our present age is of outstanding scientific and technical progress and excellence, one will not be able to enter these organizations and work effectively from within unless he is scientifically competent, technically capable, and skilled in the practice of his own profession.

Apostolate of a trained laity

We desire to call attention to the fact that scientific competence, technical capacity, and professional experience, although necessary, are not of themselves sufficient to elevate the relationships of society to an order that is genuinely human: that is, to an order whose foundation is truth, whose measure and objective is justice, whose driving force is love, and whose method of attainment is freedom.

For this end it is certainly necessary that human beings carry on their own temporal activities in accordance with the laws governing them and following the methods corresponding to their nature. But at the same time it is also necessary that they should carry on those activities as acts within the moral order: therefore, as the exercise or vindication of a right, as the fulfilment of a duty or the performance of a service, as a positive answer to the providential design of God directed to our salvation. In other words, it is necessary that human beings, in the intimacy of their own consciences, should so live and act in their temporal lives as to create a synthesis between scientific, technical, and professional elements on the one hand, and spiritual values on the other.

Integration of faith and action

It is no less clear that today, in traditionally Christian nations, secular institutions, although demonstrating a high degree of scientific and technical perfection, and efficiency in achieving their respective ends, not infrequently are but slightly affected by Christian motivation or inspiration.

It is beyond question that in the creation of those institutions many contributed and continue to contribute who were believed to be and who consider themselves Christians; and without doubt, in part at least, they were and are. How does one explain this? It is our opinion that the explanation is to be found in an inconsistency in their minds between religious belief and their action in the temporal sphere. It is necessary, therefore, that their interior unity be reestablished, and that in their temporal activity faith should be present as a beacon to give light, and charity as a force to give life.

Integral education

It is our opinion, too, that the above-mentioned inconsistency between the religious faith, in those who believe, and their activities in the temporal sphere, results—in great part if not entirely—from the lack of a solid Christian education. Indeed, it happens in many quarters and too often that there is no proportion between scientific training and religious instruction: the former continues and is extended until it reaches higher degrees, while the latter remains at elementary level. It is indispensable, therefore, that in the training of youth, education should be complete and without interruption: namely, that in the minds of the young, religious values should be cultivated and the moral conscience refined, in a manner to keep pace with the continuous and ever more abundant assimilation of scientific and technical knowledge. And it is indispensable too that they be instructed regarding the proper way to carry out their actual tasks.[65]

Constant endeavor

We deem it opportune to point out how difficult it is to understand clearly the relation between the objective requirements of justice and concrete situations; namely, to perceive the degrees and forms in which doctrinal principles and directives ought to be applied to reality.

And the perception of those degrees and forms is all the more difficult in our times, which are marked by a pronounced dynamism. For this reason, the problem of bringing social reality into line with the objective requirements of justice is a problem which will never admit of a definitive solution. Meanwhile, our children must watch over themselves lest they relax and feel satisfied with objectives already achieved.

In fact, all human beings ought rather to reckon that what has been accomplished is but little in comparison with what remains to be done: because organs of production, trade unions, associations, professional organizations, insurance systems, legal systems, political regimes, institutions for cultural, health, recreational, or sporting purposes—these must all be adjusted to the era of the atom and of the conquest of space: an era which the human family has already entered, wherein it has commenced its new advance toward limitless horizons.

Relations between Catholics and non-Catholics in social and economic affairs

The doctrinal principles outlined in this document derive from or are suggested by requirements inherent in human nature itself, and are, for the most part, dictates of the natural law. They provide Catholics, therefore, with a vast field in which they can meet and come to an understanding both with Christians separated from this apostolic see, and also with human beings who are not enlightened by faith in Jesus Christ, but who are endowed with the light of reason and with a natural and operative honesty. In such relations let the faithful be careful to be always consistent in their actions, so that they may never come to any compromise in matters of religion and morals. At the same time, however, let them be, and show themselves to be, animated by a spirit of understanding and detachment, and disposed to work loyally in the pursuit of objectives which are of their nature good, or conducive to good.[66]

However, one must never confuse error and the person who errs, not even when there is question of error or inadequate knowledge of truth in the moral or religious field. The person who errs is always and above all a human being, and he retains in every case his dignity as a human person; and he must be always regarded and treated in accordance with that lofty dignity. Besides, in every human being, there is a need that is congenital to his nature and never becomes extinguished, compelling him to break through the web of error and open his mind to the knowledge of truth. And God will never fail to act on his interior being, with the result that a person, who at a given moment of his life lacks the clarity of faith or even adheres to erroneous doctrines, can at a future date be enlightened and believe the truth. Meetings and agreements, in the various sectors of daily life, between believers and those who do not believe or believe insufficiently because they adhere to error, can be occasions for discovering truth and paying homage to it.

It must be borne in mind, furthermore, that neither can false philosophical teachings regarding the nature, origin, and destiny of the universe and of man, be identified with historical movements that have economic, social, cultural or political ends, not even when these movements have originated from those teachings and have drawn and still draw inspiration therefrom. Because the teachings, once they are drawn up and defined, remain always the same, while the movements, working on historical situations in constant evolution, cannot but be influenced by these latter and cannot avoid, therefore, being subject to changes, even of a profound nature. Besides, who can deny that those movements, insofar as they conform to the dictates of right reason and are interpreters of the lawful aspirations of the human person, contain elements that are positive and deserving of approval?

It can happen, then, that a drawing nearer together or a meeting for the attainment of some practical end, which was formerly deemed inopportune or unproductive, might now or in the future be considered opportune and useful. But to decide whether this moment has arrived, and also to lay down the ways and degrees in which work in common might be possible for the achievement of economic, social, cultural, and political ends which are honorable and useful: there are the problems which can only be solved with the virtue of prudence, which is the guiding light of the virtues that regulate the moral life, both individual and social. Therefore, as far as Catholics are concerned, this decision rests primarily with those who live and work in the specific sectors of human society in which those problems arise, always, however, in accordance with the principles of the natural law, with the social doctrine of the church, and with the directives of ecclesiastical authority. For it must not be forgotten that the church has the right and the duty not only to safeguard the principles of ethics and religion, but also to intervene authoritatively with her children in the temporal sphere, when there is a question of judging about the application of those principles to concrete cases.[67]

---

[65] Cf. IOANNIS XXIII Litt. Encycl. Mater et Magistra, A.A.S., 1961, p. 454.

[66] Ibid., p. 456.

Little by Little

There are some souls, particularly endowed with generosity, who, on finding situations where the requirements of justice are not satisfied or not satisfied in full, feel enkindled with the desire to change the state of things, as if they wished to have recourse to something like a revolution.

It must be borne in mind that to proceed gradually is the law of life in all its expressions; therefore in human institutions, too, it is not possible to renovate for the better except by working from within them, gradually. Pius XII proclaimed: "Salvation and justice are not to be found in revolution, but in evolution through concord. Violence has always achieved only destruction, not construction; the kindling of passions, not their pacification; the accumulation of hate and ruin, not the reconciliation of the contending parties. And it has reduced men and parties to the difficult task of rebuilding, after sad experience, on the ruins of discord.[68]

An Immense Task

There is an immense task incumbent on all men of good will, namely, the task of restoring the relations of the human family in truth, in justice, in love and in freedom: the relations between individual human beings; between citizens and their respective political communities; between political communities themselves; between individuals, families, intermediate associations and political communities on the one hand, and the world community on the other. This is a most exalted task, for it is the task of bringing about true peace in the order established by God.

Admittedly, those who are endeavoring to restore the relations of social life according to the criterions mentioned above, are not many; to them we express our paternal appreciation, and we earnestly invite them to persevere in their work with ever greater zeal. And we are comforted by the hope that their number will increase, especially among those who believe. For it is an imperative of duty; it is a requirement of love. Every believer in this world of ours must be a spark of light, a center of love, a vivifying leaven amidst his fellow men: and he will be this all the more perfectly the more closely he lives in communion with God and in the intimacy of his own soul.

In fact, there can be no peace between men unless there is peace within each one of them: unless, that is each one builds up within himself the order wished by God. Hence St. Augustine asks: "Does your soul desire to overcome your lower inclinations? Let it be subject to Him who is on high and it will conquer the lower self: there will be peace in you; true, secure and well-ordered peace. In what does that order consist? God commands the soul; the soul commands the body; and there is nothing more orderly than this."[69]

The Prince of Peace

These words of ours which we have wished to dedicate to the problems that most beset the human family today and on the just solution of which the ordered progress of society depends, are dictated by a profound asipration which we know is shared by all men of good will: the consolidation of peace in the world.

As the humble and unworthy Vicar of Him Whom the prophet announced as the "Prince of Peace,"[70] we have the duty to expend all our energies in an effort to protect and strengthen this gift. However, peace will be but an empty-sounding word unless it is founded on the order which this present document has outlined in confident hope: an order founded on truth, built according to justice, vivified and integrated by charity, and put into practice in freedom.

This is such a noble and elevated task that human resources, even though inspired by the most praiseworthy good will, cannot bring it to realization alone. In order that human society may reflect as faithfully as possible the Kingdom of God, help from on high is necessary. For this reason, during these sacred days our supplication is raised with greater fervor toward Him who by His painful passion and death overcame sin—the root of discord and the source of sorrows and inequalities—and by His blood reconciled mankind to the Eternal Father; for He himself is our peace, He it is that hath made both one * * * and coming He announced the good tidings of peace to you who were afar off, and of peace to those who were near.[71]

And in the liturgy of these days we hear the announcement: Our Lord Jesus Christ, after His resurrection, stood in the midst of His disciples and said "Peace be to you", alleluia: the disciples rejoiced seeing the Lord.[72]

He leaves us peace, He brings us peace; "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give to you; not as the world gives do I give to you."[73] This is the peace which we implore of Him with the ardent yearning of our prayer.

May He banish from the hearts of men whatever might endanger peace, may He transform them into witnesses of truth, justice and brotherly love. May He enlighten the rulers of peoples so that in addition to their solicitude for the proper welfare of their citizens, they may guarantee and defend the great gift of peace; may He enkindle the wills of all, so that they may overcome the barriers that divide, cherish the bonds of mutual charity, understand others, and pardon those who have done them wrong; by virtue of His action, may all peoples of the earth become as brothers, and may the most longed-for peace blossom forth and reign always between them.

As a pledge of this peace, and with the ardent wish that it may shine forth on the Christian communities entrusted to your care, especially for the benefit of those who are most lowly and in the greatest need of help and defense, we are glad to impart to you, venerable brothers, to the priests both secular and religious, to the religious men and women and to the faithful of your dioceses, particularly to those who make every effort to put these exhortations of ours into practice, our apostolic blessing in propitiation of heavenly favors. Finally, upon all men of good will, to whom this encyclical letter is also addressed, we implore from Almight God health and prosperity.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's on Holy Thursday, the 11th day of April, in the year 1963, the fifth of our pontificate.

JOHN XXIII.

LIKE THE WORD OR NOT, THE RESULT IS APPEASEMENT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, some of the newspapers and the Kennedy apologists have been annoyed during the past week because the administration has been charged with appeasing the Communists. Well, we can only reach a decision as to what the President is doing by the results achieved. Whether or not we like to use the word appeasement, the result of Kennedy policies in Cuba, Laos, the nuclear test ban negotiations, is closely akin to appeasement.

It is time for the American people and Congress to face the facts of what is happening because of our confused, or total lack of a workable foreign policy. Looking at the record of the past 2 years we find that the Kennedy administration has been consistent in its failures. Under Kennedy policies Cuba has been lost and is now a solid beachead for communism in the Western Hemisphere. Kennedy policies have resulted in turmoil and confusion in every country in Latin America with Cuban-inspired subversion putting every government to the south of us in dire peril.

Following Kennedy policies we are fighting a war, which we refuse to call a war, in South Vietnam and American boys are dying there. A neutral Laos has been lost through a Kennedy program of insisting upon the establishment of a coalition government with the Communists. The Kennedy policy of backing down on demands for proper inspection in any test ban treaty has merely led Khrushchev to get tougher and to insist on even more unreasonable conditions.

In short the Kennedy administration cannot point to any notable success in its foreign policy. The one bright moment when we might have snatched a victory was following the President's brave sounding speech of last fall on Cuba, but once the election was over, our policy returned to one of drift and indecision and the advantage we held momentarially was lost.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic story of the Communist doublecross in Laos is just another in the long list of failures of the Kennedy administration. Evidently the President lacks total understanding of communism, its objectives, and its history.

---

[67] Ibid., p. 456; cf. Leonis XIII Epist. Encycl. Immortale Dei, Acta Leonis XIII, V, 1885, p. 128; Pii XI Litt. Encycl. Ubi Aracano, A.A.S. XIV, 1922, p. 698; et Pii XII Allocutio ad Delegatas Unionis Internationalis Sodalitatum mulierum catholicarum ob communem Conventum Romae coadunatas, habita die 11 mensis Septembris anno 1947, A.A.S. XXXIX, 1947, p. 486.

[68] Cf. Allocutio ad opifices ex Italiae dioecesibus Romae coadunatos, habita in festo Pentecostes, die 13 mensis Iunii anno 1943, A.A.S. XXXV, 1943, p. 175.

[69] Miscellanea Augustiniana * * * S. Augustini Sermones post Maurinos reperti, Roma, 1930, p. 633.

[70] Cf. Is. 9, 6.

[71] Eph. 2, 14–17.

[72] Resp. and Mat., in feria VI infra oct. Paschae.

[73] Io. 14, 27.

The President continues to try to make deals with Khrushchev in the interest of peace. Almost daily we are told of suggested compromises in order to win over the Russians—our protection of Castro from patriotic Cubans fighting to regain their freedom, our backdown on on-site inspections in the nuclear test ban talks, and the forcing of a coalition government on the freedom-loving people of Laos.

The President's backdown on Cuba is strengthening the Communist beachhead in the Western Hemisphere and threatening other Communist takeovers in Latin America. Our weak position in regard to on-site inspections in any nuclear ban treaty has resulted, even as late as this weekend, in further blustering demands by Khrushchev. Finally, our abandoning of a free Laos in favor of a coalition with the Communists has resulted in the usual classic doublecross by the Communists who ignore another treaty, establish a firm hold on another country and do it all on the money of the taxpayers of the United States.

Where are we headed as a result of the zigging and zagging of the Kennedy administration? Wherein lies the responsibility for continuing to follow a course which consistently results in failure? These are questions demanding an answer from the President.

The strange, unrealistic course of the Kennedy administration is ably discussed in an article from Barron's, issue of April 15, 1963, called "From Cuba to Laos," and I include it as a part of these remarks at this point.

The strange, unrealistic course of the Kennedy administration is set forth in three articles I would like to include as a part of these remarks at this point and to urge their careful study by every Member of this body. First, "A Doublecross for the United States in Laos" from the U.S. News & World Report of April 22. Second an article, "From Cuba to Laos" from Barron's, issue of April 15. Finally, an excerpt from the current, April 29 issue of U.S. News & World Report on the dangers threatening freedom and our security in the Caribbean because of the failure of the Kennedy administration to stop Communist aggression in Cuba.

A Doublecross for the United States in Laos

Communists have got things going their way in Laos. Spring flareup of fighting in a key area is only one of the signs.

It's a familiar Communist strategy: Make a deal, welch on it before the ink is dry, then turn it to their own advantage.

By agreeing to neutralize Laos, Reds kept what they had, added gains, and cut the ground out from under the United States.

Signs are increasing that the United States, trying to do business with the Communists, is being doublecrossed once again.

This time the doublecross is taking place in Laos. It has come barely 9 months after a formal agreement with the Communists to set up a neutral coalition Government—free of outside influence—in this highly strategic area of southeast Asia.

From the first, the Communists have violated that agreement.

In early April, fighting flared again when Communist forces attacked the town of Xiengkhouang in a move to tighten their hold on the crucial Plaines des Jarres in central Laos. Even before that flare-up occurred, however, the Reds—aided by North Vietnamese Communists in violation of last year's agreement—already had sealed off a big chunk of the country.

STRATEGIC POSITION

They are now in position to send forces and equipment along a Communist-held corridor in Laos to their guerrillas in South Vietnam, where the United States is heavily involved. Also, Communist infiltrators from Laos can move freely into Thailand at scores of points along the border to carry out subversion, and to arm and recruit agents.

It is becoming clear that, the longer the neutral coalition of government of Communists, anti-Communists, and neutralists exists, the stronger the Communist military forces become.

The coalition itself came about through a sharp switch in U.S. policy.

Early in his administration, President Kennedy threatened to use force to stop the Communist inroads in Laos. On March 15, 1961, he said, "We are determined to support the Government and the people of Laos in resisting" the Reds. Then, 8 days later, he told a news conference this:

"If there is to be a peaceful solution, there must be a cessation of the present armed attacks by externally supported Communists. If these attacks do not stop, those who support a truly neutral Laos will have to consider their response."

NOT SO EASY

It soon became evident, however, that the promise to check the Communists was easier to make than to fulfill. A cease-fire was announced in May of that year, but the Communist pressure continued.

In April of 1962, fighting broke out on a considerable scale. In May, the Communists—aided by thousands of troops from North Vietnam—engulfed whole areas of the country and chased thousands of Laotian Government troops across the border into Thailand.

The United States, as a countermove, sent American marines into Thailand. Hints were dropped of a direct attack on Communist North Vietnam if agression did not stop.

In the negotiations that followed, however, the United States seemed to change directions. Financial aid was withheld from the anti-Communist government of Laos to try to pressure it into a coalition with the Communists.

Averell Harriman, as chief diplomatic strategist for the United States advocated neutralizing Laos by getting the warring factions together in a government that included Communists in the cabinet. An agreement for such a government was signed in Geneva on July 23, 1962—and it quickly developed that the Communists had gotten exactly what they wanted: a voice in the central government and a firm grip on key areas.

BACK IN THE FRAY

On April 8, 1963, Mr. Harriman was sworn in as U.S. Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs. On that same date, the Communists renewed their offensive in Laos.

But long before that they had made it a practice to ignore any part of the peace agreement that got in their way.

The United States, for example, withdrew its troops from Thailand and halted military assistance to Laos. But the Communists disregarded the agreement and left thousands of North Vietnamese troops in the country. Russian promises to get them out have not been lived up to.

An international commission, set up to guarantee the neutrality of Laos, has been unable to function. Its members cannot get into many Communist-held areas.

There has been a series of political assassinations carried out by the Communists to weaken the neutralists, and thus strengthen Communist influence.

In November 1962, and again in January 1963, unarmed American supply planes were shot down while trying to fly relief supplies to non-Communists bottled up in Red-held territory.

Now the danger is that the Communists will be able to infiltrate formerly anti-Communist areas along the Mekong River while keeping their own zone tightly locked up.

What Western forces face is the collapse of the Laos formula for neutrality. Vietnamese and Laotian Communists actually have improved their position over what it was when the deal to neutralize the country was agreed to.

Despite sporadic fighting, political assassinations, and other harassing tactics, most experts on Asian affairs doubt that the Reds will launch an all-out military campaign at this juncture.

The reason: A military takeover would end the U.S. economic assistance on which the coalition depends. Also, it might bring American forces back into Thailand and result in stepped-up U.S. activity against the Communist guerrillas fighting in South Vietnam.

According to this theory, the Communists would gain little they don't have already by an all-out military assault.

Turncoat neutralists are being trained by Communist instructors from North Vietnam who stayed in Laos after the truce came. The anti-Communist forces, on the other hand, no longer are receiving U.S. training and equipment. The military muscle and spirit are eroding as their enemies grow stronger.

When Communist forces made their move in early April, the United States and other members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization decided on a show of strength. On April 9, they ordered extensive military maneuvers in Thailand and naval exercises in southeast Asian waters.

This decision obviously was intended to impress the Communists with the armed power that could be unleashed against them. But, in Asia, no one really expects the United States to intervene militarily if serious civil war should erupt again in Laos. As of now, it would be impossible for the United States to generate any substantial support inside the country.

One westerner long experienced in southeast Asia expressed it this way: "When the United States abandoned the anti-Communists and forced them into a coalition with the Reds it gave up all of its high cards. Now its only hope is to try to maintain a precarious neutrality and keep the coalition Government operating."

Western allies of the United States are beginning to have some second thoughts about the deal with the Communists to "neutralize" Laos.

British observers concede, for example, that over the long pull the Communists still are bent on taking all southeast Asia, and they see little prospect of checking them, the way things are going.

French sources are inclined to the view that the United States must be willing to take major risks to save what's left of southeast Asia. Otherwise, the Communists will go right on using subversion and guerrilla operations to rot away the foundations of non-Communist and anti-Communist government in the area.

In Laos itself, most western observers feel that the neutralists are finished as a military force. If the coalition holds together, the Reds will have a bigger voice in the Government from now on, and anti-Communist power gradually will be whittled away.

Once again, the Reds have used a deal with the West as a tool for doublecrossing the West. Strategic Laos, which stood up for years against Communist attackers with U.S. backing, now seems to be sliding into the Communist camp.

Landlocked Laos is "the stopper in the jug." If it goes, beyond its borders lie Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, South Vietnam—the whole of southeast Asia.

From Cuba to Laos: U.S. Foreign Policy Smacks of Appeasement

The Kennedy administration, as its most ardent critics must admit, has consistently displayed admirable skill in the use of words. Last week the President himself was in rare rhetorical form. After keeping the Nation in mounting suspense for 36 hours, Mr. Kennedy on Thursday snapped the tension—and sent the stock market skyrocketing—with one of the most adroitly phrased political pronouncements on record. While remaining firmly opposed to "across-the-board" increases in steel price, he stated, the powers that be are willing to accept "selective adjustments up or down, as prompted by changes in supply and demand." The day before the steel crisis, at a ceremony conferring honorary American citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill, the Chief Executive rose to the occasion no less nobly. In a glowing tribute to his new compatriot, the President said in part: "In the dark days and darker nights when England stood alone, he mobilized the English language and sent it into battle. Whenever and wherever tyranny threatened, he has always championed liberty."

In saluting the verbal prowess of Sir Winston, the President was speaking not merely as head of state but also as one professional to another. Since taking office John F. Kennedy more than once has sought to rally his countrymen with stirring calls to arms; at times he has succeeded in sounding almost Churchillian. Unfortunately, however, the resemblance ends right there. For in translating words into deeds, the Kennedy administration has acted not with the boldness of the great Prime Minister, but with the irresolution and timdity of his inglorious predecessor. In Latin America, southeast Asia, and in the heart of Europe, the White House, despite an occasional flash of spirit, has been pursuing a policy of appeasement. Day-by-day and step-by-step, in consequence, the Communist tyranny has gained ground; the forces of freedom, contrariwise, have been in steady retreat. In a desperate quest for "peace in our time," as the author of "Why England Slept" must know, Neville Chamberlain unwittingly paved the way for World War II. To prevent history from writing a catastrophic sequel, the President and his official family would do well to learn from it.

A prerequisite to learning, of course, is the willingness to face facts. On this score the White House and its advisers have proved sadly deficient. A case in point is Walt W. Rostow, a man whose global knowledge of economic and political affairs is matched only by his apparent lack of insight. In a far-ranging speech in Philadelphia recently on the cold war, Professor Rostow—who serves as counselor and chairman of the Policy Planning Council, Department of State—reported progress on all fronts. To be sure, he conceded, "none of the crises on the national agenda as of January 1961 has been finally and satisfactorily settled. The treaty arrangements in Laos remain precarious, still violated by the continued presence in that country of Vietminh units under the control of Hanoi. West Berlin stands firm, confident and prosperous, but the threat to its future remains. And evidently the crisis over Cuba is not at an end." Nonetheless, in a stunning nonsequitur he proceeded to conclude: "We have achieved something substantial in these 26 months: the momentum of Khrushchev's postsputnik offensive has been halted, and in the vast areas which have been threatened by it freemen breathe easier."

More dangerous nonsense would be hard to come by these days. Under the hapless leadership of the New Frontier, as even its stanch supporters now concede, the free world has suffered a dreary succession of defeats. Regarding Cuba, for example, William V. Shannon, Washington columnist for the leftwing New York Post, recently pulled no punches. "Two years ago," he observed last week, "a brave and active underground movement against Castro was spreading. Exiles in Florida were alive with hope for his early overthrow." Since then, however, their hopes have been dashed by one betrayal after another, from the Bay of Pigs to the incredible blockade imposed by the U.S. Coast Guard, not against the Communist regime in Havana, but against its mortal foes. Such perfidy now has led to the rupture of friendly ties between Washington and the Cubans in exile, a denouncement which, wrote Mr. Shannon scathingly, "Brings to a close a cycle of defeat, political ignorance and moral confusion. Everything has now been surrendered, including honor * * *."

In Laos, too, the once firm U.S. posture has developed a perilous sag. Until 1961 this country actively supported a regime in Vientiane which, despite its defects, was pro-Western and willing to resist the thrust of Communist aggression, launched years before by native Reds aided and abetted by North Vietnam and Red China. However, in the ill-founded hope of restoring peace to the embattled land, the Kennedy administration, through its roving Ambassador, W. Averell Harriman, began urging—and finally pressuring—its Laotian allies to form a coalition government with a neutralist group and the local Communist Pathet Lao. Last summer at an international conference the three factions signed an agreement which established such a troika government and demanded the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Laotian soil.

Describing the settlement as a calculated risk—Barron's chose at the time to call it a witless gamble—Washington promptly complied. The Reds did not. On the contrary they quickly set about demonstrating once again that every treaty with a Communist is an open invitation to trouble. The Pathet Lao first tried assassination—one of the trusted lieutenants of Kong Le, the misguided neutralist who originally launched the revolt, was murdered a few weeks ago. Next came subversion, a tactic revealed last month when a loyal Laotian soldier shot the Foreign Minister and denounced him as a traitor. Finally, in early April the Pathet Lao launched an unprovoked attack against the neutralist forces on the Plaine des Jarres, capturing several strongholds and other strategic real estate.

To the latest outburst of naked Communist aggression, the New Frontier reacted with its customary vigor. Even as his diplomatic handiwork was collapsing, Averell Harriman was promoted to Under Secretary of State. His boss, Dean Rusk, appealed for a cease-fire. And the SEATO Alliance, at U.S. behest, announced plans to stage an impressive show of force, not in Laos, where the shooting happens to be, but in neighboring Thailand, where freemen, Mr. Rostow to the contrary notwithstanding, today surely breathe easier.

"Don't worry, they're still 90 miles away," proclaims a satiric Republican car sticker. Evidently Washington hasn't gotten the message. Even as fighting broke out afresh in Laos, the White House was recording its elation over another dubious diplomatic stroke, the tentative agreement to set up a direct line to the Kremlin. Even as President Kennedy was eloquently hailing a now retired champion of freedom, the cause of freedom was suffering. Appeasement is an ugly word, and one which even Nelson Rockefeller, who sounds more like a party standard-bearer every day, backed away from last week. History has no such qualms. Unless the current disastrous course of events is reversed, there will be only one place in history for the Kennedy administration. And it won't be among the profiles in courage.

The Caribbean Area—Threatening Security

Watch the Caribbean area. Three more "Cubas" are a real threat there.

Danger signals are flying in Haiti, Dominican Republic, British Guiana.

Situations are very different in all three countries.

Net result could be the same—a race between Reds, anti-Reds for control.

In Haiti the dictatorship of Dr. François Duvalier faces the prospect of a sudden and violent end. Duvalier has virtually had to disarm Haiti's United States-trained army, source of several plots against him. The weapons have gone to Duvalier's militia and a motley crowd of gangsters called the Ton-ton Macoute.

The country is in frightful shape. Haiti has less trade now than it did in 1789. Tourist trade has collapsed. Business is dying off. Ninety percent of Haiti's people live in misery, squalor, and hunger.

Pro-Castro Communists work in Haiti's confused underground. Castro's Cuba is just 50 miles away across the Windward Passage. In the race to be touched off if Duvalier quits or is assassinated, Castro may start out ahead.

The Dominican Republic, after 30 years of the Trujillo dictatorship, is still in confusion. In the middle is Juan Bosch, the elected President in office since February. Bosch has cut the government budget, slashed government salaries. Question is whether Bosch will get the time to push through reforms.

Rivals aplenty are after Bosch's job. Police boss is Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert, an ambitious national hero who helped assassinate Trujillo. Dominican Army leaders, also ambitious, distrust Bosch as an ex-Communist. Communists are working underground or train in Cuba, backed by Castro.

There is a tradition of rule by force in the Dominican Republic. There is every expectation of more tries by would-be dictators sooner or later. Then, as when the Trujillos fell, Castro's Communists will push for power.

British Guiana appears to be splitting wide open along racial lines.

Premier Cheddi Jagan is a Communist. He leads Guiana's East Indians, brought in by the British as plantation workers.

In the opposition, Forbes Burnham leads Guiana's Negroes, mainly industrial workers. He is a Socialist and anti-Communist. Peter D'Aguiar, a right wing anti-Communist, leads Guiana's Europeans, mainly Portuguese.

It's a witches' brew of trouble. Jagan's Indians are outbreeding whites and blacks. The opposition riots to keep Britain from granting independence. Only a handful of British troops prevent a race war, a takeover by Reds.

In London, among British officials who once urged the United States to "try the neutralist solution" to save Laos, this is the grim look of southeast Asia:

Only U.S. armed force can save Laos now. Only alternative is to admit the collapse of the neutralist regime under Communist attack, to talk again.

Next deal with the Communists might mean the end of Laos, the slow collapse of Cambodia, then Thailand, finally South Vietnam.

Impression you get from the British these days is that it's really all gone anyhow, that, unless the United States is willing to go to war, there's not much that can be saved in

> southeast Asia. As for the British themselves, they appear to be willing to fight for nothing in southeast Asia north of Malaya, still a member of the British Commonwealth and rich in tin and rubber.

THE ADMINISTRATION OPPOSES EXPENDITURE REFORM

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a growing tendency on the part of administrative spokesmen in recent weeks to charge that those who seek some reduction in next year's budget are advocating a policy which would impair our national security, retard our space program, bring on a recession and, in general, cause hardship and suffering for our people.

It is regrettable, indeed, that the national economic debate on how best to strengthen our economy and provide jobs for the growing labor force should be reduced to an emotional and, in some cases, a demagogic level.

One of the most important leaders of the Democratic Party in Congress was quoted in the Washington Post of March 6 as asking whether Republicans plan to cut funds for veterans benefits, education, youth, "and mothers." The Democratic spokesman added, "if Republicans plan to come out against people, that is their privilege. They've done it before."

The President, himself, has aided and abetted the campaign. Those who question the wisdom of tax cuts, higher spending, and deeper budget deficits have been made to appear without human feeling and reckless with the Nation's security. In his press conference of March 6, President Kennedy said he wanted to know "whose life is going to be adversely affected" by the reductions in spending which had been suggested. Referring to the school lunch and the aid to dependent children programs, he asked:

> Are you going to cut those kind of programs which are essential to a better life for our people?

Continuing in the same manner, the President asked whether those who suggest budget cuts are going to take action which would make the United States "permanently second-best" in space and in national security.

The President also is in the forefront of those who claim that any cut in new spending authority or budget expenditures for fiscal 1964 would cause a recession. In a speech on March 13, he clearly said that a budget cut today would ultimately lead to another recession. According to the President, if the budget is cut, those who have honest doubts about the administration's unique and experimental fiscal policies will have to take the blame for any recession which might occur.

What a striking contrast there is between the President's attitude toward reductions in spending today and his attitude when he was a candidate for election. The day before the last Presidential election, he told a television audience—with pride—that—

> The fact of the matter is that the Democratic Congress, of which I am a member, in the last 6 years cut $12 billion off of the President's request.

In President Kennedy's eyes, a large reduction in the budget requests of the last administration was an act of wisdom and patriotism; today, attempts to reduce his own administration's rapidly rising level of spending, impairs the Nation's security and hurts people.

Mr. Speaker, there are many able and humanitarian men who are particularly well-informed in their special areas of competence who believe that the budget can be prudently trimmed. Many of them foresee advantages to the Nation from prudent and selective reductions in spending.

Basil O'Connor, former president of the American Red Cross and now President of the March of Dimes, has said that the Nation's medical research program is threatened by an over-abundance of Government grant money that is being spent wastefully and often on unsound projects. "The plethora of funds actually constitutes a positive threat to excellence," he said.

David E. Lilienthal, former Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has called upon the Government to abandon its support of atomic power development and reduce substantially its support of basic atomic research.

The Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, Senator DOUGLAS, has said in a committee press release of March 21 that over $3.4 billion annually can be saved in the Department of Defense alone. He said:

> All responsible studies in this area since our hearings in January 1960 (including 207 reports by the Government Accounting Office) show the possibilities of economies without hurting defense through better organization and management, such as Secretary McNamara is now instituting.

An American Farm Bureau Federation spokesman told the House Ways and Means Committee recently that his organization would recommend that $1 billion be cut from the funds the administration is requesting for farm price support operations and payments to farmers. While campaigning on television on November 7, 1960, President Kennedy said that $1 billion to $1.5 billion could be cut from expenditures for agriculture. At that time they were less than $6 billion, but in fiscal 1963, they will total $7.5 billion.

The Clay Committee, which was appointed by the President and which was composed of some of the Nation's most eminent and able men, said in its report on our foreign aid programs that "we are trying to do too much for too many too soon, that we are overextended in resources and undercompensated in results, and that no end of foreign aid is either in sight or in mind." The Committee said that if its program criteria were now in effect, "present programs would be reduced by approximately $500 million, and there would be additional reductions in the following years."

In his column of March 26, Walter Lippmann has termed the Clay committee's assessment of foreign aid "quite true," and has suggested that we should not try to give aid to the 95 countries and territories which are now receiving it and that we should instead focus our aid so that it is enough to do the job in key countries.

Even some of the administration's top spokesmen have recognized the need and the feasibility to cut back on some programs that have outlived their usefulness. Thus, Secretary of Commerce Hodges, before the Joint Economic Committee on January 30, in answer to a question as to whether there were older programs that could be cut back, answered, "I think this is a problem with all governments, and this included." He also said that if he had the discretion to make cuts in his Department where he wanted to make them, he could reduce the number of his employees by 10 percent without impairing the national interest.

Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, told the Joint Economic Committee on January 28 that "obviously there are points where Government spending is less efficient than some other points. We always have to be on the lookout for reallocation." While Dr. Heller went on to claim that this is what the administration has been doing, he left the clear impression—and I think the right one—that still more could be done.

A Democratic member of the Joint Economic Committee, Senator PROXMIRE of Wisconsin, has also put himself on record as to the possibility and the desirability of reducing spending in the areas of defense and space, which, he said at the committee's hearings on January 29, have become "sacred cows." He added, "they could all be reduced and I think we could make a stronger case in defense than in any other area and also make a very strong case in space."

Mr. Speaker, other statements of this kind by responsible people who care about their fellowmen and this Nation's security as much as anyone does could be cited. The desire to bring the rapidly rising level of Federal spending under better control is not a question of who is or is not humanitarian or who is or is not concerned with the Nation's security or space effect. Neither is it a partisan matter. Thoughtful individuals on both sides of the political fence agree on the need and the feasibility of expenditure control.

Recognizing this, the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee are seeking an objective and nonpartisan examination of Federal Expenditure policy. In our minority views to the Joint Economic Committee's 1963 Annual Report and in a letter to President Kennedy dated March 19, we urged the immediate establishment of a Presidential Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditures. We set forth clearly the objectives we believe such a Commission should seek. Combined with several other aproaches to expenditure control I believe that such a Commission could be most useful.

I ask unanimous consent that a number of newspaper clippings and other items relating to the quotations which I have cited above, as well as a copy of the letter to President Kennedy sent by the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee, be inserted in the Record at this point.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1963]

NIH Called Too Affluent by O'Connor

(By Harry Nelson)

La Jolla, Calif.—The Nation's medical research program is threatened by an overabundance of Government grant money that is being spent wastefully, often on unsound projects, the president of the March of Dimes charged tonight.

Basil O'Connor told a group of scientists that the uncritical generosity of Congress in appropriating enormous funds to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) promises to create a kind of nationalization of science.

He told the scientists, most of whom are recipients of Government grants, that they must make a realistic appraisal of the problem lest the "forced feeding" of medical research lead to a dependence on money instead of intelligence.

O'Connor spoke at a dinner held in conjunction with the third International Symposium on Immunopathology sponsored by the March of Dimes and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Stating that more than money is needed to promote genuine progress in scientific research and education, O'Connor said that logrolling and sheer waste which accompany ill-advised, massive Government appropriations could undermine public confidence in science.

He charged that NIH, the granting agency, more than once has had to "beat the bushes" to find researchers willing to accept huge amounts so that the money would not revert to the general fund at the end of the year.

Because there is so much money, he said, NIH has a less rigorous system for evaluating applications.

"The plethora of funds actually constitutes a positive threat to excellence," O'Connor said. "While in the past both thought and money were scarce, only thought is now scarce and the result is a tendency to spend rather than think."

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 12, 1963]

Lilienthal and the Atom

Lately we have been reading some lectures delivered at Princeton University by David E. Lilienthal, First Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Lilienthal thinks the Government should take a new look at this agency, now spending about $2.5 billion a year. AEC efforts to develop atomic energy—at low cost—for industrial use are not likely to succeed soon, are costly, and not necessary now—and when need for this energy does come he is sure private capital will meet the need.

He suggests that the "atoms for peace" program, involving research reactor equipment for "underdeveloped" countries is an "expensive showpiece" but meaningless and wasteful. These peoples much more need doctors, plows, seed, and "elementary" scientific instruction.

Mr. Lilienthal proposes a drastic reevaluation of the "peaceful" atom, based on "realistic" prospects for the immediate future.

What we take from the Lilienthal lectures is the necessity for our Government to review constantly its priorities—in the light of current events and knowledge. The atomic outlook of 1946 no longer is valid.

The taxpayers now are burdened with the staggering costs of defense and space exploration, both steadily on the rise—and any other programs which do not match these undertakings in importance well may be put aside, at least for the time being.

The general attitude here in Washington, when cuts in spending are proposed, is that you can't touch this, and you can't touch that. But every program can't be a sacred cow—and none, regardless of its priority, should be immune from the supreme test: Is it essential, in the light of everything else, to spend this dollar; and will it be well spent?

Mr. Lilienthal has lived with the atom a long time. His credentials for counsel are blue ribbon. He has taken a broad, visionary analysis of the problem; not the narrower view natural to a bureaucracy. He is at least logical, if not right—and Congress, looking for ways to balance the biggest budget of all time, ought to take advantage of his thinking.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1963]

Lilienthal Asks Halt in Atomic Power Plans

(By Howard Simons)

A call by David Lilienthal for the Government to abandon its support of atomic power development and to reduce substantially its support of basic atomic research has prompted a congressional committee to ask the Atomic Energy Commission to answer its critic.

Lilienthal, the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, challenged the AEC last month in a series of lectures at Princeton University. The theme of his lectures was that "the facts of the world of 1963 are in conflict with the way in which we think and deal with the atom, we should jettison and junk those outmoded ideas."

Lilienthal urged the Government to put "the atom into the mainstream of men's affairs" and not keep it artificially separate and apart, as Lilienthal views the present role of the atom in U.S. activities. To do this, Lilienthal suggested that the AEC, itself, might need drastic modification.

What aroused the interest of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy even more than these comments were Lilienthal's suggestions about continued Government support for civilian nuclear power and basic science as it relates to the atom.

The Joint Committee has championed Government support of both these programs.

As regards atomic power development, Lilienthal suggested the following as premises for 1963:

Energy from the atom is not now needed for civilian purposes.

At the time and place where it is needed it will be forthcoming without governmental prodding. If there is a real need it will be met by the utility and manufacturing industries, as it has been with the automobile, the diesel engine, the telephone, and so on, in response to proved economic need.

There is now no urgent fuel or power crisis and no prospect of one in the foreseeable future; when such a shortage develops, it will be taken care of by the atom if that is then the best alternative.

"Moreover," said Lilienthal, who resigned as Chairman of the AEC on February 15, 1950, the Government "should stop trying to force-feed atomic energy."

"Throw away the present discredited timetable." Don't abandon the hope for competitive power, he advised, but deal with it realistically.

The same approach, Lilienthal argued, should apply to the atom in basic science, in medicine, and agriculture, and industry. Funds and scientific manpower should be freed for other "starved" areas of research and development, such as biochemistry.

In effect, Lilienthal was saying just the opposite of what the AEC had reported to President Kennedy in November 1962, and what AEC officials told the Joint Committee in late February.

This was essentially that nuclear energy can and should make a vital contribution toward meeting the Nation's long-term energy requirements and that the proper role for the Government is to develop and to demonstrate the technology that will lead to a self-sustaining and growing nuclear power industry.

In short, where Lilienthal wants the AEC to get out of the nuclear power business, the AEC not only wants to remain in the atomic power business, but to increase its support of the Nation's nuclear power efforts.

Citing such "variances" between the AEC and Lilienthal, the Joint Committee, in an unpublished letter, has asked the AEC for its comments. The Joint Committee further asked the AEC to make its views of Lilienthal's views known before the resumption of its annual hearings on the state of the Nation's atomic energy industry.

These hearings continuing those held in February, will begin on April 2 and will be devoted largely to non-Government witnesses.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1963]

Cut Budget Before Tax, Farm Group Demands

The Nation's biggest farm organization said yesterday it would oppose a tax cut this year unless Congress makes a deeper cut in President Kennedy's spending plans than even Republicans are talking about.

The American Farm Bureau Federation told Congress it would favor cutting income taxes "if and when" the lawmakers slash $13.6 billion from the $107.9 billion in new spending authority sought by Mr. Kennedy.

The economy target set by House GOP leaders calls for a reduction of $10 billion in the new funds sought by the President.

The views of the farm federation were outlined by its secretary-treasurer, Roger Flemming, for the House Ways and Means Committee.

He said his organization would recommend that $1 billion be cut from the funds Mr. Kennedy wants for farm-price support operations and payments to farmers.

Flemming said "tax reduction is needed to improve the climate for economic growth" but "our past record of fiscal management in the Federal Government has not earned us a tax cut * * * the Federal Government has spent more than its revenue in 26 of the past 32 years."

Meanwhile, Postmaster General J. Edward Day joined the chorus of Cabinet officers calling for enactment of the President's tax proposals without offsetting budget cuts.

Day spoke out for the first time on the administration tax program before the traffic club here. He attacked "those who have been yelling loudest for budget cutting" while they "ask for large increases for some particular pet purposes."

Senator Douglas Announces Hearings of Subcommittee on Defense Procurement

Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, announced today that hearings will be held by the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement to review the progress that has been made since its last hearings. The committee is concerned both with improving the efficiency of defense procurement and service activities and their effect on the economy.

The Senator commented that "recent statements by the President, the Budget Director, Secretary McNamara, and others indicate that a cost reduction program of major proportions is underway that will ultimately save over $3.4 billion annually in the Department of Defense alone. These savings will stem from the success of the Defense Supply Agency, more competitive procurement, reducing gold-plating, reducing inventories, standardizing items, and streamlining other operations covered by previous hearings and reports of the subcommittee."

"Many of us have for years considered that savings of magnitude are possible and attainable," said Senator DOUGLAS. "This is especially true when one considers that Defense Department expenditures for fiscal year 1963 will be close to $50 billion and that it has property holdings of $165 billion, including $128 billion personal property of which $41 billion represents unissued stores inventory.

"Furthermore, all responsible studies in this area since our hearings in January 1960 (including 207 reports by the General Accounting Office) show the possibilities for economies without hurting defense through better organization and management such as Secretary McNamara is now instituting."

Senator DOUGLAS again emphasized that the subcommittee is interested in procurement, supply, and related service activities which consume such a large portion of the budget and have such a heavy impact upon the national and local economies and not with questions of military strategy, weapons, size of force, etc.

Members of the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement are: Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman; Senators JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York; and Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of Michigan; THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri; and WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 26, 1963]

THE CLAY REPORT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Clay report on foreign aid deals with an immense subject in a few pages. For that reason alone it will not furnish the general public, which includes most Members of Congress, with enough material for that serious reappraisal which has become so necessary.

The report mentions most of the questions which have to be asked, but what it gives are its answers and not the facts and the reasoning by which its conclusions were reached. As a result, the ordinary reader receives little more than a bundle of declarations as to what ought and ought not to be done. He gets little help toward an enlightened debate.

There is an explanation for this. The Committee which consists of 10 eminent men was appointed last December "to advise the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development." Quite evidently, that is exactly what it has done, and done, it appears, with profit to the administration. The report is not really a public document meant to clarify a public discussion. It is, so to speak, an interoffice memorandum for the insiders of the administration, and is no doubt highly significant and intelligible to those who have taken part in the conferences which are not reported in the report.

Because it is the kind of document it is, it will, I am afraid, provoke unfortunate reactions abroad. It is peppered with criticism which, because it is anonymous and not specific, could apply to some or all of the recipients of foreign aid. No country would be able to tell whether it is or is not being criticized. Furthermore, the report contains a sweeping criticism of all our allies, including Canada, for what they do or do not do in foreign aid.

I am sure that this was not the intention. But I do not think it is merely charitable to say that the Committee was so intensely concerned with advising the administration insiders that it did not realize what its report would sound like to the vast world of the outsiders.

If the report was to be a public document, and of course it had to be, it should not have declared only its conclusions. It should have argued them persuasively. In my view, this was entirely practicable since the main theme is sound.

Thus, it is quite true that "we are trying to do too much for too many too soon, that we are overextended in resources and under compensated in results, and that no end of foreign aid is either in sight or in mind." It follows, rightly enough, that we should not try to give aid to the 95 countries and territories which are now receiving it, and that we should, instead, focus our aid so that it is enough to do the job in key countries. We must find a way to stop diluting and diffusing it all over the globe. Let the bridges we have to build be fewer but let all of them cross the river.

The Committee is quite right, I believe, in advising the administration to let ex-colonial Africa depend chiefly on Europe for aid. And if I read between the lines correctly, it is asking the administration to concentrate aid for Asia, apart from the military subsidies, on India and Pakistan.

When it comes to Latin America the report shows little evidence of a serious knowledge of the actual problem of inducing the Latin peoples to emerge from their primitive past into the modern age. In fact there is a considerable ideological confusion in that the report seems to say that the only alternative to communism is the American form of private enterprise.

That is not true. There are many forms of a mixed economy—some of them very successful in Europe—which are quite different both from Soviet communism and American capitalism. Whether we like it or not, most Latin American countries are pointed toward one form or another of a mixed economy, and we should not give them the impression that we are incapable of understanding why they are pointing that way.

I feel I must say also that the report itself exemplifies one of the principal reasons why, though since 1946 this country has spent some $100 billion in foreign aid, it is so much disliked in so many places. A persistent theme is that we should be giving and withholding favors, which mean so much in human terms, in our own interest. There is in this an assumption of superiority which is abrasive in the kind of world we are living in—for the most part very poor and for the most part of some other color than white.

With our great wealth and power there should go humility, not pride. Thirty years ago this country had not only the respect and the trust but also the affection of the under-developed world. Yet it had no foreign aid program. Why? Because 30 years ago the country was struggling with its own desperate economic problems and with the rising menace of fascism. Because we had grave problems of our own, we were not proud and self-satisfied, and we gave the effect of being in the same boat with the rest of mankind. That was when we had friends all over the world.

We shall not have them again until this country becomes possessed once again, as it surely will when the political seasons change, in the high enterprise of making a good society.

EXCERPTS FROM JANUARY 1963 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—HEARINGS BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, JANUARY 30, 1963

Senator PROXMIRE. Are there any older programs that could be cut back?

Secretary HODGES. You put your finger on one of my favorite subjects that I probably won't need to discuss today. I think that is a problem with all governments, and this included. You never cut back old ones. That includes the Congress. But you always add new ones.

Senator PROXMIRE. Parkinson's law.

Chairman DOUGLAS. Mr. Secretary, there is a sort of an impish desire which takes hold of me at this moment. I have a vague memory that once you declared that you felt that the Department of Commerce could operate more effectively with 10 percent fewer employees. Is my memory at fault?

Secretary HODGES. No; you have the basic idea right. The exact quotation is not correct. I made the statement before an Appropriations Commitee. I have done it on several occasions. If the Congress will say, which they will not do, after asking them time and time again, will allow flexibility of appropriations where you could take old programs, tired blood, Mr. CURTIS, and cut them down or eliminate them or what not, and take that money and put it into things that are more modern and up to date such as civilian technology, the whole science of technology, that you could save 10 percent. I said that.

U.S. CONGRESS,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: In response to your recent invitation for a continuing dialog on the major economic issues before the Nation, we should like to set forth some of our observations on your proposed 1963 tax program and to offer a suggestion for expenditure control which we believe would contribute to sound and stable long-term economic growth.

While we recognize that knowledge of the sources of economic growth and the means of accelerating it are limited, it seems clear that well-conceived incentive tax reduction and reform is a major and necessary step toward improving upon our Nation's rate of economic growth. We have long supported tax reduction and reform as a high priority objective of our economic policy. However, it is also clear that such a program will involve costs as well as benefits. These costs must be weighed and, if possible, offset.

One cost will be budget deficits higher than those which would have been incurred without the tax cut. These would follow 3 years of steadily mounting deficits which have totaled more than $19 billion, or more than the net deficits of the previous 7 fiscal years combined. Some opinion holds that budget deficits need not concern us. We do not share this view.

The experience of the past suggests that it would be reckless to ignore the inflationary dangers posed by persistent and increasing deficits. The state of economic learning is neither so advanced nor so precise as to safely admit any other conclusion as a guide to policymaking. Sound long-term economic growth cannot be based upon a foundation of budget deficits. Furthermore, we cannot ignore the adverse effects such deficits could have on our continuing balance-of-payments problem and on the entire free world trade and payments system.

Recognition of the potential dangers of chronic budget deficits is implicit in your proposed tax program. As one of its objectives, the program seeks to bring the budget into balance by stimulating economic activity and thus increasing revenues.

We should not, however, pin all of our hopes for ending our chronic deficits on the possibility of rapidly rising tax revenues. It is clear that hard thought must be given to the other side of the ledger—to controlling rapidly increasing Federal expenditures.

We do not suggest an across-the-board cut in Federal spending. In view of the Nation's domestic needs and international and security commitments, such an approach would be self-defeating. What we should seek, however, is a reform of Federal expenditure policy so as to effect important savings without impairing the national interest or retarding economic growth. Indeed, thoughtful and selective control of Federal expenditures can increase our national security and stimulate our economic growth.

In view of these considerations, we believe that Federal expenditure policy requires thorough, objective, and nonpartisan examination. Support for the principle of tighter control and more effective use of Federal expenditures is virtually unanimous; support for specific suggestions for achieving it is more difficult to attain. The difficulty of the task, however, should not deter us from making the attempt.

In our separate minority and additional views to the Joint Economic Committee's 1963 Annual Report, we made several specific suggestions which we believe offer a sound basis for a reform of Federal expenditure policy. At this time, we wish to call one of these recommendations to your attention and ask that you give it your serious consideration.

As an essential step to a reform of Federal expenditure policy, we suggest that you appoint a Presidential Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditures, composed of private citizens from business, labor, education, the professions and Members of Congress equally from both parties. The work of this Commission, assisted by a staff, should parallel the 3-year period over which your tax program is scheduled to take effect. During this period, the Commission should conduct studies and periodically make public its recommendations in the following areas:

(a) Establishment of spending priorities among Federal programs, separating the desirable from those that are essential in order to serve as a guide to the administration in drawing up the budget, particularly in years of expected deficits.

(b) Appraisal of Federal activities in order to identify those programs which tend to retard economic growth and for which expenditures should be reduced or eliminated.

(c) Improvement of the Federal budgeting and appropriations process in order to increase the effective control of expenditures.

(d) Examination of responsibilities and functions which are now assumed by the Federal Government, but which could be better performed and with superior effectiveness by the private economy.

(e) Review of Federal responsibility and functions in order to determine which could be better performed at the State and local levels.

(f) Improvement of Government organization and procedures in order to increase efficiency and promote savings, including a review of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in order to determine how those already implemented have worked out in practice and whether those not yet implemented should be given further consideration.

(g) Determination of policies with regard to the level of user charges and fees to be made for special services furnished to members of the public by the Government.

The recommendations of an objective and nonpartisan Commission of this kind described should command widespread support among the public and within the Congress. Its proposals would offer a sound basis upon which to begin the reform of Federal expenditure policy.

In view of the relevance which expenditure control has for the success of a tax reduction and reform program, we earnestly hope you will give this recommendation your early and favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Thomas B. Curtis.
Clarence E. Kilburn.
William B. Widnall.
Jacob K. Javits.
Jack R. Miller.
Len B. Jordan.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Broyhill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess I spent the entire time touring the 11 counties of the 9th District of North Carolina, talking to the people and finding out what they think about the problems facing our Government. I believe it is the duty and the responsibility of a Congressman to go to the people he is representing and not sit back and wait for them to come to him.

The people gave freely of their opinions and of their views concerning legislation and governmental affairs. Perhaps it was because it was around April 15, the Federal income tax deadline that I received such a volume of comments about the huge cost of Federal Government and the need for more fiscal responsibility in Washington. I found that the people of my district, regardless of political affiliation, are demanding less spending and are worried about the future financial solvency of our country. They believe that money from Washington is not a free handout or manna from Heaven. They know its cost and are concerned about the huge national debt, deficit financing, and what this means to our children to whom we are leaving a tremendous burden of financial obligation.

Because I was visiting the district near the Federal tax deadline of April 15, people were naturally interested in the tax bill and were very aware of high Federal income tax. They are very aware that they work a good part of the year, not for themselves, but for the Federal Government. They are very conscious of the continued growth in Federal Government employment and are beginning to speak up and speak out against the continuing burden of huge Federal payrolls on the backs of the taxpayers.

I have read with interest an editorial by WRAL–TV, channel 5, Raleigh, N.C., the fact that Tax Freedom Day will begin at 1:05 p.m. today, Monday, April 22. The average American taxpayer has been working all year, not for himself and his family, but for the government—Federal, State, and local. All the money the average taxpayer has earned up until 1:05 p.m. today will be equivalent to the amount of money he will have to pay in taxes for the year 1963.

I commend this editorial to the membership of the House.

The withholding system of income taxations is, we suppose, with us forever now that it has been installed by both the Federal and State governments. It would be next to impossible to reverse in either case. Just the same, citizens ought not to be misled by its deceptiveness.

We noticed a few months ago an interesting experiment in psychology conducted, as we recall, by an employer out in Missouri. For several months he had been paying his employees in cash all of their salaries. He deducted nothing for taxes. Instead, he required each employee to step immediately to the next window and pay the taxes that normally would have been withheld.

By the time the second payday had rolled around, he noticed a remarkable increase in the interest shown by his employees in governmental affairs, especially Government spending. By the end of the second month, he said, his employees were writing to their Congressman and Senators, demanding that Government spending be cut.

This is more than just a dramatic lesson in practical civics. It is a demonstration that most citizens are inclined to overlook the huge tax bite that is regularly taken from their paychecks.

Some time later we ran across an item describing how another employer had accomplished the same purpose in a different way. Instead of making regular weekly deductions, he paid all of his employees their full salaries for the first 3 weeks of each month. Then, at the end of the fourth week, he deducted the taxes for all 4 weeks. This meant, of course, that most of the employees received, at most, only a few dollars for their week's work. Some did not come out even that well—they owed the company.

These employees also developed a healthy interest in governmental affairs.

We wish that all employers would adopt one of these systems, just to see what the effect would be. At the very least, we wish that all citizens could somehow be made aware of a nationwide observance of what is called "Tax Freedom Day." The observance is coming later each year because of the increasing burden of taxation.

This year, Tax Freedom Day will begin at 1:05 p.m. on Monday, April 22. That should be easy to remember because it is 1 week after the filing deadline for income tax returns. As of 1:05 p.m. on April 22 the average American taxpayer will begin, for the first time in 1963, to work for himself and his family. Ever since January 1, he has been working for the government—Federal, State, and local. All the money the average taxpayer has earned up until 1:05 p.m. on April 22 will be equivalent to the amount of money he will have to pay in taxes for the year 1963.

According to statistical surveys, the first 2 hours and 26 minutes of your 8-hour workday is spent to earn money to pay your taxes. This is 2 hours and 26 minutes, every workday, all year long.

This brings to mind again the fact that the Federal income tax law is just 50 years old. Prior to 1913, there was no such thing as an income tax. In 1894, the Congress passed an income tax law, but the Supreme Court knocked it down as unconstitutional. A member of the Supreme

Court, Mr. Justice Stephen J. Field, warned against giving the Government such a power to tax the income of its people. Said Mr. Justice Field: "It will be but the steppingstone to other governmental powers, larger and more sweeping, until our political contests will become a war of who can spend and tax the most; a war constantly growing in intensity and bitterness."

Who will deny that Mr. Justice Field's prophecy has come true? And, by the way, the income tax that the Supreme Court killed in 1894 was a mere 2 percent levy on all income over $4,000 per year, without any graduated increase at all. Nobody foresaw top rates like those now in effect—91 percent on personal income and 52 percent on corporations.

Cuts in taxation cannot be made sensibly without cuts in Government spending. The spending is the key. Every citizen owes it to himself to take note of Tax Freedom Day which begins at 1:05 o'clock on the afternoon of April 22.

TIMBER INDUSTRY IN NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Broyhill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the timber industry in North Carolina and the South has made tremendous strides. The South in former years was an underdeveloped area of our country, but in the last few years great changes have been taking place. It is significant that the great timber resources in the South have played an important role in the development of new industry and increased income for our local citizens.

In addition, private industry has taken the lead in promoting conservation and planting programs and have been ever conscious that these important forest resources should be not only utilized but that landowners should be encouraged to do even more to increase the supply of these resources.

Up until this time, timber landowners have been given additional incentive under the Internal Revenue Code by being able to apply capital gains tax treatment on certain sales of timber, but now the Secretary of Treasury proposes to change these tax laws and in effect breaking faith with those who have participated in reforestation and conservation projects.

The North Carolina General Assembly recently passed a joint resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I wish to call to the attention of the House the resolution as follows:

Joint Resolution Petitioning the Congress of the United States To Defeat and Reject the Extreme and Harmful Changes in Timber Taxation Proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury

Whereas capital gains tax treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code has been the major factor responsible for the vast progress of North Carolina in forest management and the growth of forest resources during the past half century; and

Whereas the substantial elimination of capital gains treatment for the owners of forest lands would constitute the most severe setback in this generation to the growth of forest products; and

Whereas the jobs of thousands of employees and many hundreds of communities are affected by the forest industries of North Carolina and are jeopardized by the proposed elimination of capital gains treatment of timber; and

Whereas there have been large sums of private and public money invested in reforestation for timber production and soil and water conservation; and

Whereas the proposed change in the income tax law would break faith with those participating in such programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, the house of representatives concurring:

Section 1. That the legislators of the State of North Carolina petition the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on February 6, 1963.

Sec. 2. This resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 12th day of April 1963.

T. Clarence Stone,
President of the Senate.
H. Clifton Blue,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, yesterday marked the beginning of another National Library Week. I would like to say a few words this afternoon on this topic about which enough can never be said. I refer to the wonderful world of books and the continuing growth of the mind through the free use of libraries in the United States.

Libraries all over the country will this week display various exhibitions and stress the great importance of reading. The freedom-to-read, Mr. Speaker, is one of the great freedoms the human being possesses. On this week particularly, I recall the many great libraries that exist in the First District of Massachusetts, one of the Nation's great areas of academic accomplishment. From the beautiful Berkshire hills of Pittsfield to the great urban city of Holyoke, citizens of my district daily take advantage of our great libraries. In a city like Northampton, for example, the Calvin Coolidge Room attracts visitors from all over the Nation at the great Forbes library. In Amherst, at the Jones library, we have the finest collection of Robert Frost material extant and on and on.

I could name libraries for almost every community. I have visited most of them and have been greatly impressed. This week then, Mr. Speaker, is a great historic week not only in my district but in the entire Nation. I want to take this opportunity to salute National Library Week and hope that we will continue to be a Nation of readers every week of every year.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 5733, ADMINISTRATION BILL TO AUTHORIZE FUNDS FOR NATIONWIDE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous material and the text of H.R. 5733.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 5733, the Kennedy administration bill to authorize funds for a nationwide food stamp program similar to the program now in operation on a pilot basis in 31 of our cities and counties.

I have battled for such a nationwide program for 9 years, since introducing my first bill on this subject in the second session, my first term in Congress. The issue came to a vote several times; and in 1959, Congress, for the first time, agreed to the idea of a food stamp plan. I shall never forget the help I received at that time from so many of the Members of the House, including the present Speaker, and including particularly, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina, Harold D. Cooley.

Thus, I was deeply touched and most grateful when the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman Cooley, deferred to me in the matter of sponsorship of this administration measure, which normally would carry his name as the chairman of the committee which will consider it. It is one of the most flattering things which has ever occurred to me in the House—that a committee chairman would so gallantly step aside to allow a Member not even on his committee to introduce what I am sure will be one of the most popular of the Kennedy administration measures to be acted upon in this Congress.

WHY A NEW BILL IS NEEDED

Let me explain why a bill is necessary. The legislation we passed in 1959 would have provided authority for only 2 years for a program which consisted of distributing only those foods found by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus in any 1 month. This authority was never used by the previous administration.

The Kennedy administration is operating the present pilot food stamp projects, which include all domestic foods sold in grocery stores, under the general authority of section 32, of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, using money earmarked from customs receipts for removal from the market of surplus agricultural commodities. If the food stamp plan were to be permanently limited in scope only to a size which could be financed entirely by section 32 money, there would be no need for additional fund authorizations.

But to extend the plan nationally would take all of the money now provided for each year under section 32—money used now for a variety of surplus removal programs. There would then be no section 32 funds left over for school lunch purposes, or removal of surplus perishables on an emergency basis.

Thus, new enabling legislation is necessary to authorize appropriation of the full amount of funds needed to extend the food stamp plan nationally. This is estimated to cost about $360 million a year, although much of this cost would be offset by savings elsewhere in the Department budget. If this bill becomes law, funds would then be appropriated in the regular departmental appropriation bill each year for the food stamp plan rather than be drawn, as now, out of section 32 money.

SUPERIORITY OVER DIRECT DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

Over a period of years, I tried to persuade the Eisenhower administration to adopt the food stamp method of distribution of surplus food to the needy, through the regular grocery stores, in preference to the direct method of distribution which resulted in so much expense to local communities participating, so little help to the needy, and so many opportunities for abuse. But the previous administration insisted the food stamp approach was terribly wrong, and less efficient, and more costly, and not nearly as effective as the direct method of distribution. The former Secretary of Agriculture flatly refused to consider a food stamp method of distribution, even after Congress, in 1959, passed my bill as an amendment to Public Law 480, authorizing, for 2 years, a limited program which would have been restricted to just those foods determined by the Secretary to be in surplus in any month.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud as a member of President Kennedy's party that his first Executive order on becoming President was to order a better method of distribution of surplus foods to the needy, and addition of a greater variety of foodstuffs to the distribution list each month—more of the foods which would have been included under the food stamp program passed by Congress. Shortly thereafter he agreed to ask the Secretary of Agriculture to institute a series of pilot food stamp operations to determine if a food stamp plan were feasible and more effective than the direct distribution programs.

The success of the pilot plan operations has been outstanding. It is true that in every new area where the plan has been instituted—including my own city of St. Louis—many problems arose in connection with the certification of eligibles, and the requirements instituted by the Secretary of Agriculture for purchase by recipients of food stamps equal in value to their normal expenditures for food, in order to receive additional stamps free.

Many of those eligible for participation complained that the requirements on stamp purchases were far too rigid, and did not take into consideration unusually high costs for individual families, such as rent, medical expenses, and so on. I am pleased to report that these problems are being worked out—I hope satisfactorily for all concerned—and if there is still too much rigidity in the regulations, they can be further improved and amended.

NOT A DISGUISED INCREASE IN INCOME

The food stamp plan has come as something of an unhappy development for those who had hoped it would make available to them more money out of their limited incomes to spend on things other than food. As the Department of Agriculture has tried to make clear, the plan is, by law, a method of increasing food consumption among those families not enjoying an adequate diet, and cannot be used as a device for enabling welfare recipients to use for other purposes some of the money they would normally spend for food. I think the welfare allowances in many areas of the country, including Missouri, are far too low to permit families to maintain even minimum standards, but this problem cannot be solved through a food stamp plan, or even by providing free food.

On the other hand, since we have these simply huge surpluses of food items which overhang the agricultural economy and depress prices, and which cost the Government as much as a billion dollars a year to store and billions of dollars in price supports each year, it is simply indefensible to have any of this food go to waste while we have underfed and undernourished Americans. Every American deserves a decent diet. This plan enables our needy to obtain good, balanced diets.

The food stamp plan has been a tremendous success in every area of the country where it has been in effect long enough for local problems to be worked out and special adjustments made. And, as Secretary of Agriculture has reported, in a letter to the Speaker which I am including as part of my remarks today, this plan on a national basis would not only raise standards of nutrition, and improve diets, and sell more food—aiding every level of the food industry—but would, to a large extent, pay for itself in reducing costs which the Government now must sustain in food storage, and in the direct distribution program.

COMMUNITIES ACTIVELY SEEKING PLAN'S EXTENSION

I am also submitting, as part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, a list of the 31 areas where pilot food stamp programs are now in operation; and another list—9 pages long—of the counties and local communities which are actively seeking to have the food stamp program extended to their areas. This is perhaps the best evidence of all the superiority of the food stamp plan over the direct distribution method.

Many areas of the country, which are not depressed areas and do not have sufficiently large numbers of unemployed to justify the expenses of participating in the direct distribution system, nevertheless do have many needy people who need help in obtaining an adequate diet, and who could be included at little local expense if there were a food stamp plan in operation. The food stamp plan can reach needy Americans wherever they live—in their home communities. The direct distribution system cannot and does not.

EVERYONE BENEFITS UNDER A STAMP PLAN

Hence, the way to assure the sharing of our abundance of food to all needy Americans is through such a plan, operating through the neighborhood grocery store, and open to any and all Americans who can qualify under the income limitations, and who are willing to do their part by voluntarily earmarking a reasonable part of their own budgets for food purchases, in order to qualify for the extra stamps which will assure them a well-rounded, nourishing, and attractive variety of foods.

The farmer will benefit both by selling more food, and by having more of the section 32 money available for surplus removal emergencies; the Government will save on farm price support and food storage costs, our municipalities will save substantially in the costs they now must underwrite for surplus food distribution, and the recipients, who will benefit most, will be able to obtain all of their food needs in the nearby stores, rather than have to go miles to a central depot for bulky gift packages of the few items available once each month.

I urge prompt action by the Committee on Agriculture on this bill.

LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN

Mr. Speaker, I now submit as part of my remarks a copy of the letter sent by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman to our Speaker, in forwarding to the House of Representatives the draft of proposed legislation which I have now introduced as H.R. 5733. The Secretary's letter to the Speaker is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 17, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft of a proposed bill which authorizes the operation of a food stamp program.

The submission of this proposed bill is a result of experience gained by this Department in the operation of a series of pilot food stamp programs. These pilot operations were inaugurated in mid-1961 at the request of the President and were conducted under the authority of Section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, as amended. Currently, the program is being further tested in a total of 31 separate areas under a wide variety of operating conditions. Additional areas have been designated for inclusion later this fiscal year. A series of studies designed to determine the impact of the program on family food purchases have been made or are underway. Furthermore, administrative and operating techniques are being tested and evaluated so as to provide the Department with the experience necessary to effectively operate the type of program provided in the proposed bill.

The Department recommends favorable action on this proposed bill.

The food stamp program is designed to strengthen the agricultural economy, help achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundance, and to improve levels of nutrition among those households in economic need. These purposes are achieved by increasing the limited food buying ability of such households. The program will be operated through normal channels of trade.

Under such a program, needy households are provided with an opportunity to purchase—at a charge that is equivalent to the amounts of money they could normally be expected to spend for food—an allotment of coupons of higher monetary value. The Federal Government finances the cost of the coupons which are provided free of charge. The purchase of coupons by participating households is designed to insure that the additional coupons provided free of charge to such households actually results in increased food purchases through normal trade channels.

Coupons issued to participating households may be used by them only to purchase food out of regular commercial supplies at retail food stores. Coupons accepted by such stores are redeemed through wholesale food concerns or directly through banks. The proposed bill also provides for the undertaking of an educational program to encourage participating households to purchase foods available in abundant supply and those most needed in diets.

Studies conducted by this Department during the pilot program indicate that a food stamp program is practicable in terms of its administrative and operating aspects and is effective in expanding food markets and in improving the diets of participating households.

A survey conducted in a sample of retail food stores in the eight original pilot programs showed that the dollar volume of food sales increased by 8 percent after the inauguration of the food stamp program. The stores included in this survey represented an estimated 50 to 85 percent of total retail food store sales in all of the original eight pilot areas except Detroit. There, the survey stores were drawn from low-income areas of the city. Meats, produce, and other grocery items shared in the increase in food sales and the smaller retail stores were able to attract a reasonable proportion of the coupon business.

A second survey undertaken in two of the original pilot areas showed that households participating in the pilot food stamp program made significant increases in food purchases and in the total value of food used after they started to participate in the pilot food stamp program. This information was collected through a detailed investigation of food consumption among a representative sample of households in April–May of 1961, before the inauguration of the pilot food stamp program, and in September–October of that year when the pilot program had been in operation for some time.

Animal products—such as meat, poultry, fish, milk, and eggs—and fruits and vegetables accounted for more than 80 percent of these gains in the value of food used. These are the foods most needed for dietary improvement and a shift of more of our agricultural resources into the production of such foods would help to strengthen the agricultural economy.

This survey also showed that a food stamp program is especially effective in providing assurance that the Federal contribution (in the form of the coupons provided free of charge to eligible households) actually resulted in an increase in food purchases by participating households. A special analysis of the data derived from this survey showed that approximately 85 to 95 percent of the Federal contribution to participating households was reflected in increased food purchases in retail stores. This level of effectiveness is considered to be about the maximum to be expected under any program designed to expand markets for food.

These two household food consumption surveys also showed that there was a substantial improvement in the quality of diets among households participating in the program. From nearly two-fifths to almost one-half of these households had good diets in September-October under the food stamp program. Only slightly more than one-fourth of these households had good diets in April-May before the food stamp program was inaugurated.

It is clear that farmers have a definite stake in any program which expands markets and results in increased food sales, even though no one program can be relied upon to strengthen our agricultural economy. A food stamp program appears to be an effective way of increasing total food consumption by economically needy households and in concentrating these increases in animal products and fruits and vegetables. Increases in markets for these foods will help to relieve the general problem of overcapacity in agriculture. Particularly, increased markets for animal products would use more feed grains and, thus, a food stamp program could make an important contribution to the total effort to bring our feed grain supplies into balance with demand.

The proposed bill to authorize a food stamp program would provide for the gradual extension of such a program to those political subdivisions in which the various States wish to conduct such a program. The distribution of federally owned foods to needy households would be discontinued in those subdivisions participating in the food stamp program but such distribution would continue to be made to eligible schools and institutions in those areas.

It is not contemplated that the food stamp program would be restricted to designated areas of economic distress because it is designed to improve diets of needy households wherever they may reside. However, as indicated by our experience under the donation of federally owned foods to needy families, we anticipate that many political subdivisions would not feel the need to participate in the program. Therefore, we estimate that, with a continuation of current economic conditions, the program could be reaching approximately 4 million needy persons within a period of 5 years following the passage of this bill. By that time, it is also estimated that the cost of the food stamp program would be approximately $360 million a year, exclusive of Federal administrative expenses. Such costs would be offset in substantial part by the discontinuance of Federal food donations to needy households in political subdivisions participating in the food stamp program and would tend to reduce the total nationwide cost of this direct distribution program. Also, in accordance with the requirements of Public Law 801, 84th Congress, there is enclosed a table showing estimates of man-years of civilian employment, expenditures for personal services, and expenditures for all other purposes.

Recommendations for the implementation of this program would be made within the framework of the annual budget and fiscal policies of the President.

There is also enclosed a detailed section-by-section analysis of the proposed bill which describes the type of program to be operated and the manner in which it will be conducted.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

A similar letter is being sent to the President of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

TEXT OF H.R. 5733

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of H.R. 5733, the provisions of which are referred to in the Secretary's letter above:

[88th Cong., 1st sess.]

H.R. 5733

(In the House of Representatives, April 22, 1963; Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.)

A bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Food Stamp Act of 1963."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, in order to promote the general welfare, that the Nation's abundance of food should be utilized to the maximum extent practicable to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's population and raise levels of nutrition among economically needy households. The Congress hereby finds that increased utilization of foods in establishing and maintaining adequate national levels of nutrition will tend to cause the distribution in a beneficial manner of our agricultural abundances and will strengthen our agricultural economy, as well as result in more orderly marketing and distribution of food. To effectuate the policy of Congress and the purposes of this Act, a food stamp program, which will permit those households in economic need to receive a greater share of the Nation's food abundance, is herein authorized.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) The term "food" means any food or food product for human consumption other than alcoholic beverages and tobacco.

(c) The term "coupon" means any coupon, stamp, or type of certificate issued pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(d) The term "coupon allotment" means the total value of coupons to be issued to a household during each month or other time period.

(e) The term "household" shall mean a group of related or nonrelated individuals, who are not residents of an institution or boarding house, but are living as one economic unit sharing common cooking facilities and for whom food is customarily purchased in common. The term "household" shall also mean a single individual living alone who has cooking facilities and who purchases and prepares food for home consumption.

(f) The term "retail food store" means an establishment, including a recognized department thereof, or a house-to-house trade route which sells food to households for home consumption.

(g) The term "wholesale food concern" means an establishment which sells food to retail food stores for resale to households.

(h) The term "State agency" means the agency of the State government which has responsibility for the administration of the Federally-aided public assistance programs.

(i) The term "bank" means member or nonmember banks of the Federal Reserve System.

(j) The term "State" means the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

(k) The term "food stamp program" means any program promulgated pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary shall formulate and administer a food stamp program under which eligible households shall be provided with an opportunity more nearly to obtain a nutritionally adequate diet through the issuance to them of a coupon allotment which shall have a greater monetary value than their normal expenditures for food as determined by the Secretary. The coupons so received by such households shall be used only to purchase food from retail food stores which have been approved for participation in the food stamp program. Coupons issued and used as provided in this Act shall be redeemable at face value by the Secretary through the facilities of the Treasury of the United States.

(b) The Secretary shall, from time to time, issue such regulations, not inconsistent with this Act, as he deems necessary or appropriate for the effective and efficient administration of the food stamp program.

ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS

Sec. 5. (a) Households eligible to participate in the food stamp program shall be those whose economic status is such as to be a substantial limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet.

(b) Each State shall establish standards to determine the eligibility of applicant households which standards, among other things, shall take into account such of the factors used by each State in granting assistance under the federally aided public assistance programs as the Secretary determines will tend to effectuate the purposes of the food stamp program. The standards of eligibility to be used by each State for the food stamp program shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary.

ISSUANCE AND USE OF COUPONS

Sec. 6. (a) The Secretary shall cause coupons to be printed in such denominations as he may determine, and shall make provision for their issuance only to households which have been duly certified as eligible to participate in the food stamp program.

(b) Coupons issued to eligible households shall be used by them only to purchase food in retail food stores which have been approved for participation in the food stamp program.

VALUE OF THE COUPON ALLOTMENT AND CHARGES TO BE MADE

Sec. 7. (a) The face value of the coupon allotment which the Secretary shall authorize State agencies to issue to households certified as eligible to participate in the food stamp program shall be in such amount as will provide such households with an opportunity more nearly to obtain a nutritionally adequate diet.

(b) Households shall be charged such portion of the face value of the coupon allotment issued to them as the Secretary determines is equivalent to their normal expenditures for food.

(c) The value of the coupon allotment provided to any eligible household which is in excess of the amount charged such households for such allotment shall not be considered to be income or resources for any purpose under any Federal or State laws including but not limited to, laws relating to taxation, welfare, and public assistance programs.

(d) Funds derived from the charges made for the coupon allotment shall be promptly deposited in a manner prescribed by the Secretary in the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, in a separate account maintained in the Treasury of the United States for such purpose. Such deposits shall be available, without limitation to fiscal years, for the redemption of coupons.

APPROVAL OF RETAIL FOOD STORES AND WHOLESALE FOOD CONCERNS

Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary shall provide in the regulations issued pursuant to this Act for the submission of applications for approval by retail food stores and wholesale food concerns which desire to participate in the food stamp program and shall approve those applicants whose participation he determines will effectuate the purposes of the food stamp program. In determining the qualifications of applicants the Secretary shall consider, among such other factors as he may deem appropriate, the following: (1) the nature and extent of the retail or wholesale food business conducted by the applicant; (2) the volume of coupon business which may reasonably be expected to be conducted by the applicant retail food store or wholesale food concern; and (3) the business integrity and reputation of the applicant. Approval of an applicant shall be evidenced by the issuance to such applicant of a nontransferable certificate of approval.

(b) The Secretary shall in the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, require an applicant retail food store or wholesale food concern to submit information which will enable him to determine whether such applicant qualifies, or continues to qualify, for approval under the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act. The Secretary shall provide in the regulations issued pursuant to this Act for safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information obtained under the authority granted by this subsection to purposes directly connected with administration and enforcement of the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act.

(c) Any retail food store or wholesale food concern which has failed upon application to receive the approval of the Secretary to participate in the food stamp program may obtain a hearing on such refusal as provided in section 13 of this Act.

REDEMPTION OF COUPONS

Sec. 9. In the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, the Secretary shall provide for the redemption of coupons accepted by retail food stores through approved wholesale food concerns or through banks, with the cooperation of the Treasury Department.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 10. (a) In the formulation and administration of the food stamp program, the Secretary is authorized to enlist the cooperation of existing Federal, State, local or private agencies and may utilize such agencies in the undertaking of an educational program to encourage the purchase of foods available in abundant supply or those most needed in diets, and to improve nutritional knowledge of households participating in the program.

(b) The Secretary may exercise any power, duty, or discretion vested in him under this Act through such person or persons as he may designate.

(c) The State agency of each participating State shall assume responsibility for the certification of applicant households and for the issuance of coupons: *Provided*, That the State agency may, subject to approval by the Secretary, delegate its responsibility in connection with the issuance of coupons to another agency of the State government. There shall be kept such records as the Secretary may determine are necessary for him to ascertain whether the program is being conducted in compliance with the provisions of this Act and the regulations issued pursuant to this Act. Such records shall be available for inspection and audit by the Secretary at any reasonable time and shall be preserved for such period of time, not in excess of three years, as the Secretary determines is necessary or appropriate.

(d) In the administration of the food stamp program the State agency shall not discriminate against any household by reason of race, religious creed, national origin or political beliefs.

(e) Participating States or participating political subdivisions thereof shall not decrease welfare grants or other similar aid extended to any person or persons as a consequence of such person's or persons' participation in benefits made available under the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act.

(f) The State agency of each State desiring to participate in the food stamp program shall submit for the approval of the Secretary a plan of operation specifying the manner in which such program will be conducted within the State, the political subdivisions within the State in which the State desires to conduct the program, and the effective dates of participation by each such political subdivision. In addition, such plan of operation shall provide, among such other provisions as the Secretary may by regulation require, the following: (1) the specific standards to be used in determining the eligibility of applicant household; (2) that the State agency shall undertake the certifications of applicant households in accordance with the general procedures and personnel standards used by them in the certification of applicants for benefits under the federally aided public assistance programs; (3) safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information obtained from applicant households to persons directly connected with the administration or enforcement of the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act; and (4) for the submission of such reports and other information as the Secretary may from time to time require.

(a) If the Secretary determines that in the administration of the program there is a failure by a State agency to comply substantially with the provisions of this Act, or with the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, or with the State plan of operation, the Secretary shall inform such State agency of such failure and shall allow the State agency a reasonable period of time for the correction of such failure. Upon the expiration of such period, the Secretary may require that there be no further issuance of coupons in the political subdivisions where such failure has occurred until such time as corrective action satisfactory to the Secretary has been taken.

DISQUALIFICATION OF RETAIL FOOD STORES AND WHOLESALE FOOD CONCERNS

Sec. 11. Any approved retail food store or wholesale food concern may be disqualified from further participation in the food stamp program, on a finding by the Secretary that such store or concern has violated any of the provisions of this Act, or of the regulations issued pursuant to this Act. Such disqualification shall be for such period of time as the Secretary may determine. The action of disqualification shall be subject to review as provided in section 13 of this Act. *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any of the other provisions of this section or of section 13 of this Act, if the Secretary has reason to believe that a serious or flagrant violation of this Act or of the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, has occurred or that there are facts or circumstances of a nature which indicate a lack of ability or willingness on the part of such store or concern to carry out properly the provisions of the program, he may suspend such store or concern without advance notice or hearing for such period, not in excess of 90 days, as may be required to complete an investigation and take such administrative action as may be found appropriate by the Secretary. Such suspension action shall not constitute a final determination for the purpose of section 13 of this Act.

DETERMINATION AND DISPOSITION OF CLAIMS

SEC. 12. The Secretary shall have the power to determine the amount of and settle and adjust any claim and to compromise or deny all or part of any such claim or claims arising under the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 13. Whenever the Secretary (a) determines that a retail food store or a wholesale food concern should not be approved to participate in the food stamp program, (b) disqualifies a retail food store or a wholesale food concern under the provisions of section 11 of this Act, or (c) directs the denial, under the provisions of section 12 of this Act, of all or part of any claim of a retail food store or wholesale food concern, he shall cause notice of such administrative action to be issued to the retail food store or wholesale food concern involved. Such notice shall be delivered by certified mail or personal service. If such store or concern is aggrieved by the action of the Secretary, it may, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary, within ten days of the date of delivery of such notice, file a written request for an opportunity to submit information in support of its position to such person or persons as the Secretary may designate. If such a request is not made or if such store or concern fails to submit information in support of its position after filing a request, the administrative determination of the Secretary shall be final. If such a request is made by such store or concern, such information as may be submitted by the store or concern, as well as such other information as may be available to the Secretary, shall be reviewed by the person or persons designated by the Secretary, who shall, subject to the right of judicial review hereinafter provided, make a determination which shall be final. If the store or concern feels aggrieved by such final determination of the person or persons designated by the Secretary he may obtain judicial review thereof, without regard to the amount in controversy, by filing a complaint against the United States in the United States District Court for the District in which he resides or is engaged in business within thirty days after the date of delivery or service of the final notice of determination upon him, requesting the court to set aside such determination. Service of process in such action shall be made in accordance with the rules for the service of process upon the United States as prescribed by the Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts. The copy of the summons and complaint required to be delivered to the official or agency whose order is being attached shall be sent to the Secretary or such person or persons as he may designate to receive service of process. The action in the United States District Court shall be a trial de novo by the Court without a jury, in which the Court shall determine the validity of the questioned administrative action in issue. If the Court determines that such administrative action is invalid it shall enter such judgment or order as it determines is in accordance with the law and the evidence. During the pendency of such judicial review, or any appeal therefrom, the administrative action under review shall be and remain in full force and effect, unless on application to the Court on not less than 10 days notice, and after hearing thereon and a showing of irreparable injury, the Court temporarily stays such administrative action pending disposition of such trial or appeal.

VIOLATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 14. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, the Secretary may provide for the issuance or presentment for redemption of coupons to such person or persons, and at such times and in such manner, as he deems necessary or appropriate to protect the interests of the United States or to insure enforcement of the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act.

(b) In addition to the jurisdiction vested in the United States District Courts by section 13 of this Act, such courts are hereby severally vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce, and to prevent and restrain any person from violating, the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act. If and when the Secretary shall so request, it shall be the duty of the several United States Attorneys in their respective districts, acting under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings to enforce the remedies provided for in this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, to represent the United States in any action for judicial review of any final administrative determination made under the provisions of section 13 of this Act, or to effect collection of any claims or indebtedness determined to be due the United States by the Secretary under the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act.

(c) Whoever knowingly uses, transfers, acquires or possesses coupons in any manner not authorized by this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act shall, if such coupons are of the value of $100 or more, be guilty of a felony and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both, or, if such coupons are of a value of less than $100, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

(d) Whoever presents, or causes to be presented, coupons for payment or redemption of the value of $100 or more, knowing the same to have been received, transferred or used in any manner in violation of the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act shall be guilty of a felony and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, or, if such coupons are of a value of less than $100, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

(e) Coupons issued pursuant to this Act shall be deemed to be obligations of the United States within the meaning of title 18, United States Code, section 8.

PAYMENTS TO STATE AGENCIES

SEC. 15. The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with the formula specified in this section, to make payments to State agencies for the purpose of reimbursing such agencies for part of the costs incurred in the certification of those households which are not receiving benefits under the federally aided public assistance programs. The amount of such payment to any one State agency shall be 50 per centum of the sum of: (1) the direct salary costs (including the cost of such fringe benefits as are normally paid to its personnel by the State agency) of the personnel used to make such interviews and such postinterview field investigations as are necessary to certify the eligibility of such households, and of the immediate supervisor of such personnel, for such periods of time as they are employed in certifying the eligibility of such households; (2) travel and related costs incurred by such personnel in postinterview field investigations of such households; and (3) an amount not to exceed 25 per centum of the costs computed under (1) and (2) above.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 16. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such portion of any such appropriation as may be required to pay for the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments shall be transferred to and made a part of the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act.

(b) In any fiscal year, the Secretary shall limit the value of those coupons issued which is in excess of the value of coupons for which households are charged, to an amount which is not in excess of the portion of the appropriation for such fiscal year which is transferred to the separate account under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) If the Secretary determines that any of the funds in the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act are no longer required to carry out the provisions of this Act, such portion of such funds shall be paid into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 5733

Mr. Speaker, in his letter above, the Secretary of Agriculture referred to the section-by-section analysis of a draft of legislation he was submitting for introduction in the House to authorize funds for a nationwide food stamp program. The analysis referred to is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED BILL, THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1963

SECTION 2

This section declares it to be the policy of Congress to make maximum use of our abundance of food to improve the health and well-being of the Nation's population. It finds that the operation of a stamp program, as one part of our national food and agricultural program, will help maintain adequate levels of nutrition, strengthen our agricultural economy, and result in a more orderly marketing of food.

SECTION 3

This section of the proposed bill provides definitions for the purposes of a Food Stamp Act.

For purposes of such an act, food would be defined as any food for human consumption and all such foods would be eligible for purchase with food coupons (subsec. b). To avoid any misunderstanding as to intent, however, the wording of the subsection specifically excludes alcoholic beverages and tobacco as coming within the meaning of this definition of food.

The section defines the term "State agency" as the agency of the State government which has responsibility for the administration of the federally aided public assistance programs. The term "State agency" is intended to include the State and local offices of that agency or, in those States where the federally aided public assistance programs are administered on a decentralized basis, the counterpart county or local agencies which have responsibility for the administration of such assistance programs. Under section 10 of the bill, these States agencies are required to assume responsibility for the certification of households making application for the program.

Subsection (j) of this section defines "State" as the 50 States and the District of Columbia. In view of the intent to provide for a gradual expansion of the food stamp program over a period of years, it is recommended that action authorizing the possible operation of the program in any of the territories or possessions be held for later review and decision by the Congress.

SECTION 4

A general description of the type of food stamp program authorized by this bill is included in section 4. The type of stamp program described is the type which has been tested on a pilot basis by the Department of Agriculture since mid-1961 under the authority of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended.

This section also would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue regulations governing the operation of a food stamp program.

SECTION 5

This section of the bill limits eligibility for the program to economically needy households, i.e., those households whose economic status is a substantial limiting factor in their ability to attain an adequate diet.

The section further provides that States shall establish specific eligibility standards which will measure the economic need of applicant households, taking into account the general standards and other factors they use in providing welfare assistance to needy persons and households. However, all such standards must be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture to insure they will effectuate the purposes of the food stamp program.

SECTION 6

Under the authority of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture would provide for the printing of food coupons and their issuance to eligible households. Under the pilot food stamp program, coupons have been printed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department and it is intended that this arrangement be continued if this enabling legislation is authorized by the Congress.

This section also limits the use of coupons to the purchase of food in retail food stores which have been approved to accept such coupons.

SECTION 7

Section 7 of the bill specifically provides that eligible households shall be charged for a portion of the coupons provided to them. Such charges shall be based upon the household's normal expenditures for food. In return, the household will receive some coupons free of charge and in this manner, they are able to buy more food.

The stamp program is specifically designed as a food program. It is not intended to act as a general income supplement to low-income households. Its purpose is to permit these needy households to buy more food and to improve the nutritional quality of their diets rather than to help them to save on their food expenditures. It is for this reason that participating households are required to exchange the amount of money they normally could be expected to spend for food for coupons of equal value before they are provided with additional coupons free of charge.

This section also provides that the coupons provided free of charge are not to be considered to be income to the households for purposes of the Social Security Act and other Federal and State statutes. This provision is deemed necessary to make certain that additional food purchasing power provided to needy households under a stamp program does not automatically result in a reduction in benefits under programs where income determines the availability or amount of such benefits. Likewise, the value of free coupons would not be subject to income taxes.

A separate food stamp account would be established in the Treasury of the United States. All sums collected from participating households would be deposited in this separate account and would be available to redeem the coupons accepted by retail food stores. Section 16 of the bill would authorize a transfer of funds, out of each annual appropriation for the program, to this same account to provide funds for the redemption of those coupons which are issued free of charge to participating households.

SECTION 8

This section of the bill specifies the procedures and conditions under which retail food stores and wholesale food concerns would make application to the Department of Agriculture for approval to accept food coupons. Approved retailers would obtain such coupons in payment for food purchased by participating households. These retailers could redeem coupons through the commercial banking system or they could redeem coupons through the approved wholesale food concerns.

Any information which the retailer or wholesaler would be required to provide the Department on the volume of his business could be utilized by the Department only for purposes directly connected with the administration and enforcement of this act and regulations. Administrative and judicial review is provided in the event that the Department fails to approve the application of any retailer or wholesaler.

SECTION 9

This section of the bill specifically authorizes the use of the commercial banking system to redeem food coupons.

It is the intent of this section of the bill to provide for the same system of coupon redemption that is currently being used under the pilot food stamp program. Authorized retailers and wholesalers redeem coupons through commercial banks. These banks then redeem the coupons through Federal Reserve banks, which, under the provisions of section 15 of the Federal Reserve Act, are acting as fiscal agents of the Department of Agriculture. Federal Reserve banks examine coupons for genuineness, destroy the coupons, and call upon funds in a Treasury account to reimburse them for the value of coupons received from commercial banks.

SECTION 10

This section of the bill is concerned with legislative provisions for the administration of a food stamp program. Under it, the State agency responsible for the administration of the federally aided public assistance programs would assume responsibility for the certification of applicant households. That same agency would assume responsibility for the sale and issuance of food coupons, unless it was mutually agreed that coupon issuance responsibilities could be more effectively carried out by another agency of the State government. In either event, it would be possible for the State agency to contract with local government agencies, or with banks, for the actual sale and issuance of the food coupons.

The general administrative arrangement between the Department of Agriculture and the State public assistance agency would be the same as that used in the operation of the pilot food stamp program, which was patterned after that authorized in the Social Security Act. State agencies would submit for approval a plan of operation which would commit them to observe the requirements of the enabling legislation and the provisions of the Federal food stamp regulations. As well, the plans would specify the manner in which each State would carry out its certification and issuance responsibilities.

This section would further require that the State public assistance agency carry out its certification responsibilities under the same general procedures and merit system personnel standards as are required of such agencies by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the administration of the federally aided public assistance programs. Within political subdivisions within each State, the certification responsibility would be carried out by the local offices of the State public assistance agency, or in those States where the federally aided public assistance programs are operated on a decentralized basis, by the counterpart local assistance agencies which now administer such federally aided programs.

While this section provides that the State public assistance agency assume full responsibility for the certification of applicant households, it is not the intent to preclude the possible use of casework information and records on the economic status of households which has been developed by other public agencies that are responsible for the granting of general assistance or relief.

This section further provides that, where necessary, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide a State agency with reasonable opportunity to institute any necessary program or administrative corrective measures to bring its food stamp operations into compliance with Federal requirements, before the benefits of the food stamp program are withheld from eligible needy households within the State.

SECTION 11

Under this section of the bill, the Department of Agriculture has authority to disqualify from further participation in the program those retailers and wholesalers who have been found to be in violation of program requirements. Such disqualifications are subject to both administrative and judicial review under the provisions of section 13 of the bill.

SECTION 12

This section provides the Secretary of Agriculture with the power to settle claims arising out of the operation of a food stamp program.

SECTION 13

Section 13 specifies the administrative and judicial reviews available to a retail food store or a wholesale food concern in the event (a) the store or concern has failed to receive the approval of the Department to accept food coupons; (b) it is disqualified from further participation under the provisions of section 11 of this bill; or (c) it is denied a payment of a claim under the provisions of section 12.

Judicial review can be obtained through U.S. district courts.

SECTION 14

This section of the proposed legislation permits the Secretary to incorporate appropriate provisions in the Federal program regulations for the issuance or redemption of coupons at such times and in such manner as he may find necessary to protect the interest of the United States, and to facilitate enforcement of the provisions of the proposed Act and the Federal regulations.

Jurisdiction is conferred on the U.S. district courts to enforce the proposed act or the program regulations. The U.S. attorneys, acting under the direction of the Attorney General, are authorized to represent the Government, at the request of the Secretary, in any legal proceedings instituted in the several district courts under the proposed act.

Subsections (c) and (d) of this section impose criminal sanctions for violations of the proposed act and the Federal program regulations. The section also provides that coupons shall be deemed to be obligations of the United States within the meaning of title 18, United States Code, section 8, thus making applicable to food coupons all existing statutes relating to offenses involving obligations of the United States.

SECTION 15

To insure careful and effective certification of the eligibility of those households which are not receiving benefits under the federally aided public assistance programs, it is deemed necessary and in the interest of the Federal Government to assist State agencies in meeting a part of the cost of certifying such households for the food stamp program.

The amount of such payments will be computed under a formula which is prescribed in this section of the bill. The formula provides for arbitrarily computing the payment by taking 50 percent of the sum of (1) the salary costs of those caseworkers who are employed in the certification of nonassistance households and of the immediate supervisors of such caseworkers; (2) the travel costs incurred by these employees in field investigations of applicant households; and (3) an amount equal to 25 percent of the costs incurred in (1) and (2) above.

SECTION 16

This section of the bill authorizes an annual appropriation to carry out the provisions of the bill. The annual appropriation would be used to cover (1) all program costs, such as the value of coupons issued free of charge to households, related costs in the printing and shipment of coupons, and the payments to States authorized by section 15 of this bill; and (2) Federal administrative expenses.

Additionally, this section gives clear direction to the Secretary that the annual appropriation for the program is the basic factor which determines its size and scope and determines the rate at which it can be extended to those areas where the inauguration of such a program is warranted and requested by State agencies. Further, this section authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to terminate the separate food stamp account maintained in the Treasury of the United States if such action is deemed necessary and appropriate at some future date.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE—FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Estimated maximum average annual positions of civilian employment and fund requirements

	Fiscal year—				
	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
A. Average annual positions of civilian employment:					
1. Administrative support	19.7	48.7	71.3	88.3	97.1
2. Executive direction [1]	.1	.5	.5	.5	.5
3. Program functions	135.2	405.8	663.2	836.2	887.4
4. Total, average annual positions	[2] 155.0	455.0	[3] 735.0	[3] 925.0	[3] 985.0
B. Obligations:					
1. Personnel compensation	$1,050,000	$3,500,000	[3] $5,670,000	[3] $7,140,000	[3] $7,560,000
2. All other items	50,450,000	126,500,000	227,430,000	303,060,000	363,240,000
3. Total obligations	[2] 51,500,000	130,000,000	233,100,000	310,200,000	370,800,000

[1] Reflects portion of the time of those now performing this function that would be applied to this program.

[2] Reflects estimated cost for the pilot areas expected to be in operation by July 1, 1963, for which the 1964 budget proposes financing from sec. 32 funds until a direct appropriation is available.

[3] Would be offset in part through some reduction in direct distribution program.

AREAS WHICH NOW HAVE, WILL SOON HAVE, OR ACTIVELY SEEK TO HAVE FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS ESTABLISHED

Mr. Speaker, in preparing H.R. 5733 for introduction, I asked the Department for a full list of all of those areas of the country where the food stamp plan is in operation, or soon to be in operation, or where the States, counties, or municipalities have requested it. This list is as follows:

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM AREAS

ORIGINAL PILOT AREAS

County and State and date of opening

Franklin County, Ill., July 10, 1961.
Floyd County, Ky., June 1, 1961.
City of Detroit, Mich., July 5, 1961.
Parts of St. Louis and Itasca Counties, Minn., June 5, 1961, June 7, 1961.
Silver Bow County, Mont., June 1, 1961.
San Miguel County, N. Mex., June 5, 1961.
Fayette County, Pa., June 1, 1961.
McDowell County, W. Va., May 29, 1961.

ADDITIONAL AREAS DESIGNATED AND NOW OPERATING

County and State and date of opening

Jefferson County, Ala., March 11, 1963.
Independence County, Ark., April 2, 1963.
Humboldt County, Calif., March 1, 1963.
Vanderburgh County, Ind., April 1, 1963.
Knott County, Ky., December 3, 1962.
Perry County, Ky., March 4, 1963.
Avoyelles Parish, La., March 1, 1963.
Evangeline Parish, La., January 7, 1963.
Carlton County, Minn., March 4, 1963.
Remainder of St. Louis and Itasca Counties, Minn., November 1962.
City of St. Louis, Mo., January 2, 1963.
Nash County, N.C., November 1962.
Lucas County, Ohio, December 3, 1962.
Multnomah County, Oreg., December 3, 1962.
City of Pittsburgh, Pa., March 1, 1963.
Cambria County, Pa., March 1, 1963.
Luzerne County, Pa., October 1, 1962.
Dickenson County, Va., March 4, 1963.
Lee County, Va., March 5, 1963.
Wise County, Va., February 1, 1963.
Logan County, W. Va., November 1962.
Mingo County, W. Va., November 1962.
Wayne County, W. Va., November 1962.
Douglas County, Wis., November 1962.
Iron County, Wis., March 1, 1963.

ADDITIONAL AREAS DESIGNATED BUT NOT YET OPEN

County and State and probable starting date

Walker County, Ala., May 6, 1963.
Rice County, Kans., June 2, 1963.
Mora County, N. Mex., June 2, 1963.
Santa Fe County, N. Mex., June 2, 1963.
Cuyahoga County, Ohio, May 2, 1963.
Grundy County, Tenn., June 3, 1963.
Hamilton County, Tenn., June 3, 1963.
Marion County, Tenn., June 3, 1963.
Sequatchie County, Tenn., June 3, 1963.
Grays Harbor County, Wash., June 1 or later.
Pacific County, Wash., June 1 or later.
Yakima County, Wash., June 1 or later.

LOCAL REQUESTS, FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Source of request and specific area requested

Alabama

Judge Cargile; Fayette County.
C. H. Jackson, manager, Chamber of Commerce, Florence, Ala.; Lauderdale County.
William F. Baker, O. K. Wholesale Grocery Co., Montgomery, Ala.; Lauderdale County.
Milton Durrett, Alabama Food Council, Montgomery, Ala.; Lauderdale County.
J. I. Burnett; Etowah County.
B. H. Hall, chamber of commerce; Covington County.
J. L. Channell, mayor, city of Opp, Ala.; Covington County.
Clarence Weeks, national sales manager, Sessions Co., Inc., Enterprise, Ala.; statewide.

Arkansas

Sam Corder, Forrest City, Ark.; St. Francis County.
Walter E. Webb., secretary, Helena-West Chamber of Commerce, Helena, Ark.; statewide.

Colorado

Fred Sawaya; Castilla County, Huerfano County, Las Animas County.

District of Columbia

District of Columbia Commissioners, Rogers-Wilkins Milling Co., Washington, D.C.; District.

Georgia

Wholesale Grocers Association; statewide.
Ellsworth Hall, county attorney, Macon, Ga.; Bibb County.
William F. Pendleton, A. S. Pendleton Co., Valdosta, Ga.; Lowndes, County.
Emmett Snellgroye, county clerk, Bibb County.

Illinois

Gale Williams, State representative, Illinois State General Assembly; Alexander, Pulaski, Union, Jackman, Monroe, Randolph Counties.
Ralph Bradley, office of Gov. Otto Korner; city of Chicago.

Indiana

Robert P. Butler, Indiana Labor Commission; St. Joseph County.

Kentucky

Judge A. M. Bell; Owsley County.
C. A. Wolfe; Martin County.
Judge Cam Smith, Harlan, Ky.; Harlan County.
Judge Tom Carter, Grayson, Ky.; Carter County.
Judge Clyde Sayer; Magoffin County.
Judge Charles Porter; Elliott County.
Judge James E. Phipps; Morgan County.
Judge James M. Caudill; Letcher County.
Judge Sam P. Deaton; Breathitt County.
Judge W. C. Flannery; Rowan County.
Judge Jess Slusher; Bell County.
Judge Acey Cornett; Harlan County.

Louisiana

Iberia Parish police jury; Iberia Parish.
Lafayette Parish Chamber of Commerce, Lafayette Parish police jury; Lafayette Parish.
Franklin Parish police jury; Franklin Parish.
Jackson Parish police jury; Jackson Parish.
Vernon Parish police jury, Civitan Club; Vernon Parish.
Calcasieu Parish jury; Calcasieu Parish.
Jefferson Davis Parish police jury; Jefferson Davis Parish.
Livingston Parish police jury; Livingston Parish.
St. Landry Parish police jury; St. Landry Parish.
St. Mary Parish police jury; St. Mary Parish.
St. James Parish police jury; St. James Parish.

Maine

Stanley J. Bernard, Portland; Cumberland County.
Mr. Barron, director, public welfare department; Cumberland County.

Maryland

Gov. J. Millard Tawes; statewide.
W. F. Strong, AFL–CIO; statewide.
Robert Baker, administrative assistant, commission, Somerset County; Somerset County.
Oliver W. Singleton, regional director, AFL–CIO (western Maryland); Allegany County.

Michigan

Clarence Minkin, AFL–CIO; Gogebic County.
Joseph Snyder, councilman; Macomb County.

Minnesota

John H. Zimmer, secretary, Association of Food Dealers; statewide.

Director, department of public welfare; Pine County.

Director, department of public welfare; Lake County.

Frank Borig; statewide.

George Teller, United Steel Workers; statewide.

Wayne Alsop, county auditor; Beltrami County.

R. J. McMullen, director, department of public welfare; Clay County.

L. H. Furcht, director, department of public welfare; Lake of the Woods County.

Becker County Welfare Department; Becker County.

R. J. Nelson, chairman, county department of public welfare; Becker County.

Roger Headley, director, department of public welfare; Beltrami County.

John S. Brazzell, director, department of public welfare; Cass County.

James Steck, director, department of public welfare; Clearwater-Mahnomen Counties.

Mr. Charles E. Henstead; Crow Wing County.

Director, department of public welfare; Hubbard County.

Harry Hoehne, director, department of public welfare; Lake County.

Mississippi

F. A. Jackson, president, county board of commissioners, Charleston, Miss.; Tallahatchie County.

Robert G. Geoffrey, manager, chamber of commerce, Vicksburg; Warren County.

Missouri

Sam L. Hunter, president, chamber of commerce, New Madrid; New Madrid County.

Harold James, court clerk, Pemiscot County court, Caruthersville, Mo.; Pemiscot County.

Evans Baker, president, New Madrid Merchants Association; New Madrid.

New Jersey

Hon. Arthus J. Holland, mayor, city of Trenton, Trenton, N.J.; city of Trenton.

New York

Harold Kearnye; Kings County.

William J. O'Brien, assistant to commissioner, department of public welfare, White Plains, N.Y.; Westchester County.

North Carolina

Dr. Ellen Winston, commissioner, State board of public welfare, Raleigh, N.C.; statewide.

Hon. Terry Sanford, Governor, State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N.C.; Mecklenberg County.

Melvin Holmes, county accountant, Northampton County, Jackson, N.C.; Northampton County.

O. L. Moore, Jr., Laurenburg newspaper; Scotland County.

North Dakota

Arco Josephson, Bismarck-Mandan Trades and Labor, Assembly, AFL–CIO, Bismarck, N. Dak.

Gottfried J. Kuhn, Benson County Board of Commissioners, Minnewauken, N. Dak.; Benson County.

O. A. Parks, secretary, Bottineau Chamber of Commerce; Bottineau.

Ohio

George W. Lawrence, director, Huron Public Welfare Department, Norwalk, Ohio; Huron.

Nelson Smith, director, Pike County Department of Welfare; Pike County.

Bernard Ribley, president, local No. 1211, UAW–CIO, Lima, Ohio; statewide.

Verne O. Woolf, secretary, local 105, UAW, Wapakoneta, Ohio; statewide.

Arthur K. Fagan, local 128, UAW, Troy, Ohio; statewide.

Dennis R. Ulita, local UAW, Lima, Ohio; statewide.

Southwest Ohio Food Dealers; Hamilton County.

Oklahoma

Jack Thompson; Okmulgee County.

Oregon

Harold E. Carlson, Independent Retail Grocers Association; statewide.

Claude Ballard, vice president, International Woodworkers of America; statewide.

W. R. Litzenberger; Coos County.

Mrs. Betty M. Hall, administrator, county public welfare committee; Lincoln County.

Miss Jeane Jewett, State welfare commission, Portland, Oreg.; Multnomah County.

Ray E. Doerner, county commissioner; Douglas County.

Pennsylvania

Andrew S. Romito, city solicitor, Arnold, Pa.; Westmoreland County.

Fred W. Lamberton, chairman, Erie County commissioner; Erie County.

Fred Rhoads, chairman, Clearfield County Board of Commissioners; Clearfield County.

R. N. Cary, manager, Economy Wholesale Grocery; Centre County.

Walter A. Sanker, Altoona Association; Centre County, Blair County.

John W. Gardner, chief clerk, board of county commissioners; Blair County.

Tennessee

Mr. Walter R. Johnson, Nashville, Tenn.; statewide.

Cohen Turner Williams, president, Martha White Mills, Inc., Nashville, Tenn.; Davidson County (Nashville).

George Burke, Dixie Savings Stores; Hamilton County.

R. S. Horner, Brownsville, Tenn.; Haywood County.

Malcolm Dixon, Brownsville, Tenn.; Haywood County.

R. E. Sharp, Knox County.

Terry Williams; Shelby County.

Judge Beverly Briley; Davidson County.

Texas

Judge James C. Alvis; Haskell County.

Frank Ferres, Harlingen, Tex.; Cameron County.

Judge Davey; Cameron County.

Vermont

Cornwin E. Elwell, town manager, Brattleboro; Windham County.

Washington

R. A. Campbell, executive director, Washington State Food Dealers Association; Yakima County.

Hon. S. R. Holcomb, chief clerk, House of Representatives, Olympia, Wash.; statewide.

West Virginia

State Representative Halliday; Fayette County.

J. Flint Greene; statewide.

Earl Miller; Boone County.

Paul E. Hampton, Huntington; Cabell County.

John P. Broderick, president, Martha White Mills, Inc., Huntington, W. Va.; Cabell County.

J. D. Cutlip, Webster Springs; Webster County.

Retail grocers, Elkins; Randolph County.

Wisconsin

John S. Patton, director, welfare department; Douglas County.

John R. Lynch, director, county board of supervisors; Douglas County.

Chairman, board, department of public welfare; Ashland County.

County officials; Dane County.

J. E. Baldwin, director, Milwaukee County Department of Public Welfare; Milwaukee County.

Glen E. Ehle, director, Price County Department of Public Welfare; Price County.

John H. Lubbers, director, Waupaca County Department of Public Welfare; Waupaca County.

Leo T. Jelinkke, director, County Department of Public Welfare; Shawano County.

Eugene Raddatz, department of public welfare; Menominee County.

HOW THE FOOD STAMP PLAN HAS OPERATED—AND WHAT IT HAS MEANT IN TERMS OF BETTER NUTRITION AND INCREASED FOOD PURCHASES

Mr. Speaker, there have been several studies made of the effects of the food stamp program in pilot plan areas where it went into effect midway in the first year of the Kennedy administration. These studies show that the participants buy more—and better—foods, and enjoy a much higher level of nutrition under the plan than previously, when they were receiving monthly quotas of just a few food items under the direct distribution system. Furthermore, these studies have demonstrated that the participating stores have substantially increased their sales and have benefited from the program.

The Department, a year ago, issued a report in detail on the before-and-after aspects of the plan's operations in two widely different types of communities—the rural areas of Fayette County, Pa., and the highly industrialized urban area of Detroit, Mich. This report, entitled "Food Consumption and Dietary Levels Under the Pilot Food Stamp Program," shows us what the food stamp plan can accomplish for the needy people throughout this Nation, in terms of better diets.

As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I submit this report, by Robert B. Reese and Sadye F. Adelson of the Agricultural Research Service, as follows:

Food Consumption and Dietary Levels Under the Pilot Food Stamp Program, Detroit, Mich., and Fayette County, Pa.

(By Robert B. Reese, agricultural economist, Marketing Economics Division, Economic Research Service; and Sadye F. Adelson, nutrition analyst, Consumer and Food Economics Division, Agricultural Research Service)

PREFACE

An Executive order of the President, issued January 21, 1961, directed the U.S. Department of Agriculture to take immediate steps to expand and improve its program of food assistance to needy families. As a first step, the Department increased the variety and value of federally owned foods being made available to States for donation to needy families. In his message to the Congress of February 2, 1961, the President requested the Department to inaugurate a series of pilot food stamp programs to determine the effectiveness of such an approach in providing better nutrition for needy families and in paving the way for a substantial improvement in use of our food production capacity.

Pilot food stamp programs were inaugurated in eight economically depressed areas of the country in mid-1961. Each of these areas had been participating in the food donation program but that program was terminated when the food stamp program was placed in operation in each pilot area. At the same time, research agencies of the Department undertook a series of special studies to determine attitudes about the program and to measure its economic and dietary effects.

This report presents the preliminary findings from research in two of the eight pilot areas as to the effect of a food stamp program on food consumption by needy families and on the nutritional adequacy of their diets. The findings should help public administrators and others concerned with providing food to needy families. Related research—not reported here—included surveys of sales in retail food stores and of attitudes and opinions of low-income families, members of the food industry, welfare workers, and others.

This research represents the joint efforts of a team of the Department's market development specialists in the Marketing Economics Division, Economic Research Service, and nutrition specialists in the Consumer and Food Economics Division, Agricultural Research Service. Special guidance was given by Robert M. Walsh and William S. Hoofnagle, Economic Research Service, and Faith Clark, Janet H. Murray, and Evelyn Grossman of the Agricultural Research Service. Field operations in Detroit, Mich., were supervised by Thomas M. Brooks, ERS, and Lillian Fincher, ARS; and in Fayette County, Pa., by Ennis Blake, ARS; Kenneth E. Anderson, ERS, and Beatrice Evans, ARS. Elizabeth M. Davenport, ARS, coordinated automatic processing of the data.

The Department has recently published two other reports about the program: "The Food Stamp Program, an Initial Evaluation of the Pilot Project," AMS-472, and "Effect of the Pilot Food Stamp Program on Retail Food Store Sales," Agricultural Economic Report No. 8, both dated April 1962.

HIGHLIGHTS

The dual objectives of the food stamp program as stated are to expand markets for agricultural products and to improve diets by increasing the ability of needy families to purchase more and better foods. Preliminary findings from surveys of food consumption by low-income families in 2 pilot areas in which studies were made indicate that the program has made substantial progress in attaining both objectives.

The market for food was expanded among needy families. Program participants consumed food that was greater in quantity and money value in the program period than previously. During September and October 1961, urban recipients of food coupons in Detroit consumed foods with a money value 34 percent higher than during April and May, the preprogram period. Among rural recipients in Fayette County, Pa., an increase of 9 percent was found.

This market expansion appears to be related primarily to operation of the pilot food stamp program. Retail prices of foods used by families not qualified for the pilot food stamp program declined 2 percent in Detroit and 6 percent in rural Fayette County between the periods. Also, during September-October qualified nonparticipants were consuming food of somewhat less value in both Detroit (−1 percent) and rural Fayette County (−7 percent)—changes comparable to the seasonal price variation found for nonqualifying families with slightly higher incomes.

More than 80 percent of the increased consumption (money value) by food coupon recipients in both areas was for animal products (such as meat, poultry, fish, milk, and eggs) and fruits and vegetables. In Detroit, expanded use of meats constituted more than one-third of the net increase. In rural Fayette County, however, meats accounted for a limited part of the increase in money value of foods consumed by participants.

Efficient use of the Federal subsidy in expanding the market for food was indicated by comparisons of increases in expenditures for food and the amount of free coupons made available to participants. Among the households surveyed, it appears that expanded food purchases may have accounted for the total subsidy in Detroit and more than 80 percent of the subsidy in rural Fayette County. Thus, a very high percentage of each dollar spent by the Government for food coupons in both areas accomplished the intended expansion of the commercial market for agricultural products.

The pilot food stamp programs in both Detroit and Fayette County drew participation primarily from families with incomes well below the maximum permitted. Among participating families interviewed, about 9 out of 10 had incomes at least 25 percent below the maximum allowable in the program. Also, most of the participants were in the larger and younger family groups.

The food stamp program helped to improve the diets of needy families in the two pilot areas. In April–May just under 30 percent of the families who were later to participate in the program had diets fully meeting the allowances recommended by the National Research Council for eight nutrients. During the test period, nearly 50 percent of the participants in Detroit and nearly 40 percent of those in rural Fayette County had diets meeting the recommendations.

April–May diets of participants were especially short in calcium and ascorbic acid. Diets were also in need of improvement in vitamin A value and riboflavin. In September–October, diets were improved in ascorbic acid and vitamin A value, reflecting increased use of fruits and vegetables.

Calcium and riboflavin levels rose in Detroit but not in Fayette County. The improved levels in Detroit were due to increased use of meat, poultry, fish, vegetables, and grain products in the later period.

BACKGROUND

The Federal food stamp program is a dual-purpose effort to expand utilization of agriculture's abundant resources and to improve the nutrition of needy families. The program is designed to enlarge the market for foods by increasing the food-purchasing ability of low-income families.

Under the program, food-purchasing power is increased by giving needy families an opportunity to exchange the amount of money they would normally spend for food for an allotment of coupons of higher monetary value. These coupons are used by participants for the purchase of domestic foods from retail food stores at prevailing prices. Retailers then exchange the coupons for cash at banks.

During June and July 1961, the pilot food stamp program was initiated in eight economically depressed areas across the country.[1] This program was aimed to test the effectiveness of a food stamp program under actual operating conditions. In the eight areas the food stamp program replaced the direct distribution program under which needy families had been receiving federally donated foods.

To determine the effect of the food stamp program upon purchasing practices and consumption by low-income families, and the adequacy of their diets, household food consumption surveys were conducted in Detroit, Mich., and rural areas of Fayette County, Pa., during April–May and September–October 1961, before and after initiation of the program in these areas.[2] The two places, one a metropolitan area and the other a rural area in the bituminous coal mining section, both having chronic unemployment, permitted tests of the program under widely varying conditions.

HOUSEHOLD FOOD CONSUMPTION SURVEYS

The household food consumption surveys were based upon area probability sampling of residences in predominantly low-income areas. In Detroit a sample of 1,268 residences was drawn from all census tracts in which 5 percent or more of the families were receiving public assistance. In Fayette County a sample of 837 residences was developed from all dwellings located in the rural portions of townships comprising approximately two-thirds of the county. Local officials designated these townships as primary rural hardship areas of the county.

During April–May, specially instructed interviewers obtained detailed information from all housekeeping families[3] with a current family income of less than $5,000 annually (after income taxes). Data were obtained concerning consumption of foods during the past 7 days by source (purchase, home production, Federal donation, gift, or other); also concerning food purchasing practices, income, and family characteristics. During September–October 1961, the same residences were revisited and comparable information obtained.

The basic analysis of shifts in food consumption and dietary levels was developed from comparisons of matched households in the two survey periods. Matched households were those residing at the same address during both survey periods, whose eligibility status for participation in the program (either qualified or not qualified) remained the same. With few exceptions, the matched households were in fact the same families.

The matched households were divided into three categories based on their characteristics in September–October. They were (1) participants in the pilot food stamp program, (2) nonparticipants whose family incomes were within qualifying range for participation in the program, and (3) nonparticipants who did not qualify for participation, since family income exceeded the maximum specified under the program. This breakdown provided comparisons of food consumption patterns and dietary levels during the two survey periods for recipients of food coupons, families choosing not to participate, and neighboring families with moderately higher incomes. The participant and qualifying nonparticipant groups were separated further by whether the family had been receiving federally donated foods during April–May (table 1).

PARTICIPATION IN FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The food stamp program was based on voluntary participation by families certified as needy by State and local welfare agencies, with a single exception. Families receiving assistance from the city of Detroit were enrolled in the Program Qualifications for participation in each State were essentially the same as those used in the direct distribution program. All households receiving federally aided public assistance or State-sponsored general assistance were eligible for participation in the food stamp program, as well as other low-income households having less than specified levels of income and liquid assets established for each family size. Income qualifications for households not receiving other types of assistance bear a direct relationship to the income standards used by each State in the administration of its welfare assistance programs.

Among the States, Michigan and Pennsylvania have relatively high monetary levels of welfare assistance. Family income standards for participation in the food stamp program by nonrecipients of welfare assistance are about the same in Michigan and Pennsylvania. For example, the maximum gross monthly income for a participating four-person household was $265 in Michigan, and $245 in Pennsylvania. Liquid assets in the possession of a four-person household could not exceed $795 in Michigan and $735 in Pennsylvania.

---

[1] The eight pilot areas were Franklin County, Ill., Floyd County, Ky., Detroit, Mich., the Virginia-Hibbing-Nashwauk area of Minnesota, Silver Bow County, Mont., San Miguel County, N. Mex., Fayette County, Pa., and McDowell County, W. Va.

[2] A survey also was conducted in urban areas of Fayette County. The findings are in process of tabulation.

[3] Families having at least 1 member eating 10 or more meals at home during the week preceding the interview.

TABLE 1.—*Matched households in survey of pilot food stamp program, Detroit, Mich., and rural Fayette County, Pa., April–May and September–October 1961* [1]

Location and status of households in September–October	Number of households		
	Received federally donated foods in April–May	Did not receive federally donated foods	Total
Detroit:			
Participants in food stamp program	71	16	87
Qualified nonparticipants [2]	102	81	183
Not qualified			78
Total			348
Rural Fayette County:			
Participants in food stamp program	66	5	71
Qualified nonparticipants [2]	55	54	109
Not qualified			111
Total			291

[1] Matched households are those occupying the same address and having the same eligibility qualifications in September–October as in April–May.

[2] Based on family incomes reported.

After being certified by the responsible local or State welfare agency, the qualified household can participate in the food stamp program. Current income and family size determine the ratio of bonus to purchased coupons. The amount of money the family pays for coupons increases with income. The value of bonus or free coupons diminishes as the income level increases. Selected standards for four-member households in Fayette County, Pa., are shown in table 2.

Upon receipt of food coupons, semimonthly or monthly, recipients use them to purchase domestically produced foods in approved retail food stores at regular prices. Coupons may not be used to purchase coffee, tea, cocoa (as such), bananas, or any packaged food identified as imported. These imported foods, however, constitute only 6 or 7 percent of the value of all foods consumed by the low-income families interviewed.[4]

TABLE 2.—*Monthly payments for food coupons and value of free coupons received by 4-member households with various incomes, Fayette County, Pa., 1961*

Gross monthly income (selected intervals)	Amount family pays for coupons	Value of free coupons	Total value of coupons received
$55 to $64.99	$22	$40	$62
$105 to $114.99	48	32	80
$155 to $174.99	64	26	90
$215 to $245	76	20	96

Food coupons were printed by the U.S. Treasury Department in 25-cent and $1 denominations. They are issued to participating families in booklets containing $2, $3, or $10 worth of coupons. Since the coupons do not have printed expiration dates, expenditures may be deferred. However, the rate of coupon redemption at banks indicates that nearly all food coupons are used soon after they are issued.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS

The food stamp program in both Detroit and rural Fayette County drew participants primarily from families in the lowest levels of income (figs. 1 and 2, not printed in RECORD). In most of these families (80 percent), the head of the household was unemployed and incomes had been at their current low levels for a year or more. Over 60 percent of these families reported that their incomes in September–October 1961 were the same or more than they had been in 1960. Of those reporting reduced incomes, many had had prior incomes that were only slightly higher, and would have qualified for participation if the food stamp program had been operating during 1960.

Among participating families interviewed in Detroit and rural Fayette County, about 9 out of 10 had incomes at least 25 percent below the maximum permissible under the program. Many had incomes more than 50 percent below qualifying standards.

Participating and qualified nonparticipating families were separated into low, middle, and upper levels of qualifying incomes (figs. 1 and 2, not printed in RECORD). These are equivalent to less than 50 percent, 50 to 74 percent, and 75 to 100 percent of the maximum family incomes permitted under the food stamp program.

Since families with lowest incomes received the largest subsidization (free food coupons), most of the participants were in the higher subsidization levels. Not many qualified families with incomes near the maximum chose to participate in the program. According to program sources, bonus or free coupons have accounted for about 36 percent of the total coupons issued in Detroit and 39 percent in Fayette County. Participants have paid for more than 60 percent of the food coupons in both areas.

Families already receiving aid under public and general assistance programs constituted about 25 percent of the participants in the food stamp program in Detroit and 45 percent in rural Fayette County. Thus, although many unemployable needy (aged, blind, disabled; also dependent children) received food coupons, most of the recipients were employable but jobless or doing unskilled and part-time work, with incomes low enough to qualify them for the food stamp program. The employable needy included families receiving cash assistance from local public and private agencies, and families receiving no outside assistance.

The food stamp program had greatest appeal to large families. Over two-thirds of the participating households had four or more family members. Relatively few one-member households were participating in either Detroit or Fayette County.

The program is serving many families in which the homemaker has a limited formal education. In approximately 40 percent of the participating families in Detroit, and 60 percent in rural portions of Fayette County, the homemaker had only a primary school (8 years) education or less.

The program also appeals most to young or middle-aged families. In more than 75 percent of the participating households interviewed, the homemaker was less than 50 years of age. In contrast, homemakers were under 50 in only 55 percent of households qualified but not participating in the program.

A comparison of participating families and qualified nonparticipants (figs. 1 and 2, not printed in RECORD) indicates that the program had been effective in serving families in the lowest economic levels, and large families. It has been somewhat less effective in obtaining participation from the older and smaller family units. Further study may indicate the need for adjustments in coupon purchase and bonus requirements for certain classes of qualified households.

CHANGES IN FOOD CONSUMPTION

Money value of foods consumed

Needy families participating in the food stamp program have substantially increased their consumption of food, in terms of dollar value, since initiation of the program. In Detroit, the money value of foods consumed during September–October was 34 percent greater than during the preprogram survey period. In rural Fayette County, an increase of 9 percent was found (table 3).

TABLE 3.—*Retail value of food consumed in a week per member of participating families, before and after initiation of Federal food stamp program, Detroit, Mich., and rural Fayette County, Pa., 1961* [1]

Food	Detroit			Rural Fayette County		
	April–May	September–October	Difference (percent)	April–May	September–October	Difference (percent)
Meat	$1.26	$1.86	48	$1.21	$1.31	8
Poultry	.30	.40	33	.12	.18	50
Fish	.14	.24	71	.10	.08	−20
Milk, cream, ice cream, and cheese	.56	.80	43	.72	.88	22
Eggs	.25	.21	−16	.32	.23	−28
Total	2.51	3.51	40	2.47	2.68	9
Fats and oils	.26	.27	4	.36	.28	−22
Flour and other cereal products	.40	.41	2	.45	.43	−6
Bakery products	.30	.44	47	.35	.50	43
Sugars, sweets	.18	.22	22	.27	.28	4
Total	1.14	1.34	18	1.43	1.49	4
Fresh vegetables	.26	.38	46	.24	.40	67
Potatoes, sweetpotatoes	.11	.14	27	.13	.12	−8
Fresh fruits	.14	.25	79	.15	.26	73
Commercially frozen fruits and vegetables	.02	.04	100	(2)	(2)	0
Commercially canned fruits and vegetables	.16	.21	31	.29	.23	−21
Fruit and vegetable juices, fresh, frozen, canned, powdered	.03	.06	100	.03	.05	67
Dried fruits and vegetables	.07	.07	0	.10	.07	−30
Total	.79	1.15	46	.94	1.13	20
Beverages	.16	.21	31	.29	.32	10
Miscellaneous foods	.30	.37	23	.37	.37	0
Total	.46	.58	26	.66	.69	5
All foods	4.90	6.58	34	5.50	5.99	9

[1] Before adjustment for seasonal changes in price and foods consumed. In September–October, prices paid by low-income families were less than in April–May (2.3 percent less in Detroit and 6.3 percent less in rural Fayette County). Includes money value for home-produced, gift, and federally donated foods.

[2] Less than 0.01.

---

[4] In the food stamp program, schedules of family payments and issuance of food coupons make allowance for usual purchases of excluded food items.

In contrast, qualifying nonparticipants were using foods during September–October with less money value than during April–May—1 percent less in Detroit and 7 percent less in rural Fayette County. This reduction is attributable in part to seasonal changes in food consumption and prices. An index of retail food prices was constructed from the prices paid and quantities of foods used by the nonqualifying low-income families. It showed a reduction of 2 percent in Detroit and 6 percent in rural Fayette County.

On a per capita basis, the average money value of foods consumed in a week by food coupon recipients in Detroit during September–October was $1.68 more than in April–May. Among participating families in rural Fayette County, food consumption was up $0.49 per person per week.

Approximately 82 percent of the participating families in Detroit and 93 percent of those in rural Fayette County were obtaining donated commodities in April–May through the direct distribution program. Values in table 3 for consumption during April–May include estimated retail prices for federally donated foods received. Thus, increases in dollar value of foods consumed during September–October represent actual increases in consumption of foods from all sources, and not merely in expenditures.

Meats and other animal products (excluding eggs), and fruits and vegetables, were the main groups of food which increased in money value in the program period (table 3). Prepared bakery products also increased in value.

Participating families in both areas had considerably more fresh fruits and vegetables and fresh and processed juices in September–October. Although lower seasonal prices for fresh produce may have contributed to the increase, it was found that the value of produce used by qualified nonparticipating families in both areas remained relatively unchanged from the April–May level.

The combined money value of meats, poultry, fish, milk, and eggs, as a group, increased 40 percent in Detroit and only 9 percent in rural Fayette County. In Detroit, meats alone accounted for over one-third of the net increase in the dollar value of foods consumed by participating families. This increase resulted from a rise of about 1 pound per capita in meat consumption rather than from a shift to more expensive meats. The average price of meats consumed rose only from $0.46 to $0.48 per pound between the survey periods.

The combined money value of milk, cream, ice cream, and cheese rose in both Detroit (43 percent) and rural Fayette County (22 percent). These increases, however, reflected partial substitution of fluid whole milk for the less expensive nonfat dry milk solids previously made available through the direct distribution program.

Eggs were the only food which had a lower money value in September–October in both areas. An important element in consumption during April and May was the receipt of federally donated dried eggs by most of these families. Reductions in egg consumption during September and October were also observed among the other low-income groups—both qualified and nonqualified nonparticipating families. Price information obtained from the surveys indicates also that these low-income families were paying more for shell eggs in September–October than in April–May.

Limited increases in money value of beverages and miscellaneous foods occurred in both areas. Increases were equivalent to $0.12 per person in Detroit and $0.03 per person in rural Fayette County.

No major rise in money value of food usually considered luxury items was found in either pilot area. Money value of all foods consumed by participants in the food stamp program gained, relative to that of families with comparable incomes who did not participate. Program participants narrowed the gap between the money value of their food and that of families in the same areas with higher incomes. The money value of meats and other animal products, fruits and vegetables, beverages, and miscellaneous foods consumed by food coupon users, however, continued to be less than that of families with incomes above the needy level.

Quantities and prices of foods consumed

Quantities of most major groups of foods used by participants increased in the program period (table 4). Variations in quantities were generally similar to the changes found in money value. However, a comparison of pound and dollar measures shows important shifts to items of higher or lower average price within several groups of foods.

In September and October 1961, participants in both areas were consuming foods of higher average price than in April–May in the following categories: Fish, fluid milk and milk products (excluding butter), bakery products, and fruit and vegetable juices. The fats and oils, fresh vegetables, and miscellaneous items they consumed were of lower average price. The price per pound was slightly changed for meat and poultry, for frozen, canned, and dried fruits and vegetables, and for beverages. Divergent patterns were found in the two areas for prices of sugars and sweets, flour and cereals, fresh fruits, and potatoes.

Some of the major shifts in average prices may be explained by cancellation of donated commodities. Substitution of fluid whole milk and other more expensive milk products for the donated nonfat dry milk solids would account for a part of the increase in the average value per pound of fluid milk and dairy products (excluding butter). Among Detroit participants, quantities of milk and dairy products consumed rose only 1 percent, whereas the money value rose more than 40 percent. Rural Fayette County participants were consuming 17 percent less of these products but 22 percent more in money value in September–October than in April–May.

Increases in average price of bakery products consumed also may reflect cancellation of commodity donations. The direct distribution program provided the primary ingredients for home baking of many products.

Elimination of federally donated butter may account for much of the reduction in average money value per pound for fats and oils. Similar reductions in money value were found in both areas.

Seasonal changes in prices and availability of fresh foods also contributed to variations in average money value of several foods consumed. During the September–October period, for example, the quantity of fresh vegetables participants used in Detroit was 125 percent more than during the spring survey. The money value, in contrast, increased by 46 percent. In rural Fayette County, 171 percent more fresh vegetables were used but their money value was only 67 percent above the April–May level.

As consumption data for individual commodities or products become available, the type and extent of shifts in consumption will be easier to see. Most of the needy families participating in the food stamp program consumed relatively few kinds of foods. In the April–May survey, for example, the average family in both Detroit and Fayette County was using less than 45 different foods. Approximately 150 foods accounted for as much as 95 percent of the total food consumption by these low-income families. Therefore shifts in consumption, in quantity or money value, may involve a limited number of food items.

TABLE 4.—*Quantities of specified foods consumed in a week per member of participating families, before and after initiation of Federal food stamp program, Detroit, Mich., and rural Fayette County, Pa., 1961* [1]

Food	Detroit			Rural Fayette County		
	April–May	September–October	Difference	April–May	September–October	Difference
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Percent*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Percent*
Meat	2.753	3.782	37.4	2.507	2.522	0.6
Poultry	1.014	1.348	32.9	.373	.608	63.0
Fish	.364	.471	29.4	.257	.180	−30.0
Milk, cream, ice cream, and cheese [2]	7.372	7.438	.9	9.954	8.222	−17.4
Eggs	.754	.602	−20.2	.950	.661	−30.4
Fats and oils	.863	1.027	19.0	1.161	1.176	1.3
Flour and other cereal products	2.516	2.509	−.3	3.553	2.715	−23.6
Bakery products	1.567	2.827	29.4	1.603	2.122	32.4
Sugars, sweets	1.143	1.230	7.6	1.465	1.605	9.6
Fresh vegetables	1.806	4.062	124.9	1.810	4.905	171.0
Potatoes, sweetpotatoes	1.875	1.973	5.2	3.186	2.658	−16.6
Fresh fruits	1.564	2.618	67.4	1.337	2.392	78.9
Commercially frozen fruits and vegetables	.049	.096	95.9	.012	.016	33.3
Commercially canned fruits and vegetables	.824	1.085	31.7	1.597	1.257	−21.3
Fruit and vegetable juices, fresh, frozen, canned, powdered	.307	.539	75.6	.313	.420	34.2
Dried fruits and vegetables	.354	.337	−4.8	.505	.313	−38.0
Beverages	.622	.877	41.0	.740	.837	13.1
Miscellaneous foods	.867	1.135	30.9	1.270	1.439	13.3

[1] Before adjustment for seasonal changes in price and foods consumed. Includes home-produced, gift, and federally donated as well as purchased foods.

[2] Fluid milk equivalent.

SOURCE OF FOOD

During the preprogram period, rural families in Fayette County were consuming foods from all sources (purchased and nonpurchased) of greater money value per capita than the families in Detroit. By September and October 1961, this situation was reversed (table 5).

TABLE 5.—*Participating families: Money value of food used per person in 1 week (21 meals), by source of foods, before and after initiation of the pilot food stamp program, Detroit, Mich., and rural Fayette County, Pa., 1961* [1]

Source of food	Detroit		Rural Fayette County	
	April-May	September-October	April-May	September-October
Purchased	$4.21	$6.43	$4.23	$5.45
Federally donated	.63	-----	1.00	-----
Home produced	.01	.01	.23	.36
Other [2]	.05	.14	.04	.18
All sources	4.09	6.58	5.50	5.99

[1] No adjustment for seasonal changes in foods used or prices.

[2] Primarily foods received as gifts or payment in kind. September-October figures also include minor amounts for federally donated foods still available to the household.

Before the pilot food stamp program was initiated, food expense for families in both areas was approximately the same. Differences in total money value arose from the greater money value of federally donated and home-produced foods used by rural families in Fayette County.

Increases in money value of foods consumed by food coupon recipients in September-October in Detroit resulted almost entirely from greater use of purchased foods. Although rural Fayette County families also used purchased foods of greater money value, they were using more foods produced at home or received as gifts or pay during September and October.

Home-produced foods constituted a negligible part of consumption by participants in Detroit. In contrast, almost one-half of the rural Fayette County families reported using home-produced foods during April and May—and two-thirds in September and October. The money value of home-produced foods used by most of these rural families was low. However, 15 to 20 percent of the families were using home-produced foods in a week valued at $2 or more.

Similarly, few participating families in Detroit received supplemental foods as gifts or pay. In contrast, nearly two-thirds of the rural families in Fayette County were using such foods during September and October.

Nearly all of the rural families in Fayette County were using nonpurchased foods—home-produced, gift, or pay. For 60 percent of these families the money value of nonpurchased foods consumed in a week during September and October was more than $1 per household. For almost 40 percent of the participating rural families, the value was greater than $2.

This difference in food sources available (purchased, home produced, gift, or pay) to urban and rural families partially explains variations in the effect of the pilot food stamp program in Detroit and rural Fayette County. Consumption in Detroit during September and October by food coupon recipients was based primarily on availability of foods for sale in the market. Consumption by rural families in Fayette County reflected availability of nonpurchased foods to a greater extent.

NEW FOOD PURCHASING POWER

A special analysis was undertaken to measure the efficiency of the food stamp program as a mechanism for expanding the market for food.

Basically, this efficiency is related to two factors: (1) The establishment of coupon purchase requirements at levels which closely represent the amounts participating families could be expected to spend for food in the absence of such a program; and (2) the degree of compliance obtained, on the part of both retailers and participants, with program regulations which limit the use of coupons to the purchase of eligible foods.

Amounts normally spent for food vary considerably even among families of the same size and approximately the same income. The variations are explained in part by the composition of the family, the importance the family places on food, fixed payments for rent, and unusual expenses, such as those for medical care. It was not feasible under the pilot food stamp program to establish individual purchase requirements for each applicant family. Rather, the purchase requirements were average amounts, based upon data largely derived from the Department's 1955 household food consumption survey.

Thus, an individual family participating in the program might have been spending somewhat less, or somewhat more, for food than the purchase requirement established under the program. Among program participants included in the matched households, it is estimated that approximately 20 percent of the Detroit families and 25 percent of the rural Fayette County families were spending less for food in April-May than they were paying for coupons in September-October.[5] The remaining families appeared to have been spending as much or more for food in April-May than the established coupon purchase requirement.

It was anticipated, however, that the total amount of money collected from participants would closely approximate their total preprogram expenditures for food, despite differences on an individual family basis. If this were true, and if there was close compliance with regulations governing the use of the coupons, actual increases in food expenditures under the program should be close to the value of free coupons issued under the program.

This was found to be the case. Expanded use of purchased food by participating families appears to have accounted for the entire free coupon subsidy in Detroit and for more than 80 percent of the subsidy in rural Fayette County.

These findings for Detroit and rural Fayette County indicate that the food stamp program was an efficient method of using Government money to increase food consumption by needy participants. A very high percentage of the Federal subsidy was used to create a net expansion in the retail food market—the coupon purchase requirements tended to maintain preprogram levels of food expenditures by participating families. Thus, the Government's contribution was effective in meeting the dual objectives of supplementing food consumption by needy families and providing an expanded market for the output of the Nation's farms.

CHANGES IN DIETARY LEVELS

The effectiveness of the food stamp program in improving the nutritional quality of diets of needy families has been investigated. Comparison has been made of the dietary levels of participating families before and during the program in both Detroit and rural Fayette County. Dietary levels were evaluated in terms of the percentage of each group of families whose diets met the allowances recommended by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council for each of eight nutrients, and then summarized in terms of the percentage of each group whose diets met the allowances for all eight nutrients.

Individual nutrients

In comparison with recommended allowances, diets of the participating families in April-May were found to be shortest in calcium and ascorbic acid (table 6 and figure 3). Only about 40 percent of the Detroit diets met calcium allowances; about the same proportion of the rural Fayette County diets met ascorbic acid allowances. Many more diets provided allowances for other nutrients but for each nutrient some diets were below allowances. Roughly 60 percent to well over 70 percent met allowances for vitamin A value and riboflavin. At least 80 percent of the diets provided allowances for other nutrients.

In September-October, diets were considerably higher in ascorbic acid, close to 70 percent of the families having diets meeting allowances in this nutrient. Diets also were greater in vitamin A value, the percentages of families with diets meeting allowances increasing by at least 10 percentage points. Calcium and riboflavin levels rose markedly only in Detroit, bringing the diets meeting calcium allowances to 55 percent and those meeting riboflavin allowances to 84 percent.

Many families used their increased food-purchasing power in the program period for extra amounts of foods rich in the nutrients that were shortest in their family diets. Higher levels of ascorbic acid and vitamin A value were the result of more fruits and vegetables; families in Detroit consumed 50 percent more fruits and vegetables and rural families in Fayette County over 30 percent more. In rural Fayette County it seems clear that more home produce and lower food prices, particularly for fruits and vegetables in season, helped to improve diets since nonparticipants also had better diets in the later period (table 7). In Detroit there is no conclusive evidence that season was an important factor in dietary levels.

Calcium and riboflavin in Detroit diets were increased by use of about 50 percent more vegetables, about 35 percent more meat, poultry, and fish, and somewhat under 10 percent more grain products (flour equivalent). In rural Fayette County, however, changes in consumption of these three groups of food were about plus 5, plus 30, and minus 10 percent, respectively, and therefore in combination did not improve diets in calcium and riboflavin. The reduced consumption of grain products by participants in rural Fayette County was accompanied by a shift from flour, cereals, and meals (four such items were federally donated in April-May) to more expensive commercially baked goods.

---

[5] An adjustment was calculated for the foods not eligible for purchase with coupons.

TABLE 6.—*Percentages of diets meeting recommended allowances for 8 nutrients, average amounts per nutrition unit per day of these nutrients in food supplies, and average amounts of groups of food consumed per person per week, by participants in food-stamp program, matched families, Detroit, Mich., and rural Fayette County, Pa., 1961* [1]

Nutrient or food group	Detroit			Rural Fayette County		
	April–May	September–October	Difference	April–May	September–October	Difference
Households……number	87	87	----------	71	71	----------
	Diets meeting recommended allowances					
All 8 nutrients……percent	29	48	[2] 19	26	39	13
Protein……do	88	92	4	84	90	6
Calcium……do	41	55	14	50	52	2
Iron……do	90	92	2	87	88	0
Vitamin A value……do	74	86	[2] 12	64	74	10
Thiamine……do	82	85	3	84	84	0
Riboflavin……do	74	84	8	77	76	−1
Niacin……do	94	98	4	90	90	0
Ascorbic acid……do	57	69	12	39	65	[2] 26
	Average per day per nutrition unit (equivalent adult male unit)					
Food energy……calories	4,398	5,365	967	4,853	4,897	44
Protein……grams	114	139	25	123	117	−6
Calcium……milligrams	757	843	86	903	800	−103
Iron……do	17	21	4	19	18	−1
Vitamin A value……international unit	10,760	15,050	4,290	8,740	8,980	240
Thiamine……milligrams	2.37	2.84	.47	2.92	2.56	−.36
Riboflavin……do	2.55	2.87	.32	2.91	2.55	−.36
Niacin……do	29.4	36.4	7.0	29.0	29.2	.2
Ascorbic acid……do	83	112	29	81	116	35
	Average per week per person					
Milk, cream, ice cream, cheese (fluid milk equivalent)……pounds	7.36	7.44	0.08	9.96	8.23	−1.73
Meat, poultry, fish……do	4.13	5.60	1.47	3.14	3.31	.17
Eggs……do	.75	.60	−.15	.95	.66	−.29
Fruits, vegetables……do	7.47	11.40	3.93	9.78	12.58	2.80
Grain products (flour equivalent)……do	3.56	11.86	.30	4.62	4.13	−.49
Fats, oils……do	.86	1.03	.17	1.16	1.18	.02
Sugars, sweets……do	1.14	1.23	.09	1.47	1.61	.14

[1] Matched families are defined in table 1, footnote 1.

[2] Statistically significant at the 5-percent level. Only the percentages of diets meeting recommended allowances have been tested for significance.

The major source of calcium and riboflavin in U.S. diets is milk and its products. In both places use of nonfat dry milk solids, federally donated in April–May, dropped considerably in September–October. The drop was fully balanced by increased use of fluid milk and other milk products in Detroit but not in rural Fayette County where milk (fluid equivalent) consumption decreased almost 20 percent. Total use of eggs, which furnish small amounts of riboflavin and most other nutrients, declined 20 percent in Detroit and 30 percent in rural Fayette County, apparently due to lack of federally donated dried eggs and seasonally higher prices for shell eggs.

Overall diet quality

Only slightly more participating families in Detroit (29 percent) than in rural Fayette County (26 percent) had diets that met the recommended allowances for all eight nutrients in April–May (table 6). In both places the number of families with such diets increased considerably in September–October, the percentages becoming 48 in Detroit and 39 in rural Fayette County. Thus, about two-thirds more participating families in Detroit and one-half more in rural Fayette County had diets meeting allowances in September–October than previously.

April–May dietary levels of qualified nonparticipants were similar to those of participants in both places (table 7). However, in September–October the percentages of participants with diets meeting allowances had increased 19 percentage points in Detroit and 13 in rural Fayette County, whereas proportions of qualified nonparticipants with such diets had increased negligibly (1 or 2 percentage points).

TABLE 7.—*Number of matched households and percentage with diets meeting recommended allowances for 8 nutrients, by qualification and participation of households in food stamp program, Detroit, Mich., and rural Fayette County, Pa., April–May and September–October 1961* [1]

Location and status of matched households	Number in survey	Households with diets meeting NRC allowances for 8 nutrients		
		April–May (before stamp program)	September–October (during stamp program)	Difference
	Households	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percentage points*
Detroit:				
Qualified for food stamp program:				
Participants……	87	29	48	[2] 19
Nonparticipants……	183	27	28	1
Total……	270	28	34	6
Not qualified for food stamp program……	78	33	32	−1
Rural Fayette County:				
Qualified for food stamp program:				
Participants……	71	26	39	13
Nonparticipants……	109	26	28	2
Total……	180	26	32	6
Not qualified for food stamp program……	111	46	51	5

[1] Matched households are defined in table 1, footnote 1.

[2] Statistically significant at the 5-percent level.

In a nationwide survey of food consumption in 1955, about 50 percent of nonfarm households in the North with incomes under $4,000 had diets that met allowances for all 8 nutrients. The food stamp program helped needy families in Detroit in September-October 1961 to attain similar dietary levels. The program, however, had somewhat less effect on the diets of families in rural Fayette County.

Better selection of foods rather than more food is the key to much of the superior nutritional quality of family diets in Detroit compared with those in rural Fayette County, especially in September-October under the food stamp program. On a per person basis meat, poultry, and fish were the only major group of foods consumed in greater quantity during either period in Detroit than in rural Fayette County. But the Detroit families consumed more of such extra rich sources of nutrients as citrus fruit, dark leafy greens, deep yellow vegetables, and pork.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide "that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no financial or other assistance may be furnished under any law of the United States, directly or indirectly, to or for the benefit of any program or activity carried out in any State or possession of the United States or in the District of Columbia, in the course of which any individual is discriminated against on the ground of his race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin."

The Federal Government should not contribute in any way to segregated programs. In the 87th Congress I urged antidiscrimination amendments to bills for Federal programs such as, the Housing Act of 1961 and the Hill-Burton Hospital program. The time has come for the Federal Government and the Congress unequivocally to oppose the use of Federal funds for segregated programs and to deny Federal funds to any program which discriminates against individuals because of race, creed, color, or national origin. Such action is consistent with the great foundation principles of our Nation and would be a major step in the enforcement of the Constitution.

Mississippi, a State which is receiving more Federal funds than it pays into the Treasury, is flagrantly disregarding the Constitution and the laws of the land. In an interim report the Civil Rights Commission suggested that Federal funds be denied to Mississippi. However, the restriction of Federal funds should be applied across the board, not just to Mississippi. Funds should be denied to any program administered by any State, locality or agency which discriminates against American citizens in violation of our great democratic principles and the Constitution.

When I introduced H.R. 4586 to deny funds to any educational institution which discriminates against students or prospective students on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin, I pointed out that the University of Mississippi received $73,688 in Federal funds from the summer of 1959 and through the academic year 1961–62. The University of Mississippi, however, is only one example of Federal funds being used in segregated programs. The bill I introduced today will cover all programs, whether in Mississippi or any other State in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when American citizens are courageously struggling for their constitutional rights and are being shot, beaten, jailed, and harassed for doing so, it is imperative that the Congress and the administration take all possible steps to eliminate segregation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the interim report of the Civil Rights Commission which was issued on April 16 while the House was in recess.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The report referred to is, as follows:

INTERIM REPORT OF THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Pursuant to its statutory duty to submit reports to the President and to Congress at such times as either the Commission or the President shall deem desirable, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights submits the following special report with respect to the status of equal protection of the laws in the State of Mississippi:

Since October 1962, the open and flagrant violation of constitutional guarantees in Mississippi has precipitated serious conflict which, on several occasions, has reached the point of crisis. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has become increasingly alarmed at this defiance of the Constitution. Each week brings fresh evidence of the danger of a complete breakdown of law and order.

Citizens of the United States have been shot, set upon by vicious dogs, beaten, and otherwise terrorized because they sought to vote. Since October, students have been fired upon, ministers have been assaulted, and the home of the vice chairman of the State advisory committee to this Commission has been bombed. Another member and his wife were jailed on trumped up charges after their home had been defiled. Even children, at the brink of starvation, have been deprived of assistance by the callous and discriminatory acts of Mississippi officials administering Federal funds.

All this affronts the conscience of the Nation.

The Commission is fully aware that the administration has followed developments in Mississippi closely, that it has taken strong and vigorous action in assuring that violators of Federal law are prosecuted, and that court orders are enforced. Despite the diligent and aggressive handling of each case as it has arisen, the Nation must be concerned that the pattern of unlawful activity shows no sign of abating. Moreover, 9 years after the Supreme Court unanimously decided that segregation in public elementary and secondary schools violates the equal protection clause of the Constitution, Mississippi has taken no step to comply with the law of the land.

Since its organization, the Commission has been deeply concerned with developments in Mississippi. Its hearing scheduled for October 1962 in that State was first postponed at the request of the Attorney General of the United States, and finally canceled. On March 26, the Attorney General, after referring to the Barnett case, stated that "while this case is pending, I continue to hold the view that a public hearing in Mississippi by the Civil Rights Commission would not be appropriate. In the meantime, I hope that the work of the Commission staff can continue as in the past on the question of the operation of Federal programs in Mississippi as elsewhere."

Since October the Commission has received more than 100 complaints from Mississippi alleging denials of constitutional rights. Investigation of these complaints, reports of our State advisory committee, and other evidence confirm the conclusion of the Commission that prompt and firm action is now required. The Commission has concluded unanimously that only further steps by the Federal Government can arrest the subversion of the Constitution in Mississippi.

The Commission notes the action taken by the President of the United States in employing the force necessary to assure compliance with the court decrees in the University of Mississippi case. It is mindful of the unequivocal public statements of the President expressing his belief that discriminatory practices are morally wrong. The Commission, nevertheless, believes that the President should, consistent with his constitutional and statutory authority, employ to the fullest the legal and moral powers of his office to the end that American citizenship will not continue to be degraded in Mississippi. We urgently request that (1) the President formally reiterate his concern over the Mississippi situation by requesting all persons in that State to join in protecting the rights of U.S. citizens, and, in accordance with his duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, by directing them to comply with the Constitution and laws of the United States; (2) the President continue and strengthen his administration's efforts to suppress existing lawlessness and provide Federal protection to citizens in the exercise of their basic constitutional rights; and (3) the Congress and the President consider seriously whether legislation is appropriate and desirable to assure that Federal funds contributed by citizens of all States not be made available to any State which continues to refuse to abide by the Constitution and laws of the United States; and, further, that the President explore the legal authority he possesses as Chief Executive to withhold Federal funds from the State of Mississippi, until the State of Mississippi demonstrates its compliance with the Constitution and laws of the United States.

The people of Mississippi and of the other States should know that according to information available to the Commission in fiscal year 1962, the Federal Government received from all sources in Mississippi $270 million. During the same period, payments from the Federal Government to the State, counties, municipalities and individuals exceeded $650 million for grant-in-aid programs, U.S. Corps of Engineers construction contracts, military prime contracts, and direct civilian and military payrolls. Examples of additional Federal programs benefiting Mississippi include area redevelopment loans and grants, small business loans, accelerated public works projects, and Federal Aviation Agency grants.

Massive assistance to the economy of Mississippi has continued past the time when the State placed itself in direct defiance of the Constitution and Federal court orders. For example, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency is proceeding with plans to build a $400 million moon rocket engine test center in Pearl River and Hancock Counties, Miss.

Taking into account the need to comply with statutory requirements which limit the discretion of the executive branch, and recognizing that the location of large Federal installations must reflect national needs, the Commission believes there is an overriding constitutional obligation to make certain that Federal funds are expended in a manner which will benefit all citizens without distinction. The Federal Aviation Agency failed to take cognizance of such an obligation when it granted $2,180,000 for the construction of a jet airport to serve Jackson, Miss., without questioning the airport's plan to build separate eating and restroom facilities.

The financial benefits accruing to Mississippi and its citizens as a result of Federal programs are necessarily financed by American citizens throughout the Nation. The Commission deems it appropriate and desirable that the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government inquire into the moral and legal considerations arising out of a situation where, in large measure, the lawless conduct and defiance of the Constitution by certain elements in one State are being subsidized by the other States.

The Commission does not want the people of Mississippi, either Negro or white, to lose benefits available to citizens of other States. Rather, its goal is that all citizens in the United States be assured the full enjoyment of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. It is upon adherence to that great charter with its powerful moral premises that our survival as a free society depends.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN A. HANNAH,
Chairman.
ROBERT G. STOREY,
Vice Chairman.
Rev. THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C.
ROBERT S. RANKIN.
SPOTTSWOOD W. ROBINSON III.
ERWIN N. GRISWOLD.

APRIL 16, 1963.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. MCFALL), for 10 days, on account of illness.

Mr. FORRESTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for the balance of the week of April 22, on account of official business attending the Inter-American Development Bank Conference.

Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for indefinite period, on account of official business with the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WALLHAUSER (at the request of Mr. GOODLING), for 30 minutes, on April 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KNOX.

Mr. PUCINSKI in two instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TOLL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODLING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. BARRY.
Mr. HORTON.
Mr. ALGER.
Mr. WESTLAND.
Mr. SAYLOR.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 247. An act to authorize survey and establishment of a townsite for the Juneau Indian Village in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 394. An act to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 873. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and tendering thanks of Congress therefor; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution authorizing the temporary placement in the rotunda of the Capitol of a statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota, and the holding of ceremonies incident thereto; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late John Burke, of North Dakota; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution for ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South Dakota; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to tender the thanks of Congress to South Dakota for the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document the proceedings at the acceptance of the statue of Joseph Ward, to be placed in Statuary Hall; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business of its hearing of the 87th Congress on "Space Satellite Communications"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 277. An act to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada;

H.R. 1087. An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve;

H.R. 1544. An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz.;

H.R. 2291. An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass;

H.R. 2294. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz;

H.R. 5067. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 23, 1963, at 12 o'clock.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

680. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1964 in the amount of $14,607,500 for the legislative branch and a decrease of $49,300,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 105); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

681. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

682. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

683. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the Air Force military construction contracts awarded by the Department of the Air Force without formal advertising for the period July 1 to December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 87-554; to the Committee on Armed Services.

684. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

685. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting a report relating to Army research and development contracts for $50,000 or more which were awarded during the period July 1 to December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

686. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installation and Logistics), transmitting the semiannual report on military construction contracts awarded on other than a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder for the period July 1 through December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 87-554; to the Committee on Armed Services.

687. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report setting forth the financial condition of working capital funds as of June 30, 1962, and the results of their operation for the fiscal year then ended, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (10 U.S.C. 2208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

688. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ending March 31, 1963, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

689. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the audit of the exchange stabilization fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, pursuant to section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

690. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, as amended, to exempt from licensing thereunder physicians employed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

691. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

692. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

693. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

694. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote safe driving, to eliminate the reckless and financially irresponsible driver from the highways, to provide for the indemnification of certain persons suffering injury or loss as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by uninsured motorists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

695. A letter from the president, D.C. Transit System, Inc., transmitting additional material to a report covering operations of D.C. Transit System, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 435, dated March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

696. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

697. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year January 1 through December 31, 1962, pursuant to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat., 30 U.S.C. 451–483); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

698. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of unnecessary costs incurred because of failure of the Army to store M–35 trucks in covered storage space; to the Committee on Government Operations.

699. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected automatic data processing facilities of the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

700. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the disposition of insurance premium refunds received under a New York State disability benefits insurance policy by Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage, N.Y.; to the Committee on Goverment Operations.

701. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of causes of overpayments of military pay and allowances, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

702. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a followup review of supply management of selected radio communication sets within the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

703. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the excessive costs of long-distance message communications in the armed services made primarily within the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

704. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting a report of its activities during the year ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to section 4 of the academy's charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

705. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the applicability of the conflict-of-interest provisions to persons serving in the Federal Communications Commission unit of the National Defense Executive Reserve; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

706. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 203(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the filing of schedules of charges by connecting carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

707. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315g); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

708. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of all laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1962 regular and special sessions, pursuant to section 9(g) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

709. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to add certain lands to the Cache National Forest, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

710. A letter from the national adjutant, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, transmitting a copy of the audit of final transactions of the Military Order of the Purple Heart for the fiscal year ending July 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85–761; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

711. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a special report with respect to the status of equal protection of the laws in the State of Mississippi, pursuant to its statutory duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

712. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

713. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

714. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize reimbursement to owners and tenants of certain lands or interests therein acquired by the United States for certain moving expenses and losses and damages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

715. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 5, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Pointe aux Pins, and other harbors, Bois Blanc Township, Mackinac County, Mich., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 12, 1959, and August 14, 1959; to the Committee on Public Works.

716. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 21, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, an a letter report on Wickford Harbor, R.I., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 27, 1956. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

717. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 17, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of coastal areas of Florida, authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955; to the Committee on Public Works.

718. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 152(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of including nationals of the United States within the definition of the term "dependent" in connection with deductions for personal exemptions, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

719. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissable to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

720. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

721. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification under the act, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 11, 1963, the following bills were reported on April 12, 1963:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 3190. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will; with amendments (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4330. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 5044. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 5081. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 5338. A bill to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted April 22, 1963*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. House Joint Resolution 82. Joint resolution designating the navigation channel and canal portion of the Arkansas River navigation and multiple purpose project as the "Robert S. Kerr Seaway"; with amendment (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2072. A bill to assure payment of just compensation for the use and occupancy of certain lands on Kwajalein and Dalap Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 5706. A bill to encourage the needy blind to enroll in rehabilitation programs by prohibiting State residence requirements in assistance to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 5707. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 5708. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to extend coverage to certain U.S. commissioners; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY (by request):

H.R. 5709. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5710. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe in North Dakota and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5711. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 5712. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5713. A bill to provide penalties for certain offenses committed in connection with highway construction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5714. A bill to repeal the depletion allowance for oil and gas wells in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5715. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for contributions and gifts to civic organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5716. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5717. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $900; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5718. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of himself or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5720. A bill to provide for an averaging taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $3,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5722. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers excise tax on cosmetics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5723. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work or school; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 5724. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 122d anniversary of the birth of Phoebe Apperson Hearst; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5725. A bill to amend section 1331 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide for entitlement to retired pay for non-Regular service in the Armed Forces at the age of 55 with at least 20 years of such service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 5726. A bill to provide for the admission of certain evidence in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 5727. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 5728. A bill for the relief of the county of Cuyahoga, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 5729. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 5730. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5731. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5732. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an elected Governor and Lieutenant Governor, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 5733. A bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 5734. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication service or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 5735. A bill to amend section 217 of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military or naval service not now creditable toward benefits under title II of such act may be counted toward such benefits if such service is not used in determining entitlement to, or the amount of, military retired pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5736. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5737. A bill to authorize the construction of a causeway from Jersey City, N.J., to Liberty Island; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 5738. A bill to provide a different basis for determining the amount of money to be made available to the State of Illinois because of the location of national forest lands within such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5739. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct certain inequities with respect to the taxation of life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5740. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5741. A bill to provide that no Federal financial or other assistance may be furnished in connection with any program or activity in the United States in which individuals are discriminated against on the ground of their race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 5742. A bill to eliminate the category of the "wheat unfit for human consumption" for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.J. Res. 383. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the first full week in May of each year as "National Employ the Older Worker Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.J. Res. 384. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.J. Res. 385. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim November 19, 1963, as Gettysburg Address Centennial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 322. A resolution creating in the House of Representatives a Committee on Grievances to study complaints concerning the conduct of Members of the House of Representatives and to make investigations and appropriate recommendations thereon; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the need for remedial action in connection with Alaska's air transportation problems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to restoration of Federal medical care rights denied by administrative ruling for persons employed or engaged on vessels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to supporting legislation relating to the safeguarding of homesteader rights through the establishment of an independent Board of Public Lands Appeals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to legislation pending in Congress authorizing compensation to the Yakutat community of Tlingit Indians for the extinction of their original title; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the completion of studies on the Rampart Dam project; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the economic development of California tide and submerged lands; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to legislation to authorize construction of the Auburn Dam and Folsom South Canal as part of the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation granting additional funds which will enable the States to establish a system of itinerant unemployment insurance benefit offices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to proposing a constitutional amendment to provide for the election of the President and Vice President in a manner fair and just to the people of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to enact the King-Anderson bill or other similar legislation, and expressing the opposition of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado to such legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Congress to enact legislation providing for Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Congress to provide for a peacetime veterans education program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to considering the request to name a dam on the Columbia River after Judge Homer T. Bone during his lifetime; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 5743. A bill for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5744. A bill for the relief of Mario Gvardiljan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 5745. A bill for the relief of Rev. Loren B. Sutherland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5746. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Bagby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5747. A bill for the relief of Kevork Kiristopuryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5748. A bill for the relief of Michal Wnuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5749. A bill for the relief of Maria Gabriella Ligniti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5750. A bill for the relief of Salvatrice Maurello and Giuseppe Maurello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 5751. A bill for the relief of Tim L. Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5752. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Castro Sicat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 5753. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 5754. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mahfouz Habib Rizk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H.R. 5755. A bill for the relief of Ednita Gonzaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 5756. A bill for the relief of Huseyin Duru; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5757. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Violette Boglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5758. A bill for the relief of Flora Lee (Shih-yu Li); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5759. A bill for the relief of Connecticut Beverage Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

89. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition to preserve the Monroe Doctrine signed by Mrs. Robert H. Nelson and 48 others; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

90. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Resolution of Ulster County, N.Y., Board of Supervisors re the construction of the Appalachian Parkway, extending from the Shenandoah National Park through the Shawangunk-Kittatinny region northward; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

91. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William S. Davis, commander of the American Legion Post No. 29, Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting enactment of legislation authorizing the naming of the new veterans hospital, to be built in Miami, Dade County, Fla., as the Joe H. Adams Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE

Monday, April 22, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, from whom all thoughts of truth and peace proceed, kindle, we pray Thee, in our hearts the true love of peace, and guide with Thy sure wisdom those who here take counsel for our Nation, and for the other nations of the earth.

In this opening moment of the new week's deliberations, help us to draw near to Thee in tranquillity, in humility, and in sincerity. Grant unto us, who at noontide seek Thy face, fervently to desire and obediently to fulfill all that is pleasing unto Thee. We would lay aside any selfish, partisan ambitions, so that with tallness of stature we may see—above the walls of our own prideful opinions—the common good.

As we play our part in days of destiny, with all mankind standing in the valley of decision, deliver us from all fear save that of failing Thee in Thy purpose for an earth redeemed from its sin and shame.

In the name and spirit of the Christ, we lift our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 18, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF U.S. SCIENCE EXHIBIT, SEATTLE WORLD'S FAIR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of sec. 5(b), Public Law 85–880, approved September 2, 1958, I transmit herewith the final report of the U.S. Science Exhibit, Seattle World's Fair.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *April 22, 1963.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

H.R. 277. An act to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada;

H.R. 1087. An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve;

H.R. 1544. An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz.;

H.R. 2291. An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass;

H.R. 2294. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz;

H.R. 5067. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Supplemental Appropriation To Pay Claims and Judgments Rendered Against the United States (S. Doc. No. 14)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States, in the amount of $3,574,144 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Report on Transfer of Funds by National Aeronautics and Space Administration

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the transfer of funds from the Saturn V account of the research, development, and operation appropriation for the fiscal year 1963 to the construction of facilities appropriation; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the transfer of research, development, and operation funds for the fiscal year 1963 for the construction of an administration and service building at the Government-owned contractor-operated S–II stage final assembly facility, U.S. Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Working Capital Funds of the Department of Defense

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on working capital funds of that Department, dated June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Department of Defense on Military Procurement Actions for Experimental, Developmental, or Research Work

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental or research work, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Department of the Navy on Military Construction Contracts Awarded Without Competition

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded without competition, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Act Relating to Establishment of a Register of Names in the Department of Commerce of Certain Motor Vehicle Drivers

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act approved July 14, 1960, 74 Stat. 526, as amended, relating to the establishment of a register of names in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle drivers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Control of Transportation Systems by the President in Time of National Emergency

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Motor Vehicle Indemnification Fund Act of the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote safe driving, to eliminate the reckless and financially irresponsible driver from the highways, to provide for the indemnification of certain persons suffering injury or loss as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by uninsured motorists, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Revised Statement of Income and Earned Surplus of D.C. Transit System, Inc.

A letter from the president, D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised statement of income and earned surplus of that system, for the year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT ON PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government, fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED BECAUSE OF FAILURE OF THE ARMY TO STORE M35 TRUCKS IN COVERED STORAGE SPACE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of unnecessary costs incurred because of failure of the Army to store M35 trucks in covered storage space, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE PREMIUM REFUNDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the disposition of insurance premium refunds received under a New York State disability benefits insurance policy by Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage, N.Y., dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING FACILITIES, NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected automatic data processing facilities, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF THE EXCESSIVE COSTS OF LONG-DISTANCE MESSAGE COMMUNICATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the excessive costs of long-distance message communications in the armed services, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8 OF THE TAYLOR GRAZING ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C., sec. 315g) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1962 regular and special sessions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON PETITIONS TO CLASSIFY STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS FOR FIRST PREFERENCE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT RELATING TO STATUS OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a special report with respect to the status of equal protection of the laws in the State of Mississippi, dated April 16, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS

A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that academy, for the year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 14

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States not to enact the King-Anderson bill or other similar legislation, and expressing the opposition of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado to such legislation

"Whereas the State of Colorado has long been a leader in the field of State programs for medical assistance to the indigent aged, and as part of the expansion of such program, the people of this State adopted in 1956 a $10 million old-age pension health-care program; and

"Whereas this State financed and administered program has been ruled to qualify under the old-age assistance provision of the Kerr-Mills Act and has, subsequent to the passage of the Kerr-Mills Act, been receiving Federal funds for the implementation of the Act; and

"Whereas this general assembly has recognized the need for further investigation into the adequacy of medical care for the aged in Colorado by directing a study by the joint budget committee to determine ways and means for the further implementation of the Kerr-Mills Act: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That this general assembly hereby expresses strong opposition to the proposal now pending in Congress to amend the social security law, through the enactment of the Hospital Act of 1963, popularly known as the King-Anderson bill, and hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States not to enact such bill or any similar legislation, since such an approach is contrary to the efforts now being made by this State to meet this problem at the State level under the provisions of the Kerr-Mills Act; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado, and the Governors of the other 49 States.

"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"*President of the Senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"DONALD H. HENDERSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, unless Congress shall sooner have submitted such an amendment, to provide for the election of the President and Vice President in a manner fair and just to the people of the United States

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States, presidential and vice presidential electors in the several States are now elected on a statewide basis, each State being entitled to as many electors as it has Senators and Representatives in Congress; and

"Whereas the presidential and vice presidential electors who receive the plurality of the popular vote in a particular State become entitled to cast the total number of electoral votes allocated to that State irrespective of how many votes may have been cast for other elector candidates; and

"Whereas this method of electing the President and Vice President is unfair and unjust in that it does not reflect the minority votes cast; and

"Whereas the need for a change has been recognized by Members of Congress on numerous occasions through the introduction of various proposals for amending the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein)*, That application is hereby made to Congress under article V of the Constitution of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an article of amendment to the Constitution providing for a fair and just division of the electoral votes within the States in the election of the President and Vice President; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That if and when Congress shall have proposed such an article of amendment this application for a convention shall be deemed withdrawn and shall be no longer of any force and effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"*President of the Senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"DONALD H. HENDERSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 33

"Joint resolution relating to the completion of studies on the Rampart Dam project

"Whereas a sound and vigorous development of Alaska's resources is desirable, and indeed essential, not only from the standpoint of the people of Alaska but of the Nation whose great northernmost and westernmost outpost and underdeveloped dominion and potential is the State of Alaska; and

"Whereas as a diversification and enlargement of Alaska's economy is needed for the above declared objective; and

"Whereas the resources on which the people of Alaska depended when their numbers were far fewer in territorial days; namely, gold mining and fishing—both now diminished in quantity and in economic impact—will not suffice to create a vigorous, thriving, and expanding economy; and

"Whereas for years the Federal Government has developed the hydroelectric resources of the 48 older States with such projects as the Tennessee Valley Authority, Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, Bonneville Dam, Hungry Horse Dam, and others, and is now engaged in the continuance of this sound utilization of our water resources with Glen Canyon, Arkansas Frying-Pan, and other hydroelectric projects; and

"Whereas the greatest potential hydroelectric project on the North American Continent, and indeed in the free world, is available on the Yukon River in Alaska, which can generate power at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, which would be the lowest cost power under the American flag; and

"Whereas studies by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army have already established the engineering feasibility of the dam at Rampart on the Yukon; and

"Whereas the marketability of its low-cost power and the consequent attraction to Alaska of diverse industries and the utilization thereby of Alaska and other raw materials not practically exploitable without low-cost power has been suggested in a study by the Development and Resources Corp. of New York, a qualified, promotional agency retained by the Corps of Engineers for that purpose; and

"Whereas the United States, through its foreign aid program, is financing hydroelectric projects in many parts of the world among people to prevent their amalgamation with Communists bloc nations, but who pay no taxes to the United States, and the products derived from them will be competitive with our own U.S. products: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Alaska Legislature strongly urges Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to the Federal agencies involved to speed the completion of Rampart and other Yukon river studies, and to report promptly to the Congress, and make possible the early request by the Alaska delegation in Congress for legislation providing authorization and appropriation for the advanced planning of Rampart Canyon Dam; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of the Army; the Honorable Lt. General W. K. Wilson, Jr., Chief of the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate March 30, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"*President of the Senate*.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"*Secretary of the Senate*.

"Passed by the house April 9, 1963.

"BRUCE KENDALL,
"*Speaker of the House*.

"Attest:

"PATRICIA R. SLACK,
"*Chief Clerk of the House*.

"By the Governor:

"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"*Governor of Alaska*."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 1498

"Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation implementing the programs set forth in the President's special messages on mental illness and mental retardation; youth; and the elderly citizens of our Nation

"Whereas President Kennedy's special messages to the Congress on mental illness and mental retardation; youth; and the elderly citizens of our Nation call for sweeping and progressive programs affecting the well-being of all Americans; and

"Whereas dynamic social programs calling for Federal assistance and leadership in establishing community mental health centers; in working toward the prevention of mental retardation; in establishing wholesome and productive youth work training programs; and in providing hospital insurance for our elderly through social security will, if enacted, immeasurably strengthen the Nation's social and economic fiber and will further the physical and mental well-being of our people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation implementing the proposals set forth in the President's special messages to the Congress on mental illness and mental retardation; youth; and the elderly citizens of our Nation, directing the secretary of state to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress, to His Excellency, the President of the United States, and to the Members of Congress from the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 4A

"Joint resolution ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the abolition of the poll tax and other taxes as a voting requirement in Federal elections

"Whereas both Houses of the 87th Congress of the United States of America, at the 2d session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America, in the following words, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'"ARTICLE —

"'"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"'"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation"': Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified by the legislature of the State of Wisconsin; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this joint resolution, certified by the Secretary of State be forwarded by the Governor to the General Services Administration of the Government of the United States in Washington, D.C., and to the Presiding Officer of each House of the Congress of the United States.

"JACK B. OLSON,
"*President of the Senate*.
"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
"*Chief Clerk of the Senate*.
"ROBERT S. HAASE,
"*Speaker of the Assembly*.
"KENNETH E. PRIEBE,
"*Chief Clerk of the Assembly*."

A resolution adopted by the Citizens' Study Club, of Oahu, Hawaii, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 747, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR CONTINUED MAXIMUM EMPLOYMENT AT THE FORE RIVER SHIPYARD

"Whereas, the Fore River shipyard in the city of Quincy has in the past made significant contributions to the defense of our country in time of peril; and

"Whereas a vast pool of skilled personnel employed at said shipyard will be lost unless sufficient work is found to insure maximum employment at said shipyard; and

"Whereas both the national defense and the economic welfare of our Commonwealth would be adversely affected by any curtailment of employment at said shipyard: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will enable the Fore River shipyard to receive a sufficient share of naval construction and repair work from the Federal Government to effect continued maximum employment at said shipyard; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 27, 1963.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 1, 1963.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

Two resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION REPEALING THE 10-PERCENT EXCISE ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

"Whereas as an emergency measure during time of war the United States levied a 10-

percent excise on telephone service in the nature of a luxury tax; and

"Whereas the state of emergency which gave rise to this tax has long since passed; and

"Whereas the telephone cannot even remotely be considered a luxury, but is instead a vital necessity in the home, office, factory and public institution; and

"Whereas it is grossly unfair and inequitable to continue to levy such a tax upon the citizens of this country: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation repealing the excise on telephone service; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate, March 28, 1963.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, in concurrence, April 4, 1963.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING MEDICAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING

"Whereas a major problem facing a large number of the elderly citizens among us is how to meet the rising cost of medical care with fixed or declining income; and

"Whereas the social security system has enabled large numbers of our elderly citizens to maintain a way of life which preserves their dignity and their independence; and

"Whereas adding medical care would be a natural extension of the social security idea: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide medical care for the elderly through social security financing; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state transmit a copy of these resolutions to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate March 27, 1963.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, in concurrence, April 1, 1963.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing which were referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION EXTENDING FINANCIAL AID TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS FOR PURIFICATION OF THE WATERS OF THE MERRIMACK RIVER

"Whereas the pollution of the waters of the Merrimack River continues to be a danger to the health and welfare of all the inhabitants of the Merrimack River Valley; and

"Whereas the joint effort and financial assistance of the Federal and State Governments are required in order to accomplish the monumental task of purifying the Merrimack River: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation extending financial aid to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the purification of the waters of the Merrimack River; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the Senate, March 28, 1963.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives, in concurrence, April 4, 1963.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1338. A bill for the relief of Wong Chuck Ying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1339. A bill for the relief of Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1340. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1341. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Kerenyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 1342. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

INCLUSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEMPORARY TEACHERS IN HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, temporary teachers employed by the District of Columbia Board of Education cannot participate, as matters stand, in the Health and Life Insurance programs available to permanent employees. I am informed that the reason for this situation is that the U.S. Civil Service Commission, by regulation, has excluded all employees in a temporary category.

I am informed that there is a high percentage of teachers employed by the Board of Education who are considered temporary even though they may have many years of service in the District of Columbia school system. In my judgment, it is desirable and equitable that remedial legislation designed to afford such employees an opportunity to participate in the health and life insurance programs open to other Federal and District of Columbia employees, be enacted.

Thus, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill designed to include such temporary teachers employed by the Board of Education within the purview of the health and life insurance programs now available to permanent teachers employed by the District of Columbia Board of Education. This legislation has the endorsement of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1340) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health-benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers; introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 710; 5 U.S.C. 3002 (a)) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*: Provided*, That no teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, whose salary is established by section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (sec. 31-1501, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), shall be excluded on the basis of the fact that such teacher is serving under a temporary appointment if such teacher has been so employed by such Board for a period or periods totaling not less than two school years."

SEC. 2. Section 2(a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 736), as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091 (a)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and in no event shall any teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, whose salary is established by section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (sec.

31-1501, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), be excluded on the basis of the fact that such teacher is serving under a temporary appointment if such teacher has been so employed by such Board for a period or periods totaling not less than two school years."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins not later than the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

STEEL SHIPPING CONTAINER IDENTIFICATION ACT, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill intended to permit the buyers of steel shipping containers to know when steel is used in the manufacture of the containers and to promote the use of steel produced in this country.

The bill, to be known as the Steel Shipping Container Identification Act of 1963, is endorsed by the Steel Container Shipping Institute, who believe that such legislation will be of great benefit to the steel industry, to the steel shipping container industry, and to the general public.

U.S. customs laws require that a foreign product be plainly marked with the country of origin in which it is produced. The courts sustain the fact that the authority and jurisdiction of the Bureau of Customs ends when the product has been released from its custody. This, in turn, means that while the bundles or coils of sheet steel are marked with the country of origin upon arrival in this country, no agency of the United States under present regulations has any further jurisdiction over the marking or identification of products, such as drums, pails, and like containers, which are ultimately manufactured from the imported sheet steel.

The proposed bill, Mr. President, would require that drums, pails, and like containers, made of foreign steel be plainly marked with the country of origin of the steel and would place enforcement of the act under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission and would include their usual penalities for noncompliance.

This act is not otherwise punitive and does not ask special favors, increased duties or tariff protection. It only requires that containers made from foreign steel be so identified.

It is hoped, Mr. President, that with the practice of our own steel producers being beat competitively with the use of foreign steel in drums, pails, and like containers that these items should be marked so that the general buying public at least will know whether they are purchasing a product made with foreign steel or with domestic steel.

Mr. President, so that my distinguished colleagues may have the opportunity to join with me in sponsorship of this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the bill to lie on the table until Friday, April 26, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1342) to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel, introduced by Mr. Hartke (for himself and Mr. Scott), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. The Senator is putting forth a most commendable idea. It is very foresighted action on the part of the Senator to introduce the bill. I should like to join him in sponsoring it.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Maryland. He has always stood with me in these matters both in the Committee on Commerce and in the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CANYONLANDS PARK—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald there appeared an editorial entitled "Canyonlands Park," which discusses the proposal which will be before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this coming Thursday, for the creation of Canyonlands National Park in southeastern Utah. This editorial is a very clear exposition of the situation now existing, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Canyonlands Park

The outlook for creation of another magnificent national park in the West has notably improved with the current agreement within the Utah congressional delegation and among State officials. The park would be located in what has come to be known as Canyonlands at the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers in southeastern Utah. This is one of the wildest and most inaccessible areas in the United States, and the proposed park is said to be a wonderland that cannot be matched by any American scenery now outside national park boundaries.

Canyonlands has found high favor with the National Parks Service, and National Parks Association, conservationists and outdoorsmen. Senator Frank E. Moss has sponsored a bill to authorize establishment of the proposed park, but in the last session of Congress there was sharp disagreement over the land to be included. Now a compromise has been reached between Gov. George Clyde and Senator Wallace F. Bennett, on one hand, and Senator Moss, on the other, to limit the area to a little more than 250,000 acres.

Agreement has also been reached on the phasing out of mineral and oil exploration in the area within 25 years. Mines and wells developed during that period could continue to operate. This is the most questionable aspect of the agreement but there is some precedent for such continued operations in areas that have become national parks. The most important thing is to set aside the finest scenic features of this area for park purposes. Additional land can be acquired later if that seems desirable. The reduced acreage would include the spectacular areas that have come to be known as Chesler Park, Virginia Park, Druid Arch, Angel Arch, Elephant Canyon, Upheaval Dome, the Needles, and the Basin of Standing Rocks.

Hearings on the new Moss bill will be held by the Senate's Public Lands Subcommittee on April 25, and it is to be hoped that similar action will be taken on the House side. The rapid growth of the country makes it especially desirable to conserve scenic areas of national park quality. If it is found feasible to link Canyonlands with the Zion, Bryce, and Grand Canyon National Parks, with the Glen Canyon Dam and the Arches and Natural Bridges National Monuments in the same general area, the combination would make a strong bid for first place among the country's scenic playgrounds.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to submit at this time two proposed amendments to S. 27, which is the Canyonlands National Park bill; and that these amendments may be printed, so as to be available at the time of the hearing on Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS AND RAILWAY LABOR ACTS—RESCISSION OF ORDER FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, previously the bill (S. 1330) to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes, was ordered to lie on the table. I ask unanimous consent that that order be rescinded, and that the bill be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED NATIONS PEACE BONDS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the bill (S. 1171), relating to the sale of United Nations bonds, is next printed, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] may be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A METRIC SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] be allowed to become cosponsor with me of S. 1278, which I introduced on April 4. I ask that her name be included at the next printing of this bill. This bill, which would authorize the Bureau of Standards to study the feasibility of adopting the metric system in the United States, is of basic importance to the entire Nation; and I am immensely pleased and honored to have the Senator from Oregon associated with me in its passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY LABOR DISPUTES ACT OF 1963—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of April 18, 1963, and today April 22, 1963, the name of Mr. Aiken was added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1330) to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes, introduced by Mr. Javits on April 18, 1963.

PRESS RELEASE ON CERTAIN HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point the text of a press release issued on April 19 announcing hearings on S. 414 and other bills pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations which relate to the training of foreign affairs personnel.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

April 19, 1963.

U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman, announced today that on April 29 and May 1, the Committee on Foreign Relations would hold hearings on S. 414, a bill to create a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy. S. 414 was introduced on January 22 by Senator Mundt, for himself and other Senators.

On April 4 and 5 of this year the committee held public hearings on S. 865, an administration bill to establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs. S. 865 was introduced by Senator Symington, for himself and other Senators on February 20.

Also pending before the Committee are S. 32 and S. 99, bills to create a U.S. Foreign Service Academy. Both of these bills were introduced on January 14, S. 32 by Senator Smathers and S. 99 by Senator Dominick.

Anyone wishing to present testimony on any of the aforementioned bills during the course of the hearings announced today should contact without delay Mr. Darrell St. Claire, chief clerk, Committee on Foreign Relations.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 63, TO PROVIDE FOR REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS, AND S. 1057, TO PROMOTE THE CAUSE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE BY PROVIDING FOR THE REPRESENTATION OF DEFENDANTS WHO ARE FINANCIALLY UNABLE TO OBTAIN AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE IN CRIMINAL CASES IN THE COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled beginning Monday, May 6, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in Room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on S. 63, a bill to provide for representation of indigent defendants, and S. 1057, a bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above bills may make such representation as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF L. J. ANDOLSEK TO BE A CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to announce that a public hearing on the nomination of L. J. Andolsek to be a civil service commissioner will be held Wednesday, April 24, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building.

The hearing will be open to the public and will be held before the full committee.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. HARTKE:

Address by Senator Bayh at Indiana Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner on April 6, 1963.

MEETINGS WITH SENATOR METCALF IN MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the past several days, my colleague in this body, Senator Lee Metcalf, was in Montana, discussing vital issues with the people of the State. I know these discussions have been most helpful to him and to the groups with whom he talked. Typical of the reaction in the State was that expressed in an editorial on April 15 by the Billings Gazette. It lauded the high tone and frankness of a give-and-take discussion between Senator Metcalf and the Billings Chamber of Commerce, and expressed the hope that there be more such sessions in the future.

Mr. President, I heartily agree that such meetings between the public and its elected officials are both necessary and valuable. Much credit goes to the Billings Chamber of Commerce for scheduling the discussion, to Senator Metcalf for giving of his time, and to the Billings Gazette for recognizing the importance of these face-to-face encounters and bringing it to the attention of its readers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Model for Future Meetings

Lessons in conduct of informative meetings between persons with conflicting ideas, at least on how to best accomplish good government, could well be taken from a session the congressional action committee of the Billings Chamber of Commerce had with U.S. Senator Lee Metcalf, Democrat of Montana, the past week.

Question askers from Chairman Art Lorfling down through the media didn't stay away from controversial questions. In fact, they plunged into them. It was the manner in which the questions were put and the way Metcalf handled the answers that set the high-level tone for the meeting.

Metcalf helped set the stage when he informed his questioners that "I have strong convictions and was elected on a program I intend to carry out." But at the same time, he let it be known that he is seeking information on those subjects as well as many others pertaining to Montana business and people.

The veteran Congressman now in his first term as Senator described the congressional job as one to "winnow a little wheat from all the chaff and pass legislation that is not too harmful."

Congress is confronted with the cold war, international relations, special farm problems, tax reforms and reductions, continuing unemployment, slackening national growth, and health insurance as major issues.

"What comes out may not be the way I want it or you want it but it will be worked out the American way," Metcalf declared.

In advising he wanted constituent opinions from persons interested, concerned, and informed, Metcalf said mimeographed letters, duplicate telegrams, and petitions carry little weight.

Metcalf's candor in answering questions also brought legislative process enlightenment as to why westerners should stand together on all mineral depletion allowances.

Metcalf's answers to the question have been carried in the news columns. For those who attended, the predominate factor was the tone of the meeting—an exchange of information, not name calling or out-of-place vituperativeness that could turn such a session into senseless generalities.

The chamber is to be commended for scheduling such a session. Let's have more of them.

FUTURE UNITED STATES-CANADIAN CONFERENCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Edmonton Journal of Saturday, April 6, 1963, appears an article entitled "The Publisher's Notebook," written by Mr. Basil Dean, vice president and publisher of that newspaper. I believe that what Mr. Dean said will be of interest to the Senate and to all the people of the United

States. I feel, also, that now that the Canadian elections are over and the issue there is settled, it is time to say to our Canadian friends that both of us should do our utmost to keep alive and to encourage the warmth and friendship which we have for one another.

I should like to quote one paragraph of Mr. Dean's article:

> The fact is that all Americans are proud of their relationship with Canada, of the long undefended frontier, of the sense of common purpose which usually distinguishes our joint affairs.

Mr. President, let me say that, in my opinion, neither Canada nor the United States should take one another for granted. We are the closest of neighbors and the best of friends. As a Senator who represents the State with the longest border with Canada—it extends over 700 miles, and includes the southern borders of British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan—I wish to state that we look upon our Canadian neighbors from these Provinces almost as blood relatives. We are close to one another economically, socially, and otherwise; and we hope we make contributions to their betterment and welfare, through our friendship, as we are proud to admit they have made similar contributions to the welfare of my State and our country.

Now that the election has been settled and Mr. Pearson has taken over the office of Prime Minister, I hope that to cement these relations the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN, the chairman of the Canada-United States interparliamentary group, will confer with his Canadian counterparts, to the end that these meetings may once again be resumed, and that any differences which confront us can be considered across the conference table.

I hope Senator AIKEN and the heads of the Canadian delegation, as well as the chairman of the delegation from the House of Representatives, will also seriously consider the possibility of holding some future meetings outside the respective capitals of the two countries. I have in mind places such as Vancouver, Victoria, Calgary, Edmonton, and Regina, to mention a few on the Canadian side; and, on the U.S. side, cities such as Seattle, Spokane, Great Falls, Montana, Montpelier, Vermont, and the twin cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, among many others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD "The Publisher's Notebook," signed by Basil Dean, and published in the Edmonton Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLISHER'S NOTEBOOK

Whatever party is elected to office on Monday, it will face the difficult, uphill, often frustrating and sometimes embarrassing task of repairing our relationships with the United States.

There is no doubt that United States-Canadian relations are today at their lowest ebb in many years. This is by no means entirely the fault of the Government of Canada, but it is by no means entirely the fault of the Government of the United States either.

I recently spent a few days in the company of a number of prominent Americans, discussing some questions relating to United States-Canadian trade. The courtesy and politeness of the Americans at this gathering were almost embarrassing. They were invariably tactful about the problems of Canada, with which they were extremely well acquainted; they leaned over backward to say nothing, even in private conversation, which could be construed as an interference in our political affairs; and they were more than willing to admit that most of the blame for the difficulties surrounding relations between the two nations lay on the American side.

Considering the relative size and strength of the two countries, and considering the innumerable worldwide preoccupations, many of them highly perilous, with which the Government of the United States must grapple every day, it is astonishing how much time and attention Washington is prepared to give to the question of United States-Canadian relations.

The fact is that all Americans are proud of their relationship with Canada, of the long undefended frontier, of the sense of common purpose which usually distinguishes our joint affairs.

It may be true, as we often allege, that they sometimes take us for granted, but at the same time I gather that a widespread wave of annoyance with Washington swept across the United States when Mr. Diefenbaker reacted so violently to the American public statement on nuclear warheads.

The fact of the matter is that while we in Canada must continue to fight for our national identity and preserve it against the friendly but relentless social and economic pressure from across the border, we also have to face the fact that we live alongside the most powerful nation on earth.

We must recognize that the United States today is an imperial power, with a responsibility, voluntarily assumed at incredible cost, to maintain the security of the whole free world.

In 1963, the United States is almost as powerful in relation to the rest of the world as Rome was at the apex of her imperial power, and as Britain was in the middle of the last century.

It is inevitable that the United States, in the discharge of these frightening responsibilities, will often do things which we in Canada do not like.

When we do not like them, we are entitled to make our opinions known. We are also entitled to be apprehensive about the extent to which corporate enterprise in this country is dominated by American ownership. We are entitled to take such measures as we can to minimize the effects of this alienation of our industry and our natural resources.

But at the same time we cannot ignore the fact that friendship with the United States must be, and will continue to be for the foreseeable future, the only possible foundation of Canadian foreign policy.

If we think life is sometimes uncomfortable with this friendly superpower just across the border (something like, as one of my American friends once put it, sharing a small tent with a friendly elephant), we might consider what it would be like if the superpower were not friendly.

There are many reasons why it is in the American interest to have a friendly nation on the northern borders of the United States. But there are much more compelling reasons why it is in the Canadian interest to have a friendly nation on the southern borders of Canada.

If the two nations became genuinely unfriendly, it would be bad for the American image abroad, and the United States would find it a bit of a nuisance. Canada, by contrast, would find it a total disaster.

We ought not to forget this. We ought to remember that the stronger the United States is, the safer in the long run we are. We ought to be as understanding as we can about the awful decisions which the President of the United States must make every day, and while we can and should tell him when we think his decisions are damaging to us, we ought also to recognize that the Canadian view of what he is doing is by no means the only factor which he has to take into account.

BASIL DEAN.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am happy to hear the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, because I feel that he always says what he thinks and what is good for the country.

I wish to inform him that the Canadians have gotten the jump on us, because this morning I received from a prominent member of the Canadian Parliament, who also is a member of the victorious party in the recent election, a letter in which he states that he believes we should be making plans for the parliamentarians to get together as soon as possible, because he feels sure that any difficulties which have arisen in recent months can be ironed out and that the relationship between the two countries will be better than ever.

I agree with that suggestion by the distinguished Canadian; and I, too, feel that the time has come when we should be making such plans.

I suppose the Canadians will first wish to organize their Parliament—which will occur sometime within the next 60 days, I believe. But certainly we should be making plans for getting together for consultations, because there is nothing like sitting across the conference table and talking with representatives of the other country, in order to lay at rest unfounded rumors.

Certainly the Senator from Montana is—as he always does—rendering a great service by making his statement today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Vermont; and I look forward to the resumption, under his leadership, of these meetings—which, I repeat, I hope will on occasion be held elsewhere than in the two Capitals, so that the representatives of Canada can see what the rest of our country looks like, and so that the representatives of our country can see what the rest of Canada looks like.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Montana means elsewhere than in Ottawa and Washington, I suppose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Not elsewhere than in Helena and Montpelier.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly. [Laughter.]

EVILS AND CRUELTIES OF TOTALITARIANISM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, Herbert Brin, a gifted writer, is a distinguished newspaper publisher in California. I am proud to count him a dear friend.

Recently Mr. Brin dispatched two significant and deeply moving reports from behind the Iron Curtain which appeared in his newspaper. Those reports remind us who read them of the evils and cruelties of totalitarianism, both Communist and Fascist. The two news stories—one from Moscow entitled "Russian Jews Doomed," and the other from Auschwitz entitled "A Visit to Auschwitz"—speak more eloquently than any further introduction which could be made in the Senate concerning them.

I am delighted to share the reports published in Mr. Brin's Jewish Family Weekly Heritage with the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the two articles, one dated January 17, 1963, and the other dated February 14, 1963, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Heritage, Jan. 17, 1963]

RUSSIAN JEWS DOOMED

(By Herb Brin)

Moscow (Special to Heritage).—Barring a miracle, Jewish life is doomed in this land where nearly 3 million of our people live.

I bear witness.

The totality of repressive measures used to convert Jews to a least common denominator status in this dialectic heaven is frightening.

They are destroying a people's spirit, culture and history.

There is absolutely no contact possible with Jewish life in Russia.

If there are Jews who care in Russia—who can find them?

And in my search that took me to many parts of Moscow, I could find but one Soviet authority to speak for the Jewish community—a very frightened commissar named Aaron Levovitch Vergelis.

Vergelis is editor of the only Yiddish publication in Russia, the Sovietishe Heimland—a literary magazine of little consequence which was launched about a year ago.

He is the spokesman for Jewish life because no formal Jewish community exists.

The rabbi of Moscow's synagogue is silenced: used to attend functions of the party hierarchy at the Kremlin, and little else.

One Russian citizen warned me not to attempt to speak with the rabbi.

He described Vergelis in a singular Yiddish word: "Shvantz," "Snake"—a measure of the acceptance of the magazine by Jews.

These are facts that I found: no newspaper exists to serve Jewish life in Russia; only three or four concerts of Yiddish music are presented during a winter season; there are no Jewish schools for children; each person carries an identification card marked: "Nationality, Jewish"; intermarriage is high as Jewish life is in an advanced process of disintegration.

I was brought to the office of Editor Vergelis by an Intourist guide who was present during the discussions. (To check on the conversation which was to be held in Yiddish?)

Vergelis insisted that despite the assimilation process—which he acknowledged—"the Jewish people will not die out in Russia."

He gave me the "broad picture" act—that the future will one day evolve a "single world culture" and that this was good.

"Is it good for a people to lose its history?" I asked.

Vergelis looked from me to the Intourist guide, and answered in Russian, to be translated to me in English: "It will not be lost."

I asked why Jews of Russia could not be called upon to help the Jews of Morocco (in order to open the subject of contact with Jewish life abroad).

"Our principle is that the Government of Russia acts for us," said Vergelis.

I reminded him that the Jews of America had once called upon the Government of the United States to act in the matter of the Kishinev pogroms. (The United States subsequently recalled its Russian Ambassador in protest against the pogroms.)

"Can the Jews of Russia call upon government to act in behalf of Jews who may be assaulted in other lands?" I asked.

Vergelis understood the implications: that the Jews of Russia were not free.

Then I asked whether it was a wrong principle demanded by Jews of America that they be accorded the right of contact with coreligionists—and families—in Russia.

This was the answer: "For peace, it is a good thing to have contacts against fascism."

I insisted that the principle was larger than a brotherhood against "fascism"—rather that men be accorded the right to communicate freely one with the other.

"There is no organization of Jews in Russia," I said. "How can there be contact except through you?"

Vergelis said there were peoples friendship clubs in America that had contact with him.

"That's the Communist Party," I told him. "American Jews don't want to involve in politics in the matter. We want to be free to communicate with our people here."

I had the feeling that the conversation, in three languages, was being tape recorded, so I appealed over the head of Vergelis to whomever may be listening:

"You have your cultural and political structure and we have ours. That's your business and ours. But I appeal to you to help in the establishment of a committee for contact."

I suggested that the poet, Yevtushenko, be named honorary chairman of such a Russian committee—for while Yevtushenko was not Jewish, he was aware of the depth of the Jewish tragedy in Russia.

Editor Vergelis, obviously moved by my plea, flushed and spoke softly, but promised nothing.

He had advice for Israel:

"Israel must develop a more progressive (meaning Communist) politic; engage more strongly in the fight against fascism * * *. Israel's politics of animosity toward the Arabs and against the progressive (Communist) countries is not clever politics; the support of Adenauer by Israel is deeply resented by Soviet Jews; the press, and parties of Israel should not attack the progressive countries.

"We wish for Israel that they build the land in a democratic way. What is best for the people of Israel is best for the land of Israel."

Then the editor arose and made a speech in Russian, to be transmitted through me to the people of California: that the only way to fly was through cooperation with the Communists.

I suspected the speech was for the authorities on high.

Vergelis was quick to point out that his literary magazine was printing the works of Yiddish writers who had been slain by the Communists under Stalin.

This constituted rehabilitation of the writers, he noted.

I told him that I was the first editor in America to print the story in the English-Jewish press of the destruction of 68 Jewish writers during the Stalin era.

I told him that when I published the stories originally, in 1954 and 1955, I had been attacked by the Communist press as being "irresponsible."

A few weeks later, admission of the tragedy was printed by the Yiddishe Folkstimme in Warsaw, and later confirmed in the famed "cult of the individual" speech of Mr. Khrushchev.

On the sabbath, I attended services at the Moscow Synagogue.

This huge structure is the only one serving our people in the heartland of communism.

It is dirty, unpainted, and a woeful picture of Jewish life in the land.

At the synagogue, I was asked by an attendant to sit up front in a special section set aside for visitors.

Instead, I sat in an area to the right, surrounded by old people, pensioners, who asked a torrent of questions and wanted to know so much.

I prayed with them, and for them.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Heritage, Feb. 14, 1963]

A VISIT TO AUSCHWITZ

(By Herb Brin)

Auschwitz, Poland.—How is a man remembered?

By a scratch upon a wall, he is remembered that once a human being was born, attained manhood, became a father, and nourished a dream within his heart.

But here at Auschwitz the scratches are many, scratch upon scratch upon scratch.

The fingernails bled to find plaster on the walls to scratch an initial, a prayer, a desolate, desperate cry for help.

Twenty years ago it happened that a modern government gathered a people from the far reaches of a continent to manufacture for them death.

Twenty years ago the drama of horror raged in fury, shielded from human understanding by a war that defied description.

If children cried at Auschwitz, there was none to hear.

If mothers fled naked into the forests for their lives, they were returned by the peasants for a grisly ransom.

Children and parents walked here to their eternity, naked and ashamed.

It is to Auschwitz that I came in pilgrimage.

At Birkenau's gas chamber I stood in a foot of snow to light a candle and to recite a prayer.

The cold wind chilled the marrows, and blood was ice in my veins.

Snow gave no beauty to the desolation and the sun gave it no warmth.

At Birkenau, the factory of death for Auschwitz, I stood in silence and in the bleakness of it all, I stood alone.

Only a memory ago, 4 million dreams were destroyed here in the most depraved act by government in human experience.

Three million were Jews.

The rest were citizens of Poland—and the gypsies of Europe.

One asks: Why the gypsies?

But then, one asks: Why a child?

My ride to Auschwitz was an austere one. It began from the city hall of Crakow, the university city of southern Poland, where I was the guest at coffee with Mayor Jan Garlicki.

By car, west, toward the small industrial city of Oswiecim, where terror struck by night and by day, in fire, and in gas.

Here were marshaling yards, for to transport cargo, such yards are necessary.

Still filling the yards of Oswiecim are the cattle cars, the box cars of eternity, now mercifully empty.

They are the same cars that trundled in the night toward the spur track at Birkenau, where a doctor's finger would wave to the right or to the left.

If to the right—it was to the labor camp.

If to the left—it was to the showers without water.

Only a handful were selected for labor.

If the victims were "aryans," they would be photographed and their fate recorded.

If they were "subhumans"—even the dignity of a photograph in death was denied them.

Few of the victims at Auschwitz' 25 square miles of horror ever saw the sign: "Arbeit Macht Frei," "Work Makes Freedom." This was the sign at the main gate to Auschwitz, under which passed the first victims to be met by a band of prisoners playing lively Strauss waltzes.

Later, so the manufacturing process would not be hampered, the victims were taken directly from railroad spur at Birkenau to the underground shower rooms.

In contrast to the desolation at Birkenau, the main barracks at Auschwitz proper are two-story brick structures which, under a covering of snow, have a college dormitory appearance.

Here, human torture knew no measure.

Does a baby's shoe tell the story?

Thousands upon thousands of baby shoes are contained in these barracks.

Does a shaving mug tell the story?

Who can count them? Or the pots they hoped would contain food for them in prison; or the mounds of crutches of the infirm.

Of this human hair, no wigs will be made and no longer will the suitcase of Suse Pollak take her on a holiday in Europe * * * for the macabre suitcases at Auschwitz tell the story for Ludwig Wodak and Olga Kornfeld, and Herman Pasternak, and Franz Kohn—names you can see on top.

Prayer shawls are in showcase, but they are not for sale.

The shoe polish tells the story: the brands are from Greece and from Holland; from France and from Hungary; from Poland and from Yugoslavia.

The flags of 28 nations of the earth are displayed at Auschwitz—the nations whose people were taken.

The flags include the American flag—for many American citizens died in the orgy of horror.

One sees the empty cans of Cyklon B gas pellets, and one leaves the barracks of Auschwitz for Birkenau 3 miles away.

The roads are themselves forbidding as a gray stillness descends upon the earth and an oblique sun strains pitifully through the early haze.

This is the factory of death.

A woman guard takes you through the wooden huts where 1,200 souls would be stored, a day, a week, 2 weeks * * *

Protecting the Nazis from the women and children was an electrified fence of barbed wire.

Who will ever know how many ran to the fence, early?

The inside of the huts were as though yesterday they were throbbing with death: the odor has not left them, the odor of human refuse and terror.

In a corner I found a tiny wire scale.

It was one of many fashioned by the prisoners to measure rations of bread—that in extremes, the sharing would be fair.

The wooden bunks of terror are still there, and I could hear the sobs coming from the corners, from the shadows, a child here, a mother there * * *

On to the railroad spur which ends at an austere stone monument which says simply: "Oswiecim, 1940–45."

Past the twisted jungle of destroyed buildings and to the contorted concrete roof of the crematorium building.

Shame of sorts came to the German army only when it was caught.

For only then were the gas chambers blown up, the crematorium destroyed.

One walks through snow to the knee to approach a monument to the Jewish victims at Birkenau.

The footprints are mine alone—for who will come to Birkenau of a winter to light a candle that 20 winters ago men, women and children * * *

I recited the ancient Kaddish, the Hebrew prayer for the dead that speaks not of death but of holiness.

"Yiskadal v'yiskadash."

Blessed is the name of the Lord.

It was man who failed.

IMPEACHMENT NONSENSE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, recently the San Francisco Examiner, a great American newspaper, threw some needed cold reason on the occasional bleatings of extremists who demand the impeachment of that great American, the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. In a rational and responsible editorial entitled "The Nonsensical Itch To Impeach," the San Francisco Examiner warns that the shrill cry for impeachment is errant nonsense, but that it "attracts frightened souls who, unable to cope with a complex and difficult world, need someone to blame."

The editorial points out further that "the Chief Justice's 'treason' consists of writing opinions with which the extremists disagree."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask that I may be permitted to speak for 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Examiner concludes with the statement:

> The lesson in all this probably won't get through to the kind of persons who put up "Impeach Earl Warren" billboards. But it is, we trust, a useful reminder to all others that the fretful, lunging and frightened way of the radical right is not the American way.

The text of the editorial is excellent. The lesson that it spells out is clear. I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the editorial appearing in the San Francisco Examiner on March 18, 1963, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NONSENSICAL ITCH TO IMPEACH

> Billboards exclaiming "Impeach Earl Warren" have made a belated appearance in the bay area. This cry was first raised in 1954 by a few southerners after the Supreme Court's unanimous decision outlawing segregation. Chief Justice Warren wrote that decision. Later the cry was taken up by various extremist groups, including the John Birch Society; all claim the Court is soft on communism.
>
> Judged strictly as a slogan, the cry is shrewd. It attracts frightened souls who, unable to cope with a complex and difficult world, need someone to blame. The Chief Justice is handy to their purpose, a personal devil to flay. The impeachment slogan promises the relief of action with a high emotional content.
>
> But as a practical political slogan, an obtainable objective, the cry is arrant nonsense.
>
> We are indebted to the Los Angeles Times for a reminder that the rarely used impeachment process is hardly as simple as the extremists seem to regard it.
>
> In the first place, to impeach is not to convict or to remove from office. To impeach is only to vote a formal charge. This must be done by the House of Representatives. Thereafter a trial must be held before the Senate, sitting as court and jury. The Senate arrives at a verdict by majority vote.
>
> But wait a minute. What offense has the Chief Justice committed? Treason, reply the extremists. Treason is specifically defined in the Constitution. And that definition isn't really the kind of treason they are talking about. Winnow out the nonsense, and it develops that the Chief Justice's "treason" consists of writing opinions with which the extremists disagree.
>
> As it happens, millions of Americans disagree at one time or another with decisions written by the Chief Justice or other members of the Court. That includes us. We too have regarded as wrong the Court's decision in some cases dealing with domestic Communists.
>
> But if the crime of treason were charged or impeachment invoked every time the Supreme Court or the President acted contrary to the views of a part of the American public, we would have no stable Government—and no claim to stability as a people either.
>
> The first and greatest Chief Justice, John Marshall, was accused of usurping the power of Congress and the President. The Dred Scott decision split the Nation before the Civil War; the Court of the so-called "Nine Old Men" of the early Roosevelt era evoked fire and fury. But in all these instances our people had the good sense not to invoke impeachment. The one impeachment from political motives that nearly succeeded—that brought against President Andrew Johnson—taught our people that impeachment is never the proper weapon to settle political differences.
>
> The lesson in all this probably won't get through to the kind of persons who put up "Impeach Earl Warren" billboards. But it is, we trust, a useful reminder to all others that the fretful, lunging and frightened way of the radical right is not the American way.

PROBLEMS OF OREGON FARMERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Paul T. Rowell, chief of the Agricultural Development Division of the Oregon Department of Agriculture, in the March 1963 issue of the official publication of the State department of agriculture, has written an article entitled, "Tariff and Trade Restriction Problems of Oregon Agriculture."

In this article, Mr. Rowell has given an excellent exposition of the problems faced by Oregon farmers, particularly our orchardists, seedgrowers, poultry and potato producers in connection with the export of farm commodities.

I particularly call to the attention of Senators the view expressed under the heading of "Conclusions" in his article in which Mr. Rowell states:

> Self-sufficiency in agriculture production is laudable for any nation if that can be attained through efficient production and costs under its type of economy. It is not so when this is attained through inefficient production protected at an artificial level by undue trade restrictions on imports from other countries.
>
> Oregon producers never have requested this type of protection.

They have asked only that efficient production at the level of the U.S. economy be protected against ruinous competition from nations with much lower labor and other costs of production.

What we need is a two-way street, upon which commodities may be traded on a live-and-let-live basis between the friendly and free nations of the world.

Upon such a basis I feel sure Oregon agriculture can hold its own and make further progress in the future.

In my judgment, this is a fair summation of the situation and expresses clearly and concisely the views of those Oregon citizens engaged in our No. 2 industry. Because of the helpful background material contained in the article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TARIFF AND TRADE RESTRICTION PROBLEMS OF OREGON AGRICULTURE

(By Paul T. Rowell)

Oregon agriculture faces both import and export tariff and trade restriction problems in maintaining and broadening markets for its products. On some commodities, Oregon producers must compete with imports to maintain their markets in our own country. On others, they need access to foreign markets for a portion of their output.

At first glance this might appear to indicate that Oregon producers want to eat their cake and have it too. What is the true situation?

BACKGROUND

Going back to the early 1930's, most nations, including our own, had rather high protective tariffs on both industrial and agricultural commodities, particularly on those produced at home. Following passage of our first Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1934, many reductions in import tariffs or duties were made by our country in return for import duty concessions by other countries.

In addition, however, under the most-favored-nations clause in our act, concessions granted by our country on imports from one nation automatically became effective on such imports from all other most favored or friendly nations. As such broadened concessions were not given by other nations, our import duties were decreased on a broader basis and more rapidly than were those of other nations.

Then came World War II, at the end of which the economies of practically all other nations were in much worse shape than our own. European countries were short of dollars during that period, and developed nontariff added restrictions in the form of embargoes, the withholding of import tender or import licenses, and other means of curtailing imports to conserve their dollars.

POSTWAR DEVELOPMENT

Since then the economies of many of those countries have been rebuilt, and they are no longer short of dollars. However, those nontariff absolute restrictions continue to be used by European and many other countries long after economic justification is gone. As then Foreign Agricultural Service Administrator Max Meyers testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee in the spring of 1960:

"No matter how hard we work on the merchandising end of foreign marketing, such work can be frustrated if the trade policies of other countries give our products only limited access to their markets. One of our high priorities is being given to easement of foreign trade restrictions.

"Since the war our Government has engaged in a series of negotiations with other countries in which we have lowered tariffs on each other's goods in order to enlarge trade in both directions. In many instances we were not able to obtain the full benefits of the concessions we received because other countries had quotas or other restrictions in effect which limited our export opportunities.

"Often there was justification at the time for such controls due to the serious balance-of-payments problems these countries were experiencing.

"By late 1959, however, it became apparent that the balances of payments and foreign exchange reserves of a number of countries had improved to the point where they could no longer justify continuation of major restrictions which many of them still maintained against imports from the dollar area. The full power of the U.S. Government has been brought into play to make a renewed assault on this type of trade barrier. We in the Department of Agriculture are participating actively in this effort."

Efforts by our Government to date have been unsuccessful in obtaining removal of those nontariff real regulators of import trade by European countries and most others except our own. Diplomatic rather than trade considerations have been the primary factor in trade agreement negotiations with other countries. This approach has ruled out the withholding of further import duty concessions by our country or the threat of our application of added restrictions if necessary to obtain removal of the nontariff absolute restrictions applied by other nations. These are applied by most other nations whenever their domestic production is adequate for their market demands and added supplies might affect market prices for their own producers.

APPLE AND PEAR EXPORTS

As an example, quoting from "Foreign Agriculture," issue of January 28, 1963, by Foreign Agricultural Service of USDA:

"Onetime leader in the world's apple trade, the United States now ranks fifth, after Italy, Argentina, the Netherlands, and Australia.

"In the years before World War II, this country outran all competitors—the race wasn't even close. Then during the war, U.S. apple exports shrank to one-tenth of their 1935–39 average. Except for Canada's, trade totals of most world exporters also declined.

"By 1948, the world's apple exports had bounced back to one-half of the prewar levels. U.S. apple exports, however, never made a comeback. Around 1945, Western Europe—chief outlet for U.S. apples—had shut its doors to apple imports. Initially, the controls were for balance-of-payments reasons and were authorized by GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade). Although no longer justified on these grounds, the controls were retained to protect local producers. Last year, U.S. apple exports were 4.9 million bushels, or one-half of the U.S. prewar average."

The above experiences apply equally well to U.S. winter pear exports. Over the years, Europe has been an important market outlet both for Hood River apples and for Medford and Hood River winter pears. Both have suffered heavy losses of markets in those countries since World War II.

IMPORTS

On the import side, Oregon producers of several commodities have been affected, in some cases severely, by import competition with little import tariff protection and none of the nontariff absolute restrictions protecting agricultural producers in other countries. Oregon producers of cherries, filberts, strawberries, lamb, wool, beef, cheese, seafoods and fur-bearing animals are some of those affected to greater or lesser degrees.

FINE FESCUE SEEDS

An outstanding example of severe damage to Oregon producers from import competition is that of fine fescue seeds, about 90 percent of U.S. production of which is in Oregon. U.S. usage of these fine lawn and turf seeds has increased greatly in recent years with the vast amount used for suburban home development, golf courses, and similar purposes.

Oregon producers set about to fill those demands, and were doing a good job of it. Then wheat producers in the Peace River Valley of Canada found they could grow creeping red fescue seed quite successfully, and at much lower costs, on their cheaper lands and with cheaper labor costs than in this country.

As a result, in several recent years, Canada has exported to this country far more creeping red fescue seed than we have produced and in some years, Canada shipped to us more than our total production of both creeping red and chewings fescue seeds, which are similar and interchangeable for most usage needs.

With U.S. costs of production around 25 cents per pound, our import duty on fine fescue seeds is only 1 cent per pound, and has been no deterrent to imports from production areas with much cheaper land and labor costs. As a result, and with total market supplies in this country far exceeding market needs, prices to Oregon producers of fine fescue seeds dropped heavily below costs of production for several years. Last year the price here was around 10 cents a pound, with little market demand. This year there is some improvement in market prices and demand, due in part to some abandonment of acreage and reduced production by Oregon growers. Also helping the situation was some return to wheat production by Canadian growers due to their government's emphasis on and incentives given for greater wheat production there the past year, along with the very low U.S. market prices for fine fescue seeds.

By comparison, let's look at some situations faced by Oregon farmers who wish to export even a small portion of their production.

TURKEYS

In July 1957 Canada put in effect a price-support program on their turkey production, and simultaneously placed a total embargo on imports of slaughtered or dressed turkeys from this country. With the costs of production of turkeys and of fine fescue seeds about equal per pound, Canada's import duty on turkeys was and is 5 cents per pound, compared with our 1-cent-per-pound import duty on fine fescue seeds.

U.S. turkey exports to Canada had been only about 1 percent of U.S. production, and were equal to about 10 percent of Canada's turkey production. Oregon producers, however, had been marketing around 15 percent of their turkey production in western Canada, while paying that country's 5 cents per pound import duty. Canada's total embargo remained in effect over 2 years, with resulting surpluses here and serious effects on market prices to Oregon turkey producers.

POTATOES

Another example of nonreciprocal handling of import duties is in the application of Canada's so-called antidumping duty. This is an added duty which is applied on an overnight basis when a competitive agricultural commodity is coming in at a price which would reduce the market price substantially to their own producers.

In the fall of 1961 U.S. potato production was heavy, and market prices fell to $2 per hundredweight F.O.B., for U.S. No. 1 potatoes. With a market price in Canada at that time of $2.78 per hundredweight that country applied an antidumping duty of 78 cents per hundredweight, in addition to its regular import duty of 37½ cents per hundredweight.

The United States has an antidumping duty also, but which is applied only when an exporting nation is pricing its product to our country at less than it is selling within its own country. In the instance above (as in other such instances on U.S. fruits and vegetables), U.S. potatoes were selling at the same price to U.S. markets as they were offered to Canada's markets.

EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Much emphasis has been given during the past year to formation of the European Common Market, and to the passage of the Trade Expansion Act last fall by our Congress to cooperate with the ECM and to meet the problems developed by it.

Basically, the ECM, known more formally as the European Economic Community, is a trade federation of six countries of Western Europe, including Italy, France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg.

Over a period of several years, trade barriers between the ECM member countries are to be reduced to zero, and a common external tariff on each commodity is to be applied to imports from nonmember countries.

As pointed out earlier, trade policies of European countries, as well as of most others, have been heavily protectionist on agricultural commodities which they produce. In general, ECM policies and plans now include a continuation of those strongly protectionist policies, but on a uniform basis by all member countries which would average those previously in effect in the various member countries. Already this has developed serious effects on European trade of some U.S. farm commodities.

POULTRY

ECM regulations on poultry imports have set up a complex system of fixed duties, variable levies, and minimum prices, tending to insulate the Common Market from competitively priced poultry from the United States and elsewhere. West Germany's import fee on U.S. broiler chickens was hiked from 5 cents a pound to 12½ cents on August 1, 1962, and U.S. exports skidded 50 percent from their rate which sent more than 40 million pounds of broilers to West Germany in 1961.

German farmers and other ECM countries can't yet fill the gap, so some German buyers predict a cut in the import fee to stimulate shipments. Nevertheless ECM policy is geared to building self-sufficiency in their agricultural production, so the long-range outlook at this time is poor for our exports of competitive products to that area.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT

Under provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, our President has been given greater powers than ever before to deal with these problems and to obtain fair treatment for U.S. producers. Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, before the Agricultural Ministers of the organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in Paris on last November 19, said:

"We cannot be internationally minded in industrial areas of our respective economies, but nationalistic and overly protective in the agricultural sector. Either the two great sectors must move forward together under liberal trade arrangements, or both will in time succumb to protectionism."

Under Secretary of Agriculture, Charles S. Murphy, in a statement before the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee, on December 12, 1962, said of our negotiations with the ECM:

"We propose to insist upon fair treatment. * * * We have a mandate by the Congress to use this act to gain access for our agricultural commodities. This is evident from the section 252 provision." (Section 252 authorizes the President to withdraw existing trade agreement benefits or to refrain from proclaiming any negotiated trade agreement concessions to countries which maintain unreasonable import restrictions which burden U.S. commerce directly or indirectly.)

These statements were made by Under Secretary of Agriculture Murphy also in his talk before the Sugar Club in New York City on December 17, 1962. In a letter December 28, 1962, to Under Secretary Murphy, I complimented him for making such statements. I added, however, in part,

"It seems apparent that the solution of this matter lies in now doing what we have not done in the past, insisting upon removal of such unwarranted restrictions as a prerequisite to our consideration of any further concessions to those countries, coupled with a threat if necessary, of imposition of similar restrictions by this country, as a "big stick" if needed to convince them that we no longer will knuckle under their continuation of such unjustified restrictions. Until we insist on fair treatment with something other than words, arguments, and entreaties for fair play, we will continue to be at the mercy of those shrewd bargainers across the table.

"With a mandate by the Congress to use this act to gain access for our agricultural commodities, and the powers given the President to carry this out, the way is there if we will use it. This means realistic administration with full backing by the President, of the policies laid down in the Trade Expansion Act, so well voiced in your talk before the Sugar Club on December 17."

CONCLUSIONS

Self-sufficiency in agricultural production is laudable for any nation if that can be attained through efficient production and costs under its type of economy. It is not so when this is attained through inefficient production protected at an artificial level by undue trade restrictions on imports from other countries.

Oregon producers never have requested this type of protection.

They have asked only that efficient production at the level of the U.S. economy be protected against ruinous competition from nations with much lower labor and other costs of production.

What we need is a two-way street, upon which commodities may be traded on a live and let-live basis between the friendly and free nations of the world.

Upon such a basis I feel sure Oregon agriculture can hold its own and make further progress in the future.

EXPENDITURES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Dean Richard W. Lindholm of the School of Business Administration of the University of Oregon, last February published in the Oregon Business Review an article entitled "Higher Education Expenditure Comparisons." Because of the information contained in this article, which I feel will be helpful to Senators at the time education legislation is considered on the floor, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION EXPENDITURE COMPARISONS

(By Richard W. Lindholm)

State and local government taxes and expenditures are being treated together in this article because comparisons of State figures alone can give an incorrect impression.[1] In different States larger or smaller portions of total education expenditures are made by local governments. Even comparisons including total State and local government taxes and expenditures cannot be assumed to indicate absolutely correctly the relative support. For example, the portion of the higher education effort undertaken with tax revenues varies considerably from State to State. In the States used in the comparison the portions of higher education financed from private sources seem to be about the same.

State and local government expenditures are expanding at accelerating rates and between 1958 and 1960 tended to increase more rapidly than personal income. Table 1 shows that in 1960 State and local government expenditures as a percent of personal income varied from a low of 13.9 percent in California to a high of 15.9 percent in Minnesota. This 2 percentage points of difference amounts to a 14 percent difference between the two States in the relative importance to the economy of each State of the level of State and local government activities. Oregon, with State and local government expenditures equal to 15.3 percent of personal income in 1960, is just below Minnesota.

The point highlighted by the above discussion and clearly shown in table 1 is that higher personal income in California permits very substantial State and local government expenditure efforts, while the total, as a percent of personal income, remains lower than in any of the other five States included in the comparison. One cannot help wondering whether or not the boldness of California's State and local government expenditure programs has been a cause of the high per capita income arising from activities other than those of State and local government. In other words, is there a multiplier impact of State and local government expenditures when pointed in directions closely related to economic growth?

HIGHER EDUCATION DEMAND

Higher education expenditures by State and local governments[2] have expanded rapidly. The increase in the Nation has been more than tenfold since 1942; from 1957 to 1960 there was an expansion of 38.9 percent, and these were years when the number of persons of college age did not increase particularly and the value of the dollar was not shrinking noticeably. The growing activity in this area is obvious.

The numbers of persons between the ages of 15 and 24 in the United States for the years 1960, 1965, and 1970 are given in table 2. These are the most recent official population projections by age bracket provided for the United States by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Additional population projections by age brackets have been made by the U.S. Bureau of the Census for planning purposes in particular areas. Education is one area where this has been done.

---

[1] Data and comparisons are presented for Oregon, Washington, California, Minnesota, Colorado, and Florida.

[2] Junior and community colleges are frequently local rather than State institutions.

TABLE 1.—*State and local government expenditure trends in Oregon, Washington, California, Minnesota, Colorado, and Florida, 1958–60* [1]

State	Total direct general expenditures of State and local government (millions)		Percent of growth, 1958 to 1960	Total State and local expenditures as a percent of personal income	
	1958	1960		1958	1960
Oregon	$539.4	$608.0	12.7	15.2	15.3
Washington	879.5	951.6	8.2	14.7	14.4
California	5,016.0	6,020.6	20.0	13.5	13.9
Minnesota	981.1	1,127.1	14.8	15.1	15.9
Colorado	542.3	605.0	11.6	15.3	15.0
Florida	1,132.0	1,415.9	25.0	13.3	14.4

[1] Oregon's comparative position improves when it is tax collections that are compared with personal income. This arises because in Oregon Federal funds provide a larger portion of State and local government expenditures, e.g., in 1960 18.6 percent in Oregon and 12.1 percent in California.

Table 2 age brackets are not particularly appropriate for estimating higher education enrollments. The table is useful to this discussion only because it indicates in a general way the expansion in numbers in the upper "teens" and lower "twenties" that is upon us. This general expansion of the numbers in these age brackets is closely related to the expenditure expansion in higher education that is also upon us.

Table 3 is based on a special U.S. Bureau of the Census study of school and college enrollment expectations. The estimate for 1985 was prepared by the Bureau of Business Research of the University of Oregon. The Bureau of the Census estimated enrollment on the basis of a number of different assumptions. The estimates included in table 3 assume a moderate increase in the percentage of persons within the college age brackets who will actually attend college. It also assumes a decline by 1970 from the very high fertility level of 1955–57 down to the level of 1949–51. This decline is not of critical importance in estimating higher education enrollments, because most persons for the period of the forecast have already been born. However, the assumption of the percentage of persons in each college age bracket who will attend college is important. The assumption of only a small increase in this percentage rather than a continuation of the larger current upward trend gives a conservative yet realistic estimate. It will be too high only if facilities for higher education fail to expand sufficiently to meet the need.

The rapid expansion of higher education enrollment is expected to be completed by 1980. It is also clear that by 1980 the demand for higher education will certainly be twice as great as in 1960, and it may be considerably more.

Although the increase in numbers enrolled in American colleges and universities in 1970 over 1965 will be approximately the same as the increase in 1965 over 1960, it may be forecast with considerable confidence that the addition to the financial burden will be more than proportionate. This will be true because:

TABLE 2.—*Expected number of persons in the United States between the ages of 15 and 24, selected years, 1960–70*

	1960 (thousands)			1965 (thousands)			1970 (thousands)			Percent increase from 1960 to—					
										1965			1970		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
15 to 19 years	13,446	6,806	6,640	17,019	8,635	8,384	18,911	9,595	9,316	26.6	26.9	26.3	40.6	40.9	40.3
20 to 24 years	11,100	5,553	5,547	13,542	6,810	6,732	17,094	8,623	8,471	22.0	22.6	21.4	54.0	55.2	52.7

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Serial P–25, No. 241.

TABLE 3.—*Projections of college enrollment in the United States, selected years, 1960–85*

	Both sexes 14 to 32 years of age		Male 14 to 32 years of age		Female 14 to 32 years of age	
	Total (thousands)	Percent increase from 1960	Total (thousands)	Percent increase from 1960	Total (thousands)	Percent increase from 1960
1960	3,570		2,339		1,231	
1965	4,664	30.6	3,045	30.2	1,619	31.5
1970	5,825	63.2	3,872	65.5	1,953	58.6
1975	6,928	94.1	4,647	98.7	2,281	85.3
1980	7,577	112.0	5,129	119.3	2,448	98.9
1985	7,600	112.9	5,131	119.4	2,469	100.6

Source: 1960–1980, U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1985, Bureau of Business Research, University of Oregon.

1. A much larger proportion of students will be taking upper division and graduate courses in 1970 than in 1965. Nineteen sixty-five will be only the second year of the expansion of higher education enrollment arising from larger high school graduating classes. Because of this, the enrollment expansion will exist only in the freshman and sophomore years in 1965, but in 1970 it will be spread throughout college upper division and graduation programs. Upper division and graduate work is much more expensive in terms of faculty, libraries, and laboratories than is lower division instruction.

2. During the 1960 and 1965 period some very expensive facilities of higher educational institutions are being utilized more completely than during the 1955–60 period. This more complete utilization permits assimilation of expanded enrollment by meeting only the additional variable costs. By the 1965–70 period, under-utilized libraries and laboratories will have become overcrowded. Under these conditions, full costs will have to be met in providing higher education for each additional student.

3. During the postwar inflation, salaries of college staffs have not risen as rapidly as many other technical and professional salaries. The rapidly rising need for additional teachers at all levels, and particularly at the college level, will develop pressures tending to rectify this situation. The result is very likely to be faculty costs rising considerably more rapidly than the size of the student body.[3]

4. To a considerable extent the increase in college enrollments prior to 1964 consisted of expanded numbers of female students. With the increase in the absolute size of high school graduating classes, the portion of expanding college enrollment consisting of male students will increase. The types of college work tending to be taken by males, i.e., science, engineering, and medicine, are considerably more expensive than those for females, who tend to concentrate in education, language and literature, and general studies.

HIGHER EDUCATION EFFORT

Table 4 has been devised to show the rate of growth of higher education between 1942 and 1960 in Oregon and the five States chosen as a comparison base, Washington, California, Minnesota, Colorado, and Florida. State and local government expenditures for higher education as a percent of personal income have increased the least in Minnesota. Measured in this fashion, Minnesota's higher education expenditures in 1942 were 42.1 percent as great as in 1960. In California the increase has been most dramatic, with the level in 1942 only 14.2 percent of that in 1960. The Oregon expansion, measured as change of percentage of personal income spent on higher education by State and local governments, is 6.3 percentage points less than in Washington, 12.4 percentage points greater than in Minnesota, and 15.5 percentage points less than the California expansion.

In all States, with the exception of California and possibly Washington, the expansion of higher education expenditures by State and local governments as a percent of personal income was relatively moderate between 1957 and 1960. Measured in this fashion, expenditures for higher education in California increased 46 percentage points between 1957 and 1960, and the increase for Washington, the next most active State in this respect, was less than half as great and equaled 22.6 percentage points. Oregon, with an increase of 16.9 percentage points, was fourth in effort expansion, being exceeded by Minnesota as well as by California and Washington. Colorado's higher education expenditure growth of 12 percentage points is the lowest.

TABLE 4.—*Index of personal income spent on higher education*

State	1960	1958	1957	1942
Oregon	100	94.9	83.1	29.7
Washington	100	73.4	77.4	23.4
California	100	66.9	54.0	14.2
Minnesota	100	88.9	80.2	42.1
Colorado	100	93.5	88.0	37.0
Florida	100	83.9	85.5	40.3
Average	100	83.6	78.0	31.1

---

[3] Prof. Seymour E. Harris has over a period of years carried out studies in this area. It is his belief, which is backed by considerable data, that, if 1930 is considered 100, the real income of college professors in 1958 had fallen to 85, while the real income of the average American had risen to 175.

Although California has experienced by far the greatest growth rate as measured in table 4, her expenditures in 1960 as a percent of personal income as shown by table 5 are only 0.01 percentage points greater than those of Colorado, the State with the lowest growth rate between 1957 and 1960. Table 5 shows clearly that both California and Washington between 1958 and 1960 dramatically increased their commitment to higher education. They were able to do this partially because their relative effort measured as percent of personal income spent on higher education by State and local governments in 1958 was considerably below that of Colorado, Minnesota, and Oregon (see table 5).

TABLE 5.—*Higher education expenditures as a percent of personal income* [1]

State	1960	1958	1957	1942
Oregon	1.18	1.12	0.98	0.35
Washington	1.24	.91	.96	.29
California	1.39	.93	.75	.19
Minnesota	1.26	1.12	1.01	.53
Colorado	1.38	1.29	1.20	.51
Florida	.62	.52	.53	.25

[1] Comparative data are not available to determine if a difference exists between States in the portion of higher education expenditures financed with Federal funds.

Table 5 shows that in 1960 higher education expenditures as percent of personal income were just about even and highest in California and Colorado at 1.39 and 1.38 percent, respectively. The next two States in terms of effort, and also about equal, are Minnesota and Washington at 1.26 and 1.24 percent, respectively. Oregon at 1.18 percent is alone, with Florida far in the rear at 0.62 percent. Relative effort in Oregon has deteriorated since 1958, when the State was tied with the second most active State, Minnesota; the relative position of these two States in 1957 has been reestablished.

These measurements of percent of personal income spent on higher education do not measure the effectiveness of that education. Certainly, unwise policies and duplication of services may cause State and local governments to make ineffective expenditures in the area of higher education. But there are no good grounds for believing that efficiency is any lower in educational expenditure than in any other activity.

THE MALLORY RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Washington Post there appears an excellent editorial entitled "Protecting Defendants."

The editorial deals with the position of the Washington Post in regard to the Mallory rule. The position stated happens to be my position. It is also the position that was taken by a majority of the members of the District Bar Association at a meeting here in Washington, D.C., last week. The editorial comments briefly upon the so-called Acheson proposal—the proposal of the U.S. district attorney—in this area. It criticizes the Acheson bill. I think every word of the criticism is sound. The Acheson bill is a most unacceptable compromise. When one concludes a reading of the Acheson bill, he discovers he has nothing but a meaningless hodgepodge left.

I believe that the position of the Washington Post is so sound in its criticism that I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTECTING DEFENDANTS

The explosion at the District Bar Association meeting last week was a thoroughly healthy one. It reflected a rank-and-file rebellion against an attempt by the Board of Directors to put through a resolution which would have placed the association on record behind proposed legislation designed to diminish the protection of defendants in District courts.

An overwhelming majority of the 900-odd lawyers who attended the meeting voted against three bills proposed by a special committee (set up in disregard of the regular criminal law committee) aimed at revising the Mallory rule and permitting easy interrogation of suspects by policemen. The outcome was immensely becoming to independent lawyers in a free country—where one of the functions of a lawyer is to protect individuals against arbitrary or overbearing governmental conduct. Lawyers are, in a special sense, the champions of legal and constitutional rights. The District Bar Association ably vindicated that special responsibility.

The Senate and House District Committees are both now considering a sheaf of proposals to deal with the admissibility of criminal confessions in court here. In one way or another these seek revision of the *Mallory* rule laid down by a unanimous Supreme Court in 1957, although no real showing has ever been made that the *Mallory* rule interferes unduly with effective law enforcement.

Conspicuously absent from this sheaf of proposals is any recommendation from the Department of Justice, which has had the subject under consideration for many months. Instead, there is a bill proposed by U.S. Attorney David Acheson after consultation with Department officials but without their expressed concurrence or any official administration endorsement.

The Acheson bill seems to us longer but not much better than the proposal rejected last week by the bar association. It hems and haws, advances and retreats, gives with one hand and takes away with the other. It makes a gesture at protecting constitutional rights by providing that arrested persons be plainly advised of their right to remain silent by police officers—but not by a judicial officer—and by providing that arrested persons be afforded reasonable opportunity to notify a relative or friend and consult with counsel—but it does not assure provision of counsel for the indigent and the ignorant.

This proposal by the U.S. attorney is undoubtedly a conscientious effort to reconcile the exigencies of criminal prosecution with the imperatives of constitutional liberty. We think it ends in whittling away dangerously at vital procedural safeguards. It is a sound principle of law that arrested persons should be taken before a judicial officer without unnecessary delay, that they should be advised of their rights by a judicial officer and that they should be subject to detention only upon the authorization of a judicial officer. The only effective way we can think of to make the police observe this principle of law is to forbid the use of any evidence, including confessions, obtained in violation of it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, announcing that the American Law Institute will undertake a study of the whole question of investigation arrest and the assurance that there shall be adequate notice and hearing on arraignment prior to long police examination. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW GROUP TO PROBE ARREST ISSUE

The American Law Institute plans a deep probe into a legal issue that is generating attention and controversy in Washington—the period between the arrest of a suspect and his appearance before a magistrate.

The Ford Foundation announced yesterday in New York City that it has made a grant of $215,000 to the institute, to draft a model statute that it hopes will be a guide for State legislation and for Federal, State, and local officials.

The model code on prearraignment procedures will be drafted by a small research staff and reviewed by a committee of judges, lawyers, law teachers, police officers, and sociologists. No time limit was set for the production of the code, but Washington lawyers said some of the studies carried out by the institute have lasted 3 or more years.

The rights of crime suspects stirred controversy here with the banning of investigative arrests effective March 15, a move defended by civil liberties advocates and attacked by those who feel the court's liberal rulings will let criminals go free.

Legislation is also before Congress to modify the Mallory rule, which requires that an arrested person be arraigned promptly and that he be instructed of his rights if a confession obtained from him after his arrest is to be used to convict him. Police officers have protested that overly strict enforcement of the rule hampers interrogation of suspects.

Although the District of Columbia operates under Federal procedural rules, systems vary widely in the 50 States and many authorities complain that the functions of police and prosecutor remain unregulated during the prearraignment period.

Officials here say the newly announced probe will be discussed when the institute holds one of its regular meetings at the Mayflower Hotel May 21–25.

Another grant of $500,000 was made by the Ford Foundation to the Walter E. Meyer Research Institute of Law to probe criminal justice, particularly the handling of petty offenses. The Meyer Institute's program also will include research on family disorganization and juvenile crime as dealt with by the courts; reparation for victims of auto accidents; protection of consumers against deceptive products and practices; the integrity and efficiency of police, courts, and other agencies in large cities; and problems of local government and community services.

Among the other grants announced by the Ford Foundation was one of $175,000 to Morgan State College in Baltimore. The grant is to expand that predominantly Negro college's program of education in public affairs. It will include internships in political offices, field research, and related activities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to those in the Congress who are so anxious to have quick action reversing the U.S. Supreme Court landmark decision in the Mallory case that we should wait until the American Law Institute completes its study of the subject. A group of scholars, judges, and law enforcement officers will prepare the study. We will then in my judgment for the first time have a sound, factual, and scholarly basis on which to act on the Mallory rule.

I strongly recommend a postponement of any further consideration of the matter in the Senate until the American Law Institute prepares its report.

The article, entitled "Law Group To Probe Arrest Issue," states:

> The American Law Institute plans a deep probe into a legal issue that is generating attention and controversy in Washington—the period between the arrest of a suspect and his appearance before a magistrate.
>
> The Ford Foundation announced yesterday in New York City that it has made a grant of $125,000 to the institute—

Which will be available for the study. I certainly think it would be shortsighted for the Congress to proceed to act until this scholarly report and study is completed.

PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE FEDERAL SUBSIDIES TO MISSISSIPPI

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the New York Times of Friday, April 19, there appeared a column by James Reston entitled "How To Make Things Worse Than They Really Are." The article sets forth Mr. Reston's opposition to any proposal that Federal funds should be denied the sovereign State of Mississippi because of difficulties in Mississippi in giving first-class citizenship right to all American citizens, including Negroes.

I completely agree with the observation of Mr. Reston. The way to solve our civil rights problem is not by way of the penalty route. We do not solve problems by penalizing or acting out of vindictiveness or on an emotional basis.

We have a serious problem of civil rights in Mississippi. In my judgment, the way to handle it is to amend the civil rights laws of our country on a legislative basis, and to enforce the laws that we already have. But I do not believe that it would be a sound course of action to follow the proposal made by some in the Congress that we ought to deny to any State its share of Federal aid money in regard to a measure that involves sound general welfare programs because we do not like what is going on inside the borders of that State. In my judgment, that is not the way to solve our civil rights problems.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to what the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon had to say about Mississippi. I agree wholeheartedly with his remarks on the Mississippi situation and the suggestion by the Civil Rights Commission.

Insofar as the proposal or suggestion made by the Civil Rights Commission that the President cut off Federal subsidies to Mississippi is concerned, the President has stated that he does not have this power, nor does he think any President should have that power. The President is correct in both instances, because he does not have the constitutional power, and, secondly, if he did have that authority and used it, Mississippi might be used as a precedent and the same tactic might be employed against other States. Furthermore, Mississippi is a part of the Union of 50 States, and a proposal of this kind would not only bring about a "set apart" status for Mississippi, but it would also be felt most deeply by the Negroes who comprise approximately 45 percent of Mississippi's population. In addition, such a proposal would bypass the courts by giving to the President, and/or the Congress, the right to determine when a State's conduct conflicts with the Constitution. Mississippi is not the only State in which the Government spends more money than it takes out.

Finally, so far as the new airport at Jackson is concerned, I understand there are no Federal funds involved in the construction of the terminal.

Patience and the judicial process are the answers in instances of this kind—not arbitrary proposals or unwarranted, dictatorial action; the provision for it does not exist under the Constitution.

CRITICS MISS POINT ON FEDERAL FINANCE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Members of Congress are aware of the concern of our citizens over the rising cost of Government in the last decade. And we are well aware—although many of our citizens are not—that both the costs and the debts of State and local governments have risen much faster than those of the Federal Government.

This fact does not imply criticism of the States. We understand, I am sure, the tremendous burdens being placed on these units of Government by the needs of a rapidly expanding population, and the vigorous efforts many are making to carry these burdens.

However, if our citizens are to make the proper decisions concerning Government, they must act from a knowledge of the facts. And it is refreshing to see on the business pages of our newspapers such an analysis as that by the well-known financial writer Mr. Harold B. Dorsey, which was carried by the Washington Post last Monday, April 15.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dorsey's column be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITICS MISS POINT ON FEDERAL FINANCE

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

There is a propensity among critics of government expenditures and taxes to concentrate on the Federal Government's financial operations and to ignore those of the State and local governments. There have been instances where the word "government" has been used so loosely that the Federal Government tends to be criticized for State and local government actions.

In the 5 years through 1962, the number of workers on the Federal Government payroll increased 124,000 (5.6 percent). The number of employees on the payrolls of State and local governments increased by 1,435,000 (26 percent). State and local government workers outnumbered Federal employees by 2.9 times last year.

Federal Government debt in the same 5-year period increased about 14 percent. The debt of State and local governments increased by about 55 percent. On a cash basis, Federal Government expenditures in the same period increased about 34 percent and the State and local government expenditures increased 43 percent. Furthermore, the increase in the Federal expenditures includes substantially larger grants-in-aid to the State and local governments.

When we think of "government" levies siphoning off an increasing proportion of the productive efforts of the nongovernment economy, perhaps we should note that, on a cash basis, Federal receipts increased by approximately 27 percent in the 5 years through 1962, whereas the State and local government receipts increased by about 43 percent.

Five years ago (1957), Federal Government purchases of goods and services accounted for 11.8 percent of total gross national product and last year the proportion was 11.3 percent. The proportion for similar State and local government purchases was 8.3 percent in 1957 and increased to 10.3 percent last year.

It is quite clear then that in all of these measurements of employment and fiscal operations, the State and local government figures have been rising much more rapidly than those of the Federal Government. I doubt that there is a broad comprehension of these facts. This is unfortunate because it leads to many misunderstandings in the interpretation of business and government statistics.

For example, the Federal tax burden is not difficult to follow—and to criticize—because the bulk of it consists rather simply of income and social insurance taxes. The bulk of the State revenues comes from property taxes and from various types of sales and excise taxes, and license fees. Most of the sales and excise taxes are directly added to the price of goods and services sold and tend to be overlooked. Some portion of the increase in the cost-of-living index is caused directly by these taxes.

The rising importance of State and local government activities vis-a-vis the Federal Government deserves more attention in the projections of business prospects. Business analysts labor over the economic effects of Federal receipts and expenditures, but usually do not have a proportionate interest in the same figures for the State and local governments.

Similarly, the effect of Federal debt on the banking structure is analyzed carefully with little thought being given to the effects of State and local government deficit financing. In the past 18 months there has been little change in the commercial bank holdings of Federal securities whereas their holdings of State and local government issues have been rising quite sharply.

There is not enough space here to even tabulate the economic, sociological, and political interpretations that are distorted by a failure to comprehend the rapidly changing relationship between the Federal Government's financial operations and those of the State and local governments.

One small item occurs to me that may be germane to the current situation. The beneficial effects of a reduction of, let us say, $10 billion in Federal income taxes are likely to be offset, in part, by the steady increase in the tax burden of State and local governments, even though these latter levies may be fairly well hidden in sales and excise taxes that increase the prices of commodities and services.

RATIFICATION BY FLORIDA LEGISLATURE OF PROPOSED ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am particularly happy to report to the Senate today that the State of Florida, which

I represent in part, has ratified the proposed anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution, thus becoming the 31st State to do so.

This action followed the strong recommendation of the Governor of Florida, the Honorable Farris Bryant, in his regular message to the legislature. Florida was the second Southern State to ratify, the first being Tennessee.

Pursuant to the assurances which I have frequently given Members of the Senate during the years of consideration by the Congress of this matter, I appeared personally on April 10 before a joint meeting of the senate committee on constitutional amendments and the house committee on memorials and resolutions of the Florida Legislature, representing not only myself but also my distinguished colleague (Mr. SMATHERS) who has stood stanchly with me, along with so many other Members of this body, in this long fight. Those were the committees to which the resolutions of ratification had been referred.

Immediately thereafter, each committee favorably reported its respective resolution of ratification with a single dissenting vote. Shortly thereafter, on Friday, April 12, the Florida Senate approved the anti-poll-tax resolution by a vote of 36 to 6, and the Florida House by a vote of 105 to 3.

On last Thursday, April 18, the Florida House accepted the Senate's resolution ratifying the amendment, thus completing formal ratification by the legislature of my State.

With this highly commendable action by the Florida Legislature, leading toward better government through wider voter participation in Federal elections, we thus have moved one more important step forward toward ratification by the 38 States of the Union required.

As I have pointed out to the Senate recently, one house or the other of the legislatures of four other States has approved a resolution ratifying the anti-poll-tax amendment. Those States are Iowa, Delaware, Oklahoma, and Missouri.

The legislatures of four other States to which the anti-poll-tax amendment has been submitted by the General Services Administrator are also presently in session. Those States are Maine, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Texas.

I am indeed hopeful that we shall soon receive good news from the legislatures of several of the above named eight States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished senior Senator from Florida is entitled to special commendation, because for more than a decade he has been the leader in the fight to abolish the poll tax as a means for validating a voter's right to cast his vote.

The Senator from Florida within the past several days appeared before his own State legislature. I am sure, because of his active and personal interest in the proposal, that he had much to do with getting the legislature of his State to go along with his proposal.

I have heard statements made time and time again on the floor of this Chamber that the way to bring about the abolition of the poll tax is to legislate, rather than to follow the process of constitutional amendment. I am happy, therefore, to know that Florida is the 31st State to take action, and that under the amendatory constitutional process we are so close to the goal of removing the poll tax as a means test for voting.

I wish to pay public tribute to the leader in this fight who, against terrific odds—and time and time again against entrenched opposition—has been able to bring this particular issue to the extremely favorable position which it occupies at the present time. I express the hope that if we cannot get the necessary votes from State legislatures this year, that next year will mark the end of this struggle.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate those more than generous remarks. I would be derelict if I did not say that the action in 31 States has been due in large part to the activities of Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, who, having supported my resolution proposing the amendment last year, have proceeded to bring the matter to the attention of their own State legislatures, with such gratifying results. I am certainly deeply beholden to them.

Since our State has now become bipartisan—there are some 15 members of the legislature who represent the party which occupies the other side of the aisle here—I wish to make it very clear that the support of ratification came from both parties, and was completely bipartisan. Although I have not reviewed the vote, it is my understanding that every member of the opposing part of both Houses of the Florida Legislature voted for ratification.

So we continue this completely bipartisan effort, which I hope will soon be consummated.

I thank the majority leader.

THE SITUATION IN LAOS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, today's Washington Post carries the story:

> Neutralist Prime Minister Prince Souvanna Phouma brought back another Communist Pathet Lao cease-fire promise from the Plain of Jars today, a week after he hopefully returned with the first one that turned out to be embarrassingly empty.

During 1961, and in the early part of 1962, the newspapers of the country, commentators and others, were reporting word that there was to be a cease-fire in Laos.

Day after day I listened to commentators and read newspapers giving the encouraging word to the people of the world that firing would cease in that important land in the Far East. But no cessation of firing came about. The firing continued. The Communists were the ones who were moving forward, taking increasing control of the Laotian land.

Today we have a sad spectacle of an identical repetition of what happened in 1961 and 1962. I think we ought to give some consideration to the fact that we have been again deceived, again trapped, and again weakened in our political and military position by the coalition government that was so widely heralded by members of the administration and others as the solvent of the problem in South Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Malaya, and other places in the Far East.

On this score, a year or more ago, I warned against the establishment of a troika government. I pointed out what happened in Yugoslavia, wherein the Mihailovitch forces were compelled to join in a coalition government with Tito. Others pointed out what had happened in China when Chiang Kai-shek was compelled to enter into a coalition government with the Communists of China. Others pointed out the situation which prevailed in Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, and other countries.

Wherever a commitment was made by the Communists to establish a neutral coalition government, that commitment was violated.

We then come down to the summer of 1962. The proposal was made, "Let us have a coalition, a three-headed, a troika government. We will have a neutralist in the middle, a Communist in the left wing, and a member of the incumbent government in the right wing, and out it will come triumph in the Far East."

Those who warned and those who spoke about the danger and said that the coalition government would be only a vehicle for the advancement of the Communist cause were looked upon with contempt and disdain.

Well, the newspapers today report that practically all of the strongholds of the incumbent royal government have been taken over by the Communists. The question is, How far can we tolerate conditions of that type?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have some additional time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I know these words are unwelcome, but, though unwelcome, they are true. They cannot be denied. And I will not remain silent just because of their unpopularity.

I have before me the protocol that was entered into by, I think, 14 nations, concerning Laos. It is the protocol for the establishment of the coalition government. To begin with, a commission was created, a commission made up of Canada, India, and Poland, to insure that the commitments in the protocol would be carried into effect.

We knew then, and we know now, that Poland and India could not be expected to do much with regard to carrying into effect the commitments. One of the articles in the protocol provides that within 30 days after the protocol is signed the troops of the United States, of France, and of Communist China and Russia were to be removed from Laos.

The agreement was signed, I think, on September 6. By October 6, those troops were to be removed. The United States removed its soldiers. France removed its soldiers. But Red China and Red Russia did not comply with the agreement. Ten thousand of them were there. How many went out of the country we do not know, but it is an established fact that that part of the agreement was flagrantly voilated.

There were other articles in the agreement. Practically none of them were fulfilled. The commission, made up of Poland and India, primarily, and also Canada, was supposed to be insurance that there would be no firing. There was no firing since last September, but the firing has begun again and the Communists are advancing.

Laos is gone. The papers report today that the President may sent the fleet to South Vietnam area to give a demonstration of strength.

We are doing exactly what Chamberlain did. We are being pushed and we are retreating, and each day our problem is betting graver. Now we are going to try to help in South Vietnam. Our ability to help has been substantially reduced by the fall of Laos.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's additional time has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask to have some additional time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has been the practice, and it has been so since 1944, that when a coalition government is created, with the Communists as a part of it, they break their word. They did exactly that in Laos. The consequence is that our position in the world is made basically and fundamentally worse than it was 2 years ago.

A moment ago I stated that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] had made a statement on the floor of the Senate on May 21, 1962. I suggest that his statement be read, because it foretold exactly what we are witnessing today. He told about the coalition government of Subasic of Yugoslavia. Tito took over and the neutralists were kicked out. The Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs, who believe in a democratic form of government, in the main have had to flee to Canada, Australia, South America, and the United States.

The same thing happened in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, and in Bulgaria. Yet we persist in making coalition agreements with Communist Russia.

It is now proposed to make a treaty on the banning of nuclear tests and the banning of armaments. I would like to see a treaty of that type executed, but I warn that we must have an agreement filled with ironclad provisions, so that we shall never again be betrayed and duped by the duplicity and the deceit and the mendacity of the Communists.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the speech of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] in the Senate on Monday, May 21, 1962.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF HON. THOMAS A. DODD, OF CONNECTICUT, IN THE U.S. SENATE, MONDAY, MAY 21, 1962

Mr. President, we are all, I know, deeply distressed over the trend of events in Laos. No one could help but be impressed by the President's message, and by his warning concerning the gravity of the situation in southeast Asia.

President Kennedy will, I am certain, have the support of all of us in his decision to dispatch American troops to defensive positions on the Laotian frontier, and for any further measures he may find it necessary to take to prevent the subjugation of southeast Asia by international communism.

In his prompt and solitary decision to send American forces into Thailand, President Kennedy has provided the kind of leadership which galvanized the free world at the time of the Korean invasion, the kind of leadership which our allies expect of us. By his actions President Kennedy has greatly bolstered the entire position of the free world in the southeast Asia crisis. But these energetic measures, I fear, will be seriously undermined and conceivably negated unless we also take measures to reappraise and revise certain aspects of our policy in Laos.

Both Republican and Democratic administrations have committed themselves to defend the freedom of Laos against the threat of Communist aggression. When SEATO was established after the fall of North Vietnam, Laos was specifically brought under the SEATO umbrella and the Asian Communists were warned that an attack against it would result in a collective response by the SEATO powers.

But today, despite our onetime assurances to Laos and despite the assurances we have now given to Vietnam and to Thailand, the fact remains that Laos stands in serious danger of a Communist takeover.

The present crisis makes it imperative that we reappraise our recent policy in Laos, to see where we have erred and what might be done, even at this late date, to salvage something from the situation.

In Laos, Communist tactics have admittedly been complex, but they have in no way been novel. On the one hand, they have exercised military pressure through native guerrillas and North Vietnamese troops. On the other hand, they have inactivated us through protracted negotiations and bewitched us with the prospect of a neutralist Laos, governed by a Communist-neutralist-conservative coalition.

In Laos, indeed, our entire policy has been predicated on the assumption that Soviet desires did not go beyond the establishment of a truly neutral government, open to the influence of Moscow and Washington alike. It is in line with this belief that we have urged our Laotian friends to enter into a coalition government with the Communist and neutralist forces. But the prospects of peaceful coexistence in Laos have been shattered by the events of the past week.

"That the United States has been played for a fool—"

Said the distinguished columnist Marguerite Higgins, in the New York Herald Tribune, Monday, May 14—

"was evident in Washington, firstly, from events in Laos, where Red troops led by Hanoi and Red-Chinese trained officers were ferociously giving the lie to the Harriman doctrine * * *. It was evident from the small, smug smiles of the Communist statesmen and journalists in Washington, who were patronizingly telling the subdued and silent non-Communist set that—in the words of one Soviet bloc official—'the New Frontier never really set much store by Laos anyway, so how could you consider it a setback?' It was evident from the cold indifference with which Moscow heard out Washington's pleas to live up to pledges to support the cease-fire."

The crisis of Laos represents a crisis of the first magnitude for the whole of southeast Asia. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that it represents a crisis of the first magnitude for the whole free world.

The countries of southeast Asia are rich in natural resources. But it is their strategic importance, rather than their economic importance, that makes them primary targets of Communist aggression.

If the Communists ever succeeded in establishing their dominion over the whole of southeast Asia, they will, in effect, have cut the world in half. The western Pacific land mass will be theirs from the Bering Straits to Singapore, while the control of the southern island chain, from Sumatra to New Guinea, would give them command of the entrances from the Pacific Ocean to the Indian Ocean.

The Communists' conquest of southeast Asia would produce so serious a shift in the world balance of power that our very ability to survive would be called into question.

From our recent policy in Vietnam and from the commitment we have now made to Thailand, it would appear that we have accepted the harsh reality that our own security and the security of southeast Asia are inseparately intertwined. The most dramatic evidence of this is the fact that 5,000 American soldiers are today serving in South Vietnam as instructors in guerrilla warfare, as transport pilots, and as advisers in combat areas, while another several thousand have now been dispatched to the frontier of Thailand.

The administration has made it clear by these commitments that South Vietnam and Thailand will not be permitted to fall to communism. But we have been warned, and rightly, that it may take many years before this battle is won, and that it will almost certainly take a much heavier commitment in American manpower and, conceivably, in American blood.

The Communist assault on the countries of southeast Asia has been incredibly persistent, incredibly cunning, and remarkably successful.

Their primary weapon in this area has been guerrilla movements, organized and trained in and supported from territory already under their control. With this weapon they almost succeeded in taking over Malaya, they succeeded in conquering the larger part of Vietnam, and they have now taken control of the larger part of Laos.

In Malaya, the number of Communist guerrillas never exceeded 10,000. But it required the expenditure of billions of dollars and the efforts of a highly trained British Commonwealth force of several hundred thousand men over a period of 5 years before the Malayan guerrillas were brought under control. As a result of the British experience in Malaya, it is now accepted as a fact that, even employing troops of the highest quality, a successful antiguerrilla operation requires antiguerrilla forces 10 to 15 times as numerous as the guerrilla forces which oppose them.

In Vietnam, when I was there less than a year ago, the number of Communist guerrillas was estimated at approximately 10,000 men. Opposing them was a Vietnamese army some 120,000 strong, backed up by another 30 or 40 thousand home guards. But even with these numerical odds, the Government was able to make no serious headway against the guerrillas. More than 1,000 Government representatives and village administrators were being assassinated every month. Every day brought new reports of attacks on bridges and powerhouses and other installations. The hard-pressed Government army, which had done without leave for many months, was strained to the breaking point. The administration of the country was slowly deteriorating as a result of the terrible casualties inflicted on administrators and technicians at all levels of government. The morale of the people was sagging.

I wholeheartedly applaud the administration's commitment to save South Vietnam from the growing menace of Communist subversion. But, on the basis of what I saw and learned in the course of an extensive tour of southeast Asia last year, I am afraid that there has been a tendency to focus too narrowly on South Vietnam.

As matters stand today, I believe that our policy in South Vietnam is in conflict with our policy in Laos, that our policy in Laos, as a matter of fact, is undermining the affirmative and courageous policy we are endeavoring to follow in Vietnam.

I think we would all have less difficulty in understanding the world situation if we studied our maps more frequently. In the case of Laos, its strategic importance should be instantly apparent from a look at the map.

If there is any one country that may be described as the geographic heart of southeast Asia, it is Laos. For Laos has common frontiers with virtually every country in the area—with Communist China and North Vietnam, with the neutralist nations of Cambodia and Burma, and with the two committed nations of the southeast Asia mainland, South Vietnam and Thailand.

Toward the end of 1960, Soviet planes began airlifting supplies to the Lao Communist, or Pathet Lao, forces. At this point, the Soviets were still very uncertain of our reaction. The first Soviet planes that flew in carried benzene. These Soviet planes discharged their cargoes unmolested: we did nothing. Perhaps President Eisenhower did not want to commit the American Government to a potentially hazardous course of action in the last days of his regime.

In any event, the next group of Soviet planes that arrived carried small arms ammunition. Still, we did nothing.

Then Soviet planes began to arrive bearing jeeps and howitzers and other heavy equipment. Still, we did nothing.

Finally, when it was apparent that they could intervene with impunity, and that there would be no American reaction, the Communists began flying in technicians and military personnel.

There still was the possibility that SEATO would honor its obligations to defend Laos against the threat of Communist aggression. But when the SEATO Council met in April of 1961, it took no action. The SEATO nations in the immediate area—the Philippines, Thailand, Australia, New Zealand, and Pakistan—all favored common military action in defense of Laos. Britain and France objected. The United States sat on the fence. And since all SEATO decisions must be unanimous, SEATO did nothing.

I want to emphasize that at the time this SEATO meeting took place, our Asian allies were prepared to provide all or most of the necessary ground troops. They took the stand that it was much better for Asians to fight in Asia and that, if SEATO did intervene, American participation should consist primarily of air and logistical support. Had we provided the necessary leadership at this historic session of SEATO, Laos would not be on the verge of falling to communism today. But instead of providing such leadership, our own primacy in SEATO was used as a brake to prevent the Asian member nations from taking the measures of collective self-defense which they considered essential.

Our Asian allies were bitterly disappointed. "We are prepared to fight and die with you if necessary."

Philippine Foreign Minister Serano said to me just a year ago this month—"but we cannot fight without American leadership."

For this delinquency we shall, I am afraid, have to pay a heavy price both in American and Asian blood.

One of the excuses that has been offered for our own inaction in Laos is that the Lao people and the Lao Army have shown no will or ability to resist the Communists. This is coupled with the assertion that the Communists apparently have far more popular backing than does the Royal Lao Government.

Even if these assertions were completely true—which they are not—it would, in my opinion, still be necessary to defend Laos; even if we were not interested in the fate of the Lao people, the defense of Laos would still be a strategic necessity because, ultimately, the fate of all southeast Asia and our own security may hinge on it.

But I do not accept the thesis that the Lao people are indifferent to communism and that the Royalist forces are incapable of fighting.

I remind the Senators that it was a year ago last December that the Royalist army, under General Phoumi, drove the highly touted Kong Le rebels out of Vientiane.

I remind the Senators, too, that certain units of the Lao Army, in particular the 10,000 Meo tribesmen who are serving with it, have put up truly heroic resistance in situation after situation.

I call to their attention the fact that there are now more than 40,000 refugees from Communist terror in the Vientiane area, and that hundreds more are arriving every day.

I call to their attention the reports of the dedicated American missionary, Father Matthew Menger, whom I met in Laos, and whom I recently had the pleasure of seeing again in this country. Father Menger is one of the very few Americans who speak Laotian fluently. He has traveled extensively on foot throughout the country. He has, even in recent months, visited many villages in territory that is supposed to be under firm Communist control. Father Menger has reported that the Communists control the strategic centers; but even in the northern province of Samneua, which was the first to fall to the Communists, the capital city of Samneua is completely surrounded by anti-Communist villages.

As of 2 years ago, it was probably true that few Laotians knew the meaning of communism or felt very strongly about it. But, as of today, the evidence is that the Laotian people have learned the meaning of communism the hard way, from their actual experiences under Communist rule in those portions of the country that have been overrun by the Laotian and Vietnamese Red forces.

True, the Laotians, by and large, are not a martial people. There may be a number of reasons for this. Certainly one of them is the orthodox Buddhist religion which prevails in Laos and which frowns upon the killing of any living thing, even so useless a thing as a mosquito. But American military men with whom I discussed the situation told me that, with adequate training and proper leadership, the Lao can be a very good fighting man. They said that certain of the best trained units in the Royalist army had conducted themselves in a highly creditable manner in engagements with the Communists. Against the Laotian Communists, I was told, the Royal army was generally able to hold its own and better. But they were simply no match for the hardened professionals of the North Vietnamese Communist army which has been participating in the Laotian civil war through independent units and through units of specialists attached to the Laotian Communist forces.

There is another reason, in my opinion, why the Royal Laotian army units have frequently failed to stand up against the Communist enemy. All the world has confidence in a winner; and in Asia, far more than in Western countries, human behavior is determined by a belief in an irresistible wave of the future or by an equally fatalistic acceptance of certain downfall and defeat.

With their aggression, their determination, their persistence, their arrogant self-confidence, and the unstinting backing they have received from the Soviet Union and Red China, the Lao Communists have succeeded in creating the impression that they are part of the irresistible wave of the future. By our own inaction and by our repeated failures to live up to our assurances, we have fostered the corollary impression that our side is doomed.

Under these circumstances, who can blame the Lao army if its morale has frequently been uncertain? Even Americans serving as instructors and advisers in Laos have been demoralized by the ambivalence of American policy. For example, last Sunday over one radio news program, an American instructor in Laos was quoted as saying:

"Why am I here trying to teach these people to fight, if it's already been decided that the country is to be turned over to the Communists?"

Parenthetically, at this point, I would like to say a few words about the unfortunate habit of designating Prince Boun Oum and Gen. Phoumi Nouvasan as rightwing leaders. The manner in which this description has been used by the press and, regrettably, by some State Department spokesmen, somehow suggests that Prince Boun Oum and Gen. Phoumi are exploiters or big landowners or political reactionaries. Actually, Laos is a very primitive country without any landowning or capitalist class, and from a purely economic standpoint, it makes little sense to talk of rightwing or leftwing. I believe it would be far more correct and far more meaningful, and certainly, it would feed far less grist to the Communist propaganda mill, if our press could learn to refer to the Communists as "Communists" and to people like Prince Boun Oum and General Phoumi as Loyalist or anti-Communist leaders rather than rightwing leaders.

I consider this matter of nomenclature of the greatest importance, because it is with insidious little words like these that public opinion is poisoned against our friends in other countries.

Against the background of SEATO's failure, the Lao Government in May of last year agreed to negotiations with the Communists.

Speaking in Manila a year ago, and speaking on the floor of the Senate on my return from the Far East, I said that the Communists would not be satisfied with the partial conquest of Laos, and that they would violate the cease-fire at every opoprtunity. For the accuracy of this prediction, I take no particular credit. I believe that this prediction could have been made by anyone familiar with Communist tactics.

Since the cease-fire was signed, the Communists have occupied point after point, until today they hold more than half of Laos. North Vietnamese intervention, previously limited and carefully veiled, is now unconcealed and massive. At the present time, there are reported to be in excess of 7,000 battle-hardened soldiers of the North Vietnamese armies fighting alongside the Lao Communist forces.

Communist supplies are moving into Laos at a constantly accelerated rate, by land and by air, supporting the greatly increased Communist military activities, both in Laos and in Vietnam. As a matter of fact, it is thanks primarily to their control of this area adjoining South Vietnam that the Vietnamese Communists have been able to double the size of their guerrilla forces in South Vietnam over the past year.

And while all this has been going on, we have continued to negotiate with undeterred good faith, in the hope that a truly neutral government can be constructed around the personality of Souvanna Phouma.

Prince Souvanna Phouma, we are told, is not a Communist. But I also recall that we were told that Castro was not a Communist. For my own part, I believe that we are building our foreign policy on forlorn and impossible hopes when we assume that Prince Souvanna Phouma, who has visited the Communist capitals but has refused an invitation to the United States, and who openly shares offices and living quarters with his half-brother Prince Souphanouvong, the acknowledged head of the Lao Communist movement, will save Laos from communism.

When I was in Laos last May, I was assured categorically that we would never consent to giving the Communists the key positions of the Ministry of the Interior and Ministry of Defense in any coalition government. But today, it is reported that our representatives have agreed to assign both the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of the Interior to the designees of the so-called neutralist leader, Prince Souvanna Phouma, on the specious theory that a Souvanna Phouma government is the only thing that can save Laos from a complete takeover by the Communists. Not merely have we accepted this position, but for several months now we have been pressuring our Lao friends to enter into such a coalition government against their own better judgment.

Prime Minister Prince Boun Oum and his Defense Minister, General Phoumi, have, to their credit, resisted our pressures. And, to our shame, we have now cut off our monthly assistance to the Government of Laos in an effort to force them into a coalition with the Communists.

THE QUESTION OF COALITION GOVERNMENT

I do not know whether to be surprised or awed over the fact that, after so many sorry experiences, we have again fallen for that most shopworn of all the Communists' shell games; the coalition government.

The free world first fell for the coalition government trick during World War II. In November 1944, having abandoned General Mihailovitch in Yugoslavia, Britain and the United States attempted the impossible task of preventing a Communist takeover by forcing Prime Minister Subasic into a coalition government with Marshal Tito. Needless to say, there were all kinds of assurances from Marshal Tito that he did not intend to communize Yugoslavia, and that there would be free elections at an early date.

In February 1945 at the Yalta Conference, the Tito-Subasic formula was to become the model for a whole series of coalition governments in central Europe—coalition governments which invariably and, in my opinion, inevitably paved the way for a complete Communist takeover. The central formula of the Yalta Declaration promised the liberated countries of Europe, "governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements of the population." This, of course, was a euphemism for coalition governments.

Hardly had the Tito-Subasic agreement been signed, than Tito began to dishonor its terms. He made it clear that by free elections he meant elections with a single slate of Communist-approved candidates. The few non-Communist political leaders in the cabinet were removed, and placed in prison or total obscurity.

With minor differences in timing and technique, the coalition governments established in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia developed along similar patterns.

The proven Communist techniques for subverting representative government via interparty coalitions has been described with amazing frankness by the Czechoslovak Communist, Jan Kozak, in a book intended as a guide for fellow Communists. In this booklet, Mr. Kozak spoke of "the possibility of forming a government of broad democratic forces grouped around the working class, relying on the revolutionary activity of the masses. Such a government can be set up without armed battle by peaceful means. Its installation would be practically tantamount to the establishment of the democratic revolutionary power of the people." Specific lessons were drawn from the Red takeover in Czechoslavakia.

Mr. Kozak's formula calls for a combination of "pressure from above" and "pressure from below" to convert the coalition government into a "socialist" one. He said:

"Gradually, as the national and democratic revolution changed into a socialist one, the pressure 'from above' was applied in an ever-increasing measure for the direct suppression and destruction of the counterrevolutionary machinations of the bourgeoisie. Let us recall the signal role played in the development and extension of that pressure by the Ministry of the Interior, for instance, which was led by the Communists, and the units of State Security directed by them."

I challenge anyone to read Mr. Kozak's brochure outlining the Communist theory and practice of coalition governments, and come away from this reading still convinced that Communists can enter into coalitions in good faith.

I find it all the more difficult to understand our present policy in Laos because Ambassador Harriman has, himself, had a very personal and exceedingly bitter experience with coalition governments in the immediate postwar period.

The governments set up in the central European countries after their "liberation" by the Red Army did not correspond in any way to the democratic governments that had been forecast by the Yalta Declaration.

Speaking in the House of Commons on August 20, 1945, the British Foreign Secretary said:

"The governments which have been set up in Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary do not, in the view of the British Government, represent a majority of the people. The impression I got from recent developments was that one kind of totalitarianism was being replaced by another. * * * The form of government being set up does not impress me as being sufficiently representative to meet the requirements of diplomatic relations."

It was against this background that the foreign ministers of the allied powers met in Moscow in December 1945. Despite the wholesale violation of the Yalta agreement, the British and American Governments joined the Soviet Government in calling for the establishment of a new coalition in Rumania. This coalition was to include representatives of the two national parties, the National Peasant and the National Liberal Party, and it was to be followed by free and unfettered elections. To carry out this agreement, a supervisory commission consisting of Foreign Minister Vishinsky, Ambassador Harriman, and British Ambassador Sir Archibald Clark-Kerr, was sent to Bucharest.

Jules Maniu, the revered leader of the Peasant Party, and the other democratic leaders warned the Western ambassadors that the Communists had absolutely no scruples and that their assurance of free elections meant nothing. But Sir Clark-Kerr and Mr. Harriman argued against these misgivings and urged the democratic Rumanian leaders to enter into the coalition.

What happened subsequently is a matter of recent history; but our memories, unfortunately, seem even too short for this small span. The opposition press was completely suppressed. Opposition parties were first intimidated, then terrorized, then illegalized. The opposition leaders, Jules Maniu of the Peasant Party, Bratianu of the National Liberal Party, and Petrescu of the Social Democratic Party, were all imprisoned; and in July 1951 it was reported that Maniu died in prison, a martyr to his country's freedom.

Today in Laos, it seems to me that the tragedy of Rumania is being repeated almost step for step. Even some of the cast is the same. Thus, we find Mr. Harriman urging the Lao anti-Communist leaders, against their own better judgment, to enter into a coalition government with the Communists; and I take it for granted that Mr. Harriman must be repeating some of the well-intentioned assurances that he gave to the democratic political leaders in Rumania in 1946.

The assurances in Laos, I am afraid, have not always been the most friendly. I should like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the following account by the distinguished American correspondent, Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for April 23, 1962:

"Governor Harriman looked at the Lao leaders one by one; pointed a stern forefinger at each of them in turn; and told them that he wished them to know they would be 'responsible for the destruction of their country' if they refused to do his bidding. There was a brief silence, and General Phoumi then replied: 'You know, Governor Harriman, we in Laos have many years' experience of colonial rule. But we were never spoken to in quite that fashion in the colonial times.'"

The coalition government gambit has had results just as disastrous in Asia as in Europe. In fact, our commitment to a coalition government in China in the postwar period was perhaps more responsible than any other single factor for the loss of mainland China to the Communists.

The commitment to a coalition government or a "government of national unity" was formalized in the so-called Marshall directive of December 1945. This directive, which was drafted by John Carter Vincent, the head of the Far Eastern desk in the Department of State, reflected the philosophy of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which for many years had enjoyed a near monopoly on Far Eastern expertise.

At the time when the Marshall directive was issued, the Nationalist forces occupied the bulk of China, had overwhelming military superiority, and were pressing offensives against the Communists at a number of points. In a misguided effort to force President Chiang into a coalition government with the Communists, Secretary of State Marshall, in the summer of 1946, placed an embargo on arms and ammunition to the Nationalist forces. Repeatedly, the Nationalists were told that unless and until they came to terms with the Communists, they could expect no active assistance from the United States. Finally, in the fall of that year, with the aid of the embargo and a variety of other pressures, the Department of State succeeded in forcing President Chiang to agree to an armistice, and to conversations with the Communists with a view to forming a coalition government.

These conversations dragged on for months and months, punctuated by repeated violations of the cease-fire by the Communists. The Chinese Reds, for their part, maintained the pretense of favoring a coalition government until the Nationalist position had so weakened that the Communists were no longer interested in compromise.

Our folly in China persisted to the bitter end. As late as March 1948, the administration reiterated its adherence to the principles enunciated in the Marshall directive.

Commenting on the similarity between our ill-fated China policy and our present policy in Laos, the New York Times said editorially on May 12, 1962:

"The American policy is based on Washington's belief that the Lao are uninterested in political or ideological conflicts and, in contrast to the Vietnamese, will not fight.

But to back up that policy and force the pro-Western leaders into the coalition with the Communists, even to surrender the army and police, which they refuse, American authorities have tended to undercut the pro-Western Government, even to accuse it of provocation, until this policy begins to resemble that which lost China."

In justification of the coalition policy in Laos, it has been argued that not every government which included Communist ministers has wound up by succumbing to communism. It has been pointed out that such coalitions did, in fact, exist in France, in Italy, and in Finland, and one or two other countries in the postwar period.

This comparison completely skirts the issue. France and Italy emerged unscathed from the postwar experiments in coalition because there was no Communist military presence in these countries, because their security forces and the armed forces remained under anti-Communist control, and because the democratic parties in these countries disposed of very considerable resources in men, money, and experience.

Finland survived her postwar coalition because the Finns are one of the toughest people in Europe and perhaps the most sophisticated about the ways of their Soviet neighbors.

But Laos is not France or Italy; and the Laotian people, in terms of sophistication, cannot be likened to the French, Italians, or the Finns. Given the massive presence of the Red Chinese and North Vietnamese army on its frontiers, given the existence in Laos of substantial units of Red Chinese and Vietnamese forces, given the lack of national unity, the lack of sophistication, the dearth of political leadership, not even a miracle could save Laos if it were ever saddled with a coalition government such as is now proposed.

I cannot understand the persistence in believing, despite all the available evidence, that Souvanna Phouma is truly a neutralist, that he is not under Communist domination, and that he can be trusted to designate non-Communists for the positions of Minister of Defense and Minister of the Interior.

In an interview with Ronald Stead of the Christian Science Monitor, which appeared in the March 21, 1962, issue of that paper, Prince Souphanouvong, the Laotian Communist leader, on the one hand denied that his half-brother Prince Souvanna Phouma "is a prisoner of the Pathet Lao." Mr. Stead wrote: "He described this as 'an odious calumny against the rightful Prime Minister of Laos (Souvanna Phouma) and a maneuver to cause a split between my half-brother's government and the Pathet Lao.'"

On the other hand, Prince Souphanouvong said to Mr. Stead: "Nobody can destroy the firm solidarity forged in the fire of battle. For this reason American efforts to separate us must be in vain."

Mr. Stead, incidentally, was to my knowledge the only American correspondent to point out that—"Souvanna Phouma now has headquarters and joint residence with his half-bother, Prince Souphanouvong, leader of the pro-Communist Pathet Lao armed forces and their political counterpart, the Neo Lao Haksat."

In the light of all this, it is inconceivable to me that the kind of coalition government now proposed can terminate in anything but a Communist Laos. True, there are a few instances of coalition governments—France, Italy, and Finland—which did not terminate in disaster. But this was only so because the democratic elements in these countries succeeded in extricating themselves from the coalitions with the Communists at their earliest opportunity.

It can be stated categorically that there has never been an instance of a stable, neutral coalition government, embracing Communists and non-Communists.

It can be stated categorically that there has never been an instance of a coalition government that has served the interests of the free world.

It can be stated categorically that there has never been a coalition government in which the Communists held the twin positions of the Ministry of the Interior and Ministry of Defense, which did not culminate in a complete Communist take-over.

It is in the light of this historic experience, that we must take a fresh look at the situation in Laos.

To let Laos fall to communism while we attempt to defend South Vietnam would be like trying to catch the flood waters in buckets, while doing nothing to strengthen or maintain the river levees. I have discussed the situation in southeast Asia with a number of military men with experience in the area, and I have yet to meet one who does not agree with this estimate. But apparently in this situation, as in other situations, we have paid scant attention to the opinions of our military men.

We have also paid scant attention to American missionaries serving in the field. Why we consult them so little, I shall never be able to understand, because they are a remarkably dedicated and intelligent group of men, who have no political axe to grind, who invariably speak the language of the country, who have lived with the people, and who have traveled widely, frequently on foot. They are in a far better position than most people to know what is going on in a country such as Laos or the Congo.

In this connection, I would point out that our policy in China went off the tracks when our State Department fell for the proposition that the Chinese Reds were really agrarian reformers. American missionaries in China warned against this policy, but no one listened to them. By the time we got the "agrarian reformer" sand out of our eyes, China had gone Communist.

Speaking from a more recent and more personal experience, I believe that many of the mistakes we have made in our Congo policy could have been avoided if we had troubled to obtain the opinions of the scores of American missionaries who are today serving there, and who know the country far more intimately than most foreigners there. But so far as I know, the many dedicated American missionaries in the Congo were never asked for their opinion; and the few that offered their opinions were ignored.

During the past week, the Lao Communist forces, supported by the Chinese Communists and North Vietnamese, have seized Nam Tha and other towns in northern Laos, in a drive that has carried them all the way to the border of Thailand. At this very moment, Communist forces are threatening the capture of the royal capital of Luang Prabang and the administrative capital of Vientiane.

There are reports that, as a result of the massive and flagrant violations of the armistice by the Communists, the administration is now reconsidering its position on Laos. I earnestly hope that this is so. I earnestly hope that the measures already announced in Vietnam and in Thailand will be followed by still further measures already specifically geared to the situation in Laos. I earnestly hope that we will not accept this new act of aggression in Laos as a fait accompli and force our friends in Laos into a coalition government against this background.

I am in wholehearted agreement with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], who said several days ago that he would prefer a partitioned Laos to a united Laos governed by a coalition government.

We already have two Koreas, two Germanys, two Vietnams. And no one could possibly be happy at the prospect of seeing another country partitioned. But we are in the unpleasant position where we are compelled to choose the lesser of two evils. And, recognizing this, there is no doubt in my own mind that partition would be an infinitely less dangerous evil than a coalition government that is bound to terminate with the Communists in complete control of the country.

I do not think I am revealing any military secret when I say this attitude is shared by many of our own military men, by many of our friends in southeast Asia, and by some of our much-abused friends in Laos. The reason for their preference is obvious. If an anti-Communist government can be maintained in the southern portion of Laos, including the critical Lao panhandle and the Mekong River Valley as far west as Vientiane, and as far north as Luang Prabang, this would protect Cambodia, it would greatly facilitate the struggle against the Vietnamese guerrillas, and it would afford a large measure of protection to Thailand.

LESLIE N. SHAW, ACTING POSTMASTER OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, recently I had the pleasure of administering the oath of office to Leslie N. Shaw as acting postmaster of Los Angeles. Mr. Shaw has had a successful career in the business world and has distinguished himself in civic affairs. He is highly qualified to meet the challenges of one of the largest post offices in the country.

I am pleased to call attention to an editorial in the Los Angeles Times paying tribute to Mr. Shaw, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Los Angeles' Negro Postmaster

Leslie N. Shaw, 41, took his oath of office Monday as postmaster of Los Angeles. He is the first Negro to hold the postmastership in a major U.S. city.

Shaw, a savings and loan banker and business executive, has obvious qualifications for his new job. But his appointment is also a measure of steady progress Negroes have made in the last 25 years under both Democratic and Republican regimes.

Despite the slow-paced advance in the Deep South, racial intolerance is being erased with the approval and support of men of good will.

The civic luncheon honoring Shaw was a deserved tribute to a man of demonstrated merit and ability.

CALIFORNIA TO COMMEMORATE RESTORATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT IN MEXICO

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, by a concurrent resolution of each house of the State legislative body, adopted without a single dissenting vote, effective March 6, 1963, the Legislature of California has instructed the California Civil War Centennial Commission to commemorate the restoration of constitutional government in the Republic of Mexico consequent upon the withdrawal of the imperial forces of Napoleon III and the overthrow of Archduke Maximilian.

The California commission was created by legislative resolution in January 1961, and is composed of 29 uncompensated members appointed by the Governor. The chairman is William Lawrence

Shaw, of Sacramento, who is also a deputy attorney general of California.

The resolution reads as follows:

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32

Resolution Relative to the Civil War Centennial Commission

Whereas in April 1862, Emperor Napoleon III undertook the conquest and exploitation of the Republic of Mexico then headed by President Benito Juárez; and

Whereas President Juárez was the symbol of constitutional government in Mexico and of the election of a president and other officials responsible to the people; and

Whereas despite the gallant resistance of the Mexican armed forces, the nation was overrun by the minions of Napoleon III and in June 1863 Mexico City was occupied; and

Whereas through the intrigues of Louis Napoleon, the Archduke Maximilian was declared Emperor in April 1864, contrary to the will and wishes of the Mexican people; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America was distracted by a great Civil War raging from April 1861 until April 1865, and was thus unable to prevent and forestall the invasion of Mexico by Napoleon III although the United States of America constantly refused to accede to the conquest of the Republic of Mexico by foreign might, and vigorously protested by President Abraham Lincoln and by President Andrew Johnson against the imposition of tyranny upon the Mexican nation; and

Whereas after the cessation of hostilities in the American Civil War in April 1865, the United States of America demanded the removal by Napoleon III of his invading forces in Mexico and the termination of the purporting rule of Maximilian; and

Whereas the influence of the United States of America was a far-reaching weight to induce Napoleon III to withdraw from Mexico beginning in 1866 and concluding in 1867, and thereafter Maximilian was deposed and overthrown and constitutional government was restored in the Republic of Mexico under triumphant President Juárez; and

Whereas the Civil War Centennial Commission of California is currently engaged in the commemoration in California of the great American Civil War, 1861–65, which as an event in history is linked closely in part to the invasion and the attempted conquest of Mexico, 1861–67; and

Whereas sentiment in California in the years 1861–67 was overwhelmingly in favor and support of the people of the Republic of Mexico and adverse to Napoleon III and to Maximilian and among others U.S. Senator James A. McDougall of California, 1861–67, repeatedly in the Senate of the United States challenged and condemned the incursions of Napoleon III into Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California (the Senate thereof concurring), That the Civil War Centennial Commission of California is directed and authorized to observe and commemorate by all proper means the restoration of constitutional government in the Republic of Mexico consequent upon the withdrawal of the imperial forces of Napoleon III and the overthrow of Maximilian; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of the State of California, and to the executive secretary of the Civil War Centennial Commission of California.

THE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAROLINA CHARTER

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, on March 24, 1663, Charles II of England made a princely grant of land in the New World to eight of his friends who had helped him win back the throne his father had lost, along with his head, to Cromwell and the Puritans.

These eight men became known as the Lords Proprietors of Carolina, and the grant included the territory between Virginia and Florida westward from the Atlantic to the "South Seas" or Pacific Ocean.

This year in North Carolina we are celebrating the 300th anniversary of the signing of the Carolina Charter, after several years of intensive preparation under the leadership of the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission, established by our general assembly, and the Federal Tercentenary Commission, established by act of Congress last year.

The anniversary year opened on March 24 with numerous local observances in cities and towns throughout North Carolina. On April 6, at historic Edenton, Postmaster General J. Edward Day presided over ceremonies marking the issuance of the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commemorative stamp which went on sale for the first time that day. During the remainder of this year commemorative programs will be held by schools, colleges, universities, religious and civic organizations, and other groups in our State.

Mr. President, the original charter is itself on display in the Hall of History in Raleigh. It was acquired for the State of North Carolina in 1949 by public-spirited citizens who purchased it from a British bookseller.

The original document is on four pages of parchment and, of course, contains some obsolete words, spellings, and usages of the times. The Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission arranged for the preparation of a transcription in modern English from the original charter which faithfully follows its text and meaning. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this transcription be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARTER TO THE LORDS PROPRIETORS OF CAROLINA

MARCH 24, 1663.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In the following transcription, care has been taken to follow faithfully the text of the charter, but certain features have been modernized. Some obsolete words have been replaced by their modern equivalents. Spelling also has been modernized and made uniform except for proper names, for which the original spellings, including variations, have been retained. The capitalization in the document has been kept, but a few capitals have been added. Punctuation and indentation have been supplied by the editor. In the original document, each time reference is made to the Lords Proprietors all their names and titles are set forth. This occurs 35 times in the Charter. For the sake of brevity, in this transcription the names of all proprietors are mentioned only once. Thereafter only the name of Edward, Earl of Clarendon, is shown, the other proprietors' names being replaced by ellipses. Transcribed from the original charter, which is on display in the hall of history, Raleigh, N.C.)

Charles the Second, by the grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defender of the Faith, etc. to all to whom these presents shall come, Greeting:

Whereas, our right trusty and right well-beloved Cousins and Counsellors: Edward, Earl of Clarendon, our High Chancellor of England; and George, Duke of Albemarle, Master of our Horse and Captain General of all our Forces; Our right trusty and well-beloved William, Lord Craven; John, Lord Berkley; Our right trusty and well-beloved Counsellor, Anthony, Lord Ashley, Chancellor of our Exchequer; Sir George Carterett, Knight and Baronet, Vice Chamberlain of our Household; And our trusty and well-beloved Sir William Berkley, Knight; and Sir John Colleton, Knight and Baronet, being excited with a laudable and pious zeal for the propagation of the Christian Faith and the enlargement of our Empire and Dominions, have humbly besought leave of us, by their industry and Charge, to Transport and make an ample Colony of our Subjects, Natives of our Kingdom of England and elsewhere within our Dominions, unto a certain Country, hereafter described, in the parts of America not yet cultivated or planted, and only inhabited by some barbarous People who have no knowledge of Almighty God;

And whereas, the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * have humbly besought us to give, grant, and Confirm unto them, and their heirs, the said Country, with Privileges and Jurisdictions requisite for the good Government and safety thereof:

Know ye, therefore, that We, favouring the pious and noble purpose of the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * Of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, have given, granted, and Confirmed, and, by this our present Charter, for us, our heirs and Successors, do give, grant, and Confirm, unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns:

TERRITORY AND PRIVILEGES GRANTED

All that Territory or Tract of ground, situate, lying, and being within our Dominions in America, extending from the North end of the Island called Luck Island, which lies in the Southern Virginia Seas and within six and Thirty Degrees of the Northern Latitude, and to the West as far as the South Seas; and so Southerly as far as the River Saint Mathias, which borders upon the Coast of Florida, and within one and Thirty Degrees of Northern Latitude; and West in a direct Line as far as the South Seas aforesaid; Together with all and singular Ports, Harbours, Bays, Rivers, Isles, and Islets, belonging unto the Country aforesaid; And also, all the Soil, Lands, Fields, Woods, Mountains, Farms, Lakes, Rivers, Bays, and Islets situate or being within the Bounds or Limits aforesaid; with the Fishing of all sorts of Fish, Whales, Sturgeons, and all other Royal Fishes in the Sea, Bays, Islets, and Rivers within the premises, and the Fish therein taken;

And moreover, all Veins, Mines, and Quarries, as well discovered as not discovered, of Gold, Silver, Gems, and precious Stones, and all other, whatsoever be it, of Stones, Metals, or any other thing whatsoever found or to be found within the Country, Isles, and Limits aforesaid;

And furthermore, the Patronage and Advowsons of all the Churches and Chapels which, as Christian Religion shall increase within the Country, Isles, Islets, and Limits aforesaid, shall happen hereafter to be erected; Together with licence and power to Build and found Churches, Chapels, and Oratories in convenient and fit places within the said Bounds and Limits, and to cause them to be Dedicated and Consecrated according to the Ecclesiastical Laws of our Kingdom of England; Together with all and singular the like and as ample Rights, Jurisdictions, Privileges, Prerogatives, Royalties, Liberties, Immunities, and Franchises of what kind soever within the Country, Isles, Islets, and Limits aforesaid;

To have, use, exercise, and enjoy, and in as ample manner as any Bishop of Durham, in our Kingdom of England, ever heretofore have held, use, or enjoyed, or of right ought or could have, use, or enjoy.

And them, the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and assigns, we do, by these presents, for us, our heirs and Successors, make, Create, and Constitute the true and absolute Lords and Proprietaries of the Country aforesaid, and of all other the premises;

Saving always, the Faith, Allegiance, and Sovereign Dominion due to us, our heirs and Successors, for the same; and Saving also, the right, title, and interest of all and every our Subjects of the English Nation which are now Planted within the Limits and bounds aforesaid, if any be;

To have, hold, possess, and enjoy the said Country, Isles, Islets, and all and singular other the premises; to them, the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, forever;

To be held of us, our heirs and Successors, as of Manor of East Greenwich, in our County of Kent, in Free and Common Soccage, and not in Capite nor by knight's Service;

Yielding and paying yearly, to us, our heirs and Successors, for the same, the yearly Rent of Twenty Marks of Lawful money of England, at the Feast of All Saints, yearly, forever, The First payment thereof to begin and be made on the Feast of All Saints which shall be in the year of Our Lord One thousand six hundred Sixty and five; AND also, the fourth part of all Gold and Silver Ore which, within the limits aforesaid, shall, from time to time, happen to be found.

And that the Country thus by us granted and described may be dignified with as large Titles and Privileges as any other parts of our Dominions and Territories in that Region:

PROVINCE NAMED CAROLINA

Know ye, that We, of our further grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, have thought fit to Erect the same Tract of Ground, Country, and Island into a Province, and, out of the fullness of our Royal power and Prerogative, we do, for us, our heirs and Successors, Erect, Incorporate, and Ordain the same into a Province, and do call it the Province of Carolina, and so from henceforth will have it called.

And forasmuch as we have hereby made and Ordained the aforesaid Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, the true Lords and Proprietors of all the Province aforesaid:

PROVISIONS FOR ENACTING LAWS

Know ye, therefore, moreover, that We, reposing especial Trust and Confidence in their fidelity, Wisdom, Justice, and provident circumspection, for us, our heirs and Successors, Do Grant full and absolute power, by virtue of these presents, to them, the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * and their heirs, for the good and happy Government of the said Province:

To ordain, make, Enact, and under their Seals to publish any Laws whatsoever, either appertaining to the public State of the said Province or the private utility of particular Persons, according to their best discretion of, and with the advice, assent, and approbation of the Freemen of the said Province, or of the greater part of them, or of their Delegates or Deputies; whom, for enacting of the said Laws, when and as often as need shall require, WE WILL that the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * and their heirs, shall, from time to time, assemble, in such manner and form as to them shall seem best;

PROVISION FOR ENFORCING LAWS

And the same Laws duly to execute upon all people within the said Province and Limits thereof for the time being, or which shall be Constituted under the power and Government of them, or any of them, either Sailing towards the said Province of Carolina or returning from thence towards England, or any other of our or foreign Dominions; by Imposition of penalties, Imprisonment, or any other punishment, YEA, if it shall be needful and the quality of the Offence require it, by taking away member and life, either by them, the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * and their heirs, or by them or their Deputies, Lieutenants, Judges, Justices, Magistrates, Officers, and Ministers, to be Ordained or appointed according to the tenor and true intention of these presents;

And likewise, to appoint and establish any Judges or Justices, Magistrates or Officers whatsoever within the said Province, at Sea or land, in such manner and form as unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarindon; * * * or their heirs, shall seem most convenient;

Also, to remit, release, Pardon, and abolish, whether before Judgment or after, all Crimes and Offences whatsoever against the said Laws; and to do all and every other thing and things which unto the Complete establishment of Justice, unto Courts, Sessions, and forms of Judicature, and manners of proceeding therein, do belong, although in these presents express mention be not made thereof;

And by Judges, by him or them delegated, to award Process, hold Pleas, and determine, in all the said Courts and Places of Judicature, all Actions, Suits, and Causes whatsoever, as well Criminal as Civil, real, mixt, personal, or of any other kind or nature whatsoever;

Which laws, so as aforesaid, to be published our pleasure is, and We do enjoin, require, and Command shall be absolute, firm, and available in law; And that all the liege People of us, our heirs and Successors, within the said Province of Carolina, do observe and keep the same inviolably in those parts, so far as they concern them, under the pains and penalties therein expressed or to be expressed;

Provided, Nevertheless, that the said laws be consonant to reason and, as near as may be conveniently, agreeable to the laws and Customs of this our Kingdom of England.

LAWS IN EMERGENCIES

And because such assemblies of Freeholders cannot be or suddenly called as there may be occasion to require the same:

We do, therefore, by these presents, give and Grant unto the said Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, by themselves or their Magistrates in that behalf lawfully authorized, full power and authority, from time to time, to make and Ordain fit and wholesome Orders and Ordinances within the Province aforesaid, to be kept and observed, as well for the keeping of the Peace as for the better Government of the People there abiding; and to publish the same to all to whom it may concern;

Which Ordinances We do, by these presents, straightly Charge and Command to be inviolably observed within the said Province, under the penalties therein expressed; So as such Ordinances be reasonable, and not repugnant or contrary, but as near as may be agreeable, to the laws and Statutes of this our Kingdom of England; And so as the same Ordinances do not extend to the binding, charging, or taking away of the right or interest of any Person or Persons in their freehold, goods, or Chattels whatsoever.

And to the end the said Province may be the more happily increased by the multitude of People resorting thither, and may likewise be the more strongly defended from the incursions of Savages and other Enemies, Pirates, and robbers:

Therefore, We, for us, our heirs and Successors, Do give and Grant, by these presents, Power, licence, and liberty unto all the liege people of us, our heirs and Successors, in our Kingdom of England or elsewhere within any other our Dominions, Islands, Colonies, or Plantations, Excepting those who shall be especially forbidden, to transport themselves and Families unto the said Province, with convenient Shipping and fitting Provisions, and there to settle themselves, dwell, and inhabit; any law, Act, Statute, Ordinance, or other thing to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.

RIGHTS OF ENGLISHMEN GRANTED TO SETTLERS

And we will also, and, of our more especial grace, for us, our heirs and Successors, do straightly enjoin, Ordain, Constitute, and Command, that the said Province of Carolina shall be of our Allegiance; And that all and singular the Subjects and liege people of us, our heirs and Successors, transported or to be transported into the said Province, and the Children of them and of such as shall descend from them there, born or hereafter to be born, be and shall be Denizens and lieges of us, our heirs and Successors, of this our Kingdom of England; and be in all things held, treated, and reputed as the liege, faithful people of us, our heirs and Successors, born within this our said Kingdom or any other of our Dominions; and may inherit or otherwise Purchase and receive, take, have, hold, buy, and possess any lands. Tenements, or hereditaments within the same Places, and them may Occupy and enjoy, give, sell, alien, and bequeath; as likewise, all liberties, Franchises, and Privileges of this our Kingdom of England, and of other our Dominions aforesaid, may freely and quietly have, possess, and enjoy as our liege people born within the same, without the let, molestation, vexation, trouble, or grievance of us, our heirs and Successors; any Statute, Act, Ordinance, or Provision to the contrary notwithstanding.

And furthermore, that our Subjects, of this our said Kingdom of England and other our Dominions, may be the rather encouraged to undertake this Expedition with ready and cheerful minds:

CONDUCT OF TRADE

Know ye, that We, of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, do give and grant, by virtue of these presents, as well to the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * and their heirs, as unto all others we shall, from time to time, repair unto the said Province with a purpose to inhabit there or to trade with the Natives of the said Province, full liberty and License to lade and freight in any Ports whatsoever of us, our heirs and Successors;

And into the said Province of Carolina, by them, their Servants and Assigns, to Transport all and singular their goods, Wares, and Merchandises; as likewise, all sorts of grain whatsoever, and any other things whatsoever necessary for the food and Clothing, not prohibited by the laws and Statutes of our Kingdoms and Dominions; to be Carried out of the same without any let or molestation of us, our heirs and Successors, or of any other our Officers and Ministers whatsoever; Saving also, to us, our heirs and Successors, the Customs and other duties and payments due for the said Wares and Merchandises, according to the several rates of the Places from whence the same shall be transported.

We will also, and, by these presents, for us, our heirs and Succesors, do give and Grant Licence, by this our Charter, unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, and to all the Inhabitants and Dwellers in the Province aforesaid, both present and to come, full power and absolute authority to Import or unlade, by themselves or their Servants, Factors, or Assigns, all Merchandises and goods whatsoever that shall arise of the fruits and Commodities of the said Province, either by land or Sea, into any the Ports of us, our heirs and Successors, in our Kingdom of England, Scotland, or Ireland, Or otherwise to dispose of the said goods in the said Ports; and, if need be, within one year next after the unlading, to lade the said Merchandises and goods again into the same or other Ships, and to Export the same into any other Countries, either of our Dominions or foreign, being in Amity with us, our heirs and Successors; So as they pay such Customs, Subsidies, and other duties for the same, to us, our heirs and Successors, as the rest of our Subjects of this our Kingdom for the time being shall be bound to pay, beyond which We will not that the inhabitants of the said Province of Carolina shall be any way Charged.

Provided, nevertheless, and our Will and pleasure is, and We have further, for the Considerations aforesaid, of our more especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, given and Granted, and, by these presents, for us, our heirs and Successors, Do give and grant, unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarindon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, full and free license, liberty, and authority, at any time or times from and after the Feast of Saint Michaell The Archangel which shall be in the year of our Lord Christ One thousand six hundred Sixty and Seven, as well to Import and bring into any of our Dominions from the said Providence of Carolina, or any part thereof, the several goods and Commodities hereinafter mentioned: That is to say, Silks, Wines, Currants, Raisins, Capers, Wax, Almonds, Oil, and Olives; without paying or Answering to us, our heirs or Successors, any Custom, Impost, or other duty for or in respect thereof, for and during the term and space of Seven years, to commence and be accounted from and after the First Importation of four Tons of any the said goods in any one Bottom, Ship, or Vessel from the said Province into any of our Dominions; as also, to export and carry out of any of our Dominions into the said Province of Carolina, Custom free, all sorts of Tools which shall be useful or necessary for the Planters there in the accommodation and Improvement of the premises; any thing before in these presents contained, or any Law, Act, Statute, Prohibition, or other matter or thing heretofore had, made, Enacted, or provided or hereafter to be had, made Enacted, or Provided, to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PORTS IN CAROLINA

And furthermore, of our more ample and especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, WE DO, for us, our heirs and Successors, Grant unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, full and absolute power and authority to Make, Erect, and Constitute within the said Province of Carolina, and the Isles and Islets aforesaid, such and so many Seaports, harbours, Creeks, and other Places for discharge and unlading of goods and Merchandises out of Ships, Boats, and other Vessels, and for lading of them, in such and so many Places, and with Jurisdictions, Privileges, Jurisdictions,[1] and Franchises unto the said Ports belonging, as to them shall seem most expedient;

And that all and singular the Ships, Boats, and other Vessels, which shall come for Merchandise and Trade into the said Province, or shall depart out of the same, shall be laden and unladen at such Ports only as shall be erected and Constituted by the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, and not elsewhere; any use, Custom, or any thing to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.

And we do, furthermore, Will, appoint, and Ordain, and, by these presents, for us, our heirs and Successors, do Grant unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, That they, the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, may from time to time, forever, have and enjoy the Customs and Subsidies, in the Ports, Harbours, Creeks, and other Places within the Province aforesaid, payable for goods, Merchandises, and Wares there laded or to be laded or unladed; the said Customs to be reasonably Assessed upon any occasion by themselves, and by and with the Consent of the free people there, or the greater part of them, as aforesaid; to whom We give power, by these presents, for us, our heirs and Successors, upon just Cause and in a due proportion, to Assess and Impose the same.

AUTHORITY FOR SUBGRANTING LAND

And further, of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, We have given, Granted, and Confirmed, and, by these presents, for us, our heirs and Successors, do give, Grant, and Confirm, unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, full and absolute licence, power, and authority that the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, from time to time hereafter, forever, at his and their will and pleasure, may Assign, Alien, Grant, Demise, or enfeoff the premises, or any part or parcels thereof, to him or them that shall be willing to purchase the same, and to such Person or Persons as they shall think fit;

To have and to hold to them the said Person or Persons, their heirs and Assigns, in Fee simple or Fee tail, or for term of life or lives or years; to be held of them, the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, by such Rents, Services, and Customs as shall seem meet to the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, and not immediately of us, our heirs and Successors.

And to the same Person or Persons, and to all and every of them, We do give and Grant, by these presents, for us, our heirs and Successors, License, authority, and power That such Person or Persons may have or take the premises, or any parcel thereof, of the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns; and the same to hold to themselves, their heirs or Assigns, in what estate of Inheritance soever, in Fee simple or Fee tail or otherwise, as to them and the said Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, shall seem expedient; The Statute made in the Parliament of Edward, Son of King Henry, heretofore King of England, our Predecessor, commonly called the Statute of Quia Emptores Terrarum, or any other Statute, Act, Ordinance, use, Law, Custom, or any other matter, Cause, or thing heretofore published or provided to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.

NOBILITY IN CAROLINA AUTHORIZED

And because many Persons born or inhabiting in the said Province, for their deserts and Services, may expect, and be capable of, Marks of Honour and favour, which, in respect of the great distance, cannot conveniently be Conferred by us:

Our will and please, therefore, is, and We do, by these presents, Give and Grant unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their Heirs and Assigns, full Power and Authority to give and Confer, unto and upon such of the Inhabitants of the said Province as they shall think do or shall merit the same, such marks of favour and Titles of honour as they shall think fit; so as those Titles or honours be not the same as are enjoyed by or Conferred upon any the Subjects of this our Kingdom of England.

FORTIFICATION OF CAROLINA

And further, also, We do, by these presents, for us, our heirs and Successors, give and grant Licence to them, the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, full power, liberty, and licence to Erect, raise, and build, within the said Province and Places aforesaid, or any part or parts thereof, such and so many Forts, Fortresses, Castles, Cities, Boroughs, Towns, Villages, and other Fortifications whatsoever, And the same, or any of them, to Fortify and furnish with Ordnance, Powder, Shot, Armour, and all other Weapons, Ammunition, and habiliments of War, both offensive and defensive, as shall be thought fit and convenient, for the safety and welfare of the said Province and Places, or any part thereof; And the same, or any of them, from time to time, as occasion shall require, to dismantle, disfurnish, demolish, and pull down; and Also, to place, Constitute, and appoint, in or over all or any of the said Castles, Forts, Fortifications, Cities, Towns, and Places aforesaid, Governors, Deputy Governors, Magistrates, Sheriffs, and other Officers, Civil and Military, as to them shall seem meet;

CITIES AND TOWNS

And to the said Cities, Boroughs, Town, Villages, or any other Place or Places within the said Province, to grant Letters or Charters, of Incorporation, with all Liberties, Franchises, and Privileges requisite and usual, or to or within any Corporations within this our Kingdom of England granted or belonging; And in the same Cities, Boroughs, Towns, and other Places, to Constitute, Erect, and appoint such and so many Markets, Marts, and Fairs as shall in that behalf be thought fit and necessary;

MANORS AND MANORIAL COURTS

And further, also, to Erect and make in the Province aforesaid, or any part thereof, so many Manors as to them shall seem meet and convenient; and in every of the same Manors to have and to hold a Court Baron, with all things whatsoever which to a Court Baron do belong; And to have and to hold Views of Frankpledge and Courts Leet, for the Conservation of the Peace and better Government of those parts, within such Limits, Jurisdiction, and Precincts as by the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * or their heirs, shall be appointed for that purpose, with all things whatsoever which to a Court Leet or view of Frankpledge do belong; the same Courts to be held by Stewards, to be Deputed and authorized by the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * or their heirs, or by the Lords of other Manors and Leets for the time being, when the same shall be Erected.

And because that, in so remote a Country and situate among so many barbarous Nations, the Invasions as well of Savages as other Enemies, Pirates, and Robbers may probably be feared:

PROVISION FOR ARMED FORCES

Therefore, we have given, and, for us, our heirs and Successors, do give, power, by these presents, unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, by themselves or their Captains or other their Officers, to Levy, Muster, and Train all sorts of men, of what Condition or wheresoever born, in the said Province for the time being; and to make War and pursue the Enemies aforesaid, as well by Sea as by land, yea, even without the limits of the said Province; and, by God's assistance, to vanquish and take them, and, being taken, to put them to death, by the law of war, or to save them, at their pleasure; and to do all and every other thing which unto the Charge And Office of a Captain General of an Army belongs, or has accustomed to belong, as fully and freely as any Captain General of any Army has ever had the same.

Also, our Will and pleasure is, and, by this our Charter, We do give unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, full power, liberty, and authority, in case of rebellion, tumult, or Sedition, if any should happen, which God forbid, either upon the land within the Province aforesaid or upon the main Sea in making a Voyage thither or returning from thence, by him and themselves, their Captains, Deputies, or Officers, to be authorized under his or their Seals for that purpose, to whom also, for us, our heirs and Successors, we do give and Grant, by these presents, full power and authority, to exercise Martial Law against mutinous and seditious Persons of those parts, such as shall refuse to submit themselves to their Government, or shall refuse to serve in the Wars, or shall fly to the Enemy, or forsake their Colors or Ensigns, or be loiterers or Stragglers, or otherwise howsoever offending against Law, Custom, or Discipline Military; as freely and in as ample manner and form as any Captain General of an Army, by virtue of his Office, might, or has accustomed to, use the same.

---

[1] Repetition in the manuscript.

SEPARATION OF CAROLINA FROM OTHER COLONIES

And Our further pleasure is, and, by these presents, for us, our heirs and Successors, We do Grant unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, and to the Tenants and Inhabitants of the said Province of Carolina, both present and to come, and to every of them, that the said Province, and the Tenants and Inhabitants thereof, shall not from henceforth be held or reputed a Member or part of any Colony whatsoever, in America or elsewhere, now transported or made, or hereafter to be transported or made; nor shall be depending on, or subject to, their Government in any thing, but be absolutely separated and divided from the same;

And our pleasure is, by these presents, that they be separated, and that they be subject immediately to our Crown of England, as depending thereof forever; And that the Inhabitants of the said Province, nor any or them, shall, at any time hereafter, be compelled or compellable, or be any ways subject or liable, to appear or Answer to any matter, Suit, Cause, or Plaint whatsoever, out of the Province aforesaid, in any other of our Islands, Colonies, or Dominions in America or elsewhere, other than in our Realm of England and Dominion of Wales.

PROVISION FOR RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE

And because it may happen that some of the People and Inhabitants of the said Province cannot in their private opinions Conform to the Public Exercise of Religion according to the Liturgy, forms, and Ceremonies of the Church of England, or take or subscribe the Oaths and Articles made and established in that behalf; and for that the same, by reason of the remote distances of those Places, Will, as We hope, be no breach of the unity and uniformity established in this Nation:

Our will and pleasure, therefore, is, and We do, by these presents, for us, our heirs and Successors, Give and Grant unto the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns, full and free License, liberty, and Authority, by such legal ways and means as they shall think fit, to give and grant unto such Person and Persons inhabiting and being within the said Province, or any part thereof, Who really in their Judgments, and for Conscience sake, cannot or shall not Conform to the said Liturgy and Ceremonies, and take and Subscribe the Oaths and Articles aforesaid, or any of them, such Indulgencies and Dispensations in that Behalf, for and during such time and times, and with such limitations and restrictions, as they, the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs or Assigns, shall, in their discretions, think fit and reasonable;

And with this express Proviso and Limitation also, that such Person and Persons to whom such Indulgencies or Dispensations shall be granted, as aforesaid, do and shall, from time to time, Declare and continue all fidelity, Loyalty, and Obedience to us, our heirs and Successors; and be subject and obedient to all other the Laws, Ordinances, and Constitutions of the said Province, in all matters whatsoever, as well Ecclesiastical as Civil; And do not in any wise disturb the Peace and safety thereof, or scandalize or reproach the said Liturgy, forms, and Ceremonies, or any thing relating thereunto, or any Person or Persons whatsoever for, or in respect of, his or their use or exercise thereof, or his or their obedience or Conformity there unto.

INTERPRETATION OF CHARTER BY COURTS

And in Case it shall happen that any doubts or questions should arise concerning the true Sense and understanding of any word, Clause, or Sentence contained in this our present Charter:

We Will, Ordain, and Command that, at all times and in all things, such interpretation be made thereof, and allowed in all and every of our Courts whatsoever, as lawfully may be Adjudged most advantageous and favourable to the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * their heirs and Assigns.

Although express mention be not made in these presents of the true yearly value and certainty of the premises, or any part thereof, or any other gifts and grants made by us, our Ancestors or Predecessors, to them, the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; * * * or any other Person or Persons whatsoever, Or any Statute, Act, Ordinance, Provision, Proclamation, or restraint heretofore had, made, published, ordained, or Provided, or any other thing, Cause, or matter whatsoever to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding.

In witness whereof We have caused these our Letters to be made Patent.

Witness, our Self, at Westminster, the Four and Twentieth day of March, in the Fifteenth year of our Reign.

By the King.

Howard.

CANADIAN LUMBER IMPORTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for some time the question of trade between the United States and Canada has been a matter of deep concern to both countries. We in the Northwest have been particularly apprehensive because some of the lumber problems that we face have been created by increased imports of lumber from Northwest Canada. At this time, I shall not detail the extensive steps which the Kennedy administration has undertaken. In my judgment these steps have been of value. Nor shall I discuss the extensive legislative proposals the industry has offered suffice it to say, there are still many unresolved problems.

On April 7 and 9, the Pacific Northwest Trade Association called a general conference in Yakima, Wash. Mr. Robert B. Pamplin, president of the Georgia-Pacific Corp., made an extremely constructive presentation, as did Mr. B. M. Hoffmeister, the president of the Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia. In addition, on April 9, in Portland, Oreg., Mr. G. C. Edgett, executive vice president of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, addressed the Oregon Bankers Association on the same subject.

I am deeply impressed by these three papers because in my judgment they set forth the possibilities of settling differences over the conference table and moving forward through the use of commonsense and industrial statesmanship.

Canada now has a new Government and I look forward to the possibility that there may be further discussions between our Governments. I think it useful that these papers be given wide circulation. Even more significant is the value of the suggestions made in these papers for use by those in the industry who wish to seek out solutions relying upon private initiative and mutual good will.

It is for the foregoing reasons that I ask unanimous consent that the three papers I have referred to, plus a newspaper clipping on the conference, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the papers and clipping were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TOTAL FREE TRADE—TODAY'S OPPORTUNITY AND TOMORROW'S PROSPERITY

(By R. B. Pamplin, president, Georgia-Pacific Corp.)

Before speaking my views about the effect of free trade in the area of the forest products industry, I think it would be well to establish my perspective. My company is one of the U.S. major forest products concerns. We own something over 2 million acres of timberlands and have 73 manufacturing operations scattered in all parts of the country. Our only association with Canada is approximately 275,000 acres of timberlands in New Brunswick. The products we make include plywood, paper and paper products, lumber, hardboard, flakeboard, and chemicals.

I am at heart a believer in free trade. However, when we talk about free trade I do not believe that we can localize it to the forest products industry. Therefore, I am going to talk about free trade generally and about free trade in the forest products industry in particular.

First of all, let us look at free trade as such. We know that President Kennedy leans toward free trade. We also know that free trade is being tried and has proved very, very successful in the Common Market in Europe. Therefore, having this background, you might say that the trend is to free trade, and it has proved to be a very desirable and beneficial trend.

Being a businessman, I have learned through experience that when you see a desirable trend developing you should try to get on it as soon as possible. In fact, it is better to create and lead a trend, but you certainly do not want to sit back and let the trend get ahead of you. If you do this, others are going to be running with the ball while you are sitting and looking on.

Right here, I feel it would be well to examine what it was that caused those six countries to bind together and form the European Common Market and to examine the beneficial results they have received therefrom.

The great technological developments of the 20th century made possible substantial cost reductions through large-scale production. In the case of automobiles, for instance, as you increase the number of units your cost goes down quite substantially. Therefore, in order to compete successfully, it was necessary to produce the maximum number of units; and if you produce these large numbers of units you must have a mass market in which to distribute and sell the product. Prior to the Common Market, this was not possible as economic nationalism had divided Europe into cramped compartments sheltered by tariffs and other protective devices. This prevented producers from having the mass market which is so vital to this type of an economy. Therefore, when these walls were removed, it permitted the people in these six countries to take advantage of technological developments and to build plants for mass production. Most important of all, it enabled them to distribute and sell their products to the mass market that was created.

One of the reasons that we have been so successful in the United States is because we have a common market among 50 States, which enables us to take advantage of the very same points I have mentioned. That in my opinion is one of the main reasons why we are leaders of the world today.

A good example of what I am talking about is plywood. Plywood came into its own during World War II. Since the war, plywood usage has increased at an average of 10 percent, compounded annually, which is almost unheard of in a commodity. At the same time the index price of plywood has decreased since 1948 from $97 to $62. And the most amazing part of this story is that even though prices decreased over 35 percent, wages in turn increased in the same period by over 50 percent. This is a classic example of prosperity and deflation, both at the same time. It is what every government tries to accomplish, but no government has been able to do. This is so important to us that I feel we should examine the story of plywood and see how it came about, hoping that we can accomplish the same thing in other products.

The first and most important ingredient of course was the mass market that permitted large-scale production. Then we had the wonderful cooperation between labor and management. The leaders of our unions and management in the Northwest are to be complimented on the way they have cooperated and worked together in cutting costs through better equipment and more efficient labor. I know you have heard management state many times that they cannot give a wage increase unless productivity goes up proportionately. In my opinion, this is self criticism most of the time for management should have more to do with increased productivity than anyone else. Sure, labor can help, but labor is dependent upon leadership from management. Our company has been one of the leaders in this movement, and we can certainly say that we are very satisfied with the results. The last ingredient is a free market without any restrictions—that is, no protection and with the law of supply and demand operating.

Now, let us look at a proposed common market between the United States and Canada and see what each of us has to gain by such a common market.

We in the United States will gain an additional market in Canada represented by some 19 million people, which is about 10 percent of our present market. This is important to us. However, it is in my opinion practically the only point that we will gain from an economic point of view.

Now, what does Canada have to gain? Canada has followed a policy of protecting its manufactures with high tariffs. This is an expensive luxury. It keeps Canadian prices higher than they need be, while restricting foreign trade. If we had free trade, these higher prices would disappear. Then, too, we would be expanding Canada's market, without restrictions, from some 19 million people to some 206 million people. This would enable Canada to concentrate on the production of items on which she has an economic advantage. This would include forest products, aluminum, oil, gas, etc. Since Canada is endowed with wonderful natural resources for the production of these products, it would give her the shot in the arm that is needed to utilize these natural resources. Here again the secret to Canada's strong economy for the future would be the mass market without restrictions that would be available to her.

Let us talk now about the effect of this on the timber products industry. Canada is capable of mass producing substantially more lumber, pulp and paper, and other wood products than can be marketed in Canada, and the United States is a logical market for most of this surplus. Therefore, we in the United States who are in this type of business will have to compete with this Canadian surplus. Myself, I would go along with this free competition providing we could compete on equal terms. Right now, we cannot. We have the Jones Act which permits Canadian producers to ship on foreign ships while we must ship on American ships. This gives Canadian producers an advantage of anywhere from $8 to $17 per thousand feet on lumber and a similar advantage on other products. Then, too, the Canadian dollar is now selling at approximately 92½ cents compared with the American dollar, which in turn gives Canadian producers an additional 7½ percent advantage on exports to the United States. However, on imports, Canadian importers are penalized by this same 7½ percent which doesn't make too much sense since Canada imports more than she exports.

Therefore, the Jones Act should be repealed and the Canadian dollar put on a par with the American dollar as soon as possible. It is bad policy to build up an industry to a substantial capacity through protective devices when you know that over the long pull these protective devices have to be removed. In other words, when you see something that is as wrong as this is, the quicker you can correct it the less the damage is going to be. We are willing to compete with Canada on equal terms, but we are not willing to compete with the handicap of the Jones Act and the discount on the Canadian dollar.

Naturally, when you go from a protected market to a free market it has to be done in a gradual way, and in doing so the present tariff should be decreased say over a 5- or 10-year period in order that there might be an orderly adjustment. Even though this is done, there is going to be quite a bit of disruption in both countries as a result. However, these disruptions can also be stimulating and beneficial. In other words, what will happen will be the same thing that happened in Europe. A lot of new plants will be built to take advantage of this new market. These plants will produce at a much lower cost than a lot of our present plants. The present plants will be forced to modernize or be put out of business. We look on this quite often as bad. However, in my opinion it is good. Any time that we can find a better and cheaper way to do things, it should be done. This is growth. This is prosperity. And since we are going to have to compete in a world market more and more in the future we are going to have to work together as a team and do things bigger and better or we will not be able to compete with the Common Market in Europe and our other competitors the world over.

Perhaps we should not overlook the fact that there may be a better way for solving this than by having a common market. Perhaps we should examine our two countries joining together as one. This is where one plus one equals three instead of two. We would then gain all the economic advantages of a common market that I have mentioned and in addition pick up an indirect advantage—that of national defense. This is so important for survival that it certainly should be considered. In view of changing parties in power and the individuals running the governments, we are now constantly having trouble coordinating our national defense. I will not go into it here, but you know some of the problems that we are having in this respect at the present time. If we were all one country, we would not have this problem. This union could very easily be accomplished if the provinces of Canada should elect to become States and instead of having the United States of America perhaps have a United States of America and Canada or some other suitable name.

Then, too, if the results of the United States and Canada joining together are beneficial, perhaps we should consider extending an invitation on some suitable basis to our Mother Country—England—as well as to our brothers Australia and New Zealand. I am sure we would all benefit by such a move as we are the same type of people and our countries complement each other in an economic way. It would give us a mass market of right at 271 million people. One hundred and eighty-seven million of these people would be from the United States and 84 million from Canada, England, Australia, and New Zealand. This would compare with approximately 174 million people in the Common Market of Europe.

Over and above this economic advantage, we would be in a much better position for the defense of our countries in case of an emergency.

In the event we were to do this, then I feel Europe should be weaned and permitted to grow up as an equal partner with us. In other words, what I am trying to say is that we as a group would pull out of Europe and let them handle their own affairs. This is what General de Gaulle wants and in my opinion it would probably be the best for all concerned to permit this to happen. I recognize that it is easy to say this and it is much more complicated to do. However, Europe is certainly strong enough economically to permit this, even though we might have to help them in a military way initially. When they are on their own they can and will develop capacity to take care of themselves.

Were we to do this, it would certainly take a big load off the United States. It would relieve us of the support that we are now giving Europe and also it would be possible to make Europe an equal partner with us in helping support the economies and defenses of the rest of the free world.

In conclusion, I feel that if we were to have a free market between Canada, the United States, and include England, Australia, and New Zealand, we could and would be the leaders of the world for many, many years to come. Particularly is this true if we as countries, and in turn our leaders of industry and labor, would work together as a team, recognizing each others problems and taking advantage of our know-how, mass markets, and vast natural resources.

I want to thank you for inviting me to appear here today and for the opportunity of expressing my views.

U.S. AND CANADA FREE TRADE AREA IN RELATION TO FOREST PRODUCTS

(Address given to the Pacific Northwest Trade Association, April 8, 1963, Yakima, Wash., by B. M. Hoffmeister)

Dynamic postwar changes have shifted the balance of world economic power. The relative importance of Europe has increased; there is a beginning of industrialization in the underdeveloped countries; and the Communist bloc has become important. The result is a lessening of the relative strength of North America.

These realities underline the necessity of a Canadian and American partnership to provide a secure base for the free world.

This partnership cannot exist without economic cooperation. The forest industries of both countries have long been a strong foundation of the economy and leaders in economic growth. Our industry contributes to the living standard by converting forest crops to building materials, paper products and chemicals. We rely upon prosperous people, an expanding population, and sound public forest policy for our prosperity. In this we have more in common than not. Surely our industries can set an example that will lead the way to freeing trade and strengthening North America.

Interdependence in all facets of the free world's affairs has remolded the devices of economic cooperation. These include the

International Monetary Fund, set up to stabilize currency; the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, designed to provide loans to countries in need of capital; and, most important, the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, which provides an agency to police an agreed code of international behaviour to prevent increased trade restriction. These are deliberately created devices which have become the pivot of free world solidarity. More is still to be done, and the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is an example of further American leadership for freer trade. But this is a general offer to all countries. A step beyond seems necessary in Canadian-American relations. Failure to achieve a specific form of economic partnership would fly in the face of the most significant change of the postwar world; that is, the rapid welding of Canadian-American economic interdependence in response to the natural forces of economic geography inherent in both nations.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

In simple terms, we buy commodities we do not have or which we can purchase to better advantage in the United States, and the United States supplements its domestic needs with Canadian supply. In 1960, 43 percent of our American purchases were iron and its products, and forest products were 44 percent of American purchases from us. Logically, the exchange of Canadian natural resources for the production of efficient American factories is mutually beneficial.

It cannot be overlooked that an important portion of American imports flow from American investment placed in Canada to supply U.S. needs. It follows that the vital interests of three groups of American citizens are injured by trade restriction placed upon such goods. These Americans are: the consumers, whose cost of living is increased; the investor, whose capital investment in Canada is in jeopardy; and the producers of American goods sold in Canada, whose market is threatened.

It is significant that in 1961 the average Canadian bought $212 of American goods, while the average American spent $18 on Canadian goods. This, more than anything else, measures the reliance Canadians place upon U.S. trade. But there are other measures of the economic interdependence. Canada's purchasing power is the equivalent of a European country of 40 million people. We buy more from the United States than the six countries of the European Economic Community. Twice as much U.S. capital is invested in Canada as in Europe. The U.S. balance-of-payment problem would be more serious without the $7 billion earned in trade with Canada in the last decade.

Our two nations should not push against our natural destiny of greater economic integration or step backward into an era of increasing trade restriction.

The forest industry relies upon the growth of a crop that requires several generations to mature and depends upon the plans of man and nature. In fact, the laws of nature bear as heavily on this industry as on any other. This is the common ground to which the industries on both sides of the border are rooted.

It is an industry with a tradition of independence. We have never been able to afford unnatural conditions or inefficiencies. It is an industry which has succeeded through competition and, in doing so, has met the challenge of competitive substitutes by widening the range of its building products, creating new improvements in paper and better quality chemicals. If it had been an industry content to stand pat, breaking logs into boards, it would have been run over by the rush of substitutes.

These fundamental characteristics make me believe that free trade will benefit the industry. I believe that removing the cost of artificially supporting the inefficient sectors of the economy will free consumer purchasing power and increase demand for our products. This is more than Darwin's theory of survival—it is a reality of the modern need to strengthen the economy. As an example of the cost of trade restriction, one can examine Canadian experience. Many Canadian purchases bear tariffs, and domestically produced goods are priced to include the tariff. On this basis, it has been reliably estimated that Canadian tariff policy costs the consumer more than $1 billion per year, which is a 4- to 5-percent reduction in the standard of living. The forest industry should not condone this wastage of the consumer's dollar. We need rising employment and an economically strong population seeking new homes and communities. This is why the North American forest industry must stand for freer trade.

FOREST PRODUCTS IN RELATION TO FREE TRADE

The tariffs of Canada and the United States on forest products favor the entry of raw and semimanufactured supply, and the restriction of manufactures. Under this, paper is protected with tariffs ranging up to 160 percent of value. Cabinets, furniture, and similar manufactures have complicated tariff structures. Building products, with the exception of plywood and other manufactured board, are low tariff items primarily because a product, such as lumber, is not truly a manufactured item. It is a raw material of the housing industry.

The United States has been a net importer of forest products since 1915. The volume of imports has increased in response to an 85 million population increase in the period, and the fact that domestic harvest of industrial timber in the decade just ended was no higher than the 10 years ending 1915.

The industries in both countries have changed in response to the static supply of U.S. commercial timber. There has been a significant shift in the U.S. industry to manufacturing higher valued products, such as paper, pulp, newsprint, and plywood, in preference to lumber. Canadian producers have concentrated on supplying the gaps in U.S. production of forest products. The shift in the form of the industry is most marked in the United States. The big three users of forest harvest are lumber, plywood, and pulp, and paper. In 1910, of the total raw material consumed by these three, lumber was 96 percent; now, it is 78 percent and in the Far West, once the lumber capital of the world, lumber is only 55 percent. More significantly, in coastal Oregon and Washington the value of lumber production is only half that of other forest products.

The shift is toward the ultimate goal where large factories produce paper, chemicals, and building products from a tree. Within each category, individual items compete with one another, just as the automobiles of General Motors overlap one another.

This means the lumber industry is shifting and emerging as part of an integrated forest industry, making full use of the resource supply and wasting nothing of the tree.

In this evolution the customer is the vital factor. His demands must be molded to accept the commodities available from the new age of wood. It is the total use of these products that is of pressing concern to the forest economy. Since the logs used for plywood or lumber are largely interchangeable, and many of the markets are equally interchangeable, does it matter that plywood, which is more profitable, expands and lumber declines? The forest industry ought to be more concerned with Armco Steel Corp.'s program to place 1.5 million tons of steel annually on the housing market.

The selective protection of particular commodities is a feature of forest product tariffs in both countries. This policy may have been rationalized in 1910 when there was a surplus resource relative to population, and an industry that was underdeveloped. In modern times, the choice of commodities and the location of industry is primarily determined by natural factors of economic geography, resource supply, and production costs. The Douglas-fir region of Oregon, which has two-thirds of the recent plywood expansion, naturally tends to that product because of the region's large sized tree and quality species. The 20-percent tariff on plywood is not a factor either in raising the price of plywood or the choice to shift from lumber to plywood. Plywood prices are set by competition with available alternatives, and the total supply in relation to consumer demand.

Canada, with its supply of northern spruce and hemlock, has a natural advantage to specialize in newsprint and specific grades of chemical pulp. In addition, other species provide sound tight knotted lumber specialties.

In many respects, the Canadian forest complements the American. Specialization on both sides results from natural factors. The removal of tariffs is not likely to alter the established trends. It is more likely that free trade will stimulate full-scale industrial cooperation to the benefit of the North American and export markets for forest products. This cooperation will help to get the most out of the forest and win for the industry an increased share of the consumer's dollar in the contest with substitutes for wood products.

We do not expect that freeing trade will be easy, and that adjustments will not be required on both sides of the border. But a study of free trade should be approached from the view that:

First, the tree is an amazing raw material, capable of producing paper of many kinds, a wide range of building materials and unnumbered chemicals from the residuals.

Second, all categories of forest products, paper, building materials and chemicals receive intense competition from nonwood alternates. There is no market that is exclusively a wood product market. The consumer market is one that is shared by the available alternate, with the largest share going to the industry which can serve it the most efficiently.

Third, competition for the consumer's dollar between the commodities within the three categories of forest products is healthy because it enables our industry better to withstand the inroads of nonwood substitutes.

Fourth, regional specialization to utilize natural advantages reduces costs and raises the consumer's purchasing power, which in turn benefits the economy and directly assists the forest industry.

The Canada-United States trade agreements now provide shingles, newsprint and pulp under free trade, and lumber under low tariffs providing free trade in most items. Of these, only lumber is a controversial item. A close study of the controversy reveals it is first, lumbermen complaining against a list of U.S. domestic policies, second, an effort to raise the price of lumber to the consumer. This controversy brings into focus all the emotions, logical and illogical, which would bear upon a study of free trade in forest products.

It seems reasonable to refer to the controversy in some detail since it is difficult to discuss free trade under the cloud of an anti-Canadian campaign, by sectors of the U.S. lumber industry.

LUMBER CONTROVERSY

The lumber industry has been involved in a series of tariff episodes since 1866. Each time the tariff went up there was retaliation, and looking back, very little if anything was accomplished.

For the past 20 years, lumber has been on a relatively free trade basis, during which our trade became well established. Last year, the U.S. Lumbermen's Economic Survival Committee complained that they were being injured by lumber imports from Canada and applied for a hearing under the escape clause provisions of international trade agreements.

The facts are readily available in authoritative studies prepared by qualified American agencies, both private and public. The most recent is the February 14 Report of the U.S. Tariff Commission which is no ordinary study. There were 1,309 pages of testimony, plus 65 exhibits, 2 weeks of hearings, followed by voluminous statements and briefs by all interested parties. The Tariff Commission sent out a comprehensive questionnaire to U.S. producers and consumers. They took 6 months to study the matter. All of the arguments made by lumber producers, both before and after the hearing, were presented to the Tariff Commission and all were considered by the five members of the Tariff Commission as well as the professional staff of the Commission.

The Commissioners reported a unanimous finding that the present trade agreements with Canada do not result in softwood lumber being imported in such increased quantities as to cause, or threaten to cause, serious injury to the American industry. The report goes further and details the major domestic factors which cause the rise in imports. Some U.S. lumber spokesmen are saying that the Tariff Commission recognized the validity of the U.S. industry's complaints but were bound by some technicality of U.S. laws from ruling in their favor. To these spokesmen, and that is to U.S. lumbermen, editors, and Congressmen we say in sincerity, please read the Tariff Commission report and choose for yourself. Decide whether it is not true that the main theme of this report is that there is not enough commercial timber in the United States to satisfy all the demands made upon it.

The Tariff Commission found that the basic reasons for increased imports were: A limited supply of commercially available softwood timber in the United States, coupled with tree-farming policy of owners, aimed at balancing cut to growth, results in an inelastic annual harvest of trees. Competition for this supply from lumber producers and from manufacturers of other forest products, whose needs are expanding, works against lumber by raising the price of logs.

Additionally, acquisition of land for pulp production is reducing forest land dedicated to growing timber of sawlog size.

These are manifestations of a shift from lumber to other wood products.

The Commissioners reported that a significant part of lumber imports is produced by Canadian mills owned or financed by Americans. They go on to say, "Much of this investment is made up by U.S. producers who have relocated or expanded operations into areas having extensive timber supplies and by U.S. distributors seeking an assured supply of timber."

After drawing attention to the inelastic supply of U.S. timber, the Commissioners showed that "consumption of logs by softwood plywood increased by 2.6 billion board feet from 1951 to 1961 which was more than the increase in the annual import of softwood lumber." This finding underlines the I.W.A.'s analysis that the major cause of sawmill closure is either shortage of timber or management's policy of shifting to other products.

Examination of the trend of forest industry employment in Oregon reveals a dramatic economic progress. Private enterprise has shifted to higher valued products and created employment and averted what would have been serious loss of jobs had the emphasis remained on lumber. The Commission noted that the Jones Act is a problem confronting Pacific coast shippers. There is disagreement with U.S. forest policy and in certain areas of the Pacific Northwest there tend to be more sawmills than available timber supply.

It should be noted that these are entirely domestic matters and that surely the solution will not result from tariffs or quantitative restrictions.

Incorrect statements are consistently being made respecting the position of Canadian shippers about which I would like to state a few facts.

British Columbia is not a low wage area. The base labor rate in the coastal region is $2.08 per hour in 1963 compared with coastal Oregon and Washington $2.10. The I.W.A.'s statement to the Tariff Commission highlighted this parity and drew attention to the fact that a large part of U.S. lumber production originates from hourly rates well below $1.50 per hour.

Second, Canadian currency is not deliberately manipulated to benefit British Columbia lumbermen. The Canadian dollar was forced down from 105 percent to 92.5 percent of U.S. parity by external pressures causing the Canadian currency to reach a realistic relation with the U.S. currency. It is interesting to note that during 9 of the past 11 years, the Canadian dollar was at a premium. Fundamentally, there is no more reason for the two currencies to be the same value than there is for the Mexican peso to equal the Jananese yen.

Underlying the Canadian currency problem is the persistently adverse balance of payments with the United States, which in 1961 amounted to approximately $1,400 million. The currency crisis followed a decade in which current account loss with the United States was $12 billion dollars, offset partially by a northward flow of capital.

Third, the Government of British Columbia does not subsidize timber prices. Far from it, the appraisal formula was borrowed from the United States and innovations were added, making it more harsh than the U.S. version. In both countries Government stumpage is a share of the difference between cost of production and selling price of lumber and where these factors are equal stumpage will be approximately the same.

Fourth, it is said Canadian tariffs prevent American lumber sales in Canada. On a per capita basis, in 1961 we bought $1.50 worth of your lumber and you bought $1.52 of ours.

The lumber producers in North America have problems but we recognize the common enemy as the per capita decline in the use of wood products, arising from steady replacement of substitutes. For example, per capita softwood lumber consumption dropped from 223 board feet in 1950 to 166 board feet in 1962.

The solution is not to raise the price of lumber by artificially curtailing the supply. This is a withdrawal instead of stepping forward to challenge the competitors on the construction site.

There is vital need for determined product promotion to place lumber in all uses best suited to its capabilities. This requires action to insure the customer gets the service and uniformity of quality he is entitled to receive.

There are exports markets available and these can be developed by a concerted effort offering a high standard of customer service.

Free trade in lumber products would be a constructive force, enabling us to go forward together in a forthright attack against substitutes—the real enemy.

THE FOREST OF THE PACIFIC SLOPE

The forest under two flags is divided about one-half on each side of the border. The American share has the highest value species and the major portion of plywood logs. The Canadian share provides high quality lumber and species ideally suited for pulp and newsprint. Both countries are reaching the full utilization of the present commercially available annual harvest. Further expansion will come from using those portions of the tree not now utilized and increased supply from more intensive forestry. This requires vigorous private enterprise unfettered by artificial gimmicks. From the bark, lignins and resins not used in making chemical cellulose or papermaking pulps, there are a host of silvichemicals. These new products come from residues. The Northwest has the power supply, the know-how and the capital—in fact, all the advantages to compete in world markets. This new horizon can be achieved but it will be frustrated by restriction of the natural laws of economic geography.

The objectives of the forest industry, in both the United States and Canada, are identical. Harvest the forest crop at the lowest possible cost, recover the maximum possible per acre, obtain the utmost utilization per cubic foot of tree, maintain competitive vigor by constantly researching technological and product improvement and earn a profit commensurate with capital and management skills employed.

There are numerous areas for cooperation and joint action suggested in the foregoing. By accepting the principle of freer trade, it seems to me that a number of inhibitions currently present would either disappear or be greatly diminished, thereby providing better opportunities for working out our problems rather than fighting them out. The latter course is expensive and seldom produces a clear-cut win. Furthermore, it is very important to work toward elimination of the so-called anti-American or anti-Canadian gossip which is very largely ill founded and imaginary. Injury, moreover, is a poor method of cultivating one's best customer and good neighbor. Surely, in our common interest, there is no alternative but to work together and approach our problems objectively. Let us have a quick end to this "anti" nonsense which does little more than please our enemies.

May I conclude by stating that I believe that the freeing of trade between our countries will provide greater economic security for North America, particularly in the light of patterns developing on the world scene. At the same time, I feel the forest industry of the Pacific Northwest would be stimulated.

As a preliminary step toward closer economic integration and fuller utilization of the great forest we share, I suggest that consideration be given to the following five points.

1. Develop a proposal for submission to the two Governments respecting elimination of tariffs on forest products.

2. Undertake joint action to resist the invasion of substitute materials, including a joint wood promotion program, and cooperative research projects aimed at expanding the engineered use of building materials, and reducing the cost of getting wood products into place in buildings.

3. Develop areas for cooperation in the expansion of oversea markets.

4. Foster closer relation in establishing and maintaining standards of quality in forest products.

5. Establish full liaison in the forestry sciences, relating to the control of forest fires, prevention of insect infestation and management of the forest crop.

A NEW APPROACH TO RESOLVE THE SOFTWOOD IMPORT PROBLEM

(Address by G. Cleveland Edgett, executive vice president, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, before the Oregon Bankers Association, Portland, Oreg., April 9, 1963)

There is always a problem in presenting the story of an industry. Its achievements can be magnified if for any reason this seems desirable. Its difficulties can be made to appear more dire than they actually are in an effort to enlist support.

You are concerned with the lumber industry, but I imagine that you are no more concerned with it than you are with any other enterprise—large or small—which is not willing or able, on the basis of its own skill, to perform successfully.

If we are unable or unwilling to meet our obligations, you have a responsibility to your investors and the community to proceed with great care. At the same time, you are deeply involved with any industry which has an influence on the well-being or prosperity of the people who depend on you for security.

The lumber industry has problems at the moment. It has always had them. It has always met them. It is not necessary to tell you that in this respect it is in no way different from any other enduring industry.

Because we work closely together, I appreciate this opportunity to share with you some background information on our problems. Also, I would like to take advantage of this occasion to offer some new ideas on how our difficulties might be overcome.

Let me say first that we, as an industry, ask only that we be permitted to operate on a fair, competitive basis. Given the same set of ground rules, we believe that we can compete with any nation in the world.

Traditionally, the Northwest lumber industry has prospered when homes and commercial structures have been in demand in the United States. Traditionally, the sawmills in this area have produced the boards, the 2-by-4 studs, the 2-by-8 or 2-by-10 joists for this type of construction.

Now, you should know that the forests which provide this material recognize no such artificial boundary as the Canadian border. The same forests which grow north in Oregon and Washington continue to grow north into the province of British Columbia. Mills in British Columbia harvest substantially the same type of timber that we harvest here. And they use the same type of equipment that has been developed here.

Traditionally, British Columbia mills—many of them cargo, or waterside, mills—have sold the bulk of their output in the United Kingdom. However, in recent years this pattern has changed in two respects. First the Baltic countries and Russia have tended to make the United Kingdom market less remunerative for British Columbia producers. Second, very large new stands of timber in interior British Columbia have been opened up and many new productive units installed. Canada has been forced to find a new market for its lumber production and the United States was the nearest and most lucrative market available.

We now find additional millions of board feet of Canadian lumber pouring down across the border through the Lake States, streaming down even to Texas, going by ship to all the ports of the eastern seaboard.

In 1939, 29 percent of Canada's lumber exports was sent to the United States. By 1961 the total had risen to 79 percent. This represents 15 percent of total domestic softwood consumption and it may reach over 18 percent this year.

As the result of a number of trade agreements, the duty on imported softwood lumber declined during this period from $3 per thousand board feet to 25 cents per thousand board feet—which is obviously of no consequence. It is easy to see that the lumber industry has been sacrificed at the bargaining table in favor of other commodities.

As an initial step, the lumber industry of this country sought relief by applying to the U.S. Tariff Commission for a more realistic duty on lumber imports. From October 2 to 12, 1962, the industry presented evidence of the injury to which it was being subjected.

The time, however, was, to say the least, inauspicious. On October 11, the day before the hearing ended, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was passed by Congress and signed by the President.

The goals of the act are the development of an open and nondiscriminatory trading system in the free world, an economic and efficient international exchange of goods and the stimulation of economic growth.

Political and economic questions apart from tariff reductions will influence the course of future negotiations under the new act. Aid to developing nations, political and military problems, conflicting national and regional goals, differences in economic and political structure and in the rate of economic development and the pressing internal problems of each of the major nations of the free world must be considered.

Obviously, the problems of the lumber industry are to be judged against a backdrop of global problems. The act specifically states that any increased imports complained of must result "in major part" from previous tariff concessions.

This is the nub of the matter. The Tariff Commission was unable to find that any competitive difficulties besetting the lumber industry were due "in major part" to tariff reductions.

In the course of its exhaustive investigation, however, the Tariff Commission found that there had indeed been serious injury. It assigned specific reasons for the deterioration of the competitive position of this country's lumber industry. I think you will be interested in some of these reasons.

The most important cause of the increased imports, said the Tariff Commission in its official report, is reflected in the much more pronounced "cost-price squeeze" in the United States than in Canada between the price of lumber and the rapidly rising price of timber and purchased logs.

The timber management policies of Government agencies and other owners of large timber resources have operated, and continue to operate, to limit the commercial availability of mature sawtimber. These policies, which are designed to achieve a long-term balance between cut and growth, have resulted in much more intense competition among buyers of such timber in this country than exists in Canada.

The competition for the supply of timber, especially in the United States, has occurred not only among producers of lumber, but among producers of a variety of other forest products, such as plywood and pulp and paper and, sporadically, among exporters of logs. The rising aggregate demand for such forest products in the United States, in conjunction with rather rigid limitations on the commercial supply of timber, has resulted in an upward trend in the domestic price of timber. This, in turn, has exerted an upward pressure on U.S. prices of lumber. The persistence of this pressure has encouraged the opening of new areas of production of timber and the expansion of sawmill capacity in Canada, particularly during the past few years.

The average bid price of Douglas-fir stumpage in the coastal district of northwestern Washington, for example, rose from about $23 per thousand board feet in 1958 to about $38 per thousand in 1959, then declined to about $23 per thousand in 1961. In the same years the bid prices for Douglas fir in the coastal district of British Columbia were less than half those indicated for northwestern Washington.

In the United States, national forest timber is offered for sale to all bidders. In British Columbia, cutting privileges are controlled by a complex system of licensing priorities, quotas, and quota rights, the provisions of which vary according to several categories of public timberland. Often these provisions tend to reserve cutting privileges to established operators in local areas and to limit competitive bidding.

The Tariff Commission went on to say that the depreciation of the Canadian dollar has been, and continues to be, an important stimulus to U.S. imports of lumber from Canada.

In May 1962, pursuant to an arrangement with the International Monetary Fund, Canada pegged its dollar at 92½ cents. The pegging of the rate at that level was designed to accomplish several purposes. Among the more important of them were the general curtailment of imports and the general expansion of exports. Inasmuch as lumber is a leading Canadian export and the United States is the major foreign market for it, the currency depreciation effectively promoted the expansion of lumber exports to the United States.

In terms of U.S. dollars, the depreciation of the Canadian dollar since 1959 is equivalent to approximately $7 per thousand board feet, based on the average unit value of imports of softwood lumber from Canada in 1962.

Cost of transportation accounts for a large part of the delivered price of most shipments of softwood lumber. An important factor affecting the volume of imports of softwood lumber, the Tariff Commission went on to say, is the charter rate for waterborne shipments from British Columbia to Eastern United States in relation to the intercoastal conference rate on shipments from the west coast of the United States to the same destinations.

Under the Jones Act, as you know, intercoastal shipments of cargo from U.S. ports must move in U.S.-flag vessels. A modest break in this restrictive pattern was achieved recently when temporary legislation was passed permitting the shipment of domestic lumber in foreign-flag vessels to Puerto Rico upon determination by the Secretary of Commerce that no U.S.-flag vessels are reasonably available.

For approximately 3 years before October 1957 the Canadian charter rate to Atlantic ports was higher than the U.S. conference rate by $3 to more than $7 per thousand board feet of lumber. During that period waterborne shipments from British Columbia to eastern United States declined materially. Commencing in October 1957, however, charter rates applicable to shipments from Canadian ports were reduced sharply.

Largely as a result thereof, British Columbia mills increased their waterborne shipments to eastern United States by more than 500 million board feet from 1957 to 1961. The differential favoring shipments from Canadian ports reached the highest point on record—$12 per thousand board feet—in April 1962, thereby contributing further to increased imports of Canadian lumber.

The Tariff Commission concluded with the observation that the evidence obtained in the course of the investigation suggests that the factors giving rise to the increase in imports, rather than the increase itself, are mainly responsible for the major problems confronting the domestic softwood lumber industry.

Let me say again at this point that we are seeking no favors. We expect no special treatment. We do feel we are entitled to the opportunity to compete on equal terms with our neighbors to the north, and we intend to aggressively fight for that opportunity.

We have a program and are spending our time, manpower, and money to implement it. It is true that some of us place the emphasis on different facets of the problem. But, basically, I believe that the industry would support an entirely new concept of achieving equality.

There are seven primary areas where I am convinced that specific action can be taken to resolve the problem of excessive imports of softwood lumber.

With respect to the Jones Act, I would suggest to Congress that it enact legislation that would require all softwood lumber discharged at ports in the United States, its territories, districts, and possessions to be transported in American-flag ships or vessels registered in the country of the point of origin.

One of the chief purposes of the Jones Act, you will recall, was to preserve this country's merchant marine fleet for use in the eventuality of war. This placed upon the Northwest lumber industry the considerable burden of operating at a heavy financial disadvantage in order to protect the interests of the Nation as a whole.

During World War II, when a scarcity of ships existed, Canada operated her own fleet of merchant ships. While she has virtually none now, the shipping companies are still in existence. Certainly Canada should share in the defense of the North American Continent by building up her own fleet of merchant marine vessels. The alternative, which poses many additional problems, is to permit American shippers also to use foreign bottoms which are cheaper because wages, food, maintenance, and other considerations are inferior.

Canada has already cooperated with this country in eliminating the 15-day freehold on shipments moving by rail. This actually was a concession involving the bulk of Canadian shipments of lumber into this country, for three-quarters of the approximately 4.5 billion board feet enter by rail. If an accommodation can be made in one area, it can be made in another.

There are, of course, important considerations which must be dealt with, among them the needs of our own steamship people, of American workers on American ships, and the Southern Pine producers. Nevertheless, this new proposal provides an opportunity to achieve equality in the market with other countries and maintain the relationship between rail and cargo shipping within our own Nation.

For the second point in this program, I believe that the American lumber industry would be willing to accept an orderly marketing agreement between Canada and the United States which would remove tariffs on softwood lumber in both directions.

The results of the election in Canada yesterday seem to indicate that our friends to the north believe that an improvement in international relations is long overdue. Historically, the party which now holds a slim majority in Canada has had more harmonious relationship with the United States; this may provide us with a better chance to achieve a new approach to tariff matters between our two countries.

In the past, Canada has maintained high tariff barriers on lumber—and the previous administration was particularly restrictive in a number of different fields. Canadian tariffs on lumber, for example, range from $5 to $10 per thousand, while ours remain very nominal at from 25 cents to $1 per thousand.

In another area of operation, our administration should, at the next meeting of the International Monetary Fund, suggest that Canada reexamine her previous fiscal policies and consider the repegging of the Canadian dollar to a higher value. It is by no means impossible that a new Canadian administration would be receptive to this view. You, as bankers, know that it is impossible to continue to rob Peter to pay Paul.

I feel, in addition, that all softwood lumber should be marked as to country of origin. This would tend to eliminate confusion as to species and areas of growth, and permit buyers who wish to "Buy American" to do so. This is not a restrictive measure as Canada is already marking its lumber for other export markets.

In the matter of forest policies there is much that can be done. I respectfully suggest to the Governors of the Western States that they immediately appoint a committee of specialists in the field of forestry to examine Forest Service policies in British Columbia and consult with softwood producers in the Northwest regarding policies in existence on this side of the border. This committee should document these policies and recommend measures which would result in greater equality between Canadian forest policies and those in existence under the various administrative agencies in the United States.

The Northwest lumber industry is presently investing very substantial sums of money in promoting the use of lumber throughout the United States. Canadian producers make a very modest contribution to this promotional effort through the national wood promotion program. The net effect, however, is that the Northwest industry is spending millions of dollars to promote the sale of 4.5 billion board feet of Canadian lumber in the markets of this country. Since the basic purpose of this program is to preserve lumber's position with regard to substitute materials, I believe that Canada's financial share in this effort should be very much greater than it is.

Perhaps I should mention at this point that we, likewise, are trying to do our share in developing oversea export markets—to the advantage of both the Canadians and ourselves. Next month a trade mission of eight key Northwest industry representatives will fly to the United Kingdom and Common Market countries to explore trade possibilities in that area and promote the advantages of lumber from this region. A similar trade mission to the Far East and Australia is on the planning boards.

Finally, I believe that if the foregoing program cannot be put into effect before the summer recess of Congress, the President should be given the authority to invoke section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and temporarily impose a 10 percent quota—10 percent of the softwood lumber consumption in this country—on the imports of Canadian lumber.

There is at least one bill before Congress calling for an even lower quota, but I feel that it is time to be both fair and realistic.

Ample justification for such action by the President exists. The several billion board feet of timber which were blown down in the Columbus Day storm constitute a salvage and marketing problem which is of vital economic importance.

If something tangible can be accomplished within the next 4 months in the areas mentioned, I do not believe that the industry would be inclined to press for a quota. Should no appreciable progress be made, however, the interests of both the lumber industry and this region as a whole demand that the quota solution be resolutely advanced.

Gentlemen, I submit these proposals for your earnest consideration. I suggest to you that the time is opportune to carefully appraise our responsibilities to investors in this great industry and vigorously pursue a program of reform that is practical and in accord with these changing times.

[From the Yakima (Wash.) Republic, Mar. 28, 1963]

CANADIAN LUMBER IMPORTS WILL BE TOPIC FOR PNTA

Free trade effects in an area where U.S. industry already has battlelines manned against Canadian imports will be under scrutiny during Pacific Northwest Trade Association spring general conference in Yakima, April 7–9.

All conference discussions will be on aspects of "A Canada-United States Free Trade Area." That theme will be introduced at the opening banquet in Chinook Tower, April 7, by Dr. Robert L. McNeill, Deputy Assistant U.S. Secretary of Commerce for Trade Policy. Dr. McNeill has replaced Christian A. Herter, former Secretary of State, who is now President Kennedy's special representative for trade negotiations, as the conference keynote speaker.

CONFLICT AREA

The area of present trade conflict to be discussed is that of lumbering. B. M. Hoffmeister, of Vancouver, British Columbia, and Robert B. Pamplin, Portland, Oreg., will be spokesmen for the forest industries of Canada and the United States on the April 8 conference luncheon program. All conference sessions are scheduled in the Chinook.

Hoffmeister is president of the Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia. Pamplin is president of Georgia-Pacific Corp., a major producer of lumber and other wood products in the U.S. Pacific Northwest.

TWO CAREERS

Hoffmeister has gained prominence in two careers—military and industrial. He has been a lumberman all his business life, starting at age 17 as a junior clerk for the Canadian White Pine Co. Nine years later he was sales manager of the company, a subsidiary of MacMillan, Bloedel & Powell River, Ltd.

He volunteered for service with the Seaforth Highlanders of Canada when World War II broke out in 1939 and, in field actions, he gained successive promotions until he became Canada's youngest major general. Among his many military medals is the American Legion of Merit. He led the Seaforth Highlanders landing in Sicily; commanded Canada's 5th armored division in Europe; and, at the close of the war, was commander of Canadian forces in the Pacific.

VIRGINIA NATIVE

Pamplin is a 1933 graduate of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and did graduate work at Northwestern University. He is a native of Virginia.

He joined Georgia-Pacific in 1934, became its secretary and treasurer 2 years later, financial vice president in 1948, administrative vice president in 1952, executive vice president in 1956, and president in 1957.

CIGARETTE ADS ON TELEVISION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I have discussed before in this Chamber my interest in a program which would advise the American people of the hazards of cigarette smoking. Legislation which I cosponsored last session with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] was not pursued when the U.S. Public Health Service announced the creation of a commission of impartial experts to undertake a study of the available data on the effects of smoking. We are now awaiting that report. I am advised, however, that it will not be forthcoming for some time—perhaps for a year—and meanwhile cigarette advertising goes on unabated in a form most calculated to entice our youth to adopt the cigarette habit.

Because of the urgency I have recently directed letters to the presidents of the major television networks and of the tobacco companies themselves, asking them to take the glamour out of cigarette advertising in the hope that they will begin to do voluntarily what I trust we will do more thoroughly through a massive educational campaign.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the TV networks be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I am writing to ask that you and your board of directors do everything possible to take the glamour out of cigarette advertising.

I am concerned about the appeal to youth through advertisements which make it appear that the most virile and accomplished of men, the most attractive and feminine of women, and our leaders in almost every field are all cigarette smokers—and the inference in some of the ads is that success in the business or social world go hand in hand with tobacco smoking. TV cigarette advertising is particularly insidious because the ad comes right into the living room and reaches all members of a family in a way that a newspaper or magazine ad would not.

I am aware, of course, of the extent to which your revenues come from tobacco advertising, and that some of the country's most informative and entertaining TV programs are made possible by the huge expenditures of the tobacco companies to sell their products. I am not suggesting that tobacco advertising be stopped, but I do feel that glorifying advertising in this field should definitely be curbed—and that the broadcasting industry should take a firm stand on it.

There is mounting medical evidence as to the health hazards of the extensive use of tobacco. The most serious is the soaring death rate from cancer of the lung. At least 36,000 Americans died of lung cancer in 1960, more than 50 times the number who died in 1914. Medical evidence compiled in this country, as well as in Europe, shows a positive relationship between cigarette smoking and the incidence of lung cancer. I am referring, of course, to such studies as the report released a year ago in Britain by the Royal College of Physicians and that of Dr. Oscar Auerbach and Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond before the 1962 annual meeting of the American College of Chest Physicians.

As you may know, the Royal College of Physicians appointed a committee of specialists to study the effects of smoking on the body. After nearly 3 years of work they concluded that cigarette smoking is a cause of both lung cancer and bronchitis. It delays healing of gastric and duodenal ulcers and probably contributes to the development of coronary heart disease and certain arterial disorders. The committee also believes cigarette smoking may cause cancer of the mouth and pharynx.

In this country Doctors Auerbach and Hammond examined lung tissue from nearly 1,600 autopsies over a 5-year period. They now agree that tobacco smoke is unquestionably the chief cause of thickening and rupture of the small air sacs and blood vessels in the lungs. As a result, the body's oxygen supply is sharply reduced, thus forcing the right side of the heart to work harder to supply enough oxygenated blood from the lungs. Dr. Hammond pointed out that nearly half of all deaths in this country are due to heart failure and circulatory diseases and that smoking is a contributing factor in the progress of these conditions. In fact, in nearly all of the cases they analyzed, the degree of damage was directly related to the amount and kind of smoking done.

I have been studying the mounting medical evidence on the hazards of cigarette smoking for some time, and in the last session of the Congress I was one of the sponsors of a resolution which asked the President to create a Commission on Tobacco and Health to conduct a massive educational program on what cigarette smoking does to the human body, with particular emphasis on the relationship between smoking and lung cancer. This resolution was not passed because shortly after its introduction the U.S. Public Health Service announced the creation of a commission of impartial experts to undertake a comprehensive and dispassionate review of all available data on cigarette smoking, and to make recommendations in this area. It is expected that the first phase of this study, the survey of the nature and magnitude of the health hazard, will be completed by this September. But it will be some time after that before any recommendations can be formulated.

I am hopeful that the well-documented recommendations which come out of this study will be meaningful and sound. America is considerably behind major European countries in looking squarely in the eye the growing epidemic of death and debilitation caused by cigarette smoking. In Italy, for example, the Parliament has passed an act outlawing any form of public advertising. In Britain, the Ministry of Health has blanketed the Nation's schools with posters warning of the dangers of cigarette smoking. In addition the tobacco industry itself has agreed to deglamorize cigarette advertising on television, and all advertisements which do appear are shown after 9:00 p.m. In Denmark the cigarette makers have agreed to stop advertising their products in moving picture slides and magazines aimed at teenage audiences.

In making my request that the American Broadcasting Co. television network control the type of cigarette advertising presented, I wish to state that I am familiar with the claims made by some individuals in the tobacco industry that their advertising is not directed at converting nonsmokers but merely at winning the support of established smokers for a particular brand. They hold that the choice of whether to smoke or not to smoke is an individual matter. I am sure that this is an honest appraisal of their motivation.

However, I believe what they fail to acknowledge is that cigarette advertising is skillfully directed toward young people in such a way to make it seem imperative for them to smoke if they are to be manly or glamorous, handsome, active, successful, gay, vibrant, and glowing with good health. I am told that to this end, the 20 top brands spent $144 million on advertising in 1961.

Studies show that more than half of all high school students smoke, and 4,500 more boys and girls between the ages of 12 and 17 take up the habit each day of the year. By doing so they are greatly increasing their chances for dreaded diseases and early deaths. In view of these facts, how can it be ethical for our mass media to continue using sports heroes and glamorous models in an effort to associate smoking with all that is exciting, pleasant, and desirable in life?

I hope you will accept this letter in the spirit in which it is written, and take a hard look at the type of cigarette advertising you are allowing sponsors to present on your network. I know you will agree with me that the resources of television should not be used to convince the youth of America—or even the nonsmokers in more adult groups—that they should use a product which is injurious to their health.

I am also writing directly to the major cigarette manufacturers to make the same sort of plea I am directing to you.

HEROES OF THE WARSAW GHETTO

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, 20 years have passed since the Warsaw ghetto uprising. During those years the world has slowly learned the full extent of the heroic, hopeless fight waged by a small group of individuals against a massive military machine.

On this 20th anniversary, extensive and memorable tributes are being paid to the 50,000 Jews who died during those terrible 3 weeks in Warsaw. At ceremonies in Warsaw, Polish resistance fighters, who had given some help despite the terror, watched as the heroes of the battle were honored. Here in Washington, a memorial will be dedicated today to the martyrs of Warsaw at the Adas Israel Synagogue.

Mr. President, these ceremonies are tributes to the courage of an immortal group of men, women, and children. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article from the New York Times describing the Warsaw ceremonies. An editorial in the New York Times of April 21 is also offered as another memorial to those who died in the Warsaw ghetto.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1963]

HEROES OF THE GHETTO

Twenty years ago, in the Warsaw ghetto where the Nazis had herded thousands of Jews to die, a handful of men, women and children gathered their last strength and took up arms in a revolt they knew to be hopeless. Emaciated, fever racked, they had few weapons, few fighters to pit against the well-equipped units of the S.S. If they knew that they could not prevail in battle, they also must have known that the Nazis' fury would fall on the survivors.

Yet the pitiful army fought, in the ruins and sewers of the Warsaw ghetto. It is doubtful whether, measured by military standards, the action proved of value. The Jews inflicted few casualties. In a few short days they were overwhelmed and the ghetto was in flames.

It is fitting that the Warsaw ghetto uprising be remembered, as it will be today in ceremonies in New York and other parts of the country. As President Kennedy has said, the nameless ghetto fighters provided "a chapter in the annals of human heroism, an inspiration to the peace-loving people of the world and a warning to would-be oppressors."

Wherever men of any nation or creed respect courage in face of inhumanity, the fight of the few in the Warsaw ghetto will not be forgotten.

[From the New York Times]

POLES MARK ANNIVERSARY OF 1943 GHETTO UPRISING

Warsaw, April 18.—Senior Polish officials led delegates from all over the world today at the opening here of a 2-day ceremony marking the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. Nearly 50,000 Jews died in the hopeless 3-week fight against Nazi troops.

Edward Ochab, a high Communist Party official, began the ceremonies by awarding 91 state decorations to heroes of the battle. Included were Jewish survivors and Polish resistance fighters who aided them, and many posthumous awards.

Prominent among the visitors was an eight-man delegation from Israel led by former Attorney General Gideon Hausner, chief prosecutor in the Adolf Eichmann trial, who was born in Poland.

ROLLCALL TO BE READ

Ceremonies scheduled in Warsaw tomorrow included a wreath laying at the stone memorial cairn in the former ghetto that marks the site of the Jews' last stronghold. A rollcall of the resistance fighters will be read.

A trip will be made to the former Nazi extermination camp at Treblinka, 80 miles away, where 800,000 Jews were killed.

Mr. Hausner, whose delegation visited the Jewish cemetery in Warsaw, said it was, paradoxically, the only Jewish center in Poland. The country's prewar Jewish population of 3,500,000 has shrunk to 30,000, mostly old people who have refused to emigrate.

The fierce and bloody ghetto battle—along a street called Mila (Pleasant)—erupted on an Easter Sunday as the last gesture of those of the ghetto's original population of 600,00 who remained.

HOUSE-TO-HOUSE FIGHTING

Helped by the Polish underground, the survivors fought house to house and yard by yard as the encircling German forces moved in. Hitler eventually ordered in tanks and armored cars.

After 3 weeks the assault troops blasted their way into the command bunker, where the Jewish leaders had taken their last stand. The survivors there died fighting or turned their guns on themselves.

The anniversary ceremonies are sponsored by the Communist government.

Premier Jozef Cyrankiewicz, onetime inmate of the Auschwitz concentration camp, was patron, and Warsaw's mayor, Janusz Zarzycki, headed the organizing committee. Streets in many parts of Poland are to be named for Jewish resistance leaders.

MIGRANT FARM LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the March 15 issue of Presbyterian Life carried a most interesting article on the situation of the migrant farm laborers in the United States.

In his informative and judicious article, Mr. Sissel points out quite accurately that the farmer has problems as well as the migrants, and that one of the forces working to help the migrant is "the active conscience of an increasing number of farm employers." However, the farmer cannot improve the housing and living conditions of his workers entirely unaided. Help such as proposed in the legislation before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor is needed by both the farmer and the worker.

Mr. Sissel has given a carefully drawn and balanced picture of the situation of our migrant farmworkers, a group often voiceless and voteless. Because I think my colleagues will find this article of great interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSLETTER FROM WASHINGTON

(By H. B. Sissel)

Given either a well-organized, well-financed lobby or deep, broadly articulated public support, any group interest can fare rather well in the Nation's Capital. Lacking both, it is likely to lose out among the competing voices clamoring for legislative and executive attention.

It may therefore come as a surprise that our Nation's 500,000 domestic migrant farmworkers (2 million if you count all family members) stand the best prospects in years of benefiting from ameliorative legislation from the Congress. A migrant health act approved by the last Congress, though insignificant in its contribution to the total solution, presaged these prospects. Several factors have helped create this guardedly hopeful situation. The most obvious was the controversial television documentary "Harvest of Shame," which pictorialized some of the worst, but not atypical, aspects of the lives of migrants before millions of TV viewers. Another has been the meticulous efforts of Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey, assisted by a dedicated staff who has assiduously avoided casting the grower in the role of villain in the picture. Another has been the active conscience of an increasing number of farm employers who have tried to improve the lot of the people who are with them so short a time, but upon whom they depend to bring in their harvests of vegetables, fruits, and nuts. And one of the most important factors has been the persistent, year-after-year hammering away by church groups and private agencies so easily dismissed as "do-gooders." Facts, figures, and experience gained from migrant ministries and social welfare work have buttressed the arguments of these latter groups on behalf of "the forgotten 2 million."

Migrant farmworkers continue to be one of the very few minority groups in the United States whose conditions have not improved in the last 30 years. In fact, relative to the improved standard of living in most of the rest of our population, their plight has actually worsened since John Steinbeck wrote "Grapes of Wrath" in the midthirties. Much of the propaganda put out by the cause groups states with only a modicum of license that migrants are "without voice and without vote." There is no question that the mobility of the migrant as he follows the crops deprives his children of formal education and his family of minimal health and sanitation provisions, and cuts him off from the benefits of the labor legislation that has given industrial labor cohesion and power. Lacking an established residence, he is cut off even from those subsistence welfare services that most communities give to their own indigent poor. Equally important from the point of view of the church, the migrant's sense of identity, personal awareness and worth, and his energy and aspiration are sapped by his inability to settle and belong anywhere. His total situation is not helped by virtue of the fact that his skin is probably dark.

* * * * *

As for public education, health, and welfare services, many local school districts or public health and welfare departments are unable adequately to take care of their own, let alone to meet the needs of a massive influx of temporary visitors.

Yet as of now the migratory farmworker is absolutely essential to the production and harvesting of a significant portion of our country's food supply. Further, the domestic worker competes with a foreign labor force that comes in temporarily (some permanently) under the protection and regulation of Federal law. Most of this foreign labor force consists of Mexican nationals who depend economically upon their seasonal income within the United States. At the same time, that income in a sense subsidizes their continuation in a state of poverty and takes some of the pressure off the Mexican Government to build its own durable economic institutions, starting with genuine land reform. Sudden and radical elimination of Mexican migrants from the farm labor force would undoubtedly be harmful to domestic growers, and to Mexican nationals as well.

What is needed to rationalize the farm labor market, as the experts put it, is a comprehensive Federal program that takes into consideration all the major components in this complex tangle of economic, political, and human problems. The grower needs a predictable number of harvesters on a temporary basis at the right place at the right time. Otherwise, he loses his crop. The worker needs to be assured of a systematic series of jobs under decent working and living conditions at an adequate wage. The Mexican national needs to be "phased out" of the picture in such a way that necessary adjustments can be made for his welfare at home. The consumer needs to be assured that his food costs won't skyrocket if justice is done for the worker. (They won't. Labor costs in this sector are insignificant in comparison to packaging and marketing costs.) This is obviously a situation in which the free play of the forces involved can only lead to further disorganization of the farm labor market and intensification of the human and economic problems it produces.

Meanwhile, Senator WILLIAMS has again introduced a series of bills intended to provide migrants with minimum wage protection; assistance to State-controlled improvement in health, education, and welfare programs; improved recruitment, transportation, and distribution services; regulation of the use of child labor; registration of crew leaders; better housing; and other benefits. Proposed legislation is also designed to assist growers in getting an orderly labor supply without at the same time perpetuating the plight of the harvesters. Detailed information about migrant labor legislation now before the Congress may be obtained without cost from the National Committee on Agricultural Life and Labor, 1751 N Street, NW., Washington, D.C. Much of this legislation could pass this year with just a bit more expression of concern and interest from the public, especially church people.

The United Presbyterian General Assembly, which meets this May in Des Moines, will have before it a comprehensive statement with appropriate recommendations for legislative and other action that can be taken toward solutions to the problems clustered around the production of the food most of us will eat today.

TASK FOR A PEACE CORPS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the proposed National Service Corps is one of the most important legislative measures to come before the 88th Congress. Among the many areas in which the Corps would operate, none is more needy than the migrant farm families of this Nation. Recognizing this fact, Cyrus Karraker, in a recent article in the Christian Century, spells out in detail exactly how great a help National Service Corps volunteers will be to this neglected group. Mr. Karraker is president of the Pennsylvania Citizen's Committee on Migrant Labor and he has a wide knowledge of the problem. In this interesting article he gives a clear picture of what can and should be done for our migrant farm workers by the National Service Corps. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Task for a Peace Corps" be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TASK FOR A PEACE CORPS

(A program like that operating abroad could transform the lives of our migrant workers.)

(By Cyrus Karraker)

Last November it was announced that President Kennedy had named a Cabinet-level group headed by his brother Robert, the Attorney General, to study the feasibility of a domestic Peace Corps, patterned after the program which today has 4,000 volunteers at work in 40 countries. The wide press coverage given the President's announcement indicates how great is the public's interest in the humane work being done by the Peace Corps abroad. A domestic corps organized along the same lines would present opportunities to citizens to make their country a better place to live in. Could there be a higher type of patriotism?

A preliminary report submitted earlier by the Attorney General had suggested certain domestic areas in which volunteers could play important roles, "such as working in slum schools and recreation areas, migrant labor camps and correctional institutions."

I propose to deal with only one of the domestic areas mentioned, migrant labor, suggesting some services which volunteers might perform to help solve a grave social problem.

The challenge to these volunteers comes from a group of people estimated variously to number between 1 and 2 million—people whose average annual individual income is less than $1,000, whose education and health are neglected, and who lack every form of security. Among them are at least 150,000 children under 12 years of age.

Through the years many organizations have engaged in efforts to solve the problem posed by the presence of these unfortunate people, but progress in improvement of their welfare has been slow and spotty. And though congressional legislation would accomplish the greatest amount of improvement, at its last session Congress adopted only 1 of the 12 bills on migrant welfare that were introduced. That one had to do with health, and Congress adjourned without providing the funds necessary for its functioning. Obviously something extra and different is needed if public concern is to be aroused and if the walls that isolate migrant farm laborers from the rest of American society are to be broken down. That something might prove to be the suggested domestic Peace Corps.

Volunteers enrolled in such a corps could help the migrant farm laborers in many creative ways. Most urgent need at present is improvement of the physical conditions of the camps in which most of these people live. Thousands of those camps serve only as shelter from the weather. They are fly-ridden, they lack refrigeration facilities, they are overcrowded and unsanitary. The owners of many such camps protest that they cannot afford to provide better quarters for their workers.

Carefully chosen for their tasks and organized under able leadership, Peace Corps volunteers could transform these shelters into comfortable housing. In such an enterprise there is a precedent in the American Friends Service Committee's work camps, which for years have given students an opportunity to help convert bad city housing into decent places to live. Many migrant camps are the rural equivalent of slums, like them imperiling the physical and moral health of their residents. Physical improvement of the camps would in the end benefit the growers, too, since comfortable living conditions mean satisfied workers, more productive labor, greater monetary return.

Volunteers who possess certain necessary skills could be set to work building children's playgrounds at the camps, organizing adult recreation programs, and planning and carrying out vocational programs for the workers and their families. Though all the efforts to improve the camps may do no more than help the workers achieve a minimal living standard—a makeshift shelter in a camp can never be a home—that standard will be far above what most of these people have known.

Services besides the merely physical are needed, too. One of the most significant is establishment of education and health programs for the workers' children. In certain places this has been accomplished to a degree by provision of day-care centers and summer schools. But though the great value of such projects has been demonstrated over the years, no more than a fourth of the States in which migrants work make anything like adequate provision for the children's welfare. And only five States have so far taken advantage of the fact that Federal funds are available to the States for the extension of welfare services to migrant children as well as to resident dependent children. In 1962 the only satisfactory work being done for the benefit of migrant children was to be found in Colorado, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Washington. Just now, however, welfare agencies in other States are displaying interest in such services, and apparently await only encouragement to begin offering them. Initiation of Peace Corps projects among migrants might not only result in improved living conditions; it might also focus the attention of State and county welfare officials on their responsibility for the welfare of migrant farm workers.

Volunteers for Peace Corps projects of this kind should of course be people with training and experience in child care, elementary education, health, and social work. One of their most important tasks would be to refer migrants burdened with personal problems to appropriate county welfare agencies; another, in cooperation with chaplains, would be to cultivate friendly relations between the migrant laborers and the community. Pennsylvania provides a model in its use of social workers in migrant welfare. Operating as mobile units, Peace Corps volunteers could be called to whatever area needed their particular skills at a given time.

Other needed services lie in the areas of religion and adult education. The value of the work already being done by chaplains in spiritual counseling and in promoting social adjustment is widely recognized. Usually the service is provided by a local council of Protestant churches or by Roman Catholic parishes in the neighborhood. But the chaplains are too few and in many instances their burdens are too great. Why should not a domestic Peace Corps have in its ranks persons able to serve as chaplains, working in cooperation with the social workers enrolled?

In adult education of migrants the field is virtually unlimited, because so far almost nothing has been done—this despite the fact that the average migrant worker has no more than a fifth grade education. Instruction is needed in the English language, American culture, child care, home management, nutrition and many other subjects. Aptitude and other tests could be used to discover youth who possess the potential for vocational or college education. A model is to be found in the student committees that have been formed at a number of colleges to help migrant youth get an education. Bucknell University has assumed leadership in this area, and committees are in existence at Bowling Green University and at Oberlin, Swarthmore, and Douglass colleges. Funds are available for scholarships; the difficulty lies in discovering young migrants who wish to continue education beyond high school.

There remains another area for service to migrant laborers, that of health. Most migrants live under conditions that favor the spread of contagious diseases not only among themselves but to the resident population of the area. This fact was acknowledged by New Jersey last summer when it conducted mass tuberculosis testing for its 25,000 migrant workers. Any comprehensive health program, however, should rest on such basic research as is being conducted in California, which has assumed national leadership in migrant health programs by setting up family health clinics in a number of counties, with the help of citizens' health committees. Any health program that approaches adequacy requires doctors and nurses far beyond the present resident supply. This is where trained medical personnel in a domestic Peace Corps could turn the tide of need.

Here, then, are the vital needs in one area where Peace Corps volunteers will be most welcome. We await the inception of a domestic Peace Corps.

MENTAL ILLNESS AND RETARDATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, truly remarkable advances have been made in the past several years in many fields of medicine but in few has the progress been as dramatic as in the critical area of mental health.

Within the memory of virtually every Member of the Senate is the time when the mentally ill were consigned to bleak, dreary institutions which were little better—and in some cases infinitely worse—than jails.

In recent years, however, magnificent strides have been taken and the subject of mental illness, once shunned in public discussion, was again the subject earlier this year of a Presidential message to the Congress.

Time magazine, in the medicine section of its April 5 edition, discusses the work being done in the various States and concludes:

> Nebraska has been trying possibly the most fundamental approach to prompt treatment for the mentally ill, and is now being acclaimed as the Nation's second most advanced State in the promotion of mental health—after neighboring Kansas. Guided by Dr. Cecil W. Wittson, Nebraska's program aims at training the family doctor, pediatrician, internist and obstetrician-gynecologist to handle the everyday emotional problems of their patients. The Nebraska Psychiatric Institute invites family doctors to Omaha for training in consultation and observation of patients. They may even bring their own patients along for study. Back home, they are expected to set aside one half-day a week for patients with emotional problems. Twenty of them now have an average of 18 psychiatric patients each. And for a 6-month course in family-practice psychiatry scheduled to begin July 1, it is the doctors, for a change who are lined up on a waiting list and not the patients.

We salute the State of Kansas for the work it is doing along with the States of Georgia, New Mexico, and Illinois, which are also cited in the Time article.

The Omaha World-Herald, observed editorially:

> Nebraska's mental health program is one of which Nebraskans are justly proud. Time's estimate should be interesting reading for those who have been saying that in providing essential services for its people, Nebraska has been woefully deficient.

The progress made in Nebraska stems from action taken many years ago. In fact, the Senator from Nebraska witnessed and participated in many of the foundational steps when he served as chairman of the Douglas County Board of Commissioners. Fifteen years ago, our Douglas County Hospital extended its hospitality for several years at a $1 per year rental to the State board of control and the University of Nebraska College of Medicine to cover one entire wing of the Douglas County Hospital. The arrangement was to commence the gathering of a staff for the psychiatric unit which would take several years to build on the campus of the college of medicine in Omaha.

When the construction of that unit was completed, the staff which took charge was moved over from the leased space to put into operation procedures and activities which had a running start in the leased quarters. Thus there was never a day lost for the new building in getting off to a splendid start what has now developed into a very worthwhile and meaningful program.

My mind goes back to many fine citizens who participated in that work. Phil Vogt, administrator of Douglas County Assistance Department, and in my book one of Nebraska's first citizens; the then chancellor of the University of Nebraska, Dr. Reuben G. Gustavson, who brought about fine cooperation of the university and its board of regents; the board of control, then composed of W. H. Diers, Mrs. Harold Prince, and Forrest R. Johnston. Of the Douglas County Commissioners who were active at that time, only Leonard Bergman is still in office and doing a splendid job. Then and now appears the name and the authority in his field of Dr. Cecil W. Wittson, who undertook guidance of the institute and who enjoys national renown in his field, and of course many others.

All of us then knew that we were taking steps which would have impact for years to come. It was at considerable expense to Douglas County because of the shortage of space for its hospital patients. But we doubled up, the staff in charge underwent a great discipline and exercised competent management, as well as infinite patience, all of which were necessary to bridge that interim between organization of the Nebraska Psychiatric Institute and its moving into its present permanent home.

Again, I should like to say that Nebraska's progress in this field, as in so many others, has been commonsense, practical, within our resources, both financial and manpower. It is gratifying after all these years to note the progress made and the confidence with which the State faces the future for its even greater problems in this area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the April 5 issue of Time, entitled, "Out of the Snake Pits."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUT OF THE SNAKE PITS

When John F. Kennedy sent to Congress the first Presidential message ever devoted exclusively to mental illness and retardation the core of his proposal was a plan to set up mental health centers in every major U.S. community—which might run to a total of 500 or more in the next 5 years. Even before Congress gets around to implementing the President's ideas, the prospect of Federal money for pump priming and pilot plants has set mental health officials and crusaders in all 50 States to taking stock of where they now stand.

A few States, mainly the more populous and wealthy, have anticipated the President's proposals—which, in fact, are based largely on their pioneering. Kansas, Massachusetts, New York and California have already done much to improve their State hospitals and to convert them into places where patients are treated instead of being simply locked away. But high on the list of mental health pioneers there is also, surprisingly, the State of Georgia.

ROTTEN UNDERNEATH

As recently as 1959 a newspaper exposé showed that Georgia's only mental hospital, saddled with the stigmatic name of State Hospital for the Insane at Milledgeville, was a monstrous snakepit. Behind the facade of an administration building that looks like the White House, it was crowded to its rotten, rat-infested rafters with 12,000 patients. At least 3,000 were senile oldsters who did not belong there—any more than the epileptics, dope addicts or alcoholics who jammed the hospital. Comparatively few patients ever got better, and those who did succeeded mainly on their own resources, for among Milledgeville's 50 doctors, many of dubious repute, were only three psychiatrists.

Milledgeville has now been taken out of woolhat politics and reformed by a topflight psychiatrist imported from New York, Dr. Irville MacKinnon. Its budget is up from $2.49 per patient per day to $3.29 (against a national average of $5.40). It has 50 psychiatric doctors, admits 6,000 new patients a year, and sends 60 percent of them home within 90 days.

NO BARS, NO LOCKS

More surprising than Georgia's backlog of woes, though, is that even before the 1959 scandal it had started an earnest effort to save its citizens from Milledgeville. Psychiatric clinics were set up in general hospitals for prompt and intensive treatment of the mentally ill, and outgoing Gov. Marvin Griffin put aside $300,000 in surplus funds to get the movement rolling.

In Atlanta's Grady Memorial Hospital, one of the first such clinics is now one of the most relaxed places in that vast and forbidding pile. Its windows have no bars, its doors are unlocked. Its four doctors and six nurses are more informal than their colleagues elsewhere in the hospital. Only a neat little name tag marks them as "staff." Patients are kept busy with psychotherapy (some of it in groups), occupational therapy and their own chores. Nearly all receive drug treatment, though few now get shock.

The Grady unit has 18 beds. Georgia also has a 20-bed unit in Augusta, and there are centers with 10 to a dozen beds in Macon, Columbus, and Albany. But because the facilities are still so limited, the Georgia clinics have strict eligibility rules. To get in, a patient must have the backing of a psychiatrist and another physician; he must be seeking help voluntarily; he cannot be currently addicted to drugs or alcohol; and the admitting psychiatrist must be convinced that his illness is likely to be arrested within a month.

By now, more than 2,600 patients have passed through the Georgia centers. Fewer than 300 have had to go on to Milledgeville, as against 1,700, the doctors estimate, who otherwise would have had to go there.

LINEUP OF DOCTORS

Other widely separated states are approaching the twin goals of early detection and intensive treatment by different methods:

New Mexico is the proving ground for a plan financed by the National Institute of Mental Health. In three areas, each embracing three counties, the state has installed a "community mental-health consultant" in the office of a county health department. Their job is to serve as counselors, to spot the client who is so disturbed that he should become a patient, and to refer him elsewhere for prompt treatment. But in practice, virtually every client has been so relieved by talking things out with his consultant (and sometimes his minister as well) that an imminent crackup has apparently been averted. For those with more severe upsets, scattered over New Mexico's sparsely settled acreage, Psychiatrist William Sears goes barnstorming in his own plane, visits each district at least once a month. In 3 years the 3 consultants have handled 1,800 cases in 2,775 interviews, referred fewer than 1 percent for intensive psychiatric treatment.

Illinois has 40 community clinics scattered around the State and has been supplying outpatient treatment for years. But for the more severely ill, instead of patching up the gloomy old State hospitals, Dr. Francis J. Gerty, director of the department of mental health, plans to spend $50 million on eight "hospital clinics." They will be so distributed that no one in the State will have more than a 2-hour drive to reach one: two in Chicago, one each in Centralia, Peoria, Springfield, Harrisburg, Rockford, and Decatur-Champaign.

Nebraska has been trying possibly the most fundamental approach to prompt treatment for the mentally ill, and is now being acclaimed as the Nation's second most advanced State in the promotion of mental health—after neighboring Kansas. Guided by Dr. Cecil W. Wittson, Nebraska's program aims at training the family doctor, pediatrician, internist and obstetrician-gynecologist to handle the everyday emotional problems of their patients. The Nebraska Psychiatric Institute invites family doctors to Omaha for training in consultation and observation of patients. They may even bring their own patients along for study. Back home, they are expected to set aside one-half day a week for patients with emotional problems. Twenty of them now have an average of 18 psychiatric patients each. And for a 6-month course in family-practice psychiatry scheduled to begin July 1, it is the doctors, for a change, who are lined up on a waiting list and not the patients.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges, and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

DELINQUENT FEDERAL TAXES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I present the ninth annual report on delinquent Federal taxes.

This report is rendered as of December 31, 1962, and as in preceding years is broken down by district offices, first to show the delinquencies in employment taxes and second to show the total of all delinquent Federal taxes, including employment.

Under the term "employment taxes" are included withheld income taxes, social security taxes, unemployment taxes, railroad retirement, and so forth.

The total for all types of tax delinquencies in the United States for the year ending December 31, 1962, showed an increase of 3.5 percent or $1,100,780,000 as compared to $1,063,248,000 on December 31, 1961. This compares with a total of $1,614,494,000 in 1954—the first year in which these statistics were assembled.

While this represents a 3.5-percent increase in the overall tax delinquencies over last year, nevertheless when compared to the first report—1954—of $1,614,494,000 it is still a creditable record showing a little over a $500-million drop in total tax delinquencies during the past 9-year period.

Delinquent employment tax by December 31, 1962, had dropped 9 percent, as compared to the previous year, or from $268 million to $242 million. But this still remains an item which should be given continued attention. We must never overlook the fact that these employment taxes represent money which is withheld from the pay envelopes of the employees, and under no circumstances should they ever be considered or used as funds belonging to the employer.

Spectacular increases will be noted in some of the small district offices such as in Burlington, Vt., and Portsmouth, N.H., which show increases of 324.8 percent and 449.9 percent, respectively, in tax delinquencies for last year. The letter of the Commissioner, however, points out that these two increases largely result from the assessment of a certain large account involving a single taxpayer in those respective areas.

A similar explanation appears in connection with the San Francisco district, which shows an 80-percent increase in total tax delinquencies or an increase from $57,977,000 in 1961 to $104,359,000 in 1962. The Commissioner's letter points out that the issuance in December of income and gift tax delinquent accounts totaling over $68 million in the case of two taxpayers in the San Francisco district accounts for most of this unusual increase.

Even after taking into consideration these unusual increases outlined above, the 1962 report still shows better than a $500 million reduction in the total amount of tax delinquencies during the past 9 years, and it is in the face of this accomplishment under the reorganization act which was approved in 1952 that there is a question in the minds of some concerning the wisdom of the recently proposed concentration of the work in the large area offices.

I was a strong supporter of the reorganization act approved in 1952 which embraced several changes in the old procedure of tax collecting facilities. Significant in these changes were two particular and very essential points. The first was the removing of the directors from political patronage by placing them under civil service. The second was the decentralization of the workload from the heavily concentrated areas into the smaller regional offices.

In my opinion each of these points was of major importance, and while no one could assess to what extent either or both played in the accomplishment of a $500 million reduction in our total tax delinquencies, nevertheless I am concerned by that portion of the recent reorganization plan which reverses this decentralization idea and once again starts to concentrate the workload in the major offices.

That does not mean that some parts of the Commissioner's reorganization plan may not have merit or that the elimination of some area offices may not be wise, but I would strongly recommend caution before proceeding too far in reestablishing a system patterned after the old regime. We must not forget that the concentration of too much authority at the Washington level was the downfall of the old system.

Under the decentralization provisions of the reorganization plan the $500 million reduction in total tax delinquencies speaks for itself.

The 1962 report for the various offices is as follows:

Augusta, Maine, has a good report for 1962. Employment tax delinquencies were reduced 38.4 percent, and total tax delinquencies were reduced 13.7 percent. However, even with this drop the total tax delinquencies for 1963 are still higher than they were in 1954.

Boston, Mass., again has a very bad report. While showing a 4.2-percent decline in employment tax delinquencies, it shows a 17.3-percent increase in total tax delinquencies, bringing the total tax delinquencies in this office to an alltime high since these records were first computed. Delinquent accounts in this office have over the years consistently been increasing while the rest of the country has on an average been achieving a reduction of over 30 percent. This office needs the attention of the Commissioner.

Burlington, Vt., shows a reduction of 24.1 percent in its employment tax delinquencies but an increase of nearly 325 percent in total tax delinquencies; however, as the Commissioner points out, this drastic increase is largely accounted for by the assessment of one large delinquent account.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to advise the Senator from Delaware that since he received those figures, the Goldfine property in Vermont has been sold. There was a $3 million tax delinquency on the part of that one concern, but it cannot be carried as a delinquent tax in Vermont any more. As the Senator from Delaware knows, the Goldfine delinquency of $3 million was charged to every State where Goldfine owned any property. He owned $500,000 or $600,000 worth of property in Vermont, so Vermont was charged with that delinquency.

In my opinion, the small Internal Revenue offices, which Mr. Caplin is proposing to emasculate, are among the most efficient in the country. For instance, in Burlington, Vt., every tax return that was received on or before April 15 was tabulated and every dollar of the receipts deposited in the bank by April 18—within 3 days. If the Boston office can show any record that even remotely approaches the record of the Burlington office, I should be very much surprised.

I commend the Senator from Delaware for his exceptionally good work in trying to keep the Internal Revenue Service on the straight road. We all recall the Senator's reaction a few years ago, when he learned that there were so many delinquents in the Internal Revenue offices themselves. There seemed to be more in the offices than there were among the general taxpayers. The Senator performed a remarkable service in disclosing that fact. Of course, it cost quite a large sum to operate our penal institutions for a few years after that. The Senator performed a remarkable service then, and he is doing so now.

If the Internal Revenue Service in Washington would only ask its directors in the States where it is proposed to reduce the size of the offices how money can be saved, every one of them could tell how the cost of operating the offices could be reduced. But, as Mr. Caplin told us the other day at a hearing before the Committee on Finance, the Internal Revenue Service has established a management pattern and requires every office to hire so much management. Whether it be in New York City or in Anchorage, Alaska, it is necessary to hire the same number of supervisory personnel. That is ridiculous, because so large a number of officials is not needed in the smaller offices.

Again, I commend the Senator from Delaware for the excellent work he is doing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Vermont. As the report and the Commissioner's letters point out, Vermont has a fair record over a period of years. The drastic increase in this year's report is accounted for by the assessment of one large account. That is true also in the instance of Portsmouth, N.H., whose report I shall discuss in a moment.

Mr. AIKEN. Each year the national office of the Internal Revenue Service establishes collection goals. The Vermont office has well exceeded its goals in every way, for whatever purpose they have been established.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, Hartford, Conn., has made progress in reducing both its employment tax delinquencies and its total tax delinquencies, showing a reduction of 16.6 percent and 11.5, respectively.

Portsmouth, N.H., like Burlington, Vt., shows a drastic increase in total tax delinquencies of nearly 450 percent; however, again this results from the assessment of one large account. It should be noted that without this account Portsmouth has over the past 9 years been consistently making progress toward bringing its delinquencies in line.

Providence, R.I., decreased its employment tax delinquencies by 11 percent and total tax delinquencies by 12 percent.

Albany, N.Y., shows a reduction in its employment tax delinquencies of 29.6 percent and a 19.6 percent in total delinquencies. Both figures represent alltime lows in this office.

Brooklyn, N.Y., reports an 8.2 percent increase in its employment tax delinquencies and a less than 1 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies. This latter figure is a 9-year low.

Buffalo, N.Y., has reduced its employment tax delinquencies during the past 9 years by approximately $500,000 and reduced its total tax delinquencies by over $7 million, with the 1962 results showing a 14.7 percent and 8.7 percent reduction in employment and total tax delinquencies, respectively. Both of these accounts for 1962 are at an all-time low.

Lower Manhattan and Upper Manhattan were combined in 1960 and are now reported as Manhattan, N.Y. Their combined reports show a 14.8 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies this year and a 5.1 percent reduction in their total tax delinquencies. These two offices have reduced their total tax delinquencies since 1954 from $329 million to $110 million in 1962. During this same period employment tax delinquencies in these two combined offices have been reduced from $44 million to $24 million. Both of these offices were in bad shape prior to the reorganization in 1952, and I commend them on their progress during this entire 9-year period. The 1962 figures represent lows for these offices.

Syracuse, N.Y., shows a reduction of 19.5 percent in its employment tax delinquencies, but this still leaves the account higher than it was 9 years ago. Total tax delinquencies were increased by 1.4 percent over last year, with that item approaching a 9-year high.

Baltimore, Md., turned in a good report for 1962, showing a reduction in both employment tax delinquencies and total tax delinquencies of 16.5 and 25.4 percent, respectively.

Camden, N.J., is another office which has not done too well in reducing its delinquent accounts over the past 9 years, showing a reduction in 1962 of 1.3 percent in employment tax delinquencies and a 3.3 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies; but employment tax delinquencies are still nearly 60 percent higher than they were in 1954, and total tax delinquencies are also higher than the first year in which these records were assembled. This office likewise needs attention, particularly in reference to its employment tax delinquencies.

Newark, N.J., shows an increase of 5.6 percent in employment tax delinquencies and 1.2 percent in total tax delinquencies; however, over the 9-year period this office has shown progress in both categories, each having been reduced by approximately 50 percent.

Philadelphia, Pa., shows a 30.3 percent increase in its total tax delinquencies during 1962 against a 2.8 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies.

Pittsburgh, Pa., reports a 10.2 percent reduction in both employment tax delinquencies and in total tax delinquencies for 1962. However, again it should be pointed out that employment tax delinquencies for this office are over 30 percent higher than they were in 1954, the first year of such records.

Scranton, Pa., shows a reduction of 19.9 percent in employment tax delinquencies and 2.4 percent in total tax delinquencies.

Wilmington, Del., shows a 48.8 percent increase in employment tax delinquencies, bringing these delinquent accounts to a point 20 percent higher than they were in 1954. Total tax delinquencies in this office last year were increased by 9.4 percent; however, over the 9-year period total tax delinquencies in this office have been reduced from $22 million to $2.8 million.

Cincinnati, Ohio, last year reported a 27.3 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 12 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies; however, employment tax delinquencies, even after this reduction, are nearly double the 1954 total.

Cleveland, Ohio, reports a 14.4 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 15.2 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies. This represents an alltime low in total delinquencies.

Indianapolis, Ind., reports an 11.2 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies; but even after this reduction, delinquent employment taxes in this office are still more than double the total in 1954. This office needs some attention. Total tax delinquencies during 1962 were reduced by 7 percent.

Louisville, Ky., reports a 9.8 percent increase in employment tax delinquencies, bringing these delinquent accounts to a 9-year high, or approximately double what they were in 1954. Increases during the recent years have been rather consistent; and, again, some attention should be given to finding the reasons. Total tax delinquencies in this office increased 18.1 percent last year.

Parkersburg, W. Va., in 1962 reported a reduction of 1.9 percent in employment tax delinquencies and an increase of 9 percent in total tax delinquencies.

Richmond, Va., reported a 17.4 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 15.7 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies. Employment tax delinquencies in this office are higher than the 1954 report, but the total delinquencies are at a 9-year low.

Atlanta, Ga., in 1962 reported a 4.9 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 9.2 percent increase in total tax delinquencies.

Birmingham, Ala., reported a 2.7 percent increase in employment tax delinquencies and a 24.4 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies. This brings the total tax delinquencies for this office to an alltime low.

Columbia, S.C., reported a 27.3 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 5.8 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies.

Greensboro, N.C., reported a 20.1 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies, against an increase of less than 1 percent in total delinquencies. Total delinquencies in this office are near an alltime low.

Jackson, Miss., reports a 7.1 percent increase in employment tax delinquencies, bringing this item to a 9-year high. Total tax delinquencies were increased 3.3 percent. Employment tax delinquencies in this office need more attention.

Jacksonville, Fla., reported a 15.1 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 1.9 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies. Employment tax delinquencies in Jacksonville are still nearly double what they were 9 years ago.

Nashville, Tenn., reported a 5.9 percent and a 17.7 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and in total tax delinquencies, respectively.

Chicago, Ill., reported a 7.4 percent and a 21 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and in total tax delinquencies, respectively. Both categories in Chicago for 1962 were at an alltime low.

Detroit, Mich., is another office reporting an alltime low in its total tax delinquencies, having reduced them by 15.5 percent in 1962. It shows a reduction last year of 28.4 percent in employment tax delinquencies.

Milwaukee, Wis., for 1962 reports a reduction of 16 percent in its employment tax delinquencies and an 11.8 percent reduction in its total tax delinquencies. This brings the total delinquencies to an alltime low.

Springfield, Ill., reports both employment tax delinquencies and total tax delinquencies as having been reduced to an alltime low since these reports were first assembled in 1954. Its 1962 report shows a reduction in employment tax delinquencies of 20.2 percent and a reduction of 10.4 percent in total tax delinquencies.

Aberdeen, S. Dak., reports a 50.9 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 22.7 percent in total delinquencies. This is another office showing a commendable record in collecting employment taxes, having reduced these to an alltime low.

Cheyenne, Wyo., reduced employment tax delinquencies and total delinquencies by 37.7 percent and 4.3 percent, respectively.

Denver, Colo., reported a 2.7 percent increase in employment tax delinquencies. Employment taxes are more than 50 percent higher than they were in 1954, representing an alltime high. Total tax delinquencies were reduced last year by 13.1 percent.

Des Moines, Iowa, reports a 29.3 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies; however, it reports a 53.7 percent increase in total tax delinquencies during the same year.

Fargo, N. Dak., reports a 40.2 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 29.6 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies, bringing the latter item for this office to an alltime low.

Kansas City, Mo., reports a 44.3 percent reduction in delinquent employment taxes, bringing this category to an alltime low, while it reports a 9 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies. This still leaves total delinquencies at more than double the figure in 1954.

Omaha, Nebr., reports a 1.7 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies for 1962. This item is still higher than it was in 1954. Omaha last year, however, reduced its total tax delinquencies by 36.4 percent, thus reducing the total delinquent accounts to an alltime low.

St. Louis, Mo., reports a 22.6 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 13.2 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies. This represents an alltime low in total tax delinquencies for this office, and brings the account down to less than half of what it was in 1954.

St. Paul, Minn., reports a 21.2 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 4.4 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies.

Wichita, Kans., has a good report having reduced employment tax delinquencies by 41.2 percent and total tax delinquencies by 9.1 percent, bringing both accounts to a 9-year low.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Delaware yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I am pleased to note the fine progress which has been made in the Wichita office in the reduction of delinquencies in the payment of employment taxes and in the payment of taxes generally. I am personally acquainted with members of the staff, as well as with the regional director; and I am proud of the record they have made in the past year.

I am also pleased to note that progress has been made in the Kansas City, Mo., office, which also collects taxes in our area.

It seems to me it would be most unfortunate if the Director of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury Department were to insist on a complete relocation and reorganization of these structures, which are doing fine work.

The report being made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware is an encouragement to those who are doing a good job, and it also proves to those who are somewhat back in their percentage of collections that they have an opportunity to improve their collections in the next year or two.

Certainly the Senator from Delaware is entitled to great commendation from the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the taxpayers of the Nation for his efforts to secure these ever-increasing reductions in delinquencies in tax payments.

I believe he stated that the amount of reduction during the past year has been $500 million. I believe that is a commendable record; and all of us should give our commendations to the officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue who are making increased efforts to collect the taxes, in the interest of the taxpayers generally.

So I commend the Senator from Delaware for his fine work, which I know involves a great many details.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for his remarks. He has every right to be proud of the record of the Wichita report. This office has shown excellent progress since 1954, the first year for which these statistics were assembled.

Over the years, the Treasury Department nationally has achieved a reduction in the total tax delinquencies from approximately $1.6 billion to $1.1 billion—or $500 million less. I certainly commend the districts which have made possible this progress. I believe these annual reports help show the trouble spots, so that both the Department and we in Congress can give them our attention.

I was much surprised to find that prior to 1954 such annual figures had not been assembled. In 1954 that situation was called to my attention; and, upon my request the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, instructed the Department to compile these annual reports as of December 31 and to submit them to our committee.

I have been assembling these cumulative totals each year in order that we could get a clearer picture of what each office is doing. This report serves to keep the district officials more alert to their problems. The employees of the Treasury Department have done an excellent job. The reduction of $500 million in the total tax delinquencies during the past 9 years has been achieved during a period in which total tax collections of that agency have increased from around $60 billion annually to around $85 billion to $90 billion a year. So the reduction in the face of the larger collections is even more remarkable.

Continuing my reference to the various States:

Albuquerque, N. Mex., reports employment tax delinquencies reduced by 5.4 percent, but this still leaves this account nearly double the amount in 1954. In 1962 its total tax delinquencies were increased by 52.4 percent, which brings total delinquencies for this office to an alltime high and nearly double the 1954 report. This office has not been doing too well and needs attention.

Austin, Tex., shows employment tax delinquencies as being reduced by 26 percent, but this still leaves delinquent employment tax for this office higher than they were in 1954. Total tax delinquencies last year were increased by 9.6 percent.

Dallas, Tex., reports a 13.2 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 7.8 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies.

Little Rock, Ark., reduced its employment tax delinquencies by 23.2 percent, but this still leaves this category substantially higher than the 1954 report. While total tax delinquencies in 1962 were reduced 1.5 percent, it still leaves total tax delinquencies for the Little Rock area at approximately 400 percent over the 1954 report. This office also needs some attention.

New Orleans, La., reports a 4.7 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 10.2 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies.

Oklahoma City, Okla., reports an increase of 13.1 percent in employment tax delinquencies and a 16.7 percent increase in total tax delinquencies. Employment tax delinquencies in this office are at an alltime high.

Anchorage, Alaska, reports a 12.2 percent and a 13.7 percent increase in employment tax delinquencies and total tax delinquencies, respectively.

Boise, Idaho, reports a 5 percent increase in employment tax delinquencies and a 1.9 percent increase in total delinquencies. The delinquent employment tax account is at a 9-year high in this office.

Helena, Mont., for 1962 reports a 29.6 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 12.8 percent increase in total tax delinquencies. Employment tax delinquencies in this office are likewise higher than the 1954 report.

Honolulu, Hawaii, reports a 22.6 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 3.1 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies.

Los Angeles, Calif., while reporting a 2.7 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies still carries this item as double the amount in 1954. Total tax delinquencies in Los Angeles last year were increased by 5.9 percent, bringing this item to an alltime high. This office likewise has not been doing too well and should be given attention.

Phoenix, Ariz., listed employment tax delinquencies last year as increased by 23.4 percent, bringing this item to an alltime high, or about double the amount of 9 years ago. At the same time the total tax delinquencies were increased by 10.7 percent, establishing a new high in this category. This office in recent years has been rendering very poor reports in handling its delinquent accounts.

Portland, Oreg., reports a 19.9 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 13.7 percent reduction in total delinquencies.

Reno, Nev., reports a 5.4 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies, but again this account is still approximately 40 percent higher than it was 9 years ago. Total tax delinquencies in Reno increased by 19.9 percent last year.

Salt Lake City, Utah, reported an increase of 3 percent in employment tax delinquencies, bringing these accounts for this office to an alltime high; however, they do show a 12.7 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies, thus establishing an alltime low in this category.

San Francisco, Calif., reported a 2.1 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and an 80 percent increase in total tax delinquencies. As the Commissioner pointed out this unusually large increase in total tax delinquencies results largely from the assessment of two accounts.

Seattle, Wash., reports a reduction in delinquent employment taxes of 11.2 percent, thus bringing these delinquent accounts down to an alltime low. At the same time this office reduced its total delinquent accounts by 6.4 percent.

International operations showed delinquent employment taxes as being reduced by 42.4 percent, but this still leaves these accounts more than double the amount reported in 1956. Total tax delinquencies for international operations last year jumped 36.8 percent, bringing this account to an alltime high and to nearly 4 times the amount reported as being delinquent in this category just 7 years ago. These accounts likewise need special attention.

Puerto Rico over the past 9 years has been rendering very poor records of collecting its delinquent income taxes. This year it again reported a 21.6 percent increase in delinquent employment taxes and a 41.3 percent increase in total tax delinquencies. This represents an increase in both categories of nearly 400 percent over the past 9 years. This increase has been rather consistent over the years, and certainly the record demonstrates that this office needs a complete overhauling.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mortimer M. Caplin, dated February 20, 1963, followed by the statistical report for each office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your request of December 6, 1962, for a report on our taxpayer delinquent account inventories and for a report by district and type of tax showing all tax accounts classified as uncollectible during 1962 or otherwise set aside as being of questionable value.

I am glad to be able to report a more favorable situation in our delinquent account activity. We are beginning to see results from the emphasis we have been placing on taxpayer education and other measures to improve voluntary compliance, followed by prompt and firm enforcement measures in the case of those who do not respond. Delinquent account issuances in 1962 were down 176,000, 5.7 percent in number, and $76.4 million, 5 percent in amount from calendar year 1961. Some of this improvement may be attributed to our emphasis on prompt action in the case of employers who file their employment tax returns unaccompanied by required payments. We are collecting more and more of these accounts in notice status—before they ever reach delinquent status. Rather than simply mailing notices to the taxpayers, personal contact by telephone or a revenue officer is made in every case where the liability is in excess of $2,500. Also in many offices, where the workload permits, contact is made on all amounts in excess of $500. In the last 6 months of 1962, for example, we collected almost 24,000 more of these accounts in notice status than we did in the corresponding period of 1961, and the total of collections attributable to these accounts was almost $78 million, $41 million more than the employment taxes which we collected in notice status during the corresponding period of 1961. Depositary receipts validated by banks provide another indication of improved compliance. While yearend figures are not available, depositary receipts validated for the first 9 months of 1962 were up 7 percent in number and 12 percent in amount over the corresponding period in 1961.

Numerically, our delinquent account inventories are again down; in fact, the lowest since 1959. Were it not for the issuance in December of income and gift tax delinquent accounts totaling over $68 million in the case of two taxpayers in the San Francisco district, our dollar inventory would have continued its downward trend again this year. Large accounts like these distort the inventory picture, and we might note that several others are included in our year-end figures. Of these, the Goldfine accounts alone amount to above $10 million. These large accounts, especially those made against individual taxpayers, are generally the most difficult to collect. It is not unusual to find that the taxpayer does not have sufficient assets or projected income to pay more than a part of his liability. In these cases, the Service has no alternative but to write the balance off as uncollectible.

The table which follows is a summary as of December 31, 1961 and 1962, of the taxpayer delinquent account inventory broken down as to those in an active and an inactive status. As indicated in previous reports, inactive accounts are those on which collection action has been deferred pending the outcome of audit examination, court cases, or other contingent actions.

	Active	Inactive	Total
Amount (thousands):			
Dec. 31, 1961	$637,328	$425,920	$1,063,248
Dec. 31, 1962	668,647	432,133	1,100,780
Change from 1961 to 1962	+31,319	+6,213	+37,532
Percent of change	+4.9	+1.5	+3.5
Number:			
Dec. 31, 1961	972,400	99,260	1,071,660
Dec. 31, 1962	873,077	103,070	976,147
Change from 1961 to 1962	−99,323	+3,810	−95,513
Percent of change	−10.2	+3.8	−8.9

Attached is a tabulation of our delinquent account inventory broken down by the various tax groups, the inactive accounts being shown in the columns to the right. As in previous years, the figures in the inactive category are also included in the figures appearing in the columns under the various tax groups. All offices were current in their issuances as of December 31 which means that the tabulation includes all accounts that were in a delinquent status as of that date.

Regarding uncollectible accounts and accounts disposed of by means other than by collection or uncollectibility, detailed data on such accounts were published prior to fiscal year 1958 in the Commissioner's Annual Report to the Secretary of the Treasury. Beginning with fiscal year 1958, data on these accounts were consolidated and shown in the report as one item, identified as "Other disposals." For your information, we have broken "Other disposals" down into uncollectibles and abatements and show the data below for calendar years 1958 through 1962. The same data for 1961 and 1962 only are shown by district in a tabulation attached. However, our figures on uncollectibles and abatements are not compiled by type of tax, so we are unable to comply with that part of your request. The figures shown in the table below and in the tabulation attached do not, of course, agree with the figures shown in our annual reports to the Secretary since the calendar year is the period used for the figures which we are furnishing you, whereas the annual reports to the Secretary are made on a fiscal year basis:

[Amount in thousands]

Calendar year	Uncollectible	Abated
1958	$227,236	$217,414
1959	285,985	195,493
1960	222,910	195,518
1961	191,878	169.479
1962	189,371	155,593

In the area of uncollectible accounts, I should like to point out that many accounts are assessed, even though it is known at the time that the prospects for collection are extremely poor. Nevertheless, the assessments must be made in order that the liabilities may be established and the interests of the Government fully protected. I might add, however, that the decision to classify these accounts, or any others, as uncollectible is not made until all reasonable efforts have been exerted to locate the delinquent taxpayer and any income or assets from which collection may be enforced. In other words, delinquent accounts are classified as uncollectible only after it becomes clear that the accounts truly qualify as uncollectible. Furthermore, even after a decision has been made that one or more delinquent accounts are uncollectible, collection action is merely suspended until such time as collection prospects are improved or the period of limitations has expired. Many such accounts are reactivated on the basis of improvement in the taxpayer's financial situation and subjected to collection action before expiration of the statute of limitations. Separate records on such reactivated accounts are not maintained and adjustments to the amount reported as uncollectible cannot be made so as to reflect the amount that is ultimately written off as uncollectible.

Abatements are, of course, entirely different from uncollectibles. Except in the case of offers in compromise, an assessment is abated only if it is in excess of the tax amount actually due and owing at the time.

Following is a list of assessments which qualify for abatement.

1. Assessments in excess of the amount legally due as determined by audit examination.

2. Assessments in excess of the amount accepted on an offer in compromise.

3. Jeopardy assessments later determined by court ruling to be excessive.

4. Jeopardy assessments where it is administratively determined that jeopardy does not exist.

5. Transferee assessments in excess of the basic transferor assessment.

6. 100-percent penalty assessments in excess of the basic corporate assessment.

Assessments made in transferee cases always constitute a duplication of an amount already assessed against the transferor, and in cases involving the 100-percent penalty, assessments made against officers or employees of the taxpayer always constitute a duplication of an amount already assessed against the taxpayer himself. In fact, transferee assessments, all representing the same basic transferor liability, may be made against more than one transferee, and the 100-percent penalty may be assessed against more than one person in respect of the same offense. However, no more is actually collected than is actually due, of course, and all assessments over and above the basic one must ultimately be abated.

In jeopardy cases, the situation differs in that the assessments made are usually against the taxpayer and the taxpayer only. However, the amounts involved are determined on the basis of such information, sometimes rather limited, as is immediately available to the Service. Jeopardy assessments may, therefore, be in excess of the true liability as subsequently determined when all the facts are disclosed. In such cases, the amount of the jeopardy assessment is adjusted to the true liability.

We appreciate your interest in this matter and are pleased to supply you with the information requested.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,

MORTIMER CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

Delinquent taxes

District	Year	Employment tax		Percent change over previous year	Total taxes		Percent change over previous year
		Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
Augusta, Maine	1954	1,145	$665	---------	3,478	$2,582	---------
	1955	1,119	489	−26.4	3,018	1,915	−25.8
	1956	1,138	543	+11.0	3,582	1,489	−22.2
	1957	1,185	543	---------	4,027	2,032	+36.4
	1958	1,176	588	+8.2	3,986	1,569	−22.7
	1959	889	815	+38.6	2,992	3,842	+144.8
	1960	1,003	851	+4.4	3,242	3,565	−7.2
	1961	1,715	977	+14.7	4,361	3,857	+8.1
	1962	1,107	602	−38.4	3,563	3,329	−13.7
Boston, Mass	1954	15,058	11,226	---------	57,082	41,306	---------
	1955	11,122	10,000	−10.9	39,723	37,835	−8.4
	1956	9,477	9,632	−3.6	36,337	36,896	−2.4
	1957	8,826	8,597	−10.7	36,239	30,255	−17.9
	1958	9,372	8,456	−1.6	34,992	34,107	+12.7
	1959	8,837	8,586	+1.5	30,952	31,601	−7.3
	1960	9,595	9,531	+11.0	31,389	33,512	+6.0
	1961	12,411	13,455	+41.1	35,486	36,658	+9.3
	1962	12,166	12,887	−4.2	35,530	42,996	+17.3
Burlington, Vt	1954	619	241	---------	1,424	644	---------
	1955	441	145	−39.8	1,245	409	−36.4
	1956	421	201	+38.6	1,714	685	+67.4
	1957	510	236	+17.4	1,936	604	−11.8
	1958	762	322	+36.4	2,514	1,009	+67.0
	1959	373	200	−37.8	1,601	722	−28.4
	1960	658	396	+98.0	1,807	876	+21.3
	1961	769	370	−6.5	2,054	937	+6.9
	1962	575	281	−24.1	1,529	3,980	+324.8
Hartford, Conn	1954	4,232	2,831	---------	22,554	15,271	---------
	1955	5,079	3,298	+16.4	21,219	15,348	+0.5
	1956	4,079	3,202	−2.9	21,783	11,445	−25.4
	1957	5,156	4,317	+34.8	23,188	14,572	+27.3
	1958	4,836	4,370	+1.2	22,122	14,402	−1.1
	1959	3,885	3,413	−21.8	16,149	13,077	−9.2
	1960	5,610	4,973	+45.7	18,172	13,380	+2.3
	1961	6,771	5,313	+6.8	20,977	13,920	+4.0
	1962	4,134	4,429	−16.6	17,432	12,322	−11.5
Portsmouth, N.H.	1954	1,017	460	---------	2,854	3,252	---------
	1955	840	310	−32.6	2,347	2,179	−32.9
	1956	829	315	+1.6	3,144	1,948	−10.6
	1957	718	347	+10.1	2,556	1,018	−47.7
	1958	779	307	−11.5	2,785	911	−10.5
	1959	511	266	−13.3	2,006	744	−18.3
	1960	538	357	+34.2	2,628	979	+31.5
	1961	547	314	−12.0	2,107	905	−7.5
	1962	376	334	+6.4	1,645	4,977	+449.9
Providence R. I	1954	1,847	1,204	---------	8,060	7,389	---------
	1955	1,259	894	−25.7	5,985	7,173	−2.9
	1956	1,874	1,254	+40.2	7,329	6,041	−15.7
	1957	2,447	1,358	+8.2	7,169	3,331	−44.8
	1958	2,234	1,383	+1.8	6,828	3,421	+2.7
	1959	1,960	1,243	−10.1	5,551	2,864	−16.2
	1960	1,935	1,303	+4.8	5,381	2,760	−3.6
	1961	2,693	1,907	+46.3	5,922	7,275	+163.5
	1962	2,269	1,698	−11.0	5,143	6,399	−12.0
Albany, N.Y	1954	4,679	3,559	---------	13,822	15,061	---------
	1955	4,770	3,454	−2.9	14,246	11,274	−25.1
	1956	3 818	3.368	−2.4	14.296	11.142	−1.1
	1957	3,960	3,366	---------	15,598	12,223	+9.7
	1958	4,177	3,200	−4.9	13,413	8,988	−26.4
	1959	3,014	2,074	−35.1	9,233	8,397	−6.5
	1960	2,698	2,044	−1.4	9,384	6,912	−17.6
	1961	3,666	2,925	+43.1	10,663	7,338	+6.1
	1962	2,616	2,059	−29.6	8,747	5,901	−19.6
Brooklyn, N.Y	1954	28,903	18,534	---------	88,274	106,522	---------
	1955	37,482	24,523	+32.3	100,932	133,339	+25.1
	1956	33,648	23,624	−3.6	105,604	129,428	−2.9
	1957	35,112	24,882	+5.3	108,819	125,382	−3.1
	1958	28,275	21,773	−12.4	83,173	90,776	−27.6
	1959	22,196	18,637	−14.4	62,176	75,461	−16.8
	1960	13,658	14,431	−22.5	41,091	60,670	−19.6
	1961	11,743	13,588	−5.8	38,621	58,504	−3.5
	1962	9,913	14,703	+8.2	39,361	58,147	−.6
Buffalo, N.Y	1954	4,664	2,351	---------	21,869	12,368	---------
	1955	4,756	2,916	+24.0	18,203	12,058	−2.5
	1956	4,141	2,778	−4.7	20,172	12,309	+2.0
	1957	4,836	3,436	+23.6	19,184	12,869	+4.5
	1958	4,031	2,969	−13.5	17,021	10,174	−20.9
	1959	3,128	2,508	−15.5	10,655	7,961	−21.7
	1960	3,395	2,666	+6.2	9,089	6,786	−14.7
	1961	3,255	2,218	−16.8	10,727	5,772	−14.9
	1962	2,679	1,892	−14.7	8,101	5,269	−8.7
Lower Manhattan (2 N.Y.)	1954	22,636	17.622	---------	48,155	171,309	---------
	1955	25,952	20,573	+16.7	53,341	169.476	−1.0
	1956	19,669	21,087	+2.4	44,725	153,697	−9.3
	1957	17,600	18,495	−12.2	36,963	124,178	−19.2
	1958	13,497	13,689	−25.9	30,560	117,290	−5.5
	1959	10,081	13,867	+1.3	20,980	73,946	−36.9
	1960[1]	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------
Upper Manhattan (3 N.Y.)	1954	24,420	26,447	---------	67,328	158,538	---------
	1955	31,922	32,691	+23.6	109,567	195,098	+23.0
	1956	33,586	31,514	−3.6	124,641	202,676	+3.8
	1957	32,259	32,466	+3.0	121,388	176,094	−13.1
	1958	30,135	32,199	−.8	116,608	182,180	+3.4
	1959	19,616	21,505	−33.2	78,620	120,370	−33.9
	1960[2]	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------
Manhattan, N.Y	1960	24,325	32,750	−7.4	81,025	149,762	−22.9
	1961	22,607	28,346	−13.4	68,863	115,918	−22.5
	1962	17,181	24,150	−14.8	67,934	110,024	−5.1
Syracuse, N.Y	1954	3,046	1,552	---------	12,486	5,650	---------
	1955	2,565	1,664	+7.2	9,308	5.395	−4.5
Syracuse, N.Y.—Continued	1956	3,341	2,019	+21.3	13,955	6,443	+19.4
	1957	4,593	$2,411	+19.4	16,618	$5,921	−8.1
	1958	2,974	2,044	−15.2	11,859	5,415	−8.5
	1959	2,185	1,841	−9.9	7,287	5,550	+2.4
	1960	2,584	1,917	+4.1	8,555	5,226	−5.8
	1961	3,270	2,146	+11.9	9,649	5,338	+2.1
	1962	2,667	1,728	−19.5	8,881	5,411	+1.4
Baltimore (Maryland and District of Columbia)	1954	12,249	6,296	---------	120,870	68,663	---------
	1955	9,577	5,733	−8.9	95,861	62,497	−8.9
	1956	6,963	4,402	−23.2	60,642	42,778	−31.5
	1957	7,246	5,100	+15.8	44,982	36,069	−15.6
	1958	5,965	4,010	−21.3	32,469	25,705	−28.7
	1959	3,560	2,739	−31.6	29,066	17,133	−33.3
	1960	4,662	3,014	+10.0	32,941	23,106	+34.8
	1961	6,485	4,341	+44.0	37,783	23,390	+1.2
	1962	4,845	3,626	−16.5	34,899	17,440	−25.4
Camden, N.J	1954	3,526	2,090	---------	16,986	10,638	---------
	1955	3,684	2,657	+27.1	16,958	16,896	+58.8
	1956	4,709	2,950	+11.0	19,659	14,015	−17.0
	1957	4.876	3.590	+21.6	19,376	14,881	+6.1
	1958	4,379	4,194	+16.8	16,187	15,040	+1.0
	1959	2,700	1,984	−52.6	10,848	8,580	−42.9
	1960	3,445	2,852	+43.7	11,952	10,745	+25.2
	1961	4,070	3,308	+15.9	14,654	11,883	+10.5
	1962	4,078	3,264	−1.3	14,263	11,490	−3.3
Newark, N.J	1954	37,438	24,083	---------	122,953	92,962	---------
	1955	23,673	22,244	−7.6	84,883	79,793	−14.1
	1956	17,240	18,193	−18.2	71,578	79,913	+.1
	1957	14,575	17,170	−5.6	55,722	55,667	−30.3
	1958	10,929	13,291	−22.5	36,048	44,825	−19.4
	1959	8,169	10,160	−23.5	30,459	38,527	−14.0
	1960	9,432	11,998	+18.0	39,146	37,731	−2.0
	1961	10,347	12,441	+3.6	37,028	37,905	+.4
	1962	9,573	13,132	+5.6	33,068	38,350	+1.2
Philadelphia, Pa	1954	18,014	15,700	---------	95,824	63,450	---------
	1955	17,918	17,060	+8.6	87.594	74,744	+17.7
	1956	11,923	12,342	−27.6	55,994	66,115	−11.5
	1957	7,564	10,317	−16.4	42,254	48,455	−26.7
	1958	5,816	8,944	−13.3	29,852	42,563	−12.1
	1959	4,387	6,274	−29.8	21,134	34,203	−19.6
	1960	5,222	7,515	+19.7	26,953	36,874	+7.8
	1961	9,095	10,393	+38.2	29.948	34,577	−6.2
	1962	7,840	10,100	−2.8	32,730	45.050	+30.3
Pittsburgh, Pa	1954	4,880	3,800	---------	40,973	28,955	---------
	1955	6,651	5,079	+33.6	34,891	30,144	+4.1
	1956	5,251	4,858	−4.3	28,534	23,103	−23.3
	1957	4,592	3,583	−26.2	21,759	15,683	−32.1
	1958	5,976	4,569	+27.5	27,821	17,374	+10.7
	1959	3,998	3,206	−29.8	20,494	12,386	−28.7
	1960	4,301	3,823	+19.2	19,233	16,849	+36.0
	1961	7,179	6,091	+59.3	26,104	19,934	+18.3
	1962	6,130	5,471	−10.2	21,852	17,901	−10.2
Scranton, Pa	1954	2,134	2,345	---------	9,414	7,948	---------
	1955	1,743	2,324	−.8	6,659	7,233	−8.3
	1956	1,397	2,220	−4.4	4,975	6,516	−9.8
	1957	1,547	2,127	−4.1	5,096	8,075	+23.9
	1958	1,598	1,655	−22.1	5,393	6,196	−23.2
	1959	1,563	1,421	−14.1	4,897	5,931	−4.2
	1960	1,585	1,679	+18.1	4,841	3,900	−34.2
	1961	2,016	1,907	+13.5	5,439	5,192	+33.1
	1962	1,715	1,527	−19.9	4,868	5,068	−2.4
Wilmington, Del	1954	571	303	---------	5,460	22,009	---------
	1955	683	327	+7.5	4,586	3,639	−83.4
	1956	621	301	−7.9	5,522	3,722	+2.2
	1957	522	272	−9.6	4,817	3,811	+2.3
	1958	331	347	+27.5	3,706	3,296	−13.5
	1959	325	184	−46.9	3,435	2,043	−38.0
	1960	695	415	+125.5	3,743	2,701	+32.2
	1961	516	248	−40.2	3,717	2,591	−4.0
	1962	617	369	+48.8	4,053	2,835	+9.4
Columbus, Ohio	1954	1,207	594	---------	13,054	6,652	---------
	1955	1,290	657	+10.6	11,010	6,624	−.4
	1956	1,517	845	+28.6	12,340	9,972	+50.5
	1957	1,625	878	+3.9	13,217	9,079	−8.9
	1958	1,714	1,087	+23.8	12,916	10,244	+12.6
	1959	904	681	−37.3	6,917	6,433	−37.2
	1960[3]	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------
Cincinnati, Ohio	1954	3,431	1,784	---------	26,545	15,128	---------
	1955	3,630	1,947	+9.0	24,423	12,685	−16.1
	1956	3,060	1,801	−7.4	22,534	11,410	−10.0
	1957	3,349	1,980	+9.9	24,995	10,228	−10.3
	1958	2,764	1,529	−22.7	16,539	9,681	−5.3
	1959	1,886	1,273	−16.7	8,652	6,916	−28.5
	1960	5,015	3,102	+58.7	23,794	16,245	+21.6
	1961	5,212	4,243	+36.7	21,184	15,038	−7.4
	1962	3,966	3,085	−27.3	20,080	13,239	−12.0
Toledo, Ohio	1954	929	392	---------	6,072	3,317	---------
	1955	785	393	+.2	4,855	2,896	−12.6
	1956	1,078	617	+56.9	6,277	2,471	−14.6
	1957	980	633	+2.5	6,328	3,180	+28.6
	1958	981	500	−21.0	6,449	2,373	−25.3
	1959	1,396	772	+54.4	5,426	4,495	+89.4
	1960[4]	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------
Cleveland, Ohio	1954	7,958	5,272	---------	49,841	42,963	---------
	1955	8,720	5,523	+4.7	46,546	35,547	−17.2
	1956	8,219	5,924	+7.2	39,521	42,590	+19.8
	1957	7,431	5,788	−2.2	37,631	36,371	−14.6
	1958	5,951	3,794	−34.4	26,206	29,076	−20.0
	1959	4,777	3,021	−20.3	16,201	21,195	−27.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Delinquent taxes—Continued

District	Year	Employment tax		Percent change over previous year	Total taxes		Percent change over previous year
		Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
Cleveland, Ohio—Continued	1960	6,444	$4,351	+14.7	26,993	$24,311	−5.3
	1961	6,579	4,899	+12.5	26,165	27,511	+13.1
	1962	4,131	4,194	−14.4	21,106	23,327	−15.2
Indianapolis, Ind.	1954	3,420	2,477	----------	23,475	19,133	----------
	1955	4,767	2,953	+19.2	22,273	20,760	+8.5
	1956	3,959	3,120	+5.6	20,007	20,574	−.8
	1957	4,667	3,386	+8.5	19,952	21,993	+6.8
	1958	3,594	2,907	−14.1	15,511	16,397	−25.4
	1959	2,889	2,376	−18.2	10,164	13,072	−20.2
	1960	4,278	3,070	+29.2	14,577	13,992	+7.0
	1961	5,337	5,643	+83.8	15,290	19,682	+40.6
	1962	3,557	5,010	−11.2	14,817	18,295	−7.0
Louisville, Ky.	1954	2,019	1,035	----------	12,161	11,834	----------
	1955	2,934	1,228	+18.6	12,963	13,172	+11.3
	1956	2,457	1,343	+9.3	12,331	12,930	−1.8
	1957	2,468	1,380	+2.7	11,367	10,876	−15.8
	1958	1,696	1,117	−19.0	8,725	8,378	−22.9
	1959	1,981	1,034	−7.4	7,463	8,682	+3.6
	1960	2,940	1,630	+57.6	11,289	9,609	+10.6
	1961	3,050	1,839	+12.8	11,954	8,807	−8.3
	1962	2,818	2,019	+9.8	11,996	10,401	+18.1
Parkersburg, W. Va.	1954	3,221	1,952	----------	15,917	12,931	----------
	1955	2,257	1,376	−29.5	11,094	10,627	−17.8
	1956	1,533	1,064	−22.6	8,357	9,032	−15.0
	1957	1,574	1,117	+4.9	6,877	6,860	−24.0
	1958	1,769	1,077	−3.5	7,794	5,372	−21.6
	1959	1,518	997	−7.4	5,243	4,299	−19.9
	1960	1,807	1,055	+5.8	6,446	4,492	+4.4
	1961	2,114	1,188	+12.6	6,674	3,581	−20.2
	1962	1,865	1,165	−1.9	6,361	3,904	+9.0
Richmond, Va.	1954	4,692	2,239	----------	32,611	20,986	----------
	1955	5,147	2,663	+18.9	29,332	21,881	+4.2
	1956	4,118	2,420	−9.1	26,199	23,932	+9.3
	1957	3,988	2,263	−6.4	19,830	15,687	−34.4
	1958	3,502	1,929	−14.7	15,574	12,333	−21.3
	1959	3,339	2,235	+15.8	14,553	11,927	−3.2
	1960	3,920	2,471	+10.5	18,203	12,781	+7.1
	1961	5,607	3,693	+49.4	21,895	13,762	+7.6
	1962	4,618	3,050	−17.4	22,001	11,604	−15.7
Atlanta, Ga.	1954	4,963	2,947	----------	26,021	20,972	----------
	1955	5,889	3,572	+21.2	24,979	18,809	−10.3
	1956	5,540	3,432	−3.9	24,713	17,080	−9.1
	1957	5,864	3,829	+11.5	25,328	18,972	−11.0
	1958	5,981	3,948	+3.1	23,875	15,388	−18.8
	1959	4,506	2,101	−46.7	16,554	10,763	−30.0
	1960	5,610	2,362	+12.4	22,928	10,996	+2.1
	1961	5,410	2,539	+7.4	18,469	11,386	+3.5
	1962	4,624	2,414	−4.9	19,071	12,437	+9.2
Birmingham, Ala.	1954	4,874	2,299	----------	19,506	19,488	----------
	1955	3,655	1,965	−14.5	16,003	17,636	−9.5
	1956	3,658	1,880	−4.3	16,780	21,969	+24.5
	1957	3,826	1,772	−5.7	15,986	18,889	−14.0
	1958	3,653	1,735	−2.0	14,130	17,066	−9.6
	1959	2,489	1,461	−15.7	12,188	14,954	−12.3
	1960	2,796	1,753	+19.9	12,516	11,930	−20.2
	1961	3,604	2,183	+24.5	15,121	13,156	+10.2
	1962	2,823	2,243	+2.7	14,847	9,947	−24.4
Columbia, S.C.	1954	3,727	1,078	----------	14,246	7,201	----------
	1955	3,318	822	−23.7	12,972	6,511	−9.5
	1956	3,311	850	+3.4	13,202	5,413	−16.8
	1957	2,938	948	+11.5	13,339	4,462	−17.5
	1958	2,773	1,064	+12.2	11,573	4,471	+.2
	1959	1,697	1,011	−4.9	7,141	3,082	−31.0
	1960	2,595	1,159	+14.6	10,681	3,882	+25.9
	1961	3,362	1,308	+12.8	10,621	3,843	−1.0
	1962	2,050	951	−27.3	8,208	3,619	−5.8
Greensboro, N.C.	1954	5,332	2,016	----------	22,459	26,395	----------
	1955	4,318	1,998	−.8	15,687	21,018	−20.3
	1956	4,336	1,957	−2.0	17,696	22,222	+5.7
	1957	4,922	2,023	+3.3	17,598	14,872	−33.0
	1958	4,186	1,359	−32.8	15,706	12,716	−14.4
	1959	4,078	1,441	+6.0	15,763	10,381	−18.3
	1960	3,682	1,597	+10.8	18,321	9,917	−4.4
	1961	4,834	2,079	+30.1	20,255	7,661	−22.7
	1962	3,578	1,662	−20.1	19,860	7,707	+.6
Jackson, Miss.	1954	1,500	636	----------	5,563	4,717	----------
	1955	1,526	596	−6.2	5,231	2,957	−37.3
	1956	1,321	656	+10.0	5,371	2,744	−7.2
	1957	1,634	684	+4.2	7,229	2,975	+8.4
	1958	1,774	852	+24.5	5,999	2,411	−18.9
	1959	1,505	614	−27.9	5,165	2,903	+20.4
	1960	1,891	797	+29.8	7,190	2,674	−7.8
	1961	2,725	1,267	+58.9	7,800	3,750	+40.2
	1962	1,884	1,357	+7.1	5,998	3,872	+3.3
Jacksonville, Fla.	1954	8,451	4,686	----------	31,020	47,883	----------
	1955	8,239	4,996	+6.6	30,918	49,361	+3.0
	1956	10,203	6,562	+31.3	36,962	41,546	−15.8
	1957	11,447	8,519	+29.8	36,770	39,272	−5.4
	1958	10,375	8,029	−5.7	33,938	39,915	+1.6
	1959	9,947	8,608	+7.2	27,780	34,367	−13.8
	1960	10,813	9,407	+9.2	33,299	31,131	−9.4
	1961	14,095	10,436	+10.9	38,359	34,787	+11.7
	1962	10,506	8,863	−15.1	29,995	34,129	−1.9
Nashville, Tenn.	1954	3,721	1,775	----------	15,763	12,463	----------
	1955	3,181	1,601	−9.8	12,971	13,220	+6.0
	1956	3,100	1,587	−.8	13,320	11,457	−13.3
	1957	3,214	1,679	+5.7	13,248	12,115	+5.7
	1958	2,522	1,287	−23.3	10,667	9,053	−25.2
	1959	1,910	870	−32.4	8,943	7,166	−20.8
	1960	2,411	1,142	+31.2	13,616	10,353	+44.4
	1961	4,065	1,993	+74.5	16,756	11,043	+6.6
	1962	2,283	1,875	−5.9	13,063	9,083	−17.7
Chicago, Ill.	1954	21,439	12,802	----------	136,532	81,650	----------
	1955	22,891	15,915	+24.3	119,822	87,843	+7.5
	1956	24,597	20,829	+30.8	143,457	120,971	+37.7
	1957	35,678	32,698	+56.9	180,796	154,085	+27.3
	1958	25,352	22,996	−29.7	122,072	120,323	−21.9
	1959	20,410	17,580	−23.5	76,597	83,625	−30.4
	1960	16,550	15,445	−12.1	59,022	63,051	−24.6
	1961	15,062	12,682	−17.8	62,488	60,273	−4.4
	1962	12,249	11,742	−7.4	48,027	47,619	−21.0
Detroit, Mich.	1954	11,891	7,782	----------	68,809	44,787	----------
	1955	16,325	10,808	+38.8	81,569	68,904	+53.8
	1956	16,871	13,328	+23.3	93,782	70,964	+2.9
	1957	20,538	15,168	+13.8	95,549	68,369	−3.6
	1958	18,337	14,121	−6.9	75,443	62,288	−8.8
	1959	14,465	13,259	−6.1	45,933	46,530	−25.2
	1960	14,326	12,437	−6.1	43,908	44,154	−5.1
	1961	16,816	13,830	+11.2	43.712	38,163	−13.5
	1962	12,334	9,896	−28.4	33,776	32,238	−15.5
Milwaukee, Wis.	1954	3,758	1,704	----------	16,962	16,592	----------
	1955	3,781	2,087	+22.4	14,322	16,279	−1.8
	1956	4,534	2,314	+10.8	14,936	13,455	−17.3
	1957	4,529	2,551	+10.2	18,403	14,964	+11.2
	1958	4,608	3,033	+18.9	12,065	13,418	−10.3
	1959	3,090	2,180	−28.1	9,139	10,893	−18.8
	1960	4,015	3,176	+45.6	10,827	12,047	+10.5
	1961	3,933	2,992	−5.7	10,489	9,929	−17.5
	1962	2,903	2,512	−16.0	8,744	8,756	−11.8
Springfield, Ill.	1954	4,563	1,903	----------	19,192	9,101	----------
	1955	3,381	1,627	−14.5	12,885	8,723	−4.1
	1956	3,374	2,171	+33.4	15,117	8,526	−2.2
	1957	3,255	2,007	−7.5	15,829	9,442	+10.7
	1958	2,027	1,378	−31.3	8,070	7,126	−24.5
	1959	1,432	885	−35.7	5,478	5,759	−19.1
	1960	1,995	1,474	+66.5	6,338	5,289	−8.1
	1961	1,837	1,092	−25.9	5,333	5,597	+5.8
	1962	1,409	871	−20.2	4,622	5,017	−10.4
Aberdeen, S. Dak.	1954	734	282	----------	3,092	1,255	----------
	1955	604	248	−12.0	2,488	1,613	+28.5
	1956	823	248	----------	2,948	1,441	−10.6
	1957	788	264	+6.4	2,844	1,391	−3.4
	1958	515	209	−20.8	1,865	971	−30.1
	1959	439	137	−34.4	1,476	676	−30.3
	1960	559	242	+76.6	1,763	1,003	−48.3
	1961	665	277	+14.4	2,006	1,420	+41.5
	1962	359	136	−50.9	1,447	1,097	−22.7
Cheyenne, Wyo.	1954	688	248	----------	2,445	1,629	----------
	1955	727	256	+3.2	2,215	1,344	−17.4
	1956	639	264	+3.1	2,126	1,077	−19.8
	1957	490	205	−22.3	2,013	1,266	+17.5
	1958	616	264	+28.7	2,305	1,326	+4.7
	1959	354	182	−31.0	1,480	1,053	−20.5
	1960	667	380	+108.7	2,405	1,513	+43.6
	1961	946	448	+17.8	3,275	1,244	−17.7
	1962	570	279	−37.7	2,248	1,190	−4.3
Denver, Colo.	1954	2,754	1,319	----------	9,888	7,552	----------
	1955	3,056	1,642	+24.4	9,748	7,960	+5.4
	1956	2,483	1,402	−14.6	10,236	8,142	+2.2
	1957	2,346	1,475	+5.2	10,336	7,163	−12.0
	1958	2,917	1,586	+7.5	10,946	7,938	+10.8
	1959	1,806	1,042	−34.3	7,339	4,795	−39.5
	1960	2,674	1,818	+74.4	10,078	8,056	+68.0
	1961	3,420	1,983	+9.0	11.772	8,605	+6.8
	1962	2.468	2,036	+2.7	9,124	7,480	−13.1
Des Moines, Iowa.	1954	1,781	770	----------	5,810	9,737	----------
	1955	1,596	749	−2.7	5,207	8,200	−15.7
	1956	1,989	989	+32.0	6,729	9,118	+11.1
	1957	2,069	947	−4.2	6,351	7,480	−17.9
	1958	1,730	850	−10.2	5,101	4,564	−38.9
	1959	1,217	683	−19.6	3,995	4,965	+8.7
	1960	1,987	1,138	+66.6	6,236	5,289	+6.5
	1961	2,310	1,056	−7.2	6,945	4,566	−13.6
	1962	1,342	747	−29.3	5,877	7,016	+53.7
Fargo, N. Dak.	1954	843	310	----------	2,352	1,353	----------
	1955	578	217	−30.0	1,607	1,011	−25.2
	1956	563	228	+5.0	2,199	1,336	+32.1
	1957	628	236	+3.5	2,135	1,414	+5.8
	1958	729	307	+30.0	2,320	1,342	−5.0
	1959	397	255	−16.9	1,430	1,001	−25.4
	1960	682	391	+53.3	2,038	1,073	+7.1
	1961	962	463	+18.4	2,558	1,248	+16.3
	1962	406	277	−40.2	1,542	879	−29.6
Kansas City, Mo.	1954	1,783	884	----------	8,155	9,021	----------
	1955	2,030	1,146	+29.6	7,615	9,433	+4.5
	1956	2,522	1,466	+27.9	8,650	8,673	−8.0
	1957	2,591	1,497	+2.1	10,168	7,887	−9.0
	1958	2,882	1,454	−2.8	9,889	8,820	+11.8
	1959	1,754	1,414	−2.7	5,902	8,298	−5.9
	1960	2,324	1,539	+8.8	8,005	23,454	+182.6
	1961	2,875	1,514	−1.6	9,574	22,990	−1.9
	1962	1,155	844	−44.3	5,947	20,925	−9.0
Omaha, Nebr.	1954	810	548	----------	3,932	4,180	----------
	1955	638	480	−12.4	2,697	3,364	−19.5
	1956	770	528	+10.0	3,441	3,544	+5.3
	1957	834	585	+10.7	2,884	2,729	−22.9
	1958	601	267	−54.3	2,234	2,770	+1.5
	1959	512	267	----------	1,764	1,684	−39.2
	1960	585	366	+37.0	2,456	2,052	+21.8
	1961	919	640	+74.7	2,721	2,071	+.9
	1962	622	629	−1.7	1,900	1,318	−36.4
St. Louis, Mo.	1954	1,958	974	----------	11,539	12,267	----------
	1955	2,686	1,323	+35.8	9,999	10,085	−17.7
	1956	2,001	1,119	−15.4	8,997	9,606	−4.7
	1957	2,202	1,308	+16.8	10,578	10,031	+4.4

See footnotes at end of table.

***Delinquent taxes*—Continued**

District	Year	Employment tax		Percent change over previous year	Total taxes		Percent change over previous year
		Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
St. Louis, Mo—Continued	1958	2,665	$1,302	−.4	12,875	$9,447	−5.8
	1959	1,824	846	−35.0	7,876	6,167	−34.7
	1960	1,699	956	+13.0	8,147	6,138	−.4
	1961	2,483	1,247	+30.4	10,745	6,096	−.6
	1962	1,489	965	−22.6	8,599	5,293	−13.2
St. Paul, Minn	1954	3,096	1,929	--------	10,916	9,725	--------
	1955	3,110	2,093	+8.5	9,616	9,270	−4.6
	1956	3,590	2,546	+21.1	12,035	11,203	+20.8
	1957	3,830	2,711	+6.4	12,512	13,600	+21.3
	1958	3,969	2,494	−8.0	11,474	12,139	−10.7
	1959	2,376	1,951	−21.7	7,481	10,644	−12.3
	1960	2,735	2,176	+11.5	9,271	11,012	+3.4
	1961	3,287	2,384	+9.5	9,708	12,702	+15.3
	1962	2,421	1,878	−21.2	8,921	12,149	−4.4
Wichita, Kans	1954	2,405	939	--------	10,542	7,316	--------
	1955	2,912	1,018	+8.4	10,279	6,757	−7.6
	1956	2,300	1,269	+24.6	9,038	8,047	+19.0
	1957	2,294	1,299	+2.3	7,703	7,084	−11.9
	1958	2,298	1,104	−15.0	7,044	6,621	−6.5
	1959	1,815	1,094	−.9	5,612	6,323	−5.8
	1960	2,138	1,224	+11.8	7,121	5,203	−16.5
	1961	2,570	1,438	+17.4	8,147	5,359	+2.9
	1962	1,488	845	−41.2	5,874	4,864	−9.2
Albuquerque, N. Mex	1954	1,911	741	--------	5,491	2,824	--------
	1955	1,994	853	+15.1	5,078	2,960	+4.8
	1956	1,957	1,062	+24.3	5,888	3,926	+32.6
	1957	2,378	1,192	+12.2	6,777	3,935	+.2
	1958	2,077	1,075	−9.8	6,085	3,233	−17.8
	1959	1,717	1,095	+1.8	4,576	2,915	−9.7
	1960	1,947	1,345	+22.8	5,391	3,930	+34.8
	1961	1,954	1,434	+6.6	5,104	3,671	−6.5
	1962	1,880	1,356	−5.4	4,962	5,595	+52.4
Austin, Tex	1954	5,609	3,021	--------	22,355	20,202	--------
	1955	6,580	2,702	−10.5	18,391	12,754	−36.8
	1956	5,283	3,080	+13.9	19,534	15,230	+19.4
	1957	5,664	3,336	+8.3	23,351	14,386	−5.5
	1958	4,445	2,797	−16.1	19,437	12,246	−14.8
	1959	3,700	2,439	−12.7	18,126	14,070	+14.8
	1960	3,306	5,271	+116.1	24,407	17,744	+26.1
	1961	7,798	5,486	+4.0	25,329	17,874	+.7
	1962	5,995	4,062	−26.0	25,706	19,592	+9.6
Dallas, Tex	1954	9,311	5,077	--------	31,244	23,748	--------
	1955	6,816	3,608	−28.9	22,420	16,337	−31.2
	1956	6,158	3,642	+.9	25,793	20,822	+27.4
	1957	8,225	4,750	+30.4	30,526	22,022	+5.7
	1958	5,530	3,225	−32.1	23,620	18,221	−17.2
	1959	5,515	3,658	+13.4	20,481	18,037	−1.0
	1960	5,187	3,976	+8.6	26,676	20,660	+14.5
	1961	7,678	5,918	+48.8	25,741	23,377	+13.1
	1962	6,859	5,139	−13.2	25,059	21,565	−7.8
Little Rock, Ark	1954	1,801	462	--------	5,431	2,315	--------
	1955	1,259	319	−30.9	4,182	2,108	−8.9
	1956	1,179	453	+41.5	4,781	2,355	+11.7
	1957	1,209	489	+7.9	5,338	2,465	+4.6
	1958	975	374	−23.5	4,115	6,930	+181.1
	1959	1,511	437	+16.8	4,481	8,849	+27.5
	1960	1,179	465	+6.4	4,256	8,844	--------
	1961	2,377	800	+72.0	5,636	9,435	+6.6
	1962	1,867	614	−23.2	5,147	9,295	−1.5
New Orleans, La	1954	4,566	1,948	--------	19,566	17,472	--------
	1955	4,261	2,260	+16.0	14,225	13,613	−22.0
	1956	4,097	2,214	−2.0	15,298	11,536	−15.2
	1957	4,300	2,489	+12.4	15,851	10,182	−11.7
	1958	4,342	2,420	−2.7	14,751	9,249	−9.1
	1959	3,638	1,920	−20.6	12,920	6,977	−24.5
	1960	3,569	2,093	+9.0	13,962	7,968	+14.2
	1961	5,140	3,041	+45.2	15,077	9,534	+19.6
	1962	4,270	2,897	−4.7	12,453	8,566	−10.2
Oklahoma City, Okla	1954	3,311	1,790	--------	9,994	9,043	--------
	1955	3,123	1,825	+1.9	9,455	9,421	+4.1
	1956	3,764	2,167	+18.6	12,886	8,737	−7.2
	1957	4,998	2,239	+3.3	15,637	7,629	−12.6
	1958	3,975	2,189	−2.2	11,580	8,452	+10.7
	1959	3,425	1,965	−10.2	9,482	11,017	+30.3
	1960	3,176	1,973	+.4	9,448	6,125	−44.4
	1961	3,255	2,177	+10.3	10,052	5,976	−2.4
	1962	3,819	2,463	+13.1	10,704	6,974	+16.7
Anchorage, Alaska [5]	1961	851	996	--------	2,314	2,079	--------
	1962	779	1,118	+12.2	2,087	2,363	+13.7
Boise, Idaho	1954	1,050	470	--------	3,115	2,083	--------
	1955	1,099	472	+.5	2,949	1,988	−4.5
	1956	860	411	−13.1	3,211	2,155	+8.4
	1957	842	513	+24.8	3,559	2,280	+5.8
	1958	760	395	−23.0	2,812	2,213	−2.9
	1959	791	509	+28.8	2,382	2,106	−4.8
	1960	1,068	656	+28.8	3,241	1,381	−34.4
	1961	1,066	659	+.4	3,059	1,546	+11.9
	1962	972	692	+5.0	3,165	1,576	+1.9
Helena, Mont	1954	1,064	436	--------	3,214	2,863	--------
	1955	831	333	−23.6	2,912	2,575	−10.0
	1956	1,035	527	+58.2	3,299	1,799	−30.1
	1957	1,122	624	+18.4	4,136	2,047	+13.7
	1958	1,040	550	−11.8	3,572	2,024	−1.1
	1959	802	398	−27.6	2,857	1,510	−25.3
Helena, Mont.—Continued	1960	1,231	$742	+86.4	3,912	$2,098	+38.9
	1961	1,835	1,022	+37.7	5,031	2,368	+12.8
	1962	1,313	719	−29.6	4,243	2,671	+12.8
Honolulu, Hawaii	1954	1,338	898	--------	4,682	4,620	--------
	1955	1,196	876	−2.4	3,835	4,345	−5.9
	1956	1,047	668	−23.7	3,800	3,929	−9.5
	1957	1,095	772	+15.5	4,101	3,297	−16.0
	1958	989	606	−21.5	3,448	2,887	−12.4
	1959	738	543	−10.3	2,092	1,606	−44.3
	1960	770	631	+16.2	2,064	1,828	+13.8
	1961	873	950	+50.5	2,565	5,102	+179.1
	1962	909	735	−22.6	2,480	4,944	−3.1
Los Angeles (6th Calif.)	1954	16,989	13,396	--------	86,733	88,047	--------
	1955	22,429	19,706	+47.1	105,039	83,679	−4.9
	1956	17,151	16,600	−15.7	92,176	68,937	−17.6
	1957	19,853	20,762	+25.0	89,014	76,679	+11.2
	1958	19,895	18,723	−9.8	81,683	83,911	+9.4
	1959	15,736	16,199	−13.4	58,231	60,562	−27.8
	1960	20,005	20,468	+26.3	71,305	79,326	+30.9
	1961	25,123	28,692	+40.1	79,080	92,954	+17.1
	1962	21,804	27,920	−2.7	78,455	98,389	+5.9
Phoenix, Ariz	1954	2,158	1,384	--------	8,957	5,510	--------
	1955	2,059	1,327	−4.1	7,023	5,057	−8.2
	1956	1,533	1,169	−11.9	5,871	4,095	−19.0
	1957	2,039	1,396	+19.4	6,760	4,452	+8.7
	1958	1,961	1,288	−7.7	6,218	4,276	−3.9
	1959	1,881	1,560	+21.1	5,162	4,265	−.2
	1960	2,674	2,019	+29.4	7,463	6,169	+44.6
	1961	2,823	2,218	+9.8	8,263	7,076	+14.7
	1962	2,917	2,736	+23.4	7,938	7,834	+10.7
Portland, Oreg	1954	4,059	2,053	--------	14,799	15,351	--------
	1955	3,950	2,281	+11.1	11,636	12,429	−19.0
	1956	2,767	1,934	−15.2	10,300	13,215	+6.3
	1957	2,554	2,073	+7.1	10,295	13,139	−.5
	1958	2,410	1,766	−14.8	9,496	12,879	−1.9
	1959	2,659	1,857	+5.1	9,471	10,798	−16.1
	1960	3,140	2,248	+21.0	13,638	15,107	−39.9
	1961	3,366	2,879	+28.0	13,732	13,138	−13.0
	1962	3,725	2,306	−19.9	13,846	11,335	−13.7
Reno, Nev	1954	1,455	1,480	--------	4,576	6,043	--------
	1955	1,195	1,470	−.6	3,782	6,697	+10.8
	1956	1,038	1,574	+7.0	3,545	5,995	−10.4
	1957	928	1,393	−11.4	3,739	6,324	+5.4
	1958	717	1,174	−15.7	3,152	6,804	+7.5
	1959	715	1,143	−2.6	2,665	4,965	−27.0
	1960	1,088	1,977	+72.9	4,140	5,984	+20.5
	1961	1,170	2,194	+10.9	4.095	4,628	−22.6
	1962	1,107	2,076	−5.4	3,819	5,550	+19.9
Salt Lake City, Utah	1954	1,671	925	--------	5,554	4,649	--------
	1955	1,491	809	−12.5	4,668	3,560	−23.4
	1956	1,374	778	−3.8	4,505	3,771	+5.9
	1957	1,527	861	+10.6	4,878	3,906	+3.5
	1958	1,344	807	−6.2	4,572	4,084	+4.5
	1959	1,137	741	−8.1	3,929	3,605	−11.7
	1960	1,517	968	+30.6	4,102	3,160	−12.3
	1961	1,849	1,122	+15.9	5,022	3,334	+5.5
	1962	1,813	1,165	+3.8	4,939	2,912	−12.7
San Francisco (1st Calif.)	1954	17,616	10,597	--------	85,750	66,858	--------
	1955	17,509	11,951	+12.7	73,245	88,983	+33.0
	1956	11,473	9,214	−22.9	61,138	77,550	−12.8
	1957	12,797	10,119	+9.8	60,441	74,781	−3.5
	1958	12,169	9,562	−5.5	50,947	63,834	−14.6
	1959	8,360	7,103	−25.7	37,997	56,626	−11.2
	1960	8,972	7,909	+11.3	43,648	59,661	+5.3
	1961	11,763	9,480	+19.4	43,675	57,977	−2.8
	1962	10,778	9,280	−2.1	44,853	104,359	+80.0
Seattle, Wash	1954	5,932	4,324	--------	27,707	19,804	--------
	1955	6,417	5,409	+25.0	22,634	18,285	−7.6
	1956	5,937	5,687	+5.1	20,852	16,441	−10.0
	1957	5,715	4,786	−15.8	20,940	15,890	−3.3
	1958	5,238	3,935	−17.7	18,424	13,462	−15.2
	1959	4,315	3,246	−17.5	14,446	10,886	−19.1
	1960	4,997	4,011	+23.5	15,166	13,294	+22.1
	1961 [5]	4,095	2,500	−12.8	11,493	11,779	+4.2
	1962	3,486	2,221	−11.2	11,000	11,029	−6.4
International operations (exclusive of Puerto Rico)	1956	197	146	--------	11,812	16,704	--------
	1957	129	69	−52.7	11,372	16,722	+.1
	1958 [6]	255	120	+73.9	7,637	41,230	+146.5
	1959	428	175	+45.8	19,886	35,532	−13.8
	1960	475	490	+180.0	20,166	50,492	+42.1
	1961	512	689	+40.6	19,651	44,280	−12.3
	1962	524	397	−42.4	14,124	60,597	+36.8
Puerto Rico	1954	1,530	147	--------	2,020	273	--------
	1955	1,853	252	+71.4	3,249	622	+127.8
	1956	1,307	296	+17.4	2,509	624	+.3
	1957	1,755	375	+26.6	2,674	721	+15.5
	1958	1,612	290	−22.6	2,451	593	−17.7
	1959	1,129	260	−10.3	1,682	393	−33.7
	1960	1,616	428	+64.6	2,205	686	+74.5
	1961	1,850	565	+32.0	2,622	951	+38.6
	1962	2,232	687	+21.6	3,517	1,344	+41.3

---

[1] Merged with Upper Manhattan as Manhattan.

[2] Merged with Lower Manhattan as Manhattan.

[3] Merged with Cincinnati.

[4] Merged with Cleveland.

[5] Alaska included in Seattle prior to 1962. Percentage change for Seattle for 1962 adjusted to reflect separation of Alaska from that office.

[6] Result of district offices' transferring to this division delinquent accounts of taxpayers known to be abroad and out of reach.

TOTALS

Year	Employment tax		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year	Total taxes		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year	Year	Employment tax		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year	Total taxes		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year
	Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)			Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
1954	390,398	$254,062	----------	1,725,474	$1,614,494	----------	1959	256,287	$216,439	−17.7	949,146	$1,071,016	−22.1
1955	399,269	284,803	+12.0	1,596,615	1,646,383	+1.9	1960	268,396	236,843	+9.4	1,023,770	1,072,440	+.1
1956	356,748	279,183	−1.9	1,560,685	1,619,629	−1.6	1961	316,612	268,465	+13.3	1,071,660	1,063,248	−.8
1957	377,253	300,678	+7.6	1,554,876	1,504,709	−7.0	1962	257,421	242,375	−9.7	976,147	1,100,780	+3.5
1958	329,457	263,186	−12.4	1,280,642	1,375,737	−8.5							

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after conferring with the distinguished acting minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and others, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, April 23, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill S. 2, the so-called Water Resources Research Act, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to announce to the Senate that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will lead off in the debate on the measure this afternoon. I assume that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and other Senators will have something to say on the subject.

If there is a lag in the discussion of S. 2, the water resources bill, it is the intention of the leadership to call up the bill S. 1007 to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

I merely make that announcement so that the Senate can be prepared.

I thank the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] who also has been waiting to address the Senate.

THE U.S.S. "THRESHER"

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on the morning of April 9, at 8 a.m., the SS(N) 593 departed Portsmouth Naval Shipyard to undergo sea trials following extensive shipyard overhaul. This submarine, the U.S.S. *Thresher*, under command of Lt. Comdr. John W. Harvey, had aboard 112 naval personnel and 17 civilians. These men who set sail that morning were never again to see their families and their loved ones. The following morning, while undergoing a deep test dive, approximately 200 miles off the coast of Cape Cod, the submarine went down with all hands. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the names of those men, civilians and military, who went down with the *Thresher*—men whose names will forever be part of the tradition of the U.S. Navy.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Fred P. Abrams.
Lt. Comdr Philip H. Allen, U.S. Navy.
Tilmen J. Arsenault, Enca (SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Lt. (jg.) Ronald C. Babcock, U.S. Navy.
Ronald E. Bain, En2(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Mr. Daniel W. Beal, Jr.
John E. Bell, Mm1-P2, U.S. Navy.
Lt. Robert D. Biederman, U.S. Navy.
Lt. Comdr. John H. Billings, U.S. Navy.
Edgar S. Bobbitt, Em2(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Gerald C. Boster, Em3(SS)-P1, U.S. Navy.
George Braceyn, Sd3(SS), U.S. Navy.
Richard P. Brann, En2(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Richard Carkoski, En2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Patrick W. Carmody, Sk2, U.S. Navy.
Steven G. Cayey, Tm2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Mr. Robert E. Charron.
Edward Christiansen, Sn(SS), U.S. Navy.
Larry W. Claussen, Em2(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Thomas E. Clements, Etr3(SS), U.S. Navy.
Lt. Merrill F. Collier, U.S. Navy.
Mr. K. R. Corcoran.
Mr. Kenneth J. Critchley.
Francis M. Cummings, Sos2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Mr. Paul C. Currier.
Samuel J. Dabruzzi, Etn2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Clyde E. Davidson III, Etr3-P1, U.S. Navy.
Donald C. Day, En3(SS), U.S. Navy.
Roy O. Denny, Jr., Em1(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Mr. Richard R. DesJardins.
Peter J. DiBella, Sn, U.S. Navy.
Mr. George J. Dineen.
Lt. Comdr. Michael J. DiNola, U.S. Navy.
Don R. Dundas, ETN2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Troy E. Dyer, ET1(SS)-P1, U.S. Navy.
Mr. Richard K. Fisher.
Ellwood H. Forni, SOCA(SS)-P1, U.S. Navy.
Raymond P. Foti, ET1(SS), U.S. Navy.
Larry W. Freeman, FTM2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Gregory J. Fusco, EM2(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Andrew J. Gallant, HMCS(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Napoleon T. Garcia, SD1(SS), U.S. Navy.
John E. Garner, YNSN(SS), U.S. Navy.
Lt. Comdr. Pat M. Garner, U.S. Navy, executive officer.
Robert W. Gaynor, EN2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Robert H. Gosnell, SA(SG), U.S. Navy.
Lieutenant (jg.) John G. Grafton, U.S. Navy.
William E. Grahm, SOC(SS)-P1, U.S. Navy.
Mr. Paul A. Guerette.
Aaron J. Gunter, QM1(SS), U.S. Navy.
Richard C. Hall, ETR2(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Lt. Comdr. John W. Harvey, U.S. Navy, commanding officer.
Norman T. Hayes, EM1-P2, U.S. Navy.
Laird G. Heiser, MM1-P2, U.S. Navy.
Marvin T. Helsius, MM2, U.S. Navy.
Lieutenant (jg.) James J. Henry, Jr., U.S. Navy.
Leonard H. Hewitt, EMCS(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Joseph H. Hoague, TM2(SS), U.S. Navy.
James P. Hodge, EM2, U.S. Navy.
John F. Hudson, EN2(SS), U.S. Navy.
John P. Inglis, SN(SG), U.S. Navy.
Mr. Maurice F. Jaquay.
Brawner G. Johnson, FTG1(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Edward A. Johnson, ENCA(SS), U.S. Navy.
Richard L. Johnson, RMSA, U.S. Navy.
Robert E. Johnson, TMC(SS)-P1, U.S. Navy.
Thomas B. Johnson, ET1(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Richard W. Jones, EM2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Edmund J. Kalusa, SOS2(SS)-P1, U.S. Navy.
Thomas C. Kants, ETR2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Robert D. Kearney, MM3, U.S. Navy.
Donald D. Keiler, IC2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Mr. D. Keuster.
George J. Kiesecker, MM2(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Billy M. Kiler, EN1(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Lieut. Comdr. Robert L. Krag, U.S. Navy.
George R. Kroner, CS3, U.S. Navy.
Norman G. Lannouette, QM1(SS), U.S. Navy.
Wayne W. Lavoie, YN1(SS), U.S. Navy.
Lt. Comdr. John S. Lyman, U.S. Navy.
Templeman N. Mabry, EN2(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Lieutenant (jg.) Frank J. Malinski, U.S. Navy.
Richard M. Mann, Jr., IC2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Julius F. Marullo, Jr., QM1(SS), U.S. Navy.
Douglas R. McClelland, EM2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Donald J. McCord, MM1(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Karl P. McDonough, TM3(SS), U.S. Navy.

Sidney L. Middleton, MM1(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Mr. Henry Moreau.
Ronald A. Muise, CS2, U.S. Navy.
James A. Musselwhite, ETSN(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Donald E. Nault, CS1(SS), U.S. Navy.
Walter J. Noonis, RMC(SS), U.S. Navy.
John D Norris, ET1, U.S. Navy.
Cheslev C. Oetting, EM2-P2, U.S. Navy.
Mr. Franklin J. Palmer.
Lt. (jg.) Guy C. Parsons, Jr., U.S. Navy.
Roscoe C. Pennington, EMCA(SS)-P2.
James G. Peters, EMCS-P2, U.S. Navy.
James G. Phillippi, SOS2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Dan A. Philput, EN2(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Richard Podwell, MM2-P2, U.S. Navy.
Mr. Robert D. Prescott.
John S. Regan, MM1(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
James P. Ritchie, RM2, U.S. Navy.
Pervis Robinson, SN, U.S. Navy.
Glenn A. Rountree, QM2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Anthony A. Rushetski, ETN2, U.S. Navy.
James M. Schiewe, EM1(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Benjamin N. Shafer, EMCM(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
John D. Shafer, EMCS(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Joseph T. Shimko, MM1-P2, U.S. Navy.
Burnett M. Shotwell, ETRSN, U.S. Navy.
Alan D. Sinnett, FTG2(SS), U.S. Navy.
Lt. John Smars, Jr., U.S. Navy.
William H. Smith, Jr., BT1-P2, U.S. Navy.
Ronald H. Solomon, EM1-P2, U.S. Navy.
Mr. D. Stadtmuller.
Robert E. Steinel, SO1(SS)-P1, U.S. Navy.
James L. Snider, MM1-P2, U.S. Navy.
Rodger E. Van Pelt, IC1(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
David A. Wasel, RMSN, U.S. Navy.
Joseph A. Walski, RM1(SS)-P1, U.S. Navy.
Charles L. Wiggins, FTG1-P2, U.S. Navy.
Lt. (jg.) John J. Wiley, U.S. Navy.
Donald E. Wise, MMCA(SS)-P2, U.S. Navy.
Mr. Laurence E. Whitten.
Ronald E. Wolfe, QMSN(SS), U.S. Navy.
Jay H. Zweifel, EM2-P1, U.S. Navy.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Nation mourns the loss of this submarine, the first nuclear submarine to be lost at sea. The submarine, however, can be replaced. What cannot be replaced are the lives of these 129 Americans. These men are irreplaceable.

A court of inquiry, under Vice Adm. Bernard L. Austin, has been convened, and since April 11 has been conducting an investigation to ascertain the cause of the loss. Admiral Austin, an officer experienced in the submarine service, is assisted on the court by other senior naval officers from the submarine service. They include Rear Adm. Lawrence Daspit; Capt. James B. Osborn, commanding officer of the first U.S. Polaris submarine—the U.S.S. *George Washington;* Capt. William C. Hushing, and Capt. Norman G. Nash. Capt. Saul Katz is counsel to the court.

The court has been holding hearings at New London, Conn., and Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. The hearings are in public except where classified information is involved.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by law is required to make continuing studies of problems relating to the development, use and control of atomic energy. In compliance with this responsibility, as chairman of the Joint Committee, upon notification of the loss of the *Thresher*, I sent two senior staff representatives to New London, Conn., as official observers to the court of inquiry. The two staff men—Executive Director John T. Conway and Assistant Director Edward J. Banser—have been present during the public and closed sessions as the court of inquiry has been receiving evidence. They traveled with the court by special military plane from New London, Conn., to Portsmouth, N.H., where the court moved the site of investigation on April 12.

Both of these committee staff men are particularly qualified to follow the course of the court of inquiry's investigation. Mr. Conway, a naval officer during World War II, holds a degree in engineering and in law and has been with the Joint Committee staff nearly 7 years. Mr. Bauser is a retired Navy captain with 22 years of active duty. He holds a master's degree in nuclear engineering from MIT and actively participated in the development, design, and test of nuclear submarines including the first one, the *Nautilus*.

These two men have been in continuous contact with me and report that they are receiving the fullest cooperation from the Department of the Navy and the court of inquiry. All classified information and evidence being obtained by the court is being made available to the Joint Committee staff. Mr. Conway and Mr. Bauser advise me that in their opinion the court of inquiry is making every effort to ascertain the true cause of this terrible accident with the hope and expectation of preventing similar occurrences in the future. The members of the court, career Navy officers of the submarine service, have a bond of affinity with their lost comrades that never can be fully understood by those who have not shared the common experiences and dangers of the men in the submarine service. This bond is such that it demands every effort be made to bring forth all facts and that no stone be left unturned in discovering what the fault or faults may be.

On April 17, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I represented the committee at memorial services conducted by Francis Cardinal Spellman at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, at the conclusion of which His Eminence met with the families of the lost men. I cannot describe to Senators the full depth of the feelings shared by those who were present at these services and the other services held that day by Bishop Henry Knox Sherrill of the Episcopal Church.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the prayer by Francis Cardinal Spellman and the memorial message by Bishop Henry Knox Sherrill, together with the eulogy by Bishop Daniel Feeney. I also request unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the remarks of Rear Adm. J. Floyd Dreith, U.S. Navy, director of the chaplain's division, the remarks by Comdr. Karl G. Peterson, U.S. Navy, Protestant chaplain, Rabbi Abraham I. Jacobson, and the Honorable Kenneth BeLieu, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, at the memorial services for the U.S.S. *Thresher* at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard on April 15, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, many articles have been written and will be written in honor of the men of the U.S.S. *Thresher*. In a discussion with Vice Admiral Austin, president of the court of inquiry, at Portsmouth last week, he handed me a copy of an editorial of the April 13 issue of the New York Times which had been reprinted in the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard newspaper—the Portsmouth Periscope. Admiral Austin, himself a submariner, described this editorial as symbolizing the true spirit of the U.S. Navy submarine service. I ask unanimous consent to place the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THRESHER

She was the finest product of the shipwright's art and one of the maritime marvels of this technological age.

Like the great fish for which she was named, her kingdom was the ocean and its black depths. She was the lead ship of a class designed to run silent, run deep, and run fast—deeper and faster than any submarine of the past. She was shaped like a teardrop and powered with the fissioned energy of the atom. Her cylindrical pressure hull of heavy steel was designed to withstand the crushing weight of deep water.

When the klaxon sounded and the command "Dive! Dive!" echoed through the boat last Wednesday morning there were no intimations of disaster. *Thresher* had already established her preeminence and power. Today, with Lieutenant Commander Harvey and his crew, she lies many fathoms deep off the Continental Shelf. The Navy that built her and manned her may never know what destroyed her; the silent forces of the deep are implacable enemies to detailed investigation.

Yet no investigation is needed to reiterate certain verities. Death—of a ship or a man—is not an end but a beginning; man builds upon the past. Throughout the history of the sea men have died and ships have sunk. In the endless history of conflict between man and nature men have lost but man has triumphed. The earth's mountains have been conquered; the blue sky and the realm of space are sealed and now the forbidding depths—so long beyond the reach of man—are in process of conquest.

Man's indomitable spirit has never in history faltered in such extensions of man's kingdom. The *Thresher* is gone but *Thresher* lives.—New York Times, April 13.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy at 4 p.m. today will meet in executive session at which time it will receive a report from its executive director and assistant director, Mr. Conway and Mr. Bauser, as to the investigation conducted to date by the court of inquiry. Since much of this information obtained by the court is of a classified nature the Joint Committee meeting, of necessity, will have to be in executive session. As chairman of the Joint Committee, I intend to have the committee, through its staff, continue to follow very closely the investigation of the court. The Joint Committee has a responsibility to assure that an investigation is properly and thoroughly conducted. The Joint Committee is particularly concerned that design and manufacturing standards are adequate to meet the exacting service demanded by nuclear submarines. Nuclear submarines must be operated as an integral unit. Standards of all parts must be the highest possible and carefully adhered to. I can assure the American public and the Congress that the Joint Committee will closely follow this investigation. I believe, however, the most efficient manner of obtaining the facts at this time is to permit the court of inquiry to conduct its investigation unhampered by parallel congressional investigation. I believe it is important to permit the comrades of those men lost on the *Thresher* to pursue the investigation without interference of other investigations. The Joint Committee will continue to have representatives of its staff as observers during the closed as well as the open session of the court. I have the assurance of the full cooperation of the court of inquiry. While the investigation may take a long time it is important that it be done thoroughly and fully in order that future tragedies may be forever prevented.

EXHIBIT 1

PRAYER BY FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Let us pray. Oh God, the Creator, Redeemer of all the faithful, hear our supplications and through thy infinite love and mercy graciously grant the souls of thy servants departed remission of all their sins by which they may have deserved the severity of thy divine justice and punishments in the world to come. Vouchsafe to them grace and mercy before the divine tribunal and let them attain to everlasting rest and happiness through the infinite merits of Jesus Christ. Oh God, great and omnipotent Judge of the living and the dead before whom we are all to appear after this short life to render an account of our works. Let our hearts, we pray thee, be deeply moved at this sight of death. Let us be mindful of our own fraility and mortality, that walking always in thy fear and in the ways of thy commandments, we may after our departure from the world, experience a merciful judgment and rejoice in everlasting happiness through the same Christ our Lord.

Grant Oh Lord, we beseech thee that while we lament the departure of thy servants, our brothers, out of this life, we may bear in mind that we are most certainly to follow them. Give us grace to make ready for that last hour by a divine and holy life. Teach us how to watch and pray that when thy summons comes, we may go forth to meet the bridegroom and enter with him into life everlasting through the same Christ our Lord. Almighty and most merciful Father, who knowest the weakness of our nature, bow down thine ear and pity unto thy servants upon who thou hast laid the heavy burden of sorrow. Take away out of their hearts the spirit of rebellion and teach them to see thy good and gracious purpose in all the trials that shall descend upon them. Grant that they should not languish on unabandoned grief nor sorrow as those who have no hope, but through their tears look meekly up to thee, the God of all consolation through Jesus Christ Our Lord. Amen.

I feel sure that all of us have been consoled by the eulogy by Bishop Feeney and in sympathy and sorrow we offer our prayers to Almighty God that God will grant eternal rest to our heroes. Certainly very few tragedies in recent years can so touch the heart of all Americans with sympathy and sorrow—abiding sorrow and a desire to be helpful in their prayers. As Bishop Feeney was speaking I thought of a few stanzas of a verse I learned long ago. "The bravest battle that ever was fought shall I tell you where and when. On the map of the world you find it not—it's in the hearts of the mothers and wives of men," and I am sure that all of us feel and grieve deeply with you in the loss of your dear ones. They however, have reached the goal of eternal life. In the prayers we are reminded that after this short life, and even the longest life is short, but we can be happy in the thought that these men who did their duty to their God and their country have received the award and the reward of eternal life. I like to think that when that last cry echoed through the *Thresher*, "Dive," that shortly afterwards the men of the crew heard the response—the response that came from Almighty God their Creator, their Redeemer and their Saviour; "Well done," and now you faithful servants enter thou in the procession of the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world.

THE MEMORIAL MESSAGE BY BISHOP HENRY KNOX SHERRILL

We are met together this afternoon for meditation, for worship, in order to pray for strength and courage and in order to thank God for lives which have been given in the service of the Nation and the free world. It is not a time therefore for long and intricate speech, as Mr. Lincoln said at Gettysburg so long ago, "it is not what we say here that matters," but certainly the whole Nation, indeed the entire world has been saddened and shocked by this event. This does not change the hard reality of loss, the tragedy still remains and it must not or cannot be underestimated, but the fact that in countless churches on Easter day throughout this Nation prayers were offered for the families of these men, the fact that everywhere people are praying for God's blessing upon them must be a sustaining and a strengthening force in the realization of the great company who share this experience to some degree with you.

These men were, of course, unusual in their gifts. They were chosen because they had special aptitudes of training, of native ability and above else, of character, in order to serve in a pioneer enterprise, in a new type of service for the protection of the Nation and of the free world. So there are many memories of what they were and what they did and a very deep sense of thanksgiving for their service. We live in a strange world, it's a world in which there is peace and yet there is no peace. A world in which, unfortunately it seems to the moment impossible, to have international understanding and a genuine concord among the nations of the world. This kind of service in days of so-called peace is never as dramatic as wartime service—someone said to me this morning that perhaps this tragedy will make the ordinary casual citizen realize more deeply all that the armed services are doing for us today—many times so undramatically. It has been my lot at various times to be in similar situations. I recall conducting a service in Honolulu Harbor over those who were lost in the attack at Pearl Harbor. I remember conducting service during two World Wars where there was again this tremendous loss. But what I would say now is from the point of view of the Nation, these men have given their lives for home and country just as much as if they had been at Pearl Harbor or in the Coral Sea or in the events of actual war.

I am confident that they did not wish war. I am confident that there was no hate of others in their minds or hearts. I have always found in a long experience there is more hatred expressed by those who are at home far away from action, than by those who are actually engaged in the struggle itself. No, they were performing a very important service in keeping the peace of the world, in making it impossible for aggressors to destroy our liberties, our heritage and all that is meant by freedom, in many nations of the world. So we owe them a tremendous debt for they gave their lives very truly, not only that the rest of us may be safe but that liberty and justice and freedom may pass on from our generation to those yet unborn. Again, what I'm saying does not break the impact of the hard loss but I say that here is a cause of humble pride. We are not our own because we have been bought with so great a price. What can be said in the way of comfort and strength? I must be honest, there are no easy answers to many of the things which happen in this world. Again and again, as a parish minister, I have been in difficult circumstances and you just do not know what to say. People say, "Why must this have been, why?" and I have to answer, "I do not know." There is a mystery in life and there is a mystery in death, and no one, I think, clearly can see the way. But I have faith in the Easter hope that someday, freed from the limitations of time and of space when we do not see anymore through a glass darkly but face to face, somehow, sometime, in the goodness of God, these strands will be brought together and in God's Eternity we will find the will of God and know this answer. The problem is as old as suffering, sin and death. St. Paul asked the question that I am suggesting now, St. Paul said, "What can we say to these things, what can we say to these things." Then after discussing some of the tribulations which come to the children of man, he closes with that magnificent statement, which is part of the Christian experience of the ages, and of us all, "for I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor things present, nor things to come, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, in Christ Jesus, our Lord. I had an old friend in Boston, a wonderful old man who lost a brilliant son at an early age. His son was a remarkable physician, before him were all sorts of opportunities for overcoming illness and disease and suddenly he was stricken just at the beginning of the manifestation of his powers. And I met his old father on Beacon Street in Boston and I said, "We have all been thinking of you and have been helped by the courage and faith which you and your family have shown during this difficult time." The old man said, "Yes, thank you, I had a letter yesterday. The letter read, you have been conquerors, you and your family, through this experience." The old gentleman smiled and then he said, "I wrote back, you entirely misunderstand, we have been more than conquerors through Him that loved us." So we do not meet these changes and circumstances of life by ourselves, there are great invisible spiritual forces, the love of God, the presence of the living Christ who rose from the dead himself, the promise of strength and courage and peace even of deep abiding joy that is the Easter message that is true for all times. So we pray to those who are immediately and specially bereaved that they may feel underneath God's everlasting arms, that they may feel something of this Easter joy. Death is swallowed up in victory. And we pray that we may entrust to God's loving care all those who are dear to us for this life and the life to come. May God give you strength and courage and the everlasting hope.

EULOGY BY BISHOP DANIEL FEENEY

Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord. Your Eminence, your Excellency, good friends all in Christ. It is with the deepest conviction that I believe in the immortality of the soul of man. It is not because great thinkers and philosophers of all shades of culture over the ages have accepted this truth—no. I have a stronger and a sounder basis for the conviction that is mine. We are still within the period of the commemoration of the event that raises the ceremony of this kind above the level of soft sentiment to the very lofty heights of reality. How futile it would be, how permeated almost with mockery. Yes, more, how degrading to the proud who still lives the ceremony of this kind meant only that death was a completion of man's existence. The event that we commemorate this last Friday taught us that death is no more a mystery, but rather that it does not indicate the extension of man but is only an incident in the path of man's existence from this life to the realization, the yearnings, the longings that the human soul has ever experienced that can be satisfied only in the bosom of the Infinite, the Inexhaustible and the Eternal God. This thought alone gives dignity to a ceremony of this nature. The soul of man is immortal. The dominant thought in our minds this noon is union, union of the temporal living with those eternally living. In this spirit of union we cherish the love that has united us over the years. We esteem the memory of friendship and the appreciation of the character and the virtues of the loved ones. We know that the character of a good man does not die, but continues to exercise its beneficent influences just so long as there are those who are to carry on his memory. In this spirit of loving union, we gather here this morning to express also our deep gratitude to those whose services have been offered in behalf of our great country. Many of them had already exposed their lives before for us, others in the first great challenge had already indicated the will to place themselves in peril for us. Heroism is not always in the act, but frequently is it found in the determination and the will and the acceptance of what life may have for them. They have been sacrificed on the altar of freedom. We are not deceived today that our freedom is secure, for our freedom is still in danger and it is those who are willing to accept the risks that we look as its guardians. On this sad and yet solemn occasion I think it is not consolation or even sympathy that those who commemorate their loved ones are seeking from us, but rather I think we all should be actuated by the spirit of mutual suffering and distress in union with those who are suffering and in distress. With the wives, children, fathers, mothers, and all the close kin of those today we commemorate, we do unite in spirit, suffering, sadness, and distress and we all pray together the Almighty Father of us all may look with pitying eye upon them and grant them the release from their suffering. There was a noble President of the United States who had the gift of sympathy and of mutual suffering with those who sought his help and on one occasion in the dark days of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln penned a letter to a mother who suffered. With a bit of paraphrasing, you will permit me to read it. The great Lincoln said, "I feel how weak and fruitless must be any word of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming, but I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic for which they died. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost and a solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom. May God bless us all, protect us all and make us worthy of those whose memory this morning we cherish."

MEMORIAL ADDRESS DELIVERED BY J. FLOYD DREITH, CHC, U.S. NAVY, DIRECTOR OF THE CHAPLAINS' DIVISION GIVEN AT MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR U.S.S. "THRESHER" AT THE PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD APRIL 15, 1963

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, but particularly you, the bereaved members of the families of the departed officers and men of the *Thresher*. The entire Nation went into a state of shock last week when the word was flashed on the news wires that the U.S.S. *Thresher*—with 129, both civilian and naval personnel aboard—was lost at sea. Prayer groups were started among those, one by Mrs. Korth, the wife of the Secretary of the Navy, beseeching Almightly God, that He might find it in His wisdom and mercy to bring that ship and those men safely back. In His wisdom and mercy He decreed otherwise. The fact that the Nation went into shock is a high compliment to the U.S. Navy. Seldom a week goes by that we don't read about an airplane crash. Daily, hundreds of lives are taken upon our highways. We take all this more or less for granted. But when a ship of the U.S. Navy is lost in peacetime, the entire Nation is astounded. Because it so seldom happens, and because the Navy has demonstrated such high regard for the safety and welfare of its personnel. Those men that went down on that ship were God's men, and I say this without having had the priviledge of knowing any one of them personally. A Russian cosmonaut may encircle the globe and find no evidence of the existence of God. An American sailor when he goes to sea is very much aware of the fact that he is God's child and in God's hands.

It is given unto all men once to die. We seldom know when and the time is never propitious whenever it does come for any of us, it seems, and we seldom know how. But if we had the choice, the free choice given unto us by Almighty God today, I'm sure that we could ask for no higher honor or glory than that accorded to those men to give their lives in the service of their country upon the altar not only of that country, but the altar of human dignity and freedom throughout the world. And were they here now to speak to us I'm sure that they would ask us not to grieve for them, because they could have selected no higher honor or glory than that which was accorded unto them. The young son of Doctor Keuster, a Navy scientist, who was aboard that ship, said to his mother, "Since God holds the ocean in the hollow of His hands, our daddy is safe." And so in that sense particularly you bereaved members, loved ones of the departed, may I commend unto you that God holds them in the hollow of His hand and as we commend them to the depths of the sea which they loved and their souls to His tender mercy, may we here and now commit ourselves to a nobler service of God in the service of our fellow men. To that may our Heavenly Father strengthen us and bless us.

REMARKS BY COMDR. KARL G. PETERSON, U.S. NAVY PROTESTANT CHAPLAIN, AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR U.S.S. "THRESHER" AT THE PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD, APRIL 15, 1963

Wives, parents, children, relatives, and friends of those lost in *Thresher*, we are gathered here to honor and to show our esteem for your loved ones: and to express our sincere sympathy to you in your sorrow. To assure you of the deep appreciation of our Nation for the gallant services of those lost in *Thresher*. There are present representatives of our Government, the Department of Defense, the Navy Department, and other agencies dedicated to the protection of our Nation, local and national. Time permits the mention of only the following:

The Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics); Vice Adm. W. R. Smedberg, Chief of Naval Personnel; Vice Adm. E. W. Grenfel, Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet; the Honorable John W. King, Governor, New Hampshire.

The loyalty, dedication, and selfless sacrifice of those lost in *Thresher* demands recognition of our common debt of gratitude. They have written a page in naval history that will not be forgotten.

REMARKS BY COMDR. KARL G. PETERSON, USN, PROTESTANT CHAPLAIN AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR U.S.S. "THRESHER," AT THE PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD, APRIL 15, 1963

Almighty God, Heavenly Father, to Thee be honor and glory forever. By Thy divine guidance Thou hast led us: by Thy providence Thou hast blessed us. Thou hast lifted us up to be a favored people. These manifestations of Thy power and goodness give substance to our faith in Thee, as we turn to Thee in this memorial service.

O Thou who are the strength of the weak and the consolation of the sorrowful be attentive to the prayers of Thy grief stricken children who turn to Thee now in these solemn moments laden with their sense of tragedy. As Thou hast known the anguish of suffering and sorrow in the death of Thy beloved Son, we beseech Thee in Thy compassion to bring balm and healing to those whose hearts are wounded and burdened with grief. Through Thy gift of faith may the assurance of our Saviour's victory over death proclaimed in the Easter message bring them strength and comfort and provide them with that peace which passes understanding. May the bright rays of the resurrection light shine into every dark place in life. Now we commit to Thy love and mercy, the souls of the shipmates and those builders and engineers who made their last voyage in *Thresher*. Vouchsafe to them light and rest, peace and refreshment, joy and consolation, and the companionship of Thy saints, and in Thine own presence, O Thou gracious, risen Saviour. Amen.

REMARKS BY RABBI ABRAHAM I. JACOBSON, D.D., AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR U.S.S. "THRESHER" AT THE PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD, APRIL 15, 1963

Psalm 121: "I will lift up mine eyes unto the mountains; from whence shall my help come? My help cometh from the Lord, who made heaven and earth. He will not suffer thy foot to be moved; He that keepeth thee will not slumber. Behold, he that keepeth Israel doth neither slumber nor sleep. The Lord is thy keeper; the Lord is thy shade upon thy right hand. The sun shall not smite thee by day nor the moon by night. The Lord shall keep thee from all evil; He shall keep thy soul. The Lord shall guard thy going out and thy coming in, from this time forth and forever."

PRAYER

Out of the depths we call unto Thee, O God, our heavenly Father. In Thy hands are the souls of all the living and the spirits of all flesh. Thy loving kindness is never withdrawn from us, but abides with us, in death as in life. In Thy wisdom, Thou hast laid upon us this heavy burden. Mayest Thou in Thy mercy, give us the strength to bear it.

Guide us and sustain us. Give us the strength of faith that shall keep us from murmuring against the justice of Thy dispensation, even when Thou dost afflict us. Grant us we pray Thee the understanding which shall enable us to recognize that the hand that woundeth is the hand that bindeth up again. Enable us always to be supported by the knowledge that these dear ones whom Thou in Thy wisdom hast seen fit to take from us have reflected their deep love for our country, their loyalty to their oath, and their courage in the face of their supreme trial. What greater glory than to die for our beloved country. Thou art the Life of all life.

KADDISH MEMORIAL RECITED IN HEBREW

Go your way for the Lord hath called you. Go your way and may the Lord be with you.

May your righteousness go before you and the glory of the Lord receive you. Amen.

Remarks by the Honorable Kenneth BeLieu, Assistant Secretary of the Navy at Memorial Services for U.S.S. "Thresher" at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, April 15, 1963

While we gather in solemn reverence in memory of our gallant comrades both civilian and military, it's appropriate to remember the President's words, for he said the courage and dedication of these men of the sea, pushing ahead into depths to advance our knowledge and capabilities is no less than that of their forefathers who led the advance on the frontiers of our civilization. These brave men have joined their comrades 1,500 of whom were lost in submarines in the fight for freedom in World War II. The future of our country will always be sure when there are men such as these to give their lives to preserve it. The Secretary, McNamara, desired that I convey to you these words today. Today the entire Nation and people of the free world as well mourn the brave men of the *Thresher*. The sorrow in our hearts is symbolized by this memorial service. Only those whose loved ones gave their lives can feel the deep sense of personal loss. But that does not preclude us in the Defense Department from our own feeling of grief. The bereaved families may take some measure of comfort from knowing that their men died serving their country. The world will continue to live in freedom as long as men like these devote their lives to the highest service on the land, in the air, and on and under the sea, and as you and I are in memory of these gallant men let us not leave this ceremony alone as the only symbol of our honor. Rather let us resolve here today of this instant that you and I will somehow, someday, each day, in some way, perform some continuing act of patriotism, so in the future when and if we are to give an account to them, they shall know they did not die in vain and we carry the torch with them.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Simpson in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I have listened with attentiveness to the remarks the Senator has made. I wish to tell him that every Member of the Senate, as he well knows—as is true of all the American people—keenly regrets the loss of the *Thresher*. This represents the worst submarine disaster in the history of the U.S. Navy. But more important than the loss of the vessel, we feel a very deep and abiding sympathy for the families of the brave crew aboard the *Thresher*.

I am happy to learn that the Senator was present at the memorial ceremonies which recently took place at Portsmouth, N.H. His feeling is shared by all of us for the terrible bereavement suffered by the families of the officers and men of the U.S.S. *Thresher*.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

AMERICAN FOREIGN AID—ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN JAPAN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, no American who has visited Japan in recent years can fail to be impressed with the astonishing pace of her burgeoning economy. Today Japan enjoys the fastest rate of economic growth of any of the great industrial powers, while the United States continues to suffer from a lingering affliction of stunted growth.

Last December, as I walked the streets of Tokyo, I was amazed at the evidence of economic vitality to be seen at every corner. Hundreds of modern business buildings—factories, hotels, department stores—were under construction. The din of riveting filled the air, and the steel skeletons of high-rising new construction could be seen in all directions across the skyline of the city.

Broad boulevards were being pounded out to make way for the clogged traffic, a vast new subway system was being dug, and expanded terminals were being built to meet the need for rapid transit. Never have I seen an American city more alive with activity than today's Tokyo. Never have I seen a city anywhere experience so surging a boom.

And what is true of Tokyo is true also of Japan itself. Her current production of goods and services dwarfs her prewar yield. Not only has Japan become self-sustaining, she has achieved an unprecedented level of prosperity, far beyond anything her people have ever known before. Alone among the nations of the Orient, Japan is rapidly approaching living standards which are comparable to those that now exist in some countries of Western Europe. If present trends continue, Japan will outdistance most of her rivals, and many of us who now serve in this Senate will live to see the day when Japan is listed in the forefront rank, among the richest nations of the world.

I say this, not in criticism, but in praise of the Japanese. They exult in hard work; they are an efficient and competitive people; they have the good sense to understand the superiority of the incentive system of free enterprise, and they are making it work for them, with startling success, in the marketplaces of the world. They are practicing popular, free government, in an area of the world where one must search for it with the patience and persistence of a Diogenes, and, though recently our enemy, they have forsworn the course of neutralism to ally themselves formally with the United States. For all this, we can rejoice and raise our voices in praise of Japan.

We would also do well to remember—for if we forget, no one else is likely to remind us—the central and controlling role of the United States in the working of the miracle of modern Japan. From the day the war ended, we have treated the Japanese, not as the victor has historically administered to the vanquished, but as a doctor administers to a sick patient. We have nursed Japan back to health and vigor. The economic and political reforms decreed by MacArthur during the period of American occupation, which were unashamedly patterned after our own national experience, furnished Japan the framework for her remarkable recovery. Instead of extracting reparations from Japan for her attack upon us, as other attacked countries in southeast Asia and the western Pacific have done; instead of making Japan repay us for the heavy toll she took in American lives and property when she seized Guam, Midway, and the Philippines, possessions we had to forcibly recover at so dear a price to ourselves; instead of taking any act of retribution or demanding any part of the ransom customarily due a conqueror, we were soon offering our own money to Japan to help her bind up her wounds, repair her wreckage, and regather her strength. From July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1962, the United States has given Japan some $3.3 billion in grant aid.

Again, let me say, I recall these facts, not to deride the policy of the United States, but to praise it. For it matters not whether we were motivated by the fear of communism, as our critics charge, or inspired to act in conformity with the Scriptural injunction, "love thine enemy," in either case the policy was a sound and statesmanlike response to the needs of the postwar era. With it we helped to rejuvenate Japan, and she, in turn, willingly allied herself with us, as the northernmost anchor in the chain of island defenses on which we rely in the far Pacific.

But policies once wisely begun often outlive their usefulness. The respect of a beaten people for a conqueror so strong that he generously extends his own help to put them back on their feet again, can quickly turn to contempt, if, when robust and healthy once more, they discover that the conqueror has somehow turned so weak that he cannot stop the subsidy. This has come to be the hard truth concerning our continuing grants of military equipment and supplies to the Japanese Government, whatever other arguments may be offered to justify the perpetuation of this aid program.

The plans for a demilitarized Japan were punctured by the Korean war. The fear of potential aggression, revived by the Communist invasion of South Korea, led the Japanese Government to reestablish a home defense force, comprising army, navy, and air units. This was done, notwithstanding the prohibition in the Japanese constitution against the maintenance of armed forces, though the legality of the action still remains a troublesome issue in the politics of the country.

We approved the rearming of Japan. Indeed, we consented to help finance it. From July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1962, we have given Japan over $737 million in grants for military supplies and equipment. This represents approximately 18.5 percent of the total cost, during the 9-year period, to the Japanese Government for maintaining her defense forces.

Mr. President, in order to detail the amount of military aid we have furnished Japan over the years in question, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a chart which sets forth these figures, giving the totals for the full period, as well as the breakdown for each fiscal year since 1958.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Chart No. 1.—*Japan-United States MAP deliveries, defense expenditures, and defense expenditures as percent of GNP, by fiscal year*

[Dollars in millions]

Country	Total, 1953–62			1962			1961			1960			1959			1958		
	MAP[1] deliveries	Defense[4] expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures	
		Amount[2]	Percent of GNP[3]		Amount	Percent of GNP		Amount	Percent of GNP		Amount	Percent of GNP		Amount	Percent oı GNP		Amount	Percent of GNP
United States	--------	$453,500	10.1	------	$53,400	9.6	------	$49,000	9.4	------	$45,700	9.1	--------	$46,200	9.6	--------	$44,800	10.1
Japan	$737.8	4,424	1.4	$74	572	1.1	$66.9	503	1.1	$85.8	454	1.2	$131.5	436	1.3	$130.9	421	1.5

[1] Figures were furnished by the Department of Defense, and the amounts include only the price of the chargeable program in grant form. The amounts do not include acquisition price of excess material delivered to Japan, which totaled $169,900,000 during the same period of time. MAP to Japan did not commence until fiscal year 1954, so this total is 1954 to 1962, inclusive.

[2] The amounts shown for United States were rounded from figures given in chart No. 3. Amounts shown for Japan were taken from chart No. 2.

[3] The percentages shown for the 10-year period were computed from data contained in charts Nos. 2 and 3. The percentages shown for the individual years were taken from charts Nos. 2 and 3.

[4] As indicated on charts Nos. 2 and 3, the United States totals are in calendar years totals for Japan are in fiscal years commencing April 1 of each year.

Mr. CHURCH. It will be noted that this chart also gives the comparative figures, from fiscal year 1958 forward, of the dollar equivalents spent each year by the United States and Japan, respectively, for defense purposes, together with the percentage these amounts bear to the gross national product of each country. These figures give us an accurate comparison of the proportionate effort each country is making to provide for its own defense. The chart also shows the total amounts for the entire period since American military subsidies to Japan began, fiscal years 1953 through 1962, inclusive. These totals are most revealing. They show we spent the grand sum of $453.5 billion on our own Armed Forces, which was 10.1 percent of our gross national product, while Japan spent $4.4 billion, which was 1.4 percent of her gross national product.

I cite these figures not because I think it realistic to expect Japan to make anywhere near as much an effort, in proportion to her resources, to provide for her own defense, as we make in proportion to ours. Why on earth should she? Under the terms of our mutual defense treaty with Japan, we guarantee to defend her, with our own forces, against attack, and the umbrella of our protection has enabled Japan to escape the stifling burden of armaments. Indeed, this has been one of the primary reasons why Japan has been freed to pour her energies into peaceful, consumer production, and thus to lift her standard of living to an alltime high.

No, Mr. President, I cite these figures merely to show how little Japan is doing in her own behalf. Yet, this very fact is often used as a basis for justifying continued grants on our part, by those ingenious men who think up arguments for perpetuating aid programs. They say we must continue to offer the aid as an encouragement to the Japanese to do more on their own. I have frequently heard such arguments made on behalf of further extensions of military assistance to wholly self-supporting nations, by sober-faced spokesmen appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It is not easy to understand how such contentions go unchallenged, when, year after year, the facts are precisely the contrary. How long are we to permit ourselves to be fooled? We have now given the Japanese Government nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars in military aid. We have been at it for 10 years. Has it induced the Japanese Government to increase their own defense effort, as their capacity to do so has grown with their burgeoning wealth?

It has not. In fact, the very opposite is the case. Just to prove the point, and to demonstrate how the Japanese have slackened their own rate of expenditure for defense, I ask unanimous consent to publish in the Record at this point tables giving the exact data, both for Japan and for the United States.

There being no objection, the charts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chart No. 2.—*Selected data on Japan*

[Calendar years, unless indicated otherwise]

Year	Population[1]	GNP current prices	Per capita GNP	Per capita personal consumption expenditures	Defense expenditures[2]	Percent of GNP spent for defense
	Thousands	*Millions*			*Millions*	
1953	87,000	$19,039	$219	$135	$431	2.2
1954	88,200	20,498	232	147	430	2.1
1955	89,276	22,696	254	156	378	1.7
1956	90,170	24,990	277	167	374	1.5
1957	90,920	28,119	309	180	425	1.5
1958	91,760	27,703	302	188	421	1.5
1959	92,630	33,441	361	201	436	1.3
1960	93,419	38,845	417	223	454	1.2
1961	94,280	47,584	505	253	503	1.1
1962	95,180	[3] 51,700	[4] 543	[4] 295	572	1.1

[1] As of Oct. 1.

[2] Budgeted totals for fiscal years beginning Apr. 1 of year indicated.

[3] Fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1963.

[4] Estimate.

Source: "Economic Statistics of Japan," 1961, the Bank of Japan.

Prepared by Far Eastern Division, OIRE, Bureau of International Commerce, Department of Commerce.

Chart No. 3.—*Selected economic measures, United States, 1953–62*

[Calendar years]

Year	Population	Gross national product	Per capita GNP	Personal consumption expenditures	Personal consumption expenditures per capita	Defense expenditures	Defense expenditures as percent of GNP
	Thousands	*Billions*		*Billions*		*Billions*	
1953	159,559	$365.4	$2,290	$232.6	$1,458	$49.3	13.5
1954	162,388	363.1	2,236	238.0	1,466	41.2	11.3
1955	165,276	397.5	2,405	256.9	1,555	39.1	9.8
1956	168,225	419.2	2,492	269.9	1,604	40.4	9.6
1957	171,278	442.8	2,585	285.2	1,665	44.4	10.0
1958	174,154	444.5	2,553	293.2	1,684	44.8	10.1
1959	177,080	4[illegible].7	2,726	313.5	1,771	46.2	9.6
1960	180,676	503.4	2,786	328.5	1,818	45.7	9.1
1961	183,742	518.7	2,823	338.1	1,840	49.0	9.4
1962	186,591	553.9	2,969	356.7	1,912	53.4	9.6

Note.—Per capita figures computed from unrounded data.

Sources: Population figures from the Bureau of the Census; all other data from the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Prepared by U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a quick glance at these tables will suffice to give the picture. Between 1953 and 1962, the gross national product of Japan nearly tripled, difficult as this is to believe. It jumped from $19 billion to over $51 billion; the per capita income went up from $219 to $543. But Japanese defense expenditures, as a percent of the GNP, went down from 2.2 percent in 1953 to 1.1 percent in 1962. In short, 10 years after our military subsidies to Japan commenced, the Japanese were making only half as much effort to maintain their own armed forces as they had made to start with. The inducement argument obviously lacks any factual basis.

Is it the purpose of the foreign-aid program to subsidize wholly self-supporting countries? If it is, then Congress had better speedily execute the monster once and for all. We have our own solvency to protect, a stubbornly persistent adverse balance-of-payments problem to correct, a deficit to reduce, chronic unemployment to eliminate, and many other urgent problems at home that the money we are spending abroad could help to cure.

If, on the other hand, the purpose of foreign aid is to help poor, undeveloped nations resist communism by arming themselves against it, and by raising the living standards of their people, which I have always understood the purpose of the program to be, then why do we continue to dole out money to Japan?

Groping for an answer to this question, the Pentagon has come up with a new and different argument. By offering money to assist the Japanese in the procurement of certain types of weapons, it is argued, we can influence the kind of forces they maintain, fitting them into our overall strategic plan for the defense of the western Pacific.

Well, perhaps this argument is all that is needed to perpetuate our subsidy to Japan indefinitely. To accept it as valid is to concede that there cannot be an end to our handouts, ever. It is the perfect solution for those who administer the program; it can be applied to any country, rich or poor or in-between; and it has no limits whatever in time.

Mr. President, if Congress will use a little commonsense, it will become at once apparent that the size of Japan's defense force does not even begin to be sufficient to successfully defend her against a full-scale attack. For defense, she relies upon us. We are formally committed to protect her under the terms of the treaty of mutual defense between the two governments. Japan maintains hardly more than token forces, as a semblance of good faith. If they are to be of any use to her in an emergency, they necessarily must fit into the overall strategic plan for the general defense of the area. We do not have to pay Japan to make these forces fit the bigger scheme of things; it is in Japan's own national interest to see to it that they do.

Mr. President, twice before during this session I have taken the floor of the Senate to speak in support of an amendment I propose to offer to this year's foreign-aid bill. This amendment will bar further grants of aid, whether economic or military in form, to self-supporting countries, excepting only that which may be required to fulfill prior commitments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted that the Senator from Idaho will offer his amendment. I understood him to say that he will offer it. If so, he would honor the senior Senator from Oregon if he permitted him to be one of the cosponsors of the amendment again this year, as he was privileged to be when the Senator from Idaho offered the amendment previously.

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to welcome the senior Senator from Oregon as a cosponsor of the amendment. I wish publicly to thank him on the floor for the very effective help he gives cosponsoring the amendment. I hope Congress will adopt it. If we are to make the kind of sense that we need to make in our foreign-aid program, we must start here. If we cannot stop the subsidies to prosperous, flourishing nations, how on earth can we expect to reform the program elsewhere where we face great difficulties in the underdeveloped areas of the world?

The amendment will, of course, apply to Japan. It will apply also to a number of flourishing countries in Western Europe. I believe it conforms with both the letter and spirit of the Clay report on our foreign-aid program, and so I hope the Congress will approve it. If we do, we will have taken one important step toward making more sense out of foreign aid—a course we must pursue if we expect the American people to continue to accept and sustain this program.

I want to make it clear that my sponsorship of this amendment is, in no sense, a reflection upon the leadership of the President, or the direction he has given our foreign-aid program. He himself has often urged our prosperous allies, in Europe and in the Pacific, to assume a larger part of the aid burden that we have carried so long. It must be very difficult for him to make them believe he means it, when we continue to pour subsidies into the very countries to which he appeals for help.

No, the fault lies with the legacy that Kennedy has inherited. Alone, he has not been able to force an end to programs which are carried along by their own momentum. He needs the help of Congress, and so, too, do the taxpayers of this country.

But we will never accomplish even so sane and sensible an objective as that embraced by the amendment I have mentioned, without hearing the outcry of the easily intimidated: "We dare not change the law to exclude Japan," they will plead, "for this will offend the Japanese."

Mr. President, I shall conclude these remarks as I commenced them—with a personal reference. Twenty years ago, I sat in the great hall at Nanking and witnessed the formal surrender of Okamura Jasugi, commanding general of the Japanese occupational forces, to the Republic of China. That day we thought the Japanese had lost the war. Now we know it was Tojo who lost. As for the Japanese people, they have turned out to be the winners, perhaps more so than any other people involved in the Second War, including ourselves.

Only their total defeat on the warfronts, followed by the surrender and occupation of their country, could have destroyed so completely the military tyrany which had so long dominated their affairs. It was then that we reformed their institutions, and with our own money helped repair the damage they sustained in the war that they themselves had thrust upon us. If now, when Japan has emerged as the fourth greatest industrial power of the world, protected by American might, and free not only to occupy herself with the profitable pursuits of peaceful commerce, but to heap ceaseless criticism upon us in the process—if, in this situation, we cannot even muster the gumption to stop subsidizing the token defense forces Japan does maintain, for fear of offending the Japanese Government, then God pity the United States of America.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. If I were to interrupt the Senator every time I find myself in agreement with him, I would be constantly interrupting him. He is so right in the observations he has made with respect to the position of Japan vis-a-vis the United States.

As the Senator knows, I hold the same point of view in regard to the aid that we are giving to many NATO countries. These countries are simply not carrying their burden of the price of freedom. I see no reason why the American taxpayers should continue to pay through the nose, to pour into Great Britain and France and Portugal and other NATO countries the huge sums of money that we are pouring into them, including, I may say, West Germany, when, first, they are well able to pay their own way with regard to this subject and, second, I am greatly disturbed about the attitude that certain NATO countries have taken with regard to the United States concerning economic relations.

I see no reason why we should continue to pour money into West Germany, while West Germany prepares to take the discriminatory attitudes she is preparing to take against the United States in regard to agricultural products. That is true also of France and of the Low Countries. Once again I call the attention of the State Department to the fact that of the $3 billion-plus of United States exports, more than $1 billion worth in the past has been American agricultural products. Yet when we talk with the officials of the State Department, we continue to be given the old line that we still are selling more to Europe than we are buying from Europe. That does not change the fact that negotiators for the State Department have been for some time selling American agriculture short in our relationships with the NATO countries.

I repeat my notice: I do not intend to vote for this administration's foreign aid policies vis-a-vis the United States and Europe until the State Department proceeds to do a better job of protecting American agriculture.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. He and I have supported the foreign aid program in the past because we have recognized it to be an essential instrument of American foreign policy in dealing with a world in ferment, and in coping with the Communist menace. This very fact makes it clear that our efforts are not directed toward opposing foreign aid, as such. We have been friends of foreign aid; we have recognized its necessity. What we are striving to do is to reform the program, so that it will make better sense.

I have observed on the floor of the Senate in the past, that if Congress fails to effect such reforms, the day may come when the pendulum of reaction will fill the Halls of Congress and the White House itself with men who would return this country to a last lingering isolation. Foreign aid can be sustained only so long as the American people are willing to sustain it. Their good sense tells them that much is wrong with the foreign aid program, much that must be reformed.

I appreciate the support of the distinguished Senator from Oregon of the amendment I intend to offer. I think it will provide for us, with respect to the NATO countries, Japan, or any other self-sufficient foreign country, the basis upon which we can improve and strengthen our relationships. I believe the NATO Alliance today is weakened because we cannot summon the resolution to stop subsidies to our prosperous NATO allies, for these governments know that they are fully capable of maintaining their own armed forces without further help from the United States.

If we desire to strengthen the NATO Alliance, let us insist that each member with the capability do its share. Ending our subsidies will make it so much easier for the President to say to them that we expect more help from NATO, and more help from Japan, in carrying the heavy burden of foreign aid in the underdeveloped parts of the world which, up until this time, has so largely been borne by the United States alone.

How can we expect them to believe our plea if, on the one hand, we exhort them to greater effort while, on the other hand, we continue to dole out subsidies to the very countries whose help we are asking?

I have made my address today in the spirit of constructive criticism of the foreign aid program, and in the hope that my argument may lead to the kind of reform that will strengthen the program, and thus assure it the continued support of the American people. Before closing, I want to say that I have just received a written message from the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], advising me that he, too, wishes to be a cosponsor of the amendment I propose to offer. I am grateful to him for his expression of support.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE WILDERNESS BILL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the famous daughters of our State of Idaho is Inez Robb, the well-known newspaper columnist. We are extremely proud of Miss Robb, and I have been particularly proud to read her column in the Washington Daily News of Friday, April 13, 1963.

Miss Robb writes eloquently of our need for the wilderness bill, and with a firm logic that should help sustain those of us who have worked so hard for this legislation.

I would like unanimous consent to insert this fine article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST GET WILDERNESS BILL PASSED, CITIZENS

(By Inez Robb)

The Senate has again passed, by overwhelming vote, a wilderness bill that would preserve for future generations some small part of the wondrous natural endowments with which this Nation was originally blessed.

Whether it will pass the House is regarded as chancey. Every bloc in the country that could or would use public land for its own special benefit is fighting the measure. Powerful lobbies for the cattle, sheep, and mining interests have been at work for a long time here in Washington. They have made hay in the House.

There isn't an American alive who doesn't bless the foresight and courage that in the past preserved for the Nation such treasures as Yellowstone, Yosemite, Mammoth Cave, Everglades, Crater Lake, Bryce Canyon, Glacier, Mesa Verde, Shenandoah, Hot Springs, Grand Teton, Platt, and Olympic National Parks, to name a few.

MORE, MORE

We rejoice in such national historical parks as Saratoga, Independence, Appomattox Court House, Morristown, and Minute Man; such national military parks as Gettysburg, Pea Ridge, Vicksburg, Shiloh, and Fort Donelson; such a national seashore project as Cape Cod; and such national parkways as the Blue Ridge, George Washington Memorial, and Natchez Trace.

We count among the Nation's treasures such national historical sites as the Adams house, the Abraham Lincoln birthplace, Fort Laramie, Fort Raleigh, Fort Vancouver, and Hopewell Village.

None of us would change their status. All of us would be horrified at the thought of their merciless commercialization—the hotdog stands and the gum wrappers—if they were denationalized. If any citizen wants to see what happens when such a national treasure as Plymouth Rock is open to exploitation, let him go to Cape Cod and see.

PORTICO HELPS

At least, a granite portico has been built around and over Pilgrim Rock to protect it from the vandals who once felt they were entitled to chip away souvenir pieces to carry home. However, the descendants of these vandals still drop their gum wrappers, popcorn boxes, and paper napkins around the Rock.

If any proof is needed that heedless man would destroy the stars if he could get his hands on them, it lies in what is left of Plymouth Rock.

We can believe that not a stick of Mount Vernon would now remain if it were not for the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, which bought it around 1858, repaired it, reassembled original Washington furniture, and has guarded the place in behalf of the Nation for more than a century.

If any of this Nation's great wilderness is to remain for posterity, if future generations are to enjoy it as we now enjoy our national parks and monuments, its preservation cannot be delayed. It is a treasure too great to be frittered away.

Now is the time to get out that ballpoint pen and write your Congressman. He has heard from the lobbies. Now, let him hear from you.

LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL SUPPORTS GI COLD WAR BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Wednesday, April 10, 1963, I commented in the Senate on the testimony presented at hearings before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on S. 5, the cold war GI bill. In those comments I complimented the able junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] and the other witnesses who appeared during the first 2 days of hearings for the fine statements which were made in support of that bill.

I was not alone in that opinion. Mr. Barry Bingham, editor and publisher of the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky, on Saturday, April 13, 1963, published a fine editorial pointing out the merits of the cold war GI bill, not only for the deserving veterans, but for the whole country, as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD, the editorial entitled "The Merits of a GI Bill for Cold War Veterans," published in the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., of April 13, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was orderd to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MERITS OF A GI BILL FOR COLD WAR VETERANS

Senator BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana, is one of the 39 Senate sponsors of a GI bill for cold war veterans. Making his first appearance in behalf of major legislation, the freshman Senator had a persuasive case for the measure, which would give a new group of exservicemen educational and vocational training aid, as well as loan guarantees and direct loans for homes and farms.

The benefits would be available to veterans of the period from January 31, 1955, to June 1, 1963. Senator BAYH noted that only 46 percent of the men in the draft-eligible age group have seen military service since the end of the Korean war. "Those not required to serve in the Armed Forces," he told a Senate subcommittee, "have had the opportunity to advance themselves educationally, professionally, and financially. It is only fair and equitable that those men who have had their lives and careers interrupted by service be compensated for that interruption."

What he is proposing has much more merit than any veteran bonus plan, which would provide, in effect, only a one-shot handout. The great advantage to the kind of legislation Senator BAYH favors is that its effects are cumulative and its benefits of lasting value to the veteran and to the country as a whole.

Senator BAYH pointed out that money spent on the new group of veterans would be returned in taxes because of the higher incomes that "almost inevitably come from a higher education." This is a supportable theory, but whether, in this sense, it would be self-financing is not the main point.

The history of similar legislation for World War II and Korean veterans makes it clear, it seems to us, that its results, in a broader sense, are in the national interest. This legislation underwrote the largest program of mass adult education the world has ever seen. There are intangibles here that cannot be measured in dollars and cents. The veterans alumni group numbers 11 million, including 460,000 engineers, 360,000 teachers, 130,000 doctors, dentists and nurses, and 150,000 scientists. Moreover, every fifth home started since the end of World War II was financed by a GI loan. This was important to the construction business, but it also was important to the psychological well-being of the millions of families who otherwise would not have been able to have a home of their own. And how much better for our social fabric to have millions of people exposed to higher education than to have them nursing festering grievances about being denied this opportunity after serving the Nation in crisis.

The country is richer because these opportunities were made available, and it could be further enriched by extending them to cold war veterans.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges, and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I strongly endorse the enactment of S. 2—of which I have the privilege to be a cosponsor—the bill establishing water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities and stimulating other water research.

This is a sound approach to what is to be the biggest problem in the future growth of many areas, including large parts of Texas; namely the need for water. My State, in parts somewhat arid, and with a fast-growing population and economy, is faced increasingly with the need for greater attention to the conservation of water. Much has been done in Texas toward water conservation; billions of dollars have been spent and will be spent toward assuring an adequate water supply.

This great expenditure for water-conservation facilities points up the curious fact that we have been relatively inattentive to the basic need of water-supply control and the need for research into the scientific problems of water conservation. At the hearings on this bill it was stated that nationwide at this time some $10 billion annually are being spent on water facilities, but that expenditures on research on the basic problems amount to only three-fourths of 1 percent of that amount. This percentage for research seems far less than that found necessary by any of our great industries to maintain progress and development within their technologies. Because of the great importance of water to us, we must increase our efforts. There are too many unsolved problems in connection with the overall problems of water scarcity, water pollution, and adequate supplies of pure water.

We know it is not enough to construct a large dam. In my region of the United States, evaporation from a large reservoir under our hot sun can mean a staggering water loss. Research has been done on the effectiveness of spreading a chemical film over the water surface of such a reservoir, but no practical solution has yet been found. This is a prime target for research, one which would be of especial interest at research centers established in the Southwest. This bill is sound in encouraging such State or regional autonomy in the selection of the research problems of great importance.

Another possible field of research likely to be of importance in my area relates to the problem of control of the phreatophytes, the water-loving plants. One type of these plants, the salt cedar, has spread through the Pecos River Valley, choking the water channels and virtually guzzling the flow of the river. It is estimated that unless these plants are checked, before the end of this century, they will be consuming the whole flow of the Pecos River.

I am pleased to be associated with the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in the sponsorship of a bill aimed at controlling that particular problem. However, his leadership in connection with the pending bill is even more to be commended, for through the research started under this bill it may be possible to discover a simpler and more economical way to prevent nonbeneficial water use by such plants.

The plan of this bill is good. It will allow the establishment of a water resource research center in each State, at a land-grant college or State university. That is the pattern which was followed in establishing our agricultural research stations, back in 1887. Let us all hope for the same result; namely, that such research, when applied to water problems, will produce in our water supply the same abundance that agricultural research has produced in our food supply. Such research centers can provide the necessary concentration of efforts and talent, especially in encouraging the training of more specialists in water problems. It is not enough to spend millions of dollars for research. Centers where students will be attracted to acquire specialized knowledge and advanced training in water studies are also necessary. At the same time, title II insures that research will continue to be done at other institutions where there are interest and capability in contributing to knowledge of our Nation's water resources.

The cost of these programs is very, very modest, when we compare it with what we spend each year for the construction of new facilities. In Texas, the study completed last year by the U.S. Study Commission recommended the construction of 30 major new reservoirs before 1975, to meet our needs. The cost of these reservoirs alone will be $563 million. Is it too much to hope that research will find a way to reduce the needed costs by 1 or 2 percent? If that happens, certainly the modest investment we make today will be one of the soundest investments it is possible to make.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the pending bill is S. 2 to establish water resources research centers at colleges and universities, and to promote a more adequate Federal program in the water research field. The bill was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

On May 20, a group of national conservation organizations will hold a dinner to honor Senator ANDERSON for his continuing national leadership in the conservation field. During his many years of service, he has promoted many efforts to achieve more adequate forest programs, public land programs, soil conservation programs, programs for the development of the mining industry, recreation, wilderness—in fact, every type of conservation of both natural resources and human resources.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I believe I would be recreant in the performance of my duty if I did not take this occasion, as the distinguished majority leader comments upon one of our colleagues, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], to say that I completely agree with the Senator's characterization of a very great American, a very distinguished citizen of his own State, and one who has served his Government both in the executive branch and now, with supreme distinction, here in the legislative Halls.

I look on CLINTON ANDERSON—if I may say this to my friend—as one of the giants in U.S. Government. I call him my friend, and I am honored to do so.

I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for 11 years—during all the years that I have been permitted by the people of my State to be a Member of the Senate. I have enjoyed my work on that committee. From time to time I have brought to the committee matters of great interest to the people of my State. I have never failed to receive full and sympathetic consideration by Senator ANDERSON—and, I may add, on many occasions, full and enthusiastic approval and assistance.

So, Mr. President, as the distinguished Democratic leader rises to pay tribute to one of our colleagues, I am grateful that he has accorded me—sitting here on the other side of the aisle—an opportunity to join him in this deserved tribute to a fine Senator, and one whom I am proud to know as a friend.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

But, Mr. President, first let me say that I agree completely with what the distinguished acting minority leader [Mr. KUCHEL] has said about the Senator from New Mexico; and I hazard the estimate that the remarks of the Senator from California would be echoed by the other 98 Members of the Senate.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to say that I concur completely in what the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority whip have said about the former chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Those of us who live in a neighboring State feel we know him even better than do the Senator from Montana and the Senator from California.

Because of the problems which develop between States, perhaps those who live in a neighboring State are not always the best judges of the true worth of a Senator from an adjoining State, inasmuch as sometimes the interests of the two States conflict. But that is not true in this case. The people of my State honor and congratulate the Senator from New Mexico for his leadership in these fields, including his leadership in connection with Senate bill 2 and other bills which already have been before the Senate and have been passed by the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico is a distinguished leader. His service as a Cabinet officer, before he became the chairman of this committee, was also of great value to the Nation. Because of his service as Secretary of Agriculture, he has outstanding knowledge of the problems of land, water, and air, and the chemical relationship between them, and also of water, its effect on the land, and the effect of environment on human beings.

So it is a great pleasure to me to state, on behalf of the 10 million people of my State, our profound regard for this distinguished leader of a most important Senate committee.

I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] in what he has just said. Both he and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] serve as members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In that assignment they are in a position to see at first hand what magnificent contributions the Senator from New Mexico has made.

Parenthetically, if we in this body have made much of a record to date, it has been because of the efforts of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the committee of which he was chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. What we have heard sounds a little like the things that are said after a man dies. Many times I have said that I expect eventually to be dead and buried, but I would like those events to happen in that order, if possible.

The statement made by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] was one of the kindest things that have been said in a long time.

I greatly appreciate his statement, because of his position on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. No man ever worked with a finer colleague than the distinguished minority whip, the able Senator from California.

I wish to say to my good friend the Senator from Texas that it is difficult to live as close to the Texanos as we do without occasionally having some differences with them. But one of the principal reasons we have gotten along so well is the great spirit of tolerance on the part of the senior Senator from Texas, which I have appreciated. I have long enjoyed his confidence. I sincerely appreciate the kind words he has said about his State, which I love almost as dearly as he does.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the edification of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, I observe that prior to my obtaining the floor, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] called attention to the activities of the Senator from New Mexico in regard to, I believe, the salt cedar problem which affects both States, and he did so in a very enthusiastic manner.

As the Senate starts consideration of the third conservation measure sponsored by Senator ANDERSON at this early date in its present session, I want to pay my personal tribute to him.

The Senate passed a bill to make the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation a fully useful, functioning agency. This bill is an outgrowth of the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission which the Senator from New Mexico successfully sponsored in legislation passed in 1958.

The Senate also passed this year, by an overwhelming 73-to-12 vote, a wilderness preservation bill to establish, for the first time in world history, a national reserve of lands to be maintained in their primitive condition for recreational, educational, and scientific values—a measure which reflects the great vision of the Senator from New Mexico as well as other Senators, like my associate, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who have long sponsored it.

The fact that S. 2, the water resources bill, is his third major measure on the floor this session is not only significant of Senator ANDERSON's energy; it is significant of a timeliness greatly appreciated by the leadership of the Senate. It is an example we may all appreciate more later in the year.

Senator ANDERSON was a member of the Select Committee on National Water Resources which reported to the Senate in 1961 that we should conduct an expanded, coordinated Federal water resources research program, and that we should prepare plans for optimum development of our great river basins by 1970.

The report did not recommend specific legislation. It stated:

> The committee hopes that appropriate legislation to implement these recommendations will be introduced in the Senate and considered by the appropriate legislative committee.

Our colleague from New Mexico does not believe that expensive and arduous studies and research jobs should be printed and the reports allowed to gather dust on shelves.

He believes that they should be implemented and that the studies as well as the river basins should yield optimum benefits.

Since the select committee report was filed, Senator ANDERSON has labored persistently on preparing, introducing, holding hearings, and passing legislation needed to implement it.

Every Member of the Senate is indebted to CLINT ANDERSON for the energy he has given and the leadership he has provided in this body in the conservation field.

Late last year he took the basin act establishing the agricultural experiment stations—which he once directed as Secretary of Agriculture—and converted that long-tested and highly successful measure from an agricultural act to a water resources research act.

As a consequence, he solved the delicate problems of the relationships in a cooperative Federal-State program by simply adopting the pattern of relationships developed in a long-established program over a period of 75 years.

The agricultural research program had its difficulties near the end of the 19th century. The State education institutions did not want Federal dictation. The Federal agencies did not want to dictate, but they wanted to weld the State stations into a coordinated program working on fundamental as well as local problems.

By conferences, give-and-take, they did work out a program which substituted Federal influence for Federal coercion, cooperation for conflict, and—as the Senator from New Mexico and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman well know—agricultural surpluses for scarcity.

The pattern on which S. 2 has been built by the Senator from New Mexico assures its success, in my judgment.

Senator ANDERSON offered his first draft of S. 2 last July. He got departmental reports, and the comments of colleges, universities, State and local officials—in fact, from everyone who had views to express. He then redrafted the first bill into S. 2, the measure now before us, reported by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee without dissent.

I express to the distinguished Senator, for myself and, I am sure, all other Senators, a sense of deep appreciation for the tireless and effective work he has done in bringing to the Senate this third major conservation bill this year.

I am delighted that conservation groups are going to honor him for his leadership in the conservation field. He richly deserves every honor given him.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the able Senator from Montana will not forget that all this work is really a product of Senate Resolution 48, which was submitted by the able Senator from Montana, and in which many of us joined. The resolution established a Select Committee on Water Resources. The Senator from Montana, with his usual modesty, declined to be chairman of the committee. Since it was his resolution, he had a right to be chairman of that committee if he had so desired. He turned over the chairmanship to our late great friend, Senator Robert Kerr of Oklahoma, who did a magnificent job in connection with that subject.

I do not desire that the record on the subject should terminate without Senators being reminded again that the able Senator from Montana conceived the idea and broached it to a conference of western Senators. The western Senators thought highly of the idea. The proposal was brought to the floor through a resolution, which was adopted by the Senate.

It was a fine piece of work. I am sure that when the Senator from Montana stops and thinks about his work, he will recognize that one of the ablest things which he has done was his sponsorship of the resolution relating to water resources, which I think has called attention to a great many serious problems and made it possible for many of us to contribute some effective work in that field.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I assure him that the reports of the committee and subsequent measures brought to the Senate after that committee had disbanded have more than justified my hopes and the interest which I showed in the beginning.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the pending business of the Senate is S. 2, the water resources research bill, on which I am honored to have 22 cosponsors from both political parties.

S. 2 has a history dating back into the 86th Congress, when a group of us, at the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader of the Senate [Mr. Mansfield], on April 20, 1959, submitted Senate Resolution 48 to establish a Select Committee on National Water Resources.

The resolution was agreed to and a select committee was chosen from among the ranking members of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Agriculture and Forestry, Public Works, and Commerce.

The late Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, was chairman of the select committee. The distinguished assistant leader of the minority [Mr. Kuchel] was vice chairman. Chairman Dennis Chavez, of the Public Works Committee, Chairman Allen Ellender, of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, and Chairman Warren Magnuson, of the Commerce Committee, served as members, while the late James E. Murray, of Montana, then chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, was an ex officio member.

It was a distinguished committee. Under the leadership of Robert S. Kerr, it did a distinguished job. Hearings were held from ocean to ocean, and from the Great Lakes States to the Gulf of Mexico, giving the committee a firsthand understanding of the variation of water problems in nearly every State in the Nation.

Outstanding students of water problems in and out of Government contributed to a series of 32 committee prints, or studies. Water resources were inventoried. The Nation's needs to the year 1980 and the year 2000 were projected for agriculture, industry, municipal and domestic water supply, recreation, fish and wildlife, dilution of wastes of all kinds, navigation, generation of power—every conceivable use.

The first region-by-region, basin-by-basin, nationwide demand-supply projections were made. These studies demonstrated conclusively that we have entered a period in which serious supply problems are going to spread across the country, from the Southwest to the Great Lakes basins and the Hudson-Delaware region by the year 2000.

We are today using 25 percent of total water runoff to meet our needs. By the year 2000 with medium population growth we will require a supply equal to 75 percent of annual runoff. It would be no great problem if the water fell where the peole live and if each of us—like Joe Bflpsk in the Little Abner cartoon strip—had a private cloud that followed us about and provided us with water. But clouds do not follow people. And rainfall is not timed to come when it is needed.

So the Council for Science and Technology, interpreting the select committee report, tells us:

> To obtain, as an assured supply, such a large fraction of the total runoff would require structures for storage, regulation, transportation, and distribution that would be far more expensive, in proportion to present structures for this purpose, than the proportionate increase in the amount of withdrawal.
>
> If surface storage were used, the required storage sites would intrude on areas already intensively occupied or needed for urban and industrial development.
>
> The total capital cost would be several hundred billion dollars and annual charges would be of the order of tens of billions.
>
> Technological and economic developments leading to marked reductions in future requirements for water withdrawals, to lowering the unit cost of water structures, and to greater utilization of underground storage are clearly desirable. Otherwise, both the economic and social costs of meeting future water needs will be painfully high.

In the face of this sort of situation, the Select Committee on Water Resources agreed that one necessary part of a national water program is accelerated research into every possibility of conserving water, stopping evaporation from reservoirs, reducing or stopping losses in transport of water, reducing cost of water facilities of all kinds, use of underground storage, waste water salvage, recycling and reuse of available supply, desalting saline and brackish water, weather modification, elimination of water-loving plants along watercourses and reservoirs—everything that might stretch or increase our water supplies.

We believed, as does the task force of the Council for Science and Technology, that water problems can be solved and billions of dollars saved by a relatively small investment in research.

The science task group said:

> Research in recent years has led to spectacular savings in construction and operating costs and to provision of structures and facilities that function more efficiently and have a longer effective life. But opportunities and needs for further research-induced economies and other benefits are now greater than ever. Expanding scientific knowledge, improved instruments for measuring and transmitting data, electronic computers for collating and analyzing data, and other technological advances have enhanced opportunities for even greater research gains than have previously existed and, thereby, for comparatively revolutionary advances in the tools and techniques of water resources development.

I happen to believe that the prediction of increasingly great research benefits are correct.

There is some evidence that in areas where provision of storage is essential so high seasonal flows can be stored and held until needed, that it may be feasible to create great underground caverns with high yield nuclear explosions at about one-third the cost of providing surface storage in reservoirs. This would also eliminate the problem of flooding land.

This will take a great deal of research. The geologists are going to have to determine the behavior of various kinds of rock under the intense pressures of a 10-megaton explosion, so the results of such shots can be forecast with some accuracy. We will need to know in advance the size of explosion needed to match capacity requirements, and whether the underground bottle will leak. It is going to take the work of engineers and economists to determine the feasibility of and best location of such storage and pumping projects.

Mr. President, at the present time a most interesting study is being made of testing this possibility of storing water in what is termed an underground bottle. The loss by evaporation in a large reservoir is surprisingly high. Several people, including a very successful businessman in the State of Texas, have suggested the use of such a bottle, using a nuclear explosion to blow out a hole in the ground.

I had the privilege of discussing this proposal with Robert Kleberg, of the King Ranch, a short time ago in San Antonio. He presented information which indicated he had given the proposal substantial study. I transmitted his suggestion to the Atomic Energy Commission and to the Department of the Interior. I look forward to the study being made.

I am not able to say that this will be a successful method of storing water. I can only say that it is a very promising method for the storage of water, which has been brought about as a result of studies made in Nevada, when the results of tests on nuclear projects were reviewed.

With greater knowledge of the basic nature of water and of the physics of the earth's atmosphere, many of us believe that weather modification will be possible, and greater yields of usable rainfall obtained from the sky in water-short areas. There is a bill before the Committee on Commerce to speed experimentation in this field, and particularly to test the practicality of cloud seeding, which is a considerably debated matter. Studies are also underway of the possibility of coaxing rain-producing storms, which move across the Nation from west to east, to make their journey a little farther south, or north, to cross areas where water is needed the most.

A breakthrough in the desalinization of water may come out of research into methods of producing large quantities of low cost energy, or heat—a major ingredient in the desalinization process. Such breakthroughs, combined with water conserving practices, improved methods of storing and transporting water, and of purification and recycling, can provide abundant water for our children and grandchildren at reasonable economic costs. But it will come about, in the opinion of every committee, commission, and task group which has studied water problems in the past decade or two, only if we greatly intensify research and the development of a much larger staff of hydroscientists.

There were 10 Democrats and 6 Republican members of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, which recommended an expanded, comprehensive Federal water research program. Six members from each party joined in the majority report. Then we had minority views, which is not unusual. These particular minority views were a little out of the usual pattern, however, because they did not disagree with the majority. They simply contended, in effect, that the majority recommendations were unrealistically conservative, and that we need to move on our water problems with greater speed and more ambitious programs than the majority had indicated.

Certainly, we have no time to lose. Serious water problems are already upon us. This Congress—the 88th—is going to have to deal with the high salinity of water delivered to Mexico from the Colorado River basin; with water supply for California and Arizona; with Chicago's need for more waste dilution water from the Great Lakes; with development of projects in the Delaware River basin and planning of the Susquehanna to help our great eastern industrial area supply itself, and a great many lesser water problems.

I have previously made two statements of the content, purposes, and rationale of S. 2.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 14, at page 202, will be found my statement upon introduction of S. 2. It includes excerpts from previous remarks on S. 3579, the bill which was introduced in 1962 and was the basis for getting departmental views and making detailed study of the proposal.

The report on S. 2 that is on each Member's desk brings up to date the background of the measure and provides a section-by-section analysis of the measure as it comes before the Senate.

S. 2 is an effort to combine research and training of needed hydroscientists. It would activate, in the water resource field, an alliance between operating agencies and educational institutions which has been strongly recommended by the National Academy of Sciences, the Council for Science and Technology, educators, and officials.

It would begin to implement the recommendations of the Select Committee on National Water Resources in the research field by establishing a research program patterned after the agricultural research and experiment station program. That program was established by the Hatch Act of 1877. It has been operating for 75 years and is an outstanding success.

We are fortunate to be able to adapt from this long-tested program a pattern for one of our water research efforts.

Mr. President, there has been no opposition to S. 2 within the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Hearings were held on it February 19 and 20. The committee had probably the most distinguished group of witnesses which has appeared before it in recent years. A panel composed of four State university presidents and the dean of engineering at Utah State University presented an organized case for the bill. The Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments supported it. A number of scientists in the water field came to Washington to add their endorsement, including Dr. Arthur Maas, of Harvard University, Omer J. Kelley, of the Stanford Research Institute in California, Dr. W. S. Bailey, of the Graduate School at Auburn University, Drs. Milton E. Muelder and L. L. Quill, of Michigan State University, and Dr. Irving Fox, of Resources for the Future.

Numerous organizations appeared in support of the bill including the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation District Officials, the National Reclamation Association, the American Farm Bureau, the Izaac Walton League, the National Wildlife Federation, and last, but far from least, the National League of Women Voters, which is a group of very effective ladies who have made water and water resources the subject of nationwide study.

A number of Senators appeared for the legislation, and I am especially pleased that this included the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who also gave the bill his endorsement in an address on the floor; Senator FONG, of Hawaii, where there is an abundance of salt water but no surplus of fresh water supplies; and Senator GRUENING, Senator MCGEE, Senator BIBLE, Senator ENGLE, Senator HART, and Senator MORSE.

This is bipartisan legislation, Mr. President, which I trust will pass this body with an impressive majority.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I rise to support the objectives and purposes which S. 2 seeks to achieve. The importance of water to our society cannot be overemphasized. Those of us who live in the West are particularly conscious of this precious commodity, and the history of the Western States will surely reflect more wars over water than any other commodity.

In Colorado, water is a vital commodity, and a scarce one as well. Where it is available, it has turned arid plains on the eastern slope into productive soil. My home in Lamar is on the eastern slope. I have lived through the droughts of the thirties and the fifties; and still carry with me memories of dry, parched soil, precious topsoil blowing away—all for lack of water. A dust bowl is not a pleasant sight.

As a practicing attorney, I have represented ditch companies and water companies over a long period of time—in fact, about a quarter of a century—and I think I know the intrinsic value of water. I have also represented many farmers and know, from their point of view, what it means to have an adjudicated right to the beneficial use of water.

In fact, I would be inclined to say, with respect to this particular bill, that there is no such thing as a water problem. There are thousands of water problems. If we approach this matter from any other point of view, we are showing a complete lack of regard for the complexities and the kind of problems we are discussing.

Water is a scarce commodity in Colorado on the eastern and western slopes. There simply is an insufficient quantity to meet all the recognized needs. Nor is the problem confined to any one State. It exists in many. Any program which attempts to deal with this deserves to be supported. There is a real need, in my judgment, not only to look to the requirements today, but to plan for the increasing demands ahead. Dr. W. E. Morgan, president of Colorado State University and chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, pointed up the problem in his testimony before our committee, supporting S. 2. He said:

> Every activity of man, every facet of industry, leaves its influence on the water resource. Water, like sunshine and air, is fundamental to life itself, and the right of the individual to enjoy unpolluted water necessary for the essentials of life and health is today more than just a license. Water is a major concern of civilized society. The story of water is the story of man. As every informed person knows, the demands upon the water resource are rapidly multiplying, and, in an area embracing nearly one-third of the United States, 1980 demands will exceed the supply.

Mr. President, just a few moments ago the distinguished author of this bill [Mr. ANDERSON] enumerated a few of the water problems which we face. I said a few moments ago that there is no such thing as a water problem—that there are thousands of water problems. I think that is an accurate statement.

I should like to cite just one small example to show how this problem can become complicated. Let us consider the use of irrigation water, for example, for a given crop. Assuming the crop is wheat, or alfalfa, or sorghum, or milo, or maize, the application of water upon a given crop in one community may require a completely different sort of approach and type of use than the water would take in another community in the same State. This fact is governed by the altitude, it is governed by the winds, it is governed by the topography, it is governed by the type of soil and land upon which the crop is planted. So that even in the farming and watering of a given crop in just one State, there can be as many as 50 or 60 problems with respect to it.

We have the problem of increasing salinity. In the Arkansas River, in my own State, there are cities in which the people are drinking water which is as bad as we are told is the water we are exporting to Old Mexico. So we have the problem of salinity with respect to producing fresh water from salt or brackish water. We have the problem of producing fresh water under treaties with other countries, such as with Mexico.

We have the problems of conserving our water, and conserving it behind high dams and in high places in the mountains. That was one of the things that gave me the greatest trouble about the wilderness bill which we passed recently, because the best and most logical place for water storage is not in the low reaches of a river, but in the high reaches of the mountains. That is where we get effective flood control, and that is where we get effective water storage.

Therefore we have to consider the matter of water erosion in connection with this subject. If we do not have control of that, of course, we lose land. Then, once having started to lose land, we lose more land by reason of wind.

There is literally no end to the separate and different problems involved in water research and our total water effort.

Water research is now being carried on, not only in the Department of Interior, which would have the responsibility for implementing S. 2, but is the subject of research by many departments and agencies of Government. The Federal Council for Science and Technology in its report to the President on water resources research, dated February 11, 1963, indicates that:

> At present, five major departments—Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior, as well as three independent agencies—Atomic Energy Commission, National Science Foundation, and Tennessee Valley Authority—conduct or support research programs in one or more fields, related to water resources.

In addition to this, it is safe to say that almost every land-grant college in the Nation conducts some research into water use. In the West they are performing a great amount of research into this effort.

It becomes important, then, to understand the nature and extent of research now being undertaken. Again referring to the report of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, I quote from page 44:

> ### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
>
> The Department of Agriculture has interests and statutory responsibilities that comprehend almost every aspect of water.
>
> The Department's responsibility in the effective use of water is evident when one considers some of the data on water use and management. The average annual precipitation on the 48 conterminous States is 4.75 billion acre-feet. The first impact of this primary water supply is on the surface of the land. The nature of vegetative cover, slope, soil characteristics, cropping patterns, and conservation practices influences whether precipitation becomes direct surface runoff, rapid subsurface flow (subsurface storm flow), deep percolation (ground water recharge), or soil moisture for evapotranspiration. About 70 percent of this total water supply presently is consumed by evapotranspiration. The remainder, about 1⅓ billion acre-feet per year, constitutes the water supply presently available to the Nation for all other purposes. And, of the portion of this water that is consumptively used as a result of man's activities, about 90 percent is used by irrigation agriculture.
>
> Authorized operational programs of the Department, carried out through nine different agencies, include (1) technical and other assistance to soil-conservation districts and individual farmers in planning and installing soil- and water-conservation programs, (2) cost-sharing assistance to farmers for specified soil- and water-conservation practices; (3) loans to individuals and water-use associations for water facilities, irrigation improvements, rural waste-disposal systems, soil and water conservation and erosion prevention, and related measures; (4) assistance to local sponsors of resource conservation and development projects; (5) assistance on rural-renewal projects; (6) planning and financial assistance and loans to local watershed organizations in planning and carrying out works of improvement for flood prevention and damage abatement, irrigation and drainage, fish, wildlife, and recreation development, and municipal and industrial water supply; (7) participation in cooperative State and private forestry programs, and management, protection, and development and proper use of the 186 million acres, in the national forests and grasslands; (8) credit and other assistance to organizations furnishing electric energy to persons in rural areas, among other things to finance construction of steam and hydroelectric generating plants; and (9) participation in comprehensive river-basin development activities.
>
> How land in farms and forest, and rangeland not in farms, are managed has a tremendous impact on the potential yield and use of water. The close association in the Department between research and action in land and water use is of great importance. Each serves the other. Action programs in the Department of Agriculture dealing with more than three-fourths of the land area in the United States are principal users—often the first users—of research results.
>
> The Department of Agriculture has broad authority to engage in research as it bears on agriculture and the programs administered by the Department. The Department may engage in research (1) directly through its own facilities and personnel; (2) through the State Agricultural Experiment Stations both by cooperation and through grants; and (3) through research grants and contracts with nonprofit institutions of higher education and other such organizations engaged in scientific research. The following agencies have water-resources research programs that are considered in this report: Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Experiment Station Service, Economic Research Service, Forest Service, and Soil Conservation Service.
>
> These programs include basic research in the natural, physical, social, and engineering sciences underlying water research. Applied-research programs include research on soil and water management, on costs and benefits of water-related programs of this and other executive agencies, and on institutional factors affecting water use.
>
> ### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
>
> Department of Commerce agencies having statutory responsibilities entailing water-resources research include the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Public Roads, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Maritime Administration, and Business and Defense Services Administration.
>
> The primary mission of the Weather Bureau is to provide a national service for reporting weather and climate—including precipitation, evaporation, and river stages—and for issuing forecasts and warnings of weather and river conditions affecting the Nation's safety and economic welfare. The reliability of prediction is a true test of knowledge; conversely, erroneous forecasts signify a need for research. Thus, the Bureau has found it necessary to pursue major research programs involving the evaluation and prediction of water movement in all phases of the hydrologic cycle. The agency would also probably have a major responsibility for operational aspects of Federal programs in weather modification, if it becomes feasible, which necessitates a research program in this field. The Weather Bureau receives a considerable portion of its funds for hydrometeorological observations and research by transfer from other agencies.
>
> The Bureau of Public Roads is involved in water-resources research to the extent necessary to provide adequate protection of the highway system and highway traffic against damage by floods and other storm hazards.
>
> The Coast and Geodetic Survey's research program in the field of water resources is largely concerned with the part played by the oceans in the hydrologic cycle. The agency's responsibilities lead it to have an interest in research on land settlement and displacement resulting from lowering of ground-water levels, erosion and sedimentation in coastal areas, estuarine oceanography and coastal engineering, measurement and prediction of tides, and problems of movement of the earth's crust. Part of the Coast and Geodetic Survey's research programs on water is funded and dealt with in connection with the Federal program for oceanographic research.
>
> The Maritime Administration includes among its statutory responsibilities certain missions that have a direct relationship to water-resources programs. Research work is sponsored in connection with development of information on salinity; pollution content of water; bottom relief and characteristics; tide characteristics, volume-discharge, and velocity of flow; flood stages and causes; current directions and velocities; and port development, industrial development along navigable waterways, and long-range planning associated with river and harbor improvements. The Maritime Administration was authorized to prepare for the operation of the atomic vessel N.S. *Savannah*. As a result, certain environmental surveys were or are being carried on by the Public Health Service, Corps of Engineers, Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Geological Survey with Maritime Administration and Atomic Energy Commission funds, relative to water circulation in harbors, harbor models, flocculating agents, salinity and pollution, and climatology of 60 selected ports; and to salt-water encroachment into fresh-water aquifers along the Delaware River.
>
> Work of the Business and Defense Services Administration becomes involved with water-resources research in connection with the agency's objective of assisting in the development of the industry and commerce of the Nation. Since industrial growth depends in part on the adequacy of water supply, the Business and Defense Services Administration conducts selected research into the economic aspects of water-resources development and the development of methods for prediction of future trends of water use in relation to economic growth.
>
> ### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
>
> The water resources program of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, has been expanded gradually in nature and scope through a series of Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Acts since its inception in 1824 by congressional action. It now encompasses a major part of the Federal activity in development of water and related land resources. The Corps of Engineers' civil works program comprises the planning, design, construction, and operation of multiple-purpose projects and systems of projects aimed at meeting the Nation's needs for better waterborne transportation; protection from storms and floods; development of hydroelectric power; conservation of water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes; abatement of pollution through river-flow regulation; and shore erosion control. At the same time its

program is aimed at satisfying the growing needs for outdoor recreation and provides for the conservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife values. The Corps of Engineers also has regulatory functions in connection with navigable waters, is responsible for emergency flood fighting and rescue work, and constructs and operates the water supply system of the Nation's Capital.

In support of these wide-ranging activities, the Corps of Engineers undertakes a comprehensive program of research and development directly oriented toward carrying out its responsibilities with maximum effectiveness and economy. Its research activities are aimed primarily at overcoming existing inadequacies of basic knowledge and development of practical techniques of basic techniques applicable to all aspects of civil works projects and project systems. Corps of Engineers research has heretofore pertained essentially to such technical fields as hydrology and hydraulics, soil mechanics and geology, structures and concrete, and electrical and mechanical equipment. There is now increasing realization that research on resources-oriented, engineering socioeconomics cannot be neglected without detriment to optimum water resources development. With the present emphasis on comprehensive, multiple-purpose, river basin system development (rather than single-purpose individual projects), the Corps of Engineers is interested in broad interdisciplinary research to provide a more intimate understanding of how to formulate and execute a well-balanced water resources program responsive to local and regional requirements and geared to national goals.

The Department of Defense conducts such other types of research and exploratory development related to water resources as are necessary in support of its military operational missions. For example, the Air Force is investigating weather-radar techniques, numerical weather prediction, and meteorological research to improve forecasting; research on basic mechanisms of clouds; and studies of improved methods of terrain assessment including water supply. Similarly, the Navy's research program in the field of water resources includes projects in meteorology, atmospheric physics, oceanography, geography, advanced-base facilities, and utilities and services. The Navy's work is supported by the Office of Naval Research, the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and the Marine Corps.

In the Army, water-related research has as its goal an increase in combat effectiveness. The Army's concern with meteorology stems from the sensitivity of its operations to current meteorological situations. Meteorological information must be ready on the spot, minute by minute. Hence, this capability must be organic to each individual Army unit. The meteorological requirements of the Army are varied and complex, ranging from the routine measurement of meteorological parameters through the computation and application of meteorological corrections for artillery fire, including the desirability of modifying weather conditions to make them more favorable for Army operations. The Army's research and development efforts on mobile weather radar are directed at improved forecasting and observation techniques for use on micrometeorological and mesometeorological scales. From the Army's trafficability and soil-mobility research may come a better understanding of the energy and water-flow systems that occur within the earth-atmosphere boundary environment. The Army Medical Service is responsible for the detection and qualitative analysis of chemical, biological, and radiological contaminants in water. It insures that water is properly treated and, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers and the Army Material Command, makes studies and recommendations on the design, selection, and operation of water-purifying equipment. It conducts research and investigates new techniques and methods for determining the treatment and disposal of sanitary and industrial wastes. The Army Corps of Engineers has responsibility for supplying water to the Army in the field. Hence, research and development are undertaken on processes and equipment for surface-water treatment and waste-water reuse, on improvements in water storage and distribution facilities compatible with new equipment for water production, on water decontamination, and on techniques and equipment for location and recovery of ground-water supplies. The Army maintains close contact with the Office of Saline Water to exploit the benefits of that Office's research. The Army's mission-related program of research in the field of snow, ice, and permafrost has contributed much to the advancement of knowledge in the water-resources field.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has basic statutory responsibilities for water resources research under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Public Health Service Act. It has responsibility to support and aid technical research related to the prevention and control of water pollution. The Public Health Service is directed to conduct, and to encourage others to conduct, research relating to disease and impairments of man, including among other subjects water purification, sewage treatment, and ameliorating pollution of lakes and streams. In carrying out its responsibilities, the Department is authorized to make available the results of research and demonstrations relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; to make grants-in-aid and contracts for research or training and demonstration projects; to provide training in pollution control to personnel of public agencies and other persons having suitable qualifications; and, upon the request of any State or interstate water pollution control agency, to conduct investigations and research and to make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view to recommending a solution for such problems.

The Department also has the responsibility, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies having related responsibilities, for collecting and disseminating basic data and other information on chemical, physical, and biological water quality in relation to water pollution and its prevention and control.

Furthermore, the Department is directed to conduct research and to develop and demonstrate means of treating municipal sewage and other waterborne wastes to remove the maximum possible amounts of physical, chemical, and biological pollutants; and improved methods and procedures to identify and measure the effects on water quality and water uses of augmented streamflows designed to control water pollution not susceptible to other means of abatement.

To carry out these responsibilities, and promote the objectives of the Department, laboratories in addition to those already existing are to be established and maintained for research, investigations, experiments, field demonstrations and studies, and training relating to the prevention and control of water pollution. Location of such a facility in each of seven major geographic areas of the United States is specified. The law states also that the facilities should be located near institutions of higher learning in which graduate training in such research might be carried out.

Research and technical development work and studies with respect to the quality of the waters of the Great Lakes are also authorized.

Two water-quality-standards research laboratories, one for fresh water and one for salt water, are provided for by Congress in the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act of 1962.

The responsibilities of the Department for preparation and development of comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of the waters of the United States, and for planning for the inclusion of storage in Federal reservoirs for streamflow regulation for water-quality control, also generate a need for research into ways of dealing with these subjects.

The basic authorities contained in the Public Health Service Act, as amended, also call for research sponsored by the Public Health Service, including research fellowships, and grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private institutions, and to individuals, with particular reference to health and medical fields.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Department of the Interior is concerned with the study of water as a resource, with the use and control of water, with increasing water supplies from all sources while at the same time serving and developing multiple-purpose uses of existing supplies, with integrated systems of river basin and watershed development, with water in the environment of fish and wildlife, and with the economic and engineering aspects of water projects of many different kinds.

Legal authority for the Interior Department's water resources research is explicit or implicit in a large number of congressional enactments, some of which are specific to particular fields of research and some of which provide for water research very broadly. It is the only Department having authority for water resources research throughout the country without limitation or relationship to specific operational problems.

The Geological Survey carries out water resources research and data collection and interpretation pursuant to the objectives of its Organic Act of March 3, 1879, which directs the examination of the mineral resources and products of the national domain, and of subsequent legislation. Specific appropriations by Congress for gaging streams and performing other functions relating to water resources have been made annually since 1894.

While the systematic collection of streamflow data that constituted the first direct water product of the arid lands work begun by the Survey in 1888 might not now be considered a research program, at the time it broke new ground in developing techniques and defining the resource, and led to the establishing of research programs in basic hydrology. The present research program of the Geological Survey includes study of water in all its forms, solid, liquid, and vapor, of its quantity and quality, and of its distribution in time and in place. It carries out its research with funds provided by Congress—matched, for large segments of its work, with funds provided by the States. Federal water resources research funds expended by the Geological Survey are augmented by State cooperative funds to the extent of about $3.5 million and $4.3 million for 1963 and 1964 fiscal years, respectively. These sums are not included in the totals shown in the tables in chapters 4 and 5. The Survey has no construction or operational responsibilities; its research programs therefore are not aimed at any particular operational program, although they produce information that lies at the foundation of all plans for the improvement of water use and control. The Survey through its broad-gage studies of geology and physiography and its particular experience and personnel makeup in water studies is especially qualified for research on water occurrence and movement in broad hydrologic systems—ground water reservoirs and related surface water bodies—and on the effect of man's activities on these systems and the principles governing their practical development and control.

Over the years, missions of the Department of the Interior have been enlarged to cover many other fields of basic and applied research in water. The Bureau of Land Management carries out research programs in some of the same fields as the Department of Agriculture, in order to discharge effectively its responsibilities for management of more than 467 million acres of public lands. Better means are needed to provide adequate water for the many beneficial uses of these public lands, and to prevent waste and assure conservative use. The development of adapted plant species that utilize water more efficiently than do the most prevalent native species is of importance, as well as the establishment of practical means of vegetative conversion to these superior plants. There is also need for more effective practices in eliminating or reducing the discharge of soil-erosional and other pollutants from public lands, and operations located thereon, to streams and water-storage facilities.

The Bureau of Reclamation was established for the reclamation of arid lands in the West. The early reclamation projects were constructed without sufficient research, and as a result some of the first settlers on reclamation projects experienced severe economic hardships, and several projects had to be abandoned. As the agency gained more experience, mistakes were corrected, and research programs were established to develop the basis for successful reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation now conducts important research in matters concerning streamflow regulation, water-quality control, evaporation and seepage reduction, and other means of increasing efficiency of irrigation; induced precipitation; control of sedimentation; and economic and other aspects of multiple-purpose river-basin development.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, having responsibilities for irrigation of Indian lands, is concerned with some of the same problems as the Bureau of Reclamation in the field of water resources. In discharging its responsibilities for the management and protection of watersheds on Indian reservations, the Indian Bureau is concerned also with many of the same problems as the Bureau of Land Management and the Department of Agriculture.

The statutory responsibility of the National Park Service for protection and regulation of national parks and monuments has led the agency to be concerned with research in various aspects of water resources in relation to recreational pursuits.

The Bureau of Mines is concerned with water-resources research because of its primary mission to assure that the Nation has a supply of usable minerals to meet its needs in war and peace. This calls for the prevention or reduction of the waste of mineral resources. Since water is one of the primary raw materials required by the mineral industry, research in the fields of water use, water quality, and water supply are of concern to the Bureau of Mines. Its activities are related to problems of the mineral industry and the national interest in utilization of mineral resources, taking advantage of appropriate research accomplished by others.

The Office of Saline Water was established by the Department of the Interior to carry out the responsibilities placed in the Department by the act of July 3, 1952, as amended June 29, 1955, and September 22, 1961. The primary objective of this legislation is the development of low-cost means for the large-scale production of potable water from saline water, and for studies and research related thereto. The exercise of this responsibility has necessitated the establishment of major water-research programs on an expanding scale.

The Fish and Wildlife Service, composed of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, was established to conserve the Nation's fish and wildlife resources. It has responsibilities for the study and protection of the fish and shellfish that inhabit the seas bordering our shores, the fish that inhabit the inland waters, and the wildlife that is part of our natural heritage. To exercise these responsibilities, the Service must be concerned with water resources, and has many programs that deal indirectly with water. To understand the life histories of these animals we must know how water influences their development, how pollution affects their existence, and how manmade changes affect their environment.

Specifically, the Secretary of the Interior, through the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to make such investigations as he deems necessary to determine the effects on wildlife of domestic sewage; mine, petroleum, and industrial wastes; sediment resulting from erosion; and other polluting substances.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

By the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and subsequent enactments, the Atomic Energy Commission is charged with the responsibility for the development, use, and control of atomic energy in such a way as to make the maximum contribution to the general welfare, defense, and security of the Nation. Specifically, the Atomic Energy Commission is directed to conduct research and development and training activities in or related to nuclear processes, theory and production of atomic energy, utilization of nuclear and radioactive materials, and protection of public health and safety in all nuclear activities. The Atomic Energy Commission is authorized also to make research and development studies in military applications of atomic energy, which also affect water resources.

Activities in the Atomic Energy Commission with respect to the control and disposal of radioactive materials have led to intensive environmental studies involving radioactivity and its effect on ground and surface waters. In connection with the application of atomic energy to improve the welfare of the Nation, the Atomic Energy Commission carries on research into the use of radioisotopes and nuclear techniques as tools for measurement and analysis, and into the development of economical power based on nuclear energy. The Atomic Energy Commission conducts research into ways of using atomic energy in attacking problems of water resources. Many of the Commission's research programs are carried on through transfer of funds to other Federal agencies, such as the Weather Bureau and the Geological Survey, that have primary responsibilities in the field. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Commission does work for other agencies in fields in which it has particular competence—for example, the work it is doing for the Department of the Interior in the field of desalination.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The National Science Foundation was created by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to promote the progress of science, to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare, to help secure the national defense, and for other purposes.

The Foundation has the specific mission of strengthening the Nation's scientific-research potential. One of the ways in which this is done is through a program of grants to stimulate basic research in all fields.

With respect to basic research, the Foundation considers all proposals, including those dealing with water-related research. Most proposals to the Foundation originate in or are sponsored by the various universities throughout the country. Because of the relatively small number of water proposals received by the Foundation, it has not been necessary or prudent to provide specialized staff assistance or a special program to handle them. Water proposals therefore go to one of several of the research programs (atmospheric sciences, earth sciences, etc.) where they compete for support with other research proposals. Except for the special field of weather modification, the Foundation has made no effort to channel funds to any one facet of water research.

Under legislation enacted July 11, 1958, the National Science Foundation has been given specific responsibility for initiation and support of a program of study, research, and evaluation in the field of weather modification. A large program of research in this field has been established in cooperation with the Weather Bureau, the Air Force, and other agencies. The weather-modification program of the Foundation supports a full range of theoretical studies and field research on the physics and chemistry of precipitation. The research is in the main experimental and characterized by a long-term, fundamental approach. However, field tests and engineering studies are vigorously pursued when basic discoveries suggest that they will be rewarding.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The Tennessee Valley Authority's research responsibilities related to water resources center around the hydrologic and economic problems arising out of the water-control and resource-development functions vested in the Authority. The Authority was created to improve navigation in the Tennessee River and to control the destructive floodwaters in the Tennessee River and Mississippi River basins in the interest of agricultural and industrial development. It is authorized to construct dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee and its tributaries for purposes of navigation and flood control, to undertake cooperative activity for the prevention of soil erosion, and to regulate the streamflow, primarily for the purpose of promoting navigation and controlling floods. In addition, the Authority is empowered to make such studies and experiments as may be necessary and suitable to aid in the proper use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River drainage basin and adjoining territory.

Mr. President, many difficult problems are involved. I shall not discuss them at this time. Suffice it to say that some eight principal agencies of the Federal Government are already engaged in research in the field of water. The report of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, which I have just completed reading, affords a superficial albeit a good look at the work which is being done in this area by the various agencies of the Government.

The report shows further that during fiscal year 1963 the total programing on all phases of water research, exclusive of amounts reported separately to the Committee on Atmospheric Sciences and Oceanography amounts to $66.327 million and that the total fiscal year 1964 budget calls for an increase of more than $10 million, for a total of $76.419 million. A total showing the breakdown on these figures by Department and Agency as well as by nature of the study appears at page 264 of the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Summary of 1963 program and 1964 budget for water-resources research

[Excludes amounts reported separately to Committees on Atmospheric Sciences and Oceanography; in thousands of dollars]

	Agriculture		Commerce		Defense [1]		Health, Education, and Welfare		Interior		Atomic Energy Commission		National Science Foundation		Tennessee Valley Authority		Total, 1963 program	Total, 1964 budget
	1963 program	1964 budget	1963 program	1964 budget	1963 program	1964 budget	1963 program	1964 budget	1963 program	1964 budget	1963 program	1964 budget	1963 program[2]	1964 budget[2]	1963 program	1964 budget		
I. Nature of water	70	70	0	58	0	0	0	0	1,995	3,500	0	0	------	------	0	0	2,065	3,628
II. Water cycle:																		
A. General	0	0	5	30	0	0	0	0	203	373	0	0	------	------	0	0	208	403
B. Precipitation [3]	514	499	322	353	168	172	0	0	213	218	0	0	------	------	43	43	1,260	1,285
C. Snow, ice, and permafrost	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	75	100	9	9	------	------	0	0	94	124
D. Evaporation and transpiration	749	769	35	65	4	3	0	0	784	849	0	0	------	------	11	5	1,583	1,691
E. Streams and lakes	398	398	52	102	112	110	0	0	1,720	2,444	0	0	------	------	224	209	2,506	3,263
F. Ground water and hydrogeology	102	102	0	0	4	3	0	0	5,304	6,495	645	475	------	------	0	0	6,055	7,075
G. Oceanic influences	30	30	5	15	0	0	0	0	50	100	0	0	------	------	0	0	85	145
H. Forecasting [3]	214	214	449	519	0	0	0	0	10	33	0	0	------	------	7	0	680	706
Subtotal	2,007	2,012	878	1,099	288	288	0	0	8,359	10,612	654	484	------	------	285	257	12,471	14,752
III. Water and land management:																		
A. Water movement in soils	946	963	0	0	0	0	229	307	15	25	0	0	------	------	0	0	1,190	1,295
B. Water and plants	775	803	0	0	0	0	14	18	40	90	0	0	------	------	0	0	829	911
C. Watershed protection	1,279	1,372	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	225	0	0	------	------	0	0	1,479	1,597
D. Water-yield improvement	992	1,098	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	16	0	0	------	------	0	0	1,038	1,114
E. Erosion and sedimentation	1,445	1,583	72	85	67	72	0	0	106	162	0	0	------	------	18	18	1,708	1,920
F. Upstream flood abatement	943	1,068	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	------	------	153	178	1,096	1,246
G. Irrigation	503	519	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	113	0	0	------	------	0	0	578	632
H. Drainage	519	529	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	------	------	0	0	521	531
Subtotal	7,402	7,935	72	85	67	72	243	325	484	633	0	0	------	------	171	196	8,439	9,246
IV. Development and control:																		
A. Water supply	114	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	310	351	0	0	------	------	9	0	424	465
B. Flood control (downstream)	80	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	250	150	0	0	------	------	13	57	343	287
C. Hydropower	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	30	30	0	------	------	0	0	50	30
D. Navigation	0	0	464	750	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	------	------	5	0	469	750
E. Urban and industrial water-use problems	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260	270	0	0	------	------	0	0	260	270
F. Recreation	30	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	0	0	------	------	10	10	53	49
G. Fish and wildlife	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,226	2,433	0	0	------	------	38	77	2,264	2,510
H. Estuarine oceanography	0	0	50	60	2	2	479	757	35	130	135	225	------	------	0	0	701	1,174
I. Coastal engineering	0	0	5	20	48	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	------	------	0	0	53	38
Subtotal	224	226	519	830	50	20	479	757	3,114	3,371	165	225	------	------	66	144	4,617	5,573
V. Qualitative aspects:																		
A. Characterization of wastes	60	60	0	0	0	0	438	493	1,237	1,900	0	0	------	------	0	0	1,735	2,453
B. Effects of pollution on water uses	0	0	50	50	0	0	643	1,007	506	989	0	0	------	------	28	43	1,227	2,089
C. Interactions of wastes	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,856	1,961	0	0	0	0	------	------	0	0	1,856	1,961
D. Disposal of waste effluents	15	16	0	10	0	0	251	259	0	0	2,055	2,109	------	------	0	0	2,321	2,394
E. Surface interactions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312	516	155	175	------	------	0	0	467	691
F. Effects of development on quality	0	0	0	0	0	0	496	574	0	0	0	0	------	------	6	26	502	600
G. Quality characteristics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	655	820	0	0	------	------	92	147	747	967
H. Aqueous solutions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,135	2,199	0	0	------	------	0	0	1,135	2,199
Subtotal	75	76	50	60	0	0	3,684	4,294	3,845	6,424	2,210	2,284	------	------	126	216	9,990	13,354
VI. Reuse and separation:																		
A. Saline-water conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,031	6,281	0	0	------	------	0	0	4,031	6,281
B. Advanced waste treatment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,230	1,348	0	0	645	640	------	------	0	0	1,875	1,988
C. Improved treatment of wastes	15	15	0	0	0	0	827	880	0	0	0	0	------	------	0	0	842	895
D. Treatment of water	26	27	0	0	0	0	426	506	0	0	0	0	------	------	0	0	452	533
E. Use of water of impaired quality	411	413	0	0	0	0	60	79	0	0	0	0	------	------	0	0	471	492
Subtotal	452	455	0	0	0	0	2,543	2,813	4,031	6,281	645	640	------	------	0	0	7,671	10,189
VII. Economic and institutional aspects:																		
A. Role of water in growth	144	170	166	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	------	------	35	19	345	357
B. Economics of development and management	343	352	0	0	78	100	114	131	814	1,290	100	200	------	------	4	8	1,453	2,081
C. Economic analysis of institutions	103	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	70	0	0	------	------	0	0	167	176
D. Area appraisals	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	33	70	100	0	0	------	------	4	0	99	133
Subtotal	590	628	166	168	78	100	139	164	948	1,460	100	200	------	------	43	27	2,064	2,747
VIII. Engineering of systems:																		
A. Design	57	60	275	245	384	426	0	0	1,010	960	0	0	------	------	0	0	1,726	1,691
B. Materiels	0	0	0	0	438	440	0	0	94	128	0	0	------	------	0	0	532	568
C. Construction, operation, and maintenance	0	0	0	0	1,076	2,460	0	0	508	639	0	0	------	------	0	0	1,584	3,099
Subtotal	57	60	275	245	1,898	3,326	0	0	1,612	1,727	0	0	------	------	0	0	3,842	5,358
IX. Manpower and research facilities:																		
A. Education and training	0	0	22	27	0	20	1,664	2,810	150	425	0	0	------	------	0	0	1,836	3,282
B. Research facilities	1,225	0	0	0	0	0	10,200	6,290	0	0	0	0	------	------	0	0	11,425	6,290
Subtotal	1,225	0	22	27	0	20	11,864	9,100	150	425	0	0	------	------	0	0	13,261	9,572
Undistributed grant program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,907	2,000	0	0	1,907	2,000
Grand total	[4]12,102	[4]11,462	[5]1,982	[5]2,572	2,381	3,826	18,952	17,453	[6]24,538	[6]34,433	3,774	[7]3,833	1,907	2,000	691	[8]840	66,327	76,419

---

[1] Includes Corps of Engineers—civil functions only. Includes only the part of estuarine and coastal studies directly related to water resources; remainder of oceanographic work included in oceanography program.

[2] Grant program cannot be distributed among categories in advance.

[3] Weather-modification program not included; it is included in atmospheric-sciences program.

[4] Totals differ from figures of $12,300,000 and $11,700,000 printed in budget because of calculating-machine error of $100,000 in each year, and of inadvertent inclusion of sums of $140,000 and $150,000 from subcategory IV-A that were already covered in other categories, in figures supplied to Budget Bureau.

[5] Totals shown here differ from those printed in budget because of redefinition of research content of programs, reflecting no increase in departmental 1963 program or 1964 allowance, after figures of $1,900,000 and $2,000,000 were supplied to Budget Bureau.

[6] Totals differ from figures of $24,800,000 and $34,900,000 printed in budget because of incorrect figures for Bureau of Reclamation included in totals supplied to Budget Bureau.

[7] Total differs from figure of $4,000,000 printed in budget, which was derived by rounding upward an erroneous total of $3,958,000 reported to Budget Bureau.

[8] Figure of $900,000 printed in budget was rounded downward from agency asking of $944,000; Budget Bureau allowance of $840,000 received too late for correction of figure supplied for printing in budget.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the figures in the table speak for themselves. However, to me it is significant that when all of the water research and development work that has been gathered together in the various departments is analyzed in light of the table, it will be found that we are now planning to spend for fiscal year 1964, $76,419,000 for research in the use of water.

S. 2, would establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities and would also provide additional funds, available to the Secretary of the Interior, to encourage research on all phases of water problems. The bill establishes a permanent program which, at the maximum, would require expenditures of $20 million annually. This $20 million is not in place of anything which is now being spent, but is in addition.

My concern is chiefly with the establishment of a permanent program at the outset. It is difficult, in fact impossible to tell how such a program will function, whether it will fill a need, whether it will overlap significantly work presently being carried on elsewhere. I feel certain that much of the work proposed by the bill to be done at colleges will, in fact, overlap work which is presently being financed by the National Science Foundation in those particular areas. For this reason I propose that a limitation of 5 years be placed on the program, in order that Congress can then satisfy itself as to the success being encountered. Frankly, I hesitate to encourage potential participants in this program to look too far down the road, as this bill does, until we have a record to examine.

As matters now stand, the money in S. 2 is subject to appropriation, and although a permanent program, it would be terminated simply by Congress failing to provide the necessary moneys. This is an uncertain status in which to place these potential participants. It seems to me that the wiser course to follow is one which places a limitation at the outset with the understanding that, if a justification exists, this limitation can be lifted at the end of the trial period. To this end, amendments which I submitted earlier, Nos. 50, 51, and 52, and which I intend to offer, would place a 5-year limitation on all three phases of the bill. These amendments would have been offered during committee deliberations on S. 2. However, an emergency situation prevented my attendance at the time.

I observe in the Chamber the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the acting chairman of the committee at that time. He is also the author of the bill. What I have said concerning the offering of the amendments is no reflection upon him. He has now had copies of my amendments for about a week and is fully aware of their content. Had it not been for an emergency, and had I been able to attend the executive session of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when it considered S. 2, the amendments would have been offered at that time. I say this because objection is often raised on the floor of the Senate by asking why amendments were not offered in committee prior to their being offered on the floor. I can only say that because of an emergency the amendments were not offered by me in committee.

I have done my best to inform the chairman of the committee of my purpose and my intent; and in the regular course I shall offer the amendments.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to confirm what the Senator from Colorado has said. Because of an emergency, he was required to be away from the committee. On Thursday, he did provide copies of the amendments; and I am glad to confirm what he has said.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I have no criticism of him for the failure to consider the amendments at that time. The situation which developed was unavoidable, and was not his fault, nor was it mine.

Five years would seem to be sufficient time in which to have the research projects begin to bear fruit. At the end of that period we shall have an adequate history upon which to make an informed judgment on the questions which, today, have no ready answer. I trust that the Senate will concur, and will adopt these amendments.

Mr. President, tomorrow I shall discuss the amendments at some length.

As an example of what I believe the bill will do—although I am sure it is not the intention of the Senator from New Mexico that the bill will do this—let me refer to section 100(a), of title I, on pages 2 and 3 of the bill, which authorizes the appropriation, for the fiscal year 1964 and subsequent years, for distribution to a college or university in each State and Puerto Rico, of "a sum adequate to provide $75,000 to each State in the first year, to be increased by $12,500 each succeeding fiscal year for 2 years and to continue at $100,000 thereafter, for the purpose of establishing a collegewide or universitywide water resources research institute, center, or equivalent agency."

But in subsection (b), on page 3, we find this provision:

> (b) There is further authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior in the fiscal year 1964 the sum of $1,000,000, increasing by $1,000,000 each year for four years to $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1968 and thereafter, which the Secretary of the Interior may use to match, on a dollar for dollar basis, funds made available to State water resources research institutes or centers by the States or other non-Federal sources.

I believe the "non-Federal sources" would certainly include the same universities dealt with in subsection (a) "to meet the necessary expenses of water resources research projects."

And so forth. I believe that, in all likelihood, Congress would continue the grants under subsection (a), but that at the end of the 5 years Congress might decide that it would be more feasible and more desirable for some other agency to utilize the $5 million which now are proposed to be authorized for appropriation to the Secretary of the Interior, to be used for this purpose.

Tomorrow, I shall seek to have corrections made in various other items. Those amendments are chiefly mechanical in nature.

Title II provides:

> SEC. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1964, increasing $1,000,000, annually for five years, and continuing at $10,000,000 annually thereafter from which he may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions; with private firms and individuals; and with local, State, or Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior, which may be deemed desirable and are not otherwise being studied.

As I read the provisions of the bill—and I believe I have a correct understanding of the English language—these provisions are to a great extent duplicative. I believe this provision of title II is to a great extent duplicative of the provisions of subsection (b), on page 4.

Tomorrow I shall go further into these matters.

It seems to me foolish to commit ourselves to an open-end authorization forever, when we are not certain that we shall wish to continue it forever.

I hope I shall persuade the Senator from New Mexico to see the light and to take the high road. In answer to my criticism, undoubtedly, it will be said, "If we do not like it, at the end of the 5 years we can revoke these provisions."

But, Mr. President, such a course is never taken; and at the end of the 5 years, the impetus to develop our water resources and to engage in research in that connection will be very great. So let us pass a 5-year authorization bill, and begin that work in a sound manner; and as the program develops let us ascertain how the Secretary of the Interior handles the other two grants made to him, with which he will have almost a free hand. If we then do not like the results, at the end of the 5 years we certainly can pass a new authorization bill. Undoubtedly there will be no difficulty in doing that for any portion of the program which is found to be desirable and good.

In my opinion, the part of the bill which relates to the developmental and research work at land-grant colleges and universities will be the only part which will really pay off in a large way. That is true because particularly in the West, where water has been a pressing problem, beginning with the very first settlements, the people know the importance of water, and have engaged in long-time research programs in regard to the use of water, its conservation, the prevention of water erosion, and similar problems. This work has been going on for years.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that the part of the bill which relates to developmental and research work at the land grant colleges and universities will pay off the most, because essentially the other provisions of the bill will duplicate to a certain extent the work of the National Science Foundation, although we would be placing the work in charge of the Secretary of the Interior. So I have my doubts about section 200.

We know that the work under title I must be done. So let us do it, and then examine the entire work done at the end of the 5 years. If that is done, I assure Senators that the part of the bill which I think will pay off—I refer particularly to the part in connection with the land grant colleges—will, if necessary, be renewed and reenacted at that time. As to the balance of the program, all of us will be the beneficiaries by not permanently placing on the statute books legislation which probably has no real need to be there.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the most pressing of all our resource problems is that of water. The situation is already acute, with actual scarcity threatening some areas of the country.

Because of the magnitude of this problem, I intend to support S. 2, the Water Resources Research Act. This will be a modest program, but I believe it is an important step toward insuring that the water needs of the American people will be met in the years ahead.

I am especially pleased by the decentralized way in which this water resources program will be set up. S. 2 authorizes $75,000 per year to a land-grant college, State university, or other institution of higher education in each State, at the discretion of the State, to establish and maintain a water-resources research institute or center. This is based on the highly successful agricultural research stations at land-grant colleges and State universities.

It assures that each State will be able to establish a water-research center, where attention can be focused on the water problems peculiar to a State or area. A few comments about my State should illustrate how important and eminently reasonable this State-by-State approach is.

Connecticut is a highly urbanized State, with a substantial amount of industry. The solution of our water problems does not lie in moving large quantities of water hundreds of miles, as, for example, from northern California to the southwestern part of that State.

In my State, we need research in pollution abatement, so as to develop improved methods for the treatment or control of the waste materials that are disposed of in water.

We need better ways to salvage waste water.

We need more insight and knowledge about the reuse, recycling, and the elimination of wasteful water use by industry and by urban areas.

It would be helpful to learn how to reduce evaporation from the surface of reservoirs.

These areas of study will benefit Connecticut and other States in a similar position. California and other Western States, with their vast geography, can at the same time concentrate on their own immediate problems.

One further field of study, which holds great promise for the alleviation of a future water shortage, is the desalting of saline or brackish water. Connecticut, as an eastern seaboard State, will no doubt want to go into this area of research, to help with its local needs. And this would be to the benefit of the rest of the United States and to other countries as well. Under the water resources research program, my State could look in depth into the possibilities of desalting water.

Several years ago, Connecticut and the other five New England States negotiated a northeastern water and related resources compact, so that a cooperative, areawide effort could be made to study and work out the best ways for the six States to assure an adequate water supply in the years ahead. To date, four of the State legislatures have ratified this compact, and I intend to reintroduce shortly a bill to give congressional consent to this interstate agreement.

The northeastern compact and the Water Resources Research Act have the same objective in mind, to assure a continued abundance of water, and the two, once operative, should complement each other nicely.

In fact, S. 2 would allow two or more States to designate a single interstate or regional research institute or center. This is a possibility that the State officials may want to look into and consider, in connection with the compact.

Each year the American people spend $10 billion on public and private water facilities. It is estimated that during the 16-year period between 1959 and 1975, $171 billion will be spent for these facilities. Against this background, the cost of the research bill we are debating today is indeed modest.

For the first year, the total cost of S. 2 would be just under $10 million. Once it is in full operation the annual expenditure of Federal funds would be around $20 million.

I am sure that the benefits we will receive from these research centers and the programs of matching grants for research by the centers and by other educational institutions, private foundations and business, and by individuals, will be worth many times our investment.

I hope the Senate will pass S. 2, and that the House, too, will take favorable action at an early date.

I observe that my colleague [Mr. RIBICOFF] is the Presiding Officer of the Senate at present. We are all familiar with his great and continuing interest in the problem of air pollution. But he has also been a leader in our State in the fight to rid our waters of pollution as well. It is a pleasure for me to join with him in the Senate in the struggle to clean up our streams and rivers and reserve an adequate water supply for our people.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the kind things which have been said about the senior Senator from New Mexico, and the leadership he has provided in the conservation field, have been very much deserved.

It was my privilege to serve on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during his chairmanship in the 87th Congress. It was a privilege for, under his leadership, the committee has purposefully approached major conservation issues and attempted to implement programs which would deal with them wisely.

Since 1958, when he successfully sponsored the bill establishing the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the Senator has kept recreation matters moving. A long stalemate in the development of parks has been ended. We have authorized a number of new areas in the past 2 years and we are now in the process of implementing on a nationwide basis, a thoughtful, forward-looking program to provide needed Federal, State and local recreation facilities, including a Wilderness Preservation System, seashores, and some magnificent new national park areas.

The Senator had a leading role in the enactment of a helium conservation program before many knew how important this rare element was becoming in our new technology.

Under Senator ANDERSON's guidance, effort is being made to keep the Nation abreast of its water problems not only through research, as proposed in the pending legislation, but by getting an adequate water resources planning program underway.

The Senator's energy and initiative have made him a very successful citizen in private business. He has worked at his public tasks just as assiduously, both to the great benefit of his State, and to the great benefit of the Nation.

Things which have been said of him here today, and will be said at the dinner in his honor May 20, are well deserved and even more.

In proposing and pressing the pending water resources research bill, the senior Senator from New Mexico has outdone himself and brought about what I regard as a miracle.

Last week, the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate received a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States which is unprecedented in my experience in Congress, which dates back to the 83d.

For the first time in my experience, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has agreed that a new Federal program, entailing Federal expenditures, is needed and would serve a useful purpose. They do not quibble over a penny of the money to be appropriated.

Of course, the chamber wants amendments to S. 2—amendments which I regard as unnecessary or unwise—but that was to be anticipated. The really significant thing about the chamber of commerce letter is its agreement that S. 2 has merit. I want to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what, to me at least, are some historical sentences. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has written me:

> Additional research, investigations and experiments in the field of water and related resources are needed to help meet the water demands of future generations. The training of additional scientists to conduct such activity is vital.
>
> The stimulation of more research effort at industrial, State, and local levels and the training of additional scientists by the States and other agencies are the most satisfactory methods of achieving greater knowledge about water because they would minimize unwarranted Federal research activity, providing a preferable alternative to the expansion and duplication of federally conducted research effort.

> The Chamber of Commerce of the United States supports S. 2 subject to the amendments suggested hereafter.

I recognize that the endorsement of S. 2 has reservations. I want to deal with them, so the Senators may know that they are making no mistake to adopt S. 2 as it has been reported to the Senate.

First, however, I want to congratulate the senior Senator from New Mexico for having proposed the first new Federal program, involving an expenditure of funds, which, in my experience, at least, has received that sort of endorsement from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. And I want to congratulate the chamber for going as far as it did.

Chambers of commerce in my home State of Montana, I am proud to say, have frequently suported desirable programs in past years. A number of them have given intelligent support to the programs for farmers. A number of them have endorsed proposals in the recreation field. In several instances they have taken progressive positions on measures which the chamber here in Washington has opposed.

Occasionally I have observed that other western chambers were becoming a little more progressive. It pleased me recently to see that the Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce has given support to S. 859, the Land and Water Conservation Fund bill to implement a national recreation program, subject to a couple of amendments on distribution of funds which, while very important, are technical rather than fundamental. The fundamental principles and purposes of the bill were given support—just as the chamber of commerce of the United States has now, for the first time in my experience, given support to the fundamentals of proposed national legislation involving a new Federal program.

I want to discuss the amendments proposed to S. 2 by the chamber because there are pending several amendments, offered by the senior Senator from Colorado, some of which parallel the chamber's suggestions.

The first proposal is to amend the preamble of the bill to state that one of its purposes is to reduce the need for expansion of Federal water research agencies and activities.

S. 2 will have that effect. It will avoid the necessity of Federal laboratories handling a great many practical, local water problems. It will bring into water resources research non-Federal matching funds and non-Federal personnel—scientists in colleges and universities, foundations, and private life—who will undoubtedly make a great contribution in both practical and fundamental research if given the opportunity.

But there will remain water problems of national significance, as Senator ANDERSON has been careful to point out, which require major laboratories and major test facilities—and I am thinking in terms of saline water conversion, weather modification and aspects of pollution control—in which Federal expenditures will need to be increased. There is a possibility that we can provide underground storage for water, which avoids loss from evaporation and flooding of lands, at a fraction of reservoir costs, with atomic explosives. Development of this potentiality will necessarily have to be a Federal project.

So it would be a mistake, in my judgment, to put language in S. 2 that might later be interpreted as a declaration that need for expanded Federal research in the water resources field was being eliminated by S. 2. We should adopt the bill and actually reduce the demand without encumbering the measure with phraseology subject to later misinterpretation.

The chamber's second suggestion is for an amendment to assure that there will be optimum utilization of existing water research facilities located in the individual or several States before any new water research agency or center is assisted.

A study of water resources research underway around the country made by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, showed that every land-grant college or university in the Nation, except possibly in Connecticut the home State of the Presiding Officer where the experiment station is a separate institution, is doing water research. Each has a water resource facility of some sort. There are scores of facilities in other institutions ranging from one-faucet laboratories to a multiple-faucet laboratory with electronic computers in other institutions.

The very well intended suggestion of the chamber would lead to more debates over interpretation than results. What is a facility? What is a center? What is optimum utilization? I am happy to see that no such amendment has been offered.

A third suggestion of the chamber of commerce is that an advisory board of "qualified, top level scientists other than Federal employees" be given the power to allocate basic support funds under section 100(a) and to advise the Secretary whether certain water research efforts will contribute to a comprehensive, nationwide water related resources research program.

S. 2 provides, at section 300, that the Secretary of the Interior shall arrange for the regular advice and cooperation of all Federal agencies, of State and local governments, and of private institutions and individuals, in the administration of the program. It would be highly unwise, in my opinion, to exclude the fine scientists—some of the finest in the world, who have dedicated their lives at modest salaries to public service with Federal agencies—from the Secretary's council. It would be both improper and unwise to delegate the power to allocate and direct the expenditure of Federal funds to a group which has no responsibility to the Federal Government.

It is always difficult for me to understand the sort of prejudice against anyone who works for the Federal Government reflected in such a recommendation. Each of us in the Senate of the United States is a Federal employee—a part of the Federal Government. I do not believe that entering upon Federal service somehow automatically robs a man of all competence. I cannot believe that the Senate will for a moment consider an amendment that carries such an implication.

The most dangerous amendment suggested by the chamber of commerce, and I regret that such an amendment has been placed before us, is a proposal to put a termination date on the S. 2 program.

Mr. President, the ability of the senior Senator from New Mexico to diagnose and analyze problems, and get to the core of them, is nowhere better reflected than in S. 2's proposal of continuing program of Federal support of water resources research at non-Federal centers of competence.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has for some time sought to place research contracts in the water pollution field at colleges and universities.

Last fall, Mr. Leonard B. Dworsky, assistant to the chief of the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control at HEW, appeared at a symposium on social and economic research at Portland, Oreg., and complained a little about their experience. He said:

> The universities are best geared to assume the major role of research in water pollution control needs. With isolated exceptions, however, there is little effort, little interest, and seemingly little understanding at the university level of these needs.

In contrast, S. 2 has created a great deal of interest on the part of universities in water research.

A panel of four State university presidents and the dean of engineering from Utah State University appeared at our hearings on S. 2 to endorse its passage. Other volunteer witnesses came from Michigan, Auburn, Harvard, California and elsewhere. There have been many enthusiastic letters of endorsement.

The difference between the HEW's disappointing experience, and the response to S. 2, lies in the assurance of continuity which S. 2 carries—a repeat of the now 75-year-old agricultural research program.

Dr. W. B. Morgan, president of Colorado State University, who is chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, has described the importance of continuity to us as follows:

> Colleges and universities cannot afford to build and equip laboratories and rearrange curriculums to accommodate a short-term program. Top scientists in disciplines related to water resources—physics, engineering, geology, botany, silviculture, meteorology, economics and many others—are not easily persuaded to specialize in water problems if there is the threat of termination of the principal program in the field. They look for specialties in which they may find a lifetime career. Neither can students be persuaded to spend many years in graduate training for work which may be stopped before they complete their training. The assurance of continuity which S. 2 provides is one of the basic strengths of the bill. Provision is made at section 305 for a comprehensive review at the end of 5 years. Congress can itself review the results of the work whenever it deems it appropriate. The

adoption of the suggestion (for a termination provision) would be especially injurious to the bill.

Dr. Wayne Reitz of the University of Florida has commented to the author of S. 2:

> To establish a definite termination date would mitigate against a State developing sound and farsighted programs for research in this important field. Had termination dates been provided for agricultural research, we would never have made the progress that has been made.

Mr. President, S. 2 has ample provision for review. That provision carries with it a notice to the participants in this program that results will be expected. But S. 2 does not carry a threat of termination which would stifle the project before it got started.

If we put a 5-year termination in S. 2, we are in reality postponing for 5 years the opportunity to have an effective program. Many colleges, universities and needed scientists and students will undoubtedly wait to see if the program is to be renewed and continued before they dedicate their assets and their careers to the water research field.

Finally, Mr. President, the chamber of commerce has asked that sections 302 and 303 be eliminated. They authorize a Water Resources Service in the Department of the Interior to administer the S. 2 program, and 5 positions in that Bureau, in addition to the usual number, at a grade above civil service grade 15.

Many of us regularly oppose statutory direction or authorization of a subordinate agency in a department. The Cabinet Secretaries have authority to develop their own organizational patterns. They can establish bureaus and services as they feel the need.

The S. 2 provision is not mandatory. It authorizes a service.

There are both internal and external reasons why the provision for a service is appropriate in S. 2.

There are several agencies in the Department of Interior concerned with water resources. They would not be very alert, ambitious, or aggressive if they did not each want jurisdiction over the new S. 2 program, or at least a part of it. There will be pressure within the Department of Interior to assign the administration to a single existing agency, with a limited mission in the water resources field, or to segment it among several such agencies and thereby make it a disorganized operation by limited mission agencies.

In accordance with strong recommendations of our own Select Committee on Water Resources, of the National Academy of Sciences and other agencies which have studied the water research problem, S. 2 calls for a broad, multidisciplinary approach to water research.

It wisely calls for collegewide or universitywide institutes or centers at the State level, so no single discipline will dominate and narrow the approach to water problems at State level.

We must have that same broad, multidisciplinary approach at the Federal level—a single agency which looks at water from the viewpoint of all sciences and disciplines, not a single, narrow one.

The external pressure which the Department will feel in regard to administration of the program is exemplified in the chamber of commerce letter itself. It says:

> Existing bureaus and services within the Department of the Interior should be assigned the responsibility of administering the programs that would be authorized by this legislation. * * *

Here again, from the outside, is the pressure to segment and disperse responsibility for the program, so it will become a group of limited mission programs rather than a broad approach.

Since section 302 only authorizes a water resources service, it in reality amounts to a strong expression of the belief of Congress that a single, new broad agency should handle administration, which is certainly desirable.

There is an unusually high relationship between the competence of people who run research programs and the results, or returns, from those programs. Highly trained, alert, and ingenious men can make research dollars repay investment hundreds of times over. No amount of money can produce results from a staff which lacks competence to do research work.

The provision for five extra positions in the water resources service at salaries which will attract and hold competent men will undoubtedly prove a very wise investment.

Mr. President, I regret that the chamber of commerce did not have a witness at the hearing on S. 2. I believe that we might have persuaded them, or they might have been persuaded by other witnesses, that the suggestions they have made are either sufficiently provided for in the bill, or would work to its detriment.

But, in any event, Mr. President, the most significant fact about the chamber is that it has, in this instance, approved a new Federal program.

The chamber has not quibbled about the expenditures proposed.

It has not objected to the formula Senator ANDERSON has given for basic support to State research centers, supplemented by two matching funds which will increase over 5 years to a total of $15 million per year.

I want to congratulate the Chamber of Commerce of the United States for recognizing the basic merit of S. 2, and to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico for presenting us a proposal so obviously right that it has won this unusual approval.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, every time a measure which implements recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources takes a stride closer to enactment, I feel there should be rejoicing in the arid sections of the West and Southwest, because our very future is tied up in the extent to which we can husband our water supply—can increase and make better use of the water we have.

This bill before us today, S. 2, would help fulfill the third recommendation made by the Water Committee—the recommendation calling for a greatly expanded and comprehensive Federal program of scientific research on water, probing ways both to increase our supply and to increase the efficiency of the use of available water. And it would do this in a most practical and effective way in that it would, in many cases, strengthen research already established and staffed in many of our land-grant colleges and universities, or in other competent institutions of higher education in many States. In others it would provide a modest beginning, which we hope would attract other funds.

It was my privilege to serve on the Water Resources Committee and although I knew previously in general the outlines of our coming water shortage, my service on that committee has intensified my interest in legislation to head off our impending water bankruptcy.

Full development of all available water supplies will be necessary if we are not to be deficient in meeting consumptive water requirements by 1980 in five major river basins or areas: The South Pacific area, the Great Basin area, the Rio Grande-Pecos, the Lower Colorado and the Upper Missouri River Basin. I would point out that my State of Utah lies astride two of these water deficient basins—the Great Basin and the Lower Colorado River Basin.

Another three great water areas will be at the limit of their supplies, with full development by the year 2000. This group includes the western Great Lakes area composed of Michigan, northern Indiana, most of Illinois, and eastern fractions of Wisconsin and Minnesota. It also includes the western gulf area in Texas, and the upper Arkansas-Red River Basins involving major parts of Colorado, Kansas, and Oklahoma, and smaller sections of northeastern New Mexico and northern Texas.

Briefly, by the year 2000 the western half of this Nation excepting the Upper Mississippi, the immediate Mississippi River drainage area, the Lower Missouri and the Columbia River Basins will have come to the end of present available water resources.

Nor will the rest of the Nation escape the water shortage—by the year 2000 they will also be trying to conserve purify, recycle, and transport water to points where needed, and their investments in water facilities could run well over $10 or $15 billion a year.

So this is not just a regional problem. It is one all of us must solve, and this bill before us today takes a giant step in that direction.

The 50 water research centers which this bill would establish in universities or colleges, and for which it would authorize $100,000 each a year, would be ideally located and suited to passing on to water users the fruits of their research.

Dr. D. F. Peterson, dean of engineering at the Utah State University, who testified in behalf of the bill, made an excellent statement on the capability of colleges and universities to make available the knowledge resulting from work done in this field. Although Dr. Peterson's statement has been summarized in the very well prepared report on this bill—Senate Report 117—I would like to repeat parts of it for emphasis. He stated:

> Many of the problems of applied research will have to be attacked item by item, location by location. Water resources development must be closely linked to community and even individual objectives and I believe the State research efforts will greatly assist the States in discharging their responsibilities in planning and development.
>
> Bringing the universities into the picture has many advantages besides the production of increased manpower. Universities since World War II have demonstrated their capability in administration of research. The interdisciplinary resources of the university should accelerate the progress of basic and interdisciplinary research. In the university, research and teaching work together not only to develop the body of new knowledge, but with the same effort to spawn the manpower capability which can carry the new knowledge to common practice.

Dr. Peterson is well equipped to make such observations. Utah's land grant college, Utah State University, is already far advanced in the development of a water research institute—the Utah Water Research Laboratory. The Utah State Legislature has appropriated substantial amounts for it, and during the past 2 years two Federal grants of $200,000 each were obtained for the Logan laboratory, one from the National Science Foundation and one from the National Institutes of Health. The laboratory is now a going concern, and is in a strong position not only to soundly expand its research activities through the additional funds which would be made available through passage of this bill, but to provide the research facilities and instruction necessary to train some of the water scientists which will be needed in States and areas just inaugurating water research programs.

The Utah State University is also the location of a new Forest Service Watershed Research Laboratory for which facilities are now being constructed, and for which funds were appropriated in the 87th Congress. These facilities should be ready for use in about a year, and they will contribute to the growing reputation of the university as a water center.

It has been most satisfying to me to have a part in securing the additional Federal financing for the State water research laboratory and to work with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in establishing the watershed research laboratory at USU, just as it has been my pleasure to cosponsor S. 2 and support it in committee and here on the floor.

So I say with great earnestness that this is one of the most significant bills on which we will have an opportunity to act this session. It is important to all of us in all sections of the country—only through basic research can we increase our available supply of water and make the most efficient use of what we now have. I trust that this bill will pass.

PRIORITY TO ELECTRIC CONSUMERS IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST TO ENERGY GENERATED AT HYDROELECTRIC PLANTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 100, Senate bill 1007, to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the request of the Senator from Montana, it is that the pending business be temporarily set aside and that the bill, the title of which has been read, be placed before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill S. 2 would be temporarily set aside for consideration of the bill S. 1007. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. For the RECORD, so that the situation will be clear in the RECORD for Senators to see tomorrow, it is my understanding that the bill S. 2 would be temporarily set aside so that the distinguished author of the bill S. 1007, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], may speak concerning it. No votes of any kind on the measure are contemplated today. At the end of whatever discussion may ensue on the bill S. 1007, the Senate will return to consideration of Senate bill 2.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Tomorrow. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, S. 1007, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, is similar to S. 3153, passed by the Senate on August 8 of last year. It differs from S. 3153 in that two clarifying amendments suggested by Governor Hatfield of Oregon have been added to the bill.

The purpose of this bill is to define the primary marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration and permit the orderly marketing of surplus or seasonal hydroelectric power outside Bonneville's present marketing area.

The Northwest is unique in generating 97 percent of its electricity by water power. The area has had for many years and will continue to have large surpluses of seasonal or dump power, that is, power which is available when streamflows are normal but is not available in critical water years. At the present time, billions of kilowatt-hours of this power and millions of dollars of revenue are being wasted in water spilled over the great power dams of the Northwest. A market for this surplus power is available in the Southwest, principally in California.

At the time of the passage of the Bonneville Power Act in 1937, Bonneville's marketing area was defined as that area within "economic transmission distance." Transmission distance then was limited by technology to approximately 200 miles. With the technological developments of recent years, it is now possible to transmit power thousands of miles. As a result, with the surplus seasonal power in the Pacific Northwest and a marketing need for such power in the Southwest, it was inevitable that there would be proposals to construct a high-voltage interconnection or intertie linking the Pacific Northwest to the Pacific Southwest and permitting the sale of Pacific Northwest surplus power. The early construction of such an interconnection was recommended by a special task force of the Department of the Interior. Subsequently the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Pacific Power & Light Co. announced plans for a 110-mile 230,000-volt interconnection between southern Oregon and northern California, capable of being stepped up to a total voltage of 550,000 volts. Recently, at the request of the House and Senate Appropriation Committees, the Bonneville Power Administration circularized the utility industry of the west coast to determine the extent of interest among non-Federal utilities in the construction and use of such an intertie. To date Bonneville has received seven proposals for non-Federal construction of all or parts of two intertie lines.

This bill, like last year's bill, contains no authorization for a Federal intertie. Existing statutes authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct such a line. This bill does facilitate the fullest practical use of an intertie whether it is built by the Federal Government or by non-Federal public or private utilities. It provides for the sale in the Pacific Southwest of existing Northwest surplus energy and any additional surplus energy which may be installed. It provides for transmission north of energy made available in the Southwest to firm up a portion of the Northwest's secondary energy, thereby making optimum use of the plant facilities in both regions. This is possible because the Northwest's electric consumption has a winter peak and the Southwest's electric consumption has a summer peak. It will be possible by maximum use of the resources of both regions to save new plant investment greater than the cost of any intertie, with resulting economies to electric users in both regions.

Whatever form an intertie may take, it is necessary to define the primary marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration and to establish by law the ground rules for transfers of power between that marketing area and other regions. This legislation meets that need. Under this legislation an intertie could not be used to sell outside a region year-round firm hydroelectric power generated by the Federal Government in that region. Firm power is power that could be produced if the most critical river flow on record should reoccur. It is power absolutely essential to the region. None of the intertie proposals and none of the users of the proposed intertie has asserted that year-round firm hydroelectric power for which there is a demand in a region should be sent outside that region. Yet if an intertie is built without the orderly ground rules for transfer of power set up by this proposed legislation, it would be possible to require such a shipment of needed firm power with disastrous economic consequences to long-established industries and private utilities. S. 1007 expressly permits the Bonneville Power Administration to sell surplus electric energy and peaking capacity outside its described marketing area subject to recall when such electricity is needed within the marketing area.

The marketing area described in S. 1007 was selected because it makes economic sense. It would comprise some 259,000 square miles and would be one of the largest marketing areas of any electric utility system in the United States. By comparison, the marketing area established by Congress for the Tennessee Valley Authority is about one-third the area described in this bill.

This bill has been drafted by the Bonneville Power Administration with great care in consultation with all of its customers, public agencies, private utilities, and private industry, and the Governors of Washington, Oregon and California.

I add that the bill is being sponsored by all the Senators from the Pacific Northwest.

In summary, S. 1007 should be enacted:

First. Because it will help end a shocking waste of resources. In 1962 $23 million of unsold surplus power were lost over the spillways in the Pacific Northwest; this is the equivalent of 20 million barrels of oil wasted.

Second. It will provide for the orderly transfer of large quantities of power between the regions of the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest with great savings to the electric consumers of both regions.

Third. It will provide for the sale of such surplus power without disastrous and indefensible economic consequences to private investment and employment which might otherwise occur.

Mr. President, these are only some of the compelling reasons for the enactment of S. 1007.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE UNITED STATES-UNITED NATIONS POLICY IN THE CONGO

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, when I had occasion to address the Senate a month or so ago I pointed out the substantial success of the United States-United Nations policy in the Congo. I invited attention to how wise the policy of our President and of our State Department in that area had been, as a result of which the Congo had been pacified under the leadership of the United Nations and peace reestablished there under the leadership of Premier Adoula.

Recent newspaper accounts indicate that, despite the criticism of many in this country and elsewhere—criticism by those who felt we should not have supported the United Nations; criticism by those who supported Mr. Tshombe and his white mercenaries in Katanga—peace and parliamentary government are making substantial progress there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in this morning's New York Times, entitled "Congo's Regime Wins First Test," under the byline of J. Anthony Lukas, written in Leopoldville, may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congo's Regime Wins First Test—Adoula's New Government Beats No-Confidence Move

(By J. Anthony Lukas)

Leopoldville, the Congo, April 21.—Premier Cyrille Adoula's new "Government of National Reconciliation" has defeated the first challenge by the die-hard opposition in Parliament.

After a noisy 7-hour debate that ended late last night, government supporters in the senate defeated a nonconfidence motion against the cabinet. The vote was 31 to 20 with 4 abstentions.

The margin indicates that Mr. Adoula's new coalition, formed only 5 days ago, has at least a temporary majority in Parliament.

The new government contains a wide sampling from the opposition, which has been harrying the Premier for months. Only the extremists remain in opposition.

SIGNIFICANT VICTORY

Observers believed last night's victory was particularly significant because the no-confidence motion was based on an issue that had aroused concern cutting across party lines. This was that Mr. Adoula planned to send the legislators home for an extended vacation June 30 and rule by decree.

Opposition speakers charged during the debate that the Premier recently told associates he would take this step, relying on powers in the controversial article 67 of the country's fundamental law.

This article provides that the present legislature must sit at least 3 years, but not more than 4 years. The 3 years would be up June 30.

Opposition speakers charged last night that Mr. Adoula would close the legislature on that day and rule by decree until new elections could be held. That would probably be several years away.

As evidence of Mr. Adoula's intentions, the motion cited statements he was alleged to have made to his associates, his past handling of the Parliament and a message sent from New York to the Adoula government here.

Etienne Kikaka, chief spokesman for the opposition, declared that this message contained instructions for Mr. Adoula from quarters in the United States on how to deal with Parliament.

"This is an authentic document," he shouted, waving a piece of paper.

It was later identified as a French translation of an article that had appeared in the New York Times. The message apparently was sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs here by the Congolese Mission at the United Nations.

The article, written by the Times' correspondent in Leopoldville, was an analysis of the political situation here on the eve of last week's cabinet reshuffle. It appeared in the Times of April 7.

The motion of no confidence quoted only part of one paragraph from the French translation in support of the charge against Mr. Adoula. The quotation, in the original English, is as follows:

"A cabinet reshuffle may ease the situation, but skeptics have their doubts. There are increasing suggestions that the way to handle Parliament is to send it on a nice long vacation again, maybe 2 years instead of 2 months this time. There is even talk of a military coup d'etat."

In the original article that paragraph ended with the words "if the opposition should get out of hand again."

In his response last night Mr. Adoula did not deny he was considering using article 67 as a means of ending this legislature's term on June 30.

He denied, however, that this would amount to a dissolution of Parliament, as the opposition alleged. The Premier said Parliament could be dissolved only by the head of state, President Joseph Kasavubu, with the concurrence of two-thirds of at least one chamber.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the article points out that Premier Cyrille Adoula's new "Government of National Reconciliation" has defeated the first challenge by its diehard opposition in the Parliament. It should be pointed out that, in an effort to pacify the various political factions in the country, Premier Adoula had brought into his government all save the most irreconcilable factions in the Congo. The question was raised as to a vote of confidence for his government, and the Premier won by a vote of 31 to 20.

This new government contains a wide sampling from the various factions of the opposition which had been harrying the Premier for months. I believe it is an indication of the sound statesmanship of Mr. Adoula, who is strongly supported by the United Nations and the United States, that he has been able to win this parliamentary fight.

It is interesting to note that those who are attempting to create more havoc in the Congo, including, of course, the Soviet Union, which has found some rather strange allies in this country in that regard, have been misquoting newspaper articles which have appeared in this country—indeed, in the New York Times.

The New York Times account referred to in the article which I have placed in the Record was quoted out of context, and if read as a whole is clearly a sound report of political conditions in the Congo, and not critical of Mr. Adoula's government.

I am happy to note again for the record that the U.S. policy in the Congo has been extremely successful.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an interesting column by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer this morning, may also be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Column by Roscoe Drummond

Washington.—Whenever the Soviet Union loses the diplomatic initiative, it turns to propaganda to cover up. Moscow is up against it in Africa. Things are going badly, with their reach for power blocked or blunted by the African nations themselves.

So Pravda is called to the front lines. It aims a barrage at those awful "Western imperialists," whom it accuses of being intent upon fastening colonial rule on the whole African continent.

This bizarre blast comes in the wake of one of the most remarkable achievements in behalf of political freedom in all human history: In only 3 years—from 1960 to 1963—the once colonialist Western nations have furthered the independence of 23 African countries and welcomed them into the United Nations.

At the same time the Soviet Union grips tenaciously the nations of Eastern Europe which it took by force after the Second World War and which it had to hold by force when the people of East Germany, Hungary and Poland successively sought to free themselves from Soviet rule.

It reached out to expand its imperialist power to Cuba and has made such menacing gestures toward the Middle East and Africa that local communism has lost much of its lure.

The fact that the Kremlin has been so unsuccessful in extending its sway into the Middle East and into Africa undoubtedly explains, in part, the full-page editorial in Pravda appealing to the Africans to be wary of any and all association with the West. This is what's been happening:

Ghana and Guinea have shown themselves exceedingly disappointed in their relations with the Soviets and are encouraging investment of Western capital to reinforce their economies.

The new African states are showing little interest in embracing the proclaimed Communist answer to their economic ills. The broad tendency is toward a mixed economy with some public ownership and a substantial borrowing from the ways of Western society.

Former French colonies which have now won their independence have their eyes far more on the burgeoning European Economic Community than on Russia.

Arab Nations in North Africa have been giving the Reds the back of their wrist. Arab-Soviet ties have been steadily deteriorating, as evidenced by the suppression of Communist parties in Iraq, Syria, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia and the United Arab Republic.

The Kremlin is not, of course, giving up. It never does. It is staking much of its hopes for expanding its influence on the indoctrination of several thousands of African students who have been attending Soviet universities and colleges.

But the indoctrination isn't going very well. There are signs that the African students are becoming disenchanted. A group of them recently bolted Bulgaria, complaining of racial discrimination and police brutality.

Mr. CLARK. This article points out, in Mr. Drummond's usual, clear style, how very successful U.S. policy has been, under the Kennedy administration, throughout Africa; how 23 new African countries have obtained their independence between 1960 and 1963; have been welcomed peacefully into the United Nations; how much of this is due to the efforts of both the Kennedy administration, and the Eisenhower administration. This article points out that this has been a great diplomatic triumph over the Kremlin and Russia, because of the support we have given the African policy of the United Nations.

I think everyone in our country who supported either President Eisenhower or President Kennedy in their African policy is entitled to feel well rewarded for standing up against the divisive forces of this country which did so much in the last 12 months to try to confuse and obstruct the policy of attaining peace and nationalism in the new nations of Africa.

I am happy to say that whatever efforts there have been from certain racist groups in this country to keep the people of Africa from obtaining control of their own countries, and getting their independence and freedom, appear to have been defeated.

No one can say how long this success can continue, and I would be the last to predict that our policy in Africa will not suffer setbacks in the future, as they have in the past; but I am confident we are on the right track. When we stand up for freedom and independence without regard to race, color, or creed, we are standing for the finest traditions of our country, and we have achieved great success in following that policy in what was once called the Dark Continent.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have noted during the weekend and the last few days a new spate of criticism with respect to the administration's Cuban policy. Articles have appeared with the suggestions that the authors have had access to confidential intelligence information indicating there has been a large buildup of Russian forces in Cuba.

It is suggested that the number of troops there has increased substantially, rather than been reduced. It is even suggested that the President of the United States has been fooled in the intelligence information which he is receiving. It is suggested that a certain U.S. Senator on the other side of the aisle knows more about the intelligence situation in Cuba than does the President of the United States, the Chief of our CIA, the intelligence agencies of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others.

This may well turn out to be correct in the long run, Mr. President. I have no secret information with respect to intelligence in Cuba. I do have a feeling that the President of the United States and Mr. McCone, head of the CIA, who, I am sure, is advising the President on the basis of the most accurate and up-to-date intelligence information which is available to our country, are receiving a great deal better information than one could get from reading Hanson Baldwin in the New York Times and listening to certain Members of this body who would have us believe that they know more about what is going on in Cuba than do the President and his advisers.

It so happens that there appeared in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer a lead editorial entitled "Charting a Course on Cuba."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may appear in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Charting a Course on Cuba

America's agonizing debate over the problem of Cuba, and what to do about it, is in danger of getting bogged down in generalities at a time when the emphasis should be on specific courses of action.

Discussion of hypothetical conditions under which U.S. Armed Forces might invade Cuba does not get to the nub of the matter.

As we see it, U.S. policy on Cuba should have these four fundamental components:

1. The foremost objective should be the establishment of national independence, individual freedom and democratic government for the Cuban people.

2. The primary emphasis should be on attaining this objective by peaceful means rather than by war. (War is not a legitimate arm of diplomacy; it is the result of the failure of diplomacy.)

3. The first priority of immediate goals should be to obtain the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba and whatever weapons of aggression may still be there.

4. The sole authority over U.S. foreign policy must be held at all times by responsible officials of the U.S. Government, not by Cuban exiles who have been given sanctuary in this country. Aid and advice of the exiles should be enlisted when appropriate but a great nation cannot allow any foreign group, no matter how sympathetic we are to their aspirations, to call the shots in a situation where the issue of peace or war may hang in precarious balance.

To supplement this kind of policy on Cuba it will be necessary to learn definitively and at an early date whether or not Premier Khrushchev intends to get those Russian troops out of Cuba. This query must be put to Moscow in a reasonable but blunt manner. If Mr. Khrushchev chooses to consider such a question an ultimatum, then so be it.

An affirmative response is not so unlikely as some of the pessimists think. The Soviets, for all their ruthlessness, are practical men. They know that America, not Russia, holds the high cards in the Cuban controversy.

If the Russians insist on continuing their moves to make Cuba a Soviet military state there are a number of steps open to the United States and other members of the Organization of American States, and perhaps the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, that need not provoke war. Collective economic sanctions—including, possibly, some kind of quarantine or blockade—could be applied as circumstances warrant.

Bang-bang boys who want to solve the problem by opening fire on Cuba ought to bear in mind that the aim is to save the country, not annihilate it. Last resorts should not be applied until first resorts have been fairly tried.

The weakness in American policy on Cuba is not, as some critics contend, a reluctance to use armed force. That is a strength. The great need is for more vigorous application of economic and diplomatic weapons.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, that editorial, from my point of view, states accurately and ably what our policy in Cuba should be. The policy advocated by this fine Philadelphia newspaper is the exact policy of the President of the United States.

It calls for, first, as the foremost objective, the establishment of national independence, individual freedom, and democratic government for the people of Cuba.

That is our national objective, the first and primary one. That is the policy of the President of the United States.

The second point is stated as being the attaining of that objective by peaceful means rather than by war. The Inquirer points out that war is not a legitimate arm of diplomacy; it is the result of the failure of diplomacy.

I am glad to say that despite the many war-whoopers, as Mr. Lippmann calls them, some of them among our own Members of this body, the President of the United States is committed to the objective of attaining that goal through diplomacy, legitimate sanctions short of war, conferences with our allies in the Organization of American States, and, through diplomatic efforts on the part of Latin American countries as well as our own, toward attaining the first and foremost objective, which is the establishment of national independence, individual freedom, and democratic government for the people of Cuba.

The third point made by the editorial is that the first priority of immediate goals should be to obtain the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba and whatever weapons of aggression may still be there.

That surely is true. That is certainly one of the most important objectives of this administration. The point is we mean to do it by diplomatic means, we mean to do it by keeping our treaty obligations, not by violating them, we mean to do it by supporting the United Nations, we mean to do it by supporting the Organization of American States. We do not mean to do it in an immature, childish way, by taking an attitude of "March up San Juan Hill"; by sending American boys to die in Cuba; by starting a war which, almost without question, would spread across the world; or imposing that kind of blockade which would, in itself, be a violation of international law, and therefore an act of war.

The fourth point made in the editorial is that the sole authority over U.S. foreign policy must be held at all times by responsible officials of the U.S. Government, and not by Cuban exiles.

We want to support the Cuban exiles in their legitimate desires to return to Cuba. We hope in due course they will be able to return and take their legitimate place in the economy and in the Government of that country, which we can hope will be under democratic auspices. We hope that they may be able to return to their native country and help their country take its rightful place among the democratic nations and people who believe in freedom.

But the way to do it is to make perfectly clear that we, too, believe in freedom, that we, too, believe in international law, that we, too, believe in keeping our treaty commitments. Here is the sentence from the editorial which I commend to the consideration of my colleagues in the Senate:

> Bang-bang boys who want to "solve" the problem by opening fire on Cuba ought to bear in mind that the aim is to save the country, not annihilate it.

I support that position wholeheartedly. I am happy to note that it is the policy of the President of the United States. I call attention to the fact that the Philadelphia Inquirer, its publisher and editor, my good friend, Walter Annenberg, has always supported the Republican Party in national elections. That makes this editorial even more significant than before.

In this connection we should give careful attention to the very intelligent answer made by the President of the United States in the question and answer period which took place after his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington last Saturday.

I ask unanimous consent that the question asked at the conclusion of his speech and the answer that he made thereto may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIFT WITH CUBAN EXILES

Q. Mr. President, would you give us your views or whatever you have to say about Miró Cardona and his charges that you backed out on a promise for a second invasion and the other things in his statement?

A. Why, I think the Department of State has already made a comment which represents the views of the Government. Dr. Cardona lives in Miami which is the center, of course, of the exiles, the center of their hopes, and I think that a good many Cubans feel that the only way that they can return to Cuba is by a military action of the United States.

We're conscious of our obligations to our own people, our own security, our alliances, our responsibilities, as I said, as the chief defender of freedom all over the world. We have not determined that it's in our national interest or in the general interests of the hemisphere for us to launch an invasion. And naturally, that disappoints the exiles. But, as the State Department statement said, the foreign policy of the United States, when so much depends upon us, must be made by the United States. And however much we may sympathize with their desire to be free, the United States cannot launch itself into a massive invasion of Cuba without considering the worldwide implications to other free countries and also its effect upon our own position.

Now, as to his charges, I don't think it's necessary to go through them. Quite obviously nobody in the U.S. Government ever informed anyone in the Government or outside the Government, Dr. Cardona or anyone else, that we were going to launch, or committed ourselves to launch, a military invasion of six divisions.

We appreciate very much the fact that a good many Cubans have volunteered for the American Armed Forces. I think that they can be very valuable there. No one knows what the future is going to bring. But I hope that Dr. Cardona and others will realize that this is not a struggle between the United States and the exiles. It's really a struggle against the Communist infiltration in this hemisphere. And while we may disagree as to what actions we should take to remove it, and while my obligations are somewhat different from Dr. Cardona's, I would hope that it would be possible for us to work together in the general interest, and that is the object of this Government.

We want to work with Dr. Cardona and all the other Cubans, but we must maintain the control of our policy here in the United States and here in Washington, and will continue to do so.

RELATIONS WITH CASTRO

Q. I'd like to read two others here also on the question of Cuba. If Castro remains in power for another 5 years, will the United States continue in its refusal to deal with his government? And the second one is, 2 years ago tomorrow, Mr. President, you stood here and told us Fidel Castro's days were numbered. You said, "Our restraint is not inexhaustible." You said we must not let, "the inter-American doctrine of noninterference conceal or excuse a policy of nonaction." Now, sir; Communist domination of Cuba is, if anything, more complete than 2 years ago and is stiffened by Russia. Many Americans believe our policy toward Cuba is indeed one of nonaction. What can you say to persuade them that this is not so? When, if ever, is our restraint going to come to an end?

A. Well, I hope our restraint or sense of responsibility will not ever come to an end. Now in the general question, since the last 2 years the United States has taken a good many actions in—to contain the spread of communism in the hemisphere. We—a good many nations in the Alliance for Progress, the Punta del Este declaration, the San Jose declaration—a number of nations have broken off diplomatic relations. Only five continue them with Cuba.

The free world trade—has dropped from 800 million to 80 million. The—efforts are being made since the San Jose conference to work with other countries to control the movement of personnel in and out of Cuba. It's quite obvious now to the hemisphere and, in fact, to the world, that Castro is merely a Soviet satellite. Every survey, every study, every meeting shows a sharp deterioration in the image that he once had as a great nationalist leader. And now he's generally regarded in the hemisphere as having sold out to the Communist movement and having now become a spearhead for the Soviet advance.

CONSTANT SURVEILLANCE

In addition, the United States maintains a constant surveillance. We've indicated that we would not permit any troops from Cuba to move off the island of Cuba in any offensive action against any neighboring country. We've indicated, also, that we would not accept a Hungary in Cuba—the use of Soviet troops against Cubans if there was any internal reaction against Castro. In many ways, we have attempted to isolate Cuba and to indicate our determination to continue that policy until Cuba is free.

Now after we've done all those steps, the—there are two alternatives—there are two additional policies which could be carried out.

I think that when those talk about—talk about Cuba, we ought to say what we want to do. We shouldn't say, Well, let's do something, or How long is our restraint going to last? I would think the two remaining policies are, one, a blockade, which of course brings us once again to a confrontation with the Soviet Union, and the other is invasion of Cuba.

In my judgment, it would be a mistake to carry out either one of those policies today. I don't know what conditions are going to bring in the future. No one predicted with certainty what was going to happen last fall. I don't know what's going to happen any place in the world. But—therefore, I think that we should maintain our strength and our determination, but I don't think that the conditions would serve the interest of the United States or of our allies to carry out either an invasion or blockade under these present conditions.

The United States is responsible for the independence of dozens of countries stretching from South Korea to Berlin. It is responsible for the defense, really, of Western Europe. It is responsible for the major struggle against the Communists in our own hemisphere. For 6 percent of the world's population we carry tremendous burdens. I do not think we can indulge ourselves at this point, if that is the proper word, in concentrating all of our material strength in one section of the world and be indifferent to its consequences elsewhere.

Now I don't know—I don't accept the views Mr. Castro is going to be in power for 5 years. I can't indicate the role by which there will be a change. But I've seen enough—as we all have—enough change in the last 15 years to make me feel that time is on the—that time will see Cuba free again, and I think when that happens the record will show that the United States has played a significant role.

But for the present, and for a great power which carries worldwide responsibility, I think our present policy is the right one. If the American people decide differently, then, of course, they have an obvious remedy. But for now we intend to follow this policy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the answer, in short, given in colloquial terms, but with the clarity for which our President is famous, indicates his strong support of the present policy in Cuba. I call particular attention to the fact that he says in his statement, after reviewing the strong steps we have taken to discourage Mr. Castro:

> After we've done all those steps * * * there are two additional policies which could be carried out.

Then he points out that one is a blockade, which, of course, once again brings us into confrontation all over the world with the Soviet Union, and the other is an invasion of Cuba.

The President turns his back on both of these courses. He takes what I believe, I say again, to be a mature and sensible and commonsense approach to the very difficult problem confronting us 90 miles from our shore. I commend him for his maturity. I commend him for the soundness of his policy.

TEXAN STRESSES NEED FOR S. 1200 WHICH WOULD GIVE VALIDITY TO THE WORDS "FHA INSURED"

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on March 28 I introduced a bill designed to give validity to the term "FHA insured" as a protection for home buyers. Twelve Members of the Senate have joined as cosponsors.

The national response to this legislation is heartening, and I will from time to time bring to the attention of my colleagues comments which are particularly pertinent.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter I have received from Texarkana, Tex., be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXARKANA, TEX., *April 1, 1963.*

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that you plan to submit a bill that will require the Federal Housing Administration to correct major defects that appear after construction of an FHA house.

We need such legislation badly in this country, as the public is being cheated right and left on FHA housing.

FHA has had the responsibility, by implication if not by law, to protect the public in the past but has not lived up to this responsibility.

How many times have you seen the advertisement "Built Under FHA Inspection," or "Conforming to FHA Specifications"?

The average citizen, who is not expert in construction, believes that FHA sees that their insured loans houses are properly built and this certainly is not the case.

I know of several persons who contacted FHA about defective construction and were told that this was a matter between builder and buyer, in spite of the fact that they had made several inspections while the house was being built.

Another example of FHA's laxity is in the evaluation of houses. Old John Q. Citizen doesn't know the value of a house and is generally content to pay what FHA says a place is worth. I will bet you that more often than not, the FHA evaluation is higher than the actual market value of the house.

I am sure that all FHA people are honest, but if they are not, this would be a real fine opportunity for an unscrupulous builder and FHA employee to rook the public. Maybe they do, who knows?

I surely hope you get some help from Congress on this.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

AUTHORITY FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN THE ENROLLED BILL H.R. 4715

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate today the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House and that the Vice President be authorized to sign the enrolled bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 23, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 13, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, APRIL 13, 1963

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL—ADMINISTRATION BOONDOGGLE

The fiscal irresponsibility of the Kennedy administration was clearly indicated this week with the passage by the House of the supplemental appropriation bill of 1963 containing $450 million worth of new public works projects. In spite of determined Republican effort to cut this $450 million boondoggle from the bill it was passed with 208 Democrats voting for it, and 151 Republicans against it. Only 20 Republicans (of 177) voted for the spending and 33 Democrats (of 258) against it, proving once again that basically the Republicans stand for fiscal responsibility and reduced Federal spending. I spoke against the bill as follows:

"I oppose this deficiency or supplemental appropriation bill because we are appropriating money for new projects which is not the purpose of a supplemental appropriation bill. The list of new starts * * * clearly shows the improper procedure. Further, it is wrong to spend additional money for public works at this time of deficit financing. The accelerated public works project was wrong at its inception last year and restoring money to the program is wrong now. Pump priming did not work before in correcting or relieving unemployment and it will not now.

"Our country faces fiscal collapse because of wild Federal spending. We must economize to protect our currency value, gold on hand, and our entire economy. We must bolster confidence in our economy and Government by responsible action now. Let us reduce Federal spending, not increase. Let us cut the national debt, not add to it. Let us then reduce taxes. Each of these steps separately and collectively will bolster confidence in our Government's fiscal self-discipline and preserve our private economy. Let us stop financing socialism. Capitalism is the bulwark of our country's economic health, not Federal spending."

DEVALUING OUR CURRENCY THROUGH SUBTERFUGE

H.R. 5389, to repeal the law dealing with the purchase of silver, passed the House: This action in reality sets the stage for devaluation of our currency and, in fact, actually does devalue the dollar. The bill's stated purpose is to free silver from Federal controls by (1) Repealing the Silver Purchase Acts, (2) Permit the Federal Reserve System to issue in $1 denominations under the same terms and conditions it now issues currency in $5 and higher denominations. (This means substituting Federal Reserve notes for the present $1 bills which are silver certificates, backed by 100 cents on the dollar in silver.) (3) Remove the tax on transfers of any interest in silver bullion. This legislation rightfully comes within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee, but because of the part dealing with the transfer tax, it had to also be considered by my Committee on Ways and Means.

The repeal of the Silver Purchase Act is long overdue and I am for it. Federal pegging of the price of silver, instead of a free market, is wrong. My opposition to this bill is the lack of guidelines and stemmed from (1) it actually does devalue the dollar because it provides that our $1 bills which are now backed by 100 cents worth of a precious metal (silver) will henceforth be supported by 25 cents in a precious metal (gold), (2) Secretary of the Treasury Dillon admitted, though not planned, this step is necessary if our currency is to be devalued, (3) Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William McChesney Martin, testified it would affect our gold supply by $500 million, (4) President Kennedy is selling a capital asset ($2 billion in silver), to pay current expenses. These views in opposition contradicted the bland assurances of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee that our gold supply would not be reduced and that silver would not be sold to pay current Government expenses.

The further pressure on our imbalance of payments contained in this bill concerns me and I presented tables showing that as a result of five large successive deficits in our balance of payments we have transferred to foreigners some $7 billion from our monetary gold stock and added another $9 billion to our liquid liabilities. Foreign nations now hold $24 billion of our money, callable in gold ($11.7 billion of our $15.8 billion gold supply must be reserved for backing our currency). In this dangerous position we, as the world's banker, could not withstand a run on the bank if our foreign creditors demand payment of outstanding obligations. It is long overdue, but let us hope not too late, that Congress immediately direct its attention to solving the imbalance of payments and the gold outflow. This means cutting Federal spending, an immediate balanced budget, a reduction in our debt, and with that background, tax reform which primarily means a drastic cutback in the tax progression and a reduction of rates.

CONFUSED AND BEWILDERED PRESIDENT NOW PROTECTING COMMUNISTS

The United States, on Presidential order, is now taking a stand against freemen and using our might to protect a vicious and bloody-handed dictator. The end result of the confused and bewildered policies of President Kennedy must be the complete Communist takeover of Central and Latin America and Communist encirclement of the United States. The brave actions of President Kennedy this week included the arrest of more Cuban exiles whose crime is wanting to free their homeland; a break with Dr. Jose Miro-Cardona, Cuban exile leader, and further efforts to curtail critics of Communist dictators Khrushchev and Castro in order that the administration could make deals with the Soviet boss. There is no reasonable explanation for the Kennedy failure to enforce the Monroe Doctrine or to refuse to demand the immediate removal of all Russian troops and war material from Cuba. Whatever his motive, the actual result is appeasement of the Communists and history records that appeasement always results in victory for the Reds and defeat for us. Last year the Kennedy administration bought the Communist coalition as a solution in Laos. As we all knew, the Communists are at this moment, after breaking another agreement, taking over completely there. What is the President's answer to this failure? He has rewarded the architect of the Laos disaster, Averell Harriman, by promoting him to a higher position in the State Department where he will be responsible for mapping all our political relationships with the Communists. An insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, of California, notes the activities of Dr. Walt Rostow and McGeorge Bundy, close advisers to the President and apparent architects of a new U.S. policy reversing our support of anti-Communist exiles which is forcing Russian and Baltic exile groups to restrict their anti-Communist activities. Before it is too late, President Kennedy should tell the American people now what secret deals are planned and who and what is behind the strange policies, or lack of policies, which continue to increase the strength and prestige of the Soviet Union and weaken U.S. leadership of the free world.

SPOTLIGHT ON URBAN RENEWAL

In an effort to expose the direction in which Federal urban renewal and public housing is leading this free Nation, I took the floor of the House this week for another major speech on this subject. The bill of particulars against Federal urban renewal and public housing includes: (1) Because of urban renewal, the Supreme Court has reinterpreted the Constitution, and violated the letter and spirit of the law, (2) private property can be taken away for esthetic and spiritual reasons for private—not public—use, (3) the Federal contribution results in Federal control of local government, (4) local need for Federal help has been fraudulently determined both by local and Federal Government, (5) the financially less able cities and States are supporting the wealthier cities and States in the Federal aid distribution, (6) Federal guidelines, procedures, criteria, and formulas are inequitable and cannot be made equitable, (7) misuse of Federal aid is scandalous, (8) windfall profit at taxpayer expense is commonplace, (9) public housing is forced on communities that want urban renewal, (10) crime abounds in public housing and is getting worse; morals and moral values are being destroyed, (11) urban renewal and public housing are being use to effect sociological changes in U.S. society at the planners' whim, (12) when people know the facts and there is a referendum, public housing is rejected.

The 27th Annual National Trout Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, on April 26 the village of Kalkaska, in Kalkaska County, Mich., opens its 27th Annual National Trout Festival. This is one of the most unique celebrations in the country and Kalkaska County is probably the most suitable location in the United States for such an event.

With its 275 miles of trout streams, 85 lakes, 25 of which are abundant with fighting brown, brook, rainbow and lake trout, Kalkaska County is a virtual fisherman's paradise, attracting literally thousands to this event annually and throughout the year.

The scenic splendor of Kalkaska County complemented by an abundance of deer, partridge, bear, and other wildlife gives me a feeling of homesickness, particularly at this time of year.

For this reason I would like to extend a cordial invitation to all my colleagues in the House to come to Kalkaska, Mich., this coming weekend and enjoy the wonderful hospitality that Kalkaska's citizens so freely offer.

If it is not possible to join in Kalkaska's National Trout Festival, I would like to extend an invitation to visit Kalkaska County at any time of year. Its recreational facilities know no season. I assure you will not be disappointed.

Taxpayers: Paying More but Getting Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I challenged Secretary of Agriculture Freeman—on Tuesday, April 16—to explain why taxpayers are paying more but getting less results in the feed grains program this year, compared with 1962.

In my letter to Freeman, I quoted Department of Agriculture reports which predict Government stockpiles will be reduced far less while payments to farmers are up $98 million.

The stockpile cutback was 393 million bushels for the 1962 marketing year. Payments were $842 million, for a $2.14 average for each bushel cutback. In 1963 the predicted cutback will be only about 107 million bushels. Payments will be $940 million, for an $8.78 average for each bushel cutback.

Why this shocking jump in cost for 1963? Before Congressmen give the feed grains program a new 2-year lease on life, an explanation is in order.

Full text of my letter follows:

APRIL 16, 1963.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Next Wednesday the House of Representatives takes up the proposed 2-year extension of the feed grains program. Before debate begins I respectfully suggest you explain why taxpayers are paying more but getting less results in the feed grains program this year, compared with 1962.

According to your Department's "Feed situation" report released April 10, this year's feed grain crop will be 151.6 million tons—up 8.5 million tons from 1962. After harvest, feed grain supplies will be only 2 million tons less than the year before. Feed grain disappearance during the 1963–64 marketing year, according to the report, may "rise a little from the 154 million tons estimated for 1961–62 and 1962–63."

If disappearance holds even, stockpiles would be down only 2.4 million tons when the 1963 marketing year is over. This compares with an 11 million-ton cutback in the 1962 marketing year. Clearly disappearance would have to rise more than "a little" to match the 1962 marketing year cutback.

What makes this especially puzzling is the fact that payments to farmers in the 1963 program are up $98 million from 1962.

In 1962, payments were $842 million with a stockpile cutback of 393 million bushels (11 million tons) for the 1962 marketing year. This figures $2.14 per bushel.

In 1963, payments will be $940 million. If we allow "a little" increase in disappearance, say, 600,000 tons, that would mean stockpiles would be down 3 million tons, or 107 million bushels. This figures $8.78 per bushel. Even if disappearance should climb to 155 million tons, the cost per bushel would still be $7.74, compared with $2.14 the year before.

These cost figures include only payments to farmers. Realized losses to Commodity Credit Corporation and administrative costs are not included.

Why this shocking jump in cost for 1963? Before Congressmen give the feed grains program a new 2-year lease on life, an explanation is in order.

President Kennedy Urges Federal Agencies To Work as Hard as They Can To Reduce Jet Noise at Major Airfields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to fly to Chicago, together with other members of the Chicago delegation, with President Kennedy to participate in the dedication of O'Hare International Airport which lies on the very edge of my congressional district.

I was very much inspired to hear the President make an eloquent plea to the Federal agencies and the airlines to work as hard as they can to make sure that noise from jet aircraft which use O'Hare and other major airfields in the country is reduced to a minimum.

Millions of Americans can find comfort in knowing that the President of the United States, with all of his complex national and international problems, is cognizant of the way in which the jet age has disturbed and changed the lives of these people who live in the proximity of major airfields which have jet operations. The greatness of President Kennedy is reflected in this ability to understand the problems of each individual American.

President Kennedy stated in Chicago:

> I hope that the National Government, along with the airlines, will continue to work as hard as they can to make sure that the noise from these jets which take us in and out do not disturb the lives of a half-million people whose homes are in the immediate area.

It is my hope that those Federal employees at all levels who are charged with the responsibility for operating traffic to and from airfields will heed the President's eloquent plea. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if the President of the United States can find understanding of this very serious problem affecting the daily lives of millions of people throughout this country, it is not asking too much that his subordinates at all levels of government show the same concern.

It was my privilege to discuss this matter with President Kennedy during our flight to Chicago and I know that the people who I represent and who have suffered indescribable hardship from the noise at O'Hare appreciate the fact that President Kennedy would personally help seek a solution to this problem.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I should like to add here that Mr. Najeeb Halaby, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and Mr. Alan Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, accompanied the President on this trip and witnessed his eloquent statement in Chicago. I am sure that all the people living in proximity of major jet airfields would be pleased to learn that both Mr. Halaby and Mr. Boyd shared the President's concern over this new phenomena of jet noise which has followed the advent of the jet age in aircraft.

Both these men have assured me of their full cooperation to carry out the President's request.

Mr. Speaker, the text of President Kennedy's remarks at the O'Hare Field dedication follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE DEDICATION OF THE O'HARE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mayor Daley, Governor Kerner, Senator Douglas, Government and State officials, ladies and gentlemen: 21 years ago this year, a young Navy officer stood at the White House and was decorated by President Roosevelt with the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism extending far beyond the line of duty. I remember as a young naval officer myself how the extraordinary feat of "Butch" O'Hare captured the imagination not only of our Armed Forces but also of the country. His extraordinary act in protecting his ship, shooting down, while he was alone, shooting down five of the enemy, during the difficult days in the Second War, gave this country hope and confidence not only in the quality and caliber of our fighting men, but also in the certainty of victory.

Therefore, 21 years later, I am proud to come to Chicago, to this airport, to take part in this act which commemorates his public service, his great naval service, and also reminds me of how much we owe to those who made this country of ours.

I think one of the extraordinary facts of the Second War was this number of men who were highly decorated, particularly with the Congressional Medal of Honor, who later lost their lives in combat in later days. "Butch" O'Hare was one of them, being killed 18 months after the act of honor by the President of the United States, when his life could have been much easier. John Basilone, who got the Congressional Medal of Honor, in the Marine Corps, in Guadalcanal, and who was later killed on the beach at Iwo Jima, was another. But time after time, men who could have stayed at home and felt their duty done, went out again and some of them were killed. So today we not only dedicate the International Airport, but we also recall all those who made it possible. This is an extraordinary airport in an extraordinary city, in an extraordinary country, and it is a tribute to the constructive action of the Federal Government, the State government, and the city government, under the distinguished leadership of your great mayor, Mayor Daley.

To keep these various interests working together and make this the most extraordinary airport in the world for this great city is an amazing feat. This airport lives up to its name. There is no other airport in the world where planes can make instrument landings on parallel runways, simultaneously. There is no other airport in the Nation which maintains three instrument landing systems. And there is no other airport in the world, and this should be a source of satisfaction to the people of Chicago, there is no other airport in the world which serves so many people and so many planes. Some 13.5 million airline travelers passed through O'Hare Airport last year. In 5 years it has gone from the 16th most active field in the country to the 1st, like so many other things about Chicago. During this airport's daily peak periods, an airliner lands and takes off every 43 seconds. Every day, 1 out of every 5 air travelers in this country passes through this airport, enough people in 1 day to equal the population of Bloomington, Ill. Every day, some 1,300 to 1,400 landings and takeoffs occur. So I think this airport is an extraordinary national asset, named after an extraordinary American.

All of this traffic in and out of Chicago proves, as it has since the beginning of this country, that Chicago occupies a most important and vital strategic area in the United States, where all the lines of communication cross. That is why the future of this city is so bright. Indian canoes traveled this route from Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River before this was the United States.

And it will be doing the same thing in the year 2000. Railroads, highways—all the rest will come and meet in Chicago and make this a vital, booming city. These are all the things that can be done, but I think a good deal more must be done. One of the problems is with the people who live around the airports. I hope that the National Government, along with the airlines, will continue to work as hard as they can to make sure that the noise from these jets which take us in and out do not disturb the lives of a half million people whose homes are in the immediate area. In addition, air cargo is only beginning in importance. In addition, I think we must make a special effort at O'Hare and all our other airports to welcome the people who come from abroad. This may be the first view they have of America. We want them to know what a warm and vital and vigorous country this is. And I hope we will make every effort to make them at home, and to urge their countrymen to come and visit us.

Finally, we look forward to the day in aviation when we are going to travel three times the speed of sound, and go to any place in the world in a few hours. And when that happens, we want the United States to be in the lead, as it has been in the lead in jet transportation since the jet was invented. All in all, I am proud to be here in Chicago taking part in a great ceremony, honoring a great American to whom we owe much, looking to the past and saluting him, and looking to the future and saluting the city of Chicago. Thank you.

Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, April 19, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, when power-hungry Nazi forces under their evil-minded leader, were on their victorious rampage in most of the Eurasian Continent, destroying and devastating everything before them, and terrorizing peoples by the hundreds of millions, a small band of gallant, stouthearted, and desperately embattled people in Warsaw initiated a glorious fight against their ruthless and unconscionable Nazi oppressors. That bold and daring move marked the uprising of the remnants of once the largest Jewish ghetto in Europe, numbering at one time more than 400,000 but now, through deportation, starvation, and death, reduced to only 63,000. While many of these were not physically fit to fight, they all were determined to carry on the struggle against their mortal enemy, and they all managed to sell their lives at a terrific cost to the enemy. In this unequal struggle, in which no quarter was given and no prisoners taken, 13,000 fighting Jews lost their live in the course of 27 days, while some 50,000, mostly aged, women, and children, surrendered, and it is estimated that less than 80 escaped through the sewers under the ghetto walls.

In that uprising and desperate fight the oppressed and downtrodden Jewish people proved to the world that, even under an impossible and despairing circumstance they still retained their faith in the righteousness of their cause, their right to live and the right to fight for the preservation of their lives. While so many of these unfortunate souls lost their lives in this historic uprising, yet by that very act they covered themselves with glory and honor, profoundly setting a moving example to their descendants. We honor the memory of these unknown gallant fighters for freedom, fighters for elemental human rights, on the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising against the Nazis.

National Park Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a study of the North Cascades area of Washington State is scheduled to begin soon. Much of the area involved lies in the Mount Baker and Snoqualmie National Forests of the congressional district which I represent. The outcome of the study, therefore, will have a direct effect upon my constituents, many of whom rely upon these forests for their income.

Because this matter is of utmost importance to the State of Washington and to the Second Congressional District, I have made it the subject of my current newsletter.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this newsletter in the RECORD.

The article follows:

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARK

You know, the bureaucrats are at it again. Secretary of Interior Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, with the President's approval, have authorized a study of the area between Mount Baker and the Canadian border, ostensibly to determine the best way to use the resources of the North Cascades.

But, the North Cascades Conservation Council has prepared a draft bill to create a 1,308,168-acre North Cascades National Park. The Seattle-based council claims Secretary Udall suggested it prepare the bill for introduction in Congress.

The proposed legislation, which is marked confidential, calls for a national park that would extend from Stevens Pass to Ross Dam, including 606,429 acres of the Mount Baker and Snoqualmie National Forests of the second district. Maybe the people of Washington State want another national park, I don't know. If they do, I'll have no objections. However, I don't want to see a decision by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., instead of by the citizen owners.

I know the national forests belong to all the people of the United States, but I believe the people back home should have something to say about this proposal, because they are the ones who are really affected.

It seems to me another study of the North Cascades will only duplicate what has gone before. In 1939, a committee composed of National Park, Forest Service, and State officials made a study. The people of Washington State didn't go along with the idea of a national park then.

When Glacier Peak was being considered as a possible wilderness area, there were further studies. Again, last year a study to set the policy for use of our high mountain country was completed. Now, the taxpayers are being asked to finance another study.

During 1962, about 450 million board feet of timber was harvested in the Mount Baker and Snoqualmie National Forests. This volume is capable of supplying jobs to 4,500 persons employed directly in the timber industry and would support another 11,250 persons indirectly. A national park would mean the loss of livelihood for a great percentage of these people, because timber isn't harvested in national parks. Unemployment is too high as it is without adding fuel to the fire.

Each year the Forest Service returns 25 percent of its receipts to local counties in proportion to the amount of national forest area each contains. This amounted to $304,476 for Whatcom, $173,783 for Skagit, and $244,199 for Snohomish last year. Any area redesignated national park land would reduce these payments now available to the counties for schools and roads.

I'm for more recreational opportunities and have supported both the Forest Service and the National Park Service in their efforts to provide for the recreational needs of our growing population. And, as I've mentioned before, if the people of Washington State really want another national park, I'll have no objections. However, the decision should be left to the people, not the bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

Sincerely,

Congressman JACK WESTLAND.

Midtown Plaza: The Nation's Showplace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, while in my home community of Rochester, N.Y., during the Easter recess, I had the honor and great pleasure to participate in the ceremonies held on April 15 to mark the first anniversary of the Nation's first and only urban shopping plaza. This is Midtown Plaza, a 7-acre business and shopping complex in the very heart of downtown Rochester.

The celebration of Midtown Plaza's first year centered around a patriotic theme and was highlighted by the raising of an American flag. The flag was one with special significance attached to it: It had flown over our Nation's Capitol.

At the anniversary ceremonies, I spoke to those gathered on one of the elements that has made our country the great and free land we cherish today.

That element is individual initiative—the kind of self-starting action that punctuates our national history—the kind of free enterprise which has built Midtown Plaza.

Midtown Plaza is a monument to the free enterprise system and a challenge to every urban redeveloper in the United States. It symbolizes the best in the American tradition, a willingness to take a chance, individual enterprise, courage, and faith in the future.

Midtown Plaza comprises a 1-acre 2-story covered Mall; Midtown Tower, an 18-story, office-hotel-restaurant building; and a 2,000-car city-owned and operated underground garage.

Midtown Plaza created 220,000 square feet of new retail space in downtown Rochester. More than a million square feet of retail space is accessible from it.

Midtown Tower is composed of 13 floors of office space, a 220-seat restaurant, and a 3-floor, 78-room hotel. It is Rochester's highest building. The Tower building provides 173,000 square feet—more than 4 acres—of new office space in the center of the downtown business district.

The 3-level underground municipal garage has an average daily turnover of 4,500 automobiles.

The stimulus to downtown business and the assurance of a prosperous and vital future for both business and the city provided by Midtown Plaza, mark Midtown as one of the most remarkable undertakings by American businessmen in recent years.

Midtown Plaza was built with private capital by its cosponsors, the McCurdy and Co. Department Store and the B. Forman Co., Women's Specialty Store. The stores have been close neighbors and keen competitors for many years.

The project is a monument too, to cooperation between a municipality and private business. In an agreement believed to be the only one of its kind, the city committed itself to build and operate the 2,000-car underground garage and make necessary street improvements all at a cost of more than $11 million.

The owners of Midtown agreed to construct a covered mall and an office building at least 10 stories high above the garage. The happy result for downtown business and the city of Rochester is a revitalized city.

Midtown Plaza today is the home of 33 shops and services, 6 of them new businesses in Rochester. Midtown Tower provides space for 34 firms. Of the 173,000 square feet, or more than 4 acres of space, all but 12,000 feet is leased or occupied.

Midtown Plaza is more than a complex of steel and stone. It is the fulfillment of a community desire to preserve a civic asset.

Midtown Plaza is living witness to the ability of local interests and local government to develop a community resource. This ability has caught the imagination of other communities throughout the Nation and has been well publicized in their news media.

But, above all, Midtown Plaza has become a source of pride for all of us who live in Rochester. We are proud of this downtown Plaza. We tell our visitors about it and delight in giving them a tour of it.

Midtown Plaza is durable. It will live and grow as part of a dynamic Rochester, a Rochester made more dynamic by its presence in the heart of the city.

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising April 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago a group of tortured and abandoned men and women, their children hidden out of sight, gave vent to the desperation of their situation and with guns, bricks, bottles, and even their own bodies as weapons, took on the might of a well-equipped army with but one idea—to fight, to the death if necessary.

The Nazi army marched into Poland in September of 1939. Not only did this mean the beginning of a war that would rock the world for the next 6 years, it also marked the start of a campaign of mass slaughter and extermination that still leaves one stunned at the enormity of the crime committed. Before the end of the war 6 million Jews, mostly of Eastern Europe, would be dead, methodically killed under the orders of one man, Hitler, carried out by his sadistic henchmen. The center of this slaughter was Poland. Throughout Nazi-conquered Europe, a policy of Jewish extermination was carried out against heroic resistance by many of those doomed. Yet the heart is stirred most by what happened when the Warsaw ghetto finally exploded with wrath against the mass murder camps in the Polish countryside to which the Jews of the ghetto were taken to die, just for being Jews.

When the first stories began to circulate among the ghetto population of what actually happened to those who were taken off to "work camps" in the country and never heard of again, there was disbelief. When the real nature of these camps was established beyond doubt, there was fear. When the word was passed that the Nazi commandant had been ordered to dispose of the remaining Jews of the ghetto in a like manner, there was finally a will to fight.

It was the time of the Passover, a time of reflection for all Jews on the greatness of their history; it was the evening of April 18, 1943. The news spread quickly among the remaining 40,000 in the ghetto that tomorrow the Nazis would come to round them up for their one-way trip to death. But they had decided that the end would not come without resistance. As the storm troopers, with their Polish and Ukrainian police support, marched into the ghetto that Saturday morning, the fighting began. Since the invaders were taken completely by surprise, German dead sprawled on the streets. The Nazi high command was aghast. More troops were sent in and repulsed. The situation was serious, and Hitler was in a rage at the spirit shown by the Jews. Finally the local German commander took the last course available—he put the torch to the ghetto area. The partisans were driven from their attic hideouts into underground bunkers, covered by the rubble of falling buildings. Food and water were short, and weakened women and children were dying. The weak in spirit, willing to sell their souls for food and the chance to live a little longer, stole out to the Nazis and gave away some of the hiding places of the fighters. Rather than fall into German hands, sons shot their own mothers, mothers killed their own children, and still the resistance went on.

Outside the walls of the ghetto it was Easter. Spring had come to Warsaw, and while thousands were dying in the flames, the rest of the city carried on its usual business with only the smoke and ash marring the festive spirit.

On May 8 the main bunker was captured and most of the leaders of the movement killed. By the end of May most of the ghetto area had been destroyed and all but a handful of the fighters vanquished. The end had come, but only in Warsaw. The fight was carried on in the woods and hills. It is still going on today in the creation and preservation of the Jewish State of Israel. It is for us to remember in all honor and humility the brave freedom fighters of the ghetto of Warsaw. A monument to their sacrifice must be built and maintained in all our souls.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Senator Bayh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on April 6, 1963, at Indianapolis, Ind., the junior Senator of Indiana [Mr. Bayh] was called upon to deliver the principal address at the Indiana Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

The junior Senator of Indiana performed eloquently, giving to his audience a clear picture of Jeffersonian and Jacksonian principles, and how those principles are applicable today.

For the benefit of all of those who did not have the privilege of hearing my distinguished colleague of Indiana, I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Jefferson-Jackson Day Speech

(By Senator Bayh)

Tonight we meet to celebrate a victory, a victory most Hoosiers thought an impossible task only 12 short months ago. Through your faith and devotion, with your energy and dedication to purpose, together we won the good fight. Words are insufficient to express the deep gratitude which Marvella and I feel in our hearts for you who honored me by bestowing the honor of serving as your U.S. Senator from Indiana.

Yes, there were those who said Democratic victory in Indiana was impossible. There are those who utter this same sterile sounding slogan tonight. Let us here and now proclaim to those pitiful prophets of doom who declared it impossible to elect Vance Hartke to the U.S. Senate, who thought it impossible to seat Matthew Welsh in the Governor's chair, who pessimistically prophesied that a young State legislator from the city of Terre Haute was wasting his time, let us say to them at this very hour that the Democratic Party does not now nor will we ever again believe that the election of Democrats in Indiana is impossible.

Let us start now determined to elect and reelect Democratic mayors throughout this State. Let us decide now that a Democrat will be elected Governor, that Indiana will continue to have two Democratic Senators, that Democrats shall control the next general assembly and that Indiana shall cast its electoral votes for John Fitzgerald Kennedy in 1964.

The people of Indiana want good government and we are giving it to them. Hoosier citizens demand straight talk and solutions to complicated problems. This we pledge. This is our goal.

As Democrats we can be proud of the heritage to which we fall benefit. From the time the principles of the Democratic Party were laid down by Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, ours has been the party of the people, the defender of minority groups, the party of progress.

Shortly after the founding of our party, Thomas Jefferson defined its goals, characterized its philosophy and contrasted it with opposing forces when he said:

> "Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the high classes; and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as most honest and safe."

In the span of nearly a century and a half from Jefferson to Kennedy, a great nation and the world's oldest democracy has sprung from the waiting lands of a continent and the hearts of a people and has spread around the world. And across this Nation is emblazened the record of the Democratic Party, its belief in the people, its belief in the dignity of every man, its belief that there is no more noble aspiration for a political party or government than to tend to the needs of its citizens and to promote the basic opportunities of each individual American.

The Democratic Party has pursued these goals with concrete legislative programs. Democrats have been responsible for the cornerstones of family security, the social security program, unemployment compensation, consideration for the aged, the blind, our children. Democrats established the minimum wage and throughout the years we have improved it and increased its coverage. We have made considerable progress in the field of civil rights.

But we need not dwell in the past to talk of Democratic accomplishments. The Democratic Party is a party of the present and the future. After 2 years of the New Frontier, at the quarter post of the presidency of John F. Kennedy, we can see progress that has improved life here and around the world. Great progress has been made. Yet we are determined to solve problems still unsolved.

America has long been known for its Bill of Rights. Franklin Delano Roosevelt spoke eloquently of the four freedoms. Today a space age America must echo these thoughts and must rededicate itself to ensure certain basic opportunities for each American.

Each American must be given the opportunity to secure a job sufficient to provide for his family. Through the leadership of President Kennedy more Americans are gainfully employed today than at any other time in the history of our Nation.

Over 71 million American working men and women labor in the industries, shops, farms and mines of this country. Yet the challenge remains as long as many American workers cannot find jobs; as long as young minds and bodies are not properly equipped to find employment in space-age occupations. We, as Democrats are determined to meet this challenge with tax reviews to spur lagging economic growth; with retraining programs to assist those with unneeded skills; with a special youth program to guide and assist our younger citizens.

We are equally determined to provide this opportunity for those who labor on the farms of America. The efforts of the present administration have brought about an increase in farm income of approximately 10 percent during the last 2 years. Yet we will not rest until the American farmer enjoys equal prosperity with the rest of America, and the abundance from American farms is utilized as a blessing to a hungry world rather than as a stumbling block to high farm income.

Those who labor in business, large and small, must be guaranteed the opportunity to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home and abroad. We, as Democrats, believe in a truly free economy, free from Government control and free from the oppression of monopolistic power. Ample opportunity for the small businessman is an important goal.

Each American, as a member of a family group, should be afforded the opportunity for compatible family living. The opportunities for jobs, for decent housing, and for adequate medical care during the twilight years of life are important steps toward attaining this goal. And we as Democrats must continue the efforts made in past years to see that adequate legislative programs are enacted in this important area.

Finally, each American child must have the opportunity for a good education. No investment we make as a nation is more important than that which we make in providing adequate training for our most valuable natural resource, our children. Every child must have the opportunity to develop full his own potentiality. To be sure it takes classrooms, it takes teachers; and these take money. But investment in our Nation's future through education is our best guarantee of meeting the challenges of the space age and the future.

If these opportunities are to be provided for Americans today, each of us must be resolute in opposition to these few persons who would deprive them to some Americans because of race, religion, or national origin; for full American citizenship means freedom of worship, freedom of access to public places, freedom to speak without fear of reprisal, and freedom to vote one's own convictions in the privacy of a polling place.

The cold war struggle today finds communistic totalitarianism and democratic freedom locked in mortal combat.

A waiting world is watching the American response to the challenges of this age. Awakening nations, searching for a better way of life, are asking will democracy and freedom work?

Let us answer with a hearty chorus of yes. Let us answer by renewing our determination to keep the United States of America a land of opportunity, for all Americans, for each American.

A Rebuke to the New England Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] inserted in the daily Congressional Record a statement entitled "New England Council Statement in Answer to Representative John P. Saylor." It not only challenged my knowledge of the problems of the coal industry, but also questioned my veracity in this regard.

The council purported to substantiate its attack through the medium of a report on residual oil imports issued by the Office of Emergency Planning, whose conclusions on the oil import control program were so obviously fallacious that even the Department of Interior took issue and the White House itself rejected the Office of Emergency Planning recommendations.

It is not my purpose today to reexamine the Office of Emergency Planning proposals or to protest the New England Council's vicious attack. In view of the selfish attitude of the council in years past, its latest unfounded and inexcusable charges are not surprising. What is disturbing, however, is that this scurrilous material would find its way into the Congressional Record.

In assuring the gentleman that I have no intention of replying in kind to this abusive treatment, I should like to suggest that he and his New England colleagues may in the future choose to examine closely any and all council statements before repeating them.

I recognize that the gentlemen are so hard put to satisfy the council's voracious demands that it is impossible for them to give the necessary attention to the statistical information brewed in defiance of accuracy and principle at the council's chambers in Boston. Apparently frantic distribution of the propaganda is deliberately planned on the theory that the delegation patently and patronizingly serving the council will place the material on public display without questioning its authenticity. I trust that my friends from New England will in the future be more cautious on this treatment of the printed products of the council.

The council attack on me inserted in the April 4 issue of the Congressional Record is by no means the first instance of the careless handling by the New England delegation of matters pertaining to the question of oil imports. When the gentleman from Massachusetts was recognized on the floor of the House for 3 hours last March 28, I sat throughout the subsequent discussion and was frankly fascinated at the coordinated participation of the several Representatives from New England and the Members from other areas they had been able to solicit for the meeting that—unless so well managed—would have fallen completely flat because of the obvious exaggerations and irrelevancies that echoed time and again through this Chamber. The gentleman was so gracious as to permit me and my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] time to inject pertinent questions which, of course, were never answered but nevertheless became an official part of the proceedings.

It was not until the transcript of those proceedings reached my office later that evening that I discovered that the New England floor show had apparently been contrived in the same haste that has marked other instances of the campaign against the oil import control program. Without in anyway attempting to embarrass any of the Members who participated in that day's discussion, I should like to call your attention to a photostatic copy of a page that inadvertently had become a part of the transcript. Scribbled in longhand on one page of the transcript—the official transcript of the proceedings of the House, I remind you—was the notation:

> Questions will be asked by Mr. ———— of ————.

So perhaps, with evidence such as this at hand, we should be more cognizant of the pressure exerted by the New England Council. We should be more disposed to understand why the gentleman from Massachusetts would be so indifferent to the House amenities as to insert in the Record the inexcusable statement by the New England Council attacking the integrity of a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that subsequent presentations produced in deference to the imported oil merchants of the East will also provide for a response to one question which I have submitted without success to my friend from New England for the past several years:

Is New England willing, if in fact the oil import control program should be abolished and no restrictions placed on the volume of foreign oil moving into this country, to permit free import—without tariffs, quotas, or other restrictions—of textiles, fish, brass mill products, rubber products, footwear, watches, bicycles, and whatever other products are manufactured in the northeastern portion of our country?

Here is the fundamental issue. In its glib reference to the restoration of free enterprise, does the New England Council proclaim to want the products of New England accorded the same competitive conditions to which it would subject America's coal industry?

Mr. Speaker, can we expect this matter to be resolved at the next New England prayer meeting that takes place here in the House of Representatives? I repeat that I do not wish to embarrass any of my colleagues, even those who would give publication to improper and undignified remarks such as those leveled by the New England Council. For this reason I shall not name the Member of the House who, just 5 days after he took part in the March 28 rumble against oil import restrictions, stood on this very same floor and made violent protest against importation of woolen goods so destructive of the New England economy that they have been responsible for the closing of a plant in the home State of my friend who gives currency to the New England Council's criticism of a Member of Congress.

The two-part travesty is available for reading on pages 4951 and 5540. In the first instance, the gentleman stanchly asserts that New Englanders want to pay the free world price for their fuel; the next week he demands that the President immediately impose quantitative restrictions on the importation of woolen goods. New Englanders must pay 27 cents more for domestic than for foreign residual oil, he asserted on March 28; 5 days later he said that the Massachusetts plant had been closed because their fabrics cannot meet the competition of Japanese products, which sell for 40 cents per yard cheaper. As I interpret these remarks, our friends in New England expect Americans to pay more for textiles in order to keep New Englanders employed. I concur with that philosophy. But I should like to hear some attempt at justifying the position of those same New Englanders who are willing to see Pennsylvania and West Virginia coal miners lose their jobs in order that greater volumes of foreign residual oil may be made available on the Atlantic seaboard.

For the record, I feel compelled to dwell briefly on that 27-cent figure to which I have just referred. Here is the way my colleague used it on March 28:

> Mr. Speaker, New Hampshire residual oil consumers feel they are being unfairly treated by the Kennedy administration. They are being forced to pay 27 cents extra for a barrel of residual oil than foreign consumers pay.

Now, this difficult-to-understand conclusion is another indication of how the New England Council has been able to confuse even their protagonists in Washington. I would suspect that most economists would accept as a truism the fact that a commodity—any commodity—would vary in sales prices according to points of production and consumption. A barrel of oil—any kind of oil—would be expected to be cheaper in Saudi Arabia or Venezuela than it is in Portsmouth, Pendleton, Pago Pago, or Rahway Junction. It is also likely that a sheaf of writing paper produced in New Hampshire is going to cost more at Las Vegas or Buenos Aires than it does in Manchester.

Now let us take a look at the New England Council's own reference to this magic figure unquestionably developed in Boston's Statler Building. The attempted calumniation of a Member of Congress by the council, as placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by my friend from Massachusetts, includes this sentence:

> Residual import restrictions have forced the cost of residual oil to 27 cents per barrel more than in Canada and other countries.

It is my earnest hope that, when the New England delegation next favors us with its stereotyped routine, an attempt will be made to get that 27-cent item on the proper shelf. If it has not been picked out of thin air, then certainly it can be presented with some degree of lucidity. Meanwhile the New England delegation might want to attempt to square its calculations with data released April 15 by the Office of Emergency Planning, the outfit whose recommendations for abandoning the oil import controls program was evidently not politically agreeable to the White House. OEP lists the February residual oil cargo sales price at $2.01 in New England, a reduction of $1.18 since February 1957. You will remember that the mandatory control program, which went into effect in April 1959, used the 1957 figure as criteria for the quota system. The OEP chart shows no indication that at any time in the past 8 years has the selling price of residual oil in New England been lower than it is at the present time.

The New England Council, as reported through the good offices of the gentleman from Massachusetts, quotes me as having said that the import quota system has at no time been used to benefit affected coal producing regions. I have indeed made such a charge, and I reiterate it. The April 1 increase in quota allocations is summary proof that the levels have been adjusted to court the favors of New England Members of Congress and President Betancourt of Venezuela without regard to the economic impact upon coal mining areas. If, as the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] averred on March 28, unemployment in West Virginia is of concern to all Americans, then I ask him to consider the impact of the increase in residual oil imports that went into effect on the first day of this month.

For the past year coal companies, railroads, and public utilities have been cooperating in an effort to bring about a substantial reduction in the delivered price of coal through the introduction of the unit train. The experiments have been so successful that some of the lines were able to initiate price reductions of as much as $1.50 per ton on coal moving from western and central Pennsylvania to the east coast—traffic that would normally cost from $4 to $4.50. This new concept in coal transportation has been looked to by residents of mining regions as the method through which present markets could be preserved and others regained. Since oil importing companies are able to adjust sales prices without regard to production and shipping costs, the peddlers of foreign oil need have no worry about competing with domestic coal regardless of the extent to which delivered prices may be reduced.

The increase allowed by the Department of Interior in residual oil imports for the year beginning April 1 amounts to 50,000 barrels per day. To serve the markets into which this foreign fuel will move would require the service of a series of unit trains, two of which—each made up of 100 60-ton cars—would move every day of the year from Pennsylvania's mines to the east coast. Under the new order, those trains will not go into service. Their operating crews and maintenance men will remain idle. The miners who would produce the coal will continue to wait for their jobs to reopen.

This prospect obviously meets with the approval of the New England Council. I am hopeful that my colleagues in the House of Representatives, assuming a less narrow perspective, will no longer concur in this malevolent philosophy and will no longer stand ready to broadcast character assaults on Members of Congress as perpetrated and effectuated by the Council.

Chicago's Northwest Side Needs Mass Transit Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the Jefferson-Park Press, which is published in my district by Mrs. Morton Steinman, carried a most convincing editorial in support of the mass transit bill which we hope will come before the House for action very soon.

Miss Sally Swanson, very capable civic affairs editor of the Jefferson-Park Press, has certainly stated the case in support of the mass transit bill in terms which should help every Member of Congress better understand how the people at the grassroots level in this country feel about the massive traffic jams which clog our large and small cities daily during rush hours.

I was very pleased to see this frank editorial since it has been my privilege to be among the first Members of Congress to cosponsor this legislation.

Recently, I appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee in support of this proposal to help America's communities develop a more effective mass transit system.

More than one-half million people living in Chicago's Northwest Side, most of whom I represent in Congress, would benefit from this legislation.

I am including my own testimony in my remarks today following the excellent editorial by Miss Sally Swanson.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Swanson's editorial and my own remarks follow:

MOON TALK MAY GET COOL RECEPTION ON NORTHWEST EXPRESSWAY

(By Sally Swanson)

Yesterday the Nation's first astronaut to orbit the earth, John Glenn, came to town, signalling the start of Chicago space month, and for the next 30 days talk of spaceships, meteorites, and moon blast-offs should excite the imagination.

One segment of the population may be indifferent. A trip to the moon in this decade? How will that strike the bumper-to-bumper crowd known collectively as the Northwest Expressway commuting public?

The man caught twice a day in a car-choked nightmare, may consider a moon launch ludicrous as he stops, starts, dodges, and listens to his car radio chide: "Northwest Expressway congested today." Like yesterday and tomorrow.

A trip to the moon? The trip to work is challenge enough.

Two and a half years ago when the expressway opened, the Northwest Side hailed a new era of automobile transportation. The area has drawn closer to distant parts of Chicagoland, with driving time unthinkable a few years ago.

But not during rush hours. Disgruntled motorists insist they make better time on city streets.

The congestion could be eased simply enough, according to experts, by installation of CTA tracks in the expressway's median strip. Simple enough except for one problem: money.

About $46 million is needed to install the tracks, including an extension from Logan Square el, to O'Hare Field.

INFLUENTIAL GROUPS REAPPRAISE STAND

Provisions were made for the CTA system when the road was built, and installation was expected in due course. The plan toppled in the spring of 1961 when four powerful business and civic groups which had planned to help the CTA get the necessary money withdrew their support.

Instead they asked for a study of the Northwest Side's overall transportation situation.

It surprised no one when a bill for the CTA expressway subsidy failed to pass the State legislature.

Last November—18 months and several thousand dollars later—the transportation survey reported that the CTA tracks would be "the most effective single improvement in public transportation" to relieve the Northwest Side's traffic woes.

The CTA expressway received a second important endorsement last fall from the Chicago area transportation study, a 6-year research program costing $3½ million.

Principal opposition has come from the Chicago & North Western Railroad, whose officials complain that as a private enterprise the railway could not compete with a subsidized public agency.

Perhaps the protests have been effective because of the railroad's sincerity in attempting to make its commuter business pay.

It has replaced dirty, ill heated, and often overcrowded coaches with doubledeckers that are roomy, air conditioned, and altogether comfortable. It has added more trains to its schedule, and inaugurated a river cruiser connection from its depot to Michigan Avenue. All draw the respect of a free enterprise society.

RAILROADS HAVE DISADVANTAGES

But railroads best serve the suburban commuter—Northwest Expressway is within the city of Chicago—and it has distinct disadvantages for city riders: High fares, few stops, no transfer privileges.

Long delay in the CTA system could be costly. Experience proves that congested expressways create a demand for more expressways.

And expressways are expensive. Their construction costs many times that of a CTA installation and they remove land from the tax rolls, to say nothing of incalculable expenses from disrupted neighborhoods, displaced homes, and air pollution.

And so it was encouraging news when Walter J. McCarter, general manager of the CTA, proposed Thursday that construction of Northwest Expressway CTA have top priority if Federal aid to mass transportation is approved by Congress.

The bill, which would offer up to two-thirds of the difference betwen the cost of the project and the amount paid by fares, has been approved by the Senate. It faces a steep hurdle in the House.

Hence the fate of the urban transit bill this week in Washington is vitally important to Northwest Side motorists. Possibly more important than an "Operation Moonlift."

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ROMAN C. PUCINSKI BEFORE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 6, 1963

Mr. Chairman, permit me to express my gratitude to you and your committee for affording me an opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 3881, which would provide up to $500 million for development of mass urban transportation systems.

It has been my privilege to submit identical legislation—H.R. 807—both in the last Congress and again in this Congress.

Gentlemen, I have here an aerial photograph of my district showing the Northwest Expressway which goes right through my district. It has been our hope to develop in the median strip of this expressway a rapid transit system to relieve the tremendous automobile congestion which makes this expressway one solid mass of automobiles every working day during the early morning rush hour and the evening rush hour.

Chicago at present has three expressways: the Congress Expressway, the Northwest Expressway, and the Dan Ryan Expressway. We are now in the process of building our fourth expressway, cutting through the southwest section of our city. All of our expressways have been specially designed to provide a median strip for rapid transit.

The Northwest Expressway, the Dan Ryan Expressway, and the Southwest Expressway were all financed by Federal grants-in-aid as part of the National Defense Highway System.

I am sure your committee will agree that with 78 percent of America's population now living in urban areas, the decision to extend the National Defense Highway System into the large cities is indeed a wise one. This decision to extend the National Defense Highway System in the large cities was made in order to afford these cities an opportunity to move huge masses of people out of the city very quickly in the event of a national emergency.

However, Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that under the existing situation in all of the large cities of America, including Chicago, if an enemy force ever wanted to wreak havoc and destruction on this country, the time for a sneak attack would be during the early morning rush hour or the evening rush hour when perhaps as much as 60 percent of this Nation's entire industrial labor force is hopelessly bogged down in traffic snarls all over America.

While I hope this bizarre prospect never develops, I mention this merely to emphasize to the committee the complete futility which faces the large urban communities of America in trying to relieve this indescribable traffic congestion during rush hours without some form of Federal assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I consider this legislation to provide assistance to our cities for development of rapid transit systems as important to our national defense effort as any single appropriation now before us in the multibillion-dollar defense program.

The Chicago Transit Authority has done a magnificent job in developing what I believe to be the finest mass transportation system in the world.

Earlier this year you heard testimony from Mr. Virgil Gunlock, chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority, and also from Mr. Walter McCarter, general superintendent of the Chicago Transit Authority. I am sure their experience is similar to that of transit operators all over the country, whether the transit system they operate is privately owned or publicly owned. In each instance they are faced with the dilemma of either raising the fares to bring about necessary improvements and seeing their passenger volume decline, or leaving fares at their present rate and forsaking the needed modernization programs.

There is no question in my mind that in all of the large cities of this country, present rates have reached their peak, and any further increases would result in a tremendous decline in rider volume.

It is quite proper that the urban communities of America should turn to their Federal Government for assistance. These large cities are the lifeblood of the Nation. From these large industrial centers flows the revenue that makes it possible for this country to meet its defense commitments and, yes, Mr. Chairman, its very struggle for survival.

We do not hesitate to appropriate an estimated $8 billion a year in this country to help the people in the rural areas of America remain in the economic stream of the Nation. It is a long-established fact that when the rural areas of America suffer economically, it is only a matter of a short time before the economy of America falters.

Mr. Chairman, nor did we hesitate to appropriate billions of dollars in our country in military and economic assistance to our allies because we realize that the survival of freedom could be decided by the rebuilding of the large industrial centers of Europe in making these countries economically independent.

Why, then, should there be any strong objection to helping solve one of the most serious problems facing America's urban areas in this 7th decade of the 20th century?

If the local communities could resolve this problem through their own resources, I certainly would agree there is no need for Federal intervention. But study after study shows conclusively that these urban areas of the country cannot solve their transportation problems without some form of assistance from the Federal Government, and for this reason I strongly urge adoption of this measure.

I would, however, like to call your attention to some provisions of this legislation which would create very severe hardships to employees of the mass transportation industry.

Section 3 of the bill provides for grants or loans to State or local public bodies or agencies for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, reconstructing, or improving existing transit systems.

In many States, when a private operation has been acquired by the State or a political subdivision of a State, the public body has taken the position that it is legally disqualified from entering into collective bargaining with the collective bargaining agent of the employees and also from entering into arbitration agreements with such collective bargaining agent, even where, as is usually the case, the employee has been for many years represented by a union under a system of collective bargaining with provisions for arbitration.

It would be my hope that this legislation can be amended to include provisions to protect public utility workers in the right to union recognition.

It is my further hope that some provision can be made which would give these employees of publicly owned mass transportation systems the right to enter into collective bargaining agreements and to negotiate with management. Certainly these provisions should include the right to agreements which would provide some channel for settling grievance disputes.

Mr. Chairman, if in the judgment of this committee you cannot agree on appropriate language to guarantee these rights to collective bargaining of employees working for publicly owned mass transportation systems, perhaps the committee would consider including in its report language which would make it clear that the intent of Congress on this legislation is not to deny in any manner or form, directly or indirectly, workers from exercising their right to collective bargaining if in fact the majority of the workers in a given union endorse such an action for collective bargaining.

A second shortcoming in this legislation which I hope will be corrected by the committee is its failure to provide protective conditions for employees who would be displaced or adversely affected as a result, at least in part, of the Federal financial assistance program.

One way in which transit employees of existing transit companies could be adversely affected is where a rapid transit operation is undertaken by a public agency with Federal assistance, and the private transit company continues in existence. It is inevitable, for example, that if a rapid transit line is erected which serves the same area as is presently served by a private bus line, that patronage will be attracted from the bus line, and employees of the bus line will be adversely affected.

Here, also, perhaps this problem can be resolved by language in the report establishing legislative intent that an effort should be made to absorb displaced workers from existing public transit systems to newly developed transit systems financed through Federal assistance. I would suggest that perhaps some reference should be made to the Manpower Retraining Act so that where employees are dislocated from their existing jobs because of new transit systems, these dislocated workers, if they need additional training, should get this training under the Manpower Retraining Act and then be absorbed by the newly developed transit system.

Certainly if we are going to spend Federal funds to develop new mass transit facilities, it is not asking too much that we at least establish in the committee report a recommendation that displaced workers in existing facilities, wherever practicable, be given priority in applying for employment with the new facility.

I am reasonably convinced that the Federal assistance which urban areas could receive under this legislation would indeed create so impressive an expansion of mass transit facilities throughout America that the workers presently employed in this country would be absorbed into new job opportunities. However, I am sure that we can understand the concern of those presently employed in the transit industry that modernization and automation may eliminate their jobs. It is my hope that the committee will give serious consideration to this concern, and I am confident that reasonable men can work out reasonable solutions in this difficult field.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you for giving me this time to appear before this committee, and I shall be very happy to answer any questions you might have.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

Rev. Harry W. Campbell, the Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, whose yearning is for noble men and nations, inspire us by Thy presence in these days. Let Thy spirit fill these venerable walls and touch our tempers and our words. Walk amongst us, and through these galleries, and across our land, we pray, and cover us all with the mantle of Thy protection.

Grant us to be so broad in vision as to be incapable of narrow prejudice. Teach us to aim so high that we can walk through mires of circumstance and remain clean. Protect us from too much trust in our skills, and grant us the grace to lean on Thee for guidance through the dark places. Make us, we pray, eager to reach for heaven, but able also to touch the oppressed of earth. And through all our deliberations, help us to be wise. In the blessed name of Jesus. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARTLETT thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 22, 1963, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of yesterday, the Vice President, on yesterday, signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on yesterday, April 22, 1963, the Vice President had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 277. An act to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada;

H.R. 1087. An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve;

H.R. 1544. An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz.;

H.R. 2291. An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass;

H.R. 2294. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz;

H.R. 5067. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1049. An act to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n);

H.R. 1159. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases;

H.R. 1213. An act for the relief of World Games, Inc.;

H.R. 1267. An act for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird;

H.R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells;

H.R. 1292. An act for the relief of Carmela Calabrese DiVito;

H.R. 1428. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll;

H.R. 1447. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 1459. An act for the relief of Oliver Brown;

H.R. 1492. An act to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart;

H.R. 1561. An act for the relief of Melborn Keat;

H.R. 1853. An act for the relief of Patti Jean Fulton;

H.R. 1876. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi;

H.R. 2179. An act for the relief of Mrs. David Ishmael, Manhattan, Kans.

H.R. 2245. An act for the relief of Stella McKee;

H.R. 2257. An act for the relief of Kenneth F. Miller;

H.R. 2292. An act for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee;

H.R. 2302. An act for the relief of James M. Norman;

H.R. 2326. An act for the relief of Maurice Casner and Eileen G. Casner;

H.R. 2327. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Campbell;

H.R. 2364. An act for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.;

H.R. 2699. An act for the relief of Victor L. Ashley;

H.R. 2700. An act for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians;

H.R. 2708. An act for the relief of Vasiliki Moundroukas;

H.R. 2736. An act for the relief of William C. Jessup;

H.R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke;

H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer;

H.R. 2798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Veselenak;

H.R. 2859. An act to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3022. An act for the relief of Gene H. King;

H.R. 3029. An act for the relief of Maj. Arnold M. Anderson;

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will;

H.R. 3240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Dubins;

H.R. 3356. An act for the relief of Josephine Maria (Bonaccorso) Bowtell;

H.R. 3369. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason;

H.R. 3450. An act for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.;

H.R. 3545. An act to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968;

H.R. 3574. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, Calif., for defense purposes;

H.R. 3612. An act to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act;

H.R. 3623. An act for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 3624. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 3625. An act for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 3627. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others;

H.R. 3755. An act for the relief of Glendal W. Hancock;

H.R. 4214. An act for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri;

H.R. 4330. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act;

H.R. 4349. An act for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson;

H.R. 5044. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes";

H.R. 5081. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1049. An act to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n);

H.R. 1213. An act for the relief of World Games, Inc.;

H.R. 1267. An act for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird;

H.R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells;

H.R. 1292. An act for the relief of Garmela Calabrese DiVito;

H.R. 1447. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 1459. An act for the relief of Oliver Brown;

H.R. 1561. An act for the relief of Melborn Keat;

H.R. 1853. An act for the relief of Patti Jean Fulton;

H.R. 1876. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rita M Bravi;

H.R. 2179. An act for the relief of Mrs. David Ishmael, Manhattan, Kans.;

H.R. 2245. An act for the relief of Stella McKee;

H.R. 2257. An act for the relief of Kenneth F. Miller;

H.R. 2292. An act for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee;

H.R. 2302. An act for the relief of James M. Norman;

H.R. 2326. An act for the relief of Maurice Casner and Eileen G. Casner;

H.R. 2327. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Campbell;

H.R. 2364. An act for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.;

H.R. 2699. An act for the relief of Victor L. Ashley;

H.R. 2700. An act for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians;

H.R. 2708. An act for the relief of Vasiliki Moundroukas;

H.R. 2736. An act for the relief of William C. Jessup;

H.R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke;

H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer;

H.R. 2859. An act to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3022. An act for the relief of Gene H. King;

H.R. 3029. An act for the relief of Maj. Arnold M. Anderson;

H.R. 3240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Dubins;

H.R. 3356. An act for the relief of Josephine Marie (Bonaccorso) Bowtell;

H.R. 3450. An act for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.;

H.R. 3623. An act for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 3624. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 3625. An act for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 3627. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others;

H.R. 3755. An act for the relief of Glendal W. Hancock;

H.R. 4214. An act for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri; and

H.R. 4349. An act for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1159. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases;

H.R. 3545. An act to amend section 131 of title 13. United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968; and

H.R. 3612. An act to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1428. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll;

H.R. 2798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Veselenak; and

H.R. 3369. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1492. An act to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart;

H.R. 3574. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, Calif., for defense purposes; and

H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will;

H.R. 4330. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act;

H.R. 5044. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes"; and

H.R. 5081. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. **Mansfield**, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Actual Procurement Receipts for Medical Stockpile of Civil Defense Emergency Supplies and Equipment Purposes

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ended March 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committe on Armed Services.

Report on Backlog of Pending Applications and Hearing Cases in Federal Communications Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of February 28, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Additional Assistant Secretary of State

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Audit Report on Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, for the period July 30, 1957, through June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Employees' Air Travel Authorized by the Washington Office, Veterans' Administration

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of employees' air travel authorized by the Washington office, Veterans' Administration, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Section 104(b)(5), Title 23, United States Code, Relating to Certain Cost Estimates for Completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the submission of certain cost estimates for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to itinerant offices for unemployment insurance benefits

"Whereas unemployment is not limited to the heavily concentrated population areas but extends into the suburban areas; and

"Whereas individuals who are unemployed are often required to go great distances in order to negotiate and claim their accrued State unemployment benefits; and

"Whereas the burden of the travel expense falls upon those who are in a position least able to shoulder such expense and this added expense tends to vitiate the objectives of the unemployment compensation program; and

"Whereas a program conducted in Anderson, Calif., has indicated that establishment of itinerant offices to handle unemployment benefits is administratively feasible and will result in only a small added cost; and

"Whereas this program at Anderson, Calif., has saved those claimants using the local unemployment insurance benefits office in 1962 a total travel mileage of 39,314 miles; and

"Whereas the above 39,314 miles saved represented an approximate 25 percent of those eligible to receive pay in the Anderson area and had the other 75 percent of those eligible received their pay in the Anderson office there would have been a total mileage saving of 167,000 miles at a cost to the unemployment insurance agency of only 600 miles. The other 75 percent of those eligible to receive pay in the Anderson office penalized themselves an additional 127,686 miles of travel in order to receive their pay weekly instead of semimonthly, as the Anderson office is on a semimonthly basis; and

"Whereas additional funds from the U.S. Government are necessary in order for the State of California to implement a regular program of itinerant unemployment insurance offices: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact legislation granting additional funds which will enable the States to establish a system of itinerant unemployment insurance benefit offices, on a weekly payment basis, for suburban areas; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of the California delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, the American Legion, Miami, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation to name the new veterans hospital to be erected in Miami, Dade County, Fla., the Joe H. Adams Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Resolution 247

"Whereas the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, created by act of Congress in September 1961, has supported and promoted the "U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World," which could result in complete disarmament in the United States in less than 10 years; and

"Whereas history has taught us that peace is only achieved when a free people stay militarily strong; and

"Whereas Khrushchev has sworn he will bury us, but he intends to bury our freedom, take our children and place us in slavery; and

"Whereas personal freedoms and economic security can be enjoyed only by those who possess the power to protect their citizens against the invasions of other systems of government; and

"Whereas an understanding of the disarmament policy of our administration, Congress, and the State Department is the most crucial issue facing our citizens today: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas,* That the house of representatives of the 58th legislature wishes to go on record in opposition to the disarmament policy of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; provided, that the Congress of the United States is notified that, irrespective of Federal action, the sovereign State of Texas will never release her State military forces to any international organization, but will forever retain her right under the Constitution of this Republic and State to keep a militia for the protection of her citizens; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be prepared and sent to members of the Texas delegation in the National Congress and to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON as an indication of the views of this house concerning our present disarmament policy as proposed by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

"BYRON TUNNELL,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"DOROTHY HOLLMAN,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Memorial 229

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to more fully recognize that the impact of approximately 150,000 Cuban refugees has created a substantial and persistent unemployment and social problem, which has and does exist in the heavily populated Dade County area and that further and immediate action must be taken and prompt remedies be found to alleviate the harmful conditions that do now exist and will continue to exist and become acute with the continuous heavy influx of these refugees among the residents of this State

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore given recognition to the existence of the large numbers of Cuban refugees in this State and to the problems caused thereby; and

"Whereas this large number of refugees who continue to flee from the tyrannical and oppressive conditions of the communistic Government of Cuba to seek a haven in a democratic country where human rights and dignity are recognized supreme; and

"Whereas it has become obvious that the needs of these refugees who, through no fault of their own, have become a burden on certain local areas of this State and that the local resources and facilities of these areas have been taxed beyond their capacities; and

"Whereas the education of Cuban refugee children is now pressing hard on the educational funds and facilities provided by the State of Florida; and

"Whereas the present existence of this large number of Cuban refugees has already placed tremendous and herculean economic burdens upon the local residents and the local governments of these areas in that the local labor market has been drastically affected to the detriment of the permanent working population; and

"Whereas many of these local residents are being displaced from their regular employment and thus becoming an additional economic burden to the local welfare bureau and in many instances causing the permanent residents in these areas to become a burden on their friends and relatives; and

"Whereas the charitable organizations in these areas have also had placed on them an unduly heavy economic burden arising as a result of the tremendous influx of Cuban refugees which has strained their resources to the breaking point; and

"Whereas it has become obvious that the needs of these refugees cannot be met from local resources and facilities which have been substantially depleted; and

"Whereas regardless of previous measures to alleviate this burdensome problem, the continued increase in the numbers of refugees to be found in the Dade County area, which is the major port of entry for these helpless and unfortunate refugees, due to the existing policy of the U.S. Government; and

"Whereas there is the ever-present danger that the problems created by this tremendous influx of Cuban refugees may spread to other areas of Florida and aggravate their problems; and

"Whereas this tremendous problem must be immediately alleviated in order to prevent irreparable harm, both to the economic and social well-being of the citizens of this State; and

"Whereas these helpless and unfortunate Cuban refugees and local residents who have been displaced from their places of employment because of these problems in these local areas now have more than doubled in number the unemployment in these local areas and have brought the unemployment situation in these areas to a critical stage; and

"Whereas there is pending legislation in the Congress of the United States with a definite purpose to alleviate the acute economic and social problems caused in these local areas by Cuban refugees fleeing the tyrannical and oppressive pressure of the communistic government of Cuba: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully urged and requested to give full recognition to the fact that the Cuban refugee problem in this State is primarily the responsibility of the Federal Government and of national concern and ask that additional assistance and relief be provided to Dade County and any other counties similarly affected and that other Cuban refugee centers be established in the United States and other ports of entry be established for the entrance of these unfortunate and helpless refugees from Communist tyranny; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Secretary of Commerce of the United States; to the Secretary of Labor of the United States; to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States; and to each member of the Florida congressional delegation."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1196. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler (Rept. No. 143);

H.R. 2833. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding (Rept. No. 144);

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311) (Rept. No. 145);

H.R. 2842. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code (Rept. No. 146); and

H.R. 2849. An act to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act (Rept. No. 147).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 787. A bill for the relief of Zofia Miecielica (Rept. No. 148).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 495. A bill for the relief of Evanthia Haji-Christou (Rept. No. 149); and

S. 732. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zorich, Amabile Miotto Zorich, and Fiorella Zorich (Rept. No. 150).

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 980. A bill to provide for holding terms of the U.S. district court for the district of Vermont at Montpelier and Saint Johnsbury (Rept. No. 152).

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 102. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for additional commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 151).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week (Rept. No. 142).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of February 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, FEBRUARY 1963

INTRODUCTION

This is the 39th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of February 1963.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of February 1, 1963, totaled $14,159,810,325, and as of February 28, 1963, they totaled $14,025,156,888, a net decrease of $134,653,437 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile [1]	$5,879,281,200	$5,870,072.100	−$9,209.100
Defense Production Act	1.500,905,400	1,500 308.600	−596.800
Supplemental—barter	1,304,643,502	1,312,701,632	+8.058,130
Total, strategic and critical materials [1]	8,684,830,102	8.683,082,332	−1,747,770
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	5,042,931,625	4,903.701,615	−139,230,010
Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1]	127,874,190	127,874,190	
Total, agricultural commodities [1]	5,170.805.815	5,031,575,805	−139,230,010
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	32,377,298	32,846,003	+468,705
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	177,403,810	182,862.548	+5.458,738
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	209,781,108	215,708,551	+5,927,443
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	2.230,800	2,230,800	
National Industrial Reserve Act	92.162,500	92,559,400	+396.900
Total, machine tools	94.393.300	94,790,200	+396,900
Total, all inventories	14,159,810,325	14,025,156,888	−134,653,437

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87–548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net changes figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the originally acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

The appendix to this report, beginning on page 19, includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, February 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories, February 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,989	1,128,989			
Defense Production Act	430,717,600	431,622,100	+$904,500	do	851,575	853,351	+1,776		
Total	918,398,200	919,302,700	+904,500	do	1,980,564	1,982,340	+1,776	1,200,000	782,340
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grains:									
Supplemental—barter	7,560,206	8,324,709	+764,503	do	25,476	28,035	+2,559	(2)	28,035
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		Short dry ton	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500		do	378,359	378,359		200,000	178,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	20,488,000	20,488,000		Short ton	30,301	30,301			
Supplemental—barter	10,841,007	11,022,816	+181,809	do	18,858	19,136	+278		
Total	31,329,007	31,510,816	+181,809	do	49,159	49,437	+278	70,000	(3)
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	2,637,600	2,637,600		do	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	5,241,890	5,308,866	+66,976	do	21,246	21,247	+1		
Total	7,879,490	7,946,466	+66,976	do	32,951	32,952	+1	45,000	(3)
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,355,700	3,356,200	+500	Short dry ton	6,223	6,224	+1		
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	3,934,500	3,934,500		do	5,532	5,532			
Total	9,392,800	9,393,300	+500	do	14,103	14,104	+1	11,000	3,104
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702,100	702,100		Short ton	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	5,620,877	6,151,100	+530,223	do	20,841	22,830	+1,989		
Total	6,322,977	6,853,200	+530,223	do	22,408	24,397	+1,989	(2)	24,397
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	13,925,000	13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	85,249,134	85,987,508	+738,374	do	5,543,113	5,576,145	+33,032		
Total	117,342,134	118,080,508	+738,374	do	7,792,930	7,825,962	+33,032	2,600,000	5,225,962
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78,572,500	78,565,600	−6,900	do	4,963,201	4,963,030	−171		
Supplemental—barter	45,873,603	45,667,300	−206,303	do	2,927,256	2,927,256			
Total	124,446,103	124,232,900	−213,203	do	7,890,457	7,890,286	−171	6,400,000	1,490,286
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton.	299,279	299,279		137,000	162,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,770,200	9,770,200		Short ton	23,233	23,233			
Defense Production Act	1,425,800	1,425,800		do	2,543	2,543			
Supplemental—barter	22,739,500	22,739,500		do	11,321	11,321			
Total	33,935,500	33,935,500		do	37,097	37,097		23,100	13,997
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	9,441,032	9,814,950	+373,918	do	81	84	+3	(2)	84
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,674,300	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,342,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,901	22,901			
Supplemental—barter	5,515,200	5,518,400	+3,200	do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,241,900	8,245,100	+3,200	do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,000,000	871,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	21,260,000	21,260,000		do	10,829,640	10,829,640			
Supplemental—barter	12,310,663	12,311,000	+337	do	7,448,989	7,448,989			
Total	33,570,663	33,571,000	+337	do	18,278,629	18,278,629		6,500,000	11,778,629
Castor oil:									
National stockpile	55,243,900	54,452,700	−791,200	do	213,720,820	210,095,326	−3,625,494	68,000,000	142,095,326
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1,412,300	1,412,300		Short dry ton	28,816	28,816		22,000	6,816
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12,286,800	12,286,800		do	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	20,200,996	20,650,447	+449,451	do	608,625	632,748	+24,123		
Total	32,487,796	32,937,247	+449,451	do	1,168,077	1,192,200	+24,123	475,000	717,200
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	264,765,600	264,765,600		do	3,799,176	3,799,176			
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,646	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	224,615,366	224,615,366		do	1,543,114	1,543,114			
Total	525,260,866	525,260,866		do	6,327,936	6,327,936		2,700,000	3,627,936
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		do	1,047,159	1,047,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,320,800	5,578,370	+257,570	do	189,623	198,624	+9,001		
Total	30,470,100	30,727,670	+257,570	do	1,236,782	1,245,783	+9,001	1,300,000	(3)

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value: Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	Cost value: End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Cost value: Net change during month	Quantity: Unit of measure	Quantity: Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	Quantity: End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Quantity: Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	$169,363,300	$169,313,100	−$50,200	Pound	76,788,587	76,768,118	−20,469		
Defense Production Act	52,076,600	52,074,600	−2,000	do	25,195,172	25,194,122	−1,050		
Supplemental—barter	2,169,000	2,169,000		do	1,077,018	1,077,018			
Total	223,608,900	223,556,700	−52,200	do	103,060,777	103,039,258	−21,519	19,000,000	84,039,258
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	16,981,400	16,763,800	−217,600	do	112,057,733	110,630,853	−1,426,880	(2)	110,630,853
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton	67,636	67,636		(2)	67,636
Columbium:									
National stockpile	23,860,400	23,860,400		Pound	7,488,960	7,488,960			
Defense Production Act	50,255,500	50,255,500		do	8,222,684	8,222,684			
Supplemental—barter	799,000	799,000		do	388,877	388,877			
Total	74,914,900	74,914,900		do	16,100,521	16,100,521		1,900,000	14,200,521
Copper:									
National stockpile	522,204,700	522,308,400	+103,700	Short ton	1,008,351	1,008,351			
Defense Production Act	62,779,600	62,258,600	−521,000	do	112,064	111,116	−948		
Supplemental—barter	8,242,803	8,242,803		do	12,381	12,381			
Total	593,227,103	592,809,803	−417,300	do	1,132,796	1,131,848	−948	1,000,000	131,848
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile	38,198,900	38,148,200	−50,700	Pound	151,574,148	151,321,593	−252,555	150,000,000	1,121,593
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile	43,701,600	43,420,400	−281,200	do	323,078,769	320,346,127	−2,732,642	320,000,000	346,127
Corundum:									
National stockpile	393,100	393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,000	8
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act	8,197,000	8,197,000		do	29,685	29,685		(2)	29,685
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile	465,300	475,800	+10,500	Piece	15,313	15,464	+151	25,000	(3)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	61,609,500	61,609,500		Carat	31,113,411	31,113,411			
Supplemental—barter	15,456,700	15,456,700		do	5,523,748	5,523,748			
Total	77,066,200	77,066,200		do	36,637,159	36,637,159		30,000,000	6,637,159
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile	100,501,500	100,501,500		do	9,315,183	9,315,183			
Supplemental—barter	186,159,160	186,160,100	+940	do	15,394,744	15,394,743	−1		
Total	286,660,660	286,661,600	+940	do	24,709,927	24,709,926	−1	18,000,000	6,709,926
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		(2)	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile	38,797,100	38,563,800	−233,300	Pound	9,364,689	9,308,390	−56,299	8,800,000	508,390
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental—barter	33,465,200	33,495,700	+30,500	do	673,232	673,232			
Total	61,027,100	61,057,600	+30,500	do	1,155,981	1,155,981		280,000	875,981
Fluorspar, metallurigical grade:									
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,443	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	1,508,100	1,508,100		do	42,800	42,800			
Total	18,840,500	18,840,500		do	412,243	412,243		375,000	37,243
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile	937,900	937,900		do	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1,428			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		3,600	2,283
Graphite, natural, Madagascar, crystalline:									
National stockpile	7,092,500	7,088,500	−4,000	do	34,410	34,390	−20		
Supplemental—barter	90,736	109,421	+18,685	do	826	938	+112		
Total	7,183,236	7,197,921	+14,685	do	35,236	35,328	+92	17,200	18,128
Graphite, natural, other, crystalline:									
National stockpile	1,896,400	1,896,400		do	5,487	5,487		2,100	3,387
Hydrochloride of quinine:									
National stockpile	1,400	1,400		Ounce	103	103		(2)	103
Hyoscine:									
National stockpile	30,600	30,600		do	2,100	2,100		2,100	(3)
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,977,648	2,977,648			
Supplemental—barter	1,018,222	1,039,500	+21,278	do	996,958	994,920	−2,038		
Total	5,100,222	5,121,500	+21,278	do	3,974,606	3,972,568	−2,038	4,300,000	(3)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Iridium:									
National stockpile	$2,525,800	$2,525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		4,000	9,937
Jewel bearings:									
National stockpile	3,805,800	3,809,600	+$3,800	Piece	51,037,267	51,088,611	+51,344	57,500,000	(2)
Kyanite-mullite:									
National stockpile	824,400	820,200	−4,200	Short dry ton	9,536	9,486	−50	4,800	4,686
Lead:									
National stockpile	319,298,100	319,298,100		Short ton	1,050,370	1,050,370			
Defense Production Act	2,461,800	2,415,900	−45,900	do	6,499	6,377	−122		
Supplemental—barter	78,225,100	78,279,300	+54,200	do	327,998	237,998			
Total	399,985,000	399,993,300	+8,300	do	1,384,867	1,384,745	−122	286,000	1,098,745
Magnesium:									
National stockpile	131,338,800	131,293,200	−45,600	do	180,921	180,858	−63	107,000	73,858
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21,025,500	21,025,500		do	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter	14,034,837	14,502,798	+467,961	do	137,671	142,322	+4,651		
Total	35,060,337	35,528,298	+467,961	do	282,156	286,807	+4,651	50,000	236,807
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3,095,500	3,095,500		Short dry ton	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act	2,523,600	2,523,600		do	3,779	3,779			
Total	5,619,100	5,619,100		do	25,051	25,051		20,000	5,051
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	2,133,300	2,133,300		do	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter	7,127,300	7,160,300	+33,000	do	103,731	103,731			
Total	9,260,600	9,293,600	+33,000	do	133,038	133,038		30,000	103,038
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	132,600	132,600		do	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter	6,826,200	6,834,800	+8,600	do	99,016	99,016			
Total	6,958,800	6,967,400	+8,600	do	100,838	100,838		53,000	47,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248,293,500	248,240,000	−53,500	do	5,851,828	5,851,264	−564		
Defense Production Act	176,710,900	176,710,900		do	3,056,771	3,056,771			
Supplemental—barter	225,835,908	229,013,199	+3,177,291	do	3,238,648	3,292,390	+53,742		
Total	650,840,308	653,964,099	+3,123,791	do	12,147,247	12,200,425	+53,178	6,800,000	5,400,425
Mercury:									
National stockpile	20,039,500	20,039,500		Flask	129,525	129,525			
Supplemental—barter	3,446,200	3,446,200		do	16,000	16,000			
Total	23,485,700	23,485,700		do	145,525	145,525		110,000	35,525
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27,644,200	27,644,200		Pound	11,626,674	11,626,674			
Defense Production Act	40,858,100	40,858,100		do	6,456,253	6,456,253			
Supplemental—barter	4,380,878	4,492,034	+111,156	do	1,334,753	1,370,313	+35,560		
Total	72,883,178	72,994,334	+111,156	do	19,417,680	19,453,240	+35,560	8,300,000	11,153,240
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9,058,100	9,058,100		do	1,733,083	1,733,083			
Defense Production Act	633,300	633,300		do	102,679	102,679			
Supplemental—barter	867,497	884,281	+16,784	do	88,988	90,512	+1,524		
Total	10,558,897	10,575,681	+16,784	do	1,924,750	1,926,274	+1,524	1,300,000	626,274
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile	40,598,300	40,598,300		do	40,040,294	40,040,294			
Supplemental—barter	6,225,800	6,225,800		do	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total	46,824,100	46,824,100		do	44,866,551	34,866,551		21,200,000	23,666,551
Mica, phlogopite block:									
National stockpile	303,600	303,600		do	223,126	223,126		17,000	206,126
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	2,580,500	2,580,500		do	3,079,062	3,079,062			
Supplemental—barter	1,975,335	1,981,635	+6,300	do	1,690,678	1,690,678			
Total	4,555,835	4,562,135	+6,300	do	4,769,740	4,769,740		1,700,000	3,069,740
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	89,184,400	89,184,400		Pound	84,063,203	84,063,203		59,000,000	25,063,203
Nickel:									
National stockpile	181,996,600	181,996,600		do	334,329,580	334,329,556	−24		
Defense Production Act	105,029,200	104,542,400	−486,800	do	112,005,021	111,494,958	−510,063		
Total	287,025,800	286,539,000	−486,800	do	446,334,601	445,824,514	−510,087	323,000,000	122,824,514
Opium:									
National stockpile	13,661,700	13,661,700		do	195,757	195,757		172,800	22,957

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Palladium:									
National stockpile	$2,079,000	$2,079,000		Troy ounce	89,811	89,811			
Defense Production Act	177,300	177,300		do	7,884	7,884			
Supplemental—barter	12,170,200	12,170,200		do	648,124	648,124			
Total	14,426,500	14,426,500		do	745,819	745,819		340,000	405,819
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	5,148,200	5,074,200	−$74,000	Pound	28,604,089	28,192,569	−411,520	[2]	28,192,569
Platinum:									
National stockpile	56,879,900	56,879,900		Troy ounce	716,343	716,343			
Supplemental—barter	4,024,500	4,024,500		do	49,999	49,999			
Total	60,904,400	60,904,400		do	766,342	766,342		165,000	601,342
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415,000	415,000		Pound	66,188	66,188		66,000	188
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	69,625,500	69,625,500		do	5,647,292	5,647,292			
Supplemental—barter	3,128,684	3,128,684		do	232,252	232,252			
Total	72,754,184	72,754,184		do	5,879,544	5,879,544		650,000	5,229,544
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	2,103,200	2,103,200		Ounce	1,823,377	1,823,377		1,600,000	223,377
Quinine:									
National stockpile	4,765,200	4,765,200		do	7,533,732	7,533,732		[2]	7,533,732
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton	10,042	10,042			
Supplemental—barter	5,555,379	5,585,161	+29,782	do	6,183	6,384	+201		
Total	12,690,279	12,720,061	+29,782	do	16,225	16,426	+201	5,700	10,726
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	657,800	657,800		Pound	6,085,570	6,085,570		[2]	6,085,570
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78,100	78,100		Troy ounce	621	621		[2]	621
Rubber:									
National stockpile	795,887,000	790,437,400	−5,449,600	Long ton	1,029,234	1,022,187	−7,047	750,000	272,187
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce	15,001	15,001		[2]	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act	2,725,100	2,725,100		do	17,592	17,592			
Supplemental—barter	1,061,300	1,061,300		do	11,632	11,632			
Total	5,856,500	5,856,500		do	47,823	47,823		65,000	[3]
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	190,000	190,000		Carat	16,187,500	16,187,500		18,000,000	[3]
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757,100	757,100		Pound	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter	1,070,500	1,070,500		do	156,518	156,518			
Total	1,827,600	1,827,600		do	253,618	253,618		400,000	[3]
Shellac:									
National stockpile	8,850,500	8,850,500		do	17,654,298	17,654,298		7,400,000	10,254,298
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile	11,394,500	11,394,500		Short ton	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter	26,796,900	26,812,800	+15,900	do	131,805	131,805			
Total	38,191,400	38,207,300	+15,900	do	196,502	196,502		100,000	96,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	3,033,000	2,749,500	−283,500	Pound	2,124,769	1,944,476	−180,293	970,000	974,476
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	486,600	486,600		do	113,515	113,515		120,000	[3]
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4,775,400	4,775,400		do	23,442,158	23,442,158		23,000,000	442,158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	498,700	498,700		Short ton	1,279	1,279		300	979
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231,000	231,000		do	3,901	3,901		[2]	3,901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	10,905,500	10,905,500		Pound	3,422,874	3,422,873	−1		
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do	1,531,366	1,531,366			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do	8,036	8,036			
Total	20,661,000	20,661,000		do	4,962,276	4,962,275	−1	2,420,000	2,542,275
Thorium:									
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		do	848,574	848,574			
Supplemental—barter	15,474,689	16,379,484	+904,795	do	7,285,212	7,874,725	+589,513		
Total	15,516,689	16,421,484	+904,795	do	8,133,786	8,723,299	+589,513	[2]	8,723,299

See **footnotes at end of table.**

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Tin:									
National stockpile	$824, 656, 200	$823, 850, 600	−$805, 600	Long ton	339, 153	338, 822	−331		
Supplemental—barter	16, 404, 000	16, 404, 000		do	7, 505	7, 505			
Total	841, 060, 200	840, 254, 600	−805, 000	do	346, 658	346, 327	−331	185, 000	161, 327
Titanium:									
Defense Production Act	176, 804, 000	176, 804, 000		Short ton	22, 456	22, 456			
Supplemental—barter	32, 097, 700	32, 097, 700		do	9, 021	9, 021			
Total	208, 901, 700	208, 901, 700		do	31, 477	31, 477		(²)	31, 477
Totaquine:									
National stockpile	4, 853, 800	4, 075, 000	−778, 800	Ounce	7, 654, 196	6, 426, 015	−1, 228, 181	(²)	6, 426, 015
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	369, 129, 300	369, 129, 300		Pound	120, 072, 509	120, 072, 509			
Defense Production Act	319, 498, 500	319, 052, 900	−445, 600	do	78, 367, 948	78, 256, 833	−111, 115		
Supplemental—barter	18, 647, 400	18, 648, 100	+700	do	5, 765, 752	5, 762, 319	−3, 433		
Total	707, 275, 200	706, 830, 300	−444, 900	do	204, 206, 209	204, 091, 661	−114, 548	50, 000, 000	154, 091, 661
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	31, 604, 200	31, 604, 200		do	15, 758, 802	15, 758, 801	−1	2, 000, 000	13, 758, 801
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	11, 967, 700	11, 953, 800	−13, 900	Long ton	42, 895	42, 845	−50	30, 000	12, 845
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	49, 374, 900	49, 262, 500	−112, 400	do	199, 557	199, 103	−454	180, 000	19, 103
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9, 992, 400	9, 959, 900	−32, 500	do	39, 618	39, 489	−129	39, 000	489
National stockpile	364, 131, 100	364, 131, 100		Short ton	1, 256, 012	1, 256, 012			
Supplemental—barter	79, 587, 900	79, 588, 100	+200	do	323, 895	323, 896	+1		
Total	443, 719, 000	443, 719, 200	+200	do	1, 579, 907	1, 579, 908	+1	178, 000	1, 401, 908
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	710, 600	710, 600		Short dry ton	16, 533	16, 533		(²)	16, 533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	372, 700	333, 800	−38, 900	do	6, 300	5, 641	−659	(²)	5, 641
Total:									
National stockpile	5, 879, 281, 200	5, 870, 072, 100	−9, 209, 100						
Defense Production Act	1, 500, 905, 400	1, 500, 308, 600	−596, 800						
Supplemental—barter	1, 304, 643, 502	1, 312, 701, 632	+8, 058, 130						
Total, strategic and critical materials	8, 684, 830, 102	8, 683, 082, 332	−1, 747, 770						

---

[1] Maximum objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). The present objectives represent quantities of materials estimated to be necessary in the event of a 3-year war in which oversea sources would not be available.

[2] No present objective.

[3] Not in excess of maximum objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$1, 148, 076, 131	$1, 049, 159, 564	−$98, 916, 567	Bushel	987, 136, 997	900, 855, 639	−86, 281, 358
Cotton, extra-long staple	4, 350, 336	4, 350, 336		Bale	15, 865	15, 865	
Cotton, upland	809, 815, 726	809, 749, 800	−65, 926	do	4, 684, 629	4, 684, 254	−375
Peanuts, farmers' stock	4, 068, 801	3, 262, 460	−806, 341	Pound	37, 764, 836	31, 308, 766	−6, 456, 070
Peanuts, shelled	5, 091, 378	5, 976, 620	+885, 242	do	25, 354, 191	31, 275, 746	+5, 921, 555
Rice, milled	637, 773	183, 616	−454, 157	Hundredweight	64, 364	18, 530	−45, 834
Rice, rough	95, 130	8, 816	−86, 314	do	18, 641	1, 762	−16, 879
Wheat	2, 016, 161, 189	1, 997, 916, 537	−18, 244, 652	Bushel	1, 035, 801, 588	1, 026, 529, 213	−9, 272, 375
Wheat flour	435, 539		−435, 539	Pound	7, 807, 300		−7, 807, 300
Bulgur	1, 338, 538	1, 209, 128	−129, 410	do	24, 418, 900	22, 090, 600	−2, 328, 300
Total, basic commodities	3, 990, 070, 541	3, 871, 816, 877	−118, 253, 664				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	24, 263, 065	24, 188, 417	−74, 648	Bushel	28, 197, 621	28, 102, 033	−95, 588
Grain sorghum	575, 561, 312	548, 599, 276	−26, 962, 036	do	543, 172, 505	519, 449, 294	−23, 723, 211
Honey	130, 868	129, 950	−918	Pound	1, 045, 076	1, 037, 746	−7, 330
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	197, 728, 332	221, 013, 237	+23, 284, 905	do	335, 843, 465	376, 412, 964	+40, 569, 499
Butter oil	35, 081, 437	34, 210, 797	−870, 640	do	43, 587, 172	42, 508, 633	−1, 078, 539
Cheese	39, 158, 314	34, 143, 407	−5, 014, 907	do	104, 412, 680	91, 357, 129	−13, 055, 551
Ghee	369, 883	369, 883		do	455, 322	455, 322	
Milk, dried	97, 761, 792	102, 642, 815	+4, 881, 023	do	655, 273, 510	689, 608, 924	+34, 335, 414

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1962	End of month, Dec. 31, 1962	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1962	End of month, Dec. 31, 1962	Net change during month
Price-support inventory—Continued							
Designated nonbasic commodities—Continued							
Oats	$9, 188, 763	$9, 152, 015	−$36, 748	Bushel	15, 297, 460	15, 241, 310	−56, 150
Rye	865, 352	801, 282	−64, 070	do	833, 710	763, 113	−70, 597
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	980, 109, 118	975, 251, 079	−4, 858, 039				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry, edible	5, 107, 651	4, 248, 621	−859, 030	Hundredweight	772, 442	657, 125	−115, 317
Cottonseed oil, refined	1, 014, 923	1, 014, 923		Pound	8, 339, 550	8, 339, 550	
Flaxseed	4, 270	358, 256	+353, 986	Bushel	1, 574	107, 703	+106, 129
Soybeans	42, 534, 889	29, 780, 846	−12, 754, 043	do	17, 873, 419	12, 528, 178	−5, 345, 241
Turpentine	669, 451	545, 596	−123, 855	Gallon	1, 275, 814	1, 039, 776	−236, 038
Vegetable oil products	23, 420, 782	20, 685, 417	−2, 735, 365	Pound	127, 362, 724	112, 632, 915	−14, 729, 809
Total, other nonbasic commodities	72, 751, 966	56, 633, 659	−16, 118, 307				
Total, price support inventory	5, 042, 931, 625	4, 903, 701, 615	−139, 230, 010				
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [1]							
Cotton, Egyptian	103, 913, 705	103, 913, 705		Bale	123, 001	123, 001	
Cotton, American-Egyptian	23, 960, 485	23, 960, 485		do	47, 638	47, 638	
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile.	127, 874, 190	127, 874, 190		do	170, 639	170, 639	
Total, agricultural commodities	5, 170, 805, 815	5, 031, 575, 805	−139, 230, 010				

[1] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. (See Appendix, p. 6739.)

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, February 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings)	$9, 994, 073	$9, 999, 941	$+5, 868	10-mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	1, 930, 667	1, 852, 491	−78, 176	(1)			
Radiological equipment	20, 452, 558	20, 993, 571	+541, 013	(1)			
Total	32, 377, 298	32, 846, 003	+4, 468, 705				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses	132, 244, 022	137, 822, 102	+5, 578, 080	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	5, 449, 502	5, 449, 502		(1)			
Civil defense emergency hospitals	38, 057, 291	37, 944, 067	−113, 224	Each	1, 930	1, 930	
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals)	1, 652, 995	1, 646, 877	−6, 118	(1)			
Total	177, 403, 810	182, 862, 548	+5, 458, 738				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	209, 781, 108	215, 708, 551	+5, 927, 443				

[1] Composite group of many different items.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, February 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
In storage	$43, 600	$43, 600		Tool	11	11	
On lease	2, 144, 300	2, 144, 300		do	103	103	
On loan	42, 900	42, 900		do	7	7	
Total	2, 230, 800	2, 230, 800		do	121	121	
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	84, 244, 100	84, 214, 800	−$29, 300	do	7, 721	7, 739	+18
On lease	27, 500	27, 500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	1, 865, 300	1, 965, 000	+99, 700	do	187	195	+8
On loan to school programs	6, 025, 600	6, 352, 100	+326, 500	do	1, 420	1, 489	+69
Total	92, 162, 500	92, 559, 400	+396, 900	do	9, 329	9, 424	+95
Total, machine tools	94, 393, 300	94, 792, 200	+396, 900	do	9, 450	9, 545	+95

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

APPENDIX

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—Barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgage collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursement for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

As authorized under Public Law 920, 81st Congress, and following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958, the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, has delegated responsibility to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan and direct operation of the medical supply portion of the OEP stockpile. The warehousing of the medical stockpile is principally within the OEP warehouse system; in addition, the medical stockpile includes a program designed to preposition emergency hospitals and other treatment units in communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462).

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of February 28, 1963, totaled $14,025,156,888. This was a net decrease of $134,653,437 as compared with the February 1 total of $14,159,810,325. Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, February 1963	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials	−$1,747,770	$8,683,082,332
Agricultural commodities	−139,230,010	5,031,575,805
Civil defense supplies and equipment	+5,927,443	215,708,551
Machine tools	+396,900	94,790,200
Total	−134,653,437	14,025,156,888

These figures are from the February 1963 report on Federal stockpile inventories, compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory, and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 95 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Maximum objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 95 materials. Of the 76 materials having maximum objectives, 65 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of February 28, 1963.

Increases in cost value were reported in 30 of the 95 materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 21 materials, and 44 materials remained unchanged during the month of February 1963.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of February 28, 1963, totaled $5,870,072,100. This was a net decrease of $9,209,100 during the month. The largest decrease was $5,449,600 in rubber.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of February 28, 1963, totaled $1,500,308,600. This was a net decrease of $596,800. The largest decreases were in copper and nickel, partially offset by an increase in aluminum.

Supplemental-barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of February 28 totaled $1,312,701,632. This was a net increase of $8,058,130. The largest increases were in manganese, thorium, aluminum oxide, and chromite.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report, the largest is $5 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during February were reported for corn, grain sorghum, wheat, and soybeans in the price support inventory.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed increases in radiological equipment and medical stocks; and the machine tools inventories showed a net increase during February.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Louis M. Janelle, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Hampshire;

Paul G. April, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Hampshire; and

Frank Udoff, of Maryland, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Maryland.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Chad;

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federal Republic of Germany;

Roger, Hilsman, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

David Elliott Bell, of Massachusetts, to be alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank;

Edwin M. Martin, of Ohio, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Latin America of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; and

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 18th plenary session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1343. A bill providing for the improvement of public education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1344. A bill to provide for the precise determination of the southern boundary of the Salt River Indian Reservation, Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1345. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Dominick, and Mr. Mechem):

S. 1346. A bill to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Allott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of railroad freight rates applicable to shipments of grain in carload lots from States in the Midwest region of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Burdick when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

BACK PAY FOR CAPTIVE ARMED SERVICES PERSONNEL

Mr. DOMINICK submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38); which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Whereas many naval and Marine Corps officers were captured by the enemy during World War II, and, although selected for promotion to higher rank by ALNAV or block promotion lists, were not promoted because of their captivity; and

Whereas many of these officers, upon repatriation, received one or more promotions by means of appointments predated to show appropriate dates of rank, but received pay for the higher grades only from the dates on which the promotions were actually made; and

Whereas, despite the language of section 2 of the Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143, 144), as amended, commonly called the Missing Persons Act, that such person shall "be entitled to receive or have credited to his account the same pay and allowances to which he was entitled at the beginning of such period of absence or may become entitled thereafter", these officers have consistently been denied increases in pay and allowances from date of rank to the actual date these promotions were made: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is affirmed that it is the intent of Congress that those officers of the Navy and Marine Corps whose promotion was authorized by ALNAV or block promotion lists during the periods when they were prisoners of the enemy during World War II but not effected because of such imprisonment, and who were promoted after repatriation with dates of rank relating back to the dates on which they would have been promoted but for their captivity, shall by authority of section 2 of the Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143, ch. 166), be entitled to pay, allowances, and precedence from the date of rank stipulated in the later appointing orders.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] has announced that the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will begin hearings on aid to education and related bills beginning Monday, April 29.

I know that the members of the committee will want to consider all possible approaches to this controversial subject. For this reason, I am introducing today a bill based on principles recommended by the bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education and the Council of Chief State School Officers. A distinguished educator of my State, A. W. Ford, State Commissioner of Education, is president of the council.

This is a companion bill to H.R. 5344 which was introduced by Representative Carl Perkins on April 1. I do not necessarily endorse every detail of this bill, but I did want to assure that the proposals recommended by the Council of Chief State School Officers and the bipartisan citizens committee, composed of many distinguished individuals of all walks of life, were considered during the Senate committee's study of education bills. This bill expresses the composite views of the State school officers and, in view of the continuous controversy about Federal control in connection with aid to education, their views should be considered very carefully by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record following my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that a series of questions and answers and a State-by-State tabulation pertaining to the bill be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, questions and answers, and tabulation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1343) providing for the improvement of public education, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SURVEYS OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS BY THE STATES

Statement of purposes and policies of act

Sec. 101. The Congress finds that Federal financial assistance to the States for the further improvement of public elementary and secondary education is necessary in the national interest, and declares that its policy requires that allocation of Federal funds for this purpose shall be made after assurance by each State that the Federal funds can and will be allocated among its local education agencies according to their relative needs and for purposes that have been carefully determined by the State educational agency to be relatively most important in improving the scope and quality of public education.

The Congress finds that data adequate to enable each State educational agency to make such assurances require that each State educational agency desiring to participate in the allocation of Federal funds as authorized by title II shall make a survey of the educational needs of all local education agencies within the State prior to application for such funds.

Guidelines for State surveys

SEC. 102. It is the intention of the Congress that State surveys made under the provisions of this title shall ascertain the relative needs among the local education agencies of each State for Federal financial assistance for the improvement of public elementary and secondary education, expressed in terms of relative priorities among the needs specified in this section, and other similar needs in each State. In undertaking the survey, the State educational agency shall agree to establish and to describe educational priorities in a manner that will form a reasonable basis for a practicable formula under which commingled State and Federal funds may be allocated among local education agencies to meet these needs according to their respective priorities. Each State educational agency in making this survey shall take into account the following factors, among others, in determining relative need in each local education agency within the State:

(a) Adequacy of the scope of the curriculum and the quality of instruction in the elementary schools; (b) adequacy of the scope of the curriculum and the quality of instruction in the secondary schools, with particular reference to basic subjects such as English, history, government and other social sciences, mathematics, natural and physical sciences, modern foreign languages, fine and industrial arts, and vocational education; (c) provisions of school programs giving special attention to particular problems of education such as opportunities for gifted, retarded, mentally or physically handicapped, prospective dropouts, and other exceptional or underachieving pupils; (d) guidance and other personnel services for all pupils; (e) provisions for vocational and technical education suitable for modern society; (f) school plant and equipment suitable for housing of an improved educational program and the relative financial ability of local education agencies to supply the same; (g) special situations in local education agencies that can be improved by the use of additional funds, such as overcrowding, teachers having insufficient preparation and experience or inadequate laboratories, equipment, materials, supplies, teaching aids, or library services; (h) the relative cost of current operation per pupil in average daily attendance; and (i) the relative economic ability of local education agencies to finance public education, including funds available from the State and other sources.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 103. In order to enable the States to carry out the purposes and policies of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $6,000,000, to remain available until expended. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to State educational agencies whose applications for funds for carrying out such purposes and policies have been approved under section 104.

Applications for funds

SEC. 104. The Commissioner shall approve any application from a State educational agency for funds to carry out the purposes of this title, provided such application: (a) designates the State educational agency as the sole agency for carrying out such purposes; (b) provides for making a survey under the general supervision of a committee composed of not fewer than five or more than ten persons skilled in public school work and an equal number of lay citizens broadly interested in education, and the members of the committee shall be appointed for the term of the survey by the State board of education or, in States having no such board, by the chief State school officer, and the chairman shall be the chief State school officer or a staff member of the State educational agency appointed by him; (c) provides that the State educational agency will make such reports, in such forms, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner, upon request, access to the records upon which such information is based; (d) meets all other requirements of this title necessary to qualify a State for allocations of Federal funds under title II of this Act.

Allocation of funds

SEC. 105. Of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 103, $175,000 shall be allotted by the Commissioner to American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs and upon the basis of agreements made with their respective State educational agencies, and the remainder shall be allotted to the other States in the same proportions as their respective school-age populations bear to the total school-age population of such other States; except that no such allotment to any State (other than to American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands) shall be less than $20,000.

The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the sum to which each State will be entitled under this section during such ensuing period as he may determine, and shall thereupon certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Commissioner finds that his estimate for any prior period was greater or less than the amount to which the State was entitled for such period. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Commissioner, the amount so certified.

Survey report and distribution plan

SEC. 106. Upon the completion of the survey provided for in this title, each State educational agency shall file with the Commissioner ten copies of the survey report, together with ten copies of a practicable plan, approved by the State educational agency and based on the survey report, for the distribution to local education agencies within the State of the funds authorized by title II of this Act. The plan for distribution of funds shall include, in addition to the distribution formula, a description of the administrative processes to be used by the State educational agency in supervising the use of such funds in local education agencies and of the accounting procedures to be used by the local education agency in accounting to the State educational agency for the use of such funds.

Certificate of eligibility under title II

SEC. 107. The Commissioner shall approve the distribution plan of each State eligible to receive funds under title II of this Act if such distribution plan has been formulated according to the provisions of title I and is certified by the State educational agency to the Commissioner as the distribution plan of the State.

The final refusal of the Commissioner to approve any State distribution plan certified by a State educational agency under this title, and the Commissioner's final action, shall be subject to judicial review on the record, in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act.

TITLE II—GENERAL ASSISTANCE

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 201. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for making grants under this title for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as Congress shall determine.

Allotments to States

SEC. 202. (a) For each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall make a basic allotment to each State that has qualified under title I of this Act, to be paid from funds appropriated pursuant to section 201, equal to 2 per centum of the public school expenditures of the State during the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available.

(b) In the case of each State whose per capita personal income for a fiscal year is below that of the State having the highest per capita personal income for that fiscal year, such State's basic allotment under this section for that fiscal year shall be increased by an amount equal to the product of such State's basic allotment and six times the percentage by which the State's per capita personal income is less than the per capita personal income of the State having the highest per capita personal income for that fiscal year.

Payments to States

SEC. 203. Subject to the provisions of section 205, upon certification of the allotment for each State by the Commissioner to the Secretary of the Treasury not later than the first day of the fiscal year for which the allotment is made, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State one-fourth of its allotment on or before the following July 31, one-fourth on or before the following October 31, one-fourth on or before the following January 31, and one-fourth on or before the following April 30 of that fiscal year.

Purposes for which Federal funds may be expended

SEC. 204. Upon receipt by the State, funds received under this title shall be added to State funds appropriated for public elementary or secondary education and shall thereafter be deemed to be State funds. The commingled funds from both State and Federal sources shall be distributed or expended under State law for the benefit of local education agencies in the State in accord with the provisions of the distribution plan of the State educational agency approved by the Commissioner under title I of this Act.

Maintenance and improvement of State and local support for public school financing

SEC. 205. (a) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 202 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, shall be reduced if such State's effort for such fiscal year is not at least equal to such State's base effort for such year. The amount of such reduction shall be the difference between the State's public school expenditures in such year and the public school expenditures it would have made in such year had it exerted the State's base effort for such year.

(b) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 202 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, shall also be reduced if such State's effort for such year is not at least equal to the State's base effort for such year plus the average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1959, and ending June 30, 1964. The amount of the reduction under this subsection (which shall be in addition to the reduction, if any, under subsection (a)) shall bear the same relation to the sum otherwise allocable to the State under section 202, (1) as the difference between the State's effort and the national effort for such year bears to the national effort for such year, or (2) if it would result in a smaller reduction, as the difference between the State's expenditure per public school pupil and 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year. This subsection shall not apply to any State for any year for which the State's effort equaled or exceeded the national effort for such year or the State's expenditure per public school pupil equaled or exceeded 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year.

(c) The total reductions which may be made under subsections (a) and (b) from the sum otherwise allocable to a State for any fiscal year shall not exceed one-third of such sum.

State matching contributions

SEC. 206. (a) The Commissioner shall determine for each State for each fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, the amount (if any) by which such State's contributions (derived from State sources) to its local educational agencies for the support of public elementary and secondary schools exceeds such contributions of that State for the preceding fiscal year. The Commissioner shall also determine, as provided in subsection (c), a State percentage for each such fiscal year for each State.

(b) If for any fiscal year the product determined by multiplying the State percentage of a State by the amount determined for such State for such year under the first sentence of subsection (a) is less than the State's allotment under section 202, after any reductions under section 203, then the State's allotment shall be reduced to the amount of such product.

(c) The "State percentage" for any State shall be 100 times the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita personal income of the State by the per capita personal income of the Nation.

Reporting

SEC. 207. Each State educational agency receiving and distributing funds under this Act shall make a complete report to the Commissioner on how the Federal funds have been distributed and expended not later than the October 31 following the close of each fiscal year. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to accept for these purposes the normal accounting procedures used by each State for State funds allocated to local educational agencies for public elementary and secondary school purposes. Not later than the January 1 following the close of each fiscal year the Commissioner shall transmit all such State reports to the Congress, together with his recommendations for the next fiscal year.

Prohibition of Federal control

SEC. 208. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

TITLE III—DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

SEC. 301. Definitions for purposes of this Act:

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the (United States) Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "State" means a State, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

(c) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

(d) The term "local education agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary and secondary education in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State; and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains public elementary or secondary schools.

(e) The term "public elementary and secondary schools" means schools providing education in the kindergarten and in the first twelve grades beyond the kindergarten, under the public supervision and control of a local educational agency and without tuition charge to resident pupils.

(f) The "public school expenditures" of any State in any fiscal year means the total expenditures by the State and subdivisions thereof in such year for public elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources in the State (including payments received under Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, and other payments in the nature of payments in lieu of taxes from any sources).

(g)(1) A "State's effort" for any State for a fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the State's expenditure per public school pupil in such fiscal year by (B) the income per such pupil for the State for such year; except that the State's effort shall be deemed to be equal to the State's base effort and to the national effort in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

(2) A State's "base effort" for the fiscal year means the average State effort over the three immediately preceding fiscal years.

(3) The "income per public school pupil" for a State or for all the States for any fiscal years means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of public school pupils in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(h)(1) The "national effort" for any fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the expenditure per public school pupil for all the States in such year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (B) the income per such pupil for all such States for such year.

(2) The average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five-fiscal-year period beginning July 1, 1959, and ending June 30, 1964, shall be determined by dividing the difference between the national effort for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, by four.

(i)(1) The "expenditure per public school pupil" for any State for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing the State's public school expenditures in such year by the number of its public school pupils for such year.

(2) The "national expenditure per public school pupil" for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the public school expenditures of all the States in such year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (B) the number of public school pupils in all such States for such year.

(j) The "per capita personal income" of the State and of the Nation for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of the latest data available from the Department of Commerce, except that the per capita personal income of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be deemed to be 75 per centum of the Nation's per capita personal income, and the Nation's per capita personal income shall be computed without regard to persons residing in such areas.

(k) The Commissioner's determinations of the State effort, base effort, income, public school expenditures, and expenditure per public school pupil, per capita personal income, for any State, and his determinations of the national effort, average rate of increase, and expenditure per public school pupil, per capita personal income, shall be conclusive for purposes of this Act, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise any such determination, and as so revised, such determination shall be equally conclusive.

The questions and answers, and tabulation presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT, are as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE PUBLIC EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1963

1. What organizations are making this proposal available?

The proposal follows the basic principles of the Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education and the policies of the Council of Chief State School Officers. It is substantially within the policies of numerous organizations interested in public education.

2. What are its major purposes?

To achieve further improvement of public education in the national interest. The proposal would authorize allocation of Federal funds among the States on the basis of need and State effort. It would enable each State to allocate commingled funds from State and Federal sources among local school districts according to their relative educational needs, fiscal abilities, and economic capacities for purposes determined, after a careful statewide survey, to be relatively most important for the improvement of public education (sec. 101).

3. What would be the term and cost of the proposal?

It suggests a 4-year bill, with a complete district by district survey report and State proposal for fund distribution, supervision of expenditures and reporting during the first year (secs. 102, 106). The surveys would be made by the State educational agencies under the general supervision of a committee composed of public school authorities and lay citizens, and the cost would be $6 million of unmatched Federal funds for all of the States (including American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) (secs. 104, 103, 105, 301(b)). The U.S. Commissioner of Education would certify the eligibility of each State to participate in the final 3 years of the program if such distribution plan has been formulated according to the provisions of title I and is certified by the State educational agency to the Commissioner as the distribution plan of the State (sec. 107).

The Federal cost would be on the order of $500 million annually for the final 3 years (secs. 201, 202).

4. What is the formula for Federal allotments to the States?

The basic Federal allotment during each of the last 3 years is 2 percent of public school current expenditures in each State. In addition, each State except the one having the highest average per capita personal income would receive 6 times the percentage by which its average income falls below that of the State having the highest average income, multiplied by the 2 percent basic allotment. To illustrate, a State 50 percent below the average income of the State with the highest income would receive the basic 2 percent increased by 6 by 50 percent or 300 percent of its basic allotment. Thus the total allotment of this low income State would be 2 percent plus 6 percent, or a total of 8 percent of its current expenditures. A State with income falling 25 percent below that of the highest State would receive 2 percent plus 150 percent of 2 percent, or a total of 5 percent of its current expenses; a State with average personal income 10 percent below that of the highest State would receive 2 percent plus 60 percent of 2 percent, or 3.2 percent of its current public school expenses.

If more equalization among States is desired, an equalization factor of 7, 8, 9, or even

10 could replace the factor of 6 suggested here; if less equalization among States is desired, the factor could be reduced from 6 to 5, 4, or 3. This formula would give cumulative financial improvement of from 2 percent, 8 percent, 9 percent, 10 percent or more each year for the poorest State, after the fashion of a growth stock investment in educational improvement. It removes stumbling blocks of the past, such as counting pupils according to average daily enrollment, average daily membership, school-age population, total enrollment, etc. Current expenditures are substituted for pupil counting in the formula (sec. 202).

5. Purposes for which Federal funds may be expended.

Public elementary and secondary education purposes as defined by the State, but limited to the distribution plan of the State as approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education (sec. 204).

6. Matching by State appropriated funds.

The proposal includes variable State matching through State appropriations for this purpose. A State of average per capita personal income would match Federal funds dollar for dollar; a State 25 percent below the national average per capita income would match each Federal dollar with 75 cents; a State 25 percent above the national average per capita personal income would match each Federal dollar with $1.25 (sec. 206).

7. Maintenance of State and local financial effort: reward for effort.

The proposal penalizes reductions in State and local financing of schools by reducing the amount of Federal funds allotted. The policy is that the State shall not use the Federal public school funds to reduce State and local financial effort. On the other hand, the States would receive financial rewards for State and local financial effort because increased State and local expenditures would provide a larger base for computation of the Federal share in future years (sec. 205).

8. Payments to States and reporting on use of Federal funds.

Payments to the States would be made quarterly by the U.S. Treasury, after certification of the amounts for each State on an annual basis by the U.S. Commissioner of Education (sec. 203). Each State would make a complete report to the Commissioner annually according to the normal accounting procedures used for the State funds (sec. 207), but the distribution plan approved by the Commissioner would furnish guidelines for local-State and State-Federal accounting (sec. 106).

The Commissioner would submit the State reports to Congress not later than the January 1 following the close of each fiscal year, together with his recommendations for the next fiscal year (sec. 207).

9. Proposal concerning Federal control of education.

The draft contains a standard statutory prohibition of such controls (sec. 208).

The Federal funds are specifically commingled with State funds upon receipt by the State, and thereafter are deemed to be State funds to be distributed to local districts and their use reported upon under provisions of State law (secs. 204, 207). During the first year, carefully guarded discretionary authority has been given to the U.S. Commissioner of Education to approve State distribution, supervision, and reporting plans that meet Federal fiscal requirements (sec. 107). Subsequently, Federal administrative discretion is absent. The Congress reviews the annual State reports directly rather than having to rely entirely upon generalized Federal administrative reports based on Federal forms to which each State must have adapted its system of accounting as best it could.

State and local autonomy in education is completely protected in this proposal, and Federal control of State and local educational programs is made both illegal and impossible.

Official data—Estimated allotments to States under title II based upon total expenditures for public elementary and secondary education[1] *and per capita income,*[2] *fiscal year 1963*

State (1)	Allotments to all States (2 percent of total expenditures, 1959-60 [3]) (2)	Percent that each State is below the national average per capita income in 1960 (3)	Additional allotment to States below national average per capita income [4] (4)	Total State amount (5)	Total allotment percentage (6)
50 States, District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	$315,323,780	--------	$122,535,750	$437,859,530	--------
50 States and District of Columbia	314,015,060	--------	120,572,670	434,587,730	--------
Alabama	3,817,300	34	7,787,292	11,604,592	6.08
Alaska	483,300	--------	--------	483,300	2
Arizona	2,795,120	10	1,677,072	4,472,192	3.20
Arkansas	2,006,020	40	4,814,448	6,820,468	6.80
California [5]	40,413,380	--------	--------	40,413,380	2
Colorado	3,692,400	--------	--------	3,692,400	2
Connecticut	4,602,120	--------	--------	4,602,120	2
Delaware	1,112,580	--------	--------	1,112,580	2
Florida	7,252,000	11	4,786,320	12,038,320	3.32
Georgia	4,870,040	28	8,181,666	13,051,706	5.36
Hawaii	964,980	--------	--------	964,980	2
Idaho	1,050,540	19	1,197,618	2,248,158	4.28
Illinois	16,893,700	--------	--------	16,893,700	2
Indiana	8,553,180	2	1,026,384	9,579,564	2.24
Iowa	4,680,080	10	2,808,048	7,488,128	3.20
Kansas	4,186,340	7	1,758,264	5,944,604	2.84
Kentucky	3,192,580	31	5,938,200	9,130,780	5.72
Louisiana	5,916,880	28	9,940,356	15,857,236	5.36
Maine	1,199,800	15	1,079,820	2,279,620	3.80
Maryland	5,668,380	--------	--------	5,668,380	2
Massachusetts	7,345,460	--------	--------	7,345,460	2
Michigan	16,196,060	--------	--------	16,196,060	2
Minnesota	6,969,880	8	3,345,540	10,315,420	2.96
Mississippi	$2,893,560	47	$8,159,838	$11,053,398	7.64
Missouri	5,964,420	1	357,864	6,322,284	2.12
Montana	1,276,720	9	689,430	1,966,150	3.08
Nebraska	2,239,080	5	671,724	2,910,804	2.60
Nevada	650,080	--------	--------	650,080	2
New Hampshire	821,940	7	345,216	1,167,156	2.84
New Jersey	11,916,880	--------	--------	11,916,880	2
New Mexico	1,771,740	19	2,019,786	3,791,526	4.28
New York	34,464,780	--------	--------	34,464,780	2
North Carolina	5,922,300	29	10,304,802	16,227,102	5.48
North Dakota	1,192,380	22	1,573,944	2,766,324	4.64
Ohio	16,848,520	--------	--------	16,848,520	2
Oklahoma	3,706,720	17	3,780,852	7,487,572	4.04
Oregon	3,704,580	--------	--------	3,704,580	2
Pennsylvania	17,746,500	--------	--------	17,746,500	2
Rhode Island	1,057,460	--------	--------	1,057,460	2
South Carolina	2,711,160	37	6,018,774	8,729,934	6.44
South Dakota	1,076,160	17	1,097,682	2,173,842	4.04
Tennessee	4,282,700	30	7,708,860	11,991,560	4.60
Texas	14,701,280	13	11,466,996	26,168,276	3.56
Utah	1,934,180	14	1,624,710	3,558,890	3.68
Vermont	561,780	16	539,310	1,101,090	3.92
Virginia	5,303,720	17	5,409,792	10,713,512	4.04
Washington	6,262,440	--------	--------	6,262,440	2
West Virginia	2,435,440	25	3,653,160	6,088,600	5
Wisconsin	6,740,840	2	808,902	7,549,742	2.24
Wyoming	936,880	--------	--------	936,880	2
District of Columbia	1,028,700	--------	--------	1,028,700	2
American Samoa	5,200	25	7,800	13,000	5
Guam	90,300	25	135,450	225,750	5
Puerto Rico	1,178,280	25	1,767,420	2,945,700	5
Virgin Islands	34,940	25	52,410	87,350	5

---

[1] Total expenditures within each State for public elementary and secondary education are assumed to be the total expenditures reported for public elementary and secondary day schools. They are for current expense, interest, and capital outlay including expenditures of public school building authorities. Expenditure data are obtained from preliminary statistics for 1959-60, and are for total revenue from all sources.

[2] Based on per capita income data for 1960. Per capita income for the territories is assumed to be 75 percent of the national average.

[3] Allotments to all States were computed as the product of (1) 2 percent and (2) total expenditures within each State for public elementary and secondary day schools.

[4] Additional allotments to States below the national average in per capita personal income were computed as 6 times the product of (1) the percentage which the State is below the national average per capita personal income and (2) the State allotment based upon total expenditures.

[5] Expenditures for summer schools and adult education and community colleges are included with current expenditures for elementary and secondary day schools.

STEEL SHIPPING CONTAINER IDENTIFICATION ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1345) to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the intended purpose of the Steel Shipping Container Identification Act is to (1) permit the buyers of steel shipping containers to know when foreign steel is used in the manufacture of the containers, and (2) promote the use of steel produced in this country.

Customs laws in the United States do require that a foreign product be marked plainly with the country of origin in which it was produced. However, the courts sustain the fact that the authority and jurisdiction of the Bureau of Customs ends when the product has been released from its custody. In other words, while the bundles or coils of foreign sheet steel are marked with the country of origin, no agency of the United States under present regulations has any further jurisdiction over the marking or identification of products such as drums and pails which are ultimately manufactured from the imported sheet steel.

The proposed bill would require that drums and pails made of foreign steel be plainly marked with the country of origin of the steel and would place enforcement of the act under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission and would include their usual penalties for noncompliance. The act is not otherwise punitive and asks no special favors, tariff protection, or increased duties.

The Steel Shipping Container Institute believes that this bill, if enacted, will be of substantial value to the fabricators and purchasers of steel shipping containers. It would in turn benefit the basic steel industry and its employees through increased use of domestic steel, thereby curtailing unemployment resulting from the use of imported steel.

As a matter of information, here are the latest available hourly employment costs of American versus foreign steel workers, which include direct and all supplemental wage costs: Japan, 63 cents, European Coal & Steel Communities, $1.25, and United States, $3.99.

In the State of Pennsylvania, in addition to the basic steel producers, there are six members of the Steel Shipping Container Institute:

Manion Steel Barrel Co., Rouseville, Pa., U.S. Steel Products, division of U.S. Steel Corp., Sharon, Pa., Standard Can Corp., Leetsdale, Pa., Virginia Barrel Co., division of the Greif Bros. Cooperage Corp., Eddystone, Pa., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., container division, Lancaster, Pa. and Philadelphia, Pa., U.S. Barrel Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

In conclusion, the Steel Shipping Container Institute believes that this legislation will be of great benefit to the steel industry, the steel shipping container industry, and to the general public in the State of Pennsylvania.

COMPACT BETWEEN NEW MEXICO AND COLORADO GOVERNING COSTILLA CREEK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson and Mr. Mechem], my colleague from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] and myself, a bill to give the consent of Congress to an amended interstate compact entered into by the States of New Mexico and Colorado governing Costilla Creek.

Costilla Creek arises in Colorado, crosses the Colorado-New Mexico boundaries three times above its confluence with the Rio Grande in New Mexico. The original compact between the two States was entered into in 1944 for the purpose of apportioning the use of Costilla Creek waters between the two States and for resolving jurisdictional conflicts in regard to the appropriation, diversion and use of water from the creek to irrigate lands on both sides of the boundary.

The amended compact permits the Colorado users to change their point of diversion to a different interstate delivery point. This change, agreed to by both parties to the compact, is permitted on condition that a stated fraction of water be diverted at the original point in order to compensate for losses.

Neither the original nor the amended compact establishes any general principle or precedent in respect to any other interstate stream.

I would hope, Mr. President, that action can be taken on the bill soon. The legislatures of the States of Colorado and New Mexico have ratified this amended compact and the consent of Congress is the final step.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1346) to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek compact, introduced by Mr. Allott (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STUDY OF FREIGHT RATES FOR SMALL GRAINS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, a serious maladjustment in freight rates for small grains exists in many areas of the Midwest. A thorough investigation is needed and corrective action should be taken.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to make a full and complete investigation of the situation and to recommend remedial measures.

My State of North Dakota faces a particularly bad problem, because the costs of shipping grain to markets are disproportionately high, putting the State at a serious competitive disadvantage. Adjustments would benefit not only farmers but also shippers and common carriers.

Not since 1934 has the ICC made a comprehensive, general investigation of freight rates on grains in the West. It is time for a complete analysis of the situation to eliminate discriminatory rates.

The North Dakota State Legislature took cognizance of the problem in approving House Concurrent Resolution R-1. The joint resolution that I am introducing today is aimed at relieving an unfair situation not only for my State but for other areas in the Midwest, as well. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 70) to provide for an investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of railroad freight rates applicable to shipments of grain in carload lots from States in the Midwest region of the United States, introduced by Mr. Burdick, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Interstate Commerce Commission shall make a full and complete investigation and study of freight rates charged by carriers subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act for the shipment of grain in carload lots from the various States in the Midwest region of the United States, for the purpose of determining whether any such rates are discriminatory in any way. The Commission shall report the results of such investigation and study to the Congress as soon as practicable. Such report shall include a description of any action taken or proposed by the Commission to remove any discrimination determined to exist, and any amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act which the Commission recommends, as a result of such investigation and study.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 915, to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas, and to require, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects, and that it be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the reasons for the request be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The senior Senator from New Jersey, who introduced S. 915, and the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee have agreed to this move. Transferral is requested because of the broadly similar objectives of S. 915 and S. 855, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and subsequently to the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. S. 915 seeks to encourage planning and programing of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas, and to require the Housing and Home Finance Administrator's approval of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal financial assistance. S. 855 seeks to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local grant applications. Both measures, then, deal with the general topic of metropolitan planning problems. Wisdom would seem to indicate that they should be analyzed in conjunction with one another.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 200) to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, and that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee. This relates to the "mustering-out payments" section of the veterans laws which is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON SENATE COMMITTEE STAFFING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year the majority leader and I, after an understanding, caused a study to be made by the Library of Congress with respect to the staffing of the Senate. I believe a similar study was made by the House of Representatives. Only a few copies have been made available, but I think the study should be made available to all Members of the Senate. I have discussed this proposal with the distinguished majority leader. I ask unanimous consent that the letter addressed to the majority leader and to me, together with the report from the Library of Congress, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1963.

The Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: Enclosed herewith is a report on committee staffing in the Senate, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service in response to the joint request of Senator MANSFIELD and yourself.

The report is based on information obtained in interviews with committee and subcommittee chairmen and ranking minority members, and with staff directors and a number of minority staff members. The interviews of necessity were of varying duration, were informal in nature, and were conducted with the understanding that neither individuals nor committees would be identified by name.

Members of the Service staff participating in the interviewing included Gustav Peck, James P. Radigan, and John Kerr Rose, senior specialists; and Mary Louise Ramsey, legislative attorney. Lester S. Jayson, Deputy Director, was closely associated with the study at all stages. He and Mr. Radigan were chiefly involved in the drafting of the report, with assistance from the others named. Dr. George B. Galloway, with whom Senator MANSFIELD and you had some discussions preliminary to our undertaking the study, was unable to participate in its preparation because of his commitments during recent months as executive secretary to the U.S. delegation to the Conference of the Interparliamentary Union.

We are forwarding also a compilation entitled "Statistics on Senate Committee Staffs, 1947–59," prepared in our American Law Division by Margaret Fennell. This is a bulky document, but it may be useful for reference purposes. Differences of opinion have frequently arisen over the extent to which the size of committee staffs has increased since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Comparisons based on the total number of persons employed within a given period, or on the payroll on a given date, may, of course, be misleading. The accompanying compilation, drawn from committee reports which were required to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from 1947 through 1959, shows not only how many persons were employed by each committee in each reporting period, but also the nature of their positions and just how long they were employed. The compilation could not be extended beyond 1959 because of a change in the reporting procedure in January 1960.

May I take this opportunity to express, on behalf of the members of our Service who participated in this study, our appreciation for the cooperation and time which so many Senators and committee staff members gave us.

Sincerely yours,
HUGH L. ELSBREE,
Director.

SENATE COMMITTEE STAFFING

(A study prepared at the request of the Honorable MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD and the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN by the Legislative Reference Service, February 19, 1963)

This survey of Senate committee staffing was undertaken in response to the request of Senator MANSFIELD and Senator DIRKSEN and with the cooperation of the committees themselves.

Through informal interviews by members of the Legislative Reference Service staff with committee and subcommittee chairmen, ranking minority members, staff directors, and minority staff members, information was sought on the development of staffing by the different committees, the policy and practice with reference to minority staffing, and suggestions from the members as to how staffing might be improved.

Interviews were held with 15 of the 18 chairmen and 12 of the 14 ranking minority members of the 18 standing and select committees; and with 13 of the 16 chairmen and 9 of the 12 ranking minority members of 20 subcommittees having separate staffs.[1] Many of the chairmen and ranking minority members of subcommittees that do not have separate staffs were also interviewed. In all, interviews were held with 53 Senators, 27 majority and 26 minority.

Interviews were held also with 18 staff directors of the standing and select committees, and with 19 staff directors of subcommittees having separate staffs. Eight minority staff members were interviewed on committees and subcommittees where there was a definite separation of staff between majority and minority. In all, 45 interviews were held with staff members.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMITTEE STAFFING

The pertinent statutory provisions applicable to committee staffing are contained in section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a, Senate Manual, secs. 275.1, 275.3):

"(a) Each standing committee of the Senate * * * (other than the Appropriations Committee) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members * * * on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Each such committee is further authorized to terminate the services by a majority vote of the committee of any such professional staff member as it may see fit. Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned them.

* * * * *

"(c) The clerical staff of each standing committee, which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable; * * *. The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work."

Information obtained in the interviews and summarized herein shows that as a result of established practice and the adoption of special resolutions, present staffing organization and procedures differ in a number of respects from those outlined in the act.

Size of committee staffs

Excluding the Appropriations Committee, the Legislative Reorganization Act authorizes a maximum of 170 employees (68 professional and 102 clerical) for the 17 standing and select committees. At the time of the interviews, there were 255 employees (116 professional and 139 clerical) on the committee staffs, not including employees of subcommittees having separate staffs.[2] This is 85 employees (48 professional and 37 clerical) over the number authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act. The additional employees are accounted for as follows: Two committees, Foreign Relations and Judiciary, have had a total of 6 additional positions (3 professional and 3 clerical) authorized on a permanent basis; 90 employees (50 professional and 40 clerical) were authorized by special resolutions. As against these additions, staff directors of 5 committees reported having altogether 11 positions less than the full number authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act.

A breakdown of the relative size of committee staffs as reported is as follows:

Number of committees:	*Total number of employees*
6	10 or less
1	11
2	12
2	14
1	15
1	19
1	20
1	27
2	31

The number of employees classified by staff directors as professional and clerical on these committees is as follows:

Professional employees

Number of committees:	*Total number of employees*
6	4 or less
3	5
1	6
1	7
3	8
1	13
1	15
1	18

---

[1] The number of interviews sought was less than the total number of positions because in several instances one Senator occupied more than one position. In a few instances a Senator designated one of his staff to represent him in the interview with the member of the Legislative Reference Service.

[2] The interviews covered a period of over 3 months. There have been variations in the total number of employees during this period, and since that time. The staffs of the joint committees are not included in this study.

Clerical employees

Number of committees:	Total number of employees
7	6 or less
4	7
3	9
1	13
1	14
1	16

Subcommittee staffing is not circumscribed by any statute or Senate rule. Many subcommittees are staffed with staff members of the full committee. Twenty subcommittees, however, have separate staffs, authorized by special resolutions. According to figures furnished during the interviews, there are a total of 196 employees (116 professional and 80 clerical) on these subcommittees. A breakdown of the relative size of subcommittee staffs and of the number of employees classified as professional and clerical on these subcommittees is as follows:

Total subcommittee staffs

Number of subcommittees:	Total number of employees
14	10 or less
1	11
1	14
1	15
1	27
1	28
1	35

Professional employees

Number of subcommittees:	Number of employees
12	4 or less
2	6
2	7
1	8
1	17
1	18
1	21

Clerical employees

Number of subcommittees:	Number of employees
16	6 or less
1	8
2	10
1	14

Staffing of the Committee on Appropriations is treated separately here because it is separately provided for in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Under that act, 2 U.S.C. 72a (b), the number of professional and clerical employees is determined by a majority vote of the committee. At the time of the interview the staff comprised 33 employees (24 professional and 9 clerical).

The total number of Senate committee and subcommittee employees, according to the information submitted during the interviews and summarized above, is indicated to be 484, of whom 256 are classified professional and 228 clerical.

It is evident from the interviews that practice is not uniform in classifying employees as professional or as clerical. Since the act does not provide definitions nor establish classification standards, it is natural that there should be varying interpretations. There seems to be no difference of opinion as to the classification of economists, engineers, lawyers, political scientists, etc., as professional, and as to the classification of stenographers, typists, or minor clerks as clerical. Different practices do obtain, however, in the classification of chief clerks, assistant chief clerks, administrators, and investigators.

Differing opinions were expressed in the interviews concerning the extent to which staff had grown since enactment of the Reorganization Act. Because the facts in this regard have frequently been in issue over the years, it seemed desirable to gather as precise information as was available. The accompanying report, "Statistics on Senate Committee Staffs, 1947–1949," shows the development in the size of each committee and subcommittee staff for the period covered.[3]

Opinions expressed in the interviews by Senators and staff members differed as to the adequacy of the size of present committee staffs. (Minority staffing will be discussed separately, below.) A frequent comment was that the Reorganization Act's limitation of 10 staff members for each committee was unrealistic in view of the wide difference in committee workloads. Several Senators expressed the opinion that the use of special resolutions to provide for employees in excess of the 10 authorized in the act gives better control over the size of staffs than would be likely to result from amendment of the act.

Some of those interviewed thought that committee staffing was still inadequate in spite of enlargement by special resolutions. Views were expressed that paucity of staffing had led to the proliferation of special investigations and subcommittees; to a shift in the initiative in policymaking from the Congress to the Executive; to legislating in the dark; to legislating without a basis of real research; to placing much of the burden of committee work on the members' office staffs; to foreclosing the possibility of any real help for the minority; and to precluding any but the senior members of some committees from obtaining significant staff assistance. Some spoke of the need for separate or larger subcommittee staffs.

While each of the above views was expressed by more than one or two Senators, it should be emphasized that the Senators generally, although not always, were referring to committees with smaller staffs, and also that a substantial number of Senators regarded existing staffs as generally satisfactory as far as size is concerned. Many placed greater importance on the need for competency of staffs than on their enlargement.

Appointment and tenure

The Legislative Reorganization Act provides that the professional and clerical employees of the committees shall be appointed upon a vote of the majority of the committee. This provision does not apply to employees appointed under authority of special resolutions, a category which includes some standing and select committee employees and all employees of subcommittees having independent staffs.

It appears from information obtained in the interviews that staff appointments generally are made by committee chairmen rather than by vote of the majority of the committee. Minority employees are usually appointed by the chairmen after consultation with, or on the recommendations of, the ranking minority members. A number of Senators expressed the view that the selection of staff employees was too dependent on the chairmen, or ranking minority members in the case of minority staff.

No attempt was made to examine in detail the tenure of committee staffs. Of the staff members of the 18 standing and select committees, approximately 62 percent occupy so-called permanent positions authorized by the Reorganization Act and approximately 38 percent occupy positions authorized by special resolutions enacted on an annual basis. Information supplied in the interviews indicated that in general staff members of both types have had tenure in the sense of continued employment over many sessions and Congresses. This has apparently been the case also with respect to subcommittee staffs. There was little comment pertaining to tenure made in the interviews.[4]

Types of staffing

Section 202 of the Reorganization Act provides that the professional members of committee staffs are to be appointed "without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. * * * Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them." With respect to clerical staff, the act provides that they shall "be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable." The act states further that the clerical staff "shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work."

Information obtained in the interviews disclosed that committee staffs differed widely in respect to the above matters. At least three different types of staff are now to be found: (1) staffs commonly referred to as nonpartisan, the members of which are selected solely on the basis of merit and without regard to political affiliation, and none of whom are designated either formally or informally as "majority" or "minority" staff members; (2) staffs whose members are sponsored by majority or minority but who work together as a team serving members of both parties, in varying degrees; (3) staffs whose members are divided, in varying ratios, between majority and minority not only as to sponsorship but as to working relationships as well.

While these three general types of staffing may be observed, it is also apparent that each committee staff differs in some respects from others even in the same group. Most of the staff directors interviewed tended to place their staff within the second type.

There were among the Senators and staff members interviewed strong supporters for each of the above types of committee staffs. Most of those who supported a particular type of staffing qualified their support by stating that this type would not necessarily be the best type for all committees. There was a reluctance to prescribe any across-the-board principle or formula in this regard.

STAFFING FOR THE MINORITY

Interviews with Senators and staff directors revealed a highly complex situation as to the facts, considerable disagreement as to which members of the committee staffs should be counted as minority employees in any enumeration of such employees, and a variety of views as to what ought to be done on the subject of staffing for the minority.

To begin with, there is no uniform understanding as to the meaning of the term "minority employee." On some committee staffs there are positions specifically labeled

---

[3] The data were compiled from the personnel reports which every Senate committee was required to make semiannually to the Secretary of the Senate under the Legislative Reorganization Act as implemented by S. Res. 123, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947), and which had to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This form of reporting procedure was terminated in January 1960 when S. Res. 123 was repealed by S. Res. 213, 86th Cong., 2d sess. (1960), because it was believed to be substantially duplicative of other types of reports filed by the committees. Since the latter reports do not provide some of the detailed data which are the basis for the accompanying statistical breakdown, the tabulation could not be extended beyond 1959.

[4] The permanency of tenure of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations bears mention. Of 24 professional staffers, all except 1 have service ranging from 6 to 50 years. All except 4 have over 10 years service and of these 4, 3 have 8 years and 1 has 6 years.

"minority," for example, "minority clerk," or "minority counsel." There was substantial agreement that the number of minority employees would be understated if only those so labeled were included. Some thought that staff members known to have been sponsored by minority Senators ought to be included, along with those specifically designated minority employees. Others would include both of the above plus staff members known to be affiliated with the minority party. Members of the minority generally were of the opinion that the latter two definitions were too broad. They stated that many staff members, although originally minority sponsored or affiliated, could not, after years under the control of the majority, be considered minority employees.

Another possible basis would be to classify employees in accordance with the manner actually employed, designating each one "majority," "minority," or "nonpartisan" depending upon where his time was primarily devoted. While the manner in which staff members were actually employed was obviously given some weight by those interviewed, no precise or comprehensive data of this nature existed or could have been developed without elaborate investigation.

In light of these difficulties and divergences in terminology, it was not practicable to lay down an arbitrary definition. Each staff director did, however, report the number of professional and clerical employees on the staff of his committee or subcommittee who, in his best judgment, should be classified as "majority," "minority," and "nonpartisan." It should be emphasized that the figures below are drawn from the data furnished by the staff directors. It is obvious that other figures could be produced, depending upon the concepts of the compiler and the intimacy of his knowledge of the background of staff members and their appointments and the nature of their actual employment.

Full committee staffs

Of the 116 professional employees on the 17 standing and select committees (the Committee on Appropriations being excluded), 33 were reported to be nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation, 59 as majority, and 24 as minority. Of the 139 clerical employees on these committees, 78 were reported as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation, 46 as majority, and 15 as minority.[5]

(a) Professional employees: The 59 professional employees reported as being majority employees were distributed among 13 of the 17 standing and select committees as follows:

	Professional employees reported as majority	Total
Number of committees:		
2	1	2
3	2	6
1	3	3
3	4	12
1	5	5
1	9	9
1	10	10
1	12	12
Total (13)		59

The 24 professional employees reported as being minority employees were distributed among 12 of the 17 standing and select committees as follows:

	Professional employees reported as minority	Total
Number of committees:		
7	1	7
3	2	6
1	5	5
1	6	6
Total (12)		24

The 33 professional employees reported as being nonpartisan were distributed among 8 of the 17 standing and select committees as follows: a total of 24 of them were reported to be with 4 committees all of whose staff members were reported as nonpartisan; the remaining 9 were distributed among 4 committees, 3 committees having 2 each, and 1 committee having 3.

The ratios of professional employees reported as being majority to those reported as being minority on the 13 standing and select committees which reported one or more employees as being majority or minority (the 4 nonpartisan committees being excluded) were as follows:[6]

Ratio of majority to minority professional employees

Number of committees:	
3	1: 1
1	2: 0
3	2: 1
2	3: 2
2	4: 1
1	5: 1
1	12: 1

(b) Clerical employees: The 46 clerical employees reported as being majority employees were distributed among 9 of the 17 standing and select committees as follows:

	Clerical employees reported as majority	Total
Number of committees:		
1	2	2
3	3	9
2	4	8
1	5	5
1	7	7
1	15	15
Total (9)		46

The 15 clerical employees reported as being minority employees were distributed among 11 of the 17 standing and select committees as follows:

	Clerical employees reported as minority	Total
Number of committees:		
7	1	7
4	2	8
Total (11)		15

The 78 clerical employees reported as being nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation were distributed among 10 committees as follows: a total of 58 of them were reported to be with 6 committees all of whose clerical staff members were reported as nonpartisan; the remaining 20 were distributed among 4 committees, 1 committee having 2, 1 having 3, 1 having 6, and 1 having 9.

The ratios of clerical employees reported as being majority to those reported as being minority on the 11 standing and select committees which were said to have both majority and minority clerical employees (the 6 committees whose entire clerical staff were reported as nonpartisan being excluded) were as follows:[7]

Ratio of majority to minority clerical employees

Number of committees:	
1	1: 1
1	2: 1
2	3: 1
1	3: 2
1	4: 1
1	5: 2
1	7: 2
1	15: 1
2	0: 1

Subcommittee staffs

Of the 116 professional employees on the 20 subcommittees with separate staffs covered by interviews, 9 were reported as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation, 76 as majority, and 31 as minority. Of the 80 clerical employees on these subcommittees, 35 were reported as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation, 32 as majority, and 13 as minority.

(a) Professional employees: The 76 professional employees reported as being majority employees were distributed among 19 of the 20 separately staffed subcommittees as follows:

	Professional employees reported as majority	Total
Number of subcommittees:		
7	1	7
4	2	8
1	3	3
2	5	10
2	6	12
1	7	7
1	11	11
1	18	18
Total (19)		76

The 31 professional employees reported as being minority employees were distributed among 16 of the 19 separately staffed subcommittees as follows:

	Professional employees reported as minority	Total
Number of subcommittees:		
13	1	13
1	3	3
1	6	6
1	9	9
Total (16)		31

The 9 professional employees reported as being nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation were distributed among 2 of the 20 separately staffed subcommittees, 7 such employees being with 1 subcommittee and 2 with another.

The ratios of professional employees reported as being majority to those reported as being minority on the 20 separately staffed subcommittees were as follows:[8]

---

[5] The Committee on Appropriations with a staff of 33 employees (24 professional and 9 clerical) were reported to have 20 majority and 4 minority employees on the professional staff, and 8 majority and 1 minority on the clerical staff. It is generally recognized, however, that this committee staff functions on a nonpartisan rather than a partisan basis.

[6] In some instances committees reporting majority and minority employees also reported employees as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation.

[7] See footnote 6.

Ratio of majority to minority professional employees

1	0:1
4	1:0
3	1:1
4	2:1
1	3:1
2	5:1
3	6:1
1	7:9
1	11:6

(b) Clerical employees: The 32 clerical employees reported as being majority employees were distributed among 11 of the 20 separately staffed subcommittees as follows:

	Clerical employees reported as majority	Total
Number of subcommittees:		
5	1	5
1	2	2
2	3	6
1	4	4
1	7	7
1	8	8
Total (11)	----	32

The 13 clerical employees reported as being minority employees were distributed among 8 of the 20 separately staffed subcommittees as follows:

	Clerical employees reported as minority	Total
Number of subcommittees:		
6	1	6
1	2	2
1	5	5
Total (8)	----	13

The 35 clerical employees reported as being nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation were distributed among 9 of the 20 separately staffed subcommittees as follows:

	Clerical employees reported as nonpartisan	Total
Number of subcommittees:		
2	1	2
1	2	2
1	3	3
2	4	8
1	5	5
1	6	6
1	9	9
Total (9)	----	35

The ratios of clerical employees reported as being majority to those reported as being minority on the 12 separately staffed subcommittees (those subcommittees whose entire clerical staffs were reported to be nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation being excluded) were as follows:[9]

Ratio of majority to minority clerical employees

Number of subcommittees:	
1	0:1
1	1:5
2	1:0
2	1:1
1	2:0
2	3:1
1	4:0
1	4:1
1	7:1

Summary

The foregoing information indicates that at the time of the interviews there were a total of 484 committee and subcommittee employees comprising 256 professionals, of whom 155 were reported as majority, 59 as minority, and 42 as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation; and 228 clericals, of whom 86 were reported as majority, 29 as minority, and 113 as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation.

A breakdown of the composition of each of the committee and subcommittee staffs covered by the interviews, in terms of reported majority, minority, and nonpartisan or unknown political affiliation, follows:

Committee staffs

	Professional	Clerical	Professional				Clerical			
			Majority	Minority	Nonpartisan or unknown	Total	Majority	Minority	Nonpartisan	Total
Total staff:										
33	24	9	20	4	----	24	8	1	----	9
31	15	16	9	6	----	15	15	1	----	16
31	18	13	10	5	3	18	2	2	9	13
27	8	19	----	----	8	8	----	----	19	19
20	6	14	5	1	----	6	----	----	14	14
19	13	6	12	1	----	13	----	----	6	6
15	8	7	----	----	8	8	----	----	7	7
14	7	7	----	----	7	7	----	----	7	7
14	5	9	2	1	2	5	5	2	2	9
12	8	4	4	2	2	8	3	1	----	4
12	5	7	4	1	----	5	----	1	6	7
11	2	9	1	1	----	2	7	2	----	9
10	5	5	4	1	----	5	4	1	----	5
9	4	5	2	2	----	4	3	2	----	5
9	5	4	3	2	----	5	3	1	----	4
8	4	4	1	1	2	4	----	----	4	4
7	2	5	2	----	----	2	4	1	----	5
6	1	5	----	----	1	1	----	----	5	5
Total (288)	140	148	79	28	33	140	54	15	79	148

Subcommittee staffs

	Total staff	Professional	Clerical	Professional				Clerical			
				Majority	Minority	Nonpartisan	Total	Majority	Minority	Nonpartisan	Total
Subcommittee:											
1	35	21	14	18	3	----	21	8	2	4	14
2	28	18	10	7	9	2	18	1	5	4	10
3	27	17	10	11	6	----	17	----	1	9	10
4	15	7	8	6	1	----	7	7	1	----	8
5	14	8	6	----	1	7	8	----	----	6	6
6	11	7	4	6	1	----	7	3	1	----	4
7	9	6	3	5	1	----	6	----	----	3	3
8	8	4	4	3	1	----	4	3	1	----	4
9	8	3	5	2	1	----	3	----	----	5	5
10	8	6	2	5	1	----	6	----	----	2	2
11	7	3	4	2	1	----	3	4	----	----	4
12	5	3	2	2	1	----	3	1	----	1	2
13	5	3	2	2	1	----	3	1	1	----	2
14	4	2	2	1	1	----	2	2	----	----	2
15	4	2	2	1	1	----	2	1	1	----	2
16	3	2	1	1	1	----	2	----	----	1	1
17	2	1	1	1	----	----	1	1	----	----	1
18	1	1	----	1	----	----	1	----	----	----	----
19	1	1	----	1	----	----	1	----	----	----	----
20	1	1	----	1	----	----	1	----	----	----	----
Total	196	116	80	76	31	9	116	32	13	35	80

---

[8] See footnote 6.

[9] See footnote 6.

While the statistics concerning minority staffing present in themselves a complicated issue, the interviews with the Senators made it clear that much more far-reaching issues than that of numbers are involved. The overwhelming number of minority Senators interviewed expressed in various ways the opinion that in a two-party legislature, each party should have staff assistance possessing that party's political philosophy and available to help minority members present the party's views on issues before the committees. To these Senators, the staffing needs of the minority are not met merely by virtue of the fact that committee staff assistance is available to majority and minority alike for development of background information, research, and general assistance of other kinds. Nor is it, according to them, met by the presence on the committee staff of employees originally sponsored by members of the present minority party but who are now under the control and influence of chairmen of the present majority party. What most of these minority Senators contended for was an extension of the principle of minority staff representation, recognized to some extent in the provision contained in nearly all special resolutions since 1957 to the effect that the minority shall be authorized to select one person out of those paid under authority of the resolutions.

While a few of these Senators suggested that there should be a fixed ratio across the board for committee staffs, such as 60 to 40, others thought that greater flexibility was desirable, on the grounds that the need for partisan staff assistance probably varied from committee to committee.

A substantial number of the minority Senators also expressed the view that the need for minority staffing was not met by the practice of having a member of the staff assigned to the ranking minority member, or to some other minority member. The powers of appointment, control, and dismissal of minority employees, most of these Senators believed, should be vested in the minority, in contrast to the practice of having "the ranking minority member's man" or "Senator X's man." A number of minority members noted that where only one professional staff position is assigned to the minority, the ranking minority member or other Senator who sponsors the minority staffer may demand all or most of his time, leaving the other minority members with little or no help. Ranking minority members interviewed rarely expressed dissatisfaction with the staff assistance they received, but at the same time the majority of them thought that assistance available to the rank and file of the minority might be inadequate.

Many minority Senators indicated that they receive satisfactory service on certain committees which have professional staff and on which there is no sharp difference of opinion along party lines. It was also said that on some committees having separate majority and minority staffs minority members do request and receive highly satisfactory service from the majority staff. On such committees majority members sometimes seek and receive help from the minority staff. This may be done because of the special competence of a staff member on a particular subject, or because he happens to be available at the time. On rare occasions, it reflects a preference for the service of a staff member assigned to the opposite party.

However, it appears from the interviews that many minority members ordinarily do not call on majority staff for anything more than routine information. Some minority members indicated that even when a majority staff member would be available to undertake their work, they are not convinced that a staff member controlled by the majority could give them the service they need on controversial matters without jeopardizing his tenure.

Of the majority Senators interviewed, a substantial number opposed separate majority and minority staffing, and, on the whole, seemed to be satisfied with the existing makeup of the staffs of their respective committees. Some expressed the view that the function of the staff is to prepare background and factual material and to analyze problems thoroughly to bring out the facts upon which the committee must act, and that partisanship could not serve this purpose. These Senators personally favored nonpartisan staffing but noted that the principle had not been consistently practiced on most committees; there were comments that while nonpartisan staffing is ideal in principle, it is not easy to apply. A number of majority Senators thought there were some committees which, because of the controversial nature of the issues within their jurisdiction, probably could work better with separate majority and minority staffs.

A smaller number of the majority Senators interviewed favored partisan staffing, on the same grounds put forward by the minority Senators.

The majority Senators interviewed, whether proponents of nonpartisan or partisan staffing, felt that staffing assistance should be available to the minority, and, while very few expressed any definite opinion as to the adequacy of staff available to the minority at the present time, most chairmen, and staff directors interviewed stated that the service of the entire committee staff is available to minority members, even on committees, and subcommittees which have a separate minority staff.

Some Senators commented that the real minority on some committees or subcommittees is the conservative or liberal group, as the case may be, rather than the minority party group. These Senators felt that such committees should have experts representing different shades of opinion in their respective fields.

LIST OF SENATORIAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

The comments and suggestions set forth below are not isolated statements by individual Senators, but rather a paraphrasing of views expressed by at least several Senators and considered of real importance by them. Most of these comments and suggestions have been referred to in the earlier parts of this report, in the discussion of the particular matters to which they relate. It may be useful, however, as emphasizing the large number and wide variety of views expressed, to bring them together in summary form.

Paucity of staffing of committees has led to shifting the initiative in policy making from the Congress to the Executive.

Paucity of staffing of standing committees has led to a proliferation of special investigations and subcommittees.

Lack of staff specialists in a field often leads to legislating in the dark.

Some committee staffs are so small they cannot do any real research.

Adequate technical staffing for both the majority and minority is necessary for good government.

Competence of staff is more important than numbers.

Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 gives a better control over size of staffs than would increasing staffs generally on the basis of projected workloads.

Subcommittees generally are not as well staffed as standing committees.

Some committees or subcommittees are overloaded with patronage appointees.

Some subcommittees are used to obtain extra help for senatorial offices.

The small size of many committee staffs, regardless of the good intentions of the majority, forecloses any real help for the minority.

Worthwhile committee staff assistance on both the majority and minority side is available only to senior members.

The selection of personnel and the operation of committee staffs at the present time are too dependent upon personalities of the chairman and the ranking minority member.

A central roster of qualified persons should be maintained from which staff members might be drawn.

The present practice of having: "the chairman's man;" "the ranking minority member's man;" or "Senator X's man" should be abolished.

A nonpartisan staff is the proper setup for a committee as the function of a staff is to supply factual information on issues.

There is no such thing as a neutral nonpartisan staff.

A nonpartisan staff is too often nothing more than a funnel for the views of the departments over which the committee exercises oversight.

In a two-party legislature each party should have staff assistants who possess the same political philosophy.

Minority staff members should be allowed more participation in the setting-up and conduct of hearings and in questioning witnesses.

Committee staff members should work for the committee.

The appointment and dismissal of minority employees of a committee should be under the control of the minority of the committee.

Minority staff should work for the minority primarily but should work as part of the whole staff.

The smaller the minority the greater the need for staff.

Many longtime employees appointed or sponsored by Republicans have, over the years, adopted nonpartisan or Democratic viewpoints.

Representation of minority on staffs should be on some formal basis, possibly 40 percent.

There should be no fixed rule as to committee setups; flexibility in meeting the needs of each individual committee should be permitted.

The minority on a committee is not necessarily Republican, it may be conservative or liberal.

In staffing, recognition should be given, when it exists, to different points of view in the same party.

Competent staff to serve all shades of political opinion would be ideal.

Committees should have experts of different points of view available in their respective fields.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Will not it be desirable also to have it published as a Senate document, so it will be more easily accessible for distribution?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I adopt the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon; and I ask that, in addition, the staff report be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FALSE ADVERTISING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 1249, which I introduced on April 1, 1963, to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 1274, the Area Redevelopment Act, introduced by me on April 4, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"OPEN ARMS" CAMPAIGN IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the proclamation, last week, by President Ngo Dinh Diem, of an "open arms" campaign is a commendable and significant political contribution to the effort to bring about peace and stability in South Vietnam. It has been under consideration for some time; and now that it has been announced, it is to be hoped that it will be pursued down the line with faithfulness and dedication, for they constitute the key to its potential effectiveness.

Similar efforts, ably pursued, went a long way in helping bring about internal peace in Malaya and in the Philippines, under President Magsaysay.

A campaign of positive amnesty to all except the hard-core Communists—and that is what the "open arms" announcement adds up to—could have similar results in Vietnam. President Ngo Dinh Diem has shown the way; and it is certainly in the interest of all concerned—Vietnamese and Americans—that the statesmanlike campaign he has announced should succeed.

RECLAMATION PAYS 5 TO 1 IN 61 YEARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Reclamation Pays 5 to 1 in 61 Years." The article was published on April 21 in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reclamation Pays 5 to 1 in 61 Years

Denver.—In the 61 years since President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Reclamation Act, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has spent about $4.5 billion, less than 10 percent of what the Defense Department spent last year. And it got its money back.

This comparatively modest figure for Government spending has accomplished what man has dreamed of for centuries. It has transformed wastelands into rich, useful areas and made the desert bloom.

Since President Roosevelt put his signature to the Reclamation Act on June 17, 1902, more than 8.2 billion unwatered acres have been reclaimed and put to use. More than 400 billion kilowatts of electricity have been generated by dams that store and release water and millions of dollars have been saved by flood preventive measures connected with reclamation projects.

HUGE WATER PROJECTS

The largest of these is the 10-State Missouri River Basin project. Running a close second is the vast Colorado River storage project, scheduled for completion in 1969, and covering 110,000 square miles in Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Reclamation officials hasten to point out that the $4.5 billion investment since 1905 has brought back $21.2 billion in repayment of construction costs, value, and Federal tax payments. Water and power sales pay 92.6 percent of project costs, and the bureau does not begin construction of a project without signed contracts for water sales.

The Bureau, headed by Commissioner Floyd Dominy, is eyeing future projects, mainly in Idaho and Oregon.

KEYED TO PROGRESS

"Since water is the only physical ceiling on future progress in the West, the productive past considered only as a prologue to future resource development under the urgent pressures of lowering water tables and present and imminent water shortages," he said.

If reclamation plans for the future are far reaching, then so are the accomplishments. Reclamation Bureau facilities now of reclamation projects must be in operation include 216 multipurpose dams and reservoirs, 131 diversion dams, 27,810 miles of canals and lateral water ways, 9,767 miles of drains, 48 powerplants capable of producing 6,396,085 kilowatts of electricity, and 11,087 miles of transmission lines.

CHOOSING OUR ALLIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the plight in which our country finds itself denies us the luxury of choosing our allies to fight the ever-growing menace of communism. We direly need the friendship and association of people and governments unwilling to live side-by-side with the Communist regime of Moscow.

Too often there has been repetition of the statement that the purpose of the Communist bloc is to destroy our Nation and participate in its burial. I, of course, have a disbelief in dictatorships; however, if a foreign people are to have a dictatorship, I would want it friendly to the West, not allied to the Communist bloc.

As for Cuba, we should not be laboring with the idea that Castro, our enemy, should be removed, not by a friendly right-wing dictatorship, but only by a democratic form of government favorable to our cause. The latter situation, of course, would be the preferable one; but if that is not attainable, it will be to our advantage to have a government, whatever its form, that is hostile to the Communist bloc and friendly to the West.

We have helped to knock out Diefenbaker, weaken Macmillan, jar De Gaulle, and to be indifferent to Adenauer. Ultra leftwingers of our country want Franco of Spain and Salazar of Portugal eliminated, even though they are friendly to the cause of the West. We helped in the eradication of Batista and the establishment of Castro. As between Batista, who was friendly to the West, and Castro, who is hostile to it, it would have been far better for the Western Hemisphere and the people of the world to have continued Batista in power.

Finally, if we are to continue destroying our friends, our problems will grow more dangerous as time goes on. This we cannot endure. Manifestly, if we are to serve the best interest of our country, we must quit insulting and quit weakening the nations which wish to be friendly to our cause.

THE ADVOCATES OF FISCAL INTEGRITY

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently many of us who have been discussing the need for fiscal integrity in this country and for reducing the unnecessary spending at the present level have been accused of having old-fashioned Puritan ethics and outmoded concepts of government. We have been told that the only way to move the country forward is to spend more of the people's money that we do not have and will not have for many, many years to come.

Recently, Mr. President, I came on a very thoughtful and entertaining article, published in the Wall Street Journal, which comments on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 13, 1963]

How To Pick a Pocket or Two

To a smalltown fellow come to the big city it was bound to happen sooner or later, and finally it did. On the way to Wall Street, that den of iniquity, our pocket was picked in the subway, that haunt of the huddled masses.

Along with a couple of credit cards, an unfilled prescription for the drug store, and a shopping list from the lady of the house, this skillful disciple of Fagin made off with $100, which for years we've kept secreted in the back of our wallet against such grave emergencies as running out of expense-account money in San Antonio or St. Paul.

Now being imbued with a Puritan ethic, we do not approve of pickpockets, especially those who pick our own. But in all honesty we must confess that purely from the standpoint of the Nation's economic balance sheet there was no net loss to the country. Indeed, if some of the economic theories bruited about today are correct, it could be argued that the Nation's economy had been helped thereby.

For our loss of $100 was somebody else's gain of $100, the one canceling out the other insofar as economic statistics are concerned. Furthermore, since there was a transfer of funds from one party to another there was a gain in the gross national product as well as the national income. The fact that we paid an exorbitant price for the service received; namely, a lesson in personal finance management—is no concern in abstract economics.

Finally, we suspect the unknown artist of the subway is less well endowed with worldly goods than we are, less likely to keep the money out of circulation as idle savings for a rainy day. So this transfer of our funds to his pocket probably resulted in an increase in the Nation's consumer spending.

Whatever our personal feelings, then, the result represents a consummation devoutly to be wished by the influential thinkers of the day. The whole object of current economic policy is to increase the transfer of funds, raising the statistics of national income and the gross national product, and especially such transfers of funds as may increase consumer spending. The sociological objective is called the "redistribution of income."

Hence the great emphasis on Government spending, which has gotten to be a large part of the gross national product. There's no surer and more efficient way to transfer huge sums than to take taxes from citizens of, say, New York and spend them in New Mexico or Mississippi. According to this thinking, it's a further help if the dollars can be transferred from corporations and rich folk, who might have a proclivity toward savings, to the hands of those who will inject it more quickly into the spending stream.

We are told that the good effects of all this are enhanced if the Government, unlike our friend on the subway, can spend more than it takes or at least seem to. Big deficits, especially those arising from tax cuts, allow more dollars to be put in some people's pockets without appearing to take quite so much out of other people's pockets.

True, this is illusory; what the Government spends it must take away from somebody in some form. Nonetheless, there's no denying it's less painful to steal a bit from everybody's dollars by inflation than to take the money away from them in immediate taxes.

On the subway we had a blissful ignorance of being plucked until, much later in the day, we found ourselves less well off than we thought. And even now we think there must be many a helpful pickpocket who wishes that policemen understood the ethics of the new economics.

LIBERAL FORMULA FOR HAPPINESS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, over a period of years we have been told by many persons that the liberals have the only true concept of government and are the only ones who understand what government is all about, and that somehow or other all conservatives are but a few centuries ahead of Louis XIV, and that is about all.

I hold in my hand an entertaining article, published on April 22 in the Washington Star, which goes quite clearly into the concept of liberals in government and what they are trying to avow, insofar as the concept of government is concerned. It seems to me the article is both timely and extremely pertinent to many of the debates in the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Liberal Formula for Happiness—Some Accused of Championing Liberty While Favoring Creeping Coercion

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Self-styled liberals are generally nicer people than sour-puss reactionaries.

It would be better to be cast away on a desert island with an outgoing and outgiving liberal than with a guy who's against everything including the construction of a raft. But this doesn't mean that liberal government is a good recipe for equity or human happiness. Many liberals suffer from smug assumptions about human behavior and political theory that simply don't jibe with reality.

They are capable of a great degree of dogma, while imagining themselves to be the foes of dogma. They honestly believe themselves to be champions of liberty while they favor creeping coercion as long as they can be the authors of the coercion. They are so sure their theories are good for you that they think they are only doing you a favor when they tie you to a post, pry open our jaws, and pour their nostrums down your throat.

Willie Howard, the late great Jewish comedian, had a skit in which he impersonated a Communist holding forth in Union Square.

"Comes da revolution," shouted Willie, "you'll eat strawberries and cream."

"But," protested someone in his stage audience, "I don't like strawberries and cream."

Willie assumed a contemptuous sneer, "Comes da revolution and you'll eat strawberries and cream."

This is not a bad description of the liberal formula for human happiness.

One of the chief characteristics of the professional liberal in America is his naive belief in the corrective power of law. Every time he sees social maladjustment or a personal tragedy he wants to pass a law to correct it. Gradually and with the best intentions he weaves a net of verbotens and must-do's that paralyzes the individual.

If you keep on passing laws to obviate every possible injustice, eventually you arrive at the ultimate injustice, the police state.

Although the liberal often professes a contempt for money, he has almost a childlike faith in its power. What he can't cure with a law he thinks he can cure with an appropriation. When mulish taxpayers balk at such expenditures at the local level, he demands that the Federal Government take over, on the sound theory that the farther the taxing agency is removed from the individual the more chance there is that the individual will be complacent about the tax. The argument: "If Oklahoma doesn't take the money, Maine will" is a potent one.

Therefore, the liberal arrives quite logically at his advocacy of centralized power. Centralized power is the device by which the normal caution of the taxpayer is overwhelmed by his greed. Federal aid to schools will provide more teachers without raising school district taxes. Ninety percent Federal highway money means that he won't have to pay for a bond issue. Increased Federal relief means that local responsibility can be shirked. And so supergovernment grows and the liberal is delighted.

He is delighted because he questions whether local government will ever have adequate social vision. But he will see to it that the supergovernment has. There will be plans, bold plans of new frontiers entered into with vigor.

The liberal also seems to hold a double standard in the matter of human behavior. He is irate about the greed of corporations and the evils of stock options. But the mugger in the park who stabs for $20 is a deprived person who wouldn't have gone wrong if there had been enough social legislation.

The liberal can't believe that removing the penalties for misbehavior or lack of performance could increase human cussedness and sloth. Instead, according to his theory, what we need are more social workers, more public housing, more youth clubs. And with them we keep getting more chiselers, more illegitimate children, more delinquency and crime.

One problem with the liberal is that he's getting way behind the times. He can't adjust his dogmas to new forces. He looks at labor-management problems as though the Pinkertons were still shooting the strikers at Homestead. The significance of Jimmy Hoffa eludes him. He is furious at the price-raising attempt by United States Steel, but unable to comprehend the cost-fixing capabilities of the United Steel Workers. He is still chasing Commodore Vanderbilt and the beef trust.

The liberal thus deludes himself with the comfortable assurance that he is far-seeing, a progressive, a man of the future. In his effort to cure injustice by piling on more government he forgets that all the great struggles for freedom have been directed against the overblown force of government.

He has, with minor interruptions, been in power in America for 30 years. He is getting gray, and even a little quaint. He won't admit error or consider pragmatic results. He has concocted his medicine, and as our colic increases he merely calls for bigger doses.

The liberal is a nice guy. He is loving us to death.

CUBA FAILURE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, many of us have been reporting, from all over the country, to our colleagues and to members of the administration, the complete confusion on the part of the American public as to what we are doing or what we are not doing in terms of trying to regain for the Cuban people, themselves, the control of their own government.

I have been among those who have felt that the policy of indecision has been so extreme that we have been left in a position of failure insofar as concerns the protection of other countries in Central and South America. The prestige of the United States has gone down sharply. We must develop a policy which will afford some assurance of success over the next few years. Such policy should include a process of giving to the Cubans themselves the right to control their own government.

In the New York Post for April 11, a columnist, Mr. William V. Shannon, who is rather noted for his support of the present administration, wrote an analysis of the Cuban situation under the title of "Cuban Failure." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cuba Failure

(By William V. Shannon)

Washington.—The Kennedy administration's rupture with Jose Miro Cardona, coming on the second anniversary of the mismanaged Bay of Pigs invasion, brings to a close a cycle of defeat, political ignorance, and moral confusion in America's relations with the Cuban revolution. Everything has now been surrendered, including honor, and we have no policy nor recourse save to wait for whatever good or bad tidings the future may bring. Events have passed out of our hands.

It is instructive to recall the state of affairs when Mr. Kennedy took office. Castro, having been in power for 2 years, had already alined himself with the Communists, broken with the liberal elements in the revolutionary coalition, and was far advanced in transforming an indigenous radical uprising into a self-shackled Communist dependency.

A brave and active underground movement against the dictator was spreading. Exiles in Florida were alive with hope for his early overthrow. The United States which had encouraged Batista to depart and which had originally extended a sympathetic tolerance to the Castro government, was in a strong position to influence the course of events, both in its own national interest and in the interest of the freedom of the Cuban people. There were then no Soviet troops and no short-range Soviet missiles in Cuba.

The Kennedy administration took office seemingly committed to a clear and sound policy that this country would not permit a Communist Cuba. Since the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, the United States had taken the consistent position that we would not allow foreign countries to establish new colonies or export alien systems of government to this hemisphere. Since Castro had turned out to be only a stalking horse for the Communists, we had no alternatives except to force his departure or compromise our historic position.

There were only two ways to get rid of Castro. One was to organize a mixed invasion of Cubans and Americans under the aegis of a government-in-exile which we would recognize. The other was to organize sabotage, political subversion and economic pressure. This program could only have succeeded if the administration had been willing to make bold political decisions. In a revolutionary situation, the most effective alternative is usually a group only a shade less radical than the faction one is trying to overthrow. What was wanted was a political leadership for the Cuban underground-and-exile movement that shared most of Castro's original radical social and economic program but disavowed his terrorism and his links to Moscow. We shall never know if a left-of-center alternative, properly supported by the United States, could have brought Castro down. The President and his brother, Robert and their CIA and State Department advisers lacked the political sophistication and imagination to attempt it.

President Kennedy chose the more direct alternative of an invasion. Since the Cuban exiles ranged from radicals to reactionaries, a temporary coalition was pasted together under the presidency of Miro Cardona, an honorable man of centrist sympathies. But this coalition was not recognized as a government in exile. The administration also held back from providing the U.S. troops and planes necessary to bolster the exile force. Moreover, the CIA, with extraordinary political obtuseness, placed most of its reliance on the sons of the wealthy and on the supporters of the fallen Batista. In short, the White House policymakers avoided the political choices and the CIA made the wrong ones.

There was nothing wrong, in my judgment, with a mixed Cuban-and-American military intervention to throw out Castro except that once embarked upon, it could not be allowed to fail. President Kennedy did allow it to fail.

But there was no reason, after that single defeat, for panic or despair. The political alternative could still be attempted, although now under less favorable circumstances, or a second successful invasion could be properly planned and carried out. Instead, the administration did nothing. The 18 wasted months from April 1961 to October 1962, are in my opinion, a worse offense on the administration's record than the defeat of the Bay of Pigs invasion. What had appeared to be a firm resolve to get rid of Castro proved, after only one setback, to be made of jelly.

The only conclusion drawn from the events of April 1961, was that clandestine operations are impossible in a democracy. The exiles and the underground were simply written off as too divided and unmanageable. Micawberism—"Maybe something will turn up"—reigned.

What turned up were the Russian missiles. Khrushchev had not wasted those 18 months. Mr. Kennedy was able to force the Russians to withdraw the missiles by going to the edge of nuclear war. We are all grateful to him that his resolute firmness in October succeeded, but he is scarcely entitled to any credit for handling Cuban affairs in such a way that they produced a nuclear crisis. The introduction of the Soviet missiles completely exposed the shallowness of those, in the administration and in the general public, who thought we could happily coexist with a Communist Cuba. Because we permitted Castro to stay in power, Khrushchev very nearly outflanked us on our defenseless southern border.

The long-range missiles are presumably gone, but Cuba is far stronger militarily than it was 2 years ago. We cannot get rid of Castro because his safety has now become linked with Khrushchev's prestige. Cuba has become like Berlin, a hostage in the cold war. The suppression of the Cuban raiders and the dropping of poor Miro Cardona constitute the final admission that we have met total defeat on the Cuban front. The Cuban people have been left to the mercies of their bearded tyrant.

DEATH OF DR. A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD, PRESIDENT OF YALE UNIVERSITY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, president of Yale University, died on Friday, April 19, at New Haven, Conn. I knew him, served under him as a member of the Yale Council, respected him and held him in deep affection. But there are thousands of Yale students and graduates, members of the faculty, associates in the profession of teaching, and people in every walk of life who came in association with him, who were moved by his teachings and writings, and who felt his influence. His influence in thought and action moved far beyond the confines of Yale University, and had its bearing upon our Nation.

He has been described as an eloquent defender of academic freedom—and that description is correct. He was a strong believer in the fundamental soundness of our system of government and our political philosophy, and therefore he was not fearful of academic freedom, and freedom of inquiry throughout our Nation. He defended freedom, and advocated it, courageously and joyfully.

There is so much that he said to choose from, but I would like to quote the following:

> The only loyalty upon which true reliance can be placed is the kind evoked by the inherent virtue of the cause or institution or individual toward which the loyalty is felt. In creating this kind of loyalty, oaths are of little value compared to the devotion of a man who has been free to examine and evaluate the evidence and, on the strength of that experience, in Cromwell's words, "knows what he fights for and loves what he knows."

It is sad that his great abilities, his courage, his joyful spirit are lost to the Nation at the early age of 56 years. Our thoughts go out to his wife and family.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a number of editorials and articles relating to Dr. Griswold.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Apr. 21, 1963]

YALE'S GRISWOLD—A LEADER OF MEN

NEW HAVEN, CONN.—A. Whitney Griswold, Yale's sixth president and a leading spokesman for higher education and academic freedom, died of cancer yesterday in his home on the Yale campus.

The 56-year-old educator had been seriously ill for many weeks. The cancer had been first detected on January 19, 1961, when Dr. Griswold underwent an abdominal operation.

Dr. Griswold was the embodiment (although, if taxed, he would have denied it) of the "educated man" in whose behalf he devoted the greater part of his life. His wide-ranging interests encompassed music, student rows with the New Haven police, American policy in the Far East.

Alfred Whitney Griswold could say:

"The strength of higher learning derives more directly from the liberal arts than from any other source. Take it away and you have the ruination of higher education."

He could, and did, after his first tussle with the university budget, write:

> "Some insolvent evening,
> "We will find an oil well
> "Right under Woodbridge Hall * * *"

Dr. Griswold was scholar and wit, administrator and author, stone-faced adherent to principle and gay social companion. He was one of Yale's youngest full professors and one of its youngest presidents. He became one of the world's most respected educators.

His selection to succeed Dr. Charles Seymour in the presidency was just as much a surprise to him as it was to a great part of the academic world. He and his wife, Mary, were in New York that February day and lunched with Dr. Roswell Ham, then president of Mount Holyoke College. Dr. Ham expanded on the worries and frustrations of such a post.

"Thank God," Dr. Griswold is reported to have said after their friend had left, "that we're not in that racket."

Moments later, he got a phone call informing him of his appointment by the Yale Corp. He returned to New Haven next day and accepted one of the most difficult posts in the world of education.

A colleague once called him "a very sudden man."

The then Secretary of State Dean Acheson (Yale 1915) and the late Senator Robert Taft (Yale 1910) were fellows of the corporation at that time and joined in the unanimous selection of the almost unknown history professor. Said Mr. Acheson: "Pull up your socks, boy, and get on with it."

Whether or not Dr. Griswold needed this admonition, the record shows that he did "get on with it." When he assumed the presidency of Yale, the endowment fund was just above $121 million. By now it is more than $375 million.

Under Dr. Griswold's leadership the faculty pay scale was more than doubled. As a result, there was assembled at Yale one of the finest university faculties in the English-speaking world.

His success in putting through salary increases was one of the accomplishments which gratified Dr. Griswold highly. He had campaigned for a higher scale long before he became president. While still an assistant professor, he had a rubber stamp with which he marked all the menu cards at Mory's. It read: "Raise faculty salaries."

THE M'CARTHY ERA

That, plus a thousand lesser problems, was the administrative side of the job, but this Yale president was much more than administrator and fundraiser. In 1952, when the McCarthy investigations had thrown many Americans into near hysteria over the supposed threat to civil liberties, Dr. Griswold remained the calm history scholar.

"Books won't stay banned," he said. "They won't burn. Ideas won't go to jail. In the long run of history, the censor and the inquisitor have always lost. The only sure weapon against bad ideas is better ideas."

On the other hand, in 1953, Dr. Griswold took a dim view of teachers who invoked the fifth amendment when questioned by congressional committees. He signed a report, by the Association of American Universities, which said that faculty members have a duty to cooperate in official investigations even when the "powers of legislative inquiry are abused."

"Above all, a scholar must have integrity and independence," the report said. "This renders impossible adherence to such a regime as that of Russia and its satellites * * * such membership extinguishes the right to a university position."

Six years later, and still very much concerned with Yale's finances, he withdrew the university from a part of a Federal program making money available for loans to needy students. Among the requirements was one that students seeking such loans should not only swear allegiance to the United States but also file an affidavit disclaiming membership in or support of any organization advocating the overthrow of the Government by violence.

ROOTS IN CONNECTICUT

"The negative affidavit," said Dr. Griswold, "partakes of the nature of the oppressive religious and political test oaths of history which were used as a means of exercising control over the educational process by church or state. The universities of the free world * * * have taken the lead in resisting and doing away with such oaths."

Like Yale itself, his roots were in Connecticut, although he was born on October 27, 1906, in Morristown, N.J. One ancestor was a colonial Governor of Connecticut. He was a direct descendant of two Governors of Connecticut, after it became a State, and a collateral descendant of two others. He was also a collateral descendant of Eli Whitney, inventor of the cotton gin.

He was graduated from Yale in 1929, dubbed by his classmates the "wittiest" and "most original" member. His first job, which lasted until the stock market crash, was with a Wall Street brokerage house. He commented later that "ours was probably the last class in history to leave New Haven on a magic carpet. Every one since 1929 has taken a day coach."

After the crash, he returned to Yale to teach freshman English and, except for studies abroad, never left that campus.

In 1930, he married Mary Morgan Brooks, of Scranton, Pa., a marriage that was to span 33 years and produce three daughters and a son, who survive him.

He had aspired early to be a writer but changed his major line of study from English to history and received his doctorate in that field in 1933. He began as an instructor and became a full professor 14 years later, at the age of 40.

During World War II, he directed two Army training schools at Yale. One was that which taught Americans how to handle civil government in occupied territories. The other was the foreign area and language study known as the Army specialized training program.

Dr. Griswold was a prolific writer. His articles on a wide variety of subjects appeared in periodicals as diverse as the New York Times magazine and Sports Illustrated. His books included "The Far Eastern Policy of the United States," "Farming and Democracy," "Essays on Education," "In the University Tradition," and "Liberal Education and the Democratic Ideal."

He received honorary degrees from Trinity College, Princeton, Harvard, Jewish Theological Seminary, Columbia, Brown, University of Pennsylvania, Wesleyan, and Johns Hopkins.

Dr. Griswold was an officer of the French Legion of Honor.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Apr. 20, 1963]

THE MEASURE OF A WARM AND MANY-FACETED MAN

(By Terry Ferrer)

There are those who say that Whit Griswold was the greatest college president in the East. There are those who say he was, above all, the finest history professor they ever had. There are those who insist he was the best essayist and writer in the academic world.

There are also those who know that Whit Griswold was a warm, witty, and generous man who every day did his utmost to raise the quality of whatever crossed his path, be it an academic program at Yale or a fresh defense of the academic freedom which he cherished so deeply.

Whit Griswold liked to open the door himself when a visitor came to the imposing president's house at 22 Hillhouse Road on the Yale campus. He would smile and crack a joke with his welcome. But always, he would thank you for bothering to come to see the president of Yale University.

A reporter recalls a day a few years ago when Dr. Griswold sent a car halfway across Connecticut to pick her up at the end of a meeting and bring her to New Haven. He wanted to make sure that a point in a forthcoming story was clear.

The point was minor, except that to Dr. Griswold nothing was minor. Every detail of a story, a fundraising drive, a speech, a decision, was vital, and he gave it his undivided attention and his driving energy.

We sat over tea in his living room as darkness fell. Thin and frail as he always was, he was not sitting in one of the deep armchairs, but was perched on a straight chair, the legs tilted back. Rocking precariously back and forth, his eyes burning with concentration, he talked of plans for Yale, to make it better, to make it more useful to society, to devise ways that the university could better prepare excellent teachers, could offer its undergraduates a true liberal arts education.

I asked him if he still had time for his music. When we had first met in 1951, the year after he became president, he had spent most of one evening at the piano, singing songs and parodies of his own making, singing songs usually heard at Mory's (where women are barred).

Quite typically, he answered that he was then taking flute lessons for relaxation.

Also quite typically, when he learned a few weeks ago that his cancer was inoperable, he left the hospital to go home—to do some work.

During his 13 years as Yale's president, Dr. Griswold changed the physical face of the campus as well as bolstering its academic climate. In 1960, he boldly embarked on Yale's first capital-funds campaign in 34 years. The goal: to raise the equivalent of $69.5 million in new capital in 2 years. The money was in before the 2 years was over, and with $5 million to spare.

Two new residential colleges, designed by the late Eeero Saarinen, were built and opened, bringing the university's residential colleges to 12. Their soaring towers have added new beauty to the whole city of New Haven.

Last May, Dr. Griswold broke ground for a $10 million science center. On that occasion, he said: "I am sick and tired of the use of the disparaging, not to say pejorative, term 'brick and mortar' as if these things were beneath the dignity of universities."

"Is it not remarkable," he continued, "that man throughout the ages has used brick and mortar to express his highest ideals, his purest and noblest aspirations and that these structures are treasured by archeologists and historians of art as among the most accurate measures of the progress and dignity of the human race?"

Dr. Griswold always reserved the right to give the baccalaureate address at Yale's commencement exercises. Each year he spoke movingly of God and man, his broad face solemn, his thinning sandy hair brushed straight back, his lanky frame straight and still. If he was not very tall, he seemed tall when he gave these sermons.

He was a man who did not scare easily. When the first Russian Sputnik went up in 1957, he refused to be drawn into the general panic and rush toward more science and mathematics. He insisted that a well-rounded, liberal arts education was the key to man's survival on this planet. Education, he maintained clearly and publicly, must aim for a triple competence, in the sciences, in the political and social fields, and in the arts.

When a "disclaimer" affidavit was required of students who wanted to participate in the student-loan program of the National Defense Education Act of 1953, Dr. Griswold was one of the first college presidents to declare that Yale would not participate in the program.

The negative affidavit required that, in addition to a loyalty oath, students sign an affidavit declaring that they did not believe in and were not members of an organization seeking the overthrow of the U.S. Government. Dr. Griswold likened the affidavit to "test oaths" through the centuries which had persecuted Catholics, Protestants, Quakers, and Puritans.

He lived to see the affidavit repealed and Yale in the Federal program.

Undergraduate, graduate student, instructor, professor and president—Whit Griswold was all of these at Yale, spanning 38 of his 56 years of life.

He once wrote: "Loyalty cannot be coerced or compelled. If men are born loyal, the only kind of loyalty that survives infancy in any thinking person is the kind that survives curiosity and withstands criticism and even doubt."

This was the kind of loyalty Whit Griswold, gave to his university, the academic community and the society of all men.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald-Tribune, Apr. 21, 1963]

GRISWOLD WIT AND WISDOM

A. Whitney Griswold had a way with words, sometimes winning, sometimes withering, always to the point. He wrote and spoke with good humor, wit, and wisdom. Here are some selections from the Griswold record:

Intercollegiate football: "Undue deference to spectators has led the colleges to default to a certain extent on their professional competence * * *. This was tantamount to a surrender of academic freedom on the athletic field while (academic freedom) was being defended in the classroom." Athletic scholarships were "one of the greatest educational swindles ever perpetrated on American youth."

Society: "Conversation in this country has fallen upon evil days * * *. It is drowned out in singing commercials by the world's most productive economy that has so little to say for itself it has to hum it. It is hushed and shushed in dimly lighted parlors by television audiences who used to read, argue, and even play bridge, an old-fashioned card game requiring speech."

Cold war: "We are the world's greatest salesmen, but can't even talk intelligently about our greatest product—democracy."

Rule of law: "I think that law in the United States has suffered some retrogression of recent date (1950's) * * *. I do not think that the full meaning and value of law are communicated to society through the law's own formal processes * * *. To be effective, the rule of law must be comprehended by society, not as an esoteric concept, but as a working principle comparable to regular elections and the secret ballot; and the plain fact is that it is not so comprehended. This, I think, is an educational deficiency."

Old-fashioned alumni: "We must take a hammer" to the popular image that pictures the American college alumnus as "the irascible member of the old guard who neither dies nor surrenders, fuming with rage (and perhaps a little bourbon) at his football tickets, or the coach, and dashing off sulfurous letters to his university beginning, 'I was shocked to discover that' and ending 'unless something is done about this at once I shall no longer contribute or remain, sincerely.' "

Race issue: "Among our many faults we have in particular a race problem; until we pluck that beam from our own eye we shall have a hard time getting rid of the mote in anybody else's."

Teacher training: "The whole teacher training curriculum has been frozen into law in many States. There are certification requirements, and if you will examine them you will find that many are the icicles of the old system of pedagogy."

Loyalty oaths: "The affidavit cannot create loyalty. Loyalty cannot be coerced or compelled. If men are born loyal, the only kind of loyalty that survives infancy in any thinking person is the kind that survives curiosity and withstands criticism and even doubt. Such loyalty may and usually does have an instinctive base; but if the opportunity to satisfy curiosity and answer criticism is limited, or qualified, or made conditional upon the acceptance of restraints, the instinctive base of loyalty is undermined.

"The only loyalty upon which true reliance can be placed is the kind evoked by the inherent virtue of the cause or institution or individual toward which the loyalty is felt. In creating this kind of loyalty, oaths are of little value compared to the devotion of a man who has been free to examine and evaluate the evidence and, on the strength of that experience, in Cromwell's words, 'knows what he fights for and loves what he knows.' "

U.S. world role: "All the Russian earth satellites, all the Yankee-go-home legends chalked on walls of foreign cities, all the rocks thrown at our Vice President, have not disproved the fundamental soundness of our system of government and our political philosophy."

U.S. trivialities: "We have become too much a nation of lookers and listeners, a nation of spectators. Amidst the easy artificiality of our life, the plethora of substitutes for learning and thinking, the innumerable devices for avoiding or delegating personal responsibility for our opinions, even for having any opinions, the fine edge of our faith has been dulled, our creative powers atrophied."

Creativity: "Could 'Hamlet' have been written by a committee, or the 'Mona Lisa' painted by a club? Could the New Testament have been composed as a conference report? Creative ideas do not spring from groups. They spring from individuals. The devine spark leaps from the finger of God to the finger of Adam, whether it takes ultimate shape in a law of physics or a law of the land, a poem or a policy, a sonata, or a mechanical computer."

Congressional investigations: "Congressmen and Senators are not magistrates with roving commissions to go about the length and breadth of the land hailing people before them to respond to what they will. Congressmen and Senators are legislators, entitled to make inquiries and examine facts in support of their work as legislators. They can readily get all the information they need about any topic without asking any person about his own past thoughts, beliefs or associations."

Destiny: "We would all like to know more perfectly our mortal destiny in order that we might steer more perfectly our mortal course. It would do us all good to understand more clearly the world of science as it would the world of humanities, for both are essential to an understanding of the true nature of the world in which man lives. We do not gain this unity of knowledge and understanding by delegating it to others. We shall not gain it from statistical measurements of our own inadequacies, or by inoculating one another with expedient doses of science and humanism."

[From New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 21, 1963]

A. Whitney Griswold

The cause of freedom had no more devoted champion than Dr. Alfred Whitney Griswold. He brought to the presidency of Yale University a view of academic responsibility that ranged far beyond the broadening of the curriculum, the strengthening of the faculty or the augmentation of endowments. His concern was the advancement of man and the repelling of every assault on human liberty and dignity. Wit and good humor were part of his arsenal in that task, but so was a courage that scorned the cautions of more timorous colleagues.

He condemned loyalty oaths and all other efforts to legislate conformity. "Books won't stay banned," he once said. "They won't burn. Ideas won't go to jail. In the long run of history, the censor and the inquisitor have always lost." The vigor and articulateness he marshalled against the suppressors of freedom contributed much to building a stronger America. His death of cancer at the age of 56 is a loss to the Nation, even more than it is a loss to Yale.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 22, 1963]

A. Whitney Griswold

The motto of Yale University—"Lux et Veritas"—was upheld with honor by A. Whitney Griswold, president since 1950 of New Haven's great seat of learning. Early in his tenure, he resisted pressures intended to protect Yale undergraduates from the dangerous world of ideas. He felt that man and God could endure at Yale without limitations on the spirit of free inquiry—a conviction that was reflected in an influential statement on academic freedom prepared in 1953 by a committee of university presidents that Dr. Griswold headed.

A teacher and historian of international relations, Dr. Griswold proved a vigorous administrator as president. The endowment and physical plant grew at Yale—and, notably, so did faculty salary scales. Dr. Griswold had the belief, considered eccentric by some, that teachers should be generously paid as one measure of the country's esteem for learning. Now dead at a premature 56, Dr. Griswold's legacy is a flourishing university providing more light than ever before in the quest for truth.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 22, 1963]

Griswold of Yale

In the all-too-brief span allotted him, Dr. A. Whitney Griswold left an imprint neither time nor change will erode. His eloquent voice carried the message of freedom far beyond the elms of Yale University, whose presidency he filled for 13 years.

Judged as an administrator alone, Dr. Griswold made a remarkable record. His relentless work on behalf of faculty members nearly doubled their pay in a decade. Unsuspected of money-raising skills, he nearly tripled the endowment fund. But he also more than tripled the budget for sciences, and in so doing, attracted such gifts as the $10 million grant of C. Mahlon Kline for a new science center.

He championed free academic expression at Yale and elsewhere. He believed that no one who cares should be denied a liberal arts education as a means "to expand to the limit the individual's capacity, and desire, for self-education, for seeking and finding meaning, truth, and enjoyment in everything he does."

Most notably, through example and precept, Dr. Griswold elevated individual effort above "sterile and stultifying" committee action. He taught that neither Hamlet, nor the Mona Lisa, nor the New Testament could have been wrought by committee. Rather, he said, "the divine spark leaps from the finger of God to the finger of Adam."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky in memorializing, as he has, the life of the president of Yale University. Dr. Griswold was one of our most gifted educators. I knew him personally. He made significant contributions toward American public and educational life. I join the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and all other Senators in an expression of sadness on hearing that he has been cut off at the most fruitful point in his life by the dread disease of cancer. If we needed anything to stir us to Herculean efforts to deal with the terrible scourge of cancer, we see in Dr. Griswold's passing an impressive example of what the disease has cost our world.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

RESEARCH GRANTS AND SALARIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the administration of federally sponsored research grants and contracts, including salary charging practices of academic institutions is receiving increased attention and study. To obtain factual background information on this situation, the Committee on Sponsored Research of the American Council on Education conducted a survey of 60 universities which are most heavily involved in Government research projects. On the basis of the information thus obtained, the committee has made a number of recommendations which it believes should be very helpful to colleges and universities in improving their relationships with the Federal Government. Members of the committee are Fred R. Cagle, vice president, Tulane University; Lowell T. Coggeshall, vice president, University of Chicago; Lee A. DuBridge, president, California Institute of Technology, chairman; Milton S. Eisenhower, president, the Johns Hopkins University; Clifford C. Furnas, president, State University of New York at Buffalo; T. Keith Glennan, president, Case Institute of Technology; Virgil M. Hancher, president, State University of Iowa; Laurence R. Lunden, vice president, business administration, University of Minnesota; and Logan Wilson, president, American Council on Education, ex officio.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the summary entitled "Recommendations on Faculty Salaries Charged to Government Contracts," issued by the Committee on Sponsored Research, American Council on Education, April 1963.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS ON FACULTY SALARIES CHARGED TO GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

The Committee on Sponsored Research of the American Council on Education has been aware for some time of the growing concern in certain universities, and in a number of Government agencies, about the lack of uniformity in policies relating to the billing of the Government for a portion of the salaries paid to regular faculty members for their work on sponsored research grants and contracts.

The committee believes that it is sound policy to regard the prorated portion of the salaries of faculty members working on such grants or contracts as a proper direct cost of research, and we believe that the Government should pay the full costs of the research work it sponsors in colleges and universities.

Nevertheless, such a wide variety of procedures and practices has developed among universities and various Government agencies that misunderstandings have arisen—and some abuses may have arisen—causing certain Government representatives to propose more uniform and rigid regulations covering salary reimbursement. Such rigid or uniform regulations would not recognize the differing situations present in various institutions, and would partially destroy the flexibility essential for good relations between the universities and the Government.

On the other hand, the universities themselves must recognize that there must be one overall guiding principle that is rigidly adhered to—namely, the Government should not be billed for more than that share of the total annual salary of a faculty member that is represented by the effort actually expended on the sponsored research project or projects. Careful adherence to this principle will avoid abuses and misunderstandings, as well as unreasonable intrauniversity salary competition for support by Government funds.

Specifically, the committee proposes the following recommendations:

1. It would be ideal if the salaries of all faculty members carrying on scholarly work throughout the calendar year were on a 12-month basis, including 1 month paid vacation. Such a salary basis simplifies the identification of the percent of effort charged to extramural sponsors. Thus, if a faculty member devotes 50 percent of his effort during the 12-month period to a project, the university should be reimbursed for 50 percent of his total 12-month base salary. Thus, no portion of a faculty member's salary is contingent on Government support of his research.

2. Wherever it is not feasible for the salaries of faculty members to be converted to a 12-month basis, the percent of effort devoted to sponsored projects should be determined for the academic year and the university should request reimbursement for the corresponding portion of each salary.

3. The additional amount requested by the university for summer salary should be determined by the percent of effort and period the faculty member devotes to a project. Thus, if a faculty member devotes 100 percent of effort to research during certain summer months, the university should claim the appropriate one-ninth, two-ninths, or three-ninths of the base salary, depending on whether the faculty member works 1, 2, or 3 months. Other ratios may also be justified, but a claim of 3 months' salary for less than 3 months' 100 percent effort must be avoided, as should arrangements which charge the sponsor for more than a properly prorated share of the vacation allowance. Faculty work schedules allowing for no vacation should not be regularly permitted.

4. If the sponsors of projects require periodic reports on percent of effort, they should be called for only at the end of each academic period (for example, quarter, semester, trimester).

5. In consonance with the principles expressed in the foregoing paragraphs, universities should avoid extra compensation (compensation above the full-time base salary) for work on special projects during the academic year. The base university salary should include compensation for all university duties (for example, teaching, research, administration, intrauniversity consulting). Exceptions to this rule should be made only for very compelling reasons and in unusual cases.

A SOUTHERN CAMPAIGN MANAGER SPELLS OUT THE PROPER PROCEDURES FOR WINNING BY REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES FOR CONGRESS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there has recently come to my attention a remarkable letter written by a southern campaign manager to his Republican candidate for the U.S. Congress. I consider this to be one of the most interesting, impressive, and informative documents in many years of political evolution and development. It is for that reason that I ask unanimous consent to place it in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the review and consideration by historians as well as for the possible guidance and inspiration of other current political leaders desirous of establishing effective two-party government in every State and section of America.

The fact that this significantly different letter was written by a former colleague of ours—former Senator Harry Cain of Washington—not only adds to its interest and effectiveness but guarantees to its readers that it is written by one of the most proficient practitioners and most careful students of American political activity.

This letter was deemed of such significance that several weeks after the campaign was over, both of the great Sunday newspapers of Miami, Fla., asked and received permission to print the letter in full even though the Cain-managed candidate had been defeated and the election was long since over. Senator Cain's candidate, while losing, gathered up about 45 percent of the vote in the fall election in a campaign where earlier polls and estimates indicated he would receive less than 20 percent of the vote since he was running not only against an able and experienced candidate for Congress—former Senator CLAUDE PEPPER—but in an area which previously had given scant if any encouragement to Republican candidates for Congress.

All of these developments lend real and realistic encouragement to candidates and citizens of the so-called one-party areas of the Deep South who may have come to realize that only by developing an effective Republican organization and honorable and effective Republican candidates and procedures of campaigning can the Southland once again come to be considered sufficiently independent or unpredictable in its election behavior so that it will once more be able to play an important part in shaping our national policies and in selecting and electing our national leaders. Until the fine and cultured citizens of Dixie develop this necessary unpredictability in our national campaigns for President and for Congress, I greatly fear they will continue to be considered "in the bag" by the Democrats and "out of reach" by the Republicans. Until and unless these great Southern States with their vast resources of sound judgment and high purpose develop a political mechanism which will indicate alike to the Republican and Democratic national campaign committees that they are indeed not really the "kept voters" of Democratic politicians but that they, too, have both the desire and the means at hand to "reward their friends and punish their enemies" at the polling places each election year in November, I fear that for many years into the future the traditional South will be as ineffective and unheeded in national campaigns as it has been, increasingly, ever since the abrogation of the two-thirds voting rule in the 1936 Democratic National Convention.

I urge all who cherish the preservation of our great American ideals to read carefully and to file for future reference this remarkable letter of a distinguished campaign manager to his capable and high-minded candidate for Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 25, 1962]

THE LETTER, ITS BACKGROUND, AIMS

The following letter was written by Harry P. Cain, for 7 years the State of Washington's Republican Senator and for many, many more a student of American politics.

It was sent to his candidate, Robert A. Peterson, who battled unsuccessfully against former Senator CLAUDE PEPPER for the congressional seat in Greater Miami's new Third District.

This is a memorandum prepared by Cain and delivered to Peterson 2 days after he agreed, at the urging of mutual friends, to take on the task of directing an admittedly hopeless campaign.

Cain is proud of the results. So is Peterson and so, Cain says, are those "upon whose toes I stepped hard during the 5 weeks we worked so hard to give the party and the moderates in the district a foundation on which they could build future victories."

When the campaign was over, and Peterson's skimpy 2,800 votes in the May primary had been parlayed into almost 43,000 in November's election, Cain agreed to release his memo or "declaration of war against a campaign that was going full speed backwards."

Cain, a Miami resident since 1957 and a vice president of First Federal Savings and Loan Association, sent a copy to the Herald's publisher, John S. Knight, "because I wanted him to know how rough and rugged the job really was."

"My desire to help Peterson had two sides," Cain said. "First to build the foundation I spoke of, and second because I was afraid that CLAUDE PEPPER would win by such a landslide that no man would run against him for the next several campaigns."

Pepper polled approximately 58 percent of the vote and Peterson 42 percent.

As for Cain's goal that all his candidate's campaign bills be paid by election night: "We beat our deadline by 24 hours."

"We took in a bit more than $19,300," Cain said, "and almost all of it after October 15 as the campaign gained steam. We ended up with a balance of $98.15."

[From the Miami News, Nov. 25, 1962]

Intimate View of Florida Politics

(By Morris McLemore)

We have here a rare document.

It is an unique revelation of the inner works of American politics—the relationship between a candidate for public office and a friend who dedicates himself to his cause.

The candidate, Robert Peterson, was the Republican opponent of Claude Pepper, Democrat, in the November 6 voting that resulted in Mr. Pepper's election to Congress from the new, Third District, in North Dade County.

It was a bitter contest. Claude Pepper claims he was the object of smear tactics and the Federal Bureau of Investigation reportedly is looking into the matter.

The letter herewith was written well before the balloting but apparently at a date considered late in the campaign of Mr. Peterson.

Its author, Harry P. Cain, is a veteran of political campaigns at many levels. He was for 7 years a Republican U.S. Senator from the State of Washington and for 3 years a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, appointed by President Eisenhower. He also lectured on political matters at Yale University.

Since 1957, he has lived in Miami, and is a vice president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association.

An excellent speaker, as we discover in the letter, Senator Cain also is a facile writer. More important, he also is a man who believes in knowing his place in a political campaign—and making certain in advance that others know it and their places, too.

Senator Cain made the letter available to me in an effort to clarify his own attitude and that of Mr. Peterson toward the latter's candidacy and the possibility that militantly anti-Pepper elements would attempt to inject their influence into the Republican effort.

"This declaration was, to the best of my knowledge, observed by Robert Peterson and those men and women who constituted his official family," says Senator Cain.

Thus, he makes clear his posture toward all who might attack the patriotism of the Democratic opponent of Mr. Peterson.

More than this, the letter etches for us the relationship of candidate and manager, of the image and the man who draws the image, of the fighter and his handler.

It is an intensely interesting and meaningful document.

[From the Miami News, Nov. 25, 1962]

September 29, 1962.

Memo to: Robert A. Peterson.
From: Harry P. Cain.
Subject: Terms and conditions of agreement with candidate.

Since meeting with you and your executive committee on Wednesday, September 27, I have agreed to assume responsibility for your political affairs, beginning with Monday, October 1, until the election is concluded on Tuesday, November 6.

You and your executive committee have accepted my terms, which are listed next below, for the services I shall earnestly seek to render:

1. Such decisions as I may find it necessary to make will be accepted by the Peterson campaign organization without argument or debate. When convenient, I will gladly explain the reasons for a given decision.

You would not tolerate nor would I insist on this condition except that you have become aware that your campaign which has been going nowhere for several months is presently moving backward. We agree that only the most drastic actions can result in a respectable showing for your splendid candidacy.

2. No person, including your good self, will be permitted to commit your campaign for any goods or services without my oral or written approval.

Since June, your campaign has received just over $4,900 in contributions. The information I have is that your bills payable presently amount to just about $3,500. As of this morning the balance in your operating account was $360.16.

It does not bother me that a sizable portion of your income has been wasted or thrown away. What does bother me is that your credit standing has been impaired; some of your bills payable are more than 60 days overdue.

Until further notice, I will use $0.50 from each new dollar of income to apply on past due obligations. As soon as your income posture permits, all of your bills payable will be satisfied.

From now on no commitment for goods or services will be made unless there is money actually in hand to satisfy it. My ambition for you is that every bill that is owed by your campaign will be paid by the evening of election day, November 6.

If money enables your campaign to present you in the next 5 weeks to the public by means of newspaper, radio, and television, this will be done. Unless the money is available, none of this will be done.

You will understand, please, that you will make no further money contribution of your own to the campaign unless I permit it and I very much doubt if I will. It is quite enough that you have offered yourself as a first-rate candidate.

(3) If any person violates a decision of mine or disregards it in any meaningful manner, I shall summarily separate that person from your campaign organization or I will feel free to separate myself from your service without notice to you or anyone else.

(4) Neither you nor the executive committee will think of or refer to me as being Peterson's campaign manager. I will be known as your friend who willingly undertakes to accomplish what you ask.

For planning purposes my day in support of your campaign will begin at 4 o'clock or later each afternoon. Campaign workers and leaders will soon learn to accommodate themselves to this schedule. It will rapidly teach them to know what they want to talk about when they show up.

YOUR CAMPAIGN

You have no campaign at this time. What has posed as a campaign has had neither purpose, direction, workers, nor money.

The several so-called professional political staff members are doing you and your camgain more harm than good. This is as much your fault and that of the others who hired them as it has been their fault. They have been employed improperly and in consequence you and the executive committee have been working for them rather than the other way around.

These several individuals will be retained for as long as it takes to determine what they know. This will not take long. They will be gone in several days' time.

THE CAMPAIGN TO BE EXPECTED

Your campaign for the Congress from the newly established Third District of Florida will begin during the Cramer fundraising dinner that is scheduled to take place in the Carillon Hotel on the evening of Saturday, October 6. Between Monday and Saturday of next week, what has been done to this date will be undone and then we shall be prepared to go to work. This means that your campaign for the Congress will cover a period of 30 short but extremely precious days.

THE CRAMER DINNER

The only changes in present plans for the Cramer dinner are these:

(a) The head table will consist of three places to be occupied by Mr. Cramer, you, and myself. The purpose is to direct the focus of attention on you. Other important officials, functionaries, and distinguished guests will be seated at a longer table on a lower level.

(b) I will act as the master of ceremonies and not because I am anxious to speak in public. The purpose is to control the evening and to make those in attendance more aware of the seriousness of the campaign which will then be launched.

In addition, I anticipate that Congressman Cramer, a fine fellow, will make a speech as though he were a candidate for some statewide office. This is a laudable ambition but it could lead to difficulties and misunderstandings we shall want to avoid. As the toastmaster, I can precede then follow him with such remarks as may then be needed.

The dinner will mark your first public appearance of any importance. I suggest that you prepare yourself carefully to speak between 5 and 10 minutes. I would urge you to refrain from any attack on your opponent. Your need is to convince others that you are sincere, attractive, reasonable, and that you are possessed of convictions which you want to share with others should you be elected on November 6.

YOUR ROLE AS OUR CANDIDATE

As a mature person, you will speak as you think proper on any occasion. When in doubt about issues, developments, or trends, you will confide in me.

If you are to make a good showing by the time the course is run, it will be because individuals, in every section of your district, have grown to know, admire, and believe in you. If we were adequately financed, as we are not, this could be achieved in large part through the public media. It will be necessary for you to largely do for yourself what money could do for you in a different manner. You will not regret this advice and you will enjoy meeting many different kinds of people whom you have had no previous knowledge about.

MY RELATIONSHIP WITH YOU

I shall be at your service day and night but you will see remarkably little of me.

Within a week's time, I shall have relieved you of every possible detail. In return, you will feel completely free to refer every detail that your friends bring to you to me.

Following the Cramer dinner, you will not be expected to attend any meeting of campaign leaders or workers. You will be welcome whenever you care to appear but it will be my job to convince others that they must work for you in your understandable absence. I strongly urge that you restrict your conversations with people in your organization to a minimum. Unless you are careful, these conversations will disturb you, for they deal with many things you know nothing about, and they will consume your energies that ought to be exercised in other ways.

My main obligation is to do for you what you could do but haven't the time for.

YOUR FRIENDS AND YOUR ENEMIES

The most difficult lesson to learn in politics, and it is generally learned the hard way, is that your friends will often cause you much more trouble than your enemies. The latter is openly out to do you in and this enables you to prepare your defenses and to launch your counterattacks against his assaults. A friend, however, does not always know what he is doing and you may naturally assume that he is working and contributing when he is doing nothing at all.

Your friends, not your enemies permitted or persuaded you, as an example, to establish an executive committee which is weak and lopsided on its face. Conspicuously absent from it are Jewish, Negro, and labor elements. I will call for a meeting of the committee. If 80 percent of the members show up, the membership will be promptly enlarged. If fewer members appear, the committee will not be formally disbanded but will not be relied on again.

Beware of friends who address you as Mr. Congressman or tell you that you are certain to win. Successful politicians are those who gather together men and women who share the same goals and points of view. When a friend has these political qualifications, his friendship becomes a real asset. But any friend who is lacking in this area will probably become either a troublemaker or an obstacle.

CAMPAIGN THEMES

There are only two primary issues to be developed and exploited in the campaign. They are—

(a) The contrast and differences between you and your opponent: This must largely be developed by having the public become aware of you as a person. We will work together on this goal from this time forward.

(b) Moderation versus extremism: Here the differences are clearcut and obvious. Our intention will be to make your position of moderation appealing to both Democrats and Republicans.

The first thing to understand and the last thing to forget in this campaign is that it will be fatal and futile for you to appeal for support on the grounds that you are a Republican who insists on waging war against the Democrats. I will have a set of figures in a few days' time that will justify this premise.

It is apparent that you are a Republican and proud of being one. Beyond that, the issue stated above is much more important than any party affiliation.

DECLARATION OF INTENT

(a) On Monday, I shall write to Senator Pepper to advise him of my decision to support you as best I know how. In having served with him, I would expect him to do as much for me were the shoe on the other foot.

(b) By Wednesday of next week, I will write and forward an "estimate of the situation" to Mr. Thomas Brown, the Republican State chairman in Tampa, with copies to prominent Republican officials and some Democrats in Washington, D.C. This letter will include a request for assistance in several ways, including financial. We must determine immediately what, if anything, we may expect from outside sources. We shall not again ask any assistance in the area stated above. By October 10 we ought to know what we will have available from the above sources to work with.

RELATIONSHIP WITH REPUBLICANS IN THE THIRD DISTRICT

You must avoid letting them formulate or dictate any policy. This is not being disrespectful. It will take the Republicans, particularly in official positions, a little while to appreciate that it will remain for moderate Democrats and independents to elect Robert Peterson. In the beginning this is not likely to occur to them and they will feel something of a shock when they first are confronted by the declaration. In our part of Florida, Republicans know too little about campaigning. You must become their teacher. When the campaign is over, most of the Republicans will applaud your wisdom.

RELATIONSHIP WITH RIGHTWING ELEMENTS AND BIRCHITES

These interesting groups of people will either remain at home on election day or they will vote for you, however reluctantly. They will be treated with every consideration but no concessions will be made to them at any stage in the campaign. Some of your refreshing moderation will rub off on them and they are likely to feel better for having voted for you. On occasions, some among them will become furious and walk out. They will be made welcome should they care to return but we shall not change the course of your campaign in any effort to get them back.

SMEAR TACTICS AGAINST YOUR OPPONENT

These can be expected from a variety of unknown quarters. Your position is and will continue to be that you will not tolerate any of these activities from or by anyone who has any known connection with your campaign. I will make this clear, in your name, to your workers at the first opportunity. As for myself, I consider Mr. Pepper's loyalty to our country to be as positive and certain as is my own.

ENDORSEMENTS BY THE MIAMI HERALD AND THE MIAMI NEWS

Don't worry about them and don't seek them. In my judgment the Herald may be inclined to endorse you if they grow to believe, in several weeks' time, that your candidacy is deserving of their interest. I would guess that the News will endorse your opponent even though they endorsed his opponents in his two previous unsuccessful attempts to return to the U.S. Senate. In any case, there is nothing you can do or should do about endorsements. I will make known your ready availability should the board of editors in either or both papers wish to exchange views with you.

YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE WEEKLIES AND THE METROPOLITAN PRESS

(a) If you have not done so, I encourage you to personally visit and meet the editor or publisher in each of the weekly papers within the Third District. It is important that they know you as a person. After the initial visit, your agents can speak for you effectively.

(b) You may see one or both of the political editors of the Herald and the News at the fund raising dinner on October 6 but otherwise it will be surprising if you see them within the Third District at any time during the campaign. They are talented, knowledgeable writers but, for a variety of reasons, they are not inclined to follow political campaigns in person.

Were I you, I would rely on them to write as they like without any suggestions or requests from you. They will not, in my opinion, be unfriendly but they are not likely to be very helpful. It is well for you to remember that these gentlemen are products of their environment. They have long taken Democratic victories for granted and I would not have you seek to persuade them that a new day is dawning. This is an appreciation they will come to realize but I think they should figure this out without any attempted guidance from you or me.

FROM ME TO YOU

At no time during the campaign will I discuss with you the chances of your being elected. I commit myself to you not because I think you can win, for at this time I do not, but because I think it possible for you to make a good showing and this will be of real benefit to what I believe the needs of our time require. We will plow forward each day on the conviction that we are doing better than we did yesterday.

I shall make some people very mad and step on many toes but there will be a sound reason for all of this. I will not be made unhappy by those who, perhaps and I hope temporarily, dislike me intensely, providing they love and admire "My Tiger." I will give you the best I have because in return I possess a strong feeling that you will give to the people many reasons why they should have confidence in your aspirations and hopes for the future.

For the next month I shall be your second self. Let this second fellow be the guy who takes on your worries, frustrations and alarms. This will free you to be your own man, unafraid and challenging. On election night, you will derive the greatest satisfaction from your travels and meeting life head on in the previous 30 days.

HARRY P. CAIN.

A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Yale University, Connecticut, and the Nation have lost a distinguished leader, A. Whitney Griswold, the 16th president of Yale University. Distinguished scholar, able administrator, profound philosopher, Dr. Griswold was a stouthearted defender of the rights of freemen and an advocate of learning in the broadest sense. He will be sorely missed. There have been many editorials about A. Whitney Griswold in recent days.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several of the most outstanding be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Haven Register, Apr. 21, 1963]

A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD, 16TH PRESIDENT OF YALE

A. Whitney Griswold, the 16th president of Yale University, was relatively young in years when he assumed that distinguished office and his tenure was short in terms of his alma mater's illustrious age. But in the 13 years of his presidency the impact of his leadership, his enterprise, and his service was impressive.

His death at 56 of cancer, following periods of failing health but unflagging devotion to the interests and welfare of the university, is being mourned by all Yale men, faculty and administration associates, students and alumni; by the New Haven community of which he was so conscientiously a member; and throughout the educational world which recognized his work and contributions so well and so widely.

A graduate of Yale in 1929, and a member of the university's faculty in 1933, Griswold was a professor of history when named president in 1950, succeeding Charles Seymour. His academic attainments and his championing of the liberal arts speak for themselves, as did his efforts toward improvements of education at Yale. On the business side, the university experienced under him one of its greatest building periods, supported by successful fundraising impetus.

The world is apt to think that great institutions like Yale University live and move, and even prosper, of themselves. And so they do, perhaps, in a certain sense; for other forces and personalities are at work beside those of Whitney Griswold to make the university what it is today. But no one who knows the delicacy of such an operation, the forethought and sincerity of purpose, and the intellectual stimulus that are required will be tempted to underrate the value of Mr. Griswold's contribution.

Cheerful and courageous to the end in the face of an incurable disease, his life personified the striving for excellence tempered with the humanity of a man who had the remarkable ability to wear his education lightly. To the Yale community and to his family we offer our deep sympathy, secure in the knowledge that his mark upon the university will provide an enduring inspiration to all.

[From the Hartford Courant, Apr. 21, 1963]

Alfred Whitney Griswold

A distinguished leader has been lost to a great university and to the academic world spreading far beyond its campus. The tragedy will seem the more because A. Whitney Griswold has died in the full flush of life. As he became one of Yale's youngest presidents at the age of 43 in 1950, so he has been taken at the age of 56 which is woefully early compared to the venerability of many university heads.

Venerability however is a word that probably never would have fitted President Griswold. His nature was far from any such mossy implications. He practically vibrated with drive, his mind was surcharged with ideas and the energy to force them to fulfillment. And he had a salt wit and pungency of speech that made it impossible he should ever become a university Polonius.

Some heads of great institutions of learning have achieved distinction as administrators, others as scholars, others as philosophers of academic purpose. President Griswold, with characteristic force, bundled all three attributes in his single nature. He had the management of a Yale community numbering some 11,000 persons in one way or another. He provided for them well, with bulging endowments, a thriving alumni fund, worthy faculty salaries and ample new buildings. And as a historian, he was a ranking scholar in his own right.

After three decades from undergraduate to president, Dr. Griswold was as rooted in Yale as the elms and the ivy. But his concern was for all the academic world and the university ideal. In the uneasy days when witchhunting was beginning to invade institutions of learning, President Griswold was a champion of academic freedom and the courage and right to speak out. In more recent days, when a new threat—the domination of a scientific age—has been narrowing men's outlook, President Griswold fought parity for the liberal arts, so that a whole and steady philosophy should keep universities from ever becoming the birthplace of new Frankensteins.

It remained a touch of lifelong disappointment in him that he was not able to write as much as he had hoped in earlier years. Yet what he has written in achievements for Yale, and the world of immeasurable value to which it belongs as a university, can only be a rich legacy to present and future.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1963]

A. Whitney Griswold

The cause of freedom had no more devoted champion than Dr. Alfred Whitney Griswold. He brought to the presidency of Yale University a view of academic responsibility that ranged far beyond the broadening of the curriculum, the strengthening of the faculty or the augmentation of endowments. His concern was the advancement of man and the repelling of every assault on human liberty and dignity. Wit and good humor were part of his arsenal in that task, but so was a courage that scorned the cautions of more timorous colleagues.

He condemned loyalty oaths and all other efforts to legislate conformity. "Books won't stay banned," he once said. "They won't burn. Ideas won't go to jail. In the long run of history, the censor and the inquisitor have always lost." The vigor and articulateness he marshaled against the suppressors of freedom contributed much to building a stronger America. His death of cancer at the age of 56 is a loss to the Nation, even more than it is a loss to Yale.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1963]

A. Whitney Griswold

The motto of Yale University—"Lux et Veritas"—was upheld with honor by A. Whitney Griswold, president since 1950 of New Haven's great seat of learning. Early in his tenure, he resisted pressures intended to protect Yale undergraduates from the dangerous world of ideas. He felt that man and God could endure at Yale without limitations on the spirit of free inquiry—a conviction that was reflected in an influential statement on academic freedom prepared in 1953 by a committee of university presidents that Dr. Griswold headed.

A teacher and historian of international relations, Dr. Griswold proved a vigorous administrator as president. The endowment and physical plant grew at Yale—and, notably, so did faculty salary scales. Dr. Griswold had the belief, considered eccentric by some, that teachers should be generously paid as one measure of the country's esteem for learning. Now dead at a premature 56, Dr. Griswold's legacy is a flourishing university providing more light than ever before in the quest for truth.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 21, 1963]

A Great Loss for Education

Fortunately, Dr. A. Whitney Griswold came to the presidency of Yale relatively young; tragically, he died at an age when, in the normal course, he might have been expected to contribute many more years to American education. Cut short as it was, however, his tenure at Yale marked an era at the university and made a significant mark upon American higher learning.

Dr. Griswold faced and conquered the great dilemma of all university heads: to administer a vast enterprise while infusing it with the challenge and excitement of geniune scholarship. His practical work at Yale, and his example, were immensely valuable for a nation which is wrestling with the complexities of democratic education in a world of suddenly expanding horizons; he upheld the great tradition of liberal learning, of the humanities, at a time when there are mounting pressures toward narrow specialization and mechanistic philosophies.

For Dr. Griswold had always a deep sense of the value of the individual. He acted on the conviction that, as he told the Herald Tribune Forum in 1951, in his first public address as president of Yale, "for 9,000 years society has depended upon its members as individuals for those creative achievements of mind and spirit that have guided it along the road of civilization."

Dr. Griswold took his responsibilities seriously, but wore his talents lightly. His manner cloaked, but did not conceal, moral courage of a high order, and his last years called for physical courage to match it. Yale, and the whole academic community, will remember him with affection, pride, and grief.

THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE SLOVAK SISTERS OF THIRD ORDER OF ST. FRANCIS IN AMERICA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, training their children to be good citizens is one of the greatest responsibilities of the citizens of this Nation. Fortunately there are many educational and fraternal organizations which can ably assist parents in this vital task.

In my State of Pennsylvania and neighboring States, the Slovak Sisters of Third Order of St. Francis in America have performed this important function for the past half-century. Not only has the order educated thousands of good citizens, but it has also provided teacher-training so that there would always be individuals with the ability to teach the art of citizenship. It did the job without any form of Government assistance. It relied for aid only on its loyal supporters, who gave generously even during the trying years of the great depression.

The Slovak Sisters are observing their golden anniversary during 1963. I commend the Slovak Sisters for the excellent job they have done. They have my warm encouragement for the future years.

In connection with the anniversary, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. John C. Sciranka, a noted American-Slovak journalist, a native Pennsylvanian, and a former student of the Slovak Sisters.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Golden Anniversary of the Slovak Sisters of Third Order of St. Francis in America

(By John C. Sciranka)

This year, in which the Slovaks and the Slavs are observing the 11th centennial of the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to the country of their ancestry—Slovakia—is also a Golden Anniversary of the Slovak Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, who have two large motherhouses in Pennsylvania, one at Mt. Assisi Academy, Bellevue, the suburb of Pittsburgh and the other at Monacacy Manor, Bethlehem, Pa.

As one of their first pupils in the newly established Slovak Parochial School of St. Gabriel, North Side Pittsburgh, Pa., I recall most vividly the arrival of these first Sisters to our parish a half century ago. Our pastor, the late Reverend Ferdinand Prikazky, greeted them in the church filled to capacity. For many of us it was the first time that we came so close to the nuns and were curious about them and their life.

However, before their establishment of the first parochial school in Pittsburgh, there was a great more to their arrival in this country, about which we learned later.

The writer has been in constant touch with them for the half century and besides myself, my two brothers and two sisters were also taught by them in the old home town of Pittsburgh.

A half century ago there was a great need for the Slovak priests in this country and even a greater need for Sisters to teach in parochial schools. Two orders were already established and especially the Vincentian Sisters came here in 1902 and settled in Braddock, Pa. About that time the late Father Matthew Jankola was seeking permission in Rome for the establishment of the Congregation of the Sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius which was founded 54 years ago and celebrated its golden anniversary at Danville, Pa., in September 1959, where Bishop Andrew G. Grutka pontificated by celebrating a Mass in Old Slavonic Rite.

Prior to these three orders, Sisters of other non-Slovak congregations taught in Slovak parochial schools and encouraged their girl pupils to join their orders, thus enriching the much needed teaching staffs.

FIRST SLOVAK PAROCHIAL SCHOOL

In order to appreciate the endeavors of our pioneers in this educational field, we must go back to the first Slovak Parochial Catholic School in the Western Hemisphere, which was established in 1889 in Streator, Ill., at St. Stephen Slovak Catholic Parish by Rev. Erwin Gellhof, pioneer Slovak priest and fraternalist who was born on October 26, 1859, in Spis County, Slovakia, ordained to the priesthood in September 1883 and came to Streator, Ill., where he assumed his pastoral duties on September 22, 1887.

Father Gellhof engaged the Sisters of St. Francis from Joliet, Ill., to teach in his first school. The first teachers were Sister M. Mary of Irish descent and Sister M. Magdalena of Czech (Bohemian) descent. The Slovak language was taught by Father Gellhof and Edward Schwartz-Markovic, editor of the Nová Vlast (New Country), second Slovak newspaper in America and first published in the literary language.

These St. Francis Sisters of Joliet, Ill., also trained the first American Slovak nun of their order, Miss Mary Simko, who chose a monastical name of Sister M. Erwina in honor of Father Erwin Gellhof, who is known as one of the first American Slovak Fraternalists. From Illinois he moved to the bituminous coal and coke region of New Haven and Connellsville, Pa., where he established several Slovak parishes in the Pittsburgh diocese.

These St. Francis Sisters also established the first parochial Slovak school of St. Stephen Parish in Johnstown, Pa., at the invitation of the late Rev. John Martvon, who died at the age of 96. One of their former pupils came to Johnstown school as Sister Superior.

However, these were not Sisters of a Slovak order, although they did gigantic service and are still carrying on with a new generation of teachers.

BISHOP JOSEPH M. KOUDELKA

A half century ago a need for Slovak Sisters as teachers was so great, that priests of various parishes, namely, Rev. Ferdinand Prikazky whom I served as altar boy for close to 10 years, sought aid from all over. In 1912 the late Bishop Joseph M. Koudelka, who was an American of Czech origin but mastered the Slovak language and gave many missions to the Slovaks, suggested to Father Julius Vrana of McKees Rocks, Pa., that he introduce the visiting Sisters in 1912 from Bohemia, who taught in schools in Slovakia, to Father Prikazky, which bore rich fruit. Bishop Koudelka was the successor as Czech bishop in America, the Venerable Joseph Nepomuk Neumann, fourth bishop of Philadelphia, whose beatification will be held in Rome in June 1963. He was elevated to the dignity of bishop by the late Pope, now St. Pius X in 1907 and became auxiliary bishop of Cleveland, later auxiliary bishop of Milwaukee, which was followed by being an ordinary of the diocese of Superior, Wis., where he built with the help of American Slovaks, especially the late Rev. Andrew E. Komara of Bridgeport, Conn., a beautiful orphanage.

Rev. Mother M. Hyacintha, who made the original plans, died here in March 1912. Her associate, Sister M. Georgia, whom the writer knew personally as an altar boy, remained to complete the plans and in September 1913, the first parochial school was opened at St. Gabriel's in Pittsburgh, also St. Clement's, Tarentum, Pa., where Rev. Edmund Kitz was pastor and St. John's, Barnesboro, Pa., where Rev. Victor Frankovsky was pastor.

The Sisters established their temporary convent and motherhouse at St. Gabriel's and soon received candidates for their order to be trained as Sisters and teachers.

In a period of two decades they had established parochial schools in the following cities: St. Mark's, McKees Rocks, 1917; Holy Family, Erie, Pa., 1920; Holy Redeemer, Ambridge, Pa., 1920; St. Anna, Farrell, Pa., 1929; St. Michael, New Castle, Pa., 1929; SS. Cyril and Methodius, Clifton, N.J., 1929; St. Mary's Assumption, Jersey City, N.J., 1931; Holy Rosary, Clarksburg, W. Va., 1931; SS. Peter and Paul, Phillipsburg, N.J., 1935; SS. Cyril and Methodius, Charleroi, Pa., 1935, and later at SS. Cyril and Methodius, Boonton, N.J. and other cities.

In 1938 when they observed their Silver Jubilee the Sisters, whose official name is the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, had over 125 teachers and some 4,000 pupils in these parochial schools.

GIRLS ACADEMY

On May 30, 1930, the late Bishop Hugh C. Boyle of Pittsburgh dedicated their new motherhouse at Bellevue, Pa., where on September 17, 1928, they opened a high school for girls under the name of Mount Assisi Academy, which was granted all privileges and faculties as a school of higher education by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on February 8, 1932. This Academy turned out several hundred of most capable young women, who are an asset to our American way of life.

After the death of Rev. Ferdinand Prikazky on November 10, 1927, who was their great benefactor with other Slovak priests and laity, his successors, the late Reverend George Malinack, great promoter of war bonds during World War II and present pastor of St. Gabriel's, Rev. Joseph Straka aided the Sisters in their great work for the education of youth.

In 1947 with the approval of General Superior in Rome, the Sisters established a new motherhouse at Monacacy Manor, Bethlehem, Pa., known also as the Retreat Home of St. Francis for Women. They also teach in the parochial schools of Allentown diocese, where they staffed schools at St. Mary's, Northampton, Pa., St. Theresa's, Hellertown, Pa., and later SS. Cyril and Methodius, Bethlehem, Pa.; St. Ann's, Emmaus, Pa., and St. Stephen's, Shenandoah, Pa.

On October 12, 1947, the late Dennis Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia dedicated the new motherhouse and expressed his happiness that the Sisters are working in his archdiocese. After his death, his successor, the late Cardinal O'Hara also was pleased with their work. In the Pittsburgh diocese all the bishops, starting from the late Archbishop J. Regis Canevin, who granted them permission of stay and his successors, Bishop Boyle, Bishop Dearden, now archbishop of Detroit, Mich., and the present bishop and a great friend of the Slovaks, Most Rev. John J. Wright are happy with their work and commend them on various occasions.

Similar praises were offered from other bishops and especially Bishop McShea of Allentown and Bishop McNulty of Paterson, N.J.

The writer is very happy that one of his teachers, Rev. Mother M. Methodia, former Superior, living now in retirement at Monacacy Manor, often remembers him with a note about some of his articles which have special interest to her. My sister Betty Kuziel named her only daughter Constance in honor of her former Sister. At our family reunions we all recall the first Superior, Rev. Mother M. Louisa, who was an excellent organist and a choir director. Also, Rev. Mother M. Aloysia, who lives in retirement at Shenandoah, Pa., and Rev. Mother M. Clotilda. The present Rev. Mother M. Mildred is a daughter of the late Charles Zaremba, one of the leading members of Holy Rosary Society, who led the prayers in our church of St. Gabriel for over a half century. We often mention Sister M. Boleslava of Ambridge, who observed her golden jubilee last year.

The Slovak Sisters of Third Order of St. Francis, on this their golden jubilee, can look back with great pride at the progress they made for God and Nation. Thousands of their pupils, friends and admirers, will commend them on the half century of progress with a proverbial: Ad multos annos.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE CARL ALBERT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, we in Oklahoma are proud of Congressman Carl Albert.

Born the son of a coal miner in eastern Oklahoma, he has built a great career on his way to his present position as majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Debating champion, Rhodes scholar, and soldier are but a few of the roles Carl Albert has played, and always with the profound honesty and sincerity that earns the respect of all who know him.

Recently, the people of Oklahoma had an opportunity to learn more about Carl Albert's work as House majority leader through a series of articles in the Tulsa Tribune. Written by Jenk Jones, Jr., the Tribune's Washington correspondent, the articles not only give insight into the majority leader's job but also present a good description of the legislative process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, Mar. 20, 1963]

Congressman Albert's No. 1 Duty Is Representing People in His District

(By Jenk Jones, Jr.)

Washington.—If Representative Carl Albert, of McAlester, ever decides to quit his post as House majority leader, he can take up a more relaxing line of work—like taming tigers.

The job that Albert holds is one of crushing responsibility, especially as his Democratic Party holds the presidency as well as the edge in both Houses of Congress.

Much of the success of his party is dependent on whether Albert and his aides can get the Democratic program, or at least those parts of it which seem valuable and proper, through Congress.

Yet a majority leader cannot exist just to do the bidding of his President and his party. He has an even more important job—to represent the people in the district which sent him to Congress.

These different roles can often conflict.

Albert wears several hats. His "top hat" is that of representing his own district.

He said his second most important function is to represent his party "constituency" in Congress, the Democratic Members of the House who elected him majority leader.

Third, he must represent his national party, headed by the President in times when a Democrat occupies the White House.

Although this loyalty comes third, Albert said "it is to the interest of the majority leader's party that the President is successful."

The views and desires of the three different groups that he represents can clash. That is why the "priority list" is so important to Albert.

The majority leader is chosen from among the members of his party, just as the minority leader is done on the other side of the aisle.

The majority leader is not an official of Congress. Nor is he his party's leader in the House. The Speaker of the House, Representative John McCormack of Massachusetts has that role.

But because the Speaker cannot both run the House and his party business, the latter is turned over to the majority leader.

Albert's tasks are manifold.

He must program legislation, trying to decide which bills shall be taken up at what time and what must be done to speed the House business along.

He must contact committee chairmen to see what measures they have ready to report to the House as a whole.

He must urge members of his party to support the party's views on key issues.

He must be responsible for the maintaining of decorum on the House floor.

It is a job of constant responsibility—even when he is not on the floor—and often little reward.

"If a committee gets a bill through easily, the chairman gets credit," ALBERT said wryly. "If it gets 'mussed up' the leadership gets the blame."

The hours are tough—10½ to 11 hours 5 days a week, 6 hours on Saturday and 2 or 3 hours or more on Sunday. ALBERT last year went many months without missing a day at the office.

Daily meetings are held before the House session starts at noon. And there are usually more sessions after the day's work on the floor is done.

The tangible rewards? A Cadillac and a chauffeur, more telephone, telegraph and office expense allowances than normal and the traditional large office with a good view sum up the total benefits. There is no pay increase.

These—and the chance that the 54-year-old ALBERT may someday succeed the 70-year-old McCORMACK as Speaker. Only once in this century has the majority leader failed to advance to Speaker, ALBERT said.

A man has to seek the majority leader's job—it does not seek him. He must run, often against strong opposition, for the post.

And when he gets it, he is saddled with many pressures.

None of this deters ALBERT.

"I like it personally," he said. "Sometimes I'm frustrated, but I wouldn't swap it for any job I know of."

He explained that although the majority leader takes more "heat" he has more to do with the formation of issues and their ultimate success or failure than do the vast majority of Members of Congress.

ALBERT had his eye on a House leadership post from his first day in Congress in 1947.

He said, "I spend as much time on the floor as any Member." Not only did he concentrate on learning how the House work was done, but he learned the name and face of every Member of both Houses.

ALBERT stepped up to the post of House whip, directly under the majority leader, in 1954. And on the death of Speaker Sam Rayburn in 1961, both he and McCORMACK moved up a notch last year, although ALBERT had an election opponent.

ALBERT's job runs into many a rough path. But he's not despairing.

A native of Oklahoma is used to standing lots of heat.

[From the Tulsa Tribune, Mar. 21, 1963]

TIMING IS KEY TO HANDLING OF LEGISLATIVE BILLS

(By Jenk Jones, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The timing in the passage of a bill can be as critical as that in a trapeze act—just the tiniest error can drop you right on your head.

One of House Majority Leader CARL ALBERT's tasks is to see that key bills come up at just the right time to get the maximum chance of passage.

The McAlester Democrat used the following example:

Three bills are ready of top priority for the majority party. The second is one which could stir extreme controversy. The third is one which needs bipartisan help to be passed.

Which one would come first? The latter, before a fight over the controversial bill or minority coolness toward the priority bill could stir tempers.

Last week Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, told ALBERT that he was ready to report the military pay raise bill out of his Armed Services Committee.

But another of VINSON's bills, one providing funds for the RS-70 bomber, had just passed Congress over the Kennedy administration's objections. It had caused a lot of ill will and the legislative sea was troubled.

So ALBERT told VINSON to hold the pay raise bill off for a couple of weeks so things could quiet down.

The majority leader, by virtue of his position, generally is in favor of administration measures when his party holds the Presidency. So he is careful about bringing them to a vote.

"I never program a bill unless I know I have an excellent chance of passing it—unless the national interest demands that the matter be disposed of," ALBERT said.

But he doesn't have to rely on "guesstimates" of a bill's chances. "Ninety-nine times out of a hundred I know if a bill will pass," he said.

The reason for this is the House whip and his assistants, who work under ALBERT. The whips take polls of the membership.

In a close race the leadership then will try to persuade those on the fence or even those leaning away from the measure to go with them.

On many bipartisan measures, both the majority and minority leaders will poll their members, then get together to decide what they must do to obtain passage.

Often compromises are worked out that will make it easier for members of both parties to support a bill.

But even so, some members aren't always swayed. "We've got some who are really team members and some who are strongly independent," ALBERT said.

Also, in an issue that is not razor close a Member may be given the green light to vote against the administration's measure if to vote for it would hurt him in his district, ALBERT said.

That permission is given more readily if the member has voted with the administration on other tough votes.

But even in the case of mavericks who frequently buck the party leadership, ALBERT said, "We never take punitive action."

He said a Member is elected to represent the beliefs of his home district, not those of his party as a whole.

ALBERT prefers the gentle touch with party members if it can be used profitably.

"My view is that you get further with people if you work in a cooperative manner and get them to go along willingly rather than by putting on the heat."

[From the Tulsa Tribune, Mar. 22, 1963]

CONGRESS' SENIORITY PLAN A BRAKE

(By Jenk Jones, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—It may seem odd that the man charged with the responsibility of getting new legislation through Congress should revere the system which often makes his job more difficult.

But House Majority Leader CARL ALBERT of McAlester lauds the seniority system which gives the heads of committees extraordinary power in Congress.

For despite the fact his job is to effect many changes, ALBERT favors the evolution rather than the revolution of our laws.

"It was never intended that our Government should change drastically" after each election, he said.

There has long been criticism, especially from liberal circles, that present system thwarts attempts to pass legislation for new programs.

ALBERT, however, sees the committee system, based as it is on seniority, as an effective brake against runaway legislation.

He said the committee chairmen, who are generally Southerners or members of big city machine politics, usually have a traditional view of matters.

On the other hand, the "demands of the last election" are expressed in the choice of the President and the congressional leadership and in the new Member of Congress.

The merging of these opposites frequently results in progress without reckless speed, ALBERT contends.

"The response (of Congress) should be to the deliberative will of the people and not to snap judgments."

Even when the President advocates a major change, the interactions of Congress work in an atmosphere that slows down the proposal and "demands major justification" for its acceptance, ALBERT added.

He listed two major benefits derived from the existing system:

1. "It brings stability to the House, and makes the direction it takes more important than the speed."

2. "Men become experienced in legislative areas. The system enables legislators to become professionals in their fields."

ALBERT acknowledged there has been a strong trend in recent years toward a larger Federal Government and a more powerful executive department.

The former is inevitable, he said, because of "the shift from an agrarian to an industrial population."

There is now more interdependence of people on one another, ALBERT added. This has necessitated the Government playing an increasingly important role in citizens' lives.

WEST VIRGINIANS PARTICIPATE IN 33D NATIONAL 4-H CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.—NEARLY 2,286,000 YOUTH BELONG TO 94,707 CLUBS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the worthwhile activities of 4-H Clubs are part of the national educational system of cooperative extension work in agriculture and homemaking in which the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the State land-grant colleges, and counties participate.

More than 2,285,592 young Americans, chiefly in rural areas, between the ages of 10 and 21 years, belong to the more than 94,707 local 4-H Clubs located in every agricultural county in the United States and Puerto Rico. Additionally, there are approximately 307,745 adult leaders and 114,959 junior leaders lending guidance to these useful activities. And, the 4-H Club idea is now worldwide, the plan having been adapted to fit widely varying conditions in some 70 different countries.

The 33d National 4-H Conference is being held here in the Nation's Capital from April 20 to 26, and attended by delegates from each of the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and Canada.

During a week of inspiration, learning, and fellowship the young people will have an opportunity to attain an insight into the individual and group responsibilities of the American citizen. They will achieve a deeper and keener appreciation of our rich heritage. They will meet national leaders who are responsible for determining major policy, and discuss with them areas of particular interest. Throughout, the delegates will be encouraged to express their own ideas and to ask questions, thereby bringing to the conference the benefit of their own background of experience in 4-H work and community service.

This morning it was my privilege to attend the breakfast with Congress' portion of the conference, attended by many Senators and Representatives. We enjoyed a meal in a congenial and informal atmosphere designed to provide the young citizens an opportunity to meet the legislators from their own State.

On this occasion, Vice President Lyndon Johnson expressed greetings, and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, brought a helpful message.

Hon. Harley O. Staggers and Hon. Ken Hechler were at our table with the 4-H Club delegates from West Virginia, as well as adult leaders from the Mountain State who are attending the conference. Present were delegates Jorene Butcher, Glenville, W. Va.; Rose Lee Matthews, Monongah, W. Va.; Richard Steven Hannah, Mount Clare, W. Va.; and Edwin Hill, Chesapeake, W. Va. During the conference Miss Butcher serves as a member of the speakers committee, Miss Matthews is on the hospitality committee, Mr. Hannah on the recreation committee, and Mr. Hill is a representative on the vesper committee.

Also representing West Virginia were Miss Mildred Fizer, State extension 4-H programs leader, and C. P. Dorsey, State extension 4-H Club leader. These devoted citizens commented on the success of the 4-H movement in West Virginia, pointing out that there is representation in each of our 55 counties, and that membership now exceeds 35,000 and is growing rapidly. They also paid deserved tribute to the efforts of the late T. P. Kendrick, the first State extension 4-H leader for West Virginia. I, too, was privileged to know and work with this good and great 4-H organizer.

Two other responsible and civic-minded Americans were with the West Virginians during the breakfast program: Miss Gertrude Warren, an energetic pioneer at the national level in 4-H work; and Miss Bonnie Rollins, representing the Farm Journal magazine. It was valuable to our youth to share the thinking of these two ladies, and to discuss with them the impacts of 4-H programs.

Mr. President, the 4-H Clubs are making a significant contribution to the mental, physical, and moral growth of young people the world over. The members of this purposeful organization, and their dedicated adult leaders, are deserving of our highest praise for their devotion to principle and patriotism.

FIRE IN STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a tragic fire, swept by high winds, has devastated hundreds of homes in Staten Island, N.Y. Almost 300,000 acres of land have been blackened in a fire which involved more than half of New York City's fire department who fought this fire with great courage and diligence.

Staten Island is a community of homeowners and small businesses populated by hard working, prudent citizens. Our sympathy is extended to them over the severe and heart-rending losses they have suffered.

In an effort to be of assistance to these people, I have communicated with John Horne, the administrator of the Small Business Administration, asking that this county be declared a disaster area for purposes of receiving emergency Federal aid. I have also contacted Borough President Maniscalco, expressing my extreme concern for the people of this community and offering to do everything possible to help them through this crisis.

I take this opportunity to express my support for the efforts of the people of Staten Island to rebuild their homes and businesses after this tragedy, and I assure them that the Federal Government—as is true, I am sure, of all their Representatives in Congress—is working to obtain help for them.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with my colleague from New York in the sympathy extended to the people of Staten Island, whose homes have been devastated by fire. This also is true of the people in the parts of New Jersey similarly affected.

I join also in paying tribute to the heroism and high sense of duty of the New York City fire department. As a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I join with my colleague in the request that this be declared a disaster area.

I assure the people of Staten Island of the indefatigable efforts I know we shall make—and which I know the whole New York delegation will make—to see to it that the resources of the Federal Government give to them such aid in this disaster as is practicable and possible.

It is not often, Mr. President, that we think of New York City in terms of a disaster. It is a great, populous city. Nonetheless, there are some rather open areas in Staten Island, the county of Richmond.

This is one time when New York needs the Nation. I am confident that the Nation will respond, as it does to disaster wherever it occurs.

I appreciate the privilege of joining with my colleague, so that we may do all we can to alleviate the impact of this misfortune.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today my colleague, Mr. Javits, and I referred to a communication we had addressed to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in which we called attention to the tragic fire on Staten Island, and requested that that county be declared a disaster area.

I am very happy to state at this time that I have just received a telephone call from the Small Business Administration in which I was informed that Staten Island has been declared a disaster area. That means that Federal loan programs will be extended to homes, businesses, churches, and charitable institutions there which have been so badly ravaged by the fire, and that the New York office of the Small Business Administration will begin promptly to handle loan applications.

I wish to express publicly to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration my appreciation for the prompt action taken to alleviate the great distress suffered by this important area of my State. I am deeply grateful.

SOVIET STRENGTH IN CUBA—ANALYZED BY HANSON W. BALDWIN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the distinguished military affairs analyst of the New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin, offers some very perceptive comments on the Soviet forces in Cuba. Mr. Baldwin reports in his column that:

> There appears to be a consensus that no major reduction in Soviet strength has taken place and that the Russians are rotating troops, rather than withdrawing them.

Mr. Baldwin's views are backed by years of experience and proven accuracy. I know that his analysis will be of interest to many Senators and, therefore, ask unanimous consent that his article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Soviet Strength in Cuba Put High—Some Experts Believe Count May Be 30,000 to 40,000

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

A recent reassessment of Soviet forces in Cuba has convinced some intelligence experts that there may be 30,000 to 40,000 Russian military personnel on the island.

Many experts believe the number has not actually changed greatly since last fall; the upward revision of past figures stems from a close study of all available intelligence facts. The experts believe, too, that the Russians are rotating troops to Cuba, not withdrawing them.

These interpretations provide the background for the recent assertion by Senator Kenneth B. Keating, New York Republican, that Russian strength in Cuba, despite withdrawals announced by the President, was still about 17,000 men.

At a news conference April 3, the President estimated that a 4,000 Soviet troops had been withdrawn in recent weeks. He did not estimate the number that remained, but left the impression that about 13,000 were still there.

CAPITAL'S OPINIONS VARY

There is no consensus in Washington about how many Soviet troops are in Cuba. In fact, some of the highest Government officials and many intelligence officers admit that they do not know how many are on the island.

It is far easier to estimate tonnages of equipment and numbers of guns than numbers of personnel. Last fall, emphasis in the intelligence community was fixed on the Soviet medium-range missiles in Cuba and there was a tendency, until after the crisis had passed, to neglect the details of the ground forces and of conventional equipment.

Moreover, it has been possible to estimate approximately the numbers of Soviet troops withdrawn from the island in recent weeks, but not how many have been brought in.

Many officials are convinced that the total number has not changed greatly and that the Russians are replacing the troops they have withdrawn in a rotation plan similar to those the United States uses for its oversea units.

SOVIET UNITS LISTED

Details are lacking on what some Pentagon officials now call the "Soviet expeditionary force" in Cuba. But some experts believe the Russians are maintaining the equivalent of a heavily reinforced motorized rifle division. Such a division normally numbers about 13,000 men.

The four principal tactical ground units, identified in the past as battalion size units, are still on the island and have made no attempt to conceal their identity.

Other units of field artillery, antiaircraft, infantry, and so on, are said to be somewhat harder to pinpoint, and a large number of the Russian forces are crews for the antiaircraft and coast defense missiles and provide communications, maintenance, and specialist services for their own and Cuban forces. An unknown number wear civilian clothes and blend into the population.

Though many intelligence experts and some Government officials say they do not know how many Russian troops are in Cuba, one said he would bet a year's pay that the number was closer to 30,000 than to 17,000, and a month's pay that it was closer to 40,000 than to 17,000.

There appears to be a consensus that no major reduction in Soviet strength has taken place and that the Russians are rotating troops, rather than withdrawing them.

The purposes of the continued presence of so large a Soviet force in Cuba could be multiple.

VARIOUS FUNCTIONS SERVED

It was undoubtedly intended originally to provide protection for the long-range missiles that Premier Khrushchev attempted to install there last fall, which have now—in the opinion of most intelligence experts—been withdrawn. Since the withdrawal of all or part of these missiles, the troops appear to have a number of functions:

To help protect the island against any invasion by the United States or by exile forces aided by the United States.

To perpetuate Premier Fidel Castro's rule and to secure the Communist government there against internal revolt.

To train Cuban forces and other Communist Latin American cadres.

To provide small infiltration and subversion units capable of exporting armed communism to other areas of the Western Hemisphere.

To maintain a base of Soviet Communist military power in the Western Hemisphere for psychological and political purposes and as a bargaining gambit in the world conflict.

Some experts believe the President may not have known of the revised estimates of some intelligence experts when he implied a few weeks ago that Soviet troop strength in Cuba had been reduced to 13,000.

Some observers have been concerned that official intelligence estimates that have reached some of the highest officials during and since the Cuban crisis may have been shaped—perhaps unconsciously—to conform with policy rather than evaluating the Russian capabilities baldly.

NAVAL COURT OF INQUIRY AND THE SUBMARINE "THRESHER"

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I deplore the exaggerations and emotional distortions surrounding the naval court of inquiry into the disastrous loss of the submarine *Thresher*.

The purpose of the naval court of inquiry into the loss of the nuclear attack submarine *Thresher* is to draw from the disaster all possible knowledge of future benefit to the nuclear submarine program. Our naval shipyard workers have consistently demonstrated their mastery of the painstaking and intricate techniques required for the development of modern weapons systems.

The modern submarine reactor plant is a marvel of safety and power. Our Navy command and combat personnel have consistently shown skill and enterprise in the operation of these vessels. I am confident that the record of the court of inquiry will establish beyond doubt the overall quality of shipyard work and skill of Navy submarine personnel.

I deplore the misleading sensationalism of some reports of isolated details of testimony before the court of inquiry. It is worth pointing out that its purpose is neither recrimination nor the reckless fixing of blame. I have the utmost confidence in the court and its staff, to produce not only fair, but permanently useful findings.

No one should ignore the constructive aspects of the inquiry and its positive disclosures of meticulous inspection and competent naval management and command.

The public has a right to know about the inquiry proceedings. The doors of the hearing room should not be closed to the press, yet the importance of this inquiry imposes a responsibility upon all news media to review the whole record instead of sensational details. In that way we will meet our obligation to the men who went down with the *Thresher* in learning the truth and making of it an instrument for improving the submarine service.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am increasingly disturbed over the reception which the President's tax program has been receiving. While I am not necessarily in agreement with all the specific reform proposals contained in the original message, I am convinced of the importance of reducing our present level of unemployment, stimulating industrial investment, and raising our rate of economic growth.

While I am pleased with the recent report of the Department of Labor which indicates a significant drop in the unemployment figure from a high of 6.1 percent of the labor force in February, this is only a beginning. Much more must be done in this area and in the area of industrial expansion referred to above. In this latter connection, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appearing in the Baltimore Sun on March 11, indicating the importance of personal and corporate tax cuts, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO KINDS OF SPENDING

One of the arguments in the tax debate is that the main thing we need to promote economic growth is expanded consumers' demand. People who talk this way would concentrate projected tax reductions in the lower brackets. The extra spending made available to a maximum number of householders would stimulate all the heavy investment the economy needs, according to this view. Upper-bracket and corporate tax reductions are criticized as smacking of old-fashioned theories about prosperity trickling down from the top.

One way to test these arguments is to see what the actual figures of spending and investment have been since the most recent business peak, which was in 1957. Total personal consumption expenditures in 1957 were $285.2 billion. They totaled $356.7 billion in 1962. To be sure, population had also grown—from 171,278,000 in 1957 to 186,591,000 in 1962. However, personal income growth kept well ahead of population gains. Per capita disposable personal income in 1957 was $1,803 and in 1962, $2,052.

Over this same stretch key trends in industrial investment were quite different. Expenditures for new manufacturing plant and equipment were $15.96 billion in 1957. They were $14.80 billion in 1962 and in the first quarter of 1963 had risen to a rate of only $14.95 billion. The term economic growth has many meanings, but one of the main ones is certainly expansion in manufacturing plant and equipment.

What the figures suggest then, is that a gain of $71.5 billion in annual personal consumption expenditures from 1957 to 1962 was accompanied by a drop of just over a billion dollars in annual plant and equipment expenditures in the same period. The figures are crude, of course, and the comparisons are subject to many qualifications. They do suggest that there is something less than a direct booster effect between consumers' spending and plant growth. That, undoubtedly is why the administration tax plan provides for high-bracket and business tax cuts as well as for low-bracket reductions.

FEDERAL CAREER SERVICE AWARDS OF 1963

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on March 26 the National Civil Service League honored 10 outstanding Federal career employees for their major contributions to the Nation through Government service. The recipients of the league's 1963 Career Service Awards were cited "in recognition of a distinguished career in the U.S. Government which has exemplified in an outstanding manner the highest characteristics of public service."

On this occasion, the President of the United States recognized the achievements of these individuals with the following message:

> To the 10 winners of the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League, I send warm expressions of gratitude. The Nation has good reason to be proud of the exceptional abilities you have applied in your productive years of service and your vital roles in shaping and moving our Government programs. All citizens should be reassured to know that the demanding problems that confront our Government are being met with knowledge, imagination, and leadership. The wide range of your achievements exemplifies the great variety of opportunities for a challenging career in the Federal service.
>
> The National Civil Service League has again, by its selection and acclaim of outstanding award winners, made a valuable contribution to better public understanding of our career service. My best wishes for continued success in their endeavors go to Graeme C. Bannerman, Capt. Hewlett R. Bishop, August C. Hahn, Dr. G. K. Hartmann, Arthur C. Lundahl, Nicholas J. Oganovic, Dr. Hildrus A. Poindexter, James J. Rowley, Frank A. Taylor, and William H. Weathersby.
>
> JOHN F. KENNEDY.

On meeting with the award winners the following day, President Kennedy said:

> I want to commend the league for its long history of spotlighting the dedicated public service of our civil servants. I think it made an unusually appropriate selection this year. I think it reminds us as citizens how much we owe some people who work quite anonymously for the people of the United States. So, I want to congratulate the league and the winners this year.

I think it very commendable of the National Civil Service League, an organization of private citizens dedicated to improving the Federal career service, to stimulate this recognition of excellence in Government service. I invite the attention of my colleagues to these outstanding individuals and the achievements for which they were honored. The award winners are—

Graeme C. Bannerman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, oversees procurement activities of the Department of Defense involving approximately $25 billion annually—some 30 percent of the total Federal budget. In carrying out his duties, he has achieved national stature as a recognized authority on Defense procurement policy, systems, and practices. Through Mr. Bannerman's leadership, the procurement elements of the armed services have been drawn into a cooperative and cohesive group thus paving the way for significant improvements in purchasing policy and techniques and the consequent saving of millions of dollars in Defense appropriations.

Capt. Hewlett R. Bishop, of the Department of Commerce, is responsible for the effective management of all Maritime Administration programs and operations in the large and complex Atlantic coast district. During World War II he conceived and developed several extremely effective and widely adopted cargo-loading innovations that permitted maximum utilization of our shipping resources. He has made important contributions to the safety of ships at sea and in port. He was instrumental in providing the efficient and rapid reactivation of ships from the Reserve Fleet when vitally needed during the Korean emergency. Captain Bishop has also provided strong leadership in organizations dedicated to achieving cooperation and coordination of Government and industrial efforts toward a stronger public service.

August C. Hahn, Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, in carrying out his responsibility for functional direction of post office operations and activities—including the collection, distribution, and delivery of mail—has demonstrated distinguished leadership and expert technical knowledge in improving postal management and administration. He has played a key role in the Department's modernization and decentralization program. He has provided gifted direction to the implementation of the accelerated business collection and delivery program, and to the strengthening of local management skills in post offices throughout the Nation. Mr. Hahn's imaginative leadership has been instrumental in the development of postal innovations which have permitted budgetary savings of $20 million in 1 year alone.

Dr. Gregory K. Hartmann, Technical Director, U.S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory, has provided leadership, both as a scientist and as an administrator, in accomplishing scientific work of the most advanced nature and vital significance for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Atomic Energy Commission, and other Government agencies. He pioneered in the study of nuclear-weapon effects and has been responsible for the work of scientific groups at several nuclear test operations. His brilliant work and tireless efforts have led to immeasurable contributions in the field of underwater-explosives research. As the first chairman of the Undersea Warfare Research and Development Planning Council, Dr. Hartmann played an important role in the successful development of our vital Polaris weapons system.

Arthur C. Lundahl, Assistant Director for Photographic Intelligence, CIA, serves as the Government's highest photographic-intelligence officer and has, consequently, been intimately involved in the most important problems affecting national security. Over the course of the last 10 years, he has organized and developed our photographic intelligence system thus bringing about a significant advance in America's intelligence resources. Through his extensive experience and his appreciation of national strategic problems, Mr. Lundahl has developed means to insure the efficient exploitation of new and unique types of photography of the greatest importance and the highest priority.

Nicholas J. Oganovic, Deputy Executive Director, U.S. Civil Service Commission, has made an outstanding contribution to better public service through his forceful and imaginative administration of Civil Service Commission activities, particularly in its field operations. Primarily through his efforts, major reorganizations have been accomplished creating new, more effective patterns of service and having significant impact on Federal personnel management. Especially notable is his concept of on-the-spot service through assignment of Civil Service representatives to more than 50 metropolitan centers outside the Commission's regional office cities. Mr. Oganovic was responsible for the administrative measures establishing the Federal Executive Boards to improve the efficiency and economy of Government field operations and has been prominently identified with the Government's quest for quality in recruiting. He has also won recognition for the new vitality he brought to the program for selective placement of the handicapped in Government service.

Dr. Hildrus A. Poindexter, Chief Public Health Adviser, Agency for International Development, scholar, teacher, healer, administrator, in 31 years of Government service, has made outstanding contributions to medical research and public health both in the United States and abroad. His foreign-duty assignments have taken him to Liberia, Vietnam, Laos, Surinam, Iraq, Libya, and he is currently serving in Sierra Leone. His efforts have provided and encouraged training for doctors, dentists, pharmacists, and nurses in this country and for laboratory technicians and nurses now holding positions of major responsibility in Liberia, Vietnam, and Laos. Dr. Poindexter directed the public-health measures associated with the evacuation of over 600,000 Vietnamese from North Vietnam when the Communists overran the country. His leadership has been instrumental in the adoption of public-health legislation by many of the countries in which he has served.

James J. Rowley, Chief of the U.S. Secret Service was for 15 years special agent in charge of the White House detail and was personally responsible for establishing, developing, and maintaining security techniques and procedures necessary to assure the protection of the first families of the Nation. During the period of his responsibility several serious attempts were made to harm the first family; yet none was successful. Since becoming Chief he has assumed still greater responsibilities in instituting protective planning and research, developing new methods for the investigation and detection of counterfeiting activities, and dealing with other important Secret Service assignments.

Frank A. Taylor, Director of the U.S. National Museum, Smithsonian Institution, currently bears what may well be the heaviest responsibility of any museum official in the world. Among his achievements are the planning, organization, and administration of a highly successful program of exhibit modernization throughout the Smithsonian and the initiation of a vital new program of research and scholarly publication within the Museum of History and Technology. In addition to this work, he is responsible for the general administration of a museum that has important departments of anthropology, zoology, botany, geology, the history of science and technology, the cultural history of the United States, and Armed Forces history. Possibly his greatest contribution has been in his leadership in the planning and development of the new $36 million Museum of History and Technology of the Smithsonian Institution.

William H. Weathersby, Country Public Affairs Officer for India, USIA, currently directs a critically important and USIA's largest operation abroad. He serves in a dual role as public-affairs adviser to the Ambassador and the Embassy and as operational chief of a large information and cultural program throughout India. In addition to the major contribution he has made to the attainment of American informational objectives in the Near and Middle East, his abilities have made a strong impact on the management and operation of the Agency itself. As personnel director, Mr. Weathersby has developed a Foreign Service career system, revised the Agency's examination system, improved and accelerated the recruiting process, and instituted a number of other significant improvements in personnel management and policy.

DISCRIMINATION BY CERTAIN EUROPEAN NATIONS AGAINST AMERICAN FRESH FRUITS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the discriminatory practices levied by certain European nations against imports or our American fresh fruits are continuing in substantial degree.

I am convinced that the European countries who practice this discrimination, particularly France, will cooperate only if retalitory measures are taken against them. I have communicated with the Honorable Christian H. Herter, special representative for trade negotiations, advising him of my view on this subject and requesting appropriate action by him. I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD, at this point of my remarks, a copy of my letter of April 22 to Mr. Herter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 22, 1963.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERTER: During a recent visit to the State of Oregon, I had the opportunity to discuss with leading growers and shippers of Oregon pears and apples the very difficult situation with which they are confronted due to nontariff trade barriers imposed against American apples and pears by France and other European nations. The situation that prevails with respect to France is particularly acute and is becoming increasingly difficult for Oregon growers and shippers as the months go by.

In a letter addressed to me, under date of December 19, Under Secretary of State Ball wrote to me as follows:

"I agree with you that the progress we have made thus far in opening the French market for our apples and pears has been negligible. I am concerned at this lack of success.

"It was this combination of factors—our concern and our lack of progress—that led us to bring our formal complaint against France under article XXIII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The contracting parties to the GATT at the 20th session recently completed in Geneva agreed that the French restrictions were inconsistent with the GATT, that benefits to which we were entitled were being nullified or impaired, and that the United States was entitled to exercise its right to suspend equivalent concessions which France enjoys in the American market.

"The contracting parties also recommended that the U.S. Government refrain from exercising its right of retaliation 'for a reasonable period' in the hope that further bilateral discussions between the United States and France might lead to the expansion, rather than the retaliatory contraction, of trade. It would not be appropriate or beneficial to us for the United States to retaliate immediately and ignore this international recommendation.

"If the French fail within a reasonable time to take significant steps to reduce unjustifiable restrictions against our trade, we are prepared to resort to our rights under GATT for compensatory action."

It is my opinion and the opinion of many other Senators that a reasonable time for the French to reduce unjustifiable restrictions against our trade has long since passed. In this connection, Mr. Ray Reter, of the Reter Fruit Co., of Medford, Oreg., one of Oregon's leading pear growers and shippers, stated in a recent letter:

"It may well be we will never gain access to the French market for our fruit and fruit products, but I am convinced we will get no consideration unless we take prompt action and go through with retaliatory procedures under article XXIII. We were originally told by Under Secretary Ball that action would start in late January if the French did not correct the situation. The French did not take corrective action and after De Gaulle wrecked the United Kingdom's entry into the Common Market and made clear his complete protectionist agricultural policy, we are again to defer action because it might be construed as a retaliation against De Gaulle.

"Mr. Herter should indicate clearly why action has not been instituted against France and should also tell us when the Government definitely expects to take action against France. Also, what does the Government plan to do to secure access for 1963 on pears and apples?

"If we do not promptly proceed against France in this matter, there is little hope that any country or the Common Market will pay any attention to us in the future."

The somewhat pointed language that I have just quoted is typical of the comments I receive from fruitgrowers throughout the State of Oregon. These growers ask me when our Government plans to end the discriminatory action that is practiced against our American fresh fruit exports—especially by France—and I simply do not have the answer.

To give you a further idea of the comments I am receiving on this general subject, I enclose the following:

1. The report of Mr. Frank Elliott of the U.S. Fruit Export Council, dated March 27, 1963.
2. A letter, dated April 6, addressed to Mr. Ray Reter by Mr. Roger Capgras, the representative in France of certain fruitgrowers.
3. The minutes of the meeting of the National Fruit Export Council, February 8, 1963.

Because of the seriousness of this problem, I would appreciate it very much if you would advise me as to whether the Government intends to proceed against France and against other European nations that have imposed nontariff restrictions against American fresh fruit imports, under article XXIII of GATT. In addition, I would appreciate information as to what can be done under existing laws and treaties to effectively bring to an end these discriminatory barriers against our American fresh fruits, particularly apples and pears.

Your assistance in this matter at an early date would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

TRIBUTE TO HEROES OF THE WARSAW GHETTO

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, 20 years ago, from April 19 to May 8, 1943, the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto carried on a heroic and hopeless fight against the overwhelming power of the Nazi troops bent on their extermination.

While each of us would probably rather forget that humanity is capable of acts of extermination such as those carried out by the Nazis, I think it is well for us to look back on this tragic event, perhaps the most tragic event in recent history. For a new generation has grown up since 1943 which might otherwise never fully realize that acts such as this took place during their childhood.

Reflection on the Warsaw uprising will remind us, too, of the valor of the human spirit, as well as the need to prevent any recurrence of the depravity of which man is also capable. With a little sharper awareness of the danger of mass murder, our country might long since have ratified the Genocide Convention, signed by our Government at the United Nations in 1948.

In 1943, Wolf Zyto, now a dental technician living in London, was a young man in his early twenties who had escaped from the Warsaw ghetto and who was living outside it, with some members of his family still confined within the ghetto. He is one of the few escapees from the ghetto who witnessed the valiant Warsaw uprising and who lived to record his memories of it.

Mr. President, on Sunday, April 21, the Washington Post republished some memories by Wolf Zyto of this period, written in diary form and sent to the London Observer. I ask unanimous consent to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD part of the Washington Post's introduction to these published memories and part of Mr. Zyto's entry for Tuesday, April 20, 1943, the day after the Nazi troops began their campaign of annihilation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1943

(This is the diary of a Jew who watched his family and his people dying in the ghetto. Wolf Zyto was one of the Polish Jews who survived with the help of their Christian neighbors. In April 1943, he was living in Warsaw under an assumed name, working in a factory and sheltered by a friendly Polish family. Earlier, Zyto had lived in the ghetto itself. He acted as one of the couriers who smuggled in food. Some of his family managed, like him, to escape from the ghetto. But his mother and a brother were still there when the Germans launched their attack. At the time, Zyto was 21. He now lives in London and is a dental technician. He recently wrote down his memories in diary form, to exorcise the past, and sent them to the London Observer on the off-chance that it might publish them.)

I haven't slept all night, but have met by arrangement my elder brother, and we go to a friend's family at Okopowa Street opposite the Feifer leather works. From their second-floor window, looking through the curtains, I can see German soldiers. They have an anti-tank gun in position behind the leather works and are firing away at dead and apparently empty houses, setting them on fire.

Then the figure of a man appears at one of the top windows of a six-story house that is burning, and after a moment's hesitation he jumps.

Henry and Janina S. and their father, Stanislav S., all are in tears and have been praying silently. My brother takes me in his arms and tries to stop my sobbing, but he cannot keep back his own tears.

What a courageous man Stanislav S. is. One of the lights that shine in this dark age. He is about 60 years old and until today worked in Przytulski leather works, which are in the ghetto. He had a special permit, but instead of entering the ghetto through the gate in Dzika Street, as was marked on his card, he would pretend he had made a mistake and walk through the gate at Gesia Street, so that he passed the house where we lived—and where my mother and little brother are still hiding because old people and children are no longer allowed. Stanislav S. would pass on a loaf of bread, already specially thickly buttered, and sometimes even a bottle of milk.

This was supposed to be his own lunch, and he would then go hungry all day because the Germans checked everything they carried in their pockets. If he had been caught he would have been shot on the spot. We hoped that one day we might find a place for my mother and little brother, and ways of getting them out, but now all hope is gone.

The spring sun is still shining, but thick clouds of smoke hang over the rooftops. From time to time there is machine-gun fire, and single explosions of cannon shells and grenades.

What can I do? The wall is surrounded in such a way that a mouse could not get through.

I go out into the street and into a church. Unbelievable quiet. I can't think, but I look at a figure of Christ, and I ask inside me, "How many times have You been crucified? * * *"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges, and State universities to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business having been concluded, the unanimous agreement entered into yesterday with respect to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges, and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research, controlling time, becomes effective.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to intrude a quorum call for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding the previous unanimous-consent agreement, I now ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes without the time being charged to the bill, and that in addition I may proceed for as long as it is necessary to yield to my friend and colleague the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me.

REPEAL OF THE SILVER PURCHASE ACTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the administration has proposed to repeal the silver purchase acts and the silver transactions tax and to authorize the Federal Reserve Board to issue $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes. Questions have been raised as to whether this proposal would be inflationary or would be a step in the direction of devaluation of the dollar. This question will loom large in the minds of the Committee on Banking and Currency next Monday when it hears testimony on H.R. 5389, the House-passed administration bill.

I am particularly concerned because of my interest in a sound economy and a sound Federal financial position. I have expressed many times my concern over current inflationary trends, including particularly those relating to Federal tax and spending policies and our national balance of payments.

Consequently, if I thought the purpose or effect of H.R. 5389 was inflationary, or if I thought that its purpose or effect was to devalue the dollar, I should oppose it vigorously.

However, from everything I have heard about this bill so far, including the strong support given to this administration proposal by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon and Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin, the bill does not seem to me to be inflationary, nor does it seem to be a step in the direction of devaluation of the dollar. On the contrary, it seems to me that the threat of inflation and devaluation of the dollar comes from other sources.

As I see it, the principal danger of inflation—aside from imprudent price and wage policies, which injure our balance of payments as much as they injure our domestic situation—comes from constantly unbalanced Federal budgets, which would cause immediate and uncontrolled inflation, if the Federal Reserve Board were not extremely cautious in exercising its existing monetary authority.

At the present time, demand deposits in commercial banks—by all odds the largest and most important form of money in the country—amount to about $115 billion. This amount is limited and controlled in large part by the Federal Reserve Board's power over reserve requirements. The Federal Reserve Board now requires reserves on demand deposits of 16½ percent for Reserve city banks and 12 percent for country banks. The Board has power, under existing law, to reduce these requirements to 10 percent and 7 percent, respectively. This action would immediately release about $6.25 billion in reserves, which might be expected to generate up to $50 billion in demand deposits. In other words, the Federal Reserve Board today could, if it chose, increase demand deposits by about $50 billion, or almost 50 percent.

At the present time, we have some $3 billion in free gold. The Federal Reserve Board could use this $3 billion to support new bank reserves through Federal Reserve purchases of Government securities. This would increase bank reserves by about $12 billion, and, even at present reserve requirement levels, could generate up to $80 billion in demand deposits. In other words, the Federal Reserve Board could today, if it chose, increase demand deposits in this fashion by up to $80 billion, or about two-thirds.

If the Board should at the same time reduce reserve requirements, demand deposits could rise as high as $300 billion, about 2½ times the present figure.

Or the $3 billion in free gold could also be used to increase by $12 billion the supply of Federal Reserve notes outstanding, now almost $30 billion, an increase of more than one-third.

The existence of these authorities in the Federal Reserve Board at the present time means, of course, that we now have a managed currency. We accomplish nothing if we deny this or try to conceal it. We would do better to recognize it frankly and to rely on managing it well and responsibly, as I believe the Federal Reserve Board is now doing.

I believe it is equally important for the executive branch and the legislative branch to act responsibly with respect to Government revenues and expenditures. Permitting the Government budget to be unbalanced on the upside of a business cycle is not, in my judgment, acting wisely or responsibly. And a deficit of the nature which would result if taxes are cut $10 billion, without a corresponding reduction in expenditures, would not, I am convinced, be consistent with sound fiscal management and responsible monetary policy.

The proposed change from silver certificates to Federal Reserve notes would, however, not have any bearing whatever on our financial stability. A comparison of the quantity of $1 and $2 silver certificates—the only certificates affected by the bill—makes clear the relative unimportance of these certificates, of which only $1.5 billion were outstanding on March 31, 1963. At the same date, $2.4 billion in subsidiary silver and minor coins were in circulation; almost $30 billion in Federal Reserve notes were in circulation; and demand deposits amounted to $115 billion.

Fluctuations in the price of silver mean that the value of the security behind a silver certificate varies greatly from time to time. A $1 silver certificate is backed by 371.25 grains of pure silver, or just over three-fourths of an ounce. In 1932, the price of silver sank as low as 25 cents and ounce. At that rate the silver in a silver dollar was worth something less than 20 cents.

For virtually all of the period covered by the silver purchase acts, the price of silver has been 91 cents an ounce or less. At that price the silver in a silver dollar was worth no more than 70 cents.

For 10 years—from 1935 to 1945—the price of silver was below 50 cents. At that price the silver dollar contained less than 40 cents worth of silver.

The $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes which would be authorized under the bill would be backed up, like all other Federal Reserve notes, by 25 percent gold and 75 percent in Government bonds and other eligible paper.

Federal Reserve notes and silver certificates, and U.S. notes too, are legal tender for all debts, public and private. All of these notes and certificates are completely interchangeable, and they are, as we all know, equally acceptable to the public.

The Government stopped selling silver in November 1961. At that time the market price was approximately 91 cents, the Government's selling price. This was an artificially low price kept down by the Government's sales from the amounts it had previously been required to buy under the silver purchase acts. Over the 15 years preceding the Government's decision to stop selling silver, consumption in the United States for industrial uses and coinage had risen from the 1947–49 average of 119 million ounces to 161 million ounces in 1961, while the aggregate of net imports and American production had sunk from a 1947–49 average of 77 million ounces to 68 million ounces in 1961. The deficit was made up by Treasury sales, which began to be substantial in 1959 and rose to 62 million ounces in 1961, not counting 55 million ounces used for coinage.

As soon as the Treasury stopped selling silver, the price rose sharply. It now is at about $1.27½ an ounce. With silver at this price, a $1 silver certificate is backed up by about 98 cents in silver.

The break-even point comes when the price of silver is $1.29-plus an ounce. At that price, each silver certificate will be backed up by exactly $1 of silver.

If the price of silver should rise substantially above $1.29 an ounce, it would be worth while for holders of silver certificates to present them at the Treasury and to demand silver dollars or silver bullion. The resulting reduction in $1 bills would have serious effects on business and trade, but it would not be inflationary.

The mint, of course, will have to continue to obtain silver for subsidiary coins. It could buy silver on the open market, either from domestic production or from foreign sources, with the resulting effects on the price of silver and on the balance of payments, or silver could be made available by withdrawing Treasury-held $1 silver certificates from circulation, which would decrease further the number of $1 silver certificates.

The new $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes which would be authorized under the proposed bill would, of course, impose an additional burden on our gold reserves because they, like other Federal Reserve notes, would have to be covered by 25 percent in gold certificates. The Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board state that they intend to make these transfers gradually, at a rate which, allowing for increases in the number of $1 bills needed, would require only about $35 million of gold certificates a year. This would not have any appreciable impact on our gold reserves.

In any event, of course, the balance of payments situation must be squarely faced and must be solved on its own merits. Whether the administration proposal with respect to $1 Federal Reserve notes is adopted or is not adopted, we will still have a serious balance of payments problem, and we must solve it.

H.R. 5389, in my judgment, has no connection with devaluation of the dollar. Repealing the silver purchase acts and issuing $1 Federal Reserve notes would not help to devalue the dollar, and it is not a necessary step in the devaluation of the dollar. This can only be accomplished by changing the price of gold from $35 an ounce to some higher figure.

Secretary Dillon and Chairman Martin have assured us that the administration does not intend to undertake devaluation. And it seems appropriate to point out in this connection that section 5 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act provides as follows:

> Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall on behalf of the United States * * * (b) propose or agree to any change in the par value of the United States dollar under article IV, section 5, or article XX, section 4, of the articles of agreement of the fund, or approve any general change in par values under article IV, section 7—

Sound and responsible fiscal policies and responsible and competitive price and wage policies are vitally important to the Nation and to our position of world leadership. We must concentrate our efforts in support of such policies.

Mr. President, again I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me.

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP FOR LATIN AMERICA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am taking this time today to report to the Senate on what I consider to be something critically important—what I hope will prove to be a major help in respect of the development of Latin America and, incidentally, of the solving of the problems with respect to Cuba, because everybody agrees that inherent in our problems with respect to Cuba is the need for satisfactory economic and social development of Latin America. If this development can be accelerated, if the Alliance for Progress can be buttressed and supported in order to do the job which we had planned it should do, then—for both critics of or supporters of the administration policy—this will represent a major contribution in respect to dealing with the grave danger that Cuba poses. The danger, of course, is that this example may permeate others of the American States. Therefore, Mr. President, I make this report within that frame of reference.

I am today announcing the organization of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America, an organization privately financed by grants from foundations, including a substantial grant from the Ford Foundation, and by United States, Western European, and Latin American businessmen.

The purpose of this organization is to encourage Western European investment in Latin America in coordination with indigenous and U.S. private capital, and to recommend a permanent mechanism which will serve as a medium for continued private investment in Latin America.

Mr. President, I emphasize it is proposed that the governments shall back private enterprise, and that this is where the governments will come in; but that the fundamental purpose of this plan is to induce tripartite private investment under congenial conditions in individual Latin-American countries which are willing and able to create those conditions.

Three executive directors to carry on the activities of the group are being appointed for the United States, West Europe, and Latin America and will be formally announced soon. They have actually been chosen and named.

Over the past 9 months a new intent and willingness has become apparent on the part of Western Europe to look beyond the confines of its own present economic growth. There is a growing revival of Western European interest in Latin America. This healthy trend has cut through the discouraging and divisive forces unleashed by the failure of the United Kingdom's application for Common Market membership. It has become increasingly clear that the resources available to the United States and to Latin America do not reach far enough to achieve the vast goal of Latin American economic progress in freedom—and, I emphasize, in time, since I believe the time is one of our greatest problems in respect of Latin America. The human and capital resources available to members of the whole Atlantic Community clearly must be marshaled in order to achieve success soon enough and effectively enough.

The genesis of this effort, Mr. President, was in November 1962 when the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in Paris adopted a resolution pursuant to a recommendation of its economic committee, of which I have the honor to be the chairman. The resolution urged that "the private and public sectors of the member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development OECD—be enlisted in an accelerated development program with Latin America in coordination with the Alliance for Progress."

It will be remembered that the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development consists of 18 western European countries and the United States and Canada; and it is designed for the economic coordination of the Atlantic Community. Within its context is also the Development Assistance Committee, consisting of the nine principal countries giving foreign aid in the world, and including as an additional member, Japan.

Between April 5 and 7 of this year in Paris, I participated in what I believe to be a highly important and concrete development in Western Europe's newfound identification with the problems of Latin America—meetings toward the establishment of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America.

This group, Mr. President—I hasten to add—is based upon the efforts of a working party of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference consisting of the Parliamentarian representatives of delegations of seven NATO countries; and I have the honor to be chairman of that working group.

The Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America is an action committee with the purpose of pulling together over the next 6 to 12 months immediate-impact, private-investment projects on a tripartite basis—utilizing Western European, United States, and indigenous Latin American capital and managerial and technical know-how. In addition this group, headed by a tripartite directorate from Latin America, Western Europe, and the United States, will formulate recommendations for a permanent mechanism to bring together United States, Western European, and indigenous Latin American capital for specific development projects.

It is believed that arrangements for suitable indigenous governmental acceptibility of such an effort will greatly help private enterprise participate in Latin American development all along the line.

The basic concept behind the establishment of this group develops from the fact that in Latin America, the United States needs Europe now and that Europe should come forward to help in the same spirit as did the United States in 1947, 1948, and 1949 under the Marshall plan.

By September of this year we believed that sufficient progress will have been made to submit an action plan to the Parliamentary Working Party of the interested Atlantic Community nations; that is, the working party I described of which I am the chairman. Within 2 months from now—or in June or July—it is expected that a high level conference of public and private officials from Western Europe, the United States and Latin America will convene to make policy recommendations with respect to this work, first to the Working Party of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, and then to a broad international conference which is contemplated by the NATO Parliamentarians Conference resolution.

The ultimate aim of our work is to have it taken over and actually put into effect by existing organizations such as the OECD, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Organization of American States, cooperating with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and other international agencies.

At this very moment our distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is participating in the meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank at Caracas, Venezuela, where he is furthering and explaining the purposes of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America, in the creation of which he has, at my invitation, taken an active part with me, and as to which I am honored to state he is my full associate.

Next week I hope that we shall have here in the Senate a report from the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as to what took place in Caracas. In the meantime, however, I should like to discuss the significance and some of the details of what has taken place in Western Europe and in the United States with respect to this Atlantic Community effort.

Two events occurred in November of 1962, both following some months of preparation, one of which took place in Paris and the other of which took place in Brussels.

In Brussels, about a week after the NATO Parliamentarians Conference of November 1962, the International Association of Christian Employers held a forum to discuss and make recommendations on the role of Europe in Latin American economic development.

Out of this forum has grown the European Committee for Cooperation with Latin America. Both of these actions, that is, that of the parliamentarians and that of the International Association of Christian Employers, are beginning to bear fruit this spring.

I have described the establishment of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America. This group is now working in close liaison with the UNIAPAC secretary, who is undertaking preparatory work for the first full meeting of CECAL expected to take place late this month.

At the same time, there have been increasing indications that the European Economic Community—EEC—and individual member nations of the EEC are taking hold of their responsibilities to freedom and economic progress in Latin America. The EEC has made a start by agreeing to finance, in cooperation with the Inter-American Development Bank, certain projects under the Alliance for Progress.

Although exact terms of this assistance have not been formulated and there are indications that much more must be done to make the necessary credits available on terms and at rates consistent with Latin American needs, a definite start has been made.

One further development: The Government of France has recently entered into a long-term, $150 million agreement to back its private investors in Mexico. This is an important step.

Thus, by a remarkable consensus, the why, what, and where of Western Europe's participation in Latin American development have been settled. This consensus has come at a critical point in history and has emanated from divergent sources.

It is not unique in historical terms for responsible men and nations to recognize and act upon the necessities of history when the time is ripe. Obviously the time for the Atlantic Community to act in Latin America is ripe. The resources to meet responsibilities now exist in a vital Europe—a Europe which can act in partnership with the United States at the very moment—with time so short, and I emphasize this again—when there is grave danger in Latin America of severe losses to freedom.

The question remaining is, How?

We have answered the why, what, and where. The remaining question is, How? That is the question to which this group will give the answer. The support for this group has been so widespread that I am confident we shall have an answer, and that very likely, it will be the right one.

I may say we have really worked very hard and have enlisted the total resources of the three areas involved, the United States, Europe, and Latin America, in an effort to find the right plan.

Last September 1962, and again in February 1963, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I were cohosts for groups of leading Latin American and U.S. businessmen interested in Latin America. They were leaders in their respective fields. We received from them the strongest confirmation of the need for the kind of work that has been undertaken by the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America.

I traveled to Europe three times and to Latin America twice during the past half year for the specific purpose of gathering opinion, information, and advice on the "how" of Atlantic Community assistance for Latin American development. Individually and collectively leaders in Europe and Latin America have expressed support for a tripartite effort in ventures which bring the imagination, know-how, resources and incentives of private capital together with the basic public investments in economic development.

Especially important, it was, and is now felt, is the partnership of all Atlantic Community nations and their private and public sectors together with the private and public areas of those Latin American nations willing to undertake the commitments needed to assure sound economic growth.

I think it is only fair and proper to say I have received indispensable encouragement and valuable assistance from our State Department and other levels of the U.S. Government.

Finally, upon my return to the United States from the Paris meetings early this month, the newly established group met with me and with heads of those international organizations most profoundly concerned with Latin American development: The Inter-American Development Bank, the Organization of American States, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These meetings have produced far-reaching results in terms of cooperation and coordination.

Over the next months I believe that we can look for concrete achievement in Atlantic community partnership in an area of the world second to none in importance for the survival and expansion of human freedom and dignity.

This is a matter of the greatest magnitude, one we are thinking of now on the order of $1 billion in investment with respect to the project I have described.

A start has been made—perhaps it has been long overdue—and the impetus of this beginning augurs very well for the future.

In closing I pay my tribute to the President of the United States, to the State Department, to our colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], to our colleague, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is chairman of our delegation to the NATO Parliamentarian Conference, to Representative HAYS in the other body, who is a leading figure in, and our representative on the steering committee of the NATO Parliamentarian Conference, and to all those who have helped bring this situation to its present pass.

It is financed, it is staffed, it is an excellent idea to sponsor—the bringing of Europe into the developmtnt of Latin America. It has every augury for success.

As I reported when I returned here from Paris in April, I am convinced it can be done. It remains for us to do it. If we can do it, and I believe we can in association with the leaders of America, European, and Latin American business, labor, and government, then it can prove to be the difference between magnificent success and perhaps an inadequate success or even a failure in the development of Latin America, which is so crucial not only to the freedom of this hemisphere, but to the freedom of the world.

I thank the Senator for yielding me time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have been attending a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, and I have come into the Chamber just now. I understand the Senator is speaking about the recommendations which he made to the North Atlantic Parliamentarians' Conference. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask that I be granted 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator from New York be extended for 2 additional minutes, without it being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. In response to the question of the Senator from California I would say that we have actually organized the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America. It has been financed. It is enthusiastically backed by all elements of the economy in Western Europe, the United States, and Latin America. We are at work on drafting a plan under which this kind of investment from Europe, in association with the United States and Latin America, may be forthcoming. We have a target of a billion dollars a year. As I said a moment ago, I know it can be done. The only question is whether we can do it. I know it can be done.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise to pay a deserved tribute to the Senator from New York. The Alliance for Progress is of importance to the people of the United States, because a part of our destiny is historically and naturally intertwined with our neighbors in Latin America. It is also of supreme importance to members of the Atlantic Community. I well remember, because I was a delegate to that conference with the Senator from New York, the enthusiasm with which his original recommendations were received by our parliamentary colleagues representing the nations of NATO.

What he has said means that the NATO nations will share our own interest in keeping the South American countries free and share the burdens which the U.S. Government have undertaken.

I salute the Senator from New York for his excellent statesmanship in the fruition of the recommendations which he made last fall in Paris.

Mr. JAVITS. I express my gratitude to the Senator from California and also my thanks for his indispensable help in Paris and here in the continuing development of this project.

I also wish to add my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is Chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have kept him informed on what we were doing. He was most generous in helping me with respect to this subject.

I am indeed grateful to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] for his fine support and for the splendid endorsement which he has given to this work.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the previous unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the senior Senator from Oregon may be permitted to proceed for 25 minutes and that at the conclusion of his statement the junior Senator from New York, [Mr. KEATING], may proceed for about 3 minutes, without any of this time being charged to either side on the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MR. NIXON AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Saturday night the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the American public were treated to a replay of the old Nixon theme song. It made use of all the same old techniques of forensic deceit that have come to be so closely associated with Mr. Nixon. "If only I were the 'partisan type'," he began, "what a field day I could have." One cannot help wondering whether Mr. Nixon meant the chuckles to come at his characterization of himself or at his characterization of the administration's record. Certainly Mr. Nixon holds some kind of unofficial title in this country as a champion partisan infighter, and it is unbelievable that he meant the description of himself to be taken seriously.

But just in case anyone might have any question of this man's ability to deceive himself with words, even when his audience remains undeceived, we are then treated to the shopworn and transparent tactic of making a charge by denying that the charge is being made. "Nor do I charge that this administration is trying to appease Mr. Khrushchev," says Nixon. "Nor do I charge that because of the failure of the economy to grow as fast as was predicted when the administration came into office we are in deadly peril of being outproduced by the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc."

How often we have heard in years past that old verbal technique. It carried Richard Nixon a little further than it carried Joe McCarthy, but not much further. I would have more respect for the man if he made these charges honestly and straight out, instead of disguising them with pious semantics.

But the old refrain from this speech of Saturday that really strikes a chord of memory is the Nixon prescription of how to deal with Cuba. Nixon on Cuba in 1963 is nothing more nor less than the 1952 Republican prescription for dealing with China. "The more things change, the more they are the same," according to the French proverb. Richard Nixon is the living proof of the truth and applicability of that axiom to the policies of the modern Republican Party.

The Nixon prescription for Cuba, like the 1952 Republican prescription for China, consists largely in big talk and easy promises of liberating both these victims of communism. The "activist" quality in both cases is remarkably similar. Eleven years ago, we heard about how China would be freed by "unleashing" Chiang Kai-shek; Saturday night, we heard that Cuba is to be freed by "unleashing" the Cuban exiles.

During the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, it must be presumed that Chiang Kai-shek was indeed "unleashed." One cannot be sure because not much of anything happened, except that after a few years, all expectation that Chiang's forces would actually invade the mainland of China disappeared.

Those expectations disappeared when it became evident that the forces to be unleashed were not to be the real forces which would have to carry the brunt of the battle. It finally became perfectly clear even to the most gullible that putting Chiang's forces into battle against the Chinese Communists would require vast American air and sea support, and that unless those Nationalist forces were to be abandoned to their fate, a full-scale American invasion in support of them would be necessary.

The question that Mr. Nixon raises in my mind is whether this is not what he really has in mind in Cuba. The principal element of his Cuban policy is that the Cuban exiles in this country not be "leashed." Instead, he calls for open support of what he calls, but fails to define, "forces of freedom." It is his recommendation that we openly support forces organized to overthrow a Communist-controlled government in the Western Hemisphere.

On the face of it, Mr. Nixon is calling for official violation by the U.S. Government of its laws against participation by residents in this country, either citizens or noncitizens, in attacks, raids, or invasions of any kind aimed at nations with which we are not at war. Perhaps Mr. Nixon had it in mind that he believes those laws should be changed and just did not spell it out.

But even so, what he is really advocating is a program of aid to the Cuban exiles that would bring the military power of the United States into play sooner or later on their behalf. It would be either that, or repetitions of the Bay of Pigs, because financing, organizing, and training the Cuban exiles was not enough even in 1961.

The Cuban exiles were unleashed for some 3 years. The results were nothing more than nuisance raids that were followed by attacks on U.S. shipping. The following is a résumé of the raids by the Cuban exiles and their results:

August 24, 1962, First raid, Revolutionary Student Directorate Group shelled hotel on Havana waterfront causing minor damage.

September 10, 1962: Five-man crew from Alpha-66 group fired on a United Kingdom vessel and a Cuban vessel near Cayo-Frances causing slight damage to both vessels.

October 8, 1962: Estimated 10-man party representing Alpha-66 staged raid on harbor installation at Isabela de Sagua causing undetermined number of casualties.

October 12, 1962: A six-man party under the direction of Manolo Quiza machinegunned a Cuban vessel in the sea area off the port of Cardenas. The vessel was reportedly sunk and two of the four crew members were injured.

December 4, 1962: Several dozen raiders, representing the second front of the Escambray, in two small craft fired on installations in the port of Caibarien.

March 17, 1963: Vessel carrying small number of raiders representing Alpha-66 and the second Escambray front raid the harbor at Isabela de Segua causing minor damage to the Soviet freighter *L' Gov*. There may have been casualties.

March 26, 1963: An estimated six raiders representing the L-66 group attacked the Soviet vessel *Baku* in the harbor of Caibarien. Substantial damage was caused to the Soviet vessel.

SUMMARY

Cuban exiles have carried out seven hit-and-run pinprick raids against Cuba beginning with the attack on a Havana waterfront hotel in late August 1962. These attacks in the main were improvised and with the exception of the last attack on a Soviet vessel caused virtually no damage.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield when I finish my speech; then I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. President, is this Mr. Nixon's idea of how Cuba is to be liberated? Surely he knows it would require not merely U.S. sea and air support, but the presence of large numbers of U.S. troops to make any invasion of Cuba a success.

Mr. Nixon thinks he has shrewdly avoided making that bald assertion to the American people. His speech to the editors is carefully worded to give the promise of freeing Cuba without giving the price in American blood that would have to be paid for it under his policy. "Unleash the Cuban exiles," cries Nixon. But there is an unspoken corollary that is fully known and appreciated by Mr. Nixon, even if it was not uttered by him. It is that a continuation of the exile raids and eventual landings of exiles in Cuba would require massive American participation to make them successful.

The American Nation has registered its rejection of these intellectual dishonesties of Richard Nixon. I suspect that the disillusionment with the unleashing of the Chinese Nationalists will put this newest "unleashing" shell game into its proper perspective. For the plain truth is that in either case, the unleashing would be nothing more than a vanguard to full-scale U.S. invasion. I think the American people know that. They did not want any part of that kind of policy toward China, and I do not believe they are any more interested in such a policy toward Cuba.

"UNLEASHED" POLICY HAS ALREADY FAILED

They might be, were it not for the very fact which Nixon brings up in support of his own case. It is that the Cuban exiles cannot be expected to carry alone the brunt of opposition to the Soviet power which has been planted in Cuba.

Mr. Nixon says this is why we should openly support the exiles. But it also means that only the U.S. military power can successfully challenge the Communist power in Cuba. The exiles have already had the benefit of U.S. open support extending to financial aid, training, weapons, and transport. The Bay of Pigs was the result. Even if Soviet troops were not still present in Cuba, the Cuban exiles could not do any better now than in 1961 without American troops to help them. In my judgment, they could not do it nearly so well. If Nixon is advocating a U.S. invasion, why does he not say so to the American people with intellectual honesty? The policy he outlined must eventually bring about American military involvement in Cuba. He knows that. Why does Nixon persist in believing that all the American people can be fooled all of the time?

I have said many times from the Senate floor that I do not rule out the possibility of American military involvement in Cuba. We saw it occur last October, when there was a direct threat to American national security. We may again have to protect the security of the Western Hemisphere from the Cuban threat with the use of our military power.

I repeat again, as I have said several times from this desk and many times from the platforms of America, that the American people have every reason to place complete confidence in the purpose of the President of the United States to proceed immediately, at any critical moment, to protect the security of this Republic whenever its security is challenged or endangered by either Castro or Khrushchev or both acting jointly.

The President has also made it clear that he intends to keep this Republic within the framework of international law. However, the speech by Richard Nixon the other night was a warmongering speech which would have taken us outside the framework of international law had we carried out Nixon's proposal.

I thank my God that sitting in the White House is a man who recognizes the sacred, solemn responsibilities of being President of the United States, and the duty to keep this Republic within the framework of international law. This President recognizes that an aggressor course of action or a violation of American-signed treaties or a violation of our responsibilities to international law cannot be justified in maintaining our efforts in the realm of freedom around the world.

If we sought to implement the aggressor course of action, which was the very essence of the Nixon proposal the other day, we would lose one ally after another in the United Nations, because we have a duty in this era of civilization to see to it that we do not follow a course of action of international outlawry. In essence, the proposals of Nixon the other night were proposals that this country should become a party to international outlawry. If he was aware of the treaties the United States has signed, he ignored them in the preparation of the speech he delivered the other day when he spoke to the newspaper editors.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of allowing the United States to be drawn into military involvement on behalf of or because of the Cuban exiles. Neither am I in favor of a U.S. policy which uses the Cuban exiles as a front, and as an excuse for American involvement. Let not the Cuban exiles forget that possibility, either. The refugees here in the United States account for only some 4 percent of the people of Cuba. Ninety-six percent of the Cuban people are still in Cuba.

I am not in favor of keeping this relatively small percentage of its people on a string to use as a convenient pretext for an American invasion of Cuba. After Cuba, what? British Guiana? Brazil? There are voices in America right now who will swear that the Government of Brazil and the Government of Venezuela are both Communist-dominated.

The extreme right in this country should leave no room for doubt on the part of the thinking people of the country that they want war. They represent the war party of America. I believe that the challenge of statesmanship these days is to try, first, to win the fight against communism on the basis of bloodless combat. We will shed our blood if it ever becomes necessary to do so to protect the security of this Republic. But I am one Senator who does not intend to sweep under the rug attacks such as the one from Nixon the other night. I believe the people must be warned at all times against the dangerous propaganda of the warmongerers, such as Nixon, who seek to poison the thinking of the American people by waving the American flag into tatters. As a patriotic American, I do not believe we pay due respect to the American flag by waving it into tatters.

I do not want to see any return to the unilateral American policy of deciding when a government of Latin America is to be overthrown in furtherance of U.S. interests. That is what Mr. Nixon is calling for. It would be a return to the 19th century diplomacy which made the United States a hated nation in the hemisphere and did damage which has required half a century to repair.

U.S. ALREADY AIDING NON-COMMUNIST GOVERNMENTS

A part of Mr. Nixon's prescription for Latin America is for open U.S. support of those same "forces of freedom" in nations threatened by Communist activity. But we have such a policy in full force and effect right now. The Punta del Este conference of a year and a half ago, to which I had the honor to be one of the two Senate delegates, the other being the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], spelled out some of the steps to be taken by all our governments to curb Communist activities and influences in the nations of the hemisphere. A large part of that policy includes the careful and effective patrolling of the waters of the Caribbean by American forces to prevent the smuggling of arms, propaganda, and trained personnel from Cuba into other Latin American countries.

We send them large amounts of military aid to maintain internal security. Another large part of this policy is the Alliance for Progress itself.

In short, I simply do not know what Mr. Nixon is talking about when he says we should openly support the forces of freedom in countries where internal communism is threatening. We are doing it now. Let me say, parenthetically, that Brazil is one of the most important of these; yet Mr. Nixon derided our aid to Brazil. It is hard to see just what kind of "open support" he would have us extend to Brazil, to keep communism from advancing in that country, if he considers our present massive aid to be a mistake.

There is one more point in Mr. Nixon's Cuba policy which I should like to mention. It is that when asked for specifics of what action the United States should take to oust communism from that country, he declined to name any that are not already being undertaken. He thus left the exiles as the "front" for his American involvement, when he could have spelled out the desirability of supporting their invasion of Cuba with American forces—which in my judgment is the proposal that is concealed and imbedded in his program. But he was not intellectually honest enough to tell the American people what he really meant. The specific actions mentioned by Nixon are now being taken by the Kennedy administration, to remove the Soviet presence in Cuba, and eventually the Communist presence—political methods, political pressures, and economic pressures.

We should, said Mr. Nixon, begin with the minimum steps, and see what result they bring, before stepping up what we do. It is too bad that Nixon is not willing to find out what results these methods bring. It will surely take many more months before we know whether they are effective or not. But he wants to unleash the exiles, too, with all that implies.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Latin-American Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and as one who for years has been steeped in the problems of the United States vis-a-vis Latin America, let me say, that in my judgment the proposals made the other night by Mr. Nixon would cause catastrophe throughout Latin America and would end in war. As I have said before, in my judgment, statesmanship calls for us with honor to do everything we can to win a bloodless victory over communism in Latin America, although ready at all times to shed our blood in whatever amounts may be necessary in order to protect the security of our country in case Castro and Khrushchev follow an aggressive course of action against the Western Hemisphere. We must not forget the the Act of Punta del Este pledges all the free nations of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States and our Latin American neighbors, to support each other whenever there is a violation of international law by an aggressive course of action on the part of Cuba and its master, Khrushchev.

It is always hard to tell whether Mr. Nixon advocates a move of this kind because it sounds like a good, cheap way of gaining something all Americans desire without ever having to put it to the test, or whether he advocates this particular policy with the full knowledge that effectuating it would bring about tremendous consequences for the American people, consequences he deliberately fails to mention or discuss.

Fortunately, the American people have decided that they do not want to find out what he has in mind. They made that clear in November 1960.

EUROPEAN POLICY COSTLY, DANGEROUS

In some ways, Mr. Nixon's outline of a policy toward our NATO allies was much more far-reaching and ominous than his Cuban policy, and deserved more attention in the press, than what he said about Cuba. Mr. Nixon would, in Western Europe, have us fall back on the Republican theory of diplomacy which calls for arming every nation to the teeth as a means of avoiding war. That was the Dulles policy, and Nixon is apparently ready to carry it to a fatal extreme.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I opposed the Dulles program during the last 3 or 4 years of his leadership in the State Department. In my judgment, we are still suffering terrible consequences because of the misconceptions inherent in the Dulles program.

The way to repair the Atlantic alliance, says Mr. Nixon, is to give our NATO partners nuclear weapons. He calls for a change in the Atomic Energy Act that would permit "the transfer of a limited number of nuclear warheads for the appropriate use of our European allies."

Is General De Gaulle unhappy because France does not have its own national nuclear forces? Then give him some, says Mr. Nixon. What interest of the United States this conceivably could serve, Nixon does not say. From the context of his remarks it appears that he simply wants to give our allies in Europe anything they want, to keep them happy and quiet. I do not see where Nixon even expects Europe to pay for those nuclear warheads, since he calls for their "transfer," not their sale.

I find it especially surprising that Nixon should offer such a proposal when he also calls for a move toward greater political unity within NATO. He urges, in fact, a "confederation" to permit unified political control of the NATO organization. Giving France, Britain, and Germany—to start with—nuclear weapons of their own is exactly the opposite of leading them toward greater political unity.

Mr. President, here is one Senator who never will vote a dime to a NATO country for the development of a national atomic, nuclear-weapons program. Here is one Senator who will insist that, for the preservation of civilization itself, we continue to maintain control of nuclear power, under international agreements with our allies. Here is one Senator who repeats his statement made from this desk on January 16—namely, that he does not intend to see the United States help or aid De Gaulle in any way in his program to make France an independent nuclear power.

We cannot run the risk of encouraging individual nations to develop individual national nuclear weapons programs, if we are still to have any hope of preserving the peace in our time. Certainly we have great moral obligations to the next generation and to future generations of Americans.

If Mr. Nixon were genuinely interested in a closer political unity and control over the NATO military forces, I cannot imagine that he would also propose to destroy that unity by setting up each member as an independent nuclear power. The kindest thing I can think of Nixon's proposal is that he is resorting to the practice of trying to "buy off" unwilling or recalcitrant partners.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The time available to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am flatly opposed to any amendment of the Atomic Energy Act which would permit the transfer, the sale, or any other placing of nuclear warheads in the hands of other nations, for their own use. If Mr.

Nixon is sincere in seeking a closer political relationship with our European allies, let him begin talking about changes in the Atomic Energy Act that would release to a purely NATO organization some degree of American control.

There is plenty of room for negotiation and maneuvering over how to bring about better relations within NATO. But, by and large, I believe that among nations which are basically friendly, basically democratic, and have the same basic objectives, a reasonably straight line is the best one to follow in trying to reach agreement. There may be some complex rationale behind his idea that the way to move toward unity is to fractionalize. If so, Mr. Nixon has a lot more explaining to do.

Mr. President, I close by saying, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that in my judgment the balance between war and peace in the world today is a very delicate one; and, in my judgment, there will not be any little wars. If we start a war in Cuba, we shall very likely start a world war. I think the leaders of all nations should recognize that.

Therefore, whenever the warmongers seek to spread their poisonous propaganda of war—as Mr. Nixon did the other day, before the newspaper editors—irrespective of the political consequences, I will take to this floor in defense of trying to reach an honorable peace and in defense of the great foreign policy program of a great President, President Kennedy.

The time has come to make perfectly clear to the warmongers that the American people are entitled to the facts. They are entitled to intellectual honesty. They are entitled to be protected from the kind of deceit in which Mr. Nixon engaged in his shocking speech to the newspaper editors.

I say to the newspaper editors, You, too, have a patriotic obligation to keep faith with the first amendment of the Constitution, and, in the exercise of your precious guarantee of free speech, to present to the American people the facts about foreign policy, and not permit warmongers to give to the American people the big dose of intellectual poison and war propaganda that Mr. Nixon gave to your conference when he spoke the other day.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the fine analysis of the Cuban policy by Mr. Walter Lippmann, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KENNEDY-KEATING CUBAN POLICY

(By Walter Lippmann)

Cuba got a good airing last week before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and the significant fact about the speeches of the President, Secretary Rusk, and Senator KEATING was that there is substantial agreement about what the United States should and should not do. It is hard to say what Mr. Nixon's Cuban policy would be. He sounded like a man who was ready to go to war. But all he actually said was that he wanted the Cuban exiles to make hit-and-run raids.

Senator KEATING, who is the most conspicuous of the critical opposition, began by saying that it is foolish to pretend that there are easy answers to the Cuban problem. He did not pretend. Then in the course of his speech he admitted that he agrees with the main theses of our present Cuban policy. He is opposed to an invasion. He is opposed to a blockade. He is opposed to hit-and-run raids mounted from American soil. He is in favor of greater stress on nonmilitary measures, and he wants to exert increasing economic pressure so that the Soviets will be driven to the conclusion that the price of maintaining a base in Cuba is too high.

This is the same story which the administration is telling. Senator KEATING's differences are not in the substance of the text but in the editing, the typography, the layout, and the captions. The Senator, like the President, excludes in present circumstances the resort to war—invasion, blockade, and raiding; like the President, he, too, would deal with Cuba by surveillance, containment, isolation, economic pressures, and propaganda.

There is no doubt that at least for some time to come the Kennedy-Keating policy will leave the Soviet troops 90 miles from Florida. This is an affront to our pride. Not since Napoleon III put French troops into Mexico to enthrone and support the Emperor Maximillian has anything like this happened so close to us. In the end the French troops went away. But, because there was no prudent alternative, Lincoln put up with the Bonapartist troops for several years.

How long must we put up with the Russian troops? The honest answer is that we must put up with them until they can be gotten rid of by measures short of nuclear war. Here is the sticking point in the argument with Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon. They sound, they intend to sound, as if they know a way to get rid of the Russian troops promptly without waging nuclear war.

What is this prompter way to make the Russians go away from Cuba? They do not tell us, but the most reasonable interpretation of what they say is that the prompter way is not to make war but to threaten war. Both Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon have avoided saying plainly what they do mean. But if what they sound like has genuine meaning it is that they believe the United States can deliver an ultimatum which the Soviet Union will bow to.

If this is not what they mean, what in the name of common sense do they mean with all their big words? If they are prepared to be so bold with the Russians, they ought to be bold enough to talk plainly to their fellow Americans.

The Rockefeller-Nixon position appears then to be that Cuba can be liberated by ordering the Soviet Union to withdraw from this hemisphere, and to stand by passively while we blockade Castro and arrange for a replacement of Castro's government. If this is what they have in mind, they are making an enormous guess. For nobody can possibly know that the Soviet Union would surrender its whole position in Cuba as it surrendered its offensive weapons last October. It is the supreme folly in the nuclear age to drive a nuclear power into a corner. And if the Soviet Union refused to bow to the ultimatum, all this would do for us would be to make us look like fools.

The President of the United States cannot play with an ultimatum to a government like that of the Soviet Union. He cannot use an ultimatum unless he is prepared to go through with it and begin a war. If he is not prepared to go to war, an ultimatum is a bluff and everyone will soon see that it is.

While the present policy does not promise a quick withdrawal of the Russians or the fall of Castro, it is surely not true to say that it is complacent do-nothingism. To a degree which is just short of war Cuba is being photographed, patrolled, embargoed and squeezed, and isolated. If Cuba were a great power, we would be at war with her for what we are already doing. I doubt whether there is any precedent where we have exerted such strong measures short of war on any other country.

However much we are impatient and frustrated we have to grasp the fact that Cuba is no military threat to the United States and is not very much of a threat to Latin America. The worst of Castro is his example and a long way after that such agents as he is able to train and infiltrate into the Latin American countries. He is an affront to our pride, he is a nuisance, he is a mischiefmaker. But he is not a mortal threat to the vital interests of the United States, and therefore, in this age of thermonuclear war, we must deal with him by measures that are short of war.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the American people are a peace-loving people. The Government of the United States joined the United Nations because we believe in peace. We continue to seek peace with justice and with honor in this world.

I believe the American people understand the ugly and dread hazard to the free way of life which is posed by international communism. For that reason again this year the representatives of the American people will vote to spend, in round numbers, approximately $100 billion to perfect our Defense Establishment and further to sophisticate the defensive weapons of obliteration which modern science and technology have brought not only to the free nations, but also to the nations under the yoke of international communism.

The American people are bitter. They object to the transformation of Cuba into a Communist satellite. Their own feelings were reflected only a year ago on the floor of the Senate when it adopted the following resolution:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States is determined—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

'c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.

That resolution was approved by the Congress and likewise by the President of the United States. I think it fair to say that it represents basic American policy. Our country will never permit Cuba to become a nuclear or an offensive launching pad; and, to the everlasting credit of the President of the United States, the action which he took last October indicated that our Cuban policy was to be vindicated on that occasion.

But the American people continue to be bitter. They continue to urge the American Government to take any action that can be taken to isolate and, under the very terms of the resolution, to extirpate from the Western Hemisphere communism in any form.

I receive letters from people in California upon occasion demanding action. I have written replies to those letters in which I have said, "What do you mean when you say 'action'? If you are demanding that I use my vote and my voice upon this occasion now, immediately, to demand a military invasion of Cuba, you are wrong, because I will not do that."

Neither will the American people. The President of the United States has said, "We have fought wars before." And now we face, God forbid, a continuing hazard of an obliterating nuclear war. Nevertheless the American people intend that they and their Government proceed with honor and courage and vigor, and firmness with respect to communism in this hemisphere and in any other clime around this globe. "Deeds not words," was the Eisenhower phrase. It still goes.

Mr. President, I did not read the text of the comments of former Vice President Nixon, and therefore I cannot comment very well upon the points which my able friend from Oregon has raised.

There is no more vigorous advocate in the Senate than my colleague the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. When I propose a measure which is controversial, I am always happy when my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] is on my side and agrees with me.

I take the floor of the Senate on this occasion to say that from the newspaper accounts of former Vice President Nixon's speech, I do not consider it a "shocking" speech. In my judgment his speech reflected the uneasiness of the American people with respect to the continuing presence in Cuba, 90 miles off our shore, of a Communist ideology. They hope and pray—I go further than that when I say they demand—that our Government do everything that can be done to isolate and eventually to eliminate that hazard from our way of life.

Former Vice President Nixon is an American. He did not attack President Kennedy as an appeaser. He simply presented his views with vigor to an audience of newspaper editors which extended an invitation to him to speak on the occasion of their convention.

I say very frankly to my friend from Oregon that, when the President of the United States the other day approved a loan to Brazil I did not denounce that loan. But I say to him most sincerely that I desire more facts with respect to the reasonableness of that loan before I place my own personal stamp of approval upon it. We must remember that a few weeks ago the State Department publicly said that Communists were working their will in the government of Brazil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. A couple of days later the State Department said that Communists did not dominate Brazil. As an American citizen I say that if Brazil went down the Communist drain, it would be another body blow to the cause of freedom. We do not want our hemisphere to go Communist. For that reason, I shall continue to support the Alliance for Progress. I desire that our ties with our Latin American neighbors be strong. I wish to see us go forward in helping those countries eliminate many of the causes for communism—ill health, poverty, illiteracy, poor housing, lack of widespread individual landownership, sickness, and disease. But I do not consider the comments of the former Vice President last week to be susceptible of the interpretation which my able friend has placed upon them, as he has a perfect right to do. I merely believe that he reflected the feeling of the American people that we desire peace with justice and honor. We seek it. For that reason, we wish to continue to negotiate with the Soviet Union for a dependable and realistic test ban. That is why we hope and pray that the Atlantic Alliance may continue strong.

I generally share my colleague's views with respect to the problem of the nuclear deterrent. Quite aside from that, the American people want our country and our Government, as I say, to be united, to continue a policy of firmness toward our unyielding, unalterable American goal—to protect our own security, to eliminate communism from this hemisphere, and eventually to give to the people on this earth an opportunity themselves to determine how their own society shall conduct their own business.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The water resources bill, known as S. 2, is before the Senate. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time for calling the role not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed, on page 3, line 9, after the word: "advisable", to add the following: "by the institute or center,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I think the purpose of this particular amendment is clear. It is an exceedingly simple amendment. It is a perfecting amendment. The purpose of it is to keep the control of the research in the hands of the institute or center. It is an amendment to certain language in section 100(a) of the bill, which provides for research at the land-grant colleges and institutes.

The bill now reads: "as may in each case be deemed advisable, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States and Puerto Rico."

In my opinion, that language makes the bill uncertain. I do not know what is meant by "as may in each case be deemed advisable." I do not know who determines what is advisable. So the purpose of my amendment is to be certain that the institution in the particular State where the problems are being studied is the judge of what the problems are and what is advisable, and in what case it is advisable.

I felt certain that this was merely a perfecting amendment and that the author of the bill would be willing to accept it. I am sure it would not be his idea that, for example, in the State of New Mexico the decision as to what was to be deemed advisable would be made here in Washington. I know that for the State of Colorado I would have no desire to see the Secretary of the Interior have control of money or a project where he has the say as to what is advisable. Because of the many ramifications of this subject, I think it is for the States to say which ones are advisable and which ones are not.

I may ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico as to whether he has objection to this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the able Senator from Colorado that I do have opposition. It is not the objection which the Senator probably thinks I have, but I will discuss it shortly.

Mr. ALLOTT. That being the case, and having stated my reasons for the amendment, I will reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to yield some time to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart].

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it was necessary for me to be in Michigan yesterday, and I was thus unable to join in the opening discussion of the pending bill (S. 2) and in the compliments paid its chief sponsor, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. But as a cosponsor of this bill, and also as one of the "minority of four" who had urged a more forceful report from the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, I am delighted and gratified that the Senator from New Mexico is forcefully pursuing the recommendations of our committee. He is not letting them die on the shelf. He is proceeding promptly, thoughtfully, and thoroughly to see that they are implemented. It is clear that he intends to see that we take all possible actions to meet the Nation's water needs of the future as envisioned by our committee.

This particular bill has been most warmly received in Michigan. Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, was given a draft of the bill last summer. He endorsed the concept, and said:

> "The draft bill takes cognizance of the fact that the use of water constitutes one of the most complex and pressing problems confronting almost every State in the country.

We in Michigan will put this program to good use. I commend the Senator for his initiative in the drafting of the legislation and for his leadership in bringing it to the floor of the Senate. I hope it will be supported overwhelmingly.

I support the Senator in his opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska wanted to speak on the bill. I thought this would be the best time for him to do so, and I yield him some time.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we are witnessing a historical change in our national thinking, as we find citizens becoming increasingly aware of the value—indeed of the preciousness—of our water resources. The bill we are considering, S. 2, provides that, in addition to the land-grant colleges and State universities, other universities and research institutions may also be aided in water resources research.

Our water resources are not by any means inexhaustible. Nor are they at present well tended. The cosponsors of S. 2 heard testimony outlining the severity of the water shortage which our country faces. Some States have already experienced the fears and frustrations arising from inadequate water reserves. I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation which should help solve some of our water resource problems.

President Kennedy's task force on water resources reported that water is being used at an alarming rate. The issue, of course, is how do we best utilize our water? How can waste be eliminated? How can reuse methods for water be found? How can the waters of the sea be desalinized at the least cost? How can water pollution be ended? How can we assure adequate water supply for the future?

As I have had occasion to say before, water conservation cannot be the goal and responsibility of the States alone. The language of S. 2 makes available to our great State universities and colleges funds with which to establish within each State a water resources research institute, center, or equivalent agency.

In my State of Alaska a water pollution research laboratory is being located at the University of Alaska at College, near Fairbanks. It will be seek to establish how the waters of the far north can be best put to work. The environmental studies planned within our State will have far-reaching effects in this country and in other lands.

Strange as it may seem to men and women unfamiliar with Alaska and its vast regions, our usable water supply is limited. I remember when U.S. Public Health Service employees examined our water supply and found, in amazement, that many of the streams within the State were polluted with glacial flour. This type of pollution could and does impede the usability of other Alaskan streams.

I doubt if the extent of Alaska's ground water resources will be known in even the near future. Possibly the State will depend upon its surface waters for most of its water requirements, but certainly these questions cannot be answered until the proper research has determined some of the answers.

In years ahead Alaska will have the industry it seeks today. It will have the investment capital so needed today. It will have increased population. And it will have all the problems these improvements bring.

Dr. William R. Wood, president of the University of Alaska, has examined S. 2 as have members of his faculty. They strongly support this proposed legislation. They believe, as do I, that the program envisaged will complement the work of the U.S. Public Health Service in the Arctic research program which is being developed in the 49th State.

Mr. President, many groups have testified in support of S. 2. I will not attempt to relate their findings in detail, but I do want to mention the statement of Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, director of the League of Women Voters of the United States, who said:

> Efficient utilization and protection of our water supply is so important to national well-being that we think the Federal Government has a responsibility to encourage research in this field, research the need for which has been supported by many eminent scientists and politicians.

The League of Women Voters is nonpolitical. The league does a good job in presenting the pros and cons of important issues to its membership, and it does a responsible job. I applaud the work of the league in the important area of water conservation, and I urge the favorable enactment of this legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this amendment directly poses the question of whether the paramount authority is in the Federal Government or the local institutions or centers. It happens that Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, and the Bureau of the Budget, supported an exactly opposite position to that being proposed by the Senator from Colorado. They sought greater Federal authority.

The Hatch Act and this bill both contain sections providing that nothing within the act shall change the relationship between colleges or universities and their States. This act carries that language. The States are jealous of their prerogatives. They should not be overridden. But there must be some Federal participation in decisions.

A good many years ago, perhaps in 1945 and 1946 and 1947, the senior Senator from New Mexico worked on an agricultural research bill, which was adopted in 1947. We found at that time, by using a punchcard system, that literally millions of dollars was being spent on projects by States who had no idea that their neighboring States were spending money on similar projects.

We had the problem of dye affecting cotton, not only in the rain belt, but also in other places. Research laboratories were working on the problem of how dye worked on cotton grown in desert areas. My State was one of those States. They included New Mexico, Arizona, and California. We were dealing with irrigation cotton, and found that this problem existed there.

These various agencies were not working together, but independently.

As a result of the passage of the Agricultural Research Act of 1947 we were able better to program the money appropriated. We did not interfere with the State programs. We called their attention to what was going on in other areas to solve this problem, and in the solution of which they could participate.

The Hatch Act has been on the books for a long time. By using the language of the Hatch Act in S. 2, we attempt to carry over to the water field the same mutually satisfactory relationship which exists in the agricultural field, which involves a sharing in the decisions as to "advisability" of projects and policies rather than a sharp granting of ultimate authority to one side or the other.

I know that some feel it is advisable to grant this final authority to the States. I believe it would be preferable to have the States and Nation work together, as they have done under the Hatch Act. Furthermore, I do not know of any objection being made to our proposal by any land-grant colleges.

We have not stopped any land-grant college by the exercise of blind authority here in Washington.

There are many examples of how this has worked. The language in the bill is a compromise between two extremes. We have, as Dr. Edwin West Allen has said, set forth a "unique example of national administration in which influence, rather than coercion, is the policy."

That is what should exist. That is why I find myself unable to accept the amendment.

We have had a long history in this field.

This matter has been under the administration of many Secretaries of Agriculture. So far as I know, no land-grant college has ever objected to it, and no land-grant college has suggested that this proposed change should be made. We worked up this bill with the people from land-grant colleges to be sure they were satisfied. As I have said, no land-grant college has suggested that this change should be made. They are satisfied with the way the Hatch Act has worked. They are satisfied with our language in the water resources bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I had considerable difficulty in hearing the Senator from New Mexico because of the noise in the Chamber. However, I should like to say that his arguments in behalf of his position are not persuasive, to me, at least. They add up to one thing, that we are drafting a bill which is purposely vague, and we are being vague because we do not want to be tied down.

Congress has taken similar action many times, and far too many times in the past few years. Citing the Hatch Act is somewhat analogous, but not completely, because we are dealing here with completely different areas, the areas of water. I believe we have a different type of problem to deal with.

All I want is to be sure of what we are doing when we write this particular sentence:

> It shall be the duty of each such institute or center to plan and conduct—

This refers to colleges—

> as may in each case be deemed advisable—

And so forth. All I wish is to have language set out in the bill so that we know, from reading the act, who is going to decide whether the action is advisable or not.

If the author of the bill wants the Secretary of the Interior to be the judge of that, let us say so in the bill. I do not want him to be the judge of that. Neither do I want to leave it so vague that the Secretary of the Interior may, by a temporary or permanent withholding of funds, put enough pressure on one or another of the land-grant colleges, so as to dictate the kind of research in water that is going on at a land-grant college.

I spoke at some length yesterday about the importance of the kind of research provided for. It is important. It is particularly important to our States in the West at this particular time. As we progress along in this century, it will be important to every State in the country, except perhaps Alaska, which is not going to be hard pressed on its water problems for some time, and every State will be under the necessity of taking action.

My argument boils down to this: Let us put in the bill what we mean. If we mean that we want the Secretary of the Interior to make the decision, let us put that language in the bill. If we mean that we believe, as I believe, that our land-grant colleges can do a better job of determining the direction of our water research than can the Secretary of the Interior, then let us follow that plan, as I have suggested, that it be left to the decision of the institute or center which has done the job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have a quorum call without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I cannot help agreeing in theory with many of the statements made by the Senator from Colorado. I merely point out that I base my objection to the amendment on the actual operation of the Hatch Act, which is the principal act under which agricultural land-grant colleges have cooperated with the Department of Agriculture. I have never known an instance when the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges have found themselves in really serious opposition on this question. I should like to continue the same basically friendly, cooperative arrangement with the land-grant colleges, and I believe the proposal will work out in that way. I know that the Secretaries of Agriculture, without exception, have cooperated with the land-grant colleges. I hope that the Secretary of the Interior, whoever he may be, will have the same good sense to do so. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a typographical error on page 4, line 23. The first word in line 23 should be "been" instead of "them." The error was made in the printing of the final document. I ask unanimous consent that the first word in line 23, page 4, be changed from "them" to "been."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered 49 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 10, beginning at line 7, it is proposed to strike out all through line 20.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to clear away any fuzziness or haziness with respect to the language of the bill. On page 10, line 7, the bill provides:

> Sec. 302. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish in the Department of the Interior a Water Resources Service for the purpose of administering programs authorized in this Act.

The subsequent section, section 303, provides, in part:

> The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to employ a director of the Water Resources Service at civil service grade 18 and, if necessary to obtain personnel competent to administer a program involving scientific knowledge and highly trained staffs, he may employ not to exceed five employees above civil service grade 15 in addition to the number otherwise authorized by law.

The purpose of the amendment is to strike out section 302, which provides for the establishment of a new agency within the Department of the Interior. It also would strike the proviso for the personnel which would staff the proposed agency.

Rarely do I have the support for an amendment which I have for this particular amendment; but I do have good support for it. I refer Senators to page 23 of the report, which was written by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson]. I shall read in part from a letter written by Philip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, to the then chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson]:

> Finally, we believe that provisions of title III with respect to establishment of a Water Resources Service within the Department of the Interior are unnecessary and undesirable. The Secretary of the Interior now has adequate reorganization authority to take future action if and when he so decides. Furthermore, in view of the general authorization provided in the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, special personnel provisions should not be required to staff new constituents of the Department.

That is the position taken by the Bureau of the Budget in its letter to the former chairman of the committee. I believe that in this day and age it is undesirable to continue to add agencies and bureaus to the Department of the Interior. If the Department, with its thousands and thousands of employees, cannot administer a program such as that envisaged by the bill without adding a new agency within the Department, then it had better take a good look at its own organization and do some needed reorganizing. I believe that the Department of the Interior can perform this function with personnel which is either available or can be made available for this work.

I hope the amendment will be accepted, although I have had no indication from the Senator from New Mexico concerning his intentions.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The Bureau of the Budget, in its reports on S. 3579 and S. 2, recommended the deletion of what are now sections 302 and 303 of S. 2, authorizing a Water Resources Service in the Department of the Interior and five extra-grade jobs for the administration of the water resources research program. This is what amendment 49 would do.

The Bureau of the Budget assures that the Secretary of the Interior has adequate authority to establish such a service, and states that there is sufficient authorization of super-grade jobs in the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962 so the special provision is not required to provide adequate competent staff.

It is important that we have a single, broadly based, independent office in the

Department of the Interior to direct this new program.

The Select Committee on National Water Resources pointed out that many sciences, or disciplines, are involved in the solution of our water problems and urged a broadly based approach to them. The Water Resources Committee of the National Academy of Sciences called for a multidisciplinary approach to water research, and the training of hydroscientists with a broad understanding of the many sciences involved. This was also emphasized in the report of the Council for Science and Technology.

There will be both internal and external pressures to assign this new program to one, or several, existing agencies. Each has a limited mission in the water field. They would quite naturally incline any program they can capture toward their own mission. I am not critical of the existing agencies, for if they are worth their salt, they miss no opportunities.

The external pressure to segment the program among several mission-oriented agencies is exemplified in the chamber of commerce recommendation that:

> Existing bureaus or services within the Department of the Interior should be assigned the responsibility of administering the program that would be authorized by this legislation.

Such fragmentation would, of course, be a serious mistake. Colleges, universities, and other research agencies would have to shop among the limited-objective agencies with research projects. The multidisciplinary approach we seek would not be attained.

It is equally important that the new agency have a highly competent staff. There is no activity where results from an investment is more directly related to the competence of the men who run the program than in research.

I am reluctant to insist upon statutory provision for a particular service, or office, in the executive branch. The Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch recommended that organizational structure of the various departments be left to the Secretaries. Congress has gone along with that recommendation.

In view of this precedent, and the assurance that has been given that there will be a competently staffed independent office under existing authorities—I will accept the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

I will yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from Colorado will yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his willingness to accept the amendment. I believe the amendment is in the best interests of all concerned.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read. The amendment has not been printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 7, line 7, after "ascertain," it is proposed to insert "whether the requirements of section 101 have been met."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the language of this paragraph has bothered me considerably. I have not been quite certain as to how to attack this particular question. On page 7, commencing with line 5, the bill reads:

> On or before the 1st day of July in each year after the passage of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall ascertain as to each State whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriations for water resources research under section 100(a) of this Act and the amount which thereupon each is entitled, respectively, to receive.

What bothers me is that the Secretary of the Interior is required to determine two things: First, he must determine whether any State is entitled to receive its share; and second, the amount.

The language of my amendment would really place in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior the power to decide whether a land-grant college will receive money; and second, the amount it will receive.

Particularly in view of the fact that in connection with the amendment I offered a few minutes ago—that in regard to who would determine the type of research to be carried on—the Senate purposely decided, I say, to leave this matter vague, therefore I believe it wise that we try to pin down, on page 7, whether we are going to leave in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, without adequate safeguards, the power to determine whether the colleges will get these funds and the amounts they will get.

My amendment simply inserts in line 7, after the word "ascertain," the following: "whether the requirements of section 101 have been met."

That will subject the Secretary of the Interior to the use of definite criteria for the determination of whether the money shall be given to the colleges, and in what amounts it shall be given. In my opinion, the amendment will greatly strengthen the bill. It will protect the land-grant colleges, and will assure them that there will be definite guidelines—those set out in section 101—which must be followed before the Secretary can determine whether they are entitled to receive the money, and in what amounts.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator from Colorado that the amendment takes me a little by surprise, for I did not have a chance to study its language.

I state frankly that I do not know what position I would take in conference, after having a chance to study the amendment. However, on first glance, the language appears to be satisfactory.

So I am inclined to accept the amendment; but I hope the Senator from Colorado will not hold me to insisting on the amendment after we get into conference and confer about the amendment with the other conferees.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico. As he knows, I have been worrying about this provision; but until now I have not been able to draw up the necessary language. I think he recognizes, as I do, that a problem does exist.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, before I yield back the remainder of the time available to me, let me say that I had some language drawn up, as follows:

> When it shall appear to the Secretary of the Interior from the annual statement of receipts and expenditures that any portion of the preceding annual appropriation allotted to a State institute or center under this act remained unexpended at the end of the fiscal year, such amount shall be deducted from the next subsequent annual allotment made to the State concerned.

I am told that such a provision is unnecessary, because the Appropriations Committee will do that very thing. I thought that was what the Senator from Colorado was aiming at.

However, I believe the amendment he proposes is satisfactory; and I will accept it, and hope it will be adopted.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). All remaining time on the amendment is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 53, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 11 beginning at line 3, it is proposed to strike all through line 13, and to insert in lieu thereof:

> Sec. 305. Within two years following enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Senate and House of Representatives a comprehensive report on progress and accomplishments under the Act, together with his recommendations on revisions of the Act, and with the independent recommendations of the governing authorities of the State colleges and universities on desirable revisions.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, we may be able to accomplish a little here. The amendment is a very simple one. It provides that section 305 be amended so that within 2 years after the enactment of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare, and shall submit to the President, for transmittal to Congress, "a comprehensive report on progress and accomplishments under the act."

The original bill provides that shall be done within 6 years. I think that is too long a time for us to wait to find out what progress is being made under this open end authorization. So it is my purpose to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall make the report within 2 years.

I am told that the objection to the amendment is that the program will not proceed that rapidly. I realize that it will not proceed overnight. However, although we may be able to wait 1 year to see how the program is going, I certainly think that by the end of the second year it should be possible for the Secretary of the Interior to report to us in regard to how the program is going, what progress is being made, what amounts are being spent, what research is being done, and where the research is being done, so that Congress will have a comprehensive picture in regard to all such matters.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me on this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not particularly like the amendment, because many of the State legislatures will not meet for 2 years; and, therefore, the only report the Secretary could make would be that nothing had happened. On the other hand, there would be States as to which he could report what was happening.

I am not opposed to having the reports made. The Secretary of the Interior will have to report. If the Senator from Colorado insists on his amendment, I shall accept it. I say frankly that 2 years is a very short period of time for the land-grant colleges to get tooled up and be able to report. My colleague from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] is well acquainted with our State's land-grant college and its president. He and I frequently visit it. It is a fine institution; it has a fine president; and it has a fine faculty and a fine program. But it cannot get tooled up on this program within 2 years. Therefore, a report would be that in less than 2 years nothing significant had been done.

I want the reports made regularly and I want Congress to know all about the work being done and all about the program; and I find that I cannot maintain my desire to have the reports made and still oppose this amendment. Therefore, if the Senator from Colorado insists upon the amendment, I shall accept it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 3 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from New Mexico that I did not offer the amendment facetiously.

Mr. ANDERSON. I realize that.

Mr. ALLOTT. As the Senator from New Mexico has said, I realize that some of the State legislatures will not meet for 2 years. On the other hand, many of the State legislatures are now considering this matter, and many of the legislatures meet each year. Certainly by the end of 2 years the report should be made.

So I am happy to have the Senator from New Mexico accept the amendment; and I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 53 of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, beginning at line 9, it is proposed to strike all through line 19, and to insert in lieu thereof:

> SEC. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1964, and in each of four fiscal years thereafter, from which he may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with recipients such as educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions; with private firms and individuals; and with local, State, or Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems indigenous to the area where such recipient is located and not otherwise being studied.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I can discuss the amendment in the same context as I would two other amendments that I have offered. One relates to section 100(a) and the other relates to section 100(b).

Section 200, to which the amendment relates, should be in the RECORD at this point, so I shall read it:

> SEC. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1964, increasing $1,000,000, annually for five years, and continuing at $10,000,000 annually thereafter from which he may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions; with private firms and individuals; and with local, State, or Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior, which may be deemed desirable and are not otherwise being studied.

My amendment provides as follows:

> SEC. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1964, and in each of four fiscal years thereafter—

Otherwise, the limitations of the section remain the same.

What is the basic difference between the amendment and the bill? There are two simple, basic differences. First, we would give the Secretary of the Interior, not $10 million at this time, but $5 million. We would give him $5 million for undertaking research, grants, and matching research grants with private funds and individuals and, in fact, with anyone with whom the Secretary might wish to make a contract.

This sort of thing has gone pretty far. We are now at the place at which any activity which has the word "research" tacked onto it can receive almost any amount of money that is needed. I have seen all sorts of activities entitled "research" which required no more ability or energy than a man with an adding machine and a pair of eyes with which to read.

The issues are as follows:

First, we would reduce the amount authorized from $10 to $15 milllion.

Second, as written, the bill would be an open end authorization. We would start at $5 million, adding $1 million a year until we reached $10 million, and then we would authorize the appropriation of $10 million, not for 1 year, not for 5 years, and not for 10 years, but forever.

Research into water problems is a sensitive area. It is extremely important to some of us. But as a principle of legislation I do not believe that there should be an open end authorization in this type of activity.

I said yesterday, and I repeat today, that I believe the best results from any provision of the bill will come not from the Department of the Interior or any contract that it might make, but from the work which is done by those in our land-grant colleges who are skilled in water research matters. The bill would provide an open end authorization, until Congress should decide to act otherwise, authorizing the sum of $10 million, starting with the sum of $5 million for the first year, and increasing by $1 million each year for 4 years thereafter to $10 million, and from then on the authorization would be $10 million a year.

We shall receive reports. I believe that the best way to approach the question of research is to limit the time that we would appropriate the money. At the end of 5 years, if the program is paying off in real research and accomplishments, we shall have no trouble in Congress in passing another authorization bill, not for $10 million, but for $20 million, if that amount is needed. If the population explosion continues, and pressure is exerted against the people who require water, it will have to be obtained, no matter what the cost. So let us take a look at the program.

This is an argument of sound reasoning. Let us authorize an appropriation of $5 million to the Secretary of the Interior for 5 years, and at the end of 5 years let us examine the situation and decide what we want to do. I am sure that if the money is used wisely and if the research program pays off, there will be no difficulty in passing a new authorization bill.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

As the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, the amendment would do three major things:

First, it would reduce the title II program to a straight $5 million a year;

second, it would terminate the program in 5 years; and third, it would change the limitation on research projects from water problems "related to the mission of the Department of the Interior" to problems "indigenous to the area where such recipient is located."

I cannot accept the amendment because of the damage it would do to the bill. All three of the changes would have extremely undesirable results.

First, water resource problems are so pressing and urgent, and the need for training hydrosciences so great, that no one has previously questioned the sums provided in S. 2. This includes the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which has stated in a letter to committee members:

> Additional research, investigations and experiments in the field of water and related resources are needed to help meet the water demands of future generations. The training of additional scientists to conduct such activity is vital. The stimulation of more effective research at industrial, State and local levels and the training of additional scientists by the State and other agencies are the most satisfactory methods of achieving greater knowledge about water because they would minimize unwarranted Federal research activity * * *.

The chamber did recommend amendments—but a reduction in the sums proposed in S. 2 was not suggested.

It is anticipated that a large portion of S. 2 funds will be matched. The appropriations authorized in S. 2 were set at a modest original level, moving upward for 4 or 5 years to keep pace with available matching funds. The appropriation of a flat sum for 5 years will deter and put a lid on the potential flow of matching funds. In agricultural research, matching funds very considerably exceed Federal appropriations.

Therefore, I must oppose the amendment on that basis.

Second, the inclusion of a termination provision in the bill would kill its most important value.

As evidence in support of that point, I shall read a portion of a letter which I received from Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo., dated April 18, 1963. It is a letter from the president of the college, commenting on chamber of commerce suggestions, in which he said:

> The proposal to put a termination date on section 100 programs would defeat the very purpose of the bill. Sections 104 and 305 insure periodic review of the programs. Surely these requirements plus the continuing concern of the Congress as it considers appropriations annually will provide ample safeguard against deterioration of value of the research undertaken by section 100 funds.
>
> Further, colleges and universities cannot afford to build and equip laboratories and rearrange curricula to accommodate a short-term program. Top scientists in disciplines related to water resources—physics, engineering, geology, botany, silviculture, meteorology, economics and many others—are not easily persuaded to specialize in water problems if there is the threat of early termination of the principal program in the field. They look for specialties in which they may find a lifetime career. Neither can students be persuaded to spend many years in graduate training for work which may be stopped before they complete their training. The assurance of continuity which S. 2 provides is one of the basic strengths of the bill. Provision is made at section 305 for a comprehensive review at the end of 5 years. Congress can itself review the results of the program whenever it deems it appropriate. The adoption of this suggestion would, in our judgment, be especially injurious to the bill.

Dr. Morgan is as right as he can be in his appraisal of the proposal. I think it would completely kill the bill.

Colleges and universities cannot tool-up—they cannot afford to build and equip laboratories, for a short-term program. Faculty members looking for a field in which to specialize are not looking for an odd-job business, but something in which they will find a lifetime career, worth years of study and preparation. Students would not spend years in training for work that may be terminated before they graduate. Congress may review and reenact the program.

The bill provides for a 5-year review, and we have amended that to 2 years. But schools and scientists are not going to commit their assets and their lives to a program authorized on a short-term basis.

S. 2 originally handled the situation by providing at section 305 that within 1 year after the 5th year of operation, the Secretary of the Interior shall make a review report and submit it to the President and Congress, together with the independent views of college and university heads. Those are to start in 2 years now.

Reviews will be made. Everyone is under notice that results are expected. But there is no threat of termination in S. 2 and there should not be. Water problems will be with us for a long time to come and we must have a water research program just as long as water is necessary to human existence on the planet.

Therefore, because of this second provision I must oppose the amendment.

The limitation of research projects to "mission of the Department of Interior" was to keep, and to reassure other Federal departments that the Department of Interior would be kept, in its own water fields. That is needed and should not be stricken from the bill.

The substitute limiting phrase, "indigenous to the area where such recipient is located" would have a very serious effect.

The phrase has a definite implication that the local agencies are to work on the practical problems in their locality. Perhaps some will involve basic research, but the whole pressure of the phrase will be away from fundamentals toward practical research.

This tendency became a serious problem at one period in the development of the agricultural research program and led to the enactment of the Adams Act of 1904, broadening the language of the original act and providing an extra $15,000 annually of funds. Federal Director A. C. True of the Office of Experiment Stations wrote, in 1902:

> Under present conditions it is useless to expect that * * * our stations will discover many of the new principles on which permanent improvement of our agriculture must rest. But unless the way is opened for them to seriously attack these fundamental problems their future work will necessarily be comparatively fragmentary and inconclusive. They may, as in the past obtain many results which can usefully be applied in practice, but they will not be able to furnish solid foundations for the enlargement of our agricultural industries.

Harvard University is doing a tremendously big job of setting up a computer system to analyze multiple-purpose river basin plans, and thereby speed the adoption of plans that maximize benefits. Once perfected, the computer system could be used over and over at Harvard for the many river basins of the Nation—but not if Harvard were limited to work indigenous to its area.

The Corps of Army Engineers has a big experimental laboratory at Vicksburg which builds scale models of dams, spillways, and even rivers to test engineering plans and dam designs. They have a model of the Mississippi River, of New York Harbor, and dams to be built all over the Nation. They could not concentrate in this one station—at great savings—this sort of research and experimental work if limited to problems "indigenous to the area."

The scientists now tell us that Texas droughts are the result of the fact that storms which develop in the Aleutians and Bay of Alaska and sweep south to cross the United States from east to west, remain too far north for an extended period to cause rainfall in the Lone Star State. They are studying ways to coax these storms, or major weathermakers, to go over areas where water is needed. The problem becomes how Texas—and New Mexico—can do research on weather problems of utmost importance to the Southern States up in Alaska, or Montana.

These examples are not necessarily in the fields with which Interior Department could or should concern itself, but they illustrate the danger of the "indigenous problems" limitation proposed by the amendment.

I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, which has been under discussion.

By way of preface I wish to say that I am a cosponsor of the measure. I spoke at length upon it here on the Senate floor and I testified before the committee in favor of the bill.

I again congratulate and commend the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for the splendid job which has been done on the bill. It is a constructive piece of legislation. It follows a proven procedure and will prove to be easily workable.

I do endorse the legislative principle involved here, which is to have as important a piece of legislation as this returned to the Congress periodically, not for affirmative action, but for review and reconsideration, so that we may make such changes as may be indicated after 4 or 5 years of experience.

I think that would have a salutary effect upon those who are granted funds to administer this bill. It would make them a little more alert. It would cause them to be more vigilant and more determined to develop proper programs, and more responsive in their efforts to get from their programs the maximum benefit.

It is just good legislative procedure, it seems to me, to provide for congressional review.

The point has been raised that it is necessary to have a permanent program. Otherwise, it is contended, technicians and faculty would not agree to commit themselves to something that is not assured to last forever and a day. It seems to me there is nothing in the provision for a 5-year review which would militate against the permanence of this kind of work for teachers, professors, or technicians. While they may not be pursuing their work under the particular auspices set up by this bill, there is in this country, and there will continue to be, wide demand for that type of development and achievement.

I wish to say again that the legislation is good. It is sound, and it should be approved. But I think it would be improved if we added an amendment, providing for review by the Congress, which would follow if the Allott amendment were adopted. I hope it will be.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his support of the amendment. I am sure everyone in this body is aware of the great sincerity with which he approaches this type of problem. His own State is as aware of water problems as my own.

I can see that there are persons who want to see the present provision for the money kept in the legislation and see it go on and on, but it seems to me that as legislators the only sensible thing we can do is place this legislation in a position where we know Congress is going to have a review.

It is estimated that there will be 250 million people in this country before 1970. The pressures for an adequate supply of water are going to get greater and greater all the time. The problem is not going to be solved overnight. Of all the problems we have, the problem of water is probably going to be the greatest and the one which is going to be with us the longest. It may get worse. There may come a time when people may have to move to other places, and perhaps outside the bounds of this country, in order to find water. I do not know. Nobody can foresee. But one thing is sure, and that is that the pressures for water use are going to increase, and we are going to have to make better use of that commodity.

With such a situation facing us, nobody under heaven could keep the research program from being continued 5 years from now, if the research people made good use of the money appropriated, if the money was used correctly, if real research was being performed, and not merely a bunch of boondoggling contracts. If research was being done, there is no question that the law would be reenacted. Let us provide legislation so that Congress can reevaluate it at the end of 5 years, instead of starting off on a program that will go on and on, and, by reason of the fact that it will go on and on, Congress would have to repeal the law in order to do anything about it. We should limit the law now, rather than later.

I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico proposes to speak further at this time.

I yield to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] 3 minutes.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Colorado. It is a worthwhile amendment. I am sure if the money is spent wisely, under the amendment before the Senate, Congress will continue the program and reenact this legislation.

As a cosponsor of S. 2, I am pleased and privileged to give wholehearted endorsement to this important proposal. It is a measure that has been carefully studied and drafted to cope significantly with a national problem.

S. 2 is designed to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research. The bill authorizes funds starting at $75,000, and increasing to $100,000 annually, to a land-grant institution of each State for a water research center. In addition, other appropriations would be authorized to match State funds and to provide the Secretary of the Interior with money for expanded water research.

Exhaustive studies have amply confirmed the acuteness of water supply needs. We are facing, not a theoretical problem, but a real and growing crisis across the Nation. Projections of available water resources and anticipated needs in the coming decades underscore the already developing seriousness of water shortages in many areas today. They foretell a far grimmer picture for the future.

So we are not discussing now the reasons for this legislation. The need for it is plain for all to see; the record is clear on this score. We are, or should be, concerned more with the means and methods for achieving the broad purpose of S. 2: to assure an abundance of water, both in quantity and quality. The question is, to help achieve this end, How can we best stimulate research, investigations, and experimentation in the field and also encourage the training of needed scientists through assistance to colleges and universities?

S. 2 is soundly patterned after the very successful agricultural experiment station program, the Hatch Act of 1887. The outstanding results of this time-tested program enhance the desirability of having land-grant institutions administer water resources research, as provided in S. 2. Through this Federal-State approach, needed Federal support can be made available for water research by land-grant institutions, and other designated research institutions—research that would be responsive to both local and national needs.

Speaking for the State of Hawaii, I can state emphatically that we place great importance upon water research. Like the Nation as a whole, Hawaii has experienced an increase in demand for water from the greater per capita demand as well as the greater number of people. We are intensifying our efforts to expand and diversify our island economy. Both urban and suburban development, and the agricultural potential of Hawaii, will depend heavily upon our ability to increase and conserve our water resources.

Dr. Thomas Hamilton, president of the University of Hawaii, has described our water research needs as pressing and requiring local research. We have been limited by lack of funds rather than by lack of interest or lack of problems to work on, according to Dr. W. J. Holmes, dean of the University of Hawaii, College of Engineering. Dean Holmes points in Hawaii's problem when he states:

> If anything serious happens to our basal water supply, the population that Hawaii can support will be most seriously reduced.

There are other facets of a total water research program beyond that encompassed by S. 2, but this bill goes far toward coming to grips with a national problem.

Time is on our side if we move aggressively toward the objective set forth in S. 2. I urge my colleagues to act promptly and decisively to approve this important measure.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the able senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I find it somewhat difficult to oppose the pending amendment, for I think, as a general rule, the Congress of the United States ought, by the type of legislation it writes, provide for periodic scrutiny of the intent for which legislation is passed and the manner in which the administrative or executive branch in the Government has performed its duty.

In this instance, however, I make an exception. I come from a State which I think deserves the applause of the people of the country for what it has done to try to set its own house in order with respect to an adequate water supply. California does not have within its borders sufficient water to meet its growing needs. The people of my State at the local level and at the State level have sought to remedy this deficit. Two years ago, the people of California bonded themselves in a statewide election for the first phase of the State water plan for an extraordinary amount of money, some $1,750 million.

There has hardly been a year when I have not come before the Senate asking for additional assistance in an effort to help the people of my State, now and hereafter, to have a continuing water supply. True, the money is repayable into the U.S. Treasury by the water users.

The outlook for an adequate supply of water is somewhat bleak. Here we not only have an opportunity to enlist the aid of educational institutions in all 50 States, but, as was said by one of our State's leading educational and research administrators who testified before our committee on behalf of the University of California, it is quite possible that breakthroughs with respect to the problems of an adequate supply of water could take place in your State, Mr. President, or in one of the Eastern States, where the problem of an adequate water supply is not so acute.

I believe, therefore, in this instance, if I make a mistake, I wish to make a mistake on the side of giving the educational institutions of America a greater opportunity to study and to conduct research and to try to find ways and means by which potable water in this country can cope with the population explosion which we face in the days to come.

Therefore, having placed my name on the bill as a coauthor, and having been very glad to accept some of the amendments that have been offered by my very able colleague in the Senate from Colorado, in this instance I feel that by remaining silent I would not discharge my duty if I did not say to the Members of the Senate that I believe the continuing policy of the Government of the United States as enunciated in the proposed legislation is in the public interest. For that reason I must oppose the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that under the terms of the bill the Secretary of the Interior will have to return to Congress every year for an evaluation. The Senator from Nebraska said that he should return to Congress for an authorization. He will have to do so, in effect, at every appropriation hearing.

We know what would have happened if Congress, when it passed the Hatch Act of 1877, had written in a provision for the filing of a report every 5 years. Does anyone undertake to say how long it would have been before someone would have come in with an antidiscrimination rider and destroyed that act, as they have destroyed housing?

The Hatch Act was originally drawn to permit schools to do experimental work as long as they were doing useful work.

Reference was made to boondoggling contracts. I have examined hundreds of contracts in person—perhaps thousands of them—submitted by land-grant colleges, and I have never seen one boondoggle contract of a land-grant college.

The Senator from Colorado has referred to Chancellor Aldrich, of the University of California, who testified before our committee in favor of the very things that we propose. I should like to read from a letter which has been sent to me by the president of the University of Florida, Dr. J. Wayne Reitz. He wrote to me on April 15, 1963. He says, in connection with amendments to be proposed by the chamber of commerce, including the very amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado:

> 3. It is suggested by the chamber of commerce that title I should provide a definite termination date of the program of annual grants of funds to the States. Here again the basic assumption is made in S. 2 that water research is going to be a continuing and increasingly important area of investigation if we are to meet the needs of our ever-growing population for personal as well as agricultural and industrial consumption. To establish a definite termination date would mitigate against a State developing sound and farsighted programs of research in this important field. Had termination dates been provided for agricultural research we would never have made the progress that has been made.

I agree with him a thousand percent.

Then, at the end of the letter he says:

> I fear that the chamber of commerce in attempting to amend the bill is in effect trying to kill it, notwithstanding its announced support. Certainly if the bill were amended as suggested by the chamber it would be so far from the mark that it might as well be killed.

I appeal to the Senate not to destroy a longstanding piece of work, of negotiations between land-grant colleges, and departments of Government and Congress, because it may well result in killing a good bill that would work. I believe it would be a workable act. These people would have to come back regularly for appropriations. There would be provision for review, just as there is now provision for review under the Hatch Act, which has stood since 1877.

I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for his remarks. Both he and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska realize the importance of the bill, and are cosponsors of it. Therefore, their support of the principles of the bill and the principles of my amendment are indeed encouraging.

I particularly wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, because we are prone to think of the State of Hawaii as one of those lush paradises in which water is never a problem. Yet of my own personal knowledge I know that that distinguished Senator from Hawaii carried through in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and also through the Senate, and through the Congress, a reclamation project which will add greatly to the total agricultural wealth of Hawaii, and enable it to stabilize its agricultural economy.

Few people could see the necessity of this in a place like Hawaii, because their ideas are entirely different. However, as the result of his foresight and his thinking, the agricultural economy of one area of his State is going to be stabilized by more advantageous use of water.

I should like to say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico, first, that he has taken two things out of context in my remarks; at least there is the implication that they are out of context. I wish to get the record straight about that first. He quoted from a letter from Dr. Morgan, who is the very capable and distinguished head of our Colorado State University. In that letter, Dr. Morgan referred to the program under section 100.

The amendment I am proposing has nothing whatever to do with section 100. It has nothing to do with grants to land-grant colleges. Let us make that clear. That problem does not exist.

The Senator from New Mexico also said that we should never consent to a land grant college boondoggling on its research grants. No one on this floor has said that they did. Since I am the only one that I know of who has used the word "boondoggle" on the floor in the last hour or two, I must separate the word "boondoggle" from anything having to do with land-grant colleges.

However, I am not afraid to say on the floor of the Senate that we have department after department in the Government of the United States who are boondoggling with so-called research contracts.

I documented that on the floor of the Senate last year. I documented one instance in which the National Science Foundation had done just such a thing, and had made a hopeless shambles out of what should have been one of the great primary basic research projects of this age.

I shall document it again within the next week on the floor of the Senate, to show exactly what is happening. It is no secret any longer that the National Institutes of Health have so far outgrown so-called research programs, that many of them would be strained to have them called research programs.

A man with a pencil or an adding machine could do most of the research involved, so far as most of it being carried on in this country is concerned. When I see research being carried on by research teams, under the National Institutes of Health with respect to small indigenous tribes, I wonder what we are spending our money for, especially when we are chalked up with a $12 billion deficit this year. I want to keep the record straight.

I am sure the Senator from New Mexico did not mean to imply that I thought colleges were boondoggling. However, I wish to make it perfectly clear that in my references I meant to say that I do not have the confidence in the Secretary of the Interior that I have in our colleges and universities throughout the country so far as conducting research in water is concerned.

Perhaps the Senators are ready to give the Secretary of the Interior $5 or $10 million forever in the hope that he will conduct a meaningful research program. I am not willing to do so. I do not have that much confidence in the present Secretary of the Interior, and I doubt whether I would have that much confidence in any Secretary of the Interior.

The statement has been made in the Senate that Congress would review the program when appropriations for it were under consideration. But the review should not be made by the Committee on Appropriations; it should be made by those who, day after day, year after year, work in the areas of water resources, land utilization, reclamation and conservation, in the legislative committee, which is the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That is the committee in which policy should be made as to whether this program shall be continued forever and ever, ad infinitum, or whether it should be limited. If that is not a reasonable suggestion, then I know of no suggestion that could be reasonable.

Congress should place a limitation on the amount of money which the Secretary of the Interior can contract with land-grant colleges for research, or so-called research. Therefore, I have suggested that the amount be limited to $5 million, and the duration of the act be limited to 5 years. I believe that is a wholly reasonable suggestion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call not to be charged to either side.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico is prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available to him on the amendment, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available to me, inasmuch as I have not received requests for further time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I do likewise.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 60 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—61

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—9

Beall
Bible
Dodd
Humphrey
Jordan, N.C.
Kefauver
Magnuson
McClellan
Morton

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "$1,000,000" each time it appears and insert in each case "$800,000".

On page 3, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000".

On page 8, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000".

On page 8, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$800,000".

On page 8, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000".

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the amendments would merely reduce the authorizations, with the exception of the authorization for land-grant colleges, by 20 percent, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

How much time does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to himself?

Mr. COTTON. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the amendments considered en bloc would merely reduce by 20 percent—by one-fifth—the authorization in the bill, with the exception of the authorization for research in the case of land-grant colleges. They would not in any other respect affect the planning, the term, or the bill.

On a long-term basis S. 2 would authorize a $20-million-a-year program of water research activities under the supervision of the Department of the Interior. The amendments would reduce the total scope of the program to $17 million a year on the long-term basis, and make corresponding reductions in the earlier phases of the program.

There are several reasons for the amendment:

First, this is a new program. The extent of State participation, the ability of the States to finance additional water research, and the availability of research personnel are all relatively unknown factors at this time. A modest reduction such as this proposal will not thwart the program, nor will it hamper it in any way.

I ask the attention of Senators especially to the following point:

Second, the Federal Government is already spending sizable sums on water research. The Federal Council for Science and Technology has calculated that eight major agencies of the Federal Government are already engaged in this research. They are: Agriculture, Commerce, Defense—chiefly Corps of Engineers—HEW, Interior, AEC, National Science Foundation, and TVA. In fiscal 1963, these Federal water research programs will involve expenditures of more than $66 million, and the budget requests for fiscal 1964 exceed $74 million. Thus a modest cut in the amounts in S. 2 will not reduce the Government's efforts in this field, but only slow down the rate of increase by a small amount. Its chief effect would be simply to channel the research efforts into the most important and most productive fields.

Mr. President, this is a good bill. The purpose of the bill is good. It has long been the position of the Senator from New Hampshire that our water resources and our water supplies represent the unfinished business of our generation.

Simply because we in my section of the country are not faced with quite the same emergency faced by other sections does not lessen my enthusiasm for this program, which is a thoroughly legitimate Federal activity.

But, Mr. President, the general fiscal and budget picture of the Government urgently demands at this time the utmost economy.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time the Senator yielded has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the committee in its report indicated it did not attempt to coordinate the activities; that that was to be left to the executive branch of the Government—and no doubt properly so.

We are conducting all these activities simultaneously. The bill would add a new one. I think the people of this country—who are watching with care the efforts of the Congress to show its disposition to hold down, so far as can be done without serious damage to vital programs, the authorizations for expenditures in the coming years—would look with favor upon this modest reduction.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COTTON. I yield with pleasure to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Since the amendment offered by the Senator is not printed, do I correctly understand the effect of the amendment would be not to cut the amounts to be available to land-grant colleges under section 100(a), but only to cut those amounts in subsection 100 (b) and section 200 which would go to the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Colorado is completely correct in his analysis of the amendment. I repeat that the amendment would leave untouched the authorization of amounts available for research for land-grant colleges. It would cut all along the line by 20 percent the other authorizations in the bill available to the Secretary of the Interior, and to be expended in accordance with the terms of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. With that answer I wish to tell the Senator I shall be much pleased to join him in his amendment, particularly since the Senate did not adopt the amendment offered a few minutes ago to limit the authorization to 5 years.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator for his support of my amendment. I am disappointed that the Senator's amendment was not agreed to; but this would be a more modest reduction, and I hope the Senate will act favorably upon it.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have no wish to detain the Senate on this amendment. It is a question of seeking to reduce a carefully worked out bill, a carefully worked out proposal, passed upon by educators all across the country. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished assistant majority leader [Mr. Humphrey]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 61 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Lausche
McIntyre
Mechem
Miller
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—58

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Beall
Bible
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Humphrey
Jordan, N.C.
Kefauver
Kuchel
Magnuson
McClellan
Morton

So Mr. Cotton's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed, on page 2, line 23, to change the period to a colon and add the following:

> *Provided*, That a State may designate both a college (or university) established in accordance with said Act approved July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503) and one or more other institutions of higher education for this purpose.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to make absolutely clear what the proponents of the bill intend. The way the bill reads now, it seems it could possibly be interpreted that a land-grant college could receive the program, or, if a land-grant college was not designated by a State, then one or more institutions of higher learning within the State could be determined upon by the State.

It seems to me we ought to leave it up to the State legislature whether it wanted to have both a land-grant college and one or more universities or institutions of higher learning in the State so designated. This amendment provides that a State will have that power.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator specify an instance of what he is referring to? Is there an institution in his State involved?

Mr. MILLER. This matter came to my attention as a result of information from one of the presidents of one of the institutions of higher learning in Iowa. In Iowa we happen to have a land-grant college which is no longer a college. It is now designated a State university. We also have the State University of Iowa. I would like to have the bill provide that discretion is given the State of Iowa as to whether it may wish to have this program carried on both at Iowa State at Ames and at the State University of Iowa at Iowa City.

I can see where other States might have a similar problem.

As I interpret the bill as it is now written, if it should be determined by the State that it should be Iowa State at Ames that will handle the program, then it cannot go into another institution of higher learning within the State.

The amendment will give the State that choice. I am quite sure the Senator from New Mexico would like a State to have that choice.

Mr. ANDERSON. We think the language of the bill is abundantly clear. But we want the Senator from Iowa to be satisfied. I know of the situation in

Iowa, having been a neighbor to that State for many years. I do not believe the amendment changes the intent of the bill.

Therefore, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and do so.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time for debate has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 55 which is offered by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. Beginning on page 5, strike all of section 103 and substitute in lieu thereof:

> Sec. 103. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 4152(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking the word "and" at the end of subparagraph (E) and by adding the following at the end of subparagraph (F): "and
>
> "(G) Any institute or center engaged in activities authorized by the Water Resources Research Act consisting of bulletins, reports, periodicals, reprints of articles, and other publications necessary for the dissemination or results of researches and experiments within the scope of the Act, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, mailed from the principal place of business of the institute or center, or from an established subunit of the same."

(b) Section 4156 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection (d) as follows:

> "(d) The Department of Interior shall transfer to the Post Office Department as postal revenue out of any appropriation made to it for that purpose the equivalent amount of postage, as determined by the Postmaster General, for penalty mailings under section 4152(a)(1)(G) of this title."

Mr. JOHNSTON. The only purpose of the amendment is to provide that the Postmaster General shall determine the amount of postage for penalty mail used under the terms of the bill, in the same way in which he now determines such postage. The bill provides a new item, and there is a possibility that the refund to the Post Office Department for penalty mail will not be included under the language of the bill as it now reads.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand that this involves merely a bookkeeping transaction, in reality. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. A bookkeeping matter between the two Departments. Penalty mail is involved already, but we feel that under the language of the bill the new penalty mail might not be considered in determining the total amount of penalty mail.

Mr. ANDERSON. For the sake of legislative history I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service if it is true that this does not involve the operation of the colleges themselves, or where the money is to go, or anything of that nature.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. It involves only penalty mail. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It involves only the penalty mail that would be included in the grand total. The Postmaster General would make up the estimates.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have no objection to the amendment. I accept it. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as No. 56.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 11, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new section:

> Sec. 305. No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act for any scientific or technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the Attorney General, to be effective to insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will (with such exceptions and limitations as the Secretary may determine after consultation with the Secretary of Defense to be necessary in the interest of the national defense) be made freely and fully available to the general public. Nothing contained in this subsection shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity of any right which that owner may have under that patent.

On page 11, line 3, strike out "Sec. 305", and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 306".

On page 11, line 14, strike out "Sec. 306", and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 307".

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment seeks to assure that the result of the research done under the program authorized in the pending bill would be made available in general to industry, States, cities, and other communities throughout the entire country, by assuring that the Government would retain patent rights to the inventions that would result from research performed with Government money.

The present policy in the Department of the Interior, we are assured, is to that effect. We have been told that the same result would come under the present policy of the Department as would be assured by the adoption of the amendment. However, we do not know what could happen under a future Secretary of the Interior, or whether at some future time pressure would not be brought to bear upon the administration to permit private patents to exist from developments in this field.

The amendment provides that the Department could not yield to such pressures.

The amendment is identical to the amendment which was added to the saline water research bill, which was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That amendment carried out the same purposes with respect to saline water research. We do not want a private contractor to obtain a patent as a result of research being done with Government money, and thus deny cities, States, and other communities of something that has been developed with such Government money.

I know that the chairman of the committee is sympathetic to this amendment, having added such an amendment to the saline water research bill. He also had something to do with the Helium Gas Act, now the law, and which also contains such a provision. He also approved of it when it was made a part of the Coal Research Development Act.

The amendment I am offering seeks to carry out the policy that was approved by Congress on several occasions. We want to make sure that the public gets the benefit from any inventions that might result, and that no private patents will be obtained as a result of Government research.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As a cosponsor of the bill, I agree with everything the Senator from Louisiana has said. I hope the chairman will see fit to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know what the Senator from Louisiana has been trying to do for a long time in this field. I see absolutely nothing wrong with the amendment. As the Senator from Oregon has suggested, I will take the amendment to conference. I accept the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I merely wish to point out that on page 19 of the committee report the Secretary of the Interior states that he feels the amendment would be appropriate on the bill. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. ANDERSON. I know that the Senator from Colorado has another amendment to offer. We have discussed it.

Mr. ALLOTT. There is so much noise in the Chamber I cannot hear what is being said. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 10, line 22, it is proposed to insert after the word "Act" the words "with an educational institution or nonprofit organization." On page 11, line 1, it is proposed to strike out the words "such payments" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "advance payments of initial expense."

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. The purpose of the amendment is to enable initial payments to be made to educational institutions and nonprofit organizations when they are unable to do so.

The real reason for the proposed change is that the language in the bill is not satisfactory. The amendment will make it conform to the principles which we worked out under S. 20 since the first of the year. I have discussed the amendment with the author of the bill. I believe it is entirely satisfactory to him.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **ALLOTT**. I yield.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. I wish to say that the Senator from Colorado did help us materially with S. 20. This is an attempt to follow the same principle in the pending bill. I commend him for his efforts. As far as I am concerned, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. I should like to add that this is not the exact language, but it follows the same principle.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. Yes. I subscribe to what the Senator has said. It is not the exact language. I did not mean to say it was. The Senator from Colorado was helpful in connection with S. 20 in working out the language. The language he suggests now will accomplish the same purpose under the same principle. I am glad to accept the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. **MUNDT**. Mr. President, the Water Resources Research Act at maturity would make available $100,000 each year to every State for water research; would make an additional $5 million available each year to these research centers on a matching basis, dollar for dollar, for money supplied by the States or by other non-Federal sources; and would make another $10 million available annually to be directed by the Secretary of Interior through arrangement with the States or other qualified organizations for needed water research not otherwise being studied.

The Great Plains and the West have been aware since settlement of the significance of water. Development there has been guided by and has been limited to the availability of water.

These limitations on development potential become more discernible every year, and further development is feasible largely to the extent that water is available and to the extent that available water is more prudently used.

And now in recent years responsible studies are giving notice that the eastern half of the country will be facing the same problems before the expiration of the 20th century. Until recently the East has considered itself secure against problems of water scarcity.

So obviously it is time for a national implementation of a purposeful, expansive, coordinated, and determined continentwide scientific pursuit for better methods of water acquisition and utilization. The Water Resources Research Act would begin such a pursuit. I support it enthusiastically.

The program adopts the same kind of decentralized and diversified effort that the United States has used for 75 years in striving toward better and more productive agricultural methods. And this approach is very likely the most promising one we could take toward reducing the water problem.

One essential reason for the success of agricultural research and for the success in our having its findings adopted in translating good research into better farming practices has been its widely decentralized attack. Federally encouraged agricultural research has been done by each State, each one directing its own efforts at problems peculiar to its own area, which has resulted in a solid betterment of agricultural practices in every segment of agriculture.

The effort to utilize this same system for water research is well grounded. There is no one single problem in water research. Nor is there merely a half-dozen or so problems that could be farmed out to a half dozen high prestige university research centers for investigation.

We are here approaching a many-faceted problem far more fundamentally in establishing a procedure whereby the States are free to adapt the water research program however it best fits their needs.

And in their doing this, each State will be able to develop a substantial number of cooperating water experts whose availability to the States will continue. The States will not be dependent on a body of expert knowledge developed at Federal expense but available to the States only at high cost from a center of learning perhaps half a continent away.

Passage of this bill will position us from the beginning to meet a continental water shortage squarely, looking for solutions to as many facets of the problem as there are facets which demand attention.

I think it is appropriate, too, in discussing this most promising piece of legislation, to recall the work of my late colleague from South Dakota, Francis Case, during his 25 years in Congress.

Water was his basic campaign concern in 1934, when he was defeated, and again in 1936, when he was first elected to Congress, and from then until his death. He worked continuously on water legislation during his generation in Congress. Much of the existing water legislation has the imprint of his work, right up to the recent saline water programs and the futuristic interest in weather modification.

Throughout those more than two decades of effort on the problems of water conservation and utilization it was my privilege and purpose to work closely with former Senator Case in promoting and developing these programs. In the House, when we served together there he was on the Appropriations Committee and I was on a legislative committee enabling us to operate a "one-two punch" in support of constructive water projects. We worked together for example on the first effective water pollution control bill to pass the House in the form of a measure which I authored. We advanced so-called Wheeler-Case water projects. We cooperated on other water development programs including the Pick-Sloan plan and many Missouri River development projects including both those on the main stem and dozens of water-conservation area and local projects. In the Senate, in turn, I served on the Appropriations Committee and Francis Case served on a legislative committee again enabling us to work jointly in authorizing programs and projects and in securing the needed money to implement them.

With the death of Francis Case last year I picked up where he left off promoting unfinished projects which he had started and initiating and supporting others in this wide area of constructive activity. I shall continue to concentrate my time and effort in this important area of public service.

As much as with the work of any person, enactment of this bill will be the logical outgrowth and natural extension of Francis Case's efforts for adequate water.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Alaska.

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT VITAL TO ALASKA'S FUTURE

Mr. **BARTLETT**. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is today taking final action on S. 2, a bill to establish water resource research centers in the several States in cooperation with State and educational authorities.

This bill is a beginning step in the development of a more adequate national program for water research and water resource conservation.

As such, it is badly needed.

The bill before us today is a modest measure designed to meet what will become one of the major problems to face our Nation in this century. Our rapidly growing population and our vast industrial complex are making heavier and ever heavier demands on our Nation's water supply. It has been estimated that by 1980 the south Pacific, the Colorado River Basin, the Great Basin, the Upper Rio Grande-Pecos, and the Upper Missouri River Basins will be unable to fulfill the water demands placed upon them. Our Nation needs new sources of water and comprehensive plans on how to use them.

This bill, S. 2, is not intended in itself to offer solutions to our water shortage problems. It is intended to provide the skilled scientific personnel and the laboratory facilities and techniques which will be needed if the solution is to be found.

My own State of Alaska has great need for such research facilities as are envisioned by S. 2. Alaska's water problems are not of scarcity, they are of utilization. We have in our State vast resources of water which are unused and wasted. Millions of kilowatts of power run unused into the sea. As, in the coming years, Alaska's economy expands and develops the State will have need of this power and of this precious resource.

This bill will assist the State to plan the development of a research center in conjunction with the State university. Such a center will be able, in a coherent and ordered manner, to map the development of Alaska's water resources.

I am pleased, Mr. President, to be a cosponsor of this measure. I urge its early and wholehearted adoption by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I addressed to the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee and enclosures will be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S. 2, a bill to assist the establishment of water resource research centers at State universities; to promote a more adequate national program of water research; and to provide for the training of research personnel.

This bill is important to my State of Alaska and to all the States. I congratulate you and your committee, Mr. Chairman, for giving this measure the priority consideration it so clearly deserves.

The bill before the committee is a modest proposal concerning a major problem. The problem, of course, is how efficiently to utilize our water resources and how best to provide for their proper conservation. The proposal is not a solution to this problem—nor is it intended to be. When solutions are found, however, they will be found by personnel trained under the provision of S. 2, utilizing techniques and equipment developed in S. 2 laboratories.

The research centers which this bill provides for are modeled after the wholly successful program of State agriculture extension services. Funds—not more than $100,000 per year—would be provided to the several States for use in the establishment of a State water center. This bill also provides for specific grants in aid for particular research projects. It is the hope of the sponsors of this legislation that it will encourage and develop the training of scientists and personnel equipped to work in the area of water research.

I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will make very clear that S. 2 will not conflict with—but will rather complement—research programs already undertaken by the Federal Government in water use and conservation. It should also be made clear that it does not interfere with studies now underway, with Federal, State and local participation, into the economic needs and development of river basins.

For example, under the terms of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, seven water pollution laboratories are to be constructed at sites across the country. Alaska is fortunate to have been selected as one of the sites and the fiscal 1964 budget now before the Congress includes funds for the construction of this laboratory. It is clear, I believe, that should the University of Alaska undertake to set up a water resource research center using S. 2 funds there would be ample opportunity for coordination and cooperation between the two facilities.

The Alaska congressional delegation has been working closely with the executive branch in an effort to establish a joint Federal-State Planning Commission to attempt a coherent projection of the economic development of Alaskan resources. Such a study would, of course, include water use and would have ample reason to work closely with, and to profit from, a State water research center.

The University of Alaska is greatly interested in S. 2. Enclosed you will find expression of this interest, a letter from the president of the university, William R. Wood, I would appreciate your making it a part of the committee record on the bill.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

FEBRUARY 12, 1963.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I have read with much interest the copy of S. 2, "a bill to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities," which as a cosponsor you sent to my office. The bill has been reviewed in detail by a number of our faculty, including Dr. Kenneth Rae, director of the Institute of Marine Science, Dean Earl Beistline, of the College of Earth Science and Mineral Industry, and Dr. C. T. Elvey, vice president for research and advanced study. All of us are keenly interested in the intent of S. 2 and are in strong support of its several provisions. We believe that a program such as the one proposed would compliment the work that is in prospect in water pollution studies by the U.S. Public Health Service, and could become an important part of the total Arctic research program which we are attempting to develop.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter from Dr. Elvey to Senator ANDERSON concerning the interest of the University of Alaska in water resources research. These, I am certain, you will find of interest.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM R. WOOD,
President.

JULY 5, 1962.

Hon. CLIFTON P. ANDERSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: With reference to your letter of May 31, 1962, requesting information on water research, we have only a few projects supported by various governmental agencies which have a bearing on the subject.

One project entitled "Glaciological Investigations in Central Alaska" is partially supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation. As you know, a glacier is an index of climatic conditions: hence, understanding of the glaciers gives us a long history of climatic conditions. Another line of attack on past precipitation is furnished by studies of the snow and ice fields at the heads of glaciers. We have one project supported by the Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory of the U.S. Army to study the snow field at the top of Mt. Wrangell, an approximate 14,000-foot elevation. Studies of the stratified layers in the snow fields give important data on the amount of precipitation.

In certain regions of Alaska water precipitation is small and mostly in the form of snow. It is very difficult to measure the amount owing to the shifting of the snow by the winds. Studies of snow fields will provide the only method of measuring the amount of precipitation on the north coastal slope of Alaska as well as certain areas in the interior. In connection with this work, we have a grant supported by the National Science Foundation entitled "A Reconnaissance Snow Survey on the Arctic Coast of Alaska." A similar project surveying the snow of the Yukon Valley will be supported by the Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory of the U.S. Army.

The projects we have underway, as listed above, are only scratching the surface as far as research pertaining to water resources in Alaska.

The problem of water resources in Alaska varies greatly across the State. On the Arctic slope north of the Brooks Range there is permafrost which extends to a depth of 1,000 feet. This produces a serious limitation on the supply of water and upon the disposition of sewage and other waste products. In the interior of Alaska the permafrost is intermittent and often the underground water is associated with boggy areas, therefore of poor quality. The winter frosts reach to a depth of 7 feet, consequently upsetting water supplies during the winter months. In the southern parts of the State where the annual precipitation is high we have extensive glaciers. Streams which originate with glaciers are "milky" with finely ground rock.

I hope this gives you a feel for the problems in connection with water research in Alaska. If I can be of any further service to you please call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

C. T. ELVEY,
Vice President for Research and Advanced Study.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from South Dakota.

LET'S TAKE ACTION TO PREVENT WATER SHORTAGE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I believe that Senate bill 2, the Water Resources Research Act, of which I am a cosponsor, is one of the most important measures before the 88th Congress. All human activity is affected by the availability of pure water. We must know more about the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources. We have a great deal to learn, and S. 2 will enable us to speed up the acquisition of knowledge by complementing and coordinating Federal, State, and private research now in progress.

Under title I of the bill, funds would be authorized for distribution by the Secretary of the Interior to land-grant or other State-designated institutions for the purpose of establishing water resources research institutes. Additional funds would also be authorized which the Secretary could use to match funds made available to the institutes by the States or by other sources.

Title II of the bill would authorize additional appropriations to the Secretary from which he could make grants, contracts, or other arrangements with Government or private agencies and institutions.

Title III contains certain miscellaneous provisions related to the administration of programs under the bill, including authority for the Secretary to establish in the Department a Water Resources Research Service.

According to the study made by the President's Special Task Force on Water Research, vast areas of the Nation face serious and even critical water shortages. In the Southwest underground water is being mined at an alarming rate, and new sources must soon be found to supply even the present population. In several humid areas the amount of water needed to dilute sewage approaches, and in some places already exceeds, the amount of water in the rivers during times of low flow." By the year 2000 the use of water probably will exceed supplies in the Upper Missouri, Rio Grande-Pecos, Colorado, Great Basin and southern California regions and may exceed supplies in the western gulf areas.

According to the report, the increasing demand for water can be met by increasing the efficiency of water use. The report goes on to point out that in many parts of the Nation new and undeveloped sources of surface water are extremely limited. Some areas may have to reduce their rates of industrial and population growth or shift to crops demanding less water if something is not done. Much research needs to be undertaken in the conversion to human use of presently unusable water supplies, including salt water. The report also urged that every effort be made to use and conserve the existing local water supplies.

In South Dakota we are well aware of the need for research in water resources. Water has long been the economic lifeblood of our State. The northern plains have traditionally been a water-shortage area, limiting the economic growth of the region and the opportunities for young people. All of our State is within the area designated by the President's Committee as facing a serious water shortage by the year 2000.

In a recent letter Dean Orville G. Bentley of the Division of Agriculture of South Dakota State College made an incisive analysis of the reasons why South Dakotans are interested in this legislation. He wrote:

> Our problems are characteristic of those indigenous to the Great Plains area and include the variability of rainfall as it threatens the economic stability of the region's major industry—agriculture. Besides an inadequate supply of water, the quality of water available to municipalities is poor and frequently hampers urban and industrial growth. Fluctuating water supplies interfere with the State's future development of recreational areas and profitability of converting land from agriculture to other uses such as recreation. We look at water resource development as one of the tools for increasing the employment opportunities for young people within the State. For these reasons South Dakota State College has committed resources to research, teaching, and extension programs that are related to water resource development. We are limited in funds and personnel but, given additional support, we could expand our research into such areas as evaporation reduction, desalinization of water, the development of small-scale water treatment facilities, and expanding studies on the improved utilization of water in agriculture.

Mr. President, the bill before us today calls for a comparatively modest expenditure, but it can make a very large contribution to the life and progress of our Nation. Currently, we are using more than 300 billion gallons of water daily and this amount will double in the next 20 years. Scarcely any measure in the 88th Congress will have a bearing on so many facets of the lives of our citizens as S. 2. Continued progress in industry, agriculture, recreation, and public health, to mention only a few areas of our national life, is dependent on a continuous and expanding supply of good water.

The passage of this bill, like the TVA 30 years ago, will be, in the words of George Norris, "emblematic of the dawn of that day when every rippling stream that flows down the mountainside and winds its way through meadows to the sea, should be harnessed and used and made to work for the welfare and comfort of man."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators wish to yield any of their time, or do they desire to yield back the remainder of their time on the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield back the remainder of my time on the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2) was passed.

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, a short time ago the Senate took a voice vote on the question of the passage of the water resources bill. I disapprove of the bill. For years, Ohio has been doing the work which is contemplated in connection with the bill. I cannot believe that the States are financially incapable of doing the job envisioned by those who support the provisions of the bill which the Senate passed this afternoon. Moreover, I believe this bill is but the forerunner of huge expenditures by which the Federal Government will, after the studies are made, finance projects which should be financed at home.

Hence, Mr. President, I desire to state that if a yea-and-nay vote had been taken on the question of the passage of the bill, I would have voted against it.

DEATH OF IZHAK BEN-ZVI, PRESIDENT OF ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the death of the President of Israel, Izhak Ben-Zvi, at the age of 78. Mr. Ben-Zvi had been President of Israel since 1952. He was a great friend of the United States.

I had the privilege to know him and, together with my wife and children, to visit with him in his official residence.

Mr. Ben-Zvi was a great hero in the establishment of the State of Israel. He helped to organize the Jewish Legion, and returned to Palestine with the conquering army of British General Allenby. He was a great force, even at that time, in laying the basis for an independent state.

Mr. Ben-Zvi was a distinguished scholar and writer. He was the closest friend of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, throughout his active days in the work for the establishment of Israel and took part, in the formation of the country's leading institutions, the Histadrut, the country's labor federation; and the Hashomer, the forerunner of the Haganah defense organization, which ultimately brought about Israel's independence.

Mr. Ben-Zvi was in the great tradition of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the first President of Israel. He had numerous friends among members of this body and of the other body, many of whom visited with him personally. I know that we all mourn with Israel the loss of this eminent statesman and scholar. I feel certain that the next President of Israel will be worthy of the example set by this distinguished man.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep regret over the loss suffered by our Nation and by the entire world in the death of President Izhak Ben-Zvi, of Israel. His career as the head of this friendly and courageous nation—Israel—has been a great asset to the free world, as well as to Israel; and I join with the people of Israel in mourning his death.

President Ben-Zvi will long be remembered for his leadership in behalf of his people. Renowned for his scholarship and writing, he took a leading role in the formation of the Histadrut, Israel's labor federation, and the Hashomer, the forerunner of the Haganah defense organization which battled for Israel's independence.

A distinguished successor to Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Israel's first President, President Ben-Zvi will long be remembered—along with his close friend and ally in forging freedom for the people of Israel, Prime Minister David Ben Gurion—as one of the principal architects in creating the Jewish State.

As a great admirer and friend of the people of Israel in their struggle for national recognition, I join in the great sorrow the whole world feels in being deprived of the services of this great humanitarian and distinguished statesman.

UNITY IN THE TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRIES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, one of the outstanding personalities in the field of transportation in the United States is Morris Forgash, a distinguished citizen of New York. Mr. Forgash is president of the U.S. Freight Co.

Yesterday the New York World Telegram and Sun published an article about Mr. Forgash entitled "U.S. Freight Head Champions Unity," written by Mary C. Stokes. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Apr. 22, 1963.]

U.S. FREIGHT HEAD CHAMPIONS UNITY

(By Mary C. Stokes)

One trouble with many leaders in the transportation industries—railroads, truckers, airlines, and steamship lines—is they are not to familiar with that old saying of Benjamin Franklin:

"If we don't all hang together, we'll all hang separately."

This is particularly true of the railroads and truckers, which have been fighting a bitter battle.

Meanwhile a huge proportion of the freight of both has been carried off by unregulated carriers known as "gypsy" or private truckers.

While the two modes of transportation have been slugging it out and not combining to cut costs, many corporations have decided it's cheaper to buy their own truck fleets to carry their own products.

A VOICE FOR UNITY

On the illegal side, farmers and private owners who truck their own goods to market have been renting out their vehicles for the return trip at prices below those allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and charged by truckers and railroads regulated under it.

One of the strongest voices raised in favor of coordinated action to take advantage of the economies of all types of transportation and give the buyer the cheapest service is that of Morris Forgash, president of U.S. Freight Co.

He heads a freight-forwarding firm, which does just that. It puts together carloads of freight from different shippers and routes them the cheapest way, he says:

"A shipper does not buy the mode of carriage. He only buys time in transit and price. He couldn't care less if you put the freight in a wheelbarrow or rolled it with your nose on the highway."

WANTS CONGRESS TO ACT

One of Forgash's key recommendations for relieving the transportation dilemma is getting Congress to pass a new definition of "private carriage" so action against private truckers who lease out their vehicles would be easier and more cut and dried.

He has plugged for this to congressional leaders.

He also looks for great things for piggybacking, carrying truck trailers on flatcars as well as behind truck tractors to speed deliveries and cut cost.

U.S. Freight's use of piggybacking has grown from 10 percent in 1958 to 34 percent in 1962 and it continues upward.

Another of his themes is "standardization" of transport equipment. With others, he has worked for universal containers which could be used on land, sea, or in the air.

Dimensions of 5, 10, 20, and 40 feet long and 8 by 8 feet in width and height have been adopted by the National Defense Transportation Association, but implementation is slow.

FAST WRITEOFF

To step up the process Forgash recommends fast tax writeoffs for piggyback equipment and universal containers.

"We must also provide for interchangeability," he points out. "We must get the manufacturers together to agree on uniform clasps and tiedown equipment."

In his own company he has acted to help solve the problem of "imbalance of traffic" and advocates more action along these lines.

The problem stems from the fact many perishables, fruits, and vegetables are shipped east from California in refrigerator cars. Solid freight of the nonperishable sort is more apt to move West.

This means a lot of empty refrigerator cars are going one way and boxcars the other.

U.S. Freight was one of the first to start using convertible cars which are refrigerated one way and not the other.

It is this kind of thinking which makes Forgash the transportation man of the year.

CONSTANT PURCHASING POWER BOND LEGISLATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I noted with pleasure that my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], reintroduced on April 18 his constant purchasing power bond bill.

Under Senator McNamara's able leadership the Special Committee on Aging has done extensive research on the problem of finding fiscally sound solutions for the retirement needs of this Nation. We all know from the mail that we received and talking to our constituency the disappointment of those who have invested in Government bonds for their retirement and found the value eroded by the rising cost of living.

This bill will provide the means for investing in safe Government bonds without fear that the investment will be diminished by inflationary pressures. It would not only give our citizenry an opportunity to plan for a secure retirement, but will also serve as an impetus for investment in U.S. Government bonds. I, therefore, congratulate my distinguished senior colleague and heartily endorse the bill.

TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL NATIONAL TROUT FESTIVAL, KALKASKA, MICH.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we who have angled a fly into a gentle stream and watched a trout flop over a rock for a sharp moment before disappearing into a dark pool know that to capture the fish is not all of the fishing.

There are many sides to fishing, and a truly outstanding one can be found this week in Kalkaska, Mich. It is the 27th annual National Trout Festival, being held April 26 through 28.

The hosts—the Kalkaska County Chamber of Commerce—are well schooled in the ways of the trout from Michigan's endless miles of fishing streams. And they know how to plan an outdoor event for fishermen.

Many Senators will join me, I know, in wishing we could be in Kalkaska this week to swap a story or two with fishermen from throughout the country. In fact, I have been asked to extend an invitation to any Senator who would like to wet a line in our Michigan trout streams. I am sure the Kalkaska Chamber of Commerce would be delighted to show them all the good spots, and I am delighted to extend this invitation.

PRIORITY TO ELECTRIC CONSUMERS IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST TO ENERGY GENERATED AT HYDROELECTRIC PLANTS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of S. 1007.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of Stephen A. Douglas, one of the most famous and outstanding political figures in the history of the United States.

While Stephen Douglas belonged by birth and ancestry to New England, as he was born in Brandon, Vt., April 23, 1813, he belonged to the Mississippi Valley and the State of Illinois by the circumstances of his adult life wherein he served the great State of Illinois in many capacities as a young lawyer, judge, U.S. Representative, and then U.S. Senator, until his death on June 3, 1861.

Douglas' fame in history probably is marked by the Lincoln-Douglas debates, which preceded the senatorial campaign for the U.S. Senate in Illinois in 1859 and in which election Douglas defeated Lincoln; and these same debates projected Abraham Lincoln into the national spotlight culminating in his election as President of the United States in 1860.

The Senate of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois adopted a resolution on April 8, 1963, paying homage to the memory of Illinois "Little Giant" Stephen A. Douglas, upon the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the State senate be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 44

Whereas, on April 23, 1963, the people of the State of Illinois will be celebrating the 150th anniversary of the birth of one of the State of Illinois most illustrious former residents, Stephen A. Douglas, the "Little Giant"; and

Whereas Stephen A. Douglas was one of the most famous and outstanding political figures in the history of the United States; and

Whereas Stephen A. Douglas showed marvelous energy, adroitness and resourcefulness, and a genius for leadership as both an Illinois and Federal legislator; and

Whereas the "Little Giant" had few equals in American history and his generosity in defeat, his courage and capacity for inspiring warm personal friendships, were among his most attractive qualities; and

Whereas Stephen A. Douglas is particularly remembered for the famous debates he participated in with Abraham Lincoln and for his victory over President Lincoln for the Senate; and

Whereas Stephen A. Douglas displayed during his eventful lifetime a continuing example of selfless service to his country, and his memory will live on with all Americans as being one of the heroes of a great nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we join the citizens of this State and Nation in paying homage to the memory of Illinois "Little Giant," Stephen A. Douglas, upon the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Adopted by the senate April 8, 1963.

Samuel H. Shapiro,
President of the Senate.
Edward E. Fernandes,
Secretary of the Senate.

THE STEEL PRICE POLICY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "The Steel Price Policy," which was published on April 16 in the Peoria Journal Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Steel Price Policy

President Kennedy's continued interest in the price of steel is a case of treating a cut on the finger by brain surgery—using Ben Casey as the surgeon instead of a real doctor, to boot.

The present national policy on steel emerged from a couple of hours conference between a busy President of the United States and his economic advisers.

So now all Government experts in the broad field of world economics, political budgets, and new theories about the collection of taxes are discussing the pros and cons of pricing certain items of steel by certain companies. So are, of course, politicians and commentators.

Everybody seems to be in the operating room except the doctors—the steel men themselves, the only people who have worked with the problems involved day in and day out and proven their proficiency over the years.

And, the debate is half-political as well as half-economic—and all generalizations.

That's the way, of course, when you get away from the guys who really know their subject and who have to make it work by an intimacy with all of its complicated details.

This is the trouble we get into once we take the road of Government intervention, no matter how fetching the particular circumstance was that justified the original breakthrough.

In the long run you wind up taking decisions out of the hands of those most experienced and most competent to make them, and turn them over to first-rate theorists and eventually to fourth-rate bureaucrats.

But what is developing in our steel industry is not really much different than if we had turned our Armed Forces in World War II over to a Harvard professor with a special interest in military history, or turned the AFL-CIO over to some top theorist in the college ranks on the grant principles of labor-management relations.

There is a lot more to running large, effective working organizations than broad general principles, lovely theories, and high level paperwork.

It looks to us like we are more and more tossing the doctors out of the case of steel, calling in the quacks, and, as we said, beginning to operate on the very brain of the whole mechanism as a means of curing a cut finger—and somebody else's finger at that.

Then, too, immobilizing this patient, as we seem determined to do, is likely to have a devastating effect on his family.

PRIORITY TO ELECTRIC CONSUMERS IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST TO ENERGY GENERATED AT HYDROELECTRIC PLANTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time let me state, in regard to Senate bill 1007, in support of which I testified on April 1 of this year before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that this afternoon I find myself in a position in which I can support the bill; and I wish to congratulate the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] on his leadership in connection with the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the statement in support of Senate bill 1007 which I made on April 1, 1963, before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Morse Before Senate Interior Committee on S. 1007, April 1, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to submit this statement in support of S. 1007, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. The following factors are of great importance and I trust they will receive serious consideration by the committee:

1. The Pacific Northwest's economic growth—past, present, and potential, is inseparably linked with the development of Federal hydroelectric power. In his statement to this committee last year, Bonneville Power Administrator Luce most adequately delineated the importance of Federal power in our region. He stated:

"For years industries in the Pacific Northwest have been important customers of the Federal system. Their purchases have varied from more than 60 percent of the energy sold by Bonneville Power Administration in 1945 to an average of approximately 36 percent during the past 4 years. Their original plant investment is more than $350 million. Their plant replacement cost would be double that figure. They employ 15,000 Pacific Northwest citizens directly and another 30,000 indirectly. The utility of those plants and the thousands of jobs which they have made possible are directly dependent upon the maintenance of a low-cost power supply. If Pacific Northwest Federal power—and that area has no low-cost alternative—is diverted to other regions, many of these industries would have to stop production. The Nation would not gain by shutting down these plants in order to export the power from the Pacific Northwest, and the impact on that region would be catastrophic."

2. Prime income-producing activities in the Pacific Northwest are lumber, agriculture, and tourism. All three are subject to the whims of weather. All three exhibit severe seasonal fluctuations and are highly sensitive to business cycles. Lumber and agriculture are presently confronted by serious problems and are subject to drastic fluctuation due to demand in elasticity and international marketing problems. Electroprocess industries provide stable payrolls. Low-cost power compensates for our long distances from major markets and supplies industrial incentive for creation of new jobs.

3. Water is the source of our electricity. We have no proven reserves of gas or oil, and known coal resources are limited. Approximately 96 percent of our firm energy capability is hydro and about 62 percent of this hydro is owned and operated by the Federal Government. No other area in the country is so dependent on hydropower and, only the Tennessee Valley exceeds this region in percentage of federally owned generation.

4. The people of the Pacific Northwest are paying off the Federal Government's power investment there—with interest. To date they have returned to the Treasury over three-fourths of a billion dollars.

5. An electrical interconnection between the Pacific Northwest and California was outlined as early as 1935 by the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission, which included a representative of the State of Oregon. With the knowledge that such transmission link is technically and economically feasible, the Department of the Interior has this year requested $24 million to begin construction of this extra-high-voltage line.

6. A common-carrier, high-capacity interconnection linking the electrical systems of the two regions will provide enormous benefits to both areas. With public and private electric systems participating and with optimum facilities, it is currently estimated benefits would exceed costs by a ratio of more than 3 to 1. The economic benefits which would accrue to BPA would restore Bonneville's surplus repayment picture, open a market for nonfirm, dump power, and provide a means by which the Pacific Northwest could obtain additional firm power when needed in the future.

7. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has long recognized the need for proper protection of the interests of power consumers in any energy or capacity interchange involving Federal power. In a resolution of June 21, 1960, the committee requested that no contract be made for transfer of BPA power to California pending completion of further studies and consideration of legislation to preserve the position of BPA customers in the Northwest. I joined with other Northwest Senators in asking the then Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton to act in accordance with that resolution.

8. Interconnection of the Northwest and Southwest by major transmission facilities will soon be a reality. Already the Bonneville Power Administration has received six offers to build all or part of the extra-high-voltage line. A Federal request for an appropriation of $24 million to begin construction of a Federal intertie is now before Congress. New technology has made it possible to use such lines to transmit power from northern Washington to southern California.

A solution to the problem pointed up by hearings held by your committee in 1959 and 1960 should insure two things: It must (a) protect against raiding the resources of one region to make rich another and (b) provide for an orderly and equitable share of benefits between regions. I believe that maximum mutual advantage can be achieved without Balkanization and without doing violence to traditional power marketing policies.

Integrated operation can produce benefits for individual electric systems which are impossible with isolated operation. Power pooling in the Northwest provides a practical demonstration of this fact. Coordination has produced benefits impossible of achievement by power producers operating singly, and this has been accomplished without infringement upon the basic rights and responsibilities of particular utilities. Technology has increased the opportunities for mutually advantageous cooperation. Organization and operational patterns must keep pace.

In 1962 similar legislation was considered by this committee and passed by the Senate. At that time, Mr. Luce informed the committee of the exhaustive review which preceded the submission of this proposal by the Department of the Interior. The bill has wide support, including the general backing of private and public utilities throughout the Northwest, and has received bipartisan support in Congress. The committee in its study of this legislation gave full consideration to the comments of residents of the Northwest last year when S. 3153 was acted upon favorably. I know that the committee will reiterate its positive position of last year, and act favorably on S. 1007 in recognition of the vital stake of the people of the Northwest in the ultimate decision of Congress on this matter.

The good of the Northwest, Southwest, and in fact the whole Nation will be served by establishing ground rules which will permit cooperation and coordination in use of our surplus electrical energy resources for the maximum benefit of all.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in opposition to Senate bill 1007, ordinarily referred to as the Pacific Northwest power bill. I say that, instead, it is a Pacific Northwest power steal, and should be designated as such.

Last year I spoke at considerable length about this matter; so I do not intend to say a great deal about it today.

In connection with this matter, we find that we are in a situation in which the people of the Northwest are putting around the electricity generated in that area an unjustified fence, by means of completely new criteria and new standards for the distribution of electricity in the United States.

I do not know whether a yea-and-nay vote will be taken on the question of the passage of the bill. I do not intend to request a yea-and-nay vote on that question; but I desire to make clear my own position, which is that regardless of whether a yea-and-nay vote is taken on the question of the passage of the bill, I wish to be recorded as being opposed to the bill; and I shall never vote for the bill or for any conference report based on such a measure.

Mr. President, the facts are that, because of two factors, the people of the Northwest are receiving electricity which to a great extent is being subsidized by the people of the United States. Many years ago Congress established what is known as the preference system, so that in the public hydroelectric power projects built by the Federal Government on rivers, the people who were members of the municipalities and of the cooperatives would receive what is known as a preference right. So our communities which had publicly owned systems, and all the people who had cooperative systems, were able to purchase electricity under what is known as a preference right. This principle has been established for many, many years, and it is accepted by everyone I know. I do not know of one member of an REA in the United States who is not completely wedded and devoted to the principle of preference rights. I, myself, have supported them ever since I first had to do with questions involving power.

But the net effect of Senate bill 1007—which, I am sorry to say, was passed last year by the Senate—is to upset completely all preference rights in the United States.

Last year the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] offered an amendment to extend the same rights to the Upper Colorado River. Actually, Mr. President, I do not think it makes any difference to us whether that is done or is not done; but, certainly, what is sauce for the goose should also be sauce for the gander, and it is just as logical to apply the principles of the bill to the Upper Colorado as it is to apply them to the Pacific Northwest.

Some of my friends in the Senate are very happy about the bill. My friends from Montana ought to be reasonably happy with it because they are in the geographical area of the country referred to in the bill. Idaho has been taken into the geographical area of the bill. But now a fence has been placed around the Northwest.

The power of the Northwest is cheap for two reasons:

First, there is the unusual geographical situation of the rivers, mountains, and gorges, which permit the development of large amounts of hydroelectric power.

Second, the Federal Government has put about $3 billion into the development of electricity for the people of the Northwest.

Consequently, in the Northwest electricity is not only being produced, but the Bonneville Administration is selling it even to private customers at less than 2 mills. If I remember correctly the testimony of Mr. Luce, electricity is being sold in that area to private customers for 2 mills or less per kilowatt. In the short time we have had available since the bill was called up for consideration I have not been able to locate the testimony, but I believe I have stated the correct amount. In almost every other part of the country it is almost impossible to produce electricity for much less than 5 or 6 mills. So with that extremely favorable situation, which has been financed by the Federal Government, what is proposed? If the bill ever becomes law, first, it would permit sales of electricity to preference users in the Northwest.

Then comes the catch. A letter fence is placed around the northwestern corner of the United States, and the rest of us who have helped to finance the development for them will not be able to participate in the development. We are told, "If our preference customers cannot use all the electricity, then it must be sold to private customers in the Northwest. If there is anything then left over, we shall allow it to go outside to the preference customers outside of our fenced-in area, and then if there is anything left after that, it may go to the private customers outside of our fenced-in area."

There can be no question that that would be the net effect of the bill. There can be no question that what I have stated would result. There can be no question that it would upset the concept of preference rights as they have been established in this country, for I believe, almost 50 years.

So in S. 1007 we have an upset of a long-established principle of preference rights.

I do not know whether or not the measure would be the first foot in the door to completely upset preference rights. If they can be upset in the Northwest, I can see no reason they cannot be upset in other places. So the proposal looks to me like a foot in the door for upsets in other places, which would be a very unsatisfactory situation in view of the development of power in our country, and would be a situation with which I personally could not agree.

I do not intend to discuss all the ramifications or the technical aspects of the bill. They were developed at the hearings last year and the present year. But in order that my own position may be clear, I merely wish to say that I feel about it as I felt last year. I am opposed to the bill. I hope that it will not pass. It should never become law. The measure would do an injustice to thousands of electrical cooperatives in our country and would upset completely the system of preference law in the United States.

Whether the bill is voted on by voice vote or by a yea-and-nay vote, I wish my position to be clear. I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, last year when the bill S. 3153, which is essentially the same bill that we now have before us in S. 1007, was before the Senate for consideration, I outlined in some detail the reasons for my opposition to that measure. In order to save the time of the Senate, I shall not reiterate at length my views stated at that time. However, since I desire to have my views again in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I made last year, which are found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 12, page 15795, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, the proposed legislation, the so-called regional preference bill, S. 3153, is deeply disturbing to me. It has major implications for the entire Nation which cannot be overlooked.

Initially, I was inclined to regard this bill as a kind of back-fence argument on the west coast between the Pacific Northwest, where tremendous quantities of electric power are generated cheaply at federally built dams, and southern California, which must rely on the more expensive steam generation of electricity. But much more, in fact, is involved, and I want to address my comments to the effects that the principle of this legislation would have on the rest of the country.

Behind this bill lies recent technological advances which now make it possible to transmit large blocks of electric power economically over very long distances. The Bonneville Power Administrator, Mr. Charles Luce, indicated that the economic transmission distance may extend for 2,000 miles. Under these circumstances, low-cost hydropower could be made available over a substantial region of the country, giving citizens some direct benefit from the billions which they have paid for the Federal power developments in the Northwest and elsewhere. We ought to be free to do this, provided that these benefits can be made available to all with sufficient safeguards to make sure that we do not exclude isolated islands in distant or sparsely settled areas that will thereby be forced to pay even higher electric rates or to compete against even greater odds than now.

The bill turns its back on this possibility. It is not designed to spread the benefits of low-cost power, but instead to confine them.

As I understand the bill, it draws a line around and in some cases through portions of half a dozen States, reaching as far east as Montana and Wyoming, and defines that area as the Pacific Northwest. Then it provides that all present and future Federal power produced in that region shall belong to that region exclusively, that it shall be used for present and future private industry as well as for public purposes, and that no power can be exported across the region's border, even for public purposes, unless the Northwest permits it, and then only on a severely restricted basis.

On that point, let me declare it bewildering from any national point of view, and certainly from a New Englander's view, that Federal power which has been developed and paid for by all the people, could thus be reserved for only a privileged few and denied to all others. In my State of New Hampshire, in fact in all of New England, there are no Federal powerplants. Many other States share with us this "have not" status. Under the precedent which this legislation would set, no "have not" States or regions could ever get any firm Federal power from any of the Federal plants located in the "have" regions, even though their tax dollars helped build them.

According to data in the hearings, half of all the hydroelectric power developed by the Federal Government is in the Northwest. The bill would restrict all that power to an area comprising less than six States. That power would be locked up tight in a Northwest power preserve.

To date, the Nation's taxpayers have invested $1.7 billion in Federal power facilities in the Northwest. The Bonneville Power Administration, which runs the Federal system there, is operating in the red and is losing millions of dollars each year. Thus, the power is being sold to privileged northwesterners at below-cost rates. No wonder they want to keep it to themselves—all of it.

The determination as to what power is available for export, when it may be available, who can have it, where the exact borderlines of the preserve shall be located, and many other powers, would be left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. The bill would give the Secretary virtually dictatorial power over half of the Federal hydroelectric power in the Nation, and would usurp much of the control over the Federal power policy which now properly resides in Congress.

This is what Senate bill 3153 proposes.

It is important to point out that the Bonneville Power Administration, which markets the Federal power in the Pacific Northwest, is not the sole source of power in the region. More than 150 non-Federal generating plants also serve the area, and provide about 40 percent of the region's total power suply. This is more than a statistic. It means that the Bonneville Power Administration does not have a utility responsibility for the area. It is under no legal or moral obligation to provide 100 percent of the region's needs for electric power now and into the future. It operates solely as a wholesale supplier of large blocks of power.

The role of Bonneville is thus in sharp contrast to the role of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has a complete utility responsibility for its area, and is the sole source of electric power for its service area. In the case of TVA, Congress has limited its service area by statute in much the same way as most public utilities have limited and defined service areas under their franchises. As an original proponent of an area limit for TVA, I can state that its purpose was to define the area in which it was to be the sole supplier of power so that TVA could plan, budget, and build efficiently to meet the growing demands for power within its area.

The TVA area limitation—16 U.S.C. 831n–4—clearly and expressly permits the sale and transmission of blocks of power to other utilities outside the service area. It thus permits TVA to do what the bill would bar in the Pacific Northwest, and the TVA area limitation is, in fact, a sound precedent for the defeat of the bill.

I should like to call upon my colleagues in the Senate to search their souls as they contemplate what such a proposal as this could do to the Nation. In full conscience, we must consider how such a bill would affect all of the United States. We must rise above local interests; we must look beyond the administration's nose as it tries to satisfy conflicting demands among Federal power supporters; we must regard the proposed legislation from the viewpoint of all the people of all our 50 States, and we must look to the future welfare of the Nation.

With these obligations in mind, the bill poses many questions which call for answers based on equality, justice, and the general welfare. The conflicting and contradictory nature of some of these questions reflects the confusion and contradictions in the bill itself.

First. Why should the United States set aside tax-subsidized power that belongs to all the people and reserve it exclusively for just a few people?

Second. When it is economically feasible to transmit electric energy 2,000 miles, why should not the power from all Federal generating installations in all sections of the country be made available to all the people within reach?

Third. Why should Congress lock up all present and future Federal power in the Northwest, permitting the Northwest to lure more industry and payrolls from other areas with its below-cost electric power?

Fourth. Why should the Senate fall prey to the contention that somehow and for some reason the situation in the Northwest is unique and therefore deserves a special handout? We must bear in mind that the bill not only reserves present Federal power for present Northwest customers but also applies to all future Federal power and all future Northwest customers. Nor are the provisions limited to Federal hydroplants. Coal-fired steamplants and maybe even Federal nuclear plants also would be reserved in the privileged sanctuary of the Northwest.

Fifth. Why should the Senate Interior Committee have to adopt an amendment to the bill with regard to power from Hungry Horse Dam on the basis that "existing rights, established by prior legislation should not be infringed upon" when this very bill itself infringes upon the existing rights of customers outside the fences which would be erected by this bill?

Sixth. Why should Congress permit a Chinese wall to be erected around one region in the Northwest and not permit similar Chinese walls around every other region in which a Federal electric plant is located?

Seventh. Why should Congress give any Secretary of the Interior the discretionary power of a czar over half the Federal hydroelectric power in the Nation?

Eighth. Why should Congress create economic or marketing regions which would ignore State borders, and could form super States under the control of an executive department of the Government?

Ninth. Could the Senate allow the Northwest to have its way, and then reject the similar demands for regional protection, or for exclusive regional rights? These demands are now before us in amendments. They come from the State of Montana, from the State of Arizona, from the Missouri River Basin, from the northern California region of the Central Valley project, and unquestionably will come from many other regions of origin of Federal power.

Tenth. Why should the law of preference be abrogated in just one region, for the purpose of satisfying purely local special interests?

Eleventh. Why should the Congress consider any bill that penalizes the great majority of the people, to give more special privileges to an already privileged few?

I submit that in reaching responsible answers to these questions, we can make no finding with respect to this bill except that it is highly dangerous to the national welfare.

The principle of the bill is vicious.

The use of Federal money and Federal power would be confined to certain States and regions. States and regions, like my own, that do not have and are not blessed with the potentiality for power development, would find themselves completely starved by the creation of special privilege facilities whose benefits would be confined to more fortunate sections of the country, despite the fact that they are paid for by our people. Such a situation would be so monstrous that it would compel only one solution: Complete Federal power over the entire Nation. Make no mistake about it, that is what this bill aims at. That is why it must be defeated.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show in 1963 as it does in August of 1962, that I am still unalterably opposed to the concepts of S. 1007 just as I was to the concepts of S. 3153 a year ago which granted a superpreference to electrical consumers who happen to be fortunate enough to reside in the Pacific Northwest.

May I point out once again that I consider that by enacting this type of legislation granting preference to one section of the country on the sale of electricity generated by Federal installations, Congress is going back on its word to cooperatives, municipalities and other designated preference customers that generation capacity built with taxpayers' funds shall be available to preference customers to meet their needs before making it available to other potential consumers.

This is unfair legislation and it is wrong in principle. There are pertinent basic reasons why this legislation should not be acted upon by the Senate or the Congress. The concept of regional preference is incompatible with the best use of the Nation's power resources, and this incompatibility will continue to grow as we increase our technological ability to transmit energy for greater distance. Further, if we enact this type of legislation then Congress will have a precedent to enact similar legislation granting a similar priority for other areas of the Nation. The principle of this type of legislation is wrong in that it would reserve all present and future Federal power for all present and future consumers in the region of origin to the detriment of those outside the region.

As I pointed out in the debate on S. 3153 as it appears in the Congressional Record, volume 108, part 12, page 15699 through page 15945, this type of legislation tends to "Balkanize" the power grids of this country for the first time. It proposes to start in the Northwest by establishing around the Northwest a Chinese wall. It provides that none of the power which is generated from the dams in which Federal funds have been employed—and I think that even includes private generating plants in this instance—shall be transmitted beyond the boundaries of the areas into other areas not located in the area in which the power is generated. I believe it is undesirable to start "Balkanizing" the great power systems of this country which are brought about by the expenditure of public funds or by money borrowed from the Public Treasury.

Further, I am fearful of the effect which this concept of regional preference rather than user preference will have on REA people living outside of the preferred area. The prevailing preference criteria concept has done much to develop, build, perpetuate, and expand REA. I have always supported the user-preference concept and I am disturbed by the thought that enactment of this type of legislation could well sound the death knell to the preference customer criteria and regulations in America.

Mr. President, in the act of 1937 authorizing the Bonneville project there is a section designed to protect the taxpayers. Let me read it to you so that it will be a part of the Record:

> In order to encourage the widest possible use of all electric energy that can be generated and marketed and to provide reasonable outlets therefor, and to prevent the monopolization—

Note the word "monopolization"—

> thereof by limited groups, the Administrator is authorized and directed to provide, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such electric transmission lines and substations, and facilities and structures appurtenant thereto as he finds necessary, desirable, or appropriate for the purpose of transmitting electric energy, available for sale, from the Bonneville project to existing and potential markets, and, for the purpose of interchange of electric energy, to interconnect the Bonneville project with other Federal projects and publicly owned power systems now or hereafter constructed.

In another section of the act it states:

> In order to insure that the facilities for generation of electric energy at the Bonneville project shall be operated for the benefit of the general public, and particularly of domestic and rural consumers, the Administrator shall at all times, in disposing of electric energy generated at said project, give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives.

Thus, Mr. President, it is clear that when the Congress enacted the authorizing legislation it rightfully protected the claim of preference customers to the power generated under the auspices of this project. Therefore, I cannot understand the reasoning behind the Department of Interior when in its release of March 29, 1963, it states:

> A preference applicant or customer outside the Pacific Northwest will not have a priority over a nonpreference applicant or customer in the Pacific Northwest.

This is a recitation of a new category of preference customers. It is creating an elite within preference groups. It substitutes geographical location for user designation as the basic reason for establishing preference customers.

In South Dakota, Mr. President, we as you know, have Federal installations generating power which we are sharing with our neighboring States. In fact, we are sharing so broadly that preference customers in the area served are only receiving about 80 percent of their needs from the Federal hydroelectric facilities on the Missouri River. The farmers and cooperatives of the Plain States are banding together in cooperatives and borrowing money from the Rural Electric Administration to build thermal plants to meet their power needs.

Mr. President, with transmission techniques developed as they are today, I am firmly convinced it is wrong to abrogate commitments to preference customers regardless of their locality. Throughout America today we see many Federal projects generating power. Let us make absolutely sure that before we legislate permission to sell this power to nonpreference customers that all our REA users demands are satisfied. Let us maintain Federally generated power for preference customers and induce private utilities to expand to meet the needs of nonpreference customers. Let us not through a "gimmick" such as S. 1007 find a way for the Government to circumvent its long-standing commitment to the preference customer. I therefore hope that before the Congress finally places a stamp of approval on this type of legislation that the millions of preference customers throughout America will have their day in court and that in the final analysis the Congress and the Department of Interior will wisely decide to continue to honor its long-standing commitment to preference customers everywhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1007) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to extend my congratulations to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and particularly to the chairman of that committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], for the expeditious way in which he has handled the bill, and for the amount of work which has come out of that committee.

Of all the committees in the Senate, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been the most diligent up to this time. If the Senate has any kind of record, much of the credit must go to that committee.

I also wish to pay my tribute once again to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] for what he, along with the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], has been able to do this year.

The committee has reported and has obtained the passage of the following major bills: S. 20, the outdoor recreation bill which will give a statutory basis for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; S. 4, the wilderness bill; S. 2, the water resources research bill; and now S. 1007, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

My distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] and I have a very special interest in the bill just passed by the Senate because of the part that the Hungry Horse project will play in it. It is a project which means a great deal to our State. We are delighted that, once again, as it did last year, the Senate has passed the measure.

So for the Record I merely wish to extend my thanks to the distinguished chairman of the committee, my old friend and colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], and also to the former chairman of that committee, who is now chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson]. They have both served their area and the Nation well.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I merely wish to observe that we have been able to move quite rapidly in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs because of the fine support from all members of that committee and particularly the assistance of the ranking member on the Democratic side, the former chairman, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson].

We have also received the full cooperation of the majority leader. He has been invaluable in expediting the proposed legislation that has been brought into the Senate. I know I speak for all members of the committee in expressing our appreciation to the distinguished majority leader for his help.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also wish to extend my thanks to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who indicated that he thought the last two bills considered should be amended in certain ways. The Senator from Colorado has fought cleanly and with vigor. I know personally that he has been subject to great pressure, but he has shown a tolerance and understanding for which I am deeply grateful.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the intention to have the Senate consider tomorrow the nominations of the persons to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, according to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 24, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations which were received by the Senate and omitted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 22, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Brockway McMillan, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, vice Joseph V. Charyk resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) or section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Andrew Pick O'Meara, O18062, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of General.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

MAJOR TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Line of the Air Force

Abbott, Elmond H., 12709A.
Abraham, Bruce H., Jr., 22591A.
Adams, John H., 14487A.
Addis, Darwin R., 14502A.
Adkins, Harold F., 34250A.
Adler, Bernard R., 13982A.
Amalt, Roy M., Jr., 34343A.
Akin, Elisha G., Jr., 34408A.
Alden, John E., 14262A.
Alderson, Sam W., 34015A.
Alexander, Glenn R., 14777A.
Alger, Leroy, 14312A.
Alkonis, Stanley J., 51804A.
Allen, Charles D., 34115A.
Allen, John R., 13213A.
Allen, Kenneth L., 14495A.
Allen, Leroy E., 34066A.
Allen, Robert C., 14624A.
Allen, Robert W., 34051A.
Allen, Wilfred H., Jr., 34123A.
Alven, Harold F., 11965A.
Alvestad, Russell C., 14004A.
Ambrecht, John F., 14226A.
Amick, Roy W., 34001A.
Amos, William J., 14823A.
Anderson, Gene C., 34411A.
Anderson, George O., 18184A.
Anderson, Howard W., Jr., 34204A.
Anderson, Ingvar E., 34093A.
Anderson, John J., 14475A.
Anderson, Norman C., 33170A.
Anderson, Raymond I., 14912A.
Anderson, Russell G., 13954A.
Andrews, Gordon J., 14431A.
Anglin, Harold D., 33704A.
Anthony, Richard P., 14065A.
Apperson, Edward B., 13984A.
Arbogast, Filbert E., 14316A.
Archer, Lee A., 14040A.
Armagost, Edgar R., 34135A.
Arnold, William A., Jr., 14944A.
Askelson, Howard S., 14442A.
Aswad, Saleem, 14042A.
Atherton, Jack, 14525A.
Atherton, John W., 34087A.
Austin, George E., 34147A.
Bach, Charles E., 34322A.
Bailer, Harold W., 13460A.
Bailie, Robert W., 34391A.
Baker, Marshall E., 20675A.
Baldwin, Robert C., 34387A.
Ballinger, Philip R., 14404A.
Banias, Bill B., 51846A.
Bard, Paul F., 34184A.
Barr, Thomas A., 14509A.
Bartlett, Edward J., 34166A.
Barzee, Kenneth G., 14326A.
Bashor, Owen H., 13871A.
Baskerville, Robert D., Jr., 34292A.
Bathurst, Raymond J., 14562A.
Batsel, Lee H., 34406A.
Baulch, Warren, 34107A.
Bauman, Ray W., 14721A.
Baumann, Robert P., Jr., 18203A.
Baumgardner, Haynes M., 14897A.
Baydala, Edward T., 14091A.
Beachum, Graham C., 33977A.
Beaty, Edward E., 14860A.
Beavers, James L., 2d, 14832A.
Beckham, Dwight S., 34196A.
Beckman, Kenneth N., 14183A.
Behrens, William C., 13202A.
Bell, Robert B., 13569A.
Benedict, George J., 34335A.
Bennett, Charles I., Jr., 16442A.
Bennett, George A., 18154A.
Beno, William G., 18205A.
Benoit, Eugene J., 34061A.
Bergendahl, Harley C., 51852A.
Berkley, John W., 51848A.
Berman, Samuel D., 34186A.
Berodt, Howard H., 14782A.
Berry, Erskine G., Jr., 34344A.
Berry, James E., 14153A.
Bessant, Aaron Z., 34162A.
Best, William H., Jr., 14383A.
Bethe, Kenneth E., 51815A.
Bettis, Howard E., 34273A.
Beveridge, Andrew L., 12781A.
Bird, Everett L., 33955A.
Bird, Joseph M., 34102A.
Birdsall, Otis S., 34330A.
Birdsong, Samuel E., Jr., 21791A.
Bischoff, Hans M., 13774A.
Blackburn, Thomas W., Jr., 14415A.
Blacker, Jack A., 34345A.
Blaha, Roy C., 14513A.
Blakeney, Charles M., 14855A.
Blessing, Samuel E., 14877A.
Bluhm, Roy B., Jr., 34060A.
Boggs, Kenneth S., 14236A.
Bolint, Michael J., Jr., 11636A.
Bolyard, John W., 14071A.
Bonitz, George E., 14593A.
Boone, Herbert D., 13975A.
Borchert, David W., 14407A.
Bossa, Amos L., 14023A.
Bosworth, Wallace C., Jr., 14302A.
Bourassa, Henry L., 51801A.
Bourus, George J., 51818A.
Bowden, William W., 14201A.
Bower, James A., 13691A.
Bowlin, Sidney J., 51825A.
Bowman, Gordon Y., 51845A.
Bowman, William H., Jr., 34167A.
Boyd, Henry L., 23652A.
Bradley, Charles H., 12480A.
Bradley, Lewis L., Jr., 13995A.
Brame, George F., 15033A.
Brandt, Charles A., 33748A.
Brannon, Raymond T., 14240A.
Brazie, Charles L., 13979A.
Breed, Tracy S., 34225A.
Breininger, Louis H., 34362A.
Bridges, Wyman M., 14050A.
Bright, William, 14746A.
Brinkman, Edward A., 15034A.
Britting, Wesley E., 14945A.
Brofft, Robert E., 14332A.
Brooks, William D., Jr., 14712A.
Broughton, Richard N., 14570A.
Broughton, Thomas E., 14280A.
Brower, Charles F., 3d., 14545A.
Brown, Ben R., 13548A.
Brown, Dale L., 34431A.
Brown, Frederick I., Jr., 33540A.
Brown, Joseph, Jr., 13264A.
Brown, Russell S., 14466A.
Browne, Donald V., 14604A.
Brownlee, Gordon L., Jr., 14322A.
Bruce, Joe B., 14096A.
Brunner, Arnold C., 34226A.
Bryant, James A., 14585A.
Buchert, Anton F., 33680A.
Buck, Alvin B., 14386A.
Buckingham, Kent O., 14533A.
Buckley, Cornelius E., 14154A.
Budnik, Eugene J., 14344A.
Buerger, Delbert E., 14678A.
Bull, Daniel H., 34140A.
Bullen, Howard R., Jr., 14454A.
Bulli, Dante E., 14964A.
Bullinger, Rollin R., 14177A.
Buls, Milton R., 14173A.
Burch, Nolan E., 14279A.
Burgandine, Phillip N., 34079A.
Burnette, Charles E., 34198A.
Burningham, Haven R., 14450A.
Burton, Carmen W., 14027A.
Busch, Robert E., 34377A.
Bush, William B., Jr., 14828A.
Butera, Alfonso H., 51840A.
Butler, James J., Jr., 14361A.
Butler, John E., Jr., 14961A.
Butler, Raymond E., 51850A.
Button, Louis H., 14671A.
Buzze, Frank C., 34392A.
Byrd, Neal A., 14272A.
Cadden, James J., 34007A.
Cadenhead, John O., Jr., 13445A.
Cahelo, George, Jr., 14152A.
Callahan, Ellsworth D., 14875A.
Callahan, John A., 14150A.
Callam, William K., 34260A.
Campbell, David D., 14663A.
Campbell, Earl J., 14596A.
Campbell, Warren E., 15032A.
Campbell, Warren G., 34020A.
Canning, Douglas S., 20577A.
Cannon, Harry E., 34306A.
Carder, Orval B., 13355A.
Carey, Gates C., 14273A.
Carey, Russell J., Jr., 14095A.
Carmichael, Donald L., 14790A.
Carney, Francis M., 13440A.
Carpentier, Joseph H., 34339A.
Carris Roy B., 14874A.
Carroll, George B., 34156A.
Carroll, Thomas P., 15017A.
Carson, Clarence L., 14127A.
Carson, Luther D., 34263A.

Carter, Robert F., 14297A.
Carter, Wilbur D., 14531A.
Cartwright, Richard H., Jr., 14508A.
Cary, Thomas I., 12851A.
Casbeer, Roy N., 14858A.
Casey, George W., 14120A.
Casey, Robert W., Sr., 51842A.
Cason, Edgar P., 34298A.
Cassady, Richard H., 14664A.
Casto, Lloyd L., 14771A.
Cather, Robert M., 14234A.
Cathey, John W., 14078A.
Catts, William G., 23189A.
Caulfield, John G., 14528A.
Cecil, Thomas J., 23654A.
Chacey, David D., 14413A.
Chaffee, William A., 14210A.
Chamberlain, Clarence N., 23686A.
Chambers, Thomas L., 14256A.
Chambers, Wayne C., 34323A.
Chavez, Manuel J., Jr., 12828A.
Chenault, Charles J., 14665A.
Chew, John C., 25611A.
Childress, Rollin D., 14580A.
Chiodo, Vincent R., 12440A.
Christensen, Douglas H., 14672A.
Christensen, Richard D., 14142A.
Christner, Winton, 34246A.
Clark, Don O., 14147A.
Clark, Edward R., 34311A.
Clark, John F., 34366A.
Clarke, John S., Jr., 14963A.
Clarke, Russell C., 13934A.
Claybaugh, K. Wayne, 14854A.
Cleary, John E., 19793A.
Clemence, Charles J., Jr., 14017A.
Cleveland, Lewis A., Jr., 14753A.
Cloaninger, Francis A., 34230A.
Clowry, John P., 23687A.
Coats, Wilbur L., 14083A.
Cobeaga, Mitchell A., 34338A.
Cochrane, Robert G., 14614A.
Cole, Dick T., 34058A.
Coleman, Patrick E., 14558A.
Coleman, Robert G., 14719A.
Collette, Robert W., 14612A.
Collings, Buford E., Jr., 34036A.
Collings, Kenneth L., 14939A.
Collins, Glenn R., 14255A.
Connally, Hulon L., 14191A.
Connelly, John T., 34291A.
Conner, Preston E., 14063A.
Cook, Walter E., 14627A.
Cook, Warren G., 14702A.
Coon, Elmer D., 34119A.
Coon, Robert E., 14586A.
Cooper, Ernest G., Jr., 14903A.
Cooperman, Harold, 14812A.
Copeland, Phillips J., 14920A.
Copher, Paul D., 22619A.
Cordes, Harry N., 14659A.
Cory, Ward E., 34086A.
Cote, Richard D., 49141A.
Cotton, Allen B., 14124A.
Cotton, J. W., Jr., 14972A.
Council, Robert R., 51828A.
Courson, Lewis E., 33821A.
Covell, Dwight W., 14333A.
Covert, Wayne L., 33980A.
Covey, John L., 34390A.
Cowan, George O., 34294A.
Cowan, Leslie W., 14394A.
Cowart, Robert P., 14100A.
Cowgill, Wayne J., 14906A.
Cox, Rufus A., Jr., 34215A.
Cox, Samuel J., Jr., 12960A.
Craft, Jacob F., 14584A.
Craig, Robert P., 20649A.
Crain, Robert N., 34241A.
Crans, Robert E., 14759A.
Crawford, Franklin A., 33981A.
Crawford, Wayne S., Jr., 34037A.
Creedon, Jeremiah, 34363A.
Crego, John C., 14130A.
Crews, Sidney W., 14824A.
Cribbs, Thomas J., 34187A.
Cridland, William C., 33492A.
Crockett, Woodrow W., 13254A.
Crosby, Samuel E., Jr., 20612A.
Crosby, Warney L., 34328A.
Crose, Leonard, 13513A.
Crosland, Daniel, 14072A.
Cross, Richard G., Jr., 14492A.
Crowder, Leon L., Jr., 34013A.
Crowe, Donald A., 14666A.
Crozier, Gordon W., 11830A.
Crum, Glenn, 34237A.
Crum, Leroy A., 34235A.
Cude, Willis A., Jr., 21463A.
Culbertson, William W., 14738A.
Culet, Ralph S., 14430A.
Cummings, Robert D., 14625A.
Cummins, Timothy, 22594A.
Curran, Francis E., 13958A.
Currie, Alexander D., 11925A.
Curry, Deane G., 34378A.
Curton, Warren D., 14337A.
Cushman, Gene M., 14905A.
Cusic, William D., Jr., 15014A.
Cutler, William M., 14481A.
Dailey, John G., 14910A.
Dale, Howard H., 14987A.
Dale, Manley H., Jr., 14039A.
Daly, John P., Jr., 34072A.
Daly, Robert P., 14795A.
Damewood, Lawrence D., 51851A.
Daus, Nelson C., 14814A.
Davidson, Jerrold K., 34358A.
Davidson, Ross, 14306A.
Davis, Beverly E., Jr., 14529A.
Davis, Clayton E., 12451A.
Davis, Lavoi S., 14136A.
Davis, Onner D., 2d, 13348A.
Davis, Ruby E., Jr., 14946A.
Day, Joseph D., 34059A.
Dean, John J., 33585A.
Dearey, Ralph H., 34278A.
Deaton, Clarence J., 51839A.
Decoster, James V., 34409A.
Dehaan, Benjamin F., 34262A.
Deleo, Hector J., 34030A.
Delgiorno, Anthony M., 34240A.
DeLong, Robert F., 14069A.
DeLorenzo, Claude A., 34150A.
DeLosier, Bernard C., 13664A.
Denning, Charles W., 34074A.
Dennis, Gordon A., 14968A.
DePalma, Frederick A., 34161A.
DeSandro, Louis J., 34396A.
Desutter, Ralph B., 14085A.
Desvoigne, Melvin C., 14267A.
Dethman, Ivan H., 14258A.
Dewey, Charles J., 34312A.
DeWitt, Robert I., 33529A.
Dezonia, Lawrence E., 14899A.
Dick, Wagner W., 14139A.
Dieck, Theodore F., 13315A.
Dieckman, Jack D., 34175A.
Diehl, Kenneth C., 51819A.
Distler, Jack L., 14796A.
Dixon, Dick, 14952A.
Dixon, Robert J., 14462A.
Dodge, William L., 14850A.
Dodson, Claude B., 13492A.
Donaldson, Glenn H., 13589A.
Donnelly, James E., Jr., 12914A.
Donnelly, Leonard F., 14743A.
Donnelly, William E., 34136A.
Dotson, Verl D., 14811A.
Dougherty, John E., 14578A.
Douglas, Louis R., 13506A.
Douglass, James R., 34155A.
Douglass, Richard B., 34275A.
Douglass, Walter A., 14742A.
Dow, Hugh D., 14797A.
Dow, Norman C., 14856A.
Dow, Robert, 34085A.
Dowdell, James N., 13949A.
Dowless, James R., 34397A.
Downey, Frank A., 14986A.
Downey, Russell A., 14747A.
Downie, Currie S., 14376A.
Downie, Wilbur R., 34258A.
Downing, Elijah M., 34038A.
Downs, Richard J., 34297A.
Doyle, Jesse M., 34245A.
Dreesen, Victor L., 14802A.
Dreller, Karl E., 33978A.
Drew, John C., 34045A.
Dubose, Robert C., 33636A.
Dufault, William F., 20680A.
Duff, Robert T., 14238A.
Duke, Robert H., 12739A.
Duker, Orlo F., 34073A.
Dukes, Ernest F., Jr., 14801A.
Dunaway, Kennieth D., 14478A.
Dunbar, Neal B., Jr., 34402A.
Duncan, Wayne M., 13935A.
Dunlap, Glen R., 14932A.
Dunlap, Hendricks M., 34024A.
Dummire, Floyd T., 14764A.
Dunn, Donald A., 49161A.
Dunn, James M., 33872A.
Dunn, John H., 14656A.
DuPont, Charles G., 33685A.
Durante, Anthony R., 13688A.
Durbin, Robert F., 34010A.
Durell, Alger E., 34365A.
Dvorak, Edward H., 34081A.
Dvorak, Edward R., 34398A.
Dwyre, George T., 34375A.
Dyer, Eugene N., 13590A.
Dyer, James T., Jr., 14974A.
Dyer, John C., 13466A.
Dyke, Samuel E., 14319A.
Dykes, Leo M., Jr., 11877A.
Dysart, Blan P., Jr., 34108A.
Eaglen, James A., 14601A.
Eanes, Fred T., Jr., 34261A.
Earhart, Pat H., 34360A.
Early, John S., 14022A.
Easley, Preston W., 13719A.
Eckles, William H., 34299A.
Edge, William C., 14277A.
Edmonson, Richard W., 15037A.
Edwards, Gerald B., 13224A.
Edwards, Leland V., 14204A.
Ehorn, Merle A., 34025A.
Ehrlich, Albert, 34096A.
Elder, James A., Jr., 15039A.
Ellingson, Bertrum E., 34008A.
Elliott, John W., 34180A.
Elliott, William P., 18204A.
Ellzey, J. Murray, 18204A.
Emig, John W., 34276A.
Engelbreit, Joseph C., 14569A.
Erickson, Donald H., 14784A.
Escue, Walter H., 17702A.
Estes, Carl A., 34267A.
Estes, Herman C., 48728A.
Eubank, Graydon K., 18132A.
Evans, J. L., 14368A.
Evans, Jack T., 14215A.
Evans, Lawrence W., 33984A.
Evans, Marvin F., 51829A.
Evans, Wilbur L., 14958A.
Evans, William R., 14076A.
Evans, William S., 33983A.
Everett, Hal W., 14323A.
Fahrney, Richard L., 18191A.
Fairburn, Craig H., 14116A.
Fallon, Edward R., Jr., 34173A.
Farmer, Marion L., 14849A.
Farrar, Aubrey O., 24702A.
Fasolas, James E., 14110A.
Faulkner, Dwight L., 34071A.
Feagin, Luther W., 22687A.
Feeney, John W., 34386A.
Feldt, Albert J., 34056A.
Ferguson, James H., 13801A.
Fernley, Aaron R., 15005A.
Fetsko, Joseph R., 34124A.
Fetty, Randall L., 14979A.
Fieker, Virgil E., 14098A.
Findlay, Clayton, 14020A.
Finlayson, James C., 14472A.
Finnan, George A., Jr., 14176A.
Fish, Bruce B., 22623A.
Fish, Jules V., 14271A.
Fisher, Alfred K., 13729A.
Fitch, Edward S., 12941A.
Fitjar, Raymond A., 34342A.
Fitschen, Iver C., 12712A.
Fitzgerald, Paul A., 34364A.
Fitzwater, Charles E., 13800A.
Flaherty, William F., 14868A.
Flake, Alma R., 34206A.
Flynn, Norman C., 12916A.
Ford, John P., 34158A.
Foreman, Benjamin A., 34274A.
Foreman, Charles A., 14449A.
Forman, Richard J., 14293A.
Forseth, Vernon E., 34356A.
Fory, Garland V., 12612A.

Foster, Charles R., 14637A.
Fowler, Robert R., 14686A.
Fowler, Walter M., 14113A.
Fox, Edward J., 14773A.
Fox, Harold L., 34401A.
Frailey, Homer F., 14458A.
Framsted, Kenneth G., 13536A.
Franck, Lewis S., 11876A.
Franklin, George W., 14699A.
Franklin, Louie, 14523A.
Franks, Charles H., 34247A.
French, Johnson L., Jr., 34383A.
Frese, Raymond J., 34132A.
Friend, Robert J., 14915A.
Fritsch, James E., 51821A.
Fruit, Firman H., 13269A.
Fullilove, Jacob F., 34388A.
Gaenzle, Jay S., 25723A.
Gagliard, John, 34026A.
Gaines, Edwin F., 14090A.'
Galentine, Paul G., Jr., 14734A.
Gallagher, James G., 14056A.
Gamble, Jack K., 14026A.
Garden, Francis, 19904A.
Gargan, Frank, Jr., 34080A.
Garlick, Roy D., 14157A.
Garlock, Karl H., 14785A.
Garrison, Vermont, 33987A.
Garrison, Vernon W., 14230A.
Garvin, Charles T., 34065A.
Gearhart, Fred Z., 14143A.
George, Ellis P., 34369A.
George, Robert L., 14527A.
Gerber, Norris H., 14514A.
Gibbs, Gordon M., Jr., 13981A.
Gibney, Richard J., 34376A.
Gibson, Billy P., 14070A.
Gibson, William J., 34168A.
Gill, Robert E., 14263A.
Gillaspie, Mark W., 13305A.
Gillespie, George F., 15035A.
Gilmore, Charles J., 14372A.
Gleason, Robert L., 14512A.
Goade, William R., 14552A.
Godsey, Cephas Q., 34163A.
Goetsch, Conrad W., 34092A.
Goff, Theodore B., 14544A.
Goldsberry, Francis R., 34207A.
Goodlad, Harold G., 14520A.
Goodreau, James J., 13313A.
Gordon, John H., 14220A.
Gore, Granville I., 22721A.
Goss, Donald K., 14760A.
Goudy, Jack B., 34171A.
Grabher, Carl J., 34032A.
Grant, Archie W., 14698A.
Grantham, Douglas L., Jr., 14739A.
Gravenstine, Donald J., 14062A.
Gray, Lawrence U., 14329A.
Green, Clifford N., 33979A.
Greene, Julius P., 14609A.
Greenhalgh, William H., Jr., 33799A.
Grier, Robert K., 14999A.
Griggs, Frederick M., 34379A.
Grimes, Robert Z., 14842A.
Groom, John F., 14218A.
Grosse, William R., 12768A.
Grosshuesch, Leroy V., 14052A.
Grotenstein, Morton, 13185A.
Grundmann, William J., 14198A.
Grunewald, Kenneth F., 33995A.
Grunig, David B., 14539A.
Gryskiewicz, Lawrence R., 14346A.
Guerrein, Carl J., 12716A.
Guffey, Herman F., 14736A.
Guinn, Euin N., 14861A.
Gunn, Charles D., Jr., 13929A.
Gutekunst, Charles J., 14474A.
Guy, George A., 34148A.
Hackett, Wilbur M., Jr., 14437A.
Hadden, Perry W., 34420A.
Hagerty, Frederick J., 34371A.
Haigler, Claude S., 24308A.
Hall, Felton W.. 13259A.
Hall, Hubert E., 14830A.
Hall, Wilbur L., Jr., 49165A.
Hall, William P., 33508A.
Haller, Edward J., 34320A.
Halm, Frank N., 34361A.
Halsey, George E., Jr., 14231A.
Hamby, Jesse M., 14290A.
Hamill, Jimmy M., 12243A.
Hamill, Robert S., 34078A.
Hamilton, Richard L., 13042A.
Hancock, John J., 14496A.
Hancock, Robert M., Jr., 13683A.
Hanks, Dale J., 14356A.
Hanna, Max E., 33524A.
Hansen, Homer K., 14983A.
Hansen, Paul K., 15030A.
Hansen, Robert P., 18159A.
Harbaugh, Howard C., 49151A.
Harbula, Edward A., 12902A.
Harden, Charles R., 14835A.
Harkins, Walter C., 15026A.
Harmon, George L., 15018A.
Harper, Flamm D., 14890A.
Harris, Daniel B., 14441A.
Harris, Elsey, Jr., 24309A.
Harris, George W. E., 34033A.
Harte, Allan S., Jr., 14459A.
Hartley, James R., 12160A.
Hartzell, Connett F., 13411A.
Hassel, Robert K., 14164A.
Hathaway, Frank A., Jr., 14519A.
Haupt, Fred J., 3d, 14620A.
Havard, David J., 14937A.
Hayen, Bernard N., 14440A.
Hayford, Elbert D., Jr., 34372A.
Hays, Raymond F., 14808A.
Hayslip, Frank W., 34114A.
Haywood, Vernon V., 13477A.
Heft, Robert E., 14385A.
Heintz, James E., 14726A.
Heiser, Thomas F., 34088A.
Held, Fred J., 3d, 51841A.
Henderson, Jack J., 14532A.
Henderson, Thomas W., 34048A.
Hendricks, Howard F., 34122A.
Hendrickson, Oscar S., 14140A.
Henry, Patrick H., 14548A.
Hensarling, Arthur L., 14649A.
Hepler, Jesse B., 14092A.
Herbert, Floyd, 14804A.
Hergenreder, Larry P., 34316A.
Hermann, Wayne E., 14553A.
Hershberger, George A., 14887A.
Hervey, Robert E., 14633A.
Hess, Walter N., 34049A.
Hessler, Elmo B., 14862A.
Hester, Henry E., 34042A.
Heyroth, James W., 14789A.
Hill, Harold I., 14714A.
Hill, John F., 13077A.
Hiltenbrand, John R., 14641A.
Himes, David A., 34112A.
Hirsch, Henry R., 12566A.
Hodges, Hubert W., 14864A.
Hodges, Robert M., 14643A.
Hoey, William K., 14717A.
Hof, Robert T., 33986A.
Hoffmann, Leonard C., 34325A.
Hogan, Miller E., 12993A.
Holland, Gould K., 14621A.
Hollis, Medford E., 14501A.
Hollis, William N., 12349A.
Holman, Averill F., 14798A.
Holman, Jack W., 14287A.
Holmberg Herbert A., 14587A.
Hooven, Francis V., Jr., 34129A.
Hoover, Ferris E., 15044A.
Horey, Raymond S., 22593A.
Horgan, Michael C., 34044A.
Horn, John D., 12714A.
Hornick, George, Jr., 12845A.
Horton, John N., 13998A.
Hosack, Harold W., 34164A.
Hosford, Lynn H., Jr., 14767A.
Hoskins, Robert O., 14962A.
Houser, Patrick B., 13239A.
Hovey, Harold G., 13387A.
Hovey, Marsh, 14660A.
Howard, Ronald M., 14900A.
Howard, Wilson W., 13952A.
Howse, Benjamin M., 13498A.
Huettig, Hans G., 34218A.
Hughes, Alfred A., 14093A.
Hughes, Claude A., Jr., 14024A.
Hughes, Harson B., 34416A.
Hughes, James E., 34334A.
Hughes, John L., 34220A.
Hughes, Robert E., 14107A.
Hughes Robert L., 12944A.
Hughs, William M., 33845A.
Hugo, Frederick J., Jr., 11656A.
Humphries, Buford M., 18175A.
Hundley, Charles P., 14077A.
Hurlbut, Byron A., 14727A.
Hurley, Richard M., 14498A.
Hutchins, Alfred G., 14682A.
Hutchison, Joseph G., 34242A.
Iles, George J., 14792A.
Ingram, Stanford M., 34283A.
Inks, Howard R., 14626A.
Ireland, Paul J., 13326A.
Irons, Victor E., Jr., 14000A.
Ishmael, Chester C., 33772A.
Jabbour, Nicholas, 14175A.
Jackson, Duard Y., 34083A.
Jackson, William C., 14285A.
Jacobi, George A., 34009A.
Jacobs, John W., 14774A.
Jacobs, Robert A., 14007A.
Jacobson, Richard K., 20689A.
Jaeger, Frank J., 14615A.
James, Daniel, Jr., 34012A.
James, Robert H., 34126A.
Janssen, Carl A., 13038A.
Janssen, Jan W., Jr., 12426A.
Jarman, Wallace J., 34203A.
Jensen, Clayton E., 34405A.
Jewell, Forrest W., 14429A.
Johns, Gordon H., 14315A.
Johns, Mervyn T., 13268A.
Johnson, Alfred E., 14711A.
Johnson, Charles G., 14992A.
Johnson, Conrad L., 13992A.
Johnson, Fon E., 22598A.
Johnson, Gordon M., 14949A.
Johnson, Jack D., 13047A.
Johnson, Walter E., 14839A.
Johnson, Warren D., 14367A.
Johnson, William T., 13347A.
Jones, Billy J., 13160A.
Jones, David B., 18183A.
Jones Donald O., 15016A.
Jones, Ellis M., Jr., 13120A.
Jones, Howard A., 14965A.
Jones, Milton J., 33841A.
Jones, Richard F., 13654A.
Jones, Troy H., Jr., 14049A.
Jorgensen, Kenneth B., 14732A.
Julin, Donald D., 14872A.
Julin, Harold S., 34039A.
Junker, Harold R., 14876A.
Justen, Eugene J., 34295A.
Kaluta, William R., 13997A.
Kammerlohr, Morton A., 13815A.
Karr, William, 48723A.
Karschner, Donald F., 14149A.
Kaurin, Robert H., 14733A.
Keeler, William J., 21763A.
Keeling, Rufus K., 14185A.
Keils, Walter A., 22599A.
Kekoa, Curtis, 14730A.
Keller, August N., 34142A.
Kelley, George J., Jr., 12519A.
Kelly, Joseph D., 11903A.
Kemper, Othmar A. J., 14526A.
Kennedy, William E., 15021A.
Kensler, Thomas C., Jr., 14909A.
Kepler, Paul H., 13311A.
Kerstetter, Albert S., 34047A.
Kettler, William H., 12877A.
Key, Marvin E., Jr., 34137A.
Key, Oran R., Jr., 22589A.
Kidd, John B., 34076A.
Killeavy, Francis T., 12878A.
Kimball, John G., 14647A.
King, Alfred N., 34221A.
King, Donald B., 34353A.
King, Edwin V., 20585A.
King, Homer J., Jr., 11796A.
King, Lonnie T., 12950A.
King, Walter S., 34374A.
Kinney, James F., 14893A.
Kinsella, William E., 13357A.
Kitchens, Ralph L., 34280A.
Kleinhelter, Robert W., 13128A
Kleinwechter, Frank F. Jr., 51827A.
Klentzman, James F., 14476A.
Klerk, Jacob W., 12866A.
Klingler, Djack, 14975A.
Knight, Jack, 20039A.

Knight, William T., 14889A.
Knotts, James M., 33794A.
Koehler, Carl J., 34264A.
Kost, Stephen D., 14030A.
Kovach, Michael M., 22683A.
Kozina, Joseph J., 14757A.
Kraus, Robert E., 34281A.
Kregloh, Edwin R., 14724A.
Kriehn, Norman A., 34423A.
Kropenicki, John J., 14115A.
Krug, Frederick C., 14393A.
Kupersmith, Louis W., Jr., 14355A.
Labbe, Erwin G., 33974A.
Lacagnin, Leonard J., 14574A.
Lacey, William H., 34255A.
Lahren, Lawrence G., 34419A.
Lamb, Bennett G., 14321A.
Land, Cary J., 34367A.
Lander, Jack D., 34403A.
Landsperger, William J., 34002A.
Lane, Thomas W., 34084A.
Lange, Roy A., 20690A.
Langebartel, Edward P., 34121A.
Langley, Edwin W., 14806A.
LaSalle, Harry S., Jr., 13937A.
Lauder, Edmund, 14461A.
Lawrence, Norman T., 14284A.
Leach, Wayne, 14851A.
Leavitt, Roy D., 14268A.
Lee, Zaden O., 13862A.
Leech, Richard G., 24312A.
Legge, Leonard M., 14749A.
Lehmann, Elroy C., 49160A.
Leighty, Robert M., 14843A.
Leigon, Charles W., 14006A.
Lemes, Ralph, 34303A.
Lemoine, Ray F., 33745A.
Leo, Carl H., 34021A.
Lester, Harry N., 51832A.
Levesque, J. B. L., 34099A.
Lewis, Charles H., 14703A.
Lewis, Henry S., Jr., 19794A.
Lewis, Jack M., 12732A.
Lewis, William, 14161A.
Light, Clifton F., 14810A.
Lillard, David C., Jr., 14188A.
Linden, Robert M., 51805A.
Lindley, Wesley L., 14331A.
Lindquester, David M., 14827A.
Liniger, Vaun N., 13048A.
Link, Charles H., 51834A.
Linscheid, Gerald, 34257A.
Lively, James R., 15031A.
Livers, George M., 14433A.
Livingston, Clyde M., 11657A.
Locker, Bernard D., 33901A.
Loflin, William A., 13408A.
Loman, William T., Jr., 20669A.
Loney, George A., 14339A.
Long, Paul H., 20635A.
Louden, James L., 14126A.
Loudermilk, James A., 14403A.
Loughnan, Victor J., 22573A.
Lowell, Charles L., 13928A.
Lowell, Julius C., 34422A.
Loyd, Robert O., 34208A.
Lucas, Truman, 33999A.
Lucchesi, Gene A., 34027A.
Luckey, William J., Jr., 14299A.
Ludwig, Charles A., Jr., 14536A.
Lukeman, Robert P., 14156A.
Lutkenhouse, Henry E., 34035A.
Lutz, Raymond K., 11691A.
Lyon, Moncure N., Jr., 34191A.
Lyons, Horace C., 12354A.
Macefield, James, 34233A.
MacGregor, Jack M., 14859A.
MacKenzie, Alexander S., 34188A.
MacLaughlin, John T., 14190A.
Macomber, Louis N., 34077A.
Maggert, Donald W., 14600A.
Maher, Philip J., Jr., 14761A.
Mahon, Keith, 13945A.
Mahoney, Daniel C., 23006A.
Major, Stanley T., 34118A.
Malkiewicz, Frank J., 14978A.
Maloney, Robert F., 34055A.
Mann, Edwin, 14419A.
Mann, Harry A., 34224A.
Manning, Simon W., Jr., 14286A.
Manning, William J., 33993A.
Manor, Leroy J., 14307A.
Marcum, Everette L., 14137A.
Marcum, Robert S., 12212A.
Markel, Carroll B., 14602A.
Marlin, Roger T., 14298A.
Marsden, William F., 14097A.
Marshall, Wofford E., Jr., 12502A.
Martin, Edward O., 14366A.
Martin, James F., 14447A.
Martin, Thomas W., 14269A.
Mason, George I., Jr., 14417A.
Masonheimer, Robert H., 12727A.
Matlick, Benjamin M., Jr., 14607A.
Matte, Joseph Z., 20615A.
Mattson, Conrad E., 34285A.
Maughan, Weston F., 13698A.
Maurer, Homer F., 14729A.
Maxwell, Sidney R., 34120A.
Mayo, Francis L., 34329A.
McAllister, Warren W., 23672A.
McCambridge, Andrew J., 34004A.
McCarty, Harold H., 14239A.
McClure, Robert D., 13714A.
McCorkle, George W., 34043A.
McCormack, Robert, 14618A.
McCormick, Robert R., 14128A.
McCreary, Frank E., Jr., 34153A.
McDaniel, Robert E., 14894A.
McDonell, Roger W., 14503A.
McFadden, Kenneth L., 20746A.
McGehee, Harold F., 14347A.
McGinniss, Robert H., 11624A.
McGrain, Thomas W., 12912A.
McGrew, Russell G., 14395A.
McGugan, Charlie T., 51813A.
McHugh, John F., Jr., 14206A.
McIsaac, Lewis G., 14212A.
McKay, Allen F., 20613A.
McKeag, Charles M., 14425A.
McKean, William A., 33998A.
McKendrick, Howard R., 14676A.
McKenney, Earl F., 14834A.
McKinney, Fred D., 14106A.
McKinney, Isaac H., 34231A.
McLaughlin, William A., 14515A.
McLean, Richard Q., 13648A.
McLendon, Robert A., 14984A.
McManaman, Charles J., 34384A.
McMichael, Lyle E., 34277A.
McMunigle, Francis M., 34144A.
McNary, Lawrence B., 14902A.
McQuillan, David P., 34000A.
McVey, William H., 14700A.
McWilliams, Robert T., 34216A.
Meacham, Chauncey W., 13986A.
Meagher, Robert B., 14223A.
Mealka, John C., 14497A.
Mechling, James E., 34418A.
Meholic, James J., 14445A.
Melton, Carl M., 18190A.
Melvin, Robert E., 18193A.
Menninger, Charles J., 13609A.
Merrill, Edward G., 14303A.
Mersereau, Robert T., 14971A.
Mertely, Frank, 18201A.
Messer, Frank A., 14048A.
Metcalf, John C., 14809A.
Metheney, Frank W., 14374A.
Meyer, Lloyd F., 14538A.
Meyers, Oliver H., 12794A.
Michael, Edward S., 13343A.
Mickey, Harry F., 34054A.
Miller, Cecil D., 34394A.
Miller, Clair R., 14638A.
Miller, Clarence M., Jr., 14088A.
Miller, Earl D., 14677A.
Miller, John W., 18198A.
Miller, Luther J., 34016A.
Miller, Paul R., 14254A.
Miller, Robert A., 13106A.
Miller, Robert L., 12494A.
Miller, Robert L., 51817A.
Miller, Roy A., 14409A.
Miller, Sidney H., 21459A.
Mills, Arthur J., 18180A.
Mills, Thomas A., 51807A.
Millsap, Frederick M., 33559A.
Mims, Edwin T., 14505A.
Mitchell, Clarence D., Jr., 14929A.
Mitchell, Daniel B., 14354A.
Mitchell, Howard C., 14740A.
Mitchell, John W., 14159A.
Mitchell, Maurice S., 14171A.
Mitchell, William L., 14397A.
Moats, Sanford K., 14948A.
Moench, John O., 14318A.
Moffatt, Leo J., 51836A.
Monroe, Ralph E., 34170A.
Montague, Hal R., 51800A.
Montoya, Patrick E., 14426A.
Moody, Robert P., 14464A.
Moore, Grover P., Jr., 51749A.
Moore, Howard M., 14125A.
Moore, Jerry P., 14646A.
Moore, William P., 34151A.
Moorhead, Chester D., 34300A.
Moreman, Robert, 34213A.
Morgan, Thomas W., 13964A.
Morgan, Wayne D., 14722A.
Morris, Frank G., Jr., 34069A.
Morris, George W., 34382A.
Morrison, Manley J., 14427A.
Morrison, Maurice, 34172A.
Morse, Oscar L., 34104A.
Morton, William G., 14838A.
Moseley, Nelson B., 34127A.
Moseley, Walter S., 34117A.
Mosher, Francis L., 14942A.
Mosier, Walter M., 14402A.
Mowat, John J., 14991A.
Mozley, Claude D., Jr., 14028A.
Muldoon, James E., Jr., 22651A.
Mullen, Bernard N., 11890A.
Mulligan, John L., 34265A.
Mulvey, Gordon E., 24697A.
Mumbower, Wilbur E., 14205A.
Murphy, John E., 14169A.
Murphy, Joseph J., 34138A.
Murphy, Joseph L., 51814A.
Murtha, Manus F., Jr., 34268A.
Myers, Bill E., 14038A.
Myers, George B., 22621A.
Myers, Russell W., 14634A.
Nabors, Jack, 34174A.
Naftel, Stacy D., 34309A.
Nanney, James T., 18177A.
Nash, Charles E., 14257A.
Navarro, Michael, 14499A.
Nebughr, Raymond L., 13241A.
Nelson, Carl A., 14825A.
Nelson, Frances W., 34415A.
Nelson, Hal J., 14282A.
Nelson, Leslie D., 34029A.
Nelson, Lyles B., 34192A.
Nelson, Richard G., 14684A.
Nesley, William L., 14378A.
Neu, John J., 14896A.
Neumann, Howard G., 14713A.
Neundorf, Charles A., 51833A.
Neville, Harry W., 17704A.
Newman, Forrest D., 34100A.
Newman, James E., 13953A.
Newman, John C., 14976A.
Newquist, Weldon D., 34067A.
Neyland, Lewis J., 14387A.
Nice, Albert T., 23182A.
Nichols, Malcolm G., 13366A.
Nixon, Lewis D., 14913A.
Nixon, Stanley J., 14066A.
Nolan, Bernard T., Jr., 14794A.
Nolan, Robert A., 34193A.
Norman, Isaac G., 14911A.
Norman, James S., 14010A.
Norris, Loy R., 14953A.
North, Ernest J., 49170A.
North, William H., 14194A.
Northcutt, Carol R., 33682A.
Norwood, James P., 13983A.
Nowlin, David M., 12892A.
Noziglia, Robert E., 23675A.
Nuding, William F., Jr., 33503A.
Nunneley, Clarance M., 13145A.
Nurnberg, Malcolm L., 14046A.
Obus, Louis J., 14866A.
O'Connor, John C., 34251A.
O'Connor, Walter B., 14708A.
O'Donnell, Eugene B., 34410A.
O'Dwyer, Phillip W., 14606A.
Ogle, Sherman L., 13780A.
Ogozaly, Leo E., 13999A.
Olsson, Ward T., 34006A.
Ong, Dong, 14556A.
O'Reilly, Thomas P., 34068A.

Orton, George W., 14675A.
Orton, Robert B., 34232A.
Osborne, William F., 12900A.
Ostendorf, Ted H., 14752A.
Ousley, Carl A., 33997A.
Owen, Robert C., 34333A.
Pagozalski, Ladislaus J., 34185A.
Palmer, Garth C., 14565A.
Palmos, Peter G., 14919A.
Parker, William C., 14375A.
Parmentier, Edgar M., 34354A
Parrish, James M., 14217A.
Parrott, John H., Jr., 25504A.
Parsonson, Ernest C., 12973A.
Pascoe, Herschel T., 14845A.
Patterson, Alfred K., 14311A.
Patterson, John E., 34352A.
Patterson, Joseph B., 14369A.
Paul Charles T. A., 22622A.
Pavlica, Pete, 34017A.
Pawlowski, Thomas, 15028A.
Pawlowski, William J., 34318A.
Payne, Hugh A., 34272A.
Payne, Joe W., 13852A.
Peck, Donald A., 14644A.
Pedersen, Harry P., 51811A.
Pedigo, William E., 14109A.
Penhall, Raymond D., 14579A.
Pennington, Alvin L., 14021A.
Pennock, Paul W., 14590A.
Penton, Gordon K., 13039A.
Perbetsky, George, 14041A.
Perfetto, Albert J., 14863A.
Perry, William E., Jr., 23673A.
Pesacreta, Samuel, 14281A.
Petersen, Nelson L., 14252A.
Peterson, Eugene F., 14611A.
Peterson, Richard B., 14488A.
Petrul, Paul J., 14207A.
Phifer, James H., Jr., 14453A.
Phillips, Lowell G., 18050A.
Phillips, Norman P., 34373A.
Phippen, Charles D., 51837A.
Pierce, Alfred L., 34341A.
Pierce, Harry F., 12956A.
Pierce, Milton R., 13613A.
Pierce, Sammy A., 14439A.
Pierson, Robert E., 14826A.
Piggott, Myron G., 12911A.
Plummer, Horace A., 34359A.
Podonsky, Reuben, 34133A.
Poerschke, Raymond A., 34380A.
Pool, Fain H., 13324A.
Pope, William K., 34282A.
Porter, Clifford L., 14935A.
Porter, John G., 33996A.
Pouncey, William A., 34412A.
Prather, Jack F., 14715A.
Preller, Gordon C., 18144A.
Prewitt, Ernest L., 13994A.
Price, Harry M., Jr., 14141A.
Price, James L., 34018A.
Price, Robert Y., 14297A.
Priest, Royce W., 14758A.
Primavera, Amadeo A., 34177A.
Prince, William H., 33726A.
Pritchard, James B., 13836A.
Purdum, James S., 34399A.
Pusko, Stanley J., 13972A.
Qualls, Melvin E., 34098A.
Quinn, William H., 14377A.
Rackham, Edwin J., 14399A.
Raisor, Clifford E., 14015A.
Raley, Theodore M., 18200A.
Ramer, Richard L., 14436A.
Randle, Robert J., 14516A.
Rankin, Hobart R., 34324A.
Raschke, Wendell M., 14138A.
Ratti, Emilio P., 34178A.
Rauscher, Donald E., 34301A.
Rayborn, Garland, 14500A.
Records, Walter L., 33992A.
Reed, Charles D., 14310A.
Reed, Charles K., 34307A.
Reed, Merlin L., 34385A.
Reeves, Horace B., 14564A.
Regan, Robert F., 33575A.
Reger, Ted E., 14820A.
Rehbein, Norman W., 15012A.
Reilley, Philip F., Jr., 13398A.
Reilley, Orville K., 51843A.
Remmele, Frank M., 14642A.
Rettinger, Henry P., 14917A.
Reusche, Robert L., 34214A.
Reuther, Daniel, Jr., 34089A.
Reynolds, Glenn A., 49148A.
Reynolds, Herbert A., 49147A.
Reynolds, James W., 34244A.
Reynolds, Joseph F., 12617A.
Reynolds, Richard F., 14011A.
Rhodes, Donald F., 13948A.
Richards, William W., Jr., 14162A.
Richardson, Howard, 14345A.
Richey, Albert L., 14469A.
Richmond, Joe F., 14057A.
Ridgway, Guy E., Jr., 14930A.
Rigley, James D., Jr., 34130A.
Riordan, Daniel W., 24327A.
Riseden, Jack W., 14145A.
Risher, Edward H., 34293A.
Ristau, Siegfried E., 18169A.
Roberton, Harold E., Jr., 14391A.
Roberts, Earl R., 15041A.
Robeson, John C., 49142A.
Robinett, Russell N., 14265A.
Robinson, Charles J., 13562A.
Rodriguez, Edward F., 12881A.
Rogers, Donald K., 34326A.
Rogers, William T., Jr., 14518A.
Rogge, William A., Jr., 49164A.
Rohloff, John F., 34313A.
Rolin, Mitchell A., 14933A.
Rondel, Albert O., 33501A.
Rood, Eric W., 22620A.
Rooney, Gerard W., 34022A.
Rose, Frank L., Jr., 14803A.
Rose, John G., 14460A.
Rosengrants, David E., 14468A.
Rosser, Samuel E., 14260A.
Roth, Martin E., 14412A.
Rounds, Kenneth G., 13229A.
Rowe, Mayron H., 14928A.
Rowland, Keith C., 14408A.
Rowland, Richard G., 14025A.
Rubich, Edward M., 33944A.
Rufener, Kenneth E., 14619A.
Runyard, Gerald D., 34094A.
Russell, Demetrius H., 34152A.
Russell, Irving J., 34346A.
Russell, James W., Jr., 14507A.
Ryan, John J., 14869A.
Ryan, William A., Jr., 34223A.
Sahl, Frederick H. G., 14008A.
Samuelson, Dale L., 24310A.
Sandacz, Victor L., 34284A.
Sandberg, Howard A., 34199A.
Sanna, Francis P., 18148A.
Sansing, Virgal E., 34050A.
Sarter, Lee A., Jr., 14058A.
Sartori, Gerard A., 34090A.
Sauers, Dale E., 13967A.
Saunders, Earl R., 14342A.
Saunders, Jackson, 12541A.
Saunders, Maurice E., 14357A.
Savidge, Dale E., 34234A.
Scanlon, Thomas S., Jr., 14382A.
Scarborough, Stanley R., 34139A.
Schaaf, Robert A., 14632A.
Schenker, Edward R., 14013A.
Schlipf, Harold A., 14750A.
Schmerbeck, David J., 14781A.
Schmid, Donald E., 14652A.
Schmidt, David J., 24320A.
Schmidt, Fred J., 14807A.
Schmidt, George R., 18202A.
Schmidt, Karl F., 51820A.
Schmitt, Hugh L., 34349A.
Schreiber, Joseph, 14988A.
Schuler, Paul J., 13970A.
Schutt, George G., Jr., 34413A.
Scott, Charles E., Jr., 13831A.
Scott, James L., 34228A.
Scott, Leonard B., Jr., 13966A.
Scott, Richard E. J., 14002A.
Scott, Robert A., 14278A.
Scott, Thomas H., 34053A.
Scribner, Orville E., 51816A.
Scruton, Albert M., 21786A.
Scurlock, Frank L., 14748A.
Scuro, Vito M., 13170A.
Seaman, Merrill H., 34256A.
Seaver, Owen L., 14805A.
Segler, Thomas F., Jr., 12696A.
Seitz, Edwin A., 34062A.
Selkregg, James B., 33502A.
Shaffner, Douglass D., 14380A.
Shannon, James A., 14510A.
Shaw, Dan L., 14881A.
Shea, Robert B., 14950A.
Sheehan, Douglas M., 14586A.
Sheehan, Frank A., 51812A.
Sheehan, Joseph B., 13956A.
Sheidow, Robert G., 14251A.
Shelton, Lenward A., 51847A.
Shelton, Melvin D., Jr., 14938A.
Shepherd, Arthur C., 33603A.
Sher, Harry L., 14232A.
Shewan, Clifford W., 18150A.
Shick, Ira H., 34227A.
Shipley, Fred D., 14755A.
Shook, Abraham E., 14821A.
Shotts, Bryan M., 14680A.
Showers, Herbert C., 34229A.
Shuck, John F., 12913A.
Siebern, Vincent P., 13133A.
Siebert, Raymond A., 14135A.
Silva, Theodore D., 14270A.
Simmons, Alfred C., 13957A.
Simmons, John C., 14844A.
Simmons, Roy D., Jr., 14465A.
Simmons, Willis M., 13057A.
Simokaitis, Frank J., 15013A.
Simon, Bernard R., 14670A.
Simpson, Robert F., Jr., 14068A.
Simpson, Thomas L., 14423A.
Sims, Lewis P., 14692A.
Sims, Thomas J., 34205A.
Singleton, Earl H., 14253A.
Skinner, Ernest C., 14317A.
Skoglund, Peter J., 14921A.
Sloan, Howard M., 14745A.
Slupe, Harold D., 14044A.
Smallfield, George B., 14959A.
Smith, Donavon F., 14577A.
Smith, Edgar H., 23684A.
Smith, Harry E., Jr., 14543A.
Smith, Kenneth E., 14400A.
Smith, Lewis R., 51823A.
Smith, Norman H., 33727A.
Smith, Orrin R., Jr., 15038A.
Smith, Paul K., 51806A.
Smith, Richard H., 16603A.
Smith, William B., Jr., 12853A.
Smolen, Michael, 34368A.
Sokay, Leslie W., 14362A.
Sommers, William J., 14636A.
Sparrevohn, Frederic D. R., 13985A.
Speed, Worth M., 34116A.
Speer, Arthur E., 34315A.
Spence, Ross E., 34064A.
Spencer, Horace L., 15000A.
Spiker, William O., 14970A.
Spindler, Walter E., Jr., 14179A.
Sprinkel, Milton D., 13304A.
Sproul, Matthew, Jr., 13528A.
Stahle, Paul J., 14353A.
Stallsmith, Donald L., 14082A.
Stanfield, Louis P., 14228A.
Stanton, Charles R., 12797A.
Stanton, Frank G., 15025A.
Stark, Louis K., 12067A.
Stauff, Oscar B., Jr., 14592A.
Stearns, Seymour, 51808A.
Steed, Cecil V., 34070A.
Steele, Gordon H., Jr., 13723A.
Steele, Ralph J., 14388A.
Steelman, William D., 14349A.
Steelnack, Einar H., Jr., 33994A.
Steinberger, Alfred C., 12146A.
Steinkraus, Lawrence W., 14847A.
Stenger, Edward J., 14967A.
Stephens, Joseph W., Jr., 14444A.
Stevens, Blythe E., 13920A.
Stillie, Edward O., 14947A.
Stobie, William H., 14658A.
Stockton, Floyd C., 13930A.
Stockus, Leonard, 34351A.
Stoeppelwerth, Earl, 14059A.
Stoker, Norman P., 14493A.
Stokes, Arthur J., 14973A.
Stone, Leon, 14174A.
Stoner, Charles W., 34046A.
Stooksberry, Sam D., 14370A.
Story, Harvey L., 14772A.
Stowell, Frederick R., 15006A.
Strand, George E., 14870A.

Strange, Russell P., 14165A.
Stringfellow, Glassell S., 34145A.
Strong, Roy L., 14364A.
Stroot, Robert C., 34389A.
Struby, Joseph R., 14707A.
Stubblefield, Lee E., 51853A.
Stuber, Harold B., 15019A.
Stump, Charles F., Jr., 14324A.
Sullivan, Harold J., 14770A.
Sullivan, James E., 14936A.
Sullivan, Richard D., 13686A.
Sullivan, Robert F., 13733A.
Sullivan, Woodfin, M., 51824A.
Sumner, Charles D., Jr., 15045A.
Sunderland, Lloyd E., 26395A.
Sunderman, Everett C., 34395A.
Suprenant, Charles E., 12829A.
Suroweic, Eugene L., 34200A.
Susong, Charles J., Jr., 14631A.
Suther, Fred L., Jr., 14283A.
Svenson, Wesley W., 14818A.
Swan, Frederic C., 34266A.
Swedberg, Robert B., 33990A.
Sweeney, Daniel J., 34417A.
Swisher, Keith D., 14448A.
Talbot, Philip B., 12966A.
Tarasko, Frank E., 14918A.
Tarwater, Benjamin W., 14264A.
Tate, Clark A., 34169A.
Tatsio, Theodore G., 14599A.
Taylor, Hubert J., 14776A.
Taylor, Liston T., 13963A.
Taylor, Robert L., 34348A.
Taylor, Robert R., 51822A.
Taylor, Ulysses S., Jr., 13465A.
Tebbs, Merlin E., 51844A.
Tennyson, Allen R., 15028A.
Terry, Vernon P., Jr., 34400A.
Thomas, John B., 14996A.
Thomas, John H., Jr., 14080A.
Thompson, Brian C., 14691A.
Thompson, Byron M., 34011A.
Thompson, Cary A., Jr., 14221A.
Thompson, Edward L., 14291A.
Thompson, John, 14016A.
Thompson, John C., 33577A.
Thorn, James R., 25613A.
Thresher, Robert D., 14694A.
Tibbets, Oscar J., 14379A.
Tips, George R., 34082A.
Tiroux, Clyde B., 34110A.
Titsworth, James H., Jr., 14335A.
Todd, Vernon R., 14246A.
Toler, Harold M., 14473A.
Townsend, George E., 13545A.
Trakowski, Albert C., Jr., 14384A.
Traverso, Normand H., 34201A.
Traylor, Alwyn W., Jr., 49156A.
Tremblay, Armand L., 22624A.
Trimble, George L., Jr., 14595A.
Trout, Darvin L., 14822A.
Trueblood, Charles H., 33976A.
Trueblood, Roger W., 14848A.
Truitt, Robert G., 14685A.
Trumbo, Charles E., Jr., 14104A.
Tucker, Charles L., 12890A.
Tucker, Ralph D., 49162A.
Tuel, Houston N., 34302A.
Tull, Gordon F., 14957A.
Turner, Howard D., 25799A.
Turnier, Walter C., 34041A.
Tychsen, Charles E., 14817A.
Tyldesley, Robert H., 15043A.
Tyler, Loren S., 14966A.
Umphress, F. E., Jr., 34063A.
Unger, Edward C., 14491A.
Ureke, George, 33982A.
Valentine, James W., 14398A.
VanBlaricum, Wilmer A., 34222A.
VanBloom, Jay C., 18147A.
VanBruggen, Richard, 12713A.
Vanhoy, Lonnie E., 14629A.
Vaughn, Richard E., 34259A.
Vella, Vito T., 14841A.
Verbeck, Ernest L., 14904A.
Verhagen, Kenneth W., 14456A.
Verhulst, Florent J., Jr., 12328A.
Versurah, Vincent V., 14989A.
Vester, Curtis P., Jr., 34019A.
Vilchek, Edward J., 34355A.
Vincent, Robert W., 20575A.
Vizi, Joseph C., 14628A.
Vogel, James J., 48725A.
Voss, Clyde K., 14541A.
Vowell, Fred C., 48730A.
Vowinkel, Merlin J., 14778A.
Wack, Joseph H., 34337A.
Wagaman, Merle A., 34183A.
Waggener, Herman A., Jr., 14047A.
Wagner, James M., 14199A.
Walker, Barton F., Jr., 14249A.
Walker, Charles L. 14167A.
Walker, Harold E., 14432A.
Walker, James C., 14619A.
Walker, John D., 14005A.
Walker, Richard I., 14589A.
Waller, Charles S., 13692A.
Waller, Roy E., 49167A.
Walsh, Edward M., Jr., 14688A.
Walsh, James J., 34202A.
Walters, William J., 49152A.
Wampler, Louis C., 12883A.
Ward, Albert T., 13889A.
Wardner, Robert S., 14522A.
Warner, Richard J., 14108A.
Warren, Arthur L., Jr., 34149A.
Warren, Johnnie J., 13097A.
Waterfill, Eugene A., 14371A.
Waters, Olen L., 34014A.
Watkins, Doyce L., 34287A.
Watson, James A., 34194A.
Watson, Paul C., 14603A.
Watts, William A., Jr., 48724A.
Weaver, William H., Jr., 14813A.
Webb, Bert H., Jr., 12132A.
Webber, Louis A., 34340A.
Webster, Frederick L., Jr., 14121A.
Webster, John A., 14134A.
Weeks, Roy F., Jr., 18189A.
Wehrman, Kenneth E., 14178A.
Weidenbusch, Albert C., 34357A.
Weir, Gerald C., 14542A.
Weir, Richard A., 34128A.
Welborn, James E., Jr., 14901A.
Wells, Mac C., 14616A.
Welsh, Stephen J., 20634A.
Wennergren, William A., Jr., 14648A.
Wenzel, Lloyd M. N., 14960A.
Werber, William A., 18178A.
Wernette, Eugene C., 34146A.
Wertz, John C., 14160A.
West, Wielding F., 22614A.
West, James P., 34336A.
West, Sammy A., 14202A.
Westerman, Raymond S., 14617A.
Wheeler, Kenneth R., 12806A.
White, Harry A., Jr., 14305A.
White, Jon E., 34270A.
White, Morris D., 14320A.
White, Raymond E., 22661A.
White, Robert G., 11712A.
White, Ross D., 34195A.
White, Victor M., 14594A.
Whittington, Curtis A., Jr., 48726A.
Wholley, Francis G., 34252A.
Whye, Harry D., 14865A.
Wiechert, Stanley J., 14530A.
Wiese, Frank E., 15024A.
Wiggins, Leland R., 11625A.
Wilborn, William T., 18194A.
Wiley, John C., 21782A.
Wilhelm, Andrew C., 14181A.
Wilkins, Linus A., 34190A.
Wilkins, Paul H., 14667A.
Wilkowski, Ernie W., Jr., 12685A.
Will, William F., Jr., 14571A.
Wille, Herman B., 34314A.
Wille, Thomas, 51849A.
Williams, Arthur F., 14203A.
Williams, Evan E., 12249A.
Williams, George M., 34347A.
Williams, Hubert L., 14446A.
Williams, James F., 34269A.
Williams, Lawrence, 18152A.
Williams, Paul R., 14075A.
Williams, Richard F., 14559A.
Williams, Robert G., 12139A.
Williams, Thomas J., 34113A.
Williamson, Louis O., 34296A.
Wills, Robert M., 12405A.
Wilson, Clifford A., 14118A.
Wilson, Elbert, Jr., 18263A.
Wilson, James R., 34160A.
Wilson, John E., Jr., 14716A.
Wilson, Lee V., 34105A.
Wilson, Merle E., 51830A.
Wilson, Roy E., 14288A.
Wilson, William, 14735A.
Wilson, Woodrow W., 12788A.
Wine, Paul H., 14055A.
Winfree, Douglas W., Jr., 18278A.
Wise, John F., 49158A.
Wise, John W., 14340A.
Woda, Robert G., 14744A.
Wolfe, Charles S., 18176A.
Wood, Denver J., 14718A.
Wood, Edwin A., 14117A.
Wood, John B., Jr., 34253A.
Wood, William A., 22595A.
Woods, George K., 34141A.
Woodward, John L., Jr., 13354A.
Woodworth, William C., 14406A.
Woody, Rufus, Jr., 23655A.
Woolridge, Ray E., 34091A.
Wozniak, Stanley E., 14296A.
Wright, Charles F., 13284A.
Wright, Noble D., 14259A.
Wright, Roy P., 34327A.
Wurth, Herbert L., 14980A.
Wylie, Billy C., 14225A.
Yentz, Robert J., 34179A.
Yorra, Arthur, 34005A.
Young, Barnett B., 12637A.
Young, Pete H., Jr., 34212A.
Young, William A., 34254A.
Younger, John P., 14705A.
Youngs, James R., Jr., 13159A.
Zedler, Donald L., 12438A.
Zerr, Bert R., 34125A.
Zimmerman, Pershing G., 14434A.
Zimmerman, Robert E., 14914A.
Zimmermann, Hugo, 14728A.
Zimmermann, John A., 34279A.
Zunker, Leroy O., 51831A.
Zweifel, Harold J., 13773A.
Zwinger, Herman H., 26437A.

Line of the Air Force (*WAF*)

Casey, Florence B., 21301W.
Dion, Lucille B., 21357W.
Holm, Jeanne M., 21395W.
Knight, Carolyn G., 21344W.
Lucas, Ruth A., 21391W.
McAmis, Agnes W., 21350W.
McKim, Anna M., 34134W.
O'Connor, Ellen G., 21358W.
Sewell, Jane, 21342W.
Watt, Marion L., 21328W.
Wier, Peggy J., 21394W.

Medical Corps

Baker, Benjamin R., 24112A.
Ballinger, Edwin R., 21692A.
Bashore, Sidney M., 25728A.
Berry, Charles A., 22414A.
Bittick, Paul, Jr., 21910A.
Burner, Alvin M., 66016A.
Caris, Timothy N., 21854A.
Coles, John E., 24129A.
Collins, Frederick G., 21737A.
Dawson, Robert G., 24115A.
Dobyns, James H., 19831A.
Fitch, Ray F., 24655A.
Flint, John S., 55735A.
Ford, Charles F., 19568A.
Gabby, Samuel L., Jr., 22413A.
Goltra, Evan R., Jr., 27480A.
Hines, Henry L., 24201A.
Holcomb, Thomas M., 22404A.
Jones, Robert F., 27584A.
Kern, Sidney B., 19769A.
Livermore, David I., 19533A.
Lofton, Joseph E., 19844A.
McGrade, Hugh P., 24123A.
Mitchell, Hugh B., Jr., 29858A.
Morese, Kenneth N., 23579A.
Nafis, Warren A., 23581A.
Preston, Rhea S., 19770A.
Reiner, Robert N., 27596A.
Robison, Jack R., 22550A.
Ryan, Arthur E., 29614A.
Shirley, Robert E., 23102A.
Smith, Edward P., Jr., 20825A.
Smith, J. Lewis, Jr., 24194A.

Spiro, Franklyn C., 22964A.
Starrett, Jack R., 29273A.
Streete, Billie G., 19832A.
Thompson, William W., 24122A.
VanVranken, Eugene E., 19356A.
Warren, Donald J., 24114A.
Weigel, Arthur E., 26353A.
Wesp, Joseph E., 23055A.
Wheaton, Jerrold L., 29472A.
Whitsell, Wilber R., Jr., 24196A.
Wolter, David F., 26363A.
Wrede, Henry F., Jr., 25647A.

Dental Corps

Ambrose, James A., 19622A.
Ayres, Elmer V., 19619A.
Barale, Philip A., 21600A.
Bergmann, Robert W., 21764A.
Best, Robert N., 29729A.
Cole, James B., 29412A.
Davis, Edward E., 29299A.
Fritz, Jackson W., 29413A.
Funk, Edward C., 27978A.
Hill, Robert E., 19971A.
Hoot, Norman G., 21847A.
Hughes, Wilbur R., Jr., 25693A.
Jamieson, Glenn W., 18971A.
Jones, Eugene H., 18962A.
Knoll, Oliver J., 19969A.
Kolodny, Stanley C., 27981A.
Kurth, Donald E., 29276A.
Leonard, Ovide R., 29650A.
Long, Richard E., 18948A.
Malloy, Charles B., 24660A.
Masters, William Z., 19919A.
McCall, Clarence M., Jr., 22408A.
Milbourn, Arthur L., 21849A.
Nicoletti, Joseph P., 29806A.
Potts, Henry R., 25467A.
Raab, Lester W., 26360A.
Reese, Robert T., 19629A.
Schilb, Enslie I., Jr., 21732A.
Sprague, William G., 25667A.
Staerkel, Julius G. R., 26736A.
Stillson, William T., 26696A.
Tarsitano, John J., 27495A.
Weaver, Robert N., 24140A.
Wyatt, James L., Jr., 19847A.

Veterinary Corps

Hayman, William P., Jr., 21866A.
Thomas, George O., Jr., 51119A.

Medical Service Corps

Adrounie, V. Harry, 55324A.
Burke, Charles S., 19514A.
Carter, Russell J., 19515A.
Conner, Ned F., 55322A.
Duquette, Louis F., 48910A.
Ehardt, Frederick, 48906A.
Henry, James E., 19517A.
Herrin, Daniel M., Jr., 21620A.
Hill, Leonard D., 19516A.
Hjort, Arthur W., 48911A.
James, Raymond E., 48904A.
Johnson, John A., 21611A.
Jones, Thomas C., 48903A.
Larocca, Eugene W., 48912A.
Lindsay, Charles W., Jr., 19499A.
Little, Herman I., 21616A.
Morden, Harold R., 19510A.
Morgan, Floyd E., Jr., 19512A.
Saul, Lee I., 21871A.
Schirmer, Walter D., 55323A.
Schult, Harold G., 21617A.
Schwartz, Seymour, 19518A.
Skewes, Kenneth W., 48905A.
Smith, Chauncey W., 55319A.
Smith, Stuart S., 19502A.
Smyth, Kenneth E., 21619A.
Tayloe, Leon T., 23076A.
Washburn, Robert E., 19511A.
Weller, William E., 21618A.
Willett, Joseph E., 19520A.
Woolf, Henry M., 21615A.
Zellers, Billy B., 21614A.

Nurse Corps

Arrington, Agnes M., 25743W.
Carmine, Flora G., 21957W.
Clark, Leota H., 21095W.
Coats, Ada L., 21403W.
Cook, Ruby, 21010W.
Dodson, Dorothy M., 21106W.
Dunsmore, Elizabeth M., 21161W.
Elam, Geraldine E., 22007W.
Fahrenkopf, Bernadette K., 25751W.
Gersema, Vivian M., 21082W.
Hoefly, Ethel A., 22055W.
Jernigan, Marguerite L., 21991W.
McNulty, Margaret J., 20971W.
Neese, Sara K., 21998W.
Respini, Ellen M., 21104W.

Chaplain

Dickinson, James H., 48583A.
Minor, Earl W., 20855A.
O'Laughlin, John C., 55106A.
Penrod, Everett D., 55104A.
Smith, Meredith P., 48582A.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Line of the Air Force

Acker, Michael W., 69059A.
Adame, Frederick P., Jr., 63422A.
Almanzar, Donald H., 59126A.
Altenhofen, William H., 69014A.
Anthony, Russell D., Jr., 59907A.
Austin, Roger J., 59743A.
Beatty, James D., 59934A.
Betz, John C., Jr., 59849A.
Biesiadecki, Richard J., 62973A.
Binkowski, Francis S., 59852A.
Blaker, Philip C., 59797A.
Blecha, Dennis L., 59863A.
Bloyder, Joseph J., 61117A.
Bondurant, Robert A., 3d, 59928A.
Bowers, Richard L., 68640A.
Bowles, James E., 62040A.
Boyer, George K., 59877A.
Bredahl, Myron D., 67973A.
Bria, Lawrence S., 59891A.
Brown, Robert L., 59870A.
Buchholz, Francis J., Jr., 69521A.
Buchner, Ronald H., 67595A.
Byerly, Richard L., 63001A.
Cable, Dick A., 59892A.
Cain, James E., 62972A.
Caldwell, William B., 59862A.
Callari, Walter C., 59828A.
Canter, Ronald M., 62045A.
Carlin, Jerry L., 68303A.
Carnes, Frederick E., 59764A.
Centala, Martin D., 59875A.
Chapman, Robert L., 67807A.
Cheney, Robert S., Jr., 59844A.
Cheshire, Frank E., Jr., 62955A.
Clark, Chris W., 59746A.
Clarkson, Rolland F., Jr., 59871A.
Clink, Richard H., 62048A.
Cloutier, Richard A., 59927A.
Cobb, John T., 59895A.
Conrad, Theodore J., 63379A.
Corcoran, Robert W., 59678A.
Cornwell, William C., 68636A.
Couranz, George R., 59773A.
Cox, Samuel J., 63005A.
Crase, Harold V., 68853A.
Crockett, Richard H., Jr., 59926A.
Dasenbrock, Frederick E., 59794A.
Davis, James R., 59760A.
DeBell, Joseph J., 62038A.
DeBellis, Leonard M., 62962A.
Degler, Kenneth R., 59850A.
Dellalibera, Gino, 59909A.
Dempsey, James C., 62946A.
Devin, Phillip D., 59872A.
Dillow, James D., 59779A.
Dimario, Michael F., 59910A.
Dixon, Reuben T., Jr., 69459A.
Doan, Larry R., 59780A.
Drew, Philip M., 61139A.
Dunlap, Frederic C., 63147A.
Dwelle, Thomas A., 62956A.
Eastlack, Richard J., 68904A.
Elsesser, Frederick L., 59881A.
Englund, David B., 61116A.
Entrekin, Herbert L., Jr., 62957A.
Ewing, David L., 59830A.
Fass, Peter J., 59903A.
Felton, Richard F., 59744A.
Flaherty, George C., 62055A.
Foxwell, Vaughn M., Jr., 61115A.
Frost, Spencer C., 3d, 63004A.
Fuelling, Clinton P., 59798A.
Gahm, Philip S., 59826A.
Gamble, John E., 68857A.
Gardner, Carl B., 68369A.
Gardner, Maurice G., 59886A.
Giambri, Philip, Jr., 62054A.
Gieszelmann, Edward L., 59763A.
Gist, Phillip M., 62958A.
Glenn, Robert L., Jr., 69188A.
Glime, Douglas G., 68619A.
Gordon, Herbert D., 59882A.
Griffith, Gerald D., 59774A.
Gruidl, Thomas G., 68703A.
Gulliford, James P., 70536A.
Hansen, Lynn M., 59796A.
Harris, Thomas L., 59843A.
Harriss, Winston R., Jr., 69526A.
Hart, Paul W., 59921A.
Hartshorn, Gordon C., Jr., 59842A.
Harty, John R., 59748A.
Havey, James H., Jr., 62954A.
Hawkins, John L., 62053A.
Healy, Charles B., 68951A.
Hein, James L., 61138A.
Heller, Jerome, 59771A.
Henderson, Donald T., 59693A.
Henderson, Donald W., 59831A.
Hill, Roger H., 59807A.
Hilliard, John R., 59887A.
Hilten, John W., 59767A.
Hitt, Ellis F., 59778A.
Hoeting, Paul M., 59874A.
Holaday, James W., 68834A.
Holko, Andrew R., 68598A.
Huggins, Lawrence E., 59845A.
Hulett, Douglas G., 68738A.
Hullender, John R., 62049A.
Humphreys, Robert P., 59745A.
Hunsaker, John R., 59790A.
Hunter, Robert W., 59880A.
Hutchison, Daniel B., 68476A.
Jacobs, Richard L., 69159A.
Johnson, Bruce W., 59899A.
Johnson, Howard R., 59908A.
Johnson, James D., 68089A.
Johnson, William P., 59808A.
Jones, Eugene J., 59827A.
Keesey, Michael S. W., 49814A.
Kelley, Gilbert F., 59766A.
Kimmell, Wayne R., 59873A.
King, Richard T., Jr., 59813A.
Klein, Carl J., 62970A.
Knecht, Marvin J., 68612A.
Koepke, Richard W., 59759A.
Krause, Frederick A., 59897A.
Kudriavetz, Stephen P., Jr., 61114A.
Kunkle, Elmer E., Jr., 59839A.
Lackey, Robert G., 59791A.
Laing, Richard L., 59876A.
Lapolt, Thomas, 59692A.
Lawhon, James B., 63002A.
Lawrence, William F., 59765A.
Leidolf, Emil J., Jr., 69047A.
Lemon, Melville L., Jr., 59925A.
Lester, Hugh H., 59818A.
Lewis, Samuel E., 59861A.
Lewis, Thomas H., Jr., 59824A.
Linden, Richard C., 59888A.
Lister, Charles E., 59811A.
Lott, Thomas M., 59695A.
Lux, Edward C., Jr., 59696A.
Mabrey, Wayne E., 63003A.
Macon, John C., Jr., 59817A.
Magner, Stanley D., 59933A.
Manly, James H., 61113A.
Manske, Robert G., 62052A.
Matalucci, Rudolph V., 59761A.
Mauldin, Winford E., 59677A.
McClanahan, James R., 62963A.
McDonald, Warren R., 59652A.
McDonnell, John J., 63355A.
McGauley, Gerald M., 68605A.
McGlade, Charles J., 59898A.
McGrath, Denis P., 59697A.
McKinley, Howard L., Jr., 59741A.
Michel, Jerome A., 63006A.
Milan, William G. 2d, 59840A.
Miller, Carl M., 69397A.
Mims, George E., 67938A.
Mleynek, Roger G., 62044A.
Motley, Langhorne A., 59816A.

Mundy, William E., 62047A.
Murphy, Timothy J., Jr., 59841A.
Napier, Alexander J., Jr., 59906A.
Napier, Wilton K., 59809A.
Neal, Robert D., 59641A.
Nellans, William L., 63380A.
Neubauer, Charles H., Jr., 59829A.
Nielsen, Dennis E., 67888A.
Nunez, Joe C., 68132A.
Parker, Frederic C., 61111A.
Paskin, Harvey M., 59742A.
Pehoushek, Joseph W., 59914A.
Penick, Thomas E., Jr., 59919A.
Perna, Louis C., Jr., 59789A.
Phillips, Kenneth E., 68880A.
Proud, James G., 59894A.
Pryse, Zack D., 3d, 69461A.
Puddy, Donald R., 59838A.
Quay, Perry J., 62034A.
Reely, Robert H., Jr., 59823A.
Regan, Thomas A., 62953A.
Ridgway, Charles Z., Jr., 59694A.
Roberts, Dennis K., 59815A.
Robertson, Dennis C., 69524A.
Rodgers, Thomas E., 63007A.
Rogers, Billy D., 68140A.
Roth, John C., Jr., 59679A.
Sabine, Paul B., 59913A.
Sandberg, Robert, 69317A.
Sapp, Richard S., 59783A.
Sawyer, Jerry A., 59762A.
Schaff, William J., 62041A.
Schneider, Donald A., 69192A.
Schoeppner, John P., Jr., 59865A.
Schumacher, Leon R., 59772A.
Semrad, Vernon V., 59810A.
Senay, Robert A., 69148A.
Sharp, Arthur S., 68335A.
Shearer, Milo E., 59777A.
Shilling, William M., 59846A.
Shovein, Donald L., 59915A.
Simaitis, Eugene, 59911A.
Slack, John L., 59775A.
Slinkard, John D., 59889A.
Small, Larry F., 59864A.
Smith, Rodger W., 59905A.
Snyder, Arnold L., Jr., 59833A.
Sohmer, Eliot, 59749A.
Sommerfeld, Dale A., 68926A.
Songy, Edward J., 63008A.
Spinler, Darrell J., 59922A.
Stauber, Ralph O., Jr., 62971A.
Steedly, James E., Jr., 59893A.
Steeves, Richard A., 59319A.
Steinmeier, James H., 59917A.
Stogdill, Robert E., 59896A.
Stokes, Ronald B., 59822A.
Surette, Robert G., 59747A.
Taft, Ronald H., 69522A.
Tamura, Thomas T., 59691A.
Tesoro, Salvador R., 62050A.
Tetrault, Frank A., 67949A.
Thomas, Weston D., 59932A.
Tillander, John P., 62043A.
Tolson, Joel A., 59793A.
Townsend, Ralph D., 69523A.
Troyer, Thomas G., 59821A.
Turner, Robert F., 59848A.
Turoff, Michael C., 59832A.
Uhlig, George F., 59776A.
Uliss, Alan M., 63000A.
Vache, Floyd A., 62042A.
Vegoda, Paul R., 61112A.
Viola, John T., 59854A.
Visnick, Arnold M., 63609A.
Vitt, Jerry W., 59878A.
Wagner, Thomas J., 59851A.
Ward, Charles J., 59930A.
Ward, Thomas M., 59800A.
Ware, Philip K., 59890A.
Weiss, David W., 62964A.
Weisul, Charles J., Jr., 59847A.
Wendland, Gustav E., 59698A.
Werking, Dennis M., 59923A.
Whelan, James F., 3d, 62960A.
White, Craig M., 62046A.
White, Larry D., 62035A.
White, Richard E., 62945A.
Whitmire, Jack N., 59820A.
Widener, Warren H., 59916A.
Wilhelm, Luther R., 59799A.
Wilson, Bernard E., 68835A.
Wilson, Clifford B., 68323A.
Wilson, Winfred A., 62944A.
Wingert, Charles J., 68397A.
Wittmaack, Charles S., 62037A.
Wright, James E., 59918A.
Wright, William B., 59853A.
Wylie, Donald L., 69525A.
York, John R., 68515A.
Yorks, Robert A., 63353A.
Young, Donald E., 62056A.
Youngblood, James H., 62974A.
Zaricor, Wayne M., 62051A.

Medical Service Corps

Bryant, John L., Jr., 59792A.
Conley, Raymond P., 65981A.
Coughlin, John J., 59929A.
Fry, David A., 65982A.
Gabriel, James E., 65983A.
Greene, Wendell J., 65980A.
Hudock, Jack, 65975A.
Mason, William M., 65976A.
Robison, Bobbie S., 65978A.
Schulz, John F., 65974A.
Silliman, Charles L., 65977A.
Smith, Michael F., 65979A.

Nurse Corps

Buksa, Beatrice J., 69778A.
Smith, Alvin W., Jr., 69779A.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald L. Abbey
Terry A. Abell
Charles E. Adams
Gary R. Adams
Phillip A. Adams
Shelby O. Alcott
John W. Alford
Bruce D. Alitt
George R. Allen
John W. Almond, Jr.
David M. Anderson
Richard G. Anderson
Ross K. Anderson, Jr.
William G. Anderson
William P. Anderson
Richard L. Arvedlund
John W. Asher III
Lawrence I. Astor
Larry R. Atkinson
John P. Aucella
Richard M. Augur
Richard G. Bachmann
Harold E. Bahr, Jr.
David A. Baker
Gary A. Baldwin
Harry F. Ball, Jr.
Lionel A. W. Banda
Wayne C. Barlow
William C. Barney
Bart H. Bartlett, Jr.
Creighton E. Barton
Thomas J. Batzel
Stephen W. Baumgart
William J. Baumhofer
George R. Baxter
Travis N. Beard
Robert F. Beckham
Denis J. W. Bell
Henry L. Bell, Jr.
John C. Bender
Franklin L. Bennett
Robert L. Bennett
Russell E. Berry, Jr.
David A. Bingemann
Michael R. Biro
Cecil L. Blackwell, Jr.
Carl M. Bohley
John R. Boley
C. Ward Bond, Jr.
Michael R. Bonsignore
Robert A. Borlet
William E. Bowen
Thomas E. Bowman III
Ronald A. Boyd
Michael B. Bracy
William E. Bradford
Thomas K. Brandt
Harold A. Breard, Jr.
Alfred L. Breen, Jr.
Robert J. Bridgeman
William S. Brinkley
Richard W. Brown
Peter A. Browne
Vernon G. Browne
Richard B. Bryant
Earl F. Buck
Duane W. Buckingham
Thomas D. Buckley
Kenneth R. Buell
Richard W. Buelow
Stephen M. Buescher
Melvin L. Bunnell
John P. Burke
John P. Burns, Jr.
William R. Burns
Charles J. Bustamante
Francis W. Butler
David T. Byrnes
Richard P. Byrnes
John J. Calande, Jr.
Ronald J. Calhoun
Charles N. Calvano
Brian F. Campbell
Cletus L. Campbell
Robert L. Campbell
William H. Campbell, Jr.
Lee B. Cargill
Kenneth L. Carlsen
William R. Carmichael,, Jr.
Lawrence A. Carpenter
Joseph F. Carroll
Peter C. Carrothers
James O. Carter
John Castro
Anthony J. Celebrezze, Jr.
Austin E. Chapman
Richard B. Cherry
Donald W. Christensen
John B. Christie II
Arthur D. Clark
Dennis M. Clark
Wayne A. Clarke
Joseph S. Collins
Michael G. Colston
John M. Colyer, Jr.
Dennis R. Conley
James B. Connaughton
John D. Conroy
John F. Cook, Jr.
Joseph T. Cook
Robert E. Cooper
Michael T. Corgan
William L. Coulter
Landon G. Cox, Jr.
Mark F. Crane
Michael P. Cronin
Robert R. Cronin
George D. M. Cunha, Jr.
Andrew J. Curtin
James H. Czerwonky
Eli Dabich, Jr.
Thomas B. Dade
Henry F. Dalton
Nicholas T. Daramus, Jr.
Shaun M. Daugherty
Milo P. Daughters II
Alexander B. Daunis
Francis L. Davey, Jr.
Philip W. Dean
Victor E. Dean
Felix E. de Golian III
Charles E. Dehnert
Theodore J. Del Gaizo
James J. DeLong
James A. Dennis, Jr.
Antonio F. DeSantis
Ernest M. Detrick II
John H. Detweiler
Peter T. Deutermann
Charles C. DiBari
Michael L. Dickerson
Anthony P. Ditto
Dennis C. Doherty
Lawrence A. Doll
Drake A. Donahue
John J. Donegan, Jr.
John O. Donelan
Charles A. Donovan, Jr.
Merrill H. Dorman
Alfred F. Dougherty, Jr.
Carl L. Doughtie
James R. Duke
Stephen M. Duncan
Michael J. Dunn
David L. Durfee
William A. Earner, Jr.
Robert L. Eastman
David J. Ebert
Jacob Edge II
Frank R. Edrington II
Frank E. Eissing III
William T. Ellison
George W. Emery
James C. Farley
Evan A. Evans
George P. Farrin
Peter A. Featherstone
Steven H. Ferencie, Jr.
James R. Fields
Joseph H. Fields
Mario P. Fiori
John N. Fischer, Jr.
John E. Fitzgerald
William C. Fitzgerald
Charles G. Fishburn
George R. Fister
Wayne A. Fogel II
Roland G. Fontaine
James D. Fontana
Paul S. Forman
Robert D. Forster
Joseph F. Fossella
Ted G. Franklin
Charles D. Frazer
Ernest R. Freeman
Donald R. Freese
Charles E. French
David E. Frost
Charles E. Galloway
Abel A. Garcia
James C. Garde
Willard J. Gentile
Raymond "O" Gibson, Jr.
Robert G. Giddens, Jr.
James E. Gill
Vincent J. Gilroy, Jr.
Roger B. Glaes
Arnold Glassner
Charles E. Gosnell
Lawrence L. Graham, Jr.
Donald E. Grant
Wiley G. Grantham
George W. Graves, Jr.
Thomas R. Green
David L. Greene
Francis C. Gregory
Richard O. Gregory
Matthew M. Gretchen
George W. Grider, Jr.
Harold R. Grover
Philip S. Gubbins
George R. Guest
Richard E. Guffey
William T. Gunn III
William C. Gustafson
Stephen D. Guthrie
Frederick P. Haeni
William D. Hahn
James R. Hall
Thomas F. Hall
William J. Hamilton IV
James R. Hand
Tom B. Haney
Carl K. Hansen
William L. Hansen
Orville O. Hanson
Jerry L. Harken
Michael J. Harman
Robert L. Harper
Ben W. Harris
Jon R. Harris
Wilson F. Harris, Jr.
Robert W. Harrison, Jr.
Edward S. Hartford, Jr.
John M. Harvey
Timothy R. Harvey
William J. Haslet
Joel K. Heine
Raymond R. Heins
G. Alan Hellawell, Jr.
Charles F. Helsper
Don R. Hidy
Francis W. Hilton, Jr.
William A. Himchak
Henry C. Hirsch
Raymond A. Hoag
William A. Hoefling III
James J. Hogan III
William R. Hollenack
Frank C. Holmes
David C. Honhart
John M. Hood, Jr.
Irvin G. Hopkins II
Larry M. Hopkins
Rodney Hopkinson
Major K. Howe
George C. Howell
Stephen G. Hoy
William C. Hughes, Jr.
David N. Hull
Jerry F. Huss
James E. Hutcheson, Jr.
James G. Hutchins
George R. Hutter
Richard J. Hyland
Niles A. Iannone
Albert A. Isger
Marshall N. Jackson
Donald E. Jacobs
Michael R. Jacqmin
Paul T. Jara
Ronald A. Jarvis
Joel B. Jaudon
Arne E. Johnson
Patrick W. Johnson
William S. Johnson

Dennis R. Jones
Thomas E. Jones
Thomas H. Jones, Jr.
Jerry W. Jordan
Wesley E. Jordan, Jr.
"J" Henry Kahrs III
Frederick H. Kaiser, Jr.
John R. Kallestad
William J. Kaman
Richard E. Kane, Jr.
Felix F. Karabasz
Jack L. Karson
Karl L. Kaup
Robert J. Kearns III
Robert W. Keeler
Walter R. Keen
William J. Keffer, Jr.
Richard E. Kell
Bernard J. Kelley, Jr.
Keith R. Ker
Albert W. Key
Wilson D. Key
James E. Killian
Ronald W. Kilmer
George L. King, Jr.
Max H. Kirkpatrick
Ronald J. Klemick
Daniel J. Koczur
James R. Koehn
Carl S. Kolon
David W. Konold, Jr.
Joseph E. Kotowski
Robert A. Kottke, Jr.
Karl M. Kozak
Michael S. Krause
Eugene G. Kreinik
Eric W. Krieger
Theodore K. Krohne
James E. Kuneman
Richard L. Kuntz
Raymond A. Kutch
Donald M. Lachata
Robert E. LaGassa
Thomas V. LaMay
James J. Lamb
Charles L. Lamberth
James B. Lasswell
Glenn P. Laury
David F. Leake
Joseph Lederhaas
George R. Leever
Richard J. Lennox
John M. Lents
Bruce B. Lenz
John E. Lesko
Austin S. Lett, Jr.
Jary W. Lewis
Colen R. Lindell
Larry E. Linn
Robert D. Little
Thomas B. Locke
Jerry T. Lockett
Carl F. Logan
Herman J. Long, Jr.
Samuel J. Lo Presti
George P. Love III
Charles E. Lueth
David B. Lutes
Charles S. Lynch
Jimmy S. Lynne
Robert W. Lyons
Donald L. McAlister
John A. McAnally
Edward F. McBride, Jr.
John S. McCabe
William R. McCann, Jr.
Charles B. McCarthy, Jr.
Michael J. McCarthy
Martin W. McCreary, Jr.
Donald L. McCrory
Michael N. McDermott
John E. McDonald
John J. McDonald, Jr.
Kenneth R. McGuire
Richard B. McKenna
Russell E. McKenna, Jr.
David M. McLean
Michael J. McQuown
Ronald R. Machens
Donald C. MacLaughlin, Jr.
Charles S. Maclin
Lynn J. Madison
Robert A. Maier
David G. Maples III
Charles W. Marik
Phillip S. Marsden
Larry R. Marsh
William L. Marsh
Glenn T. Martinsen
Eddy J. Mascitto
Donald W. Mathis
John W. Matton
Michael E. Mays
Gerald R. Mezetis
Roger W. Mahle, Jr.
Denis C. Meredith
Alan N. Merkel
James A. Metcalfe
Kenneth S. Metviner
Thomas E. Meyer
David W. Meyers
Frederick E. Meyett, Jr.
Andrejs M. Mezmalis
Richard A. Miehle
Thomas J. Mikulis, Jr.
Richard J. Miles
Joel D. Millen
George M. Miller III
Robert G. Miller
Thomas H. Miller
Robert W. Mills
Roger J. Milos
Charles S. Minter III
Richard W. Mister
David B. A. Moore
Robert B. Moore II
Daniel H. Moran, Jr.
William P. Moran, Jr.
Thomas E. Morgan, Jr.
Clayton K. Morse
Wayne O. Mosher
Lyle J. Mulholland
George M. Musick III
Charles M. Musitano
Frank K. Mutch
James B. M. Myers
Michael E. Nadolski
William A. Naiva
Anthony J. Nargi
David A. Nelson
John W. Nelson
Nicholas J. Nerangis
James H. Newell, Jr.
Charles R. Newkirk
John H. Newsom
Robert C. Newton
Robert G. Newton
Robert G. Nickerson
Robert J. Niss
Robert G. Nobbs
George F. Nolan
Richard L. Nutt
Anthony J. Oakes, Jr.
William H. Oatway III
Terence J. O'Brien
Thomas J. O'Brien, Jr.
Michael P. Obsitnik
Daniel G. O'Claray
Charles P. O'Leary, Jr.
Gerald H. Olendzenski
David R. Oliver, Jr.
Richard E. Omohundro, Jr.
William J. Optiz
Winthrop B. Orgera
Richard M. Ortwein
Robert B. Otis
Michael A. Owen
Richard R. Pace
Don G. Palen
Alexander J. Palenscar III
John L. Parks
Phillip E. Parotti
Bernard L. Patterson III
James K. Patterson
William J. Pawlyk
John W. Pearson, Jr.
Rufus J. Pearson III
Raymond L. Pekary
William L. Penn
Chad A. Pennington
James N. Penrod
Brian T. Perkinson
Peter R. Peroni
John T. Pessoney
John C. Peterson
John J. Pfeiffer
Jerald L. Pinneker
Robert Polich
John E. Pollard
Joseph J. Polli
Jerauld S. Prather
Richard R. Pratt, Jr.
David B. Puckett
Thomas G. Puckett
Peter D. Quinton
William D. Rabin
Frank M. Radik
James V. Ragano
Roger L. Rahl
Donald R. Raulston
James A. Rave
Benjamin D. Redd, Jr.
Thomas G. Redford, Jr.
John R. Reed
Thomas E. Reemelin
Donald L. Reeves, Jr.
David C. Reif
Kenneth G. Reinhardt, Jr.
Keith E. Reynolds
John J. Richards
Stephen W. Richter
David R. Riley
James E. P. Ring
Charles B. Robbins
Walter S. Roberts
William J. Roberts, Jr.
Thomas J. Robertson
David B. Robinson
Donald T. Rogers
Richard B. Rogers
Peter L. Rollosson
Philip J. Rooney
William R. Rosenfelt, Jr.
Benjamin F. Ross III
Raymond H. Ross, Jr.
Thomas J. Rossa
Paul V. Roundy III
Edward A. Ruckner, Jr.
Walter B. Ruland
William A. Runkle, Jr.
Lars H. Runquist
John E. Ryan
Jerud W. Ryker
Paul Saacke
Gerald W. Saber
Donald E. Saidman
Harry P. Salmon, Jr.
Kenneth T. Sanger
Ian H. Sargent
Peter P. Savage
James J. Scanlon
Carl E. Schafer II
Hugh E. Schall
John M. Schantz
Ferdinand M. Schery
Paul Schleifer
Charles M. Schmidt, Jr.
Ronald O. Schowalter
Coral V. Schufeldt
Emil M. Schwing
Crawford W. Scott
Jon P. Scott
Lawrence A. Scott
Austin M. Seay
Clarence W. Seay, Jr.
Thomas L. Selden
Charles F. Sell
Stuart W. Settle, Jr.
Norman J. Shackelton, Jr.
Richard J. Shanley, Jr.
Joseph D. Sharpe, Jr.
James A. Shaw, Jr.
Robert "D" Shaw, Jr.
John W. Sheehan, Jr.
Michael H. Shelley
Thomas R. Sheridan
Allan Sherman
James M. Shull, Jr.
David C. Shute
Forrest N. Siburt, Jr.
Walter F. Sickel, Jr.
Richard L. Sidford
Derek "J" Simmons
James C. Singler
Jimmy R. Slaughter
Terry R. Sloan
James A. Small II
Selden M. Small
William E. Small
Allan R. Smelley
Stanley K. Smiley
Gary Smith
Homer F. Smith II
Randall R. Smith
Wilton J. Smith, Jr.
Thomas E. Sollars
Peter W. Soverel
Michael J. Spear
James H. Spruance III
James H. Stageman, Jr
Michael W. Stegenga
David G. Stephan
James H. Stewart
William J. Stewart
Howard S. Stoddard
Charles W. Stone, Jr.
John F. Stone
Michael D. Stout
Ralph H. Stowell, Jr.
Joseph C. Strasser
Kevin F. Sullivan
Frederick H. Sutherland
Paul W. Sutton
Robert N. Tanis
James A. Tate
Alan B. Taylor
Thomas L. Taylor
Wade H. Taylor III
Ronald D. Tebben
Grant R. Telfer
Erwin B. Templin, Jr.
Ronald F. Testa
Roger E. Tetrault
Raymond T. Theep
Gary L. Thomas
Laile H. Thompson, Jr.
Olen D. Thompson
William H. Thompson II
James C. Thorell
John C. Thorn
David W. Thornhill
James C. Thornton
Craig L. Thrasher
Robert B. Tieslau
Martin J. Tillapaugh
Frank L. Tillotson
Paul E. Tobin, Jr.
Stephen S. Toth
Charles N. Tozer
Charles A. Trabandt
George P. Tracy
Frederick E. Trani, Jr.
John M. Truesdell
Eric A. Turner
James R. Turner
Harlan K. Ullman
Willard L. Umphrey
Clyde J. Van Arsdall III
Robert L. Van Buren
Robert L. Van Nice, Jr.
George D. Vaughan
Raymond E. Vaughan
David A. Vetter
Vernon H. Von Sydow
Peter G. Vreeland
Kenneth B. Waide, Jr.
Richard G. Wakefield
Michael T. Wallace
Edward L. Walsh
Ronald F. Walters
Arthur E. Walther
Don H. Walton
Robert E. Waples
Trenwith R. Ward
Jon C. Warn
Lawrence F. Warnken
Roy D. Warren
Joseph "H" Waterfill III
Peter D. Waters
Edward J. Weaving, Jr.
Bruce C. Webb
Richard L. Weidman
Arthur H. Weidner
Roland L. Weidt
John J. Wermuth III
Carl T. Westgard
Frank R. Whalen
Chester G. White, Jr.
Donald M. White, Jr.
Larry R. White
Peter R. White
Jay N. Whiting
Michael K. Whitmore
Robert A. Wildman
Patrick W. Wilkes
John G. Wilkinson, Jr.
Richard Wilkinson
Theodore A. Willandt
James C. Williams
Michael V. Williams
Richard H. Williams
James K. Williamson
Ronald J. Wills
Albert S. Wilson
Gary W. Wilson
Richard A. Wilson
Ronald K. Wilson
William R. Witcraft
Raymond L. Witter
Talmadge A. Womble
Paul F. Woods
John B. Worcester
Julian M. Wright, Jr.
Malcolm S. Wright
Patrick E. Wright
Frank M. Wroblewski
Richard H. Wyttenbach
Milton E. Yarbrough, Jr.
Douglas H. Zanzot
Sherwood R. Zimmerman

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy (engineering duty) subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David P. Greeneisen
Richard J. Kinnear

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Traian Benchea
Chester B. Cole
Kendall R. Cook
Fredric C. Davis
James M. DeFrancia
James D. Driskell III
Howard A. Ginter
Frederick E. Goodwin
David H. Green
Kenneth L. Grover
William Gushue, Jr.
Drake C. Hawkins
Theodore J. Healy
Daniel K. Hennessy
Thomas C. Heslop
Dennis W. Hobbs
David G. Johnston, Jr.
John M. Johnston
Alfred W. Kenlin
William L. Kennedy, Jr.
Richard F. Kleinfeldt
James E. Leeper, Jr.
Alan L. Lutz
John M. McClure
John E. McDermott
John F. McIntyre, Jr.
Robert "R" Newell
Gerald T. Nomura
Robert L. Norton
Robert F. Price
Sidney P. Revere, Jr.
Max V. Ricketts, Jr.
Michael J. Rubel
Paul J. Ryan
Gary E. Shay
Edward J. Shields
George M. Singer
Richard M. Smith
Robert D. Stiger, Jr.
Earl M. Stockslager
Erwin F. Storz
Imants A. Straupenieks
Jackson R. Terwilliger
David W. Unsicker
David A. Wells
Thomas D. Yannessa

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard E. Andrews
Stephen H. Coester
James W. Eckert
Gary R. Hosey
Robert T. Hudspeth
Michael A. Pero, Jr.
Walter C. Pierce, Jr.
Richard M. Rohrbach
Donald R. Sheaffer
Stephen E. Stewart

The following-named Air Force Academy graduates to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard L. Bunce
James B. Kerley
Louis S. Matjasko

The following-named Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas B. Ackland
James M. Adell
Ernest L. Andrews, Jr.
Thomas A. Bailey
Lawrence P. Beam
Max H. Beasley, Jr.
William E. Bugg
Robert N. Burris
Michael R. Carr
Francis H. Dietz
James F. Felte
Joseph J. Gareffa
James H. Harmon
George R. Hundelt
Thomas D. Jackson
Vernon A. Kalshan
Ronald L. Lindsay
Daniel J. Lynch II
Gary L. McClung
Warren C. Miller, Jr.
Paul W. Muench
Donald R. Nelson
John P. Oakwood
Thomas R. Peterman
Jason M. Pilalas
George C. Priebe, Jr.
William C. Sammons
Michael A. Scully
Gary D. Weale
Robert T. Webber

The following-named Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Joseph R. Fischenich
Dennis W. H. Wong

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert O. Beals, Jr.
Richard K. Belmore
Robert G. Bennett
Russell H. Bern
Rudolph A. Bezrutch
Monte J. Blankenship
Arthur E. Buck, Jr.
Loran V. Breeland
Donald O. Burrell
Donald E. Deburkarte
Wilbur E. Holton
Raymond Johnson
Kenneth R.Limstrom
Vincent J. McHugh
William P. Needham
Collin D. Nipper
Paul W. Northrup
Vernon B. Paul
Randolph M. Ridgel
James R. Roton
Neil E. Sampson
William D. Spencer
Orville L. Stevens
Claude J. Walters
Mitchell L. Williams

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard L. Abbott
Dall H. Andrew
Robert H. Ball
David H. Bennet, Jr.
Fred J. Bice
Charles W. Boak
Charles R. Brady
Jerry B. Brown
Frederick W. Bruns
John E. Caler
David R. Campbell
Robert A. Clair
Jackie L. Clark
Ralph B. Clark, Jr.
Charles L. Christensen
James A. Collins
William N. Cushard, Jr.
Alan L. Dahlvig
Stephen W. Dallas
Jack L. Deitrick
Kenneth D. Denbow
Leo G. Dillon
William E. Downs
James B. Edmiston
Robert D. Ferguson
John C. Finley
John L. Fry
James D. Gilbert
Girard H. Gilpin
James W. Goodspeed
George W. Graft
James F. Helt
Peter L. Hendricks
Richard D. Hill
Anders Hokanson
Rudolph A. Horst
Kenneth L. Janssen
Carl R. Jokela
Raymond J. Judd
Adolf W. G. Kunze
David E. Lilly
Gail F. Linn
Guy B. Logan, Jr.
Duane M. Longcore
Kenneth J. Lynes
Larry E. Miles
John H. Morgan II
Aubrey R. Monish
Harvey G. Nelson
John R. Ostromecky
Lawrence D. Overman
Gerald T. Parker
Charles S. Payne
Fred G. Perry
Victor L. Peters
Karl J. Phaler
Brian R. Quanbeck
John J. Reed
Bob G. Rees
Richard E. Reumann
David P. Richardson
William A. Robbins
Richard P. Roy
Donald R. Ruegg
Kermit L. Sawer
William C. Schmidt
Eugene W. Scott
Gerald W. Scott
William J. Scott
Richard F. Schuerger
John P. Segen
Leon T. Semeter, Jr.
George D. Sheerer
Robert J. Shields
Charles D. Shires
Edgar C. Soly, Jr.
Joseph A. Sowers
Stephen W. Smith
Robert C. Spencer
David L. Sterner
Dale F. Stoecker
Stuart L. Tenney
Gary R. Thompson
Charles W. Turley
Charles R. Veeck, Jr.
Richard G. T. Welsh
Marvin J. Weniger
John C. Vincent
Joe L. Wilkins
Ronald L. Williams
Charles E. Wilson

Michael G. Simpson (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy (engineering duty) in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps, as previously nominated and confirmed, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Jan G. Kloek (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Rolland E. Greenburg (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Robert H. Riordan (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Bythel D. Dutton (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John F. Caratti
Ned L. Mangelson
Robert E. Stanell
Francis W. Wachter

Lawrence Cooke, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a chief warrant officer, W-4, in the Navy for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code 1211.

The following-named limited duty officers, to be limited duty permanent chief warrant officers, W-4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Stewart V. Buchanan
Charles C. Kauffman, Jr.
Arnold J. Scanzillo

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard S. Davidson
William R. Showacre, Jr.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John D. Alden, Jr.
Peter E. Bies
Joseph A. Camamo

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald E. Applegate
Alfred Billotte

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Calvin W. Borchardt
Michael Brenyo, Jr.
Hugh D. Burke
Carmen A. Ciardello, Jr.
Joseph Dupcak, Jr.
Peter L. Eckerson
Ronald D. Giordan
Duane A. Hansen
Ronald K. Harris
Richard A. Hesby
Leonard F. Hodes
Robert M. Hoffman
Robert P. Jones
James C. Kelly, Jr.
John H. MacPherson
John G. Mather
Joseph P. McMahon
Sam J. Poidmore
Jerome "J" Rudolph
Robert G. Switala
Richard A. Thibodeau
James E. Vaught
Arthur R. Vernino

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications thereof as provided by law:

Donald R. Berg
Charles A. Cooper
Roland P. Duprey
William B. Finagin
Wayne J. Fitzpatrick
Teddy L. Fullhart
William S. Harrison
John L. Heibel, Jr.
Earl T. Holdsworth, Jr.
William G. Housley III
William R. Knehans
James M. Mathers
Robert B. McWilliams
Donald R. Merryfield
Lionel C. Neilans
John W. Porter
Siegfried J. Schaberg
Robert G. Triplett

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) selected as alternates, to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications thereof as provided by law:

Neal P. Davis
David E. Cordoba
Harry B. Elmes
Albert S. Mowery, Jr.
Larry G. Harris
William Benjamin, Jr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David G. Amey
Richard T. Barker
Abraham Bevis
Kenneth P. Sympson
Paul F. Kramer
Jerry R. Weibel

The following-named (Army Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William B. Terrill
Albert N. Wheeler
John A. Woggon, Jr.
Daniel J. Ogle
Lance V. Bevins

The following-named (U.S. Military Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John R. Ahern
Benjamin E. Benjamin
Jack O. Eitel
James R. Herd
David R. Little
Laurence R. Medlin
Alexander W. Whitaker

The following-named (Naval Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John M. Anderson
Peter L. Barth
Noel C. Bing
Robert A. Black, Jr.
Walter J. Breede III
Gary E. Carlson
Joseph B. Clancy
William E. Cole II
Bernis B. Conatser, Jr.
William D. Davidson
John D. De Holl
John W. Dohrman
Clay J. Dugas II
Leonard M. Eaton
Richard W. Elsworth
Patric S. Enright
Holger G. Ericsson, Jr.
Joseph M. Favor
James D. Field
James A. Fisher
Joel R. Gardner
Bernard Grabowski
Alfred L. Griggs
William W. Hilgaertner
Daniel A. Hitzelberger
Otis E. Howard III
Harold C. Johnston, Jr.
Richard C. Jones, Jr.
Charles G. Jordan
John A. Kelly
Edward A. Kolbe
Howard F. Langley, Jr.
James F. Lloyd, Jr.
Joseph S. Longo, Jr.
Michael A. Marra
William S. Marshall III
Ronald R. Matthews
Harry M. McCloy, Jr.
Perry W. Miles III
Joseph G. Morra
Christopher D. Munger
John L. Newton
Ken W. Nisewaner
Peter S. Optekar
Alson H. Parker III
Joseph R. Pleier
Dirck K. Praeger
Daryl L. Rabert
Kenneth R. Ramsey
John A. Rank III
Donald J. Reynolds
John A. Roney
Ludwig J. Schumacher
David R. Shore
Louis L. Simpleman
Charles A. Spadafora
Herbert H. Swinburne, Jr.
Glenn Takabayashi
Richard D. Tomlin
Douglas O. Tozour
Emilio E. Varanini III
Joel M. Warshaw
Dudley M. Weathers
Wyatt C. Whitworth, Jr.
Thomas E. Williams, Jr.
Willis C. Wilson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary promotion to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William B. Binch
Norman T. Berthusen
Durk F. Buffington
Thomas M. Carpenter
James O. Carroll
Joseph M. Cavanagh
Thomas W. Depretoro
John T. Dolan
George E. Fort
Richard A. Frindt
Jackie W. Fraim
Richard L. Guinn
Billy C. Henry
Thomas E. Hopkins
Jack C. James
John K. Kangas
Peter V. Marcoline, Jr.
James E. Martin
Gary T. McAplin
James P. Murray
Thomas D. Nelson
Clarence R. Price
Charles J. Pyle
Lawrence E. Reed
Michael E. Rich
Edward F. Riley
Ross D. Rosi
Thomas A. Scheib
David C. Sikes
James D. Sparks
Robert S. Starke, Jr.
Samuel D. Turner, Jr.
Charles W. Van Horne
Fred W. Veil
Billy J. Widman
Henry G. Williams, Jr.

The following-named (Air Force Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Larry A. Backus
Thomas V. Burns
John J. Dougherty
George F. Holland III
Joseph G. Tkac, Jr.

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 23, 1963:

U.S. Attorney

William A. Meadows, Jr. of Florida to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Florida for the term of 4 years, vice Edward F. Boardman, transferred.

◆

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 29: 18: *Where there is no vision, the people cast off restraint.*

Most merciful and gracious God, may our President, our Speaker, and all who hold positions of leadership and trust lay hold of their many difficult tasks with confidence.

May they continue to possess that soul of adventure and that strength of vision and faith which are often darkened by doubt but never eclipsed; delayed and disappointed by adversity, but never defeated.

Grant that the whole world may come to see that our Nation is rooted in spiritual realities and ruled by a passionate devotion to the ideals of liberty and justice, friendship and fraternity.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HOUSE BILL ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, announced that that committee had on April 22, 1963, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, April 22, 1963, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

THE LATE DR. MEYER JACOBSTEIN

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a memorial service, conducted by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein of Temple B'rith Kodesh.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad duty that causes me to rise on this occasion, for I must report to my colleagues the death of a former Member of Congress.

Last Thursday—April 18—in my home community of Rochester, N.Y., death took Dr. Meyer Jacobstein. Dr. Jacobstein was 83 years old.

Dr. Jacobstein was the elected Representative of the 38th Congressional District—now the 36th Congressional District—of New York State for three terms. He served successively in the 68th, 69th, and 70th Congresses.

Today, only five men are in the House who served alongside Dr. Jacobstein.

As a Congressman, teacher, labor mediator, banker, publisher, and scholar, he impressed his vital personality on the scene of Rochester, N.Y., for more than half a century. His life was always one of service and concern for the public good and much of his effort was a community contribution.

During his 6 years of service in the House of Representatives from 1923 to 1929, Dr. Jacobstein became widely known and respected for the knowledge and understanding he brought to the many matters which were before the Congress. He represented his constituents with dedication and ability.

Dr. Jacobstein was a constant inspiration to those who knew him and came under the influence of his intellect.

Our condolences on this personal loss go to his widow and two daughters, Mrs. Harold Berlove, of Webster, N.Y., and Mrs. Joseph Thaler, of Spokane, Wash.

This past Sunday evening in Rochester, N.Y., a memorial service was held for Dr. Jacobstein. His longtime friend and spiritual leader, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Temple B'rith Kodesh, delivered a moving eulogy.

Memorial Service for Dr. Meyer Jacobstein

Meyer Jacobstein was one of the stars, one of the luminaries, that swam into my horizon when I was a youth in Rochester. I thought of him then as a warm, colorful, extraordinary personality, and I have never had any reason to change that opinion. He was even at that time a poor Jewish boy who had made good. He was a professor of economics at the University of Rochester where Jews in those days were not very numerous. He lectured brilliantly in the community and was highly popular.

Then when I returned to Rochester as rabbi of this temple in 1926, a relationship developed which continued through the years and which meant much to me in my own life. On my part it was a feeling of affection, friendship, of respect, and I think he returned this feeling. Out of that relationship I speak of him today.

First let me talk about his accomplishments, the externals of his life. Here was the son of a poor immigrant family, one of nine children. He had to earn his way peddling newspapers. And out of this difficult background came his remarkable achievements. He was one of the boys in whom Dr. Gannett of the Unitarian Church took an interest, and which led to the founding of the Boys' Evening Home which meant so much in the lives of men like Meyer, and Ben Goldstein, Sol Appelbaum, and others. This broadened his horizon and led him on to new fields.

He became a brilliant economist and, after having taught for awhile in the Midwest, returned to Rochester where his students liked him very much for they found him progressive, intelligent, stimulating. He was interested in labor relationships and this was a comparatively early period in those relationships in the clothing industry. In due course he found himself a labor mediator and arbitrator, and handling labor relationships for clothing firms. He never ceased to be an economist. In fact he became a better economist as through involvement in public life as Congressman, banker, publisher, and the head of a business institute, he learned more intimately, more realistically, what makes the wheels go round. My brother Irving, among many others, is greatly indebted to Meyer for direction, counsel, stimulation, and information, which he received when Meyer was a member of the faculty of that great Brookings Institution in Washington. Subsequently Meyer became of invaluable help to his former colleagues when he served on the staff of the Library of Congress and gave help, guidance, information, counsel, to the Members of Congress as they sought to think through the economic problems that confronted our National Legislature.

Because personally Meyer was eager and ambitious and also civic minded with a strong sense of public responsibility, he decided to run for Congress. Everything was against him. He was a Democrat, and in Rochester Democrats then were very much in the minority. He was a Jew. He was a liberal and in those days a liberal might be regarded as a radical. A powerful political machine was lined up against him. Nevertheless, in spite of all these handicaps, by the sheer power of his personality, his good sense, his obvious usefulness, his hard work, he was elected to the Congress of the United States. There he remained for 6 years, and could have stayed on indefinitely if he had chosen. He was one of the best Congressmen this area has ever had with a very strong sense of responsibility not only to his own constituency but also to the country, and to its welfare. In those days I would talk with other Members of Congress who told me how highly regarded he was by his colleagues, which was understandable, because he knew more than most of them about the problems that were confronting the Nation. In that period it became clear that Meyer was loved by the common man, and respected by the uncommon one. The poor, the immigrant, the Negro found in him an understanding friend. The cultivated person saw something of extraordinary worth in Meyer's warm, multifaceted personality.

After a time he found the wear and tear of congressional responsibilities too much for him and his family. He also was concerned with building up his economic position for the future. So he returned to Rochester and before long this man who had been a left-of-center liberal, an economics professor, a labor authority, a Democratic Member of Congress, became the president of a bank. During the depression, Meyer's bank was absorbed by a larger one (we had no bank failures in Rochester) and not long thereafter he became the publisher of the Journal American. My impression was that he thoroughly enjoyed this activity. It enabled him to express himself, to be in the thick of community and national life. It was challenging and stimulating to him, but then in due course the newspaper found it wise to discontinue its operations in Rochester, and so did Meyer. He and Lena loved Washington and they returned to it where he began the last phase of his active life. Working first with Brookings and later with the Library of Congress he put to use his vast knowledge, his extraordinary experience, his intellectual facility, his capacity for improvisation, and became of great value to students, to researchers, and to Members of Congress. This proved to be a happy period in Meyer's and Lena's life. Their children were grown up and married and on their own. The Jacobsteins loved Washington. They had many interests and many fine friends, but this too had to come to an end and Meyer returned to Rochester.

Those who knew Meyer only in this latter period of his life when he was back home and didn't know quite what to do with himself, hardly knew the Meyer whom most of us here knew and loved. Although he did direct an employment survey for Governor Harriman, something seemed to have gone out of him when he left Washington for good. I urged him to write his life experience which was really extraordinary but apparently this wasn't his talent or his interest. He could speak with remarkable charm, facility, delight, and humor about his experiences on every level from the common man up to Presidents of the United States. But somehow he couldn't get around to write about it.

We turn now from Meyer's external achievements which tell us what he did but not what he was, to the personality of the man. We draw the curtain over these last few years of decline and disability to the man we knew for threescore years and ten and more, for the personality that was warm and vital, colorful, charming. We think of the man who found everything interesting and was interested in everybody and who thereby became himself a very interesting personality. We see his eyes light up as a new idea strikes fire. His mind was facile. It leaped from one thing to another quickly and brilliantly. He had the capacity to think through and around a question, seeing its various sides. We remember Meyer's humor, his ready laughter, his charm. There was indeed something warm and light-giving in his personality. His very name—Meyer—which could be translated as light-giver—somehow expressed the light, the warmth, that Meyer brought into the life of others. He looked for the good in others. As Shelley said in another connection, "Life like a dome of many-colored glass stains the white radiance of eternity."

I see in Meyer not only his achievements but the capacity to achieve. He symbolized the best of the children of Jewish immigrants to this land; out of humble origins doing so much with their own lives and doing so much for America. He loved this country. It was an inspiration to him. He felt that he was only paying back, when he served it, a fraction of what it had done for him and for his family. Perhaps because of the influence of the Boys' Evening Home and Dr. Gannett and his associates at the Unitarian Church his Jewishness was broad. He was a profoundly loyal and devoted Jew but he also had strong universal feelings. He would like to go to religious services other than Jewish. He read the writings of religious thinkers whose views were very different from those of the official representatives of the synagogue. He and Lena were particularly fond of the writings of Robert and Elizabeth Barrett Browning. In some way Robert Browning's poem "Rabbi Ben Ezra" captures much of Meyer's spirit and outlook.

"Grow old along with me!
The best is yet to be,
The last of life, for which the first was made;
Our times are in His hand
Who saith, 'A whole I planned,
Youth shows but half; trust God; see all, nor be afraid.'
So, take and use Thy work;
Amend what flaws may lurk,
What strain o' the stuff, what warpings paid the aim!
My times be in Thy hand!
Perfect the cup as planned!
Let age approve of youth, and death complete the same."

How can I begin to do justice to what Meyer meant to his family. He was a source of pride to them. He was helpful to them in every way that was needed. He was a loyal and devoted brother. His nephews and nieces loved him.

The marriage of Meyer and Lena was so good, so wonderful, so mutually satisfying that one almost hesitates to speak of it. They were such a perfect combination. Lena with her keen, Lipsky mind, level headed, wise and practical. Meyer, colorful, volatile, constantly challenged and stimulated with new ideas. And both blessed with a sense of humor which enabled them to laugh at each other, but more often with each other.

How he loved his children, and how they loved him. And how he loved his grandchildren, and how they loved him. This was not the feeling toward a father or grandfather based on a sense of duty, but he was so much fun to be with that they just loved being with him.

As we think of Meyer in decline, as we saw how the frail body could not begin to keep up with the spirit, we can't wish him back. But we can remember him with affection and with profound gratitude. He gave us something as individuals and as a community which was unique and for which we will be eternally thankful. Remembering his feeling of responsibility we, who knew him and cared for him, should carry on where he left off. Because of you.

We lift our hearts in prayer to the God, God of Israel, God of all mankind, the God of the universe, in whom Meyer deeply believed. O God our Father and Friend, we thank Thee for this good man. We thank Thee for the richness and the warmth of his personality, for his usefulness and his helpfulness to his fellow men, for the inspiration that he gave to youth, for the heritage of good works that he has left behind him as an enduring monument. We thank Thee for the love that he gave and for the love that he received. We thank Thee for the nearly threescore years of good companionship with his beloved wife. We thank Thee for his children and theirs who gladdened his life. Help us to the faith that death is not the end. That such goodness, usefulness, love, do not die but live on in other lives better because of them, live on somehow eternally with Thee. Help us with the faith to carry on in his spirit and to continue good works to which he devoted his life. Strengthen us now with the faith of his fathers which sustained him throughout his life and which should strengthen and comfort us now as we contemplate his death.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Meyer Jacobstein, is dead. That my personal loss is great is understandable, for our friendship endured many, many years, both in and out of Congress. I sought freely and he gave freely to me, of his counsel, of his affection, of his wisdom.

There are those who knew him only and measured him only by the standards of his attainments—as Congressman, as editor and journalist, as educator, as banker, and as economist. He had been elected to the 68th, 69th, and 70th Congresses from March 4, 1923, through March 3, 1929, but did not seek renomination.

Formidable as these achievements may be, they are as nothing when compared to Meyer Jacobstein's depth of heart. Meyer Jacobstein is known as a newsboy Congressman. As a mere lad, who sold newspapers on the corners of the street, he never lost the common touch. He had experienced hardship first-hand and had retained the memory of those days so that to him the qualities of kindness and of mercy bespoke the noblest ideals of man. And these qualities were reflected in everything he said and did—in his political life, in his affiliation with the Government, in his friendships, and as husband and father.

After a day of tension, it was good to be with Meyer. He put things into perspective. His smile was gentle, his voice was gentle, and his soul was gentle. I am poorer and the world is poorer for his passing. I talk of my own sorrow so much because Meyer Jacobstein was a part of my life, a very precious part.

When he left Washington, after his retirement as economic counsel in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, I thought then that life had become a little grayer because Meyer was not there to break bread with and to talk with, but we wrote to each other and that was a measure of consolation. Now that he is gone from us, that vacuum is complete.

It is not fashionable these days, I know, to speak of one as "a good man," but I say that Meyer Jacobstein was a good man, possessed of that rare combination of mind and heart. The world has need of men like Meyer. It is my hope that there will be many who will study the story of this man's life and follow the ideals he set for himself and fulfilled. His wife, Lena, his family, and his colleagues, know that story. I hope one day it will be written.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened the other day to read of the passing of a distinguished former Member of the House from my State of New York, Dr. Meyer Jacobstein, of Rochester.

Mr. Speaker, for many years Rochester was my home. I can remember very clearly when I was a boy in school that Dr. Jacobstein was one of the distinguished leaders of our community, and was a popular and much-beloved Congressman from our city of Rochester. I can recall very clearly, in fact, as a lad of 10, coming to Washington at Easter time, 1927, for my first visit. My parents and I called on Congressman Jacobstein at that time, since he was a friend of my father, and he arranged for the three of us to visit the White House and to shake hands with President Coolidge. How the demands on the President of the United States have changed since that day.

Many years later, Mr. Speaker, after World War II, I had the great pleasure to become much better acquainted with Congressman Jacobstein, when he was serving as a major consultant with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I found him then, as the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton] has already remarked, a most charming, vital, exciting, and stimulating person.

Mr. Speaker, Meyer Jacobstein was one of the men whose personality and intelligence, and sheer capacity for hard work, helped to develop the great city of Rochester into the industrial and cultural center it is today. We who lived in that city will always owe him a deep debt of gratitude. And we are, I believe, wiser and better people today for having had the opportunity to know him. He will long be missed and mourned both here and in New York State.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the passing of Dr. Meyer Jacobstein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ACTION NOW ON CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the release of 21 Americans from Castro's jails now provides the United States with a clear path for new action to free Cuba. No longer must U.S. policies be based on fear of jeopardizing the safety of Castro's American hostages.

And no longer can the U.S. Government underestimate the growing consensus in America that coexistence with a Cuba dominated by a hostile foreign power will not be tolerated.

The Communist world even now attempts to shift America's attention from Cuba by fomenting anxiety in southeast Asia. For America to fall prey to this tactic would only give Khrushchev another cold war hot spot to turn off and on at will.

As one who has long recommended that this Nation lead the OAS into firm sanctions against Cuba, it is gratifying to me to see support for this approach echoing from responsible places in our Government. It is gratifying and my hope that the release of these American prisoners will now signal an intensified, hard-driving, and comprehensive U.S. program to topple Communist Cuba.

THE DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT OF ISRAEL

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House this morning of a sad event, the death of the President of Israel, Itzhak Ben-Zvi. The President of Israel made, in my opinion, significant contributions to the forging of abiding ties of friendship between Israel and many new and older nations of the free world. He had many friends in this country. He believed strongly in close ties between the United States and Israel. His loss will be much felt in this country and throughout the free world.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the distinguished gentlemen from New York has taken this time for this purpose. I had the honor of visiting the State of Israel while the gentleman was serving as ambassador with great distinction and devotion. No one is better able than he to speak of the life and service of president Itzhak Ben-Zvi. I know we all join with him in an expression of sorrow over the loss of one of the great men of the world. I know I speak for Members on this side as well as the other side of the aisle when I say this. I extend my personal condolences to the family of the late president and to the people of Israel.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I should like merely to add that I believe it to be the sense of the Congress that all of us here would like to express our condolences to the people of Israel, to Mrs. Ben-Zvi and to the family on the passing of this statesman and scholar who contributed much to the future of the world.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Ashley
Betts
Brock
Buckley
Chenoweth
Dent
Fisher
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Gubser
Hardy
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
King, Calif.
Lennon
Lesinski
Lloyd
Martin, Mass.
Pepper
Pillion
Powell
Purcell
Rivers, S.C.
Roosevelt
Schadeberg
Shelley
Sheppard
Skubitz
Steed
Talcott
Tollefson
Vinson
Walter
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wydler

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 305, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of that hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], and pending that, Mr. Speaker, all I will say is that the reading of the resolution makes clear that this is an open rule providing for 3 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling], a member of the Rules Committee, has explained, this resolution makes in order, under 3 hours of general debate and an open rule, to be followed by the 5-minute rule for consideration of amendments, H.R. 12.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is designed to increase the opportunities for the training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes, which comes to us from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which, as the Members know, has legislative jurisdiction over all legislative problems and matters dealing with the Public Health Service.

The bill, as I read it and understand it, really consists of two main sections or divisions. One would provide Federal grants to different types of schools in the Public Health Service field for brick and mortar construction either of new buildings or for the reconstruction or expansion and modernization of existing buildings.

This particular provision of the bill would be designed for the purpose of furnishing training based on this consideration, the population and the availability of trained technicians or physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, dentists, or professional public health personnel in various sections of the country. It provides some $175 million in Federal funds to be granted over a 3-year period for construction purposes. Some of the funds could be furnished on a matching basis of as much as 75 percent to be paid by the Federal Government and 25 percent by the schools or other agencies. In some instances the Federal Government would give 66⅔ percent of the cost of this brick and mortar construction work and in other instances the contribution of the Federal Government by way of grants for construction of these schools and other facilities would be 50 percent, for a total cost, as I said, for the 3-year period, according to the report, of about $175 million.

The other portions of the bill are devoted to establishing, creating or setting up a loan program to furnish loans and financial aid to students who might attend these schools to study medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and the other related professions in the Public Health Service field; and those loans would cost on the first 3-year basis, according to the report on page 5, something like $30,700,000 or $30,800,000. In addition to that there would be administrative expense over the 3-year period, 1964, 1965, and 1966, of some $1,150,000.

So there are really two questions before the House in connection with this legislation. One is whether or not the House of Representatives and the Congress itself feels that the Government should furnish financial aid for brick and mortar work in the construction of buildings and facilities for medical, dental and pharmaceutical schools as outlined in this bill for a 3-year period. I believe all Members will agree with me, there are very few Members of the House who are naive enough to believe otherwise, that once this legislation is enacted into law 3 years will not see the end of it, but instead at the end of 3 years undoubtedly legislation will be brought before this House to extend the grant of aid for the construction of medical and dental school facilities. That has been the history of all Federal aid programs in the past. That was learned very well I think in connection with the so-called Hill-Burton Act a number of years ago.

A number of years ago at the end of World War II many communities were forced to suspend the construction of hospitals because of a shortage of material and manpower. Bonds had been issued for the construction of these hospitals. Funds had been raised. When the war ended there were not sufficient funds available to finish the hospitals, and a bill was brought in from this same committee. I happened to be a member of it at that time and supported the legislation. It was a bill to give Federal aid on a matching basis to complete the construction of these hospitals which had been interrupted during World War II, $60 million a year, if I remember correctly, for a 3-year program. That was to solve the dilemma of that day, just to finish the construction of the hospitals which had been under construction and underway when the war interfered with their completion. Yet that program still lives, it still is carried on under the Hill-Burton Act, Federal aid or Federal programs for construction of hospitals throughout the land. I am not sure as to the cost this year but it is better than $200 million, if my information is correct, instead of the $60 million a year that we started with; and the end is not in sight.

So I think in considering this legislation as to the need, and seemingly all the testimony indicates that there is a great need for the expansion of the physical facilities of these medical, dental, and other schools of that nature, then the question arises as to whether or not the Congress thinks it is wise to embark upon this new program.

Then the other question revolves around the necessity and the wisdom of keeping in this legislation those sections that deal with the making of loans to students. I would like to remind you, if I may, of several facts.

No. 1. The Congress of the United States in its wisdom through the passage of the Defense Education Act has provided for the granting of Federal loans to college and university students, not quite as much as is provided in this bill but still providing for the Federal Government to contribute 90 percent up to a total of $5,000, I believe, to assist worthy students through the college or university training courses. Those funds are available now under present law.

This bill would increase the amount of loans that could be made to students, and I will agree that the expenses of those that take graduate studies in medical, dental, and pharmaceutical schools could run more than those in other colleges.

But there are other sources. I have here a letter from the officials of the American Medical Association stating the fact that that association does have a program and a loan fund from which it will make loans to any needy student in any of these fields of education that are covered in this bill, to any of them and all of them. The testimony shows, according to the statements of the American Medical Association, that not a single student in any of these schools has dropped out because of the lack of funds or the inability to get the aid they need to complete their education.

It goes further than that. There are other arrangements made for loans to be made to worthy students available at all times. I am rather proud of the fact that the State from which I hail, the State of Ohio, through the enactment of legislation some time ago set up what is called the Ohio Higher Education Assistance Commission, under which the State of Ohio through this commission, legally constituted and properly authorized, will insure and will guarantee loans to students to complete their higher education, not only in schools where medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, or public health service is taught, but in all types of schools.

These are schools for engineering and schools for education and science and where every type of education may be available—not only in the colleges and universities in Ohio but there are provisions for any student if he is a citizen of the State of Ohio to obtain a loan guaranteed by the State of Ohio. That student may attend any accredited college or university or any type of school—medical schools?—yes. Dental schools?—yes. Schools of pharmacy?—yes and others. This applies anywhere in the United States so long as that person is a citizen of Ohio who can meet the rather easy requirements of the laws of our State so that the commission and the State of Ohio itself will put behind that loan to that young man or that young woman the full faith and credit of the State of Ohio. It is the opinion of those who have studied this problem and who must live with it and who must meet it, there is no reason in the world why by the enactment of this bill, and as it is now written and as it is now being considered by the House, that we should set up another and a different loan program for those who may wish to attend these professional schools. Because all their needs and all their requirements can and will be met by other methods that are already established, already available and are just waiting for the students to apply for these loans.

Let me go further if I may. It just does not appeal to me that it makes commonsense to make loans to students to attend schools if you do not have any room for them in the schools. If the Congress is to enact legislation of this type, I think the first responsibility of the Congress is to do the brick and mortar job of furnishing the buildings and the laboratories in which you may give opportunity, to students who desire to do so, to study medicine and dentistry and pharmacy and all these other related professions.

I think it is the first responsibility of the Congress to do that before you begin to make loans. Because, as I said a moment ago, according to the statements that have been furnished to many of us, there has not been a single student now going to any of these institutions of higher learning in these particular fields who has been compelled to stop his or her educational endeavors because of lack of finance. There is plenty of money available in other ways without enacting into law this particular part of the bill to make loans with all the related provisions for forgiveness, and so forth and so on, that are contained in this measure which is rather complicated and rather difficult to administer, put into effect and carry through.

If this bill becomes law and later on, after you construct these new buildings, and after you increase the capacity of our medical, dental, and other professional schools to accommodate and educate more men and women, then if you find that you need these loans, they can be taken care of at that time, instead of doing it in advance of the time when you have room to put the students into college or into training.

It just does not make commonsense to do this particular thing, because it will be here for a long time to come. If this bill becomes law, if it is enacted, it will be with us for a long, long time.

I have made this statement on the floor of the House because I understand there will be amendments offered to strike out the loan provisions of this bill so that the measure may be considered only upon that section. If the loan provisions are stricken it will leave those which deal with the construction of facilities for the use of our medical, chemical, pharmaceutical, or public health training schools, and that is provided for in this bill. Without the loan provision the bill does give a great deal of authority, does provide for the spending of some $175 million in the next 3 fiscal years and, of course, as I said in the beginning it would probably be just the start of a long-range program of Federal aid to this particular phase of our school system.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate on Thursday next.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there may be some objection to that. Will not the gentleman withdraw his request?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think you have a pretty good idea now what this bill contains. Historically I might say that there was a larger bill of the same type before the Rules Committee last year and it was favorably reported to the House but not called up. The committee this year I think has very wisely circumscribed the program by reducing it to a 3-year program and reducing the amount. If there is any good reason for Federal aid to education I believe medicine would be the prime field in which it might be used, and I expect to support the bill so far as the construction provisions are concerned.

I have grave doubts about part 3 of the bill which provides for student loans. I do not think it is necessary. I say that for several reasons. In the first place, I wonder if anybody here knows the medical school situation in the United States? There is not a medical school that does not have more applicants able to pay for their education than they have facilities in which to teach them. That situation prevails all over the Nation. There is an ample number of students who by one reason or another are willing, ready, and financially able to take the medical course. I do not think anyone is denied because of lack of funds; they are denied taking the medical course because of lack of facilities in the medical colleges.

What I want to talk about a little is in connection with this whole subject of Federal aid to higher education and, particularly, I want to talk about the muddle in which it now is.

I wonder if there is any Member of this House, unless it is a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, who can tell you now, within a hundred million dollars, what we are spending in the Federal Government for aid to higher education.

I am going to tell you out of the horse's mouth, because the Committee on Education and Labor itself has for a long time been disturbed about the wild scattering of the functions of Federal aid to education throughout every agency of the Government of the United States.

In the pursuit of their efforts to solve that problem and bring some order out of this chaos, in which the whole educational program now exists, it made a study last year. So it is not up to date. It is in the form of a committee print, and it is called A Directory of Federally Financed Student Loans. It discloses that in 1959, which was the last available appropriations data, the Congress had appropriated—you people here—and the agencies of the Government had spent for aid—not to build colleges, not to build schools, not to furnish facilities and laboratories, but had spent for Federal aid to higher education, in the form of student aid—the sum of $2,413,186,000. Three years ago you were spending that amount for aid to education.

Where were you spending it? Through the Department of Education? Were you spending it under the supervision of any particular agency? No. That $2,413,186,000 in 1959 was spent by 20 different agencies of the Federal Government. Twenty different agencies of the Federal Government had their fingers in the pie. Some had all their fingers in the pie and some only a little finger in.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare alone spent on higher education in that year $737 million, which was the largest amount.

Then it goes on down and includes the 20 agencies I have referred to.

Why pour more money into what I think has become a rathole by reason of the divergency and the other chaos in which this whole problem is now? No Member of Congress can find out where a boy can get an education, because there are 20 agencies of the Government through which it is scattered. There are agencies of the Government even now that are dealing in the medical education field. The Navy Department, for instance, has a Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. That department in that year educated or started on their way 679 students at an expense of $2,850,000.

Take the Veterans' Administration. They have got a Department of Medicine and Surgery, and that department had 18,300 students. Now, that is a whole lot more than this whole program would amount to, 18,300, and they spent $17,277,000.

Now, you go all the way through the list of these 20 agencies and you will find somewhere in them that they are doing something in the nature of Federal aid to higher education. And, I am not talking about anything but the pupils. Here is $2,413,000,000 that went to higher education in the form of student aid.

Now, when are you going to get some common sense into this thing? The very committee that has jurisdiction over it, that this Congress gave jurisdiction to, the Committee on Education and Labor, has become so thoroughly confused that they have made this study. They issued this report last year. They have just recently issued another one four times as big on the same subject that I have not had the opportunity to examine. So, I would say that any Federal aid to higher student education might well be deferred until we take some means or some measures to lead ourselves out of this morass in which we are now immersed with practically every agency of the Federal Government dealing with the subject of higher education and put it all under one head, where it belongs, so that we will know what we are doing about it. For that reason I think we could well dispense with aid to medical students and devote our efforts to building up the college facilities that are needed to accommodate the medical students already knocking at the door.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an excellent editorial entitled "Root of Opposition," by John McCormally, executive editor of the Hutchinson News, Hutchinson, Kans., which first appeared in that paper in September 1962. I have learned that this editorial has subsequently been made available in pamphlet form by the Federal relations division of the National Education Association. This pamphlet has been the subject of a series of attacks by Fulton Lewis, Jr., and other extreme rightwing spokesmen.

Mr. McCormally's thesis is that the schools have been caught in the age-old economic battle between the few who control great wealth and those who seek better educational opportunities for the children of this Nation. As Mr. McCormally says:

> It is not popular, or even polite, to describe (the battle) in these terms—

But the fact remains that there is, with notable exceptions, a great deal of truth to his contentions.

Those who testify for Federal aid to education year after year are those who represent the blue and white collar workers, the family farmers, the great majority of the average or low income members of our society. AFL–CIO, National Farmers Union, civic and social welfare organizations such as the National Council of Jewish Women, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, join with the great educational organizations in urging the Congress to provide assistance to the States and local communities to improve educational opportunities. Conversely, the chamber of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Farm

Bureau, and other representatives of corporate industry and agriculture oppose—and thus far successfully—the proper Federal sharing of the cost of educating the Nation's citizens. The battle is indeed one between those representing wealth and those representing the rank and file citizens.

The fact that other issues of religion, race and States rights have more emotional appeal has been cleverly exploited by those who do not believe in the American dream of availability of quality education for every individual, limited only by his capacity to learn. The forces opposing Federal aid are all too often the same forces who oppose local school taxes, and who oppose increased State taxes for the support of education. The cynicism of those who preach piously against Federal aid on the phoney appeal to fear of Federal control is appalling. The practice of casting the Federal Government in the role of an evil monster attempting to destroy the freedom of its citizens is a travesty in light of our constitutional heritage. Ever since the failure of the Confederation and the adoption of our Constitution we have sought to develop and advance as one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. It is ironic that some self appointed patriots mouth the inspiring phrases of our Pledge of Allegiance as an opening exercise preceding an attack on our Federal system—and those who are dedicated to its preservation.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. McCormally's editorial for themselves. He has used blunt, strong, and in some instances bitter words to describe an impolite truth—that money is at the root of opposition to Federal aid to education. The editorial follows:

The Root of Opposition

Young America will go back to school this month against a background of loud and bitter bickering over the future of its schools.

The fight over Federal aid to education is, on the surface, a political fight, with spicy dashes of racial prejudice and religious bitterness thrown in.

But under the surface, in reality, it is an economic battle—one of the oldest and hardest fought in this country. It falls in the classic pattern of historic battles between the haves and have-nots, between those who control the wealth of the land and those who make up its masses.

It is not popular—or even polite—to describe it in these terms. We are all brainwashed from childhood to pretend that the United States has no classes or masses, no sharp and fundamental disagreement between its have minority and have-not majority.

We are all supposed to be of a mold—good, pert, freshly scrubbed Americans, believing that capitalism and free enterprise came down to us on stone tablets from the mountain and that democracy was devised by angels.

But the truth of the matter is that the minority, who are the elite financially and culturally, do not trust democracy very far. They tremble—and with good reason—at what would happen to their wealth and position if the masses ever really could bring the vote of the majority into full play. And they have spent the better part of 200 years devising little ploys (such as the House Rules Committee) to thwart the will of the majority, all the while paying lip service to the word "democracy."

And on the other hand, the majority, while it admits to something patriotic in the word "capitalism," particularly since it has become an antonym of "communism," nevertheless exerts most of its political energy—and has been doing so since the last century—controlling, curtailing, and transforming capitalism into some forms and stages of socialism.

The first and greatest of these social programs—of channeling the wealth of the Nation to the benefit of the masses—is the public school system.

But free public education (radical as the idea was and still is to some untainted patriots), was for a long time no great economic threat. As long as it remained local, it could be controlled. The masses might fill the schools with their children; but the community leaders—its business and professional men—those concerned with preserving the community's wealth, controlled the schools. And they kept them inexpensive.

This meant keeping them, in most cases, inadequate and crowded, with vastly underpaid and sadly undereducated and uninspired teachers. But it was cheap.

But education feeds upon itself. Two generations ago, when utterly uneducated parents sent their children to school they were amazed, overjoyed, and endlessly grateful for the one-room building and $30 teachers which the local landowners in their magnanimity had provided them.

A generation ago more parents had been through high school and some had been to college and they began to insist, for their children, on fireproof buildings and teachers with degrees and public high schools big enough for everyone.

Now this generation, with vastly improved tastes, wants, in addition, pastel walls and multipurpose rooms, and foreign language and exceptional child programs, and teachers with two degrees, and public colleges big enough for everyone. And this is anything but cheap. So the fight has developed and grown * * * a fight between the people with the wealth and the people with the kids. And each time wealth won—each time it dug in its heels and threw up a line against more spending, the parents (ably commanded by professional educators) simply went around the end and started the fight all over again, in a larger arena.

When district funds no longer sufficed because some districts were so poor in property and rich in children, the fight was made for county funds—for funneling wealth from the rich districts into the poor ones. And the next move was for the State funds—for funneling the wealth from the rich counties into the poor ones. And now the battle is for Federal funds—for funneling the wealth from the rich States into the poor ones.

But the change is more than geographic, more than just a move to larger taxing bases. The method of taxation changed too. The school district is limited to taxing real estate, no longer necessarily a true measure of wealth. But State and Nation, with their sales and income taxes, are in a much better position to stick the rich.

* * * * *

Familiar cries of combat warn of the dangers of Federal control; although numbers increase who refuse to be terrified of their own Government.

The real battle involves no such principles. It is simply, unglamorously, a matter of money.

The great mass of American people, whose children fill the schools, want more money spent on education—on teachers and facilities and subject matter which they believe, rightly or wrongly, will mean better, richer futures.

Once public education has been made as much a Federal responsibility as national defense or national highways, more money than was ever dreamed of will be spent on it. More than ever of the Nation's wealth will be taken from those who possess it and spent on the education of the Nation's children.

That harsh, impolite economic truth is at the root of the opposition to Federal aid to schools.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Brown] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], covered different aspects of the bill which I will not take the time of the Members in discussing, but I was more or less interested in the statement that we should build the hospitals and postpone this critical situation that exists in regard to providing doctors and teachers and surgeons and internes and nurses and that we will get them in some mysterious way after the hospitals are constructed.

The pending bill, H.R. 12, will help greatly toward relieving the critical shortage of physicians, dentists, nurses, and professional health personnel which has been existing in our Nation for a number of years. As each year passes, the number of doctors, dentists, and nurses decreases in percentage to the health demands of an exploding population.

This bill authorizes an appropriation for 3 fiscal years beginning June 30, 1963, of $237 million for medical school building construction and also loans for the education of qualified medical students, nurses, and so forth. A substantial amount will be authorized for the training of physicians, pharmacists, dentists, nurses, and other professional health personnel. It also provides $35 million for the replacement and rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for the medical and dental professions.

This legislation provides much needed financial assistance to qualified students who are unable to finance the long years necessary to procure a complete and practical medical education. Evidence was presented before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the period of time after graduation from high school requires a student to take 4 years of college, 4 years of medical school, 1 year of internship and 2 or 3 years of residency, involving a total cost for a medical education which is in excess of $20 thousand. In the past 10 years, there has been a sharp increase in the number of college graduates, but a sharp decrease of applicants to medical and dental schools. One of the main facts contributing to the scarcity of medical and dental graduates has been the long and increasing cost of training and the fact that highly qualified college graduates can step into more remunerative careers in scientific, business, and other fields. This legislation provides a reliable loan program to qualified and acceptable students to enter the medical and dental fields. This money can be paid back on a reasonable basis beginning 3 years after they have qualified as doctors, dentists, and in other medical fields.

Several weeks ago, the U.S. News & World Report had a three-page article calling the Nation's attention to the shortage of doctors throughout the Nation and sounding the alarm that something drastic must be done to meet the challenge of the present and the future. Dr. Luther L. Terry, U.S. Surgeon General, told a congressional committee in February, "over the past 10 years the output of our medical schools has lagged behind the population growth." Dr. Terry noted that adequate medical care takes about 1 physician for every 1,000 persons. Yet in 1960, more than two-thirds of the 3,101 counties in the United States had only 1 physician for every 2,000 or more.

One sign of the shortage is the large scale use of graduates from foreign medical schools as "house doctors," residents and interns, in U.S. hospitals. Out of the 38,000 such posts occupied, about 9,000 are filled by men trained outside the United States. To put it another way, more than 1 out of 4 resident doctors and almost 1 out of 6 interns in American hospitals is a graduate of a foreign medical school. And even so, there are thousands of internships and residencies unfilled.

Russell A. Nelson, M.D., president of Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, recently told a congressional committee hearing:

> On the whole, it is my opinion that foreign educated physicians are not as good practitioners as the American school graduates, and I personally would like to see more American young men and women practicing medicine in this country.

The Federal Government has concluded that U.S. medical schools must turn out at least 11,000 new physicians a year by 1973 to keep pace with the expected population growth. That would require, according to Government figures, a 50-percent increase in medical student graduating classes for the next 10 years. The equivalent of some 35 new medical schools would have to be built, staffed, equipped and put into operation within a period of 72 months to achieve this goal.

In the industrial Calumet region of Indiana which comprises the First Indiana Congressional District, there exists a critical shortage of doctors engaged in the general practice of medicine. Doctors of recognized standing in the medical profession are able to administer to but a small percentage of the patients requesting their services. This industrial area has increased in population from 340,000 in 1942 to almost 600,000 in 1962. The increase of doctors does not come close to the population expansion.

Immediately after World War II, my office was bombarded with letters from students and returning veterans complaining that their applications for admission to medical colleges were rejected because of lack of medical educational facilities. Upon investigation, I found that the medical school at Indiana University in 1947 could only accept about 150 medical students out of almost 3,000 applicants. Today the American public is paying the penalty for the failure of our Government during the last 20 years to do something about the physician, nurse, and hospital shortage.

During these years, I supported legislation in Congress which, if enacted into law, would have helped to solve the doctor and hospital crisis with which we are confronted today. This necessary legislation was defeated by the powerful highly financed lobby of the leaders of the American Medical Association. In the 1952 congressional campaign, the brass hats of this well-disciplined medical union marshaled their money and propaganda in an unsuccessful effort to bring about my defeat. These high-powered medical politicians of the AMA discovered that the majority of doctors in my congressional district were not misled and realized that something must be done to keep pace with the medical and hospital demands of our rapidly growing population. The vast majority of doctors in my district are rejecting the AMA leaders and are favorable to legislation that will solve the doctor and hospital shortage. They realize that each passing year, medical services are rapidly receding behind the population growth.

Every session of Congress, powerful lobbies are in Washington, pressing for legislation to help the farmer, big and small business, oil, mineral interests, et cetra, but the millions of people who need ample medical care cannot afford the powerful lobby representation.

We have thousands of working families in the Calumet region of Indiana who need proper medical care, but suffer on account of the scarcity of general practitioners in the medical profession.

The thousands of qualified students without finances to become doctors have no lobbies in Washington to aid them in securing financial loans to establish themselves in the medical profession and contribute toward relieving this crisis in doctors and hospitals.

A letter arrived in my office yesterday from F. J. L. Blasingame, M.D., executive vice president of the American Medical Association, stating that the association endorses the provision in H.R. 12—the pending bill—which provides for money to aid in hospital construction, expansion, and so forth, but is opposed to the provision providing for the loan program to aid students in securing a medical education. No doubt that decision was made by a small committee of AMA leaders without consulting the rank and file doctor, nurse, and intern throughout the Nation.

One of the great difficulties with hospitals in my area and throughout the Nation is to secure proper medical personnel and qualified help to man the hospitals. That is the reason why such a great percentage of foreign doctors of questionable talents and professional ability are today taking over hospital duties in this country, for which service most of them are unqualified. Our Immigration and Naturalization Service is bombarded with requests from foreign doctors and interns who come to this country as students, to remain and help relieve the doctor and intern shortage in our hospitals.

The few leaders of the AMA who make these decisions should consult some of the doctors and hospital personnel who are struggling with this burden of medical scarcity.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include with my remarks, a letter which I received from Dr. Myron E. Wegman, dean of the University of Michigan School of Public Health, endorsing this legislation and also a letter from Dr. Gerald D. Timmons, president of the American Dental Association, who endorsed this legislation in testifying before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I do hope that H.R. 12 will pass this House without changes by an overwhelming vote.

The University of Michigan,
School of Public Health,
Ann Arbor, Mich., April 17, 1963.

Hon. Ray J. Madden,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Madden: As president of the Association of Schools of Public Health, I have been asked by our association to express to the membership of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives our warm appreciation of their action in clearing the Health Professions Act, H.R. 12, for consideration by the House. Our association is mindful of the fact that each of the 12 schools of public health in the country must in fact be a national school preparing trained personnel for increasingly complex public health programs. The Federal Government has generously recognized this fact in its support of general and specific teaching programs in schools of public health and, if H.R. 12 is passed, will be in position to assist in providing vitally needed physical facilities to care for the growing student load.

Schools of public health are not, of course, affected by the student loan provisions of H.R. 12 but it is precisely our own very favorable experience with a Federal aid program for professional students in public health that makes us endorse wholeheartedly Federal assistance to medical students. Our constant concern for provision of adequate medical care to the population convinces us that the sections on student aid in H.R. 12 are sound and urgently needed.

In thanking you for your action in sending this bill to the floor of the House, may I respectfully bespeak your support of the bill in the House debate and vote.

Very sincerely yours,
Myron E. Wegman, M.D.,
Dean.

American Dental Association,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1963.

Members, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressmen: In view of recent events, I wish to confirm to you the American Dental Association's support of H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The position of this association has not changed in any way since February 6, 1963, when our president-elect, Dr. James P. Hollers, of San Antonio, Tex., appeared before the committee in support of H.R. 12.

As Dr. Hollers testified, we believe H.R. 12 is well conceived and critically needed health legislation.

In dentistry, there is a well-documented need for construction grants and for a student loan program if we are to have sufficient professional manpower to meet the dental care needs of the people of this country in the years to come.

We hope, therefore, that you will support all provisions of H.R. 12 as they relate to dentistry and that you will oppose any amendments that would eliminate dental students from any part of the program contained in H.R. 12.

The American Dental Association appreciates your interest in sound programs to improve health care in this country.

Sincerely yours,

GERALD D. TIMMONS, D.D.S.,

President.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the committee, I believe, has done excellent work in pointing up the urgent need for increased numbers of doctors and health personnel in this country, so I will not add to the many statistics that have already demonstrated this ever-growing problem. I would, however, like to add that, in my work on the Armed Services Committee, it has been apparent for some time that this national problem also affects our military mission in that procurement of adequate doctors for the services has become very difficult. It was to alleviate this difficulty that I introduced H.R. 67 in the 84th Congress to provide for Armed Forces medical scholarships. However, if the capacity of medical schools is not increased, benefits from a scholarship program are very limited. The very security of our country therefore requires that we tackle the whole problem as soon as possible.

The approach of H.R. 12, the chairman's bill, H.R. 180, my own bill, and other identical proposals is doubly helpful, I believe, in that the smaller, less affluent, medical schools can greatly increase their capacity. These schools in many cases may be persuaded to concentrate on preparing graduates for practice in rural and semirural areas where the need is most critical. However, it takes time to bring about an increase in doctors, even if we act quickly to provide Federal assistance. The Association of American Medical Colleges points out that it takes 6 to 10 years to develop a medical school and 5 to 9 years after college to complete a medical education. In spite of this they warn that 3,500 additional physicians will be needed each year by 1975.

I want to commend the committee on their early attention to this urgent problem in this Congress. I am in hopes that our other colleagues will join also in securing this Federal assistance that should no longer be delayed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana referred to an article in U.S. News & World Report, which I have before me. I wish he had pointed out the conclusion that has been reached by the authors as stated in the article, to the effect that research is luring too many medical men from the goal of everyday practice.

The reason we have this bill before us today is that people feel we need more doctors, but the facts are that of all the doctors that are graduated only 21 percent go into general practice, as contained in this summary in U.S. News & World Report. The rest of them go into specialties, in psychiatry and surgery and into research. The more we put into research the more the doctors are going into research. That is the reason we do not have practicing physicians in the various communities throughout the country.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman failed to mention that the percentage to which he called attention does not include surgeons and does not include specialists, who are necessary, too.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I just mentioned, if the gentleman was listening, that I did include psychiatrists and the specialties but this does not meet the real problem in getting the family-type doctors, and only 21 percent of the graduates are going into that field. This legislation will not solve that problem.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, important to the Nation and especially important to Arizona. The rule should be adopted and the bill should pass.

Our State, in the fastest growing part of the Nation, doubled its population between 1950 and 1960. Rapid growth will continue in the foreseeable future. Yet Arizona has no medical school.

Studies have shown a substantial inmigration of physicians. But the number has been insufficient to maintain the State's physician-to-population ratio. Arizona already compares unfavorably with the national average.

We have an interstate compact program for helping train Arizonians—in institutions located in other States—in the fields of medicine, dentistry and veterinary. The program has worked well as far as it goes. But Arizona is ready to do more to encourage young people to enter medicine and thus to help this Nation maintain its high medical standard.

Some years ago Arizona asked a panel of the Nation's leading medical educators to make a study and determine whether the State needed a medical school and where that school should be established. After a thorough study the committee advised that a medical school should be established at the University of Arizona in Tucson.

There followed an unfortunate intrastate controversy over the school's location. Fortunately, that controversy has been resolved, thanks largely to the statesmanship of certain State legislators and the wise and tempering counsel of the Arizona Republic, of Phoenix, the State's largest newspaper.

The problem facing Arizona today is not whether or where a medical school should be established—those decisions have been made—but how to meet this heavy financial burden. I am sure my State is not unique. What is true in Arizona is true in other rapidly growing States of the West. It is likewise true, I am sure, in the populous States of the East. State property taxpayers are carrying burdens which cannot be substantially increased. The passage of H.R. 12 will not solve all of these problems, either in Arizona or other States, but it will be a big help at a time of maximum need. It may well help my State to establish a medical school earlier than would otherwise be possible.

I think H.R. 12 is one of the important and significant pieces of new legislation to come before the 88th Congress, and I urge its passage.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, first let me say that I am in support of this bill. I am supporting the bill as it was brought out of the committee by the very fine Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I should like to direct my brief remarks to the situation which was brought to our attention a little while ago by my good friend and colleague from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], regarding the sudden change of position, apparently, of the American Medical Association. Upon examination of the testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which I am sure will be touched on later, it will be noted that at no time did they take the position that today, all of a sudden, they are taking. Because of this feeling, Mr. Speaker, I feel so deeply the disservice sought to be worked on the American people that I cannot refrain at this time from expressing my abhorrence of this new attack by the hierarchy of the American Medical Association upon the efforts of Congress to provide better medical care in the United States.

The "high priesthood of medicine," which I know does not speak for the hardworking, dedicated doctors of my district or yours, finally has shown its true purpose, a design not only to completely control the practice of medicine, but even to keep its iron grip upon admission to medical practice, to so tighten the purse strings on medical education as to make it impossible for the student without large family finances to attend medical school unless he can obtain a loan from the American Medical Association. Thus, this ruling hierarchy not only would control admission to practice of medicine, but would be in a position to retain financial control of the doctors through long periods of loan repayment, and, judging by the ruthless tactics exhibited in the past, would not hesitate to keep these men in line through the years by threat of financial squeeze added to its present weapon of professional ostracism.

I think it is time we recognize our duty to free our doctors from the shackles of this power-hungry little group of medical politicians and offer an opportunity to them to rescue their professional society and restore it to democratic control. I think your doctor and mine and the future doctors in the United States do not and will not approve a reversion to the Dark Ages of healing and an effort to block medical education advances just as the witch doctors and high priests sought by fear, religious mystery, and threats to block the first advances toward modern medicine.

We must not today permit this tightly controlled, rule-or-ruin clique to gain complete mastery of our deserving, qualified, but poor medical student.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman mentioned my name. The gentleman does not question that the statement I made as to what the American Medical Association said is correct; does he?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman from Ohio is exactly right. I have a copy of the identical letter myself. I am not questioning the gentleman but I am questioning the American Medical Association's activities and statements that are distortions of facts.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from California may question them but do not question me.

Mr. SISK. I want to assure the gentleman, I am not questioning him.

Now I realize, Mr. Speaker, that these charges against the hierarchy of the American Medical Association may sound grave, but the facts are, this very small group of men is attempting to rule and to dominate the medical profession throughout this country.

I would like to call your attention to some experiences I had as a member of another committee a few years ago regarding the tactics of the American Medical Association, when they distributed, somewhat surreptitiously, to key doctors in districts throughout the United States a questionnaire, a questionnaire for which under questioning by me before a committee, they denied responsibility at the time. However, 5 days later they changed their position and admitted they issued this questionnaire. I might say I received this questionnaire from a doctor in the State of Nebraska, but it was distributed throughout all the congressional districts of the United States. Let me read you some of the questions that they were asking:

> 1. Who is the person or persons in each ward or county in the congressional district who is most influential with the Congressman? List names, addresses, and business or profession of each.
>
> 2. Who is the physician who knows and can work with each of the above?
>
> 3. Who are the four or five men in the Congressman's district who really influence him? List their names, addresses, and business or profession.
>
> 4. Who are the principal contributors to his campaign?

Mind you, these are questions which the American Medical hierarchy here in the Nation's Capital were directing to certain key doctors throughout the country to provide them with information to bring pressure on individual Members of the Congress. I charged the American Medical Association with this and I received a letter 4 or 5 days later which finally admitted they were sending out this type of communication.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman earlier referred to a letter from the American Medical Association and has made reference to a loan program which they describe in the letter. Does the gentleman know who controls this loan program and who determines how much goes to the various colleges and who passes on the individual loans? Can the gentleman enlighten the House with reference to these questions?

Mr. SISK. It is my understanding that this loan program is completely under the control of the American Medical Association; and, further, that it actually is an underwriting procedure in which these students will pay somewhere from 6 to 8 percent interest on these loans. In addition, I might say that the testimony before the committee by certain representatives of the American Medical Association, as I understand it, indicates that every time a student makes application anywhere in the United States for admission to a medical school they know within a matter of hours; a copy of that admission request is filed with the association.

What right has the little clique of medical politicians to control rigidly, as they are doing today, through devious methods, the admission of young men and women across this country to the practice of medicine?

It is evident they are opposing the loan program in this bill and blandly seeking to substitute a loan scheme they can rigidly control in a power grab without precedent, even in their own sorry history. They are seeking even more power than they now possess—not for the hardworking, dedicated grassroots doctors across the country, but for the group that already dominates them. They are seeking a professional closed shop, literally from the high school to the grave, manipulated by medical politicians who dominate from the top.

Let me continue with some of these questions they are using to bring pressure upon Members of Congress:

> 5. What contacts does the medical profession have with officers or leaders of such organizations as Blue Cross-Blue Shield, dentists, hospital boards of directors, chambers of commerce, Farm Bureau and Grange? Who are the doctors who can talk to these leaders?
>
> 6. Who is the Congressman's personal physician? At home? In Washington?
>
> 7. What contacts does the medical profession have or who knows the Congressman's top secretariat on his Washington staff?
>
> 8. What are the Congressman's hobbies? Favorite charity? Boards, organizations, church?
>
> 9. What newspapers in the district supported him in his last campaign? What is their present attitude toward him?
>
> 10. What contacts does the medical profession have with any or all of these newspapers? Either directly with the editors or through other influential citizens or advertisers?
>
> 11. How big a factor is labor in the district?
>
> 12. Do any of the local labor organizations deviate from the national labor organizations and for what reasons?
>
> 13. How big a factor are old folks in the district?
>
> 14. What contacts has organized medicine or individual physicians made with the Congressman?
>
> 15. What was his general attitude?

To verify that the American Medical Association put this questionnaire out after they originally denied it, somewhat red-facedly, they came back with a letter to me in which the doctor who at that time was the chairman of their legislative committee made the following statement:

> In my testimony before the Veterans' Affairs Committee on July 24, you requested further information relative to a questionnaire concerning Congressmen. I am advised that this questionnaire was used in connection with the association's efforts to defeat H.R. 9467, 85th Congress. This bill as you know is a proposed amendment to title II of the Social Security Act to provide health benefits to eligible recipients. The American Medical Association, together with several other organizations, is deeply disturbed about the impact of this bill, if enacted, on the public and the profession. We have therefore made every proper effort to prevent the adoption of what we consider to be dangerous and ill-conceived legislation.
>
> It has been the objective of the association to inform Congressmen and those individuals on whom they may depend for advice and guidance of the serious nature of this bill. It is vital in our opinion that the public and the Congress be aware of the extremely unfavorable potentialities of the bill. The questionnaire was designed to ascertain the most constructive means and effective avenues by which our position on this legislation and the reasons for this position could be made known to Members of Congress.

I want to again emphasize that my remarks are not directed against the medical profession as such, nor against the many individual doctors I know will secretly agree with these remarks. I am talking about the activities of a little, dominating group, who were responsible for probing into your private life in the questionnaire just quoted in full in an effort to tighten their clutch on the Nation's medical services and, in truth, to intervene in and destroy the very doctor-patient relationship they pretend to protect.

It is to my mind a very happy fact that this medical hierarchy has not succeeded in stilling the voices of some members of the profession, and notable among them are medical educators who are strongly backing this bill and its loan provisions.

Listen to what Dr. Clayton G. Loosli, dean of the School of Medicine of the University of Southern California writes:

> I strongly urge you to support this legislation as a means of securing and improving the health of our citizens.

And Dr. R. W. McNulty, dean of the School of Dentistry of the same university writes:

> We are losing well-qualified applicants because of their lack of funds and we feel that the loan aspect of the bill is also important.

Dr. Robert Ward of the Childrens Hospital of Los Angeles writes:

> As I see it, the provision of funds for teaching, library, research, and hospital facilities, as well as long term, low interest loans to medical students, is vitally important to medical education in this country, and as such would directly influence the health of the Nation.

The American Dental Association has this view:

> We hope, therefore, that you will support all provisions of H.R. 12 as they relate to dentistry and that you will oppose any amendments that would eliminate dental students from any part of the program contained in H.R. 12.

I have taken the floor today to speak out, perhaps with some political peril to myself, against what I consider to be a most disturbing and dangerous threat to the American medical system, a constantly enlarging effort of the few to dominate the many, a rule or ruin policy seeking to make complete captives of all doctors, from the inception of their medical education to the end of their professional lives. It is time we gave doctors a chance to recapture their own society, their freedom of professional action, and the dignity they richly deserve.

I hope you will adopt the rule, and, in light of the facts and background as I see them and as I have outlined them, I hope you will vote this bill out without amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to ask unanimous consent that I may extend the remarks I intend to make in the Committee of the Whole and that I may include therein letters and other extraneous matter that will be referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12 with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is my very great pleasure today, at the direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to bring to the floor of the House a bill which I consider to be the most important health bill which the membership of this House will have had an opportunity to consider in many years.

I hope you will let me explain to you why I feel this way. If the membership of the House will only let the facts speak for themselves, Mr. Chairman, I am certain that an overwhelming majority will agree with me and will support this legislation.

First, let me ask you to keep in mind that this is a health bill. It has already been stated on the floor of the House that this bill should be considered as a Federal aid to education bill. If you will keep in mind the distinction between health and education in connection with this legislation, I believe it will help to clarify some of our thinking.

This is a health bill. It is just as much a health bill as hospital bills are. It is just as much a health bill as research programs are, as the quarantine programs that started in 1798 and other health bills through the years. This is the very important problem that I urge you to keep in mind, because the major difference would be that education bills go to the Commissioner of Education for administration. This is a health bill and it should go to the Surgeon General since those people are experienced and knowledgeable in the field of health. I ask you to keep that distinction in mind. If you will, we will not have nearly the trouble that some have indicated we might have with this legislation.

In the 79th Congress, 1945–46, the Congress began to take a very active interest in programs aimed at providing improved health services for the American people, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

In 1946 Congress completed and passed the Hill-Burton hospital construction program and the Mental Health Act, two of the most important programs to safeguard the health of the people.

Then there followed in quick succession in 1948 the National Heart Act and the National Dental Research Act. Who among us has ever questioned either the need for these two programs? Then, in 1950, we saw important health legislation relating to research on arthritis, rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, polio, blindness, leprosy, and other major diseases. These enactments laid a broad foundation for subsequent legislation in the public health field. But, broad as these laws were, note one thing, they have failed up until now to provide the additional facilities for the training of personnel, doctors, dentists, and professional public health personnel. Now, I do not have to remind you how our population has increased in recent years, but I do remind you that we have not provided the personnel to keep up with it. Thus, from 1946 to the present time the Congress has provided programs for hospitals, research, research facilities, research training, vaccination programs, community health services, community health facilities, but we have not taken account of the fact that our evergrowing population on the one hand and our increased medical knowledge and enlarged medical facilities on the other have greatly outdistanced the available supply of professional health personnel, that is, medical doctors, dentists, and so forth.

Research alone, Mr. Chairman, cannot cure people. Hospitals and other health facilities alone cannot cure sick people. Robot machines and computers designed to supply health services are not in existence as yet. And, I doubt seriously that they ever will be. For the time being and for the foreseeable future, therefore, we shall have to rely on professional health personnel to render professional health services.

Now, how does one go about increasing the supply of professional health personnel? Have you thought about that? Have you ever stopped to think about that at all? Where is the bottleneck that keeps us from increasing the supply of doctors, dentists, and so forth? There was no dispute in regard to this program at all in the course of the hearings that we held. The bottleneck is to be found in the inadequacy of present facilities in which our doctors and dentists are trained. I refer you to the hearings conducted in the 87th Congress and again in the 88th Congress which are available and which are replete with information substantiating the facts. These two hearing records support the claim as to the need for this program.

Mr. Chairman, our committee wrote this legislation to meet the need that we think exists at this time and we reported this bill out of the committee by a vote of 21 to 1. This is no partisan program at all. Our committee does not work on that basis. Some people who studied the problem have proposed in all seriousness the establishment of Federal medical and dental schools. Those who raise questions and are fearful of socialized medicine had better keep this in mind. These people thought the need for additional professional health personnel just as urgent as our need for professionally trained soldiers, sailors, and aviators. More moderate counsel prevailed and it was thought preferable to rely on a Federal grant program to hasten the expansion of facilities of the existing system of State and private medical schools, and that is what we do here. This bill is based on sound American principles. Let me emphasize at this point—because I think it is important that we keep this in mind—our committee was concerned with finding the most appropriate way by which we might increase the supply of professional health services. We were not concerned primarily with education in this program. I repeat that statement because I want you to keep it in mind. We were not and we are not primarily concerned with the increase of knowledge or learning for its own sake.

We are concerned here with the principal purpose of increasing the supply of health manpower and thereby of health services. That is the purpose of H.R. 12. I repeat again, with emphasis, its basic purpose is improved health for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, after these brief preliminary observations permit me to discuss with the Members of the Committee the highlights of the bill which our committee reported, after extended hearings, as I have referred to. It is designed to expand the Nation's capacity to train scarce health personnel. The committee amendment here provides, first, for a 3-year program of matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, osteopathic, and professional public health personnel as well as for collegiate nurses; and second, a 3-year program of loans for students of medicine, dentistry and osteopathy. That is what the bill does in very simple terms.

Matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities are authorized conditionally for the training of pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, because the committee report spells out in detail that grants for the construction of these facilities depend upon a showing in future years of a manpower shortage in these fields. They were not included when the bill was sent up by the administration and introduced, but the committee included them. It was not shown in the hearings of the committee that there is need for such facilities as those at this time, but these professions contend that there may come a time when there will be such a need. For that reason the committee, by a majority vote, included conditionally in the $15 million in the first fiscal year and in $45 million in each of the next two fiscal years, grants for the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of optometrists, podiatrists, and pharmacists.

The sum of $5 million in the first fiscal year and $15 million in each of the following 2 years are authorized for grants for construction of new teaching facilities for the training of dentists. Finally, $5 million in the first year and $15 million in each of the 2 succeeding years are authorized for replacement and rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for all of the foregoing categories.

Let me say here—and keep this in mind—we authorize for the first year only funds that are already budgeted for. So we are not in this program authorizing or providing something beyond the budget. This is a program that is already included in the budget for this next fiscal year.

Matching grants for construction of new schools and for major expansion of existing schools may be made up to two-thirds of the cost of construction. Major expansion means an increase of at least 15 to 20 percent of the first-year enrollment or at least 15 additional places, whichever is the largest. This was included by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER]. It was thought, and certainly it was justified, that if we are going to increase the facilities, we should be sure that they increased the turnout of personnel.

Other grants may not exceed 50 percent of the cost of construction. Grants for the expansion of an existing school may only be made where the school will expand its first-year class enrollment by at least 5 percent but not less than five students. We are assuring that we will get additional personnel. That is the purpose of it.

Grants to schools of public health may be made up to 75 percent of the cost of construction. That was made necessary because of the lag in these facilities and the difficulty over the years of providing for the need.

The 3-year loan program authorizes loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. The loan program is administered by the individual schools—not by the Federal Government but by the local institution itself. The institutions are required to put up 10 percent of the funds that are loaned. In other words, under this program the institutions must put up 10 percent of the total and furthermore they administer the whole program.

Loans are repayable within 10 years beginning 3 years after graduation. Up to 50 percent of such loans, at the rate of 10 percent per year, may be forgiven for practicing in a shortage area, for active duty in the uniformed services, and for employment in a public or nonprofit agency.

Part of this provision follows the National Defense Education Act which was approved by this Congress in 1958 at the request and recommendation of President Eisenhower. The policy, adopted in this bill, therefore, was established by the previous administration.

The provision for forgiveness for practicing in a shortage area was included by an amendment offered by Members of the minority. One Member wanted to expand it to forgive 100 percent; and I am sure he will tell you so during the course of this debate.

The maximum appropriation authorized for the 3-year program for construction of teaching facilities would be $175 million.

Let me emphasize here this program is for teaching facilities and nothing else. You have heard some rumors, which may be discussed during the debate, that these funds may be used for some other purpose, a religious purpose, as an example. But this bill says positively and explicitly that the funds are to be used for teaching facilities for health professions. So let us keep in mind actually what the program does and let us not be influenced by any biased comments or positions or statements. Let us keep in mind what the program does.

For the 3-year student loan program we provide $30,700,000. A substantial portion of this sum would be repayable by the borrowers. The total authorization for all aspects of the program during the first year, fiscal 1964, would be just a little over $30 million. As I have already emphasized, that is in consonance with the budget already submitted by the President. For the second and third years it is expected that the full amount of the appropriation authorized by the bill, $85.6 million and $98 million, respectively, will be asked for.

Let me advise you, when this program was sent up to us in the last Congress it was a 10-year program. The administration bill asked for scholarships. The committee, after careful hearings in the last Congress, reported a bill for a 10-year program, but we did not provide for scholarships as we were requested because I know the feeling of the House with reference to scholarships. But in an effort to provide for a need, a need that is not met by the provisions of the National Defense Education Act—and we will get to that discussion later—we developed a program that is suitable to get more doctors.

We thought that we would limit this program to 3 years, and then 3 years from now we could determine how successful this has been and the Congress could then decide in the interest of the American people if we need another 3 years or a different program or no program at all. If this is not a reasonable proposition then I have never come before this House with anything reasonable in my life.

I could talk to you about the shortage of doctors, about which there seems to be no controversy, because even those who have expressed themselves critically with regard to this program have indicated that insofar as the construction program is concerned it is needed. Let me remind you that the problem worsens year by year. By 1975 if we do not do something about it we are going to leave a heritage that will say to you and me, "Shame on you." Do you want to face that? I think not.

In 1950 we had 1 family doctor in this country to every 1,300 people. In 1960 the statistics show we had 1 family doctor to every 1,700 people. By 1970 it is going to be 1 family doctor to every 2,100 people. Who is going to get blamed for this?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. I certainly have been very appreciative of the distinguished chairman of this committee and after having listened to him speak on the floor of the House for many years, I know of his sincerity. You said a few minutes ago that this bill does exactly what it says—it is factual—and I would understand the gentleman to be correct in that. But, on page 13 of the bill, it states under "Recapture of payments"—and this is what I want to get at—if this bill is factual—under "Recapture of payments, section 723" it reads:

> If, within 10 years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this part—

And then skipping to (b):

> (b) the facility shall cease to be used for the teaching purpose for which it was constructed (unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so).

Are not these regulations to be written by the Surgeon General and are not we, as a Congress, delegating our powers to give that construction away that the taxpayers have paid for under this section, if the Surgeon General so determines?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, but the gentleman did not read the rest of it.

Mr. BECKER. I did.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit me to continue, let us not take this out of context here. The gentleman did not read the rest of it. It reads:

> The United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement * * *.

In other words, we make an agreement with them, and we expect them to carry those agreements out. However, the Surgeon General under the bill has some discretion in determining whether any changed use of any facility still meets the purposes of this legislation.

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman will just bear with me, I am going along with him except that in these agreements the regulations under this section will be written by the Surgeon General and not by the Congress. This is what I am getting at and the agreement, any agreement made, will be under those regulations written by the Surgeon General; is that not correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, but it would have to be in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BECKER. I know that.

Mr. HARRIS. The Surgeon General cannot write agreements unless he is given the authority under this bill to do so.

Mr. BECKER. I may say to the gentleman, I agree with that except there are no provisions in the bill respecting the agreements that are to be reached under this particular section under the recovery part of this construction. I do not find it in here and that is the reason I am raising the question.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to refer the gentleman to the report. We have a paragraph in the report covering that, and I think it will help the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. I will look for it in the report.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take much further time on this because others of our colleagues want to speak and should have the opportunity to do so. But, I want to say to you, I regret exceedingly the situation with reference to the position of the American Medical Association. I have great respect for the doctors of this country. I think we have to depend on them for our health and for our lives. I know how dedicated they are. I must say that their change in position caught me by surprise. Without compromising the original bill in any way in an effort to meet the health needs of the American people, our committee worked out a limited program. We think this program will help private institutions and State institutions with their medical and health programs. We believe we have done that in this bill.

Dr. Gerald D. Dorman, of the American Medical Association, testified on behalf of the AMA this year.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SILER. Is it not true that this bill gives free public tax money to medical schools that are conducted by religious groups such as Baylor University Medical School in Texas, a Baptist school?

Mr. HARRIS. Baylor University Medical School, as all other private and State institutions, would be eligible—yes.

Mr. SILER. Is not that in direct conflict with the principle that we Baptists have against giving tax dollars to private or religious schools?

Mr. HARRIS. Let me say to the gentleman I am a Baptist myself.

Mr. SILER. I realize it.

Mr. HARRIS. I know pretty well about the philosophy and the attitudes of the Baptists, but it is somewhat amazing to me why—and I am talking about myself now and my own denomination—in most cases when there comes a time when you can get college housing or this educational facility or that research facility, they are always willing to accept it.

Mr. SILER. This would violate the principle of the Baptists, though.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not consider that it would, because I consider this a health program all the way through. The gentleman from Alabama is a Baptists. I yield to him.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. As another Baptist, you might say that we as a religious denomination approved legislation for loans to hospitals and some of those Federal loans to hospitals went to Baptist institutions. Is not that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true. We did that, I think, in the 85th or 86th Congress.

Let me go back to where I started a moment ago about the program. Dr. Dorman testified about the AMA program. He explained their own loan program and said:

> We recognized then that it would not do the full job; we never intended that it do the full job.

That is what Dr. Dorman said in behalf of the AMA before the committee. But what we are doing here is to help meet the needs that we know exist.

Furthermore, he said that the proposed student loan provisions in this bill on which they, the AMA, took no position—and those are his words—took no position at all—would not in any way conflict with their lending program. I submit to you that we had every right as a committee to believe that he was the spokesman for the American Medical Association, because he appeared as a witness for the association. I know other members of our committee had that in mind also when in executive session we worked out this program. Then, on the eve of this legislation they sent this letter to me and each member of the committee. I will say this, they did me the courtesy to come to my office and deliver the letter to me before they announced it. But even so, after we had gotten the rule, and after the record had been made, then to come to us and send this letter to every Member of Congress, I think, is unfortunate. Much as I respect and admire the organization I feel they are wrong.

I hope that the membership will not be swayed by the fact that we have been given this letter. Each one of us should keep in mind that this is a letter sent to us by the trustees of the American Medical Association, and not by the membership. It is not based on any action in convention or at their annual meeting. They have a right to do it; I grant them that.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce received extensive expert testimony at hearings in February of this year, and at hearings on H.R. 4999 in the 87th Congress. The committee has also taken into account a large body of other information available on health manpower needs and resources.

Just to keep abreast of the growth in population, we must increase the number of young people who enter medicine and dentistry from the present 12,500 to 19,000 a year by 1970. This represents an increase during the next 10 years which is four times the rate of increase during the past 10 years.

Currently planned expansion of existing medical and dental schools cannot be expected to meet the need for additional training places. The best that the existing schools could do would be to contribute a part of the increase. They testify that they cannot do even this unless adequate financing is made available.

The committee was told that adequate financing cannot be provided from State, local, and private sources alone. Without a new source of construction funds, some medical and dental schools may even be forced to reduce the size of their present classes, because their facilities are so antiquated that they cannot continue to be used for teaching.

Testimony by the American Medical Association indicates some of the present planning efforts have ceased entirely, as in the case of the University of Maine, because funds are not available. The testimony in the hearings last year and this year is uncontradicted that new medical schools in sufficient number will come into existence only if Federal aid is made available.

Funds available for dental school construction are even more limited than funds for medical school construction. The American Association of Dental Schools estimates that 10 to 12 new schools would be started if given Federal financial support.

There is no serious reason to fear that the provision of Federal construction aid will "dry up" financial contributions from other sources. On the contrary, experience in existing grant programs indicates that the provision of Federal matching tends to increase the amount of State, local, and private money made available. Federal matching grants have stimulated very substantial programs for the construction of health research facilities, hospitals, and other health facilities. The committee has no doubt that Federal support will serve as a catalyst for financial effort in the crucial area of medical education just as it has in other areas of need.

Provision of Federal aid would recognize the fact that the Nation's 87 medical schools and 48 dental schools represent in many respects a national resource. To a greater or lesser degree, most States depend on other States to provide the very expensive education for the physicians and dentists who give them service. Nor can we rely on regional efforts alone to meet medical and dental manpower needs. Such organizations as the Southern Regional Education Board, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, and the New England Board of Higher Education testified before the committee last year that Federal aid is urgently needed if the timetable for expanding medical and dental education is to be met.

Since the teaching hospital is an essential part of medical or osteopathic schools, it is appropriate that such hospitals, under certain circumstances be eligible for teaching facility construction grants. In the past a number of teaching hospitals have received some assistance through the provisions of the Hill-Burton program. But since the Hill-Burton program emphasizes the building of hospitals in areas without sufficient hospital beds, the amount of Hill-Burton funds going to teaching hospitals has been severely limited. H.R. 12 therefore makes specific provision for aid to necessary teaching hospitals and other clinical facilities which have been denied funds under the Hill-Burton program because of low priority or lack of funds in the State's Hill-Burton allotment.

PUBLIC HEALTH PERSONNEL

Although the needs for increased numbers of physicians and dentists are probably the most clearly defined at this time among the different categories of health personnel, there are several other health professions for which expanded training capacity is indicated. Outstanding among these are the public health professions which furnish the manpower for public health positions in Federal, State, and local governments, industry, and elsewhere. The bill, therefore, includes authority for construction grants for schools of public health.

OSTEOPATHY

Need for assistance for the training of osteopathic physicians will have to be considered side by side with the needs for medical schools. In some States, doctors of osteopathy provide a very substantial part of the total medical services available. In other States their contribution is smaller. These factors will have to be considered in dealing with applications from schools of osteopathy.

COLLEGIATE NURSES

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare advised our committee that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service with the assistance of an advisory group has submitted comprehensive recommendations for a general program of Federal aid to nurse education. Pending evaluation of these recommendations it is difficult to determine the scope of a general all-inclusive program for nurse education.

Nevertheless, the need for expansion of facilities to train nurse teachers and supervisors is sufficiently urgent that the committee has included collegiate schools of nursing among the institutions eligible for construction grants. This aspect of Federal aid would be a first step in the direction of a more general program of aid to nursing education.

NEED FOR FEDERAL LOANS FOR MEDICAL AND DENTAL STUDENTS

In proposing a 3-year program of loans to medical and dental students, the committee has acted on the conviction that existing programs must be supplemented in order to attract an adequate number of well-qualified students into medicine and dentistry. After hearing a substantial body of testimony, and on the basis of its best judgment of the facts presented, the committee concluded that student aid from other sources would not alone suffice to reverse the disquieting downward trend in medical and dental school applicants.

Representatives of the American Medical Association in testifying before the committee described a loan guarantee program for medical students, interns, and residents which has been instituted under the sponsorship of the Education and Research Foundation of the association. This loan guarantee program has clearly helped some medical students and is providing much-needed assistance to interns and residents. However, the AMA witnesses themselves testified that the AMA loan guarantee program is not adequate to meet all existing needs. The cost of loans under the program is high and the program offers no repayment relief to physicians who enter lower-paid positions in rural places or other areas of special need, and the program does not give help to dental and osteopathic students.

Medical and dental students are eligible for loans under the National Defense Education Act student loan program. This program, however, is not well suited to their needs. The national defense student loan program was designed primarily for undergraduate college students, particularly those planning to go into the teaching profession. The high cost of medical and dental education requires a substantially higher loan ceiling than is provided under the existing program. Because medical students have a long period of postgraduate hospital training, they need more than 1 year completion of education before they must begin to repay the loan.

In contrast, the Federal Government at present makes available more than 10,000 fellowships for graduate students in the natural and physical sciences. These fellowships entice qualified students away from medicine and dentistry.

In order to fill the gap, the loan program included in the proposed legislation makes low-interest loans available to students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, and the terms of repayment are tailored to suit the special needs of these students.

The proposed loans would carry an interest rate of 3 percent or the going Federal rate, whichever is greater, and provide a forgiveness feature for service in geographical areas of need, active duty in the uniformed services, or service in positions of employment by Government agencies or nonprofit organizations where many positions have remained unfilled because compensation is usually at comparatively low levels. The loan program would be operated by the individual schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. It is to be a 3-year program and at the end of that period an evaluation of the program is to be made to determine whether it meets existing needs or whether program modifications are called for.

PREVENTING DUPLICATION OF PROGRAMS

In considering this legislation, the committee gave careful attention to the need for avoiding any duplication of Federal grant or loan programs. It might be noted that the Rules Committee also evidenced its concern with this important question during its consideration of the bill.

Under the provisions of H.R. 12 there will not be any duplication with any other program because any grant under another program would have to be deducted from any grant made under H.R. 12 for the same facility. Therefore, there cannot be greater benefits for a single facility under two programs than would be available under H.R. 12.

For example, under the program for the construction of health research facilities and the Hill-Burton program for the construction of hospitals, medical schools may qualify for some Federal grants for some facilities which are part of a medical school. However, any such grant would have to be deducted from a grant made under H.R. 12.

The same applies to student loans authorized by H.R. 12. Under the provisions of H.R. 12, any amount borrowed by a medical student under the National Defense Education Act program during any year while he is attending medical school will have to be deducted from the amount of any loan made to him for such year under H.R. 12. In actual practice, however, there is no reason why a medical student should apply for, and be granted, a loan under the National Defense Education Act program. The loan terms under H.R. 12 are more attractive to medical students because the maximum amounts which may be borrowed, the repayment terms, and the forgiveness features of H.R. 12 are especially tailored to meet the needs of medical students. The same applies, of course, to students of dentistry and osteopathy.

In summary, while other grant and loan programs by their own terms may in theory cover medical schools and medical students, any benefits derived under such programs would have to be deducted from benefits available under H.R. 12. In this way, there is avoided any piling up of Federal benefits on top of each other in a manner which would give medical schools or medical students benefits greater than are contemplated by H.R. 12.

The provisions of H.R. 12 aimed at avoiding duplications carry out the principles laid down by the Comptroller in decisions dealing with this subject. (32 Comptroller General 141; 32 Comptroller General 561; cf. 32 Comptroller General 184).

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

I want to emphasize that under the program which would be authorized by H.R. 12, the primary responsibility belongs to the sponsors who would apply for grants-in-aid. The sponsors will have to decide where a medical school is to be located—not the Federal Government.

Depending on who applies for grants, the sponsors may be a State, a community, or a private nonprofit organization. Again, the Federal Government does not decide the question as to who shall operate medical schools.

In other words, the responsibility under this program is primarily vested in the sponsors just as in the case of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program which has been so eminently successful in providing much-needed hospital facilities.

NONINTERFERENCE WITH ADMINISTRATION OF INSTITUTIONS

This describes briefly the programs authorized by H.R. 12 and the provisions which will prevent any duplication with other Federal programs.

Before closing, however, let me stress one other provision in the bill, and that is the provision which specifically prohibits any department or employee of the United States to exercise any control over, or impose any requirement with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any institution which receives assistance under this legislation.

This provision makes clear beyond any doubt the intent of the Congress that the authority granted to the Surgeon General under this legislation is strictly limited to do the specific things which he is authorized to do under this legislation and does not in any way authorize any action going beyond the authorized acts.

CONCLUSION

Over the past 10 years Congress has provided over $4 billion in support to medical research and to the building of hospitals and other medical care facilities. But acquisition of knowledge and construction of buildings will not of themselves meet the Nation's health needs. Today we are jeopardizing our investment in research and facilities by not training enough doctors and dentists to make full use of what we already know. H.R. 12, as amended, authorizes Federal programs to help assure a minimum adequate supply of professional health manpower—an essential factor to our strength and future progress as a nation. Therefore, I appeal to the membership of the House to give its overwhelming support to this legislation.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, in my humble judgment, it is my firm conviction, we have a complete program here that will enable private and State colleges and universities to provide a need for the American people that is imperative.

I urge that you approve this bill in its entirety.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new bill. I can remember when I was a member of the Health and Science Subcommittee, and I say that was about 7 or 8 years ago this coming August. The late Percy Priest was chairman of this committee, and was chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Science. That was the first year we held hearings on this particular bill. In August, before we adjourned, we were almost ready to bring that bill out, but unfortunately the illness of the chairman, Percy Priest, at that time prevented us from doing anything with it.

We have had hearings on this bill off and on since 1955.

Here we are in 1963. I said in March 1962, when the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, ABE RIBICOFF, came to our committee that I would not support this bill unless and until there was a provision put in the bill which would actually increase the number of doctors.

At that time, Mr. RIBICOFF was for the bill. He was for more money and more expansion, but there was nothing in the bill to increase doctors. I made a statement at that time, and I think I am pretty familiar with this subject, having traveled over most of the country with the subcommittee looking at medical schools, that the quality of our medical schools is the highest in the world. There is no system of medical schools any place in the world that is as high in quality as the medical schools in the United States, nor are there as many.

I said I was satisfied with the quality, not that it could not be improved upon, it was excellent, but I did not believe that Federal Government intervention was justified if all we were going to do was to pour out money trying to improve what I considered to be excellent medical education. I said that if provisions were put in this bill which would actually guarantee there would be an increase in the number of doctors graduated when this program got underway, I would support it.

Why? I think there are some good reasons for that. It is admitted, I think, when this program gets underway—4 or 5 years it will take—we ought to be putting out in the neighborhood, depending on how many new schools are created, and also what the enrollments in the freshman classes were during the last 5 years, that there ought to be an increase of somewhere between 400, 500, and 1,000 new students in the medical schools presently existing and the new ones that will be created, that will not be enrolled beginning in September 1962.

In other words, we will by this legislation gain between 400 and 1,000 or more graduates each year.

Now, you say under those circumstances will that increase the number of doctors. I am sorry to say to you it will not increase the number of doctors per thousand population by 1970. If we are able to increase by 400 to 1,000 the doctors each year beginning in 4 or 5 years from now, by 1970 we will still have only the same number of doctors per 1,000 population that we had in 1963. So, if this bill comes before you again 3 years from now, if you are asked how many more doctors per 1,000 are there in 1966 than there were in 1963, I can guarantee you that there will not be. This program, in my estimation, is not big enough to lower the number of doctors per 1,000 over what it was in 1963, but if we are able to pass this legislation, it will guarantee that there will not be fewer doctors in 1970 than there were in 1963 per 1,000. So, I think the House ought to understand that we are not going to get a substantial number of doctors per 1,000, because this legislation does not provide that. All we will be able to do in the next 8 years is stay even with what we are today.

Now, extensive hearings were conducted this Congress on H.R. 12 and last year on H.R. 4999, which has proven conclusively and beyond a doubt that there is a real need for more doctors and more dentists. Some areas, particularly rural areas, are real short of doctors per capita. Those of you from Missouri, listen to this: In 1960, one county in Missouri had just 1 doctor for a population of almost 12,500, while many counties throughout the United States, in at least 30 States, had as few as 10 to 12 doctors per 100,000 population.

In my own district of central Illinois, which is a fairly prosperous area, six of the nine counties in my congressional district, in black Illinois land, fell much below the standard for the number of doctors per capita average throughout the United States. The standard set forth—and I think it is the truth—in a survey prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare states: As a rule of thumb experience in large medical groups indicates that comprehensive medical care, including general and specialized services, requires on the average of 1 physician per 1,000 people.

Great strides have been made in the past few years with the support and the active help of the Congress in medical research and the building of hospitals and other medical care facilities. The Hill-Burton program is one example of that. But, without sufficient doctors to staff these hospitals and to put into use the great knowledge gained through research, they cannot possibly be utilized to the fullest extent. And, it is for lack of interest in the medical profession on the part of young people seeking to carve out careers for themselves that we are burdened today with this tremendous shortage of doctors. It is not that the medical profession has lost its appeal to these young people; it is simply because we lack sufficient training facilities for training them.

Let me give you this example, turning once more to my own district, which is the seat of the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana. I have been informed by the medical school at the University of Illinois that there were this year, in September 1962, 89 applicants for the school of orthodontia.

Out of those 89 applicants just 10 could be accepted. This means that the other 79 young persons desiring to study dentistry at the University of Illinois could not do so just because there was no place to put them. Whether they were able to gain admission to some other school of dentistry, I do not know. I rather doubt it; at least, I am almost sure that not all 79 were able to go somewhere else, because the same situation which exists at the University of Illinois exists elsewhere across this great country.

Mr. Chairman, the situation in regard to students seeking to enter the medical school at the university was not quite as critical as in the school of dentistry, but it was still critical. These critical conditions, unless something is done right now in 1963, will be worse in the years that lie just ahead, as I have pointed out to the members of the Committee already.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12 will not increase the number of doctors per capita, but it will insure that conditions do not get worse. It will insure that the number of doctors per capita will remain at about the same level as it is now

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. In its consideration of this measure did the committee have any figures presented to it as to the number of private contributions that have been made to medical schools, along with the number of dollars which States had contributed to State university medical schools?

Mr. SPRINGER. You mean in comparison between private and otherwise?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Just the number of dollars that have been put into the building of medical facilities and medical training facilities in the past year.

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not recall that we did.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I take it that—and I am referring to the report on page 4 where the committee very frankly states that this is a 3-year program as set up in the bill but will not be completed within this 3-year period. Is it the gentleman's feeling that this then means that the Federal Government in effect will take over the construction of our teaching facilities at medical schools from here on out?

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman mean by take over—I take it you mean continue this contribution to it?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the program, as I visualize it, would probably last 10 years.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If the gentleman will yield further, at that time would the gentleman from Illinois contemplate that the same private contributions would be made to the medical schools that have been made in the past?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is assuming they would both continue at the same rate. I can say to the gentleman that I do not have the figures. We are assuming that the contributions will be at the same rate.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Does the gentleman feel that this is a fair assumption?

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe it is. I do not think what we are doing here would make anyone feel that they ought to contribute less. To give the gentleman an example, let us take Dartmouth where at the present time they have a 2-year school and they are hoping to expand and to make it a 4-year school. I still think there would be substantial contributions to Dartmouth in spite of that fact even if they are able to get money to make this a 4-year program. That is an example. I think their contributions would continue to come to Dartmouth at approximately the same rate, because as I understand it a great majority of the money at Dartmouth is contributed by its own alumni.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this bill will accomplish what I am talking about through a 3-year program of matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities for mental, dental, osteopathic, and professional public health service personnel as well as pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, and nurses. May I say in connection with nursing that these involve only the nurses' buildings which are attached to university medical schools. These will not be grants for nursing schools not attached to universities.

Mr. Chairman, a total of $105 million for a 3-year period is authorized for grants for the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, or professional public health personnel. The sum of $35 million for a 3-year period is authorized for grants for the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of dentists and, finally, $35 million for a 3-year period is authorized for the replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities for all of these categories.

Mr. Chairman, matching grants for the construction of new schools and for major expansion of existing schools may be made up to two-thirds of the cost of construction. Other grants may not exceed 50 percent of the cost of construction.

Mr. Chairman, grants for the expansion of an existing school can only be made where the school will expand its first-year class enrollment for the following 3 years by at least 5 percent over the highest first-year enrollment in any of the 5 years immediately preceding the passage of this legislation, but not less than 5 students and in some instances not less than 15 students if it is a major grant.

Grants to schools of public health may be made up to 75 percent of cost of construction. Let me point this out again; under the provisions of H.R. 12 there will not be any duplication of Federal grant or loan programs. There are in existence at the present time, and there may come into existence at a later date, Federal programs under which medical schools and other schools which come within the purview of H.R. 12 may qualify for Federal construction grants. For example, under the program for the construction of health research facilities and the Hill-Burton program for the construction of hospitals, medical schools may qualify for some Federal grants for some facilities which are part of a medical school or facility. Therefore, there cannot be benefits for a single facility under the two programs which would be available under H.R. 12.

In my opinion H.R. 12 is good legislation. The Congress must, on a matching-grant basis, provide the facilities for the training of an increased number of doctors necessary to maintain, to keep the health standards of our country as they are in 1963.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, seldom do I seek and take the opportunity to speak from the well of the House, and do so now only because I feel this legislation is so very important in many ways.

Our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is a very able chairman of our committee and it is both an honor and a privilege to serve as a member of this committee under his chairmanship. I want to pay a sincere tribute to our chairman and to all the members of our committee. Therefore I regret especially to find myself in opposition to the legislation under consideration here.

This has been a difficult decision for me to make and I have made it with extreme reluctance. Yet in all sincerity and honesty after fully considering this legislation and discussing it with many knowledgeable members in the profession I find that I must oppose the bill because I am convinced it is not in the best public interest.

If you will notice from the hearings on this bill, it originally started out as a 10-year program, and even then was referred to as being only a good start but to make it a little more palatable and perhaps a little easier to gain approval in the Congress it was reduced to a 3-year program. But let no one be fooled into the idea that 3 years will in any way complete the program. It will no doubt become a permanent program, as many of these temporary programs have a way of doing. And the cost will be tremendous.

May I also refer you to the hearings at which Secretary Celebrezze testified and at which time I asked him if he felt that the number of doctors being graduated from medical school would keep pace with the growing population, and whether or not it was keeping pace with the growing population. Secretary Celebrezze, although only recently made Secretary, and therefore drawing on his experience as the mayor of a great city in Ohio plus what had been told to him by the professional staff of HEW stated that there had been an average of 135 doctors per 100,000 population in this country but that in the last year or two that had grown to 137 per 100,000 of population.

However, he also stated that as the population continued to grow there would be fewer doctors per 100,000 population. The number of doctors per 100,000 population is not a particularly significant figure, because, as the Secretary pointed out, there are many areas in this Nation, rural areas and elsewhere, where the number of doctors per 100,000 population is much below the national average, and a number of areas where the number of doctors is greater than the national average per 100,000 of population. This is obviously true, because certainly most doctors would decide on a location where they would find an opportunity to practice their profession in the way they wanted to practice and where they felt they could best serve their fellow men.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. On this point, can the gentleman tell me how they intend under this bill to regiment doctors to practice in rural areas where there is a shortage and get them out of the metropolitan areas he is talking about where there is an overabundance? How can they do this under this legislation?

Mr. SCHENCK. I am glad my distinguished colleague from New York brought that question up, though I was going to touch on it. It seems to me there is no way for the Federal Government, short of controls, and make no mistake there will be Federal controls regardless of any provisions or assurances to the contrary to determine where and in what part of the medical profession a graduate should practice. It has been said that this bill in order to make it palatable would increase the number of graduates per school, that sort of thing, but if we are then going to tell these doctors where they may practice or what they may practice and whether or not they can go into general practice or into one of the specialties, that is another thing and is but one more effort to obtain socialized medicine. Of course, the number of doctors who are going into research and into specialty fields of work naturally reduces the total number of doctors remaining in the field of general practice.

Mr. BECKER. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman—I have listened to the gentleman from Arkansas—that although we may be increasing the facilities for the educating of more doctors or providing more, how do we cure the problem of transference of doctors from the overabundance in the metropolitan areas to the rural areas where the shortage is? This does not seem to provide for that, unless you have something in here to regiment doctors.

Mr. SCHENCK. I would say to my friend that that is the trend toward regimentation and socialism and is one of the aspects which is of such serious concern to many of us.

What are some of the factors which discourage students from going into medical practice? In the first place, a student must have 8 years of college, 4 years of general courses and 4 years of medicine, following which he must serve an internship of at least 1 year. If he is going to do postgraduate work, he will have been in school and in the nonproductive part of his life for some 14 or 15 years before he becomes a doctor ready to begin his medical practice. That is one thing that is discouraging otherwise capable students from going into medicine. Certainly the danger of Federal controls, about which my distinguished colleague from New York and I were talking, is also a factor in determining whether or not a young man or a young woman wants to go into the practice of medicine.

If a doctor is to be controlled and told just what drugs he can prescribe, that he must prescribe these drugs by their generic name and must prescribe the drug from a particular list of approved drugs; if the doctor, as was the recent experience of one of my friends in the medical profession, is then subjected to a lot of inquiry and questions from some clerk in a State or Federal health department, saying, "You cannot prescribe this particular drug because it is not on the approved list," then the doctor cannot practice his medicine in the best way that he knows how and in the best interest of his patient. So the danger of Federal controls, the danger of being told where to practice and when to practice and how to practice, what drugs he can use or prescribe, and how to conduct his profession seems to me to be a very discouraging situation to any doctor.

Many of you, I am sure, are familiar with this particular magazine. This magazine is called the Medical World and News. It is published in New York by the Medical World Publishing Co. In this issue of March 1, 1963, which I hold in my hand, they have a discussion about medicine as it is practiced in Great Britain under the socialist system.

May I just call your attention to one picture here on page 77 of this particular March 1 issue. Here is a table full of forms which this doctor must work with and complete and keep tabs on in order to serve his people. So the time that he can spend in his interviews and the time that he can spend in discussing medical history and the time that he can spend making physical examinations is very, very limited. He has to complete innumerable forms and spend a great amount of his very valuable time doing desk work and clerical work. He has to have a whole office staff occupied in such an effort—or, shall we say, to electronicize this type of professional service. Are we going to have people going into a medical office and punching keys on a computer to say, "I have a pain here and I have a pain there, I have a little strange feeling here and I have a little different feeling there," and then punch these keys and out will come a card with a diagnosis; then he takes this diagnosis card to the doctor and the doctor punches a few more holes in it and the patient takes it to the pharmacist and gets the prescription? A computer is nothing more or less than a sponge anyhow. It only absorbs what you put into it. If you put the wrong information in, you get the wrong information out.

So we in this electronic age may be in for some real jim-dandy type of diagnosis of what might be serious complaints.

The Dayton, Ohio, Journal Herald includes a syndicated column in the April 15 issue where a doctor, Leslie J. Mason—a doctor of education, incidentally—discusses the problem in his column of why well qualified students are not going into medicine. Under unanimous consent, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

MEDICAL SCHOOLS NEED STUDENTS

(By Leslie J. Nason)

A serious shortage of doctors is just around the corner.

The output of our medical schools is barely meeting demands now. Many medical school graduates are entering the fields of research and teaching, rather than going into private practice.

This is just at the time when, because of our expanding population, we need many more practicing doctors.

Building and staffing more medical schools will not in itself solve the problem. For the very staffing of these schools puts an additional drain on the available supply of trained doctors.

We must remove some of the blocks in the thinking of these young students which cause them to bypass medicine for other goals. The case of Hal well illustrates what I mean.

Hal came to me for advice 5 years ago. He was a high school senior and a good student; that is, he made high grades. His father, a successful surgeon, hoped Hal would follow in some branch of the medical profession.

But Hal said: "Perhaps I can do it, but I have to work hard to make good grades in high school. Premed and medical school would mean many years of excruciatingly hard work—with no fun.

"Even if I finished, in general practice I would be on call at all hours. My family life would not be normal. I would rather work 8 hours a day and be home evenings."

Hal went on to say that only an A average in premed would gain him entrance into a medical school. (Of course this is not true. Some 70 percent of students accepted in medical schools have B averages.)

These fears had to be reduced if Hal was to choose medicine as a career. He had the intelligence and physical energy to succeed, but he didn't know how to make the best use of his talents.

Hal and I set up a plan. During the summer after high school graduation and before college entrance, Hal was to get a running start on each of his courses.

We carefully considered the manner in which each course should be studied, and planned a preview to provide him with the vocabulary necessary for efficient listening to lectures.

Hal planned to take courses which would give him background for his medical school training. Each summer was to be used to relieve the pressure on the next year.

Once this plan was established, medical training lost its threat to Hal.

From time to time during the 5 years since I've seen Hal, he not only carries on his work happily and successfully, but finds time to enjoy the normal social life of the college student. He is well on his way to becoming a successful doctor.

So you see we have to begin solving the problem of the doctor shortage by changing the attitude of the high school student.

One boy said, "Perhaps I can do it, but I have to work"—this boy's father, incidentally, was a surgeon—"I have to work in order to make good grades in high school, and to go to medical school with many, many years of excruciatingly hard work and no fun. Even after I finish and enter general practice, I would be on call all hours and my family life would not be normal. I would rather work 8 hours a day and be home evenings."

So we are having boys go to law school, we are having boys go to engineering school, we are having boys going to various other kinds of schools so they can work 8 hours a day, and then are free from professional responsibilities when they go home in the evening, so that they can have their evenings and weekends with their families.

So it would seem to me that this particular bill which we are considering will not increase the number of doctors that are going to be available. It may in fact have an adverse effect, because every time we need to staff for more medical schools they must be staffed by available doctors and available trained personnel. So we will be draining off out of the doctors we now have additional doctors in order to teach in the expanded schools.

I would hope that this bill could be very carefully considered by all of us and each of us make up his own mind as to the merits of the bill. Personally, it seems to me to be a very real effort toward the further socialization of the practice of medicine and to the unnecessary expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Is it not true that every witness representing a medical school who testified on this bill a year ago when asked whether or not if this program were enacted they could accommodate an additional medical student in 1963, 1964, 1965, or even up to 1966, answered in each instance "No"?

Mr. SCHENCK. I think that is very true.

Mr. COLLIER. One additional question: As I understand the proposal this year, there would be no scholarship loan fund or loan fund of any nature available until the student was ready to enter medical school.

Mr. SCHENCK. Four years hence.

Mr. COLLIER. In other words, he would have to have his 4 years premedical. If he could not afford to attend college in the first place, how could he qualify for a loan or how could he participate in this program in order to go to medical school?

Mr. SCHENCK. I think the gentleman has answered his own question.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is not new to the Congress, although I believe it is new to the floor of the House. It was considered by our committee last year as H.R. 4999. But it has created some mighty strange bedfellows. This is the first time I have seen the AFL–CIO and American Medical Association in the same bed, although we must bear in mind that the American Medical Association kept one leg out from under the covers and firmly on the ground, for they have taken a position in opposition to the loan provisions of this bill.

What are we doing here? Let us not kid anyone. This is a straight out and out bill for Federal aid to education. You can dress it up with all kinds of fancy names, but it is still a bill for Federal aid to education. It is one of many bills that have been presented to Congress. We know a great deal about this overall subject. During the school year 1958–59, Federal support for educational programs amounted to $2,413,168,000 from a total of 20 different Government agencies. My source or my authority for making that statement is on page 3 of the April 1962 Directory of Federally Financed Student Loans, in the field of higher education in the United States, from the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Now, we hear that this legislation is designed to create more physicians in the United States because of the tremendous lack of doctors. It is designed to meet a need. When the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze, testified before the committee, he had the original H.R. 12 bill, which was a 10-year program, and the cost was $813,050,000.

In talking about that bill covering a program involving over $813 million, what did he say?

He said it would give us an opportunity to really get started.

He is talking about the $800 million, 10-year program. He said:

> We could evaluate the program as we went along, but I think it would be an excellent start at this point.

What happened in committee? This bill was reduced to a 3-year program, and the cost, depending on construction, the loans, and so forth, is about $300 million, as I understand it. But we enlarged it. It was reduced from 10 to 3 years so that it would be more palatable to the Members of Congress. We cut it down from $800 million to around $300 million. But in addition to the original purpose of building teaching facilities for schools of medicine, and so forth, osteopathy and public health, it has been enlarged to include schools of nursing, schools of pharmacy, schools of podiatry and other schools. Someone mentioned that we have overlooked the morticians. But it has been expanded.

I have had considerable correspondence from chiropractors, who felt that they were discriminated against because they had not been included as among the health professions.

In my correspondence in this respect, I said that this bill was originally designed to meet a need, and was not a big pie to be cut up and distributed among all of the health professions. Apparently the persons in that profession had failed to establish a need before the committee.

Secretary Celebrezze said:

> There are two prime reasons for this type of legislation, two prime reasons for the need of this legislation; there is a shortage of doctors and dentists in this country, due (1) to lack of facilities, and (2) lack of financial means.

What is the ratio today? On page 43 of the committee hearings the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare stated:

> In 14 States there are fewer than 100 physicians per 100,000 population. In four States there are 160, or more, per 100,000; but the rate for the whole of the United States—and I think this is important—has stayed practically static since 1940.
>
> In 1940 we had 135 physicians for 100,000 population. Today, in 1962, we have 137 per 100,000, or 2 more.

Then he further stated that under our projection to 1970 it will be down to 126. I do not know on what particular set of facts he based this projection, but it is clear that in the last 22 years, the ratio rather than going down has increased in fact by two.

On the basis of need, on page 310 of the committee hearings, Dr. Wiggens, a member of the American Medical Association Council, in discussing the quality and quantity of applicants to medical schools stated:

> There has been a very significant difference between what existed in the 1950–1953 as opposed to what exists now.

However, he said our medical schools had far more applicants during that period because of the postwar situation. He continued:

> But, when looked at over a 30-year period, it is down a little bit, but I do not think if one figured it out statistically, that it would be a statistical difference for the average of some 30 to 50 years.

Well, what is the ratio here as compared with England? We know what the medical situation is now in England. These figures were provided to me by the American Medical Association: 1960 population-physician ratio for the United States as compared with England: Active physicians in our country: There were 237,700; in England and in Wales 47,700, which means this: Active physicians per 100,000 population in the United States were 130 as compared to 104 in England and in Wales. Persons per active physician in the United States, 769; in England and in Wales there were 962 persons per physician. This is not a complete statistic here, but persons per family physician in the United States were 1,700, but there were no figures available for England.

We have had an influx of foreign doctors: In 1955, 1,057; in 1956, 1,002; in

1958, 1,316; in 1959, 1,776; in 1960, 1,569; in 1961, 1,730.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I will be glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has mentioned a very important point, I think, with reference to doctors from foreign countries. I think it is rather significant that I was in New York recently meeting with a group of people, including some doctors. The doctors from a large hospital in New Jersey told me that they could not get interns in their hospital at all sufficient to meet their needs, and two-thirds of the interns of that hospital had to be drawn from foreign students. I think that is significant.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. On the matter of foreign doctors, I made inquiry during the hearings of Dr. Terry and the American Medical Association people, and they could give no conclusive answer as to why these people are coming here. They certainly could not prove that it was because of the shortage. I think it is evident that these people are coming here not because of the shortage but because of the advantages they have in this country that they do not have in their own country.

Mr. DEVINE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Under the student loan provisions, would it be possible to loan money to foreign students for training in this country; that is, medical training in this country?

Mr. DEVINE. I am not prepared to answer that. But, I would like to get into the loan provision here.

One thing that I think we should point out very clearly is this: I would like to point out particularly to my colleagues that are interested in States rights that there are many programs on a voluntary private basis existing today by virtue of which students, medical students, proposed medical applicants, can obtain funds with which to attend college and universities. I have a list here broken down State by State and county by county of medical societies having scholarship programs which I will later seek permission to insert in the RECORD at this point:

COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETIES HAVING SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

ALABAMA

Baldwin County Medical Society: N. Van Wezel, M.D., secretary, Foley, Ala.

Blount County Medical Society: Thos. M. Towns, M.D., secretary, Oneonta, Ala.

Bullock County Medical Society: Sidney A. Cohn, M.D., secretary, Union Springs, Ala.

Coffee County Medical Society: J. F. Stanley, M.D., secretary, Enterprise, Ala.

Cullman County Medical Society: M. S. Whiteside, M.D., secretary, Cullman, Ala.

Dale County Medical Society: Robt. J. McLaughlin, M.D., secretary, Ozark, Ala.

DeKalb County Medical Society: G. I. Weatherly, M.D., secretary, Fort Payne, Ala.

Escambia County Medical Society: E. Scharnitzky, M.D., secretary, Brewton, Ala.

Franklin County Medical Society: Wayne Hyatt, M.D., secretary, Russellville, Ala.

Jefferson County Medical Socitey: Paul Burleson, M.D., secretary, Birmingham, Ala.

Lauderdale County Medical Society: O. L. Burton, M.D., secretary, Florence, Ala.

Lowndes County Medical Society: R. L. Staggers, M.D., secretary, Benton, Ala.

Marion County Medical Society: Robt. H. Mason, M.D., secretary, Hamilton, Ala.

Mobile County Medical Society: C. W. Winsor, M.D., secretary, Mobile, Ala.

Pike County Medical Society: W. H. Abernathy, M.D., secretary, Troy, Ala.

Shelby County Medical Society: Jean Clark, M.D., secretary, Vincent, Ala.

ARIZONA

Maricopa County Medical Society: Howard D. Lawrence, M.D., secretary, Phoenix, Ariz.

CALIFORNIA

Alameda-Contra Costa County Medical Societies: David Dugan, M.D., secretary, Cos Medical Society, Oakland, Calif.

Fresno County Medical Society: N. J. Wilde, M.D., secretary, Fresno, Calif.

Shasta-Trinity County Medical Society: R. R. Bfeeden, M.D., secretary, Weaverville, Calif.

Sonoma County Medical Society: Clayton B. Taylor, M.D., secretary, Santa Rosa, Calif.

COLORADO

Weld County Medical Society: Edward Kinzer, M.D., secretary, Johnstown, Colo.

FLORIDA

Dade County Medical Society: D. D. Daughtry, M.D., secretary, Miami, Fla.

Madison County Medical Society: W. J. Coggins, M.D., secretary, Madison, Fla.

GEORGIA

Cobb County Medical Society: R. Y. Clark, M.D., secretary, Marietta, Ga.

Spalding County Medical Society: J. W. Watkins, M.D., secretary, Griffin, Ga.

ILLINOIS

Jackson County Medical Society: Charles Young, M.D., secretary, Carbondale, Ill.

IOWA

Cerro Gordo County Medical Society: J. R. Utne, M.D., secretary, Mason City, Iowa.

Henry County Medical Society: R. S. Wettach, M.D., secretary, Mount Pleasant, Iowa.

Johnson County Medical Society, R. A. Wilcox, M.D., secretary, Iowa City, Iowa.

Pottawattamie County Medical Society: C. V. Caughlan, M.D., secretary, Council Bluffs, Iowa.

KENTUCKY

Barren County Medical Society: Lewis Dickinson, M.D., secretary, Glasgow, Ky.

Calloway County Medical Society: H. L. Houston, M.D., secretary, Murray, Ky.

(Knott County) Perry-Knott County Medical Society: W. F. Kelley, M.D., secretary, Hindman, Ky.

MARYLAND

Baltimore City Medical Society: J. N. Classen, M.D., secretary, Baltimore, Md.

Frederick County Medical Society: Thos. R. Reid, M.D., secretary, Frederick, Md.

MASSACHUSETTS

Charles River District Medical Society: K. B. Lawrence, M.D., secretary, Brookline, Mass.

MICHIGAN

Genesee County Medical Society: John B. Rowe, M.D., secretary, Flint, Mich.

Grand Traverse-Benzie-Lenawee Counties Medical Society: W. W. Cline, M.D., secretary, Traverse City, Mich.

Ingham County Medical Society: Wm. Cheney, M.D., secretary, Lansing, Mich.

Kent County Medical Society: G. A. Mulder, M.D., secretary, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Washtenaw County Medical Society: Gerhard Bauer, M.D., secretary, Ann Arbor, Mich.

MINNESOTA

Nicollet-Lesuear County Medical Society: A. H. Thompson, M.D., secretary, St. Peter, Minn.

Zumbro Valley Medical Society: E. W. Johnson, M.D., secretary, Rochester, Minn.

Stearns-Benton County Medical Society: Thomas G. Murn, M.D., secretary, St. Cloud, Minn.

MISSOURI

Greene County Medical Society: F. T. H'Doubler, Jr., M.D., secretary, Springfield, Mo.

Jackson County Medical Society: Edward G. Kettner, M.D., secretary, Kansas City, Mo.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Centre District and Merrimack County Medical Society: T. G. Cogswell, M.D., secretary, Concord, N.H.

Stafford County Medical Society: Jesse M. Galt, M.D., secretary, Dover, N.H.

NEW JERSEY

Atlantic County Medical Society: John W. Holland, M.D., secretary, Atlantic City, N.J.

Bergen County Medical Society: Charles Campbell, M.D., secretary, Hackensack, N.J.

Monmouth County Medical Society: Wanamassa, N.J.

Union County Medical Society: E. H. Pogue, M.D., secretary, Elizabeth, N.J.

NEW MEXICO

Bernalilo County Medical Society: John Torrens, M.D., secretary, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

NEW YORK

Cattaraugus County Medical Society: C. L. Mather, M.D., secretary, Olean, N.Y.

Schenectady County Medical Society: J. B. Cortesi, M.D., secretary, Schenectady 13, N.Y.

NORTH DAKOTA

First District Medical Society: M. H. Poindexter, M.D., secretary, Fargo, N. Dak.

Sixth District Medical Society: C. R. Montz, M.D., secretary, Bismarck, N. Dak.

OHIO

Mahoning County Medical Society: C. E. Pichette, M.D., secretary, Youngstown 4, Ohio.

Montgomery County Medical Society: W. J. Lewis, M.D., secretary, Dayton 7, Ohio.

OKLAHOMA

East Central Oklahoma Medical Society: G. Berkenbile, M.D., secretary, Muskogee, Okla.

Pottawattomie County Medical Society: Clinton Gallaher, M.D., secretary, Shawnee, Okla.

OREGON

Multnomah County Medical Society: Quinten W. Cochran, M.D., secretary, Portland, Oreg.

PENNSYLVANIA

Delaware County Medical Society: William Y. Rial, M.D., secretary, Swarthmore, Pa.

Philadelphia County Medical Society: G. Mackmull, M.D., secretary, Philadelphia 44, Pa.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Columbia Richland County Medical Society: R. F. Haines, M.D., secretary, Columbia, S.C.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Wetstone County Medical Society: D. A. Gregory, M.D., secretary, Milbank, S. Dak.

TENNESSEE

Dickson County Medical Society: L. D. Jackson, M.D., secretary, Dickson, Tenn.

Roane County Medical Society: B. W. Sitterson, M.D., secretary, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

TEXAS

Andrews, Ector, Midland Counties Medical Society: J. R. Walton, M.D., secretary, Midland, Tex.

Dallas County Medical Society: W. C. Sellman, Jr., M.D., secretary, Dallas 1, Tex.

Kerr, Kendall, Gillespie Counties Medical Society: Julia S. Eley, M.D., secretary, Kerrville, Tex.

Lubbock, Crosby County Medical Society: James G. Morris, M.D., secretary, Lubbock, Tex.

Taylor County Medical Society: J. Williams, M.D., secretary, Abilene, Tex.

UTAH

Salt Lake County Medical Society: Donald Smith, M.D., secretary, Salt Lake City, Utah.

WASHINGTON

King County Medical Society: R. Robertson, M.D., secretary, Seattle, Wash.

Spokane County Medical Society: S. E. Shikany, M.D., secretary, Spokane, Wash.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cabell County Medical Society: W. L. Neal, M.D., secretary, Huntington, W. Va.

Central West Virginia County Medical Society: Jane Freeman, M.D., secretary, Buckhannon, W. Va.

Harrison County Medical Society: Andrew Weaver, M.D., secretary, Clarksburg, W. Va.

Kanawha County Medical Society: A. B. Curry Ellison, M.D., secretary, Charleston, W. Va.

Logan County Medical Society; R. M. Kessel, M.D., secretary, Logan, W. Va.

Preston County Medical Society: Charles Y. Moser, M.D., secretary, Kingwood, W. Va.

WISCONSIN

Racine County Medical Society: W. W. Williamson, M.D., secretary, Racine, Wis.

WYOMING

Natrona County Medical Society: D. J. Jacobson, M.D., secretary, Casper, Wyo.

North Eastern County Medical Society: R. M. Minket, M.D., secretary, Upton, Wyo.

PARTIAL LIST OF FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS FOR MEDICAL STUDENTS

1. Arkansas medical student loans: Dean of students, University of Medicine Center, University of Arkansas, Little Rock, Ark., approximately 31 awards, $400 to $500.

2. Arkansas medical student loans (rural areas): Dean of students, University Medical Center, University of Arkansas, Little Rock, Ark., 17 awards, $400 to $1625.

3. Illinois Agricultural Association and the Illinois State Medical Society: Student loan fund to board, Chicago, Ill.

4. Boettcher Foundation: Boettcher Foundation medical scholarships; grants, 30 for 1 year; $500; not renewable, general expenses; Colorado residents, juniors and seniors in Colorado medical schools; no earlier than February 1.

5. Connecticut State Medical Society: New Haven, Conn., number varies, for 1 year, $500; Connecticut residents, must be in fourth year of medical school in United States or Canada.

6. Iowa State Medical Society: Des Moines, Iowa, educational loan fund, loan amount varies; residents or former residents of Iowa, preference to juniors and seniors in medical school, interns, and residents.

7. Kansas Medical Society medical student loan fund: Dean, University of Kansas Medical School, Lawrence, Kans.

8. Kentucky Heart Association: Louisville, Ky., student research scholarships; number varies; for 3 summer months; $600; not renewable junior and senior medical students attending Kentucky medical schools; no test; March 1; apply to the medical school.

9. Kentucky State Medical Association: Louisville, Ky.; rural Kentucky medical school fund; number varies; renewable for study of medicine, recipients must agree to return to practice in rural area of Kentucky for a time equal to the duration of aid received.

10. Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corp.: Boston, Mass.; bank loans; $500 per year (maximum total loan $1,500); renewable for a third year; students beyond the freshman year who are domiciled in Massachusetts. The corporation has for its purpose making bank credit available to college students on more favorable terms than have ever before been feasible. Apply to Dudley Harmon executive director, as above.

11. Massachusetts scholarships for dental, medical, and nursing students: Medical, dental, and nursing scholarship board, Boston, Mass.; fellowships; 276 awards; $150 to $500.

12. Mississippi State Medical Education Board: Mrs. Lucille M. Hardy, executive secretary, Jackson, Miss.; loan number varies; for 1 year; $1,250 (maximum total loan $5,000); renewable; Mississippi residents, for premedical education, must plan to do general practice and sign contract agreeing to practice for 5 years in towns of 5,000 or under. No tests.

13. Woman's auxiliary to the Missouri State Medical Association: Odessa, Mo.; medical student loan fund; loan number varies; for 1 year; stipend individually determined; renewable, Missouri residents, third or fourth year medical students at accredited schools.

14. North Carolina Medical Care Commission: Raleigh, N.C.; loan number varies; for 1 year; $140 to $800 per year (maximum total loan $700 to $3,200); renewable for a fourth year; residents of North Carolina for 8 years, for study of medicine, dentistry, nursing, or pharmacy, must agree to practice for 4 years in North Carolina town with population not over 2,500.

15. New York scholarships for medical and dental students: Bureau of examinations and testing, State education department, Albany, N.Y.; fellowships; 390 awards; $350 to $700; renewable; tuition and fees; U.S. citizen and a resident of New York State; regents scholarship examination.

16. South Carolina medical student scholarship loans (rural areas): Medical College of South Carolina, Charleston, S.C.; eight awards; $1,000.

17. South Dakota Medical School Endowment Association: Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; loan number varies, for 4 years; $600 per year (maximum total loan $2,400); must be South Dakota resident or in a South Dakota medical school for study of medicine; no deadline.

18. Vermont scholarships for medical students: University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; fellowships; 35; $200.

19. Virginia out-of-State scholarships for medical students (rural areas): Virginia State College, Petersburg, Va.; fellowships; 10 awards; $1,000.

20. Virginia scholarships for medical and dental students at Medical College of Virginia (rural areas): fellowships, 24 awards, $1,000.

21. Virginia scholarships for medical students at the University of Virginia (rural areas): dean of the School of Medicine, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., fellowships, 12 awards, $1,000.

22. Virginia State Board of Health: Rural physician scholarships; fellowships for 1 year, $1,000; renewable, Virginia residents; must agree to practice medicine in rural Virginia community for period equal to duration of financial aid received. Apply to as above or to Department of Medicine, Medical College of Virginia, University of Virginia, or to Meharry Medical School.

23. Indiana United Student Aid Funds, Inc.: Predominately for undergraduates but they have loaned to more than 100 medical students at Indiana University.

24. National Medical Fellowships, Inc.: Chicago, Ill. For Negro students entering medical school and also those doing postdoctoral study.

25. American Medical Woman's Association, Inc.: General headquarters, 49 West 49th Street, New York, N.Y.: Loan, four to five for 1 year, $500; well-qualified female medical students; early January; apply to chairman, scholarship loan fund, as above.

26. Gold medal tuition loan plan of Chemical Bank, New York Trust Co.: For medical students; parent, relative, guardian, or sponsor must cosign; bank pays tuition; payment starts 1 month from date of loan on monthly installments.

Woman's auxiliary scholarship and loan figures (1961–62) (totals): Medical student scholarships, $9,295; medical student loans, $37,347.13.

MEDICAL SCHOLARSHIP AND LOAN FUND PROGRAMS

The American Medical Association presents this summary of scholarships and loan funds which are being provided by State and county medical societies and their woman's auxiliaries as an aid to student counselors, medical students, and undergraduate students who are contemplating careers in medicine.

This survey, however, does not summarize all the programs providing financial assistance to medical students. In addition to these medical society programs, a considerable number of States have funds administered by their legislatures, medical schools, and private and public foundations.

Students interested in scholarship or loan programs not included in this survey should contact their medical school deans or the executive secretaries of State medical associations for additional information. Further information may also be obtained from:

Association of American Medical Colleges, Evanston, Ill., and from Council on Medical Education and Hospitals or Council on Rural Health of the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

States included in this summary which offer financial assistance programs administered by State and county medical associations or their Women's Auxiliaries are: Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

ALABAMA

Jefferson County (1)

Program: Jefferson County medical tuition grant.

For: Medical College of Alabama students.

Qualifications: Good scholastic record, character reference, based on need, interviews, supporting letters from faculty.

Selection: By application.

Maximum amount per year: $400.

Total amount: $1,600.

School: Medical College of Alabama.

Gift or repayment: Gift.

Postgraduate requirements: Must practice in Jefferson County 1 year for each year of grant. (May be waived.)

Program begun: 1945.

Additional information: Board of Censors, Jefferson County Medical Society, 901 South 18th Street, Birmingham, Ala.

Jefferson County (2)

Program: Jefferson County Medical Society scholarship loan fund.

For: Medical College of Alabama students.

Qualifications: Good scholastic record, character reference, based on need, interviews, supporting letters from faculty.

Selection: By application.

Maximum amount per year: $800 to $1,000.

Total amount: $3,200 to $4,000.

School: Medical College of Alabama.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 6 percent interest beginning 1 year after internship. May be repaid in three installments.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1945.

Additional information: Board of Censors, Jefferson County Medical Society, 901 South 18th Street, Birmingham, Ala.

ARIZONA

Program: Benevolent and loan fund of the Arizona Medical Association.

For: Students or accepted applicants in United States or Canadian medical schools.

Qualifications: Arizona resident.

Selection: Based on financial need.

Maximum amount per year: $1,500.

Total amount: $6,000.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 6 percent interest beginning at completion of first year of internship.

Postgraduate requirements: Recipient expected to practice in Arizona community.

Program begun: 1959.

Additional information: Benevolent and Loan Fund Committee, Suite 1021, Central Towers Building, 2727 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

ARKANSAS

Program: Ilse F. Oates medical student loan fund of the Woman's Auxiliary to the Arkansas Medical Society.

For: Third- and fourth-year medical students.

Qualifications: Based on need and scholastic standing.

Selection: By application to dean's office.

Maximum amount per year: $500.

Total amount: $1,000.

School: University of Arkansas School of Medicine.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 3 percent interest beginning 1 year if possible after graduation.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1926.

Additional information: President, Woman's Auxiliary in care of Arkansas Medical Society, Post Office Box 1345, Fort Smith, Ark.

CONNECTICUT

Program: Connecticut State Medical Society loan fund for interns and residents.

For: Interns and residents.

Qualifications: U.S. citizens serving in Connecticut hospitals approved for intern and resident training.

Selection: By application to intern committee of hospital.

Maximum amount per year: $500.

Total amount: Not specified.

School: See above.

Gift or repayment: Repayment with 2 percent interest expected to begin after 2 years and expected in full within 5 years.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1955.

Additional information: General manager, Connecticut State Medical Society, 160 St. Ronan Street, New Haven, Conn.

FLORIDA

Program: Dade County Medical Association medical student loan fund.

For: Second, third, and fourth year students at University of Miami School of Medicine not necessarily residents of Florida; also Florida residents studying at other medical schools.

Qualifications: Based on need; recommendation by dean.

Selection: By Dade County Medical Association.

Maximum amount per year: Not stated.

Total amount: $500 per loan.

School: See above.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment. Recipient also pledged to pay equivalent of 6 percent interest per annum beginning 12 months after graduation.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1957.

Additional information: Dade County Medical Association medical student loan fund 2 S.E. 13th Street, Miami, Fla.

GEORGIA

Program: William R. Dancy student loan fund of the Woman's auxiliary to the Medical Association of Georgia.

For: Second-, third-, and fourth-year medical students.

Qualifications: Georgia residents; acceptable scholastic record; five references.

Selection: By student loan fund committee.

Maximum amount per year: Determined by deans of Georgia medical schools.

Total amount: No predetermined maximum.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment loan becomes interest-bearing 1 year after graduation.

Postgraduate requirements: Recipient is encouraged, but not required, to practice in Georgia.

Program begun: 1950.

Additional information: President Woman's Auxiliary c/o Medical Association of Georgia, 938 Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Ga.

ILLINOIS

Program: Student loan fund, Illinois State Medical Society and Illinois Agricultural Association.

For: Medical students from Illinois rural areas.

Qualifications: Good scholastic record; good health; need; recommendation by county farm bureau and medical society.

Selection: By committee representing county farm bureau and medical society.

Maximum amount per year: $1,000.

Total amount: $5,000.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment within 5-year period.

Postgraduate requirements: General practice in Illinois small community for 5 years.

Program begun: 1948.

Additional information: I. E. Parett, secretary, loan fund board, Illinois Agricultural Association, Bloomingdale, Ill.

INDIANA

Program: Indiana State Medical Association student loan fund.

For: Indiana medical school students.

Qualifications: Indiana residents.

Selection: By student loan fund committee.

Maximum amount per year: $500.

Total amount: $1,500.

School: Indiana University.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 2 percent interest to start at the beginning of active medical practice.

Postgraduate requirements: No restrictions.

Program begun: 1955.

Additional information: Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

IOWA

Program: Iowa State Medical Society Educational fund.

For: Third- and fourth-year medical students.

Qualifications: Iowa residents; financial need; good scholastic record; good character.

Selection: By educational fund committee.

Maximum amount per year: No maximum.

Total amount: No maximum.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school; University of Iowa Medical College preferred.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment beginning fourth year after graduation.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1953.

Additional information: Dean, College of Medicine, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

KANSAS

Program: Medical students loan fund.

For: Third- and fourth-year students at the University of Kansas School of Medicine.

Qualifications: Financial need.

Selection: By faculty committee.

Maximum amount per year: $500.

Total amount: $500.

School: University of Kansas School of Medicine.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 2 percent interest 2 years after entering practice.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1950.

Additional information: Dean, University of Kansas School of Medicine, 39th and Rainbow Boulevard, Kansas City, Kans.

KENTUCKY

Program: Rural Kentucky medical scholarship fund.

For: Medical students or accepted applicants.

Qualifications: Kentucky residents.

Selection: By board of trustees of scholarship fund; judged in interview on need and willingness to practice in rural area.

Maximum amount per year: $900.

Total amount: $3,600.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 2 percent interest unless recipient practices in one of Kentucky's critical areas. Payable 7 years after date of loan.

Postgraduate requirements: Requested to practice 1 full year for each loan received.

Program begun: 1946.

Additional information: Kentucky State Medical Association, 1169 Eastern Parkway, Louisville, Ky.

MICHIGAN

Program: Michigan Foundation for Medical and Health Education, Inc.

For: Fourth year students, interns, and residents in Michigan medical schools.

Qualifications: None.

Selection: By medical school dean and by qualifications committee of the foundation.

Maximum amount per year: No maximum.

Total amount. No maximum.

School: Michigan medical schools.

Gift or repayment: Repayment mandatory beginning in first year of practice.

Postgraduate requirements: Required to practice in community with not more than 5,000 population for period of 3 years.

Program begun: 1951.

Additional information: Michigan Foundation for Medical and Health Education, Inc., Box 539, Lansing, Mich.

MINNESOTA

Program: Minnesota State Medical Association long term loan fund.

For: Second-, third-, fourth-year students and interns at University of Minnesota medical school.

Qualifications: Financial need.

Selection: By Minnesota State Medical Association Committee.

Maximum amount per year: $900.

Total amount: $3,600.

School: University of Minnesota.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 2 percent interest beginning 1 year after internship and increasing 1 percent per year.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1960.

Additional information: Minnesota State Medical Association, 496 Lowry Medical Arts Building, St. Paul, Minn.

MINNESOTA

Program: Herman Johnson Memorial loan fund.

For: University of Minnesota medical students.

Qualifications: University of Minnesota medical students.

Selection: By Minnesota Medical Foundation.

Maximum amount per year: $200 per student for 90 days.

Total amount: $200 per student for 90 days.

School: University of Minnesota.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with no interest within 90 days.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1959.

Additional information: Minnesota Medical Foundation, Minnesota State Medical Association, 496 Lowry Medical Arts Building, St. Paul 2, Minn.

MISSOURI

Program: Missouri State Medical Association medical student loan fund.

For: Medical students.

Qualifications: Missouri residents; financial need; five recommendations; good scholastic standing.

Selection: By special committee.

Maximum amount per year: $1,000.

Total amount: No predetermined maximum.

School: Any U.S. medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 2 percent interest due 1 year after entering practice. Interest increases by 1 percent per year to a maximum of 6 percent.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1960.

Additional information: Executive Secretary, Missouri State Medical Association, 623 Missouri Theater Building, 634 North Grand Avenue, St. Lous, Mo.

MISSOURI

Program: Medical student loan fund of the woman's auxiliary to the Missouri State Medical Association.

For: Third- and fourth-year medical students.

Qualifications: Missouri residents; acceptable scholastic record; three references and transcript.

Selection: By special committee.

Maximum amount per year: Depending on individual need.

Total amount: Depending on individual need.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 2 percent yearly rate; becomes payable 3 years after date of graduation.

Postgraduate requirements: Must intend to practice in Missouri.

Program begun: 1958.

Additional information: Chairman, student loan fund, woman's auxiliary to the Missouri State Medical Association, 634 North Grand Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

Program: Greene County Medical Society, foundation medical scholarship and loan fund.

For: All medical students.

Qualifications: None; preference to students in area.

Selection: By committee of medical scholarship and loan fund.

Maximum amount per year: $1,200.

Total amount: $2,000.

School: Any U.S. medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 2 percent interest to be completed within 5 years after entering practice. Six percent interest charged after 5-year period.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1959.

Additional information: Greene County Medical Society, Medical Arts Building, Springfield, Mo.

NEBRASKA

Program: Student loan fund, Nebraska Medical Foundation, Inc.

For: Medical students beyond first 2 years.

Qualifications: Nebraska residents.

Selection: By committee of student loan fund.

Maximum amount per year: No maximum.

Total amount: No maximum.

School: Nebraska medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment; if recipient wishes to practice in Nebraska rural area, debt can be reduced.

Postgraduate requirements: Practice 1 year for each year of financial aid in rural community selected by executive board.

Program begun: 1948.

Additional information: Executive secretary, Nebraska State Medical Association, 1315 Sharp Building, Lincoln, Nebr.

NEVADA

Program: Peter Frandsen scholarships.

For: All medical students.

Qualifications: Nevada residents; financial need; plan to practice in Nevada.

Selection: By Nevada State Medical Association professional education committee.

Maximum amount per year: $500.

Total amount: $2,000.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Gift if recipient practices in Nevada; otherwise, a noninterest loan.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1956.

Additional information: Executive secretary, Nevada State Medical Association, Post Office Box 2790, Reno, Nev.

NEW JERSEY

Program: Medical student loan fund of the Medical Society of New Jersey.

For: Third year students in United States or Canadian medical school; first and second year students may be considered.

Qualifications: Five-year residence in New Jersey; financial need; dean's reference and other recommendations; interviews.

Selection: By committee of medical student loan fund.

Maximum amount per year: $1,000.

Total amount: Not stipulated.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment beginning 2 years after entering practice; 3 percent interest to begin upon recipient's entrance into practice.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1956.

Additional information: Committee on medical student loan fund, Medical Society of New Jersey, Post Office Box 904, Trenton, N.J.

NEW MEXICO

Program: New Mexico Medical Society, loan fund.

For: Medical students.

Qualifications: New Mexico residence; financial need.

Selection: By student loan fund committee.

Maximum amount per year: $750.

Total amount: Usually one-time loan to cover immediate need; may be extended if warranted.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with no interest within 3 years after graduation; 6 percent interest on unpaid balance thereafter.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1958.

Additional information: Executive secretary, New Mexico Medical Society, 221 West Central Avenue, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

NORTH CAROLINA

Program: Student loan fund of the woman's auxiliary to the Medical Society of State of North Carolina.

For: Third- and fourth-year medical students.

Qualifications: Good scholastic standing; financial need.

Selection: Special committee.

Maximum amount per year: $500 for each of 2 years.

Total amount: $1,000.

School: University of North Carolina School of Medicine; Duke University School of Medicine; Bowman Gray School of Medicine.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with no interest for 3 years; 3 percent interest on unpaid balance at end of fourth year.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1930.

Additional information: Chairman, medical auxiliary student loan fund, Medical Society of State of North Carolina, 203 Capital Club Building, Raleigh, N.C.

OHIO

Program: The Ohio State Medical Association rural medical scholarship.

For: Students accepted for medical study but not yet enrolled.

Qualifications: Ohio residence in nonmetropolitan area; scholastic ability; good character; interest in rural activities.

Selection: By scholarship subcommittee of committee on rural health.

Maximum amount per year: $500.

Total amount: $2,000.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Gift.

Postgraduate requirements: Encouraged to practice in nonmetropolitan area.

Program begun: 1949.

Additional information: Committee on Rural Health, Ohio State Medical Association, 79 East State Street, Columbus, Ohio.

OREGON

Program: Woman's auxiliary, Multnomah County Medical Society student loan fund.

For: Third- and fourth-year medical students and first-year graduates.

Qualifications: University of Oregon students.

Selection: By application.

Maximum amount per year: Not specified.

Total amount: Not specified.

School: University of Oregon Medical School.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with interest.

Postgraduate requirement: None.

Program begun: 1940.

Additional information: Woman's auxiliary student loan fund, Multnomah County Medical Society, 2164 SW. Park Place, Portland, Oreg.

PENNSYLVANIA

Program: Educational fund of the Pennsylvania Medical Society.

For: (1) medical students beyond first year, and (2) children of deceased or disabled physician members in high school, college and medical school.

Qualifications: Financial need; high scholastic record; several references; sponsorship by county medical society and recommendation by dean.

Selection: By committee on educational fund.

Maximum amount per year: Cost of tuition.

Total amount: Cost of tuition.

School: See above: (1) Any United States or Canadian medical school; (2) high school, college, or medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment. See above: (1) 2 percent or less interest beginning 3 years after graduation with full repayment within 10 years; (2) repayment expected when earning or within 3 years after graduation.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1949.

Additional information: Secretary, Committee on Educational Fund, Inc., Pennsylvania Medical Society, 230 State Street, Harrisburg, Pa.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Program: South Dakota Medical School Endowment Association and South Dakota Medical Association auxiliary benevolent fund.

For: South Dakota medical students.

Qualifications: Medical student at State university or other schools; recommendation by dean.

Selection: By application.

Maximum amount per year: $400 to $660.

Total amount: $1,400.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment within 4 years at 3-percent interest.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1948.

Additional information: Executive secretary, South Dakota State Medical Association, 711 North Lake Avenue, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

TENNESSEE

Program: Nashville Academy Medical Foundation.

For: Davidson County third- and fourth-year medical students; consideration also given to underclassmen.

Qualifications: Good scholastic record; financial need.

Selection: By committee of the Nashville Adademy Foundation.

Maximum amount per year: $1,000.

Total amount: $1,000.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with no interest within 5 years after graduation.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1958.

Additional information: Nashville Academy Medical Foundation, 112 Louise Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.

TEXAS

Program: Loan fund, woman's auxiliary to the Texas Medical Association.

For: Second- and third-year medical students, interns, and residents.

Qualifications: Texas residence; good scholastic record; three references (minister, personal friend, bank where family has had business transactions).

Selection: By student loan fund committee.

Maximum amount per year: See below.

Total amount: $200 to $1,000 (depending on need).

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 2¼-percent interest.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: Not stated.

Additional information: Woman's auxiliary to the Texas Medical Association, 1801 North Lamar Boulevard, Austin, Tex.

TEXAS [1]

Program: Dr. S. E. Thompson scholarship fund.

For: Medical students beyond first year of study at University of Texas; also first-year students with good records.

Qualifications: Texas residence; recommendation by dean; financial need.

Selection: By board of trustees, Texas Medical Association.

Maximum amount per year: $1,000.

Total amount: $3,000.

School: University of Texas Medical Branch.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 4-percent interest per year beginning 4 years after graduation.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1959.

Additional information: Dean, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, or executive secretary, Texas Medical Association, 1801 North Lamar Boulevard, Austin, Tex.

UTAH

Program: Rural medical scholarship program, Utah State Medical Association.

For: Students at University of Utah School of Medicine.

Qualifications: Agreement to practice in rural community.

Selection: By committee of Utah State Medical Association.

Maximum amount per year: $1,000.

Total amount: $4,000.

School: University of Utah School of Medicine.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment.

Postgraduate requirements: Practice in rural community equal to number of years funds were provided.

Program begun; Not stated.

Additional information: Utah State Medical Association, 42 South Fifth East Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

WEST VIRGINIA

Program: West Virginia State Medical Association medical scholarship program.

For: Students at the University of West Virginia School of Medicine.

Qualifications: West Virginia residence.

Selection: By university's scholarship committee and the association's committee on medical education and scholarships.

Maximum amount per year: $1,000.

Total amount: $4,000.

School: University of West Virginia School of Medicine.

Gift or repayment: See below.

Postgraduate requirements: Recipient of 4-year loan must agree to practice in selected rural area for 4 years to receive grant as a gift. If recipient terminates practice in area in less than 2 years, he must repay full loan; in less than 3, one-half; if less than 4, one-quarter.

Program begun: 1957.

Additional information: West Virginia State Medical Association, medical scholarships program, 401 Atlas Building, Charleston, W. Va.

WISCONSIN

Program: Charitable, Educational, and Scientific Foundation, State Medical Society of Wisconsin.

For: Medical students, preferably at the University of Wisconsin or Marquette University.

Qualifications: Wisconsin residence.

Selection: By board of trustees of foundation.

Maximum amount per year: No predetermined maximum.

Total amount: No maximum.

School: Any approved medical school; University of Wisconsin or Marquette preferred.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with interest not to exceed 4 percent. Not applicable while in active military service.

Postgraduate requirements: None.

Program begun: 1951.

Additional information: Secretary, State Medical Society of Wisconsin, Box 1109, Madison, Wis.

WYOMING

Program: Wyoming State Medical Society scholarship loan fund.

For: Wyoming medical students.

Qualifications: Wyoming residence; financial need; approval by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Selection: By special committee.

Maximum amount per year: $500.

Total amount: $2,000.

School: Any United States or Canadian medical school.

Gift or repayment: Mandatory repayment with 7 percent interest beginning 6 years after loan is made or when beginning medical practice.

Postgraduate requirements: Not stipulated.

Program begun: 1960.

Additional information: Wyoming State Medical Society, Box 15, Cheyenne, Wyo.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, EDUCATION AND RESEARCH FOUNDATION, MEDICAL EDUCATION LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM—PROGRESS REPORT THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1962

THE FIRST 10 MONTHS

Nearly 1 of every 10 medical students in the country now has borrowed under AMA-ERF's loan guarantee program.

Through December 31, 1962, a total of 4,694 individuals (2,890 medical students, 672 interns and 1,132 residents) received 5,299 loans worth $6,111,400 in principal amount. Ten percent of the borrowers applied for and received more than one loan. The borrowers are in training in 83 medical schools and 462 hospitals in 46 States and possessions.

The vast majority of them—97 percent—are men—72 percent are married, 25 percent are single, and 3 percent are divorced, separated or widowed.

Established in March 1962 to provide medical students and physicians in training with a ready resource to meet essential living and education costs, the program allows a maximum of $1,500 a year, and $10,000 over 7 years, to be borrowed by an approved applicant, with no payment of either principal or interest required until 5 months after completion of training.

Applicants must be U.S. citizens in training and in good standing in an AMA-approved medical school or hospital. First year medical students must have completed their first quarter or semester to qualify. Each applicant must demonstrate, through a listing of present assets, debts, and estimated expenses and income, a clear need for loan funds.

Of the 5,823 loan applications received through the end of the year only 6.8 percent had been rejected by the Continental Illinois Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, the institution currently making the loans under this program.

All approved loans are guaranteed by AMA-ERF. The bank has required the posting of $1 in a guarantee fund for every $12.50 it extends in credit.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO LOAN GUARANTEE FUND

Contributions and pledges from physicians, foundations, and private industry brought the total size of the guarantee fund to $975,165 as of December 31, 1962.

---

[1] The Nueces County Medical Society also grants four $1,000 scholarships annually. Contact Society at 2606 Hospital, Corpus Christi, Tex.

Contributions of $1,000 and over include:

America's physicians [1]	$460,490
Merck Sharp & Dohme [2]	200,000
Charles Pfizer & Co., Inc.—Pfizer Laboratories and J. B. Roerig Divisions	100,000
American Home Products Corp.—Wyeth and Ayerst Laboratories Divisions	30,000
Abbott Laboratories	25,000
G. D. Searle Co	25,000
Upjohn Co	25,000
E. R. Squibb & Sons	20,000
Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc	20,000
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago	10,000
Smith Kline & French Foundation	10,000
Student American Medical Association	10,000
Woman's Auxiliary, AMA	10,000
Ciba Pharmaceutical Co. [3]	5,000
Mid-Columbia (Oreg.) Medical Society	4,000
George M. Fister, M.D	2,500
Norwich Pharmacal Co	2,500
Schering Foundation, Inc	2,500
Paul Revere Life Insurance Co	2,000
The American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc	1,000
Leta N. Boswell, M.D	1,000
Burroughs Wellcome & Co	1,000
Macoupin County (Ill.) Medical Society	1,000
Mayo Association	1,000
Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co	1,000
North American Clinical Dermatologic Society	1,000
S. B. Penick Foundation	$1,000
W. Clement & Jessie V. Stone Foundation	1,000
Wallace Laboratories	1,000
Warner-Lambert Pharmaceutical	1,000

[1] Includes $189,257 for AMA.

[2] $100,000 of this amount is pledged for 1963.

[3] Pledged for 1963.

How the guarantee fund is committed

For $1,136,625 in estimated interim interest	$90,930
For $2,589,305 in estimated payout interest	207,144
Uncommitted	176,543
For $6,256,736 in principal (including loans in process)	500,538

As shown above, loans already made, together with estimated interim and payout interest, have committed more than 80 percent of the guarantee fund.

(During the interim period, before repayment begins, simple interest accrues at the rate of 5.5 percent. During the payback period, which extends up to a maximum of 10 years, 6.5 percent simple interest is charged, computed monthly on the amount still outstanding.)

The funds' uncommitted balance of $176,543 is sufficient to guarantee approximately 1,200 additional loans. If the present rate of borrowing continues, however, some 7,200 loans will be made in 1963. To make these loans possible, it will therefore be necessary to increase the guarantee fund by at least $1 million this year.

Borrowers and loans by type of borrower

Category	Number of borrowers	Percent of all borrowers	Number of loans	Loans per borrower	Mean loan	Mean per borrower
Medical student:						
1st year	291	6.3	321	1.11	$1,035	$1,145
2d year	832	17.9	934	1.12	1,100	1,240
3d year	829	17.8	946	1.14	1,130	1,290
4th year	935	20.1	1,094	1.17	1,155	1,300
Intern	672	13.8	751	1.12	1,180	1,320
Resident:						
1st year	534	11.5	584	1.09	1,210	1,300
2d year	323	7.0	377	1.14	1,245	1,450
3d year	169	3.7	185	1.09	1,225	1,330
4th year [1]	90	1.9	96	1.07	1,250	1,330

[1] Includes 2 residents in 5th year of training and 1 in 6th year.

Occupation of borrowers' fathers

	Percent
Deceased, disabled, retired	32.0
Professional and semiprofessional	18.2
Owner, partner, small business	12.5
Executive	8.6
Skilled worker	6.8
Sales	5.6

Occupation of borrowers' fathers—Continued

	Percent
Semiskilled and unskilled worker	4.7
Clerical	3.9
Agricultural	3.9
Personal and protective services	2.2
Temporarily unemployed	1.6

Borrowers and loans by medical school

School	Number borrowers	Number loans	Principal value of loans
Albany (Union University)	3	3	$3,600
Albert Einstein	10	11	14,600
Arkansas	70	74	84,000
Baylor	10	13	16,000
Boston	9	9	10,400
Bowman Gray	10	11	13,500
Buffalo	7	7	8,100
California (San Francisco)	12	12	15,400
California (UCLA)	27	29	33,800
California College of Medicine	86	106	114,400
Chicago, University of	1	1	1,200
Chicago Medical	20	21	23,200
Cincinnati	14	16	18,700
Colorado	76	95	95,800
Columbia	1	1	1,500
Creighton	74	97	109,500
Dartmouth	3	3	3,900
Duke	9	13	13,500
Emory	11	11	12,400
Florida	32	38	42,400
Georgetown	41	45	55,800
George Washington	81	90	70,500
Georgia	60	66	84,000
Hahnemann	17	18	23,400
Harvard	1	1	1,500
Howard	100	100	125,700
Illinois	101	137	122,200
Indiana	103	115	133,200
Iowa	84	97	114,200
Jefferson	32	36	37,800
Kansas	6	6	6,600
Kentucky	31	36	38,800
Loma Linda	134	172	222,500
Louisiana	56	56	64,900
Louisville	49	52	65,500
Loyola	20	26	24,100
Marquette	59	63	79,500
Maryland	33	36	44,700
Meharry	94	97	123,800
Miami	50	58	71,100
Michigan	39	44	49,900
Minnesota	40	41	48,400
Mississippi	95	109	124,500
Missouri	18	19	$16,800
Nebraska	10	10	13,900
New York Medical College	2	2	2,500
New York State (New York)	3	3	4,500
New York State (Syracuse)	4	4	3,900
New York University	1	1	1,500
North Carolina	30	31	38,900
North Dakota	14	15	15,700
Northwestern	7	9	10,900
Ohio State	69	72	74,600
Oklahoma	68	76	82,600
Oregon	33	37	43,200
Pennsylvania	4	4	5,200
Pittsburgh	14	15	16,900
Puerto Rico	40	41	52,800
Rochester	1	1	500
St. Louis	95	106	128,900
Seton Hall	22	22	27,200
South Carolina	24	26	29,100
South Dakota	24	24	26,100
Southern California	39	45	55,200
Stanford	7	10	12,200
Temple	22	31	32,700
Tennessee	149	188	176,800
Texas (Dallas)	41	45	52,500
Texas (Galveston)	114	144	116,500
Tufts	3	3	3,200
Tulane	21	22	25,800
Utah	39	40	45,300
Vanderbilt	2	2	3,000
Vermont	14	15	16,000
Virginia (Medical College)	8	10	10,800
Virginia, University of	17	17	20,100
Washington (St. Louis)	5	8	8,900
Washington, University of	5	5	6,600
Wayne	38	40	47,400
West Virginia	44	46	52,700
Western Reserve	3	3	23,200
Wisconsin	9	12	15,000
Yale	11	11	13,600
Total	2,890	3,298	3,694,400

Borrowers and loans by State

State	Interns			Residents			Total (including medical students)		
	Number of borrowers	Number of loans	Principal amount	Number of borrowers	Number of loans	Principal amount	Number of borrowers	Number of loans	Principal amount
Alabama	8	8	$9,500	11	12	$15,600	19	20	$25,100
Arizona	10	11	10,200	4	8	11,000	14	19	21,200
Arkansas	4	4	5,300	2	2	1,600	76	80	90,900
California	108	124	142,200	108	124	157,900	521	622	753,600
Canal Zone	2	4	5,000				2	4	5,000
Colorado	19	22	22,700	35	41	45,300	130	158	163,800
Connecticut	7	7	7,500	16	17	19,500	34	35	40,600
District of Columbia	21	21	27,800	38	41	51,600	281	297	331,400
Florida	18	22	25,400	45	49	56,900	145	167	195,800
Georgia	17	18	20,500	39	42	50,800	127	137	167,700
Hawaii	2	3	2,700	3	3	4,300	5	6	7,000
Illinois	26	30	35,800	48	52	63,700	223	276	281,100
Indiana	18	19	22,700	21	23	23,600	142	157	179,500
Iowa	7	9	9,900	17	18	22,900	108	124	147,000
Kansas	1	1	1,000	10	11	13,000	17	19	22,100
Kentucky	4	4	4,300	7	7	8,300	91	99	116,900
Louisiana	15	19	26,200	43	49	60,400	135	177	177,300
Maryland	15	16	21,000	24	25	32,500	72	77	98,200
Massachusetts	10	10	11,800	33	35	40,400	56	58	67,300
Michigan	28	29	36,400	36	40	49,500	141	153	183,200
Minnesota	13	17	21,100	58	64	70,500	111	122	140,000
Mississippi	13	16	19,000	14	20	25,300	122	147	171,300
Missouri	26	28	30,400	33	36	43,500	177	197	282,500
Nebraska	3	3	3,200	4	4	6,000	93	116	135,000
New Hampshire	1	1	1,200	5	5	6,600	9	9	11,700
New Jersey	10	11	13,700	7	7	10,000	39	40	50,900
New Mexico	4	4	4,800	6	6	8,500	10	10	13,300
New York	66	72	88,500	101	114	144,400	199	219	273,600
North Carolina	4	5	5,500	16	17	23,100	70	78	95,700
North Dakota							14	15	15,700
Ohio	47	51	59,200	49	52	66,500	182	194	222,200
Oklahoma	13	13	13,300	20	22	27,000	101	111	122,900
Oregon	8	8	9,500	15	16	16,800	56	61	69,500
Pennsylvania	30	31	38,400	60	66	76,900	179	201	231,300
Puerto Rico	1	1	1,100	7	8	10,900	49	51	66,300
Rhode Island	1	1	1,500	4	4	5,500	5	5	7,000
South Carolina	3	3	3,400	8	8	11,700	35	37	44,200
South Dakota				1	1	1,500	25	25	27,600
Tennessee	16	19	22,500	27	28	32,600	288	335	360,200
Texas	31	39	44,400	68	73	94,100	265	310	325,000
Utah	17	18	21,200	17	19	21,800	73	77	88,300
Vermont	[illegible]	5	5,300	6	7	7,800	24	27	29,100
Virginia	6	6	7,700	27	30	37,400	58	63	76,000
Washington	10	11	15,200	13	17	17,600	29	33	39,400
West Virginia	2	2	2,800	7	7	9,300	53	55	64,800
Wisconsin	3	5	5,200	19	20	26,900	90	100	126,600
Total	672	751	886,000	1,132	1,250	1,531,000	4,694	5,299	6,111,400

I also have from the American Medical Association a list of programs relating to education and research foundations which I will ask later to be inserted at this point.

I would also like to say in connection with the scholarship programs of the American Medical Association that in addition to the AMA $16.5 million loan program, there are many others, foundations, State governments, and even medical schools that have loans, which would indicate that this is not an area that is being left to be financed just by the Federal Government.

The activity in these loan programs continues at a brisk rate today in 1963. And, again, the AMA reports that through March 31 an additional 1,313 loans were granted, bringing the total number to 6,612. Of the total loans 62 percent had been received by medical students and 15 percent by internes and 23 percent by residents. The average loan to medical students is $1,100. The internes loan is a little bit higher because they normally have some family responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out the minority views that appear at page 69 of the report. This particular reference I shall read for the purposes of the RECORD:

> The witness representing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated that H.R. 12 is required because the loans available under the National Defense Education Act are not adequate. He pointed out that under the National Defense Education Act the maximum loan is $5,000 and $1,000 per year while H.R. 12 allows for $8,000 and $2,000 per year. The forgiveness feature is also cited as a major difference in the two loan schemes which justifies adding a new loan source to those already existing.
>
> While a large number of students availed themselves of National Defense Education Act loans in fiscal year 1962 (3,213 medical students, 1,881 dentistry students) the average loan was less than $700. These figures would tend to show that the increased amounts provided by H.R. 12 are unnecessary. It further tends to dispute the value of forgiveness as a determining factor in the graduate's decision to pursue his career in general practice. If the average loan were to remain at $700 for each of 4 years, it is unlikely that a new doctor will be influenced to enter general practice against his inclinations merely to avoid repaying such a sum over a period of 10 years.

I would like to point out that the testimony has been clear that applicants are beating on the doors of medical schools to get in; that they do not have the facilities to handle them and if we grant loans to additional applicants in order to get in schools that cannot handle them, what is going to happen? I think we will all admit it will take some time—3 to 7 years—to build facilities to handle these additional students and, therefore, in my opinion it would be at least 3, 4, 5, or 6 years before the loan provision would be of any benefit whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I plan to offer an amendment to strike the loan provision from H.R. 12.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. I have read the gentleman's views in the minority report with interest as well as have listened to what he has said here in the debate. I am particularly interested in the views expressed in the minority report. I appreciate the gentleman submitting those views to the members of the committee and pointing out that no need for the proposed legislation has been justified and that these proposed programs and grants would stifle the medical profession and its individual initiative.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 1 additional minute.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I looked at the testimony of the gentleman from the AMA when he says—this was Dr. Dorman:

> It can now be said, with assurance, that medical education in this country is superior to that found anywhere else in the world. It is not a coincidence that improved standards of medical care in the last half-century saw the elimination of substandard medical schools and "diploma mills" which had been turning out graduates in large numbers.

This improvement in medical education is the direct result of the vigorous efforts of this association, and other interested organizations.

There it is a clear recognition of what private efforts have accomplished. The best medical education in the world.

Then he goes on to say, in effect, therefore, we need Federal aid.

Does not the gentleman from Ohio see a very serious clash of logic in this view as expressed by Dr. Dorman, member of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association?

Mr. DEVINE. I certainly do. This very same Dr. Dorman is a very respected gentleman, and he testified on behalf of the AMA, pointing out that they were unable to raise funds from a local standpoint to do this very job in his State of New York. I pointed out to him that the people of New York are paying about $1.60 for every dollar they get back in Federal aid. It does not make sense that we are still dealing in that mythical area where there is something magic about Federal funds. It must first be extracted from the pockets of the taxpayers.

Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman will yield further, I compliment the gentleman and associate myself with his views.

Mr. Chairman, in my previous colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio I tried to point out the failure of logic and judgment evidenced by Dr. Dorman's testimony when he pointed out that "medical education in this county is superior to that found anywhere in the world." Then after reciting this accomplishment through private means the illogical assumption then followed that Federal aid and programs were needed.

How shortsighted can people be? The members of the medical profession from their medicare experiences should know the dangers of Federal encroachment. Doctors have united to proclaim that Federal control follows Federal aid; that a foot in the door is all that is necessary by the Government to then enter and dominate the field.

Have the doctors asked themselves these questions:

First. What happens to the private loan programs when the Federal Government enters the field?

Second. What happens to private construction when Federal funds enter the field?

Third. What happens to private contributions when Federal grants and loans replace private contributions?

Fourth. Where does Federal aid and control stop, once started?

The minority report wisely contains this statement:

> There is some reason to think that proposed programs which would gradually rob the medical profession of its tradition of personal independence and dedication are already beginning to create a reluctance on the part of possible medical students to commit themselves and their futures to the healing arts. No abundance of physical plants nor availability of liberal loans will overcome this seed of doubt about the future of the profession.

We face a choice here once again which many fail to see and as a result will lose by default. It is this: Either we provide financial support and regulation and control of medicine by private means or we take the Federal tax funds—money raised through force—with jail sentences for tax evasion—and control medicine by government. It is clear to me that we should choose private means. Yet many do not even see the choice or the danger of taking Federal money.

So it is that by tests of logic and how best to do the job of assuring best medical education I shall oppose Federal aid and control, placing my faith in our private means which has done so well that we are the medical wonder of the world.

I could have more simply objected today to these programs of Federal aid in grants and loans by declaring their unconstitutionality. This is not the role of Federal Government.

As for the cost, at a time of deficit financing what sense is there in embarking on new programs, that further endangers our entire fiscal solvency? How statesmanlike is this? Who is going to pay for it should be our concern, too.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts], chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this important and urgently required legislation.

We are faced today, as the hearings conducted by the committee make so abundantly clear, with a problem which is fast approaching critical proportions—the problem of insuring an adequate, well-trained supply of medical personnel.

Too few doctors, dentists and nurses would make it impossible for us to capitalize on the great gains we have made in the field of medical science—gains which today enable us to prevent or cure diseases that were the scourge of previous generations, and which today enable us, by the techniques of modern surgery, to save countless lives for which there previously was no hope. Too few, in brief, would prevent us, or seriously handicap us, from insuring the health of this Nation—a resource which Emerson has so correctly tabbed as the "first wealth."

Yet this is the problem, Mr. Chairman, toward which we are heading—the problem of fewer and fewer medical personnel in relation to our evergrowing population—and this is a problem which will only grow more acute unless prompt and effective action, such as is provided for in this bill, is taken.

My own State of California presents, I believe, a dramatic example of this problem. We now have a population of approximately 17½ million persons—a population which is swelled every day through out-of-State migrations by 2,000. From this daily influx of 2,000 comes 80 percent of the new physicians and 50 percent of the new dentists which California licenses every year. Yet, despite this sizeable number—a number which of course depletes the supply in other States—we are unable to maintain even the present ratio of physicians to population.

If California is to meet its needs, it must, in the next decade, double its number of medical and dental students. Last fall, California's medical schools, both private, and public, admitted 484 freshmen. By 1972, this figure must be in excess of 900 just to maintain the present ratio.

California is making a substantial and a determined effort on its own behalf to meet this requirement. The University of California is in the process of expanding its medical schools at San Francisco and Los Angeles, and it has acquired a site for a medical center in San Diego—a development alone which will require construction and equipment expenditures of $50 million. The private schools are struggling, against increasingly rising costs, to maintain their present student levels, and they have indicated their willingness to expand opportunities for admission if new funds can be found.

But these efforts by California alone will not be enough, particularly if we are to ease our present heavy drain on the health personnel of other States, and if the United States is to lessen its drain on the health manpower of other countries.

The Federal matching assistance provided in H.R. 12, would provide an urgently needed supplement to the demonstrated efforts of California. It would go far toward meeting our Nation's critical health manpower requirements and in promoting the welfare of this and future generations of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this bill be passed without delay.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in the more than 12 years that I have had the privilege of serving in this distinguished body and particularly the service that I have had under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] and other chairmen, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Wolverton, and the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Priest, I have had the privilege of hearing and working on a good many bills in the field of health.

I believe that in my experience there has not been a more significant piece of legislation to come before the House than H.R. 12. I might say that although this bill was sent up by the administration it is a committee bill. The committee very carefully worked on this bill. Hearings were held on this and similar bills in five Congresses, the 81st, the 84th, the 85th, the 87th, and the 88th. And, frankly, until I found out today that there has ben some change in mind and heart on this legislation, I believed that there would be very little controversy with reference to it. I do not mean to impugn the motives of anyone who may have changed his mind, nor do I say that a Member does not have that right.

Some have been opposed to the legislation throughout the hearings. I will say, however, that there was only one vote against the bill as reported when it came out of the full committee, which I think is significant.

I do not know that I disagree with those who say that you cannot take the figure of, perhaps 141 to 100,000 of population and absolutely prove that there is a shortage of physicians; or that when you say that there are perhaps 54 dentists to 100,000 people you can definitely prove that there is a shortage of dentists. But I can tell you as a Representative of a district that has some rural counties in it that if you want any definite proof of a shortage you just let a draft board tell one of the doctors to report for duty in the armed services, and I will guarantee you that your constituents will let you know that there is a shortage of physicians and dentists in that rural community. I have worked in one county for the past 8 to 9 years trying to get one doctor, just one, for this rural county, and I finally succeeded in getting one man released from the Air Force. We set him up in the cattle business, built him a clinic and paid for it with public funds. He stayed a year and was gone. If I knew where he was I would try to get him drafted again.

Let me say this, that we have had testimony from eminently qualified people who have studied this problem over the years and I have heard them say to us that we are bringing in about 1,700 or 1,800 foreign physicians a year. I do not think there is any testimony in the record that says we are bringing in any dentists, but we are bringing in foreign doctors. I have had experience with both kinds, the bad and the good; some of them are very good.

I do not think that as the leader of the free world we should go out to these countries which are already deficient in this type of highly skilled personnel and bring their doctors into this country by whatever means we do it. One of them may come in as a student and later become valuable as a medical man, and some Member of Congress introduces a private bill to let him stay. In the meantime he has married, and he has carved out a valuable place in the community. Many of them come in that way. But, as the most powerful nation in the world, we certainly should meet the challenge of providing enough skilled people in these important fields.

We know, if you want to go back to the figures, that the number of doctors is less per 100,000 today than it was a decade ago. With the explosion of population and with the greater demands for services, people are using doctors and dentists more than they ever have. You may say there may not be a shortage, but go down to any dentist's office and tell him you want to have some work done. In my opinion, in the metropolitan area of Washington, which is fairly well supplied compared with other areas of the country, you will get a waiting period of a week to 2 weeks before he can see you, unless it is an emergency. It is not quite that bad with physicians, but in some particular cases if you want to get a doctor to come to your home at night it is almost an impossibility. I say that without any reflection on the medical profession, because I think they are overworked, I think they have too much to do. I think the passage of this particular bill would go a great distance in alleviating these shortages.

I know of the tremendous need, and there is no point in my bringing this into the picture, because there is no argument about the construction need. Apparently there is no fight being made on that phase of the bill. The fight is being made on the student loan provision. Frankly, I do not know why I am so anxious to see it retained, because the idea came from the other side. I went along with them. I was not in favor of the grants, because I feel that once a medical or dental student is established he can easily pay back this money.

I think it is an understatement indeed to contend that this legislation has been long overdue. I believe it can be shown that if this legislation had been enacted a decade, or even 5 years ago, medical and dental services in this Nation might be more readily available than they are at present. Perhaps there might be even less pressure for the enactment of highly controversial Federal programs concerning the financing of medical care.

I was firmly convinced 5 years ago that legislation providing Federal aid for the construction of medical and dental school teaching facilities was an utter necessity.

During the 85th Congress I introduced a bill (H.R. 11913) to authorize grants for research and teaching facilities for existing and new medical, dental, and public health schools. At that time, the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Williams, was chairman, conducted hearings on my bill which was substantially similar to H.R. 12 reported by our committee this year. The testimony given to the subcommittee in support of a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of medical and dental school facilities so impressed the members of the subcommittee that they reported favorably to the full committee legislation which would have provided a measure of support not only for health research facilities but also for teaching facilities.

At that time, however—5 years ago—the organized medical profession had not as yet come to realize the great need for training more doctors to serve the health needs of the American people. While the AMA testimony supported Federal construction grants for medical schools, the emphasis was primarily on the high cost of high-quality medical education rather than the need for training additional doctors.

The bill reported by the subcommittee did not find sufficient support, and during the 85th Congress only legislation was enacted to extend for a period of 3 years the construction grant program for health research facilities.

Today, 5 years later, there is little dispute over the threat of an impending doctor shortage. As a matter of fact, there is a fairly clear realization on the part of many persons that such a shortage is already upon us. Persons who have had occasion in recent years to seek the services of their family physician will not doubt the truth of this statement.

H.R. 12, in my opinion, is an absolute necessity, if this Nation desires to avoid a dire catastrophe in future years. It has been estimated that unless something like this legislation is enacted, by 1975 a family physician will have to take care of 2,000 persons instead of 1,700 persons on an average in 1960.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my strong endorsement of the report on H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, and to recommend that the House of Representatives act favorably upon this bill.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has emphasized that the shortage of trained professional health personnel is a national problem. In these mobile times, when both the practitioners and the consumers of health services move from State to State and region to region, health manpower is necessarily a national resource. It must grow so as to keep pace not only with our swiftly expanding population but also with the growth of medical science. It would be tragic and ironic if the fruits of research fail to reach people who need them because too few men and women are trained to perform the new services.

I am keenly aware that this problem of national dimensions has special urgency for my own State of Alabama and the southern region. In recent years the South has expended a larger proportion of its resources to provide opportunities for medical education than has the Nation as a whole. As a result, the ratio of practicing physicians to the population in many of our Southern States has been rising while the national ratio has declined. In Alabama the ratio has gone up from 66 to 74 non-Federal physicians per 100,000 people since 1940. The national ratio during the same period has declined from 122 to 119 per 100,000.

But obviously there is still a tremendous gap to be overcome. The Southern Regional Education Board, which has performed excellent service in helping to make professional education available to young people in our region, estimates that the South will need 86,000 physicians by 1975, compared with 54,000 we now have, just to reach a level that the Nation as a whole has already attained.

It is clear to me that currently existing sources of support for education in the health professions cannot meet this challenge alone. The States and private institutions have carried an overwhelming load. They have done a herculean job, both separately and collectively. But they cannot supply the Nation with the physicians, dentists and other health professionals that the health of our people requires in the years ahead.

I am impressed by the strong support for H.R. 12 which has been expressed by leading authorities in medical and dental education, by the health professions, and by many others well qualified to judge the urgency of the need and the validity of the instrument. I was especially interested in the strong statement of the distinguished former dean of the University of Alabama Medical College, Dr. Robert C. Berson, outlining the problems faced by medical schools in recruiting outstanding young people to health careers.

I am convinced that the health of present and future generations of Americans will be in serious jeopardy unless we act swiftly and effectively to meet the shortage of professional health manpower. I am convinced that H.R. 12, providing Federal assistance in the expansion of existing schools, the construction of new schools, and the recruitment and retention of top-quality young people in these all-important disciplines, represents a logical and necessary advance in the support of education for the health professions. I wholeheartedly endorse it, and urge its rapid enactment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I would ask the gentleman from Alabama a question which was asked but not answered in the hearings. The National Defense Education Act was established ostensibly to increase the number of engineers in training. Has the number of engineers in training increased under the National Defense Education Act?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am not much of an authority on the National Defense Education Act. I would say that one reason I think this loan provision should be retained is that there is a great deal of competition under the National Defense Education Act among those who are preparing to become scientists and teachers.

Mr. KYL. I am not proposing an argument to the gentleman; I seriously want to know the answers to these questions. We have a forgiveness provision in the teacher-training language under the National Defense Education Act. I would like to know if that provision has increased the number of teachers in training.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I would say to the gentleman, I think it has. I know certainly that the GI bill increased the number of teachers and the number of scientists and the number of engineers. I might yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky who may be able to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. PERKINS. I would say to the gentleman, under the National Defense Education Act program and under the forgiveness provision of the student loan program with regard to teachers, the true intent of the act has been very successful in that qualified public school teachers have been increased by at least 25 percent.

Mr. KYL. And have they been increased sufficiently so that the program is no longer necessary?

Mr. PERKINS. No, the program is necessary and it should be continued because there was a great deficit when we started out. But we are making progress. But for the student loan program, I would say we would be at least 25 percent behind where we are today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee I became convinced of the merit of this legislation. But as we studied the provisions in detail, I became concerned, as I have explained in my additional views in the committee report, about the loan provisions of this proposal. This is probably the most generous loan program of any program in which the Federal Government has ventured. It has an extraordinarily low rate of interest. There is no interest paid during the period that the student is in school or while he is an intern. Further, in the event of the student's death, his indebtedness is canceled.

Certainly, in this proposal we are not encouraging an individual to assume all of the financial responsibility that those of us who went to college in years past would have assumed had we borrowed money from a friend or from an agency of our Government. As the bill now stands, the appropriate State health authority can certify certain areas as having a need for physicians or dentists. If the State authority so certifies, then if a doctor or a dentist practices in those areas, his indebtedness is further forgiven to the extent of 50 percent.

I ask my colleagues whether or not in their opinion the authorities within their States would discriminate between one town and another as to which one really needed the doctors the most. I believe in the long run we would find the State authorities concluding that the entire State is in need of doctors and thereby entitle the doctor or dentist practicing within that State to a forgiveness in the amount of half of the indebtedness.

It seems to me there should be a responsibility on the part of the State to assume half the cost of this forgiveness feature. The State should be required to participate by reimbursing the Federal Government for half the amount of the loan that has been advanced to the participating student. It would mean that the State would be truly discerning in its determination of what is a needy area.

Finally, it seems to me, the Federal funds would go further because there would be more students who could be aided with the same amount of money. I encourage the House to support my amendment, thereby improving the bill and at the same time improving its chances of passage.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I plan to offer at the appropriate time an amendment that will require the States to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that it will pay to the United States one-half the portion of any loan, plus interest, which is canceled by reason of the certification of an area as a needy area.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL].

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, I requested this time to attempt to put into perspective the bill as it exists before the House today. When the committee received this proposed legislation in the form of an Executive request in the first instance, it was substantially different from the legislation we are called upon to vote upon today.

I would point out to my colleagues on the Republican side that as the bill came out of committee and is before you there is nothing in the bill which is in conflict in any way with our party platform of 1960. In its original form the scholarship provision was for grants. The committee eliminated the grants provision and changed it to a loan provision.

There was a 10-year authorization program under the originally suggested legislation. It has been reduced to a 3-year program.

Originally figures on requested financial authorization were beyond that which was listed in the submitted budget for the fiscal year 1964. As it now appears it is within that budget.

The need for additional medical facilities for the training of doctors has clearly been established. Some reference was made to an exchange between the previous speaker and one of the Members of the House concerning the superiority of American medical education, and this is certainly true. But I would point out to you that more and more we are turning to people who are trained outside of these shores, who are not always receiving the kind of training which we feel is important for physicians who are going to be treating us and future generations. This is the purpose of this legislation, to insure highly trained medical personnel in adequate numbers.

The suggestion that somehow or other this is a new approach which is at variance with that of the past I think is not supported by the facts. There is one aspect of the bill, however, which bothers me very much, and that is that once again we propose to act on legislation which does not in any way prohibit discriminatory practices by the universities and colleges which would benefit under this bill. For many, many years now we have heard about the legislative branch becoming the third ranking branch of Government in the public mind, that somehow or other we are being invaded by the executive; and the judiciary along with the executive has exercised its prerogatives in a much more aggressive way than the Congress has. Yet, whenever we have an opportunity to change that state of affairs by acting with courage in an affirmative way, we duck it because somehow or other we take the argument that these things can be spelled out by executive decree or judicial decision.

Very recently the President of the United States, when asked if he would withhold Federal funds from a great State of this Nation, indicated he did not have the authority. He indicated this was not proper, and I agreed with him.

But he also said:

> I do not think that we should extend Federal programs in a way which encourages or really permits discrimination.

That is very clear. He made this a direct challenge to the Congress of the United States to see to it that additional programs which we may enact do not permit discrimination. Among the needs in this country for additional physicians, the need is certainly greatest in the Negro population. I submit this is the way, not with bayonets, not with bloodshed, not with dramatic action, but responsibly to meet the civil rights question.

If we see to it, and in so doing, by no means dictate to the institutions that they must participate in this program, but give them the choice of participation in accordance with the guidelines we lay down, or no participation, this is the way intelligent, rational, peaceful men will bring about an end to the kind of thing which has been a blot on our national reputation.

At an appropriate time I shall introduce an amendment which would prohibit the use of Federal funds to institutions which practice discrimination. It is argued firmly that this is the way to defeat the legislation, but I assure you that is not my purpose nor the purpose of those who will support the amendment.

As a matter of fact, last year H.R. 8900, the college assistance bill was passed overwhelmingly by this House. It parallels this legislation in many respects. If every single Member of this House who might conceivably be influenced by the kind of amendment I shall submit, had I voted against that bill, it still would have passed by a substantial majority. I am confident that if we have the courage in the House of Representatives today to express ourselves by our vote in the way we talk so eloquently, this bill will pass, the amendment will be agreed to, and the American people will be reassured that the Congress has not in fact abandoned its prerogatives to the executive and to the judiciary.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised to receive, as I know each of you received, under date of April 18, a letter from the American Medical Association opposing the student loan provisions of H.R. 12. I was surprised because, from the very beginning of the consideration of this bill and of similar legislation, in the 87th Congress, the American Medical Association was accorded every courtesy by the chairman of the committee and by the members of the committee to appear and to give the committee the benefit of its experience, the benefit of knowledge which is uniquely the property of the American Medical Association. Yet, at no time, including their appearance just a little more than 2 months ago, did they ever acquaint the committee with the fact that they were opposed or were planning to oppose the loan provisions of this legislation.

Now, the letter of April 18—and I have read it carefully a number of times, because I would not want to incorrectly interpret the import of it—leaves me with the distinct feeling that the American Medical Association has found that their program provides the last measure of assistance necessary to meet the demands of students for medical education, yet in their appearance before our committee in February of this year, in response to questions by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], we find this colloquy between the gentleman from Illinois and Dr. Dorman of the American Medical Association and the man who was appearing as the spokesman of the American Medical Association:

> Mr. SPRINGER. Are you saying, though, in your statement on pages 4, 5, and 6, that the American Medical Association-Education and Research Foundation program is inadequate?
>
> Dr. DORMAN. No, sir. We say that it is filling a big need. We did not say that it was inadequate. It was never designed to take the entire load. It was designed to assist in this area. It does not carry the full load, and I do not believe it ever could.

Well, this matter of dividing the means of financing medical education appears to be one of the most significant problems confronting the medical schools and the medical students. I know of no witness appearing in lengthy hearings in the 87th Congress from medical schools or from the medical profession who did not make it clear that they regarded the heavy burden of financing medical education as one of the most pressing problems.

The Association of American Medical Schools in testimony in February of this year reemphasized the significance of the burden of financing medical education. The fact is that the AMA–ERF program was never envisioned as being adequate to meet all of the demands, and, as a matter of fact, there is grave doubt that it is going to be able to continue doing the job, the part of the job contemplated by the American Medical Association. Let me quote from the very authoritative American Medical Association News of February 18, 1963, the official publication of the American Medical Association. The headline is "Loan Fund Demand High; Dollars Needed":

> The student loan guarantee program of the American Medical Association-Education and Research Foundation is one of the most successful projects ever undertaken by the American Medical Association, George M. Fister, M.D., American Medical Association president, said.
>
> Demand for loans by medical students, interns and residents has been so heavy, he said, that the program faces curtailment unless the guarantee fund is enlarged by about $1 million in 1963.

The full article follows:

LOAN FUND DEMAND HIGH; DOLLARS NEEDED

> The student loan guarantee program of the American Medical Association-Education and Research Foundation is "one of the most successful projects ever undertaken" by the American Medical Association, George M. Fister, M.D., American Medical Association president, said.
>
> Demand for loans by medical students, interns and residents has been so heavy, he said, that the program faces curtailment unless the guarantee fund is enlarged by about $1 million in 1963.

PROGRAM'S STATUS

> Dr. Fister reported on the status of the program in the eighth annual Walter Bierring lecture delivered at the annual dinner of the Federation of State Medical Boards of the United States.
>
> On December 31, he said, the fund totaled just over $975,000, but almost $800,000 of this was committed. The uncommitted balance of $176,543, Dr. Fister continued, will guarantee approximately 1,200 additional loans totaling about $2 million, since American Medical Association-Education and Research Foundation can lend $12.50 for each dollar in the fund.
>
> The guarantee fund must be enlarged, Dr. Fister warned, because loan applications continue to arrive at a rate of about 150 a week, with no indication of a decline. At this rate, he said, about 7,200 loans would be made during 1963.
>
> However, he said, this will be impossible unless the guarantee fund is increased by at least $1 million this year.

YEAREND REPORT

> As of December 31, 1962, Dr. Fister said, this was the status of the American Medical Association-Education and Research Foundation program:
>
> Nearly 1 of every 10 medical students was benefiting from the program.
>
> A total of 4,694 individuals had received 5,299 loans amounting to nearly $10 million in principal and interest. This included 2,890 medical students, 672 interns, and 1,132 residents in training at 83 medical schools and 462 hospitals in 46 States and possessions.
>
> Less than 7 percent of 5,823 applications received had been rejected.
>
> Some 97 percent of the borrowers are men and 72 percent are married.

STATE PARTICIPATION

> The American Medical Association president urged all State medical societies to consider recommendations made by the American Medical Association house of delegates regarding American Medical Association-Education and Research Foundation fund raising.
>
> These include following national appeals with appeals at the State level; contacting industry and foundations for contributions; publicizing the program in State journals and through speeches and exhibits, and examination of the possibility of relating existing State loan funds with the American Medical Association-Education and Research Foundation guarantee fund to gain advantage of the 12½-times multiplier factor.
>
> This, he pointed out, "would in no way endanger the autonomy or independence of the State programs."

Now, this is a very current article. It goes on to stress the need for greater efforts on the part of the AMA to recruit these dollars and to prevent curtailment of the already limited activities of this student loan fund. This is a high-cost fund. It is based on the prime rate of money, and during the interim period of financing the medical education at this time the simple rate is 5½ percent. If a student converts it to a payout note it is going to become 6.5 percent. I point out that rates this high could have a serious impact upon the decision of a graduate of a medical school when he undertakes to make the decision as to the nature of the practice he would follow.

Mr. Chairman, we have all been interested in statistics which have been offered. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] indicated that there had been a fair degree of stability following World War II in the ratio of physicians to population. But, that hardly tells all of the facts because we live in an age where medical practice is becoming a very complex matter. We are living in the age of specialization, where the ability of one doctor to handle a given number of patients is vastly restricted. So in interpreting the ratio of practitioners to population we have to take into account a great many factors in order to arrive at the actual availability of doctors. However, certainly, a very burdensome debt carried over after medical school and the necessary internship or residency could compel a doctor to seek the opportunity to practice in the area where the rewards would be the greatest. Yet one of the needs in this country is to bring about a better distribution of our physicians. Of course, in this whole matter of student loans we must not overlook other important areas of medical services or healing services. I think it is of great interest, and it should be to all of us, that the American Dental Association, under date of April 22 of this year, has addressed letters to the Members of the House of Representatives reaffirming their support of the student loan provisions, making it very clear that they do not find the rosy picture facing prospective students of dentistry which appears to the American Medical Association in regard to their students. I assume we could say the same thing of those who would undertake the practice of osteopathy.

The letter referred to follows:

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1963.
Members, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: In view of recent events, I wish to confirm to you the American Dental Association's support of H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The position of this association has not changed in any way since February 6, 1963, when our president-elect, Dr. James P. Hollers, of San Antonio, Tex., appeared before the committee in support of H.R. 12.

As Dr. Hollers testified, we believe H.R. 12 is well conceived and critically needed health legislation.

In dentistry there is a well-documented need for construction grants and for a student loan program if we are to have sufficient professional manpower to meet the dental care needs of the people of this country in the years to come.

We hope, therefore, that you will support all provisions of H.R. 12 as they relate to dentistry and that you will oppose any amendments that would eliminate dental students from any part of the program contained in H.R. 12.

The American Dental Association appreciates your interest in sound programs to improve health care in this country.

Sincerely yours,
GERALD D. TIMMONS, D.D.S.,
President.

Mr. Chairman, there is no evidence of any great availability of funds to meet the needs of the students in that particular discipline of practice.

Mr. Chairman, the total cost of a student loan program is so insignificant in relation to the needs of the Nation to have a continuation of the best medical services. I doubt if the total cost over a period beyond that contemplated in this legislation would reflect the amount we are going to be asked in this Congress to vote for limestone to carry on certain conservation practices in agriculture. Yet the contribution to the health of the American people is of far greater significance. To permit loan funds to be available to students who have the will and desire to put up with the extended periods of study, the sacrifices entailed in gaining a medical education, I think is an act of wise investment. If we forgive a portion of those loans in order to encourage practice in areas where the income prospect will be far less, such as in the public health field, or if we encourage a doctor to go to the rural areas of the country where there is a scarcity of adequate medical services, I think again it constitutes a very sound public investment.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I have been here 7 years, and I do not suppose I have been down in the well of this House very often because when I come down here I hope that I have something to say. I think I might have something to say today which will be of interest. I do not kid myself. I am sure that 99.5 percent of the Members of the House have their minds made up, but I do have some significant remarks which I would like to mention to you.

Mr. Chairman, I will say, as the distinguished chairman of our committee mentioned earlier, this is a nonpartisan bill but in my opinion that does not mean that it is sound legislation. I do not think it is. I think it was poorly drawn. I think it includes all kinds of cats and dogs that do not belong in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, my views are contained in two sections of the committee report—the minority views, which I join with one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] and my additional views. I hope the Members of the House will recognize the fact that there are two sides to every question, and that they might be kind enough to read the views that are contained in the report of the minority views.

I listened to the hearings and I am as convinced as I have ever been in my life that there is no proven need for this legislation. This is a proposal that is attractive because it puts one in a position, if he is against it, of being against doctors and medicine. Certainly that is far from the truth. A main purpose of this legislation is to try and furnish doctors to the small communities instead of having them congregate in the major cities.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will not in any way, shape or form guarantee a doctor to any small or medium-sized community if that doctor does not want to go there and practice. I have seen instances out of my own family relationship, where a young doctor went to a small town, some 300 miles from Omaha, which district I represent. They furnished him a clinic, and they furnished him a home. They wanted a doctor out there. He stayed 6 or 7 years and moved to Omaha, which is a major medical center.

There is a provision in here for loans. If you go out to these communities you are supposed to have the loan forgiven. The doctors do very well in these communities. But they are not going to stay out there against their will, because they are going to be forgiven repayment over a 10-year period, and they can easily forgo that forgiveness and move to one of the major cities where they prefer to practice.

In case anyone is under the impression that this is going to furnish doctors to rural areas, let me say that it certainly is not.

Mr. Chairman, I see my distinguished friend from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in the Chamber. He and I have had many things in common in the 7 years that I have been here. I have fought with him in the Well of this House on many occasions when attempts were made to slice funds from various programs in the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor. Actually the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], I believe, is responsible for the problem of a shortage of doctors because he has done such a magnificent job of supplying funds for the building up of research at the National Institutes of Health and other places and that is where the doctors are going.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], when we were debating the rule, referred to U.S. News & World Report. He did not mention the conclusion that the article reached and that is that the majority of the doctors are going first into specialties—psychiatry, orthopedic surgery—and the next greatest number into research and teaching and only 21 percent of our doctors are going into general practice. There lies the problem.

This is the problem this bill is supposed to solve, yet only 21 percent are going into general practice, and that is because they prefer to be teaching doctors and to go into research. So this bill is not going to solve that problem.

Another thing that disturbs me is that the President, whom I respect greatly, has proposed a tax reform measure with a 5-percent floor on itemized charitable contributions. This if put into effect is going to dry up a tremendous number of dollars, in the millions and billions, that have been contributed to the colleges and universities, two of which I have in my district, two great universities of medicine. They are providing new buildings and new facilities, and particularly a Jesuit school which is entirely financed privately, and which is going out on a big program of expansion. These universities, particularly the private universities, are going to have their funds dried up and not forthcoming if this so-called tax reform with the 5-percent floor is enacted into law.

So then what do they have left to do? If these funds are not forthcoming from private people with no strings attached, then of course they are going to have to turn to the Federal Government under a program such as this with its Federal control and Federal direction. I do not like to see that trend, but I see it happening at this very session of Congress. You enact that reform program and you are going to drive colleges and universities both public and private to Federal aid with its resultant Federal control.

I have heard today that one doctor in 1950, if my memory serves me right, took care of a thousand patients, and one doctor in 1960 took care of an additional number; and that one doctor in 1970 is going to have to take care of a much larger number, because of an increase in population.

Mr. Chairman, we are not back in the horse-and-buggy days of 25 and 30 years ago. The respected and distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island has championed legislation which has brought new discoveries. It has brought the new miracle drugs. We have a solution to polio. A doctor does not have to treat as many patients now as he did. It is not as if we were back 25 years ago, when everybody had to go to a doctor for measles, polio, and all of these other things. These people no longer go, because they take advantage of these miracle drugs and that is the end of their visit to the doctor. So I do not think there is too much validity to that particular argument.

I should like to say this, and it is my considered view. This issue today is clear. If this body is determined to substitute Federal control for private effort, then this bill provides you a golden opportunity to do so.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. I would like to compliment the gentleman for his part in the minority views and the statement he has here presented. It strikes me that at a time when we are endeavoring to economize, to advance new programs is fiscally unwise. Further, the gentleman's statement in which he pointed out that Federal control followed Federal aid is the lesson I thought the medical profession had learned because of their medicare experiences. If the medical profession does not wake up to what we are doing today, in the future it is going to have more trouble with medicare, because doctors cannot have it both ways. Either Federal control follows Federal aid or it does not. It now appears to be a case of whose ox is gored.

I should like to read this statement from page 70 of the report and ask the gentleman's views on it.

Mr. Chairman, this is the statement the gentleman made:

> There is some reason to think that proposed programs which would gradually rob the medical profession of its tradition of personal independence and dedication are already beginning to create a reluctance on the part of possible medical students to commit themselves and their futures to the healing arts. No abundance of physical plants nor availability of liberal loans will overcome this seed of doubt about the future of the profession.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would comment on the danger there, as he sees it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Of course, that is the trend and, of course, if the student should be given loans to go through college, of course, they are going to be indoctrinated by the trend toward centralized government and we may eventually lose our independence.

I would like to read my additional views as set forth in the report:

> First it must be assumed that enactment of H.R. 12 would be just the first step in a continuing new program of Federal aid. Last year H.R. 4999 provided for a 10-year program. H.R. 12 also provided for a 10-year program when introduced, but it was reduced in committee to 3 years.
>
> It would be foolish indeed to conclude that this Federal-aid program will not be extended for years into the future, especially since it was originally proposed as a minimum 10-year program.
>
> I do not think that this Congress, faced with a record peacetime budget deficit, should engage in questionable new spending programs. I do not think there is a proven need for another program in the medical field.
>
> It should be kept in mind that the Federal Government already has nearly 100 medical programs either administered or financed by 19 different agencies and departments. The total dollars involved exceed $10.5 billion annually. In addition, more billions of dollars are already spent in the education field.
>
> In the face of public protest over the spending practices in Washington, I do not see how this Congress can approve a vast new program with an estimated cost of $205.7 million in the first 3 years alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to add to the endorsement of my esteemed colleagues my own support of the legislation now before us, H.R. 12, a bill to increase the appropriation for training professional health personnel and for other purposes, to meet the Nation's critical need for more physicians, dentists, and other health personnel.

As chairman of this body's Committee on Science and Astronautics, I am keenly aware of the barren areas in our scientific and technological sources. Just as technology translates scientific knowledge into goods and power, so medical research is constantly revealing many of the secrets underlying human health and well-being. But technology and medical research are, of themselves, meaningless unless there are the skilled minds and hands to convert the tremendous scientific findings of our age.

Last year and again in committee hearings earlier this year, Secretary Celebrezze, Surgeon General Terry, and others reviewed the compelling reasons why the Federal Government should provide assistance to remedy the shortage of health personnel. Most of us in the House of Representatives know only too well the solid truth in the Secretary's statement that hospitals, public health agencies, the armed services, research laboratories, and communities searching for private practitioners are all competing for the alarmingly short supply of health personnel. It is a sad commentary that large areas in our population are deprived of the benefit of much of the knowledge this great scientific age has developed.

The bill before us today has been most carefully drawn to increase opportunities for the provision of needed medically trained manpower. It proposes a 3-year program of construction grants to help build teaching facilities for schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and public health to make possible greater enrollments in these schools. It would establish a program of student loans to assure that lack of funds will not continue to be a deterrent to qualified individuals desiring training in the health professions.

Along with its humanitarian intent, it contains carefully built-in safeguards against abuse either by institutions or individuals and against any infringement on academic, scientific, and individual freedom.

Since my early days in the Congress, I have been conscious of the need to increase the supply of physicians, dentists, and other health personnel. The record is abundantly clear that we cannot wait longer to act. We know the need and we must not be afraid to take action to remedy it. The situation already is critical and unless we act now, will become even more critical in the immediate years ahead.

The president of the University of California has enthusiastically supported this bill. In a State as rapidly growing as California, we are conscious of the shortage of medical personnel. Unless we pass a bill such as this the future is not bright for the future supply of doctors of medicine.

This bill, H.R. 12, deserves the full support of the House so that its provisions may be quickly enacted into law, and I intend to vote for it.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak here in order to try to clarify the atmosphere. I am one of three physicians in this House of Representatives. I am opposed to this bill. My position—a carefully considered one—is contrary to an organization to which I belong that has been oft quoted on this floor today; and I would like to make it clear that I am opposed to the brick-and-mortar construction portion thereof, as well as the loan features of the bill. I feel that we cannot "have our cake while eating it too," as has been said here before.

I am a little concerned about trying to define this strictly as a health matter rather than an education matter when it contains brick and mortar for schools only for medical, dental, and allied professions, and where it says it is also for training and educating physicians, dentists, and adjuvant personnel.

Furthermore, big centralized Government cannot buy willingness to practice or serve. Perhaps it is a sign of a complete generation of regimentation and spoon feeding, that makes young graduate physicians wish to practice in association with and near great hospitals, medical teaching institutions, and at least laboratories, rather than in rural areas. At any rate, Federal legislation can only lead to further deterioration of our people's moral fiber.

It is easier, quicker, more logical and humane to travel 50 miles today to expert medical care via good roads and by car, than 40 years ago to hitch up the team and transport the ill or wounded 5 miles via rough roads to a small rural area where much less qualified aid would then be obtained.

In spite of wonderful efforts, most State university medical schools have not graduated and persuaded M.D.'s to practice within the State—or in rural areas—even with forgiveness plans, in greater than 60 percent. Great State universities with international reputations, have done less well, percentagewise.

In fact, the greater the university the greater the school of medicine, and more likely the students are to become international and seek their education here.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly why we are cutting our pins out from under us as we come full-circle, and complain about the 10,000 or 12,000 foreign medical graduates who are coming to this school in order to participate in competitive, free enterprise type of education in advanced medicine.

At one time I was planning to go to Germany to study under a famous doctor over there. I would have if it had not been for Hitler. I think that is completely reversed now, and I think that this is a projected need we are discussing here today, very similar to the cry in 1956 about the need for additional classrooms, 700,000 by 1960. Of course private enterprise and local resources have built all but 40,000 of those, under their local boards of education.

I have seen enough here that indicates the technique to be "getting a foot in the door," or acting as "a starter," for a thing that will bring us about in this full circle to the place where we have a government of socialized medicine, in fact, or at least aiding and abetting it to the point where people will no longer beat their path to graduate medical education in the United States of America.

I have heard an awful lot today about hierarchies. I am not too impressed about that. I have been called worse and better things as a doctor. I do not believe in a hierarchy. I happen to think that the American Medical Association is well and democratically represented through its house of delegates and through its own component medical societies. But we will not discuss that. I insist there is no control of funds or applications to medical schools.

I served for a long time as a personnel director during the days of the 9–9–9 program and the accelerated program of education for the chief personnel in the Surgeon General of the Army office when we were really expediting things that have not yet been again drawn on, incidentally. This is the reason for not going all out for this type of further education bill, even though it comes from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I think there is no control by the AMA of admissions. I believe we should differentiate between AMPAC, which is a political action committee of the American Medical Association, and which is perfectly legal, and was quoted here rather extensively and surprisedly, and which they have founded in self-defense, copied after the AFL–CIO COPE. In fact, the questionnaire that was read here could have been one of Andy Biemiller's—and incidentally, I received a letter from him today, dated yesterday. This letter is written in the same language of Falk, Cohen, and Altmeyer, and many others, from the origin of this back in 1936, and repeated against the AMA, through the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill of 1946–47, and now updated. They are no more expertise in medicine than doctors are in labor matters.

I submit to you, if you simply divide the 246,000 physicians of the United States into the 188 million people, you have 1 doctor for every 705 people. Actually it is 1 for every 705 people if you count the interns and residents in hospitals. This is a drop of 45 per 1,000 since 1949 when there were only about 1 to 750.

I do not think we should resort to trickery and distort the facts. I think we should know why the foreign medical graduate is coming here, and I think we should know this is not a student loan proposal, although there is a difference here between the brick-and-mortar concept of further educational facilities, and the loan program.

I would personally apologize to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and anyone else, for any reversal of opinion in midstream, but if I read page 277 of the hearings correctly, the representative of the organization to which I belong, said that it had no position on the loans. This has not been changed. He says they do have a position on the loans for brick and mortar as a one-time shot in the arm only. I am still against it.

No one disputes the fact that it takes over $11,000 to complete medical school. That is why the AMA loan program sets a maximum of $1,500 a year and a total maximum of $10,000 on any loan. When I went to medical school I worked and paid my own way. I am proud of that. I think there are still many people who would like to do that.

I would like to say that I defy any Member who opposes this bill that is stronger for the portion that will grant forgiveness of loans or grants and actual scholarships; to name a single medical student anywhere in the country who was making passing grades, once admitted, who has had to leave and quit medical school because of inability to obtain a loan to continue to advance his medical education. I would be glad to have that given to me personally.

I want you to know that the bottleneck, Members of this House, is not the hierarchy; it is not the American Medical Association; it is not the ADA—and that stands for American Dental Association, in my language; the bottleneck to further graduates in the schools of medicine and dentistry and allied personnel is not all of the total cost today. The bottleneck I fear is the welfare state or controlled medicine, regardless of what you call it, or the advent of socialism in the United States of America, and I hope that that will not come.

It is inconceivable to me that the current administration proposes this legislation on the one hand, while suggesting tax reforms on the other which limits contributions, and thereby puts the Government in the position of supporting private institutions while taxing private giving.

All knowledgeable people admit to oversubscribed adequate Government and other funds for research. In fact, this is part of the problem, in that we are funding it until it is "choked," unless we have great breakthroughs in techniques and/or better pay for researchers; which paradoxically distracts private practitioners and others who would normally teach in medical schools. We would not have enough classroom teachers if the new school buildings were given to us.

Medicine, more than elsewhere, depends on teachers, educational background, internship, and bedside training. This cannot be legislated, even though it were the function of the Federal Government to redistribute the wealth.

One cannot justify this additional spending of the taxpayers' money at any priority level in view of our Nation's bankruptcy, to say nothing of the fiscal year 1964 budget imbalance, and our first and large planned deficit.

Mr. Chairman, I will have much more to say during the 5-minute rule on the amendments to be offered.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I am associated with him on the Committee on Armed Services of this House, and I appreciate the statement he has made. If I take your remarks, and I certainly can take them, honestly and sincerely, this bill does not in any way end the shortage of doctors in the rural areas of the Nation. As I understand it, that is where the shortage is. And, we have an oversupply in the urban areas of the Nation. Now, how can we, under this bill, correct the shortage in the rural areas unless somewhere under this legislation there is some type of regimentation of the doctors now in existence?

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry. The answer is that you cannot legislate this. This is exactly what we are trying to do here today, and therefore we are coming full circuit again. The only way this can be done, as has been done in the great State of Kansas, is to make the climate and the conditions for practice so ideal in the form of self-help or, as the Sears Foundation has done, provide facilities so that the doctor will be happy to practice there locally with modern facilities, office, and laboratories, plus possibly a few dispensary or holding beds.

Mr. BECKER. So that what we are doing is appropriating some $205 million for 3 years, but we do not correct that which we are attempting to do under this legislation?

Mr. HALL. I will say to the gentleman from New York that we do not only not correct it, but we are barking up the wrong tree, because we have a better ratio of doctors to patients in this country than we have ever had. The rate of graduates coming out of medical schools has increased from 4,600 to just under 8,000 per year since 1949. The number of medical schools has increased by 14, and they are all class A, whereas during World War II we had at least 4 substandard schools that I could mention.

Mr. BECKER. I compliment the gentleman for his very fine presentation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I support the student loan provision and the forgiveness provision that goes along with it, because I feel that it will permit thousands of bright youngsters to enter a profession they otherwise would not enter because the cost is prohibitive. The same arguments made today against the medical and dental student loan program were made against the National Defense Education Act bill in 1958, the year that it was enacted. Now, before the enactment of the National Defense Education Act bill student enrollment in the universities was 2.9 million. In 1959, the first year thereafter, the enrollment jumped up to 3.2 million. This school year the total university enrollment is 4.6 million.

Mr. Chairman, since the enactment of the National Defense Education Act, 480,000 have gone all the way through, and 50 percent of this 480,000 figure are public school teachers. Because of the forgiveness provision in the law, the program for public school teachers has been accelerated at least 25 percent. So, I cannot see where we can successfully argue today that the program which is being proposed will not be helpful in getting doctors and dentists in the rural areas where we have a great shortage.

I know that we have a shortage of doctors and dentists in eastern Kentucky. I know that there will be hundreds of youngsters who would like to enter dental and medical schools who cannot enter because the cost is prohibitive, unless we pass this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to a letter that I have before me, signed by the dean of a new dental school at the University of Kentucky, Dean Alvin L. Morris, D.D., Ph. D. Here is what he states, and I think this answers an argument that has been made by the gentlemen opposed to this legislation. I will just read a paragraph of this letter:

> Now that our first class of students have begun their program it is apparent that difficulties of financing programs of health education are also felt acutely by the students. It should be pointed out that the magnitude of our present problem has been increased as the result of the attempts to produce solutions to a larger and more difficult problem; namely, that of bringing better oral health care to the many people of Kentucky who are presently virtually without care. Every effort must be made to seek ways to encourage our future graduates to take their talents and skills into those areas of the State where they are so badly needed. It has been a premise of our committee on admissions that students who come to us from rural Kentucky will be more inclined to return to rural Kentucky to practice. Admittedly, not all will return; however, it is extremely doubtful that any students from such metropolitan areas as Louisville and Lexington will choose to practice in eastern Kentucky. If we select only—

Now, I think this is pertinent—

> if we select only the financially able student, we will be eliminating the possibility of bringing to the profession the sons of parents of more modest means who reside in the rural part of the State. Therefore I wish to emphasize that the dental student loan aspects of H.R. 12 are of utmost importance.

Now, the director of research, Dr. Raymond C. Bard, of the University of Kentucky Medical Center College of Dentistry, has expressed his views, and here is what he states about the loan program:

> As one deeply interested in dental research, I find it somewhat difficult to comprehend why we are willing—via a variety of Government-supported scholarship and fellowship programs—to support graduate science research students amply, while we resist such support for dental students who, academically, at least, are equivalent to other graduate students.

I throw that question out to Members who are opposing this bill. Why should we discriminate against this particular group? This is not going to solve the problem but this is going to permit thousands of bright youngsters to enter medical school and dental school who would not otherwise enter, which the NDEA program conclusively proves; and if we knock out this forgiveness provision we are discriminating against a category of worthy students in a field where we have a great shortage.

I certainly hope that this Congress will not practice any such discrimination because this program is long overdue.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman has related the NDEA forgiveness features to this program. The latest figures of the National Education Association indicate that the need for teachers has not altered a bit. Today we need nine elementary teachers for every six high school teachers and we are getting nine high school teachers for every six elementary school teachers. Nor has there been an iota of proof that this program has promoted the teacher going to the area where he is needed the most. I should like to ask the gentleman this question.

Mr. PERKINS. First, I disagree with the gentleman's premise.

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will permit me to ask this question: Under this program, under the forgiveness feature, let us say a man is trained in the medical field as a radiologist. Where are we going to send this man to a rural area to practice, and with what?

Mr. PERKINS. If there is not a demand in the rural area certainly he will not go to the rural area. But where the need exists we need to get these trained specialists, doctors and dentists, into the rural areas. This will attract them.

Mr. KYL. But if the ratio of trainees in general practice is the same as it is now in comparison with specialists, with radiologists, with teachers, how are we going to fill this need?

Mr. PERKINS. In my area today, in Hazard, Ky., I was talking to one of the able local doctors last night. We have a hospital that belongs to the UMW welfare fund that is about to close. But if we had to operate that hospital, he tells me we would have to bring some specialists in from the outside. This points up the need for specialists, and giving these boys forgiveness at the rate of 10 percent a year for up to 5 years of service in the rural areas where they are not going to make so much money is just good government. We can afford this small portion of the cost of medical and dental services for our rural areas because it is a sound investment in our future.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, apropos of the last statement which was made in respect to the forgiveness feature of this bill, I would like to point out that the last expression of the House of Representatives was had last year after we had enacted here in the House a bill for assistance to higher education known as the bricks and mortar bill. That bill passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote. It came back to the House of Representatives after a conference with certain provisions dealing with scholarships and what were then called nonreimbursable loans. Of course that is just the same thing as forgiveness. A motion to recommit was made in respect to that conference report and the motion to recommit carried by a very decisive vote. So my position simply is this, that on that occasion, and the last occasion on which the House of Representatives acted, we there very definitely said that such an item of forgiveness should not be included.

Mr. MEADER. If the gentleman will yield, it is shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 15, page 20152, that the recommittal motion carried by a vote of 214 to 186.

Mr. HALLECK. I said it was a decisive vote and that did not require any recount. As I say, that was the last expression from the House of Representatives in respect to the very proposition that has been under discussion here.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished friend, the majority leader, has raised a question which is very important. I have tried to make it very clear throughout this whole debate that the major issue here is a matter of health. What the House passed on last year and what the gentleman from Indiana referred to was the general education program. This is not a general education program. It is a health program altogether, and it should be considered by this House and the American people as such, just like the hospital program, the research program, and the rest.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman agree with me that the bill that was enacted by the House of Representatives last year for increased aid for higher education, for public and private colleges, that passed here overwhelmingly, if it had finally become law could have made available funds for the construction of medical and dental schools as is contemplated by the bill now before us?

Mr. HARRIS. I understand that these schools would have been eligible for construction grants, just as medical and dental students have been eligible under the National Defense Education Act for loans. But anyone in the field of medical schools, health, and so forth, knows that these provisions are not suitable for health programs. They are designed for general education programs and they do not meet the needs of the medical requirements and the professional personnel of the country.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman knows of my high regard for him.

Mr. HARRIS. And mine for the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. If that bill that passed here in the House of Representatives last year had finally become law, and money by reason of that action had become available to build medical or dental schools, does the gentleman mean to say to me that would not have been available for the teaching of medicine or dentistry?

Mr. HARRIS. I say to the gentleman that the requirements and the restrictions under the bill would not have met the needs of the medical and dental institutions in meeting the health needs of the American people, just as the National Defense Education Act loan provisions do not meet the needs of medical students. They are two entirely different programs. Furthermore, under that program, it is known that the Commissioner of Education would administer it. I contend and I think we all contend—that the reason this Committee has jurisdiction is that this is a matter for administration by the Surgeon General, and that is the official who should administer it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how any single person could read the hearings of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on this bill and not be aware of the urgent need for doctors, dentists, nurses, pharmacists, and others in these fields. I do not know how anybody in the United States could read the report of the President's Scientific Advisory Committee and not be keenly aware of the shortage of highly trained manpower—not only doctors and dentists, but scientists and engineers. Dr. Terman of the President's Scientific Advisory Committee's manpower panel said that the man on the moon project alone could use every single graduate we have in the field of engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences. So I disagree very definitely with those who stand here today and say there is not a need for more doctors and dentists. I do not know of any education bill that has ever been before this House that I have not voted for. I have supported every one of such bills throughout the years—in the Eisenhower administration and now in the Kennedy administration. I supported them last year and I hope to be able to support this bill today. But, there are parts of this bill that concern me. I would like to ask either the chairman of the committee or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] a couple of questions, if I may.

If I understand this bill correctly, first of all, teaching hospitals may receive funds under this legislation?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Nursing schools may also receive funds under this legislation?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true—but only collegiate schools of nursing.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Any school that offers courses leading to a degree in nursing?

Mr. HARRIS. Collegiate schools of nursing, yes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. A degree in nursing or graduate nursing—if I read the bill correctly.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, that is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. This would provide for funds to go to both private and public colleges, church-related and non-church-related colleges; is that not correct?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then may I call the attention of the House to one defect in this bill which I think is very serious? In education bills before the House Education and Labor Committee—and this is an education bill, regardless of the semantics we employ—in every education bill, we have been very careful to write in an exclusion clause so that none of the Federal funds could be used for buildings or for rooms for sectarian instruction or religious worship or chapels. I would call the attention of the House to teaching hospitals that actually have chapels in them. A member of my staff went to a church-related college, a church-related teaching hospital, a nursing school in this city last evening—and there are chapels in both—I do not quarrel with this—in fact I strongly favor it. But I do not think Federal funds should be spent to build them. In this bill there is no exclusion feature, which says that none of the Federal funds can be used for such rooms which would be used for sectarian instruction or for religious worship. There was a colloquy on the floor earlier in the afternoon between the chairman of the committee and a gentleman on the other side of the aisle, and the gentleman from Alabama, and the question was raised about Baylor University in the State of Texas. If I understood them correctly, both gentlemen defended the bill as is. May I call the attention of the House to the fact that under this bill as presented today these funds can go to any church-related college and be used for chapels—or rooms for sectarian instructions. Let me give some own examples in my own State. The only school in the Northwest that is accredited for the teaching of optometry is a church-related college. In Oregon and across the Nation, there are many nursing schools that are church-related schools. I have supported consistently the use of Federal funds for private colleges because I believe they are making a great contribution to this country, and I supported last year the provisions in the higher education bill which said that Federal funds can be used for private and public colleges, church-related and non-church-related colleges, because the Government is asking them to contribute in an effort to meet our desperate needs; we are asking them to do medical research, we are asking them to train urgently needed manpower. So I do support Federal funds for private colleges as well as public—but I must say also to this House that unless an amendment is adopted that would specifically exclude Federal funds for chapels or for buildings where sectarian instruction is given or where religious worship is corried on, I cannot support this bill.

If I may direct one other question to the chairman of the committee, and this is in regard to loans under the second part of the bill: If I understand it correctly, the loans can be used for both graduate and undergraduate students; is that not correct?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true, yes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Is it not also true at the present time under the National Defense Education Act there have been several thousands of medical school students and dental students who have borrowed under the National Defense Education Act?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentlewoman is correct, but the average loan that has been received by medical students under that program is only in the amount of approximately $640.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. But they could borrow up to $1,000 but the average is just about $600 under the National Defense Education Act?

Mr. HARRIS. No, I believe not, because the NDEA provides that no institution may lawfully be granted more than $250,000 for the purpose of making loans to students, and because of that restriction, the size of loans to medical and dental students has obviously been reduced accordingly.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further, under NDEA, the ceiling for any one college or university is $250,000. But a student may borrow up to $1,000 in any 1 year. The Subcommittee on Education already has agreed to remove this $250,000 ceiling.

The loan limit for any individual student is $1,000 a year with a maximum of $5,000, and the subcommittee intends to increase this to $10,000 for graduate students.

I support an expanded loan program for students. I think it is desperately important to this country that we get more qualified students in our colleges and universities; but I would call the attention of my colleagues now to a couple of features in this particular bill that seem to me grossly unfair. In fact, it seems to me this section is a special privilege bill. If a student who is studying for medicine or dentistry under the H.R. 12 loan program borrows up to $10,000 and then practices medicine or dentistry in an area of need or in a public health agency he is forgiven up to 50 percent of the loan, which means $5,000. However, if the same student borrows under the National Defense Education Act he is not forgiven a single cent.

I also call the attention of the House that if an individual borrows up to $10,000——

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I think I may have misunderstood the gentlewoman, but in the case of a public school teacher who goes back and teaches in an elementary or secondary school, that teacher is forgiven at the rate of 10 percent of that loan a year up to 5 years under the present law.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I apparently did not make myself clear. I stated that if a student who is going into medicine or dentistry and borrows under H.R. 12 up to a maximum of $10,000, he is forgiven up to $5,000. If the same student who is studying for medicine or dentistry—not teaching—borrows the same amount under the National Defense Education Act he is not forgiven a single dime.

Now, let me turn to the question of teaching. The forgiveness provision for teachers was put in NDEA primarily because teachers are underpaid. There are literally thousands of teachers in this country who are receiving $5,000 a year. The Education Committee thought that this was far below what they should receive. On the other hand, do you know what the average salary of doctors is in this country? It is $19,000. Should we provide a $5,000 forgiveness feature for one of the highest paid professional groups in this country? Should we, in effect, give them up to a $5,000 scholarship—and other needy students not a dime in so-called forgiveness?

Let me point out a couple of other inadequacies or inequities.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield again?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. The cost of going to medical school is not in proportion to the cost of going to a regular university or college, is it?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If I may continue with a couple of other inequities that, it seems to me, are very apparent in this bill: If a nurse wants to go to graduate school, as the chairman indicated just a moment ago, she cannot borrow under this bill; she has to borrow under the NDEA. If the nurse goes into the Public Health Service or a Public Health Agency, or if she goes into a rural area, an area of need, she is not forgiven one single dime on her loan. I have yet to see a nurse who receives the same kind of salary a doctor receives. Are we going to say here that we will forgive the doctor up to $5,000 because he goes into an area of need and not provide any forgiveness for the nurse who goes into an area of need?

Then there is one other matter which I would like to call to your attention. And that is military service. I do not know whether the Armed Services Committee or the Veterans' Committee has considered this part of the bill, but if a doctor or dentist goes into the military service and he has borrowed up to $10,000 he receives a forgiveness of up to $5,000. What pay does he receive when he goes into the service? A doctor who goes into the service I am advised gets an initial salary of $415 a month, plus subsistence and plus quarters. So we say to the doctor, if you have borrowed up to $10,000 to go through college and you go into the military, we will forgive you half the loan, up to $5,000. But the buck private—the GI who borrowed under the NDEA to get a Ph. D. in history or to become a nuclear physicist or to specialize in some of the other sciences and goes into the military service, we do not forgive him one dime.

So the doctor, who becomes the commissioned officer and gets $415 a month is forgiven up to $5,000—but the GI who goes in at $84.50 a month is not forgiven one cent.

Is this justice? Is this fair? Or is this special privilege legislation?

To the nurse who has borrowed money—under National Defense Education Act—and goes into the military service—we also forgive not one red cent? Why the doctor and not the nurse?

May I ask the Members of this House: Is this the kind of legislation we want to pass; legislation that, it seems to me, could clearly be labeled as special privilege legislation; legislation that would give to one of the highest paid professions in the world what may amount to a $5,000 scholarship; and yet we would not forgive a dime to a nurse or we would not forgive a dime to a GI?

Let me say in conclusion, if amendments to take care of situations such as these can be adopted by the House, then I really would like to support this legislation. I know there is a crying need for doctors and for dentists, and all other trained personnel. We have today in our colleges about 4 million students. By 1970 we are going to have 7 million. We are going to have to find places for them. Instead of standing up on this floor and arguing about socialized medicine or about what the AMA stands for or what the AMA does not do or some of the other things that seem to me irrelevant, may I refer you to what Dr. David Henry, of the University of Illinois, said very succinctly:

> Debating Federal aid is dealing with a strawman—an irrelevant oversimplification. Instead, we should be asking the American people: "Do you want teachers in your classrooms, doctors at your bedside, lawyers in your courts, scientists in your laboratories? Are you in favor of having the Federal Government help in the war on cancer, and in the evolution and new ideas in the exploration of space?"

So I say to the chairman and the members of the committee I hope they will agree to some of these amendments. Otherwise, it will be difficult for some of us who would like to support the legislation to actually vote for it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want the RECORD to show that there are Members of this House who are acutely aware of that need without recognizing the Federal Government as the way to solve it. I think this shows once again failure of the liberal doctrine that we can bury everything with money. There are those of us who feel there are private means of doing that, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] pointed out on the floor when he said that this bill may ultimately destroy the very cure and hopes of those who would solve the problem of medical education. We say that the need can be met privately, without Federal aid.

I simply want the RECORD to show that I and many others do not believe we can solve it by throwing the Federal Government into this program.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Education and Labor and the subcommittee chaired by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has made a detailed study of the needs of higher education. In general, we found that academic facilities construction aid is of the highest priority. In fact, we found it to be an urgent necessity.

Many of us also felt that the Federal Government has assisted higher education for over a century and that the assistance we proposed is consistent with a well-defined Federal role in education. The needs of higher education are beyond dispute.

What I am concerned about is that by passing legislation such as H.R. 12, providing special assistance for the medical profession, calling this a health bill rather than an education bill, we may be setting a precedent for the further fragmentation of education legislation. The subcommittee on which I served, the Green subcommittee, has made a study of higher education and other education assistance provided by the Federal Government, and we found it extremely difficult to discover all the ways in which the Federal Government is assisting. There are so many Federal programs, conducted by so many agencies, that it becomes extremely difficult to even identify and classify all of them.

In the area of student assistance, it seems that rather than engage in further fragmenting of Federal education assistance, we ought to look at the overall financial needs of the students and to legislate on that basis. The House last year very clearly indicated that it was opposed to granting scholarships no matter what you call them. The program that we had before us last year, which was sent back to the committee of conference by a vote of 214 to 186—and I supported that legislation—provided for so-called nonreimbursable loans to aid students who were in need to help them go to school. Now, what do we have here? We have a loan program designed not just to help students, but to empower the Federal Government to direct them where they should go: into rural areas and into public service. It tells them to go into those areas. I think this is unreasonable and even dangerous. Parenthetically, 8 percent of our physicians already work for the Federal Government. I think that rather than adopt so questionable an approach the House ought to turn student assistance aid over to the Committee on Education and Labor and let us report a bill that is good, which is beneficial, and which is soundly based upon the demonstrated will of the House. Last year we learned that this House is opposed to Federal scholarship grants, whether they are called loan forgiveness or nonreimbursable loans or scholarships. Our committee is ready to take effective, well-considered action in the field of student aid and I would think for that reason we ought to support the amendment to remove the loan provision. We have in H.R. 12 a provision also for grants for academic facilities in medical schools. Last year the House passed a bill providing aid for all higher education academic facilities construction which would have permitted the institutions to choose which academic facilities were most needed. That bill was stymied by what people thought was a church-state issue. It was not. Right now this House finds that it is perfectly acceptable to provide grants to medical schools and dental schools that are church affiliated. I have a list which I will submit for the Record in which they provide for 11 dental schools and 13 medical schools church affiliated.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. In line with what the gentleman is talking about, if my memory serves me correctly—and I think it does—when we had that bill before the House last year to provide Federal assistance, what we might call brick and mortar for higher education, we included assistance for both public and private colleges and universities.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. And I also recall—and I am sure I am correct in this—that there was no discussion here, no dissension at all revolving around so-called private against public schools, because as I remember it the bill was so drafted as to avoid it. There was some discussion in the other body which was injected into the consideration that did raise that issue, but when the bill passed—will the gentleman remind me of the figures?

Mr. QUIE. When the measure passed the House, 319 to 79.

Mr. HALLECK. That was a very decisive vote and I, too, supported that bill. But, as I say, I think it is worthy of note when that measure was before the House of Representatives we did not have the difficulties that sometimes arise with respect to the treatment of public as against private insitutions.

Mr. QUIE. That is right. And I supported that legislation. I just want to point out—and I will list the schools in order that you might know—that we have not chosen to eliminate private institutions. Therefore, there need be no objection to a consideration of the urgent construction needs of the whole system of higher education in this Nation. It seems to me the wisest thing to do would be to substitute the bill we passed last year, H.R. 8900, in order to provide construction aid to any institution in the country for any medical or other academic facility that it badly needs to accommodate increases in its enrollment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like for the gentleman to tell the Committee the average cost for a youngster to go to medical school today.

Mr. QUIE. If the medical school students receive assistance under the National Defense Education Act they will get the same kind of assistance they would get here if we provided for increased loans of money.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Minnesota is an able scholar, and the gentleman knows the average cost of a medical student today. What is that cost? Tell the Committee.

Mr. QUIE. It depends upon the school they are going to attend, but I imagine something over $12,000 would be the cost of going to a medical school for 4 years.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will yield further, under this bill as I understand it we are trying to help the GI, the poor fellow, and if we close the doors to the youngster who is not able to go to school, then we will have defeated our purpose.

Mr. QUIE. This is a complete misconception of this bill. I will ask you who is one of the best paid men in any small community in your congressional district. Is it not the medical doctor? The medical doctor is likely to be the best paid man there. Look around over that community and ask who is best able to pay back his loan. The doctor is. Why should we be forgiving him a loan? How can we give 50-percent loan forgiveness to a doctor and not give it to everyone else? There is no reason whatsoever that we should do this.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Is it not true that the subcommittee that has under its jurisdiction the NDEA and 2 or 3 weeks ago was studying this loan provision that we had already agreed to recommend to the full committee, and to the House to remove the $250,000 ceiling first?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not also true that we had already agreed to recommend to the House that we would increase the total amount in the loan from $90 million to $140 million or $144 million—I have forgotten which—the first year, and then it goes up to $175 million?

Mr. QUIE. That is right; to provide for the needs as we see them and which would be apparent.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Is it not also true that we had also agreed that for a person who goes to graduate school, the same as under the NDEA, that he would either be able to borrow $1,500 or $2,000 and that this was the point in controversy when we postponed further meetings? But this was the only point, whether it should be $1,500 or $2,000, which would be the same provision as in this bill, except we did not specifically forgive the doctors and the dentists?

Mr. QUIE. That is true. That was the point that was about to be decided when the President brought it all to a halt and we got no further into the subject of vital legislation for higher education. In other words, under our proposal any graduate student could get the loan money. But here we are limited to medical and dental students and are saying that they should have special treatment and forgiveness. There is no reason whatsoever that this will not then be used as a precedent to give the grants to everyone else. There is no reason why this should ever be put into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12 and urge favorable action by the Congress in assisting medical education.

It is significant that there is universal support from such groups as American Medical Association and American Dental Association in recognizing the need for Federal assistance. Dr. Gerald Dorman, board member of AMA, in testifying before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee stated, "there does not seem to be any substitute to the support that the Federal Government can give." This was in the area of school construction, where $25 million will be authorized for 1964 under this bill.

An example of need on the local level comes from Dr. Edward J. Forrest, dean of the School of Dentistry at the University of Pittsburgh. He has written me:

> The School of Dentistry of the University of Pittsburgh is just one example where dental facilities are well below standard. Our clinical facilities are completely inadequate and classes must be alternated throughout the week. Currently, we have paper plans for a new outpatient clinic facility and for which no financial support has been made available.

Such support can and must be furnished if this deplorable situation is to be changed.

The AMA representative, Dr. Dorman, also expressed preference in the field of research grants, saying, "this is another area where we feel that we need the Federal help." It is only in the area of student loans that any division of opinion appears. However, only 1 member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee opposed the entire bill as reported out of the committee, while 21 from both parties voted for it. I think the $5 million authorized for student loans is the minimum amount which can be of any use and that after the States have divided up this "pie" there will be very thin slices indeed for the 87 medical schools in the United States to dispense. I know this will be a welcome supplement to other loan and grant funds already in effect at the university of Pittsburgh Medical School, which has reached the limits of resources in helping its 375 students. Direct aid from the university has risen almost 10 times the amount disbursed 4 or 5 years ago and I note that the Student American Medical Association there has gone on record in recognizing the need for Federal assistance.

Mr. Chairman, of all areas of higher education, the study of medicine is the longest and most expensive. Pittsburgh is fortunate in having such a fine medical school, but I note that Allegheny County is below the national metropolitan county average of 145 physicians per 100,000 of population. This bill should help to provide the extra medical care Pittsburghers all deserve and expect. The health of our citizens is certainly our No. 1 asset.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support H.R. 12 to increase the opportunities for training professional health personnel.

I take this position because I believe it to be a legitimate function of our Government to provide for the adequate medical and dental care of the American people.

It is my hope that if this measure is enacted, the young men and women who benefit from it and become the doctors and dentists of tomorrow will remember that their Federal Government has a responsibility in the area of the health of the American people. I hope that they will not raise the false cry of "socialism" in the future against congressional action to promote the health of the American people.

It seems to me that there is an unfortunate tendency on the part of many Americans to favor as wise and necessary those laws which help them, but to decry as "socialistic" those measures which help others.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time remaining on this side.

Mr. Chairman, we are about to conclude the debate on this most important legislation. In view of what has been said in the last few minutes let me say to the Members of the House that our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had no intention whatsoever of becoming involved in a jurisdictional dispute with another committee. We do not have such intention now. This bill was sent up in the usual way, as provided for by the rules of the House, by the department in the last Congress, and it was reintroduced this year. It was again referred to our committee.

Mr. Chairman, since 1798 matters involving public health have been under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. But the real question here, as has been said so well by the distinguished lady from Oregon [Mrs. Green] and so many others is how to meet the needs of the American people. That is the important thing.

The religious issue was raised heretofore, the question was never raised in the committee, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana. The question was never raised in the course of the hearings and in the several days when we considered the bill in executive session. There was no thought ever given to it; just as was the case with other health measures and just as it was with the hospital program which has been so successful throughout the years since 1946.

So far as the committee is concerned we felt that the language of the act meant what it said, that this was to assist in the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, and so forth; and insofar as dentists are concerned, the construction of new teaching facilities. It did not say for the construction of chapels and facilities for religious worship.

So when that question was raised by some who have some fear concerning this—and I do not—I directed the staff to prepare perfecting amendments which I propose to offer at the proper time in order to make it abundantly clear that there will be no such construction so far as this legislation is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963".

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Quie: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'College Academic and Health Professions Facilities Act'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the security and welfare of the United States require that this and future generations of American youth be assured ample opportunity for the fullest development of their intellectual capacities, and that this opportunity will be jeopardized unless the Nation's colleges and universities are encouraged and assisted in their efforts to accommodate rapidly growing numbers of youth who aspire to a higher education. The Congress further finds and declares that these needs are so great and these steps so urgent that it is incumbent upon the Nation to take positive and immediate action to meet these needs through assistance to institutions of higher education in providing classrooms and other academic facilities."

Mr. QUIE (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the substitute be dispensed with, that it be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I did not hear the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] asks unanimous consent that further reading of the substitute be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the request except that I should like to raise a point of order against the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may do that after the request of the gentleman from Minnesota is acted upon.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to take this opportunity to inquire of the chairman of the committee having this bill in charge and the majority leadership concerning their plans for further consideration of this bill this evening. I ask that question because a great many Members on my side have been asking me and I have been unable to tell them. As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] knows, I talked with him very informally a little bit ago. I might say to him my information is that there are numerous amendments that are to be offered before the bill can be finally brought to a conclusion. I understand likewise that there probably will be two rollcall votes. Under the circumstances, and I appreciate the dilemma of some of the people here, if we could have some information as to just how far we might expect to proceed this evening I think it would be very helpful. If this is not the propitious time to make that inquiry I shall withdraw it, but if we could be told, I think it would be very helpful.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should say if we could go along for another 30 or 40 minutes I think we could come to some definite conclusion. I have a feeling at this time that we will not be able to conclude today. I will say to the gentleman I would like to see how we get along with one or two major things within the next 30 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. May I suggest to the gentleman that unless it is fairly certain that we could conclude this evening I cannot see how very much could be gained by going on further. We have the rest of this week, as I understand, to dispose of this measure and one other measure that is of some significance, and certainly we want to dispose of them this week if we can.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KYL. Since this amendment is in the nature of a substitute, Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk continued the reading of the substitute amendment.

Mr. HARRIS (during the reading of the substitute amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, what is proposed to be done after this happens?

Mr. HARRIS. I propose to raise a point of order against the substitute amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman propose to go on into the night with this bill now?

Mr. HARRIS. No. It is the intention after this matter is disposed of and after discussing the situation with the leadership on both sides, it is contemplated that the Committee rise.

Mr. GROSS. That is after the point of order is made and ruled upon, then the Committee rises; is that the story?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; that is the intention.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART A—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 101. (a) In order to enable the Commissioner of Education (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commissioner") to make grants to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities in accordance with the provisions of this part A, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for the succeeding fiscal year, for making such grants the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for preceding fiscal years and the aggregate of the sums which were appropriated for such preceding years under such sentence.

(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 107 until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated.

Allotments to States

SEC. 102. (a) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 for any fiscal year (1) one-half shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-half as the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of students enrolled in such institutions in all the States; and (2) the remaining one-half shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of students enrolled in grades nine to twelve (both inclusive) of schools in such State bears to the total number of students in such grades in schools in all the States. For the purposes of this subsection, (A) the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education shall be deemed to be equal to the sum of (i) the number of full-time students and (ii) the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations; and (B) determinations as to enrollment under either clause (1) or clause (2) of this subsection shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data with respect to such enrollment are available to him.

(b) The amount of each allotment to a State under this section shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this part A, for payment of the Federal share (as determined under sections 106(b)(3) and 122(d)) of the development cost of approved projects for the construction of academic facilities within such State by institutions of higher education. Sums allotted to a State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 107 until the close of the next fiscal year, in addition to the sums allotted to such State for such next fiscal year.

(c) All amounts allotted under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for the succeeding fiscal year, which are not reserved as provided in section 107 by the close of the fiscal year for which they are allotted, shall be reallotted by the Commissioner, on the basis of such factors as he determines to be equitable and reasonable, among the States which, as determined by the Commissioner, are able to use without delay any amounts so reallotted. Amounts reallotted under this subsection shall be available for reservation until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were originally allotted.

State commissions and plans

SEC. 103. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this part A shall designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education in the State, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (hereafter in this part A referred to as the "State commission"), a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

(2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 105, objective standards and methods (A) for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects for the construction of academic facilities submitted by institutions of higher education within the State, and (B) for determining the Federal share of the development cost of each such project (unless such plan provides for a uniform Federal share for all such projects);

(3) provides (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible projects submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part A; and (B) for approving and recommending to the Commissioner, in the order of such priority, applications covering such eligible projects, and for certifying to the Commissioner the Federal share, determined by the State commission under the State plan, of the development cost of the project involved;

(4) provides for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the commission as to the priority assigned to such project or as to any other determination of the commission adversely affecting such applicant; and

(5) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this part A, and (B) for making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part A.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to expend not exceeding $3,000,000 during each of the first two fiscal years of the program under this part A in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this part A, including expenses which he determines were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

Eligibility for grants

SEC. 104. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this part A only if such construction will, either alone or together with other construction to be undertaken within a reasonable time, (1) result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity, or (2) in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating urgently needed enrollment capacity.

Basic criteria for determining priorities and Federal share

SEC. 105. (a) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible construction projects, and the application of such standards and methods to such projects under such plans, shall be subject. Such basic criteria (1) shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part A while leaving opportunity and flexibility for the development of State plan standards and methods that will best accommodate the varied needs of institutions in the several States, and (2) shall give special consideration to expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity. Subject to the foregoing requirements, such regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria, including provision for considering the degree to which applicant institutions are effectively utilizing existing facilities, provision for allowing State plans to group or provide for grouping, in a reasonable manner, facilities or institutions according to functional or educational type for priority purposes, and, in view of the national objectives of this Act, provision for considering the degree to which the institution serves students from two or more States or from outside the United States; and in no event shall an institution's readiness to admit such out-of-State students be considered as a priority factor adverse to such institution.

(b) The Commissioner shall further prescribe by regulation the basic criteria for determining the Federal share of the development cost of any eligible project under this part A within a State, to which criteria the applicable standards and methods set forth in the State plan for such State shall conform in the absence of a uniform statewide Federal share specified in or pursuant to such plan. The Federal share shall in no event exceed 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of a project covered by an application approved under this part A.

Applications for grants and conditions for approval

SEC. 106. (a) Institutions of higher education which desire to obtain grants under this part A shall submit applications therefor at such time or times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, and such applications shall contain such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make the determinations required to be made by him under this part A.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application covering a project for construction of an academic facility and meeting the requirements prescribed pursuant to subsection (a) if—

(1) the project is an eligible project as determined under section 104;

(2) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission;

(3) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, the Federal share of the development cost of the project, and sufficient funds to pay such Federal share are available from the applicable allotment of the State (including any applicable reallotment to the State);

(4) the project has, pursuant to the State plan, been assigned a priority that is higher than that of all other projects within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section (other than this clause) and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved;

(5) the Commissioner determines that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials; and

(6) the Commissioner determines that (in addition to the assurance required by section 121 and such assurance as to title to the site as he may deem necessary) the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances—

(A) that Federal funds received by the applicant will be used solely for defraying the development cost of the project covered by such application,

(B) that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal portion of such cost and to provide for the effective use of the academic facility upon completion, and

(C) that the facility will be used as an academic facility during at least the period of the Federal interest therein (as defined in section 108).

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

Amount of grant payment

SEC. 107. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this part A, the Commissioner shall reserve from the applicable allotment (including any applicable reallotment) available therefor, the amount of such grant, which (subject to the limits of such allotment or reallotment) shall be equal to the Federal share (ascertained by him under section 106(b) (3)) of the development cost of the project covered by such application. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application covering such project or upon revision of the estimated development cost of a project with respect to which such reservation was made, and in the event of an upward revision of such estimated cost approved by him he may reserve the Federal share of the added cost only from the applicable allotment (or reallotment) available at the time of such approval.

Recovery of payments

SEC. 108. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that, if a facility constructed with the aid of a grant or grants under this part A is used as an academic facility for twenty years following completion of such construction, the public benefit accruing to the United States from such use will equal or exceed in value the amount of such grant or grants. The period of twenty years after completion of such construction shall therefore be deemed to be the period of Federal interest in such facility for the purposes of this part A.

(b) If, within twenty years after completion of construction of an academic facility which has been constructed in part with a grant or grants under this part A—

(1) the applicant (or its successor in title or possession) ceases or fails to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

(2) the facility ceases to be used as an academic facility, or the facility is used as a facility excluded from the term "academic facility" by section 122(a) (2), unless the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for waiving the application of this paragraph to such facility or use,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from such applicant (or successor) an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project or projects) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal grant or grants bore to the development cost of the facility financed with the aid of such grant or grants: *Provided*, That the authority to waive the application of paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not apply to any case in which a facility (A) is used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship or (B), although not used for a purpose described in clause (A), is used primarily for any part of a program of a school of divinity (as defined in section 122(a)(2)). Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated.

Administration of State plans

SEC. 109. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part A, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this part A, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 103(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this part A until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Judicial review

SEC. 110. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this part A, or with respect to his final action under section 109(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located, a petition for review of such action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissoner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in subsection (a) of this section, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

PART B—LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Lending authority

SEC. 111. The Commissioner may, in accordance with the provisions of this part B, make loans to institutions of higher education or to higher education building agencies for construction of academic facilities.

Loan limit for any State

SEC. 112. Not more than 12½ per centum of the funds provided for in this part B in the form of loans shall be used for loans to institutions of higher education or higher education building agencies within any one State.

Eligibility conditions, amounts, and terms of loans

SEC 113. (a) No loan pursuant to this part B shall be made unless the Commissioner finds (1) that not less than one-fourth of the development cost of the facility will be financed from non-Federal sources, (2) that the applicant is unable to secure the amount of such loan from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this part B, and (3) that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

(b) A loan pursuant to this part B shall be secured in such manner, and shall be repaid within such period not exceeding fifty years, as may be determined by the Commissioner; and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner which shall not be more than the higher of (1) 2¾ per centum per annum, or (2) a per annum rate that is one quarter of 1 percentage point above the rate of interest paid by the Commissioner on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (d) of this section.

(c) In order to enable the Commissioner of Education to make loans to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities in accordance with the provisions of this part B, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for the succeeding fiscal year, for making such grants the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for preceding fiscal years and the aggregate of the same which were appropriated for such preceding years under such sentence.

General provisions for loan program

SEC. 114. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this part B the Commissioner, not notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall—

(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

(2) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Commissioner as the making of loans and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

(b) (1) Funds made available to the Commissioner pursuant to the provisions of this part B shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Commissioner in connection with the performance of his functions under this part B, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Commissioner under this part B (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized), shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Commissioner in connection with the performance of such functions.

(2) The Commissioner is authorized (A) to prescribe a schedule of fees which, in his judgment, would be adequate in the aggregate to cover necessary expenses of making inspections (including audits) and providing representatives at the site of projects in connection with loans under this part B, and (B) to condition the making of such loans on agreement by the applicant to pay such fees; and, if such fees are prescribed, the Commissioner's expenses for such purposes shall be considered nonadministrative. For the purpose of providing such services, the Commissioner may, as authorized by section 123(b), utilize any agency, and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such applicant or from the Commissioner, and shall, if a Federal agency, credit such amounts to the appropriation or fund against which expenditures by such agency for such services have been charged.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this part B, the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part B;

(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this part B without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in such office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this part B from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

(3) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any property in connection with which he had made a loan pursuant to this part B; and, in the event of any such acquisition (and notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States), complete, administer, remodel and convert, dispose of, lease, and otherwise deal with, such property: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local laws of the inhabitants on such property;

(4) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any real property so acquired or owned;

(5) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix;

(6) obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;

(7) subject to the specific limitations in this part B, consent to the modification, with respect to the rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other term of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this section; and

(8) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this part B such other covenants, conditions, or provisions (including provisions designed to assure against use of the facility, constructed with the aid of a loan under this part B, for purposes described in section 122(a) (2) as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this part B will be achieved.

PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR LOAN AND GRANT PROGRAMS

Labor standards

SEC. 121. (a) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a grant or loan under this Act except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction assisted by such grant or loan will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be; but, in the case of any nonprofit educational institution, the Commissioner may waive the application of this subsection in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the Commissioner determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the educational institution undertaking the construction.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Definitions

SEC. 122. As used in this Act—

(a) (1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, the term "academic facilities" means structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities necessary or appropriate for instruction of students, or for research, or for administration of the educational or research programs, of an institution of higher education, and maintenance, storage, or utility facilities essential to operation of the foregoing facilities.

(2) The term "academic facilities" shall not include (A) any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public, or any gymnasium or other facility specially designed for physical education or athletic or recreational activities, or (B) any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or (C) any facility which (although not a facility described in the preceding clause) is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

(b) (1) The term "construction" means (A) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of initial equipment therefor; or (B) acquisition of existing structures not owned by the institution involved; or (C) rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement (including the acquisition and installation of initial equipment, or modernization or replacement of built-in equipment) of existing structures; or (D) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

(2) The term "equipment" includes, in addition to machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as an academic facility, including necessary furniture, except books and except items of current operating expense such as fuel, supplies, and the like; the term "initial equipment" means equipment acquired and installed in connection with construction as defined in paragraph (1) (A) or (B) of this subsection or, in cases referred to in paragraph (1) (C), equipment acquired and installed as part of the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of an existing structure which structure would otherwise not be adequate for use as an academic facility; and the terms "equipment", "initial equipment", and "built-in equipment" shall be more particularly defined by the Commissioner by regulation.

(c) The term "development cost", with respect to an academic facility, means the amount found by the Commissioner to be the cost, to the applicant for a grant or loan under this Act, of the construction involved and the cost of necessary acquisition of the land on which the facility is located and of necessary site improvements to permit its use for such facility, but excluding any cost incurred before, or under a contract entered into before, the enactment of this Act. There shall further be excluded from the development cost—

(1) in determining the amount of any grant under this Act, an amount equal to the sum of (A) any Federal grant which the institution has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, under any law other than this Act, with respect to the construction that is to be financed with the aid of a grant under this Act, and (B) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant; and

(2) in determining the amount of any loan under this Act, an amount equal to the amount of any Federal financial assistance

which the institution has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, under any law other than this Act, with respect to the construction that is to be financed with the aid of a loan under this Act.

(d) The term "Federal share" means a percentage (as determined under the applicable State plan) not in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of a project covered by an application for a grant for the construction of an academic facility under part A of this Act.

(e) The term "higher education building agency" means (1) an agency, public authority, or other instrumentality of a State authorized to provide, or finance the construction of, academic facilities for institutions of higher education (whether or not also authorized to provide or finance other facilities for such or other educational institutions, or for their students or faculty), or (2) any corporation (no part of the net earnings of which inures or may lawfully inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual) (A) established by an institution of higher education for the purpose of providing academic facilities for the use of such institution, and (B) upon dissolution of which all title to any property purchased or built from the proceeds of any loan made under part B of this Act will pass to such institution.

(f) The term "institution of higher education" means a public or other nonprofit educational institution in any State which—

(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

(3) provides an educational program for which it awards at least a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree; and

(4) is accredited by a nationally organized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited: *Provided, however*, That the requirements of this paragraph (4) shall be deemed to be satisfied in the case of an institution applying for assistance under this Act, if the Commissioner determines that there is satisfactory assurance that upon completion of the project for which such assistance is requested, or upon completion of that project and others under construction or planned and to be commenced within a reasonable time, the institution will meet such requirements. For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

(g) The term "high school" does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

(h) The term "nonprofit educational institution" means an educational institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(i) The term "public educational institution" does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

(j) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Federal administration

SEC. 123. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

(c) The Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may appoint one or more advisory committees to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to the administration of any of his functions under this Act. Members of any such committee, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare but not to exceed $75 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. The provisions of section 1003 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 shall apply to members of such committees.

Method of payment

SEC. 124. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant or loan may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Administrative appropriations authorized

SEC. 125. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act, including the cost of payments for the administrative expenses of State commissions.

Prohibition against Federal control

SEC. 126. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. I reserve the point of order as I understand the gentleman from Minnesota would like to have 5 minutes.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] reserves the point of order against the substitute amendment and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this substitute for the purpose of bringing before the House the higher education academic facilities bill which the House passed last year. At that time it had the number, H.R. 8900. The House by a vote of 319 to 79 indicated its position that the Federal Government ought to make available $180 million a year in the form of grants and $120 million a year in the form of loans to assist in the construction of academic facilities in our colleges and universities in order that the rapidly increasing enrollment might be cared for. It is estimated today that 4.2 million students are enrolled in our colleges and universities. In 1970 this will grow to 7 million. By the fall of 1965, that is about a year and a half from now, one-fourth of this enormous increase will have occurred. Those estimates are conservative. They are based on the same percentage of high school graduates going on to higher education in these future years as presently do. The estimates that have been made in the past have always been low because every year a greater proportion of students go on to higher education. We have studied this in our subcommittee and in the committee and this was the basis for the historic vote in the House of Representatives last year. The House realizes that in education, considering all education legislation proposed to the Congress this year, the highest priority in terms of urgent national interest is for higher education academic facilities construction aid. Also looking at the question of Federal assistance to education, I share the views of those who are opposed to general Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, because I feel this is the responsibility of State and local governments. They can accept this responsibility and handle it better than the Federal Government can. However, in higher education I feel that there is definitely a Federal responsibility, which began to be exercised with the Land-Grant College Act of 1862 and has continued since then. A principal reason for this distinction is that there is no political subdivision which has a basic responsibility for higher education, as there is for elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand this substitute bill which the gentleman has offered is identical in terms with the bill that was passed by the House of Representatives last year?

Mr. QUIE. Yes. This is identical with the one that was passed last year as far as medical, dental, and other schools of medicine and health are concerned. They are included in this bill. There are a few technical changes, such as limiting the duration to 3 years to conform with H.R. 12 in that respect.

Mr. HALLECK. In other words, what the gentleman is attempting to do is to provide in this substitute the terms of the bill passed last year for the measure presently before us.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct, yes. We worked this out last year and determined the way they wanted it. In the matter of priority it lets the college and the State commission decide which is of the greatest priority, what is of the greatest need. We cannot say that the medical profession is in the greatest need and should be handled separately and apart from all other fields of higher education. The fact is that there are several disciplines in higher education that appear to need aid more than the medical profession.

To pass this bill in its present form would amount to a further fragmenting of assistance to all education, for we do not know now what the need may be in future years or what separate program will be offered in any particular area of education. If we are going to legislate responsibly this ought to be put in one place, under the Commissioner of Education. That is the way this type of legislation should be handled. I think this is the way we ought to operate.

I am sorry that the House procedure is such that the Chair might rule that this is not germane, because I feel that there is no area of government where we can adopt a new program which has as great priority as the substitute which I am offering today. I think we ought to exercise every effort we possibly can in order to enact it.

I was greatly disappointed when the subcommittee on which I am privileged to serve was about to report out a bill similar to this with the support of Democrats and Republicans on this subcommittee, but they did not do so because the administration apparently did not want it to go any further. The administration wants to lump the demonstrated and critical needs of higher education with all kinds of less urgent, less important—and even very dubious—proposals in an omnibus bill which they know cannot be enacted. If they are at all serious about having omnibus legislation it seem peculiar to me they support H.R. 12, a separate higher education bill. They want to take the rest of higher education and put it in with the elementary and secondary school bill and many other extraneous proposals. I will point out that we will have a separate rule on the National Science Foundation and other educational facilities. I think that the administration strategy—if one can call it that—is most unwise and damaging to the national interest.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. I raise a point of order against the substitute. It is not germane to the bill under consideration. The proposed substitute goes far beyond the purposes and intent of the matter we have before us. The bill we have before us would provide for training of physicians, dentists, and professional Public Health personnel. It would amend the Public Health Service Act.

The proposed substitute is much broader. It would broaden the administration. The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to carry out the program, whereas under the committee bill the Surgeon General is directed to carry it out.

I therefore submit that the amendment is not germane and that the point of order should lie.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on the point of order.

The substitute which I have offered is an education bill, but the bill which we have before us also is an education bill, because it also provides for the construction of academic facilities. Also the bill which we are considering, H.R. 12, refers to the National Defense Education Act and the loans that are provided by that act. I feel that is definitely education legislation. It is what we are considering in the Committee on Education and Labor, although just a part of it.

For that reason I feel that my substitute bill is germane because it is expanded to take in the area that is left out in H.R. 12.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill. The pending bill, H.R. 12, is a bill which has for its objective the training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, subjects which are within the jurisdiction of the committee to which the pending bill was referred and from which it was reported.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute is on examination a bill that covers a much wider, broader school of academic training of all kinds. It, therefore, is a bill that more properly should have come from another equal and coordinate standing committee, the Committee on Education and Labor.

In view of the statements made by the gentleman from Arkansas, who supports his point of order, the Chair has come to the conclusion that the point of order is well taken and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 12 which provides for training facilities for schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, pharmacy, nursing, and public health. We are long overdue in granting assistance to the health professions of our country.

It has been estimated by the Public Health Service that in order to maintain the present physician-population ratio, the expected 1975 population of 235 million will require a total of 330,000 doctors of medicine and osteopathy. This will necessitate an annual graduation of 11,000 students—an increase of approximately 3,600 over the present number graduating each year—"Physicians for a Growing America," report of the Surgeon General's Consultant group on Medical Education, U.S. Department of Health Education, and Welfare, October 1959, page 13. Furthermore, this 30-percent increase in medical graduates is only a minimum goal. In the years ahead the need for physicians will be stimulated by the increased use of medical services due to growth of urbanization and widespread participation in health insurance plan. Moreover, the percentage of our population over the age of 65 continues to grow; this group will also create additional demands for medical care. In short, we must greatly increase the number of medical graduates in order to maintain the present doctor-patient ratio; to meet the increased demands we can expect, we must think in terms not only of maintaining the ratio but of improving it.

According to the report of the Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Medical Education, if we are to meet even our minimum goal, the present medical school facilities must be increased substantially, and new schools must be established. This bill will help accomplish both of these objectives.

New York State is proud and fortunate to have nine fine medical schools—six of which are in New York City. All of these schools are excellent; they boast outstanding faculties and high quality teaching hospitals. They are presently graduating over 900 young doctors per year, more than any other State. We will have to do better than this, however, if we are to be able to meet our future demands for medical care. H.R. 12 will make it possible for medical schools to expand and rehabilitate existing facilities in order to be able to train additional students. Clearly, this legislation will be of tremendous value to the medical schools of my State, to the young men and women who will train there, and to the citizens of New York who will ultimately benefit from the increased supply of well-trained doctors.

Another area in which H.R. 12 will be of great assistance to New York is that of professional public health. Columbia University has one of this country's outstanding schools of public health, yet according to the executive director of the School of Public Health, Ray E. Trussell, in testimony presented to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during hearings last year, its physical facilities are "severely limited." The dean's report continued as follows:

> The last full professor appointed to the faculty was placed in an office 7½ feet wide constructed by closing off the last corridor possible under the fire laws. The acquisition of additional facilities is absolutely necessary if we are to increase our enrollment. Our classrooms are so crowded now that at times the regular faculty member in charge of the class has to sit in the doorway if we have a visiting lecturer.

The work of our public health personnel is vitally important to all of us. Through their vigilance we are protected against contaminated food and water, against epidemics of dreaded diseases, industrial hazards, air pollution, and so forth. If we are to continue to enjoy this protection, we must greatly increase the number of public health personnel graduated each year. A conference committee called by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1958 reported that there were more than 2,500 vacancies which could not be filled because of lack of trained personnel. Moreover, at least 20,000 of our present public health officers are inadequately trained for their jobs. The committee estimated that 6,100 more public health workers would be needed to meet the demands of an increased population by 1963. We have not begun to approach the point of meeting these needs, let alone planning for the even greater number of public health personnel who will be needed as our country continues to grow in the next few decades. H.R. 12 will help to meet this urgent need.

Although it would be possible to go on at length citing statistics to show the needs of all the various health professions for the aid provided by this bill, I should like to call your attention to only two other figures. The first of these is in the field of dentistry. According to the American Council on Education's Commission for a Survey of Dentistry, the present ratio of dentists to population is sufficient to provide only one-third of the population with comprehensive dental care. Furthermore, the supply of new dentists is not keeping pace with the increase in population. The commission has recommended that new schools be constructed and existing facilities be expanded to provide for the increased number of dental students who must be recruited. In dentistry, as in medicine, government aid in meeting these construction costs is essential.

The State of New York has 3 of this country's 46 dental schools. We are proud of this fact, but we need still more. We also need to expand our present schools. H.R. 12 can be of great assistance to my State and to the Nation in helping to meet this critical shortage.

We are all aware of the serious shortage of trained nurses confronting this country. Especially serious is the shortage of nurses holding academic degrees who are thus qualified as teachers and administrators. At the present time only 7 percent of the employed professional nurses in this country have baccalaureate degrees and less than 2 percent hold master's degrees. If our future nurses are to be well trained and our hospitals efficiently operated, we must have a great many more professional nurses with college training. For this reason I am pleased that the bill before us defines "school of nursing" as a school, division, or administrative unit within a college or university which grants baccalaureate and graduate degrees in nursing.

While I have spoken at length of the desirability of the provisions of this bill for construction of facilities, I have not lost sight of the provisions for student loans, another excellent feature of the bill. These loans are an extremely important aspect of the proposed program to improve medical education. The cost of any type of medical education is extremely high, certainly higher than the average cost of other graduate and professional training. The Federal Government presently has no program of scholarship or loan aid to medical students that in any way compares with the assistance given to other graduate students through the National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, and others. It is little wonder that young men and women who must depend upon scholarships and loans to finance their educations often choose to take a graduate degree in chemistry or one of the other sciences where financial help is more easily obtainable rather than to embark upon a long and difficult preparation in the field of medicine or dentistry.

Another factor to be considered here is the possibility of drawing more young men and women from low-income families into the medical professions. Under existing conditions a medical education is an impossibility for many of these young people. One-fifth of the present medical students come from families with incomes of less than $5,000. There are undoubtedly many young men and women from such families who are capable of meeting the academic challenges of medical or dental school if we could make it financially possible for them to enter these schools. We would be doing a service not only to these students but to the Nation as well by helping to meet our overwhelming demands for more trained personnel in every one of the health professions.

Considerable thought and effort has been spent on the provisions of the student loan program, and I believe we now have before us a program that is well suited to the needs of our medical and dental students. I am referring to the fact that a 3-year period is established following the completion of academic training before repayment must begin. This is desirable because of the internship and residency period following medical school during which the new doctor receives very little compensation. Another feature which makes this loan program more satisfactory than the national defense student loan program from the standpoint of medical and dental students is that the limits are considerably higher. The $2,500 annual limit is much more in keeping with the financial needs of medical and dental students than is the $1,000 figure set under the National Defense Education Act program.

I believe that by passing this bill we would be acting in the best interest of our country. Let us work toward the goal of providing facilities and training for all of our capable young men and women so that they may serve society to the fullest.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us today is one of the most farsighted and constructive measures to maintain and improve the health of our Nation that has ever come before the Congress.

In brief, H.R. 12 provides a 3-year program of matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, osteopathic, and professional public health personnel as well as for pharamcists, optometrists, podiatrists, and nurses. Also, the bill makes provision for a 3-year program of loans for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

It is vitally important that the House enact this measure today. President Kennedy, in his health message of February 7, stressed the great need which exists for more highly trained professional health personnel. He also pointed out the necessity of upgrading the health efforts of our country in all aspects. The first recommendations he made in that message—those concerning the training of professional health personnel—are incorporated in the bill which we are considering this afternoon.

Ample figures are in evidence to support the contention that there is a serious shortage of doctors, dentists, nurses, and professional health workers. In a nation that has made such great strides in the conquest of disease and in the general improvement of health services, such a shortage is inexcusable. The passage of H.R. 12 by Congress would make possible more and better schools for the education of doctors, dentists, and other health personnel. It would also enable many more students to enter medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy by reason of the provision for student loans.

My State of Rhode Island would derive significant benefits from this bill. To give one example, the new school of research medicine at Brown University would be greatly aided in its development by the enactment of H.R. 12.

We cannot afford further delay in providing for the present and future health protection of our fellow citizens. The action we take today will determine how well these needs are met in the years to come.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, occasionally, throughout the history of this legislative body, its Members are presented with opportunities to demonstrate to the American people that it is closely attuned to their best interests. I would like to speak for a few minutes about such an opportunity.

Today, a bill, conceived out of a concern for the health needs of our citizens, developed and remolded throughout the deliberations of two Congresses, and processed—with amputation of some of its parts—through two committees in the present Congress, now awaits delivery from legislative limbo.

I refer to H.R. 12, a proposal designed to alleviate our Nation's critical shortage of physicians, dentists and other professional health personnel by providing for a 3-year, $175 million program of matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, and other health personnel, and for a 3-year, $30 million program of loans for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

The provisions of this bill are carefully designed to avoid duplication with any other existing or future programs in which schools or individuals under the purview of H.R. 12 may qualify for other Federal funds.

Behind this bill stand hours of careful deliberation, weeks of consideration by various committees, and years of procrastination.

The factors that have created the need for this legislation have been enumerated time and time again by me, my colleagues, experts from many professional disciplines, and numerous health organizations.

We have nodded in agreement with reports that 5 full years ago urged immediate steps to increase the Nation's output of physicians and dentists. We have pointed to the need for more nurses, public health personnel, osteopaths, optometrists, pharmacists, and other health personnel. We have emphasized the special needs of rural communities, one-third of which have more than 2,000 people per physician, twice the number considered satisfactory according to our health standards. We have said that 14 States have no 4-year medical schools and 24 States have no dental schools. We have warned that we are seriously jeopardizing the great investments that we have made in medical research and health facilities by not training enough doctors and dentists to make full use of existing medical knowledge.

With regard to the financing of medical education, we have cited the almost prohibitive costs and financial problems that face aspiring young doctors and dentists—problems far more acute than those faced by aspirants to other professions. We have testified about these needs, and we have proposed many bills to alleviate these needs—but the only thing that we have passed is time.

Many of the bills that have been proposed have gone further than the present legislation to meet our health personnel problems. I myself have introduced before this assembly four separate bills. One proposed a program of Federal funds to assist in the construction of medical and dental schools; one proposed a system of scholarships for medical and dental students; and one proposed assistance to medical and dental schools in meeting their operating expenses. The fourth was an amendment to the National Defense Education Act whereby loans made to medical and dental students would be forgiven under certain conditions.

Even though I believe that we should go much further than the provisions of H.R. 12, pragmatic considerations dictate that we do what we can. Even though H.R. 12 has been reduced from a 10-year to a 3-year program, even though it offers loans instead of scholarships, even though the funds which are being authorized are considerably less than was originally proposed, it represents a beginning.

Having emerged into the realm of political possibility, this bill, I feel, should be regarded not from the standpoint of partisan politics, but from the standpoint of the health needs of our people.

Let us not add one more partisan hurdle to the long and rocky road over which this bill has traveled. Let us rather act as men and women entrusted with a decisionmaking power that can either shortsightedly weaken our Nation by endangering its health, or can wisely recognize and enact long-range solutions to one of the most serious problems besetting us today. Presented with an opportunity to act, let us act now.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, my home community of San Diego County will be well served by passage of the bill under consideration. Testimony before the committee disclosed that construction grants available under H.R. 12 might hasten by 2 years the completion of a medical school in conjunction with the University of California's San Diego campus. This, in turn, can mean an earlier start on the Veterans' Administration hospital sorely needed there.

By taking a purely parochial view, it would be possible for me to support this measure without its other main feature, the liberal student-loan program with which it is hoped to attract young people into medical training, and to encourage them to enter rural and other fields where the need is greatest.

But this legislation, on which I heard most of the testimony offered in committee, must accomplish both objectives—the construction of more medical and dental schools, and assistance to students from income levels which now make it so difficult to complete the long, expensive years required for medical or dental training.

Some Members apparently understand the need for "bricks and mortar," but cringe from the human side of this bill. We may respect their right to disagree, but I wish they would stop referring to what the House did with similar legislation last year. Some 67 of us were not Members of that earlier Congress, and do not wish to be saddled with its mistakes.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, based on the record made here, it is clearly established that there is a need for construction of additional medical training facilities. Accordingly, I shall give my support to the construction phase of this bill.

On the other hand, the need for the Government loan program in the amount of $30 million has not only failed of proof, but I submit that it has been clearly demonstrated that such a program is not the answer.

Many of those in the medical profession with whom I have discussed this important bill advised me there is presently adequate money in the American Medical Association's loan program to meet the needs of deserving students. I understand, further, that this fund was established by private contributions from the doctors themselves as well as various pharmaceutical companies. This private effort should be applauded by each of us.

Mr. Chairman, let us provide the necessary facilities for training students in the various health professions, but we should not enter a field of making Government loans to medical students where the need for assistance is totally lacking in proof.

Not only is this an unnecessary expenditure of more than $30 million, but the medical students themselves, those who would presumably benefit from this new program, have stated through the Student American Medical Association that the need for loans has been met without additional Federal funds.

Actually, this is not a student loan program, but in reality is a grant program. That contention is supported by the fact that the Surgeon General of the United States is empowered within this measure to forgive the loans of up to $5,000 for those medical students practicing in particular areas. It is irreconcilable for us to have these so-called loans forgiven for medical students when such a feature is not available to other students who have made loans from the national defense education fund in the pursuit of their chosen vocation.

Then, too, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, this new loan proposal is repugnant to one of my basic beliefs—namely, that the Government should not interfere in any field where private citizens are adequately meeting a need. Instead of competing with or disrupting such private endeavors the Government should encourage them, and I feel that to be our responsibility as representatives of the people.

I believe the construction phase of this health program is a logical and necessary sequel to the long established and well utilized Hill-Burton Act. With Hill-Burton funds we have both expanded and renovated hundreds of hospital facilities throughout our respective districts and the Nation, but facilities alone do not provide the answer to proper medical care.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, may I commend the American Medical Association and the American Dental Association for joining us in the support of the construction aspect of this bill to the end that the American citizens may receive adequate and competent medical attention. The serious shortage of doctors throughout our Nation and particularly in South Carolina is not attributable to a lack of available loans for students but is due to a lack of adequate medical teaching facilities.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, nurses, and professional public health personnel. I am against any amendment to strike out the student loan provisions which would be of assistance to students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

This legislation proposes a 3-year program designed to alleviate critical shortages of professional health personnel which already have begun to affect the level and quality of health care in this Nation. These shortages threaten to become worse during the next decades unless immediate steps are taken to increase the supply of professional health personnel. In order to accomplish these objectives, the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reporting this legislation recommends and provides for in this bill: first, a 3-year program of matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, osteopathic, and professional public health personnel as well as for pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, and nurses; second, a 3-year program of loans for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

URBANIZATION AND HEALTH PROBLEMS

Mr. Chairman, Disraeli once said:

> The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a state depend.

We as a nation have long recognized this to be true and have therefore worked diligently to reduce infant mortality, to wipe out communicable diseases, to increase life expectancy, to rehabilitate the handicapped, and in every way possible to provide for a long, happy, healthy life for each one of us. We can well be proud of the progress we have made in this country; however, challenges still confront us—challenges that demand our best efforts during the next few years if we are even to maintain our present standards of medical care, let alone improve them.

As President Kennedy points out in his health message to the Congress:

> More people than ever before are in those vulnerable age groups—the very young and the very old—which need the greatest amount of health services.

The President also commented on the health problems attendant on increased urbanization. He said:

> More people are living in huge metropolitan and industrial complexes, where they face a host of new problems in achieving safety even in the common environmental elements of food, water, land, and air.

The need for more doctors, dentists, and nurses to care for our growing population, especially the very young and the aged, and the need for trained public health personnel to combat the problems of urbanization should be very clear.

The Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Medical Education has reported that our population is growing faster than our supply of physicians and that if we are to be able to meet the demands for medical care in the 1970's, we must increase our annual medical school graduation figure from 8,000 to 11,000. We cannot do this without enlarging and improving existing facilities and building new ones. According to the testimony of the American Medical Association before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on H.R. 12, an increase in the number of medical students and graduates without regard to the need for new and more adequate facilities will result in a lowering of the quality of medical care. H.R. 12 will help to provide these badly needed teaching facilities through its matching grants program.

LOAN PROVISION NECESSARY

H.R. 12 will help meet the needs for more doctors and dentists in another way—through its loan provisions. At the present time many bright students are discouraged from entering these professions because of the cost of training as compared to other scientific fields which are not only less expensive but which also offer considerable scholarship assistance from both Federal and non-Federal sources. The only loan program now available to the health professions is the National Defense Education Act which is unsuitable because of the $5,000 limit on the loan and the repayment provisions. H.R. 12 includes a loan program which is much better suited to the needs of medical students because of its higher limits and because it allows a 3-year period of grace rather than only 1 year—a factor that is quite important to a medical graduate who has a year of internship plus 2 or 3 years of residency ahead of him.

In his health message the President emphasized the need for a 25-percent increase in the supply of nursing personnel by 1970. This will require a major expansion of both collegiate and hospital programs of nursing education. The President believes that the schools themselves are unable to bear the tremendous financial burden an expansion of this size would impose. Therefore, Federal assistance is a necessity if our goal is to be met. H.R. 12 will aid in construction of these new teaching facilities and will also provide financial assistance to students to enable many young women who now cannot afford an education beyond high school to obtain a nursing degree.

An increased supply of well-trained health personnel means better medical care, expanded research efforts, and improved health services for all of us. If, as Disraeli said, the power of the Nation depends on the health of the people, the H.R. 12 offers great benefits to our country. Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this very important measure.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, in assessing the merits of H.R. 12, which is the Health Professions Educational Act, for the State of California, one must review the position of this State in relation to medical education and the need for new members in the medical profession.

The intent of H.R. 12 is to provide in a 3-year program, money for both a loan and grant program for construction of facilities in colleges and universities, for teaching medicine and its like professions, and a program for loans and grants to students who will be attending such colleges and universities for medical training or training in the allied professions.

California has not only its own interest in this matter, but it must be recalled that our universities and colleges at the graduate level have been providing substantially all the readily available facilities for Arizona, Nevada, Wyoming, and Utah. The over commitment of our existing facilities and the under production for the needs of the growing West for adequate professional medical care is dramatically set forth in a recent letter sent to me by the president of the University of California, the text of which follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, Calif., April 17, 1963.

Hon. RICHARD T. HANNA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANNA: Last year when H.R. 4999, the medical aid bill, was under consideration by Congress I sent a communication to California's Representatives and Senators urging close consideration of the measure and support of its major provisions as a matter of great importance to the State. I would like to assure you that the comments I made then apply with equal force to the current proposal in this area, H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963.

Any State which is obliged to import 80 percent of the physicians it needs and 50 percent of the dentists it needs to offer minimum standard services to its people is in a precarious position. That is the case in California at present. Furthermore, the best population forecasts we can get indicate that we must spend upward of $300 million in the next 10 years on medical and dental training facilities, public and private, to keep up with the growing demand and decrease this dependence on other States by as much as 15 percent.

As you know the University of California is in process of expanding its medical center facilities at San Francisco and Los Angeles, has acquired a site for a medical center in San Diego, and is surveying the needs elsewhere in the State. The San Diego development alone will involve construction and equipment expenditures of $50 million. The State of California is aware of the problem that confronts us and has done its best to find the necessary funds from current revenues and by issuing bonds. But when we consider other educational needs, and the multitudinous institutions and services which must serve the public welfare, it seems clear that we cannot carry this construction program in the high cost medical field without outside help. This is a national problem by its nature, and it happens to be one in which California is involved heavily, not through past neglect of needs, but in spite of all we have been able to do, because of unprecedented migration of people, and the birth rate.

I hope that you will be able to indicate your interest in H.R. 12 reaching the floor, and will do your best to have it passed.

Sincerely,

CLARK KERR,
President.

These arguments appear to make a good case for support of H.R. 12, debated on the floor of this House today.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. My only regret is that it does not go far enough in meeting what I consider to be the urgent health needs of the American people in the field of health care through the training of more physicians, dentists, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, and professional public health personnel for a sufficiently long period of time.

Although I strongly prefer the original provisions of H.R. 12, I sincerely feel the amended bill before us is a long step forward in this field, vital to the interest, yes, even to the survival of the United States. The only answer to this problem—which is unquestionably a national concern—is through a Federal program as provided through this type of legislation.

I have long sought legislation in this area, Mr. Chairman. As a stanch advocate of similar legislation ever since I came to this House, I introduced H.R. 11651 in the 86th Congress providing a broad program for medical and dental education. I introduced similar legislation in the 87th Congress, H.R. 4110. And in this, the 88th Congress, I introduced H.R. 5113 which is similar to the preferable original provisions of H.R. 12.

The chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has brought forth a compromise bill. I wish to congratulate him on the work he has done and the dedication he has shown in this field.

The committee bill and H.R. 5113 have one basic disagreement. On the one hand, H.R. 12 would provide for a 3-year program for construction grants and student loans for 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, what are the reasons for the 3-year limitation in this bill? I should like to quote from the committee report—House Report No. 109—page 4, paragraph 7:

> The committee wishes to emphasize, however, that in substituting 3-year programs, it does not anticipate completion of these programs in their entirety within this period. On the contrary, it believes, that extensions of the initial 3-year programs will be necessary in order to achieve fully the objectives of this legislation.

> In the opinion of the committee, the programs contemplated by this legislation demand periodic review by the Congress if their administration and operations are to be satisfactorily adjusted to meet changing needs and conditions. Hence, the more limited duration of the programs is simply a manifestation of the committee's intention to maintain the necessary congressional control.

Mr. Chairman, I say most respectfully that the reasons stated by the committee for a reduction of this program from 10 to 3 years, are for me, disappointing. We are told that this reduction is "simply a manifestation" of the committee's desire to supervise the activities of this program. Surely, Congress would not lose any authority over the Health Professional Educational Assistance Act if we passed a bill containing more than the committee stipulation of 3 years operation time. The committee itself acknowledges that the program may well be extended.

In my opinion, the program should be outlined for the 10-year period. During that time Congress will have an annual opportunity of addressing itself to any necessary modifications in the act that might be thought worthwhile.

Wherein could Congress lose its authority? Unlike a great deal of legislation that passes this Congress, we have not further diminished legislative authority by this bill. The administrators of the bill, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the U.S. Commissioner on Education, and the Surgeon General of the United States, all these officials file annual reports with the Congress, as required by law, describing in detail the operation of the programs under their supervision.

The rules of this House provide specifically for the jurisdiction of the committees of the House. The annual examination by committees of the agencies over whom they exercise legislative review is a most important aspect of committee work. Another check vested in the Congress is its appropriation power, through which mechanism an annual review is made of all agency activities.

So, I say good naturedly, that if the only holdback on the bill is a question of jurisdiction, as to legislative review, we should have no misgivings.

Mr. Chairman, aside from the 7-year reduction for the program, and the accompanying reduction on authorization for appropriations from $750 million to $175 million, there are few alterations in the committee bill.

The committee eliminated the section providing planning grants for health education programs.

Further modification was made with respect to the student loan program, the committee striking out the 3-percent per annum rate and stipulating a 3-percent per annum rate or the going Federal rate at the time the loan is made, whichever is greater.

The committee also struck section 712 from the bill, dealing with the construction of regional facilities for research.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this program to assist in the construction of the necessary health education facilities for which such a need exists today. I am also concerned with the need for providing a loan fund for needy students in the health education field. Although I am not entirely pleased with the reductions made in this program by the committee, over the original H.R. 12 and my own bill H.R. 5113, I will give my full support to the legislation before us as a long step forward in filling a vital gap in America's health needs.

Mr. Chairman, I trust it will receive a resounding vote of approval.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Chairman, this current measure, H.R. 12, now before us in the House of Representatives and providing millions of dollars of free tax aid to medical and other professional schools, whether public or private, whether Baptist, Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, constitutes, according to my viewpoint, an absolute infringement of the principle of separation of church and state, one of the foundation pillars upon which our country was establsihed.

In answer to my direct question on this subject, the distinguished chairman of the committee having charge of this measure indicated that the bill does provide free tax aid to such schools as the great medical school of Baylor University, an institution that is of Baptist affiliation and is supported by my own fellow Baptists of Texas and elsewhere.

We Baptists have, since the days of Roger Williams and the early beginning of his "free church in a free state" up there in Rhode Island, jealously guarded our sacred principle of "no tax money for any church or church institution." Yet today some of us are willing to forget our principle, our heritage and our tradition and vote for this measure that actually does give free tax money to church colleges, such as Baptist colleges and other similar schools. Why can we not be consistent and fearless and stanch in a matter of this kind? Now if the bill only provided aid for public institutions, then I could doubtless support it in view of the great need for more and better doctors. But whenever you give a single tax dollar to support any religious school whatever, then you are certainly treading on the very thin ice of an eventual state-owned and state-operated religion for all America. This will not come next year nor in the next 10 years. But it will come and you and your children can mark it down. Whenever the Great White Father gives you a single dollar, he always takes from you an equal dollar's worth of your freedom.

Thomas Jefferson once said he was willing to dedicate his whole life to freedom and he then indicated his undying enmity to tyranny in any field of endeavor. Well, some of us wish he were still around and present with us so he could speak out for our complete freedom and for the indelible demarcation line separating church institutions of all kinds from taxpayer assistance of all kinds.

I feel that no one wants to listen to me and yet I feel that this ought to be said: "Beware, my fellow Americans, for that Government wolf all dressed up in a nice sheepskin garment of free tax money for our churches and church institutions. Your religious integrity and freedom were bought with blood. Will you sell them out for a mess of tax aid pottage?"

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD at this point on the legislation pending.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE FIGHT AHEAD: ADVANCE MAGAZINE OUTLINES 10-POINT PROGRAM FOR REPUBLICANS IN PRESSING FOR MORE MINORITY STAFF MEMBERS ON CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of Advance magazine carried an article entitled "Staffing: A 10-Point Program—The Fight Ahead," in which the editors of this superb, thought-provoking magazine outlined a 10-point program to guide Republicans in Congress in their efforts to improve the terrific imbalance that exists between majority and minority staff members on congressional committees.

The complete text of the article follows:

STAFFING: A 10-POINT PROGRAM—THE FIGHT AHEAD

On January 8 the House Republican caucus unanimously endorsed three fair play amendments to the House rules, including a demand for a 60 to 40 division of committee staff between the majority Democrats and the minority Republicans.

Since agitation for better minority staffing began, over a year ago, the response of congressional Republicans has been promising. Representative FRED SCHWENGEL received the support of 130 of the 174 House Republicans for his minority staffing resolution last session. The initial indifference and skepticism of the Republican leadership has yielded to the overwhelming sentiment of the Members. In the Senate, CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska, and WINSTON L. PROUTY, of Vermont, have been mobilizing GOP opinion. Last October staffing advocates formed their own Special Committee to Improve Congressional Committee Staffs to lead the fight for fair staffing. Its members include: Senators CURTIS, Prouty; and Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania (chairman); Representative Tom Curtis, of Missouri (vice chairman); Glen Lipscomb, of California; and Schwengel, of Iowa.

Where then do the Republicans go from the caucus? At the general strategic level the minority must realize that the main opponents to staffing reform are the Democrats and Democratic-affiliated pressure groups—the very groups that want to keep the Republican Party weak and ineffective, to consign it to permanent minority status.

In opposing reform, we can expect the Democratic Party interests to hide under the cloak of nonpartisanship, citing the principles of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It should be clear to all but the most politically naive that this is a mere rationalization of a status quo that disproportionately benefits the majority. It is not and should not be allowed to stand as an effective argument. We also can expect a strategy of delay and diversion aimed at discouraging Republicans from the long and difficult task ahead.

After surveying the situation, Advance urges the party to adopt the following tactical program over the current session of Congress:

The Special Committee to Improve Congressional Committee Staffs should continue in existence to coordinate the overall campaign for committee staffing. The Special Committee will need the full support of Republicans in Congress and across the country if it is to expand its activities.

The staff situation of each congressional committee should be examined. The minority is not yet fully aware of the abuses in the system or of the opportunities it is being denied.

The minority members of the House Administration and the Senate Rules and Administration Committees should enlist themselves actively in the staffing drive, since their committees are entrusted with approving all staff appointments.

Political scientists should be invited to do further research into the operation of committee staffs, perhaps through case studies of selected staffs. The GOP minority has nothing to fear and everything to gain from a full and impartial inquiry into the actual functioning of the committees.

The special committee should present its case with the fullest documentation possible to the majority leadership of both Houses. If the majority does not make concessions in cases of obvious abuse, the special committee should systematically use all parliamentary methods open to the minority to dramatize its case—the use of minority reports, objections on the floor, testimony before the committees themselves, etc.

Nationwide mailings of selected speeches and supporting documents sent to public, civic, and educational leaders will help the minority spread its case much further than the Halls of Congress.

The minority should present its case through scheduled addresses to friendly or neutral organizations such as the chamber of commerce or the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Efforts should be made to educate those interest groups which oppose minority staffing because they fear it would undercut their own lobbying function (such as the NAM). Their most effective role is in cooperation with a professionally trained, politically educated, minority staff.

A clearinghouse for locating and recruiting qualified minority staff might be organized. Actual hiring would be left at the committee or office level but the benefits of a centralized exchange of information on applicants and vacancies should be considerable.

The minority should urge Republican-oriented groups to loan or encourage talented young people in their organizations to serve apprenticeships with congressional committees. This practice already exists on the Democratic side, with unions and similar groups benefiting.

The effective timespan for these operations is short. The minority has a year, at best 16 months, to build its case for the 1964 congressional elections. The success of that campaign will depend in no small measure on the success or failure of this one.

The work ahead is marked out. Will the Republicans in Congress be equal to it?

IMBALANCE BETWEEN MAJORITY AND MINORITY STAFF MEMBERS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks, the public and the press seem to have awakened to the fact that a terrific imbalance exists between the majority and minority staff members on congressional committees. The public is beginning to see that the result of this imbalance is poor or no legislation. Various Members of the House have received many letters from constituents inquiring about the minority staffing situation. Also, newspapers throughout the country have been printing more and more stories concerning minority staffing. Below follows the story carried in the Allentown, Pa., Chronicle, March 6; the Norman, Okla., Transcript, March 6; St. Petersburg, Fla., Times, March 6; Vineland, N.J., Times Journal, March 13; Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis., March 5; San Bernardino, Calif., Sun, March 7; Lynchburg, Va., News, March 7; Walla Walla, Wash., Union-Bulletin, March 13; among others:

Committee Abuses, Staffing Come Under House Scrutiny

Washington.—The committees of the House are coming under sharply increased scrutiny with attention centered on skyrocketing budgets, junkets, duplicating investigations and the issue of committee staff for the minority party.

Reports of abuses in the Education and Labor Committee headed by New York Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Democrat, have been most widely publicized, but numerous other alleged abuses are being studied.

On the Republican side, Conference Chairman Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Republican, of Michigan, appointed a special subcommittee on minority staffing which was extremely active in January and February and reported it had obtained over 30 new slots for professional committee staff to aid the minority.

BUDGET CRACKDOWN

Concern was by no means limited to Republicans, however. Under Chairman Omar E. Burleson, Democrat, of Texas, the House Administration Committee, watchdog over House budgets and employment practices, began to subject committee chairmen to close questioning over their requested budgets.

During February, House Administration slashed five committee budgets in sums ranging from $15,000 to $150,000 for the year and the House approved all the reductions February 27. Further cuts were likely in the Education and Labor Committee budget—up from $328,000 for 1959–60 to a requested $697,000 for 1963–64—and the investigatory funds for Banking and Currency—up from $5,000 for 1961–62 to $530,000 in requests for 1963–64. Both groups' funds are due for consideration shortly.

In a switch of policy, House Administration this year began to approve committee budgets for 1 year only. Committee chairmen will have to return early in 1964 to justify their expenditures to date and ask for more. Controls over investigations were also tightened by a flat prohibition against duplicating probes by various House groups. All new investigations must be reported to the House Administration group.

"It's time to discipline ourselves—there has been too much expansion on the Hill," Burleson says in jurisdiction of his committee's tough new policy. Representative John H. Kyl, Republican, of Iowa, a member of the Burleson committee, told Congressional Quarterly that "empire building" in the committees was more widespread than the public imagined and that it was Congress' duty to clean its own house.

MINORITY STAFFING

The Republicans' minority staff task force under Representative Fred Schwengel, Republican, of Iowa, launched an intensive drive in February. The group argued that the GOP needed staff if it was to develop new legislative initiatives and oppose the majority constructively and effectively. They said the issue was nonpartisan because a healthy two party system requires an effective opposition party.

Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, a member of the Schwengel group and early advocate of minority staffing, developed a strategy for pushing GOP staff demands in committee budget hearings before House Administration. The strategy, which met with at least partial success, was to persuade committee chairmen to make some concessions on minority staff rather than find their entire operations opened to hostile questioning.

Republicans were unsuccessful, however, when they tried to persuade House Administration to tack an amendment on committee budget authorizations giving the minority the right to hire up to 40 percent of the staff when a majority of a committee's minority members so request.

A chief problem of the Schwengel group was to persuade House Minority Leader Charles A. Halleck, Republican, of Indiana, who had publicly disparaged the minority staff drive in 1962, to work hard for their cause. Halleck himself faced a problem in convincing ranking Republican committee members, many of whom had their own long-standing private patronage agreements with the Democrats, to "rock the boat" and fight for increased and effective staff.

By late February, however, several of the ranking Republicans had joined the staffing drive. With a heavy majority of rank-and-file Republicans supporting the fight for more staff, Halleck took an increasingly active role in its favor. The major initiative, however, came from Ford and the young activist group that installed him in the conference chairmanship last January.

House Speaker John W. McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts, February 20 told reporters that he saw little need for the drive of Ford, Schwengel, and Curtis to develop independent Republican programs through increased staff. McCormack said the program of the Democratic Congress would be the President's program anyway.

MINORITY STAFFING

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SCHWENGEL.** Mr. Speaker, there have been an increasing number of instances where Sunday newspapers, because of the more space allotted to news stories, have discussed in depth some of the issues facing the American people and organizations. Naturally the Congress, as a whole, is discussing minority staffing, meaning staff members responsible and reporting to the minority. A good example of this is the Newark Sunday News of March 31, 1963, which said in part:

> In addition to the recent controversy, in which Republicans charged they were not receiving a fair share of the available staff assistance on congressional committees, questions have arisen concerning the uses of staffs and the advisability of increasing staff allowances for both parties.
>
> Senator Hugh Scott, Republican, of Pennsylvania, recently summed up the argument for more staff for both majority and minority: "The most severe limitation to the effectiveness of a Representative or Senator is time." "Staff," Scott said, "was essential to increase the effectiveness of Congressmen by relieving them of a variety of chores and by keeping them informed."

This same newspaper in its edition of March 25, 1963, also said in part, explaining the need for adequate staffs:

> A sturdy defense of big congressional staffs comes from Dr. George B. Galloway, senior specialist in American Government for the Library of Congress and former staff director of the Senate-House committee that conducted hearings on the reorganization of Congress in 1946.
>
> "The increase in staff is one of the most favorable developments in Congress," Galloway said in an interview. "It is a third force that provides Congress with information and intelligence to counteract the interested opinions that come to Congress from interesting parties on the one hand and from the executive department on the other."
>
> In Galloway's view, the cause of most of the mushrooming is quite simple: "The problems of Congress today are far different and far more complex than the problems of Congress when Carl Vinson was a freshman."

The problem of obtaining adequate staff responsible to the minority continues to be a serious problem confronting the Members of Congress of both parties, and their respective leaderships.

In the April issue of Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, an article appeared which indicates some of the problems being faced on one of the committees of the House. I was shocked recently to learn from several secretaries working on the Hill that a fine young lady working for the minority had recently been forced to take a very sizable cut in salary because of the reduction of staff funds available for clerical help for the minority. This one human drama is a problem which has appeared in other places and has not been discussed openly or been brought fully to light. However, the conscience of the Members of the House will have to solve some of these serious problems and handicaps facing the minority in the months ahead.

Below follows the full text of the article which appeared in Roll Call:

GOP Moves for Added Education and Labor Funds

> Hard-pressed Republicans on the House Education and Labor Committee are putting up another battle for staff funds.
>
> As the controversial group continued plowing through some of the administration's most vital proposed legislation, GOP members sponsored legislation to give themselves another $35,000 a year for minority purposes.
>
> Their request would go toward hiring staff help in addition to the two professionals and one clerk now allowed Education and Labor Republicans. At the start of the last Congress, they had one more employee.
>
> Representative Charles Goodell, Republican, of New York, a "young Turk" Education and Labor member, introduced the resolution for more minority funds. He is also on the House Administration Accounts Subcommittee which will first consider the proposal.
>
> The GOP has been grumbling about its treatment ever since the House scaled down Chairman Adam C. Powell's, Democrat, of New York, request to $200,000 a year. Chairmen of six subcommittees were given control of $25,000 each, leaving Powell with only $50,000.
>
> Some Republicans admit Powell treated them as favorably as could be reasonably expected, considering the amount of funds he had to work with. Representative Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey, ranking Education and Labor minority member, has been trying to pry loose some funds from subunit heads but has received none.

REQUIRING FUTURE DISTRICT GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TO LIVE IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. **KUNKEL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SCHWENGEL.** Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would require future District Government employees to live in the District. This is certainly not asking for special treatment for the District. Nearly every major city in the United States has a requirement that its employees reside in that particular city. Until the District of Columbia has home rule, and I hope this day is not far off, this legislation is certainly a minimum requirement if the citizens of the District are to have confidence in their own officials. And it would certainly aid these officials in their duties by giving them a better understanding of the community in which they would both reside and work.

The District of Columbia faces financial problems paralleled by few metropolitan areas in the United States. Over one-third of the 30,000 municipal employees of the District live outside the District. Their salaries total $60 million a year. It is grossly unfair for District taxpayers to export such a sum to the suburbs. Residential requirements for city employees would be one step in bringing funds into the District.

In the interests of fiscal equity, social harmony, and good government practice, we should pass this legislation. It should be noted, finally, that this legislation will only apply to the hiring of employees in the future. The current employees of the District will be unaffected by this amendment to the District Code.

"REMEMBER THE 'MAINE' "

Mr. **KUNKEL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **JOHANSEN.** Mr. Speaker, one swallow does not make a summer and one Washington Post editorial does not necessarily add up to a firm and consistent policy or program.

Nevertheless, the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Remember the *Maine*" seems to indicate a significant, albeit much belated, double discovery; namely, that the Kennedy administration has no meaningful Cuban policy and that the American people are becoming completely fed up with this bankruptcy of leadership.

The editorial states, for example:

> The broad proposition on which there is accumulating accord is simply this: that the existence of a Communist regime, linked to the Soviet Union, in this hemisphere, is a threat to the safety and survival of the United States and of all other free countries in this part of the globe. No administration that openly opposes this belief can long survive. Sooner or later an administration that denounced this maturing conviction would be followed by an alternative government committed to it.

These are strong words—although no stronger than the sorry record of this administration warrants.

To some of us this conclusion comes with no "Damascus Road" flash of revelation. What is startling is the acknowledgment of this truth by the Washington Post.

It seems obvious to me that this statement would not have been made and indeed would be entirely pointless if the Washington Post had not come to the conclusion, however reluctant, that the Kennedy administration is perilously close to acquiescence in a permanent Soviet occupation and Communist control of Cuba.

The Washington Post calls for a policy and program "of minimum risk," and for the public disclosure of its policy is, by implication at least, a fearful indictment of the gyrations and lack of clear and firm policy of which this administration is guilty.

There is no need at this point to document in detail the evidence of these gyrations. The latest example, I might say, is the pronouncement last Sunday by the Attorney General—whose office seems to have an uncommon prominent role in foreign affairs—that Cuban exiles in this country should perfect their unity of leadership and purpose. These are the same exiles, if memory serves me right, upon whom unprecedented restrictions were imposed by the President only 3 weeks earlier.

I cannot forbear calling attention to one striking coincidence in connection with today's Washington Post editorial. In the same issue—and in fact on the adjoining page—appears a typical contribution by the Nation's chief apostle and advocate of appeasement, Walter Lippmann. Once again Mr. Lippmann pontificates that "Cuba is no military threat to the United States and is not very much of a threat to Latin America." I am not prepared to assume on the basis of a single editorial that the Washington Post is at long last throwing off the deadly spell of Lippmann appeasement. Nevertheless, the juxtaposition of the Washington Post editorial and the Lippmann article underscores the agonizing reappraisal which the Kennedy administration is going to have to face vis-a-vis its Cuban policy. As the starting point of this reappraisal, the administration is going to have to decide whether it accepts the Washington Post conclusion that "this sense of jeopardy is beginning to pervade the whole body politic" or whether it is going to continue to ride along with the comforting Lippmann reassurances that neither Castro nor Soviet occupation of Cuba poses any real threat.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the Washington Post editorial, the Lippmann article, and an address of the Cuban situation which I delivered on the Manion Forum April 7:

"Remember the 'Maine' "

Something like a consensus on Cuban policy is beginning to emerge in this country. The debate over when and how that policy is to be executed should not conceal the growing accord on the policy itself. Last week, the President, the former Vice President, the State Department and Republican critics of the State Department had different things to say about Cuba, but on two points there was general agreement. And on these two points there is a gathering agreement in the country.

The broad proposition on which there is accumulating accord is simply this: That the existence of a Communist regime, linked to the Soviet Union, in this hemisphere, is a threat to the safety and survival of the United States and of all other free countries in this part of the globe. No administration that openly opposes this belief can long survive. Sooner or later an administration that denounced this maturing conviction would be followed by an alternative government committed to it. In a negative way, there is almost the same accord on how this policy should not be pursued. There is almost universal agreement that invasion, openly and directly, immediately or in the near future, is not the way to pursue our policy.

This aversion to foreign control of Cuba by a hostile power is the constant of American attitudes toward our island neighbor. The Monroe Doctrine was an expression of a view already long held in this country. It was given even fuller expression in the administration of John Quincy Adams when this country made known its opposition to the transfer of Cuba from Spain to France, England, or any other power. The practical basis of this policy was clearly stated in Daniel Webster's support of President Adams' decision to send delegates to a conference with South American countries, in which the great orator said:

"A member has said that if Spain chose to transfer the island to any other power she has a right to do so, and we here cannot interfere to prevent her. I must dissent from this opinion. The rights of nations in matters of this kind are much modified by circumstances. Because France or Great Britain could not rightfully complain of the transfer of Florida to us, it does not follow that we could not complain of the cession of Cuba to one of them. The transfer of Florida to us was not dangerous to the safety of either of these nations, nor fatal to any of their great and essential interests. Proximity of position, neighborhood, whatever augments the power of injuring or annoying, very properly belong to the consideration of all cases of this kind. What might otherwise never be thought of is justified for these reasons and on these grounds."

If the American people are aware of such dangers now, they are aware of other dangers that unhappily and unfortunately also exist and that must be weighed with equal care and caution. Impetuous and impulsive and ill-considered acts by this country might bring on the dangers of thermonuclear war without diminishing the dangers of Soviet occupation of Cuba.

Therefore, it must be the object of the Government of the United States to develop some alternative to direct action that will further the policy of this country without incurring the hazards of invasion or like military intervention. It is very urgent that the Government develop such a policy and that it disclose it. It is very plain that, throughout this country, the conviction that the Nation is in peril is hardening to a point where no threats and no fears may be sufficient to inhibit the demand for action against the forces that occupy Cuba. Democratic governments are not wholly free agents. A government that does not develop a program of minimum risk runs the danger of being coerced into a program of maximum risks, almost against its will. The absence of an affirmative design, in such a situation, is dangerous—dangerous to this country, to its neighbors and to the peace of the hemisphere and of the whole world.

The Government of this country, the governments of friendly countries and the government of the Soviet Union as well had better take note of the increasing sense of Americans that the United States is endangered by the Soviet occupation of Cuba. This sense of jeopardy is beginning to pervade the whole body politic. The Soviet Government, whatever its fears and doubts, felt compelled, by such an impulse, to send its forces into Hungary. It ought to understand the much greater force that such sentiments exert upon democratic governments. Every day that passes without the termination of the Soviet occupation of Cuba increases the certainty and multiplies the likelihood that another Maine disaster will put the spark to the combustible materials in the Caribbean.

The Kennedy-Keating Cuban Policy

(By Walter Lippmann)

Cuba got a good airing last week before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and the significant fact about the speeches of the President, Secretary Rusk, and Senator Keating was that there is substantial agreement about what the United States should and should not do. It is hard to say what Mr. Nixon's Cuban policy would be. He sounded like a man who was ready to go to war. But all he actually said was that he wanted the Cuban exiles to make hit-and-run raids.

Senator Keating, who is the most conspicuous of the critical opposition, began by saying that "it is foolish to pretend that there are easy answers to the Cuban problem." He did not pretend. Then in the course of his speech he admitted that he agrees with the main theses of our present Cuban policy. He is opposed to an invasion. He is opposed to a blockade. He is opposed to hit-and-run raids mounted from American soil. He is in favor of "greater stress on nonmilitary measures," and he wants to exert increasing economic pressure so that the Soviets "will be driven to the conclusion that the price of maintaining a base in Cuba is too high."

This is the same story which the administration is telling. Senator Keating's differences are not in the substance of the text but in the editing, the typography, the layout, and the captions. The Senator, like the President, excludes in present circumstances the resort to war—invasion, blockade, and raiding; like the President he too would deal with Cuba by surveillance, containment, isolation, economic pressures, and propaganda.

There is no doubt that at least for some time to come the Kennedy-Keating policy will leave the Soviet troops 90 miles from Florida. This is an affront to our pride. Not since Napoleon III put French troops into Mexico to enthrone and support the Emperor Maximillian has anything like this happened so close to us. In the end the French troops went away. But, because there was no prudent alternative, Lincoln put up with the Bonapartist troops for several years.

How long must we put up with the Russian troops? The honest answer is that we must put up with them until they can be gotten rid of by measures short of nuclear war. Here is the sticking point in the argument with Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon. They sound, they intend to sound, as if they know a way to get rid of the Russian troops promptly without waging nuclear war.

What is this prompter way to make the Russians go away from Cuba? They do not tell us, but the most reasonable interpretation of what they say is that the prompter way is not to make war but to threaten war. Both Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon have avoided saying plainly what they do mean. But if what they sound like has genuine meaning it is that they believe the United States can deliver an ultimatum which the Soviet Union will bow to.

If this is not what they mean, what in the name of commonsense do they mean with all their big words? If they are prepared to be so bold with the Russians, they ought to be bold enough to talk plainly to their fellow Americans.

The Rockefeller-Nixon position appears then to be that Cuba can be liberated by ordering the Soviet Union to withdraw from this hemisphere, and to stand by passively while we blockade Castro and arrange for a replacement of Castro's government. If this is what they have in mind, they are making an enormous guess. For nobody can possibly know that the Soviet Union would surrender its whole position in Cuba as it surrendered its offensive weapons last October. It is the supreme folly in the nuclear age to drive a nuclear power into a corner. And if the Soviet Union refused to bow to the ultimatum, all this would do for us would be to make us look like fools.

The President of the United States cannot play with an ultimatum to a government like that of the Soviet Union. He cannot use an ultimatum unless he is prepared to go through with it and begin a war. If he is not prepared to go to war, an ultimatum is a bluff and everyone will soon see that it is.

While the present policy does not promise a quick withdrawal of the Russians or the fall of Castro, it is surely not true to say that it is complacent do-nothingism. To a degree which is just short of war Cuba is being photographed, patrolled, embargoed and squeezed, and isolated. If Cuba were a great power, we would be at war with her for what we are already doing. I doubt whether there is any precedent where we have exerted such strong measures short of war on any other country.

However much we are impatient and frustrated we have to grasp the fact that Cuba is no military threat to the United States and is not very much of a threat to Latin America. The worst of Castro is his example and a long way after that such agents as he is able to train and infiltrate into the Latin American countries. He is an affront to our pride, he is a nuisance, he is a mischiefmaker. But he is not a mortal threat to the vital interests of the United States, and therefore, in this age of thermonuclear war, we must deal with him by measures that are short of war.

ADDRESS BY HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, MANION FORUM, APRIL 7, 1963

More than 40 months ago, in a public address October 29, 1959, I asked this question, apropos of the Communist threat posed by Castro's takeover of Cuba: "Where better than in our own hemisphere and continent can we take the stand which survival itself dictates must be taken?"

In the years since, I have been repeating that question in varying forms and with many elaborations, so have countless other Americans, in and out of public office.

The answer, in terms of adequate policies and deeds, has not been forthcoming either under the previous or present administrations. For a moment, before the fiasco became evident, we thought we had found the answer at the Bay of Pigs.

For a brief few days last October we thought the stand was being taken. But this firm answer quickly faded out—with the announced willingness to give a no-invasion pledge, with abandonment of the demand for on-site inspection, and with the premature lifting of the naval quarantine.

I do not need to remind my listeners of the many other adverse developments of the past 40 months—or of the situation today. But I do call your attention to a statement last February 7 by President Kennedy: "I couldn't make any prediction about the elimination (of communism in Cuba). I am quite obviously hopeful that it can be eliminated, but we have to wait and see what happens * * *. I remember a good deal of talk in the early 1950's about liberation, how Eastern Europe was going to be liberated. Then we had Hungary, Poland, and East Germany and no action was taken. The reason no action was taken was that they felt strongly if they did take action it would bring on another war."

Granted that this statement was made in response to a newsman's inquiry—under the catch-as-catch-can conditions to which the President subjects himself in his news conferences.

Yet, how can even the most responsible Member of Congress or any thoughtful citizen avoid asking what message this statement signals to our enemies—to Khrushchev, Castro, to the international Communist plotters of progressive takeover of Latin America and of ultimate world conquest?

How can we avoid asking whether this statement does not, to an uncomfortable degree, correspond to the facts as to our Cuban policy—or lack of policy?

I address myself to two aspects of the President's statement.

It was Charles Dickens' famous character, Mr. Micawber, who immortalized the attitude of "waiting for something to turn up." Are we not in truth now following a Mr. Micawber foreign policy so far as Cuba and the Communist threat in Latin America are concerned? Or, at the very least, are we not giving our enemies the basis for so assuming—thereby laying the foundation for very grave miscalculations on their part?

Unfortunately I see no convincing evidence of any meaningful policy other than that of "wait and see." The Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in a report dated March 14, flatly declared, after extensive hearings, that "no plan for collective action against Communist subversive aggression has been put into effect."

WHILE WE "WAIT AND SEE"—THE COMMUNISTS ACT

The recent San Jose conference has apparently produced no specifics—except stepped up aid to Central American countries; and the same subcommittee report noted that the success of any long-range economic aid program for Latin America "is dependent on reducing and finally eliminating the threat of subversive aggression."

Isn't the emphasis on economic aid at this point like arguing that the foundations of a house should be repaired while the house is in flames?

Whether effective joint efforts will result from this conference adequate to stem Communist infiltration of arms and personnel remains to be seen. The President has declared that "further action, invasion, or blockade, at this time would (not) be fruitful."

Meanwhile, the propagandists for the do-nothing, or do-nothing-more philosophy, are operating full blast. Walter Lippmann pontificates that "there is no clear and certain solution in the present phase of the Cuban problem."

We are sternly warned against a "Cuban fixation"—which means, "quit worrying about it." And Columnist Murrey Marder sees the best hope of a solution in some unforeseen and unpredictable "lucky break."

For 40 months we have followed a "wait and see what happens" policy. The results have been calamitous. There is every reason to believe that results of a continuation of this policy will be no different—unless they are even more calamitous.

We may wait—but events don't wait, Mr. Khrushchev won't wait, and the Latin American countries and people who face the loss of their freedom to Castro-type takeovers can't wait.

Even more disquieting is the second half of President Kennedy's statement at his February 7 news conference. He said the reason no action was taken to back up the talk of liberation of Communist-captured countries in the 1950's was that it was "felt strongly if they did take action it would bring on another war."

Does this mean what it seems to mean? Are we telling Mr. Khrushchev that we automatically reject any measures against Communist takeover in Latin America or against Castro which he—Khrushchev—might decide justified his launching nuclear war?

Isn't this an open invitation to nuclear blackmail? Isn't this an abandonment of the courageous willingness to risk war which Mr. Kennedy briefly displayed last October? Doesn't this confirm Senator LAUSCHE's blunt warning: "Khrushchev is pushing us, we are retreating. The more we retreat, the more he will push."

I submit that there is not a single argument presently being offered against effective action regarding Cuba which cannot be offered with equal force and logic against effective action regarding any future Cubas.

Is there any doubt that there will be additional Cubas?

Or that these same arguments against action will again be advanced?

And will not any risks we might run in calling a halt now also be present in the face of new Cubas—and, indeed, may not such risks in the future actually be magnified?

And so doesn't the "wait and see" attitude and the "risk of war" argument all add up to piecemeal, and ultimate, capitulation?

There is another, immediate, grave problem. Is it now administration policy to prevent, at all costs, any liberation efforts by Cuban exiles themselves—on the grounds that such action will irritate Soviet Russia and risk war? Can we expect to retain world respect or our own self-respect—or can we expect to silence the Cuban exiles themselves—if we by words or worse openly oppose their own future liberation efforts?

Are we to do to any future Cuban liberation leaders what we did to Chiang Kai-shek when the 7th Fleet, on President Truman's orders, blockaded him on Formosa during the Korean war? Is this what is meant by waiting to see what happens? I am convinced that such a colossal blunder is actually in the making.

OUR ALTERNATIVE NOW: STAND UP TO COMMUNISM IN CUBA OR, SURRENDER

In February, I introduced a joint resolution expressing this Nation's determination to take, jointly with other free nations or unilaterally, such political, diplomatic, and military action as may be necessary, to remove and hereafter bar Soviet or other foreign Communist military forces from Cuba; to liberate Cuba itself; to neutralize Cuba as a base for Communist subversion, infiltration, sabotage, and aggression in this hemisphere; to establish representative constitutional government in Cuba through free elections, and to exercise such on-site inspection and supervision as are necessary to accomplish these results.

I believe these actions should proceed from less drastic to more drastic steps as circumstances may require; such as termination of diplomatic relations between Western Hemisphere countries (including the United States) and the Communist countries (including Soviet Russia); effective restrictions on importation of personnel and arms from Cuba to Latin American countries; restoration of effective naval blockade of Cuba; firm notice, with a time limit, that Soviet troops must be withdrawn; and finally, liberation of Cuba, either by the forces of a Cuban exile government, or by joint OAS forces, or by the United States alone—as may be necessary.

For 40 months I have lived—and, more importantly, the American people have lived—with the question I asked in October 1959. The question persists: "Where better than in our own hemisphere and continent can we take the stand which survival itself dictates must be taken?"

NO. 1 CITY: LIBERTY, KY.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, a high honor and significant recognition has come to one of the cities in my congressional district. The city is Liberty, Ky., which I hope and trust will always live up to that sacred appellation, and it has been designated as the "No. 1 City in Kentucky," by the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce. The citizens of Liberty, where I have visited many times and where I have enjoyed the hospitality of some of their homes, are justly proud of this honor. Their Congressman is likewise proud of this honor and is grateful for a news item that refers to an outstanding award such as this instead of merely continuing to mention some of the dark tragedy of our depressed economy. Below is the news item that many will find stimulating and inspiring in the face of misfortune and hardship that are, like the poor, with us always:

The city of Liberty has been declared the No. 1 city in Kentucky.

The county seat of Casey County was proclaimed the overall State winner in the 1962 Kentucky Chamber of Commerce community development contest today at the State chamber annual meeting in Lexington.

Liberty won over 7 district winners who represented an original field of 84 entries.

The No. 1 city in community development is not a newcomer to the winner's circle as they won in the district competition in the 1960 and 1961 contests.

A new look came to Liberty through a well-planned and executed beautification program. Streets were repaved, new homes and churches were constructed, retail establishments were remodeled and improved, a "litterbug" contest was launched and a memorial shrub center was planted on the Liberty graded school lawn.

The presentation of a plaque designating the top spot was made by Malcolm Mason, Lexington, chairman of the State chamber's community development contest. The honor was received by Mrs. Arlis Sanders, representing the Liberty-Casey County Community Development Association. Later, Mason announced, a bronze plaque will be placed in a prominent spot in Liberty for generations in the future to see the city's recognition in the 1962 contest.

Receiving the runner-up awards as district winners were: Barlow, Campbellsville, Flemingsburg, Prestonsburg, Somerset, and Sturgis.

INCOME TAX REFORM

Mr. **KUNKEL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALGER**. Mr. Speaker, after many weeks of hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on President Kennedy's tax proposals, it has become increasingly clear that the Kennedy tax reforms will not achieve the results promised. For the information of my colleagues, I think it is important to point out that witness after witness before the committee has testified that the Kennedy proposals are self-defeating and, if passed, would curtail, not unleash our economy.

Certainly tax reform is needed. Most assuredly tax cuts are a necessity if we are to strengthen our private enterprise system. Our present hodgepodge of tax law, our almost disregard of fiscal responsibility when it comes to Federal spending which results in taxes which are bordering on being completely confiscatory, is drying up the basic food of capitalism, risk capital.

Several responsible proposals have been presented for workable tax reform. A number of us support the Baker-Herlong formula for gradual reform with tax adjustments in every bracket. I, myself, have introduced a measure to provide discussion for a flat percentage tax which would cost all of us less, provide greater equity and reduce the costs of tax collection.

To provide the latest available material in connection with our tax studies, I will include at this point in the RECORD an article from the U.S. News & World Report, by Rene A. Wormser, a leading tax authority. I think Mr. Wormser's study will convince many of the need for an entirely new tax code:

IS IT TIME TO WRITE A WHOLE NEW INCOME TAX LAW?—WHAT A LEADING TAX AUTHORITY SAYS

(NOTE.—"Reform" the income tax law? Not on any piecemeal basis, urges a top authority on taxes.

(The only solution, say René A. Wormser, is to start over and write a new law. As for the present law, "Congress has created a monster." Here, in detail, Mr. Wormser sets out the taxpayer's problem and offers a solution. In this article, written for U.S. News & World Report, he draws on 40 years' experience as a leading New York lawyer, specializing in taxes and estates.)

(By René A. Wormser)

Prompted by a message from President Kennedy, Congress is now struggling with proposals for the reform of our income tax laws.

There is general recognition that tax rates are far too high and that the system is badly maladjusted.

But the specific proposals of the President for reform are largely designed with political motivation, and, in great part, are unsound. They are likely to increase the harassment of already distressed taxpayers. They do not begin to strike at the basic fallacies of our tax system.

What is urgently needed is a careful reexamination of our whole tax structure. Tinkering with the tax laws is not the answer.

Congress has created a monster. As a former Internal Revenue Commissioner has put it: There is no answer short of wiping the slate clean and starting over.

Tax laws should be understandable to the citizen of average intelligence, but our Internal Revenue Code is so infinitely complex that it is far beyond the comprehension of all but experts.

Indeed, there are few experts, if any, who know and understand all its provisions.

In its rates, and often in its theory, our income tax system is frequently very harsh and even punitive. Therefore, considerable sections of the American bar and of our accountants apply their brains and energy to the devising of ways in which to get around objectionable features of the law by legal means.

A way is found in which legitimately to avoid a harsh rule, whereupon the Internal Revenue Service—at its own instance or prompted by a legislator or a pressure group—concludes that a loophole has appeared in the law. The loophole is then closed by a new piece of legislation, intended to be remedial.

Generally, more complexity results.

It is often impossible to anticipate the full effect of a remedial provision. It frequently opens up further loopholes of which clever tax experts take legal advantage. So the process of opening and closing loopholes goes on interminably until we have a pyramiding of provisions which truly are enough to confound genius.

As for the businessman who must deal with this complex monster, he not only cannot understand the beast himself but cannot always get a positive and clear answer from his confounded advisers.

Many of the President's current proposals are attempts to close what he or his advisers deem to be loopholes. Some, offered in part to simplify some rule, certainly will end by adding further complications to existing intricacy.

Consider, first, the impact of the tax laws themselves, and the effect of changes proposed by President Kennedy.

We have lived under the system of progressive tax rates so long that most of us have come to accept it as a self-evident logical application of the theory of paying in accordance with ability to pay.

Yet a top rate of 91 percent to a man whose income runs into the hundreds of thousands per year punishes him far less than a rate of 50 percent reached by a single man after attaining a taxable income of $16,000, or a married man after reaching $32,000.

Nor are the top tax brackets realistic. They produce very little in revenues. Not only can the wealthy use tax-exempt investments, but all sorts of mechanisms are available to them devised by tax experts for reducing the income tax impact.

This has been recognized now, even by those most anxious to use the income tax for sociological reasons.

The President has suggested that the top rate eventually be reduced from 91 to 65 percent, though he proposes an absurdly small reduction, to only 84.5 percent, for 1963.

But the unfairness of the progressive-rate system would persist if, in reducing the top rate, there were merely an approximately proportionate reduction in middle rates.

Suppose, for example, the top rate for a single man after attaining a taxable income of $16,000 were reduced from 50 to 35 percent. The impact of this rate upon him would be far greater in actuality than the impact of a 65-percent rate on a man with hundreds of thousands of dollars of income.

The conclusion is inevitable that the citizen who is most hurt by the progressive personal income tax system is the man in the middle, the man in the economic class which is most important to our society. The class includes the professionals, the self-employed, the high-grade artisans, the teachers, the small businessmen.

This class, in particular, is hurt by two philosophic absurdities which underlie the progressive tax system. The reward granted for extra work and greater effort is the imposition of a higher tax rate; and, after a member of this class has gone through what is usually a long period of economic struggle, his peak income is clipped off by the tax law during that often short period in which he has attained financial success. Indeed, Government-created inflation increases his tax burden.

Many idealistic reformers want to use the income tax to improve and extend education and to protect the public health.

Yet these same reformers are unwilling to give adequate tax relief to the citizen who wishes to support education or to protect his health.

This is a grave example of the distorted use of the tax system to sociological ends.

Why should a citizen have to pay any income tax on the money he uses to pay for his and his family's medical expenses?

If my family suffers illness, my ability to pay is certainly reduced, but the tax law gives me only very partial relief.

Pressure for public health-relief measures, such as medicare, are based in part on the fact that medical expenses have increased materially over the years. Why not, then, allow me to deduct my full medical expenses on my income tax return?

Similarly, Federal aid to education is pressed on the ground that education has become so expensive. Why, then, am I not permitted to deduct the expenses of educating my children?

The President's reform proposals indicate that he recognizes the logic of the foregoing arguments only in part. He proposes no relief for educational expense. He does—admirably—propose the abolition of the ceiling on medical deductions. But he suggests that the floor on medical deductions—including drugs—be increased from 3 to 4 percent of adjusted gross income.

There is a direct conflict here between those who believe that the individual should be encouraged to help himself and those who believe that he should be prevented from helping himself in order that the Government could step in, as a father, to protect him.

The President proposes an overall 5 percent floor on all itemized deductions—including medical. This could be tragic to many taxpayers. If a deduction is proper in theory, why should it not be deductible in full?

Here is but one of the odd results which would follow the President's deduction proposal: A taxpayer paying alimony to his wife could not deduct it in whole even though his wife, in turn, would be obliged to include the full payments in her own tax return.

The complexities of the rules of personal income tax are matched by those of the corporation income tax. They operate together to create virtually confiscatory conditions.

Again, the President's proposals leave much to be desired.

After a taxable income of $25,000 has been reached, a corporation enters an income tax rate of 52 percent. It is proposed that this rate be lowered in stages to 47 percent, but this reduction, desirable as it is, will not materially alter the impact.

For instance, there are rules which prohibit an accumulation of income after taxes in a corporation in an amount deemed to be improper. The stockholder-proprietor, therefore, is obliged to distribute such "unreasonable" accumulation of income to himself in dividends which are taxed to him with personal income tax.

Under our progressive-rate income tax system, he may thus find that the profits to which he has devoted his time, money, and energy are virtually confiscated.

Therefore, in order to come out with a reasonable return it is necessary for him to try to pass on to the customer, in his selling price, most of this tax burden. This creates fictitiously high prices to the consumer.

Recognizing that this form of double taxation of profits may be unfair and even confiscatory, relief has been given in some situations. In certain closely restricted cases a corporation can elect to be a "subchapter S" corporation, permitting it to be taxed as though it were an unincorporated enterprise, but the restrictions sharply limit its use.

Some types of corporations are prohibited from accumulating any income and are, therefore, forced to distribute their profits in dividends, with a resulting full double taxation. These are the ones classed as "personal holding companies"—roughly, corporations whose income comes from investment.

Not satisfied with the extent to which such corporations are already penalized, the President suggests that one rule by which it is now possible to escape being a personal holding company be withdrawn. Today, if half the income of a corporation comes from gross rents, the corporation is not a personal holding company.

The President does not like this escape and proposes its abolition.

In other respects, also, the President has indicated that he approves heartily of the double taxation involved in the interaction of the corporate and individual income tax rules. Among the evidence of this is his suggestion that the tiny dividends-received credit and the tiny dividend exclusion be eliminated.

AS EXECUTIVE SALARIES GO UP

Another interaction of corporate and personal income taxes is to be found in the sometimes fantastic scale of salaries paid by large corporations to their executives.

Because of the rapid progression of the personal income tax rates, it now requires salaries in very large figures to give executives the take-home pay—net income after income taxes—adequate to their contribution to the corporate enterprise and to society.

In spite of such large salaries, the take-home pay can be comparatively modest.

The income tax for a single man on a taxable income of $100,000 is $67,320, leaving him $32,680, subject to further reduction if he also has to pay a State income tax.

Now suppose we want this important executive to have another $10,000 of take-home pay. This would mean he would have to have a raise of almost another $100,000, for his Federal income tax on $200,000 would be $156,820, leaving him only $43,180.

There has been superimposed upon this economic extravagance which the progressive-scale system has nurtured a whole series of fringe benefits.

Some of these are of massive benefit to employees and executives. Each bears some special tax advantage and each adds, again, to the cost which the public must pay for product or service.

The President proposes to cut off two of these special benefits—one relating to group insurance paid for by an employer, the other relating to what are called restricted stock options.

This, again, is tinkering, and makes no attempt to solve the problems which brought about a wide series of employee tax benefits.

The tax law has encouraged such tax-saving fringe benefits and in doing so has promoted inflation and distorted our socio-economy. For many of these special tax benefits are not available to large sections of our citizenry.

Elsewhere in the President's tax program you find proposals which, at best, are only halfway measures. Others could be positively harmful.

In a conditional manner, the President has proposed a reduction of the alternative capital-gains tax from 25 to 19.5 percent. For corporations it is to be reduced only to 22 percent. He added, however, that, if his proposal to assess capital gains upon death and upon the making of a gift is not accepted, "there would be no justification for any reduction of present capital-gains rate schedules."

The President's rate-reduction proposal would be welcome—if not tied into the condition which he imposes—but would, in any case, not go far enough.

Virtually everyone who has any capital assets from time to time refrains from selling and taking a profit because this would involve losing part of his capital through the capital-gains tax.

If the tax rate were reduced, say, from 25 to 10 percent, most of these people would be glad to make periodic sales, to take the momentary profits which are offered by the markets and run. They would reinvest, then, and wait for another opportunity to take another profit.

There would thus be far more frequent capital turnovers, and the Government would receive a far larger aggregate capital-gains tax if the rate were 10 percent rather than its present 25 percent.

The President deserves approbation for his suggestion that the 5-year limitation on the right to carry losses forward be abandoned. It has been ridiculous and unfair that individuals have been taxed in full on gains but have been limited to a term of years within which they might carry losses forward.

However, his accompanying proposal that unrealized capital gains should be taxed to the donor upon making a gift and to an estate upon the death of a decedent is quite beyond the pale.

It is by no means certain that the theory of taxing long-term capital gains as income is sound, but at least it has been our consistent rule that no tax on any gain is to be imposed unless and until there has been a realization of gain—a sale of property or its virtual equivalent. To impose a tax on gains which have not been realized seems indefensible.

What hardship such a rule could cause.

In this era of high income taxes which prevent the easy accumulation of wealth through the direct method of savings, many a man dies leaving as the overwhelmingly major part of his estate a corporate business interest which represents a venture built up from scratch.

Providing for enough liquidity to pay the heavy estate taxes which may be due is difficult enough. To impose a death-precipitated income tax on an unrealized gain, and then an estate tax on the balance, would add tragically to the burden of many of these estates and often prevent the continuance of an enterprise which the deceased had the right to expect could be carried on by his family.

Consider also the case of the proprietor of an enterprise who wishes to give some of his stock to his son—or perhaps to an executive—for incentive reasons.

To compel this donor to pay a capital-gains tax—as well as a gift tax—on the theory that he has made a gain does seem oppressive. In addition, he might even be obliged to raise the capital-gains tax by selling some stock and thus having to pay a capital-gains tax to pay a capital-gains tax.

If Congress should be ill-advised enough to enact such a proposal, it would be found necessary to make exception after exception, and then exceptions to these exceptions. That has happened before in our law.

Let's look at one of the more simple complications: Are the new capital-gains rules to be coordinated with the respective gift tax and estate tax exemptions? You try to think that one through. It is too much for me.

Turning now to the administration and application of our chaotic tax system—

The income tax law is full of traps, traps which are sometimes wholly unreasonable and unfair.

The law so often concerns itself with form rather than substance. Accomplish a proper result one way and you escape a tax; do it another way and you are penalized.

Moreover, a taxpayer can be trapped through no fault of his own. To illustrate, in a recent case a retired employee was held to be taxable in his first retirement year with the entire value of the installments of pension he was to receive in the future. This was not because of anything the poor taxpayer had done, but because his employer had erred in the way it had set up the pension plan.

Here is what the individual's tax adviser is up against today in trying to comply with tax rules:

He must be sure to be currently conversant with not only the pertinent Internal Revenue Code sections, but he must also have pored over the pertinent regulations, examined the applicable case decisions and the published rulings. There may even be unpublished rulings of which he cannot be aware.

He may not feel safe without getting a ruling of his own. A ruling is an opinion by the Internal Revenue Service given after a statement of the exact proposed facts.

Given? It is not easy to get rulings. On many subjects, the Service refuses to give a ruling. On others, because it has not made up its bureaucratic mind, it refrains or delays. On still others, while it is willing to rule, a long period of time may elapse before the ruling gets through the departmental machinery—sometimes too long to wait.

It is difficult for the taxpayer to understand why, when his tax adviser tells him that the law is unclear as to the tax result of taking a proposed step, he cannot get from the Internal Revenue Service a prompt statement of the position it will take on the point. Why is he obliged to gamble?

Nor is this the end of the troubles.

The Internal Revenue Service can change its bureaucratic mind, and does not hesitate to do so. On top of that, the courts sometimes change their minds also and reverse what has been accepted law, so that even existing decisions cannot always be relied upon fully.

WHEN COURT RULINGS DIFFER

Then there is the frustrating phenomenon that the courts of one district will hold one way and those of another, another. This uncertainty is unrelieved until the Supreme Court has decided between them—if, indeed, it deigns to entertain the dispute.

The Internal Revenue Service, it seems, frequently acts as though it were our enemy.

It makes up its bureaucratic mind how the law should be interpreted in a given set of facts. If there is no finally binding opinion by the courts, and if the taxpayer is unwilling to accede to the Service's interpretation, he is given the choice of capitulating or engaging in a legal battle which is quite unequal. The reason: It is costly to the taxpayer, while the administrative agents of the Service do not have to worry about the cost of a litigation. That might be considered merely an unavoidable burden on the taxpayer if the Service always did its interpreting objectively.

But how objectively does the Service interpret the law?

Taxpayers are often given the impression that the Service's interpretations are not based on a desire to be fair and reasonable but rather to extract as much as possible from the public.

In dealing with a field agent the taxpayer often feels himself persecuted. This is sometimes due to the fact that the law in question is so obscure or intricate that the agent himself does not fully understand it.

Then there is the occasional agent who seems to have a resentment against anyone with substantial income, or has a general animus against society and shows it.

There is also the rare one who is venal.

Finally, there is the agent who seems to believe that his legitimate purpose is to try, by hook or crook, to amplify the Treasury of the United States.

These last three characters create ill feeling and bad public relations to an extent difficult to offset by the conscientious work of the overwhelming majority of the field agents who are able and try to be fair in their examinations.

Suppose an agent asks for an additional tax of $500 and it will cost you $1,000 to fight him. The chances are that, regardless of how indignant you may feel at what you believe to be an unjust assessment, you will pay up and merely growl.

Or you may have this experience: The field agent may contest four items on your tax return but finally agrees that you are right about three of them.

If, then, you say that you are willing to battle out the fourth issue, on which you are convinced you are utterly correct, the agent may reply that if you do not agree to his position on the disputed point, he will have to leave open even those points on which he has already indicated that he would otherwise concede.

This way of doing the Government's business is, in the taxpayer's opinion, "dirty pool."

THE RIGHT TO APPEAL

Yes, you have relief. You can appeal from the field agent's decisions to his group chief and from him to the appellate division, and you can start a lawsuit if that administrative agency does not satisfy you.

Do you always get reasonable treatment from these appellate units? I can cite one case in which the field agent made an assessment in a demonstrably ridiculous amount—more than twice the valuation accepted by the Service in another district—and was supported both by his group chief and by the appellate division.

Relief was finally obtained only after a lawsuit had been started and the Internal Revenue Commissioner himself learned of the case and caused the assessment to be cut in half.

The courts frequently rescue the harassed taxpayer. But all this is highly expensive.

A field agent has the right to go through all your financial records. He can examine your checkbook and see exactly how you spent what and why, to whom you paid money and from whom you got any.

A great deal of your personal business is reflected in your books and accounts, and, however private these may be, the agent of the Internal Revenue Service can compel you to give him access to most of them. This invasion of your privacy would have shocked our forefathers.

It is eminently distasteful to many Americans today that a perfect stranger, armed with a card showing that he is an employee of the Internal Revenue Service, can peer into their highly personal and private affairs.

The situation can be even worse when a professional man is concerned.

As a lawyer, I have an ethical duty not to disclose my client's business. But the income tax law, in administration, has little regard for my ethical obligations.

Suppose, for example, my books show a receipt from a client which I have not listed on my return as personal income. The agent may ask me why I have not done so.

My reply might be that it represents an expense item, a reimbursement of something paid for the client or a fund to be paid out for the client. He can then insist on my proving that this is not income. He can insist on knowing to whom I have paid it and why.

Suppose I answer that the client's affairs are none of the agent's business. That would merely cause me a tax assessment.

What needs to be done to improve upon our present punitive tax system?

Possibly there can be no perfect tax system, but ours is so disjointed, unfair, and economically regressive that it is obvious enough that a better one could be devised.

Tinkering with what we have through selected "reforms" may do more harm than good. Our whole tax system needs reconstruction from the ground up.

In order to create a sound platform upon which to build, the philosophic, social and economic principles which underlie the present law should be reexamined.

Among them are these, all of which seem to be fallacious either in theory or in practice:

1. That we should be burdened with a tax law which is uncertain and so intricate that not even experts can understand it fully.
2. That the Federal revenues should be produced predominantly through taxes on income, as against taxes on consumption.
3. That a progressive-rate income tax system is socially and economically sounder than a flat-rate system.
4. That double taxation, in the form of a personal income tax imposed upon profits already taxed with corporate income tax, makes economic sense.
5. That the Federal Government should absorb the aggregate taxing capacity to such a degree as virtually to make the States mere fiscal dependencies.

Congress itself is probably not the place to attempt to design a new system. Its operations are necessarily cumbersome and its committees would be subjected to so many conflicting pressures from Members of Congress and the public that a state of endless confusion could result.

NEEDED: A WHOLLY NEW CODE

Instead, Congress should create a special commission to make a fundamental study of taxation. This commission would then offer to Congress a wholly new code based upon carefully selected basic principles and sound economic theories.

Such a commission would be a calamity, however, if it were packed with representatives of pressure groups, such as special representatives of labor and of capital.

Nor should it be packed with academic intellectuals who might believe that the social objectives to which they happen to be attached are more important than economic horsesense.

There is precedence for a special commission to study problems of national importance.

More than 50 years ago, after the panic of 1907. Congress created a special commission, made up of 18 Senators and Representatives, to study the Nation's banking system and recommend changes.

The commission sought expert advice from bankers, finance specialists, lawyers, businessmen. Its report helped pave the way for the setting up, in 1913, of the Federal Reserve System.

Today, the urgent need is to remodel our chaotic tax system. Mere tinkering will solve nothing. A complete overhaul, by an objective commission, is the only answer.

Perhaps the best approach would be for Congress to ask the American Bar Association to create a commission to study and report.

The bar association is nonpolitical, and it could supply the technicians required to do the job. Such a commission would also be able to call on outside experts.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF WARSAW GHETTO RISING

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the 20th anniversary of the rising in the Warsaw ghetto. Twenty years ago this month 40,000 Jews were destroyed. They were desperate men; many of them were probably frightened men; but they died with courage and with dignity. They were destroyed, but they were not humiliated. In life the men and women and children in the Warsaw ghetto were despised and degraded. In death they won a great victory.

This month the Jews of the world are mourning the victims of the Warsaw ghetto. Memorial services have been held in Berlin and London and New York, as well as in Israel and in Warsaw itself. For, the 40,000 who died in the Warsaw ghetto were Jews, and they died because they were Jews. But before these men and women were Jews, before they were Poles, they were human beings. And they were destroyed, not by bullets or shells or fire, but by other human beings. The tragedy of the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto was not merely a tragedy for the Jewish people; it was a tragedy for the whole human race, for Jews and non-Jews alike. The Jews of the world are mourning this month; the whole world should mourn. "Never send to ask for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee."

FOREIGN BRANCHES OF NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill would transfer from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to the Comptroller of the Currency the power to authorize foreign branches of national banks.

At present the chartering, regulation, and examination of national banks, including their domestic branches, rests with the Comptroller of the Currency. That Office also conducts the bulk of the examinations which are made of foreign branches. A thorough and systematic examination program is not possible, however, because of the existing division of the chartering and examination functions.

Since the Comptroller of the Currency has the entire supervisory authority over domestic branches of national banks, it would be logical for the Office to have the same authority over foreign branches of national banks. The duplication of work by two Federal instrumentalities in the same field of national bank branches with its attendant increased cost to the Government should be ended. The present division of responsibility dilutes the power of the Comptroller effectively to supervise the national banking system. Also, it is cumbersome to require national banks to petition one department of the Government to establish a domestic branch and another to establish a foreign branch. There should be a unified approach to the question of establishing branches of national banks. The passage of this bill is in the best interests of the national banking system and the Nation.

UPSTREAM FLOOD CONTROL IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the winner of a statewide conservation speech contest in Oklahoma sponsored this month by the Oklahoma Garden Clubs, Inc., was Miss Sally Cooksey, of Ada, a resident of my district.

Her subject, "Upstream Flood Control," is one of particular interest, because her home city of Ada is in an area where small watershed projects under Public Law 566 of the 83d Congress have been intensively developed. The leadership of the local people there has enabled this program, of which I am proud to have been a cosponsor when it was enacted in 1954, to go far toward remaking the face of the land. Conservation, flood prevention, water storage, all are provided by this worthwhile program.

Miss Cooksey has gone into the countryside around Ada and seen the upstream conservation dams in various stages of development. Her speech shows how young people of our State, as well as their elders, regard the realization of this program as a challenge for the future. Already achieved in a few fortunate valleys, it can by 1980, as Miss Cooksey predicts, make virtually all of Oklahoma's countryside abundant, a land dotted with small lakes and ponds, curving terraces green with sod:

UPSTREAM FLOOD CONTROL IN OKLAHOMA

(By Sally Cooksey)

Let's suppose the time is, say, 1980.

The place: Oklahoma.

The locality: your county.

A drive through the country shows you fields abundant with fully ripened grain, the land dotted with small lakes and ponds, curving terraces green with sod.

Does this sound like a description of a paradise or a fantasy of a dream world? I wonder if we could make this dream a reality.

Let us now think of another dream which was a reality and it was a nightmare for our parents. I have heard and read just as you have about the terrible droughts endured by people living in Oklahoma not too many years ago. We are told that at the end of a long, dry summer fields literally became parched and dead and worthless, that the ponds at which cattle drank became hard, crusty holes in the ground, and farmers were forced to haul water to keep the animals alive.

Now what makes the difference between this paradise we could have and the ugly truth learned by Oklahomans in the recent past? The difference lies in the upstream flood control. Could this one matter of controlling water in our streams take us from drought to abundance? There are many men who feel that it can, that one of the greatest needs in Oklahoma today is the successful management of our water resources.

How, then, can we do this? Is it one of those things that is simple and yet not so simple? For one thing it is a long-term program. I was surprised to learn that work in this area started as far back as 1903. The work progressed slowly for several reasons—probably because of lack of interest and certainly because of lack of funds. It seems that it takes a great deal of time and money to just survey and see what needs to be done. The current watershed program being carried on is a big step in the right direction.

I was interested to learn how and where these projects begin. An authority in the field explained to me that a watershed program must originate with a local group. They in turn prepare an application for a conservation district which they submit to the State agency. They then send experts to make a detailed study of that district. If the work is approved by State and Federal Governments, then the Federal Government will share with the State in financing the project. So, you see, each flood control project is a local undertaking with Federal help, not a Federal project with local help.

I believe educators tell us that the first step toward solving a problem is to recognize that we have a problem and to face it squarely. So, for a few moments, let's analyze our situation in Oklahoma. I know one group that saw the problem for the first time 2 years ago—that was the high school students who prepared for this same contest sponsored by the garden clubs. That year we studied gullies and the matter of soil erosion and we saw firsthand the terrible results of uncontrolled streams. By letting small streams run at will wherever the slope led, we were allowing this unruly water to do great damage to valuable land. Now, with this year's study of upstream control I can see that this runoff water damage could be prevented.

Of course, when we say the word "flood" the picture that comes to my mind is of low lands, or bottom lands which we have seen literally flooded and standing in water. We recognize that many times crops are lost by too much water just as by too little.

Actually, I guess, the kinds of floods which harm people are even more serious than those which destroy land. So a big part of our problem, then, is our neglect of larger rivers which rise and swell, and spread to engulf and endanger human life. Years ago floods were accepted as accidents—unpredictable and unavoidable. But men have learned that this is not entirely true. Men have learned something of control and prevention.

There is another phase of our problem encountered by people who travel by car over our highways. Oklahomans, like all Americans, increasingly spend more time and travel more miles in automobiles. It is not uncommon in certain areas for creeks, swollen by excessive rains, to dislodge a bridge and carry it forward in strong torrents leaving the road impassable.

In the face of all this I'm afraid we have to acknowledge that uncontrolled water running rampant over our State is a problem and should not be ignored. Our own watershed has its own combination of problems. So do all the other watersheds of the Nation, and solutions must fit the problems in each.

Now—is there a solution to our trouble? Luckily, there is. I believe the old saying is—"Heaven helps those who help themselves." And so it does.

We will have to have farmers, ranchers, small people, important people, conservation offices, State, and Federal agencies all working together to correct some mistakes that have been made and to take immediate action for improvement. All the people must be fully informed about what is being done and why. And what each group's responsibilities are. This calls for a continuing program of information and education. One thing that has been used for several years and is proving very successful is the land treatment called terracing. The county and State conservation service has taught land users the great value of retaining land by this method. Now the newest plan is what is called small detention dams. The idea here is that by having many small dams upstream the moisture is kept on areas that need it, rather than rushing downstream where it is not needed. One reason this is a good plan is that the smaller dams are so much less expensive than one very large dam making one large lake. The small upstream dams are usually earthen dams.

I want to take just a minute here to talk specifically about the construction of these dams and the control system used. Perhaps the reason I am especially interested in this is because of an on-the-spot inspection I made of several damsites. A few weeks ago two men from our local conservation office took me on a lengthy tour to see some structures in various stages of building. Our first stop was to see just the proposed location of a small dam. It had been surveyed and approved, but no work had been started. Our next stop was to one nearing completion, and the final and most impressive view was of a large dam which had been finished and in use for 2 years and which backed up quite a few acres of beautiful water. My escort explained that the base of this dam, and others, is clay. Above that is a dirt fill and on the very top is 6 inches of topsoil. This last layer had been sodded with Bermuda grass to prevent erosion. The next thing my guide pointed out was probably the most important feature of the flood control and that was the concrete spillway. This, he said, can be in any of various positions at the base of the dam, but is always in a very deep spot. This drawdown, as it is sometimes called, had a 36-inch pipe for the water to flow through constantly. As I watched that water flowing through the pipe I found it a little difficult to imagine that it would continue on to New Orleans and maybe even to the sea.

Another protective measure on pasture land is the building of ponds to hold water that might be a serious hazard if left free.

Here in this connection we become very aware of how closely water conservation ties into this flood control discussion. While I think the immediate concern in this upstream control program is not the accumulation and saving of water for future use, some day this may prove to be a great asset. We are being told by national planners the amount of water our Nation's people are using is rising tremendously and that there is danger that we may some day experience a real shortage of water in America. We had an example of this very close to home a few years ago when Oklahoma City found itself with an inadequate water supply for its growing population. So it will be well if anything we do now in the way of controlling water may later prove more valuable than we know.

Perhaps we should mention a matter that seems of less importance and that is that some of the larger dams are holding beautiful lakes which afford recreational facilities for Oklahoma residents.

Now let us suppose that it is April 1963 and the place again is Oklahoma. We can be mighty glad that at this point we see great sums of money being spent to preserve our land. And we should hope that in our future we can see the dream of the good earth come true.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE TRENDS (THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET) IN CURRENT FISCAL 1963 (AS OF MARCH 31, 1963) COMPARED TO FISCAL 1962 AND TO BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with leave granted, I include the third monthly synoptic tabulation of the trend of net budget receipts and expenditures in the current fiscal year 1963 as of March 31, 1963, with comparisons to the official budget estimate for the fiscal year 1963 and to corresponding actual data for the previous fiscal year 1962.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Budget revenues are officially projected by the President at $85,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30th—an increase of $4,091,000,000 over actual budget revenues for fiscal 1962. Through the first 9 months—to March 31, 1963—actual budget revenues exceeded the corresponding 9 months of fiscal 1962—to March 31, 1962—by $4,609,000,000.

To reach the net budget revenue prediction of $85,500,000,000 for fiscal 1963 will require net revenues of $23,874,000,000 in the 3 months, April–June 1963. In the corresponding 3 months of fiscal 1962, net budget revenues were $24,392,000,000.

In contrast to budget expenditures which tend to recur more evenly throughout the fiscal year, the pattern of budget receipts shows the months of September, December, March, and June as the peak months; and receipts in the second half of the fiscal year, January–June, are usually higher than in the first half.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures are officially projected at $94,311,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30th—an increase of $6,524,000,000 over actual budget expenditures for fiscal 1962, of which $1,901,000,000 is for national defense and $4,623,000,000 is for other than national defense.

Through the first 9 months—to March 31, 1963—actual budget expenditures exceed the corresponding 9 months of fiscal 1962—to March 31, 1962—by $4,701,000,000, of which $2,157,000,000 is for national defense and $2,544,000,000 is for other than national defense.

AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENDITURES

Using straight averages in both instances, the table discloses that expenditures during the first 9 months of fiscal 1963 averaged $7,763,000,000—slightly less than the projected budget average of $7,859,000,000 for the full fiscal year of 1963 based on the official budget estimate of expenditures—a little less for national defense items and slightly less for nonnational defense items.

To reach the net budget expenditure prediction of $94,311,000,000 for fiscal 1963, net budget expenditures in the 3 months April 1—June 30, 1963, would have to aggregate at least $24,443,000,000—in other words, a monthly average of at least $8,147,000,000 during the 3 month period as against the actual monthly average of $7,763,000,000 in the first 9 months of fiscal 1963. Thus the monthly average expenditure in the 3 months, April–June, could rise $384,000,000 above the monthly average during the first 9 months without exceeding the budgeted total of $94,311,000,000 for the full 12 months. The table discloses that expenditures for all of fiscal 1963 are officially budgeted at a monthly average $544,000,000 greater than the actual monthly average of all of the preceding fiscal year 1962 and that, in comparison to this, in the first 9 months of fiscal 1963 the actual monthly average exceeded the corresponding 9-month average of fiscal 1962 by a little less; namely, by $522,000,000. Stated another way, in the first three-fourths of the fiscal year about 72 percent, or $4,701,000,000 of the officially projected $6,524,000,000 expenditure increase, fiscal 1963 over fiscal 1962, has been realized.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The official budget estimate of the deficit for all of fiscal 1963 is $8,811,000,000, or $2,433,000,000 larger than the actual deficit for all of fiscal 1962.

Through 9 months of fiscal 1963, the actual deficit is $8,242,000,000—only $92,000,000 larger than the actual deficit during the corresponding 9 months of fiscal 1962.

The comparisons and the trend will of course vary each month between April 1 and June 30 in relation to the full year amounts and in relation to each other.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

The official budget projection of last January is that the public debt at the end of fiscal 1963—on June 30, 1963—will be $303,494,000,000, a projected increase of $5,293,000,000 from the actual debt of $298,201,000,000 at the beginning of the fiscal year on July 1, 1962. The substantial explanation for the projected debt increase of $5,293,000,000 during fiscal 1963 being somewhat less than the projected budget deficit of $8,811,000,000, for the same period is that the general fund balance on hand at the start of the fiscal year is estimated to be drawn down to a lower level to help meet part of the deficit rather than borrowing an equivalent amount.

The actual public debt on March 31, 1963, stood at $302,993,000,000—or $6,905,000,000 above the corresponding date in fiscal 1962—at March 31, 1962—and $4,792,000,000 above the total of the debt at the start of the fiscal year on July 1, 1962.

The table follows:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the administrative budget), 9 months of fiscal 1963 versus 9 months of fiscal 1962 and comparison with full-year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 9 months			Budget estimates for all of fiscal 1963 compared to actual for fiscal 1962		
	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1962	1963 compared to 1962	Budget estimate, 1963	Actual, 1962	Estimate 1963 over actual 1962
1. Budget receipts (net)	61,626	57,017	+4,609	85,500	81,409	+4,091
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	30,126	36,969	+2,157	53,004	51,103	+1,901
(b) Other than national defense	30,742	28,198	+2,544	41,307	36,684	+4,623
3. Total expenditures	69,868	65,167	+4,701	94,311	87,787	+6,524
4. Net surplus (+) or deficit (−), (line 1 minus line 3)	−8,242	−8,150	−92	−8,811	−6,378	[1] −2,433
5. Average monthly expenditures:						
(a) National defense	4,347			4,417		
(b) Other than national defense	3,416			3,442		
Total monthly average	7,763	7,241	+522	7,859	7,315	+544

[1] That is to say, the budget projects an estimated increase of $2,433,000,000 in the size of the deficit in fiscal 1963 as compared to the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Sources: Budget for 1964 and monthly Treasury statement for Mar. 31, 1963.

HOW THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT WORKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has long recognized the importance and complexity of the problem created by unemployment and in order to deal with such unemployment, the 87th Congress enacted Public Law 87–27, the Area Redevelopment Act.

The Governor of the State of Connecticut, the Honorable John N. Dempsey, and Connecticut's labor commissioner, Renato E. Ricciuti were among the first to realize the great value of this act and immediately proceeded to implement it.

I believe my colleagues would be interested to know just how this law is operating in my State and district and, therefore, I append herewith an article from the Evening Sentinel of Ansonia, Conn., dated April 4, 1963, and describing the record already made in the important retraining aspect of this program:

Fifteen From Valley Complete ARA Machine Shop Practice Course

Fifteen valley residents were graduated from the seventh Gateway Area Redevelopment Act basic machine shop practice class at Bullard-Havens Regional Technical School, Bridgeport, last night.

Reinhardt Buchli of Shelton, assistant director of adult education at the school, states the men have completed 240 hours of intensive and concentrated instruction in shop mathematics, blueprint reading, and the setting-up and operating of the more common basic machine tools. Each student received a certificate. Graduates are as follows:

Ansonia: Robert A. Bruno, Charles R. Dickerson, Robert J. Koskolowski, David J. Mensch, Robert W. Reichelt, and Michael R. Spinelli.

Derby: Hollis B. Cox, Joseph J. Matto, and Anthony Nuzzo.

Monroe: Russell Bevans.

Seymour: Glenn S. Whitehill, Peter C. Morrow, David A. Bowen, and Raymond McDonald.

Shelton: Anthony J. Ottman.

Mr. Buchli stated the majority of the trainees have expressed an interest and desire to continue in advanced machine shop courses at the school. Any valley resident is eligible to apply. Registration for a variety of technical courses, many on a collegiate level and offering degree credits, will begin after Labor Day for the evening sessions. Further information can be obtained at the school any evening or at the Ansonia office of the Connecticut State Employment Service.

EXCEEDED NORMS

Alex Osedach, manager of the Ansonia office, reported 17 men started the class February 4. To qualify for entrance, each retrainee had successfully exceeded the minimum norms of the U.S. Labor Department machinist apprentice aptitude test battery administered at his office. During the course two dropped out, one to accept a formal 8,000-hour tool and diemaker apprenticeship and the other obtained an in-plant machine tool operator training opportunity.

During the past 2 weeks, three others were placed as a maintenance mechanic, general machine operator trainee, and a diecaster. In order that the three could receive their certificates the employers permitted the men to leave work with enough time to get to school.

Entering jobs immediately after graduation are three other students, two as Swiss automatic screw machine setup and operator trainees and one as an apprentice in a formal State-approved 8,000-hour machinist training program. All other retrainees are in open referrals but their placements in training-related work appears tc be no problem. Mr. Osedach states.

Both Mr. Buchli and Mr. Osedach agree that the ARA federally sponsored course for retraining, which has been operating continuously since October 1961, has consistently been gaining in stature and acceptance by area employers as evidenced by the fact that more and more applicants are being absorbed by industry prior to graduation time for formal apprenticeships or advanced inplant training.

RECORD BEST

The record of the present class is the best to date. Some of the men embarking on rewarding careers previously had work histories as a retail sales clerk, building supply salesman, woodworker, greenhouse helper, dairy farmhand, grocery stockboy, construction equipment serviceman, air compressor operator, drill press operator, and order clerk. Some had no work experience.

In an age of automation and fast-moving technological changes, they state, each is better prepared now to make his contribution to the area's basic industrial economy.

BOSTON COLLEGE CENTENNIAL CONVOCATION ADDRESSED BY PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, AN HONORARY ALUMNUS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a speech by President Kennedy at Boston College.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Boston College, that great Jesuit university in the capital city of my native Massachusetts, observed its centennial of founding last Saturday afternoon with a resplendent convocation addressed by President John F. Kennedy, and attended by leaders of the church, state, and academic world.

As an alumnus of Boston College, I was proud to accompany President Kennedy on the round-trip Washington-Boston jet flight for this momentous occasion in the history of a university which has exercised a profound and beneficial influence upon the intellectual and moral thought of our community, our commonwealth, and our country. President Kennedy himself, when a Senator from Massachusetts in 1956, received an honorary doctor of laws degree from Boston College, an institution he described on Saturday as follows:

> Boston College for 100 years has been of the Nation and so it will be for the next 100.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to read an excellent editorial from the Boston Globe of Friday, April 19, 1963, about Boston College entitled "Monument to Learning":

Monument to Learning

When the Very Reverend Michael P. Walsh, S.J., became president of Boston College in 1958, in the midst of its most concentrated building drive, he declared that his primary purpose was not physical plant but academic development. The extent to which that pledge has been fulfilled is extraordinary, even in an age of dynamic intellectualism and social demands.

New buildings at University Heights shoulder their tan granite through linden trees and maples, but the eye of pedestrian or motorist on Beacon Street cannot see, for instance, that the doctoral degree program in the past 5 years has doubled in scope. The casual visitor to the campus would have no way of knowing that faculty growth and heightened student competence have revolutionized the life of scholarship and communication in laboratory and lecture hall.

Depth in quality in student and teacher admits no precise measurement. A chronicler finds it easier to point out that Boston College was one of the first to adopt the advanced placement plan, that its honors program in the school of education has won the support of the Ford Foundation, that its honors program in liberal arts and sciences has earned the support of the Carnegie Foundation, that its research program has mounted in 5 years from $100,000 to $2 million in grants and that a full-time director of research has become a necessity.

The intensifying of undergraduate disciplines has further stimulated graduate school growth, with research only one measure of its success. Father Walsh was head of the biology department when he was named president of the college. But at his accession he showed his awareness that science was supplementary and not dominant. Jesuit education has always thought in terms of the whole person and the theological dimension. The centennial celebration began with a conference that was a high point in Christian ecumenicism at the university and a new beginning in human relations for its second century.

The celebration has continued with a mingling of humanities and sciences in the truest tradition of the West. The presence of President Kennedy tomorrow, however, is not merely a logical extension of the centennial program. It is a personal tribute of a statesman to an amazing achievement by a community of scholars.

Such explosive expansion as Boston College has seen in the past 5 years would not have been possible if the institution did not have behind it the traditions of the Society of Jesus, a teaching order for 400 years, with colleges ringing the globe. Such a treasury of wisdom, of insight, sensitive and visionary, makes for a ready integration of disciplines and a sure synthesis of multiplying knowledge which might otherwise be denied such a university, building and broadening at the same time.

Prospects for the second century, consequently, are stirring to the imagination. At Boston College, the Jesuits have built a commonwealth of learning that seeks to establish the city of God by exploring, charting, and perfecting the city of man.

HONORARY DEGREES TO LADY BARBARA WARD JACKSON, FATHER BUNN, AND PRESIDENT PUSEY

Mr. Speaker, during the convocation Saturday, the Very Reverend Michael P. Walsh, S.J., president of Boston College, conferred honorary degrees upon Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, president of Harvard University; Miss Barbara Ward—Lady Jackson—the esteemed British economist and author; and the Very Reverend Edward B. Bunn, S.J., president of

Georgetown University here in Washington, D.C., the oldest Jesuit university in the United States, founded in 1789. Under unanimous consent, I include the text of President Kennedy's address and the texts of these honorary degrees at this point in the Record:

Prepared Text of President Kennedy's Speech at Boston College Ceremonies Saturday

Your Eminence, Governor Peabody, members of the faculty, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to come back to a city where my accent is considered normal and where they pronounce the words the way they are spelled.

It is good to be back in Boston; it is still better to be able to join in the heartiest congratulations to Boston College on the occasion of this centennial celebration. I feel the more pleased and the more at home—in that you have chosen this occasion to do honor to three friends and counselors of mine—a friend from Cambridge, Mr. Pusey; a friend from Washington, Father Bunn; and a friend from all the world of freedom, Lady Jackson.

Boston College is 100 years old by the lifespan of men, but young by that of universities.

In this week of observance you have rightly celebrated the achievements of the past—and equally rightly you have turned, in a series of discussions by outstanding scholars, to the problems of the present and the future. Learned men have been talking here of the "knowledge explosion"—and in all that they have said, I am sure, they have implied the heavy present responsibility of institutions like this one. Yet today I want to add a word on the same theme—to impress upon you as urgently as I can the growing and insistent importance of universities in our national life. I shall speak of universities because that is what Boston College has long since become—but most of what I say applies to liberal arts colleges as well.

HAILS ENCYCLICAL

My theme is not limited to any one class of universities—public or private—religious or secular. Our national tradition of variety in higher education shows no sign of weakening, and it remains the task of each of our institutions to shape its own role among its differing sisters. I must hope that my general comments on the condition of the higher learning can be interpreted usefully by those who understand most closely the particular needs of particular institutions.

In this hope, I am much encouraged by a careful reading, in this last week, of the remarkable encyclical, Pacem in Terris. In its penetrating analysis of today's great problems of social welfare and human rights, of disarmament, international order and peace, that document surely shows that on the basis of one great faith and its tradition there can be developed counsel on public affairs that is of value to all men and women of good will. As a Catholic, I am proud of it, and as an American I have learned from it. It only adds to the impact of this message that it closely matches notable expressions of conviction and aspiration from churchmen of other faiths, as in recent documents of the World Council of Churches, and from outstanding world citizens with no ecclesiastical standing.

We are learning to talk the language of progress and peace across the barriers of sect and creed. It seems reasonable to hope that a similar process may be taking place across the quite different barriers of the higher learning.

From the office that I hold, in any case, there can be no doubt of the growing meaning of universities in America. That, of course, is one basic reason for the increasing urgency with which those who care most for the progress of our society are pressing for more adequate programs in higher education, as in education generally. It is for this reason that I urge upon everyone here and in this country, the pressing need for national attention and a national decision in the national interest.

OUTLINES TASKS

In at least four ways the new realities of our day have combined to intensify the focal role of the university in our Nation's life.

First, and perhaps most obvious, the whole world has come to our doorstep, and the universities must be its students. In the strange geometry of modern politics, the distant Congo can be as close to us as Canada, and Canada itself is worth more attention than we have sometimes given. Cultures not our own press for understanding; crises we did not create require our participation; accelerating change is the one universal human prospect. The universities must help.

Second, there is indeed an explosion of knowledge, and its outward limits are not yet in sight. In some fields progress seems very fast, in others distressingly slow. It is no tribute to modern science to jump lightly to the conclusion that all its secrets of particle physics, or molecular life, or heredity, or outer space, are now within miraculously easy reach. The truth is more massive and less magical; it is that wherever we turn, in defense, in space, in medicine, in industry, in agriculture, and, most of all, in basic science itself, the requirement is for better work, deeper understanding, higher education.

And while I have framed this comment in the terms of the natural sciences, I stand squarely with those who insist that at every level of learning there must be an equal concern for history, for letters, and the arts—and for man as a social being, in the widest meaning of Aristotle's phrase. This also is work for the universities.

Third, as the world presses in, and knowledge presses out, the role of the interpreter grows. Men can no longer know everything themselves; the 20th century has no universal man. All men today must learn to know through one another—to judge across their own ignorance—to comprehend at second hand. These arts are not easily learned. Those who would practice them must develop intensity of perception, variety of mental activity, and the habit of open concern for truth in all its forms. Where can we expect to find a training ground for this modern maturity, if not in our universities?

SPIRIT OF SERVICE

Fourth, and finally, these new requirements strengthen still further what has always been a fundamental element in the life of American colleges and universities—that they should be dedicated to "the Nation's service." The phrase is Woodrow Wilson's and no one has discussed its meaning better. What he said in 1896 is more relevant than ever today—and I close with a quotation from him.

I offer it to you with renewed congratulations, and in the confident hope that as her second century opens, Boston College will continue to respond—as she did in her beginning—to the new needs of the age:

"It is not learning," said Wilson, "but the spirit of service that will give a college place in the public annals of the Nation. It is indispensable * * * if it is to do its right service, that the air of affairs should be admitted to all its classrooms * * * the air of the world's transactions, the consciousness of the solidarity of the race, the sense of the duty of man toward man * * * the promise and the hope that shine in the face of all knowledge * * * the days of glad expansion are gone, our life grows tense and difficult; our resource for the future lies in careful thought, providence, and a wise economy; and the school must be of the Nation."

Boston College for 100 years has been * * * of the Nation and so it will be for the next 100.

Texts of the Three Honorary Degree Citations Awarded at Boston College's Centennial Convocation

BARBARA WARD JACKSON

Barbara Ward shares with her husband, Sir Robert Jackson, the oldest title of honor within the gift of kings. But in the kingdom of the intellect she has won more golden opinions than ermine and quarterings can signify. Educated in her native England, in France and in Germany, she has continued her prophetic success in Modern Greats at Oxford by a long series of books in which her luminous mind has elaborated a philosophy of compassion, a politics of brotherhood, an economics of the heart.

Boston College asserts its affectionate gratitude for a voice that responds with uncommon beauty and wisdom to the question: "Who is my neighbor?"

Mindful of the honor she does us by joining the fellowship of the honorary doctors of the University the President and Trustees, empowered thereto by the supreme authority in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, joyfully declare Lady Jackson doctor of letters honoris causa.

EDWARD BERNARD BUNN

For those who know the history of Boston College, the long look backward down the arches of the years brings us even further than an April morning in 1863. Not only was our founder a son of Georgetown, who joined the Jesuits there, and there was ordained to the priesthood, but our pattern of endeavor, the warrant on which we came into being, and the substance of our hopes were derived from the beloved university which was founded on the slopes of the Potomac in 1789.

These are the traditions we recall today as we greet with unbounded joy and affection the Reverend Edward Bernard Bunn, the president of the first Catholic university in the United States.

In Father Bunn we hail a gracious statesman of the educational establishment in America, whose ample talents have been superbly manifested in two university presidencies. More than any other, he symbolizes and hands on a commitment to the ancient ideal of Catholic higher learning, which along with religious liberty and the church itself, was first planted in the free air on the Maryland shore.

Wherefore, the president and trustees, empowered thereto by the supreme authority in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, declare Edward Bernard Bunn, of the Society of Jesus doctor of laws honoris causa.

NATHAN MARSH PUSEY

The greatness of a university is ineluctably bound up with the characters of its founder and leaders. Some have left their splendid names upon the facades of colleges, like Robert de Sorbon and John de Baliol. Others have carved their deeds upon the tablets of history by enlarging the university's charters of instruction, or by setting in clearer view the ideals of faith and order which first called together the company of scholars.

Nathan Marsh Pusey, now in his 10th year as president of Harvard, has guided America's oldest university with a strength and diplomacy equal to the leverage of his office. Not content to preside over the growth of his ancient academy in Georgian brick and imaginative stone and glass, he has raised new pediments and spires on the landscape of the mind. Today the writs of Harvard scholarship run with more compelling voice than ever before in every quarter of the world.

To express their admiration and profound respect for a scholar so singularly blest, the president and trustees of Boston College have enrolled Nathan Marsh Pusey among our honorary alumni, and now proudly style him doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

Mr. Speaker, I also include with my remarks a news story account of the Boston College's centennial convocation from the Boston Sunday Globe, by Ian Forman, including excerpts of the speeches of Father Walsh, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Roman Catholic archbishop of Boston, President Pusey, of Harvard University, and Gov. Endicott Peabody, of Massachusetts:

Calls for Decision on Education—20,000 Hear J.F.K. at Boston College

(By Ian Forman)

President Kennedy, speaking at Boston College's centennial convocation Saturday, urged a "national decision in the national interest upon the national question of education."

In the sun-bright oval of Alumni Stadium, brilliantly filled with academic colors from many colleges and universities, he said before the 20,000 assembled:

"From the office I hold * * * there can be no doubt today of the growing meaning of universities in America.

"That, of course, is one basic reason for the increasing urgency with which those who care most for the progress of our society are pressing for more adequate programs in higher education, as in education generally.

"It is for this reason that I urge upon everyone here the pressing need for national attention and a national decision—in the national interest upon the national question of education," he said.

The President put an emphasis upon the word "national" each time he said it.

His own legislative program for Federal aid to education, both at higher and lower levels, is once again deadlocked on the horns of conflicting interests and groups for the third straight year.

Aside from the seriousness of his words, Mr. Kennedy looked relaxed and happy, refusing to put on his black academic cap, as he joined in the climactic event of Boston College's 100th anniversary celebration.

He recalled that the honorary doctor of laws degree which Boston College had conferred upon him in 1956 had made him, as he put it, "an instant alumnus."

He expressed pleasure that the president of his Harvard alma mater, Nathan M. Pusey, was being honored on this occasion with an honorary doctor of humane letters degree.

The President, tanned, his hair tousled by the stiff breeze, listed four ways in which "the new realities of our day have combined to intensify the focal role of the university."

The fourth point was that "these new requirements strengthen still further what has always been a fundamental element in the life of American colleges and universities—that they should be dedicated to 'the Nation's service.' "

The phrase, he said, was Woodrow Wilson's and "no one has discussed its meaning better than what he said in 1896."

"It is not learning," he quoted Wilson as saying, "but the spirit of service that will give a college place in the annals of the Nation."

To Boston College, the President offered "renewed congratulations * * * in the confident hope that as her second century opens, Boston College will continue to respond—as she did in her beginnings—to the new needs of the age.

"Boston College," he said, "for 100 years has been 'of the Nation' (Wilson's phrase)—and so it will be for the next 100 years."

The setting for the centennial climax was bright and springy, with the fresh green turf of the stadium spreading a handsome carpet for the multicolored procession of gowned and capped representatives from 294 colleges and universities throughout the United States.

PUSEY HAILS BOSTON COLLEGE

President Pusey of Harvard spoke for the other institutions on higher education in congratulating Boston College upon its 100th birthday.

"It is a joy," he said, "to see Boston College forging ahead in its accomplishments."

On a light note, Dr. Pusey added:

"May I as the president of an institution over 300 years old say this discouraging word to Father Walsh and his associates—that the tasks do not get easier as the centuries pass."

Boston College's 22d president in its first 100 years, Very Rev. Michael P. Walsh, S.J., a scientist, conferred honorary degrees upon Dr. Pusey; Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson), British economist and author; and Very Rev. Edward B. Bunn, S.J., president of Georgetown University, the oldest Jesuit university in the Nation, founded in 1789.

Lady Jackson was given an honorary Doctor of Letters and Father Bunn, an honorary Doctor of Laws.

In his own talks, Father Walsh said: "A university must span many centuries before it can be said to be old.

"And so, after only one century, it would be fitting to say that Boston College is still young.

"While we pay grateful and most respectful tribute to our past, our energies and our interests are directed to our future. We are impatient to move on with greater and firmer strides into our second century," he said.

Father Walsh paid tribute to Cardinal Cushing, an alumnus of Boston College, Class of 1917, saying: "* * * at one our most benevolent father and devoted son, our welcome is what it has always been, one of gratitude and deepest affection."

Cardinal Cushing, in his remarks, replied: "For what Boston College has done, is doing and will continue to do for God and for country, for Church and for State, for the education world and for the common good, we are thankful today."

Governor Peabody, who brought the good wishes of the Commonwealth, said:

"All of us who are working for better education opportunities here in Massachusetts can take heart from the accomplishments of Boston College. For education is one of this Commonwealth's most precious assets."

ENCYCLICAL PRAISED

In addition, the President's brother, 31-year-old Senator Edward M. Kennedy, walked in academic dress beside his senior colleague, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, in his Harvard cap and gown.

President Kennedy, in his address, also commented upon "the remarkable encyclical, Pacem in Terris" which Pope John issued last week.

"As a Catholic I am proud of it, and as an American I have learned from it," he said.

"It only adds to the impact of this message that it closely matches notable expressions of conviction and aspiration from churchmen of other faiths—as in recent documents of the World Council of Churches—and from outstanding world citizens with no ecclesiastical standing.

"We are learning to talk the language of progress and peace across the barriers of sect and creed.

"It seems reasonable to hope that a similar process may be taking place across the quite different barriers of the higher learning," he said.

The President also cited the other ways in which the universities must help meet the "new realities of our day."

They are in helping the nation understand the world which "has come to our doorstep;" to continue the explosion of knowledge which "in some fields seems so fast, in others distressingly slow;" and to act as interpreter "as the world presses in, and knowledge presses out."

ROGERS CITES NEW FIGURES IN CUBAN SHIPPING

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the period from April 6 to 19, a total of six more ships flying the flags of our allies called in Communist Cuba. Five of these were British, one of which was an 11,182-ton tanker. Another was of Lebanese registry.

A total of 56 allied vessels have called in Cuba since January 1. Such trade is an affront to the United States and the entire hemisphere. Again I urge our Government to close its ports to all nations engaged in sea trade with Communist Cuba.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CUBAN POLICY IS RIGHT AND HAS GROWING SUPPORT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's Cuban policy is basically correct and right and has growing support.

Walter Lippmann in his column of April 23, 1963, in the Washington, D.C., Post, declared that the significant fact about the speeches of the President, Secretary Rusk, and Senator Keating before the meeting last week of the American Society of Newspaper Editors was that:

> There is substantial agreement about what the United States should and should not do.

It is interesting that Governor Rockefeller and former Republican Vice President Richard Nixon have become almost singlehandedly "the war party."

I include the text of Walter Lippmann's penetrating article entitled "The Kennedy-Keating Cuban Policy."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 23, 1963]

The Kennedy-Keating Cuban Policy

(By Walter Lippmann)

Cuba got a good airing last week before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and the significant fact about the speeches of the President, Secretary Rusk, and Senator Keating was that there is substantial agreement about what the United States should and should not do. It is hard to say what Mr. Nixon's Cuban policy would be. He sounded like a man who was ready to go to war. But all he actually said was that he wanted the Cuban exiles to make hit-and-run raids.

Senator Keating, who is the most conspicuous of the critical opposition, began by saying that "it is foolish to pretend that there are easy answers to the Cuban problem." He did not pretend. Then in the course of his speech he admitted that he agrees with the main theses of our present Cuban policy. He is opposed to an invasion. He is opposed to a blockade. He is opposed to hit-and-run raids mounted from American soil. He is in favor of "greater stress on nonmilitary measures," and he wants to exert increasing economic pressure so that the Soviets "will be driven to the conclusion that the price of maintaining a base in Cuba is too high."

This is the same story which the administration is telling. Senator Keating's differences are not in the substance of the text but in the editing, the typography, the layout, and the captions. The Senator, like the President, excludes in present circumstances the resort to war—invasion, blockade, and raiding; like the President he too would deal with Cuba by surveillance, containment, isolation, economic pressures, and propaganda.

There is no doubt that at least for some time to come the Kennedy-Keating policy will leave the Soviet troops 90 miles from Florida. This is an affront to our pride. Not since Napoleon III put French troops into Mexico to enthrone and support the Emperor Maximilian has anything like this happened so close to us. In the end the French troops went away. But, because there was no prudent alternative, Lincoln put up with the Bonapartist troops for several years.

How long must we put up with the Russian troops? The honest answer is that we must put up with them until they can be gotten rid of by measures short of nuclear war. Here is the sticking point in the argument with Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon. They sound, they intend to sound, as if they know a way to get rid of the Russian troops promptly without waging nuclear war.

What is this prompter way to make the Russians go away from Cuba? They do not tell us, but the most reasonable interpretation of what they say is that the prompter way is not to make war but to threaten war. Both Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon have avoided saying plainly what they do mean. But if what they sound like has genuine meaning it is that they believe the United States can deliver an utlimatum which the Soviet Union will bow to.

If this is not what they mean, what in the name of commonsense do they mean with all their big words? If they are prepared to be so bold with the Russians, they ought to be bold enough to talk plainly to their fellow Americans.

The Rockefeller-Nixon position appears then to be that Cuba can be liberated by ordering the Soviet Union to withdraw from this hemisphere, and to stand by passively while we blockade Castro and arrange for a replacement of Castro's government. If this is what they have in mind, they are making an enormous guess. For nobody can possibly know that the Soviet Union would surrender its whole position in Cuba as it surrendered its offensive weapons last October. It is the supreme folly in the nuclear age to drive a nuclear power into a corner. And if the Soviet Union refused to bow to the ultimatum, all this would do for us would be to make us look like fools.

The President of the United States cannot play with an ultimatum to a government like that of the Soviet Union. He cannot use an ultimatum unless he is prepared to go through with it and begin a war. If he is not prepared to go to war, an ultimatum is a bluff and everyone will soon see that it is.

While the present policy does not promise a quick withdrawal of the Russians or the fall of Castro, it is surely not true to say that it is complacent do-nothingism. To a degree which is just short of war Cuba is being photographed, patrolled, embargoed and squeezed, and isolated. If Cuba were a great power, we would be at war with her for what we are already doing. I doubt whether there is any precedent where we have exerted such strong measures short of war on any other country.

However much we are impatient and frustrated we have to grasp the fact that Cuba is no military threat to the United States and is not very much of a threat to Latin America. The worst of Castro is his example and a long way after that such agents as he is able to train and infiltrate into the Latin American countries. He is an affront to our pride, he is a nuisance, he is a mischiefmaker. But he is not a mortal threat to the vital interests of the United States, and therefore, in this age of thermonuclear war, we must deal with him by measures that are short of war.

THE NEED FOR RESHAPING U.S. TRADE POLICY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in an article appearing in the forthcoming issue of Harper's magazine, I have appealed for an end to America's preoccupation with Europe and a redirection of our policy toward the broader goal of a free world community.

The text of the article follows:

America Gets an Unexpected Break

(By Henry S. Reuss)

Instead of cursing De Gaulle, we ought to thank him for compelling us to reexamine the goals of our foreign policy. For the past 2 years we have uncritically supported the Common Market, although it was bound to impair free world trade by discriminating in favor of the insiders and their former colonies, and against those on the outside looking in.

Our vision was warped. For, in fact, since World War II our goal should have been nothing less than a community of the entire Free World. In such a community, the industrialized countries—Western Europe, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and perhaps some others—would strive together for full employment and rapid growth within their own borders. They would also work toward the removal of trade barriers which separate them from each other and from the developing nations. And they would seek a mechanism of international exchange and payments which would avoid crises and permit each country to progress socially and economically. The industrialized countries would achieve full employment and at the same time provide their partners, the developing countries, with growing export markets and a dynamic source of public and private capital.

From time to time there have been glimmerings from official Washington that we were dedicated to such a large concept. But mostly we have been preoccupied with a particular view of Europe, centered on the Common Market. European regionalism should have been seen as merely a means to an end. Instead we have allowed it to become an end in itself. When Common Market policy collided with free world policy, the former nearly always won out.

Immediately after World War II it made sense to concentrate on rebuilding war-torn Europe as a step toward a free world community. We invented the Marshall plan. We encouraged regional institutions, such as the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Council of Europe, the Coal-Steel Community, and Euratom. The Common Market of France, Italy, Germany, and the three Benelux countries (often called the Six) was part of this pattern.

In the beginning its entirely valid purpose was to strengthen the economies of its members by giving them a mass market and the spur of competition. Another sound objective was the ending of animosity between France and Germany. These things have now been done.

Curiously, the most significant steps toward free world unity were taken in the immediate postwar period, when emphasis on Europe was amply justified by the need to fend off chaos. At Bretton Woods in 1945, we laid the foundation for a worldwide monetary order. In 1948 we convened the countries of the free world to establish the multilateral tariff-cutting procedures of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade known as GATT. With the point 4 program in the early 1950's, we gave direct aid to the developing nations. Those programs have not been matched by any comparable efforts since the midfifties. European regionalism has had top priority in our foreign policy. Ironically, as Europe came to need less of our concern and the free world more, we gave Europe more and more and the free world less. In effect, we turned our backs on the larger goals and, as a result, little progress toward them has been made since the promising postwar beginnings.

We knew, for example, that the free world needed a better system of international payments. But we were unwilling to go to France and other prosperous European countries and frankly ask for needed help. So we staggered along with monetary arrangements that have remained at best precarious.

Likewise we recognized that the developing countries needed economic assistance. But until very recently, we allowed the Europeans to drag their feet on foreign aid. And, although we paid lip service to the principle of multilateral, liberalized trade, we hailed the Common Market, with its obvious discriminatory features, as a great progressive step.

Strangely, hardly anyone questioned the assumptions that led to our single-minded concern with Europe. In the Great Non-Debate, few people pointed out that the Common Market was encouraging a European particularism rooted in the ancient dreams of unity of Charlemagne, Dante, and Henry IV, at just the time in history when speedy communications and the aspirations of rising peoples everywhere required a free world generalism.

THE DISHWASHER GAP

To understand how great a mistake this was, let us see just how the Common Market works, and who gets hurt.

First of all, we do. Unless our surplus of exports can be increased to offset our deficit items such as military expenditures overseas and investments abroad, we face continuing deficits in our balance of payments. Incomes are rising in the Common Market countries. They could be our fastest growing export area. But if the Common Market continues on its recent inward-looking course, we will lose rather than gain exports. The Common Market aims to insulate its members against the rest of the world with an external tariff averaging 11 percent and no tariff wall between its members. Such discrimination will hurt us.

Metal lathes provide a case in point. In 1958, the last pre-Common Market year, we exported $1.5 million of metal lathes to Germany, and $3 million to France. The German tariff was zero; the French tariff 11 percent. The Common Market external tariff is now 9 percent. The increase in the German tariff from zero to 9 percent is likely to cut us off from that market entirely. And the decrease in the French tariff from 11 to 9 percent is not likely to help us, since the Germans can ship their lathes into France duty-free. Thus even if Americans were to lead a Spartan life, keep wages and prices stable, and make admirable gains in productivity, our export possibilities to the Common Market could be largely gobbled up by its own members.

Consider, for instance, our consumer durable-goods industry, which produces such things as washing machines, driers, refrigerators, dishwashers, garbage-disposal units, and lawnmowers. Market studies show that these commonplace amenities of the American home have been rare luxuries abroad. Now, however, there is a shortage of domestic help in Europe due to full employment. There is a huge new market for every kind of appliance from clothes driers to dishwashers. And we could easily meet this demand, for our appliance plants have vast idle capacity while over 6 percent of our labor force is unemployed.

Yet the new Common Market external tariffs effectively exclude most U.S. appliances (the tariffs are: electric percolators, 18 percent; dishwashers, 19 percent; vacuum cleaners, 18 percent). Were it not for this tariff wall, exports of our consumer durable goods to Europe could match the spectacular sales in America of Europe's compact cars, which have been admitted under our low (6.5 percent) automobile tariff.

The man from Mars might well clutch his forehead and wonder: Why don't these foolish mortals put some of the unemployed in the United States back to work making and exporting these household appliances which Europeans now want and can afford? This would not merely spur the U.S. economy and create jobs for Americans. It would also help the European countries. At present, a wage increase in Europe can cause inflation because higher purchasing power will compete for roughly the same amount of consumer goods. If Europe were to let down her trade barriers, new imports could sop up this excess purchasing power. And these sales of our products abroad would help wipe out the U.S. international payments deficit and Western Europe's payments surplus, to the advantage of the whole free world. Only thus can the dollar—the international currency of Europe and the United States—become stable once again.

The discriminatory tariffs of the Common Market imperil not only our exports of manufactured goods. Our farm exports face at least an equal threat from the market's policy of agricultural protectionism. For other countries of the free world—including the European countries left out of the Common Market—the prospect is ominous.

RICH MAN'S CLUB

Exports are the economic lifeblood of Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, and other members of the European Free Trade Association. A large share of their exports have traditionally gone to the Common Market countries.

Denmark's efficient farmers, for example, have earned about half of the Nation's export income. A major market for their products has been West Germany. However, as the Common Market agricultural policy goes into effect, Denmark is already beginning to feel the pinch. The Danes must anticipate the probable loss of $150 million yearly in export trade.

Israel, as well as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and other British Commonwealth countries, also face serious problems of discrimination from the Common Market, although they are breathing a momentary sigh of relief at Britain's failure to join it.

Israel, for example, has staked her economic future on expanding trade with Europe. Sixty percent of her exports now go to Britain and the Six. She sells oranges, her principal export earner, to Britain at a nondiscriminatory tariff of 10 percent—that is, the same tariff paid on oranges from any other country. This enables Israel to compete successfully with other orange-growing countries. If Britain joins the Common Market, Israel would have to pay a tariff of 20 percent to sell her oranges in Britain. It would be hard to compete with oranges from Italy and North Africa, which are members of the Common Market and thus pay no tariffs.

Or take Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. They sell vast quantities of grain, meat, dairy products, and fruit to Britain duty free, or at a low tariff. Britain fought for a provision that would safeguard the present level of Commonwealth exports to Britain, and this insistence proved a major stumbling block to British entry.

Grave as is the threat to the other industrialized nations, the most damage will be done to the developing countries. A few former French and Belgian territories will receive preferential entry for their products into the Common Market. But to most of Latin America, Asia, and Africa the Common Market looks like a rich man's club designed to make the rich richer.

Argentina, for example, will be hurt if the Six proceed to eat French duty-free grain, rather than Argentine grain that must pay the Common Market external tariff. Brazil will be hurt when the former French African colonies increase their coffee production and export it to the Six duty free. Ecuador faces the same problem as cocoa production shifts to former French Africa. What the United States gives to Latin America through the Alliance for Progress it can take away by failure to bargain away the Common Market's discriminatory policies.

Some time ago our policymakers perceived that the Common Market could become a threat as well as a blessing. We then decided that Britain must be helped to join in order to leaven the lump of the Six with the yeast of British democracy and free-trade philosophy. Future historians may well dispute whether Britain's entry might not instead merely have enlarged the area of the Common Market's discrimination against the outside world.

But whatever the merits of the Britain-must-join-at-all-costs position, the method we used to pursue it did a disservice to ourselves and to the rest of the free world. We distorted and crippled the tariff-cutting power of President Kennedy's Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to make it a lever to push Britain into the Common Market. The key and much-publicized provision of this act was the power to abolish tariffs entirely on many major industrial commodities, such as consumer durable goods, machinery, chemicals, and paper. Not only the United States but the whole free world stood to benefit. But this power was conditioned on Britain's joining the Common Market. The intent was to convince all concerned that if Britain failed to join, there could be no effective tariff-cutting negotiations. Now that Britain is out, we awaken to find the act's zero-bargaining clause "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."[1]

A second result of our fixation on the Britain-must-join policy has been the postponement of the negotiations made possible by the Trade Expansion Act. There is no reason why these negotiations should not be taking place now. But State Department spokesmen have let it be known that bargaining must be delayed until at least 1964 while we wait for the British position to be "clarified."

RIGHT THE FIRST TIME

What should the United States do now? To pursue an outworn policy would be the worst folly. It could result in a revival of American protectionism and isolationism. Such a course would make it impossible for us and other advanced countries to meet our responsibility to developing nations. This is a forbidding prospect.

But where there is danger there is also opportunity. De Gaulle's veto of Britain may shake us out of our obsession with the Common Market and its enlargement and cause us to concentrate on the logical goal—a free world community—in trade, in international payments, in economic growth, and in aid. We should take positive steps toward that goal now. This means that we must use the Trade Expansion Act to reduce free world trade barriers quickly and multilaterally, for our own benefit and for everyone else's.

When? Instead of a business-as-usual approach to negotiations, we should start tomorrow.

With whom? Our main bargaining partners, hopefully, will be the Common Market and the free world's other industrialized nations. If the Common Market refuses to negotiate, we should immediately conduct aggressive bargaining with the other industrial nations. We should extend the benefits of these negotiations to the developing countries, but not to a noncooperating Common Market. This would require an amendment to the present GATT most-favored-nation clause, under which tariff reductions negotiated between any countries accrue to the benefit of all other GATT members.

How deep? We should enact the Douglas-Reuss amendment to the Trade Expansion Act, which will give us the power to abolish tariffs on major groups of commodities. At present, administration policy is to the contrary. At his February 7, 1963, press conference, when he was asked whether he planned to seek passage of this amendment, President Kennedy said:

"No; we haven't planned to ask Congress, because we do have the power, under the trade expansion bill, to reduce all other tariffs by 50 percent, which is a substantial authority. We lack the zero authority."

It is true that a 50 percent tariff-cutting power is better than none at all. But it is far from sufficient to stimulate a large expansion in world trade. In fact we had this 50 percent tariff-cutting power several times under the old Reciprocal Trade Agreements Acts of the 1930's and 1940's which President Kennedy consigned to limbo on January 24, 1962, when he sent the trade expansion bill to Congress. "The Trade Agreements Act," he said at that time, "must be replaced by a wholly new instrument. A new American trade initiative is needed to meet the challenges and opportunities of a rapidly changing world economy."

---

[1] The wording of the zero-bargaining clause of the act is complicated. It allows us to bargain foreign tariffs down to zero on commodities of which the United States and the Common Market are the "dominant supplier"—carrying on together at least 80 percent of the world trade in that commodity. The big hitch is that without Britain in the Common Market, there simply are no such commodities (except jet aircraft and margarine). Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois and I, last year, pressed an amendment to the act which would have given the United States down-to-zero bargaining power on some 26 major groups of commodities, whether or not Britain joined the Common Market. The amendment was adopted by the Senate, but was deleted in Senate-House conference, and hence is not in the act. Under Secretary of State George Ball testified that the reason for the administration's opposition to the Douglas-Reuss amendment was that "we would be injecting ourselves into the UK-EEC negotiations." Senator DOUGLAS replied to Mr. Ball at this point: "I would say you have already been injecting yourself on the side of putting pressure on Great Britain to get into the Common Market.

The President went on to request the special authority to eliminate tariffs: "To be effective in achieving a breakthrough agreement with the EEC so that our farmers, manufacturers, and other free world trading partners can participate," he said, "we will need to use both the dominant-supplier authority (to eliminate tariffs) and the general authority (to reduce tariffs by 50 percent) in combination." [2]

The President, it would now seem, was right the first time—in his 1962 trade message rather than in his 1963 press conference. In the modern industrial world, a vestigial tariff of a few percentage points can effectively block trade.

There is an even more important reason why we need the power to eliminate, not just reduce by 50 percent, the Common Market's tariff wall. The Common Market internal tariffs will shortly be at zero. Discrimination against countries outside it can be eliminated only if the Common Market's external tariff is also reduced to zero. Unless we likewise have the power to reduce our own tariffs to zero we lack the leverage to get rid of those aspects of the Common Market which threaten us and the whole free world. Regardless of the benefits of the Franco-German rapprochement and a new market for the Six, our initial support of the Common Market made sense only if we were prepared to try to bargain away its threatening features as soon as possible.

As the Trade Expansion Act now stands, we are in effect saying: "Since France has kept Britain out of the Common Market, we are going to punish ourselves. We will make it impossible to bargain effectively for the entry of American goods into foreign markets."

Clearly this position makes very little sense. Instead, our first order of business should be to invigorate the Trade Expansion Act by including down-to-zero bargaining power. This would be helpful in many ways.

We in the United States, with our lagging growth rate, our persistent balance-of-payments deficits, our chronic unemployment, will benefit particularly.

The United Kingdom, the European countries not in the Common Market, Canada, and Japan, seriously damaged by the Common Market's protectionism, would also gain. They would welcome U.S. leadership in bargaining down tariffs.

Similarly, the developing nations of Latin America, and the Asian and African countries not affiliated with the Common Market, would profit. They need expanded outlets in the industrialized world for both their raw materials and their growing manufactures. American initiative in eliminating tariffs would be a major step in opening up such markets.

Even the nations of the Common Market themselves would be aided in their economic progress, if not in the political aspirations of some of their leaders. An attempt at autarchy does not make the best use of the resources of the Six or of their former colonies associated with them. They would do far better by concentrating on the items which they are best suited to produce, rather than by using protective tariffs to make uneconomic enterprises profitable.

As U.S. trade policy shifts from its Common Market fixation to a free-world-wide orientation, we must take other steps to advance the prosperity of the free world community.

Foremost, our rate of economic growth must be stepped up. We are already committed to this objective. President Kennedy's tax reduction is to be the prime mover. But this measure must be supplemented by the vigorous trade policy I have outlined here. It will serve to make our industry better able to compete in the world market and also give us some new customers.

Additionally, we need a more durable system of international payments. As the Joint Economic Committee of Congress has pointed out, the present policies of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System to protect the dollar are inadequate. Our foreign creditors could still start a run on the dollar. Because of this possibility, the Federal Reserve is anxious to make bank loans harder to get, and interest rates higher, all "to protect the dollar." This threat of renewed tight money could mean continued stagnation for our economy.

Fortunately, a way out of this dilemma exists. The countries of Europe should be asked to do for us what we helped them do for each other in the fifties: form a payments agreement under which capital that flows from one country is matched by compensating credits from the others. With such an agreement in effect, the Federal Reserve would have no excuse for restricting growth "to protect the dollar," since the dollar would be protected by our international partners. If France's financial authorities have acquired the habit of saying "No" from France's President, and oppose such an agreement, we should go ahead and negotiate one without France.

At the same time we must continue to push all the industrialized nations to increase their foreign aid efforts in the developing countries. A good start in this direction has been made by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It should be energetically encouraged. However, I believe that a healthy economic relationship between the industrialized countries—with freer trade, an adequate system of international payments, and full employment—will actually help the developing countries more than any amount of direct aid they are likely to get.

Will the kind of free world community I am proposing involve the surrender of sovereignty by its members? The answer is surely: not much. Existing political machinery—like GATT, for trade; the International Monetary Fund, for payments; the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, for growth and aid—can do the job for a long time to come.

MEETING WITH A PURPOSE

Indeed, elaborate political machinery might do more harm than good. If it is less broad than the free world—just sixes or sevens or Atlantic powers—it may merely divide the free world. I do not think we need another supranational organization now. It would be far better, I believe, for parliamentarians and ministers from the industrial countries of the free world to meet from time to time to debate trade or payments or growth or aid. If new institutions are needed they should be allowed to evolve organically from progress in economic and social cooperation rather than from an advance blueprint.

Obviously the free world community cannot be born without the cooperation of other industrial nations. Cabinet ministers must agree to mutual tariffcutting, to buttress each other's currencies, and to share the foreign-aid burden. Such agreements, our own standpatters may say, are unlikely. Perhaps the Belgians will balk, or the Germans will refuse, or the French will once again say "No." How foolish, our pessimists will argue, to make requests that are bound to be turned down, to everyone's embarrassment.

I do not agree. I think we should go ahead and make our requests. Ministers in democratic countries come and go, but public opinion remains. If we place our proposals before the world, public opinion just might bring public officials around, sooner or later.

Sometimes, when the cause is just, the result comes sooner rather than later. In 1962, for instance, Congress had before it the bill to reimburse Philippine citizens for war damage caused by U.S. Armed Forces. On May 9, the House unexpectedly voted the bill down, 201 to 171. The Philippine Government stuck to its guns, saying very publicly that the bill was a just one and ought to pass. President Macapagal canceled his June trip to the United States. The Philippine Independence Day was changed from July 4 to June 12. The American people and then Congress got the message. On August 1 the House passed the bill, 194 to 35, and it became law on August 30.

Similarly if we develop a just proposal for a free world community, it is better to make it publicly, and to take our chances that it will one day prevail. To keep quiet about it is simply to insure failure.

A summit conference of the heads of the free world's industrialized nations might well serve to get us all moving toward the goal of community, and away from interim means that have failed. The sooner we can fix our minds on that goal, the better the chances that the free world will avoid shaking itself apart over United States-European political or military disputes—over who joins or does not join the Common Market, for instance, or over who should have nuclear weapons and how they are to be controlled.

These disputes will continue to occur. They may become more heated as, in one European country after another, power is transferred from the old men who now wield it to younger hands. But these disputes need not be fatal if the free world has a larger purpose to hold it together.

From the standpoint of domestic politics, the goal of a free world community is one the American people can grasp. Once they understand, they will give more support to programs designed to end our economic lag and unemployment at home. For Americans respond best when they can see the connection between domestic and foreign policy, between individual measures and broad goals, between practical means and idealistic ends.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit Thursday afternoon when the House is in session but only during special orders; in other words, the gentleman from Ohio

---

[2] Administration witnesses testified to this same effect before the House Ways and Means Committee on the trade expansion bill. For example, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges on March 12, 1962, said:

"This 50 percent authority by itself is simply and clearly not enough to accomplish our objectives concerning the European Common Market. If we were able to reduce our tariffs by no more than 50 percent, the EEC could then be expected to impose a similar limitation in its reductions, still leaving an only partially reduced tariff wall as a formidable barrier against many particularly large U.S. export products.

"With the internal tariffs paid by our European competitors being eliminated altogether, this would still leave U.S. business trying to export to the EEC under a heavy cost disadvantage tariffwise * * *.

"The Europeans are moving to free trade; we need authority to go to zero, too, on at least part of our trade which is primarily concerned with European markets. Either we give our exporters a real chance to keep their markets and share in the growth of the new Europe, or we turn our backs in retreat * * *."

[Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON] and I just discussed this matter, and the minority does not object if we commence our meeting when the special orders commence on the floor.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Texas and I have discussed this matter. I made the point that I did not want to sit while there was business on the floor of the House, and we agreed that once special orders came up, we would withdraw our objection, and I will be glad to sit during special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

"REMEMBER THE 'MAINE'"

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I read with pleased surprise this morning the lead editorial in the Washington Post. It now appears that that newspaper, or the editorial writers, are aware of the fact that we do have a problem in Cuba. I hope that this is only the first of a number of such editorials that we may find in that paper and elsewhere. Many of us during recent weeks and months have been saying on this floor and throughout the United States that as long as there is an aggressive Communist government in Cuba, we have a problem which cannot be solved simply by closing our eyes to it.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the administration will now take active, positive steps to remedy this evil and to remove this cancer from our hemisphere.

The editorial reads as follows:

"REMEMBER THE 'MAINE'"

Something like a consensus on Cuban policy is beginning to emerge in this country. The debate over when and how that policy is to be executed should not conceal the growing accord on the policy itself. Last week, the President, the former Vice President, the State Department, and Republican critics of the State Department had different things to say about Cuba, but on two points there was general agreement. And on these two points there is a gathering agreement in the country.

The broad proposition on which there is accumulating accord is simply this: that the existence of a Communist regime, linked to the Soviet Union, in this hemisphere, is a threat to the safety and survival of the United States and of all other free countries in this part of the globe. No administration that openly opposes this belief can long survive. Sooner or later an administration that denounced this maturing conviction would be followed by an alternative government committed to it. In a negative way, there is almost the same accord on how this policy should not be pursued. There is almost universal agreement that invasion, openly and directly, immediately or in the near future, is not the way to pursue our policy.

This aversion to foreign control of Cuba by a hostile power is the constant of American attitudes toward our island neighbor. The Monroe Doctrine was an expression of a view already long-held in this country. It was given even fuller expression in the administration of John Quincy Adams when this country made known its opposition to the transfer of Cuba from Spain to France, England, or any other power. The practical basis of this policy was clearly stated in Daniel Webster's support of President Adams' decision to send delegates to a conference with South American countries, in which the great orator said:

"A Member has said that if Spain chose to transfer the island to any other power she has a right to do so, and we here cannot interfere to prevent her. I must dissent from this opinion. The rights of nations in matters of this kind are much modified by circumstances. Because France or Great Britain could not rightfully complain of the transfer of Florida to us, it does not follow that we could not complain of the cession of Cuba to one of them. The transfer of Florida to us was not dangerous to the safety of either of these nations, nor fatal to any of their great and essential interests. Proximity of position, neighborhood, whatever augments the power of injuring or annoying, very properly belong to the consideration of all cases of this kind. What might otherwise never be thought of is justified for these reasons and on these grounds."

If the American people are aware of such dangers now, they are aware of other dangers that unhappily and unfortunately also exist and that must be weighed with equal care and caution. Impetuous and impulsive and ill considered acts by this country might bring on the dangers of thermonuclear war without diminishing the dangers of Soviet occupation of Cuba.

Therefore, it must be the object of the Government of the United States to develop some alternative to direct action that will further the policy of this country without incurring the hazards of invasion or like military intervention. It is very urgent that the Government develop such a policy and that it disclose it. It is very plain that, throughout this country, the conviction that the Nation is in peril is hardening to a point where no threats and no fears may be sufficient to inhibit the demand for action against the forces that occupy Cuba. Democratic governments are not wholly free agents. A government that does not develop a program of minimum risk runs the danger of being coerced into a program of maximum risks, almost against its will. The absence of an affirmative design, in such a situation, is dangerous—dangerous to this country, to its neighbors and to the peace of the hemisphere and of the whole world.

The Government of this country, the governments of friendly countries and the Government of the Soviet Union as well had better take note of the increasing sense of Americans that the United States is endangered by the Soviet occupation of Cuba. This sense of jeopardy is beginning to pervade the whole body politic. The Soviet Government whatever its fears and doubts, felt compelled, by such an impulse, to send its forces into Hungary. It ought to understand the much greater force that such sentiments exert upon democratic governments. Every day that passes without the termination of the Soviet occupation of Cuba increases the certainty and multiplies the likelihood that another Maine disaster will put the spark to the combustible materials in the Caribbean.

LAOS-SOUTHEAST ASIA-CUBA MESS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress sworn to uphold the Constitution, I intend to champion capitalism, U.S. sovereignty, and the Republic.

So, it is necessary for me to describe President Kennedy's program as a series of failures on the one hand, and attempts to assume dictatorial power on the other, regardless of existing law.

Yesterday I mentioned a domestic specific. Today I want to call attention to the Laos-southeast Asia-Cuba mess. Without authorization by Congress we are at war in South Vietnam, by President Kennedy's dictation, we are subsidizing Communist takeover of Laos, and we are doing nothing about Khrushchev and communism in Cuba and its spread throughout this hemisphere, in clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

The dictator complex which seems to be dominating the thinking from the White House is further pointed up in a news story in the Washington Daily News of April 22 by Virginia Prewett. This story reports the Kennedy administration has "been working on a plan for Cuba—a so-called Laos solution wherein the administration was actually attempting to make a deal with Russia to set up a coalition government to include Communists in Cuba. At the very moment his Laos solution is falling about his ears and we are about to give the Communists another complete victory in Asia, the administration is negotiating for the same kind of deal in Cuba. The world has been saved from the disaster of such a sell-out of freedom in Cuba only because of the magic Kennedy touch which results in failure for every administration-sponsored enterprise."

Mr. Speaker, Congress and the people must be aroused to the terrible danger we face from such arrogance, such disregard of constitutional powers, such an easy assumption to dictatorship now taking place in America. Once more, in the name of the people of the Fifth District of Texas, and as a responsible Member of Congress, sworn to uphold the Constitution and to protect from all enemies, foreign and domestic, I call upon the President to tell the American people his plans for the kind of government he envisions for this Republic.

I call upon the President to tell the American people what his plans are in connection with this violation of the Monroe Doctrine and the taking over of this hemisphere by the Communists and to confide in us without managing the news.

DISCUSSION OF ENTRANCE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GUERRILLA TRAINEES IN CUBA

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the amount of sabotage and subversion going on throughout the Americas with Cuba as the spawning grounds, as well as the high degree of efficiency on the part of the Communists in Cuba, has been brought to my attention in the form of a questionnaire which all guerrilla trainees from the Americas have to fill in upon their arrival in Cuba's training camp.

Containing 38 questions, the questionnaire was turned in by a Communist defector who was being trained in Cuba for Communist subversion in South America. The list shows that Communists, through Cuba as the beachhead, are blueprinting a plan for the communization of Latin America through subversion, sabotage, armed action, and encouraged uprisings, and every other detestable Marxist-Leninist tool being taught in Cuban training schools.

It shows the intent and purpose of Cuban subversive training camps, namely, the overthrow of the governments from which the trainees come.

It shows that Cuba is the focal point for gathering vital information for subversive activities by the international Communist conspiracy.

It proves that the forceful overthrow and sabotage activities, if peaceful political subversion does not succeed, is the program in the Western Hemisphere.

It proves long-range planning with Cuba as the base for future arming and training of subversives and for eventual striking at vital installations and existing weak spots.

After the usual questions dealing with the identity, occupation, and places of residence of the trainee, more salient questions are posed:

For example, question 15 asks: Give a description of the police organization and the investigative agencies of your place. Who are the officers in charge of repression? What is their rank? List the names and addresses of any victims of their repressive actions and state if they are persons of strong opinions.

Question 17 asks: What are the possibilities of guerrilla warfare in your region? What would be the morale of the people with regards to this struggle?

Question 18 asks: What is the morale and the preparation of the army for an antiguerrilla war?

Some questions deal with smuggling activities, such as question 23, which asks: List the names and addresses of persons whom you have knowledge to be involved in smuggling activities; and some questions deal exclusively with obtaining information about military establishments in the countries in question. Question 36 asks: Where are the military aircraft located in your region? How many aircraft are there? How are the airfields guarded? What type of documents are needed by the workers to gain access to the airfield? Are the workers under vigilance by the authorities?

Question 38 asks: Where are the naval bases located in your region? Where are the river patrol stations located, if any?

This list, the full text of which I am placing in the RECORD, evidences that Cuba is a clear and present danger to the security of the hemisphere and that it is urgent that we formulate planned action to eliminate Castro's communism.

Incidentally, U.S. citizens going to Cuba for subversive training are called upon to answer this same questionnaire, another reason why I am continuing my efforts to have the open door to subversion in this hemisphere, the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City, closed, and Americans who are taking this subversive route to Cuba prosecuted.

A copy of the questionnaire follows:

ENTRANCE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GUERRILLA TRAINEES

1. Complete name.

2. Place and date of birth.

3. Residence address.

4. Professional training and occupation before entering Cuba.

5. Names and addresses of parents, brothers, and/or sisters.

6. Occupation of members of the immediate family. List title of position and address of office if any of them occupies a position of responsibility with the government, the armed forces, or the police.

7. Names and addresses of friends who occupy positions of responsibility in the government, the armed forces, or the police. List the titles of their positions, the addresses of their offices, and make a brief statement on the responsibilities of their positions.

8. Have you ever occupied a government position? If so, list title of position, address, the names and addresses of friends employed there. Reason for leaving? How long employed there? Are your friends still employed there?

9. Past and present political affiliations. Duration of affiliation and reasons for terminating them.

10. Have you held any office in the labor unions? In a cultural, social, or sport club? What was the nature of the office held? What was the political orientation of the club or other organization? In the case of a cultural or sport club, were there any events and competitions sponsored by it? If member of a sport club, what type of physical training was administered? Did this training take place in the country? What interest was shown by the police or other authorities about this training?

11. List the revolutionary organizations of your place. Who are their leaders and what is their capability?

12. Describe your personal experience in the underground struggle.

13. Have you ever been arrested? How many times? On what charges? Where were you arrested? How did you obtain your freedom?

14. Have you ever been deported? Reason? How many times? When?

15. Give a description of the police organization and the investigative agencies of your place. Who are the officers in charge of repression? What is their rank? List the names and addresses of any victims of their repressive actions and state if they are persons of strong opinions.

16. What means of transportation are used by the repressive organs of your place? What are the means of communication? What type of information net they have?

17. What are the possibilities of guerrilla warfare in your region? What would be the morale of the people with regards to this struggle?

18. What is the morale and the preparation of the army for an anti-guerrilla war?

19. What is the morale of the police? Was its response to acts of sabotage efficient?

20. What would be the attitude of the police subalterns and men in the eventuality of a revolution? Would they be favorably inclined?

21. What repressive acts by the police or the army are considered the most oppressive in your place?

22. What acts of resistence by the people have brought about the strongest measures of repression by the police?

23. List the names and addresses of persons whom you have knowledge to be involved in smuggling activities.

24. What are the articles most commonly smuggled in and by what method?

25. Give the names and addresses of any smugglers you came in contact. What would be the best way to approach them? When did you contact them? Where? Who are the ones you have most confidence and trust? On what basis?

26. What is situation on the borders of your country? What type of control does the government maintain? Who are the border guards of your region? Whom do you know personally?

27. By what means can one enter your country and what are the necessary procedures?

28. Can one obtain personal identification documents by paying cash?

29. What documents are the citizens of your country required to carry and how are they obtained normally?

30. Can a foreigner buy a home? Can he establish a commercial firm?

31. How can one obtain the necessary documents for an accredited institution?

32. Where do government officials gather? Where do the governing classes meet? How can one obtain admission to these social gatherings? How can credentials be obtained? Can one pay his dues or fees in cash?

33. How many persons know that you are in Cuba? List their names and addresses.

34. How and when did they come to know?

35. What was the length of your military service? Where? What units? What rank did you attain?

36. Where are the military aircraft located in your region? How many aircraft are there? How are the airfields guarded? What type of documents are needed by the workers to gain access to the airfield? Are the workers under vigilance by the authorities?

37. Where are the military bases located? Which are the units in garrison there? What are the means of transport and communization to them?

38. Where are the naval bases located in your region? Where are the river patrol stations located if any?

OHIO AMERICAN LEGION ESSAY WINNER

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio annually sponsors an American essay contest among the young students of our great State.

This year I am very proud that one of my constituents, George Meese, a 12th-grade student of 5132 East Farnhurst, Lyndhurst, Ohio, is one of the winners.

One merely has to read his essay to understand why George Meese was declared a winner. He gives one the assurance that our youth of today have an abiding respect for America and a sincere sense of citizenship responsibility.

May I take this occasion to congratulate George Meese on his splendid essay, and include it herewith in the Record.

The essay follows:

American Legion Essay "How Can I Help Preserve the American Democracy"

(By George Meese, 132 East Farnhurst, Lyndhurst, Ohio, 12th grade, Brush High School)

I am a high school senior. I am a series of digits at a test-computing center; I am an impersonal, lifeless statistic on numerous records; I am almost insignificant. Despite this, one simple factor keeps me from becoming an oblivious atom in my own environment. I am an American.

I was created by a Supreme Being through my parents, and at the instant of my creation, I became an American citizen. Because a group of men had the courage and genius to create a new and unique society, I am not equal to a particle of dust, I am a human individual.

Our American democracy is founded on the simple proposition that every man is a sovereign state unto himself, and from this proposition are derived all of our freedoms and civil liberties. Preservation of our democracy, in the true sense of the word, depends entirely upon the individuals in our society. It is fitting, therefore, that as an individual and a sovereign state, I must develop, nurture, and stand by all of the principles which are worthy, and live by all of the standards which breed right.

So many times, attempting the right course seems futile and almost impossible. Yet to preserve democracy, diligence is essential. I'm not speaking of just the major acts and decisions of life, I'm talking about minute, seemingly trivial aspects. When I go to the store, do I return the grocery cart to its place after I have employed its convenience? Do I grumble in assemblies when I'm asked to give the pledge of allegiance? Am I ashamed to freely sing out my national anthem at athletic events? Do I respect my school, made free to me by democracy? The list of these small, seemingly insignificant actions of everyday life is endless, yet every question is extremely personal. Each question denotes a small, but specific, aspect of an individual's behavior. And since the individual is the basis of democracy, the individual's response to these questions is indicative of that democracy.

Preservation of our democratic state is not complete, however, with the mere adherence to rules and worthy standards, nor is it secure through blind devotion to our country. The United States is a society of human beings, and as such, is prone to human error as much as any single individual. Thus mass, blind devotion and extreme nationalism is as harmful to democracy as espionage. Without critics within our society, dedicated to the good of our society, we have no method of self-betterment, and no way of correcting cancerous errors. Thus it is the responsibility of every citizen to be informed concerning his country's policies and actions. To be informed, one must constantly strive for mental acuteness through education, whether formal or informal. As a high school student, then, my biggest responsibility, right now is to acquire a useful, well-rounded, and well-developed knowledge of the world about me. I must broaden my interests and develop my powers of observation and comprehension. In conjunction with this, I must fight apathy more vigorously than any other threat to our democracy. I must urge others to take an active interest in their country, for only with an enlightened, interested public can democracy thrive and progress.

Finally, as a student, I must carefully select and solidify my aspirations, morals, and convictions, with a constant awareness of the fact that I am an American citizen, that I am an individual, and that as such I am a part of the basis of my American democracy.

YITZCHAK BEN-ZVI, PRESIDENT OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we today join with the people of Israel to mourn the death this morning of their wise and able President, Yitzchak Ben-Zvi. His name was probably little known to most of us until we read in the newspapers, just the other day, of his illness; it is an irony of fate that a man so dedicated to his country and the development of its ideals should be eulogized for his work only after death.

Mr. Ben-Zvi was born in Poltava, Russia, in 1884, and was educated in the universities of Kiev and Istanbul. He was cofounder and leading member of one of the earliest Zionist organizations in Russia, in 1905, and he came to Palestine in 1906—a pioneer in the dream of a Jewish state in the Holy Land, a home for his people in the land of their ancestors. Mr. Ben-Zvi was a writer and scholar, but primarily a Jewish patriot to whom the education and advancement of the Jewish people then resident in the Hold Land was of prime importance. In keeping with this aim he was cofounder of the first Hebrew Secondary School in Jerusalem, and he set about devoting his life to related activities in the aid of his people.

War changed all of this and he was exiled from Palestine by the Turks in 1915. He made his way to the United States and lived in this country until 1918, writing, teaching, and devoting his energies to the eventual formation of a Jewish nation in Palestine. He was cofounder with David Ben-Gurion of the Hechalutz movement, as well as the American Jewish Legion for Palestine. Then, with the coming of allied victory in the war against Germany and her Turkish ally, he returned with the British Army under General Allenby, as a private, to Jerusalem and, with the Allied victory, to marriage, to establishing a home and family, and to new dedication in his work toward the Israeli nation.

Ben-Zvi became an emissary of world zionism to conferences throughout Europe during the 20 years between world wars, and was also a member of the roundtable discussions in London during the 1930's trying to work out the proposals for a separate Jewish state in British-mandated Palestine.

The agony of his fellow people during the years of Hitler's march of extermination through Europe bore heavily on Dr. Ben-Zvi's heart and mind, and he worked with renewed determination to secure a refuge for them in Palestine. The end of the war brought the Jewish revolution against the British authorities in Palestine, and in the fighting the Ben-Zvi's lost their son who died a soldier's death for a free Jewish state.

After independence in 1948, 15 years ago next month, Ben-Zvi, in spite of his loss, worked even harder for the solidarity of the state, and the cooperation of all its people. First as a member of the provisional council, then as a member of the first and second Knesset, finally as President, in 1952, succeeding Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Mr. Ben-Zvi, with quiet patience and firm conviction guided his country through internal crisis and external pressures, to the great and progressive state it is today.

His country is going through a new period of trial at this very moment, with Arab nationalism pressing all about and with voices of dissension within the country—Israel will sorely miss his counsel, but that this Jewish state has grown so strong of moral conviction and political compassion can be laid to the quiet efforts of this great man, whom we, in this House, must salute today—Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, writer, scholar, able politician, statesman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Frelinghuysen (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for the balance of this week, on account of death in family.

Mr. Dent (at the request of Mr. Libonati), for Tuesday, April 23, 1963, on account of illness.

Mr. Healey (at the request of Mr. Keogh), for Tuesday, April 23, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Kunkel), for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Gross and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bennett of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Moss to include in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today an article and letter referred to in those remarks.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEVINE to include in the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole certain extraneous material and charts.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include extraneous matter in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. MAILLIARD.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GRABOWSKI.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. DELANEY.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 22, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House on the following titles:

H.R. 277. An act to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada;

H.R. 1087. An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve;

H.R. 1544. An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz.;

H.R. 2291. An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass;

H.R. 2294. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz;

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation;

H.R. 5067. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 24, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

722. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report on the Fruitland Mesa project, Colorado, pursuant to 53 Stat. 1187 (H. Doc. No. 107); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

723. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting reports submitted by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense Supply Agency for the period July through December 1962, listing contracts negotiated under authority of sections 2304(a)(11) and 2304(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code, pursuant to provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

724. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting the third quarterly report of the fiscal year 1963 (March 31, 1963), showing the number of Air Force officers assigned or detailed, pursuant to section 8031 (c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

725. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the space flight operations facility at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif., pursuant to 76 Stat. 383; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

726. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of employees' air travel authorized by the Washington office, Veterans' Administration, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

727. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audit of Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission for the period July 30, 1957, through June 30, 1961, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

728. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the authorization to appropriate money for the maintenance and operation of three experimental stations of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

729. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to correct a land description in the act entitled 'An act to provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes' "; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

730. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to furnish and receive emergency assistance, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

731. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act approved July 14, 1960, 74 Stat. 526, as amended, relating to the establishment of a register of names in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle drivers"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

732. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, through grants for construction of recreational activity centers, and through grants to stimulate employment opportunities"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

733. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to improve the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act relating to aged individuals and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2073. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 60, 87th Congress, pertaining to a study mission to Latin America; without amendment (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1709. A bill to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island; with amendment (Rept. No. 232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5042. A bill for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay; without amendment (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2262. A bill for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2726. A bill for the relief of John F. Wood of Newport News, Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2753. A bill to authorize suits against the United States to quiet title of certain real property in Modoc County, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1395. A bill for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson; without amendment (Rept. No. 227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler; without amendment (Rept. No. 228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2751. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White; without amendment (Rept. No. 229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4773. A bill for the relief of referee in bankruptcy; with amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4811. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis; without amendment (Rept. No. 231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 5760. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction for certain educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5761. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for the dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial exclusion from gross income of interest received by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5763. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum amount allowable as a child-care deduction, and to increase the amount of income which may be received without reducing such deduction in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5764. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the present percentage limitations on the deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit the deduction for depletion to the adjusted basis of the property involved, and to reduce the percentage depletion rate for oil and gas wells from 27½ to 23 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 5766. A bill to amend the authorization to appropriate money for the maintenance and operation of three experimental stations of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 5767. A bill to bring together families in the United States by granting nonquota status to brothers, sisters, and certain sons and daughters of citizens of the United States and their spouses and children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 5768. A bill to provide direct aid to the States and territories for educational purposes only for the benefit of the taxpayer and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5769. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 5770. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid in small business survival by adjusting corporate income tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 5771. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73 million for that purpose"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5772. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to authorize courts of bankruptcy to determine the dischargeability or nondischargeability of provable debts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 5773. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5774. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for mandatory retirement of employees upon attainment of 70 years of age and completion of 5 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5775. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5776. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for mandatory retirement of employees upon attainment of 70 years of age and completion of 5 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5777. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require a premarketing showing of the safety of cosmetics; to clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 5778. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5779. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that where the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65 no gain on the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will be taxed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 5780. A bill to amend the act of March 9, 1928, to permit the town of St. Marks, Fla., to use for any municipal purpose certain land heretofore patented to it by the United States for public park purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 5781. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 5782. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodity to such nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5783. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus agricultural commodities to such nations at prices less than those available to American consumers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5784. A bill to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 5785. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 as it relates to the commitment of the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 5786. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 5787. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5788. A bill to amend section 111 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to agreements concerning the use of an access to rights-of-way on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 5789. A bill to extend the existing temporary suspension of duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn to the same classifications of yarn of silk and rayon or other synthetic textile; to the Committee on Way and Means.

By. Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 5790. A bill to amend the act of October 24, 1951, in order to insure that the salaries of the police for the National Zoological Park shall equal those of members of the U.S. Park Police having comparable duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 5791. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exclude, for purpose of dependent parent's death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation, income derived from sale of a personal residence when ownership existed under certain conditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 5792. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 5793. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 7 between Norwalk and Canaan, Conn., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5794. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 5795. A bill to repeal the provisions of law relating to the fixing by the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of rates of postage on fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 5796. A bill relating to the provision of facilities and services for the accommodation of visitors in the national parks, monuments, and reservations, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to guarantee the obligations of concessioners incurred for such purpose; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 5797. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local youth public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 5798. A bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 5799. A bill to provide for the precise determination of the southern boundary of the Salt River Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5800. A bill to place in the Comptroller of the Currency authority over foreign branches of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5801. A bill to eliminate the population limitation as it affects the eligibility of communities in redevelopment areas for certain benefits under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5802. A bill to repeal sections 132 (a), (b) and 409(a) of the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 5803. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5804. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 5805. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to provide for the carriage of lumber by U.S. flag commercial vessels or by vessels of the country of origin of lumber; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5806. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 5807. A bill to grant leave with pay for Government personnel engaged in any international athletic competition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 5808. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.J. Res. 386. Joint resolution to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 387. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to bring the Baltic question before the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 323. Resolution to create a Committee on Employment and Economic Growth; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning our present disarmament policy as proposed by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NORBLAD: House Joint Memorial No. 9, adopted by the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, 1963, urging the expeditious processing through the Federal agencies concerned of the review of the Tualatin Valley irrigation project plan, Washington County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Cuban refugee problem; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing appreciation to Members of Congress and to the President of the United States for instituting and retaining this capital gains tax treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code and requesting that it be retained; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to naming a dam on the Columbia River after Judge Homer T. Bone; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the abolition of the poll tax and other taxes as a voting requirement in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5809. A bill for the relief of Helen Stathopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5810. A bill for the relief of Frank Myung-Hi Sohn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5811. A bill for the relief of L. C. Atkins & Son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5812. A bill for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5813. A bill for the relief of Col. and Mrs. Harvey H. Hewitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5814. A bill for the relief of Norman R. Tharp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 5815. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yok Sun Lee and her minor son, Mark Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5816. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsie F. Larson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania (by request):

H.R. 5817. A bill for the relief of Carlos C. Bancroft III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 5818. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Colleen Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5819. A bill for the relief of Audrey Fay Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 5820. A bill for the relief of Chin Hyong Yoo and Dong Myong Shin Yoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5821. A bill for the relief of Mrs. May Cagney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5822. A bill for the relief of Theodore Zissu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5823. A bill for the relief of W. J. Hickey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5824. A bill for the relief of F. Mildred Huggins, Sarah Huggins, and Nettielee Huggins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 5825. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Mary Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5826. A bill for the relief of Virgilio Vaccarezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 5827. A bill for the relief of Czeslawa Podgorska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5828. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Bua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5829. A bill for the relief of Goffredo Barretta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 5830. A bill for the relief of Luigia Anceschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5831. A bill for the relief of Jacob Jambor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 5832. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yung Kook Im; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 5833. A bill to authorize the admittance of the vessel *City of New Orleans* to American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade between the State of Alaska and the State of Washington; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 5834. A bill for the relief of Anthony Joseph Calandi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of of rule XXII,

92. Mr. HANNA presented a petition of the Committee for the Monroe Doctrine signed by several residents of California, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, because of the far-reaching implications—extending far beyond the boundaries of my own congressional district—I would like to call attention to the following results, just tabulated, of my seventh annual questionnaire on legislative issues.

Like many colleagues, I have had a tremendous response to the questionnaires distributed both by direct mail and printed in many newspapers throughout Michigan's Sixth District indicating to me the vital interest of those at home in Federal Government problems. I have found such a poll most helpful in measuring the sentiments of the people from time to time with regard to the many important issues facing the Congress.

The tabulation of the replies, stated in percentages, is as follows:

1963 questionnaire results

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Not sure
1. Should the Federal Government create a Domestic Peace Corps to help with social problems at home?	27	55	18
2. Do you favor the administration's request for a Youth Conservation Corps?	51	32	17
3. Should Congress approve $195,000,000 for a civil defense shelter program?	17	65	18
4. Do we need legislation to provide a Government-supervised secret ballot for union members before a strike can be called?	65	24	11
5. Would you favor a program of direct subsidies either to producers or processors of agricultural commodities to lower prices for consumers?	12	74	14
6. Do you favor the President's recommendations for tax reduction?	42	42	16
7. Should spending be cut to compensate for any tax reduction?	83	8	9
8. Should tax deductions be limited to amounts in excess of 5 percent of income for—			
Medical expenses?	25	58	17
Charitable contributions?	24	56	20
State and local taxes?	20	60	20
Interest payments?	20	59	21
9. If taxes are cut to stimulate growth, should reduction of the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles be part of the package?	78	14	8
10. Would you favor tax deductions for college tuition?	63	28	9
11. Do you approve raising the ceiling on the national debt?	10	76	14

12. Considering current economic conditions, do you regard a balanced budget:

	Percent
Essential	42
Desirable	49
Not important	7
No answer	2

13. Should the Federal Government aid colleges in construction of academic buildings:

	Percent
By loans	50
By grants	14
Not at all	31
No answer	5

14. With regard to medical care for the elderly, do you favor:

	Percent
Increasing social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing costs for those over 65 (King-Anderson approach)	22
A tax credit or Federal financing for private insurance for medical and hospital care for those over 65 (Bow bill)	24
No Federal participation in this field	32
Other	8
No answer	14

15. The budget requests $4.9 billion for foreign aid (military and economic assistance). Should this program be:

	Percent
Continued at this level	18
Substantially reduced	63
Discontinued	13
No answer	6

16. How do you rate President Kennedy's policies:

	Percent
Domestic:	
Excellent	8
Good	23
Fair	41
Poor	24
No answer	4
Foreign:	
Excellent	7
Good	21
Fair	34
Poor	33
No answer	5

The Army Times Guide to Army Posts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, coming to my desk the other day from the hands of John Ford, Washington correspondent, was the recently published Army Times Guide to Army Posts, a book edited by Tom Scanlan which seems to me to have great value to Army families—in fact it is designed for such families who want to discover as much as they can about housing, school, and general living conditions at their next post. I have read with great interest about posts where I have been stationed while I was in the armed services or which I visited since I have been on the House Armed Services Committee and it seems to me an excellent job has been done in putting this book together and a job very useful to those in the armed services.

It is my honor to represent a town which is very much interested in military affairs and so when I read the comments of this book I did so with the background of living in a town of this sort and having had an active service in the Army and the background from the House Armed Services Committee. It is my impression that the book should be useful to all Army families and to many others who may wish to make a general study of living conditions in the Army.

Olympic Athletes in Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that would permit employees of the Federal Government a leave of absence with pay for the purpose of participating in recognized international athletic events.

I cite for the attention of the House the case of Herman Stokes, an employee of the Los Angeles Post Office.

Mr. Stokes, I understand, is one of the two most outstanding athletes of his particular classification that we have in the United States. This year, Mr. Stokes is unofficially a member of the U.S. team that will be competing in the Pan American games to be held in Brazil in the month of April. Also, Mr. Stokes is a likely candidate for the U.S. team that will be competing in the Soviet Union during the month of July.

It is necessary for Mr. Stokes to be granted at least 4 weeks of leave with pay in addition to his normal vacation leave to participate in these major international athletic events.

Mr. Speaker, the honor and prestige of the United States of America becomes a matter of great concern whenever a team from this country enters an international amateur athletic tournament. Whatever the semantics of discussion on sportsmanship may entail, the fact remains that our Nation is judged by people all over the world on the success or failure of our amateur athletes.

The Post Office Department is sympathetic to the problem presented here;

however, under existing rules and regulations can do nothing to aid or assist this fine young man in his desire to bring international sports trophies home to America.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will speedily deal with this proposed legislation. I believe the majority of honorable Members will support it, and I believe our country needs it.

Blasts New Frontier Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for printing in the Record a newspaper report of a speech made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, William K. Van Pelt, to a meeting of the Fond du Lac, Wis., Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The article follows:

REPRESENTATIVE VAN PELT BLASTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY

"If the present administration had a motto it no doubt would read 'If at first you don't deceive, try, try again' " said Representative William K. Van Pelt, Republican, Fond du Lac, in a talk given Friday afternoon following a luncheon for Daughters of the American Revolution and their guests.

Appearing at Raulf Hotel, Representative Van Pelt, in discussing present national and world conditions, said "they are serious."

The Republican Party, the speaker recalled, is in the minority and has been for some time. "But we have fought, we continue to fight for the preservation of this Republic, the very things which the DAR holds dear," he said.

"In Oshkosh and elsewhere they say we have conservative Democrats who will hold the line. I say that just isn't so," the speaker declared. Then he mentioned some of the so-called pork-barrel legislation pushed through Congress because it will provide things for the cities of the Representatives.

"I say to you that you get nothing for nothing. You pay for everything you get and you pay more when the Government does it than if you do it yourself."

Representative Van Pelt then briefly reviewed the accomplishments of the 88th Congress emphasizing two situations on which he focused attention.

One of these is the Cuban situation "more serious than the administration will admit," according to the speaker.

"Maybe the President thinks it's the Soviet Peace Corps which we have in Cuba. I say that any weapon called defensive in nature can also become an offensive weapon.

"I say that so long as one Russian technician remains on Cuban soil, it is one too many. It's serious, it's like having a pistol pointed at your head 24 hours a day."

"And I also believe," the speaker continued, "that we are losing face with the other Latin countries, who no longer, because of our weak and vacillating stand on Cuba, have any faith in the United States."

Van Pelt, before opening the meeting to a question and answer period, also touched on the Clay report on foreign aid.

"I have never realistically been able to see our aid program. We have tried to do something for all people and have spread ourselves so thin we have accomplished nothing," he declared.

The Clay report, the audience was told, "substantiates our stand that our aid is not accomplishing the purpose for which it was intended and should be curtailed."

The administration, he added, "practicing its customary deceit," curtailed a bit and recommended a small reduction.

"What will happen after the several committees complete their review, is hard to tell. All we can do is be hopeful. But let's," he urged, "stand up and be counted in the political arena."

The speaker was introduced by Mrs. O. C. Walstad, DAR regent, who welcomed the members and guests, seated for the luncheon at a flower-decorated table.

Tax Cuts and Tax Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, during this past week of Easter recess, I met with many of my constituents at various functions throughout the communities in my congressional district. The Seventh Congressional District of New York has a population of nearly a half million people.

The question most asked of me by my constituents and others was in reference to the proposed tax cuts and tax reforms. I found that they, by and large, favor a tax cut, but they have expressed their opposition to tax reforms as the "reforms" affect charitable contributions, medical expenses, real estate taxes, and mortgage interest.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced several bills which I believe will give the fairest tax aid to those who are in most need of same. I find myself in accord with the views of those who have written to me on this subject and those with whom I have discussed the proposals in my district.

The several bills I have introduced encompass the following proposals:

First. Deduction for certain educational expenses.

Second. Eliminate the present percentage limitations on the deduction for medical, dental, and so forth, expenses.

Third. Provide a partial exclusion from gross income of interest received by individuals.

Fourth. Increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer—including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness.

Fifth. Increase the maximum amount allowable as a child-care deduction, and to increase the amount of income which may be received without reducing such deduction in certain cases.

Sixth. Limit the deduction for depletion to the adjusted basis of the property involved, and to reduce the percentage depletion rate for oil and gas wells from 27½ to 23 percent.

It is my hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will favorably consider these proposals during their present deliberations on tax legislation and that this Congress will give to the people the best and most just tax relief, relief which the people deserve.

U.S. Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Composite Company 5–48

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of my colleagues in the House to the U.S. Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Composite Company 5–48, which meets every Thursday while Congress is in session.

Ours is a volunteer training unit established in January 1957, to afford Members of Congress an opportunity to continue their active participation in the Reserve program of the U.S. Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. The time and place of meeting are such that Members may participate prior to the normal working day of their congressional duties.

Each weekly meeting consists of a classified operational briefing on Navy-Marine-Coast Guard matters throughout the world, followed by a formal presentation on a subject of current military interest by a foremost authority. Members receive no compensation for the performance of their assigned duties at weekly drill meetings. To further increase their knowledge of the military they engage in active duty training twice yearly. While these training exercises are scheduled during the Easter recess and fall adjournment of Congress, other 1- or 2-day inspections in the national military interest are arranged periodically during the session.

I am pleased to state that members of our unit take time from their already crowded and demanding schedules to participate in the Reserve program and inform themselves on matters which are vital to our national security.

The following Senators and Representatives assigned to U.S. Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Composite Company 5–48 are active in the Naval, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard Reserve.

NAVY MEMBERS

Representative William H. Bates, of Massachusetts.

Representative Robert B. Duncan, of Oregon.

Representative Edmond A. Edmondson, of Oklahoma.

Representative Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas.

Representative James G. Fulton, of Pennsylvania.

Representative Chester C. Hosmer, of California.

Representative George Huddleston, Jr., of Alabama.

Representative WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California.

Representative CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland.

Representative HERBERT RAY ROBERTS, of Texas.

Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of Alabama.

Representative DONALD H. RUMSFELD, of Illinois.

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania.

Representative HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, of Wisconsin.

Senator HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., of Pennsylvania.

Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., of Alabama.

Representative ROBERT T. STAFFORD, of Vermont.

Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, of New York.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey.

Representative ALBERT C. ULLMAN, of Oregon.

MARINE CORPS MEMBERS

Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER, of Maryland.

Representative JACK B. BROOKS, of Texas.

Representative JAMES C. CORMAN, of California.

Representative ROBERT C. WILSON, of California.

COAST GUARD MEMBERS

Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan.

Senator CLAIBORNE D. PELL, of Rhode Island.

Representative JOHN F. SHELLEY, of California.

In addition to the Members listed above, congressional staff personnel with current reserve status are assigned to the unit.

Another Forward Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I want to express my sincere gratification at the passage of H.R. 5389, the administration's much-needed silver legislation. And to take this opportunity to congratulate all those who helped bring this about.

As Congressman-at-Large from the State of Connecticut, I am privileged to represent an area wherein some 22 establishments are engaged in the use and fabrication of silver as silver products and plateware employing approximately 6,000 employees. The payroll in 1958 for about 3,947 employees was $19,196,000. The value of shipments out of Connecticut in 1958 was $67,186,000 with a value added of $34,621,000. While this figure would be subject to modification because of the impossibility of differentiating out nonsilver products of these producers, the modification would be smaller for Connecticut than the Nation due to the location in Connecticut of such companies as the International Silver Co., Wallace Silversmiths, and Handy & Harmon Co., manufacturers of brazing alloys, silver paint, silver contacts, and so forth, used in defense production; companies which produce the lion's share of such silver products for the entire country.

During the course of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee, I was privileged to confer at length with Mr. Douglas Dillon, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. John B. Stevens, vice president and general manager of the International Silver Co., and many representatives of mining and producing interests both from Connecticut and other areas. But early in these hearings, I came to believe sincerely that such legislation is in the best interest of the Nation as a whole for many reasons.

Mr. Speaker, although it is not usually my practice to introduce printed testimony in my remarks, I should like to present the following excerpts as I believe that they very appropriately present the questions in a suitably brief and easily understandable form.

First, I would like to quote from the testimony of Mr. Dillon as contained in the "Hearings Before the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 1st session, on H.R. 4413." His statements, I think, aptly present the need for and purpose of this legislation:

> Basic purposes of legislation: H.R. 4413 implements the recommendations of the President, going back to his instruction to me in November 1961 to suspend further sales of silver, and repeated in his Economic Report in January of this year. Its basic purposes are twofold:
>
> (1) To afford the Government a sure and substantial supply of silver for its coinage needs by making available for this purpose the stocks of silver bullion backing the presently outstanding $1 silver certificates. This amounts to approximately 1,300 million ounces.
>
> (2) To eliminate the obsolete and largely inoperative provisions on the statute books requiring the acquisition and holding of silver in our monetary reserves and putting a Government floor price of 90.5 cents an ounce under newly mined domestic silver, which is far below the current market price.
>
> For many years now silver has not served any major purpose as a monetary reserve metal. While it has been held as a reserve behind outstanding silver certificates, the amount of these in relation to total currency in circulation is small (approximately $2 billion in silver certificates, compared with $30 billion in Federal Reserve notes). Our basic currency is the Federal Reserve note which is backed by 100 percent collateral, 25 percent in the form of gold.
>
> Recent years have seen a sharply increasing worldwide demand for silver for industrial, professional, and artistic uses which is in marked contrast to the situation existing in 1934 when the Silver Purchase Act was passed and in subsequent years up to about 1959.
>
> Today, silver is at a point where current world production is not sufficient to meet current coinage and industrial demands. Most recently, annual free world production of newly mined silver has amounted to about 200 million ounces, compared to a consumption of around 350 million ounces.
>
> Since November 29, 1961, we have been retiring the $5 and $10 silver certificates, replacing them with Federal Reserve notes, and utilizing the silver so released for the coinage of subsidiary coins, but this supply is limited. Coinage requirements appear to be increasing each year, partly at least as a result of the ever-growing use of vending machines. Last year they amounted to about 75 million ounces.
>
> In addition, our increasing population leads to a steady growth in the number of $1 bills required for circulation. Since at present $1 bills can only be issued in the form of silver certificates, this leads to a further annual requirement, which last year amounted to $49 million, or roughly 38 million ounces.
>
> Problems arising if $1 Federal note not authorized: If the $1 Federal Reserve note is not authorized, the Treasury will soon be in the untenable position of being forced into the market to buy silver for its coinage needs. Since U.S. production is only one-third of our industrial requirements, all silver for coinage would have to be acquired from abroad, thus putting an unnecessary strain on our balance of payments.

The next excerpt, from a statement by Rear Adm. Donald J. Ramsey, U.S. Navy, retired, is of value because it dispels, I think, some longstanding misconceptions I have noted regarding the intrinsic monetary value of silver.

> Silver as money: The act of March 14, 1900, established the gold dollar as our standard unit of value. The Gold Reserve Act guarantees an ounce of gold will exchange for $35. Silver was actually demonetized in 1873 and is not a standard unit of value. It has no guaranteed value despite the use in various laws of such words as "standard silver dollars," "monetary value," "seigniorage," and so forth.

Despite the 40-percent increase in the price of silver during the last 15 months, domestic mine production of recoverable silver rose less than 5 percent in 1962. In fact, mine production in Nevada, Utah, and Washington declined. The gain in Arizona silver production reflects greater output of copper ore yielding byproducts of silver. An increase in the price of silver does not mean an increase in production because silver is largely a byproduct in the production of copper, lead, and zinc. These base metals are in oversupply.

Annual consumption of silver in the United States in now averaging 105 million ounces. A few large producers account for most of the 35 million ounces of domestic production. Approximately 40 percent of this production comes from ore mined primarily for its silver content—mostly in Idaho. The remaining 60 percent comes incidentally in the production of copper, lead, and zinc.

It should always be borne in mind that foreign producers greatly benefit by our silver policies. Two-thirds of our annual consumption now comes from abroad. Such purchases amount to about 70 million ounces a year which result in a claim against our gold supply of about $90 million.

Secretary Dillon stated that the silver producing industry has no further need for Government assistance. He pointed out that since late 1961 the producers have seen a spectacular increase in the price of their product amounting to about 40 percent. He stated that the recent rapid rise has created difficulties for the users, who have had to cope as best they can with these increased costs.

Mr. John B. Stevens, vice president and general manager of the International Silver Co., Meriden, Conn., said before the House Banking and Currency Committee:

> I do not feel qualified to discuss the monetary aspects of silver, but I would like to confine myself to what I understand—silver as a raw material."

In his economic report of January 1963, President Kennedy said:

> I again urge a revision in our silver policy to reflect the status of silver as a metal for which there is an expanding industrial demand.

A year earlier President Kennedy said:

> It is uneconomic for the U.S. Government to lock up large quantities of useful silver in the sterile form of currency reserves.

This I understand and applaud because silver is the single most important raw material which the International Silver Co. buys. In a single year we use over 4 million ounces in our silverplated and sterling silver products. Silver is, of course, the largest component in the cost of sterling silver products and a surprisingly large element in the cost of silverplate. For example, at the present price of silver bullion of $1.27 an ounce, the silver content comprises 75 percent of the manufacturing cost of sterling silver knives, forks and spoons, and 60 percent of the cost of sterling silver holloware, which is the trade name for coffeepots, teapots, candlesticks, bowls, trays, platters, and so forth. Even in silverplate such as the famous 1847 Rogers Bros., the silver content is 20 percent of the manufacturing cost of knives, forks, and spoons.

What this means in terms of selling prices is that the retail price of a typical five-piece sterling place setting, including the 10-percent excise tax, has had to be increased from $32.50 to $39.50 as a result of the increase in the price of silver which has taken place in the last year alone, if we are to maintain current profit margins. The retail price of a sterling teapot has had to be increased from $145.75 to $182.

When one considers the essential uses of silver in defense production as well as in less critical products such as silver-zinc batteries, alloys and solders, dental and medical uses, electrical controls, contacts and circuits, mirrors, and so forth, and the smaller, less diversified companies dependent upon moderate price margins for survival, the price of the raw material assumes a greater significance. This last excerpt from a statement by Mr. C. Edwin Ireland, vice president and treasurer, Hamilton Watch Co., on behalf of Wallace Silversmiths, points up some of these difficulties:

> Our company buys about 2 million ounces of silver annually. The sudden increase in the price of silver has therefore added, quite unexpectedly, about $700,000 to our manufacturing costs. To state the situation bluntly, our profit expectations have been substantially lessened.

The question might properly be asked that if the entire industry is faced with the same increase in the cost of raw materials would not an industrywide price increase in the cost of the finished product pass the burden on to the consumer and reserve the profits for the manufacturer. Unfortunately, it just is not that easy.

Changing our prices, once a year, in a period of rising costs can be handled. Changing prices twice a year in unusual circumstances can be tolerated. To do so more often is impossible.

Because of the wild fluctuations in the cost of our raw material, it is impossible to quickly adjust our selling prices to recover the added costs and still be competitive. In any industry, a price change normally entails careful forecasts of raw material costs based on past, current, and anticipated cost levels. With most raw materials, forecasts can be made within reasonable degrees of accuracy. With silver, it is impossible under present conditions. As a result, we find ourselves continually in need of price adjustments to recover, at least in part, the fluctuating cost of silver.

With continued upward and unpredictable fluctuations in the silver market, together with consequent increases in our product selling prices, our retail customers are confused and wary as to their purchasing policy. In general, they are restricting their purchases awaiting some clarification to emerge from which they can gain some assurance of normalcy.

We believe that the price of silver will become far more stable and predictable if it is freed from all artificial controls and supports and is permitted to react to the normal pressures and influences of a free, competitive market. As we understand it, there was no shortage in the supply of silver during 1962 and that all industrial requirements were satisfactorily met from regular suppliers of the commodity. If this is true, then we cannot believe that the elementary law of supply and demand was permitted to operate in that period. In our opinion, there is no other way to explain a 38-percent increase in price when there was no shortage in supply.

As we interpret the effects of H.R. 4413, silver will find its own proper price level as a commodity. To make this possible, it seems to us of great importance that the bill be passed in its entirety. The Secretary of the Treasury must not be required to enter the market for artificial reasons. At the same time, the 50-percent transfer tax must be eliminated so that buyers and sellers can operate normally, and without penalty, in a free market.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone to more length here than I ordinarily would, but so strongly do I feel passage of this legislation to be in the national interest, that I wanted to acquaint as many as possible with the subject matter of the bill. I am also going to urge the two U.S. Senators from Connecticut, Senators Thomas J. Dodd and Abraham A. Ribicoff, to give this proposal careful consideration when it comes up in the Senate. Not only would it aid Connecticut industry, but also strengthen the United States by placing somewhat less reliance upon foreign producers for our silver, at least as far as U.S. coinage is concerned.

Come to the Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, 1 year from yesterday, April 22, 1964, the gates will open on what Mr. Robert Moses has described as "the biggest, most fascinating showcase ever conceived and constructed by the mind and hands of man"—the New York World's Fair 1964–65. With equal humility I would like to say that this is undoubtedly going to be the greatest demonstration of peaceful international competition in the history of mankind—the Olympic of the arts, sciences, industry, and trade.

As the vast and complex preparations for this grand event move into the homestretch—we have less than a year to go—I extend a cordial invitation to every Member of this body and to his constituents. Come to the fair.

Today, with so little time left before the great occasion, it is difficult to imagine that the site for the fair, Long Island's Flushing Meadow Park, will be the magic city envisioned by Mr. Moses. It is a raw-looking place—cluttered with piledrivers, bulldozers, mounds of earth, and slabs of concrete.

The dream seems more real when you stop to consider the amount of work that has already been done to achieve this plateau of several hundred acres interlaced with miles of cable, conduit, and pipe, and containing all of the necessary roads, bridges, and utilities for this, the greatest of all fairs.

You become confident of the reality when you realize the infinite amount of planning and negotiation necessary to bring to the construction stage the exhibits of most of these United States, nearly a hundred foreign governments, and hundreds of producers of goods and services from all over the world.

This will be the greatest, but by no means the first, transformation of Flushing Meadow. In the mid-1930's a stalwart group of New Yorkers, including a new and zealous park commissioner, Mr. Robert Moses, began one of the most ambitious and unlikely reclamation feats of that era. They attacked almost 700 acres of ugly and odorous dump with the express purpose of creating on that site an international exposition. Through their diligent efforts, a blot on the New York landscape which F. Scott Fitzgerald described in "The Great Gatsby" as "a desolate area of land—a valley of ashes" became the scene of the legendary 1939 World's Fair.

After the fair the land was made into a park and became a pleasant oasis in what is now the geographic and population center of New York. It is this oasis, Flushing Meadow Park, that is once again preparing to play host to the world.

The variety of exhibits and events at the New York World's Fair 1964–65 will be almost endless. Visitors will have the opportunity to see the best in architecture and design from across the continent and around the globe. With a minimum of restrictions, the fair is encouraging the free display of talent and imagination in the construction of pavilions and exhibits.

Each State, country, and industry will bring forth their finest. A number of special exhibits, such as Michelangelo's "Pieta" and other religious art from the Vatican, will offer an impressive array of sights and sounds. Every major religion will be represented.

American and foreign industry will capture much of the fair's audience with diverse spectaculars ranging from lifesize reproductions of giant dinosaurs to a $5½ million futuristic wall-less pavilion displaying products of the gas industries. I cannot begin to describe the wonders of the fair. Let it suffice to say that this will be, without a doubt, a billion dollar fair.

There will be even more to the fair than the activity at Flushing Meadow. The cultural activities of the entire city of New York will be geared to the fair. Museums and galleries will hold special exhibits and the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts will integrate its program with the performing arts presentations at the fair so that this fine new facility can be used to the best advantage of those visitors interested in opera, music, theater, dance, and related offerings.

In addition to all the wonderful things that will greet you at the fair, there is probably no other location that is so well suited for such a vast undertaking. The New York World's Fair 1964–65 will be accessible by parkway, expressway, bridge, tunnel, railway, subway, ship, or plane. Over $100 million is being spent in an accelerated highway improvement program to make the fair even more accessible to those visitors coming by car. Over $4 million in waterway improvements are underway and a 2,000-boat marina—the most modern—will accommodate those traveling to the fair by water. The hotel and dining facilities are more than adequate. Over 600 hotels and thousands of restaurants are keyed to meeting the needs of millions of visitors annually.

In 1 year the New York World's Fair 1964–65 will be ready to welcome you. Arrayed around the 135-foot-tall "Unisphere," symbol of man's achievements in an expanding universe, will be the fruits of the minds and hands and hearts of a good portion of mankind. On that spring evening a 24-billion candlepower tower of light will shoot into the sky and, surrounded by countless satellites, will send up a beacon that may be seen from Boston, Mass., to the District of Columbia.

For New York it will signal, among other things, the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the city's founding and the opening of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. For all of us it will mark the launching of a magnificent endeavor toward that most difficult goal, "Peace Through Understanding." The international cooperation and peaceful competition demonstrated by the opening of the fair will give definition, form, and meaning to democracy for the 70 million people who will attend during its 2-year life. It is less than 1 year away. Mark it on your calendar and start planning now. Come to the fair.

Freeman Letter Means Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are in for trouble with farmers and other taxpayers if they try to explain their vote on the feed grain bill by quoting Secretary Freeman's April 19 letter to Members of the House. It tells only part of the story.

Text of Freeman's letter is as follows:

> DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
> OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
> *Washington, April 19, 1963.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN ———: I understand the Feed Grain Act of 1963 will come before the House shortly after the Congress returns from its recess. This legislation would extend for 2 years the highly successful measures enacted in 1961 and 1962 which have:
>
> Contributed to a 10-percent increase in net farm income between 1960 and 1962.
>
> Reduced feed grain stocks from a record 3.2 billion bushels in 1961—prior to the time the new feed grains programs became effective—to an estimated 1.9 billion bushels at the close of the current marketing year.
>
> Maintained stable food prices for consumers.
>
> Resulted in savings of $920,000 each day in grain storage and handling charges as compared with this date in 1961.
>
> This is striking progress every citizen understands.
>
> If the House reaffirms its actions of 1961–62 by passing this bill, it means elimination of the unneeded, unwanted feed grain surpluses by 1964. Once the carryover has been reduced to a level adequate for emergency and security reserves, a supply-demand balance can be maintained with less acreage diversion and less cost in the years ahead.
>
> Further, if the House takes favorable action on this legislation, farmers participating in wheat and feed grains price support programs will have greater flexibility in utilization of their land. If the wheat referendum is approved May 21, and there is also a feed grains program, producers will be able to interchange these crops. It is desirable for farmers to know before voting in the referendum what the wheat-feed grain relationship will be.
>
> I am hopeful the success of the feed grain programs and the importance of action now on feed grains in the light of the upcoming wheat referendum will make possible your favorable support of H.R. 4997.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

He calls the 1961–62 programs highly successful and says they helped to boost farm income. Note these facts:

When direct payments to farmers are deducted, net farm income went down—not up—between 1960 and 1962. The direct tax outlay to farmers rose faster—$1.2 billion—than net farm income—$1.1 billion.

The cost-price squeeze for farmers is actually the worst in years. The farm-parity ratio—prices related to costs—is 77—down from 81 when Mr. Freeman took over. In Illinois, the parity ratio is now 71—lowest on record since 1934.

Mr. Freeman claims his programs have reduced feed grain stocks 1.3 billion bushels. He uses the word "reduced" at the beginning of the sentence but hid the telltale word "estimated" later on. This 1.3 billion figure is sheer speculation.

Based on USDA reports, I can prove that Government grain holdings are down less than half the amount claimed.

Mr. Freeman says the programs have "resulted in savings of $920,000 each day in grain storage and handling charges." This is not factual. It is guesswork, and it is misleading.

Total cost to taxpayers is actually up sharply. The Wall Street Journal, April 23, 1963, said:

> This year's acreage cutting plan, providing for higher price supports on 1963 feed grain crops and lower payments for idling land, will cost taxpayers nearly $1.2 billion, Federal economists estimate. That's $100 million more than probable 1962–63 costs.

Taxpayers are spending more but getting less results. This table shows what is happening—figures from committee report on H.R. 4997.

[In millions]

	Diverted acres	Payments
1961	25.2	$782
1962	28.6	842
1963	25.8	983

NOTE.—Administrative expenses and CCC realized losses not included.

The latest report of the Commodity Credit Corporation shows total Government investment in farm surpluses $8,445,793,604—up 10 percent from a year ago.

The latest USDA "Feed situation" report clearly shows the 1963 program will get far less results despite increased cost. Taxpayers will shell out $8.78 for each dollar's worth of surplus feed grain disposed of this year.

The Secretary said in a letter last June to Senator ELLENDER:

> The voluntary programs are too costly. * * * If the voluntary programs were extended further, through the 1966 crops, the cumulative additional cost would be about $4 billion. This amount is equal to the average yearly Federal income tax payments of nearly 5 million taxpayers; would build 27,000 miles of modern highways; would complete 4,000 watershed projects.

This bill would extend these costly programs through 1965. I contend they have been a gigantic and costly failure, and are a legislative mistake which should not be compounded.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Job 28: 28: *Behold the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.*

Almighty God, as we bow our heads in prayer, may we be blessed with a stronger and steadier faith in Thee and be inspired to trust and commit ourselves unreservedly to Thy leading.

May we never be inclined to feel that perhaps our faith is a fiction and that justice is only a dream and righteousness merely a delusion.

We humbly acknowledge that in these times of clashing ideals and conflicting ideologies we are tempted to stand with trembling feet on the threshold of a future we cannot foresee or foreknow but may we be sure that each day is in Thy divine keeping and control.

Grant that we may solemnly pledge that we will remain faithful and struggle to the utmost for the sanctity and safety of humanity whenever its fundamental laws and liberties are in peril.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2. An act to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research; and

S. 1007. An act to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 22]

Abbitt
Ashley
Betts
Buckley
Burton
Celler
Cooley
Diggs
Dorn
Fisher
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Grabowski
Gray
Griffin
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Lennon
Lloyd
Macdonald
Powell
Roosevelt
Saylor
Shelley
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Vinson
Walter
Widnall

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 399 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 12, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 1 ending on line 8, page 1 of the bill. If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL, DENTAL, PHARMACEUTICAL, OPTOMETRIC, PODIATRIC, NURSING, OSTEOPATHIC, AND PUBLIC HEALTH TEACHING FACILITIES

SEC. 2. (a) Title VII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. chap. 6A) is amended by inserting "AND TEACHING" after "RESEARCH" in the heading thereof, by inserting "AND TRAINING OF PROFESSIONAL HEALTH PERSONNEL" after "FACILITIES" in such heading, and by inserting immediately below such heading "PART A—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES", and by changing the words "this title" wherever they appear in such title to read "this part".

(b) Such title is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"PART B—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TEACHING FACILITIES FOR MEDICAL, DENTAL, AND OTHER HEALTH PERSONNEL

"*Authorization of appropriations*

"SEC. 720. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year in the period beginning July 1, 1963, and ending June 30, 1973, (1) not to exceed $45,000,000 for grants to assist in the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, or professional public health personnel, (2) not to exceed $15,000,000 for grants to assist in the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of dentists, and (3) not to exceed $15,000,000 for replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, professional public health personnel, or dentists.

"*Approval of applications*

"SEC. 721. (a) No application for a grant under this part may be approved unless it is submitted to the Surgeon General prior to July 1, 1972.

"(b) (1) To be eligible to apply for a grant to assist in the construction of any facility under this part, the applicant must be (A) a public or other nonprofit school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or public health and (B) accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, except that a new school which (by reason of no, or an insufficient, period of operation) is not, at the time of application for a grant to construct a facility under this part, eligible for accreditation by such a recognized body or bodies, shall be deemed accredited for purposes of this part if the Commissioner of Education finds, after consultation with the appropriate accreditation body or bodies, that there is reasonable assurance that the school will, upon completion of such facility, meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies.

"(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in the case of an affiliated hospital, an application which is approved by the school of medicine with which the hospital is affiliated and which otherwise complies with the requirements of this part may be filed by any public or other nonprofit agency qualified to file an application under section 625.

"(3) In the case of any application, whether filed by a school or, in the case of an affiliated hospital, by any other public or other nonprofit agency, for a grant under this part to assist in the construction of a facility which is a hospital as defined in section 631—

"(A) if the facility is needed in connection with a new school, only that portion of the project to construct the facility which the Surgeon General determines to be reasonably attributable to the need of such school for the facility for teaching purposes,

"(B) if the construction is in connection with expansion of the training capacity of an existing school, only that portion of the project to construct the facility which the Surgeon General determines to be reasonably attributable to the need of such school for the facility in order to expand its training capacity,

"(C) if the construction is in connection with renovation or rehabilitation of facilities used by an existing school, only that portion of the project which the Surgeon General determines to be reasonably attributable to the need of such school for the facilities in order to prevent curtailment of enrollment or quality of training of the school,

shall be regarded as the project with respect to which payments may be made under section 722.

"(c) A grant under this part may be made only if the application therefor is approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that—

"(1) the applicant meets the eligibility conditions set forth in subsection (b);

"(2) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than ten years after completion of construction, the facility will be used for the purposes of the teaching for which it is to be constructed, (B) sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility, (C) sufficient funds will be available, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the training for which it is being constructed, and (D) in the case of an application for construction to expand the training capacity of an existing school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or public health, the first-year enrollment at such school during the first full school year after the completion of the construction and for each of the next nine school years thereafter will exceed the highest first-year enrollment at such school for any of the five full school years preceding the year in which the application is made by at least 5 per centum of such highest first-year enrollment, or by five students, whichever is greater;

"(3) (A) in the case of an application for a grant from funds appropriated pursuant to clause (1) of section 720, such application is for aid in the construction of a new school of medicine, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or public health, or construction which will expand the training capacity of an existing school of medicine, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or public health, (B) in the case of an application for a grant from funds appropriated pursuant to clause (2) of such section, such application is for aid in the construction of a new school of dentistry or construction which will expand the capacity of an existing school of dentistry, or (C) in the case of an application for a grant from funds appropriated pursuant to clause (3) of such section, such application is for aid in construction which will replace or rehabilitate facilities of, or used by, an existing school of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, osteopathy, or public health which are so obsolete as to require the school to curtail substantially either its enrollment or the quality of the training provided;

"(4) the plans and specifications are in accordance with regulations relating to minimum standards of construction and equipment;

"(5) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractors in the performance of work on the construction of the facility (A) will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a5), and (B) will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c); and

"(6) if the application requests aid in construction of a facility which is a hospital or diagnostic or treatment center, as defined in section 631, an application with respect thereto has been filed under title VI and has been denied thereunder because (A) the project has no or insufficient priority, or (B) funds are not available for the project from the State's allotments under title VI.

Before approving or disapproving an application under this part, the Surgeon General shall secure the advice of the National Advisory Council on Education for Health Professions established by section 725 (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Council').

"(d) In considering applications for grants, the Council and the Surgeon General shall take into account—

"(1)(A) in the case of a project for a new school or for expansion of the facilities of, or used by, an existing school, the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in expanding the capacity for the training of first-year students of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or osteopathy (or, in the case of a two-year school which is expanding to a four-year school, expanding the capacity for four-year training of students in the field), or for the training of professional public health personnel, and in promoting an equitable geographical distribution of opportunities for such training (giving due consideration to population, available physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, dentists, or professional public health personnel, and available resources in various areas of the Nation for training such persons); or

"(B) in the case of a project for replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities of, or used by, a school, the relative need for such replacement or rehabilitation to prevent curtailment of the school's enrollment or deterioration of the quality of the training provided by the school, and the relative size of any such curtailment and its effect on the geographical distribution of opportunities for training (giving consideration to the factors mentioned above in paragraph (A)); and

"(2) In the case of an applicant in a State which has in existence a State planning agency, or which participates in a regional or other interstate planning agency, described in section 728, the relationship of the application to the construction or training program which is being developed by such agency with respect to such State and, if such agency has reviewed such application, any comment thereon submitted by such agency.

"Amount of grant; payments

"SEC. 722. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the amount of any grant under this part shall be such amount as the Surgeon General determines to be appropriate after obtaining the advice of the Council; except that (A) in the case of a grant for a project for a new school, and in the case of a grant for new facilities for an existing school in cases where such facilities are of particular importance in providing a major expansion of training capacity, as determined in accordance with regulations, such amount may not exceed 66⅔ per centum of the necessary cost of construction, as determined by the Surgeon General, of such project; and (B) in the case of any other grant, such amount may not exceed 50 per centum of the necessary cost of construction, as so determined, of the project with respect to which the grant is made.

"(2) The amount of any grant under this part for construction of a project with respect to a school of public health shall be such amount as the Surgeon General determines to be appropriate after obtaining the advice of the Council, and may not exceed 75 per centum of the necessary cost of construction, as determined by the Surgeon General, of such project.

"(b) Upon approval of any application for a grant under this part, the Surgeon General shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant as determined under subsection (a); the amount so reserved may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as the Surgeon General may determine. The Surgeon General's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"(c) In determining the amount of any grant under this part, there shall be excluded from the cost of construction an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of any other Federal grant which the applicant has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, with respect to the construction which is to be financed in part by grants authorized under this part, and (2) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant.

"Recapture of payments

"SEC. 723. If, within ten years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this part—

"(a) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit school or, in case the facility was an affiliated hospital, the applicant or other owner of the facility ceases to be a public or other nonprofit agency qualified to file an application under section 625, or

"(b) the facility shall cease to be used for the teaching purposes for which it was constructed (unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so),

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"Definitions

"SEC. 724. As used in this part—

"(1) The terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction' include (A) the construction of new buildings, the expansion of existing buildings, and remodeling, replacement, renovation, major repair (to the extent permitted by regulations), or alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements, and (B) initial equipment of new buildings and of the expanded, remodeled, repaired, renovated, or alterned part of existing buildings;

"(2) The term 'nonprofit school' means a school owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual;

"(3) The term 'affiliated hospital' means a hospital, as defined in section 631, which is not owned by, but is affiliated (to the extent and in the manner determined in accordance with regulations) with, a school of medicine which meets the eligibility conditions set forth in section 721(b)(1);

"(4) The terms 'school of medicine,' 'school of dentistry', 'school of osteopathy', 'school of pharmacy', 'school of optometry', 'school of podiatry', and 'school of public health' mean a school which provides training leading, respectively, to a degree of doctor of medicine, a degree of doctor of dentistry or an equivalent degree, a degree of doctor of osteopathy, a degree of bachelor of science in pharmacy or doctor of pharmacy, a degree of doctor of optometry or an equivalent degree, a degree of doctor of podiatry or doctor of surgical chiropody, and a graduate degree in public health; and

"(5) The term 'school of nursing' means a department, school, division, or other administrative unit, in a college or university, which provides, primarily or exclusively, a program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or other baccalaureate degree of equivalent rank; or to a graduate degree in nursing.

"National Advisory Council on Education for Health Professions

"SEC. 725. (a) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a National Advisory Council on Education for Health Professions, consisting of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, who shall be Chairman, and the Commissioner of Education, both of whom shall be ex officio members, and sixteen members appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. Four of the appointed members shall be selected from the general public and twelve shall be selected from among leading authorities in the fields of higher education, at least eight of whom are particularly concerned with training in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or the public health professions. In selecting persons for appointment to the Council, consideration shall be given to such factors, among others, as (1) experience in the planning, constructing, financing, or administration of schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or schools of public health, and (2) familiarity with the need for teaching facilities in all areas of the Nation.

"(b) The Council shall advise the Surgeon General in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, and in the review of applications thereunder.

"(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to use the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters related to the administration of this part, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine. The Surgeon General shall, in addition, make appropriate provision for consultation between and coordination of the work of the Council and the National Advisory Council on Health Research Facilities with respect to matters bearing on the purposes and administration of this part.

"(d) Appointed members of the Council, while attending conferences or meetings of the Council or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Noninterference with administration of institutions

"SEC. 726. Nothing contained in this part shall be construed as authorizing any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirement or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any institution.

"Regulations

"SEC. 727. (a) The Surgeon General, after consultation with the Council and with the approval of the Secretary, shall prescribe general regulations for this part covering the eligibility of institutions, the order of priority in approving applications, the terms and conditions for approving applications, determinations of the amounts of grants, and minimum standards of construction and equipment for various types of institutions.

"(b) The Surgeon General is authorized to make, with the approval of the Secretary, such other regulations as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this part.

"Technical assistance

"SEC. 728. In carrying out the purposes of this part, and to further the development of State, or joint or coordinated regional or other interstate, planning of programs for relieving shortages of training capacity in the fields of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, and public health, through constructing teaching facilities, providing adequate financial support for schools, or otherwise, the Surgeon General is authorized to provide technical assistance and consultative services to State or interstate planning agencies established for any of such purposes.

"Planning grants for health education programs

"SEC. 729. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year in the period beginning July 1, 1963, and ending June 30, 1973, the sum of $500,000 to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to regional, interstate, State, or local public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations and to any public or nonprofit private institution for planning and determining the need for teaching facilities for, or otherwise planning a new, expanded, or improved program of, training physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, professional public health personnel, or dentists.

"PART C—STUDENT LOANS

"Loan agreements

"SEC. 740. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to enter into an agreement for the establishment and operation of a student loan fund in accordance with this part with any public or other nonprofit school of medicine, osteopathy, or dentistry (as defined in section 724) which is located in a State and is accredited as provided in section 721(b)(1)(B).

"(b) Each agreement entered into under this section shall—

"(1) provide for establishment of a student loan fund by the school;

"(2) provide for deposit in the fund of (A) the amounts allocated under this part to the school by the Secretary, (B) an additional amount from other sources equal to not less than one-ninth of amounts deposited pursuant to clause (A), (C) collections of principal and interest on loans made from the fund, and (D) any other earnings of the fund;

"(3) provide that the fund shall be used only for loans to students of the school in accordance with the agreement and for costs of collection of such loans and interest thereon; and

"(4) contain such other provisions as are necessary to protect the financial interests of the United States.

"Loan provisions

"SEC. 741. (a) Loans from a loan fund established under this part may not exceed $2,000 for any student for any academic year or its equivalent, reduced by the amounts loaned to such student for that year out of a loan fund established under section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. In the granting of such loans, a school shall give preference to persons who enter as first-year students after June 30, 1963.

"(b) Any such loans shall be made on such terms and conditions as the school may determine, but may be made only to a student in need of the amount thereof to pursue a full-time course of study at the school leading to a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of dentistry or an equivalent degree, or doctor of osteopathy.

"(c) Such loans shall be repayable in equal or graduated periodic installments (with the right of the borrower to accelerate repayment) over the ten-year period which begins three years after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at a school of medicine, osteopathy, or dentistry, excluding from such ten-year period all periods (up to three years) of (1) active duty performed by the borrower as a member of a uniformed service, or (2) service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act.

"(d) The liability to repay the unpaid balance of such a loan and accrued interest thereon shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if the Secretary determines that he has become permanently and totally disabled.

"(e) Such loans shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum, computed only for periods during which the loan is repayable.

"(f) Where any person who obtained one or more loans from a loan fund established under this part—

"(1)(A) engages in the practice of medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy in an area in a State determined by the appropriate State health authority to have a shortage of and need for physicians or dentists; or

"(B) is employed full-time as a physician or dentist by any public agency, is on active duty as a physician or dentists with a uniformed service, or is employed full-time as a physician or dentist by any nonprofit private agency or organization located in a State; and

"(2)(A) in the case of practice described in paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection, the appropriate State health authority certifies to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in such form and at such times as the Secretary may prescribe that such practice helps to meet the shortage of and need for physicians or dentists in the area where the practice occurs;

"(B) in the case of employment (other than Federal employment or service in a uniformed service) by any public agency or nonprofit private agency or organization, the State health authority for the State in which the employment is performed certifies to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in such form and at such times as the Secretary may prescribe that such employment helps meet a shortage of and need for persons to perform such employment; and

"(C) in the case of Federal employment or service in a uniformed service, the head of the employing agency or uniformed service, as the case may be, certifies to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in such form and at such times as the Secretary may prescribe that such employment or service helps meet a shortage of and need for persons to perform such employment or such military service;

then 10 per centum of the total of such loans, plus accrued interest on such amount, which are unpaid as of the date such practice or employment, or such service in a uniformed service begins, shall be canceled thereafter for each year of such practice, employment, or service, or combination thereof, up to a total of 50 per centum of such total, plus accrued interest thereon.

"(g) Loans shall be made under this part without security or endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required.

"(h) No note or other evidence of a loan made under this part may be transferred or assigned by the school making the loan except that, if the borrower transfers to another school participating in the program under this part, such note or other evidence of a loan may be transferred to such other school.

"(i) Where all or any part of a loan, or interest, is canceled under this section, the Secretary shall pay to the school an amount equal to the school's proportionate share of the canceled portion, as determined by the Secretary.

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 742. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out this part $5,100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $10,200,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $15,400,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $20,600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $21,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any academic year ending before July 1, 1968, to continue or complete their education. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall be allotted among loan funds at schools which have established loan funds under this part.

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall from time to time set dates by which schools with which he has in effect agreements under this part must file applications for allotments to their loan funds.

"(2) If the total of the amounts requested for any fiscal year in such applications exceeds the amounts appropriated under this part for that fiscal year, the allotment to the loan fund of each such school shall be reduced to whichever of the following is the smaller: (A) the amount requested in its application or (B) an amount which bears the same ratio to the amounts appropriated as the number of students estimated by the Secretary to be enrolled in such school during such fiscal year bears to the estimated total number of students in all such schools during such year. Amounts remaining after allotment under the preceding sentence shall be reallotted in accordance with clause (B) of such sentence among schools whose applications requested more than the amounts so allotted to their loan funds, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the total allotted to any such school's loan fund from exceeding the total so requested by it.

"(3) Allotments to a loan fund of a school shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Secretary determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the loan fund at such school.

"Distribution of assets from loan funds

"SEC. 743. (a) After June 30, 1971, and not later than September 30, 1971, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the loan fund established under this part by each school as follows:

"(1) The Secretary shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1971, as the total amount of the allotments to such fund by the Secretary under this part bears to the total amounts in such fund derived from such allotments and from funds deposited therein pursuant to section 740(b)(2)(B).

"(2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the school.

"(b) After September 30, 1971, each school with which the Secretary has made an agreement under this part shall pay to the Secretary, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by the school after June 30, 1971, in payment of principal or interest on loans made from the loan fund established pursuant to such agreement as was determined for the Secretary under subsection (a).

"Loans to schools

"SEC. 744. Upon application by any school with which he has made an agreement under this part, the Secretary may make a loan to such school for the purpose of helping to finance deposits required by section 740(b)(2)(B) in a loan fund established pursuant to such agreement. Such loan may be made only if the school shows it is unable to secure such funds upon reasonable terms and conditions from non-Federal sources. Loans made under this section shall bear interest at a rate sufficient to cover (1) the cost of the funds to the Treasury, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3) probable losses.

"Administrative provisions

"SEC. 745. The Secretary may agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under this part, and may compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand of the United States arising or acquired under this part."

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that certain language in the bill as introduced has been stricken and the committee has adopted amendments with reference to the program which I explained in detail yesterday. In view of that fact and also the further fact that this section goes to page 28 of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered as read, included in the RECORD, so that the amendments may be read and acted upon; and, of course, it would be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment, page 2, strike out lines 14 through 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 720. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, not to exceed the following amounts—

"(1) $105,000,000 in the aggregate for grants to assist in the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, or professional public health personnel, of which not more than $15,000,000 may be available for grants before July 1, 1964, and not more than $60,000,000 in the aggregate may be available for grants before July 1, 1965;

"(2) $35,000,000 in the aggregate for grants to assist in the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of dentists, of which not more than $5,000,000 may be available for grants before July 1, 1964, and not more than $20,000,000 in the aggregate may be available for grants before July 1, 1965; and

"(3) $35,000,000 in the aggregate for replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, professional public health personnel, or dentists, of which not more than $5,000,000 may be available for grants before July 1, 1964, and not more than $20,000,000 in the aggregate may be available for grants before July 1, 1965.

If and to the extent the Surgeon General determines such action will better carry out the objectives of this part, the limitations on the amounts available for grants before July 1, 1964, under any paragraph of this section shall be decreased and the limitation on the amount so available under any other paragraph of this section shall be correspondingly increased; and the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, under each of such paragraphs shall be similarly adjusted by transfer between them. In applying the dollar limitations of each of those paragraphs for the three-year period ending June 30, 1966, any amount appropriated under any such paragraph but transferred under the preceding sentence to the appropriation under another paragraph shall be deemed to have been appropriated only under such other paragraph."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 19, strike out "1972" and insert "1965" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 13, after "school of medicine," insert "or school of osteopathy."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 22, strike out "(A)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, beginning in line 1, strike out ", and" and all that follows through the word "workweek" in line 5.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 23, insert "or school of osteopathy" before "which".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, strike out lines 1 through 12.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, strike out lines 19 through 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) Such loans shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, computed only for periods during which the loan is repayable, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum, or the going Federal rate at the time the loan is made, whichever rate is the greater. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'going Federal rate' means the rate of interest which the Secretary of the Treasury specifies during June of each year for purposes of loans made during the fiscal year beginning on the next July 1, determined by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market quotations or prices during the preceding May on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such month of May, and by rounding off such estimated average annual yield to the next higher multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, beginning in line 2, strike out "$20,600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $21,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 4, strike out "1969" and insert "1967" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 7, strike out "1968" and insert "1966" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, lines 12, 13, 18, and 25, strike out "1971" and insert "1969" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 27, line 4, strike out "1971" and insert "1969" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my colleague would indulge with me 5 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary] to give the House a bit of information that he has regarding another matter in which we are all interested with reference to the Post Office Department.

Mr. DEVINE. I should be very happy to.

The CHAIRMAN. Before recognizing the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary], the Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: On page 28, strike out lines 1 and 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address the House regarding recent reports in the press and on radio and television of the Post Office Department's protests of reductions by this body of its budget requests for the current year and for fiscal year 1964.

I am sure that certain of these reports have caused concern among the Members because of the curtailment of service that has been threatened. I would remind the House that the Post Office Department can paint a black and tearful picture when its funds are being cut. Former Postmaster General Summerfield was a past master in this field.

In cutting the budget in years past as a member of two appropriations subcommittees, I have been accused, with my colleagues, of ruining the Post Office and wrecking our foreign-aid program. It should be noted that the postal service has survived and that the foreign-aid program is flourishing.

Now, because of our action, it is said the elimination of Saturday mail delivery will have to be considered and that the delivery of junk mail may have to be slowed down. It is charged that no delivery service will be possible to new homes and offices.

I have in my possession the only actual order the Post Office Department has made in this regard to date. It prohibits the appointment of new employees in 68 of the largest post offices across the country and calls on these same offices to limit their overtime. It asks that the Department be advised if these restrictions result in any curtailment of service. Richmond, Va., in my congressional district, comes under this order and I am willing to stand firm on the action taken by the Appropriations Subcommittee of which I am chairman and with which the House concurred.

It is true that the House cut $92 million from the budget request of the Department for 1964—but it gave the Post Office $227 million more than it is getting this fiscal year.

It is true the House did make the biggest cut in the Post Office budget in history—but the Post Office budget was also the biggest in history, almost $5 billion.

It is true the House cut $70 million in the operations end of the postal service—but this was less than a 2-percent reduction in the Department's request for operations.

It is true that the new appropriations will have to cover the pay increase voted last year—but we allowed the necessary $133 million for this purpose and approximately $100 million additionally.

It is true that the Post Office did not get $8 million it requested as a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1963—but it did get $162 million from a request for $170 million.

It was our deliberate intention to recommend appropriations that would require economies of operation.

But as I told the House when presenting the bill that has the Post Office up in arms, Postmaster General Day has done an outstanding job and I have the utmost confidence in his ability.

Our subcommittee is convinced he can meet the challenge demanded by our enormous postal deficit; our country's long string of unbalanced budgets and the huge public debt that has resulted.

If it is merely the job of this body, Mr. Speaker, to approve the actions of the executive branch of the Government without making a judgment of our own, we might as well pack up and go home.

This House has made a judgment. I am confident that it was a reasonable judgment and that the Post Office will be able to operate. Some tightening of the belt will be necessary but this is a chore that should be undertaken not only by the Post Office Department—but by the Federal Government as a whole.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HERLONG. I would like to say to the gentleman that the suggestion that we do away with Saturday mail could not bother me less. If they want to really help us they could do away with Monday morning mail. Then we would get some help.

Mr. GARY. I am sure you are all aware of the fact that some 10 years ago we did away with two deliveries a day in residential sections, reducing it to one. This has resulted in a savings over the 10 years of a billion and a half dollars on that item alone without causing a hardship to anyone.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Harris: On page 14, line 14, immediately after the semicolon insert the following: but such term shall not include the construction or cost of construction of so much of any facility as is used or is to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes.

Yesterday we had some discussion regarding the possibility that the funds could be used for constructing facilities which might be used for religious purposes. That is not the intention of the committee. The matter was never raised during the course of the hearings or in discussions we had in executive session. I have looked into the matter. In view of the definition that is included on page 14 of the bill of "construction" and "cost of construction," it appears that someone might interpret it in a way that such use would be possible. This amendment is simply to make it abundantly clear that none of the funds can be used for this purpose.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am very pleased that the chairman of the committee has offered this amendment. With his permission I would like to ask him a couple of questions. I have in my hand a memorandum from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dated April 20, 1961, in which they specify that none of the funds may be used for such construction. This would be under the Hill-Burton Act for public health services—that none of the funds could be used for such construction if it were for a particular denomination. But, for example, if a chapel in a hospital were to be used by all denominations then the construction funds could be used. I take it from the gentleman's amendment it would prohibit the use of Federal funds for the construction of any chapel where any religious instruction could be carried on.

Mr. HARRIS. For a house of worship, yes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Another question, if the gentleman will permit: Under this memorandum they say funds can be used for equipment under the present programs that are in existence for which funds are used; for example, for pulpits, for news, and so forth, in chapels and other places.

I notice in the bill that part of the funds can be used for original equipment, if I read the bill correctly. Would the amendment which the gentleman offers prohibit the use of any Federal funds for equipment as well as construction for places where there would be sectarian instruction or religious worship?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, that is a fact. As a matter of fact, I do not think there would be any question that such funds could be used for religious equipment even if this amendment had not been offered.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Do I understand, then, that under this amendment, if a university obtained assistance to use these funds for construction of its university and then proceeded, with its own funds, to build a chapel for religious purposes, the amendment would bar any Federal assistance, even though the chapel was built with the university's own private funds?

Mr. HARRIS. No, the gentleman is not correct. It does not interfere with what any school might do on its own.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the distinguished chairman object if we had the amendment reread?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Harris amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. So there can be no question as to what we mean by this amendment, and to establish legislative history, can we have an agreement that there is nothing in this language which would preclude the use of funds for the construction of an educational institution in which a facility of such an institution is to be built for religious purposes, so long as that particular facility for religious purposes is built with funds other than Federal funds?

Mr. HARRIS. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that we cannot have any agreement about anything. The facts speak for themselves, the language speaks for itself. It is very clear none of the funds can be used in the construction of facilities for religious purpose. If the school, or someone else on behalf of the school, wants to take it upon themselves to build such facilities for such purposes, they may do so, and it would not be prohibited by this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

May I ask if the gentleman from Arkansas will yield for a question. We have a similar provision in the higher education bill which we have before our Education and Labor Committee. We also refer to the same exclusion in the recapture of payments portion of the bill. In your recapture of payments portion on page 13 it is stated:

> If, within 10 years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this part.

And going down to (b), it is stated:

> the facility shall cease to be used for the teaching purposes for which it was constructed.

Would this mean if the facilities were used for the teaching of religion or used for sectarian purposes, then it would no longer be used for teaching purposes for the reason it was constructed; therefore, the Federal Government could recapture payments?

Mr. HARRIS. In the first place, the amendment provides that the facility cannot be used for sectarian purposes. The provision that the gentleman refers to is the recapture provision. That provision is aimed at a situation where the funds are allocated for a specific purpose and after a certain period the institution decides that it no longer needs the funds for that purpose. In such a case, the agency may go in and recapture a ratio of the Federal funds.

Mr. QUIE. In the event in the future if any of these facilities were used for religious instruction or sectarian worship, the recapture clause would apply?

Mr. HARRIS. I repeat, these funds cannot be used for sectarian and religious purposes. I am not going to make any comment different from that, because that is what the amendment says.

Mr. QUIE. What happens after the building is constructed and the institution uses it for religious purposes?

Mr. HARRIS. If the institution uses the facility for a religious purpose and they insist on using them for such purposes, the recapture provision would be a way to stop that.

Mr. QUIE. If we cannot recapture the funds, how can we enforce it?

Mr. HARRIS. We can recapture the funds but if the institution repays the Federal investment it is then free.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Would it be agreeable to the chairman to accept another amendment on page 13, immediately below line 20, and insert this language:

> (C) The facility is used for sectarian construction or as a place for religious purposes.

I think that would cover the objection which the gentleman from Minnesota raises, and would be clarifying language to the provision that the chairman proposes.

Mr. HARRIS. I have not seen the language, I have not had any opportunity to know anything about it.

Now, I would think if the funds are used as intended by this program, and then at some subsequent date they tried to use the facilities for purposes that were not intended, then a proper procedure could be brought to prevent them using them for that purpose and to recapture the Federal grant. That is the only way you can get at that problem.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would commend to the chairman the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon. We have a comparable provision in the proposed higher education bill. This provision would see to it that if, for instance, a classroom was built in a medical school and the medical school was side by side with a school of divinity and 2 to 3 years after the medical classroom was built it became the practice for the school of divinity to have regular classes in one of the classrooms built by these funds in the medical school section, that there could be resort by the Federal Government to recapture the funds used in that construction. This gives the Federal Government some leeway to see that the building is not, for 10 years after construction, turned over for any use for religious purposes. I think it is a very clear and simple amendment.

Mr. QUIE. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want it clear that in supporting the Harris amendment, I in no way object to Federal grants to church-affiliated dental and medical schools. This language will add a further precedent that when Federal assistance is given in higher education, it is never limited to public institutions and that there is no danger of the Federal assistance being used for sectarian instruction or religious worship.

When the higher education bill providing Federal assistance for the construction of academic facilities in institutions of higher learning comes before this House—and I surely hope this might some day happen despite the stranglehold the President has on the measure by holding it in the omnibus bill—some people may feel disposed to object on the grounds that this is contrary to the constitutional separation of church and state. I want to point out to them that there are 11 church-affiliated dental schools and 13 church-affiliated medical schools in the country, the list of which I am inserting in the RECORD.

DENTAL SCHOOLS

California: Loma Linda University; Seventh-Day Adventist.
District of Columbia: Georgetown University; Catholic.
Georgia: Emory University; Methodist.
Illinois: Loyola University; Catholic.
Louisiana: Loyola University; Catholic.
Missouri: St. Louis University; Catholic.
Nebraska: Creighton University; Catholic.
New Jersey: Seton Hall; Catholic.
Tennessee: Meharry Medical College; Methodist Episcopal.
Texas: Baylor University; Baptist.
Wisconsin: Marquette University; Catholic.

MEDICAL SCHOOLS

California: Loma Linda University; Seventh-Day Adventist.
District of Columbia: Georgetown University; Catholic.
Georgia: Emory University; Methodist.
Illinois: Loyola University; Catholic.
Missouri: St. Louis University; Catholic.
Nebraska: Creighton University; Catholic.
New Jersey: Seton Hall; Catholic.
New York: Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Yeshiva University; Jewish Orthodox.
North Carolina: Duke University; Methodist.
North Carolina: Bowman Gray School of Medicine, Wake Forest College; Baptist.
Tennessee: Meharry Medical College; Methodist Episcopal.
Texas: Baylor University; Baptist.
Wisconsin: Marquette University; Catholic.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I have had occasion to read the amendment as read by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon, and in view of the provisions of the act and what is intended by the amendment here, I can see no objection whatsoever to the amendment. As a matter of fact, I would expect the agency and those who enter into these agreements for this purpose to carry out the letter as well as the spirit of the law. This amendment would simply make it abundantly clear if ever it is necessary to use this provision, that the recapture provision would become operative in case a grantee would violate the terms of the agreement.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then, may I ask the chairman, will you offer that as part of your amendment, or separately?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I will offer it after this amendment is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: (1) On page 13, immediately below line 20, insert the following: "(c) the facility is used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship,".

Mr. HARRIS. I think it is unnecessary to go into this further, because we have just discussed it.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. My question is directed to the meaning of the words "sectarian instruction." Now, is this confined to anything that might be taught from a medical viewpoint, in other words, the question of medical ethics, the question of sterilization. All of this might be permissible from a medical viewpoint as long as they do not teach doctrine.

Mr. HARRIS. I think it is understood that the term "sectarian instruction" here has to do with religious instruction.

Mr. CAREY. Primarily medical instruction and not doctrinal in nature.

Mr. HARRIS. I will ask the gentlewoman from Oregon if that is not her interpretation.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. On the bills of the Higher Education Subcommittee we discussed this at some length and we said that in sectarian instruction presenting a particular denominational viewpoint, we felt that any administrator who was half smart could put any classes that were involved in another building that was not built by Federal funds and avoid that controversy.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CAREY. Under this amendment the instruction could be carried out in a part of the building which would have to be privately financed or it could be another part of the building; is that not correct?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

I might say in further response to it that this is the type of approach which we adopted in the Federal Airport Program, I think in the 83d Congress—with regard to this type of problem. We provided that the grantee could not utilize any of the funds for the purpose of certain facilities in terminal buildings. We prohibited the use of funds for cocktail lounges and similar such facilities. No precedent is being set by this at all, and we simply follow the same pattern.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Does the term "facilities" as used in the gentleman's amendment mean the entire building?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, if the facility is an entire building. However, it could mean a wing or other expansion of a building, if the grant is for a wing or expansion.

Mr. GOODELL. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not hear that last part of his statement.

Mr. HARRIS. It could mean the entire building or a part of the building, depending on the situation.

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman will yield further, my concern is that if a classroom in a building is used regularly for sectarian instruction, and there is no question that it is sectarian instruction, do they recapture the pro rata value of the classroom or will they go back to the whole value of the building?

Mr. HARRIS. I should think that the Secretary would take into consideration just what is intended here and then proceed to move accordingly. I just cannot see that there would be any difficulty in that regard.

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I am trying to give the Secretary some guidance as to our intention. In our Committee on Education and Labor we intended if they used any part of a facility which is constructed—and that means the entire portion that was constructed with Federal funds—for sectarian purposes, then the recovery clause would apply against the entire portion that was constructed and not just a pro rata share of a small area that might have been used for sectarian purposes. I would like to have that guidance for the Secretary.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the amendment is very clear and it speaks for itself on it. It says if the facility is used for a religious purpose.

Mr. GOODELL. Is it the intention of the chairman and, I believe, this House, that no portion of the building be used at any time for sectarian instruction or religious worship at any time?

Mr. HARRIS. It is my intention that the language be administered just as it reads. The instruction is very clear:

> No part of the funds can be used for this purpose.

Mr. GOODELL. We are talking about the recapture action, if I may say so.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOODELL. The building is already constructed? I am talking about the problem that may arise after the building is constructed.

Mr. HARRIS. You can recover only the amount of funds that was put into the project by the institution.

Mr. GOODELL. Is it our intention that they not use any portion of this facility at any time for sectarian instruction or religious worship?

Mr. HARRIS. I am not going to make a statement here that would be contradictory to what I said to the gentleman from Illinois a while ago. If some institution or someone on its behalf comes in and establishes some kind of a chapel in the building with his own funds, then the recapture provision would not apply and religious worship in such chapel would be permitted under this provision.

Mr. GOODELL. My point does not apply to the facility which is constructed or part of it constructed for sectarian purposes with funds provided separately by someone other than the Federal Government. If a facility is constructed with Federal funds and subsequently they convert some part of it at any time for sectarian purposes, then I think it was our intention on the Education and Labor Committee through this type of amendment to have the Federal Government go in and recapture Federal funds used to construct that facility.

Mr. HARRIS. It says the "facility," and that means the entire "facility" but a "facility" under this program could be an entire building or a separate wing or an additional floor of an existing building.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment for the following reasons. This is a very important amendment. It goes to the very substance of this act. It is an amendment that neither the committee reporting the bill has had a chance to study nor the other committee interested in education has had a chance to study. There has been no testimony on this amendment. I submit that my colleagues should know what they are doing here. If you read the entire section that we are amending, you will see the reasons why it is a bad amendment to adopt under the circumstances which brought it before this House.

We are amending section 723 on page 13 of the bill, "Recapture of Payments." It reads as follows:

> If, within ten years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this part—

And then it lists (a) and (b), and then the proposed language, that the facility is used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship. And then we read on—

> the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated) of

the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

The gentleman from New York raised the very question a moment ago which we are discussing here regarding an educational institution. We have Protestant colleges and universities; we have Jewish colleges and universities; we have Catholic colleges and universities; and we have nonsectarian institutions of higher learning. These institutions engage in the practice of teaching medicine and its many phases frequently including ethics in their particular field. We are now saying this, that in view of the answer of the chairman to the gentleman from New York when the question was raised, what constitutes a facility? the answer was the entire building could constitute the facility. Who is going to make that determination? the Surgeon General? the court? Who is going to decide?

Suppose a religious-oriented university has a chapel that has been built with its own funds. Earlier the chairman stated that under those conditions it would not constitute a bar to Federal aid for the construction of a school. But along comes the language of this amendment which says "if the facility is used for sectarian instruction or as a place of religious worship." If a chapel has been established in that school with private funds, that facility is being used for religious worship and under the strict interpretation of this amendment, it is entirely conceivable that the United States could move to recapture all the funds expended on the building of that school.

You are dealing with a fundamental question that has plagued this Congress for many, many years. I dare say it is dangerous to try to write amendments to an important act like this—and I think this is a very important bill—I think it is dangerous to be writing amendments under such circumstances; important, basic philosophical amendments that go to deep religious issues, philosophical issues. I say that the ramifications of this amendment are so manifest that I would just as soon take my chances on striking this amendment and proceeding to the approval of this bill. This amendment does not state who is going to make these determinations, who is going to decide. What portion of the facility would be subject to recovery if it is a chapel? What portion of the facility is subject to recovery if, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], suggested, a school engages, as part of its curriculum, in the teaching of medical ethics of that particular religion?

Therefore, it is my hope that the House in its wisdom will reject this amendment simply because I do not think we have had sufficient time to study its full ramifications within the time allotted here on the floor. I believe the amendment needs further clarification before we adopt it.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my colleague from Illinois that this is not an amendment that is new or different. This is language that was considered at some length by the Education Committee. Also, it is an amendment that this House adopted in the Higher Education bill in January of 1962. The only difference is that instead of "10 years after completion of construction," the Education Committee said within 20 years. The language which was adopted by this House in 1962 is more strict than the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Arkansas. It has been thoroughly considered. It was carefully considered by the committee on which the gentleman from Illinois serves. At the time it was voted out favorably by that committee this question was not raised. So I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BROMWELL].

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation about this amendment. It is likely to cause trouble; I agree with the gentleman from Illinois. It is also fundamentally foolhardy. A great many of these institutions which propound and disseminate information concerning the healing arts have a religious connection. I do not see how you can separate the study and practice of any of the separate skills of the healing arts from the real or fancied spiritual needs of the people being cared for. Some of our great hospitals have been religiously founded, and some more of our medical schools, as the gentleman observed.

From personal observation I think everyone knows that when a hospital is connected to a medical school many, many of them have a system of morning and evening prayers which are acts of worship which involve not only the clericals of the faith, whatever it may be, but each patient. Moreover, many denominations have the practice of preparing a person about to die for entrance into the hereafter, which involves acts of worship, connected in many instances with institutions of learning.

We are moving into an area of study and practice of medicine in which all aspects of activity are coming under scrutiny, even though acts of mental activity shade off into the spiritual realm. I think the study of the healing arts should be made more unitary rather than fragmentary, for whatever that observation is worth. But I think this amendment represents the kind of silly secularism we should try to avoid in lawmaking activities in the United States because it bears no relationship to life as it is lived. It should be opposed.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEVINE: On page 19 strike out line 13 and all that follows down to line 24 on page 27.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes out the entire loan provision of this bill. I addressed the House at some length yesterday in the Committee of the Whole relative to the provisions relating to the student loans. All of you have available here in the Chamber the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. I would invite your attention to page 6818 and the five pages immediately following wherein there is set out in detail, on a State-by-State basis, the private foundations, the private funds for private sources of loans and the private sources of scholarships that are available to medical school applicants and applicants to schools of higher education throughout the country.

As you know, the American Medical Association has a $16½ million loan program. There are many other foundations that have been set up by State governments and even by medical schools for loan funds. There has been a lot of talk here in the last 2 days about why this bill was before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That is a good question. In fact, I asked that very question in committee of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze. I told him, this appears to me to be a Federal aid to education bill—which it is. He said, "No, this is a health bill." I said, "Mr. Secretary, how about medicare; is that not a health bill? Why is that before the Committee on Ways and Means instead of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?" He said, "Medicare is not a health bill; it is an insurance bill." So we could go on and on at length, but I think there is no question here today but that we are talking about a Federal aid to education. And we are talking about loans or scholarships. The House must keep in mind that we resolved this very issue relating to scholarships on the floor of this House last year and a very important piece of legislation was passed by the House and sent to the other body where they could not reach agreement. They put some linguistic gymnastics in it in the form of a provision called "nonreimbursable loans." The bill came back to the House, but nothing ever happened because the House had established its position in opposition to scholarships.

Another thing that is being talked about here is this. All the testimony indicates that the students are beating on the doors of the medical schools wanting to get in, but we do not have room for them and, therefore, the Congress should by this bill, H.R. 12, build more medical facilities to take care of these applicants who cannot get into the schools.

Well, we have a self-defeating argument here. If we provide scholarships to get the kids into school; where are they going when they do not have the room for them?

Another part of the bill says to build the facilities so we can take care of these youngsters. Again it would take from 3 to 5, and, perhaps, 7 years under the terms of this bill to provide the additional medical facilities to take care of the new students for whom we are going to provide the money to go to these schools. As is indicated in the minority views, as contained in the committee report, while a large number of students avail themselves of NDEA, that is National Defense Education Act loans in fiscal year 1962, and there were 3,215 medical students and 1,881 dentistry students, the average loan was less than $700. Let me say this to you. If we leave the loan provisions in this bill, we are going to open up a Pandora's box the likes of which have never been seen before in the Congress. We all admit the medical profession is highly respected and they develop into a higher income category in their community. If these youngsters are not financially able to go into a profession where they can make all this money, what about those who will enter other professions that are less attractive from a future financial standpoint? It would seem to me, if all students need help to go to school, certainly, help should not be restricted to those who would go to the medical schools.

Further, as far as the applicants to medical schools are concerned, I received letters in the last few days and I read one letter before the Committee on Rules about other students who feel they are being discriminated against financially. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] yesterday referred to his research to determine whether other programs from a scholarship standpoint which have been authorized by the Congress through the National Defense Education Act have, in fact, solved the problem that we are seeking to solve and that is to attract more people to a particular area where there apparently is a lack or a need. He demonstrated that the program failed to accomplish its objective.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: On page 20, line 13, strike out "and", and immediately below line 13 insert the following:

"(4) provide that loans may be made from such fund only to students pursuing a full-time course of study at the school leading to a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of dentistry or an equivalent degree, or doctor of osteopathy, and that while the agreement remains in effect no such student who has attended such school before July 1, 1966, shall receive a loan from a loan fund established under section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; and".

On page 20, line 14, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

On page 20, beginning line 19, strike out ", reduced by the amounts loaned to such student for that year out of a loan fund established under section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958".

On page 22, strike out line 14 and all that follows down through line 5 on page 24.

On page 24, line 6, strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)".

On page 24, line 11, strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)".

On page 24, line 17, strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)".

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLLIER. Is this a perfecting amendment? I contend that it is not, because it does not deal with the area where it could be construed as a perfecting amendment to the amendment just offered. I make a point of order against this amendment on that ground.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas is a perfecting amendment to the text of the pending bill.

Mr. COLLIER. The pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a perfecting amendment to the text of the pending bill, to which language of the bill the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is directed.

Mr. COLLIER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLLIER. This is a perfecting amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. No, it is not.

Mr. COLLIER. Then how does it get precedence over the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Because it is a perfecting amendment to the text of the bill to which the gentleman from Ohio offers his amendment. The vote will come first on the perfecting amendment before the vote is had on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. COLLIER. A further parliamentary inquiry. Will there be an opportunity, then, to vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio?

The CHAIRMAN. After the perfecting amendment is disposed of the question then will recur on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, but there cannot be a further amendment offered and pending until these are disposed of.

Mr. COLLIER. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLLIER. In the event the perfecting amendment is adopted it forecloses, does it not, a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio?

The CHAIRMAN. No; it does not. The vote then will come on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio as changed by the perfecting amendment.

Mr. COLLIER. Which strikes out the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote then will be on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio whether the text of the pending bill has been perfected by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas or not.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered here has for its purpose the clarification of the question of duplication which is of concern to several Members. I appeared before the distinguished Rules Committee on this question.

I pointed out that the committee had given very careful attention to this problem, and that we included a discussion of it in our report and also referred to the specific provisions which are included in the amendment. The nonduplication provisions of this amendment are based on administrative decisions of the Comptroller General.

I also made the statement that if there were any questions in the minds of any Members about what we wanted to make abundantly clear, I would submit an amendment for that purpose. That is what the first part of this amendment I have offered here does today. It is very simple. It merely says if a student obtains a loan while pursuing a full-time course of study at the school leading to a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of osteopathy, doctor of dentistry, or an equivalent degree, or that while the agreement with the school remains in effect no such student shall receive a loan from a loan fund established under the NDEA.

In other words, there is no duplication whatsoever. The H.R. 12 loan program is designed for this purpose, it is suitable for this purpose; therefore, those who endeavor to prepare themselves for this profession have a place to which they can go to obtain funds for this purpose.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If the language of the gentleman's amendment is adopted, would it follow that if a student wanted to he could obtain a loan under the National Defense Education Act instead of under this act?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; but if he did, he could not receive a loan under this act.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand, but he could go the route of the National Defense Education Act instead of the route provided by this bill?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true, if he can get approval of his loan application.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the fact scholarships are now provided for in the National Defense Education Act, will not the gentleman agree with me this actually is a duplication of what the Congress has been trying to do to assist needy students in getting a higher education?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I would not agree to that. That is not the intent and purpose of it; because, as I have said on many occasions, the provisions of the general education program provided in the National Defense Education Act are not well suited to the needs of medical and dental students. It was not designed for that purpose. The first amendment simply carries this purpose out.

No. 2 is merely a conforming amendment.

No. 3 is similarly conforming, in view of the fact that the bill now provides that such funds would be reduced by the amount received under NDEA. If this amendment is adopted, that provision will no longer be necessary.

The other major amendment would strike out the provisions on pages 22, 23, and 24 which refer to forgiveness of the loans. We have heard much about that. There seems to be a feeling that under this bill these provisions would, in effect, provide scholarships. In order to meet that objection, I offer to strike out the forgiveness provisions.

As a matter of fact, the committee considered at the outset the forgiveness provisions included in the NDEA in connection with the forgiveness feature of this bill. By amendments offered by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Illinois, we perfected these provisions and expanded them to meet the purposes of H.R. 12.

In view of the fact that differences arose and that the loan provisions are so important, in order to remove any doubt in the mind of any Member, we thought we would just strike out these provisions altogether, and that is what is done in this amendment.

The other amendments are clearly conforming, in view of this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Following up the colloquy between the gentleman and the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], with respect to availability of other loans, I would like to ask the gentleman's view of the eligibility for a loan under this section of one who also had received a loan from the American Medical Association Education and Research Foundation. And, I call the attention of the committee and the gentleman to page 251 of the committee hearings in which a witness on behalf of the AMA testified that in the 10 months their loan program had been in effect, they had granted some 5,299 loans to a total of 4,694 individuals. Now, my question is this: Will a medical student, if this bill becomes law, be able to go to the AMA fund and also go to the loan fund under this act?

Mr. HARRIS. We do not intend nor is there any implication in the language of the bill that might prevent or prohibit a student from going any place, legitimately, to get any assistance that he can, whether it is from this fund or the bank or their parents or whoever it might be.

Mr. MEADER. The only thing he could not do would be to go to the National Defense Education fund if he was applying for a loan here?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

Mr. MEADER. He could not get a loan from the Government?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

Since you mentioned Dr. Dorman, let me say that he testified before the committee that "there is a need for student loans.

"The question comes up whether these loans should be drawn from Federal sources, and on this we have no specific position, either for or against. We do not oppose it."

Mr. MEADER. They subsequently have made up their minds and sent a letter to every Member of the House definitely opposing the loan provision of this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. That was at the very last, too, only a few weeks ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Will the gentleman from Arkansas be kind enough to inform me whether any of his perfecting amendments amend the National Defense Education Act?

Mr. HARRIS. They do not, with one exception. If a student files an application through his own institution, where he proposes to go, and receives funds through this program, then he would not be eligible for an NDEA loan.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that section of the perfecting amendment which amends the National Defense Education Act as it not being within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the point of order which the gentleman now raises comes too late.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that these amendments are very appropriate. I believe they are very desirable, and will strengthen this program. They will certainly clear up some of the misunderstandings that a lot of Members have, in my judgment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. One of the justifications for the legislation cited by the majority is that it will make doctors available in rural areas where they are not now available. Would not the striking of this provision do away with the justification for the legislation because the encouragement is thus gone?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, the committee went into that, too, and it found out that in many instances, called to our attention, that although through some such method they were caused to move into rural areas, when they get firmly established they sometimes move into other areas.

Mr. CRAMER. Then I understand the gentleman's amendment would eliminate anything in the bill so far as encouraging doctors to go to rural areas; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. We are trying to encourage doctors to go to all areas of the United States.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the perfecting amendment that the chairman has just introduced, and I do so because it was my amendment that provided for the forgiveness. Actually, if you will read the testimony you will find and I believe I attended every session when the hearings were held. There is very little evidence that there is a shortage of either dentists or doctors in the cities. Unless we can provide some method of getting doctors and dentists into the areas where there is a shortage—and those are the rural areas—then I must confess that there is not much evidence in the hearings which would support the stated purposes of the entire bill. For that reason I believe that we ought to provide some incentive for the doctors to go into the areas where they are needed. Therefore, I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Then does the gentleman understand and agree with the answer of the chairman on the question I just asked, that the only incentive in the bill insofar as providing physicians or encouraging physicians to practice in rural areas is the loan forgiveness provision and the striking of the loan forgiveness provision results in the bill offering no incentive of any kind to doctors to practice in rural areas and therefore no assistance where the assistance is really needed?

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman from Florida is correct. In the committee I even went so far as to offer an amendment to give 100-percent forgiveness because unless we can provide some method of getting the doctors into areas where they are needed then we are not accomplishing very much by this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. I am not in favor of the forgiveness provision, but would there be any other way by which doctors could be encouraged to go to rural areas other than by providing for forgiveness or actual grants to the doctors? I do not think that is the approach that should be followed.

Mr. YOUNGER. In answer to the gentleman, evidence was presented where the communities have actually built a small clinical unit and persuaded a doctor to come into the area. He stayed there for a year or two and then left. It is my recollection that one of the Members yesterday told of a case where they got a doctor out of the Air Force to come into a particular area and practice. He practiced just long enough so that he could be sure that he was outside of the jurisdiction of the Air Force, and then he left, and avoided the draft in that way. There is nothing I know of which has been presented that would offer the incentive other than the forgiveness.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the perfecting amendment, offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that this is a highly important amendment. It is my further opinion that it deals with a basic philosophy in connection with making loans to college students.

Mr. Chairman, when we undertake to make loans to young men who are studying to be doctors we are assisting them to enter perhaps the most lucrative profession that exists today. To provide as an incentive or whatever else you want to call it, the forgiving of a part of that obligation for the doctor to practice in a rural area or into a city area, or into any other particular area of the country after he graduates, is basically wrong in my opinion. If the medical student or any other student borrows $5,000 from the Government to pay for his education, he ought to be very happy to pay it back, and he ought to be very happy to voluntarily go to the area of the country where his services are most needed rather than being forced into a community through bribery or regimentation. Therefore, I think that this is one of the most important amendments to this legislation, in all deference to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER], who sponsored this provision. I think the gentleman's intention is the best, but in my opinion to give a medical student or a doctor a reward to control the location of his practice is un-American. In my judgment any American who does not want to repay a loan for his college education is not worth his salt.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. What would happen if a student borrowed from the National Defense Education Act, took his doctor's degree and went into a section of the country, whenever it might be, and took a part-time teaching job and practiced medicine under the National Defense Education Act? He would be forgiven 50 percent of his loan under the present bill. Under this amendment you prohibit a doctor from borrowing from this fund, but only from the National Defense Education Act, and under that he could go into a community and get his forgiveness of 50 percent of his loan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the fact that we made a mistake in some of these other bills as to forgiveness of loans is no reason we should do it again. We are headed in the wrong direction, if this kind of language is going to stay in the bill. It would mean that we have commenced a policy, of having the Government give medical students a free college education. If we are going in that direction, we ought to recognize it and make our decision now.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Apropos of the question addressed to the gentleman from Michigan by the gentleman from California, it has been pointed out, but I think it is worthwhile to point it out again, that the last time the House of Representatives spoke on this matter was last year when we had a motion to recommit the bill for assistance in the construction of higher education facilities. The conference report came back with an arrangement for scholarships and an element of forgiveness that was called nonreimbursable loans. Decisively the House recommitted that bill. I think that was the attitude then and I think it is very well the attitude now.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, did the committee consider limiting the loans to those students who were willing to go and agreed to go into the rural areas which is where they are trying to get these doctors? Why not make their eligibility for a loan an agreement that he will practice in these areas where we now do not have the doctors?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. That would be regimentation, and, of course, this is a form of it, too. This is regimentation in the form of a bribe. You are asking him to practice in a certain area and if he does he will be forgiven a part of his loan. I say that he ought to pay for his education. If the Government loans him the money and provides the opportunity for his education, there is no reason why he ought not fully repay his Government. No red-blooded citizen would want to do anything else.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, from the best information that I can get, it costs on an average $20,000 for a qualified medical student to get his degree from the medical university. In the case of a dental student, the average is $15,000. As I view this legislation, the purpose of the loan fund is for that student who does not have the money, the student who cannot afford the $20,000 to go to medical school or the dental student who does not have the $15,000 to go to a dental school.

It is this group that this legislation would aid. It is this group who have no opportunity to attend medical school, even though they have the ability and all the qualifications. If a boy or girl does not have the money, though well qualified, this Nation stands to lose valuable medical services.

So as I view this program, the loan program makes it possible for this youngster of modest means or from a poor family to get this professional education. We should not price the ability of these youngsters to enter medical school clear out of the reach of these young men.

I want to make another thing clear. I realize there is some criticism of this loan program for medical students. I view this program as a health program. But there is a lot of misinformation about this. There is no intention to duplicate the present NDEA excellent loan program which is now operating in more than 1,600 American colleges.

This is the reason. Part C of H.R. 12 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, not the Surgeon General, to enter into agreements with medical and dental schools for operation of the student loan fund. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is going to exercise good judgment, he is going to work in the interest of the taxpayers. Naturally he would merge this loan fund with the National Defense Education Act fund, with no duplication. It would eliminate all the duplication of administration. It would work well.

I personally regret that the gentleman from Arkansas has offered an amendment to delete the forgiveness feature, because I do think that the forgiveness feature is a necessary one to assist the rural and less economically privileged areas. It has worked well in the National Defense Education Act for the public and elementary schools, and there is no reason why it would not work well here. If we do not maintain this loan program, the boy of modest means is just not going to have the opportunity to enter medical school. The doors are going to be closed from now on out for that youngster.

If this Congress in view of the shortage of doctors in rural areas fails to permit loans for this type of youngster, I am telling you we are really derelict in our responsibility. The doctor shortage is serious. There have been many charges and countercharges about what the actual situation is, but the fact remains that in many areas such as those in the district I am privileged to represent, we have as few as 46 doctors to every 100,000 people. If we go ahead here and kill this loan provision, you are going to create a much greater shortage in the future. Only the relatively wealthy will be able to attend medical school, and they in turn will never seek out those areas where these critical shortages exist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the perfecting amendment and in support, I might say, of the original amendment, whatever its parliamentary status may be at this time.

It is my understanding that the loans to be granted under sections 740 and 741 of this bill will be made on the basis of financial need in much the same manner that individual loans are granted under the National Defense Education Act.

Those of you who have seen the financial statement forms required for various types of college students' assistance are familiar with the great detail, information, and personal data required.

It is certainly as demanding in every detail as financial information required for assistance under the Kerr-Mills medical care program. Yet many of those who have indicated their support of the legislation before us have criticized the financial statement required under the Kerr-Mills proposal. They have charged that it is a pauper's oath. But, of course, we all know that a financial statement becomes a pauper's oath when there is an emotional appeal in opposition to any need requirement for financial assistance—but it becomes a financial statement by convenience on other occasions. And so I pose this question to you today: "When is a financial statement a financial statement and when is it a pauper's oath for the purpose of determining need?" Are we going to establish a double standard in this legislation as it relates to need for the doctor as compared to establishing need for the services he administers? If it is humiliating at any time, as has been charged, to divulge personal financial information under a need program, how then do we determine whether such a requirement should or should not be necessary of any individual seeking Government aid of any kind.

There is another point that I would like to make here today which I think is so very pertinent to the legislation before us. There has been extensive testimony given by even the most ardent proponents of this bill representing the medical schools to the effect that for the next 4 or 5 years enrollment of medical students cannot possibly be increased. I do not think there is anyone on the floor of this House that can refute this statement. Yet this is a 3-year program—and this simply means this: Any funds used for student loans are simply replacing funds which are now coming from private or other sources. It boils down to just this. Let us say, for example, we have John Doe ready to enter a medical school. He has saved or otherwise is in a position to pay for his own schooling. Let us further assume that John Doe is a "B" student. Now, John Smith is ready to enter medical school. He is an "A" student but does not have funds to enter medical school. The particular medical school to which both of these young men apply has a limited enrollment. Must we not then assume that if a choice is to be made between the two applicants that John Smith will be given preference over John Doe because his academic grade is a little higher and because he is able to secure Government money or a Government loan that might well keep the other young man able to pay his own way out of the medical school?

May I ask some member of the committee if it is not true that under the loan provisions of this program an applicant will have to file a financial statement, known in the Kerr-Mills Act as the pauper's oath?

Mr. COLLIER. I ask the chairman of the committee if that is the manner by which a student qualifies for a loan.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Let me say in the first place, the answer to the basic question is "No."

Mr. COLLIER. The student applying does not have to show need when applying?

Mr. HARRIS. Not under the terms of this bill; that is what the gentleman is asking.

Mr. COLLIER. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. These loans are made at the instance of the institution. We make it abundantly clear that the Federal Government does not in any way run the institution or make the decision for it. An agreement is made with the institution and then the institution decides. The provisions of the bill have this language:

> (b) Any such loans shall be made on such terms and conditions as the school may determine, but may be made only to a student in need of the amount thereof to pursue a full-time course of study at the school leading to a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of dentistry or an equivalent degree, or doctor of osteopathy.

That is what the language provides, and the institution carries it out.

Mr. COLLIER. Would it be safe to assume, therefore, that a financial statement would be necessary upon which the determination would be made with regard to a loan?

Mr. HARRIS. I think it would be safer to say, the institution would undoubtedly handle it, we must assume, and we must assume they will do so in the best way that they can to carry out the spirit and purposes and intent of the law.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Then there is no needs test with respect to this bill? There is no true needs test; nor is there a full recovery provision dealing with loans.

Mr. COLLIER. There is no needs test written into the legislation before us, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. So then this is a refutation of the argument that we are trying to help needy students and that the loan money necessarily goes to needy students.

Mr. COLLIER. I think that is a fair observation, but I think it goes a bit farther. This is a 3-year program. Everyone who testified before the committee last year, when I was on the committee at that time, very specifically stated that not for 1 year and not for 2 years or 3 or 4 years would they handle one additional student. If it is a 3-year program, then how in the world are we going to get additional students into the schools under the loan provisions of this program? Instead, here is what will happen: Ten students who do not have funds to attend a medical school, but who might be rated "A" students in their previous academic work can get a loan and can go to a medical school and foreclose 10 "B" students who are in a position to pay their own way through medical school. Is this bill to grant preference to students with the best academic rating or is this a bill to increase the number of doctors? I think we are caught completely in a web of conflict of purpose. I think the amendment offered by the distinguished committee chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, is more or less a sweetener to what is already an unnecessary portion of this bill, the loan program. Again repeating what the distinguished minority leader said, it was certainly the sense and will of the Congress, expressed last year on the higher education bill, that we did not want to get into this student loans. Furthermore we find ourselves faced with a new proposition on the forgiveness end of the program, which was the only means, whether I agree or disagree, and of getting doctors in those areas where there are shortages.

Now we write that off; I would like to know why we have a loan program before us at this point at all?

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. To further bear out the point the gentleman is making, on page 40 of the hearings is an answer to a question by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] addressed to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze:

> My point, Mr. Secretary, is to bring it much closer: If you can grant the University of Illinois a grant, are any more students going to be able to study in that medical and dental school? That is my question.

The answer of Secretary Celebrezze is: "No."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there should be no confusion as to the intent of the perfecting amendment. It is really very clear. It does two things: One, it makes certain there will be no duplication of loans to students borrowing under the provisions of H.R. 12. They will not be able to borrow concurrently under the National Defense Education Act; and, second, all forgiveness features are stricken from the language of the bill. I supported in committee the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. YOUNGER] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER]; but I think it is in recognition of the temper of the House that we are not going to have a forgiveness provision adopted whether it encourages doctors into rural areas, whether it encourages them into general practice, or wherever it might encourage them.

I was surprised here a moment ago to have a new item injected that this would require some sort of pauper's oath or means test. I do not know which was intended by the previous speaker, but the language of the bill is clear, the loans are to be made under an agreement entered into between the institution and the Surgeon General. I call attention to the language starting in line 25 on page 20:

> Any such allowance shall be made on such terms and conditions as the school may determine, but may be made only to a student in need of the amount thereof to pursue a full-time course of study.

This matter of need can be variously interpreted. I do not think it is the intention of the committee, nor would it be my judgment, that the temper of the House would dictate that the loan be made only to a pauper; the need would be a reasonable need. That would be my interpretation, and I think I correctly interpret the temper of the committee at the time we discussed this. There was no effort to write language so tight as to limit it only to someone who would qualify for a pauper's oath.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. COLLIER. I was not even suggesting that this would be a requirement. I am simply trying to find out from someone in this Chamber when a pauper's oath is required and when it is not, whether you have to become a pauper to get consideration.

Mr. MOSS. I think the gentleman has a good enough background to know that whenever and from whatever source you seek a loan you normally are expected to file some statement of your financial condition. It is a reasonable and a normal requirement. I think in determining need under this language it does not have to be a case of the most necessitous, but of reasonable need. I think that is all that is intended. I think that is a reasonable construction of this language, and I do not think that places on the Surgeon General any onerous or difficult requirement. It is just a matter of good commonsense.

Mr. COLLIER. If the gentleman will yield further, in this legislation are we to understand that the word "need" as it applies to qualifications is entirely and totally an interpretation that this Congress in enacting this legislation will provide no restriction but will leave it entirely to another source? Is this responsible legislation?

Mr. MOSS. Well, there is a little more stiffness than the gentleman would indicate. I have been reasonable in the interpretation of the language. I think that is all that is required, a reasonable showing of need, no implication that you have to be a pauper.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Devine amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Devine amendment, whether the Harris amendment is adopted or not. I do not favor the forgiveness feature of this program in the medical school bill, but beside that it is unwise to provide a loan for students in this medical school bill.

At the present time there is one Federal loan program administered by the Commissioner of Education. It would be a duplication if this were passed. This provision in the perfecting amendment no longer provides a duplication for an individual student in his loans from an institution. But there would be duplication to the institution. The institution would do its best to derive money for loans both from the National Defense Education Act and from this medical school bill. Both would be made available. They would determine who would get the National Defense Education Act money and who would secure it under the Medical School Act. Duplication would make it more expensive to operate a loan program. Two agencies would be running a loan program at the same time. That particular kind of waste is uncalled for. There is no reason why the House cannot wait until the National Defense Education Act extension is reported out of our committee.

It has been pointed out earlier by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], who will handle this National Defense Education Act in her committee, that we are already considering increasing the money for graduate students if they want it to enable them to borrow more money. The medical schools have been borrowing to lend the money to the students—3,213 students are receiving money under that act, amounting to better than $2 million.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. If I understand the gentleman correctly, his position is he believes we should have a Federal program for student loans under the General Higher Education Act?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I supported the loan program under the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman's position, if I understand it correctly, is that he is not opposed to loans for students studying for a doctors' or dentists' degree, but he thinks it should be included in the National Defense Education Act or be administered by the Commissioner of Education?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. I just wanted to be sure.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, if we continue to fragment our education program, the next thing we can see that will be called justifiable, is the Aeronautics and Space Committee coming in here and asking us to provide a similar loan program for physics or anyone who goes into space. You can expect any profession to go to a committee of Congress for a loan program other than the Education and Labor Committee. They could go to the Committee on the Judiciary for loans to prospective lawyers, they could go to the Committee on Agriculture for loans to agricultural students.

What kind of sense can we make of this education picture if we fragment it all over the Federal Government and give no jurisdiction at all to the Commissioner of Education? From the study that has been made, there has been too much fragmentation already, and we should bring it all together.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to point out that I think there might have been a misconception in the answer to the chairman's question. I do not believe that we on the Committee on Education and Labor think there should be a special provision for doctors and dentists, so far as loans are concerned, as distinguished from students in graduate schools, schools of physics, biology, mathematics, and others that are very expensive. These all ought to be considered in relation to each other. We do not want any priority here for doctors and dentists, least of all for doctors and dentists.

They are the best off in terms of their income subsequently, all the way along, to take care of themselves. We feel that all students who need assistance should have the opportunity to have loans, regardless of whether or not they are striving to become doctors or dentists or other occupations requiring long and expensive studies.

Mr. QUIE. I want to make one other point, that under the National Defense Education Act we still have an oath that a student must take. There is no oath in here. It also provides here that student doctor can delay the repayment of the loan if he goes into the Peace Corps. I think these are actual changes in a loan program that ought to be considered in the National Defense Education Act. It seems to me we ought to do this for everybody. And, I do not think the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should enter the educational field, as they have done here. I think they are setting a precedent.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I ask you, I implore you, to support the Devine amendment, to knock out the loan provision here, because I assure you I do this as a person who supports loans and not as one who opposes them.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to my chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the perfecting amendments and the Devine amendment close at 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no obection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I think that while we were arguing here, we perhaps have lost sight of the objective of this legislation. We are talking about the second most precious commodity on earth. The first is life, and the second is health. Everything else fades into the background when you consider the fact that health is something you cannot buy, and it is difficult to preserve, and I happen to be getting to the age where I know health is a most important consideration of my life and habits.

Now, in talking about this, let us go back to the hearing record. We find there is no question about the need for the mortar and the brick. It has not been questioned here; it was not questioned at the hearings, and so far as I can understand, it has not been questioned in the debate.

Now, as I understand the Devine amendment, its purpose is to question the necessity of loans to fill the mortar and the brick with the students necessary to preserve the health of a great and a free and a happy civilization.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. For a question, because I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. I only point out that these medical and dental students are getting loans today under the National

Defense Education Act, and I think the purpose is not to have overlapping student loan programs.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Well, if the person who testified for the American Medical Association had said that they were doing everything that was sufficient, you might have a case, but he admitted that they were not doing it. He admitted there was more to be done, and we intend to do it.

We have here a situation in which this committee considered—and this has not been brought out as yet—a proposal to give grants to students, and we determined in the committee, by a majority vote, that the reason we were not giving grants was that anybody who would not want to pay back at least a part, or most, of the loan would certainly not have the proper incentive or the proper motive in becoming a doctor or dentist or osteopath. I fought the student grant proposal vigorously. I was not too happy over the forgiveness feature attached to the loans, but accepted the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger].

If the States, or the various denominations, had the necessary revenues to do this job of providing the caretakers of our health I would not support this bill. They do not. I pause to salute what they have done. But, with an admitted need, and no admitted or suggested source of sure and dependable relief other than the Federal Government, I must, in fairness to the hopes, the desires, the rights of the people of this great democracy to the best in life, including the best of health, and the best of health care. I must censure every Republican who has tried, or is trying, to defeat, or abort this legislation, for his individual effort, and his party for a collective effort, to deny the American people the doctors, the dentists, the osteopaths they need, and, in the process of exhibited selfishness, deny adequate schools to produce them.

Now, the Devine amendment seeks to knock out these loans. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Devine] referred to certain pages in the Congressional Record. When I turned to those pages in the Congressional Record I found this—that the loans were limited. Not only were the loans limited, but all the loans that have been provided for have been taken up. If that is true, if they have been taken up, and the Congressional Record so reflects, then certainly these loan provisions are necessary because there is no use in building the facilities to produce the help if we do not have the students who are going to be the guardians of our health such as the doctors, dentists, and osteopaths.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, we went along with that amendment in committee because we had compromised between grants and the straight-out loans. I agree with what was said yesterday about the fact that here are some forgiveness features when there are not similar forgiveness features included in educational legislation, but let me say this: Let me say that we have now taken out by that action the forgiveness features and eliminated any question about the sincerity of purpose of a person to whom the loan will be made.

In addition to that we have written into this particular legislation certain rules and certain provisions which I think give us some protection. We have said this: We have said that the institution to which the student applies will set the guidelines. Now, let us not be so ridiculous as to say that because the Congress did not set up a basis of need, or because the Congress did not set up the guidelines, that these people who would be entrusted with the administration of these rules, these people who have been entrusted with the training of doctors, dentists and osteopaths who now serve us well, because they have this legislation in a loan program, may now go out and dissipate what we would call the moral factors involved in the administration of any such program. It is ridiculous to say that. If they have had sense enough to supervise the medical colleges and the other colleges so far, certainly they have the know-how, the character, the integrity, and the experience to run the program as we have written it here in this particular legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have had personal experience with students who have knocked at the doors of medical schools. I have seen them turned away. I have seen young boys with brilliant minds and dedicated hearts turned away because they neither had facilities nor did they have money, and the people who were turned away in most instances were people who did not have money. They did not have money to have any influence or anything else.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this loan program is to meet the needs of those people. I am for the legislation. I support the loan program. The Harris amendment should be accepted, the Devine amendment defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton] for 2 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the perfecting amendment. We have two purposes before us in connection with this legislation as I see it. One is to encourage more doctors. We desperately need more doctors. There, basically, is the purpose of this legislation as I see it.

But we also have a second purpose, and that is to encourage more doctors to go into practice in the rural areas of America where they are in desperately short supply.

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent a very substantial rural area, and I know as a matter of personal experience how many rural communities in my district have been desperately trying, by every possible means, to attract a doctor into their areas. The American Medical Association cannot seem to help them. We in Congress have not been able to help them. Here at last is one program that does provide a method by which it might be possible to attract doctors in the rural areas. Maybe we can do the job in some other way, but nothing concrete has been offered, and this is the only program before us today.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a serious mistake to adopt the perfecting amendment and rule out the opportunity for rural areas to get the doctors they desperately need.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday several members of the committee were talking about the fact that doctors make an average of $19,000 a year. Let me say first of all that doctors do not make an average of $19,000 a year when they practice in rural areas. And in the second place, when a young man who is either trying to decide whether to go to medical school or who has graduated and is about to make his decision as to where he is going to practice, he does not make that crucial decision on the basis of the kind of income that statistics might show that he would be likely to receive 10 or 20 years from the day he decides where to practice. He makes it on the basis of what might relieve from him a portion of the heavy financial burdens he has assumed.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of a program would certainly have an important effect on the decision of a young medical graduate which would increase our chances of getting more doctors into the rural areas of America.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the perfecting amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee for striking out the debt cancellation provision. I do not want to say "forgiveness" because being against forgiveness is like being against motherhood. But I do not think you can justify debt cancellation, especially to doctors who go into private practice, although it might be indicated, perhaps, for those who go into the armed services or into public health.

We hear a lot about the need for doctors in rural areas, but the bill as presently written does not meet that need. It provides for so-called forgiveness in any State where it is determined that there is a shortage of or a need for physicians and dentists.

Mr. Chairman, there is a shortage of and a need for physicians and dentists all over. In fact, that is the very reason for this bill. I daresay that if this forgiveness feature were not taken out, it might result in every student who participated in this program being relieved from the responsibility of paying back. Because there is such a shortage of and a need for these doctors, they will earn a good living and will be well able to pay back. Under the National Defense Education Act, the only people who get the forgiveness are teachers who admittedly are receiving low salaries. But the doctors are on top of the heap economically and can afford to pay.

We hear that doctors advocate self-reliance—we hear that time and time again. I think this is a good opportunity to give them a chance to indicate their self-reliance by having them pay back to Uncle Sam the money that Uncle Sam has advanced or will advance to them so that they can do a job for the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the perfecting amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

I say to you that if this bill be passed it should contain the forgiveness feature and the loan feature in it, according to my humble opinion.

There is good precedent for the forgiveness feature. We tend to forget that last year when we talked on the bill on higher education that was presented, this bill contained scholarships, they were outright grants; they were gifts; they were scholarships that were not tied to any particular national need. We have in the National Defense Education Act a forgiveness feature for teachers, so I say to you that the forgiveness feature in this bill does not establish a precedent.

The tremendous need for doctors in this country is in the smaller areas, the rural areas. If there be any question about what would constitute a shortage, I would say if you have a community of 2,500 that does not have even one doctor, that is a shortage. If you have a community that serves 7,500 people and there is not even one doctor or dentist, it would seem to me that constitutes a shortage. If this bill be passed, it should have the forgiveness feature as originally suggested by the able gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio has suggested that we do away with the loan feature. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] very ably pointed out the difficulty of the poor students obtaining a medical education. I have in my hand here a statement by John A. D. Cooper, appearing in the Journal of Medical Education of March 1963.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the time allotted to me to the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

This article to which I refer contains these words:

> There are data indicating that almost half of our medical students come from families with incomes of over $10,000 per year. These families make up only about 11 percent of the general population and supply less than a third of the bright students to our colleges, as judged by studies on the National Merit Scholarship Semifinals.

We talk about the gentlemen who finish medical schools, who make good doctors and high salaries, but what about the able students who are never able to go to medical school? So if you have a bill to help improve the health of this Nation, this loan provision should be included. A medical student faces 12 years of preparation after high school—4 years in college, 4 years in medical school, and 4 years as an intern and resident.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman from Florida agree with me that this type of loan program deserves priority from the Congress?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It would certainly seem to me that the health provisions in this bill should include the loan feature.

Mr. PERKINS. There is no conflict in the administration of this program, no duplication, because both the loan programs will be reviewed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare both under NDEA and under this medical program.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I agree with the gentleman.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say again we ought to keep the forgiveness provision and the loan provision in this bill.

Thomas Jefferson said that all men are created equal. Mason of Virginia said that all men are by nature equally free and independent. America is still a land of opportunity. If we are going to have equality of opportunity, let us retain the loan provision to help enable every American student of ability to become a doctor if he so desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a physician. There are three of us in this House. I have heard a lot of discussion about statistics the last few days and I have heard a lot of interpretation and misrepresentation of these statistics.

I rise in favor of the Devine amendment and am opposed to the Harris amendment. We have heard about the self-reliance of physicians. Yet, they are self-reliant. They do have a loan program, and they are making it work effectively.

This new program of loans if passed will be superfluous in that respect as well as a reduplication of the National Defense Education Act. I would also like to make the point that it will not serve the purpose which it was meant to serve in getting physicians into the rural areas. No forgiveness of loan or any other feature such as that is going to take our new physicians into the rural areas. We have had urbanization of physicians by drawing them into our large cities just as the general population is shifting to urban areas. We have had a specialization which has cut down on the number of family doctors such as I am. Twenty-five years ago 85 percent of all physicians were general practitioners. The ratio now is about 40 percent. This is partly what has cost us the number of active practitioners per family that we need. We do not have enough 24-hour physicians that we used to have. Any amount of construction that is done in the next few years will not add a single man to a medical school for 5 years. I am for the construction feature, but I am opposed to the loan feature of this bill as being reduplication of both private loans and the National Defense Education Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the remarks that were made by the speaker who preceded me, who opposed the loan program, because we have today in existence a loan program from which doctors, dentists, and other graduate and undergraduate students are borrowing. This decision was made in 1958. The Congress said we need loans to enable more needy students to attend college. I rise in support of the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Arkansas. I think it improves the bill immeasurably. I think it eliminates the inequities to which I referred yesterday. I said then, I cannot see any justice in saying to a person who is a doctor and who goes into the military at $415 a month, we will forgive you up to $5,000 but if a GI or a nurse borrows under the NDEA we will not forgive that GI or that nurse one dime. This, to me, is a great inequity and a great injustice. So both amendments offered by the chairman of the committee have improved this legislation to the point where I can support it; that is the amendment which the gentleman from Arkansas now recommends and the amendment previously adopted to prohibit the use of Federal funds for chapels or buildings for religious instruction. The remaining question is whether or not we are going to have two loan programs. I regret the position that I am in today in supporting the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE]; he offers it because he is opposed to all loans. I am in hearty disagreement with that position. I think we desperately need to provide loans for needy students. I think it is deplorable that more and more—we see only the sons and daughters of the affluent go to college. I want to see students who want to be doctors or dentists or nurses or teachers go to college even though they may be poor. They are the ones who need the loans. So I support the loan program. I am afraid I am in the position of having to support the Devine amendment for one reason, and that is the question: Do you want two loan programs established by this Congress? The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] introduced the NDEA program in 1958. Thousands of medical and dental students borrow under it. Under the amendments adopted in the Committee on Education, there will be no loan provision in this bill that will not be in the bill that you will be called upon to support or to oppose in a few weeks from now. Do you want to adopt two loan programs and impose on every single college and university in this country two sets of bookkeeping? People talk about economy—you are raising the administrative costs of the loan program in all the colleges and universities when you set up books for two of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the 2 minutes allotted to me be granted to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I may repeat the duplication of programs is my one remaining objection. I would say to the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this is not a jurisdictional dispute, as it has been described. I really do not care whether the whole loan program was under the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or under the Committee on Banking and Currency or under some other committee. This is not the argument—a jurisdictional dispute. The question is whether or not you want to require colleges to have two separate administrative procedures. I think this is unwise. I think it is costly. I think it adds to the burden of all colleges and universities.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree 100 percent with what the gentlewoman has said. I think it clarifies the issue that we face here today. It is not a question of whether you are for or against loans for medical students.

The question is clear. I think we now have a program that provides loans to all students of higher education including medical and dental students. If that program needs reviewing it should be done as part of a general program; it should all be coordinated and not put into two systems. I feel I will have to vote for the adoption of the amendment to eliminate all loans under this proposal. I also intend to vote for the Harris amendment which will eliminate the forgiveness feature. This to me is the worst kind of meddling. Those of us who are opposed to controls by the Federal Government and are sincere should not go into this indirect kind of control by going through the doctors. I thank the gentlewoman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the perfecting amendment and in opposition to the Devine amendment.

I have asked for this brief time because I think we are getting this whole matter a little out of perspective. The gentlewoman from Oregon spoke about needy students who would like to continue their education. I would like to see all higher education helped. This bill is not in behalf of needy students but is in behalf of needy sick people, and we have a direct interest in aid to medical colleges. But I am not supporting this bill for that reason, I am supporting it because we need more people in the medical profession; we need them desperately. It is not sufficient to say, as one Member did, that he knows of no medical student who quit after he started. What about the families all across this land who have had to sacrifice a college education for two or three of their children so they could send one boy to medical college? This loan provision will enable that parent to give that child or other children their opportunity. I think that is sufficient reason to support it.

I think that the opposition at the last minute of the American Medical Association is most difficult, because during the Easter recess I spoke to members of a local medical society. I intend to support this bill with the loan provision. I told them so. They had no objection. They did not know what their trustees were going to do. My vote today is a selfish vote for people in my family and in my children's families who may need a doctor. I am not going to wait for a general education bill so some people can kill the whole animal with one blow of the axe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the duplication that supposedly will result if we enact the loan provisions of H.R. 12. For this reason we ought to look a little more carefully into just how these loan provisions work and whether or not there will be harmful duplication. When I went to school—and I do not think it is much different now—there were any number of loan funds and scholarship funds available to students who needed financial assistance. Loans and scholarships were available to law students, medical students, and others. We did not apply for a loan from any particular fund. The school administered the program and matched each student's application to the loan program best tailored to meet his particular needs. The loan provisions of this bill provide one more weapon for the Administrator to use in helping students in financial need to continue their education. I can not believe that participating institutions would experience any real difficulty in administering these funds.

This will provide just one more form of assistance, a form of assistance, I take it from the report of the committee and from remarks made on the floor, which is necessary and vital.

A second point has been made that this objective can be better accomplished by amendments to NDEA, now being considered in committee. This may be so. As a matter of fact, it has been true for some time. The committee has been favorably disposed to such amendments for several years but has not been able to bring them before the House. The situation is such we may not be able to bring these amendments to the floor this year either. It seems to me that this is our best chance to provide needed assistance to students of the health professions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virgina [Mr. Staggers].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Devine amendment, and I certainly would like to oppose the Harris amendment, because I do believe, as any reasonable man would realize, that we need doctors in rural areas. No Member of the House has given a constructive idea of how to get these doctors into the rural areas. Other than this proposed plan.

There are 99 counties in America that do not have a doctor. That is the testimony before our committee. In 90 other counties which have a population of over 5,000, there is only 1 physician for those counties. We reach the ideal in only 391 counties which have 1 physician for each 1,000 or less of population.

The need for medical personnel, as testified before our committee, is that we need 6,500 more entering students each year.

There are 87 medical colleges, and 48 dental schools in America, and in only 20 States do they train as many physicians as they use.

It has been testified that the loan provision is duplication. In the one that is now in operation only $1,000 is loaned to a student, and he has to start paying back at the end of 1 year. Anyone who reasons knows a doctor has to have 2 or 3 years of internship residency and he does not have the money to start paying it back. As stipulated it costs around $20,000 to be a doctor. It has been testified that this precludes some of the best brains in America from ever going to medical school. Can we afford to have less than the best in charge of the health problems of the Nation? I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this matter yesterday. I am opposed to the bill, as is noted in the minority report. I was hopeful, however, that the bill could be cleaned up so that it would be something that might be workable.

I certainly will support the Harris and Devine amendments, because I feel all these scholarships, loans, grants, and so on ought to come under one committee.

I might say to all of the people who have been pleading for doctors in the rural areas that this loan program or the forgiveness of it will not guarantee you a doctor. There is no amount of money by which you can get a doctor to go into a rural area.

I said to my very good friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], yesterday that he is probably the man who is responsible for this so-called shortage of doctors. He has done a magnificent job, which we all supported, to increase the money given to the NIH and other research agencies so that now the majority of the doctors are not going into general practice.

As an article contained in the U.S. News & World Report states, they are going into specialties and into research.

Only 21 percent of the doctors are going into general practice, and very, very few of them are going into rural communities because they prefer to practice in larger centers.

In our own family, in a remote area of Nebraska, a relative of mine was given a clinic; it was equipped; he was given a house. He went there for 3 or 4 years. He made good money. He did not like the rural life, so he came back to the big city.

What disturbs me more than anything else in this bill is this amendment that was adopted earlier on recapture of payments where the facility is used for sectarian training or as a place where religious worship is held. This must be spelled out. We have a great Jesuit university in my district. Does this mean if a Catholic priest should come and give a short talk to the medical students, perhaps on Catholic medical ethics, that they are going to have their building recaptured. There ought to be some clarification of this. This is a very serious flaw in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I have been on the floor of this House for many years and have listened to debate time after time, but I do not remember any time in my career that I have been so convinced in 2 days of debate on this bill and on the amendments, that this bill is not only unnecessary, but it is a bad bill. I have been convinced since yesterday that this bill is not intended and will never do the job which it was set out to do, and that is to provide more doctors in the rural areas of this country where it is claimed they are needed.

Statistics were given here yesterday that there is 1 medical doctor in this country to every 705 people, but if you are going to take the doctors and you are going to move them into rural areas, you are going to have to regiment and control them, and I think this bill would be a step in that direction, no matter how you read it.

We have now taken out of the bill the very part that the chairman of the committee said was necessary in the beginning. He is rewriting the bill, by taking out the foregiveness provision of the loans that was supposed to induce doctors to practice in rural areas. We have had an Indian Bureau in our Government for over 100 years. It has spent hundreds of millions of dollars, supposedly to take care of the American Indians, to solve their problems, but God help us if by this bill we try to solve the medical problem as we have the American Indian problem in the United States, because there is no group of people in this country, worse off than the American Indians. I have never seen a bill like this cure any problem. I think the American people are sick and tired of the spending of their money on this type of waste, to start a program amounting to $205 million. This is only a start. It will not cure any problem, and these 2 days of debate have convinced me beyond the shadow of a doubt that I must vote against this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Casey].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I listened very closely to the debate yesterday, and frankly, when the debate started, I had not made up my mind to support this bill. But, you are looking at a man that had to borrow every cent he could to go to school and work in the daytime besides. I am for the loan program. I am for every man having an opportunity to get an education, especially such a high-priced education as the medical education.

Now, yesterday during the debate they mentioned one of the very outstanding medical schools in this country, which happens to be located in my district, Baylor University College of Medicine, and there seemed to be an inference that since it was a Baptist college, that it would be opposed to this bill. Well, I do not know how the trustees feel; I do not know how the students feel; I do not know how the faculty feels. But the dean of that university says even though Baylor has been blessed and does not need such a bill, for the good of the country he thinks this bill should be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I heard an argument yesterday from one of the Members who said that we were curing a lot of the ills and, therefore, we do not need so many doctors. On the contrary, I think they have found more ills lately.

Mr. Chairman, my old grandmother used to say that there were only three ills, a little peaked, kind of puny, and plumb down, and I think the list has grown considerably since then.

Mr. Chairman, we need the doctors, and if we are going to head off socialized medicine let us make available an ample supply of doctors so that they are at the beck and call of the ill at a reasonable price.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill and its loan program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall], for 2 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the perfecting amendment. I shall vote for the Devine amendment and then, as I said yesterday, I shall vote against the entire bill.

Mr. Chairman, I defy any Member opposing this amendment to name a single medical student, anywhere in the country, who is making qualifying grades, and who has had to quit medical school because of inability to obtain a loan to continue to finance his medical education.

Mr. Chairman, I have here four different brochures. One pertains to the much discussed and sometimes maligned AMA's education and research loan program. I would like for the members of the Committee to know that it multiplies itself 12½ times through backing of private and nonrelated lending institutions on the basis of guarantees. It is a good loan program. Even the U.S. Government cannot do this. But in addition, today there are many county and State medical association loans in use for this purpose.

I would like for you to know that these loans are made at the rate of 5.5 percent, and do not have to be paid back until the recipient begins practice.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to that there are medical-scholarship and loan-fund programs which are provided by the various schools. This pamphlet pertains to all of those just as this first one does to the AMA-ERF loans, which I have personally supported over the last 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to these I have here a list of partial financial aid programs for medical students by the various components such as the county medical societies of the AMA, and the sample page of many other loan programs taken from an 8-page listing of approximately 100 county medical society loan programs. I am proud that my own Greene County Medical Society currently maintains over seven deserving students in medical schools in addition to our auxiliary scholarships. This is help at the correct level.

Mr. Chairman, I think first, it is not important that we have this; second, that there is a moral obligation; third, that we cannot afford it; and fourth, it is good to keep this moral obligation on the part of these students.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. Pucinski] for 2 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Harris amendment and in opposition to the Devine amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in Chicago we have the largest medical center in the world. Many of our students will benefit from this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I think the House should keep this in mind: Under the private loan programs which have been listed in the Record yesterday and which have been mentioned here today, a student taking a loan and attending a medical school must start paying interest immediately at the rate of 5.5 percent while he is a student attending school. Under this procedure, by his fourth year his loan may have reached $8,000. This young man, even though he is still a student in school, may have to pay more than $400 a year in interest rates alone under existing programs for private loans to medical students. He then must begin paying off the loan a year after graduating.

Mr. Chairman, I and the other Members of the House know that most of these young doctors do not reach a position where they can pay these loans back until at least 3 or 4 or 5 years after they graduate. Most young doctors experience considerable financial difficulty during their first few years of practice. Under the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], no interest would be paid while a medical student is attending school, and he would not start paying it back until 3 years after he has graduated.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] presents us with a realistic program, and I hope the House will approve the Harris amendment and reject the Devine amendment, so that we can let the young men of poor families in this country join the noble medical profession. I am getting tired of hearing people malign the doctor. We have heard here about their excessive earnings but no one has mentioned the hardships many doctors must experience before they build up a successful practice. Nor has anyone mentioned the difficulties a doctor experiences even in the prime of his success. I do not think many of us here would be willing to make the sacrifices the average doctor must make. He works long hours, he gets little time to himself. His family's privacy is frequently interrupted when the doctor must leave his home on emergencies at all hours of the day and night. No, Mr. Chairman, I do not envy the average doctor his lot. If, in the course of his profession, he carves for himself financial independence, he has more than earned it through many years of hard work and sacrifice. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the tremendous responsibility a doctor carries in fulfilling his professional duties fully entitles him to all the consideration. If I can help make his lot a little easier while the medical student is struggling through school, I am proud to be able to do so.

Mr. Chairman, finally, as to the need for doctors in rural areas, I share the concern of the gentleman from West Virginia about the need for additional doctors in rural areas. But I believe this is caused primarily by a shortage of doctors in America, and if we fill that gap we will fill the need for doctors in rural areas. You will find doctors gravitating to the rural areas of this country when you have trained sufficient doctors to overcome the present shortage with this legislation. And so, for this reason, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Harris amendment. I think it is a good bill; it is a historic bill that will help the people of this country get the medical care to which they are entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to try and place the loan program under this bill into perspective, to make it abundantly plain that the Devine amendment is not in the public interest.

Let me start out by pointing out the fact which I think should be easily observable and that is this. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], at the time this matter was being heard in committee, queried the doctor who was testifying on behalf of the AMA with regard to the adequacy of the AMA program. Dr. Dorman appeared for the AMA and said in response to the question as to the adequacy:

> No, sir. We say that it is filling a big need. We did not say that it was adequate. It was never designed to take the entire load. It was designed to assist in this area. It does not carry the full load, and I do not believe it ever could.

Subsequent to this, the AMA having taken no position, rushed forward to the Congress to advise all of us that it had changed its position, or that it had discovered its position anew and at this time we are expected to reject the program in favor of the AMA program. Let us look at the AMA program. It is a good program; it is useful. But it does not include dental students, nor does it aid students of osteopathy. Medical students are not eligible for loans until they have completed their first semester of instruction.

If we want to make it easy for young men to enter medical school, the way is to give them a loan program at a reasonable rate of interest, at a low rate of interest, on sufficiently liberal amounts, and early enough at the time of their entrance into medical school so that they may derive benefit from it so that we will attract the needed students into the medical schools. We have heard a lot of testimony in the committee to the effect that there are vacant places in the medical schools. There are vacant places in the medical schools. We have heard a good deal of testimony that the caliber of the young men entering our medical schools is not sufficiently high. I say that it is worth our trouble and worth the taxpayers' money to have a liberal program which will recognize the need and which will attract the capable to fill these vacant spaces.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, much emotion has been demonstrated throughout the halls of the House today. Nobody is against the students. Nobody is against education. Nobody is against doctors. Let us see exactly what are the objectives of H.R. 12.

No. 1, apparently there is a shortage of physicians in America.

No. 2, apparently there is a shortage of facilities in which to train physicians.

No. 3, there is apparently a shortage of money which everybody needs who wants to go to medical school. So H.R. 12 is presented for the Congress and is before us today.

I have introduced an amendment that would strike the loan provisions from this bill for a very simple reason, or for two reasons: No. 1, the House has already expressed its will in this general area; it did last year, on the higher education bill.

No. 2, assuming the loan provisions were good, there is no place to put these students because we have to first build the facilities to accommodate them in order to get the loans for them to go to school. It is in connection with that section that my respected chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, has introduced an amendment that would "perfect" the loan provisions, because apparently there is some feeling that maybe they are not strong enough. You strike out the forgiveness provision, and that is the only provision that provides the means to induce the medical students, the physicians, to go to the area where there is a need.

It seems to me that the proper thing to do here is this. It is not too important to me whether the Harris amendment is adopted or rejected. If it is adopted we will then have the opportunity to vote on the amendment that I offered, to strike the loan provisions. Let us then build the facilities, if that is the desire of the Members of the House. After they are built, then consider whether or not the loans or scholarships are the proper way to get the applicants into the medical schools.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] to close debate.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, we are about to come to a vote, rather a crucial vote, as I understand it, on this far-reaching and important legislation. The vote will first occur on the perfecting amendment that I offered to the language of the bill in connection with student loans. The first amendment prohibits any duplication with respect to loans for medical and dental students. The second amendment eliminates the forgiveness provisions of the loan program.

As I said earlier, I urge you to vote for this amendment. Then following the action on the amendment, whether it is up or down, a vote will be had on the Devine amendment, which would strike the loan provisions entirely.

I recognize that many of those who are against the bill are against it all the way, but I urge you on the basis of the records of hearings held by our committee during four sessions—that is, within the last 4 years of the Congress—to vote for the loan program. It is very important to the future health of this Nation. There is no duplication. There will not be a double set of books. One program is for medical and dental training and the other is in the field of general education, particularly for scientific students. Lord knows, if we need scientists in this country we need doctors in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HARRIS and Mr. DEVINE.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 150, noes 188.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. SIBAL: Page 4, line 24, after the word "health" add: "which does not practice discrimination in its entrance requirements on the basis of race, creed, color or national origin."

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, first let me make it clear that I am in favor of this bill. I supported it in committee and I will support it whether my amendment passes or not. My purpose in offering the amendment is not capricious. I am most sincere, because I think it is about time that the Congress of the

United States gave action in place of lipservice on this great issue.

We hear all the time that the executive and judicial branches of our Government have superseded the great legislative branch, the Congress of the United States, as the most effective branches of our Government. I do not agree with this. Yet, when we dodge important issues such as this, by hiding behind the skirts of the executive and the skirts of the judiciary, we are contributing to the general opinion that the Congress is on the downgrade.

The President of the United States within the past week has challenged Congress on this issue, and I am going to quote him. He said, in response to a question as to whether or not he could withhold funds from a State of this Nation that he could not, but he added:

> I do not think we should extend Federal programs in a way which encourages or really permits discrimination. That is very clear.

The bill we are considering today does not in any way deny participation to an institution which has discriminatory practices. It is eligible to participate unless we act today.

The previous Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor on another matter said, in response to a question put to him by one of the members of the committee:

> Congressman, you people control the purse strings. You vote the impacted money in Congress. You vote us the money and say "Give it out." As far as I am concerned, our Department listens to the voice and the instructions of the Congress of the United States.
>
> You control the purse strings and you can determine how the money is spent. And this is a congressional problem and not an administrative problem. You can determine under what conditions the money is paid out.

This is our responsibility. The people of this Nation are beginning to look upon us as a bunch of hypocrites. We go around during campaign time talking about one thing, but when the matter comes before the House we vote another way.

Those who believe in this principle need not fear it is going to kill the bill. That is the excuse some people use, some people in leadership, I am afraid, in an effort to give some kind of solace to those who do not agree with this position.

We are talking about the need for doctors in critical areas. The need exists probably in our minority groups to a far greater extent than it does so far as the general public of America is concerned. There is no argument that can be made that Negro doctors and doctors among some of our newer citizens in this country are needed and needed badly. I cannot conceive that we should continue to practice in this country the principle that we collect the tax money from all the people but we distribute it in such a way that many of our citizens are denied the use of it.

This is one of the great issues in this country today. This affects our foreign relations, it affects our prestige in the world. The House of Representatives today can take a great step forward in once again establishing the principles upon which this country was founded.

I urge you to vote for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIBAL. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. This is the so-called Powell amendment, which I authored in 1954. I have always opposed this amendment when it was used as a device to kill legislation. The gentleman has assured this body that he voted for this bill in committee.

Mr. SIBAL. That is correct.

Mr. POWELL. He has assured this body that whether or not his amendment passes, he will vote for this legislation.

Mr. SIBAL. That is correct.

Mr. POWELL. Therefore, he comes with clean hands and with a pure heart.

Mr. SIBAL. I like to think so.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to also say to the gentleman that he is exactly correct when he states that you can pass this amendment and pass the legislation, because the last time that I offered this amendment it was passed by this body; and the legislation with the Powell amendment was then passed by this body. I would just like to clear the atmosphere for my own personal conscience before I vote on this matter, and I commend the gentleman from Connecticut for being forthright in his presentation.

Mr. SIBAL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIBAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut on the talk that he has just made. I voted with him to retain the loan provision, and I will vote on a rollcall to retain the loan provision. I know the importance of this provision with respect to the training of doctors and nurses in New York. Bricks and mortar are important, but in my area they are not as important as manpower. Time after time, as my colleagues in the House know, I have argued for equal access and equal treatment in the distribution and use of Federal money. In the housing fight 2 years ago I fought for the bill and also fought for an amendment that would bring about fair housing practices. I voted with the Democratic side of the aisle in order to have the bill, and even then, because of my fair practices amendment I was accused of trying to kill the bill. Those who make such accusations are experts at preserving the status quo. They are the most unprogressive of all. They talked this way 10 years ago, 20 years ago, and 30 years ago. And if they have their way they will be talking this way 30 years from now. The time has long passed to make the point that Federal programs designed to uplift the general welfare of the community have to be made available to all citizens regardless of race, creed or national origin.

Mr. SIBAL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIBAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Connecticut on his initiative. I feel strongly that this amendment should be voted on and passed by the House. I think it essential throughout these United States that the Congress be clearly on record that we believe in equality of opportunity for an education on merit. I think it would be repugnant if we passed legislation that might preclude any American from an opportunity to gain a medical education, for reasons of race, creed, color, or national origin and hence I hope the House will vote affirmatively on this amendment. We must have equality of opportunity for all Americans now.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIBAL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman, I do not believe, mentioned the vote on this amendment in committee.

Mr. SIBAL. As I recall, the vote was 13 to 10.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I want the record to show that I supported the gentleman in committee and I support the amendment that he has offered at this time.

Mr. SIBAL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIBAL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well of the House. If you will look at the minority views, you will find I signed the minority views with the gentleman in the well, and I intend to vote for this bill.

Mr. SIBAL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, some of us have been here a long time, and we remember a gentleman from Alabama by the name of Judge Hobbs. Judge Hobbs was a man who had convictions, many of them opposite from mine. But I remember one story that he used to tell. He said he had a servant who worked for him who loved to go fishing, and he loved catfish. He would catch himself a mess of catfish, as we say, and he would take them out and put them on a stump in the backyard. Of course, a catfish will keep its life for a long time after it is out of water. As this catfish was wiggling around a little bit the old servant would say, "Hold still, little fish, all I is going to do is gut you."

This amendment would destroy the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion—and I will put my record for voting for civil rights up against any Member in this

House, and I believe in the principle of civil rights—but I term this amendment as a mischievous amendment. It is an amendment which may or may not pass this House. If it does pass this House, assuming that it does pass this House, there is another step in the legislative process, and that is in the other body.

Mr. Chairman, in my considered opinion, if we want this bill to be passed and become law it must not only get through this body but get through the other body and I hope we will vote down this amendment. I am going to vote against it because I think we need more doctors in this country, more Republican doctors. I have 600 out in my congressional district, and I do not know of a single one that voted for me in the last election. Most of them sent out letters to all of their patients telling them to vote against this man HOLIFIELD and vote for his opponent. So, when I am voting for this bill to provide for more doctors I am voting to let these poor young fellows go to school and get their doctor's degree and by that time the American Medical Association will have indoctrinated them to the point where they will write letters against HOLIFIELD for reelection, if I am still in Congress at that time.

Mr. Chairman, on the important legislative question, I want to see more doctors and nurses in this country, throughout this country, and I am going to vote against this amendment.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I simply ask the gentleman to yield to join with the gentleman in his excellent statement. I think the gentleman's story was well put, because some of us who have been around here year after year have seen this type of amendment, a device used to gut and defeat good legislation. That is exactly what this amendment amounts to.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who are concerned about making it possible for more of our boys and girls to get into medical school and to get into the medical profession later on should stand up and be counted for this legislation and against such amendments as this that will tend to detract from and destroy this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I shall be glad to yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete agreement with the position taken by the gentleman from California. No one can question my convictions in connection with principle. This applies to civil rights. For 36 years I have voted for equal opportunity under the law for all citizens. But we have a bill pending before us now which is of tremendous interest and of great potential value to our country. I do not think we ought to take any calculated risk which would endanger the passage of this bill either in this House or in the other body.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Judiciary is going to start hearings in a few weeks on civil rights legislation, and that is a proper place for this matter to be taken up.

We all recall the gentleman from New York, my dear friend, Mr. POWELL, who took a very fine statesmanlike position in connection with the housing bill a few years ago. I admired his action and the country applauded him because he was not going to permit anything to endanger the passage of that great bill and was not going to take any chances at all in relation to its possible defeat. The same situation exists today.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of passing this progressive, forward-looking measure that is so important to the people of our country, I join with the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], in urging that this amendment be rejected and that this question be brought up in some other bill to which it is relevant.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. YOUNGER and Mr. HARRIS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 161, noes 133.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. MATHIAS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this preferential motion because I feel this is a subject on which debate should not be curtailed. This is a vital subject of interest to the entire Nation, and it is shocking that an attempt should be made to preclude its discussion.

It has only been within the past week or 10 days that the Civil Rights Commission made a report and recommendation to the President of the United States. In that report it recommended that the President by Executive fiat deprive one of the great sovereign States of this Union of the benefits of Federal programs which were authorized by legislation approved by both Houses of the Congress.

In response there were a large number of people who advanced the argument that this would disrupt the constitutional balance of powers upon which this Republic stands, that it would immediately establish a precedent by which the President could assert the right to withdraw from a State the benefits which had been conferred upon all of the States equally and impartially by the Congress.

I think there is a good deal of substance to this argument that such an action pursued by the President would disrupt the foundation of the Constitution and the balance of powers. There is, however, an answer to that problem. The answer is that Congress live up to its responsibilities in the area of civil rights; that in the legislation which is proposed here and approved here we make provision for civil rights in a manner consistent with the ideals and aspirations of the American people for all of our citizens. I think that this is where we ought to do this job and not leave it up to the President to devise new extraconstitutional means to work his will or to satisfy his whim on any subject. Nor should we tempt Presidential advisers to tell him he should withhold from a sovereign State the benefits that we have legislated in their behalf. If we do the job here and if we do the job now, we will be preserving the fabric of the Constitution and preserving the rights of all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, we are about to conclude, in my judgment, one of the most important bills that this Congress will consider during this session. I made the motion to limit debate for one purpose only. We have considered and we have debated the question of civil rights almost ever since I have been in this Congress, which is for a period of 23 years. There is not a Member on the floor of this House who does not know what the problem is. There is not a Member on the floor of this House this afternoon who does not know that this is a subject that can inflame the hearts and minds of the people and the hearts and minds of the Members. Certainly, in my judgment, it can do no good for us as responsible Members of the Congress to become engaged here in an inflammatory debate over a subject that we are all so familiar with. I believe, in all sincerity, in the wisdom of this program but I recognize the sincerity of those who feel some other way about it. I do not question anyone's motives. I do believe that in the interests of comity and the right kind of feeling that the motion to limit debate was justified. For that reason I believe we ought to proceed to vote down this preferential motion and then pass the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, on Monday I introduced a bill, H.R. 5741, to deny Federal assistance to any program in which there is any form of discrimination. I believe the pending amendment is consistent with the bill which I introduced, and I intend to support it. The Federal Government should not contribute in any way to segregated programs. In the 87th Congress I was the only Democrat to vote for an antidiscrimination amendment to the Housing Act of 1961. The Democratic Party in Congress must face this issue squarely and stand firmly for full equality for all Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am in wholehearted support of the amendment. I supported this matter in the committee and have always voted for this principle.

Perhaps one of the most critical problems facing us is that of providing equality of opportunity for all people, regardless of race, creed, or color.

This week the Civil Rights Commission recommended that Federal funds be withheld from support of segregation. In this matter we have a clear choice. To do other than to vote to outlaw use of Federal funds to support segregated schools is to vote to sacrifice the future of untold numbers of Americans of minority groups and to deny those Americans the privilege not only of equal opportunity but the privilege of making the fullest and best contribution to their land.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at this point that I am greatly disturbed with the motion to limit debate to 5 minutes on this important amendment by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL]. This is absolutely ridiculous, and I am afraid that Congress is in serious danger of becoming a national laughing stock.

The press daily is lambasting us for our lack of genuine accomplishment and the Nation is beginning to grow restless. We have fiddled around, Mr. Chairman, since January. Rome, I might suggest, burned very quickly, while Nero played his fiddle. We cannot afford to be unconcerned with the great issues that confront this Nation.

The Congress has just reconvened after a 10-day vacation and here we are in a position of limiting debate to 5 quick minutes on a matter that threatens to split this Nation apart at the seams. It would be appropriate to paraphrase Voltaire at this stage—we may find disagreement, but we must defend our right to state our position. Free and open discussion is the only hope of a democratic society. I voted twice to expand the Rules Committee for this purpose. This is the great distinction of our Nation. We must have free discussion. I think that it is dastardly to cut off this discussion at this time.

I do not think, as Members of the other side have suggested, that this amendment will gut the bill, which I favor. I think that it will improve the bill considerably.

We must face this segregation issue squarely. Mr. SIBAL's attempt to deny aid to segregated schools is a noble effort on his part and coincides with the feeling that many of us have. We cannot willingly give Federal money to groups that defy the inherent intent of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We may start to take some of the sugar away. We cannot hope to continue being the paternal "sugar daddy" on the one hand, and expect that our recipients will respect us as "fathers." In fact, the more aid we give to segregated schools will compound the matter, intensify bitterness in the future and leave us in a position of no return.

We must begin to seriously consider all Federal programs that faintheartedly give away money to segregated institutions. It does not seem out of order to suggest that any institution receiving Federal moneys should, in theory and fact, accept the provisions of our Constitution and Bill of Rights. The whole world watches our every effort to solve this terrible problem—an American problem—through decency and common concern for our fellow man. The question, finally, is one of fairness. We must treat all men fairly, and we must begin now. To cut off debate on a matter that directly relates to this problem is, in my opinion, an affront to the free and open society in which we live.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be granted to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my so-called liberal friends who voted the motion up which closed off debate on such a serious matter that you have clearly demonstrated your concern for the basic civil liberties.

I would say to the press that this is a good observation——

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order in addressing the press gallery or any other gallery from the floor of the House.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not addressing the press gallery. I am addressing——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri will suspend. The Chair advises the gentleman that the correct parliamentary procedure is for the gentleman to address the Chair and only the Chair. The gentleman will proceed in accordance with the rules.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to observe the carefulness with which the majority party has a care for the rules and wants to encourage straightforward debate. I would say to the press and others that we observe at this point of your proceedings what is the basic coalition in this Congress, the northern Democrats-southern Democrats coalition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it must be admitted that I am rather quiet as far as involving myself in debate on this floor is concerned as well as in the committees; but when the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] of this body gets up and repeats this little old phrase, worn out as it is: "Don't wiggle, little catfish, we're just going to gut you," it implies that this amendment is introduced as a means of killing this bill. It seems to me that in fairness when Federal moneys are to be parceled out that they be available to all the people. I am sorry anybody would impugn my objectives and that of my colleagues by such a statement as was made on this floor. I regret that it happened. I hope this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] is recognized.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, my integrity has been questioned by my colleague who suggests that this amendment is made merely to kill the bill. I oppose this legislation on grounds which have been amply discussed during the debate. I intend to vote against the bill. I am not so naive as to assume that there are not sufficient votes garnered to support it. That is the reason I am in favor of this amendment. If the bill is to pass, all the people of these United States must have the assurance that there will be no discrimination in programs involving Federal funds.

They would have that assurance and would not need to depend upon the whims or wishes or political consideration of one person's Executive order.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my support for the Sibal amendment. If we are to have help for students studying medicine then equal opportunity must be provided for all students, regardless of race, color, or creed.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL]. This amendment would insure that aid to be given under the provisions of this bill would go to all Americans regardless of race or religion. I support the purposes of the bill as being worthwhile, but without this provision the form of the bill is bad. I cannot subscribe to the argument that the adoption of this amendment will make the passage of the bill more difficult in the other House. Once that argument is accepted all hope for meaningful Civil Rights legislation is lost. If we want to achieve this goal we must fight it now and at every opportunity in the future. I do not believe that the other House will remain deaf to the justice of such provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas desire recognition?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, may I make the point that our basic objective, whatever the coalition may be, is to pass progressive legislation to promote the health and education of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL].

The question was taken and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. SIBAL and Mr. HARRIS.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 146, noes 186.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am still somewhat disturbed and perplexed by an amendment that was adopted under the section called recapture of payments which reads that payments will be recaptured if the facility is used for sectarian instrument or as a place for religious worship. I think that this is a very serious amendment and there ought to be some definite clarification as to what this wording means. I am wondering if the chairman of the committee could enlighten me for the record as to just what this wording means.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman please repeat that?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was referring to the amendment passed earlier under recapture of payments which says they may be recaptured if the facility is used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship. I think that is rather broad language, and I do not know that it really will give anyone any guidance as to what it does mean.

As I say, I have in my congressional district a great Jesuit university and there are many great Protestant universities in the United States. They may want a building under this program. Being familiar with the Jesuit university, this building may be used for the teaching of medical students but, perhaps, the good Jesuit fathers will come in for a 15-minute talk on some subject, perhaps religious medical ethics. What will be the situation with the university under this program if this happens?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I have no trouble with this amendment, myself. I tried to explain earlier in the day that it had a very simple purpose. You have got to consider the two amendments together in interpreting it. The first amendment makes it clear that chapels shall not be financed with Federal funds.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I understand that part of it.

Mr. HARRIS. The second amendment says that facilities constructed with Federal funds shall not be used for religious purposes. Now, that is just as simple as it can be.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I understand the wordage but what are "religious purposes"? These must be defined. What does the gentleman have in mind when he says "religious purposes"?

Mr. HARRIS. Where you have set aside a place as a place of worship.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Here is a building, no chapel in it, 20 classrooms, and medical students are going to school at a religious sponsored school. It could be a Methodist school or any other type of religious school; what is your definition of "religious services"?

Mr. HARRIS. If they were to conduct religious services in the facilities that the gentleman is talking about and they are set aside for that purpose. If they are not so set aside for that purpose——

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am no lawyer, but I have seen so many times when we pass broad legislation and the courts render an interpretation of our actions which is not compatible with what we had in mind. Again I say that what if a Jesuit priest comes in to talk to a group of medical students at a university where there is no chapel, but just a classroom, and he may refer to the Diety, he may refer to the precepts of the church, what is the gentleman's interpretation under this language?

Mr. HARRIS. If a Jesuit priest were to go into a room where there is a class and were to talk to the members of the class and mention the Diety, that would not be a violation. But if that classroom were to be used for religious services or religious instruction conducted regularly I think it would be a violation. I think it is a well-known term understood by everyone.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have a hunch that the courts or an administrator may interpret it in another way.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield further; of course, those who have grave concern about this entire legislation naturally raise questions of this kind. But I myself, who have given long years of considerable thought to it, going back as far as the 1940's I have no difficulty with this at all.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have a lot of difficulty.

Mr. HARRIS. I know you do, because the gentleman has been against the entire bill from the outset.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE:

On page 11, line 22, strike out "66⅔" and insert "50".

On page 12, line 1, strike out "50" and insert "33⅓".

On page 12, line 8, strike out "75" and insert "50".

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide that when the Federal Government participates in the construction of a building that the Federal share shall not be more than 50 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I should think that if the Federal Government pays 50 percent of the cost of any building this ought to be sufficient to encourage the local community, the State or whoever is involved in putting up additional facilities at a medical school, to finance at least 50 percent of it.

The bill presently provides for new construction; in the case of public health facilities the Federal share may be 75 percent and for new construction of medical schools the Federal share may be 66⅔ percent. That portion which has to do with remodeling of old buildings, the bill provides for 50 percent and there I should think one-third should be sufficient for the Federal share.

Mr. Chairman, we went into this in great depth in the Committee on Education and Labor. We considered general aid to higher education—that is, academic facilities. The American Council on Education asked us to support a Federal share of 50 percent. At that time we decided that in order to make the money go further we would limit the Federal grants to one-third of construction costs. But in order to be as generous as possible on this matter and still be sound, it seems to me that we ought to cut the Federal share back to at least 50 percent, and that is the purpose of my amendment.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce chose to reduce the amount of money authorized for this program for the first year. That means there will be fewer buildings constructed and that the Federal Government will have to pay two-thirds or 75 percent of the cost of the buildings as the case may be. Therefore, with the lesser amount of money, $25 million in the first year, it seems to me we could construct so much more with the amount of the Federal participation if the Federal share were limited to 50 percent for new construction in public health buildings.

Mr. Chairman, that is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not prevail. If we are going to have a program, let us do the job. I appreciate the great work of the Committee on Education and Labor. I have striven very hard to stay away from any implication of any controversy. I have always tried to indicate as strongly as I could that matters of public health are one thing and matters of general education are another.

Now, the gentleman is talking about a program of education when he talks about how fully they went into that problem. Do you know what a new medical school costs? A minimum of $10 million. And if they have to have a hospital in connection with it, it will cost a great deal more.

Those facilities that need rehabilitating and expanding can be provided up to 50 percent.

Someone said a moment ago, "The Indians have to be taken care of." Provision is made for the public health schools, which everybody knows we need in this country, and only a very few of them exist. Then it provides that up to 75 percent may be provided for the construction of that particular facility.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this bill has been very carefully worked out under the formula we have here. I urge that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE) there were—ayes 74, noes 150.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section do now close.

Mr. BROMWELL. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Section 705(c) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on the construction of the facility (A) will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a5), and (B) will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c)."

(b) Part A of title VII of such Act is further amended by inserting after section 710 the following new sections:

"Technical assistance

"SEC. 711. The Surgeon General is authorized to provide assistance to applicants under this part, and other public or nonprofit institutions engaging or competent to engage in research, or research and related purposes, in the sciences related to health, in designing and planning the construction of facilities for the conduct of such research or research and related purposes.

"Construction of regional facilities

"SEC. 712. When the Surgeon General finds, in accordance with regulations, that the purposes of this part can best be achieved through the construction of research, or research and related purposes, facilities of particular value or significance for the Nation or a region thereof, and that because of the cost of such facilities or their use as a national or regional resource for research or related purposes a grant pursuant to the preceding provisions of this part does not provide an effective or appropriate means of financing the construction of such facilities, he may construct or make arrangements for constructing, through contracts for paying (including advance or installment payments) part or all of the cost of construction or otherwise, facilities for the conduct of research or for research and related purposes, in the sciences related to health. The Surgeon General may, where he deems such action appropriate, make arrangements, by contract or otherwise, for the operation of such facilities (for the conduct of such research, or research and related purposes) or may make contributions toward the cost of such operation of facilities of this nature whether or not constructed pursuant to, or with aid provided under, this section. Title to any facility constructed under this section may be transferred by the Surgeon General on behalf of the United States to any public or nonprofit private institution competent to engage in the type of research, or research and related purposes, for which the facility was constructed. Such transfer shall be made subject to the condition that the facility will be operated for the research, or research and related purposes, for which it was constructed and to such other conditions as the Surgeon General deems necessary to carry out the objectives of this part and to protect the interests of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 28, line 11, strike out "(A)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 28, beginning in line 15, strike out ", and" and all that follows through the word "workweek" in line 19.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 29, line 3, strike out "sections" and insert in lieu thereof "section".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 29, line 11, strike out "purposes." and insert "purposes.'" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 29, strike out line 12 and all that follows through line 18 on page 30.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make inquiry of the chairman of the committee along the line that inquiry was instituted by the gentleman from Nebraska to attempt to obtain for the record some specific reference which will illuminate the phrase "religious worship" as included earlier in connection with the recapture of payments in the earlier prohibitions.

I would like, if I may, ask a couple of questions. In connection with the hospitals that are associated with medical faculties of learning, is all religious observance to be barred by reason of the language of this bill? If not, what is included?

Mr. HARRIS. It merely provides, as I have said a number of times, that none of the funds here can be used for the construction of facilities to be used for the purpose the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. BROMWELL. Let me ask the gentleman from Arkansas this question. If a man is dying in one of the rooms built with money provided by this bill and a priest or a minister of his church comes in to bestow the last rites, is this then a place of religious worship?

Mr. HARRIS. No, it is not.

Mr. BROMWELL. And is this not then an act of worship?

Mr. HARRIS. No, it is not in the sense in which we deal here with this problem in the bill.

Mr. BROMWELL. I am not worried about that. I am worried about places built with this money where an act of religious ritual is conducted by an officer of a church inside. It happens every day.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from Iowa is trying to place an interpretation on this which is not at all intended by the language of the bill.

Mr. BROMWELL. And prayers may be said; is that right?

Mr. HARRIS. Under the conditions mentioned by the gentleman, I should think so and I do not think anyone would object to it.

Mr. BROMWELL. Suppose in a religiously founded medical school an officer of a church, a sponsoring church, or a bishop or a lay person comes in and delivers a lecture on ethics from the point of view of that faith; is this sectarian instruction?

Mr. HARRIS. I think the gentleman knows, as well informed as he is, the generally accepted meaning of what is involved in religious worship.

Mr. BROMWELL. I know that I would include rites for the dying as religious worship.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not know of anyone who would exclude it either.

Mr. BROMWELL. You are by your very language.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BROMWELL. It now appears, Mr. Chairman, that we have a bill in which it is difficult if not impossible to include the rites for the dying. In addition you exclude tax-paying citizens because they are of the wrong color. Both are done under limited debate. It is a strange commentary in liberalism.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I support House bill No. 12, which is designed to help educate additional medical doctors to serve the medical needs of our people; and which is designed to help our medical schools expand their teaching facilities so as to train more doctors.

This bill will aid the efforts of small towns and rural areas to obtain badly needed doctors.

I am proud to have been the author in the U.S. House of Representatives of the National Defense Education Act in 1958. That act established a system of loans to enable boys and girls to attend college. Many thousands of doctors, as well as teachers, scientists, mathematicians, and many others have been educated under that act.

The loans provided in this bill will be more attractive to medical students than those now available to them. They will provide more doctors.

Our people must have more professional medical services than are now available to them.

The sons and daughters of parents from low income groups must have an opportunity to go to medical school if they qualify.

Opportunity is the key word of American democracy.

More doctors and larger medical schools add up to better medical care for the people. The people's interest should be paramount.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, during the course of debate over H.R. 12, I was interested and sometimes amazed by the statistics presented both for and against the passage of this bill. The statistics if emotionally distorted or misinterpreted will not give a true picture of the health personnel and facility needs of this country.

There are proven needs for increased medical personnel and educational facilities in this country. The United States has undergone a transition which has seen its population transformed from three-fourths rural to three-fourths urban. Naturally, there has also been a similar desire on the part of physicians to gather themselves around adequate health facilities in our larger cities and towns. This has been one trend which has urbanized the physicians of America. Another trend has been that of specialization. Whereas, a little over 25 years ago most physicians took care of all types of patients and families we now find that there are about 40 percent of the physicians of America who are in family medicine. With these two trends we have heard and accurately so that the number of physicians per hundred thousand of its population have remained the same over the past 20 years. This would be about 133 physicians per hundred thousand population with similar stabilized statistics in the other fields of dentistry, nursing, osteopathy, and podiatry. One-third of the 3,000 counties have more than 2,000 patients per physician. Sixty percent of the counties have more than 1,500 patients per physician. Ideally, we need 1,000 patients per active practicing physician. However, if we take into consideration the two basic factors of urbanization of physicians and the specialization of physicians, we then find that geographically we have a misdistribution of physicians or health personnel. Likewise, a decrease in the total number of physicians in the active 24-hour family medicine practice per hundred thousand population. As a family doctor who has been through the mill of 16-hour day service with 24-hour a day call, I can state to you that we do not have at this time in this country sufficient active practicing physicians to give the medical care that they prefer to give to the people of this country. And you can also see that with this need for active practitioners we cannot improve any form of our medical care by adding an additional burden of a catch-all partial hospital program through social security taxes.

It is true that in our country we have about 14,000 hospital internships with about 7,000 graduates of medicine per year. This is in contrast with a few years ago when we had roughly 8,000 hospital internships and some 6,000 available American graduates. The result of this disparity of graduates per hospital bed has been the influx of foreign interns, roughly 2,500 this last year, with about 6,000 foreign medical graduates studying in this country at the present time. It has been my personal opinion that the hospital bed requirement which has been roughly 1 intern per 25 hospital beds is no longer a realistic figure and should be roughly 1 intern for 35 to 50 hospital beds, and that the deficiency expressed through 14,000 internship vacancies each year is not realistic. Even a reduction of 4,000 internship requests would still leave a 3,000 deficit of American graduates to fill hospital internships. Another result of this disparity of graduates per hospital internship is that available American graduates cluster around the university centers in the larger cities leaving the community hospitals without adequate interns, thus thrusting upon them foreign graduates in larger numbers each year, some of whom are very fine and capable men but they still have not been trained in the American standard nor have they often the ability to meet the language requirements thrust upon them by our civilian population. These readjustments are in the state of being studied but, nevertheless, they do point out that we have in this country a need for more graduating physicians per year and this, of course, means more facilities in our medical schools.

The question was raised that our medical schools have more applicants than they do admissions. This is very true, but the number of applicants has decreased over the past decade for many reasons. One is the fear of prospective medical students that they will enter a long training period which may end in a Federal medical center rather than the private medical practice of the past. Other factors include the loss of many medically qualified students to other shorter training periods such as in the space and higher science fields, or in such fields as engineering where the training is less and more rapidly remunerative. The medical schools of America desire high quality, high caliber students. Their opportunity to teach this caliber student will decrease as the applicants decrease and many of the students applying may not be adequately suited for the field of medicine both scholastically and vocationally. So, in my opinion, the matter of applicants per medical school is not a realistic argument against medical personnel needs because individual applicants will apply to an average of three medical schools.

I am repulsed by any political suggestion that "H.R. 12 will give the doctors something then we can vote for increased social security taxation for hospital financing." Any expansion of educational facilities either private or public is for the people of America.

In conclusion I want to state that there is a very definite need both for health personnel and adequate educational facilities for such health personnel. This is very realistic and it is very practical if we are to maintain our position as world leaders in medicine with the highest standard of medical care enjoyed by any nation. In my opinion, the loan program for medical students provided for by private sources is adequate. I do not feel that we should place the Federal Government in this particular field to the discouragement of the free enterprise system and the private sources which are now providing and developing loan funds. I do feel that university medical facilities should be expanded and, therefore, I stand in support of the construction features and opposed to the loan features of this bill.

Whatever your philosophy—conservative or liberal—it should be actively applied to proven needs with compassion for people. These are proven needs that can jointly be made by private initiative with judicious governmental aid.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, and to urge favorable consideration of this bill.

The legislation is designed to help this Nation meet its critical needs for professional health personnel. It will do this in two ways: First, by authorizing a 3-year program of Federal grants to help in the construction of teaching facilities for several categories of health personnel; second, by establishing a 3-year program of Federal loans for students in medical, dental, and osteopathic schools.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has described the provisions of the bill and explained the reasoning behind the recommendations of the committee. I believe this reasoning is sound. I believe the bill, with the amendments which have been made by the committee, now represents a constructive approach for the Federal Government to take in this field. The measure is prudent and fiscally sound and at the same time responsive to the dimensions of the need.

It is my understanding that the committee gave this measure very serious attention; both this year and last year the committee heard from many of the Nation's leaders in the fields of medical, dental, and related professional education. It had the benefit of several carefully done studies, all of which documented the need and urged an expanded Federal program.

The committee is convinced and I am too that a national need does indeed exist. If the United States is to continue its progress in health, there must be an expanded supply of well-trained professional men and women. At present, however, the supply is barely keeping pace with population growth and the demand for services. The outlook for the future is even more serious.

From the committee's findings it is clear that there is a need for a national program, with the Federal Government playing a significant supporting role. With such support the schools themselves, as well as professional and voluntary groups, would play a greater role in increasing the training opportunities for professional health personnel.

The primary objective of H.R. 12 is to encourage expanded enrollments in professional schools. The recommended program, therefore, is aimed not at helping the schools meet their existing needs. Rather, it concentrates on the primary national goal of expansion of training capacity.

Of the $175 million authorized over the 3-year period for construction grants for teaching facilities, $140 million would be available only for new facilities. These include new schools or new construction to expand enrollments in existing schools. To be eligible for such a grant, a school must show that it will expand its enrollment by 5 percent or by the addition of five new student places in its first-year class.

The matching provisions of the legislation also reflect the emphasis on expanded enrollment. Matching above 50 percent of the cost of construction may be made only for major expansions of training capacity. In such instances, grants could be made covering up to two-thirds of the cost of construction. Although no uniform definition of major expansion was deemed feasible, the committee has laid down a general guideline of a first-year enrollment expansion of not less than 15 or 20 percent, or 15 first-year student places.

The committee has explicitly stressed its intent that the two-third matching figure constitute a ceiling on Federal grants. Applicants would by no means be automatically entitled to such a maximum grant simply by meeting the minimum requirements. A number of other factors would have to be taken into account in determining the amount of the Federal grant.

Only $35 million of the $175 million authorized would be available for renovation or replacement of existing facilities. These grants would be limited to bona fide hardship cases, that is, where the lack of modern school facilities seriously threaten enrollment or the quality of instruction. Again, this is in keeping with the overriding purpose of the legislation—to increase enrollments. It would mean that the financing for most of the modernization and improvement of existing facilities would be left to non-Federal sources.

This is as it should be. An exclusive or all-embracing Federal program is not one to be encouraged. Many groups have a stake in this effort; they should all participate. It is my hope that as in the past with similar programs of Federal aid in the construction of health facilities, this new program will stimulate financial contributions from many private and local sources.

According to studies made available to the committee and testimonies of expert witnesses there is an urgent need for some form of financial assistance to medical and dental students if the number of qualified applicants are to be increased. Medical and dental education is long and costly. The health professions are in a very poor competitive position with respect to other intellectually and financially rewarding careers, particularly in various scientific fields. Scholarship and fellowship support is available from a number of Federal and non-Federal sources for students interested in the natural and physical sciences. But support for medical and dental students is meager indeed.

The result has been an alarming decline in the number of applicants for these schools. Medical and dental educators are finding it difficult to attract enough well-qualified students to fill existing vacancies. They have expressed grave concern about a decline in the quality of applicants. Yet we cannot afford less than the best if we are to maintain our high standards of medical care.

Undoubtedly, some measure of student aid is necessary. It is my understanding that many witnesses urged the committee to adopt a scholarship program. Others suggested student loans. And there were some who felt that financial assistance to medical and dental students should be furnished entirely through private resources.

I agree with the committee that Federal action is necessary and that a liberal loan program similar to that authorized under the National Defense Education Act should be effectuated. The program would be authorized for a 3-year period, at the end of which a thorough report and evaluation would be made. This would enable this House to determine whether any changes or modifications are necessary.

In keeping with the particular needs of medical and dental students, the loans would be of a long-term nature and carry a low interest rate. They would also include forgiveness features for service in sections of the country with unusually heavy needs for health personnel, for active duty in the uniformed services, or for service in certain hard-pressed government agencies or nonprofit organizations. The loan program would be operated by the individual schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

The student loan program of the American Medical Association will be of help to some medical students, and particularly to interns and residents. Because of its relatively high interest rate, however, and because it offers no repayment relief to physicians who would serve in areas of special need, it will be of limited attractiveness to students from low-income families. The proposed program would go a long way toward meeting this need. Together, both programs should make substantial inroads on the problem of assuring an adequate supply of well-qualified applicants.

In summary, H.R. 12 is directed toward getting the essential job done. It represents a sound and well balanced approach for the Federal Government to take. It concentrates on the truly national objective of assuring a reasonably adequate supply of professional personnel in the health fields.

I am happy to endorse the committee report on this important legislative proposal and to urge its enactment by the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say for the RECORD at this point that I have received telegrams in support of H.R. 12 from the Alabama State Nurses Association, the vice president of the University of Alabama, the Alabama School of Dentistry, and the dean of the Medical College of Alabama.

I am glad these individuals and organizations support this legislation.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation. It is a reasonable and necessary approach to a problem that is fast reaching critical proportions. In New York and in the country there is a shortage of nurses, hospital technicians and even doctors. Applications to nursing and medical schools are not keeping pace with a growing and longer lived population.

In Manhattan, training facilities for nurses are in particularly short supply. But in addition to bricks and mortar, I favor the loan provisions of the bill. The training process for doctors and nurses is a long one—too long for most at the cost. Why should we not meet this crisis with a reasonable loan program? It is repayable not only in dollars but in a strengthened medical profession and a healthier population. It should be enacted.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House this afternoon, H.R. 12, proposes a 3-year program to alleviate a critical shortage of professional health personnel which already has begun to affect the level and quality of health care in this Nation. Furthermore, these shortages threaten to become worse during the coming decades.

In order to stave off this impending crisis, the legislation before us provides for a 3-year program of matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, osteopathic, and professional public health personnel as well as for pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, and nurses. Also, provision is made for a 3-year program of loans for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. Consequently, it will be noted that H.R. 12 conforms generally to the construction grant and student loan programs proposed under H.R. 4999, which was reported favorably by our committee in the last Congress.

Under the provisions of H.R. 12, Mr. Chairman, a total of $105 million is authorized over a 3-year period for construction grants to new teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, or professional public health personnel. Further, for this same period $35 million would be authorized for the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of dentists and a similar amount for the replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities. The bill provides that grants up to two-thirds of the total cost could be made whereas all other grants may not exceed 50 percent of the construction cost. Such grants, however, will be made to existing schools only if they agree to expand their enrollment by at least 5 percent.

As set out in the bill, the student loan program authorizes loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and ostepathy. This is again a 3-year program and would be administered by the individual schools who would match Federal funds with a 10-percent contribution of their own. These student loans would be repayable within 10 years beginning 3 years following graduation. However, up to 50 percent of such loans—at the rate of 10 percent per year—may be forgiven for practicing in an area lacking medical personnel, for employment by a public or nonprofit agency, or for active duty in the Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, the benefits derived from the program as set out in the legislation before us make the total cost minor. As a matter of fact, the construction feature of the bill will cost the American taxpayer less than 33 cents per year, or about $17 million for the 3-year period. The loan program, a substantial portion of which would be repayed, would amount to only $30.7 million for the same period. Compared to our vast foreign-aid program, the expense of both features is indeed very slight.

Mr. Chairman, as already indicated, H.R. 12 provides for a 3-year program. This aspect of the measure stems from the wisdom of the committee and its distinguished chairman, the Honorable OREN HARRIS, and constitutes the basic change in the bill as compared with its original form. By virtue of this new language, at the end of a 3-year period the program will then be subject to review by the Congress. Its objective can be reevaluated and its worth reexamined. If changes are needed, they certainly can be made at that time; if the program proves ineffective, the Congress can then refuse to extend it.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest the need for legislation of the kind that is before us this afternoon is apparent. The hearings before our committee cite example after example which singularly would more than justify a program of educational assistance to the health professions. However, the situation that exists in my home State of Oklahoma is typical of the overall circumstances and indicates how a proposal such as that contained in H.R. 12 would be so beneficial.

Consider that the University of Oklahoma School of Medicine has been granting the M.D. degree for 51 years. Yet only as recently as 11 years ago they began admitting some 100 medical students per year. In this connection, Dr. Mark Everett, dean of the medical school, testified before the committee during hearings conducted last year that "since it has required all of the intervening time to secure anything like a comparable increase in the operating budget of the school, we have had to curtail every aspect of new construction and modernization and have been unable to set up scholarship funds." As a result, the university at the present time grants only two scholarships and is faced with the possibility of losing part of its faculty due to antiquated teaching facilities. Also, as pointed out in a series of articles recently published by the Oklahoma City Times, the university's teaching hospital is in such a financial squeeze that there is real danger of having to shut down some of the 470 beds. If help is not forthcoming from some source, medical teaching in Oklahoma faces serious curtailment.

Results of a survey recently made by the Oklahoma Chapter of the American Association of General Practice indicates only 21 percent of those who graduated from the medical school in 1957 were practicing medicine in Oklahoma, while another 13 percent were engaged in other professions. The remaining 66 percent had unfortunately left the State despite the fact that 8 of our 77 counties have no doctors who are graduates of the Oklahoma University Medical School. There is no specified reason for this deplorable exodus, but is simply an extension of that factor which causes the rural areas of this great land to lack adequate medical personnel. Happily, the bill before us takes cognizance of this condition and seeks to provide a loan program that would encourage young doctors to go into rural areas and discourage them from leaving a location where their services are needed.

Currently, the State legislature is considering a resolution which would submit to the voters of Oklahoma a proposal to issue $7 million in bonds to finance the construction of a modern teaching hospital in Oklahoma City. Should the $7 million become available and H.R. 12 becomes law, Oklahoma would be in a position to build a 600-bed teaching hospital worth some $22 million. Such a facility would enable the university to increase its student load by 25 percent and to provide better facilities for teaching and for patients. Further, with the enactment of this measure, there would be finances available to supplement the practically nonexistent scholarship and loan fund of the medical school.

In view of the circumstances just described, medical education in Oklahoma is at a crossroads. If help is not forthcoming from a source outside of the State, we in Oklahoma can expect to see a continued lack of medical care in rural areas, watch our teaching hospital curtail its already limited activities, and continue with insufficient scholarships for worthy, but nonetheless needy, students.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the enactment of H.R. 12 would go a long way toward solving the crisis that now faces health education, not only in Oklahoma but in other areas as well. Therefore, I urge the House to approve this proposal.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, in a real sense this measure, H.R. 12, concerns itself with two very basic problems in the area of health and medical care: The first is an adequate supply of doctors, dentists, nurses and other needed medical professionals which will enable the people of this country to enjoy the level of health that is their right; the second, and more implicit problem, is the loosening in a modest fashion, of the economic and institutional barriers which restrict the entry of talented young people into the field of medicine.

The committee report on this bill is replete with facts and figures showing the need, across the country, for additional trainees in the field of medicine and dentistry. For example, the committee tells us that at the present time, there is something over 1,700 people in the United States for every family physician—general practitioner, intern, or pediatrician. The committe also tells us that, even to maintain our present inadequate ratio, we will have to increase the number of enrollees in medical and dental schools from 46,000 to 75,000 by 1970.

The national figures are important, but I am particularly interested in how these problems affect Hawaii.

Figures supplied to the committee by the Office of the Surgeon General indicate that the average number of non-Federal physicians per 100,000 population in metropolitan counties, which would include such areas as the city and county of Honolulu, is about 145; however, Honolulu only has about 106 non-Federal physicians per 100,000 population. The average for the State of Hawaii as a whole is about 101 non-Federal physicians per 100,000 people; this is below California's 144, Oregon's 121, and Washington State's 118. Of course, Hawaii does rank ahead of some States; Mississippi, for example, is listed as having 72 per 100,000; many of the predominantly rural States also suffer from a severe doctor shortage.

It is, therefore, extremely important that we do everything we can to increase the number of doctors across the Nation. The tremendous cost of a medical education is usually too much for a student to bear alone. We certainly should not restrict the medical profession to the wealthy; nor should we make the financial burden such as to force young doctors into the cities and the higher income areas of medical practice. Sickness knows no boundaries; it can strike the farm family as well as the city dweller; it falls as often on the poor as on the rich. Our supply of medical talent must be available to meet all of these needs. This bill will help.

There is a final factor which has probably caused the American Medical Association to enter its last-minute opposition to the student loan provisions of H.R. 12: The loans under the bill are far more desirable than the loan programs presently promoted by the AMA. The interest rate is around 3 percent and will not start to accrue until the student has finished training. Even more important, the fact that the money will be owed to a Government loan program will tend to dilute AMA control over members of the medical profession, and this, I suspect, is one of the basic reasons for AMA opposition to the student loan provisions.

Of course, the AMA program is of minor assistance to Hawaii. The exhibit submitted for inclusion in the Congressional Record of Tuesday, April 23, by our Republican opponents of the student loan program shows, on page 6824, that Hawaii only has six AMA loans outstanding and that only two areas in the Nation where such loan programs exist, the Canal Zone and Rhode Island, have fewer. This same exhibit, on page 6818 of the Record, indicates that Hawaii, unlike many States, has no loan program sponsored by the county medical societies.

Mr. Chairman, the medical profession in this country and in Hawaii should be open to all young people with the requisite talent who desire to enter it. This honored profession should not be stifled by the domination of any clique or by the forces of economics. H.R. 12 is a modest step in the right direction.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my support for H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, which is to be voted on today. The expected shortage of doctors and dentists in this country by 1975 requires action now. H.R. 12 answers the need with construction grants of $175,000,000 and student loans of $30,700,000.

All America will benefit by this bill. That is why such organizations as the National Farmer's Union and the AFL–CIO favor it. There is strong support for this legislation in my State—the State of Minnesota. Several Minnesotans have expressed their opinions to me as follows:

> Dr. W. H. Crawford, dean, School of Dentistry, University of Minnesota: "We will appreciate anything you can do to make available funds for building and remodeling of dental and medical schools, and to provide loan funds for dental and medical students."
>
> Dr. Robert B. Howard, dean, College of Medical Sciences, University of Minnesota: "Strongly urge your support of H.R. 12 as important measure that will add materially to health resources of Minnesota and entire United States."
>
> Dr. Victor Johnson, director, Mayo Foundation, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.: "The Association of American Medical Colleges makes a good case for this legislation. As a member I voted to endorse it. Improvement in the quality and numbers of students graduating from medical schools will have an important effect on the graduate training program of the Mayo Foundation."
>
> Carl V. E. Cassel, D.D.S., secretary, Minnesota State Dental Association: "I respectfully urge, on behalf of the Minnesota State Dental Association and the dentists of Minnesota that you support H.R. 12, which will provide construction funds for dental schools and a low interest loan program for dental students."
>
> Phillip H. Moos, D.D.S., chairman, public policy committee, Minnesota State Dental Association: "The forgiveness feature of the student loan provisions should be most helpful in encouraging new graduates to practice in our smaller towns. This is good legislation for Minnesota, and I hope you will see fit to support it."
>
> William F. Braasch, D.D.S., Minneapolis, Minn.: "I have made many inquiries among my fellow dentists to sound them out on their stand. We would very much like to see loan funds substantially increased beyond the 4 year $1,500 limit now placed. Many students are married and with their families, this makes it almost impossible for some worthy students to complete their educations. The dental education costs upwards of $5,000 for the 4 years and is in addition to the 2 years predental training. Upon graduation these boys have to borrow again to equip offices and this frequently costs $10,000 to $15,000. Help in financing educations would be a Godsend to these boys."

STUDENT LOANS

The argument is sometimes made that there are enough loan funds available already for dental and medical students.

What are the facts?

At the University of Minnesota 4,000 to 5,000 students seek help from the bureau of student loans and scholarships. Many very competent students taking predental and premedical courses have to change their goals to other fields for no other reason than that they cannot get enough money through present loan and scholarship programs to pay for a dental or medical school education.

At the medical school of the University of Minnesota in the 1962–63 school year there have been 279 loans for a total of $101,245. The American Medical Association loan program provided funds for 34 of these loans.

Under the main scholarship program for these 562 students at our medical school 57 awards were made—mostly of $500 each. There had been 163 applications.

The freshmen are hardest hit by the shortage of funds. Next year's freshman class of 150 contains 100 who have applied for scholarships. Eighty percent will be disappointed because there are only 15 or 20 scholarships available for freshmen.

In the dental school the situation is the same. Dean W. H. Crawford has written me saying:

> I have talked with many young men who are thinking about entering dentistry but are giving it up because of the high cost. Minnesota is one of the lower cost university dental schools for residents and the absolute minimum for tuition and instruments at this university for a resident is $5,000 for the 4 years of training. This figure does not include room and board, clothing, or other expenses. It is possible for students to borrow $1,500 from the university during their 4 years of training. This is a far cry from what many of them need in order to get through the course in dentistry.

It is clear that H.R. 12 is needed. More students with the interest and ability to become doctors and dentists must receive financial help far beyond what is now available. Classrooms and laboratories must be expanded more rapidly than private funds and State legislatures have been able to provide alone. There is a nationwide shortage developing in the health professions. H.R. 12 is a national answer to this serious threat to America's health standards.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Keogh, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 305, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DEVINE. I certainly am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Devine moves that the bill H.R. 12 be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: "on page 19, strike line 13 and all that follows down through line 24 on page 27."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the motion to recommit which I understand will strike out the student loan provision. If this prevails, I will vote for the bill which will then provide only grants for the construction of academic facilities at medical and dental schools. If the motion to recommit does not prevail, I shall vote against H.R. 12 for two reasons.

One, as I stated in my support of the Devine amendment, I am opposed to fragmenting our student loan program. Such fragmenting would be duplicating, wasteful, and confusing to administer.

Two, I feel it is unwise for the Federal Government to assist a limited number of institutions to as great a proportion as 66⅔ percent or 75 percent. To me, a 50 percent Federal grant for the construction of any type of academic facility in an institution of higher learning is sufficient incentive.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on this I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 239, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—171

Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Findley
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Gathings
Gavin
Goodell
Goodling
Grant

Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McLoskey
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Norblad
Nygaard
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebell
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Short
Shriver
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stinson
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead

NAYS—239

Addabbo
Albert
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Hemphill
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Wharton
White
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—24

Abbitt
Ashley
Betts
Buckley
Cooley
Fisher
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Green, Oreg.
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Lennon
Rich
Roosevelt
Shelley
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Vinson
Walter
Widnall
Wyman

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Abbitt for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Tuck for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Betts for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Wyman for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Rich.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. On this vote, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 288, nays 122, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—288

Addabbo
Albert
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Hemphill
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Landrum
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
White
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—122

Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Baker
Baring
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Berry
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Findley
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Gavin
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McLoskey
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Morton
Murray
Norblad
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schwengel
Short
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Steed
Stinson
Teague, Calif
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Westland
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead

NOT VOTING—24

Abbitt
Ashley
Ayres
Betts
Buckley
Cooley
Fisher
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Lennon
Rich
Roosevelt
Shelley
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Vinson
Walter
Widnall
Wyman

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Teague of Texas against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Tuck against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Betts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Ashley.

Mr. BURKE changed his vote from "nay" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the Record at the appropriate place on the bill, H.R. 12, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FRANCIS KEPPEL, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, a fine portrait of a splendid Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, has been drawn by George Oakes in an article published in the April 14, 1963, edition of the Sunday Star. Commissioner Keppel has impressed many members of Congress with his knowledge, his grasp of the complex education field, his charm, his vision, and his direction. We wish him well in his task.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Record an article that gives a glimpse of the major problems confronting public officials and educators alike as they grapple to bring our education system into harmony with the revolutionary, explosive trends in our economic system.

Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education

The appointment of Francis Keppel as Commissioner of Education is probably the most important action taken so far by the Kennedy administration to advance its program for Federal aid to education.

The former dean of Harvard's graduate school of education is a professional whose entire career has been devoted to education at the highest academic level. He was born in the world of education for his father, the late Frederick P. Keppel, was dean of Columbia College and later president of the Carnegie Corp., one of the largest foundations dedicated to the improvement of American and international education.

Francis Keppel is noted for a keen, incisive mind, and the ability to express forcefully his ideas. A graduate of Groton and Harvard, he is 47, a dark-haired, slight man with a brisk manner.

Although he has only been grappling with his job as Education Commissioner since last December (he was confirmed by the Senate a little more than a month ago), he has had time to formulate some of his ideas on national education problems generally.

TIED TO NATIONAL STRENGTH

He is deeply convinced for example, that improvement of our entire educational system is central to the Nation's strength and status in the modern world. He believes that the American people must be made to understand that whatever this country can do to relieve unemployment, to retrain manpower, to accelerate the economy, to carry out our defense and space programs basically depends on the urgent expansion and upgrading of our education from elementary school through university graduate training. Once the public appreciates the relationship between improving the education of our youth and these national programs, which have widespread popular backing, then rapid progress will be made on the educational front. As he said on March 8 at the University of North Carolina: "A growing body of evidence indicates that the development of human capital—particularly investment in education—has actually been more important as a source of economic growth than has the accumulation of physical capital. Education contributes directly to economic growth becasue it improves the equality of the labor force * * *. As I see the situation, national security and economic growth now change the need for a Federal program in education from a desirable domestic goal to a deadly serious necessity."

SPECIALIZES IN COOPERATION

In tackling the task of trying to bring together the views of educators and educational organizations whose rivalry was partially responsible for the defeat of higher education legislation in Congress last year, Dr. Keppel has the advantage of commanding their confidence. He has already made a beginning in developing greater cooperation between the American Council on Education, the largest organization representing higher education, and the National Education Association, the major spokesman for elementary and secondary schools. A believer that successful operation results when a consensus has been achieved, Dr. Keppel has been moving vigorously to bring this about among various educational organizations and groups. He has pointed out that educators cannot pass education legislation, but by their action or inaction they can keep it from passing.

Dr. Keppel is convinced that the key element in raising the level of education is expanding the number and especially improving the caliber of our teachers both in school and college. The most significant factor in the learning process, next to the aptitude of the learner, is the quality of instruction.

This job of raising standards must start in the home. Parents must think that learning is important and show it when dealing with their children.

The Commissioner believes that the Federal Government must help increase very low starting salaries in many States to attract better schoolteachers and also to raise the top salaries, as he has proposed in the new education bill. Too often a 21-year-old man can reach the top salary after 15 years. If we are going to retain good teachers, there must be a satisfactory goal to work for. This would encourage more male schoolteachers to enter and stay in the profession and this Dr. Keppel feels is important, for he thinks that there is too large a proportion of women teaching in our public schools.

The tremendous expansion of college students between now and 1970, when college enrollments are expected to double is going to require a substantial number of new teachers, especially in science.

Starting from the premise that reforms in education "require training of people," Dr. Keppel is pleased Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover keeps stirring up a critical point of view toward our educational deficiencies but he believes a national examining standard must be considered flexibly. For example, it would be hard to give the same examination in schools located in wealthy suburban areas as in those in city slums. There is also the danger that a single examining standard might stultify the independence of the teaching staff. Dr. Keppel thinks that new curriculums and educational research projects will be important instruments in raising standards.

Pointing out that the role of the Federal Government in education "has been evident since before the adoption of the Constitution" and citing such landmarks as the Land Grant College Act, the GI bills of World War II and the Korean war and the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Dr. Keppel stresses that "Federal participation should continue to be selective, stimulative and, where possible, transitional." He favors the Federal Government working through and strengthening the State departments of education in quality and independence.

SEES A LIAISON TASK

Dr. Keppel is not pushing for the creation of a Department of Education as was proposed last year by Secretary Ribicoff. Rather he sees the role of the Office of Education in the Federal structure as a "convener" or "liaison point" but not a director of the 40 Government departments and agencies that operate different educational programs in schools and colleges. As Commissioner of Education, it is believed that the President, who occasionally telephones Dr. Keppel directly, regards him as his primary adviser on education matters. Dr. Keppel expects to keep his eye on the overall effects of government on education and, if possible, help to settle any obvious conflicts on educational policy among the departments and agencies.

Dr. Keppel plans to improve the Office of Education by upgrading the key positions and attracting more well-qualified personnel. However, some claim that his own status was not enhanced by the recent establishment of two additional new Commissioners of Welfare and Vocational Rehabilitation in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Nevertheless, Secretary Celebrezze is reportedly letting Dr. Keppel run his own office without interference.

SEEKS TO PERSUADE STAFFERS

As the principal administration advocate for the primary school to graduate college education bill, Dr. Keppel began his campaign of persuasion with the strong personal indorsement of such influential figures as Senator Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, and Representative Edith Green, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of the House subcommittee handling major elements of the bill. He has been active on the Hill, talking to Congressmen who both favor and look with skepticism on the administration's program. Unlike many Government administrators, he has taken pains to seek out influential staff aids on both sides of the Capitol who play a vital role in advising their congressional bosses.

Although Dr. Keppel contributed to the education bill and indorses it, many of its features and particularly the omnibus approach were determined before his arrival.

The real question on the education bill is whether the administration, highly sensitive to the religious issue it always stirs up, will give Dr. Keppel the support he needs for major education legislation before the 1964 presidential election or whether they will use him to prepare the ground for a possible push during a second Kennedy term.

Education Not Meeting Job Needs

(By Susanna McBee)

American education is failing to pass one of its most important tests: training enough people to meet the Nation's future employment needs.

Education never has achieved the goal of placing the most qualified people in the right jobs—right for them and for the country—and it probably never will.

The fault lies not just with the educational system but with the facts of life in a free society. Some men get engineering degrees and become high-salaried business administrators; some women prepare to teach and get married instead.

Thirty years ago it was not so important to be trained specifically for certain jobs; today it is.

With what educators call the "knowledge explosion" (the world's store of knowledge is doubling every 10 or 15 years), there is an increasing need for more people to perform more tasks produced by more new knowledge.

"This has become such a big problem that it isn't really being faced," says one of American education's strongest critics, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, father of the nuclear submarine.

"No country has ever had an educational system adequate to its needs," Rickover said. "That's inherently impossible because of the vast capacity of the human mind to learn and change society. But the issue really is, Are we doing all we should to provide the people for the kind of society we will have in the next decade?"

He and some others answer this question with a loud, impassioned "no." With notable exceptions, however, not many people seem concerned.

One who is concerned is Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, who told a House Education subcommittee last month that there is no future in America for the unskilled laborer.

Noting that the economy used to have a "shock absorber" mechanism permitting it to make use of millions of unskilled workers, Wirtz said machines are removing the shock absorber. The problem of older unskilled workers losing their jobs to machines will get worse between now and 1970, he said, as 26 million young people enter the labor market—"a far greater number than the country has ever had to educate, train and absorb into employment in any comparable length of time."

As Wirtz pointed out, the employment problem is twofold: technology is changing the job growth pattern, and the postwar baby boom is adding an unprecedented supply of manpower to the labor force this decade.

One difficulty is that no one knows exactly how many people will be needed in various vocations by 1970. Rough estimates by the Bureau of Labor Statistics are based on assumptions which are themselves uncertain.

It is assumed, for example, that there will be no major war, that business productivity will be high, that unemployment will be below the present 5.6 percent rate, that current labor force trends will continue without abrupt change, that college enrollment will double and "that the trend toward higher levels of education will not be stifled by lack of school facilities or staff or of needed aid to students."

With all these "ifs" in mind, the Bureau predicts that over this decade the labor force, about 67 million in 1960 and going up 21 percent to more than 80 million in 1970, will include:

A remarkable 43-percent increase in the number of professional and technical workers—from 7.5 million to 10.7 million, or 13.3 percent of the 1970 labor forces.

A 34-percent increase in the number of service workers, such as nurses, waiters, cleaners, to total nearly 14 percent of the work force. Growth percentages in other categories are clerical, 31; sales, 23; managerial, 21; craftsmen and foremen, 20, and semiskilled, 13. The semiskilled will continue to be the largest group in the labor force—16.9 percent in 1970 compared with 18 percent in 1960.

A static number, 3.7 million, of unskilled industrial laborers, who will drop from 5.5 to 4.6 percent of the work force.

A 22-percent reduction in the farmworker population, dropping from 8 to 5.3 percent of the labor force.

Given the uncertain profile of the Nation's 1970 employment, the next question—one with an even more uncertain answer—is: How many trained people will American education (public, private, vocational, and general schools and apprenticeship programs) supply? A few examples will demonstrate the problems.

Labor Department studies show that during this decade 5.5 million new professional and technical workers may be needed to fill new jobs and replace those leaving others. However, only 3.7 million college graduates are expected to enter these fields by 1970.

New engineers required by 1970 could total about 700,000 to provide the projected 1.4 million employes in this field. But unless drastic steps are taken, new engineering entrants will be only 450,000, including those transferring into engineering from other fields and those without degrees who are upgraded into the profession.

Scientists, who numbered 313,400 in 1960, should total 548,000 by 1970, according to a 1961 study. To meet the projected average annual demand for 25,000 new scientists to fill new jobs and to replace losses, 83,000 person with science degrees should be graduated each year. About 80,000 will be, but this near balance may not bridge a great gap between supply and demand in certain specialties.

Teachers required for elementary and secondary schools should number about 2.2 million, and nearly 2.1 million (newly graduated and those reentering the field) will be supplied. The deficit over the decade will be 84,000.

About 225,000 new electricians will be needed to meet growth and replacement requirements by 1970. Apprenticeship programs will supply only 31 percent, or 70,000.

For tool and the diemakers, 85,000 will be required to meet growth and replacement demands, and apprenticeship programs will supply 45 percent, or 38,000.

These projections take into consideration the fact that nearly 70 percent of American young people were high school graduates last year and that more than 72 percent will be by 1970. Now about 18 percent are completing college, and 20 percent will do so by the end of the decade.

What happens when education does not supply the manpower demand is simply that people without all the qualifications get the jobs. Teachers are hired on a "temporary" basis; nondegree holders become engineers; electricians learn their trade on the job.

"The saving thing is that people are adaptable, and industry is willing to be flexible," says Assistant Commissioner Harold Goldstein of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

But, as he noted in a recent speech, "the implications are clear that the general educational level of the work force will have to increase and (that) there will be fewer jobs open to people without at least a high school education."

Goldstein sees a danger in the possibility that with one of four boys getting college degrees, "we may starve our skilled trades of the bright people they need" since most college men avoid this field.

Growing attacks have been directed at vocational training programs in public schools, and recently 81 percent of the school administrators responding to a survey by the Nation's Schools magazine said such programs must be improved and updated. Most criticism centers on the emphasis on agriculture in many programs and on their failure to keep pace with the country's technological development.

Ward Beard, consultant in the Vocational Division of the U.S. Office of Education, says additional funds can solve most of these problems.

Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel says that "we'll be shooting ahead of the 1970 employment target" if Congress passes the administration's proposed reform of vocational education, aid for technical institutes, and plans for improving the quality of education. "Vocational programs should stress the kind of knowledge that has the widest application—math, science and language," he added. Keppel also advocates more retraining for people on the job or those who must change jobs.

Other serious problems which the Nation is just beginning to attack are school dropouts (about one-third of the young people entering the work force lack a high school education) and job discrimination against Negroes.

The problems of both groups, who often are the same people, overlap—both lack the training for any but the most menial jobs. Most educated Negroes face additional difficulties of either inferior quality of schooling in segregated institutions or rebuffs in many trades and white-collar jobs despite their good education.

When the Nation's educational mechanism cannot keep up with employment demands, obviously the economy does not fall. But as Goldstein observed, "There will be more stresses, more pressures. We should be thankful that the adaptability of our people can alleviate the pressure. But then we cannot continue indefinitely to count on it."

PRESIDENT FAILS TO UNDERSTAND PEOPLE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President's failure to understand people is at the root of the present trouble both at home and abroad. This is apparent as applied to the Cuban exiles who are seeking to free their homeland and is also why this Nation is moving ever closer to dictatorship.

President Kennedy shows no understanding of what motivates freedom-loving people. He does not trust them. In aggrandizement of his own role he substitutes his judgment and his solutions for the will of the people in the apparent belief that only he can be right.

Lacking human understanding, the Kennedy administration has come dangerously close to taking the heart out of the Cuban people. In his beautifully phrased speeches he promised them a brighter tomorrow in which their native land would be free; then he dashed their hopes and shattered their dreams by adopting a policy of protecting their oppressor and turning the might of this great Nation against those seeking freedom.

This same failure to understand the yearning and determination of the Cuban people to rid themselves of their Communist masters, has been in evidence in the domestic policies of the Kennedy administration. The President does not believe in the wisdom and the judgment of the people of his own country. He does not trust them to solve their own problems, to determine the course of their own lives, but insists that only through bureaucratic planning can free Americans achieve happiness. He does not understand that a people controlled by a dictatorship cannot be free and without freedom there can be no happiness.

The Kennedy failure to solve the Cuban problem emphasizes again that the administration is not telling all it safely could about Cuba. He ignores the fact that Khrushchev's position in Cuba is firmer than it was a year ago. He insists that Russian troops are being removed from Cuba while there is ample evidence to indicate they are merely being rotated. He ignores the threat of a Communist, Russian-dominated Cuba to the rest of Latin America. He refuses to use the means available to him, short of military action, to help free Cuba. In short, the President seems to lack any real plan to bring about the overthrow of communism in this hemisphere, and failing to have a plan is misleading both the Cuban freedom fighters and the American people through management of the news and by withholding information.

I would like to inquire once again of the President, What is your plan to enforce the Monroe Doctrine and protect this hemisphere from foreign aggression? What is the Kennedy master strategy for the United States? As the head of a Nation that is still free, the people have a right to know where you intend to lead us and what form of government you and your advisers have in mind for the United States.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 24—STATE OF OREGON ON EL PASO NATURAL GAS CO. PETITION

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] and myself, I wish to place in the RECORD a certified copy of House Joint Memorial 24, adopted by the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, now in session. This memorial relates to a petition of the El Paso Natural Gas Co. for authority to construct a gas line from Eugene, Oreg., to Grants Pass, Oreg. I am pleased to bring this matter to the attention of the House.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 24

To the Honorable CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has under advisement the petition of the El Paso Natural Gas Co. for authority to construct a gas line from Eugene, Oreg., to Grants Pass, Oreg., being petition No. CP 62-265; and

Whereas the plans and proposals of many persons and organizations in Oregon and elsewhere are dependent upon the granting or denial of such petition by the Federal Power Commission; and

Whereas the season for construction of major facilities of various kinds in the State of Oregon is rapidly approaching; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Federal Power Commission is urged to expedite its determination of petition No. CP 62-265 and render a prompt decision thereon.

2. The Secretary of State shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to each Member of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

Adopted by house March 26, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate April 9, 1963.

BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY—LAW DAY U.S.A.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the United States and the Communist world celebrate May Day in sharply contrasting ways. The Reds will flaunt their military might. In quieter, less spectacular fashion, we will pay tribute to the law—for May Day is Law Day in America.

The basic differences between the rule of men in Communist lands and the rule of law in the free world are summed up in one phrase: individual liberty, and its handmaiden, law. Liberty without law is license, and law without liberty is tyranny. America's objective is the advance of peace and individual freedom throughout the world under the rule of law. Communism seeks to smother freedom under an oppressive rule of men.

A full flowering of human endeavor is possible only when the individual is free to think for himself, to follow his own bent, and to enjoy the fruits of his own efforts. Men can do this only when they live in a free society in which individual rights are protected and basic obligations fixed by law.

It is literally true that law is the alternative to chaos on the one hand, and to terror on the other. No system of government known to man is free from errors of judgment in the lawmaking process, or in the executing of its laws. There is need for constant vigilance against the modification of other laws that do not serve the general welfare.

It is true that no system of government is slower to change its course than a democratic society such as our own. In our Republic, lawmaking is usually a slow, thoughtful process. Representatives of the people must give individual citizens an opportunity to participate in that process by contributing their ideas and opinions. This format has produced the best system of government yet known to man.

We must never forget that we are an orderly people under the rule of law, and that if we do not like a law we nevertheless obey it while we work to change it.

May we never listen to those who say that our present form of constitutional government is outmoded in this advanced scientific age. Our Constitution and Bill of Rights are flexible documents which allow room for change within the guidelines of individual liberty.

As Somerset Maugham so aptly put it:

> If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and the irony of it is that if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that too.

It is my pleasure to join with the Minnesota State Bar Association, the American Bar Association, the news media, and other civic, patriotic, and educational groups by urging Americans everywhere to participate in this, the sixth annual Law Day observance in America.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14B OF THE NATIONAL RELATIONS ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, under section 14B of the National Labor Relations Act, State law is permitted to diminish a right recognized under Federal law. This section provides that if States enact legislation concerning union security that is more restrictive than the Federal law, which allows a union shop, the State law prevails. This provision permits a State to override and nullify the intent of Federal labor-management policy. The right-to-work laws enacted at the State level outlaw the union shop—an arrangement that is both permitted and regulated by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Today I am introducing legislation to repeal section 14B of the National Labor

Relations Act, by which States are empowered to enact the so-called right-to-work laws. This grant of power to the States abridges the right of free collective bargaining. It is neither equitable nor conducive to peaceful and enlightened labor-management relations.

Section 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act now permits any State to outlaw collective-bargaining agreements which are otherwise permissible under Federal law. Sixty percent of the States, including my own State of Maryland, do not infringe on the rights of employers and unions to include a union shop clause in their freely bargained contracts. In these States without right-to-work laws, a contract can be negotiated which requires an employee, after he has been hired, to join the union where he works or pay to the union an initiation fee and an amount equal to monthly dues. This is the maximum union security permitted under Federal law. In addition to permitting union shop, the Taft-Hartley Act also contains several safeguards to prevent abuse of the union shop. Of course, no contract is legal which requires union membership as a condition for getting the job in the first place.

At the present time, restrictive right-to-work laws exist primarily in nonindustrial States. Indiana is the only industrial State to enact such a law. Maryland has considered passage of this restrictive legislation but wisely rejected it, as have other States with maximum experience in labor-management relations.

The practical effect of the so-called right-to-work laws is to pit State against State in a ruthless battle to lure industry by virtue of restrictive State legislation.

For the most part, States which have adopted regressive laws to attract industry have done their citizens no favor. An employer with so little civic responsibility that he will abandon a community on the hope of paying lower wages and no taxes elsewhere is a questionable asset to the community to which he moves. When the "gifts" run out in this new area, so does the employer.

The term right-to-work itself is a misnomer. These laws do not give any person the right to work. These laws give him the right to enjoy the benefits of union negotiated contracts without "paying the freight" so to speak. It is not only fair, but the very essence of responsible democratic self-government in this country, that one who derives the benefit of a union negotiated contract, should be obliged to help pay his share of the cost of such services. It has been my experience that the absence of a provision for sharing the costs of union representation frequently leads to unstable labor-management relations. Thus, in reality, right-to-work laws undermine union security and with it responsible collective bargaining.

The workers themselves have overwhelmingly shown that they favor union security agreements in a collective bargaining contract. When the Taft-Hartley law was first passed in 1947, there was a section which provided that, after the union and the employer negotiated a union shop contract, that clause had to be ratified by a secret ballot vote of the affected employees. The results of these elections were so overwhelmingly in favor of the union security clauses that Senator Taft moved to discontinue these votes. In more than 97 percent of the elections, the union shop was ratified and 91 percent of the employees voted for a union shop. Moreover, the employees under a union shop agreement have the right to secure a secret ballot vote to rescind the provision. The use of this procedure has been negligible.

History has shown that the overwhelming number of workers want these union shop clauses. Where an employer and the union want to incorporate such a provision in a contract, it is unfair for a State to restrict this right. If the workers favor union security clauses, who then advocates right-to-work laws? These laws are of course advocated by those who have shown little real concern regarding the rights of workers. If the right-to-work advocates were really sincere about insuring occupational choice, they could properly concern themselves with fair employment practices legislation instead of using noble thoughts about freedom to cripple legitimate collective bargaining activities.

The 1960 Democratic platform adopted in Los Angeles states "we will repeal the authorization for right-to-work laws." Enactment of my bill would make this pledge a reality. Right-to-work laws are opposed by many religious groups on the grounds that such laws are an unnecessary restriction on free collective bargaining. These include the general board of the National Council of Churches, the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the Board of Social and Economic Relations of the Methodist Church, the Rabbinical Council of America, and the Catholic Committee of the South.

Enlightened members of the business community have also favored repeal of the authorization to the States to enact right-to-work laws because they realize that the mischief and divisiveness caused by this legislation is a heavy price to pay for legislation that is largely irrelevant to the great labor-management issues of our day.

In conclusion, I see no reason why any State should be permitted to exercise undue interference with the rights of negotiating parties in collective bargaining. Union membership as a basis for continued employment should be left to agreement by labor and management through collective bargaining. Reason, justice, and experience point to the need for repeal of the existing pernicious authorization to the States which enables them to infringe on the collective bargaining process.

FAIR HOUSING ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 5843, which is designed to prohibit discrimination by reason of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin against persons seeking or utilizing housing in the District of Columbia. This bill is in the form as recommended by the Corporation Counsel of the District, acting pursuant to instructions of the chairman of Subcommittee No. 6 of the House District Committee.

Although I am convinced that the Commissioners have the authority under existing law to issue appropriate regulations accomplishing this purpose, I have, nevertheless, introduced this bill so that the District Committee and the Congress will have full opportunity to examine the issues and so that all interested parties can be heard.

PERMITTING NATIONAL BANKS TO UNDERWRITE AND DEAL IN SECURITIES ISSUED BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to aid States and municipalities by permitting national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments.

Since 1933 commercial banks have been prohibited from all underwriting and trading in securities. An exception was made in the case of general obligations of States and municipalities, obligations of the United States and certain other issues. The purpose of the legislation which enacted this prohibition was to take commercial banks out of speculative development projects and out of the corporate and foreign bond business. At that time, the volume of bonds payable solely from the revenues of a specific project was relatively small and tended to be concentrated on new development projects. Therefore, with some exceptions, revenue bonds were considered greater risk investments than general obligation bonds.

For many reasons there has been a shift in municipal financing. More and more, new types of revenue bonds are being used in place of general obligations. However, these new types are quite different from the old high risk revenue bonds. They have an excellent record and are fundamentally general obligations in different form. They have been used to build schools, highways, bridges, water and electric plants. This type of revenue bond financing has greatly increased in recent years.

This bill will permit banks to underwrite, trade and deal in revenue bonds only to the extent national banks can invest in such bonds under the National Banking Act. Any bank can only own or be obligated to buy an amount of bonds limited to 10 percent of the bank's capital and surplus. Therefore, the risk level is not raised.

Revenue bond financing from which commercial banks are now automatically excluded runs about one-third of the total market. State and local governments need the broadest possible markets for their growing volume of securities. The broader the market the greater the competition and the lower the interest rate. If commercial banks were permitted to participate in revenue bond financing the interest rate that the municipalities and States must pay would be lower. Therefore, more public improvements which are financed in this way would be possible.

THE NIAGARA FRONTIER IN WESTERN NEW YORK STATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 19, 1963, the Niagara frontier in western New York State was honored by a very impressive ceremony—the New York Army National Guard assumed operational responsibility for the first Nike-Hercules air defense sites in the State of New York.

It was my pleasure to witness this eventful occasion and under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am happy to include the program.

Music by the 27th Armored Division Band, New York Army National Guard, which was followed by the rendition of honors. The invocation was given by a National Guard officer and the change of command ceremony followed. Lt. Ronald J. McQuaid, U.S. Army, was relieved by Capt. Robert H. Dupont, New York Army National Guard; Lt. William R. Pooley, U.S. Army, was relieved by Capt. Henry E. Close, New York Army National Guard.

Col. Thomas A. Rodgers, commanding officer, 31st Artillery Brigade—Air Defense—made the opening remarks which follow:

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and a privilege to welcome you to the Lancaster Missile Site. The symbolic ceremony that you have just witnessed marks the transfer of manning responsibility for two Nike-Hercules sites to the New York Army National Guard. This unit, the 2d Missile Battalion, 209th Artillery, has a proud record of service in the Nike-Ajax program. It is only proper that it is honored again today by being the first National Guard unit in the State of New York to be armed with the powerful Nike-Hercules.

By assuming this responsibility, the guardsmen here continue to participate as equal partners in the one-Army, U.S. Air defense effort. We are proud to have them as teammates, certain of their ability and confident that as a team we stand ready to meet any challenge.

At this time it is my privilege to present to you the acting commanding general of the 1st Aradcom region, who will speak on behalf of the Army Air Defense Command, Brig. Gen. Stephen M. Mellnik.

General Mellnik.

General Mellnik's remarks follow:

General O'Hara, Congressman Dulski, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the ceremony you have witnessed has more than passing significance. It deserves serious contemplation and reflection. For the first time in our history as a great nation we live in an atmosphere of continuing tension and danger. This ceremony recognizes the danger by placing powerful defense weapons into the hands of its citizen Army. We are a strong nation in every sense of the word. This quiet ceremony states our intention to use our strength to defend ourselves.

The Armed Forces are proud of the contribution they make to the defense posture of our Nation. You, as leaders of industry, government, and education, must be equally proud of the vital roles your professions play in developing the strength of this country. It is together—as a team—that we will grow and continue to remain strong.

Traditionally, America based its security on its potential strength—that is, on its ability to mobilize its resources at a leisurely pace to meet any challenge. This is a luxury we can no longer afford. Today, time and space factors have taken on new dimensions. Explosive devices have powers of destruction which stagger the imagination. These devices can be delivered by aircraft traveling 20 miles a minute.

The air defense of America is a unified responsibility with the Army, Navy, and Air Force contributing elements to the overall effort. We of the Army are proud of the part we play in this joint effort. We have a modern missile force; and you see before you what we believe to be the best air defense missile in the world today—the Nike-Hercules. Army research and development created this weapon and will continue to improve it to meet the challenge of the future.

It is most appropriate that the New York National Guard, in the traditional spirit of the minutemen of the Revolutionary War take its place in the active defense of our homeland. We are proud to turn over to the New York Army National Guard the most modern air defense missile arm, located here and at Grand Island. We do so with complete confidence. The units have demonstrated their professional competence in missile firings at Fort Bliss. Our citizens can remain secure in the thought that unfriendly aircraft will not have free access to our population and industrial centers. This Niagara frontier unit is the first unit to be equipped with the Nike-Hercules in the State of New York. There is no finer service, nor one more in keeping with tradition, than this mission which the National Guard of New York assumes today.

To you, General O'Hara, and to the fine soldiers of the Army National Guard of New York, I extend my congratulations on the superior fashion in which the citizen soldiers performed their duties with the Nike-Ajax missile system. I consider it a great privilege to pass on to you the responsibility for manning the Nike-Hercules sites at Lancaster and Grand Island.

Thank you.

Maj. Gen. Almerin C. O'Hara, commanding general, New York Army National Guard, and chief of staff to the Governor of New York State, delivered the principal address which follows:

General Mellnik, Colonel Rodgers, officers and men of the U.S. Army—Active and National Guard—Congressman Dulski, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, having served in the military forces of the State and Nation for nearly 30 years—I, like you, have lived through many difficult and extraordinary changes in military technology.

Most of us have been participants or, at least, vitally interested spectators in the metamorphosis of military techniques from the days when infantry soldiers scattered and fired their Springfields or M–1 rifles at attacking enemy aircraft—through the days of radar-controlled guns—to the advent of missiles and the space age that staggers the imagination in 1963.

Through all of these advances one of the most exciting to me has been the steady progress of the National Guard from infantry minuteman to missileman.

June 1960 highlighted this progress:

On that day I was privileged to participate in the turnover ceremonies of the Nike-Ajax missile from the Active Army to the National Guard in the Metropolitan New York City area and in August of 1960 we duplicated those ceremonies at Orchard Park here on the Niagara frontier.

Now, 3 years later, our National Guard takes its greatest stride forward as the 2d Missile Battalion, 209th Artillery, New York Army National Guard, accepts the Hercules mission from so distinguished a group of soldiers as is represented here today by the Active Army units of batteries A and C of the 1st Missile Battalion, 4th Artillery, 31st Artillery Brigade.

In charging the National Guard, who are about to assume this most responsible mission from the capable hands of the active service, I can think of no more profound words than those of Gen. George Washington, our first Commander in Chief, in a message to his officers during the Revolutionary War, when he said:

"Impress upon the mind of every man, from the first to the lowest, the importance of the cause, and what it is they are contending for."

The seriousness of this day can be found in the question, "What are you contending for?" Let me answer.

You are contending with a ruthless enemy in the battle for world peace versus world domination. This enemy switches from cold war to hot war—from peaceful coexistence to threats of nuclear war—in maneuvers aimed at promoting fear, confusion, and frustration in the minds of men throughout the world that he would dominate.

This is the strategy of despair and it will continue to be the desperate strategy of communism so long as the U.S. Army—and you are the U.S. Army—continues to maintain its traditions of duty, honor, country, that have been chiseled out of history by the dedication and blood and suffering of soldiers of the U.S. Army.

For 179 years the U.S. Army has been the great equalizer against the threat of the tyrant.

Forty years of experience in antiaircraft weapons from guns to the supersonic Hercules missile and hopefully, on to Nike-Zeus or a more sophisticated weapon, will continue to frustrate the evil ambitions of the tyrant.

In August of 1960, at Orchard Park, I reminded our National Guardsmen that Pearl Harbor, with its day of infamy, with its death and destruction, did happen once.

On that day I reminded you that a great trust had been placed in your hands and I charged you to justify that trust.

To your great credit, you have not failed. You have reconfirmed faith in your ability, and I say again to you today, as I did nearly 3 years ago, that there can be no acceptable excuse for failure to be ready and prepared against the Pearl Harbor of the missile age.

Now yours will be a technical business and susceptible to mistakes. But you, in this business, can't afford mistakes, and this was brought clearly home several days ago while perusing some old military books when I ran upon an article entitled, "Tactics of the Future," from a German translation of 1899, which is as appropriate today as the day it was written, and I quote:

"Let not military theory disregard men with their mistakes and imperfections, for it is from these that in great part the victory accrues to the other side. The conqueror is always he who makes the fewest mistakes."

We cannot afford mistakes.

Remember that in Greek mythology "Nike" was the Goddess of Victory, and she will be your constant companion.

Unfortunately, the commander in chief of the State military forces, the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, could not be with us today, but he has addressed a note to me which I should like to read:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, April 19, 1963.

Maj. Gen. A. C. O'HARA,
Chief of Staff to the Governor, State Division of Military and Naval Affairs, Albany, N.Y.

DEAR GENERAL O'HARA: I sincerely regret that I cannot join with you today to personally accept the Nike-Hercules mission for our Army National Guard units on the Niagara frontier.

The record of proficiency achieved by the Active Army Forces, who will today release control of a portion of their mission to the National Guard, is well known and is a most creditable performance deserving of the appreciation of all patriotic citizens. The example set by the Active Army in its personal relationship with the people of our community, as well as its outstanding proficiency, can be well emulated by our National Guard Forces.

The New York Army National Guard's progression from antiaircraft guns to Ajax missiles and now to the vitally important Nike-Hercules is a testimonial to their individual and collective abilities.

The achievements of our 2d Missile Battalion of the 209th Artillery (Air Defense) who will be charged with this new mission of great responsibility, speak eloquently of their capability to discharge this national defense responsibility.

As commander in chief of the State military forces, I enthusiastically accept this new mission and responsibility for our Army National Guard units who will continue to work shoulder to shoulder with their Active Army counterparts in the defense of this great country.

Please express my personal congratulations to the officers and men of the Active Air Defense units and the New York National Guard Missilemen who are today participating in this historic ceremony.

Sincerely,
NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

I join with Governor Rockefeller in expressing to all of you, Active Army and National Guard, my personal sincere appreciation for the things you have accomplished in the past and for the effective duty you will render in the future.

As New York State accepts this Nike-Hercules mission, I say to all of you, may Nike, the goddess of victory, walk by your side.

Following the ceremony the visitors had an opportunity to visit various areas of the installation which were supervised by the Guardsmen.

At this point, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the mission of the U.S. Army Air Defense Command.

MISSION OF THE U.S. ARMY AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

The mission of the U.S. Army Air Defense Command is to provide combat-ready Army air defense forces to the Commander in Chief, North American Air Defense Command, for air defense of specified critical locations. ARADCOM's contribution of forces to the air defense system includes surface-to-air missile units which shield major target centers of the United States.

ARADCOM's concept of defense is a combination of men, weapons, and determination that will prevent enemy aircraft or missiles from making a successful attack upon defended areas. Under this concept, the primary goal is to deter an enemy from an air assault on the United States by making him see in advance that his probable losses are not worth the risk. If that deterrent fails, the goal then is to deny the enemy destruction of the centers of America's great retaliatory and productive might. ARADCOM is a major component of the North American Air Defense Command, a unified command which is charged with the overall mission of air defense of the North American Continent. NORAD has full operational control of Army air defense forces assigned to continental defense, as well as those forces also contributed to this system by the U.S. Air Force, Air Defense Command and U.S. Naval Forces, Continental Air Defense Command.

Air defense is recognized as a joint task in which the Army shares responsibility with its sister services. Each component of NORAD contributes those forces which it is best suited by experience to train, equip, and sustain as an effective element of this single, unified system.

The component structure is designed to give the continental air defense system true depth. This "defense in depth" strategy combines the dimensions of distances with that of a variety of weapons. The enemy would be met and engaged not only along the full range of his attack, but by different weapons.

SOME GRAIN FIGURES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have felt it is important to ascertain how many farmers obtain price support loans on three crops. I have felt it is important to ascertain how many farmers obtain price support loans on two crops. I have felt it is important to ascertain how many farmers obtain price suport loans on three crops. I have felt it is important to ascertain how many farmers obtain price support loans on four crops. I wrote the following letter to a number of the divisions of our Government. Some effort has been made to help me obtain this information. I include at this point a copy of a letter I wrote and some information which has been furnished me by the Department of Agriculture:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1962.

DEAR DIRECTOR: For the years 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961 I desire the following information for your county:

How many barley producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your county in each year?

How many corn producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your county each year?

How many grain sorghum producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your county in each year?

How many oat producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your county in each year?

How many rye producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your county in each year?

How many soybean producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your county in each year?

How many wheat producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your county in each year?

How many peanut producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your county in each year?

How many rice producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your county in each year?

How many cotton producers participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program? What was the total loaned in your county in each year?

How many farmers participated in the programs of two of these crops? How many farmers participated in the programs of three of these crops? How many farmers participated in the programs of four of these crops?

For this information I shall be grateful.

Regards,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1963.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in further reply to your request for information on loans made to farmers on one or more of certain crops for 1961.

The attached tabulation was prepared from estimates furnished by ASCS State offices. As you remember in our earlier correspondence we indicated that the cost of preparing this material on individual basis was in the neighborhood of $700,000, and without additional appropriations we could not develop it in that manner. Therefore, we have prepared this report based on the above-mentioned estimates.

This information supplements that previously furnished you on the number of loans and the amounts of commodities placed under support broken down by States.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH M. BIRKHEAD,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Loans made to farmers on 1961 crop—barley, corn, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat

[Number]

State	Loans on 1 commodity	Loans on 2 commodities	Loans on 3 commodities	Loans on 4 commodities
Alabama	246	5	3	1
Alaska	9	--------	--------	--------
Arizona	345	7	--------	--------
Arkansas	1,822	--------	295	--------
California	180	27	4	--------
Colorado	3,925	255	64	--------
Delaware	28	1	--------	--------
Florida	74	--------	--------	--------
Georgia	1,218	99	24	3
Idaho	2,725	492	66	--------
Illinois	81,398	9,684	274	--------
Indiana	15,254	4,068	1,017	--------
Iowa	104,512	41,690	693	575
Kansas	4,294	115,958	21,474	1,432
Kentucky	1,440	144	16	--------
Louisiana	116	--------	--------	--------
Maine	108	--------	--------	--------
Maryland	154	17	3	--------
Michigan	6,767	286	71	18
Minnesota	57,045	10,991	904	626
Mississippi	996	31	5	--------
Missouri	16,552	10,345	2,069	591
Montana	2,085	251	12	--------
Nebraska	27,434	59.638	28,626	3,578
Nevada	1	--------	--------	--------
New Jersey	102	1	--------	--------
New Mexico	1,865	359	22	--------
New York	523	34	6	--------
North Carolina	497	279	217	41
North Dakota	8,884	483	193	96
Ohio	13,924	2,532	1,628	5
Oklahoma	20,453	9,227	923	154
Oregon	2,027	895	60	--------
Pennsylvania	745	15	8	--------
South Carolina	1,002	235	20	6
South Dakota	16,438	1,072	357	--------
Tennessee	929	39	--------	--------
Texas	50,025	9,207	1,841	307
Utah	98	--------	--------	--------
Virginia	803	8	8	--------
Washington	5,698	2,244	604	86
West Virginia	1	--------	--------	--------
Wisconsin	1,345	64	14	--------
Wyoming	220	12	--------	--------
Total	454,307	280,936	61,521	7,841

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 17, 1962.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Attached is a list, by States, of the number of grain price support loans and the total dollar amounts of these loans made for 1961. This supplements the material which we prepared for you last year regarding loans made for 1958, 1959 and 1960.

In addition to this information, in response to your request, we are trying to develop information, by States, concerning the percentage of farmers who have loans in two or more of these crops. We hope that this information will be available at an early moment and we will send it to you immediately.

Your request has indicated your need for this same material by counties. We are exploring whether we could arrange to provide essentially the same information by counties by using our machine installations in Kansas City, New Orleans, and other locations. If this information is prepared at the local county office, it would be disruptive of carrying on assigned tasks since it would require an enormous number of man-hours and it would be tremendously expensive. It is our best estimate that it would take something in the neighborhood of 300,00 to 350,000 hours to collect the information and at the average hourly cost of about $2 for clerks, the total bill would be in the neighborhood of $600,000 to $700,000.

It has been brought to our attention that you have received a number of letters from the State of Kansas indicating that the county offices there were not providing the information, but that the information would be forthcoming from the State office. This resulted from a misunderstanding of the information you have requested. It was their understanding that the information you had requested was concerned with State figures and not with county figures and the State had indicated at the offices that the State information would be provided, as it is, in fact, in the attached material.

I might say that on peanuts and tobacco the price support program is handled through cooperatives and in the case of peanuts the records are kept by marketing associations and in the case of tobacco by grower cooperatives. In both of these commodities it is doubtful that there is any information by counties. The information is maintained primarily by post office addresses, thereby further complicating the task of providing the information in the form in which you desire it.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH M. BIRKHEAD,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Loan activity on 1961 crop grains

State	Grain sorghums			Oats		
	Number of loans made	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Number of loans made	Quantity (bushels)	Amount
Alabama	--------	--------	--------	15	35,686	$25,726
Arizona	323	927,139	$2,036,727	--------	--------	--------
Arkansas	--------	--------	--------	60	144,051	97,543
California	28	135,411	336,435	11	86,391	63,467
Colorado	533	506,545	896,537	8	12,321	8,606
Florida	--------	--------	--------	1	280	196
Georgia	--------	--------	--------	251	735,587	517,505
Idaho	--------	--------	--------	218	646,362	338,719
Illinois	3	3,031	6,154	60	69,683	43,954
Indiana	5	4,806	9,131	6	8,601	5,620
Iowa	91	58,109	114,093	657	665,379	404,075
Kansas	30,805	16,323,526	30,504,801	97	111,509	71,549
Kentucky	3	2,908	5,796	1	809	558
Louisiana	--------	--------	--------	14	31,599	22,767
Maine	--------	--------	--------	108	139,359	99,364
Michigan	--------	--------	--------	75	96,991	62,911
Minnesota	5	1,617	3,224	2,115	4,764,063	2,577,002
Mississippi	9	18,200	34,148	419	1,454,758	991,071
Missouri	1,121	620,194	1,256,535	31	33,805	21,929
Montana	--------	--------	--------	21	56,347	32,006
Nebraska	26,576	14,194,369	27,663,445	165	169,610	101,286
Nevada	--------	--------	--------	1	1,084	813
New Mexico	1,629	2,435,309	4,709,141	--------	--------	--------
New York	--------	--------	--------	44	54,889	39,460
North Carolina	3	2,328	4,744	41	64,780	45,480
North Dakota	--------	--------	--------	887	1,720,469	920,682
Ohio	--------	--------	--------	36	41,437	27,734
Oklahoma	1,671	1,444,098	2,797,015	517	531,702	339,053
Oregon	--------	--------	--------	112	1,453,320	989,289
Pennsylvania	--------	--------	--------	11	12,676	8,945
South Carolina	--------	--------	--------	164	612,652	432,188
South Dakota	436	254,812	467,436	1,912	3,350,598	1,838,190
Tennessee	--------	--------	--------	5	6,482	4,648
Texas	50,568	68,786,773	139,345,328	1,079	1,759,341	1,204,818
Utah	--------	--------	--------	2	1,677	1,238
Virginia	--------	--------	--------	1	4,497	3,058
Washington	--------	--------	--------	203	313,202	191,034
Wisconsin	--------	--------	--------	52	82,381	51,435
Wyoming	--------	--------	--------	21	34,649	21,482
Alaska	--------	--------	--------	4	1,706	1,509

Loan activity on 1961 crop grains—Continued

State	Rye			Soybeans			Wheat		
	Number of loans made	Quantity (bushel)	Amount	Number of loans made	Quantity (bushel)	Amount	Number of loans made	Quantity (bushel)	Amount
Alabama				48	119,983	$270,665	123	86,517	$159,195
Arizona							1	3,471	6,491
Arkansas				2,360	4,540,189	10,544,419	129	285,001	555,612
California							33	156,258	295,275
Colorado	16	19,692	$17,322				2,894	7,592,461	12,874,647
Delaware				6	26,897	60,787	4	7,295	14,584
Georgia	3	1,944	2,352	152	178,651	400,325	300	434,484	809,886
Idaho	19	18,883	19,224				2,603	6,523,536	10,527,975
Illinois	3	2,895	3,213	25,417	24,913,432	58,563,671	2,511	2,398,044	4,471.564
Indiana	1	604	658	5,068	4,900,620	11,380,292	619	643,419	1,196,123
Iowa				46,037	35,748,143	80,435,395	827	557,516	1,063,933
Kansas	132	90,504	86,628	4,811	2,919,374	6.477,031	92,289	105,119,852	189,413,734
Kentucky				214	364,720	834,193	854	894,518	1,593,106
Louisiana				9	176,982	409,679			
Maryland				7	21,751	49,159	88	88,535	171,590
Michigan	1	245	255	644	438,737	1,004,917	1,092	987,275	1,747,617
Minnesota	69	49,640	49,516	26,346	17,934,134	39,660,721	917	1,102,700	2,098,588
Mississippi				523	1,474,166	3,350,364	31	53,960	94,289
Missouri	5	8,049	8,761	10,216	9,110,711	20,879,010	6,928	6,010,343	11,477,054
Montana	21	56,704	45,465				1,808	5,370,944	8,604,911
Nebraska	178	153,345	146,448	4,142	2,228,788	4,926,525	31,508	27,798,467	50,150,698
New Jersey				11	16,927	38,373	51	99,707	199,132
New Mexico				2	909	1,974	595	2,900,069	5,013,762
New York	2	649	753	7	3,690	8,303	372	347,906	618,435
North Carolina	3	1,297	1,544	276	265,036	599,282	219	194,042	363,530
North Dakota	322	289,632	265,422	930	721,017	1,553,170	4,248	4,813,132	8,857,433
Ohio				6,145	5,360,864	12,459,756	3,024	2,509,279	4,634,372
Oklahoma	1	492	448	516	556,463	1,232,360	22,118	36,386,773	63,602,399
Oregon	5	24,124	28,824				1,632	5,573,996	9,769,167
Pennsylvania				6	4,766	10,694	662	396,224	737,148
South Carolina	2	7,548	7,984	638	1,229,319	2,764,132	271	291,944	536,719
South Dakota	232	243,973	234,963	765	423,257	927,931	2,768	4,317,851	7,850,998
Tennessee				680	624,817	1,434,051	234	226,667	405,714
Texas				253	204,222	449,016	6,241	19,428,131	34,283,009
Utah							84	133,914	209,940
Virginia				54	109,640	247,971	715	492,915	921,773
Washington	256	550,237	595,011				4,831	16,916,083	29,023,568
Wisconsin				113	84,170	192,076	20	28,545	54,438
Wyoming	9	10,914	9,832				173	484,494	821,146

State	Barley			Corn		
	Number of loans made	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Number of loans made	Quantity (bushels)	Amount
Alabama				69	62,060	$78,689
Arizona	28	859,050	$873,493			
Arkansas	125	197,661	197,234	6	12,240	15,300
California	129	5,419,258	5,634,975	10	57,136	75,906
Colorado	256	488,432	402,342	537	910,983	1,090,501
Delaware	1	3,927	4,084	18	68,299	89,472
Florida				73	150,420	179,730
Georgia	5	11,304	11,242	633	935,609	1,149,915
Idaho	443	879,980	753,600			
Illinois	38	31,116	30,877	63,324	138,692,721	167,952,712
Indiana	9	9,783	9,175	14,631	32,634,693	39,531,312
Iowa	25	21,326	20,464	99,833	176,890,404	201,824,517
Kansas	6,658	4,921,805	4,487,317	8,366	10,662,802	12,565,322
Kentucky	17	31,152	28,492	511	1,093,471	1,364,700
Louisiana				3	5,962	7,453
Maryland	34	80,393	92,515	45	118,168	154,808
Michigan	34	18,818	18,682	5,296	6,595,170	8,167,243
Minnesota	1,506	2,485,987	2,300,925	38,608	60,099,844	66,573,680
Mississippi	1	2,736	2,736	49	86,832	106,975
Missouri	183	231,414	231,091	11,073	20,545,009	25,008,220
Montana	498	1,381,643	1,008,600			
Nebraska	534	568,929	495,490	56,173	99,936,053	114,863.578
New Jersey	8	15,423	15,797	33	71,881	95,609
New Mexico	18	44,854	40,790	2	11,207	13,784
New York	7	4,622	4,807	131	144,587	190,876
North Carolina	39	48,041	47,665	453	625,884	811,550
North Dakota	2,562	3,796,521	3,347,577	707	937,348	1,009,212
Ohio	15	12,984	11,843	8,869	12,867,672	15,999,237
Oklahoma	5,923	5,047,566	4,607,601	11	11,290	14,038
Oregon	1,222	3,261,194	3,141,185	11	24,899	32,663
Pennsylvania	23	23,063	23,032	66	78,161	103,237
South Carolina	24	40,550	40,824	164	232,499	286,158
South Dakota	842	1,004,231	895,286	10,912	13,338,331	14,517,854
Tennessee	1	2,723	2,438	48	105,554	132,409
Texas	2,525	3,173,353	2,939,250	714	663,927	841,799
Utah	12	15,316	12,807			
Virginia	14	42,135	42,850	35	80,225	105,459
Washington	3,290	8,719,578	8,005,437	52	152,283	195,263
West Virginia				1	8,198	8,432
Wisconsin	1	332	319	1,237	2,150,084	2,597,314
Wyoming	18	31,156	24,260	11	15,917	19,417
Alaska	5	2,204	2,898			

Mr. Speaker, I also include at this point in the RECORD some letters and statements pertaining to agriculture:

JUNE 18, 1962.

To: Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.
From: Natural Resources Division.
Subject: CCC loans.

Response is made to your request of June 1, 1962, for information concerning the number of CCC borrowers participating in more than one commodity loan program.

Based on the listing of borrowers and related data furnished by your office, 27 parties who borrowed $50,000 or more on cotton or $25,000 or more on other supported commodities participated in two commodity loan programs. The data supplied failed to reveal any parties borrowing under more than two commodity loan programs.

The enclosed table lists the 27 borrowers by name, address, commodities, and amount of loan.

WILLIAM F. WOODS.

CCC borrowers participating in more than 1 commodity loan program, 1960

Name and address	Commodity	Amount
J. F. Twist Plantation, Twist, Ark.	Soybeans Rice	$97,511.17 35,989.72
Total		133,500.89
C. P. Gould:		
Tolleson, Ariz.	Barley	39,529.90
Litchfield, Ariz.	Cotton	94,322.77
Total		133,852.67
Westlake Farms and Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif.	Cotton Barley	733,256.76 838,333.24
Total		1,571,590.00
Jack Corn, Friend, Kans.	Grain sorghum Wheat	27,854.88 30,135.15
Total		57,990.03
Max Engler, Jr., Garden City, Kans.	Corn Wheat	$26,318.05 31,036.47
Total		57,354.52
Raymond G. Morris, Garden City, Kans.	Corn Wheat	33,979.66 40,057.60
Total		74,037.26
Spike Bros., Hugoton, Kans.	Grain sorghum Wheat	31,135.06 37,235.01
Total		68,370.07
Wilbur J. Ulrich, Holcomb, Kans.	Grain sorghum Wheat	28,200.30 32,077.76
		60,278.06
Total		
S. L. Reed:		
Belzoni, Miss.	Rice	36,492.84
Do.	do	30,473.46
	Soybeans	33,975.51
Total		100,941.81
J. C. O'Neal, Cleveland, Miss.	Soybeans Rice	32,210.14 44,145.35
Total		76,355.49
The Albert Painton Co., Inc., Painton, Mo.	Soybeans Corn	30,538.76 50,000.00
Total		80,538.76
Cornhusker Farms (Morrison-Quirk Grain Corp.), Hastings, Nebr.	Corn Wheat	185,350.24 26,433.51 211,783.75
Total		
		39,727.50
Flo Wal Farms, Inc., Dewitt, Nebr.	Grain sorghum Corn	35,623.50 75,351.00
Total		
		29,063.17
Wayne Lyon, Merna, Nebr.	Wheat Corn	29,702.40 58,765.57
Total		
		$25,858.56
Angus Myers & Sons, McCook, Nebr.	Corn Wheat	26,735.44 52,594.00
Total		

CCC borrowers participating in more than 1 commodity loan program, 1960—Con.

Name and address	Commedity	Amount
Clarence and W. T. Meeks, Farwell, Tex.	Grain sorghum Wheat	34,682.76 31,434.64
Total		66,117.40
Roy Williams & Sons, Clovis, N. Mex.	Grain sorghum Wheat	46,349.75 30,713.26
Total		77,063.01
Tulana Farms, Klamath Falls, Oreg.	Barley Oats	33,229.14 50,000.00
Total		83,229.14
Robert G. Bafus, Colfax, Oreg.	Barley Wheat	25,000.10 49,999.04
Total		74,999.14
Browder Bros., Sunray, Tex.	Grain sorghum Wheat	27,973.76 27,868.39
Total		55,842.15
Claude Higby, Stinnett, Tex.	Grain sorghum Wheat	25,310.20 41,448.67
Total		66,758.87
Carl H. Kuper, Dalhart, Tex.	Grain sorghum Wheat	47,190.00 47,367.00
Total		94.557.00
G. W. Lee, Silverton, Tex.	Grain sorghum Wheat	37,605.32 27,440.93
Total		65,046.25
Bruce, Parr, Friona, Tex.	Grain sorghum Wheat	38,993.56 35,587.80
Total		74,581.36
W. F. Ponder, Hereford, Tex.	Grain sorghum Wheat	$25,151.42 26,026.92
Total		51,178.34
Berkley Stringer, Dumas, Tex.	Grain sorghum Wheat	28,627.23 47,224.80
Total		75,852.03
Texas Tech College (Pan Tech farms, Texas Tech), Panhandle, Tex.	Wheat Grain sorghum	27,486.00 39,418.12
Total		66,904.12

William F. Woods,
Natural Resources Division.

Department of Agriculture,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1962.

Hon. **Lindley Beckworth,**
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Beckworth: This is in reply to your letter of May 14, requesting the names and addresses of individual farmers who have received price support on more than one agricultural commodity.

There are approximately 3.7 million farmers in the United States and many produce one or more commodity which is eligible for price support. Further, some individual producers obtain more than one loan on a commodity, a separate one for each storage location, for example. There are more than 20 agricultural products which are eligible for price support, and within this number there are distinct grades or classifications which are also eligible for support, such as extra long staple cotton, American Egyptian and so forth. Our records are not maintained to show the number of producers who obtain price support through cooperatives or groups, or who obtain more than one loan on a commodity or who obtain loans on more than one commodity. However, I am sure you recognize that farmers who do not directly participate in a price support program obtain benefits to the extent that the support price influences the market price of the commodity he sells.

We believe that it would be administratively and economically impracticable to maintain records which would show in detail the names and addresses of every individual farmer who received price support on more than one commodity. The cost in terms of money and man-hours would be very high and the utility of the information obtained of doubtful value from an operational standpoint.

Sincerely yours,
Kenneth M. Birkhead,
Assistant to the Secretary.

June 24, 1962.

Dear Mr. Birkhead: I would like this information on all who received loans of $50,000 or more on more than one crop. Please return.

Regards,
Lindley Beckworth.

Department of Agriculture,
May 29, 1962.

Hon. **Lindley Beckworth,**
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Beckworth: We are enclosing several tables showing 1960 crop price support commodity loans of $25,000 or more, by producer, in accordance with your communication of May 24.

Your communication is being returned as requested.

Sincerely yours,
Kenneth M. Birkhead,
Assistant to the Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

1960-crop price-support commodity loans of $25,000 or more, by producer

BEANS, DRY EDIBLE

Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned
ARIZONA			
		Bushels	
Youngker Farms Co.	Buckeye	273,785	$234,903.19
Chatham & Chatham	Peoria	69,466	58,705.98
C. P. Gould	Tolleson	45,965	39,529.90
Maryvale Land & Cattle Co.	Glendale	38,736	33,312.96
Arlington Cattle Co.	Arlington	34,008	29,246.88
CALIFORNIA			
Salyer Land Co.	Corcoran	1,360,985	1,197,666.67
Westlake Farms, Inc.	Stratford	952,651	838,333.24
Giffen, Inc.	Huron	446,308	397,214.12
Calflax Co.	Five Points	255,853	227,709.17
William Dal Porta & Sons	Stockton	48,500	47,578.50
Jackson & Reinhart	Paso Robles	34,491	29,317.35
Basin Farms	Corcoran	31,538	27,753.73
Rancho San Lucas	San Lucas	30,978	27,260.64
OREGON			
Tulana Farms	Klamath Falls	41,667	33,229.14
OREGON—continued			
		Bushels	
Ashbeck & Luciani	Echo	31,775	$28,490.54
Robert G. Bafus	Colfax	28,090	25,000.10
COLORADO			
		Hundredweight	
Western Bean Growers Association	Denver	11,000	$56,560.00
MICHIGAN			
Michigan Cooperative Bean Marketing Association.	Lansing	72,661	469,386.44
Bean Growers Mutual Cooperative Association.	Owendale	51,450	332,365.71
Great Lakes Farmers Cooperative Association.	Saginaw	41,445	267,738.08
Mabel Graham	Breckenridge	5,282	34,770.30
WASHINGTON			
Western Farmers Association	West Seattle	30,000	178,200.00

GENERAL MILLS HOMEMAKER SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, on this date, 50 high school seniors, each representing a sovereign State in our Union, with their 50 teacher-sponsors, honor us by assembling at their Capitol to receive college scholarship awards. The donor of the awards is the General Mills Corp., which has instituted an annual Betty Crocker search for the American homemaker of tomorrow.

This has come to be a feminine age. Women have fought for the right to enter every field of human activity, the professions, industry, commerce, Government. It might have been feared that their victory in this struggle would alienate their interest in the one indispensable occupation which has engaged their attention through the centuries, that of homemaking. That would indeed have been a sour and unsavory fruit of victory. But no such outcome has resulted. On the contrary, as the frantic activity of the marriage license bureaus attests, the foremost ambition of every young woman is to preside over a home of her own. There she has full scope to exercise every talent and skill with which nature has endowed her. Women instinctively realize that homemaking is a job in the full sense of the word, the noblest of jobs, one whose mastery brings more progress and joy to the individual and to society than all other jobs combined. We believe this job should be elevated to the rank of a profession. Our high schools and colleges marshal their resources to inculcate and dignify the many skills involved in becoming a successful and gracious homemaker. Now this great industrial concern has set aside a significant portion of its gains for the purpose of motivating an interest in becoming highly proficient in the art. General Mills is to be commended for a program designed to accentuate appreciation of what good homemaking means to our Nation. And the presence of these young women in Washington today should enlist the attention of every Congressman who is proud of his State and of the people whose accomplishments have made it great.

THE BETTY CROCKER SEARCH FOR THE AMERICAN HOMEMAKER OF TOMORROW

Educators have discharged with conspicuous success their responsibility for training the Nation's young women as future homemakers and citizens. The magnitude and quality of our schools' efforts, unfortunately, have often been overshadowed by the sensationalism of occasional juvenile delinquency. The psychological power of the negative has deprived the country's dedicated teachers and administrators of the credit they so richly deserve.

In establishing the Betty Crocker search for the American homemaker of tomorrow in 1954–55, General Mills set out, specifically, not only to help the Nation's teachers in educating future homemakers, but also to focus attention on the work of the schools. The program provides recognition for teacher and student alike. It endeavors to heighten interest in the world's number one career, homemaking. It establishes a scholarship program for exceptional young women and rewards every participant by exposing her to new ideas on homemaking as a career. It is the only national scholarship-educational program exclusively for girls, with $110,000 in scholarship grants awarded annually.

Highly significant and satisfying to General Mills is the fact that the scholarship winners represent more than 400,000 other girls in 12,900 high schools of the land, who each year have an opportunity to learn from the program. It is these young women, in large measure, who will shape the Nation's homes of tomorrow and therefore the Nation's future.

MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS: A RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT FOR MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATORS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD TO FOLLOW

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, April 17, Mayor Richard J. Daley was sworn in to his third term as chief executive of Chicago.

During the impressive ceremonies, Mayor Daley delivered his inaugural address. I shall ask unanimous consent today to include the text of his address at the conclusion of my own remarks.

The record which Mayor Daley has written in the past 8 years as chief executive of Chicago and the bold program which he has outlined for the next 4 years, can well serve as a model for municipal administrators throughout the world.

Richard J. Daley is today considered one of the most outstanding administrators in the world. A careful analysis of his inaugural address showing the awe-inspiring developments in Chicago during the past 8 years and his bold and imaginative program for the next 4 years will quickly convince anyone that Mayor Daley's worldwide recognition is more than well deserved.

I am including Mayor Daley's entire speech today because in my judgment the program outlined by Mayor Daley can serve as a guideline for administrators of large cities throughout the world.

Chicago is indeed fortunate to have a mayor with such tremendous foresight and imagination. It would be my hope that those who are quick to malign the city of Chicago will carefully read Mayor Daley's inspiring message. They will find that here is a city which has set the pace for urban modernization which can serve as a guideline for our Nation and the world.

In behalf of my colleagues in Congress from Chicago, I congratulate Mayor Daley for his inspiring message and hope that those who read his speech will find guidance in their own hopes for their own urban communities.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Daley's inaugural address follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY, APRIL 17, 1963

The objectives, the policies, the goals of this administration are a matter of public record. In my inaugural address in 1955 I said, "We must take first things first, we must concentrate our efforts on city services which are essential to keep the people of Chicago the healthiest, best protected and most prosperous in the Nation.

"We want the finest police and fire departments in the Nation. We can't be satisfied with a school system in which 14,000 students must attend double-shift schools and where classes are overcrowded and school buildings are old and dangerous.

"We must provide the opportunity for every citizen to have decent housing. We must have slum clearance. While we are clearing the slums we must prevent the spread of blight into other neighborhoods."

I said then: "Community betterment programs will also include cleaner and safer streets, extension of sewers, the expansion of street lighting, and a bigger street cleaning department and a realistic human relations program. More recreation facilities are needed in the neighborhoods, more playgrounds and parks.

"There is no dispute among us that we need more police and a better police department; that we need more schools and more teachers; that government should be continuously streamlined and modernized; that there must be something done to improve our transportation system.

"There are great projects underway: slum clearance, new housing, school buildings, superhighways, street lighting projects, neighborhood redevelopment, offstreet parking in neighborhood communities, and many other improvements. I shall not only support these projects; I shall speed them vigorously and with energy. I will permit nothing to stand in the way of Chicago's growing civic consciousness and civic integrity."

This was my platform, my pledges in 1955 when I first took office.

During the past 8 years I have endeavored to fulfill those pledges and for me there can be no greater reward than the vote of confidence expressed by the people at the polls on April 2.

Tonight, as we continue our task of carrying out the mandate given by the citizens of Chicago, I find it difficult to express my mingled feelings of challenge and confidence, of pride and humility.

I have lived in one neighborhood of Chicago all my life. The desires of my neighbors for a community which will enable them to give their families the best possible environment, is shared by all the residents of the neighborhoods of Chicago. Their needs and their wants have been and will continue to be my guide in the 4 years to come.

Police, fire, health, sanitation, building, education, and recreation are the everyday responsibilities of local government. The program, the new plans, that any municipality can carry forward are dependent on the high standards of these vital services and the effective performance of city departments in providing them to city residents.

These are the mainsprings of local government and the continual improvement of these services will by themselves cause an improvement in all services and stimulate and make possible the success of new programs and new plans. In programing for the next 4 years and in planning for the future, we must first appraise the quality and performance of essential services, the programs which are underway and the steps which must be taken to further improve them.

Your Chicago today has a police force which is rapidly becoming a truly professional police department. Since he has taken command, Supt. O. W. Wilson has created a new image of the police department. The department enjoys the public respect and the public confidence. In the past 7 years the appropriations for the Chicago Police Department have increased by $36 million, of which more than $15 million was appropriated in the past 2 years. The Chicago Police Department now has the most modern communications system in the Nation.

The record is clear that the police department is run without interference by outside influences, and it will continue to be completely administered by the Chicago Police Board and the superintendent of police.

The police department will increase its emphasis on patrol and crime prevention activities, with more foot patrolmen and squad cars assigned to areas of high crime incidence. More personnel will be assigned to the task force undercover unit and to the canine section, which has proven to be a highly successful crime prevention operation.

Continued efforts will be made in the coming year to replace sworn personnel with civilians so that more police personnel can take part in crime prevention and crime fighting activities.

The 1963 budget provides $100 annual clothing allowance for all uniformed personnel and $50 annual uniform allowance for crossing guards.

Bringing the police force up to its present high professional standard has been costly. It will no longer be necessary to add 4,000 policemen, which we have done since 1956. Their salaries amount to approximately $26 million a year. It will not be necessary to provide for a communications system, the remodeling of police headquarters, and the new equipment that was urgently needed. It is generally agreed that in the future the compensation of our police and fire departments should be increased.

Your Chicago today has a fire department that is the most completely equipped firefighting force in the world. With the new fire academy, adequate manpower, new stations, new equipment, snorkels, the fire department has made a record of reducing extra-alarm fires, while in other cities extra-alarm fires have increased. How many cities in the Nation have emergency ambulance service within 2 to 3 minutes of every one of its residents?

As in the police department, bringing the fire department up to its high standards has been costly. It will not be necessary in the future to add nearly 1,000 firemen at an annual compensation of nearly $6,500,000, nor to provide for expensive equipment, and the construction of a new fire academy. In the months ahead, the fire department will carry on its building program of relocating and consolidating apparatus from single fire stations into multiple fire stations, reducing both operating and maintenance costs.

With the facilities of the new fire academy available, the department is able to give a much finer course of training to probationary firemen.

As in the police and fire departments, all of the city departments have been greatly improved.

Today, the Chicago Board of Health's leadership in preventive medicine is recognized throughout the world. Its programs of dental treatment, immunization, and inspection have been greatly increased. It is a pioneer in launching a chronic disease health program in such vital areas as heart, cancer, diabetes, and mental health. The city of Chicago is the only city in the State which gives physical examinations in our public and parochial schools to protect the health of medically indigent children.

It has expanded its services of quarantine inspection at both the port of Chicago and O'Hare Field. The city's first district health center will be opened in Garfield Park in early June. It will provide a comprehensive health service directly to the community and will include prenatal care, well-baby clinic, mental health program, dental health, chronic disease control program, and health education. In the future, we hope to provide for more of these health centers which work in full cooperation with the medical society and the local hospitals.

Chicago, which was once thought of as "a dirty city," has won first awards in the national contest in Washington for being the cleanest big city in the United States in 1959, in 1961, and again in 1962.

Actually, nothing is more important to civic pride and in creating an atmosphere in which the citizens will seek to maintain and improve their property than clean streets and alleys. It is not an easy task to keep a city of this size clean.

Making our big city clean and attractive has cost money, but it has been well worth it. The government alone could not have achieved the goal of a much cleaner city. It has been only through the cooperation of industry, commerce, labor, churches, civic groups, all of our media of communications, and above all, the people of Chicago who gave this program their whole-hearted support.

The goal of a clean and beautiful city is a never-ending task, and we will continue not only to maintain but to expand this program.

The building department has been expanded and most modern techniques are being continually adopted to insure that the codes are strictly followed. Owners of property now are voluntarily repairing and rehabilitating their buildings rather than waiting to be taken into court.

One of the most effective programs that has been carried on by the building and law departments is the demolition and vacation of dangerous and hazardous buildings which have long been eyesores in the community.

The inspection activities of the building department are vitally important, but not only in terms of enforcement. This administration believes that the building department is essentially a service department that can aid and assist property owners in protection and increasing the value of their property. The building department will continue its program of demolishing hazardous and dangerous buildings from the neighborhoods of Chicago.

These five departments—police, fire, health, sanitation, and buildings—account for 75 percent of the total operating fund of the city. Eighty percent of all of the increases in the budget since 1955 have gone to improve these essential services.

In the 1963 budget, the total appropriation for the city's operating and capital improvement expenditures was reduced by more than $40 million. The 1963 property taxes for the operation of the city's departments was reduced by more than $7 million—the most substantial reduction in the city's tax levy for more than half a century. This reduction will be effective next year.

The appropriations for virtually all city departments were reduced, but in no instance will there be a curtailment of their basic services.

The lightening of the tax burden for property owners, especially for the small home owners, was accomplished without diminishing the quality of vital city services—services which are being maintained at standards which are the highest in the city's history. These reductions were made possible by stringent economies in all operations involving contracts, personnel, commodities, equipment, and by improved supervision.

With few exceptions all of the home rule recommendations have been adopted. Also put into effect were: The executive performance budget, the classification and compensation plan, the consolidation of functions of the Chicago Park District and the city police, the consolidation of the land clearance commission and the community conservation board into the department of urban renewal, the creation of the departments of aviation and the Port of Chicago, the program of coordinated capital improvement budgeting, and the microfilming of records in all departments. These have all contributed to greater efficiency and superior service.

Nearly every department in the city has had surveys by expert municipal consultants, the consolidation of functions, the elimination of paperwork, and the introduction of electronic office machinery. In some departments there were nonrecurring costs. The modernization of equipment and the remodeling of offices has been virtually completed.

We can look forward to further benefits of this modernization program. We shall continue this program of efficiency and economy, to utilize the most modern business techniques, to streamline procedures, cut red tape, reduce overlapping by consolidating functions and agencies wherever possible, and employ the best talent in the field. We shall continue to utilize outstanding consultants.

The objective is to continue to give the taxpayer the greatest value for his dollar.

In 1952, under a previous administration, the Mayor's Commission on Revenue, which was not a political commission in any way, analyzed the needs of Chicago. Three years later, when I assumed office, I followed the recommendations of the commission.

Last January I appointed a citizens committee on city revenue and expenditures. The purpose of the committee was to study the proposition to place limitations on the real estate tax levy and to study alternative proposals in relation to revenue resources and city expenditures.

The committee will present its recommendations shortly, and we will then present to the city council a special message on taxes and revenue.

Our agencies dealing directly with the welfare of people have all been pioneers in new programs.

The Human Relations Commission has made great strides in developing better understanding among all our people in recent years. The commission has not only had great success in preventing racial stress but has also made great progress in increasing employment opportunities.

Our other commissions, senior citizens, youth welfare, newcomers, and the alcoholic treatment center, are making steady progress in their fields, all of these activities contributing to the well-being of our people.

Because of the unavoidable neglect which had caused an accumulation of urgent needs, this administration established a policy of expediting all of its public works programs so as to bring the benefits of new facilities to the citizens as quickly as possible.

To determine the city's needs and the needs of the many suburbs to which the city supplies water, we requested a survey to formulate plans for the next 25 years.

A few weeks ago, the southwest pumping station was in full operation, and within a few months the largest filtration plant in the world will supply filtered water to millions of people residing on the central and north sides of the city and to 19 suburbs.

The public works improvements during the past 8 years are evident everywhere. Included in this area of activity has been the construction of numerous new playlots and playgrounds, new sewers, new water mains, pumping stations, new filtration plant, bridges and viaducts, police and fire stations, new parks, beaches, and swimming pools, house of correction improvements, 50 miles of expressways to give this city the finest expressway system of its kind in the country.

Chicago is the best lighted city in the United States. We have rebuilt Navy Pier as a modern port. O'Hare Field is the busiest and most modern in the Nation, without cost to the taxpayer.

The city of Chicago has carried on this tremendous public works and community improvement program while at the same time it has improved its national credit rating, which will result in the savings of hundreds of thousands of dollars to taxpayers. Chicago's overall per capita debt is the fourth lowest of the Nation's 42 largest cities.

The city has underway 27 community improvement projects under the direction of the department of urban renewal. Six projects have been completed. The total assessed value of these six projects after redevelopment has increased so that they produce a tax yield that is 147 percent higher than before development.

For all 27 redevelopment projects, which include construction for educational, medical, and other nontaxpaying institutions, the annual tax yield is expected to more than double. These community improvement programs, working with the building and law departments, are leading the way to the goal of eliminating blighted and dilapidated buildings from every neighborhood in the city of Chicago.

The U.S. census of housing reported that in the period between 1950 and 1960 the number of dilapidated dwellings in Chicago was reduced by more than 50 percent, from 64,000 to 30,000. In the past 2 years the number of such dwellings has been further reduced by 5,000 to 6,000.

The fundamental principle behind all of our planning for community improvement is that there will be no program undertaken until the residents of the community have had every opportunity to participate in hearings and discussions, and to make their contributions to the plans for their neighborhoods.

Chicago's housing program for the aged is serving as a model for the Nation. Our senior citizens are being given an opportunity to live in housing they can afford, in their own communities where they will continue to maintain their ties with their relatives, neighbors, and churches. The department of planning is developing the comprehensive general plan.

The position of the city of Chicago today is far different than it was in 1955. Then we were faced with the urgent program maintenance and inadequate revenues. Every property owner, every businessman, knows that if he permits his property or his plant to run down for many years the job of bringing it back is far more costly and difficult than if maintenance and service is kept on a day-by-day basis.

The city now has for most part brought its plant and its services to standards that are able to meet the present day needs of its citizens.

It has been making up this deferred maintenance which has made necessary substantial expenditures and increased taxes.

We are now on the threshold of making progress with much greater speed because we have the tools and the climate in which to do so.

It is to the credit of the members of the city council and the people of Chicago that our city now is considered to have one of the finest administrative governments in the Nation. We can now reevaluate our programs for the future from this new position of strength, rather than of weakness.

It must be understood that urban renewal are words that cover nearly all of the activities of government, for urban renewal is just one way of saying community improvement.

We are now in the position where we can properly reevaluate the rebuilding of our communities taking under specific consideration:

Expanding and improving communication with the public and giving greater participation and a broader comprehension in what local government is doing to improve its neighborhoods, and reappraising what resources we have to finance a community improvement program which means much to all the people of Chicago. The need for reexamination of our program is not because we have not made substantial progress but because we feel that under the new Chicago we can make much greater progress.

A community improvement program must include better schools, libraries, beaches, and playgrounds.

We will continue our policy of noninterference with the board of education, but we will continue to join in every effort of giving all the young people of Chicago the finest educational opportunities.

All of us can take pride that Chicago is one of the few big cities in the nation where not a single student is on a double-shift in the public schools.

In 1965, a new branch of the University of Illinois will give unequaled opportunity to our young people in Chicago and in the surrounding area.

This administration and the people of Chicago will work hand in hand with university officials and the faculty to make this urban university a positive influence in serving the economic, the social, and cultural life of our city.

As mayor, I have felt that one of my great responsibilities was to present a true picture of our city, and to erase the unreal notion that many people had of Chicago and its people. Throughout the past 8 years, Chicago has been visited by the highest representatives of nearly every nation. We have had many events that have drawn worldwide attention to the beauty, the greatness of our city and the warmth and friendliness of our people. Chicago now is a magnet for visitors from all over the world.

Work to completely upgrade the outer drive will begin this year with the construction of the grade separation to eliminate the bottleneck at Oak Street. The entire drive will be repaved. Similar work will start at 57th Street and the outer drive repaved on the south side.

It is not our intention to make it a superhighway. The lakefront drives are a showplace of the world and this administration will keep it that way. It will be my firm policy to reject any attempt to commercialize or to build any structure along the lakefront unless it is directly concerned with public recreation or culture. We will do everything possible to further the enjoyment of this front yard of Chicago for its citizens with more landscaping, gardens, and additional recreational facilities.

In 1955 approximately 22,000 tons were handled at Navy Pier. Last year an alltime high for import-export traffic of general merchandise was established with more than 257,000 tons. Approximately $22 is added to the city's economy from each ton crossing the docks. Thus the $9 million invested in the port improvement is being returned to the economy and will be returned several times over in the future. We will intensify our efforts to promote the Chicago port and expand this trade. At Lake Calumet the city has one of the most modern ports in the world. We know that its full potential has yet to be realized. The completion of the Cal-Sag project in 1965 will have a greater impact to Chicago than the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. We will give all of our support and assistance to the growth of this great harbor.

Our goal is to open the Southwest Expressway in 1964. Studies are being made for a North-South Expressway near Cicero Avenue. In planning for new expressways we must be extremely careful that we do not adversely affect any of our fine neighborhoods. Our transportation program will provide a balanced and coordinated transportation network which includes expressways, major and preferential streets, and mass transportation.

Again, looking into the future, there is a definite need for a cultural center and central sports stadium convenient for all our residents. Studies are underway concerning these proposals.

The objective of our transportation program is not just to move vehicles but to move the greatest number of people safely and conveniently. This of necessity must involve the expansion and improvement of the mass transportation system. The utilization of the median strips in the Northwest Expressway and the Dan Ryan Expressway would provide a direct service to our neighborhoods and relieve congestion from the expressways and arterial streets. It would be a great improvement to tear down the El structure around our Loop and extend the Wells Street Subway.

Extending the State Street Subway south of 19th Street, down Archer Avenue, to connect with the Dan Ryan Expressway would provide mass transportation for many thousands. However, the CTA cannot expand and improve its service from its own revenues. It must have the combined financial assistance of the Federal, State, county, and city governments.

Chicago has less unemployment than most big cities. However, there must be increased emphasis upon expanding job opportunties.

Essential cooperative programs between universities and business have been formulated which will draw the proper attention to Chicago as a research and development center. Positive assistance to business and labor to bring more contracts to Chicago and to make known the industrial capabilities of the many excellent companies and unions in Chicago are being pursued.

In the area of youth welfare, Chicago has made important gains. But we must not be blind to the fact that we still confront serious problems. The problems of the out-of-school, out-of-work youth are serious.

One of the most crucial questions in the coming years will be youth employment opportunities. The greater proportion of the expansion in the labor force in the next 10 years will be in young persons under 24 years of age. More and more of Chicago's youth will be entering the labor force during the next 4 years and job opportunities and proper training must be provided for these youth.

We cannot permit the lack of opportunity to handicap the next generation. In the years ahead, we will carry out a vigorous program consisting of:

1. A maximum effort to attract to Chicago expanding industries.
2. A canvass of every industrial and business complex in Chicago and its environs for full- and part-time work opportunities for youth.
3. We will take advantage of every Federal and State resource for improving the skills of young people in order to make our youth eligible for employment opportunities.
4. We will support and give assistance to every neighborhood-centered program for counseling and helping youth to fit into the world of work.

Closely related to the problem of youth employment is the problem of the school dropout. We support the tremendous effort of the board of education to expand counseling and guidance services, their efforts to develop more vocational education programs geared to the work opportunities in the city of Chicago, the elimination of double-shifts for school children, the expansion and development of the junior college program.

This year, the commission on youth welfare, in cooperation with community groups and committees, is working with the schools to meet with every youth who is considering dropping out of school.

In the general area of youth welfare, we will continue community campaigns to build respect among youth for high standards of law and order, to control the availability of alcohol to youth, to eliminate the environmental hazards to the health and the welfare of children, to expand the child health program and improve the control of the diseases that particularly affect children, to eliminate discrimination, and to equalize opportunity.

These are goals which can be achieved only through a partnership between agencies and organizations of government and local community effort, including churches, schools, youth organizations and civic groups. This partnership is already working, and it will be expanded.

Our administration worked hard to bring about the consolidation of the railway terminals. This improvement, which will put precious land to its best use and provide free circulation to the South Side, must be carried out. We are continuing to meet with the railroad presidents and will intensify our efforts to bring about this civic improvement.

In 1965, the new civic center and courthouse will be ready. It will make a genuine contribution to the better administration of justice, to providing needed space for government office, and will bring to our central area a plaza and a modern building which will add to the attractiveness of that area.

One of the basic problems that faces Chicago and most metropolitan cities is the lack of equitable representation of the urban population in the State legislature. The people of our city, the residents of the entire metropolitan area, must insist that the laws which directly affect them are prepared and deliberated upon by representatives who understand their needs and their problems. It is not a question of political parties. It is basically a question of true representation for the greater majority of the people who live in the State of Illinois.

This does not mean that any one county or any one area should dominate our General Assembly, but it does mean that our urban population should have proper and fair treatment in determining their own destiny.

For all of us who are in city government, my running mates, City Clerk John C. Marcin; City Treasurer William G. Milota; the members of the city council, the heads of departments, city employees in all branches and agencies, this is a night of solemn rededication to the duties we are delegated to perform.

Uppermost in our minds is not the feeling of triumph nor of self-glorification, but rather the sense of gratitude and the devout wish to prove worthy of tremendous responsibility to our beloved Chicago.

I was elected on April 2 as a Democrat. I am proud that I had the support of my party. As in my previous terms as mayor, I will serve all of the people of this city, Republicans, Independents, and Democrats alike. I am especially proud of the strong and indispensable support that was given to me by the many thousands of citizens, responding to nonpartisan appeals, who put progress ahead of partisan considerations. As I have frequently said, I have tried always to conduct my public life in accordance with the principles that good government is good politics, and good politics is good government.

To the members of the city council who have been reelected, I extend my heartiest congratulations and my very deep appreciation of the fine cooperation my administration has had from them. To the newly elected members go equally hearty congratulations. I assure these men that they will have from me every consideration and assistance I can give. I am confident we can all work together, with diligence and with integrity, to make an even greater Chicago.

I would like to express my appreciation to all of the media of communications, the metropolitan press, the community press, the radio, and TV stations, civic organizations, the clergy, labor organizations, all who have a part in shaping public sentiment, all who are truly concerned with promoting the physical, material, social, and spiritual welfare of the millions of people, of every race, creed, and color, who live and work and worship here in harmony.

Always we have to bear in mind that in Chicago, great among the greatest of industrial, commercial, and cultural centers of the world, the greatest resource of all is the people themselves. It is from the people that our proud spirit of "I will" springs. It is with the people that this spirit resides, spurring all of us to greater effort, impelling us to live up to the heritage we have from those who have gone before us.

There is no greater honor to me than to serve the people of Chicago as their mayor. This is the city of my birth, this is the city of my upbringing and all that I am I owe to my mother and father, to my good wife and family, to my teachers and to my good neighbors and friends.

The goal of the metropolis is to offer to its citizens the widest possible variety of choice in all aspects of living and working, providing the greatest variety in choice of jobs, and the maximum variety of educational and cultural opportunities.

It is the destiny of Chicago to be a great metropolis.

With your cooperation and with the cooperation of the people of Chicago, and with God's help, we shall not fail.

TIME FOR MANDATORY SEVERANCE OF AID TO NASSER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that our Nation is commemorating the 20th anniversary of the heroic but ill-fated uprising of the persecuted Jews in the Warsaw ghetto at the very time that a new totalitarian despot, Nasser of the United Arab Republic, is preparing new aggression to wipe out the State of Israel and to annex other territory.

If the observances of the Warsaw ghetto anniversary are to have any real meaning, it is essential that we prevent a repetition of the notorious atrocities of the Nazis. Former Nazis and other German technicians and scientists are now in Egypt aiding the United Arab Republic to perfect the missiles and weapons to destroy those Jews, now resident of Israel, who managed to escape Hitler's holocaust.

The United Arab Republic, in advocating "Arab socialism" is pursuing a policy reminiscent of the "national socialism" of Hitler's Germany. Instead of raising the living standards of the masses through reforms in education, health, housing, and peaceful production of necessary commodities, Nasser is concentrating on building a police state which is preparing for a space age war. Nasser is squandering his own assets to buy Soviet jet bombers and jet fighters as well as military rockets. The Arab peasant remains in the horse age but Nasser dreams of a vast Arab empire ruled by his missile-equipped army, trained by Soviet and ex-Nazi military technicians.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot dictate the internal affairs of the United Arab Republic despite the threat to peace. Nasser has openly announced that his expanded Arab union will "liberate Palestine" through destruction of Israel. His agents and spies are plotting to overthrow pro-Western Jordan and Saudi Arabia. His treasury is paying out millions for Soviet equipment of even more recent design than that supplied Cuba. His shipping, incidentally, trades with Cuba while his press condemns the United States and condones Castro.

No, Mr. Speaker, we cannot dictate the internal affairs of the United Arab Republic even though the conscience of mankind has just been shocked by the employment of former Nazis to perfect missiles to sow mass destruction on Israel.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are things that we can do in the national interest of the United States. There is certainly no logic in the American taxpayer subsidizing, however indirectly, the U.A.R. military missile build up and further acquisition of a dangerous arsenal of Soviet weapons. I do not think that 1 cent should go to defray the Soviet weapons expenditures of a country like the U.A.R. which supports Communist Cuba.

A country which takes upon itself to jeopardize world peace by irresponsible and power-mad proliferation of the rocket race does not deserve our subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, I am preparing therefore legislation which I intend to propose to make mandatory the severance of American assistance to the United Arab Republic in view of its use of its own resources to finance sophisticated Soviet weapons systems, to train its officers and specialists in the Soviet bloc military centers, and to establish a Nazi-staffed missile center in the inflammable Near East.

There has been on the books the stipulation introduced last session by Senator KEATING and myself known by some as the Keating-Halpern amendment to favor, in dispensing our aid, those nations which do not divert their own resources to buy Soviet arms. Those implementing our aid program have ignored this expression of the sense of Congress. The time has come for more forceful action and I call on all my colleagues to join with me in writing language into this year's bill to end our misguided and disastrous subsidy of Mr. Nasser, the Fidel Castro of the Near East.

I would like in this connection to draw attention of the Congress to a pertinent syndicated news column by Milton Friedman, a White House correspondent, whose writings appear in many newspapers. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this point in my remarks to insert the Milton Friedman column:

MILTON FRIEDMAN COLUMN

WASHINGTON.—There are actions the administration could take to give deeper meaning to President Kennedy's proclamation calling for observance on April 21 of the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

Mr. Kennedy noted that the Jewish martyrs lacked military resources but struggled against the overwhelming forces of the Nazi occupiers for more than 3 weeks, thereby providing a chapter in the annals of human heroism.

Today, the scene shifts to Israel. Nasser's goal, annihilation of Israel, is no different from that of SS-General Jurgen Stroop, commander of the Nazi forces assigned to liquidate the Warsaw ghetto.

The survivors of the Nazi holocaust and other Israelis have no desire to die in another fiery and doomed ghetto. They see Egypt being armed and trained by the Soviet Union. Egypt has received Russian offensive weapons more modern than those removed from Cuba at American insistence. Meanwhile, Egypt is developing a new Afrika Corps of West German scientists and technicians, including Nazis, to build missiles and supersonic Messerschmitt jet fighters.

But the fact most difficult to live with is the indirect subsidization by the United States of the Egyptian military buildup. State Department officials still refuse to draw a moral distinction between democratic Israel and totalitarian Egypt and equate the two nations as equally worthy. There are hints that if Israel says too much about Egyptian missiles, some people here might start questioning Israel's development of new weapons.

President Kennedy last year met a situation which then existed. He authorized Israel to purchase Hawk antiaircraft missiles from the United States. Negotiations over purchase terms are just ending. The Hawks are yet to be delivered.

A gap now exists, to Israel's perilous disadvantage. An "escalation" of weapons system has occurred. Nasser no longer has to use bombers to blast Israel. He needs only to push buttons and dispatch salvos of missiles which are unstoppable by Hawks or anything else.

The Egyptian missile does not have to land on top of Tel Aviv's Dan Hotel, Allenby Road will do.

The Hawks will arrive this year to meet last year's situation. Israel once more lags behind.

Nasser has received hundreds of millions of dollars in American loans, grants, and other aid. He uses his own resources, thus freed, to build missiles and pay Nazis. Even funds generated by sale of American surplus food given to Egypt are used partially for military purposes.

The American taxpayer is thus made to help Egypt buy Soviet arms, pay Communists for instructing Egyptian personnel, and compensate Germans, including Nazis, now working in the Egyptian military establishment.

This issue will certainly be raised, by Democrats and Republicans alike, when the aid program comes before Congress this spring.

America is buying Nasser's favor by subsidizing the work in Cairo of former Nazi Storm Troop Col. Ferdinand Brandner who directs one of the new special weapons groups. America also finances, however indirectly, the German unit's medical officer, the notorious Dr. Eisele, who escaped to Egypt from Germany to avoid trial for atrocities he committed as camp doctor at Buchenwald concentration camp.

President Kennedy said the heroic uprising of Warsaw ghetto Jews was "an inspiration to the peace-loving people of the world and a warning to would-be oppressors which will long be remembered."

This proclamation was a kind and sincere statement by the President. But it would achieve functional significance if American policy withheld aid from "would-be oppressors" and otherwise prevented Nasser from becoming another SS Gen. Jurgen Stroop.

A fitting commemoration of the Warsaw ghetto uprising could include a new look by Washington at Egypt, the nation which is arming to wipe out the survivors of Hitler's holocaust.

U.S. POLICY IN CUBA

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a tour of Naval Reserve duty to our naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, our Atlantic Command headquarters at Norfolk, and several other top military bases.

I have come back deeply impressed with the clear and convincing evidence I found that the situation in Cuba is well under control, that our forces are well trained, alert, their morale high, their weapons outstanding, and ready for anything that comes. I found the level of our military intelligence about Cuba still of the highest quality.

After such a visit one realizes that only the sheerest kind of demagog could still maintain that the United States has no Cuban policy.

Of course we have a policy, clear, simple, and precise. It is to proceed, in company with our Latin American allies, to isolate Castro as completely as possible, to keep his Cuba under complete and constant military surveillance, to apply a whole myriad of political and economic pressures to his regime, and to maintain immediately available and in full combat readiness an overwhelming military force capable of completely wiping out his regime in case the Cuban dictator should ever again threaten direct military operations anywhere in the Caribbean. And our basic objective is to remove Soviet troops from Cuba, to eliminate the Castro regime, and to establish a free and independent Cuba.

This is a policy which at the moment involves actions short of war. But it is a policy which also takes into account every possible contingency. No reasonably informed American would expect us to publish those contingency arrangements in the newspapers any more than he would have expected us to broadcast the time and place of the Normandy landings over the radio a week before D-day.

It is not Castro who has us boxed in down there—it is we who have Castro boxed in. And I for one would certainly hate to be in his shoes, and on his side of the Cactus Curtain right now.

We can best understand what is going on in Cuba, I think, by comparing Castro to a fugitive from the police, holed up in a farmhouse with the farmer's wife and youngsters as hostages, and with the police surrounding the house on all sides. The police can wait the fugitive out, they can go in shooting and run the risk of hurting the wife and children, or they can lob tear gas shells at him until the heat and irritation force him out with his hands up.

Nobody in his right mind would criticize the police for momentarily resisting the temptation to shoot and trying the other alternatives first—nobody, that is, except someone who needed to keep his name in the headlines at any cost.

It has been something of a shock to me to come back and find that over the Easter week the same old people are at the same old stand, still peddling the same old campaign of fear, distortion, confusion, and pretense over Cuba. Obviously their information comes straight from the lecture platforms and the Mimeograph machines because it is a cinch it does not come from the foxholes or the command plotting rooms of American fighting men.

As one who is proud to be a naval reservist, I resent these continuing efforts to portray our American military forces as either stupid or liars. If the Member of the other body who claims he knows all about all these Russian troops getting back into Cuba had taken the trouble to visit Cuba instead of trying to run American Cuban policy from the press gallery at the other end of the Capitol, he would never have dared to launch those preposterous charges of a new Cuban buildup. The plain fact of the matter is that shipping into Cuba today is vastly smaller than it was last summer.

So how are these new Russian troops supposed to get into Cuba anyway—by paddling rubber boats all the way down from the North Sea?

Some people, I suppose, will never be happy until we are fighting a full-scale war in the Caribbean. But I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of Americans understand and support our present Cuban policy. If new conditions arise, if new actions become necessary, they know that that decision can only be made by the President of the United States—just as he made it bravely and effectively last October. It assuredly cannot be made on the floor of the U.S. Senate and much less so in its press gallery.

Coming back from Cuba, I find myself a little bored with the antics of old men still desperately trying to stir up wars for young men to fight—all the time piously proclaiming both their opposition to invasion and of course their complete nonpartisanship.

"PACEM IN TERRIS"—POPE JOHN'S ENCYCLICAL ON THE DIGNITY OF MAN

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, when 4½ years ago John XXIII ascended the papal throne, people everywhere sensed, I think, that something remarkable had happened, that a new force for good had come into the world. Here, it seemed, was a man of extraordinary wisdom and humility—a man who, though old in years, was young in his zest for life and in his sympathy for modern humanitarian ideas. Men of good will welcomed Pope John's elevation in 1958. They have not been disappointed since.

With the publication of "Mater et Magistra" in July 1961, it became clear that Pope John's pontificate would mark a turning point, not merely in the history of the Catholic Church, but in the history of all mankind. And now we have "Pacem in Terris"—"Peace on Earth." It is a great and good document. I earnestly hope it will be read and pondered by Catholics and non-Catholics, by Christians and non-Christians.

The whole of "Pacem in Terris" has already been included in the RECORD. It is a wide-ranging document and almost all of it impressed me. But what particularly caught my attention were the Holy Father's references to fundamental human liberties. Perhaps never before has a great Christian leader shown so clearly how the rights of man can be deprived from the religious doctrine of natural law.

> By the natural law every human being has the right to respect for his person, to his good reputation, the right to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating his opinions, and in pursuit of art, within the limits laid down by the moral order and the common good.

The Holy Father added:

> And he has the right to be informed truthfully about public events.

The Holy Father lists other human rights.

> From the dignity of the human person—

He says—

> there also arises the right to carry on economic activities according to the degree of responsibility of which one is capable.

There is also a right to a working wage sufficient to give the worker and his family a standard of living in keeping with the dignity of the human person. In addition, the individual has a right to move freely within his own country and to be immune from all arbitrary attacks.

> Human society—

The Holy Father states—

> is realized in freedom, that is to say, in ways and means in keeping with the dignity of its citizens, who accept the responsibility of their actions, precisely because they are by nature rational beings.

I should like to draw attention to two other points, both of them stressed by his holiness. The first appears in the section of the encyclical headed "Duties." Pope John notes that both rights and duties stem from natural law. He continues:

> Once this is admitted, it is also clear that in human society to one man's right there corresponds a duty in all other persons; namely, of acknowledging and respecting the right in question. For every fundamental human right draws its indestructible moral force from the natural law which, in granting it, imposes a corresponding obligation. Those, therefore, who claim their own rights, yet altogether forget or neglect to carry out their respective duties, are people who build with one hand and destroy with the other.

The lessons to be drawn from those sentences are many, but paramount among them is the absolute necessity of tolerance and restraint in our dealings with those who may differ from us.

The second point also appears under the heading of "Duties," where the holy father refers to human society as "a spiritual reality." He continues:

> Society should enable men to share in and enjoy every legitimate expression of beauty, and encourage them constantly to pass on to others all that is best in themselves, while they strive to make their own the spiritual achievements of others. These are the spiritual values which continually give life and basic orientation to cultural expressions, economic and social institutions, political movements and forms, laws, and all other structures by which society is outwardly established and constantly developed.

Those words should be engraved on the mind and heart of every American.

OCCUPATION OF THE CAMPUS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI AND THE EVENTS RESULTING THEREFROM

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the report of the general legislative investigating committee of the Mississippi State Legislature reporting on "Operation Rapid Road," concerning the alleged protection of civil rights by the Department of Justice in connection with the Oxford, Miss., incident. This report contains such shocking revelations of brutality on the part of the Justice Department agents of Attorney General Robert Kennedy as to shock the sensibilities of any good, patriotic, American citizen. I hope that the Members of this House will take the time to read this report and the press release which accompanies it, so they can learn the facts that have been so carefully censored from the American people by a controlled press.

Mr. Speaker, this report is of such significance and makes such serious charges that it should be followed by an objective investigation by the Congress. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the appropriate committees of this House, and the other body, will make a thorough and complete investigation of these reported outrages and recommend appropriate action to the Congress.

The report and press release to which I refer are as follows:

REPORT OF GENERAL LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE (FIRST SECTION) TO THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI AND THE MEMBERS OF THE MISSISSIPPI STATE LEGISLATURE CONCERNING OCCUPATION OF THE CAMPUS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI AND THE EVENTS RESULTING THEREFROM

"OPERATION RAPID ROAD": THE PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The occupation of the campus of the University of Mississippi on September 30, 1962 (which was officially designated "Operation Rapid Road" by the Federal authorities), was upon direct orders of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, under the personal supervision of Deputy Attorney General Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, assisted by Mr. Ed Guthman, publicity director for the Department of Justice, Chief U.S. Marshal James McShane, Mr. John Doar, Mr. Norbert Schlei, and other members of the staff of the Department of Justice. This line of command was supported by 97 penitentiary guards, 336 border patrolmen, and 123 deputy marshals, all of whom are said to have been deputized for the occasion as deputy marshals. The events which occurred cannot be understood unless the actual conduct of the personnel utilized is considered to comprehend their nature and their complete lack of training and experience. A pattern of treatment of students and other citizens was followed from and including the first firing of gas, through the evening of Sunday, September 30, during the day and evening of Monday, October 1, and subsequent thereto. This pattern is best understood when considered in three categories:

1. The treatment accorded on Monday night and Tuesday to citizens detained in a garage adjoining the soil sedimentation laboratory near the campus used as a detention stockade. Up to 100 people at one time were confined therein. At that time violence had ceased and the entire area was under complete control of the marshals and the military.

2. The treatment accorded students and other citizens after they had been seized on the campus of the University of Mississippi and taken into the lyceum building Sunday night and Monday, where they were confined in a basement 17 feet by 40 feet (at times heavily contaminated with gas) in numbers up to more than 85 at one time.

3. The treatment of students on Monday morning after order had been restored and all violence had ceased, when they were taken into custody on the campus of the university on the way to classrooms, university buildings, or passing through the campus.

The treatment of university officials, campus policemen, highway patrolmen, and students upon the university campus on the evening of Sunday, September 30, and the early morning of Monday, October 1, is discussed in another section of this report. Treatment of citizens in the vicinity of the university on October 2 is also discussed in another section of this report.

In an attempt to give a clear picture of the treatment of students and other citizens by the Department of Justice of the United States and its representatives, the committee will first give the pattern of treatment followed in each of the three categories, followed by some of the individual instances illustrative of such pattern. Space will not permit the recitation of all such incidents. The general nature and type of treatment of those who were seized and taken into custody is supported by the sworn testimony of six or more witnesses. The treatment of individuals while incarcerated in the basement of the lyceum building and in the garage of the Soil Conservation Service and the treatment of individual students and other citizens before they were incarcerated in either of the places of detention are supported by the sworn testimony of two or more witnesses, with the exception of a few instances in which the sworn testimony of only one witness was available. General reference to marshals includes penitentiary guards and border patrolmen acting as deputy marshals.

1. Treatment of students and other citizens in the soil sedimentation garage Monday night and Tuesday, after the entire area was under control of the marshals and the military and all disturbances had ceased

Order was restored on the campus before 7 a.m., Monday, October 1. After 5:30 p.m.

on Monday the Justice Department set up a stockade or place of imprisonment in a garage adjacent to the soil sedimentation laboratory. The garage had a concrete floor, one end was open to the weather. It was not equipped with lights. Marshals were placed in charge of this place of detention and Chief Marshal McShane visited this spot several times. To this place of imprisonment there were taken between 100 and 150 persons. Some were transferred to this garage from the basement of the lyceum building, being told by the marshals they were to be taken to where bunks and food would be provided. Others were brought there after being seized on Monday or Tuesday by either marshals or members of the military forces. All disturbances had ceased before any persons were imprisoned in this garage. The persons seized varied in age from 14 or 15 years old to more than 60 years of age.

Some had been badly beaten, others were ill. All persons, regardless of age or physical condition, were forced to sit on the concrete slab for periods up to 20 hours, with their knees drawn up toward their chins, their hands clasped around their knees, their eyes to the front, without turning their heads or speaking to anyone. This was planned and executed as physical torture.

During the night of Monday, October 1, the marshals on duty changed shifts every 2 hours. During the entire night the marshals walked up and down between the rows of prisoners in pairs throwing flashlight beams upon them to prevent them from going to sleep or obtaining any rest. When a prisoner moved his head from a direct front angle or spoke to any other person and was observed by a marshal, he was either clubbed or kicked by the marshals.

If a captive fell asleep or became cramped and moved his hands from around his knees, or changed the position of his legs as he was seated upon the torture slab, and was seen by the marshals, he was struck with a club or kicked, and threatened with further beatings.

Some prisoners who fell asleep or changed positions were forced to place their hands above their heads, leaning tiptoe with their faces to the wall; then they were beaten, jabbed in the back, and their feet kicked out from under them. Others were jabbed in the kidney or the groin with the marshals' clubs.

Several young boys between 12 and 15 years of age, some older men, and members of a wedding party dressed in wedding attire, as well as disabled veterans of World War II, were thus treated.

Medicine required by one or more captives was confiscated. A disabled veteran begged the marshals for his medicine (required to prevent jerking and blackout spells) and they refused to give it to him. When he suffered from one such spell for lack of medicine, he was clubbed and manhandled.

Persons thus incarcerated, who appeared before this committee, were denied the right to make any telephone call or contact any person and were given no food until they were interrogated by FBI agents, between 2 and 5 o'clock Tuesday afternoon.

A few of the individual instances of mistreatment by the marshals in the garage are as follows:

(a) An 18-year-old boy went to sleep. A marshal pulled him up, hit him on the forehead with a club, two other marshals joined them, pushed the boy against the wall, struck him in the throat and jabbed him in the groin with clubs.

(b) A captive's hands became cramped and one of his hands dropped off his knees. One marshal hit him across the back with a club and another jabbed him in the kidney.

(c) A young boy went to sleep. He was first beaten on the floor by the marshals, then they stood him up against the wall and beat him some more, and when his father protested, he was also beaten.

(d) A sophomore, after having been held in the lyceum building all night, had been beaten about the body and beaten so badly on the head that 16 stitches were taken in the wound. After being released, he was again seized and taken to the garage. When, through loss of blood and exhaustion, he was unable to maintain the required position on the torture slab, he was twice clubbed on the back by the marshals.

(e) One prisoner who was ill begged for his medicine and was refused, and he passed out twice and each time the marshals kicked him in the mouth and forced him to sit back in the required position.

(f) A disabled veteran had a pin in his knee so that he could not bend it up under his chin. The marshals changed shifts every 2 hours. Several times he was clubbed on this leg by marshals when they saw it extended in the row.

(g) Several prisoners who failed to maintain the prescribed position on the torture slab were forced to stand with their faces to the walls, hands above their heads, on their toes, and the marshals kicked their feet from under them so they fell on their faces on the concrete.

2. Treatment by marshals of students and other citizens in the lyceum basement on Sunday night and Monday

During the night of September 30 and the day of October 1, students and other persons seized were taken to the basement of the lyceum building on the campus of the university. At one time between 100 and 150 captives were crowded into this room 17 by 40 feet in size. The marshals wore gas masks but none were given to the captives, who suffered severely from the presence of tear gas during a large portion of the time they were held in this basement. Prisoners were held in this basement up to as much as 18 hours, through the night of the 30th and the day of October 1, and some were then transferred to the soil sedimentation garage and handled there as outlined elsewhere in this report.

Prisoners, who were bleeding after having been badly beaten and in need of medical treatment, were held for as much as 6 hours without being given any medical attention. Requests to use the telephone, to be permitted to go to the toilet, or to call a lawyer, were frequently met with either being knocked to the floor with fists or hit with billies. Later captives were permitted to go to the toilet and upon demand of the university authorities, to use the telephone. While some of the prisoners were permitted to sleep sitting on the floor, others were kicked by the marshals when they went to sleep. Some of the students taken to the lyceum basement were forced to stand on tiptoe leaning against the wall with their backs to the marshals, and then were either jabbed in the back or their legs were kicked out from under them after having been struck on the legs with clubs. A number of students, as they were taken down to the lyceum basement, were either hit on the shins or back with the butts of the marshals' sidearms and with their clubs. Students were spit upon and repeatedly cursed by the marshals. From time to time at the end of the hall leading to the basement the students were struck severely on the shins, jabbed or hit on the back with night sticks or kicked on the legs.

A few of the instances of mistreatment by marshals in the lyceum basement are as follows:

(a) A university freshman, after being clubbed across the back of the neck with a billy, was kicked a number of times by the marshals.

(b) One of the prisoners found a spot where he could lie down and sleep in the crowded basement, and he was kicked in the stomach by a marshal.

(c) A boy who had been badly beaten about the head and was bleeding from the head asked for water and when he went to the water fountain and bent over to drink, the marshals grabbed him by the hair and shoved his head in the fountain, although he was bleeding from the head at the time.

(d) A student approached a marshal and asked to be permitted to call a lawyer and the marshal slugged him in the face with his fist and knocked him to his knees.

(e) A student asked a marshal to be permitted to use the telephone, and he was hit by the marshal with a club and knocked to the floor.

(f) One of the students went to a marshal at the door of the basement and while he was talking to him, another marshal came up and they both grabbed the student and beat him with their fists.

(g) While a freshman was standing in the hall of the lyceum building in custody, a marshal walked by and told him he did not like the way he was holding his feet, and when he did not move quickly enough, the marshal cursed him, struck him a severe blow with his club across the knee knocking him to the floor.

(h) A boy who had been shot in the face with a tear gas bomb, resulting in both eyes being badly swollen and bleeding, who also had been beaten, repeatedly asked for a doctor and was refused medical attention for a number of hours.

(i) A student who was placed in a bus called to some friends to ask them to get him help. Two marshals struck him on the arm with their clubs, and later when he asked to be permitted to make a telephone call, he was again hit by a marshal with a club.

3. Treatment of students on the campus Monday morning

On Monday morning, after order had been restored on the campus and in its vicinity, the campus remained in full control of the marshals. Members of the military forces participated with the marshals in seizing students and other citizens. The pattern of treatment included forcing students going from their dormitories to classes to lie spread eagle on the ground with faces in the dirt while they were searched at gunpoint.

Students passing along the campus to go to classes were treated as the junior going to his thermodynamics class in the engineering building who made a remark to several deputy marshals concerning the mess the campus was in. He was seized by two marshals, his arms were twisted behind his back, he was hit in the back with a billy, cursed, taken to the lyceum basement and, as he walked toward the basement, a marshal on each side kicked him in the shins. A billy was forced between his legs and he was struck on the testicles.

Students were beaten or jabbed with night sticks or billies. Students who were seized on Monday, after being taken to the lyceum building, were forced to lean forward against the wall with their hands over their heads on the wall and then their feet kicked out from under them. They were hit with clubs on their shins and ankle bones.

Students from other schools were found asleep on the campus in the early morning, were hit on their legs, backs or heads with billies. One was awakened, forced to stand with his legs spread apart, clubbed on both the inside and outside of his legs, and struck in his crotch and in his groin.

The above general patterns of conduct occurred after the penitentiary guards, border patrolmen and marshals had taken students and other citizens into custody, or after all disturbance had been quieted on the campus of the University of Mississippi.

Mississippi General Legislative Investigating Committee,
Representative Russell L. Fox,
Chairman.
Senator George M. Yarbrough,
Vice Chairman.
Senator Frank D. Barber,
Secretary.
Representative W. L. Sims.
Representative Walter M. Hester.
Senator Dennis M. Baker.

Committee Release

"Deliberate and repeated brutalities, carried out systematically by U.S. marshals for a period of more than 20 hours at a detention stockade set up in a garage by the Justice Department at a remote spot off the campus of the University of Mississippi, have been revealed by the testimony of many of the more than 90 witnesses heard by the committee," said Chairman Russell Fox in a statement released today when he filed the first section of the general legislative investigating committee's report of its investigation of the occupation of the campus of the University of Mississippi last September 30. Chairman Fox also charged that the prison guards, border patrolmen and others used as deputy marshals deliberately gassed eight dormitories on the university campus on the night of September 30, forcing the students out upon the campus where they were gassed promiscuously by roaming bands of marshals and many were seized, incarcerated in the lyceum building basement and there hit with clubs, beaten with fists, kicked and spit upon by the marshals.

"The Department of Justice successfully concealed the actions of its marshals from the press and other news media by its management of news at the university. It took weeks of investigation for the committee to learn the facts concerning the brutalities at the garage detention stockade," said Mr. Fox.

SYSTEMATIC PATTERN OF BRUTALITY

The section of the report which was finalized and filed today dealt with the brutalities of the 97 penitentiary guards, 336 border patrolmen, and 123 marshals who were deputized and used as marshals by the Justice Department at the University of Mississippi. Mr. Fox stated that, in view of his announcement last week that the committee expected to file its report within 10 days, it is filing and releasing the portion which has been finalized and expects to complete and release the full report within approximately a week.

The committee announced that it ascertained from sworn testimony that late Monday afternoon, October 1, many hours after all violence in the university and Oxford area had ceased, nearly 100 persons, varying in age from 12 years to more than 60 years, were taken to a garage near a soil sedimentation laboratory by the Justice Department marshals. The garage was used as a detention stockade and was in charge of the marshals. Chief Marshal McShane visited it several times. Some of the prisoners had been badly beaten, others were ill. Regardless of age or physical condition, the prisoners were forced to sit on the concrete slab of the garage all night and for periods up to 20 hours, with their knees drawn up to their chins, with their hands clasped around their knees, their eyes to the front, without turning their heads or speaking. During the entire night the marshals worked in two-hour shifts walking up and down between the rows of prisoners, throwing flashlight beams upon them to prevent them from going to sleep or obtaining any rest. A systematic pattern was followed. When a prisoner moved his head from a direct front angle, fell asleep or spoke to any other person and was observed by the marshals, he was either beaten or kicked by the marshals. Some were jabbed in the kidney or the groin with the marshals' clubs. Many were imprisoned on this concrete slab without food and without sleep for more than 20 hours.

INDIVIDUAL BRUTALITIES AT THE GARAGE DETENTION STOCKADE

Some of the individual instances of mistreatment by the marshals in the detention stockade at the garage were:

An 18-year-old boy went to sleep. A marshal pulled him up, hit him on the forehead with a club, two other marshals joined them, pushed the boy against the wall, struck him in the throat and jabbed him in the groin with clubs.

A captive's hands became cramped and one of his hands dropped off his knees. One marshal hit him across the back with a club and another jabbed him in the kidney.

Medicine required by one captive was confiscated. A disabled veteran begged the marshals for his medicine (required to prevent jerking and blackout spells) and they refused to give it to him. When he suffered from one such spell for lack of medicine, he was manhandled and clubbed.

A young boy went to sleep. He was first beaten on the floor by the marshals, then they stood him up against the wall and beat him some more, and when his father protested, he was also beaten.

A sophomore, after having been held in the lyceum building all night, had been beaten about the body and beaten so badly on the head that 16 stitches were taken in the wound. After being released, he was again seized and taken to the garage. When, through loss of blood and exhaustion, he was unable to maintain the required position on the torture slab, he was twice clubbed on the back by the marshals.

One prisoner who was ill begged for his medicine and was refused, and he passed out twice and each time the marshals kicked him in the mouth and forced him to sit back in the required position.

A disabled veteran had a pin in his knee so that he could not bend it up under his chin. The marshals changed shifts every 2 hours. Several times he was beaten on this leg by marshals when they saw it extended in the row.

DORMITORIES GASSED

Mr. Fox stated that the remainder of the report being finalized will be filed within a week and that it will reveal that dormitories to which students had withdrawn when the violence erupted in the early evening of Sunday, September 30, were deliberately gassed by the penitentiary guards, border patrolmen and other deputy marshals. He stated that the report will reveal that "this deliberate gassing of the dormitories forced the students out upon the campus, where they were mistreated as will be detailed in the final report. The dormitories which were gassed by the marshals included Faulkner Hall, Garland Hall, DuPree Hall, Barr Hall, Howry Hall, LaBauve Hall, and Odom Hall. The pattern of gassing the dormitories was observed by the university police, dormitory managers, Lt. Gov. Paul Johnson and many others who have testified under oath before the committee. Canisters of tear gas were thrown by the marshals into several dormitories and they heavily gassed other dormitories by throwing gas canisters and shooting gas projectiles into the quadrangles formed by the halls so that the dormitories would be filled with gas."

Mr. Fox further stated that "disorganized groups of deputy marshals roamed the campus in groups of from 8 to 15, shooting gas projectiles and throwing gas canisters promiscuously at students, members of the university staff, including Dean L. L. Love, university police, and highway patrolmen upon sight, without regard to their location or actions."

TREATMENT OF STUDENTS AND OTHER CITIZENS IN THE LYCEUM BUILDING BASEMENT

The committee found that a pattern of brutalities was also followed by the Justice Department in its treatment of students and others who were seized and imprisoned in the basement of the lyceum building on the campus Sunday night and during the day Monday; that at one time there were between 100 and 150 persons crowded into this room, which was 17 by 40 feet, and during a part of the time the room was badly contaminated with gas, the marshals wearing gas masks, but the students were held for hours in this gas-contaminated basement without masks. The report stated that "prisoners were held in this basement up to as much as 18 hours, through the night of the 30th and the day of October 1, and some were then transferred to the soil sedimentation garage and handled there as outlined elsewhere in this report. Prisoners who were bleeding after having been badly beaten and in need of medical treatment asked repeatedly for a doctor, but were held for as much as 6 hours without being given any medical attention. Requests to use the telephone, to be permitted to go to the toilet, or to call a lawyer, were frequently met with either being knocked to the floor with fists or hit with billies. Later captives were permitted to go to the toilet and, upon demand of the university authorities, to use the telephone. While some of the prisoners were permitted to sleep sitting on the floor, others were kicked by the marshals when they went to sleep. Some of the students taken to the lyceum basement were forced to tiptoe leaning forward against the wall with their backs to the marshals, and then were either beaten on their backs, or their legs were kicked out from under them after having been struck on the legs with clubs. A number of students, as they were taken down to the lyceum basement, were hit on the shins with the butts of the marshals' sidearms or jabbed in the back with their clubs. Students were spit upon and repeatedly cursed by the marshals. From time to time at the end of the hall leading to the basement the students were struck severely on the shins, jabbed, or hit on the back with night sticks or kicked on the legs."

TREATMENT OF STUDENTS ON THE CAMPUS MONDAY MORNING AFTER ORDER WAS RESTORED

Mr. Fox stated that the sworn testimony revealed "after students going from their dormitories to classes had been searched in plain view of a military group, they would then be forced by such group to lie spread eagle on the ground with faces in the dirt while they were again searched at gunpoint."

The committee findings concerning the treatment of students on Monday included:

"Students passing along the campus to go to classes were treated as the junior going to his thermodynamics class in the engineering building who made a remark to several deputy marshals concerning the mess the campus was in. He was seized by two marshals, his arms were twisted behind his back, he was hit in the back with a billy, cursed, taken to the lyceum basement and, as he walked toward the basement, a marshal on each side kicked him in the shins. A billy was forced between his legs and he was struck on the testicles.

"Students were beaten or jabbed with night sticks or billies. Students who were seized, after being taken to the lyceum building, were forced to lean forward against the wall with their hands over their heads on the wall and then their feet kicked out from under them. They were beaten with clubs on their shins and ankle bones.

"Students from other schools were found asleep on the campus in the early morning, were hit on their legs, backs or heads with billies. One was awakened, forced to stand with his legs apart, beaten on both the inside and outside of his legs, and struck in his crotch and his groin.

"The above general patterns of conduct occurred after all disturbance had been quieted on the campus of the University of Mississippi."

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN THE UNIONS: AN EXCHANGE BETWEEN THE ILGWU AND THE NAACP

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, early this Congress, January 31, I made a speech on the floor of the House—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 31, 1963, pages 1569-1572—in conjunction with a number of speeches given that day on the subject of civil rights. In this speech I called attention to the difficulties that Negroes were experiencing in getting jobs. Our incidence of unemployment is highest among the young workers and among the country's Negro minority; where these two factors meet—the young Negro workers just entering the labor market—we find our severest unemployment problem.

As part of that speech I included a statement which had been presented by Mr. Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, to the House Education and Labor Committee on the subject of racial discrimination in the labor unions of this country. I also included a letter which I had written Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz forwarding a copy of Mr. Hill's testimony to him, asking him what action would be taken by the Department on this subject.

Thus the question has been referred to the two proper governmental bodies—the Department of Labor and the Education and Labor Committee—to be followed up, and both have failed to do so. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offer a second way to get into the details of this matter, a poor second I might say to the investigative process of either the Department or the committee, but in the face of the inactivity of these more adequate forums I am using the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to try to get the facts of this matter before the Congress and the people of this country.

Apparently the Democratic Party leaders are backing off from looking into this. The leaders of organized labor are, in many cases, also the political leaders of the Democratic Party. Racial discrimination in our unions, led by those who have so large a part in guiding the destiny of the Democratic Party, is an important factor in the problem which I cited earlier—the extremely high rate of unemployment among young Negro workers. It is incongruous that the Negro voter will stand with a party led by those who, in their capacity as union leaders, have done so much to stand in the way of Negroes obtaining quality employment.

The testimony which Mr. Hill gave centered largely around the discrimination of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union against Negroes and Puerto Ricans. The ILGWU issued a statement in reply to Mr. Hill and Mr. Hill, in turn, has written an article responding to the ILGWU statement. I am placing both of these, although they are quite lengthy, in the RECORD. Unfortunately, this seems to be the only way in which we can carry this debate forward, and I believe it is a matter which we must look into.

I have assured the representatives of the ILGWU union that I will place any further response they care to make in the RECORD if that is their request.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE ILGWU

(This brief statement has been prepared for two reasons and in response to many requests: (1) To set it clear that the ILGWU has no quarrel with the NAACP or any other civil rights organization on the principles of equal opportunity; and (2) to make a factual examination of the charges raised publicly by Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the NAACP, about the ILGWU.)

On August 17, 1962, the labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Herbert Hill, began to read testimony to the subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee investigating the extent of discrimination, exploitation, and corruption in the garment industry and the union. Hill never had a chance to finish his statement. Committee members objected to its inclusion in the record because it was not factual testimony but "opinions, conclusions, and characterizations" (New York Times, August 19, 1962).

Unable to have his testimony accepted by the committee (to which he was a special consultant) as submitted, Hill used the facilities of the NAACP to circulate the statement widely. The same piece appeared as an article in New Politics, volume 1, No. 4.

When David Dubinsky, president of the ILGWU, appeared before the committee to refute charges, he was repeatedly told that the committee would not entertain replies to Hill since the Hill statement was not part of the record.

On October 8, Hill's testimony became the basis for a resolution passed by the NAACP board of directors demanding further congressional investigation of the ILGWU. The resolution stated that "the union leaders have as yet made no adequate answer to charges."

Since the Hill testimony is the basis for a widening rift between the NAACP and the progressive labor movement, it may be worth while to see how much truth there is in this basic body of charges.

Hill charge: "As a matter of practice and policy, Negroes and Puerto Ricans are barred from membership in these locals: Local 10, Cutters, Local 60, Pressers, and the Pressers Branch Local 89."

The truth: In local 10, there are 199 known Negro and Spanish-speaking members (the ILGWU has many Cubans, Panamanians, Colombians, Dominicans, Salvadorians, Mexicans, etc., as well as Puerto Ricans) as of the summer of 1962. There are probably more. An exact count is difficult since the union does not tag its membership by racial categories. The 199 names were found in a shop count. (The count rose to 239 by November 1962.)

The 200 or more Negroes and Spanish-speaking members of Cutters' Local 10 is an impressive demonstration of integration, since in this trade where there is very little turnover of employment, the total number of jobs covered by local 10 has fallen in the last decade. Despite a diminishing number of available jobs, there are at least 200 Negroes and Spanish-speaking members in the cutters' union.

Hill charge: "Local 60 has an all-white membership."

The truth: One out of every five pressers (a skilled craft) in local 60 is either Negro or Spanish-speaking, mainly Puerto Rican. The total is well over 300. This, too, was accomplished in the face of diminishing jobs for pressers in the New York market.

Hill charge: "Locals 10, 60, and 89 are lily white."

The truth: The charge is pure fabrication, as we have seen, in the case of locals 10 and 60. The charge is comical in the case of local 89. This local was created at a time when dressmakers' local 22 conducted its meeting in Yiddish, because the members could not speak English. The newcomer Italians did not understand Yiddish, so they set up a parallel local to conduct the union's business in Italian. Local 89 still does so, with the result that it is not lily white, but pure Italian, barring Negroes, Jews, Puerto Ricans and all non-Italians from membership. To put Negro pressers in local 89, as Hill seems to suggest, would be to disfranchise them completely from union participation unless they were Italian-speaking Negroes.

Negro dress pressers (who work in the same shops as Italian local 89 dress pressers under the same contract with the same wage rates) are members of local 60—where the business is conducted in English, a language more convenient for most of the Negro pressers.

Hill charge: "Negro and Puerto Rican workers (in the New York dress joint board) are limited to membership in local 22 and in the unit known as 60A which is the Jim Crow auxiliary of local 60."

The truth: The locals of the dress joint board are 10, 22, 60, and 89. There are Negro and Puerto Rican members in every single one of these locals except 89, the Italian affiliate of the joint board. Local 60A is not "Jim Crow," it contains all races, religions, etc. It is composed of dress shipping clerks no matter what their race, creed or color. It is a craft affiliate of local 60 and not a racial grouping. Most of its members are Negro or Puerto Rican, but to call it a Jim Crow local for that reason would be the same as calling the Sleeping Car Porters' Union a Jim Crow union because all or most of its members are Negro.

Hill charge: "To anyone acquainted with the realities of the union's operations, the reason for denying a separate local union charter to 60A is that, given the ethnic composition of the membership, there would inevitably be a Negro or Puerto Rican local union manager."

The truth: In the ILGWU, around the country, shipping clerks do not have separate locals, whether they are white, Negro, gentile, Jewish or Mexican. Generally, ILGWU locals are industrial, not craft. The cutter and presser locals in New York and a few other areas is a historic fact that does not apply to parts of the country or even to the trades in New York that have been more recently organized.

More important: A majority of the combined members of local 60 and local 60A are Negro and Puerto Rican. Each member has an equal vote—whether in 60 or 60A. If the present manager is not a Negro or Puerto Rican, it merely indicates that the members of this union prefer not to cast a racial vote.

Hill's suggestion that a separate local of shipping clerks would elect a Negro manager is both inaccurate and vicious. It is inaccurate because local 60A is "mixed" with no one ethnic group—Negro, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Irish, Jewish, or Italian in a simple majority. What is more, if a predominantly gentile labor movement could elect a Jew, Samuel Gompers, as its president for more than three decades; and if a Protestant United States could elect a Catholic as President; and if the NAACP could choose a white Jew as its Labor Secretary, there is no reason to believe that the members of local 60A would elect a manager on a racist rather than unionist basis. The proposal is socially vicious because to create a separate local 60A just to guarantee the election of a Negro or Puerto Rican manager is to create a Jim Crow local—separate but equal. ILGWU members prefer integration: craft and color.

Hill charge: "These workers (members of local 60A) earn in the vicinity of $50 a week."

The truth: This may have been true before local 60A organized the shipping clerks into a union. A study of 536 shops, employing 1,220 members of 60A, shows: 3 percent earn from $46 to $49 a week; 13 percent earn from $50 to $60 a week; 21 percent earn from $60 to $70 a week; 22 percent earn from $70 to $80 a week; 17 percent earn from $80 to $90 a week; 9½ percent earn from $90 to $100 a week; 14½ percent earn more than $100 a week.

This means that about two-thirds (63 percent) earned from $70 a week up to more than $100. The truth is that the shipping clerks owe a vote of thanks to the pressers local, whose relatively stable membership, whose high dues rate (more than twice that of the shipping clerks), and experienced staff made these gains possible. Standing by itself, the clerks would have great difficulties primarily because of the very high turnover of workers in their craft. The clerks enjoy all benefits of being united in industrial union fashion with a more highly skilled craft. No student of labor relations has to be told why—and to destroy these advantages to create a Jim Crow local is bad economics and worse intergroup relations.

Hill charge: "Over a number of years, Negroes, who are members of other locals of the ILGWU, have attempted to secure membership in local 10 but are almost without exception denied membership."

The truth: Among the more than 200 members of Negro and Spanish-speaking origin (including Puerto Ricans) there are members of local 10 who were transferred from locals 23, 66, 91, 105, and even 60A.

Hill charge: "It is quite possible that for public relations purposes the ILGWU will produce one or two Negroes or Puerto Ricans who claim to be members of locals 10 and 60."

The truth: The actual count in locals 10 and 60 of members from these ethnic groups is well over 500. They do not claim to be members; they are. They have been for years.

On a November 9 broadcast, Hill stated, "There are in the vicinity of 50 [Negro] cutters of local 10 in the city."

Here it is clear that when Hill said "one or two," he had no regard for the truth. Now when he says 50 he still has no regard for the truth. This is the old McCarthy numbers game: a couple of thousand Communists in the State Department; a couple of hundred Communists in the State Department, may be a couple in the State Department.

Hill charge: Local 10 had been found guilty of excluding Ernest Holmes from membership because he was a Negro.

The truth: On November 4, 1962, WNBC-TV broadcast the following:

"On September 9, 1962, in the second half of a broadcast of 'Our Protestant Heritage,' over this station, a guest, Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, made certain spontaneous and unrehearsed remarks concerning the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and two of its leaders.

"Mr. Hill stated that, in the Ernest Holmes case, local 10 of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union had been found guilty of discrimination by the State commission for human rights.

"The fact is that this case is still being investigated by the commission and no final determination of guilt has been made."

The full story will be available when the investigation is completed.

Hill charge: "To prevent the admission of nonwhite persons into that local union [local 10], the leadership exerts rigid control of admission into various training programs including the referral of young persons to the Fashion Institute of Technology High School."

The truth: Local 10, of course, does not prevent the admission of Negroes and Puerto Ricans. They are members of local 10.

The Fashion Institute of Technology High School is nonexistent. There are two separate schools of major importance to the needle trades in New York where the trade is taught. The first is the High School of Fashion Industries, run by the New York Board of Education. The other is the Fashion Institute of Technology, a 2-year college-level school, licensed by the State of New York. Despite the fact that these two schools are the great training ground for the industry since 1933, Hill has done so little research into the way people are trained and placed in the New York garment trades that he does not even know the names of these schools.

Neither local 10 nor any other union controls admissions, formally or informally, to the High School of Fashion Industries or to the Fashion Institute of Technology. Any grammar school graduate who wishes to may enroll in the high school. If that high school discriminates against any student, then the NAACP ought to denounce the New York Board of Education. The truth of the matter is that in the High School of Fashion Industries, the student body is presently about 40 percent Puerto Rican and about 30 percent Negro. The school graduates cutters as well as operators and has for years been successfully placing its graduates.

Hill charge: "The ILGWU continues to operate the union in the interests of a small and declining number of white garment workers with high seniority."

The truth: In the New York metropolitan area as in almost 95 percent of the ILGWU shops, there is no seniority clause in contracts. The ILGWU contracts call for equal division of work when there is not enough to go around.

The terrible irony is that the ILGWU is one of the few, perhaps the only major union, calling for equal division of work. In the ILGWU, the Negro or Puerto Rican in New York, or Mexican in the Southwest, or Japanese on the west coast is not the last hired and the first fired. Once a member of the union, any worker—regardless of origin—shares the work equally. No union in America—or anywhere in the world—has a greater job security clause for newcomers to the trade and union.

Hill charge: "A shortage of skilled sewing machine operators is developing [in New York]. The leadership of the skilled craft locals of the ILGWU must bear a share of the responsibility."

The truth: There is a shortage of skilled sewing machine operators. Nobody knows this better than the ILGWU. Some employers have either closed shop in New York or threatened to fold up for lack of skilled operators. Hill's charge implies that the ILGWU prejudice is so deep that rather than teach Negroes and Puerto Ricans these advanced skills, the union would prefer to lose the industry and lose its strength at its prime center in New York.

The truth is that as far back as 1938, the ILGWU worked with Max Meyer to set up the Central Needle Trades High School (now the High School of Fashion Industries) to train skilled workers. The school is a huge establishment, advertising its existence in subway car cards pleading for increased enrollment. Its student body numbers about 2,000. Its ethnic composition: 40 percent Puerto Rican and 30 percent Negro.

In addition: The high school runs evening sessions. Here there is open enrollment for any worker in the trade to learn any skill; operator, cutter, patternmaker. Last year, more than 700 ILGWU members attended. Ninety percent were either Negro or Puerto Rican.

In addition, to encourage ILGWU members to upgrade skills, New York locals run special union-sponsored classes—advertised by and recruited by the locals. The high school teaches the class on its premises. Five hundred and thirty-two ILGWU members attended last year. Ninety percent were Negro or Puerto Rican. These classes have been run for years.

(For any reader who may doubt that Hill could so have perverted the truth, I propose that you get the facts by writing either to Michael Katzoff, principal, or Theresa Fanelli, teacher in charge of the evening session, at the High School of Fashion Industries, 225 West 24th Street, New York 11, N.Y. Or better yet, organize a committee and go and look.)

Hill charge: The two Puerto Rican locals are denied Puerto Rican leadership.

The truth: The entire leadership of the Puerto Rican locals—director of organization, business agents, organizers, local presidents, and executive board members—are Puerto Rican. The sole exception: Jerry Schoen, a stateside man with many years of experience who serves as manager. (Schoen was appointed only after Alberto Sanchez, Puerto Rican director of organization, turned down the job as manager to stay with organizing.)

Perhaps more pertinent for those who prefer the "colorblind" approach to this problem is the letter submitted by Hipolito Marcano, president of the Puerto Rican Federation of Labor, to the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, on this matter:

"The workers in Puerto Rico never look at the national origin, color, race, religion, or political ideas of their leaders with the only exception of Communist affiliation which is barred by our State federation constitution. A labor leader's worth cannot be measured by his religious beliefs, his origin, or color of his skin but by his service, dedication, and devotion to the cause of the working people whom he represents. We learned that lesson at the turn of the past century, when our labor movement was founded—not by a Puerto Rican—but by a native-born Spaniard, Mr. Santiago Iglesias.

"The workers in the garment industry in Puerto Rico were earning 2 cents an hour in 1940, when President Dubinsky and other 'continentals' representing labor, were appointed as part of the first wage and hour committee to investigate this industry. Today those workers average over $1 an hour and their wages are constantly increasing in addition to very reasonable fringe benefits. A great change has taken place and is going on. Organized labor has done a substantial part to win that battle for the enrichment of our life as a free and democratic community. We don't care about the color, origin, or religion of the leaders who have done that task of constructive leadership.

The credit goes to the union and in this particular industry the credit goes to the ILGWU for a job well done and for which we are grateful."

Hill charge: In the locals where there is a major concentration of nonwhite workers, the so-called minimum wages are in fact the maximum wages.

The truth: ILGWU members, with rare exception, work on a piecework system. This means that a rate is set for a given operation and workers are paid for what they produce. The minimum is set so that the slowest worker will, on the set rate, make the minimum; the faster worker makes proportionately more—some twice as much or more. The average wage and the maximum wage in an ILGWU shop on piece work are never the minimum or even near the minimum.

In addition, ILGWU contracts provide for supplementary benefits—medical care, hospitalization, optical care, vacations with pay, holidays with pay, death benefits, retirement benefits, severance payment, etc.—that automatically add 10, 15, or 20 percent to the money wage. This does not exist in similar ways in nonunion shops.

ILGWU contracts provide that the union minimum shall not only be above the Federal minimum but shall automatically rise whenever the legal minimum rises.

ILGWU policy is to set union wages as high as possible without jeopardizing the jobs of unionized shops that must meet nonunionized competition in one of the most fiercely competitive industries in America. To pave the way for higher union wages, the ILGWU has successfully spearheaded repeated campaigns to raise the Federal legal minimum. For an account of the pioneer role of the needle and textile unions in the fight for an improved Federal minimum, see "A Legislative Campaign for a Federal Minimum Wage—1955," by Gus Tyler, published by the Eagleton Foundation, Rutgers University, New Jersey. Also see Dissent, summer 1961, "Marginal Industries; Low Wages, High Risks," by Gus Tyler.

Hill charge: "I cite the Fine Art Pillow & Specialties Co. of 37 West 26th Street in Manhattan as a typical example of conditions. * * * Here, virtually all nonwhite workers, male and female, who are union members are paid $1.15, $1.20 or $1.25 an hour."

The truth: According to a payroll check, 54 of the 104 employees are paid more than $1.25 an hour. These are overwhelmingly Negro and Puerto Rican. Of the top 10 earners—from $1.53 an hour to $3.23 an hour—7 are Negro or Puerto Rican.

The further truth is that Fine Art Pillow is about as typical of ILGWU conditions as Mississippi is typical of America. This is a rubber and plastic shop in a trade where union jurisdiction is contested by dozens of legitimate unions plus dozens of racket unions. Of the thousands of ILGWU shops in New York, Hill chose this one for an on-the-spot check. And, even then, Hill got the facts all wrong.

Hill charge: There is "systematic exclusion of Negro and Puerto Rican members from effective participation in the leadership and policymaking procedures of the union." Hill refers specifically to the fact that the ILGWU constitution sets up rules on caucuses and qualifications for holding top offices in the international union.

The truth: The caucus clause dates back to the 1920's, when the ILGWU was in a battle with the "standing" caucuses of the Communist Party. Whatever the merits of the clause—a good subject for a full set of articles—it certainly is no bar to Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Cubans, Portugese, French and other minorities running for and winning office in the union. Dozens out of these background presently hold both appointed and elected office. If this "clause" is a sign of the "Decay of a Labor Union," then the ILGWU has been decaying ever since it beat the Communists several decades ago and increased its membership tenfold.

Other qualifications provide that to run for president a member must be elected as delegate to the ILGWU convention. Hardly a disqualification. If a member cannot be elected by his own local, he is hardly presidential timber. In any event, this clause applies to all members—regardless of race, creed, or color.

To run for the general executive board (top legislative body of about two dozen elected at the convention) a candidate must have served as a paid officer with the benefit of 3 years' experience. Hardly a disqualification. Virtually every paid officer of the ILGWU has seen 3 years' service, including the dozens of Negroes and Puerto Ricans on staff.

Most important: Every convention of the ILGWU is a constitutional convention. At any convention, a simple majority may remove all these qualifications to elect anyone the delegates want under any qualifications they set up.

The truth is that the ILGWU has made labor history by a most extensive and expensive program for leadership development, unparalleled in the world labor movement, with a conscious concentration on the development of leadership that would reflect the newer ethnic groups in the industry of the union.

In 1938, the ILGWU set up an officer qualification course to prepare candidates for elective union posts. Enrollment was open to all members of 2 years' standing. Eight hundred and thirty-two applied. Of these, 19 were Negro and 8 were Spanish-speaking—a total of 27 in 24 years.

Why so few? The answer is the composition of the union, where 80 percent of the members are female, with little interest in and less time for full-time union jobs. Of the 832, only 106 were women.

Because of the predominantly female composition of the ILGWU, especially among the fewer ethnic groups, the union set up a full-time, full-year training institute in 1950 to reach outside the trade, if necessary to recruit leadership talent. (The only such program in the entire American labor movement.) In the first 11 years of its existence, the institute graduated 30 trainees of Negro or Spanish-speaking origin. (Ninety applied. One out of three was graduated, a higher percentage than for the institute as a whole.)

Some idea of the philosophy of the institute and of the ILGWU can be obtained from a letter written by an ILGWU vice president when one Spanish-speaking graduate left the union staff. The letter was addressed to a Puerto Rican social agency in February 1960:

"No one knows better than you that in the last few years many Spanish-speaking workers, especially Puerto Ricans, have entered our industry and union. To develop staff and leadership from this community of working people, we have a special training institute, a full-year course. We look forward with keen interest to the growth and maturation of such new personnel so that in the coming years they may be able to play a major role in our union.

"To us, C——— represented more than an individual. He represented a trend. His progress, we felt, would be an encouragement for other young men and women with his interests to serve in the labor movement.

"To put it bluntly, we feel that C——'s departure represents a setback to our program of developing Spanish-speaking staff and leadership in our union."

In the report of the general executive board of the union to its 1959 convention, progress was reported. "The call for the development of such leadership in the ranks of the ILGWU, on the basis of merit only, has taken the form of numerous appeals in the Spanish-language press and in Justicia for Spanish-speaking ILGers to enroll in the ILGWU training institute. The results of the recent ILGWU elections indicate that a corps of such leaders is already emerging from the ranks."

The report went further. "President Dubinsky urged that the Puerto Rican government establish a training institute for developing community, civic and labor leadership for the thousands of islanders who are in transition. This would be the greatest preventive to their being exploited by misleaders and charlatans taking advantage of language and initial cultural confusion in the slum environment, as well as in the homeland island itself."

The ILGWU offered to provide on-the-job training on the mainland for these Puerto Rican trainees and pledged to place them on ILGWU staff immediately after graduation.

Without appearing to be superior or self-righteous, may I ask whether there is any other union in the world that can show a comparative record of trying to develop new leadership—with a specific eye on new ethnic groups?

Hill charge: "Workers who take home $49 a week tell each other jokes about the greed of union business agents."

The truth: The ILGWU has one of the tightest systems ever devised by a union to check on the conduct of its officers: an army of accountants with a special corps of accountants to check accountants. In the last 30 years, the union has had occasion to drop some 40 of its officers for improper conduct.

The Hill charge is trial by rumor and humor. It is an anonymous smear: the kind of smear used to characterize races, religions, the NAACP, or the labor movement by reference to some piece of gossip embedded in jokes. No facts. No names. No evidence. Just a report on alleged jokes.

The truth is that, although I knew this anonymous piece of evidence—trial by rumor—was in the Hill "testimony," I was shocked that New Politics did not use the editorial scissors here.

To characterize a union or any body of humans by the anonymous smear—the great mark of McCarthyism, of the antisemite, of the white racist, of the bigot—is hardly "evidence." This is the lynch spirit.

(Unfortunately, this piece is limited to answering charges. For those who would like to know what the ILGWU has done over 62 years to promote intergroup understanding and civil rights—may I suggest a reading of "Equal Opportunity—Union Made," Educational Department, ILGWU, 1710 Broadway, New York City, N.Y.)

A Reply to Gus Tyler: The ILGWU—Fact and Fiction

(By Herbert Hill)

In "The ILGWU Today: The Decay of a Labor Union," which appeared in the summer 1962 issue of New Politics, I charged that: "In the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union in New York City, the Negro and Puerto Rican members are concentrated in the low-paid job classifications and with very little employment mobility." This was my main charge. I further stated that: "There is a direct connection between the permanent condition of semipoverty experienced by these workers and discriminatory racial practices. The factual record discloses that Negro and Puerto Rican members of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union are discriminated against both in terms of wages and other conditions of employment and in their status as members of the union."

These charges were and remain justified. No statement or explanation by officials of the ILGWU or their apologists refutes the major points of my arguments. On the contrary, their defense of the union essentially confirms my criticism of the ILGWU's policies and practices.

The most serious effort made to counter my charges was the reply by Gus Tyler, educational director of the ILGWU, which appeared in the last issue (fall 1962) of New Politics (also distributed in mimeographed form). Much of Tyler's material had previously appeared in a widely circulated document by Harry Fleischman, director of the American Jewish Committee's National Labor Service, entitled "Is the ILGWU Biased?" November 5, 1962. The Jewish labor committee distributed the same material in the form of a memorandum from Emanuel Muravchik, national field director, dated November 16, 1962.

Tyler's technique was to quote me (Hill Charge: * * *) followed by his answer (The Truth: * * *). After almost 12 pages of rapid fire dialog between "Hill charge" and "The Truth" I can readily understand the reader falling under a semihypnotic spell. Tyler, the "Truthsayer," writes with such seemingly inviolable "facts" that one might think he is really giving a point by point refutation of my charges. Aside from the failure to refute my charges, his is not a point by point discussion of my article. A number of the most important specific charges I made are not commented upon at all, others obviously distorted or treated so perfunctorily that he might well have omitted any comment and, most seriously, his "fact" fails completely to come to grips with the basic charges I directed against the ILGWU concerning the source discriminatory practices suffered by nonwhite garment workers in New York City.

At no time did I charge the ILGWU with discriminatory practices emanating from a conscious racist ideology. What I have argued is that the social fact of discrimination is rooted in the ILGWU today because of the interaction of the old union leadership with the changing social composition of the membership and the nature of the industry.

In the first place, there is the sheer weight of numbers of the Negro and Puerto Rican minorities. They comprise nearly one-third of the national membership and more than a half of the membership in the New York area, the heart of the international union's operation. Given the rapidly increasing number of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the garment industry in New York, they have a unique status within the union which the all-white top leadership clearly sees as a growing threat to its monopoly of control.

A second factor contributing to discriminatory practices relates to the garment industry itself. The industry is made up of many small, highly competitive firms, further threatened by low priced imports. It therefore seeks to draw workers from a large, cheap labor market, one that in New York consists largely of nonwhite workers. This directly encourages discriminatory practices as the unskilled, lowest paying jobs are the only jobs available to Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

The many problems that the ILGWU faces in the industry are very real. To improve the living standards of its members and particularly those who are doubly victimized by a sick industry because of their color would pose a problem to the best of unions. The issue is how to meet the problem: to resist or acquiesce to the employers' demand that the ILGWU maintain a cheap labor market for the garment industry in New York City.

It is clear that some years ago the ILGWU leadership made a fundamental decision to keep the industry in New York City on the basis of maintaining low wages and minimal standards for tens of thousands of unskilled workers; i.e., Negroes and Puerto Ricans. Thus, the union provides itself with a vast dues paying membership which also constitutes the base of its extensive political operations in New York City and State. In this manner the ILGWU has chosen to operate as a stabilizing force in the industry.

The present wage rates of the unskilled and semiskilled garment workers, most of whom are nonwhite, are below the subsistence levels indicated by the 1960 Interim City Workers Family Budget established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. (Data given in my previous article.)

A detailed report of wages in New York City, released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on June 27, 1962, clearly indicates that New York City has become a low-wage area. One of the major reasons for this development is the wage policies of the apparel unions.

The U.S. Government report found that between 1950 and 1960, wages for the city's apparel workers fell from 2d place among 16 industrial categories to 11th place, and dropped below the national average for all manufacturing.

The tacit collusion between employer and union to maintain a cheap labor market was revealed by the ILGWU's opposition to a bill introduced in the New York City Council in 1962 to establish by law a minimum wage in New York City of $1.50 an hour. The ILGWU representative on the Mayor's Citizens' Commission on the City Economy, E. Howard Molisani, manager of Italian Cloakmakers' Local 48 and a vice president of the ILGWU, originally voted against the commission's report which recommended prompt enactment of a law establishing a $1.50 minimum hourly wage in New York City, but, for the public record, later changed his vote to an abstention.

This is evidently "the philosophy of the ILGWU" to which Tyler repeatedly alludes and which Fleischman and Muravchik defend.

Arnold Witte, general manager of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York City, writing in the October 5, 1962, New York World Telegram and Sun, cited the ILGWU's opposition to the city minimum wage bill. Mr. Witte noted that "the garment workers, the largest union of the largest industry in the city, has refused to indorse this legislation."

On February 12, 1963, a mass demonstration was held in Albany in support of passage of a $1.50 minimum wage law for New York City. Several major trade unions participated, as did the NAACP, the Negro American Labor Council, and many other groups. The ILGWU was conspicuous by its absence.

There is a third factor behind the discrimination suffered by nonwhite garment workers. It pertains to the ingrown quality of the union leadership. Again, I do not charge that the ILGWU leadership is motivated by a deliberate racist ideology. But it is evident that the top all-white leadership has grown contemptuous of the younger, less educated, the less sophisticated—the altogether different—newer members who are overwhelmingly Negro and Puerto Rican.

That many of the older leaders of the ILGWU have nothing in common with their radical past is beside the point; that they have a certain past in common is very much to the point. (Talk about discrimination in his union and David Dubinsky will recount ad nauseam how he was imprisoned under the Czar for his Socialist activities.) The picture which would emerge from any detailed study of the leading personnel is of an old, conservative, ingrown bureaucracy. It has become an elite club which seeks to preserve for itself the leading power positions in the international, the local unions and the best jobs in the shops for those most closely identified with its own history and nostalgia. It passes these desirable, well-paying positions on from father to son, and from father to son-in-law. The "business" is kept within the family.

Prof. Daniel Bell of Columbia University recently commented on this serious problem in an article in the New Leader (Jan. 21, 1963):

"The fact is—and this is the 'bite' in Hill's charges—that the Negroes are underrepresented in the leadership of many of the unions where they form a significant proportion of the membership. In the case of these unions, what the Negroes want is 'recognition' at the level of top leadership and a growing share of the spoils of office. For one thing, the realistic political process in the United States, at least in the northern urban centers, has been one of ethnic groups advancing themselves precisely in this fashion; by organizing on bloc lines, electing their own kind, and using the patronage system to enhance the wealth and status of their group."

Bell concludes by noting that:

"In economic and educational opportunity, the Negro is in a position of inequality, and the Government is bound to help him move ahead." But doesn't the trade union movement have a special obligation to help redress the balance?

Tyler knows that crucial to my argument is my characterization of the ILGWU leadership as being rigidly bureaucratic. Yet, his "discussion" of this documented charge is so feeble and unresponsive as to be an unwitting admission of its truth.

I sought to establish that the ILGWU leadership, as is the case with virtually every bureaucracy, has tried to legitimize its privileges through constitutional provisions. While these provisions make everything "legal," they also paralyze initiative from below, prevent an influx of new life into the leading policymaking bodies of the organization and transform conventions into tedious rituals. For example, I pointed to the clause in the ILGWU constitution which prohibits a democratic internal life in the organization. Here is what Tyler has to say on the matter:

"The caucus clause dates back to the 1920's, when the ILGWU was in a battle with the 'standing' caucuses of the Communist Party. Whatever the merits of the clause—a good subject for a full set of articles—it certainly is no bar to Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Cubans, Portuguese, French and other minorities running for and winning office in the union." (Emphasis added.)

This will not do. Frankly, I do not know if the clause was justified at the time by the struggle against the Communists. And this might make for a full set of articles by labor historians. But it also makes for a full set of articles by the labor secretary of the NAACP and others on the character and practices of the ILGWU today. While the clause deprives the entire membership of democratic rights today, it takes on the added edge of discrimination against those minorities which are thus deprived, in addition, of their right to organize within the union to press for their special needs and rights.[1]

Other constitutional provisions reduce the number eligible to run for the top offices in the union to a few hundred out of a total of over 400,000. This is bad enough. Worse yet, it reduces the number of Puerto Ricans and Negroes eligible to run for the general executive board to proportionally a very small number (Tyler says, "dozens") and those eligible to run for the offices of president and general secretary to even less. (Tyler doesn't give a number.)

In the same vein he writes of these constitutional restrictions on democratic rights: "At any convention, a simple majority may remove all these qualifications [from the constitution—H.H.] to elect anyone the delegates want [to the general executive board—H.H.] under any qualifications they set up." Getting a "simple majority" at an ILGWU convention is not quite that simple. To do that would require a long, arduous campaign against the solidly entrenched leadership, a campaign which would require far more time than the 3-month preconvention limit on caucuses. And there's the rub. The ILGWU constitution itself, through the extreme limitation and control placed on opposition, is the best, built-in, guarantee that Tyler's "simple majority" will never materialize.

It is as though an assailant caught belaboring a defenseless victim with a club argues that if he is doing wrong, the poor bastard underfoot has the right to take his club away.

It is revealing to see what sections of my article completely escaped Tyler's roving but very selective eye.

Hill charge: "There is not a single Negro or Puerto Rican on the 23 member general executive board."

Tyler answer: Silence.

Hill charge: "* * * not a single Negro or Puerto Rican vice president of the union * * *"

Tyler answer: Silence.

Hill charge: "There are no Negro or Puerto Rican local managers who are usually handpicked by the Dubinsky controlled administration."

Tyler answer: Silence.

Hill charge: "Dubinsky's practice of requiring a signed undated resignation from all officers of the international union and from members of the general executive board, absolutely guarantees the perpetuation of what really amounts to one-man rule of the ILGWU."

Tyler answer: Silence.

Hill charge: "I cite the basic contract between local 98 and the Manufacturers' Association in effect until August 14, 1963. The contract provides the following minimum wages (p. 7, art. 4(a)):

	Per hour
Floor girls	$1. 15
Operators	1. 20
Shipping clerks	1. 20
Cutters	1. 20

In September 1961 the Federal wage was increased to $1.15 an hour. The current minimum for floor girls is $1.25 an hour at the end of 7 months (only 10 cents above the minimum wage required by law) and $1.30 an hour for the other classifications at the end of 9 months.

Tyler answer: Silence.

(Tyler does try to answer some of the other charges made about wage scales. All the worse for his case, as we shall see.)

Hill charge: "In this case of the Haffkine Co. the ILGWU completely organized a group of Negro and Puerto Rican workers employed by a 'sweatshop' employer whose workers engaged in a 2-day ILGWU strike for union recognition. However, these striking workers were turned over to a local of another international union, one well known for signing 'sweetheart agreements' and generally with an unsavory reputation. This was done by Herbert Pokodner, the manager of local 98."

Tyler answer: Silence.

Hill charge: "An analysis of the data provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor concludes that only 11 percent of the unionized garment workers in New York can realize the basic earnings necessary for the 'modest but adequate' standard of living established by the Bureau for the 1960 interim city worker's family bduget.

Tyler answer: Silence.

Hill charge: "In addition, it must be noted that the very modest figure of 11 percent has been reached by assuming that these workers will be employed uninterruptedly for 52 weeks. However, given the seasonal character of the New York City garment industry this is highly unlikely.

Tyler answer: Silence.

Hill charge: "'The available data clearly indicates that the wages of workers in the New York City ladies' garment industry have declined relative to the total manufacturing average."

Tyler answer: Silence.

These are, among several others, omissions of major points in my article that Tyler, Fleischman, and Muravchik make no attempt to answer, although they create the illusion they are "answering Hill item by item."

In his article, Tyler writes:

"Hill charge: 'To prevent the admission of nonwhite persons into that local union (local 10),' the leadership exerts 'rigid control of admission into various training programs * * *' including the 'referral of young persons to the Fashion Institute of Technology High School.'"

If we substitute my words for Tyler's three little dots, the question would then be that the leadership exerts:

"Rigid control of admission into various training programs. Local 10 exclusively decides who shall be referred to on-the-job-training opportunities created as the result of informal arrangement made by the union and employers operating with ILGWU contracts, or into the grading school operated by local 10 in its headquarters, or in the referral of young persons to the Fashion Institute of Technology High School."

Thus, there are three training programs mentioned in my article and Tyler dots his way over the first two: (1) the informal arrangement made between employer and union for on-the-job training, and (2) the grading school operated by local 10 in its headquarters. Why? The answer is clear enough. My charges in these two instances are incontrovertible. Where the union exercises its control, the number of Negroes and Puerto Ricans is so embarrassingly small that Tyler discreetly resorts to his dots. He discusses, instead, only the third form of training, that offered by the New York City Board of Education where the ILGWU, fortunately, does not exercise control—and here I stand corrected—about who is admitted. Tyler then rests his case on the nondiscriminatory policies of the New York City Board of Education and tacitly concedes that he has no case where the union is concerned.

What is more, the figures Tyler gives of the number of Negroes and Puerto Ricans trained by the board of education contradicts any claim that the extremely small number of nonwhite workers in the skilled trades is due to a shortage of skilled Negro and Puerto Rican labor.

The New York Times of August 18, 1962, reporting on the testimony of Moe Falikman, business manager of Cutters' Local 10, before a hearing of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, states that "Mr. Falikman explained that local 10 had no formal training program for cutters and no apprentice system." That led Congressman ROOSEVELT to observe that "with the changing pattern of population in New York it seems to me you would have gone to some lengths" to provide training and jobs for members of racial minorities.

"We are not an employment agency," Mr. Falikman replied.

"But you are," Mr. ROOSEVELT declared. "I'd have greater faith in you if you would face this situation honestly and say, 'Yes, this needs looking into.'"

After consulting with a union attorney, Falikman did agree that he would look into it.

The New York Times of August 25, 1962, in reporting Mr. Dubinsky's appearance before the House subcommittee stated that: "Mr. Dubinsky denied that it was the union's responsibility to upgrade Negroes and Puerto Ricans, as much as we would like to see them go to higher brackets. The union," he said, "is not an employment agency." Other ILGWU officials appearing before the subcommittee insisted that upgrading and promotion "was not the union's responsibility." "We are not an employment agency," they all said.

But in Mr. Dubinsky's testimony reprinted in the October 1 issue of the ILGWU newspaper Justice (p. 10), in reply to a question as to why Negroes and Puerto Ricans do not advance in the union or in the industry, Dubinsky is quoted as saying, "We are doing everything under the sun on this score."

Either the ILGWU is "doing everything under the sun," or "we are not an employment agency, it's not our responsibility." The union cannot have it both ways.

Then there is the following sleight-of-hand. According to Tyler:

Hill Charge: "Local 10 has been found 'guilty' of excluding Ernest Holmes from membership because he was a Negro."

Tyler incorporates this alleged "Hill Charge" in what purports to be an answer to my article in New Politics. Here is what I actually wrote:

"On July 2, 1962, the New York State Commission for Human Rights, which administers the State's fair employment practices statute, found 'probable cause' against local 10 in the case of Ernest Holmes, a Negro who was repeatedly denied membership in local 10 although he worked on the cutting tables of a union shop."

Tyler's dishonest practice consists of using the word "guilty" attributed to me in an unrehearsed television interview but nowhere stated in the article he is presumably answering. In this way, he relieves himself of the responsibility of answering why, after an 8-month investigation, the New York State Commission for Human Rights found "probable cause" (the first stage in a finding of guilt) against local 10 of the ILGWU. On September 14, 1962, Ruperto Ruiz, investigating commissioner, New York State Commission for Human Rights, in a letter to Emil Schlesinger, attorney for local 10, stated that the commission had "repeatedly requested and for a period of 8 months tried to obtain data pertinent to a resolution of the charges of discrimination against the Amalgamated Ladies Garment Cutters Union—Local 10. These efforts were unsuccessful. The failure of representatives of that local to cooperate in the investigation, despite their promises to do so, left me no alternative but to find 'probable cause to credit the allegations to the complaint.' "

---

[1] Incidentally, what is interesting about Tyler's answer is that it is almost exactly what I predicted he would say. I wrote in my previous article that "Mr. Dubinsky's spokesmen will answer that this is done to prevent Communists from taking over the union." Mr. Tyler performed as expected. Naturally, he did not quote my rebuttal about this anticipated canned reply which was that "one can only compare" such an answer "to the argument that we should suspend the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights because it endangers the country in fighting subversion."

Sixteen years ago the ILGWU entered into an agreement with the New York State Commission Against Discrimination (the predecessor to the State Commission For Human Rights), that it would not bar Negroes, Spanish-speaking or other persons from membership in the all-Italian locals. (*Elsie Hunter* v. *Agnes Sullivan Dress Shop*, Sept. 4, 1946.) This was an action brought by a Negro member of local 22 who was barred from higher paying jobs controlled by local 89. Today, 16 years later, not a single Negro or Spanish-speaking person holds membership in the two Italian locals which have control of some of the highest paying jobs in the industry and no action has been taken to comply with the State law forbidding such practices.

Yet in the recent statement prepared by Mr. Tyler, the ILGWU asserted that the NAACP charge that locals 48 and 89 discriminate is "comical."

What Mr. Tyler must explain is why, if the NAACP charge is "comical" today, the ILGWU agreed to go along with the comedy 16 years ago.

Tyler makes such a grand production of his comedy; so much joshing. He good humoredly tells us that the reason for all-Italian locals dates back to the days when Italian immigrant unionists who spoke no other language needed their own locals to conduct union business. Being Italian language locals, only those speaking Italian can belong. Not only Puerto Rican and Negroes are excluded (unless, as Tyler wittily thrusts, they are "Italian-speaking Negroes") but all other non-Italian groups are excluded. What could be more fair? And, if all non-Italians are excluded, how can Hill claim that Negroes and Puerto Ricans are thereby specially victimized? The Jewish Labor Committee and the director of the National Labor Service also defend this practice in a similar manner.

I submit that it is not "comical" that the largest local in the ILGWU (Italian Dressmakers' Local 89) and the largest local in the coat and suit industry (Italian Cloakmakers' Local 48) bar Negroes and Spanish-speaking persons from membership. I submit that it is not "comical" that as a result of being barred from membership in local 48 and local 89, Negro and Spanish-speaking persons are further denied access to certain high paying jobs in the two branches of the garment industry of New York City where such jobs are concentrated.

Other national and religious groupings, all of them white, have access to skilled jobs via other locals which are virtually closed to Negroes and Puerto Ricans on the basis of tradition and practice. That is the point. The practical effects of the operation of Italian language locals is to further keep Negroes and Puerto Ricans concentrated in the low paid unskilled classifications with little opportunity for advancement.

While it appears that all are equally unequal where the Italian locals are concerned, some are actually far more unequal than others.

It is obvious that the ILGWU's humorous rationalizations and glib assertions completely fail to answer the charge that these locals discriminate against Negro and Spanish-speaking persons. Indeed their admission of the facts is the proof of the charge. I further submit that the barring of Negroes, Spanish-speaking and other persons from locals 48 and 89 is a violation of the AFL–CIO constitution and a violation of the nondiscrimination pledge which the ILGWU recently signed in the office of the President of the United States. We of the NAACP do not think, moreover, that it is "comical" that the ILGWU subscribes to no-discrimination pledges for public relations purposes when in reality it fails to put an end to such discriminatory practices. Sixteen years have passed since the ILGWU entered into the stipulation agreement with SCAD concerning the Italian locals, but these locals are still "lily-white." Shall this, too, be hailed as "an impressive demonstration of integration"?

Mr. Tyler is not above borrowing a trick or two from management associations which, when pressed by unions for higher wages, place statistic-ridden ads in the New York Times and other newspapers to prove to the world that their employees never had it so good. One such gimmick is to advertise workers' wages without corresponding figures on how many hours of work the payroll represents. Tyler commits the same patent and deliberate fraud.

My report, for example, indicated that push-boys and shipping clerks in the "Jim Crow" auxiliary known as 60A—mainly Negroes and Puerto Ricans—receive extremely low wages.

Tyler "refutes" this charge by arguing that some of these workers earn from $70 to $100 per week. Of course, by working long overtime hours at time-and-a-half wages, by working 60 or 70 hours a week and more, they can earn $80 and $90. But my report, as Tyler knows, describes straight hourly wages, not overtime wages earned at time-and-a-half pay. I am describing 1 week's pay for 1 week's work, that is, a regular week's earnings for the "normal workweek," of 35 hours.

The wages set forth in the section of the union agreements that cover members of 60A are as follows:

The following minimum rates of pay for the normal workweek, as hereinafter defined, shall apply to the following employees:

Group I: Assorters, piece goods workers, push boys, porters, delivery boys, packers, and errand boys. Minimum wages of $46 per normal workweek.

Group II: Shipping clerks, receiving clerks, chargers, order pickers, checkers. Minimum wage of $50 per normal workweek.

The overwhelming majority of members of 60A are employed in the job classifications contained in group I as described above and receive a minimum wage of $46 ($1.31 an hour) for 35 hours, a "normal workweek."

In my article, I cited the pay of workers—almost all Negroes and Puerto Ricans—in a particular unionized shop as an example of an ILGWU substandard negotiated contract. Tyler takes up the "Hill charge" and then proceeds to demolish only himself with "the truth" as follows:

Hill charge: "I cite the Fine Arts Pillow & Specialties Co. of 37 West 26th Street in Manhattan as a typical example of conditions. Here, virtually all nonwhite workers, male and female, who are union members are paid $1.15, $1.20, or $1.25 an hour."

The [Tyler] truth: "According to a payroll check, 54 of the 104 employees are paid more than $1.25 an hour. These are overwhelmingly Negro and Puerto Ricans. Of the top 10 earners—from $1.53 to $3.23 an hour—7 are Negro or Puerto Ricans.

Tyler's truth is that "54 of the 104 employees are paid more than $1.25 an hour." But this means that 50 workers, approximately half the work force, in a unionized shop receive less than $1.25 an hour. That is not all. Tyler boasts that the 10 top earners receive from $1.53 to $3.23 an hour (how many earn that miserable $1.53 or only a few cents more he doesn't say). What this figure further reveals is that at least 45 additional workers receive between $1.25 and $1.53 an hour (how many are just slightly above the $1.25 scale he doesn't say either). Thus, at least 95 out of 104 workers earn from less than $1.25 to $1.53 an hour.

To cover himself in the event that some readers might work out the arithmetic presented by his "truth," Tyler argues that the shop under discussion in any case is "as typical of ILGWU conditions as Mississippi is typical of America." How typical it really is can be seen in the following exhibits of ILGWU-negotiated contracts in New York City where there is the heaviest concentration of Negro and Puerto Rican workers, in some cases as high as 90 percent.

	Progression rates for "unskilled" workers—Time intervals and rates					Contract minimum for "skilled" workers
	1 to 8 weeks	9 to 10 weeks	11 to 13 weeks	14 to 16 weeks		
Corset and Brassiere Workers' Union of New York Local 32 (6,632 members):						
Operators	1.15	1.20	1.25	1.30	--------	1.36
	1 to 8 weeks	9 to 10 weeks	11 to 12 weeks			
Pressers	1.15	1.20	1.25	--------	--------	1.30
Cleaners	1.15	1.20	1.25	--------	--------	1.30
Examiners	1.15	1.20	1.25	--------	--------	1.30
	1 to 8 weeks	--------	--------	--------	--------	
Beltmakers' Local 40 (4,504 members):						
Machine operators	1.15	--------	--------	--------	--------	1.38
Operators	1.15	--------	--------	--------	--------	1.43
General help	1.15	--------	--------	--------	--------	1.43
Shipper	1.15	--------	--------	--------	--------	1.30
Floor girls	1.15	--------	--------	--------	--------	1.30

	Progression rates for "unskilled" workers—Time intervals and rates						
	1 to 8 weeks	9 to 10 weeks	13 to 15 weeks			Class R shops	Class S shops
Undergarment and Negligee Workers' Union, Local 62 (16,802 members):							
Operators	1.15	1.25	1.30–1.33	----	----	1.30	1.33
Ironers	1.15	1.20	1.25–1.25	----	----	1.30	1.30
Examiners	1.15	1.20	1.25–1.25	----	----	1.30	1.30
Finishers	1.15	1.20	1.25–1.25	----	----	1.30	1.30
	1 to 12 weeks	----	----	----	----		
Childrens' Dress, House-Dress and Bathrobe Makers' Union Local 91 (11,943 members):							
Operators	1.20	----	----	----	----	1.41	
Ironers	1.20	----	----	----	----	1.38	
Cleaners	1.20	----	----	----	----	1.35	
Finishers	1.20	----	----	----	----	1.35	
	1st month	2 to 6 months	7 to 9 months	----	----		
Rubberized Novelty and Plastic-Fabric Workers' Union, Local 98 (4,403 members previously cited):							
Operators	1.15	1.20	1.25	----	----	1.30	
Shipping clerks	1.15	1.20	1.25	----	----	1.30	
Cutters	1.15	1.20	1.25	----	----	1.30	
Floor girls	1.15	1.20	1.25	----	----	1.25	
Plastic, Molders and Novelty Workers' Union, Local 132 (5,400 members):							
	1st month	2 to 6 months	6 to 9 months	----	----		
All workers other than molders	1.15	1.20	1.25	----	----	1.30	
	1st month	2 to 4 months	5 to 7 months	8 to 10 months	11 to 13 months		
Molders	1.20	1.25	1.30	1.35	1.40	1.45	
Unit 60A section of dress joint board agreement (1,943 members):							
Assorters, piece goods workers, pushboys, porters, delivery boys, packers, and errand boys	----	----	----	----	----	1.31	
Chargers, order pickers, checkers, shipping clerks, receiving clerks	----	----	----	----	----	1.43	

"As typical of ILGWU conditions as Mississippi is typical of America"? The United States has only one Mississippi. The ILGWU, as the above figures indicate, has a whole flock of them.

It is evident from the data above, that new workers do not even receive the contract minimum for "skilled" workers, but must work a considerable period before they even receive this low wage. Indeed, in the case of local 62, for example, workers must work 8 weeks at the Federal minimum wage and a full 15 weeks before they receive the contract minimum of $1.30 or $1.33 an hour. At the same time, of course, these workers are required, as a condition of employment, to become members of the union after 30 days and pay an initiation fee and dues.

Tyler's explanation for the creation of the "Jim Crow" auxiliary 60A is completely fraudulent. I must repeat some of the facts mentioned in my first article and supply some added information before reviewing Tyler's incredible performance.

60A is a unit composed of "pushboys," packers, piece goods workers, porters and shipping clerks. It has about 2,000 members, of whom more than 90 percent are either Negroes or Spanish-speaking persons. The existence of 60A is, in keeping with the tradition of the "old-line" AFL craft unions, an auxiliary to another local, Dress Pressers' Local 60, with less than 1,300 members.

60A is a new unit in the ILGWU. While the women's garment industry in New York City has had "pushboys," packers, piece goods workers, porters and shipping clerks for as long as the industry existed, the ILGWU did not consider these workers, virtually all Negroes and Puerto Ricans, worthy of union membership until a few years ago, and then only because other unions began organizing activities among these workers. The ILGWU, for the sole purpose of preventing another union from getting a toehold in the garment industry, and not because of the urgent needs of the low-paid, exploited Negro and Puerto Rican workers, then reluctantly organized these workers. Rather than granting them a separate charter, however, the ILGWU made them an auxiliary to Dress Pressers' Local 60.

The NAACP has charged that this was done among other reasons to prevent a Negro or Spanish-speaking person from rising to the position of local union manager.

It should be noted that the collective bargaining agreements negotiated between the Dress Joint Board and the employers' associations covering the members of the Dress Joint Board locals has two sections concerning wages, hours and conditions of employment: one section covers the members of locals 10, 22, 60 and 89, and the other covers the members of 60A. Aside from the question of wages, there are other striking and illuminating differences concerning conditions of employment between the two sections which are described below. Here are two clauses in the collective agreements between the Dress Joint Board and the employers' associations:

Fifteenth: Hours of work (covering members of locals 10, 22, 60, and 89).

A regular week's work shall consist of 35 hours in the first 5 days of the week. Work shall begin at 9 a.m. and end at 5 p.m., with 1 hour interval for lunch. There shall be no more than one shift of workers in any day.

During the season, when the inside shop and each of the contracting shops of the manufacturer or jobber for whom a member of the association is registered or designated as fully supplied with at least a full week's work, and when there are no vacant accommodations in the said shops for additional worker or additional workers cannot be secured, overtime may be worked by all the workers therein except the cutters, provided the member of the association notifies joint council in writing, in advance of the period during which overtime will be worked. In no event shall overtime worked beyond the first 5 days of the week exceed 1 hour per day. All week workers, when working overtime, shall receive pay at the rate of time and one-half. (Collective agreement 1961–1964—United Better Dress Manufacturers' Association, Inc., with International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and Dressmakers Joint Council.)

Compare the above with below, which covers 60A:

Sixty-ninth: The normal workweek, for the purpose of this agreement, shall be deemed to mean a 35-hour week. Each employer shall, in his discretion, be free to fix the hours of the day within which each employee in the unit shall work, but work in excess of 7 hours performed in any 1 day shall be compensated for at the rate of time and one-half. Saturday work shall likewise be compensated at the rate of time and one-half. All overtime shall be performed in the discretion of the employer. (Collective agreement—United Better Dress Manufacturers' Association, Inc., with International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and Dressmakers Joint Council.)

It is clear from the foregoing that members of 60A are considered by the ILGWU as different than, and inferior to, the members of the other locals affiliated to the Dress Joint Board. With respect to members of 60A, unlike the members of the other Dress Joint Board affiliates, the employer has full discretion both as to hours within which they will work and how many hours they will work. It is clear, too, how members of 60A can earn more than $50 per week: many long hours beyond the so-called normal workweek.

How does Tyler discuss the status of those consigned to 60A? In the first place, according to him, their segregated position is for their own good. Tyler writes: "The clerks (in 60A) enjoy all the benefits of being united in industrial fashion with a more highly skilled craft. No student of labor relations has to be told why." I'm afraid that Mr. Tyler takes too much for granted. The supposedly self-evident advantage of the unskilled workers being affiliated to a skilled craft local as argued by Tyler is simply an exercise in fantasy. What, concretely, have been the benefits for the members of 60A getting $46 to $50 for a normal workweek of being affiliated to a craft local with pay scales ranging up to close to $5 an hour (the highest in the industry)?

Then there is Tyler's ludicrous analogy designed to counter my charge that 60A is a Jim Crow affiliate:

Most of its (60A) members (over 90 percent to be more exact—H.H.) are Negro and Puerto Rican, but to call it a "Jim Crow" local for that reason would be the same as calling the Sleeping Car Porters' Union a Jim Crow union because all or most of its members are Negro.

In the first place, 60A is not a local. It is an auxiliary to local 60. Quite a difference there. In the second place, the Sleeping Car Porters' Union would be a Jim Crow organization if it had a parallel construction to that of 60A. If the Sleeping Car Porters' Union were an auxiliary to, say, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and, if instead of A. Philip Randolph there were the equivalent of a white local manager, selected in reality by the international office of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen to service the needs of the Sleeping Car Porters' local, then the Sleeping Car Porters' local would be a segregated auxiliary just as 60A is a Jim Crow unit.

Then we have Tyler the expert on ethnology:

"Hill's suggestion that a separate local of shipping clerks would elect a Negro manager is both inaccurate and vicious. It is inaccurate because local 60A is mixed with no one ethnic group—Negro, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Irish, Jewish, or Italian—in a simple majority."

It is Tyler who is inaccurate and vicious. Inaccurate, because I did not say that a separate local would "elect" a Negro manager but that "there would inevitably be a Negro or Puerto Rican manager." While the ILGWU constitution provides for the formal election of local managers they are not really elected. In practice they are selected by the international and confirmed by the local.[2] In the second place, I said "Negro or Puerto Rican," and not just "Negro." Tyler decided to omit the Puerto Ricans in his reference in order to make his sly point that no one ethnic group is in a simple majority in 60A. (To be sure, in a previous quote from Tyler on this matter, the reader can clearly see that he says, "most of its members are Negro and Puerto Rican." Suddenly, in an effort to fudge over the question we are introduced to Cubans, Irish, Jewish, or Italian as though they represent a significant part of the membership of 60A.) Now, it is true that Negroes and Puerto Ricans constitute a separate group. But they are coupled in my discussion and in Mr. Tyler's—except when inconvenient to him—because they are both the victims of economic, political, ethnic, and racial discrimination different in kind and degree from other ethnic groups which comprise less than 10 percent of 60A.

Tyler goes even further:

"There is no reason to believe that the members of Local 60A would elect a manager on a racist rather than unionist basis. The proposal is socially vicious because to create a separate Local 60A just to guarantee the election of a Negro or Puerto Rican manager is to create a Jim Crow local—separate but equal. ILGWU members prefer integration: craft and color."

Most damaging here (aside from the "elected" managers) is Tyler's sophistry, that pseudo-liberal conception that for Negroes and Puerto Ricans to seek their own leadership is racism in reverse. Of course, I think that Negroes and Puerto Ricans would take special interest and justifiable pride in electing a Negro or Puerto Rican manager or joint board chairman or president of the international union.

I might ask Mr. Tyler whether he uses the same standards in judging political gerrymandering when it is done to deny Negroes representation in Congress. Does he then virtuously declare that it is "socially vicious" to speak of allowing Negroes to have Negro Congressmen? Or does he, good liberal that he is, protest this kind of gerrymandering—another form of "craft and color"—because it specifically denies Negroes their representational rights?

And look at what Mr. Tyler italicizes in the above passage. How vicious it is, he writes "to create a separate Local 60A just to guarantee the election of a Negro or Puerto Rican." However, Negroes and Puerto Ricans are already separate. Who is responsible for this? The NAACP or the ILGWU? They are separated, not as an independent local as are other crafts in the Dress Joint Board, but as an auxiliary of a skilled local. Thus, they are separate and unequal. It is also interesting to note that 60 and 60A have separate executive boards but one manager for both units.

The NAACP claims that when the boundary of separation is drawn at the point where autonomy begins, this is evidence that discrimination is a hard fact. As against this affiliated status, local autonomy would, indeed, be a step in the right direction. And not "just to" guarantee the election of a Negro or Puerto Rican, but as a means of better protecting the rights of both groups and offering the enormous educational and training advantage of self-leadership.

Tyler says as against local autonomy for 60A, "ILGWU members prefer integration: craft and color." Bravo. The NAACP looks forward to seeing Negro and Puerto Rican ILGWU members on the general executive board, as local union managers, given a more equitable share of the better-paying jobs and that the union conduct a vigorous union campaign against exploitation.

One final quotation from Tyler on 60A: "a majority of the combined members of local 60 and local 60A are Negro and Puerto Rican. Each member has an equal vote—whether 60 or 60A. If the present manager is not a Negro or Puerto Rican, it merely indicates that the members of this union prefer not to cast a 'racial' vote."

I am obliged for the third time to point out to the reader that whether the manager of Local 60 is or is not a Puerto Rican or a Negro has little to do with normal elections. The manager is actually selected by the general executive board and ritualistically confirmed at a local union meeting. Apart from this little detail what Tyler is suggesting is completely demagogic. Everyone knows that given the situation as I have described it—and as Tyler unwittingly confirms—the "equal vote" that he boasts of is nonexistent because of the lack of involvement of these minorities in the union. Their apathy and the refusal to use their "equal vote" is an indication of the controlled, undemocratic atmosphere in which they are treated with contempt as "things" to be manipulated by an arrogant bureaucracy.

Am I exaggerating when I say that the ILGWU is contemptuous of Negroes and Puerto Ricans? A comparison of the clauses in the same collective agreement concerning discharge of workers, first that covering members of locals 10, 22, 60 and 89, then covering members of 60A, is in order.

THIRTY-EIGHTH: Discharge (of members of locals 10, 22, 60 and 89—H.H.); (a) no member of the association shall discharge a worker, except for misbehavior sufficient to justify a discharge, before a notice in writing is served on joint council of the reason for the intended discharge. In case of a discharge for alleged misbehavior, and it be determined that the worker be reinstated, he is entitled to receive pay for all the time he stayed out; (b) joint council shall investigate the notice of the intended discharge within 48 hours of the receipt of same. If joint council does not consent to the proposed discharge, the question shall be referred to the impartial chairman, whose decision shall be final. Pending such decision the employee shall continue working at full pay (Collective Agreement 1961–64—United Better Dress Manufacturers' Association, Inc., with International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and Dressmakers' Joint Council).

SEVENTY-FOUR: On discharge (of members of 60A—H.H.).

The employer may discharge regular employees for any just and reasonable cause including the following: incompetence, insubordination, dishonesty, intoxication, soldiering on the job, repeated lateness or absence; and assault or attempted assault on the job.

Repeated breach of reasonable rules established by the employer:

In the event that the union questions any discharge as not being for just and reasonable cause, it shall so inform the association within 5 days after the discharge. Representatives of the union and the association shall attempt to settle the grievance by negotiation. If no settlement can be reached, the joint council may invoke the arbitration machinery provided in this agreement. (Collective agreement, 1961–64—United Better Dress Manufacturers' Association, Inc., with International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and Dressmakers' Joint Council.)

In the discharge of members of locals 10, 22, 60, and 89, the burden is on the employer, not the worker.

In the discharge of a member of 60A, the burden is on the worker. It is significant that specific reasons for which a member of 60A can be discharged are set forth, while with respect to members of locals 10, 22, 60, and 89, they are not.

What do Tyler, Fleischman, and Muravchik have to say about these specifics contained in a contract negotiated by the ILGWU? Are "dishonesty," "intoxication," "soldiering on the job," "assault or attempted assault on the job" the characteristic habits of Negroes and Puerto Ricans? Or do they recognize in this listing the hallmark of the bigot enthusiastically perpetuating the sickening stereotypes of racial and national minorities? If Tyler does not understand this, his stint with the ILGWU has served to corrupt his sensibilities completely. Mr. Tyler and the other apologists for the ILGWU neglect to state that the "integrated" members of 60A are covered by a separate union agreement from that covering members of locals 10, 22, 60, and 89.

Further evidence of discrimination is documented in Tyler's own discussion of the ILGWU's officer qualification course and the union's training institute.

The officer qualification course was set up in 1938 "to prepare candidates for elective office." A total of 832 applied. Of these 832, only "19 were Negro and 8 were Spanish speaking—a total of 27 in 24 years." An annual average of one (and one-eighth).

---

[2] The Bureau of Labor Management of the U.S. Department of Labor recently investigated a complaint from an ILGWU member in New Bedford, Mass. The Bureau found improper election practices by the ILGWU and ordered a new election. This case has clear implications for the internal practices of the ILGWU nationally.

Tyler then tries to compensate for this failure with the reputed success of the union's training institute. We are told that in 11 years, 30 Negroes and Puerto Ricans were graduated by the institute. An excellent record. Certainly, it is better than the officer qualification course showing. However, far from proving the ILGWU's concern with promoting Negro and Puerto Rican leadership, the greater success of the institute reveals just the opposite when placed side by side with the failure in the officer qualification course. The reason lies in the difference between the two programs which Tyler deliberately tries to gloss over. The failure was in recruiting trainees within the union for officers with the (theoretical) right to participate in formulating and influencing the policies of the union. On the other hand, where the ILGWU achieved some success, in the institute, it has been with individuals who are not necessarily even members of the union, who are to become employees and not officials of the union and who have no voice in determining union policy. Also, the ILGWU must employ some Negro and Spanish-speaking organizers given the changing racial and ethnic composition of the industry.

As an example of discrimination, I mentioned in my article the fact that two locals in Puerto Rico—locals 600 and 601—were placed under the managership of an official from New York, one Jerry Schoen. Here is how Tyler discusses my charge:

Hill charge: "The two Puerto Rican locals are 'denied Puerto Rican leadership.'"

Now, the words are mine, but the period after the quoted phrase belongs to Tyler. What I wrote was: "However, both these locals are denied Puerto Rican leadership as they are managed by one Jerry Schoen, a former business agent for local 62, who was sent from New York City by the international union to manage these two Puerto Rican locals."

By trimming my sentence as he does, Tyler thinks that all he has to do is rattle off a list of Puerto Rican "officials" in these locals, although the point I am making, seen clearly in the omitted words, is that the two locals are denied self-leadership "as they are managed by one Jerry Schoen."

And as Tyler knows, as I know, as anyone who knows anything about the ILGWU knows, it is the manager who wields the power in ILGWU locals. It is Schoen who represents the international in Puerto Rico. His is the real power.

More than a year and a half ago, officers of local 10 claimed, before representatives of the New York State Commission for Human Rights investigating a complaint of racial discrimination, that there were 400 nonwhite members of this local of skilled, higher-paid workers. I offered to withdraw the complaint if this were proven. The figure was then reduced to 300 by the union representatives. Harry Fleischman later said that there are "250 Negro and Spanish-speaking cutters in local 10," ("Let's Be Human," October 1962, Newsletter of the National Labor Service.) In Fleischman's other article "Is the ILGWU Biased?" he refers to "Negro ILGWU member Ernest Holmes" (p. 1, 3d par.). Holmes was never, at any time a member of the ILGWU. This was precisely the charge of his highly publicized complaint, that he was refused admission into local 10 of the ILGWU. This falsehood is typical of Fleischman's frequent distortions.

In Gus Tyler's article we are told that there were 239 Negro and Spanish-speaking workers in local 10—only slightly more than one-half of what the ILGWU originally claimed.

On the basis of these figures, either the ILGWU lied one and a half years ago, or it has dropped nearly 200 Negro and Spanish-speaking people from local 10.

Of the 239 figure in Tyler's article, it would be interesting to know how many are Negro and Puerto Ricans, since his count embraces "Cubans, Panamanians, Colombians, Dominicans, Salvadorians, Mexicans, etc., as well as Puerto Ricans * * *." I, of course, am not discussing "Cubans * * * etc," but Negroes and Puerto Ricans, over 120,000 strong, with problems quite distinct from those presumably located by Tyler in his quest for as large a number as possible. It would also be interesting to know how many Negroes and Puerto Ricans have been brought into local 10 in the past 18 months—i.e., since the NAACP focused national attention on the status of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the ILGWU.

Tyler says that when Hill claims in a television broadcast "that there are in the vicinity of 50 (Negro) cutters of local 10 in the city," that he "still has no regard for the truth."

However, if one makes a modest deduction for "Cubans * * * etc." from Tyler's strained-for 239 his number of Negroes and Puerto Ricans would no doubt go below 200. Since it is most likely that there are considerably more Puerto Ricans than Negroes in local 10, I suggest that Tyler take out his slide rule and let the reader know how far off my estimated "vicinity of 50 (Negro) cutters" is from his "regard for the truth."

Now, even less than 200 skilled Negro and Puerto Rican workers would not be too bad in a local of 1,000 or 2,000 craft workers. But, if Tyler wants to play the numbers game, why does he hide the most revealing figure, "239 Negroes, Puerto Ricans plus Cubans * * * etc.," out of 7,531 members. Slightly more than 3 percent. This, Tyler tells us, "is an impressive demonstration of integration." This figure that represents integration to Mr. Tyler is not much better than the integration of Negro children in the public schools of North Carolina.

The NAACP finds this impressive evidence of discrimination, especially when over one-half the New York membership of the ILGWU is composed of Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

Tyler tells us that what makes the over 200 figure such an impressive demonstration is that "there is very little turnover of employment; the total number of jobs covered by local 10 has fallen in the last decade." While this might explain a disproportionately fewer number of Negroes and Puerto Ricans, it cannot explain the excessiveness of that disproportion.

Though they tell us that Negroes and Puerto Ricans never had it so good, as in local 10, ILGWU spokesmen usually feel compelled to explain that the union is not responsible for hiring cutters; it is all the employers' fault. This won't do. In the first place, if there is impressive integration no one is really at fault. In the second place, if it is only the employers who discriminate in hiring, it is the responsibility of the union to combat that policy. In the third place, the union does have considerable control in the hiring of cutters.

In the November 1, 1962, issue of Justice, the official ILGWU publication, there is a news story which would seem not only to substantiate the union's placement role, but to boast of it. The article states: "A total of 576 members of local 10 have been placed on permanent jobs during the year since last October, Vice President Moe Falikman, manager of the organization reported at its membership meeting on October 29. This was disclosed by a tabulation based on reports submitted by officers and business agents functioning in the various trades in which cutters are employed."

The report continues with reference to the local's placement activity over a 3-year period and says that placing its members in permanent jobs "is a major continuing activity."

Thus, it is clear beyond doubt, despite the ILGWU's public denials, that local 10 has considerable control in the placement of cutters in all branches of the women's garment industry in New York City.

On the total number of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in all the skilled craft locals, Tyler makes a boast of what is actually a confession of moral bankruptcy. He writes that the number of Spanish-speaking and Negro members "runs into the tens of thousands"[3] and in the next breath he takes pride in his reference to "hundreds of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, plus other Latins, Japanese, etc.," who are in the skilled craft locals.

A further analysis, employing the ILGWU's own figures, discloses the following: out of a total of approximately 14,500 members of Cutters' Local 10, Pressers' Locals 35 and 60, and the Pressers' branches of the two Italian Locals, 48 and 89, there are some 550 Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans * * * etc. This constitutes about 3.7 percent of the total membership of the locals controlling the highest paying jobs in New York City; 96.3 percent white and 3.7 percent Negro, Puerto Rican, Cuban * * * etc., cannot be considered "an impressive demonstration of integration." I submit that the ILGWU figures are greatly inflated; 2 percent is closer to the truth.

Why does the NAACP single out the ILGWU? Aren't there unions with far worse records than this one? These questions are usually asked by those who will candidly acknowledge that the charges against Dubinsky's union are justified in large measure, but bridle at concentrating so much fire on a "progressive" union which passes fine resolutions on civil rights, and contributes to worthy causes.

I believe that this approach is unwarranted for the following reasons:

1. The ILGWU is the largest union in the largest manufacturing industry in New York City, the world's largest city. It affects the economic welfare and dignity of hundreds of thousands of Negro and Puerto Rican men, women and children in New York. Is the NAACP supposed to refrain from presenting the truth about this union because it passes good resolutions on integration in Mississippi?

2. The "go soft on Dubinsky" line has the disagreeable connotations of "Uncle Tomism": it is suggested that the liberal and Negro community should be appreciative of small favors and not attack its "benefactors" even if those friends aren't completely perfect. This is of course nonsense and is rejected by responsible and serious elements in the Negro community.

3. It implicitly fails to give credit to the NAACP for its work in combating the anti-Negro practices of blatantly discriminatory unions, North and South. A part of my time for the past 16 years as a staff member of the NAACP has been devoted to exposing and combating the vicious racial practices of the railroad unions, the building trades unions and other labor organizations where discriminatory practices are blatant and to open new job opportunities for Negro workers in the craft jurisdictions. Most of the major breakthroughs in the past decade made by Negro workers in the "old-line" AFL-controlled craft occupations as well as in industrial union jurisdictions are the direct result of NAACP exposure and pressure.

---

[3] That many of these tens of thousands are "relative newcomers," as he puts it, helps naught, since tens of thousands of the more than 120,000 have been in the industry for many years and are "newcomers" only "relative" to those who have been there for decades.

4. Those who say "Hill is really right but why make such a fuss over a 'progressive union' substitute sentimentality for thought, myth for reality. Judging the ILGWU by its current practices and not by its past, the 'progressive' label is a nostalgic hangover." The word suggests militancy, internal democracy and social vision. On none of these counts does the ILGWU qualify.

5. The ILGWU leadership is greatly concerned with presenting a progressive liberal public image, without critically examining the social consequences of its policies and practices. This is perhaps the most dismal factor in the entire situation, their incapacity to admit that anything at all is wrong. But they do care obsessively about their public image. The concern, I believe, increases the possibility that the pressures applied by the NAACP might have salutary effects. I think that as a result of the activity of the NAACP there may be more Negroes and Puerto Ricans in better-paid jobs, that the operational bar against Negroes and Puerto Rican local managers might be raised slightly; Dubinsky will perhaps allow a Negro or Puerto Rican to find his place on the General Board and the ILGWU might feel obliged to do something about the substandard wage levels in the industry which victimizes, primarily, the Negro and Puerto Rican worker. Already one notes perhaps a little less arrogance on the part of ILGWU officials in the daily treatment of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the shops and within the unions.

I now know that the above will produce anguished cries of "anti-Semite." The epithet has already been hurled at me (and at Paul Jacobs for his article on the ILGWU in Harper's magazine December 1962).[4] The charge is too obscene, too rotten to permit dignified comment.

I anticipated that my analysis of the ILGWU would be met with the fury with which any powerful and entrenched bureaucracy retaliates when challenged. The attacks upon me for telling the truth are characterized by a viciousness and hysteria that tells much about the institution defending itself. Among a variety of other personal attacks the ILGWU leadership has charged publicly and in corridors that I am a Jewish anti-Semite, a kind of McCarthyite, and in the camp of the Birchites.

No less incredible than the anti-Semitic smear was the abortive attempt to discredit me by Evelyn Dubrow, an ILGWU staff member who together with other union representatives went to several Congressmen and other public officials and "explained" that Hill was a Communist stirring up racial strife, an anti-Semite, etc.

If I am incensed at the anti-Semitic smear, the reader will surely understand. I am, after all, a "white Jew" as Tyler so delicately puts it in his New Politics article.

Had I committed a gross injustice in my charges, the Dubinsky leadership's reaction would never take such grotesque forms. That it struck out so wildly, with such malevolence, is evidence that my criticism pierced a bureaucratic shell and pricked what there is of a sense of guilt among those who have led the ILGWU from what it was yesterday to what it has become today.

While Tyler does not make this charge—at least, not in his article—he must accept responsibility for it considering its source. I am not debating Tyler the individual, but Tyler the defense counsel for the ILGWU.

Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, responding to a Jewish Labor Committee attack on the Association, stated in a letter dated Oct. 31, 1962, to Emanual Muravchik as follows:

We assert with the greatest emphasis that nothing, absolutely nothing, in Mr. Hill's recent or more remote statements can be construed as anti-Semitic. This is a grave charge to make. It requires more substantiation that your flip reference in a part of a sentence. The charge is not only against Mr. Hill, but against the NAACP itself. We do not deign to defend ourselves against such a baseless allegation. Its inclusion in the resolution, as well as in the statements to the press by Mr. Zimmerman is unworthy of an organization like the Jewish Labor Committee which, in the very nature of things must be conversant with the seriousness of such a charge and with the evidence required to give it substance. No such evidence has been submitted in this case beyond the citation of the use by Mr. Hill of one word, "ethnic," out of a total of 4,500 words in his testimony before the House subcommittee. The relevance of his comparison of the ethnic composition of the membership and the leadership of the ILGWU can hardly be questioned in this context.

Wilkins also said: "We reject the proposition that any segment of the labor movement is sacrosanct in the matter of practices and/or policies which restrict employment opportunities on racial or religious or nationality grounds. We reject the contention that bringing such charges constitutes a move to destroy 'unity' among civil rights groups unless it be admitted that this unity is a precarious thing, perched upon unilateral definition of discrimination by each member group. In such a situation, the 'unity' is of no basic value and its destruction may be regarded as not a calamity, but a blessed clearing of the air.

In this connection, it is well to reiterate a facet of this discussion which appears to have escaped the attention of the various reviewers and resolution writers. It is that Herbert Hill, our labor secretary, has but one duty and that is to serve the interests of the Negro worker through the NAACP. Other groups, including trade unions, have powerful machinery to protect their principal interests. Mr. Hill is employed to maintain antidiscrimination work in the employment field as his top and only priority. He is not for trade unions first and Negro workers second. He has no divided loyalties."

In the years to come the effective work of the NAACP in fighting for a decent, socially conscious labor movement that is sensitive to the needs of the Negro worker will be appreciated. If trade unions in the United States are to be more than just another "business enterprise," more than just organizations that negotiate terms under which labor is bought and sold, then the struggle today for an immediate end to anti-Negro practices within the unions will provide the social basis for defending the labor movement tomorrow.

Herbert Hill is national labor secretary of the NAACP.

TEST BAN CAVE-IN A DISGRACE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, reported United States-United Kingdom offers to Khrushchev of 30 on-site inspections during a 7-year period to police a test ban treaty amount to a craven surrender to the Soviet test ban treaty bargaining position.

Premier Khrushchev has offered only "2 or 3 inspections annually," and then only under the most restrictive conditions, actually exempting from inspection any area declared by the Kremlin to be a "military area."

When negotiations began in 1958, 20 inspections annually were demanded. The Kennedy administration dropped demands to "10 to 12," then to 7. Although the presently reported concession averages 4¼ inspections annually, the effective number would actually be Khrushchev's demanded three. This is because inspections could not reasonably be consumed on an annual basis, but must be reserved by at least 25 percent to use if needed during a period of greater suspicion during the last portion of the 7 years.

This cave-in to Soviet demands deserves the most severe censure. It is time that Americans demand that courage be restored in the Nation's leadership. The constant withering of U.S. leaders in the face of Communist threats, demands, and truculence can only bring the United States down to a second-rate status and earn the world's contempt.

The ridiculous absurdity to this token number of inspections is best grasped when it is realized the Soviet Union spreads across two continents, contains one-sixteenth of the world's land mass and occupies 8½ million square miles. Three inspections could have no more deterrent effect on Soviet cheating than none at all.

It is past time that commonsense and sanity be restored to our side of the Geneva bargaining tables. The danger of Soviet cheating on a test ban treaty is real and ever present. Otherwise machinery to deter it would not have been the subject of discussion and negotiation over the past 5 years. To now abandon the very machinery that might prevent such cheating is only another way of trusting the Nation's future security and survival to no more than a Soviet promise not to sieze the opportunity to achieve overwhelming military superiority and thereby satisfy communism's fiery ambition for world domination.

MUSIC FOR YOUNG AMERICANS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

---

[4] The Jewish Daily Forward, Dec. 10, 1962. J. Fogel writes that "Two Jewish young men, Hill and Jacobs, spread anti-Semitic poison against the ILGWU and against President Dubinsky." The frequent treatment of these matters in the Jewish Daily Forward is worthy of a separate study. The Forward regards all criticisms of the ILGWU as an act of anti-Semitism and while freely distorting the news, reports these events in a tone of hysteria and self-pity. Headlines in the issue of Aug. 22, 1962—"The Racist Assault on the ILGWU."

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, 1,100 young people from 24 schools in 13 States, including New York, New Hampshire, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Wisconsin, were present at a concert last night, in the departmental auditorium of the U.S. Department of Labor in the Nation's Capital, which marked the opening of the eighth annual Music for Young America concerts by the National Symphony Orchestra under its conductor Howard Mitchell.

The American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO, chose this occasion to confer a distinguished service award on Mrs. Herbert A. May, one of our country's greatest private patrons of music, whose generosity has made these music programs possible. The award was presented by Herman Kenin, president of the international union, and it read in part:

> In grateful appreciation for efforts in behalf of live music and musicians and devotion to the advancement of the cultural arts.

In his presentation, Mr. Kenin said:

> In presenting this symbol, I wish to address myself also to the many hundreds of young people and the distinguished citizens here tonight.
>
> Music and all of the performing arts need much the same guidance and help that is so necessary to the maturing years of our young people. You, as one of the foremost patrons of music in our whole society, have provided this influence.

By completely underwriting 5 weeks of free concerts for the past several years Mrs. May has provided an introduction to symphonic music for thousands of young Americans and has provided an extended music season and additional employment for the musicians of the National Symphony Orchestra.

The Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, told the young people at last night's opening concert, as provided by the Washington, D.C., Daily News, that he hoped they would "take away a picture of a gracious lady, an extraordinary conductor and one of the finest orchestras in the whole world."

To qualify for admission young visitors to the Nation's Capital must be high school students, and many tickets are made available through the offices of Members of Congress.

The Washington, D.C., Evening Star commented editorially that this music series has the dual purpose of, first, enriching the lives of young people through an introduction to good music; and, second, financially assisting the orchestra members by extending their season.

For many young people these music programs are "the entry into a new and wonderful world," the Star added.

The Washington, D.C., Post editorial says of Mrs. May that she has long been "a generous and imaginative patron of music in this community," and this editorial added that "all of us owe her the warmest thanks."

We do, indeed, owe her our thanks for opening this important vista on our Nation's cultural heritage to so many of our young people, who are the leaders of tomorrow's world.

I include as part of my remarks a newspaper article and editorials which give a fuller account of Music for Young America programs:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Apr. 24, 1963]

YOUNG AMERICA MUSIC SEASON OPENS—MRS. MAY GETS A CITATION

(By Milton Berliner)

Boys and girls from 24 schools in 13 States were on hand at the Departmental Auditorium last night for the opening of the eighth annual Music for Young America series by Howard Mitchell and the National Symphony.

"This is something of record," Mr. Mitchell told them just before the orchestra launched into the overture to Rossini's "The Thieving Magpie."

This was followed by some Bach, Beethoven and Tchaikowsky.

Midway in the program there was a break for the presentation of an American Federation of Musicians award to the sponsor of these series, Mrs. Herbert A. May.

The citation, union's president Herman Kenin said, was "in grateful appreciation for efforts in behalf of live music and musicians and devotion to the advancement of cultural arts."

In the 8 years of underwriting these series of free concerts, Mrs. May has provided a total of 40 weeks' employment for the 95 National Symphony musicians and an introduction to symphonic music for thousands of young Americans.

Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz told the audience that he hoped it would "take away a picture of a gracious lady, an extraordinary conductor and one of the finest orchestras in the whole world."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 24, 1963]

MUSIC AND MRS. MAY

The National Symphony Orchestra is fortunate to have thousands of "angels" who contribute to its welfare. But a very special angel is Mrs. Herbert A. May who for 5 weeks each spring practically owns the orchestra. Graciously, she shares Howard Mitchell and his 95 players with visiting schoolchildren so they may enjoy "Music for Young America." This is the series she began financing 8 years ago with the dual purpose of (1) enriching the lives of young people through an introduction to good music and (2) financially assisting the orchestra members by extending their season.

The opening of this year's series was particularly auspicious. For the American Federation of Music recognized Mrs. May's generosity with a bronze plaque. It was an award well deserved, but no more significant than the audience of bright-faced youngsters from Wautoma, Wis., Suncock, N.H., Whitesburg, Ky., New York City, St. Louis, St. Paul, Mount Vernon, Ohio, and 14 other cities. For many of them it was the entry into a new and wonderful world.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 23, 1963]

MUSIC PATRON

The National Symphony Orchestra will play the opening concert today of its eighth season of free concerts for schoolchildren visiting Washington. It is altogether fitting that the American Federation of Musicians should have chosen this occasion to confer a Distinguished Service Award on Mrs. Herbert A. May, long a generous and imaginative patron of music in this community. Her generosity affords not only a great boon to the children who attend these concerts but an extended period of employment for the orchestra's musicians as well. As in past years, Mrs. May has completely underwritten the 30 concerts that will be performed between the opening concert and May 24. All of us owe her the warmest thanks.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, April 30, 1963.

Mr. HALPERN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI), for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN of New York (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON.
Mr. FINO.
Mr. BECKER.
Mr. GOODELL.
Mr. BOW in two instances.
Mr. WHALLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CELLER.
Mr. FARBSTEIN.
Mr. COHELAN.
Mr. JENNINGS.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2. An act to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1007. An act to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE LATE PRESIDENT OF ISRAEL, YITZCHAK BEN-ZVI

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to offer, on behalf of the House of Representatives, a resolution expressing the profound sorrow of the House on the death of His Excellency Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, President of the State of Israel. In the death of the late President the free world has lost a great champion. The American people have lost a friend. The people of the State of Israel have lost one of their most distinguished statesmen and beloved citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I express the sentiment of all the Members of the House of Representatives and of all the people of this country when I say we have learned with the deepest sorrow of the death of the late President. To his family and loved ones, and to the people of the State of Israel we extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, former U.S. Ambassador to the State of Israel [Mr. Reid].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the resolution and with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I believe truly that the free world has lost one of its best friends. President Yitzchak Ben-Zvi was truly a statesman and a scholar. He believed in close relations between Israel and the United States. He worked nobly in the vineyards of peace. He cared deeply about doing everything possible to establish strong and abiding relationships between Israel and the emerging as well as the older nations of the free world. Above all, let me say this: I had the privilege of knowing the President personally, and I remember him for his humanity, his humility, his simplicity, and for his scholarly statesmanship. He had many friends in this country and his loss will be much felt here and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I remember in 1960 at a diplomatic reception in Jerusalem when the President of Israel talked simply and movingly of peace. I would like here, perhaps as a fitting tribute, to quote a passage of the Bible that was especially meaningful to President Ben-Zvi. He was a scholar who was long interested in Isaiah, and I quote from a passage on peace that was particularly meaningful to him, and a passage that he called to the attention of the diplomatic corps. It is from chapter II of Isaiah, verse 2:

> And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.

Verse 4:

> And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this spirit that I remember President Ben-Zvi, who will long be an inspiration to those who were privileged to know him, and I indeed think it most appropriate that the Congress adjourn out of respect to his memory and that the sense of the Congress be that we deeply mourn the loss of this distinguished leader and extend our condolences to Mrs. Ben-Zvi, to his family, and to the people of Israel.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with a sad heart that I rise to commend our distinguished majority leader for bringing this resolution to the floor expressing the sincere regret of the Congress upon the passing of this distinguished statesman, the President of the State of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, it was my proud pleasure and privilege to have visited with him on many occasions in the State of Israel. He was indeed a learned and a profound scholar. He was a good man. It was his terrible burden to live at a time and be President of a country that was beleaguered on all sides by enemies who sought to destroy it. Yet through it all he was a man of peace.

As has so well been indicated in the remarks that have already been made on this floor, he was certainly all that a good man could be. He was deeply religious and, as I say, a profound scholar and a true statesman. The world has lost one of its finest leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I join with all of our colleagues in extending to his family and his bereaved countrymen our sincere and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York; I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, find myself saddened on the news of the passing of the late President of the State of Israel, Mr. Ben-Zvi. I had the pleasure of meeting him. If I recall correctly, I was first introduced to him by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid], in Jerusalem, some years back. I found President Ben-Zvi and Madam Ben-Zvi two of the finest people whom I have ever met. He was very democratic. He was profound in his religious devotions. He was a fine gentleman and a splendid host upon the occasion of our visit with the former Ambassador to Israel.

At this time I extend my deepest sympathy to Madam Ben-Zvi upon the loss of her great helpmate.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York; at this time I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the distinguished majority leader in support of this resolution and with the remarks that have been made here earlier in tribute to a great apostle of democracy in the world. There is no question that all Americans may grieve the passing of this great man who has made such a profound contribution toward building an island of democracy in the Middle East. I, indeed, join on behalf of the people of my congressional district in support of this resolution of tribute to a great person.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the majority leader for bringing this resolution before the House commemorating the life and mourning the passing of President Ben-Zvi. This was a man who gave luster and strength to a noble country and a noble people. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Reid], and to pay a tribute to him, because it is partially through his efforts and his friendship with the late President of Israel that American-Israeli relationships have remained firm and warm and close.

The passing of this great leader reminds us that the trials and tribulations of the Israeli people at a time of special strain and stress are great, probably as great as they have been for many, many years. We as a Congress and as individual Members of Congress express our concern for the State of Israel, for those courageous people, and our determination to see to it that they will always remain free and independent.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join in support of this resolution offered by our distinguished majority leader. I know that all Members of the House recognize the great humanitarian contributions of the late President of Israel. He led a great democracy in times of trial and the world has lost a great leader. I should like to add my voice in extending my deepest sympathy to the people of Israel and to his family.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues to support this resolution and to express my deep sympathy to the people of Israel and to the family of the late President for the grevious loss they have suffered. Israel has been fortunate indeed over the years to have such distinguished leadership not only in the late President, but also in Dr. Chaim Weizmann before him, men who have provided the kind of great moral and spiritual leadership and inspiration to the people of Israel that has made it possible for this new nation to overcome what might indeed have once seemed to be insuperable obstacles.

In adopting this resolution today the Members of Congress can indeed renew our sense of friendship with the State of Israel and also reaffirm our determination to make certain that this great bastion of freedom in the Middle East, the State of Israel, shall continue to remain free and strong in spite of all the efforts that may be directed against her.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend the news of the death of Israel's President, Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, has cast a pall over the preparations for the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel. There, as well as in many other countries throughout the world, the news of Ben-Zvi's death has come as a great shock and a sad reminder of the toll of time.

Mr. Ben-Zvi's role in Israel began early in the 20th century when the plan of a national homeland for the Jews was in its infancy. Ben-Zvi came to Palestine from Russia in 1906, uprooted and exiled in the wake of the cruel anti-Jewish programs that swept Russia at that time. From the moment of his arrival in Palestine, he had dedicated his generous heart and vigorous mind to the task of providing a place for Jews to live without ghetto and persecution.

Questions of national defense, education and the labor movement occupied this pioneer during the years between the wars. Uppermost in his mind seemed to be the work of preparation for the birth of a national state. The culmination of these labors of preparation came in 1948 when Ben-Zvi affixed his signature to the Israeli Declaration of Independence. Ben-Zvi directed his energies in the years after independence to the consolidation and strengthening of the gains he had given so much to secure. In 1952, Israel rewarded Ben-Zvi's 46 years of dedicated service by electing him the second President of the new State. He has served in this capacity until his death last week, 57 years after his arrival in Palestine.

I wish to join with Israel at this time in offering my deepest sympathy on the death of this distinguished patriot. Israel's sorrow will be tempered by its profound gratitude to one who, in the most honored sense of the phrase, gave his life to his country.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened at the passing of the late President of the State of Israel, Mr. Yitzchak Ben-Zvi.

It was my privilege to have known him personally and to have spent some time with him in the privacy of what was undoubtedly the favorite room in his modest home, his library, where the walls were covered with well-worn volumes on religion, history, and archeology, as well as copies of his own works. I was particularly impressed with his gentleness, his kindliness, and his humility.

Although he was 78 years of age at the time of his death, one would never think of President Ben-Zvi as 78 years old; rather, he was 78 years young. He represented the intellectual element of the State of Israel complementing the activist group.

His idealism, his desire to foster the traditions of Judaism and his lifelong devotion to the State of Israel remained eternally alive until his last mortal moments on earth. His last official message contained a warning that the State of Israel had no choice but to keep its defenses at peak strength and alertness.

Few individuals are singularly fortunate to see come to fruition the ideals and visions of their youth. In the establishment of the State of Israel, and in the esteem in which the State of Israel is held today by all but its Arab enemies, President Ben-Zvi realized his dreams.

His death will be mourned by all who have known and respected him for his wisdom, his courage, and his devotion to the cause of human freedom and the principles of peace and democracy.

I extend to his family, to his lifelong friend, Prime Minister Ben Gurion, and to the people of Israel, my sincerest sympathies.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in expressing deep sorrow at the passing of Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, President of the State of Israel.

The world has lost a valiant fighter for freedom, a true scholar, and distinguished statesman. And the people of Israel have been deprived of the great moral and spiritual leadership and inspiration that have helped to make it possible for this new nation to overcome what would otherwise have been almost insuperable obstacles.

This great man, born in czarist Ukraine in 1884, went through the shameful persecutions and pogroms of the 1905 year of revolution in Russia, and with his family experienced exile in Siberia.

As one of the early refugee-escapees to arrive in Israel, Mr. Ben-Zvi soon distinguished himself as a legal scholar as well as an organizer in the labor movement and one of the first leaders of Hashomer, the underground citizens' army which spearheaded the long struggle for an independent Jewish state.

It was my great honor and privilege to have met and talked with this outstanding citizen of the world during a tour of the Middle East and Europe in 1954.

I was thoroughly impressed by President Ben-Zvi's dedication and devotion for the cause for which he had worked and toiled for so many years and against such great odds. He will long be remembered and revered by men who cherish the dignity and rights of all men to live according to the dictates of their conscience.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke today on the subject of the late President of Israel be permitted to revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT YITZCHAK BEN-ZVI

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 324), and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States of America has learned with profound sorrow of the death of His Excellency Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, and sympathizes with the people of the State of Israel in the loss of their beloved President.

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to communicate this expression of sentiment of the House of Representatives to the Government of the State of Israel.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of President Ben-Zvi the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution is agreed to unanimously.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 25, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

734. A letter from the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the foundation for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1962, pursuant to section 14b of Public Law 662, 83d Congress, 68 Stat. 795; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

735. A letter from the President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for reimbursement of the Treasury by the Panama Canal Company for the annuity paid to the Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

736. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the report of activities of the Institute for the year 1962, pursuant to section 4 of the charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

737. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the third semiannual report of the Secretary of Commerce on the U.S. Travel Service, October 1962 to March 1963, pursuant to section 5 of the International Travel Act of 1961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

738. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the submission of certain cost estimates for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

739. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a request for additional funds for reprograming facilities at Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MONAGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report on conditions behind the iron curtain and in selected countries of Western Europe; without amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4152. A bill to authorize the addition of certain donated lands to the administrative headquarters site, Isle Royale National Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 5835. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to prohibit political contributions by agents of foreign principals, and to require the furnishing of certain detailed information concerning expenditures made by such agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 5836. A bill for the relief of certain veteran homestead entrymen, their heirs, and other owners of farm units on the Third Division Irrigation District, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY (by request):

H.R. 5837. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes", approved July 28, 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 5838. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449) as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5839. A bill to improve the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act relating to aged individuals and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5840. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, through grants for construction of recreational activity centers, and through grants to stimulate employment opportunities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 5841. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5842. A bill to permit certain proceedings supplementary to judgment in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and in the municipal court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5843. A bill to prohibit discrimination by reason of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin against persons seeking or utilizing housing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5844. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5845. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 5846. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 5847. A bill to repeal the act of August 30, 1962, providing for payment by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of unpaid amounts of awards under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946; and to provide full settlement of the awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission by authorizing the payment to the Philippine Government of a sum to be administered as a development grant under title II of chapter 2 of the Act for International Development of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 5848. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5849. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 5850. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 5851. A bill to promote water and air pollution control and abatement by authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide certain assistance to small business concerns in obtaining necessary treatment works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5852. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.J. Res. 388. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 389. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning the Cooperative Extension Service and opposing the use of the Extension Service as a promotional arm of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to repeal Public Law 87-297 of the 87th Congress commonly known as the Arms Control and Disarmament Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing Congress to enact legislation governing the acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction over Federal holdings within the 13 Western States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed and with reference to the recognition of the rights and laws of the States of the United States relating to the control, development, appropriation and use of waters within the States' boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Bureau of Land Management, with reference to passing legislation granting 90 percent of all moneys from the sale of, or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals, on federally controlled minerals within the State of Wyoming to the State of Wyoming. The people of the sovereign State of Wyoming recognize that the United States of America controls over 50 percent of all the lands within the borders of the State of Wyoming, and over 70 percent of the minerals on, in or under the lands of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Federal Power Commission and the congressional delegation of the State of Wyoming in favor of the Rock Springs project and calling their attention to the overwhelming importance of such project to the economy of the people in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would provide that the Federal Government may not, through legislative or judicial action restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint memorial of the Senate, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States reaffirming support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the

State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning the Federal Insurance Contribution Act and opposing any future increase in the social security tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to passing legislation which would place the timber industry of this country in a competitive position with foreign production through the establishment of import quotas or other means; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, concerning taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Congress to aid the State of Hawaii in the development of Waikiki Beach; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will provide additional income tax exemptions for persons attending institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the coverage of the Farmers Home Administration for recreational enterprises to include resort owners; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 5853. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Beas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 5854. A bill for the relief of Anastasija Dancevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 5855. A bill for the relief of Arthur Wendell Bolta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 5856. A bill for the relief of the estate of Dorothy Michels Sever and the estate of Julianne Elizabeth Sever, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 5857. A bill for the relief of Sara Schneider Pascu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 5858. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, Local Union No. 746 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 5859. A bill for the relief of George Napier, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.J. Res. 390. Joint resolution authorizing the Attorney General to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

93. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Mansfield, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that immediate steps be taken within their powers and as are necessary to terminate the influx of Communist-made goods into the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in whose will alone is our peace, Thou hast taught us that only in the reach of our love is the richness of our life.

We seek Thee as our fathers in every generation before us have sought Thee. We come with the confident assurance that we shall find, as they found, that if with all our heart we truly seek Thee, we shall surely find Thee.

Our needs throng our days as we turn in all our perplexities, from problem to problem. But our greatest need is of Thee. Unless we really find Thee as our help and hope and are found of Thee, the laws of Thy physical universe will break our mortal existence and the laws of Thy moral realm will make mockery of our futile rebellion.

Our lives become significant only as they are linked with Thy eternal purposes and become the channels of Thy will. Thus, may our work become a sharing of Thine own which gladdens this sad world; and even the drab details of our earthly tasks which chafe us, and so often seem monotonous and meaningless, will flash and flame with unexpected glory as our labor becomes a part of Thy plan.

We ask it in the name of the Master of all good workmen. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 23, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Upon request of Mr. Dirksen, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles B. Fulton, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida.

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

L. J. Andolsek, of Minnesota, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

Also, 229 postmaster nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Roger Hilsman, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that I oppose confirmation of the nomination of George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Ambassador to Germany; Edwin M. Martin, of Ohio, to be the representative of the United States to the Economic Commission for Latin America; and Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be the representative of the United States to the Economic Commission for Europe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David Elliott Bell, of Massachusetts, to be Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

HOLDING OF TERMS OF U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR VERMONT AT MONTPELIER AND ST. JOHNSBURY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 137, Senate bill 980, to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of Vermont at Montpelier and St. Johnsbury.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 980) to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of Vermont at Montpelier and St. Johnsbury was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 126 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Court shall be held at Brattleboro, Burlington, Montpelier, Rutland, Saint Johnsbury, and Windsor."

NATIONAL ACTORS' EQUITY WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 138, Senate Joint Resolution 39, designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 39 would designate the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week, in recognition of the outstanding contribution which Actors' Equity Association and its 13,000 actor-members have made to the cultural life of our Nation.

The Actors' Equity Association was founded on May 26, 1913, by distinguished members of the American theatrical profession to advance, promote, foster, and benefit all those connected with the art of the theater. It has provided responsible and creative leadership in the field of the performing arts and has encouraged and reflected the artistic ideals of our country. It has served not only in the best interests of actors and performers in the legitimate theater, but has materially enhanced and inspired the cultural life of the United States.

Observances of Actors' Equity's 50th birthday will be numerous and widespread. Special events are scheduled during the month of May to take place in California, Chicago, and New York. A golden anniversary show featuring the stars of the American theater and depicting the great theatrical events of the past half-century will be presented on May 5. The New York public libraries and the museum of the city of New York will present exhibits on the history of the American theater, and the New York celebration will be climaxed by a banquet and ball at the Astor Hotel in New York on the night of May 25.

Equity's golden anniversary promises to be one of the memorable events of the American stage. Passage of this resolution is intended not only to do honor to Equity but also to call nationwide attention to the role of the legitimate theater in our culture.

Mr. President, this resolution was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, but I am confident that it is supported by every Member of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on engrossing the joint resolution for a third reading.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of May 20–26, 1963, is hereby designated as National Actors' Equity Week, in recognition of the outstanding contribution which Actors' Equity Association has made to the cultural life of our Nation.

The preamble was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON TRANSFER OF RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND OPERATION FUNDS, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the transfer of fiscal year 1963 research, development, and operation funds to the fiscal year 1963 construction of facilities appropriation and the use of such funds for the addition of a third story to the Space Flight Operations Facility, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ON MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK, NEGOTIATED IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE OR INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental or research work negotiated in the interest of national defense or industrial mobilization, for the period July–December 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the U.S. Travel Service, for the period October 1962–March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON FRUITLAND MESA PROJECT, COLORADO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Fruitland Mesa Project, Colorado (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARIES OF THE INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE TO FURNISH AND RECEIVE EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to furnish and receive emergency assistance, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CORRECTION OF A CERTAIN LAND DESCRIPTION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to correct a land description in the act entitled "To provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas Homer T. Bone, judge emeritus of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Judicial Circuit, has dedicated his life to public service and has faithfully served therein for many decades and is widely renowned as a pioneer in the fight for public power; and

"Whereas his faith and foresight in various public enterprises has been of great value to the State of Washington and to the United States as a whole; and

"Whereas he was for many years the U.S. Senate's leading public power advocate; and

"Whereas, the development of public power projects in these United States is greatly indebted to his courage and labor; and

"Whereas it would be desirable and proper to honor him for his dedication and service; and

"Whereas no dam nor hydroelectric project has been named after him: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives*, that we most respectfully request the Congress of the United States to name a dam on the Columbia River after Judge Homer T. Bone during his lifetime; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chief clerk of the house to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior and the Federal Power Commission, and to each member of the Washington delegation in Congress.

"Attest:

"S. R. HOLCOMBE,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Mansfield, Ohio, relating to the sale of Communist goods in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 5517. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 155).

REPORT ENTITLED "STUDY OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM" (S. REPT. NO. 153)

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 262, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Study of the Federal Judicial System," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "REVISION AND CODIFICATION" (S. REPT. NO. 154)

Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 257, 87th Congress, 2d session as extended, submitted a report entitled "Revision and Codification," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TALMADGE, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S. 1347. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1348. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1349. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise Sheridan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1350. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fiannaca; and

S. 1351. A bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

S. 1352. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe in South Dakota;

S. 1353. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; and

S. 1354. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 1355. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to furnish and receive emergency assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1356. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and the Temporary Extended Railroad Unemployment Insurance Benefits Act of 1961 to increase the creditable and taxable compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. BURDICK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1357. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, through grants for construction of recreational activity centers, and through grants to stimulate employment opportunities; and

S. 1358. A bill to improve the public assistance provisions of titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act, relating to aged individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1359. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1360. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Buttes Dam and Reservoir, Middle Gila River project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 128); which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-eighth Congress, $25,000, in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL TAX LIENS AND LEVIES STATUTE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference.

A similar bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives by the very distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Representative WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, and also by the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin.

The bill would alleviate many inequities which have resulted from the judicial interpretation of present provisions of law, under which mortgagees, contract purchasers, mechanic lienors, sureties, landlords, attorneys, warehousemen, State and local governments, and other lien creditors have been subordinated to subsequently arising Federal tax liens, and thus in effect have been required to bear the burden of another person's Federal taxes. The bill would also modernize the 160-year-old law giving the United States virtually absolute priority in nonbankruptcy insolvency proceedings—receiverships, assignments for creditors, decedents' estates, etc.—and would bring the insolvency rules more into line with the principles applied in bankruptcy. The bill would also clarify the rights and obligations of debtors of a taxpayer upon whom a levy is made, so as to assure that they will not be placed in a worse position than if the taxpayer himself had sued them; and it will make a number of procedural changes—clarifying the rights of third parties to protect themselves by suit when their property is seized or threatened with seizure for the taxes of another, and simplifying the procedure for removing a Federal lien when a senior lien is enforced.

The urgent need for the bill arises out of a number of recent developments. A series of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court has engrafted a new limitation on citizens' rights under these statutes, which has substantially extended the scope of Federal tax liens and priorities, and has imperiled the security of many common, everyday business transactions. The holders of mechanics' liens, perfected under State law, have seen the product of their efforts snatched from them and sold—in what amounts to an unjust enrichment—to satisfy Federal taxes that were assessed and became liens after the materials were furnished and the work was done. Lawyers who recovered judgments for their clients, and had a lien on the recovery to secure their fees, have seen the fund created by their work taken to satisfy intervening Federal tax liens against their clients. Home buyers, who had made payments and taken possession but had not obtained title, have had their homes taken to satisfy Federal tax liens against the seller, which liens arose long after the purchase of the homes and the taking of possession.

Further, although present law, on its face, protects mortgagees and pledgees from Federal tax liens unless notice of the tax lien has first been filed, secured credit transactions have been made insecure by the new judgemade rule that an assignment for security is protected against a subsequent tax lien only if the assignment is "choate." That means that a bank or commercial finance company which loans money on the security of inventories and receivables is unsafe because its security is "inchoate." The lender who finances a construction or manufacturing contract, upon a pledge of the contract, is unsafe for the same reason. The savings and loan association or insurance company that takes a mortgage on a house, with an open-end clause to encourage further borrowing for home improvement, must incur the expense of a new search for Federal tax liens before each advance, and that expense, of course, is passed on to the homeowner.

These new courtmade rules are not only unfair; they are in part self-defeating, and are harmful to our economy. The business losses which they cause are tax deductible, so the Government shares the loss. Worse, whenever a businessman contemplates those rules and declines or hesitates to incur the added risks they entail, business suffers and tax collections inevitably decline.

Title I of this bill would remedy the inequities of those rules. It reflects a careful balancing of the Government's legitimate interest in collecting the revenues against the need of the public for security of real estate titles, convenience, and security of business transactions, and the avoidance of undue oppression of taxpayers and unjust enrichment of the Government at the expense of innocent third parties.

Title II relates to the absolute priority of the United States in insolvency proceedings other than bankruptcy. It takes the ancient law on that subject, last revised in the year 1799—100 years before the National Bankruptcy Act first was enacted, and brings the rules substantially in line with the priorities established in bankruptcy.

Title III is procedural, and is designed principally to facilitate the removal of clouds on title resulting from the existence of subordinate Federal liens. It broadens the existing consent of the Government to be joined as a defendant in actions involving the determination of rights in and liens upon property, and eliminates the Government's present 1-year right of redemption from a foreclosure sale. It also protects the Government by assuring that it will have notice of a nonjudicial sale under a mortgage or deed of trust, notice which is now denied it under recent court decisions.

This bill is the fruit of several years of study by four sections of the American Bar Association, and is unanimously approved and recommended to the Congress by the house of delegates of the association. The bill also has the general support of numerous State and local bar associations, the American Bankers Association, U.S. Savings and Loan League, the American Title Association, and many other organizations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1347) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Curtis (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

TO CREATE A NATIONAL MONUMENT PRESERVING THE HISTORIC ALIBATES FLINT QUARRIES AND PUEBLO RUINS NEAR AMARILLO, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create a national monument preserving the historic Alibates flint quarries and pueblo ruins near Amarillo, Tex.

The quarries and ruins are to be acquired by the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority, which has offered to donate the entire site to the National Park Service for preservation for its historic interest.

The quarries were a source of flint for weapons and tools for the North American Indian for thousands of years. Historians say the flint was traded over an area of hundreds of miles from the quarries, and Alibates flint has been found in Indian burials thousands of miles from the quarries. These quarries were worked by primitive man in a prehistory period long before the Comanches and Apaches arrived to dominate this region.

Mr. President, this flint has a peculiar, wavy colored line structure, and comes only from those quarries. It can be identified wherever found all over the United States. Findings which have been made in old burial grounds have shown there was wide trade among the American Indian tribes of this flint. This flint has been found in use by Indians as far east as the Atlantic seaboard.

The pueblo is said to be the only such ruin in Texas, and perhaps the easternmost structure of its type in the Nation.

The ruins are near Highway 66 and easily accessible to the public. It is also near Palo Duro Park, a great canyon Frontiersmen Kit Carson and Charles Goodnight, first rancher in the Panhandle, helped make famous.

In support of the resolution, I offer resolutions of local, State, and area governmental authorities and historical and geological societies. Among them are statements of support from Gov. John Connally, the Texas State Historical Survey Committee, the Potter County Historical Survey Committee, Potter County Commissioners Court, Panhandle Geological Society, and the Texas Panhandle Heritage Foundation. Hubert Mewhinney, Houston Post newswriter and one of the foremost authorities on flint, has also urged preservation of the site.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record, and that all of these supporting documents be printed in full in the Record, including the names of the people who signed them and the names of the committees on the letterheads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and other documents will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1348) to authorize the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept from the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority, Borger, Texas, on behalf of the United States, title to those lands comprising the Alibates Flint Quarries and the Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture sites, together with any structures and improvements thereon, located in and around Potter County, Texas.

Sec. 2. (a) The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be set aside as a national monument for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States and shall be designated as the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such monument, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935, as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of such national monument, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and maintain therein such markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The documents presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH are as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the Alibates Flint Quarries of Potter County, Tex., are outstanding in their interpretation of North American prehistory; and

Whereas the materials removed from these quarries were used by prehistoric man in the making of chipped flint instruments over a period of more than 10,000 years; and

Whereas the area to be acquired is the only area in the State of Texas where an advanced prehistoric sedentary culture constructed pueblos; and

Whereas this prehistoric sedentary culture conducted extensive trade, hundreds of miles radially, with this material; and

Whereas the area is to be acquired in the immediate future by the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority as a recreation area; and

Whereas the imminent acquisition of this recreation area by the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority will expose an irreplaceable prehistoric site to destruction by carelessness and indifference; and

Whereas many authorities of the archeological and geological sciences concur that this site be preserved for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring) recommend to the President of the United States that this area be designated as a national monument or a national park.

PRESTON SMITH,
President of the Senate.
BRYON TUNNELL,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7 was adopted by the senate on January 14, 1963.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

I hereby certify that Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7 was adopted by the house on January 15, 1963.

DOROTHY HALLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

RESOLUTION BY THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL SURVEY COMMITTEE

(Members of the Texas State Historical Survey Committee: George W. Hill, executive director, Austin, Tex.; Rupert N. Richardson, president, Abilene; Mrs. Mike Butler, vice president, Austin; F. Lee Lawrence, secretary, Tyler; Mrs. John M. Bennett, Jr., San Antonio; Millard Cope, Marshall; Roy H. Cullen, Houston; Mrs. L. E. Dudley, Abilene; Jenkins Garrett, Fort Worth; Walter Malec, Hallettsville; Tom B. Medders, Wichita Falls; Mrs. Mary Moody Northen, Galveston; I. C. Parma, Granger; Sam Privitt, Childress; Mrs. Edward Randall, Jr., Galveston; John Ben Shepperd, Odessa; Charles R. Tips, Dallas; Mrs. Max Weinert, Seguin; James E. Wheat, Woodville.)

Whereas the Alibates Flint Quarries of Potter County, Tex., are outstanding in their interpretation of North American prehistory; and

Whereas the material removed from these quarries was used by prehistoric man in the making of chipped flint implements over a period of more than 12,000 years; and

Whereas this is the only area in the State of Texas where an advanced prehistoric sedentary culture constructed pueblos and simultaneously conducted extensive trade with this material; and

Whereas prehistoric cultures traveled hundreds of miles to acquire this choice material for the making of their finest weapons points and tools; and

Whereas the area is to be acquired in the immediate future by the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority as a recreation area thus exposing an irreplaceable prehistoric site to destruction by carelessness and indifference; and

Whereas this site must be preserved for future generations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas State Historical Survey Committee, the official State historical preservation agency, recommend to the President, the Secretary of Interior, and the Congress of the United States that this area be designated a national monument or a national park.

Attest:

JOHN BEN SHEPPERD,
President.
ELEANOR BENNETT,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION BY THE PANHANDLE GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

(Panhandle Geological Society, 1962–63: president, Harold T. Henslee; vice president, Morgan W. Eddleman; secretary, David J. Tinsley; treasurer, Eugene M. Peeples. Committees: ways and means, Clyde E. Little; program and entertainment, Morgan W. Eddleman; vice chairman (program), Harold J. Trepagnier; vice chairman (entertainment), Ernest S. Brainard; vice chairman (golf), Harold W. Price; vice chairman (bowling), Frank Morris; membership, David J. Tinsley; editorial and publicity, Jere W. McKenny; field trip, William M. Quackenbush; stratigraphic, Charles B. Morgan; youth, Paul Nygreen; librarian, Ellsworth Vachon.)

Whereas the Alibates Flint Quarries and the Alibates pueblo ruins of the Texas Panhandle pueblo culture of Potter County, Tex., are outstanding in their interpretation of more than 12,000 years of prehistory on the North American Continent; and

Whereas many prehistoric cultures traveled hundreds of miles to acquire this choice material for the making of their finest weapons points and tools; and

Whereas this is the only area in the State of Texas where an advanced prehistoric sedentary culture constructed pueblos and at the same time conducted extensive trade with this material; and

Whereas the area is to be acquired in the immediate future by the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority as a recreation area of the Sanford Reservoir thus exposing an irreplaceable prehistoric site to destruction by carelessness and indifference; and

Whereas the board of directors of the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority will dedicate the required acreage of this recreation area to the National Park Service for development as a national monument or as a national park; and

Whereas many authorities of the historical, archeological, and geological sciences concur that this site be preserved for present and future generations; and

Whereas the development of this site will be of great historical, geological, archeological, and cultural significance to the Nation as a whole: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Panhandle Geological Society, That it recommend to the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Congress of the United States that this area be designated a national monument or a national park.

Attest:

HAROLD T. HENSLEE,
President.
DAVID J. TINSLEY,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION BY THE TEXAS PANHANDLE HERITAGE FOUNDATION, CANYON, TEX.

Whereas the Alibates Flint Quarries of Potter County, Tex., are outstanding in their interpretation of North American prehistory; and

Whereas the material removed from these quarries was used by prehistoric man in the making of chipped flint implements over a period of more than 12,000 years; and

Whereas this is the only area in the State of Texas where an advanced prehistoric sedentary culture constructed pueblos and simultaneously conducted extensive trade with this material; and

Whereas prehistoric cultures traveled hundreds of miles to acquire this choice material for the making of their finest weapons points and tools; and

Whereas the area is to be acquired in the immediate future by the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority as a recreation area thus exposing an irreplaceable prehistoric site to destruction by carelessness and indifference; and

Whereas many authorities of the archeological, geological, and historical sciences concur that the site be preserved for future generations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Texas Panhandle Heritage Foundation, Inc., That it recommend to the President, the Secretary of the Interior and the Congress of the United States that this area be designated a national monument or a national park.

Attest:

MARGARET HARPER,
President.
EDITH ECKHARDT,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION BY POTTER COUNTY HISTORICAL SURVEY COMMITTEE

(Members of the Potter County Historical Survey Committee: W. M. Adams, county judge, Amarillo, Tex.; Floyd V. Stuber, chairman; Henry Hertner, vice chairman; Ernest R. Archambeau, secretary; Clayton Heare, legislative committee; S. B. Whittenburg, publicity committee; Ernest R. Archambeau, archives committee; J. Robin Allen, museum committee; Charles Woodburn, historical markers committee; Ray S. Daniel; and Charles Gunn.)

Whereas the Alibates Flint Quarries of Potter County, Tex., are outstanding in their interpretation of North American prehistory; and

Whereas the material removed from these quarries was used by prehistoric man in the making of chipped flint implements over a period of more than 12,000 years; and

Whereas this is the only area in the State of Texas where an advanced prehistoric sedentary culture constructed pueblos and simultaneously conducted extensive trade with this material; and

Whereas prehistoric cultures traveled hundreds of miles to acquire this choice material for the making of their finest weapons points and tools; and

Whereas the area is to be acquired in the immediate future by the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority as a recreation area, thus exposing an irreplaceable prehistoric site to destruction by carelessness and indifference; and

Whereas many authorities of the archeological, geological, and historical sciences concur that the site be preserved for future generations: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Potter County Historical Survey Committee, That it recommend to the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Congress of the United States that this area be designated a national monument or a national park.

Attest:

Floyd V. Stuber, *Chairman.*
Ernest R. Archambeau,
Secretary.

Resolution by State of Texas

The State of Texas,
Executive Department,
Austin, Tex.

Whereas it is agreed that the Alibates Flint Quarries and the Alibates pueblo ruins of the Texas Panhandle pueblo culture exemplify the most outstanding interpretation of more than 12,000 years of continuous North American prehistory, and the lands on which they are located will be acquired by the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority as a recreation area of the Sanford reservoir and the required acreage will be dedicated without cost to the National Park Service for development; and

Whereas many eminent authorities of the geological, archeological, and historical sciences have adopted resolutions and concur in the importance to the Nation of the Alibates Flint Quarries and the pueblo culture in that there is no duplication in the proposed use of these areas in any of the existing National Park Service areas or sites and that they meet the requirements for the establishment of a national monument or a national park:

Now, therefore, I, John Connally, Governor, State of Texas, in recognizing the great and urgent need to preserve and develop this nationally significant area as a national monument or as a national park, do hereby urge the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President, to take immediate and appropriate action as recommended by this and the attached resolutions.

John Connally,
Governor, State of Texas.

Attest:

Scott P. Sayers.

Resolution by Canadian River Municipal Water Authority

(Canadian River Municipal Water Authority, office of secretary, City Hall, Borger, Tex.—Executive committee: George W. Finger, president; Ray Renner, vice president; A. A. Meredith, secretary-treasurer. Member cities and directors: Amarillo, Tex., Al E. Banasik, A. F. Madison; Borger, Tex., George W. Finger, Hudson Davis; Pampa, Tex., Fred Thompson, Clinton Evans; Plainview, Tex., R. V. Payne; Lubbock, Tex., J. Ray Dickey, Irving L. Jones; Slaton, Tex., W. Howard Hoffman; Tahoka, Tex., E. R. Edwards; O'Donnell, Tex., Clyde Winans; Lamesa, Tex., Sam Richardson, Ray Renner; Brownfield, Tex., Lee Brownfield, A. M. Muldrow; Leveland, Tex., I. F., Lea J,. Spencer Ellis.)

Whereas the board of directors of the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority in recognizing the archeological and geological significance of the Alibates Flint Quarries and the Texas Panhandle pueblo culture sites as outstanding in their interpretation of over 12,000 years of continuous prehistory on the North American Continent; and

Whereas this authority will acquire the area as one of the recreation areas of the Sanford Reservoir; and

Whereas it is the desire of this authority to preserve these outstanding prehistoric sites for future generations and to dedicate to the National Park Service the required acreage for development; and

Whereas it is urgent that the appropriate action be taken by the National Park Service to designate and develop this area as a national monument or a national park: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority, That it recommend to the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Congress of the United States that this area be designated a national monument or a national park.

Attest:

George Finger,
President.
A. A. Meredith,
Secretary.

Resolution by County of Potter, Tex.

Whereas the Alibates Flint Quarries of Potter County, Tex., are outstanding in their interpretation of North American prehistory; and

Whereas the material removed from these quarries was used by prehistoric man in the making of chipped flint implements over a period of more than 12,000 years; and

Whereas this is the only area in the State of Texas where an advanced prehistoric sedentary culture constructed pueblos and simultaneously conducted extensive trade with this material; and

Whereas prehistoric cultures traveled hundreds of miles to acquire this choice material for the making of their finest weapons points and tools; and

Whereas the area is to be acquired in the immediate future by the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority as a recreation area thus exposing an irreplaceable prehistoric site to destruction by carelessness and indifference; and

Whereas many authorities of the archeological and geological sciences concur that the site be preserved for future generations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Potter County Commissioners Court, That it recommend to the President of the United States that this area be designated a national monument or a national park.

Attest:

W. M. Adams,
County Judge, Potter County, Tex.
Ann Lyle,
County Clerk, Potter County, Tex.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in June of last year when we went to the Canadian River with the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Stewart Udall, for the ground breaking of the great Canadian River project, with the longest pipeline system to be built by the Interior Department in the United States to date, a presentation was made to Secretary of the Interior Udall by archeologists of that region. One of the archeologists came from as far away as Houston, Tex. Mr. Hubert Mewhinney, a Houston Post newswriter, is one of the foremost authorities on flint structures in the Nation. At that time all of the data was presented in support of the bill.

JURISDICTION OF U.S. DISTRICT COURTS IN PENSION AND PAY CASES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code.

Subsection (d) of 28 United States Code, section 1346 provides that the district courts shall not have jurisdiction under section 1346 of any civil action or claim for a pension or any civil action or claim to recover fees, salary, or compensation for official services of officers or employees of the United States. The purpose of my bill is to repeal this subsection so that the district courts shall have original jurisdiction, concurrent with the Court of Claims, of civil actions or claims for a pension or for salary of officers and employees of the United States. But for the subsection which this bill proposes to repeal, the district courts would have jurisdiction of these matters under 28 United States Code, section 1346(a)(2), which generally authorizes district court jurisdiction of all claims against the United States, not exceeding $10,000, based upon either the Constitution, any act of Congress, any executive regulation, or any contract with the United States.

This proposed repeal of a narrow limitation upon the jurisdiction of the district courts would not, of course, create any new liabilities or new causes of action against the U.S. Government; substantive law, in other words, is entirely unaffected. Nor would this bill, if enacted, change in any manner the present jurisdiction of the Court of Claims. As before, the Court of Claims would retain its exclusive jurisdiction of Tucker Act cases where the amount in controversy exceeds $10,000, regardless of the precise nature of the individual case. My bill is designed solely to permit the district courts around the country to share in the Court of Claims' jurisdiction of pension and pay cases where the amount in controversy does not exceed $10,000.

The chief beneficiaries of the bill would be present and former Government employees and present and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States. Whereas under present law pension and pay cases brought by such persons may be filed only in the Court of Claims, my bill would permit them to bring suit in the district courts. Under the applicable venue statute now on the books, which is title 28 U.S. Code Section 1402(a), these suits could be brought in the judicial district where the plaintiff resides. This bill is, therefore, in line with modern venue policy in Government litigation, since it offers individual citizens the convenience of litigating against the United States in or near their place of residence. At the same time, no hardship is placed upon the United States as defendant, as under the present organization of the Department of Justice the Government is presumably equipped to defend equally and conveniently in any Federal judicial district.

Mr. President, in my view this bill dovetails neatly with a measure enacted into law during the 87th Congress, and it is to be regretted that the provisions of this bill were not considered at that time. Public Law 748 of the 87th Congress added to the Judicial Code a new section 1361, which generally confers upon the district courts original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any of its agencies to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff. The principal purpose of this enactment was to rectify the peculiar situation where a person seeking to have a Federal court compel a Federal officer to perform an official duty had to channel his action into the District Court for the District of Columbia. This, in the words of our Committee on the Judiciary (S. Rept. 1992, 87th Cong., pp. 2–3), was certainly "an unfair imposition upon citizens who seek no more than lawful treatment from their Government." The committee went on to say, and here I should like to quote extensively because what is said is equally applicable to my bill, as follows:

> The committee is of the view that the current state of the law respecting venue in actions against Government officials is contrary to the sound and equitable administration of justice. Frequently, the administration determinations involved are not made in Washington but in the field. In either event, these are actions which are in essence against the United States. The Government official is defended by the Department of Justice whether the action is brought in the District of Columbia or in any other district. U.S. attorneys are present in every judicial district. Requiring the Government to defend Government officials and agencies in places other than Washington would not appear to be a burdensome imposition.
>
> On the other hand, where a citizen lives thousands of miles from Washington, * * * to require that the action be brought in Washington is to tailor our judicial processes to the convenience of the Government rather than to provide readily available, inexpensive judicial remedies for the citizen who is aggrieved by the workings of Government.

In similar manner, if the bill I am introducing today is enacted into law, a plaintiff in a pension or pay case against the United States will have the choice of bringing suit either in the Court of Claims here in Washington—and, of course, this avenue will remain convenient to the many Government employees who reside in the Washington area—or, instead, for the many who do not, in the U.S. district court in the district of the plaintiff's residence.

What is most significant from the standpoint of the history of our Federal judicial system, is that this bill would restore the situation as it essentially existed in the 11-year period between 1887, when the Tucker Act first conferred jurisdiction upon the district courts concurrent with the Court of Claims, and 1898, when the Congress enacted what is now the subsection that this repealer is directed against.

As pointed out by the Supreme Court in *Bruner* against *United States* (343 U.S. 112, 114–5), a 1952 case, it was because of claimed inconvenience for the Government to defend against pay claims in the various district courts under the 1887 Tucker Act that the Congress in 1898 withdrew those cases from district court jurisdiction and centralized them here in Washington in the Court of Claims.

Now, Mr. President, 1898 was 65 years ago. The Department of Justice has grown a bit since then, and a vast body of Government litigation is conducted throughout the country in every judicial district by the local U.S. attorneys and their assistants, under the general supervision of the Department. To paraphrase an ancient common law maxim, where the reason that gave rise to the law no longer holds water, the law ought to go.

I would expect that repeal of title 28 United States Code section 1346(d)(2) would have its best practical application in the area of civilian and military discharges. Today, when a nonprobationary civil service employee is separated from Government employment following administrative procedures under the Lloyd-LaFollette Act, or, in the case of a veteran, under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, or when a member of the Armed Forces is discharged, the former employee or serviceman who believes his discharge was contrary to law or regulations has a number of judicial remedies open to him, but none provides one-step complete relief if he is entitled to it. First, he can bring a back pay suit in the Court of Claims, but that court, if it enters judgment in his favor, has no power to grant the specific relief of ordering him restored to his former position. Or, in the alternative, he can bring an action in the nature of mandamus in the appropriate U.S. district court under the recently enacted title 28 United States Code section 1361, which, if successful, would result in a decree compelling the defendant Government officials to reinstate him in his former position. However, because of title 28 United States Code section 1346(d)(2), the district court could not supplement the reinstatement decree with a money judgment for the lost back pay that the employee was wrongfully deprived of.

Now, it is true that, whether the employee sues in the Court of Claims or in a district court, complete relief is available as a practical matter. A victorious litigant in the Court of Claims can keep on suing the United States for separate installments of lost back pay until he gets his job back, so that in order to prevent having to pay salary for services not rendered, the agency typically restores the man to his former position voluntarily. And a successful prosecution of a mandamus action in a district court, which results in employee reinstatement, sets into motion administrative repayment of the lost back pay. But in neither event could complete relief be gained in a single court action.

This bill, by removing an artificial limitation on the jurisdiction of the district courts, would enable a wrongfully discharged Government employee to sue to get his job back and to recover his lost back pay all in a single court action so long as the pay claim did not exceed $10,000. And in my judgment, very few back pay claims would exceed that jurisdictional amount. Because of the doctrine of laches, the plaintiff would be forced to bring suit in most cases before his back pay accrual reached $10,000. In rare cases, a high-salaried official might have accrued more than $10,000 and be forced to go into the Court of Claims, but this is his remedy under present law and my bill would not disturb this arrangement in the slightest.

Mr. President, this bill, if enacted, would also result in a more equitable distribution of employee discharge cases throughout the Federal court system. The Court of Claims calendar today is extremely congested. In the fiscal year ended September 30, 1962, a total of 5,116 back pay cases were pending in the Court of Claims at the beginning of the period, 832 additional such cases were instituted, 3,131 were disposed of, and, therefore, 2,817 were left pending at the end of the year. To be sure, many of these were class cases, involving identical claims, but still this segment of the Court of Claims' workload is truly burdensome.

This bill would result in spreading much of this work around the country. And the district courts would have a tremendous body of Court of Claims precedents available for adjudicating these cases with no more difficulty than is involved in interpreting and applying the usual Federal statutory problems they have to deal with.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that the Judicial Conference of the United States and the interested bar and Government employee associations will accord this proposal earnest study and consideration, and will express themselves on it to the appropriate committee as promptly as possible. The sooner we eliminate from the Judicial Code jurisdictional provisions which no longer have a reason for being, the more we shall contribute to the speedy, effective, and just administration of causes in the Federal courts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1351) to repeal subsection (d) of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts, introduced by Mr. Keating, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARIES OF THE INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE TO FURNISH AND RECEIVE EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to furnish and receive emergency assistance, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1355) to authorize the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to furnish and receive emergency assistance, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Jackson (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1963.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill, "To authorize the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to furnish and receive emergency assistance, and for other purposes."

We suggest that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The bill would enable the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture both to give to and receive from other Federal and non-Federal entities, emergency assistance in case of fires, floods, snow, and ice conditions interrupting transportation and communication, and in other situations. We believe such legislation is desirable and in many cases would constitute a form of insurance against injury and damage to Federal personnel, properties, and areas. It may not be amiss to say, in addition, that the need for relief of human suffering and the demands of ordinary public relations make it difficult to refuse assistance when such is requested.

There is need for greater Federal, State, and local cooperation in such cases than exists at present. This would be secured by the reciprocal provisions of the measure submitted.

In cases of emergencies requiring fire control assistance, many of the areas under the management and control of the National Park Service are situated within or in the general vicinity of political subdivisions where fire emergencies have occurred. When fire emergencies had occurred in nearby areas it was logically and naturally expected by the political subdivisions that available fire control equipment and personnel of the Federal Government would assist and cooperate in controlling such fires. Such assistance was an actual necessity at times.

Accordingly in 1953, the Congress gave the following authority to the National Park Service:

"Rendering of emergency rescue, firefighting, and cooperative assistance to nearby law-enforcement and fire-prevention agencies and for related purposes outside of the National Park System and miscellaneous areas." (16 U.S.C., 1b.(1).)

It is not only the National Park Service, however, which has such problems. The Congress in 1955, therefore, gave authority to each agency head to enter into reciprocal fire protection agreements with any fire organization (42 U.S.C. 1856a). This legislation provided further:

"In the absence of any agreement authorized or ratified by section 1856a of this title, each agency head is authorized to render emergency assistance in extinguishing fires and preserving life and property from fire, within the vicinity of any place at which such agency maintains fire-protection facilities, when the rendition of such assistance is determined, under regulations prescribed by the agency head, to be in the best interest of the United States." (42 U.S.C. 1856b.)

Other emergencies arise in which Federal assistance is requested. For instance, the Bonneville Power Administration is asked from time to time to make its personnel and equipment available to non-Federal agencies in emergency situations. The following are some examples of requests received:

1. The Washington State Highway Patrol, the Washington State Highway Department and the Oregon State Highway Commission have asked for the use of a sno-cat and operator for the purpose of restoring communication services, particularly radio stations located in mountainous areas and otherwise inaccessible during periods of heavy snowfall.

2. The telephone company has requested the use of its helicopter as a means of access to some of its facilities in the Cascade Mountains which were inaccessible because of snow conditions.

3. Airline officials, in 1955, requested the use of its helicopter and pilot on a standby basis for possible rescue work in connection with a Pan-American airliner that was down off the Oregon coast.

4. A sheriff's office requested the use of the helicopter and pilot in locating two lost hunters in the vicinity of Woodland, Wash.

5. The helicopter and pilot were requested for rescue measures in the vicinity of Coos Bay during heavy floods along the Oregon coast.

6. Many types of equipment were requested during the 1948 Columbia River flood disaster, particularly at Vanport.

These are instances of requests for assistance from agencies other than the actual users of electric energy supplied by Bonneville Power Administration. However, other agencies of the Department of the Interior are, from time to time, faced with the same types of emergency situations—the National Park Service and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, to cite two such agencies.

The Department of Agriculture is confronted with similar emergency situations. In many States, lands administered by the Department of Agriculture are in the same general area or adjacent to lands administered by the Department of the Interior, and the emergency needs of the two Departments are comparable. Both are sometimes asked to provide assistance in the same emergency. The Secretary of Agriculture has asked that the proposed legislation be extended to his Department.

This proposed legislation places no specific limitation on the distance to which Department personnel and equipment may go in offering assistance. In practice, the seriousness of the emergency, and the urgency of the need for assistance, will necessarily determine the distances to which departmental forces would travel.

While there may be no legal responsibility to furnish emergency assistance outside of Federal areas, it clearly appears desirable that, in the public interest, and in order to insure useful or necessary reciprocal assistance by local agencies within the Federal areas during emergencies, Government agencies should cooperate in similar circumstances by rendering all possible assistance. Under the terms of the proposed legislation, the Federal Government would be reimbursed for services rendered, if such reimbursement is not unreasonable, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, in light of the emergency involved.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT, RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX, RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, AND TEMPORARY EXTENDED RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS ACTS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Temporary Extended Railroad Unemployment Insurance Benefits Act of 1961 to increase the creditable and taxable compensation, and for other purposes.

This bill, like its forerunner, S. 729, proposes to improve and strengthen the financial condition of the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems. The provisions in this bill differ from those in S. 729 in two respects, both of which I regard as important.

The first affects the interest rate now paid by the Treasury Department of specific obligations issued for the railroad retirement account. The Railroad Retirement Act now prescribes an interest rate of 3 percent for these obligations which is substantially less than the rate the Treasury must pay for medium and long-term general obligations. The current 3-percent rate is also less than the market yield on U.S. Government obligations in general. This bill, like S. 729, would correct this inequity by specifying a rate of interest equal to the average market yield on outstanding marketable Treasury obligations. The current market yield is now in the area of 3⅞ percent. The fairer and more equitable formula of market yield is prescribed both by the bill which I now introduce and by S. 729.

This bill, however, would retain the current 3-percent rate as a minimum rate or floor, whereas S. 729 contemplates a complete spread without regard to a minimum figure. Most financial experts consider it highly unlikely that the interest rate will fall below the 3-percent floor and upon the basis of this expert judgment, it is fair to say that the provisions of this bill will not involve any appreciable risk for the Treasury Department. Imposition of the 3-percent floor, however, will serve the important and useful purpose of offering to the actuaries a more favorable basis for making an actuarial estimate of the market yield. Without the floor, the actuaries will in all probability project an interest figure which will be somewhat lower than it would be with the floor. Upon the basis of some preliminary figures, I can estimate that the difference in the actuarial estimate will amount to somewhere in the neighborhood of $3½ million per year, a sum which cannot be ignored in the present situation of the railroad retirement system.

The second difference, which is equally significant, would provide for an immediate conversion of all the funds in the railroad retirement account to the new interest yield. S. 729 provides for a gradual conversion over a period of 10 years, whereas the bill which I now offer would require immediate conversion.

The Government has had the benefits from the substandard current 3-percent rate for a number of years. In fact the substandard yield prescribed under the present law has contributed to the deterioration of the financial condition of the railroad retirement system. The correction of this inequity by providing for market yield will go a long way in repairing the actuarial deficiency now experienced by the current retirement system. It appears to me that the provisions of S. 729, providing for a graduated 10-year conversion to the market yield formula, have the effect of perpetuating this inequity throughout the 10-year period contemplated by the earlier bill. Immediate conversion of the entire 3-percent fund into special obligations bearing market yield interest is the fairer course to follow.

This adjustment in the formula specified in S. 729 yields additional revenues in about the same amounts as those resulting from the establishment of a 3-percent floor.

Overall, it may be roughly estimated that these two changes will produce an additional $8 million for the system and will cut deeply into the residual deficit which S. 729 does not reach.

I pointed out earlier in the year that the situation confronting the Board is a serious one which warrants the earliest possible attention of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1356) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and the Temporary Extended Railroad Unemployment Insurance Benefits Act of 1961 to increase the creditable and taxable compensation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BURDICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

THE SENIOR CITIZENS' COMMUNITY PLANNING AND SERVICES ACT OF 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "The Senior Citizens Community Planning and Services Act of 1963." The bill would amend the Social Security Act by establishing a new title XVII to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States.

Briefly stated the bill, if adopted, would do the following:

Part A of the proposed new title XVII to the Social Security Act would provide financial assistance to the States to help meet the costs of projects for: First, community planning and coordination of programs, second, demonstrations of programs or activities, third, training of special personnel needed to carry out such programs and activities and, fourth, establishment of new or expansion of existing programs, except for costs of construction other than minor alterations or repairs.

Parts B and C would encourage research, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects leading to the development of new and improved approaches and techniques to help older people, and would establish and expand training programs.

Part D would provide grants to assist public and nonprofit organizations in the construction of multipurpose recreational activity centers for older persons.

Part E would provide grants to assist public and nonprofit organizations in carrying out experimental and demonstration projects designed to stimulate an expansion of employment opportunities for older persons who desire to work.

Man's ancient desire to live longer is being realized at last. Life expectancy in this country has risen to 70 years. There are present today in our population 17½ million people aged 65 or older. Their numbers increase at the rate of a thousand each day.

Though this is a towering achievement of medical science, it has not yet been translated into a wholly successful human achievement.

These added years should be bonus years for the individual and for the Nation as well. They have not yet proved to be.

This is true partly because science is ahead of society—and perhaps ahead of itself—not realizing how quickly and extensively these added years would come and what profound changes they would bring with them.

Science built the bridge to longer life before the destination was prepared. Now we are attempting to carry on construction during the rush hour.

We have also been caught in the midst of other developments. As the number of people of older ages has increased, other balances have been shifting. The total population has increased, crowding housing, health facilities, and job opportunities.

The rural has given way to the urban and this, with increased mobility, changes the family structure and the place of the elderly within the family.

Thus today, the senior citizen is not only a new category. He exists within a new framework. We have not quite known what to do with him. Nor have we thought sufficiently about what he could do for us. We have too often simply closed our eyes to his predicament and shut him out of sight.

In speaking of senior citizens we have not fully recognized that we are not speaking of one group, but of many. The needs of the Nation's 10,369 men and women who have passed their century mark are very different from those of the 2,500 who are celebrating their 65th birthday each day.

Too often the tendency has been to equate the entire senior group of our population with infirmity—to think of everyone over the age of 65 as someone to be taken care of. This is patently a false grouping and a false assumption.

There are, in all age groups, the weak and the strong, the dependent and independent.

There are, of course, infirm aged. Many of them—particularly among those beyond age 75. Many are bedridden. Many are mentally confused and unable to care for themselves. Four out of five persons over the age of 65 suffer from some chronic ill. We must be conscious of their needs.

But there are also sturdy, active, creative and self-sufficient elderly men and women. We must be equally aware of their need to participate in life. Even among those with chronic ailments, there will be degrees of impairment. Some may need only to walk a little slower. Others may need certain aids in order to remain productive. Given such help, they can continue to contribute to their own happiness, to that of their families, and to the achievements of this Nation.

In point of fact, the elderly who are presently well and able are in many cases in as distressing a predicament as the chronically ill and infirm aged.

Retirement has too often meant a forced disengagement from life. In contrast, this increased lifespan of the individual could mean that for the first time in history a nation exists in which the people will have time enough to think, time enough to reach full self-realization.

It now could mean that when men and women reach the time of retirement, which was once nearly the end of life, they are merely at the beginning of a whole new period of later maturity.

The immediate personal needs for a private career and family have been taken care of. There is time left. There is energy left. There is experience available for public service. A new dimension could be added to life. But it will take action to bring this about.

Ironically, the scientific and technical advances which have made longer life possible for more people also make utilization of this gift more difficult.

In earlier societies few lived to be old and the majority of those who did were able to reserve to themselves—or were assigned—functions essential to the survival of the group.

The elders were the counselors of the people. It is harder for us today to provide this role for our senior citizens, despite the fact that the older members of any group are still its true source of continuity, and a resource of experience, talent, and skill.

Simply put, what all senior citizens need today is "A place in the world." This may be a relationship, a friend, a job to do, a role to fill, a house in which an elderly person can move about safely, a nursing home bed, home care—a chance to live, not by sufferance taking up room in somebody else's world but by continuing their earned right in their own world.

This is a goal—simple to state—but not simple to achieve.

The enactment of the Senior Citizens Community Planning and Services Act of 1963 will contribute greatly to its achievement.

It is only in recent years that we have begun to understand this variety of need. We have begun at last to seek appropriate solutions.

On the national scene, the Congress has in the last 2 years provided new tools to do these things—the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961 and the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 in particular have made possible a wider array of services.

The work of the President's Council on Aging and of the Office of Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in coordinating and stimulating programs and progress for senior citizens is having and will have an important effect.

The heart of any program for the elderly must be opportunities for, and actual services to, older citizens in their home communities.

While at the Federal level we can urge greater opportunities for older men and women, it is the community that must develop the specific plans and offer the services.

That is why perhaps the most significant proposal of all the proposals in the President's message on the elderly is that calling for the establishment of a 5-year program of grants to States and localities, to public and voluntary organizations, educational institutions, to serve the elderly, to make possible comprehensive, coordinated, adequate services, and programs.

Enactment of the proposed legislation entitled "The Senior Citizens Community Planning and Services Act of 1963" would carry out this part of the President's program.

It would provide Federal financial assistance to those who would provide care and opportunity for the elderly on their home grounds. It involves four kinds of grants under four major titles.

PART A—GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING, SERVICES, AND TRAINING

Under part A the new title XVII of the Social Security Act would provide formula grants to each State based on the ratio of the State's population aged 65 or older to the national population of that age. These moneys are to be used by the State to strengthen its program and agencies for the aging and to work with communities to strengthen theirs. Funds would be available for community planning and coordination of programs, establishment, expansion, and demonstrations of programs and services, and the training of necessary personnel.

A comprehensive State plan would be drawn up; a single State agency would administer or supervise the program.

The States are deeply concerned with the needs of their older citizens. Many have moved to action with increasing urgency. Permanent State commissions or committees on the aging have been established in 31 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; temporary State units exist in 12 other States. But only 25 of these State agencies have a State appropriation—in most cases very small—and only 22 have a full-time executive director or secretary.

Funds proposed under this part of title XVII would permit States to encourage planning and coordinating committees in cities and counties to determine the needs of their older citizens and to stimulate public and voluntary agencies to develop communitywide programs of health, social services, employment recreation, education, and housing to meet them.

Pilot projects could be developed and existing programs improved in such areas as preretirement education, the teaching of creative skills, development of social and recreational programs, provision of meal centers and home-delivered meals, establishment of homemaker services, development of sales outlets for senior craftsmen, and such safety measures as establishment of special telephone service to maintain contact with older people living alone.

Grants could be made by the States from their allotments to agencies and organizations such as adult education and training centers and university extension services.

These Federal funds would make it possible for the State to obtain and maintain up-to-date information on the numbers and general needs of their older citizens, to analyze existing programs and available services to plan improvements, new approaches, and techniques. In particular they would make possible better coordination of services and provision of guidance and consultation to communities.

I ask unanimous consent that a table of State allotments indicating the Federal sum each State can expect to receive under Part A in the peak years of the program be inserted in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

PARTS B AND C—RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND TRAINING PROJECTS

Parts B and C of the new title would provide funds for research, demonstration, and training grants to be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the advice of a 15-man advisory committee and special review committees.

Under this provision grants could be made to public and nonprofit agencies, voluntary organizations, institutions, and individuals to develop or demonstrate new approaches, techniques, and methods, which hold promise of substantially contributing to worthwhile and meaningful life for older persons.

Estimated allotments to the States under part A of the Senior Citizens Community Planning and Services Act of 1963

	Maximum annual allotment
Alabama	$215,965.63
Alaska	126,860.00
Arizona	156,445.63
Arkansas	192,715.63
California	604,356.87
Colorado	180,102.50
Connecticut	209,513.75
Delaware	137,438.75
District of Columbia	149,063.75
Florida	317,684.37
Georgia	226,253.75
Hawaii	135,171.87
Idaho	145,285.63
Illinois	464,624.37
Indiana	280,193.75
Iowa	239,157.50
Kansas	208,700.00
Kentucky	226,835.00
Louisiana	209,165.00
Maine	162,141.87
Maryland	203,933.75
Massachusetts	324,136.25
Michigan	347,328.13
Minnesota	248,457.50
Mississippi	191,204.37
Missouri	300,363.13
Montana	147,785.50
Nebraska	182,195.00
Nevada	131,335.63
New Hampshire	148,598.75
New Jersey	320,241.87
New Mexico	142,844.37
New York	712,818.13
North Carolina	233,751.87
North Dakota	145,401.87
Ohio	437,538.13
Oklahoma	211,064.37
Oregon	188,995.63
Pennsylvania	518,099.37
Rhode Island	$156,213.13
South Carolina	177,486.87
South Dakota	149,935.63
Tennessee	232,589.37
Texas	384,644.37
Utah	145,866.87
Vermont	140,228.75
Virginia	225,672.50
Washington	222,185.00
West Virginia	185,101.25
Wisconsin	265,313.75
Wyoming	134,009.38
Puerto Rico	167,547.50
Virgin Islands	63,255.63
Guam	62,906.88
American Samoa	62,674.38
Total	12,500,000.00

Research is needed in many areas. There are great gaps in our knowledge about the elderly. Many current approaches and programs need to be evaluated and improved. Current patterns and conditions of living of older persons need to be studied to determine what factors are beneficial and what detrimental.

We know little of the social-psychological processes of aging.

We know little of the preferences and patterns of older people as consumers.

We know little of the most satisfactory design and method of providing services in housing projects for older people.

We know little of the extent and kinds of activity in which older people are interested and of which they are capable.

Demonstration projects would, in the main, be pilot projects of national scope and significance, which could serve or be adapted to varying local conditions.

They could, for example, include experiments in total community organization designed to keep older people informed of all services available to them.

They could be experiments in activity, education, and recreational programs and concerted social services within or adjacent to senior housing projects designed to determine which are most effective in maintaining independence, mental health, community participation and good family relationships among older people.

They could be projects to develop teaching and training tools, study units and materials, for use by educational institutions and the professions.

Training of personnel to teach and work with the elderly is greatly needed. Institutions of higher education have only begun to work in this field. Colleges, universities, and professional schools need teachers with knowledge of aging, and almost every profession and technical occupation involved in serving older people is acutely short of persons adequately prepared to work with them.

There is immediate need for university-based training and research centers in all parts of the country.

The proposed legislation would provide funds for internships and fellowships, for establishment of courses, institutes of gerontology, and development of new training materials and curricula.

PART D—CONSTRUCTION OF RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY CENTERS

Part D of the new title would provide grants for construction, remodeling, or equipping multipurpose recreational activity centers for the elderly.

These unique centers are essentially community centers especially designed for older people. Comparatively new to the American scene, they are generally regarded as the most important facility that has come into existence in connection with community efforts to meet the needs of their older people.

They serve both the elderly and the community.

They provide opportunity for older people to continue as active participants in community life, to build retirement lives based on the pursuit of interests, skills, and recreation.

They help prevent tragic withdrawal and isolation which so often lead to premature physical and mental deterioration and hospitalization, and consequent family breakdown.

For the community they provide a point of contact at which to offer older people educational experiences promoting health, literacy, and mental alertness, a place to give personal counseling and information concerning existing community services, and a source from which to recruit the elderly for volunteer service to others in the community.

Although there has been a widespread increase in interest and development of such centers over the past 15 years, most of them today exist in old houses, store buildings, lofts, and other makeshift quarters, often unsafe and poorly suited to the purposes they are intended to serve.

Ideally, a senior activity center would offer as many as 50 or 60 different activities in response to the widely varying interest of older people. It should be centrally located, accessible by public transportation and, preferably, in an area where retired people are concentrated. It would be open every day and often during the evenings. The membership fee—if any, would never be too high to preclude low-income people.

Construction grants for these centers could be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to public agencies or voluntary organizations. Staffing and operating of the centers could be assisted under the State formula grants in part A. The programs contemplated by the centers applying for construction grants would be subject to approval by appropriate local authorities.

PART E—SPECIAL PROJECTS TO STIMULATE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Part E of the new title XVII provides for grants to stimulate employment opportunities for the elderly, primarily through projects to demonstrate their employability.

It is one of the anomalies of our day that while more people reach their 65th birthday than ever before, the percentage of older persons in gainful employment has declined steadily. To the extent that this is a result of voluntary retirement, it is good. No one would deny retirement to the worker who seeks it after many years of toil.

But there is evidence that for many of our older citizens, retirement is forced and unwelcome. They are able to work. They wish to work, yet opportunity is denied them, largely because of age. As the President has said, rules of employment that are based upon the calendar rather than upon ability are not good rules. No economy can reach its maximum productivity by wasting its human resources. This is both personal tragedy and a national loss.

Prevailing attitudes, casting doubt upon the capability of senior citizens to continue working beyond arbitrary retirement age, are major barriers to their employment. Yet, as the Presidential message points out, studies of the Department of Labor show large numbers of older workers exceeding the average performance of younger workers, and doing so with steadiness, loyalty and dependability.

In order to demonstrate this employment capability of older citizens, part E of title XVII under the administration of the Secretary of Labor, would make grants available to public and nonprofit agencies to provide employment to older persons in public or community undertakings or services that would not otherwise be possible.

PART F—GENERAL—ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND ADMINISTRATION

To strengthen the effectiveness and administration of all grant programs in the act, part F of the new title would establish, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, an Advisory Committee on Aging, made up of 15 distinguished citizens, men and women of demonstrated experience and interest in special problems of the aging. They would advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on matters of general policy concerned with the program. Each member would hold office for a term of 3 years; none should be otherwise in the employ of the United States.

In addition, part F would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, in administering their respective functions under the act, to draw upon the services and facilities of "any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit private agency or institution" that can be of assistance in strengthening the program.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in carrying out the purposes of the title could give consultative services and technical assistance to public nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions. He can provide short-term training and technical instruction. He can also conduct research and demonstrations, and can collect, prepare, publish, and disseminate special educational and information materials to assist the purposes of the act, including reports of projects for which funds are provided under the act.

SUMMARY

I have, of necessity, greatly condensed my description of this far-ranging piece of legislation. It is, I feel, of equal importance to any in our entire program for the elderly.

This proposed legislation would cost a total of $149 million over a 5-year period. I believe our senior citizens are deserving of this investment.

I cannot imagine anyone opposed to the services proposed. I can imagine some thinking, perhaps, "Yes they're fine—I'm all for them, but we have to take care of the young first, and then the middle aged and productive. We can leave the old folks till last."

May I say that they have been left till last too long. And our point is that they are or can be productive to themselves, their communities, their Nation. We cannot delay any longer. In counting their numbers, we have become eyewitnesses to their need.

I would like to speak out against the ridiculous fallacy that somehow these people are different from others, that they were always old—that they sprang full fashioned at age 65 from somewhere. These people were the young. They bore the burdens of the Nation and of those who were old, in their young days. They are us—ourselves—a few years from now—only we will have benefited by years of social enlightenment and legislation.

As President Kennedy said in his special aging message to the Congress:

> Place, prestige, status, cannot be legislated. But we can see that legislation enhances the opportunity to obtain them.

This enhancement of opportunity for the elderly is one of the major purposes of the new title XVII of the Social Security Act which Senior Citizens Community Planning and Services Act of 1963 would establish. It is intended to make possible continued, extended, improved and new services and programs, yes; but it is also designed to help change the picture—the stereotype—so many carry in their minds of older persons. Its aim is a fair one—a place in the world.

The assistance to be provided under this proposed legislation will not duplicate services now possible under other grant programs; indeed it will make possible the more effective use of these grants.

The very act of developing a comprehensive community plan, of drawing together and evaluating existing services, will enable communities to discover where gaps exist, where unnecessary duplications lie, and to determine precisely where a health grant is most needed, a sound social service program should be strengthened, or an adult education program or senior housing development is justified.

Program operations and services made possible by enactment of the measure would not infringe upon the prerogatives of State or local health, welfare, recreation, education, or housing agencies, but would assist and work with and through existing authorities wherever possible.

Just as the Federal Government, through the Children's Bureau now in the Welfare Administration, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has long been able to assist

States and communities in meeting the needs of children in both health and social welfare fields largely through grants-in-aid and the stimulation of research and demonstration projects, so should the Government be able to assist States and communities in similar broad programs for the elderly.

What we do for our elderly citizens today will allow us to touch hands with the past through their experiences.

What we do today for those who will be senior citizens in the future will indicate something of the value we really place upon the gift of added life.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1357) to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, through grants for construction of recreational activity centers, and through grants to stimulate employment opportunities, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE SENIOR CITIZENS PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "The Senior Citizens Public Welfare Amendments of 1963."

This bill has as its purpose a number of important improvements in provisions in titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act, which deal with our Federal-State programs of old-age assistance.

Section 2 of the bill would require States to provide medical protection for old age assistance recipients which would be at least equal to that provided those in the new medical category established pursuant to the Kerr-Mills Act.

Section 3 would eliminate the 42-day limitation for medical care in a general hospital for a person suffering from mental illness or tuberculosis.

Section 4 would provide that as a condition for receiving Federal grants for old age assistance, a State's plan must establish and maintain standards of health and safety for housing rendered to recipients of this program.

Section 5 would provide that the maximum period of residence which may be required for eligibility under old age assistance programs be gradually reduced to 1 year by 1970.

Section 6 would provide that protective payments under old-age assistance may be made to a third party in behalf of the needy recipient comparable to provisions adopted last year for dependent children.

Of the 17½ million persons aged 65 and over in this country today, somewhat less than 1 in 7, or about 2¼ million receive old-age assistance payments.

These payments are made on the basis of individual need and these 2¼ million aged are accordingly the neediest among our senior citizens.

About half of them are over age 76.

About one-third of them are 80 or over.

A large majority of them are women.

Many of them are widows whose husbands died before they were able to qualify for old age and survivors insurance benefits.

To a somewhat greater degree than the aged generally, they live in rural areas or small towns.

A considerable number of them, or approximately three-quarters of a million—receive modest social security benefits usually at or near the minimum. Many have high medical expenses which increase their needs. About 30 percent of these individuals are in nursing homes, institutions, confined to their own homes, or need the help of another person in getting about. Nearly 1 in 10 is in a nursing home or institution.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE NEEDY

There are a number of specific improvements that can and should be made in the provisions of the Social Security Act concerned with old-age assistance, all of which have been recommended by the President.

Two and one-half years ago, the Congress enacted a new program of medical assistance for the aged, generally referred to as the Kerr-Mills Act. This program is now in operation in just over half of the States. In a few States, six—Tennessee, California, Connecticut, Idaho, Michigan, and South Carolina—medical assistance under the new program is more generous in amount, scope or duration than the assistance that is available for medical care of the very neediest old-age assistance recipients. It seems poor policy for us to provide less in the way of medical care to persons on old-age assistance, who require help with their day-to-day living expenses, than we provide to the recipients of medical assistance for the aged, who have enough resources to meet their regular expenses other than their medical bills.

To cure this defect, section 2 of the proposed legislation would require that by July 1, 1965, States have provisions for at least the same scope of medical assistance to the persons eligible to receive old-age assistance as they provide to the persons who receive only medical assistance for the aged. The effective date—2 years hence—would give the States that may be in this situation time to work out any existing differences.

AID FOR THE TUBERCULAR AND MENTALLY ILL

Another provision of the bill is directed toward aged persons who are mentally ill or who have tuberculosis. In 1960, recognizing the trend toward more care of mentally ill persons in general hospitals where needed treatment could some times be effected in a relatively short time in the individual's home community, the Congress provided that in both old-age assistance and in the new program of medical assistance for the aged, the Federal Government would participate for up to 42 days in public assistance payments for medical care of recipients who are mentally ill or tuberculous in general hospitals.

Two problems have arisen in relation to this 1960 provision. One is that the 42-day period is a short one in relation to certain individuals.

The second is that the administrative burden of keeping track of individuals to determine exactly when the 42d day ends and the 43d day begins is unduly time consuming and has acted as a deterrent to States taking advantage of this provision. The Congress can at very small cost eliminate the 42-day time limitation on such care in general hospitals. This would be done by section 3 of the proposed legislation. Since no State is required to take any legislative action under this provision, it would become effective July 1, 1963, as an additional resource to State public-welfare programs. The provision would be applicable to medical assistance for the aged as well as old-age assistance. This section would amend the old-age assistance provisions by deleting, as of July 1, 1963, the existing limitation which precludes Federal participation in cash payments to individuals who are tubercular or mentally ill in general hospitals.

BETTER HOUSING FOR THE AGED

The studies and hearings of our Special Committee on Aging have shown that many aged persons are especially subject to various types of exploitation. One aspect of this problem is that many old-age assistance recipients live in housing that does not meet even the barest minimum of health and safety.

Studies have shown that the needy aged frequently must pay exorbitant rentals for grossly substandard quarters. Census data indicate that among households headed by a person age 65 or older who live in rental housing nearly 40 percent are in quarters that are classified as substandard.

The rental costs represent a major segment of our payments of old-age assistance despite the fact that, a large proportion of our aged own their own homes, including many of the needy aged who receive old-age assistance.

It is estimated that one-half billion dollars a year—about one-fourth—of the $2 billion total expenditure for old-age assistance—goes to pay rent.

Clearly the time has come when States and localities must come to grips with this basic problem. The bill does not propose to tell States how to set standards or who in the State government should administer those standards.

The bill would simply require that by July 1, 1966, the States establish or designate some agency to establish and maintain standards of health and safety for the quarters which recipients of old-age assistance rent. This would give the States very broad latitude in providing realistic protection for aged renters and sufficient time in which to get their provisions into operation.

LIBERALIZING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

It is estimated that one person in five in the United States moves each year. Substantial numbers move across State lines. Aged persons almost certainly do not move as often as younger workers. However, many aged persons may need to change their State residence in order to be near relatives who can offer care and companionship.

At present a State may impose a residence requirement for old-age assistance as long as 5 years out of the preceding 9. Today there are 20 States that impose this maximum requirement permitted under the Federal law. They are: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, and Washington. The Governor's conference several years ago recommended that this be reduced to 1 year. The proposed legislation would reduce the present 5-year limitation to 3 years, beginning in 1968, and to 1 year immediately preceding application, beginning in 1970. This time span would permit States to make any necessary adjustments. With the continued decline in the old-age assistance caseload the cost of this humanitarian step would be minimal.

PROTECTIVE PAYMENTS FOR THE AGED

As I indicated earlier, there are among our aged on old-age assistance substantial numbers of persons who are very old and feeble. These persons, while not mentally ill, are often forgetful. Some tend to lose things, some are subject to exploitation by unscrupulous persons. Some of these individuals live with children or relatives. Others live in nursing homes or institutions. By and large they do not need formal legal guardianship. However, they do frequently need help in managing money.

Under existing law we can make money payments to a recipient or his legal guardian. We can make payments directly to doctors, hospitals, or other suppliers of medical care, but we cannot make payments to a third person to help a feeble senior citizen.

Section 6 of the bill would make provision, with appropriate safeguards, for protective payments made to a third person in behalf of an old-age assistance recipient.

Last year the Congress enacted a provision for protective payments in aid to families with dependent children. While the need among the aged arises for somewhat different reasons, I am convinced that this provision will serve a highly useful and humane purpose.

Throughout the bill corresponding changes have been made in the new title XVI of the Social Security Act which the Congress enacted last year permitting those States that choose to, to have a combined program for the aged, blind, and disabled so that aged persons under the combined program would receive the advantages of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, I consider that this bill would make possible a number of modest, positive noncontroversial steps which would improve the situation of some of our neediest senior citizens. I believe that it is worthy of prompt consideration and early enactment by the Congress.

The cost of the amendments which I have proposed here is negligible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1358) to improve the public assistance provisions of titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act, relating to aged individuals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department.

This bill will correct, if favorable action is taken, an inequitable anomalous administrative situation in the Treasury Department. This bill will not result in any additional salary costs to the Government.

Mr. President, in order to explain the need for this legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury from me dated April 4, 1963, and the Secretary's reply dated April 10, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1359) to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 234 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U.S.C. 246), is amended by striking out "three Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury" and inserting in lieu thereof "four Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury".

The letters presented by Mr. DOUGLAS are as follows:

APRIL 4, 1963.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the hearings on S. 874, the bill to authorize the Treasury Department to construct additional facilities for the U.S. Mint, it was brought out by the chairman that the Director of the Mint reports to you through Mr. Robert A. Wallace, an assistant to the Secretary.

This raises a question in my mind as to whether it would not be more appropriate for the Director of the Mint, a Presidential appointee, to report to you through a Presidentially appointed Assistant Secretary rather than an assistant to the Secretary in the classified civil service. Upon looking into this question, I found that there are only three such Assistant Secretaries in the entire Treasury Department. This number seems unusually small when compared with other departments. The State Department has 12 such posts, Defense has 16, Justice has 8 and Post Office has 5. The Departments of Interior, Commerce, and Labor also have more Presidentially appointed Assistant Secretaries than does the Treasury.

If the Treasury Department were to be authorized an additional Assistant Secretary, bringing the number of such positions more in line with other Departments, would it then be possible for the Director of the Mint to report to you through a Presidential appointee rather than a member of the classified service? Would you favor the creation of an additional Assistant Secretaryship in the Treasury Department for this purpose?

With best wishes,

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington 25, D.C., April 10, 1963.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Thank you for your letter of April 4, 1963, pointing out that the Director of the Mint, who is appointed by the President, reports to me through a member of the classified civil service rather than a Presidentially appointed Assistant Secretary. As you noted, the Treasury Department has only three such Assistant Secretaries which is fewer than most other departments.

All three of the Presidentially appointed Assistant Secretaries in Treasury have full assignments. This makes it necessary for both the Director of the Mint and the Chief of the U.S. Secret Service to report to me through Mr. Robert A. Wallace who is authorized to perform any functions relating to these bureaus which I am authorized to perform. Mr. Wallace carries out these and other duties at the Assistant Secretary level. He is responsible for fiscal policy planning and directs departmental activities relating in Federal budgetary policies. He works closely with members of the Council of Economic Advisers, Bureau of the Budget, and White House officials in the development of programs of the Kennedy administration and represents the Treasury on many interagency committees assigned to this task.

Despite the fact that Mr. Wallace performs the functions of an Assistant Secretary, he must do so as an Assistant to the Secretary because of the limitation on the number of Assistant Secretaries in the Treasury Department. This is a distinct handicap from an organizational standpoint since he must supervise Bureau Chiefs and direct fiscal policy planning activities inside the Treasury, and work with various interagency groups where other agencies are often represented by Presidential appointees. It certainly would be helpful, therefore, if this situation could be corrected by the creation of another Assistant Secretaryship in the Treasury Department, bringing the number of such positions more nearly in line with that of other departments.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PASTORE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice it writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely, on page 19, after line 17, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

"For an additional amount for 'Construction and rehabilitation,' $6,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be nonreimbursable."

Mr. PASTORE also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5517, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. PASTORE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, on page 55, after line 9, insert the following:

"TITLE IV

"Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1963

"The Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73,000,000 for that purpose', approved August 30, 1962 (Public Law 87–616), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'That there is hereby authorized to be paid by the Government of the United States to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines the sum of $73,000,000 less the administrative expenses referred to in the third section of the Act: *Provided*, That such payment shall not be made until the Secretary of State shall have received assurances satisfactory to him from the Government of the Republic of the Philippines that such sum will be received by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines in full satisfaction and final settlement of any and all claims arising out of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 128) and that the Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall insure that no part of such sum shall be directly or indirectly paid to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation for services rendered as attorney or agent in connection with any such claim.'

"SEC. 2. All documents currently held by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and relating to unpaid claims arising out of war damages in the Philippines, except for internal documents of any agency of the United States, shall be transferred to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

"SEC. 3. Funds appropriated by the first paragraph of title V of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, not heretofore expended for administrative expenses, shall be used for making the payment authorized by the first section of this Act, except that of such funds, not to exceed $20,000 shall be available to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission for administrative expenses which may be incurred in terminating its functions with respect to awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 and in transferring documents in accordance with the second section of this Act.

"SEC. 4. This title may be cited as 'The Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1963'."

Mr. PASTORE also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5517, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. PASTORE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, on page 9, line 3, after $450,000,000, insert: "to remain available until June 30, 1964."

Mr. PASTORE also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5517, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

CELEBRATION OF SIGNING OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on February 28 the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, favoring observing on July 4 of each year, by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The Senator is to be commended for the initiative he has displayed by submitting the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor on the next printing of that resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 11, 1963, the names of Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. MCGEE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1321) to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators) on April 11, 1963.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am happy to join the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] in sponsoring S. 1321, legislation which would establish a National Service Corps. As one who has, from the outset, supported the idea of making American abilities and energies available to developing nations abroad, I believe the same abilities and dedication could be used effectively to assist local communities and areas here at home.

The National Service Corps, like the Peace Corps, fits naturally into an old and well-established American tradition of helping others to help themselves. However, while I join as a cosponsor of the bill, I believe that its provisions should be examined carefully and closely by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I reserve my position to offer amendments while this bill is under consideration.

In organizing and encouraging the people-to-people program during the last decade, President Eisenhower correctly recognized the great value to be gained by using the talents and ideas of our people abroad. In the same manner, considering the great diversity in wealth and opportunity among men and women in our country, I believe that the National Service Corps can address itself at home to problems requiring ever more attention.

In my State of Kentucky, particularly in the sorely depressed eastern portion, I have in recent weeks and months seen a variety of situations in which the services of some of these volunteers—and I hope many will be Kentucky volunteers—might well be utilized. The men and women in these areas ask—also furthering an old tradition of ours—nothing more than the chance to earn a living and to improve the conditions and opportunities which affect their lives and the lives of their children. The Corps which this bill would establish, though small in numbers, can be of help working on community and regional problems. And the volunteers will also be learning about the problems of the Nation and preparing themselves for service to the Nation during their lifetime.

I shall not speak further on this subject now, except to say that, as I observed in discussing the Youth Employment measure on April 10 in the Senate, we must provide hope and training for our youth if we are to meet our responsibilities to the Nation. This legislation we have introduced will materially assist this purpose—and more—and I hope the Congress will pass it this year.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Adm. Jerauld Wright, U.S. Navy, retired, to be Ambassador to China.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. McINTYRE:

Address entitled "A Tax Policy for Economic Growth," delivered before the New Hampshire Associated General Contractors, at Concord, N.H., on April 19, 1963.

PROBLEMS OF THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT AND EFFORTS TO MEET THEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on April 20 the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert S. McNamara, delivered an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It is a straightforward and illuminating statement of the great scope of the responsibilities of the Secretary's Office and of Mr. McNamara's approach to these responsibilities.

It is an impressive statement which sets forth the problems of the Defense Department and the efforts to meet them. It suggests to me, Mr. President, that Mr. McNamara not only understands the imperative of insuring that this nation have the kind of defense it needs, but that he also has the capacity and integrity to see to it that this defense is made available at the lowest practical cost to the people of the United States. I commend this address to the Senate, Mr. President, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. MCNAMARA BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SATURDAY, APRIL 20, 1963

What I want to talk to you about is the problem of decisionmaking in the Defense Department, and the way we are trying to approach the problem.

The Department of Defense is responsible for spending nearly 10 percent of the national income of this country. It employs 3.7 million Americans directly, in and out of uniform, and millions more indirectly in every aspect of our economic life. It absorbs over half of every tax dollar, as it has done for over a decade.

All of this is well enough known. If anything, the potential dangers of this so-called military-industrial complex have been overstated rather than understated in recent months. But at risk of repeating the obvious, let me point out once again that this unavoidably vast establishment exists for one purpose and one purpose only: to act as the servant of U.S. foreign policy. Our responsibility is to provide this Nation with the means to safeguard its legitimate interests and to meet its commitments at home and around the world. The Defense Department exists to serve that purpose, and to serve none other.

Yet, although it is easy enough to say in a few words what our purpose is, the translation of this purpose into decisions on force levels, on contingency war planning, on weapons developments—and cancellations—on reorganizations, on all the range of decisions which shape our Defense Establishment, cannot be readily or easily deduced from the general principles. You probably remember General Marshall's shrewd remark: "Don't ask me to say we agree in principle; that just means we haven't agreed yet."

What I want to do is to outline, as best I can in a single talk, how we are trying to translate these general principles, on which all Americans would agree our defense policy should be based, into specific decisions that will effectively carry through those general principles. These specific decisions will inevitably and properly remain the subject of searching, even harsh, criticism. We are, after all, dealing with issues which could affect the very life of this Nation, indeed the life of a great part of this planet. We cannot and do not claim infallibility. Only the future can tell when and where we have been right, when and where we have been wrong. We can only do our best to approach these problems as sensibly and realistically as we know how.

Let me start with two points which seem to me axiomatic. The first is that, at least within any range of defense spending that is likely to appear at all desirable in the foreseeable future, the United States is well able to spend whatever it needs to spend on national security. The second point is that this ability does not excuse us from applying strict standards of effectiveness and efficiency to the way we spend our defense dollars.

Last fall, while we were preparing for the fiscal 1964 budget decisions, the separate requests for funds of the three military departments totaled over $67 billion. The budget as finally submitted to the Congress totaled nearly $54 billion, a cut of over $13 billion. This was still $2 billion more than the current defense budget, and $10 billion more than when we took office in 1961. We have been criticized both for overruling the military, in cutting the service requests, and for spending too much money, presumably in failing to cut the service requests far enough. Sometimes, to my continuing surprise, we are criticized on both counts by the same people.

The fact is that we could, as a nation, afford to spend more than we are proposing if that were judged to be in our national interest. Our national security does not need to be compromised to keep defense spending down. Where we have cut, the cuts have not represented decisions to compromise national security in the name of frugality. For our children will hardly admire us for our frugality if it is achieved at a price they will have to pay in blood and suffering. And where we have added to defense spending, those additions have not been based on the naive notion that the bigger our defense budget is, the safer we will be. National security in this age of hydrogen bombs and intercontinental missiles is more complicated than that.

The facts are that national security in these times cannot be purchased by military spending alone, however generous a scale, and that the task of assuring that our military spending truly serves the national interest is more complicated than it has ever been in the past. And more urgent. The test we have to apply, over and over again, is whether a particular expenditure for a specific purpose is really in our national interest.

Every dollar we spend inefficiently or ineffectively is not only an unnecessary addition to the arms race which threatens all mankind, but an unfair burden on the taxpayer, or an unwise diversion of resources which could be invested elsewhere to serve our national interests at home or abroad, or a dollar that could, even if kept in the military budget, be invested in something that would better strengthen our military posture. The fact that we cannot be poor enough to grudge the price of our own survival does not mean we are rich enough to squander our resources in the name of national security.

I do not mean to suggest that we can measure national security in terms of dollars—you cannot price what is inherently priceless. But if we are to avoid talking in generalities, we must talk about dollars: for policy decisions must sooner or later be expressed in the form of budget decisions on where to spend and how much.

When we took office, we saw three major tasks before us. First, we had to accelerate the strengthening of our strategic nuclear force, a task which involves not merely increases in the size of the force, but major improvements in its survivability and in the provisions to maintain responsible command and control at all times. We had a firm base from which to work. My predecessor, Tom Gates, had already given strong support to such programs as Minuteman and Polaris, which are designed to ride out any conceivable attack, so that they do not have to be launched on short or ambiguous warning. But we felt further impetus was needed. We have, for example, increased by 50 percent the programed rate of Polaris procurement, and doubled our production capability for Minuteman. We have increased by 50 percent the portion of B-52 bombers on 15-minute ground alert. The kind of flexibility that these programs provide is absolutely vital. Overall, in the last 24 months we have doubled the number of warheads in our strategic alert forces. And during the same period we have increased by 60 percent NATO's tactical nuclear forces in Western Europe.

Second, major increases in our nonnuclear capabilities were urgently needed. Accordingly, we increased the number of combat-ready Army divisions by 45 percent. We augmented by 30 percent the Air Force capability for tactical air support of combat operations. We have increased our procurement of combat supplies and equipment, to correct serious imbalances and inadequacies that had developed over the years. We have increased nearly sixfold our special forces, made up of highly trained men who cannot only deal with guerrilla warfare, but more important, can train the people under terrorist attack to defend themselves.

The third major effort cannot be so easily defined. What it involves is a broad effort to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Defense Establishment. It is this effort that I want to talk about most, partly because it is the most controversial—really the only one of these three efforts which has been widely controversial—partly because it is, by its nature, very diffuse, involving a wide variety of largely independent efforts, which cannot properly be summed up in a few sentences.

The first two of our major objectives—the improvement of our strategic retaliatory forces and the buildup of our nonnuclear forces—commanded wide support by the time we took office.

The importance of additional effort to assure that our strategic retaliatory nuclear forces were both adequate and subject to effective control at all times was widely accepted. Consequently, it was clear that a number of major and expensive steps were needed in the strategic retaliatory area. It would have been national folly to allow any question to arise in the mind of a potential attacker that U.S. forces were not capable of absorbing a surprise attack and striking back with devastating fury.

It was equally clear that we could not either effectively or sensibly count on the threat of massive retaliation to deter the whole range of political and military aggression open to an ingenious and determined adversary. It is doubtful whether such a threat was ever a universal deterrent. It did not deter the attack on Korea, the pressure on Berlin, or the attempt to subvert southeast Asia. Still less is it likely to be a universal deterrent in an age when nuclear superiority, even though substantial in terms of numbers, cannot guarantee a victory in any meaningful sense.

No one in a position of responsibility seriously believed that a decision to employ our strategic nuclear forces could make sense except in the face of massive aggression—such as a large-scale attack on Western Europe—and consequently it was clear that, unless we were willing to live under a constant threat of having to choose between nuclear holocaust and retreat, we required major improvements in our less-than-all-out war capabilities. It remained for us to translate these general notions into specific programs, to fill in the details, to carry the programs through vigorously and expeditiously. But on the general aims, there was little quarrel.

It is only in the third area, the problem of increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of our Military Establishment, that controversy has developed. Not that there was much disagreement about the need: for years everyone who has thought seriously about the Department of Defense has felt that major improvements were needed. The solutions offered ranged from drastic proposals for complete unification of the Armed Forces to vague suggestions about "cutting the fat out of the military budget."

Thus, there was a national consensus here that reforms were in order. But there was no consensus on just what should be done. And there was an additional and inevitable human problem. For these reforms would necessarily take the shape of changes in the traditional ways of doing things, and limitations on the customary ways of spending defense money. It is inevitable that people will take more easily to suggestions that they should have more money to spend, as in the improvement of our nuclear and nonnuclear capabilities, than to suggestions that they must spend less, or that they must abandon established ways of doing things. Yet the very substantial increases in the budget which we felt necessary added a further strong incentive, if any were needed, to move ahead on these problems of increasing efficiency and effectiveness.

The first and most important thing to notice about the effort in this area is what it is not. It is not an effort to save dollars at the expense of military effectiveness. What we are trying to do can be divided into two parts; the first is essentially a series of management reforms of the kind you will find in any well-run organization, an effort which is in large part covered by the formal 5-year cost-reduction program we set up in July 1962. The common characteristic of reforms in this part of the effort is that they have very little, if anything, to do with military effectiveness, one way or the other. They neither increase nor decrease our military effectiveness; they merely save money by introducing more efficient methods of doing things.

To give a small example of what I mean, we found that the various elements of the Department were using slightly different forms for requisitions—16 in all. As a result, nearly every time a piece of property was transferred from one part of the Department to another, a new requisition form had to be typed out, tens of thousands of forms per year. By establishing a common requisition form and system, we eliminated tens of thousands of man-hours of labor formally wasted in having clerks retype the forms. This will save us about $20 million a year when the change becomes fully operative.

The creation of the Defense Supply Agency to handle the purchase of common supplies for the Department saved $31 million this year in overhead costs alone, and these annual savings will grow in succeeding years. I need not dwell on such colorful but relatively minor accomplishments as the consolidation of the 18 different types and sizes of butcher smocks, the 4 kinds of belt buckles, and the 6 kinds of exercise bloomers.

We estimate that actions initiated this year will ultimately save nearly $300 million through increased use of competitive, as opposed to noncompetitive procurement; over $300 million through shifts from cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to fixed or incentive price contracts; over $300 million through better management of inventories; nearly $300 million through closing or reducing operations at 330 installations, freeing 45,000 men and 280,000 acres of land, and so on down the line. The total savings which will ultimately be realized from actions taken so far in the cost-reduction program will be over $1.9 billion.

Our target by fiscal year 1967 is saving $3.4 billion a year, each year, every year, through reforms in the procurement and logistic areas alone. So we are not talking about trivial sums of money. And my own judgment is that we are still only scratching the surface. I believe that we should eventually be able to surpass our own present goal of $3.4 billion annual savings, and I emphasize that we are talking about annual, not one-time savings. Several years ago there was talk of saving $8 billion per year by unifying the armed services. I think that through vigorous pursuit of the cost reduction effort we can save the same kind of money that had been envisaged through unification of the services without the serious disadvantages of a single service.

As I have said, most of this formal cost-reduction program has little or nothing to do with military effectiveness, one way or the other. It merely saves large sums of money.

The second, and really the more important, part of the effort does bear directly on military effectiveness. Although dollar savings are sometimes an important byproduct, here the essential point is to increase military effectiveness. For example, we found that the three military departments had been establishing their requirements independently of each other. I think the results can fairly be described as chaotic: the Army planning, for example, was based primarily on a long war of attrition, while the Air Force planning was based, largely, on a short war of nuclear bombardment. Consequently, the Army was stating a requirement for stocking months of fighting supplies against the event of a sizable conventional conflict, while the Air Force stock requirements for such a war had to be measured in days, and not very many days at that. Either approach, consistently followed, might make some sense. The two combined could not possibly make sense. What we needed was a coordinated strategy seeking objectives actually attainable with the military resources available.

We are moving with all reasonable speed toward a properly balanced force structure. I say with all reasonable speed because there would be enormous practical difficulties in trying to get this job done overnight. But we are moving as fast as we sensibly can to balance men against supplies; deployable divisions against sea and airlift capability to handle those divisions; ground combat units against tactical air squadrons to support those units.

A realistic reappraisal of our needs resulted in a reduction of stated requirements by $24 billion, but also in a doubling of the division-months of combat equipment actually on hand. The fact is, that in the past, so-called requirements bore almost no relation to the real world: enormous requirements existed on paper, often almost entirely disembodied from the actual size and nature of the procurement program. There were gross inventory imbalances: the Army, for example, while in general far short of its stated requirements, had 270 percent of its requirement for 105 mm. towed howitzers, 290 percent of the requirements for 4.2-inch mortars; we had 10 times as many 2.75-inch rockets as were required. By taking a more realistic look at the whole requirements picture, we were able, for example, to save $150 million on Sparrow missiles for the Navy and Air Force, $163 million on Army .50-caliber machine guns.

The new form of budget for the first time grouped together for planning purposes units which must fight together in the event of war. The Navy strategic force, the Polaris submarines, are considered together with the Air Force Strategic Air Command; Navy general purpose forces are considered together with the Army and Marine divisions and the Air Force Tactical Air Command. This kind of reform provides substantial improvement in the effectiveness of our Military Establishment. Even where it does not lead directly to lower expenditures, it is economical in the true sense of the word; that is, it gives us the maximum national security obtainable from the dollars we do spend. We can imagine many different kinds of wars the United States must be prepared to fight, but a war in which the Army fights independently of the Navy, or the Navy independently of the Air Force, is not one of them. Quite obviously, the coordination of the planning of the four services makes eminently good sense on the narrowest military grounds.

So I would repeat: It is a mistake to equate our efforts toward improving effectiveness and efficiency solely with a desire to save money. That is very important. But military effectiveness is even more important. Money savings are what is easiest to talk about: For it is easy to explain something in terms of saving x hundreds of millions of dollars; and complicated to get into the details of planning and logistics, and the like. But the fact is that the total effort is aimed both at saving money and improving military effectiveness. And it is the latter, improving the effectiveness of our Military Establishment, which is the first priority, for it is the latter which directly affects national security.

Where the situation becomes more complicated is when decisions must be made on requested force level increases or development or procurement of new weapons.

The first thing to remember is that adding a weapon to our inventory is not necessarily synonymous with adding to our national security.

The second thing to remember is that even if we were to draft every scientist and engineer in the country into weapons development work, we could still develop only a fraction of the systems that are proposed. We must pick and choose very carefully among the proposals to get the ones on which we should actually proceed. This process of choice must begin with a requirement for solid indications that a proposed system would really add something to our national security. Even then, we still have to pick and choose, but we cannot even seriously consider going ahead with a full-scale weapons system development until that basic requirement has been met.

The whole subject of research and development management deserves a separate speech. Development costs alone on typical major weapons systems today average upward of $1 billion. Over a billion dollars was spent on the atomic airplane, which was little closer to being a useful weapon when we canceled it, shortly after taking office, than it had been half a dozen years earlier. Eighty million was spent on the Goose decoy missile, essentially a pilotless aircraft that the enemy would confuse with our B–52's. But the device, once launched, could not be recalled. Since the B–52's have to be launched on ambiguous warning to avoid being destroyed on the ground, the nonrecallable decoys were obviously incompatible with the B–52's. These are a few examples of the sort of thing we hope will happen less often in the future.

The RS–70 is an example of a weapon which, it seems to me, fails to meet the basic requirement for a major systems development: a solid indication that the weapon, if developed, would add significantly to our national security. It happens to be a particularly expensive weapon: to develop, procure, and operate a modest force of these planes would cost us at least $10 billion. Yet considering the weapons we already have, or will have by the time the RS–70 could be operational, it is very hard to see how this weapon would add to our national security.

The whole debate on the RS-70, in fact, has tended to be conducted in terms which have very little to do with the facts of the situation. There is a lot of talk about missiles versus bombers. I have no feeling about missiles versus bombers as such. If bombers serve our national interest, then we should be interested in bombers; if missiles, then we should be interested in missiles; if a mix, then we should be interested in the mix. As General LeMay observed: "If kiddie cars will do the job, we will use them." But the question is really not about bombers versus missiles, because the RS-70 is not a bomber in anything like the traditional meaning of the term. The RS-70 would carry no bombs. It would attack its target with a very complex air-launched missile system from distances of hundreds of miles. Now there are various platforms from which to launch missiles. We can launch them from hardened silos in the ground; we can launch them from submarines under the sea; we can launch them from aircraft. The question is not bombs versus missiles. We are all agreed it must be missiles. The debate is about alternative launching platforms and alternative missile systems. And the particular launching platform and missile system proposed in the RS-70 program just is not an effective means to accomplish the missions proposed to be assigned to it.

Skybolt was a somewhat different story. The Skybolt development was begun in 1959 to meet a very specific need. This was to clear a path for our bombers by knocking out the enemy's air defenses. The defense suppression role is vital: unless it is performed, the bombers cannot get through to their targets. One reason that it is now agreed that by the 1970's the traditional manned bomber will be obsolete is that by then we anticipate it will be more costly to suppress air defenses in order to carry out an effective bombing attack than it will be to attack the target directly with missiles. Even now, bombers are of limited value unless we have something that can go in ahead and clear a path for them. That means a missile.

The Hound Dog had been developed for that job, but the Skybolt, it was planned, would do it much better. Two important things have happened during the Skybolt development that changed this judgment: First, the development itself fell far short of its goals: Skybolt turned out to be much more expensive than had been anticipated; it would be less accurate than had been anticipated; it would take longer to achieve acceptable levels of reliability than had been anticipated. Second, we had been successful in developing other weapons that were still on the drawing board when Skybolt was proposed. What all this added up to was that while the defense suppression role remained vital, Skybolt was no longer vital. In fact, it became clear that by using the already developed Hound Dog plus some additional Minutemen, already developed, we could do the defense suppression job for about $2 billion less than we could by continuing to go ahead on Skybolt as if nothing had changed since 1959.

These two illustrations, the RS-70 and Skybolt, point up some of the fundamental considerations that must enter into defense policy decisions. Does the proposal really add something significant to our national security? If the proposal does serve an important need, does it do so as well as other alternative means of reaching the same end? Do the assumptions on which you based your preliminary decisions several years ago still hold true?

Let me note also another reason for restraint in pushing ahead uncritically on proposed new weapons of doubtful importance. As weapons systems grow more complex, more expensive, and more difficult to maintain in a high state of military readiness, it is essential that we limit as far as possible the number of new systems that we bring into operation; for we want to be as sure as possible that we can depend on every system to operate when it is really needed. A basic fact of life is that under the chaotic conditions of combat you do not get anything like the efficiency of weapons systems that you get on a test range. Relative simplicity is a most desirable characteristic of a weapons system, or of a combination of systems.

One of the difficulties in the past has been the tendency of planners, concentrating on a particular proposed system, to forget that every additional bit of complexity you add to your operation tends to degrade the overall efficiency of the operation. Eventually you reach a point where the advantage of adding a new system is outweighed by the effect of the additional complexity. We have accumulated some disturbing evidence about the effect of proliferation of weapons systems in the recent past on the operational dependability of those systems. We don't want to put ourselves in the position of the camera bug who weights himself down with so much specialized equipment for every contingency that he actually gets poorer results than a more lightly equipped competitor. And let me add that not only do the proliferation and complication of weapons reduce dependability, but they are also major factors contributing to enormous excess inventories of parts and equipment—excesses which today amount to over $12 billion.

These considerations had a great deal to do with the TFX decisions. On that issue, the really difficult decision was not the choice of contractor, but the cancellation of the Services two-plane program and the substitution of a single aircraft to serve both the Air Force and the Navy. After extended discussion and great controversy, both the civilian and military leaders now agree such a program will meet the military requirements. It will yield a saving of approximately $1 billion. The choice of a contractor for such an aircraft was a subsidiary decision. Both contractors presented acceptable designs, each capable of meeting the military requirement, and with little to choose between them on the basis of performance. The choice of contractor, therefore, could be determined by the civilian authorities who are charged by law with making such decisions, on considerations of ultimate cost and program risk.

What I have been suggesting in these illustrations is that the question of how to spend our defense dollars and how much to spend is a good deal more complicated than is often assumed. It cannot be assumed that a new weapon would really add to our national security, no matter how attractive the weapon can be made to seem, looked at by itself. Anyone who has been exposed to so-called "brochuremanship" knows that even the most outlandish notions can be dressed up to look superficially attractive. You have to consider a very wide range of issues—the missions our forces must be prepared to perform, the effects of a proposed system on the stability of the military situation in the world, the alternatives open to us for performing the missions required.

You cannot make decisions simply by asking yourself whether something might be nice to have. You have to make a judgment on how much is enough.

I emphasize judgment because you can't even be sure yourself, much less prove to others, that your decision was precisely right to the last dollar—even to the last billion dollars. But the decision has to be made.

There is an important difference between the way we make these tough decisions today, and the way they used to be made. Formerly, an arbitrary budget ceiling was fixed for national defense, and funds were then apportioned among the services. Today we examine all our military needs, and then decide at what point our military strength is in balance with the requirements of our foreign policy.

There are, of course, sharp differences of opinion on where we should spend our marginal defense dollars. And here is where the responsibility most clearly falls on the Secretary of Defense, because here is where it must fall not only constitutionally but under any rational system. For these decisions can only be made from the point of view of the Defense Establishment as a whole, not from the point of view of the individual services. Indeed the very biggest decision—such as the basic kinds of forces we need, and the occasions on which we might want to commit those forces—must be made at an even higher level: for they involve basic questions of national policy which transcend the interest of the Defense Department, or the State Department, or indeed any part of the Government, and must be made at the Presidential level.

Earlier, I described the chaotic situation that resulted from the individual Services deciding unilaterally what kind of defense preparations were most urgently needed. Each of the services had a different concept of what kinds of wars we should be prepared to fight, with the result that the forces under the Army, Navy, and Air Force simply did not fit together in the way they must to maximize their combat effectiveness. Now, this same problem comes up when the services recommend weapons systems. There is nothing wrong with that. It is inevitable. The services properly fight hard for their viewpoints. This is probably the greatest single advantage of having separate services, instead of one unified service. But as a practical matter, although it is important to consider a variety of alternative policies, at the end we must have one defense policy, not three conflicting defense policies. And it is the job of the Secretary and his staff to make sure that this is the case, just as it is the job of the President to see that we have one national security policy, and not a series of conflicting policies in the State Department, the Treasury, the Defense Department, and so forth.

There is nothing innately desirable about centralization. But the fact remains that when national security decisions affect broad interests they must be made from a central point, not from subordinate points each specially concerned with one part of the forest—and not even by a committee made up of representatives of the different parts of the forest. For the nature of committees is to compromise their special interests, which is not the same as making the decision from the point of view of the national interest.

The Secretary of Defense—and I am talking about any Secretary of Defense—must make certain kinds of decisions, not because he presumes his judgment to be superior to his advisors, military or civilian, but because his position is the best place from which to make those decisions.

This same kind of argument applies when economic interests affected by defense decisions generate, as they inevitably will, political pressures on defense officials. Such pressures are an intrinsic and necessary part of a democratic political process. There are a good many advantages in forcing public officials to listen to people outside of their own staffs who do not share their views and assumptions. But it is the duty of Government officials, representing the national interest rather than any smaller interest, to stand up to these pressures where what is asked cannot be reconciled with the national interest.

No single speech can do justice to the full complexity of defense decisionmaking. But at heart the problem comes down, always, to the same questions: What is really in our national interest? What will help this country to play the role we want it to play in this terribly critical period of the world's history? We are interested in saving money, in alleviating economic hardships from base closings and the like, in sound military-civilian relations, in the whole range of issues which tend to dominate the headlines. But the national interest towers above them all; and it is the national interest, above all, that we seek to serve.

OBJECTION TO EARLY CONSIDERATION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, customarily all Senators give unanimous consent to waive the 3-day rule. Appropriations measures have often been taken up a day or two after the committee has reported, and with very little time for Senators to study hearings and committee reports and to be prepared to act on them.

What has happened today in connection with the supplemental appropriations bill is typical. On Tuesday, the majority leader asked me if I was willing to have the bill brought up the following Monday, which is next Monday. This was in compliance with the 3-day rule and gave time over the weekend to study the measure. Of course, I agreed.

This morning I was asked by a distinguished Senator to waive the rule, so the bill could be taken up and passed on Friday of this week. As a matter of accommodation to a colleague, I reluctantly agreed.

But this will be the last time I shall waive this right, unless a clear need for prompt passage can be shown.

This supplemental bill involves more than $1½ billion of the taxpayers' money. It deals with a broad complexity of spending programs. It involves a $52 million increase in the appropriations requested by the House. It is extremely difficult to determine by how much, if any, this measure should be reduced.

But if Senators do not take the time to analyze these huge spending proposals when they come to the floor, how can they possibly vote responsibly on spending huge sums?

Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD has been doing an excellent job of handling important legislation under very difficult circumstances, and after a gallant fight to speed up our record slow start.

I am very reluctant to add to the majority leader's difficulties, by holding up Senate consideration of appropriation bills. But I can see no other alternative to a responsible discharge of our duty to the taxpayers.

Mr. President, I make this statement with great reluctance; but I feel that under the circumstances this is necessary, because these bills are extremely difficult to analyze. The hearings being held right now before our Joint Economic Committee emphasize this fact. That is why I am serving this notice now. However, I shall not object to having the supplemental appropriation bill taken up on Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am very happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the Senator from Wisconsin has said is correct, although I believe that if he will search his memory, he may recall that I left a small opening, so that if it proved at all possible for the supplemental appropriation bill to be brought up on Friday, I could see him again, and, if he had time to look at the hearings and at the bill itself, he would reconsider.

Frankly, I do not know whether it will be possible to bring up the bill on Friday. Other developments which may occur may prevent our taking it up then.

However, I did request, through the staff of the Appropriations Committee, that the Senator from Wisconsin be contacted, and asked whether he would, on the basis of his having had a chance to study all the pertinent material, be willing to consider the possibility, if circumstances permitted, of permitting the supplemental bill to be taken up on the coming Friday.

As he has said, he has graciously consented to have that done. I believe that this morning he did receive a copy of the hearings and a copy of the report.

I wish to say that the Senator from Wisconsin has been most insistent on seeing to it that he has the necessary time in which to study these most important bills, and that on many occasions he has allowed us to bring up such a bill in less than 3 days after the report was filed—which is allowed under the rule—after he had a chance to study and to peruse the contents of the bill in question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, what the majority leader has said is, of course, absolutely correct.

I yield the floor.

THE MURDER OF WILLIAM L. MOORE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, last night while alone and peacefully walking along U.S. Highway 11 about 60 miles northeast of Birmingham, Ala., William L. Moore, a citizen of the State of Maryland, was brutally and wantonly shot and killed by a person, or persons, as yet unknown.

The exact facts of this murder are not now known, but I predict that William Moore's death and the manner of his death will not soon be forgotten.

Who was William L. Moore, and what—we must ask ourselves—had he done to incur the enmity of his murderer?

William Moore was a 35-year-old white man, a native of the State of New York, and in recent years a resident of Baltimore, Md. He was a career Federal employee, a mailman in the Baltimore City Post Office. He was a combat veteran of service with the U.S. Marine Corps in the Pacific during World War II. He is survived by his widow to whom he had been married for many years. I have related a brief sketch of who and what William Moore was before his life was suddenly ended by two pistol bullets on an Alabama roadside.

What then was his fault? Why did some depraved mind conceive and carry out his execution? He was a man who strongly believed in, to quote his own words, "The right of peaceful protest." He had taken his annual leave from the Post Office and was embarked on a solitary walk from Chattanooga, Tenn., to Jackson, Miss., to deliver a personal letter to Gov. Ross Barnett expressing his personal feelings on the problem of race relations.

There may be some who will classify Mr. Moore as a crusader, as an eccentric, but it appears from the facts now at hand that he was only doing what he professed to do—exercising his inalienable right for peaceful protest against the conditions which he personally abhorred. He was not part of an organized group. He was not engaged in an activity calculated to incite civil unrest or riot.

William Moore is dead. The deed cannot be undone, but I am sure my colleagues in the Senate join me in calling on the law enforcement officials of the sovereign State of Alabama to launch an all-out effort to swiftly ferret out and bring to the bar of justice his murderer or murderers.

This heinous crime has snuffed out the life of one citizen, but more than that, it painfully and forcefully reminds us that anarchy's ugly head has reared again in our land.

The freedom we enjoy is bound to our respect for the law. Disrespect for and disobedience of the law restricts the area of freedom we all enjoy. Our society can tolerate disagreement because we know that disputes can be settled within the framework of our judicial and legislative system. Our society cannot and will not tolerate defiance of the law. The failure to take swift and deliberate action under the circumstances in this case could have lasting repercussions throughout our country.

RICE QUOTAS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in June 1962 my attention was called to the alleged abuse in the assignment of rice acreage allotments in Matagorda and Brazoria Counties, Tex. Allegedly these irregularities involved certain officials of the office personnel and pertained to several illegal transfers of producer rice allotments between Matagorda and Brazoria Counties. Involved in such irregularities were charges that in certain instances the producers were paying some of the county office employees for their cooperation in these illegal transfers.

Following my inquiry to the Department of Agriculture of June 29, 1962, I was advised that the Department had already received similar allegations and that they were in the process of an investigation.

Under date of April 3, 1963, I received a report from the Department of Agriculture, signed by Mr. H. D. Godfrey, Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, confirming the results of their investigation and outlining the prosecutions and disciplinary actions which resulted therefrom.

I will ask unanimous consent that a copy of this report be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks here today.

This report confirms that there was a rather widespread abuse under which certain employees were receiving illegal payments for their part in arranging the illegal transfer of these rice allotments. Criminal indictments and convictions were obtained against several individuals involved in the conspiracy.

As one who on occasions has been a critic of the Agriculture Department this time I wish to commend the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, upon the prompt manner in which he initiated this investigation when it was called to his attention and the diligence with which his Department has prosecuted those responsible.

I ask unanimous consent that the Department's letter of April 3, 1963, signed by Mr. H. D. Godfrey, Administrator of Agricultural Stabilization Conservation Service, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE, OFFICE OF
THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1963.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reference to your letters of June 29, 1962, and February 28, 1963, with respect to multiple assignments of rice acreage allotments in Matagorda and Brazoria Counties in Texas.

On June 3, 1962, Carl E. Lively, the Matagorda ASCS county office manager died of cancer. Immediately thereafter the Texas State office became aware of some indicated rice allotment irregularities in the county. A preliminary investigation by State office personnel pointed up several illegal transfers of producer rice allotments between Matagorda and Brazoria Counties. A further check in Brazoria County confirmed their suspicions. Similar transfers appeared to have taken place between these and other counties, Jackson and Waller.

Evidence indicated certain persons in the county offices of Brazoria, Matagorda, Jackson, and Waller Counties had accepted money from producers for rice acreage allotments or for increases in producer allotments.

The services of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Investigation Division, Office of the Inspector General; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Internal Audit Division, Office of the Inspector General; and the Federal Bureau of Investigation were requested on or about June 8, 1962, to determine the extent of the acreages and personnel involved. As their findings were disclosed, certain actions were taken by the Department.

When the investigations were well under way it became apparent that the indicated violations fell into the following categories:

A. Instances where a producer paid a county office employee annually over the past 2 or 3 years a monetary fee per acre for an increase in his producer rice acreage allotment. These irregularities appeared to be confined to four counties. This allotment acreage is usually duplicated by having been allocated to two or more farms and planted, but in some cases the producer allotment so allocated was in the name of a fictitious person.

B. Instances where two producers entered into an agreement or partnership for the purpose of producing rice on a joint basis, although it appears that one of the producers actually withdrew from the production of rice and was paid money at the time by the other producer for the use of his allotment, on an annual or permanent basis. In either instance, annual applications for allocation of producer allotments to a farm were approved on the basis that both producers were to be "engaged in the production of rice" on the farm. Effective with the 1958 crop year, regulations have provided for the recall of any producer rice acreage allotment and a reduction of the farm allotment upon a finding after a scheduled hearing before the ASC county committee, that the producer was not "engaged in the production of rice" as indicated at the time of allocating his producer allotment to the farm.

Category A cases are of a limited number; category B cases are numerous and affect many producers directly and indirectly. One or more years during the period 1958 through 1962 are involved in each. However, subsequent to the initial action taken by the State committee, which resulted in the recall or revocation of allotments in the category B cases, many of the producers involved have furnished the State committee with evidence which substantiated their claim that they were "engaged in the production of rice" in the 1962 crop year, thereby clearing their operations for such year.

Your inquiry was directed to category A cases in Brazoria and Matagorda Counties.

The excess or unexplained acreages in this category in Brazoria County from 1958 through 1962, and the illegal transfers of such acreages which emanated from Brazoria County, during this period, are, as follows:

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Brazoria	90.0	1,518.7	1,706.0	1,541.1	2,357.0
Fort Bend	----------	271.4	125.0	----------	----------
Jackson	----------	908.2	1,019.2	427.1	200.0
Matagorda	146.0	315.5	242.2	455.9	420.6
Victoria	----------	110.0	60.0	----------	----------
Waller	----------	----------	166.8	639.1	1,183.7
Total	236.0	3,123.8	3,319.2	3,063.2	4,161.3

As information became available, the field officials of the Department took steps to cancel improper allocations in the category A cases and to recall or revoke producer allotment allocations in the category B cases as provided for in existing regulations.

In view of the fact that these violations came to light just prior to or at the time of harvest of the 1962 crop of rice, administrative action was directed to 1962 cases only, with action on violations for 1961 and prior years to be taken at the earliest practicable date.

On September 7, 1962, suit was brought in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas against the Texas ASCS State executive director, the ASCS county committees and county office managers of six counties in Texas by seven Texas rice farmers, praying for a preliminary injunction to prevent the recall of the allocation of producer rice acreage allotments to farms and the cancellation or reduction of farm acreage allotments as a result thereof and asking also for affirmative relief to require the return or issuance of rice marketing cards which had been canceled or withheld. Basis for the suit was that the Government's regulations under which the defendants had acted were invalid. The suit was a class action on behalf of all farmers in Texas similarly situated and it was sought to join as party defendants all other ASCS county committees and county office managers in the Texas rice-producing area. One plaintiff withdrew from the case at the start of the trial. Trial was held on October 1, 2, and 3, 1962, and decision was rendered on October 5, 1962. The court upheld the regulation and ruled also that the plaintiffs should have exhausted their administrative and judicial remedies provided for in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. Plaintiffs appealed to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and requested a stay order pending the appeal to prevent defendants from adjusting any more farm rice acreage allotments. The stay order was granted. Arguments before the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit were heard on February 21, 1963, but to date no decision has been handed down. At the close of the argument, motion was filed by counsel for plaintiffs seeking withdrawal from the action by three of the remaining plaintiffs.

The stay order has been in effect since October 15, 1962, and the Department has been precluded by reason thereof from taking administrative action leading to the recall or revocation of the rice acreage allotment in any case in which action had not already been taken at the time the stay order was issued.

Practically all farmers whose allotments were reduced or canceled before the stay order was issued have availed themselves of the opportunity to apply for a review of the administrative action before a review committee, as provided for in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Many hearings before review committees were scheduled, but most were postponed or continued at the request of the farmers pending the outcome of the court action.

However, six category A cases were heard by the review committee for Matagorda County and three category B cases were heard by the review committee for Chambers County. In each case, the review committee found for the farmer. The Matagorda County cases were reopened on behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture, but the review committee affirmed the prior determinations.

If the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is favorable to the Government, further administrative and review committee action will be taken in accordance with applicable regulations. If the decision is unfavorable, no such action can be taken and any prior action by the Department under the regulations would likely have been invalidated.

We are informed by the Criminal Division, Department of Justice, that as a result of the investigations, criminal indictments have been obtained against Victor M. Dziewas, Farmer Fieldman, district 13, Texas ASCS State office, David C. Stephens, Brazoria ASCS county office manager, Tacitus Thornhill, Waller ASCS county office manager, J. W. Killough, Jr., farmer, Brazoria County, Lawrence G. Newman, and (Mr.) Pearl Bellard. The latter two men posed as farmers from Brazoria County, but actually were not engaged in farming. Carl E. Lively, former Matagorda ASCS county office manager and Norman E. Scaff, former Jackson ASCS county office manager, who were involved in the investigations, are deceased. Dziewas has pleaded guilty, but has not been sentenced pending trial of Stephens, who has pleaded not guilty. Thornhill originally pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 2 years in prison and fined $30,000; he later had a nervous breakdown, his guilty plea was withdrawn and a not guilty plea entered for him, a motion was filed to test his competency, and he is now in a hospital undergoing treatment. Killough pleaded guilty, but has not been sentenced, pending trial of Stephens. Newman pleaded guilty and was given a 2-year sentence, which was suspended, and fined $1,500. Bellard has pleaded not guilty and will be tried with Stephens. It is expected that the trial of Stephens and Bellard will be held during the summer months, although no date has been set.

As it became known that employees of the Department were involved in illegal transfers of rice allotments, appropriate personnel actions were initiated. As a result, all the persons indicted who were employees of the Department were removed from office. Many others who, although not considered to have violated any criminal statute, were considered to have been guilty of conduct incompatible with their continued employment, and were removed from office or their employment was terminated. These include three county committeemen, one alternate county committeeman, one county office clerk, one performance supervisor, two performance reporters, two community committeemen, and two alternate community committeemen. One review committeeman was not reappointed when his term of office expired. Three county committeemen and four community committeemen were permitted to serve out their terms of office. In addition, resignations were accepted from one State committeeman, one community committeeman, and one county office clerk.

Personnel actions in the cases of certain persons holding minor offices or positions have been withheld pending the holding of review hearings which have been initiated by such persons, and/or the results of further investigation currently in progress. Additional personnel actions of the types indicated above are currently underway and it is contemplated that others may be forthcoming.

If we can furnish you any additional information, we shall be glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. Godfrey,
Administrator.

EAVESDROPPING AND WIRETAPPING

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, several Congresses have considered the question of wiretapping and eavesdropping. The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has investigated these problems since 1958.

These investigations have been detailed and far-reaching. Initially, the subcommittee examined the general area of "wiretapping, eavesdropping, and the Bill of Rights." Then the subcommittee sought to define, as precisely as possible, the extent of wiretapping and eavesdropping and the law governing these activities. During the 87th Congress, hearings were held on various legislative proposals designed to deal with the practical and legal problems posed. One of these proposals, S. 1086 as amended, was reported by the subcommittee to the full Judiciary Committee. This bill would have permitted wiretapping by State law enforcement officers where State statute authorizes it, and then, only under court order in four specific crimes, gambling, liquor, narcotics, and prostitution, and in crimes punishable by imprisonment for 5 years or over. In addition, the bill would have incorporated certain standards for the courts in issuing and making reports on wiretapping orders.

Since that time, I have cosponsored two bills proposed by the administration which would clarify existing wiretapping statutes. The most recent of these, S. 1308, a bill to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation of specified offenses, was introduced during this session of Congress.

On April 9, 1963, the Wall Street Journal published an article entitled "Electronic Advances Aid Snoopers Using Eavesdropping Devices," which clearly points up the need for legislation prohibiting wiretapping except by officials acting within a narrowly defined area. This article illustrates with alarming clarity the serious threat which scientific developments can pose to basic constitutional rights guaranteed our citizens. I hope Congress will see fit to take appropriate action on this important subject in the very near future.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Electronic Advances Aid Snoopers Using Eavesdropping Devices—Miniature Transmitter Traps Steel Firm Spy—Government Agencies Are Big Customers

(By William M. Carley)

Guy W. Wadsworth, Jr., president of Southern Counties Gas Co., of Los Angeles, recently was shocked to find a tiny radio transmitter in his desk telephone. "We don't really know when or why it was put there, or who did it," says Mr. Wadsworth. "But it apparently had been broadcasting my private conversations to someone's receiver outside."

As Mr. Wadsworth's experience illustrates, professional eavesdroppers have been taking advantage of miniature components and other advances in electronics. Some skilled investigators build their own listening devices or "bugs." But such equipment also is produced by a handful of small electronics companies that cater mainly to private detectives, industrial security forces, local police, and Federal agencies.

These firms have been developing new gadgets and refining standard items, such as telephone tapping equipment. Solar Research, Inc., in Oakland Park, Fla., makes a device that not only records phone conversations but also prints the number, time, and date of the call on tape. It sells for $995.

Solar, which claims to be "the world's largest manufacturer of concealed listening devices," says its sales last year increased fourfold over 1961. The company sells only to law-enforcement agencies or to customers approved by them. And it offers lawmen a month-long, $175 course covering such topics as jail "bugging," concealment of wire, and telephone tapping.

"SUGAR LUMP" TRANSMITTER

"The science of investigation demands the most advanced electronic tools of the trade," advertises Tracer Electronics, Inc., of Newport Beach, Calif. Tracer offers, among other "tools," an FM transmitter, little bigger than a sugar lump, which attaches to a matchbox-sized battery. In some locations investigators plug a short antenna into the transmitter, which Tracer claims will broadcast normal conversations up to a block away for 3 days. The transmitter sells for $94.95 and a special receiver to pick up its signals costs $199.95.

James R. Swallow, of Santa Ana, Calif., who sells and services eavesdropping equipment, says he installed several sugar lump transmitters in the offices of an eastern steel forging company last year. The company wanted to learn who was leaking some trade secrets.

One night a detective monitoring the transmitter overheard the company janitor phoning technical information to a rival firm. The steel company promptly fired the janitor who turned out to be a metallurgical engineer employed by the competitor. He had posed as a janitor so he could rifle desks and files at night.

Mr. Jay Tracer, vice president of Tracer Electronics, says some aircraft companies scatter the tiny transmitters around big warehouses. A guard at a central point monitors them for the sound of shuffling feet or other suspicious noises.

CIGARETTE PACKS AND DESK SETS

Transmitters also come disguised as cigarette packs and desk pen sets and built into picture frames—with a picture of a church included by one firm. Such devices often are used by police to gain evidence on suspected blackmailers and extortionists and by private detectives working on divorce cases.

Some transmitters work without batteries. Telephone bugs similar to the one encountered by Mr. Wadsworth in Los Angeles, are designed to operate on a small amount of current drawn from the telephone line itself.

Sometimes structural interference or other conditions make radio transmission impossible. In such cases, eavesdroppers can connect a microphone to a nearby tape recorder or other receiver with electrically conductive paint, instead of conspicuous wires. The conduction coating can be camouflaged by covering it with ordinary paint.

If investigators can't gain access to a room to install listening devices they can use a spike-mike, which C. H. Stoelting Co., of Chicago, sells for $46.50. When driven into the outside wall of a room the 12-inch spike picks up conversations within the room and conducts them to listening equipment.

The Federal Government is a major customer for eavesdropping devices, manufacturers say. Some of this equipment is used for espionage and counterespionage, particularly by the Central Intelligence Agency. But manufacturers know few of the details since the CIA often buys eavesdropping devices through the Army, the General Services Administration, and dummy corporations, rather than under its own name.

Government agencies also are important customers for devices designed to detect the presence of eavesdropping equipment. The State Department received a $1.5 million appropriation to buy antieavesdropping equipment during the year ending June 30, compared with $637,000 during the preceding year. And State Department security officials are seeking about $1.5 million more for this purpose in the next budget.

For protection from eavesdroppers, Mosler Research Products, Inc., of Danbury, Conn., offers a soun-d-tect kit, which sells for $390. The kit includes a radio frequency probe that indicates the presence of concealed transmitters and an instrument, similar to a mine detector, that locates microphones hidden in walls. Mosler says its sales of eavesdropping and antieavesdropping devices have increased by 10 percent in each of the last 3 years and now exceed $60,000 a year. The company sells only to Government agencies.

Although it's legal to manufacture eavesdropping devices it isn't always legal to use them. In February a Federal grand jury in Washington, D.C., indicted three men for bugging a lawyer's hotel suite where he conferred with clients. The jury charged the three men with operating a radio station without a station license or operator's license and operating a transmitter at frequencies and strengths forbidden by the Federal Communications Commission.

A GIANT MIKE

Eavesdropping police sometimes run into legal problems, too. To check on a suspected gambling operation, Washington, D.C., police entered a vacant row house and drove a spikemike through a wall into the heat duct of an adjoining house. This converted the heating system into a giant microphone that picked up conversations throughout the home.

The police listened undetected for several days and gathered enough evidence to convict three men on gambling charges. But the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the convictions because it ruled the police tactics violated the constitutional ban against unreasonable searches.

Eavesdropping laws vary from State to State and from device to device, and for some devices the law has yet to be laid down. One manufacturer's catalog cautions prospective customers: "It must be remembered that unauthorized interception of intelligence by a third party is sometimes highly illegal. However, to the agencies who deem this instrument a useful tool in the detection and prevention of crime * * * this equipment is available."

Solar Research doesn't even list 45 of its products in its catalog. "The Government has asked us not to, so the public, particularly criminal elements, won't become aware such sophisticated devices are available," explains Jack N. Holcomb, company president.

SHIFTING OF MIDDLE TO LEFT IS TRICK

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an article written by Mrs. Pegge A. Cooksley. Mrs. Cooksley of Ucross, Wyo., was awarded for the second time the Freedoms Foundation George Washington Medal of Honor.

Mr. President, I ask that the excellent article "Shifting of Middle to Left Is Trick," which brought her the award, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Shifting of Middle to Left Is Trick

(By Pegge A. Cooksley)

February 9, 1962.

Just what is the middle of the road as related to rightwing and leftwing?

There are hawkers bouncing around who have employed the loathsome pastime of attempting to discredit our American constitutional form of government and throw off balance public logic and principle by a campaign of confusion.

These factions have been head-hammering the public with welfare-statism and bending the ear drums of individuals with sleight of hand remarks until some are actually beginning to believe that socialism is the middle of the road and that anyone right of Norman Thomas is an extreme rightwinger—a Fascist.

When this Socialist taffy-pull of the human mind is over (and should they win) we will find the finished product not quite so sweet as some have been led to believe.

Let's set, and keep, our keel on the Constitution of the United States and see who comes out left or right—red or white.

We should guard with jealousy the principles embraced in our Constitution and fend off any attempt to alter its meaning. The men who gave us our Constitution did not place their signatures on this document blindly; many of them not only sacrificed their wealth but life as well to give us something many times more precious than the Socialist promise of material gain—they gave us freedom and opportunity.

In return, this freedom and opportunity give us material gains that no other form of government can offer its people. Under our form of government the wealth is to remain with the people—not a body of government. Our free competitive enterprise system, as provided by the Constitution, encourages quality development, expansion, and creation of new jobs for more people. These things, too, are motivated and enhanced by our profit system. Once this system is disrupted we find a decay of the economic and social atmospheres.

This trick play to move the middle to left is only another effort to destroy, bit by bit, our constitutional provisions and incite our people into battle against each other even though their principles, beliefs, and loyalties are the same. By confusing the "middle of the road" issue and injecting some choice namecalling they have suppressed many people from standing up for those things they really believe in for fear of being called a Fascist or neofascist. To oppose socialism certainly does not indicate that one embraces fascism.

Our representative-democracy was set up in opposition to both national and international dictatorships, ordaining that ours would be a government for the people and by the people who would not be subject to slave state controls and regimentation such as we find in Fascist, Communist, and Socialist states.

It has been unfortunate that all liberals are being labeled "leftists" and all conservatives "rightist." Through all the namecalling and labeling we are beginning to lose the perspective of our two political parties as well as the middle of the road.

Our house does seem a little untidy and confused but we have only to read and study our Constitution of the United States to determine where the middle of the road really is. If the so-called rightwingers appear to be pulling farther to the right, 9 chances out of 10 it is only the middle of the roaders joining hands with the rightwing in an effort to pull our constitutional provisions back into true perspective.

True, there are extremists both to the left and to the right. We must approach both these segments with caution but beware of namecalling until you are sure you, yourself, are off the detour and on the straight road to freedom and constitutional government.

DEATH OF PHILLIP MAGGARD

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on March 2 a tragic airplane crash in the Philippines ended the lives of two Peace Corps volunteers, one of them 22-year-old Phil Maggard from my State of Wyoming. Since losing their son, Phil's parents have carefully sorted his mail and letters received from Filipino citizens who wrote to express their grief and shock at the death of this fine man who had given of himself to help others. Let me add that I had long counted Phil and his family among my dearest friends.

What the Maggards compiled can best be described as a tribute to this outstanding young man and his selfless work among the Filipino people, for whom he had the highest respect and admiration.

Phil's parents, with the help of their many friends, compiled a partial summary of correspondence which was printed in the Buffalo, Wyo., Bulletin.

It is apparent that Phil went to the Philippines both to learn and to teach. What he learned—especially about the image of America as discerned by his Filipino friends—does not make pretty reading.

I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the Record at this point the Buffalo Bulletin newspaper story, including the Maggard letters.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Filipino People Express Deep Regret at Loss of Peace Corps Volunteer

It has been more than 6 weeks since Phillip Maggard, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Merrida Maggard, of Buffalo, met death in a tragic air crash in the Philippine Islands, which took the life of Nancy Ann Boyd, another Peace Corps volunteer, and 25 Philippine citizens.

Since then literally hundreds of letters have poured in from the Philippine people, those who were personally acquainted with Phil and the work he was doing. Among the letters are those from public officials, including President Macapagal, of the Philippines, and dozens of public officials and mayors of various cities.

There is no question, as the communications will show, that the work being done by Phillip Maggard was outstanding. He had endeared himself to the people by becoming one of them, yet they looked up to him for his ability and genuine desire to help them become better citizens and obtain a better education.

A fund established by his parents in his memory, to be used for books and educational materials for the children in the area where he taught, has now reached $1,085.

Contributions have been made in the name of Phil Maggard to Rev. Stuart Frazier, of St. Luke's Episcopal Church in Buffalo. The Maggards are hoping to travel to the Philippines later this year and deliver the money in person to the people for whom it was raised in Lianga Bay. Any further contributions will be included in this fund.

The Philippine Airlines, at the time of the accident, offered to fly Mr. and Mrs. Maggard to the area where their son was killed. When this proved impractical, the airlines extended the offer to them for use at a later date. The Maggards have indicated they would like to make the trip this summer.

An unusual fact about Project 7 was revealed recently by a Peace Corps official. There were about 143 assigned to this project in the Philippines, and shortly before Phil Maggard's death, this group petitioned the Peace Corps office in Washington to reduce their monthly salary from $75 to $55.

The reason for this unusual request was because the Filipino teachers receive only $55 per month and the Peace Corps members wanted their salaries to be no more than that received by these teachers. Actually, they were granted only a small sum for spending money and the rest of their salary was kept in escrow in the United States for when they completed their mission.

A letter to Mr. and Mrs. Maggard from the mayor of the city of Zamboanga expressed condolences and regret at the untimely death of Phil and Nancy Ann Boyd, and it underscored the splendid work being done by the Peace Corps.

"We grieve their loss most profoundly," wrote Mayor Thomas F. Ferrer, "considering the fact that the tragedy struck at a time when the good old United States has embarked on a program known as the Peace Corps movement, dedicated to the worldwide enlightenment through education in varied fields of knowledge toward lifting up from the quagmire of ignorance and poverty and to help crush the so-called barrier of racial prejudice."

Mayor Ferrer said Phillip and Nancy Boyd and hundreds of other selfless men and women Peace Corps volunteers are working with no thought of personal gain, but only their desire to contribute their humble share in the moral, educational, and economic uplift of their fellowmen in a world being torn asunder by the ugly hands of communism.

"Phillip and Nancy Ann are gone but their memory will continue to live in the minds of a grateful people of this city and of the country in general," Mayor Ferrer concluded.

From Quezon City, Carlos del Cortith wrote: "Your son is not dead—he still lives with us. He is a symbol of a man dedicated to service of your and our countries, and for the promotion of friendship which ties us. Your son is a hero to us."

President Diosdada Macapagal had his executive secretary write to Mr. and Mrs. Maggard as follows: "To us, Phillip was an outstanding example of the Peace Corps volunteers who come to our country with the purpose of extending assistance to our people at the sacrifice of their personal ambitions and comforts. It was perhaps for this reason why our people felt over Phillip's death a sense of personal loss, as if he were one of our own people.

"We are heartened by the knowledge that you are planning to visit the Philippines next summer. This will give you an opportunity to see for yourselves that Phillip had indeed brought a gift of light and brotherhood to those countrymen of ours who had the privilege of knowing him in person."

Members of the teaching force at the Diatagon elementary school at Lianga all signed a letter extending sympathy. "We share with you the grief of his passing. He was an asset to the school and the community life and his unselfish concern and devoted service to the community and our children especially, will never slip from the memory of the people he loved and who have learned to love him as a brother and friend.

"Of course, all of us will sooner or later follow him. In the interim that we are still in the battle for life existence, it behooves that we pull together and say our prayer that Phil may rest in peace."

One young man addressed his letter to Mrs. Maggard as "Dearest Mommy."

It was a very touching letter, which read in part:

"DEAREST MOMMY: Maybe you will be surprised why I'm calling you mommy. You know, I'm one of the best friends of your late son, Phillip. He treated us as his brother, even in our young ages. My name is Lolito Rivos Ladanan at the age of 13 years. During our schooldays Phil was one of our schoolteachers. During his vacant time wherever he went (picnic, boating, show, playing, hunting, and every kind of outing) there we were.

"On March 2 we heard a news from the radio that a plane from Zamboanga to Davao was crashed. Upon hearing this, the whole family of ours prayed to God that Phil will not be one of the accidents.

"But on Sunday it was very clear that Phil was one of the dead. All of us cried with tears on our eyes, especially my mother. The whole night we did not fall asleep, we can't find anymore a friend like him.

"You know, Mommy, we have a prayer every night, led by my mother. Lastly, I'm sending my condolence. Because of late Phil, let me call you Mommy, and you call me, your son.

"LOLITO RIVOS LADANAN.

"(Errors are under your consideration.)"

A close friend of Phil's wrote a very tender letter of his last day with the people of Lianga Bay logging camp. It was from Irene Panganika, who said "the tragic event about Phil has caused us all a heavy heart. We have come to love him in his stay here.

"He is a person with such a warm personality and had spent his time with full dedication to the Peace Corps. You should have seen how these children cried with disbelief when it became known he was one of the victims.

"Before he left he went all around the place and bade goodbye. He mingled with all the people with great ease. He could discuss things intellectually with the older people and could act like a boy with the kids.

"He had just moved to a new house and we had planned a sort of house-warming.

"We will miss his jokes, his laugh and all the good things he used to do. I work as a laboratory technician in the hospital and everyday he used to pass by with a bunch of children. We have an organization here and we are going to dedicate a novena of prayer for his soul.

"I am trying to collect pictures taken of him and will try to send them to you soon. We really loved Phil as much as you love him."

Rebecca S. Pena of Quezon City wrote as follows:

"Since I am at the other end of the world in the country where your son gave his life to help make a better place for us to live in, I feel the compulson to try and tell you in my inadequate way that we share your grief and your loss. No one can give of himself to us without becoming a part of us, too.

"That Phillip gave so unselfishly cannot be questioned—ask any Filipino youngster whose life he had touched. I don't know who wrote this line, but it is the most fitting tribute to Phillip—'No man ever stood so straight as when he stooped to help a boy.'

"To you and to that great country of yours, in behalf of Filipinos in all walks of life, especially the underprivileged, to whom he gave his devotion, with aching hearts we thank you ever so much for Phillip."

Pedro P. Senarillos, of Hagonoy, Davao, Philippines, wrote that—"We can never repay you and the American people, for the contribution to the cause of world literacy.

"We are deeply grateful for the unselfish endeavor of the Peace Corps volunteers, most especially your son, who had foregone the conveniences, luxuries, and comforts that your American home could offer, in order to give my countrymen the blessings of a higher form of education.

"Your son, you may rest assured, will forever live in the hearts of my people, particularly to us living in the immediate vicinity where he died."

From San Juan, Rizal, Philippines, Rudolfo Mr. Gaerlan wrote: "I find words inadequate to convey to you my personal feeling of sympathy on the recent death of your beloved son * * * our friend and brother * * * your own Phillip, who had a special mission in life as a Peace Corps volunteer and much depended upon his performance as an 'ambassador of goodwill' from America.

"We are greatly indebted to you and the American people for having sons and daughters who left the comforts of home to come to our backward region to shed a light in the darkness of ignorance and disease and want. We can never repay you for the amount of time and effort and sacrifice that your beloved son gave to us, and I am sure that he would have given us more had not our Lord beckoned him to His eternal kingdom."

Amelito R. Mutuc, ambassador from the Philippines in the Washington embassy, wrote that he regretted he could not attend the funeral, but expressed his deepest sympathy.

"No amount of human effort can assuage your pain and loss, but you can take consolation and pride in the fact that your son, Phillip, died for a noble cause, in service, not only of your country, but mine as well.

"I have met the Peace Corps volunteers in the Philippines. I have seen them at work and know the tremendous impact which their selfless endeavors have made upon my countrymen, who will always remember your son for his help, counsel, and friendship. To the people and government of the Philippines, to whom he had endeared himself, he did not die in vain."

From the Governor in Cebu City an eloquent letter was written, pointing out how much the Philippine people appreciated what Americans did at Corregidor, where they fought side by side with Filipinos for the cause of freedom and peace.

"Your son has already carved a temple in our hearts and as long as those hearts beat, we shall always remember him. Together with our condolence for losing a beloved son, goes our congratulations for bringing up a hero."

There are literally hundreds of other letters, many eloquently describing how much the people of the Philippine Islands have appreciated the work of Peace Corps members. Many of them demonstrate the confidence these people have in the future and how much they appreciate what America has done, and is doing, to bring happiness and prosperity to a proud, but backward, nation.

Mr. SIMPSON. I beg the Senate's indulgence for another moment to read from one of his letters that has not yet been published. Phil wrote:

> Speaking of images, the American image here is distorted to a fantastic degree. To Filipinos we possess Hollywood, Las Vegas, rock 'n roll, big cars, and sex. And, due to their worship of us, they imitate us. Consequently, rock 'n roll is all you hear on the radio, the twist is taught in the schools, and boys wear ducktails. There is absolutely nothing in Western Culture. No symphonies, no art, no literature. All Filipinos know who Chubby Checker is, but they can't tell you who wrote St. Matthew Passion, nor anything about Lincoln Center. The books sold here are all comics or True Confessions—no U.S. News & World Report nor good American novels. Movies shown here are grade Z or worse. A Filipino will promptly tell you the latest on Liz Taylor's sex life, but they would be blank if you mentioned Jonas E. Salk, Leonard Bernstein, or Carl Sandburg. It is the cheap, smutty, and flashy America that is brought to the Filipino. And some gigolo in Hollywood is paying alimony of $50,000 to his fifth wife from the pesos Filipinos pay to see one of his pictures, instead of for food. (Current cinema here is House of Women, The Wild and Wanton, and Twist All Night.)

I invite particular attention to this point:

> If the Peace Corps can even be a catalyst in the eradication of this image, then we will have served our country well.

I recommend this letter not only to the Peace Corps for its attention, but also to the U.S. Information Agency as well, for it is a description of the American image as seen through the eyes of a man who truly gave his life to improve that image.

RAMPART DAM—THE GREATEST HYDROPOWER DAM IN THE FREE WORLD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in central Alaska studies of the greatest hydroelectric project in North America, indeed in the Western World, are nearing completion. They deal with the proposal to construct a dam on the famed Yukon River and to harness its mighty waters, now running wastefully to the sea, for the generation of hydroelectric power, for flood control, and for navigation purposes.

Funds to undertake the study of the Rampart Dam project were first secured in 1959 when, over administration protests, Alaska's Senators persuaded the Senate Appropriations Committee to include the sum of $100,000 in the Public Works Appropriations Act for 1960. The studies are being made under the general direction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the work is being watched expectantly by citizens of both the free and captive worlds.

We of the West tend to overlook the technical abilities of the Iron Curtain nations, although we know that our grand Grand Coulee has been surpassed by two Russian dams on the Volga River which have been completed—Volgograd with a capacity of 2.3 million kilowatts and Kuibyshev with a capacity of 2.1 million kilowatts.

And, in Russian Siberia today workmen are constructing two larger dams—one at Bratsk on the Angara River which will have a capacity of 4.5 million kilowatts and a second at Krasnoyarsk on the Yenisey River which will have a capacity now estimated to be 6 million kilowatts.

Our Rampart studies should be carried forward to conclusion as rapidly as possible. Any needless delay is harmful to the Nation. Rampart Dam will accelerate the growth of our gross national product. The installed capacity of Rampart will be close to 5 million kilowatts, enough to furnish Alaska with a stable economy which it does not now have, by attracting industries requiring large quantities of low-cost power. Rampart's power will be the lowest cost power under the American flag.

The need to develop the resources of Alaska concerns President Kennedy. As a Member of this body, he said on June 24, 1960:

> We must meet the challenge of Alaska—the challenge to reap its abundance, build its strength, and provide a reservoir of natural wealth for a growing America. We must, of course, press forward with bold, and vitally needed projects such as the Rampart Canyon Dam.

Later the same year, inside Alaska, then Senator Kennedy continued his efforts on behalf of power development within the State. He reminded his listeners at the State fair in Palmer that the U.S.S.R. is well aware that power is "the key to the future—to the development of industry—to the dispersal of armaments—to the race for power and prestige in every field of endeavor." After pointing to the advances of the Soviets in the hydroelectric field, he said on September 4, 1960:

> The tragic fact of the matter is that if Alaska still belonged to the Russians, Rampart Canyon Dam would be underway today.

Later the same day in Anchorage, then Senator Kennedy described the Alaska of the future as he foresaw it:

> A land of over 1 million people—a giant electric grid stretching from Juneau to Anchorage and beyond. I see the greatest dam in the free world at Rampart Canyon, producing twice the power of TVA to light homes and mills and cities and farms all over Alaska.

Under the direction of President Kennedy the Rampart Canyon studies are nearing completion. That giant electric grid will be a reality.

The Alaska Legislature endorses Rampart.

The 20 members of the senate on April 4 approved and passed Senate Resolution 60 in which the Federal agencies involved were urged to speed the conclusion of the remaining Rampart and other Yukon River studies, "and to report promptly to the Congress, and make possible the early request by the Alaska delegation in Congress for legislation providing authorization and appropriation for the Rampart Canyon Dam."

We do not have time to drag our feet and any agency so inclined does so only to the detriment of the Nation's strength and economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 60, IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA—THIRD LEGISLATURE, FIRST SESSION

(By Senators Hansen, Harrison, Hopson, Kilcher, McNealy, Nolan, Owen, Peratrovich, B. Phillips, V. Phillips, Smith, Walsh, Banfield, Begich, Bradshaw, Bronson, Butrovich, Coghill, Foster, and Hall)

Whereas a sound and vigorous development of Alaska's resources is desirable, and indeed essential, not only from the standpoint of the people of Alaska but of the Nation whose great northernmost and westernmost outpost and underdeveloped dominion and potential is the State of Alaska; and

Whereas a diversification and enlargement of Alaska's economy is needed for the above declared objective; and

Whereas the resources on which the people of Alaska depended when their numbers were far fewer in territorial days, namely gold mining and fishing—both now diminished in quantity and in economic impact—will not suffice to create a vigorous, thriving, and expanding economy; and

Whereas for years the Federal Government has developed the hydroelectric resources of the 48 older States with such projects as the Tennessee Valley Authority, Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, Bonneville Dam, Hungry Horse Dam, and others, and is now engaged in the continuance of this sound utilization of our water resources with Glen Canyon, Arkansas Frying-Pan, and other hydroelectric projects; and

Whereas the greatest hydroelectric project on the North American continent, and indeed in the free world, is available on the Yukon River in Alaska, which can generate power at 2 mills a kilowatt hour, which will be the lowest cost power under the American flag; and

Whereas studies by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army have already established the engineering feasibility of the dam at Rampart on the Yukon; and

Whereas the marketability of its low-cost power and the consequent attraction to Alaska of diverse industries and the utilization thereby of Alaskan and other raw materials not practically exploitable without low-cost power has been determined in the authoritative study by the Development & Resources Corp., of New York, a qualified agency retained by the Corps of Engineers for that purpose; and

Whereas the United States, through its foreign-aid program, is financing hydroelectric projects in many parts of the world among people who pay no taxes to the United States, and the products derived from them will be competitive with our own U.S. products; be it

Resolved, That the Alaska Senate strongly urges the Federal agencies involved to speed the conclusion of the remaining Rampart and other Yukon River studies, and to report promptly to the Congress, and make possible the early request by the Alaska delegation in Congress for legislation providing authorization and appropriation for the Rampart Canyon Dam; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of the Army; the Honorable Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Jr., Chief of the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

Passed by the senate April 4, 1963.

FRANK PERATROVICH,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the story of Rampart is exciting. It is a story of America on the march, a march of progress. Mrs. Irene E. Ryan of Anchorage, Alaska, recently told the story up to this moment in history at the conference on "Yukon's Resources, Today and Tomorrow," held in Whitehorse in the Yukon Territory of Canada.

Mrs. Ryan is a mining engineer. She served in both the Alaska Territorial House of Representatives and Senate and later was a member of the Alaska State Senate. Mrs. Ryan is well acquainted with the work of the Rampart Economic Advisory Board, having served as a member by appointment of the Chief of the Corps of Engineers. She is admirably qualified to speak about Rampart and to describe the potential of this vast project which will be located at the edge of the Arctic Circle in a canyon 100 miles northwest of Fairbanks.

Mrs. Ryan can speak authoritatively of the power which will be generated by the dam at the bus bar, for the lowest cost under the American flag—2 mills per kilowatt-hour. The marketability of the power was fully attested to in a report made for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers by the Development & Resources Corp. of New York. This knowledgeable agency, officered by men of national and international experience in hydroelectric development, who received earlier experience as developers and administrators of TVA, men such as the Chairman of the Board David E. Lilienthal, President Gordon Clapp, and Vice President Walton Seymour. Their report has been issued previously as a Senate document by the Public Works Committee and is titled "The Market for Rampart Power Yukon River, Alaska."

Now Mrs. Ryan has added another splendid page in Rampart's history with her Whitehorse report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of her remarks on "The Rampart Project" be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks. I hope my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find them helpful.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAMPART PROJECT

(By Irene E. Ryan, Anchorage, Alaska)

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Robert Campbell, president; members of the Whitehorse Board of Trade; distinguished guests; I consider it an honor to be invited to this conference on "Yukon's Resources, Today and Tomorrow," to tell you about the Rampart project. I wish to congratulate you for sponsoring a conference of this nature. I have felt during my years as a consulting engineer and as a member of the legislatures in Alaska that the development and full and wise utilization of the resources of our northwest quarter of the North American Continent is directly dependent upon the understanding and cooperation of the citizens of your nation and of mine. Let us meet often.

OUR INTERNATIONAL RIVER

The mighty Yukon River is one of the geographic features in which we share an interest. It, together with its tributaries and bordering resources, is one of the greatest reservoirs of undeveloped wealth on the continent. In studies to 1961 of the hydropower in Alaska, made by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, Federal Power Commission, and Bureau of Reclamation, of the total estimated potential installed capacity of 19,870,000 kilowatts, the Yukon basin has 10,743,000. To this figure on the Yukon potential should be added the kilowatts that can be developed at Taku and/or Taiya. The Yukon is the largest river flowing into the Pacific, and the fifth longest in North America. It rises as the Lewes River in British Columbia, flows through your territory before bisecting Alaska to enter Norton Sound in the Bering Sea some 2,100 miles from its source. It is the fourth in the world in capacity, being exceeded only by the Amazon, Mississippi, Missouri, and the St. Lawrence. When the potential power of this river and its tributaries has been fully developed our Pacific Northwest will support one of the largest industrial complexes on this continent. It will substantially increase the wealth of our two nations, support our growing populations with an increasing standard of living and add materially to the trade and commerce of the entire Pacific. To accomplish this task we must work together and show the industry and commerce of our two nations that the time has come to shift their interest and efforts to the Northwest.

RAMPART—THE GIANT

A survey of the waterpower potential of Alaska is relatively new. Not until the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended by the Flood Control Act of 1950, was passed by the U.S. Congress was a comprehensive investigation of the possible hydropower potential of Alaskan rivers started. This act directed the Army under its Secretary and with the supervision of the Corps of Engineers to make a study of harbors and rivers of Alaska with a view to determine the advisability of improvements in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power and allied purposes. When the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate of the 86th Congress held hearings in Alaska in the fall of 1960, Colonel Hanburger, District Engineer, U.S. Army District, Alaska, appeared to make this statement:

"During the early stages of the investigation leading to Interim Report No. 7, covering the Yukon and Kuskokwim River basins, it was apparent that the Rampart Canyon project had the greatest potential power output of any hydroelectric project in the United States."

The 4,690,000 kilowatts potential first estimated from this one project (almost one-third of the total Alaskan hydropower potential) coupled with the low cost (estimated at 2 to 3 mills at the bus bar on a 50-year payout) immediately captured the interest of those Alaskans who have been hoping for some large scale development that would result in broadening our economic base and bringing in industry with year-round payrolls to the State.

Our U.S. Senator, ERNEST GRUENING, who was Governor of Alaska as a territory, was quick to realize that Rampart could secure within a relatively short time that industrial and commercial development in Alaska, which without some comparable effort, would take decades. Early in 1959 the Senator introduced a resolution in the Senate Public Works Committee requesting a full scale report on the hydroelectric capability of the Rampart project. Following this initial appropriation, Senator GRUENING, together with our Senator BOB BARTLETT and Representative RALPH RIVERS have succeeded in securing congressional approval for the necessary continuing funds to complete the investigations.

INVESTIGATION TIMETABLE

On April 24, 1959, the corps was directed to initiate the study. Following preliminary geologic investigations and mapping, test drilling of the granite rock underlying the proposed site was started in March 1961 and completed April 1962.

Funds were allocated by the corps to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1960 to investigate the effect of the project on the wildlife resources of the area and these investigations are still continuing with assistance from the State Department of Fish and Game.

In the spring of 1961 a contract was awarded by the Corps of Engineers to the Development and Resources Corp. of New York City to make the power market study involving consideration of the local and world resources and the industries that might be established in Alaska to utilize the large blocks of low cost power. The Development and Resources Corp. is an internationally recognized consulting firm in this field. Mr. David Lilienthal, chairman, was former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and Mr. Gordon R. Clapp, president, was former General Manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Also, establishing thereby a precedent, an advisory board of specially qualified and recognized individuals was named to serve under the chairmanship of the division engineer to assist the corps in defining the scope of the economic study and to review the progress of the study at several stages of its development.

The members of the advisory board, which concluded its assignment in August of 1962 following review and approval of the report "The Market for Rampart Power," by the Development and Resources Corp., were Mr. Samuel B. Morris, consulting engineer, Los Angeles, Calif.; Dr. Edward Steve Shaw, Stanford University economist, California; Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, Vancouver, Wash.; Mr. Frank H. Mapleton, mechanical engineer, Fairbanks, Alaska; Mr. W. T. Kegley, president, First National Bank, Juneau, Alaska; Judge Vernon D. Forbes, president, National Bank of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska; Mr. Bernard Gottstein, owner J. B. Gottstein & Son., Anchorage, Alaska; Mr. Edward A. Merdes, attorney, Juneau, Alaska; Mr. Stanley McCutcheon, attorney, Anchorage, Alaska; and myself.

The feasibility report, originally scheduled by the corps for completion by the fall of 1964, will according to an announcement by Col. Christian Hanburger be completed in August of this year.

The U.S. Geological Survey published in 1962, Bulletin, 1111–H, "Geologic Reconnaissance of the Yukon Flats District, Alaska."

In addition to continuing investigations by the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Weather Bureau, and others, Mr. T. T. Contine with the Bureau of Reclamation is working under directive from the Department of Interior (which Department has been the marketing agency for federally produced power), to compile data and prepare the marketing section of the Corps of Engineers report and to prepare an impact report consisting of the summation of the views of all Interior Agencies.

In addition this year the Federal Land Department has requested withdrawal of the public domain affected, under the limitations and for the purposes defined in power withdrawals.

LOCATION

Two locations for the axis of the dam are being considered near the upstream end of 30-mile Rampart Canyon, and approximately 36 miles upstream from the confluence of the Tanana River. The site is some 30 miles northwest of Eureka (which is connected to the city of Fairbanks by road) and about 100 airmiles northwest of Fairbanks. The first, or upstream site lies approximately 3,000 feet downstream from Texas Creek. The second site is some 4,500 feet downstream from the first site. Its proposed axis falls across the center of a teardrop shaped rocky island that is exposed at low water.

HYDROLOGY

The tributary drainage area is about 200,000 square miles. Average rate of flow from this area has been estimated at 118,000 cubic feet per second and the average annual runoff (equivalent to about 8 inches from the contributing drainage area) at 85,400,000 acre feet. The reservoir behind the proposed dam would have a surface area of some 10,700 square miles (10 percent larger than Lake Erie). The storage volume would be 1,252 million acre feet; 40 times larger than that of Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam, which is the largest manmade reservoir in the United States. Because of the tremendous volume of storage it is anticipated that the seasonal drawdown will be less than 4 feet, thereby allowing the generating units to operate at peak efficiency throughout the year.

STRUCTURE

A concrete gravity dam rising approximately 565 feet above its deepest foundation would impound the water to an elevation of 660 feet. With allowance for freeboard this would place the crest at 675 feet. The crest of the dam would be about 2,800 feet long at the upstream site and about 3,900 feet long at the island site. The crest width of the dam is planned for 40 feet to allow for two lane vehicular traffic and the base width would be about 580 feet. On the basis of rough early estimates 8 to 10 million barrels of cement would be required. However, the concrete volume would be 25 percent less than that of Grand Coulee Dam for a power potential 2½ times greater.

SOME COMPARISONS

Comparing Rampart with the four largest concrete dams in the United States:

	Rampart	Grand Coulee	Hoover	Shasta	Hungry Horse
River Basin	Yukon	Columbia	Colorado	Sacramento	Flathead
Height above bed rock	565	550	726	602	520
Crest length (maximum)	3,900	4,173	1,244	3,460	2,070
Concrete (cubic yards)	8,000,000	10,585,000	3,246,000	8,710,000	2,900,000
Reservoir storage (acre-feet)	1,252,000,000	9,517,000	31,000,000	4,500,000	3,500,000

POWER

The proposed dam would control the annual discharge of Yukon River to a uniform release of 118,000 cubic feet per second. This flow combined with a 440-foot head would furnish 3,735,000 kilowatts. Based upon a 78.5-percent load factor an installation of 4,760,000 kilowatts would be warranted. Design studies indicate that the best efficiency can be secured under an average 440-foot head of a turbine capable of developing 384,000 horsepower. These turbines would be designed to drive 280,000-kilowatt generators. Seventeen of these turbine generator units would be required to develop the presently 4,760,000-kilowatt capacity and would produce an estimated 32,720 million kilowatt-hours of firm energy per year.

CONSTRUCTION AND POWER SCHEDULE

Preliminary design studies indicate that passage of 25 percent of the flow is considered adequate to permit the passage of anadromous fish and to provide adequate water for downstream navigation. Storage of 75 percent of the mean annual flow will require 19½ years to fill the reservoir to pool elevation 660. This rate of filling was considered by the Corps of Engineers in scheduling the construction period. Estimates are that the dam could be constructed to the 450-foot elevation in about 4 years and reservoir stages would begin when the dam is completed to this elevation. About 2½ years are required to fill the reservoir to elevation 440, the minimum required for power generation. The head of water available at this elevation would warrant the installation of two generating units and one standby unit, following which the dam could then be raised and units installed in a schedule corresponding to the filling rate of the reservoir. Rampart Dam could be generating a substantial block of power, approximately 350,000 kilowatts, in less than 7 years after start of construction and could be producing its ultimate potential within 24 years.

COSTS

Based upon engineering considerations only, and using January 1961 price levels the Corps of Engineers has estimated a total project cost of $1,300 million for the presently proposed power installation of 4,760,000 kilowatts. Based on these estimates the energy cost at tidewater, including the cost of transmission would be 3 mills per kilowatt hour.

ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY?

On April 26, 1961, the effective date of their contract, the Development and Resources Corporation undertook a study for the U.S. Army Engineer District, Alaska, Corps of Engineers to develop information and judgments concerning the probable size and characteristics of the power market in Alaska within feasible transmission distance of the Rampart project on the Yukon River. This study was to provide the major basis for answering the question Is it in the interests of Alaska and the United States to develop a large block of low-cost hydroelectric power at the Rampart site?

BASIS OF STUDY

Some of the basic assumptions for the study were that—

Rampart power would be on the line at a level of 350,000 kilowatts of primary power in 1972, increasing at a constant rate to 1 million kilowatts in 1989, with a jump to 3,735,000 kilowatts (5 million kilowatts installed) in 1989 upon completion of the filling of the reservoir.

The power would be made available at high load factors at (a) 2 mills, (b) 3 mills and (c) 4 mills per kilowatt hour, and should take into account other principal competing locations in the United States and elsewhere in the free world.

CONCLUSIONS

In their final report submitted April 26, 1962, the Corporation states that the principal conclusion of the study is that, if the Rampart project proceeds on the contemplated schedule, its power output can be sold substantially as it becomes available.

The projected market by 1990 was delineated as follows:

Energy available from Rampart, billions of kilowatt-hours	32.7
Less transmission losses	1.6
Net supply from Rampart	31.1
Composition of use (with minimum estimates in parentheses):	
By consumers who would use power whether or not Rampart is built:	
Energy they would use even from relatively high-cost sources	7.0(5.5)
Additional energy use by the same consumers if low-cost energy is available	3.8(2.5)
By new industries (other than primary aluminum production) attracted by low-cost power and Alaskan raw materials	9.2(7.6)
By new homes and businesses stimulated by Rampart and by the new industries	5.1(3.7)
Subtotal	25.1(19.3)
Remainder available for primary aluminum production plants (desiring up to 35 billion) unpredictable developments inter-regional markets	6.0(11.8)

TOO MUCH POWER

Although the installed capacity at Rampart makes it the largest on the North American continent in terms of potential power from one project, Mr. Gus Norwood of the Northwest Public Power Association pointed out that this amount is not going to be a very significant part of the total U.S. energy supply. The General Electric Co. load estimates for the United States assume 500 billion kilowatt-hours used in the year 1956, and it is now running about 800 billion kilowatt-hours; in the year 2000, 10.5 trillion. From 1950 to the end of the century we will have a 21-fold increase in the electric power supply needed for the American economy. Drawing Rampart into that curve, you will find that in 1972 the amount of power that Rampart would bring into the economy would be one-half of 1 percent of the total U.S. energy supply. When Rampart is in full production it would represent its highest percentage of the U.S. power supply, which would be about one-half of 1 percent.

The Development & Resources Corp. also touches on this in its report as follows:

"The projected growth in the Nation's economy will require prodigious amounts of electrical energy. Federal Power Commission estimates cited earlier indicate that more than twice as much additional generating capacity must be built in the United States before 1980 as the total of all plants built heretofore. Between now and 1990 it probably will be necessary to build nearly a billion kilowatts of generating capacity. The Rampart project's 5 million kilowatts would be only one-half of 1 percent of the required U.S. total new capacity. Devoting one-half of 1 percent of our new national power supply to development of the largely untapped resources in Alaska would not seem a disproportionately large allocation of national power capacity."

THE POWER MARKET FOR ALUMINUM

In the allocation of power from the Rampart project the Development & Resources Corp. have designated a possible range between 6 and 11 billion to primary aluminum production plants, unpredictable developments and inter-regional markets. According to conservative market forecasts aluminum production will increase between 6 and 15 million short tons annually by 1990. If all Rampart's potential were used by the aluminum industry, it would account for about 2 million short tons—only a fraction of the anticipated demand.

A major consideration in evaluating the possibility of the industry programing its expansion needs to utilize Rampart power is the extremely favorable competitive position pricewise. Again in the report it is stated:

"Any doubt that Rampart's ½-percent contribution to U.S. needs for expanded power supply would be economically useful should be removed when it is considered that Rampart would produce and deliver energy to tidewater at lower cost than any other projected powerplant anywhere in the Nation." They further state Rampart energy is in the cost range of all but one or two of the very cheapest of the great energy blocks in the world.

Competitive power users, able and willing to pay for relatively higher cost power are slowly pushing out the aluminum industry in present large power producing areas in the Nation and this situation will accelerate as the national demand increases under normal growth.

IMPACT ON ALASKAN AND NORTHWEST ECONOMY

Quoting from the study, "It is hardly possible to exaggerate the significance to regional economic development of adequate supplies of low-cost electrical energy. When regions are fortunate enough to have abundant energy resources and when steps are taken to make those resources economically available at locations convenient for their effective utilization, their use can be expected to develop rapidly. Economic benefits to the region, the Nation, and to the international communities of which the region is a part inevitably follow."

There is neither time, nor would you have the patience to listen to a detailed report of the possible developments in the fields of mining, processing or manufacture in south and central Alaska should the low-cost power from Rampart become available.

One can readily visualize however, the impact it will have on development from the first day that authorization for construction of the project is won in Congress. Construction of an extension to the railroad, improvement and extension of the road to the site, camp and construction facilities, the cement and other material requirements will spark a development in products and services within Alaska that will be utilized in Alaska after the construction needs are met. Our known mineral deposits within economical reach of transmission lines will be reexamined and reevaluated and many will be found to become profitable with the use of low-cost power; giving impetus for more intense and hopeful prospecting in known mineralized areas. With each new increment of development, whether in mining, in processing of fish and forest products, in construction and operation of tourist facilities, in use of land, in small manufacturing plants; a further expansion of population, local demand and services ensues. And with this population growth and increasing consumer demand, coupled with exports that can compete on the buying counters of the Nation, our water and land transportation facilities will improve and increase with an accompanying lowering of the unit cost of imports.

Rampart is not the complete answer nor the only one in the search for means to develop Alaska and the Pacific Northwest. However, it is today the only one that I can see possible of bearing fruit within the lifetime of my generation.

It is large enough and the cost of the developed power low enough to challenge the imagination of industry and commerce, to start their first large move into this area, where once they get their feet wet they too will catch the vision of a great northwestern industrial empire serving the needs of the Pacific.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have drawn freely from the various reports prepared by the Corps of Engineers, or made available to me while serving on the advisory board, as well as the comments of my fellow members and from the reports and material furnished by the Resources & Development Corp. To them I give my thanks.

MENTAL TOOLS FOR SCIENTIFIC THINKING AT THE HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the 100th annual meeting of the National Academy of Sciences is now being held in Washington, D.C.

A distinguished participant is Dr. William Shockley, a Nobel Prize winner. He has demonstrated the improvement which can come in logical thinking of high school students through thinking experiences with puzzles.

Participating with him, I am glad to state, are two Ohio high school juniors, David Agricola and Fredrick Walker, of Toledo. These students, because of their aptitude and keenness in thinking, are collaborating with Dr. Shockley in a teaching demonstration which had its origin at Columbus, Ohio, in the presence of a thousand outstanding science students from the State high schools.

Mr. President, recognizing the distinguished achievements of Dr. Shockley and the honors which have come to the two Ohio boys, David Agricola and Fredrick Walker, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record a statement issued by the National Academy of Sciences on the subject "Proposed Important Mental Tools for Scientific Thinking at the High School Level."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proposed Important Mental Tools for Scientific Thinking at the High School Level

(Press release based on a contributed paper to be presented at 2 p.m., Wednesday, April 24, during the 100th annual meeting of the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, D.C.)

(By William Shockley)

Some generalizations about logical thinking, similar in their usefulness but more advanced than "two plus two makes four," can be learned by high school science scholars through thinking experiences with puzzles, members of the National Academy of Sciences were told on April 24 by Dr. William Shockley, cowinner of the Nobel Price in physics for creation of the transistor at Bell Telephone Laboratories and now research director for Clevite Corp.'s Shockley Laboratory in Palo Alto.

The objective of Dr. Shockley's teaching approach is to develop comprehension of the essential features of a basic scientific principle or law in elementary terms by stating it as something which is always true, no matter what the particular circumstances may be, provided that the basic conditions for the law to be applicable are not violated. The qualifying phrases "no matter what" and "provided that" serve to convey the concept that a law has a certain range of validity; in a wide variety of cases it applies but there are usually limits which must not be exceeded.

Dr. Shockley illustrated his teaching approach by treating the answers to puzzles as simplified basic laws. The puzzles were presented with the aid of a projector and worked on by two high school juniors, David Agricola and Fredrick Walker, from Ohio. Dr. Shockely described his previous experience with these students at a teaching demonstration in Columbus, Ohio, where more than 1,000 of the outstanding science students from the State high schools met for a "project honoring the science scholar" organized by A. F. Forance, president of the Ohio Science Education Association.

Dr. Shockley suggested that learning these concepts at the junior high school level, or earlier, would make students more alert to recognize essential features of their scientific courses in high school and college, quicker to learn and better able to retain their knowledge. He proposed that the concepts focused in the minds of the students by the three phrases, "always true," "no matter what," and "provided that," might constitute the most important mental tools for scientific thinking at the high school level. He emphasized that research would be required to test the validity of his proposal but that there would be enormous value in finding the most useful mental tools for high school science students to develop. (A particular example of these concepts is that it is always true that what goes up must come down no matter what solid body it is that goes up provided that the solid body does not acquire enough speed to go into orbit. In this principle, the practical aspect of the "provided that" limit of validity was unimportant before 1957.)

Dr. Shockley illustrated the puzzle solving approach in terms of Euler's problem, published in 1736, in which seven bridges over the Pregel River in Koenigsberg connect two islands to each shore. The problem is to take a walk in such a way as to cross each bridge once and only once. (One island has three bridges, one to the other island and one to each shore; the other island has two bridges to each shore; and the problem cannot be solved.) The analysis of this problem illustrates the importance of three steps in problem solving: "familiarity" with the features of the situation, a "hunch" as to what the truth is, and finally "progress" to an ultimate answer by detailed analysis. The comprehension of the sequence "familiarity," "hunch" and "progress" is Dr. Shockley's proposed second most important mental tool for scientific thinking at the high school level. His third most important mental tool is the translation of quantitative physical reality into algebraic symbol and back again. He stated also that the practice of science is an art.

Dr. Shockley emphasized the very rewarding aspects of contributing to the learning of the eager, intelligent high school science students and expressed concern that our educational system so rarely gives these outstanding young minds intimate contact with the first-rate creators of new science.

THE GOLD RESERVE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, happily and approvingly I read that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has issued an order for global belt tightening in an effort to overcome the daily drain of U.S. gold to other nations of the world.

The relentless and constant drain upon our gold reserves has created a frightening monetary situation not only for the United States but also for practically all of the nations of the world. The gold possessed by our country now, in the amount of about $15.9 billion, is far below what we need to support and back up the paper dollar certificates issued by the Federal Reserve Bank and the dollar obligations that bank has to its depositors, and the ability of our Government to meet the approximately $20 billion in short-term obligations that it owes to foreign creditors around the world.

In the year of 1949, we reached the high mark of our gold possessions, amounting to $24.7 billion. The drain on our gold reserves resulting from the fact that at the end of each year the dollars which American citizens spend abroad in various ways are in excess of the dollars that foreign countries spend in the United States in various ways, has been one of the grave and concealed problems confronting our Nation.

While we export by way of dollar value more goods than we import, nevertheless, at the end of the year we have an adverse imbalance of dollar obligations because of the moneys that are expended by tourists, by our foreign aid program, by our military men situated practically in every country in the world, and by our constantly increasing capital investments in foreign industries.

The Secretary of Defense has given recognition to the grave contributions which the military aspects of our Government serving around the world are making in reducing our gold reserves. I commend him for what he is doing in attempting to strengthen our balance-of-dollar obligations—for which the foreign creditors can demand payment in gold. The dollar obligations of the United States to foreign creditors are increasing because tourists of the United States are visiting foreign countries in great numbers while tourists of foreign countries are visiting the United States in numbers inconsequential; because U.S. dollars under the foreign aid program are being spent in greater quantities in foreign nations than the currency of foreign nations is being spent in the United States; because the military men and the activities of the United States are spending dollars in about 70 nations of the world while few of those nations are spending their currency in the United States.

The problem is grave, relief must be found in solving it. Secretary McNamara is in a position to provide the greatest relief if he strikes at the cause with vigor and courage.

SENATOR GRUENING PROVES CASE FOR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday it was my privilege to preside at a hearing on S. 5, the cold war GI bill, at which the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] testified to the great need for enactment this year of that bill. The Senator from Alaska has been a great supporter of the cold war GI bill in the three Congresses that he and I, with many others, have been working for the enactment of this bill. His testimony yesterday presented a closely reasoned argument in support of his opening statement on S. 5:

> It is sensible. It is deserved. It has been earned—if, indeed, legislation must be earned—many times over by our men and women in military service.

Because of the great merit of his statement to the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee yesterday, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING BEFORE THE SENATE LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE'S SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS ON BEHALF OF S. 5, THE COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT, TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before you and to testify on behalf of S. 5, the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act. Once again I endorse this proposed legislation as I have in previous Congresses. I hope that the Members of the 88th Congress will enact this bill. It is sensible. It is deserved. It has been earned—if indeed, legislation must be earned—many times over by our men and women in military service.

S. 5. may be the only general education bill we will have an opportunity to enact this year.

President Kennedy has sent to the Congress a wonderful and comprehensive Federal aid to education program this session. That bill (S. 580) would strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in our country. However, for reasons I deplore, it seems to have little chance and, therefore, I believe we would be wise to speed action on what can be passed and give to some the opportunities for improvement which they so richly deserve.

The President's omnibus bill includes student loans and greatly improves the National Defense Education Act. It would provide needed construction funds, speed modern foreign language study, improve teacher training programs, better our research facilities, constructively strengthen our elementary and secondary education, and enable our schools to implement and improve vocational and special education programing. The President's omnibus bill should be passed, but the legislative history of similar proposals tends to be discouraging.

Therefore, let us move ahead now on the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act.

Since becoming a Member of the U.S. Senate, I have become increasingly interested in our foreign aid expenditures. I have repeatedly suggested that we should do as much for the folks at home as we do for those in other lands.

The United States of America has contributed in the past 7 fiscal years some $300 million in foreign aid funds to other nations for educational purposes. We shall doubtless spend more along these lines. These taxpayer dollars have been used sometimes to build schools, train and pay teachers, pay consultants, establish universities. The money in countless ways has advanced the meritorious cause of education. It could have been spent in this country to improve our lagging educational facilities and to help improve our own educational standards.

It is not my purpose today to discuss at length our oversea spending, but I do call attention to it in this particular area because it is relevant.

Earlier this month our colleague from Hawaii, Mr. FONG, endorsed S. 5 when he appeared before you. I thought his remarks particularly pertinent as I read them. Senator FONG through the use of human examples vividly underscored the hazards of the cold war in which this Nation participates. He said that guarding freedom in the cold war is the "very hazardous mission" of American GI's serving all over the globe.

We know where those particular hazardous missions are. Perhaps you read as I did Sunday that we have at least 12,000 servicemen in Vietnam. We know that U.S. casualties continue to mount. We know that the men and women of our Armed Forces guard us and freedom today just as their predecessors did in earlier battles. Keeping the peace is also a battle. Maybe the so-called cold war will be hot. It is certainly hot for those on some of these fronts.

Senator FONG suggested that the classification "nonbattle" * * * "is somewhat a distinction without a difference insofar as the dead and wounded American soldiers and their families are concerned."

The proposed legislation embodied in S. 5 would provide vocational readjustment and restore lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational aspirations have been interrupted or impeded by reasons of active duty between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963. Further, the bill would help these young people attain the education and training status to which they might normally have aspired and obtained had they not been called to serve their country.

We are told that the GI bills of earlier years were helpful to more than 10 million veterans and that of that vast number 3,435,000 entered institutions of higher education; 4,364,000 entered schools below the college level; and 2,656,000 learned skills in on-the-job and on-the-farm training programs.

We read that between the years 1955 and 1973 an estimated 25 million men and boys will be a part of the age group which is subject to the draft.

With only minimal debate Congress earlier this year once again extended the Universal Military Training and Service Act. The 4-year extension keeps the draft of our youth until July 1, 1967, and since we appear reluctant to modernize our military training system it would not surprise me to see that law reextended again in 1967 again without a survey to ascertain how the draft procedure can be modernized to meet our military manpower needs and at the same time not impede the work and study potential of our young men.

A young man of draft age in college at the undergraduate or postgraduate level may request a deferral from his draft board. The time which he would spend in the military service probably would do little to further his specialized educational pursuit and the interruption in the midst of graduate study could be harmful. He may be given his requested deferral. However, draft quotas must be filled.

In 1959 my colleague from Alaska, Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT suggested a number of ways in which our draft procedure might be improved. His observations are as pertinent now as then and I ask unanimous consent that they be reprinted in the hearing record at this point in my remarks, along with comments which I made at the time.

Why should not these youths who are drafted be given opportunity to further their education at the close of their military service? The simple and honest response is that they should have such opportunity.

I suggest that too many young men now have "neither fish nor fowl status" as they await the call of the draft board.

Why is our national unemployment rate so high in the draft age group? I suggest that the employer who seeks to train a young man as a salesman or plumber or reporter is understandably reluctant to hire an employee who may at any moment be drafted. Business-wise it isn't sensible. So our unemployment percentages remain high and our archaic draft structures implement those percentages.

The language proposed in S. 5 won't correct the inequity I have touched on. But the language in S. 5 will provide vocational training to the young serviceman who generally has no skill or trade at all upon his return to the civilian labor force.

The cold war GI bill embodies sound business practices and should be termed an investment in the United States. We know that World War II and Korean GI bill participants are earning more and paying more taxes than they would had they not had an opportunity to learn.

Senator YARBOROUGH—you who have sponsored and fought so gallantly for this legislation—you have suggested that the cold war GI bill will likewise be self-liquidating, and I agree. The cost of this proposal is very little. The highest estimate I have heard is approximately $290 million a year through 1973. Our defense budget for this fiscal year alone is $52 billion or nearly 200 times more in one year alone.

I suspect that the young men we ask to man our defenses and train to use those weapons which cost so much, understandably find it difficult to comprehend our reluctance in spending $290 million annually over the next 10 years to implement S. 5 and establish a program which can only strengthen the Nation. The program isn't identical to the earlier GI or Korean plans. There is no mustering out pay or business loans. Veterans must have had 180 days of active service. Six-month trainees under the Reserve program are not eligible.

When I testified in support of similar legislation in 1961, I noted that in Alaska the number of veterans who would be entitled to educational and vocational training benefits under provisions of the bill would be approximately 600. The figure in 1963 is substantially the same. The assistance provided by the bill would enrich the contribution of each to Alaska and to the Nation. Certainly the post-Korea GI is as much in need of assistance in obtaining loans for the purchase of homes and farms as was his older comrade who served in a different time. Interruption of a man's career cannot be heeded one moment, and ignored the next.

Senator William Fulbright made a valuable contribution to our heritage education when he fought for and successfully enacted legislation which we know today as the Fulbright scholarship program. Only last year, Senator Fulbright in a speech on the Senate floor on March 22, said:

"Through education we strive to bring out the good in our young people and to cultivate in them a desire to preserve and protect the values of our society. A good education is basic to good citizenship."

Later in the same speech, he recalled the words of President James Madison who once said:

"Popular government without popular education is a prologue to a farce or tragedy."

Madison's words are pertinent as we discuss the need for this proposed legislation. We dare not set the U.S. stage for either farce or tragedy. We dare only to set our stage for our posterity. We do not have much time for scene changes, nor do we have many pieces of furniture with which to work. We need the new tools and equipment of S. 5.

In his state of the Union address to the Congress on January 11, 1962, President Kennedy discussed the importance of education. He said the quality of our education was equally important to our strength. Said the President:

"If this Nation is to grow in wisdom and strength, then every able high school graduate should have the opportunity to develop his talents. Yet nearly half lack either the funds or the facilities to attend college."

A few lines later the President referred to the remark of H. G. Wells that "civilization is a race between education and catastrophe." Added the President:

"It is up to you in this Congress to determine the winner of that race. I welcome his challenge and I accept it.

"Nearly 150 years ago another President suggested: 'If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.' "

The words are Thomas Jefferson's, a man who never stopped in his fight to improve men's minds, a man who after serving 8 years as our President continued his efforts of enlightenment by helping establish the University of Virginia in Charlottesville.

Americans, given the choice, will select enlightenment and freedom for these are inseparables in a democracy. The bill, S. 5, now under consideration offers simple equality. Nothing more.

And the bill offers assistance to young farmers and to men and women who would like to have homes of their own. Last year in its report on this measure, the committee said it expects that some 1 million post-Korean veterans would be able to purchase homes and farms under one title of the bill. The proposed language has been retained in this bill.

Conservative estimates place the possible construction of new homes at 700,000.

The simple extension of veterans' benefits of title 38, chapter 37 as proposed in new section 18 for "veterans who serve between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963," is important. It will provide a valuable economic incentive for many industries.

Seven hundred thousand new homes, be they in the city or on farms or in suburbia, will use vast quantities of lumber, bricks, glass, electrical wiring, plumbing, tile, paint, concrete, insulation, sewage facilities, shingles, etc.

The new jobs stimulated by this proposed legislation will mean a great deal to the unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the committee for this opportunity to endorse S. 5, and I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article by Dr. Sar A. Levitan, director of the area redevelopment project at George Washington University, Washington, D.C., entitled "Youth Unemployment—A Problem That's Getting Worse: What's To Be Done?" be placed in the hearing record at the close of my testimony.

Dr. Levitan describes the pressing need and demand "for skill, education, and technical know-how needed to man jobs in our complex technological civilization."

GROWING EVIDENCE OF A BIPARTISAN CONSENSUS ON CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reports that the United States is preparing to ask the OAS to declare an economic embargo against Cuba are very encouraging.

These follow the suggestions of the majority leader on a Sunday television interview that the United States participate with the OAS in an economic quarantine against Cuba similar to the one used successfully against the Dominican Republic in 1960.

It has been my view of some time that strong economic measures are the key to a successful policy toward Communist Cuba. The first steps of the program of graduated economic sanctions which I outlined in the position paper which I presented to Secretary Rusk and CIA Director McCone in February included the curtailment of flights and steamship routings between Cuba and other Latin American countries, a trade boycott between Cuba and other Latin American countries, and the denial of Latin American cargoes or refueling facilities to ships or planes trading with Cuba.

No one would realistically expect such measures alone to drive the Soviets out of Cuba. The United States embargo has not had this effect, and trade between Cuba and most other Latin American countries is already at a low point. The real lifeline to Communist Cuba runs from the Soviet Union, and any realistic long-range program must contemplate an economic squeeze on the Soviet Union as well as Castro. This will require, as I discussed in my February position paper and earlier this month on the Senate floor, action by NATO paralleling the steps we are now urging upon the OAS.

Nevertheless, I am heartened by the growing evidence that the United States is attempting to shape the economic advantages of the free world into a powerful weapon against communism. This is not an easy task, and it will require determination and sacrifice. I am convinced, however, that a concerted program of this character can lead the Soviets to the conclusion that their Cuban venture was a costly and foolish mistake. Certainly this is a policy worth pursuing before more drastic measures are considered.

The majority leader has recognized the importance of constructive debate on Cuba and has never joined with those who treat every suggestion or criticism as an attack on our Government. In his remarks in the Senate last Thursday he made several references to my views on Cuba and voiced his own plea for "sound and good bipartisanship." All of us, I am sure, place our Nation's interests above those of any political party. I am certain that if this debate can be carried on in the tone and spirit exemplified by the majority leader's comments, it will help rather than hinder the development of an urgently needed bipartisan consensus on Cuba.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the retraining provisions of Public Law 87–415, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, have been remarkably successful during the first year they have operated.

As is more often than not the case with such Federal-State programs, the key to success lies in the level of local interest and support. In this regard, my State of Missouri is a good case in point. Industrial and civic leaders have joined with representatives of both local and State governments to launch in Missouri an aggressive program under the new law. The sure-fire formula that attacks both ends of the domestic employment problem by making it possible for the unemployed and underemployed to learn new skills and upgrade present skills to fill the critical occupational shortages that exist, is proving to be a great mutual benefit to workers and employer alike. Moreover, Missouri's program is serving to uplift and stabilize the local community and State economy.

In a recent thoughtful editorial, the Columbia Missourian lauded the program as "something new, but tried and proven," and traces the success it has been in my State. I believe all the readers of the Congressional Record will find this editorial interesting and edifying. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Off to Good Start

Seven out of every ten persons retrained through the Government Manpower Retraining Act of 1962 found work after completion of their courses.

Public Law 87–415 authorized the 3-year, $435-million program for the training of unemployed persons in vocational skills or on-the-job training to develop new skills. The first 2 years the cost will be paid by the Federal Government while the third year the cost will be shared equally by the States.

The program offers up to 52 weeks of training with monetary allowances equal to the normal unemployment compensation given by the State. Monetary allowances depend on age and family status ranging from no compensation for those under a certain age and no head-of-family status, such as a recent high school graduate, to head-of-household pay of approximately $33 per week while in training status.

A checking with the Missouri State Employment Service disclosed that in Missouri the Manpower Retraining Act is a going concern and that courses are offered in the clerical, service, medical occupational, farm, mechanical, construction, and production fields on a continuing statewide basis dictated primarily by needs of both people and places.

As an example, an auto mechanic course is slated to begin soon in Mexico with 15 students, with both travel allowance and pay granted in pertinent cases. A practical nursing course of 16 weeks is well past the planning stage here. A clerk-stenographer course of 48 weeks is scheduled to begin this summer. Aptitude tests are required of prospective students in every case.

Here is something new, but tried and proven in one short year of existence. For unemployed, or the underemployed person, this training can provide a new skill where needed or upgrade present skills to meet the job needs of workers displaced by automation, technological change, geographical change of industry, and shifts in market demands.

However, job openings in most cases, must be available or anticipated in an area before courses are established. The trainee must have reasonable expectation of employment in the immediate area or give assurance that he or she will accept employment elsewhere.

There is a need for more trained personnel in the practical nursing field and in the clerk-stenographer field here in Columbia.

Here is a program that portends a bright future, and is a good deal for the unemployed or the underemployed. For further information, job seekers should check with the Missouri State Employment Service, 804 Locust Street, which acts as the project office for the adjacent four-county area.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE E. MAHER, OF IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, too often a State sees its outstanding residents pack up their bags and leave for what appear to be greener pastures elsewhere. But the tide can be stemmed when a young man demonstrates his willingness to contribute to the betterment of his community and State, thus setting an example for others not only to follow but to imitate in selling their State. Such a man is George E. Maher, of Red Oak, Iowa, recently named winner of the 1962 Iowa Junior Chamber of Commerce's Distinguished Service Award. His story is the reason why Iowa and other States are able to retain their young leaders. To list all of Mr. Maher's accomplishments would be no small job. But to cite only a few:

First, a member of a special church committee to raise several hundred thousand dollars for construction of a new church.

Second, chairman of a citizens' steering committee to push a successful million-dollar school bond issue.

Third, active in a drive for funds to enable Red Oak's Industrial Foundation to purchase an 80-acre tract of land to attract new industry. One firm already has located there.

Fourth, chairman of a committee to modernize the Red Oak Jaycee Community Development Survey, which resulted in water fluoridation, renovation, and painting of all street signs. As a result, his committee won first place in State competition.

Fifth, chairman of a committee urging turnout for the oral polio program. Some 15,000 persons, more than double Red Oak's population, participated.

Sixth, chairman of the Red Oak Jaycee committee for establishment of a youth center.

With all this time spent in civic activities, George Maher still has not neglected his wife, Pat; son, Mike; or daughters, Kim and Kristy.

He has been an inspiration and an example to those in his community and his State.

TENURE AND THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on March 11, 1963, Mr. L. C. Binford of Portland, Oreg., who is now the national president of the Izaak Walton League of America, made a very thought-provoking talk before the National Advisory Board Council of the Bureau of Land Management.

In his position as president of the Izaak Walton League, he outlined in extremely capable fashion the views held by many in the league. I believe that his speech deserves serious consideration by all who are interested in public land management, and therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENURE AND THE PUBLIC LANDS

(Address by L. C. Binford)

It is a pleasure to join with you in counseling the Bureau of Land Management as to the public lands under their direction.

I want to thank you for having invited me, as national president of the Izaak Walton League of America, to present our views on the joint and multiple uses of the public lands and areas of understanding and misunderstanding of the users.

This meeting may become a new milestone in public land management. As a council, you have evolved from a body elected by the livestock user group plus wildlife representatives from each State, to a group that represents all users.

At your first meeting under the expanded membership held only last November at Las Vegas, Karl Landstrom, Director of Bureau of Land Management, reminded you that you reflect broader consideration than domestic livestock grazing alone, and that you must carefully identify the place of public land management in the natural resource program as a whole.

At Las Vegas, you were necessarily involved almost entirely in the question of grazing fees, which I hope is settled for now. By the nature of the subject you have asked me to discuss, I take it that this meeting will consider the broad aspects of public land management. If you do this it will truly be a milestone, and could mark the beginning of sound, comprehensive, multiple use management of Interior's 178 million acres of land. Maybe we should include Alaska and add another 273 million acres.

As an Advisory Council, you now represent 186 million people, the folks who own the public lands. We in the Izaak Walton League say that we, too, have a trust to represent the public's interest in U.S.-held lands.

As an official elected by a group of conservationists, most of whom are hunters and fishermen, I am aware of the problem faced by the rest of you, especially you stockmen who are here by the election of your user group. No doubt you are to a large degree beholden to them as I am to my sportsmen electors. You wildlife members have a mixed loyalty—if one is due our electors. You got on an Advisory Board by selection of a State director, who probably picked you from the nominees submitted by the State fish and game department and then the State advisory board selected you for this national group.

The rest of you—representing county government, urban-suburban development, oil and gas, outdoor recreation, forestry and fish, conservation, petroleum, and soil conservation—were selected and appointed by the Secretary rather than by the interest you represent.

Within your Council every user interest is represented—at least if broad definition is given to such interests as outdoor recreation and conservation. Numerically you are still a livestock group.

Let me suggest that John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Interior, in his address to you at Las Vegas, used words which should become the preamble to all your deliberations.

"We are concerned not just with the economic benefits which flow directly, but we are also concerned with values which do not easily have an economic base attached to them; certainly some types of recreation value, certain types of outdoor experiences are included in this, and certainly the wildlife values have an importance above and beyond any economic price tag that you may put upon wildlife benefits.

"In larger sense, we are interested in the future. We are conservationists, all of us, whether you are a sheep or a cattle operator or whether you are a county official or whatever. We have an interest in the future. We want to leave the land in at least as good a shape and if possible in better shape than we found it when we came upon it. So we have that common objective in the correct management of the land."

If you follow this broad concept as your common objective, it will be a milestone in public management. If you do not do so, if you are only individuals each representing a special user interest, the public will eventually demand your abolition and the creation of a comprehensive advisory group.

Multiple use of public lands is not a concept created by some public official or department of Government.

Multiple use is a fact created by people. There are values on the public-owned lands people want to use. Primary push was for some economic advantage, such as trapping fur-bearing animals, even early day market hunting, logging, grazing, and mining. As the numbers of people increased, there came recreational hunting, fishing, berrypicking, fossil and rock hunting, camping, and innumerable varieties of outdoor use.

Just to cope with this multiple-use fact, governmental agencies put into management program these demanded uses. This multiple-use concept has long been the guiding principle of land management by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, its application being carried out to the extent of public demand.

In 1960 the Forest Service was given a congressional mandate to apply the principle of multiple use, and now the people's demand for multiple use on BLM lands is recognized in a bill before Congress.

After I prepared this introductory part of my speech, I was informed that my subject was limited to "Tenure and the Public Lands." My first thought was to prepare another introduction, then I realized "tenure" is just a part of the joint and multiple use of public lands, and certainly an area of conflict.

I had hoped that we could discuss other areas of conflict and agreement, especially those of public access to federally owned lands; fencing; gates; ownership marking; mining laws; wildlife and wilderness areas;

urban and suburban developments; recreational areas; watershed management; recreational user fees and methods of financing rangeland rehabilitation and improvement.

Even though these are not subjects of our immediate assignment, we cannot discuss tenure of any one use without consideration of it in relation to the problems and the rights of other users and the public generally.

If I understand the proposed tenure stripped down to its simplest elements, as we lawyers usually attempt to do, we have the situation of a trustee owner of land (BLM) who holds title for all the people of the United States, being asked by present grazing permittees for a better deal.

FACTS TO BE CONSIDERED

1. There are approximately 29,000 grazing permittees:

Permittees in grazing districts (1961)	18,041
Sec. 15 leases	8,951
Other permittees (principally Bankhead-Jones)	2,008
Total	29,000

Only 18,041 of above are represented on advisory boards.

Now pay a total of about $3 million which will increase to about $4 million in 1963. These fees are substantially under the market value of the grazing. However, the permittee also makes some contribution in way of improvements to the public lands. Also, by reason, in part, of his low-cost use permit, his base property is valued beyond its worth if no grazing rights were attached to it.

2. Public lands being used are, on the average, in need of substantial capital investment to keep the range from deterioration and to rehabilitate and restore it to full production. Based on current budget, BLM will spend in 1963 $17 million for such range improvement. Approximately $1 billion is needed to do the job on the portion of the lands where feasible. (Kenneth B. Pomeroy, April 1962 American Forest Magazine, estimated that $700 million would increase production of public domain threefold to tenfold.)

3. Range rehabilitation and improvement can increase by two to three times the present livestock carrying capacity of the range.

4. There are now livestock ranch properties contiguous or near to BLM lands which have no grazing permits on the public lands, and which desire a use if the carrying capacity is increased to make it possible.

5. Present users contend that increase in carrying capacity should accrue to present users.

6. Most of the land used for grazing is also subject to recreational use, which includes hunting and fishing. Approximately 30 million people annually use the land for recreation. There is presently a bill under consideration to charge for this use, a fee of $3 to $5 per motor vehicle. Your speaker suggests a fee of $2 per person in the form of a stamp (or identification card) to be purchased at the post office as we now buy migratory bird stamps. By my computation this would produce, by excluding children under 16 years, about $50 million on BLM lands.

7. These lands are also subject to use for mining, forestry, watersheds, and for community expansion.

8. "The livestock industry has made it unmistakably clear that it does not believe that it should be required to pay increased grazing fees or other compensation to obtain a more secure tenure." (Letter written by Edward W. Clyde, member of this Council and a member of the special committee to study "Tenure," written January 23, 1963.)

This Advisory Board Council can, in its deliberations, take one of two courses.

If you are here as representatives of the livestock industry, it is up to you to get the best possible deal for the livestock industry.

If you are here in the capacity of a board charged with the public interest in the land, you must give consideration to all users.

LAW TO BE CONSIDERED

Before we go further we must ascertain the law that controls the situation.

1. Law that controls the use of the public lands over which BLM has jurisdiction, is the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934, to which minor amendments have been made. Under authority of this act and limited by it, grazing regulations have been promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior.

2. By the Taylor Grazing Act, persons owning nearby land who had been using the public lands for grazing were given the right to continue its use, the numbers of livestock permitted to be used on the highest 2 years out of the prior five.

The law under consideration applies only to permittees in grazing districts. It does not apply to those leasing land under section 15 of the act. This land is leased for terms up to 10 years, "upon term and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe." There is no perpetual right in the grazing user and fees and conditions of use are not necessarily the same as in the districts—in fact, fees in one area for section 15 are at the Forest Service rate.

3. This right to those within or near a district is perpetual. That is, once it is exercised, it cannot be terminated by the Department of Interior except in two situations:

(a) Interior may withdraw the land from grazing use by reason of classification for other use, or by its sale or exchange.

The original right of use as granted by Congress clearly states that the grazing districts are established for use of the land pending final disposal. In other words, the right continues until the Secretary, acting under congressional authority, makes a disposition of the land for other than grazing. Congress, of course, could at any time terminate the right.

(b) Secretary may cancel the right for certain violations, which has almost never been done.

4. Right to use may continue on a year-by-year basis or on adjudicated land, a term of 10 years may be granted, but whether by the year or term the right to renewal cannot be terminated except as the right of use is terminated.

5. Secretary is required by law to regulate use to "preserve the land" and to fix "reasonable fees." Right of use is subject to payment of the fee and the regulations to preserve the land.

6. The historical right to graze for a given number of livestock may be reduced by the Secretary's order, based on adjudication. By present regulations the historical number is not lost, and is restored to the permittee when the Secretary finds the range will provide forage for the greater number.

7. Permittee, whether operating on a year-to-year basis or for a term, can sell, mortgage, make a gift or transfer by will or by intestate death, his grazing rights, provided of course that the base property follows the transfer.

8. Under the law Secretary of the Interior must regulate the number of livestock to protect and improve grazing districts. He has no authority to regulate use or fix fees based on economic needs of the permittee, except in period of drought or general epidemic, he can "remit, reduce, refund * * * payment of grazing fees."

9. Permittee can appeal by administrative procedure and to the courts, an order that denies or limits his use. Pending appeals the order is suspended.

As a lawyer, I assure you that the present Taylor Grazing Act and administrative order is just a dandy device which we can use with almost certain success in keeping the permittee on the land with the maximum number of livestock of his historic use. Appeals can run into years—then conditions will have so changed that we can demand a new range survey and start the appeals all over again.

SUMMARY AND ADVICE ON THE LAW

Now it is said that the stockmen want a better deal than they now have. Very well—I must first tell you that the Secretary, if he carries out his directive under the law, cannot give a better deal. For that the permittee will have to go to Congress.

Obviously, Congress can, if it chooses, rewrite the entire Taylor Grazing Act. Do you dare open the Pandora box?

What can the permittee gain? There isn't much more to give him except the legal title. He now has a use for grazing in perpetuity, subject to termination only in the event of his own acts or by disposition or reclassification of the land for other uses. His use can now only be reduced when the Secretary finds the reduction necessary to preserve the land.

Would Congress give or sell the permittee the title to the property? This is unlikely. Multiple values would be lost to the public. Observe that the tendency is to acquire more Federal land, not to dispose of it except for public uses. Probably the permittee does not desire title for the property would go on the tax roll, which would generally be far beyond present grazing fees. In fact any extension of present right would likely become a taxable leasehold. Even the present tenure may be taxable in some States.

Would Congress give the permittee the right to determine the extent of his use—that is, number of animals to be grazed? Not likely—there is no precedent for giving such a right to a single user group on public lands. Could the timber industry be permitted to determine the trees to be cut? Congress might delegate some other administrative body instead of Interior to determine the permissive use. Would some other agency, such as Soil Conservation Service, do a better job? Should the standard be changed from present protection of soil and watershed to the protection of the livestock industry?

Should Congress fix the fee for the use or give positive instruction to some administrative agency other than Interior, to do it? What standard should Congress set up—cost of public land administration? Value of the forage? Ability of the permittee to pay? Regardless of standard, is it likely that any device would produce as favorable a fee as the stockmen have been given? Please note that there are stockmen not now enjoying public land use who are willing to pay a grazing fee substantially over the BLM rate as can be observed from competitive sales of Indian land leases.

It is not a pleasant task to talk about tenure. It brings back the memories of the bitter land tenure fight of 1953–54 when the D'Ewart bill was under consideration. At that time, it was the Forest Service lands more than the BLM that were involved, but the effect of the bill was to give the permittee a vested interest in rangeland use.

You know the outcome of that fight. Recreation and conservation groups, which frequently have differences, united with others in a solid front of opposition and won, but we are still licking our wounds. On both sides there remains bitterness and prejudice, which I pray may never be reactivated.

We have so much in common—the recreationist and the livestock man.

We in the league want the public lands managed for their multiple uses. We believe in management by scientifically trained and experienced personnel, not by the political spoils system.

We recognize the economic importance of the livestock industry.

We think that grazing on most lands is compatible with other uses.

We urge that livestock and wildlife numbers be kept in harmony with the land, that is, that there not be overuse by either.

We have indicated that recreationists should pay a user fee.

We believe that rangelands should be rehabilitated and improved to provide for an increased number of livestock and wildlife.

We believe that public lands should be adequately marked as to ownership and accessible to the public.

We ask that scattered ownership be exchanged or sold to provide better units of management.

I would expect that in all of these things you agree with the Izaak Walton League. But now I must say that we have been, and now are, most emphatically opposed to any one user group having a vested right of use on and to the public lands. Objection would be made to any tenure that goes beyond present rights of permittee.

We have called upon the Department of the Interior to raise the grazing fee to a fair market value, not because we wanted to pick on the stockmen, but because we want to improve the rangelands, and in our efforts to get Federal appropriation for the purpose of such improvement and adequate BLM budget, we have been confronted with the low grazing fee.

We have insisted for many years that the Secretary reduce grazing use when he finds it necessary to do so to preserve or improve the rangelands, not because we want to pick on the stockmen or to gain an advantage for wildlife, but to carry out the principles on which the league is established; namely, to preserve, protect, and use wisely our soils, woods, waters and wildlife. Secretary Udall, in our opinion, is to be complimented for carrying out the duties imposed upon him by the Taylor Grazing Act.

We have demanded a position for other users of the BLM lands on advisory boards and councils, a request which is now in effect. We aren't sure that the boards and council will represent all interests. There is complaint that only the West is represented and recreation, inadequately. Time will determine.

It is my understanding that in addition to tenure, permittees want some form of compensation for their loss if their permit is terminated or reduced.

This actual situation has not been reviewed by our organization, but I will attempt to state what I think our position would be.

1. Base property's present high valuation is due to the fact that the owner has had a low grazing fee. Had the fee been at competitive market value, little additional value would have attached to his property. This additional value is the value of his bargain. It would not seem fair to the taxpayer to be called upon to compensate such an owner for the loss or reduction of his permit.

In the case of the original owner, this is no hardship—the subsequent buyer assumed the risk in his purchase. Title he acquired was purchased subject to the Government's right to terminate. If grazing rates go up to more nearly market price, the value of the grazing permit and base property will likely decline.

2. The permittee should not be paid damages for the loss of the market value of his permit. As in the case of the base property, the value was created by the lowness of the fee he has been paying. He has had that value and is not entitled to a second payment.

3. Now in the case of the permittee who makes improvements on the public lands we have a slightly different situation. It has been generally pointed out as a justification for the low rate for grazing use of BLM lands that the permittee makes range improvements.

If that is to be considered part of his use payment and he usually contends it is, it would seem that he is not entitled to compensation for the residual value of the improvements in the event of termination or limitation of his use. As a practical matter, it seems desirable to encourage the permittee to make improvements. In most cases he can do so at lower cost than can a governmental agency.

I would suggest that if the improvement is made in conformity with the BLM plans and approval, the permittee be paid the residual value of such improvements based on the original cost less depreciation at some established basis.

Nothing is found in the record to indicate that the economic insecurity of the permittee's position is by reason of his grazing rights.

Nearly half the cattle permits issued by the BLM in the 10 Western States are for 50 head or less—two-thirds for 100 or less. Only 1 rancher in 100 runs more than 1,000. Eighty-five percent of the permits are for 200 or less. A 1961 study by the Agriculture Department's Economic Research Service indicates that 360 head and a $200,000 investment are needed to cover all costs, without a return in the investment.

The surveys that have been made indicate that small units of operation, possibly those of less than 200 cattle, some figures are as high as 500, are uneconomic. The same conclusion would be reached if the range were free and the expense of range management and improvement were all paid by the taxpayers. It is an unfortunate situation that small operations in almost every field are ceasing to be profitable. Doubling the range carrying capacity, as will happen with range improvement, should help the small rancher if he has the capacity to expand. In any event, the community as a whole should benefit for there will be ranchers who can profitably use the range.

The rancher who wants to keep his grazing permit has almost without exception done so, unless the range is overused and cuts are necessary for range improvement. In this situation the practice is to restore his use when the range is capable of carrying his livestock.

In precedence, the rancher who is in has tenure on BLM lands, which has been so infallible as to have a very substantial sales value and has given the base property this blown-up value.

Any effort to get any form of vested right or tenure in the public lands, beyond that now enjoyed by the stockmen, is going to stir the public's opposition to the point that legislation may well follow that calls for full market value of rangeland use. In fact the public would be shocked if they knew that the permittee now has a right of perpetual use.

There are more beef cattle producers in the Midwestern States than there are BLM permittees. They have no public lands and are inclined to dislike competition that feeds on forage that costs less than a dollar per ton. Any effort to enlarge tenure would be branded as a giveaway of public lands and the day for that passed 50 years ago.

Let me urge that you abandon any efforts to secure a change in tenure and limit your request to compensation for improvements. Let us not stir up the millions who own the land except to get their help in its rehabilitation and improvement. To do this, we who use the land, including recreationists, must pay a fair value for our use.

By some method more of what we pay or from funds of the taxpayer, local governments must have a greater take in lieu of taxes from these lands. (Read the address of Judge Lloyd Rea of this Council, to National Association of Counties at Las Vegas, Nev., December 13, 1962).

We in the Izaak Walton League stand ready to help you develop a sound, long-range program that gives consideration to all uses and users. Let us aggressively develop plans and implement the rehabilitation and improvement of the rangeland for a greater use. Let us double or triple the livestock carrying capacity, and provide better habitat for wildlife, and with all our use—borrowing words from Mr. Carver—"leave the land in at least as good a shape and if possible in better shape than we found it when we came upon it."

It's time we quit calling names ("necktie parties" are a thing of the past even in Nevada); it's time we users cooperate with agencies in carrying out their duties assigned to them by law for the use and preservation of public lands. The 186 million owners, nearly a third of whom visited these lands last year, expect the use and management to be in the public interest.

FENCES, GATES, AND OWNERSHIP MARKINGS

(Supplement of speech for the BLM meeting given by L. C. Binford, Mar. 11, 1963)

Most of us who go on the public lands for recreation do not like fences. There is a public attitude that a person can go across these lands anywhere he pleases. In fact he has done so for years, but now he finds a fence. His reaction is one of resentment and I am sorry to say, has occasionally found an outlet in using his wirecutters or kicking the stapled wire loose from the post in order to cross over.

Personally I hate jeeps and tote goats, and all other forms of motor vehicles that travel across my public lands. I use a horse and wish those other guys could be kept out, but unfortunately the gasoline boys outnumber us who use hay for fuel.

We who are familiar with the management of the public lands know that fences are necessary for good management (some method must be devised to get the antelope through), but there aren't enough of us to get this over to the public. In this we need your help.

Now it would help us get the message over if fences had more gates, at least at points of natural passage. Then it would help if the gates were something the city outdoorsman could operate.

Interior press release of Mr. Udall's speech to the National Cattlemen's Association in January at Las Vegas, has him to say "for there will be those who leave the gaps in the fence down." I am sure some zipper-minded secretary translated "gates" as "gaps." However, the word "gap" better describes some of the devices used to fill in the opening in the fence than the word "gate."

These 4, 5, 6, or 7 barbed wire strands (I suppose numbers depend on whether erected by sheep or cattlemen) strung between two struts, wired to the post at one end and looped, lashed, or trussed to the openable end, are a formidable device to nonrural people. The method of a lever arm to pull the gate up to the loop or as holding device has knocked many a greenhorn for the count.

Even more baffling as a method of holding the gate closed, is the section of an old lariat used as a wrap around with a knot known to a bulldogging cowhand, but completely foreign to a grocery clerk out to take a look at his public land.

To add to the confusion, he occasionally finds the gate open and tossed to one side of the road. He has been told that leaving gates open is endangering the sportsmen's relationship with the livestock people, so he carefully closes the gate which the rancher has left open so the stock can get to water.

Maybe the gate has a "no trespassing" sign, but he is in a public lands area and he knows, or has been told, that some permittee has improperly posted signs, so he ignores it.

I could go on with the problems of the outsider. He has a map but in the broad open spaces of irregular roads, he is lost. He is accustomed to named roads and directional signs. What can we do to help him out? Remember, he is one of the taxpayers, one of 30 plus million who come upon the BLM lands for recreation and we need his support in a public lands management program.

In brief—when we fence, let us provide passage through that the novice can open and close. It would be desirable if such devices were uniform. Let us provide these openings at frequent intervals. Principal ones should be identified on a map of the area. It has been suggested that all gates to Federal property be painted yellow if ownership is both sides, otherwise yellow on Federal ownership side.

Let us mark ownership. Under Director Woozley we had a marking program to which the stockmen objected, so the order was never entered. I understand I am the one who stirred up the subject, but the markings proposed at the time went beyond my proposal.

I suggest that BLM provide a small identification marker of 2 or 3 inches in diameter, circular in design which would have a knockout section which would hook onto a wire fence. The same plaque should have two small holes to permit it being nailed to a post. Pressed into the metal would be the words, "U.S. Lands, Both Sides." A second wording would say, "U.S. Lands, This Side Only."

With the rivalry between governmental departments, I am sure there must be added Department of the Interior. It would be desirable if Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture would use the same plaque. The public is not too much interested as to which Department of the United States manages the land.

There would seem to be no reason why the Government could not supply the signs. It should be a requirement in all new fencing that the simple emblem be attached at specified intervals. On existing fencing, BLM fieldmen could, with volunteer cooperation of user groups—that is, livestock men and recreationists—get them put up. It would remove a lot of friction between users.

With this administration's emphasis on physical fitness, it should be no trouble to get outdoor people in their 50-mile walks, to put the plaques up as they go. I'll take a 50-mile stretch if I can bend them to the top wire so I won't have to get off my horse.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY AT YALE DAILY NEWS ANNUAL DINNER

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the many characteristics which distinguish the present able Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, from some of his predecessors is his keen and sincere interest in what President Kennedy calls our No. 1 domestic problem, which is the slow rate of economic growth, bringing in its wake chronic, persistent, and increasing unemployment.

As many Senators know, next week, the Manpower and Employment Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will commence a comprehensive study of the unemployment problem, in an effort to develop a legislative program to deal with unemployment at the next session of the 88th Congress, next year.

A substantial contribution to this study has already been made in a very closely reasoned and excellent address by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon at the Yale Daily News annual dinner, at New Haven, Conn., on April 4. The address came to my attention only recently.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks. I commend the address to all Senators as an exceedingly able statement of the complicated and difficult problems confronting the country in the fields of employment, fiscal and monetary responsibility, the possibility of a tax cut and tax reform, and the very difficult problem of our international balance of payments.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TTEASURY, BEFORE THE YALE DAILY NEWS ANNUAL DINNER, NEW HAVEN, CONN., APRIL 4, 1963

Tonight I want to discuss with you a few of the basic economic problems facing our Nation today and then examine some alternative ways of meeting them.

At the outset, let me make it clear that when I talk of economic problems, I by no means intend to imply that our situation is bleak. Far from it. The postwar years as a whole have witnessed a flowering in our economy and in our manner of living that has been unmatched in this century for its persistence and vigor.

Why, then, is there cause for concern?

First of all, there has been a marked slowdown in our rate of progress since 1957. By that time, our economy had satisfied most of the unfulfilled needs that had accumulated during the depression years of the thirties and during wartime. Since 1957, therefore, our economy has been operating without the stimulus of that huge backlog of demand, and it has not performed as well as we would have liked.

The shortcomings in our economic performance have been most glaringly apparent in terms of unemployment. In the years 1947–57, our unemployment rate averaged 4.2 percent, and was for the greater part of that time below, or only slightly above, the 4-percent level that is regarded by many as reasonably full employment. During the past 5 years, however, unemployment has averaged 6 percent and has never fallen below 5 percent, even for a single month.

Over 4 million of our citizens were unable to find the jobs they sought. Such hardship simply cannot be tolerated in these times of relative prosperity.

Another reason for concern lies in the outlook for the future. Unless we improve our economic performance—and quickly—we must face the fact that another recession would bring with it unemployment levels such as we have not seen in more than 20 years. Next year, those young people who were born in 1946, the first year of the postwar baby boom, will turn 18 and begin to enter our labor force in large numbers. The average annual inflow of young people into our labor force during the mid-sixties will be 2,700,000, compared to 1,800,000 during the mid-fifties. We must be able to provide jobs for all of these young men and women. And we must find those jobs in a time of ever-increasing automation. The impact of automation has long been felt by our blue-collar factory workers, and it is now spreading rapidly in the white collar and service areas.

What automation can accomplish today is well illustrated by the experience of the Treasury Department, which has been in the forefront of the shift to automatic data processing. In the last 15 years, for instance, while the number of checks and bonds issued annually by the Treasury has nearly doubled, mechanization has cut in half the number of employees it takes to issue these checks and bonds—a fourfold increase in productivity.

We cannot hold back the progress represented by automation. But we can—and must—take positive and energetic steps to meet the twin challenge of automation and a rapidly growing labor force with a many-sided response. We cannot afford to sit idly by and do nothing. The potential results of inaction were graphically forecast by the president of the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. W. P. Gullander, who recently pointed out that if our economy continues to create jobs no faster than it has during the past 5 years then, by 1970, our unemployment rate would climb to a shocking 12.7 percent. Such a result would be totally unacceptable to the American people, and properly so. It would inevitably call forth massive governmental action to fill the void left by the inability of our private economy to provide the needed jobs. I can assure you that such a prospect is just as unwelcome to us in Washington as it must be to you.

The major domestic question facing us in the sixties, then, is how to act to create the jobs we lack today, as well as the millions of new jobs that will be needed in the years immediately ahead? While the welfare of its people is a natural concern of any government, the specific responsibility for action to relieve unemployment has been laid upon our Government by the Employment Act of 1946, which was adopted by overwhelming bipartisan majorities. It reads, in part:

"It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government * * * to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

In facing up to this overriding responsibility, we have to take into account at least two other major problems: First, the matter of Federal budgetary deficits. In considering deficits, remember that the past 2 years have been extremely critical in the cold war—years during which Soviet communism has mustered all of its forces in an effort to overrun the free world—years during which the Soviet rulers felt enough confidence in their power to confront us with a military challenge on a scale that has not been seen since the Berlin blockade, 15 years ago. President Kennedy saw what was coming, and, in one of the very first moves of his administration, ordered a rapid and substantial build-up of our military power. Increased military strength and the steadfastness of our citizens enabled us to withstand both the Berlin crisis of 1961 and last fall's Cuban crisis. That military buildup was vitally necessary to preserve our freedoms. Inevitably, it was also expensive. Our annual defense budget increased by some $10 billion.

In addition to their military threat, the Soviets have also challenged us in the vast new arena of space. Thanks to a considerable headstart and rockets far larger than ours they have been able to out-perform us in manned space flight and to capture the imagination of the world by their feats. But our Congress decided in the spring of 1961 that we were no longer willing to continue second best in space. It approved a program designed to put an American on the moon before the end of the decade, and hopefully before the arrival of any Soviet space explorer. That decision was extremely costly, but it involved far more than a symbolic race to the moon. It represented our clear determination as a nation that we will not permit the Soviet Union to preempt world leadership in a new and unknown environment whose eventual potentialities we cannot yet foresee.

These two decisions in the field of defense and space, coupled with increases in other areas of Federal expenditure that are mandatory to meet the basic needs of our growing population—increases of the same general order of magnitude as those of previous years—have combined to push our expenditures substantially higher than the revenues we collect from our underemployed economy.

Once again, therefore, a major problem can be traced to the inadequate performance of our economy. For if it were operating at reasonably full capacity, our tax system would be producing more than enough revenue to adequately meet the cost of financing our critical national needs with a balanced budget. Instead of worrying about deficits we would be enjoying budgetary surpluses.

But our economy is not operating at anywhere near full capacity and shows no sign of moving up to capacity to meet the very real challenges of the cold war and to fulfill the basic needs of our growing population. So once again we see that action to stimulate our economy is essential, not only to provide jobs for our people, and to guard their security, but also to provide the revenues to balance our budget.

Finally, we have to take account of another major problem, one that first became acute during 1958: the deficit in our international balance of payments. After running moderate payments deficits for a decade—deficits which helped to redistribute the world's liquid financial resources and enabled our friends in Western Europe to return their currencies to convertibility—our international deficit soared to $3.5 billion in 1958, followed by deficits of $3.7 billion in 1959 and $3.9 billion in 1960. These payments deficits were accompanied by substantial drains on our gold stock amounting to $4.7 billion for the 3-year period, 1958–60.

By early 1961, action to reduce these deficits became imperative, and it was taken. The deficits were reduced to $2.4 billion in 1961, and to $2.2 billion last year. At the same time, the annual gold drain was reduced by 45 percent. But these figures are still far too high. Further action to reduce and eliminate the deficit is imperative, and will be undertaken within the existing free world trade and payments system.

In considering our balance-of-payments deficit, we should realize that it is unique in the world's financial history. Usually, balance-of-payments deficits are associated with domestic inflation leading to an unfavorable trade balance. In our case, the reverse is true. We have the largest favorable trade balance of any nation in the world. Ever since 1958, our wholesale prices have remained absolutely level, while those of our competitors have risen.

Why, then, a deficit?

Our deficit has been due, first and foremost, to the dollar cost of maintaining substantial military forces overseas for the defense of the free world. In addition, there has been the dollar cost of our foreign aid programs. This latter, however, is being substantially reduced as we increase the proportion of aid funds spent on American goods and services. Finally, there has been a large outflow of private capital as foreign borrowers have increased their activity in U.S. markets, and as American companies have increased their investments overseas. But in this connection it is worth noting that the annual increase in the value of our foreign investments has regularly exceeded our payments deficits. All of these outflows have combined to outweigh our favorable trade balance and our other earnings abroad, and so have given us our recent deficits.

Our current balance-of-payments deficit necessarily limits our choices in meeting our domestic economic problems. Flooding the market with bank credit designed to create artificially low interest rates—a course which has often been appropriate in the past—would, under present circumstances, only mean that more funds would flow abroad in search of higher rates, creating an unmanageable problem for the dollar and doing little to help the domestic economy. On the other hand, the sharply higher domestic interest rates and the strong restrictions on credit that have been classic medicines for balance-of-payments problems are just as clearly inappropriate to the state of our domestic economy.

Since the fundamental answer to all of the problems I have cited lies in stimulating economic progress, it has long been clear to us in Washington that the Government should spare no effort to encourage our private economy to move ahead until it once more operates at reasonably full capacity. Last year, we took our first important steps in this direction. They were the enactment of the investment credit and the complete revision and extensive liberalization—for the first time in 20 years—of the tax rules dealing with depreciation. The combined effect of these two actions was to reduce the tax load on business by some $2.5 billion a year—the equivalent of a five-point reduction in corporate taxes.

Today, business is reacting to these twin measures as we anticipated. The expanding flow of new orders for machinery and equipment that marked the opening months of the year, and the recent sharp increase in business appropriations for modernization and expansion, can be traced largely to these actions. It is this reaction by business that gives us our best reason for hoping that the current recovery still has considerable momentum.

These twin actions are only a beginning. The performance of our economy over the past 5 years makes clear that it is being forcibly impeded in its natural effort to push ahead to full capacity operation. The culprit is not hard to find. The overwhelming national consensus is that our economy suffers from the harsh restraints of a tax system that was created to meet the needs of wartime, and has never been readapted to the quite different needs of peacetime. If our economy is to surge ahead, we must break the shackles of this oppressive tax system. That is precisely what the President is recommending in his new tax program. He has proposed a broad, top-to-bottom reduction in tax rates, both corporate and personal, accompanied by a number of structural reforms. The overall result would be a reduction of $10.3 billion in taxes, designed to unleash our economy and allow it to reach its full potential.

The vigor of the debate so far over the various suggestions for structural changes and the argument over just how the reduction should be applied has somewhat obscured the central importance of the President's basic proposal—which is simply to reduce taxes in order to encourage the economy to do better. Nevertheless, it is both surprising and gratifying that in the 6 weeks of public hearings that have just been completed before the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington, there has been literally no opposition to the central thesis. It has been accepted as proper policy by all, although it is usually subject to understandable reservations reflecting the special interests of particular groups.

The main thrust of the concern which has been voiced is that the tax reduction be carried out in a fiscally responsible manner. That is a concern which we in the administration fully share and, indeed, it is clearly spelled out in the President's budget message, as well as in his tax message.

It is our belief that the tax reduction we have proposed will so invigorate the economy that, in a few years, our revenues under the new, lower rate structure will be larger than if we were to continue with our present rate structure, which stifles economic growth. Nevertheless, the first and immediate fiscal impact of tax reduction will be lower revenues and a somewhat larger deficit. This calls for the most careful expenditure control. And that is just what the President has pledged. First of all, since increases in defense, space and interest on the public debt are unavoidable, he has held fiscal 1964 expenditure levels below those of the current year in the overall civilian programs of the Government.

Second, he has specifically stated on more than one occasion that a substantial part of the increased revenues from our expanding economy will be set aside to reduce the deficit until such time as it is eliminated. And, third, he has already begun to translate his pledges into action. Since January, he has cut expenditure requests by over $750 million, including the recent cut of $400 million in his foreign aid request. This is sure proof of the effectiveness of the program of expenditure control that is such an important and integral part of the President's tax reduction program.

In a further effort to minimize the effect of tax reduction on the budget, its impact has been spread over 3 fiscal years. This is surely the course of fiscal responsibility. Yet it does not mean that we have to wait 3 years to feel the economic impact of tax reduction. Quite the contrary. The tax program would release a very large amount of money throughout the economy in a very short period of time. If the tax program were enacted in September of this year and became effective in October then in the 9 months between October 1, 1963, and July 1, 1964, the economy would benefit from roughly $6 billion in tax relief, and within 15 months after October 1, 1963, the entire $10 billion reduction would be in effect.

Finally, in an effort to achieve the maximum possible rate reductions, and still hold the overall tax cut to the $10–$11 billion that seems to us to be the maximum that fiscal responsibility will allow, we have suggested a number of revenue-raising measures. None of them are essential to our objective of a freer economy as the rate cuts, but they do not permit lower marginal rates than would otherwise be possible. The largest revenue-raising proposal is a 5-percent floor under personal income tax deductions which would raise $2.3 billion. The only feasible alternative to a base-broadening approach of this general nature is to lower our sights on rate reduction by an equivalent degree.

A number of the structural changes we have suggested are highly desirable to relieve hardship and to promote growth. Important among them are the liberalized minimum standard deduction, the $320 million of relief to our older citizens, the provisions on income averaging, the deductibility of moving expenses, and the expensing of equipment used for research. Some of our other proposals deal with provisions that were written into law to provide relief from our exorbitantly high rate structure. With the sharp reduction in rates we are proposing, these special provisions will no longer be justifiable. They should be repealed or substantially modified at the same time that we eliminate the high rates which gave birth to them.

In considering possible courses of action to release our domestic economy, there are some who have felt that the answer lies in much easier money. But the fact is that we already have a monetary policy which has been a strong element in the expansion of our economy. Without going too deeply into the many complex facets of monetary policy, let me point out that during the past 25 months of recovery, our level of liquid assets has risen faster than our gross national product. From the first quarter of 1961 to the fourth quarter of 1962, our total liquid assets have risen by 13 percent, while GNP has risen by only 12 percent.

Our liquid assets, in fact, have risen far faster in recent months than they have in similar periods of economic expansions in the past. During the 6 months ending January 31, total liquid assets rose at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 7.8 percent. Yet they increased by only 0.1 percent during the similar period—the 6 months ending March 1960—of the preceding economic expansion. During the 6-month period ending in February, time deposits have increased by about 18 percent, the money supply plus time deposits by roughly 10 percent, and the money supply alone by 5 percent. These figures well demonstrate that our monetary climate has been favorable to economic growth.

Most corporations already have a large flow of cash relative to investment. In recent periods, corporate cash flow has in fact expanded more rapidly than plant and equipment expenditures. Last year's more than $39 billion in corporate cash flow—undistributed profits plus corporate capital consumption allowances—was $3½ billion higher than the nearly $36 billion in 1961.

Nor should we forget that long-term interest rates have generally declined over the past year. From March of 1962 to March of 1963, for example, average rates for new issues of double-A corporate bonds declined from 4.40 percent to 4¼ percent, municipal bond rates also fell and mortgage rates declined from 5.70 percent to 5½ percent.

Monetary policy, therefore, has done all that can reasonably be expected of it toward providing the extra impetus we need today. The evidence is overwhelming that tax reduction alone can offer a permanent and vigorous stimulus to our economy without at the same time creating new economic difficulties.

Those are the considerations that led President Kennedy to propose his program of across-the-board reduction in income taxes. The increased demand and investment that would result from enactment of this program will in turn interact upon each other and set off a chain reaction of rising economic activity. And over and above this direct income effect of a tax cut, will be the sustained impact of the lower rates themselves as powerful inducements to greater investment—an impact which itself reinforces the income effects of the tax cut.

A higher growth rate will mean larger Government revenues. This will be true even with lower tax rates. And the enlarged revenues flowing from an economy operating at reasonably full capacity, when coupled with the firm control on expenditures that the President will continue to exert, will make it possible for us to achieve the balanced budget that is our goal.

We are not a people to stand idly by when the means to achieve our national aims lie close at hand. We are not a people who wait upon catastrophe before we act or who bestow upon our future the decisions that are ours to make here and now. At no time in our postwar history has the need been greater to regain the economic momentum that can carry us to full employment. The President's tax program can meet that need far better than any proposal yet set before us. Our choice could not be clearer.

FLIGHT OF REFUGEES FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, Vincent Godfrey Burns, poet laureate of Maryland, recently composed a poem concerning the refugees fleeing from Communist countries. This work was printed in the Evening Capital of Annapolis, Md., together with a vivid commentary on the plight of these persons.

This article is so forceful and thought-provoking that I think it should be read by all Americans, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POET BURNS WRITES OF REFUGEE DRAMA

All over the world refugees are fleeing from Communist countries as if from a plague. More than a million Chinese have fled across the border into Hong Kong and thousands of pitiful men, women, and children fleeing the terror and the starvation of Red China have been turned back to that pathetic land by border guards.

In India, hundreds of thousands of Tibetans have fled over the mountains from their homeland in Tibet, where the Red Chinese have carried on a savage war of extermination against the Tibetan people.

And, in Florida and elsewhere in our own land hundreds of thousands of Cubans have sought refuge from the brutal tyranny of Castro and his Red cohorts in Cuba.

But perhaps the most voluminous flood of pathetic refugees in all the world is the millions of tragic human beings who have fled the terror and the tyranny in East Germany. Since World War II ended probably close to 5 million people have fled across the border into West Germany.

Then, the Communists, realizing that this flood of refugees provided towering proof of the false claims of communism, decided to try to prevent any further emigration by building a huge barrier of stone and concrete and barbed wire on the border. The wall was erected in August of 1961. But since that time more than 14,000 people have somehow managed to flee East Germany—by going over the wall, under it, around it, and right straight through it.

Think of it. These unfortunate people must leave behind their homes, their possessions, their friends, their jobs, their families—indeed all they possess except what they carry on their backs. What hopelessness and suffering, what oppression and cruelty there must be in that unhappy land to force so many people to take this step.

One man escaped with his fiance by binding her underneath his car. Some, at the risk of their lives, have driven trucks straight through the concrete wall and barbed wire. Others have swum through icy water to freedom.

Perhaps the most spectacular escapes of all have been through tunnels, dug 50, 75 or 100 feet under the wall. An old man of 73 years of age, assisted by his wife, dug a tunnel, which began in the living room of their home, and right under the eyes of the Vopos (the Red guards) they and 13 other old people fled from the terror of communism into the free air of West Germany.

The tyrants built a concrete wall,
A hideous barrier 10 feet tall,
Designed by lords of slavery
Who hate to see men glad and free.

With rock and stone and strong barbed wire,
With machineguns and with rifle fire,
They herd their hapless victims in
Behind this wall of shame and sin.

But human life breaks every band,
No earthly wall can long withstand
The pressure of the human soul,
Resolved upon its freedom goal.

So thousands brave the evil breath
Of Communist violence, pain, and death
And, spite of all the Reds can do,
Go over, under, round and through.

Imagine, if you can, what fear
And human suffering must be here,
That people would forsake their all
To flee across this frowning wall.

O friend, if still your heart can know
A twinge of pain for human woe,
You will—like me—not sleep tonight
Till earth is cleansed of this Red blight.

Though Reds have built this wall today—
The symbol of their wicked way—
The human race will someday be
Purged of this awful slavery.

—*Vincent Godfrey Burns.*

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—CONSERVATIVE AND LIBERAL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD a letter from our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from California, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune last Sunday, April 21. Senator KUCHEL, the Republican whip, who was reelected in California in 1962 by a majority of almost three-quarters of a million votes, wrote on a subject which is of immediate importance. He is a patriotic American who has been a great leader of our party, and I think this statement should be read by all members of the Republican Party, and by all Americans.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—CONSERVATIVE AND LIBERAL

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

The direction the Republican Party must take, in my view, is not a matter of turning left or turning right—but going forward.

If the world were blessed with a just peace and perfect security, if the America we love gleamed with shining cities, modern towns and prosperous farms, in an atmosphere of clean air and clean water, and if our Nation brimmed with full employment and equal opportunities, quality education and decent shelter, and civil rights and human freedoms for all, then—

Then I might feel that we, as a party, could stand back and, for a moment at least, stand still.

America, unfortunately, remains a reservoir of unsolved problems. But they are soluble problems, and they are problems worth solving.

Nor are we alone on earth. There remains an implacable totalitarian evil called communism, challenging us to the hilt—militarily, economically, politically, ideologically.

I devotedly believe in our capitalist, free competitive enterprise system.

And, as a Republican, deeply committed to individual and private initiative, I believe this force must take the lead in the opportunity to improve America—not simply to surpass the Russian challenge, but to fullfill the American dream.

Our party must provide the incentives to unleash private industry and business to provide goods and services and to create jobs, as has lately been accomplished in Western Europe.

Yet where free competitive enterprise cannot or will not do the job alone—and where, clearly, the job deserves to be done—government, I believe, must be called upon to help. That was Lincoln's creed. And through the years it has been good American—and good Republican—creed.

For government—Federal, State, and local—is our government, yours and mine, not the enemy's, as some seem to feel in both of our political parties. Nor is it our master, as others seem to feel in our opposition party.

Government, to me as a Republican, is simply our instrument, to be used cautiously but realistically and responsibly, to help America achieve the common good.

Just because a little bit may be good, however, does not mean—as a good portion of our opposition apparently believes—that a whole lot more is automatically better.

At the same time, I believe our party must continuously resist needless and repeated executive intrusions into the legislative domain at the Federal level, and must awaken the State and local levels to their responsibilities as well as their prerogatives.

On another front: some have called the Republican Party the party of big business. And the Democratic Party the party of big labor.

I don't care what the Democrats choose to do, but I do not want my party to be the captive of either or, indeed, of any special interest or segment of our economy.

The Republican Party, as the party of Lincoln, should, it seems to me, be the party of them many—the people—not the few, whether the few represent industrial giants, powerful unions, great farm organizations, or the few anything else.

The Republican Party must welcome businessmen, big and little; laboring men, skilled and unskilled; farmers, retired people, the young, the rich and the poor, black and white, all segments of our population to its ranks—but first and foremost as Americans who value what our party believes in, as generally and honestly set down in our last forward-looking national platform.

Within the framework of our Republican structure, built upon Lincolnian principles, there is and, of course, must be room for disagreement on specific issues, including the issues which will assume a critical importance in 1964 and beyond.

But the extremists of both the Left and the Right can find no living room in Lincoln's house.

Our party, to make American progress, must, I believe:

Continue to fight for fiscal integrity, because an unsound economy is just as hazardous as an unsound national defense:

Take the lead again, as it has so often, in the cause of human progress (which is not in the least incompatible with fiscal responsibility), in health, in housing, in education, and in civil rights—not because it may please a minority but because it is morally right and best for all America; we are the party of Lincoln, not Calhoun;

Take a realistic approach to the Communist menace, based on fact, rather than on foolishness or fear; let us be hardheaded, not softheaded or bullheaded; the latter attitudes, I fear, play only into Communists' hands.

Republicans have, for years, spent long angry hours hurling about the terms "liberal" and "conservative," while the Democrats, with an astonishing philosophical split, have been spending them happily and busily winning elections.

There are many worthwhile things to conserve in America: our ideals, our freedoms, our institutions, our resources—the very heart of our greatness.

Let us, by all means, be conservative about them.

But let us also be liberal in seeking, under our American charter, to better our people, our country, and our world.

If we, as Republicans, can preserve the best of America while improving it—and let no one mistake it: ours is the finest country on earth—our party will once again carry America forward. And future election victories will take care of themselves in abundance.

Thomas H. Kuchel.

INTER-AMERICAN POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY IGOR GORDEVITCH

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last week Mr. Igor Gordevitch, vice president of the publication Vision, the largest circulation news magazine in Latin America, addressed the 18th Annual Cleveland World Trade Conference, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Gordevitch, who has been closely involved with inter-American political and economic affairs, talks in frank and positive terms of private enterprise in Latin America.

We have heard much about the problems which private enterprise has encountered in Latin America. It is refreshing to encounter a knowledgeable, constructive statement which gives proper perspective not only to the problems but also to the progress of private enterprise in Latin America.

I commend the address to my colleague, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Igor Gordevitch, Vice President of Vision, Inc., Before the 18th Annual Cleveland World Trade Conference at the Pick-Carter Hotel on April 4, 1963

Mr. Kolby, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to renew Vision's contacts with the Cleveland World Trade Association and the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. As some of you may remember, our president, William Barlow, had the privilege of addressing you just 3 years ago.

It is also a great pleasure to listen again to Don Felipe Herrera who, as his words indicate, is a man of both insight and foresight.

I especially welcome the conference committee's invitation to attend this conference, for it gives me an ideal opportunity to discuss a matter of prime importance to all of us, as businessmen and as citizens of this hemisphere. I refer to the unwarranted and, I believe, dangerous attitude toward Latin America that has developed over the past few months. Given a certain amount of psychiatric license, it could be called the down-the-drain syndrome. It manifests itself through angry table pounding and loud talk of flight capital, dwindling exports, bankruptcy and the imminent collapse of most if not all of the governments to our south. It crops up at business lunches from New York to San Francisco, in casual conversations in Washington, and—most of all—in the press.

Last September, Business Week magazine led off a special report on Latin America with these words, and I quote: "Latin America today is heading for its worst troubles ever."

Last December the magazine followed up with a subhead reading: "Latin America: Gloomy Days Ahead."

In January, U.S. News & World Report told its readers: "One consolation about Latin America: things can hardly get worse in an economic sense."

In February, Time magazine reported that "instead of plunging in, U.S. investors are pulling out of Latin America; in the first 9 months brought home $37 million more than they invested."

And last month Malcolm S. Forbes, returned from a short trip to the area, wrote in his magazine: "Invest private capital in South America today? Not unless you consider wagering at roulette or at a crap game an 'investment'."

And so on, and on, and on—gloom and intimations of disaster on all sides.

I have the greatest respect for our press, and as a publisher in Latin America, I am fully cognizant of the enormous, wrenching problems besetting the continent. But, gentlemen, at the risk of being called a Pollyana, I would like to venture the suggestion that Latin America is not on the verge of departing this world—by way of the drain or any other exit. It is very much with us and, by all accounts, will continue to be so for sometime.

We accentuate the negative in matters Latin American because we tend in many instances to regard these 20 republics as creatures of the moment. Thus, the political and economic upheavals that have afflicted Brazil during the past 2 years are often regarded in the U.S. public mind as the sum total of Brazilian history. Even the better informed are inclined to think of Latin America as something that appeared suddenly at the end of World War II.

When we put things back into context and continuum, we see that Latin America has had about as many ups and downs as any other world area. It has gone through dictatorships and depressions, prosperity and peace—more of the latter than is commonly found in the world.

May I remind you, gentlemen, how Europe looked 15 years ago. Two countries—Italy and France—were dangerously close to communism. Britain was run by a Socialist Government that was nationalizing basic industries. And the Soviet threat in Europe, crystallized in the Berlin crisis, was far more explosive than today's Soviet presence in Cuba.

And today, how does stability in Latin America compare with that in Asia and Africa. Favorably, I think, in view of economic and political conditions prevailing in Indonesia, Communist guerrilla attacks in South Vietnam, assassinations in Laos, the possibility of further Red Chinese invasions of India, and the hopeless deterioration in the Congo.

With this in mind, permit me to do a little accentuating of the Latin American positive, starting with our private investments there. According to official estimates, during the first 9 months of last year there was a net capital flow back to the United States amounting to $49 million. That's a pretty depressing figure as it stands. But there's more to the story. First, there was a considerable return of funds from U.S.-owned petroleum companies in Venezuela during the first three quarters of 1962. If the Venezuelan figures are excluded from the total, the result is a positive capital flow into Latin America on the order of $150 million or so. For the full year, the figure will be even higher, since preliminary estimates for the fourth quarter show a net capital outflow to Latin America.

There are other positive elements in our Latin American investment picture. Take the up-and-coming manufacturing industry. One of the Government's top statisticians, Samuel Pizer, said recently that capital outflows in this sector during 1962 will have reached the record figure of $125 million set in 1960.

These are Mr. Pizer's words: "What has happened in this industry is that Brazil, which received 43 percent of the total capital flow in the previous 10 years, dropped out of the picture by the end of 1961, with many firms returning funds to the United States on balance even as others continued capital outlays for which they had earlier been committed. Flows to Cuba have also been sizable in some years but have been nonexistent since 1958. On the other hand, capital flows to Argentina, Mexico, and possibly also Venezuela, have risen enough to maintain the overall average. This means that if it were not for the dropping out of Brazil and Cuba, the record this year would look comparatively good."

No matter how you rearrange them, our capital outflows to Latin America last year fell far short of the $300 million quota for

U.S. private investments envisaged by the Alliance for Progress.

But the feeling is growing among a number of economists that capital flow is not an accurate measure of the impact of U.S. investment in Latin America. A better device, they say, is to add in reinvested earnings to show approximate increases in book value. The total—capital outflow plus reinvested earnings—came to over $400 million in 1961. And if you add in expenditures for depreciation, depletion, amortizations, and the like, you come up with a rough estimate of $1 billion for 1961.

Is this playing with figures? If it is, it is at least an admirable illustration that one can play just as well on the positive as on the negative side.

I'd like to touch for a minute on trade. All of you have read the comments of eminent economists, United States and Latin American, on Latin America's deteriorating terms of trade. The prices of her export commodities are slipping, the experts say, and the prices of the industrial goods she needs for development are rising. This is demonstrably true in many instances. But a glance at the March issue of the International Monetary Fund's International Financial Statistics suggests that it is not entirely true.

According to the IMF, the dollar value of Latin America's exports have been going up of late—from $8.58 billion in 1960 to $8.65 billion in 1961 to an annual rate of $9.1 billion for each of the first three quarters of last year.

Imports have followed suit. Despite austerity plans, exchange regulations, import substitution programs and so forth, Latin America imported $8.3 billion worth of goods in 1960, $8.6 billion in 1961, and, according to estimates, somewhere around $8.7 billion last year.

We get into the realm of the metaphysical whenever we start pushing continental statistics around. I'd like to get back to the practical by reviewing with you last year's economic development in some of the individual Republics. For, gentlemen, if one thing is sure in the incredibly complex business of inter-American relations, it is that you simply cannot regard 20 different countries as an economic—or as a political or social—entity. A good year in Mexico can be a bad one in Argentina and vice versa. And as you know better than I, even a bad year is never all bad.

Venezuela is a case in point. For months now, the papers have been full of Mr. Castro's overt attempts to do away with the tough and tenacious Mr. Romulo Betancourt. There have been reports of uprisings, sabotage, terrorism, art theft, piracy on the high seas—you name it. Now, if the down-the-drainsters are right, this sort of thing should result in flight capital, economic anemia, and a rash of ulcers. It is most certainly not conducive to improving that mysterious prerequisite for economic development, the business climate.

But the facts are, gentlemen, that last year was an uncommonly good one for many sectors of the Venezuelan economy. This is what Department of Commerce specialists have to say about it in an upcoming report: "There was continuing economic recovery in Venezuela during 1962, and at the outset of 1963 the prospects are more favorable than at any time since 1958. In 1962, gross production of goods and services increased at an annual rate of 6 percent and equilibrium was reestablished in the balance of payments * * *. With the April 1962 exchange reforms there have been indications of growing business confidence and an abatement or reversal of capital flight."

Venezuela's neighbor, Colombia, had its share of troubles last year, what with balance-of-payments difficulties, devaluation of the peso, and a considerable increase in taxes. But it was a record year for the Bogotá Stock Exchange. The number of stockholders in Colombia increased from 350,000 in 1961 to over 400,000 last year, the third largest such group—after those in the United States and Canada—in the hemisphere. Per capita GNP growth came to 3 percent last year—well over the Alliance for Progress minimum of 2.5 percent. Even more important, Colombia made significant headway in diversifying its exports—in freeing itself from the historic and crippling reliance on one or two commodities. Exports other than the usual items—coffee, petroleum, and bananas—increased by 63.5 percent in 1962. Cotton exports doubled, and textile shipments were up 290 percent.

Peru suffered an annulled election and a military coup last year. There has been labor unrest, a tax hike that has made the country one of the world's heaviest taxers, and a 24-percent increase in planned governmental expenditures for 1963. Mineral exports have slumped due to depressed world market prices for lead and zinc.

But exchange reserves at the end of the year stood at $106.6 million, as against $82.4 million in December of 1961. The S.O.L. held steady during the political troubles. Power consumption and the sales of cement jumped more than 10 percent. Exports rose 9 percent, thanks chiefly to the booming fishmeal industry, which earned $110 million for Peru last year—double that industry's 1961 export earnings.

The Chilean economy is commonly thought of as stagnant. The country's budget deficit was one-third larger in 1962 than in 1961. A fresh wave of wage hikes at the end of the year broke through President Allesandri's austerity measures and started a fresh inflationary movement. But. Again the but. Chile's industrial sales value index rose 30 percent during the first 10 months of 1962, and the retail sales value climbed 21 percent. Even though the mining industry continued to be plagued by tough and often discriminatory taxes, mining led all other sectors of the economy. Copper production, much of it by U.S.-controlled mines, rose over 9 percent last year. The iron and steel industry continued to move ahead, with domestic demand up an estimated 50 percent over 1961. Total construction activity increased by 75 percent during the first 7 months of last year.

Brazil, as you know, has been going through an economic and political crisis that would challenge the structure of any nation in the world. The fact that it has survived is, indeed, a tribute to its innate strengths. But survived it has—and grown, although not at the astounding 6- and 7-percent rates registered in recent years. Production records were set in a number of industries, most strikingly in the automotives. Motor vehicle unit production was 30 percent ahead of 1961 figures. Passenger cars were 44 percent ahead. Wheat, which has been an important item in Brazil's balance-of-payments difficulties, made a good domestic showing. According to unofficial estimates, production went from 150,000 tons in 1961 to 275,000 tons last year.

Argentina has had a plague of troubles. Inflation, though not as strong as in Brazil, has taken its toll. There have been a record number of business failures. Investment is down as businessmen try to feel their way through one political crisis after another. But there have been plus signs. Argentina's exports during the January-November period of last year were 24 percent higher than for the similar period in 1961. Beef exports alone shot up by 42.6 percent last year. And although there was a general decline in manufacturing, rubber goods, petroleum and paper industries all registered sizable gains. Production in the extractive industries increased by 11.5 percent, paced by petroleum.

I could lengthen this exercise by mentioning solid advancements in Mexico, and relatively good showings in a number of the other republics. But I trust I have made my point.

There is, however, one area of Latin American economic development that deserves special mention—economic integration. It is easy to scoff at the small size of the Central American common market or at the seemingly slow start of the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA). But it is most decidedly unwise to do so.

As President Kennedy emphasized during his recent visit to Costa Rica, the economic union of the five Central American States—and the probable inclusion of Panama within not too many more months—will give the isthmus a viability it has never had before. And a market of 14 million people with a $4 billion gross product is nothing to be sneezed at.

It is true that LAFTA's nine members often nitpick over tariff reductions on thousands of individual items rather than moving toward sweeping cuts. But they are going ahead. Consider Mexico's sales to its fellow LAFTA members: $7.8 million in 1961, $16.7 million in 1962, and an estimated $40 million for 1963.

No one would wish to criticize an investor for being cautious. But there is a difference between caution and a refusal to take risks. In my opening remarks I mentioned Mr. Malcolm Forbes and his equating of investment in Latin America with a crap game. I'd like to quote another U.S. business leader on this point—Mr. J. R. White, vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. "A prospective investor in Latin America should be precisely as alert for risks, and for opportunities, as he would be in any other area. He should not take counsel of his fears or be deterred by imaginary dangers. Latin America has a long way to go and, just like the rest of us, a lot to learn. It can certainly experience setbacks and upsets along the way. But it is also an area of enormous potential and accelerating growth."

Frankly, gentlemen, it is hard to judge who subscribes more fully to Mr. White's admirable statement—ourselves or the Europeans and Japanese. Certainly, our oversea counterparts are trying very hard to enlarge their slice of the pie. Their share of Latin America's trade has been getting larger since the war. Peru is now Japan's major foreign supplier of iron ore, though competition in this field is increasing from Brazil and Chile. In contract and financing work, European and Japanese firms are stepping up their activities in Latin America, witness the German group that will build a new copper refinery in Chile and the European consortium that will handle the expansion of Peru's Chimbote steel complex.

In manufacturing investment, our oversea competitors seem to have a slightly better feel of what lies in store for Latin America than we do. They too are cautious about the trouble spots. But they are willing to take big risks. Volkswagen do Brazil, for instance, has announced a multimillion-dollar expansion program that will make it the largest automaker in Latin America. VW sees the potential small car market that will be created once LAFTA begins to jell, and it is willing to gamble.

But as I have said, it is next to impossible to compare our recent record in Latin America with that of the other Western countries. Certainly an impressive group of American businessmen have proved immune to the down-the-drain syndrome. A check of any newspaper—yes, we have them in New York—or of any newsletter that pays much attention to these things will show that U.S. investors are still moving south. Many are doing so on the basis of commitments made 2 or 3 years ago—that is true. But others are making their decisions to move today—

particularly those who have taken the trouble to take a good long look for themselves. I am reminded of a top finance executive of one of our large manufacturing firms who was dead set against sinking his company's money in Brazil. After visiting the place himself—and any of you who have spent any time in Brazil will know what I mean—he did a complete about face.

As is to be expected, manufacturing in Latin America is unattractive to potential investors, especially those who have read of expropriations of utilities and nationalistic attacks on extractive industries. Esso, Shell, Phelps Dodge, Sears, Westinghouse, and a number of others are either setting up or expanding shop in Central America. Ford is expanding auto production in Brazil, after a recent talk between Henry Ford II and President Goulart, and has opened a new assembly plant in Venezuela. A large U.S. group is going ahead with a $72 million investment in a petrochemical plant in Argentina, despite the political alarums and excursions there. Caterpillar is doubling the size of its São Paulo plant. J. I. Case hopes to be building a completely Argentine-made tractor by 1964. Johnson's Wax is building a new plant in Buenos Aires Province. In Mexico, U.S. capital is flowing into foodstuffs, petrochemicals, automotives, electronics and machinery.

The joint venture is coming into its own as a precaution against anti-U.S. discrimination. And the investment guarantee program, or at least some phases of it, is beginning to have something of the same effect. You might be interested to know that of the $3.2 billion worth of investment guarantee applications in process at the end of last year, almost half were for enterprises in Latin America. The figure for Argentina was a tidy $400 million. This is an indication of U.S. apprehension over the risk involved in Argentine investments, but it is also an indication of U.S. desire to invest in that country.

The outlook for the next few years is, I am convinced, more optimistic than pessimistic. Men far more expert than I in the ways of the Argentines and Brazilians profess to see signs of improvements. So far, the Argentines have stuck to their guns on the vital matter of trying to put the economy on a sound basis. The Brazilians have promised to abide by a stabilization program that includes elimination of wasteful subsidies and progressive reduction of inflation. Our aid agreement with them is designed to see that they keep their promise.

There is another factor which can't be overlooked, whether you favor it or not. That is the emergence of the various national development plans, called for under the Alliance for Progress, and their effect on future patterns of investments and trade. Venezuela's 4-year development plan, with its goal of an annual 8 percent increase in GNP, puts heavy emphasis on manufacturing and agricultural development. That means a bigger market for—or investment opportunity in—capital goods and farm machinery. In Colombia, the first to submit its plan, the government will be increasing its bids for such items as trucks, tractors, generators and the other tools it needs to build up the Colombian infrastructure. The same is true of Chile, Bolivia, Mexico, and Honduras—the other countries that have submitted their plans to the Alliance. Performance does not always match the planning, but you would be surprised how close the two were last year in Chile and elsewhere.

In these development plans and in recent declarations of many Latin American governments there is at least the outline of what to me is a most important positive development: The realization at long last that the public section, necessary as it is, cannot possibly finance or administer economic progress on the scale set down by the Alliance for Progress. While there was talk of the importance of the private sector at the Punta del Este Conference, now there is concern and action. Last February, delegations from Latin America and the United States met to discuss ways of improving governmental relations with the private sector and of bringing businessmen into the planning and implementation stages of the national development programs. And over the past year or so, businessmen have been getting help from a promising and, in many areas, new source of financing: The Development Bank, geared to helping firms in expansion and modernization and to giving a hand up to small- and medium-size firms, the backbone of any democratic economy.

Our own Government has taken a decidedly warmer attitude toward the U.S. investor and his future role in Latin America. The investment guarantee program is decidedly a step in the right direction. So are the proposed steps to provide certain tax incentives for our Latin American investments.

As I see it, we have two alternatives. We can make our export and investment decisions on the basis of rumors, fears, intimations of disaster. Or we can make them on the basis of fact balanced against fact, good balanced against bad. We can make individual use of research available to us, or we can read the scare headlines and play follow the leader into blind pessimism.

A lot has ben said of the fact that you can't drive private money anywhere. You must attract it. I contend that there is a lot of attraction in a continent that has one-quarter of the world's forests, one-fifth of its copper production, at least 30 percent of its iron ore reserves. I contend that there is a lot of attraction in an area in which industrial output has jumped 40 percent in the past 5 years and in which gross product now stands at over $80 billion. Attractions and risks, too; yes, but there is no such thing as a riskless investment.

Not very much has been said, however, of the political and strategic implications of our investments in Latin America. It is perfectly clear that the Communists would like nothing better than to see every U.S. entrepreneur in Latin America turn tail and run. The Reds are actively working toward that goal. Every project dropped or shelved helps, in a very real way, the advancement of the Communist cause in Latin America.

The complaint has been made that the Alliance for Progress is not giving free enterprise a fair shake. The shake will be much less fair in the future if the Latin Americans get the idea that while we preach free enterprise, we are not courageous enough to help its development in their countries. Thank you.

COMPARISON OF VARIOUS ANALGESICS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, there is quite a bit of current public discussion of the question of comparability of various analgesics, much of which centers around the recent Federal Trade Commission sponsored study of this subject. During the recent hearings of the Special Committee on Aging, comments were made by one of the witnesses, which were given considerable publicity, on the effectiveness of various kinds of aspirin.

I have before me a letter addressed to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] from Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame of the American Medical Association which, among other things, explains the association's position in this matter, and a letter addressed to me from Mr. J. N. Cooke, president of the Bayer Co. The statements of these gentlemen merit attention, and in fairness to the point of view they represent, I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., January 23, 1963.
Hon. Pat McNamara,
Chairman, Special Committee on Aging,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: On behalf of the American Medical Association, I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify on medical and nutritional quackery before your Special Committee of Aging on January 15.

In the course of the testimony by Dr. Gerald D. Dorman and Dr. Robert E. Shank, who were accompanied by Mr. Oliver Field, director, AMA's Department of Investigation, and Mr. Paul R. M. Donelan, AMA legislative attorney, it was promised that the association would submit a statement to you covering (a) the association's new program of original jurisdiction in medical disciplinary cases and (b) the association's policies and programs urging physicians to aid in the presentation of impartial medical testimony.

In addition to presenting information on these two points, I would like to comment on the remarks made by Mr. Field in response to one of your questions.

MEDICAL DISCIPLINE

Traditionally, the local medical societies have been charged with the responsibility of handling disciplinary actions against the membership of organized medicine. Over the years, the American Medical Association has been an appellate body in these actions. At the AMA's annual meeting in Chicago, June 11–15, 1962, the association was granted original jurisdiction, under certain conditions, in local disciplinary cases.

In order to understand medical discipline in organized medicine, it is necessary to know the relationship of the AMA to individual physicians and to State and county medical societies. First, 197,369 of the 269,325 physicians in this country belong to the AMA. The AMA has no authority over those physicians who are not members.

The constitution of the AMA defines the association as "a federacy of its constituent (State) associations." The State associations are separate sovereign associations. County medical societies are chartered by the respective State associations and derive their existence from the State associations.

In the past, the State associations have been the authority through which member physicians could be disciplined. Generally, the States have delegated most original disciplinary authority to the county societies. The "trial" of a disciplinary case is usually heard by a committee of the county medical society. The "defendant" physician had the right to appeal to the State medical society and then to the Judicial Council of the AMA.

There are certain members of the AMA who are not necessarily members of State or county medical societies. They are service, affiliate, or honorary members of the association. The judicial council, for a number of years, has had authority to discipline these members directly.

In 1958, the AMA board of trustees established a medical disciplinary committee to assess the status of medical discipline. This committee submitted its report in June 1961. One of its recommendations was that "the bylaws of the American Medical Association be changed to confer original jurisdiction on the association to suspend or revoke the AMA membership of a physician guilty of a violation of the principles of medical ethics or the ethical policy of the American Medical Association regardless of whether action has been taken against him at the local level."

The following year, the house of delegates implemented this recommendation by granting the judicial council original jurisdiction under the following conditions: (a) When a State medical association, to which a member belongs, requests the AMA to take such action, and (b) when, at the request of the AMA, a State medical association, to which the member belongs, consents to such action. In these instances, the judicial council has the right to admonish or censure the accused physician or expel him from AMA membership.

In November 1962 the judicial council adopted rules of procedure for original jurisdiction cases (attachment 1). Thus, the AMA is now in a position to exercise an effective role in disciplining its members.

MEDICAL TESTIMONY

Developments in the law have placed increased emphasis on the importance of medical testimony in the administration of justice. Today, about 70 percent of all litigation invokes medical testimony. The American Medical Association has kept pace with this development by carrying out an educational program to encourage physicians to live up to their responsibility by cooperating with attorneys and with the courts.

As early as 1882 the AMA was interested in assuring impartial medical testimony. In 1928 the association endorsed the principle that in civic and criminal cases the court should appoint expert medical witnesses.

At the AMA's annual meeting in New York, June 25–30, 1961, the association's house of delegates approved supplementary report J of the board of trustees on nonpartisan medical testimony. The report resolved that the house of delegates endorse the principle of nonpartisan medical testimony in the trial of personal injury litigation. It also resolved that the AMA invite the American Bar Association and other national bar and judicial organizations to participate in a joint venture of formulating a model plan for nonpartisan medical testimony.

On November 20, 1962, representatives of the American Bar Association, the American Judicature Society, the National Association of Claimants' Counsel, and the International Association of Insurance Counsel participated in a conference on impartial medical testimony at AMA headquarters. Final agreement on a model plan was not reached, but substantial progress was made. For your information, I am enclosing the latest draft of the model plan proposed by the American Medical Association (attachment 2).

Thus far, there are nine impartial medical testimony plans in operation. These are in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Baltimore, Cleveland, Utah, Los Angeles, Illinois, and New Jersey.

In addition to impartial medical testimony plans, physicians, and attorneys at the State and local level have established joint committees to screen cases where physicians have been accused of malpractice. These professional liability screening plans have been established in Idaho; Pima County (Phoenix), Ariz.; California; Scott County, Iowa; Bucks County, Pa.; Virginia; Washoe County (Reno), Nev.; and Salt Lake County, Utah.

The American Medical Association sponsors biennially a medicolegal symposium at which it stresses physician cooperation with the courts and better physician-attorney relations. At the last medicolegal symposium in New York, April 28–29, 1961, David B. Allman, M.D., Atlantic City, N.J., a past president of the AMA, said in a keynote speech:

"The physician must realize that he has an obligation to himself, to his profession and to the public to cooperate with the legal profession and the judiciary in providing sound, impartial medical testimony under whatever mechanism exists in his particular geographic area."

The next meeting of this type will be held by the AMA at Miami Beach on March 8–9, 1963. It is anticipated that over 1,000 physicians and attorneys will attend.

MR. OLIVER FIELD'S COMMENTS

During your questioning of Mr. Field on the matter of aspirin, he made the following statement: "* * * Aspirin, in order to be labeled as aspirin, must meet the requirements or the standards of the United States Pharmacopoeia. Otherwise, the shipper would be subject to the Food and Drug Act for misbranding his product. Now, the truth is if you buy it for 10 cents a hundred, or a dollar a hundred, it is all the same."

This remark prompted the United Press International to report in a January 16 dispatch: "The American Medical Association confirmed today that aspirin is aspirin, despite the price."

For the record, I would like to state the association's position on this matter.

It is true that a product, in order to be labeled as aspirin, must meet the requirements of the United States Pharmacopoeia. But it is equally true that these are minimum standards and drug products labeled as aspirin are not all the same.

There is a mistaken belief that the active ingredient as a chemical product is the sole basis for the effectiveness of a pharmaceutical product. Actually, the physiological response to the administration of a given drug product is frequently a function of both the way in which the drug is made and the particular dosage form of the active ingredient.

The medical profession recognizes the varying standards in the manufacturing of drug products and is aware of the integrity of brand-name products. It knows that the manner and conditions under which a drug product is manufactured may be as important as the active chemical ingredients.

The association's house of delegates, at its annual meeting in New York, June 25–30, 1961, approved resolution No. 82, entitled "Opposition to Compulsory Use of Generic Names in Prescribing Drugs." This resolution stated in part:

"Whereas passage of any legislation requiring pharmaceuticals to be sold under generic names would place public health in jeopardy; when human life is at stake, the strength, purity, and quality of a drug is of critical importance; and

"Whereas all drugs containing the same active ingredients are not identical; drugs having the same active ingredients and subject to the same standards may vary in more than 24 different respects and still be entitled to share the same generic name; * * *: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the house of delegates of the American Medical Association go on record in opposition to legislative and administrative mandates which would compel physicians to prescribe drugs, or require pharmaceuticals to be sold, by generic name only."

As you can see, there has been some misunderstanding on this matter, and I hope this clears it for the record.

In closing, I again want to thank you for allowing the American Medical Association to testify before your committee. If we may be of further assistance to you in your current inquiry, please do not hesitate to call on the association.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. L. BLASINGAME, M.D.

THE BAYER CO.,
New York, N.Y., February 20, 1963.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In your presence on January 14, before the Senate Special Subcommittee on Aging, Mr. Oliver Field, director, Department of Investigation of the American Medical Association, stated:

"Now, the truth is if you buy it (aspirin tablets) for 10 cents a hundred, or a dollar a hundred, it is all the same" (transcript p. 71).

Senator, this is not the truth. This is a serious error and one which should certainly be corrected in the interests of the American public of all ages and, particularly, in the interests of many of your constituents.

You are probably aware that our plant in Trenton manufactures all the Bayer aspirin tablets used in the United States. Perhaps you are not aware that on the basis of Bayer aspirin production in Trenton alone, more aspirin tablets are manufactured in the great State of New Jersey than in any other State in the United States and, indeed, more than in any other State or country in the entire world. In the year 1962 more than 6½ billion Bayer aspirin tablets were manufactured in our plant in Trenton.

We understand that Dr. Blasingame, executive vice president of the American Medical Association, and on behalf of that organization, has written to Senator PATRICK MCNAMARA as chairman of the Special Committee on Aging pointing out that Mr. Field's statement was actually contrary to the view of the American Medical Association and explaining that the medical profession recognizes and relies on the fact that products composed of the same chemical ingredients are by no means the same in physiological activity and effectiveness. I commend this correspondence to you and to the committee.

Because of the importance of this matter and the wide publicity which Mr. Field's statement has received I do not think it should be concluded without a statement from our company whose product has been disparaged and who, after all, is the world's leading authority on aspirin. Although excellent and correct in every way, Dr. Blasingame's letter does not and cannot call upon the wealth of factual background and experience which we have at our command. Accordingly, I would like to develop certain features of this subject for you.

I assume that everyone would concede that all items in a given generic class are not necessarily the same. All aspirin is not the same for very much the same reason that—to cite a few examples—all automobiles are not the same, that all radios and television sets are not the same, and that all brands of chocolate ice cream are not the same.

Important differences between Bayer Aspirin tablets and other aspirin tablets result from qualitative differences in basic raw materials, in manufacturing and packaging methods, in the skill, care, and experience of manufacturing personnel, in particular product specifications and in the number and types of controls imposed.

Let's look at some of these differences and see what they mean.

Bayer Aspirin tablets differ from aspirin tablets made to minimum U.S. pharmacopoeia standards in purity, in stability, and in their resulting uniformity of therapeutic effectiveness and performance. They also differ in their relative freedom from acetic acid odor, in the rate and uniformity of disintegration and in the uniformity of available fine particles during and at the end of disintegration. Among the reasons for the rapid disintegration of Bayer Aspirin tablets are the specific proportions of special corn starch, the unique waterless method by which the acetylsalicylic acid itself is made, as well as the use of unique apparatus and methods in the tableting process.

From the beginning of the manufacturing process until the tablet leaves the plant, Bayer scientists perform over 100 separate laboratory tests to insure the uniformity, quality, potency, and purity of Bayer Aspirin tablets for adults. Over 200 such tests are made in connection with Bayer Aspirin for children.

The Bayer method and technique of preparing, manufacturing, and tableting aspirin tablets is distinctive and, in many important respects, is substantially different from and much more expensive than that of all other manufacturers.

Aspirin was first introduced in the United States by our Bayer Co. at the turn of the century. We put Bayer Aspirin out in tablet form in 1915. Unlike most other manufacturers of aspirin tablets, we make our own tablets from the ground up. Moreover, the entire Bayer Aspirin production is used in Bayer Aspirin tablets and not sold under any other brand name. Although the chemical configuration of Bayer Aspirin is no different from that of aspirin that meets U.S. Pharmacopoeia specifications, Bayer Aspirin has always been made by a unique process—a process quite different from that used in the manufacture of the other brands of aspirin that are on the market. In the acetylation of salicylic acid to make aspirin, no water or moisture—aqueous moisture—ever comes in contact with the Bayer product. Pharmacologists will tell you that aspirin is highly sensitive to moisture and that moisture will quickly break it down to free salicylic acid and acetic acid which is irritating.

Bayer control specifications show that all Bayer Aspirin and Bayer Aspirin tablets exceed U.S. Pharmacopoeia requirements in at least the 12 particulars described on the breakdown attached.

By imposing very careful controls Bayer is able to produce a minimum of 20 million Bayer Aspirin tablets a day and yet it is able to insure their uniformity, high quality, purity and effectiveness. Doubtless, no other manufacturer attempts to maintain such close range specifications.

In order to provide you with current data actually comparing Bayer Aspirin and other brands of aspirin, on January 21 we had our Control personnel in Trenton make random purchase of 12 different brands of aspirin, including Bayer. These purchases were made in nine different retail outlets in the Trenton area.

Routine analysis showed that the Bayer Aspirin met or exceeded all U.S. Pharmacopoeia standards and also met all of Bayer's own higher standards. Of the other 11 brands, 3 had one or more broken tablets, 2 had one or more tablets spotted with grease, 3 had an acetic odor, 3 were offwhite in color, only 1 was enclosed in a carton with a separate direction circular, 9 had no outer carton, and 2 had either an illegible or no control number.

Quite apart from this survey we know that Bayer aspirin is the only aspirin which reaches the consumer in a sealed carton. The fact that Bayer's carton is sealed and that detailed directions are enclosed is more important than it may seem at first. Besides making a pharmaceutically elegant package and providing precise and complete directions and other information conducive to proper and safe usage, this method of packaging serves to protect the product from damage in transit, from deterioration while held in stock, and from tampering at any point in the channels of distribution.

Other shortcomings in the 11 other brands of aspirin analyzed were these: One failed the U.S.P. minimum standard for weight variation, three barely passed the U.S.P. minimum for free salicylic acid and, of course, failed to meet the Bayer specifications, four did not meet the Bayer specification for aspirin grainage, and three failed to meet the Bayer specification for disintegration time.

Although these differences clearly suggest that further important differences would be found if further analysis and tests were conducted, I think the above is sufficient to demonstrate that while "all aspirin is not the same," all Bayer aspirin is—and that this is important.

In closing I would like to extend again to you, Senator, and to your staff as well as to the Special Committee on Aging, a standing invitation to visit our plant in Trenton and see for yourself the great care, skill, and experience that go into the manufacture of Bayer Aspirin tablets. Just call or write to me and we shall surely be able to accommodate your busy schedule.

Respectfully yours,
J. N. Cooke, *President*.

ACETYLSALICYLIC ACID U.S. PHARMACOPOEIA	BAYER ASPIRIN
1. Contains not less than 99.5 percent of acetylsalicylic acid.	Contains not less than 99.9 percent of acetylsalicylic acid under such test (one-fifth of permitted variance).
2. White crystals.	Crystals are of the purest white. Crystals initially produced do not thereafter need recrystallization.
3. Tabular or needlelike crystals, or crystalline powder.	Special flake shape and needle shape (i.e., slender and elegant crystals tapered at both ends); flakes translucent and unctuous.
4. Weight loss on drying: 0.5 percent permissible maximum.	Bone dry; no weight loss.
5. Residue on ignition (i.e., inorganic residue): permissible maximum 0.05 percent.	Average residue is 0.025 percent (one-half of maximum).
6. Chloride (an impurity) 0.014 percent i.e., 140 parts per million permissible maximum.	Chloride content of Bayer Aspirin never exceeds 0.007 percent. i.e., 70 parts per million (one-half of amount permitted).
7. Sulfate (very common impurity): 400 parts per million permissible maximum.	Two hundred parts per million Bayer maximum (one-half of amount permitted). Since sulfate is considered an impurity, Bayer does not even use sulfuric acid as a catalyst although it is an excellent catalyst and is used in industry.
8. Free salicylic acid: 0.1 percent permissible maximum.	Thirty-five one-thousandths percent Bayer maximum (three times better than U.S. Pharmacopoeia.
9. Heavy metals: 10 parts per million permissible maximum.	Five parts per million Bayer maximum (one-half of amount permitted).

ACETYLSALICYLIC ACID TABLETS U.S. PHARMACOPOEIA	BAYER ASPIRIN TABLETS
1. There must be 95 to 105 percent of labeled amount of acetylsalicylic acid (4.75–5.25 grain permissible potency variation in each tablet; i.e., .50 permissible potency variation).	Always 100 to 105 percent of Bayer labeled amount of acetylsalicylic acid (5.0–5.25 grain; only .25 potency variation; i.e., every tablet contains a minimum of five grains).
2. Free salicylic acid (i.e., undesirable free salicylic acid in tablet on basis of aspirin content): 0.15 percent permissible maximum (USP permits 50 percent increase in free salicylic acid to allow for deterioration of aspirin powder during manufacture into tablets).	Thirty-five one-thousandths percent Bayer maximum (four times better) (percentage of free salicylic acid same as in powder; Bayer does not take advantage of U.S. Pharmacopoeia allowance).
3. Disintegration: Must be complete in 5 minutes. (Until October 1960 was 15 minutes.)	Starts to disintegrate in less than 2 seconds. Complete disintegration within 30 seconds maximum.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, each year many thousands of small business firms, with nowhere else to turn, seek assistance from the Small Business Administration, that independent agency established by Congress to safeguard the welfare of the Nation's 4,500,000 small business enterprises.

The 13th annual report of the Select Committee on Small Business, which was filed by the committee chairman, my distinguished colleague from Alabama, on April 3, recites in persuasive detail the accomplishments of the Small Business Administration in its efforts to make it possible for small concerns to exist competitively side by side with their larger rivals. The report sets forth the progress the SBA has made in assisting small firms to obtain needed financial assistance, to secure a fair share of Government purchases, and to improve their skills as managers of business enterprises.

It is not surprising, Mr. President, that the more successful the Small Business Administration is in achieving its objectives, the more criticism it invites from quarters not noted for their sympathy with the struggles of small businessmen to survive in the highly competitive climate of the 1960's.

One such recent attack on the financial assistance programs of the SBA appeared in the Washington Daily News. I do not believe that the point of view expressed in this series of articles accurately reflects the opinions about the Small Business Administration of the vast majority of small businessmen. In support of this belief, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a comment on this series of articles from the National Federation of Independent Business, a nationwide organization having nearly 200,000 small businessmen as members.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Small Business Agency Essential

I reviewed with considerable interest your recent series on the Small Business Administration by Dickson Preston.

Bringing this subject matter out in the open may prove a blessing in disguise; that is, to make certain that the administration of the act be kept along the original planning of Congress. This agency was created to be a help to efficient independent business where their long-term financial needs were not available through regular financial circles.

Generally speaking, loan programs of banks are more or less controlled by Federal or State laws on long-term capital loans. Due to this condition, there was need for the creation of the Small Business Administration Act.

The National Federation of Independent Business has a nationwide membership of close to 200,000 independent business and professional men. From the very first, as a result of majority vote of our entire membership, it led the fight in support of the legislation (1953). During the life of the agency we took the same position in urging that it be made a permanent agency.

Those of us who have had actual business experience in owning and operating an independent business well know during the depression years the inability of the average, efficient independent business to get any kind of relief or even an entry into RFC to present its story.

There has never been any question of short-term loans from banks to small business where credit responsibility was satisfactory; when it came to long-term capital loans it was a different situation.

The establishment of the Small Business Administration will be found to be the outgrowth of congressional action in long-overdue recognition to small business, starting with the establishment of the Small Business Committees in the House and the Senate in 1940. This resulted in waking up many of the Federal agencies to the fact that efficient small business must get due recognition, the same as all other segments in our overall economy.

George J. Burger,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business.

BOSTON—AN ALL AMERICAN CITY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am very pleased to learn that the National Municipal League and Look magazine have chosen Boston, Mass., as 1 of the 11 All America Cities for 1962. This marks the third time that this honor has been conferred upon Boston since the contest was inaugurated 14 years ago. Only one other American city, Philadelphia, has received this honor three times. The All America Cities jury has also chosen the city of Medford, Mass., for honorable mention in this contest.

This is certainly a well-deserved tribute to the people of the Greater Boston area who have been working so hard to bring about major improvements in their city. Boston is a city with deep roots in the past, the locale of many of the important events which took place during our Nation's formative years. But Boston is also very much a city with a grip on the present and an eye to the future. Integrated with the many historical landmarks are new massive construction projects which will build Boston into one of the Nation's most modern cities.

The educational institutions in the Boston area are among the finest in the country. There are a total of 47 institutions of higher learning in the Metropolitan Boston area. These schools in addition to providing superlative educational opportunities for their students, are a constructive force for good in the intellectual life of the general Boston community.

Supplementing the cultural opportunities afforded by the colleges and universities in and around the city are many outstanding art galleries and museums. The Boston Symphony Orchestra has earned worldwide acclaim in the field of music. The legitimate theater is well represented in the area and Boston audiences are given an opportunity to see many plays and musicals before the latter open on Broadway.

Private research firms both in the city of Boston as well as along the developing Route 128 are making the area a world center of research and development, working for the advancement of space technology, our national defense programs, medical science, and commercial and industrial improvements.

Boston's potential for continued development and improvement is unlimited. I join with the National Municipal League and Look magazine in saluting the people of Boston for the fine work they have done thus far.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the article which appeared in the April 23 edition of Look magazine, dealing with Boston, be printed as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

All America Cities—Boston, Mass.

Boston, 333 years old, is ancient as American cities go, but it has kept its youthful vigor. A variety of citizen and business groups are facing up to the problem of urban blight: Community associations have worked out a $120 million urban-renewal program; the chamber of commerce raised $150,000 for a study of the aged waterfront area, and plans are being made for intensive redevelopment; businessmen in one part of the city have donated $58,000 to plan improvements for their neighborhood. The teenage organization for urban renewal spent hours repainting benches on historic Boston Common.

The Citizens Committee for a Cleaner Boston has also sparked massive cleanup drives. A mayor's department of citizens relations has been established to help citizen groups carry out their projects. The action for Boston community development, a nonprofit organization using Ford Foundation funds, is tackling the social complications arising out of urban renewal, as well as juvenile delinquency, the school dropout problem and training of unskilled youths.

DEATH OF YITZCHAK BEN-ZVI PRESIDENT OF ISRAEL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the people of Israel and indeed the entire world are today mourning the passing of the second President of the State of Israel, Yitzchak Ben-Zvi.

Throughout his 78 years of life Yitzchak Ben-Zvi worked with tireless and selfless devotion and energy to establish and maintain the free State of Israel. Since 1952, when he assumed the Presidential Office following the death of Chaim Weizman, he has led the State of Israel with the quiet determination of a true statesman, seeking his reward only in the continued strengthening and solidarity of the Israeli nation.

I extend my heartfelt sympathies to the family of this eminent gentleman, and to the nation of Israel, which will miss his wise counsel.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of April 24 be printed as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Yitzchak Ben-Zvi

Nation-builder, statesman and historian, Israeli President Yitzchak Ben-Zvi, left an unforgettable impression upon his country. The deep grief that now grips Israel over his death at 78 is evidence of the affection and respect he had won among his fellow citizens. It was characteristic of this simple, devoted man that he protested publicly a proposed salary increase to $6,000 recently, and when this failed he donated half of that salary to research. In any history of the State of Israel, Yitzchak Ben-Zvi must be remembered as one who helped accomplish miracles despite enormous odds.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS ON FACULTY SALARIES CHARGED TO GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Dr. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, recently provided me with a statement of the position of the American Council on Education with respect to the recommendations on faculty salaries charged to Government contracts.

Because of the widespread interest in this subject, both among institutions of higher education and Government agencies concerned, I feel it would be helpful to Senators to have this information available. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the recommendations to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks together with the names of the committee members of the Committee on Sponsored Research of the American Council on Education.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Recommendations on Faculty Salaries Charged to Government Contracts—A Statement of the Committee on Sponsored Research Endorsed by the Commission on Federal Relations, American Council on Education

The Committee on Sponsored Research of the American Council on Education has been aware for some time of the growing concern in certain universities, and in a number of Government agencies, about the lack of uniformity in policies relating to the billing of the Government for a portion of the salaries paid to regular faculty members for their work on sponsored research grants and contracts.

The committee believes that it is sound policy to regard the prorated portion of the salaries of faculty members working on such grants or contracts as a proper direct cost of research, and we believe that the Government should pay the full costs of the research work it sponsors in colleges and universities.

Nevertheless, such a wide variety of procedures and practices has developed among universities and various Government agencies that misunderstandings have arisen—and some abuses may have arisen—causing certain Government representatives to propose more uniform and rigid regulations covering salary reimbursement. Such rigid or uniform regulations would not recognize the differing situations present in various institutions, and would partially destroy the flexibility essential for good relations between the universities and the Government.

On the other hand, the universities themselves must recognize that there must be one overall guiding principle that is rigidly adhered to; namely, the Government should not be billed for more than that share of the total annual salary of a faculty member that is represented by the effort actually expended on the sponsored research project or projects. Careful adherence to this principle would avoid abuses and misunderstandings, as well as unreasonable intrauniversity salary competition for support by Government funds.

Specifically, the committee proposes the following recommendations:

1. It would be ideal if the salaries of all faculty members carrying on scholarly work throughout the calendar year were on a 12-month basis, including 1 month paid vacation. Such a salary basis simplifies the identification of the percent of effort charged to extramural sponsors. Thus, if a faculty member devotes 50 percent of his effort during the 12-month period to a project, the university should be reimbursed for 50 percent of his total 12-month base salary. Thus, no portion of a faculty member's salary is contingent on Government support of his research.

2. Wherever it is not feasible for the salaries of faculty members to be converted to a 12-month basis, the percent of effort devoted to sponsored projects should be determined for the academic year and the university should request reimbursement for the corresponding portion of each salary.

3. The additional amount requested by the university for summer salary should be determined by the percent of effort and period the faculty member devotes to a project. Thus, if a faculty member devotes 100 percent of effort to research during certain summer months, the university should claim the appropriate one-ninth, two-ninths, or three-ninths of the base salary, depending on whether the faculty member works 1, 2, or 3 months. Other ratios may also be justified, but a claim of 3 months' salary for less than 3 months' 100-percent effort must be avoided, as should arrangements which charge the sponsor for more than a properly prorated share of the vacation allowance. Faculty work schedules allowing for no vacation should not be regularly permitted.

4. If the sponsors of projects require periodic reports on percent of effort, they should be called for only at the end of each academic period (for example, quarter, semester, trimester).

5. In consonance with the principles expressed in the foregoing paragraphs, universities should avoid extra compensation (compensation above the full-time base salary) for work on special projects during the academic year. The base university salary should include compensation for all university duties (for example, teaching, research, administration, intrauniversity consulting). Exceptions to this rule should be made only for very compelling reasons and in unusual cases.

COMMITTEE ON SPONSORED RESEARCH,
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Lee A. DuBridge, president, California Institute of Technology, chairman.

Fred R. Cagle, vice president, Tulane University.

Lowell T. Coggeshall, vice president, University of Chicago.

Milton S. Eisenhower, president, the Johns Hopkins University.

Clifford C. Furnas, president, State University of New York at Buffalo.

T. Keith Glennan, president, Case Institute of Technology.

Virgil M. Hancher, president, State University of Iowa.

Laurence R. Lunden, vice president, business administration, University of Minnesota.

Logan Wilson, president, American Council on Education, ex officio.

Earl W. Lindveit, staff associate, American Council on Education, secretary to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for the purpose of considering nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with the nominations of persons to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of persons to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp. be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to these nominations en bloc?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there are many Senators who are interested in this matter and involved in it. If the majority leader is agreeable, it seems to me there should be a quorum call at this time, so that other Senators may be put on notice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has read my thoughts. With the Senator's permission, and the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, every Senator will recall the extensive discussion surrounding the consideration of the communications satellite legislation in the last session. Under section 302 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, it is provided that the President of the United States shall appoint incorporators, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve as the initial board of directors until the first annual meeting of the stockholders or until their successors are elected and qualify.

It will be recalled that the President submitted the names of the incorporators to the Senate in the closing days of the 87th Congress, and it was extremely difficult to conduct hearings and report the nominations in time for action by the Senate before adjournment. It has been suggested that recess appointments be given to the nominees so that the business of proceeding with the establishment of the Communications Satellite Corp. would proceed and that the Senate would act on the nominations in the 88th Congress. On January 30, 1963, the President submitted the following persons to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp., which nominations were referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce:

John T. Connor, of New Jersey.
George Feldman, of New York.
Edgar F. Kaiser, of California.
David M. Kennedy, of Illinois.
George Killion, of California.
Beardsley Graham, of Kentucky.
Sam Harris, of New York.
A. Byrne Litschgi, of Florida.
Leonard Marks, of the District of Columbia.
Bruce G. Sundlun, of Rhode Island.
Sidney J. Weinberg, of New York.
Leonard Woodcock, of Michigan.

On February 28, 1963, the President submitted two additional persons to be incorporators, Leo D. Welch, of New York, and Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to bring the number of incorporators to 14.

On March 11, 1963, the Commerce Committee held hearings on these nominations, at which time all 14 nominees appeared and were available for questioning by the committee. Copies of those hearings have been printed and are available. The committee considered the nominations in executive session and reported them favorably on March 12, 1963, and subsequently they were referred to the Aeronautical and Space Science Committee. Hearings were held by that committee on the nominations on March 19, 1963, and so far as I know, they were unanimously reported favorably the same day. Full and ample opportunity was given to everyone to appear before the committee with reference to these nominations.

Having been in charge of the original bill which was debated before the Senate for a prolonged period of time last year, I realize that reputable, honorable, and sincere Members of this body were opposed to the formation of this private corporation, Senators who still remain sincere, Senators who today remain opposed to the formation of that kind of private corporation. The fact that they continue to be opposed only accentuates their original sincerity in being opposed to the formation of the corporation.

The question before the Senate today is not whether there should be a Communications Satellite Corp.; that question was decided by Congress last year.

It was decided by this body by a vote of 66 to 11. As I see it, the only question is as to the competence of the nominees and their qualifications to be incorporators of the corporation. I daresay, with deference to the entire body of our American society, that if the President of the United States were to search all over again for 14 individuals who could competently fulfill this responsibility, he could do no better than he has already done.

The question before the Senate is the honesty, the integrity, the ability of the men who have been selected. I repeat, the President of the United States, if he were to act in this situation again, and if any Member of the Senate were called upon to assist him in selecting 14 men more competently qualified, we could not end with a better group than the group of nominees whom the Senate is now considering.

With that short statement, I urge upon the Senate to consider and, to discuss at length, and finally to approve the nominations made by the President of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I know of no one who intends to question the fitness of the persons whose names are before the Senate. The present question the Senate must resolve is the propriety, the advisability, and the constitutionality of the confirmation by the Senate of the nominations of officers and directors of an entirely private corporation.

I should like to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island whether the Communications Satellite Corp. has been created.

Mr. PASTORE. We all know that it has been. The Senate voted on that question last year. The corporation was created by an act of Congress.

Mr. GORE. No; I wish to correct the distinguished Senator. The act authorized the creation of the corporation.

Mr. PASTORE. Did the Senator from Tennessee ask me about the act or about the articles of incorporation?

Mr. GORE. I asked the Senator if the corporation had been effectuated; if it had been brought into being.

Mr. PASTORE. So far as the articles of incorporation are concerned, they have been filed.

Mr. GORE. What are the assets of the corporation?

Mr. PASTORE. Why does the Senator wish to know?

Mr. GORE. I know the answer. The corporation has no assets.

Mr. PASTORE. Then why ask me, if the Senator already knows?

Mr. GORE. I find it remarkably strange that a corporation without $1 in assets should obtain a line of credit of $5 million, should immediately start paying the chairman of its board $10,000 a month, and should employ another gentleman, who was previously in Government employment, at a rate something like four times the amount of his previous salary.

Mr. PASTORE. I thought the Senator wished to ask me a question. Now he is making a speech.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator find that strange?

Mr. PASTORE. It is not a question of whether I find it strange. Is there anything irregular about it? Has there been any contravention of law? Is there anything about the nominations which offends the President of the United States? Certainly the nominations do not shock or offend me. These nominees have been commissioned to fulfill certain responsibilities, and that has been done with the approbation of the President of the United States. If all this activity is intended to lead people to suspicion, certainly I will not join in giving comfort to such suspicions.

Mr. GORE. I was not seeking to cast either aspersion or suspicion; I was trying to illustrate the unusual character of the question soon to be before the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that the Senator from Tennessee did not like this corporation from the start. He was honest in his point of view. He was honest in his belief. He still is. He regrets very much that the Senate did not go along with his views. I realize all that.

But the fact which remains before the Senate today is that we have a corporation. The corporation does have incorporators. It must have them. The incorporators have filed their articles of incorporation, with the approval of the President of the United States.

The President of the United States has submitted these nominations. The nominees did not submit them. I did not submit them. The President of the United States submitted the nominations to the Senate.

The question now is, Are these nominees competent to assume this responsibility? Or should their nominations be rejected by the Senate?

If we are to get into the unusual character of the corporation, I am afraid we shall be starting to warm up, all over again, the filibuster of last year. I hope we will not warm it over again.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The question soon to be before the Senate involves neither the competency of the nominees before the Senate nor the merits or demerits of the corporation which the Senator from Rhode Island says, "We have." I might inquire, since the Senator acknowledges that the corporation is something we already have, why is it necessary for the Senate to confirm the nominations of private businessmen in order to accomplish the purposes of the corporation?

Mr. PASTORE. Because that is what the Senate voted. It is in the law. The law requires that the President of the United States shall submit the names of the incorporators, whose nominations shall be subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

I realize that the Senator from Tennessee intends to argue that the incorporators are not U.S. officers, and for that reason are not subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. But I remind the Senator from Tennessee that he should have made that argument last year. He did not make it. At that time he should have submitted an amendment to change that situation. When the original bill came from the White House, such a provision was not contained in it. It was the Senate, through its committees, that wrote in the provision that the nominations should be subject to confirmation. The Senate did that.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee did, in fact, raise that question. Unfortunately, the Senate at that time had got itself into a position in which many serious questions involving the proposed legislation were not given serious consideration.

The question I raise—indeed, the question is fundamental—is that an act passed by Congress containing a provision requiring Senate confirmation in no way can or does change the Constitution of the United States. The Senator from Rhode Island knows perfectly well that there is in the Constitution but one provision relating to the exercise of advice and consent by the Senate. I should like to read it to the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. I am already familiar with it.

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator let me refresh his memory?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not need refreshment; I already know the provision.

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator be willing to have the RECORD of the Senate contain the provision?

Mr. PASTORE. All right. That is different. If the Senator wishes to read the provision for the RECORD, that is all right; but he need not read it for my benefit, because I already know it.

Mr. GORE. Article II, section 2, provides that the President "shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law; but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments."

That provision was not included in the Constitution as a mere formality or offhand statement. A study of the debates at the Constitutional Convention reveals that this question was debated at length. No authority is given to the Senate—and this is the only provision in the Constitution which refers specifically to confirmation—to consider and confirm the nominations of businessmen engaged in a private venture for profit.

What is sought in this instance is to enmesh the Senate into the organization, the selection of the management of a private corporation organized for profit.

I ask the Senator: If that is done in this case, unprecedented in the history of our country as it is, where will it stop?

Shall the Senate next be considering the confirmation of nominations of officials of the United States Steel Corp.—perhaps the nomination of Mr. Roger Blough in the event he were nominated?

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from Tennessee want me to answer his question?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope the Senator from Tennessee is becoming unduly alarmed; I think he is blowing this matter up into undue proportions. As a matter of fact, no one here would suggest that the President would begin to appoint the director——

Mr. GORE. Well, this is a beginning.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope the Senator will permit me to finish my statement.

Mr. GORE. Of course.

Mr. PASTORE. If I may continue, I was saying that no one here is suggesting that the President is going to begin to appoint as the director the head of the United States Steel Corp. or the head of General Motors Corp.

As a matter of fact, this corporation could not come into being except through an act of Congress. That is point No. 1.

Point No. 2 is that we keep talking about "purely private." But such expressions are cliches. I do not know what is "purely private" or what is just "private." But the Government and the people of the United States have an interest in this corporation; there is no question about that.

No. 3, what the Senator from Tennessee is actually saying is that if the President had the authority to make these appointments, without confirmation by the Senate being required, they would be valid appointments; but that because we of the Senate provided that they would have to be confirmed by the Senate, and inasmuch as the President said, "All right; if that is what you want, I will go along with you," now we are saying he is wrong.

But we are the ones who wrote into the law the provision that these appointments by the President would have to be confirmed by the Senate. We wrote that provision into the law; the President did not ask us to write it in.

The Senator from Tennessee is actually saying that if we had not done that, these appointments would have been constitutional; but that because we did do that, something unconstitutional has been done. I say that is a rather specious argument.

Furthermore, if any Senator wishes to take the position that these appointments are unconstitutional, he has a perfect right to say so and to believe so; but, at the same time, Senators should give to other Senators the benefit of sincerity in their beliefs.

I hold in my hand a memorandum of the Attorney General of the United States, which says that provision of the law is absolutely constitutional, and that if the U.S. Senate joins hands with the President of the United States by confirming these nominations, the nominees will be lawfully appointed and selected; and they will then have fully qualified for their office. Thus we shall have done something in furtherance of the mandate of the law itself.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I respectfully submit that in the statement the distinguished and able Senator from Rhode Island has just now made, he has committed some errors. First, he said this corporation could not come into being without a special act of Congress. As a matter of fact, the articles of incorporation were filed pursuant to the laws of the District of Columbia. A satellite communications corporation could have been created without the passage of the special act of Congress. Indeed, it was chartered under the laws of the District of Columbia.

What are the facts? The facts are that without a special act of Congress, exemption from the antitrust laws could not have been effected for the communication carriers. Without a special act of Congress, authority of a private corporation to enter into international negotiations, on behalf of the United States, but for its own private profit and benefit, would not have existed. A special act of Congress was necessary.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask the Senator from Tennessee to wait just a moment, please, before he goes any further. He is speaking in my time.

He began by saying that I was in error, and that the corporation could not have come into being without an act of Congress; but now he is saying that Congress did pass a special act.

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator from Rhode Island be willing——

Mr. PASTORE. I ask the Senator from Tennessee not to say that I was in error, but simply to state his own opinion. He should not say on the floor of the Senate that the Senator from Rhode Island is wrong and is in error. He should simply say what he believes, and should let the people judge who is right and who is wrong.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. No offense is committed when a Senator makes an error. Many of us are at times in error. Now and then I find myself in error.

Mr. PASTORE. I think the Senator from Tennessee is in error now.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In order to complete the point I was making, I say my distinguished friend was in error——

Mr. PASTORE. Again?

Mr. GORE. Or, rather, I say there is a point on which my distinguished friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, and I have a disagreement.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Tennessee; now he is being statesmanlike. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Well, I do not wish to become too statesmanlike in this particular instance, because statesmanship will not resolve this particular point.

To complete my statement on this point, let me say that the enactment of a special bill was necessary in order to give this particular corporation its unique privileges and unique opportunity, including monopolistic control of this new and vastly important medium of communication. A special statute was necessary in order to give exemption from the antitrust laws.

But I repeat that it was not necesssary to have a special act of Congress in order to bring a corporation into existence. Indeed, it was not created by that act of Congress. That act only authorized it to have these unique powers and privileges.

There are two more statements which the distinguished Senator——

Mr. PASTORE. But, first, will the Senator from Tennessee permit a question?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the question not before us today: whether the incorporators are qualified?

As to the organization of the corporation in the first place, I know how the Senator from Tennessee feels. We went all through that last year. The Senator from Tennessee now is arguing about the monopoly, the special privileges, and the unusual nature of the corporation. But last year we went all through that, and it is now a fait accompli.

If the Senator from Tennessee does not like it, I suppose all he needs to do is introduce a bill to repeal the action we took last year. But that is not the question which is before us at this time.

I know that Senators who are opposed to the corporation are going to discuss the nomination for 2 or 3 days, and I shall enjoy it as much as they will. But the fact is that Senators are losing sight of the real point. The real point here is the question of confirmation of these nominations. Whether a Senator likes the corporation or does not like it, is entirely aside from the question now before the Senate.

The only question before the Senate today is whether it should give its advice and consent to the nominations of these men.

I realize that the Senator from Tennessee will never like this arrangement. I know that; and I am not going to argue about it with him, because I give him the benefit of believing that he is sincere in his beliefs. But I am not going to stand here and begin—this year, all over again—answering questions about the monopolistic aspects of the corporation or about whether we are giving these people special privileges. That question is not before us now; we went all through it last year.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It was the Senator from Rhode Island who raised the question.

Mr. PASTORE. About what?

Mr. GORE. It was he who made the statement that the corporation could not have been created except for the special measure which Congress passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Is that wrong?

Mr. GORE. It is incorrect.

Mr. PASTORE. Why is it incorrect?

Mr. GORE. Because of the reasons I have already stated.

Mr. PASTORE. But all the Senator from Tennessee is saying is that we could not have given that authority to this corporation unless it had been included in an act of Congress; and that is precisely why we had to do that.

Furthermore, how could such a satellite be put into space unless the Government rendered its assistance; and Congress authorized that in this act.

How can the Senator from Tennessee say that there could have been a communications satellite corporation which would have amounted to anything, unless it had been done in this way?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have been replying to statements made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. A moment or so ago he said that the question before the Senate was the confirmation of the nominations of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. I agree. That is the question. But I do not agree that the question is upon the fitness or the qualifications of the nominees. The question is upon the propriety, advisability, and constitutionality of the Senate confirming nominations of officers and directors of an entirely private corporation, organized solely for profit.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to make a big compromise with my friend from Tennessee. May we agree to disagree?

Mr. GORE. On what?

Mr. PASTORE. On what the Senator from Tennessee has just said.

Mr. GORE. How can the Senator disagree with my previous statement?

Mr. PASTORE. Because I do disagree; and I have the inherent right to disagree.

Mr. GORE. I know of the great competence of the Senator from Rhode Island and his capability for reasoning. I wonder if he would mind stating why he disagrees with that statement.

Mr. PASTORE. First, no law is unconstitutional until the Supreme Court declares it to be unconstitutional. Time and time again the Congress has enacted laws which later were declared to be unconstitutional. Until they were declared unconstitutional, they were the sovereign law of our country. The Congress of the United States does not have the right to declare a law unconstitutional. It has only the right to repeal a law if it believes it to be unconstitutional. If my friend from Tennessee believes that the law is unconstitutional and should be repealed, he ought to introduce a bill to do so.

But I repeat. The question before the Senate today is as follows: Are the men whose nominations have been submitted to the Senate qualified to receive confirmation by the advice and consent of the Senate?

Beyond that point I admit no error, with due deference to my good friend from Tennessee. All I admit is that there is a sincere area of disagreement between him and me.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. With the highest of respect for the senior Senator from Rhode Island, not only as a gentleman, statesman and scholar, but also as a lawyer, I must respectfully suggest that he has just uttered strange legal philosophy. He has made statesments from which I can only infer that the Senate is under no compunction to conform to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Wait a moment. I would not even use the word "compunction."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has said that only the Supreme Court of the United States can determine questions of constitutionality.

Mr. PASTORE. Am I correct or not?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is incorrect.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator tell me why?

Mr. GORE. Soon there will be placed before the Presiding Officer of the Senate a point of order regarding the constitutionality of the proposed procedure. Under the powers vested in him, the Presiding Officer of the Senate may render a ruling on that point of order. The ruling of the Chair may be appealed to the Senate, and the Senate itself must reach its own conclusion as to the constitutionality, propriety, and correctness of the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator permit me to proceed for an additional minute?

Mr. PASTORE. This is on my time. Does the Senator state that we should give the Presiding Officer of the Senate authority to declare a statute unconstitutional?

Mr. GORE. Oh, no. That was not my point at all.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course not. I do not know what point the Senator is making. The Senator from Rhode Island reiterates that only the Supreme Court of the United States can declare a statutory provision of a federally passed law unconstitutional. That statement relates to the Vice President, the President pro tempore, and any other Senator who may occupy the chair of the Presiding Officer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator contend that the Senate should proceed to work its will irrespective of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. PASTORE. Of course not. I never said any such thing. I would never say such a thing, and the Senator from Tennessee knows that I would not make such a statement.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator find any provision in the Constitution which authorizes the Senate to participate in the selection of the officers of a private corporation through giving its approval in pursuance of the advice and consent clause of the Constitition?

Mr. PASTORE. I find nothing in the Constitution which prohibits such approval.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator find anything in the Constitution which authorizes such procedure?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; under the interpretation of the Attorney General's office; the Constitution authorizes the action.

Mr. GORE. Under the interpretation of the Attorney General of the United States?

Mr. PASTORE. I remind the Senator that at the time the Constitution was written the formation of a Communications Satellite Corp. and the naming of its incorporators were not contemplated. I hope the Senator will not ask me to find in the Constitution, which was written more than 150 years ago, a provision relating to the corporation. At that time we were not up in space. We are up there now. Today on the floor of the Senate we are up there in more ways than one.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has now taken another strange and unusual position, namely, that the Attorney General of the United States can determine the constitutionality of the measure.

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, no. He has not done so at all. He has rendered his interpretation of whether or not the provision to which I have referred is in contravention of the Constitution. That is all he has done. The Senator has a perfect right to give his opinion as to whether it is or not.

All I am saying is that the Congress of the United States cannot declare a law unconstitutional. Until such time as it is declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, it is the law of the land. I do not know how more simply I can say that.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. No statute can, in and of itself, change the Constitution. The Senator knows that.

Mr. PASTORE. I know that. Whoever said I thought differently?

Mr. GORE. A few moments ago the Senator said that he did not find in the Constitution any prohibition of such action as is proposed. That is a remarkably strange dictum. If one is to infer that the Senate can undertake to do anything and everything not specifically prohibited by the Constitution, that is tantamount to saying that there is really no need for a written Constitution.

Mr. PASTORE. I did not say that; and the Senator knows I did not say that. I do not know how I can better state my position. If we are to fence with semantics, if we are to use strained constructions of words, that is one thing; but all I am saying to my distinguished friend is that the power which we gave to the President is not in contravention of the Constitution, it is in perfect constitutional order. We asked for an interpretation from the Attorney General, and he agrees with that interpretation.

The Senator from Tennessee has a right to adopt any other interpretation he wishes. But are we not saying the same thing over and over again?

Mr. GORE. No.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand the point made by my friend from Tennessee. The point my friend from Tennessee makes is that because the Constitution provides that an officer or ambassador appointed by the President shall be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate, anybody else is precluded from coming to the Senate for advice and consent. That is what the Senator is saying.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In response, the Senator made the statement that he found nothing in the Constitution which prohibited it.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. This raises a question of delegated powers. Since the Senator has said that such questions are determined by the U.S. Supreme Court, I should like to read to him briefly from a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, if he will be so kind as to permit me. It is the decision of *Kansas* v. *Colorado*, 206 United States 46:

> The proposition that there are legislative powers affecting the Nation as a whole which belong to, although not expressed in, the grant of powers is in direct conflict with the doctrine that this is a government of enumerated powers.

Mr. PASTORE. Who disagrees with that? What does that prove?

Mr. GORE. It proves that the Senator was in error in the position he took.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think so. I can read the Constitution as well as can my good friend from Tennessee. I think the Attorney General can read the Constitution as well as can my good friend from Tennessee. We have both read it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. We have read it separately. We have read it together. We have reached a conclusion which is a little contrary to that of my friend from Tennessee. What is so wrong about that?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator said more than that. The Senator went on to say that the proper agency for determining the constitutionality of the question was the U.S. Supreme Court. I have just read to the Senator an excerpt from a decision of that Court, and now he wants to talk about the Attorney General again.

Mr. PASTORE. Does that decision say that the President of the United States cannot appoint the directors to the corporation and have their nominations submitted to the Senate for advice and consent?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Is that what the decision says?

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I asked the Senator a question. If he will answer my question, then I will yield. Does it say that?

Mr. GORE. The Senator must yield in order that I may answer the question.

Mr. PASTORE. Go ahead and answer it.

Mr. GORE. The decision says quite plainly that an assumption that the Congress has "legislative powers affecting the Nation as a whole which belong to, although not expressed in, the grant of powers" in the Constitution "is in direct conflict with the doctrine that this is a government of enumerated powers." I should like to read further from the decision.

Mr. PASTORE. Does it not also——

Mr. GORE. May I read further?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I read further:

> The 10th amendment * * * disclosed the widespread fear that the National Government might, under the pressure of a supposed general welfare, attempt to exercise powers which had not been granted.

Mr. PASTORE. Very well. Is not my friend from Tennessee actually saying that he assumes that the proposed procedure would be unconstitutional? When he assumes that it would be unconstitutional, he relates it to the Court opinion from which he has been reading. But before the Senator can make the statement that he is making, he must first assume that the act of the President in sending the nominations to the Senate for confirmation, and the activity on the part of the Senate by way of advice and consent, are unconstitutional activities. Once he has said that, he can say that this is an assumption of unlawful power.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Then he can read the decision. But he has to get over two big "ifs" before he gets to that conclusion.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is incorrect in three respects.

Mr. PASTORE. What did the Senator say?

Mr. GORE. I said that once again the Senator is incorrect.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator wish to leave it that way?

Mr. GORE. In three different respects.

Mr. PASTORE. That I am incorrect? Or that I disagree?

Mr. GORE. The Senator has made statements about the junior Senator from Tennessee; and with respect to those, I know he is incorrect.

Mr. PASTORE. I have never said the Senator was incorrect. I have not said he was in error.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I have never said that to any Senator on this floor.

Mr. GORE. There is nothing wrong in such a statement.

Mr. PASTORE. I have always said, "I disagree with you, and you may disagree with me." When a Senator stands on the floor of the Senate and says, "You are wrong and I am right," I think he is putting wings on himself.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am not sure I would know how to use them, or in which direction I might go if I had them.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator should not let them flutter around. We are up in space as it is.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has said that I assumed the proposed act was unconstitutional. The Senator said that in order to make that assumption I would have to assume that the President of the United States had committed an unconstitutional act.

Mr. PASTORE. In sending the nominations to the Senate; that is correct.

Mr. GORE. In sending the nominations to the Senate and in selecting these nominees. That is not the question I raise at all. I raise no question about the act of the President. The President has appointed individuals to positions in private corporations before. The President has previously appointed directors of partially public and partially private corporations. I do not raise that question. That is not the question involved.

The junior Senator from Tennessee is raising the question with all respect. There is no odium about the word "incorrect." I am saying that my distinguished friend from Rhode Island, distinguished and able as he is, is incorrect when he says that I assume that, and that I must assume that, in order to come to the question of the constitutionality of the proposed action of the Senate.

That is an accurate statement. I raise only the question of the propriety, advisability, and constitutionality of the action of the Senate. This is unprecedented. This question has never previously been raised on the Senate floor in the history of the United States. A fundamental question is involved.

If I have in any way offended my distinguished friend by saying he is in error or that he is incorrect, I apologize to him. No odium was intended. If one had to be odious to say that another was in error, none of us would be pleasant with his associates. I meant nothing offensive.

Mr. PASTORE. I know that. The Senator from Rhode Island does not take any offense. But I say it is in poor taste for a Senator to say to another Senator, "You are wrong," or "You are incorrect." For one Senator to say to another Senator that he is wrong, he must assume that he knows better, and that the other Senator is wrong and he is right. That is not the way to debate issues on the floor.

I can give and take as well as any other Senator. I am not afraid of anyone. I do not care who he is. I will debate any subject with any Senator that it is my responsibility to debate on the floor. But I hope I never reach the point where, in disagreeing with any of my colleagues, I say he is wrong or give the implication that what I am saying is right and what he is saying is wrong. All I have the responsibility to do on the floor of the Senate is to state my position, not only for the benefit of my colleagues who are present, but also for the benefit of the RECORD, so that Senators who read it can decide how to vote when the time comes to vote.

Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee this question: If the law had been enacted without the provision requiring the advice and consent of the Senate, would these incorporators lawfully be incorporators of the corporation? What is the Senator from Tennessee really opposing? I cannot put my finger on it.

Mr. GORE. I shall be glad to enlighten the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Did the Senator understand my question?

Mr. GORE. Yes. Confirmation by the Senate of such nominations is entirely unnecessary in the creation of the corporation. The corporation has already hired a president at $80,000. The corporation has already rented the most palatial estate in Washington or anywhere in this area. The corporation has also employed a man at $10,000 a month, though the corporation has no assets. The corporation has obtained a line of credit of $5 million, and has already received disbursements, according to my information and according to the record, of $500,000.

Is the corporation created? Is it in business? Why is it necessary for the Senate to confirm? I say to the Senator from Rhode Island that it is not necessary, except as provided by the statute.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course, that is a big "except," is it not?

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. What is the effect? I should like to give the Senator an illustration in answer to his question. I called Mr. Charyk, the president of the corporation, yesterday afternoon, and asked him upon what collateral the corporation had obtained a credit of $5 million. I will not undertake to quote his exact reply. I will, however, give the substance of his statement. He said it was an unusual loan, in that there was no collateral.

I asked him if there were any endorsements on the note. He said, "No." He repeated that it was an unusual loan. I remarked, in a pleasant way, that I had not been able to find that kind of banker. He said again, "This is an unusual situation."

I asked him upon what reasoning, in his opinion, the banks issued a credit of $5 million. The only answer he could give me was that the banks were convinced that the United States was promoting the satellite corporation.

This is the misunderstanding from which the mischief flows. Even the bankers are lending the corporation money, really upon the faith and credit of the U.S. Government. By this act the Senate is enmeshed, entrapped, embroiled, in the selection of the officers of the corporation, and ultimately in the operation of the corporation.

What will be the result when an unwary citizen buys stock, just as the banks have extended credit, upon the assumption that the United States is promoting this corporation, organized exclusively for the profit of stockholders?

I am glad to answer the Senator. That is the question. The question is whether the Senate should permit itself to be used in the selection of the directors of a private corporation organized entirely for profit; whether the U.S. Senate shall go beyond the bounds of the Constitution and lend its approval to this bizarre and unusual arrangement.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator through?

Mr. GORE. I shall desist. I thank the Senator for his patience.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Tennessee has made a very inspiring and stirring speech.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator from Tennessee thinks for one minute that he is going to compel the senior Senator from Rhode Island, to rise on the floor of the Senate and begin to defend any of the salaries that have been decided upon by the directors of the corporation, he is in complete disagreement with his friend from Rhode Island. That is not my job. That is not my responsibility. The decision of these men as to salaries is something for which they are accountable to the President of the United States, to the stockholders, when they come into being, and even to the banks, which look for the repayment of this money. This money will not come out of the Treasury of the United States.

All I am saying is that these nominations are before the Senate for confirmation. If any of the points raised by the Senator from Tennessee go to the fitness of the incorporators, either in connection with the telephone call he made to the president of the corporation or the unsatisfactory answer he received, that is his business.

All I am saying is that the question before this body is the fitness of these nominees. If the Senator thinks there has been any misbehavior, any misfeasance or malfeasance, he is going to the gravamen of the question. He is going to the issue. All the Senator from Rhode Island did was say to his friend from Tennessee that he believes what the President has done, in furtherance of his mandate under this law, a law that was passed by the Congress of the United States, is constitutional, not only in the opinion of the Senator from Rhode Island, but also in the opinion of the Attorney General.

Any Senator has a perfect right to question the qualifications and the character of the incorporators. I, for one, feel that they are all honorable men. I believe they are all trying to serve the corporation and fulfill the responsibilities of their office.

If the President of the United States were to conduct a new search for 14 more persons, he could not find 14 more desirable men.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am grateful to the distinguished and able Senator from Rhode Island for his courtesy in yielding. I point out once again the statement which the distinguished Senator has made, which I do not believe comports with the law or the facts.

The Senator, in referring to the salaries of certain officials of the corporation, said that they must account to the President and to the stockholders in the matter of salaries. That is not according to the Communications Satellite Act. The directors are not responsible to the President of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, yes, they are.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator wish that statement to be in the RECORD?

Mr. PASTORE. Of course they are responsible to the President.

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator to show one provision in the act, in the articles of incorporation, or in the laws of the District of Columbia, under which the corporation has been chartered, which places the fiduciary trust of the directors of this corporation in anyone except the stockholders. I say that the statement which the distinguished Senator has made is not on all fours with the law. The Attorney General has held that the incorporators and directors are entirely private, that they have no public responsibility. There is nothing in the act which makes them responsible to the President.

Mr. PASTORE. I can answer that question in two aspects. First, the president and the chairman of the board were recommended to the President of the United States by the incorporators.

They submitted the names to the President. I was not present, but I hope the President analyzed their bcakground, their competence, and their ability to serve. I am told—I was not present—that at that time they discussed with the President what the salaries would be. I was not present. I do not know. That is what I have been told.

After the President was satisfied with the recommendations, both of Mr. Welch to be chairman of the board and Mr. Charyk to be president, he sent their names to the Senate as incorporators. That was done with the primary responsibility of determining at that time whether the men whose names he was submitting, including the chairman of the board and the president and the other incorporators, were qualified, so that he could ask for the advice and consent of the Senate.

That is the first phase.

The second phase is in the law. Section 404 reads:

> SEC. 404. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include a comprehensive description of the activities and accomplishments during the preceding calendar year under the national program referred to in section 201(a)(1), together with an evaluation of such activities and accomplishments in terms of the attainment of the objectives of this Act—

How does one decide what objectives are attained, unless those who operate the corporation are brought to an accounting as to whether or not the attainment has been made?—

and any recommendations for additional legislative or other action which the President may consider necessary or desirable for the attainment of such objectives—

We wrote that into the law.

(b) The corporation shall transmit to the President and the Congress, annually and at such other times as it deems desirable, a comprehensive and detailed report of its operations, activities, and accomplishments under this Act.

The President, under the law, is given the responsibility of gaging the attainments and accomplishments of the corporation, as a basis for a report to Congress. It is for that reason that I say that these men have a responsibility for the attainment of the objective and are responsible to the President who, in turn, is responsible for sending his report to Congress.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield one more time?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the patience of my distinguished friend. I hold him in warm esteem and regard, as he knows. To illustrate our disagreement on this particular point, I should like to read one sentence from the opinion of the Attorney General. If Senators wish to read the entire opinion, they can find it beginning at page 87 of the Commerce Committee hearings, serial 6. I will read this sentence, and then desist. I thank my friend from Rhode Island:

With these directives in the act, there would seem to be no doubt that the incorporators, as directors, would have the same status and responsibilities as individuals serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation and will be holding private, not public, posts.

Mr. PASTORE. I agree with that. However, the same law contains section 404, which I have read to the Senator. What the Senator has read is the interpretation of the Attorney General, with which I find no fault. Section 404 deals with the attainment of objectives. How can we assume that these officers of the corporation are not responsible to the President, and that he will not ascertain whether they are carrying out their functions properly in attaining the objectives?

Mr. GORE. The fiduciary obligation of the directors of this corporation is exclusively to the stockholders of the corporation. There is no responsibility to the President of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. I say there is.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the memorandum of the Attorney General on the constitutionality of Senate confirmation of the nominations of persons appointed by the President as incorporators and directors of the Communications Satellite Corp.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SENATE CONFIRMATION OF PERSONS NOMINATED BY THE PRESIDENT AS INCORPORATORS AND DIRECTORS OF THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

On Tuesday, March 19, 1963, a question was raised on the Senate floor about the constitutionality and propriety of confirmation by the Senate of persons appointed by President Kennedy as incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp. Any constitutional question with respect to the procedure prescribed by statute for the appointment of these persons warrants the attention of the executive branch which must make such appointments.

It was indicated that the constitutional question went to confirmation "of officers and directors of a purely private corporation." It was added that section 2 of article II of the Constitution provides that the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, "officers of the United States" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 19, 1963, p. 4554).

The Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-624, approved Aug. 31, 1962, 76 Stat. 419) requires that the President "shall appoint incorporators, by and with the consent of the Senate, who shall serve as the initial board of directors until the first annual meeting of stockholders * * *" (sec. 302). The act further provides that, after such annual meeting, three of the 15 directors "shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate * * * (sec. 303 (a)).

Article II, section 2, of the Constitution, referred to above, provides in pertinent part that the President "shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law; but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments."

It appears that the questioner was right in not regarding the incorporators and directors of the satellite corporation as "officers of the United States," but it does not follow that, on that account, they may not constitutionally be confirmed by the Senate.

It is clear that neither the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp. nor the three directors to be appointed by the President after the initial public stock offering are officers of the United States. The act, in providing for the creation of the corporation, expressly states in section 301 that it is a corporation "for profit which will not be an agency or establishment of the U.S. Government." Based on this and other considerations, the Attorney General on October 25, 1962, gave the President his opinion that neither the incorporators nor the three directors to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate under the act are officers of the United States by virtue of such appointment.

In reaching the conclusion that the incorporators were not "officers of the United States," the foregoing opinion considered the fact that the act requires Senate confirmation for their appointment. While recognizing that under article II, section 2, officers of the United States, with certain exceptions not relevant here, must be confirmed by the Senate, the opinion goes on to point out that "article II, section 2, clause 2, does not state, and it does not follow therefrom, or from anything else in the Constitution, that every appointment authorized by law which is preceded by nomination and confirmation necessarily renders the appointee an officer of the United States regardless of his functions and the provisions of the law pursuant to which he was appointed." In support of this, the opinion cites 2 Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution* (5th ed. 1891), page 362; the views of Representative Moody set forth in House Report No. 2205, 55th Congress, 3d session, page 11; and Corwin, *The President: Office and Powers* (1957 ed.), page 671. The latter authority refers to the appointment, with Senate confirmation, of Members of Congress as negotiating commissioners and points out that if these appointments were to "offices" they might violate article I, section 6, clause 2, of the Constitution, prohibiting simultaneous incumbency as a Member of Congress and in "any office under the United States * * *." In these cases, therefore, the Senate confirmed appointments to positions which were not "offices." In other words, while article II, section 2, of the Constitution may require Senate confirmation to fill certain "offices," the procedure of appointment with Senate confirmation is not a constitutionally prohibited procedure for all positions which are not "offices."

Congress clearly had authority to provide for the creation of the Communications Satellite Corp. as a private corporation, under the broad powers of Congress under article I, section 8, of the Constitution to regulate and thus to promote foreign commerce and to make laws necessary and proper to accomplish these ends. The Supreme Court has long recognized that Congress, acting under its express powers and the broad discretion conferred by the necessary and proper clause, may create private as well as governmental corporations, and that such private corporations may be for profit. See *Legal Tender Case*, 110 U.S. 421 at 445 (1884), referring to the power of Congress to incorporate national banks for profit as well settled. The Supreme Court, moreover, has upheld the constitutionality of an act of Congress which not only created a private corporation for profit as an exercise of the commerce power but which even identified by name several of the incorporators in the statute. *Luxton* v. *North River Bridge Co.*, 153 U.S. 525 (1894). There is nothing in article II, section 2, or elsewhere in the Constitution which prohibits Congress from specifying a procedure like that set forth in article II, section 2, for manning the corporate positions which Congress has validly created.

Even if the act had not expressly provided for confirmation by the Senate of these incorporators and directors, there would be nothing improper in the President's soliciting the advice and consent of the Senate in making these appointments, and in the Senate's according to the President its advice and consent. According to a memorandum transmitted to Senator MCCLELLAN on March 17, 1949, by Peyton Ford, Assistant to the Attorney General, "the President in carrying out his executive functions may consult with whom he pleases. The President frequently consults with congressional leaders * * * even on matters which may be considered solely within the purview of the Executive * * *" Senate Report No. 232, 81st Congress, 1st session, page 20. Obviously the Senate as a whole has as much power to respond to requests for consultation as do individuals.

The provision for Senate confirmation here does not infringe on the powers of the President. The President has raised no issue on this score. Moreover, in providing for the creation of a private corporation, Congress might have accorded the President no functions at all in the appointment of the incorporators or the directors, so long as the President's powers were not otherwise impaired, just as the States have done in providing for the creation of private corporations under general corporation laws, and as Congress itself has done in enacting the business corporation laws of the District of Columbia.

The exercise of power involved in Senate confirmation here is a modest one in the light of traditional legislative power over corporations. Under Anglo-American law, the sovereign may provide for the creation of corporations for a broad variety of purposes, and may provide for the identifying of the individuals who will own or constitute such a corporation in a variety of ways. Thus the act of July 1, 1862, as amended (13 Stat. 356), provided that the President name 5 of the 15 directors of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. Moreover, Congress has created many nonprofit corporations, as set forth in title 36 of the United States Code, which like the one under discussion are private in the sense of being nongovernmental, and in doing so Congress has frequently prescribed by statute the actual names of the individuals who constitute such corporations. Such legislative naming of individuals would seem a much greater assertion of legislative power to participate in the appointment of corporate officials than the Senate confirmation of incorporators and directors nominated by the President under the Communications Satellite Act of 1962.

Comment is also in order on the description, quoted above, of the Communications Satellite Corp. as "purely private" and therefore presumably not warranting senatorial attention to the nominations in question. The corporation cannot be placed outside the proper reach of Federal attention by the label "purely private." While the corporation is certainly private in the sense of not being a part of the Government, it is by no means identical to the ordinary, average American business firm in the degree to which it warrants immunity from governmental attention.

Merely as a public utility and a common carrier in foreign commerce, the corporation is affected with a public interest requiring Government regulation, which the act of course provides. While the usual pattern for utility enterprises is private ownership with Government regulation, it would have been quite constitutional to provide for Government ownership, as indeed was urged by some Senators in the last Congress. If there was no constitutional objection to total Government ownership and control, there would seem little force in the position that the Senate lacks the more limited power of confirming these nominations as provided in the act.

Over and above the public utility, common carrier status of the Satellite Corp., it is a proper subject for senatorial concern in confirming these nominations because of its unique and important national role in our overall foreign relations and space effort. Viewed in this light, the corporation is not "purely private," because it performs key functions in major areas of public policy. At a time when the United States is vitally interested in the economic health and development of all the free world, in leadership in the peaceful uses of space, and in demonstrating to the world the progress attainable through the free enterprise system, the Communications Satellite Corp., although private, is an eminently proper subject of public and governmental attention, including the Senate confirmations in question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield. But first I should like to state that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations marking up the supplemental appropriaion bill has called a meeting for 1:30 this afternoon. I will remain in the Chamber as long as I am needed here. However, the Senator in charge of the nominations is the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and he will be present after I leave. However, if Senators have any further questions, I shall be glad to remain in the Chamber as long as I am needed in order to answer them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in the recollection that in the act authorizing the establishment of the corporation there is section 302, which provides:

> The President of the United States shall appoint incorporators, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve as the initial board of directors until the first annual meeting of stockholders—

And so forth.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is upon the basis of this language that the nominations have been made and the advice and consent of the Senate asked. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. The Senator from Tennessee takes the position that under the Constitution the Senate had no business to insert the provision requiring the Senate to confirm, because that is in violation of the Constitution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My answer is that Congress, having created this organization, had the power to include in the act such conditions as it deemed advisable.

Mr. PASTORE. Provided such conditions were not in contravention of the Constitution; and I say that the act is not in contravention of the Constitution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to comment with respect to the time element which the Senator from Rhode Island raised, because I wish to accommodate the Senate. I intend to present a legal argument which is directly opposite to the position of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that.

Mr. MORSE. I shall require 2 hours or more to present it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wish it to be clearly understood that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is in charge of the nominations. Last year the Committee on Commerce considered the bill last, and I was in charge of the bill then. This year, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences considered it last. The nominations are in very capable hands. If the Senator from New Mexico needs me for anything, I shall be available. I expect to return to the Chamber shortly.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, some legal issues may be involved in the discussion this afternoon. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sol Lindenbaum, attorney adviser for the Department of Justice, may be present on the floor of the Senate to assist me during the debate on the confirmation of the nominations of the incorporators under the Communications Satellite Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am not an attorney. I never studied law a day in my life. Therefore, I feel the need of some legal advice.

It is difficult for a person who is not an attorney to take part in the debate this afternoon. This probably adds to my general confusion, because I have been wondering, as these discussions have been taking place, where the line should be drawn between the appointment of incorporators and the appointment of ambassadors. I have been wondering, for example, how Winston Churchill became an honorary citizen of the United States. I read the Constitution to try to ascertain whether there was a specific provision for honorary citizenship. I have reached the conclusion that Congress does what it deems to be expedient; and until the Supreme Court sets such action aside, it remains the law of the land.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The action of Congress with respect to the eminent statesman Winston Churchill was a ceremonial act. One might regard the confirmation of the nominations of incorporators of the Satellite Corp. as a ceremonial procedure. However, the mischiefs that could flow from this color of approval are many, whereas I see no mischief that could flow from the ceremonial act honoring a distinguished leader with honorary citizenship.

Mr. ANDERSON. That only goes to illustrate the difficulties of not understanding law. I do not understand the difference between a ceremonial law and a law.

At one time there was a lengthy discussion concerning the competence of individuals who were to be in attendance at a meeting. There were experts and technical experts. We spent considerable time in trying to determine the difference between experts and technical experts.

I had hoped that this afternoon I might discuss the competence of the nominees to be directors. That question seems not to be involved. I appreciate the action of the Senator from Tennessee in more or less removing that question from the field of discussion.

When the hearing was held on the nominations of these incorporators, I tried hard to ascertain how competent they were. Some of them were new to me. Some were persons I had known for a long time. One of the individuals on the list was a man with whom I had had many transactions in his legislative capacity 15 years earlier. Another was Mr. George L. Killion, with whom I served in official capacities when I was a member of President Truman's Cabinet. Another, Sidney J. Weinberg, I knew had been called upon by the President many times for financial advice and assistance. Therefore, I was interested in trying to ascertain whether the caliber of the other nominees measured up to that of the individuals whom I had known. I am happy to report to the Senate that, so far as I am concerned, the question of the competency of the nominees was well established by hearings which the committee conducted.

The President of the United States approved the articles of incorporation.

That is provided for by the law. There are those who might not have liked every provision in the law. I myself would have enjoyed having an opportunity to work on the articles of incorporation. We are all sure that we can write provisions better than someone else. I would have included in the articles of incorporation provisions which perhaps would have been somewhat different from what were included. In the hearings and in the subsequent discussion certain facts were developed which might have warranted a change had we operated in a different fashion from what we did.

By law, the responsibility was upon the President of the United States, not upon the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, to approve the articles of incorporation. Therefore, the President discharged his obligation and transacted his business. The same thing applies to the directors whose nominations are now before the Senate. Congress wrote into the law language which provides that the nominations shall be submitted to the Senate.

As I remember, the bill as it was originally submitted by the administration to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and turned over to me following a discussion with the late Senator Kerr, did not provide for confirmation. I hope I am making a correct statement, because I am speaking from memory, not having seen the language for some time. Nevertheless, in the exercise of its power, the Senate decided that it wanted the opportunity to see who the incorporators would be. So the Senate wrote into the bill the provision that the nominations should be submitted to the Senate, so that it might know the type of men who would take on this great responsibility which, to be sure, involves commercial enterprise on the one hand, but may, before the activity is finished, involve matters relating to the defense of the country.

I do not know to what height communications satellites will go. I have no idea of the planned use of them. I only know that not long ago the committee looked at the budget which will be submitted by NASA to the Space Committee. It contains over $50 million for communication satellites research. Therefore, I assume that that means they will be used for the benefit of the people of the United States, and of the Satellite Corp.

Of course, we would all like to have these things done differently. I have just said that I wished I might have had an opportunity to rewrite the act. Nevertheless, we must deal with the law as it is. As the law now stands, it provides that the Senate must confirm the nominations of incorporators submitted by the President.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is there not one other course available, namely, the amendment of the act?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. From the very first day that Congress convened at this session, there was an opportunity to introduce a bill which would have provided for the amendment of the act. It was some time before Senators were assigned to committees, but I am sure that the able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would have called a meeting of his committee to consider any proposed change in the act to repeal this section. I know that when I became chairman of the Space Committee, I would have been extremely happy to have held a hearing on that particular subject. But there is no such measure before the Senate. Therefore, I assume that the Senate is satisfied with the language in the act, because, so far as I know, no Senator or Representative has introduced proposed legislation to amend the act, with the exception of a bill introduced by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], dealing with small business. The point I was trying to make was that, so far as I know, there has been no proposal introduced in either the Senate or the House to change the provision requiring confirmation by the Senate of the nominations of directors.

Therefore, the Senate must deal with the question before it. Consequently, I believe the Senate should approve the nominations of the directors, and then get on with its other work.

I have been very much interested in many of the reports which have been presented. I have tried as best a layman can to read the legal opinions and conclude what is involved.

In the 80th Congress, 1st session, a report issued on February 19, 1947, by the Senate Judiciary Committee includes an appendix entitled "Corporations Chartered by Special Act of Congress." The appendix cites 288 such charter statutes, beginning with the statute chartering the First Bank of the United States, an act of February 25, 1791, and ending with the act chartering the City of Clinton Bridge Commission—an act dated December 21, 1944. Many of these statutes, particularly those enacted in recent years, authorize the incorporation of patriotic organizations, veterans organizations, scientific organizations, or charitable organizations.

A number of years ago a group of people became interested in the establishment of the Cowboy Hall of Fame. If I am not incorrect in my recollection, the present occupant of the chair, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], who then was Governor of Wyoming, himself participated in promoting the establishment of the Cowboy Hall of Fame. I was instrumental in the introduction of the bill which provided for its establishment; and the bill was enacted. Perhaps that action was hardly consistent with our other duties. Nonetheless, no damage was done; and a fine institution has been established in Oklahoma City. I could have selected a better location—one a few hundred miles to the West, or perhaps a few hundred miles to the Northwest. Nevertheless, the institution has been established in Oklahoma City, in line with the desires and ambitions of certain persons at certain times.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SIMPSON in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senator from New Mexico does not wish to draw serious analogy between organizations, such as the Boy Scouts, the American Legion, and the Cowboy Hall of Fame, and a private corporation organized entirely for profit. These are entirely different matters.

The Senator from New Mexico has referred to the Bank of the United States. I suggest that if we study our history, we find that was a rather unfortunate episode; but even in that case the Government of the United States owned part of the corporation's stock. However, I submit that I have not been able to find—and neither has the Congressional Library—any instance in the history of our country in which the U.S. Senate gave its advice and consent to the appointment of directors of an entirely privately owned corporation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wish to say that that reminds me of the biblical expression:

> Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.

So I say that although what the Senator has said may be pertinent, I am not sure that it is, because as a layman, not as a lawyer, I may have missed the point.

As I was saying, Mr. President, many of these statutes, particularly those enacted in recent years, established or authorized incorporation of patriotic, veterans, educational, scientific, and charitable organizations. Others, however, were the corporate charters of strictly private corporations or private corporations affected with a public interest. Of the 70 entries prior to 1860, the majority were for banking, insurance, turnpike and canal companies in the District of Columbia area. During and after the Civil War, acts of Congress provided for incorporation of the Union Pacific Railroad, act of July 1, 1862; the Northern Pacific, act of July 2, 1864; the Atlantic & Pacific, act of July 27, 1866; and the Texas Pacific, act of March 3, 1871; as well as local District of Columbia corporations, Continental and Capitol Hotels, acts of March 3, 1865; and private corporations without any apparent Federal or District of Columbia characteristic, for example, Loomis Aerial Telegraph Co., act of January 21, 1873.

Many of the congressional charters have included a list of individuals designated as incorporators. In effect, this has been a means by which not only the Senate but also the House advised and consented to nominations of incorporators and directors submitted by the President. In other cases, the President or a subordinate Government official has been authorized to name incorporators. No case has been found in which the President's appointment of incorporators was made subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. However, there is at least one major statutory precedent for Senate confirmation of the President's appointment of members of the board of directors of a private corporation for profit which, like the Communications Satellite Corp., was affected with a public interest and subject to special limitations in light of the public interest. This is the statute establishing the second Bank of the United States.

The earliest congressional charter for a corporation was the act of February 25, 1791, providing for the first Bank of the United States—1 Stat. 191. In this legislation, the President was authorized to appoint three persons to superintend the opening of subscriptions to the capital stock. Such appointments were not subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. The charter provided for a 25-member board of directors to be elected by the stockholders. Although the United States was authorized to subscribe 20 percent of the authorized capital of $10 million, there was no special provision for appointment or election of directors representing the Government.

The legislation establishing the second Bank of the United States—act of April 10, 1816, 3 Stat. 266—followed a somewhat different pattern. As in the 1791 act, the President was given authority, not subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint commissioners to superintend the subscription procedure. The number of directors was fixed at 25. Of this number five—who had to be stockholders—were to be appointed annually by the President of the United States "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," 3 Stat. 269. The proportion of presidentially appointed directors corresponded to the precentage of the total capital stock—$35 million—which the United States was required to subscribe. But the provision for such directors was not contingent on retention by the Government of such stock or any minimum percentage.

The second Bank of the United States was similar in certain fundamental respects to the Communications Satellite Corp. It was a private corporation in the sense that its stock could be purchased—and 80 percent of the original offering was reserved for purchase—by private investors—"individuals, companies, or corporations." The stockholders other than the United States could elect 20 of the 25 directors. The five Presidentially appointed directors did not thereby become officers of the Government. The Supreme Court so stated in Osborn v. *Bank of the United States*, 9 Wheat. 738 at 866–7 (1824). The directors were authorized to appoint officers and employees, and to manage the corporation. The corporation was given the powers customary for a private corporation. Specific authority was given to declare semiannual dividends of the profits.

On the other hand, as in the case of the Communications Satellite Corp., the function of the Bank of the United States was inherently quasi-public. It had, in effect, a monopoly position as banking agent for the U.S. Treasury and for the deposit of Federal funds.

The enabling legislation, consequently, subjected the corporation to special limitations reflecting the public interest, just as the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 surrounds the Communications Satellite Corp., with Government controls. In addition to the Presidential authority to appoint 5 of the 25 directors of the bank—by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—ceilings were set on the total amount of debt that could be incurred by the bank and on the amount of particular loans in particular categories. The Secretary of the Treasury was given special authority to require reports and to inspect the general accounts of the bank. The bank was required to give, without charge, "the necessary facilities for transferring the public funds from place to place."

As was said during the course of debate in the House of Representatives, the policy in the creation of the second Bank of the United States was "to give it a double character—to combine in it the elements of public and private interest"—29 Annals of Congress, column 1144.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield, but I do so with the faintest degree of trepidation, because my dear friend from Oregon is a skillful lawyer. I hope that he will try to protect my rights.

Mr. MORSE. I did not rise to discuss a legal point at all. I ask my friend from New Mexico whether he is familiar with the record of the bank and what happened to the bank.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assume that it did not do very well. I assume that there will be days when the Communications Satellite Corp. will not do very well. But when I worry about the Communications Satellite Corp., I am reassured by reading the long debate on the subject that was held on the floor of the Senate last year. While I lay ill in New Mexico I read the debate. I read that anticipated profits from the operations of the corporation would roll in in such enormous amounts that Senators desired to protect the public.

Therefore I assume that we may have the same experience with that corporation as we had with the second Bank of the United States. It might not be such a melon after all.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe that any such result will flow from the satellite corporation. I think it will be pretty much a losing venture. But because of procedures established in the act, American taxpayers will be called upon time and time again to pay up in order to keep the corporation afloat. That is one reason why we have a very clever design in the bill to give the American people the impression that the members of the board of the corporation in some way and some how represent the public interest instead of a private interest.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will not argue with my long-time friend on that question. I have been one of those who have said that all types of businesses have their dangers. I have occasionally invested a little risk capital in some project that looked extremely good, and I have had it turn out very badly. Occasionally I have invested in an enterprise that I thought would be horrible, and it has brought me the finest dividends. Therefore, I have concluded that I know nothing about the investment business, because things that I have counted upon have turned out badly, and things that I have rarely counted upon have returned dividends.

I cannot tell the able Senator from Oregon what might happen with relation to the Communications Satellite Corp. I can only say that a corporation in which hundreds of millions of dollars are invested involves the same chance of failure as of success. Therefore, we ought to name as members of the board of directors those who have the smartest business brains that we can find.

In my time I have organized a few small corporations. I organized an insurance company, which I believe is still solvent and occasionally contributes to my financial well-being. But I had named to the board of directors of that company the wisest and smartest friends whom I could find. The Communications Satellite Corp. must seek out men whose business background and experience will permit them to look at the problems that this great organization will have and try to manage it in fine fashion. That is why I was interested in the type of men who appeared before us. I was not interested so much in a recital of what their political affiliations might be.

I say to the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], who is from an opposite political party from my own—and a stanch member of it, too—that I did not ask the political qualifications of a single incorporator. To the present hour I do not know the political qualifications of the individual who will be chairman of the board at $125,000 a year or the man who will be president at $80,000 a year.

I could not answer a question of their political affiliation. At least one of them was brought here in the Eisenhower administration, and did such a good job that he remained on in the Kennedy administration. What his politics may be I do not care. However, I believe he is competent to head the organization.

During the debate in the House of Representatives on the bill creating the second Bank of the United States—29 Annals of Congress, columns 1060–1219—practical, financial, economic, political, legal, and constitutional issues of all kinds were raised and argued. But we have found no recorded expression of doubt as to the constitutionality of the provision for Senate advice and consent to the President's appointments to the board of directors, even during debate on proposed amendments to strike out this provision—id., at columns 1137–1148, 1209–1210.

It is strange that in all the many days of discussion on the communications satellite bill, so far as I could find—and I could easily be proved to be in error—no amendment was offered to strike the provision for Senate confirmation of the nominees or directors.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure the Senator has examined the record very closely. If he will look at the debate that occurred on August 17 and the following day, he will notice that by that time cloture had been voted and not much attention was being paid to proposed amendments. I pointed out fully—and I will say something about the subject in my speech—that under the laws of the District of Columbia the incorporators were not responsible to anyone except the stockholders of the corporation. Amendments were offered to require them to have some responsibility to the President. We sought to require them to have some responsibility to the Government, and to file reports with the President, which might put them in a different category. But those amendments were all rejected without very much consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not question what my friend from Tennessee has said. I read almost all the words he said about the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator must have read long, and far into the night.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was ill. I had no great pressure on my time. I enjoyed reading the debate. The Senator discussed the points. A short time back I raised several other questions and then found that the Senator from Tennessee covered them all in his discussion. I found that the Senator from Tennessee had already discussed questions which I subsequently raised.

My statement was that I do not know of an amendment being offered to strike the provision for Senate confirmation of the directors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I say most respectfully that the argument is completely irrelevant to the discussion, in view of the history of the bill. As the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, we offered amendment after amendment. We had the guillotine hanging over our necks at all times. Each amendment was met with a motion to lay on the table. At one time the Senate laid 26 of my amendments on the table in one fell swoop.

So I do not believe it makes a very good case to argue about what happened in that debate, under cloture, with regard to amendments.

But even if there had been no cloture, it does not follow that because no one in opposition to the bill offered an amendment to strike that particular section of the bill, we are, therefore, now subject to some doctrine of estoppel in regard to it.

I point out to the Senator what some of our amendments were. The senior Senator from Oregon was so completely opposed to the bill from beginning to end that he offered a complete substitute for it. I assure the Senator from New Mexico that the substitute bill did not contain what I consider to be an unconstitutional provision calling for the advice and consent of the Senate to the confirmation of private businessmen appointed to the board of directors of a private corporation.

In defense of my colleagues who opposed the bill, I desire to say only that I would not want the RECORD to stand in such condition that, even indirectly, we could be charged with some form of laches, because we did not seek to strike that provision from the administration's bill. We tried to strike down the administration's bill including this provision. It is most unfortunate that the Kennedy administration ever proposed such a horrendous measure. In my judgment it will rise to plague the administration as long as it is in office, and it will rise to plague the history of the Kennedy administration for all time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Again I say that I accept at face value what the Senator from Oregon has said. I am sure that if he presented a bill, he did omit the question of Senate confirmation of the members of the board of directors. I only pointed out that when the Second National Bank of the United States was discussed, even though there was criticism of the bank, no effort was made to strike out the provision requiring the advice and consent of the Senate with respect to presidential nominees. I was struck, as a matter of curiosity, with the question as to why, if the provision was bad, no effort had been made on the floor of the Senate to strike out that provision.

During the debate in the Senate—29 Annals of Congress, columns 235–281—amendments to delete the provision for Presidentially appointed directors and to provide for reduction in their number if the United States sold its stock were offered and defeated—the same, at columns 255–258. The constitutionality of the provision was questioned, not on the ground that senatorial advice and consent were unconstitutional but on the ground that the influence thus given to the Government in the banking corporation was of such magnitude as to transcend the boundaries of what is necessary and proper under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution—the same, at columns 263–266.

The constitutionality of the act of April 10, 1816 providing for the second Bank of the United States was upheld in *M'Culloch* v. *The State of Maryland*, 4 Wheat. (17 U.S.) 316, 400–437, 4 L.Ed. 579, 600–608 (1819).

It was held in that case that the creation of a corporation as a means for carrying into execution the powers vested in the Federal Government, such as the powers to lay and collect taxes, to borrow money, to regulate commerce, and to declare and conduct war, was within the broad power of making "all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." See also, *Osborn* v. *Bank of the United States*, 9 Wheat. (22 U.S.) 738, 817, 859–867, 6 L. Ed, 204, 223, 233–235 (1824). There is no suggestion, in the summaries of the arguments or in the opinions, of any doubt as to the constitutionality of the provision for Senate confirmation of the President's appointments of directors of the Bank, even though, in the *Osborn* case (9 Wheat. at pp. 866–867), the court specifically said that the directors were not "officers of government."

The original act incorporating the Union Pacific Railroad, act of July 1, 1862, 12 Stat. 489, named scores of individuals from various States, who, together with five persons to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, were to be commissioners to receive subscriptions for shares. When a specified number of shares had been subscribed, the subscribers were directed to meet to elect 13 directors who, together with 2 directors to be appointed by the President, were to take over management of the corporation.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Were these subject also to having nominations confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I think they were not.

Mr. GRUENING. I believe that is one of the essential points at issue.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do, also. I point out there was a case in which the nominations were subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

The statute was amended by the act of July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. 356) to provide for a board of 20 directors of whom the President was to name 5 and the stockholders to elect the remaining 15. So far as we can determine, no consideration was given to providing that the Presidential appointees should be subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, nor any suggestion that such a provision would be unconstitutional.

In view of the Senate confirmation of some of the directors of the second Bank of the United States, and the many acts of Congress in which the incorporators of nongovernmental corporations have been named, there is ample precedent available as rebuttal to any constitutional objection to the provision for Senate confirmation of the President's appointment of incorporators and directors of the Communications Satellite Corp.

Mr. President, I express the hope that speedily, if we might, but leisurely, if we must, the Senate will proceed to the confirmation of the nominations of these incorporators.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is whether it will advise and consent to the appointment of the 14 initial incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp. In connection with this question, I think it is appropriate at this time to spell out what I, for one, am not consenting to.

Approval of these nominees does not mean that I believe the Communications Satellite Corp. will become an immediate success, nor that returns, if any, from an investment in the corporation will meet a speculator's dream. The opposite may be true in fact. Though the law requires congressional confirmation of these initial incorporators, I hope the public will not interpret our action as giving this private corporation any congressional sanction of omnipotence. Further it should not in any way suggest that the Congress will be obligated to underwrite the corporation if it flounders. While it is true that this corporation is unique in its concept and its objectives, nevertheless it is from this point on dependent for its success not on the Congress, but rather on its corporate management.

In saying this, Mr. President, I hope that my remarks will not be construed as a lack of confidence in this corporation. I am, as are many others, hopeful that the corporation will meet the goals which it has set, but at the same time I am enough of a realist to know that there will be a number of years and many heartaches before this undertaking becomes operational.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on the issue pending before the Senate I wish to speak only briefly, to express my support of these nominees, and to express the hope that the Senate will confirm the nominations.

I always felt, in connection with the debate on the satellite communications bill, that we were engaged in an extremely important and interesting experiment in a mixed Government-private corporation. I recognize it is not purely mixed, in the sense of an admixture of investment, et cetera, but it will have Government directors and will work very closely in connection with governmental powers as they are exercised by governmental agencies.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Did the junior Senator from Tennessee correctly understand the distinguished senior Senator from New York to say that the corporation would have Government directors?

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand, it would have three directors appointed by the President.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is well aware, I am sure, that appointment by the President would not make of the directors Government directors. In fact, the Attorney General has rendered an opinion that all of the directors and incorporators would have identical responsibility; that their fiduciary trust would be to the stockholders and to the stockholders only; that they would hold private, not public, status. Therefore, under no provision of the law could it be said that directors appointed by the President would be Government directors.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will allow me, I was using that term in its colloquial sense and not in any sense of trying to qualify them as a matter of law as Government directors. I was expressing only my view that, being appointed by the President, as I see it, once the corporation gets going and is publicly financed, they will have a unique position; and this will be such a unique quality of appointment as to make the corporation in terms of those serving as directors different from normal, publicly financed corporations. That is precisely what I had in mind. Only in that sense did I use the term.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee is not aware of any colloquial meaning with respect to the words "Government directors." Is the able Senator from New York aware of the fact that the Attorney General of the United States has rendered an opinion in which he has held that these men in fact will not be Government directors, that they will have the same powers and responsibilities as directors and officers of any other ordinary business corporation?

Mr. JAVITS. It seems to me that the Senator has himself used the words "Government directors" in the negative colloquially now, by asking me whether I was aware of the fact that the Attorney General had given an opinion that they were not in fact Government directors, because they had responsibility to the stockholders.

I say to the Senator that I was using the term "Government directors" in a colloquial sense, as I understood it, to express my view of a unique character of appointment; and therefore of a unique character which, in my view—I am not asking the Senator to espouse my view—this corporation would have. That was all I intended.

I have not read the opinion of the Attorney General. I shall read it with great interest. I hope very much, before I vote upon the question of the confirmation of the nominations, to read the hearings and also to read carefully the debate to which I cannot listen—if it turns out that I cannot—with respect to what is said on the floor by the proponents of the position that the nominations of the incorporators should not be confirmed, and also, as I understand, their legal position that no confirmation is required under the circumstances.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee is aware that a great many people have had the impression that the corporation is partly public and partly private, something in between public and private. The junior Senator from Tennessee has undertaken for a long time to call attention to the express provisions of the statute which provides that it is entirely a private corporation, organized for profit.

It will operate in a unique field. The act bestows upon the corporation unusual privileges and powers; but it does not place upon the corporation any public responsibility. I read from the Attorney General's opinion:

> With these directives in the act, there would seem to be no doubt that the incorporators, as directors, will have the same status and responsibility as individuals serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation and will be holding private, not public, posts.

Mr. JAVITS. It is a fact that a number of the directors will be appointed in a way different from the way they are appointed or elected in a privately owned corporation. That is all I had in mind. That is a unique aspect of the corporation. When I made the statement I did, I made it clear that this question did not involve Government money or private money, but that it involved only a special way of designating directors. That is all I assert.

Mr. GORE. The Senator does not assert, then, that the officers of this corporation have any governmental or official public position.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not want to say yes or no and prejudice the legal conception. I made the statement, as a lawyer, that, the law, having been enacted, the nominations should be confirmed, and that the Senate should confirm them. I believe they are excellent directors. So far as I can see, unless there is something in the case which I do not see as yet, I shall vote to confirm the nominations. I hope to examine the subject more thoroughly later. But I say what I said before, that it is, in my judgment, in the nature of a mixed corporation, something which is not the normal, publicly financed corporation, but which does have some special aspect in that a certain number of directors will be specially appointed, rather than elected in the usual way, by stockholders.

Despite the fact that the Attorney General says that the directors, even if so designated, have precisely the same responsibility as stockholders and ordinary directors elected in the usual way, which I have no doubt is so, in terms of public policy, the appointment of these directors by the President gives an important aspect to this corporation which other corporations, publicly financed, do not have. That was my point.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator will examine this question and give the Senate his considered opinion. I realize that the Senator has not read the Attorney General's opinion and has not, as he said, examined this question fully, but hopes to do so later. In view of the statement the Senator has just made, I hope he will do so with the greatest of care, and give to the Senate his interpretation.

It is disturbing to the junior Senator from Tennessee that any Member of the U.S. Senate, particularly one of its ablest lawyers, should at this late date still assert his belief that, somehow, this activity is an admixture of private and public functions and responsibilities. If the distinguished senior Senator from New York still holds that view, what about the millions of our people who may very well conclude that the U.S. Government has in fact endorsed and approved and is, in fact, supporting and promoting the success and the profitability of this corporation? Much mischief can flow from this misapprehension on the part of the American people; and I hope the senior Senator from New York will give the question careful consideration and address the Senate on it.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York is not aware of being under any misapprehension. That is the word of the Senator from Tennessee. Incidentally, the Senator from New York had no intention of taking any important part in this debate, or of speaking on it more than briefly at this time. But if the Senator from Tennessee insists—and sometimes these things do not work out the way that those who are espousing the view of the Senator from Tennessee think they will work out—on my looking into the subject carefully and giving my considered judgment, I shall be happy to do so, but the result may not be satisfactory to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In the opinion of the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from New York, as a former attorney general of New York, now has the duty to do just that; and the Senator from Oregon would welcome the performance of that duty by the Senator from New York. The Senator from Oregon will await with bated breath the analysis of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is making me do some work I did not plan to do, but that is the penalty for standing up and saying anything on this subject. But I shall be glad to do it promptly, for I hope this discussion will not be too protracted.

PRO-CIVIL-RIGHTS POSTAL EMPLOYEE SLAIN IN ALABAMA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the whole country must look with considerable sadness upon a tragedy which has just occurred, which saddened me very deeply, and which should sadden us all. A young man, 35 years old, William L. Moore, a native of Binghamton, N.Y., was found sprawled on a desolate stretch of U.S. 11 in Alabama in front of a roadside park. He had been shot once in the forehead and once in the neck and was dead when he was found.

He was walking to Jackson, Miss., to deliver to Gov. Ross Barnett a personal letter on civil rights. He was wearing placards which indicated his very strong desire for equal opportunity, especially as respects race and color. He was a post office employee born in Binghamton, N.Y. As it happens, he had written me about some matters with respect to the post office, and told me about the walk he intended to take. I had written him and told him I would be glad to see him any time he wanted to come to Washington, and wishing him good luck on his walk. He was a well-intentioned American who felt he was making a big contribution to a public cause in this way.

Perhaps one could credit this sad and tragic occurrence to any one of a number of reasons. But it is an interesting fact that the coroner of Etowah County, where the slaying occurred, termed it a "civil rights case." That is not from a prejudiced source. It seems to me it was, as we lawyers say, part of the res gestae, a statement that was made shortly after the occurrence took place, when people generally say what is on their minds.

Gov. George Wallace, of Alabama, has offered a reward for information leading to the conviction of those who committed the terrible crime. I am grateful for that fact.

Apparently Mr. Moore made no secret of his mission as he went on his way, and a number of news gatherers knew of his mission, which was to hand Gov. Ross Barnett, of Mississippi, a personal letter urging him to accord Negroes their rights. The letter is set forth in news articles. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Daily News and one from the Washington Evening Star of today be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 24, 1963]

Baltimore Prorights Postman Slain in Alabama

Gadsden, Ala., April 24.—Authorities said today that a vacationing Baltimore postman hiking to Mississippi to plead for racial moderation apparently was ambushed and shot to death from a parked car.

The body of William L. Moore, 35, was found sprawled on a desolate stretch of U.S. 11 in front of a roadside park. He had been shot once in the forehead and once in the neck with a .22 caliber weapon.

On the body of Mr. Moore, who was walking to Jackson, Miss., to deliver a personal letter on civil rights to Gov. Ross Barnett, were placards reading, "Eat at Joe's, Both Black and White" and "Equal Rights for All (Mississippi or Bust)."

The white postman had passed through this northeast Alabama city around dusk yesterday and told a radio newsman that he was not afraid of violence on his antisegregation trek. "I don't believe the people in the South are that way," he said.

BODY FOUND

About 2 hours later, a motorist discovered Mr. Moore's body 10 miles from here near the crossroads community of Keener. The body was brought here for autopsy.

Etowah County Coroner Noble Yokum termed the slaying a civil rights case and said he thought racial demonstrations in Birmingham were involved in the act. "I personally don't think this was a local matter," he said.

Mr. Yokum said it appeared the killers were waiting for Mr. Moore at the roadside park and shot him as he walked by. "From the angle of the bullet and the size of the hole, I'd say it was fired from a car at close range," he said.

Gov. George Wallace offered a $1,000 reward for information leading to the conviction of the killers and sent a number of State investigators and troopers here to work with local authorities on the case.

LETTERS ON BODY

Letters to President Kennedy, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and Governor Barnett were found on the body of Mr. Moore, who said friends warned him to expect trouble in Birmingham and to fear for his life in Mississippi.

Mr. Moore, who lived at 433 East 25th Street, Baltimore, and had saved his vacation time to make the trip south, walked the 35 miles from Baltimore to Washington last Saturday in an unsuccessful attempt to deliver a personal letter to the President. He was stopped by a White House guard who told him to drop the letter in the mail box.

Mr. Moore's letter to the President said he expected southern hospitality to manifest itself in "less desirable forms" on his trek. He said he was "not making this walk to demonstrate either Federal rights or States rights, but individual rights."

The letter to Governor Barnett asked the Mississippi Governor to "be gracious and give more than is immediately demanded of you. Make certain that when the Negro gets his rights and his vote that he does not treat the white man with the contempt and disdain that, unfortunately, some of us now treat him."

Pushing a small shopping cart containing clothing, a second pair of shoes and literature, he passed through Gadsden yesterday afternoon. There he told newsman Charles Hicks of radio station WGAD that "his feet were pretty badly blistered but he planned to walk right up to the Governor's mansion in Mississippi."

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 24, 1963]

Racial Hiker Slain in Alabama—Motorist Finds Body of White Integrationist—Baltimore Man Was en Route to Mississippi

Attalla, Ala., April 24.—A white integrationist from Maryland was shot to death beside a highway near this northeast Alabama town last night. A full-scale search for the killer is underway.

Gov. George Wallace, a staunch segregationist, called the slaying of William L. Moore, 35, of Baltimore, a "dastardly act" and offered a $1,000 reward for the arrest and conviction of the killer.

Mr. Moore, hiking across Alabama and bound for Mississippi on a personal antisegregation mission, was carrying prointegration signs.

SHOT AT CLOSE RANGE

Coroner Noble Yocum said Mr. Moore apparently was shot at close range with a small caliber weapon. He said what appeared to be a .22 slug was found near the scene. One bullet went through Mr. Moore's head and another apparently lodged in the head, Coroner Yocum said.

Mr. Moore reportedly was walking from Chattanooga, Tenn., to Jackson, Miss., to tell Mississippi Gov. Ross Barnett of his racial views.

Mr. Moore had told a newsman a little earlier last night that he had left a letter for President Kennedy at the White House, taken a bus from Baltimore to Chattanooga and begun this trek.

LETTER TO PRESIDENT

Mr. Moore's letter to the President outlined plans for the walk and said in part:

"I will be engaged in interstate travel and theoretically under the protection of the 14th amendment to the Constitution guaranteeing equal rights and privileges to all citizens.

"I am not making this walk to demonstrate either Federal rights or States rights, but individual rights. I am doing it * * * for the South and hopefully to illustrate that * * * peaceful protest is not altogether extinguished down there.

"I hope that I will not have to eat these words."

PLEDGES AID IN SEARCH

Alabama's public safety director, Al Lingo, pledged his office's support in the search and urged the cooperation of all law-enforcement agencies to find the killer or killers.

A passing motorist found the body. Mr. Moore was still wearing signs reading "Eat at Joe's—both black and white" and "Equal rights for all. Mississippi or bust."

State Investigator Ray McDowell said he had talked with Mr. Moore earlier and said Mr. Moore told him he was a mail carrier in Baltimore and had been a postal worker in Binghamton, N.Y.

Mr. McDowell said part of the sign reading "black" had been torn off. He said Mr. Moore told him a Negro in Chattanooga had torn the sign, saying that the word "colored" should have been used.

WAS ON VACATION

Mr. Yocum said he had talked with Mr. Moore's wife, Mary, in Binghamton. He said she told him Mr. Moore was on a 2-week vacation and that his route would take him from Chattanooga to Birmingham, and then to Jackson via Meridian, Miss.

Attalla is just outside Gadsden, about 60 miles northeast of Birmingham.

Mrs. Moore told Mr. Yocum that relatives in both Birmingham and Meridian had advised against Mr. Moore's coming to either area because of the tense racial situation.

She was quoted as saying that Mr. Moore was a member of the American Civil Liberties Union and pacifist groups.

Mr. Yocum said Mr. Moore had a large amount of money with him and had a small, two-wheeled cart in which he carried personal effects and copies of a mimeographed letter that he had sent to radio stations and newspapers along his route. It also contained copies of the letter to the President, Mr. Yocum said.

Newsman Charlie Hicks of Radio Station WGAD in Gadsden said he talked to Mr. Moore only an hour before the body was found.

He said Mr. Moore was barefoot, but put on his shoes before entering a small country store to buy canned goods for supper. The walker had a small dog, which he gave to a boy at the store, Mr. Hicks said.

Mr. Hicks said, "I would have taken him to the State line in my car to keep him out of trouble. I told him something might happen to him, but he was determined to go on alone.

"We got an anonymous phone call at the station that this guy was walking along the highway and that there might be a news story of consequence.

"He was a nice, friendly, intelligent guy. Boy, this thing shakes me up. I just talked to him, and now he's dead."

The body was found in a rural area about a mile from the store. The nearest house was 100 yards away.

Mr. Moore was a Marine Corps veteran and fought on Guam during World War II. He has lived in a second floor apartment in downtown Baltimore since last fall.

Mr. Moore was the author of a book entitled "The Mind in Chains" or "Autobiography of a Schizophrenic" published in 1955 by the Exposition Press of New York.

He had studied in Europe and at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. According to his book, he had once lived in Mississippi and had been employed as a welfare department caseworker in Binghamton, N.Y.

During the recent session of the Maryland Legislature, Mr. Moore hiked from Baltimore to Annapolis, about 30 miles, to deliver a letter to Gov. J. Millard Tawes protesting Maryland segregation.

Last winter he was active in demonstrations aimed at desegregating a Baltimore theater near the campus of Morgan College, a predominantly Negro college.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the reason I bring this matter up in the Senate is that the civil rights problem is serious business. We must constantly be reminded of the fact that it is serious business. We are inclined to forget it is serious business, involving not only the freedoms and future and dignity of people, but also their lives. I have stood up time and time again and joined my colleagues in saying that unless we give tongue and meaning to what those who struggle for civil rights say and unless we give Negroes an outlet for things which are deeply and tempestuously bothering them, there is bound to be violence.

It is the very antithesis of what those who oppose all these measures believe. I believe that the very suppression which they preach is what is most likely to produce violence and difficulty of the gravest kind for our country.

This illustrates that this is grim, serious, deadly business. The fact that Congress persists in keeping its hands off will not help, but, instead, will hurt.

The Executive cannot carry out the law himself, even with the best will in the world. That is where I believe the President has been wrong in not adequately pressing for legislation. It is cases like this tragedy, a deep one for this poor fellow who had nothing but good will for his fellow men in his heart, that impress us with how serious this business is and how urgently it requires the attention of Congress. It is not getting that attention.

THE NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on April 2 I introduced, along with Senators COOPER and HARTKE, S. 1255, which would establish a Commission To Revise the Antitrust Laws, along the lines of the Temporary National Economic Commission of the 1940's.

In my introductory remarks, I mentioned a number of instances in which the need for comprehensive review of the antitrust laws, in my judgment, has been most clearly demonstrated. Since introducing the bill, I have received a number of favorable comments from constituents who have provided additional evidence of how much this body of law needs to be reevaluated in the light of our Nation's rapidly changing economic environment.

A clear case of the inadequacy of the antitrust laws as now defined and administered was presented by the advisory opinion of the Federal Trade Commission on April 5, 1963, to the effect that it would be a violation of the antitrust laws for independent druggists to advertise cooperatively if prices were mentioned in the advertisement.

This cooperative advertising is generally carried through to give small retailers some ratability of treatment with large retailers under the Robinson-Patman Act, so that they can pool their advertising allowances, which would be tiny if individual, but adequate if pooled. The Federal Trade Commission, in its advisory opinion, says, "You must not mention price." Of course, as anyone who has read drug ads knows, these ads are meaningless unless prices are mentioned.

While the Commissioners clearly recognized that the practice of cooperative advertising of prices is of vital importance to small businessmen and that the antitrust laws were designed to protect and encourage small business competition, yet the majority of the Commission felt constrained to advise that the antitrust laws were simply inadequate for this purpose and would be contravened by the practice.

This advisory opinion also demonstrates, apart from the uncertainty and inadequacy of the existing substantive law, how inadequate the existing procedural remedies are in this field. Although they were empowered to give an advisory opinion, the Commissioners could not bind themselves, the Department of Justice, or the courts by their opinion, and therefore the businessman could not rely on the opinion as he could, for example, on a tax ruling by the Internal Revenue Service in acting upon the facts he has stated in his request for a ruling. As a result the substantive law itself is distorted as can be seen in two of the Commissioners' statements: They state that they advise that the proposed cooperative advertising would be in violation of the antitrust laws because they want to avoid misleading businessmen to their detriment in a situation of uncertainty under the law. In this way the law becomes certain, but it does so in a way which does not reflect the Commissioners' view of the merits of the case and in a way which is of only negative use to the businessman. Under present circumstances it makes sense to request an advisory opinion only where the businessman is sure of a favorable ruling, because where the law is uncertain, which is the most appropriate occasion for an advisory opinion in advance of action, the Commission will feel constrained to give the most conservative ruling in order to protect the businessman from future enforcement activity against him; and in the process of doing so the Commission then makes the law certain—and negative. In my view this is no fault of the Commission's but of the law, in this case both substantively and procedurely. I note that today the Justice Department in reply to a senatorial inquiry stated a view contrary to that of the majority of the FTC—which only emphasizes the confusion and uncertainty under the law.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the three statements and one dissenting statement of the Federal Trade Commissioners in this case.

There being no objection, the opinions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ANDERSON

It goes without saying that the many small members of an industry should be able to compete on equal footing with its larger competitors. Unfortunately, there seem to be instances where that is not possible. I wish that I could dissent from what appears to be the majority in this case. I fear that for the individual industry members to join in an advertisement which would set out a single price to be charged by all those who participate in the advertisement would be looked upon with some suspicion. I call attention to the fact that the special counsel for the National Association of Retail Druggists has heretofore indicated his reluctance in the matter by stating to the annual meeting of the National Drug Trade Conference at New York, N.Y., on January 22, 1963, as follows:

"I venture the prediction that the antitrust enforcement agencies may frown upon a straightforward advertisement which lists a single price for a product that will be charged by all stores participating in the advertisement."

It offends my sense of justice to find that the small industry members are unable to avail themselves of the same benefits as do their big brothers and so, for that reason, I would very much like to join Commissioner Elman in his dissent hereto, but I believe that the law and the decisions as they now stand preclude such "junction." It is, therefore, with reluctance that I am compelled to subscribe to the view that the program of cooperative advertising as contemplated by the inquirants would probably be in violation of law.

Dissenting Statement of Commissioner Elman

As everyone knows, it is becoming more and more difficult for small retailers, particularly in the drug and food industries, to withstand the overwhelming competition of chainstores and supermarkets. The chains have all the advantages of mass buying power, large capital resources, and choice locations in busy shopping centers. In addition, and this is most pertinent here, a large food and drug chain can take a single ad in a newspaper to advertise products sold at the same price in all of its stores. Under cooperative advertising arrangements, the cost of these advertisements is largely borne by manufacturers of the advertised products.

Congress has recognized the need for giving small independent neighborhood retailers the opportunity to meet this kind of competition from the large chains. Under section 2(d) of the Robinson-Patman Act, a manufacturer who grants cooperative advertising allowances to some of his customers is obligated to make them available on proportionally equal terms to all of his customers. As a practical matter, however, a small neighborhood retailer cannot afford, by himself, to take a large ad in the local newspaper. The only realistic way for him to take advantage of the benefits of section 2(d) is to join with other small retailers, pool the advertising allowances to which each is legally entitled, and publish joint advertisements containing prices of the products which they sell. Obviously, a joint advertisement by small retailers which does not quote selling prices would be a waste of money. The owner of a corner grocery store is not interested in institutional advertising. That kind of advertising would hardly attract business away from his larger rivals, whose ads invariably feature weekend specials and the like.

What is proposed here, as I understand it, is not an agreement among competing retailers to fix prices, which of course is a per se violation of the antitrust laws, but an agreement among independent retailers in different neighborhoods, and who therefore do not compete with each other in any practical sense, to combine their advertising allowances, to which they are legally entitled under the Robinson-Patman Act, for the purpose of advertising cooperatively. In its advisory opinion here, the Commission flashes a red light on such cooperative advertising by small businessmen. I think the Commission is making a great mistake. Preservation of small independent businessmen is a central objective of every statute that Congress has directed this Commission to enforce; and unlike my colleagues, I find nothing manifestly illegal per se in the proposals submitted.

Per se violations of the antitrust laws comprise those restraints of trade which inherently have no function other than the stifling of competition. As the Supreme Court stated in *Northern Pacific Railroad Co.* v. *U.S.*, 356 U.S. 1, 5, per se violations are "agreements or practices which because of their pernicious effect on competition and lack of any redeeming virtue are conclusively presumed to be unreasonable and therefore illegal without elaborate inquiry as to the precise harm they have caused or the business excuse for their use."

Although an agreement to fix or maintain prices is unquestionably illegal per se, this does not mean that every agreement or arrangement which has incidental effects on prices can similarly be condemned by a per se test. *Appalachian Coals, Inc.* v. *U.S.*, 288 U.S. 344; *Chicago Board of Trade* v. *U.S.*, 246 U.S. 231, 238. In his opinion for the Court in the latter case, Mr. Justice Brandeis stated:

"The true test of legality is whether the restraint imposed is such as merely regulates and perhaps thereby promotes competition, or whether it is such as may suppress or even destroy competition. To determine that question the court must ordinarily consider the facts peculiar to the business to which the restraint is applied; its condition before and after the restraint was imposed; the nature of the restraint, and its effect, actual, or probable. The history of the restraint, the evil believed to exist, the reason for adopting the particular remedy, the purpose or end sought to be attained, are all relevant facts."

As the Supreme Court held in *Brown Shoe Co.* v. *U.S.*, 370 U.S. 294, 330, and *White Motor Co.* v. *U.S.*, decided March 4, 1963, slip opinion pp. 9–10, a restraint of trade cannot be condemned as a per se violation if "[w]e do not know enough of the economic and business stuff out of which these arrangements emerge to be certain. They may be too dangerous to sanction or they may be allowable protections against aggressive competitors or the only practicable means a small company has for breaking into or staying in business * * * and within the rule of reason."

It begs the question, the answer to which necessarily depends on the particular facts, to hold that the appearance in a joint advertisement of any "prices, terms, or conditions of sale of any of the items" establishes, without more, the per se illegality of the advertising plan. Plans for joint advertising by retailers are not necessarily, and in all circumstances, the equivalent of price-fixing conspiracies. Where, as is represented here, a plan has neither the purpose nor the effect of restraining competition, and involves no agreement by participating retailers to adhere to advertised prices, a per se test is inapplicable. Such a simple yardstick may be used only—as the Supreme Court pointed out in the Northern Pacific Railroad case—in dealing with practices whose "pernicious effect on competition and lack of any redeeming virtue" have been conclusively shown. Here, however, the Commission cannot escape the necessity for determining the legality of a joint advertising plan by examining it in the light of all the relevant factors stated by Mr. Justice Brandeis in the Chicago Board of Trade case and reiterated the other day by the Supreme Court in White Motor.

It seems to me that the Commission, charged as it is with the duty to promote rather than discourage competition and to strengthen rather than impair the ability of small businessmen to survive, should take a more positive and encouraging attitude toward programs for joint advertising by retailers. As has recently been pointed out, "Prosecuting a practice of this kind would injure rather than preserve competition, and encourage instead of preventing monopoly" (Henry Bison, Jr., general counsel, National Association of Retail Grocers, Nargus Bulletin, February 1963, p. 92). The notion that small businessmen should be sent to jail for engaging in such a practice seems to me too fantastic to be taken seriously.

Statement of Commissioner MacIntyre

The Commission's advisory opinion in this important matter correctly advises the representatives of small business organizations regarding the application of Federal antimonopoly laws to their proposed plans. It is the duty of the Commission to so advise the representatives of these small business firms. We would do them a disservice if we should advise them otherwise. Of what benefit would we be to small business firms if we should advise them that the course of action they propose to take is approved and then they should find themselves in the toils of the law for having followed that course of action? Our duty is to assist business firms in avoiding any such result.

The Supreme Court of the United States in recent cases brought by the U.S. Department of Justice against firms for engaging in price fixing in violation of the Sherman Act have made it clear that such course of action constitutes per se violation of the Sherman Act (see *U.S.* v. *Socony Vacuum Oil Co., et al.* 310 U.S. 150, decided in May 1940). In more recent cases in which small business firms were charged with violating the Sherman Act, the Department of Justice has insisted that prison sentences be given to those found guilty. As a result, some small businessmen in Ohio in recent years were ordered to serve prison terms for violation of the Sherman Act. We should do all possible to assist small businessmen in avoiding such a predicament.

Statement of Commissioner Higginbotham

This request today evokes a moment of truth for this Commission. With unquestioned sincerity, the able and distinguished dissenting Commissioner beseeches us to cast aside years of precedent in price-fixing cases. It was in 1940, and thus after its decision in *Appalachian Coals, Inc., et al.* vs. *United States*, 288 U.S. 344 (1933), that the Supreme Court stated:

"Thus for over 40 years this Court has consistently and without deviation adhered to the principle that price fixing agreements are unlawful per se under the Sherman Act and that no showing of so-called competitive abuses or evils which those agreements were designed to eliminate or alleviate may be interposed as a defense." *United States* vs. *Socony Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.* 310 U.S. 150, 218 (1940).

The holding of this case remains undisturbed.

We are not unaware of the legal maxim "Cessante ratione legis, cessat et ipsa lex," nor of the cases which rest on such reasoning. But the function of an advisory opinion is to declare the applicability of the present state of the law to novel and sometimes disturbing facts. To chart the future course of the law is not its task. Neither the thin subtleties of semantics nor the sharp but barren thrust of logic will much warm a businessman subject to the wintry blast of possible criminal prosecution.

Commissioner Elman does not dispute that price fixing is a per se offense. Rather he says that the plan involved herein does not factually amount to price fixing. We are constrained to note our exception.

1. The fact that the businessmen involved may have unhampered discretion to depart from the scheme involved does not mitigate the offense:

"The fact that no penalties are imposed for deviation from the price schedule is not material." *United States* v. *National Association of Real Estate Boards*, 399 U.S. 435, 489 (1950).

2. The agreements, even if only incidentally affecting price may still be offensive under the antitrust laws. In Socony Vacuum, supra, the court asserted that:

"Prices are fixed * * * if the range within which purchases or sales will be made is agreed upon, if the prices paid or charged are to be at a certain level or on ascending or descending scales, if they are to be uniform, or if by various formulas they are related to the market prices." *United States* v. *Socony Vacuum*, supra, at 222.

3. There is no doubt that retail drugstores operating in the same city may be held to be in competition. In *Brown Shoe Co., Inc.* v. *United States*, 370 U.S. 294, 338 (1962), the Court held:

"We believe, however, that the record fully supports the district court's findings that shoe stores in the outskirts of cities compete effectively with stores in central downtown areas."

See also, *United States* v. *Cunningham Drugstores* (complaint filed June 30, 1960, Civil Act No. 20266, D.C., E.D. of Mich., Southern Division), complaint charging violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act by Cunningham's acquisition of other retail drugstores, both being located in Detroit.

4. No one could quarrel with the dissent's assertion that particular cases pivot on particular facts. And once allowed to frame the question in terms of the facts as it sees them the dissent's answer is inescapable. Thus, Commissioner Elman declares that the proposed plan has "neither the purpose nor effect of restraining competition and involves no agreement by participating retailers to adhere to advertised prices." Obviously if all these assertions were inescapably true, or were the only permissible inference from the facts, a different result might be reached. But that is the very issue—whether in fact the purpose and effect of the plan could be construed to restrain competition.

In sum, if one assumes price fixing, one need not examine "all the relevant factors." Conversely, if one assumes no price fixing, one may examine "all the relevant factors." To employ such reasoning is to become encased in conundrums. Moreover, it is clear from the differing opinions within the Commission itself that the plan at best is on the periphery of violative behavior, and that reasonable men differ concerning its impact. And as Mr. Justice Holmes asserted in *Nash* v. *U.S.*, 229 U.S. 373, 376, 377 (1913):

> "The statute contains in its definition an element of degree as to which estimates may differ, with the result that a man might find himself in prison because his honest judgment did not anticipate that of a jury of less competent men. * * *
>
> "But * * * the law is full of instances where a man's fate depends on his estimating rightly, that is, as the jury subsequently estimates it, some matter of degree."

In view of the uncertainties and the substantial risk inherent in civil or criminal prosecution, no administrative agency should give this plan the "green light."

The function of this Commission—as I see it—is not to resolve a lover's quarrel over who loves the small businessman more. Hopefully, it is evenhanded justice we dispense—not bouquets for or vendettas against one class or group.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nominations of incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.

DWINDLE, DWINDLE LITTLE TELSTAR, HOW I WONDER WHAT YOU ARE—PUBLIC OR PRIVATE?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I rise to urge the Senate to take no action at all on the request from the President to advise and consent to the nominations submitted for appointment as incorporators and members of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp.

I assure my colleagues that I derive no measure of satisfaction from what I have to say today.

I wish it clearly understood that what I say has no bearing whatever on the competence, the integrity, the ability, and the qualifications of the proposed incorporators, upon whose nominations extensive hearings were held by the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

When I see how the Senate and the other body have maneuvered themselves into a situation which greatly diminishes their stature in the eyes of the American public, casting a shadow on their ability to enact sound constructive legislation, I obtain no solace from the fact that I can point to the record made on the floor of the Senate last year and say, "There were a few of us who tried to make you listen last year—who tried then to point out that this was bad legislation which would come back to haunt the Senate." There were 16 of us to be exact—Senators BARTLETT, BURDICK, CARROLL, CHURCH, CLARK, DOUGLAS, GORE, GRUENING, KEFAUVER, LONG of Louisiana, MCNAMARA, MORSE, MOSS, NEUBERGER, PROXMIRE, and YARBOROUGH.

We offered many amendments to delete or correct many glaring imperfections in the bill before us. All were summarily tabled with totally inadequate time or opportunity to debate the serious issues involved in the measure then before us.

I do not recall these incidents, Mr. President, in any attempt to open old wounds, or to make a "we told you so" statement. I do so only because the fact that this legislation has defects should not now come as a surprise to anyone who was in this Chamber last year. I do so also in order to point up the need for all of us together to work this year to undo thoughtfully and deliberately the errors committed by the Senate last year in haste and confusion.

You will recall, Mr. President, that one of the amendments to the satellite bill which I offered and which was summarily tabled would have established the satellite corporation along the lines of TVA. If my amendment had been adopted, the questions we face today would not have arisen.

What is the question we now face?

We are today being called upon to advise and consent to the appointment by the President of 14 men to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.—a private corporation for profit organized under the business corporation laws of the District of Columbia.

Is this the usual situation in which the Senate advises and consents in fulfillment of its responsibilities under the Constitution? The Constitution provides:

> Article II, section 2, clause 2: "The President * * * shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint * * * all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for."

Now the men on whose nominations we are being asked to advise and consent will not be—when and if appointed—"officers of the United States." If that is not clear from a reading of the law providing for the creation of the Communications Satellite Corp., then the Attorney General has made it abundantly clear.

Section 301 of Public Law 87-624—the Communications Satellite Act of 1962—provides:

> There is hereby authorized to be created a communications satellite corporation for profit which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government.

The Attorney General in his opinion has stated:

> With these directives in the act, there would seem to be no doubt that the incorporators, as directors, will have the same status and responsibilities as individuals serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation and will be holding private, not public, posts.

I know of no precedent under which the Senate has ever in the past advised and consented to the nomination of members of the board of directors of a private, profitmaking corporation. The mere fact—astonishing as it may be—that NASA has now before the Congress a request for the appropriation to it of some $51 million in public funds so that it can carry on research, the benefits of which would inure solely to the benefit of the private stockholders of the corporation and not to the United States, does not make this corporation an instrumentality of the United States. I shall deal with this extraordinary attempted raid upon the Treasury of the United States when that issue is before us.

Today, I merely wish to protest strongly against this perversion of the "advise and consent" clause of the Constitution.

The course of action we are asked to follow today will itself constitute a dangerous precedent in the years to come.

I wish to make clear that, not being a constitutional lawyer, or any kind of lawyer, I am not raising the issue as to whether constitutionally the Congress can by legislation, not in the form of a constitutional amendment, amend the Constitution to extend the "advise and consent" provision to officials of private corporations. I am saying that even if the Congress has this power—and I doubt it—it should not exercise it.

Consider, Mr. President, what a Pandora's box we would be opening if we took this course of action.

In the first place, how would these men be commissioned by the President if they were appointed? The usual form of a commission is as follows:

> JOHN F. KENNEDY, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
>
> *To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:*
>
> Know ye, that, reposing special trust and confidence in the integrity, diligence, and discretion of John Doe, of ———, I have nominated and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate do appoint him ——————— and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfill the duties of that office according to law, and to have and to hold the said office, with all the rights and emoluments thereunto legally appertaining, during the term of — years from the ——— unless this commission be sooner revoked by the President of the United States for the time being.
>
> In testimony whereof, I have caused these letters to be made patent and the seal of the United States of America to be hereunto affixed.
>
> Done at the city of Washington this — day of ——— in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ——— and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ———.
>
> JOHN F. KENNEDY.
>
> By the President:
>
> DEAN RUSK,
> *Secretary of State.*

These words are hardly appropriate in the case of persons appointed to be members of the board of directors of a private, profitmaking corporation. Should the President commission these men with a commission reading more appropriately:

JOHN F. KENNEDY, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

Know ye, that, reposing special trust and confidence in the integrity, diligence, and discretion of John Doe, of ———, I have nominated and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate do appoint him a member of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp., Inc., a private, profit-making corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfill the duties of that office according to law and for the best interests of the stockholders of that corporation, and to have and to hold the said office, with all the rights and emoluments thereunto appertaining, during the term of 3 years from the date hereof.

In testimony whereof, I have caused these letters to be made patent and the seal of the United States of America to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this — day of ——— in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ——— and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ———.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Such a commission would more properly meet the factual situation.

It would be interesting to see, if these nominations are confirmed by the Senate—although I hope they will not be, because I feel the Senate should not be voting on these nominations at all—whether the board of directors will follow a course of action which will put the interests of the people of the United States above the profit-making interests of the stockholders of this private corporation. This would involve a new and unprecedented conflict of interest.

However, there is a matter of greater importance at stake than the form of the commissions to be issued to the members of the Communications Satellite Corp. by the President.

That is the question of their removal.

At this point I wish to interject the thought that nothing I say here today is intended in any way to reflect upon the character and integrity of the nominees involved. I do not know them and my examples are without regard to them personally and only by way of illustrating a certain important point.

These men, nominated by the President to be members of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp., will serve as the initial board of directors until the first annual meeting of the stockholders or until their successors are elected and qualified. Thereafter, according to Public Law 87-624, three members of the board will be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, six will be elected annually by the stockholders who are communications common carriers; and six will be elected annually by the other stockholders. Except for the initial Presidentially appointed members of the board who will serve staggered terms of 1, 2, and 3 years, the later Presidentially appointed members of the board of directors may be removed by the stockholders.

But what about the removal of the Presidentially appointed members of the board of directors?

They cannot be removed by impeachment. The Constitution, article II, section 4, provides: The President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Since the Presidentially appointed members of the board of directors of this private, profitmaking corporation are private citizens and not "civil officers of the United States" they canot be removed by impeachment.

How can they be removed for malfeasance in office—if they can be removed at all?

Can they be removed by the other members of the board of directors? By the stockholders? For what reason? If we say they can be removed by the other members of the board of directors or the stockholders, are we not then making a nullity of the Presidential appointive powers by placing in the other members of the board of directors or the stockholders a veto over persons nominated by the President and appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate?

Could the Presidentially appointed members of the board of directors be removed, for example, because they voted consistently in behalf of a course of action which put the interests of the people of the United States above the profitmaking interests of the stockholders of this private corporation? Such a result would make a hollow mockery out of the venerated process of the Senate's Constitutional obligation of advising and consenting to certain Presidential nominations.

But there is a more serious and dangerous possibility, and that is that these men to whose nominations we are now being asked to advise and consent are not amenable to restraint at all—cannot be removed for any cause. They cannot be impeached, for they are private persons; they are not "civil officers of the United States." If then, they cannot be removed by the remainder of the board of directors or by the stockholders, they will be able to serve with impunity and engage in any activities—inimicable as they may be to the best interests of the corporation or of the citizens of the United States—as they may see fit and as may not be prohibited by any other provision of law.

I have taken an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. I cannot stand idly by while an important provision of that Constitution is used to throw a cloak of national respectability over the activities of a private corporation whose basic concern is—as it must legally be—to make the biggest profits legitimately possible for its stockholders.

I cannot stand idly by while the Senate creates the precedent of reaching into private enterprises and asserting the right to advise and consent to Presidential appointments of members of their board of directors. Where will this lead?

It should be borne in mind that at the hearings on these nominations, the nominees brought out the fact that they did not feel that the corporation was confined in its business ventures to operating the communications satellite system. They felt they could undertake any other type of business the directors and stockholders thought would be profitable. Perhaps we shall soon see, stretching from Maine to California and from Oregon to Florida, a string of roadside hotdog stands, owned and operated by the Communications Satellite Corp., proudly displaying the sign:

> Three members of the board of directors of this corporation were nominated by the President of the United States and appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States.

We would have no authority to forbid the corporation from entering the hotdog stand business.

The President of the United States would have no such authority.

To what greater extent could the dignity of the Presidency of the United States and of the Senate of the United States be debased?

If we assert the right to nominate one-fifth of the members of the board of directors of this private corporation, would we not then have a precedent for asserting a similar right with respect to all private, profitmaking corporations operating in the District of Columbia or in interstate commerce?

If so, why do we stop at only one-fifth of the members of the board? Why not appoint all the members of the board?

It should be noted that delay in acting on these nominations will not adversely affect the operations of the corporation. It is already a functioning corporation with a charter from the District of Columbia.

We are being asked, today, to take the first, long step along a road which leads I know not where.

Let us not debase the power of the Senate to advise and consent to Presidential nominations. Let us rather hold up on action on these nominations and wait until we can enact the necessary amendments to the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 either making this corporation the complete private, profitmaking corporation which it is, doing away with anomalies such as the one now before us, or making it a true instrumentality of the United States, like TVA or NASA.

Let us prevent this corporation from roaming the country, seeking to make profits for its stockholders, while wearing the cloak of Presidential sponsorship and Senate concurrence.

The American people have the right to be protected by us against any such deceit.

Last year, after the fight on the communications satellite bill was over, Mr. James A. Wechsler wrote in the October issue of the Progressive an excellent article about that fight and about some of the unanswered questions which arose concerning it. He stated in part:

> The congressional battle over the administration's communications satellite bill ended in late summer with a crushing defeat for the small band of men who had dared to oppose it. Their lost cause is probably already largely forgotten by most Americans, if, indeed, it was ever seriously noticed by many. Yet one ventures the prediction that we have not heard the last of this affair. It might be described as one of the great untold stories of the early space age—and, conceivably, the first momentous scandal of this new era. In a free society such episodes have a way of haunting the participants long after the deals have ostensibly been completed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wechsler's article appear in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SATELLITE, INC.

(By James A. Wechsler)

The congressional battle over the administration's communications satellite bill ended in late summer with a crushing defeat for the small band of men who had dared to oppose it. Their lost cause is probably already largely forgotten by most Americans, if, indeed, it was ever seriously noticed by many. Yet one ventures the prediction that we have not heard the last of this affair. It might be described as one of the great untold stories of the early space age—and, conceivably, the first momentous scandal of this new era. In a free society such episodes have a way of haunting the participants long after the deals have ostensibly been completed.

This does not purport to be the definitive history of that battle. There are many aspects of it that still defy explanation and elude inquiry. In large measure what is set forth here is based primarily on a reading—sometimes between the lines—of a 456-page volume called Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, on H.R. 11040, an act for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes. The story is supplemented by conversations with some actors in the drama who could move behind the scenes.

There will be little recorded here that was not accessible to the press; but it will also be apparent that much of it was never clearly or dramatically defined in most news organs. There were a few reporters who early sensed the dimensions of the story, but they were only a handful.

While we gaped and blinked in wonderment over the dawn of Telstar, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. staged the first and perhaps decisive commercial coup of the space epoch. That it had the official blessing of the Kennedy administration (and the natural sympathy of the Republican leadership) in this endeavor merely underlines the magnitude of the feat. Ultimately we must ask: Why? But first let us turn to the record, where the heart of the story can be found.

In December 1961 Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, speaking before the Political Committee of the U.N. General Assembly, revealed that in his view the communications satellite represents a "fundamental breakthrough in communications [which] could affect the lives of people everywhere. It could forge new bonds of mutual knowledge and understanding between the nations. * * * The United States wishes to see this facility made available to all states on a global and nondiscriminatory basis. * * * We would like to see U.N. members not only use this service, but also participate in its ownership and operation."

As Ernest Gross, former U.S. representative to the United Nations, testified before the Senate group, Mr. Stevenson's large view of the new day, originally the official administration view, was in dramatic contrast with remarks which Senator ROBERT KERR, chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, had addressed, in February to Under Secretary of State George McGhee on the same subject. "It occurs to me," the Senator said, "that you do not understand that the only new things about this hoped-for satellite communications system is that it is just an improved method of doing what is now being done."

Obviously Mr. Stevenson and Senator KERR were talking about two different worlds. Yet in the end it was essentially the perspective of the Oklahoma tycoon that shaped the legislative outcome. In the measure as finally enacted there was not a single reference to Mr. Stevenson's vision of the United Nations role in the expanding satellite universe. In the final phase of debate, a letter was extracted from Mr. Stevenson and read on the Senate floor by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY expressing approval of the pending bill. How Mr. Stevenson reconciled his earlier words with the legislative deed is one of the unanswered mysteries of this story. But it is perhaps relevant that he succeeded in avoiding a personal appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee despite persistent demands from Senator WAYNE MORSE that he submit himself to interrogation.

One begins with the Stevenson contradiction, even though he took almost no direct part in the controversy, because it points up so many of the paradoxes and puzzles of this strange proceeding.

What was fundamentally at stake in the legislative dispute was whether the Government should control the nascent system of satellite communications for primarily public ends, or whether it should cede dominance of the enterprise to A.T. & T. for primarily profitable purposes. There was much byplay over the totality of A.T. & T.'s grip under the prospective bill, but even the staunchest supporters of the measure offered weak and contradictory testimony on that point; indeed, they seemed divided between the pretense that A.T. & T.'s role would be limited, and the insistence that the Republic was fortunate to have A.T. & T. volunteer to take over.

Obviously, if one accepted, Senator Kerr's view that the whole project involved more of what had already been done, no great debate was at hand. But if one accepted Mr. Stevenson's portrait of a fateful turning point in men's lives, the abdication of government was inexplicable. Yet this is basically what has occurred, under the direction of an administration rhetorically committed to the earlier Stevenson position.

Whodunit? How?

The case for the bill was won by a compound of confusion and inertia. It is surely not my contention that all those who voted for the bill were tools of corporate power. I would argue, however, on the basis of the printed record, that those who were to be damned as the "filibusterers"—a charge worthy of fuller inquiry—were generally those who paid the closest attention to the argument. Some of the stakes at issue were first set forth on March 6, 1962, when Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, leader of the small band, appeared before the Senate Space Committee. The issues were intensively explored a few weeks later at hearings before his subcommittee, but almost none of the press bothered to attend, even though these hearings contained some of the few direct confrontations between the proponents and opponents of the bill prior to the floor debate in June. And rarely have I read as brilliant and diligent an exercise in congressional cross-examination as that conducted by Senator WAYNE MORSE in the hearing held before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Yet in most of the cryptic newspaper accounts of the whole episode MORSE emerged as a curmudgeon laboring an obscure point.

How, then, does one dramatize what really happened? How does one translate the devastating impact of the hundreds of pages of hearings that so few Americans have read and that were so inadequately reported in most places? One can try by writing some of the headlines that the testimony might have received, and by suggesting to the reader how different the outcome might have been if these headlines had been widely used. Imagine what echoes may have been stirred if there had been large headlines saying: "Stevenson Reverses Stand on Satellite Bill, but Spurns Demand That He Testify."

The biggest headlines might have been won by Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency; they would have said that he had resigned in protest over the administration's support of a measure which exposed his Agency to the dubious mercy of A.T. & T. He did not do so; instead he engaged in the difficult exercise of trying to deprecate the bill without betraying "the team." Yet, even within those limitations, his testimony might have rocked the country if its significance had been accurately appraised and heralded. For what he said was that the fees required by A.T. & T. might be so high as to bar USIA programs from the satellite system. Murrow testified that, unless the Government received preferential rates (nowhere provided for in the bill), it would cost USIA $900 million annually at commercial rates to utilize the satellite network for 90 minutes a day in underdeveloped areas. Now consider this testimony:

"Senator MORSE. Would it be desirable, Mr. Murrow, if we set up a satellite communications system, to have the facilities of that system made available to our Government for the transmitting of the type of freedom programs that you and I have had in mind as we have been discussing the problem?

"Mr. MURROW. It seems to me that this would be desirable, sir.

"Senator MORSE. Is there anything in this bill that guarantees to the U.S. Government a reduction in commercial rates for the transmission of U.S. programs of freedom to the areas of the world where the Communists are a 24-hour-night-and-day threat to freedom?

"Mr. MURROW. No, sir."

In Murrow's view, the United States might find itself at a severe disadvantage in competition with Communist programs around the world unless "we could secure a reduced rate or increased appropriations."

As the hearings progressed, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, a chief advocate of the leave-it-to-A.T. & T. bloc at these seminars, questioned Murrow's figures on prospective cost. He accused the USIA Chief of vastly overstating them. Murrow held his ground, conceding only that in the great uncharted areas we are about to enter any estimate is necessarily hazardous. Perhaps the sharpest commentary on the proceedings is that no conclusive effort was made to resolve the gap between them before the vote sealed the choice.

A reader can only assume that the Senate chose to ignore Mr. Murrow's warning. But then, so did he. For when the climatic question came, he announced that, if he were a member of the Senate, he would vote for the bill. As in the case of Mr. Stevenson, the team spirit was apparently irresistible—or compulsory.

Now let us suppose that in many cities in the land citizens picked up their newspapers and saw this headline: "Mystery Move Curbs U.S. Rights in Satellite Plan, Probe Hears."

As initially drafted, the satellite bill contained this clear clause, based directly on the President's words of July 24, 1961:

"The corporation shall not enter into negotiations with any international agency, foreign government or entity without a prior notification to the Department of State, which will conduct or supervise such negotiations. All agreements and arrangements with any such agency, government, or entity shall be subject to the approval of the Department of State."

At first the State Department and other administration spokesmen argued vehemently for this provision, despite questioning by Senator Kerr which was considered by many to be as acid and blistering as any ever heard on Capitol Hill. Apparently this assertion of government influence in the business of the emerging monopoly was unsatisfactory to the men who were taking over the show. And so this language was substituted:

"Whenever the corporation shall enter into business negotiations with respect to facilities, corporations or services authorized by this act with any international or foreign entity, it shall notify the Department of State of the negotiations. The Department of State shall advise the corporation of relevant foreign policy considerations. Throughout such negotiations the corporation shall keep the Department of State informed with respect to such consideration. The corporation may request the Department of State to assist in the negotiations, and that Department shall render such assistance as may be appropriate."

The State Department, in effect, abdicated any controlling rule over the conduct of negotiations; in return the corporation pledged only to let the Department know what it was doing. As someone remarked, the whole thing might have been simplified by admitting A.T. & T. to the United Nations.

Who dictated the change? Was not this single episode, embodying a complete reversal on the part of the administration, sufficient to cast doubt and discredit on the whole operation? Yet I would guess that not one in a million Americans knows that such a remarkable alteration was engineered, and that Secretary of State Dean Rusk eventually found himself defending it.

This was not a minor matter of rhetoric, concerning only the handling of business arrangements. The real point was underlined by Benjamin V. Cohen, that wise old New Dealer who came forward to challenge the bill. In response to a question concerning the possibility of separating business matters from foreign policy in negotiations involving the satellite communications system, Cohen responded, "I think it is utterly impossible at this stage * * * almost all problems are mixed problems, and the State Department should not be embarrassed by having to negotiate through an instrument of this character. * * * It becomes embarrassing, even in the case of companies on whose boards the Government has appointed no directors, to say these [business matters] are private negotiations that do not bind the Government. It is much more difficult to escape responsibility for a corporation, three directors of which are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate."

But the mystery of why the bill was rewritten on this crucial point was neither aired in any serious form in most public places, nor ever satisfactorily resolved.

Much of the argument for swift enactment of the bill rested on the popular cry that we could not afford any delay in the great space competition. The note of urgency dominated many headlines. Now, let us dream that many of the stories on August 8 had been headlined this way: "Witness Asks Senate Probers: Will A.T. & T. Strike Against Government Rule of Satellite Plan?"

This was the thrust of Joseph Rauh's testimony in opposition to the measure. One of a handful of citizens who testified against the bill, he argued—as did Cohen, and as had the dissident Senate bloc—that there was no desperate need for passage of any such final legislation at this time; that the National Aeronautical and Space Administration could proceed, in cooperation with private industry technicians, in promoting the satellite program, just as it had managed the Telstar achievement. Meanwhile, the country could continue to weigh its ultimate course; it should not be stampeded into surrendering to A.T. & T.'s demands.

There could be only one plausible reason for haste, Rauh observed: "If we lose any time through not passing this bill, it would be because of a sitdown strike by A.T. & T. * * * If they are not prepared to cooperate without this bill, then I think there ought to be an investigation of A.T. & T., and that fact ought to be known to the American public; that they are putting their dollars ahead of the fight against communism."

Nowhere have I found any effective answer to this contention; nowhere have I read or heard any compelling explanation as to why time was so desperately of the essence in this proceeding unless A.T. & T. had whispered the word that it would strike unless its terms were met. As far as I know, A.T. & T. never felt obliged to proclaim that its services were at the Government's disposal regardless of the outcome of the legislative argument.

There were many days on which testimony offered the committee would have justified such headline language as: "Profits Come First in Satellite Bill, Senate Probers Told."

Defenders as well as critics of the bill were obliged to acknowledge the point, for the wording of the statute is unmistakable. There were, of course, some Government witnesses who engaged in the painfully innocent exercise of suggesting that there could be no serious conflict between corporate profit and national interest.

Thus, Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton Minow, a bright and able young man who will, I predict, some day read his testimony with some degree of anguish, valiantly voiced his confidence that the directors of the satellite corporation would be Americans first.

Former U.N. Ambassador Gross, addressing himself to the same question, quietly recited the facts of life that should hardly have eluded Mr. Minow. Discussing the duality of interest that might confront the directors of the satellite corporation, he said, in response to a question from Senator Albert Gore, that the aims and goals of a corporation director were quite different from those of a Government official. "It seems to me," said Gross, "that the perspective has to be different. The director of a corporation for profit is bound, in the interests of the stockholders, to do the profitable thing. I think it would not be a matter of lack of patriotism or wisdom at all."

What he was saying, of course, was nothing more than that what is good for A. T. & T. is not necessarily good for the country.

Enterprising journalists might have found some further headline material if they had pursued the gap between the administration's ultimate position and the stand taken by Assistant Attorney General Lee Loevinger, chief of the anti-trust division of the Department of Justice, in earlier testimony before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. Discussing the prospect of A. T. & T. control of the satellite program, Loevinger suggested how the present vested interests of the corporation might cast a shadow over its operations in the great new venture: "There would be a natural reluctance on the part of companies with large investments in existing facilities to take speedy action which would make these facilities obsolete. A company controlled by A. T. & T. could scarcely avoid considering the effect of satellite facilities on existing investments in cable facilities."

It was this point which Senators Kefauver and Long tried to stress, citing instances where A. T. & T. had held back on new developments. Again no one was listening.

Despite Mr. Loevinger's warning, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy warmly saluted the satellite bill and Loevinger ceased and desisted from any further public statements along these lines. The Attorney General based his stand on the assumption that the Federal Communications Commission would keep A.T. & T. in line. He conceded that nothing in the past justified this assumption but added wistfully that he hoped the FCC would "start to meet its responsibilities."

Yet even this pious hope did not confront the central problem. For the act explicitly declares that "there is hereby authorized to be created a communications satellite corporation for profit." This is language that A.T. & T. understands.

And an International Telephone and Telegraph vice president testified that he thought the satellite corporation should get a special subsidy if the Government wanted it to conduct initially unprofitable operations in poor territory.

So it would seem that the Government—meaning the people—loses on both ends. It is denied any real assurance that A.T. & T. will carry the satellite program into those impoverished areas where it may be most urgently needed but where the returns may be least lucrative. Nor does it obtain any pledge of preferential rates for direct government programs.

In a way the most unheralded story of all, which got almost no attention except in those subscribing newspapers which chose to print Drew Pearson's column on that day, involved the press itself.

On August 3, during Newton Minow's interrogation by the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Russell B. Long had commented on the extensive volume of tax-deductible advertising published by A.T. & T. to hail its own role in Telstar. Then he observed that "any daily newspaper in the country which might undertake to attack editorially the bill that we have before us is subject to the complete right of this corporation either to advertise or not advertise in that paper. Also the corporation has the right to deduct this advertising expense but they don't have to place that advertising with any newspaper."

To which Minow responded: "I can't believe that the press would be influenced in taking editorial judgment on the basis of that."

One hopes that Minow's expression of innocence is not a true reflection of his worldliness in dealing with corporate pressures.

There are cynical men who say that it does not really matter whether A.T. & T. assumes corporate command of the satellite program or whether the Government retains nominal control while "leasing" the venture. They may not be entirely wrong. It may well be that opponents of the measure should have fought for full-fledged Government ownership and operation of the program, despite the counsels of caution from those who asserted that such a course was "politically impossible."

It is said that "public opinion" would have rebelled against any "radical" approach. But those who profess to speak for public opinion usually bear little resemblance to the man in the street. The only poll I have seen, conducted by an agency called "What America Thinks," reported in mid-August rather startling answers to the question: "Do you think the future network of American communication satellites—like Telstar—should be owned and developed by the Government or by private industry?" The replies: 44.1 per cent favored Government ownership, 39.3 percent voted for private industry, 16.6 percent were uncertain or had no opinion. This arithmetic is hardly consistent with the overwhelming pro-industry vote in a Congress that treated opponents of the bill as if they were village idiots or dangerous subversives.

Inevitably one comes to the question of the "filibuster." It was, in fact, only when the embattled opponents of the bill began their last ditch fight that the issue became page-1 news; then it was largely featured as a parody on the behavior of those liberals who were allegedly employing the device they professed to abhor, and they were generally pictured as cranky men reciting old Populist slogans.

There was a surface "touché" in this portrait. But once again the indolence and indifference of the press—mingled with a certain chronic disdain for the liberal set—sustained a false image. For one thing, the "filibusterers" repeatedly explained that they were not attempting to bury the bill; they were fighting for time. On numerous occasions they made it plain that they would be ready to vote immediately after the fall elections; have Southern filibusterers against civil rights ever similarly offered a deadline for decision?

Wayne Morse pointed out, at the time Senate Leader Mike Mansfield was piously saying "today we begin the 15th day of debate on this bill," that the measure had actually been before the Senate on 13 days for a total of 33 hours and 15 minutes. In 1957, during the debate on the civil rights bill, Strom Thurmond made a speech lasting 24 hours and 18 minutes.

Thus the cry of filibuster was in many respects a fraud. The summit of hypocrisy was reached when cloture was finally voted by those who, in the memorable words of Senator Long, would do for A.T. & T. what they would never do for the NAACP—and who thereby told the world that property rights held a large priority over human rights in the U.S. Senate.

In the end the big story is the mystery story: Whodunit?

It was a bill that for the first time in our history placed the U.S. Government in the role of promoter of a private profit-making monopoly venture, with the President himself designating three directors as his agents. As Benjamin Cohen pointed out, "It will be difficult to convince those who buy the stock that the President has not recommended its purchase." There is no precedent for this use of the Presidency for the sponsorship of a business enterprise.

Why did a New Frontier administration become the architect of this strange deal? Why was there such frantic pressure for quick action? Why were the voices of dissent within the administration forced to fall into line, creating such odd and embarrassing spectacles as the conflicts between Mr. Stevenson's wise words to the United Nations and his desultory letter of capitulation to Senator Humphrey? Why was Mr. Murrow obliged to say that he would vote for a bill that is implicitly damned by his own testimony? And why did Senator Humphrey, who had earlier counseled against deciding on organization until the system became operational, join those who clamored for haste?

President Kennedy has lamented the pervasiveness of mythology in our economic thought. Yet rarely has a measure been camouflaged in so much myth—most basically the myth that there can be no conflict of interest between corporate profit and national needs. Perhaps most wondrous of all were the testimonials to the glories of the free enterprise system recited by the Senators who were in the process of creating a vast new monopoly, paving the way for its dominance by the patriarch of monopolies, A.T. & T., and resisting an alternative leasing setup that would have guaranteed a maximum of free competition.

One is compelled to assume that the clamor for immediate action, the manifest distaste for debate, the derision heaped on the lonely men who challenged the bill, reflected a fear that the truth would out if the controversy were prolonged. Perhaps this is why they refused to consider any amendments proposed but tabled every single one offered by opponents of the bill without even trying to debate them on their merits.

In the aftermath of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, and in the time of the New Frontier, we may be too prone to dismiss as fantasy evidence of the survival of established corporate power over economic and political institutions. There were, of course, many men who voted for the bill who did so out of loyalty to the President. There were others who no doubt did so absentmindedly. There were probably some whose faith in Mr. Minow (which I share in many areas) persuaded them that the present FCC would somehow impose those restraints on A.T. & T. which its predecessors were never able to achieve, even though this Commission has shown no greater interest or ability in this area and has permitted A.T. & T. to earn a higher rate of profit than was permitted by the Eisenhower FCC.

Thus, many elements contributed to the final dismal result. But one cannot escape the sense as one reviews the record that this was also a high-pressure coup staged by a corporate body that recognized the enormous stakes in Satellite, Inc.

That the Government was divided within itself is beyond dispute; there is little overt evidence that even President Kennedy passionately favored the course finally chosen. In the Senate, Mr. Kerr's dedication to the care and feeding of corporate interests is a celebrated and not entirely impersonal fact; once the bill had been drafted (and spuriously proclaimed as a compromise between private domination and public ownership), Senate Leader Mansfield apparently concluded that it was a matter of honor that he finally prevail in some large legislative test. One can only hope that he will some day exhibit comparable ardor in dealing with the Republican-Dixiecrat obstructionists as he did in crushing the liberal dissenters.

Many informed men in Washington believe Vice President Lyndon Johnson played a decisive hand in shaping the outcome. Mr. Johnson is chairman of the President's Space Council and thus officially the President's man on space; it is said that when the State Department and some forces within the Justice Department resisted the evolving pattern, Mr. Kennedy in effect let it be know that he would defer to the Vice President's judgment. It is a matter of fact that Tom Corcoran's law firm, with which Johnson has continuous and intimate relations, displayed an active interest in A.T. & T.'s cause.

But whoever called the legislative tune, the President's responsibility is in no way diminished. There are those who believe his own attitude in the final phases of the battle was influenced by his desire to assure the business community that he harbored no doctrinaire enmity toward it. If so, the country may be paying a heavy price to underwrite this form of therapy.

In a way, what stands out as sharply as the power of the battalions mobilized in behalf of the bill was the frailty of the opposition. Once again we are reminded that, on great issues involving giveaway to special interests, there is usually no major public lobby operating to contest the deal. Traditionally this was the function of the labor movement, but labor's leaders have increasingly abdicated that role in return for the nourishment of their own special interests. In the satellite battle no labor witness took the stand. There was a telegram from Walter Reuther suggesting that "there is no more reason for turning space development over to A.T. & T. than there is for turning the Pentagon over to General Motors." The AFL–CIO executive council belatedly adopted a resolution reflecting those sentiments. The impact of even those gestures was largely outweighed by the support which the Communication Workers Union threw to the bill, presumably in return for some hints of future dispensations at the collective bargaining tables of Satellite, Inc., or of A.T. & T. itself.

The result might have been different if the press had covered the story with greater zeal and fidelity, and if the editorial pages had been less unanimous in hailing the handiwork of the legislative drafters. But the combination of labor listlessness and press hostility, joined with the lobbying legions of A.T. & T., rendered the struggle of Senators Kefauver, Morse, and company a hopeless one. Nevertheless, they have made the record, and it stands, and Americans may have many reasons to turn back to it as the saga of space unfolds.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the nominations of the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp., a private corporation, are now before the Senate for its advice and consent. I do not rise to question either the qualifications or the fitness of these individuals. I rise to protect the integrity of the procedure by which the U.S. Senate exercises its responsibility of advice and consent with respect to Presidential nominations or appointments pursuant to section 2, article II of the Constitution. I question the propriety, the advisability, and the constitutionality of the act of confirmation by the U.S. Senate of the directors of a private corporation organized and chartered for profit under the laws of the District of Columbia.

The action now proposed in the Senate is outside the scope of the confirmation process, as that function is expressly authorized in the Constitution, and as it has been exercised over the years since the founding of the Republic. The proposal that the Senate now participate, through confirmation, in the election of the management of a corporation which is wholly private in nature and is organized for profit is unprecedented. If the Senate proceeds on this course, we shall be abusing the constitutional process of confirmation, and shall be embarking on a course which can but enmesh and ensnarl the Senate in the operation or management of a private corporation, a task for which the Senate is unsuited, and which is beyond the bounds of its traditional function.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I am not here questioning the qualifications or the competency of the individuals whose names are before us. My objection is that this matter ought not be the business of the Senate.

The authority for the Senate to confirm persons nominated for positions by the President is found in section 2 of article II of the Constitution. It provides that the President "shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law: but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

This provision was not included in the Constitution as a mere formality, nor has the exercise of it been so regarded by the Senate. On the contrary, the specific language used was adopted after extended debate. As was the case with so many provisions, the approved language found in section 2 of article II was a compromise.

Under the confirmation clause, the power of selection of officers of the United States is clearly vested in the President, as is the actual power of appointment. The role of the Senate is to approve or reject.

This role of the Senate is not merely procedural. It is substantive both in form and purpose. It vests in the Senate the power and the responsibility of passing upon the qualifications of those who will occupy positions in government which will enable them to formulate policy in the executive branch and render judicial decisions. It is part and parcel of the system of checks and balances which was so carefully woven into the entire fabric of the Constitution.

This brief historical reference to the origin of the confirmation clause demonstrates that its purpose is for the resolution of matters public and governmental rather than private and mercantile. The categories of persons to whom the process would be applied were expressly set forth.

Specifically named as requiring confirmation by the Senate as a part of the appointive process are Ambassadors, ministers, and consuls, and judges of the Supreme Court. Others whose nominations to office are subject to confirmation by the Senate are described as "officers of the United States."

Since section 2 of article II also provides that Congress can vest authority for appointment of "inferior" officers "in the President alone," in department heads or in the courts, it follows that Senate confirmation of nominations (for other than Ambassadors, ministers, and consuls and judges of the Supreme Court) was intended to be limited to "officers of the United States" who are not deemed to be "inferior" officers.

It is unnecessary here to try to distinguish whether the individuals whose names are before the Senate are inferior officers or superior officers. An examination of the Satellite Communications Act of 1962 makes it clear that the officers and directors of the corporation which is authorized by that act are not officers of the United States in any respect.

Section 301 of the act provides as follows:

> There is hereby authorized to be created a communications satellite corporation for profit which will not be an agency or establishment of the U.S. Government.

Mr. President, that language is explicit. The corporation is specifically described as being a corporation for profit.

As a supporter of the private enterprise system, I surely have no quarrel with the concept of profits or the profit motive. That is the purpose of private corporations under our economic system. If the satellite corporation were not based on the profit motive, and if its management did not seek to make profits for its stockholders, it simply would not be a private corporation. This point is raised not in criticism, but solely to illustrate that the mission of the corporation, as set forth in the law authorizing its creation, is commercial rather than governmental in character.

Moreover, the section of the law quoted specifically provides that the corporation "will not be an agency or establishment of the U.S. Government."

If the corporation is not to be an agency of the U.S. Government, then its directors cannot be public officials unless, under the law and the corporation's charter, they have some responsibility to, or perform some duty for, the Government. Here again, an examination of the law and the articles of incorporation of the corporation reveals that no duties or obligations are imposed upon any of the directors which would make them any different than the directors of any other private corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia.

I find that my conclusion that neither the incorporators nor the directors who will later be appointed by the President will be "officers of the United States" is shared by the U.S. Attorney General. On page 87 of the record of the Commerce Committee hearings appears an opinion of the Attorney General on this point.

This opinion of the Attorney General that the incorporators are not officers of the United States is cited in the hearings in support of the contention that the incorporators are not subject to the conflict of interest laws that apply to Federal officials. The Attorney General's letter contains a review of the legal questions involved, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., October 25, 1962.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to reply to your request for my opinion on a question arising out of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (hereinafter referred to as the "act").[1] The question is whether incorporators appointed by the President, with the concurrence of the Senate, to effect the establishment of the communications satellite corporation authorized by the act are officers of the United States by virtue of such appointment.[2]

A similar inquiry will no doubt arise, after the incorporators have completed their work, with regard to those members of the new corporation's board of directors whom the President is authorized to appoint, again with the concurrence of the Senate. I am therefore taking the liberty of advising you with regard to the Presidentially appointed directors, as well as the incorporators.

Section 302 of the act provides for the incorporators as follows:

"The President of the United States shall appoint incorporators, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve as the initial board of directors until the first annual meeting of stockholders or until their successors are elected and qualified. Such incorporators shall arrange for an initial stock offering and take whatever other actions are necessary to establish the corporation, including the filing of articles of incorporation, as approved by the President."

Section 303(a), providing for the new corporation's regular board of directors, reads in pertinent part as follows:

For the reasons discussed below, I am of the opinion that neither the incorporators nor the Presidentially appointed directors are to be classified as officers of the United States.

The method of appointment directed by sections 302 and 303(a) is of course derived from the following portion of article II, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution:

"[The President] shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

This language has the effect of prescribing that an individual can become an officer of the Government in the constitutional sense in only two ways—i.e., by appointment by the President with the concurrence of the Senate or by appointment by the President alone, the courts or heads of departments.[3] We are interested here, of course, in the first method.

"The corporation shall have a board of directors consisting of individuals who are citizens of the United States, of whom one shall be elected annually by the board to serve as chairman. Three members of the board shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, effective the date on which the other members are elected, and for terms of 3 years or until their successors have been appointed and qualified, except that the first three members of the board so appointed shall continue in office for terms of 1, 2, and 3 years, respectively, and any member so appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the director whom he succeeds. Six members of the board shall be elected annually by those stockholders who are communications common carriers and six shall be elected annually by the other stockholders of the corporation."

---

[1] Public Law 87-624, 76 Stat. 419, approved Aug. 31, 1962.

[2] Although the incorporators whom you recently named are serving under recess appointments, they, of course, have neither more nor less of the character of officers of the United States by reason of their temporary lack of Senate confirmation.

[3] *United States* v. *Germaine,* 99 U.S. 508 (1878): *Burnap* v. *United States,* 252 U.S. 512, 515-516 (1920): Corwin "U.S. Constitution, Annotated" (1952 ed.), p. 452. These authorities also point out that, except for the President and Vice President, the portion of the Federal civil service comprised of persons other than officers in the constitutional sense consists of those individuals generally termed employees of the United States, who are appointed by officials not specifically given appointing power by the art. II, sec. 2. The directors and incorporators of the instant corporation are obviously not in this category of appointees.

It will be seen that the first part of the quotation from article II, section 2, clause 2, provides for nomination by the President and confirmation by the Senate of certain specified officers and, with exceptions not relevant here, "all other officers of the United States, whose appointments * * * shall be established by law." This language means, when read with that which immediately follows it, that every appointment of an officer of the United States which is authorized by law, other than of an "inferior" officer, must be preceded by nomination and confirmation. However, article II, section 2, clause 2, does not state, and it does not follow therefrom, or from anything else in the Constitution, that every appointment authorized by law which is preceded by nomination and confirmation necessarily renders the appointee an officer of the United States regardless of his functions and the provisions of the law pursuant to which he was appointed. Nor, so far as I am aware, are there any precedents which reach that conclusion.[4] Indeed, there is a longstanding practice which points away from it. Article I, section 6, clause 2, prohibits an appointment of a Member of Congress "to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created" during the term for which he was elected and prohibits a "person holding any office under the United States" from membership in Congress during his continuance in office. Nevertheless, Presidents have on many occasions appointed Members of Congress, with or without the advice and consent of the Senate, as commissioners to negotiate treaties and other international agreements or to represent the United States at meetings of international organizations.[5] These appointments can be reconciled with the prohibitions of article I, section 6, clause 2, only on the theory that, although made in accordance with the methods prescribed by article II, section 2, clause 2, for the appointments of "officers of the United States," they nevertheless do not place Members of Congress within that classification.[6]

In short, I find no constitutional requirement or precedent that the incorporators and Presidentially appointed directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. be treated as officers of the Government merely because of the method of their appointment, and I find the precedent involving article I, section 6, clause 2, to be persuasive of the view that such method of appointment is not determinative. It is therefore necessary to look to other factors.

The classical definition pertaining to an officer is written in terms of the position he holds, as follows: [7]

"An officer is a public station, or employment, conferred by the appointment of government. The term embraces the idea of tenure, duration, emolument, and duties."

Examining the position of the incorporators first, I believe it can reasonably be held that since they have been given merely a temporary and special task, the position does not meet the tests of office set forth in the second sentence of this definition.[8] However, I believe that a more fundamental issue is whether the incorporators are the occupants of a private, rather than a public, station.

Section 302 of the act in general requires that the incorporators discharge two successive responsibilities. First, they are to bring the Communications Satellite Corp. into being. Thereafter they are to serve as its initial board of directors until the qualification of a regular board. The nature of their role in carrying out the latter function is fixed by section 301 of the act, which states that the new enterprise is to be a "corporation for profit which will not be an agency or establishment of the U.S. Government" and, subject to the provisions of the act, is to be governed by the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act. With these directives in the act, there would seem to be no doubt that the incorporators, as directors, will have the same status and responsibilities as individuals serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation and will be holding private, not public, posts.[9]

I find nothing in the act or in its history to justify a different view as to the position of the incorporators during the period prior to the formation of the corporation. Their mission during that time places on them the same obligation for the furtherance of private interests as their later duties as the initial board of directors and in essence is therefore a private mission. I recognize that the provision in section 302 requiring the President's approval of the articles of incorporation filed by the incorporators conceivably may lend support to an argument that in preparing and filing them, its incorporators are acting as officers subordinate to the President whose work is subject to his review. However, it is probably more accurate to argue that the provision was included simply because the incorporators are not his subordinate officers and he would not otherwise have the right to pass on the articles. In any event, I am certain that Congress did not have in mind creating anything as contrived as a public office to endure only for the presumably short period prior to incorporation, with a conversion to a private office at that moment. In my opinion, the incorporators will at no time be occupying a public station and consequently will at no time be officers of the United States.

Turning now to the three directors whom the President will appoint to the regular board, I need do little more than refer again to the fact that section 301 makes the Communications Satellite Corp. an enterprise for profit which will not be an agency of the Government. The other 12 members of the board who are to be elected by the stockholders, will obviously have the same private status as individuals serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation. The act makes no distinction, except in the method of selection, between the directors appointed by the President and the elected directors. Therefore, unless there is something in the history of the act to the contrary, it seems plain that the former will also hold a private office.

The legislative history concerning the position of the directors is almost as meager as in the case of the incorporators. However, two points were developed in Senate Commerce Committee hearings which are of significance here. First, it appears that the appointment of a portion of the membership of the board by the President was conceived of as a means of protecting the interests of the public at large, as distinguished from the Government.[10] Second, the members of the executive branch of the Government who participated in the drafting of the act rejected a proposal that there be only one presidentially designated director for fear that he would be considered as the representative of the President and spokesman for the Government. They suggested three in order to avoid that implication.[11] Thus, there appears to have been no intention on the part of the originators of the legislation to create directors who would be officers of the

---

[4] Cf., the following colloquy between two Congressmen in the course of a committee hearing on the question whether one of them, who had been appointed to a temporary commission by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, thereby became an officer of the United States:

"Mr. SMITH. Do you mean that to be officers of the United States they must be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate or be appointed by courts of law or by the heads of some one of the Departments?

"Mr. MOODY. Yes.

"Mr. SMITH. The point I would like to have you answer is whether it is necessary, to constitute a person an officer under authority of the United States, that he shall have been appointed in that way?

"Mr. MOODY. That is my opinion. I would not, however, adopt the converse proposition, that everybody appointed in this manner was necessarily an officer of the United States." (H. Rept. 2205, 55th Cong., 3d sess., p. 11.)

See also, for a similar view in a somewhat different context, 2 Story, "Commentaries on the Constitution" (5th ed. 1891), p. 362: "In many cases of appointments, Congress has required the concurrence of the Senate, where, perhaps, it might not be easy to say that it was required by the Constitution."

[5] Corwin, "The President, Office and Powers" (1957 ed.), p. 71. For a statute expressly recognizing the Presidential practice of appointing a Member of Congress as a representative of the United States at an international meeting, see sec. 2 of the act of July 30, 1946, 60 Stat. 712, 22 U.S.C. 287n, which is concerned with UNESCO.

[6] Corwin, "The President, Office, and Powers" (1957 ed.), p. 71. For conflicting views on this point see H. Rept. 2205, 55th Cong., 2d sess., and S. Rept. 563, 67th Cong., 2d sess.; cf., act of July 30, 1946, footnote 5, supra.

[7] *United States* v. *Hartwell*, 73 U.S. 385, 393 (1867).

[8] *Matter of Hathaway*, 71 N.Y. 238, 243 (1877); *McArthur* v. *Nelson*, 81 Ky. 67, 71 (1883); see also Corwin, U.S. Constitution, Annotated (1952 ed.), pp. 447–449.

[9] This conclusion is supported by the only part of the legislative history of the act which touched upon the role of the incorporators in this context. Senator KEFAUVER, who opposed the legislation, placed a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which he remarked, among other things, that the fiduciary obligations of the incorporators, as directors, "will not be to the President * * * [or] the public at large * * * [or] the Federal Government" but "will be obligations to the corporation itself" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 12 p. 16872). Senator KEFAUVER'S comment would seem to be in accord with the provisions of sec. 301 of the act stipulating the creation of a private corporation, as well as with the general law pertaining to corporate directors. See *Villiainen* v. *American Finnish Workers Soc.*, 236 Minn. 412, 417, 53 N.W. 2d 112, 116 (1952).

[10] Testimony of James A. Dingman, executive vice president, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee, 87th Cong., 2d sess., entitled "Communications Satellite Legislation," pp. 185–187.

[11] Testimony of Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee, supra, p. 349.

Government but rather an intention to dissociate the Government from the directors.

Senator KEFAUVER made a comment on the Senate floor, similar to his statement with regard to the incorporators,[12] that the three appointed directors will owe a fiduciary obligation to the corporation but not to the Government.[13] In reply, Senator PASTORE, the floor manager of the pending legislation, agreed that they would be fiduciaries of the corporation but stated there was no intention to prevent the President from using them to keep himself informed and to communicate his views to the board of directors as a whole.[14] Whether Senator PASTORE's suggestion as to the relationship between the President and the three directors will prove accurate cannot be foreseen, but in my opinion neither that relationship nor their concern for the public interest beyond that ordinarily expected of the directors of a private corporation would put the mark of a public station on the board memberships of those three directors.[15]

In all, the legislative history regarding the directors to be named by the President supports the view that they, like the others, will occupy private posts and not be officers of the United States.

Finally, it might be noted that to consider the incorporators and appointed directors as public officers would be to deem them within the scope of article II, section 4, of the Constitution which makes "all civil officers of the United States" subject to impeachment. I believe it most unlikely that in authorizing the establishment of the unique Communications Satellite Corp., Congress, without affirmatively labeling these incorporators and directors as Government officials, intended that they be subject to impeachment. In other words, I believe that the congressional silence as to their status, when considered together with the provisions of article II, section 4, lends support to my view that neither the incorporators nor the three directors are, by virtue of their appointments to these posts, officers of the United States.

Respectfully,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Attorney General of the United States has concluded that the function of the incorporators and the presidentially appointed directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. is wholly private in nature and that they are not public officials. This, as I have stated, has long been and is now my own view.

There is nothing in the act or in the proposed bylaws of the corporation which confers upon these incorporators and directors any attribute of a public official. They will receive no pay from the Federal Government, they are not required to perform any duty for the Government, and they will owe their fiduciary trust solely to the stockholders who have invested private funds in the corporation.

Upon what basis, then, constitutional or otherwise, is it contended that participation in their appointment is a proper matter for consideration by the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. My able colleague is making a most important speech. I hope that it will be considered carefully by Senators in their consideration of the issue. As I understand the argument of my colleague, when the Constitution specifically enumerates the appointees of the President who are to be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate, the provision necessarily excludes others. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. In answer to my distinguished colleague, I should like to read from a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in a case entitled Kansas against Colorado:

> The proposition that there are legislative powers affecting the Nation as a whole which belong to, although not expressed in, the grant of powers is in direct conflict with the doctrine that this is a Government of enumerated powers. * * * The 10th amendment * * * disclosed the widespread fear that the National Government might, under the pressure of a supposed general welfare, attempt to exercise powers which had not been granted.

I know that my distinguished senior colleague, able lawyer that he is, is familiar with the 10th amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. GORE. It is my view that for one to infer that the Senate has authority to do anything and everything which is not expressly prohibited by the Constitution is tantamount, in fact, to dispensing with a written constitution.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The point is that if it was intended that the Senate could confirm any nomination it wished to confirm—stockholders of a rapid transit company of the District of Columbia or Knoxville, Tenn., or Chicago, Ill.; or the directors of a railroad—there would not have been specific provisions in article II, section 2, clause 2, which is the advice and consent clause, as to those Presidential appointees who would have to have the advice and consent of the Senate. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Since the Constitution enumerates specifically those with respect to whom the Senate must advise and consent function, insofar as the stitutional law would agree that that would eliminate those not within the list described and specifically enumerated in the constitutional section.

Mr. GORE. I will read it, so that we may see how explicit it is:

> The President shall nominate and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for—

That is the end of the confirmation provision. That is the end of the advice and consent function, in so far as the Constitution specifically refers to it. Section 2, article II, goes further and makes other provisions for the appointment of other inferior officers whose nominations need not be confirmed. I read that provision:

> But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of Departments.

The Senator will notice that in the case of the "inferior officers" there is a provision that the Congress can vest authority for their appointment "in the President alone."

When these words are read in consonance with the previous provision, in which the categories officers of the United States whose appointments are subject to confirmation are explicitly named, it seems to me that the view which the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee has expressed must be considered a valid one.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There was sound logic and judgment on the part of the Constitution makers in the enumeration of persons who should be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate. We know that if it is possible to give to a private corporation some color of a public sanctity it will be very much easier for it to sell stock, and very much easier for it to obtain favors from the Government.

I am sure the constitutional founders must have realized there would be great pressure on the Senate, from time to time, to confirm nominations of people the Senate had no business confirming, as is the situation before us now. Therefore, they enumerated specifically who should be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

If they had said, "Anybody the Senate wants to vote on it can vote on," we would be doing quite often what we are called on to do today, which is to vote on directors or officers of a purely private corporation who have no connection with the Government.

Mr. GORE. I concur in the Senator's view. I wish to invite his attention to the fact that in the debate earlier today an attempt was made to relate the exercise of the responsibility of advice and consent by the Senate with the appointive power of the President.

The provisions of the Constitution are not the same. The President's power of appointment of inferior officers can be provided for by law; but in section 2, article II, we find the bounds explicitly stated by which the Senate is authorized to exercise its function of advice and consent.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not true that there is a binding obligation on the part of Members of the Senate to uphold the Constitution?

Mr. GORE. We say we will protect and defend the Constitution.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We will defend the Constitution, and try to prevent the Senate from taking an action which it has no constitutional authority to take.

---

[12] See footnote 9, supra.

[13] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 12, page 16241.

[14] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 12, page 16872.

[15] It is interesting to contrast sec. 303(a) of the act with similar legislation of a century ago which seems clearly to have created a public office—i.e., sec. 13 of the act of July 2, 1864, 13 Stat. 356, amending the act of July 1, 1862, 12 Stat. 489. The 1864 legislation authorized the President to appoint 5 of the 15 directors of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and termed them "Government directors." The statute specifically required that at least one of them be on each committee of the company and that they report to the Secretary of the Interior concerning the company's operations.

Mr. GORE. I do not recall the exact oath to which Senators subscribe. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the oath administered to Senators, so that all Senators may read anew the oath which they have taken.

There being no objection, the oath was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OATHS REQUIRED BY THE CONSTITUTION AND BY LAW TO BE TAKEN BY SENATORS UNDER RULE II

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States. (1 Stat. 23, June 1, 1789.)

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter: So help me God. (15 Stat. 85, July 11, 1868.)

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in my study of this question, I sought the assistance of the Library of Congress to ascertain whether there was a precedent for application of the constitutional authority of the Senate to confirm persons nominated to public office to the confirmation of a director of a wholly privately owned corporation organized for profit. I am advised that there is no such precedent.

Some have suggested that a precedent for the course of action contemplated in the Communications Satellite Act is to be found in the act chartering the Union Pacific Railroad—12 Statutes 489. This act, providing for the chartering of the corporation and various subsidies from the Federal Government, also provided for the appointment by the President of the United States of 2 of 15 directors of the corporation. Later the act was amended to provide for the appointment by the President of 5 of a total of 20 directors. But the Union Pacific Act did not provide for confirmation by the Senate. I note with interest that the Attorney General, in a footnote to his opinion, expresses the view that the "Government directors" in the Union Pacific Act were actually to function as Government officials, in contrast with the private character of the duties of the directors of the Communications Satellite Corp.

It is conceded that the Union Pacific case constitutes a precedent for the appointment by the Government of directors in a private corporation. For reasons set forth below, I think it a most ill-advised precedent. But even that act did not undertake to involve the Senate in the appointing process.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Tennessee has just said, as appears on page 697 of his manuscript:

> Some have suggested that a precedent for the course of action contemplated in the Communications Satellite Act is to be found in the act chartering the Union Pacific Railroad (12 Stat. 489). This act, providing for the chartering of the corporation and various subsidies from the Federal Government, also provided for the appointment by the President of the United States of 2 of 15 directors of the corporation. Later the act was amended to provide for the appointment by the President of 5 of a total of 20 directors. But the Union Pacific Act did not provide for confirmation by the Senate. I note with interest that the Attorney General, in a footnote to his opinion, expresses the view that the "Government Directors" in the Union Pacific Act were actually to function as Government officials, in contrast with the private character of the duties of the directors of the Communications Satellite Corp.
>
> It is conceded that the Union Pacific case constitutes a precedent for the appointment by the Government of directors in a private corporation. For reasons set forth below, I think it a most ill-advised precedent. But even that act did not undertake to involve the Senate in the appointing process.

I shall discuss that case in my constitutional argument later, but I desire to pinpoint an observation by way of argument at this point in the speech of the Senator from Tennessee, which is a brilliant speech, a speech which, in my judgment, will prove to be of great importance in the future in connection with the legislative history of the case.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, this issue will eventually find its way to the Supreme Court of the United States. It will not be settled by the Congress of the United States. It will not be settled by the President of the United States or the Attorney General.

It will be settled by the court. In my judgment, when it is settled, it will be settled against the President and the Attorney General and the Congress. I am shocked that there should be any question on the part of the Department of Justice and the President of the United States as to the differences between this case and the precedents the Department of Justice has been citing as its rationalization for approving the alleged constitutionality of this section of the bill.

I am of the opinion that when the case reaches the court, they will be knocked down, and that the Supreme Court will throw out this section of the bill. The act is separable and the court can throw out this section and let the rest stand. However, when we consider the Union Pacific case, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out—and I emphasize that this is a very important distinction—there was no question that the members of the board of directors under the Union Pacific Act were Government directors.

As the Senator says at the top of page 7 of his manuscript, they were Government directors. There is no question about the fact that although this was a so-called private corporation, it was mixed in the sense that the Federal Government took a governmental interest in it to a degree. Congress, in setting up the organic act that created the corporation, recognized the Government interest in it, and made provision for it. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. It made great concessions, which later proved to be of great value to the railroad.

Mr. MORSE. The Government was of great financial assistance. A private corporation was created, but it took on the coloring of a Government corporation to a degree, as well, and there was an investment of public property in the operation of the corporation, so the taxpayers of the country had an interest in having Government directors appointed on this corporation. They were appointed by the President and they were responsible to him.

Here we have the Kennedy administration, in the present situation, not coming out and saying, "We are going to make this a mixed corporation, mixed between a private and a public corporation."

It has not said to the American people, "We are going to undertake legal obligations as a government in respect to this corporation."

No. We get what I think is pretty shoddy indirection in connection with the conduct of this administration in respect to this corporation. The President appoints directors, in my judgment to create the basis for misleading investors. By the thousands they will form the idea that when they are investing in this corporation, the Government stands behind it, because the President has nominated directors and the Senate will confirm their nominations.

The Kennedy administration ought to make up its mind whether or not it is going to come square with the American people and tell them whether this is or is not a private corporation. It ought to say that the nomination of these nominees by the President carries with it no governmental sanction whatever, and gives the corporation no assurance, direct or indirect, that a single dollar of American taxpayers' money is to be invested in it.

We must look behind the veil of the corporation. I would like to see my President and my administration get away from the position they have taken, and offer some amendments to the Satellite Act. If they want a corporation that will carry on some governmental responsibilities, they should say so.

I say to the President of the United States that I do not believe in setting up a legal body that will lead to the danger of misleading American investors. The corporation, in its present form, involves the danger of misleading American investors. The President of the United States, Mr. John F. Kennedy, ought to clear up this question immediately, before we proceed to confirm the nominations of directors of the corporation.

The President ought to send a message to Congress recommending some amendments to the Satellite Act. Whether or not he knows it, this issue will be put on the doorstep of his administration for the future of American history. In my judgment it will not be a pleasant recording of history.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the distinguished and able senior Senator from

Oregon has raised several provocative points.

With respect to the proper course of action, in my view the proper course of action for the Senate under the present circumstances is to decline to take action on this matter by sustaining the point of order which the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], will soon interpose.

If that point of order is not sustained, in my view, before the Senate should take this unprecedented action it should refer the nominations to the Committee on the Judiciary, to have the benefit of the advice of that group of able lawyers as to whether or not confirmation by the Senate of nominations of directors of an entirely private corporation, organized for profit, is in fact beyond, contrary to, and an abuse of the constitutional provision providing for advice and consent.

As to the action of the Kennedy administration in making it clear that this is a private corporation, I submit that the record was not too plain before passage of the act. However, the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States which was rendered soon after enactment, but only printed, so far as I know, in the committee hearings, does make it plain that this is an entirely private corporation and that the incorporators and directors will have private posts, not public posts.

The able Senator from Oregon referred to the fact that such participation by the Government through appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate would serve to give clear governmental approval but require substantially no public responsibility.

There is a distinction, it seems to me, between the powers of the President and the powers of the Senate. It may be—and I do not question it—that the President has powers which the Senate does not have. Indeed, I assert it. It may be that Congress by statute can authorize the President to make appointments of directors of private corporations, as was the case with the Union Pacific Railroad. That was an unhappy precedent, but it may be that this can be done.

I am not raising that point. I do not understand that the point of order which the able Senator is about to present will raise the question of presidential powers. Instead, I raise, and his point of order will raise, the question of constitutionality of proposed action by the Senate, which has explicit powers and only explicit powers with respect to giving advice and consent.

I should like to advert to one other point which the Senator raised; then I shall yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is on his feet.

The Senator from Oregon said that the people of the country may be misled; that they may think this is partly a private and partly a Government enterprise. If the Senator will read the hearings before the committees on the confirmation of the nominations now before the Senate, he will find that Members of the Senate demonstrated during those hearings that they thought it was a mixed private and public corporation. On the floor of the Senate this afternoon, one of the ablest lawyers in this body expressed a similar view.

This is alarming to the junior Senator from Tennessee, because the law is explicit that it is an entirely private organization, organized for profit. The act itself provides that the corporation shall not be an agency of the Government. The act itself, the articles of incorporation, and the opinion of the Attorney General, now printed, make it clear beyond possibility of mistake that this is an entirely private corporation, organized for profit. Yet the Senate is asked to participate in the selection of its officers and officials, thus giving Senate approval, and thus giving the impression to the country that Congress and the President are behind the corporation.

What about the widow who invests her mite? Considering the salaries that the corporation is starting to pay and the lush manner of its conduct, that widow's mite may vanish very quickly, unless the Senate comes through with some subsidy year after year. This ensnarls and entraps the Senate, not only in the organization of the corporation, but in the selection of the officers and the ultimate management of the corporation. I say it is improper, ill advised, and, in my opinion, beyond the scope of the constitutional provisions with respect to advice and consent.

Insofar as I can determine, the courts have never passed upon the question of the authority of the Senate to confirm individuals who are not public officials. In fact, I have been unable to locate a reported decision of the Supreme Court in which the constitutional scope of the confirmation authority was directly at issue. There are some cases in which the issue was raised collaterally, but most of these involve the right of the President to appoint "inferior" officers of the Government without confirmation by the Senate or the extent of the authority of the Congress to insist upon confirmation of various categories of public officials.

The absence of reported court decisions directly in point is not surprising in view of the lack of precedents. Perhaps the clarity of language of section 2 of article II is eloquent reason why the issue has not arisen. What is difficult to understand is the justification for the present effort to expand and enlarge this traditional process to provide, for the first time, for the confirmation of the directors of a private corporation.

Such an action, it seems to me, is surely beyond the letter and contrary to the spirit of section 2 of article II.

It may be, Mr. President, that the Senate can, if it wishes to do so, take an action which, under the Constitution, is a nullity. True, the Constitution contains no precise prohibition of such conduct or procedure. But to infer authority to take any and every action not expressly prohibited by the Constitution is, in effect, largely to dispense with a written Constitution.

Though a constitutional nullity, great mischief could flow from the action that is now proposed.

It would give the color of Senate approval, endorsement, and sponsorship, but impose no actual public responsibility.

Aside from the question of constitutionality in its legal sense, the course of action on which the Senate is now embarking is wholly inadvisable. If the Senate is to become enmeshed in the selection of corporate management for a private corporation, it is difficult to predict where the line will be drawn.

This whole procedure should be a matter of deep concern to all who support private enterprise and so frequently condemn what is often characterized as Government interference in private business. The principle at stake is a far reaching one.

What about General Motors? This giant corporation has many Government contracts. Is the interest of the Government such that we ought to provide for Presidential appointment—with or without Senate confirmation—of some of the directors of that company? I daresay, Mr. President, that many of those who supported enactment of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 would never agree that this sort of thing has any place in our American economy.

What about the General Dynamics Corp.? It has been built and has thrived upon Government contracts. Today we find that General Dynamics has been awarded what is to be expected the largest Government contract in the history of this country, the so-called TFX contract.

Would it be in the public interest for the Government to own a part of the stock of General Dynamics, or to have governmentally appointed directors of that corporation, with or without Senate approval?

Where do we stop? A goodly number of people have suggested that one way to deal with the ever-increasing concentration of economic power in a few corporate monopolies is in fact to have part Government ownership and have Government directors. I have never endorsed this proposal.

I suggest that if the precedent here proposed is consummated, it offers some interesting possibilities.

I must point out, however, that there is no governmental ownership in the Communications Satellite Corp., as was the case with the United States Bank.

Many of these questions were raised last summer when the satellite bill was before the Senate, but I do not think they were seriously considered because, unfortunately, the Senate got itself into a situation which precluded actual consideration of the issues involved. I earnestly hope they will be considered now, before it is too late.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Can the Senator tell us how much the directors are to be paid? What will their salaries be?

Mr. GORE. Of course, this is a matter that can be changed; but as I recall the hearings before the Space and Commerce Committees, the directors are to be paid $200 per meeting. Frankly, I do not believe that is an excessive amount. I do not understand how it could be concluded that Sidney Weinberg should be paid $200 a meeting, and that another incorporator should be paid $10,000 a month to give his advice. But I do not really raise that question. The question I raise involves the competency, the constitutional propriety, and the advisability of the Senate proceeding as is proposed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senate were to put its stamp of approval on these directors, would it not make equal sense that the Senate should say who should be the directors of an important corporation like General Motors or United States Steel, which are bellwethers of American industry? Why should we select this particular corporation and presume to say who the directors of it should be, without referring to all the other corporations whose stock is listed on the big board, the New York Stock Exchange?

Mr. GORE. It might be that the Senate would be starting a trend in that direction, although I think it would be an unfortunate trend. To answer the Senator's question, it seems to me that the public interest is as much involved in the operation of General Dynamics Corp. as it is in the operation of the Communications Satellite Corp. Would the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That would seem to me to be the case. I could name a number of other corporations, such as Aero-Jet General, which have achieved almost their entire net worth from Government contracts, producing items for the Government through various agencies such as the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I simply do not understand why this particular corporation should be the one as to which Congress should undertake to approve the directors. I do not understand why the President should appoint some of the directors of this completely private corporation.

I just do not understand why the Government should appoint these directors at all.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps all things must have a beginning. I do not believe that that would be a good beginning. But those who so regard it should take notice that this precedent will not go unnoticed. Not long ago, on March 25 of this year, I read in the Washington Post and Times Herald an article to the effect that the Federal Aviation Agency was considering sponsoring a public-private corporation to develop a supersonic commercial jet liner. The article went on to state:

> FAA consultants are investigating the use of the Communications Satellite Corp. as a development model.

According to this article, the aircraft people are not so certain of profit as are the communications people, and it is strongly suggested that the Government be cut in for full participation—so far as expenditures are concerned, but not profits—on this new proposal.

The Senator from Louisiana has raised a pertinent question. Where will we stop if we proceed along this road? What will be the relationship of this company to companies already existing in industry? Where will the competition in free enterprise come from? Shall we proceed to organize a Government-sponsored corporation in the transportation industry, in the railroad industry, in the supersonic aircraft industry, and in the telephone, radio, and television industries?

The Senator from Louisiana has referred to automobiles. He also referred to United States Steel. Neither the Senate nor the executive branch of the Government has been able to determine what it costs to produce a ton of steel. It just might be that someone would suggest—far be it from me to suggest it—that one way to ascertain the cost of producing steel would be to have the President appoint, and the Senate confirm the nomination of Mr. Roger Blough, or perhaps make him a Government director and thereby make him responsible to the President of the United States.

That is not what is proposed in this instance. Here it is proposed to enmesh, to ensnarl, to entrap the Senate into the endorsement and support of a corporation which will sell stock to the American people. Would there not be some moral obligation on the part of the Senate, then, to make the operation profitable? I say that great mischief can flow from such action.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not correct to say that already recommendations have been made, since the act was passed, to have the Government provide additional money to develop a satellite communications system? Is it not correct to say that recommendations will be before the Senate in the form of an appropriation bill to appropriate money to continue to put communications satellite devices in orbit at Government expense, even though the corporation has been created on the theory that it would save the Government the expense of doing that?

Mr. GORE. I believe a request has been made for an appropriation of $51 million for research and development in satellite communications.

The Senator will recall that during the hearings on the Communications Satellite Act, Dr. Dryden said the enactment of that measure would be construed as meaning that the Government had selected a chosen instrument and that the benefits of the Government's research and development would be made available to this corporation only.

Lest I do any violence to the exact statement made by Dr. Dryden, I ask unanimous consent to have his testimony printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearing was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NASA HAS NOT CONFINED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TO ONE CORPORATION

Senator GORE. Under present law as I understand your testimony, Dr. Dryden, the space agency has not undertaken to confine the research and development in this field to one particular company or group?

Dr. DRYDEN. That is correct. We have financed at Government expense a development by the Radio Corp. of America and another by the Hughes Aircraft Co.

Senator GORE. Then you would supply to any other company having the requisite technical capabilities, the services which you supplied to A.T. & T.?

Dr. DRYDEN. That is correct, sir.

Senator GORE. If this bill passes, would you expect other concerns to enter the field?

Dr. DRYDEN. If the bill passes and the corporation is set up, I think we would interpret this desire to contribute to the early realization of an operational system to mean that we would cooperate—in accordance with the provisions in the bill before you—with the corporation, and that this would——

Senator GORE. Exclusively?

Dr. DRYDEN. So far as this offer that I just spoke of, of launching satellites for private interests, so to speak.

Senator GORE. In other words, if this bill passes, then it will be the position of the Space Administration that you would not enter into negotiations with any other American citizen or American concern for the launching of communication satellites? Did you not put it that way in your statement?

Dr. DRYDEN. Yes.

Senator GORE. All right.

Dr. DRYDEN. I still stand by it. I say that our judgments would be made in the national interest.

Senator GORE. I just want to know if that is what you mean.

Dr. DRYDEN. I think this is a fair statement.

NATIONAL INTEREST TO BE GUIDELINE FOR NASA'S NEGOTIATIONS

Senator GORE. Now, do you wish to add anything further?

Dr. DRYDEN. I say that the primary concern is that of the national interest.

If a situation should develop, as I do not foresee, the Government having set up officially a corporation to establish a communications system around the world, if in spite of this somehow there was a development which indicated that the national interest was to be served by doing something different, I think we would consider it. But I believe unless the Congress established another provision for another operating communications system, there would be nothing to be gained by NASA offering its services to other——

NASA'S EXCLUSIVE COOPERATION WITH CORPORATION ESTABLISHED UNDER BILL

Senator GORE. Please understand, Dr. Dryden, that I am not being critical of you, nor am I attempting to be critical of you. I have no desire to do so. I think you have clearly established the fact in your testimony that under present law, research and development will continue, and that the opportunity for research and development, for further enterprise in this field, is open. Moreover, that the services of your agency are open for cooperation with any company or citizens having the requisite technical capabilities.

You have also established that if Congress passes this bill, you will interpret it as the will and intent of the Congress with regard to the law. Therefore you would confine your cooperation and your launchings to this particular corporation.

Dr. Dryden. May I take an example from the past?

Senator Gore. Is that a correct summation?

Dr. Dryden. That is correct.

If Congress says that this is the agency that is going to develop the operational system for the United States, then I think it follows that we should cooperate with that agency.

Senator Gore. Yet some people, Doctor, want to protest when those of us who questioned the advisability of such an action say that this is intended to create a monopoly. My time is up.

Mr. GORE. So, Mr. President, we see that here we have a monopoly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A Government-created monopoly, by the way.

Mr. GORE. Yes; and it is in a field which one expert witness testified was only 10 percent communications, a field which requires great expenditures for research and development; and the satellites can be lofted only by the Government of the United States itself.

Moreover, according to a statement by Dr. Charyk, the president of the Communications Satellite Corp., and published on yesterday in the Washington Post, this matter involves "negotiations with every country in the world." In the article it is stated that the State Department is already exploring the possibilities of this corporation's reaching such agreements.

So this corporation is to have the benefit of a monopoly, one staked out for the benefit of this corporation alone, and involving the negotiation of international agreements on behalf of the United States, but for the sole benefit and profit of this corporation—one which, according to the opinion of the Attorney General, is entirely private. Yet the Senate is asked to confirm the nominations of its incorporators and directors, even though, in the opinion of the Attorney General, they have a private status, not a public status.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield further, let me ask whether it is fair to state that the situation appears to be that this corporation has been given a monopoly by the Government, in a field in which the Government has spent many billions of dollars to develop a communications system? We are asked to confirm the nominations of these directors; but when the point of conflict of interest is raised, we are told there cannot be any such conflict because these people owe no obligation to the 180 million American people who have paid for all the research and development work. So the directors will be free to make all the profit they wish to make, no matter how much that private interest may conflict with the interest of the 180 million American people.

Mr. GORE. Yes. If these officials owed any obligation to the Congress or to the Government, there would be questions involving conflict of interest. But the directors are now absolved from that, according to the opinion of the Attorney General. If there is no conflict of interest, they must be either officers of the United States or officers of a private corporation. Which are they? Under the law, under the articles of incorporation, and under the opinion of the Attorney General, it is plain that they are entirely private in status.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what confuses me. Why should we confirm their nominations? They have no obligation to the Government of the United States, other than the obligation which any citizen has. They have no responsibility to protect the Public Treasury. Of course we predict they will be requesting more money from Congress, in the event their mission fails or if they lose money. But why should the Senate confirm their nominations? They are interested in making a private profit.

Can the Senator from Tennessee understand why the Senate should involve itself further in this matter, after it has turned over to this group the Government's large investment in space research and programs?

Mr. GORE. I think it would be entirely inadvisable, improper, and, in my opinion, beyond the bounds of the Constitution if the Senate were to give its approval to the selection of these incorporators.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to say that I know some of these men personally, and I regard them as very fine gentlemen, and I should like to be in business with them. But I see no reason under the sun why the U.S. Senate should involve itself further, once it has voted to turn over to this corporation, for its private profit, the investment the Government has made. I see no reason why the Senate should involve itself further with them, unless the purpose is merely to guarantee that Congress will pick up the tab for the losses. Does the Senator from Tennessee have any illusion that somewhere the Government of the United States might gain even a nickel of the profits, rather than merely pay the cost?

Mr. GORE. I think it quite unusual for that to be done by such a corporation, with such great assets—although I think each of the incorporators purchased one share of stock, at $100, but with the provision that the company could pay them back and could recover the stock. With those assets, the corporation employs a president at $80,000 a year, and a chairman of the board of directors at $120,000 a year, and rents Tregaron. Moreover—more incredible than "Aesop's Fables"—the corporation received a line of credit of $5 million, according to Mr. Charyk, without any collateral, without any security, without any endorsement of the notes. What does the Senator from Louisiana think of such a situation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Where did the $5 million come from? What is supporting the $5 million line of credit which the directors of the corporation are supposed to have?

Mr. GORE. It came from 10 banks. I should like to know which banks they are. I have never been able to find a bank which would give me such treatment—a line of credit of $5 million, without collateral, without security, without endorsement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Tennessee say he was going to try to learn the names of the banks?

Mr. GORE. Yes. I do not wish to criticize them; I merely wish to find out which ones they are.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator from Tennessee to find out which ones they are, because I say their stockholders are entitled to know about this matter.

Mr. GORE. It would be interesting to know how these officials would square their action with their own stockholders.

The point is that the bankers apparently believe that the U.S. Government including the Senate, is underwriting the corporation's operations. The State Department is working for it. The Senate is now asked to confirm the nominations of its directors. Even today Senators have expressed the view that the corporation is some kind of mixture of private and public enterprise. There is no basis whatsoever for such a conclusion. All the records show the reverse. But many people in our country still think that the corporation is some strange admixture of public and private enterprise.

Apparently, as I read the testimony of the Attorney General and others who testified last year, the genesis of this notion for Government appointment of directors was an idea that such action would somehow protect the public interest. In fact, however, this provision gives to the proposed corporation a color of public responsibility but no substance of public responsibility. And therein lies the danger of a great deal of mischief.

As I pointed out earlier, these governmentally appointed directors have no unique powers or responsibilities. Once appointed they will be just like any other directors of any other private corporation.

Yet the existence of three directors appointed by the President "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate" will tend to create confusion in the minds of the investing public. It may appear to some citizens, or be made to appear, that in someway the Government has endorsed this corporation and is supporting its profitability. I do not wish to endorse it. Does the Senator from Louisiana wish to endorse or place his approval on the corporation, as is requested? I daresay no. I must concede that, as a practical matter, as many of us predicted last year, this corporation is slated to become, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, the beneficiary of a great deal of Government subsidy.

This Government largesse, however, does not arise as a result of the presence on the proposed board of directors of three directors appointed by the President or confirmed by the Senate.

From time to time it happens that private American corporations engaged in business overseas act in a manner not wholly consistent with the best interests of U.S. foreign policy. But as long as they are private corporations—and that fact is known—the Government is not bound by their actions. Yet if the President shall appoint and the Senate confirm three of the directors of this corporation, efforts by the Government to escape identification with the actions of the satellite corporation will be less credible.

All this is true despite the fact that the Government will not exercise any control over the actions of the directors appointed by the President, and will have no voice in the management of the corporation. As I said earlier, the Washington Post of yesterday printed a very interesting news story with respect to the views of Mr. Joseph V. Charyk, president of the Communications Satellite Corp., in which Mr. Charyk is quoted as saying that negotiations for the establishment of a global system of satellite communications will "involve all the countries of the world." This illustrates the worldwide implications of the corporation's activity.

Mr. President, all the authorities I have examined conclude that a member of the board of directors of a private corporation owes his fiduciary responsibility to the stockholders. The Communications Satellite Act contains no language which would alter this legal responsibility on the part of any of the directors, including those to be appointed by the Government. Section 8.04 of the articles of incorporation filed by the incorporators should remove any doubt on this point. It provides:

> Each director regardless of the method of his appointment or election, shall have the same fiduciary duty to the corporation and its stockholders.

So in case the act did not make it clear, the articles of incorporation undertake to make it clear that all the directors, regardless of the manner of their selection, have the same obligations. What are those obligations? Fiduciary trust to the stockholders who have invested their money in the corporation and to the stockholders alone.

My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee, made an extensive survey of the legal obligations of a corporate director under the District of Columbia law during the course of the debate last summer. The results of this effort were incorporated into remarks he intended to deliver on the floor of the Senate in person. The limitation imposed on debate foreclosed his opportunity to deliver the speech, but he had obtained the consent of the Senate to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 13, page 17479. I commend it to my colleagues.

I have already adverted to the fact that the directors to be appointed by the Government will receive no pay from the Government and that the act imposes upon them no obligation to perform duties for the Government. There remains the question of their possible removal from "office."

In using the term "office", I do not thereby intend to call it a public office. It is a private office—the office of director of the Communications Satellite Corp. On this point of removal the act is silent. It merely provides that directors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate shall serve for a term of 3 years "or until their successors have been appointed and qualified."

I confess I have difficulty in conceiving of the Senate properly discharging the role it was designed to play under our form of government by considering the impeachment of a director of a private monopoly corporation created for the purpose of making a profit for its stockholders. Such a performance would be no more bizarre, however, than would be the original process of Senate confirmation of their appointment in the first place.

Does the Senator from Louisiana see any essential difference between the confirmation of the nomination of a director of a private corporation and impeachment procedure to remove such a director from the position to which the Senate had confirmed him?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The difficulty occurs when we consider the fact that if the Senate were to remove the director, logically our interest in doing so would be to protect the public interest, not because of its failure to protect the profit motive of the corporation. We have no legal responsibility in what the corporation might gain or lose; ordinarily that question would not be the concern of the Senate. I fail to see why the Senate should have any interest in whether a person who owes no obligation to the Government of the United States should be appointed or removed. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if it would not be correct to say that ordinarily our interest in removing a person would be to protect the public interest? But we know very well that the directors would owe no direct obligation to the public. Their obligation would be entirely to their stockholders.

Mr. GORE. I agree that it would be an improper role for the Senate to undertake to impeach the directors of a private corporation. But I submit it would be no more bizarre than what we are now asked to do, which is to confirm nominations of directors of a private corporation.

Why should the Senate involve itself in expressing either approval or disapproval of private businessmen? Where are the people who cry out against government interference with business?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Are we to understand that the stockholders of this corporation would be powerless to remove a corrupt director without the consent of the Senate?

Mr. GORE. There is no provision in the law for removal of these directors by anybody.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Should there not be some arrangement for removing a dishonest, corrupt, or unfaithful director from this corporation? Or are we to presume that those who are selected and whose nominations are confirmed by the Senate would be, like Ceasar's wife, above any suspicion of misconduct?

Mr. GORE. It seems to me, if I may give a quick answer, that the selection of directors of a private corporation and the responsibilities of directors of a private corporation should be the concern of the stockholders who have invested their money in the profit-seeking venture. That is traditional in the pattern of the American economy. The bizarre procedure we are asked to follow would be an innovation.

Perhaps, Mr. President, it may be contended that my conclusions and those of the Attorney General are erroneous. Perhaps it was intended by the authors of the Communications Satellite Act that the directors who are to be appointed by the President and whose nominations are to be confirmed by the Senate are actually to represent the Government rather than the stockholders after they are appointed.

I do not believe the terms of the law justify such a conclusion, but I can see that some of the arguments advanced during the debate last summer to the effect that this unusual corporate structure represented the middle ground between a Government-owned activity and a privately owned activity tend to create that impression.

Indeed, the records of hearings before the Space and Commerce Committees reveal that there are some who still consider that this is to be a semipublic corporation. Many people outside Government reached similar conclusions. If such an interpretation were correct—although such would be contrary to the Attorney General's opinion and my own opinion—then the so-called Government directors might appropriately be called officers of the United States and they would function as public officials. Let us examine the results that would flow from such an interpretation.

To place Government officials on the boards of private corporations would constitute a significant departure from the traditional concept of private enterprise in the United States. This would surely be an anomalous situation, and if that is what was or is now intended, it ought to be made clear to the American public.

Government officials sitting on the boards of private corporations would give rise to many questions. What would happen in the event a decision were made by the board which would be in the apparent interests of the Government but which would tend to result in reduced benefits to the stockholders? It is possible that the stockholders might go to court to contest the validity of such action.

Then, too, the Communications Satellite Corp. is supposed to be subject to regulatory action by Government agencies. We heard a great deal about that. It would be somewhat unusual, to say the least, if the Government were sitting on both sides of the table at the adversary hearings by the Federal Communications Commission which are provided for in section 201 of the Communications Satellite Act.

What would be the legal status of the Presidentially appointed directors if they are, in fact, to be considered as representatives of the Government? Questions of conflict of interest would almost certainly arise, as the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana pointed out only a few moments ago.

Frankly, I do not see how an individual could undertake to serve both masters—both the interests of the Government and the interests of the stockholders at the same time—unless he adopts the "what is good for General Motors" philosophy of the relationship between public interests and private interests.

Let us consider for a moment the future role of the Senate in this proposed procedure.

Mr. President, it is the Senate action about which I raise a question. I raise no question about the power of the President or the action of the President. I raise no question about the qualifications of the nominees whose nominations are before the Senate. I question whether it is properly and constitutionally the business of the Senate to confirm nominations of incorporators and directors of a purely private corporation organized for the profit of its stockholders.

Should the Senate unwisely proceed upon the proposed course, much mischief might flow. Whenever the confirmation of a nomination to the board of directors of the Satellite Corp. comes before the Senate—and let me remind my colleagues that the bill provides for at least one each year—some Member or group in the Senate may feel the necessity of inquiring into all facets of the operation of the corporation. It may be necessary to open the books, to examine the minutes, and to question the nominee about his philosophy and his judgment with respect to past actions and future plans of the corporation.

Some Senator or group of Senators might want to know the difference in the cost of a message via satellite between New York and St. Louis on the one hand, and between New York and Tokyo on the other. Some Senator or group of Senators might want to know what bearing this would have on the distance concept of toll charges for long distance telephone calls.

Many questions might arise.

I say to my distinguished friend from Louisiana that I am perplexed by the willingness of the big business community of this country—those who preach the values and virtues of free enterprise so frequently and loudly, and who complain so often against Government intervention—to advocate this kind of action on the part of the Senate.

If this procedure is to be followed year after year it may be necessary to open the books and examine all the records. How else could the Senate legitimately inquire into the fitness of a nominee to the job he had been nominated to fill?

The distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island said earlier today that the only question before the Senate concerned the fitness and qualifications of the appointees. He and I had a disagreement as to what the question before the Senate was.

But if that be the question, then how can the Senate reach a judgment upon the fitness of a nominee, unless it opens up all the books and examines the nominee's actions, his attitude, and his judgment with respect to past decisions and his attitude with respect to future decisions? I say many questions would arise. This is not only an improper procedure, but also an unwise action, the Senate is asked to take. The Senate is peculiarly unfitted to participate in the management of a private corporation, and I believe it would be a sad day if the Senate should undertake to do so.

Or is it in the scheme of things for the Senate to confirm without consideration of fitness? Is this, indeed, to be but a pro forma procedure, thus giving the color, but not the substance, of Senate approval? What an unworthy action that would be.

Once the Senate has embarked on such an unwise course, it may be difficult to turn back, though we may wish we had not taken such a course. It may by some be deemed equally desirable for the Government to have representation on the boards of corporations in other economic areas, as the Senator from Louisiana has suggested. But where will we stop?

Mr. President, the proper time to stop and consider the consequences of this action is now. Section 301 of the Satellite Communications Act expressly reserves the right to "repeal, alter, or amend" the act "at any time."

I say now is the time, before we take this action, which some of us regard as beyond the scope of the Constitution, and which many of us regard as entirely improper and inadvisable.

Presently before the Senate is the question of confirmation of the incorporators who are to arrange for the sale of stock. Notwithstanding the express reservation of the right to repeal or amend "at any time" it would seem desirable for the Congress to consider the matter further before stock has been purchased and legal rights vested.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask by what authority, by what standard of propriety, upon what rational basis should the U.S. Senate give its advice and consent with respect to the officers of a completely private corporation? Such an action, in my opinion, is beyond the express provisions of the Constitution and contrary to the very genius of our system.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I had intended at this time to raise a point of order, but I find that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is raising essentially the same point of order that I intended to raise, and I should like to join with the Senator from Oregon on that point of order at the time he rises to make it. But I do wish to say something briefly on the issue before the Senate. First, I desire to preface my remarks by saying that none of the comments I have to make on this subject should in any way be considered as a reflection upon the appointees. I think the President of the United States has appointed a group of distinguished American citizens.

In the point being raised here, and I am sure this is true of the rest of the Senators who object to Senate consideration of these appointees, we do not object to the quality of the men with whose confirmation we are concerned in the Senate. It goes only to the process of the Senate in making confirmation of these appointees.

Mr. President, I was not a Member of the U.S. Senate when it passed the Communications Satellite Act, so I shall not attempt to discuss the merits of that decision at this time. The facts are that Congress has chosen to establish a purely private business entity to carry out this important mission and that the Senate is now being asked to advise and consent to the appointment of incorporators who will comprise the initial board of directors of this space corporation.

I may say for the record that if I had been here I would have not voted for this type of corporation. I would have thought it better in the interest of this country to have some type of TVA Act enacted for the purpose of conducting the management of the space satellite business.

It is my understanding that the nominees before us today have already held some 11 meetings as a board of directors of this private business corporation.

The issue we must consider here today is whether the U.S. Senate should give these private businessmen the cloak of senatorial confirmation, which will declare to the world that they are somehow responsible to and representative of the public interest.

This is a most exceptional situation. In fact, it is unique.

What would the reaction be if the U.S. Senate took it upon itself to confirm Roger Blough as chairman of the board of United States Steel—or Ralph Cordiner as chief executive officer of General Electric—or George Romney as president of American Motors?

Or, if one wishes to compare this corporation with a public utility, if we took it upon ourselves to confirm the president of American Telephone & Telegraph Co.? There is not any question that it is in the nature of a public utility, but it is a purely private corporation.

The companies I have just mentioned are thoroughly imbued with a national interest; yet I can imagine the shock if we were to advise and consent to the appointment of their directors.

IMPLICATIONS OF CONFIRMATION

Senatorial confirmation of private individuals to positions in private business corporations carries with it many serious implications. I know there are a number of Senators who wish to speak on this point, so I shall deal with it briefly.

When the Senate confirms an individual, no matter who he is, the Senate says, in effect, that it is satisfied that this individual will be responsible to the interests of the public; that he will represent the interests of the American people in the office to which he has been appointed.

The Senate does not give carte blanche to every man it confirms. It imposes some restraints—to safeguard the public interest—and the Constitution sets up machinery to be used in the event the Senate is proved wrong in its evaluation of a man.

A man confirmed by the Senate must not have conflicts of interest. He must not have any allegiance which might divert him from the loyalty and fidelity he owes to the American people. He is, therefore, subjected to rigorous laws on conflicts of interest.

Should he prove himself unworthy of the public trust and confidence placed in him by the Senate, he is subject to impeachment and removal from his post. Stern sanctions are imposed on persons who do not faithfully carry out the trust which senatorial confirmation imposes.

All that I have said follows as the direct result of one simple fact. The U.S. Senate confirms public officers—officers of the United States. It confirms only public officers. It does not confirm private citizens.

A private citizen is not in a fiduciary relationship with the American people. He has no obligation to the American people except the responsibilities of citizenship which are shared by all.

He is not subject to the will of the voters. His personal interests may often conflict with the public interest. Indeed, in a democracy, such a conflict often is expected and approved.

Now, however, we are asked to place the stamp of approval of senatorial confirmation on private businessmen who are necessarily motivated—and properly so—by a desire for financial gain and profit for their private company.

There appears to be no question whatsoever about the status of these incorporators. They are completely and entirely private businessmen. The Communications Satellite Corp., by the very words of the act, is not an agency or establishment of the U.S. Government. It is a corporation organized, like any other business venture, for profit. Like any other corporation, it is incorporated under the business statutes of a State—in this case, the Business Corporation Act of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. First, I compliment the distinguished Senator on a very excellent presentation, which is unquestionably sound, in my opinion. The Senator has just pointed out that the incorporators or directors owe no responsibility to the U.S. Government or to anyone else except the corporation for which they act as directors. Under the District of Columbia Corporation Act, is that not necessarily so? Are they not required under that act to act for the corporation, the Communications Satellite Corp.? If they should undertake to operate for or have some responsibility to the President, or to the Government, or to someone else, which is in conflict with the interest of the corporation of which they are directors, would they not be subject to removal in a stockholder's suit for damages? Are they not bound to act for the corporation, and for no one else?

Mr. NELSON. I believe that is correct. As I read the law, they are answerable solely to the investors in the corporation, subject, of course, to regulation by the FCC and other agencies under our statutes which regulate private industries in this country. Their responsibility is to the investors. I do not believe that they have the authority to assume another responsibility. If they do, in any event the stockholders have the power to direct or remove their board of directors as they see fit, since they control the corporation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. Senator PASTORE pointed out in the Commerce Committee hearings on our space communications program held in February:

> We were led to believe when we formed this corporation practically all of this work [research and development] would be undertaken by this private corporation, because we said America has grown on private industry, so let private industry do it.

I believe that is a correct interpretation of the law.

The status of the incorporators was clearly spelled out by the Attorney General in a letter to the President, reprinted at page 87 of the Commerce Committee hearings. The Attorney General wrote:

> With [the directives of sections 301 and 302] * * * in the act, there would seem to be no doubt that the incorporators, as directors, will have the same status and responsibilities as individuals serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation and will be holding private, not public, posts.

And the Attorney General continued:

> I find nothing in the act or in its history to justify a different view as to the position of the incorporators during the period prior to the formation of the corporation.
>
> Their mission during that time places on them the same obligation for the furtherance of private interests as their later duties as the initial board of directors and in essence is therefore a private mission.

It would seem clear that the question of the private versus public status of these incorporators is settled. My point of order does nothing more than insist that the Senate face up to the fact of the incorporators' purely private responsibilities so that there can be no question.

The Senate appears to face a dilemma—in deciding whether to confirm these incorporators. Actually, the incorporators themselves face a much greater dilemma.

The Senate has a way out of its dilemma. It can refuse to either confirm or not confirm. It can make clear in the legislative record that it does not mean to say that these men are in any way inadequate for the posts for which they have been selected. I do not believe they are, and I have not heard from anyone else who thinks they are. The Senate has an opportunity to say, "We have no business as the elected representatives of the American people confirming the officials of a private business enterprise."

But how are the incorporators to escape their quandary?

What will they do when—as surely will happen—the best interests of the profit-seeking corporation which they represent conflict with the interests of the American Government?

Senator HART put his finger on the incorporators' dilemma when he said at the Space Committee hearings:

> Congress really has built in a conflict of interest here that we ought to face up to. If we were one of these nominees, we could have love and affection for the taxpayers, but we are being paid by the investors [of the corporation]. Unless we change basic corporate law in this act, all of us know what the obligation is. I think we just ought to say so. * * * We ought not try to kid ourselves that their role is anything other than what I have suggested it is.

If, by the act of advising and consenting, we place upon the incorporators and directors some cloak of the public interest, the directors will be subject to shareholders' suits for doing the very thing the Senate has ordered them to do.

For example, suppose that it is in the public interest to provide space satellite communications to Chile. To provide such services, however, will require the corporation to operate at a loss. By serving the public interest in such a case, the directors would subject themselves to legal action for dissipating the corporate purse.

Parenthetically, let me point out that the shareholders of this corporation will be able to remove their directors at any time that they do not like the actions of the board of directors. The President and the Senate, however, will not. There is no power of impeachment over private citizens who are not officials of the United States.

The sanctions imposed in section 403(a) of the act add nothing because the duties of the directors and incorporators, under the act, are to run the corporation as a private enterprise for profit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I recall correctly, during the space satellite debate last year the President's message indicated that it was to be one of the objectives of this Nation to provide space satellite communications with underdeveloped nations like the newly emerging nations of Africa. I believe the point the Senator is making is well taken.

Providing communications with any of these nations would be an unprofitable venture for many years, particularly because of the costs that would be involved in the early stages of satellite communications. I ask the Senator if that objective might not be completely in conflict with the interest of the shareholders of the corporation.

Mr. NELSON. If I were a member of the board of directors or if I were a shareholder in the corporation I would wish the corporation to expend my money in pursuit of making a profit for the corporation. Much as I might like to see some education in the underdeveloped nations of the world, I believe I would assume the position, as a stockholder, that I am not personally desirous of financing it with my family's invested money.

I believe that this question poses a serious problem. It was raised at the time of the debate, last year. I have read the debate since then. It is a serious problem from the standpoint of the interest of the United States and our country and our people in providing some educational opportunity for underdeveloped nations of the world. This is a responsibility of our country as a whole, and not of a private corporation. This is one of the serious questions that have been raised. I believe it will not be possible for the corporation, as it is now constituted, to discharge such responsibility effectively.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Are we to understand that the duty of the directors will be to the shareholders and not to the public interest of the United States?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I have been attentive to the arguments made by the distinguished Senator. When the recommendation of this legislation was originally made by the President of the United States, it was never intended at that time to submit the names of the incorporators to the Senate for advice and consent. The Senate itself added that provision to the law, because it was thought that the Senate should be given an opportunity to pass upon the qualifications of the incorporators, not because the President could not be trusted in making the choices, but because we believed there should be an element of partnership between the executive branch and the legislative branch, to make certain that the men selected would stand the test of both branches.

If I follow the Senator well, he is saying in essence that this procedure is unconstitutional because we are conferring upon private citizens by the process of confirmation a so-called cloak of public trust which is inimical to the very spirit of the law which was intended to create a private organization. Do I state the Senator's proposition correctly?

Mr. NELSON. No. Perhaps I did not phrase it as artistically as it should have been phrased. My real point is that the act of confirmation appears to confer a cloak of public trust or responsibility. I do not believe the Senate has the power to confer that cloak of responsibility upon the nominees. Nevertheless, I think the public interpretation of our action will be that, in fact, is what we have done. The public will not understand the intricacies of the law or the Constitution.

Mr. PASTORE. But is not the Senator from Wisconsin saying, in fact, that what is unconstitutional is that the Senate is acting on the confirmation of nominations made by the President when the Senate has no business to confirm in this area? Is not that the argument that is being developed?

Mr. NELSON. No; I have not intended to raise a constitutional question. The real essence of my statement is that since the nominees are purely private citizens, it should not be the business of the Senate to confirm their nominations. I have every confidence in the quality of the selections made by the President. But, I think the law ought to be amended. The Senate should divest itself of the unconstitutional authority under the statute to vote confirmation and leave the appointments exclusively to the President.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the point I wish to make, because I believe that is where we create some confusion or somewhat of a dilemma. If we are so sensitive that the public reaction might be that we are cloaking individuals with a sense of public trust only because their nominations are to be confirmed by the Senate, which is a part of only one of the three branches of the U.S. Government, why cannot the public reach the same conclusion when the President makes the appointments? Why should the President have the power to make appointments of purely private citizens? Why should not such action create the same impression as is created by the process of confirmation?

I am not quarreling with the Senator; I am trying to gage the situation in its proper perspective. Is there anything more noble in creating this impression by an act of the Senate than by an act of the President, which, in my opinion, is just as noble, or perhaps nobler?

Mr. NELSON. I have a difficult enough time speaking for myself and my responsibility as a Senator without presuming to speak for the executive branch of the Government.

As to my responsibility, I shall not vote for the confirmation of the nomination of a private official to be an officer of a private corporation, because that is what my constituents would interpret it to be if I should cast such a vote.

If someone in Wisconsin were to inquire why the corporation did not pay dividends for at least 10 or 15 years, I would not want him to ask, "Did not the Government participate in this program?" If he did, I should have to say, "No, the Government did not participate. This is a private corporation." He might then ask, "Then why did the Senate confirm the nominations?"

The understanding of my constituents will be that the Senate only votes to confirm the nominations of public officials who have public responsibilities. I think it is my responsibility to make it clear that that is not what the officials of this corporation are.

I think Congress should not have enacted this statute. If it were desired to have the Senate's advice, I think it ought to have been in the informal manner which prevails all the time between the executive and legislative branches.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not mean to be personal in any way in my comments. I do not mean to impinge upon the freedom of choice which the Senator from Wisconsin will have to make shortly on this important question. However, I should like to propound a question to him. Will he not agree with me that whether or not it was a wise move on the part of the previous Congress to enact this proviso, whether or not it should have been done in the first place, the fact is that the proviso as it now stands is the law of the land?

Mr. NELSON. As it now stands?

Mr. PASTORE. As it now stands.

Mr. NELSON. It is the law of the land.

Mr. PASTORE. It being the supreme law of the land, is not the only way in which it can be declared unconstitutional by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. NELSON. That is the only way in which the act could be declared unconstitutional; but I assume Congress still has the legislative power to amend the act.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. That is the point I make. If the Senate had said at any time that it desired to have this provision repealed, if at any time the motion had been made to remove this proviso, I would be the first to go along with that proposal.

Of course, the argument will be made that perhaps some such amendment was included among the 350 amendments which were tabled at the time of cloture but it will be recalled it was difficult to debate each of them individually to any considerable extent. As a consequence the amendments were tabled. The Senate is in this predicament only because it inflicted it upon itself. Congress enacted the law. The President of the United States could do nothing but submit the names to the Senate for confirmation, because he must abide by the law as it is written.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin argues that this procedure is wrong because he believes that it was unwise to enact the law in the first place, and that he cannot now vote to confirm the nominations. He has a perfect right to vote against the confirmation of the nominations, but vote he must. He can be called upon by this body and compelled to vote one way or the other, under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. NELSON. Let me assure the Senator that I will vote.

Mr. PASTORE. I know. Please do not misunderstand me. I am not trying to lecture the Senate. I am trying to make an argument. The point I am trying to make is that if this section is unconstitutional, or is deemed to be unconstitutional at this very moment, there are only two choices: Either to repeal the proviso or to accept it as the law until the Supreme Court declares it to be unconstitutional. Beyond that, I think all of us have a sworn duty to our office to abide by the law so long as it is the law of the land. That is the only argument I make.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, in order that I may address a comment to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania withhold his request, so that I may yield to the majority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may yield to me for a special purpose, without his losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY OFFICIALS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE FEDERATION OF MALAYA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to introduce to the Senate three members of a parliamentary body in the region of southeast Asia.

The first is His Excellency Tun Abdul Razak, Deputy Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya, Minister of Defense, and Minister of Rural Development.

Next, His Excellency Ong Yoke Lin, Ambassador of Malaya, and also a Member of the Parliament of Malaya.

The third distinguished visitor is Dato Teoh Chze Chong, Member of Parliament, representing the State of Johore, Malaya.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate, let me welcome these distinguished guests to this Chamber, and assure them that we are delighted to have them with us, and that we are honored that His Excellency, the Deputy Prime Minister, and his colleagues could meet with some of the Members of the Senate in the Foreign Relations Committee room, for coffee.

We have had most interesting discussions with them. As a result, we are better educated in regard to the problems of their country and their area; and we are distinctly privileged and delighted that they were able to spare the time, from their busy schedules, to meet with us today.

We extend to them every good wish.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nominations of incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I came into the Chamber during the colloquy between the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Wisconsin. I know that last year the Senator from Rhode Island very ably defended the bill; and I know how ably he is defending it today, in connection with his responsibility in regard to the developments in the space world.

I do not wish to argue with him; I merely wish to state that it seems to me this provision is clearly unconstitutional.

I have read the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee and those of the Senator from Wisconsin; and I believe this provision should not have been included in the act, in that it is unconstitutional. Therefore, I make the point that it is not the supreme law of the land, but is a nullity, and that it could not be a valid provision until the Supreme Court declared it to be constitutional.

Any citizen of the United States has a right to regard any provision of law as unconstitutional and to take the consequences—which are that if he is mistaken, he may have to go to jail; or, if he is a public official, he may be impeached for failure properly to carry out his duty.

But I believe it is for each Senator to determine for himself whether this provision is constitutional. I do not think we must wait until the Supreme Court speaks on this matter.

During my service in the Senate I have heard, time after time, the argument that a certain provision of law is unconstitutional. Each Senator determines for himself what he believes as to that; Senators do not wait until they find what the Supreme Court says about it. I admit that often Senators give the benefit of doubt in favor of the constitutionality of a statute. However, our duty is to make that determination for ourselves.

If this provision is unconstitutional, I believe we have the duty to sustain a point of order that it is unconstitutional, rather than vote for confirmation of these nominations.

My final point is that we should not have passed the act in the first place. I voted against it, and I do not feel bound to support any portion of it which in my judgment is unconstitutional.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, so that I may reply?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. First, I realize full well that Senators who were opposed to this act last year were very sincere. As a matter of fact, most of them are among my best friends; and usually I find them surrounding me in connection with many of the crusades which are conducted on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Rhode Island may remember that I voted for cloture.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Pennsylvania said I defended this act last year and that I am defending it now. However, that is not a correct statement. I advocated the act then; and I do not think there is anything about it to defend.

The Senator from Pennsylvania said any Senator has a right to challenge the constitutionality of any measure. Certainly that is a right which Senators have. But I am sure he will admit that until a measure is declared unconstitutional, it is the law of the land.

For example, if a criminal law is placed on the statute books, and if a Senator does not consider it constitutional, he has a perfect right to violate that law and to subject himself to the penalty in connection with his challenge of its constitutionality; but in the meantime he will be prosecuted according to the law, until the Supreme Court says, "Release this man, because the law had no validity in the first place." But until that declaration is made by the Supreme Court, that measure is, indeed, the law of the land.

So I hope none of my friends, including the former dean of the University of Oregon Law School [Mr. MORSE], who now is nodding his head in the negative, will take the position that whenever any American citizen decides that, in his opinion, a particular law is unconstitutional, he can proceed to violate it with impunity, and can say, "I am not subject to it, because it is unconstitutional." That is ridiculous.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield——

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not see why the Senator from Rhode Island says "with impunity." I only point out that if the law involved is unconstitutional, one who violates it is innocent, and has not committed a crime.

Mr. PASTORE. But that cannot be determined until the Supreme Court rules the law to be unconstitutional.

Mr. MORSE. But while that citizen is waiting for that determination, he still is innocent.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, but in the meantime he is incarcerated; and he remains incarcerated until the Court declares the law to be unconstitutional. The fact is that he could be held in jail until the Supreme Court declares the law to be unconstitutional.

Mr. MORSE. But in that event, he is held illegally; and when the Supreme Court states that the law is unconstitutional, that establishes his innocence.

The impression the Senator from Rhode Island is trying to create is that he is guilty until his innocence is established.

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, no.

Mr. MORSE. That is the only conclusion which can be drawn from the argument the Senator from Rhode Island has been making.

Mr. PASTORE. No; I merely said that he must submit to the law until it is declared unconstitutional.

Mr. MORSE. But no guilt is attached to his action, once the law is declared unconstitutional.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

However, only the Supreme Court can rule on the question of constitutionality. That cannot be done by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], or any other Senator.

Mr. MORSE. None of us is arguing that it can be done by anyone but the Supreme Court.

Mr. PASTORE. But that is what Senators are arguing today.

Mr. MORSE. Not at all.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield further to me——

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think there is a very real difference between the obligation of a U.S. Senator in regard to taking on the floor of the Senate, as a public official, action which he considers unconstitutional, and the position of a citizen who undertakes to violate a law which he believes to be unconstitutional. The difference is as follows: Senators swear, as a condition to their membership in this body, to support and defend the Constitution of the United States; and it is their duty to do so. If Senators vote on the question of confirmation of these nominations, I say they could well be charged with violating their oath of office, because in that event they will not be supporting and defending the Constitution of the United States. Instead, they will be knowingly violating it. I think such action would not only be illegal, but also would raise some rather grave ethical questions.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me, to permit me to make a concluding observation?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the President of the United States recognizes this act to be the law of the land. It was passed by a majority of the Senate, to the tune of 66 to 11. It was passed by the House of Representatives by almost a unanimous vote. It was signed by the President of the United States. As a matter of fact, a group of us were invited to collect the pens with which the President signed it. It became inscribed in the statute books of the United States as part of the law of the land. It now has a number as a certain public law.

In compliance with that law, the President of the United States has made the appointments, and has sent the nominations to the Senate, for confirmation. Why? Because the law requires that it be done.

Now several Senators say, "I do not think it is a constitutional law; and I do not like it, and I will not vote in favor of these nominations."

Senators have a perfect right to take that position; but I do not think they have a right to maintain that the 66 Senators out of the 77 were not cognizant of the constitutional question, and that the 11 Senators are the masters of the Constitution and the authorized interpreters of the Constitution, and that only they know it well and know what law is constitutional, legal, and correct. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think the debate on that point should be brought to a close. I point out to my able friend from Rhode Island that, in my opinion, the President of the United States has given no consideration to the serious nature of the constitutional question involved. I suspect that if he asked his own Attorney General, his own Attorney General would tell him that the provision in the act is unconstitutional and he should never have appointed those particular individuals, or if he did appoint them, he should have appointed them without the advice and consent of the Senate, because they are not public officers of the United States. Therefore, the Senate has no right, under the Constitution, to confirm the nominations.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make one more comment?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not desire to say that my friend is in error, because I do not like that kind of expression. I merely say that I disagree with my friend from Pennsylvania. The Attorney General rendered an opinion, and said that in his opinion the act is constitutional. It is in the RECORD, because I asked to have it printed in the RECORD earlier today. I have a copy of the opinion, if the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to see it. I have an interpretation by the Attorney General of the United States, who disagrees with those who say that the act is unconstitutional. He has interpreted it as being constitutional.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Then I say to my friend from Rhode Island that that is pretty nearly the neatest legal trick of the week, in view of the earlier opinion of the Attorney General.

Mr. PASTORE. There we go again. Everyone who disagrees with the Senator is out of step.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to comment on the basis of the Senator's argument. The Attorney General is not the Supreme Court of the United States. We must wait until the Supreme Court passes judgment on the constitutionality of this provision. But we must make the legislative history tonight in regard to the pros and cons of the two points of view in regard to the constitutionality of the act, because sooner or later the issue will go to the Supreme Court of the United States, and we shall abide by the decision of the Supreme Court. But before that, the Senate must consider the constitutionality of confirming these nominations.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. I shall remain in the Chamber and listen to the case being made. It is very illuminating. Perhaps I shall not agree with all of it, but Senators who are enunciating the constitutional problems today are learned men for whom I have a great deal of respect. Moreover, they are men for whom I have love and admiration.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island knows that all of us who oppose him on the question share the same opinion of the Senator from Rhode Island as he has expressed so kindly about his opposition.

Mr. PASTORE. The only reason I made the observation was so that the Senator would have an opportunity to compliment me, too.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. On the constitutional question, our distinguished friend the able Senator from Rhode Island seems to attach some importance to the vote of 66 to 11. The Senate performs most of its business by unanimous consent. But whether the action is by unanimous consent, by a large majority, or a narrow majority, the fundamental question remains: A statute is not the supreme law of the land. The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land today, tomorrow, and as long as we remain a constitutional republic.

Senators will not have the luxury of waiting until some distant time when the Supreme Court of the United States may render a decision as to the constitutionality of the proposed procedure of the Senate. The Senate itself—each individual Senator—will have an opportunity to reach his own judgment on that question. The Presiding Officer will be called upon to decide whether he will make a ruling or submit the constitutional question to the Senate. Then the question will arise as to whether the ruling of the Presiding Officer will be appealed. Today or tomorrow—I hope tomorrow—the Senate will be required to determine the question in accordance with the individual oath which each Senator has taken. I have placed that oath in the RECORD.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would not desire any Senator to think that I either affirm or disagree with all the propositions that have been advanced merely because I yielded time to either side.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Wisconsin, who has been in the Senate a short time, has already shown his astuteness.

Mr. NELSON. In response to a point made by the Senator from Rhode Island, the act is now the law of the land. The constitutionality of the act will not be determined one way or the other until, if, and when, the issue comes before the U.S. Supreme Court.

How did the Senate get into this dilemma?

That is a difficult question for me to answer, of course.

It is, however, clear that the drafters of the Communications Satellite Act sought to give the Senate some role in the selection of the key leaders of the corporation. Not surprisingly, the familiar language of "advice and consent" suggested itself.

This was not a happy choice of wording, however, and I am afraid that insufficient thought was given to the correctness of employing constitutional language with a clear and long established meaning which is simply not compatible with the act's purpose.

The records of the debate and hearings on the bill do not reveal any discussion of the problem we are talking about.

Last fall, however, it became a matter of concern.

On October 25, the Attorney General replied to a request from the President for an advisory opinion as to whether or not the incorporators and directors were officers of the United States.

As we all know, the Attorney General determined that, without question, they are not officers of the United States but rather, enjoyed exactly the same status as individuals serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation.

However, the problem troubling the President at that time apparently was whether the conflict-of-interest laws applied to the incorporators and directors. There was no indication of an awareness of the problem of the Senate's power to confirm a private business executive.

This is not surprising, because this problem is the Senate's problem, not the President's.

In any case, Mr. President, it seems to me that we must conclude that sections 302 and 303(a) are the result of nothing more than the ill-considered use of language in drafting the act.

Nevertheless, the act has been passed. It is a fact of life. We must live with it, at least for the time being. How then can we escape the dilemma in which we find ourselves? How may we save the incorporators and directors from a more serious dilemma which will be the direct result of our proceeding to confirmation today?

First, let us consider what the Congress intended when it passed the act last summer.

There is no doubt that Congress intended that the incorporators and directors would not be officers of the United States. This is the plain meaning of the words of the act itself. It is revealed in the debates. For example, Senator KEFAUVER observed during the debate on the floor:

> Section 302 apparently fails to recognize the fact that the incorporators selected by the President will become directors of the corporation. As such, their fiduciary obligations under law will not be to the President and will not be to the public at large and will not be to the Federal Government. The fiduciary obligations which will be imposed upon these directors will be obligations to the corporation itself.

Second, it is clear that Congress did not intend to place itself in the dilemma we now encounter. Without doubt, Congress had in mind that the Senate should aid the President in selecting incorporators and directors. But equally without doubt, Congress did not intend to apply the same principles and procedures to private businessmen that are reserved by the Constitution for treaties with foreign governments and the appointment of Supreme Court Justices, ambassadors, and other Government officers.

It appears that Congress wanted the Senate to have a hand in the selection of the incorporators and, apparently, be counseled about the appointments.

But surely Congress did not intend that the Senate express its opinion in such a way that the public would be led to believe—and believe correctly—that the incorporators are officers of the United States and certified by the Senate to be responsible to the public's interest.

Perhaps Congress had in mind that an ad hoc committee be appointed to cooperate with the President in its selection.

Perhaps it intended that the Senate resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to discuss the President's selections.

But one thing must certainly be clear: Congress could not have intended to give the stamp of public interest to these private businessmen by constitutionally advising and consenting to their nomination.

This is the principle which I believe we must assert here today.

In so doing, we are not opposing the incorporators as individuals, who undoubtedly are fine men.

We are simply asserting, without equivocation, that it is the intent of Congress that the Communications Sattellite Corp. be a private corporation, and that it is the intent of Congress that the directors and incorporators of the corporation shall be private businessmen and and not agents of the Federal Government.

I believe, Mr. President, that this is now—and clearly was last summer—the intent of Congress. It would seem, therefore that we have a duty to reaffirm it now.

The Senator from Rhode Island asked, "What else is there to do at this stage?"

The nominations can be referred to committee for further consideration of the issues raised, today. We can vote properly, without violating the Constitution, not to confirm. We can amend the statute.

The statute should be amended. If any value comes from the discussion, it ought to be that we, as Senators, should study the possible consequences.

I shall not discuss the constitutional question. The able Senator from Oregon will discuss that in a much more able fashion than I could. I have not intended to raise the question, although it is implied all the way through my statement. Without discussing that point, I conclude by saying that I direct my remarks primarily to the proposition that regardless of what the legal consequences or the legal capacity of the Senate is to confirm the appointments, the public interpretation will be—and that is the point that concerns me—that somehow or other these presidentially appointed nominees have a color of public responsibility. It will be thought that the nominees are clothed with some responsibility to the public interest, as contrasted with the interest of the investors in the corporation.

I believe that is unfortunate. I know it is not true. I as a Senator do not desire to go back to my State and say that I voted for confirmation of the nominations, and that confirmation confers some color or cloak of public responsibility, because it does not. I believe the action will be interpreted in that manner.

There exists almost a unique circumstance in the Senate. I do not think there is a really comparable case in the precedents of the Senate. I wonder if we should not seriously reconsider the whole question before we create a precedent with which we on a subsequent date will not wish to live. That is the main essence and burden of all I have to say on the entire issue.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of the point of order which will be raised, I understand, tomorrow by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] that the incorporators are not officers of the United States, and therefore the Senate has no constitutional right to vote on confirmation of their nominations.

In my view, the Senate has gotten itself into a terrible bind on this point, Mr. President. I point out that this was a problem about which I warned the Senate, last summer.

First, let me say that my remarks are not directed toward the persons involved. I know most of the men who have been nominated. The ones I know personally and well are outstanding men. I am sure the others are, also. This is not a question of personalities in any respect.

I know also that these men felt they were doing a public service by accepting appointment, and they have nothing but the best of motives in mind.

Mr. President, I want to read from the statement I made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 17, 1962. Incidentally, I point out that this statement of mine is cited by the Attorney General in his letter of October 25, 1962, advising the President that the incorporators and directors of the corporation are purely private businessmen and not public officers. I will have more to say about that letter, in a minute.

Here is what I said to the Senate, last summer:

> Section 302 states that the President shall appoint incorporators by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. * * * Certainly one of the most important functions which the incorporators of this corporation will perform is arranging for the initial stock offering of the corporation. * * * That initial offering will be arranged by the incorporators and there is nothing in the act as it is proposed which would insure that the public is represented among the incorporators, or that the incorporators are to follow any particular standard in deciding how to arrange the initial offering or the amount of such offering.
>
> THE FOX GUARDING THE HENHOUSE
>
> I should like to quote from the report which accompanied this bill as it relates to section 302. I am quoting from page 20 of that report: "Your committee is hopeful, that in making his choices, the President will seek fair representation from the major political parties and a good cross section of the professions and industries which will be expected to take part in the U.S. commercial communications effort. For example, it is hoped that there will be incorporators drawn from both large and small communications carriers, from persons wise in the problems of finance, from industries supplying rockets, electronic gear, tracking mechanisms, and the like. It is also hoped that there will be incorporators knowledgeable in the area of Federal Communications Commission regulations."
>
> Is that not a dandy group from which to choose the incorporators for a corporation which is supposed to protect the public interest? The committee doesn't suggest by any remote stretch of the imagination that the incorporators be selected in such a way that they represent the American public who are expected to participate as shareholders. There is no suggestion that the incorporators who will arrange the initial offering of stock by this corporation, select its officers and serve as its board of directors be representative of the American public.
>
> The group suggested for nomination by the President is a group which would one and all have a built-in conflict of interest

> with planning, organizing, developing, and operating the corporation consistently with the public interest and with the interest of the individuals who may eventually become stockholders in such a private corporation.
>
> Under normal corporate procedure, the incorporators of any corporation are ones who have a financial interest in the successful establishment and organization of the corporation. It is this interest which they are expected to protect and in this way we depend upon having a corporation created which will be consistent with the profit motives involved. Section 302 apparently fails to recognize the fact that the incorporators selected by the President will become directors of the corporation. As such, their fiduciary obligations under law will not be to the Federal Government.
>
> The fiduciary obligations which will be imposed upon these directors will be obligations to the corporation itself.
>
> There is certainly a crying need for a standard to be built into this act to insure that these incorporators in their capacity as such, and in their subsequent capacity as directors, will act consistently with the public interest in mind.
>
> There is a great deal more involved in the success and in the operation of the satellite corporation than a normal profit motivation in the typical private corporation.
>
> Section 303 provides that three members of the board of directors shall be appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. I believe I am correct, Mr. President, in stating that the single sentence referring to these directors and their appointment by the President appearing in section 303 is the only reference to the presidentially appointed directors contained in the bill.
>
> There is nothing which indicates that the nature or extent of their obligations in serving as directors is any different from the obligations of directors selected by either of the groups of shareholders who may elect the remaining 12 directors. There is no standard established in the bill which would provide a yardstick for judging the performance of these three presidentially appointed directors. The bill contains no indication that their appointment is particularly intended to protect the public interest. The committee report of the Senate Commerce Committee does not give any indication that the members of the board who are appointed by the President have any responsibilities to the President or to the public which are different from the remaining members of the board.
>
> If we refer back to the language of section 301 which makes the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act applicable to the satellite corporation, we see an indication that the Presidential directors would normally be anticipated to act as fiduciaries of the corporation itself and that their responsibilities are to the corporation rather than to the public. I think there is a real possibility that we might place the men appointed by the President in an undesirable position. Certainly the public has a right to expect that the President would appoint individuals who would protect the public interest. Yet, as a matter of law, these individuals have a primary responsibility which is different. In this respect, the bill gives a false sense of security for, even though the directors are appointed by the President, they will serve for 3-year terms and will be responsible to the corporation and would be subject to the same type of shareholder derivative suits for breach of fiduciary obligations as the directors who are elected either by the carrier shareholders or by the noncarrier shareholders.

That is what I said, last August, Mr. President. And those words are every bit as appropriate, today, as they were 9 months ago. Indeed, they may be more important, now than ever.

There is very little time left to attempt to straighten out exactly what it was we were trying to accomplish when we passed the Communications Satellite Act.

Mr. President, I am very proud of the fact that I was one of those who spoke against the bill and voted against it.

The horse is out of the barn and we are about to lock the door. We had better think carefully, Mr. President, because this is a wild, unique type of horse. It is going to be around for a long, long time and the U.S. Senate and the American people are going to have to live with it.

Let me, therefore, briefly reiterate my position with respect to the status of these nominees. I will attempt to make clear why the point of order that will be before us tomorrow must be upheld, and why these incorporators are purely private businessmen and not public officers. My opinion is based on four points: First, the Communications Satellite Corp. is wholly a private corporation for profit, and is not an agency of the U.S. Government; second, these incorporators, and later the directors appointed by the President, will not be officers of the United States but, like the other directors and like the directors of any ordinary corporation, will owe their total loyalty and fiduciary duty to the private pecuniary interests of the corporation and its stockholders; third, therefore, on this occasion, use of this procedure, which traditionally and constitutionally is used for the confirmation of nominations of ambassadors, judges, and officers of the United States pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, is improper and unconstitutional; and fourth, the implications of the confirmation of the appointment of these incorporators by this traditional procedure are wholly false and undesirable.

A little while ago there was a colloquy between the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Wisconsin as to the duty of an individual Senator at this point in the procedure—as to whether he should wait until the Supreme Court acts; and as to whether there is an obligation to vote for an act which he, in his heart and in his judgment, feels to be improper and unconstitutional and beyond the authority granted by the Constitution.

Regardless of what has been passed or how it was passed—whether by a unanimous vote or by a divided vote—as my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] said, the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. A Senator, under his oath of office, must apply the advice-and-consent section as he thinks it can be applied constitutionally. It can be applied constitutionally only to an officer of the Government of the United States or to a treaty.

The Attorney General has said—and nobody has said otherwise—that these men are not to be officers of the United States.

Before I discuss these points, however, again I want to make it clear that nothing I have said or will say is intended to reflect adversely on the incorporators as persons. I number several of these able men among my personal friends.

So let there be no question in any Senator's mind that I view any of these incorporators, as individuals, with disfavor. Quite the contrary, I have great respect and admiration for their abilities.

All of my remarks are directed at their duties as incorporators and directors of the corporation, not at their qualifications as individuals.

I. THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION IS WHOLLY A PRIVATE CORPORATION FOR PROFIT, AND IS NOT AN AGENCY OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

If there is anything on which the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 is clear, it is that the Communications Satellite Corp. is wholly private and nongovernmental in character. Section 301 of the act provides:

> There is hereby authorized to be created a Communications Satellite Corp. for profit which will not be an agency or establishment of the U.S. Government.

If some Senators are now confused on this issue, the incorporators, themselves, are not. Mr. Bruce G. Sundlun, who happens to be a personal friend of mine, during his testimony, explicitly disagreed with the opinion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] that the corporation is not "an entirely private corporation, but rather a semipublic one." Mr. Sundlun said:

> No, sir. I think that this corporation is definitely a private corporation * * *. We are conscious that there is a strong public interest factor in this corporation. But I submit, sir, that it is really and actually a private corporation.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. You mean more so that a public utility?
>
> Mr. SUNDLUN. I think we are a regulated public utility.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. So you would say that it was a private corporation comparable to a private utility?
>
> Mr. SUNDLUN. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sundlun also suggested that the corporation, like other private corporations for profit, might go into other lines of business.

Again, I would like to quote from his testimony. He said:

> If this corporation should at any time become competent in any technical fields collateral or consistent with our own purpose, we would assume that as a private company we would be eligible to compete with other private companies for contract business.

Senator SYMINGTON asked:

> Like what?
>
> Mr. SUNDLUN. Conceivably technical research.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. You mean like the Rand Corp.?
>
> Mr. SUNDLUN. A.T. & T., I.T. & T., RCA.

As has so often been pointed out, one of the big evils involved is the impression that the public will have. Here will be a corporation getting into other kinds of business, competing with A.T. & T.—which needs some competition, I will concede—I.T. & T., and RCA, in trying to get business. The public will have the impression, as a result of what the Senate is doing, that the corporation has some unusual sanctity because its officers have been given the sanction of the U.S. Senate.

In all sincerity, I put this question to my colleagues: Did you realize, when you voted for the Communications Satellite Act, that you were creating a purely private business venture that can sell anything it wants—that can offer to the public products and services other than space satellite communication services? And, had you known this, would you have voted to create such a corporation, without limiting the areas of commerce into which its congressionally granted monopoly extends?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Although it may not have been so understood by those who drafted the bill, would it be legally possible for the directors to sell the corporation, with all the public investment that has been made in this area, to the Soviet Union?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There would be no limitation under the act. There is nothing in the act to prevent such a sale. Only the laws which apply to all private business corporations would affect such a sale.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And there would be no conflict of interest if that were done?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There would be no conflict of interest.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The prime consideration would be to get all the money they could get out of it?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. They could sell it to the Soviet Union, and they would not be subject to the conflict of interest laws. They could buy A.T. & T. and sell it to the Soviet Union, if they had the money to do it.

I think the Senator from Louisiana has raised a very interesting question. I only wish more Senators were present to hear it.

I am sure Members of the Senate thought they were placing some kind of public responsibility around these directors. Now it turns out, as was stated at that time, that there was no restriction then, and there is none now. The directors of the corporation can get into some business other than space satellite communications.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As a great defender of the President of the United States, I yield to no one in this body in my defense of him. I am satisfied that the President was not aware of the implications of the questions of the Senator from Louisiana when he recommended this bill to the Congress. I said earlier this afternoon that I thought action on this matter should be held up until the President of the United States can be rebriefed, or debriefed, in regard to the satellite law. My confidence in the President of the United States is such that I believe—and I want to continue to believe—that if he had all the information, all the argument, all the data that have gone into this debate this afternoon, he would agree that what we ought to do first is to amend the Satellite Act so that we stop the dangerous deception of the American public and potential purchasers of stock in regard to the legal nature of the entity established by the Congress of the United States, by the exercise of its very unfortunate, mistaken judgment last year, in making it the law of the land, until at least the Supreme Court declares this section of the act unconstitutional.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon. He is a great constitutional lawyer. In any action we may take we should consider very gravely the question the Senator from Louisiana has raised.

What if an offer were made by the Soviet Union and the price were so attractive that the directors could not possibly deny such an advantage to the stockholders? They might get themselves in trouble if they did not act favorably on such an offer of the Soviet Union, or Poland, or some other nation.

I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana has thought about that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that 50 percent of the stock is reserved for communications common carriers, but the other half of it is available for sale to the general public. I had not explored the question, but the thought occurred to me that, in view of the fact that the whole operation is for private profit, and since there would be no conflict of interest, it is clear there is no obligation owed to the people of the United States to protect their interest, even though those in the Corporation have complete control of our space communications.

The Senator has made an important point in stating that in the act passed last year the Senate divested itself of power we might have had to protect this Nation's position in space communications. We lost it completely to the profit incentive of those who would be officers, directors, and stockholders of that corporation.

As the Senator has so well pointed out, we would be making a fool's play by confirming the nominations of persons who may have no responsibility to the Government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. More and more people are beginning to realize that fact. They have exactly the same responsibility to us that the directors of General Motors have toward us—no more and no less.

That fact is very regrettable; and it will do the history or the tradition of the Senate no good for the Senate to take any action on something we have no business doing anything about.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that a great public interest is involved. However, as pointed out in the Attorney General's letter, when it is stated that there can be no conflict of interest problem, it is meant that there is no obligation owed to the United States, other than the obligation that any citizen owes to his country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct; and if the directors act badly—and I hope none of these directors will do so—we have no right to impeach them. We have none of the rights we usually have with respect to any officer of the United States.

Despite some hopeful language in the preface to the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, and despite the common, loose characterization of the Communications Satellite Corp. as "quasi-public," it is wholly illusory and completely incorrect to say that the corporation has any public character whatever.

The language of the act is exactly contrary. All of the corporation's stock will be privately owned. The corporation is an enterprise for profit and, presumably, as much profit as it can garner within the public utility regulation to which it is subject. Any public benefit from the corporation will be indirect and incidental, as is the case with any private corporation. The corporation's objective is the advancement of the pecuniary interests of its stockholders, and the corporation is bound to do nothing inconsistent with that objective.

II. THE INCORPORATORS ARE NOT OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES

There can be no doubt that the incorporators, and the presidentially appointed directors who follow, will not be officers of the United States in any sense. Rather, they will occupy a completely private station with a wholly private mission. Their entire loyalty and their sole duty will be to the pecuniary interests of the corporation and its stockholders.

An opinion of the Attorney General, dated October 25, 1962, is addressed precisely to this question, and I will quote a few of its more pertinent passages:

> With these directives in the act there would seem to be no doubt that the incorporators, as directors, will have the same status and responsibilities as individuals serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation and will be holding private, not public, posts.
>
> I find nothing in the act or its history to justify a different view as to the position of the incorporators during the period prior to the formation of the corporation. Their mission during that time places on them the same obligation for the furtherance of private interests as their later duties as the intitial board of directors, and in essence is therefore a private mission. Turning now to the three directors whom the President will appoint to the regular board, I need do little more than refer again to the fact that section 301 makes the Communications Satellite Corp. an enterprise for profit which will not be an agency of the Government. The other 12 members of the board, who are to be elected by the stockholders, will obviously have the same private status as individuals serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation. The act makes no distinction, except in the method of selection, between the directors appointed by the President and the elected directors.
>
> Thus, there appears to have been no intention on the part of the originators of the legislation to create directors who would be officers of the Government, but rather an intention to dissociate the Government from the directors.
>
> In my opinion neither that relationship (that the President may use his directors to keep himself informed) nor their concern for the public interest beyond that ordinarily expected of the directors of a private corporation would put the mark of a public station on the board memberships of those three directors.

In all, the legislative history regarding the directors to be named by the President supports the view that they, like the others, will occupy private posts and not be officers of the United States.

The Attorney General concludes his opinion with the statement that if these incorporators and the presidentially appointed directors were officers of the United States, they would be subject to impeachment, and that is unlikely to have been Congress' intention.

If there is no objection, Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the opinion of the Attorney General in its entirety.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., October 25, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to reply to your request for my opinion on a question arising out of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (hereinafter referred to as the "act").[1] That question is whether incorporators appointed by the President, with the concurrence of the Senate, to effect the establishment of the communications satellite corporation authorized by the act are officers of the United States by virtue of such appointment.[2]

A similar inquiry will no doubt arise, after the incorporators have completed their work, with regard to those members of the new corporation's board of directors whom the President is authorized to appoint, again with the concurrence of the Senate. I am therefore taking the liberty of advising you with regard to the presidentially appointed directors, as well as the incorporators.

Section 302 of the act provides for the incorporators as follows:

"The President of the United States shall appoint incorporators, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve as the initial board of directors until the first annual meeting of stockholders or until their successors are elected and qualified. Such incorporators shall arrange for an initial stock offering and take whatever other actions are necessary to establish the corporation, including the filing of articles of incorporation, as approved by the President."

Section 303(a), providing for the new corporation's regular board of directors, reads in pertinent part as follows:

"The corporation shall have a board of directors consisting of individuals who are citizens of the United States, of whom one shall be elected annually by the board to serve as chairman. Three members of the board shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, effective the date on which the other members are elected, and for terms of 3 years or until their successors have been appointed and qualified, except that the first three members of the board so appointed shall continue in office for terms of 1, 2, and 3 years, respectively, and any member so appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the director whom he succeeds. Six members of the board shall be elected annually by those stockholders who are communications common carriers and six shall be elected annually by the other stockholders of the corporation. * * *."

For the reasons discussed below, I am of the opinion that neither the incorporators nor the presidentially appointed directors are to be classified as officers of the United States.

The method of appointment directed by sections 302 and 303(a) is of course derived from the following portion of article II, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution:

"The President shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

This language has the effect of prescribing that an individual can become an officer of the Government in the constitutional sense in only two ways—i.e., by appointment by the President with the concurrence of the Senate, or by appointment by the President alone, the courts or heads of departments.[3] We are interested here, of course, in the first method.

It will be seen that the first part of the quotation from article II, section 2, clause 2, provides for nomination by the President and confirmation by the Senate of certain specified officers and, with exceptions not relevant here, "all other officers of the United States, whose appointments * * * shall be established by law." This language means, when read with that which immediately follows it, that every appointment of an officer of the United States which is authorized by law, other than of an "inferior" officer, must be preceded by nomination and confirmation. However, article II, section 2, clause 2, does not state, and it does not follow therefrom, or from anything else in the Constitution, that every appointment authorized by law which is preceded by nomination and confirmation necessarily renders the appointee an officer of the United States regardless of his functions and the provisions of the law pursuant to which he was appointed. Nor, so far as I am aware, are there any precedents which reach that conclusion.[4] Indeed, there is a longstanding practice which points away from it. Article I, section 6, clause 2, prohibits an appointment of a Member of Congress "to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created" during the term for which he was elected and prohibits a "person holding any office under the United States" from membership in Congress during his continuance in office. Nevertheless, Presidents have on many occasions appointed Members of Congress, with or without the advice and consent of the Senate, as commissioners to negotiate treaties and other international agreements or to represent the United States at meetings of international organizations.[5] These appointments can be reconciled with the prohibitions of article I, section 6, clause 2, only on the theory that, although made in accordance with the methods prescribed by article II, section 2, clause 2, for the appointments of "officers of the United States," they nevertheless do not place Members of Congress within that classification.[6]

In short, I find no constitutional requirement or precedent that the incorporators and presidentially appointed directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. be treated as officers of the Government merely because of the method of their appointment, and I find the precedent involving article I, section 6, clause 2, to be persuasive of the view that such method of appointment is not determinative. It is therefore necessary to look to other factors.

The classical definition pertaining to an officer is written in terms of the position he holds, as follows:[7]

"An office is a public station, or employment, conferred by the appointment of government. The term embraces the idea of tenure, duration, emolument, and duties."

Examining the position of the incorporators first, I believe it can reasonably be held that since they have been given merely a temporary and special task, the position does not meet the tests of office set forth in the second sentence of this definition.[8] However, I believe that a more fundamental issue is whether the incorporators are the occupants of a private, rather than a public, station.

Section 302 of the act in general requires that the incorporators discharge two successive responsibilities. First, they are to bring the Communications Satellite Corp. into being. Thereafter they are to serve as its initial board of directors until the qualification of a regular board. The nature of their role in carrying out the latter function is fixed by section 301 of the act, which states that the new enterprise is to be a "corporation for profit which will not be an agency or establishment of the U.S. Government" and, subject to the provisions of the act, is to be governed by the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act. With these directives in the act, there would seem to be no doubt that the incorporators, as directors, will have the same status and responsibilities as individuals serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation and will be holding private, not public, posts.[9]

---

[1] Public Law 87-624, 76 Stat. 419, approved Aug. 31, 1962.

[2] Although the incorporators whom you recently named are serving under recess appointments, they of course have neither more nor less of the character of officers of the United States by reason of their temporary lack of Senate confirmation.

[3] *United States* v. *Germaine*, 99 U.S. 508 (1878); *Burnap* v. *United States*, 252 U.S. 512, 515-516 (1920); Corwin, "U.S. Constitution, Annotated" (1952 ed.), p. 452. These authorities also point out that, except for the President and Vice President, the portion of the Federal civil service comprised of persons other than officers in the constitutional sense consists of those individuals, generally termed employees of the United States, who are appointed by officials not specifically given appointing power by the article II, section 2. The directors and incorporators of the instant corporation are obviously not in this category of appointees.

[4] Cf. the following colloquy between two Congressmen in the course of a committee hearing on the question whether one of them, who had been appointed to a temporary commission by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, thereby became an officer of the United States:

"Mr. SMITH. Do you mean that to be officers of the United States they must be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate or be appointed by courts of law or by the heads of some one of the departments?

"Mr. MOODY. Yes.

"Mr. SMITH. The point I would like to have you answer is whether it is necessary, to constitute a person an officer under authority of the United States, that he shall have been appointed in that way?

"Mr. MOODY. That is my opinion. I would not, however, adopt the converse proposition, that everybody appointed in this manner was necessarily an officer of the United States." H. Rept. 2205, 55th Cong., 3d sess. p. 11.

See also, for a similar view in a somewhat different context, 2 Story, "Commentaries on the Constitution" (5th ed., 1891), p. 362: "In many cases of appointments, Congress have required the concurrence of the Senate, where, perhaps, it might not be easy to say that it was required by the Constitution."

[5] Corwin, "The President, Office and Powers" (1957 ed.), p. 71. For a statute expressly recognizing the Presidential practice of appointing a Member of Congress as a representative of the United States at an international meeting, see section 2 of the act of July 30, 1946, 60 Stat. 712, 22 U.S.C. 287n, which is concerned with UNESCO.

[6] Corwin, "The President, Office and Powers" (1957 ed.), p. 71. For conflicting views on this point see H. Rept. 2205, 55th Cong., 3d sess., and S. Rept. 563, 67th Cong., 2d sess.; cf., act of July 30, 1946, footnote 5, supra.

[7] *United States* v. *Hartwell*, 73 U.S. 385, 393 (1867).

[8] *Matter of Hathaway*, 71 N.Y. 238, 243 (1877); *McArthur* v. *Nelson*, 81 Ky. 67, 71 (1883); see also Corwin, "U.S. Constitution, Annotated" (1952 ed.), pp. 447-449.

I find nothing in the act or in its history to justify a different view as to the position of the incorporators during the period prior to the formation of the corporation. Their mission during that time places on them the same obligation for the furtherance of private interests as their later duties as the initial board of directors and in essence is therefore a private mission. I recognize that the provision in section 302 requiring the President's approval of the articles of incorporation filed by the incorporators conceivably may lend support to an argument that in preparing and filing them, the incorporators are acting as officers subordinate to the President whose work is subject to his review. However, it is probably more accurate to argue that the provision was included simply because the incorporators are not his subordinate officers and he would not otherwise have the right to pass on the articles. In any event, I am certain that Congress did not have in mind creating anything as contrived as a public office to endure only for the presumably short period prior to incorporation, with a conversion to a private office at that moment. In my opinion, the incorporators will at no time be occupying a public station and consequently will at no time be officers of the United States.

Turning now to the three directors whom the President will appoint to the regular board, I need do little more than refer again to the fact that section 301 makes the Communications Satellite Corp. an enterprise for profit which will not be an agency of the Government. The other 12 members of the board, who are to be elected by the stockholders, will obviously have the same private status as individuals serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation. The act makes no distinction, except in the method of selection, between the directors appointed by the President and the elected directors. Therefore, unless there is something in the history of the act to the contrary, it seems plain that the former will also hold a private office.

The legislative history concerning the position of the directors is almost as meager as in the case of the incorporators. However, two points were developed in Senate Commerce Committee hearings which are of significance here. First, it appears that the appointment of a portion of the membership of the board by the President was conceived of as a means of protecting the interests of the public at large, as distinguished from the Government.[10] Second, the members of the executive branch of the Government who participated in the drafting of the act rejected a proposal that there be only one presidentially designated director for fear that he would be considered as the representative of the President and spokesman for the Government. They suggested three in order to avoid that implication.[11] Thus, there appears to have been no intention on the part of the originators of the legislation to create directors who would be officers of the Government but rather an intention to dissociate the Government from the directors.

Senator KEFAUVER made a comment on the Senate floor, similar to his statement with regard to the incorporators,[12] that the three appointed directors will owe a fiduciary obligation to the corporation but not to the Government.[13] In reply, Senator PASTORE, the floor manager of the pending legislation, agreed that they would be fiduciaries of the corporation but stated there was no intention to prevent the President from using them to keep himself informed and to communicate his views to the board of directors as a whole.[14] Whether Senator PASTORE's suggestion as to the relationship between the President and the three directors will prove accurate cannot be foreseen, but in my opinion neither that relationship nor their concern for the public interest beyond that ordinarily expected of the directors of a private corporation would put the mark of a public station on the board memberships of those three directors.[15]

In all, the legislative history regarding the directors to be named by the President supports the view that they, like the others, will occupy private posts and not be officers of the United States.

Finally, it might be noted that to consider the incorporators and appointed directors as public officers would be to deem them within scope of article II, section 4 of the Constitution which makes "all civil officers of the United States" subject to impeachment. I believe it most unlikely that in authorizing the establishment of the unique Communications Satellite Corp., Congress, without affirmatively labeling these incorporators and directors as Government officials, intended that they be subject to impeachment. In other words, I believe that the congressional silence as to their status, when considered together with the provisions of article II, section 4, lends support to my view that neither the incorporators nor the three directors are, by virtue of their appointments to these posts, officers of the United States.

Respectfully,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

FIDUCIARY DUTY OF INCORPORATORS AND DIRECTORS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is elementary that all directors and incorporators owe a fiduciary duty to the pecuniary interest of the corporation and the shareholders. However lofty the motives of these men may be, as between the public and corporate profit, all directors, however appointed, are obliged by well-established law to favor corporate profit. Nothing in the Satellite Communications Act or its legislative history speaks contrary to this basic corporation law doctrine. The rule is made very clear by Professor Ballantine in that most standard text, "Ballantine on Corporations," 1946 edition, section 85. I quote:

> A business corporation is regarded as being carried on primarily for the profit of shareholders. The discretion of the directors does not, in general, extend to humanitarian purposes or to purely philanthropic donations for the benefit of mankind, or even its employees, at the expense of the shareholders. In other words it is not for trustees to be generous with other people's money.

The matter has been tried. When Henry Ford thought the the stockholders of the Ford Motor Co. had been amply rewarded for their investments, he announced that it would be the policy of the company in the future not to pay any special dividends but to put back into the business all of the company's earnings other than the regular dividend of 5 percent per month. He said:

> My ambition is to employ still more men; to spread the benefits of this industrial system to the greatest possible number, to help them to build up their lives and their homes. To do this, we are putting the greatest share of our efforts back into the business.

Mr. Ford also thought that company had a duty to give to the American public a low-priced car and he announced an $80 price cut of the Ford car to $360.

Minority stockholders disagreed and sued. The Supreme Court of Michigan unanimously ruled for the plaintiffs, and ordered the Ford Motor Co. to pay a special dividend of $19 million to the minority stockholders. The court said:

> "There should be no confusion of the duties which Mr. Ford conceives that he and the stockholders owe to the general public, and the duties which in law he and his codirectors owe to protesting, minority stockholders. A business corporation is organized and carried on primarily for the profit of the stockholders. The powers of the directors are to be employed for that end. The discretion of directors is to be exercised in the choice of means to attain the end, and does not extend to a change in the end itself, to the reduction of profits, or to the nondistribution of profits among stockholders in order to devote them to other purposes." (*Dodge* v. *Ford Motor Co.*, 204 Mich. 459, 170 N.W. 668.)

---

[9] This conclusion is supported by the only part of the legislative history of the act which touched upon the role of the incorporators in this context. Senator KEFAUVER, who opposed the legislation, placed a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which he remarked, among other things, that the fiduciary obligations of the incorporators, as directors, "will not be to the President * * * [or] the public at large * * * [or] the Federal Government" but "will be obligations to the corporation itself" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 12, p. 16905). Senator KEFAUVER's comment would seem to be in accord with the provisions of sec. 301 of the act stipulating the creation of a private corporation, as well as with the general law pertaining to corporate directors. See *Villiainen* v. *American Finnish Workers Soc.*, 236 Minn. 412, 417, 53 N.W. 2d 112, 116 (1952).

[10] Testimony of James A. Dingman, executive vice president, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee, 87th Cong., 2d sess., entitled "Communications Satellite Legislation," pp. 185–187.

[11] Testimony of Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee, supra, p. 349.

[12] See footnote 9, supra.

[13] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 12, p. 16241.

[14] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 12, p. 16872.

[15] It is interesting to contrast sec. 303(a) of the act with similar legislation of a century ago which seems clearly to have created a public office—i.e., sec. 13 of the act of July 2, 1864, 13 Stat. 356, amending the act of July 1, 1862, 12 Stat. 489. The 1864 legislation authorized the President to appoint 5 of the 15 directors of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and termed them "Government directors." The statute specifically required that at least one of them be on each committee of the company and that they report to the Secretary of the Interior concerning the company's operations.

The case of Mr. Ford is foursquare with the problem before us. Suppose, for example, that the public would be greatly benefited by the reduction of satellite communication rates. Or, suppose that international understanding and cooperation would be fostered by making international communications less expensive. Or, suppose that the commerce of an underdeveloped nation could be improved by providing its industry with less expensive communications to foreign markets.

But, suppose too, that all these desirable goals would necessitate the reduction of satellite communication rates and the concomitant reduction of the corporation's profits. What would be the position of the Presidentially appointed directors?

The answer is clear. The Presidentially appointed directors, as well as the privately elected directors, would be prohibited by law from reducing rates so as to improve international relations or aid underdeveloped countries. Their single duty is to make the corporation as profitable as possible. Indeed, they would be subject to suit by the shareholders if they sought to protect and advance the public interest at the expense of corporate profitability.

Only once before, 100 years ago, was the device of Government directors tried. The charter of the Union Pacific Railway Co. provided that 5 of the 15 directors be appointed by the President. There was no provision for advice and consent of the Senate. Since, as in the present situation, Congress did not vest in the Government directors any peculiar powers, the Supreme Court held that they had the same powers as other directors, and no more. It held that Congress did not look to any action of the directors for the protection of the public interest, and that the provision for Government directors in no way changed the general rule that the stockholders are the proper parties to take final action in the management of the corporate affairs—*Union Pacific Railway Company* v. *Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company*, 163, U.S. 564, 599, 600 (1896).

In short, Mr. President, the incorporators and the Presidential directors must be expected to act as fiduciaries of the corporation itself, and their responsibilities are to the corporation rather than to the public. As the junior Senator from Michigan told the Space Committee:

> The point I sought to make on the record almost the opening day of business was to suggest that Congress really had built in a conflict of interest here that we ought to face up to. If we were one of these nominees, we could have love and affection for the taxpayers but we are being paid by the investors. Unless we change basic corporate law in this act, all of us know what the obligation is. I think we just ought to say so * * * We ought not to try to kid ourselves that their role is anything other than what I have suggested it is.

III. CONFIRMATION PROCEDURE IS IMPROPER

Mr. President, this procedure, which traditionally and constitutionally is used for the confirmation of ambassadors, judges, and officers of the United States pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, is inappropriate on this occasion and, I think, unconstitutional.

It is clear from the notes of the debates in the Constitutional Convention, as well as from common understanding of the checks and balances system, that the Senate's power of confirmation and the Congress' power of impeachment are designed to provide the legislative branch some measure of control over the selection and the acts of the people who administer the Government of the United States, and who represent it. These powers have no other purpose.

Yet, the nominees who are now before us for confirmation will neither administer any part of the Government of the United States nor will they represent the United States. Indeed, as I have stated, they are absolutely obligated to prefer the pecuniary interest of the corporation and its shareholders to the interest of the United States whenever the two may conflict. I suggest that we are here engaged in a completely meaningless act, and that we are thoughtlessly following the form of article 2, section 2, clause 2, without regard to its purpose or its substance. There is no more sense to confirming these incorporators or, later, the Presidential directors, than there would be to confirming the election of the directors of the United States Steel Corp., or some public utility president like Mr. Kappel of A.T. & T.

This matter has always been understood before. No senatorial confirmation was called for in the Union Pacific charter, even though there were Presidentially appointed directors. The American Red Cross and the Boy Scouts of America are chartered by Congress, but they are private organizations and the Senate does not confirm the appointment of their directors. In this, as in other sections of the Communications Satellite Act passed last year, there was less than sufficient thought.

I would ask the Senate to consider seriously whether this proposed act of confirmation is consistent with the U.S. Constitution. Every Member of this body has an oath and a responsibility to the Constitution. I think the responsibility is the more weighty in a case such as this, where the matter probably never will be presented to any court. Ours is a Government of limited powers, and there is no authorization in the Constitution for senatorial confirmation of any but ambassadors, judges, and officers of the United States. By confirming the officers of a private corporation, we are expanding the authority of the Senate beyond the limits prescribed by the Constitution, itself.

It seems to me that the Senate's act of confirmation today would be not only unconstitutional, but also irrelevant and meaningless. The only meaning that it might have is that these incorporators will be officials of the United States and somehow responsible to the Congress and that they will be engaged in serving the public interest. Nothing could be further from the truth.

IV. THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS CONFIRMATION PROCEDURE ARE WHOLLY UNDESIRABLE

The implication of this confirmation procedure to the public, to foreign nations, and perhaps to the nominees themselves is that these are Government officers with their primary duty to the public, and that the Communications Satellite Corp. is a quasi-public enterprise. This is wholly untrue. I think it is a most serious objection that the Senate should not imply by its actions something which is not the truth.

The security-buying public will unavoidably be misled. As in the case of federally insured deposits in savings banks and savings and loan associations, this Federal coloring appears to guarantee safety. Of course, in fact, there is no guarantee of safety with respect to the Communications Satellite Corp. as is provided by FDIC and other Government insurance programs.

Public scrutiny and criticism of the actions of the corporation, its services and rates, will be dulled and distorted by the fase belief that in this quasi-public enterprise with Government incorporators and Government directors on the board, the public interest is well cared for. Again, there is no truth in it.

As with the postal service, foreign nations may expect service beyond that which revenues justify. They will be misled and our country will be embarrassed.

Although confirming these nominees may seem to implying the opposite, the truth is this: When our foreign policy requires 24-hour service with African nations, and the revenues of that service will not support it, the Presidentially appointed directors must vote against it. When it is proposed that the corporation should give the Government or the USIA a preferential rate because their business is the public's business, the Presidentially appointed directors must vote against it. When it is proposed that there be a major cut in rates because service will thereby be provided to very many more people and businesses, but yet the cut would lower the net revenues of the corporation, the Presidentially appointed directors, no differently than all the other directors, must vote against it.

We are placing the men appointed by the President in an undesirable position. The public will expect them to give their primary loyalty to the public interest but the law obliges them to serve the corporate purse. Let us not abet this delusion, and abase our constitutional procedure, by confirming the appointments as though we were appointing public men.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the first thing I wish to do is to extend my sincere congratulations to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for the exceptionally able and cogent, and, in my judgment, unanswerable speech he has just made to the Senate. What he has said to the American people and what we will have to tell the American people for some time to come is that the Congress should not be asked to perform an empty and meaningless gesture so far as any legal substance is concerned. In my judgment the confirmaton of the nominations of members of the board of directors has no legal significance whatever, except that it meets the form of a law passed by Congress that never should have been passed in the first place, a law which is against the public interest, and a law, as far as this particular section relative to Presidential appointment of members of the board of directors is concerned, I consider to be unconstitutional.

I am perfectly willing, after we have made the legislative record in this debate today and tomorrow, to abide the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, if, as, and when we can get the issue before the Court. Here, too, as in connection with so many other constitutional issues, the problem is a procedural one of being able to get the issue before the Supreme Court for determination. However, I am satisfied that that can be done, and I think it important that it be done, because I believe the precedent which is being started by the Kennedy administration with respect to this matter must be stopped for the good of the country. If the President of the United States is not willing to propose amendments to the Satellite Act which was passed last year, after he has had ample time to study the act and consider the legal problems we are raising, then the people of the country must make it very clear to the administration that the act must be amended in the public interest.

In my opinion—and I speak as a Democrat—the Democratic Party cannot justify, from the standpoint of the public interest, the unfortunate precedent which is being established in this instance. The Democratic Party, under the leadership of President John F. Kennedy, has the obligation to correct a mistake—for this administration made a mistake last year in urging the passage of the bill in the form in which it was passed, with the procedure embodied in the bill to have the Senate confirm Presidential appointments to a board of directors of a private corporation, when we cannot do a single thing with respect to the exercise of the powers of the board of directors by its members. In my judgment, this is a misuse of Senate procedure, and I think it ought to stop.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator for his comments about my speech. I agree with him that a mistake was made and that the Senate played a substantial part in the making of that mistake. Anyone who examines the RECORD can see that many amendments were offered which would have changed the situation. But at that time the Senate was proceeding under cloture, and no consideration was given to the amendments. I believe that as time goes on there will be much regret that some of the amendments were not discussed. I believe that some of the amendments which were proposed, which were unquestionably in the public interest and would have improved the bill, will one day be recommended for amending the Communications Satellite Act.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senate last year had adopted any one of a number of major amendments offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], it would not have made the mistake which was made when a majority of the Senate incorporated in the bill the section the unconstitutionality of which I shall shortly discuss.

I wish to commend not only the senior Senator from Tennessee for the able and cogent argument he has made in the speech just delivered; I also wish to commend the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for the equally able, and, I believe, unanswerable argument which he presented in opposition to the policy of confirming these nominations to the board of directors.

Likewise, it is my pleasure to be associated with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], who in his major maiden speech in the Senate stamped himself clearly as one who can be counted upon to devote himself to the dedicated interests of the American people.

To the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the other Senators who spoke on this side of the issue in the debate this afternoon, I extend my compliments and congratulations and my very sincere thanks.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. I shall listen to his speech with much interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe there is due from me an explanation as to why this rather lengthy legal argument will be made at this late hour. I am not doing it by personal choice; I am carrying out what I consider to be my obligation of cooperation with the Senate. It is felt that this argument ought to be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of the arguments which have been presented on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, so that, at least, it can be in printed form for reference by Senators prior to the vote tomorrow.

Furthermore, it was felt, in fairness to the press, that the press ought to have this argument made available to it, so that if it is desired to have the background material on which the point of order will be raised, the reasons will be available to the press for a better understanding of the legal basis of the point of order.

Mr. President, at an appropriate time tomorrow I shall make the point of order that since the Senate is without constitutional authority to advise and consent to the nominations of private incorporators of a private business enterprise, and since the nominees before the Senate are private incorporators of a private business enterprise, the nominations are not properly or constitutionally before the Senate at this time, and will not be at any other time.

At the time that the point of order is made, I shall, depending upon the ruling of the Chair, follow whatever other parliamentary course of action permitted under the rules to lead to a yea-and-nay vote, if it becomes necessary to have the question settled by a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Oregon will not make his point of order tonight, but will make it tomorrow?

Mr. MORSE. I have just served notice that the point of order will be raised tomorrow, and have stated what the point of order will be when raised. I shall not make the point of order tonight. I shall now make my argument in support of the point of order.

There is another reason why this speech is being delivered tonight. I do not know why such a rumor should ever have developed, but several members of our group came to me and said they had been asked by the press whether our group was going to attempt to filibuster against the confirmation of the nominations. We never had any such intention. Nothing could have been further from our thoughts. We do feel that an adequate record should be made, setting forth our point of view and our argument against the procedure we are being asked to follow. We feel that my speech tonight, which will complete our case in chief and will remove any possible conjecture on the part of any person as to any charge that we are undertaking to filibuster in the Senate.

When I conclude my speech tonight, so far as I know the case in chief will be made by those of us who are opposed to the President's request that the Senate act on the question of confirmation of the nominations, under article II, section 2 of the Constitution. We do not believe that section applicable. We do not believe the Senate can make an unconstitutional act constituational by including a provision calling for confirmation by the Senate of Presidential nominations of members of the board of directors of the private corporation.

I. THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION IS A PRIVATE BUSINESS ENTERPRISE, AND ITS INCORPORATORS AND DIRECTORS ARE NOT OFFICIALS OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT WITHIN THE MEANING OF ARTICLE II, SECTION 2 OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. President, my first major point is that the Communications Satellite Corporation is a private business enterprise, and its incorporators and directors are not officials of the U.S. Government within the meaning of article II, section 2, of the Constitution.

My argument with respect to the unconstitutionality of Senate confirmation of the nominations of incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation is premised on the fact that in their new positions these men will not be officers of the United States. It is the conviction of many of us that these men will be purely private businessmen.

The act itself makes clear that the incorporators and directors will be purely private businessmen. In light of the vote of the Senate and the actual wording of the act, if there can be any doubt left, I point out that the Attorney General has also gone on the record as follows:

> There would seem to be no doubt that the incorporators, as directors, will have the same status and responsibilities as individuals

> serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation and will hold private, not public, posts. (Letter to the President, dated Oct. 25, 1962, reprinted in hearings, nomination of incorporators, Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, 107, 109 (Mar. 19, 1963).)

I shall not argue this point any further. I believe it is finally and conclusively laid to rest by the letter from the Attorney General to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, before I proceed to discuss the question of constitutionality in connection with the perplexing situation which now confronts the Senate, I should like to pose a question relating to the "privateness" of this corporation. This question was brought to my attention by, among other things, the hearings on the corporation incorporators, held by the Senate Space Committee.

The corporation has arranged to borrow, from a syndicate of 10 banks, $5 million with which to finance its first year of operations. Yet, this corporation has no assets to put up as security.

My question is this: What moneys are being used to secure this $5 million loan? Are they public funds? I believe the American people have a right to know whether public funds are being used to secure a private loan to a private, profit-seeking business.

During the debate today, it was said several times that there are no funds, public or otherwise, by way of security to back up the loan; but this is being done by the 10 banks, on their own, without any security. If I were a depositor, I would not want any of my money placed in any of those banks, if that is the way they are operating; and if I were a stockholder in any of them, I would certainly initiate a movement to remove the board of directors. For I would not wish to be a stockholder of a bank whose board of directors would run the kind of risk which these banks apparently are brazenly and blatantly admitting they are running. Those of us who know anything about the problems which lie ahead for this corporation know that for some time it will be on a rather rocky financial road.

Of course, Mr. President, the fear of some of us who opposed the bill, and the fear of some of us who are opposed to the procedure the Senate is asked to follow now, is that part of the reason for requiring Presidential appointment of three members of the board of directors is that later on it will be possible to plead, "Well, after all, did not the Government give a color of governmental interest in the operations of the corporation; and now that it is in financial difficulty, should not the Government bail it out?"

Mr. President, it is elementary that when any procedure or policy is easily susceptible of abuse, a change in it should be made. All law-school students learn that after they are admitted to the bar, as officers of the court and as private practitioners of the law, they always have a public duty to scan very carefully the legal procedures, in order to determine whether they are subject to abuse. If they are found to be subject to abuse, then, as officers of the courts, the members of the bar should advocate the amendment, modification, or elimination of the features which could be used in a manner which would abuse the public interest.

That is why I have said several times today that I believe this administration should take a new look at this law. It has been passed, but it is not inviable. It is subject to repeal and to modification. I believe the administration should take the leadership, right now, in recommending some modifications and amendments of this law. The Senate should be considering changes in the law, rather than debating the confirmation of directors under the law.

In my opinion, Senators as public officials have the solemn obligation to see to it that members of the public are not misled. Let no one tell me that caveat emptor applies to such a situation. Let no one tell me that the purchasers of the stock of the corporation should proceed on the basis of "let the buyer beware." American citizens, either investors or noninvestors—but we are now concerned with potential investors—have a right to rely on their Government and to place their trust and confidence in it. In this case the Government is guilty of coloration in a bill giving the impression that these Presidential appointees are, after all, to carry out some kind of governmental trust in connection with the operation of the corporation, whereas we know they will not be carrying out any such trust at all, and when we know that their legal obligation is a singular one, a fiduciary one, an obligation to the stockholders to try to make profits for the owners of the corporation, and that they have no obligation of trust at all to the Government. Therefore, I believe it most unfortunate that the President is asked to appoint any members of the board of directors of the corporation. Under the circumstances, he has to make the nominations; he has to carry out his obligation under the law as it stands, insofar as making the nominations is concerned. But the President can recommend that Congress make a change in the law.

I hope that one of the results of this debate will be to cause the President to weigh and review the merits of the position of those of us in opposition to the course of action now proposed, to the end that he may give instructions for the drafting of some amendments that will remove the potential abuses growing out of the procedure encased in the bill.

II. THE SENATE DOES NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY UNDER THE CONSTITUTION TO CONFIRM THE APPOINTMENT, ELECTION, HIRING OR OTHER SELECTION OF INCORPORATORS OR DIRECTORS OF A PRIVATE BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

In discussing this second point, I want to take up jointly the first two subpoints contained in the brief summary of my speech which Senators will find on their desks tomorrow.

A. Only those powers enumerated in the Constitution are conferred on the Legislature.

B. For the Senate to advise and consent to the nomination of an incorporator of a private business is not necessary and proper within the meaning of the Constitution.

From the earliest days of our Nation's constitutional history, Mr. President, the doctrine of enumerated powers has been a bedrock principle of our limited form of Federal Government. This great doctrine was first stated in the case of McCulloch against Maryland, in 1819, by Chief Justice John Marshall.

That case is so well known, and there are so many extremely distinguished lawyers in the Senate, that I am almost embarrassed to recall it to Senators' attention. Perhaps, however, it will not be presumptuous of me to read the few lines from McCulloch against Maryland which spell out the doctrine of enumerated powers.

> This Government is acknowledged by all to be one of enumerated powers. The principle, that it can exercise only the powers granted to it, would seem too apparent to have required to be enforced by all those arguments which its enlightened friends, while it was depending before the people, found it necessary to urge. The principle is now universally admitted (4 Wheat. 316).

The doctrine of enumerated powers governs the question in point. The powers of Congress are limited. That is the very essence of the form of constitutional democracy which is inherent to government by and for the American people.

Now, the 144-year-old doctrine of enumerated powers does not mean that each and every action which Congress or the Senate may take must be spelled out with specificity in the Constitution. Broad powers are ascribed to the Congress through the commerce clause, for example, and implemented through the necessary and proper clause.

Indeed, this fact was at the heart of McCulloch against Maryland and there found fruition in that great holding of Chief Justice Marshall:

> But we think the sound construction of the Constitution must allow to the National Legislature that discretion, with respect to the means by which the powers it confers are to be carried into execution, which will enable that body to perform the high duties assigned to it, in the manner most beneficial to the people. Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.

Congress has unlimited powers to regulate interstate commerce, even where such regulation vitally affects intrastate commerce. And Congress may, without question, adopt all measures necessary to implement this power properly.

Indeed, I do not question for present purposes that Congress is within its constitutional authority in creating the Communications Satellite Corp. if, in its wisdom, it deems it in the best interests of our Nation and our people.

The Communications Satellite Corp. is, after all, no more a monopoly than A.T. & T., and no less regulated than any interstate, privately owned, public utility.

No, that is not my argument. Rather, my point is limited to the constitutionality of sections 302 and 303 of the Communications Satellite Act insofar as they require the advice and consent of the Senate on the nomination of private businessmen.

Here, the Constitution could not be more clear. It specifically limits, in article II, section 2, clause 2, the authority of the Senate to advise and consent to treaties and officers of the United States.

Let me read that portion of the Constitution to the Senate:

> The President * * * shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for * * *.

There is no constitutional justification for Congress' unilateral expansion of these enumerated powers. There is nothing "necessary" about our confirming the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp. No other private business entity in America today finds the Senate's advice and consent a necessary ingredient for operating at a profit.

Similarly, the commerce clause cannot be read in such a way as to negate the clear meaning and limits of the powers enumerated in article II, section 2, without twisting those powers' accepted meaning beyond all recognition.

I have heard it said that the old *Legal Tender* case, 110 U.S. 421, proves that I am wrong in this contention. It has been pointed out to me that that case referred to the power of Congress to incorporate national banks for profit as well settled.

I want to discuss that case and the national banks with the Senate at some length, because in my view, they constitute one of the most persuasive arguments with respect to the utter folly in the Senate becoming embroiled in the affairs of private, profit-seeking business ventures.

First, let me review the Legal Tender case, itself.

In that case, Mr. Greenman, of Connecticut, had purchased from Mr. Julliard, of New York, 100 bales of cotton. Mr. Greenman paid Mr. Julliard with two U.S. Treasury notes totaling $5,000 in face value. Mr. Julliard, apparently suspecting that these notes were not worth the paper they were printed on, objected that such notes, issued during the Civil War under acts of Congress of 1862 and 1863, redeemed in gold after the war, and then reissued under the act of 1878, were not legal tender and did not, therefore, satisfy the debt owed him by Mr. Greenman.

Unhappily for Mr. Julliard, the Court found that these pieces of paper were legal tender, holding that—

> Congress has the power to issue the obligations of the United States in such form, and to impress upon them such qualities as currency for the purchase of merchandise and the payment of debts, as accord with the usage of sovereign governments (Id. at 447).

In reaching this decision, the Court paused to mention a number of acts of Government which had affected the financial life of the Nation, thereby emphasizing the fundamental responsibility of the Government to provide for the existence and smooth functioning of the basic financial tools of commerce. One of the acts which was mentioned was the creation by the Congress of national banks. In an obiter dictum, the Court referred to the well-settled power of the Government to create a national bank for profit.

There were two national banks, the first chartered in 1791 and the second in 1816. Under the charter of 1816, 5 of the 25 directors of the bank were to be nominated by the President, by and with the advice and consent of Congress. To my knowledge, this is the only instance in the entire history of our Nation where the officials of a private, profit-seeking corporation were ever confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, it is axiomatic that two wrongs never make a right. In my judgment, in 1963 the Senate of the United States does not stand in a very sound position in trying to justify what I consider to be an unconstitutional course of action on the basis of the old national bank precedent, particularly in view of the fact that the whole national bank system was ultimately repudiated.

I realize that all the circumstances surrounding the national bank case happened a very long time ago. But, since the charter of 1816, creating the second Bank of the United States, is the only precedent for the Senate's advising and consenting to the nomination of private businessmen, we are obliged to carefully analyze the national bank and its Presidentially appointed directors. We must answer the question: Is this a good precedent which the Senate should—in the public interest and under the Constitution—follow?

After all, it is of little importance that something has been done in the past, if that thing which was done was undesirable and unconstitutional.

I approach this question with some humility, because there are a great number of Senators possessed of far greater erudition in the history of our Nation's financial institutions than I.

At the risk of disclosing my modest scholarship in this area of history, however, let me recall for Senators a few facts about the second Bank of the United States.

This bank was, first of all, a bank for profit, and a very profitable one at that. It was possessed of a number of unique and helpful ties with the Federal Government which greatly contributed to its profitability. One-fifth of its capital was subscribed by the Government.

This is a salient operative fact which I would have the Members of this body constantly keep in mind when they are tempted to compare the old National Bank Act with the Satellite Communications Act. In the Satellite Communications Act, there is no recognized investment by the Federal Government in the corporation. This is a great difference in salient operative facts between the act of 1816 and the act of 1962, for, as has been brought out in the debate time and time again, there is no Federal financial participation in the financing of the Satellite Communications Corp.

I repeat the salient fact again in respect to the money subscribed to the Bank Act. It was the repository of the public funds and was free to use these moneys for its own purposes and profit, without paying any interest to the Government. Its ability to issue bank notes was unregulated and unlimited.

In short, it was the most powerful financial institution in the United States during the two decades of its existence—from 1816 to 1836. Its president, Nicholas Biddle, was a man of tremendous power and influence, both economic and political.

I believe it can be fairly said that this tower of financial strength was one of the most vilified and most hated institutions ever created by the National Government. Its opponents included the debtor interests of the West and local banking interests in the East, as well as the working people and supporters of the basic tenets of Jeffersonian liberalism. Local bankers were repressed by the national bank's awesome financial power. Debtors smarted under the tight money policies which the bank enforced.

The political plight of this institution is well known. The U.S. Senate, during the 1820's and 1830's, divided itself into probank and antibank camps, which split party loyalties and State traditions. Not surprisingly, the probank forces, supported by Biddle, were the northern Senators from industrial areas and, as such, outnumbered the bank's opponents.

When, therefore, the charter of the bank was brought up for renewal in 1832, its success in the Senate was certain.

But, as every student of American history knows, the renewal bill was vetoed by President Jackson. The veto message delivered by President Jackson on July 10, 1832, is a great and familiar historical document. In it, Jackson said:

> It is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes. Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law; but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant * * * exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers—who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their Government.
>
> There are no necessary evils in government. Its evils exist only in its abuses.* * * Many of our rich men have not been content with equal protection and equal benefits, but have besought us to make them richer by act of Congress. By attempting to gratify their desires we have in the results of our legislation arrayed section against section, interest against interest, and man

against man, in a fearful commotion which threatens to shake the foundations of our Union. * * * If we cannot at once, in justice to interests vested under improvident legislation, make our Government what it ought to be, we can at least take a stand against all new grants of monopolies and exclusive privileges, against any prostitution of our Government to the advancement of the few at the expense of the many, and in favor of compromise and gradual reform in our code of laws and system of political economy. (2 Richardson, "Messages and Papers of the President," 590–591 (1896).)

Mr. President, in my judgment that was one of the most historic documents ever penned by Jackson. I say, most respectfully, it is applicable today. It is applicable to the communications satellite law, for in my judgment the communications satellite law in its present form is subject to the same evils and abuses which caused President Jackson to veto the renewal of the bank charter.

I wish to stress Jackson's language on the obligation of the Government to check abuses when procedures which permit abuses are found. That is why, as a loyal supporter, dedicated to the administration, my voice was raised in a critical plea to the President of the United States this afternoon, and here again in this argument tonight, to study this situation as he has never studied it before, for, with his brilliant mind, such a study would lead to the conclusion that the satellite law needs amendment, and quickly.

The satellite law needs the eradication therefrom of any action that can mislead the American people into believing that it is a corporation with a governmental interest. It is important that the satellite law be amended to make perfectly clear to all that it is a 100-percent private business venture, in which the Federal Government has no financial interest, in which the Federal Government is involved in no participation, save and except the duty of the Federal Government, the corporation being a public utility, to see to it that it is regulated in the public interest, as all other public utilities are and should be.

Mr. President, I find it difficult to see how anyone can read Jackson's great veto message, and the sound principles he laid down in that veto message and not be thrilled and moved by it. If one reaches the conclusion, as I think most of us in this day will reach, that Jackson was right, one must likewise reach the conclusion that the request to confirm these nominations is equally wrong.

With these ringing words of Jackson, the era of the Banks of the United States was brought to an end. The Senate was unable, despite the frantic efforts of Biddle to regroup his forces, to find the votes either to overcome or circumvent the veto.

The bank's charter expired in 1836. Thereafter, it continued to operate under charter of the State of Pennsylvania until 6 years later, in 1842, as the result of its overextended loans, mismanagement, and the withdrawal of Federal favors, it collapsed.

It must be remembered, in considering this brief historical sketch and in considering the constitutionality of this private bank for profit, that the purpose Congress sought to achieve in creating the national banks was a fundamentally governmental one—that is, the providing of currency.

This fact, alone, distinguishes the national banks from the corporation whose officials we are now considering. The Communications Satellite Corp., as Incorporator Bruce Sundlun testified before the Senate Space Committee, is a regulated public utility—hearings at 85. Its purpose is an essentially private one, exactly analogous to a telephone company, or power company, or any other public utility.

Yet even if the case of the national banks was not distinguishable from the action we propose to take today, I would still urge that we disregard it.

The national banks were, at the very least, a great mistake. Though constitutional, they were unquestionably an inapposite tool for performing governmental responsibilities. They were never revived after 1836. They are a bad precedent.

I say respectfully to the Attorney General that, in my judgment, the Department of Justice does not cover itself with legal distinction by using them as a precedent in the case pending before the Senate.

I do not believe that merely because the Congress long ago made a mistake in creating a national bank, that we should compound the felony by advising and consenting in the case before us now.

Even more important, however, is the helpful perspective which the history of the national banks gives us with respect to the nomination and confirmation of private, profit-seeking businessmen.

It will be recalled that I pointed out that the Charter of 1816, like the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, provided for the presidential nomination of 20 percent of the directors of a private business, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

But, though the Charter of 1816 did not require it, the fact of the matter was that the Presidentially appointed directors owed their primary allegiance to the President, not to the corporation.

That is another great difference between the two cases. It is admitted on both sides of this argument today that the members of the board of directors in the Satellite Communications Corp. owe their obligations to the stockholders of the corporation. They do not owe any obligation to the President. They do not owe any obligation to the Government of the United States. But that was not true of the National Bank Act. In that case the directors owed an obligation to the President, and not to the corporation, because of the Government's interest in the operation of the bank.

In 1833, the four incumbent directors nominated by President Jackson were directed by the President to prepare a report on the practices and policies of the National Bank. They did so, and in the report which they submitted criticized the practices of the bank and advised that the Government deposits be withdrawn.

I do not know how I can give the Senate a clearer proof of the difference between the Communications Satellite Corp. and the National Bank Corp. It is a difference that is operative in its consequences. It is a difference which, in my judgment, destroys the National Bank Act as a precedent in the case before us. The members of the board of directors appointed by the President under the Bank Act had the obligation to protect the governmental interest in the national bank. There was nothing comparable in that act to the Satellite Communications Act of 1962.

The result of this action is well known. The Senate refused to advise and consent to their nomination. The reason for this refusal, according to Senator Benton, was not that these men were in any way unfit, but rather that they had shown their loyalty to be to the President and not to the bank.

This is an important distinction. Unlike the Presidentially appointed directors of the national bank, the loyalty of the Presidentially appointed directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. will be to the corporation and not to the President.

That has been admitted here today on all sides in the debate.

But even if this was not the case, there is a lesson to be learned from the demise of these bank directors. Suppose that the Presidential appointees to the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. were to reveal, by their acts, that their loyalties were to the President and the American people rather than to the profitability and interests of the corporation. Would the Senate then refuse to confirm their nominations, as it did in the case of the bank directors, 130 years ago?

To me, it is unthinkable that it would.

Further, the implicit conflict which must arise between public and private interests of Presidentially selected and senatorially confirmed directors of a private, profit-seeking business is documented in the case of the national bank.

In 1824, the president of the Washington branch of the Bank of the United States wrote to Nicholas Biddle. In his letter, he alluded to "interests to be attended to other than those of the bank, especially that of the Government," and went on to say that he "deemed it proper to see and consult with the President of the United States."

To this letter, Biddle replied:

> If * * * you think that there are other interests to be attended to besides those with which you are charged by the administration of the bank, we deem it right to correct what is a total misapprehension. * * * The moment this appointment [of the five government directors] takes place the executive has completely fulfilled its functions. The entire responsibility is thenceforward in the directors, and no officer of the Government, from the President downward, has the least right, the least authority, the least pretense, for interference in the concerns of the bank. * * * This invocation of the Government, therefore, * * * is totally inconsistent with the temper and

> spirit which belong to the officers of the bank and the instructions of those who govern it, and who should be at all times prepared to execute the orders of the board, in direct opposition, if need be, to the personal interests and wishes of the President and every officer of the Government. [Letter from Biddle to Thomas Swann, Mar. 17, 1824, Senate document, 23d Cong., 2d sess. No. 17 (Tyler Rep.), 297–98, quoted in Schlesinger, the Age of Jackson, 76 (1946).]

How timely to the situation now before us are these words of Mr. Biddle—written more than a century ago. And how right Mr. Biddle was.

What will happen, Mr. President, when the time comes—as it surely will—that the public interest demands that communications satellite service be provided to areas of the world which will be uneconomical from the point of view of the corporation? Will Mr. Welch write to the U.S. Senate and the President and the American people, and say—as Mr. Biddle said:

> If * * * you think that there are other interests to be attended to besides those [of the Communications Satellite Corp.], we deem it right to correct what is a total misapprehension. The moment the appointment [of the three directors] takes place, the Executive has completely fulfilled its functions. The entire responsibility is thenceforward in the directors, and no officer of the Government, from the President downward, has the least right, the least authority, the least pretense, for interference in the concerns of the [corporation].

If such a letter is writen, it will be a dark day for the American people, and I hope I never see it. Yet I cannot help but be alarmed by the statement which Mr. Sundlun made before the Senate Space Committee, which I will read in a moment.

That is why this law is so unfair to the President of the United States. The Office of the Presidency has been taken advantage of by Congress. When we passed the bill last year, we committed a great wrong against the Office of the Presidency. Instead of passing upon these nominations, we should be proceeding with full speed ahead to amend the communications satellite law. With the present temper and tempo of the Senate, I may be engaged in naught but a parliamentary and legislative gesture by offering such amendments. However, at the appropriate time they will be offered by the senior Senator from Oregon.

I am going to do what I can to take out of the communications satellite law this section that deals with Presidential appointment of directors and with Senate confirmation of those directors.

It is just as true today as it was in history gone by that the Biddle point of view is likely to prevail.

The President of the United States, in my judgment, is being misused in the satellite law. The Chief Executive of this country, elected by the American people, ought not to be subjected to a law that requires him to commit an act of form that has no substance to it.

When we require the President to appoint these directors and the Senate to advise and consent to their confirmation, we are guilty of misleading the American public. The American people are not going to take the time to study the legalities involved and the legal consequences and procedures set forth in a law such as we in the Senate can in the progress of the debate. Therefore I believe that we ought to act, and act speedily on the amendment of the satellite corporation law that will strike from the law this whole section that deals with the matter of Presidential appointment of three members of the board of directors and the advice and consent of the Senate.

I have given instructions to my staff to present to legislative counsel my request for the drafting of an amendment that will carry out the intent that was just expressed on the floor of the Senate.

Returning to the troubling statement of Mr. Sundlun, Senator CANNON had said that he viewed the corporation as being not an entirely private corporation, but rather semipublic in nature. Senator SYMINGTON asked Mr. Sundlun if he agreed with that view and Sundlun replied:

> No sir. I think that this corporation is definitely a private corporation, but in view of its legislative history it is certainly imbued with what the incorporators have time and time again referred to and are cognizant of. We are conscious that there is a strong public interest factor in this corporation. But, I submit, sir, that it is really and actually a private corporation. [Op. cit. at 85.]

Shades of Biddle. Sundlun spoke as a Biddle in connection with the National Bank Act and the corporation that was created thereby. So I say, the straw is in the wind, Mr. President. Let the Senate take notice and beware.

To summarize my remarks on the precedential value of the Legal Tender case and the national banks, let me repeat that these are not precedents which justify our plunging recklessly forward to place the stamp of approval of the U.S. Senate on a purely private business. If the lesson of history is well learned, we will use these precedents to dissuade ourselves from recommitting folly, rather than as justification for an unconstitutional act.

Let there be no mistake about it. When the Senate confirms the officials of a private, profit-seeking business, it puts its stamp of approval on that business and says to the American people: "You can deal with this corporation as though you were dealing with your Government."

In a very real sense, our confirmation will say to the American people: "This corporation is like an agency of the U.S. Government." I realize full well, Mr. President, that the act specifically says that this is not true—that the corporation is not beholden to the Government and the people, but rather to its own profitability.

This was also true, however, of the national banks. Yet, the people not unreasonably believed that the national bank in fact represented the Government. As a result, the Nation was, in the words of President Jackson, drawn to the brink of a "fearful commotion" which threatened "to shake the foundations of our Union."

I do not suggest that the United States cannot weather the mistake the Senate will make if it confirms these nominees. We weathered the national bank crisis and this, too, shall pass.

But, I do urge my colleague to reflect on the inescapable fact that our confirmation of these nominees is not a meaningless, pro forma act. It is one with great significance to the American people. What that significance will be can be seen by reflecting on the turbulent, nearly disastrous history of the national banks.

I will have more to say on this subject later.

Though the charter of 1816 included the words "advice and consent," the question of the constitutionality of using that procedure was not raised in any of the national bank cases. Rather, those cases turned on the constitutionality of extending under the necessary and proper clause, the powers of Congress conferred by article I of the Constitution.

I wish to discuss that paragraph, because I have heard it said in conversations in this body today that the action of the Court on the charter of 1816 is a precedent in respect to the advice and consent clause of the Constitution. That is not a legal fact. The Court did not pass on the advice and consent clause. The Court's constitutional decision in the Bank Act dealt with the "necessary and proper" clause, not the "advice and consent" clause.

One great difficulty of lawyers, from the time they are in law school and throughout their practice, is to see differences in precedents and to understand the limitation of a court decision as it presents itself to a pleader in a legal argument. There is always a temptation for a lawyer to overuse a precedent and to read into a court decision an application of the decision to some legal principle or rule or constitutional provision when such application is not valid.

That is what is happening in the precincts of the Senate, today. There are those who are laboring under the completely mistaken viewpoint of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Bank Charter case of 1816, that the Court ruled on the constitutionality of the law involved in relation to the advice-and-consent clause. The Court did no such thing. The decision of the Supreme Court in the Bank case, in respect to the point of constitutionality, dealt with an entirely different clause in the Constitution—the "necessary and proper" clause. I am not sure that the Department of Justice has caught that distinction in the National Bank case.

Naturally, it cannot be implied that because the issue was not raised by the Court, the application of article II, section 2, to the confirmation of the nominations of private businessmen is thereby deemed constitutional.

This is another elementary point in interpreting and applying the Court decision. There are lawyers who become so overanxious in the use of a case as a precedent that they fall into the fallacious argument that because the Court in a decision did not raise an issue in regard to the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of one section of the Constitution, therefore the case is to be interpreted as an affirmation by the Supreme Court that the application of that section under the operative facts of the case is constitutional. That does not follow at all. It is basic in the interpretation of a legal opinion that the interpreter limit himself to what the Court said, and not seek to use the decision for his side of the case because the Court did not cover some other point. Silence of the Court on a point does not justify interpreting and applying the case as a precedent in support of counsel's position in his brief.

Another case which discussed the extension of congressional powers conferred by article I, was *Luxton* v. *North River Bridge Co.* (153 U.S. 525). In that case, Congress had created a private company to erect a bridge across the Hudson River. Its authority to do so was challenged by the owner of the land on the New Jersey side of the river where the bridge would connect.

The Court upheld the constitutionality of the act which created the bridge company, saying that Congress had the authority to create private companies to build bridges, roads, and railroads under the commerce clause and the "necessary and proper" clause. Since, however, the act did not require Senate advice and consent and did not require the confirmation of any of the company's officers, the issue which now confronts the Senate was not reached by the Court.

Indeed, the question of the constitutionality under article II, section 2, of the Senate's advising and consenting to the nomination of private businessmen has never been considered by the Court. This is not surprising in light of the unprecedented nature of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962.

In conversations about the precincts of the Senate today, I have heard Senators say, "Oh, but that question was settled in *Luxton* v. *North River Bridge Company* (153 U.S. 525)." It was not. That case is not in point. In the Bridge Company case, the act in question did not require the advice and consent of the Senate. There was no application of article II, section 2, so I am at a loss to understand why lawyers, particularly those in this body, are heard to say that this case is in any way a precedent. Again, I am far from convinced that the Department of Justice fully understands the distinction I have just made; but it is elementary in the use of precedents.

In my judgment, no reputable lawyer would get very far in a courtroom if, on the limited point that I am raising in my argument as to the constitutionality of that section of the Satellite Act which requires Senate confirmation of Presidential appointments of directors to a private business corporation were ever put before the court, he were to cite the Luxton case. I can hear the court say to counsel, "On what basis do you argue that Luxton against North River Bridge Company is a precedent to be considered by the court in passing judgment on whether Article II, section 2, of the Constitution has been violated by the Communications Satellite Act?" I am sure that with that question, the lawyer's jaw would drop, because he would be caught without a rebuttal.

That case has no application here.

I wish to repeat that the question of constitutionality, under article II, section 2, of the Senate's advising and consenting to the nomination of private businessmen has never been considered by the U.S. Supreme Court. That is not surprising, in light of the unprecedented situation under the Satellite Act of 1962.

I do not believe that it will be argued that the Federal Government does not have authority to regulate bridges and roads under the commerce clause, or that anyone will argue that the Federal Government lacks authority to build and operate bridges and roads, if that is in the public interest.

Indeed, it is absolutely clear to me that the Federal Government has the authority to build and operate a space satellite communications system, if it so desires. Senators will recall, I am sure, that I argued rather extensively last session that the Federal Government not only has this authority but, indeed, has the responsibility and should build the satellite communications system and then enter into contracts or leases with private companies for the operation.

But, it is quite another thing to give the Senate's stamp of approval to the incorporators and directors of a private, profit-seeking corporation, through the use of the procedure of advice and consent, spelled out in article II, section 2.

It may be said that there is nothing in article II, section 2, or elsewhere in the Constitution which prohibits Congress from specifying a procedure like that set forth in article II, section 2 for manning the corporate positions which Congress has validly created. But I urge Senators to recall the most basic proposition of constitutional law:

> Congress has authority to do only those things which the Constitution gives it authority to do. The mere fact that the Constitution fails to prohibit Congress from exercising authority does not mean that Congress has such authority. Quite the contrary. Powers not vested in the Federal Government are specifically withheld from the Federal Government, and are reserved for the States.

I said this before, but let me repeat it: If the Senate's advice and consent were necessary to the proper regulation of interstate communications commerce in the space satellite field, it would be proper for the Senate to give it. But there is simply no justification for saying that a private, profit-seeking corporation, irrespective of whether it is created by an act of Congress, requires Senate advice and consent in order for its officials to operate effectively and profitably.

It is not the burden of those of us who oppose confirmation to show that the Constitution does not prohibit it. It is the burden of those who support confirmation to prove that it is necessary to ignore the meaning of article II, section 2, of the Constitution.

Let there be no mistake on this point, Mr. President. We are not dealing with an article I, section 8, problem. No question about the powers conferred on Congress by the commerce clause of the Constitution is confronting us now. No one denies that Congress has the power to create, own, and operate a satellite communications system.

The single question before us is the constitutionality of the Senate's advising and consenting to the nominations of private businessmen. This is a problem which arises under article II, section 2, which is the section of the Constitution in which the procedure of advice and consent is spelled out—and nowhere else in the Constitution.

It follows that we are not required to determine whether the Senate has authority to insert new words in any other section of the Constitution. Obviously, it does not.

But, I repeat, that is not the question. The words "advice and consent" are already in the Constitution. They are reserved to treaties and officials of the United States. We are agreed that the nominees before us are not officials of the United States. Clearly, they are not treaties. Therefore, the only question which demands our decision is whether there is any constitutional justification for the Senate to unilaterally extend its authority beyond the clear limits imposed on it by the Constitution.

Despite this seemingly straightforward proposition which the Senate is called upon to decide, I have heard it argued that the Senate's advice and consent is a very modest exercise of power, in light of the Anglo-American history of creation of monopolies by the sovereign.

Support for this argument is said to be found in the Union Pacific Railroad Company Act of 1862, 12 Stat. 489, as amended in 13 Stat. 356. Again, this alleged precedent does not involve article II, section 2, confirmation. Nonetheless, I wish to discuss it, because I believe that there is guidance for us in the approach adopted by Congress in that 100-year-old statute.

Under the Union Pacific Railroad Act, as amended, the President was authorized to appoint, not three, but five directors of a corporation. But the act specifically directed that the directors appointed by the President should "be denominated directors on the part of the Government"—12 Stat. 489, 491.

There is no such language in the Communications Satellite Act of 1962; no such authority is vested in the directors; and there was not intent to do so—as was made very clear by the debates last summer.

From the beginning, the intention of the advocates of the Communications Satellite Act was to vest the corporation with complete power as a private corporation, subject to regulation as a public utility, and to divest the Federal Government of any governmental interest in the corporation. But, mistakenly and unfortunately, Congress went through the form of including a provision that the President appoint three members of the board of directors. In doing so, Congress abused and wronged the Office of the President of the United States. I do not believe Congress can ever justify taking such advantage of the Office of the President of the United States by asking the President to go through what amounts, in fact, to an empty legal gesture. Congress did not do so in connection with the Union Pacific Railway Act of 1862, for in that case, in which five directors were to be appointed, Congress specifically provided that those directors were specifically to be denominated directors on the part of the Government.

Thus, Mr. President, it was made clear in the Union Pacific Railroad Co. Act that the Presidentially appointed directors were beholden to the President, the people, and the public interest, not to the private, profit motives of the railroad company. Moreover, that act required no advice and consent by the Senate.

So I do not know why it is being cited in this debate as a precedent, inasmuch as the five directors appointed by the President under the Union Pacific Railway Act did not have to be confirmed by the Senate.

In 1864, after 2 years of experience with the Union Pacific Railway Act, an amendment was passed by the Congress which increased the responsibilities to the people of the Government directors. It increased the number of presidentially appointed directors to 25 percent of the total board membership. Further, it provided:

> At least one of said Government directors shall be placed on each of the standing committees of said company, and at least one on every special committee that may be appointed. The Government directors shall, from time to time, report to the Secretary of the Interior, in answer to any inquiries he may make of them, touching the condition, management, and progress of the work, and shall communicate to the Secretary of the Interior, at any time, such information as should be in the possession of the Department. They shall, as often as may be necessary to a full knowledge of the condition and management of the line, visit all portions of the line of road, whether built or surveyed; and while absent from home, attending to their duties as directors, shall be paid their actual traveling expenses, and be allowed and paid such reasonable compensation for their time actually employed as the board of directors may decide (13 Stat. 361–62).

These men were real Government directors. They were responsible to the people and to the Government. I would have had no hesitation to have advised and consented to their nominations—although, as I have said, that was not required under the Union Pacific Railroad Act.

By requiring that these Government directors report to the Secretary of Interior, Congress eliminated any question of a built-in conflict of interest and insured that the crisis of the Jackson administration would not be repeated.

Mr. President, that Railroad Act is no precedent in the present case. Yet today I have heard Senators in conversations argue that it is. I again express great doubt as to whether the Department of Justice fully appreciates the fact that it is not a precedent in the case which we are discussing.

What is there in common between the two cases? The two types of corporations are entirely different. One is a Satellite Corp., a 100-percent private business corporation. The Union Pacific Railroad Corp. was a mixed corporation with Government responsibilities, rights, and interests. Five members of the board of directors were directly responsible to the Secretary of the Interior and to the President of the United States. The two cases wash out immediately when we look at the difference in operative facts so far as the precedential question is concerned.

The next great difference in connection with the presence or absence of the advice and consent requirement of the law is that in the Union Pacific Corp. case there was no requirement of advice and consent; in the Satellite Act of 1962 there is such a requirement. The debate relates to the application of that requirement under article II, section 2. Again I say most respectfully that I do not intend to permit my opponents in the debate to vary from the limitation of the debate, for the debate is limited to a consideration of whether the section of the satellite law of 1962 that requires confirmation of the President's appointment of businessmen to a private business corporation is constitutional.

If the Communications Satellite Act required that the Presidentially appointed incorporators and directors act "on the part of the Government," I would be inclined to believe that they might then be considered officers of the United States within the meaning of article II, section 2. But, the fact of the matter is that the Communications Satellite Act's clear purport is to require exactly the opposite; that is, that the Presidentially appointed incorporators and directors be beholden to the private profit interests of the corporation.

(At this point Mr. JAVITS took the chair as Presiding Officer of the Senate.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I digress from my manuscript for a moment to note that I could not be paid a greater honor than to have the former attorney general of the State of New York presiding over the Senate while I make my constitutional argument. I greatly appreciate his presence. I want him to know that, along with my appreciation, goes a very sincere apology. I, too, regret that it is necessary under the circumstances, as I explained at the beginning of my speech, to make my argument at this late hour so that it may be in the RECORD and on the desks of the Senators prior to a possible vote tomorrow.

I hope that my good friend from New York will know that that apology is a very sincere one. Yet I also quickly add that, in my judgment, there is a clear duty on the part of those of us on this side of the issue to make our case tonight, for we are making a case, as far as our intention and motivation is concerned, that we hope will be the legislative basis for a consideration by the Supreme Court in due course of time of the constitutional issue that we are raising in the debate.

I am seriously considering introducing, at the proper time, an amendment to the Communications Satellite Act which will adopt the language of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. act and require that the Presidentially nominated directors "be denominated directors on the part of the Government." Under such an amendment, the three Presidential nominees will be transformed from servants of private profit motives into servants of the public interest and the Government.

But in considering the possibility of introducing that amendment I have already made clear to the staff that we cannot stop with that, for if we make that approach to an amendment of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, we shall have to revamp it also in a good many of its other sections. If we would place Government responsibilities upon the three directors nominated by the President, I believe it should become clear to all that we shall have to revamp the act also in regard to the role of the Government in the development of a communications satellite system. I still think that the soundest way to do it is to have the Government develop the satellites through NASA or some other Government agency and then to have the Government lease the satellites for operation to private industry.

With passage of a little more time, I am sure we shall all be surprised in regard to the number of Members of Congress who will want to take a second vote on this question, for I am satisfied they are hearing from the people. Wherever I go in this country not only do I find that questions are being raised about the satellite communications law of 1962, but also I am becoming increasingly convinced that the people are ahead of the Congress on this issue, and that American public opinion does not approve of what the Congress and the President did last year. With further discussion of this subject in the next 2 or 3 years we shall find a public demand for rewriting of the communications satellite system law which will protest the public interest, which the present law, in my judgment, does not do.

Now that the Senate has had time to reflect on this bill, I believe there will be support for such amendments, particularly in light of the fact that we will shortly be called upon to appropriate $51 million for NASA research in space satellite communications, most of which will redound to the benefit of the private corporation.

I said in the debate last year that one of the great weaknesses of the law is that it gives an implied assurance to a private corporation that the Government will subsidize it, at least indirectly. As I said earlier this afternoon, I have no doubt that if the corporation gets into financial difficulty the argument will be made, "With the President appointing three directors, of course we have an obligation to come to the financial assistance of the private corporation and bail it out."

The American people are entitled to have the law amended so that if there is to be a pouring of American money into the system the Public Treasury will be protected.

I do not know of any reason why we should appropriate $51 million for NASA research in space satellite communications when the profits from such research are to be collected by a private corporation created by the Congress of the United States and approved by the President of the United States.

I know that there is growing concern about the Federal handout aspects of this corporation among many of my colleagues who supported the Communications Satellite Act, last year.

Doctor Dryden testified before the Commerce Committee:

> I think the Government will have to carry a large part of the experimental development for a while because it is necessary to study a number of alternatives.
>
> I make this remark not in any derogation of Telstar, but we have had many experiences where we have launched one successful satellite, only to be greeted later by the other difficulties. (Hearings, Satellite Communications 57 (1963).)

During the course of those hearings, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] made the following observations:

> Now if ultimately all of this is going to fall within the control and province of this private corporation, that will be in business for profit, then my question is why shouldn't all of the research and development be sustained by the stockholders, who ultimately will get the benefit of this investment?
>
> I am not saying that research is not in the public interest. All I am discussing is who is going to pay for it. It strikes me that the administration—and I was the man who had to introduce the bill on the floor—the administration made a very important decision, when it decided this would be a private corporation, and they should be in the field of operating this commercial venture.
>
> Now the big question is, having made this decision, which is a decision that was made in order to afford private enterprise the opportunity to come into this field, under a monopolistic venture, to do this in the public interest, under Government supervision, why shouldn't all of the research and development that will lead ultimately to this operable system, be done by the private corporation. Why is it necessary to use taxpayers' dollars in order to do it, and then make a contribution to this private corporation?
>
> I am not discouraging this at all, but I am wondering here what the line of demarcation is going to be, who is going to pay for it. And we were led to believe when we formed this corporation, practically all of this work—that is research and development—would be undertaken by this private corporation, because we said America has grown on private industry, so let private industry do it.
>
> Now we are being confronted here today, that in all likelihood a lot of taxpayers' money is going to be spent anyway.
>
> This lends credence to the argument made by some people who opposed this legislation, who said this is premature. They said we ought to wait and see what we find out and then see what we are giving away. I hope we don't get into that debate again. (Id. at 58–9, 63–4.)

On the same point, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said, at the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee hearings:

> Somebody has got to make an answer as to whether this touches or does not touch the questions constantly raised in the debates and discussions as to whether we are going to continue to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in order to make this a profitable venture for those people who do not have to invest any of their own money—that is, the communications carriers. (Hearings, Nominations of Incorporators 73 (1963).)

Corporation Incorporator Sam Harris testified before the Commerce Committee that the corporation has not decided whether or not it feels obligated to reimburse NASA for the research NASA has done and will do—hearings, Communications Satellite Incorporators 68 (1963).

I do not know why anyone thinks it would decide to do it if it does not have to do it. I am perfectly willing to take judicial notice that most private businesses will take what they can get. They will not say to Uncle Sam, "Oh, please do not give it to us." They will not say to Uncle Sam voluntarily, "We want to reimburse you."

That is not the way American corporations work. This is not said sarcastically or critically, for the boards of directors of American corporations have the primary obligation of advancing the profit interests of their stockholders. If they can get Uncle Sam to pay the research bill, why should they not do so? If the Congress of the United States is as shortsighted as I think it was in passing a satellite law without protecting the American public, it is the Congress and not the corporation which should take the criticism. I say to the American people, "You ought to heap it on the Congress with tremendous force, because Congress has not written into the law the necessary protection of the American taxpayer in connection with expenditures by NASA and the research on satellite development."

The act is silent on reimbursals, except with regard to research done by NASA at the request of the corporation.

Dr. Dryden also told the Commerce Committee that the corporation should not be required to pay for all the research and development which goes into creating a profitmaking satellite system:

> Dr. DRYDEN. I think a real problem is the public interest in early obtaining of such a satellite system. I think that without the Government's participation, such a system would be delayed for very many years.
>
> Senator MONRONEY. This is just the reverse of why I voted for the Telstar bill. I felt private industry would have more flexibility, greater speed, more initiative, greater risk taking than the Government would. Now you tell us that this is going to sit back and be a paper corporation while the Government does all of the shots. (Hearings, Satellite Communications 60 (1963).)

In view of these expressions of grave concern by such distinguished proponents of the act as Senators PASTORE, ANDERSON, and MONRONEY, I am hopeful that it is not too late to make at least minimum improvements in this act. I share the concern of my colleagues. I know that we will all have more to say on this subject when the NASA appropriation comes up for debate. After all, $51 million in a single year is a lot of the taxpayers' money to give away.

At the very least, designating three of the corporation's directors as "Government directors," as was done in the Union Pacific Railroad Company Act of 1862, will insure a minimum responsibility to the people on the part of the corporation.

Let there be no misunderstanding, Mr. President. So long as the corporation exists in its present form, it will always have its hand out for doles from the Government grab bag. The corporation has no assets. It probably will have none for years. It cannot pay its own way.

There will always be a hidden subsidy, so long as we keep the corporation in its present form—and I am against it. If, however, we must endure this unhappy form of corporation—which is neither fish nor fowl—let us at least return to the precedent of the Union Pacific Railroad Company Act so that this grab-bag style of private business will not be possible.

I have heard other arguments advanced to support the constitutionality of the Senate's confirming nominations of private businessmen. I have heard it said, for example, that the President in carrying out his executive functions may consult with whomever he pleases.

The source of this rather obvious and not very helpful platitude is, apparently, a memorandum prepared by Peyton Ford, assistant to the Attorney General in 1949—Senate Report No. 232, 81st Congress, 1st session, page 20. That memorandum was prepared in response to a request by the present distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas with respect to an entirely unrelated question, to wit: Can Congress constitutionally effect its disapproval of a plan to reorganize the executive branch of the Government by a simple resolution of either House, or by a concurrent resolution of both Houses?

No one for a minute suggests—perish the thought—that the President should be prohibited from talking to anyone he wants. Heaven knows, Mr. Ford was correct when he observed:

> The President frequently consults with congressional leaders * * * even on matters which may be considered solely within the purview of the Executive.

Indeed, it is reassuring to know that Congress is still being consulted by the President, from time to time, just as it was in 1949.

I must say, however, that I find these rather oblique pearls of wisdom not very helpful in determining the constitutionality of the Senate's unilateral extension of article II, section 2, beyond the clear meaning of that article and its legislative purpose.

I am gratified to note that the President has raised no objection to our confirming these individuals. Indeed, in light of the fact that members of the executive branch actively participated in the Communication Satellite Act's drafting and actively solicited its passage; and in light of the fact that the President, himself, selected these nominees; I would be greatly surprised if he did object.

Further, I am fully aware that the Congress, had it so desired, might have accorded the President no voice whatsoever in the appointment of these incorporators. Indeed, if the corporation is to be purely private, this is exactly what should have been done in order to dispel the strong suggestion created by Presidential nomination that the President's appointees somehow will guarantee that the corporation will seek to serve the public interest rather than its own pecuniary interests.

But I cannot imagine that any of my colleagues would care to argue that the fact that the President has not objected, or the fact he might have been excluded altogether, enhances the constitutionality of an unconstitutional statute one whit.

I am aware, Mr. President, that there are a few nonprofit corporations created under title 36, some of which prescribe the names of individuals who shall constitute such corporations. To give a few typical examples: the Future Farmers of America, the Military Chaplains Association, and the National Conference on Citizenship.

I am not aware, however, of any of these corporations requiring for their incorporators and directors the advice and consent of the Senate. Nor am I as much concerned about the Senate's role in the creation of nonprofit corporations as I am with its role in the creation of private, profit-seeking corporations which have, by their very nature, a built-in conflict of interest with the common weal.

Indeed, I am aware of no precedent in the entire history of our country—with the exception of the national banks—for the requiring of the advice and consent of the Senate to the hiring of private businessmen. Even if such precedents existed, however, I would still argue that the fact that the Senate has in the past done an unconstitutional act is no justification for us, today, to repeat that transgression.

As I said earlier, it is still no answer to the old maxim that two wrongs never make a right.

In the situation before us, as in so many, many others, the clear meaning of the Constitution and the dictates of public policy and commonsense are coordinate. For us to confirm these private businessmen would create the false impression that they and the corporation will quest after the common good, and not personal profit and advancement. Article II, section 2, prevents this false impression from being created.

Another point, brought out by the Attorney General in the aforequoted letter to the President, and one which I have heard discussed by some of my most distinguished colleagues in the Senate, is the fact that Senators are nominated by the President to act as Ambassadors to the United Nations, as negotiating commissioners, and to other public offices while they are still Members of the Senate, somehow sheds light on the situation before us. The problem raised by such situations relates to article I, section 6, of the Constitution which prohibits simultaneous incumbency as a Member of Congress and in "any office under the United States."

It is true that that section of the Constitution has been construed to permit what might seem at first glance to be a simultaneous incumbency. But the basis of such construction is that a United Nations ambassadorship and other comparable positions are not "offices" within the meaning of the Constitution. Moreover, these are positions of public trust and responsibility, not private, profit-seeking ventures.

Further, with respect to positions such as U.N. ambassadors, Senators participate in the capacity of observers for the Congress. We are carrying out, if it is a Senate appointment, a senatorial duty; if a Representative is appointed, he carries out the duty of a Member of the House of Representatives. We are observers for the Congress. Such Members of Congress appointed to represent the Congress in the United Nations are obliged to report back to the Congress on the activities of the United Nations as they relate to pending and passed legislation.

Actually, therefore, the position of an ambassador to the U.N. is a post of observation, and not a separate position, unrelated to senatorial duties. Needless to say, Senators receive no compensation for filling such posts of observation.

Someone might challenge that statement by pointing out that Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, when they are sent to the United Nations, receive per diem allowances to cover their expenses, to the extent that the per diem allowance covers expenses. That is not a salary. It is an expense allowance that the Senate itself provides Senators when they travel outside the precincts of Washington, D.C., in carrying out congressional duties. If a Senator attends a congressional hearing in Chicago, or is sent to any other part of the country or the world, on congressional business, he receives a per diem allowance to cover his expenses. He does not get a second salary. So my statement that Senators receive no compensation for filling such posts of observation is an accurate statement.

There is no question about what is and is not an office with respect to the nominees now being considered. These incorporators and directors are nominees for a private office, not a public office.

Nor is there any question about the profit-seeking—as opposed to public interest—nature of the position to which they aspire. The act itself makes clear that the Communications Satellite Corp. is a profit-seeking corporation and not an agency or establishment of the United States.

With all deference, therefore, I suggest that the Attorney General's argument is not in point and, particularly, that his citation to the work by Professor Corwin, "The President: Office and Powers," fine as we all know it to be, is completely irrelevant to the question of our constitutional authority to confirm private, profit-seeking, businessmen. I have no doubt that Professor Corwin would be the first to admit that his argument is here irrelevant.

It has no value in a discussion of this issue. I am sorry that the Department of Justice should cite it in connection with this case. I shall await with some interest the offering by the Department of Justice of such citations before the U.S. Supreme Court if, as, and when this issue gets before the Court. I believe I can hear some of the questions that will be asked of the Solicitor General or the Attorney General from the bench—little penetrating questions like, "Mr. Counsel, what has that citation to do with the issue before the Court?" There is nothing more deflating to a lawyer when he is caught citing a case that has no relevancy to the issue before the court.

That is why I express such disappointment in the memorandum by the Department of Justice submitted to the President in this matter.

I hope the President will give some very serious consideration to the friendly and intended-to-be helpful suggestions that those of us in opposition to the application of article II, section 2 to these nominations are making to him today. We have complete confidence that if the President will put his brilliant mind to work on the legal problems involved and the very important public policy problems involved he will be urging drastic revisions of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962.

Parenthetically, let me mention that I note in the Attorney General's letter to the President a quoted exchange between two Congressmen which took place some 65 years ago. Let me read that exchange to you:

> Mr. SMITH. Do you mean that to be officers of the United States they must be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate or be appointed by courts of law or by the heads of some one of the departments?
>
> Mr. MOODY. Yes.
>
> Mr. SMITH. The point I would like to have you answer is whether it is necessary, to constitute a person an officer under authority of the United States, that he shall have been appointed in that way?
>
> Mr. MOODY. That is my opinion. I would not, however, adopt the converse proposition, that everybody appointed in this manner was necessarily an officer of the United States (H. Rept. 2205, 55th Cong., 3d sess., p. 11).

The point which the Attorney General is attempting to make is that the mere act of advising and consenting does not render a nominee a public official. Obviously this is correct.

Equally obviously, however, it is completely irrelevant in the issue before us. No one is contending that, by advising and consenting, the Senate is somehow able to transform a group of private businessmen into public servants.

Moreover, I am a bit surprised that the offhand remarks of Mr. Moody should be given any weight whatsoever by the Attorney General.

In 1899, when that exchange took place, a question had been raised as to the constitutionality of various Senators and Congressmen simultaneously occupying their seats in the Legislature and positions on Presidentially appointed commissions such as the Hawaiian Commission, the Canadian Commission and the Industrial Commission. Further, certain Congressmen had, while in office, enlisted in the Army which had only recently concluded the Spanish-American War.

Thus, the question presented was strictly an article I, section 6 problem and had no relationship to the question of public versus private offices, which was the subject of the Attorney General's letter.

I do not know why he cited that in his letter as a precedent or why it should have any precedential value for consideration in connection with the case before the Senate. It is completely irrelevant and would be thrown out by any court, including justices of the peace who do not even have to be learned in the law. It is a matter of commonsense.

In reading through the old hearings on dual incumbency, I was taken with a letter sent to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee by one of the Congressmen who had joined the Army. He wrote:

> DEAR SIR: In reply to your very kind invitation to appear before your committee, and either orally or in writing submit authorities bearing on House Resolution 354 (which raised the question of whether acceptance of an Army post vacated the seat of the Member accepting it), I will say that my duties here with my regiment make it impossible for me to appear in person, and as my library at this place is very limited, being confined to the Army regulations, infantry drill book, firing regulations, guard manual, and a few works on the art of war, it is impossible for me to refer you to such authorities as might enable you and the other members of the committee in arriving at a correct conclusion. Besides this, I feel somewhat indifferent as to taking any action personally in the matter, as I am sure the committee has no feeling against me and that any conclusion that you might arrive at will be from a high sense of duty as Representatives and not in any way personal to me.
>
> In conclusion I might say that I have a fine regiment of over 1,200 men, all from my congressional district, and we have a beautiful camp overlooking the gulf, surrounded with magnificent plantations, which makes it a delightful winter resort.
>
> We have but little sickness, and all are in good spirits and contented.
>
> If any of your committee should visit Cuba after the adjournment of Congress, I will be greatly pleased to offer you the hospitality of our camp.
>
> Yours, very respectfully,
>
> JAMES R. CAMPBELL,
> *Colonel, 9th Illinois Volunteers.*

While I am indebted to the Attorney General for bringing this entertaining page of history to our attention, I seriously question whether it sheds any light on the problem which now confronts us.

Therefore I am at a loss as to why the reference was made.

In sum, Mr. President, I find it hard to believe, that any student of the Constitution can fail to appreciate that the Constitution means exactly what it says. The Senate shall advise and consent on treaties and on the nominations for Supreme Court Justices, Ambassadors, public ministers, and consuls, and all other officers of the United States.

The Constitution means no less than this, and it means no more.

Our opponents in the debate cannot read a meaning into the Constitution. It is either there or it is nonexistent.

Surely, no one will argue that we may constitutionally expand our constitutionally granted authority of advising and consenting to include incorporators and directors of private businesses. The Attorney General says that there is no question that the incorporators and directors before us, today, occupy exactly the same position as persons serving on the board of an ordinary business corporation and that they will hold private, not public, posts.

Which was to be demonstrated.

To be sure, this argument conforms to commonsense, as well as to the learned legal opinion of the Attorney General, the clear meaning of the act, and the sense of the Senate.

What possible justification or necessity can there be for the Senate to butt into the private selection and hiring of officers of a private, profit-seeking corporation? Indeed, for the Senate to engage in such a monstrous practice of intervention into the private sector would deprecate free enterprise.

It is the great and sustaining genius of the Constitution that it does conform to commonsense.

Yet, in my mind's ear, I can hear a colleague of mine saying to himself: "Yes, I see your point. Congress cannot constitutionally intrude itself into the selection of officers of a private business corporation. But the Communications Satellite Corp. is different. It is created by an act of Congress. Therefore, your analogy is inapposite."

Ah, but it is not inapposite. The mere fact that a private, profit-seeking corporation has a governmental charter makes it no less private and no less profit seeking. In England, for example, governmentally chartered monopolies have, from time to time, been quite the rule and not the exception.

No, my colleague's confusion springs from the unconscious assumption that the Communications Satellite Corp. is somehow a quasi-public corporation, imbued with an obligation to the public welfare that exceeds that of companies such as General Motors, General Electric, or A.T. & T.

But I say to the American people that that is simply not the case.

The repetition of this misstatement of fact over and over again can never make it true. The act says this is a purely private corporation. The Attorney General says this is a purely private corporation. The Senate says that this is a purely private corporation. The incorporators say it is a purely private corporation. And finally commonsense points to the fact that this is a purely private corporation.

Will any of my learned colleagues argue that, for example, the public interest in the Communications Satellite Corp. exceeds the public interest in A.T. & T., or General Motors, or United States Steel, or Boeing Aircraft, or any of literally hundreds of other purely private corporations? Quite the contrary, I would say.

For after all the mere stating in a piece of legislation that something is touched with the public interest does not make it so. Public interest is a fact, not a mere assertion.

To say that the Communications Satellite Corp. is not purely private because it performs key functions which affect major areas of public policy is to say that companies like Boeing, General Motors, United States Steel, and A.T. & T., are also not purely private. They, too, perform functions intimately related to the public interest. Yet, is any Senator willing to state that they and similar companies are not private in every sense of the legal word?

No, Mr. President, I cannot accept this argument. The corporation is, without question, private. These incorporators and directors are, without question, private. It follows that the Senate is without constitutional power to advise and consent to their nomination.

C. UNDER ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLES OF STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION, THE CONSTITUTION IS PRESUMED TO HAVE BEEN INTENDED TO EXCLUDE THAT WHICH IT DOES NOT INCLUDE

Also in my mind's ear, I hear my doubting colleague making another objection to my argument. He says: "But this Communications Satellite Corp. is an entirely new idea. You cannot expect the drafters of the Constitution to have foreseen it 175 years ago. The genius of the living Constitution is that it grows with the times."

Yes, I reply, but by growing, we do not mean that it is completely mutable and without substance. Were there some necessity for our confirming these incorporators, perhaps a way could be found to do it which would effectuate constitutional intent.

The doctrine of statutory construction, expressio unius est exclusio alterius, is well established. Where the situations in which the Senate may advise and consent are affirmatively designated in the Constitution, it must be inferred that all omissions were intentional and not oversights or lack of foresight on the part of the drafters.

Perhaps this Latin maxim sounds strange to those Senators who are not lawyers. But I can assure them that it is entirely familiar to all of us who are. And, indeed, it makes great good sense. New powers should not be read into the Constitution unless there is a clear necessity for them and they are consistent with the intent revealed by the words of the Constitution, itself. Were we somehow to imply an authority for the Senate to act whenever it seemed convenient to us, constitutional democracy would in no time become a travesty, and our Nation would become a dictatorship by and of the Senate.

D. CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY MAKES CLEAR THE CONSTITUTION'S INTENT TO LIMIT ADVISING AND CONSENTING BY THE SENATE TO TREATIES AND NOMINATIONS OF OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Needless to say, the intention of the drafters is of key importance in construing the words of the Constitution, itself. Where the words of the Constitution are uncertain, lawyers always turn for guidance to those records which will reveal this intent.

With respect to the present question, it is not actually necessary to review this intent, since the meaning of the words of the Constitution themselves is plain and readily apparent.

However, for the sake of thoroughness, I have perused the journals of the constitutional debates and other contemporary writings. From this review of history, I am convinced that there is not one shred of evidence to indicate that the drafters ever gave one moment's thought to the possibility that the Senate should ever see fit to advise and consent on the hiring of a private businessman by a private business.

Such a procedure is entirely alien to the purpose of article II, section 2.

The purpose for requiring the Senate's advice and consent to nominations for public office were stated by Alexander Hamilton in the "Federalist Paper No. 76" as follows:

> It has been observed in a former paper, that "the true test of a good government is its aptitude and tendency to produce a good administration." If the justness of his observation be admitted, the mode of appointing the officers of the United States contained in the foregoing clauses (that is, art. II, sec. 2) must, when examined, be allowed to be entitled to particular commendation. It is not easy to conceive a plan better calculated than this is to promote a judicious choice of men for filling the offices of the Union; and it will not need proof, that on this point must essentially depend the character of its administration.

Note that it did not enter Hamilton's mind that article II, section 2, has any application other than to the selection "of men for filling the offices of the Union."

Hamilton goes on to explain the reason why this particular procedure was adopted over the many other suggested methods for assuring a sound, responsible Federal administration:

> It will readily be comprehended, that a man who had himself the sole disposition of offices, would be governed much more by his private inclinations and interests, than when he was bound to submit the propriety of his choice to the discussion and determination of a different and independent body, and that body an entire branch of the legislature. The possibility of rejection would be a strong motive to care in proposing. The danger to his own reputation, and, in the case of an elective magistrate, to his political existence, from betraying a spirit or favoritism, or an unbecoming pursuit of popularity, to the observation of a body whose opinion would have great weight in forming that of the public, could not fail to operate as a barrier to the one and to the other. He would be both ashamed and afraid to bring forward, for the most distinguished or lucrative stations, candidates who had no other merit than that of coming from the same State to which he particularly belonged, or of being in some way or other personally allied to him, or of possessing the necessary insignificance and pliancy to render them the obsequious instruments of his pleasure.

Mr. President, how well I recall, in an advanced course on constitutional law, at the University of Oregon Law School, the reaction of the law students when first they came face to face with that great statement by Hamilton, in which he set forth so clearly the intention of the constitutional fathers when they wrote article II, section 2, into the Constitution. In that famous paper, Hamilton spelled out what the constitutional fathers had in mind when they wrote into the Constitution article II, section 2, which is the subject of debate as to its applicability to the case now before the Senate.

I do not know whether one needs add to what Hamilton said, for one cannot possibly read the Hamilton paper and reach any conclusion other than that the constitutional fathers were talking about the confirmation process of the Senate as being limited to officials of the Union; not as applicable to officials of a communications satellite corporation.

History rises to plague our opposition in this debate. History completely rebuts them. The history of the birth and formation of the Constitution, as written by the constitutional fathers, is a complete answer to the highly fallacious argument that there is some justification for reading into article II, section 2, of the Constitution such a twisted and distorted meaning as the one our opposition seek to read into it in their attempted justification of this very unfortunate section of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962.

Mr. President, I do not know why they do not recognize the error of their ways, and come forward with some amendments to that act. I am at a loss to understand why they wish to pervert article II, section 2, of the Constitution in such a way that it would bear no resemblance to what Hamilton was talking about in the Hamiltonian argument I have just now presented to the Senate from Hamilton's own paper.

Mr. President, why is the method of appointing the officers of the United States of such great concern that it warranted the writing by Hamilton of two Federalist papers on the single clause of the Constitution? Hamilton answers that question in Federalist Paper No. 77. It is, simply, to avoid "a monopoly of all the principal employments of the government in a few families" which lead directly "to an aristocracy or an oligarchy." But, Mr. President, note that Hamilton was speaking of "employments of the government", not employments of the Communications Satellite Corp., a private concern, which in this respect bears no relationship to the Government.

Mr. President, let me emphasize, parenthetically and facetiously, that I most certainly do not have in mind any specific current situation when I discuss the wisdom of Mr. Hamilton's position when he wrote about seeking to avoid "a monopoly of all the principal employments of the government in a few families" which lead directly "to an aristocracy or an oligarchy."

Thus, I take it to be plain and clear, beyond question, that article II, section 2, was intended to limit the power of the Senate to advise and consent to the selection "of men for filling the offices of the Union."

After all, article II, section 2, is concerned with the intragovernmental power of the President, vis-a-vis the Senate. The procedure of advising and consenting is designed as a senatorial check on the President's selection of public officials. Small wonder, then, that this procedure was not intended by the Founding Fathers to be imposed upon the private sector of our economy.

In his letter of opinion to the President, the Attorney General cites the definitive commentaries on the Constitution of Justice Story to support the proposition that confirmation by the Senate of a nomination does not, in itself, render a nominee an officer of the United States. As I have already explained, this point is completely irrelevant to the issue now before us.

However, inasmuch as the great scholarly work of Justice Story has been invoked as an appropriate authority, let me read to the Senate the words of Justice Story supporting the propriety of the procedure adopted by the Constitution drafters in article II, section 2, and defended by Hamilton. Justice Story wrote:

> It should never be forgotten, that in a republican government offices are established and are to be filled, not to gratify private interests and private attachments; not as a means of corrupt influence of individual profit; not for cringing favorites or court sycophants; but for purposes of the highest public good, to give dignity, strength, purity, and energy to the administration of the laws. It would not, therefore, be a wise course to omit any precaution, which at the time that it should give to the President a power over the appointments of those who are in conjunction with himself to execute the laws, should also interpose a salutary check upon its abuse, acting by way of preventive as well as of remedy (Story, "Commentaries on the Constitution," 354 (3d ed. 1891)).

In Justice Story's words, the procedure of advising and consenting is not to be used where it gratifies "private interests and private attachments"; it is not to be used where it involves "private profit"; and its purpose is "to give dignity, strength, purity, and energy to the administration of the laws" of the United States.

Does this purpose which the Constitution was designed to serve, Mr. President, have any proper relationship to the selection of private officers of a private profit-seeking business venture?

While we are discussing the great wisdom and erudition of Mr. Justice Story, Mr. President, I should like to call attention to another section of his commentaries. Justice Story points out that the question of removal naturally arises when the process of Presidential nomination and senatorial confirmation is being considered. The power to nominate and confirm, he says, necessarily implies the power to remove. Who then, he asks, has the power to remove officers who are thus nominated and confirmed? Is it the President alone? Or must the President have the advice and consent of the Senate to remove, as well as to appoint?

Though the Constitution is silent on this question, Justice Story finds the answer in "Federalist Paper No. 77":

> The consent of * * * [the Senate] would be necessary to displace as well as to appoint.
>
> No man—

Adds Justice Story—

> can fail to perceive the entire safety of the power of removal, if it must thus be exercised in conjunction with the Senate [op. cit. at 366].

Now, I want to ask my colleagues in the Senate a most serious question: "Have you given thought to the possibility of having to remove any of these incorporators and directors? What will the grounds be if such a situation arises: That the incorporator or director is not devoting himself solely to the public interest? That he has a conflict of interest with the public interest? That he is seeking personal profit in his capacity as a nominee of the President and a confirmee of the Senate?"

The distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] discussed the subject of removal this afternoon. I desire to add the following few points.

We know the answer to these questions. We cannot remove for such causes. The act itself creates the conflict of interest. The act itself dictates that these men shall serve their own profit interests.

I suggest, Mr. President, that we have here a situation where the Senate will confirm, but cannot remove. What an ironic, unexplicable dilemma we have created for ourselves.

It has a bearing on the question of whether or not we are being asked to commit an unconstitutional act. I do not believe we can escape the findings of the Federalist papers. The constitutional fathers intended that the power to confirm carried with it the power to remove. Under the communications satellite law of 1962 there is no power to remove.

III. IT FOLLOWS THAT THE CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF THE INCORPORATORS AND DIRECTORS OF THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP. IS EITHER AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ENLARGEMENT OF THE CONSTITUTIONALLY PRESCRIBED POWERS OF THE SENATE OR A SUPERFLUOUS ACT WHICH DOES NOT IN ANY WAY AFFECT THE RIGHT OF THE INCORPORATORS OR DIRECTORS TO TAKE OFFICE

Now, it may be argued that the Constitution notwithstanding, the Senate may advise and consent to the nomination or hiring of anyone it pleases. If, for example, the Senate cares to advise and consent to the nomination of Roger Blough to be chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., that is quite all right.

True, it may be argued, the refusal of the Senate to vote its confirmation will not in any way affect Mr. Blough's right to take office. But, if it somehow satisfies the Senate to express or refuse its stamp of approval to Mr. Blough, that is the Senate's business and, since it does not have any effect one way or the other, how can it be said to be unconstitutional?

If the situation confronting us today were simply that one Member of the Senate had suggested, without any act having been passed, that we give our approval to the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp. in the form of advising and consenting to their appointments, it is conceivable that it would not be unconstitutional, although I have serious doubts even on that score. It would certainly, however, be frivolous and undignified.

But that is not the situation we confront. Here, we are dealing with an act of law, passed by the Congress and approved by the President, which directs us to advise and consent.

Can we, then, in light of this fact, view the act's requirement of our advise and consent simply as an unofficial stamp of approval by the Senate? Can we say that, while we realize that were our confirmation to be determinative of this nominee's right to private office it would be unconstitutional, our confirmation is not determinative; it is nothing more than an indication of our views; it is without actual effect and, therefore, it is not unconstitutional?

IV. BY WELL-ESTABLISHED RULES OF STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION, AN ACT OF CONGRESS WILL NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE WITHOUT EFFECT

The answer to the question I have posed is that we cannot. The definitive work on the construction of statutes, as every lawyer knows, is Sutherland's vastly learned treatise on "Statutory Construction."

According to this monumental work:

> A statute should be construed * * * so that no part will be inoperative or superfluous, void or insignificant (sec. 4705, 3d ed. 1943).

Further, Sutherland points out:

> The presumption is that the lawmaker has a definite purpose in every enactment and formulated the subsidiary provisions in harmony with that purpose; that these are needful to accomplish it; and that, if that is the intended effect, they will, at least, conduce to effectuate it (sec. 4704).

V. CONCLUSION

It follows that the confirmation by the Senate is not without effect; that under the Communications Satellite Act the incorporators cannot take office without the advice and consent of the Senate; and, therefore, the Communications Satellite Act extends the authority of the Senate beyond its constitutionally enumerated limits and is unconstitutional.

The conclusion, therefore, is inescapable. Those portions of sections 302 and 303 of the Communications Satellite Act which direct the Senate to advise and consent are not superfluous and not without real effect. Their effect, intended and in fact, is that the incorporators and presidentially appointed directors cannot take office without senatorial confirmation.

This being their effect, the Communications Satellite Act is in violation of the Constitution.

Let me stress, however, that this does not mean that the entire act is unconstitutional. Only those portions to which I have referred suffer this infirmity.

The law is clear that if a portion of an act of Congress is unconstitutional, but severable from the totality of the act in such a way as substantially to preserve the remainder of the act, only those portions which are constitutionally infirm will be voided.

This is the situation here. This private, profit-seeking corporation can continue without our formal advice and consent. Moreover, I have no doubt that methods can be found by which the Senate can make its pleasure with respect to these nominees known to the President, without resorting to the unconstitutional procedure of advising and consenting.

Let me, therefore, carefully restate my point of order, so that its limits will be clear to the Senate:

It is unconstitutional for the Senate to advise and consent to the nomination or other hiring of a private officer of a private, profit-seeking corporation and, therefore, the nomination now before the Senate for advice and consent is improperly and unconstitutionally before us, now or at any other time.

My point of order means no more and no less than it says. I want to stress that it does not mean that the Senate cannot interest itself in the Communications Satellite Corp. or its officers.

All it says is that the form for expressing our approval of these nominations adopted by the act is unconstitutional and cannot constitutionally be followed by the Senate.

Even though the point of order I have raised is a technical one, based on constitutional law, we cannot allow ourselves to lose sight of the practical, factual problem which lies behind it.

The Attorney General argues that the mere use of the procedure of Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation does not in itself render an appointee an officer of the United States. This is, of course, technically true. No one argues with this legal opinion of the Attorney General.

Yet, while the Senate's advice and consent will not produce such a magical metamorphosis from a strict, technical, legal point of view, it will have precisely this effect, in practice, in that it will cloak these private profit-seeking businessmen with a mantle of public interest in the eyes of millions of Americans.

The average American citizen will say to himself: "The incorporators and some of the directors of this corporation have been approved by the U.S. Senate. They must be men who will look out for the public's interest. I can invest my savings in the Communications Satellite Corp. without fear of losing them."

Indeed, I believe that a substantial number of Americans will interpret our confirmation as a kind of guarantee or insurance of their money, similar to Federal insurance of savings bank deposits.

True, careful reading of the fine print in the prospectus the corporation will some day file with the SEC will disabuse them of such misguided notions. The common carriers will, no doubt, carefully read this fine print. But, I ask my colleagues, how many of the little investors—schoolteachers and working people who will put their life savings in this corporation—will scrutinize these technical, legal, and financial forms?

All Senators know the answer as well as I do.

The Attorney General is, therefore, inescapably correct when he says that, as a matter of legal niceties, the Senate's confirmation will not render these nominees public officers. The opposition does not contend that it will. But, the Attorney General is inescapably wrong if he believes that this is not precisely the impression that our advice and consent will convey to the average investing citizen.

So, as I close, I have a little bit of gratuitous advice to give to the Attorney General and to the President of the United States: It is not too late for you to advise the Senate to postpone further action on these nominations, by sending them to the Committee on the Judiciary for a hearing and for a consideration of the legal points which the opposition has raised in the debate in the Senate.

It is not too late to have the Judiciary Committee hold hearings, after calling in outstanding constitutional law authorities of this country to testify on the points the opposition has raised in making its arguments against the constitutionality of the procedure which the President, the Attorney General, and the proponents of these nominations are supporting.

Mr. President, there is a second thing I would have the Attorney General and the President of the United States do. I would have them take a new look at the satellite communications law. I would have them, on the basis of the criticism which has prevailed since the passage of that law by the Congress, consider if it is not true that that law needs to be written in large measure, and consider whether we may need to pass a law which will make crystal clear that the Government is in no way involved in the satellite communications law.

I also would suggest to the President and the Attorney General that they take a second look at the importance of giving better protection to private enterprise in this country than the satellite communications law gives.

I think the President and the Attorney General are dedicated to economic freedom. We cannot have economic freedom without the perpetuation of the corporate system in this country, under a private enterprise operation. I think they ought to look again at what they have done to private enterprise in this country by vesting monopolistic power in this corporation. I would have them reexamine again the arguments we presented in opposition when the satellite communications bill was before the Senate.

Every corporation in this country should have an equal opportunity to participate in the development of a satellite communication system. I know of no other way to do that, Mr. President, than for the President and the Attorney General to reconsider and put their stamp of approval on the substitute bill we tried to offer in the Senate of United States, which the administration, without an objection from the White House, permitted the Congress of the United States to bury under a cloture procedure. That made it impossible to discuss the substitute bill in the time necessary to clearly explain it to the Congress and the American people. Also, the administration did not raise its voice in objection to the motion to lay on the table not only that amendment, but also amendment after amendment offered by men sincerely dedicated to protecting the public interest.

This administration has a blot on its record that it should seek to cleanse. The way it can cleanse it is to follow the course of action suggested now, by giving support to the postponement of action on these nominations until the Committee on the Judiciary can hold hearings and let the constitutional authorities of this country come before the committee and testify.

I recognize that a satellite communications system is—like many other corporations—vested with the public interest, and it can be very well vested with a great security interest, vital to the survival of the American people.

I think my President, my Attorney General, and my administration ought to take a second look at a proposal that the Federal Government build the satellites.

We are going to do it, anyway, Mr. President, with the $51 million the President's budget proposes for space communications satellite research and development by NASA.

This administration should give serious thought to amending the law so that the Federal Government will build and operate the satellites; and private industry, without discrimination against any corporation in this country, will be able to lease their services.

GREAT LAKES FISHERIES: PROBLEMS AND PROGRAMS TO SOLVE THEM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the fisheries of the Great Lakes are presently in acute distress. In many areas commerical fishing has all but disappeared and sport fishing becomes progressively less attractive. Unless more effective programs are instituted, and soon, this once valuable resource threatens to deteriorate rapidly into insignificance.

In my description of the plight of these fisheries and in my proposals for programs I shall not undertake the broad coverage given these matters by our former colleague from Massachusetts, Senator Benjamin A. Smith, in his talk of able discussion in this Chamber on May 24, 1962. It seems to me that Senator Smith's observations on U.S. fisheries as a whole apply very well to Great Lakes fisheries in particular. I agree also with his view that we have given our fisheries far too little consideration as a basic renewable resource of major national importance.

The Great Lakes are a geographical phenomenon unparalleled on this planet. The five huge bodies of fresh water lie in a connected chain that extends from Duluth, Minn., to Watertown in northcentral New York. Together they have an area of 95,000 square miles of which 61,000—just under two-thirds—lie within U.S. boundaries.

Before the first European arrived, the lakes were important arteries of commerce and traffic for the Indians. Later, they provided avenues of travel by which the earliest explorers penetrated to the heart of the continent. Then came the missionaries, the fur traders, and finally the growing flood of immigrants seeking new and permanent homes in an area rich in land and other natural resources. To all of them the lakes were a highway.

This stream of traffic has never ceased to grow. The annual tonnage of cargo transported over the lakes is now in the order of 300 million tons—a varied cargo of iron ore, coal, limestone, grain, oil, and manufactured products. The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway which makes ocean ports of lake ports is bringing a surge of foreign traffic to add to the domestic growth.

The lakes not only were a "water highway" for early settlers but later a major factor in determining the distribution of the dense population of the modern midwest and of the industries so vital to the region's economy. As population and industry grew, the availability of adequate water supplies for domestic and industrial use assumed importance parallel to that of cheap transportation.

More recently the recreational uses of the lakes have been assuming greater and greater importance. Nine percent of all citizens of the United States live in counties bordering on the Great Lakes and many millions more live within a distance that can be covered by a few hours' drive. As urban congestion increases, the need for outdoor recreation becomes more urgent. The Great Lakes with their 9,600 miles of shoreline—more than half of it in the United States—offer unequaled opportunities for boating, swimming, fishing, camping, hiking, and general relaxation.

What role have the fisheries played in the growth and development of the Great Lakes Region and what is their role today?

Great Lakes fish were a prime source of food for local inhabitants centuries before the first European made his appearance. The distribution of the Indian population and explorations by anthropologists at sites known to date back to the 11th and 12th centuries demonstrate clearly the strong dependence of Indians on fish for food.

Fish was a mainstay in the diet of the explorers and missionaries. Accounts of early explorations in personal journals and published reports carry repeated and enthusiastic observations on the abundance and delectable flavor of Great Lakes fishes.

The early settlers and fur traders ate fish extensively, and both soon became aware of the possibilities for fishing as a commercial enterprise. By the middle of the 19th century fur companies had added salt fish as a marketable product. When the growth of settlements warranted, some men turned to commercial fishing as a full-time profession. Much of their product was salted or smoked—the only means they had for holding fish for holding fish for local consumption or shipment to other markets.

From these small beginnings developed a productive and prosperous Great Lakes commercial fishing industry. Many small communities, especially in more northerly localities, were primarily fishing villages. Considerable areas depended on commercial fishing as their principal source of income. Even in larger towns, income from fishing contributed materially to the local economy.

The output of the commercial fisheries of the Great Lakes reached its highest levels in the last decade of the past century, and the first two of the present when the annual landings by U.S. fishermen frequently exceeded $100 million pounds. Since then the catches have been smaller. Production has not been greater than 100 million pounds since 1918, and in most years it has fluctuated between 70 and 85 million pounds.

Notwithstanding the lower production level of the Great Lakes fisheries over the last 40-odd years, these fisheries continued to be an economically significant element in the Nation's fishing industry into the 1940's. Two circumstances have prevented wide or full appreciation of the true economic worth of the Great Lakes commercial fisheries.

First, the Great Lakes do not have major fishing ports comparable, for example, with Gloucester, Mass., on the east coast or San Pedro, Calif., on the west. One does not see vast tonnages of Great Lakes fish at any single place at any one time. Rather, the landings are scattered widely. The fish are brought ashore at many ports—scores, indeed hundreds—scattered along the thousands of miles of shoreline.

Second, the value of Great Lakes fish has lain traditionally in their quality, not in the bulk. The Great Lakes have been the principal or only domestic source of such highly prized species as whitefish, lake trout, walleye, blue pike, yellow perch, and ciscoes. Some of these fish you will recognize as gourmet items, featured in the best public dining rooms. Fish of this quality bring high prices to the producer.

Let me give just three examples of the significance of the landed value of Great Lakes fish as recently as 20 years ago, based on the statistics for 1943 and 1944.

First. Commercial fishery landings on the Great Lakes in those 2 years amounted to only 7½ percent of the take of the Pacific pilchard or sardine fishery, then near its peak of productivity, but the value of Great Lakes landings almost exactly equaled that of the pilchard.

Second. Great Lakes landings of all species taken commercially were only 17 percent of the landings of salmon in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska, but the value was equal to 60 percent.

Third. Moving now to the Atlantic, Great Lakes commercial production equaled only 22 percent of the combined landings at Boston and Gloucester, Mass., and Portland, Maine, but was valued at 54 percent of those landings.

Statistics on the commercial landings fail by a good margin to reflect the total worth of the Great Lakes fisheries.

Angling for recreation around the shores and islands of the Great Lakes is a sport of longstanding. By the thirties it had grown into an economically important venture. The many small ports allowed easy access for sportsmen's boats and motors, and the quality fish of the lakes were most attractive. Trolling for lake trout in Superior, catching bass in Michigan's coastal bays, taking rainbow trout in the St. Mary's River between Lakes Superior and Huron, and yellow or blue pike around the islands of western Lake Erie became the avocation of thousands of anglers.

Sport fishing provides extensive recreation both for the millions who live adjacent to the lakes and for the many thousands of tourists who are attracted to the region. While it is difficult to obtain dependable figures on the extent and value of sport fishing, the evidence is clear that participation is enormous and that the actual take of sport fishermen often constitutes a considerable percentage of the total catch, and that for some species in certain waters it may exceed commercial landings.

Certain information is available on sport fishing, and it is most suggestive. A 1958 survey by Ohio, for example, revealed that in 160 days anglers took almost 5½ million fish weighing well over 1 million pounds within an 180-square mile area of western Lake Erie. Wisconsin has estimated an annual 2 million angler days for a single county bordering on Lake Michigan. State officials of both Wisconsin and Michigan believe that sportsmen regularly take at least as many smelt as do commercial operators. From these and other bits of information it is clear that sport fishing in the Great Lakes is highly productive and has many devotees. Certainly, the returns to many communities from tourist expenditures for transportation, food, lodging, boat rental, bait, and the like loom important in the local economy.

A 1960 survey of the economic value of fishing in the north central States, including the Great Lakes, indicated that about 2,700,000 anglers in that area fished in natural lakes and streams. Expenditures of these fishermen averaged $95 each on items necessary for their fishing trips.

The aesthetic value of the recreation is not measurable but is immeasurably important. The health value of out-of-door recreation—the exercise and relief of tensions—in our pressure-packed society, can hardly be overestimated.

Beginning in the early 1940's the Great Lakes fish populations underwent a series of disastrous changes that have been a major factor in the present distressed state of the commercial fisheries and also have affected some sport fisheries.

I do not wish to imply that fish stocks had not changed before the 1940's. A progressive shift from the choicer high-priced fish had been in progress for decades, and in the mid-1920's the disappearance of the cisco, typically dominant in the landings, dealt a hard blow to Lake Erie fishermen. The expansion of the range of the introduced carp in the past century and of the introduced smelt in the 1930's caused loud outcry from fishermen, but actual damage was hard to prove and some productive fisheries have subsequently been based on the new species.

The changes that came about before the 1940's, adverse as some may have been, were almost trifling in comparison with the debacle that followed the penetration and spread of the sea lamprey through the three upper lakes—Huron, Michigan, and Superior.

The story of the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes has attracted nationwide attention. In the Senate we have reviewed annually the budgets for research and the development of methods for control, so I shall not go into great detail on the sea lamprey problem. I do want to reemphasize the seriousness of the damage it has caused the fishing industry.

The major injury to the fisheries was the total destruction of lake trout in Lakes Huron and Michigan and the reduction of the Lake Superior stocks to a small fraction of their former abundance. The resulting loss of production, worth nearly $8 million annually, was a grievous blow. In Lake Superior, for example, the lake trout normally has accounted for a full 70 percent of the annual cash income of the producers and has provided additional income from thousands of anglers who charter boats and equipment to troll for trout in deep waters.

The catastrophic loss of the lake trout fishery was so spectacular that other damages to the fisheries were given less attention than they deserved. In Lakes Huron and Michigan lamprey depredations are keeping whitefish so scarce that they cannot be commercially taken at a profit in many areas. The recent level of production for the two lakes combined has been mostly under 1 million pounds per year; under normal conditions the lakes should yield 6 million pounds. Thus we have an annual loss of 5 million pounds for a quality fish which brings a price per pound equal to or greater than that of lake trout.

Less spectacular but still significant are the estimated losses of more than 1 million pounds per year in the commercial take of walleye in Saginaw Bay, and of 2 million pounds per year of suckers in Lakes Huron and Michigan.

Lamprey depredations have reduced the fishery for chubs or deep-water ciscoes to a chaotic low in parts of Lake Huron and all of Lake Michigan. The larger species and individuals have become so scarce that production, using the traditional gill nets, is frequently marginal or at a loss. Small chubs are plentiful, but they can be produced effectively only in those waters where the States permit experimental trawling. Even this fishery is experiencing economic difficulties.

Losses from the sea lamprey are underestimated severely, if we concentrate on the $8 million worth of lake trout. The true annual loss of revenue to the commercial fisheries surely is much greater. A figure of between $12 and $15 million would be entirely reasonable—possibly, even, too low.

The commercial fishermen of Lakes Huron and Michigan are suffering additional miseries from the recent population explosion of alewives, a species that penetrated the upper lakes from Lake Ontario. No use of alewives for human food has been developed in the Great Lakes area and only under exceptional conditions can they be taken at the thinnest margin of profit for animal food. When alewives are plentiful on gill net grounds, fishermen have to suspend operations since their value does not equal the labor and maintenance costs of clearing and repairing the nets. When such conditions prevail, even decent catches of other species become unprofitable. The story does not end here. Evidence grows more convincing that the lake herring declines when the alewives appear. Thus another valuable native fish dwindles.

The sea lamprey has never created a significant problem in Lake Erie where environmental conditions have limited its natural reproducton. Lake Erie nevertheless has experienced sweeping changes, mostly in the 1950's, that have brought the fisheries to the brink of ruin. Two of the three principal money fish, whitefish and blue pike, each yielded less than 50,000 pounds in 1960, United States and Canadian catches combined. Catches of whitefish were consistently heavy in earlier years, reached an alltime record of 7 million pounds in 1949, and accounted for landings of 2¾ million pounds as recently as 1953. The take of blue pike was nearly 20 million pounds as recently as 1955. The catch of the third money fish, the walleye, dropped from 15½ million pounds in 1956 to 1¾ million pounds in 1960 and has declined further since.

The evidence is strong that Lake Erie's difficulties have arisen primarily from environmental changes. A major factor in these changes may well be the progressive and growing enrichment from sewage effluent from the populous metropolitan area of the Detroit River and the western and southern shores of the lake.

The overall effects of fish population changes in Lake Erie that I have reviewed are not seen in the production records. The U.S. commercial catch still hovers about the 70-million-pound level. But, the fish currently produced are the less desirable lower priced species and landed at progressively smaller profit margins. Many operators have been unable to survive the high-yield, low-price, slim-margin regimen and have stopped fishing altogether. In fact, many once-thriving fishing ports are now entirely closed down and formerly major ports may now have just a few fishing craft. Fish as fish are far from scarce in the lakes. The total quantities available well may be at a record high. Yet it is increasingly difficult to take and sell them at a reasonable profit.

To the problems arising from the fish population changes with their lower income-producing characteristics must be added the difficulties which are common to the commercial fishing industry as a whole and which have been laid before you in talks by various Members of the Senate. I need review them only briefly.

The technological backwardness, the lack of capital, and the encumbrance by tradition which plague most segments of the Nation's fisheries are probably more severe in the Great Lakes than in any other important fishery. The scattered distribution of the fisheries and the high price per pound received for many species furthered the establishment of small, independent operating firms. No truly large producing firms appeared. A high percentage of the producers had one-boat operations, owned by partners or, more commonly, entirely within a single family.

This kind of operation made sense when high-priced fish were plentiful. The fishermen made a decent living and were comfortingly independent. Personal incentive to develop better means of taking fish was low. In addition, experimentation was hampered and discouraged by the stringent regulations under which the fishermen operated.

The firms were too small to afford the sizable capital outlays necessary for extensive processing. They landed and sold their catches in the round. The firms lacked any substantial reserve capital and normally did not feel the need for it.

Fisheries with this background were poorly suited to survive the changed conditions of the last 10 to 20 years. It is in no way surprising that so many operators failed to survive and more will disappear unless the industry receives effective assistance.

The Great Lakes fishing industry suffers also from that common ailment of most food-producing enterprises—the growing disparity between price received by the producer and price paid by the consumer. Labor and material costs have increased enormously. Yet, fishermen today actually are receiving less per pound for some choice species than they did before World War II. Improved efficiencies and economics in all phases of catching, handling, and selling are needed, but the industry cannot do the job alone—it needs outside help.

Still other important handicaps to economic stability have been the widely fluctuating supply and the variation of quality that originates in highly seasonal production and a general lack of adequate quality control. The major production of many species is landed within a very short period of time. During the glut period fishermen must often dispose of their catches at ruinous prices simply to keep them from going to waste. Later, when fish are scarce, prices rise sharply. If the glut production could be processed and stored, the supply to market could be stabilized and the fishermen could receive a substantially greater return. Facilities for storing and processing are inadequate today and most firms lack the capital to set them up.

The traditional practice of landing and shipping to market in the round leaves many opportunities for deterioration of the quality of Great Lakes fish before they reach the consumer. Improvement of quality control at every stage from net to retail market can increase acceptability of the product and stimulate consumer demand. Here, again, expert advice and assistance are needed.

Before I undertake comments as to the type and scope of Federal research and developmental programs, I should like to indicate briefly the role the Federal Government should play in seeking the solution of Great Lakes fishery problems. The Great Lakes are unique in that despite their considerable area they contain no international or interstate waters. The boundary between Canada and the United States is as clearly defined as are the boundaries between our States. Thus the entire extent of the lakes is part of some State or the Province of Ontario. Each political jurisdiction has full authority over the fisheries within its boundary.

The argument could be advanced that since the States own the U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, research on and development of the fisheries should be strictly a State matter. This argument might gain validity if the fish remain discretely within the correct political boundaries, but they obviously do not. We may lack interstate or international waters but we do have interstate and international stocks of fish that move about as their biological needs require and are fished by citizens under various jurisdictions. The problems of the Great Lakes know no political boundaries and they are handled best by agencies that are free to operate without regard to State lines. Federal attention to fishing matters is as justifiable in the Great Lakes as it is in coastal and offshore fisheries. The Nation as well as individual States will benefit from sound fishery development.

The Federal Government acknowledged its responsibility early by including the Great Lakes in its first major survey of the Nation's fisheries in 1879-80. A second, more comprehensive survey of the Great Lakes fisheries was made in 1885 and lesser ones followed. The Federal Government further joined Canada in the establishment of commissions and boards to review fishery problems from an international standpoint. The first of them reported in 1897 and the most recent, the International Board of Inquiry for the Great Lakes Fisheries, reported in 1942.

Although the recognition of responsibility came early, the Federal Government actually contributed little more than occasional surveys and sporadic collection of statistical records until after the first quarter of the present century. The first continuing Federal fishery program on the lakes was the biological research started in 1927 shortly after the collapse of the Lake Erie cisco fishery. The urging and cooperation of the States were a major factor in this start.

The fiscal support of the present Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Biological Laboratory in Ann Arbor, Mich., was indeed meager over the first 22 years of its existence. The total annual appropriation, salaries and operating expenses combined, did not exceed $31,000, was as low as $11,000, and averaged less than $19,000. Especially trying to the biologists was their inability to undertake research on an effective scale through the 1940's when the sea lamprey was destroying stocks of lake trout in both Lake Huron and Lake Michigan.

What this small group of scientists accomplished with so little is a record of which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service well may be proud. Let me point out also that much of the Service's early research could not have been completed without the generous financial support of the States and the hearty cooperation of the industry. This tradition of Federal-State-industry cooperation has never been lost. I am confident that the record of joint effort toward attainment of a common goal to be found in the Great Lakes region is without parallel in the Nation. The States have requested repeatedly and supported unfailingly a broadening of Federal programs in the Great Lakes. For more than three decades they have relied strongly on Federal officials for advice and counsel in fishery problems.

Federal biological research on the lakes gained its first financial support of consequence in fiscal year 1950. This support continued on a varying and uncertain basis until fiscal year 1957. Beginning in that year, funds for sea lamprey research and experimental control were obtained under contract between the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, established as one part of a treaty with Canada in 1956. Funds for other research still are included in the Bureau's budget.

Federal assistance to the Great Lakes fisheries other than biological research materialized slowly. A small-scale program of marketing was started in 1955, but it was not until the regional office of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for the Great Lakes and Central Region was established in Ann Arbor, Mich., in 1958 that even a start could be made in technology, gear development, and economics. Scant support made the programs in these disciplines largely ineffective at the start. They are better supported now but still far from adequate to meet the pressing needs of the Great Lakes fisheries.

I believe firmly that the historical neglect of the Great Lakes fisheries must come to an end and that we should meet, not merely recognize, the responsibilities of the Federal Government. These extraordinary bodies of fresh water lie in the heart of a rich and densely populated region. They can sustain large populations of desirable fish for the support of industry and the enjoyment of anglers. It is unthinkable that we should let them lie sterile and unproductive.

I shall not lay before you at this time detailed proposals for a Federal fishery program on the Great Lakes. Rather, I shall suggest the broad lines of attack along which we must move immediately and in adequate strength if a once-thriving industry is to be spared and the public allowed the full use and enjoyment of a priceless resource.

Our first major goal must be the early restoration of the stocks of valuable species in the three upper lakes. Ten years, or even five years ago attainment of this goal would have seemed fanciful. The sea lamprey had destroyed or reduced to low levels the choice species of Lakes Huron and Michigan and was making rapid inroads on the lake trout of Lake Superior. In the face of this catastrophe we had no proven method of control.

The situation is changed. We now have a control method. Its effectiveness was demonstrated in 1962 when the numbers of sea lampreys in spawning runs were reduced to a mere 14 percent of the 1961 figure. Further experience and experimentation surely will increase this fine efficiency.

Much credit must go to biologists of what is now the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for their years of patient research that culminated in this recent success. They are to be commended especially for the painstaking care and patience they exhibited as they ventured into the practically unknown field of selective toxicants. Untold thousands of tests finally uncovered chemical compounds which, used in proper concentrations, are lethal to lampreys but harmless to other fishes and to birds and mammals as well.

Laboratory tests were followed by field tests to learn better the action of the chemicals in the natural streams inhabited by larval lampreys and to develop proper field procedures. Finally came the grand experiment in which United States and Canadian biologists joined in the chemical treatment of all lamprey streams tributary to Superior, largest of the Great Lakes. The success of this experiment marked a monumental advance in the management of aquatic populations.

Lake Superior has been the scene also of experiments to learn the feasibility of restoring lake trout stocks. The United States and Canadian Federal Governments, the Province of Ontario, and the States cooperated in the rearing, planting, and subsequent research on trout survival. Federal fish hatcheries at Charlevoix and Pendills Creek, Mich., as well as State hatcheries at Marquette, Mich., and Bayfield, Wis., produced hundreds of thousands of high-quality lake trout yearlings annually for restocking purposes in Lake Superior. A new Federal hatchery at Jordan River, Mich., will help with the job in Lakes Michigan and Huron.

That lake trout stocks can be restored was demonstrated positively. Lake Superior is well along the road to recovery. A return to a good level of abundance of lake trout is anticipated within the next few years.

The experiments that succeeded so well in Lake Superior have provided the method for a similar restoration of stocks of valuable fish in Lakes Huron and Michigan. The question properly may be asked as to why we do not set out immediately to complete the work. The answer is simple. The present level of budgeting of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission is not sufficient to the task. I hold it a false economy—indeed inexcusable—that we should permit this situation to continue.

The changed fish population of Lake Erie offers a problem for which no easy solution is apparent. Additional well-conceived and designed research on the widely fluctuating stocks and their environment could uncover principles most useful in the betterment of populations and the management of the fisheries. The industry needs immediate aid in achieving more profitable use of the presently plentiful supplies of smelt and yellow perch.

Broader and more intensive research is needed also on fish stocks in the three upper lakes, particularly during the period of restoration. Unparalleled opportunities exist there for inquiry into the dynamics of aquatic populations.

Technological research and development offer substantial opportunities for the economic betterment of the commercial fisheries. Some lines of work give promise of early return.

Fishery technology can increase dollar returns to the producer's pocket and still give the consumer a better product. The resulting economic gain benefits his income without placing additional strain on the stocks. Let me take the Lake Superior lake herring or cisco as one example to illustrate the point.

The cisco or lake herring of Lake Superior is one of the tastiest food fish produced in the Great Lakes. The annual landings on the U.S. side typically are above 10 million pounds and have exceeded 17 million, but a relatively small percentage of the take reaches the tables of consumers. Formerly, quantities of lake herring were salted but this market had dwindled. Today the bulk of the catch is sold for mink food.

Three circumstances impede the profitable marketing of the Lake Superior lake herring. The take is highly seasonal; up to 90 percent or more of the annual catch is landed within a few weeks in late November and early December. The fish is so delicate that it cannot tolerate repeated handling, reasonable storage time, or shipment to distant points in the fresh state. No method of processing and freezing developed to date has been satisfactory. The flesh rapidly develops off colors and off-flavors.

The development of processing procedures and equipment that will give frozen Lake Superior lake herring a shelf life considered normal for fish could improve the economic status of the fishery enormously. Placed on the market in a suitable state, this fish could compete successfully with the choicest. Badly overloaded and underequipped technologists of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in Ann Arbor are making a start on this complex and difficult problem. They should receive sufficient support to assure the earliest possible completion of the work.

The yellow perch is another excellently flavored and plentiful Great Lakes fish that is not yielding proper economic returns to producers. The average landed price today is far below that of prewar years and frequently it is so low that fishermen must suspend operations. If yellow perch could be more efficiently caught, processed, and stored at or near the point of production a steady supply could be assured to receptive retail outlets. The price to the producer could be stabilized at a sound level. Processed and frozen yellow perch is an excellent product with a long shelf life. The industry lacks, however, the equipment and facilities to handle the fish. It needs technical advice and it may require direct aid in the form of loans and grants. In fact, assistance in finding capital may well prove to be the key to most technological advances in the Great Lakes fisheries.

What I have said about lake herring and yellow perch applies, of course, to a number of Great Lakes species.

Many other possibilities exist for increasing the income to producers through product development, including products for human consumption from such fish as the alewife and the smaller species of deepwater ciscoes now marketed as animal food.

Throughout the Great Lakes, fishermen need sound advice and practical demonstrations on the proper handling and refrigeration of the catch. Too frequently, poor quality is assured even before the fish are landed. Quality control must be stressed from the time of catch to the consumer's table. Broadening of voluntary Federal inspection of processing and packing plants should be encouraged.

The traditional gears of the Great Lakes are not satisfactory in many fisheries for production under the changed conditions of recent years. The development of new, more efficient, cheaper methods of taking fish are badly needed. When new methods and gears are developed, the fishermen must have sound advice in their use and on necessary modifications of vessels. Many will need assistance in obtaining capital for change in methods of fishing. Only a start has been made here; much remains to be done. The States are eager to have this work carried on and have exhibited readiness to modify regulations to permit more efficient fishing.

Exploratory fishing by Federal vessels, especially with new fishing gears, can provide fishermen with needed information on grounds and seasonal availability. Fishermen simply cannot afford to spend time in this searching.

Improvements in technology and in fishing methods and gear—especially those that contribute to a greater stability of supply and improvement of quality—can ease greatly the task of marketing specialists who assist and advise the fishing industry in the orderly and profitable movement of their products. The Branch of Marketing of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has done much worthwhile work in the Great Lakes region. Still, much remains to be done in the popularization of fish as a highly palatable and healthful food in homes, schools, restaurants, and institutions. Support to the Branch of Marketing in this work can pay high dividends.

Ignorance of the economics of the Great Lakes fisheries has been a great handicap in attempts to estimate costs and benefits from changes in the taking, handling, and processing of fish. Elementary but thorough cost studies are needed urgently for various fisheries and species from the time of catching to final purchase by the consumer.

Plans for the future should not overlook the orderly development of the recreational potential of the Great Lakes and their fisheries. Summer vacations on the shores and beaches can be attractive to growing numbers of people in warmer, southern climates and in the hot cities. Food and lodging, sales of automotive supplies and fishing equipment, rental of charter boats and sale of boats and motors, and many other sources of income based on the lakes and fishing are potentially or actually available. The small attractive ports and the firm, high quality gamefish species are assets that can be developed and wisely used for decades to come.

My comments on program needs in Federal research and assistance for the Great Lakes fisheries have been brief indeed. More details were not required since all segments of our Nation's fisheries have problems in common and the Senate has had them laid before it more than once.

I have confined myself to the Great Lakes fisheries because they are fascinatingly unique and have a regional and national worth far greater than is commonly appreciated. What I have said about Federal neglect of Great Lakes fisheries holds for all, but I am confident that among our fisheries those of the Great Lakes are most neglected, yet offer a tremendous potential in the commercial, sport, and recreational fields.

We can ill afford to stand by and watch a valuable industry crumble. We need not suffer the economic loss, the unemployment, the depressed communities. We need not purchase from others the products we can, with little effort, produce ourselves. The time for assumption of our Federal responsibility for our fisheries does not lie in the indefinite future. The time is at hand. Neglect must end now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of tables, providing data to substantiate my remarks, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Production of all species for the Great Lakes fisheries by total volume, value, and price per pound for all lakes, Lake Superior, and the State of Michigan, 1940–61*

[Pounds and dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Total production			Lake Superior			State of Michigan		
	Pounds	Dollars	Cents per pound	Pounds	Dollars	Cents per pound	Pounds	Dollars	Cents per pound
1940	76,887	5,498	7.2	20,672	904	4.4	26,230	2,022	7.7
1941	76,416	6,307	8.2	22,111	1,309	5.9	28,117	2,361	8.4
1942	73,562	8.493	11.5	19,227	1,498	7.8	26,268	3,137	11.9
1943	76,665	12.081	15.8	18.371	2,214	12.1	25,700	4,128	16.1
1944	74,166	10,797	14.6	19,244	2,246	11.7	22,110	3,861	17.5
1945	77,412	13,614	17.6	18,724	2.574	13.7	23,960	5,095	21.3
1946	76,891	11,525	15.0	17,848	2,218	12.4	24,159	4,058	16.8
1947	68,296	10,596	15.5	14,987	1,673	11.2	25,545	3,914	15.3
1948	81,967	12,472	15.2	19,221	2,347	12.2	30.136	5,175	17.2
1949	83,484	11,279	13.5	17,730	2,190	12.4	25,533	4,116	16.1
1950	68.895	10,666	15.5	12,584	1,977	15.7	23,152	3,497	15.1
1951	68,623	10,489	15.3	14,035	1,920	13.7	25,020	3,408	13.6
1952	79,662	11,310	14.2	15,464	1,998	12.9	29,231	4.161	14.2
1953	75,521	9,427	12.5	13,649	1,797	13.2	25,012	3,314	13.3
1954	79,746	9,834	12.3	15,384	2,117	13.8	27,230	3,202	11.8
1955	75,198	9,585	12.7	13,581	1,885	13.9	25,429	2,944	11.6
1956	78,947	10,045	12.7	13,591	1,940	14.3	24,635	2,974	12.1
1957	74,039	9,477	12.8	13,564	1,655	12.2	22,477	2,536	11.3
1958	68,896	8,546	12.4	13,193	1,525	11.6	25,487	2,943	11.6
1959	63,463	6,973	11.0	14,955	1,713	11.5	22,322	2,680	12.0
1960	65,935	6,971	10.6	13,770	1,300	9.4	25,021	2,997	12.0
1961	67,140	6,786	10.1	14,748	1,263	8.6	24,535	2,930	11.9

TABLE 2.—*Total production of the major Great Lakes species by volume, value, and price per pound, 1940–61*

[Pounds and dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Chubs			Lake herring			Lake trout			Smelt		
	Pounds	Dollars	Cents per pound	Pounds	Dollars	Cents per pound	Pounds	Dollars	Cents per pound	Pounds	Dollars	Cents per pound
1940	2, 410	344	14. 3	22, 480	486	2. 2	9, 858	1, 607	16. 3	4, 208	126	3. 0
1941	2, 272	385	17. 0	22, 700	772	3. 4	10, 533	1, 803	17. 1	4, 794	178	3. 7
1942	2, 337	470	20. 1	18, 678	788	4. 2	10, 174	2, 425	23. 8	3, 345	145	4. 3
1943	2, 776	643	23. 2	17, 893	1, 168	6. 5	10, 376	3, 444	33. 2	2, 225	242	10. 9
1944	3, 196	590	18. 5	16, 801	914	5. 4	10, 603	3, 791	35. 8	4	----------	6. 6
1945	4, 666	1, 094	23. 5	19, 525	1, 431	7. 3	8, 979	4, 055	45. 2	104	10	9. 7
1946	4, 620	529	11. 5	20, 170	900	4. 5	7, 457	2, 988	40. 1	271	31	11. 8
1947	5, 362	777	14. 5	17, 753	976	5. 5	5, 402	1, 710	31. 7	789	139	17. 7
1948	6, 297	1, 256	20. 0	24, 370	1, 176	4. 8	4, 154	1, 753	42. 2	1, 132	177	15. 7
1949	7, 731	1, 294	16. 7	21, 934	788	3. 6	3, 308	1, 354	40. 9	1, 556	148	9. 6
1950	9, 413	1, 428	15. 2	17, 454	807	4. 6	3, 255	1, 243	38. 2	2, 534	234	9. 3
1951	10, 529	1, 689	16. 0	20, 177	981	4. 9	2, 928	1, 245	42. 5	3, 624	235	6. 5
1952	11, 251	1, 731	15. 4	23, 504	1, 458	6. 2	2, 843	1, 257	44. 2	5, 386	325	6. 0
1953	11, 343	1, 690	14. 9	18, 581	945	5. 1	2, 415	1, 033	42. 8	5, 419	219	4. 1
1954	10, 999	1, 722	15. 7	20, 777	1, 056	5. 1	2, 256	1, 029	45. 6	6, 002	178	3. 0
1955	11, 366	1, 739	15. 3	16, 588	823	5. 0	2, 101	920	43. 8	5, 654	165	2. 9
1956	11, 430	2, 194	19. 2	16, 329	827	5. 1	1, 812	871	48. 1	7, 785	272	3. 5
1957	11, 318	2, 314	20. 4	14, 808	919	6. 2	1, 190	594	49. 9	7, 254	225	3. 1
1958	12, 170	2, 564	21. 1	12, 293	763	6. 2	1, 060	531	50. 1	9, 536	285	3. 0
1959	11, 211	2, 282	20. 4	12, 511	833	6. 7	868	468	53. 9	6, 889	238	3. 5
1960	16, 853	2, 550	15. 1	11, 083	638	5. 8	384	220	57. 2	4, 320	160	3. 7
1961	16, 516	2, 127	12. 9	11, 701	652	5. 6	328	198	60. 6	3, 539	133	3. 8

Year	Whitefish			Yellow perch			Walleye		
	Pounds	Dollars	Cents per pound	Pounds	Dollars	Cents per pound	Pounds	Dollars	Cents per pound
1940	4, 552	728	16. 0	6, 173	529	8. 6	5, 496	681	12. 4
1941	4, 637	894	19. 3	6, 698	643	9. 6	4, 493	603	13. 4
1942	4, 131	1, 067	25. 8	5, 209	725	13. 9	5, 111	974	19. 1
1943	3, 263	1, 145	35. 1	5, 402	923	17. 1	4, 968	1, 098	22. 1
1944	3, 226	1, 207	37. 4	5, 694	745	13. 1	4, 754	985	20. 7
1945	3, 489	1, 599	45. 8	3, 266	601	18. 4	6, 200	1, 538	24. 8
1946	4, 858	1, 726	35. 5	4, 535	810	17. 9	7, 472	1, 664	22. 3
1947	11, 593	2, 805	24. 2	3, 512	674	19. 2	4, 794	1, 258	26. 2
1948	12, 217	3, 776	30. 9	4, 893	750	15. 3	4, 920	1, 247	25. 4
1949	8, 786	3, 027	34. 5	4, 573	671	14. 7	6, 662	1, 467	22. 0
1950	5, 140	1, 999	38. 9	4, 447	783	17. 6	7, 060	1, 786	25. 3
1951	2, 716	1, 294	47. 7	4, 343	981	21. 1	6, 419	1, 985	30. 9
1952	3, 670	1, 622	44. 2	4, 199	755	18. 0	5, 613	1, 435	25. 6
1953	2, 947	1, 332	45. 2	6, 113	743	12. 2	6, 660	1, 210	18. 2
1954	2, 282	1, 082	47. 4	8, 041	878	10. 9	5, 914	1, 496	25. 3
1955	1, 832	947	51. 7	6, 555	872	13. 3	6, 936	1, 528	22. 0
1956	1, 462	814	55. 7	10, 799	973	9. 0	7, 084	1, 638	23. 1
1957	1, 357	748	55. 1	11, 948	1, 135	9. 5	5, 426	1, 505	27. 7
1958	617	359	58. 2	10, 913	1, 468	13. 5	4, 292	1, 228	28. 6
1959	568	360	63. 4	11, 710	940	8. 0	1, 949	721	37. 0
1960	781	461	59. 0	10, 223	1, 097	10. 7	1, 437	527	36. 7
1961	1, 241	662	53. 3	9, 335	1, 243	13. 3	984	392	39. 9

TABLE 3.—*Production of major species from Lake Superior by volume and value, 1940–61*

[Pounds and dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Chubs		Lake herring		Lake trout		Smelt		Whitefish		Yellow perch		Walleye	
	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars
1940	614	91	16, 502	299	2, 676	398	----------	----------	692	109	3	0. 298	5	0. 660
1941	516	87	17, 837	587	2, 854	474	----------	----------	727	152	5	. 593	4	. 672
1942	501	94	14, 844	550	2, 959	642	0. 900	0. 042	751	200	6	. 704	3	. 450
1943	434	85	13, 874	854	3, 053	980	----------	----------	731	263	8	1	32	9
1944	368	66	14, 227	670	3, 739	1, 228	----------	----------	663	256	3	. 370	37	8
1945	255	54	14, 044	775	3, 368	1, 391	. 100	. 015	717	319	2	. 415	29	8
1946	56	6	13, 141	525	3, 444	1, 325	. 300	. 036	914	334	3	. 686	38	10
1947	149	19	10, 808	541	2, 963	883	. 300	. 041	950	213	----------	----------	25	7
1948	209	40	14, 705	696	2, 953	1, 206	1	. 130	1, 200	386	5	. 695	35	8
1949	162	26	13, 204	437	2, 965	1, 203	1	. 102	1, 283	511	. 300	. 030	26	6
1950	28	3	8, 157	321	3, 201	1, 223	. 900	. 135	1, 039	412	2	. 379	33	8
1951	74	12	10, 424	439	2, 915	1, 241	1	. 097	441	209	3	. 804	22	5
1952	90	10	12, 021	574	2, 838	1, 256	44	2	350	142	. 700	. 165	11	2
1953	69	9	10, 438	482	2, 412	1, 032	20	1	606	258	. 200	. 015	15	4
1954	182	27	11, 822	576	2, 255	1, 028	25	1	1, 004	470	----------	----------	21	7
1955	153	22	10, 133	450	2, 100	920	74	3	1, 003	469	1	. 114	22	7
1956	215	36	10, 477	513	1, 812	871	118	4	917	509	3	. 305	. 900	. 240
1957	266	53	11, 355	687	1, 190	594	137	5	525	305	1	. 214	. 400	. 127
1958	1, 181	219	10, 216	574	1, 059	531	331	10	309	174	1	. 166	. 300	. 056
1959	1, 263	238	11, 511	735	868	467	800	27	382	236	. 800	. 087	. 900	. 459
1960	1, 258	255	10, 805	607	380	217	946	43	284	169	2	. 406	. 900	. 336
1961	1, 186	194	11, 456	623	322	196	1, 339	54	342	182	5	. 658	1	. 387

TABLE 4.—*Production of major species for the State of Michigan, by volume and value, 1940–61*

[Pounds and dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Chubs		Lake herring		Lake trout		Smelt		Whitefish		Yellow perch		Walleye	
	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars
1940	452	71	8,764	220	5,524	865	2,418	72	1,476	255	894	77	1,903	285
1941	477	71	9,814	368	5,949	1,011	3,039	91	1,452	305	841	84	1,709	256
1942	476	99	8,187	397	5,391	1,276	2,220	88	1,649	476	1,082	134	2,253	450
1943	552	143	7,249	398	5,362	1,769	1,723	172	1,768	636	1,343	201	1,978	415
1944	731	138	6,157	335	5,672	1,928	.200	.014	1,974	726	879	128	1,447	259
1945	1,356	320	6,910	634	4,963	2,176	46	4	1,882	909	825	160	990	279
1946	1,117	124	7,327	310	4,540	1,769	69	5	2,789	962	684	126	1,587	390
1947	1,524	240	6,490	307	3,152	975	339	63	7,363	1,673	598	101	1,127	267
1948	2,257	451	9,038	370	2,754	1,100	627	111	7,721	2,312	1,015	160	1,229	330
1949	2,575	470	8,470	299	2,405	949	1,062	99	4,040	1,503	928	134	1,635	414
1950	2,427	370	6,870	277	2,424	866	1,741	115	2,724	1,019	945	151	1,834	464
1951	3,021	518	9,124	451	2,176	879	2,660	136	1,358	645	749	150	942	310
1952	3,424	545	10,919	888	2,074	861	4,250	268	1,846	778	1,043	212	729	224
1953	3,676	647	6,888	439	1,746	698	4,375	166	1,441	664	1,160	174	847	191
1954	3,476	612	8,536	376	1,609	687	4,929	134	1,348	611	1,596	194	870	248
1955	4,102	681	6,583	328	1,377	547	5,020	139	841	388	1,656	207	1,299	342
1956	4,005	910	6,449	331	1,223	526	6,185	216	442	206	1,455	207	1,167	337
1957	4,285	885	6,372	361	848	393	5,485	154	289	170	1.148	140	672	199
1958	5,428	1,106	5,522	368	767	364	6,258	187	332	183	1,514	220	616	225
1959	4,867	960	6,523	418	671	343	3,987	124	373	242	1,156	132	452	197
1960	6,812	1,319	6,816	414	269	142	2,297	69	550	315	1,951	269	342	148
1961	6,493	1,085	7,458	434	218	126	1,398	46	938	487	2,233	333	269	117

TABLE 5.—*Total regularly employed fishermen for the Great Lakes, Lake Superior, and the State of Michigan, specified years*

Year	Great Lakes area	Lake Superior area	State of Michigan
1940	3,647	828	1,525
1950	3,193	762	1,245
1954	2,938	655	1,126
1955	2,322	536	901
1956	2,163	507	878
1957	2,076	498	821
1958	2,060	445	886
1959	1,901	451	892
1960	1,823	409	842

OUR NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on April 19 the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference held its annual meeting in New York City. One of the highlights of the program was an address by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], in which he called for a revised immigration policy consistent with the historical principles of this Nation.

This was a particularly effective and moving address since the Senator himself is living proof of the enrichment given our national life by immigrants and the children of immigrants.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech of the Senator from Maine, together with President Kennedy's message to the American Citizenship and Immigrant Conference's annual meeting, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

(Address by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, Plaza Hotel, New York, April 19, 1963)

I am an American by birth. I am the son of an immigrant. I take it that most, if not all, of us in this room are immigrants, or descendants of people who came to these shores from other lands. In that respect, this group is representative of all America.

We are here to discuss whether, and to what extent, others shall be permitted to enjoy these opportunities which, but for the accident of time might today be denied to some of us.

Certainly, we are not the first to concern ourselves with this subject. It is not new. It is older than the Republic itself. It has its origin in that far distant day when the first settlers came here seeking wider and unobstructed horizons of freedom and opportunity. It was then that the picture of America, as a land where the hopes and aspirations of all mankind might be realized began to emerge. Since then, the brush strokes of changing public policy have alternately brightened and darkened that picture.

Volumes of material are available to those who would trace the history of our national immigration policy. They would begin with the early days when immigration was eagerly encouraged as a necessity if we were to develop our economic and cultural potential. They would trace it through the devious paths of prejudice and intolerance. They would note the pessimism of those who, from time to time expressed the view that America had reached the limit of her capacity to grow and to absorb more newcomers—only to be confounded by a new period of dynamic expansion. And, having completed their study to the present day, they would have found little justification in history for the illogical and inequitable restrictions of our present law.

Interesting and productive as such a study would be, I choose to turn from such historical detail to what I consider to be the basic questions involved:

1. Does our national immigration policy present a true picture of America to the world?

2. If not, would it be sound, in terms of our best interests, to change that picture by changing that policy?

You will forgive me, I trust, if I answer the first of these two questions by touching briefly upon my own background. My father's father was a farmer in Russian-occupied Poland prior to the turn of the century. He shared the intense patriotism and love of liberty which has preserved the identity of my ancestors as a people through centuries of oppression. He early determined that his youngest son, my father, should have an opportunity to build a better and freer life than appeared possible under the czarist tyranny.

And so it was that, in his early teens, my father was apprenticed to a tailor. At the age of 17 having learned his trade, he left his home, embarking upon a new life, preferring the bright prospect of the unknown and unfamiliar freedom to his oppression-darkened homeland.

What he found here forever justified his hopes and his father's faith. At his knee, I have heard him reminisce, for hours on end, out of the fullness of his heart, upon his boyhood life—the close family ties which bound him to loved ones he was never to see again, the warmth at his father's house, the joys and pleasures of his childhood. It could not have been easy for him to leave them behind. He talked to me of these things because he wanted to relive them. But he had a deeper purpose.

Increasingly, as the years passed by and my comprehension grew, he drove home his lesson. What he had lost had been more than offset by what he had gained—for himself, for his father, and for me. Here, if a man had ability, he could express it without fear of reprisal. Here, if a man disagreed with governmental policy, he could say so, and, more than that, he could do something about it by casting his ballot at the polls. Here, a man was completely free to reap the fruits of his own integrity, intellectual and physical capacity, his own work. There were no heights to which he could not strive. It mattered not what his national background, his religious or political beliefs, his economic status in life might be.

On the evening of my inauguration as Governor of the State of Maine, he turned to me and said, very simply, "Now I can die happy." A few months later the final chapter of his life was written. I am sure that, in the closing moments, he must have thought of the strange and wonderful destiny which had so astonishingly vindicated his beliefs which had uprooted his life.

If the national origins quota system is based on truth, then my father's life was built on lies. There is no way of reconciling the two.

The national origins quota system says to the world that we consider certain national and ethnic groups to be better and more desirable as Americans than others. It says to the world that there are superior and inferior peoples, depending upon race, national background, religion, color. It says to the world that creative ability, intellectual capacity, and high moral and spiritual principles have been allocated by the Creator to some peoples to a greater extent than to others. Logically, it implies more than that.

If the peoples of different countries vary in their capacity to contribute to what we are and hope to be, so that their entry into this country must be controlled accordingly, then those who are now citizens must also vary in the same way. This suggests that there should be classes of citizenship in this country. Some of us should be allowed to vote freely, others not. We should have classes of citizenship rigidly defined on the basis of economic status, racial and national origin, political beliefs, and creed. This is not a true picture of America. It is not the picture we should hold out to the world.

In 1789, Benjamin Franklin described America in essence when he wrote to David Hartley these words:

"God grant that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man, may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere on its surface, and say 'This is my country'."

The second question I have posed is this. Would it be sound, in terms of our best interests, to change that picture by changing that policy?

May I again use a simple illustration to make my point.

In the 1860's the Maine Legislature concerned itself with the problem of inducing settlements in the unpeopled townships of the State. A commission was created to study the problem. As a result of its work, an agent was sent to Sweden, with instructions to make vigorous efforts to establish a Swedish colony in Maine. Within 10 weeks he had brought to Maine 22 men, 11 women, and 18 children—including a pastor, farmers, a civil engineer, a blacksmith, 2 carpenters, a basketmaker, a baker, a tailor, and a shoemaker. They carved a home out of the wilderness of northern Maine. New immigrants followed. Within 5 years the population had increased to 600 who had built a properous community of 130 houses, barns, 2 steam sawmills, 1 water power sawmill and the incidental business establishments. At the end of 5 years, 133 men applied for citizenship.

Mr. G. A. Hedlund wrote to the Governor of Maine, as follows:

"May the young colony of New Sweden grow and flourish, not only in material strength, but even in developing their moral and intellectual faculties. And may the new population thus add to your State and to your great Republic a good and healthy element of moral power from the old world, and, becoming imbued with the spirit of your free institutions, reflect that spirit on their native land.

"What we have lost at present in the old fatherland, will then not have been lost to humanity: On the contrary, the trees have only been transplanted on a fresher soil, where they will thrive better, and give richer and more abundant fruits. God bless the harvest. God bless your land."

We have, in this simple story, an illustration of two important points:

1. The fact that new blood, new energies, and the qualities of character and mind which these people bring to us are an immeasurable contribution to our greater growth. Our culture, our economy, and our defense have been strengthened by the contributions which they and their sons and daughters have made to our way of life.

2. The picture of America which was presented to the people of Sweden by Maine's agent, the warm and cordial reception given to the immigrants, created a storehouse of good will in the old country which could not be bought in any other way.

In this day when we are selling the product which is America in a market where there is fierce competition, we must preserve the purity and quality of what we offer. To insure that we do, we can and should welcome those from every land who, on the basis of their own merit, demonstrate their qualifications. There is always room for a good man in a dynamic, growing, fearless America. The total numbers admitted should be geared to our needs. There should be safeguards designed to exclude undesirables. But let the standards be consistent with the principles which were so unhesitatingly embraced by the Founding Fathers.

I have intentionally avoided the complexities and technical details of legislation in this field. We should first concern ourselves with what is right and what is wrong. Then, having established the principles which should govern our decisions, and holding unwaveringly to them, we can quite readily spell out the corrective legislation which is needed.

We should, most certainly, give attention to the following:

1. A unified, single quota divorced from all considerations of national origin.

2. The granting of asylum to those suffering from political, religious, and economic persecution.

3. The attracting of those whose skills, aptitudes, knowledge, and experience may be necessary or desirable for the national welfare.

4. The necessity for relieving population pressures which create tensions and unrest anywhere in the free world.

These are realistic standards. They are humane standards.

President Kennedy, long a vigorous exponent of more equitable immigration laws, has endorsed the principle of reform, as has former President Eisenhower. And there seems to be widespread support for reform in the House. Thus, the prospects at this time must be rated as favorable.

But the battle is far from over, and it would be the worst folly for us to relax our efforts now. Rather we must continue and even expand our efforts to achieve wider public understanding in an attempt to insure ultimate success; for that success will be largely dependent upon public understanding of this problem.

I do not believe that America has reached its peak, politically, economically, or culturally. I do not believe that our efforts should be directed only toward consolidating what we have. The world is expanding in every dimension and I believe the United States should be and will be in the forefront of that expansion.

Into American hands has been passed the burden of carrying, for all humanity, the torch of liberty in these perilous times. As long as men remain enslaved, as long as children remain hungry, America's destiny will remain unfulfilled.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S MESSAGE TO THE AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION CONFERENCE, PLAZA HOTEL, NEW YORK, APRIL 19, 1963

I am pleased to extend through Senator MUSKIE my best wishes for the success of this year's annual meeting of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference. I also wish to take advantage of this opportunity to express my appreciation of the continuing role which the American voluntary agencies play in the relief of refugees and other distressed persons throughout the world. I am also aware of the part you play in bringing to the attention of the public the needs in the field of immigration and naturalization. We are now engaged in an intensive search for legislative formula designed to serve our national interests and our role as leader of the free world.

We welcome the cooperation of your member agencies in our efforts.

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States.

INTERROGATION OF CABINET MEMBERS BY CONGRESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, last Sunday the Washington Post published an excellent editorial in which it approved the proposal to allow Cabinet members to report and be questioned on the floor of the Senate.

This proposal, which I introduced last month as Senate Resolution 120, would provide regular periods when Cabinet members and heads of agencies could report to the entire Senate, and, in turn, be questioned about their policies by us.

The editorial in the Washington Post gives many very good reasons why this procedure would be a valuable innovation in the Senate. I think there is another extremely important reason why we should adopt a procedure of this type.

Since members of the executive department communicate with the Senate by means of committee hearings, it now frequently happens that a Cabinet member is successful in getting his viewpoint across to members of one committee, but not the Senate as a whole. The opposite is also sometimes true—the Cabinet member does not know the feelings of the Senate as a whole, but only the members of the committee that he has faced.

The question period would open up a simple and direct new avenue of communication between the Senate and the executive branch of our Government. In the process, it would give the Senate a fresh new initiative in governmental affairs, and would demonstrate the flexibility of Congress as an institution to meet changing needs and conditions.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the Washington Post editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTION TIME

Senator KEFAUVER has revived an old proposal in suggesting that Congress set aside at least a 2-hour period once a month for questioning Cabinet members and other administration officials. We thought this a sound and useful idea when Mr. KEFAUVER put it forward as a Member of the House 15 years ago. It is all the more relevant today when the procedures of Congress have become a major political issue.

In Great Britain, of course, the question period is an established custom. Cabinet members must regularly face the House of Commons and answer probing questions from the opposition back bench as well as from members of their own party. The device has been found invaluable as a means for giving the public an insight into government thinking—and in giving Cabinet officials an insight into legislative anxieties.

To be sure, Cabinet members sit in the British Parliament while in America the separation of powers imposes an entirely different relationship between Congress and the White House. It is precisely this difference that makes Mr. KEFAUVER's proposal all the more pertinent. Too often, there is a chasm on Pennsylvania Avenue that is only imperfectly bridged by administration testimony before individual committees. A question period involving the entire Congress could give the executive a systematic and consistent opportunity to disclose its thinking before a forum where maximum publicity would be assured.

One does not have to look for foreign precedents. During the First Congress, the record contains 14 references to executive officials appearing before the Senate. The framers of the Constitution clearly anticipated that same form of regular interchange would develop between legislative and executive. But due in part to President

Washington's painful personal experience in meeting with an equally nervous Senate, the custom withered. In a time when government is vastly more complex, an old institution could well be given a second chance.

REFORM OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM OF ELECTING THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Washington Daily News ran an excellent editorial on Monday, April 8, 1963, regarding the continued efforts in the Senate to reform the electoral college system of electing the President.

The caption of the editorial was "Try, and Try Again," and it pointed out that, although various reform proposals have come before the Senate over a period of many years, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments is still actively working to achieve electoral college reform.

Those of us who have been working to reform the present archaic system have been encouraged by recent developments that have emphasized the need for reform.

Last month the Supreme Court of the United States struck down a kind of little electoral college when it held that the Georgia unit vote system violated the one person one vote conception of political equality established by the 15th, 17th, and 19th amendments to the Constitution.

This prompted many citizens to ask themselves: "Doesn't the national electoral college system violate the same principle?"

I think it does, and I think there are many other undesirable features of the present system that should be changed.

The editorial in the Daily News gives an excellent summary of many of the reasons why we should eliminate the present horse-and-buggy electoral college, and should adopt a more equitable method of electing our Presidents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of this editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRY, AND TRY AGAIN

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, is going to make another attempt to persuade Congress that the system by which we elect Presidents has outlived its usefulness.

The subcommittee will begin hearings April 9 on a half-dozen varying proposals to amend the Constitution so that presidential elections are decided more nearly on the basis of the way the people actually vote.

Senator KEFAUVER's own proposal would split each State's electoral vote in direct proportion to the popular vote. Another plan would apportion electoral votes by congressional districts, etc.

As it is, and has been since the beginning, the people do not choose a President directly. They choose members of the horse-and-buggy electoral college who then decide who shall go to the White House.

The chief evil of this system is that all of any State's electoral votes go to one candidate, even if he managed to carry the State by as little as a single vote. It has happened, and it easily could happen again, that the candidate who was the popular choice did not win the election.

This is contrary to the whole theory of our Government. The President and Vice President are the only public officials in the country who are not elected by direct vote of the people. The members of the electoral college normally cast their ballots for the candidate who carried their State—but they are under no legal requirement to do so. They can, and occasionally one has, vote for anybody, including persons who were not even candidates.

The electoral college gives a disproportionate voice to minorities. It is cumbersome, unnecessary and risky. It serves no useful purpose and it could frustrate the will of the voters.

Under Supreme Court rulings, steps are underway to give the voters in the States fairer representation in their legislatures. The Court only recently threw out an electoral college-like system for electing State officials in Georgia. But the Court can't undo the electoral college system. It's in the Constitution.

We think if the people had the option, they speedily would abolish this system. The initiative for a constitutional amendment necessarily lies with Congress. We hope Senator KEFAUVER and others who agree with him can push the amendment through this session of Congress.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

RESOLUTION OF TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution designated "H.S.R. 247," adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas on April 9, 1963. The vote on this resolution was 124 yeas to 17 nays. The substance of this measure is a condemnation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act which was enacted by the Congress on September 8, 1961.

This act by the house of representatives of my State reflects the attitude of Texans specifically and I believe also the consensus of American thinking in general. Our apparent frantic search for disarmament formulas gives the impression that we are weak and frightened.

Mr. President, several weeks ago I cosponsored a measure offered by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] calling for modifications in Public Law 87-297 which created an agency known as the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This resolution calls for:

First. Complete on-the-spot inspection of all areas involved in arms control or disarmament agreements with Members of Congress included as members of the inspection team.

Second. Reporting of the President of the United States to appropriate committees of Congress, of any and all steps taken by him which would tend to alter existing ratios of weapons and the effectiveness between this Nation and its allies, and the Soviet bloc of nations.

Third. All preliminary and final arms control or disarmament agreements be embodied in treaties subject to the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, it would seem to me that this session of Congress could take no more important action than to act upon this resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.S.R. 247

Whereas the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, created by act of Congress in September 1961, has supported and promoted the U.S. program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, which could result in complete disarmament in the United States in less than 10 years; and

Whereas history has taught us that peace is only achieved when a free people stays militarily strong; and

Whereas Khrushchev has sworn he will bury us, but he intends to bury our freedom, take our children, and place us in slavery; and

Whereas personal freedoms and economic security can be enjoyed only by those who possess the power to protect their citizens against the invasions of other systems of government; and

Whereas an understanding of the disarmament policy of our administration, Congress, and the State Department is the most crucial issue facing our citizens today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, That the house of representatives of the 58th legislature wishes to go on record in opposition to the disarmament policy of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; provided that the Congress of the United States is notified that, irrespective of Federal action, the sovereign State of Texas will never release her State military forces to any international organization, but will forever retain her right under the Constitution of this Republic and State to keep a militia for the protection of her citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and sent to members of the Texas delegation in the National Congress and to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON as an indication of the views of this house concerning our present disarmament policy as proposed by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

BYRON TUNNELL,
Speaker of the House.
DOROTHY HALLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXXIII—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] may be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 120, to amend rule XXXIII to provide for a report and question period which was submitted by me on April 8, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 45 PERTAINING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce that hearings will be held on May 13 and 14 on Senate Joint Resolution 45, a joint resolution which would amend the Constitution of the United States to provide that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex.

The hearings will begin at 2 p.m., on May 13 in room 457 of the Old Senate Office Building. On May 14 the hearings will commence at 10:30 a.m.

Any person who wishes to appear and testify on Senate Joint Resolution 45 is requested to notify the subcommittee by contacting Mr. Fred Graham, chief counsel, room 141, Old Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 5581.

RECESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 25, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 24, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Adm. Jerauld Wright, U.S. Navy, retired, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Anthony Reid Adams
John David Adams
Leo David Allen
Nicholas Heath Allen
David Lewis Andrews
Kent McFarlane Ballantyne
Robert Grandal Bates
William Marshall Baxley
William Douglas Bechtel
Roger LeRoy Beving
Denis Jack Bluett
James Dennis Boyce
Dennis James Brady
David Charles Brostrom
George Herbert Brown III
George Jack Buffleben, Jr.
Robert William Burchell
Michael Burdian
Peter Conrad Busick
Raymond Harold Canada, Jr.
William Albert Caster
Kevin Timothy Clancy
David Joseph Connolly
Ernst Michael Cummings
Edward Earl DeMuzzio
Richard Lee Da Vries
James Fonda Dewey
Robert Peter Dickenson
Andrew Franklin Durkee, Jr.
Kurt Louis Elste
Robert Emmett Fenton
Thomas Daniel Fisher
James Wilson Fry, Jr.
Forrest Fred Furaus, Jr.
Howard Bernard Gehring
Gill Reves Goodman
John William Greason
Michael Edward Greene
Charles Everett Haas
James Campbell Haldeman
Jeffrey Dean Hartman
Roger William Hassard
Ray Albert Heller
Richard James Heym
Wayne Kenneth Hodsden
Joseph Henry Hughes III
Michael Joseph Jacobs
Arthur Elliot Katz
Nelson Herbert Keeler, Jr.
Virgil Francis Keith, Jr.
Nelson Wayne Koscheski, Jr.
Robert LeRoy Kuhnle
James John Lantry
Robert Edward Leggett
John Edward Lindak
Ronald Otis MacFee
David Terrence Machamer
Robert Allen Major
James Francis McCahill, Jr.
Karl Warren Mirmak
Carl Richard Mockler
William Albert Monson
Charles Bernard Mosher
Jerome Pierce Mullins
James Aloysius Murray, Jr.
Dan Allen Nauman
Harry Donald Nelson
Philip Randall North
Harvey Francis Orr
Rudy Kahl Peschel
Paul David Pierce
Robert Matthew Pochman
Stephen Joseph Ratey, Jr.
Karl Lawrence Reichelt
Billy Wayne Richardson
Arthur Bishop Shepard
Daniel Kane Shorey
Jan Forrest Smith
Warren Dean Snider
John Joseph Soltys
Dana Wellman Starkweather
Michael Peter Studley
Harry Toshiyuki Suzuki
Barham Foster Thomson III
Murray John Towle
Stephen Terry Ulmer
Robert Lawrence Vence, Jr.
William Burns Waff
Richard Andrew Walsh
James LeRoy Webster
Gerald Francis Woolever
John Richard Yetke, Jr.
David Allen Young
David Reynolds Zwick

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 24, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Frank Udoff, of Maryland, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Maryland for a term of 4 years.

Paul G. April, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Hampshire for the term of 4 years.

Louis M. Janelle, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Hampshire for the term of 4 years.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Roger Hilsman, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad.

UNITED NATIONS

Edwin M. Martin, of Ohio, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Latin America of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 18th plenary session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

David Elliott Bell, of Massachusetts, to be Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement before the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Tuesday, April 23, 1963, in opposition to H.R. 3669 and companion bills. My statement follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 3669 AND COMPANION BILLS (QUALITY STABILIZATION) APRIL 23, 1963

H.R. 3669 is the latest version of that hardy perennial, a national fair trade bill, to permit, indeed encourage, retail price fixing.

Concealed as usual behind a fog of euphemisms, this consumer price increase bill is presented to you in this session, as in the last session, dressed up in the seductive sheep's clothing of a quality stabilization bill. Last year's "quality stabilization" price-fixing bills contained a large economy size preamble of unfair trade practices the bills purportedly would have prevented. At that time I suggested that the length of the preamble gave rise to the inference that a black and white animal resided in the bill.

This year there is no such covert attempt to conceal the price-fixing purpose of this obnoxious legislation. Nevertheless a small dose of Chanel No. 5 has been applied to this black and white animal by euphemistically dubbing it a Quality Stabilization Act.

When a cat would eat her kittens, she calls them mice.

H.R. 3669 is as drastic a fair trade price-fixing bill as has ever been proposed.

Before pointing out its particular features, which are the bases of this assertion, I propose to deal with the main thrust of the bill.

I. IN THEORY AND PRACTICE THESE BILLS ARE AGAINST THE PUBLIC INTEREST

I have long been an opponent of the system of price fixing that is permitted by the so-called fair trade laws. Such price fixing flies in the face of our antitrust laws and the free competitive system which the antitrust laws are designed to protect. This bill would gouge out a large hole in our antitrust laws.

Fair trade was spawned by wholesale and retail merchant associations, primarily the National Association of Retail Druggists, to permit vertical price fixing in the depression days, when the Federal Government was sanctioning horizontal price fixing by manufacturers through NRA. A powerful lobby was able to pressure 45 States into accepting the NARD's draft of a fair trade bill. Although manufacturers were comparatively inactive in this early effort, the rallying slogan then as now was "protection of the manufacturers' trade name or trademark." Somehow all trade names and trademarks were elevated to Cadillac significance, subject to being sullied by association with anything but an artificially high price.

A. Detriment to the consumer

The history of the last two decades has demonstrated that fair trade laws work to the detriment of both the consumer and the small businessmen purportedly protected by them. Most impartial commentators have condemned them. In some 24 States the courts have invalidated fair trade acts, or at least their nonsigner provisions. In an appendix to this statement I have attached excerpts from the opinions of a number of such courts. Some of the sponsors of these quality stabilization bills, I note, come from States where fair trade laws have been invalidated in whole or in part. These bills would impose a Federal fair trade law even on those States where fair trade has been rejected.

The principal evil that results from fair trade—the maintenance of artificially high consumer prices—has been exposed in State after State. After the Supreme Court of Ohio ruled the nonsigner clause unconstitutional, for example, prices on automatic coffeemakers quickly dropper from the $39.95 fair trade price to a $29.97 competitive price. Electric frying pans, which had a list price of $19.95 were reduced to $13.87. After an initial flurry of reduced price sales, in Ohio as in the case of other States that outlawed fair trade, the market soon became stable. The dire consequences that had been predicted by the fair traders—widespread business failures, increased concentration, and predatory excesses by monopolists—did not occur. The only result was that the consuming public received the benefit of having prices settle in the competitive market at about 20 percent lower than the former fair trade prices.

The Department of Justice in the past has presented to Congress several surveys which have demonstrated how much more the consumer must pay in fair trade States than in nonfair trade States.

In 1952, when the McGuire Act was being considered, I conducted a survey and brought into the House of Representatives three baskets. I had purchased 11 identical articles in 3 different Peoples Drug Stores. I purchased one basket in the District of Columbia, where there was no fair trade. I purchased the same articles in Bethesda, Md., where there was fair trade. I purchased another basketful in Arlington, Va., where there was fair trade, and compared the prices that I paid for these identical articles. On no item did I pay less than 10 percent more in a fair trade State than in the District and on some items I paid as much as 53 percent more. My statement to the House appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 4, pages 4909 and 4910, as follows:

"I purchased 10 cubic centimeters of u. 40 protamine zinc Lilly insulin, used by diabetics. The price in the District of Columbia was 98 cents. The price in Maryland was $1.29. The Maryland price was 32 percent above the District price. In Virginia—in Richmond, for example—the same article, Lilly's insulin, was sold at $1.48. If you can tell me that the public is protected by fair trade, I would like to know why those differences in prices.

"I purchased a BD Yale 26-gage 1-inch hypo needle, used to inject insulin into a sick person's body. In the District of Columbia the price was 15 cents. In Virginia the price was 20 cents—33 percent higher in Virginia. In Maryland the price was 23 cents—53 percent more in Maryland.

"I purchased 100 Bayer aspirin tablets in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. In the District of Columbia the price is 46 cents. What was the price in Virginia? The price was 59 cents. I paid 28 percent more for the same article in Virginia. What was the price in Maryland? Fifty-nine cents. Again I paid 28 percent more for the same article in Maryland.

"I purchased some 12-ounce bottles of Phillips milk of magnesia. Here are the bottles. In the District of Columbia the price was 34 cents. In Virginia it was 14 percent higher, or 39 cents. Similarly, in Maryland it was 14 percent higher, or 39 cents.

"I purchased some large tubes of Ipana toothpaste. See the difference in these purchases. I paid 27 percent more for the Ipana toothpaste in Virginia than I did in the District of Columbia. In the District of Columbia the price was 37 cents. In Virginia the price was 47 cents; and, likewise, in Maryland, it was 47 cents.

"I purchased packages of 20 Gillette blue blades. In the District of Columbia the price was 87 cents, whereas in Virginia I paid 11 percent more, or 98 cents, and also 11 percent more in Maryland, namely, 98 cents."

There were other articles that I purchased and for which, under fair trade, I had to pay 20, 25, and 30 percent more for the identical articles.

I am told, moreover, that in 1960 there were striking differences between fair trade and nonfair trade prices as follows, in the following nonfair trade States:

In Columbia, S.C., a sick person could buy Achromycin V capsules and Declomycin for $7.20 instead of $7.65; Serpasil for $6.50 instead of $7.50; Orinase for $6.25 instead of $6.75; Coricidin for 75 cents instead of $1.08, and Neo-Synephrine for 65 cents instead of 90 cents.

In Houston, Tex., for example, an invalid could obtain Achromycin V capsules for $6.96 instead of $7.65; and similarly as to Declomycin. Premarin could be bought for $6.73 instead of $8.25; Orinase for $5.25 instead of $6.75; Unicaps for $2.69 instead of $3.11; Theragran for $8.19 instead of $9.45. At the hearings on H.R. 6245 before the Antitrust Subcommittee last year, Senator Kefauver noted that Merck charged the retail druggist $170 for 1,000 Prednisone tablets whereas the fair trade minimum retail price is $255. Senator Kefauver added that Ciba sells 1,000 Serpasil tablets to the druggist for $39.50, while the fair trade minimum is $65.83.[1] The hearings of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee on the drug industry, and of the House Antitrust Subcommittee on H.R. 6245 last year, abound with instances of the astronomical profits of drug manufacturers.[2]

As noted below, these very drug manufacturers would be empowered by this bill to soak the invalid by enforcing artificially inflated retail prices over and above the extortionate prices charged to the retail druggist.

In an appendix to this statement I have listed similar examples in other cities and States, including Miami, Fla.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Lousiville, Ky.; St. Louis, Mo.; Seattle, Wash.; Spokane, Wash.; Huntington, W. Va.; Minneapolis, Minn.; and Cleveland, Ohio. Congressman DINGELL, in his minority report on a similar bill in 1959, adduced many more instances of lower prices where fair trade did not prevail.

In September of last year I engaged in another shopping excursion. What did I find? For 51 cents I was able to buy Coricidin (25's) in the nonfair trade District of Columbia, but I had to pay $1.08 in Maryland (fair trade). I paid $1.77 in the District for 100 Unicaps and $3.11 for the same amount in Maryland. Bayer Aspirin cost me 99 cents in Washington, D.C., and $1.48 in Maryland. I paid 54 cents for Phillips Milk of Magnesia in the District of Columbia and 63 cents in Maryland. The economy size Ipana Toothpaste cost me 60 cents in the District, 69 cents in Maryland; 10 cc u. 40 Protamine Zinc Lilly Insulin cost me 99 cents in the District and $1.48 in Maryland.

Finally, I bought something dear to the heart and gullet of many of us. I purchased a pint of Old Crow (only 86 proof, I may add). In the District it cost me $2.30 (including 7 cents tax); in Maryland, $3.07 (including 9 cents tax).

Thus, the same items which could be bought in the nonfair trade District for $7.20, cost $10.89 in the "fair" trade State of Maryland. This means that if during the year I had paid $70 for these items in the District, in Maryland the cost would have been over $30 more for the same items.

Last year, at hearings on H.R. 6245 before the House Antitrust Subcommittee, there was a great deal of testimony to the adverse effect on ill and elderly persons of the high price of drugs. I think that each of us in Congress should hesitate to add to the burdens of these people by enacting legislation which must have the necessary effect of increasing the price of drugs they buy. How can you justify this legislation to them, if it is passed?

We are told that the consumer need not worry since it is effective only when he can buy goods usable for the same general purpose as the price-fixed item. But this is small comfort indeed when, as most often happens, both items are price fixed. And the Lord only knows to what extent even this vague limitation applies where a price is fixed on several items sold as a package.

These bills will increase prices to the consumer.

B. Detriment to the merchant

And what have these fair trade laws done for the small businessman? They promoted the use by big retailers of their own private brand goods which could be sold for less than the smaller retailers' trade-name goods, purchased from the manufacturers. They favored the inefficient retailer over the efficient retailer. They facilitated the rise of the discount house. They deprived the retailer who wanted to use price as a means to compete with his larger competitors of the right to do so. They made less service and less price an infraction of the law and insured that less service would not be accompanied by less price. They took away any incentive for retailers to urge manufacturers to lower high prices. And now the proponents of these bills, in the name of free enterprise, would impose upon businessmen and the public alike, socialism in the form of federally-supported and enforced price fixing.

---

[1] On Apr. 9, 1963, Senator KEFAUVER, on the floor of the Senate, noted that Ciba, the producer of Serpasil, had a markup of almost 1,500 percent.

[2] While H.R. 3669 would exempt sales of prescription drugs, it would be wholly unrealistic to expect this exemption to survive in view of the sponsorship of this legislation by the NARD. The Senate bill, S. 774, significantly has no such exemption.

Make no mistake, this bill is not only a consumer price increase bill, it is an anti-free enterprise bill. The retailer cannot set a price on what he sells based upon his own efficiency, the cost savings that may be available to him because of self-help, long hours, use of cost savings devices, selling for cash, or what have you. He is instead to become a slave of the manufacturer, and of his competitors, who wish to keep him at their level.

Recently, in the *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Sun Oil Co.*, 371 U.S. 505, the defendant argued (p. 524) that the retailer "is but a 'conduit' for the supplier"—in that case, the Sun Oil Co. The Supreme Court replied (p. 529): "Having consciously chosen not to effect direct distribution through wholly owned and operated stations, Sun cannot now claim for itself the benefits of such a system * * *."

This bill, by giving the big manufacturer carte blanche to engage in vertical price fixing, would indeed confer on the big manufacturer "the benefits of such a system," leaving the burdens to the small retailer who would become a mere "conduit" or "outlet" for his supplier's goods at prices dictated by the supplier. If the retailer should insist on setting his own competitive price, this bill would permit the large supplier to summon the Federal courts to his aid in subjugating the retailer into economic serfdom. I should think small businessmen would be appalled at this prospect.

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania only last month pointed out how "fair" trade laws shackle, if indeed they do not strangle, small businessmen. In *Mead Johnson & Co.* v. *Breggar*, CCH 1963 Trade Cases, pars 70, 721, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court said:

"Price fixing is at its best a drastic curtailment of competitive free enterprise, one of the main pillars of support of the entire American economic structure. At its worst, it can become a straitjacket on initiative in business, resulting in monopoly manacling progress so as to serve a possible conspiratorial status quo.

* * * * *

"The very idea that a commercial entity may hold in one fettering price-fixing grasp all businessmen engaged in vending a certain product, just as a herdsman holds lassoed cattle on the plains, offends against the most elementary concept of a free and independent society. The Fair Trade Act is not only in derogation of the common law, it is in defiance of principles which the Federal Government has on countless occasions enunciated in its antitrust legislation and litigation."

Since references are often made to discount houses at these hearings, a few words on that subject may be in order.

As Mr. Bicks, former head of the Antitrust Division, explained to this committee in 1959, "initially, fair trade gave discounters an unimpeachable nationally advertised price to cut. The buyer could clearly see the savings involved. Beyond that and more important, by attempting to stifle price competition, the fair trade laws created an economic vacuum into which the discount houses rushed." Business writers have also pointed out that:

"Through the fair trade laws * * * and other devices, our legislators and courts have sought, in effect, to bottle up price competition, especially at the retail level. The discount house may be viewed as a manifestation of the explosive pressures which are likely to be generated as a result of an attempt to eliminate price competition in a competitive economy. * * *"[3]

Whatever may be said of discount houses as such, they have curbed inflationary prices and afforded the forgotten man, the consumer, the opportunity of purchasing his needs at lower prices. They have also helped relieve manufacturers of surplus stocks. To those who look askance at discount houses as price cutters, I would point out that price cutting is simply good, old-fashioned free enterprise, so long as it is not predatory. Since when, may I ask, has price competition become "unethical"? Most new types of retailing, including the department store, the mail order firm, and the supermarket, have started as price cutters. Therein lies their appeal to the public. The widespread popularity of discount houses, supermarkets, and department stores today shows that the public—your constituents and mine—is vitally interested in the savings to be achieved through price competition.

Last year, the National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealer's Association went on record as favoring this legislation. It is interesting to observe, therefore, a statement made by the president of that association in 1956:

"The discount houses * * * came into being as a counterbalance to distorted retail margins. These margins weren't distorted until we came into volume retailing. The discount house was a natural development, and when you hear a dealer talking about his 'rights' he's on his way out—because he hasn't any rights."

And how did the small businessman accept this "fair" trade "bonanza"? Well, many fought it and are continuing to fight it. Thus Mead Johnson & Co., in a 3-month period in 1961, brought over 100 fair trade suits. These small businessmen wanted, presumably they still want, to sell at a price which leaves them with a profit and also leaves the consumer with more money to make additional purchases. Parke, Davis not long ago sent out more than 200 warning letters in the New York area and started 123 suits. Yet in a recent case it was shown that in at least 100 instances 89 retailers had refused to be bound by Parke, Davis' "fair" trade prices.

Out of this natural desire to compete has spouted a veritable torrent of litigation. One has to go back to prohibition days for a comparable number of lawsuits brought to enforce legislation so justly unpopular. To greatly augmented legal staffs of the large manufacturers engaged in policing their resale prices, there have been added commercial spies euphemistically called "professional shoppers."[4] And the cost of all this is borne, as always, by the consumer. Thus, in 1955, one company is reported to have announced it would spend $750,000 to enforce fair trade in just one of its departments. Sunbeam is reputed to have spent $1 million a year for such purpose.

And who have been the primary instigators of fair trade lawsuits? They have been drug manufacturers recently shown in the hearings of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and of the House Antitrust Subcommittee to have garnered extortionate profits in many instances. As Senator KEFAUVER pointed out the other day, "In the ethical drug industry, the rate of return on investment, after taxes, is higher than that of any other industry. Since 1957 it has averaged around 20 percent as compared with 10 percent for all manufacturing. The net profit on sales has also averaged about double that for all manufacturing."[5]

Nevertheless, we find Parke, Davis & Co., suing a drugstore in New York City because a professional shopper purchased MYADEC vitamin capsules for $5.75 whereas the fair trade price was $9.67, and ABDEC vitamin preparation drops for $2.65 whereas the fair trade price was $3.51. Parke, Davis & Co. in 1958 had a 16-percent net profit on drug sales.[6] This case illustrates the consumer loss by fair trade, the harassment of small business under fair trade, and the unconscionable profiteering which fair trade protects.

The fair trade cases in which an opinion is published are collated in the annual volumes of the Trade Cases series of the Commerce Clearing House. I had my staff review the fair trade cases in the bound volumes of that series covering 1960 through 1962. In most such cases the fair trade violator, by any test, would be considered a small businessman. To mention some of them:

California, John F. Walker, a liquor dealer.

Illinois, Topps of Niles, Inc. and Darby Sales Co.

Minnesota, Playtime Sporting Goods, Inc.

New Hampshire, Max Dichter Company, Inc., operating a retail store in Manchester, N.H. and Man-Bur Sales Inc., operating the hardware department in the store.

Louisiana, Robinson Wholesale Co., a partnership composed of Robinson, his wife and brother-in-law. Among those alleged to have sold Bulova watches at less than fair trade prices were Daniels Jewelry Store, Davidsons Furniture Store, and Sales Jewelry Store.

Ohio, Norwood Vitamin & Cosmetic Distributors. Inc.

New York, Janel Sales Corp., Berner's Pharmacy Corp., Mr. Less, Mr. Falleta, the Courtesy Drug Store in Hicksville, N.Y.

Pennsylvania, Wright Motor Sales Co., a gasoline dealer and Mr. Kostak, another gasoline dealer.

Proponents of the bill assert that the retailer who wants to set his own prices is free to do so by turning to the products of a nonprice fixer. But the very purpose of this bill is to promote price fixing on the part of national advertisers, and the realities of business practice make it impossible for a retailer to shift readily from a nationally advertised fair trade product to a nonnationally advertised nonfair trade product. Moreover, this bill will prevent price competition by grocers, hardware store owners, or druggists who must, as a practical matter, carry a wide selection of similar goods of different manufacture.

Proponents of this kind of legislation shift from arguing that it is necessary to protect the brand name of the manufacturer to urging that it is necessary to keep the retailer in business. The short answer to the first claim is that many brand names continue to be held in high repute despite the absence of any attempt to use resale price maintenance for such purposes. The shorter answer to the second is that the retailer in fair trade States has not been shown to have fared any better than the retailer in the nonfair trade States.

---

[3] Alexander and Hill, "What To Do About Discount Houses," Harvard Business Review, 1955.

[4] Compare Wall Street Journal, March 21, 1963, p. 2: "'We have shoppers shopping all our dealers to see if they are selling below the agreed limit,' says one distributor." See also *Mead Johnson & Co.* v. *G-E-X Inc.* of Albany (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Albany County) 1963 Trade Cases, Para. 70,688: "The evidence clearly shows frequent inspection by representatives of plaintiff of the stores of retailers to ascertain if its minimum prices are maintained; if a violation is found it is promptly reported to higher authority of plaintiff, which sends letters to the offenders, to cease and desist; if such letters do not produce compliance, the matter is referred to local counsel, who employ a private detective agency to shop the offending retailer's store, and if the violation is found to be continuing, actions for injunctions are promptly instituted."

[5] 109 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5614 (Apr. 9, 1963).

[6] Last year this company announced it was no longer going to limit its sales to those observing its suggested prices. The president of Parke, Davis & Co. stated that the company's products would be placed on sale where people were buying them.

There has been a great deal of loose talk about how the loss of fair trade protection would cause the failure of countless businessmen.

Let us examine the failure rate per 10,000 concerns in States without fair trade acts:

	Failures [1]			Merchants' bankruptcies [2]	
	1957	1958	1959	1961	1962
Missouri	18.6	26.9	23.6	87	69
Texas	32.2	29.8	28.5	119	115
Vermont	19.0	23.0	20.1	11	16
District of Columbia	41.8	32.6	30.2	13	16

[1] Final report of House Select Committee on Small Business, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 17.

[2] Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Tables of Bankruptcy Statistics, June 30, 1961, table F-3, and June 30, 1962, able F-3.

Now, let us take some comparable "fair trade" States:

	Failures [1]			Merchants' bankruptcies [2]	
	1957	1958	1959	1961	1962
Illinois	37.3	42.6	45.6	120	306
Maryland	44.6	56.7	41.0	18	18
New Jersey	59.9	81.9	67.5	179	169
New Hampshire	27.6	27.2	23.6	12	7
Wisconsin	37.3	55.0	51.9	139	159
California	123.9	118.9	112.5	286	219
Massachusetts	34.9	42.9	41.5	57	60
New York	111.4	129.3	127.8	424	451
Pennsylvania	43.5	48.1	43.4	307	262

[1] Final report of House Select Committee on Small Business, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 17.

[2] Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Tables of Bankruptcy Statistics, June 30, 1961, table F-3, and June 30, 1962, table F-3.

Now, let us see the situation in some of the States which had the whole, or the nonsigner provision, of their "fair trade" law invalidated, 1956-58:

	Failures [1]			Merchants' bankruptcies [2]	
	1957	1958	1959	1961	1962
Colorado (1956)	45.6	20.7	32.8	142	145
Indiana (1957)	20.0	27.0	22.6	42	38
Kansas (1958)	28.2	26.8	20.6	39	41
Kentucky (1958)	13.4	19.9	14.8	54	46
New Mexico (1957)	14.6	8.4	5.1	15	17
Oregon (1956)	198.0	201.5	175.3	51	91
South Carolina (1957)	40.0	44.3	47.4	14	11
West Virginia (1958)	26.5	26.3	35.7	20	23

[1] Final report of House Select Committee on Small Business, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 17.

[2] Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Tables of Bankruptcy Statistics, June 30, 1961, table F-3, and June 30, 1962, table F-3.

These figures demonstrate, I believe, that there is no visible relation between the survival of small business and fair trade resale price fixing.

Many retail associations, I am sure, will register in support of this bill. They have been pressured to do so repeatedly by the powerful, untiring National Association of Retail Druggists whose representatives are also much in evidence on Capitol Hill. In almost every instance, I believe, these retail associations have been subjected to a one-sided argument in favor of such bills. I think it highly significant, therefore, that a poll by the National Federation of Independent Business last year, in which arguments both pro and con were summarized, showed a slight majority opposed to those bills.

I am encouraged to note, moreover, that not only have consumer organizations opposed the counterpart of this bill at hearings last year, but also retailers, retail associations, and wholesale associations.

It has been contended by some of the supporters of this bill that it would not really restrict the retailer because he is free to take off the trademark and sell the unmarked goods at such prices as he pleases. This is a fallacious argument. What does the retailer have left when he tears off the covering on a tin can? If the trade name is imbedded in metal or glass is he supposed to use a blowtorch? If the price he pays includes the goodwill of a trade name, must he throw away that value?

I would point out to retailers subjected to the propaganda barrage of the proponents of these bills that if legislation of this sort is enacted, they will have given to the manufacturer the right to fix their profit margins, and the greater the demand for a fair traded product, the more likely that the margin will be narrow. To quote from the testimony of a representative of the National Oil Jobbers Council, in reply to a question by Chairman MONRONEY of the Special Subcommittee on Quality Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Commerce last year:

"Do you know what happened to us in Pennsylvania when they tried fair trading up there? They cut the jobber's margin, gross margin, in a normal market, one-half cent per gallon. One-half cent doesn't sound much to you gentlemen, but one-half cent a gallon is the difference between a profit and going out of business. That is a specific instance."

C. *What the farmer thinks*

Last year I received a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation commenting upon H.R. 6245, a bill before the House Antitrust Subcommittee. Pertinent to this hearing are the following passages from that letter:

"Since 1947-49 wholesale prices of drugs and pharmaceuticals as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, have declined 8 percent. This has occurred during a period in which most wholesale prices increased and in which wages in manufacturing industries increased 80 percent. On the other hand, the retail price of prescriptions and drugs, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, increased 21.5 percent during this same period * * *.

"The divergence of these price trends strongly suggests that primary attention should be directed to the margins between wholesale and retail prices.

"The drug industry has been the major proponent of retail price fixing under the authority of so-called fair trade laws, and the major employer of 'fair trade' pricing programs. We believe that retail price-fixing by manufacturers should be regarded as a harmful restraint of trade, contrary to the public interest.

"We recommend that Federal laws designed to protect State fair trade laws from antitrust attack be repealed. * * *"

D. *High price does not ensure high quality*

This bill assumes that high quality is the handmaiden of high price. On this assumption, low prices are the opium of the people. Under this theory, when the price of gasoline goes down, the quality of gasoline goes down and our cars rebel; when the price of gasoline goes up, the quality of gasoline goes up and our cars rejoice.

In the dream world of "fair" trade many such a canard passes for reality. To expose this canard—that the highest in price is the best in quality—I have had my staff spot-check Consumers Reports, the publication of Consumers Union, a nationally known testing organization. In one striking instance after another the highest priced product was not the highest in quality.

Testifying last year before the House Antitrust Subcommittee on H.R. 6245, Dr. Martin Cherkasky, director of Montefiore Hospital in New York City, stated: "A series of tests recently conducted by Drug and Therapeutic Information of New York and published in their Medical Letter confirms the unfortunate fact that price and quality often are in no way related."

There is no necessary correlation between quality and price. Indeed, if high quality and high prices were synonymous the magicians of Madison Avenue would be out of work. It has been said:

"In the light of the function of advertising as a creator of value increments of enchantment, it is not surprising to discover, as we have in the consumer testing field, that there is slight if any correlation between the price and quality of many of the branded goods now offered on the market."[7]

E. *This bill is opposed to our current national policy*

Proposed increases in the price of steel products last year and actual price increases in the steel industry this year have been a matter of concern to the Nation and to our Government. Yet the inflationary threat represented by a price increase in one industry, important as the steel industry is, is in no way comparable to the inflationary threat represented by this price-fixing bill which would promote and sanction price fixing—and consequently price increases—throughout all sectors of our economy.

---

[7] Warne, "Advertising and Consumer Behavior," 10 Cartel 82, 85 (July 1960).

At a time when the administration, with widespread support from all over the country, is seeking tax reductions in order to promote an expansion of our economy and to prevent a recession, it would be anomalous, at the same time, to enact legislation which would have the inevitable effect of insuring that the consumer taxpayer would be able to buy less and less with whatever additional funds a tax cut may provide him. The efforts of the administration to stimulate our economy through the natural interplay of a free market would be thwarted by legislation designed to turn our free economy and our free market into a controlled economy and an artificially controlled market.

II. ANALYSIS OF H.R. 3669

A. Elimination of States rights provision

Last year the price-fixing "quality stabilization" bills, as they came out of this committee, contained the following provision:

"Paragraphs (7) to (12) hereof shall apply to all acts and transactions in or affecting commerce which Congress may lawfully regulate except that nothing in such paragraphs shall be construed to permit, directly or indirectly, resale price maintenance in any State where the constitution or laws thereof prohibit such price maintenance."

Traditionally, resale price maintenance has been a matter for each State to decide for itself. One State's meat has been another State's poison. By this amendment this committee recognized two things. One was the fact that many States have rejected resale price maintenance. They want none of it. Second, the amendment recognized that such State policy should be respected.

H.R. 3669, however, contains no such exception. It represents an effort to use Federal supremacy to ram resale price fixing down the throats of the residents of all States whether or not there is a contrary State policy. One could hardly imagine a more ignoble death for States rights than to be buried under Federal price-fixing legislation.

Rejected, in whole or in part, by the courts of some 24 States, and turned down by the legislatures of at least five States—Missouri, Texas, Vermont, Alaska, and the District of Columbia—fair trade is sought through H.R. 3669 to be imposed, nationwide, on unwilling as well as on willing States. Those 29 unwilling States—more than half the States of the Union—which have rejected the sort of fair trade here proposed, would have it willy-nilly.

Worse, our basic national policy of free competition would be subverted into a policy of price fixing. The antitrust laws would be gutted throughout.

B. Price fixing on a grand scale

This bill proposes to override the decisions of the courts which have held that the price fixer may not avail himself of State fair trade laws if he competes on the same level of distribution as the retailer against whom he brings suit. This provision would make it easy to effect large-scale horizontal price-fixing agreements.

This bill would promote the very types of horizontal and vertical price fixing 73 years of antitrust legislation by Congress was designed to prevent. The businessmen who could not agree to fix prices or agree to have one of them fix prices for all, may do so under this bill simply by arranging for the trademark owner to send them a convenient price-fixing notice.

It is no coincidence, I believe, that some of the most ardent supporters of fair trade have been involved in price-fixing violations under the antitrust laws. I might add that in a number of antitrust cases, the courts have found that fair trade has been used as a means for carrying on a price-fixing conspiracy.

In many of our basic industries "administered pricing" and "price leadership" have largely eliminated price competition. This legislation bids fair to abolish price competition altogether by authorizing, indeed encouraging, horizontal and vertical price fixing. Even in those areas where price competition still persists, this bill would countenance its abolishment. What lipservice then could the proponents of this bill pay at their annual conventions to our vaunted free enterprise system which has served this great Republic so well since its foundation? I would suggest that the proponents of this bill should practice what they so piously preach. Let them compete in a free market rather than destroy it.

If the Congress is now to abolish price competition by Federal fiat, let it at least be candid about it, without resorting to hypocritical phrases about "quality stabilization."

As the Supreme Court of Oregon has noted:

"In substance, what is the real purpose of the Fair Trade Act? Regardless of how its true nature may be camouflaged by high sounding terms such as 'free and open competition,' 'unfair competition,' 'protection of good will,' etc., it is a matter of common knowledge that it is a price-fixing statute designed principally to destroy competition at the retail level. Protection of the 'goodwill' of the trademark owner is simply an excuse and not a reason for the law. * * *"

The sure losers in any such precipitate flight from free enterprise will be the consumers, the sick, the poor who cannot afford the extortionate prices which fair trade fosters. The working man, too, will be hard hit, he at least may enjoy a measure of protection because so many collective bargaining agreements today are geared to the cost of living. Yet, this in turn, would beget new dangers to the public interest. The creeping inflation which successive administrations, both Republican and Democratic, have been trying to rein in since World War II, would break into a gallop if this pernicious bill should become law.

C. Vendor's power after sale

This bill's reservation of property rights, even after a resale, would replace modern principles of law by the precepts of the middle ages. No principle and policy of the common law has been more widely and uniformly accepted and approved by courts and legislatures, by commentators and by the people than the rule against restraints on the alienation of property. This is true of goods as well as of real estate. More than 50 years ago the Supreme Court in the celebrated Dr. Miles case held that the seller of a trade name product could not fix its resale price. The product in question, I might note, was a drug. Concern for the trader and for the consumer, under our competitive free enterprise system, has denied any such reserved "right" to the patent and copyright holder. Is a "trade name" now to be deemed of such greater significance as to override this traditional concern, or is the next step to propose price-fixing powers for patentees and copyrightees?

Mr. Lowell Mason, a former member of the Federal Trade Commission, testifying in support of a similar bill pending in the Senate last year, made the frank admission that the aim is to reverse a number of Supreme Court decisions and restore the old Colgate doctrine in all its vigor, namely, to deprive the retailer of supplies if he uses his own judgment in determining the price to sell to the consumer. To me it is quite strange to find Mr. Mason, on the one hand, supporting these bills in the name of private property rights, and on the other hand, arguing that a person who has paid for an article should have something much less than private property rights.

This bill gives the owner of a brand name the right to compel a reseller to sell at a price or within a price range determined by the brand name owner. Apparently there is no limitation upon the power of the owner to make as many price changes as he desires. The reseller is a puppet subject to the pull of a remote string puller.

The reseller who sells at a price he thinks is fair is subject to having his right to resell the product revoked, no matter how much good will he has developed regarding the product by his own efforts. If he persists in selling at a fair price he is subject to a suit for damages, injunctive relief, attorneys' fees, and the costs of suit.

The deterrent imposed under the antitrust laws against the collusive price fixer is now to be imposed against the independent retailer who may mistakenly believe in free enterprise.

This bill also grants a right of revocation where misrepresentation has been used in the resale of goods.

The Federal Trade Commission has been attacking deceptive merchandising practices, with ever increasing vigor. Furthermore, there can be few States indeed which do not have their own laws dealing with deceptive practices.

H.R. 3669 would utterly confuse adequate, existing Federal and State laws dealing with unfair trade practices by superimposing upon them a loosely worded, probably preemptive, Federal law.

The bill provides that "Each such currently established resale price and resale price range shall be uniform at each level of distribution within each marketing area determined by the owner of the brand, name, or trademark." (Par. 14.)

The above quoted provision appears to give the brand owner the right to determine what is the "marketing area" for the purpose of having uniform prices. Apparently, at his will, it may be small or large. It is not clear whether the trademark owner is limited to including in such marketing area only an area in the United States.

D. Bait merchandising

Section "(8)" of the bill gives the trade name owner the right to prevent a retailer from selling the trade named article, if it is used "in furtherance of bait merchandising." This might give the trade name owner the power, even without a price-fixing provision, to prevent the retailer from having a "special" on an item in order to draw people to his store in the hope they might buy something else as well. This would be so even if the "special" price was one on which the retailer made a profit.

The bill does not define bait merchandising practices, and thus invites litigation as to the meaning of this term. It might include any unusual advertising device.

Those States which have seen fit to prohibit or limit "bait advertising,"—like my own State of New York—have devised appropriate remedies. Other States have not chosen to do so. Both those States which have acted in their own ways, and those which have not, would now have this amorphous, probably preemptive, provision thrust upon them.

E. Enforcement

The proposed statute would be applicable to "all acts and transactions in or affecting commerce which Congress may lawfully regulate." The rights given under the bill are also available to owners of a brand, name, or trademark, competing at any level of distribution, with the reseller.

The bill expressly provides that such suits may be brought in a Federal district court, without regard to the amount in controversy.

As Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am sorely troubled by this provision which would engulf our already congested Federal courts in a torrent of penny ante price-fixing enforcement cases. I understand the American Bar Association is also dismayed at this prospect.

Furthermore, H.R. 3669 provides that "no action pursuant hereto shall preclude remedial action otherwise available for wrongful use of a brand, name, or trademark" (par. "(12)").

Thus, this bill, aside from the fault of its basic premise that from price fixing all blessings flow, creates a Mycenaean maze for businessmen, lawyers, and judges.

While creating a compulsory national fair trade law, it also seeks to preserve State fair trade laws. The merchant who sells below the price fixed by the manufacturer may find himself sued in a Federal court on one ground and in a State court on another ground. The courts may be widely separated, even in different States. What may be legal under State law may be illegal under this proposed Federal law and vice versa.

The bill gives a right of action to the consumer against the price fixer for any misrepresentation by the latter as to "size, capacity, quality, condition, model or age." This right of action in the Federal courts exists only if the price fixer is not subject to process "in the courts of the State in which such purchaser acquired such goods." This could readily give rise to extensive small claims litigation in the Federal courts. It also raises troublesome conflicts of law questions since the test seems to be the law where the article is purchased and not the law of the domicile of the purchaser.

F. Exemptions

The bill exempts sales to governments or government agencies. This means that there is to be one standard of business conduct in dealing with Government agencies and another in dealing with the public. Price fixing at the expense of the public is to be permitted—in fact, promoted—but price fixing at the expense of the Government is not sanctioned, and if the cost of a high price to most of us is a lower price to the Government, we may console ourselves by reflecting that such indirect form of taxation has not come about without representation, since it would be embodied in an act of Congress. There are other exceptions which have no logic except that of expediency; namely, avoiding the opposition of organizations capable of strong, organized opposition, while leaving the many unorganized to the not-so-tender mercies of the price fixers.

G. Other provisions

The bill does not say whether knowledge of the required selling price has to be actual or may be constructive. It permits those holding a monopolistic position to price fix resale items, since unlike prior fair trade acts, it protects the price fixer "if there are goods usable for the same general purpose." What that phrase means is anyone's guess but it would seem to be broader than goods of the same general class—the language generally used in State fair trade laws.

As to the right to return of goods by a nonconformer, as provided in this bill, the manufacturer may well find himself astride a Trojan horse, since he can never be sure that he has made a final sale. It is said that in 1954 the Sheaffer Co. spent $400,000 in buying back stocks of its own pens from price-cutting retailers.

III. THIS BILL IS AN ATTACK ON OUR CAPITALISTIC, FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

I think it cannot be gainsaid that a free market is essential to our capitalistic, free enterprise system. And most certainly a free market does not exist when the seller is free but the buyer is not, when the seller determines not only the price which the buyer must pay him but also the price at which the buyer may sell what he has purchased.

The concept of a free market also envisages a market where the consumer is not confronted with a network of price-fixing agreements sanctioned by law.

Increasingly State courts have found fair trade price-fixing laws an affront to those constitutional provisions of their respective States which condemn market control.

Legal rulings, moreover, have not been the primary causes that have led to the abandonment of "fair" trade in many areas. Consumer resistance to high prices, warehouses stocked with unsold merchandise and the relentless pressure of substitute merchandise from competitive distribution channels have been just as important. Fair trade simply doesn't work. The enormous costs involved in comparison shopping, legal fees, and policing fair trade enforcement, alone, have been major causes for its abandonment by many manufacturers.

The background of this bill makes it clear that it is intended to overturn two Supreme Court decisions, one decided in 1911,[8] the other in 1956;[9] two court of appeals decisions,[10] and one New Jersey Supreme Court decision.[11] In addition, as noted last year by the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in reference to a similar bill, such a bill might also overrule the Supreme Court's decision in the Parke, Davis case.[12] I suggest that this alone should give this committee pause before recommending legislation of this sort.

Small wonder that similar bills have been disapproved by the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Commerce. The Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws was opposed to fair trade legislation. Five States have refused to adopt fair trade legislation. In 24 States the courts have outlawed those consumer price increase acts. In August of last year the American Bar Association condemned a similar bill.

I could not hope to put the case against the policy of this bill as eloquently as Congress has already done in the preamble to the Small Business Act, when it said:

"The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition. Only through full and free competition can free markets, free entry into business, and opportunities for the expression and growth of personal initiative and individual judgment be assured. The preservation and expansion of such competition is basic not only to the economic well-being but to the security of this Nation. Such security and well-being cannot be realized unless the actual and potential capacity of small business is encouraged and developed."

There can be no greater erosion of States' rights than this bill; there can be no more all-enveloping attempt to sanction nationwide price-fixing; there could hardly be a more vaguely worded or more unnecessary bill. If you want to have Federal price control, vote for this bill. I earnestly urge that it be rejected.

This bill is a consumer price increase bill. This bill is an antifree enterprise bill. This bill is a bad bill. It should be defeated.

APPENDIX A

Statements from several State court opinions declaring State resale maintenance laws unconstitutional:

1. The Supreme Court of Florida declared:

"As we have stated before, the real effect of the nonsigner clause is anticompetitive price fixing; not the protecting of the goodwill of trade marked products as other courts have held. Goodwill, it has been said, should be determined by the price which the goods can command in a competitive market, and not by the ability of the manufacturer to sell at a pegged retail price which he himself selects. Corey, "Fair Trade Pricing: A Reappraisal," 30 Harv. Bus. Rev. 47, 60. Except in times of economic emergency such inflexible price arrangements which the act sanctions are not in line with our traditional concepts of free competition, which have traditionally been the 'yardstick' for protection of the consuming public. The real vice of the nonsigner clause is the absence of that standard, and the decisions of this court stated herein so hold. * * *" *Miles Laboratories Inc.* v. *Eckerd*, 73 So. 2d 680, 682 (Fla. Sup. Ct. 1954).

2. The Supreme Court of Colorado:

"The general assembly may validate resale price maintenance contracts between contracting parties within constitutional limits but when the effect of the act * * * is to make such price schedule binding upon noncontracting parties, the act is nothing more or less than price fixing by legislative mandate. An unwilling citizen cannot be thus bound.

"Any act of the general assembly which arbitrarily destroys or impairs the right of the individual to the free use and enjoyment of his property, lawfully acquired, and permits the fixing of prices for the benefit of a special group, is opposed to the constitutional concept of a free people and should not be allowed to stand. Legislation of this kind evidences the ability of organized minorities to induce legislation for their special benefit at the expense of the unorganized purchasing masses * * *. We have not yet arrived at the place in America where the many must yield to the few, so that the latter may make ever-increasing profits at the expense of those who still believe in the principle of free and competitive trade and commerce, untrammeled by legislative fiats." *Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp.* v. *Francis*, 134 Colo. 160, 186, 301 P. 2d 139, 152 (Colo. Sup. Ct. 1956).

3. The Court of Appeals in Kentucky (highest State court) held: "This statute, we think, is a legislative invasion of the broad constitutional liberty of the people to acquire and protect their property and engage in free trade.

* * * * *

"What is wrong with a man selling his own property for what he pleases? We think the statute is the antithesis of 'fair trade.' It forces price fixing.

* * * * *

"On balance, the overwhelming public interest and welfare is the right of free people to engage freely in competitive trade in commodities that may not be injurious to the general safety and welfare, such as are within special regulation under a proper exercise of the police power. We agree * * * that the overriding purpose of that statute is to sanction price fixing and that the protection of a brand name or symbol of the producer seems to have been incidental." *General Electric Co.* v. *American Buyers Cooperative* (Ky. Ct. of App. 1958), 316 S.W. 2d 354, 361.

4. The Supreme Court in Minnesota:

"The Unfair Practices Act (sec. 325.04) is designed to protect the public from predatory or below-cost trade practices. On the other hand, under the apparent purpose of protecting the goodwill of the manufacturer of the brand commodity, the nonsigner provision (sec. 325.12), in reality, eliminates competition in price honestly based on differences in selling costs as between merchants whose costs of business may differ as a result of normal and natural competitive practices.

---

[8] *Dr. Miles Medical Co.* v. *Park & Sons Co.*, 220 U.S. 373.

[9] *United States* v. *McKesson & Robbins, Inc.*, 351 U.S. 305.

[10] *Sunbeam Corp.* 1. Wentling, 185 F. 2d 903 (C.A. 3, 1950); *General Electric Co.* v. *Masters Mail Order Co.*, 244 F. 2d 681 (C.A. 2, 1957).

[11] *Gillette Co.* v. *Two Guys from Harrison, Inc.*, CCH Trade Reg. Cases, Par. 70, 223 (N.J. Sup. Ct. 1962).

[12] *United States* v. *Parke, Davis & Co.*, 362 U.S. 29.

* * * * *

"In examining the grant of authority to the trademark owner it must be conceded that he is given the privilege to place the law in effect and to amend or alter it at his will. He may do this without regard to the interest or welfare of nonsigners or the consumer who represents the public. The law does not provide for any standard or condition as to the necessity for the act. It gives to the trademark owner carte blanche authority to make that determination alone. He is not required to consult with anyone. There is no one to review his act.

"In considering the justification for reposing this authority in the trademark owner, the real character and purpose of the Fair Trade Act should be examined. Its obstensible justification is to compel adherence to fixed prices so as to protect against debasement the goodwill of tradename commodities. Although this property right may be constitutionally protected, as witness the old Dearborn decision, an examination of the great number of authorities and the vast literature by way of reviews and reports dealing with the subject compels the conclusion that the real impact of the law is in the area of price fixing. The protection of the property right in trademarks and goodwill attendant to them is of interest to a limited number of persons and constitutes legislation for their exclusive benefit.

* * * * *

"* * * The record in this case contains the testimony of a respected economist to the effect that resale price maintenance under the so-called Fair Trade Act is detrimental both to the consumer and to the economy. He was of the view that the producer of the commodity who invokes the act is usually a member of a monopoly or oligopoly, because if there were numerous producers of a competing commodity few would abide by the pricing practices of one or two. His opinion that the policy of the act makes possible a price monopoly inimical to the public welfare is clearly borne out by the record. There is in force a fair trade contract in respect to Remington shells produced by plaintiff. The major competing shells are manufactured by Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. under the name of 'Winchester.' Olin Mathieson's shells are also fair traded. These two manufacturers control 87 to 90 percent of the production of shells in the United States. It appears from the record that for almost all types of shells produced by each of these manufacturers, in fact for every type which is common to the production of both of them, the price is identical to the penny. This is significant considering that the elaborate price lists of both manufacturers were printed and published 3 days apart. It is apparent the record here establishes that the act, rather than regulating and controlling monopoly power, creates a climate where monopolies may flourish. These views are in accord with the thought of authorities who have written and reported on the subject of retail price maintenance in the past few years." *Remington Arms Co., Inc.* v. *G.E.M. of St. Louis, Inc.* (Minn. Sup. Ct., 1960) Trade Cases 69, 673.

5. The Supreme Court of Arkansas stated:

"It is a generalization, but not an overstatement, to say that the effort to 'fix prices' is made by groups who desire to sell something for more than the sponsoring group believes that the purchasing public would pay for that 'something' without an enforced fixed price. It would seem apparent that the principal objective of minimum price maintenance is the protection of profit margins for retailers and distributors unable or unwilling to meet the pressure of competition." Quoted with approval in *Remington Arms Co., Inc.* v. *Skaggs* (Wash. Sup. Ct., 1959) Trade Cases 69, 520.

APPENDIX B

COMPARISON OF FAIR TRADE AND NONFAIR TRADE PRICES

In Miami, Fla., a sick person could buy Achromycin V Capsules for $6.40 instead of $7.65; Orinase for $5.25 instead of $6.75; Declomycin for $6.40 instead of $7.65; Unicaps for $1.79 instead of $3.11; Coricidin for 97 cents instead of $1.08; J. & J. Baby Powder for 54 cents instead of 59 cents; J. & J. Cotton for 33 cents instead of 39 cents.

In Indianapolis, Ind., the sick could buy Orinase for $6.25 instead of $6.75; Serpasil for $6.50 instead of $7.50; Diuril for $7.65 instead of $9; Unicaps for $2.83 instead of $3.11; Ben-Gay for 79 cents instead of 89 cents; Anacin for 99 cents instead of $1.19. The parent could also obtain J. & J. Baby Oil for 89 cents instead of 98 cents.

In Louisville, Ky., a person could buy Unicaps for $2.39 instead of $3.11, and One-A-Day Multiple for $2.36 instead of $2.94; Coricidin for 79 cents instead of $1.08; Dristan for 63 cents instead of 98 cents; and Orinase for $6.25 instead of $6.75. Colgate Dental Cream could be obtained for 53 cents instead of 69 cents, and J. & J. Baby Powder for 47 cents instead of 59 cents.

Additional examples are found in St. Louis, Mo., where one could buy Serpasil for $6.50 instead of a fair trade price of $7.50; Orinase for $6.50 instead of $6.75; Madribon for $4.35 instead of $4.90; Unicaps for $2.19 instead of $3.11; Poly-vi-sol for $2.49 instead of $3.59; Similac for 89 cents instead of 99 cents; Bayer Aspirin for 49 cents instead of 69 cents; Colgate Dental Cream for 55 cents instead of 69 cents.

In Seattle, Wash., a sick person could buy Declomycin for $7.20 instead of $7.65; Ilosone for $10.60 instead of $11.43; Madribon for $4.79 instead of $4.90; Bufferin for 99 cents rather than $1.23. He could also buy Colgate Dental Cream for 49 cents instead of 69 cents.

In Spokane, Wash., he could buy Unicaps for $10.60 instead of $11.43; Madribon for $7.99 instead of $9.45.

In Huntington, W. Va., the hard hit diabetic miner could buy Orinase for $6.25 instead of $6.75. A sick person could buy Serpasil for $6.75 instead of $7.50; Madribon for $4.50 instead of $4.90.

In Minneapolis, Minn., a sick person could buy Achromycin V capsules and Declomycin for $7.20 instead of $7.65; Orinase for $6.25 instead of $6.75; Chlor-Trimeton Maleate for $4.50 instead of $5.58; Coricidin for 76 cents instead of $1.08 and Absorbine, Jr. for $1.25 instead of $1.45. He could also pay 54 cents for Colgate's Dental Cream instead of 69 cents.

In Cleveland, Ohio, the sick could have the benefit of a price of $5.88 for both Achromycin V capsules and Declomycin instead of a $7.65 price. He could purchase Orinase for $4.99 instead of $6.75. Gantrisin for $3.97 instead of $4.90; Kynex for $2.70 instead of $3.55; Unicaps for $2.51 instead of $3.11; Dristan for 72 cents instead of 98 cents and Ben-Gay for 70 cents instead of 89 cents.

APPENDIX C

PRICE QUALITY COMPARISONS

Frozen shrimp ("raw" breaded): Two brands rated "very good" were less expensive than at least one brand rated as "good," four rated as "fair," and three rated as "poor." Of eight brands of frozen raw peeled shrimp only the cheapest brand received a very good rating.

Upright freezers: The three top-rated brands were comparable in price to most of those tested. Of the four highest priced, none was top rated, one was in the third quality bracket, and one was rated "not acceptable." There was also a considerable price range on identical models.

Kitchen scales: The two best rated were the highest priced.

23-inch TV consoles: Two makes were top rated. One was priced at $350, the other at $279.95. There were at least four other lower rated brands selling for $279.95 or higher.

Steam irons: The six top-rated models ranged from $10.88 to $19.95. The highest priced model, $27.95, was "acceptable" but not top rated.

Seat belts: The price range of seven top-rated models was $10.95 to $14.95. Two models, one at $6.95, the other at $9.95, survived the highest-speed crash test but showed incipient failure. Seven $12.95 and one $14.95 models failed the highest-speed crash test. A number of $12.95 and $10.95 models failed all crash tests.

Tank vacuum cleaners: Of the four rated "very good," three were priced at $89.95 and the fourth at $99.75. Of those rated "good," two were the highest priced, $119.95 and $139.

Portable TV, 19 inch: The highest rated were priced at $199.95 and $209.95. A number of others not so rated were also priced at $199.95.

Transistorized electronic flash units: Of 10 brands tested the only unacceptable one was the highest priced (along with one which was acceptable).

Dehumidifiers: A number of the higher priced brands were not among the top rated.

Suntan preparations: The two top-rated brands were among the lowest priced. Three of the highest priced were among the lowest rated.

Built-in electric ranges: The three top rated were priced $89.95 to $114.95. Many lower rated were higher priced.

Black and white film: The two brands rated "very good" and three rated "good" were identically priced.

Representative Blatnik Urges Restoration of Construction Grant Funds for Sewage Treatment Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the author of the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 and the Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1961:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN A. BLATNIK, OF MINNESOTA

I was deeply disturbed to learn that the Appropriations Committee cut the President's request for $100 million for the water pollution control program to only $90 million. I believe that this action was not only a serious blow to the program but raises problems which go far beyond the actual dollar amount involved.

If the House of Representatives reduces the level of expenditures authorized in 1961 for construction of waste treatment facilities by the $10 million as recommended in H.R. 5888 by the Appropriations Committee, it will in effect:

1. Fail to meet the objectives set by the Water Pollution Control Act of 1961 to underwrite a maximum Federal effort to solve the water pollution problem;
2. Deny the economy some $60 million worth of badly needed construction activity; and
3. Reduce also by some $60 million the practical effectiveness of the public works acceleration program for which the House overwhelmingly approved $450 million within the last 2 weeks.

If the Congress acquiesces to the Appropriations Committee recommendation to deny the additional $10 million in construction funds authorized by the Water Pollution Control Act of 1961 it will be breaking the pledge it made in that year to support a maximum Federal effort to clean up the Nation's growing water pollution problem.

The effect of denying additional $10 million authorized by the Congress in 1961 is that an additional $60 million worth of badly needed sewerage construction activity will not take place, and the very substantial amount of employment activity that this expenditure would involve this year will be lost. This is true in that the ratio of local to Federal dollars invested in this program has been about 5 to 1.

The House less than 2 weeks ago approved an additional $450 million for accelerated public works activities. This program was overwhelmingly approved because the Members recognized its tremendous importance as a stimulant to employment in those areas of the Nation where economic activity has lagged. The House, if it sustains the denial of these funds for the construction of waste treatment plants, will, in effect, be reducing the $450 million APW appropriation something in excess of $30 million. Those Members who support the accelerated public works program will remember that the funds authorized under that program were to be used, not as a substitute for local money or Federal money already authorized, but were to be in addition to programs planned for and funded by the governments involved.

Indeed, the whole objective of the program is to stimulate State and local governments to raise new funds over and above what they had planned to spend by providing Federal matching grants so as to stimulate employment and to provide badly needed public facilities at the State and local level.

If the House approves this reduction in the authorization for grants for waste treatment plant construction, the principle of the public works program will have been violated and precedence set to cut back on other Federal programs involving construction activities. Such cuts can only result in the complete loss of the stimulatory effect of the public works acceleration program on employment.

Through the Water Pollution Control Act of 1961 we finally succeeded in getting Congress to approve of construction activity which we needed 10 years ago and which we will finally achieve this year if we can move the program in accordance with the request of the President. For the House to acquiesce to the reduction proposed by the Appropriations Committee would be a serious setback to the program and will mean that many of the Nation's communities will be forced to curtail and delay actions long overdue to clean up serious pollution problems.

The applications already on hand number 1,594 and call for Federal grants of $177 million. This represents approximately $2 billion in total construction costs. Following is a list of these pending applications for the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa:

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)

ALABAMA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Opelika	$250,000
Talladega	105,000
Tuskegee	90,000
Alexander City	103,350
Berry	7,500
Childersburg	60,000
Fayette	36,000
Jackson	60,000
Springville	30,000
Sylacauga	150,000
Elba	73,170
Jefferson County (Leeds)	90,000
Jefferson County (Tarrant)	180,000
Newton	24,000
Sulligent	15,000
Vernon	12,000
York	58,500
Bayou La Batre	22,500
Boaz	151,530
Brewton	132,000
Chickasaw	161,100
Clayton	32,700
Collinsville	12,000
Columbia	6,000
Columbiana	14,190
East Brewton	9,600
Fultondale	12,000
Hamilton	24,000
Leeds	52,500
Leighton	21,000
Luverne	24,000
Mobile	180,000
Mobile	250,000
Muscle Shoals	120,000
Oakman	9,000
Prichard	135,000
Parrish	15,000
Samson	16,500
Thomasville	13,500
Warrior	34,500
Butler	60,690
Foley	61,500
Gordo	19,260
Trussville	36,000

ALASKA

Seldovia	63,900
Nordale School (Fairbanks)	18,240
University Park School (Fairbanks)	19,020

ARIZONA

Gilbert	4,290
Scottsdale	403,560
Mesa	183,680
Tempe	176,620
Scottsdale	223,680
Glendale	60,000
Tolleson	20,000
Peoria	20,000
Phoenix-Scottsdale	703,560
Payson	30,000
Wickenburg	15,000
Tombstone	37,500
Snowflake	45,000
Sierra Vista	30,000
Safford	7,500
Phoenix-Mesa	360,000
Gila Bend	75,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

ARKANSAS

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Amity	$10,000
Beebe	20,000
Bardling	10,000
Bradley	15,000
Bryant	18,000
Cabot	12,000
Cotter	12,000
Dyess	20,000
Earle	20,000
Gentry	250,000
Gurdon	12,000
Fort Smith	250,000
Fort Smith	180,000
Fort Smith	250,000
Fort Smith	250,000
Hampton	10,000
Hughes	15,000
Joiner	22,000
Keiser	8,400
Leachville	15,000
Lepanto	13,500
Lewisville	13,500
Lincoln	9,000
Lockesburg	10,000
Lonoke	25,000
Mammoth Springs	30,000
Mansfield	30,000
Marked Tree	20,000
McNeil	10,000
Mountain View	25,000
Mountain Pine	25,000
Mulberry	19,200
Nashville	18,000
Newport	30,000
Norphlet	20,000
Paragould	138,000
Paris	20,000
Portland	10,000
Prairie Grove	12,000
Prescott	41,000
Rector	20,000
Rison	10,000
Russellville	200,000
Salem	15,000
Star City	13,500
Tuckerman	9,000
Waldo	13,500
West Memphis	122,000
Wilmar	20,000
Wilson	15,000
Yellville	20,000

CALIFORNIA

Capitola	101,430
City of Gridley	191,250
City of Riverbank	149,170
City of Needles	168,000
Tuolumne County	79,800
Buena	250,000
City of Red Bluff	250,000
City of Tracy	250,000
City of Jackson	72,000
American Canyon County	80,070
San Simeon Acres	35,250
East Cliff	40,350
June Lake	58,560
Snelling	12,000
Springville	29,980
Denair	28,500
City of Folsom	66,420
Cambria County	146,050
Pinedale County	60,000
City of Stockton, South	172,200
San Juan Capistrano	28,020
Callinas Village	28,560
San Buenaventura, Ventura R. Int	78,300
City of Auburn	105,600
West Sacremento	42,000
City of Oxnard	250,000
San Buenaventura, Ol. Br. Int	175,740
San Rafael	164,000
City of Los Angeles, Hyperion	127,470

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—**Continued**

CALIFORNIA—continued

Municipality:	*Grant request*
City of Los Angeles, Terminal Island	$149,340
City of Ceres	74,040
City of Millbrae	43,330
City of Burbank	195,000
Marina County	111,720
City of Farmersville	46,770
San Pablo	78,450
City and county of San Francisco	250,000
Northeast Sacramento County	250,000
San Francisco Port, piers 27–33	45,820
San Francisco Port, pier 45	29,460
San Francisco Port, piers 19–23	21,110
Goleta	82,130
Meiners Oaks	62,960
City of Kingsburg	28,950
Hagginwood	132,000
City of Oroville	29,100
Sacramento County Sanitary District No. 2	149,550
Sacramento County Sanitary District No. 6	250,000
City of Mendota	7,440

COLORADO

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Cortez	239,100
Glenwood Springs	27,000
Mead	9,000
Idaho Springs	9,000
Georgetown	7,500
Eagle	15,000
Lafayette	27,000
Louisville	9,000
Rifle	14,990
Hugo	6,000
Eads	6,000
East Lake	6,000
Fruitdale	18,000
East Canon	6,000
Blende	6,000
Trinidad	30,000
Fruita	18,000
Leadville	18,000
Walsenburg	18,000
La Veta	9,000
Rye	7,500
Cheyenne Wells	9,000
Denver Metropolitan Sewer Authority	1,889,697
Padnia	9,000
Hotchkiss	9,000
Olathe	9,000
Boulder, Sanitary District	30,000
Steamboat Springs	105,000
Greeley	300,000
Swink	9,000
Las Animas	6,000
Gregory Gulch	18,000
Arvada	24,533
Denver Metropolitan	510,303

CONNECTICUT

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Groton	600,000
Groton	90,000
University of Connecticut	240,000
Seymour	250,000
Stonington	250,000
Manchester	250,000
New Hartford	100,000
Middletown	180,000
North Haven	600,000
Plainville	150,000
Stratford	103,500
Washington Depot	90,000
East Haven	150,000
East Haven	85,000
Hamden	600,000
Milford	300,000
Woodbridge	101,000

DELAWARE

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Townsend	30,000
Millsboro	41,700

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—**Continued**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Maine Avenue interceptor	$75,000
Chesapeake Street outfall	600,000
Upper Potomac interceptor	600,000
Upper Potomac interceptor	600,000
East Side interceptor	600,000
Rock Creek interceptor	483,000

FLORIDA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Sebring	213,480
Key Colony Beach	52,700
Indian Rocks Beach	175,200
McKay Creek Sanitary District	250,000
Oldsmar	32,745
Daytona Beach	250,000
Lakeland	144,000
Duval County Sanitary Sewer District 1	53,453
Hollywood	174,111

GEORGIA [1]

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Macon	441,610
Barnesville	10,487

HAWAII

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Kaneohe Bay-south interceptor sewer, sec. 2	231,000
Euliouou SPS and FM	52,500
Wahiawa interceptor sewer, sec. 3	46,500
East Loch interceptor sewer, secs. 1 and 2	186,000
Weianae STP, unit 1 and outfall sewer	450,000
Euliouou interceptor sewer	180,000
Kaneohe Bay-south interceptor sewer, sec. 3	198,000
Waimalu SPS and FM	160,000
Makaha interceptor sewer, sec. 1	105,000
East Loch interceptor sewer, sec. 3	218,000
Mailiili SPS and FM	70,000
Wahiawa interceptor sewer, sec. 4	60,000
Halawa SPS and FM	106,000
Manakuli interceptor sewer, sec. 1	105,000
Makaha interceptor sewer, sec. 2	105,000
East Loch interceptor sewer, sec. 4	128,000
Nanakuli interceptor sewer, sec. 2	105,000
Wahiawa STP, model 3	115,000
Eihapai-Kainui Drive interceptor sewer, sec. 1	250,000
Ewa Beach STP, unit 1 and outfall sewer	300,000
Honolulu	87,000
Honolulu	78,900

IDAHO

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Fairfield	14,922
Shoshone	51,896
Ririe	25,758
Meridian	9,429
Hansen	51,000
Homedale	22,500
Ketchum	75,000
Fruitland	15,000
Kellogg	150,600
McCall	49,200
Mountain Home	36,000
Kendrick	18,000
Firth	9,000
Shoshone County Sanitary District	600,000
Emmitt	60,000

ILLINOIS

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Paxton	183,000
Richton Park	84,950
Deer Creek	20,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—**Continued**

ILLINOIS—continued

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Walnut	$52,533
Sterling	587,700
Plano	51,000
Nelson	12,900
Granville	54,200
Creve Coeur Sanitary District (Tazewell County)	404,770
Belleville	151,950
Peoria Sanitary District	784,000
Olney	304,000
Wood River Township Sanitary District	229,528
Bloomington-Normal	600,000
Port Bryan	60,600
Alton Interceptor	100,000
Manhattan	48,360
Swansea	153,397
Pittsfield	34,800
Maple Park	22,491
Cherry Valley	21,750
Hoyleton	10,100
Tremont	24,000
Macomb	96,000
Pocahontas	33,000
Clayton	23,400
Dakota	12,500
Fairview	10,410
Hinckley	48,223
LeRoy	53,200
Lisle	122,100
Malta	40,704
Monito	28,000
Moweaqua	46,620
Pawnee	33,000
Granite City	600,000
Madison	72,000
Venice	57,000
Brooklyn	21,000
Fairmont City	31,500
Washington Park	69,000
Rosemont	10,500
Caseyville	25,400
East St. Louis	600,000
Monsanto	600,000
Cahokia	168,000
Alorton	34,500
Centreville	142,500
Edwardsville	350,000
Collinsville	350,000
Trenton	28,000
Christopher	37,500
Eldorado	70,400
Prairie du Rocher	10,000
Keyesport	7,000
West Frankfort	100,000
Marissa	37,500
Livingston	15,000
Arcola	54,000
Atwood	33,000
Champaign-Urbana	250,000
Tolona	30,000
Coal City	48,000
Carpentersville	60,000
Braidwood	25,500
Harvard	40,500
West Dundee	24,000
Fox River Grove	18,000
Oswego	18,000
Mendota	105,000
East Side Levee and Sanitary District	600,000
Cordova	60,000
Warren	30,000
Lanark	30,000
Moline	600,000
Dunlap	6,000
Aquawka	20,250
Viola	30,000
Brighton	25,000
Alpha	20,000

---

[1] Listing incomplete.

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

INDIANA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Whiteland	$60, 237
Shirley	21, 300
Mount Auburn	6, 600
Milton	22, 500
Kentland	60, 000
Lynn	40, 000
Oldenburg	20, 000
Plymouth	200, 000
Ridgeville	60, 000
Pendleton	26, 229
Columbus	26, 400
Ashley	23, 130
Westfield	66, 900
Elwood	230, 000
Dyer	246, 000
Cloversdale	23, 820
Bloomfield	34, 200
Denville	95, 700
Richmond	250, 000
Clermont	61, 800
Westport	31, 248
Crothersville	32, 000
Upland	52, 800
Linton	194, 400
Syracuse	78, 000
Greenfield	250, 000
Hebron	52, 000
Haubstadt	77, 900
Frankton	45, 350
Markleville	40, 293
Cambridge City	96, 300

IOWA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Mapleton	37, 800
Urbandale Windsor Heights Sanitary District	150, 000
New Virginia Sanitary District	9, 000
Evansdale	147, 000
Geneva	7, 350
Denver	15, 000
Iowa City	60, 000
Osage	60, 000
Danbury	16, 800
Waucoma	12, 000
Agency	11, 775
Carroll	84, 000
Centerville	85, 500
Chillicothe	2, 649
Coralville	61, 500
Dumont	13, 117
Edgewood	33, 548
Ely	17, 112
Fairbank	28, 041
Fostoria	8, 160
George	11, 604
Hills	27, 094
Lone Tree	19, 566
Macedonia	6, 950
Mount Pleasant	74, 986
Meola	6, 760
New Hartford	17, 682
Oskaloosa	46, 300
Palo	19, 210
Riceville	26, 100
Roland	10, 800
Sheffield	42, 997
Shelsburg	21, 375
Spillville	13, 321
Strawberry Point	37, 710
Underwood	11, 670
Walker	22, 275
Whiting	20, 535
Charles City	180, 000
Halbur	6, 300
Humeston	16, 800
Keosauqua	19, 500
LeHigh	21, 000
Ollie	7, 350
Storm Lake	150, 000
Floyd	10, 500
Exira	27, 000
Fort Madison	600, 000
Morning Sun	23, 100
Kirkville	5, 250
Logan	37, 800
Denison	$210, 000
Rock Valley	23, 000
Blencoe	7, 350
Jesup	30, 000
Lawton	5, 400
Madrid	36, 000
Corning	30, 000
Altoona	30, 000

List of Pending Applications for Municipal Waste Treatment Works Construction Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the applications for construction grants for waste treatment works already on hand number 1,594 and call for Federal grants of $177 million. This represents approximately $2 billion in total construction costs. Under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a list of these pending applications for the States of Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, and New York:

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)

KANSAS

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Milford	$12, 000
Wakeeny	45, 000
Shawnee	60, 000
Longford	8, 000
Projects not identified (14)	425, 300

KENTUCKY

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Kentucky State, Danville	52, 516
Kentucky State Penitentiary	66, 780
Lexington	250, 000
Russell	18, 870
Louisville	250, 000
Marion	64, 400
Cumberland	87, 000
Maysville	250, 000
Harlan	183, 000
Shelbyville	60, 000
Winchester	90, 000
Carlisle	39, 600
Falmouth	45, 000
Catlettsburg	180, 000
Olive Hill	60, 000
Grayson	50, 000
Millersburg	45, 000
Clinton	45, 000
Silver Grove	30, 000
Irvington	21, 000
Shepherdsville	21, 000
Irvine and Ravenna	66, 000
Jenkins	160, 000
Greenup	30, 000
Hartford	30, 000
Hickman	30, 000
Jackson	30, 000
Livermore	30, 000
Uniontown	$30, 000
Russellville	45, 000
Albany	95, 000
Nicholasville	30, 000
Stanford	30, 000
Springfield	30, 000
New Castle	21, 000
Benton	30, 000
Loyall	30, 000
Clay	30, 000
Manchester	30, 000
Martin	30, 000
Hawesville	30, 000
Beaver Dam	30, 000
Sturgis	45, 000
Tompkinsville	30, 000
Lancaster	30, 000
Somerset	75, 000
Sebree	45, 000
Northern Kentucky S.D.	250, 000
Earlington	30, 000
Cadiz	67, 310
Pineville	152, 500

LOUISIANA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Westwego	208, 689
Basile	41, 137
Baldwin	43, 996
Cameron	77, 200
Gramercy	57, 570
Kenner	225, 000
Jefferson Sanitary District No. 1	250, 000
Baton Rouge	250, 000
Caddo Sanitary District No. 1	183, 891
St. James	166, 635
Maringouin	17, 000
Youngsville	18, 750
Vidalia	85, 710
Baton Rouge	200, 000
Jefferson No. 8	600, 000
Caddo Sanitary District No. 1	225, 000
Caddo Sanitary District No. 3	40, 000
Denham Springs	150, 000
Des Allemands	24, 000
Destrehan	41, 000
Elton	60, 000
Garyville	169, 000
Hahnville	46, 000
Iowa	30, 000
Jefferson Sanitary District No. 5	250, 000
Jefferson-West Bank	250, 000
Jennings	250, 000
Jennings	60, 000
Kinder	60, 000
Lake Charles	250, 000
Lake Charles No. 1	200, 000
Leonville	20, 000
LaPlace	244, 000
Logansport	100, 000
Lower St. Bernard	170, 000
Luling-Mimosa-Lone Star	57, 000
Mamou	100, 000
Marrero	200, 000
New Sarpy	24, 000
Nine Mile Point	200, 000
Opelousas	30, 000
Paradis	13, 000
Pleasant Hill	30, 000
Plaquemine	250, 000
Rapides Parish Sanitary District	
Roseland	250, 000
No. 1	55, 000
Sterlington	25, 000
Sunset	100, 000
West Monroe	250, 000
Slidell	238, 735
Gramercy	79, 251

MAINE

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Saco	600, 000
Old Orchard Beach	40, 665
Biddeford	486, 600
Yarmouth	269, 700
Thomaston	105, 000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

MAINE—continued

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Wilton	$48,000
Norway, South Paris	232,860
Rockland	420,000
Augusta	150,000
MARYLAND	
Denton	112,125
Baltimore County, Minebank Run	200,000
Howard County, Elkridge	44,500
Howard County, Ellicott City	200,000
Howard County, Patuxent	125,000
Frostburg	200,000
Halfway	150,000
Hampstead	20,000
La Vale	137,500
Manchester	21,000
New Windsor	17,000
North East	50,000
Ocean City	150,000
Preston	30,000
Severna Park	250,000
Sykesville	30,000
MASSACHUSETTS	
Ashland	80,000
Westfield	227,100
Metropolitan District Commission (Wellesley sewer extension)	2,400,000
Metropolitan District Commission (Arlington interceptor)	600,000
West Springfield	240,000
Whitman	300,000
Rockland	225,000
Millbury	180,000
Brookfield	60,000
Metropolitan District Commission (North Charles interceptor)	300,000
Franklin	45,000
MICHIGAN	
Lathrup Village	159,000
Dexter	30,000
Houghton	379,955
Hancock	307,901
Cedar Springs	36,750
Ypsilanti Township	360,000
Ionia	198,000
Constantine	69,000
Shepherd	48,000
Genesee County Sanitary District No. 2	490,350
Romeo	72,000
Trenton	250,000
Oscoda Township	62,400
Morrice	24,450
Perry	40,200
Saugatuck	7,800
Lake Odessa	27,000
Union City	24,462
Linden	68,400
Twelve Towns Drainage Board	196,251
Wayne County DPW north line	233,400
Road Interceptor, Wayne County DPW down river project	2,400,000
Walker Township	165,000
Charlevoix	27,048
Zeeland	78,000
Lowell	75,000
Edmore	69,000
Newaygo	36,000
Nashville	34,200
Berrien Springs	40,500
Wayland	51,000
Lakeview	19,800
Ishpeming	207,000
Lansing	250,000
Kalamazoo	104,264
Sturgis	193,650
Fenton Township	478,000
Ottawa County	13,500
De Witt	51,090
Grandville	250,000
Scottville	$41,700
Wayne County	2,400,000
MINNESOTA	
Glenwood	81,167
Cannon Falls	157,500
Norwood	104,460
Lyle	22,470
Winnebago	45,867
Upsala	15,390
Bayport	92,100
Blue Earth	190,137
Mound-Spring Park	290,000
Lake St. Croix Beach	29,232
Hutchinson	160,500
Longville	7,732
Worthington	250,000
Excelsior	86,100
Fosston	51,460
Elmore	49,859
Graceville	11,312
Blue Earth	190,137
Eden Valley	29,657
Long Lake	77,070
Janesville	45,173
Ivanhoe	21,296
Cologne	38,562
Dennison	16,560
Stewartville	22,500
Hills	20,973
Eagle Lake	18,232
MISSISSIPPI	
Ackerman	5,250
Amory	52,500
Bay Springs	42,000
Bruce	17,750
Clarksdale	90,000
Collins	10,500
Drew	21,000
Greenwood	300,000
Grenada	76,000
Kilmichael	7,500
Lexington	31,500
Winona	42,000
Harrison County, 115	471,555
Harrison County, 117	80,553
Harrison County, 118	84,800
Jackson	526,980
Cleveland	55,200
Isola	22,000
MISSOURI	
St. Joseph (Whitehead pump station)	337,500
St. Joseph interceptor	580,500
St. Joseph (Brown's Branch)	69,000
St. Joseph (Lagoon)	36,600
St. Joseph (Lagoon)	16,500
St. Joseph	17,400
St. Joseph	17,100
Scott City	10,260
Seneca	13,410
Springfield	62,700
Valley Park	81,150
Webb City	90,008
Kansas City Municipal Airport	59,400
Kansas City	250,000
Kansas City (pump station and force mains)	250,000
Kansas City	393,000
Kingsville	8,412
Lake Lotawana	50,000
Lathrop	12,551
Liberty	75,180
Mattese sanitary sewer district	51,800
M.S.D., River des Peres	178,200
M.S.D., sec. I	187,156
M.S.D., sec. II	218,235
M.S.D., sec. III	250,000
M.S.D., sec. VI	180,000
Mexico	188,611
Monett	80,340
North Kansas City	198,300
Pevely	$89,119
Platte County sanitary district	37,300
St. Charles	309,355
St. Charles	67,200
St. Joseph	600,000
MONTANA	
Scobey	19,500
Froid	12,000
Saco	21,000
Wibou	15,000
Superior	45,000
Thompson Falls	45,000
Fairview	15,000
Terry	15,000
Ekalaka	6,000
Helena	60,000
NEBRASKA	
Columbus	99,000
Gering	48,000
Terrytown	45,000
Beaver Crossing	7,200
South Sioux City	50,400
Valentine	32,400
Pender	17,640
Gothenburg	36,000
Auburn	46,800
Wahoo	72,000
Tecumseh	39,600
Falls City	144,000
Ainsworth	36,600
Fremont	180,000
Papillion	28,800
North Platte	182,000
Syracuse	23,400
Neligh	36,000
O'Neill	72,000
NEVADA	
Clark County Sanitation District No. 1	135,300
Clark County Sanitation District No. 1	250,000
Carson City	130,000
Eureka	3,000
Minden-Gardnerville	150,000
Sparks	250,000
Winnemucca	5,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Portsmouth	108,270
Laconia	423,000
Ashland	156,000
Claremont	250,000
Dover	250,000
Exeter	507,300
Lincoln	300,000
Rochester	300,000
Somersworth	300,000
Colebrook	75,000
Newport	300,000
Concord	600,000
Conway	168,000
Farmington	30,000
Hudson	600,000
Manchester	600,000
Lancaster	103,500
Boscowen	35,400
Hillsborough County	360,000
Northumberland	90,000
Epping	135,000
Peterborough	69,000
Durham	30,000
New Hampton	150,000
Bristol	225,000
NEW JERSEY	
Ewing-Lawrence	543,000
Deptford Town	73,000
West Wildwood	18,840
Sayreville	150,000
North Arlington, Lindhurst	4,500
Scotch Plains	75,000
Medford Town	10,000
Newark	270,000
Madison	120,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

NEW JERSEY—continued

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Landis Town	$37,500
Union Beach	120,000
Absecon	250,000
Lincoln Park	378,600
Hackettstown	100,000
Little Silver	105,000
Plumstpead Town	48,000
Weymouth Town	18,000
Jersey City	600,000
Allentown	250,000
Dover Town	71,000
NEW MEXICO	
Anapra	1,800
Roswell	7,791
Seboyeta	6,036
Mesilla	35,622
Alamogordo	90,000
Albuquerque	347,036
Artesia	9,000
Carlsbad	75,000
Cimarron	12,850
Clayton	15,000
Elida	22,500
Grants	22,500
Hagerman	15,000
Loving	7,500
Not identified	36,000
Springer Boys School	9,900
Thoreau	5,427
NEW YORK	
Holcomb	80,730
Watkins Glen	17,199
Rockland County Sewer Agency	2,400,000
Mamaroneck, West Chester County	1,500,000
Union-Vestal	726,000
Hilton	42,900
Glen Cove	24,000
Salamanca	481,800
Audorn	150,000
Avon	32,700
Norfolk Town	43,300
Village of Hilton	42,900
Village of Cayuga	76,000
Tenfield Town (Sanitary District No. 3)	169,200
New York City (Wards Island)	600,000
John City Village	600,000
Keesville Village	194,500
Tenfield Town	34,500
Newark Village	91,300
City of Jamestown	288,000
Ithaca	34,200
New York City (Hillcrest Center)	45,000

List of Pending Applications for Municipal Waste Treatment Works Construction Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the applications for construction grants for waste treatment works already on hand number 1,594 and call for Federal grants of $177 million. This represents approximately $2 billion in total construction costs. I am inserting in the RECORD a list of these pending applications for the States of North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Tennessee:

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)

NORTH CAROLINA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Apex	$51,000
Canton	136,950
Clarkton	12,518
Concord (westside outfall)	216,204
Creedmoor	26,178
Davidson	33,000
Elizabethtown	41,700
Goldsboro	250,000
Granite Quarry	52,200
Greensboro (N. Buffalo plant)	60,000
Hazelwood	83,775
High Point (eastside plant, etc.)	250,000
Liberty	12,600
Monroe	250,000
Plymouth	165,720
Robbins	177,900
Spindale	249,032
Spruce Pine	129,780
Waynesville	250,000
West Jefferson	45,600
Wingate	56,000
Winton	9,360
Carolina Beach	39,000
Cary	168,000
Cordova	12,000
Mebane	150,000
Southern Pines	30,000
Southport	27,000
Trenton	4,000
Winterville	18,000
Zebulon	47,000
Burgaw	15,000
Burlington	250,000
Burnsville	40,000
Candor	25,000
Carthage	20,000
Charlotte	250,000
Colerain	5,000
Hot Springs	10,000
Lowell	30,000
Marshall	15,000
Randleman	64,000
Roanoke Rapids	250,000
Roseboro	16,000
Roxboro	210,000
Salemburg	6,000
Wilmington	250,000
Wrightsville Beach	20,000
Angier	40,000
Asheville	600,000
Beaufort	75,000
Belhaven	70,000
Benson	65,000
Boiling Springs	30,000
Bonnie Doone	50,000
Clyde	20,000
Cramerton	140,000
Draper Sanitary District	165,000
Dunn	72,000
Gastonia	250,000
Hertford	50,000
Kinston	250,000
Kure Beach	12,000
Leaksville-Spray	500,000
Marion	150,000
Marshville	18,000
Morehead City	130,000
Scotland Neck	75,000
Warsaw	35,000
Wendell	48,000
Belmont	250,000
Bethel	30,000
Cornelius	40,000
Cumberland	10,000
Durham	250,000
Erwin	105,000
Fair Bluff	$30,000
Fairmont	40,000
Hookerton	5,000
Lincolnton	200,000
Manteo	15,000
Nashville	30,000
Newton	170,000
Pineville	45,000
Richlands	20,000
Rose Hill	21,000
Snow Hill	12,000
St. Pauls	22,000
Stanley	22,000
Sylva	10,000
Valdese	165,000
Waxhaw	15,000
Andrews	25,000
Beulaville	25,000
Bryson City	60,000
Buies Creek	10,000
Cliffside	80,000
Columbia	12,000
Columbus	25,000
Conover	50,000
Elm City	15,000
Enfield	38,000
Franklinton	40,000
Highlands	80,000
Kings Mountain	205,000
Lenoir	200,000
Norlina	25,000
Pisgah Forest	15,000
Robbinsville	10,000
Saluda	10,000
Shelby	250,000
Warrenton	40,000
Aberdeen	40,000
Acme	10,000
Alexander Mills	20,000
Bladenboro	35,000
Boone	150,000
Brevard	35,000
Chadbourn	55,000
Charlotte	600,000
Elizabeth City	250,000
Franklin	100,000
Hayesville	7,000
Jefferson	20,000
Lake Lure	60,000
Landis	40,000
Laurinburg	100,000
Lumberton	250,000
Maxton	30,000
Murphy	65,000
Raleigh	250,000
Sparta	20,000
Tryson	30,000
Whiteville	12,000
NORTH DAKOTA	
Bismarck	250,000
Drayton	12,000
Fairmont	7,500
Harvey	18,000
Kerenare	12,000
LaMoure	12,000
Mandan	90,000
Portel	5,400
Powers Lake	9,000
Regent	6,000
Tioga	15,000
Towner	12,000
Velva	15,000
OHIO	
Aberdeen	28,350
Belpre	159,000
Brook Park	180,000
Columbiana	150,000
Columbus	600,000
Fairfield	600,000
Genoa	100,000
Green Springs	28,200
Hebron	50,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

Municipality:	*Grant request*
OHIO—continued	
Lakewood	$600,000
Loveland	186,000
Maple Heights	250,000
Milan	20,700
Napoleon	68,700
New Albany	42,414
Pataskala	41,980
Paulding	100,000
Plymouth	95,000
Pomeroy	81,165
Quaker City	29,310
Reynoldsburg	120,000
Sylvania	150,000
Union City	30,000
Wadsworth	100,000
Warsaw	40,000
Wauseon	50,000
Woodsfield	52,200
OKLAHOMA	
Harrah	14,171
Adair	12,000
Pryor	78,500
Eufaula	70,500
Inola	11,779
Duncan	167,271
Butler	5,850
Oakland	5,136
Cleveland	77,955
Gage	4,912
Idabel	7,205
Apache	20,467
McAlester	233,405
Hollister	6,900
Freedom	10,786
Catoosa	39,058
Longdale	14,336
Ames	10,936
Hitchcock	9,803
Gould	9,962
Sterling	3,600
Del City	107,307
Snyder	42,573
Norman	414,000
Verden	5,640
Stigler	69,100
Duncan	248,625
Afton	45,000
Atoka	22,500
Alva	24,000
Barnsdall	7,500
Bixby	7,500
Bethany-Warr Acres	30,000
Bokchita	37,500
Boley	24,000
Butler	21,000
Cement	6,000
Cordell	12,000
Crescent	10,500
Durant	18,000
Dustin	30,000
Edmond	15,000
Fairview	12,000
Foss	18,000
Geronimo	7,500
Guthrie	15,000
Holdenville	18,000
Hooker	3,000
Keota	37,500
Keyes	6,000
Laverne	12,000
Marshall	7,500
McAlester	247,500
McCloud	3,500
Midwest City	37,500
Morrison	22,500
Mountain Park	15,000
Mulhall	7,500
Nash	18,000
Newkirk	7,500
Nicona Park	15,000
Okay	30,000
Okemah	12,000
Okmulgee	19,500
OKLAHOMA—continued	
Orlando	$13,500
Paden	30,000
Perry	7,500
Ponca City	30,000
Prague	24,000
Ringling	7,500
Ryan	7,500
Stilwell	9,000
Sulphur	75,000
Tishomingo	18,000
Wetumka	12,000
Wheatland	10,500
Yale	24,000
Wilson	20,000
OREGON	
Bandon	41,700
Brookings	7,570
Brownsville	58,200
Corvallis	62,100
Eastside	48,000
Eugene	421,920
Gold Beach	32,620
Manhattan Sanitary District	20,310
Metzger Sanitary District	201,000
Multnomah County	63,220
Portland	250,000
St. Helens	28,000
Salem	600,000
Sunset Valley	61,750
Tigard	36,670
White City	35,340
Woodburn	66,600
Pentleton	6,300
Aloha Sanitary District	210,000
Arlington	15,000
Echo	9,600
Forest Grove	75,000
Maplewood	63,220
Oakland	30,000
PENNSYLVANIA	
Monroeville	132,210
Spring Town	34,265
Elizabethtown	83,550
Philadelphia	250,000
Spring Town—No. 1 plant	97,788
Cumru Town	64,077
Highland Sewer and Water Authority	94,520
Turtle Creek	19,273
Colebrookdale Town	137,253
Churchill Borough	6,947
Marysville	127,560
Hamburg	194,048
Hempfield	250,000
Youngwood	84,731
Zelienople	22,650
Warminster	168,480
Wilkins Town	71,368
Canonsburg-Houston Authority	250,000
Philadelphia	250,000
Mt. Pleasant	135,000
Smithtown	18,900
West Newton	44,700
Hastings	49,800
Patton	69,000
Alexandria	14,100
Mapleton	17,400
Orbisonia	27,900
Smithfield Town	38,100
Port Royal	17,400
Kistler	10,500
Lower Alsace Town	73,800
St. Clair	61,500
Hazleton Area	600,000
Freeland	120,000
Duryea	[1] 210,000
Dupont	-------
Avoca	-------
Old Forge	-------
Moosic	-------
PENNSYLVANIA—continued	
Taylor	[2] $600,000
Scranton	---------
Dunmore	---------
Johnsonburg	108,900
Hughesville	40,500
Kane	123,900
Couder Port	100,500
Shinglehouse	41,100
Mansfield	83,400
Foxburg	18,300
Moon Town	270,000
Leet Town	43,800
Liberty	88,200
Washington Town	503,100
Brownsville	111,900
Dawson	20,400
Fayette City	35,100
Point Marion	44,700
Vanderbilt	43,200
Greensboro	20,400
Confluence	24,300
Monongahela	121,500
Cannonsburg	206,100
Dunlevy	15,600
New Eagle	62,100
Hempfield Town	168,000
Greensburg	324,300
RHODE ISLAND	
Bristol	24,000
Cranston interceptor	420,000
South Kingston	600,000
Smithfield	210,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	
Columbia	240,000
North Charleston	90,000
Kershaw	15,000
Blacksburg	15,000
Holly Hill	3,000
McColl	10,000
Columbia	1,000,000
Jefferson	9,000
St. Matthews	28,400
Bishopville	118,600
Hardeeville	40,500
Wagener	36,500
SOUTH DAKOTA	
Alcester	6,000
Alexandria	6,000
Andover	3,000
Ashton	1,500
Canistota	6,000
Clear Lake	3,000
DeSmet	15,000
Freeman	9,000
Gayville	3,000
Hudson	3,000
Lake Norden	9,000
Marion	9,000
St. Lawrence	1,500
Salem	9,000
Timber Lake	6,000
Tripp	6,000
Tyndall	9,000
Viborg	6,000
Welsey	3,000
TENNESSEE	
Cleveland	250,000
Jackson	600,000
Oliver Springs	61,286
Humboldt	229,752
Obion	56,109
Pikeville	34,050
Centerville	88,500
Bemis	96,300
Somerville	49,980
Monteagle	20,700
Hohanwald	57,900
Henderson	69,000
Halls	33,000
Greenfield	28,000

[1] Includes grants for Dupont, Avoca, Old Forge, Moosic.

[2] Includes grants for Scranton and Dunmore.

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

TENNESSEE—continued

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Collierville	$34,500
Ridgely	51,252
Dandridge	16,500
Knoxville	250,000
Bristol	30,000
Knox County	250,000
Lexington	193,500
Jefferson City	69,900
Savannah	180,000
Copperhill	36,000
Jellico	78,000
Trenton	76,500
Jamestown	31,800
Erin	120,000
Tiptonville	56,700
Memphis	250,000
Loudon	186,450
Jacksboro	19,500
Cumberland Gap	24,000
Oak Ridge	25,488
Greenville	30,000
Tazewell	84,900
North Tazewell	30,000
Alexandria	30,000
Nashville	250,000
Kingsport	250,000
Troy	30,000
White Pine	45,000
Murfreesboro	109,500
South Jackson Utility District	125,000
Chapel Hill	27,000
New Providence	120,900

List of Pending Applications for Municipal Waste Treatment Works Construction Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the applications for construction grants for waste treatment works already on hand number 1,594 and call for Federal grants of $177 million. This represents approximately $2 billion in total construction costs. I am inserting in the RECORD a list of these pending applications for the States of Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and Puerto Rico:

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)

TEXAS

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Abilene	$250,000
Jefferson	24,000
S. Jefferson Co	250,000
Celeste	8,400
Deer Park	97,800
Clarksville	58,283
Sampson Park	57,261
Rhome	10,905
Wharton	15,098
Anahauc	132,000
Amarillo	246,231
Strawn	14,682
Teague	24,720
Beverly	15,600
Lubbock	249,619
New Braunfels	$116,265
Texas City	289,500
Silsbee	92,143
Groves	86,340
Alice	180,000
Amarillo	300,000
Anahuac	19,800
Aransas Pass	91,800
Archer City	21,600
Arlington	54,000
Bay Cliff (Gal Co)	30,000
Bellaire	111,000
Boyd	6,000
Breckenridge	70,500
Carrollton	18,300
Castroville	15,000
Clyde	9,000
Coleman	69,000
Colorado City	73,800
Cuero	84,000
Calhart	64,800
Daingerfield	30,000
Denver City	37,500
El Paso	250,000
Deer Park	40,980
Graham	215,000
Devine	22,500
Eagle Pass	126,000
Grapeland	9,000
Greenville	180,000
Haltom City	30,000
Hurst	54,000
Jacksonville	99,000
Jasper	48,000
Junction	27,300
Kenedy	45,300
Kerrville	83,400
Kountz	18,300
Laredo (Del Mar district)	250,000
Littlefield	69,000
Lone Oak	15,000
Marble Falls	21,600
Meadow	4,500
McKinney	120,000
Newcastle	15,000
Newton	15,000
Palacios	30,600
Pecos	87,000
Port Neches	90,000
Quitman	9,000
Refugio	51,000
Robinson	15,000
Rockwall	17,400
Sabinal	15,000
Sabine Pass	9,000
San Antonio	250,000
Sanger	15,000
Slaton	57,000
Spur	24,000
Sulphur Springs	97,500
Terrell	66,000
Tom Bean	15,000
Tyler	250,000
Van Horn	15,000
Victoria	450,000
Waco	300,000
Walk Village	15,000
Waller	15,000
Weslaco	82,200
West	22,500
Jefferson City area	360,000
Galveston-Houston area	600,000
Tarrant County area	600,000

UTAH

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Roosevelt	43,500
Moab	75,000
Salt Lake City SID No. 1	275,000
Salt Lake City	300,000
Logan	525,000
Wellsville	45,000
Lewiston	22,500
Parowan	24,000
Chesterfield	40,000
Corinne	15,000
Cedar City	56,000

VERMONT

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Brattleboro	$88,500
Berlin	65,880
Middlebury	223,830
Vergennes	48,490
Stowe	60,900
Plainfield	37,800
Woodstock	150,000
Northfield	300,000
Hartford	60,000
Marshfield	24,630
Milton	41,920
Wells River	58,800
South Rye Gate	42,800
Groton	48,000
Richmond	43,440
Cavendish	91,200
Williamstown	75,000
Brighton	48,000
Winooski	270,000
Waterbury	84,000
Wilmington	61,500

VIRGINIA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Alleghany County	7,160
Lovingston	27,000
Abingdon	240,000
Alleghany County	23,115
Altavista	25,500
Amherst County	30,750
Amonate	30,000
Appalachia	150,000
Arlington	250,000
Arno	30,000
Bishop	30,000
Boissevain	60,000
Boykins	60,000
Brookneal	60,000
Cambria	60,000
Cape Charles	60,000
Cedar Bluff	60,000
Chilhowie	75,000
Cleveland	30,000
Coeburn	105,000
Damascus	90,000
Darby	30,000
Dayton	60,000
Deel	60,000
Dorchester	75,000
East Stone Gap	60,000
Fairfax County Park Authority	10,500
Fincastle	30,000
Gate City	120,000
Grundy	120,000
Honaker	60,000
Hurley	21,000
Jonesville	60,000
Keokee	18,000
Montague Estates	60,000
N. Tazewell	60,000
Pocohontas	120,000
Prince William County	250,000
Rich Creek	60,000
Rocky Mount	180,000
Roda	60,000
Saltville	90,000
Shenandoah	60,000
Smithfield	90,000
South Hill	75,000
St. Charles	30,000
St. Paul	75,000
Stuart	60,000
Tazewell	90,000
Timberville	60,000
Toana	21,000
Tookland	60,000
Vansant	60,000
Victoria	90,000
Vienna	117,300
Virginia Beach	30,000
Weber City	90,000
Hendico County, sanitary district No. C	250,000
Henrico County, sanitary district No. 3	110,448
Henrico County, sanitary district No. 6	14,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

VIRGINIA—continued

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Henrico County, sanitary district No. 7	$250,000
Henrico County, sanitary district No. 13	250,000

WASHINGTON

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Metaline	14,460
Pasco	162,500
La Crosse	12,000
Spokane	90,000
Spokane	60,000
Anacortes	57,000
Benton City	6,000
Blaine	45,000
Cle Elum	3,000
Concrete	45,000
Douglas County Sewer District No.1	100,000
Ellensburg	50,000
Harrington	15,000
Kettle Falls	6,000
La Center	7,500
Millwood	20,000
Moses Lake	10,000
Normandy Park	78,000
Oak Harbor	15,000
Olympia	120,000
Port Angeles	141,000
Rosalia	20,000
Roslyn	18,000
Selah	30,000
Sultan	51,000
Vancouver	45,000
Washougal	30,000
Westport	24,000

WEST VIRGINIA

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Belmont	28,778
Nutter Fort	78,600
Martinsburg	300,000
Bethlehem	200,000
Beckley	30,000
Glenville	60,000
Matewan	60,000
Fayetteville	24,000
Belle	30,000
Charles Town	30,000
Ranson	30,000
Mannington	105,000
Davis	45,000
Kingwood	90,000
Barboursville	150,000
Chapmanville	60,000
Welch	600,000
Ronceverte	60,000
Petersburg	60,000
Keyser	210,000
Clarksburg	600,000
Morgantown	450,000
Fairmont	450,000
Shepherdstown	60,000
Ridgeley	60,000
Follansbee	150,000
Wellsburg	150,000
Shinnston	90,000
Grafton	150,000
Athens	12,000
Triadelphia	21,000
Sutton	30,000
Gassaway	27,000
Rainelle	54,000
East Rainelle	39,000
Grant Town	36,000
Star City	45,000
Westover	60,000
Red Sulphur public sanitary district	60,000
Pea Ridge public sanitary district	150,000
Midway public sanitary district	60,000
Lilly Grove public sanitary district	60,000
Green Valley public sanitary district	60,000

Pending applications for municipal waste treatment works construction grants (in process or preparation)—Continued

WISCONSIN

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Amery	$33,621
Plainfield	20,622
Cassville	32,243
Monroe	110,173
Dallas	18,531
Chetek	31,673
Unity	9,732
Meenah-Manasha Sewerage Commission	500,000
Green Bay Metro-Sewerage District	25,886
Menomonie	12,090
Milwaukee Sewerage Commission	250,000
Cameron	21,450
Barron	199,425
Thorp	72,000
Kieler Town Sanitary District No. 1	22,197
Pigeon Falls	25,912
Two Rivers	62,090
Stockbridge	27,645
Metropolitan Sewerage Commission (County of Milwaukee)	600,000
Somers Sanitary District No. 1 (Kenosha)	72,044
Belmont	31,546
Muskego	34,825
White water	52,500
Lake Geneva	108,519
Menomonie	19,235
Mount Hope	22,697

WYOMING

Municipality:	*Grant request*
South Sheridan	31,200
Rock River	3,000
Basin	4,500
Cokeville	3,000
Cowley	6,300
Evanston	2,100
Ranchester	1,500
Burns	6,000
Sheridan	180,000
Fort Bridger Sanitary District	3,000

PUERTO RICO

Municipality:	*Grant request*
Margarita Trunk Sewer	105,000

A New Hampshire State Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we in Congress continue to practice hypocrisy and still persist in our sanctimonious attitude about gambling, the great State of New Hampshire decided to recognize and accept the obvious and capitalize on this universal human urge by establishing a State lottery.

The citizens of New Hampshire are to be congratulated for their wisdom in electing to the legislature fearless representatives who not only successfully resisted the strenuous objections from the bluenoses and hypocrites but responded to the wishes of the people.

In recognizing the indisputable fact that the inclination to gamble is an instinctive part of human nature, the State of New Hampshire will pump into its treasury millions of dollars a year in additional revenue.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not display the same kind of wisdom and courage by creating a national lottery?

Why can we not regulate and control this gambling thirst for our own people's benefit?

Mr. Speaker, it is about time we became sensible and realistic about this gambling problem. A national lottery could easily, painlessly, and voluntarily produce over $10 billion a year in new income which would help relieve our heavy tax burdens. Let us be—not smarter—but just as smart as New Hampshire.

The Motion Picture "Gogo"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention of the House to what I consider a very serious matter, so serious, in fact, that I have asked the Secretary of Defense to provide a full and complete investigation and to identify and punish those responsible.

This matter concerns a review published in the newspaper of show business, Variety, on April 17, 1963, of a moving picture entitled "Gogo" made in Iceland.

Variety's reviewer, who signs himself "Denk" expresses great surprise and concern over the fact that two of the actors in the movie are officers of the U.S. military service; that one of them portrayed a "souse" and the other a "girl-corruptor."

So that the record may be complete, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Variety review be made a part of my remarks at this point.

[From Variety, Apr. 17, 1963]

GOGO

(79 AV STODINNI)

(*Icelandic*)

Goteborg, April 1

Stivellproduction release of Edda production. With Kristbjorg Kjeld, Gunnar Ekjolfssen. Robert Arnfinnsson. Directed by Erik Balling. Screenplay, Godlaur Rosinkrentz from book by I. G. Thorsteneisson; camera, Jorgen Shov. At Aveny Goteborg, Sweden. Running time, 81 mins.

Gogo	Kristbjorg Kjeld
Ragnar	Gunnar Ekjolfssen
Gudmunder	Robert Arnfinnsson
Bob	John Teasy
US drunkard	Lawrence W. Schneph

This first picture ever produced on the tiny island of Iceland is a typical beginners work. There is an awful lot of pathetic acting, moralizing, car driving, boring landscapes and much too much cigarette smoking and whisky drinking as "business" performed by stage actors working before cameras.

It is simple "boy meets girl" plot from a local bestseller book. It is all about a beautiful widow-turned-prostitute who meets a local taxi driver and a romance starts, but there is no happy end. When the driver realizes that his prospective bride is a girl who entertains U.S. officers from a nearby base he gets mad also sad and performs a clumsy car-suicide.

In the second part of "Gogo" there are some short scenes of real dramatic value, but on the whole this is a picture of very slim export chances.

Almost unbelievable is the participation in this feature of actual U.S. military personnel stationed at the Keflavik Base but pictured as souses and girl-corrupters.

The unknown director of an insignificant picture managed to get two high officers from the local U.S. base Keflavik on Iceland to play roles of drunkards. One John Teasy, is believed a U.S. actor who is in charge of the U.S. Army TV network of the Keflavik Base. Another officer is Lawrence W. Schneph. Both are directed to act out the curse of America's "always present sun" on the nordic island and behave in a way the local population clearly despises.

The best thing said about Americans is a remark by a local taxi driver: "He is not like the other Americans."

The disclosure has already made front page news in Swedish press.

DENK.

And, now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that a copy of my letter to Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, be included at this point.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is addressed to you, the highest authority in our Military Establishment, for I believe it vitally necessary to do so, and enclose herewith a copy of an article which appeared in the newspaper Variety under date of April 17, 1963.

Mr. Secretary, if U.S. military personnel were permitted to participate in order to portray a "drunken, girl-corrupting image" of a U.S. serviceman, it is about time we fold up our tents and go home.

I therefore have no hesitation in requesting you make an immediate investigation—(1) To determine whether such a picture has been made for distribution in Europe (I have no doubt it has been been made); (2) To determine names and ranks of officers who participated; (3) And, to determine the names and ranks of officers, who must have had to give permission for their participation.

I am sure you must be shocked, as I am, and every other person who has seen this article. It is unbelievable. An immediate response from you, outlining the steps you are taking in order that this matter be cleared up and proper action taken against those who have participated, will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. BECKER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of thing, as I have told Mr. McNamara, is unbelievable. We spend billions of dollars building the American image and then, because of the foolhardiness of some superior officers, whose permission certainly must have been necessary for these men to play such roles, we tear it down in a crude movie.

You will note that "Denk" includes as a part of his review that "the disclosure has already made front page news in Swedish press." I would think it would, Mr. Speaker, and certainly those forces who downgrade America at every turn, will lose no opportunity to tell the rest of the world that our military officers are portraying the roles of "souses" and "girl corrupters."

I hope every Member of this House will read these remarks carefully and study this case. I am sure that all will share the sorrow and indignation I did when this matter was called to my attention.

A Tax Policy for Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "A Tax Policy for Economic Growth," delivered by me before the New Hampshire Associated General Contractors, at Concord, N.H., on April 19, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TAX POLICY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

(An address by U.S. Senator TOM McINTYRE, New Hampshire Associated General Contractors, Concord, N.H., April 19, 1963)

The most striking characteristic of the American economy has been its capacity to lift material standards of living and spread the fruits of progress widely throughout our society. Last year our output of goods and services exceeded $550 billion. If Daniel Webster had calculated the gross national product back in 1850, he would have found that it was $10 to $12 billion. We have had in the last 11 decades a fiftyfold increase in real income and the output of goods and services. The national rate of growth since 1850 has been about 3½ percent per year, a figure that we would do well to bear in mind today. Had this Nation grown only at a rate of 3 percent per year, the gross national product in 1962 would have been $330 billion instead of $550 billion. A difference of one-half of a percent per year can be critical in deciding whether or not the potential of the United States is fulfilled in a time of serious challenge.

The single most disturbing development of recent years is the failure of our economy to approach the peak in using our productive capacity and the progress it enjoyed before 1957. In 1957 there were violent differences of opinion between the managers of the President's budget and the Secretary of the Treasury. The end result of the arguments was a reduction in Federal spending, dire predictions of recession, a cancellation of planned tax reductions, and tight money. The events of that year will be a subject of debate for some time to come. Blame may be fixed both upon an uncooperative Democratic Congress and a Republican administration that was dramatically divided over issues of economic policy. I say this not to discredit the past, but because we should be intelligent enough to learn from past experience.

Before 1957, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output. Since that time it has fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.

Before 1957 those out of work barely exceeded 4 percent of the labor force. Since then unemployment has remained about 5 percent.

Before 1957 our total output, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent per year. Since 1957 the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.

Today, lying idle and unused is productive capacity that could add some $40 billion a year of corporate income to America. Twenty billion dollars of that increase would be wages, whose payment would cut unemployment in half and add $10 billion per year to consumer demand. The economy has relaxed into sluggish cycles which have not plunged us into the depths of depression, but have not led us to the heights of confidence and expansion either.

The two critical elements in breaking out of the economic doldrums are consumer demand and industrial investment. By consumer demand we mean the money available for housing, or household goods, or services. If loans are available at low interest from banks, for example, then money is more freely available and consumer demand grows. From 1957 to 1962 consumer demand grew by 16 percent. A return to the 1957 rate of employment could add at least $10 billion to the money our families have to spend. Consumer demand is a way of referring to the size of the family market by indicating the amount of money available for purchases by families and individuals.

Fully one-quarter of American families have incomes so low that appliance, automobile, and housing expenditures are unattainable. Of course the overall Federal tax rate also has its effect upon all family income, drying up markets that would otherwise be available, and cutting into expenditures on food, clothing, automobiles, and housing.

There is another area of outstanding national need. This is the need to promote investment by business itself. While personal consumption increased 16 percent from 1957 to 1962, private investment on durable equipment and industrial construction actually decreased by 2 percent. In each year from 1958 to 1962 business investment has been smaller relative to overall national production than in any postwar year before 1958. This lack of industrial investment keeps us from employing our labor force at a satisfactory rate. There is no substitute for a high rate of private investment as a means for getting our economy moving.

From World War II to 1957, inflation was very favorable to industrial investment. Business had a high volume of liquid assets. Interest rates were low, and rising costs could be passed on in the form of rising prices. But after 1957 the situation was different. Profits declined, in part, because of rising labor costs and also because the level of economic activity was not high. While investment opportunities remained, the promise of profit was less. The cost of capital goods and construction rose relative to sale prices for consumers goods and this tended to depress the rate of return on investment. As the rate of inflation diminished, future profits from current investment were squeezed between steady prices and rising labor costs. Fewer and fewer business investment prospects could leap the hurdle of high tax rates. And so the rate of industrial investment declined. The profits squeeze in combination with the recession of 1957 explains the pattern of weakness in private investment over the last few years.

In both consumer demand and private investment, high tax rates have combined with other factors to slow down the economy. If all other conditions were sufficiently favorable, the obstacle of tax rates could be overcome, but that is not the case. Taxes are now the most powerful instrument that can be deliberately used to improve both the investment situation and consumer demand.

Under the circumstances I outlined before, the need for a tax cut is clear. We have a need for many things that could be produced by labor and capital and that would be bought with the incomes earned in their production. But we have erected a high wall between these resources and our needs, in the form of high rates of taxation that prevent resources from being used. We must bring down that wall and set free the resources of demand and investment.

A great deal of debate has been wasted in trying to say whether a tax cut should be centered on low income groups or upper income groups. While I think that meaningful reductions should be given in both the upper and lower brackets of personal income taxes, and also in corporate income taxes, the purpose of those cuts should be to spur consumer demand and industrial investment. Doing one without the other would be shortsighted. The overwhelming need, as I have made plain, is not to free money to the upper income brackets so that people will invest in business. What we need far more is a sufficiently large reduction in taxes paid by business so that funds will be available for investment by businesses themselves. This would mean new plants, new jobs, and new products in response to the larger consumer demand that would be created by cuts in personal incomes.

I also believe that the Federal budget must be made to yield a surplus by 1965. To go back to our critical date of 1957, let me point out that in the 11 years preceding 1957 there had been seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget for a net cash surplus of $20 billion. The six succeeding Government fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all in fiscal 1959 ($12 billion), for a net cash deficit of $30 billion. And the reason for these deficits has been that the whole economy has not risen to a sufficiently high level. If there was a full employment today and full use of our industrial capacity, the present tax structure would yield an additional $10 billion in corporate taxes and an additional $10 billion in personal income taxes. This would permit an annual reduction in the Federal debt by more than $10 billion per year. But because of the sluggishness of business investment and consumer demand, that extra $20 billion simply isn't there. It lies on the other side of that wall of high taxes.

As a result the people are faced with a choice in policy in balancing the budget. Either the economy must rise closer to its potential capacity, expanding the tax base for greater yield of revenue, or the expenditures of government must be decreased and brought in line with the revenue we already have.

Now let me say this about budget deficits. The budget deficits before 1957 were not serious, because they occurred only at a few low points during a period of economic progress. Succeeding years of high activity wiped out the deficits and yielded a surplus. The budget must be balanced, but it should be balanced over the period of the business cycle itself. Then Federal policy would respond easily to the natural cycles of the whole economy, instead of an artificial accounting period. To build a higher tax wall when demand is sluggish is to condemn our working force to unemployment and tighten the strangling profits squeeze that is the cause of trouble. If there were a $5 billion deficit one year, it could be carried forward until the business cycle started up. When a $5 billion surplus is generated, that surplus should not be used to increase Government expenditure, but ought to be applied to the $5 billion deficit that had been carried forward. Government, like business, should be permitted to incur debts when money is in short supply. But it is sound government as it is sound business to apply a surplus to those debts as soon as possible. In this way the Federal budget can be kept in balance over each 2- or 3-year cycle of recession and expansion.

But the deficits since 1957 are serious. They are not being wiped out by surplus. They are adding to the national debt year after year. The business cycle has flattened out so that a low point is not followed by a peak to yield a surplus that can be applied to the deficits. So the choice arises between drastic curtailment of Government expenditure, or a tax cut to improve demand and promote investment. The difficulty we face is that a simple reduction in Government expenditures will not do the job of spurring the economy. And with Government expenditures continued high, a tax cut cannot do the job alone either. I therefore call for a simultaneous reduction in Government expenditure and a tax cut, so that if the budget cannot be balanced in 1964 it could show a surplus by 1965.

So I do not advocate solving all of our economic problems by immediately reducing Federal expenditures until they equal revenue, although some very noisy critics say we should. This is not the year to do so. We would only repeat the experience of 1957, perhaps with the awesome consequences we should all have been able to glimpse during the stock market tumble of last May 25. Second, it would leave the tax wall in place. Third, it would reduce the Government sector of demand, not only for construction but for procurement in support of needed space and defense programs.

Now I differ with some of the wide-eyed optimists on the effect of tax reduction all by itself. Just to reduce taxes will not spread enough wealth for the economy to yield sufficient revenue to bring the Federal budget into balance. This is really pulling yourself up on your own bootstraps. A straight tax cut of $10 billion would work its way out into the economy, be spent and respent, and eventually return to the Federal Government at a rate of some $4 to $5 billion per year. To be sure, this would stimulate demand, but not all of those dollars would return to the Government and we would be faced with a net loss. We would be using a direct subsidy to increase the size of the gross national product, but at great public expense.

That, as I see it, is the dilemma. A direct tax cut would throw the Federal budget further out of balance. A cut in Federal expenditures alone would lead to greater unemployment, less demand, and a downward spiral similar to that which followed the similar Government policy in 1957. I think I have demonstrated that the panaceas of the far right end of the far left are not suited to the needs of today. A tax cut alone would not cure all our ills. But an outright reduction in Federal expenditures without a tax cut, even if designed to balance the budget this year, would be even worse.

We must not permit the forces of depression and unemployment to dictate to the people of the country. If you closed down your garages and sold your equipment the first month you didn't have orders, you would be bankrupt in short order. It is defeatist and unsound business to let the bottom of the cycle dictate your plans. You hold onto that equipment and work for more orders. It's sometimes awfully tough to meet a payroll, but you know that you won't be able to bid on any projects at all if you lose all your workers. Well, America has lost orders, and we have lost workers, so the revenues of the Government have fallen off. Are we to permit this fact to dictate bankruptcy? This is the course now advocated by the rightwing in this country and it is as wrong for the public's business as it would be for yours.

I advocate a gradual tax cut on the order of $10 billion, spread over a 3-year period. In this way confidence would grow and industrial investment would increase, putting private dollars to work before the falloff in tax revenue was completed. The industrial base would grow, employment would increase, and consumer demand would rise, encouraging even more investment. In this way, increased tax revenues would match the tax reductions for each year. We cannot expect the Government to finance industrial expansion and economic growth all by itself. Not only do I have a preference for the use of private capital and initiative for this purpose, but I think the history of our economy shows there is no other way. With a tax cut to be completed in 3 years' time, Congress would create a promise of industrial expansion. The fulfillment of that promise in capital outlays and jobs would yield the tax revenues that we need to balance the Federal budget.

That is only one essential ingredient of the policy I recommend. The other is a reduction in Federal Government expenditure, not down to the level of this year's tax receipts, which would call for a reduction of $8 billion in Federal spending, but a reduction that would be sufficient to promote confidence among private investors and show that Congress means business in relating all programs of spending to our central needs. I think a reduction of $3 to $4 billion in the Federal budget for the coming fiscal year would serve that purpose. It is for that reason that I voted against the President's proposal to aid mass transit companies, a vote that could have saved this country $100 million this year. I would like to see further reductions in foreign aid, noncritical defense expenditures, proposed cotton subsidies, and other programs whose impact on our economic growth is small, and which have an adverse effect on business decisions. If the Federal budget could be cut to a level of $95 to $96 billion in expenditures, with a tax cut of some $2½ billion in the first year, we could lay the foundation for a surplus by 1965. Only in this way could we unleash the forces of the American economy. But I have no use for rash and intemperate calls for budget cuts too soon and tax cuts too late.

The course I have outlined, involving a 3-year tax reduction and a $3 billion cut in Federal expenditures, is the one which I think meets public needs for Federal spending and private needs for investment and tax reduction. There is yet another argument against drastic reductions in Federal programs and it is political in nature. By drastic reductions I mean the sort of reductions that reach through fat and start tearing away muscle, and it is such cuts that some rightwing prophets are calling for.

It is now only 6 months since the direct encounter between Soviet and American military systems in the Caribbean. It was a chilling experience for all of us, in which the question was whether the Soviet Union had learned the lessons of responsibility that accompany the vastness of thermonuclear power. The confrontation could have led to a war that would have destroyed human civilization. It did not, but other occasions will continue to arise until we have pressed our advantage home. Right now the forces of the Chinese Communist Army are marshalled among the Himalayan frontier of India. Berlin, Laos, and Cuba are potentially as explosive as they ever were. The forces of freedom in the world may be called to a showdown at any time. I do not like to emphasize the peril of our situation, but I think it my duty to do so. Under conditions of imminent total destruction war, it is for us who would lead the world, to maintain our strength and press forward as swiftly as possible to lay the foundations of peace. It is by answering the age-old challenges of hunger and disease that we will turn the balance of world conflict against the Communist empire. Communism feeds on the frustration of human hopes. Freedom shall triumph through their fulfillment.

The strains of heavy armaments and space are far more telling upon the Soviet Government than they are upon ours. The rate of Soviet industrial growth has declined sharply. Their military and space programs force heavy demands upon their scarce manpower resources and produce even greater strains upon their ability to produce goods. Recently large groups of African students have been leaving the Soviet Union, and returning home to describe their disappointment. Last June Mr. Khrushchev announced drastic increases in the price of meat and butter, and in October the Soviet Government announced the cancellation of a scheduled income tax cut, part of a promise to eliminate income taxes by 1965. Drastic cutbacks in rural construction have been announced. A lack of adequate investment, particularly in the use of chemical fertilizers, has led to persistent failures to meet agricultural production goals. Our unremitting pressure in reaching toward space and increasing our military preparedness is having its effect. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, attaches the greatest importance to our continued pressure on the Soviet economy. My friends, now is not the time to call off the race. Now is not the time to abandon our grim encounter with the Communist world.

Now is the time to increase our productivity, to attack the unemployment problem, and to put America back to work at the limit of her capacity. The burdens upon Federal Government revenues are large. I am sure you know that over two-thirds of the national debt has arisen from the expense of World War II and the Korean conflict. More than 70 percent of the Federal budget goes for defense, space, and interest upon the cost of past wars. These burdens, while heavy, are not overwhelming. They are a smaller percentage of our gross national product today than at any time since World War II began. I say we can bear these expenses until the Communist empire renounces its aim of world conquest.

If there is a political basis for this general economic program I have laid before you this evening, it is here. Who would dare advocate stagnation in America in such a time? Our economic offensive against the Communist world should lead them to forswear conquest. Shall their economic offensive against us cause us to abandon the struggle? Our country, my friends, is a slumbering giant. To succeed in this ultimate struggle, our productive powers need only be set free.

Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio House of Representatives has extended its congratulations to the Constitution Day Committee of Louisville, Ohio, and the committee's chairman, Mrs. Olga T. Weber, on the occasion of their receiving the Freedom Foundation's George Washington Honor Medal Award for their outstanding annual program celebrating Constitution Day.

The committee and the people of Louisville are to be congratulated for their untiring efforts to make Constitution Day an annual patriotic observance in Ohio.

School of Advanced Studies in Real Property Acquisition in New York Hears Views of Congressman Cramer on Need for Highway Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, an address by our capable and highly respected colleague from Florida, Mr. Cramer, was delivered at the School of Advanced Studies in Real Property Acquisition, Special Seminar for New York Court of Claims, Saratoga Springs, N.Y.

Due to Mr. Cramer's pressing duties, he was unable to personally participate in the seminar and Mr. Clifton W. Enfield, minority counsel of the Committee on Public Works, delivered Mr. Cramer's address.

As the ranking minority member of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, Mr. Cramer's remarks concerning right-of-way acquisition and the illicit practices uncovered concerning this subject are particularly germane to the work of the subcommittee of which I am the ranking minority member, the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition; as well as to the work of the entire Congress as it determines legislation needed to correct these improprieties.

For these reasons, I am asking permission to insert the complete text of Mr. Cramer's address in the Record at this point:

Address of Hon. William C. Cramer, Member of Congress From Florida, Delivered by Mr. Clifton W. Enfield, Minority Counsel of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, at the School of Advanced Studies in Real Property Acquisition, Special Seminar for New York Court of Claims, Gideon Putnam Hotel, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., April 19, 1963

Mr. McMorran, Mr. Mackie, Judge Young, and your colleagues from the bench of the New York Court of Claims, and distinguished persons all, Congressman Cramer asked me to express his profound regrets in not being able to attend and personally participate in this seminar, but other pressing matters in which he is engaged made it impossible. However, his absence has become my good fortune. I am honored by this opportunity to be with you, to see so many of my old friends and to make new ones, and to bring to you Congressman Cramer's views on some very important aspects of land acquisition for public purposes.

There are many things that we could discuss, such as the absolute necessity for sound and fully documented appraisals, the value of good severance damage studies, and the duty of public officials and appraisers to give recognition to special benefits that will accrue to an owner's remaining property from the construction of a public improvement. But time does not permit going into all of these subjects, and I assume they have been, or will be, included in other portions of the program of your school of advanced studies in real property acquisition. For the next 30 minutes, I would like to talk with you about two things of the greatest importance to every person engaged in right-of-way acquisition, integrity, and education.

The modern day right-of-way agent faces many complexities, and he must be proficient in many areas of endeavor. Some time ago I tried to list the qualities you have to have to be a first class right-of-way agent. I listed them something like this: 25 percent appraiser, 25 percent salesman, 25 percent engineer, 25 percent lawyer, 25 percent governmental administrator, 25 percent economist, 25 percent public relations expert, and 25 percent psychologist. You add that up and it is 200 percent—a double-sized man. It is a man who has the ability to unite the knowledge of many separate professions and to bring them to bear harmoniously upon a public undertaking in such a way that all affected parties are at least reasonably satisfied. This takes skill and patience.

Great rights-of-way agents are not born; they are products of education and training; they must be men of the highest integrity; and they must be dedicated to public service. Superintendent McMorran and the State department of public works are to be congratulated for conducting a school of advanced studies in real property acquisition, of which this special 2-day seminar is a part. Schools of this kind, which provide training at a professional level, ably presented by a highly qualified and respected person in the right-of-way field, can do much to fill the educational void left by our institutions of higher learning, very few of which offer a curriculum designed to graduate a trained right-of-way man. In right-of-way acquisition, as in every other profession, a continuing educational program is essential, both for public employees and private practitioners, to promote the growth and dissemination of a specialized body of knowledge and to spark new ideas for the development of better methods and techniques.

The need to secure the best possible information as to value and damages and the essentiality of competency to and integrity of those engaged in public land acquisition is readily apparent when we consider the vast sums of money being spent by all levels of government for all types of public works. Right-of-way for the interstate highway system alone is estimated to cost in excess of $6 billion, and when we add to that the costs of real property for all other highways and streets, dams and reservoirs, canals, public buildings, urban renewal, and all other governmental activities, the amount of money involved becomes astronomical. Unfortunately, public works programs of such magnitude, which involve such tremendous sums of money and the participation of so many thousands of people, are bound to attract some incompetent people and some dishonest, and unscrupulous persons who are looking for opportunities to profit at the expense of the public. To illustrate how this can occur, it is appropriate to look at some recent disclosures of incompetency and dishonesty in the highway program.

The State and Federal officials and employees charged with the responsibility of carrying out the Federal-aid highway program are, in the main, honest, competent, and dedicated public servants, who have fully justified the trust placed in them; however, there has been a disturbing frequency of incidents of incompetency, graft, and dishonesty.

Reports and rumors of fraud and thievery in the highway program quickly followed enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. In Indiana, the chairman of the State highway commission and several others were indicted and convicted of fraudulent activities in the acquisition of highway right-of-way. In Arizona, the chief right-of-way agent for the State highway department was accused of allegedly causing a State warrant to be issued to a fictitious person, and of pocketing the proceeds. In Arkansas, a subcontractor and a highway department engineer were convicted by a Federal court on charges involving false certification of the quantity of materials delivered to a Federal-aid project.

Because of these incidents and other reports and rumors, in September of 1959, the House Committee on Public Works established the Special Subcommittee on Federal-Aid Highway Program to conduct continuing investigations and to act as a congressional watchdog to protect the public interest. So far the subcommittee has held public hearings with respect to highway practices in five States: Oklahoma, Florida, New Mexico, Massachusetts, and West Virginia. In all of these hearings, the disclosures were most disturbing.

The first of these hearings, in May of 1960, involved the construction of an interstate highway bypass around Tulsa, Okla. The hearings disclosed that there had been a deplorable failure to meet specifications. An alarming picture was presented of inadequate or no supervision by the State, failure to make proper tests and inspections, and falsification of test reports and preparation of bogus test samples by highway department employees. It was further disclosed that a member of the Oklahoma State Highway Commission was a concealed partner of a firm bidding on highway department sodding contracts. The report of the subcommittee made a general finding "* * * that conditions were so incredibly bad that they created a climate virtually inviting the perpetration of fraud."

In Florida it was shown that for many years highway contractors had made payments of cash, whisky, turkeys, and other things of value to highway department employees who were assigned to supervise and inspect their work. Testimony also disclosed that due to inadequate planning, insufficient lead time for the acquisition of rights-of-way and disposal of improvements, and plain incompetency, the State disposed of valuable improvements on rights-of-way in total disregard of the public interest by turning them over to contractors and allowed such contractors and speculators to reap windfall profits which should have accrued to the State and the Federal Government.

The hearings involving New Mexico disclosed events somewhat similar to that found in Oklahoma. Evidence was presented showing incompetent and nonexistent inspections and wholly inadequate supervision by highway department employees, failure of the contractor to comply with specifications, and failure of a highway project even before it was opened to traffic. There was also evidence that two members of the State highway commission were suppliers of automotive supplies and equipment to firms bidding on State highway department contracts.

I have merely touched upon the highlights of these hearings. Those of you who may be interested in more details will find the printed hearings and subcommittee reports interesting reading.

Reports have not yet been issued on the hearings involving right-of-way practices in Massachusetts and West Virginia; however, the printed hearings are available. The Massachusetts hearings disclosed unbelievable laxity, incompetency, and fraud in the acquisition of rights-of-way for Federal-aid highways. The department of public works became a spawning ground for a variety of conspiratorial patterns which grew and flourished. The evidence showed that incompetent appraisers were employed by the State and that there was no adequate review of appraisals. The hearings disclosed a revolting pattern of conspiracy between certain State officials and employees, appraisers, and attorneys, resulting in the payment of greatly inflated prices for property needed for highway rights-of-way. Mr. Oscar Beasley played an important role in this investigation and hearings. He was employed by the bureau of public roads to review the appraisals of right-of-way on certain sections of Federal-aid highways, many of which had been the basis for settlements, and he found scores of them to be completely inadequate and inconsistent with actual market value. Sixteen individuals and corporations have been indicted with respect to rights-of-way matters brought out at this hearing, 12 of which have been convicted, including an asociate commissioner of the department of public works, three rights-of-way employees of the department, four independent appraisers, a private attorney, a real estate broker, and two corporations that owned property acquired by the State. Indictments are still pending against a former right-of-way engineer of the department of public works and a private attorney who was later appointed as a judge of the State courts.

The time has come when members of the right-of-way profession, as well as all others associated with the highway program, must be brutally objective and honest in the evaluation of themselves and their associates. Those who are competent, honest, and dedicated are a credit to the profession and an asset to the highway program. I am sure that the great majority of persons engaged in right-of-way acquisition for the highway program fall into this category. However, there are others who are neither a credit nor an asset to anything.

First, we have the dishonest person, who is seeking to profit at public expense. Nothing we say here will eliminate him. We can do only two things to protect the public against such a person: be alert to his activities, and enact laws which will promote his prompt detection and punishment. I will say more about such laws in a few minutes.

Second, we have the person who is basically honest but who simply does not know how to do his job and hides the fact from his superiors. You might say that, by reason of this, he, too is dishonest. but such motivations as job retention and pride can becloud one's sense of moral and ethical values.

Hearings held by the special subcommittee on right-of-way acquisition practices in West Virginia disclosed deplorable examples of what can result from employment of this latter type of person.

It was shown in these hearings that certain responsible positions in the right-of-way division of the State highway department were staffed with people who had little or no background in right-of-way work; there was no inservice training of any real substance and no manual for the guidance and instruction of employees, many of whom changed with each new administration; bewildering and ambiguous formulas for fixing value were adopted that bore no relationship to accepted appraisal standards; the highly important function of appraisal review turned out to be, for the most part, nothing more than a perfunctory check for arithmetical errors; and unconscionable overpayments had been made for rights-of-way. It was further disclosed that State highway department employees were asked to make regular monthly contributions to a political party's sustaining fund. State employees were even furnished coupon books for their use in making monthly payments.

The West Virginia hearings were devoted principally to the acquisition of rights-of-way in the town of Beckley, W. Va. The testimony indicated that State right-of-way personnel were extremely anxious to avoid court proceedings for condemnation of real property, because they were convinced that court awards would be excessive, and the history of past court awards tended to substantiate this fear. I make this observation not to defend the practices of the right-of-way personnel, but simply as a matter of background and to give you food for thought. It is common knowledge that right-of-way settlements in many States have been made above appraised value because highway officials fear, on the basis of past experience, that court awards would be even higher. This demonstrates either a lack of confidence in court procedures or a lack of confidence in the attorneys handling cases for the State, which certainly does not contribute to the desirable practice of acquiring rights-of-way at prices which are fair and just, both to property owners and to the public, who pays the bills.

In any event, the West Virginia Highway Department right-of-way personnel sought to avoid court proceedings at all costs. Properties were appraised, and offers were made on the basis of such appraisals. If such an offer was not accepted, the property would be reappraised, and if necessary re-reappraised, with additional elements or amounts of value and damages being added each time until a figure was reached that was acceptable to the property owner. The testimony disclosed that in order to justify amounts acceptable to property owners, the State's appraisals included such things as allowances both for the full amounts of proximity damages and for the full costs of moving and reestablishing buildings away from the highway, an obvious duplication of payments.

The testimony also showed that the State right-of-way people wanted to be fair to all property owners. If one property owner held out for and received a settlement in excess of the appraised value of his property, the State frequently added substantial amounts to the settlements previously agreed to by owners of other similar properties to assure that all owners were paid on an equal, even if not a rational, basis.

Obviously, the result of such practices was exorbitant expenditures of public funds. Let me emphasize the fact that, generally speaking, the West Virginia hearings disclosed no evidence of fraud or personal profit on the part of State personnel. They were simply honest people sincerely trying to get the best "deal" for the State, without being quite sure of how to go about it, without full knowledge of the appraisal process and how to apply it, without benefit of proper supervision and review, and without confidence in court proceedings.

The solution to problems of this kind is competency through education, and continuing education. Schools such as that being conducted by the New York Department of Public Works, seminars like this one, and the continuing efforts of right-of-way and appraisal organizations, the bureau of public roads, and State highway departments can minimize, if not eliminate, such problems. Two things probably can never be completely eliminated: controversy as to particular acquisitions and the occasional thief. But if all right-of-way personnel are thoroughly trained for their jobs and if their work is properly supervised and reviewed, controversy can be withstood, and the occasional thief will be as unusual as the dishonest bank teller.

I am convinced that the vast majority of persons building our highways are honest, competent, and dedicated to serving the public interest; however, the disclosures of the special subcommittee have made it abundantly clear that fraud, graft, thievery, and incompetency are far more widespread, and involve far more people, than most of us would have suspected or believed before these hearings.

I have heard many of my friends in State highway departments express shock over the irregularities found in other States and then say that it cannot happen in their States. But it can and very possibly has happened there, to some degree.

It is difficult to be suspicious of a friend. It is hard to be suspicious of people that you have known, liked, and worked with for a long time. But the cases of dishonesty and incompetency revealed in congressional hearings occurred largely because honest and competent highway officials and employees assumed that everybody else was equally honest and competent, and therefore did not review the work of their subordinates or associates carefully or critically. They accepted everything at face value, and thus created the opportunity for fraud and incompetency.

I am not suggesting that we establish a spy system where nobody trusts anybody. I am saying that we should not take everything for granted. We should not blindly accept a statement or certification that a job has been done. We must make some inquiry or examination to assure that the work has actually been done, and done properly. This is the only way that we can minimize the opportunity for fraud and incompetency, and have some assurance that dishonesty will be promptly detected and punished.

It is to serve this end, and for the protection of the public interest and the reputation of the thousands of honest, competent highway officials and employees, that Congressman CRAMER, as ranking minority member on both the Roads Subcommittee and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program of the House Committee on Public Works, has urged the Congress to provide Federal law enforcement agencies with tools that are adequate to root out and punish those responsible for dishonesty, graft, and incompetency, which could detroy public confidence in and support of the Federal-aid highway program. These tools are embodied in a bill introduced by Congressman CRAMER in September of 1961, and reintroduced, with some changes, in the present Congress on January 24 of this year.

The present bill, H.R. 2557, which would provide for an act known as the Federal-Aid Highway Reform Act of 1963, would revise and strengthen existing law by prohibiting officials, employees and other persons performing services in connection with a Federal-aid highway project from having any personal interest in any contract with respect to which they have any official authority or responsibility, and would prohibit such persons from having any interest in any real property acquired for such project without full and public disclosure of their interest. It would prohibit contractors on Federal-aid highway projects from giving money or other things of value to Federal, State, and local officials and employees who are supposed to be supervising their work, and would prohibit the solicitation of such payments. The bill would further make it a crime to knowingly perform work or furnish material or to permit the performance of work or furnishing of materials not in accordance with the plans and specifications. Further, with respect to rights-of-way, the bill would extend the provisions of existing law relating to false statements and representations concerning Federal-aid highway projects to the acquisition, administration, and disposition of real property. Finally, the bill would prohibit political contribution by anyone who is at the time negotiating for or performing a contract in connection with a Federal-aid highway project, including the sale of real property therefor. This would extend to Federal-aid contracts the provisions of existing law which apply to contracts with the United States.

The Department of Commerce also recognized the need for revising existing criminal statutes relating to Federal-aid highways and submitted proposed legislation to the last Congress in March of 1962. On the 4th of this month, the Attorney General of the United States submitted similar proposed legislation, which was developed in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, to the Congress. This proposed legislation has not yet been introduced, but it is substantially similar to Congressman CRAMER's bill, except that it does not contain a provision prohibiting political contributions, nor does it completely prohibit conflicts of interest, but simply requires full disclosure of situations which might lead to conflicts of interest.

It has often been said that you cannot legislate morals or judgment. Legislation such as that proposed should deter fraud and other wrongdoing, and it should make easier the prosecution of those who commit such acts, but it will not make moral those who are immoral, nor will it make competent those who are incompetent.

Morality and competency must spring from those in the highway industry, and no area is more sensitive to its lack than right-of-way acquisition. The spotlight of public scrutiny will continue to be upon right-of-way throughout the life of the Federal-aid highway program, and it is incumbent upon everyone engaged in real property acquisition to insist upon the highest standards of competency and integrity at all times, and to establish such checks and safeguards as may be necessary to assure that any departures therefrom will be quickly detected and corrected.

This challenge should be welcomed, for it affords an opportunity for right-of-way people to demonstrate their ability to perform professional services in a manner to merit public confidence, and I am satisfied that, with the leadership of such men as are assembled here, the right-of-way profession will meet this challenge.

Altoona Senior High School Band Praised for Washington Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Altoona Senior High School Band, under the capable direction of Mr. John Monti, band director, had the distinct privilege of officially representing the great State of Pennsylvania in the annual Cherry Blossom Festival in Washington, D.C., and winning two first prizes.

For the first time in the 60 year history of the Cherry Blossom Festival, one school won the top honors in two categories—band competition and majorettes, in competition with school units from throughout the country.

I wish to commend the 210 musicians and majorettes of the Altoona Senior High School Band, their director Mr. John Monti, administrators, school faculty, and directors and citizens of Altoona for making possible the fine performance and trip to Washington, D.C., and especially to Mr. John Monti. Without his untiring efforts, aggressiveness, personality, and spirit, the victory would not have been possible in the presentation of outstanding music, splendid displays and precision drills.

We in Pennsylvania are very proud to say that this fine high school is located in our State and in the 12th Congressional District of Pennsylvania which I have the privilege to serve.

Before Tests Are Banned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, of California, to the "Letters to the Times" column in the April 19, 1963, edition of the New York Times:

BEFORE TESTS ARE BANNED: REPRESENTATIVE HOSMER SAYS A TREATY MUST BAR SOVIET CHEATING

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

This refers to your March 25 editorial claiming U.S. test-ban treaty proposals would assure detection of clandestine Soviet underground testing; Dr. David R. Inglis's letter of April 5 associating those who dispute the claim with such words as "irresponsible," "ridiculous," and "sabotage," and James J. Wadsworth's April 8 letter charging the GOP conference committee on nuclear testing seized upon one bit of testimony to present what he describes as biased and misleading findings.

In his own way, each of the writers exemplifies a common and perilous obliviousness to facts which destroy the claim and which were placed on public record during Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hearings March 5 to March 12.

The editorial writer apparently accepted and reiterated the Disarmament Agency's self-assessment of its own handiwork.

Dr. Inglis refused to face facts in a manner characteristic of the highly emotional fringe of test-ban proponents whenever they are confronted with facts which establish the "big hole" for Soviet cheating in administration treaty proposals.

REDUCING SEISMIC SIGNALS

Mr. Wadsworth haplessly based his criticism on the Disarmament Agency's weird contortion of these facts which culminated in its erroneous assertion that the "big hole" in Soviet test cheating depends for its existence on carrying out clandestine activities in U.S.S.R. alluvial soil. Actually the "big hole" exists, as explained below, because of the size to which seismic signals from significant cheat tests can be reduced irrespective of geology, not (unfortunately for Mr. Wadsworth, who staked part of his prestige on it) upon testing in scarce Soviet alluvium.

The indisputable facts which establish the existence of the "big hole," brought to light during the Joint Committee's hearings, were:

Disarmament Agency witnesses testified that both current Anglo-U.S. proposals, and new ones soon to be announced, will rely on seismic observatories outside the Soviet Union to discover underground cheat testing inside its borders. Only a token number of unreliable delayed-reporting, tamper-prone unmanned and, as yet uninvented, "black box" devices will be demanded for placement in Russia.

The Defense Department's top seismologist, Dr. Carl Romney, testified that the capability of seismographs to record intelligible data is physically limited by natural earth background noise which occurs everywhere. Its effect on seismographs is similar to static on a shortwave radio: unless a seismic signal is larger and stronger than background noise, it is simply unintelligible.

Seismic signals double the background noise level are needed to "detect" seismic disturbances, whether they be created by man or by nature. Signals 10 to 20 times the background noise level must be recorded to be able to "distinguish" unnatural seismic events in the U.S.S.R. from earthquakes.

Recording signals big enough to make this distinction are the key to arousing the suspicion of monitors and of setting a treaty's on-site inspection machinery into motion. Here the "big hole" comes in.

SIMILARITY TO EARTHQUAKES

It exists because Soviet scientists can keep the seismic signals from secret test so small in size by the time they emerge from Soviet borders that even though they are detected, they cannot be distinguished from hundreds of similar sized small earthquakes occurring annually in the U.S.S.R. This can be done by holding yields down below three kilotons and testing in formations like alluvium which transmit seismic waves poorly; testing in underground cavities which decouple explosive shock from surrounding earth and drastically reduce the seismic signal, or a combination of the foregoing.

This eliminates the key to arousing suspicion and dispatching on-site inspectors. While the United States stopped all its testing, in effect it would simply be trusting a Soviet promise not to test by these undiscoverable means.

The Atomic Energy Commission Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, U.S. Army, testified that the entire spectrum of nuclear weapons of military interest, except very large yield super H-bombs which the Soviets already have anyway, can be perfected by tests carried out under these conditions of undiscoverability. General Betts revealed that even without a need for secrecy approximately one-half of U.S. underground tests in Nevada are carried on precisely at these very low, undiscoverable yields.

These are the facts not faced by the abovementioned writers. They must be faced if nuclear test-ban negotiations are to be carried on with the realism American citizens demand of their Government.

Even the most ardent test-ban proponent should join in vigorously demanding closure of the "big hole" by installation of manned seismic observatories inside the U.S.S.R. Only an effective treaty which inhibits nuclear progress to the same degree on both sides of the Iron Curtain has any chance of reducing the risks of today's nuclear war. A "big hole" treaty would stop our nuclear progress and create the new risk of surreptitious Soviet testing to gain the surprise military superiority needed to back up a surrender-or-die ultimatum.

Craig Hosmer,
Member of Congress.

Washington, *April 15, 1963.*

What's the Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the issues of the May 21 wheat referendum are of tremendous interest to millions of our citizens, and I believe that every possible fact should be developed before farmers go to vote. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce made a significant contribution to understanding of the issues when it presented the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Latta], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole], members of the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, in its weekly radio program, "What's the Issue?" April 21. Arch N. Booth, executive vice president of the chamber, served as moderator, and under unanimous consent, I include the text of discussion as a part of my remarks:

What's the Issue?

Mr. Booth. Today our subject is agriculture—more specifically, wheat, the staff of life. There is, of course, no wheat bill for Congress to consider this year. But there is a bill, so to speak, before an even higher tribunal—the farmers of America. Within a month—on May 21—the Nation's wheat producers will decide to accept or reject a new type of federally directed supply-management program for wheat. And wheat is grown in all 48 mainland States. Congress authorized this program in the Agricultural Act of 1962. If the wheat producers approve it will become effective with the 1964 crop.

All Americans have a stake in the outcome of the May 21 referendum—as consumers and taxpayers. So it is pretty important that not only the wheat producers, but all of us know the consequences of this decision: whether it's a "yes" vote, a "no" vote, or a failure to vote at all.

To discuss this issue, we are fortunate to have with us today three Members of the Congress of the United States. All three are members of the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. They are—

Congressman Graham Purcell, Democrat, from the 13th District of Texas, and chairman of the wheat subcommittee;

Congressman Delbert Latta, Republican, from the Fifth District of Ohio; and

Congressman Robert Dole, Republican, from the First District of Kansas.

Now, gentlemen, so that this program will be informative and helpful, let's keep two objectives in mind:

The first is to describe clearly how the new program would affect the production and marketing of wheat. The other objective is to bring into sharper focus some of the less tangible, but nevertheless important factors and issues which hang in the balance of this referendum. No doubt some of the views expressed here today will be controversial. But that's what's to be expected. That's what makes an issue, so let's proceed.

First of all, I'd like to ask each of you gentlemen why this particular referendum has attracted so much attention. In short, what is the fundamental issue the wheat farmers will be deciding when they vote next month? Congressman Purcell, as chairman of the wheat subcommittee, will you lead off?

Mr. Purcell. Thank you. I think the fundamental issue of the wheat referendum is the price of wheat for 1964. This will determine the income for farm families in the wheat area and the level of business activity in the rural towns all across the country in 1964. The direction of the wheat program is not actually involved, since the program in most respects is like the wheat program which has been in effect for over 25 years in our country.

Mr. Latta. I'd just like to add to what Mr. Purcell has said. This price situation is something to be concerned with in this program, but contrary to what we have read in the paper that if we don't adopt this program we will have dollar wheat. It's just not true because under existing law the price of wheat could not go below 50 percent of parity, and parity now is $2.49 a bushel. One-half of that would be $1.24½. When you add 5 percent to that you have 6 percent, or 6 cents makes it $1.30, plus carrying charges which would be about 5 cents a bushel. So it can't sink below $1.35 a bushel under existing law, that's been on the statute books for a good many years, if the voters turn this referendum down.

Mr. Booth. Congressman Dole, how does it look from a representative of the great wheat State of Kansas?

Mr. Dole. Well, coming from the State that has about 20 percent of wheat production, and from a district, I think the largest wheat-producing district in this country, I think there is a lot of interest, and I think perhaps the reason or reasons for it are many. First of all, this is the first time that I recall that any Secretary of Agriculture has gone all out to sell the program. I think before it's been a question of the farmers voting "yes" or "no" in a referendum. We find this time the USDA pulling all the stops in an effort to obtain a favorable vote. In the second place, we must recognize the facts that we do have a battle here between different farm organizations. And third, we have, of course, a battle of philosophy—whether we must accept Mr. Freeman's so-called supply-management program, or whether the wheat farmer shall be treated like other farmers and be entitled to a voluntary program. It seems to me that the issue is whether or not the wheat farmer is willing to accept a mandatory program in face of the administration's change of position lately in the feed grain bill and President Kennedy's statement which appears in the majority report on the Feed Grain Act of 1963, pointing out that it is a voluntary program. So if it's good for feed grains, the voluntary program would be good for the wheat producers.

Mr. Latta. Before we pass on here, I would like to just stress this point that Congressman Dole has made here, that this is the real test of the administration's supply-management approach to agriculture. It has been rejected by the Congress, and this bill just passed by a few votes on wheat. For other grains, and particularly, as he points out, in feed grains, this is the real test of supply-management. If this is approved by the farmers dealing with wheat on May 21, we probably will envision other types of supply-management programs in the future.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, if I might I would just like to point out at this point that the comparison has been made between the proposed wheat program and the existing feed grain program. Now, I think it only fair to mention at this point that the proposed wheat referendum, or the bill that calls for the wheat referendum, is quite similar to the legislation which has long been in effect in regard to other segments of our farm economy. Tobacco, rice, peanuts, and several of those crops are under now, and have been for a long time, a program very similar to the wheat referendum, or the wheat provision.

Mr. LATTA. Well, I think at that point, GRAHAM would admit that this is a major commodity we're dealing with here, as far as wheat is concerned. And this is the first time we've had such an approach to a major commodity. It's true as you pointed out, that for these less minor, minor commodities, tobacco, that you do have a tighter program, and have had it for years. But we do have some problems cropping up, even in cotton, that you're well aware of.

Mr. BOOTH. Let's move to another question that will carry this discussion right along. I'll ask each of you to comment on this one, please. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, said that the program for 1964 is similar to the wheat programs we have had for the past 25 years. He pointed out that the changes which have been made are adjustments to meet new conditions which are very familiar to wheat farmers. Congressman PURCELL, will you lead off and let me ask you this question. If that statement is acceptable, then how can there be so much at stake in the referendum?

Mr. PURCELL. Well, to answer that question, I would have to pretty much repeat what I said in answer to the first question, which is saying, in effect, that this is an extension of the basic principles as far as the manner in which the farmer will function, that the wheat program has had all of the many years. Now, I would like to say at this point that if the wheat referendum fails, there have been statements made quite generally that then there would be new legislation. I want to express the feeling of all of those of us that come from agricultural areas and say that I know that all of us will do everything we can for the farmer, regardless of what referendum passes or fails.

Mr. LATTA. May I interrupt to congratulate the Congressman on that point. I think that's a proper approach, and we certainly will support him. Isn't that true, Mr. DOLE?

Mr. DOLE. Yes, and I think that Mr. PURCELL has pointed out the true theory of a referendum. In other words, you trot out something to the farmer, and if it's not satisfactory, he has the right to reject it. Then it's our obligation in Congress, I think, to come back with something else, and not to leave the wheat producer as a lone ranger on the horizon.

Mr. PURCELL. Let me continue and say that I know that all of us who come from the "breadbasket," if you want to call it that, or the farm areas of our country, are very sincere in our feeling. I think we learned last year that the chances of us getting a major program passed late in the summer this year will be most difficult, basing our judgment upon the activity of the Congressmen from the city areas of last year. Mr. Chairman, I may not have dealt directly with the question you were asking, but I think that this is a significant area for us to think about.

Mr. BOOTH. Do either of the other two men have any comment about why there is so much at stake in this referendum, if it is true that the adjustments to meet the new conditions are familiar to the wheat farmers?

Mr. LATTA. Well, I might say that I disagree with Secretary Freeman when he says that this is something we have had in the past. Sure we've had mandatory programs for wheat producers in the past after they go through a referendum. But I might say that this is a different approach where we have this tremendous variation between the prices of wheat. For example, out in Ohio most of our wheat producers in the past have been outside these programs. And if they continue to remain outside the program they'll not get the market price for their commodity, but they'll get $1.30. Now that's a tremendous drop from $2. From that score, I think it's quite different.

Mr. BOOTH. We'll get some additional light on this question, I believe, if we'll bring just a few more details in front of us. Congressman DOLE, would you tell us, what are the key provisions of the new wheat program for 1964?

Mr. DOLE. Well, I might say, Mr. Booth, this is another area we might be bogged down on differences of opinion. But I think basically we could point out the course. The Secretary shall set the national wheat quota, and then he shall determine the acreage needed to produce this quota. Then he shall issue marketing certificates representing the amount of wheat to be eligible for sale, in other words the domestic quantity of wheat. Then, of course, the balance of the wheat will be so-called feed wheat and shall receive a feed price. And on the 80 percent of production used for domestic purposes, of course the farmer will receive around $2. On the balance—the feed wheat—he will receive around $1.30. Now we get into many areas here where we can differ. I would point out though, that under the program after 1965 the Secretary still has the authority to require a farmer to divert acres but there is no authority for payment for these diverted acres. We get into the free diversion concept which I don't believe many of the farmers understand. But to avoid any technical arguing, I think it might be just as well to point out those few highlights.

Mr. BOOTH. Fine. I'll ask Mr. PURCELL, then, if he'll elaborate a little about the certificates feature. Who pays for the differential on each bushel of certified wheat the farmer sells?

Mr. PURCELL. Well, the marketing certificates would be paid for either by the miller or by the exporter. And wheat selling at the market at $1.30 per bushel plus the 70 cents marketing certificate, will bring the cost of wheat to a miller to $2 per bushel—about the same as it is at the present time. Now eventually the certificate would be redeemed by the Government, either in kind or in cash, I believe the provisions are.

Mr. BOOTH. Let me go to Mr. LATTA, now. What about the small-farm provisions of the program, Congressman LATTA? Your State of Ohio has many of the 15-acre wheat producers. Will they benefit by the new program?

Mr. LATTA. Well, I can't say that they will. Now out in Ohio, we have approximately 170,000 wheat producers and about 150,000 of them who have not participated in the programs in the past. Now I have pointed out the discrimination towards the small farmer in this program right from the start. I did it in the subcommittee, in the committee, and on the floor of the House, and have done it since. This program requests the small farmer, meaning the 15-acre farmer, to take a double cut. This year, 1963, for example, we are entitled to a 15-acre exemption out in Ohio. Under this bill, now this is what they are going to be voting on, on May 21, they will no longer have the 15-acre exemption, but they will be permitted to plant the highest of the last 3 years, the average of the last 3 years, excluding 1963. So if a farmer planted 15 acres for 2 years and 1 year in Ohio he did not plant any, where we rotate our crops, he has 30 acres. You divide that by 3 and you have 10 acres. So he drops from 15 acres down to 10 acres.. And when they go into this program, he must take another 10-percent cut. So he gets it twice. Whereas the larger producer only takes the 10-percent cut to go into the program. I think this is rank discrimination as far as the small farmer is concerned, and he just cannot live with this type of provision.

You take the farmer in Ohio who has been producing 15 acres of wheat. I'll just run a little tab here as to how much money he would lose. We all average about 40 bushels to the acre, so you end up with 600 bushels at $2 a bushel, which he got in 1963, and he has an income of $1,200. He goes into this program and he's planted 15 acres for 2 years and none for another year, and he ends up with 10 acres. Then he has a minus 10 percent which leaves him 9 acres. Nine acres times 40 bushels to the acre, he gets 360 bushels. Then he only gets paid, if he goes into the program, on 80 percent of that. So that leaves him 288 bushels at $2 a bushel, or $576. Then on the 72 bushels remaining, or the 20 percent, he gets $1.30, even though he goes into the program. This makes him $93.60. Then he gets a diversion payment out in Ohio of about $24 an acre. So you add those up—$576, $93.60, and $24—and you get $693.60, if he goes into the program, as opposed to what he would have in income on the same 15 acres at $1,200 in 1963. And I maintain our farmers can't live with that. So they'll have to make the choice as to whether they want to go into the program or whether they don't. And I think it's important to point out here that for the first time the 15-acre, or small-type farmer, will have an opportunity to vote in a referendum. We haven't had that in the past, and if there is any good feature about this program, I say it's giving these farmers the right to vote. But they have to sign up at least 7 days prior to May 21 in order to vote.

Mr. BOOTH. Now Congressman DOLE, let me come to you to get a little more of the economics of this question in front of us. If the $2 price objective is only 80 percent of the established parity price, I wonder if there are many farmers who would raise any wheat for the low support price of $1.30. I suppose if anyone can produce wheat at that price, the western Kansas farmers can do it. Is that correct?

Mr. DOLE. This is relatively correct, yes, but under this program of course, we can only produce so much at $1.30, which is another difference between this and what they originally talked about as the McNary-Haugen bill that's been around for about 40 years, and turned down by Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, and of course vetoed originally by Mr. Coolidge. And I think we should point out, too, that 100 percent of parity is $2.49, and as you pointed out, $2 is around 80 percent of parity. Now I call this the 80–80 bill. You get 80 percent of parity for 80 percent of your production. And on the balance you get 52 percent of parity. I remember very well the promises of President Kennedy when he was campaigning, about 90 percent of parity for the basic commodities. And I don't know of any, in fact there aren't any basic commodities now receiving as much as 90 percent of parity. And this brings to me, I think, a very significant difference between the present bill, the one the farmers will vote on, and the one we've talked about in the past. In fact, one that Clifford Hope from my district, a member of the Agriculture Committee for 30 years and a well-respected Member of Congress, has long supported, which was called the domestic parity bill. Under this present 1964 program, we also have, in addition to bushel controls, acreage controls. So the farmer isn't free to plant all the wheat he wants. He can only plant so many acres. He must stay within his allotment, or he's subject to penalties and marketing quotas. I think, when we talk about the income to the farmer in the 1964 program, he just can't possibly maintain the income he had been receiving before. And from this standpoint, while the farmers of western Kansas would certainly raise all the wheat they could at $1.30, they can't do this under this program.

Mr. BOOTH. Congressman PURCELL, how much latitude does the Secretary of Agriculture have in changing the program in future years? It seems likely that the wheat producers will want to know the extent to which the program can be altered from year to year.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, the program for 1964 is not expected to change in any major respects from the program in 1963. The farm income under the program for 1965 can be as high, I think, as the 1964 program. The only major change for later years is the diversion payments are not authorized after 1965. However, it seems to me the income can still be maintained under the program because the Secretary of Agriculture is required to set price support at a level and quantities in a manner which will achieve the income objective of the farmer. And I would like to continue in this vein to say that the figures that have been quoted this morning I am sure are correct in saying that the price for wheat will be in the neighborhood of $1.30, assuming that the farmers stay within their allotments that have already been assigned. Now, if as many as 65 million acres of wheat are planted, like the Secretary and some of the figures in the Department have indicated they feel will be the case, then there will be so many farmers planting over and above and disregarding their allotment, and for that wheat there will be no price support, that then there could be dollar wheat for a large portion of our wheat. Now I'm not saying that to be argumentative. I think it is only fair to point out that if the allotments are disregarded, then there will be a lot of wheat, very likely, that is as low as $1 or in that neighborhood.

Mr. DOLE. I might state there, if I might, even if the referendum is turned down, then of course without Congress taking any action, those farmers who comply with their allotments are entitled to 50 percent of parity. And as Mr. LATTA has pointed out earlier, and as Mr. PURCELL has touched on, in addition to the $1.24½ which is 50 percent of parity, you add 5 percent above that plus carrying charges, which makes it about $1.35. This is the least that the Secretary can release surplus stocks on the market. And under section 407 of the 1949 act of course, he can strengthen the market if he wants to by raising this figure. So I don't think all is lost if the referendum fails.

Mr. LATTA. Let me point out something else here that will affect this price that we haven't talked about, and I think it's important that we talk about this. We're talking now about noncertificate wheat of $1.30. If this program doesn't go on the books, we've got $1.40 world price for wheat right now. So our farmers could sell their wheat on the world market, without benefit of any program at all. We're talking about the noncomplier, so to speak, and the compliers for 20 percent of their crop—$1.30, which is 10 cents a bushel less than the world price of $1.40 today.

Mr. BOOTH. Let's talk for just a moment about the farmer and the information he needs to help make up his mind about how to vote. Secretary Freeman has emphasized, and properly of course, that he would not presume to tell the farmers how to vote. That he would stick to the facts about the program alternatives. Now the Secretary has urged the farmers to visit the local county agricultural stabilization and conservation offices as the best place to go for information. But these men are employees of the Secretary and will of course sell the best points, emphasize the best points of the program. How can the farmer get both sides? There are two sides to this argument of course. One he can get all of, to some extent, from these offices. Where can he go to get the rest of the story?

Mr. PURCELL. I would like to respond, if I might, please. First, I don't mean to be defensive, but I would like to state that I think because the ASC county offices are employees of the Federal Government does not, per se, mean that they are not going to be fair about it. I think we should keep in mind that for 25 or 30 years this is the office where the farmers have come to get their information. I do not believe that the ASC offices have been putting out incorrect information. There are two sides to this question, and there might be other places that a farmer could go, but I would say he would get accurate information, if I may, by going to the ASC office.

Mr. DOLE. Let me state at this point that in Kansas, for example, since last March every county ASC office has been publishing a newsletter. I think this is good in some respects, but in the March 1963 newsletter that went out to every county, it said the big issue was $2 or question mark. Then it goes on in the next paragraph to say that it's between $2 and $1 wheat. This is the 1964 referendum. And these are the types of things I think have been unfair. It denies the farmer the freedom of choice that he's entitled to in the referendum. I certainly feel that my obligation, and I think the others would agree, is not to sell the program, not to try to defeat the referendum, but to give the farmer the facts. You'll find the farmers in Kansas, Texas, and Ohio can figure out which program is the best for them.

Mr. BOOTH. Our thanks to Congressman ROBERT DOLE, of Kansas; Congressman DELBERT LATTA, of Ohio; and to Congressman GRAHAM PURCELL, of Texas, for shedding some light on this important and somewhat complicated issue—the proposed supply-management program for wheat. The complete text of this broadcast will be available to anyone who will write to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington 6, D.C. If you would like to have a copy of the complete text of the remarks made by these three Congressmen today during this program, just write to What's the Issue?, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington 6, D.C. It's yours for the asking. Next week, a special program on proposals for a new look at Federal income taxes. Each week this program brings you a discussion of the choices facing free Americans. This is Arch Booth, speaking for the chamber of commerce of the United States and inviting you to join us next week at this same time.

The Age of Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Dr. T. Marshall Hahn was installed as the president of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, my alma mater. It was indeed a pleasure for me to attend and participate in these ceremonies on the campus at Blacksburg, Va.

Among the addresses delivered at the installation was that of Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges. It is appropriate, I believe, that Secretary Hodges' remarks be brought to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

We are today concerned wtih the subject of assistance to education. We will undoubtedly have this subject under discussion many times in this session, and Secretary Hodges reviews some of the reasons for Federal aid to education. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include Secretary Hodges' speech.

The speech follows:

THE AGE OF EXCELLENCE

(Address by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges prepared for delivery at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Coliseum Auditorium, Blacksburg, Va., Thursday, April 4, 1963)

Dr. Hahn, it is indeed a pleasure to participate in your inauguration as our Nation's youngest president of a land-grant institution of higher learning.

I want to congratulate both you and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute on this timely joining of your destinies. Together you symbolize, especially to a member of the Kennedy administration, the challenging opportunities for achieving New Frontiers of excellence in the field of higher education.

By your very youth, you represent the future of our country.

As an educator and a scientist, you also represent the two forces which will have the greatest impact in determining what the future of the United States will be.

But most of all, by your willingness to accept such heavy responsibilities at an early age, you embody our hopes for a new generation of men and women who will be educated to the fullest extent of their capabilities to cope with the complexities and challenges of an age of revolutionary change.

This great educational institution is also symbolic, both of our past and of our future.

As a native of Virginia who grew up just across the State line in North Carolina, I know something of what VPI has meant to the economic progress of this State and of this whole region.

I have seen the great change in our Nation from a largely agricultural society to the greatest industrial society the world has ever known. I have seen our advance in agricultural productivity, largely as a result of the work of our land-grant universities and their agricultural extension services.

A century ago, the food produced by one farmworker would feed fewer than five persons. Today, 1 American farmworker produces enough food for more than 27 persons.

I cannot imagine Virginia's progress, or North Carolina's progress, or the rise of these United States to the great nation we are today, without the enormous contributions of our land-grant colleges and universities over the past century.

I think of this whenever I hear Federal aid to education denounced as a menace to our American system. I think of how much we owe to the Morrill Land-Grant Act which led to the establishment of these vital institutions all across our country.

Our primary educational obligation is, of course, a local obligation. It rests on the people of every American community in proportion to the resources of the community. It also rests on the States according to their resources.

But the logic of the Morrill Act is as valid today as it was 100 years ago. The Federal

Government has a proper interest in education, and it has an obligation to make national resources available to assure the broadest possible geographic distribution of quality educational opportunities for the American people.

It has that obligation even more urgently today, because quality education has never been more important or more costly to provide, from the kindergarten to the graduate programs that must produce our research scientists and engineers and our future leaders in every field.

We were the first nation to realize that our greatest resource lay in the minds of our people. We developed the world's most broadly based educational system to develop that great resource.

And we see the material and social benefits of this great investment all around us.

But we have only begun to put the emphasis on excellence that is required in this increasingly complex technological age.

Millions of inadequately educated Americans are finding that there is no place for them in our economy. Their jobs are disappearing as machines do more and more of the work that requires only muscle power and routine thinking. And many of them find that they lack the basic educational qualifications for rapid retraining for more skilled work.

And manual and unskilled workers are not the only ones who are being affected by technological change. Thousands of our older engineers are finding that they are ill equipped for modern engineering work. Their training in engineering fundamentals was not broad enough or deep enough, or they have failed to keep up with the technological advances of the last 10, 20, or 30 years.

We face a massive job of education, retraining, and upgrading throughout our labor force. And we face the equally important challenge of educating all of our young people so that they will be able to meet today's higher standards and be able to continue their development to meet even higher standards tomorrow.

Our need for better quality education at all levels is a matter of great national importance. But our need for better educational opportunities at the upper levels, especially in engineering, science, and mathematics, is becoming critical.

There are two very important aspects of this problem. On the one hand, the Soviet Union is educating scientists and engineers at a much faster rate than we are. More than half of their college students are enrolled in these areas, and they are turning out more than three times as many engineers each year as we are.

On the other hand, our domestic demand for scientists and engineers for our defense and space programs is taking up the bulk of our new talent, especially in the area of research and development. Our civilian economy is in danger of being starved for new talent to develop the new technology which is necessary to undergird both our military and nonmilitary efforts.

This year we expect to have about 30,000 new scientists and engineers available for research and development work. Our space programs alone will require 25,000 of these additional research specialists. Only a few thousand will be available to expand research and development work in all of our civilian industry. This is not enough.

More civilian research and development is absolutely essential if American industry is to increase its productivity, and provide better incomes—wages and profits—for the American people; if American industry is to provide an adequate technological base for our defense and space efforts, as well as for our civilian economy; if industry is to develop the new and improved products we must have for expanded domestic consumption and for increased sales abroad; and if we are to be able to compete in world markets in the future, both in terms of price and in the quality of American export goods.

For the time being, we are still well ahead of the Soviet Union in total number of scientists and engineers, and in the quality of our scientific and technical personnel. Keep in mind the astounding fact that 90 percent of all the scientists ever trained are still living. So our problem is in the future. If the Soviets continue to educate scientists in vast numbers, they eventually will have as many or more good scientists and engineers than we have.

Our emphasis must be, however, not only on numbers, but even more on expanding our supply of top quality scientists and engineers with advanced degrees.

We also face keen competition from other western industrial nations in this field of professional scientists and engineers.

Unlike the United States and the Soviet powers today, the countries of Western Europe and Japan are not required to devote the bulk of their scientific and technical manpower to defense and space exploration. They are putting their best talent into developing new industrial processes and new consumer products which strengthen their domestic economies and improve their ability to compete in world markets.

Of the nearly $17 billion a year we in the United States are spending on research and development, only about $4 billion is spent by American industry for nonmilitary, nonspace work. And of that $4 billion, only about $1.5 billion is aimed at increasing the productivity of our economy.

The countries of Western Europe are spending twice as large a proportion of their gross national product for civilian research and development. West Germany has more than twice as many scientists and engineers, per 1,000 workers in their labor force, working on new consumer products and new industrial processes, as do we in the United States.

Japan, which many people still think of as an imitator and copier of western scientific and technical developments, actually has as high a ratio of scientists and engineers working on its civilian technology as we have. And their textile industry, their civilian electronics industry, and other industries have been showing the results of this high quality work by Japanese scientists and engineers.

The Japanese have learned how to get twice as much production from some of their textile machines as we do. They have introduced the first transistorized television sets in our own market. They have developed automated ships which carry far more cargo with smaller crews than American ships.

American industry must be much more alive to the need for more research and development work in the civilian sector of our economy. There must be a wider diffusion of this work throughout industry, and there must be greater industry support for the training of people capable of doing this work.

Some 80 percent of all our industry sponsored research is done by 300 companies, and 73 percent in only 5 industries.

Two of these industries, aerospace and electronics, account for 25 percent of the industry sponsored research, but their products account for only 3½ percent of the total production of goods and services in this country.

Such large industries as building and construction, textiles and apparel, and food processing, on the other hand, account for 10 percent of our gross national product, but perform less than 4 percent of our privately supported research and development.

Such industries as building and textiles are composed largely of relatively small companies that lack the resources for significant research programs. They lack not only the scientists and engineers to do original research, but often they do not have the technical personnel to understand and adapt for their own plants the research and development work that is done in our universities.

To help meet the needs of such industries, the Department of Commerce has proposed a new program of contracts and grants to institutions organized for research, education, or the dissemination of technical information. These institutions can be industry research organizations or universities or other broadly based organizations.

The purpose of this program is to attack technical problems common to an entire industry, and to make the results of this research readily available to all of the companies in the particular industry.

We also are proposing a nationwide university and industry extension service, similar to the agricultural extension service which has stimulated such a miracle of productivity in our farm economy.

In looking at one of your bulletins on VPI, I was struck by the fact that five paragraphs were devoted to your agricultural experiment stations and their extension work, while only one paragraph noted your engineering experiment station and its extension services.

I hope this does not reflect the actual emphasis here, but by and large, throughout the country including my own State of North Carolina, we have failed to realize that our industrial economy is now vastly larger than our farm economy, indeed, we now have almost as many business enterprises in this country as we have individual farms.

In recent years, agricultural productivity has increased much more rapidly than the productivity of the industrial sector of our economy. And both of these far exceed productivity increases in the service sector which now employs more than half of our total labor force.

We must give much more attention to the lagging sectors of our economy if we expect to make the productivity gains that are necessary for a steadily rising standard of living for the American people.

We should begin by giving much greater attention to the vital industrial sector which affects the efficiency of our whole economy and especially our ability to compete in the sale of our manufactured goods in other countries.

The Commerce Department's proposed pilot program for more effective industrial extension services is a major step in this direction. Its future growth will depend largely upon the willingness of industry, our universities, and our State and local governments, to join in financing this effort to improve our civilian industrial technology.

This program will help us meet our national need for more scientists and engineers, especially in the civilian sector of our economy. It will help by promoting better use of existing technology while we expand our scientific and technical manpower. And it will help train additional manpower, especially the people we need who understand industrial research and development problems, by providing additional research programs in association with our universities. And this program offers VPI additional challenges and opportunities which I am sure it will accept.

The President's program for improving our educational system also includes vitally important provisions for increasing the number of potential researchers who go on to obtain advanced degrees in science and engineering.

We have a serious shortage of top quality people in all fields, but perhaps none is more serious than the shortage of engineers with doctor's degrees.

These are the engineers whose research capabilities are indispensable for the translation of our scientific discoveries into practical industrial technology. Their research and design capabilities are our best guarantee that American technology will be the envy of the world in the future as it has been in the past.

Our leadership in the world today does not depend upon our vast natural resources or upon the size of our population. We are the leader of the world because we are the leader in technology. We have the greatest resources of trained brainpower and we have done the best job of applying that brainpower to the work at hand.

But we can maintain our leadership in a world in which billions of people are discovering the possibilities of education only if we drive for quality and more quality in our educational efforts.

We are entering an age in which excellence will count as it never has before, because this excellence must be broadly shared, without in any way impairing the full development of our most outstanding individuals.

We must not fail to develop this excellence in every part of our country and every part of our population. This is a matter of national importance, but it is also important to the people of every State and every region of our country.

In recent years there has been a growing concentration of our scientific and technological resources in a few areas of the country, primarily in California around the California Institute of Technology and in Massachusetts around MIT.

Our military spending for research and development has promoted this concentration of scientific and engineering manpower and facilities—in the aircraft and missile companies of the Pacific coast States and in the electronics companies of the New England States.

But it was the scientific resources of such institutions as Cal Tech and MIT which attracted many of these companies and stimulated their growth in the forefront of scientific and technological development.

The universities that had the top scientists and engineers, the universities which were training scientists and engineers for the advanced degrees necessary for research and development, attracted the research contracts and the companies engaged in research and development work.

These companies, in turn, have won the big defense production contracts, and have devoted part of their expanding resources to improving the scientific capabilities of the universities in their areas. One feeds on the other.

This has not been an unmixed blessing for these areas, because military research and development is not automatically translatable into the civilian technology that is necessary for the healthy growth of consumer industries. And consumer industries are more stable in their production and employment than defense industries.

But the important lesson is clear: The industrial development of any area in this highly technical age is going to depend directly upon the scientific and technological capabilities of the universities and colleges of that area.

The development of this area is going to depend in large measure on this institution, on the quality of its instruction, on the adequacy of its facilities, and on the appropriateness of its programs to the needs of its State, its region, and the Nation.

Today, 20 universities graduate two-thirds of all our people with doctor's degrees. And these 20 universities are located in only 12 States.

The remaining 38 States, with half of the Nation's population, produce only one-quarter of our people with the most advanced degrees.

It is estimated that we need to develop at least 50 additional top quality graduate education centers throughout the Nation to meet our needs for highly trained personnel in all fields.

VPI should be one of those centers.

Your aim should be to develop an educational center second to none in the Nation. You should be able to give your students the opportunity for the fullest development of their capabilities. You should be able to give your State and your region, its industry and its agriculture, the best university facilities that this technological age may require.

This is the challenge the future imposes upon you, Dr. Hahn, upon your faculty, and upon the members of this great student body. You should be satisfied with nothing less than the best, and you should be constantly aware that the best today will not be good enough for tomorrow.

To the students here today, let me say that your challenges will be matched only by your opportunities for self-realization and for service to your fellow men in this new age of rapid technological and social change.

Make the most of your opportunities while you are here. Learn to work hard and effectively. Arm yourself with understanding as well as knowledge, with character as well as competence, and above all, with a lasting devotion to excellence in all that you do.

It will serve you well, and you will serve well in the future.

Thank you, and my very best wishes to you all.

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising: A Commemoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Hitler's invasion of Poland was the signal for a Second World War, it was the signal for treachery and deceit, it was the beginning of the collapse of the Balkan countries before Hitler's might; it was also the beginning of something far more. It was the beginning of the mass extermination of an entire race of people, for the Jews of Poland were to be erased by methods even now almost impossible to comprehend.

When the victorious Germans first marched into Warsaw in the fall of 1939, the wheels were already beginning to turn in the plan to take care of the Jewish problem, although very few realized what was in store. First there were the restrictions: Jews were forbidden to work for the government, to work in key industries, to bake bread, to earn more than a certain amount of money, to buy or sell from any outsider, to use public transportation, to possess gold or jewelry, and each had to wear a distinctive armband. How could any man be asked to do these things? If such were to happen to us we would fight back. But no, we have our homes, children, our past lives and all that we own and hold dear to think of. Maybe we must accept, because is it not more important to survive?

Next came the ghetto. All Jews had to move to a certain part of town, to be walled in so as not to contaminate others with their Jewishness. They could only leave their walled area by pass, to work in the factories supporting the German war effort. Surely now is the time to stop permitting ourselves to be so pushed around, but wait—we are still together, we are still a family, and we can move all of our possessions to the new area. Living may be more crowded, freedom even more restricted, but we are still alive.

Some found a chance to escape the ugly city life by going off on a work gang, into the countryside. The Germans needed men to help in the war plants. At least that is what they said when, first by asking for volunteers, then by force, they took whole families into their "work camps." They would suddenly arrive at a given section in the ghetto, call all inhabitants out of the buildings, and, if necessary, drag them off to the distribution center for shipment to the countryside. Families were broken up, children torn from mothers' arms, all property left behind was taken by the state to cover the Jewish debt. Yet still, in the ghetto, organized resistance to what was happening could not be started. Still the people clung to what they had left, hoping that quotas for the work gangs would soon be filled, that they would be left alone, even if isolated from the rest of the city. After all, there was a shortage of factory workers within the city, so those who were working for the Germans or their Polish supporters felt safe in their position.

Then rumors began to circulate. Those families that were sent off to the work camps in the countryside—nothing was ever heard from them again. Spies were sent out to follow the trains of misery, to learn what was happening, to confirm or deny some stories that were so incredible few dared repeat them. The spies went out, they saw, they returned. The work camps, they were death camps. The potential workers—their only work was to strip off their clothes and be marched into the huge communal showers, to be washed with poison gas, to be slaughtered by the tens of thousands, to have their bones cremated, to literally disappear without a trace. This was Hitler's answer to the Jewish problem.

Back in the Ghetto of Warsaw the stories began to circulate with more authority. As the awful truth dawned some were stunned into apathy, but others, many others, in the agony of their reality, broke down the resistance to concerted action—if death was all that awaited them, then they would not meet it voluntarily, they would fight.

The Nazi occupation authorities, and their henchmen, finally decided in reply to the insistent demands of Himmler and Eichmann in Berlin to get on with the job, that the remaining Jews in the ghetto were to be marched out to the distribution centers, to be prepared for shipment to the countryside, to annihilation. Word of this intent was received in the ghetto. Time had come to resist.

It was Passover. It was the time when Jews the world over remember the lot of their people in Egypt under the Pharaohs, when God sent down his plagues upon the Egyptians, when all the first born of the country suffered death, only the Jews remaining untouched. It was the time of year when one remembered Moses leading his people as the Red Sea parted, and they beheld before them freedom in the land of their ancestors. But this was the evening of April 18, 1943, the Jewish ghetto quarter of Warsaw. There was no Moses to lead these people to freedom, only their dedication and courage could give them honor. There was hope at least for a brief quiet time to celebrate the occasion with prayer and the breaking of unleavened bread. Not even this small hope was answered. The word spread quickly, the Germans were coming, they were marching to the walls. It was time to prepare a greeting for them.

And what a greeting it was. Hand grenades, gunfire, liquid fire, fists, and stones. The SS men were taken unawares, they fell back, leaving many dead in their wake. It was long in coming and they had suffered through unspeakable indignities, but the time had arrived—the people of the Ghetto were in revolt.

Nazi armies returned, and were driven back again. Ammunition of the ghetto fighters was running low, they were driven underground into bunkers, or hideouts in attics of buildings, yet the fight went on. During the day they hid out in cramped quarters without water and with little food. At night the streets were theirs, and they used the time to strengthen their positions.

Then disaster struck. The Germans set fire to the entire area, burning the fighters from their attic cover; all supplies were cut off, there was no water, no food, the women and children had to remain underground all the time. Some, men and women, with spirits broken, marched out to the Germans to surrender, the others held out. They held out against constant attack from the ground and air, against hunger and thirst, against fear of death yet fear of not dying before the Nazis got hold of them. On May 8 the Germans launched a concentrated attack on the central bunker containing the headquarters operation. All 200 defenders, including the core of the leadership, were killed or committed suicide to avoid capture. Still, some held out to the end of May, a small group of heroic men and women. They held out even longer than did Poland herself against the German invaders. Finally, after almost the entire ghetto area had been flattened, with only 8 buildings still standing, resistance was broken. Of the 40,000 Jews in the ghetto at the beginning of the fighting only a few hundred were left to filter out, some through the gas-filled sewers, to continue fighting in the forests.

The revolution had been broken, but the spirit and heroism of the participants, the faith which made them withstand such torture, these are not forgotten. The State of Israel today, and the fact of its existence, stands as a living and dynamic monument to the heroic Jews of the Warsaw ghetto, who laid down their lives for life—for future life in freedom from persecution of their people.

On this 20th anniversary of the heroic uprising of the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto against their Nazi persecutors, let us remember with awe their heroism, let us not forget what they were fighting against, let us honor with our prayers the memory of their deeds, and in doing this, rededicate ourselves to the preservation of all of the freedoms denied to them.

Science and Social Problems—Speech of the Honorable George P. Miller of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that we are experiencing a period of exciting technological change. Through the advances of modern science, we live in a world which has greater wealth and greater potential than ever before.

But does this increased wealth, does this increased knowledge, and do these new horizons mean that we have achieved material security? Are they true indicators of our national strength?

This is the critical problem to which our distinguished colleague, the esteemed chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics addressed himself recently at the Dunsmuir House Conference on Space Science and Urban Life in Oakland, Calif. And, it is a problem, Mr. Speaker, with which we must all be concerned.

As the gentleman from California, Congressman Miller, so incisively pointed out in his talk:

> I think one of the most pressing needs of America is the application of its scientific research and development resources to the solution of the human problems that weigh the human balance scale opposite ourselves, that contain within them the possible threat of our destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to participate in this Dunsmuir House Conference with the gentleman from California, Congressman Miller, and I believe that after reading his remarks, our colleagues will join me in congratulating him on his timely and thoughtful address.

The speech follows:

Remarks of the Honorable George P. Miller of California, Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Before the Space Science and Urban Life Conference, Dunsmuir House, Oakland, Calif., March 28, 1963

I am honored indeed to be here with you today and to be in the company of such distinguished gentlemen as Dr. Newell, Mr. Wyatt and Mr. Lingle, three of NASA's outstanding officials.

I must admit that at first blanch, I was somewhat appalled by the possible ramifications of the subject I am to discuss this morning. It is hard to think of any areas of national interest and needs where scientific research and development do not somewhere play an integral part except in Congress.

Incidentally, I have often wished that the uncertainties, the unknowns of politics and of legislative government could be explored and solved by research tools that are as precise as those scientists have to work with. What a boon it would be if tariff and tax problems could be solved neatly and conclusively by mathematical formula.

How wonderful it would be if the conflicting interests of Maryland and Virginia in the equitable distribution of shell fish in the Chesapeake Bay could be resolved by computers. I assure you that if such things were possible, the serenity of my daily life in Congress would be greatly enhanced.

It would be entirely pretentious for me to identify and describe in specific detail research problems that are of vital importance to our country. But I think it is certainly quite possible to identify, in terms of human needs, some pressing problems that deserve much more attention from the scientific community than they are presently receiving.

I hope you will agree that the eventual satisfaction of human needs, both philosophical and material, is the only ultimate end of all science, research, and technology. I include technology here solely to emphasize the fact that it is through technology that scientific knowledge most often can be translated into goods or power.

Now, I want to concentrate for a moment on the word "need." No doubt there are as many different interpretations of that word as there are points of view. Every facet of our society that depends more or less upon science and engineering for its continued existence contributes to the overall demand for new research products.

Hence, the research needs of this country can be best understood or analyzed in terms of the effect, the stimulus to respond thereby injected into our scientific community.

The National Academy of Sciences has estimated recently that a total of $17.8 billion was spent by the Federal Government and private industry for research and development during 1962. It is quite apparent to me that regardless of whether or not private or public money was spent, the expenditure of $17.8 billion was hardly done at random.

It is obvious that funding of such scope had to be directed toward acquiring specific knowledge to satisfying specific needs, or for exploration to determine what our research products will be in the foreseeable future.

No one will question that this era, these unprecedented times of truly global conflicts and convulsive expressions of surging nationalism will be known as the age of science and technology. This will be the label of the historian who has neatly divided the past into tidy divisions.

But we are not blessed with a historical view of the present; our full course has not yet been run. We can only look at the wealth we hold in our hands, the riches that surround us and then decide whether or not science and technology has up to now fulfilled all our needs.

We are housed better, fed better with more variety, clothed better, and entertained more than any other people in the history of mankind.

We have unprecedented means of communications. We have at our command industrial power and energy that exceeds any other nation on earth.

Our society has been made far more antiseptic through medical research than any other, and hence prolonged our productive lives. We have through applied research, achieved greater leisure than has ever been known before by so many.

Has science and technology satisfied our needs? If you limit them to food, clothing, shelter and security, then of course, far beyond any expectation.

I am tempted to say that science, engineering, technology actually is and has been preoccupied as much with our desires as with our needs.

I admit to a certain uneasiness, however, to a sense of unsureness, when I contemplate all that we have. Have we really achieved material security? Are all our symbols of wealth and well-being true indicators of our national strength?

Will our future vigor, security, and advancement as a people be assured by the use we are now making of our science and technology? Or have we built for ourselves through research and its applications a lotus land where we have become so preoccupied with enhancing our own material well-being, our national ego, that the human ills of the rest of the world tend to become remote and unreal?

The people of this world have always been generally divided between the "haves" and the "have nots." All conflicts between peoples are directly or indirectly rooted in this division. It lies at the original foundation of the causes for the ideological clash of today, of State control versus private enterprise, communism versus free society.

In all ages, including our own, the "have nots" have far outnumbered the "haves." The advancement of technology of other eras, as primitive as it may seem now, made possible the isolated development of culture and civilization out of a sea of barbarism.

It seems tragically paradoxical that the results of that very same technological advancement seems often to have led to gross national self-indulgence, to have insulated eventually a relatively few people from the harsh and unequivocal facts of life and death that confronted daily the rest of mankind.

And it has been the hungry, the homeless, and the harried who have been the witnesses, often the agents of the downfall and the destruction of empires.

Thus, the fact today of more than a billion illiterate people must have some meaning for us. The fact that more than half the peoples of the world exist on diets significantly below minimum standards for good health must have some import to our future.

The fact that insurance statistics assign to us an average longevity of 65 or more as opposed to less than 30 for substantial portions of the world population cannot be dismissed as none of our concern.

We dare not ignore historical precedent, not if we look beyond the period immediately ahead of us to the next 25 years or beyond.

Just consider the nature of the world we live in today. One part is divided into two hostile armed camps, the other composed of impotent but watchful bystanders who expect to become eventually the beneficiaries of the East-West conflict, no matter the outcome.

The Soviet Union and Communist China, both of which came into being out of the desperation of millions of hopeless, destitute people, are on the march. There is no doubt about the singlemindedness of their objective to acquire in any way expedient as much as possible of the world's goods and power.

Their assault upon the West will continue to receive a major impetus from the clamor of their people for a better life. And there are many, many sympathetic ears elsewhere in the world who are not unmoved or indifferent to what they hear.

The point is this; I think one of the most pressing needs of America is the application of its scientific research and development resources to the solution of the human problems that weigh the human balance scale opposite ourselves, that contain within them the possible threat of our destruction.

As you no doubt know, the United States has for many years poured out tremendous resources to build and strengthen the economies of nations all over the world in order to eliminate breeding grounds of communism and to create political stability. Since 1946, we have sent abroad more than $100 billion in the form of all types of assistance. This is in addition to the beneficial impact of expenditures for such joint efforts as UNESCO, NATO, SEATO and our own military establishments.

Our dollars and resources have been the major factor in the rebuilding of Europe and Japan. We have helped nation after nation, new and old, in every part of the world to survive the economic, political and natural disasters that have occurred since 1945 with food, technical assistance, and credit.

American people have, and are right now, risking their lives and sometimes losing them in Asia in order to prevent chaos, and alleviate human misery. We have many such people as Dr. Tom Dooley working unsung and unknown to bring hope and relief to millions of people in Asia, Africa and South America.

Surely, we have sent out technical advisers of all kinds to teach people how to cope with their own unique problems of food, clothing, shelter and health. We have operating now the Peace Corps, a bright but relatively small effort, that has achieved from all reports promising results.

But as great and as noble as these efforts are, and as vitally important as they are in countering the subversion of the Communist bloc, they are primarily corrective, not preventive measures. We have sent out our foods, machines, and some talents. But have we really sent them the knowledge to attack the basic causes for their misery?

Suppose, for instance, we mounted a major effort to find a means by which malaria could be as effectively eliminated from Asia and South America and Africa as we have eliminated smallpox or typhoid fever from America. Think of the human resources, the economic force that would be released for effective and constructive work in those politically unstable areas.

Suppose that we mobilized our scientific resources to produce insecticides to wipe out permanently the locust plagues that annually threaten millions of people with famine. Would that not make them less susceptible to the blandishments of communism?

Suppose we effectively attacked the problem of illiteracy by the adaption through research of communication technologies in which we already lead the world. Would not the effectiveness of our program to broadcast the messages of freedom, the dignity of man, government by law, not men eventually be magnified many times over?

You might say, "We are doing these things now." Yes, we are. But in what fashion? Relatively in dribs and drabs. We have not as yet on a national basis decided, not only for political reasons, not only for economic reasons, but for practical, pressing human reasons to mobilize our research to attack these ills.

It is entirely consistent with the history of our country that the scientific community should be assigned such a critical and vital role. And I firmly believe that the Biblical promise of the hundredfold return for bread cast upon the waters applies equally to nations as well as individuals.

It has long been acknowledged that our technological leadership of the free world is based on an unmatched ability to translate into practical terms the results of research. There is no doubt that this is our special forte. It has been a unique force in the hands of our people. It has been the imprimatur of progress and dynamic energy. It has supplied a momentum to our society that has carried this Nation through vicissitudes that have perverted or destroyed nations of our times and the past.

Our problem, then is to maintain that momentum, to preserve that strength of that unique force, through those who will come after us. It is our task to make sure that our scientific research will continue to serve the needs of the world.

This Nation is faced with the never-ending problem of developing scientific and technical people of greater and greater competence, to meet the challenges such as those I have just outlined.

It is true, as you well know, that the current programs we have undertaken, best illustrated by our space program, are demanding numbers of well-trained scientists and engineers that threaten to strain our resources of competent people.

Our urgent need for well-trained scientists, technicians, and engineers has already been reflected in educational institutions throughout the country from the primary grades through the graduate degree level. Great progress has been made by educators to establish rigorous and demanding curricula in our universities and secondary schools. We have clearly understood the threat of the Soviet Union to achieve parity, both economic and military, by increasing manyfold the numbers of scientists, engineers, and technicians available to the Soviet economy. It is a well-known fact that following World War II, the Soviet educational effort received such concentrated emphasis that today, Russia is producing two to three times as many scientists and technicians as we are. And there is no question that the Soviet Union fully intends to accelerate further its educational programs.

But what kind of scientists or engineers are the Russian institutions producing? Do these people match our image, our conception of what professionally trained people should be: Well developed professionally, intellectually, and culturally?

I think you will agree that we see in the average Soviet product of today a very well-trained individual who has been neglected in the development of those human qualities that would permit him the intellectual freedom to seek out and recognize absolute truth. And it is truth, and the ability to relate that truth to human progress that is the credo of science.

We, in buttressing our defenses against the onslaught of Soviet technology must not go the same route as have the Russians. We must not through our competitive instincts, and because of the urgencies of our days, limit or ignore the need for the philosophical development of our students.

President Barnaby C. Keeney of Brown University expressed his thoughts quite eloquently on this. He said:

"There is no question but that advancements in science and technology have a greater immediate utility in the international and national situation in which we exist today. On the other hand, the whole shape of our lives in the future, and our whole attitude toward life will be strongly formed by our achievements or lack thereof in the arts and humanities."

Former Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin concurs with President Keeney by saying:

"The need for superior attainment in the sciences to guarantee our national security in the face of grave international crises has long been recognized by most Americans.

There is an equal need for superior attainment on a very broad scale in the arts and humanities if Americans generally are to gain a full understanding of their rich cultural heritage and a genuine commitment to their ideals of individual freedom and human dignity. Only with such understanding and such commitment on the part of all of its citizens will this Nation have the resources in personal and public creativeness and courage to meet successfully the continuing international struggle between freedom and tyranny."

We must continue to produce people who have been well-grounded, who have been trained how to think, how to use their minds, and how to apply their talents.

Here we are free from Government limitations of career choices and our graduates from higher institutions find their own niche in our economy. Here individual talents whether in the sciences, humanities or the arts, have the equal opportunity to become fully developed and refined.

Their usefulness has been limited only to the extent to which our economy can utilize them. Thus it is extremely heartening to me to realize that in our national community, characterized by dignified freedom of choice, we have achieved the highest levels of scientific and technological accomplishment in history. And it has been our educational institutions that have made a major contribution to that achievement.

I believe we must continue to foster and encourage in every way possible the breadth and depth we try to maintain in our approach to education. We need and must continue to produce greater numbers of people of higher scholastic achievement. And they must come from all the disciplines, not just from science and engineering.

Scientific research is neither good nor evil by itself. It is the use that men make of it that dictates the nature of its effect. And it is seldom the scientist who decides what use will be made of his handiwork.

This is in the hands of others who will dictate whether scientific achievement is to be a blessing or a curse. It is the systems under which people work and live that will enable or pervert technology.

The use men make of science is not governed by science. It is governed by men's philosophical and moral judgments. It is repugnant for me to contemplate a society in which scientists are cultural paupers. I am repelled by the thought of responsible men not thoroughly aware of the power science gives them. The thought of a system in which science and technology has been glorified to the point where it becomes the end objective rather than the means to a greater and nobler end, the advancement of human progress, is an anathema to me.

The basic integrity of our scientific community is an indespensable characteristic of this Nation. It is here that the scientific leaders of our generation have been able to find the intellectual climate in which to do their best work. Need I cite Einstein, Fermi, Seaborg, Von Karman, Lawrence and Teller, to name only a very few?

Thus, I say our research needs are centered by circumstance, by logic, and by historical precedent in the elimination of those human ills that infect more than half the world's population. In all practicality and in all conscience, we cannot ignore that task if we are not to violate the moral basis upon which this Nation was founded. And we owe to our children, to the generations to come the opportunity to assume responsibility, such as that we now shoulder, by which future challenges to the rights of man can be courageously and willingly accepted.

Scientific progress in the United States, whether in Government or in industry, will be the direct reflection of the men and women who will lead or support it. It will be you and I, however, who will be responsible in great measure whether our memory will be blessed or damned.